

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 3 DELTA SMELT CONSOLIDATED CASES | 1:09-CV-00407 OWW DLB |
| 4 | 1:09-cv-00480-OWW-GSA |
| 5 SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER | 1:09-cv-00422-OWW-GSA |
| 6 AUTHORITY, <i>et al.</i> v. SALAZAR, <i>et</i> | 1:09-cv-00631-OWW-DLB |
| <i>al.</i> (1:09-cv-00407 OWW DLB) | 1:09-cv-00892-OWW-DLB |
| 7 STATE WATER CONTRACTORS v. SALAZAR, | Partially consolidated with: |
| 8 <i>et al.</i> (1:09-cv-00480-OWW-GSA) | 1:09-cv-01201-OWW-DLB |
| 9 COALITION FOR A SUSTAINABLE DELTA, | MEMORANDUM DECISION RE |
| 10 <i>et al.</i> v. UNITED STATES FISH AND | FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION |
| WILDLIFE SERVICE, <i>et al.</i> (1:09-cv- | TO AMEND THE JUDGMENT OR IN |
| 00422-OWW-GSA) | THE ALTERNATIVE FOR A STAY |
| 11 METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT v. | PENDING APPEAL (DOC. 856) |
| 12 UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE | |
| 13 SERVICE, <i>et al.</i> (1:09-cv-00631-OWW- | |
| DLB) | |
| 14 STEWART & JASPER ORCHARDS, <i>et al.</i> | |
| 15 v. UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE | |
| SERVICE (1:09-cv-00892-OWW-DLB) | |
| 16 FAMILY FARM ALLIANCE v. SALAZAR, <i>et</i> | |
| 17 <i>al.</i> (1:09-CV-01201-OWW-DLB) | |

18 I. INTRODUCTION

19 On March 29, 2011, Final Judgment was entered on all
20 remaining claims in this case. The 2008 Delta Smelt Biological
21 Opinion ("BiOp"), its Reasonable and Prudent Alternative ("RPA"),
22 and Reclamation's December 2008 Provisional Acceptance of the RPA
23 were remanded without vacatur with the following instructions:
24

- 25 1. USFWS shall complete by October 1, 2011 a new
26 delta smelt Biological Opinion consistent with the
27 Court's December 14, 2010 Memorandum Opinion, with the
28 exception of making express written findings in either
the BiOp or the Administrative Record as to the first

1 three factors of the four-part regulatory definition of
2 an RPA in 50 C.F.R. § 402.02, which shall be completed
3 by November 30, 2011.

4 2. Reclamation shall complete review of the RPA in
5 accordance with NEPA by December 15, 2011.

6 Doc. 851 at 3.

7 On April 8, 2011, Federal Defendants moved to alter or amend
8 the judgment, or in the alternative for a stay pending appeal, on
9 the ground that the new BiOp, RPA, and NEPA compliance could not
10 be completed within the time limits prescribed. Doc. 856.

11 Federal Defendants filed a proposed amended judgment, which
12 alters the existing deadlines to extend completion of the entire
13 remand process 30 months from October 1, 2011. Doc. 856-2.

14 Federal Defendants also filed the Declarations of Susan Fry and
15 Jennifer Norris. Docs. 857 & 858. San Luis & Delta Mendota
16 Water Authority and Westlands Water District; Metropolitan Water
17 District of Southern California; State Water Contractors;
18 Coalition for a Sustainable Delta and Kern County Water Agency;
19 Stewart & Jasper Orchards, Arroyo Farms, LLC, and King Pistachio
20 Grove; and the Family Farm Alliance (collectively, "Plaintiffs")
21 oppose the specific terms of Federal Defendants' proposed amended
22 judgment, instead proposing their own 20-month remand schedule.

