

**LEGAL COMMITTEE
WORK PLAN
July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025**

1. STATE AND FEDERAL COLLABORATION REGARDING THE ADJUDICATION OF FEDERAL NON-TRIBAL WATER RIGHTS

Background: On July 15-16, 2014, the WSWC and WestFAST held a workshop in Helena, Montana to discuss ways to improve the resolution of federal non-tribal water rights claims and to begin the process of developing a clearinghouse of information that states and tribes can use to resolve these claims. The WSWC and WestFAST subsequently created a joint state-federal workgroup to help develop the clearinghouse and implement the other recommendations that emerged from the workshop.

Work-to-Date: The Committee created a Federal Non-Tribal Water Claims Subcommittee to evaluate ways the WSWC and WestFAST can improve the effective resolution of federal non-tribal water rights claims. The Subcommittee consists of WSWC members and WestFAST members, who serve in an *ex officio* capacity. Past webinars and workshops include:

November 10, 2015	McCarran Amendment – state and federal perspectives	
July 13, 2016	Groundwater and Meeting Federal Water Needs (ND)	
October 18, 2017	Continuing State-Federal Relationships through the Implementation Phase of Decreed and Adjudicated Water Rights (NM)	
October 24, 2018	State and Federal Agencies’ Approach to Grazing Water Rights (ID)	
October 15, 2019	Grazing Water Rights (CO)	https://westernstateswater.org/publications/2021/stock-water-rights-for-grazing-livestock-on-federal-lands/
September, 2021	Wild and Scenic Rivers (SD)	https://westernstateswater.org/publications/seminars-workshops/2021/wild-scenic-rivers-workshop/

2024-2025: The Committee will work to carry out the recommendations and next steps that emerged from the workshops and webinar. Under the direction of the Committee, the workgroup will hold calls on a quarterly basis to discuss the development of the clearinghouse and to serve as a forum for information sharing and relationship building. The Workgroup will also advise the Committee about potential future actions the WSWC and WestFAST may take to address federal water needs and may hold webinars on specific topics of interest. The workgroup will continue to hold workshops.

Additional topics to pursue include identifying useful principles for state-federal memoranda of understanding (MOUs) to develop a useful framework and recommended approaches.

Time Frame: Ongoing

Federal Non-Tribal Water Claims Subcommittee: Jay Weiner (MT), Jennifer Verleger (ND), Buck Smith (WA), and Chris Brown (WY). WestFAST members and agency staff participating in the Subcommittee in an *ex officio* capacity include: Michael Higgins (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), Donald Anderson (Bureau of Reclamation), Stephen Bartell (Department of Justice), Lauren Dempsey (Air Force) and Chris Carlson (U.S. Forest Service).

