1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
3	DEPARTMENT NO. S-32 HON. JOHN P. WADE, JUDGE
4	
5	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER ) DISTRICT, et al., )
6	
7	Plaintiff, ) vs. ) NO. RCVRS 51010
8	CITY OF CHINO, et al.,
9	
10	
11	
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL PROCEEDINGS
13	August 11, 2009
14	August II, 2009
15	
16	APPEARANCES:
17	AFFEARANCED.
18	(See next page)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	REPORTED BY: BETTY J. KELLEY, C.S.R. Official Reporter, C-3981
26	Official Reporter, C-3901
	COPY

1		
2	APPEARANCES:	
3	FOR THE WATERMASTER:	BROWNSTEIN, HYATT, FARBER & SCHRECK BY: MICHAEL FIFE
4		
5	FOR CITY OF CHINO:	JAMES E. ERICKSON Of Counsel to City Attorney
6		
7	FOR AGRICULTURAL POOL OF	REID & HELLYER
8	THE CHINO BASIN:	BY: STEVEN G. LEE
9	FOR MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT:	MC CORMICK, KIDMAN & BEHRENS BY: TRAM T. TRAN
10		
11	FOR THREE VALLEYS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRCIT:	BRUNICK, MC ELHANEY & BECKETT BY: STEVEN M. KENNEDY
12		
13	FOR THE CITY OF CHINO HILLS:	JENKINS & HOGIN, LLP
14		Attorneys at Law BY: JOHN C. COTTI
15		
16	FOR CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT:	BEST, BEST & KRIEGER Attorneys at Law BY: JILL N. WILLIS
17		
18	FOR CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General BY: JENNIFER NOVAK
19	OF CORRECTIONS:	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	REPORTED BY:	BETTY KELLEY, C.S.R.
26		Official Reporter, C-3981

1	SAN BERNARDINO.
2	CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2009
3	A.M. SESSION
4	DEPARTMENT S-32 HON. JOHN P. WADE, JUDGE
5	(Betty Kelley, CSR, Official Reporter.)
6	
7	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
8	Counsel wish to give their appearances, please
9	MR. FIFE: Good morning, your Honor. Michael
10	Fife on behalf of Chino Basin Watermaster.
11	MR. ERICKSON: Good morning, your Honor. Jim
12	Erickson on behalf of City of Chino.
13	MR. LEE: Good morning, your Honor. Steven Lee
14	of Reid & Helter on behalf of the Agricultural Pool of
15	the Chino Basin.
16	MS. WILLIS: Jill Willis on behalf of Cucamonga
17	Valley Water District.
18	MR. KENNEDY: Steve Kennedy on behalf of Three
19	Valleys Municipal Water District.
20	MS. TRAN: Tram Tran on behalf of Monte Vista
21	Water District.
22	MR. COTTI: John Cotti for the City of Chino
23	Hills.
24	MS. NOVAK: Jennifer Novak, Deputy Attorney
25	General, for the State of California and Department of
26	Corrections.

THE COURT: All right. The first order of business, before we get on with the presentation, is Watermaster's motion for the Court to approve the template storage and recovery agreement, which is an outline sort of proposed agreement that can be filled in later after this auction situation takes place.

MR. FIFE: Nothing to add, your Honor. I just wanted to call your attention to the fact that we did submit a revised proposed order last Tuesday. This was the result of some further negotiations between the

Mr. Fife, anything you want to add to this?

parties. We know of no objection at this point by any party to the proposed order and I'm happy to answer any

questions you might have.

THE COURT: The only thing that arose -- and apparently there are no objections, it all having gone through this process -- but there were comments by someone and I forgot to make a note as to who it was. Who filed some comments?

MR. FIFE: Those comments were by the agricultural pool, represented by Mr. Lee, who is in the courtroom today.

THE COURT: I remember that. Did you consider those comments in drafting the proposed amended agreement?

MR. FIFE: We did, your Honor. And we worked

closely with the agricultural pool. And my understanding is with the revisions as they are in the final revised order, the agricultural pool has no objections to the proposed order.

THE COURT: Mr. Lee, would you concur in that?

MR. LEE: That's correct, your Honor. I would agree with the statements.

THE COURT: Thank you for that. All right. Then the motion is approved.

MR. FIFE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Would you call the first witness, sir, if you wish.

MR. FIFE: Yes, your Honor. Before we start with that testimony, I wanted to just make a couple very brief comments. We would like to thank you for your months supervising the case. I think everybody has been very appreciative of your oversight of the case.

There are a few procedural issues that would be helpful to Watermaster and the parties if we covered, and I think the appropriate place to discuss those would probably be after the testimony this morning. But I wanted to briefly just highlight them so that maybe you could give them some thought as we go through the testimony this morning.

One of the situations that we encountered prior to you being assigned to the case, the transition from

 the previous judge to you, we went through a period of a few months where there were some objections to judges who had been assigned and we had a few months where the case essentially had no judge. It's very difficult right now for Watermaster to be in that situation because we are making a lot of progress in implementing the OBMP. And many of the items, such as the one you've just approved, require Court approval in order to allow us to move forward, so it's very difficult to not have a judge.

And so we were thinking that one of the things that might facilitate the transition would be if we had a case management order that articulated where the case is now and gave some guidance for the interim period between now and when we have a new judge in the event that that's perhaps a lengthy period. I would propose that we would draft a proposed order, circulate it amongst the the parties and perhaps submit it to you sometime in September and perhaps schedule a hearing to consider it. Again, this is just an idea and we can discuss it after the testimony this morning.

The other idea that we would like to discuss with you is whether there could be some sort of facilitation or perhaps liaison role of you between us, Watermaster, and the Presiding Judge to perhaps allow some input from the parties and Watermaster into who the next judge might be. That might avoid some of the

inefficiencies that we found last time where a judge was assigned and then objected to and then another judge was assigned and objected to. If we were able to have some input to the Presiding Judge, it might make things more efficient.

So again, just an idea that we'd like to discuss with you and see what kind of options might exist.

