1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
3	
4	
5	
6	DEPARTMENT S-1 HON. STANFORD E. REICHERT, JUDGE
7	
8	
9	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, )
10	PETITIONER, ) CASE NO.
11	VS. , RCVRS51010
12	CITY OF CHINO,
13	
14	
15	
16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
17	FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 2020
18	PAGES 1 THROUGH 49
19	
20	
21	CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT
22	
23	D'ANNE GOATCHER COURT REPORTER PRO TEMPORE
24	SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA
25	
26 27	
28	
<b>40</b>	

## FRIDAY, JUNE 26TH, 2020, DEPARTMENT 1, 2020. SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA

2.8

THE COURT: SO THIS IS JUDGE REICHERT SPEAKING. GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYBODY.

THIS IS AN UNUSUAL SITUATION INSOFAR AS WE HAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE ON COURTCALL AND A NUMBER OF ATTORNEYS HERE IN THE COURTROOM. AND MY USUAL PROCEDURE IS TO TAKE APPEARANCES HERE IN THE COURTROOM FIRST AND THEN MOVE TO APPEARANCES ON COURTCALL.

ON COURTCALL, THERE IS A DELAY BETWEEN WHEN YOU STOP TALKING AND WHEN THE SIGNAL IS RELAYED. IT REMINDS ME A LITTLE BIT OF THE DAYS WHEN I USED TO WATCH WORLD WAR II MOVIES AND PEOPLE IN THE AIRPLANES ON THE RADIO WHEN THEY WOULD STOP TALKING AND SAY "OVER." I FOUND OUT THAT WAS SO THE PERSON ON THE RECEIVING END WOULD KNOW THE SPEAKER WAS DONE AND IT WAS HIS TURN TO TALK. IF IT GETS TOO COMPLICATED, I MAY TRY TO INSTITUTE THAT EVEN THOUGH IT SOUNDS A LITTLE BIT ODD.

BUT WE HAVE TO TRY TO COME UP WITH A WAY TO KEEP THE RECORD CLEAR AND ONLY HAVE ONE PERSON TALKING AT A TIME. BOTH SO THAT I CAN HEAR AND UNDERSTAND YOU AND THAT MY COURT REPORTER CAN MAKE A CLEAR RECORD.

SO LET'S START WITH APPEARANCES HERE IN THE COURTROOM. AND I START TO MY LEFT HERE AT THE FRONT TABLE, GO AHEAD PLEASE.

MR. GAGEN: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. ANDREW GAGEN
ON BEHALF OF MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT, OPPOSING PARTY --

THE COURT: OKAY.

1	MR. GAGEN: TO THE AG. POOL'S MOTION TO AMEND THE
2	JUDGMENT.
3	THE COURT: ON THE AG. POOL MOTION?
4	MR. GAGEN: YES.
5	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND THEN BEHIND YOU.
6	MR. HERREMA.
7	MR. HERREMA: BRAD HERREMA ON BEHALF OF CHINO BASIN
8	WATERMASTER.
9	MR. SLATER: GOOD AFTERNOON. SCOT SLATER, S-L-A-T-E-R,
10	ON BEHALF OF WATERMASTER.
11	THE COURT: OKAY.
12	MS. EGOSCUE: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. TRACY
13	EGOSCUE, E-G-O-S-C-U-E, ON BEHALF OF THE AG. POOL.
14	THE COURT: OKAY. AND THERE IS SOMEONE SITTING BEHIND
15	YOU. IS THAT SOMEONE WHOSE APPEARANCE I SHOULD GET?
16	MR. CROSLEY: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. MY NAME IS
17	DAVID CROSLEY, C-R-O-S-L-E-Y. I'M THE CITY OF CHINO'S WATER
18	MANAGER.
19	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
20	HANG ON JUST A SECOND.
21	OKAY. THEN COMING UP HERE IN THE FRONT IN
22	THE JURY BOX AND UP BEHIND YOU.
23	MR. KAVOUNAS: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. PETER
24	KAVOUNAS, CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER GENERAL MANAGER.
25	THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON.
26	AND YOUR APPEARANCE, PLEASE.
27	MR. KENNEDY: GOOD AFTERNOON. STEVE KENNEDY, THREE
28	VALLEYS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT.

1 THE COURT: OKAY. AND IN THE JURY BOX HERE CLOSEST. 2 MR. FOSTER: EDGAR TELLEZ FOSTER WITH THE CHINO BASIN 3 WATERMASTER. 4 THE COURT: OKAY. CAN I GET YOUR NAME AGAIN, PLEASE? 5 MR. FOSTER: EDGAR TELLEZ FOSTER, T-E-L-L-E-Z, FOSTER. 6 WITH THE CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER. 7 THE COURT: OKAY. 8 MR. GUTIERREZ: JIMMY GUTIERREZ, G-U-T-I-E-R-R-E-Z, 9 REPRESENTING THE CITY OF CHINO ON THE AG. POOL MOTION TO 10 AMEND THE JUDGMENT AND ALSO AS TO THE WATERMASTER MOTION TO 11 RESET THE SAFE YIELD. 12 THE COURT: GOT IT. THAT WRAPS UP EVERYBODY -- ONE 13 MORE IN THE COURTROOM HERE. 14 MR. SCHATZ: JOHN SCHATZ, S-C-H-A-T-Z. APPROPRIATE 15 POOL COUNSEL. 16 THE COURT: OKAY. MR. SCHATZ, YOUR CLIENT AGAIN? 17 MR. SCHATZ: APPROPRIATE POOL. THANK YOU. 18 THE COURT: APPROPRIATE POOL. THAT'S RIGHT. THANK 19 YOU. 20 OKAY. AND BEHIND YOU? 21 MR. WILDERMUTH: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. MARK 22 WILDERMUTH, W-I-L-D-E-R-M-U-T-H, FOR WILDERMUTH 23 ENVIRONMENTAL. 24 THE COURT: THANK YOU --25 OKAY. I THINK THAT IS EVERYONE HERE IN THE 26 COURTROOM. SO LET'S START WORKING ON THE PHONE. AND I HAVE 27 A LIST. SO LET ME CALL OUT NAMES SO THAT WE DON'T HAVE

EVERYONE TRYING TO CHIME IN AT ONCE.

28

1	SO DO I HAVE ON THE PHONE CAROL BOYD OF THE
2	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE?
3	MS. BOYD: PRESENT, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
4	THE COURT: AND THEN FROM THE CALIFORNIA AGAIN FROM
5	THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, MARILYN LEVIN?
6	MS. LEVIN: YES, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
7	THE COURT: AND MR. FUDACZ, REPRESENTING THE CITY OF
8	ONTARIO?
9	MR. FUDACZ: YES, YOUR HONOR. GOOD AFTERNOON.
10	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
11	AND MR LOOKS LIKE MR. BOWCOCK, ARE YOU
12	ON THE LINE?
13	THE CLERK: NO CHECK-IN.
14	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
15	AND THEN WE HAVE GOT BOB KUHN FROM BROWNSTEIN
15 16	AND THEN WE HAVE GOT BOB KUHN FROM BROWNSTEIN
16	HYATT.
16 17	HYATT.  MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.
16 17 18	HYATT.  MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.
16 17 18 19	HYATT.  MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.
16 17 18 19 20	HYATT.  MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.  HANG ON JUST A SECOND.
16 17 18 19 20 21	HYATT.  MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.  HANG ON JUST A SECOND.  MR. GALLEANO: THAT WOULD BE GALLEANO, YOUR HONOR.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	HYATT.  MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.  HANG ON JUST A SECOND.  MR. GALLEANO: THAT WOULD BE GALLEANO, YOUR HONOR.  THE COURT: DON GALLEANO. OKAY. THANK YOU. I HAVE
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.  HANG ON JUST A SECOND.  MR. GALLEANO: THAT WOULD BE GALLEANO, YOUR HONOR.  THE COURT: DON GALLEANO. OKAY. THANK YOU. I HAVE  GOT THAT.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.  HANG ON JUST A SECOND.  MR. GALLEANO: THAT WOULD BE GALLEANO, YOUR HONOR.  THE COURT: DON GALLEANO. OKAY. THANK YOU. I HAVE  GOT THAT.  AND JEFF PIERSON FROM BROWNSTEIN HYATT.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. KUHN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.  THE COURT: THANK YOU.  AND DON LET'S SEE, THAT'S NOT A CHECK-IN.  HANG ON JUST A SECOND.  MR. GALLEANO: THAT WOULD BE GALLEANO, YOUR HONOR.  THE COURT: DON GALLEANO. OKAY. THANK YOU. I HAVE  GOT THAT.  AND JEFF PIERSON FROM BROWNSTEIN HYATT.  MR. PIERSON: YES, YOUR HONOR. PRESENT.

1	MR. GIBBNEY: I'M JUST MONITORING. I'M NOT SPEAKING.
2	THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU. BUT I'M TRYING TO FIND
3	OUT WHO IS LISTENING IN.
4	AND THEN MR. HUBSCH FROM LOBE AND LOBE.
5	MR. HUBSCH: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS ALLEN
6	HUBSCH. THANK YOU.
7	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
8	AND BRIAN GEYE, ALSO G-E-Y-E, ALSO FROM
9	LOBE AND LOBE.
10	MR. GEYE: YES. BRIAN GEYE ON THE PHONE. THANK YOU,
11	YOUR HONOR.
12	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
13	AND THEN JANINE WILSON? ARE YOU THERE?
14	MS. WILSON: YES. THANK YOU.
15	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
16	AND COURTNEY JONES FOR THE CITY OF ONTARIO?
17	MS. JONES: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.
18	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
19	AND SCOTT BURTON ALSO FOR THE CITY OF
20	ONTARIO?
21	MR. BURTON: YES, YOUR HONOR. SCOTT BURTON HERE.
22	THANK YOU.
23	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
24	AND THEN WE HAVE MR. FEENSTRA?
25	MR. FEENSTRA: PRESENT, YOUR HONOR.
26	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
27	AND THOMAS BUNN FROM LAGERLOF ON BEHALF OF
28	THE CITY OF POMONA?

1	MR. BUNN: HERE, YOUR HONOR. GOOD AFTERNOON.
2	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
3	AND, LET'S SEE, JUSTIN SCOTT-COE OF MONTE
4	VISTA WATER DISTRICT?
5	MR. SCOTT-COE: PRESENT, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
6	THE COURT: AND KRISTINA ROBB OF CITY OF CHINO?
7	MS. ROBB: I AM HERE, YOUR HONOR.
8	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
9	AND MR. CHIGOYENETCHE OF J.C. LAW FIRM ON
10	BEHALF OF INLAND EMPIRE UTILITIES AGENCY?
11	MR. CHIGOYENETCHE: YES, YOUR HONOR. JEAN
12	CHIGOYENETCHE. I'M HERE.
13	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
14	AND CHRIS BERCH? CHRIS BERCH?
15	MR. BERCH: YES, YOUR HONOR.
16	THE COURT: AND ROBERT DONLAN OF ON BEHALF OF JURUPA
17	COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT.
18	MR. DONLAN: HERE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
19	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
20	AND, LET'S SEE, SHAWNDA GRADY, ALSO FROM
21	JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT.
22	MS. GRADY: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
23	THE COURT: AND THEN GENE TANAKA, FROM BEST BEST &
24	KRIEGER ON BEHALF OF CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT.
25	MR. TANAKA: HERE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
26	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
27	IS THERE ANYONE WHOM I'VE MISSED? GOING
28	ONCE

MS. COKER: YOUR HONOR, AMANDA COKER FOR THE CITY OF CHINO.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. COULD YOU SPELL YOUR NAME FOR ME, PLEASE.

MS. COKER: SURE. AMANDA IS A-M-A-N-D-A. COKER IS C-O-K-E-R.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

ANYONE ELSE THAT I MISSED?

MR. SLATER: YOUR HONOR, IF I MIGHT, I JUST WOULD LIKE
TO CLARIFY FOR THE RECORD THAT WE HAD THREE DIRECTORS FROM
THE CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER WHO ARE ON THE CALL -- BOB KUHN,
DON GALLEANO AND JEFF PIERSON -- AND THEY IDENTIFIED AS
BROWNSTEIN. WE JUST ARRANGED FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION.
THEY'RE IN FACT WATERMASTER BOARD MEMBERS.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. IT WAS A LITTLE CONFUSING TO ME

AS I WAS READING OFF THE LIST WHO WERE THE ATTORNEYS AND WHO

WERE THE CLIENTS. SO I APPRECIATE THAT, MR. SLATER.

