

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

IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION 57034 FILED)
TO CHANGE THE POINT OF DIVERSION, MANNER)
OF USE AND PLACE OF USE OF A PORTION OF)
THE WATERS OF THE TRUCKEE RIVER HERETOFORE)
APPROPRIATED UNDER TRUCKEE RIVER DECREE)
CLAIM 630 WITHIN THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS,)
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA.)

RULING
4010

GENERAL

I.

Application 57034 was filed on December 24, 1991, by The D. Donald Lonie, Jr. Family Trust, to change the point of diversion, manner of use and place of use of a portion of the waters of the Truckee River heretofore appropriated under Truckee River Claim 630. The proposed manner of use is for municipal and domestic purposes within Westpac Utilities certificated service area. The proposed points of diversion are described as being Westpac's existing water treatment plants. The existing manner and place of use is for irrigation of 3.75 acres within the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ and 8.75 acres within the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ all within Section 21, T.20N., R.23E., M.D.B.&M.¹

II.

Application 57034 was timely protested on March 19, 1992 by the Truckee Carson Irrigation District (TCID). Protestant requested that the applications be issued subject to the following specific conditions:¹

1. Assure that lands from which the water rights are transferred do not receive any Truckee River water either inadvertently or directly. A reduction in river flows brought about by either precluding return flows or by "double diversion" as discussed under this condition will damage all downstream users, including the TCID.

2. The diversion for the various applications shall be made according to their priority and the period of use shall be as decreed.

¹ Public record in the office of the State Engineer under Application 57034.

3. Such application is also subject to the provisions of the ORR DITCH DECREE and the TRUCKEE RIVER AGREEMENT dated July 1, 1935, entered into by the United States of America, the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, the Washoe County Water Conservation District, the Sierra Pacific Power Company and others.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

On November 14, 1989, a public administrative hearing was held by the State Engineer concerning two prior applications to transfer Orr Ditch Decreed water from below Derby Dam in the vicinity of Wadsworth and one prior application to change the point of diversion from below Vista and above Wadsworth to Westpac Utilities water treatment plants for utilization within the place of use of Westpac Utilities' certificated service area. The two applications below Derby Dam were also protested by TCID who presented their case in support of their protest at the hearing. The other application which was not protested was also discussed at the hearing. The State Engineer finds Application 57034 is similar to the applications heard at the November 14, 1989 hearing. Additionally, the State Engineer finds the grounds of the protest to Application 57034 are similar to the arguments presented by protestant TCID at the aforementioned hearing. Further possible changes were discussed at the hearing and the cumulative effect of such changes was analyzed.²

The Truckee River Decree specifically allows persons who hold rights adjudicated in said decree to change the point of diversion, place and manner of use of these rights as long as they do so in accordance with the Nevada Water Law and such change would not injure existing rights as set forth under said decree.³

The State Engineer finds a hearing is not necessary in his review of this application since he has a full understanding of the

² Transcript of Administrative Hearing held November 14, 1989 concerning applications 53092, 53093 and 53369.

³ The United States of America vs. Orr Water Ditch Company, et. al. Final Decree, Docket A-3, p.88.

issues involved and has already taken evidence at the aforementioned hearing concerning the merits of similar applications and protests.⁴

II.

The State Engineer finds the approval of any application to change abrogates the permittees authority to use the water right being changed as originally decreed. The enforcement of any change of decreed Truckee River waters falls under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Master.⁴

III.

The State Engineer finds the priority and period of use of Truckee River Decreed water rights remain the same under a change application and the regulation of the same is the responsibility of the Federal Water Master.

IV.

The State Engineer has reviewed the analysis presented at the November 14, 1989 hearing concerning existing rights and finds that the approval of these applications will not conflict with existing rights.

CONCLUSIONS

I.

The State Engineer has jurisdiction over the matter described herein.⁵

II.

The State Engineer is prohibited by law from granting a permit to change where:

- A. The proposed use conflicts with existing rights, or
- B. The proposed use threatens to prove detrimental to the public interest.⁶

⁴ NRS 533.365(3).

⁵ NRS Chapters 533 and 534.

⁶ NRS 533.370.

III.

The State Engineer concludes the granting of Application 57034 would not conflict with existing rights or prove detrimental to the public interest.

IV.


The State Engineer concludes that conditions 1, 2 and 3 of the TCID protest are inherent in the approval of the applications and the enforcement of these conditions is under the continuing jurisdiction of the Federal Water Master.

RULING

The protest to Application 57034 is hereby upheld and Application 57034 is hereby approved subject to:

1. payment of statutory fees
3. existing rights on the source
4. continuing jurisdiction and regulation by the Federal Water Master.

Respectfully submitted,



R. MICHAEL TURNIPSEED, P.E.
State Engineer

RMT/MB/pm

Dated this 30th day of

June, 1993.