Centralia Appeal of Water Right Transfer Decision

Thurston County Water Utility Purveyor Meeting April 8, 2016

Mike Gallagher, Water Resources Program Southwest Regional Office



Municipal Water Law

- Legislature significantly amended Washington water law in 2003 to:
 - provide clarity on the nature of water rights issued for municipal supply purposes, and
 - to provide flexibility to municipal water suppliers in exercising their water rights.

The Municipal Water Law:

- defines the terms "municipal water supplier" and "municipal water supply purposes",
- defines when the "place of use" could be the same as a municipal water suppliers service area,
- establishes that municipal water rights were not limited to the stated number of connections but to the number of connections approved in a water system plan, and required specific conservation practices and planning.

Under the law, utilities must use water efficiently.



Definitions

- <u>"Municipal water supplier"</u> means an entity that supplies water for municipal water supply purposes.
- <u>"Municipal water supply purposes"</u> means a beneficial use of water:
 - (a) For residential purposes through fifteen or more residential service connections or for providing
 residential use of water for a nonresidential population that is, on average, at least twenty-five
 people for at least sixty days a year;
 - (b) for governmental or governmental proprietary purposes by a city, town, public utility district, county, sewer district, or water district; or
 - (c) indirectly for the purposes in (a) or (b) of this subsection through the delivery of treated or raw water to a public water system for such use.

If water is **beneficially used under a water right for the purposes listed** in (a), (b), or (c) of this subsection, any other beneficial use of water under the right generally associated with the use of water within a municipality is also for "municipal water supply purposes," including, but not limited to, beneficial use for commercial, industrial, irrigation of parks and open spaces, institutional, landscaping, fire flow, water system maintenance and repair, or related purposes.

If a **governmental entity holds a water right that is for the purposes listed** in (a), (b), or (c) of this subsection, its use of water or its delivery of water for any other beneficial use generally associated with the use of water within a municipality is also for "municipal water supply purposes," including, but not limited to, beneficial use for commercial, industrial, irrigation of parks and open spaces, institutional, landscaping, fire flow, water system maintenance and repair, or related purposes.



Municipal water suppliers can hold water rights for municipal water supply or for *other* purposes

<u>Governmental</u>

<u>entities:</u>

■ cities, ■ towns, ■ PUDs,

counties,
 sewer districts, or
 water districts

<u>Governmental Purposes:</u>

➢ commercial, \geq industrial, irrigation of parks & open spaces, \geq institutional, >landscaping, ➢ fire flow, water system maintenance & repair, or related purposes



Policy 2030

- Ecology developed an Interpretive and Policy Statement (IPS) for carrying out the 2003 Municipal Water Law under the authority of the <u>Administrative Procedure Act - RCW</u> <u>34.05.230</u>.
- This policy statement clarifies the Department of Ecology's position and management approach for carrying out that law for the primary audience of those interested in, and affected by, management of water rights for municipal supply purposes. This policy statement also enables Department of Ecology staff to have a common understanding and consistency of application.



What is the Issue?





Reason Centralia Appealed

Reason for Appeal

LEWI-15-01 (Application for Change of Water Right CG2-00731) concerns the change in point of withdrawal filed on behalf of the City of Centralia. The *Application for Change* was filed by the City with the Lewis County Water Conservancy Board June 18, 2015. The City filed the *Application for Change of Water Rights* to change the point of withdrawal, place of use and purpose of use of ground water certificate G2-00731. This water right was originally issued for the community domestic supply of the County Park Mobile Home Park, and the City has extended service to the project. The intent of this request is to effectively transfer the water right from the former well to one of the City's production wells.

Ecology affirmed this transfer as requested however they erroneously reduced the annual quantity (Qa) from 7.0 to 5.3 acre-feet per year. While no explanation for the reduction was provided in Ecology determination letter dated October 22, 2015, the City asserts that this is a municipal water right and as such qualified as a right in good standing and should not have been reduced.

The County Mobile Water System (DOH 15516) was operated up until 2014 as a Group a municipal system serving 18 residential connections, thus this water right meets the definition of "municipal water supply purposes" at RCW 90.03.015(4).

Ecology's guidance provides that inchoate portions of water rights for municipal supply purposes found to be in good standing are eligible for change or transfer. This approach allows for the inchoate portion to be transferred to another municipal water supplier or integrated into a regional water system, as is occurring. We contend that the City of Centralia is legally entitled to absorb this right in the full quantities, because the full quantities were issued for municipal purposes.



County Mobile Home Park in Centralia





County Mobile Home Park in relation to rest of Centralia





A broader view of mobile home park location





New POW for this water right change (City of Centralia Eshom Road Well)

Centralia Requesting PCHB affirm Lewis Co. WCB Decision of 7.0 AFY Water Right Transfer to City

The County Mobile Water System (DOH 15516) was operated up until 2014 as a Group a municipal system serving 18 residential connections, thus this water right meets the definition of "municipal water supply purposes" at RCW 90.03.015(4).

Ecology's guidance provides that inchoate portions of water rights for municipal supply purposes found to be in good standing are eligible for change or transfer. This approach allows for the inchoate portion to be transferred to another municipal water supplier or integrated into a regional water system, as is occurring. We contend that the City of Centralia is legally entitled to absorb this right in the full quantities, because the full quantities were issued for municipal purposes.