23 Docs. 864 & 864-1. Plaintiffs also filed the declarations of
24 James Snow and Susan Hootkins. Docs. 866 & 867. Plaintiff-in-
25 Intervention, the California Department of Water Resources
26 ("DWR"), partially joins Plaintiffs' opposition, and does not
27
28

1 oppose a remand lasting between 20 and 30 months. Doc. 865.
2 Federal Defendants replied. Doc. 868. Defendant Intervenors
3 filed an objection to Plaintiffs' request to now set an interim
4 remedies hearing in August 2011. Doc. 869.

5 Federal Defendants' request to have their motion heard on
6 shortened time was granted. See Docs. 859, 860. A hearing was
7 originally set for April 22, 2011, but was continued by agreement
8 of the parties to April 27, 2011, Doc. 862, when the matter was
9 heard.
10

11 II. DISCUSSION

12 A. Motion to Alter/Amend Judgment.

13 1. Standard.

14 A motion to alter or amend the judgment is timely if filed
15 within twenty-eight days of the entry of judgment. Fed. R. Civ.
16 P. 59(e). The district court "has considerable discretion when
17 considering a motion to amend a judgment." *Turner v. Burlington*
18 *N. Santa Fe R.R. Co.*, 338 F.3d 1058, 1063 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing
19 Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e)). Although Rule 59(e) itself does not
20 state the grounds on which relief may be granted, the Court of
21 Appeals has established that altering or amending the judgment is
22 proper where "the district court: (1) is presented with newly
23 discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial
24 decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening
25 change in controlling law." *Circuit City Stores. v. Mantor*, 417
26
27
28

1 F.3d 1060, 1064 (9th Cir. 2005). The district court has subject
2 matter jurisdiction to consider a timely motion under Rule 59(e)
3 even where such motion is filed subsequent to a notice of appeal.
4 *Tripati v. Henman*, 845 F.2d 205 (9th Cir. 1988). The filing of a
5 Rule 59(e) motion suspends the operation of a notice of appeal
6 until it is resolved, at which point the notice of appeal becomes
7 effective. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(A)(4)(B)(i).

9 2. Application.

10 Federal Defendants maintain that it is not feasible to
11 complete by the end of 2011 a new BiOp, RPA analysis, and NEPA
12 review to satisfy the December 14, 2010 memorandum decision
13 ("December 2010 MSJ Decision"). Federal Defendants emphasize
14 that no party proposed such a compressed schedule.
15

16 a) Interpretation of the December 2010 MSJ Decision.

17 Federal Defendants' motion to amend the judgment is premised
18 on their interpretation of the December 2010 MSJ Decision.
19 According to Federal Defendants' interpretation, the Court has
20 ordered the completion of several "time- and resource-intensive
21 harm and feasibility analyses," including:
22

- 23 (a) developing "alternatives" to the Reasonable and
24 Prudent Alternative that the Service deems necessary to
25 avoid jeopardy and adverse modification; (b) measuring
26 and addressing water supply needs beyond the species;
27 (c) accounting for competing demands for water from the
28 Projects, including but not limited to the requirements
of Cal. Water Code § 275, Cal. Const. art. X, § 2, and
Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, 43 U.S.C. §
383; and (d) making express written findings in either

1 the BiOp or the Administrative Record as to the first
2 three factors of the four-part regulatory definition of
an RPA in 50 C.F.R. § 402.02.

3 Doc. 856-1 at 6. Subparagraph (a) accurately reflects the prior
4 holding that Reclamation violated NEPA by failing to effect any
5 NEPA compliance prior to adopting and implementing the 2008 Smelt
6 BiOp. See generally Doc. 399. Subparagraph (d) accurately
7 recognizes the ruling that FWS acted unlawfully by failing to
8 include written findings in either the BiOp or the AR concerning
9 the first three factors of the four-part regulatory definition of
10 an RPA in 50 C.F.R. § 402.02.
11

