Exhibit A - TABLE OF CONTENTS to

PROTEST to the California State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights regarding USA Application 18115, Permit 13776, Protest filed October 1, 2009

1. [Decree, Para XV. p. 173: no diversions except as provided]

2. [Decree, Para XV. p. 173: diversions outside the season, against right limits]

3. [Decree, Para XV. p. 174: amounts or rates apply to entire calendar year]

4. [Decree, Para XV. p. 175: if allowed by water master, larger head for shorter periods]

5. [Decree, Para XV. p. 175: change point of diversion and places, means, manner or purpose of the use]

6. [Decree, Para XV. p. 177: rights in excess of decreed may not be claimed by parties, etc.]

7. [Decree, Para XV. p. 178: restrained from interfering with superior rights]

E. [phrases show Decree binds all lands in the Decree and all persons named in the Decree and their successors and assigns], p. 5

F. [errors in land descriptions in the Decree irrelevant], p. 5

G. [Decree eliminates any other USA reserved right, including forestry right], p. 6

H. [United States District Court has exclusive jurisdiction over surface flowing waters within watershed; SWRCB lacks jurisdiction], p. 6

I. [SWRCB must stop handling disputes to surface water in the watershed], p. 6

J. [attached Exhibit C, in progress, complex Decree limits; USA has taken more water than allowed in nearly every year since 1930; watermaster reported spillage & waste until reports stopped after 1946; watermaster reports to the court of USA selling water to non-project users; lack of SWRCB jurisdiction over Black Butte, half of Stony Gorge, all other USA filings and petitions and diversions, stock ponds, etc.], p. 6

K. [Decree loopholes in favor of USA, limited to storage], p. 7

1. [excess during initial reclamation]

2. [4 other types of excess, 1 system-wide, 3 parcel-by-parcel]

L. [claims under loopholes must be overt, specific and public; unproven excess a crime under California Water Code 1052; USA entitlement limited to acreage actually irrigated; Decree allowed 4.05 a-f per acre at point of diversion, USA has taken far more than that], p. 7

M. [unpermitted Intertie, Lateral 40 to Tehama-Colusa Canal] p. 8

EXHIBITS TO PROTEST:

Exhibit A to Protest - Cases in the Erosion of Water Rights in the Stony Creek Watershed (Related Cases)

Exhibit A-1 to Protest - List of Stony Creek watershed diversions in e-WRIMS, search first by stream, second by tributary, third by county, fourth by Mendocino National Forest, then by Decisions & Rulings - Count up to 314 including 4 Decisions & 8 Water Right Opinions

Exhibit A-2 to Protest - unique e-WRIMS forest/mendocino/blm in Glenn/Tehama/Colusa [counties]

Exhibit B to Protest - Letter to Mr. Tom Tidwell, Chief, US Forest Service, regarding Forest Service violations of the Angle Decree

Exhibit C to Protest - Diversion Limits in the Decree and Excess Diversions by Plaintiff United States of America (and Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District) [see Exhibit --- to this Motion Memorandum for an updated version]

Exhibit D to Protest - Excerpts from the United States Forest Service, Mendocino National Forest, Fouts Springs Youth Facility Environmental Assessment

- - -