

Water Law Review

Volume 11 | Issue 2

Article 2

1-1-2008

Vol. 11, no. 2: Editor's Note

Amy Petri Beard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/wlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Amy Petri Beard, Editor's Note, 11 U. Denv. Water L. Rev. [ix] (2008).

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Denver Sturm College of Law at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Water Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Vol. 11, no. 2: Editor's Note

EDITOR'S NOTE

Although many watersheds have had allocation regimes in place for quite some time, climate change and a better scientific understanding of the hydrologic cycle make it imperative that we evaluate and update these potentially outdated systems. Historically, statutory regimes treated surface and ground waters differently. In some cases, these regimes were completely silent on groundwater allocation. However, through greater understanding of the hydrologic cycle, we now know that there is a link between surface waters and groundwaters. Unfortunately, legal regimes are slow to catch on to what hydrologists and hydrogeologists have known for some time. Additionally, we find water quality issues when there are two (seemingly competing) regimes in place. The ultimate question becomes: who is responsible for ensuring the water quality and at what standard? This issue of the *Water Law Review* takes a close look at groundwater allocation and water quality, both in the United States and internationally.

R. Timothy Weston examines Eastern United States water allocation systems. He provides a comprehensive look at the statutory regimes, from pure riparian states to modified systems, termed regulated riparianism. Mr. Weston concludes that the ultimate goal is to ensure that allocation of surface and groundwater is consistent with the science of water.

Maria E. Hohn provides a look at Indian water rights and quality issues. The Supreme Court heard the guiding case in this area, *Winters v. United States*, one hundred years ago. Since then, further guidance on Indian water rights has cropped up in case law. However, one area where instruction is lacking is water quality standards and programs for this reserved Indian water. Ms. Hohn lays out the need for water quality parameters and suggests that a cooperative approach would benefit all.

We turn back to a groundwater discussion in Nora R. Pincus's article. Ms. Pincus paints an international picture of water allocation and how it must specifically relate to groundwater, yet does not. In her article, Ms. Pincus examines the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses and discusses the lack of groundwater principles. She suggests how and why the Convention should include these important groundwater principles.

Peter Smith delves into the troubles of the Tijuana River. From pollution to the binational nature of the river, Mr. Smith assesses if the current legal regime is sufficient. He begins with a look at the science of the basin and moves on to the uses of the watershed. Mr. Smith considers the binational legal regimes and sums up his article with a look at future issues facing the Tijuana River.

Also included in this issue is a selection of poems by the Honorable Gregory J. Hobbs, Jr. of the Colorado Supreme Court. Other poems by Justice Hobbs appear in Volume 3/Issue 2, Volume 5/Issue 2, Volume 7/Issue 2, and Volume 9/Issue 2 of the *Water Law Review*.

We hope you enjoy the works in this issue of the *Water Law Review*. The *Review* values your continued support, and we hope you will share your thoughts and opinions regarding our publication.

Amy Petri Beard
Editor-in-Chief