12 As to subparagraphs (b) and (c), Federal Defendants' offer
13 selectively incomplete portions of the December 2010 MSJ Decision
14 that do not accurately reflect the entirety of the language or
15 the intent of the decision. The relevant passages from the
16 Decision cited by Federal Defendants in support of these
17 additional "requirements" are found at pages 96, 194 n.47, 195,
18 200, and 218-19. The quoted language from page 96 follows a
19 lengthy discussion of FWS's failure to explain why it compared
20 data from two non-comparable models to quantitatively justify
21 remedial measures designed to address a shift of X2 purportedly
22 caused by Project operations:
23
24

25 This is of particular concern because DWR, a joint
26 operator of the projects communicated its scientific
27 and operational concerns based on known available
28 science. DWR and Reclamation have legal obligations to
allocate water supply reasonably and responsibly, not
solely to save the species. As discussed [] below at

1 Part VII.B, FWS's focus on its responsibilities to the
2 species appears to have caused it to ignore its own
3 regulations' obligations to consider impacts to the
4 overall water supply and additional uses. The potential
impacts of inaccurate quantitative analyses in the BiOp
cannot be understated.

5 Doc. 757 at 96 (emphasis added). The emphasized text was not
6 intended to and did not order that FWS balance economic and water
7 supply costs against those of the species. Rather, the agency
8 acted unlawfully because it failed to adequately explain its
9 decision to compare non-comparable data sets as part of its
10 quantitative justification for remedial actions. The agency did
11 not articulate or employ an "institutionalized caution" rationale
12 to justify setting specific RPA targets at levels more protective
13 than those which are absolutely necessary. The December 2010 MSJ
14 Decision did not address whether it would have been appropriate
15 to incorporate such a rationale into the justification for those
16 remedial actions.

17
18 Federal Defendants cite portions of the December 2010 MSJ
19 Decision focusing on the specific requirements of 50 C.F.R. §
20 402.02, including the requirement that any RPA be consistent with
21 the intended purpose of the action:
22

23 The specific requirements of the X2 action are another
24 example of how the record fails to address the
25 "consistency with the intended purpose of the action,"
26 and is "within the scope of the ... agency's authority
27 and jurisdiction." 50 C.F.R. § 402.02. Because of
28 competing demands for water from the Projects, combined
with a limited supply, one purpose of the Projects is
to ensure that that water use and allocation be
carefully managed, and to also ensure that water is put

1 to a beneficial use and not wasted. This purpose is, in
2 fact, required by California law, Cal. Const. art. X, §
3 2; Cal. Water Code § 275, and imposed upon federal
4 project operations by virtue of Section 8 of the
5 Reclamation act of 1902. 43 U.S.C. § 383. The Projects
6 will have to expend hundreds of thousands of acre feet
7 of water to maintain X2 as far seaward as Component 3
8 requires. Miller Decl., Doc. 400, at ¶¶ 67-73. Less
9 water would be required if X2 did not need to be pushed
10 so far downstream—water would then be available for
11 other uses. Yet nothing in the BiOp or the record
12 explains why it is essential that X2 be moved seaward
13 to the degree required by Component 3 in order to
14 protect the smelt and its habitat.

15 Doc. 757 at 194 n.47. Page 195 continues:

16 Even if, *arguendo*, the RPA is consistent with the
17 multiple purposes of the action and the agency's
18 statutory authority, and is economically and
19 technologically feasible to implement, the APA
20 requires, and the public is entitled under the law to
21 receive, some exposition in the record of why the
22 agency concluded (if it did so at all) that all four
23 regulatory requirements for a valid RPA were satisfied.
24 The RPA Actions manifestly interdict the water supply
25 for domestic human consumption and agricultural use for
26 over twenty million people who depend on the Projects
27 for their water supply. "Trust us" is not acceptable.
28 FWS has shown no inclination to fully and honestly
address water supply needs beyond the species, despite
the fact that its own regulation requires such
consideration.

How the appropriation of water for the RPA Actions, to
the exclusion of implementing less harmful
alternatives, is required for species survival is not
explained. The appropriate remedy for such a failure to
explain is remand to the agency.