The third issue is that, again, anticipating that there might be a space of time in which we don't have a judge, we're trying to look at all the issues at Watermaster right now and anticipate which ones might need Court approval in the near future, perhaps in October or November, and perhaps try to tee those up for some sort of provisional approval or something like that and maybe come to you with a request for an order shortening time and again have a short hearing in September, maybe, to deal with those. So that's the third issue we'd like to discuss with you after the testimony this morning.

THE COURT: All right. We'll go through that then.

MR. FIFE: So with that, we'll call Mr. Malone to the stand. Again, testimony this morning will be about program element seven, eight and nine. Mr. Malone will handle program element seven, then we'll call Mr. Manning and Miss Rojo, both Watermaster staff, who

1 together will cover program elements eight and nine. 2 THE COURT ATTENDANT: If you'll face the clerk and raise your right hand, please. 3 4 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly state that the 5 evidence you shall give in the matter now pending before 6 this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and 7 nothing but the truth, so help you God? 8 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 9 THE CLERK: Thank you. 10 THE COURT ATTENDANT: Please be seated. 11 THE WITNESS: May I stand? 12 THE COURT: If you wish. 13 THE COURT ATTENDANT: Will you state and spell 14 your name for the record, please. 15 THE WITNESS: Andrew Malone, M-a-l-o-n-e. 16 THE WITNESS: Good morning, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. 18 THE WITNESS: What I have prepared for you today 19 is a rather short presentation on program element seven, 20 which is the Salt Management Program in the OBMP. these are the basic steps I'm going to take you through 21 22 today is first of all, talk a little bit about some of 23 the physics behind the salinity problem, which is not unique to the Chino Basin, talk a little bit about the 24

physics, talk about TDS, and I'm going to use TDS a lot.

And what it really means is salt. It stands for total

25

26

ΤQ

dissolved solids. When we get analytical reports back from the lab, that's what they say. TDS in milligrams per liter are the units, and we'll talk about the current state of the basin with respect to TDS.

So what does the basin look like with respect to salt in the ground water? And then we'll talk about salt management in the OBMP, which is this program element seven, and we'll lead you through some of the elements within PE/7.

And then lastly, we're going to talk about the maximum benefit argument that Chino Basin Watermaster made to the State of California, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, which is the main regulatory agency that's responsible for managing salt in the watershed, and how we made this argument. And actually the OBMP, this program element was incorporated into the basin plan and we'll talk about that at the end of the presentation.

So going into just the basic physics here, what this is is this is called a free body diagram. And whenever we try to create a computer simulation model of how salt works in the ground water and surface water system, we generate something like this and break it down into its basic components. And I'm not going to ask you to understand everything here but I just wanted to show you this.

what we do is we look at how water and the salt in the water is routed through the surface water system. And a lot of that water is used for irrigation in agricultural or in irrigation for urban environments. And what happens when you irrigate is that the plants use some of the water, they don't really use too much of the salt, and the rest of the water returns through the ground surface, through the unsaturated zone and down ultimately into the saturated zone, which is our aquifer. But it returns at a more highly concentrated form because the plants use up the water.

So what happens is then we pump the water back out and reapply it to the land surface, and that process can turn into a positive feedback loop and continue to concentrate salts in the ground water basin. And that's particularly a problem in the Santa Ana River Watershed where a lot of our ground water basins are closed systems. There's not a whole lot of flushing that occurs in the ground water system because we have mountains and falls that provide barriers and make our ground water basins more or less like cereal bowls. And so it's a problem. It's a pernicious problem, and it occurs wherever you pump water and use it on the ground surface and we have returns to the system.

Looking at what the basin looks like today, what you're seeing here is a map of the Chino Basin. And what

each one of these dots represents is TDS concentration at a well. So the water was sampled from the well and sent to the laboratory and we got a result back. And what the different symbology for each well means is what the concentration is.

And the small blue dots and the green dots, that's pretty good quality water. It's less than 500 milligrams per liter. You can pump that water and with just a little bit of disinfection, you can actually serve it for drinking water purposes. So the beneficial use for drinking water is available up here in the northern part of the basin.

As you recall from past presentations, ground water flows from the north to the south, so as it's being pumped and reapplied to the land surface and makes its way down here to the bottom end of the basin where we have a lot of agricultural land uses here that are contributing salt to the system, the water quality gets worse.

And when you get down here, the yellow dots represent everything from 500 to a thousand milligrams per liter. At a thousand milligrams per liter, you've lost the beneficial use for drinking water. So anything in orange or red, you cannot use for drinking water unless you treat it and take the salt out or you blend it with some other low TDS source water.

5

---

I told you before that we do these model projections of what the TDS is going to do in our ground water basin. What we're looking at here is a TDS projection, 100-year of TDS projection from the year 2000 to 2100. And you can see that we started about 320 milligrams per liter and we move out, it's deflating in large part due to this feedback cycle I was describing.

And we show out here at 2100 that we're at about 430 milligrams per liter. And what's built in, some of the assumptions that are built into this are that we're doing a lot of salt management strategies that I'm going to be talking about in the OBMP where we're bringing on desalters and we're exporting salt, we're bringing in low TDS, other sources of low TDS water and recharging the aquifer.

This is a graphic that shows you the entire Santa Ana River Watershed. The Chino Basin is right in this area here. And what we're showing are TDS concentrations in all the different ground water basins across the water shed. The really dark colored ones are very high TDS, have a very high TDS concentration, and the light colored ones that are up near the mountain fronts and get a lot of storm water recharge, they're the lighter colored, they're the lower TDS concentrated basins. So I am showing you this here just to make the point that there are a lot of basins besides the Chino

Basin where we have high TDS problems that we're dealing with as a watershed. It's not just constrained to what's going on here in the Chino Basin.

So these are some of the main elements in program element seven of the OBMP. First is to minimize TDS loading from fertilizers and dairy waste. As you know, we have a big agricultural land use in the basin. And an example of this for dairy waste would be to -- you know, they have to do something with the manure and to apply it to the ground at agronomic rates so you're not applying so much that a lot of that salt is leaching out of the dairy waste and making its way to the ground water basin.

The regional board has a new permit for dairies. It's not brand new. It's been several years now. But they have a lot of these requirements for how the dairies deal with their wastes.

