1 2	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3	DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE
4	
5	SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, A)
	CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT CORPORATION,)
6) Case No. 19STCP01176
	Petitioner,)
7)
	vs.
8)
	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL)
9	BOARD etc., et al.,
)
10	Respondents.)
)
11	
	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS.
12)
13	/
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15	JULY 6, 2021
16	IN-PERSON APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
17	For Respondent and Cross-Complainant City of Buenaventura:
18	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
1.0	BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO, ESQ.
19	300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
	Los Angeles, California 90071
20	(213) 617-8100
	christopher.pisano@bbklaw.com
21	
	BEST, BEST & KRIEGER LLP
22	BY: SHAWN D. HAGERTY, ESQ.
	655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
23	San Diego, California 92101
	(619) 525-1327
24	Shawn.Hagerty@bbklaw.com
25	(Appearances Continued Next Page)
26	
	REPORTED BY: DEBORAH MORIN, CSR NO. 11558
27	OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE
28	
	Page 1
	rage 1

1 2	IN-PERSON APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
3	For Casitas Municipal Water District:
4	RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP
	BY: DAVID S. COSGROVE, ESQ.
5	611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400 Costa Mesa, California 92626
6	(714) 641-5100
7	, ,
8	REMOTE LACOURTCONNECT APPEARANCES:
9	
10	For Ventura County Watershed Protection District:
11	HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
	BY: NATHAN A. METCALF, ESQ.
12	425 Market Street, 26th Floor
1 2	San Francisco, California 94105
13	(415) 777-3200
14	NMetcalf@hansonbridgett.com
15	For Claude R. Baggerly and Patricia E. Baggerly:
16	IN PRO PER
	CLAUDE R. BAGGERLY
17	PATRICIA E. BAGGERLY
	119 South Poli Avenue
18	Ojai, California 93023
	(805) 646-0767
19	
20	For the California Department of Fish & Wildlife:
21	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
22	NATURAL RESOURCES LAW SECTION
22	BY: ERIC M. KATZ,
23	SUPERVISING DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
	300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
24	Los Angeles, California 90013
	(213) 269-6323
25	Eric.Katz@doj.ca.gov
26	
27	
28	
	Page 2

1	REMOTE LACOURTCONNECT APPEARANCES:
2	For the Otate Water Department Control Departs
3 4	For the State Water Resources Control Board: CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE BY: MARC N. MELNICK,
5	DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
6	P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, California 94612
7	(510) 879-0750 Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov
8	
9	For Rancho Matilija Mutual Water Company:
10	FERGUSON CASE ORR PATERSON LLP BY: SHANTAL RAZBAN-NIA, ESQ.
11	1050 South Kimball Road
	Ventura, California 93004
12	(805) 659-6800
1.0	srazban-nia@fcoplaw.com
13 14	For Jeffrey S. Bacon, Trustee of the Villa Nero Trust:
15	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE
	MALLORY & NATSIS LLP
16	BY: DAVID L. OSIAS, ESQ.
17	600 West Broadway, Suite 27 San Diego, California 92101
	(619) 211-1526
18	KDemorest@allenmatkins.com
19	
20	For the Cross-Defendant Department of Parks and Recreation:
20	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
21	LAND LAW SECTION
	BY: CARLOS A. MEJIA,
22	DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
23	1300 I Street Sacramento, California 95814
23	(916) 210-7822
24	Carlos.Mejia@doj.ca.gov
25	
26 27	
27	
	Page 3

[
1 2	REMOTE LACOURTCONNECT APPEARANCES:
3	For Erica Abrams, et al.:
	FOI EIICA ADIAMS, Et al.:
4	
	RYAN BLATZ LAW
5	BY: RYAN W. BLATZ, ESQ.
	109 North Blanche Street, Suite 103
6	Ojai, California 93023
	(805) 798-2249
7	ryan@ryanblatzlaw.com
8	For Cross-Defendants Rosanna Garrison and Gregg Garrison:
9	GARRISON LAW CORPORATION
	BY: GREGG GARRISON, ESQ.
10	12986 MacDonald Drive
	Ojai, California 93023
11	(650) 726-1111
	gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com
12	
13	For the City of Ojai:
14	BARTKIEWICZ, KRONICK & SHANAHAN
	BY: HOLLY JACOBSON, ESQ.
15	1011 22nd Street
	Sacramento, California
16	(916) 325-0658
17	(310) 323 0030
18	Also present via LACourtConnect:
19	Gina Angiolilo, AGR Breeding, Inc.
20	Peter Duchesnea, Area Energy, LLC
21	William Carter, 4205 Thacher Road, LLC
22	Jason Canger, County of Ventura
23	Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust
24	Patricia Tsao, Ventura Land Trust
25	David Ossentjuk, Robert Martin
26	Andrew Whitman
27	ATICLE W WILL CHICALL
28	
	D 4
	Page 4

1	CASE NAME:	SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER VS.
2	S	TATE WATER RESOURCES BOARD
3	CASE NUMBER: 1	.9STCP01176
4	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA J	TULY 6, 2021
5	DEPARTMENT 10	ON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER
6	REPORTER: D	EBORAH MORIN, CSR NO. 11558
7	APPEARANCES: (AS HERETOFORE MENTIONED.)
8	TIME: 2	2:10 P.M.
9		
10	THE COURT: Okay.	We're on the record in
11	19STCP01176, Santa Barbara C	hannelkeeper vs. State Water
12	Resources Control Board.	
13	I've got Mr. Pisan	o and Mr. Hagerty here for the
14	City of San Buenaventura, mo	ere commonly referred to as
15	City of Ventura; Mr. Cosgrov	re for Casitas Water District;
16	and various lawyers appearing	g through LACourtConnect.
17	In terms of new pa	perwork for today, I have
18	printed out the June 25th se	ervice document, which was also
19	filed by the City of Ventura	in response to the court's
20	request, which is a citation	to 34 items which Mr. Hagerty
21	and his team believe are dem	nonstrative of the
22	interconnection of the subsu	rface water in the area in
23	question with the repairing	flows.
24	More specific to t	oday's event, I have the City
25	of Ventura's July 2nd filing	, a filing by Allen Matkins
26	and co-counsel for Jeffrey B	Bacon as trustee of a certain
27	trust filed or actually s	served on Case Anywhere July 2.
28	I didn't find it in the cour	t's record yet, but hopefully

the Allen Matkins lawyers will remember to get it filed if they haven't already.

And likewise pulled off of File & ServeXpress served under the date of today, this morning, at 9:43 by Mr. Gregg Garrison, an attorney representing himself and his spouse, a document generally described as objections to lodgement of proposed physical solution and statement in support of court-appointed scientific expert. And then there's certain other collateral filings by the City of Ventura that aren't really statements specific to today's further status conference.

I am informed by the City of Ventura that they've requested that the continued order to show cause regarding service by publication of certain cross-defendants be continued to July 19, and we have already continued it to the afternoon of July 19 as requested by the City of Ventura. So nothing more needs to be said on that topic from my point of view.

Do I have a lawyer for the State, whether it's Water Resources or Fish & Game, such as Attorney Melnick, with us via LACourtConnect? I didn't get any filings from the State, though I thought the State continued to be energized with opposition to the receipt of the court of the proposed physical solution.

Has the State laid down its objections,
Mr. Melnick and Mr. Eric Katz, in that regard, or is the
State still displeased with the idea that the current
version of the physical solution should be put in front of

1 yours truly? MR. MELNICK: Your Honor, good afternoon. 2 3 Marc Melnick from the Attorney General's Office. 4 You're correct that we didn't file anything. 5 didn't feel we needed to waste any more paper. I think we 6 talked about this last time. Our view is that it's a settlement document. We are hoping to have more settlement conversations, and that's just not the greatest 8 9 idea. 10 If Your Honor does want to see it, we don't have an objection per se, but we would suggest that rather than 11 12 getting a one-sided view of the physical solution, that you entertain filings from other parties that comment on 13 14 its efficacy. 15 THE COURT: Well, that is certainly a possibility, and I will say that the recent submission by 16 17 Attorney Garrison on behalf of himself and his wife makes a very specific suggestion that the document be marked 18 19 Draft and that -- no, actually that wasn't from Mr. Garrison. That was from Allen Matkins' papers 2.0 suggesting that it be marked Draft and Section 8 in their 21 22 view proposed findings be deleted outright. 23 Mr. Garrison has some other objections to the 24 draft physical solution, though that would really be more a question of the substance of it than whether or not the 25 court should see it at this point in time. 26 Different question. Do I have Mr. Katz for Fish 2.7 28 & Game?

1	MR. KATZ: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Any news, good, bad, or otherwise,
3	on progress towards getting the State's water flow
4	analysis issued? I think you're the point of the spear on
5	that, or do you hand that back to Mr. Melnick for Water
6	Resources?
7	MR. KATZ: Well, the Department of Fish &
8	Wildlife is doing its own analyses regarding flow
9	requirements that it believes is what's appropriate and
10	needed for fish. The Department has released its flow
11	recommendations for the lower Ventura earlier in the year.
12	It opened it up to public comment. It extended that
13	public comment, and it's in the process of finalizing
14	that.
15	And then I think Mr. Melnick can talk about what
16	the State Water Resources is doing with regard to its
17	surface water groundwater modeling.
18	THE COURT: So back to you, Mr. Melnick. I
19	guess when I speak about waiting for Giddeaux [phonetic],
20	I guess, it's your clients' exertions that are causing me
21	to think about waiting for Giddeaux.
22	MR. MELNICK: Yes, unfortunately, Your Honor.
23	But we're on track to releasing the model next month in
24	August.
25	THE COURT: On the previously proposed date in
26	August, or are we now August 31?
27	MR. MELNICK: We did not specify a date. We're
28	trying to move it as early in the month as possible, but

1	certainly could be towards the end.
2	THE COURT: Well, if it comes out, that will at
3	least be some kind of progress.
4	MR. MELNICK: I agree.
5	THE COURT: Who else wants to be heard that I
6	shouldn't be getting the physical solution under some
7	conditions at this time?
8	For the record, nobody responded further.
9	So I do have the Garrison objection in one
10	fashion. The objection by trustee Bacon setting up some
11	proposed edits to the document before I look at it, and
12	the more broad suggestion of Mr. Katz and Mr. Melnick that
13	there be a chance to provide some kind of color commentary
14	by others at the same time that I get the physical
15	solution.
16	So Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Pisano, as you wish,
17	let's start with the trustee Bacon's two specific edits as
18	reflected in the Allen Matkins filing.
19	MR. HAGERTY: Thank you, Your Honor. Shawn
20	Hagerty for the City. We agree with the draft comment.
21	That's not an issue at all.
22	With respect to Section 8, our position is
23	because it's a draft, you can look at the whole document.
24	Section 8 is just a part of the entire document, and to
25	understand it fully, we believe that that would be
26	appropriate for you to look at that.
27	At the same time, Your Honor, we're interested
28	in just having a decision made on this issue in kind of

1 getting past this. So if it means redacting Section 8, we 2 certainly wouldn't object if we could otherwise submit it 3 to the court. 4 THE COURT: What about the separate suggestion 5 of Mr. Katz that there ought to be an opportunity for some 6 version of color commentary by others as to the wisdom or ill wisdom of the City's draft physical solution as it exists at this time if I am to see it in its current 8 rendition? 9 10 MR. HAGERTY: The parties have already taken the liberty to do that, Your Honor. I know you said you 11 haven't looked at those, but multiple parties have 12 submitted objections that are more substantive in nature. 13 14 We don't have a concern really if there's a structure by 15 which parties can make comments about the efficacy or the issues posed in the physical solution. 16 17 THE COURT: To some extent getting the cards on 18 the table is exactly what the litigation process is all 19 about. So seeing those objections has a benefit in many 20 ways. 21 MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Osias, I see you're joining us via LACourtConnect. Do you want to say anything further 23 in support of deleting the findings? 24 MR. OSIAS: I don't have much to add, Your 25 Honor, other than given the comments of the City, it 26 doesn't sound like they're very -- they're not objecting 27 28 too strenuously to the redaction. If they're redacted,

1 that satisfies our desire that we not argue yet until the 2 physical solution is put in front of Your Honor for purposes of argument, in which case there will be 3 4 appropriate briefs with page limits, service sequencing, 5 et cetera. So that was really what that was about to keep 6 the argument at bay until you determine it's time to do it and then do it in the normal fashion. And I appreciate that they agree that it should 8 be marked Draft so not only Your Honor but everyone knows 9 10 it may change if agreements can be reached. We're hopeful that they can be reached, and we won't have to participate 11 for too much longer, but we'll see. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Garrison, do you have any 13 comments about whether the court ought to see the draft 14 15 physical solution in its current form? MR. GARRISON: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you for 16 17 requesting my input on the issue. I think the document as it stands right now is 18 19 an advocacy document for the City, and I think it's misleading as an advocacy document. 20 21 I would prefer in the sense of justice and equal 22 treatment with the disparity of the parties that we have a court-appointed scientific expert that weighs in on this 23 24 issue so we don't start with an advocacy document but we have a document that's neutral that we can build on to 25 build consensus instead of having a "he takes this 26 position" and "she takes that position." 27 28 counter-position I don't think serves the Court.

1 On other cases that I've worked on with this 2 issue, we do work with neutrals, and that gives us a good 3 common ground. And I think your statement about 4 litigation, put the cards on the table, that's correct. 5 But mediation litigation are also being able to disclose 6 and find common ground, and right now I see very little common ground with this proposed physical solution with its usufructuary language, with the admission of fire 8 9 resistance and what many of the property owners are trying 10 to do. And also with the L.A. Basin, they forgot the 11 interplay in between the surface waters and the 12 groundwaters. In a case I handled in 1991 in Yolo County, 13 it's exactly what we found. Aggregate in-bed creek mining 14 took out the rocks in this riverbed and did not allow it 15 to recharge. Therefore, the groundwater fell. 16 thing we have here. I think we have to increase the 17 18 surface waters to recharge the groundwater system, and the proposed physical solution misses the boat on that point. 19 Thank you, sir. I did enjoy your 2.0 THE COURT: 21 discussion of how the word "usufructuary" -- Madam 22 Reporter, that's spelled u-s-u-f-r-u-c-t-u-a-r-y -- is a piece of legal jargon that is a polite way to hide the 23 24 unreimbursed taking of somebody else's asset. 25 MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, may I --THE COURT: Sends me back to my Black's Law 26 Dictionary from my first year in law school. 2.7 28 MR. HAGERTY: Can I address those three points?