While the "institutionalized caution" interpretation of the ESA
might justify some movement of X2 seaward of FWS's best estimate
of what is "necessary" for the species survival, the APA requires
FWS to justify its actions with the best available science. The

1 failures identified in the BiOp do not concern application of the
2 precautionary principle, because FWS does not articulate
3 "institutionalized caution" or the precautionary principle as
4 rationales for its specific actions. Nor does the December 2010
5 MSJ Decision prevent FWS from articulating a basis for its
6 actions that includes a precautionary approach. Rather, the
7 December 2010 MSJ Decision points out that FWS entirely failed to
8 comply with its own regulatory requirements in 50 C.F.R. §
9 402.02, compliance with which should have triggered evaluation of
10 whether or not moving X2 downstream to the extent required by the
11 RPA was justified. The significant impacts upon the water supply
12 serve to emphasize the practical consequences of FWS's failure.
13 The exact meaning and scope of the requirements in section 402.02
14 that FWS ensure that the RPA "can be implemented in a manner
15 consistent with the intended purpose of the action ... can be
16 implemented consistent with the scope of the Federal agency's
17 legal authority and jurisdiction ... [and] is economically and
18 technologically feasible," was not decided by the December 2010
19 MSJ Decision.¹

22 Federal Defendants also cite pages 199-200 of the December
23 2010 MSJ Decision, presumably to emphasize the following
24 paragraph:
25

26 Stewart & Jasper's contention that FWS's reserved to

27 ¹ These issues are more explicitly raised by the pending cross motions in the
28 Consolidated Salmonid Cases, which have yet to be decided.

1 itself "an ongoing power of oversight, as well as a
2 power to dictate new and different pumping
3 restrictions," assumes that neither Reclamation, as
4 action agency, nor DWR, as co-operator, have the
5 ability to not comply with the RPA. Doc. 697 at 87.
6 Reclamation is not legally compelled to blindly follow
7 FWS's pronouncements. Reclamation retains the authority
8 to reject the RPA at any time, subject to its
9 obligation to reinitiate consultation. Although FWS has
10 not yet demonstrated a willingness or capability to
11 protect interests other than the species, it cannot be
12 assumed that Reclamation will not lawfully discharge
13 its statutory water supply responsibilities.

14 (Emphasis added.) This comment imposes no practical burdens upon
15 Federal Defendants at all.

16 Finally, Federal Defendants cite pages 218-219 from the
17 Conclusion:

18 It cannot be disputed that the law entitles the delta
19 smelt to ESA protection. It is significant that the co-
20 operator of the Projects, DWR, in its endeavors to
21 protect a substantial part of the State's water supply,
22 opposes as unjustified and based on bad science some of
23 the RPA Actions. It is equally significant that despite
24 the harm visited on California water users, FWS has
25 failed to provide lawful explanations for the apparent
26 overappropriation of project water supplies for species
27 protection. In view of the legislative failure to
28 provide the means to assure an adequate water supply
29 for both the humans and the species dependent on the
30 Delta, the public cannot afford sloppy science and uni-
31 directional prescriptions that ignore California's
32 water needs. A court is bound by the law. Resource
33 allocation and establishing legislative priorities
34 protecting the environment are the prerogatives of
35 other branches of government. The law alone cannot
36 afford protection to all the competing interests at
37 stake in these cases.

38 This passage summarizes earlier findings and imposes no further
39 burdens on Federal Defendants.

40 Federal Defendants' argument is that the December 2010 MSJ

1 Decision requires FWS to "balance" the needs of the species
2 against economic interest. No such requirement exists. What the
3 Court did hold was that the additional analyses required on
4 remand by both agencies are substantial. The BiOp and its RPA
5 are unlawful under the ESA and need to be remanded. Further, the
6 action agency's failure to comply with NEPA's requirements
7 requires an analysis of water supply impacts that demands
8 cooperation of Project operators and the action agency.
9

10
11 b) Justification for 30-Month Proposed Schedule.