2. CLEAN WATER ACT ISSUES

a. CWA Jurisdiction*

Background: In 2011, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released draft guidance intended to provide clearer, more predictable guidelines for determining which water bodies are subject to Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction, consistent with the U.S. Supreme Court’s decisions in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 531 U.S. 159 (2001), and *Rapanos v. United States*, 547 U.S. 715 (2006). This was followed by the Clean Water Rule (2015 WOTUS Rule), finalized on June 29, 2015 (80 FR 37054). Many of our member states filed lawsuits challenging the 2015 WOTUS Rule in federal court. The 2015 WOTUS Rule was rescinded, and was replaced by the Navigable Waters Protection Rule (2020 WOTUS Rule), finalized on April 21, 2020 (85 FR 22250). Several of our member states filed lawsuits challenging the 2020 WOTUS Rule in federal court. The 2020 WOTUS Rule was vacated, and was replaced by the Revised Definition of the “Waters of the United States” Rule (2023 WOTUS Rule), finalized on January 18, 2023 (88 FR 3004). On May 25, 2023, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in *Sackett v. EPA* (#21-454). Citing the Justice Scalia plurality opinion in *Rapanos*, the five-Justice majority Court concluded that the definition of WOTUS in Clean Water Act (CWA) §1362(7) “encompasses only those relatively permanent, standing or continuously flowing bodies of water forming geographical features that are described in ordinary parlance as streams, oceans, rivers, and lakes.” The Court held that WOTUS does not apply to all wetlands, but extends only to those wetlands with a continuous surface connection to bodies of water that are WOTUS in their own right, so that they are indistinguishable from those waters. The Court acknowledged that “temporary interruptions in surface connection may sometimes occur because of phenomena like low tides or dry spells.” In footnote 16, the Court said: “Although a barrier separating a wetland from a water of the United States would ordinarily remove a wetland from federal jurisdiction, a landowner cannot carve out wetlands from federal jurisdiction by illegally constructing a barrier on wetlands otherwise covered by the CWA. Whenever the EPA can exercise its statutory authority to order a barrier’s removal because it violates the Act...that unlawful barrier poses no bar to its jurisdiction.” On August 29, 2023, the EPA and Corps issued an Amended 2023 Rule (88 FR 61964) to conform key aspects of the regulatory text to the *Sackett* decision. Two state lawsuits have challenged the Amended 2023 Rule: *Texas v. EPA* (TX, ID), and *West Virginia v. EPA* (AK, AL, AR, FL, GA, IA, IN, KS, LA, MI, MO, MT, ND, NE, NH, OH, OK, SC, SD, TN, UT, VA, WV, and WY). Both cases issued preliminary injunctions on the 2023 WOTUS Rule. A third case, *Kentucky v. EPA*, did not issue an injunction, but the rule is stayed while the decision is on appeal. The agencies are interpreting “waters of the United States” consistent with the pre-2015 regulatory regime and the Supreme Court’s decision in

Sackett for these 27 states until further notice. For the remaining 23 states, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, the agencies are implementing the Amended 2023 Rule.

Work-to-Date: WSWC adopted positions #369 and #373 regarding CWA rulemaking efforts and state-federal collaboration. Position #369 was revised and readopted as Position #410, while Position #373 was allowed to sunset and acknowledged as a letter with continued historical value. At the October 2018 meeting in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, Position #410 was revised and readopted as #427, with the State of Washington abstaining from the vote. At the September 2021 meeting in Deadwood, South Dakota, Position #472 was again revised and adopted, with the understanding that further efforts would be made to improve the position the following Spring. WSWC sent various letters and comments to EPA and the Corps. At the April 2022 meeting in Arlington, Virginia, Position #481 was revised and adopted, replacing #472.

In the Summer of 2022, WSWC hosted a series of workshops to consider the technical and policy implications of a regional approach to WOTUS implementation, and prepared a draft white paper to document this effort for future use.

2024-2025: The Committee will continue to work with the Water Resources and Water Quality Committees through the Workgroup to follow and comment on federal actions regarding CWA jurisdiction in accordance with the WSWC’s and WGA’s positions, as well as consider the impacts of the new rule(s) on state policies, programs and regulations.

Time Frame: Ongoing

CWA Rulemaking Workgroup: Jennifer Zygmunt (WY), Tom Stiles (KS), and Julie Cunningham (OK).

*See Item 2(a) of the Water Quality Committee Workplan

b. Maui and Groundwater

Background: The U.S. Supreme Court issued a ruling in *County of Maui v. Hawaii Wildlife Fund*, 140 S. Ct. 1462 (2020), holding that the provisions of the Clean Water Act require a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit when there is a “functional equivalent of a direct discharge,” which may include some discharges through groundwater. The Court noted that many factors may be relevant in determining whether a pollutant discharged through groundwater is a functional equivalent of a direct discharge to navigable waters. Time and distance will be the most important factors in most cases. The Court offered the examples of: (1) a 100-year migration of pollutants through 250 miles of groundwater to a river, which would not ordinarily require a permit; (2) where a pipe ends 50 miles from navigable waters and the pollutants mix with groundwater and other materials in the aquifer, ending up in navigable waters many years later, in which case permitting requirements likely would not apply; and (3) where a pipe emits pollutants only a few feet through groundwater before discharging into a navigable water. Other relevant factors might include the nature of the aquifer material, the extent to which the pollutant is diluted or chemically changed as it travels, the amount of pollutant entering the navigable waters relative to the amount discharged at the point source, how or where the pollutant enters the navigable waters, and the degree to which the pollution has maintained its specific identity.