1 I mean, those three points are exactly why we have a 2 current meet and confer. 3 Any party who has a concern about the physical 4 solution should contact us, because all three of those 5 points that Mr. Garrison has made we think can or either 6 already are accommodated or could be made clearer in the physical solution, and that's the kind of ongoing process that we're moving this forward. 8 We believe what we have today, if we were in 9 10 trial, we'd present it to you. But it can always be improved. So on the fire point, of course, we think that 11 that's something that's critical. We would clearly work 12 13 with Mr. Garrison to address that. 14 And the same with regard to -- I mean, we're 15 arguing that there is a connection, and that's what the trial is going to be between the surface water and the 16 17 basin. So we can certainly agree on that point. 18 And then on the usufructuary, Your Honor, all it means is that it's a right to use water. And in 19 California that's not something that we made up. That's 20 the long-standing law that the State owns all the water. 21 22 Everyone has a right to use it who perfects that right, and it becomes a property right. But it's a right to use. 23 24 It's not pure ownership in the traditional sense, Your That's all that means. 25 Honor. THE COURT: So I'm going to do the following. 26 Specific to whether or not it's permissible for the City 27 28 of Ventura to lodge the current draft physical solution,

1	I'm going to authorize its being lodged with the court.
2	How thick is it? How big?
3	MR. HAGERTY: It's right here, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Like a three-ring binder but only a
5	one-inch version of a three-ring binder.
6	MR. HAGERTY: Yeah. It's a hundred-plus pages,
7	Your Honor, with exhibits, but it's manageable. And here
8	it is.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Don't give it to us today
10	because I agree every page ought to get marked Draft. And
11	in the near term it's easier to keep the genie in the
12	bottle than it is to stick it back in the bottle.
13	So leave out Section 8, the findings at the
14	moment, but mark them as redacted so I know where they'd
15	be, and in that sense page by page just show deletions as
16	redacted, and you can lodge that with the court by next
17	Monday and provide a notice of lodging.
18	I infer that for everybody else involved in this
19	case such as Mr. Garrison and Mr. Osias, that this
20	document is readily available, although it has not gotten
21	into my sticky fingers so far; correct, Mr. Hagerty?
22	MR. HAGERTY: That's correct, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Does anybody claim you need access
24	to the document that's going to be lodged with the court
25	to know what I'm getting?
26	I guess you, frankly, ought to serve your
27	redacted version on File & ServeXpress with the word
28	"Draft" added and those Section 8 sections marked out.

1 That way everybody with access to File & Serve Express 2 will have the same document I have. 3 MR. HAGERTY: We will do that, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. But for the purposes of 5 filing with this court, submit like a one or two-page 6 notice of lodging with whatever necessary proof of service 7 attached, and that's the one thing that will go in the public file. 8 9 MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. I will get that by this coming Monday the 12th. I will let others who wish to be 11 educating me about why this is an awful or bad or 12 incomplete thing submit objections to the proposed 13 14 physical solution without prejudice to litigating the issues later in the fullness of time, but if you feel 15 there's something urgent about putting your position in 16 17 front of me, you can do so, but I want them served and filed by close of business on Thursday, July 15, and the 18 19 objections are to be no more than six pages of text without attachments, declarations, or exhibits. 20 21 So you've got to boil it down and state it in 22 summary terms. The six pages doesn't include the caption It doesn't include the proof of service, but in 23 24 terms of the gist of what you want me to read, I don't want more than six pages at this time from anybody. 25 26 If you have previously submitted an objection to the physical solution, do not assume I'm going to go back 2.7 and retrieve them from the file. You're obligated to file 28

1 a new document on or before July 15 if you want something 2 brought to my attention, because I'm not going to go back 3 and try to reconstruct things from the large haystack that 4 constitutes the prior filings in this case prior to today, 5 with the City of Ventura to give notice, Mr. Hagerty. 6 MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. MS. ZOLEZZI: Your Honor, Jeanne Zolezzi. THE COURT: One second. Who wants to speak 8 9 first? 10 MS. ZOLEZZI: Jeanne Zolezzi. I just had a question. I assume that the court will allow the 11 12 proponents of the physical solution to provide a reply? THE COURT: Sure. From a time point of view, I 13 14 don't know how you're going to get it in before the 19th, 15 but you can file it on the morning of the 19th. on the morning of the 19th, then you can file it in court. 16 So like serve it by noon on the 19th, and file it at the 17 18 time of the next hearing. 19 MS. ZOLEZZI: Thanks, Your Honor. THE COURT: And you can have 50 percent of the 20 21 pages that add up to the total number of objections that are filed. 22 So if five different six-page objections are 23 filed constituting a total of 30 pages, you can have 15 24 25 pages. If seven different five-page objections are filed that adds up to 35 pages, you can have 17 and a half pages 26 if my math is right. 27 28 MS. ZOLEZZI: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: The reason for that is although
2	you're getting more than six pages, I assume that the
3	objections are going to have some common themes, and
4	therefore you're going to be speaking about issues that
5	are touched on multiple times by the people that are
6	objecting.
7	In some ways it will be useful, though, because
8	this is the kind of straw poll of where your most
9	strenuous objections are.
10	Mr. Cosgrove, you've been sort of a fence-sitter
11	wallflower, or more accurately your client has been. Have
12	they gotten closer to liking the physical solution, or are
13	they waiting to be sold? Do they know they're going to be
14	the point of the spear for the opponents?
15	MR. COSGROVE: A bit of all of that, Your Honor.
16	We are engaged internally in discussions with staff and
17	the board regarding it.
18	THE COURT: Oh, I bet that's exciting.
19	MR. COSGROVE: Well, it has been. Working
20	toward potentially issuing a draft of our own that might
21	modify some of the aspects that we are a little less than
22	thrilled with. But in the end, you know, I think our
23	we are still in watch-and-wait mode on a lot of it and are
24	interested to see how the phase one and the potential
25	culling of the size of the scope of the action may come
26	out.
27	THE COURT: In geographic terms in particular?
28	MR. COSGROVE: In terms of the basins and in
	Page 17

terms of the parties in order to help inform some of our positions. So we're -- I think you've accurately characterized it that we are a little bit in watch-and-wait mode, but it is not passive watch-and-wait mode. We are looking closely at it and working on concepts of our own.

2.7

THE COURT: The reason I ask is when people like Mr. Garrison raise the question of who's going to help the small property owners who want to push back against an ill-conceived physical solution but have a lack of symmetrical resources, the obvious question is, okay, where is this alliance going to come from, and this is an alliance that's going to be led by the Casitas Water District which has probably got resources proportionate to those of the City of Ventura, or is it an alliance that won't have the assistance of the Casitas Water District?

MR. COSGROVE: At this point that decision hasn't been made, Your Honor. It is true that there have been smaller constituents or constituents from some of the basins that would characterize themselves as too remote to impact the surface water flows.

I have reached out to Casitas seeking, for lack of a better term, for Casitas to take a leadership role in carrying their banner. Unfortunately, Casitas also has a rather significant customer in the City of Ventura, and so we're in a delicate balance situation, and because the facts are still being brought to fore, and because there are, to be quite frank, political allegiances on a number

1 of different sides of the litigation, we are taking a more 2 cautious or, as I would put it, deliberate approach. I 3 can --4 THE COURT: That's why I said your discussions 5 are probably quite fascinating, but I'm sure they're 6 privileged. 7 MR. COSGROVE: Well, I think both are true. you know, I can preview for you that we're not thrilled 8 9 with the physical solutions allocations of costs and their 10 relationship to voting power on the management committee, which, when you read it, you will see I think pretty 11 12 clearly why. But we understand that that's a living, breathing document and that -- that the City and others 13 14 are anxiously awaiting our input on it, but we want that 15 input to be well thought out, and we want it to be 16 properly based. 17 THE COURT: Is there going to be some event that 18 will force your people to make a decision? I've been 19 goading Mr. Katz and Mr. Melnick -- I guess in particular Mr. Melnick -- for getting their bureaucrats to get 20 21 something done. 22 Frankly, in some ways getting an answer from Casitas Water District is a rather important decision 23 24 point in this case. Do I need to start pushing you to force them to get to a decision point, or are other 25 circumstances going to bring it to a fruition without me 26 kicking and prodding? 2.7 28 MR. COSGROVE: I have not made it a habit in my Page 19

1 career to invite judges to pressure my clients. So I 2 would say no to that. 3 I think that there's nothing in the current 4 litigation horizon that I would view as a catalyst for 5 Casitas making some of the decisions that you're talking 6 about, but I can assure you that we understand that people are looking for those decisions, but we're still sorting through our internal processes on how those decisions 8 9 might best be made. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Holly Jacobson, is City of Ojai a declared sponsor of the current draft physical solution, 11 12 or are you somewhere more like Mr. Cosgrove's client? MS. JACOBSON: Sorry, Your Honor. As soon as I 13 14 unmuted myself, I had a bunch of alerts pop up. 15 I would say that the City is not a fan of the proposed physical solution. As a matter of procedural 16 17 issues, frankly, I think it's strange that we keep jumping to view it and discuss it before the foundational issues 18 19 establishing who the correct parties are in this litigation have been dealt with in Phase 1. Long-winded 20 21 answer of saying we do not support it in its current fashion. 22 23 THE COURT: Has the City of Ojai retained one or more water experts to help it provide useful criticism of 24 25 the City of Ventura's proposal? 26 MS. JACOBSON: I don't think that I can speak intelligently or accurately on that point right now. 27 28 THE COURT: Okay. And I may be asking you to Page 20

1 disclose privileged information. So you're entitled to 2 object if you want. 3 Mr. Cosgrove, I'll ask the question anyway. 4 Casitas Water District hired any independent water experts 5 to provide advice and possible forensic support if it's 6 going to be criticizing the City of Ventura's physical solution? MR. COSGROVE: Not on the Phase 1 issues, Your 8 9 Honor. We have retained experts to analyze other aspects, 10 but not on Phase 1. And beyond that, I would invoke privilege. 11 12 THE COURT: Now, as a separate comment, I do 13 note that Mr. Baggerly appears to have solved the 14 procedural problems that hindered his first motion for the 15 appointment of an independent expert and that his renewed motion for that, which obviously Mr. Garrison thinks is a 16 17 good idea, is now on calendar for July 19. 18 So I will have an opportunity at that point to see if I should be appointing an expert, and of course, 19 Mr. Garrison and others, an independent expert selected by 20 21 the court is truly to be independent and is not 22 necessarily to become the pro/con counterweight expert to the plaintiff's expert, but rather to be a true neutral, 23 24 fair-minded person who might in the fullness of time come out saying essentially "rah-rah-rah" for everything the 25 plaintiff says, if that's what that independent expert 26 thought was a true statement. Whereas most forensic 27 28 experts, when they understand who's hiring them and what

1	position they're trying to support, have a certain
2	nimbleness of thought that allow them to find a way to
3	criticize something that otherwise might be professionally
4	exemplary work. But that isn't the nature of an expert
5	the court would be appointing, but it might be the kind of
6	expert Mr. Garrison and other small property owners would
7	want to look for, given their diverging interests from
8	those of the City of Ventura, at least as they perceive
9	it. But that's on for July 19, not for today.
10	MR. BAGGERLY: Your Honor, this is
11	THE COURT: Go ahead. Who's speaking?
12	MR. BAGGERLY: Can I have your attention just
13	for a moment
14	THE COURT: Who's speaking?
15	MR. BAGGERLY: Claude Baggerly.
16	THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Baggerly.
17	MR. BAGGERLY: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	I have been waiting for today to find out
19	whether or not you are actually going to receive the
20	physical solution for review on your own, and therefore, I
21	didn't send in my objections, which is 14 pages long.
22	Would you accept more than one filing of six
23	pages? Because I've got plenty of objections.
24	THE COURT: No. I want you to give me the best
25	of. Edit it down and give me your best of. As they say,
26	I would have written less if I had more time. So you've
27	got some time to edit down your work product and to give
28	me the high points and leave out the lesser points.

1	MR. BAGGERLY: It will be truncated then.
2	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
3	MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, also on that same
4	point, if I may. Shawn Hagerty for the City.
5	As you mentioned and we've discussed,
6	Mr. Garrison has submitted a new document supportive of
7	the motion. We've already filed our opposition, and
8	that's with the court. We were advised that we don't need
9	to refile.
10	We would like leave to file a one or two-page
11	very brief response to Mr. Garrison's points, and we're
12	happy to do that as quickly as possible. I think we can
13	get it all filed by Friday.
14	THE COURT: File it whenever your opposition
15	would be due, but note that you're referencing your prior
16	opposition and supplementing it rather than restating it
17	all.
18	MR. HAGERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	MR. OSIAS: This is David Osias, Your Honor,
20	from Allen Matkins.
21	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
22	MR. OSIAS: I had one quick question and then
23	one comment. The question is, was there a time on July 15
24	that you set for filing up to six pages of objections?
25	THE COURT: Serve it by close of business
26	4:30 P.M. on Case Anywhere. I'll give you the latitude to
27	file it on the 16th as long as you serve it by 4:30 P.M.
28	on the 15th. And for the reply, it's to be served by noon

1 on the 19th and filed with reasonable dispatch thereafter. 2 MR. OSIAS: Thank you. 3 And then you started to raise that others who 4 might be the opposition and asking whether they have 5 experts, and I know that relates to something else on 6 calendar for today, but one of the things I've been asking for as I think one of the few lawyers who has a small client, you know, with a single property and a single well 8 9 and minor use is for a user-friendly list by geography, 10 not just APN number but address or something of those similarly situated in case they do want to pool resources 11 even for a consulting expert to help them understand what 12 ultimately is released. I haven't been able to get such a 13 14 list and wonder whether the court thinks that would also 15 be helpful. THE COURT: I propose the following, Mr. Osias. 16 17 Why don't you post a message on the message board on File 18 & Serve Express that says, "Anybody who's interested in 19 sharing the costs of such and such an expert in furtherance of X or Y theory, please e-mail me at." 20 21 So, in other words, you could ask that the 22 responses be offline from what Mr. Hagerty and his team will see on File & Serve Express, but basically send out 23 your solicitation in plain view of the City, but then ask 24 people to find you via your e-mail and see what kind of 25 26 response you get.