A more thorough discussion of the standing of this right is included in the attached **Report of Examination** (Exhibit B) prepared and signed by the Lewis County Water Conservancy Board.

Action Requested

The City requests that the decision of the Lewis County Water Conservancy Board be AFFIRMED as recommended, in the amount of 7.0 acre-feet per year for municipal supply.

Centralia's existing water rights*:	9,141 AFY
Current use*:	2,543 AFY
Inchoate available*:	6,598 AFY
	*2013 Water System Plan



Water Resources Program Policy 2030

POL-2030 WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM POLICY		
2003 Municir	bal Water Law Interpretive and Policy Statement	
Contact:	Program Development and Operations Support Section Effective Date: February 5, 2007 Revised Date: May 7, 2012	
References:	Chapter 90.03 Revised Code of Washington	
Purpose:	To describe and provide interpretation of parts of the Municipal Water Law, and describe generally applicable procedures that the Department of Ecology (Ecology) will use in identifying and managing municipal water rights.	
Application:	This interpretive and policy statement is a review of the applicable sections of the state Water Code (Ch. 90.03 RCW) that were amended or added by the 2003 Municipal Water Law. The document describes how Ecology intends to apply the various sections of the law to municipal water rights and management.	
Chapter 5, Lav EFFICIENCY	hicipal Water Law (SECOND ENGROSSED SECOND SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1338; ws of 2003; 58th Legislature; 2003 1st Special Session; MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY- REQUIREMENTS) clarifies municipal water rights. y.wa.gov/programs/wr/rights/Images/pdf/2E2SHB_1338.pdf]	
Water Law un Department of earlier stateme Supreme Cour	hosen to develop this Interpretive and Policy Statement (IPS) for carrying out the 2003 Municipal der the authority of the Administrative Procedure Act (<u>RCW 34.05.230</u>). This IPS clarifies the Ecology's position and management approach for carrying out that law. This IPS supersedes ents relating to the Municipal Water Law and has been issued subsequent to the Washington rt's decision in <i>Lummi Indian Nation v. State of Washington</i> , Washington Supreme Court No, the held that all sections of the Municipal Water Law are constitutional on their face, and thus valid	
	t's primary audience is those interested in, and affected by, management of water rights for ply purposes. It clarifies Ecology's approach in interpreting and implementing the law. It enable	



Ecology staff to have a common understanding and consistency of application.

Ecology applied this part of Policy 2030 – Part 1





Ecology applied this part of Policy 2030 – Part 2

RCW 90.03.330(3) Appropriation Procedure – Water Right Certificates. This subsection provides that water rights for municipal water supply purposes documented by certificates issued prior to September 9, 2003 with maximum quantities based on system capacity (known as "pumps and pipes" certificates) are "rights in good standing."

"Pumps and pipes" certificates were issued based on the system capacity measure, rather than on the basis
of actual beneficial use. These water rights include inchoate quantities that have not yet been exercised. *See Department of Ecology v. Theodoratus*, 135 Wn.2d 582, 957 P.2d 1241 (1998). Such rights may
continue to be exercised to serve new growth. Foology is not authorized to revoke or diminish water rights
for municipal supply purposes documented by such "pumps and pipes" certificates, except under the
circumstances set forth in RCW 90.03.330(2), discussed above.

So in this particular case the mobile home park was fully built out and did not plan on adding new connections. They had no water system plan and weren't planning on extending their service area.



Determination of extent and validity of existing Country Mobile Water System water right

The County Mobile Water System (DOH 15516) was operated up until 2014 as a Group a municipal system serving 18 residential connections, thus this water right meets the definition of "municipal water supply purposes" at RCW 90.03.015(4). As a mobile home park water use was somewhat lower than traditional homes, but County Mobile does include yard and garden space. The subject water right certificate was issued with the intent of supplying approximately 60 persons as a per capita consumption rate of 100 gallons per person.

The City started supplying the system in 2014 so available data extends from 2013 to 2010 when metering first became required. A review of the information reported in the Water Use Efficiency documents the following use patterns:

- 2013 3.7 acre-feet
- 2012 2.9 acre-feet
- 2011 4.0 acre-feet
- 2010 5.3 acre-feet

It is unknown how much water was used prior to onset of metering and reporting, however we note that this system was originally developed in 1974 as a senior mobile home park in a semi-rural area with larger than average lots for mobile homes. Gardening was popular among the residents and used as a selling point. Based on conversation with City staff, the operators of the system took conservation very seriously after the passage of the Department of Health's WUE standards and dramatically reduced their water use. In 2011, the first year of for the WUE program, 24 soaker hoses were handled out to the 18 units along with ongoing literature handouts and postings on the community bulletin Board. 2012 was the year with the lowest reported water use, and notes on the WUE report indicate that in 2012, in an effort to save water, the park initiated a water use saving strategy from 1974 of watering alternate days (based on location). In 2012, the park shut off two automatic lawn sprinkler systems, and it was reported that several units were vacant. It is our presumption that water use must have been higher prior to the onset of the park's conservation efforts.