And just as urban land uses are taking over the agricultural land uses, this is happening just naturally.

Building desalters in the southern part of the basin. We have talked about this in past presentations to you. There are a lot of wells down there that are pumping the high TDS water in the southern end of the basin and using reverse osmosis to take the salt out of the water and then they export the salt out of the basin through a brine pipeline. And then what's left over, the

product water is very low TDS water and it can be used for drinking water uses.

So that's a big part of the salt management program for the basin in the OBMP.

To maximize storm water capture and recharge.

Storm water is typically very low in TDS. And so we have projects where we're trying to maximize the storm water capture and recharge.

Water -- Imported water from the state water project is very low in TDS, usually around 250 to 300. So utilizing that water for artificial recharge is a part of the OBMP.

And then this part down here, to minimize TDS in recycled water. An example of that would be to try to get the industrial discharges of high TDS waste water out of the sewer system and put it into these brine lines and take it out of the basin. That would be an example of something that IEUA is working on now.

This is a map of the whole watershed again, and the Chino Basin is right here. And this is showing some of our salt management strategies. What you're seeing in the small red -- yellow squares are the desalters, the Chino I and Chino II Desalter facilities, and our wells are generally down in this area pumping water that goes to these desalter facilities that are again using reverse osmosis and nitrate removal facilities to reduce the salt

content of the water and then the brine gets piped into these brine lines that come down to the ocean, come down to a treatment plant down here, gets treated and then ultimately discharged to the ocean. So these brine lines are a way of exporting salt out of the basin.

This right here is a nonreclaimable line that's taking waste water out of the basin, but this is mostly industrial discharges that is taking those brines out of the basin into L.A. County where they're treated and then discharged.

Can you go back.

These little blue splotches right here are the recharge basins, the artificial recharge basins where we're trying to maximize the storm water capture in the upper part of our basin. And we also bring in low TDS imported water and we discharge it to these basins here, too. Now, we're starting to do recycled water, recharge of some of these basins for water supply reliability and to augment our supplemental water supplies. Recycled water quality is typically higher in TDS because it's already gone through a cycle and added a mineral increment to the concentration of the water. And so we have to blend with other low TDS sources in order to comply with the basin plan. I'll be talking a little bit more about that later.

This diagram right here is a pretty good simple

5

5

graphic that explains the OBMP in a lot of different ways. So what this is supposed to represent is the Chino Basin from the mountains down to the Santa Ana River, and we're splicing through it here to take a look at what the system looks like.

And I think the main thing from a salt management perspective to note here is that we have in this upper part of the basin, where we're getting storm water recharge to the system, that we have very high quality ground water, low TDS ground water that you saw on that previous map, and then as you move down toward the southern end of the basin, you get lesser quality water, higher TDS, higher nitrate water. And this is where we put our desalter facilities. And we pump this ground water here, and then this is our desalter where it's treated and the brine gets exported out the brine line. And then we use that water for drinking water down here in the southern end of the basin.

What you're also seeing here is the Santa Ana River, which is a source of recharge to the basin. So what these desalters do is that they lower the ground water levels here and enhance the recharge from the Santa Ana River into the basin so it's a yield enhancement project here to have these desalters here, too. So not only are we addressing a water quality problem, but we're also addressing a water supply problem, too. So if we

didn't have these desalters here -- and this is a major point -- if we didn't have them here, these agricultural uses that used to pump a lot of ground water here, they're starting to move out and we get less pumping and this ground water level could creep back up and actually so high that the ground water system could feed the surface water system here in the Santa Ana River and start getting some of this lower quality water into the Santa Ana River, which flows down to Orange County and is used for drinking water down there.

So we're also, through this program, we're protecting downstream beneficial uses by putting these desalters in here and lowering water levels to the point where we're protecting the quality of water in the Santa Ana River.

Can you go back. I'm not quite finished yet.

The other thing that you see up here in the northern part of the basin are these artificial recharge basins where we've done a lot of improvements to help capture storm water recharge. We have an imported water pipeline coming in here, and then you're seeing your waste water treatment plant here discharging some of its recycled water into these basins for artificial recharge to the system.

We also have a lot of our municipal wells up here in the northern end of the basin that are

purposefully trying to draw down water levels here right now. This is called basin reoperation where we're trying to draw down water levels so we decrease this hydraulic gradient towards this area so we can have what's called hydraulic control here.

This whole concept of bringing water levels down is called hydraulic control of our basin, and it's a term that we use all the time. So bringing water levels down throughout the entire basin helps us achieve hydraulic control down here at the southern end of the basin and it also frees up some storage space here to operate storage and recovery programs in the main part of the basin.

So in a lot of ways this graphic here explains a lot of the OBMP not only from a water quality perspective but from a water supply perspective.

So how did the OBMP get incorporated into the basin plan is what I want to talk about next.

The basin plan is the main regulatory document that the regional board uses to manage salt and water quality in general throughout the watershed. And from time to time they amend the basin plan with new information. And in 2004 it was a major basin plan amendment that did a lot of these things right here that I'll step through.

First of all, it established basin boundaries, new ground water basin boundaries based on the most

up-to-date hydrogeologic information, and the OBMP had done a lot of that work. So the basin plan just took what the OBMP had for its new management zones and brought them into the basin plan.

It also established new water quality objectives for each one of these new management zones. And what it did was it based it on what water quality was like in the Chino Basin in 1968. And that was consistent with the state's antidegradation policy, that from 1968 forward we're supposed to not degrade our basins. So that's what became our new water quality objective was what was water quality like in 1968.

So we went through that process of characterizing it, looking at the historical data and characterizing what the basin looked like from a TDS perspective in 1968, and that became our water quality objective that the regional board would then regulate to from that point forward.

We also looked at current ambient water quality. What's the current TDS concentration in the basin? And the reason why that's important to the regional board is they compare current ambient to the water quality objectives. And this gives them their finding of what's called assimilative capacity.

And can you go to the next?

What happened in the Chino Basin is that these

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

26

were the water quality objectives that we came up for in 1968. 293, 255, 262 for the main part of the basin. Very good quality water. Better quality in fact than imported water a lot of times and definitely better than recycled water quality. So our current ambient water quality of the basin had degraded a little bit and had gone up into the 320 range, somewhere around in there.