Page 24

participating today. The same thing will doubtless be

2.7

28

Presumably we have a fair number of lawyers

1 true on the 19th. And let me check one thing. Off the 2 record. 3 (Brief pause.) 4 THE COURT: Okav. Back on the record. 5 I've been reminded that the service that was 6 offered for time to let anybody in the world verbally listen in to a court proceeding without otherwise more formally registering or paying a fee was terminated mostly 8 9 due to problems experienced in the misuse of that resource 10 and people observing the criminal docket, but that tells us then that the people participating today are limited to 11 those who we see registered on LACourtConnect, and this 12 is, as appearances for this case go, a fairly short list 13 14 today, but maybe the 19th we'll have a larger attendance. 15 Mr. Osias, in any case, I have no quarrel with 16 you using the bulletin board on Case Anywhere to see who you can find. And if you want them to respond to you in 17 18 front of Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Pisano on File & ServXpress, 19 I leave it up to your good judgment. 2.0 Mr. Hagerty? 21 MR. HAGERTY: Yeah. I would also offer to the 22 court and to the parties that we've heard this comment repeatedly. As I've said, we're working on a more 23 24 searchable database. But in the interim, we've also --25 we're going to take everyone who's appeared in the action. There's about 244 parties who have appeared. 26 We're going to create a map so that people can see sort of if there 27

are fellows within the basins, which I think was

28

1	Mr. Osias's point, and we're going to post that. It will
2	take us probably about a week to two weeks, so it won't be
3	immediate, but we are going to do that. It will be posted
4	on the website and we'll make it available to anyone.
5	THE COURT: To your perception, Mr. Hagerty, is
6	Thacher School, as a large consumptive user, now a sponsor
7	of your physical solution, or it's not clear?
8	MR. HAGERTY: There are five proposing parties,
9	Your Honor, who are very you know, who are part of the
10	party groups putting forward the physical solution, and
11	then there are somewhere in the order of 60 parties who
12	have stipulated to the physical solution. Thacher is not
13	one of those parties.
14	THE COURT: So they might be unhappy with it
15	given the water uses they have and where they take their
16	water?
17	MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, I think the thinking
18	here from everyone is that this is all subject to
19	continued discussion, and we're hoping to get to a
20	solution that everyone or the majority can support, but
21	they have not yet indicated their specific support for the
22	current version of the physical solution.
23	THE COURT: Do I have a lawyer for Thacher
24	School joining us this afternoon?
25	MR. CARTER: Yes, Your Honor. William Carter
26	appearing specially for Craig Patterson on behalf of the
27	Thacher School.
28	THE COURT: And a variety of other clients;
	Page 26

1 correct, Mr. Carter? 2 MR. CARTER: Yes. I guess they're referred 3 to -- our clients are referred to as the East Ojai Group. 4 THE COURT: And if people like Mr. Garrison or 5 Mr. Baggerly are looking for somebody who's ready to pick 6 a fight with the City of Ventura because the physical solution is ill conceived and unfair to users in East Ojai and elsewhere, are you looking for people to join your 8 9 forces, or are you not willing to be seen as the pied 10 piper? Your Honor, this is William Carter. 11 MR. CARTER: We welcome all those discussions. I think Thacher School 12 is in the same position as Ojai. We're not thrilled with 13 it. We're not a fan of it. And we're open to having 14 15 further discussions with like-minded individuals on all 16 aspects of the matter. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Garrison, is there something 18 more you want me to do to try to bang the drum in how to form a crowd? 19 MR. GARRISON: Well, I do have some concern 20 about the physical solution. In interviewing some of the 21 22 106 residences in Rancho Matilija, one recent homebuyer was told a precondition of purchasing a new home in a 23 24 subdivision was that he had to execute the proposed physical solution. 25 26 When you hear that type of thing, when the new buyer said he didn't know what the physical solution 27 28 meant, but he was required to do it to consummate the

1 transaction, I wonder if that is one of the 60 people that 2 have signed the proposed physical solution. 3 Is there a list the City of Ventura has of the 4 five principal and the 60 additional that have signed the 5 proposed physical solution? 6 THE COURT: So that question goes to you, 7 Mr. Hagerty, from Mr. Garrison. MR. HAGERTY: Well, Mr. Garrison, if you look at 8 9 the physical solution itself, it says, "The parties who 10 are proposing it." So the five parties are there, but it's the City of Ventura, it's the Ventura River Water 11 District, it's Meiners Oaks Water District, it's Rancho 12 Matilija Mutual Water Company, and it's the 13 14 Wood-Claeyssens Foundation, also known as Taylor Ranch, 15 are the five proposing parties. There are -- all of the parties who have already 16 submitted stipulations, and I'm happy to share that with 17 18 you, but they're of record in the court filing. And then there's a series of other filings that are mostly clients 19 of Ryan Blatz that we're working with to refile some 20 21 documents that were previously filed that the court had some questions and concerns about. 22 So it will all be of record, and the parties 23 that have already filed are of record. 24 THE COURT: It's certainly true that if you go 25 to the L.A. Superior Court public record in this docket 26 number and look at documents filed, once I've signed this 27 28 or that stipulation for entry of judgment as to a given

1 cross-defendant or different unnamed party, that then 2 becomes part of the court's public record. 3 So it's got a very similar document description. 4 So you can just start eyeballing the court's docket and 5 see which kind of parties show up with their names 6 associated with it. By way of example, if I were to scan that docket at this time -- give me a second while it loads. It's a 8 huge data file due to all the parties. 9 10 The Round Up case totally crushed the software in Alameda Superior. This case has almost crushed our 11 software, but so far it hasn't actually crushed the 12 software, although I think we did have the experience that 13 14 when people try to sign up for things when we have 15 multiple events on calendar, the accumulation of 20,000 or 2,000-plus cross-defendants and five events on calendar 16 17 then freaked out the software. Still loading. 18 I'm going to turn to the question of discovery scheduling in a moment. And when we do that, one of my 19 first questions is going to be the lawfulness of 20 21 nonunilateral disclosure of experts. Let me take a second 22 to sort of try to recite some of these stipulations which can be gleaned from the court's records. 23 24 I've gone into the documents tab. Here's one Stipulation made with -- oh, no, that was the 25 peace treaty with the original plaintiff. That doesn't 26 2.7 count. 28 MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, if it will expedite Page 29

1	things, we're happy to share with Mr. Garrison the list of
2	the ones that have been filed so that he can understand.
3	We're happy to help him with that process.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Now, here are a couple.
5	June 14, Big Black Dog, LLC is party to such a thing.
6	Ventura Unified School District, June 7.
7	When we come back on the 19th, by the way,
8	please give me an update on how you're doing on the
9	default-o-rama.
10	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: I do know that my staff is not
12	complaining to me. The courtroom staff is not and the
13	management on the second floor and the 8th floor is not.
L 4	So apparently your processes are going tolerably well or
15	else they'd be down here moaning and groaning.
16	MR. HAGERTY: I think we have a good process
L 7	going, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Okay. March 24, we have a gaggle of
19	them. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles.
20	Joseph Lynn Bartholomy and Elvira Lily Bartholomy. James
21	P. Robey. Deborah Liz Martin Crawford. Konrad with a K.
22	A whole bunch of them on March 24. But as Mr. Hagerty
23	indicated, he can tell you what's already in the court's
24	public record, Mr. Garrison and Mr. Osias.
25	So okay, experts. Rafael Metzger, Esquire, had
26	well educated me in toxic tort cases that although they're
27	oftentimes when having a plaintiff go first an expert
28	disclosure has a certain practical logic to it that it's

1 inconsistent with the legislative provisions and CCP 2 Section 3024, and as interpreted by a court of appeals 3 case that's got the City or County of Los Angeles in the 4 caption. 5 All that being said, is the City of Ventura 6 willing to waive those arguments and go first, or are you adamant that it has to be a mutual exchange, Mr. Hagerty? 8 MR. PISANO: Your Honor, Mr. Pisano. The City 9 is fine with a tiered approached whereby some of the 10 smaller parties, smaller users, who have not yet retained an expert to look at these issues, get a glimpse at what 11 12 those larger parties who have retained experts have done. 13 But we are not waiving the argument that there 14 are -- waiving the argument that there be a mutual 15 exchange of experts for those parties that are currently in the process of looking at these issues that are going 16 17 to be tried in Phase 1. We think it should be a mutual 18 exchange. THE COURT: So then I guess there's a debate, as 19 I understand it, as to whether this first mutual exchange 20 21 should happen in late August versus in September. Because 22 your Exhibit A to today's report suggests that this mutual exchange be September 24, but the text indicates other 23 24 people think that that is too slow and is going to backload the trial. 25 26 Who, by way of example, wants a mutual exchange by the big players earlier than September 24? 27 28 MS. JACOBSON: Your Honor -- [Inaudible].

1	THE COURT: Who's speaking?
2	MS. JACOBSON: Holly Jacobson for the City of
3	Ojai.
4	THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Jacobson.
5	MS. JACOBSON: Earlier you referenced the
6	General Civil Discovery Act 2030 something. But here we
7	are dealing with a very specific statute for the
8	groundwater dedication phase of this trial. It is CCP
9	832, et seq. When it comes to the disclosure of experts,
10	it's CCP Section 843.
11	THE COURT: One moment. Okay. I have it in
12	front of me. Go ahead, ma'am.
13	MS. JACOBSON: And that essentially says that in
14	a situation where a party is alleging that it can
15	adjudicate the groundwater rights of others, that it can
16	disclose its expert and opinions according to the schedule
17	laid out in 843 unless there's a stipulation among the
18	parties or the court orders it otherwise.
19	This statute being directly on point is what's
20	going to govern this case, not the general provisions
21	under the Discovery Act. And so
22	THE COURT: Concur, Mr. Hagerty? Do you agree
23	with Ms. Jacobson on that point?
24	MR. HAGERTY: Not entirely, Your Honor. I mean,
25	843 does come into play, but the other CCP are
26	specifically preserved where it's not inconsistent and we
27	think the way you phrased it earlier is absolutely
28	consistent. I mean, 843 requires, as it's written, that

1 all parties mutually disclose within 30 days of the trial 2 setting, which is something we have agreed not to do. But 3 the mutual parties --4 THE COURT: It was your plans to do it much in 5 advance of the trial, whether it's mutual or phased. 6 MR. HAGERTY: Absolutely. Yeah. THE COURT: So what I need is briefs from you and Ms. Jacobson and others who have a dog in this fight 8 9 delineating the pros and cons of these arguments. I don't 10 intend to just do it on the fly now, but I would appreciate briefs from you and Ms. Jacobson and others so 11 that I can decide this on July 19. 12 13 MR. HAGERTY: Okay, Your Honor. That's fair. 14 And we're happy to do that. 15 THE COURT: Are there others who support Ms. Jacobson's position that the City should be made to go 16 first who want a chance to brief the same issue? 17 18 appreciate the fact that there's at least one advocate for 19 the position. MR. OSIAS: David Osias from Allen Matkins, Your 2.0 Honor, for Villa Nero Trust. Our papers suggested that 21 22 the issue of when the City discloses its expert sequentially or concurrently, it shouldn't be so late that 23 24 we don't have enough time to do anything about it because 25 of the time gap. And therefore, thought sequential or earlier, in early to mid August, not late August, would be 26 necessary to meet the deadline at the end of their 27 28 proposed schedule.

In our meet and confer, there were several who objected to earlier than September 24th. Some of them aren't -- I guess they're all here today in court so they can speak for themselves. But our main concern is to have enough time between the receipt and the ability to do anything about it. And under this schedule it's only seven weeks.

2.7

Now, I had an idea between our filing and today's hearing that might allow the current schedule for those with experts to go forward, which at the meet and confer was acceptable to many, if not all. And that is the City had proposed to allow the later submission for those who would sign a declaration that they didn't have an expert at this time, which we're certainly prepared to do, and if we added to that declaration a confidentiality clause or even having Your Honor order it, that those without experts can get it sooner but not share it with anyone so that we do have enough time -- other than share it with like-situated people without an expert, so that we have enough time to deal with it.

The mutual exchange at a later date would not be prejudicial to those with no expert because no one with an expert would have access to it. And so the City's concern from a litigation tactical perspective to not go first would be protected, and our concern that we not have an unrealistic time to read it, see if we can find help if we need it -- don't even know if we're going to need help yet because we don't know what it says -- and do something

1 about it.

2.7

So that was the new idea I had that didn't make it into my papers but would seem to satisfy the City's concern that it not reveal its expert reports before others reveal theirs and our concern that we have enough time and the City's willingness to go earlier so long as it was concurrent. We can avoid that last condition if we keep it confidential except for the people who don't have an expert. We can talk to each other about it.

THE COURT: Well, that raises a couple of points. Let me speak first and then I'll hear from Mr. Hagerty.

One, if there is to be a traditional California Discovery Act procedure of disclosure of experts, you get a crummy lawyer declaration that says I've hired a genius. Here's his CV. He's prepared to testify as follows and give a deposition.

And the lawyer then gives you a kind of paraphrase of what the expert is supposed to say but no report. But that's good enough for the legislature. So then that raises the question of whether the court makes an order in the style of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that says nah, you're also going to provide a report either at the time of the designation or within reasonable dispatch after the time of designation. That's policy question and there are pros and cons to that.

MR. HAGERTY: Can I address that, because I think there's an answer. 843 does say what is in the

1 disclosure and it's the report. And when we have 2 disclosed, mutually hopefully, we will disclose the full 3 report, and we expect other parties to as well. 4 THE COURT: That's Mr. Hagerty's statement of 5 position and may be right insofar as 843 is more precise 6 than CCP 2034. So in that regard, he is happy to lean on 843, Ms. Jacobson, even if he scatters the parts of 2034 that he likes, such as the mutuality provision. 8 But that then raises a different question. 9 10 you've got, say, an asbestos case with one plaintiff and 13 defendants, and for whatever reason, because of the 11 deep pocket or because the facts tend to implicate two of 12 the 13 defendants more than the others, maybe the battle 13 14 of experts is between the plaintiff and functionally two of the 13 defendants but not all 13 of the 13 defendants. 15 But the plaintiff hasn't settled with the other 11 16 17 defendants. They're in the case. 18 So my understanding, even if they're not 19 designating at the time of a mutual exchange an expert, they're entitled to see everybody else's designation. 20 21 MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: So in that sense, you can't just say, oh, if I know that Casitas Water District is going to 23 24 designate an expert at the same time I do, I'm going to send my information to Casitas through counsel, but I 25 won't send it to Mr. Baggerly. Or I won't send it to 26 To my understanding, it's got to go to 27 Mr. Osias. 28 everybody even if you're not getting anything in return.