12 Federal Defendants now propose that the best way to complete
13 remand is to permit FWS to develop the required analyses in
14 consultation with Reclamation and concurrently with Reclamation's
15 NEPA process. It is not disputed that Reclamation, the action
16 agency, not FWS, has the expertise to evaluate water supply
17 impacts and related effects. Federal Defendants assert that
18 concurrent preparation of the revised BiOp and the NEPA document
19 will enhance the quality of the end product. Specifically,
20 Defendants now propose that remand, including certification of a
21 new BiOp, completion of NEPA analysis, and satisfaction of all
22 the other requirements of the Court's December 14, 2010
23 Memorandum Opinion, will take until May 1, 2014.
24

25 Federal Defendants' rationale for this deadline is as follows:

- 26
- 27 • A draft BiOp and RPA can be completed by October 1, 2011;
 - 28 • Completion of an EIS is expected to take 30 months following

1 formulation of the draft RPA. *See generally* Fry
2 Declaration. Doc. 857.

- 3 • The procedures of NEPA are rigorous: The Agency must
4 develop a list of issues to be analyzed and submit those to
5 the public for "scoping" comments, which usually involves
6 numerous public meetings. Reclamation anticipates it could
7 draft and publish the NOI within 9 months of receiving the
8 draft RPA. *Id.* at ¶ 11.
- 9 • Then, the agency must complete a Draft EIS and submit that
10 to other federal agencies and the public comment. Even for
11 far less complex projects, this can take years to complete.
12 Reclamation anticipates issuing a draft EIS approximately 17
13 months after receiving the draft RPA. *Id.* at ¶ 13.
- 14 • The agency must then respond to any comments by modifying
15 alternatives, developing and evaluating new alternatives,
16 correcting errors and or explaining why comments do not
17 warrant further response. 40 C.F.R. § 1503.4. Only then
18 may an agency prepare a final EIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9.
19 NEPA then requires a 30-90 day period for additional public
20 comment. 40 C.F.R. § 1506.10(b)-(d).
- 21 • Finally, NEPA requires Reclamation to issue a final record
22 of decision ("ROD") stating the agency's decision,
23 identifying alternatives considered and stating all
24 practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm.
25
26
27
28

1 Reclamation anticipates it could issue a ROD no earlier than
2 30 months from the issuance of the RPA. Fry Decl. at ¶ 14.

3 Federal Defendants proposed schedule has FWS producing a
4 draft BiOp consistent with the December 2010 MSJ Decision by
5 October 1, 2011, and provides that FWS and Reclamation will
6 cooperate during the NEPA review process to produce the
7 information necessary to complete the remaining tasks, including
8 preparation of additional analyses required by 50 C.F.R. § 402.02
9 and NEPA review. Within one month after Reclamation completes
10 its NEPA review, FWS will complete the remaining tasks.
11

12 Plaintiffs argue that 30 months is unreasonable and present
13 the declaration of Susan G. Hootkins, a senior consultant at
14 ENTRIX, an environmental consulting firm with considerable NEPA
15 compliance experience, including on projects for Reclamation.
16 She states that Federal Defendants' timeframe is "not aggressive
17 and provides more time than legally or reasonably necessary ...
18 principally because it includes over estimates of the time needed
19 to complete some of the basic steps in the NEPA process." Doc.
20 867 at ¶ 7. She opines that 10 months can reasonably be shaved
21 off the 30 month estimate. *Id.* at ¶ 16.² Plaintiffs also cite
22 numerous cases in which the NEPA process was expedited by a court
23 order. *See* Doc. 864 at 13. It is unquestioned that all parties
24
25

26
27 ² Federal Defendants correctly point out that Plaintiffs' alternative 20-month
28 schedule is not properly before the court because Plaintiffs did not
separately move to amend the judgment.

1 and the water-consuming public urgently require and deserve some
2 degree of predictability. The longer the work remains
3 uncompleted, the greater the dislocation to all.