So what the regional board said is you have no assimilative capacity. When current ambient quality is worse than your water quality objectives, no assimilative capacity. And that really takes away a lot of flexibility the regional board has on how they regulate it. when you have no assimilative capacity, the regional board cannot permit any discharges to the ground water basin at TDS concentrations higher than the water quality objectives. You just simply can't do it without some sort of offset program, some sort of mitigation. So that was a big problem for the basin stakeholders here because they had all these plans to do recycled water recharge and imported water recharge. It was a big part of the So this became a major issue that we had to deal OBMP. with and negotiate with the regional board.

And that brings us to this maximum benefit concept. So I just talked in here -- This is the other slide that describes how the regional board uses these findings of the assimilative capacity in order to

regulate discharges to the ground water basin.

So what we did -- How could we use recycled water for a recharge source here? What we did is we went back to the state's antidegradation policy. 6816 is the state's antidegradation policy, and we also looked in the California Water Codes related to setting water quality objectives and what we learned was this. That water quality objectives can be changed and the way we want them changed is we want them higher. They can be changed if you can show these two things here. That, if by changing them, that you will not unreasonably affect your beneficial uses.

And the most sensitive beneficial use for us is drinking water. So if we change the water quality objectives, will we affect beneficial uses negatively? We have to show that we'll not.

The second one here is that by changing these objectives, it's consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state. So we had to show these two things here.

And with maximum benefit -- I'll show you the next slide here -- we went back to the OBMP and we looked at all these things we were doing here. Building desalter facilities, so we're removing salt and making a source of water that really wasn't usable. Now we're making it into a usable supply. Nitrate removal

facilities, the same thing.

Doing storage and recovery programs and storm water capture programs and using recycled water for reuse and for recharge. All these things were making us more reliant on our own local water resources and less reliant on imported water from the north, from the Delta or from the Colorado River.

So it was clearly a benefit not only to the basin stakeholders but also a benefit to people in Northern California and to people in the Colorado River watersheds and you could even include Mexico in that, too. So there was international benefits to what we were doing here to make ourselves more reliable on our local water resources.

And then we were also establishing hydraulic control of the ground water basin, again protecting Orange County, protecting downstream beneficial uses through these desalter facilities in particular.

So with all of this here, we could clearly demonstrate that our activities were to the maximum benefit to the people of the state and people outside of the state even.

So the regional board bought into that argument and said, "Yes, you have demonstrated maximum benefit. Yeah, you can go on to the next one".

The next thing, beneficial uses in the basin.

Are we protecting beneficial uses in the basin? And I showed you this chart here that showed that water quality is degrading. But again, this 500-milligram-per-liter is a limit that we don't want to exceed here because the beneficial uses begin to be impacted at 500 and at a thousand. That's where drinking water beneficial use goes away.

So we were showing here that without doing our recycled water projects, we were protecting beneficial uses through all these desalter programs and storm water recharge programs. So then the regional board wanted to see what happens when you add the recycled water projects to your simulation.

And what we showed here is this is with recycled water. So without recycled water, with recycled water, we show over about a hundred-year period that we maybe have 30 to 40 milligrams per liter extra degradation but we still don't impact beneficial uses negatively. So we still protect our basin in beneficial uses. So this was the second part that we were able to demonstrate to the regional board as part of our maximum benefit argument.

The regional board is very happy with -- they want people to do these forward projections, tell them where water quality's going and then they will help us out by raising our water quality objectives.

So this is what the regional board gave us is

they combined all three of those management zones into one. This is where we do most of our recycled water recharge. And they gave us a TDS objective of 420. Again, remember the current ambient water quality is around 320. So they gave us about a hundred milligrams per liter of this assimilative capacity which then gave us -- gave them and us more flexibility to comply when we're doing recycled water recharge.

But when they did that, when they gave us that, this maximum benefit water quality objective, strings are attached to that, too, commitments to do certain projects and requirements. They write those requirements and projects into the basin plan. So that's how the OBMP became incorporated into the basin plan, and those commitments are now being watched by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. And I'll talk about those commitments now.

I think I've covered this, the benefits of doing the maximum benefit.

The commitments are generally these. To continue to do ongoing monitoring and analysis. The regional board likes to see those projections, those model projections but they also want to see the monitoring data. They want to see if the models are actually predicting it correctly. So there's a commitment to continue to do ground water and surface

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

water monitoring in the basin plan.

Expansion of desalters. There's a certain schedule and trigger points for as water quality degrades, to bring on more desalting over time. expansion of the desalters are some commitments.

To improve the artificial recharge facilities so we can bring in the storm water and the imported water, low TDS sources. That was a commitment.

The blending of the recycled water. Yes, we can bring in the recycled water, but we have to blend it with low TDS storm water and imported water to get a certain concentration at that 420 milligrams per liter.

To do some waste water improvements. Again, trying to get the industrial discharges out of the sewer. The IEUA right now has some legislation where we're trying to get the self-regenerating water softeners outlawed because those bring in a lot of high TDS water into the sewer system. And so that's something that they're trying to do.

And then this hydraulic control. This concept of hydraulic control, not only to do it with the desalters but to prove it with a monitoring program. So we have a very comprehensive water level monitoring program in the southern end of the basin that is required by the regional board, and we report on it annually.

So I think from the Court's perspective, that

following these commitments is probably the most important thing with regard to the salt management plan, and you have the regional board also looking at these as well.

I believe that's it. This model here, we're calling it a model now because it's really the first time that maximum -- this maximum benefit argument has been made in the state, and there's been a couple of others that have followed here in the watershed. But the Chino Basin was really the first one to do it.

Salt management plans are something that the state board wants everyone to do, every region to do throughout the state. And they, in their recycled water policy and the Little Hoover Commission Report right here, they are calling out what we've done here in the Chino Basin as an example that other regions should follow. Especially making these maximum benefit arguments and getting the stakeholders to commit to doing, you know, good, smart salt management programs.

Unless you have any questions, that's all I have.

THE COURT: No, that was a good presentation.
Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Next person.