1 MR. HAGERTY: That's correct, Your Honor. 2 And if I may, the idea of just a quick briefing. 3 We can make this really complicated or we can make it 4 pretty simple. There's really two questions. 5 somehow one party going first, which you know our position 6 on that. And when. And I think if we just brief that and the court makes a decision on the 19th, we're off and Otherwise --8 running. THE COURT: So what I need for that then is 9 probably the City to go first with why it must be mutual 10 and why it should be no sooner than whatever it is that 11 12 you want to protest. MR. HAGERTY: To be clear, we're okay with 13 14 moving it up by a month to August 24th. It's other 15 parties, I think. If it's mutual, they may have some objection to the other dates. So that's why getting those 16 17 both in --18 THE COURT: But I'm going to have you speak Could you get us a brief by this Friday in support 19 of it being mutual and in support of whatever date you're 20 21 arguing for? MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And then I would let anybody who 23 wants to object either on the aspect of mutuality or the 24 25 timing, and you can object to both or just one of the two. But if you're going to object, I want you to object, and I 26 need you to object with something served on the 14th, 27 28 4:30 P.M., filed on the 15th, with a reply served close of

1	business on the 16th at 4:30 P.M. and filed on the next
2	business day on the 19th with Mr. Hagerty to give notice.
3	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
4	THE COURT: So if you don't like the idea that
5	the big dogs have got extra already have to designate
6	at the same time as Ventura city, you'd better get a brief
7	in on the 14th in terms of service. And if you don't like
8	the idea of a September disclosure as opposed to an
9	earlier disclosure date, then you'd better speak to that
10	same issue on a brief on the 14th. No page limits on
11	these briefs.
12	Okay. What else should we usefully take up this
13	afternoon, Mr. Hagerty?
14	MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, I think there's just
15	two more issues. One well, actually just one point of
16	clarification, Your Honor. I had asked for leave to file
17	a very short response to the Garrison item, and you had
18	indicated it's when our opposition would have been due,
19	which it would have been today.
20	THE COURT: Well, then file it Thursday.
21	MR. HAGERTY: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. One
22	other issue that I think
23	THE COURT: And I will give Mr. Garrison until
24	Friday to file a reply in support of his motion.
25	Mr. Baggerly will.
26	MR. HAGERTY: Thank you, Your Honor. The only
27	other issue before the court is you had trailed the issue
28	of initial disclosures, and I believe you asked for the

1 stay to provide an explanation to the court why. 2 THE COURT: You don't think you need them. 3 You're willing to do the 850 map someday, if ever, without 4 them and make the assumptions. 5 MR. HAGERTY: The court ordered that the parties 6 provide the initial disclosures. Many have. The question really is for those parties who have stipulated and essentially attempting to sit on the sideline but not be 8 9 out of the case, we don't believe that they're necessary. 10 I think Mr. Blatz articulated why he thinks they're not necessary. And that was just the only open issue that we 11 had in our notes, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: So, Mr. Melnick, Mr. Katz, or 13 14 Mr. Mejia, who wants to be heard as to why the perfect is 15 the enemy of the good here. MR. MELNICK: Thank you, Your Honor. It's Mark 16 I can speak to this. I think there's three 17 Melnick. 18 things I want to say. One is, first, Mr. Blatz had made a 19 pitch that this was a big endeavor for him. And we don't have a problem with giving him as much time as he wants. 20 21 This isn't relevant to the first phase. This is relevant to future phases. And if he needs to take several months 22 to get this done, we're perfectly fine with that. 23 24 The second thing I want to say --25 THE COURT: Can I ask it another way, Mr. Melnick. If there's some chance of peace breaking out 26 in the next few months, why don't you just give him an 27 28 extension to February 1st and see if peace breaks out in

1 the interim. 2 MR. MELNICK: That's perfectly fine. THE COURT: Mr. Blatz, is that a practical 3 4 solution to your concern about putting undue burdens on 5 people who are trying to get away from the fistfight? 6 MR. BLATZ: Thank you, Your Honor. Ryan Blatz 7 on behalf of a litany of defendants. I suppose that could work. The problem is, Your 8 9 Honor, and this is really without getting into the 10 nitty-gritty on the physical solution, but there's this cost element to it that's unknown. And if they are 11 required, I mean, there's -- other than a full peace 12 treaty that gets this whole thing settled before February, 13 14 which listening to the parties I don't think is likely. 15 They've -- we've -- multiple big parties have indicated that the necessity of Phase 1 is before there could be any 16 17 settlement potentially where this thing was approved. 18 So it's not just the time issue, it's the 19 resources that all of these de minimis users -- and again, these are all de minimis users who I represent have 20 stipulated. None of them use over 5-acre feed on an 21 22 annual basis. It's just the cost outlay and the whole point of trying to get them stipulated early and on the 23 24 sideline was to avoid what is cumulatively a lot of money that they'd have to pay to just get that work done. 25

Page 40

though it may not be unbelievably complicated, it still

requires requesting ten years' worth of data often from

the basin management agencies. Right now I can tell you

26

27

28

we have overloaded the OBGMA, the Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, with the disclosures that we're doing right now in getting data from them.

These parties have only one interest, and it is that they want to get out of this case and move on with their lives as cheaply and as efficiently as possible because they're de minimis users and the stipulation provided that.

So I do agree that the time wouldn't hurt if it was going to absolutely be necessary, but the level of information that's going to come out of it, the outlay of costs that the individuals are going to have to put up with and the time element to it seem unduly burdensome on them. And that's why they are deemed de minimis users, that they are literally not important enough under the de minimis principles of the Groundwater Management Act that they're not important enough to have to be active litigants. And as soon as they're doing initial disclosures, they've been there. They're now active litigants and having to spend more money and be more involved in all these filings and everything done. Wrangling a lot of cats, Your Honor.

But ultimately, if there was after Phase 1 -- and we just heard that Phase 1, it was not going to be necessary for that. If post-Phase 1 there was an absolute need for these individuals to have to do initial disclosures, then I think at that time it might be appropriate, and that's why I have told all of them, even

1 though they're paying a very small flat rate to be 2 represented, that I would maintain representation of them 3 throughout the remaining portion of the case to ensure 4 that if something changed like this, that someone would be 5 in the room to be able to represent them and let them know 6 we needed to have them. But until Phase 1 is complete and there's definitely no agreement, I don't see that there's a 8 9 material need for this information from these litany of 10 clients. Cumulatively if they were even estimating, like I said, it would only be 500 acres between about 100 11 12 stipulating de minimis parties. THE COURT: If I delayed the compliance deadline 13 14 to say March 1, presumably after the court trial has been 15 wrapped up but perhaps before a decision has been rendered, with a determination presumably to be made at 16 17 the end of the court trial as to whether the March 1 deadline has any relevance, doesn't that practically solve 18 19 the problem by just letting you and your clients put this aside and out of mind for more than half a year? 20 21 MR. BLATZ: Yes, Your Honor. Other than the 22 numerosity of the stipulating clients would make it difficult post the Phase 1 decision to get them done 23 24 immediately after that unless we're working on it the whole time before, which is kind of counterintuitive. 25 THE COURT: No, I don't intend to be working on 26 it at all before March 1. I indeed could make an order 2.7

that you're to take no steps to gather information between

28

1	now and March 1, and the court will revisit what is a
2	reasonable deadline, if any, on March 1 so that it's clear
3	that you're not to be blamed if you don't get your
4	homework done in advance.
5	MR. BLATZ: Well, I don't rescind my argument
6	about the material nature of not needing the information
7	even past Phase 1. I do think that would be an
8	appropriate way to handle it if they are deemed to be
9	done.
LO	THE COURT: Can you live with that, Mr. Melnick?
11	MR. MELNICK: Your Honor, I can live with that.
12	I think what Mr. Blatz told you is incorrect, though.
13	He's not his clients are not taking no side. They're
L4	taking the City's side. And all the people that have not
15	taken the City's side are going to have to do initial
16	disclosures; right? So this is really about fairness
17	amongst parties with different views of this case.
18	THE COURT: No. These people capitulated, and
19	by capitulating, they avoid a nuisance. That to me in the
20	world of litigation doesn't sound like it's unfair.
21	That's just the consequence of surrendering early.
22	MR. MELNICK: Well, they didn't they didn't
23	allow defaults to be taken, right? They took a side.
24	THE COURT: They surrendered. They surrendered
25	and threw themselves in the arms of the City.
26	MR. MELNICK: Right.
27	MR. BLATZ: Your Honor, if I may. Ryan Blatz
28	again.

2.0

The clients that stipulated, and it's written in there, they did -- the only stipulation that was available was stipulating to the physical solution. The reality of it was, it avoided the filing fee. It got them on the sideline quickly. It's the most efficient way for a de minimis user who wants to not have a default that states that they have no extraction rights or surface diversion rights on their property or they want to have them in the future that was created for the efficiency purpose of it.

But it's written specifically that -- and I amended some of the language on the generic stipulation specifically for this reason, that states they are stipulating as long as their rights as a de minimis user don't change, meaning they don't really need to do anything, they just need to be present sufficiently not to have a default taken.

Now, the way Ventura, and rightly so, wanted to couch that in the stipulation --

THE COURT: I've heard enough on the issue.

Thank you, Mr. Blatz. The court will make an order that the people who made a stipulation do not need to provide initial disclosures. They don't need to take any preparatory steps to be able to make initial disclosures between now and March 1 of 2022. And the court on March 1 of 2022 will take up the question of whether there's any reason at that time to put a burden on the people who signed a stipulation to commence to gather the information

1	to provide initial disclosures. That will be in the order
2	you make today or notice of ruling, Mr. Hagerty.
3	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Other new issues we need to
5	take up this afternoon. Mr. Hagerty?
6	MR. HAGERTY: That's all we have, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Melnick?
8	MR. MELNICK: No, Your Honor. Nothing else.
9	Thank you for your time.
10	THE COURT: No problem.
11	MR. OSIAS: Your Honor, David Osias again for
12	Mr. Bacon, the trustee of the Villa Nero Trust from Allen
13	Matkins.
14	For de minimis users who were worried about the
15	impact of the stipulation, because I haven't signed it,
16	and who are participating and my client is participating
17	through counsel, which is not a nominal expense, is it
18	necessary that our initial disclosures still occur before
19	the Phase 1 trial? And if so, to what purpose or can we
20	have the deadline moved and if you need a formal request.
21	But I'm wondering what's the relevance of imposing that
22	burden at this time for others?
23	THE COURT: Candidly, in my own mind, I don't
24	have a sentiment on the topic. Mr. Hagerty, do you have a
25	sentiment?
26	MR. HAGERTY: We don't think the information
27	from any of the de minimis users is going to be material,
28	but maybe what we could do is, I'm happy to speak with

1	Mr. Osias and maybe we can present that to the court on
2	the 19th with more background for the court.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Melnick, do you want to be heard
4	on the same issue?
5	MR. MELNICK: I think Mr. Hagerty's approach is
6	fine. And I think I don't have a problem with any
7	de minimis user having the same March 1 extension as the
8	stipulating parties.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So go bargain about it and
10	see what happens.
11	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Remember to give me the
13	latest update on your default-o-rama when we get together
L 4	again.
15	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor.
16	MR. KATZ: Your Honor, can I interject. This is
L7	Eric Katz for the Department of Fish & Wildlife.
18	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
19	MR. KATZ: I just wanted clarity as to whether
20	the extension of the deadline or staying of the deadline
21	to provide initial disclosures for stipulating parties
22	applies only to de minimis parties who stipulate?
23	That seems implied in the discussion, but it
24	I guess I wanted just to make sure if my assumption was
25	everyone else's assumption.
26	THE COURT: Well, it's an interesting point. I
27	recited that the archbishop of Roman Catholic
28	Archbishop of Los Angeles had been one of the stipulating

1	parties based on cemeteries or prep schools or Catholic
2	parishes. Are they a de minimis user in the aggregate?
3	MR. HAGERTY: I'm not currently aware, as we sit
4	here today, of any party other than the proposing parties
5	who have already made their initial disclosures. So
6	they've agreed to the stipulated judgment, but they've
7	already done their initial disclosures.
8	THE COURT: But that's all the five.
9	MR. HAGERTY: Correct. But I think everyone
10	else as I sit here today without it all in front of me,
11	but I believe they're all de minimis users, and I will
12	take a look at that weekend report on that in the status
13	conference report, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Even hypothetically the archbishop.
15	MR. HAGERTY: There are many property owners who
16	don't have a well.
17	THE COURT: Fair enough. If they take it out of
18	a city water main, that is de minimis.
19	MR. HAGERTY: That's right, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: It's how much they take from the
21	city water main, that doesn't count.
22	MR. HAGERTY: That's right, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Got you. If it comes to a water
24	meter, that's irrelevant.
25	MR. HAGERTY: If they take from the stream or if
26	they have a well, that's the relevant discussion here.
27	THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. Okay. Why
28	don't you take it up between now and July 19.

1	Anything else, Mr. Hagerty?
2	MR. HAGERTY: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
3	THE COURT: Again, anybody else have any
4	suggestions or issues we've got to take up this afternoon?
5	THE REPORTER: The court reporter would like the
6	parties to email me their appearances. I put my address
7	in the chat box.
8	THE COURT: Okay. So the court reporter, to
9	repeat, has indicated she has put her address in the chat
10	box, and she requests that if you want your appearance
11	noted on the transcript, that you email her to confirm
12	that you were here on this session this afternoon.
13	Okay. Mr. Hagerty, do you have what you need
14	for notice?
15	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Court is in recess. You're free to
17	go.
18	
19	(At 3:28 P.M. the proceedings were
20	adjourned.)
21	* * *
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	Page 48
	rage 40

1 2	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3	DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE
4	DEFARIMENT TO HON. WILDIAM F. HIGHDERGER, CODGE
5	SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, A)
5	CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT CORPORATION,)
6) Case No. 19STCP01176
O	Petitioner,)
7)
,	vs.
8)
O	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL)
9	BOARD etc., et al.,
	board ccc., cc al.,
10	Respondents.)
10	respondenes.
11	
	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS.
12)
13	·/
14	
15	
16	I, DEBORAH MORIN, CSR NO. 11558, OFFICIAL
17	REPORTER PRO TEMPORE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
18	CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DO HEREBY
19	CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING PAGES, 1 THROUGH 48, COMPRISE A
20	FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND
21	TESTIMONY TAKEN IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CAUSE ON JULY 6,
22	2021.
23	DATED THIS 15TH DAY OF JULY, 2021.
24	Divide this 13th Divide Court, 2021.
25	0 0 0 1
23	Suborahnor
26	CSR NO. 11558
20	DEBORAH MORIN, OFFICIAL REPORTER
27	DEDOMIN PORTIN, OFFICIAL REPORTER
28	
20	
	Page 49

[& - accumulation]

