

1 JEAN E. WILLIAMS and PRERAK SHAH,
2 Deputy Assistant Attorneys General
3 U.S. Department of Justice
4 Environment & Natural Resources Division

5 ROBERT P. WILLIAMS, Senior Trial Attorney
6 Wildlife & Marine Resources Section
7 Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611
8 Washington, D.C. 20044-7611
9 Telephone: 202-307-6623; Fax: 202-305-0275
10 Email: robert.p.williams@usdoj.gov

11 THOMAS K. SNODGRASS, Senior Attorney
12 Natural Resources Section
13 999 18th Street, South Terrace, Suite 370
14 Denver, CO 80202
15 Telephone: 303-844-7233; Fax: 303-844-1350
16 Email: thomas.snodgrass@usdoj.gov

17 *Attorneys for Federal Defendants*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
19 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
20 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

21 YUOK TRIBE, PACIFIC COAST)
22 FEDERATION OF FISHERMEN'S)
23 ASSOCIATIONS, and INSTITUTE FOR)
24 FISHERIES RESOURCES,)

25 Plaintiffs,)

26 v.)

27 U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION and)
28 NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES)
SERVICE,)

Defendants,)

and)

KLAMATH WATER USERS)
ASSOCIATION,)

Intervenor-Defendant.)

Case No. 3:19-cv-04405-WHO

FEDERAL DEFENDANTS'
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION TO LIFT THE STAY OF
LITIGATION AND TO ENTER A
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER (ECF 909)

Hearing Date: May 22, 2020

Hearing Time: 10:00 AM

Judge William H. Orrick

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

I. Introduction 1

II. Statutory Background: the Endangered Species Act..... 4

III. Factual Background: Klamath Project, Endangered Suckers, Threatened Salmon..... 5

IV. Standards for Emergency Preliminary Injunctive Relief 5

V. Standard of Review on the Merits of Plaintiffs’ Claims 5

VI. Argument..... 5

 A. The Negotiated Stay of Litigation Should Not Be Lifted Because the Bureau
 Continues to Operate the Project In Accordance With the Interim Plan 5

 B. If the Stay of Litigation is Lifted, Plaintiffs Have Failed to Carry their Burden
 of Demonstrating Entitlement to a Temporary Restraining Order 11

 1. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Establish a Likelihood of Success on the
 Merits 11

 (a) Plaintiffs Have No Claim Based on the Interim Plan..... 11

 (b) Plaintiffs’ Challenges to NMFS’ 2019 BiOp Lack Merit 12

 (i) NMFS’ Critical Habitat Finding Was Based on the Best
 Available Science and Cannot Be Assailed With Post-
 Decisional Information (ESA Count III)..... 12

 (ii) NMFS’ Critical Habitat Conclusion Was Rational 13

 (iii) NMFS’ “No Jeopardy” Conclusion Was Rational (ESA
 Counts I & II)..... 15

 (c) The Bureau Is Not “In Violation” of the ESA..... 18

 2. Plaintiffs Have Not Shown that their Requested Flows Are Necessary
 to Avoid Irreparable Harm to the SONCC Coho Salmon, and
 Granting those Flows Would Harm Endangered Suckers 19

 3. Plaintiffs’ Flow Rates Are Not in the Public Interest..... 23

 C. If the Stay of Litigation is Lifted, Plaintiffs’ Request to “Reinstate” their Preliminary
 Injunction Motion Should Be Denied 25

