

1 KATHERINE POOLE (SBN 195010)
DOUGLAS ANDREW OBEGI (SBN 246127)
2 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 Sutter Street, 20th Floor
3 San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 875-6100
4 Facsimile: (415) 875-6161
kpoole@nrdc.org; dobegi@nrdc.org

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff NRDC

6 HAMILTON CANDEE (SBN 111376)
7 BARBARA JANE CHISHOLM (SBN 224656)
TONY LOPRESTI (SBN 289269)
8 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
177 Post St., Suite 300
9 San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 421-7151
10 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064
hcandee@altber.com; bchisholm@altber.com; tlopresti@altber.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff NRDC

12 TRENT W. ORR (SBN 77656)
13 EARTHJUSTICE
50 California St., Suite 500
14 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 217-2000
15 Facsimile: (415) 217-2040
torr@earthjustice.org

16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs NRDC, California Trout, San Francisco Baykeeper, Friends of the River, The
17 Bay Institute, Winnemem Wintu Tribe, and Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's
Associations/Institute for Fisheries Resources

18 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE
21 COUNCIL, CALIFORNIA TROUT, SAN
FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER, FRIENDS
22 OF THE RIVER, THE BAY INSTITUTE
OF SAN FRANCISCO, WINNEMEM
23 WINTU TRIBE, and PACIFIC COAST
FEDERATION OF FISHERMEN'S
24 ASSOCIATIONS/INSTITUTE FOR
FISHERIES RESOURCES,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 SALLY JEWELL, in her official capacity
28 as Secretary of the Interior, DAN ASHE, in

Case No. 1:05-cv-01207 LJO-EPG

**FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT
FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF**

1 his official capacity as the Director of the
2 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and
3 ESTEVAN LÓPEZ, in his official capacity
4 as Commissioner of the Bureau of
5 Reclamation,

6 Defendants.

7 SAN LUIS & DELTA MENDOTA
8 WATER AUTHORITY, STATE WATER
9 CONTRACTORS, WESTLANDS
10 WATER DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA
11 DEPARTMENT OF WATER
12 RESOURCES, CALIFORNIA FARM
13 BUREAU FEDERATION, GLENN-
14 COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
15 NATOMAS CENTRAL MUTUAL
16 WATER COMPANY, PELGER
17 MUTUAL WATER COMPANY,
18 PLEASANT GROVE-VERONA
19 MUTUAL WATER COMPANY,
20 PRINCETON-CODORA-GLENN
21 IRRIGATION DISTRICT, PROVIDENT
22 IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
23 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 108, and
24 RIVER GARDEN FARMS,

25 Defendants-Intervenors.

26 ANDERSON-COTTONWOOD
27 IRRIGATION DISTRICT, BEVERLY F.
28 ANDREOTTI *et al.*, BANTA-CARBONA
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CHRISTO D.
BARDIS *et al.*, BYRON BETHANY
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CARTER
MUTUAL WATER COMPANY,
COEHLHO FAMILY TRUST,
CONAWAY PRESERVATION GROUP,
DEL PUERTO WATER DISTRICT,
EAGLE FIELD WATER DISTRICT,
FRESNO SLOUGH WATER DISTRICT,
HOWALD FARMS, INC., JAMES
IRRIGATION DISTRICT, LOMO COLD
STORAGE, MAXWELL IRRIGATION
DISTRICT, MERCY SPRINGS WATER
DISTRICT, MERIDIAN FARMS WATER
COMPANY, OJI BROTHERS FARM,
INC., OJI FAMILY PARTERSHIP, ORO
LOMA WATER DISTRICT, PACIFIC
REALTY ASSOCIATES, L.P.,
PATTERSON IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
ABDUL AND TAHMINA RAUF,
RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1004,

1 CITY OF REDDING, HENRY D.
2 RICHTER *et al.*, SACRAMENTO RIVER
3 RANCH, LLC, SUTTER MUTUAL
4 WATER COMPANY, KNIGHTS
5 LANDING INVESTORS, LLC, TISDALE
6 IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND
7 DRAINAGE COMPANY,
8 TRANQUILITY IRRIGATION
9 DISTRICT, WEST SIDE IRRIGATION
10 DISTRICT, WEST STANISLAUS
11 IRRIGATION DISTRICT, and
12 WINDSWEPT LAND AND LIVESTOCK
13 COMPANY,

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

PREFACE TO FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT

1. Plaintiffs hereby supplement their complaint to add claims against the federal Bureau of Reclamation (“Bureau”) and the Sacramento River settlement contractors that are parties to this case for violations of the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”), 16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*, that have occurred, and are occurring, subsequent to the filing of Plaintiffs’ Third Supplemental Complaint. This Fourth Supplemental Complaint incorporates the allegations and causes of actions set forth in the Third Supplemental Complaint and identifies additional bases for Plaintiffs’ newly alleged claims in separately identified sections.

INTRODUCTION

2. This case centers on the long-term future operations of the massive Central Valley Project (“CVP”) and State Water Project (“SWP”), which are operated by the federal Bureau of Reclamation (“Bureau”) and the California Department of Water Resources (“DWR”), respectively, as set forth in a June 30, 2004 document known as the “Long-Term Central Valley Project Operations Criteria and Plan” (“OCAP”).

3. The CVP and SWP are among the largest water storage and diversion projects in the world. Together, the CVP and SWP annually manage more than 11 million acre-feet of water. That is roughly enough water to supply all of the water requirements for fifteen cities the size of Los Angeles. As part of their operations, the two projects run massive pumping facilities in the Delta, an estuary at the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in northern California, which

1 presently export an average of 1.6 to 2.0 *trillion* gallons of water annually out of the Delta for
2 delivery to irrigation agencies and other water users further south. The existing operations of these
3 pumps have altered natural flow patterns in the Delta and San Francisco Bay and even cause the San
4 Joaquin River — one of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary’s two major tributaries — to flow
5 backwards. Now, as set forth in the OCAP, the Bureau and DWR will significantly expand these
6 existing operations of the CVP and SWP.

7 4. The delta smelt is a two- to three-inch-long fish endemic to the Delta. Unlike many
8 fishes, the delta smelt typically lives just one year, making it particularly vulnerable to short-term
9 environmental fluctuations and threats. Extinction of the delta smelt could result from just a single
10 year of spawning failure or from just a few consecutive years of high fish kills or poor spawning or
11 rearing conditions. The existing operations of the CVP and SWP have been major factors in the
12 delta smelt’s decline and its listing under the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”), 16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et*
13 *seq.*

14 5. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“FWS” or “the Service”) nevertheless bowed to
15 intense political pressure and, in July 2004, rendered its original biological opinion that the
16 intensification of CVP and SWP operations as set forth in the OCAP will not jeopardize the
17 continued existence of the delta smelt or adversely modify its critical habitat. Plaintiffs initially filed
18 a complaint on February 15, 2005, alleging that the original biological opinion was arbitrary,
19 capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance with the law because its conclusion had no
20 basis in the record and the Service failed to consider the cumulative effects of the action, failed to
21 rely on the best available science, and improperly relied on uncertain mitigation measures.

22 6. At the Bureau’s request, the Service reinitiated consultation on this matter in order to
23 reexamine “potential critical habitat issues” and issued a new biological opinion (“Biological
24 Opinion”) on February 16, 2005. Despite, or perhaps because of, plaintiffs’ allegations of
25 impropriety, this “no jeopardy” opinion contained only minor alterations and is substantially
26 identical to the original.

27 7. Despite revisiting the impacts of the sweeping changes proposed to this project and
28 issuing two separate, though almost identical, biological opinions, the Service’s analysis violated the

1 most basic standards of rational decision-making. The biological opinions concluded that
2 implementation of the OCAP would neither jeopardize the survival of the delta smelt nor cause
3 adverse modification of the delta smelt's critical habitat, even though the proposed operations would
4 dramatically alter the Delta's hydrology and aggravate some of the very threats that led to the delta
5 smelt's ESA listing in the first place. Plaintiffs renew their challenge to this politically expedient
6 series of decisions because the second biological opinion, like the original biological opinion,
7 violates the ESA's core purposes of preventing extinctions and recovering threatened species and, in
8 addition, fails to add anything of substance to the Service's deficient analysis of whether the OCAP
9 will impact delta smelt critical habitat in a manner that affects recovery of the species.

10 8. In rendering these biological opinions, the Service simply ignored factors that
11 Congress required the Service to consider and reached a conclusion based on political expedience
12 rather than sound science. In particular, the Service's decision ignored the recent decline of smelt
13 abundance and the correspondence between periods of decline and increases in export.

14 9. Notwithstanding the patent inadequacy of the Service's biological opinions, the
15 Bureau has taken and is taking agency action in reliance on those opinions' faulty analysis regarding
16 the likely impacts of the OCAP on the delta smelt and its critical habitat.

17 10. By this action, plaintiffs Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.; California Trout;
18 Baykeeper; Friends of the River; and The Bay Institute (hereinafter collectively "plaintiffs")
19 supplement their challenge to the Service's July 30, 2004 original biological opinion in order to
20 challenge the superseding February 16, 2005 Biological Opinion and the Bureau's reliance thereon to
21 implement the 2004 OCAP and related actions.

22 11. Plaintiffs allege, among other things, that the Biological Opinion is legally invalid
23 because it failed to analyze the factors Congress required be considered (including, despite the
24 intervening reinitiation of consultation on just this issue, whether the proposed CVP and SWP
25 operations would cause adverse modification of delta smelt habitat in a manner that affects the
26 recovery of the species) and reached its "no jeopardy" conclusion by relying on an undefined
27 promise of "adaptive management" that provides no assurance of protection whatsoever.

28 12. Plaintiffs further supplement their challenge to the Bureau's ongoing violations of the

1 ESA and allege that, notwithstanding the patent inadequacy of the Service’s biological opinions, the
2 Bureau has acted in reliance on those opinions, for example by implementing the 2004 OCAP and by
3 executing long-term water supply renewal contracts based on the opinions’ faulty analysis regarding
4 the likely impacts of the OCAP on the delta smelt and its critical habitat. In doing so, the Bureau has
5 failed and is failing to fulfill its affirmative duty to insure that its actions are not likely to jeopardize
6 the species’ continued existence or adversely modify its critical habitat.

7 **ADDITIONAL INTRODUCTION TO FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

8 13. In 2004, the Bureau initiated consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service
9 (“NMFS”) regarding the effects of the OCAP to listed anadromous fish species, including the
10 endangered Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon (“winter-run Chinook”) and threatened
11 Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (“spring-run Chinook”). On October 22, 2004, NMFS
12 issued a biological opinion (“NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp”) determining that the OCAP would not
13 cause jeopardy to these species.

14 14. The Bureau also initiated consultation with NMFS in 2004 regarding the effects that its
15 decision to renew approximately 145 long-term water contracts with Sacramento River settlement
16 contractors, including the 28 parties that intervened or have been joined as defendants to this action
17 (hereinafter “SRS Contractors”),¹ on specific negotiated terms would have on listed anadromous
18 species, including the winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon. On January 10, 2005, NMFS
19 concurred with the Bureau’s finding that the decision to renew and implement the contracts with the
20 Sacramento River settlement contractors would not cause jeopardy to these species. NMFS based its
21 determination exclusively on the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp.

22 15. After a federal court invalidated the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp, NMFS issued a new
23

24 ¹ The SRS Contractors that intervened or have been joined as defendants include: Carter Mutual,
25 Meridian Farms, Natomas Central Mutual, Pelger Mutual, Pleasant Grove-Verona Mutual, and
26 Sutter Mutual Water Companies; Anderson-Cottonwood, Glenn-Colusa, Maxwell, Princeton-
27 Codora-Glenn, and Provident Irrigation Districts; Tisdale Irrigation and Drainage Company;
28 Reclamation Districts 108 and 1004; Beverly Andreotti *et al*; Christo Bardis *et al*; Conaway
Preservation Group; Howald Farms, Inc.; Oji Brothers Farm; Oji Family Partnership; Pacific Realty
Associates, L.P.; Abdul and Tahmina Rauf; Henry Richter *et al*; River Garden Farms; Sacramento
River Ranch, L.L.C.; Windswept Land and Livestock Company; the City of Redding; and Knights
Landing Investors, LLC (formerly Fred Tehhunfeld *et al*).

1 biological opinion on June 4, 2009 (“NMFS OCAP BiOp”) that, unlike the prior BiOp, determined
2 that the OCAP *would* cause jeopardy to the winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon, and other
3 anadromous species. The NMFS OCAP BiOp expressly stated that it did not analyze the impacts of
4 the Bureau’s decision to renew and implement water contracts. On April 7, 2011, NMFS amended
5 the NMFS OCAP BiOp to reflect the report of an independent review panel. NMFS also amended
6 the NMFS OCAP BiOp in 2014 and 2015 when the Bureau petitioned the California State Water
7 Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”) to modify the Bureau’s obligations to implement water
8 quality standards in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary Water Quality
9 Control Plan (“Bay-Delta Plan”) and to modify provisions of the Bureau’s obligations under the
10 NMFS OCAP BiOp. None of these amendments analyzed the impacts of the Bureau’s decision to
11 renew and implement water contracts. The Bureau did not reinitiate consultation on the SRS
12 contract renewals after the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp was invalidated, nor after the NMFS OCAP
13 BiOp was issued, nor after the NMFS OCAP BiOp was subsequently amended.

