
State Water Resources Control Board

NOTICE OF STATUS CONFERENCE, PROCEDURAL RULING, AND PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF ISSUES

The State Water Resources Control Board
Administrative Hearings Office
will hold a status conference on the pending petitions of

**Consolidated Irrigation District, Fresno Irrigation District,
and Alta Irrigation District,
and
Semitropic Improvement District of Semitropic Water Storage District
and
McMullin Area Groundwater Sustainability Agency**

to revoke or revise the Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems
with respect to the Kings River and, on the Board's motion, the portion of the Fresno
Slough to which the Kings River is tributary.

The **Status Conference** will be held on
December 3, 2026, at 9:00 A.M.

Representatives of parties will receive individual invitations to join each scheduled
meeting by e-mail from Zoom.

**Interested members of the public who would like to watch this hearing without
participating may do so through the Administrative Hearings Office YouTube
channel at: bit.ly/aho-youtube**

LANGUAGE SERVICES AND ACCESSIBILITY

The status conference will be offered in English. To request translation of a written document, interpretation services for the hearing or sign language services, please use one of the following options as soon as possible for the conference, and no later than **November 20, 2026, for the status conference:**

- Submit a [Language Services Request online](#)
- Call (916) 341-5254
- E-mail languageservices@waterboards.ca.gov

**Comuníquese con nosotros para solicitar servicios lingüísticos o
información en su idioma:**

**ਆਪਣੇ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿੱਚ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਸੇਵਾ ਅਤੇ/ ਟੈਕਸਟ ਬਾਝ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਸਭ ਨਾਲ ਸਪਰਕ
ਕਰ:**

**Makipag-ugnayan sa amin para humiling ng mga serbisyo sa wika at/o
impormasyon sa iyong wika:**

**Txuas lus rau peb los thov cov kev pab cuam txhais lus thiab/los sis cov ntaub
ntawv ua koj hom lus:**

[Bit.ly/LanguageAccessForm](https://bit.ly/LanguageAccessForm) | AdminHrgOffice@waterboards.ca.gov

**Users of a Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) may contact the
California Relay Service at (800) 735-2929 or the teletype (TTY) voice line at (800)
735-2922.**

PURPOSE OF STATUS CONFERENCE

The Administrative Hearings Office (AHO) will hold a status conference on December 3, 2026, in advance of conducting a later public hearing on whether the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board or Board) should revoke or revise the Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems (FAS Declaration) to allow the Board's Division of Water Rights (Division) to accept applications to appropriate water from the Kings River and that portion of the Fresno Slough to which the Kings River is tributary (FAS Hearing). This Notice includes a preliminary assessment of issues to aid in preparation for the status conference and actual FAS Hearing. The hearing process, including the submission of briefs and evidence, will be discussed at the status conference.

The preliminary assessment is intended to focus discussion during the status conference to facilitate an efficient FAS Hearing to be held at a later date. We invite the parties to include comments in their status conference statements on the proposed issues, scope, and analysis set forth in the preliminary assessment as discussed in more detail below.

The preliminary assessment contained in this Notice is not a final decision or a proposed order under Water Code section 1114. The Hearing Team will consider all relevant evidence and argument submitted in connection with the ultimate FAS Hearing in preparation of a proposed order for the State Water Board's consideration.

BACKGROUND

A. Petitions to Revise the Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems

On May 9, 2017, Consolidated Irrigation District, joined by Alta Irrigation District and Fresno Irrigation District, filed a petition to revoke or revise the FAS Declaration (Joint FAS Petition) and an accompanying joint water right application (A032810).

On May 25, 2017, Semitropic filed a petition (Semitropic FAS Petition) and an accompanying water right application (A032815). Semitropic submitted hydrologic and water usage data with its petition in support of its argument that water is available for appropriation in the Kings River Stream System.

On November 24, 2021, the McMullin Area Groundwater Sustainability Agency (McMullin Area GSA) filed a petition (McMullin Area GSA FAS Petition) and an accompanying water right application to appropriate water from Fresno Slough and James Bypass (A033259).