4 The agencies, not the Court, are in the best position to
5 determine how long it will take them to complete these required
6 processes. A court cannot tell the agencies how to allocate
7 resources on remand, nor how to accomplish the required tasks.
8 Plaintiffs' declarant is unfamiliar with agency operations,
9 budgets, staffing, expertise and resources. Federal Defendants'
10 own declarant, Susan Fry, is familiar with these matters and has
11 opined that a 30-month schedule is the absolute minimum time
12 necessary to complete all the work. She anticipates considerable
13 public interest in these issues, which will preclude the
14 accelerated timetable Plaintiffs recommend. Plaintiffs'
15 declarant also assumes Reclamation could begin the NEPA process
16 on May 2, which is not possible given the condition precedent,
17 issuance of a draft BiOp and RPA, will not be completed until
18 October 1, 2011.

19 Federal Defendants have demonstrated that the existing Final
20 Judgment would cause manifest injustice, as it would require FWS
21 and Reclamation to complete their duties on remand in a time
22 frame impossible for them to achieve. Federal Defendants'
23 schedule delays completion of a new BiOp, which extends
24 uncertainty and increases the likelihood that court intervention
25
26
27
28

1 in annual water allocations will be necessary. However,
2 Plaintiffs' suggestion that a deadline of December 2012 should be
3 chosen with the understanding that Federal Defendants could apply
4 for an extension if needed does not permit Federal Defendants to
5 proceed with remand in an orderly manner.

6
7 Federal Defendants' motion to amend the judgment is GRANTED,
8 but the deadline will be modified to require completion of a
9 final BiOp, RPA, and NEPA review by December 1, 2013. This is
10 approximately 32 months from now, 36 months following the
11 December 2010 MSJ Decision, and prior to the water season in
12 which supply restrictions have historically been imposed to
13 protect the species.

14
15 B. Motion for Stay Pending Appeal.

16 As an alternative to an amended judgment, Federal Defendants
17 move for a stay pending appeal. Federal Defendants represented
18 in open court that they do not prefer and would withdraw their
19 motion for a stay if the motion to amend is granted to permit a
20 complete and lawful BiOp, RPA, and NEPA process to be
21 accomplished. It is unnecessary to address the alternative
22 motion for a stay.

23
24 C. Additional Requests for Correction.³

25
26 ³ These additional requests are to correct the Final Judgment to accurately
27 reflect success on the merits. A court may correct a clerical mistake of this
28 nature on its own, with or without notice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 60. Normally,
leave of the appellate court would be required if the correction is made while

1 1. State Water Contractors' Request.

2 State Water Contractors ("SWC") also request that Paragraph
3 C of the Final Judgment be amended to reflect that they prevailed
4 on their Fifth claim for relief, which alleged among other things
5 that Federal Defendants violated the Endangered Species Act
6 ("ESA") and 50 C.F.R. § 402.02 by failing to determine whether
7 the RPA could be implemented consistently with the scope of DWR's
8 legal authority and jurisdiction. *See State Water Contractors v.*
9 *Salazar, et al.*, 1:09-cv-00480 OWW GSA, Doc. 1 at 34-36. This
10 claim, which narrowly focuses on the RPA's consistency with DWR's
11 legal authority, was not squarely addressed by the December 2010
12 MSJ Decision. SWC points to page 194 n.47, which states:

13
14 The specific requirements of the X2 action are another
15 example of how the record fails to address the
16 "consisten[]tcy with the intended purpose of the
17 action," and is "within the scope of the ... agency's
18 authority and jurisdiction." 50 C.F.R. § 402.02.
19 Because of competing demands for water from the
20 Projects, combined with a limited supply, one purpose
21 of the Projects is to ensure that that water use and
22 allocation be carefully managed, and to also ensure
23 that water is put to a beneficial use and not wasted.
24 This purpose is, in fact, required by California law,
25 Cal. Const. art. X, § 2; Cal. Water Code § 275, and
26 imposed upon federal project operations by virtue of
Section 8 of the Reclamation act of 1902. 43 U.S.C. §
383. The Projects will have to expend hundreds of
thousands of acre feet of water to maintain X2 as far
seaward as Component 3 requires. Miller Decl., Doc.
400, at ¶¶ 67-73. Less water would be required if X2
did not need to be pushed so far downstream—water would
then be available for other uses. Yet nothing in the
BiOp or the record explains why it is essential that X2
be moved seaward to the degree required by Component 3
in order to protect the smelt and its habitat.

an appeal is pending, *id.*, but, as discussed above, the filing of a Rule 59(e)
motion suspends the operation of a notice of appeal until it is resolved, *see*
Fed. R. App. P. 4(A)(4)(B)(i).