14 16. In 2014, the Bureau delivered to the SRS Contractors, and the SRS Contractors diverted,
15 excessive amounts of water from Shasta Reservoir to satisfy the terms of the renewed contracts with
16 the SRS Contractors (“SRS Contracts”). These releases and diversions caused the Bureau to lose
17 control of water temperatures in the upper Sacramento River during the “temperature management
18 season” for threatened and endangered Chinook salmon, which generally lasts from June through
19 October. As a result, almost the entire stock of winter-run Chinook that had hatched, or would have
20 hatched, in the upper Sacramento River in 2014 (“2014 brood year”) was killed. There were similar
21 devastating impacts to the 2014 spring-run Chinook brood year in the Sacramento River.

22 17. In spite of the Bureau’s repeated assurances to the SWRCB and NMFS that another loss
23 of temperature control would not occur in 2015, the agency again made excessive releases to satisfy
24 the terms of the SRS Contracts and again failed to provide adequate cold water below Shasta Dam to
25 sustain Chinook spawning and rearing throughout the 2015 temperature management season.
26 Although the full effects of the Bureau’s excessive releases and failure to control temperatures in
27 2015 are not yet known, early data indicates that there is even higher mortality to winter-run Chinook
28 in 2015 than there was in 2014.

1 18. Plaintiffs hereby supplement their challenge to the Bureau's ongoing violations of the
2 ESA and allege that the Bureau violated, and is violating arbitrarily and capriciously, Section 7(a)(2)
3 of the ESA and the ESA's implementing regulations by failing to reinitiate consultation on the SRS
4 Contract renewals based on new information that reveals that the SRS Contracts may affect the
5 winter-run and spring-run Chinook in a manner not previously considered.

6 19. Plaintiffs further supplement their challenge to the Bureau's ongoing violations of the
7 ESA and allege that the Bureau and the SRS Contractors violated Section 9 of the ESA by taking
8 winter-run and spring-run Chinook, and by impairing these species' critical habitat, unlawfully and
9 without required authorization.

10 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 20. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (action arising
12 under the laws of the United States); 16 U.S.C. § 1540(c), (g) (action arising under the ESA); and 5
13 U.S.C. §§ 702, 703, and 706 (judicial review of federal agency actions).

14 21. The Secretary has issued a final Biological Opinion on the effects of the OCAP on delta
15 smelt pursuant to 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b). Plaintiffs assert that the Biological Opinion is arbitrary and
16 capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance with law within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. §
17 706(2). An actual controversy therefore exists between the parties within the meaning of the
18 Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).

19 22. On February 7, 2008, more than 60 days prior to the filing of the Third Supplemental
20 Complaint, plaintiffs provided defendants with written notice of the violations of the ESA alleged
21 herein, as required by 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)(2). A copy of this written notice is attached hereto as
22 Exhibit 1.

23 23. This case was originally filed in the Northern District of California. The case was
24 transferred to the Eastern District of California on September 28, 2005.

25 **ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION FOR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

26 24. A final letter of concurrence on the effects of the SRS Contracts on winter-run and
27 spring-run Chinook was issued on January 10, 2005, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2). Plaintiffs
28 assert that the Bureau's decision not to reinitiate consultation with NMFS is arbitrary and capricious

1 and violates 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2) and the ESA’s implementing regulations, 50 C.F.R. § 402.16.
2 Plaintiffs further contend that the Secretary and SRS Contractors have taken, and are taking, winter-
3 run and spring-run Chinook in violation of 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a). An actual controversy therefore
4 exists between the parties within the meaning of the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a),
5 as to the claims newly alleged in plaintiffs’ Fourth Supplemental Complaint.

6 25. On August 10, 2015, more than 60 days prior to the filing of this Fourth Supplemental
7 Complaint, plaintiffs provided the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau and the SRS Contractors with
8 written notice of the additional violations of the ESA alleged in the Fourth Supplemental Complaint,
9 as required by 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)(2). A copy of this written notice is attached hereto as Exhibit 6.

10 **PARTIES**

11 26. Plaintiff NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL (“NRDC”) is a non-profit
12 environmental organization with more than 294,000 members nationwide, including more than
13 54,000 members in California. NRDC’s purpose is to safeguard the Earth: its people, its plants and
14 animals and the natural systems on which all life depends. The organization works to restore the
15 integrity of the elements that sustain life — air, land and water — and to defend endangered natural
16 places. NRDC seeks to establish sustainability and good stewardship of the Earth as central ethical
17 imperatives of human society and strives to protect nature in ways that advance the long-term
18 welfare of present and future generations. For more than three decades, NRDC has advocated
19 extensively for the protection of the nation’s waterways and wildlife, including the delta smelt and
20 salmon species at issue here. In July 2003, NRDC submitted formal comments and scientific
21 information to the Bureau raising concerns about the impacts of the Bureau’s then-proposed OCAP
22 on delta smelt and salmonids, and in July 2004, NRDC submitted formal comments and scientific
23 information to FWS regarding the impacts of the Bureau’s OCAP on delta smelt, during the
24 pendency of the ESA consultation that resulted in the original FWS biological opinion. In February
25 2005, NRDC submitted recent scientific data to FWS indicating that delta smelt are at the lowest
26 levels ever measured in the history of monitoring. In addition, NRDC has long worked to protect the
27 San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary and the fish for which it provides habitat, including the delta smelt,
28 winter-run Chinook, and spring-run Chinook, in non-litigation settings. For example, NRDC was

1 involved in the development of, and actively supported the enactment of, the Central Valley Project
2 Improvement Act and participated deeply in the negotiation of the record of decision for the
3 CALFED Bay-Delta Program, a joint federal-state process the mission of which is to develop and
4 implement a long-term comprehensive plan that will restore ecological health and improve water
5 management for beneficial uses of the Bay-Delta estuary. NRDC has submitted formal comments
6 and scientific information to NMFS regarding the impacts of the 2004 OCAP on the salmonid
7 species at issue here during the ESA consultation that resulted in the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp.
8 NRDC has urged the Bureau to reinitiate consultation with NMFS on the renewed Settlement
9 Contracts.

10 27. Plaintiff CALIFORNIA TROUT (“CalTrout”) is a non-profit conservation corporation
11 organized in 1971 under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in San
12 Francisco, California. CalTrout’s mission is to protect and restore wild trout and steelhead and the
13 waters they inhabit throughout California and other California native fish species such as the delta
14 smelt. CalTrout fulfills its mission by protecting wild trout habitat throughout California, and the
15 native biodiversity associated with this riparian habitat, including the delta smelt and other
16 vulnerable species. In fulfilling its mission to protect freshwater habitat and its biodiversity,
17 including native fish, CalTrout has participated in watershed protection and restoration efforts such
18 as preserving and restoring the habitat of California’s unique state fish, the California golden trout,
19 working with the California Department of Fish and Game and other key partners to establish a
20 statewide steelhead trout and a northern California coho salmon recovery plan, restoring San
21 Francisco’s Lake Merced and the Eastern Sierra’s Mono Lake, and mobilizing concerned anglers to
22 protect and restore wild trout waters in the Mount Shasta and Mammoth Lakes regions of the state.
23 CalTrout participates regularly in administrative processes and in the past two years has commented
24 on the U.S. Forest Service’s proposed changes in Forest Practices, Roadless Rules, and Sierra
25 Framework; Bureau of Land Management Grazing Regulations; California Department of Fish and
26 Game Trout Strategic Plan; and amendments proposed for Clean Water Act. CalTrout members
27 support the conservation of entire watersheds and all of their associated biodiversity, as well as the
28 effective implementation and enforcement by government regulatory agencies of planning and

1 conservation laws, like the Endangered Species Act, that relate to the protection of these watersheds
2 and their native biodiversity. CalTrout represents nearly 6,000 recreational anglers, of whom more
3 than 2,000 live within a one-hour drive of the Delta and regularly utilize these riparian areas for
4 fishing, photography, and hiking and to seek aesthetic relief from the urban environments of the Bay
5 Area.

6 28. Plaintiff SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER (“Baykeeper”) is a regional non-profit
7 public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California. Baykeeper’s mission
8 is to protect and enhance the water quality of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for the benefit of
9 its ecosystems and human communities. Founded in 1989, Baykeeper is the premier legal and policy
10 advocate for the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary. Through its on-the-water presence, Baykeeper
11 patrols hundreds of miles of waterways throughout the Bay-Delta, investigating pollution problems
12 and bringing enforcement actions against polluters directly when necessary. Baykeeper also uses
13 targeted administrative and legal advocacy before state and regional regulators, playing a lead role in
14 developing sound and legal standards, permits, and regulations. A key area of the group’s focus is
15 ensuring that state and federal environmental laws are implemented properly and enforced.
16 Baykeeper’s office is located in Oakland, California. Baykeeper has approximately 3,000 members
17 and supporters, most of whom reside in the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed.

18 29. Plaintiff FRIENDS OF THE RIVER (“FOR”) was founded in 1973 and is incorporated
19 under the non-profit laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in
20 Sacramento, California. FOR has more than 5,600 members dedicated to the protection,
21 preservation, and restoration of California’s rivers, streams, watersheds and aquatic ecosystems.
22 Half of FOR’s members live in the San Francisco bay area, near the Delta and river areas that
23 provide delta smelt habitat. FOR has been involved in the protection and management of
24 California’s rivers and estuaries for more than 30 years, with an emphasis on protecting free flowing
25 rivers and streams, watersheds, water quality, aquatic habitat, and aquatic species. FOR was an
26 original plaintiff in the lawsuits to list the delta smelt and challenge the FWS’s biological opinion for
27 the species. Many members of FOR utilize California rivers and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay
28 Delta Estuary for outdoor recreation and spiritual renewal.

1 30. Plaintiff THE BAY INSTITUTE OF SAN FRANCISCO (“TBI”) is a nonprofit
2 conservation organization incorporated under the laws of California and dedicated to the
3 preservation, protection, and restoration of the San Francisco Bay, its estuary, the accompanying
4 watershed (including the Delta), and this region’s fish and wildlife resources, from the Sierra to the
5 sea. TBI’s headquarters are located in San Francisco, California. TBI and its more than 1,600
6 members have a direct interest in the survival and perpetuation of fish species and other aquatic
7 resources that are dependent upon Central Valley Rivers, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the San
8 Francisco Bay, and its estuary. Most of TBI’s members live in the San Francisco Bay’s watershed,
9 and many rely on this region for their livelihood in the commercial and sports fishing and boating
10 industries. In addition, many TBI members regularly visit and use the San Francisco Bay, its estuary,
11 and the Central Valley rivers that flow into the Bay and its estuary for recreational experiences and
12 aesthetic enjoyment. TBI regularly participates in administrative and judicial proceedings on behalf
13 of its members to protect, enhance, and restore declining populations of native California fishes,
14 including ESA-listed salmon, steelhead, and delta smelt, throughout the Bay’s watershed. Since its
15 founding in 1981, TBI has pioneered a research, advocacy, and education approach to the San
16 Francisco Bay Estuary’s issues that considers not just the Bay, but the entire ecosystem related to the
17 Bay’s estuary as a single, interdependent watershed. TBI’s efforts therefore encompass a region
18 extending from the headwaters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems to the Golden
19 Gate. In 1992, TBI and other environmental organizations sued the Service over its failure to list the
20 delta smelt under the ESA, and since then TBI has carefully monitored the federal government’s
21 efforts to protect this species. TBI was one of three environmental organizations that negotiated the
22 historic 1994 Bay-Delta Accord, which forged a consensus among the state and federal governments,
23 and environmental, agricultural, and urban interests to achieve improvements in the water quality of
24 the Bay-Delta. The 1994 Bay-Delta Accord also set in motion CALFED, in which TBI has been
25 heavily engaged. In July 2003, TBI submitted formal comments and scientific information to the
26 Bureau regarding the impacts of its then-proposed OCAP on delta smelt. The Bay Institute works
27 collaboratively with government agencies, independent academic experts, water users, and land
28 owners to design and implement large-scale ecological restoration programs through the CALFED

1 Bay-Delta Program, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (“CVPIA”) (Pub. L. No. 102-575,
2 106 Stat. 4714 (1992)), and other initiatives. TBI commented on the original environmental impact
3 statement and environmental impact report (“EIS/EIR”) for the 1986 CVP/SWP Coordinated
4 Operating Agreement (“COA”). In July 2003, The Bay Institute submitted formal comments and
5 scientific information to the Bureau regarding the impacts of its then-proposed OCAP on the five
6 salmon and steelhead evolutionarily significant units present in the Central Valley.

7 31. Plaintiffs and their respective members have been and will continue to be actively
8 involved in efforts to protect and restore delta smelt and the winter-run and spring-run Chinook in
9 the Delta and Sacramento River watershed. Among other things, they have written to numerous
10 federal, state, and local agencies and officials to urge increased protection for the delta smelt and
11 winter-run and spring-run Chinook and their habitat.

12 32. Plaintiffs and their respective members live and/or work in communities near or on
13 the Delta. In addition to advocating for protections for the delta smelt, members of the plaintiff
14 organizations, all environmental, conservation, or fishing organizations, are active participants in the
15 life of the Delta. Individual members of each organization frequently visit the Delta, critical habitat
16 for the delta smelt, to use and appreciate the Delta ecosystem. The health and survival of the delta
17 smelt species is considered indicative of the health of the Delta itself. *See* U.S. Fish and Wildlife
18 Service, Recovery Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Native Fishes at 1 (Nov. 26, 1996).
19 Plaintiffs’ use of the Delta for educational and recreational activities, such as hiking, boating, bird
20 watching, swimming, and fishing, would be detrimentally affected by the decline of the delta smelt
21 and the corresponding decline in the health of the Delta. Plaintiffs and their members regularly
22 derive scientific, educational, and conservation benefit and enjoyment from the existence of the delta
23 smelt and will continue to do so by regularly engaging in scientific, education, and conservation
24 activities involving the delta smelt. These benefits and enjoyments would increase if the delta smelt
25 were to recover from its precarious status of being threatened with extinction.