OKAY. SO LET ME START BY POINTING OUT THAT
THE COURT HAS CONFUSION TODAY. AND THE CONFUSION COMES IN
BECAUSE WHEN THE COURT STARTED PREPARING THIS -- PREPARING
FOR THIS HEARING TODAY, THE COURT DISCOVERED THAT THERE WERE
A NUMBER OF PLEADINGS THAT I HAD -- THAT I HAVE THAT HAD
BEEN PREVIOUSLY COPIES DELIVERED TO MY COURTROOM BUT WERE
NOT ON THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS. SO IT LED ME TO START
WONDERING EXACTLY IF I HAD ALL OF THE MOVING PAPERS OR NOT.

AND SO WHAT THE COURT DID WAS PREPARE A

DOCUMENT WHICH WAS ENTITLED WATERMASTER PLEADING SUMMARY AND

IT'S DATED YESTERDAY. IT INCLUDES EVERYTHING ON THE -- THAT

I THINK IS RELEVANT ON THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS EXCEPT -
JUST A MOMENT -- THE CITY OF CHINO'S OPPOSITION TO THE

AGRICULTURAL POOL'S EX PARTE MOTION TO STRIKE CITY OF

CHINO'S REPLY TO AGRICULTURAL POOL OPPOSITION TO WATERMASTER

MOTION REGARDING 2020 SAFE YIELD RESET AMENDMENT OF THE

STATED JUDGMENT PARAGRAPH 6, WHICH WAS FILED TODAY. BUT

THAT IS ON THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS, WHICH I HAVE UP HERE IN

THE COURTROOM JUST SO EVERYONE KNOWS THAT GOT INCLUDED.

THE COURT IS GOING TO ATTACH TO THE MINUTE

ORDER TODAY THE PLEADING SUMMARY THAT THE COURT PREPARED AND

THE PRINTOUT FROM THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS THAT THE COURT

PRINTED OUT AND MODIFIED OR -- ADDED TO. IF YOU GO TO THE

COURT WEBSITE, YOU WILL SEE THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS PRINTOUT

WITH NUMBERS TO THE LEFT OF SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS. AND AS

THE COURT WAS GOING THROUGH THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS, WHAT I

DID WAS START NUMBERING THE DOCUMENTS. THOSE NUMBERS YOU

SEE I HANDWROTE ON THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS. AND THEN IF YOU

LOOK AT THE WATERMASTER PLEADING SUMMARY THAT I PREPARED,

THOSE NUMBERS ARE BRACKETED. SO YOU CAN USE -- SO YOU CAN

CROSS RELATE THE TWO DOCUMENTS.

SO IT LED ME TO WONDER WHAT ELSE I MIGHT BE MISSING. AND IN THE WATERMASTER PLEADING SUMMARY THE COURT PREPARED, I BOXED THE DOCUMENTS THAT I COULD NOT FIND IN THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS. AND THEY ARE AN AG. POOL MOTION TO STRIKE JOINDERS OF POMONA I.E.U.A., CUCUMONGA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT AND FONTANA UNION WATER COMPANY, J.C.S.D. AND THREE VALLEYS COMMUNITY WATER DISTRICT.

AND THAT LEADS ME TO SAY WHAT STARTED ME ON

THAT IS I GOT THE INLAND EMPIRE AGENCY'S OPPOSITION TO THAT MOTION AND THEN I STARTED TRACKING DOWN THE MOTION, WHICH I HAD, BUT IT WAS NOT -- I COULD NOT FIND IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS.

ALSO THERE WAS A JOINDER BY WESTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT AND A JOINDER BY THREE VALLEYS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT AND THE WATERMASTER RESET THAT I COULD NOT FIND IN THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS. AND AN AG. POOL MOTION TO STRIKE THE CITY OF CHINO'S REPLY TO THE AG. POOL OPPOSITION THAT I COULD NOT FIND IN THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS. AND FINALLY, AN AG. POOL TO STRIKE THE APPROPRIATE POOL'S REPLY TO THE AG. POOL OPPOSITION ALSO NOT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS.

SO IN ORDER TO TRY TO SOLVE THIS PROBLEM, I'M GOING TO MAKE TWO REQUESTS. FIRST, FOR THE PARTIES WHO HAVE THE -- I WILL CALL IT THE BOXED DOCUMENTS ON MY PLEADING SUMMARY, WITH QUESTION MARKS BY THE WORD "FILED," TO PLEASE REFILE THOSE DOCUMENTS AND PUT IN YOUR CAPTION THE TITLE OF THE DOCUMENT FILED BY ORDER OF JUDGE REICHERT ON JUNE 26TH, 2020. BECAUSE IF SOMEWHERE THESE DOCUMENTS ARE LURKING IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE AND THEY POP INTO THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS, IT'S POSSIBLE THE CLERK WOULD NOT TAKE A SECOND DOCUMENT UNLESS THERE IS A SPECIFIC ORDER TO DO SO.

SO WITH RESPECT TO ALL OF THE DOCUMENTS IN MY PLEADING SUMMARY THAT ARE BOXED, IDENTIFIED WITH THE WORDS FILED AND FOUR QUESTION MARKS, PLEASE FILE THOSE -- REFILE THOSE -- OR FILE THEM AGAIN, I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM, WITH THE CLERK'S OFFICE WITH THAT SPECIFIC ORDER

INDICATED IN THE TITLE.

AND REGRETTABLY FOR SOME REASON, MS. EGOSCUE,

A NUMBER OF THEM ARE YOURS, NOT ALL OF THEM, BUT THAT NEEDS

TO BE DONE SO WE HAVE A CLEAR RECORD.

AND THEN I STARTED TO WONDER IF EVERYBODY GOT
THESE DOCUMENTS BECAUSE IF THEY'RE NOT IN THE REGISTER OF
ACTIONS, MAYBE THEY WERE -- THERE WAS SOME OTHER PROBLEM
WITH THE SERVICE.

MS. EGOSCUE, I SEE YOU STANDING. SO WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADDRESS THE COURT, PLEASE?

MS. EGOSCUE: YOUR HONOR, MAY I, PLEASE?

THE COURT: YES. COME UP TO THE MICROPHONE, PLEASE.

MS. EGOSCUE: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: FEEL FREE TO BE SEATED.

MS. EGOSCUE: SO MANY MONTHS AGO, YOUR HONOR -- THIS IS

TRACY EGOSCUE ON BEHALF OF THE AG. POOL -- YOU ISSUED AN

ORDER THAT REQUIRED ALL OF OUR FILINGS TO BE THROUGH

WATERMASTER.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MS. EGOSCUE: AND ALL OF THESE FILINGS, INCLUDING THOSE
THAT WERE FILED BY OTHER ATTORNEYS, WERE INDEED FILED
THROUGH THAT PROCESS. AND I DO HAVE A LIST OF WHEN THEY
WERE FILED, BUT THE LAST ONE WAS FILED ON THE 23RD OF JUNE.
SO THESE FILINGS WERE FILED BY WATERMASTER, SERVED ON THE
PARTIES. WE RECEIVED E-MAILS THROUGH THE WATERMASTER.

AND I WILL ALSO NOTE THAT WE DID NOTICE THAT YOUR DOCKET WAS NOT RECEIVING A LOT OF THESE FILINGS IN A TIMELY MANNER AND WE WERE CONCERNED. HOWEVER, I BELIEVE IT

MUST BE SOMETHING THAT IS RELATED TO THE CONSTRAINTS THAT

THE COURT IS OPERATING UNDER RIGHT NOW. BUT I CAN INDICATE

TO YOU AND REPRESENT TO YOU THAT EVERY SINGLE ONE OF THESE

FILINGS IN THE BOX -- AND I DON'T REPRESENT WESTERN OR THREE

VALLEYS. THEY ARE ABLY REPRESENTED. BUT I CAN REPRESENT TO

YOU THEY WERE ALL FILED PURSUANT TO YOUR ORDER TO GO THROUGH

THE WATERMASTER PROCESS.

THE COURT: OKAY. I APPRECIATE THAT. THANK YOU.

IT MAY BE SOME INTERNAL PROBLEM WITH THE

COURT. THERE WAS -- DURING THE COURT CLOSURE, I UNDERSTAND

THERE WAS A REALLY HUGE BACKLOG OF MAIL AND FILINGS. AND

ALTHOUGH THESE CAME IN AFTER -- IT LOOKS LIKE THESE CAME IN

AFTER THE COURT OPENED, IT'S POSSIBLE THEY GOT SHELVED. AND

SO I'M NOT -- I SAY THIS WITHOUT ANY KIND OF REPROACH OR

REBUKE TO ANYONE. I JUST NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE

HAS THE SAME PAPERWORK AND EVERYONE IS LITERALLY ON THE SAME

PAGE IN TERMS OF WHAT DOCUMENTS ARE FILED. SO IF THERE IS A

PROBLEM GOING FORWARD, THERE IS A COMPLETE CLERK'S RECORD OF

WHAT WAS FILED.

AND SO I SEE MR. HERREMA WAITING TO ADDRESS

THE COURT. BUT LET ME -- ARE YOU FINISHED, MS. EGOSCUE?

MS. EGOSCUE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I WAS JUST GOING
TO NOTE THAT WE WOULD AGAIN RESUBMIT THROUGH THE WATERMASTER
PROCESS WITH THIS NOTE ON THE FILINGS PER YOUR INSTRUCTIONS
AS YOU'VE INDICATED.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

MR. HERREMA?

MR. HERREMA: YOUR HONOR, BRAD HERREMA --

THE COURT: SIT DOWN AND SPEAK INTO THE MICROPHONE,
PLEASE. THANK YOU FOR STANDING, BUT IT'S ABSOLUTELY
ESSENTIAL THAT EVERYONE SPEAK INTO THE MICROPHONE TODAY.
AND IT SHOULD BE ON. YEAH. BELIEVE IT OR NOT, WHEN THE
LIGHT IS OFF, THE MICROPHONE IS ON.

MR. HERREMA: OKAY. BRAD HERREMA ON BEHALF OF THE WATERMASTER.

I WOULD CONCUR WITH MS. EGOSCUE THAT ALL OF
THESE BOXED DOCUMENTS WERE FILED THROUGH WATERMASTER'S
FILING MECHANISM. THE PARTIES SEND THEIR DOCUMENTS TO
WATERMASTER, AND WE ENGAGE WITH A SERVICE THAT COMES AND
DROPS THEM OFF. AND WE SERVED THEM ALL BY E-MAIL AND SOME
FOLKS BY MAIL. ALL THESE DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN SERVED. THEY
HAVE ALL BEEN DISTRIBUTED TO ALL THE PARTIES, AND THEY ARE
ALSO HOSTED ON WATERMASTER'S LEGAL FILING WEBSITE.

THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT.

MR. HERREMA: WHEN YOU ARE READY, YOUR HONOR, IN REGARDS TO GOING THROUGH THE PLEADINGS, I HAVE A HANDFUL OF OTHER UNOPPOSED MOTIONS THAT WERE FILED PRIOR TO THE TWO PRIOR HEARINGS THAT WERE CONTINUED.

THE COURT: YES. I THINK I MAY HAVE LISTED THOSE,

NUMBER FIVE MISCELLANEOUS, ON THE SECOND PAGE.

