

FILED

MAR 10 1 21 PM '95

CAROL C. FITZGERALD

BY JRH
DEPUTY

CHARLES R. ZEH, ESQ.
JAMES SPOO, ESQ.
TREVA J. HEARNE, ATTORNEY AT LAW
ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue
Reno, Nevada 89509
702/323-4599

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor
MINERAL COUNTY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

Plaintiff,)

WALKER RIVER PAIUTE)

TRIBE,)

Plaintiff-Intervenor,)

vs.)

WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION)

DISTRICT, a corporation, et al.)

Defendants.)

IN EQUITY NO. C-125-C-ECR

AMENDED MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT OF MINERAL
COUNTY'S AMENDED
COMPLAINT IN
INTERVENTION

///

///

///

///

///

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT	3
A. MINERAL COUNTY MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERVENTION AS OF RIGHT UNDER RULE 24(a)(2), F.R.C.P.	3
1. Mineral County Has Not Delayed in Moving to Intervene in the Pertinent Federal Case Affecting the Adjudication of the Waters of the Walker River, Case C-125.	3
B. MINERAL COUNTY HAS A SIGNIFICANT PROTECTABLE INTEREST IN THE PRESERVATION OF WALKER	7
1. Mineral County Has Water Rights in the Surplus Flows of the Walker River That Directly Feed the Waters of Walker Lake and, Moreover, Mineral County Asserts the Right to Minimum Sustainable Levels in Walker Lake on Behalf of the Public	7
2. Mineral County Has a Great Financial Stake in the Property Values of Mineral County's Taxable Private Property, Which Are Inexorably Attached to the Presence of Walker Lake and Would, Likewise, Be Devalued by Loss of the Lake	10
3. Mineral County Has a Significant Protectable Interest in the Recreation, Wildlife Habitat, Aesthetic and Other Economic Concerns That Support Mineral County Because of the Presence of Walker Lake	10

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1	C.	MINERAL COUNTY IS NOT ADEQUATELY	
2		REPRESENTED BY ANY OF THE PRESENT PARTIES	
3		TO THE LITIGATION	13
4	D.	MINERAL COUNTY HAS NO OTHER MEANS TO	
5		PROTECT ITS INTEREST IN WALKER LAKE THAN	
6		TO ENTER THIS PROCEEDING AND PRAY THAT	
7		THIS COURT REALLOCATE THE WATERS OF THE	
8		WALKER	14
9	E.	IN THE EVENT THAT THIS COURT DOES NOT	
10		ALLOW MINERAL COUNTY INTERVENTION AS OF	
11		RIGHT, IN THE ALTERNATIVE MINERAL COUNTY	
12		ASKS FOR PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION PURSUANT	
13		TO F.R.C.P. 24(b)(2)	15
14	1.	Mineral County Meets Each and Every	
15		Element of Permissive Intervention Pursuant	
16		to F.R.C.P.	15
17	2.	The Intervention of Mineral County at this	
18		Stage of These Proceedings Will Not Unduly	
19		Delay the Litigation And, Moreover, Will	
20		Significantly Contribute to the Underlying	
21		Factual and Legal Issues	16
22	III.	CONCLUSION	17
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE

<u>Arizona v. California,</u>	
460 U.S. 605, 615, 103 S.Ct. 1382, 1389 (1983)	12
<u>Conservation Law Foundation v. Mosbacher,</u>	
966 F.2d 39 (1st Cir. 1992).	12, 13
<u>County of Orange v. Air California,</u>	
799 F2d 535 (9th Cir. 1986), cert. denied,	
480 U.S. 946, 107 S.Ct. 1605, 94 L.Ed2d 791 (1987)	5
<u>Environmental Defense Fund v. Higginson,</u>	
631 F.2d 738 (D.C. Cir. 1979)	14
<u>Levin v. Ruby Trading Corporation,</u>	
333 F.2d 592 (2d Cir. 1964)	17
<u>Mille Lacs Band of Indians v. State of Minn.,</u>	
989 F.2d 994 (8th Cir. 1993).	6
<u>NAACP v. New York,</u>	
413 U.S. 345, 365-66, 93 S.Ct. 2591, 2602-03, 37 L.Ed.2d 648(1973)	4
<u>National Audubon Society v. Superior Court,</u>	
33 Cal.3d 419, 189 Cal.Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709 (Cal. 1983)	9
<u>Natural Resources Defense Council v. Tennessee Valley Authority,</u>	
340 F.Supp. 400 (S.D.N.Y.1971)	17
<u>Nebraska v. Wyoming</u>	
13 S.Ct. 1689 (1993)	12
<u>Nuesse v. Camp</u>	
1385 F.2d 694 (D.C. Dist. 1967)	16
<u>Permit No. 36-7200 In the Name of the Idaho Department of Parks & Recreation,</u>	
828 P.2d 848 (Id. 1992).	7
<u>Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt,</u>	
713 F.2d 525 (9th Cir. 1983)	11