26 33. Delta smelt populations will continue to decline, and the fish may soon become
27 extinct, unless the utmost care is taken in protecting the fish’s limited critical habitat in the Delta.
28 The health of the delta smelt population is one indicator of the overall health of the Delta. Therefore,

1 while the extirpation of the delta smelt from any portion of the Delta would constitute an irreparable
2 environmental loss in and of itself, it would also indicate more generally that the health and diversity
3 of the fish's Delta habitat had been severely degraded. These events, and the threat of these events,
4 would deprive plaintiffs and their members of the recreational, spiritual, professional, aesthetic,
5 educational, and other benefits they presently derive from the Delta ecosystems.

6 34. The above-described aesthetic, conservation, recreational, scientific, educational,
7 wildlife and fisheries preservation, and other interests of plaintiffs and their respective members,
8 have been, are being, and, unless the relief prayed for herein is granted, will continue to be adversely
9 affected and irreparably injured by the defendants' arbitrary and capricious issuance of a Biological
10 Opinion that found that the implementation of intensified CVP and SWP operations, as set forth in
11 the OCAP and in the Biological Opinion's project description, would not jeopardize the survival of
12 the delta smelt or adversely modify its critical habitat. These injuries are actual and concrete and
13 would be redressed by the relief sought herein. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

14 35. The Defendants in this action are:

15 a. SALLY JEWELL: Ms. Jewell is sued in her official capacity as Secretary of
16 the Interior, the Bureau's parent agency. She is ultimately responsible for implementing the ESA
17 and for ensuring that the consultations required by Section 7 of the ESA regarding impacts to the
18 delta smelt and winter-run and spring-run Chinook from the OCAP and contract renewals are
19 completed in accordance with the letter and intent of the law. She is also ultimately responsible for
20 ensuring that the Bureau's operation of the CVP does not violate the ESA.

21 b. DAN ASHE: Mr. Ashe is sued in his official capacity as Director of the
22 Service. He has been delegated the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior described in the
23 preceding paragraph. He is responsible for administering the ESA, including reviewing and
24 approving the findings of the delta smelt final Biological Opinion.

25 c. ESTEVAN LÓPEZ: Mr. López is sued in his official capacity as
26 Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Under the supervision and direction of the Secretary
27 of the Interior, he is responsible for insuring that the operations of the CVP are consistent with ESA
28 requirements.

1 36. The following Defendant-Intervenors voluntarily intervened in this action, thereby
2 submitting themselves to the jurisdiction of this Court:

- 3 a. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES (“DWR”).
- 4 b. CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.
- 5 c. GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 6 d. NATOMAS CENTRAL MUTUAL WATER COMPANY (“NCMWC”).
- 7 e. PELGER MUTUAL WATER COMPANY.
- 8 f. PLEASANT GROVE-VERONA MUTUAL WATER COMPANY.
- 9 g. PRINCETON-CODORA-GLENN IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 10 h. PROVIDENT IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 11 i. RECLAMATION DISTRICT 108.
- 12 j. RIVER GARDEN FARMS.
- 13 k. SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY (“SLDMWA”).
- 14 l. STATE WATER CONTRACTORS (“SWC”).
- 15 m. WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT.

16 37. The following parties were joined as defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
17 Procedure 19 in the Third Supplemental Complaint:

- 18 a. ANDERSON-COTTONWOOD IRRIGATION DISTRICT (“ACID”).
- 19 b. BEVERLY F., ARNOLD A., MICHAEL D., AND MARK C. ANDREOTTI.
- 20 c. BANTA-CARBONA IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 21 d. CHRISTO D. BARDIS, JOHN D. REYNEN, AND JUDITH REYNEN.
- 22 e. BYRON BETHANY IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 23 f. CARTER MUTUAL WATER COMPANY.
- 24 g. COELHO FAMILY TRUST.
- 25 h. CONAWAY PRESERVATION GROUP.
- 26 i. DEL PUERTO WATER DISTRICT.
- 27 j. EAGLE FIELD WATER DISTRICT.
- 28 k. FRESNO SLOUGH WATER DISTRICT.

- 1 l. HOWALD FARMS, INC.
- 2 m. JAMES IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 3 n. LOMO COLD STORAGE.
- 4 o. MAXWELL IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 5 p. MERCY SPRINGS WATER DISTRICT.
- 6 q. MERIDIAN FARMS WATER COMPANY.
- 7 r. OJI BROTHERS FARM, INC.
- 8 s. OJI FAMILY PARTNERSHIP.
- 9 t. ORO LOMA WATER DISTRICT.
- 10 u. PACIFIC REALTY ASSOCIATES, L.P.
- 11 v. PATTERSON IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 12 w. ABDUL AND TAHMINA RAUF.
- 13 x. RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1004.
- 14 y. CITY OF REDDING.
- 15 z. HENRY D. RICHTER et al.
- 16 aa. SACRAMENTO RIVER RANCH, LLC.
- 17 bb. SUTTER MUTUAL WATER COMPANY.
- 18 cc. KNIGHTS LANDING INVESTORS, LLC (FORMERLY FRED
- 19 TENHUNFELD et al.)²
- 20 dd. TISDALE IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE COMPANY.
- 21 ee. TRANQUILITY IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 22 ff. WEST SIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 23 gg. WEST STANISLAUS IRRIGATION DISTRICT.
- 24 hh. WINDSWEPT LAND AND LIVESTOCK COMPANY.

25 **ADDITIONAL PLAINTIFFS FOR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

26
27 ² On October 7, 2015, counsel for Mr. Tenhunfeld sent a letter to Plaintiffs stating that Mr.
28 Tenhunfeld's contract had been assumed by Knights Landing Investors, LLC.

1 38. Plaintiff WINNEMEM WINTU TRIBE (the “Winnemem”) is a historic California
2 Native Tribe recognized by the California Native American Heritage Commission. The
3 Winnemem’s historical territory included the east side of the upper Sacramento River watershed, the
4 McCloud River watershed from origin to termination, the Squaw Creek watershed from origin to
5 termination, and approximately 20 miles of the Pit River from the confluence of the McCloud River,
6 Squaw Creek, and Pit River up to Big Bend. The Winnemem has tribal members living, and tribal
7 concerns, in areas including Clear Creek from Whiskeytown Dam to the Sacramento River, the
8 Sacramento River from Shasta Dam to the Delta, and Spring Creek from the Debris Dam to Keswick
9 Dam. For centuries, the Winnemem has had a deep cultural and spiritual relationship with the
10 salmon that use these rivers. Prior to the advent of the CVP and throughout implementation of the
11 CVP and the CVPIA, the Winnemem have been voicing their concerns for the salmon. In 1872, for
12 example, the United States Fish Commission (now the FWS) sought to build a Salmon Fish
13 Hatchery on the McCloud River, which the Winnemem opposed due to the serious threat it would
14 pose to the salmon. Similarly, in 1937, the Bureau began construction of Shasta Dam, which the
15 Winnemem also opposed because it blocked salmon migration. At these and all other opportunities
16 of which they were aware, the Winnemem have voiced concern and advocated for the salmon. The
17 Winnemem have testified in numerous hearings before the Bureau, the United States Senate, and the
18 CALFED Bay Delta Authority, in attempts to achieve protection for Sacramento River salmon and
19 steelhead.

20 39. PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION OF FISHERMEN’S ASSOCIATIONS/
21 INSTITUTE FOR FISHERIES RESOURCES. Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman’s
22 Associations (“PCFFA”) is the largest trade organization of commercial fishing men and women on
23 the West Coast. PCFFA is a federation of port associations and marketing associations in California,
24 Oregon and Washington. PCFFA’s Southwest Regional Office is located in San Francisco,
25 California. Collectively, PCFFA’s members represent more than 1,000 commercial fishing families,
26 most of whom are small and mid-sized commercial fishing boat owners and operators. Most of
27 PCFFA’s members derive all or part of their income from the harvesting of salmonids, a valuable
28 business enterprise for the West Coast and California economies. The decline of California’s salmon

1 species has severely impacted PCFFA members in California by limiting commercial harvest
2 opportunities, both through lost production of impaired stocks and because of restrictions imposed
3 on the fishing fleet to protect impaired salmon populations. Habitat losses to date already have cost
4 the West Coast salmon fishing industry (including both commercial and recreational components)
5 tens of thousands of jobs in the last thirty years. These losses are directly related to widespread
6 inland habitat destruction resulting from the construction of dams and diversions of water as part of
7 the CVP and SWP. PCFFA has been active for over 30 years in efforts to rebuild salmon
8 populations in Central Valley streams and rivers as well as watersheds connected naturally and
9 unnaturally to the Central Valley rivers. The SRS contract renewals have an adverse effect on
10 salmonid species that are critical to PCFFA's members' livelihoods. PCFFA has presented written
11 comments and/or testimony to the Bureau and CALFED on numerous CVP contract renewals.

12 The INSTITUTE FOR FISHERIES RESOURCES ("IFR") is a sister organization of PCFFA.
13 IFR is a nonprofit organization with headquarters in San Francisco, California. Established in 1993
14 by PCFFA, IFR is responsible for meeting the fishery research and conservation needs of working
15 men and women in the fishing industry by executing PCFFA's expanding habitat protection
16 program. From its inception, IFR has helped fishing men and women in California and the Pacific
17 Northwest address salmon protection and restoration issues, with particular focus on dam, water
18 diversion, and forestry concerns. IFR is an active leader in several restoration programs affecting
19 winter-run and spring-run Chinook, including removal of antiquated storage and hydroelectric dams.
20 PCFFA and IFR both operate ongoing programs aimed at addressing recovery of salmonids affected
21 by the OCAP and the SRS contracts, including winter-run Chinook. PCFFA and IFR have actively
22 advocated for the protection and restoration of flows critical to the health of the Bay and Delta.

23 40. NRDC, Baykeeper, TBI, the Winnemem Wintu Tribe, and PCFFA/IFR, and their
24 respective members, live, work, recreate, research, and worship in the Sacramento River watershed.
25 They depend on the winter-run and spring-run Chinook for professional, recreational, and spiritual
26 sustenance, and the health of these runs impacts the availability of the commercially and
27 recreationally fished fall-run Chinook, on which PCFFA members rely for a substantial portion of
28 their economic well-being and livelihood. In addition to advocating for protections for the winter-

1 run and spring-run Chinook, members of these plaintiff organizations, all environmental,
2 conservation, tribal, or fishing organizations, are active participants in the life of the Sacramento
3 River watershed. Individual members of each organization either live in, work in, or frequently
4 travel to the Sacramento River watershed, critical habitat for the winter-run and spring-run Chinook.
5 Plaintiffs' use of the Sacramento River watershed for educational, professional, spiritual, and
6 recreational activities, such as hiking, boating, bird watching, swimming, and fishing, would be
7 detrimentally affected by the decline of the winter-run and spring-run Chinook. Plaintiffs and their
8 members regularly derive scientific, educational, spiritual, professional, economic, and conservation
9 benefit and enjoyment from the existence of the winter-run and spring-run Chinook and will
10 continue to do so by regularly engaging in activities involving these species. These benefits and
11 enjoyments would increase if necessary measures were taken to provide for the recovery of these
12 species.

13 41. Winter-run and spring-run Chinook populations will continue to decline, and the
14 species may soon become extinct, unless the utmost care is taken in protecting their limited
15 remaining critical habitat. The winter-run and spring-run Chinook are important to the natural
16 balance of the Sacramento River watershed, and their extinction would adversely affect the entire
17 ecosystem. These events, and the threat of these events, would deprive plaintiffs and their members
18 of the recreational, spiritual, professional, aesthetic, educational, economic, and other benefits they
19 presently derive from the Sacramento River watershed.

20 42. The above-described aesthetic, conservation, recreational, scientific, educational,
21 economic, wildlife and fisheries preservation, and other interests of plaintiffs and their respective
22 members, have been, are being, and, unless the relief prayed for herein is granted, will continue to be
23 adversely affected and irreparably injured by the defendants' failure to comply with the provisions of
24 the Endangered Species Act discussed herein. These injuries are actual and concrete and would be
25 redressed by the relief sought herein. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

26 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

27 **The Delta Smelt**

28 43. The delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) is a slender-bodied fish typically reaching

1 just over 2 inches in length. The delta smelt is the only native estuarine species found in the Delta
2 that spends its entire life span in the Delta.

3 44. Historically, delta smelt could be found throughout the Delta. However, during the
4 past 30 years, the population has declined by 85 percent; in 2004, delta smelt abundance was just 8
5 percent of the average abundance measured from 1967-1973.

6 45. Delta smelt typically live for only one year, and, therefore, they are particularly
7 vulnerable to extinction resulting from atypically harsh conditions. One year in which the population
8 fails to spawn or in which a high proportion of juveniles are killed could result in the extinction of
9 the species. Similarly, increased abundance from a good year will not serve to mitigate damage to
10 population caused by a subsequent bad year. As a result, delta smelt are affected greatly by any
11 disturbance to their reproductive habitat or larval nursery areas.