VII. Conclusion..... 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

1		
2	Cases	
3	<i>Bennett v. Spear</i> ,	
4	520 U.S. 154 (1997).....	18, 19
5	<i>City of Tacoma v. FERC</i> ,	
6	460 F.3d 53 (D.C. Cir. 2006)	18
7	<i>Ctr. for Biol. Diversity v. FWS</i> ,	
8	807 F.3d 1031 (9th Cir. 2015).....	17
9	<i>Ctr. for Biol. Diversity v. U.S. Bureau of Recl.</i>	
10	No. 6:15-CV-02358-JR, 2016 WL 9226390 (D. Or. Apr. 6, 2016)	23, 25
11	<i>Hartford Cas. Ins. Co. v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co.</i> ,	
12	No. 15-CV-02592-SI, 2015 WL 5168643 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2015).....	9
13	<i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> ,	
14	463 U.S. 29 (1983).....	14, 15, 16, 17, 18
15	<i>Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n v. National Marine Fisheries Service</i> ,	
16	524 F.3d 917 (9 th Cir. 2008)	17, 18
17	<i>Pac. Coast Fed'n. of Fishermen's Ass'ns. v. U.S. Bureau of Recl.</i> ,	
18	426 F.3d 1082 (9th Cir. 2005).....	14, 15
19	<i>Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. U.S. Dept. of Navy</i> ,	
20	898 F.2d 1410 (9 th Cir. 1990)	18
21	<i>Rock Creek Alliance v. FWS</i> ,	
22	663 F.3d 439 (9th Cir. 2011).....	17
23	<i>Salmon Spawning & Recovery Alliance v. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv.</i> ,	
24	342 F. App'x 336 (9 th Cir. 2009).....	18
25	<i>San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Auth. v. Locke</i> ,	
26	776 F.3d 971 (9th Cir. 2014).....	12, 14
27	<i>San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority v. Jewell</i>	
28	747 F.3d. 581 (9 th Cir. 2014)	16
	<i>Sn. Ctr. for Biol. Diversity</i> ,	
	143 F.3d 515 (9 th Cir. 1998)	19
	<i>The Lands Council v. McNair</i> ,	
	537 F.3d 981 (9 th Cir. 2008)	17
	<i>Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council</i> ,	
	555 U.S. 7 (2008)	5, 6, 7, 14, 20, 21
	<i>Yurok Tribe v. U.S. Bureau of Recl.</i> ,	
	231 F. Supp. 3d 450 (N.D. Cal. 2017).....	20, 22

Statutes

1 16 U.S.C. § 1532(3) 13, 21
2 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).....12
3 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)(2)(A)..... 11, 19
4 Cal. Civ.Code § 33999

Regulations

5
6 50 C.F.R. § 402.02..... 13, 17, 18, 21
7 50 C.F.R. § 402.16(a)(2)12
8 50 C.F.R. 402.16.....22

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

1 **I. Introduction**

2 As the Court is aware, this litigation is currently stayed pursuant to the unanimous
3 stipulation of the parties, which was approved by this Court on March 27, 2020. ECF 907 & 908.
4 The stipulation was the end result of intensive negotiations in which all parties to the litigation
5 actively participated over the course of many weeks, and during which the parties discussed in detail
6 the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's ("Bureau") proposed plan for interim operation of the Klamath
7 Project (the "Interim Plan") while it completes reinitiated consultation pursuant to the Endangered
8 Species Act ("ESA") on a longer-term plan that protects endangered suckers in Upper Klamath
9 Lake ("UKL") and threatened Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast coho salmon ("SONCC
10 coho") in the Klamath River, listed species with countervailing water needs, among other listed
11 species. Methods of maintaining elevations of UKL to protect suckers and Klamath River flows to
12 protect SONCC coho in light of various potential hydrology scenarios were discussed. In the end,
13 all parties agreed that the litigation should remain stayed in full until September 30, 2022, so long as
14 the Bureau did not deviate from implementation of the Interim Plan, the details of which were fully,
15 and well, known to all parties. ECF 907 at 5, ¶ 3.¹

16 A key benchmark of the Interim Plan was holding an elevation of 4,142.00 feet in UKL in
17 April and May for suckers, and the Plan intended that there would be no augmentation of Klamath
18 River flows if implementation of such flows would thwart this elevation. The Interim Plan provides
19 that the Bureau would coordinate with the Services, Yurok Tribe, and other affected Klamath River
20 Tribes on how to manage water to best meet the needs of listed species if augmentation was
21 triggered by the April 1 forecast but delivery of those flows would cause UKL to fall below 4,142.00
22 feet in elevation. The Plan provides that the Bureau would adaptively manage the situation in
23 coordination with the relevant stakeholders to best protect suckers and coho salmon while it
24 continues to operate the Project. As it turned out, due to a late storm event, the Natural Resources
25 Conservation Service's ("NRCS") April 1, 2020 forecast for inflows to UKL – the standard metric
26 used for operational decisions – eked in near the bottom end of the range of inflows that would
27 trigger a 40 thousand acre feet ("TAF") augmentation of river flows under the Interim Plan.

28

¹ Citations to ECF filings are to the ECF pagination, not the internal pagination on the filings.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.