&	1702 2:23	300 1:19 2:23	777-3200 2:13
& 1:18,21 2:4,20	19 6:15,16 21:17	3024 31:2	798-2249 4:6
3:15 4:14 6:3,20	22:9 33:12 47:28	31 8:26	8
7:28 8:7 14:27	1991 12:13	325-0658 4:16	
15:1 24:18,23	19stcp01176 1:6	34 5:20	8 7:21 9:22,24 10:1 14:13,28
25:18 46:17	5:3,11 49:6	35 16:26	805 2:18 3:12 4:6
	19th 16:14,15,16	3:28 48:19	832 32:9
1	16:17 24:1 25:1	4	843 32:10,17,25,28
1 20:20 21:8,10	25:14 30:7 37:7	415 2:13	35:28 36:5,7
31:17 40:16 41:23	38:2 46:2	4205 4:21	850 39:3
41:24,25 42:7,14	1st 39:28	4203 4.21 425 2:12	879-0750 3:7
42:17,23,27 43:1,2	2	425 2.12 48 49:19	8th 30:13
43:7 44:25,25	2 5:27	4:30 23:26,27	
45:19 46:7 49:19	2,000 29:16	37:28 38:1	9
10 1:3 5:5 49:3	20,000 29:15		90013 2:24
100 42:11	2006 4:23	5	90071 1:19
1011 4:15	2000 4.25 2021 1:15 5:4	5 40:21	916 3:23 4:16
103 4:5		50 16:20	92101 1:23 3:17
1050 3:11	49:22,23	500 42:11	92626 2:5
106 27:22	2022 44:25,26 2030 32:6	510 3:7	93004 3:11
109 4:5		525-1327 1:23	93023 2:18 4:6,10
11 36:16	2034 36:6,7	6	94105 2:12
11558 1:26 5:6	20th 3:5	6 1:15 5:4 49:21	94612 3:6
49:16,26	21 29:25	60 26:11 28:1,4	95814 3:23
119 2:17	210-7822 3:23 211-1526 3:17	600 3:16	9:43 6:4
12986 4:10		611 2:5	a
12th 15:11	213 1:20 2:24	617-8100 1:20	ability 34:5
13 36:11,13,15,15	22nd 4:15	619 1:23 3:17	able 12:5 24:13
36:15	24 30:18,22 31:23	641-5100 2:6	42:5 44:24
1300 3:22	31:27	646-0767 2:18	abrams 4:3
14 22:21 30:5	244 25:26	650 4:11	absolute 41:25
1400 2:5	24th 34:2 37:14	655 1:22	absolute 41.23 absolutely 32:27
14th 37:27 38:7,10	25th 1:19 5:18	659-6800 3:12	33:6 41:10
15 15:18 16:1,24	269-6323 2:24		accept 22:22
23:23	26th 2:12	7	accept 22.22 acceptable 34:11
1515 3:5	27 3:16	7 30:6	access 14:23 15:1
15th 1:22 23:28	2:10 5:8	7050 49:25	34:23
37:28 49:23	2nd 5:25	70550 3:6	accommodated
16th 23:27 38:1	3	714 2:6	13:6
17 16:26	30 16:24 33:1	726-1111 4:11	accumulation
			29:15
			27.13

[accurately - backload]

accurately 17:11	ahead 22:11,16	appearance 48:10	aspect 37:24
18:2 20:27	32:4,12	appearances 1:16	aspects 17:21 21:9
acre 40:21	al 1:9 4:3 49:9	1:25 2:1,8 3:1 4:1	27:16
acres 42:11	alameda 29:11	5:7 25:13 48:6	asset 12:24
act 32:6,21 35:14	alerts 20:14	appeared 25:25,26	assistance 18:16
41:16	allegiances 18:28	appearing 5:16	associated 29:6
action 17:25 25:25	alleging 32:14	26:26	assume 15:27
actions 1:11 49:11	allen 3:15 5:25 6:1	appears 21:13	16:11 17:2
active 41:17,19	7:20 9:18 23:20	applies 46:22	assumption 46:24
adamant 31:7	33:20 45:12	appointed 6:8	46:25
add 10:25 16:21	allenmatkins.com	11:23	assumptions 39:4
added 14:28 34:15	3:18	appointing 21:19	assure 20:6
additional 28:4	alliance 18:12,13	22:5	attached 15:7
address 12:28	18:15	appointment	attachments 15:20
13:13 24:10 35:27	allocations 19:9	21:15	attempting 39:8
48:6,9	allow 12:15 16:11	appreciate 11:8	attendance 25:14
adds 16:26	22:2 34:9,12	33:11,18	attention 16:2
adjourned 48:20	43:23	approach 19:2	22:12
adjudicate 32:15	amended 44:12	46:5	attorney 2:21,23
admission 12:8	analyses 8:8	approached 31:9	3:4,5,22 6:5,20
advance 33:5 43:4	analysis 8:4	appropriate 8:9	7:3,17
advice 21:5	analyze 21:9	9:26 11:4 41:28	august 8:24,26,26
advised 23:8	andrew 4:26	43:8	31:21 33:26,26
advocacy 11:19,20	angeles 1:2,19	approved 40:17	37:14
11:24	2:24 5:4 30:19	archbishop 30:19	authorize 14:1
advocate 33:18	31:3 46:28 49:2	46:27,28 47:14	available 14:20
afternoon 6:16 7:2	49:18	area 4:20 5:22	26:4 44:2
26:24 38:13 45:5	angiolilo 4:19	argue 11:1	avenue 1:19 2:17
48:4,12	annual 40:22	arguing 13:15	avoid 35:7 40:24
agencies 40:28	answer 19:22	37:21	43:19
agency 41:2	20:21 35:28	argument 11:3,6	avoided 44:4
aggregate 12:14	anton 2:5	31:13,14 43:5	awaiting 19:14
47:2	anxiously 19:14	arguments 31:6	aware 47:3
agr 4:19	anybody 14:23	33:9	awful 15:12
agree 9:4,20 11:8	15:25 24:18 25:6	arms 43:25	b
13:17 14:10 32:22	37:23 48:3	articulated 39:10	back 8:5,18 12:26
41:9	anyway 21:3	asbestos 36:10	14:12 15:27 16:2
agreed 33:2 47:6	apn 24:10	aside 42:20	18:9 25:4 30:7
agreement 42:8	apparently 30:14	asked 38:16,28	background 46:2
agreements 11:10	appeals 31:2	asking 20:28 24:4 24:6	backload 31:25

[bacon - christopher]

bacon 3:14 5:26	better 18:23 38:6	brought 16:2	25:15,16 29:10,11
9:10 45:12	38:9	18:27	31:3 32:20 36:10
bacon's 9:17	beyond 21:10	buenaventura	36:17 39:9 41:5
bad 8:2 15:12	big 14:2 30:5	1:17 5:14	42:3 43:17 49:6
	•		
baggerly 2:15,15	31:27 38:5 39:19	build 11:25,26	cases 12:1 30:26
2:16,17 21:13	40:15	bulletin 25:16	casitas 2:3 5:15
22:10,12,15,15,16	binder 14:4,5	bunch 20:14 30:22	18:13,16,22,23,24
22:17 23:1 27:5	bit 17:15 18:3	burden 44:27	19:23 20:5 21:4
36:26 38:25	black 30:5	45:22	36:23,25
balance 18:26	black's 12:26	burdens 40:4	catalyst 20:4
bang 27:18	blamed 43:3	burdensome 41:13	catholic 30:19
banner 18:24	blanche 4:5	bureaucrats 19:20	46:27 47:1
barbara 1:5 5:1,11	blatz 4:4,5 28:20	business 15:18	cats 41:22
49:5	39:10,18 40:3,6,6	23:25 38:1,2	cause 6:13 49:21
bargain 46:9	42:21 43:5,12,27	buyer 27:27	causing 8:20
bartholomy 30:20	43:27 44:21	c	cautious 19:2
30:20	bliss 4:23	c 12:22	ccp 31:1 32:8,10
bartkiewicz 4:14	board 1:9 3:3 5:2	calendar 21:17	32:25 36:6
based 19:16 47:1	5:12 17:17 24:17	24:6 29:15,16	cemeteries 47:1
basically 24:23	25:16 49:9	california 1:1,5,19	certain 5:26 6:9,14
basin 12:11 13:17	boat 12:19	1:23 2:5,12,18,20	22:1 30:28
40:28 41:1	boil 15:21	2:21,24 3:4,6,11	certainly 7:15 9:1
basins 17:28 18:20	bottle 14:12,12	3:17,20,23 4:6,10	10:2 13:17 28:25
25:28	boulevard 2:5	4:15 5:4 13:20	34:14
basis 40:22	box 3:6 48:7,10	35:13 49:1,5,18	certify 49:19
battle 36:13	breaking 39:26	candidly 45:23	cetera 11:5
bay 11:6	breaks 39:28	canger 4:22	chance 9:13 33:17
bbklaw.com 1:20	breathing 19:13	capitulated 43:18	39:26
1:24	breeding 4:19	capitulating 43:19	change 11:10
bed 12:14	bridgett 2:11	caption 15:22 31:4	44:15
behalf 7:17 26:26	brief 23:11 25:3	cards 10:17 12:4	changed 42:4
40:7	33:17 37:6,19	career 20:1	channelkeeper 1:5
believe 5:21 9:25	38:6,10	carlos 3:21	5:1,11 49:5
13:9 38:28 39:9	briefing 37:2	carlos 5.21	characterize 18:20
47:11	briefs 11:4 33:7,11	carrying 18:24	characterized
believes 8:9	38:11	carter 4:21 26:25	18:3
benefit 10:19	bring 19:26	26:25 27:1,2,11,11	chat 48:7,9
best 1:18,18,21,21	broad 9:12	case 1:6 3:10 5:1,3	cheaply 41:6
20:9 22:24,25	broadway 1:22	5:27 11:3 12:13	check 25:1
bet 17:18	3:16	14:19 16:4 19:24	christopher 1:18
		23:26 24:11 25:13	
		23.20 24.11 23.13	

[christopher.pisano - court]

christopher.pisano	closely 18:5	concur 32:22	cosgrove 2:4 5:15
1:20	closer 17:12	concurrent 35:7	17:10,15,19,28
circumstances	collateral 6:9	concurrently	18:17 19:7,28
19:26	color 9:13 10:6	33:23	21:3,8
citation 5:20	come 17:25 18:12	condition 35:7	cosgrove's 20:12
city 1:17 4:13 5:14	21:24 30:7 32:25	conditions 9:7	cost 40:11,22
5:15,19,24 6:9,12	41:11	confer 13:2 34:1	costa 2:5
6:17 9:20 10:26	comes 9:2 32:9	34:11	costs 19:9 24:19
11:19 13:27 16:5	47:23	conference 6:11	41:12
18:15,25 19:13	coming 15:11	47:13	couch 44:19
20:10,15,23,25	commence 44:28	confidential 35:8	counsel 1:16 2:1
21:6 22:8 23:4	comment 7:13	confidentiality	5:26 36:25 45:17
24:24 27:6 28:3	8:12,13 9:20	34:15	count 29:27 47:21
28:11 31:3,5,8	21:12 23:23 25:22	confirm 48:11	counter 11:28
32:2 33:16,22	commentary 9:13	connection 13:15	counterintuitive
34:12 37:10 38:6	10:6	cons 33:9 35:26	42:25
43:25 47:18,21	comments 10:15	consensus 11:26	counterweight
city's 10:7 34:23	10:26 11:14	consequence	21:22
35:3,6 43:14,15	committee 19:10	43:21	county 1:2 2:10
civil 32:6 35:22	common 12:3,6,7	consistent 32:28	4:22 12:13 31:3
claeyssens 28:14	17:3	constituents 18:19	49:2,18
claim 14:23	commonly 5:14	18:19	couple 30:4 35:10
clarification 38:16	company 3:9	constitutes 16:4	course 13:11
clarity 46:19	28:13	constituting 16:24	21:19
claude 2:15,16	complainant 1:17	consulting 24:12	court 1:1 5:10 6:8
22:15	complaining 30:12	consummate	6:23 7:15,26 8:2
clause 34:16	complete 42:7	27:28	8:18,25 9:2,5 10:3
clay 3:5	compliance 42:13	consumptive 26:6	10:4,17,22 11:13
clear 26:7 37:13	complicated 37:3	contact 13:4	11:14,23,28 12:20
43:2	40:26	continued 1:25	12:26 13:26 14:1
clearer 13:6	comprise 49:19	6:13,15,16,22	14:4,9,16,23,24
clearly 13:12	con 21:22	26:19	15:4,5,10 16:8,11
19:12	conceived 18:10	control 1:8 3:3	16:13,16,20 17:1
client 17:11 20:12	27:7	5:12 49:8	17:18,27 18:7
24:8 45:16	concepts 18:6	conversations 7:8	19:4,17 20:10,23
clients 8:20 20:1	concern 10:14	corporation 1:5	20:28 21:12,21
26:28 27:3 28:19	13:3 27:20 34:4	4:9 49:5	22:5,11,14,16,24
42:10,19,22 43:13	34:23,25 35:4,5	correct 7:4 12:4	23:2,8,14,21,25
44:1	40:4	14:21,22 20:19	24:14,16 25:4,7,22
close 15:18 23:25	concerns 28:22	27:1 37:1 47:9	26:5,14,23,28 27:4
37:28		49:20	27:17 28:6,18,21

[court - diverging]

28:25,26 30:4,11	current 6:27 10:8	declaration 34:13	desire 11:1
30:18 31:2,19	11:15 13:2,28	34:15 35:15	determination
32:1,4,11,18,22	20:3,11,21 26:22	declarations 15:20	42:16
33:4,7,15 34:3	34:9	declared 20:11	determine 11:6
35:10,21 36:4,22	currently 31:15	dedication 32:8	dictionary 12:27
37:7,9,18,23 38:4	47:3	deemed 41:14	diego 1:23 3:17
38:20,23,27 39:1,2	customer 18:25	43:8	different 7:27
39:5,13,25 40:3	cv 35:16	deep 36:12	16:23,25 19:1
42:13,14,17,26	d	default 30:9 44:6	29:1 36:9 43:17
43:1,10,18,24		44:17 46:13	difficult 42:23
44:20,21,25 45:4,7	d 1:22	defaults 43:23	directly 32:19
45:10,23 46:1,2,3	data 29:9 40:27	defendant 3:19	disclose 12:5 21:1
46:9,12,18,26 47:8	41:3	29:1	32:16 33:1 36:2
47:14,17,20,23,27	database 25:24	defendants 4:8	disclosed 36:2
48:3,5,8,8,16,16	date 6:4 8:25,27	6:15 29:16 36:11	discloses 33:22
49:1,17	34:21 37:20 38:9	36:13,15,15,17	disclosure 29:21
court's 5:19,28	dated 49:23	40:7	30:28 32:9 35:14
29:2,4,23 30:23	dates 37:16	definitely 42:8	36:1 38:8,9
courtroom 30:12	david 2:4 3:16	delayed 42:13	disclosures 38:28
craig 26:26	4:25 23:19 33:20	deleted 7:22	39:6 41:2,19,27
crawford 30:21	45:11	deleting 10:24	43:16 44:23,24
create 25:27	day 38:2 49:23	deletions 14:15	45:1,18 46:21
created 44:9	days 33:1	deliberate 19:2	47:5,7
creek 12:14	de 40:19,20 41:7	delicate 18:26	discovery 29:18
criminal 25:10	41:14,16 42:12	delineating 33:9	32:6,21 35:14
critical 13:12	44:6,14 45:14,27	demonstrative	discuss 20:18
criticism 20:24	46:7,22 47:2,11,18	5:21	discussed 23:5
criticize 22:3	deadline 33:27	department 1:3	discussion 12:21
criticizing 21:6	42:13,18 43:2	2:20,21 3:19,20	26:19 46:23 47:26
cross 1:11,17 3:19	45:20 46:20,20	5:5 8:7,10 46:17	discussions 17:16
4:8 6:15 29:1,16	deal 34:20	49:3	19:4 27:12,15
49:11	dealing 32:7	deposition 35:17	disparity 11:22
crowd 27:19	dealt 20:20	deputy 2:23 3:5,22	dispatch 24:1
crummy 35:15	debate 31:19	described 6:6	35:25
crushed 29:10,11	deborah 1:26 5:6	description 29:3	displeased 6:27
29:12	30:21 49:16,26	designate 36:24	district 2:3,10
csr 1:26 5:6 49:16	decide 33:12	38:5	5:15 18:14,16
49:26	decision 9:28	designating 36:19	19:23 21:4 28:12
culling 17:25	18:17 19:18,23,25	designation 35:24	28:12 30:6 36:23
cumulatively	37:7 42:15,23	35:25 36:20	diverging 22:7
40:24 42:10	decisions 20:5,7,8	33.23 30.20	divising 22.7
.5.21 12.10			