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1	<u>Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v. U.S.,</u>	
2	921 F.2d 924, 928 (9th Cir.1990)	10
3	<u>Sierra Club v. Robertson,</u>	
4	960 F.2d 83, 86 (8th Cir. 1992)	13
5	<u>Sierra Club v. U.S. E.P.A.,</u>	
6	995 F.2d 1478 (9th Cir. 1993)	4, 5
7	<u>State of Utah v. Kennecott Corp.,</u>	
8	801 F.Supp. 553, 572 (D.Utah 1992)	17
9	<u>State v. Morros,</u>	
10	766 P.2d 263, 265 (Nev. 1988).	7
11	<u>U.S. ex rel. McGough v. Covington Technologies,</u>	
12	967 F.2d 1391 (9th Cir. 1992).	6
13	<u>United Sates v. American Telephone and Telegraph Co.,</u>	
14	642 F.2d 1285, 1295 (D.C. Cir.1980)	4
15	<u>United States v. Alpine Land and Reservoir Co.,</u>	
16	697 F.2d 851 (9th Cir. 1983)	8, 9, 15
17	<u>United States v. Oregon,</u>	
18	745 F.2d 550 (9th Cir.1984)	5
19	<u>United States v. Truckee-Carson Irrigation District,</u>	
20	649 F.2d 1286, 1308 (9th Cir. 1981)	15
21	<u>United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist.,</u>	
22	104 F.2d 334 (9th Cir. 1939)	14
23	<u>Williams and Humbert Limited v. W.&H. Trade Marks (Jersey) Ltd.,</u>	
24	840 F.2d 72 (D.C. Cir. 1988)	4
25	N.R.S. Section 533.030(c)	7
26	N.R.S., Section 244.150	10
27	F.R.C.P. Rule 24,	3, 4, 5, 18
28		

1	F.R.C.P. Rule 24(a)(2)	3
2	F.R.C.P. Rule 24(b)(2)	15
3		
4	Johnson, "Reallocation" Volume 2, Chapter 16, <u>Water and Water Rights</u>	9
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

I.

INTRODUCTION

Since the dawn of the ice age, Walker Lake, an arm of the Pleistocene Lake Lahontan, has graced the desert landscape of Mineral County. Throughout pre-recorded human history and into the twentieth century, Walker Lake continued to support the naturally occurring Cutthroat Trout, Lahontan suckers, and tui chub, enough so that the Indian tribes living on the banks of this lake were actually named for their consumption of the bounty of the Lake. Walker Lake is a terminal lake fed by the waters of the Walker River. This river represents 84% of the lake's source of recharge with the balance made up from rainwater and groundwater. (See, Declaration of Kelvin J. Buchanan already filed 10/25/94, hereinafter referred to as, "Buchanan Declaration".)

In 1989, there were a series of events beginning with the release of sediment-laden irrigation water from Bridgeport Reservoir. This dewatering of the Reservoir resulted in litigation by upstream interests, initiated by the State Water Resources Control Board of California (SWRCB), which initiated the total loss of the fishery at Walker Lake, quickly and certainly, without further consideration. By the actions taken to retain minimum levels at Bridgeport Reservoir, a man-made trout fishery, the SWRCB essentially decreed a death sentence to Walker Lake, a naturally created trout fishery.

