

1 JEANNE M. ZOLEZZI - SBN 121282
2 **HERUM CRABTREE BROWN**
3 *A California Professional Corporation*
4 2291 WEST MARCH LANE, SUITE B100
5 STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95207
6 Telephone: (209) 472-7700
7 Facsimile: (209) 472-7986

8 Attorneys for SOLANO COUNTY WATER AGENCY

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Coordination Proceeding Special Title
(Rule 1550b)

PUTAH CREEK WATER CASES

PUTAH CREEK COUNCIL,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT, and
SOLANO COUNTY WATER AGENCY,

Defendants.

CITY OF DAVIS,

Cross-Complainant,

v.

SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
SOLANO COUNTY WATER AGENCY,
CITY OF VALLEJO, CITY OF SUISUN and
MAINE PRAIRIE WATER DISTRICT,

Cross-Defendants.

SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
SOLANO COUNTY WATER AGENCY et al.)
Plaintiffs,

v.

THE NAMES OF ALL APPROPRIATIVE
WATER RIGHTS HOLDERS IN UPPER
BASIN, et al.

Defendants.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION
PROCEEDING NUMBER 2565

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SUPERIOR
COURT CASE NUMBER 515766

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
CASE NUMBER 108552

**DECLARATION OF JEANNE M.
ZOLEZZI IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
AMEND JUDGMENTS PURSUANT TO
STIPULATION AMONG ALL PARTIES
PURSUANT TO SECTION VI OF
AMENDED JUDGMENTS
(NO OPPOSITION)**

DATE: November 1, 2002

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

DEPT: 47

1 I, Jeanne M. Zolezzi, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney, duly licensed to practice law in the State of California.

3 2. I have been the general counsel for Solano County Water Agency ("Agency")
4 since its formation in 1989.

5 3. The Settlement Agreement entered into on May 23, 2000 among the Agency, City
6 of Davis, Putah Creek Council and the Regents of the University of California anticipated that
7 the Agency, on behalf of the Solano parties, would request that the Bureau of Reclamation file
8 Petitions for Change with the State Water Resources Control Board in order to conform the
9 water right permits held by Reclamation for the Solano Project to the Amended Judgments.
10

11 4. When developing the language for those petitions, the parties realized that while
12 they had agreed to refrain from enforcement action through the courts under certain
13 circumstances, they had not agreed to refrain from enforcement action through the State Water
14 Resources Control Board under those same circumstances.
15

16 5. The parties determined that it was in their best interest to clarify such intention,
17 while at the same time clarifying further the circumstances under which such enforcement action
18 could be taken.
19

20 6. The Stipulation entered into among the parties dated June 18, 2002 is intended to
21 accomplish clarification of enforcement action, and apply the restraint of enforcement provision
22 to both the court and the State Water Resources Control Board.
23

24 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 6th
25 day of September, at Stockton, California.

26
27 By  _____
28

JEANNE M. ZOLEZZI