MR. FIFE: Our next witness will be Mr. Manning

1 about the storage program. THE COURT ATTENDANT: would you stand here, face 2 3 the clerk and raise your right hand, please. 4 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly state that the 5 evidence you shall give in the matter now pending before 6 this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and 7 nothing but the truth, so help you God? 8 THE WITNESS: I do. 9 THE CLERK: Thank you. 10 THE COURT ATTENDANT: Are you going to be 11 standing? 12 THE WITNESS: I'm going to stand. 13 THE COURT ATTENDANT: Would you state and spell 14 your name for the record, please. 15 THE WITNESS: Kenneth Manning, K-e-n-n-e-t-h, 16 M-a-n-n-i-n-g. I'm the CEO of the Chino Basin 17 Watermaster. 18 Your Honor, Sheri Rojo, the Assistant General 19 Manager and CFO at Watermaster, and I are going to kind 20 of tag team program elements eight and nine. 21 As you can tell, the storage and recovery have 22 some overlap, so we felt that it made more sense if we talked about them in general and then Sheri will follow 23 24 up with some more details about how we actually do manage 25 to keep track of all of the storage programs within the Chino Basin. 26

Going back to some of the discussions that we've had in previous presentations to the Court, I wanted to remind the Court that Chino Basin in its judgment -- in the evolution of judgments in 1978, Chino -- the Chino judgment was in fact very unique. It recognized and implemented some strategies that had not been implemented in previous judgments.

It gave Watermaster planning oversight in the Chino Basin, something that was unique to that judgment in 1978.

Since then, other judgments have implemented that, seeing that it worked out very well within our basin.

Older judgments did not contemplate storage. So if you go back to judgments prior to 1978, many of them are still struggling today with trying to recreate what we have implemented within our judgment. So storage programs within our judgment were unique in 1978 and are still in the way we implement them, still very much unique.

The other thing that the judgment did provide for as it relates to storage was it provided for Watermaster keeping track of loss as it relates to storage so that we kept a real time credit and debit on what was going on within our basin. So there were no artificial numbers created based upon no losses when in

fact they were being created.

So -- The other key elements within the judgment that we want to point out is that it consolidated control of storage underneath Watermaster. This provided a mechanism by which there was control. The individual parties to the basin could not be competing with each other. They had to go through Watermaster, and approval had to be created.

This required written authority by the Watermaster, as it is stated within the judgment. So Watermaster has a document that we have, and everyone of the parties who have storage agreements have to go through and get those approved through Watermaster. Watermaster must make a finding of no material physical injury to the parties or to the basin.

Now, that doesn't mean that there is no repercussions to how you extract the water, how you put water in. But what it means is you must talk with each other and discuss how you're going to mitigate any identifiable kinds of problems that were created based upon the way you extract water in or put water into storage.

Let me distinguish between storage and recovery versus local storage. First of all, local storage was created in the judgment. The judgment created this program where parties to the basin could actually use

water or store water depending upon where they were going to be getting water. We'll get into that in a little bit.

Also what that did it also offsets overproduction. So if a producer in one year uses the ground water more than they have rights to, they can use water and storage to offset that production.

It also provides revenue for parties. So if a party doesn't have enough water in storage, they can sell it back and forth and create revenue. That revenue goes to the party to use for that infrastructure.

So let's say if Ontario has water in storage and they sell it to Fontana, they create revenue that allows them to build additional wells or put in pipes or put in the kinds of infrastructure they need to serve their citizenry. So it provides internal mechanisms with which they can generate the revenue.

It also provides options so in times of drought we can draw upon our storage accounts or we can use other water from other sources. Sometimes our basin parties have access to other basins, the Cucamonga Basin or other basins they might be able to draw water from or they have imported water capability, treated water that's delivered from the Metropolitan water District or in some cases they'll be using recycled water to use as an offset to some of their potable water needs, and that's becoming

available now.

Storage and recovery programs were created through the Peace Agreement. So in the year February, 2000, the parties recognized that there was a need to bring maybe — that our storage capability within the Chino Basin could be a regional asset that could be used by others. And by doing so, we could also then have some benefit to the Chino Basin that could be realized in general by all of the parties.

It provided a mechanism to utilize stranded water. I'll explain a little bit about how some of the stranded water is going to be utilized in a few minutes, but it allows in this case where water is accumulating and there is no use for it, that we can redistribute that water out and use it in a storage and recovery program.

In this particular case, that creates revenue for infrastructure for everybody. So if Watermaster is creating the infrastructure for the use by everybody in the basin, it allows other mechanisms by which that can be done.

In the OBMP implementation plan, they were very specific in terms of what Watermaster was -- what our charge was. It was to develop a storage and recovery program that will benefit all the parties in the basin and assure that basin water and storage capacities are put to maximum beneficial use while causing no material

\_

physical injury to any producer or to the basin. That's the definition by which Watermaster is operating storage and recovery programs.

Current storage and recovery programs we have within the basin. We currently have within the Metropolitan Water District a storage and recovery program where they're storing a hundred thousand acre feet of water in the basin, and we put -- they bring water and put it in the basin.

It can be done in two different ways, either what's called in lieu -- it will be explained a little bit later -- or in wet water. They can actually deliver water, put it into the ground and it goes into the account. Water has gone in in their case using both different methods. And we have that hundred thousand acre-foot agreement in place right now and as a matter of fact during this drought condition, Metropolitan Water District is drawing 33,000 acre foot per year from their storage account and utilizing it in the basin.

And so our parties are utilizing the ground water instead of taking Metropolitan water, which makes that water then available to other places like San Diego or San Fernando Valley, et cetera.

We also have a cyclic storage agreement with MWD of 10,000 acre foot. Even though that's with the same agency, Metropolitan Water District, it's different in

that in Metropolitan's dry year yield account, decisions about who puts water in the basin and when it can be taken out, Met decides when water can be taken out of that account and used.

In the cyclic storage account, we make the decision of when we're going to use it. So it's just a reversal of the program, but it gives us latitude in being able to take water. Currently that agreement has zero water in it. The storage account is there but there's no water in the account because we have taken all that water out.