B. Semitropic's Complaint

On July 2, 2018, Semitropic filed with the Division a complaint in support of its FAS Petition (Semitropic Complaint). The Semitropic Complaint alleges that the Kings River

Water Association (KRWA) and its member units: (1) forfeited, abandoned, or failed to perfect their water rights under Licenses 11517 and 11521 and any pre-1914 water rights that cover the same points of diversion, purposes of use, and places of use described in the licenses; and (2) are diverting water in violation of Water Code section 1052 and the terms and conditions of Licenses 11517 and 11521.

C. Assignment of Petitions and Complaint to Administrative Hearings Office

On May 26, 2020, the Deputy Director of the Division transmitted a memorandum to the State Water Board's Executive Director, which concluded that hydrologic and water usage data submitted by the petitioners and other information contained in the record presented a possibility that water may be available for appropriation in the Kings River Stream System. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 871, subdivision (c)(4), the Deputy Director determined that there was reasonable cause to conduct a hearing on the question of whether the fully appropriated status of the Kings River Stream System should be revoked or revised and recommended that the Board assign the matter to the AHO for hearing. On May 29, 2020, the Executive Director transmitted a memorandum to the presiding hearing officer of the AHO, assigning the petitions to the AHO.

On October 29, 2020, the Deputy Director transmitted a memorandum to the Executive Director recommending that the Board assign the Semitropic Complaint to the AHO for further proceedings because of the common and interrelated factual and legal issues raised by the Semitropic FAS Petition, the Joint FAS Petition, and the Semitropic Complaint. The Executive Director transmitted a memorandum to the AHO, also dated October 29, 2020, assigning the Semitropic Complaint to the AHO.

On March 10, 2022, following proceedings noticed as Phase 1, the Executive Director assigned the McMullin Area GSA FAS Petition to the AHO for further proceedings. On March 10, 2022, the AHO issued a Notice of Assignment of the petition which stated the hearing officer's intent to incorporate the petition into Phase 2 of this proceeding.

D. Phase 1 Proceedings

On February 19, 2021, the AHO hearing officer issued a ruling letter to split the proceeding into phases. Phase 1A of the hearing was intended to address the threshold question of whether there is evidence tending to show that Licenses 11517 and 11521 should be revoked, or if a violation of a requirement described in Water Code section 1831, subdivision (d), by KRWA or its member units is occurring or threatening to occur. If appropriate, a Phase 1B hearing would have addressed the question of whether the State Water Board should revoke the licenses or issue a cease-and-desist order.

The AHO conducted Phase 1A beginning in June 2021. Following Phase 1A, the hearing officer determined that an AHO hearing officer is not the appropriate person to issue any notice of a proposed revocation of a water right license or proposed cease and desist order to KRWA or its member units due to the separation of functions within

the State Water Board and delegation of authority by the Board and the Executive Director. AHO hearing officers do not hold or exercise the discretionary prosecutorial function of determining whether the Board should initiate an enforcement proceeding, and neither the Board nor the Executive Director has purported to delegate any such authority to them.

As such, this Notice confirms that the AHO will not issue any decision or recommendation on the question of whether there is evidence tending to show that Licenses 11517 and 11521 should be revoked or whether a violation of a requirement described in Water Code section 1831, subdivision (d), is occurring or threatening to occur. Additionally, the AHO will not conduct a Phase 1B hearing to address the question of whether the State Water Board should revoke the licenses or issue a cease-and-desist order.

The Phase I hearing therefore is concluded without a final action by the Board. Further proceedings on Semitropic's complaint, if any, will be a decision of the Executive Director.

The remainder of this Notice addresses the Kings River and Fresno Slough FAS Hearing.