Simultaneously, in conjunction with this action by the SWRCB, the Walker River Irrigation District (WRID), manager of storage and irrigation allocations along

ZEHL, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1 the River, has failed in its stewardship. WRID has failed to mitigate waste of water
2 resources along the River, failed to monitor and require returns of irrigation water to
3 the river channel, and failed to require that the diversions be technically efficient,
4 thereby, preserving the river to the extent possible with twentieth century technology.
5 This failure has reduced the available waters to flow through the Walker River to
6 Walker Lake. (See, Buchanan Declaration.) WRID has also allocated more water for
7 irrigation then contemplated at the time the decree in C-125 was adopted. (Headley,
8 Economic Study of Walker River Irrigation District.)
9

11 The State of Nevada has failed to enforce the water pollution laws and issued
12 certificates for diversions that allowed allocations to greatly exceed the waters of the
13 River actually available which deprives any natural or excess flows from reaching
14 Walker Lake. WRID, the State of Nevada, and the Walker River Paiute Tribe (the
15 "Tribe") have not contracted with the United States to install and maintain accurate
16 measuring devices along the Walker River so that lawful and proper allocations of
17 water will be made (see, Declaration of Buchanan). As a result, Walker Lake has
18 been denied flows that might have survived the treacherous path along the River to its
19 inlet.
20
21

23 Without sufficient flows through the Walker River arriving at Walker Lake, the
24 Lake has dropped so precipitously that, some scientists predict, within two years the
25 Lake will not be able to support its naturally occurring fish population (see,
26 Declaration of Buchanan). Mineral County depends on this resource for recreation,
27 wildlife habitat, and other economic and aesthetic reasons for both the citizens of
28

1 Mineral County and the users of the Lake.

2 Mineral County requests intervention into this case in order to represent
3 interests for the preservation of this irreplaceable natural resource, Walker Lake,
4 which is nearly totally dependent on adequate flows from the Walker River.
5

6
7 II.

8
9 ARGUMENT

10 A. MINERAL COUNTY MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS
11 FOR INTERVENTION AS OF RIGHT UNDER RULE
12 24(a)(2), F.R.C.P.

13 1. Mineral County Has Not Delayed in Moving
14 to Intervene in the Pertinent Federal Case
15 Affecting the Adjudication of the Waters of
16 the Walker River, Case C-125.

17 Intervention as of right under Rule 24(a)(2) Federal Rules of Civil
18 Procedure¹ requires that the applicant claim an interest, the protection of which may as
19 a practical matter be impaired or impeded if the lawsuit proceeds without him. The
20 Ninth Circuit has enunciated the test to be administered for applying these elements of
21 Rule 24, F.R.C.P.:

22 We (the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals) apply a four-part test
23 under this rule: (1) the motion must be timely; (2) the
24 applicant must claim a "significant protectable" interest

25 ¹Rule 24 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: (a) Intervention of Right. Upon timely
26 application anyone shall be permitted to intervene in an action: (2) when the applicant
27 claims an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the
28 action and the applicant is so situated that the disposition of the action may as a
practical matter impair or impede the applicant's ability to protect that interest, unless
the applicant's interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

ZEI, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1 relating to the property or transaction which is the subject
2 of the action; (3) the applicant must be so situated that the
3 disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or
4 impede its ability to protect that interest; and (4) the
5 applicant's interest must be inadequately represented by the
6 parties to the action. Sierra Club v. U.S. E.P.A., 995 F.2d
7 1478 (9th Cir. 1993) at page 1481.

8
9 Moreover, Rule 24, F.R.C.P., is to be liberally applied:

10 The rule is construed "broadly in favor of the applicants for
11 intervention." Sierra Club v. U.S. E.P.A., supra at page
12 1481.

13 Taking the elements of the Ninth Circuit's test, *seriatim*, and then
14 tempering that by the liberal construction to be given Rule 24, F.R.C.P., it is evident
15 that Mineral County satisfied the requirements of Rule 24, F.R.C.P., and should be
16 allowed to intervene as of right in this case as developed, below.

17 A decision on the appropriation of the waters of the Walker River
18 materially affects the preservation of Walker Lake. Mineral County cannot protect the
19 interests of the Lake unless it can represent those interests in the present litigation.
20

21 The Court must, in its discretion, based upon the circumstances,
22 determine if the motion to intervene is timely:
23

24 Timeliness of intervention is a matter for the sound
25 discretion of the trial court, NAACP v. New York, 413
26 U.S. 345, 365-66, 93 S.Ct. 2591, 2602-03, 37 L.Ed.2d
27 648(1973), but a court should be more reluctant to refuse
28 when intervention is sought of right, as here. United Sates
v. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 642 F.2d 1285,
1295 (D.C. Cir.1980). Williams and Humbert Limited v.