1 Doc. 757 at 194 n.47. This footnote discussed 50 C.F.R. §
2 402.02, which provides:

3
4 Reasonable and prudent alternatives refer to
5 alternative actions identified during formal
6 consultation that can be implemented in a manner
7 consistent with the intended purpose of the action,
8 that can be implemented consistent with the scope of
9 the Federal agency's legal authority and jurisdiction,
10 that is [sic] economically and technologically
11 feasible, and that the Director believes would avoid
12 the likelihood of jeopardizing the continued existence
13 of listed species or resulting in the destruction or
14 adverse modification of critical habitat.

15 50 C.F.R. § 402.02 (emphasis added). The regulation plainly
16 restricts itself to consistency with the federal agency's legal
17 authority and jurisdiction. Footnote 47 discussed provisions of
18 California law because those are "imposed upon federal project
19 operations by virtue of Section 8 of the Reclamation act of 1902.
20 43 U.S.C. § 383." No authority has been presented suggesting
21 that this regulation should be extended to impose a requirement
22 that the RPA be consistent with a state agency's legal authority
23 and jurisdiction. SWC did not prevail on its fifth claim for
24 relief. Its motion to amend the judgment is DENIED.

25
26 2. Coalition for a Sustainable Delta & Kern County Water
27 Agency's Request.

28 Coalition for a Sustainable Delta ("Coalition") and Kern
County Water Agency ("KCWA") separately request that Paragraph C
of the Final Judgment be amended to reflect that they prevailed
on their Third claim for relief, which alleged Federal Defendants
failed to adequately analyze the status of the species and the

1 environmental baseline in the BiOp in violation of the ESA and
2 Administrative Procedure Act. *See Coalition for a Sustainable*
3 *Delta, et al. v. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, et al.*, 1:09-cv-
4 00422 OWW GSA, Doc. 23, at 22-23. The December 2010 MSJ Decision
5 found a number of errors in the BiOp's baseline analysis of
6 "other stressors" on the smelt. *See* Doc. 757 at 146-155. These
7 findings result in the Coalition's and KCWA's success on their
8 Third Claim. The Amended Final Judgment shall be corrected to
9 reflect this success.
10

11 III. CONCLUSION

12 Federal Defendants' implicit contention that water supply
13 impacts of the OCAP cannot be considered under the ESA is a total
14 abdication of NEPA's requirement to evaluate the impacts of the
15 RPA on humans. Federal Defendants cannot avoid this
16 responsibility by isolating the ESA issues.
17

18 The remand schedule must be revised. Federal Defendants'
19 have demonstrated that the existing deadline for completion of
20 remand is infeasible. They say they need 30 months. The Court
21 would prefer to see the work done in 24 months. Federal
22 Defendants' request to amend the judgment is GRANTED, with the
23 slight modification discussed above. A draft BiOp shall be
24 completed on or before October 1, 2011, and a final BiOp and RPA,
25 as well as the required NEPA analysis, shall be completed by
26 December 1, 2013.
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

Plaintiffs' alternative 20-month proposal is not properly before the court and does not reflect a realistic commencement date or an enforceable process, given limited agency resources.

SWC's motion to correct the Final Judgment is DENIED.

The Coalition's and KCWA's motion to correct the Final Judgment is GRANTED.

Federal Defendants shall submit a proposed Amended Final Judgment consistent with this memorandum decision within five (5) days following electronic service of this decision.

SO ORDERED
Dated: May 4, 2010

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger
United States District Judge