E. Assignment of the Fresno Slough Stream System

The parties who filed petitions and applications in connection with the Kings River did not explicitly petition the Board to revise or revoke the FAS Declaration with respect to the Fresno Slough Stream System. Water Right Order 98-08 states that a downstream FAS declaration encompasses all upstream, hydraulically continuous waterways. (Order WR 98-08, p. 21.) Hence, a change in the Kings River FAS may require revision of the Fresno Slough FAS declaration if the change includes circumstances when the systems are hydraulically connected. (Order WR 98-08, p. 21.) Moreover, the McMullin Area GSA filed an application to appropriate water with its petition to revise or revoke the FAS Declaration in 2022, seeking to divert flow from the James Bypass and Fresno Slough. Hydraulic continuity does occur at times between the Kings River and Fresno Slough so that any amendment to the FAS Declaration to allow applications to appropriate water on the Kings River should include consideration of that portion of the Fresno Slough to which the Kings River is tributary.

On October 15, 2026, the Deputy Director of the Division of Water Rights transmitted a memorandum to the State Water Board's Executive Director, which concluded that consideration of the Fresno Slough Stream System as part of the Kings River FAS proceeding is necessary inasmuch as hydrologic and water usage data submitted by the petitioners and other information contained in the administrative record from Phase IA presents a possibility that Fresno Slough water may be available for appropriation.

In accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 871, subdivision (c)(4), the Deputy Director determined that there was reasonable cause to conduct a

hearing on the question of whether the fully appropriated status of the portion of the Fresno Slough Stream System that is tributary to the Kings River should be revoked or revised, and recommended that the Board assign the matter to the AHO for hearing. On October 15, 2026, the Executive Director transmitted a memorandum to the Presiding Hearing Officer of the AHO, assigning the matter to the AHO.

As discussed below, the AHO seeks input from the parties on how and to whom notice of the addition of the Fresno Slough to the FAS Hearing should be sent.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FOR THE UPCOMING FAS HEARING

The key issue for consideration at the FAS Hearing is as follows:

Should the State Water Board revoke or revise the Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems under Water Code section 1205, subdivision (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 871, to allow the Division of Water Rights to accept applications to appropriate water from the Kings River Stream System and that portion of the Fresno Slough Stream System to which the Kings River is tributary?

Based on the information in the Phase 1 administrative record and other publicly available information,¹ the AHO's preliminarily assessment finds that there is unappropriated water in the Kings River and Fresno Slough Stream System/s, and that the State Water Board should amend the FAS Declaration to allow the Division to accept and process applications to appropriate water in the Kings River and that portion of the Fresno Slough Stream System to which the Kings River is tributary.

A. Water Rights Decision 1290

On November 30, 1967, the State Water Rights Board adopted Water Rights Decision 1290, approving eight water right applications to appropriate water from the Kings River watershed. In approving these applications, the Board acknowledged that "while it is not possible in years of extreme flood," the permittee's intention was "to utilize all of the runoff of the river." (Decision 1290 (1967), p. 40.) Accordingly, the Board determined that the permits issued on the approved applications "will appropriate essentially all of the available unappropriated water of the Kings River." (*Id.* at pp. 41–42.)

On May 18, 1984, the Board issued licenses to replace six of these permits. The remaining permits, Permit 15717 and 15718 (issued on Applications 11023 and 11075),

¹ Unless the context indicates otherwise, references in this order to exhibits are to exhibits introduced during the Phase I hearing for this proceeding. These exhibits are filed in a folder titled "Parties' Hearing Exhibits" within the Hearing Documents folder in the administrative record for this proceeding.

were revoked.² These two revoked permits authorized appropriation of Kings River water up to 1,136,700 acre-feet (AF) per year. (Decision 1290, p. 8, tbl. 1.)

B. FAS Declarations

In 1989, the Board issued an Order Adopting Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems and Specifying Conditions for Acceptance of Applications and Registrations (Order WR 89-25), which included the Kings River and Fresno Slough Stream Systems. The Board noted that “Staff has pointed out that Decision 1290 determined that the Kings River and Fresno Slough are fully appropriated year-round. Accordingly, the Declaration should include these Stream Systems.” (Order WR 89-25, pp. 11–12.)

The Board included the Fresno Slough and Kings River Stream Systems in subsequent FAS Declaration updates and revisions in 1991 and 1998. (Orders WR 91-07, WR 98-08.)