We are currently reviewing an expansion with the Metropolitan Water District to expand the dry year yield program to a 150,000 acre feet. So we have a current operating of 100,000. They want to expand it to 150. They think the program is working very well, and we're now working with them in expanding that program.

We're also requesting the Court's approval, and you gave that earlier this morning, for a storage and recovery water auction, and that's approximately 40,000 acre feet we're talking about.

This brings us into the auction issue, the questions in terms of water that we're talking about being auctioned off. Some of the basic questions that we are answering for people, what water is being auctioned?

In this particular case, it's what I referred to

earlier as stranded water. In the case of the overlying non-ag parties, over a period of time, operations within the Chino Basin by those parties has diminished. So they're not pumping the amount of water that they have rights to within the Chino Basin. They only have the ability to trade that water internally within that pool. So if Vulcan Materials wants to trade with Sunkist, for instance, they could trade that within their group but they couldn't trade it with producers.

So in this particular case, because the overall use of that water is going down, we're getting stranded water every year. We're getting additional water added to a storage account which has no use. So we're having approximately -- right now in that account is approximately 40,000 acre feet of stranded water. What the parties have done is they've decided that 10 percent of that would be dedicated to desalter replenishment, so approximately 4,000 acre feet. The other 90 percent would be used in the particular auction.

The next question, who might buy the water? In this particular case, we have identified three potential groups of users who might be interested in buying the water. One of them is in basin users. For instance, a good example might be Fontana Water. They have no water rights within the Chino Basin, but they pump from the ground water. Every drop of water, virtually, they pump

has to be replenished. Access to this water could give them an asset to draw from for production in the future. So they would be a natural within-basin type user that might be interested in the water. Others also.

Regional partners. The Metropolitan Water District is always looking for new water. This would give them 40,000 acre feet of new water plus a storage account on top of the existing storage accounts that they have where they could actually put more water.

Other regional partners might be Western Municipal Water, even San Diego or Castaic Lake, other places that are within the system that might be able to use the shifting of water as the mechanism to use this 40,000 acre feet.

The actual molecules never leave the basin but they use water that would have been delivered to our basin in lieu of us using them.

The other would be investment firms, and we've seen some activity of people calling us from investment companies, including developers who have requirements to prove that they have access to water in order for them to be able to have large developments within Southern California. So developers and investment firms from New York who are looking for good places that might have a better return than they might get on the open market today, and they think that this water source might

provide them with an opportunity to do that. So we're getting some interest from all three of those kinds of classes of investors and we're anxious to see how this pans out.

what will the money be used for? We have a very narrowly defined use for the proceeds from this auction and it will go to a broad based mutual benefit program. That is, as I explained before, that it would go to something that everybody in the basin has responsibility to do. And in this case, we're using it to finance facilities from the court-ordered Recharge Master Plan.

what we're finding as we develop the recharge master plan is we have a lot of facilities within our basin, almost enough to be able to deal with the future needs of our basin, but they're not necessarily in the right location and they're not necessarily efficient enough to capture as much rain water or recycled water as we might need in the future.

And we've anticipated there's probably somewhere between a hundred and 200 million dollars worth of capital projects that are going to be identified within the Recharge Master Plan that the parties are going to be responsible for financing. This money that's received from the auction will go to offset part of that cost of the 100 to 200 million dollars of investments. So that's where it's going to go.

1 And with that, any questions you might have on 2 this part of the presentation. If not, I'll turn it over 3 to my colleague. Sheri Rojo. THE COURT: Let's take -- Before we do, let's 4 take a little break. We'll be in recess here until 20 6 minutes to 11, okay? 7 (Recess.) 8 THE COURT: All right. The next witness, 9 please. 10 MR. FIFE: Thank you, your Honor. We'll call 11 Sheri Rojo. 12 THE COURT ATTENDANT: If you'll stand here, face 13 the clerk and raise your right hand. 14 THE WITNESS: I do. 15 THE CLERK: Thank you. THE COURT ATTENDANT: Please state and spell 16 17 your name for the record, please. 18 THE WITNESS: Sheri Rojo, S-h-e-r-i, Rojo, 19 R-o-j-o.20 Good morning, your Honor. I am the Chief 21 Financial Officer and Assistant General Manager at 22 Watermaster. And this morning, Ken spoke on the storage 23 and recovery programs that we have currently in progress. 24 And I'd like to take a few minutes to just talk about the storage accounts that are held in the basin for the 25 26 parties that are to the judgment.

First of all, we get questions as to why storage accounts are so important and what's the relevancy of them. What we have are storage accounts. We have a carry-over storage account, and we'll get into discussing the different types of storage accounts, but having a carry-over storage account allows for annual flexibility for the producers. So in any given year if they've overproduced more than their allotment, they can just pull from this carry-over account.

Now, we also have local supplemental storage accounts, which generally tends to be water that's none native to the basin so it's been brought in from outside sources.

Having these storage accounts allows Watermaster to be somewhat drought proofed, and it protects us from loss of imported water. So in years when there's low supply of water, producers can just pump more from the ground, and if they pump more than their right, then they can just take it out of storage to cover their overproduction.

The storage balances offer an asset. Ken was talking earlier that parties that have water in storage are allowed to sell that water to other parties in the basin and generate revenue for themselves. They can generate a stream of cash flow but it also, if they use that in a future year, just by holding onto that storage

account, they can offset future anticipated costs that they may have as well. So either source of cash flow or offsetting of costs.

We have three ways that I know of that we can get water into storage. Two are listed here.

The first one is simply underproduction. So if we have an annual safe yield that's allocated to a party in the basin and that party does not produce all of that right, then the water just stays in the ground through the natural ways of the water getting in the ground.

We also have what's called wet water recharge. You'll see that terminology occasionally and Andy spoke about the recharge basins and showed you the blue dots on the map, Andy Malone.

But what we have here is a picture of actual recharge basins that are full of water. We have channels that come down from the north. We get imported supplies or we get recycled water. We put them in the recharge basins and the water percolates down into the ground water, and that allows for different types of recharge.

We also have what's called in lieu recharge. So that the MWD, the dry yield program that Mr. Manning spoke of, deals with in lieu recharge. And that's an exchange from an appropriator in this case, from MWD, so instead of an appropriator pumping their right, they get water given to them on the surface from Met, and in

exchange, they give Met the water that was in their storage account for that water. Watermaster has five different storage accounts that we currently keep track of.