In January 2021, EPA issued a notice of implementation guidance (86 FR 6321) which was rescinded in September 2021 (86 FR 53653). EPA issued a new draft guidance in November 2023 (88 FR 82891). Several WSWC member states submitted comments on the proposed guidance (WSW Special Report #2591).

Two federal cases have analyzed the application of the “functional equivalent” standard: *Cottonwood Environmental Law Center v. Edwards*, 86 F.4th 1255 (9th Cir. 2023) (over-irrigation of golf course leaching nutrients into groundwater) and *Stone v. High Mountain Mining Company*. #22-1340 (10th Cir. 2024) (discharge from unlined settling ponds seeping into groundwater).

2024-2025: The Committee will work with the Water Quality Committee through the Workgroup to follow and comment on federal actions regarding *Maui* guidance in accordance with the WSWC’s and WGA’s positions, as well as consider the impacts of any guidance or rules on state policies, programs and regulations.

Time Frame: Ongoing

Maui Workgroup: Jennifer Zygmunt (WY), John Mackey (UT), Julie Pack (AK)

*See Item 2(j) of the Water Quality Committee Workplan

3. AD HOC GROUP ON RESERVED INDIAN WATER RIGHTS

Work-to-Date: The Western Governors’ Association (WGA) and WSWC have long supported the negotiated resolution of Indian water rights claims (WSWC Position #504). As a result, the WGA and WSWC have worked with the Native American Rights Fund (NARF) for over forty years as part of an Ad Hoc Group on Reserved Indian Water Rights to promote negotiated settlements.

Over the years, the Ad Hoc Group has carried out a number of activities to support the negotiated settlement of Indian reserved water rights claims, including frequent trips to Washington, D.C. to support policies and legislation that facilitate settlements. A biennial symposium on settlements is held by the WSWC and NARF every odd year. The Group has also worked to highlight the need to secure a permanent funding mechanism for authorized settlements and to identify alternative funding sources to help ensure that settlements authorized by Congress and approved by the President will be implemented.

In recent years, the WSWC and NARF have established regular meetings with the Deputy Secretary of the Interior’s Office, the Secretary of the Interior’s Indian Water Rights Office, and other Interior and Department of Justice officials engaged in Indian water rights settlement efforts. The WSWC and NARF have also held regular meetings with the White House Office of Management and Budget and other White House officials to support the WSWC’s settlement policies.

On August 8-9, 2023, the WSWC and NARF co-hosted the 18th Biennial Symposium on the Settlement of Reserved Water Rights, highlighting the Hualapai Tribe’s settlement authorized by the 117th Congress. The Symposium also provided a forum to discuss the Biden Administration’s settlement and negotiation policies, Congressional outlooks for pending settlement bills and permanent funding mechanisms, and water leasing of reserved water rights. Recordings and

presentation materials are available at: <https://westernstateswater.org/events/wswc-narf-18th-biennial-indian-reserved-water-rights-symposium/>

2024-2025: The Committee will oversee WSWC’s Ad Hoc Group efforts in the following areas: (1) activities to gather support for an appropriate remedy to settlement funding issues, including the development of a permanent settlement funding mechanism, the identification of other possible funding sources, and funding for federal assessment, negotiation, and implementation teams; (2) continue meeting with the Administration via quarterly conference calls and other face-to-face opportunities to discuss key issues associated with Indian water rights settlements, including possible modifications to the Criteria & Procedures; (3) discuss potential adjustments to the long-time support of the Reclamation Water Settlement Fund in light of new Congressionally-authorized funds and the mix of both project-based and fund-based settlements; and (4) prepare to hold the 2025 Symposium on the Settlement of Indian Reserved Water Rights Claims in partnership with the Native American Rights Fund.