C. Water Right Applications 11023 and 11075 (Permits 15717 and 15718)

During the public hearing for Decision 1290, applicants and Board³ members discussed source, diversion amounts, and purpose of Applications 11023 and 11075. While there apparently was some initial uncertainty regarding their purpose, the Board eventually understood the applications to be seeking to appropriate up to approximately 1.13 million AF of Kings River water that may be released from Pine Flat Reservoir for flood control operations, and summarized its consideration of the applications as follows:

“Going forward, we have ... [Application] 11023 with 10,000 cubic feet per second, an application designed to cover any flood control releases if such releases are deemed to be unappropriated water ... [Application] 11075 which is a companion in effect to 11023 and that is for 2,000 cubic feet per second not to exceed 136,700 acre-feet. That was designed to cover again the flood control releases.”

(Decision 1290 Tr. Vol. 15., p. 45:22–46:13.)

² Pursuant to the Board’s records retention policy, records of application files and revocation orders for Permits 15717 and 15718 may no longer exist; however, staff are continuing their effort to locate files in various archives. As a result, information about these permits available to the Hearing Team is limited though it appears the Board revoked these permits at some point between the 1976 licensing inspection reports and May 1984, when it issued the licenses for the other applications approved in Decision 1290. Any additional evidence the parties can provide on these cancellations will be considered as part of the FAS Hearing.

³ In 1967, the legislature consolidated the State Water Rights Board with the State Water Quality Control Board to create the State Water Resources Control Board. (Wat. Code, § 174.) Decision 1290 was decided by the State Water Rights Board.

In a 1976 licensing inspection report, Division staff calculated beneficial use amounts under the permits issued for Applications 360, 5640, and 11023. Staff did not document that any water was diverted or used pursuant to Application 11023 and recommended revocation of the permit. (1976-03-26 Calculations of diversion during maximum season, p. 1.)

In a subsequent 1976 report, Division staff summarized licensing recommendations for the eight permits issued on the applications approved in Decision 1290, including recommendations that Permits 15717 and 15718 should be revoked. (1976-05-26 Summary of Conditions, p. 1.)

Water Code Section 1410 provides that there shall be cause for revocation of a permit “if the work is not commenced, prosecuted with due diligence, and completed or the water applied to beneficial use as contemplated in the permit.” (Wat. Code, § 1410, subd. (a).) Following revocation of a permit, the Board shall declare the water subject to appropriation. (*Id.* at subd. (b)(2).)

As noted in footnote 1, the AHO has yet to locate any records of a Board or Division order revoking Permits 15717 and 15718, and declaring water appropriated under those permits to be subject to appropriation. However, the information available, including the 1976 Division reports, KRWA’s evidence in Phase 1 relating to its water rights reporting (Exh. KRWA-037), and the absence of any dispute that the permits were revoked, overwhelmingly suggests that the permits were in fact revoked. As a result, we preliminarily assess the water previously appropriated under Permits 15717 and 15718 has ceased to be appropriated under the permits and is now subject to appropriation. We invite the parties to provide any additional information regarding these revocations.

D. Flows Measured in the James Bypass

In Decision 1290, the Board had limited data on the hydrology of the Kings River after the commencement of operations at Pine Flat Dam. Decision 1290 was issued in 1967, only 13 years after Pine Flat Dam became fully operational. (Decision 1290, p. 14.) The administrative record for Decision 1290 shows that between 1954 and 1966, a total of 248,765 AF left the system through the Fresno Slough and that outflow through the Fresno Slough had occurred in less than one-third of years. (Decision 1290 Tr. Vol. 1, pp. 131:24–132:6.) Utilizing this hydrologic data, the Board determined that approving the applications would essentially appropriate all available water in the Kings River and Fresno Slough Stream Systems, though noted that utilizing all the runoff of the river “is not possible in years of extreme flood.” (*Id.* at pp. 39, 41–42.) This limited data set, however, did not capture the magnitude of extreme flood events possible on the Kings River. For example, in 1967, the year the Board issued Decision 1290, approximately 481,987 acre-feet left the system via the James Bypass, which was more than the previous 13 years of outflow combined. (Exh. KRCWA-37.)