[diversion - filed]

diversion 44:8	educating 15:12	event 5:24 19:17	extension 39:28
docket 25:10	efficacy 7:14	events 29:15,16	46:7,20
28:26 29:4,7	10:15	everybody 14:18	extent 10:17
document 5:18 6:6	efficiency 44:9	15:1 36:20,28	extra 38:5
7:7,18 9:11,23,24	efficient 44:5	exactly 10:18	extraction 44:7
11:18,19,20,24,25	efficiently 41:6	12:14 13:1	eyeballing 29:4
14:20,24 15:2	either 13:5 35:24	example 29:7	f
16:1 19:13 23:6	37:24	31:26	f 1:3 5:5 12:22
29:3	element 40:11	exchange 31:7,15	49:3
documents 28:21	41:13	31:18,20,23,26	fact 33:18
28:27 29:24	else's 12:24 36:20	34:21 36:19	facts 18:27 36:12
dog 30:5 33:8	46:25	exciting 17:18	fair 21:24 24:27
dogs 38:5	elvira 30:20	execute 27:24	33:13 47:17,27
doing 8:8,16 30:8	email 48:6,11	exemplary 22:4	fairly 25:13
41:2,18	endeavor 39:19	exertions 8:20	fairness 43:16
doj.ca.gov 2:25	enemy 39:15	exhibit 31:22	fan 20:15 27:14
3:7,24	energized 6:23	exhibits 14:7	far 14:21 29:12
doubtless 24:28	energy 4:20	15:20	fascinating 19:5
draft 7:19,21,24	engaged 17:16	exists 10:8	fashion 9:10 11:7
9:20,23 10:7 11:9	enjoy 12:20	expect 36:3	20:22
11:14 13:28 14:10	ensure 42:3	expedite 29:28	fcoplaw.com 3:12
14:28 17:20 20:11	entertain 7:13	expense 45:17	february 39:28
drive 4:10	entire 9:24	experience 29:13	40:13
drum 27:18	entirely 32:24	experienced 25:9	federal 35:22
duchesnea 4:20	entitled 21:1 36:20	expert 6:8 11:23	fee 25:8 44:4
due 23:15 25:9	49:21	21:15,19,20,22,23	feed 40:21
29:9 38:18	entry 28:28	21:26 22:4,6	feel 7:5 15:15
e	equal 11:21	24:12,19 30:27	fell 12:16
e 2:15,17 4:23	eric 2:22 6:26	31:11 32:16 33:22	fellows 25:28
24:20,25	46:17	34:14,19,22,23	fence 17:10
earlier 8:11 31:27	eric.katz 2:25	35:4,9,19 36:19,24	ferguson 3:10
32:5,27 33:26	erica 4:3	experts 20:24 21:4	fight 27:6 33:8
34:2 35:6 38:9	esq 1:18,22 2:4,11	21:9,28 24:5	file 6:3 7:4 14:27
early 8:28 33:26	3:10,16 4:5,9,14	29:21 30:25 31:12	15:1,8,28,28 16:15
40:23 43:21	esquire 30:25	31:15 32:9 34:10	16:16,17 23:10,14
easier 14:11	essentially 21:25	34:17 35:14 36:14	23:27 24:17,23
east 27:3,7	32:13 39:8	explanation 39:1	25:18 29:9 38:16
edit 22:25,27	establishing 20:19 estimating 42:10	express 15:1 24:18 24:23	38:20,24
edits 9:11,17	esumating 42:10 et 1:9 4:3 11:5	extended 8:12	filed 5:19,27 6:1
educated 30:26	32:9 49:9	CARCHURU 0.12	15:18 16:22,24,25
	34.7 47.7		23:7,13 24:1

[filed - groups]

28:21,24,27 30:2	foregoing 49:19	garrison 4:8,8,9,9	glimpse 31:11
37:28 38:1	forensic 21:5,27	6:5 7:17,20,23 9:9	go 15:7,27 16:2
filing 5:25,25 9:18	forgot 12:11	11:13,16 13:5,13	22:11,16 25:13
15:5 22:22 23:24	form 11:15 27:19	14:19 18:8 21:16	28:25 30:27 31:6
28:18 34:8 44:4	formal 45:20	21:20 22:6 23:6	32:4,12 33:16
filings 6:9,21 7:13	formally 25:8	27:4,17,20 28:7,8	34:10,24 35:6
16:4 28:19 41:21	forward 13:8	30:1,24 38:17,23	36:27 37:10 46:9
finalizing 8:13	26:10 34:10	garrison's 23:11	48:17
find 5:28 12:6 22:2	found 12:14	garrisonlawcorp	goading 19:19
22:18 24:25 25:17	foundation 28:14	4:11	goes 28:6
34:26	foundational	gather 42:28	going 13:16,26
findings 7:22	20:18	44:28	14:1,24 15:27
10:24 14:13	francisco 2:12	general 2:21,23	16:2,14 17:3,4,13
fine 31:9 39:23	frank 18:28	3:5,22 32:6,20	18:8,12,13 19:17
40:2 46:6	frankly 14:26	general's 7:3	19:26 21:6 22:19
fingers 14:21	19:22 20:17	generally 6:6	25:25,26 26:1,3
fire 12:8 13:11	freaked 29:17	general's 3:4	29:18,20 30:14,17
first 12:27 16:9	free 48:16	generic 44:12	31:16,24 32:20
21:14 29:20 30:27	friday 23:13 37:19	genie 14:11	34:27 35:23 36:23
31:6,20 33:17	38:24	genius 35:15	36:24 37:5,18,26
34:24 35:11 37:5	friendly 24:9	geographic 17:27	41:10,11,12,24
37:10,19 39:18,21	front 6:28 11:2	geography 24:9	43:15 45:27
fish 2:20 6:20 7:27	15:17 25:18 32:12	getting 7:12 8:3	good 7:2 8:2 12:2
8:7,10 46:17	47:10	9:6 10:1,17 14:25	21:17 25:19 30:16
fistfight 40:5	fruition 19:26	17:2 19:20,22	35:20 39:15
five 16:23,25 26:8	full 36:2 40:12	36:28 37:16 40:9	gotten 14:20 17:12
28:4,10,15 29:16	49:20	41:3	govern 32:20
47:8	fullness 15:15	giddeaux 8:19,21	grand 1:19
flat 42:1	21:24	gina 4:19	greatest 7:8
floor 1:19,22 2:12	fully 9:25	gist 15:24	gregg 4:8,9 6:5
3:5 30:13,13	functionally 36:14	give 14:9 16:5	gritty 40:10
flow 8:3,8,10	further 6:11 9:8	22:24,25,27 23:26	groaning 30:15
flows 5:23 18:21	10:23 27:15	29:8 30:8 35:17	ground 12:3,6,7
fly 33:10	furtherance 24:20	38:2,23 39:27	groundwater 8:17
following 13:26	future 39:22 44:9	46:12	12:16,18 32:8,15
24:16	g	given 10:26 22:7	41:1,16
follows 35:16	gaggle 30:18	26:15 28:28	groundwaters
force 19:18,25	gamble 3:15	gives 12:2 35:18	12:13
forces 27:9	game 6:20 7:28	giving 39:20	group 27:3
fore 18:27	gap 33:25	gleaned 29:23	groups 26:10
	-		

[gsgarrison - issue]

gsgarrison 4:11	46:3	hopeful 11:10	infer 14:18
guess 8:19,20	hearing 16:18	hopefully 5:28	inform 18:1
14:26 19:19 27:2	34:9	36:2	information 21:1
31:19 34:3 46:24	help 18:1,8 20:24	hoping 7:7 26:19	36:25 41:11 42:9
h	24:12 30:3 34:26	horizon 20:4	42:28 43:6 44:28
	34:27	huge 29:9	45:26
habit 19:28	helpful 24:15	hundred 14:6	informed 6:12
hagerty 1:22 5:13	heretofore 5:7	hurt 41:9	initial 38:28 39:6
5:20 9:16,19,20	hide 12:23	hypothetically	41:18,26 43:15
10:10,21 12:25,28	high 22:28	47:14	44:23,24 45:1,18
14:3,6,21,22 15:3	highberger 1:3 5:5		46:21 47:5,7
15:9 16:5,6 23:3,4	49:3	i	input 11:17 19:14
23:18 24:22 25:18	hindered 21:14	idea 6:27 7:9	19:15
25:20,21 26:5,8,17	hired 21:4 35:15	21:17 34:8 35:2	insofar 36:5
28:7,8 29:28	hiring 21:28	37:2 38:4,8	intelligently 20:27
30:10,16,22 31:7	holly 4:14 20:10	immediate 26:3	intend 33:10 42:26
32:22,24 33:6,13	32:2	immediately 42:24	interconnection
35:12,27 36:21	home 27:23	impact 18:21	5:22
37:1,13,22 38:2,3		45:15	
38:13,14,21,26	homebuyer 27:22	implicate 36:12	interest 41:4
39:5 45:2,3,5,6,24	homework 43:4	implied 46:23	interested 9:27
45:26 46:11,15	hon 1:3 5:5 49:3	important 19:23	17:24 24:18
47:3,9,15,19,22,25	honor 7:2,10 8:1	41:15,17	interesting 46:26
48:1,2,13,15	8:22 9:19,27	imposing 45:21	interests 22:7
hagerty's 36:4	10:11,21,26 11:2,9	improved 13:11	interim 25:24 40:1
46:5	11:16 12:25 13:18	inaudible 31:28	interject 46:16
half 16:26 42:20	13:25 14:3,7,22	inch 14:5	internal 20:8
hand 8:5	15:3,9 16:6,7,19	include 15:22,23	internally 17:16
handle 43:8	16:28 17:15 18:18	incomplete 15:13	interplay 12:12
handled 12:13	20:13 21:9 22:10	inconsistent 31:1	interpreted 31:2
hanson 2:11	22:17 23:3,18,19	32:26	interviewing
hansonbridgett.c	26:9,17,25 27:11	incorrect 43:12	27:21
2:13	29:28 30:10,17	increase 12:17	invite 20:1
happen 31:21	31:8,28 32:24	independent 21:4	invoke 21:10
happens 46:10	33:13,21 34:16	21:15,20,21,26	involved 14:18
happy 23:12 28:17	36:21 37:1,22	indicated 26:21	41:21
30:1,3 33:14 36:6	38:3,14,16,21,26	30:23 38:18 40:15	irrelevant 47:24
45:28	39:12,16 40:6,9	48:9	issue 9:21,28
haystack 16:3	41:22 42:21 43:11	indicates 31:23	11:17,24 12:2
hear 27:26 35:11	43:27 45:3,6,8,11	individuals 27:15	33:17,22 38:10,22
heard 9:5 25:22	46:11,15,16 47:13	41:12,26	38:27,27 39:11
39:14 41:24 44:20	47:19,22 48:2,15	T1.12,20	40:18 44:20 46:4
33.14 41.24 44.20			

[issued - mail]

issued 8:4	katz 2:22 6:26	latest 46:13	little 12:6 17:21
issues 10:16 15:15	7:27 8:1,7 9:12	latitude 23:26	18:3
17:4 20:17,18	10:5 19:19 39:13	law 2:22 3:21 4:4	live 43:10,11
21:8 31:11,16	46:16,17,19	4:9 12:26,27	lives 41:6
38:15 45:4 48:4	kdemorest 3:18	13:21	living 19:12
issuing 17:20	keep 11:5 14:11	lawfulness 29:20	liz 30:21
item 38:17	20:17 35:8	lawyer 6:19 26:23	llc 4:20,21 30:5
items 5:20	kicking 19:27	35:15,18	llp 1:18,21 2:4,11
	kimball 3:11	lawyers 5:16 6:1	3:10,15
j	kind 9:3,13,28	24:7,27	loa 4:23
jacobson 4:14	13:7 17:8 22:5	leadership 18:23	loading 29:17
20:10,13,26 31:28	24:25 29:5 35:18	lean 36:6	loads 29:8
32:2,2,4,5,13,23	42:25	leave 14:13 22:28	lodge 13:28 14:16
33:8,11 36:7	know 10:11 14:14	23:10 25:19 38:16	
jacobson's 33:16	14:25 16:14 17:13	leck 3:15	lodged 14:1,24
james 30:20			lodgement 6:7
jargon 12:23	17:22 19:8 24:5,8	led 18:13	loging 14:17 15:6
jason 4:22	26:9 27:27 30:11	legal 12:23	logic 30:28
jeanne 16:7,10	34:27,28 36:23	legislative 31:1	long 13:21 20:20
jeffrey 3:14 5:26	37:5 42:5	legislature 35:20	22:21 23:27 35:6
join 27:8	known 28:14	lesser 22:28	44:14
joining 10:22	knows 11:9	letting 42:19	longer 11:12
26:24	konrad 30:21	level 41:10	look 9:11,23,26
joseph 30:20	krieger 1:18,21	liberty 10:11	22:7 28:8,27
judge 1:3 49:3	kronick 4:14	likes 36:8	31:11 47:12
judges 20:1	l	likewise 6:3	looked 10:12
judgment 25:19	l 3:16	liking 17:12	looking 18:5 20:7
28:28 47:6	l.a. 12:11 28:26	lily 30:20	27:5,8 31:16
july 1:15 5:4,25,27	lack 18:10,22	limited 25:11	los 1:2,19 2:24 5:4
6:15,16 15:18	lacourtconnect	limits 11:4 38:10	30:19 31:3 46:28
16:1 21:17 22:9	2:8 3:1 4:1,18	list 24:9,14 25:13	49:2,18
23:23 33:12 47:28	5:16 6:21 10:23	28:3 30:1	lot 17:23 40:24
49:21,23	25:12	listen 25:7	41:22
jumping 20:17	laid 6:25 32:17	listening 40:14	lower 8:11
june 5:18 29:25	land 3:21 4:24	litany 40:7 42:9	lynn 30:20
30:5,6	language 12:8	literally 41:15	m
justice 2:21 3:20	44:12	litigants 41:18,20	m 1:18 2:22
11:21	large 16:3 26:6	litigating 15:14	ma'am 32:12
	larger 25:14 31:12	litigation 10:18	macdonald 4:10
k	late 31:21 33:23	12:4,5 19:1 20:4	madam 12:21
k 30:21		20:20 34:24 43:20	
	33:26		mail 24:20,25