12 46. Delta smelt live for most of their year-long life spans in the low-salinity zone at the
13 saltwater-freshwater interface, but they migrate upstream to spawn. However, the amount and the
14 quality of suitable habitat has declined dramatically due to Delta water diversions and exports. As
15 freshwater is exported, the low-salinity zone shifts upstream from large-area, shallow habitats, such
16 as Suisun Bay, to narrow, deep river channels, which are less productive and have less habitat area.
17 This impact to the critical rearing habitat of the smelt is compounded by the disastrous levels of
18 direct mortality that occur at the Projects' pumps: Both pre-spawning adult fish moving upstream to
19 spawn and their larval and juvenile progeny moving downstream to low-salinity rearing habitat are
20 killed in large numbers at the Projects' fish salvage facilities and pumps.

21 47. In response to a lawsuit brought against the Service by TBI, FOR, and other
22 conservation groups to compel such listing, the Service listed the delta smelt as a threatened species
23 under the ESA on March 5, 1993. These same groups were forced to bring litigation to compel
24 designation of critical habitat for delta smelt, which the Service designated on December 19, 1994.
25 The critical habitat includes all waters and submerged lands within the Delta, including those at the
26 pumping plants for the CVP and the SWP.

27 48. The California Department of Fish and Game has confirmed that data from the 2004
28 abundance measurements for the delta smelt indicate that the species abundance is at the lowest level

1 ever measured in over 30 years of monitoring. Population viability analysis conducted for the
2 species indicates that the risk for extinction within the next 20 years is high. *See, e.g.,* Bennett,
3 W.W. and K.T. Honey, *Modeling the Canary: How Do We Assess Population Viability for the*
4 *Threatened Delta Smelt?*, Proceedings of the 2004 CALFED Bay-Delta Program Science
5 Conference.

6 **ADDITIONAL FACTUAL BACKGROUND FOR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL**
7 **COMPLAINT**

8 **The Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon**

9 49. The winter-run Chinook's population has declined precipitously since the early 1980s,
10 from an estimated historic high of 117,808 in 1969 to as few as 191 adult individuals returning to
11 spawn in 1991. The winter-run Chinook was declared threatened on November 5, 1990 (55 Fed.
12 Reg. 46515) and reclassified as endangered on January 4, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 440). NMFS re-
13 affirmed the listing of the winter-run Chinook as an endangered species on June 28, 2005. 70 Fed.
14 Reg. 37160, 37191.

15 50. Critical habitat for the winter-run Chinook was first designated on August 4, 1989 (54
16 Fed. Reg. 32085) to include the portion of the Sacramento River from Red Bluff Diversion Dam in
17 Tehama County (River Mile 243) to Keswick Dam in Shasta County (River Mile 302), including
18 adjacent riparian areas as well as the river water and river bottom. On June 16, 1993, critical habitat
19 was extended downstream to Chipps Island (River Mile 0) at the westward margin of the
20 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Critical habitat now includes all waters from Chipps Island
21 westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait, all waters
22 of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge, and all waters of San Francisco Bay (north of
23 the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge. 58 Fed.
24 Reg. 33212.

25 51. The NMFS OCAP BiOp stated that the winter-run Chinook is "at high risk of
26 extinction" and warned that a prolonged drought could have devastating effects on the species.
27 NMFS OCAP BiOp at 672, 674. Winter-run Chinook inhabit the upper Sacramento River and its
28 tributaries, where the flow of cold water throughout the summer allows for successful spawning, egg

1 incubation, and rearing. Historically, winter-run Chinook relied on the McCloud, Pit, and Little
2 Sacramento rivers, as well as Hat and Battle creeks, for habitat conducive to egg and fry
3 development and survival and juvenile rearing. The construction of Shasta Dam blocked access to
4 almost all of these rearing waters. Today, the upper Sacramento River below Keswick Dam is the
5 only remaining spawning area used by winter-run Chinook. The survival of the winter-run Chinook
6 is therefore completely dependent on the Bureau's management of the temperature and flow
7 conditions below Keswick dam.

8 52. Winter-run Chinook are particularly vulnerable during the "temperature management
9 season," which generally lasts from June through October. Adult winter-run Chinook migrate up the
10 Sacramento River in the winter and spring and then hold below the Keswick Dam for several months
11 before spawning. During these critical months, the salmon require cold water for the maturation of
12 their gonads and the development of fertilized eggs and embryos. The optimal temperature for egg
13 incubation is at maximum daily water temperatures of between 41 and 54.5 degrees Fahrenheit. Egg
14 viability is reduced when maximum daily water temperatures exceed this optimal temperature range.
15 Additionally, the adverse effects of high incubation temperatures extend beyond the egg stage,
16 causing higher rates of mortality in later salmonid life stages. As a result, the 2009 NMFS OCAP
17 BiOp requires the Bureau to manage releases from Keswick Dam such that there is sufficient volume
18 in Shasta Reservoir's cold water pool to enable the Bureau to maintain daily average water
19 temperatures that do not exceed 56 degrees at compliance locations between Balls Ferry and Bend
20 Bridge from May 15 through September 30 of each year.

21 **The Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon**

22 53. The spring-run Chinook was historically the second largest salmon run in the Central
23 Valley watershed and supported the bulk of the commercial fishery. Only remnant independent
24 natural spring-run Chinook populations survive. These remnant populations represent the last
25 vestige of the once robust populations in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system.

26 54. The Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon was listed as threatened on September
27 16, 1999. 64 Fed. Reg. 50394. NMFS reaffirmed its threatened status on June 28, 2005. 70 Fed.
28 Reg. 37160, 37191.

1 55. On September 2, 2005, NMFS published the final designation of critical habitat for
2 the spring-run Chinook, which is described and illustrated in detail in the Federal Register at 70 Fed.
3 Reg. 52488, 52518, and 52590-52603.

4 56. Spring-run Chinook enter the Sacramento River between March and September,
5 primarily between May and June, and spawn in the river's tributaries in September and October.
6 Historically, the mainstem of the Sacramento River has sustained a substantial portion of the spring-
7 run Chinook population. Between 1969 and 1986, an average of over 10,000 spring-run Chinook
8 used the upper mainstem to spawn, incubate, and rear. Since the early 1990s, however, only a few
9 hundred fish have successfully returned, and in recent years, surveys have indicated that no spring-
10 run Chinook have returned to spawn in this reach of the river. The remaining remnant populations of
11 the spring-run Chinook rely principally upon small tributaries of the Sacramento River below Shasta
12 Dam.

13 57. Spring-run Chinook require similar cold water temperatures as winter-run Chinook
14 for successful spawning, egg incubation and rearing.

15 **Loss of Sacramento River Temperature Control in 2014 and 2015**

16 58. The Bureau is responsible for conducting temperature modeling to determine how
17 much water stored in Shasta Reservoir can be released to the contractors in the spring and summer
18 months. The Bureau must retain sufficient cold water reserves in Shasta Reservoir so that it can
19 make timed releases from Keswick Dam throughout the temperature management season to maintain
20 temperatures conducive to salmonid spawning, egg incubation, and rearing. The Bureau's ability to
21 meet the needs of salmonids and their habitat throughout the temperature management season is
22 affected by the SRS contracts. In 2014, in order to meet the demands of the SRS Contracts, the
23 Bureau made releases from Keswick Dam in April, May, and early June that depleted the cold water
24 pool behind Shasta Dam and ultimately led to the loss of temperature control. State and federal
25 agencies estimate that the Bureau's failure to maintain temperature control led to 95% mortality of
26 the 2014 brood year of winter-run Chinook. Additionally, high temperatures in September led to
27 virtually complete mortality of spring-run Chinook eggs in the Sacramento River.

28 59. In February 2015, in reviewing the Bureau's forecast and water supply allocation for

1 water year 2015, NMFS stated that, “in light of the high mortality (95%) associated with water
2 temperatures observed in 2014 for juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon that spawned in upper
3 Sacramento River, it is critically important to improve the accuracy of water temperature forecasting,
4 and specifically the Bureau’s temperature model.” Letter from Maria Rea, Assistant Regional
5 Administrator, NMFS, to Ron Milligan, Operations Manager, Bureau of Reclamation 2 (Feb. 27,
6 2015). NMFS specified that “it is . . . important to conserve storage in Shasta Reservoir, and
7 specifically the cold water pool, in order to provide for the needs of winter-run eggs and alevin
8 throughout the temperature management season.” *Id.*

9 60. In spite of NMFS’s clear warnings, the Bureau again made excessive releases in April
10 and May of 2015 to satisfy its contractual obligations to the SRS Contractors. These releases again
11 depleted the cold water pool and severely compromised the spawning, egg incubation, and rearing
12 habitat for the annual brood of winter-run Chinook. By the end of May of 2015, the Bureau’s
13 updated forecasting showed that daily average water temperatures of 56 degrees at the Clear Creek
14 compliance point *could not* be met for the duration of the temperature management season. Since
15 June 2, 2015, the daily average water temperature at the Clear Creek compliance point has been
16 above 56 degrees almost every day of the temperature management season. Specifically,
17 temperatures at Clear Creek were above 56 degrees for 29 days in June, 30 days in July, 28 days in
18 August, and 28 days in September of 2015.

19 61. In June of 2015, at NMFS’s request, the Bureau issued a revised Temperature
20 Management Plan. Reviewing that plan, NMFS stated that, “It is now very clear through evaluating
21 operations in both 2014 and 2015 that the volume of cold water available for real-time management
22 in June through October is highly dependent on Keswick releases in April through early June. In
23 2016, should drought conditions persist, these releases in April through early June will need to be
24 held to minimal levels to achieve adequate temperatures only.” Letter from William Stelle, Jr.,
25 Regional Administrator, NMFS, to David Murillo, Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation 9 (July
26 1, 2015). Mr. Stelle explained that due to the Bureau’s April and May releases, “the quantity and
27 quality of the cold water pool[] will not provide for suitable winter-run [Chinook] habitat needs
28 throughout their egg and alevin incubation and fry rearing periods” and that the “conditions. . . could

1 have been largely prevented through upgrades in monitoring and modeling, and reduced Keswick
2 releases in April and May.” *Id.*

3 62. These releases to satisfy the terms of the SRS Contracts are the primary reason why
4 devastating mortality of winter run is occurring again in 2015. NMFS has forecast that, based on its
5 intervention and the Bureau’s revised temperature model and contingency plan, there is a
6 “reasonable possibility that there will be *some* juvenile winter-run survival” in 2015. *Id.* (emphasis
7 added). In a subsequent memorandum for the CVP-SWP operations administrative record, NMFS
8 reported that the Bureau’s model estimates that cumulative egg and egg-to-fry survival of winter-run
9 Chinook in 2015 to Bend Bridge is likely to be only approximately 6.89%. Memorandum from
10 Brycen Swart to CVP-SWP operations administrative record, number 151422SWR2006SA00268, at
11 100. As of October 22, 2015, preliminary data on winter run passage at Red Bluff Diversion Dam—
12 an indicator of brood year survival—was even lower for the 2015 winter-run brood year than for the
13 2014 winter-run brood year.

14 PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

15 **Operational Changes to the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project and the** 16 **Biological Opinion**

17
18 63. The CVP is a federal water storage and diversion project. It is one of the largest water
19 projects in the world, annually managing an average of approximately 9 million acre-feet of water
20 and annually delivering an average of approximately 6.8 million acre-feet of water. The CVP is
21 comprised of approximately 20 dams and reservoirs (including some of the largest storage facilities
22 in the State, such as Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River, the Trinity and Whiskeytown Dams,
23 which divert water from the Trinity River to the Sacramento River for export through the Delta, and
24 Folsom Dam on the American River), the Tracy Pumping Plant (which draws hundreds of billions of
25 gallons of water per year out of the Delta and into the Delta-Mendota Canal), and some 500 miles of
26 major canals, as well as conduits, tunnels, power plants, and related facilities. The SWP is a major
27 water storage and diversion project of the State of California that coordinates operations with the
28 CVP and shares the use of the San Luis Reservoir, among other facilities, with the CVP. As set forth

1 in the OCAP, the Bureau proposes to further coordinate operations of the CVP and the SWP and to
2 expand and intensify existing CVP and SWP operations in a manner that would significantly affect
3 the hydrology of the Delta, including the hydrology of areas designated as critical habitat for the
4 delta smelt. The implementation of these and other changes to and expansions of CVP-SWP
5 operations, as set forth in the OCAP and the Biological Opinion, significantly increase water exports
6 from the Delta.

7 64. As part of its CVP operations, the Bureau contracts with approximately 253 long-term
8 water contractors to deliver CVP water. A central goal of the OCAP was the execution of many of
9 these long-term CVP water supply renewal contracts. Upon completion of its OCAP consultation
10 with the Service, between February 2005 and April 2006 the Bureau executed at least 144 long-term
11 water supply renewal contracts that collectively provide for the export and diversion of CVP water
12 totaling approximately 2.5 million acre-feet per year.

13 65. The Biological Opinion purports to provide “early consultation” for operational
14 changes that are a part of the South Delta Improvement Program (“SDIP”). These changes would
15 include those listed above, as well as permanent barriers placed in the South Delta and further water
16 diversions. The Biological Opinion expressly states that it does not consider the impacts of
17 construction activities associated with the SDIP or the effects of other interrelated and
18 interdependent activities. This Biological Opinion indicates that its “early consultation” will be
19 formalized as a final consultation when the specific implementation plan for the South Delta is
20 completed, assuming that the project description does not change.

21 66. Despite the Bureau’s request that the Service reinstate consultation more completely
22 to address the impacts of the OCAP on delta smelt critical habitat, the Biological Opinion does not
23 consider or reach any conclusion as to how changes to the critical habitat of delta smelt caused by the
24 proposed CVP and SWP operations would adversely affect recovery of the delta smelt. This
25 reinstitution of consultation was necessary because courts have found that the Service’s definition of
26 adverse modification to critical habitat is an impermissible interpretation of the ESA because it reads
27 the goal of “recovery” out of the inquiry by holding that a proposed action “adversely modifies”
28 critical habitat only if the value of the critical habitat for *survival* is also appreciably diminished.