After the Board issued Decision 1290 and approved applications that would “essentially appropriate all available water in the Kings River and Fresno Slough systems,” Kings

River water continued to leave the watershed via the James Bypass and Fresno Slough in 18 years between 1968 and 2017. (Exh. Semitropic-29, Figure 2, p. 15.) Publicly available data for the James Bypass Gage (JBG) after 2018 indicates measured flow in 2019, 2023, 2024, and 2025 (USGS # 11253500).⁴

Substantial amounts of Kings River water has left the watershed via the James Bypass and Fresno Slough since 1968. Gage data shows that flows at the JBG were approximately 2.3 million AF in 1983,⁵ and approximately 767,000 AF in 2023.⁶ Additionally, more than 500,000 AF of Kings River flows left the watershed in 1998 (1,006,495 AF), 2006 (612,148 AF), 2011 (500,566 AF), and 2017 (723,160 AF). (Exh. KRWA-37 [Revised Reporting Calculation, column 'P'].)

In 1983, more than double the 1.13 million AF authorized by the revoked Permits 15717 and 15718 was measured at the JBG. This water exceeded the demand or capacity to divert by existing water right holders within the Kings River Stream System and exited the Stream System unappropriated. (See e.g., Order WR 2010-0010, p. 5.)

Together, the revocation of Permits 15717 and 15718, combined with measured flow leaving the system exceeding 1.13 million AF, support the preliminary determination that revocation of Permits 15717 and 15718 has made available at least 1.13 million AF of unappropriated water in the Kings and Fresno Slough Stream Systems.

Although the above evidence may be sufficient on its own to revoke or revise the FAS Declarations, other policy considerations also support reopening of the FAS including the passage of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), the increased ability to capture high-volume flows, and hydrologic variability due, in part, to climate change further justify the AHO's preliminary assessment to revoke or revise the FAS Declaration (See Executive Director's letter referring this matter to the AHO; 2020-05-26_aho_referral_memo_kings_river_fas, p. 8.)

⁴ We rely on data from the United States Geological Survey James Bypass Gage (USGS # 11253500) in this Preliminary Assessment subject to additional information that may be submitted at the FAS Hearing. A search of the Board's records indicates there are no active surface water right diversions between the JBG and the confluence of the Fresno Slough and the San Joaquin River. Accordingly, this preliminary assessment assumes that flows measured at the JBG are representative of all flows that leave the Kings River into the Fresno Slough Stream Systems via the James Bypass.

⁵ See United States Geological Survey, "Monitoring Location James Bypass (Fresno Slough) NR San Joaquin CA - USGS-11253500," data table found at <https://waterdata.usgs.gov/monitoring-location/USGS-11253500/#dataTypeId=daily-00060-0&showFieldMeasurements=true&startDT=1983-01-01&endDT=1983-12-31>

⁶ See California Department of Water Resources, "James Bypass," data table found at https://cdec.water.ca.gov/cdecplotter/JspPlotServlet?sensor_id=6908&end=2024-01-01&geom=SMALL&interval=365&cookies=

Based on the above, it is the AHO's preliminary assessment that the FAS Declaration should be amended to allow the Division to accept applications to appropriate water from the Kings River and Fresno Slough Stream Systems up to a total amount of 1.13 million acre-feet.

E. Issues Relating to Public Trust Considerations are Reserved for Future Consideration.

The AHO is mindful that the diversion of flow from the Kings River and Fresno Slough Stream Systems may impact public trust resources or other legal users of water within or downstream of these systems. Importantly, issues of injury to specific legal users and public trust considerations **will not be at issue** in the FAS Hearing. The decision whether to reopen the FAS Declarations will not alter the water rights of any party or affect instream flows absent further action on a water right application. If the FAS Declarations are revised or revoked and applications for appropriation are processed, the Board will analyze how approval of specific applications may or may not impact fish and wildlife or injure other legal users of water.

ISSUES AND PROCEDURE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE

The Hearing Team will hold a status conference on the date and at the time specified on the first page of this notice by Zoom teleconference. No in-person appearances will be allowed. The status conference will be held and electronically recorded by Zoom teleconference. The AHO will not retain a court reporter for the status conference. Any party may arrange for a court reporter at the party's own expense.