MR. HERREMA: I SHOW A FEW MORE ON MY LIST.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MR. HERREMA: AND ALSO JUST ONE OTHER NOTE WHILE WE'RE LOOKING AT THE SUMMARY. I THINK WHAT MAY HAVE HAPPENED IN THE DOCUMENTS BEING SENT FROM THE FILING BACK UP HERE OR BECAUSE OF THE BACKLOG IS THAT SOME OF THE DATES SHOWN ON

1 HERE FOR FILINGS ARE NOT THE DATE THAT WE SERVED AND FILED 2 ON SOME OF THESE DOCUMENTS. SO THERE MAY HAVE BEEN A DELAY. 3 THE COURT: OKAY. THE DATES THAT I PUT IN MY SUMMARY 4 PLEADING WERE STRICTLY TAKEN FROM THE DATE INDICATED IN THE 5 REGISTER OF ACTIONS. SO IF -- I'M NOT SURPRISED THAT THE 6 SERVICE DATE MAY BE OUITE A VARIANCE FROM THE DATE THAT THEY 7 ACTUALLY SHOWED UP IN THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS. 8 MR. HERREMA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 9 THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HERREMA. 10 SO PERHAPS IT WOULD BE BEST IF WE COULD TURN 11 TO SOME UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FIRST UNLESS SOMEONE HAS A BETTER 12 SUGGESTIONS. YOU KNOW, I'M ALWAYS OPEN TO SUGGESTIONS. 13 MR. SLATER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS 14 SCOT SLATER. 15 BRAD HERREMA HAS, I THINK, A HELPFUL TIDY 16 LIST TO WALK THE COURT THROUGH WHAT IS UNOPPOSED. 17 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 18 MR. HERREMA? 19 MR. HERREMA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 20 WE HAVE A -- I WILL GO IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER 21 IF THAT'S OKAY. 22 THE COURT: SURE, PLEASE. 23 MR. HERREMA: WE HAVE A WATERMASTER REQUEST FOR THE 24 COURT TO RECEIVE IN THE FILE THE WATERMASTER SEMIANNUAL OBMP 25 STATUS REPORT, NUMBER 2019-1. 26 THE COURT: YES. 27 MR. HERREMA: THAT WAS FILED ON OCTOBER 2ND. AND

THAT'S UNOPPOSED. IT WAS ADDITIONALLY SET FOR HEARING LAST

28

DECEMBER.

THE COURT: YES. SO THE COURT HAVING RECEIVED NO
OPPOSITION AND NO OBJECTION TODAY, THE COURT WILL RECEIVE
THE 2019-1 OBMP UPDATE PLAN AND APPROVES IT.

MR. HERREMA: I HAVE A PROPOSED ORDER WITH ME. IT'S

THE SAME PROPOSED ORDER THAT WE FILED BACK IN OCTOBER. THE

DATE WAS THE INITIAL HEARING DATE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. I WILL MAKE THE MODIFICATION RIGHT NOW AND SIGN THE ORDER. GIVE ME JUST A MOMENT, PLEASE.

MR. HERREMA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YES. SO THE COURT IS GRANTING THE REQUEST AND RECEIVING THE WATERMASTER SEMIANNUAL OBMP STATUS REPORT 2019-1. AND I'M GIVING THAT TO MY COURT JUDICIAL ASSISTANT TO PROCESS RIGHT NOW.

MR. HERREMA. GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

MR. HERREMA: WE HAVE A WATERMASTER MOTION FOR COURT
APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO RESTATED JUDGMENT REGARDING
COMPENSATION OF ADVISORY AND POOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THAT
WAS FILED ON OCTOBER 31ST, 2019. AGAIN, I HAVE A PROPOSED
MOTION HERE WHICH IS THE SAME COPY WE FILED AND HAS THE DATE
OF THE ORIGINAL HEARING DATE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. THE COURT HAS RECEIVED NO OPPOSITION AND GRANTS THAT MOTION.

LET ME GET THE ORDER AND SIGN IT FOR YOU

RIGHT NOW, PLEASE. I'M GOING TO INDICATE -- CHANGE THE DATE

FROM DECEMBER 13, 2019 TO 6-26-20, AND SIGN IT TODAY.

6-26-20. AND I'M GIVING THAT RIGHT NOW TO MY JUDICIAL

1	ASSISTANT TO PROCESS.
2	MR. HERREMA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
3	THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HERREMA.
4	NEXT, PLEASE.
5	MR. HERREMA: I HAVE A WATERMASTER MOTION FOR COURT TO
6	RECEIVE AND FILE A GROUND-LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE ANNUAL
7	REPORT THAT WAS FILED ON NOVEMBER 26TH, 2019. AND THAT
8	PROPOSED ORDER STILL SHOWS A MARCH 20 HEARING DATE.
9	THE COURT: THANK YOU. I'LL MAKE THAT AMENDMENT. AND
10	LET THE RECORD REFLECT THE COURT HAS RECEIVED NO OPPOSITION
11	AND IS GRANTING THAT MOTION.
12	OKAY. THAT ORDER IS SIGNED. I'M GIVING IT
13	TO MY JUDICIAL ASSISTANT TO PROCESS.
14	MR. HERREMA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
15	NEXT IS A WATERMASTER MOTION FOR COURT TO
16	RECEIVE AND FILE THE 42ND ANNUAL REPORT THAT WAS FILED ON
17	JANUARY 31ST. AND AGAIN, THIS PROPOSED ORDER HAS A MARCH 20
18	HEARING DATE ON TOP.
19	THE COURT: THANK YOU. I WILL JUST NOTE FOR THE RECORD
20	THAT MARCH 20 WAS THREE DAYS AFTER THE COURT CLOSED. SO
21	THAT'S WHY WE ARE GETTING THESE NOW.
22	OKAY. YOUR ORDER GRANTING YOUR REQUEST AND
23	RECEIVING THE 42ND ANNUAL REPORT I'VE SIGNED AND GIVEN TO MY
24	JUDICIAL ASSISTANT TO PROCESS.
25	MR. HERREMA: YOUR HONOR, THOSE ARE THE FOUR UNOPPOSED
26	MOTIONS THAT HAD BEEN ON CALENDAR FOR THE PREVIOUS HEARING

27

28

DATE.

THE COURT: YES.

1 MR. HERREMA: THERE ARE TWO OTHERS THAT ARE LISTED IN 2 YOUR MISCELLANEOUS LIST. 3 THE COURT: YES. 4 MR. HERREMA: THEY'RE NUMBERS 15 AND 16. THEY WERE 5 ACTUALLY FILED ON MAY 29TH. I KNOW THEY SHOW ON YOUR LIST 6 AS BEING PUT ON THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS ON JUNE 15. WE 7 FILED THOSE ON THE 29TH WHEN THE COURT REOPENED. 8 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 9 MR. HERREMA: THEY ARE UNOPPOSED. AND I DO HAVE PROPOSED ORDERS FOR EACH. THEY DO SHOW TODAY'S HEARING 10 11 DATE. 12 THE COURT: THANK YOU. I'M READY TO GRANT THOSE 13 MOTIONS. SO IF YOU HAND THE ORDERS UP, I WILL SIGN THEM. 14 MR. HERREMA: OKAY. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 15 THE COURT: THANK YOU. SO LET THE RECORD REFLECT THAT 16 I HAVE THE ORDER GRANTING THE REQUEST TO APPROVE THE 17 INTERVENTIONS AND THIS IS ALL IN ORDER. 18 OFF THE RECORD. 19 (A DISCUSSION WAS HELD OFF THE RECORD.) 20 THE COURT: BACK ON THE RECORD. 21 I'M GRANTING THE REQUEST FOR THESE TWO 22 INTERVENTIONS. GIVE ME JUST A MOMENT. 23 I'VE SIGNED THE ORDER ON THE INTERVENTIONS. 24 I'M GIVING THAT TO MY JUDICIAL ASSISTANT TO PROCESS. 25 AND THEN I HAVE THE ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO RECEIVE THE WATERMASTER SEMIANNUAL OBMP STATUS REPORT, 26 27 2019-2. AND SIGNING THAT RIGHT NOW.

MR. HERREMA: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

28

1 THE COURT: GOT IT. 2 OKAY. THANK YOU. 3 MR. HERREMA: YOUR HONOR, THAT WAS IT FOR THE UNOPPOSED 4 MOTIONS. WE DID HAVE AN OBMP UPDATE STATUS REPORT THAT WAS 5 INITIALLY FILED IN AUGUST. 6 THE COURT: I REMEMBER THAT. 7 MR. HERREMA: AND IT'S BEEN SUPPLEMENTED A COUPLE OF 8 TIMES. IT WAS ON THE DECEMBER AND THEN THE MARCH HEARING 9 CALENDARS AS WELL. THERE IS NO PROPOSED ORDER FOR THAT. IT 10 WAS INTENDED TO BE A REPORT FOR THE COURT. 11 THE COURT: WHICH I RECEIVED AND REVIEWED. THANK YOU. 12 MR. HERREMA: I THINK WE'RE --13 MR. SLATER: YOUR HONOR, IF I MIGHT. 14 THE COURT: YES, MR. SLATER. GO AHEAD, PLEASE. 15 MR. SLATER: AGAIN, THIS IS UNOPPOSED. THERE IS NO 16 ORDER THAT IS BEING SOUGHT -- MAYBE I NEED TO LEAN IN. 17 THE COURT: THERE YOU GO. 18 MR. SLATER: I'LL LEAN. CAN YOU HEAR ME? OKAY. GOOD. 19 THE COURT: OFF THE RECORD. 20 (A DISCUSSION WAS HELD OFF THE RECORD.) 21 THE COURT: BACK ON THE RECORD. 22 MR. SLATER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I APPRECIATE THAT. 23 SO AS MR. HERREMA INDICATED, THERE WERE THREE 24 SEPARATE STATUS REPORTS. AND BECAUSE WE SEEM TO COME TO 25 YOUR HONOR WITH A BIG PILE OF STUFF FROM TIME TO TIME AND 26 YOUR HONOR IS FORCED TO SORT OF SORT THROUGH IT, IN THIS

INSTANCE WE HAD FILED THE STATUS REPORTS REGARDING THE OBMP

UPDATE. BECAUSE THIS IS A NEW ACTIVITY, A NEW UNDERTAKING

27

28

BY WATERMASTER, AND WE WANTED TO TAKE A COUPLE MINUTES TO HELP YOU UNDERSTAND THE CONTEXT FOR THESE FILINGS.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

MR. SLATER: SO YOUR HONOR IS AWARE THAT THE ORIGINAL OBMP WAS DONE IN 2000. WE GOT A -- QUITE OF BIT OF TRACK RECORD AND A LOT OF SUCCESSES AS YOUR HONOR IS AWARE. NOT WITHSTANDING THAT AND NOT WITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT WE DO HAVE A STRUCTURAL COMMITMENT TO GO FORWARD AND TO RESPECT THE AGREEMENTS THAT WERE PREVIOUSLY MADE, THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH WE DO BUSINESS IN AN ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORLD, YOU HAVE TO KEEP PACE WITH WHAT'S GOING ON. THERE HAVE BEEN CHANGES IN THE PHYSICAL AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT, AND THE NOTION THAT THE EARLIER WORK DONE IN 2000 WAS SUPPORTED BY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCERN THAT THE ORIGINAL CEQA, CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT REVIEWS THAT WERE UNDERTAKEN HAD GROWN STALE.

THERE IS NOTHING THAT I'M TALKING ABOUT OR
THAT'S PRESENTED IN THE REPORTS AS COMPULSORY. THIS IS
REALLY ABOUT WHAT THE ORIGINAL OBMP THAT WAS ORDERED BY
JUDGE GUNN WAS INTENDED TO DO AND THAT WAS TO ACHIEVE AN
OPTIMUM BASE IN MANAGEMENT PROGRAM. AND SO A PROCESS WAS
BEGUN, A VOLUNTARY PROCESS, WITH THE INTENTION OF DOING
BETTER ON A FORWARD BASIS, AND IN AN EFFORT NOT TO PREJUDICE
THE OUTCOME BUT TO TAKE INPUT FROM THE PARTIES AND TO
PROVIDE A CONCEPTUAL DIRECTION ON WHAT MIGHT BE AGREED AMONG
THE PARTIES.

AND IF YOU WOULD THINK ABOUT IT, THE OBMP IS SORT OF THE GENERAL PLAN OF WATERMASTER OR THE BUSINESS

PLAN. IT IS THE UMBRELLA UNDER WHICH VARIOUS INITIATIVES
ARE HOUSED. AND THEY MUST BE CONSIDERED AS AN INTEGRATED
WHOLE. AND FOR THEM TO BE ENFORCEABLE AND IMPLEMENTABLE,
THIS COURT WILL ULTIMATELY HAVE TO BE INVOLVED IN THE
UNDERSTANDING, REVIEW AND ENFORCEMENT OF COMMITMENT SHOULD
THEY BE FORTHCOMING.

