

1 Scott B. McElroy  
Jeff J. Davis  
2 Greene, Meyer & McElroy, P.C.  
1007 Pearl Street, Suite 220  
3 Boulder, CO 80302  
303/442-2021

4 Evan Beavers  
Beavers & Young  
1616 Highway 395  
5 P.O. Box 486  
Minden, Nevada 89423  
6 702/782-5110

7 *Attorneys for the WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE*

8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )

10 Plaintiff, )

11 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, )

12 Plaintiff-Intervenor, )

13 vs. )

14 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, )  
15 a corporation, et al. )

16 Defendants. )

17 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, )

18 Petitioner, )

19 STATE OF NEVADA, )

20 Petitioner-Intervenor, )

21 vs. )

22 CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES )  
CONTROL BOARD, W. DON MAUGHAN, )  
23 EDWIN H. FINSTER, ELISEO M. )  
24 SAMANIEGO, JOHN CAFFREY and )  
DARLENE E. RUIZ, Members of the )  
25 California State Water Resources )  
Control Board, )

26 Respondents, )

27 CALIFORNIA TROUT, INC., )

28 Respondent-Intervenor. )

Dec 23 10 25 AM '95  
BY JRH  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
FILED  
JAN 3 1995  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
BY JCH  
IN EQUITY NO. C-125  
SUBFILE C-125-B-ECR

THE WALKER RIVER  
PAIUTE TRIBE'S REPORT  
CONCERNING MINERAL  
COUNTY'S MOTION TO  
INTERVENE

10

1 Pursuant to the November 15, 1994, Stipulation and Order  
2 Concerning Mineral County's Motion to Intervene and for Pretrial  
3 Conference Thereon, the Walker River Paiute Tribe ("the Tribe")  
4 files this report. While this Court may be the appropriate forum  
5 for the resolution of claims such as those advocated by the  
6 County, the Tribe disagrees with many of the assertions in the  
7 County's motion to intervene and supporting documentation and  
8 will respond to the motion at the appropriate time. The Tribe  
9 notes, however, that the precise nature of the County's claimed  
10 rights is unclear and that it will be difficult to respond to the  
11 County's claim in its present form. The Tribe also is concerned  
12 that the County's attempt to intervene does not delay the  
13 resolution of the Tribe's pending claims to additional water from  
14 the Walker River.

15 **A. THE PERSONS WHO SHOULD BE GIVEN NOTICE OF AN**  
16 **OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO THE MOTION TO INTERVENE.**

17 In addressing the question of who should be given the  
18 opportunity to respond to the County's motion to intervene, it is  
19 important to distinguish between the issues surrounding inter-  
20 vention and the issues surrounding the claim which the County  
21 seeks to assert if intervention is permitted. The Tribe submits  
22 that only the present parties to this litigation need to receive  
23 notice of the motion to intervene. If intervention is permitted,  
24 the County then should be required to provide notice to all  
25 claimants on the Walker River consistent with this Court's  
26 earlier order requiring the United States and Tribe to serve all  
27 surface water claimants in the Walker River Basin. See Order at  
28

1 6 (Oct. 27, 1992) ("claimants to the water of the Walker River  
2 clearly have an interest in the action.").

3 This Court retains jurisdiction over the East and West  
4 Walker Rivers, pursuant to the complaint filed by the United  
5 States in 1924 and the Final Decree entered in 1936 and amended  
6 in 1940. See United States v. Walker River Irrigation Dist., In  
7 Equity C-125, *Final Decree* (D. Nev. April, 14, 1936), as amended by,  
8 *Stipulation and Agreement for Entry of Amended Final Decree Pursuant to Writ of Mandate*  
9 *of the Circuit Court of Appeals - Ninth Circuit - and also Amended Decree entered herein on*  
10 *April 15, 1936 to Clarify Certain Provisions Thereof* ("Amended Decree") and *Order*  
11 *for Entry of Amended Final Decree to Conform to Writ of Mandate, etc. dated April 24,*  
12 *1940.* In its October 27, 1992 Order, the Court required the  
13 United States and Tribes to serve all claimants to the waters of  
14 the Walker River with notice of the federal and tribal claims to  
15 additional water. Order at 5-6. The Court reasoned that in  
16 order to protect the interests of claimants of state water rights  
17 who had not sought recognition of their rights in this case, such  
18 claimants should be joined in the adjudication. The Court  
19 rejected the notion that a later adjudication would safeguard the  
20 interests of such claimants: "[t]hey may be able to protect their  
21 interests after this suit is concluded through another lawsuit;  
22 however, during the pendency of a later action these claimants  
23 may suffer without their water rights." Id. at 6.