[main - number]

main 34:4 47:18	meiners 28:12	month 8:23,28	need 14:23 19:24
47:21	mejia 3:21 39:14	37:14	23:8 33:7 34:27
maintain 42:2	melnick 3:4 6:20	months 39:22,27	34:27 37:9,27
majority 26:20	6:26 7:2,3 8:5,15	morin 1:26 5:6	39:2 41:26 42:9
making 20:5	8:18,22,27 9:4,12	49:16,26	44:15,16,22,23
mallory 3:15	19:19,20 39:13,16	morning 6:4 16:15	45:4,20 48:13
manageable 14:7	39:17,26 40:2	16:16	needed 7:5 8:10
management	43:10,11,22,26	motion 21:14,16	42:6
19:10 30:13 40:28	45:7,8 46:3,5	23:7 38:24	needing 43:6
41:2,16	mentioned 5:7	move 8:28 41:5	needs 6:17 39:22
	23:5	moved 45:20	
map 25:27 39:3			nero 3:14 33:21
marc 3:47:3	mesa 2:5	moving 13:8 37:14	45:12
marc.melnick 3:7	message 24:17,17	multiple 10:12	neutral 11:25
march 30:18,22	metcalf 2:11	17:5 29:15 40:15	21:23
42:14,17,27 43:1,2	meter 47:24	municipal 2:3	neutrals 12:2
44:25,25 46:7	metzger 30:25	mutual 3:9 28:13	new 5:17 16:1
mark 14:14 39:16	mid 33:26	31:7,14,17,20,22	23:6 27:23,26
marked 7:18,21	mind 42:20 45:23	31:26 33:3,5	35:2 45:4
11:9 14:10,28	minded 21:24	34:21 36:19 37:4	news 8:2
market 2:12	27:15	37:10,15,20	nia 3:10,12
martin 4:25 30:21	minimis 40:19,20	mutuality 36:8	nimbleness 22:2
material 42:9 43:6	41:7,14,16 42:12	37:24	nitty 40:10
45:27	44:6,14 45:14,27	mutually 33:1	nmetcalf 2:13
math 16:27	46:7,22 47:2,11,18	36:2	nominal 45:17
matilija 3:9 27:22	mining 12:14	n	non 1:5 49:5
28:13	minor 24:9	n 3:4	nonunilateral
matkins 3:15 5:25	misleading 11:20	nah 35:23	29:21
6:1 7:20 9:18	misses 12:19	name 5:1	noon 16:17 23:28
23:20 33:20 45:13	misuse 25:9	names 29:5	normal 11:7
matter 20:16	moaning 30:15	nathan 2:11	north 4:5
27:16	mode 17:23 18:4,5	nation 2.11 natsis 3:15	note 21:13 23:15
mean 13:1,14	model 8:23	natural 2:22	noted 48:11
32:24,28 40:12	modeling 8:17	natura 2.22 nature 10:13 22:4	notes 39:12
meaning 44:15	modify 17:21	43:6	notice 14:17 15:6
means 10:1 13:19	moment 14:14	near 14:11	16:5 38:2 45:2
13:25	22:13 29:19 32:11		48:14
meant 27:28	monday 14:17	necessarily 21:22	nuisance 43:19
mediation 12:5	15:11	necessary 15:6	number 5:3 16:21
meet 13:2 33:27	money 40:24	33:27 39:9,11	18:28 24:10,27
34:1,10	41:20	41:10,25 45:18	28:27
		necessity 40:16	

[numerosity - phases]

numerosity 42:22	46:12 47:27,27	p	parts 36:7
0	48:8,13	p 30:21	party 13:3 26:10
o 30:9 46:13	once 28:27	p.m. 5:8 23:26,27	29:1 30:5 32:14
oakland 3:6	ones 30:2	37:28 38:1 48:19	37:5 47:4
oaks 28:12	ongoing 13:7	p.o. 3:6	passive 18:4
obgma 41:1	open 27:14 39:11	page 1:25 11:4	paterson 3:10
object 10:2 21:2	opened 8:12	14:10,15,15 15:5	patricia 2:15,17
37:24,25,26,26,27	opinions 32:16	15:23 16:23,25	4:24
objected 34:2	opponents 17:14	23:10 38:10	patterson 26:26
objecting 10:27	opportunity 10:5	pages 14:6 15:19	pause 25:3
17:6	21:18	15:22,25 16:21,24	pay 40:25
objection 7:11 9:9	opposed 38:8	16:25,26,26 17:2	paying 25:8 42:1
9:10 15:26 37:16	opposition 6:23	22:21,23 23:24	peace 29:26 39:26
objections 6:6,25	23:7,14,16 24:4	49:19	39:28 40:12
7:23 10:13,19	38:18	paper 7:5	people 17:5 18:7
15:13,19 16:21,23	order 6:13 18:1	papers 7:20 33:21	19:18 20:6 24:25
16:25 17:3,9	26:11 34:16 35:22	35:3	25:10,11,27 27:4,8
22:21,23 23:24	42:27 44:21 45:1	paperwork 5:17	28:1 29:14 31:24
obligated 15:28	ordered 39:5	paraphrase 35:19	34:19 35:8 40:5
observing 25:10	orders 32:18	parishes 47:2	43:14,18 44:22,27
obvious 18:11	original 29:26	parks 3:19	perceive 22:8
obviously 21:16	orr 3:10	part 9:24 26:9	percent 16:20
occur 45:18	osias 3:16 10:22	29:2	perception 26:5
offer 25:21	10:25 14:19 23:19	participate 11:11	perfect 39:14
offered 25:6	23:19,22 24:2,16	participating	perfectly 39:23
office 2:21 3:4 7:3	25:15 30:24 33:20	24:28 25:11 45:16	40:2
official 1:27 49:16	33:20 36:27 45:11	45:16	perfects 13:22
49:26	45:11 46:1	particular 17:27	permissible 13:27
offline 24:22	osias's 26:1	19:19	person 1:16 2:1
oftentimes 30:27	ossentjuk 4:25	parties 7:13 10:10	21:24
oh 17:18 29:25	ought 10:5 11:14	10:12,15 11:22	perspective 34:24
36:23	14:10,26	18:1 20:19 25:22	peter 4:20
ojai 2:18 4:6,10,13	outlay 40:22 41:11	25:26 26:8,11,13	petitioner 1:6 49:6
20:10,23 27:3,7,13	outright 7:22	28:9,10,15,16,23	phase 17:24 20:20
32:3 41:1	overloaded 41:1	29:5,9 31:10,12,15	21:8,10 31:17
okay 5:10 14:9	owners 12:9 18:9	32:18 33:1,3 36:3	32:8 39:21 40:16
15:4,10 18:11	22:6 47:15	37:15 39:5,7	41:23,24,25 42:7
20:28 25:4 30:4	ownership 13:24	40:14,15 41:4	42:23 43:7 45:19
30:18,25 32:11	owns 13:21	42:12 43:17 46:8	phased 33:5
33:13 37:13 38:12		46:21,22 47:1,4	phases 39:22
38:21 45:4 46:9		48:6	
20.21 .2 10.7			

[phonetic - purpose]

phonetic 8:19	23:11 35:11	preserved 32:26	profit 1:5 49:5
phrased 32:27	poli 2:17	pressure 20:1	progress 8:3 9:3
physical 6:7,24,28	policy 35:26	presumably 24:27	proof 15:6,23
7:12,24 9:6,14	polite 12:23	42:14,16	properly 19:16
10:7,16 11:2,15	political 18:28	pretty 19:11 37:4	property 12:9
12:7,19 13:3,7,28	poll 17:8	preview 19:8	13:23 18:9 22:6
15:14,27 16:12	pool 24:11	previously 8:25	24:8 44:8 47:15
17:12 18:10 19:9	pop 20:14	15:26 28:21	proponents 16:12
20:11,16 21:6	portion 42:3	principal 28:4	proportionate
22:20 26:7,10,12	posed 10:16	principles 41:16	18:14
26:22 27:6,21,25	position 9:22	printed 5:18	proposal 20:25
27:27 28:2,5,9	11:27,27,28 15:16	prior 16:4,4 23:15	propose 24:16
40:10 44:3	22:1 27:13 33:16	privilege 21:11	proposed 6:7,24
pick 27:5	33:19 36:5 37:5	privileged 19:6	7:22 8:25 9:11
piece 12:23	positions 18:2	21:1	12:7,19 15:13
pied 27:9	possibility 7:16	pro 1:27 2:16	20:16 27:24 28:2
piper 27:10	possible 8:28 21:5	21:22 49:17	28:5 33:28 34:12
pisano 1:18 5:13	23:12 41:6	probably 18:14	proposing 26:8
9:16 25:18 31:8,8	post 24:17 26:1	19:5 26:2 37:10	28:10,15 47:4
pitch 39:19	41:25 42:23	problem 39:20	pros 33:9 35:26
plain 24:24	posted 26:3	40:8 42:19 45:10	protected 34:25
plaintiff 21:26	potential 17:24	46:6	protection 2:10
29:26 30:27 36:10	potentially 17:20	problems 21:14	protest 37:12
36:14,16	40:17	25:9	provide 9:13
plaintiff's 21:23	power 19:10	procedural 20:16	14:17 16:12 20:24
plans 33:4	practical 30:28	21:14	21:5 35:23 39:1,6
play 32:25	40:3	procedure 35:14	44:22 45:1 46:21
players 31:27	practically 42:18	35:23	provided 41:8
please 24:20 30:8	precise 36:5	proceeding 25:7	provision 36:8
plenty 22:23	precondition	proceedings 1:14	provisions 31:1
plus 14:6 29:16	27:23	48:19 49:20	32:20
pocket 36:12	prefer 11:21	process 8:13 10:18	public 8:12,13
point 6:18 7:26 8:4	prejudice 15:14	13:7 30:3,16	15:8 28:26 29:2
12:19 13:11,17	prejudicial 34:22	31:16	30:24
16:13 17:14 18:17	prep 47:1	processes 20:8	publication 6:14
19:24,25 20:27	preparatory 44:24	30:14	pulled 6:3
21:18 23:4 26:1	prepared 34:14	prodding 19:27	purchasing 27:23
32:19,23 38:15	35:16	product 22:27	pure 13:24
40:23 46:26	present 4:18 13:10	professionally	purpose 44:10
points 12:28 13:1	44:16 46:1	22:3	45:19
13:5 22:28,28			

[purposes - right]

purposes 11:3	readily 14:20	registering 25:8	request 5:20 45:20
15:4	ready 27:5	related 1:11 49:11	requested 6:13,17
push 18:9	reality 44:3	relates 24:5	requesting 11:17
pushing 19:24	really 6:10 7:24	relationship 19:10	40:27
put 6:28 11:2 12:4	10:14 11:5 37:3,4	released 8:10	requests 48:10
19:2 41:12 42:19	39:7 40:9 43:16	24:13	required 27:28
44:27 48:6,9	44:15	releasing 8:23	40:12
putting 15:16	reason 17:1 18:7	relevance 42:18	requirements 8:9
26:10 40:4	36:11 44:13,27	45:21	requires 32:28
	reasonable 24:1	relevant 39:21,21	40:27
q	35:25 43:2	47:26	rescind 43:5
quarrel 25:15	receipt 6:23 34:5	remaining 42:3	residences 27:22
question 5:23 7:25	receive 22:19	remember 6:1	resistance 12:9
7:27 16:11 18:8	recess 48:16	46:12	resource 25:9
18:11 21:3 23:22	recharge 12:16,18	reminded 25:5	resources 1:8 2:22
23:23 28:6 29:18	recite 29:22	remote 2:8 3:1 4:1	3:3 5:2,12 6:20
35:21,26 36:9	recited 46:27	18:20	8:6,16 18:11,14
39:6 44:26	recommendations	rendered 42:16	24:11 40:19 49:8
questions 28:22	8:11	rendition 10:9	respect 9:22
29:20 37:4	reconstruct 16:3	renewed 21:15	_
quick 23:22 37:2	record 5:10,28 9:8		respond 25:17
quickly 23:12 44:5	25:2,4 28:18,23,24	repairing 5:23	responded 9:8
quite 18:28 19:5	28:26 29:2 30:24	repeat 48:9	respondent 1:17
r	records 29:23	repeatedly 25:23 reply 16:12 23:28	respondents 1:10 49:10
r 2:15,16 12:22,22	recreation 3:19	37:28 38:24	response 5:19
rafael 30:25	redacted 10:28	report 31:22 35:20	23:11 24:26 38:17
rah 21:25,25,25	14:14,16,27	35:24 36:1,3	responses 24:22
raise 18:8 24:3	redacting 10:1	47:12,13	restating 23:16
raises 35:10,21	redacting 10.1	reported 1:26	retained 20:23
36:9	referenced 32:5	reporter 1:27 5:6	21:9 31:10,12
rama 30:9 46:13	referencing 23:15	12:22 48:5,5,8	retrieve 15:28
ranch 28:14	referred 5:14 27:2	49:17,26	return 36:28
rancho 3:9 27:22	27:3	reporter's 1:14	reveal 35:4,5
28:12	refile 23:9 28:20	reports 35:4	review 22:20
rate 42:1	reflected 9:18	represent 40:20	revisit 43:1
razban 3:10	regard 6:26 8:16	42:5	revocable 4:23
reached 11:10,11	13:14 36:6	representation	right 11:18 12:6
18:22	regarding 6:14 8:8	42:2	13:19,22,22,23,23
read 15:24 19:11	17:17	represented 42:2	14:3 16:27 20:27
34:26	registered 25:12	representing 6:5	36:5 40:28 41:3
	1051510104 23.12	representing 0.5	43:16,23,26 47:19
			TJ.10,23,20 T1.17

[right - solution]