The first two, annual carry-over and excess carry-over storage accounts held by both the appropriative pool and the non-agricultural pool.

The annual carry-over deals with the annual fluctuations in annual production rights. So if -- That is, that generally tends to be smaller balances that people would keep in that storage account, with larger balances from year to year getting transferred into an excess carry-over account. You can think of the annual carry-over account as being maybe a cup and the excess carry-over as being a bucket for water potential storage that the parties have. And again, that's for both of those two different pools.

Supplemental storage and recycled storage, those are exclusive to the appropriative pool.

The supplemental storage again deals with non-native basin water. So usually that's what we tend to think of. So if we get imported water deliveries from Met that are not for recharge purposes but let's just say the appropriators get together, they want to put water in the ground, so they contract to get some water brought in, that water gets put into the ground through the

\_\_\_\_

recharge basins and divvied out and allocated into their storage accounts individually.

We also have started this last year -- This information we'll go over in another second as well -- but the recycled water storage has now its own storage account just for tracking purposes to keep track of how much recycled water is going into the ground. But that water becomes part of the supplemental storage account that the appropriators are free to trade amongst themselves.

The difference between the supplemental storage and the excess carry-over, because the supplemental is non-native water, they can actually enter storage and recovery deals on their own if they have water in that account.

And then we also keep track of storage and recovery accounts through MWD. And right now we have the dry year yield account, and we would also keep track of the cyclic storage account if we had water in it. Watermaster's responsible to track and report the balances and the activity in these accounts.

And you'll find it in two different places. The first place we put this -- we track it is in the assessment package. That's an annual summary of the production and water activity of the basin is all found in the assessment package.

5

The assessment package will show transfers to and from storage accounts because of over or underproduction so waters coming in and going out of storage accounts. Transfers to cover the sale and lease of rights. So when appropriators sell water to another appropriator, that's listed in there and it goes in and out of the storage accounts accordingly.

water and imported water. And they all get put into different types of storage accounts, depending on what the water came in for. Recycled water goes into the recycled water accounts. Storm water goes into their annual account, and imported water is either used for recharge purposes to meet a replenishment obligation that we had if appropriators have overproduced and were able to buy water or if we buy imported water and we don't have a replenishment obligation, then we'll put that into appropriators -- allocate that and put that into appropriators' supplemental accounts.

So we record the recharge of the supplemental water into the storage accounts depending on what the intent of the water's for.

And then we also record the in lieu storage, the puts and the takes. That's the water that comes in and goes out of the storage programs.

what you're looking at is a page that comes

1 directly from the assessment package here. This is a 2 page that all appropriators get. We have workshops that 3 cover our assessment package as we prepare it. We're 4 just about to have a workshop coming up. And the intent of this demonstration here is to show you that all of the 5 6 appropriators are listed. And on this page we have three 7 of their four storage accounts in different groups, and 8 it's fully transparent in that all appropriators know 9 what all other appropriators have in their storage 10 accounts and all of the activity that goes on in each of 11 the accounts. The additions and subtractions to the 12 accounts and the accounting for losses is all shown in 13 the assessment package and everybody knows what everybody 14 else has. So all the parties are aware of what each 15 person has. 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Not only do we show it in one collective page with all of the appropriators listed, we also generate individual storage activity, you know, water activity in production detail that we give to each of the appropriators individually.

So there's the four different accounts for their different storages.

THE COURT: How often do these come out?

THE WITNESS: Annually. Annually, good question.

We reconcile -- Our year end is June 30th and it

takes us a while to get all of the transfers and the transactions processed and in there. We generate what's called a water activity report, Watermaster does, so once we think we have all the information in there, we generate what's called a water activity report.

THE COURT: What's the delay time on this report? In other words, there's got to be a cut-off period sometime for information before it's released so what's that transition?

THE WITNESS: We're working on that now. We hope to have this assessment package workshop. We're hoping to have the workshop in September and then the assessment package will be in the October agendas for approval.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: So we're actually in the process now. We sent out the water activity reports. And what's happened in the past with these water activity reports is we'll get quarterly production reports from a party and we'll go to put together an assessment package and we'll say, "Okay, here's the summary of all our water activities but they don't necessarily reconcile", so for some reason maybe they added a well that we didn't have added into our system because maybe we weren't notified on time or there's discrepancies in production.

So now what we do is we send out a confirmation

at the end of the year. We call it a water activity report, and those have just been sent out about a week and a half ago. So this is all the water transactions that you have. This is your production with all these different wells. This is the transfers among all the different parties. This is the water assignments that you had, all the different things that could happen that affect the water that comes in and out of their accounts.

So that report, they have to sign off on that.

And once they sign off on that and we get all those back -- and it sometimes takes a while to work out some of those discrepancies -- then we're able to generate the assessment package that you'll see come through in October.

But this here just summarizes what the appropriative pool gets, and the non-ag pool gets a very similar one, and it just summarizes in the different columns, in annual accounts or excess carry-over accounts, their local supplemental and then their recharged recycled water so it comes in with all the pluses and minuses and then their ending balances are listed across the bottom. So it's pretty clear, and we're able to work out a lot of the bugs through the water activity report system that we're doing now.

THE COURT: Now, does everyone get a copy of everybody else's?

1 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh, yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: Okay. THE WITNESS: And we all go through it. 3 4 assessment package workshop, not just at the individual 5 appropriator level of detail, but we go through the whole package every time. We talk about what all the different 6 7 columns are in the assessment package so people know what 8 they're being charged for, what their sources of water 9 are, this is the amount of storm water that we captured 10 on your behalf, this is the amount of recycle water that 11 came in on your behalf. So everybody is sitting in a 12 room and mostly they look at their line to know what 13 their -- you know, what their impact is but then they can 14 also see everybody else's. So they take them back to 15 their offices and they're able to digest them and make 16 decisions accordingly. 17 THE COURT: And they can see comparisons of what 18 the other people are doing? 19 THE WITNESS: Exactly, working together. 20 And that pretty much summarized what I have, if 21 you have any other questions. THE COURT: No, I'm done with my questions. 22 23 Thank you, ma'am. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Fife, is that the end of the 25 presentation? 26 MR. FIFE: That is all. We've gone through all

nine elements now.