1 W.&H. Trade Marks (Jersey) Ltd., 840 F.2d 72 (D.C. Cir.
2 1988) at pp. 74-75.

3 The Ninth Circuit has also set forth the standard for assessing the
4 timeliness of a motion to intervene:

5 In determining whether a motion to intervene is timely, we
6 evaluate three factors: (1) the stage of the proceeding at
7 which an applicant seeks to intervene; (2) the prejudice to
8 other parties; and (3) the reason for and length of the delay.
9 County of Orange v. Air California, 799 F2d 535 (9th Cir.
10 1986), cert. denied, 480 U.S. 946, 107 S.Ct. 1605, 94
11 L.Ed2d 791 (1987) (citing United States v. Oregon, 745
12 F.2d 550 (9th Cir.1984).

13 Sierra Club v. U.S. E.P.A., supra at p. 1481.

14 Without a doubt, Mineral County's motion under Rule 24,
15 F.R.C.P. is timely, first and foremost, because Mineral County began the process for
16 intervention as soon as the Commissioners learned of the litigation. Mineral County
17 had no knowledge of the litigation until September 1, 1994, and has never had written
18 notice by any of the other parties of this litigation (see, Declaration of Herman F.
19 Staat already filed 10/24/94). The County has clearly acted immediately upon the
20 information, once supplied them. The County's immediate actions could not be
21 construed as dilatory or less than vigilant in protecting their rights. Rule 24,
22 F.R.C.P., demands no more of a potential intervenor in the timely pursuit of a claim.

23 Furthermore, Mineral County seeks to intervene in these
24 proceedings at a time that notice is being given to other parties that may wish to
25 intervene. By November 25, 1994, the Tribe, Plaintiff-Intervenor, will give notice to
26 all surface water diversion license holders of the Walker River, pursuant to order of
27
28

1 the Court (see, May 23, 1994, Stipulation and Order for Enlargement of Time). After
2 this Notice any certified holder may wish to intervene to protect his interest or water
3 diversion. Mineral County's intervention at this time will not be any different than
4 the other potential interventions that may join after this Court ordered notice.
5

6 Moreover, these proceedings have not progressed to an agreement
7 on the merits or substance of the case. Neither actual diversions, the request by the
8 Tribe for additional quantities, the unlawful conditions imposed upon the Walker
9 River Irrigation District ("WRID") by the SWRCB, nor the change of diversion
10 requested by WRID has been heard, nor has discovery been commenced by any of the
11 parties. The preliminary stage in the proceedings also argues in favor of intervention.
12
13 See, Mille Lacs Band of Indians v. State of Minn., 989 F.2d 994 (8th Cir. 1993).
14

15 No prejudice to other parties could possibly arise because of the
16 intervention of Mineral County. Its presence will not cause to unravel a complex
17 settlement since none has been completed and entered into by the parties. The parties
18 will remain essentially in the same position as if Mineral County had intervened
19 earlier. See, U.S. ex rel. McGough v. Covington Technologies, 967 F.2d 1391 (9th
20 Cir. 1992).
21
22

23 Each element of the three-pronged timeliness test set forth in the
24 Sierra Club case is manifestly satisfied, here. There is no plausible basis for denying
25 the motion of Mineral County to intervene because it is delinquent. Having engaged
26 counsel, approved its intervention and voted to go forward to protect the interests of
27 Walker Lake within less than 60 days from the date Mineral County learned of this
28

1 litigation, Mineral County has been diligent. For these reasons, the intervention of
2 Mineral County is timely and should be allowed by this Court.
3
4

5 B. MINERAL COUNTY HAS A SIGNIFICANT
6 PROTECTABLE INTEREST IN THE PRESERVATION
7 OF WALKER LAKE

- 8 1. Mineral County Has Water Rights in the
9 Surplus Flows of the Walker River That
10 Directly Feed the Waters of Walker Lake and,
11 Moreover, Mineral County Asserts the Right
12 to Minimum Sustainable Levels in Walker
13 Lake on Behalf of the Public.

14 Mineral County is the only party representing the preservation of
15 Walker Lake. Nevada State Law recognizes that recreational purpose is a beneficial
16 use, NRS 533.030(c). This recreational, beneficial use can be a right to flows in situ
17 without the requirement of diversion from the source. A similar fact situation arose in
18 Humboldt County, Nevada:

19 The Blue Lake application is for a water grant to waters of
20 Blue Lake in situ, in place as a natural body of water. The
21 BLM manages the land surrounding the lake and desires this
22 water right to assure maintenance of Blue Lake for public
23 recreation and fishery purposes.