ONE OF THE PRIME EXAMPLES THAT DESERVES

ATTENTION AND IS GETTING ATTENTION NOW WITHIN THAT OVERALL

EFFORT IS THE SUBJECT OF STORAGE MANAGEMENT. AND I USE THAT

NOT AS A SPECIFIC MEANINGFUL TERM BUT MORE OR LESS AS A

CONCEPT THAT IS BEING PURSUED. WE ALREADY HAVE A PEACE

AGREEMENT. THE PEACE AGREEMENT PROVIDES EXPRESS RULES ON

HOW TO MANAGE STORAGE, WATER IN AND OUT, TRANSFERS, PARTIES'

BURDENS OF PROOF. ALL OF THAT IS AVAILABLE TODAY. BUT WE

ARE SORT OF AT A PLACE WHERE WE NEED TO ANSWER TWO

QUESTIONS, AND PART OF THIS IS THAT WE ARE A VICTIM OF OUR

OWN SUCCESS. AND THAT IS IF YOU GO BACK AND YOU LOOK AT THE

ASPIRATIONAL GOALS OF THE OBMP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN WHEN IT

WAS ADOPTED, IT REALLY HAD AN ASPIRATIONAL GOAL OF STORING A

HALF A MILLION ACRE-FEET.

AND, YOUR HONOR, YOU CAN GOOGLE THIS OR LOOK
THIS UP ON YOUR OWN, BUT I REPRESENT TO YOU THAT A HALF A
MILLION ACRE-FEET OF GROUND WATER IN STORAGE IS A LOT. AND
I'M NOT AWARE OF ANYBODY IN THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE AREA IN
THE SIX COUNTIES THAT'S ACHIEVED THAT KIND OF SUCCESS. SO
STORAGE ON THE ONE HAND IS GREAT. IT'S A BLESSING. THE
PARTIES DID A LOT TO DO THAT.

THEN THERE IS A SECONDARY QUESTION ASSOCIATED

WITH THAT WHICH IS MAKING SURE THAT WHEN THE WATER IS PULLED OUT OF STORAGE THAT NO HARM IS CREATED. AND HENCE WHAT WE HAVE IS WE HAVE A PEACE AGREEMENT AND OBMP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, RULES AND REGULATIONS, WHICH TELL WATERMASTER EXACTLY WHAT TO DO WITH 500,000 ACRE-FEET. WHAT THEY DON'T TELL US WHAT TO DO IS WHAT DO -- HOW DO WE ADDRESS QUANTITIES IN EXCESS OF 500? HOW ARE IMPACTS TO BE EVALUATED? HOW ARE IMPACTS TO BE DISTRIBUTED? AND IT IS NOT IMPERMISSIBLE FOR PARTIES AND WATERMASTER TO ENABLE STORAGE IN EXCESS OF 500. IT'S JUST THAT WE DON'T HAVE CLEAR DIRECTION YET AS TO HOW TO MANAGE THAT.

SO AGAIN, CONTENTION, CONSERVATION OF WATER IS A GOOD THING. HAVING DRY YEAR RELIABILITY IS A GOOD. WE ALL KNOW WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH THE COLORADO RIVER AND SAN JOAQUIN AND SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA. IT IS A PHENOMENAL ASSET FOR US TO HAVE STORAGE AVAILABLE TO US. ON THE OTHER HAND, WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE THAT IN THE PROCESS OF WITHDRAWING WATER, IT IS DONE WITHOUT CAUSING HARM.

SO IN THE CONTEXT OF THE OBMP UPDATE, WHAT WE HAD TO DO IS ALSO CONTEMPLATE CEQA. AND YOUR HONOR MAY RECALL THAT IN 2000, WATERMASTER IS NOT A PUBLIC AGENCY. IT IS NOT SUITABLE TO RUN A CEQA PROCESS. WE NEEDED TO FIND A CEQA SPONSOR WHO HAD THE CLOSEST NEXUS TO THE ENTIRETY OF THE ORIGINAL PEACE AGREEMENT OBMP AND THAT WAS IUA.

SO IUA PERFORMED THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ENTIRETY OF THE OBMP.

AGAIN, THE CEQA DOCUMENT DOES NOT COMPEL ANY PROJECT
THEREUNDER. IT WAS AN INVENTORY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
FOR THE WHOLE OF THOSE THINGS BEING CONTEMPLATED.

JUDGE GUNN TO AUTHORIZE THE OLD PROJECT HYDRAULIC CONTROL -WHICH BY THE WAY, OKAY, IS WE HAVE 40 MGD OF DESALTER
CAPACITY UP AND RUNNING, AND IT IS OPERATING AS EXPECTED.
WE DID A SUPPLEMENT AT THAT TIME TO THE EARLIER
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. AND SO THE SAME PATTERN IS
BEING FOLLOWED IN THIS INSTANCE WHERE IUA IS GOING TO BE
ASKED TO APPROVE A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL -- OR, SORRY,
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. SO THAT PROCESS IS UNDERWAY.
WATERMASTER IS WORKING WITH IUA TO PREPARE A DOCUMENT THAT
WILL ENABLE THE ACTIVITIES THAT ARE CONTEMPLATED WITHIN AN
OBMP -- A NEW OBMP OR AN UPDATE TO THE EARLIER ONE.

PROGRESS IS SLOW BECAUSE PEOPLE WANT TO BE

CAREFUL. THEY WANT TO DO THE RIGHT THING. THEY WANT TO

MAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS AND NOT HAVE TO UNWIND THEIR

DECISIONS LATER. AN INCREMENTAL STEP HAS BEEN TAKEN BY THE

APPROVAL -- NOT WITHOUT OBJECTION, BUT WITH THE APPROVAL OF

THE BASE CONCEPT -- BASIC CONCEPTS, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN

WHAT IS CALLED A STORAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN. NOW THAT'S -
THAT LABEL STORAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN IS WITHOUT LEGAL AFFECT.

IT IS A STATEMENT OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. AND I WANT TO BE

CLEAR, IT'S NOT A -- IT'S NOT UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORTED AMONG

THE PARTIES. NEVERTHELESS, IT WAS DEEMED TO BE INCREMENTAL

PROGRESS ON THE ROAD OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

AND HERE IS THE IMPORTANT PART. TO IMPLEMENT

WHATEVER VISION THAT WATERMASTER AND THE PARTIES OPENLY AGREE UPON, THERE WILL NEED TO BE LEGAL INSTRUMENTS THAT WILL FIND THEIR WAY TO YOUR HONOR. AND THOSE LEGAL INSTRUMENTS, WE HOPE, WILL BE UNANIMOUS IN THEIR SUPPORT. BUT THEY MAY NOT BE. WE DO NOT HAVE ANY PROPOSAL TO BE MAKING OR LANGUAGE TO BE SHARING WITH YOU. WE ARE IDENTIFYING FOR YOU THIS IS AN EFFORT THAT IS UNDERWAY. THE PARTIES ARE WORKING HARD. THERE IS AN APPROVAL OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. IT IS NOT BINDING. WE SAID THIS A NUMBER OF TIMES AND I WANT TO MAKE IT CLEAR TO YOUR HONOR. IT IS NOT BINDING ON ANY PARTY. IT IS NOT BINDING ON ANY POOL. IT IS NOT BINDING ON THE WATERMASTER ITSELF. IT IS AN EFFORT TO MAKE INCREMENTAL PROGRESS, TO ENCOURAGE FURTHER DISCUSSION TO GET A STORAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN ULTIMATELY IN PLACE WHICH MEANS COULD BE AMENDMENTS TO THE PEACE AGREEMENT, COULD BE AMENDMENTS TO THE OBMP IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND IT COULD BE OTHER THINGS THAT THE PARTIES DEFINE THAT WE'RE NOT AWARE OF YET.

1

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

27

28

SO WE HAVE A PROCESS WHICH IS, I WOULD SAY,
MORE OR LESS POLICY DRIVEN WHICH HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN TERMS
OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. NOW THERE IS ACTIVE
DISCUSSIONS ABOUT HOW PORTIONS OF THAT VISION OR ALL THAT
VISION CAN BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH LEGAL INSTRUMENTS. AND
THEN THERE IS A HOSTING ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. AND ALL
THOSE THINGS ARE HAPPENING, LITTLE BIT OF TRIAGE. BUT THEY
ULTIMATELY WILL COME HERE. AND WE DIDN'T WANT TO WAIT UNTIL
IT WAS ALL DONE TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN TO YOUR
HONOR WHAT WE ARE WORKING ON AND WHY WE ARE WORKING ON IT.

20-YEAR-OLD OBMP NEEDS SOME WORK, REFRESHING, AND WE WANT TO DO THAT, WE WANT TO DO IT CONSENSUALLY. A PROCESS IS UNDERWAY. AND IF WE ARE SUCCESSFUL, WE WILL BE BACK TO YOU TO DISCUSS HOW THAT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FORM OF INSTRUMENTS AND ULTIMATELY A COURT ORDER.

LAST POINT I HAVE IS BECAUSE WHILE WE ALWAYS
HOPE TO ACHIEVE OUR OBJECTIVES, SOMETIMES WE ARE A LITTLE
SLOWER, AND WE DO HAVE A MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE BECAUSE OF OUR
EARLIER SUCCESS IN STORAGE. SO IF OUR TIMELINE SLIPS, IT
COULD BE THAT WE EXCEED THE QUANTITY THAT HAS HISTORICALLY
BEEN EXPRESSLY AUTHORIZED, MEANING THAT THERE ARE RULES WITH
WHAT WE DO WITH IT. THAT MEANS THAT WE MAY NEED TO
EITHER -- WE MAY NEED TO DO SOMETHING WITH THE EXISTING
RULES TO MAKE THEM ACCOMMODATE OUR OVERAGES.

SO IF WE HAVE COVERAGE FOR 500,000

HYPOTHETICALLY AND WE HAVE 620 SITTING IN THE BANK, WHAT ARE

WE DOING WITH THAT? WHAT ARE THE RULES THAT ARE COVERING

THAT? AND SO IN THE EVENT THAT WE CAN'T DO THE WHOLE THING,

WE MAY HAVE AN INTERIM STEP WHERE WE COME BACK TO YOU AND

SAY, OKAY, THERE IS A LITTLE MORE THAN WE AUTHORIZED IN THIS

ACCOUNT. WE HAVE TO HAVE SOME BASIS TO ENSURE NO HARM TO

THE BASIN AND ENSURE THE PARTIES THAT THEY CAN GET THEIR

WATER OUT.

AND SO I WANT TO ALSO REPRESENT TO THE COURT THAT THERE IS INTENTION OF HARMING ANYBODY IN AN INTERIM RESOLUTION, BUT WE MAY NEED SOMETHING SMALLER THAN THE BIG TO GET US BY UNTIL WE GET THE BIG DONE.

THE COURT: I APPRECIATE THAT. I HAVE A COUPLE OF

QUESTIONS.

MR. SLATER: SURE.

THE COURT: WHAT DID YOU MEAN BY HOSTING AN

4 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT?

MR. SLATER: SO WATERMASTER UNDER THE PEACE AGREEMENT AND COURT ORDER DOES NOT PERFORM CEQA, BUT IT MUST FIND THAT CEQA HAS BEEN PREPARED, COMPLIANCE HAS OCCURRED FOR ANY PROJECT THAT GOES THROUGH THE WATERMASTER PROCESS. SO WE HAVE AN OBMP ORIGINAL PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT THAT COVERED STORAGE AND ALL THE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH IT. SO NOW, IF WE ARE GOING TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT OR MORE, WE HAVE TO -- IN ORDER FOR US TO SATISFY OUR OBLIGATION TO YOU, YOUR HONOR, WE HAVE TO FIND THAT CEQA COMPLIANCE WAS DONE BY SOMEBODY.

AND SO WHEN I SAY HOST, THE INTENTION IS

THE -- I USED THE WORD UMBRELLA EARLIER. MAYBE IT'S A

VESSEL. IT HAS TO BE -- IT HAS TO BE -- WE HAVE TO FIND

SOMEPLACE THAT THE COVERAGE WAS DONE IN ORDER FOR US TO

SATISFY OUR OBLIGATION. AND TO AGAIN PUT THIS IN CONTEXT OF

WHY IUA DID IT ORIGINALLY, CAN YOU IMAGINE 32 DIFFERENT

PARTIES DOING THEIR OWN ENVIRONMENTAL AND THEN DOING WHAT?

DRAWING FIRE FROM EACH OTHER ABOUT THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL

DOCUMENTS. SO THE INTENT HERE IS TO CREATE HARMONY WITHIN

THE FAMILY, HAVE A UNIVERSALLY APPLICABLE DOCUMENT THAT

OTHERS USE.

THE COURT: IN OTHER WORDS, PEACE IN THE VALLEY AGAIN?