During the status conference, the hearing officer intends to raise the topics below for discussion. To aid discussion, the AHO requests status conference statements addressing the issues identified below as a preliminary matter in addition to any additional information the parties wish to raise. Status conference statements up to 15 pages in length (including exhibits) may be submitted no later than November 16, 2026:

1. Whether the scope of the issues raised in the preliminary assessment should be broadened or narrowed and, if so, why?
2. Whether the evidence and methodology relied upon in the preliminary assessment are sufficient to support a finding that unappropriated water is available and if not, why not?
3. Whether the FAS Hearing can be limited to written testimony, briefing, declarations, and evidentiary objections without oral testimony or cross-examination.
4. How the Parties intend to satisfy the noticing requirements in Water Code section 1207.

5. Other procedural issues that participants may wish to discuss including, but not limited to, whether additional parties need to be notified of these proceedings.

Parties may submit a reply in response to the status conference statements. Any responsive statements should be limited to 8 pages (including exhibits) and received no later than November 25, 2026. Evidence **should not** be submitted with the status conference statements or responsive statements.

HEARING OFFICER AND HEARING TEAM

Senior Hearing Officer Malissa Hathaway McKeith and Hearing Officer Cody Phillips will preside during the status conference and any further hearings required in this matter. The Hearing Team will include State Water Board staff from the AHO, the Division, and the Office of Chief Counsel. Up to two State Water Board members may be present during the status conference or during hearings; however, the State Water Board will not act on the matter until after a noticed hearing and preparation of the recommended decision or order by the hearing officer. Other staff members may be present and may assist the hearing officer throughout these proceedings and may consult with members of the executive management of the State Water Board and State Water Board members to discuss or deliberate on matters relevant to this proceeding.

PROHIBITION ON *EX PARTE* COMMUNICATIONS

While this proceeding is pending, ex parte communications between any party, party representative, or interested person and the hearing officer, any member of the Hearing Team, or any State Water Board member are prohibited. Ex parte communications include any type of communication regarding this proceeding that occurs between a party or interested person and the hearing officer, a member of the Hearing Team, or a State Water Board member without notice and an opportunity for all parties to participate. (See Wat. Code, § 1110, subd. (c); Gov. Code, §§ 11430.10–11430.80.) Additional information about ex parte communications is in response number 16 of the AHO's FAQ posted at bit.ly/aho-faq.

If any party wants to communicate with any member of the Hearing Team, the hearing officer, or any Board member, at any time while this proceeding is pending regarding any potentially controversial procedural or substantive issue then that party shall make such communication in writing (by e-mail or letter) and serve all other parties with copies of the communication and include a proof of service demonstrating such service of the written communication to the AHO. A party may provide this proof of service through a formal proof of service or by other verification. For e-mails, the verification shall be a list of the e-mail addresses of the parties or their representatives in an electronic mail "cc" (carbon copy) list. For letters, the verification shall be a list of the names and mailing addresses of the other parties or their representatives in the cc portion of the letter.

If the AHO receives any substantive or potentially controversial procedural communication regarding this proceeding that is addressed to the AHO, a Board

member, the hearing officer, or any other member of the Hearing Team, the AHO will file a copy of the communication in the “Misc. Correspondence” folder within the State Water Board’s FTP folder for this proceeding. Parties should plan to regularly check this folder for such communications.

Please do not attempt to communicate by telephone or in person with AHO staff or any Hearing Team member regarding this proceeding, because other parties would not be able to participate in such communications. If oral communications with any members of the Hearing Team are necessary to discuss any potentially controversial procedural or substantive issue, then the AHO will set up a conference call in which representatives of all parties may participate. Any party may request such a conference call at any time using the written communications protocols described above.

STATUS CONFERENCE SCHEDULE AND DEADLINES

Deadlines / Schedule	Date and Time
Deadline for filing status conference statements	November 16, 2026, at 11:59 p.m.
Deadline for filing responsive statements	November 25, 2026, at 11:59 p.m.
Status Conference	December 3, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

UPDATES TO SERVICE LIST

The AHO prepared the attached service list using information from Phase I of the Proceedings. If any party or interested person on the service list wants to change any of their information in the current service list, the party or interested person should submit this information by e-mail to EXEC-Kings-Fresno-FAS@Waterboards.ca.gov. The party or interested person does not need to send copies of the e-mail to the service list.

SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS TO THE AHO

All documents submitted to the AHO shall be addressed and submitted by one of the following methods:

E-mail (preferred method for documents other than exhibits):

EXEC-Kings-Fresno-FAS@Waterboards.ca.gov

By Mail: State Water Resources Control Board Administrative Hearings Office P. O. Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-0100	By Hand or Overnight Delivery: Joe Serna Jr. CalEPA Building State Water Resources Control Board Administrative Hearings Office 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
---	--

By uploading to FTP (Preferred method for exhibits): All participants must submit exhibits by uploading them to the State Water Board's FTP site.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

The AHO has maintained documents in the hearing folder for this proceeding on the Water Board's FTP site, accessed at <https://ftp.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Anyone may view and download documents from the FTP site. To access the FTP folder for this proceeding, please send an email to EXEC-Kings-Fresno-FAS@Waterboards.ca.gov with "Request for AHO FTP (Kings River) login credentials" in the subject line.

AHO WEBPAGE AND NOTICES

Subject to legal limitations, including the requirements for Internet website accessibility in Government Code section 11546.7, the AHO will post all of its notices and other AHO documents regarding these proceedings on the AHO's Internet webpage at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/administrative_hearings_office/

HEARING LIVE-STREAM AND RECORDING

The status conference will be live-streamed through the AHO's YouTube channel, accessible by clicking on the link provided below.

After the conclusion of the hearing, a recording of the hearing live-stream sessions will be available on the AHO's YouTube channel. These recordings will include automatic captions for accessibility.

The live-stream and recordings may be accessed at the following link by clicking on "Live" and then clicking on the name of this proceeding: [bit.ly/aho-youtube](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bit.ly/aho-youtube).

MORE INFORMATION

Forms

For copies of the Notice of Intent to Appear and Request Party Status for parties interested in joining as parties, refer to the AHO Forms page, available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/administrative_hearings_office/forms.html.

Frequently Asked Questions

For information about the AHO and general hearing procedures, refer to the AHO Frequently Asked Questions, available at bit.ly/aho-faq.

E-mail List

Any interested person may sign up to receive communication related to this proceeding at bit.ly/swb-subscribe by selecting “Kings River Fresno Slough FAS” in the Administrative Hearings Office subscription topic group.

October 16, 2026
Date

/s/ Malissa Hathaway McKeith
Malissa Hathaway McKeith
Senior Hearing Officer
Administrative Hearings Office
State Water Resources Control Board

Attachments:

- Attachment 1 - Service List

ATTACHMENT 1 Service List

By Email Only:

Meredith E. Nikkel
Jake R. Voorhees
Downey Brand LLP
621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
mnikkel@downeybrand.com
jvoorhees@downeybrand.com
dfillon@downeybrand.com
dreeder@downeybrand.com
*Attorneys for Semitropic
Improvement District*

Jason Gianquinto
General Manager
Semitropic Water Storage District
1101 Central Avenue, P.O. Box 8043
Wasco, CA 93280-0877
jgianquinto@semitropic.com

Steve Torigiani
Brett Stroud
Young Wooldridge
1800 30th St., 4th Floor
Bakersfield, CA 93301
storigiani@youngwooldridge.com
bstroud@youngwooldridge.com
*Attorneys for Semitropic Water
Storage District*

Nicholas Jacobs
Michelle Chester
Somach Simmons & Dunn
500 Capitol Mall, Ste. 1000
Sacramento, CA 95814
njacobs@somachlaw.com
mchester@somachlaw.com
*Attorneys for Alta, Consolidated, and
Fresno Irrigation Districts*

Chad Wegley
General Manager
Alta Irrigation District
289 North L St.
Dinuba, CA 3618
cw@altaid.org