	I		
47:22	scatters 36:7	september 31:21	side 43:13,14,15
rightly 44:18	schedule 32:16	31:23,27 34:2	43:23
rights 32:15 44:7,8	33:28 34:6,9	38:8	sided 7:12
44:14	scheduling 29:19	seq 32:9	sideline 39:8 40:24
ring 14:4,5	school 12:27 26:6	sequencing 11:4	44:5
river 28:11	26:24,27 27:12	sequential 33:25	sides 19:1
riverbed 12:15	30:6	sequentially 33:23	sign 29:14 34:13
road 3:11 4:21	schools 47:1	series 28:19	signature 49:25
robert 4:25	scientific 6:8	serve 14:26 15:1	signed 28:2,4,27
robey 30:21	11:23	16:15,17 23:25,27	44:28 45:15
rocks 12:15	scope 17:25	24:18,23	significant 18:25
role 18:23	se 7:11	served 5:27 6:4	similar 29:3
roman 30:19	searchable 25:24	15:17 23:28 37:27	similarly 24:11
46:27	second 16:8 29:8	37:28	simple 37:4
room 42:5	29:21 30:13 39:24	serves 11:28	single 24:8,8
rosanna 4:8	section 2:22 3:21	servexpress 6:3	sir 12:20 23:2,21
round 29:10	7:21 9:22,24 10:1	14:27	46:18
rules 35:22	14:13,28 31:2	service 5:18 6:14	sit 39:8 47:3,10
ruling 45:2	32:10	11:4 15:6,23 25:5	sitter 17:10
running 37:8	sections 14:28	38:7	situated 24:11
rutan 2:4	see 7:10,26 10:8	servxpress 25:18	34:19
ryan 4:4,5,7 28:20	10:22 11:12,14	session 48:12	situation 18:26
40:6 43:27	12:6 17:24 19:11	set 23:24	32:14
ryanblatzlaw.com	21:19 24:23,25	setting 9:10 33:2	six 15:19,22,25
4:7	25:12,16,27 29:5	settled 36:16	16:23 17:2 22:22
S	34:26 36:20 39:28	40:13	23:24
s 2:4 3:14 12:22	42:8 46:10	settlement 7:7,8	size 17:25
s 2.4 3.14 12.22 sacramento 3:23	seeing 10:19	40:17	slow 31:24
4:15	seeking 18:22	seven 16:25 34:7	small 18:9 22:6
san 1:23 2:12 3:17	seen 27:9	shanahan 4:14	24:7 42:1
5:14	selected 21:20	shantal 3:10	smaller 18:19
santa 1:5 5:1,11	send 22:21 24:23	share 28:17 30:1	31:10,10
49:5	36:25,26,26	34:17,18	software 29:10,12
satisfies 11:1	sends 12:26	sharing 24:19	29:13,17
satisfy 35:3	sense 11:21 13:24	shawn 1:22 9:19	sold 17:13
saving 20:21 21:25	14:15 36:22	23:4	solicitation 24:24
saying 20.21 21.23 says 21:26 24:18	sentiment 45:24	shawn.hagerty	solution 6:7,24,28
28:9 32:13 34:28	45:25	1:24	7:12,24 9:6,15
35:15,23	separate 10:4	short 25:13 38:17	10:7,16 11:2,15
scan 29:7	21:12	show 6:13 14:15	12:7,19 13:4,7,28
Scall 49.7		29:5	15:14,27 16:12

[solution - terminated]

17:12 18:10 20:11	spouse 6:6	straw 17:8	suppose 40:8
20:16 21:7 22:20	spring 2:23	stream 47:25	supposed 35:19
26:7,10,12,20,22	srazban 3:12	street 2:12,23 3:5	sure 16:13 19:5
27:7,21,25,27 28:2	staff 17:16 30:11	3:22 4:5,15	46:24
28:5,9 40:4,10	30:12	strenuous 17:9	surface 8:17 12:12
44:3	standing 13:21	strenuously 10:28	12:18 13:16 18:21
solutions 19:9	stands 11:18	structure 10:14	44:7
solve 42:18	start 9:17 11:24	style 35:22	surrendered 43:24
solved 21:13	19:24 29:4	subdivision 27:24	43:24
somebody 12:24	started 24:3	subject 26:18	surrendering
27:5	state 1:1,8 3:3 5:2	submission 7:16	43:21
someday 39:3	5:11 6:19,22,22,25	34:12	symmetrical 18:11
soon 20:13 41:18	6:27 8:16 13:21	submit 10:2 15:5	system 12:18
sooner 34:17	15:21 49:1,8,17	15:13	t
37:11	state's 8:3	submitted 10:13	t 12:22
sorry 20:13	statement 6:7 12:3	15:26 23:6 28:17	tab 29:24
sort 17:10 25:27	21:27 36:4	substance 7:25	table 10:18 12:4
29:22	statements 6:10	substantive 10:13	tactical 34:24
sorting 20:7	states 44:7,13	subsurface 5:22	take 18:23 25:25
sound 10:27 43:20	status 6:11 47:12	sufficiently 44:16	26:2,15 29:21
south 1:19 2:17,23	statute 32:7,19	suggest 7:11	38:12 39:22 42:28
3:11	stay 39:1	suggested 33:21	44:23,26 45:5
speak 8:19 16:8	staying 46:20	suggesting 7:21	47:12,17,20,25,28
20:26 34:4 35:11	steps 42:28 44:24	suggestion 7:18	48:4
37:18 38:9 39:17	stick 14:12	9:12 10:4	taken 10:10 43:15
45:28	sticky 14:21	suggestions 48:4	43:23 44:17 49:21
speaking 17:4	stipulate 46:22	suggests 31:22	takes 11:26,27
22:11,14 32:1	stipulated 26:12	suite 2:5,23 3:16	talk 8:15 35:9
spear 8:4 17:14	39:7 40:21,23	4:5	talked 7:6
specially 26:26	44:1 47:6	summary 15:22	talking 20:5
specific 5:24 6:10	stipulating 42:12	superior 1:1 28:26	taylor 28:14
7:18 9:17 13:27	42:22 44:3,14	29:11 49:1,17	team 5:21 24:22
26:21 32:7	46:8,21,28	supervising 2:23	tell 30:23 40:28
specifically 32:26	stipulation 28:28	supplementing	tells 25:10
44:11,13	29:25 32:17 41:7	23:16	tempore 1:27
specify 8:27	44:2,12,19,22,28	support 6:8 10:24	49:17
spelled 12:22	45:15	20:21 21:5 22:1	ten 40:27
spend 41:20	stipulations 28:17	26:20,21 33:15	tend 36:12
sponsor 20:11	29:22	37:19,20 38:24	term 14:11 18:23
26:6	strange 20:17	supportive 23:6	terminated 25:8
			20.0

[terms - ventura]

terms 5:17 15:22	thought 6:22	toxic 30:26	understand 9:25
15:24 17:27,28	19:15 21:27 22:2	track 8:23	19:12 20:6 21:28
18:1 38:7	33:25	traditional 13:24	24:12 30:2 31:20
testify 35:16	three 12:28 13:1,4	35:13	understanding
testiny 33.10 testimony 49:21	14:4,5 39:17	trailed 38:27	36:18,27
text 15:19 31:23	threw 43:25	transaction 28:1	undue 40:4
thacher 4:21 26:6	thrilled 17:22 19:8	transcript 1:14	unduly 41:13
26:12,23,27 27:12	27:13	48:11 49:20	unfair 27:7 43:20
thank 9:19 11:16	thursday 15:18	treatment 11:22	unfortunately
12:20 16:28 22:17	38:20	treaty 29:26 40:13	8:22 18:24
23:2,18 24:2 38:3	tiered 31:9	trial 13:10,16	unhappy 26:14
38:21,26 39:16	time 5:8 7:6,26 9:7	31:25 32:8 33:1,5	unified 30:6
40:6 44:21 45:3,9	9:14,27 10:8 11:6	42:14,17 45:19	unknown 40:11
46:11 48:2	15:15,25 16:13,18	tried 31:17	unmuted 20:14
thanks 16:19	21:24 22:26,27	true 18:18 19:7	unnamed 29:1
theirs 35:5	23:23 25:6 29:8	21:23,27 25:1	unrealistic 34:26
themes 17:3	33:24,25 34:5,14	28:25 49:20	unreimbursed
theory 24:20	34:18,20,26 35:6	truly 7:1 21:21	12:24
thick 14:2	35:24,25 36:19,24	truncated 23:1	update 30:8 46:13
thing 12:17 15:7	38:6 39:20 40:18	trust 3:14 4:23,24	urgent 15:16
15:13 24:28 25:1	41:9,13,27 42:25	5:27 33:21 45:12	use 13:19,22,23
27:26 30:5 39:24	44:27 45:9,22	trustee 3:14 5:26	24:9 40:21
40:13,17	times 17:5	9:10,17 45:12	useful 17:7 20:24
things 16:3 24:6	timing 37:25	try 16:3 27:18	usefully 38:12
29:14 30:1 39:18	today 5:17 6:4	29:14,22	user 24:9 26:6
think 7:5 8:4,15	13:9 14:9 16:4	trying 8:28 12:9	44:6,14 46:7 47:2
8:21 11:18,19,28	22:9,18 24:6,28	22:1 40:5,23	users 27:7 31:10
12:3,17 13:5,11	25:11,14 34:3	tsao 4:24	40:19,20 41:7,14
17:22 18:2 19:7	38:19 45:2 47:4	tucker 2:4	45:14,27 47:11
19:11 20:3,17,26	47:10	turn 29:18	uses 26:15
23:12 24:7 25:28	today's 5:24 6:10	two 9:17 15:5	usufructuary 12:8
26:17 27:12 29:13	31:22 34:9	23:10 26:2 36:12	12:21 13:18
30:16 31:17,24	told 27:23 41:28	36:14 37:4,25	v
32:27 35:28 37:6	43:12	38:15	variety 26:28
37:15 38:14,22	tolerably 30:14	type 27:26	variety 20.28 various 5:16
39:2,10,17 40:14	topic 6:18 45:24	u	ventura 2:10 3:11
41:27 43:7,12	tort 30:26	u 12:22,22,22,22	4:22,24 5:15,19
45:26 46:5,6 47:9	total 16:21,24		, ,
thinking 26:17	totally 29:10	ultimately 24:13 41:23	6:10,12,17 8:11 13:28 16:5 18:15
thinks 21:16 24:14	touched 17:5		18:25 22:8 27:6
39:10		unbelievably	
		40:26	28:3,11,11 30:6

[ventura - zolezzi]

21.7.20.5.11.10	00715171015	7 04 04
31:5 38:6 44:18	8:3,5,16,17 13:16	words 24:21
ventura's 5:25	13:19,21 18:13,16	work 12:2 13:12
20:25 21:6	18:21 19:23 20:24	22:4,27 40:8,25
verbally 25:6	21:4,4 26:15,16	worked 12:1
version 6:28 10:6	28:11,12,13 36:23	working 17:19
14:5,27 26:22	47:18,21,23 49:8	18:5 25:23 28:20
versus 31:21	waters 12:12,18	42:24,26
view 6:18 7:6,12	watershed 2:10	world 25:6 43:20
7:22 16:13 20:4	way 12:23 15:1	worried 45:14
20:18 24:24	22:2 29:7 30:7	worth 40:27
views 43:17	31:26 32:27 39:25	wrangling 41:22
villa 3:14 33:21	43:8 44:5,18	wrapped 42:15
45:12	ways 10:20 17:7	written 22:26
voting 19:10	19:22	32:28 44:1,11
vs 1:7 5:1,11 49:7	we've 23:5,7 25:22	X
W	25:24 40:15 48:4	x 24:20
w 4:5	website 26:4	X 24.20
	week 26:2	y
wait 17:23 18:4,4	weekend 47:12	y 12:22 24:20
waiting 8:19,21 17:13 22:18	weeks 26:2 34:7	yeah 14:6 25:21
	weighs 11:23	33:6
waive 31:6	welcome 27:12	year 8:11 12:27
waiving 31:13,14	west 1:22 3:16	42:20
wallflower 17:11	whitman 4:26	years 40:27
want 7:10 10:23	wife 7:17	yolo 12:13
15:17,24,25 16:1	wildlife 2:20 8:8	Z
18:9 19:14,15	46:17	zolezzi 16:7,7,10
21:2 22:7,24	william 1:3 4:21	16:10,19,28
24:11 25:17 27:18	5:5 26:25 27:11	10.10,19,28
33:17 37:12,26	49:3	
39:18,24 41:5	willing 27:9 31:6	
44:8 46:3 48:10	39:3	
wanted 44:18	willingness 35:6	
46:19,24	winded 20:20	
wants 9:5 16:8	wisdom 10:6,7	
31:26 37:24 39:14	wish 9:16 15:11	
39:20 44:6	wonder 24:14 28:1	
waste 7:5	wondering 45:21	
watch 17:23 18:4	wood 28:14	
18:4	word 12:21 14:27	
water 1:8 2:3 3:3,9	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
5:2,11,15,22 6:20		

California Code of Civil Procedure

Article 5. Transcript or Recording

Section 2025.520

- (a) If the deposition testimony is stenographically recorded, the deposition officer shall send written notice to the deponent and to all parties attending the deposition when the Original transcript of the testimony for each session of the deposition is available for reading, correcting, and signing, unless the deponent and the attending parties agree on the record that the reading, correcting, and signing of the transcript of the testimony will be waived or that the reading, correcting, and signing of a transcript of the testimony will take place after the entire deposition has been concluded or at some other specific time.
- (b) For 30 days following each notice under subdivision (a), unless the attending parties and the deponent agree on the record or otherwise in writing to a longer or shorter time period, the deponent may change the form or the substance of the answer to a question, and may either approve the transcript of the deposition by signing it, or

refuse to approve the transcript by not signing it.

- (c) Alternatively, within this same period, the deponent may change the form or the substance of the answer to any question and may approve or refuse to approve the transcript by means of a letter to the deposition officer signed by the deponent which is mailed by certified or registered mail with return receipt requested. A copy of that letter shall be sent by first-class mail to all parties attending the deposition.
- (d) For good cause shown, the court may shorten the 30-day period for making changes, approving, or refusing to approve the transcript.
- (e) The deposition officer shall indicate on the original of the transcript, if the deponent has not already done so at the office of the deposition officer, any action taken by the deponent and indicate on the original of the transcript, the deponent's approval of, or failure or refusal to approve, the transcript. The deposition officer shall also notify in writing the parties attending the deposition of any changes which the deponent timely made in person.
- (f) If the deponent fails or refuses to approve the transcript within the allotted period, the

deposition shall be given the same effect as though it had been approved, subject to any changes timely made by the deponent.

- (g) Notwithstanding subdivision (f), on a seasonable motion to suppress the deposition, accompanied by a meet and confer declaration under Section 2016.040, the court may determine that the reasons given for the failure or refusal to approve the transcript require rejection of the deposition in whole or in part.
- (h) The court shall impose a monetary sanction under Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 2023.010) against any party, person, or attorney who unsuccessfully makes or opposes a motion to suppress a deposition under this section, unless the court finds that the one subject to the sanction acted with substantial justification or that other circumstances make the imposition of the sanction unjust.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1,

2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE STATE RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.