1 *See, e.g., Gifford Pinchot Task Force v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 378 F.3d 1059, 1069 (9th Cir.
2 2004).

3 67. The Biological Opinion states baldly that the Service relied on the statutory
4 provisions of the ESA and not the regulatory definition of adverse modification when reaching its
5 conclusions. However, this statement is not supported by any new analysis or by the few changes
6 made to the original biological opinion, and no new definition of adverse modification is provided or
7 applied.

8 68. In reaching a “no jeopardy” conclusion, the Biological Opinion relies heavily on
9 certain existing or potential future protective measures, the adequacy of which has not been
10 demonstrated, and several of which may not be implemented in the form assumed by the Biological
11 Opinion or at all. The Bureau has a long history of disregarding or violating such protective
12 measures. For example, the Bureau failed to consistently meet the conservation obligations agreed
13 upon in the biological opinions for the Friant Unit long- and short-term renewal contracts. In
14 addition, in multiple years since the endangered Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon and
15 the threatened delta smelt were listed under the ESA, the Bureau and the DWR have operated the
16 CVP and SWP in such a way that the ESA-mandated incidental take limits for both species have
17 been exceeded.

18 69. Among other defects, the Biological Opinion assumes benefits to the delta smelt from
19 future, long-term implementation of an Environmental Water Account (“EWA”). The EWA as it
20 presently exists is a water redistribution program that maintains exports to entities with contracts for
21 water from the Delta when protections for delta smelt or certain other species are put into effect. At
22 the time the original biological opinion was signed, however, the then-existing EWA was scheduled
23 to expire by September 2004.³ Although both the original and the revised Biological Opinion
24 assume a future EWA, the Biological Opinion also states that “inclusion of the EWA in this
25 description does not constitute a decision on future implementation of the EWA.” *See* Biological
26 Opinion at 84. Any benefits to delta smelt from any long-term EWA are, at best, speculative.

1 Moreover, the Biological Opinion’s characterization of the EWA does not agree with the description
2 provided by the Bureau in the June 30, 2004, OCAP when consultation with the Service was
3 requested.

4 70. Recognizing that assumed protective measures may be inadequate and, indeed, may
5 not even be fully carried out, the Biological Opinion provides for an “adaptive management” process
6 under which the Bureau and certain fisheries management agencies would discuss and *potentially*
7 agree to *further* changes in the CVP operations that affect delta smelt through an “adaptive
8 management” process. However, the Biological Opinion does not provide any assurance of any
9 particular level of protection for the delta smelt as a result of this promise of future “adaptive
10 management.”

11 71. The Opinion’s adaptive management process involves the use of a so-called “Delta
12 Smelt Risk Assessment Matrix” as a decision-making tool intended to be used by a Working Group
13 to monitor the effects of the CVP and SWP on the delta smelt. The Matrix is a tool to identify when
14 delta smelt may be negatively affected by a project and to suggest possible management strategies.
15 The Biological Opinion generally requires that the Working Group be informed should the triggering
16 conditions be met. However, the Biological Opinion does not require that the Working Group, or the
17 Bureau, take any particular action if a triggering condition occurs. No particular level of protection
18 for delta smelt or its critical habitat is insured.

19 72. The day before the Service issued its revised OCAP Biological Opinion, it issued a
20 concurrence letter in response to the Bureau’s July 15, 2003, request for consultation on its proposed
21 renewals of water service contracts with twenty water districts in the Delta Mendota Canal Unit
22 (“DMCU”). Pursuant to these twenty contracts, the Bureau has committed to annual exports of
23 342,865 acre-feet of CVP water from the Delta, via the Tracy Pumping Plant and the Delta-Mendota
24 Canal. Combined with other existing demands on CVP water, these exports will further deteriorate
25 water quality in the Delta; shift the delta smelt’s preferred habitat to less optimal upstream locations;
26

27 ³ CALFED temporarily extended the EWA through December 2007. The EWA has not been
28 reauthorized since that time.

1 and increase the risk of entrainment at the Tracy Pumping Plant, which has a diversion capacity of
2 4,600 cubic feet per second (“cfs”).

3 73. Despite the clear threat to the delta smelt and its critical habitat posed by the renewal
4 of these twenty long-term water service contracts, and notwithstanding its own recognition in the
5 2004 Biological Opinion that water exports from the Delta pose a serious threat to the delta smelt’s
6 survival, the FWS concluded in its February 15, 2005, concurrence letter that the proposed renewals
7 were not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt or any other listed species, or
8 to adversely modify any species’ critical habitat. The FWS expressly based this conclusion on its
9 2004 Biological Opinion.

10 74. Just three days later, on February 18, 2005, the FWS issued the first of three
11 concurrence letters responding to the Bureau’s April 14, 2004, request for consultation on the
12 proposed renewals of 145 Sacramento River settlement contracts. Sacramento River settlement
13 contractors own and maintain their own water diversion and conveyance facilities on the banks of the
14 Sacramento River.⁴ Delta smelt, which may currently be found as far north as Verona, are at risk of
15 being entrained at diversion points located at or south of Verona. The delta smelt and its critical
16 habitat are further imperiled by substantial upstream diversions by north-of-Verona settlement
17 contractors. Among other impacts, these upstream diversions increase the risk of entrainment by
18 shifting delta smelt closer to the site of diversion points, decrease outflows, and cause a shift in the
19 location of delta smelt’s preferred habitat to non-optimal areas. Sacramento River diversions from
20 January through June pose a particular threat because they reduce outflows into the Delta and alter
21 Delta flow patterns during critical pre-spawning and spawning months.

22 75. Nonetheless, the FWS concluded that the Bureau’s proposed renewals of 138
23 settlement contracts, which collectively provide for yearly diversions of 1,830,188 acre-feet of CVP
24 water, were not likely to jeopardize the delta smelt’s continued existence or adversely modify its
25 critical habitat. On March 9, 2005, the FWS issued a second concurrence letter in which it
26 concluded that the proposed renewal of the NCMWC settlement contract, which provides for yearly
27
28

1 diversions totaling 120,000 acre-feet of CVP water, was not likely to jeopardize the delta smelt's
2 continued existence or adversely modify its critical habitat. On May 12, 2005, the FWS issued a
3 third concurrence letter in which it concluded that the proposed renewals of the ACID and City of
4 Redding settlement contracts were not likely to jeopardize the delta smelt's continued existence or
5 adversely modify its critical habitat. The FWS expressly based each of these no jeopardy
6 conclusions on the OCAP Biological Opinion.

7 76. Together, these water-service and settlement renewal contracts provide for the
8 maximum delivery of far more water from the CVP than the CVP has, in recent years, been able to
9 deliver. In fact, the Bureau intends to increase water deliveries substantially during the life of these
10 renewed contracts. For example, in the Bureau's projections of water deliveries dated January 20,
11 2004, and attached as Exhibit 2 hereto, annual deliveries to the south-of-Delta Westlands Water
12 District are anticipated to increase steadily to an average of 1.127 million acre-feet from 2026 to
13 2030 — a full 98 percent of the 1.15 million acre-foot total in the current Westlands contract. These
14 planned delivery increases are inconsistent with previous statements regarding the quantity of water
15 to be exported from the Delta. The Bureau's OCAP Biological Assessment suggests that long-term
16 deliveries to south-of-Delta agricultural contractors will only average 58 to 61 percent of the full
17 contract amount. The Environmental Protection Agency highlighted this discrepancy in a letter
18 dated December 15, 2004, and attached hereto as Exhibit 3, where it noted that the Bureau is
19 contractually authorizing much higher future water deliveries than it is analyzing in environmental
20 impact documents or has delivered in recent years. If the Bureau is to deliver the maximum
21 quantities of water provided for in the contracts, it will need significantly to intensify CVP
22 operations and increase its deliveries north of the Delta and its water exports out of the Delta, as
23 compared to the operations assumed and analyzed in the Biological Opinion. Neither the Biological
24 Opinion nor the subsequently issued concurrence letters adequately consider or address the effects of
25 these long-term water service contracts on the delta smelt or its critical habitat.

27 ⁴ Four Sacramento River settlement contractors divert from Sutter Bypass or the Natomas Cross
28 Channel.

1 **Recent Developments in This Litigation and Regarding the Condition of the Delta Smelt⁵**

2 77. On May 25, 2007, the Court granted in part and denied in part plaintiffs' motion for
3 summary judgment herein. The Court summarized its holdings as follows:

4 The Delta smelt is undisputedly in jeopardy as to its survival and recovery. The 2005
5 BiOp's no jeopardy finding is arbitrary, capricious, and contrary to law. For all the
6 reasons set forth above, the 2005 OCAP BiOp is unlawful and inadequate on the
7 following grounds:

8 (1) The DSRAM, as currently structured, does not provide a reasonable
9 degree of certainty that mitigation actions will take place, even if the agency retains
10 the discretion to draw upon numerous sources of water, not just the EWA,
11 CVPIA(b)(2), and VAMP programs, to support fish protection.

12 (2) The agency failed to utilize the best available scientific information by not
13 addressing the 2004 FMWT data and the issue of climate change.

14 (3) The BiOp's historical approach to setting take limits fails to consider take
15 in the context of most recent overall species abundance and jeopardy.

16 (4) The BiOp did not adequately consider impacts to critical habitat by (a)
17 failing to analyze how project operations will impact the value of critical habitat for
18 the recovery of the smelt and (b) failing to consider impacts upon the entire extent of
19 known smelt critical habitat.

20 Order at 119 (Doc. 323).

21 78. Current and ongoing operations of the CVP and SWP under the existing OCAP—
22 including but not limited to pumping and water conveyance and export operations from the Delta—
23 jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt and adversely modify its designated critical
24 habitat.

25 79. Data from 2007 showed serious threat to the delta smelt's continued existence. The
26 2007 spring larval survey located only 98 smelt in the entire Delta, a number representing only 9% of
27 the number of smelt found by that time in 2006, a year in which smelt abundance was already
28 extremely low. The Delta Smelt Working Group ("DSWG"), a group of agency biologists
responsible for evaluating the current status of the delta smelt and recommending operational
measures to protect the smelt, explained that this data indicated cause for alarm: "For an annual
species such as delta smelt, failure to recruit a new year-class is an urgent indicator that the species
has become critically imperiled and an emergency response is warranted."

⁵ This section contains "recent developments" as of the filing of the Third Supplemental Complaint.

1 80. In light of the spring larval survey and increasing take of delta smelt at SWP and CVP
2 pumps during early summer 2007, throughout June and July the DSWG recommended that the
3 Bureau and DWR operate the CVP and SWP so as to achieve non-negative flows in Old and Middle
4 Rivers (“OMR”) and to prevent any entrainment of delta smelt at the Project pumps; to alter Project
5 operations to maintain average Delta temperatures of 25°C until delta smelt left the south and central
6 Delta; and to pump at reduced rates during periods of take.

7 81. The Bureau and DWR reduced pumping at CVP and SWP export facilities for
8 approximately 10 days in June 2007, during which time no delta smelt were taken at the CVP and
9 SWP pumps. But, over the DSWG’s objections, starting on or about June 10, 2007, the Bureau and
10 DWR rapidly increased pumping at their respective facilities, and by July 9, 2007, combined daily
11 pumping had risen to 10,160 cfs. As the pumping increased, so too did take of delta smelt. From the
12 beginning of May 2007 through July 9, 2007, 2,588 delta smelt were killed at CVP and SWP
13 pumping plants. However, until the Court’s December 14, 2007 remedial order, neither the SWP nor
14 the CVP decreased pumping or otherwise made any effort to follow DSWG recommendations for
15 protecting the delta smelt.

16 82. In light of these data and the Court’s May 25, 2007 summary judgment order, on
17 December 14, 2007, the Court entered a remedial order (Doc. 560) requiring that:

18 a. The federal defendants complete a new biological opinion regarding the
19 combined effects of CVP and SWP operations on the delta smelt.

20 b. The Bureau meet a 25% minimum frequency for sampling delta smelt
21 entrained at the Jones Pumping Plant.

22 c. The Bureau and DWR conduct larval delta smelt monitoring at the Jones and
23 Banks Pumping Plants, respectively, pursuant to the Court’s specifications for frequency and
24 timing of such monitoring.

25 d. The Bureau and DWR meet the Court’s specifications for limiting net
26 upstream flow in Old and Middle Rivers.

27 e. The Bureau and DWR continue to implement the Vernalis Adaptive
28 Management Plan (“VAMP”), San Joaquin River flow enhancement, and CVP and SWP

1 export curtailment.

2 f. Until the end of the VAMP action implementation, the Bureau and DWR
3 minimize the tidal effects to the south Delta agricultural barriers and not install the spring
4 Head of Old River Barrier.

5 g. That the federal defendants implement any and all measures that are necessary
6 to prevent an irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources pending completion of the
7 reinitiated OCAP consultation and the issuance of a valid Biological Opinion.

8 83. These interim remedies, while necessary, may not be sufficient to protect the delta
9 smelt and its critical habitat. The species' 20 mm index for 2007 was 1.0, an approximately 90%
10 drop from 2006 and the lowest on record. The species' 2007 FMWT index was 28, an
11 approximately 30% drop from 2006 and the second lowest on record. The most recent salvage data
12 show that during March 2008, 83 delta smelt were taken at SWP and CVP facilities, for a total of
13 more than 350 adult delta smelt salvaged at the pumps since January 1, 2008.