MR. SLATER: WE HAVE HIGH ASPIRATIONS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I APPRECIATE THAT. THANK YOU.

ANOTHER QUESTION I HAVE IS ON THE SURFACE IT SOUNDS A LITTLE BIT LIKE SOME OF THE MANAGEMENT IDEAS THAT CAME UP IN CITY YIELD RESET AGREEMENT FROM 2015. ARE THERE SIMILARITIES TO THAT?

MR. SLATER: WELL, I THINK THAT WAS A -- HAVING SOME -BE VERY CAREFUL WHEN I DESCRIBE THAT BECAUSE I REPRESENT
WATERMASTER HERE AND WAS AN ADVOCATE FOR THOSE CHANGES. I
THINK THAT WAS VASTLY MORE SWEEPING BECAUSE IT INVOLVED MANY
MORE ISSUES THAN ARE PRESENT IN THIS INSTANCE. I THINK WE
HAVE -- IN THE FILINGS, YOUR HONOR, YOU'LL SEE THE SPECIFIC
ELEMENTS BUT THE SIGNIFICANT ELEMENTS OF THIS, AS IN THE
OBMP, ARE STORAGE MANAGEMENT AND HOW THAT'S ADDRESSED. AND
I DON'T BELIEVE -- I DON'T HAVE ANY RECOLLECTION OF US
TRYING TO DEAL WITH THESE OUTER LIMITS OF STORAGE IN THAT
ENVIRONMENT.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MR. SLATER: AND THEN WHAT I WOULD CALL BACKGROUND

CONDITIONS BEING -- WE HAVE ALL THESE VARIABLE CONDITIONS

THAT OCCUR, PARTICULARLY MAYBE IN THE AREA OF WATER QUALITY.

AND I AM GOING TO BE VERY CIRCUMSPECT AS TO HOW I DESCRIBE

THIS, AND I WILL EXPLAIN WHY. OUR EFFORT HERE IS TO TRY TO

ASCERTAIN WHETHER WE CAN HAVE PROJECTS AND UNDERTAKE

PROJECTS THAT DON'T -- IN LIGHT OF THE MOVING VARIABLES IN

WATER QUALITY, IN TRYING TO UNDERSTAND EXACTLY WHAT THE

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS ARE SO THAT WHEN WE DO PLANS AND

PROGRAMS AND DO THINGS LIKE STORAGE, TRANSFERS, RECHARGE

THAT WE HAVE A GOOD HANDLE ON WHAT THOSE ARE.

NOW WHAT I WANT TO SAY IS REALLY IMPORTANT

BECAUSE THERE ARE PEOPLE LISTENING ON THE PHONE IN THIS ROOM.

I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT GOVERNMENT'S DECISIONS.

I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT HOW DECISIONS GET MADE TO IMPLEMENT

VARIOUS PROVISIONS. AND I WILL GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, YOUR

HONOR. WE HAVE A COMMITTEE STRUCTURED THAT TACKLES SUBJECTS

LIKE LAND SUBSIDENCE WHERE THE COURT, THROUGH WATERMASTER,

HAS DELEGATED -- THROUGH AGREEMENT HAS DELEGATED

RESPONSIBILITY TO DISCRETE MEMBERS OF WATERMASTER TO MANAGE

AN ISSUE WHICH IS MOST NEAR AND DEAR TO THEM.

OR WITHIN THE UMBRELLA OF THE OBMP, WE'RE NOT PREDETERMINING TODAY HOW THAT GETS MANAGED OR WHETHER IT'S THE WATERMASTER BOARD OR SOME SUBSITE THAT MAKES DECISIONS ABOUT THAT. THAT HAS TO BE CUSTOMIZED TO WHAT THE ISSUE IS AND THE DESIRES OF THE PARTIES. AND AN ASPIRATIONAL GOAL IS NOT A FAIT ACCOMPLI; RIGHT? SO I JUST WANT TO BE CAREFUL. WE WANT TO DO THINGS RIGHT, WE WANT TO DO THINGS THE RIGHT WAY, BUT BE MINDFUL THAT THERE ARE MANY TIMES DIFFERENT WAYS TO ACCOMPLISH THE SAME RESULT.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND THAT. REASONABLE MINDS CAN DIFFER.

I REMEMBER WHEN WORKING WITH JUDGE GUNN, 20
YEARS AGO, ON THE ORIGINAL -- WHEN I WORKED WITH HIM ON
WATERMASTER CASE THEN AS A RESEARCH ATTORNEY, HE HAD -- I
BELIEVE IT WAS MS. SCHNEIDER --

MR. SLATER: CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: -- AS A REFEREE?

MR. SLATER: AND MR. SCALANI.

THE COURT: OKAY. ARE THESE -- WHILE WE'RE TALKING GENERALITIES AND PROPOSALS, WOULD THIS BE SOMETHING SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH WHERE THE COURT SHOULD START THINKING ABOUT GETTING A REFEREE TO EVALUATE THEM?

MR. SLATER: WELL, YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO SAY -- OR
I AM GOING TO REPRESENT TO YOU THAT THE PARTIES ARE WORKING
AND MAKING PROGRESS IN THIS REGARD. I HOPE NOT.

THE COURT: OKAY.

MR. SLATER: I THINK YOUR HONOR HAS SHOWN THE CAPACITY
TO WORK WITH THE PARTIES, LISTEN TO THE PARTIES. AND IF
THEY DECIDE, IF WE GET TO A PLACE, AN IMPASSE, WHERE WE
COULD USE SOME ASSISTANCE, I THINK WE WOULD BE WISE TO LET
YOU KNOW. BUT I THINK THAT MY OBSERVATION, HAVING
REPRESENTED WATERMASTER, BEEN A FACILITATOR FOR THIS GROUP
IN A VARIETY OF CONTEXTS, PEOPLE ARE WORKING. AND I HAVE
EVERY HOPE THAT THEY WILL GET TO A SOLUTION THAT MAKES
SENSE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE THAT.

MR. SLATER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ON THIS ISSUE, BEFORE WE LEAVE IT, ANYONE WANT TO CHIME IN NOW? I SEE MS. EGOSCUE RAISING HER HAND.

COME ON UP, PLEASE.

MS. EGOSCUE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. TRACY EGOSCUE ON BEHALF OF THE AG. POOL.

I JUST HAD TWO MINOR COMMENTS AND

OBSERVATIONS. THE FIRST WAS YOUR HONOR'S QUESTION REGARDING

THE SAFE FIELD RESET AND WHETHER OR NOT IT ADDRESSED ANY OF

THESE ISSUES THAT MR. SLATER SO ELOQUENTLY DISCUSSED JUST

NOW. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO BRING TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION

THAT STORAGE WAS A COMPONENT OF THE SAFE YIELD RESET

AGREEMENT. AND DURING ARGUMENT AND DISCUSSIONS IN YOUR

COURT, THERE WERE REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO YOU -- AND THERE

IS A TRANSCRIPT SO WE CAN GO BACK AND PULL IT OUT -- THERE

WERE REPRESENTATIONS MADE THAT STORAGE WAS NOT AN ISSUE AND

DID NOT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED AT THE TIME.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO OPINE ON BEHALF OF THE AG. POOL THAT YOUR QUESTION REGARDING A SPECIAL MASTER OR SPECIAL REFEREE IS A VERY GOOD QUESTION. WE ARE HOPING THAT AT THE END -- BY THE END OF TODAY THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE A MORE EDUCATED VIEW OF WHETHER OR NOT THAT IS NECESSARY. THESE ARE HIGHLY COMPLEX AND TECHNICAL ISSUES, AND WE ARE READY TO ADDRESS THE COURT TO EXPLAIN HOW COMPLEX THEY HAVE BECOME.

THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.

MS. EGOSCUE: I JUST WANTED TO ALSO NOTE, YOUR HONOR,
THE AG. POOL HAS A POOLING PLAN AMENDMENT THAT'S BEEN
PENDING. WE WERE ORIGINALLY GOING TO HAVE A HEARING IN
DECEMBER. IT WAS MOVED BY ORDER OF YOUR COURT TO MARCH. I
JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT SEEMS LIKE WE MIGHT BE DIVING
INTO SAFE YIELD, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO BE HEARD ON OUR POOLING
PLAN AMENDMENT THAT MY CLIENT HAS BEEN WAITING FOR.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND AND WE WILL GET TO THAT. IT'S ON THE AGENDA.

MS. EGOSCUE: APPRECIATE THAT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: THANK YOU.

ANYONE ELSE HERE IN THE COURTROOM WANT TO

CHIME IN ON THIS BEFORE WE MOVE ON? I DON'T SEE ANY HANDS.

ANYBODY ON THE PHONE WANT TO CHIME IN ON THIS

BEFORE WE MOVE ON? GOING ONCE. GOING TWICE. CLOSED.

OKAY. THANK YOU.

LET'S MOVE ON TO THE RECENT MOTION. AND LET

ME TELL YOU RIGHT NOW, THE INDICATED RULING ON THAT IS TO

GRANT THE MOTION TO CONTINUE. THERE WERE DOCUMENTS FILED -
GIVE ME JUST A MINUTE. LET ME GET THAT SET OF DOCUMENTS.

AND THIS WAS JUST FILED WITH THE COURT

JUNE 16, 2020. THIS WAS JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

JOINDER TO AND REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE OF THE CHINO BASIN

WATERMASTER MOTION REGARDING THE 2020 SAFE YIELD RESET. AND

WHOM DO I HAVE ON THE PHONE FOR JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES

DISTRICT.

MS. GRADY: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS SHAWNDA GRADY.

THE COURT: OKAY. MS. GRADY. PLEASE -- I SAY THIS
WITHOUT A HINT OF REPROACH. BUT PLEASE DON'T COMBINE TWO
ISSUES AGAIN IN ONE DOCUMENT. WHEN I HAD TO TRY --

MS. GRADY: I'M SORRY, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: THANKS. WHEN I HAD TO TRY TO SORT THIS OUT
TO FIND OUT WHO WAS OPPOSING, WHO HAD FILED, WHO HAD JOINED,
WHO OPPOSED AND WHO WAS DOING SOMETHING ELSE, IT GOT QUITE
CONFUSING. I MUST SAY -- AND, REMEMBER, I DO ALL OF THIS
MYSELF, TO FIGURE THIS OUT.

SO THAT MOTION -- WHILE I CALL IT A MOTION,

IT WAS A REQUEST -- WAS APPARENTLY SERVED JUNE 15 AND THEN

THERE WAS -- BEAR WITH ME A MOMENT WHILE I GO BACK TO MY

1	SUMMARY AN OBJECTION BY JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT
2	TO THE REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE AND THAT WAS WAS THAT
3	MR. CHIGOYENETCHE? WAS THAT YOU?
4	MR. CHIGOYENETCHE: NO, SIR. THAT WAS NOT ME.
5	THE COURT: HANG ON. LET ME GET THE PAPER THEN. GIVE
6	ME JUST A MOMENT.
7	MS. GRADY: I BELIEVES IT WAS MS. EGOSCUE, THE
8	AG. POOL.
9	THE COURT: OKAY. MS. EGOSCUE, WOULD YOU LIKE COME UP
10	AND ADDRESS THIS, PLEASE.
11	MS. EGOSCUE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
12	THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME.
13	MS. EGOSCUE: TRACY EGOSCUE ON BEHALF OF THE AG. POOL.
14	WE DID FILE AGAINST THE REQUEST FOR
15	CONTINUANCE. HOWEVER, IN LIGHT OF THE INCOMPLETE FILE
16	BEFORE YOUR HONOR, WHICH OBVIOUSLY PREJUDICES MY CLIENT MOST
17	OF ALL, I THINK THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO SUPPORT YOUR
18	INDICATION TO CONTINUE THIS MATTER.
19	THE COURT: THANK YOU, MS. EGOSCUE.
20	I SEE MR. HERREMA AND MR. SLATER CONFERRING.
21	ANYONE WANT TO WE COULD TAKE A SHORT RECESS IF YOU NEED
22	TO CONFER WITH YOUR CLIENTS OR CONFER WITH EACH OTHER ABOUT
23	WHAT THE PROPOSAL MIGHT BE? I WOULD BE HAPPY TO DO THAT,
24	YOU KNOW, TO TRY TO BE COOPERATIVE.
25	MR. SLATER: YOUR HONOR, SCOT SLATER.
26	WE ARE MINDFUL THAT THERE WAS A REQUEST FOR

CASE THAT WE'RE PREPARED TO GO FORWARD. BUT GIVEN THE

CONTINUANCE AND WE WERE PREPARED WALKING IN HERE TO MAKE THE

27

28

IRREGULARITIES IN THE RECORD, WE ARE INDEED CONCERNED. SO I
THINK IF WE COULD HAVE A FEW MINUTES TO CONFER WITH COUNSEL
OUTSIDE AND SEE IF WE CAN COME TO SOME UNDERSTANDING AND
THEN RETURN TO YOU.