24 State v. Morros, 766 P.2d 263, 265 (Nev. 1988).

25 The State of Nevada recognizes the recreational purpose and the
26 in situ appropriation. Pursuant to this recognition, the State of Nevada issued a
27 certificate for 795.2 Cfs to the Nevada Department of Fish and Game (now the
28 Department of Wildlife) on December 28, 1983, for Walker Lake. The Department

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1 of Wildlife holds the certificate in trust for the benefit of Mineral County. (See,
2 Exhibit "A" to Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed 10/24/94.) This trust
3 relationship where a state agency holds rights for the benefit of the public has been
4 recognized by other states. Permit No. 36-7200 In the Name of the Idaho Department
5 of Parks & Recreation, 828 P.2d 848 (Id. 1992).

6
7 The Court has precedent to determine such matters of a "water
8 duty for public recreation."
9

10 The court need not allow the issue to lie unresolved; if the
11 United States (in the instant case, the State of Nevada) is
12 unwilling to represent the public, anyone with standing who
13 can adequately represent the public's interest may be
14 allowed to do so. [Parenthetical added.] United States v.
15 Alpine Land & Reservoir Co., 697 F.2d 851, 860 (9th Cir.
16 1983).
17
18

19
20 The State of Nevada has failed to come forward to enforce its
21 public trust responsibilities to preserve minimum flows to the lake and failed to protect
22 the water quality of Walker Lake. Mineral County will allege that it is the only party
23 representing such responsibilities.
24

25 Mineral County will also allege that the Court should review the
26 allocation in the C-125 decree of 1936 to determine if the waters of the Walker River
27 are being put to beneficial use.
28

1 The Court must determine beneficial use from the circumstances
2 before it. United States v. Alpine Land and Reservoir Co., supra. Beneficial use is a
3 dynamic concept and should not allow waste. Circumstances in 1994 are different
4 than in 1936 when the Walker River Decree was last considered; different, in that
5 society has determined that preservation of our natural waterways are critical to
6 environmental balance and ecological survival. A summary of the conflict between in-
7 stream flow preservation and appropriative rights is found in Johnson, "Reallocation"
8 Volume 2, Chapter 16, Water and Water Rights.
9

11 A reallocation of the waters of Walker River is required to
12 preserve the public's right to the natural body of water existing in Mineral County
13 known as Walker Lake. The State holds land in its sovereign capacity in trust for the
14 public purposes of navigation and fisheries. Any conveyance of trust property to a
15 private individual, as in the case of a certificate of appropriation for waters, is subject
16 to the public trust and the State remains trustee with the duty to supervise the trust.
17
18 See, National Audubon Society v. Superior Court, 33 Cal.3d 419, 189 Cal.Rptr. 346,
19 658 P.2d 709 (Cal. 1983). Mineral County requests intervention to insure that the
20 State of Nevada performs its duties and obligations as trustee of the waters of Walker
21 Lake for the benefit of the public.
22

23
24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27
28

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

2. Mineral County Has a Great Financial Stake in the Property Values of Mineral County's Taxable Private Property, Which Are Inexorably Attached to the Presence of Walker Lake and Would, Likewise, Be Devalued by Loss of the Lake.

Mineral County has the right to tax the property of the private owners situated in and around Walker Lake since it is totally located within the political and legal boundaries of the County. N.R.S., Section 244.150. Any devaluation of the property values in Mineral County because of loss of Walker Lake will substantially reduce the budget of Mineral County which is dependent upon property tax revenues (see, Declaration of Marlene Bunch, hereinafter referred to as "Declaration of Bunch," already filed 10/25/94). "These taxing and regulatory interests are inherently ripe for protection by intervention as a practical means for a political subdivision to protect its financial and administrative affairs. Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v. U.S., 921 F.2d 924, 928 (9th Cir.1990). Mineral County will allege the substantial loss of value of property within its borders if Walker Lake ceases to be a viable fishery.

3. Mineral County Has a Significant Protectable Interest in the Recreation, Wildlife Habitat, Aesthetic and Other Economic Concerns That Support Mineral County Because of the Presence of Walker Lake.