14 84. In recent flow recommendations, attached as Exhibit 4 hereto, the Smelt Working
15 Group⁶ has identified several current active risk factors for the delta smelt, including the low 2007
16 delta smelt FMWT index and early results from the Spring Kodiak Trawl, water temperatures
17 exceeding 12° Celsius for a five-week period and other indications that spawning has begun in
18 earnest, a corresponding increase in the number of larval delta smelt that are being transported to the
19 south Delta and thus more susceptible to entrainment at export facilities, higher than normal recent
20 adult smelt salvage, and adult distribution in the Delta. The Smelt Working Group described these
21 risk factors as grounds for a March 31, 2008, recommendation that the Bureau and DWR maintain a
22 combined OMR flow more positive than -2,000 cfs. The Bureau and DWR, however, have
23 determined to allow more negative flows than the Smelt Working Group recommended and operate
24 to a combined OMR flow level of -2,500 cfs, as explained in Exhibit 5 attached hereto.

25 **ADDITIONAL PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND FOR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL**
26 **COMPLAINT**

27 _____
28 ⁶ The DSWG has been renamed the Smelt Working Group.

1 **The Bureau's consultations with NMFS as relevant to the Fourth Supplemental Complaint**

2 85. On October 22, 2004, NMFS issued the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp on the impacts of
3 the OCAP to listed anadromous species. It concluded that the OCAP would not jeopardize the
4 survival of the winter-run or spring-run Chinook or adversely modify their critical habitat.

5 86. On January 10, 2005, NMFS issued a letter of concurrence concluding that 145 SRS
6 contract renewals, including the contract renewals with the SRS Contractors, would not jeopardize
7 the winter-run and spring-run Chinook and other listed species. NMFS's analysis relied expressly
8 and exclusively on the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp. NMFS's concurrence letter stated, "we find that
9 the effects of the Valley [sic] spring-run Chinook salmon . . . and the designated critical habitat of
10 winter-run Chinook salmon were previously considered as part of the OCAP action and fully
11 analyzed in the [NMFS 2004 BiOp]." The concurrence letter stated that "no additional incidental
12 take is authorized for these contract specific actions beyond the amount or extent of incidental take
13 authorized in the October 22, 2004 OCAP BiOp" and that reinitiation of consultation on the
14 renewals of the Sacramento River settlement contracts may be necessary if new information revealed
15 an effect to listed species or their critical habitat that was not considered in NMFS's concurrence
16 letter.

17 87. In 2008, a federal district court invalidated the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp because it
18 contained "inexplicabl[e] inconsisten[cies] as to the species' survival and recovery," was "unlawfully
19 silent on critical habitat effects," did not analyze the impact of global warming, and failed to analyze
20 species recovery. *Pacific Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Ass'ns v. Gutierrez*, 606 F. Supp. 2d 1122,
21 1193 (E.D. Cal. 2008). The court further ruled that the Bureau violated Section 7 of the ESA by
22 relying on a biological opinion "with such obvious flaws," and "obviously contradictory evidence."
23 *Id.* at 1188-91.

24 88. On June 4, 2009, NMFS issued the NMFS OCAP BiOp. Unlike the NMFS 2004
25 OCAP BiOp, the new BiOp concluded that the OCAP *would* cause jeopardy to listed anadromous
26 species, including the winter-run and spring-run Chinook, and adversely modify critical habitat.

27 89. The NMFS OCAP BiOp affirmatively states that it *did not* analyze the effects of
28 water contracts, such as the SRS contract renewals: "[T]his consultation does not address ESA

1 section 7(a)(2) compliance for individual water supply contracts. Reclamation and DWR should
2 consult with NMFS separately on their issuance of individual water supply contracts.” NMFS
3 OCAP BiOp at 35.

4 90. The NMFS OCAP BiOp also clarifies that the Bureau *does not have ESA*
5 *authorization* to take listed salmonid species to satisfy terms of the SRS contract renewals it deems
6 nondiscretionary: “In the event that Reclamation determines that delivery of quantities of water to
7 any contractor is nondiscretionary for purposes of the ESA, any incidental take due to delivery of
8 water to that contractor would not be exempted from the ESA section 9 take prohibition in this
9 Opinion.” *Id.* At the time of the 2009 NMFS OCAP BiOp, the Bureau had deemed deliveries of
10 water to the SRS Contractors non-discretionary.

11 91. NMFS has amended the NMFS OCAP BiOp several times. In 2011, NMFS amended
12 the BiOp in response to a report by an independent review panel (“IRP”). Specifically, NMFS
13 amended the reasonable and prudent alternative (“RPA”) so that the actions and implementation
14 procedures were consistent with the recommendations of the IRP. NMFS also revised the BiOp to
15 correct errors and provide clarification. NMFS again amended the NMFS OCAP BiOp in 2014 and
16 2015, when it responded to the Bureau’s request for reinitiation to analyze the impacts of the
17 Bureau’s Drought Operations Plan and the impacts of the temporary urgency change petitions
18 (TUCPs) it jointly filed with DWR to modify the water quality standards in D-1641, Bay-Delta water
19 quality standards, and provisions of the NMFS OCAP BiOp. Although the Bureau sought
20 modifications to the NMFS OCAP BiOp, D-1641, and the Bay-Delta water quality standards to
21 provide more water to the SRS Contractors, the Bureau did not reinitiate consultation on the renewed
22 SRS contracts themselves when it filed the TUCPs. Nor has the Bureau reinitiated consultation to
23 address the take of winter-run and spring-run Chinook caused by the loss of temperature control in
24 the Sacramento River during the 2014 and 2015 temperature management seasons.

25 **Subsequent Developments in This Litigation Leading to the Fourth Supplemental Complaint**

26 92. On July 16, 2008, Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment on their claim that the
27 Bureau violated Section 7 of the ESA by executing long-term water contracts based on FWS’s
28 invalid consultation. Doc. 680-81. Federal Defendants cross-moved for summary judgment, arguing

1 that the Bureau had properly consulted with FWS. Doc. 678-79. The DMC and SRS Contractors
2 also moved for summary judgment, challenging Plaintiffs’ standing and arguing that the Bureau had
3 adequately consulted or, alternatively, had no duty to consult regarding the renewals. Docs. 689-90;
4 Docs. 696-97. On November 19, 2008, the Court held Plaintiffs had standing to challenge the SRS
5 contracts, but not the DMC contracts. Doc. 761. Although the Court eventually held (in a ruling
6 later reversed by the Ninth Circuit) that threshold issues precluded a ruling in Plaintiffs’ favor, it
7 found that the Bureau’s consultations with FWS on the SRS contracts violated the ESA because
8 FWS had relied exclusively on the “legally flawed [FWS 2005] OCAP BiOp which failed to
9 competently and completely evaluate the impacts of water deliveries under the [SRS] Contracts on
10 the Delta smelt.” *Id.* at 94. The Court further found that the Bureau’s reliance on the FWS 2005
11 OCAP BiOp was arbitrary and capricious given the numerous “serious” and “obvious” flaws in the
12 document. *Id.* at 77.

13 93. The Court, however, asked for further briefing on the Bureau’s discretion to modify
14 SRS contract terms, *id.* at 94, and subsequently held that the ESA did not apply to the Bureau’s
15 renewal of the SRS contracts because the original contracts left the Bureau without sufficient
16 discretion to negotiate new terms that would benefit the delta smelt, Doc. 834. After entering two
17 clarifying orders on June 3 and August 6, 2009, the Court entered final judgment on September 23,
18 2009. Doc. 851, 862, 873.

19 94. In a unanimous en banc decision, the Ninth Circuit reversed. *Natural Res. Def.*
20 *Council v. Jewell*, 749 F.3d 776 (9th Cir. 2014) (en banc). The panel rejected the district court’s
21 holding that the “shortage provision”—a term in the DMC contracts that shields the Bureau from
22 liability if it adjusts water deliveries to comply with the ESA—stripped Plaintiffs of standing,
23 holding that “[b]ecause adequate consultation and renegotiation could lead to . . . revisions [that
24 would benefit the delta smelt], plaintiffs have standing to assert a procedural challenge to the DMC
25 contracts.” The Ninth Circuit also rejected the Court’s conclusion that the ESA does not apply to the
26 SRS contracts because the Bureau lacks sufficient discretion to renegotiate terms more protective of
27 the delta smelt. *Id.* at 784-85. The panel explained that there is “nothing in the original Settlement
28 contracts [that] requires the Bureau to renew the Settlement contracts” and, because “Delta water

1 diversions’ are the most significant ‘synergistic cause[]’ of the decline in delta smelt,” a decision not
2 to renew the SRS contracts could benefit the delta smelt. *Id.* (quoting 58 Fed. Reg. 12854-01,
3 12,859). Although the en banc panel held that the original SRS contracts do not require renewal, it
4 declined to decide “whether other legal obligations may compel the Bureau to execute renewal
5 contracts.” *Id.* at 785 n.1. Instead, it explained that, even if the Bureau were obligated to renew the
6 SRS contracts, the Bureau retained discretion that required ESA consultation on the renewals
7 because “the Bureau could benefit the delta smelt by renegotiating the Settlement contracts’ terms
8 with regard to, *inter alia*, their pricing scheme or the timing of water distribution.” *Id.* at 785.

9 95. On remand, the Defendants moved to stay the litigation to allow the Bureau to
10 reinstate consultation with FWS on the contract renewals’ impacts to the delta smelt. Doc. 955, 962.
11 The Court granted the motion and stayed litigation until December 15, 2015. Doc. 979 at 21. The
12 Court required that Federal Defendants file a formal motion one month prior to the expiration of the
13 stay if requesting an extension. *Id.*

14 96. On July 30, 2015, the Bureau requested reinitiation of consultation with the Service
15 on the SRS and DMC contract renewals. In the Biological Assessment submitted with the request
16 for reinitiation, the Bureau claimed that it does not have discretion to “alter the quantities,
17 allocations, or timing of SRS diversions from those set forth in the initial SRS contracts.” The
18 Bureau also claimed that it “lacks discretion to set pricing terms in the SRS contracts for the sole
19 purpose of protecting delta smelt.”

20 97. The Bureau has not requested reinitiation of consultation with NMFS on the effects of
21 the SRS contract renewals on listed anadromous species.

22 LEGAL BACKGROUND

23 Consultation under the ESA

24 98. Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires that each Federal agency, in consultation with the
25 Secretary,⁷ insure that any activity which it authorizes, funds, or carries out is not likely to jeopardize

26
27 ⁷ The Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce share responsibilities under the ESA according to the
28 type of species involved. 16 U.S.C. § 1532(15). For the delta smelt, the Secretary of the Interior is
the responsible official.

1 the continued existence of any threatened or endangered species or destroy or adversely modify any
2 listed species' critical habitat. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2); 50 C.F.R. § 402.14 (1986).

3 99. An action would jeopardize a species if it reasonably would be expected to reduce
4 appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of the species in the wild. 50 C.F.R. §
5 402.02 (1986).

6 100. Following consultation, the Secretary must issue a "biological opinion" in which he
7 determines whether the activity is likely to jeopardize a listed species or adversely affect its critical
8 habitat and provides a summary of the reasons for this conclusion. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(3)(A). In
9 formulating his opinion, the Secretary must use the best scientific and commercial data available. 16
10 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2); 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(g)(8) (1986).

11 101. The Secretary has delegated his duties under the ESA to the Service. 50 C.F.R. §
12 402.01(b) (1986).

13 **Adverse Modification of Critical Habitat under the ESA**

14 102. The Service has defined the phrase "destruction or adverse modification" of critical
15 habitat in Section 7(a)(2) as:

16 [A] direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of
17 critical habitat for both survival and recovery of a listed species. Such
18 alterations include, but are not limited to, alterations adversely modifying any
of those physical or biological features that were the basis for determining the
habitat to be critical.

19 50 C.F.R. § 402.02.

20 103. As discussed above, courts have found that the Service's definition of adverse
21 modification to critical habitat is an impermissible interpretation of the ESA because it reads the goal
22 of "recovery" out of the inquiry by holding that a proposed action "adversely modifies" critical
23 habitat only if the value of the critical habitat for *survival* is also appreciably diminished. *See, e.g.,*
24 *Gifford Pinchot*, 378 F.3d at 1069. Established case law demands that the agency be afforded a
25 presumption of regularity, meaning a presumption that the Service relied upon its own regulations.
26 *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 415 (1971). The Service can rebut this
27 presumption and, therefore, establish that its presumed reliance on the flawed regulation was
28

1 harmless error if it can establish that it considered recovery in its analysis despite the existence of the
2 regulatory definition. *Gifford Pinchot*, 378 F.3d at 1072.

3 104. The Service states that it did not rely on this definition but rather on “statutory
4 provisions of the ESA” to complete the analysis in the Biological Opinion. This unsupported
5 statement does not alleviate the problem unless there is sufficient evidence in the record to support
6 that claim. *Gifford Pinchot*, 378 F.3d at 1071. There is no such evidence in the Biological Opinion.
7 In fact, the Biological Opinion lacks any discussion of how the OCAP will impact the recovery of
8 the species through changes to critical habitat. The Biological Opinion only adds the word
9 “recovery” to the discussion three times, and each of those instances merely involved renaming a
10 variable, previously termed the “Midwinter trawl index,” to the “recovery index”; no changes were
11 made to the accompanying graphs or discussion of those graphs or that variable. *See* Reinitiation of
12 Formal and Early Section 7 Endangered Species Consultation on the Coordinated Operations of the
13 Central Valley Project and State Water Project and the Operational Criteria and Plan to Address
14 Potential Critical Habitat Issues (Feb. 16, 2005) (*i.e.*, the Biological Opinion) at 110, 113.