Time Frame: Ongoing

Reserved Rights Subcommittee: Jay Weiner (MT), Teresa Wilhelmson (UT). NARF members participating in the Subcommittee in an *ex officio* capacity include: John Echohawk, Dan Lewerenz, and David Gover. Other *ex officio* members include:

4. WRDA/CORPS POLICIES

Work to date: The Council has in the past supported regular passage of a Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), and has addressed a number of specific policy issues, while not taking any position on specific project authorizations. The Council has raised concerns with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ approach to identifying and regulating the use of “surplus waters,” and Corps drought authorities related to Corps projects. The Council also worked successfully to exclude irrigation water supply canals from federal levee safety program, and to encourage the Corps to withdraw the Surplus Water Supply rulemaking.

On May 10, 2022, the Council sent a letter in support of Senator Cramer’s proposed legislation to create a committee with the Corps of Engineers and the States focused on cooperative federalism concerns surrounding the management of water resources, which passed as §8158 of WRDA 2022. The purpose of the Western Water Cooperative Committee (WWCC) is to ensure that U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) “flood control projects in Western States are operated consistent with congressional directives by identifying opportunities to avoid or minimize conflicts between the operation of the [Corps] projects and water rights and water laws in such States.” The membership of the Cooperative Committee includes the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, the Chief of Engineers, two representatives from each Western State appointed by the governor and the attorney general, and one employee from each of the impacted regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. On March 17, 2023, the WSWC co-hosted a briefing for our western states on the WWCC with the Conference of Western Attorneys General (CWAG) and WGA, and encouraged our Governors and Attorneys General to prepare appointment letters to the Committee. The briefing materials are available at: <https://westernstateswater.org/events/wswc-cwag-briefing-wwcc/>

On May 18, 2023, the WSWC and CWAG sent a group of 25 appointment letters to Assistant Secretary Mike Connor, with some Governors and Attorneys General sending letters directly to the Army Corps of Engineers. On August 29, 2023, the Corps reached out to verify contact information for each of the current appointees, and WSWC assisted with outreach and filling in the gaps. The Corps indicated that they were nearing a point where they would be able to stand up the WWCC, but were still waiting for approval on funding to facilitate efficient operation of the committee and to determine whether FACA rules apply. In December 2023, the Army determined that FACA rules apply.

2023-2024: The Council will continue to work with the Congress and Corps on WRDA and Corps-related issues, to ensure that state water rights and prerogatives are protected, specifically as it relates to natural flows, Corps storage and other issues.

Subcommittee:

5. GROUNDWATER

There are a number of ongoing groundwater issues that pertain to WSWC policies or are otherwise of interest that the Committee will monitor and address on an as-needed basis.

a. Reserved Water Rights

Background: On March 7, 2017, the 9th Circuit (849 F.3d 1262) upheld the California District Court's summary judgment from Phase I of the trifurcated case, *Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians v. Coachella Valley Water District* (No. 15-55896). The 9th Circuit decision holds that the United States implicitly reserved a right to water when it created the Agua Caliente Reservation, and that the Tribe's reserved water right extends to the groundwater underlying the Reservation. The court acknowledged that it was unable to find any controlling federal appellate authority explicitly holding that the federal reserved water rights doctrine in *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908), extends to groundwater. Instead, it pointed to *United States v. Cappaert*, 426 U.S. 128 (1976) and *In re General Adjudication of All Rights to Use Water in Gila River System and Source*, 989 P.2d 739 (Ariz. 1999) as persuasive and implied authority for its decision, emphasizing that *Winters* does not distinguish between surface and groundwater or prohibit the inclusion of groundwater.

Given that the federal agencies have relied on tribal water rights cases in the past to press for reserved water rights to groundwater, the implications of the 9th Circuit decision could be far reaching, not only for states and tribes outside the 9th Circuit's jurisdiction, but also for federal agencies seeking to control groundwater appurtenant to federal lands.

As one example, the Forest Service issued a proposed groundwater directive May 6, 2014. Although the Forest Service asserted that the directive would not infringe on state-issued water rights or change how state groundwater and surface water quality regulations affect federal lands, the proposed directive would have: (1) required application of "...the Reservation or Winters Doctrine to groundwater, as well as surface water, consistent with the purposes of the Organic Administration Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Wilderness Act;" (2) required the Forest Service to evaluate all applications to states for water rights on lands adjacent to NFS lands; and (3) would have presumed that groundwater and surface water are connected unless proven otherwise. Western

Governors strongly objected to the directive, as did the WSWC, which worked with the Forest Service to modify it. The Forest Service later withdrew this proposed directive.