THE COURT: THAT WOULD BE GREAT. AND HOW ABOUT THIS:

I'M GOING TO TAKE A RECESS BUT LEAVE THE -- WE'LL TAKE A

FULL-ON COURT RECESS OF ABOUT 10 MINUTES OR 15 MINUTES, BUT

I'M GOING TO LEAVE THE BENCH SO YOU USE THE COURT SYSTEM TO

TALK ON THE PHONE IF YOU NEED TO TALK TO OTHER COUNSEL.

MR. SLATER: OKAY. THAT'S FAIR. THAT'S A GREAT SUGGESTION, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: AND IT WILL BE -- I WILL BE ON THE

10TH FLOOR BACK IN CHAMBERS. I WON'T HEAR YOU A BIT. FEEL

FREE TO TALK FREELY. AND I WILL BE BACK AT -- I CAN NEVER

SEE THE CLOCK AT THE BACK OF THE COURTROOM. IT LOOKS

LIKE -- I'VE GOT 2:30 STRAIGHT DOWN, SO TO SPEAK. I'LL BE

BACK IN 15 MINUTES.

MR. SLATER: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: THANK YOU EVERYBODY. COURT'S IN RECESS.

(A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

THE COURT: BACK ON THE RECORD IN OUR WATERMASTER CASE.

MR. SLATER, DID YOU HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO TALK?

MR. SLATER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONFER.

AFTER SPENDING AND TAKING THE OPPORTUNITY TO

TALK WITH COUNSEL, WE THINK THAT -- WE WOULD PREFER THAT ANY

IRREGULARITY THAT'S ARISEN FROM THE FACT THAT THERE ARE SOME

DISCREPANCIES IN WHAT MAY HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO YOUR HONOR

AND THE ABILITY OF THE PARTIES TO BE FULLY HEARD ON THE SAFE YIELD RESET, THAT WHAT WE WOULD SUGGEST SUBJECT TO YOUR CALENDAR, YOUR HONOR, IS THERE IS A -- I WOULD START WITH THERE'S A STRONGLY HELD VIEW THAT RAMPING UP AGAIN FOR THIS HEARING CAUSES PEOPLE A LOT OF INCONVENIENCE AND ADDITIONAL EXPENSE. AND FROM WATERMASTER'S PERSPECTIVE, WE WOULD REALLY LIKE TO GET THIS HEARD AND GET A SAFE YIELD NUMBER FOR OUR OPERATION.

SO CONSEQUENTLY, HAVING CONFERRED, WE THINK
THAT IF YOUR HONOR WOULD BE PREPARED TO PROCEED TWO WEEKS
FROM TODAY, ON JULY 10TH, IN THE AFTERNOON, FRIDAY
AFTERNOON, WE WERE -- WE'VE CANVASED EVERYBODY AND EVERYBODY
IS AVAILABLE TO APPEAR ON THAT DATE IF THAT'S SUITABLE FOR
YOUR HONOR. IF NOT THAT DATE, AS SOON THEREAFTER AS
POSSIBLE. WE RECOGNIZE THE DIFFICULTY OF WHAT THAT MEANS
FOR YOUR CALENDAR, YOUR HONOR. WE ARE WILLING TO TRY TO GET
HERE AND GET IT DONE IF WE CAN.

AND FURTHER TO -- WE HAVE A STIPULATION AMONG COUNSEL THAT THEY WILL FILE NO MORE PAPER ON THIS MATTER.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

MR. SLATER: THE MATTER OF THE FILE WILL BE STILL FOR YOUR HONOR IN PREPARATION SO THAT YOUR HONOR NEED NOT RAMP UP AGAIN.

THE COURT: AND I SEE MS. EGOSCUE WANTS TO ADD SOMETHING.

MS. EGOSCUE: WITH JUST THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE FILINGS
THAT YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED. THOSE WILL BE COMING IN.

MR. SLATER: UNDERSTOOD, THAT IF SOMETHING HAS BEEN

PREVIOUSLY FILED.

MS. EGOSCUE: YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. ON THE BOXED ITEMS IN MY RESET I

HAVE THOSE. I JUST DON'T KNOW IF EVERYBODY HAS THEM. I

LISTED THEM. SO YOU DON'T NEED TO GET THEM TO ME AGAIN FOR

THE NEXT HEARING. I'VE GOT THEM. THAT'S HOW I KNEW TO PUT

THEM ON THE LIST. WHAT I WAS CONCERNED ABOUT IS THE FAMOUS

ADAGE FROM DONALD RUMSFELD, THE UNKNOWN UNKNOWNS. BECAUSE I

KNEW NOW THAT I HAD SOME KNOWN UNKNOWNS WHICH WERE ITEMS

THAT I HAD THAT DON'T SHOW UP ON THE REGISTER OF ACTIONS AND

I KNOW THEY EXIST. THEN I STARTED WORRYING ABOUT THE

UNKNOWN UNKNOWNS IN CASE THERE WAS SOMETHING ELSE THAT

REALLY DIDN'T GET FILED, DIDN'T SHOW UP ON THE ROA AND I

DIDN'T GET.

SO I WOULD REQUEST COUNSEL TO BY ONE WEEK

FROM TODAY -- I AM GOING TO SET A DEADLINE. OKAY? BY

NOON -- ONE WEEK FROM TODAY IS THE 4TH OF JULY -- OR THE

HOLIDAY IS THE 3RD OF JULY. BY NOON THURSDAY, JULY 2ND, TO

E-MAIL OR PHONE MY JUDICIAL ASSISTANCE AND SAY IF YOU HAVE

SOMETHING ELSE THAT NEEDS TO BE FILED, AND ALERT ME TO IT

AND GET IT TO ME BY THE FOLLOWING MONDAY. AND IF I HEAR

NOTHING, AS THE SAYING GOES, QUI TACET CONSENTIERE. DIDN'T

WORK TOO WELL FOR THOMAS MORE, BUT I HOPE IT WORKS WELL FOR

US. SILENCE IMPLIES CONSENT. AND IF I DON'T HEAR ANYTHING,

GREAT ACTUALLY. I KNOW I HAVE EVERYTHING. BUT IF YOU'VE

GOT SOMETHING, THAT'S THE DEADLINE TO LET ME KNOW. AND I

WILL GRANT THE MOTION TWO WEEKS FROM TODAY WHICH IS JULY 10

AND I WILL MOVE WHATEVER I HAVE GOT IN THE AFTERNOON SO WE

CAN GET THIS GOING. IT'S A TOP PRIORITY FOR ME NOW.

MR. SLATER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME. THANK YOU, EVERYONE, FOR WORKING TOGETHER TO GET A NEXT DATE. WE WILL BE READY TO GO. SO --

MR. SLATER: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE ONE MORE THING -- AND I THINK THE ONLY THING LEFT IS THE AG. POOL MOTION. BUT I HAVE ONE MORE THING. IN PRESENTING THE SITUATION ON THE OBMP, I THOUGHT WE MIGHT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A FURTHER ORDER ARISING OUT OF THE SAFE YIELD RESET WHICH WOULD COVER WHAT I THINK WE NEED, WHICH IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK TO YOU ON THE OBMP ELEMENT IN SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER TIME FRAME. WE HAVE A LOT OF THINGS THAT WE ARE WORKING ON IN FRONT OF US, AND WE WOULD APPRECIATE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEE YOUR HONOR IN THE SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER TIME FRAME ON THE PROGRESS OF THE OBMP.

THE COURT: OKAY. SO WHAT I'LL DO IS WHEN WE GET

TOGETHER AGAIN ON THE 10TH OF JULY, I'LL GIVE YOU -- WORK

OUT A DATE. I'LL GIVE YOU A COUPLE.

MR. SLATER: PERFECT.

THE COURT: EVERYTHING SEEMS TO BE BETTER ON A FRIDAY

AFTERNOON, I HOPE FOR YOU. IT WORKS PRETTY WELL FOR ME.

AND FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE TRAVELING A DISTANCE, SORRY.

MR. SLATER: YOU KNOW, YOUR HONOR, IT'S ACTUALLY PREFERABLE. IT'S A GOOD DAY FOR US. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. SO WE WILL WORK OUT A DATE.

I'LL LOOK AT MY CALENDAR. AND WHILE I'M LOOKING AT DATES,

WOULD YOU PREFER SEPTEMBER OR OCTOBER? JUST SO I HAVE A

LITTLE BIT -- A RANGE OF OPTIONS.

MR. SLATER: YOUR HONOR, I THINK WE'D PREFER TO SPLIT
IT AND WE SAY LATE SEPTEMBER WOULD BE GREAT.

THE COURT: OKAY. GOT IT. SO WE WILL SHOOT FOR THE LAST COUPLE OF FRIDAYS -- I WILL LOOK AT MY CALENDAR FOR THE LAST TWO FRIDAYS IN SEPTEMBER AND EVERYBODY ELSE DO THE SAME SO THAT WE CAN COME TO AN AGREEMENT. AND I'LL SET A FUTURE HEARING. IT WILL BE ONE OF THE LAST FREE FRIDAYS IN SEPTEMBER FOR FURTHER HEARING. AND WE CAN SET THAT DATE ON JULY 10 WHEN EVERYBODY COMES BACK.

MR. SLATER: PERFECT, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THE COURT: OKAY. HERE IN THE COURTROOM, ANYTHING

FURTHER ON WHAT I CALL THE WATERMASTER RESET MOTION? HERE

IN THE COURTROOM, ANYTHING FURTHER TODAY? NO HANDS. OKAY.

ON THE PHONE, ANYONE ELSE WANT TO CHIME IN?

GOING ONCE. GOING TWICE. ALL RIGHT. THAT IS ALL THAT WE

WILL DO TODAY ON THE WATERMASTER RESET MOTION.

THE HEARING IS FIRM THEN, JULY 10 AT 1:30. I
WILL JUST INDICATE THAT THE HEARING AGAIN WILL BE HERE IN
THIS COURTROOM -- OOPS, I WILL NOT INDICATE THAT IT'S GOING
TO BE HERE IN THIS COURTROOM BECAUSE I HAVE TO RESERVE THIS
COURTROOM. AND SO I WILL TRY TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE IN
ANOTHER LARGE COURTROOM. THERE ARE SEVERAL HERE ON THIS
FLOOR. WITH A LITTLE LUCK, WE WILL BE BACK HERE IN S-1. IF
IT'S NOT AVAILABLE, WE WILL DO THE BEST WE CAN IN MY INITIAL
COURTROOM ON THE TENTH FLOOR, S-35, AND PICK IT UP FROM
THERE. BUT JUST WANT TO LET YOU KNOW, LOGISTICALLY, I HOPE
TO HAVE IT HERE IN S-1. AND IT WILL BE POSTED ON THE DOOR

IN S-35 IF WE ARE HAVING IT SOMEPLACE ELSE. SO TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED IN S-35. IF IT'S -- AND SO YOU ALL KNOW WHERE TO GO AT LEAST INITIALLY. AND IF YOU WANT TO -- I SHOULD KNOW A DAY OR TWO AHEAD OF TIME WHERE THE ACTUAL LOCATION IS GOING TO BE IF YOU WANT TO CHECK ON THAT AND SAVE YOURSELF AN ELEVATOR RIDE HERE IN SBJC.

ALL RIGHT. LET'S TURN NOW TO MS. EGOSCUE'S MOTION. GIVE ME A MOMENT WHILE I GET THAT PAPERWORK.

HERE WE GO AGAIN. IN MY LOOKING THROUGH THE PAPERWORK, IT LOOKED TO ME LIKE, MS. EGOSCUE, YOUR NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES
DISTRICT'S JOINDER TO MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT AND CITY OF ONTARIO'S OPPOSITION AND REQUEST TO SUBMIT A SUR-REPLY DIDN'T MAKE IT IN THE ROA.