15 105. The Biological Opinion fails adequately to consider or to render any conclusion as to
16 whether the action on which consultation was conducted would adversely impact delta smelt critical
17 habitat in a manner that would adversely impact recovery of that species. The action in question
18 would have such an adverse impact to delta smelt critical habitat.

19 **Reliance on Uncertain Measures as Basis for No Jeopardy Opinion**

20 106. According to Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, the Service must “insure that any action
21 authorized . . . is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened
22 species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of such species.” 16
23 U.S.C § 1536(a)(2).

24 107. A biological opinion must include a discussion “as to whether the action, taken
25 together with its cumulative effects, is likely to jeopardize [the species].” 50 C.F.R. §402.14(g)(4).
26 The Service has defined the “effects of the action” as “the direct and indirect effects on the species or
27 the critical habitat.” 50 C.F.R. §402.02. The definition goes on to define indirect effects as “those
28

1 that are caused by the proposed action and are later in time, but still are reasonably certain to occur.”

2 *Id.*

3 108. “Mitigation measures must be reasonably specific, certain to occur, and capable of
4 implementation; they must be subject to deadlines or otherwise enforceable obligations; and most
5 important, they must address the threats to the species in a way that satisfies the jeopardy and
6 adverse modification standards.” *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Rumsfeld*, 198 F. Supp. 2d 1139,
7 1152 (D. Ariz. 2002); *Sierra Club v. Marsh*, 816 F.2d 1376, 1385 (9th Cir. 1987).

8 109. Reliance on the uncertain “adaptive management” and unproven future mitigation
9 measures to conclude that the project will not put the species in jeopardy or adversely modify its
10 critical habitat violates Section 7(a)(2) the ESA. Such reliance allows take of and potential jeopardy
11 to smelt, and destruction or adverse modification of smelt habitat, without first insuring that the
12 species will not be jeopardized and recovery will not be delayed or impaired.

13 **Failure to Consider the Entire Effects of the Action**

14 110. Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA and its implementing regulations require the Service to
15 “[e]valuate the effects of the action and cumulative effects” and to render its biological opinion “as
16 to whether the action, taken together with cumulative effects, is likely to jeopardize the continued
17 existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.” 50
18 C.F.R. § 402.14(g)(3), (4). The Service’s regulations specify that the “actions” on which ESA § 7
19 consultation is required include “all activities or programs of any kind *authorized*, funded or carried
20 out” by any federal agency, including “the granting of . . . contracts.” 50 C.F.R. §§ 402.02, 402.14
21 (emphasis added). The Service’s regulations further define the phrase “effects of the action” to
22 include “the direct and indirect effects of an action . . . , together with the effects of other activities
23 that are interrelated or independent.” 50 C.F.R. § 402.02 (emphasis added). “Indirect effects” are
24 those effects “caused by the proposed action and later in time, but still reasonably certain to occur.”
25 *Id.* “Interrelated actions” are actions that are “part of a larger action and depend on the larger action
26 for their justification.” *Id.* “Interdependent actions” are actions that “have no independent utility
27 apart from the action under consideration.” *Id.* In short, the ESA requires a biological opinion to
28

1 analyze the effects of the entire action authorized by the agency, without piecemealing the
2 consultation into incremental steps.

3 111. FWS did not comply with this mandate in issuing the challenged Biological Opinion.
4 Among other inadequacies, the FWS failed to consider the full effects of the action authorized in
5 impending long-term water supply contracts, which were the chief motivating force behind the
6 Bureau's and FWS' rush to complete the Biological Opinion, and did not consider the effects of
7 construction activities associated with the SDIP.

8 **Failure to Consider the Best Available Science**

9 112. Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires consultations to be based on the best available
10 scientific information. FWS did not adhere to that mandate in rendering the challenged Biological
11 Opinion. Among other deficiencies, the Service failed to consider current population viability
12 analyses indicating that the species has a high risk of extinction within the next 20 years. In addition,
13 the Service wholly failed to consider the effects of global climate change. Scientific data available
14 today predict warming in the western United States of several degrees centigrade over the next 100
15 years and indicate that this temperature change will dramatically change western hydrology. The
16 Biological Opinion did not consider these changes in evaluating the effects of future CVP and SWP
17 operations on delta smelt.

18 **Failure to Insure that Project Operations Are Not Likely to Jeopardize Delta Smelt or** 19 **Adversely Modify Its Critical Habitat**

20 113. As the action agency, the Bureau has an independent obligation under ESA § 7(a)(2)
21 to insure that its actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt or
22 adversely modify its critical habitat.

23 114. Agency action that is based on what the action agency knows to be an inaccurate or
24 incomplete jeopardy analysis by the consulting agency violates ESA § 7(a)(2). *See, e.g., Resources*
25 *Ltd. v. Robinson*, 35 F.3d 1300, 1305-06 (9th Cir. 1994). The Bureau knew or had reason to know
26 that the Biological Opinion was inadequate and, consequently, that the four contract consultations
27 that tiered off the analysis in the Biological Opinion were also inadequate. For example, the Bureau
28 knew that the FWS failed to consider the best available science prior to issuing the Biological

1 Opinion; that the Biological Opinion did not analyze the impact of full water delivery under the
2 proposed renewal contracts; and that the FWS's DMCU concurrence letter was based on the
3 withdrawn 2004 Biological Opinion.

4 115. Despite this, the Bureau has taken and is taking actions in reliance on the faulty
5 jeopardy analysis set forth in the Biological Opinion and four concurrence letters, even in the face of
6 significant take of delta smelt by the export facilities and adverse modification of critical habitat
7 caused by water exports and diversions. These actions include the Bureau's continued
8 implementation of expanded Project operations, as set forth the 2004 OCAP, and the execution and
9 continuing performance of the long-term water supply renewal contracts described above. The
10 Bureau has thus failed to insure that its actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of
11 the delta smelt or adversely modify its critical habitat.

12 **LEGAL BACKGROUND FOR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

13 **Reinitiation of Consultation Under the ESA**

14 116. Even when a valid consultation is completed, and the action that was the subject of
15 that consultation is being implemented, federal agencies have a duty to reinitiate consultation
16 pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA under specified circumstances. The ESA's implementing
17 regulations provide that:

18 Reinitiation of formal consultation is required and shall be requested by the Federal
19 agency or by the Service, where discretionary Federal involvement or control over the
20 action has been retained or is authorized by law and: (a) If the amount or extent of
21 taking specified in the incidental take statement is exceeded; (b) If new information
22 reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a
23 manner or to an extent not previously considered; (c) If the identified action is
subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical
habitat that was not considered in the biological opinion; or (d) If a new species is
listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action.

24 50 C.F.R. §402.16.

25 117. The Ninth Circuit has clarified that "an agency's responsibility to reinitiate
26 consultation does not terminate when the underlying action is complete." *Cottonwood Envtl. Law*
27 *Ctr. v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 789 F.3d 1075, 1086 (9th Cir. 2015). An agency's duty to reinitiate can be
28

1 triggered so long as the agency retains some modicum of “involvement or control” over the
2 implementation of the action. *Id.*

3 118. The Bureau violated, and is violating, 50 C.F.R. § 402.16 by failing to reinitiate
4 consultation on the SRS contracts to determine how the NMFS OCAP BiOp and its subsequent
5 amendments affect the winter-run and spring-run Chinook. NMFS’s letter of concurrence on the
6 SRS contracts did not include independent analysis of the effects of the SRS contract renewals but
7 instead came to its conclusion because it determined that the effects of the renewals were fully
8 analyzed in the NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp. The NMFS 2004 OCAP BiOp thus provided the sole
9 basis for NMFS’s letter of concurrence. When a federal court ruled that the NMFS 2004 OCAP
10 BiOp was invalid and illegal, it undermined the basis for the letter of concurrence. The NMFS
11 OCAP BiOp (which, unlike the prior BiOp, found that the OCAP *would* cause jeopardy) and
12 NMFS’s subsequent amendments constitute “new information [that] reveals effects of the action that
13 may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered,”
14 triggering the Bureau’s mandatory duty to reinitiate consultation under 50 C.F.R. § 402.16(b). The
15 Bureau is engaged in an ongoing agency violation by implementing the SRS contract renewals
16 without reinitiating consultation.

17 119. The Bureau also violated, and is violating, 50 C.F.R. § 402.16 by failing to reinitiate
18 consultation based on the information regarding the massive mortality of the 2014 and 2015
19 generations of winter-run and spring-run Chinook. The Bureau’s excessive releases from Shasta
20 Reservoir in 2014 and 2015 to satisfy the terms of the SRS contracts relied on faulty temperature
21 modeling that led to a fatal increase in temperatures throughout the temperature management season.
22 The Bureau is engaged in an ongoing agency violation by implementing the SRS contract renewals
23 without reinitiating consultation.

24 120. The Bureau’s “discretionary Federal involvement or control over” the SRS contract
25 renewals has been established multiple times during this litigation. The Ninth Circuit en banc panel
26 unanimously ruled that the Bureau retained discretion to take species-protective measures with
27 regards to the SRS contracts. The Bureau itself obtained a stay on the premise that it would reinitiate
28

1 consultation with FWS under 50 C.F.R. § 402.16 to evaluate the impacts of the contract renewals on
2 the threatened delta smelt. Doc. 979.

3 121. There is also ongoing “Federal involvement” in the SRS contract renewals’
4 implementation. The contracts require that the Bureau implement the contracts in compliance with
5 the ESA. Further, the Bureau is involved in the ongoing implementation of the SRS contracts. For
6 instance, the Bureau makes real-time determinations regarding the timing and volume of releases that
7 allow the SRS Contractors to make diversions of water. And the Bureau has sought and received
8 approval to modify requirements under D-1641 and the Bay-Delta water quality standards to increase
9 the amount of water it can provide to the SRS Contractors.

10 **Unlawful Take Under ESA Section 9**

11 122. Section 9 of the ESA prohibits the “take” of any endangered or threatened species of
12 fish or wildlife within the United States, 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1)(B). No person may directly take a
13 protected species nor “cause to be committed” any take. *Id.* § 1538(g).

14 123. Congress defined take broadly to mean “to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound,
15 kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” *Id.* § 1532(19). The
16 ESA’s implementing regulations further define “harass” and “harm.” “Harass . . . means an
17 intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying
18 it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not
19 limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering.” 50 C.F.R. § 17.3. “Harm” includes “significant habitat
20 modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing
21 essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering.” *Id.*

22 124. The ESA’s legislative history supports “the broadest possible” reading of take.
23 *Babbitt v. Sweet Home Chapter of Cmty. for a Great Or.*, 515 U.S. 687, 704-05 (1995). The
24 Supreme Court has explained that “Congress intended ‘take’ to apply broadly to cover indirect as
25 well as purposeful actions.” *Id.* at 704. For instance, “harming a species may be indirect, in that the
26 harm may be caused by habitat modification.” *Defenders of Wildlife v. Bernal*, 204 F.3d 920, 924-25
27 (9th Cir. 1999).

1 125. Any “person” under the jurisdiction of the United States can be liable for violating
2 ESA section 9. 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1). The ESA defines “person” to include “any officer,
3 employee, agent, department, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, of any State,
4 municipality, or political subdivision of a State” and “any State, municipality, or political
5 subdivision of a State.” *Id.* §1532(13). Government actions authorizing third parties to engage in
6 harmful activities can constitute illegal take under Section 9 of the ESA. *See, e.g., Strahan v. Coxe*,
7 127 F.3d 155, 164 (1st Cir. 1997).

8 126. Pursuant to Section 7(b)(4) of the ESA, a consulting agency may issue an “incidental
9 take statement” if the agency concludes both that the federal action in question will not jeopardize a
10 listed species, or can be carried out pursuant to a RPA without jeopardizing a species, and that the
11 taking of the species is incidental to the action and will not cause jeopardy. 16 U.S.C. §
12 1536(b)(4)(A)-(B). The consulting agency must “specif[y] the impact” of the incidental taking,
13 “specif[y] those reasonable and prudent measures . . . necessary or appropriate to minimize such
14 impact,” and “set forth the terms and conditions (including, but not limited to, reporting
15 requirements) that must be complied with by the Federal agency or applicant . . . to implement the
16 measures specified” under the incidental take statement. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4)(i)-(ii), (iv). “If the
17 terms and conditions of the Incidental Take Statement are disregarded and a taking does occur, the
18 action agency or the applicant may be subject to potentially severe civil and criminal penalties under
19 Section 9.” *Ariz. Cattle Growers’ Ass’n*, 273 F.3d at 1239.

20 127. The Bureau’s excessive releases, and the SRS Contractors’ diversions, of water from
21 Shasta Reservoir in 2014 and 2015 violated Section 9 of the ESA. The Bureau’s releases depleted
22 the cold water reserves behind Shasta Dam, causing the Bureau to lose temperature control in the
23 upper Sacramento River throughout the temperature management season. The Bureau’s excessive
24 releases and the SRS Contractors’ diversions were the predominant and direct cause of the loss, or
25 “take,” of an estimated 95% of the winter-run brood for that year, and the almost complete loss, or
26 “take,” of spring-run Chinook eggs in the Sacramento River in 2014. The Bureau’s excessive
27 releases, and the SRS Contractors diversions, are causing similar take in 2015. The Bureau’s actions
28 in 2014 and 2015 not only killed endangered winter-run and spring-run Chinook, they also harmed

1 the species by causing “significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or
2 injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding,
3 or sheltering.” 50 C.F.R. § 17.3.