Doug Jensen
Lauren Layne
Baker Manock & Jenson
5260 North Palm, Ste. 421
Fresno, CA 93704
djensen@bakermanock.com
llayne@bakermanock.com
*Attorneys for Alta Irrigation
District and Consolidated
Irrigation District*

Phil Desatoff
General Manager
Consolidated Irrigation District
2255 Chandler St.
Selma, CA 93662
pdesatoff@cidwater.com

Bill Stretch
General Manager
Fresno Irrigation District
2907 S. Maple Avenue
Fresno, CA 93725
bstretch@fresnoirrigation.com

Adam Claes
Assistant General Manager
Fresno Irrigation District
2907 S. Maple Avenue
Fresno, CA 93725
aclaes@fresnoirrigation.com

Jeff Boswell
Fresno Irrigation District 2907 S.
Maple Ave Fresno, CA 93725
jboswell@fresnoirrigation.com
Attorney for Fresno Irrigation District

Russell McGlothlin
Zachary Smith
O'Melveny & Myers
400 S. Hope St., 18th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
rmcglathlin@omm.com
zsmith@omm.com
Attorneys for Terranova Ranch Inc.

Robert E. Donlan
Shawnda M. Grady
Wanger Jones Helsley PC
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2550
Sacramento, CA 95816
rdonlan@wjhattorneys.com
sgrady@wjhattorneys.com
*Attorneys for McMullin Area
Groundwater Sustainability Agency*

Jennifer L. Spaletta
Stoel Rives LLP
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600
Sacramento, CA 95814
jennifer.spaletta@stoel.com
*Attorney for Laguna Irrigation District,
Burrel Ditch Company, Stinson Canal &
Irrigation Co., Upper San Jose Water
Co., Liberty Mill Race Company, Liberty
Mutual Canal Company, and Clarks
Fork Reclamation District*

Scott Sills
Manager
Laguna Irrigation District
Burrel Ditch Company
Upper San Jose Water Co.
Liberty Mill Race Company
Liberty Mutual Canal
Company 5065 19 ½ Avenue
Riverdale, CA 93656
scott@lagunaid.com

Stephen Heintz
Manager, Stinson Canal &
Irrigation Co. 1100 W.
Shaw Avenue, Suite 148
Fresno, CA 93711
hbm1100@aol.com

Sterling Duncan
Manager, Clarks Fork
Reclamation District
P.O. Box 874 Lemoore,
CA 93245
Sterling-duncan@sbcglobal.net

Kenneth J. Richardson Peltzer &
Richardson LC
3746 W. Mineral King Ave.
Visalia, CA 93291
krichardson@prlawcorp.com
*Attorney for Peoples Ditch Company
and Last Chance Water Ditch
Company*

Shannon Little
California Department of Fish
and Wildlife
P.O. Box 944209 Sacramento,
CA 94244-2090
Shannon.Little@wildlife.ca.gov
*Attorney for California Department
of Fish and Wildlife*

Stefanie Morris
Steve Haugen
smorris@calnevawaterlaw.com
shaugen@kingsriverwater.org
*Attorney for Kings River
Water Association*

Leonard C. Herr
HERR PEDERSEN & BERGLUND
LLP100 Willow Plaza,
Suite 300 Visalia, CA 93291
lherr@hpblaw.net
*Attorney for Kings River
Water Association*

Peter J. Kiel, SBN 221548 Law
Office of Peter Kiel
P.O. Box 422 Petaluma, CA 95955
pkiel@cawaterlaw.com
*Attorney for Tulare Lake Basin Water
Storage District*

Aubrey A. Mauritsen Ruddell Stanton
et al. 1102 N. Chinowth Street
Visalia, CA 9329
amauritsen@visaliaalaw.com
*Attorney for Tulare Lake Basin
Water Storage District*

Administrative Hearings Office
AdminHrgOffice@Waterboards.ca.gov

Interested Persons:

Brandon Silveira
13498 15th Ave
Hanford, CA 93230
brandonsilveira@me.com

Kenneth Petruzzelli
Division of Water Rights
Office of Enforcement
801 K Street, 23rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Kenneth.Petruzzelli@waterboards.ca.gov