FILED
APR 15 2010
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE

IN THE OFFICE OF THE STATE ENGINEER OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

RECEIVED
2010 APR 16 PM 1:27
STATE ENGINEERS OFFICE

In the Matter of Application Number 79295 Filed By Southern Nevada Water Authority on January 28, 2010 for Permission to Appropriate the Public Waters of the State of Nevada	**PROTEST**

Comes now The Long Now Foundation, whose post office address is Fort Mason Center, Landmark Building A, San Francisco, California 94123, and protests the granting of Application Number 79295, filed on January 28, 2010 by Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) for permission to appropriate the public waters of the State of Nevada, for the following reasons and on the following grounds, to wit:

1. Presently, Application No. 79295 is one of 79 applications recently filed by SNWA to appropriate or change water rights in the Spring and Snake Valley Basins. This application is identical to Application No. 54005, originally filed on October 17, 1989 to appropriate groundwater from the Spring Valley. The applicant should be required to withdraw previous Application No. 54005 or the current, duplicative Application No. 79295.

2. Application No. 54005 is subject to the issues concerning the recent opinion of the Supreme Court of Nevada (Opinion No. 49718 filed on January 28, 2010). Application No. 79295 should not be considered, and certainly not granted, until the proceedings pertaining to the Supreme Court's recent opinion have been concluded.

3. The full extent of the water exportation scheme contemplated by SNWA is unknown at this time and it is uncertain how many additional groundwater and/or surface water appropriations or change applications SNWA will file to supplement the amount of water sought by Application No. 79295. Before acting on the individual applications, the applicant should be required to provide a detailed abstract of the total duty of water sought for exportation including details as to the supplemental nature of the individual groundwater and surface water applications.

4. The applicant's answer to "Question 12" does not provide sufficient details for the proposed project or proposed water usage, to allow the public, interested parties, protestants, and the State Engineer to make a proper evaluation of the potential impacts of approving the application. Based on the scope and magnitude of the water exportation scheme proposed by Application Nos. 79295 et al., the applicant should be required to conduct the Hydrologic and

Environmental Studies specified by NRS 533.368, before the State Engineer makes a final determination on the applications.

5. On information and belief, Application Nos. 79295 et al. seek to appropriate more groundwater than the perennial yield of the basin as currently recognized by the State Engineer.

6. On information and belief, Application Nos. 79295 et al. seek to appropriate more groundwater than the safe yield of the basin.

7. The application involves an interbasin transfer and should be rejected pursuant to NRS 533.370(6) for, among other reasons, the applicant's failure to:

A. justify the need to import water to the other basin(s);

B. demonstrate that a conservation plan(s) has been adopted and effectively carried out for the other basin(s);

C. demonstrate that the proposed export of water from the basin is environmentally sound;

D. demonstrate that the proposed action is an appropriate long-term use which will not limit growth and development in the basin; and,

E. identify the specifics of the proposed project, including the basin(s) into which water will be imported.

8. The application for interbasin transfer should also be rejected pursuant to NRS 533.370 for the lack of information regarding:

A. access to the use of public/private lands necessary for the construction of the works of diversion and the means of conveyance;

B. financial ability to construct the works and apply the water to the intended use with reasonable diligence;

C. technical feasibility to construct the works and apply the water to the intended use with reasonable diligence; and,

D. justification for the quantity of water required for the proposed project.

9. Granting the application would threaten to prove detrimental to the public interest.

10. Granting the application would threaten to prove detrimental to the public interest in ways that are not yet known to this Protestant, but which may arise or first become known to this Protestant in the period between the date of filing of the Application and the hearing on the protested Application.

11. Granting the application would threaten to prove detrimental to the public interest and the interests and rights of The Long Now Foundation for the reasons stated above, and because among other things, it would:

A. result in degraded air quality and adverse impacts to visual resources in the region;

B. result in adverse economic impacts due to degraded air quality and visual resources;

C. result in adverse impacts to hydrological, biological, cultural, and environmental resources;

D. result in adverse impacts to the riparian vegetation and natural habitat that support sensitive plant and animal species in the region;

E. result in adverse impacts to the water resources in adjacent basins;

F. result in interference with artesian water sources, springs, and seeps in the region; and,

G. otherwise adversely affect the interests of The Long Now Foundation.

12. This Protestant incorporates in this Protest by reference, as if fully set forth herein, every relevant protest ground set forth in any other Protest filed by any other Protestant regarding this application.

///

///

///

///

///

///

THEREFORE this Protestant requests that the above-referenced application be denied and that an order be entered for such relief as the State Engineer deems just and proper.

Stephen B. Reich, P.E.
Stetson Engineers, Inc.

Agent for:

The Long Now Foundation
Alexander Rose, Executive Director
Fort Mason Center
Landmark Building A
San Francisco, CA 94123
Tel: (415) 561-6582

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of April, 2010.

P. BOHM
COMM. #1850757
NOTARY PUBLIC-CALIFORNIA
MARIN COUNTY
My Comm. Expires June 20, 2013

P. Bohm
Notary Public

State of California

County of MARIN

My Commission Expires: 6-20-2013

$25 FILING FEE MUST ACCOMPANY PROTEST. PROTEST MUST BE FILED IN DUPLICATE - ALL COPIES MUST CONTAIN ORIGINAL SIGNATURE.

CALIFORNIA JURAT WITH AFFIANT STATEMENT

☒ See Attached Document (Notary to cross out lines 1–6 below)
☐ See Statement Below (Lines 1–5 to be completed only by document signer[s], *not* Notary)

Signature of Document Signer No. 1

Signature of Document Signer No. 2 (if any)

State of California

County of Marin

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this

15 (Date) day of April (Month), 2010 (Year), by

(1) Stephen B. Reich (Name of Signer),

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me (.) (,)

(and

(2) [illegible] (Name of Signer),

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me.)

P. BOHM
COMM. #1850757
NOTARY PUBLIC-CALIFORNIA
MARIN COUNTY
My Comm. Expires June 20, 2013

Signature P. Bohm
Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Further Description of Any Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: _____

Document Date: _____ Number of Pages: _____

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: _____

RIGHT THUMBPRINT OF SIGNER #1	RIGHT THUMBPRINT OF SIGNER #2
Top of thumb here	Top of thumb here

©2007 National Notary Association • 9350 De Soto Ave., P.O. Box 2402 • Chatsworth, CA 91313-2402 • www.NationalNotary.org Item #5910 Reorder: Call Toll-Free 1-800-876-6827