Mineral County has participated in many federal and state actions to preserve and enhance the Lake. (See, Exhibit "B" to Memorandum of Points and

1 Authorities filed 10/25/94.) Mineral County has always been very interested and
2 active in Lake matters (see, Declaration of Buchanan). Likewise, the federal courts
3 have recognized these are significant protectable interests justifying the right to
4 intervene by other public agencies that have actively participated in the issue that will
5 be affected by the litigation. See, Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt, 713 F.2d 525
6 (9th Cir. 1983).
7

8
9 Mineral County has a more critical concern than a public
10 advocacy group as was the intervenor in Sagebrush Rebellion in protecting the
11 interests of its citizens and the users of Walker Lake. A substantial percentage of
12 Mineral County's businesses is related to Walker Lake and its available recreation
13 (see, Declaration of Louis Thompson (hereinafter referred to as "Declaration of
14 Thompson") already filed 10/25/94). Significant decreases in the revenues to these
15 businesses have been realized already because of the damage to the Lake by the loss
16 of flows into the Lake from the Walker River. (See, Declarations of Bunch and
17 Thompson.)
18

19
20 The loss of flows of the Walker River into Walker Lake has so
21 degraded the quality of the water of the Lake that fish no longer flourish and other
22 wildlife have disdained to make Walker Lake their home or transient stop in migratory
23 journeys. Besides the inability for the businesses to survive because of the loss of
24 fishing in the Lake, other tourists are lost because the pathetic condition of reduced
25 Lake levels does not entice those who came before to witness the pristine beauty of
26 the Lake and the abundance of waterfowl and other wildlife present. Tourists do not
27
28

ZEI, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

ZEI, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

come to witness the death of a Lake.

Only Mineral County is so affected by the loss of tourism and the presence of a naturally occurring desert lake with the exceptional beauty of the water itself and the incumbent wildlife populations. The loss of the familiar view of the Lake to a community that has little else in its vista cannot be measured in property terms alone, but must also be measured in aesthetic, environmental, and historical terms. Flows from Walker River are the only means by which Walker Lake can be rejuvenated and maintained. (See, Declaration of Buchanan.)

"[T]he determination of whether an interest is sufficient for Rule 24(a)(2) purposes is colored to some extent by the third factor-whether disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair or impede the applicant's ability to protect its interest." Conservation Law Foundation v. Mosbacher, 966 F.2d 39 (1st Cir. 1992).

The U.S. Supreme Court allowed the intervention (certain Indian tribes who had claims in the Corado R. adjudication) on similar grounds as Mineral County alleges herein. "Accordingly, the Indians' participation in litigation critical to their welfare should not be discouraged." Arizona v. California, 460 U.S. 605, 615, 103 S.Ct. 1382, 1389 (1983). Mineral County is not a party to the original decree nor had it suffered any injury at that point in history regarding degradation of the Lake. Mineral County will contend the original decree omitted reference to Walker Lake. Mineral County will ask this Court to interpret and modify the Decree, if necessary, in light of Mineral County's substantial injury. Mineral County does not

1 believe that the original decree gave the upstream users the right to de-water Walker
2 Lake. (See, Nebraska v. Wyoming, 113 S.Ct. 1689 (1993).
3

4 One of the allegations of the Mineral County position is that the
5 waters of Walker River are allocated beyond the capacity of the River, leaving no
6 natural flows left to enter the Lake. The instant litigation is where the issues of
7 allocation will be adjudicated. Mineral County must be allowed to intervene in order
8 to preserve and protect Walker Lake in the forum where reallocations can and will be
9 determined, the instant case.
10

11
12 C. MINERAL COUNTY IS NOT ADEQUATELY
13 REPRESENTED BY ANY OF THE PRESENT PARTIES
14 TO THE LITIGATION

15 Mineral County may very well have interests coincident with some of the
16 parties to the present litigation to contest the right of the SWRCB to entrap flows to
17 protect the man-made fishery of Bridgeport Reservoir at the cost of the natural fishery
18 in Walker Lake. But no other party to this litigation has expressed even a casual
19 reference to the protection of the levels of Walker Lake.
20

21 Whether a party may intervene turns, in part, upon a
22 comparison of the adequacy of representation primarily by
23 comparing the interests of the proposed intervenor with the
24 current parties to the action. Sierra Club v. Robertson, 960
25 F.2d 83, 86 (8th Cir. 1992). To satisfy the adequacy of
26 representation test, an intervenor . . . need only show that
27 representation may be inadequate, not that it is inadequate.
28 Conservation Law Foundation v. Mosbacher, 966 F.2d 39
(1st Cir. 1992). (Emphasis added.)