4 128. The NMFS OCAP BiOp, as amended, states that the Bureau does not have
5 authorization to take winter-run or spring-run Chinook in the course of delivering quantities of water
6 it deems non-discretionary under a water contract. During the relevant time period, the Bureau has
7 taken the position that it has no discretion to alter the quantities of water to SRS Contractors. If, as it
8 has claimed, the Bureau lacks discretion as to the quantities of water it delivers to satisfy the terms of
9 the SRS contracts, the NMFS OCAP BiOp makes clear that the Bureau did not have authorization
10 for the take of winter-run and spring-run Chinook in 2014 and 2015.

11 129. In 2014, the Bureau and DWR reinitiated consultation with NMFS on the Bureau and
12 DWR’s Drought Operations Plan. The Drought Operations Plan included further modifications to
13 the NMFS OCAP BiOp. NMFS approved the Drought Operations Plan and modifications to the
14 NMFS OCAP BiOp on the condition that it “[c]onserv[e] storage in Shasta Reservoir by limiting
15 releases from Keswick Dam to no greater than 3,250 cfs ... unless necessary to meet
16 nondiscretionary obligations or legal requirements.” Letter from William Stelle, NMFS Regional
17 Administrator, to David Murillo, the Bureau’s Regional Director, at 4 (undated, but posted on April
18 8, 2014:

19 [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/drought/docs/tucp/031814order_](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/drought/docs/tucp/031814order_urgchg_swcv/20140408_nmfs_to_usbr_dop.pdf)
20 [urgchg_swcv/20140408_nmfs_to_usbr_dop.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/drought/docs/tucp/031814order_urgchg_swcv/20140408_nmfs_to_usbr_dop.pdf)). The Bureau made releases during that time period
21 far in excess of 3,250 cfs, including for deliveries to the SRS Contractors. If the Bureau has
22 discretion as to the quantities of water it delivers to the SRS Contractors, it violated the conditions of
23 NMFS’s reinitiated consultation and therefore did not have take authorization under the NMFS
24 OCAP BiOp.

25 130. In 2015, the Bureau and DWR reinitiated consultation with NMFS on the Bureau and
26 DWR’s 2015 Drought Contingency Plan. Given the disastrous outcomes in 2014, NMFS directed
27 the Bureau to plan its operations throughout the summer and fall to maintain temperatures below 56
28 degrees at the Clear Creek compliance point. The Bureau, however, again made releases well in

1 excess of what was required to maintain temperature control. In doing so, the Bureau violated the
2 conditions of NMFS's reinitiated consultation for a second consecutive year.

3 131. Because the NMFS OCAP BiOp did not include analysis of the impacts of water
4 contracts, it does not provide the SRS Contractors with take authority.

5 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

6 **(By Plaintiffs NRDC, California Trout, Baykeeper, FOR and TBI)**

7 **Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act**
8 **(5 U.S.C. § 706)**

9 132. Plaintiffs re-allege, as if fully set forth herein, each and every allegation contained in
10 the preceding paragraphs.

11 133. The Secretary's conclusion, in the Biological Opinion for the Coordinated Operations
12 of the CVP/SWP, that the changes, including operational changes and future operations, will not
13 jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt and will not result in the destruction or adverse
14 modification of the critical habitat of delta smelt is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and
15 not in accordance with law.

16 134. The Biological Opinion unlawfully failed adequately to consider or to render a
17 biological opinion on how the actions on which consultation was undertaken would affect delta smelt
18 critical habitat's value for recovery of the species.

19 135. The Secretary's conclusion, in the Biological Opinion, that the planned operational
20 and other changes to the CVP and SWP, and their future operations, will not jeopardize the
21 continued existence of the delta smelt or cause adverse modification to the delta smelt's critical
22 habitat has no basis in the Biological Opinion or elsewhere in the record. The Biological Opinion
23 improperly relies on uncertain future mitigation measures and a promise of adaptive management
24 without adequate evidence that the mitigation measures will be undertaken and will be effective and
25 without identifying concrete actions sufficient to insure protection of the delta smelt and its critical
26 habitat as a result of any future "adaptive management."

27 136. The Biological Opinion failed properly to define the agency action or to consider the
28 "effects of the action," thereby significantly underestimating and/or ignoring the effects of the entire

1 agency action.

2 137. The Biological Opinion failed to consider the best available scientific information.

3 138. The analysis, reasoning, and conclusion of the Biological Opinion, and the Secretary's
4 actions described herein, are arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in accordance with law,
5 in excess of statutory authority, and without observance of procedure required by law, in violation of
6 ESA § 7 and its implementing regulations and the standards of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5
7 U.S.C. § 706.

8 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 **(By Plaintiffs NRDC, California Trout, Baykeeper, FOR and TBI)**

10 **Violations Of ESA And APA:**

11 **Bureau's Failure To Insure That Its Actions Are Not Likely To Jeopardize**
12 **The Continued Existence Of The Species Or Adversely Modify**
13 **Its Critical Habitat**
14 **(16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2); 5 U.S.C. § 706)**

15 139. Plaintiffs re-allege, as if fully set forth herein, each and every allegation contained in
16 the preceding paragraphs.

17 140. The Bureau has an independent duty to insure that its actions avoid jeopardy. The
18 Bureau cannot satisfy this duty by relying on what it knows or should know to be an inadequate
19 consultation with the FWS.

20 141. As alleged above, the Biological Opinion incorrectly concludes that the 2004 OCAP
21 will not jeopardize the delta smelt or adversely modify its critical habitat, as the Bureau knew or
22 should have known. Implementation of the 2004 OCAP operations, including its direct, indirect, and
23 cumulative effects, has both short-term and long-term adverse impacts on the delta smelt that
24 jeopardize its continued existence and that adversely modify its critical habitat. Accordingly,
25 notwithstanding the Biological Opinion, by implementing the 2004 OCAP and related actions, the
26 Bureau has failed and is failing to perform its affirmative obligation to insure that its actions will not
27 jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt, in violation of ESA § 7(a)(2), 16 U.S.C. §
28 1536(a)(2).

1 142. For the same reasons, the Bureau also has failed and is failing to insure that its actions
2 are not likely to adversely modify the designated critical habitat of the delta smelt. The final rules
3 designating critical habitat for the delta smelt describe many features of critical habitat essential for
4 these species' recovery, including, among other things, adequate water quality and quantity, water
5 temperature, and safe passage conditions. Implementation of the 2004 OCAP is adversely impacting
6 these features of designated critical habitat and will adversely modify the ability of the critical habitat
7 to contribute to the recovery of the species, in violation of ESA § 7(a)(2), 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).

8 143. Furthermore, the Bureau has failed and is failing to comply with ESA § 7(a)(2), 16
9 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2), by executing and implementing the long-term water supply renewal contracts
10 described above, in reliance on what it knew or should have known to be faulty analysis by the FWS.
11 The execution and continued performance of these renewal contracts has short- and long-term
12 adverse impacts on the threatened delta smelt that jeopardize the species' continued existence and
13 adversely modify its critical habitat.

14 144. The Bureau's failure to insure that its actions do not jeopardize the continued
15 existence of the delta smelt or adversely modify its critical habitat is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse
16 of discretion, and not in accordance with law, contrary to the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

17 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

18 **(By Plaintiffs NRDC, California Trout, Baykeeper, FOR and TBI)**

19 **Violations Of ESA And APA:**
20 **Irretrievable And Irreversible Commitments Of Resources**
21 **That Foreclose Reasonable And Prudent Alternatives**
(16 U.S.C. § 1536(d); 5 U.S.C. § 706)

22 [Dismissed pursuant to the Court's order of January 23, 2008 (Doc. 567).]⁸

23 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

24 **(By Plaintiffs NRDC, TBI, Baykeeper, Winnemem and PCFFA/IFR)**

25 **Violations of ESA And APA:**
26 **Bureau's Failure To Reinitiate Consultation Pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA**
(16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2); 50 C.F.R. § 402.16; 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g); 5 U.S.C. § 706)

27 ⁸ Plaintiffs in the Third Supplemental Complaint preserved all rights to challenge the Court's
28 dismissal order on appeal.

1 145. Plaintiffs re-allege, as if fully set forth herein, each and every allegation contained in
2 the preceding paragraphs.

3 146. The ESA's implementing regulations, 50 C.F.R. § 402.16, require the Bureau to
4 reinitiate ESA section 7(a)(2) consultation when the Bureau retains discretionary involvement or
5 control over a federal action that was the subject of a prior consultation and new information reveals
6 effects of that action that were not previously considered.

7 147. The ESA citizen suit provision authorizes suits to enforce the ESA and its
8 implementing regulations against any person who is alleged to be in violation of any provision of the
9 ESA or regulations implementing the ESA. 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g).

10 148. As alleged above, the Bureau arbitrarily and capriciously violated, and continues to
11 violate, Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA and the ESA's implementing regulations, 50 U.S.C. § 402.16, by
12 failing to reinitiate consultation on the SRS contract renewals based on the issuance of the NMFS
13 OCAP BiOp and subsequent amendments. The Bureau retains discretionary federal involvement and
14 control over the implementation of the SRS contracts. The NMFS OCAP BiOp constituted new
15 information that undermined the January 10, 2005 letters of concurrence and revealed effects of the
16 SRS contract renewals that were not previously considered.

17 149. Furthermore, and also alleged above, the Bureau arbitrarily and capriciously violated,
18 and continues to violate, Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA and the ESA's implementing regulations, 50
19 U.S.C. § 402.16, by failing to reinitiate consultation based on information relating to the massive
20 mortality to the 2014 and 2015 generations of winter-run and spring-run Chinook that occurred when
21 it made excessive releases to satisfy the renewed SRS contracts. Additionally, the Bureau's excessive
22 deliveries to the SRS Contractors triggered a mandatory obligation to reinitiate consultation because
23 the deliveries caused effects to the winter-run and spring-run Chinook that were not considered in the
24 January 10, 2005 letter of concurrence.

25 150. The Bureau's ongoing failure to ensure that its actions do not jeopardize the
26 continued existence of the winter-run and spring-run Chinook or adversely modify the species'
27 critical habitat is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance with law,
28 contrary to the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(By Plaintiffs NRDC, TBI, Baykeeper, Winnemem and PCFFA/IFR)

**Violations Of ESA:
Bureau's and SRS Contractors' Violation of Section 9 of the ESA
(16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1)(B); 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g))**

151. Plaintiffs re-allege, as if fully set forth herein, each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs.

152. Section 9 of the ESA, 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1)(B), prohibits the Bureau and the SRS Contractors from taking any endangered or threatened fish or wildlife within the United States without authorization.

153. The ESA citizen suit provision authorizes suits to enforce the ESA and its implementing regulations against any person who is alleged to be in violation of any provision of the ESA or regulations implementing the ESA. 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g).

154. As alleged above, the Bureau's excessive releases, and the SRS Contractors' diversions, of water during the temperature management season in 2014 and 2015 caused massive take of winter-run and spring-run Chinook. The Bureau's excessive releases depleted the cold water pool in Shasta Reservoir, causing the Bureau to lose control of temperatures in the upper Sacramento River, which is critical habitat for winter-run and spring-run Chinook. The Bureau's excessive releases caused fatal increases in water temperatures that led to the near total loss of the 2014 and 2015 generations of winter-run and spring-run Chinook. The Bureau's releases and the SRS Contractors' diversions were the predominant and direct cause of the loss, or "take," of winter-run and spring-run Chinook in 2014 and 2015.

155. Neither the Bureau nor the SRS Contractors had authorization to take winter-run or spring-run Chinook to meet the terms of the renewed SRS contracts.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court:

1 A. Find and declare that the Secretary's issuance of the Biological Opinion, and the
2 Biological Opinion itself, are arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance
3 with law, in violation of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).⁹

4 B. Order the Secretary to comply with the law forthwith by withdrawing the Biological
5 Opinion and reinitiating consultation with respect to the proposed changes to and future operation of
6 the CVP-SWP.¹⁰

7 C. Enjoin the defendants and defendant-intervenors from taking any action in reliance on
8 the invalid Biological Opinion.

9 D. Enjoin the defendants and defendant-intervenors from taking any action that would
10 jeopardize the continued existence of the delta smelt or adversely modify its critical habitat.

11 E. Order the Secretary to comply with the law forthwith by reinitiating consultation with
12 NMFS on the effects of the SRS contract renewals on winter-run and spring-run Chinook.

13 F. Enjoin the Secretary from continuing to make releases of water from Shasta
14 Reservoir, and the SRS Contractors from diverting such water, to satisfy the terms of the SRS
15 contracts where such releases and diversions will cause the unauthorized take of winter-run and
16 spring-run Chinook.

17 G. Enjoin the defendants and defendant-intervenors from continuing to perform the
18 unlawfully executed long-term water supply contracts identified herein and order them to renegotiate
19 and re-execute these renewal contracts only upon completion of a valid ESA § 7(a)(2) consultation.

20 H. Retain jurisdiction over this matter until such time as the Secretary and DWR have
21 fully complied with the Court's order.

22 I. Award Plaintiffs their costs of litigation, including reasonable attorney and expert
23 witness fees.

24 J. Grant Plaintiffs such further and additional relief as the Court may deem just and
25 proper.

26
27 ⁹ This paragraph pertains to Plaintiffs' challenge to FWS's 2005 Biological Opinion on the OCAP,
28 which has been resolved in Plaintiffs' favor.

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

DATED: November 9, 2015

/s/ Trent W. Orr
Trent W. Orr

Attorney for Plaintiffs

¹⁰ This paragraph pertains to Plaintiffs' challenge to FWS's 2005 Biological Opinion on the OCAP, which has been resolved in Plaintiffs' favor.