MS. EGOSCUE: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M GLAD THAT YOU

CAUGHT THAT AS WELL. I ALSO THINK -- AND IT'S HARD BECAUSE

THERE HAVE BEEN SO MANY FILINGS, THAT WE MIGHT BE MISSING

TWO MORE. I DID A ROUGH COUNT. SO I THINK WE, IN THE

INTEREST OF JUSTICE, SHOULD NOT HEAR THIS MOTION. WE SHOULD

TAKE THE TIME TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL THE FILINGS ARE IN.

THERE IS DEFINITELY NOT THE MOTION TO STRIKE THEIR JOINDER.

AND BECAUSE OUR FILING WAS DONE SO LONG AGO, THAT MIGHT BE

PART OF IT IS THAT THE JURUPA FILING CAME IN JUST -- WELL, I

THINK IT WAS LAST WEEK.

THE COURT: BECAUSE THERE WAS A JURUPA -- THIS IS

MS. GRADY. YOUR FILING, JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES

DISTRICT -- SERVICES DISTRICT'S JOINDER TO MONTE VISTA WATER

DISTRICT AND CITY OF ONTARIO'S OPPOSITION AND REQUEST TO

SUBMIT A SUR-REPLY ALSO DIDN'T SHOW UP IN THE ROA. SO CAN I

JUST ADDRESS THIS, THE SUR-REPLY ISSUE SO WE CAN GET THE

PLEADINGS BECAUSE WHAT I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO DO IS SEE IF I

CAN RULE ON THIS ON JULY 10 AS WELL AND GET -- FINALLY GET

THIS ISSUE RESOLVED. CAN SOMEONE GIVE ME SOME INSIGHT AS TO

WHAT'S GOING ON? PERHAPS YOU, MS. GRADY, AS A START.

MS. GRADY: YES, YOUR HONOR. SO AS NOTED IN THE OPPOSITION THAT WAS FILED BY MONTE VISTA AND ONTARIO AT THE END OF LAST YEAR, THEY HAD, AMONG OTHER THINGS, A TIME-OUT TO SEE IF THESE ISSUES COULD BE RESOLVED TRYING TO DETERMINE THE PURPOSE OR THE DESIRE OF AG. POOL'S REQUEST TO INCORPORATE A PORTION, BUT NOT ALL, OF SECTION 5.4 FROM THE PEACE AGREEMENT INTO THE POOLING PLAN WHICH, AS YOUR HONOR'S AWARE, IS PART OF THE JUDGMENT THAT CONTROLS AND IS, YOU KNOW, ON A DIFFERENT LEVEL THAN THE CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT AMONG THE PARTIES.

DEFER TO LET THE OTHER PARTIES WHO ARE ENGAGED IN SPECIFIC
CONVERSATIONS SPEAK TO THOSE -- SOME CONVERSATIONS CONTINUED
BUT CONCERNS WERE RAISED ON BEHALF OF JCSD WHOM WE REPRESENT
ABOUT THE COST AND THE SCOPE, AS ADDRESSED IN THE SUR-REPLY,
OF THE FEES WHAT THE APPROPRIATE POOL IS BEING ASKED TO PAY
FOR ON BEHALF OF THE AGRICULTURAL POOL. THIS WAS AN ISSUE
THAT WAS TOUCHED UPON IN THE OPPOSITION PAPERS. AND JCSD,
WE FOUGHT TO SUBMIT A SUR-REPLY JUST TO PROVIDE FOR THE
CONTEXT TO THE COURT REGARDING AN ISSUE. IT DOES NOT
PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION, PER SE, THAT'S NEW TO THE COURT OR
THAT, YOU KNOW, THE OTHER PARTIES WOULDN'T OTHERWISE BE

AWARE OF. JUST CONTACT AROUND THE PARTICULAR CONCERNS THAT JCSD HAS IN RELATION TO THIS MOTION.

AND IN ANSWER TO THE ISSUE RAISED IN THE AG. POOL'S MOTION TO STRIKE, I CAN GO FURTHER INTO THE MOTION TO STRIKE. BUT WE WOULD JUST ASSERT THAT THE MOTION TO STRIKE WAS IMPROPER PROCEDURALLY. A MOTION TO STRIKE DOESN'T APPLY TO THIS TYPE OF DOCUMENT OR FILING, AND THAT THE REQUEST TO FILE A SUR-REPLY IS EXACTLY THAT, IT'S A REQUEST TO THE COURT. AND THE COURT HAS DISCRETION TO ACCEPT OR DENY ANY FILING THAT'S OUTSIDE OF THE TYPICAL THREE DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED. AND A SUR-REPLY IS NOT UNUSUAL AND WE WOULD PROVIDE THAT THERE HAS BEEN TIME FOR THE AG. POOL TO RESPOND. AND IF THIS IS BEING CONTINUED, THERE'S CERTAINLY MORE TIME.

THE COURT: GOT IT. THANK YOU, MS. GRADY.

MS. EGOSCUE.

MS. EGOSCUE: YOUR HONOR, CONTRARY TO WHAT JCSD'S

ATTORNEY JUST TOLD YOU, THEIR SUR-REPLY ACTUALLY DOES ARGUE

A PARTICULAR IN LIMINE INTERPRETATION OF THE PEACE

AGREEMENT, AND THERE IS NO MOTION CURRENTLY PENDING FOR THE

COURT'S INTERPRETATION OF THE AGREEMENT WHICH JCSD'S

ATTORNEYS ALSO ADMIT IN THEIR FILING.

THIS FILING IS SPURIOUS. IT IS LATE. IT IS NOT APPROPRIATELY BEFORE THE COURT. THIS MOTION WAS COMPLETE IN TERM OF FILING MANY MONTHS AGO. AND THE AG. POOL WOULD LIKE TO MOVE FORWARD.

I AGAIN REITERATE THAT I DO NOT THINK WE SHOULD BE HEARING THIS MOTION TODAY DUE TO THE INCOMPLETE

RECORD. BUT SINCE THE ATTORNEY FOR JCSD OPENED THE DOOR, SO TO SPEAK, I MUST RESPOND.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

MS. EGOSCUE: THE AG. POOL WAS SEEKING TO AMEND ITS
POOLING PLAN TO REFLECT THE PRACTICE OF THE AG. POOL FOR
MANY YEARS. THIS PRACTICE PROCEEDED WITHOUT OBJECTION BY
ANY PARTY. THIS WAS A MINISTERIAL ACT. THIS MOTION
REFLECTS THE AG. POOL SEEKING TO UPDATE THE RULES AND
REGULATIONS WHICH CANNOT BE DONE IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE
POOLING PLAN. SO THEY BOTH HAVE TO MOVE TOGETHER.

THE AG. POOL WITH EXTRAORDINARY AND EXTRA

NOTICE TO THE PARTIES BROUGHT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT THROUGH

THE POOLS IN OCTOBER IN ADDITION TO THE PROPOSED AMENDED

RULES AND REGULATIONS. AT THAT TIME, THE NON-AG. POOL

APPROVED BOTH. THE APPROPRIATIVE POOL DID NOT TAKE A

POSITION. AND, IN FACT, THE AG. POOL DID OBVIOUSLY APPROVE

THAT AND DIRECTED ME TO FILE WITH THIS COURT.

OPPOSITIONS COME IN. THERE WAS A MOTION TO STRIKE THAT WAS FILED AGAINST CHINO'S OPPOSITION WHICH WENT UNANSWERED, I WILL NOTE, WHICH MEANS THAT IT IS NOW NO LONGER ACTIVE. AND THE AG. POOL SUBMITTED A REPLY THAT ACTUALLY IS IN CONCERT WITH WHAT THE APPROPRIATIVE POOL FILED WHICH IS THAT THE POOLING PLAN AMENDMENTS DO NOT IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM AMEND THE PEACE AGREEMENT. IT'S CLEAR ON THE FACE OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE POOLING PLAN. AND IT'S CLEAR IN THE FILINGS BEFORE THIS COURT.

THE COURT: OKAY. I SEE -- DID A HAND COME UP?

1 GO AHEAD, PLEASE, COUNSEL. CAN I GET YOUR 2 APPEARANCE, PLEASE. 3 MR. GAGEN: YES. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. ANDREW GAGEN 4 ON BEHALF OF MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT, OPPOSING PARTIES. 5 THE COURT: YES. GO AHEAD, PLEASE. 6 MR. GAGEN: THE VERY ACTION OF CARVING OUT LANGUAGE 7 FROM SECTION 5.4 OF THE PEACE AGREEMENT AND ELEVATING IT TO 8 THE JUDGMENT IS AMENDING THE PEACE AGREEMENT. THE COURT 9 DOES NOT HAVE TO LOOK ANY FURTHER THAN SECTION 4.4 IN THE 10 PEACE AGREEMENT WHICH ALLOWS FOR THREE, AND THREE ONLY, 11 PROVISIONS WITHIN THE PEACE AGREEMENT TO BE ELEVATED TO THE 12 JUDGMENT. 13 THE DRAFTERS OF THE PEACE AGREEMENT, THE 14 PARTIES THAT SIGNED THE PEACE AGREEMENT INCLUDING AG. POOL, 15 AGREED AT THAT TIME FOR THREE AND THREE ONLY PROVISIONS TO 16 BE ELEVATED TO THE JUDGMENT. 17 WHAT THE AG. POOL IS PROPOSING TODAY IS TO 18 CARVE OUT LANGUAGE FROM THE PEACE AGREEMENT IN SECTION 5.4 19 AND ELEVATE IT TO THE JUDGMENT. THAT WOULD BE NOW ITEM 20 NUMBER 4 IN SECTION 4.4 TO BE ELEVATED TO THE JUDGMENT WHEN 21 THE PEACE AGREEMENT DOES NOT ALLOW FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN 22 THE THREE PROVISIONS THAT ARE IN SECTION 4.4 OF THE PEACE 23 AGREEMENT. 24 THE COURT: GOT IT. THANK YOU FOR THAT SUCCINCT

ARGUMENT.

I CAN SEE ANOTHER HAND COMING UP.

MR. SCHATZ.

25

26

27

2.8

MR. SCHATZ: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

JUST TO CLARIFY SOMETHING THAT MS. EGOSCUE

JUST SAID. THE APPROPRIATE POOL POSITION IS THAT SO LONG AS

THE IMPORT REMAINING INTERPRETATION APPLY IS NOT CHANGED BY

RESULT OF ELEVATION OF JUDGMENT, THEN WE ARE NOT OPPOSED.

WE WOULD BE OPPOSED IF IT DOES.

THE COURT: OKAY. I GOT THAT.

ALL RIGHT. SO DO I NEED A SUR-REPLY?

MR. FUDACZ: YOUR HONOR?

THE COURT: SOMEONE ELSE, PLEASE?

MR. FUDACZ: YES, YOUR HONOR. FRED FUDACZ ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ONTARIO.

I WOULD REINFORCE THE COMMENTS MADE BY

MR. GAGEN THAT THIS IS SIMPLY A MATTER OF CONTRACT LAW. WE

HAVE A PROVISION IN THE PEACE AGREEMENT THAT SAYS, THOU

SHALT NOT ELEVATE ANYTHING EXCEPT THESE THREE PROVISIONS

INTO THE JUDGMENT, WHICH IS IN EFFECT OUR CONSTITUTION. IT

GOES BEYOND ANY AGREEMENT AMONG THE PARTIES. AND THEY ARE

SEEKING TO DO THAT IN THE FACE OF THAT PROVISION.

THEORETICAL LEGAL ISSUE HERE. APPROPRIATE POOL MEMBERS ARE BEING ASKED TO PAY HUNDRED OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS OF ATTORNEY'S FEES THAT JUST AREN'T BEING INCURRED CONSISTENT WITH THE PEACE AGREEMENT AS A WHOLE. SO HOWEVER CHARACTERIZED BY THE AG. POOL, THIS CLEARLY IS AN AMENDMENT. AND WHEN YOU AMEND AN AGREEMENT, AND PARTICULARLY IN THIS CASE WHERE IT'S REQUIRED UNDER THE SECTION APPLICABLE TO AMENDMENTS IN THE PEACE AGREEMENT THAT EVERYONE CONSENT, YOU CAN'T DO THAT. THERE HASN'T EVEN BEEN AN ATTEMPT HERE TO

AMEND THE AGREEMENT BY CONSENT. WE DID TRY TO MEET AND CONFER. YOUR HONOR SHOULD BE AWARE THAT WE DIDN'T GET ANYWHERE. SO THAT'S WHY WE ARE HERE BEFORE YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OKAY. SO THE QUESTION I HAVE

GOT NOW IS DO I NEED A SUR-REPLY AFTER THIS ARGUMENT?