ZEI, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

The State of Nevada is required by its very position to protect all of its citizens. The interests of its citizens are not necessarily identical and may become competing. Some residents may not favor the preservation of Walker Lake, if other, more immediate, pronounced, or self-serving interests are at stake. The burden of showing inadequate representation by a political sub-entity of a State when that State is a party also, may be more than minimal; however, Mineral County can more than show why its interests differ from all of the interests that the State of Nevada must represent upstream. See, Environmental Defense Fund v. Higginson, 631 F.2d 738 (D.C. Cir. 1979). The State must protect its own decisions regarding the appropriation of the waters of the Walker River which may in large part have deprived Walker Lake of its critical recharge. Further the State of Nevada only listed its concern for protection of the Mason Valley Wildlife Preserve as any specific reason for its intervention. (See, State of Nevada Motion for Intervention, Page 3, Lines 12-15.) Walker Lake, indeed, has no protector but Mineral County.

D. MINERAL COUNTY HAS NO OTHER MEANS TO PROTECT ITS INTEREST IN WALKER LAKE THAN TO ENTER THIS PROCEEDING AND PRAY THAT THIS COURT REALLOCATE THE WATERS OF THE WALKER RIVER

The Walker River is a stream the headwaters of which rise on the eastern slopes of the Sierra Nevada mountains in California. United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist., 104 F.2d 334 (9th Cir. 1939). The River flows through lands that are arid, mostly rough or mountainous into the Walker River Paiute Reservation for a distance

ZEHL, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

of approximately thirty miles where the stream empties into Walker Lake. See, United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist., supra at p. 335. The River has been the subject of litigation culminating in the Decree of C-125 entered on April 14, 1936, which is the basis for the continuing jurisdiction of this Court and the instant litigation. In order for Mineral County to claim minimum flows and in situ rights for the Lake, Mineral County must be a party to this action. An adjudication is a quiet title action in equity for the purpose of settling all claims to the waters of the watercourse that is the subject of the adjudication. (United States v. Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, 649 F.2d 1286, 1308 (9th Cir. 1981), United States v. Alpine Land and Reservoirs Co., supra. When the matters brought before this Court are determined and the waters of the Walker River reallocated accordingly, the fate of Walker Lake will be in the balance.

E. IN THE EVENT THAT THIS COURT DOES NOT ALLOW MINERAL COUNTY INTERVENTION AS OF RIGHT, IN THE ALTERNATIVE MINERAL COUNTY ASKS FOR PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION PURSUANT TO F.R.C.P. 24(b)(2)

1. Mineral County Meets Each and Every Element of Permissive Intervention Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 24(b)(2).²

Permissive intervention is allowed a party that has a claim that involves a question of law or fact that is common to the main action. In both the

²Rule 24. Intervention (b) Permissive Intervention. Upon timely application anyone may be permitted to intervene in an action: . . . (2) when an applicant's claim or defense and the main action have a question of law or fact in common.)

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

claims presently filed, Mineral County's request for flows to Walker Lake will impact the outcome and the considerations. Because Walker Lake is located in Mineral County and comprises such an integral part of the economy and well-being of Mineral County, the County Commission considered it part of their public duty to protect and preserve the Lake as a healthy, viable recreational asset and fishery.

It is a living tenet of our society and not mere rhetoric that a public office is a public trust. While a public official may not intrude in a purely private controversy, permissive intervention is available when sought because an aspect of the public interest with which he is officially concerned is involved in the litigation. Nuesse v. Camp, 385 F.2d 694, 702 (D.C. Dist. 1967).

2. The Intervention of Mineral County at this Stage of These Proceedings Will Not Unduly Delay the Litigation And, Moreover, Will Significantly Contribute to the Underlying Factual and Legal Issues.

No party to this litigation presently can offer the intimate knowledge of the Lake that Mineral County can. Mineral County has accumulated as much information as it can find regarding the scientific studies involving the biology, geology, hydrology and history of Walker Lake. Starting when the Bureau of Land Management indicated an interest in funding the recreational aspects of the Lake, and particularly through the last years when the loss of the Lake has been imminent, Mineral County has requested assistance in analysis from United States Senator Harry Reid, the Office of Technology Assistance, the University of Nevada at Reno, the State of Nevada Division of Wildlife, the Bureau of Land Management, the United

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
 450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
 Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1 States Geologic Survey and other engineers and other governmental and non-profit
 2 agencies. See, Natural Resources Defense Council v. Tennessee Valley Authority,
 3 340 F.Supp. 400 (S.D.N.Y.1971); and Levin v. Ruby Trading Corporation, 333 F.2d
 4 592 (2d Cir. 1964). In those cases the Court gave weight to the knowledge and
 5 expertise of those seeking intervention in its granting of their motion to intervene.
 6