THE COURT: Now, you -- and I appreciate that.

Let's talk about these matters that you brought up
earlier. And I have some information for you that may
impact how you deal with this transition that's going to
take place.

I had a conversation with the supervising judge this morning about what's going to happen shortly after, I believe, what is the first part of October.

The -- They're reducing the number of civil judges in this courthouse from seven to five, which will have a huge impact on all the judges remaining. And that's, of course, all due to budgetary problems that everybody is having.

will be -- all the cases we all have will be reassigned by number. And, of course, this one has a number and I don't know who is going to get that number. I don't think anybody does at this point. So it will go to one of the judges in this area unless it is taken out of this courthouse and taken to either Rancho Cucamonga or perhaps to Victorville. Those are the three courthouses. I think it's unlikely that it would go to Victorville because they're quite pressed for time and resources there even more so than here perhaps.

At any rate, the only reason that I could

foresee that there would be a delay in having a new judge assigned is that there would be a desire on the part of some of the parties to object to the judge assigned. And that's why I think there was a delay previously. I'm not so sure that at this point there's a real ability to make a legal objection to a person unless you've got actual prejudice instead of perceived prejudice. At any rate, somebody might try and then you'd have to go through that hearing process and that could account for a delay. And of course, everybody has the legal right to do that so that's possible.

As far as input into the next assigned judge, you've got about 45 days. And I would suggest -- I can't impact this process at all. What I suggest you do is contact the Presiding Judge directly, Judge James McGuire, contact him directly and ask him if he would be willing to have some sort of joint meeting to get the input of the parties as to who might be assigned. If he doesn't want to do that, then you're not going to get it done. But that's my suggestion. And because of the nature of this and because if you stress to him that you don't want a delay period in between assignments, then perhaps he would be open to doing that, which would be kind of outside the norm. But he might want to do that. He's a very reasonable man. So that's my suggestion in that regard.

MR. FIFE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So having said that, going on to your concern about a case management order, what did you envision this management order might contain?

MR. FIFE: We hadn't specifically contemplated what the order would actually say. We were thinking of things in terms of part of what you've been looking at over this multi-month process of whether Watermaster is in compliance with its commitments under the OBMP, whether it is in compliance with deadlines that have been set out say in the December 21, 2007 order, things like that, so when the next judge comes in, he can very easily look at the order and know that Watermaster is on track with the OBMP, it is on track with its deadlines, here are the next deadlines it has coming up.

In the last hearing you excused us from a couple of the deadlines so we could put that in there so that it's memorialized and he knows that we've been excused from a deadline, not that we're simply missing a deadline. So things like that just so that the next judge has a very simple way of orienting himself to the status of this case.

THE COURT: That could be helpful especially if you run it through the process with all the parties so that they have input and that there's, you know, an opportunity to present objections or additions or

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

amendments, whatever.

MR. FIFE: Absolutely, we would run it through the whole process.

THE COURT: That could be helpful because in one document then you might have some sort of synopsis for the next judge coming in to have a way to know what's pending and what's not and so forth.

My intention, if I get an opportunity to do this, is to whenever I find out who would be my replacement, to try to present to the person what I know at this time and to give them the idea of how to go about getting as close to up to speed as possible. So that's part of what I've been trying to accomplish here.

MR. FIFE: And we appreciate that.

THE COURT: I think that that would be a good If you can do those things, then the next judge would have something, more or less a briefer way, a more efficient way to get up to speed along with the materials that I've created for him or her. So that's probably a good idea and probably worth contemplating doing that.

> MR. FIFE: Okay.

THE COURT: And you also mentioned a hearing on some pending matters. Did you have something in particular in mind?

MR. FIFE: We don't particularly. It was more of just sort of a warning that we're going through a

review of everything, and if something comes up, we might be coming to you with a motion for an order shortening time. And if that happens, the reason for it is that we've found something that we really could use your input on before we lose you at the end of September.

THE COURT: Probably it's a good idea to do some review and see if there are any loose ends that need to be tied up before I leave.

MR. FIFE: Right.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll tell you what. I can put you down for September 17th if you want to shoot for that date. That's a little over a month from now. But that's about the only date that I have available.

MR. FIFE: Okay. Would that be in the morning at the same time?

THE COURT: At 9:30. I have a couple of other things on calendar but I can probably rush through those and we can get you started as close to 9:30 as possible if we need to. If for some reason that's not possible, you just let us know and we'll take it off calendar. But that gives you a date that I'll reserve for hearings on what comes up.

MR. FIFE: Okay. That would be perfect. And we'll endeavor to have the proposed case management order in to you well in advance of that. And if nothing else,

we can then get your input on that at that date and time. THE COURT: All right. MR. FIFE: And we'll provide notice to everybody. THE COURT: All right. MR. FIFE: Thank you, your Honor. Again, we really appreciate your oversight for the last several months. We appreciate all your good work, and we're sorry to see you going. THE COURT: Thank you. Nice of you to say. Have a good afternoon. Thank you. MR. FIFE: (Whereupon the foregoing proceedings in the above-entitled matter were concluded.) 

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
3	DEPARTMENT NO. S-32 HON. JOHN P. WADE, JUDGE
4	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER )
5	DISTRICT, et al.,
6	Plaintiff, ) vs. ) NO. RCVRS 51010
7	CITY OF CHINO, et al.,
8	) REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  Defendants. )
9	Defendants.
LO	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ) ) ss
L1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
12	
L3	I, BETTY J. KELLEY, C.S.R., Official Reporter
L4	of the Superior Court of the State of California, for
L5	the County of San Bernardino, do hereby certify that the
L6	foregoing pages 1 through 50, inclusive, comprise
L7	a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings
L8	held in the above-entitled matter reported by me on
L9	August 11, 2009.
20	
21	
22	DATED this 17th day of August, 2009.
23	Bett, Hollow
24	BETTY KELLEY, C.S.R. Official Reporter, C-3981
25	office the constant of the con