SOMEONE LIKE --

MS. EGOSCUE: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE QUITE A LITIGIOUS BUNCH AND SINCE THE RECORD IS NOT QUITE CLEAR, I THINK THAT WE SHOULD CONTINUE THE MATTER AND BE BEFORE YOU AGAIN IN TWO WEEKS TO HAVE A DECISION WHEN WE ARE ASSURED THAT THERE IS A COMPLETE RECORD.

THE MOTION NEEDS TO BE PRESERVED AS IT WAS
FILED. IF COUNSEL WOULD LIKE TO BRING IN OTHER EVIDENCE OF
FACTUAL ASSERTIONS OR STATEMENTS, THAT IS A DIFFERENT
MOTION. MR. FUDACZ WAS STARTING TO DISCUSS FEES AND THE
COST OF THOSE. THAT'S NOT WHAT IS BEFORE THIS COURT. WHAT
IS BEFORE THE COURT IS SOMETHING THAT THE AG. POOL HAS BEEN
DOING FOR A DECADE. AND THEY WERE ASKED TO CLEAN UP THEIR
RULES AND REGULATIONS IN THEIR POOLING PLAN, AND THEY HAVE
ATTEMPTED TO DO SO. THIS ISN'T ELEVATING ANYTHING. IT'S
NOT CHANGING THE IMPORT. IT'S SIMPLY REFLECTING LEGALLY
WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE WATERMASTER PROCESS.

BELIEVE ME, YOUR HONOR, I THINK THAT THE

OTHER ISSUES THAT ARE ELUDED TO WILL BE BEFORE YOU SHORTLY.

BUT IT IS NOT PART OF THIS, NOR IS IT APPROPRIATE TO THIS

MOTION.

THE COURT: OKAY. MR. GAGEN, GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

MR. GAGEN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

SOMETHING THAT THE COURT SAID IN REGARDS TO
THE 2017 RESET IN ITS ORDER, THE APRIL 2017 RESET ORDER, IN
REGARDS TO SOMETHING THAT WATERMASTER HAD DONE. THE COURT
SAID THIS: EVEN THOUGH SOMETHING HAS BEEN DONE WRONG FOR A
LONG TIME DOESN'T MAKE IT RIGHT.

AND SO THAT IS AN ARGUMENT THAT WE WOULD
ASSERT AGAINST THE AG. POOL'S ASSERTION THAT THIS IS

AND SO THAT IS AN ARGUMENT THAT WE WOULD ASSERT AGAINST THE AG. POOL'S ASSERTION THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR A LONG TIME, SO THEREFORE IT'S OKAY TO DO WHAT ITS TRYING TO DO WHICH IS AMEND THE PEACE AGREEMENT.

THE COURT: I GOT IT. OKAY.

2.8

I SEE MR. GUTIERREZ. YES, MR. GUTIERREZ, GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

MR. GUTIERREZ: YOUR HONOR, ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF CHINO. I DON'T ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE CITY OF CHINO'S JOINDER IS NOT BEFORE THE COURT. I RECOGNIZE THAT THE AG. POOL FILED A MOTION TO STRIKE, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT THE MOTION TO STRIKE IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE STATUTES THAT ARE MENTIONED IN THAT MOTION.

NEXT I WOULD LIKE TO STATE THAT THE CITY OF CHINO CONCURS WITH THE STATEMENTS MADE BY MR. GAGEN AND MR. FUDACZ AND MR. SCHATZ.

THE COURT: GOT IT.

CAN I COME BACK TO MY QUESTION: DO I NEED A SUR-REPLY NOW? I HAVE HEARD QUITE A BIT OF ARGUMENT. SOMEONE LIKE TO CHIME IN?

MS. GRADY: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS SHAWNDA GRADY.

I WOULD STILL RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THE

COURT ACCEPT THE FILINGS OF THE SUR-REPLY TO ACKNOWLEDGE -AND I THINK TO FOLLOW IN THE HISTORY OF THIS COURT'S

PRACTICE WHICH IS PROVIDING THE PARTIES OPPORTUNITY TO BE

HEARD ON MATTERS THAT IMPACT THE PARTIES MOVING FORWARD.

JCSD IS PARTLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE IMPACT OF THE AG. POOL'S

REQUEST. I WOULD DISAGREE WITH THE CHARACTERIZATION OF MY

REPRESENTATION OF PAPERS -- WASN'T AN ADMISSION BUT AN

ACKNOWLEDGMENT THAT THE MATTER BEFORE THE COURT PRESENTLY IS

NOT THE DISPUTE OF FEES. I WOULD AGREE WITH MS. EGOSCUE

THAT I ANTICIPATE IS SOMETHING THAT WE WILL BE COLLECTIVELY

VISITING SOONER RATHER THAN LATER.

HOWEVER, I THINK AS ARTICULATED IN THE
PAPERS, IT'S RELEVANT TO THE COURT'S CONSIDERATION AND
UNDERSTANDING ABOUT THE PARTIES' CONCERN OF ELEVATING THIS
PORTION OF THE PEACE AGREEMENT INTO THE JUDGMENT. AND I
THINK, FINALLY, YOU KNOW, THAT IS AN OBLIGATION FOR THE
AG. POOL TO ESTABLISH THE NEED FOR THAT TO OCCUR. AND OUR
SUR-REPLY JUST PROVIDES FURTHER COMMENTARY ON WHAT THE
CONCERNS ARE OF THE OTHER PARTIES IN THAT REGARD.

THE COURT: OKAY. ANYTHING FURTHER?

MR. TANAKA: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS GENE TANAKA FOR RANCHO CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT.

YOUR HONOR, I'M A LITTLE UNCLEAR IF YOU'RE
PLANNING TO CONTINUE IT BUT I DON'T WANT TO MISS THE

OPPORTUNITY -- I'LL WITHHOLD ANY COMMENTS IF YOU'RE GOING TO

CONTINUE IT, BUT IF YOU WANT TO HEAR COMMENTS AS PART OF

MAKING THE DECISION TO CONTINUE, THEN I WILL GO AHEAD AND

SET FORTH THE POINT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE ABOUT MY OPPOSITION

TO THE MOTION.

THE COURT: I'M GOING TO CONTINUE IT.

MR. TANAKA: OKAY. SO THEN I WILL SAVE THE COURT AND THE PARTIES TIME AND HOLD OFF.

THE COURT: OKAY. THE QUESTION I HAVE GOT THEN, IT SOUNDS LIKE, IS TO ALLOW A SUR-REPLY. AND I AM GOING TO ALLOW A SUR-REPLY ON ONE HAND. ON THE OTHER HAND, I NEED TO FIGURE OUT SOME WAY TO STOP THE BRIEFING ON THIS SO WE ARE NOT INTO A SUR-REPLY, SUR-OPPOSITION, A SUR-SUR-SUR-REPLY, A SUR-SUR-OPPOSITION, AND BRING IT TO A CLOSE SOMEHOW. AND I'M OPEN TO SUGGESTIONS ON HOW I MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO THAT AND STILL KEEP THE HEARING ON THIS SET FOR JULY 10 WHEN EVERYBODY ELSE IS GOING TO BE HERE, QUOTE, ANYWAYS, CLOSE QUOTE.

MR. GAGEN.

MR. GAGEN: YES, SIR. YES, YOUR HONOR.

SIMILAR TO WHAT THE COURT ORDERED WITH THE
MOTION TO APPROVE THE SAFE YIELD RESET, CAN WE JUST AGREE TO
HAVE THE MATTER DEEMED NO MORE PAPERS TO BE FILED?

THE COURT: WELL, THAT WAS -- IF I DO A SUR-REPLY, THEN SOMEBODY COULD BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO THE SUR-REPLY. AND SO --

MR. GAGEN: YOU ARE REFERRING TO JURUPA'S?

THE COURT: YEAH. YEAH. SO I'M THINKING -- ONE
THOUGHT THAT OCCURRED TO ME IS THAT I LIMIT THE SUR-REPLY OF
JURUPA TO FIVE PAGES. SO IT'S NOT LENGTHY. AND THEN
MS. EGOSCUE, YOU ADDRESS IT ORALLY AT THE HEARING. AND HOW
DOES -- I CAN'T -- AT LEAST WE WILL HAVE -- EVERYBODY WILL

1 HAVE A CHANCE TO BE HEARD AT LENGTH AT THE HEARING AND YOU 2 CAN GET YOUR PAPERWORK FILED AND THE COURT'S DUE PROCESS 3 OBLIGATIONS ARE MET. AND I'M OPEN TO ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS, 4 MR. GAGEN. 5 MR. GAGEN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. IS THERE A 6 MISUNDERSTANDING BECAUSE THE JCSD HAS ALREADY SUBMITTED ITS 7 SUR-REPLY? 8 THE COURT: IT HAS. OKAY. YES, THAT'S RIGHT. 9 MR. GAGEN: IT WAS ATTACHED TO THE REQUEST. 10 THE COURT: IT WAS. THANKS. OKAY. I HAVE GOT IT. 11 SO YOU WANT TO REPLY, MS. EGOSCUE? 12 MS. EGOSCUE: I HAD -- DID THE REPLY, YOUR HONOR. IT'S 13 NOT BEFORE YOU. SO THE FILING -- I DIDN'T RESPOND TO 14 JURUPA'S FILING WHICH IS -- FURTHER UNDERSCORES THE NEED TO 15 CONTINUE --16 THE COURT: OKAY. 17 MS. EGOSCUE: -- THE HEARING. BUT I WOULD ALSO SUPPORT 18 NO FURTHER BRIEFING OR EVIDENCE BEFORE YOUR HONOR ON THIS 19 MATTER. IT'S BEEN LONG OVERDUE. AND WE KNOW WHAT'S COMING 20 AND THEY CAN FILE ANOTHER MOTION TO ADDRESS IT. 21 THE COURT: OKAY. IN THAT EVENT, NO FURTHER BRIEFING. 22 MS. EGOSCUE: THANK YOU. 23 THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME. THANK YOU, EVERYONE. 24 I WILL HEAR THE MOTION. I HAVE GOT THE 25 SUR-REPLY. I HAVE GOT THE RESPONSE OF MS. EGOSCUE. THAT'S 26 A WRAP ON THE MOTION ON THE POOLING PLAN. 27 I SEE MR. SLATER ARISING TO ADDRESS THE

28

COURT. MR. SLATER.

1	MR. SLATER: YES, YOUR HONOR. JUST TO WAS GOING TO
2	OFFER TO PROVIDE NOTICE AS A COURTESY FOR THE ORDERS GIVEN
3	TODAY BY THE COURT.
4	THE COURT: THANK YOU SO MUCH, MR. SLATER. I
5	APPRECIATE YOUR WILLINGNESS TO DO THAT AND GRANT THAT
6	REQUEST GRATEFULLY.
7	ANYTHING ELSE I NEED TO ADDRESS TODAY BEFORE
8	WE ALL RECONVENE ON JULY 10TH? GOING ONCE. GOING TWICE.
9	COURT IS IN RECESS. THANK YOU EVERYONE FOR
10	ALL OF YOUR HELP. SEE YOU ON THE 10TH AT 1:30.
11	/ / /
12	(PROCEEDINGS FOR THE DAY WERE CONCLUDED.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
3	: SS. COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO )
4	
5	
6	I, D'ANNE GOATCHER, PRO TEM REPORTER FOR THE SUPERIOR
7	COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
8	SAN BERNARDINO, DO HEREBY CERTIFY:
9	THAT AS SUCH REPORTER, I REPORTED IN MACHINE SHORTHAND
10	THE PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE FOREGOING CASE;
11	THAT MY NOTES WERE TRANSCRIBED INTO TYPEWRITING UNDER
12	MY DIRECTION AND THE PROCEEDINGS HELD ON JUNE 26, 2020,
13	CONTAINED WITHIN PAGES 1 THROUGH 49, ARE A TRUE AND CORRECT
14	TRANSCRIPTION.
15	
16	DATED THIS 5TH DAY OF JUNE, 2020.
17	
18	D. Bacher
19	D'ANNE GOATCHER
20	CSR NO. 11726
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	