7 Other factors to be considered in connection with permissive
 8 intervention are: the nature and extent of the intervenor's
 9 interest, whether the intervention will unduly delay or
 10 prejudice the adjudication of the rights of the original
 11 parties, whether the applicant will benefit by the
 12 intervention, whether the intervenor's interests are
 13 adequately represented by the other parties, and whether the
 14 intervenors will significantly contribute to the full
 15 development of the underlying factual issues in the suit and
 16 to the just and equitable adjudication of the legal questions
 17 presented. State of Utah v. Kennecott Corp., 801 F.Supp.
 18 553, 572 (D.Utah 1992).

19 As discussed heretofore, granting intervention to Mineral County
 20 will in no way delay these proceedings. Granting intervention to Mineral County will
 21 add an aspect to the adjudication of the waters of Walker River that has been
 22 neglected to this point in history and is a very necessary consideration to save Walker
 23 Lake.

24 III.


25 CONCLUSION

26 As stated hereinabove, Mineral County seeks intervention as of right or, in the
 27 alternative, as permissive intervention pursuant to Rule 24, F.R.C.P. For the
 28

1 foregoing reasons, Mineral County respectfully requests that the Court grant its
2 motion for intervention.
3
4

5 DATED this 10th day of March, 1995.

6 LAW OFFICES OF
7 ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
8

9 By 
10 TREVA J. HEARNE, Attorney at Law
11 450 Marsh Avenue
12 Reno, Nevada 89509
13 702/343-4599

14 Attorney for Plaintiff
15 MINERAL COUNTY
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Law Office of ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE, and that on this date I caused to be mailed a copy of the attached **AMENDED MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MINERAL COUNTY'S AMENDED COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION**, with postage fully prepaid to:

See attached Service List

DATED this 10th day of March, 1995.


MARILYN MITCHELL

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE

450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509

Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

SERVICE LIST

1		
2	Shirley A. Smith	Western Nevada Agency
3	Asst. U.S. Attorney	Bureau of Indian Affairs
4	100 West Liberty, Suite 600	1677 Hot Springs Road
5	Reno, Nevada 89501	Carson City, NV 89706
6	Roger Bezayiff	Scott McElroy
7	Chief Deputy Water Commissioner	Greene, Meyer & McElroy
8	U.S. Board of Water Commissioners	1007 Pearl Street
9	Post Office Box 853	Boulder, CO 80302
10	Yerington, NV 89447	
11	James T. Markle	Matthew R. Campbell, Esq.
12	State Water Resources Control Board	McCutche, Doyle, Brown & Enerson
13	Post Office Box 100	Three Embarcadero Center
14	Sacramento, CA 95814	San Francisco, CA 94111
15	John Kramer	John P. Lange
16	Dept. of Water Resources	Land & Natural Resources
17	1416 Ninth Street	Federal Building, Dr. 3607
18	Sacramento, CA 95814	999 18th Street, Suite 945
19	Evan B. Beavers, Esq.	Denver, CO 80202
20	BEAVERS & YOUNG	Roger Johnson
21	1616 Highway 395	Water Resources Control Board
22	Post Office Box 486	State of California
23	Minden, NV 89423	Post Office Box 2000
24	Ross E. de Lipkau	Sacramento, CA 95810
25	Post Office Box 2790	Linda Bowman
26	Reno, NV 89505	Vargas & Bartlett
27	Garry Stone	Post Office Box 281
28	290 South Arlington	Reno, NV 89504
	Reno, NV 89510	Mary Hackenbracht
	Richard R. Greenfield	Deputy Attorney General
	Dept. of the Interior	State of California
	Two North Central Ave., Suite 500	2101 Webster Street
	Phoenix, AZ 85004	Oakland, CA 94612-3049

ZEH, SPOO & HEARNE
450 Marsh Avenue • Reno, NV 89509
Phone: (702) 323-4599 • Fax (702) 786-8183

1 Frankie Sue Del Papa
2 Attorney General, State of Nevada
3 198 S. Carson Street
4 Capitol Complex
5 Carson City, NV 89710
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Gordon H. DePaoli
Woodburn & Wedge
One E. First Street, Suite 1600
Post Office Box 2311
Reno, NV 89505