WSWC position #466 notes that no federal statute has addressed any federal property or other rights to groundwater, and opposes “...efforts that would establish a federal ownership interest in groundwater or diminish the primary and exclusive authority of States over groundwater.”

Subsequent court decisions that have cited to *Agua Caliente*’s groundwater holding include: (1) *Silver v. Pueblo Del Sol Water Co.*, 423 P.3d 348, 353 (Ariz. 2018); (2) *State ex rel. State Eng’r v. United States*, 425 P.3d 723, 733-734 (N.M. Ct. App. 2018) (oblique reference, as the settlement at issue included reserved groundwater); (3) *United States v. State (In re CSRBA Case No. 49576 Subcase No. 91-7755)*, 448 P.3d 322, 350-351 (Idaho 2019); (4) *Baley v. United States*, 942 F.3d 1312, 1338, (Fed Cir. 2019) (although for the discussion on groundwater this case cites to *Cappaert v. United States*, 426 U.S. 128, 142-43 (1976)); (5) *United States v. Walker River Irrigation Dist.*, 473 F. Supp. 3d 1150, 1156-1157 (D. Nev. 2020).

Additionally, the Department of Defense is considering reserved water rights claims to the use of groundwater for Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake in the groundwater basin adjudication *Indian Wells Valley Water District v. All Persons Who Claim a Right to Extract Groundwater in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, etc., et al.* (Orange County Superior Court, California, 30-2021-01187275-CU-OR-CJC).

On January 31, 2024, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service submitted a letter asserting federal reserved water rights to groundwater that could be negatively impacted by a proposed permit from the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GEPD) for a mining company that seeks to withdraw 1.4 million gallons a day to mine titanium dioxide three miles from the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge. The letter noted the risk to the refuge, despite GEPD’s conclusion that there would be a minimal impact.

2024-2025: The Committee will continue to work to ensure that state water rights and prerogatives are protected, specifically as they relate to tribal and non-tribal federal water rights and state authority over groundwater.

b. Groundwater Storage Projects

Background: In 1983, Congress passed the High Plains States Ground Water Demonstration Project Act, authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a westwide groundwater recharge program. In 1989, WSWC and Reclamation entered a cooperative agreement to prepare a number of case studies to evaluate project effectiveness, identify economic and institutional problems such as the allocation of project costs and requisite legal authorities, and recommend alternative solutions to improve public policymaking with respect to future groundwater programs and projects. As a result of this agreement, WSWC prepared two reports in 1991 and 1998, titled Ground Water Recharge Projects in the Western United States. Among other recommendations to encourage recharge opportunities, the 1998 report suggested that each state examine its own legal and institutional systems to assure that they adequately address groundwater recharge, amending statutes as necessary to recognize it as a beneficial use, and reasonably protect the right to recover recharged waters.

2024-2025: In coordination with the Water Resources Committee, the Legal Committee will work on updating the information in the old reports, and prepare a new summary report. The Committee will query the states to review and update their relevant laws on groundwater storage, particularly as they relate to groundwater banking or Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) projects.

c. State Groundwater Regulation

Background: In 2023, various news organizations began publishing articles on the use of groundwater in the nation, with a particular focus on groundwater overuse in the West. While the articles highlighted genuine challenges (depletion, pollutants, subsidence, lack of monitoring), they lacked information about the nuances of western water laws, and did not include the efforts and progress states have made over the past several decades to address those challenges. Several of the articles called for federal regulation of groundwater, asserting that the states would not or could not do enough to address the groundwater management challenges.