24 Mineral County argues that recognition of its claimed rights  
25 will protect the fishery, recreational benefits, wildlife  
26 preservation, aesthetic, and economic benefits of Walker Lake.  
27

28

1 See *Mineral County's Proposed Petition to Intervene* at 6 (Oct. 25, 1994).  
2 Mineral County thus claims a right to 103,000 acre/feet per year  
3 of water for Walker Lake. Id. at 5-6. The County further asks  
4 the Court to reallocate the existing water uses on the Walker  
5 River. Id. Mineral County's claims potentially affect the  
6 rights of all other water right holders on the Walker River.  
7 Accordingly, the County should be ordered to serve all claimants  
8 to the waters of the Walker River and its tributaries if it is  
9 permitted to intervene.

10 **B. OTHER MATTERS THAT WILL AID IN THE DISPOSITION OF THE**  
11 **MOTION TO INTERVENE.**

12 **1. The Nature of the County's Claims.**

13 Based on the pleadings to date, it is difficult to  
14 understand the precise nature of the County's claim. While it is  
15 apparent that the County wishes to protect the water supply for  
16 Walker Lake -- a goal with which the Tribe sympathizes -- the  
17 extent and scope of the water right claim is amorphous. Does the  
18 County claim merely to be the beneficiary of an existing state  
19 right or does it seek additional rights in its own name? Does  
20 the County seek "reallocation" of decreed rights or all rights on  
21 the Walker River? Does the County claim that only the holders of  
22 decreed rights must further monitor their water uses or should  
23 all water right holders do so? If it is permitted to intervene,  
24 the County should clarify its claim prior to providing notice to  
25 all claimants.

26

27

28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

2. The County's Proposed Intervention should not delay resolution of the Tribe's claims.


The resolution of the issues surrounding the County's claim should not delay addressing the issues involved in the Tribe's pending claims for additional water. To be sure, the County's claims may affect the tribal claims and may need to be addressed concurrently with the tribal claims. We also recognize that the next step in bringing the tribal claims before the Court is to accomplish service of process on the water right claimants who are not parties to the case. The Tribe, however, is anxious to proceed with its claims and is concerned that the determination of those claims not be unduly delayed as a result of the County's motion to intervene.

Dated: Dec. 22, 1994

Respectfully submitted,

Scott B. McElroy  
Jeff J. Davis  
Greene, Meyer & McElroy, P.C.  
1007 Pearl Street, Suite 220  
Boulder, Colorado 80302  
(303) 442-2021

Evan Beavers  
Beavers & Young  
1616 Highway 395  
P.O. Box 486  
Minden, Nevada 89423  
702/782-5110

By:   
Scott B. McElroy

*Attorneys for the Walker River Paiute Tribe*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have sent a true and correct copy of the foregoing Walker River Paiute Tribe's Report Concerning Mineral County's Motion to Intervene, via overnight carrier, all charges prepaid thereon, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of December 1994, addressed to:

David Lungren, Attorney General  
Mary Hackenbracht  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of California  
2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-3049

Richard R. Greenfield  
Field Solicitor's Office  
Department of Interior  
2 N. Central Avenue, Suite 500  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

David E. Moser  
McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enerson  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Western Nevada Agency  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
1300 Curry Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

Frankie Sue Del Papa, Attorney General  
Susan Joseph Taylor, Deputy Attorney General  
Division of Water Resources  
123 West Nye Lane  
Carson City, NV 89710

Roger Bezayiff  
Chief Deputy Water Commissioner  
U.S. Board of Water Commissioners  
P.O. Box 853  
Yerington, NV 89447

Linda A. Bowman  
Vargas & Bartlett  
201 W. Liberty St., Suite 300  
P.O. Box 281  
Reno, NV 89504

James T. Markle  
State Water Resources Control Bd.  
P.O. Box 100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Kathryn Landreth  
John P. Lange  
U.S. Dep't of Justice, Environment  
& Natural Resources Div.  
999 - 18th Street, Suite 945  
Denver, CO 80202

John Kramer  
Department of Water Resources  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gordon H. DePaoli  
Woodburn and Wedge  
One East First Street, Suite 1600  
P.O. Box 2311  
Reno, NV 89505

Ross E. deLipkau  
P.O. Box 2790  
Reno, NV 89505

James Spoo  
Zeh, Spoo & Hearne  
450 Marsh Avenue  
Reno, NV 89509


Garry Stone  
290 South Arlington Ave.  
Reno, NV 89510

Shirley A. Smith  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
300 Booth Street, Room 2031  
Reno, NV 89509

R. Michael Turnipseed, P.E.  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada  
123 West Nye Lane  
Carson City, NV 89710

Larry C. Reynolds  
Deputy Attorney General  
State Engineer's Office  
201 S. Fall Street  
Carson City, NV 89710

Roger Johnson  
Water Resources Control Board  
State of California  
P. O. Box 2000  
Sacramento, CA 95810

  
\_\_\_\_\_