In 2024, the White House solicited input from the public to address questions regarding groundwater use, recharge, and storage across the United States. The President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) issued specific questions regarding methods for timely collection of data, effective modeling and prediction of groundwater changes, efficient scaling of groundwater recharge, ensuring clean and safe groundwater availability, community engagement, and strategies to limit groundwater overuse. The PCAST briefing read: “In the western states especially, groundwater resources are being depleted at an alarming rate, mostly from agricultural withdrawal. The problem of groundwater depletion is exacerbated by climate change and precipitation variability and in many aquifers, groundwater withdrawal has outpaced natural and artificial recharge. There is a need to explore the consequences of artificial recharge and to identify successful recharge approaches that might be scaled across the country.... Groundwater is managed locally, with best practices that vary from state to state, but there is an opportunity to develop and scale approaches to restore clean water in every community.”

Work to Date: On July 1, 2024, the WSWC submitted a comment letter along with two policy positions on groundwater allocation and groundwater quality. On July 22, 2024, Council staff participated in the PCAST workshop.

2024-2025: The Council will explore the potential of hosting a groundwater workshop in the coming year, with opportunities for states to share with each other challenges and developments in technologies, resources, and regulations.

Subcommittee: Raquel Rancier (OR), Anna Pakenham Stephenson (MT), Mathew Weaver (ID), Melissa Flatly (NV), Chris Brown (WY), Joaquin Esquivel (CA), Sara Schecter (UT), Theresa Wilhelmson (UT), Jesse Bradley (NE). Ex-Officio members: Dan Yates (GWPC).

6. WATER RIGHTS

Some of our states have expressed interest in understanding how other states approach different aspects of the management and administration of water rights, including what qualifies as beneficial uses, extensions of time to prove beneficial use to perfect a water right application, and statutes or rules or court procedures governing curtailments in times of scarce water resources, and regulation

of water wells. In December 2020, Council staff began distributing a series of survey questions to member states to facilitate this understanding. In 2021, WSWC members responded to the survey questions, and WSWC staff began compiling the responses into four separate reports.

a. State Water Well Construction Rules and Regulations

Background: The State Engineer, or other state official, is required to make rules regarding well construction and related regulated activities and the licensing of water well drillers and pump installers. Various states have varying requirements, which may change from time to time. The purpose of these rules is to: (1) assist in the orderly development of underground water; (2) insure that minimum construction standards are followed in the drilling, construction, deepening, repairing, renovating, cleaning, development, testing, disinfection, pump installation/repair, and abandonment of water wells and other regulated wells; (3) prevent pollution of aquifers within the state; (4) prevent wasting of water from flowing wells; (5) obtain accurate records of well construction operations; and (6) insure compliance with the state's authority for appropriating water. The rules establish administrative procedures for applications, approvals, hearings, notices, revocations, orders and their judicial review, as well as requirements related to well construction standards, such as casing, and procedures for monitoring, reporting and criteria for the waivers of certain requirements.

2024-2025: Council staff will prepare a report of the 2021 responses to the survey questions. The Committee and Council will also provide a forum for the discussion of best management practices.

Subcommittee:

Timeframe:

b. Proof of Beneficial Use of Water and Extension Criteria

Background: Beneficial use is the measure of any right to the use of water in the West. The State Engineer, or other state official, on behalf of the State, may grant a permit to put water to beneficial use but evidence or proof of completion of the work necessary to then actually put the water to use is also required. Only after development is done and the water is being fully put to beneficial use, will a water right be granted, which will be limited to the extent and nature of use in the accepted proof. This also applies to requests to change the use of a water rights, whether changing the point of diversion, use or purpose of use, or location water is returned to a natural source. Generally, some specific period of time will be allowed to complete the work, and if needed applicants may request an extension of time. The specific criteria for proof of beneficial use and extending timelines may vary by state.

2024-2025: Council staff will compile responses to the 2021 survey questions and report on the results. The Committee and Council will also provide a forum for the discussion of best management practices.

Subcommittee:

Timeframe:

c. Calls and Curtailments

Background. Droughts in many areas of the West have highlighted state procedures and methods of enforcing curtailment of water uses and administration of water rights in a priority system, particularly where junior groundwater pumping, insufficient carriage water, instream flow for fish and wildlife, junior municipal supply, and federal reserved rights are at issue.

2024-2025: Council staff will prepare a report on the 2021 survey responses. The Committee and Council will also provide a forum for a discussion of water rights enforcement.

Subcommittee:

Timeframe: