STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD BOARD MEETING/HEARING

(Portion)

MARCH 17, 2015

Coastal Hearing Room - Second Floor 1001 I Street Sacramento, California 95814

scribed By: Diane F. Fattig, CSR No. 3692



STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD BOARD MEETING/HEARING

(Portion)

MARCH 17, 2015

Coastal Hearing Room - Second Floor 1001 I Street Sacramento, California 95814

Transcribed By: Diane F. Fattig, CSR No. 3692

1	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
2	BOARD MEMBERS
3	Chair Felicia Marcus
4	
5	Vice-Chair Frances Spivy-Weber
6	Board Member Tam M. Doduc
7	Board Member Steven Moore
8	Board Member Dorene D'Amamo
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

KATHRYN DAVIS & ASSOCIATES 916.567.4211

1	PORTION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
2	(File 9, 2:00 until end)
3	(File 10, entire file)
4	000
5	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: We're reconvened at 5:20.
6	Mr. Howard, are you ready for item number nine?
7	BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: Let's call for the
8	vote.
9	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: I was trying to see who was
10	just going to step up and maybe I should have made it a
11	longer coffee break, but we need to get going.
12	Item number nine.
13	ANDREW TAURIAINEN: Good evening
14	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Good evening.
15	ANDREW TAURIAINEN: Chair Marcus and members of
16	the Board. I'm Andrew Tauriainen, attorney with the
17	Office of Enforcement.
18	Due to an unfortunate and also a bit convoluted
19	series of events I'm kicking off this staff presentation.
20	Mr. O'Hagan's voice is gone due to an illness so we'll be
21	Brian Coats and I will be tag teaming on the
22	presentation.
23	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: And you can say all the
24	things you always wanted to say when Jon was speaking
25	before.

```
ANDREW TAURIAINEN: His voice isn't all the way
 1
 2
    gone. Right. But -- so --
           BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: And Jon can use sign
    language like -- yeah, that kind of thing.
 4
 5
          ANDREW TAURIAINEN:
                              This slide I won't linger too
    much on just because it really gives the headings of all
    the subsequent slides. But this is the outline of our
 8
    presentation.
          Now I'll turn it over to Brian.
 9
           BRIAN COATS: Okay. These first four slides are
10
11
    somewhat redundant based on the information that you have
12
    all seen earlier today from the presentations by the DWR,
    USBR and other agencies. So I'll go through them really
13
14
    quick.
           On the first slide here we're indicating that these
15
16
    are two pictorial representations of the level of drought,
17
    the one on the left being from 2014 in March and the one
18
    on the right being from 2015. The darker the color, the
19
    more severe the drought.
20
          And, as you can see, we're in much worse shape this
    year than we were last year with the exception of the
21
22
    North Coast. Every other area seems to be pretty much a
    darker shade.
23
           And this is just a little background information as
24
```

the -- as to the continuing need for the emergency.

25

4

```
to insufficient rainfall being able to end the state's
    historic drought, Governor Brown signed an executive order
 2
    on December 22, 2014, extending the California
 3
    Environmental Quality Act waiver to May 31st of 2016,
 5
    which consequently extended the Board's authority to adopt
 6
    emergency regulations.
 7
           To mitigate the effects of the drought and allocate
 8
    the limited water resources, State Water Board needs an
    effective method of acquiring information to address water
10
    allocation during curtailment, responding to complaints
11
    and enforcing against unauthorized diversions.
12
           Due to time commitments required pursuing these
13
    changes in our normal rule-making process and a limited
14
    window for the current water year, the need for emergency
15
    relations is present.
16
           And here you can notice that there's two graphs.
17
    One is on the Sacramento eight-station precipitation
    index, and the one on the right is the San Joaquin
18
19
    five-station precipitation index indicating as of
20
    yesterday on March 16 we currently stand at 31.1 inches
    for the Sacramento eight-station area and then 13.5 for
21
22
    the one on the right.
23
           Okay. And -- turn it back on. Okay. All right.
24
           And this is a -- it's still doing that to me. So
```

this is just a little bit of background information as

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Okay. So for the 2014 curtailment effort, our goals consisted of improving the enforcement process with better information, namely refined reported demand, and noting which curtailed post-1914 rights could claim an alternate basis of right.

Secondly, providing a level of transparency in our analysis to the public. Through this increased level of transparency gaining stakeholder buy-in of our analysis through watershed meetings and providing our analysis dataset willingly.

And, lastly, providing the public with frequent updates to the curtailment effort and ensuring the effort's effectiveness by enforcing against any party failing to respond to a Board order and/or notice.

During the 2014 curtailment effort, division staff hosted watershed stakeholder meetings to improve data

```
quality and discuss project operations. Once curtailment
notices were issued, we later hosted meetings to discuss a
method of lifting curtailment in response to short-term
rainfall events. That method of implementing an e-mail
notification system was very effective at notifying
curtailed parties of a temporary lift and later a
permanent lift of of the 2014 curtailments due to
short-term rainfall events.

Division staff have also posted our 2015 demand data
set on our website as of February, which uses a four-year
average demand versus the prior year's curtailment's
```

Division staff have also posted our 2015 demand data set on our website as of February, which uses a four-year average demand versus the prior year's curtailment's single year. By posting the demand data set well in advance of any potential curtailments, division staff have contributed to our goal of increased transparency.

Currently division staff are in the process of preparing to host another stakeholder meeting, initially for the San Joaquin River Watershed, to discuss potential curtailment.

Division staff are also in the process of downloading and analyzing almost 1,000 responses to the most recent Informational Order for the Sacramento, San Joaquin and Delta statements.

As you know, over 9,000 curtailment notices were issued in 2014. While the 2014 emergency regulations provided the means to issue orders after the notices had

gone out, division staff did not pursue this enforceable route due to limited resources already deployed for curtailment inspections.

For the watersheds not curtailed but considered in our spring analysis, local voluntary solutions such as those in the Tulare Lake Basin and also lack of supporting information for the Salinas River Watershed were found not to meet the need to go about the order route.

Lastly, since the 2014 emergency regulations were limited to post-1914 rights, there was no avenue to issue an enforceable curtailment order against a senior right.

Of the parties that returned the curtailment certification form, some of the responders claimed a senior right as an alternate source. Division staff looked at a 325 inspection sample size out of the 950 conducted and found 54 claimed a senior right. Of those 54, 20, or about 37 percent, did not have a statement filed with the division.

For these 20 parties, if 2014 was the first year of use under their senior right, they are required to file an initial statement by July 1, 2015, which currently restricts enforcement of the statement filing law until the summer. Had curtailment orders been issued in addition to the notices for post-1994 water rights, the result would likely have been the same.

```
actually curtailed, meaning they actually stopped and they
 1
    didn't claim an alternate basis of right.
 2
 3
          So some of those that were claiming a senior right
 4
    since the post-1914 right was curtailed. So in that
    event, yes, their post-1914 right was curtailed but the
    actual amount diverted is -- they're still diverting it,
   but they're doing it under a senior right.
 8
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: But wait. That's just a
    percent from the ones that returned the form.
10
         BRIAN COATS: Yes.
11
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: What about people that didn't
12
    return the form?
13
         BRIAN COATS: We don't have that information right
14
    there. We can compile it, I'm sure. Yes.
15
         CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Well, it's just apropos of
16
   the enforcement conversation we keep having.
17
         BRIAN COATS: Yeah, there's always been a lot of
    questions on that last column. It's kind of interesting
18
19
   but, you know. Okay.
20
           Okay. And late last year division staff issued 23
21
    Informational Orders to parties downstream of Friant Dam
22
   as a result of a complaint filed in May of 2014.
23
           Enforcement action has been taken for failure to
24
   respond, with additional actions for failure to respond,
```

and threatened and/or unauthorized diversions are pending.

25

```
Of the Informational Order recently issued in
 1
 2
    February 2005 to the top 90 percent of Delta statement
 3
    holders and the remaining top 90 percent of the Sacramento
 4
    and San Joaquin River statement holders, we have received
 5
    as of a couple days ago, over a 94 percent response rate
 6
    with the preliminary results showing in the following
 7
    graphs.
 8
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS:
                                  Now, that's a number.
 9
          BRIAN COATS: That's pretty good.
10
          CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: I like it.
11
           BRIAN COATS: I like it. Okay. So this -- again,
12
    on the -- this is the actual amount of water that we were
13
    using. On the left there, the brown or red, whatever, if
14
    you're color-blind or not. So that's the 2010 to 2013
15
    four-year average demand we were using for curtailment
16
    analysis up to the Informational Order.
17
          And so you can see there there's 5.2 million
    acre-feet or fifty two hundred fifty four thousand
18
19
    acre-feet that we had planned on being consumed for the
20
    Sacramento, San Joaquin and Delta statement holders.
21
           After compiling the responses to the web form from
2.2
    the informational order, we noted -- we noticed a
23
    reduction for 2014 reported diversions of about 23 percent
24
    down to about 4,031 -- or 4 million acre-feet. So that's
25
    already a 23 percent reduction in demand just from the
```

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Not a reduction in demand. It means it's trued up the numbers we would be relying on versus our estimate.

BRIAN COATS: Right. So in our --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: That's an important reason to have the information.

BRIAN COATS: Exactly. That's the reason why -that's the benefit of the Informational Order is prior to
those results coming in from the Informational Order, we
would have utilized the 5.2 million acre-feet number for
demand, which would have unfortunately caused us likely to
curtail people that didn't need to be because the 2014
demand is showing a lesser number.

And then the 2015 in green is the projected diversions. So it's a little bit less. And so that's the April through September summary.

And if you go to the next graph here, and this is the monthly distribution. Because, again, when we requested that information from the statement holders, it was by month, and so we graphed this to show that as well.

So the top curve there representing the four-year average demand we were initially using. The blue curve representing the adjusted 2014, and then the green what they plan on doing this year for demand. And so that's

2.2

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: And I guess -- it was my understanding that last year in 2014 crops came in earlier because it was so hot, and so you might have had a decline because they were just harvesting rather than watering.

Well, not in May, but when you get out to July.

BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: I think historically the storage units sounds correct. Thank you.

BRIAN COATS: Okay. At this point I'll hand the presentation over to Andrew.

ANDREW TAURIAINEN: Thank you. I'm going to get into the nuts and bolts of the proposed emergency regulation. First I want to just mention briefly what the existing 879(c) does, the one adopted last July.

879(c), the current, allows informational orders only against pre-1914 and riparian claimants and only in two limited conditions. One is whether -- when there's a complaint received alleging an interference with a water right by that type of claimant or, two, when the division receives information alleging unlawful diversion of stored water. So it's a very limited tool for gathering this type of information.

The proposed emergency regulation expands this

authority. It makes it a more useful tool for the purposes that we're proposing it for. Let me talk about what it is.

2.2

It's an enforceable tool to investigate complaints alleging interference with a water right by a water right holder, diverter or user. And in that sentence -- and this is the way it reads in the -- in the resolution -- oh, and also you've probably seen, but the first page of the digest has a red-lined version or strike-out bolt underlined, and strike-out version comparing the proposal to last year's because the changes are fairly significant.

But in the first sentence in the first bullet point, the interferor is the water right holder, diverter or user. The complaints don't have to come from those parties.

So also, in circumstances where parties claim previously unasserted senior rights in response to an investigation or curtailment, which we did see last summer and last fall during the inspections on the curtailment notices.

Also in response to parties claiming unverified and previously unnoticed transfers or contract purchases.

What we mean there is when a party claims instead of a senior right they say I've purchased or I've received a transfer from somebody claiming a senior right. And this

And then finally, in circumstances where there are threats of waste or actual waste, unreasonable use, unreasonable method of diversion, unlawful diversion of water by any water right holder, diverter or user.

So in any of those circumstances those -- that last slide was the triggering conditions. If any of those conditions are met then the Deputy Director may issue an order requiring information regarding claim of right, property patent date, date of initial appropriation, and diversions made or anticipated during the current year.

Those are all more or less in the current version of 879(c). The last two bullets points, compliance with transfer law if the diversion is not subject to approval of Board or Department of Water Resources. Again, that's a paraphrase of what's actually in the section, but the intent there is to allow us to gather information regarding the right underlying any approval -- or any transfer or contract purchase if we didn't already know about it.

And then finally, any other information relevant to authenticating the right or forecasting the use and supplies in the current drought year.

So why do we need this tool? This allows the

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

This kind of regulation, this kind of information tool, allows us to get better information faster. It is important to note that as a regulation adopted under the drought emergency provisions of the water code it becomes immediately enforceable. That is, a party who doesn't respond or who wholly inadequately responds could potentially be subject to enforcement immediately. There's a \$500 per day provision allowing going directly to administrative civil liability for that kind of

But the penalties -- or enforcement can also take place under the sort of standard enforcement provisions of the water code. That is, start with a cease and desist order and then go into ACLs, administrative civil liabilities, for violations of the cease and desist order, or an administrative civil liability for unauthorized diversion.

These -- the orders themselves won't necessarily cause these kinds of enforcement actions, but they will help bolster those cases.

And finally, better information aids enforcement, helps the Board to more quickly and accurately refine curtailments.

A couple slides about the fiscal impact analysis. This is Appendix 10 of the regulatory digest.

As you're aware, the analysis is required by the Office of Administrative Law to examine the effect on state and local government, federal funding of state programs. And the analysis does not require a broader economic impact analysis. It's just impacts on public agencies.

So here the government agencies we've identified as being potentially affected are public, agricultural and municipal water agencies and state and local governments.

And that form is essentially -- it's a web-based form that you fill out, and then in some cases where there needs to be further justification of the basis of the water right claimed, that information is e-mailed in. So we've estimated the time we -- we think it would take for public agencies to comply with this form. There are 2,483 diversions owned or controlled by public agencies in our records. Of those, 2,058 are post-'14 water rights. So they're permits or licenses. In those cases those agencies would not have to submit the backup information to support their claim of right. That's already on file.

So for them it would take, we estimate conservatively, about an hour to gather their diversion data because that's information they should be collecting along the way anyway, compile it and then submit it.

For riparians and pre-'14s, there are 425 riparians and pre-'14 claims controlled or owned by state and local governments. There they have the one hour to compile their diversion data and submit it on the form, but they

We've estimated that, you know, conservatively -- or roughly estimated that about half of the agencies will have that information somewhat easily obtainable, meaning they can obtain it within three to five hours of staff time. In other cases it may take them a lot longer, so the other half would be up to 24 hours of staff time to gather the information.

We averaged that out to 15 and a half hours total compliance time for those 425 diversions.

Multiply all of the hours that we -- it would take for each of these diversions by our estimate of \$65 an hour for a staff engineer. It's the same estimate used in last year's fiscal analysis for the previous version of this emergency regulation. And the total fiscal impact of the cost state wide -- and this is important to note. This would assume that every state agency's diversion receives an Information Order, which I think is a very, very conservative estimate, is \$561,958.

The curtailments and related costs were not affected by these Information Orders, and in our examination there's no effect on state or local government or on federal funding of state programs.

There's one -- we didn't do a change order for this.

There's one small typo that occurred in between bullet --

7

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

well, it occurred in between the agenda notice that went out about ten days ago and the digest that was posted about four or five days ago. One letter of one word of Subsection (c)(1)(C) was changed. And you can see at the very end the word "has" was changed to "had."

So that's the correction. Again, we don't have a change sheet, but we're going to propose that -- we're going to recommend that the Board adopt the resolution as presented with this correction.

The next steps -- this is repetitive of the present staff presentation from the prior item. This is just the OAL process. We are hopeful that the regulation can go into effect in early April. The current version of 879(c) expires on April 14. It -- it goes through April 13. And then it would last for 270 days.

That last point about when the regulation expires is relevant because a number of the commenters made comments about the status of Section 879(c). The comment deadline was extended until yesterday at noon.

We received about seven comments. We did list them, but I haven't been able to, you know, tabulate what the comments are into a slide. I can briefly note what the main comments are, the ones that are shared by several commenters.

The first is that there -- that the 30-day time

```
limit might not be enough when it's necessary to gather
 2
    information to support the basis of a right.
 3
           We found this to be a common theme of the responders
 4
    to the February Information Order. And so the proposed
    regulation is (C)(3), allows the Deputy Director to grant
    additional time beyond the 30 days upon a showing of good
    cause and if there's substantial compliance with the rest
 8
   of the regulation requirements. Meaning if they can
    submit what they have. And that especially means the
10
    diversion data which should already be present. Most
    agencies should already have that. Or most diverters.
11
12
           The second comment is that Section 879(c) actually
13
    expired on February 28. A number of commenters -- local
14
    agencies of the North Delta, Restore the Delta,
15
    San Joaquin Tributaries Authority, and Spaletta Law -- all
16
   made this comment. There may be others that I'm
17
    forgetting.
```

Oh, pardon me. It's Merum Crabtree's comments. The Banta-Carbona.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The -- 879(c) was adopted in an emergency regulation that was approved by OAL on July 16th of last year, so it doesn't expire until April 14. April 13 is the last date it's valid

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: They're counting from the date of adoption rather than OAL?

ANDREW TAURIAINEN: No. They're counting from the date that 879 initially was adopted under last year's version of the fisheries regulation, and that did expire on February 28. But 879(c) was added in July with the state-wide curtailment order. Right.

DAVID ROSE: Yeah, briefly. The initial package that you -- well, the Mill, Deer and Antelope Creek package that the Board just heard about was initially adopted last year -- I believe May 21 -- and that included a number of sections in brand new Article 24. One of those was Section 879. It only included subdivisions (a) and (b), which were reporting requirements for anybody who received a curtailment order.

This item, this state-wide curtailment and
Informational Order item, was presented at the Board and
made its way around about a month later. And 879(c) was
added at that time. So while it's true that --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: We didn't do everything on the same day last year.

DAVID ROSE: No, we did not. 879(a) and (b) have in fact expired except that the Board readopted them an hour ago. They haven't gone to OAL yet, so they're not on the books. But 879(c) is not floating out there in the ether. It does still exist and will until April 14, when it would expire after 270 days.

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

ANDREW TAURIAINEN: And then the last sort of general category of comments -- there's a number of comments that I'm going to skip. I see that most of the commenters are here and they will probably bring up some of the specific ones.

But the comment that I think was most common is that the regulations should define the term "complaint" as it's used in Section (c)(1)(a). And again, the language there is upon -- it's a triggering condition for issuing these orders upon receipt of a complaint alleging interference with a water right by a water right holder, diverter or user.

The term "complaint" has its commonly understood definition, and the Board has always used it that way. There is no specific definition of "complaint" anywhere.

There is a section in the Code of Regulations addressing complaints alleging certain types of harm caused by violations of permit and term -- permit and license terms or conditions. But that's -- that's really more of a form-in-process requirement.

Broadly speaking, there's always been a complaints unit in the Division of Water Rights, and there still are staff that receive complaints. There's a direct phone line for phoning in verbal complaints and there's no format requirement there.

http://www.veelaw.net/help

commenters have proposed language to the effect that staff

1 -- that the division should make a determination that any
2 complaints that are issued are reasonable and
3 substantiated.

Another one of the proposed languages is that the complaints meet a minimum standard of evidence to support a claim of unlawful diversion.

Staff does these kinds of examinations for every complaint that's received. If a complaint comes in and has no basis and no substantiation through staff's own investigation, or based on what's received, then the complaint goes no further. But if there is some basis for it, complaints -- investigations can occur for a very long time. I'm one of the attorneys now who helps shepard those complaints through their -- and those investigations through their process.

So I would say those proposed changes are unnecessary.

We've hit most of the main comments -- I don't -- unless the Board would like, I don't necessarily want to list right now all the specific comments, because I think we're about to hear them relating to, you know, the concept of water rights in the Delta or water availability in the Delta for a couple reasons. One, we're about to hear them and, two, a lot of the issues are rased in petitions for reconsideration of the Delta -- or of the

1	statewide San Joaquin, Sacramento and Delta Informational
2	Order that was issued in February. It's Order WR
3	2015-2-DWR. And I don't necessarily want to go too deeply
4	into any of those matters that might be subject to the
5	petition.
6	At this point that concludes the staff presentation.
7	And we'll take questions now.
8	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Questions now?
9	All right. Well, let's move on to the comments now.
L 0	Thank you very much.
L1	First we have Jon Rubin, San Luis and Delta-Mendota
L2	Water Authority. I'd thought you'd be last and you could
L3	open and close. Someone thought you wanted to do that,
L4	but here you are on the top of the pile. What can I do?
15	JON RUBIN: After your reaction to my comments this
16	morning, I'm happy to be before you.
L 7	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: He's followed by Tim
8.	Stroshane.
19	JON RUBIN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, members of
20	the Board. Jon Rubin, general counsel for the San Luis
21	and Delta-Mendota Water Authority, and I do have just a
22	brief comment for you.
23	The water authority believes it's important that the
24	State Water Board be prepared to exercise mechanisms or a
25	mechanism to stop the diversions that are causing a

trespass on the waters of this state.

And because of that, I do want to highlight what's not before you today. Last year when you were faced with this question about action to stop it -- diversions that are illegal, there was discussion about the mechanism that you currently have or the mechanisms that you currently have that are set forth in the water code. And there was also a discussion about supplementing that.

And last year staff had proposed a regulation, emergency regulation, and through discussions with the Board ultimately the Board adopted something, but it was different than the staff's proposal. I believe it was codified under Section 875.

That regulation or something similar to that regulation is not before you.

I stand today not to recommend a particular course of action, but just to highlight how important it is, given how dry conditions are, that you do have a mechanism that would allow you to act very quickly to stop illegal diversions.

From my understanding of the Water Code, if you do not adopt an emergency regulation, you really only have one mechanism available to you, and that's under Water Code Section 1052, and specifically it's a referral to the attorney general.

Information Order should be useful beyond just
constructing this year's demand curves. We encourage the
State Water Board to address the paper water issue for all
Central Valley water right holders, perhaps not now but in
the future when there's more time perhaps.

And the California -- that you would address this issue for all Central Valley water right holders and the California public that cares about the state's rivers and streams and the natural heritage of the Delta.

Paper water is the practical reality that there are far more water rights claims to use water than there is actual water available to allocate especially, of course, during droughts.

Since eight of the last nine years have been below normal water years, it may be that in the era of climate change, California enters a new normal. We urge the Board to ask and hopefully answer questions like if water right holders have riparian or pre-1914 right and also post-1914 rights, do they really need multiple rights?

There may be a basis for it. I don't know. And the Board would need to investigate that, but it's a question that I think you should be asking.

What is the status of claims -- the second question is what is the status of claims against which enforcement actions are applied? Are those claims to divert water

extinguished permanently by Board action under emergency drought regulations or are enforcement actions merely in effect while the emergency regulations are in effect?

Third, what due process and equal protections must the Board apply to permanently eliminate redundant -- excuse me. Redundant water rights once they are identified?

Another question is if the State Water Board believes it obtains meaningful information on demand and supply, could and should the Board encourage the Department of Water Resources and the Bureau of Reclamation to better plan their operations to fit that new normal better than they do now?

By doing so couldn't the multiple objectives of reservoir operation for water supply, temperature control and salinity and water quality control in the Delta be planned before experts -- sorry. Exports are determined?

I've done research into these sorts of questions, but I don't know the answers to them. I don't -- I'm not sure that you do either right now.

But it seems to me that answers to such questions may help reduce confusion and increase reliability of water rights found valid by the Board. By reducing confusion the Board can help reduce the claims of so many chasing so little water during California's droughts,

Other western states have done much to accomplish something similar. Reduced water demand would benefit public trust resources, including listed species ease in the Delta, whichever ones still exist.

The Delta Protection Act of 1959, I'll conclude, states that it is state policy that no person, corporation or public or private agency or the state or the United States should divert from the channels of the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta to which the users within said Delta are entitled.

Finally, the act also says that in determining the availability of water for export from the Delta, no water shall be exported which is necessary to meet the requirements of the act.

And I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you very much.

After Mr. Jones, Tim O'Laughlin. Or Valerie Kincaid.

KYLE JONES: Good evening, Chair, Board. Sierra
Club of California -- Kyle Jones with Sierra Club of
California, and we'd like to show strong support for this
measure.

Information pertaining to rights that -- prior to

1914 and riparian rights is critical to helping us understand exactly what we're dealing with, what resources we have going forward through this drought and however long it may last and for future droughts.

Again, strong support for this. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Valerie Kincaid, followed by Rebecca Akroyd from Westlands Water District.

VALERIE KINCAID: Thanks. Valerie Kincaid, San Joaquin Tributaries Authority.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS:

The San Joaquin Tributaries Authority submitted comments, and I'm not going to go through those. It's late. But I do want to go through the issue of the finding of emergency and focus on that.

There were significant changes from the previous version to the new proposed version, and the finding of emergency doesn't explain the need for those changes and it doesn't explain why those changes are needed in an emergency context, which I think is very important.

And it feeds into my second point, which is that it would be very helpful from a stakeholder perspective to understand what the State Water Board and the State Water Board staff plans to do with this information. It's the number one question I get from clients all over the state is why are we submitting this? What are the next steps?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And it would be really helpful for stakeholders to understand not only just for them to feel comfortable but for their due process rights if this is going to lead to an enforcement action, if there's an adjudication down the road.

And I understand that you might not have all of that figured out right this second, but there has to be a greater plan of why you're just collecting the information. Certainly collecting this information just to collect it and not do anything with it also probably can't be an emergency under these regs.

So we have the technical comments and I guess my plea maybe would be just to work with stakeholders and ask them for this information. Most of our clients, if you go

an
 of
 no
 mu

and ask and say hey, listen, we're unclear about the basis of your right, can you provide us this information in a nonthreatening and a nonenforcement context, they would be much more willing to do that.

I think unfortunately this round of emergency regs has put people a little bit on the defensive. They feel like they're having allegations thrown at them.

And then the second part of it is that they really don't understand what's going to happen with these allegations. So, you know, from my perspective this caused quite a bit of confusion and maybe from your perspective more panic than there needs to be since maybe you guys either have an understanding of what you would or wouldn't do and have a greater plan. But the stakeholder community doesn't understand that and hasn't been given enough information to better understand that.

Thanks.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thanks. (Unintelligible)

MICHAEL LAUFFER: Well, first of all, I think the

digest as well as the presentation you heard from the

division staff and then also from Mr. Tauriainen this

morning goes through a number of the reasons why the

division may may be interested in using this information.

It's important to appreciate that until an order is actually issued, there hasn't been a finding, if you will,

However, in the context of the regulations and the types of information that the Board is interested in gleaning, some of it may be just for purposes, as Mr. Tauriainen explained, of determining whether or not there is an appropriate basis for the diversion. And that could potentially lead to a subsequent enforcement action.

And likewise, as you heard in the presentation earlier this evening, it is used to feed into our overall demand curve, which informs the Board's drought response.

I mean this is a recurring theme that you all have heard over the last year, which is the Board's inability to -- or the Board's lack of sufficient information to respond to the drought and make the determinations about whether or not curtailment needs to be turned on or off. And you see these regulations as part of an approach to ensuring that if we get to that point later this year we will have tools to issue informational orders or take other enforcement action as appropriate

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Well, in a timely manner so that it might matter. Also in the hopes of resolving some of the long held, I would say rhetorical, badmitten matches that have gone on. I think our goal is to try and resolve issues in as timely a way we can. Some of them we

24

(File 10)

25

BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: The lessons we learned

from last year was that the quality of information, the timeliness of information was lacking for us to do the orderly administration.

That's just my take on it. I think those are valid questions and we didn't mean to communicate these type of intents. But I think it's important that we be -- that we respond in a fashion that mirrors our findings of emergency.

So I want to honor that comment

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Ms. Akroyd, followed by John Herrick, South Coast Water Agency.

REBECCA AKROYD: Good evening. Excuse a bit of laryngitis. Rebecca Ackroyd, for Westlands Water District.

My comments are going to build slightly on Jon Rubin's comments that were made just a little while ago. As Jon pointed out, in July 2014 when the precursor to the present regulation was enacted, it was paired with an emergency regulation that allowed the Board to issue curtailment orders. Right now there's no similar curtailment order regulation being proposed.

However, as Jon also stated, there's existing authority that allows the Board to investigate and stop illegal diversions. Westlands's comments today would encourage the Board to be prepared to utilize that

Separate and apart from the proposed emergency regulation regarding the Information Orders, the Board has the ability to undertake investigations to determine whether a water use is illegal. In Section 856 of the Board's regulations require the Board to investigate allegations of misuse of water.

And I think, going back to what was said earlier just talking about allegations, no complaint is required to investigate allegations of misuse of water.

Past investigations, the Board has the ability to take immediate actions to stop illegal diverters, whether the diverter claims riparian or other right. Water Code Section 275 requires the Board to take all of the proceedings or actions for executive, legislative and judicial agencies to prevent waste or unreasonable use.

So together the Water Board and Board -- sorry.

Excuse me. The Water Code and Board regulations require
the Board to both investigate and take appropriate
proceedings to stop illegal diversion.

Although typically the Board has used the EO and administrative civil liability as the tools to accomplish this end, as Jon stated before, Section 1052 provides another even more important tool in the present drought,

That enables the Board to request the attorney general to have an action for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction or permanent injunction for any unauthorized diversion or use, including a violation of a Board order or decision.

We believe it's critically important that the Board be prepared to take immediate action to stop illegal diversions. While the Board must do so in a way that respects due process, the action must be swift. We believe taking swift action this year will put us in a better position for later this year, for next year if there's continued droughts or for future droughts.

If the Board does not plan on using its existing authority under Section 1052 or other provisions, then we would request that the Board consider adopting new emergency regulations that would give the Board additional authority to do so.

Any questions?

Great. Thank you.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: All right. Mr. Herrick, followed by Mr. Nomellini from the Central Delta Water District.

JOHN HERRICK: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Chairlady and members. John Herrick for the South Delta Water Agency. Thank you very much.

I won't say déjà vu all over again, but here we are in the fourth year of a drought, emergency regulations at the last minute in order to address problems, which is not the way to handle things. I think everybody would agree with that.

Last year we made comments -- I'll just say them briefly again -- dealing with the due process issues. You know, we all have serious concerns that an expedited, truncated process that would fine somebody for not responding within a short period of time actually turns out to substitute for an evidentiary hearing determining somebody's water rights.

So I don't know how the Division of Water Rights is going to make a decision that somebody is or isn't worthy of a cease and desist order or something else, you know, a in 30-day period after somebody's only had that much time to provide information. But that's the -- that's our complaint from before.

I'd like to join the comments of Ms. Spaletta and Ms. Zolezzi, and I want to focus on one issue and that was touched upon by staff and that deals with the -- what complaint might start an investigation.

The reason that's important is -- we've already gone

through this. There's either -- there are two issues. It's either a water right or a water availability issue for purposes of you going after them during the drought.

Now, for water rights, I think everybody remembers back in 2009 and before where the general consensus was to slander my clients in public and say they were all illegal diverters. And we had the legislation saying they're all illegal diverters, and appointed a watermaster to investigate only my clients, and not other people.

And the watermaster did three or four years' investigation and we spent -- we spent hundreds of hours and thousands of documents and hundreds of meetings -- not hundreds of meetings, lots of meetings -- and the watermaster prepared that I saw two reports or two updates that would be presented to you which said goodness, we just wasted all our time and money. It appears there are a few issues and we're pursuing those few people and it appears that everybody else has sufficient water rights.

So the notion that you need me to spend another thousand hours to give you more information on the Delta water right diverter seems odd at the very least. Your process has already made that initial threshold determination for purposes of pursuing somebody, I think.

Now, maybe you don't trust your prior watermaster.

Maybe someone threw away his boxes. I don't know, but we

already went through that. And so I don't see you -- what the purpose is to have an expedited method by which to make me work overtime that I don't get paid for, even on St. Patrick's Day. So I have no concerns.

The second area deals with the supply. Now, I'm not going to get into that now, but we have the issue -- we've gone through this before -- about whether or not the Delta always has water. We think we showed you before that when you don't have releases, when you don't have stream flows, there's no water in the Delta, it slowly degrades and you're obligated to protect water salinity or quality. Excuse me.

All those things are, I guess, valid points of disagreement. We think it's pretty clear on our part. But that's a disagreement between the contractors, or the state and federal projects, and us. And we think it's all pretty clear.

So I don't know what you would do in the middle of that fight unless you're trying to fight for there being water surplus to the needs of the areas of our knowledge for the Delta. And this is the fourth year of drought. If anybody thinks there's water surplus to the needs of the North California Delta, I don't know what they're looking at. Right? We can't meet our minimum standards, so there isn't any surplus water.

So finding on the edges there to see if somebody can be shut down in the Delta so that, you know, four CFS is either released or not released from Shasta seems like a poor use of our time.

Now, again, I think that's something between the contractors, the projects, and us. I don't know what purpose or benefit you guys would have joining in that fight in that you would have to make these decisions based upon what we think was pretty clear. So I don't know.

Anyway, I also wanted to say really quickly the costs that you have done and the analysis for the thing is offensive, horribly wrong. The notion that somebody would -- would spend a short amount of time responding to a 30-day demand or request to provide evidence of a pre-1914 right is unrealistic, to say the least.

We have other fights going on, as you know. Some of them involve hearings scheduled here, so I'm not going to get into that. But, you know, we spent years and hundreds of thousands of dollars, and people are out there reading, you know, thousands of newspapers from 1880 through, you know, 1914, looking for certain key words.

The notion that it's a small cost for somebody to comply with this is incorrect. I mean it takes a long time, which again, argues against this notion that you need an emergency regulation so you can demand something

in 30 days.

If you -- if you contact any diverter who's a single diverter, not an agency or an irrigation district, and you say show me what happened on your land in 1893 or 1914, that takes a lot of work. There isn't -- there aren't documents that say, you know, hi, got up this morning and applied water on 37 acres. There isn't that information.

So, you know, I don't see what the purpose of this is. The Board does need information. As you know, we've spent lots of time assisting you in gathering information. So I don't know why you need the threat against somebody to get it done.

I'm actually here to express my disappointment that nobody's thanked us for all the work that we did for that 94 percent compliance rate. It's higher than that because a couple of -- a number of the ones that add up to the six percent were -- were statements that have been deactivated. So it wasn't a noncompliance.

But anyway, and with that stupid joke. You know, we think the regulation's unnecessary. We need to have a process that deals with these things on a normal basis, not at the last minute.

We cannot give you a complete history of a diversion upon 30-day notice. I thought I did that to a sufficient level with the last watermaster, and apparently it has no

effect on the Board's decisions now, so with that I oppose the regulation.

Thank you very much.

The extra time I took should come off of Dante's because of what happened last time.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: And following Mr. Nomellini will be Terry Erlewine from the State Water Contractors.

DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: Hello. I'm Dante John Nomellini, manager and co-counsel for the Central Delta Water Agency.

Without belaboring the point, I think your emergency regulations are an abuse of the emergency. I would just restate that for the record because that's my feeling, that we have artificially created a situation here where the projects depleted the storage, created a situation where we don't have sufficient water to meet the standards.

The standards have been set. The people have adopted emergency -- temporary emergency changes to let them off the hook. That's okay. The water's gone. And, like I said before, I recognize that there's not a hell of a lot to fight over at this stage.

Now, with regard to the emergency order, it seems to me that it's unnecessarily too broad and not defining what the delegation of the authority is to the -- your staff.

That any user could come in and say hey, we do an investigation and an emergency order could go out demanding information.

Now, we are committed in the Central Delta and the South Delta to give you 100 percent response. You know, I don't appreciate the shortness of time in the notice and the lack of discussion with your staff beforehand because we could have helped address this in a way that would make more sense.

However, I want to thank them for making changes in the form so we could at least have our clients find it.

And there was a concerted effort, and it helped us achieve the success that we have in providing the information.

The other thing was we started trying to gather the database in September of last year, and we were fortunately able to get it indexed because the data is there. But how do you find it for an individual point of diversion?

So, and I think I said it before, I sent one of my staff over to try and find this information, whatever it is, and they stumbled into the State Lands Commission and they were willing to provide an index for the Central and South Delta.

I should have ordered it for the whole Delta because the database, I think, is for the whole state.

Anyway, they wanted an immediate payment of \$5,000. We gave it to them and it took about -- over two months before we got an index. But it was that index that allowed us to be responsive to this short-term request. Don't think that that short term would allow somebody else that didn't have the fortune of getting the index to provide you that information.

I think we're okay. We've given you patents. We've given you -- that database has the certificates of purchase. It has the swamp and overflow surveys.

Now, what you're going to do with it -- and I cautioned everybody before -- is that we have no problem trying to give you the information, but what you're going to do with it is a different problem.

And that is you're going to formulate curtailment notices perhaps. And I've discouraged you from doing that because water rights are very specific to location and to the individual situation.

For example, the patent date in our -- in my humble opinion as a lawyer practicing in the water field, gives you the date of vesting, not necessarily the date of priority. The date of priority is when settlement took place, where you could have started water on the piece of property. That's a riparian right, and it's not quantifiable. In an adjudication you can quantify it, but

```
it doesn't have a limit except reasonable beneficial use.
    Okay.
           So giving you a quantity for riparian right, no
    lawyer in their right mind that represented a client like
 4
    that could do that short of an adjudication.
 6
           So some of the problems we have and you have and
   your staff has in reporting is trying to do something that
   we can't -- can't do.
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Is that why you used the
   comment section?
10
11
           DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: Yeah.
                                         That's why we've given
12
   you an explanation. The comment section wasn't in the
13
   first round of the forms, but we submitted a standard
   explanation form with everything that we did in our office
14
15
   to you to explain that, and we talked to staff about it as
16
   well.
17
           So the priority date is not the date of patent, but
18
   that establishes the vesting of the title to make that
19
   claim. So the priority date is different.
20
           The pre-1914 date, some drunken miner went up on
21
   federal land and diverted water to separate the gold from
22
   the gravel diggings or whatever. That establishes a
23
   pre-1914 use of the water.
24
           There's a very complicated issue as to whether
25
   there's a priority for that right versus the riparian
```

Now, we also have filings -- post-1914 filings in the Delta. Years ago when there was turmoil around how water rights were going to be treated and this and that, many of the more sophisticated people said well, we better cover our bet, and they filed for appropriate rights with the Board.

So we have overlapping rights that we cannot unwrap without adjudication and determining some of these issues. And it isn't because we're just trying to be obstinate. It's a real practical problem for us.

Now, we are willing in the Delta, Central Delta and South Delta, to work with your staff to try and sort this out. Now, there has been double reporting because we hadn't been able to segregate it. And your staff doesn't like us to comment and say well, these are overlapping rights, you only count them once.

I'm going to try and do it for all of my future reports and try and get that sorted out so you don't accidentally end up with this complicated overlap of rights and a large quantity of water that is being criticized as being out there.

Now, water rights law created appropriations and

```
1
    filings with you people as a hunting license to go out and
 2
    try and find water. So if somebody came in and said hey,
 3
    in a flood year there's water coming down the river, we
 4
    want to try and get a permit to go out there and exercise
 5
    our due diligence to perfect that right.
 6
          So there's lots of filings. The two biggest
 7
    examples are the State Water Project and the Federal Water
 8
    Project. They asked for an extension from you for their
 9
    due diligence. We objected to it and I never heard from
10
    anyone again.
11
           They still want to be out there claiming all this
12
    water that doesn't exist or isn't practical to capture.
13
           So it's those real problems that I hope you people
    will understand. We'll try and work with your staff in
14
15
    good faith. But to come up with a short timeline and
16
    expect people to respond and fine them to me is bad.
17
    know, I mean it's just not the right thing do to.
18
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS:
                                  There's something in between
19
    open-ended multiple decades and -- (Unintelligible)
20
          DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: Yeah, I agree with you.
21
   was your --
22
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: We have the authority.
23
   you can see from what we did last year, we didn't use it
    to the full extent. But we have the tools we need --
24
25
    (Unintelligible)
```

Ιt

DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: Yeah, but to me you shouldn't be using the emergency authority to do this. But I understand what people are saying, yeah. I just think -- don't think --

BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: 94 percent's a good number. And we saw the same thing with our partner agencies, with the water agencies last year. They would give us 66 percent response on basic information and then when we required it with these uncomfortable enforcement provisions, we got 98 percent.

DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: That's okay. If you give me a gun, you know, and go out and illegally put a gun to somebody's head and say I'm going to shoot you, then you may get some compliance. But it's procedural due process that you hear people talking about and the emergency authority to get at this.

There's no question you can be effective with -- I'm going to call it an unlawful means. And I'm appealing to you that that's not a good way to do it.

Now, I didn't file the suit against you on the emergency regulation and I'm thinking of other litigations, not necessarily against you. But the state and the federal projects are saying things about the Delta and all of a sudden they now claim they don't understand it, there's water in the Delta all the time, and I've

But anyway -- you're hopeful, I realize that. That that's the case. But don't forget there are appellate courts, supreme courts and all of this and that. So you may not -- you may not prevail in that regard.

But I would urge you not to get into the detail of curtailment of water rights if it's possible. You have the bully pulpit. You have the ability -- people pay attention to you. I mean we have always paid attention to you. I pay attention to the chairperson's admonitions that other people have submitted all their information about their water rights.

I knew it was tough, but we lucked out and found a database that gave us a good bit of that information. A lot of people don't have that luck.

So anyway, I would appeal to you not to use the emergency requirements, to be flexible in dealing with the people with regard to the information.

I would caution your staff, although they're all very competent, aggressive people, that jumping into the detail of curtailment of water rights is a sticky, detailed process.

And so anyway, those are my comments. And I hope you don't require us to provide reams of information again

1	on a very short timeline because many of us lost our
2	weekends and a lot of time. But we think we're happy
3	with the success and we do want to give you the
4	information you need to do your jobs.
5	So thank you.
6	BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: I just have to jump in
7	here and thank you for that because I think your
8	leadership has a lot to do with the high numbers that we
9	saw.
10	DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: I think my luck has to do
11	with the problem with the database.
12	BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: Yeah, but even before
13	you knew about that tool last year when we were here, you
14	did say that you would comply.
15	DANTE JOHN NOMELLINI: Well, we want to comply.
16	Why do we want to not comply with you guys? We got so
17	many people to fight with. Why do we want to fight with
18	you?
19	BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: I really don't want you
20	to quit because I just really enjoy such a coherent
21	description of the puzzle that's out there about the issue
22	of overlapping water rights, and I thought your
23	explanation was really easy to understand. It was a good
24	teaching moment.

Thank you.

T	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Mr. Erlewine, followed by
2	George Hartman of District 2030.
3	TERRY ERLEWINE: Thank you. Good evening. Terry
4	Erlewine, State Water Contractors.
5	I just wanted to say that the State Water
6	Contractors support the resolution. We actually think
7	that you don't need the emergency basis or emergency basis
8	for passing the resolution. We think you could do it
9	under the regular your regular authority, but we
.0	support the use of the emergency authority.
.1	We think that this is a good step toward providing
.2	additional information that's needed to administer water
.3	rights, and particularly towards protecting stored water
4	because we had some discussion of excess water over the
.5	last year. We had during the irrigation season when we
.6	were water short, it was project water that was going
. 7	towards meeting all of the outflow and supporting a lot of
. 8	the upstream use.
.9	So I wanted to make sure that's on the record and
20	reiterate that we are supportive of this resolution.
21	Thank you.
22	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you very much.
23	Mr. Hartman, followed by Jeannie Zolezzi. Jeanne
24	Zolezzi.
5	GEORGE HARTMAN. Hi George Hartman representing

```
the Reclamation Districts 2030 and 2074.
                                              It's late.
   Hello, everybody. Madam Chair, Board members.
          I -- I have two concerns: First, as some of you
   know, I'd really like to change this dialog. I'd really
   like to see a different way of talking about these issues
   and hopefully an effort that we're working on will make a
   dent in that and set a precedent. We don't know. We're
   still working on it.
          So I've got a couple of concerns. Number one is the
   attorney for staff -- I'm sorry. I don't know your name,
10
   sir. You talked about how staff vets these complaints
11
12
   before it takes action.
13
           I don't think that's embodied in the regulations.
   think that's an in-house safeguard that you have adopted
14
15
   to verify that a complaint has enough merit to warrant
   further action.
16
17
          Is that about right?
18
         ANDREW TAURIAINEN: Andrew Tauriainen.
19
         GEORGE HARTMAN: I didn't know your name.
20
   sorry.
21
         ANDREW TAURIAINEN: Not necessarily in the way
22
   you're putting it. Maybe the way I explained it wasn't
23
   quite the way it is anyway.
24
          An Information Order or even an inspection just on a
25
   complaint that comes in through the Internet, let's say,
```

```
by nature gets some vetting and some determination as to
 2
    its efficacy, and those that have more get more
    investigation and they all result in something, an
    investigation report --
 5
          GEORGE HARTMAN: Who makes that decision? Who makes
    the decision as to whether it has efficacy or not?
 7
           ANDREW TAURIAINEN:
                               The staff.
 8
          GEORGE HARTMAN: Under what guidelines?
          ANDREW TAURIAINEN: Under their expert opinion.
10
          GEORGE HARTMAN: That is set by what? I mean, where
11
    can I find a written description of what qualifications
12
    they have to have in order to render an expert opinion?
13
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Staff does the best they can,
    based on their experience and judgment. They don't chase
14
15
    every complaint because there's not time to chase every
    complaint. We're not funded to chase every complaint.
16
17
    There's a certain amount of judgment involved.
18
           If you're asking for us to put out every -- you're
19
    creating a giant mousetrap in which really nothing would
20
    ever happen. So I'm not quite sure the point you're
21
    trying to make.
22
          GEORGE HARTMAN: Well, that would be okay with me
23
   but --
24
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Well, it shouldn't be okay
25
   with you.
```

Т	GEORGE HARTMAN: NO, DUT
2	CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: People have lived in this
3	agonizing finger pointing for years and years and years,
4	and maybe some people enjoy living in it. I don't think
5	you do.
6	BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: I imagine you're
7	getting to the suggestion that I think Jeanne Zolezzi has
8	in her letter to tighten up the language.
9	GEORGE HARTMAN: Yeah, I think
10	BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: Just so we can be
11	GEORGE HARTMAN: Yeah. I don't doubt the staff
12	BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMATO: more specific on
13	the point you're raising. I'm looking for that language.
14	ANDREW TAURIAINEN: I have one more point, I'm
15	sorry, and that is specific to the regulations and the
16	Information Orders that would be issued under the
17	regulation.
18	Those orders every order of the Board requires
19	findings to support the order. Those findings in every
20	case will describe both the evidence and the reason
21	GEORGE HARTMAN: Sure.
22	ANDREW TAURIAINEN for issuing the order. That's
23	the safeguard that that, I think, is what you're
24	looking for.
25	GEORGE HARTMAN: That's the consummate safeguard.

What I'm worried about is Mr. Nomellini described to you the great luck and fortune that he had in finding a State Lands database that has all the information that enabled his office and the engineers to really give you great compliance. And a lot of that involved my clients. They did an amazing job.

But it was -- there was fortune in that. It was luck. But it was a burdensome task that without finding a database I think would have been near impossible.

And so what I'm worried about is -- the trigger is a complaint. Someone files a complaint. That's a trigger. The staff is the first level of safeguard.

And -- and the gentleman talked about how they make an effort to determine the materiality or substantiality of that complaint before it goes any further. But when it goes further and an Informational Order gets issued -- it's like a very nice client of mine, a lady who is not in Central Delta, who operates a dairy whose husband passed away a few years ago and she's doing it on her own. Came into my office on March 1 with the Informational Order.

And I had looked at the list attached to the order to see if her name was on it, and it wasn't. At least not alphabetically. Her deceased husband's name was on it indexed by his first name, and I didn't see it. She came in with it and said what do I do?

```
1
 8
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

She is not in Central Delta. She's in North Delta. And it was only because of all the work Dante and his folks had done, Ann Kelsey and Baker and on and on, we were able to get her information put together for her two points of diversion and be submitted to you.

Absent that, she would have been in violation and it would have been a very expensive burden for her to meet to ferret out the information that you were requesting.

I'm concerned about the fact that there's no threshold for filing a complaint. Anyone can file a complaint.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: Well, if I could?

GEORGE HARTMAN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: It seems to me that there are two issues. One is whether or not the language should be tightened up. And I would just refer everyone to -- Jennifer Spaletta has a suggestion on the first page of her letter, and Jeanne Zolezzi, I'm sure she'll speak to this. Different language but language to tighten up the provision on the complaint.

But I'm just wondering if you're speaking to yet a separate issue. We have heard that there was just a lot of confusion when that order went out, and staff after -- I think we had -- I don't remember when the Board meeting was, if it was maybe a month ago. Staff was very

But this issue about finding out where you are on the list by first name, I just heard from a lot of people. They were very frustrated by this.

2.5

And so I'm just -- would like to hear from staff on in the event that you go forward again with another order, what can you do to commit to work with stakeholders in advance so that they can see a copy of the form in advance and provide suggestions?

Because I think a lot of the -- the criticisms that came in were not just we don't want to fill this out but they were frustrated. It was difficult for them to figure out how to fill it out and who it applied to and all those sorts of questions.

So could you respond to what your plans are in the event that you issue another order?

BRIAN COATS: Yeah. As far as the informational order form, we did provide a template on our website which had all three pages outlined as to what the questions were supposed to be asked. And they could download that and just at their leisure go about filling it out and then they can go to the actual form and fill it out.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: Well, I'm referring to in the event that you do this again, what can you commit

to do to work with stakeholders in advance so that they can see what you plan on having people fill out so that they can make comments? You know, maybe it could be simplified or, you know, since they're out on the ground they may see some options that you all wouldn't have thought of.

And then the other issue that comes to mind is the website. I heard a lot of complaints about your website. It was too difficult for them to finally get to the place where they could get the information.

BRIAN COATS: Right. Yeah. On the first issue, I don't think management has any objection to providing the form in advance. I don't think there's a problem there.

As far as finding the link on the form, the hyperlink to the web form was referenced in the letter. So if they received the letter, the URL address was there on page 2, I think it was paragraph three.

As far as going to the website and finding it, yeah, we only had it listed on one particular area because at the time we were planning on doing a website revamp to a new format, tab style, and that never came to fruition.

But when we did receive enough people commenting on the fact that the link on the actual Informational Order that we posted on the website wasn't clickable, we went ahead and made the adjustments and everything seemed to be

CAREN TRGOVCICH: Just to reference, we are doing an upgrade of the website now. The tab form that Brian mentioned is going to go live hopefully soon. We've just had to work it through all the programs that have drought activities.

And the other thing is we are very happy to put out the form, and if there's a group of stakeholders that would like to provide input, that would like to sit down and talk to us about it, we're very happy to do that. It only helps us to do our job better.

GEORGE HARTMAN: Let me wrap up. I don't want to prolong this.

Had two other concerns. One is a client in the Los Banos area I met with yesterday was -- who's 86 years old, knows all the folks down in that area quite well. His property abuts the California aqueduct.

And he said how do these people get away with pumping groundwater and pumping it and putting it in the canal and getting paid for it?

Now, I'm going to dig into it a little further and find out what's going on, but as long as you're getting into abuse and reasonable or unreasonable uses of water, I've heard other rivers that that's happening, that people are selling groundwater somehow through some contrivance.

```
I'd like to know more about that, and if I find anything

-- if there's materiality to it, I'll investigate it

before I file a complaint.

And the other thing is one slide showed that it was
```

And the other thing is one slide showed that it was costing a thousand dollars per report for public agencies to respond to your informational requests.

I think because there's no barrier to a person filing a complaint, if their complaint is found to be without merit, there ought to be some way to charge them with -- with the cost of a person having to prove that they have the right all along.

So I'll just throw in the old English system, loser pays, something like that.

So I think that's pretty much -- pretty much all I have to say, but I want to thank all the folks who helped us meet your order. They did a great job and I hope you're pleased with them.

Thank you.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Great. Thank you very much. I know we'll hear from more speakers, but we do have some suggestions on ways to clarify the comparing that might give people some comfort to allay their wildest fears about it or fear of use about it.

So I just want to encourage you guys to think about which -- because some of them sound kind of reasonable;

```
some require too much. But I want you to be thinking
    about that because I know we're going to be hearing -- I
    just want you to think about language, separate language,
   on that one because, again, people do -- they -- they fear
    an extreme in the absence. I don't think you can button
    it down all the way, but some of the suggestions are
   pretty reasonable.
 8
           BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: Is it true that with the
    development of the form that maybe we're refining that,
    and so future actions you feel would resolve some of the
10
11
   concerns?
12
          DAVID COATS: Yeah. And when we actually developed
    a form through stakeholder comments, we made some
13
   revisions and some updates and we're continuing to refine
14
15
   it. So I imagine in the event that this were approved and
16
    we were -- got the go-ahead to issue more informational
17
   orders, we would consult with them and hopefully get our
18
    IT department to put a -- like a more robust password
19
    system into place because that was one of the complaints
20
    that they brought up.
21
           But, yeah, we'll continue to refine it.
22
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you. Ms. Zolezzi,
    followed by Danny Merkley.
23
24
          JEANNE ZOLEZZI: Thank you. Jeanne Zolezzi,
25
   representing Banta-Carbona Irrigation District and
```

2 CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: I always want to call you 3 Jeannie. Just the way it's spelled. Jeanne Zolezzi.

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: It's -- yeah. Either way.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: I do it wrong all the time.

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: And Patterson Irrigation District.

And obviously my letter's on file. I just have two issues that I want to hit that we think are the most important.

And the first is what a lot of people have mentioned, and that is our fear of an unsubstantiated complaint or I think to me, more importantly, the other requirement of information being provided. Because to me, it's just an opportunity for abuse.

The reason we're really concerned is because we saw what happened with the last Information Order that went out. And I won't belabor that. You've seen our Petition for Reconsideration.

But basically you got a letter with no information and no substantiating information saying someone's stealing my water and I think they're in the Delta. And you sent out a thousand Information Orders from, you know, way south on the San Joaquin River all through the Delta trying to investigate that. We don't think that was sufficient information on which to make people do all that.

So my language, or Ms. Spaletta's language, I think something saying that that information or the complaint needs to be supported by at least some evidence determined by staff to be reasonable is a reasonable requirement, and with all due respect, as your staff mentioned, if they do that anyway then they really shouldn't mind if it's in the regulation. That would give us some protection, something to fall back on.

The second thing that we're very concerned about is the expansion of the regulation. We know that you needed the information. I agree with everyone else. We didn't think you needed to do it by emergency regulation. We didn't think you needed to do it by regulation. We have been volunteering that information since early last year saying that you needed that to make good curtailment decisions. And obviously you can see the impact that it makes, so we're glad about that.

We're very concerned with the expansion because we think it goes beyond information that you need and beyond your jurisdiction.

Two sections in the proposed regulation in particular expand the requirement to require information of compliance with transfer laws and information about transfers that haven't been approved by the Board and, as staff in its presentation said, unverified or previously

Those are transfers that are in compliance with law and outside of the State Board's jurisdiction.

And we have a serious concern that by requesting information on that you are going to somehow insert yourself into the legality of those transfers, and obviously that's a concern.

We acknowledge -- while we don't agree with it, we acknowledge that the courts have said that the State Board can determine the validity of a pre-'14 right. We just don't think that that court case went further than that and said and once you determine that validity you can then regulate that right and tell them when they can change their place of use, purpose of use and accomplish a transfer.

Because that's regulating that right and you don't have that authority. And the law already provides the standard for that transfer, and the method to object is to bring a lawsuit on that.

So that's our main concern with the regulation is the whole issue of verifying those transfers that haven't been noticed or approved by the Board.

So that and clarification of the complaints or information is what we would request. Thank you.

MARIANNA AUE: Yeah. The issue is that similarly to when we sent a curtailment notice and then investigated and the response is oh, I'm using a riparian right for which I never filed a statement

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: That's totally different. We support that part of the regulation.

MARIANNA AUE: Okay. But with transfers there can also be a similar -- if it's something we've never heard of, then there's that same question of did somebody really do this.

And so being able to follow up and say okay, now, who did you get -- whose water right are you talking about and being able to look at their water right and say things like yes, it is for June and, yes, it is at a place where you could conceivably divert it here, allows us to look at that and decide is this something that needs to be investigated or is this something that -- that we just want to throw into the calculation of where the demand is on this stream system? Is it way up at the top? Is it down at the bottom?

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: Well, the information that the regulation says you can ask for is not narrowed in the way that you've just described it. Because if you said, you know, you have to provide us with how much you're diverting under that right and what right it is, then

```
that's different. But it goes way beyond that.
 1
2
          It says we can ask for all information upon it and
   we can ensure that it complies with transfer criteria.
 3
   That's a whole different level of analysis that is not
    required under the law currently.
         BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: But could you
6
    recommend some language, as you did with --
7
8
           JEANNE ZOLEZZI: Well, our recommendation would be
    taking it out.
           BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'AMANO: Well, yeah.
10
                                                      No.
11
    -- but if we're going to move forward with trying to
    compile the information for a potential curtailment, I
12
    could see why we would need that information.
13
14
           JEANNE ZOLEZZI: Well, you know, with all due
    respect, I think it's already encompassed in what you
15
16
    have. I'm just thinking of some of the transfers that I
17
    know are going on.
          You are asking for -- already under the reg you
18
    would ask for how much they're pumping every month.
19
    you have the amount they're pumping. You know that
20
    they're curtailed, so everything they're pumping has to be
21
    under that transfer that they're talking about.
22
          You can obviously ask them who the transfer's from
23
24
    under your existing regulation. You can call that other
    diverter and say did you transfer to so and so? And you
25
```

1.1

So all you need is the total information. If that pre-'14 user has the right to pump 200 and there's 50 being pumped at both points of diversion, you have enough information right there.

And that's all available under your existing regulation, so you don't really have to expand it to say we need all the information about your transfer so that we can go through and make sure it complies with transfer criteria. That's a whole different level.

So I think you already have the ability to get the information that you need to verify. I can't provide you language other than what's already in there.

DAVID ROSE: We're looking at it. Certainly.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: My understanding is we had people who would say I got it from so and so, but we had no ability to get any awareness of whether so and so transferred the water and fallowed or did something to reduce their use by the amount they transferred. We're just trying to make sure --

DAVID ROSE: We are definitely intending to leave that in. But whether the language specifically of (c)(2) regarding compliance with transfer law could be narrowed, that's what we're trying to decide right now.

```
Because what you're talking about, the existence of
1
2
    the right whether it was in fact transferred, that goes to
   whether there was an unauthorized diversion, not
   regulating a pre-'14 or riparian water right. But we're
    trying to see -- we're working on that right now.
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Okay. Thank you.
 6
         MARIANNA AUE: Because I think there's a little bit
7
   of a -- to assume that we can -- that someone says oh, I'm
   using water transfer for so and so means that we should
    immediately go investigate so and so because we can assume
10
11
   that there's an unlawful diversion, I think that's the
   kind of logical leap we were trying to avoid --
12
13
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS:
                                  Right.
         MARIANNA AUE: -- having to make every time. But I
14
15
    think that it is possible to get at everything we're
    trying to get at using more words that describe exactly
16
    the type of information we're looking for rather than just
17
    sort of the pithy, you know, was this transfer okay.
18
19
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Yeah.
         MARIANNA AUE: So I think we'll go for more detail
20
21
    and then run something by you guys.
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Think about that one.
22
         Mr. Merkley, followed by Deirdre DesJardins.
23
          DANIEL MERKLEY: Thank you, Chair Marcus, members of
24
    the Board. Danny Merkley, with the California Farm Bureau
25
```

I'm going to go real quick because I'm going to repeat some things that you've already heard. But I want to start with if this is truly about collecting data for managing the system better, then every effort needs to be made to convey that in a -- in a clear and better way.

I thought that was -- that was a very good point.

It was up on the Power Point earlier by staff. And that's something that isn't necessarily conveyed to folks in a clear way. And, quite honestly, when this stuff comes, it comes across to people that are out there in a very threatening and scary way.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: People read the most negative thing into something unless --

DANTEL MERKLEY: So anything we can do to help that tone in letters and notices like that, but then also when staff is reaching out to them. And as we all know, we're human beings and some of us are better at that than others, and some of us are better some days than other days, too.

Moving on, the information request is spelled out in this, seemed to be without the same careful triggers that were in the emergency regulations last year.

And that's a concern for us. It seems to be almost asking for information without cause. So -- so that's a

```
concern and something -- you know, we weren't real thrilled with the emergency regulations last year. We're even more so concerned with what we're seeing this opening up and the changes this year.
```

Also -- and I led into this a little bit. Please understand the unfamiliarity with this stuff for some of these folks out there. I mean you heard stories about some of the older ones and folks that really don't understand this stuff.

We're dealing with that every day with our members. I'm getting calls, far more calls than I can handle. I've probably got a bunch today, but I don't know because I've been here most of the day.

So -- so that's important. It's -- for the most part you're looking at very honest, hard-working people that are dealing with Mother Nature in a way that most of us have never had to deal with it, and they got to get it done or it doesn't get done and there are no excuses.

Maybe you can make a little excuse to the Water Board or ask for a little forgiveness or a little extra time to get something done and, if you're showing good effort, that works. But with Mother Nature it doesn't work. Doesn't at all. Especially if you have a dad you're working with on the ranch.

But I digress.

Also, want to be real clear about the ask. Why we're asking for this. A little bit what I said earlier and what we're asking for so that we really do understand. And I think that goes a long way to helping people realize that well, this is actually good information. It's going to help us with the curtailment notices so that we're not curtailing --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Right.

DANIEL MERKLEY: -- users that aren't necessary. And that's not necessarily put out there.

And I want to -- I was really concerned about the slides I saw talking about the fiscal impact. It -- maybe I missed something. Maybe I glazed over for a minute. But in talking about the fiscal impact to local governments and other governmental agencies, there's a huge fiscal impact and -- and resource burden on a lot of these folks in trying to get this stuff figured out.

Because it's information that -- that they assume they have. Whether that's correct or not, it takes time for them to go back and research this.

You heard some of this from -- from previous presenters. And that's -- that's a real challenge. We have worked -- Farm Bureau has worked very hard to try to help folks with the information to help them comply.

There's a number of things that have passed, laws

```
and regulations, that we were opposed to, we didn't like,
   but when they passed we're out there trying to help our
   members comply.
           Every time a curtailment notice went out this last
   year, that very same day we sent information out to all of
   our members immediately to help them understand what was
    going on, to help them be in compliance, and we're
 8
   continuing to try to do that.
 9
          But we need a little help helping you, if you will,
   with that and helping our members be in compliance with
10
11
    something that's new and difficult and very hard for them
12
   to do.
13
           I'm going to end there because the buzzer just went
   off and it's late. Thank you.
14
15
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you very much.
   thank you for the help when that happens. We actually do
16
17
   need all that, the help we can get that way.
18
           DEIRDRE DES JARDINS: Thank you.
                                             I know it's real
19
20
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS:
                                  One second. After you will
21
   be Julie Ann Phillips.
22
           DEIRDRE DES JARDINS: Thank you. I know it's late.
23
    I just had an observation about the Delta curtailment
   generally, and that's -- I know the method that DWR is
24
25
   using for the curtailment analysis, and they're not
```

```
considering -- there's a 55-year-old requirement for the
 1
   Bureau of Reclamation to provide water for salinity
   control in the Delta. And the Board has required that
    since D-990 was instituted.
          And I just want to -- you know, this is fundamental
    and this is what they said.
          "Throughout these proceedings the Bureau's
   representatives have consistently affirmed their policy to
    recognize and protect all water rights on the Sacramento
   Watershed and in the Delta existing under state law at the
10
    time these applications were filed including riparian,
11
12
    appropriateness and others.
          "Unfortunately, these rights have never been
1.3
    comprehensively defined. It is imperative, therefore,
14
15
    that the holders of existing rights and the United States
   reach agreement concerning these rights and the
16
    supplemental water required to provide the holders with a
17
18
    firm and adequate water supply, if a lengthy and extremely
```

And as we know, they did reach that agreement with the Sacramento Watershed settlement contractors but not with the users in the Delta.

costly adjudication of the waters of the Sacramento River

and its tributaries is to be avoided."

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Skipping to -- there was a specific term included in the contracts.

"The State Water Rights Board reserves continued jurisdiction over permits issued pursuant to applications 5625 --" yada, yada -- "until March 1, 1964, or such additional time as may be prescribed by the Board for the purpose of formulating terms and conditions relative to salinity control in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.

"Permittee shall on or before 1962 and each six months thereafter submit to the Board a written report as to the progress of negotiations relative to agreement between permittees and the State of California and/or the permittee and water users in the Delta and in northern Contra Costa County."

They're not submitting these progress reports, and I don't -- it just seems like cooperative efforts have broken down. But I just wanted to urge the Board to think about this in the context of this curtailment proceeding because this was an interpretation of the area-of-origin rights by the Board when they initially issued this permit.

I calculated that they needed 2,000 CFS of supplemental water in June. Most -- they didn't -- 1,500 CFS came from the Bureau, and that was exactly the amount that their engineers estimated they would need for salinity repulsion back in 1960.

It may not be that there's any extra water for

```
salinity. But are we going to shift the burden for
 1
    salinity control onto the riparian users or not?
 2
 3
          So thank you.
 4
           CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you.
 5
 6
                   (Whereupon, end of file 10)
 7
 8
                             --000--
 9
10
11
12
13
14
1.5
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

KATHRYN DAVIS & ASSOCIATES 916.567.4211

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	State of California)	
4) SS. County of Sacramento)	
5		
6	I certify that the statements in the foregoing	
7	hearing were transcribed in the within entitled cause by	
8	audio; that said hearing was taken at the time and place	
9	therein named; that the testimony of said witnesses was	
10	reported by me, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter of the	
11	State of California authorized to administer oaths and	
12	affirmations, and said testimony was thereafter	
13	transcribed into typewriting.	
14	I further certify that I am not of counsel or	
15	attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing,	
16	nor in any way interested in the outcome of the matter	
17	named in said hearing.	
18	In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this	
19	30th day of August, 2015.	
20		
21		
22		
23	Diane F. Fattig, Certified Shorthand Reporter	
24	Certificate No. 3692	
25		

KATHRYN DAVIS & ASSOCIATES 916.567.4211

<u> </u>	1880 44:20	
\$	1893 45:4	3
\$5,000 48:1	1914 33:1 44:21 45:4	30 22:6 45:1
\$500 17:24	1959 32:6	30-day 21:25 41:18 44:14 45:24
\$561,958 20:19	1960 79:24	31.1 5:20
\$65 20:12	1962 79:7	31st 5:4
11	1964 79:3	325 8:15
(37 8:17 45:7
(a) 23:11	2	
(b) 23:12,20	2 62:17	4
(C) 69:11	2,000 79:20	4 11:24
(c)(1)(a) 24:8	2,058 19:14	4,031 11:24
(c)(1)(c) 21:4	2,483 19:12	40 9:16,17,20,24
(c)(2) 72:23	20 8:17,19	425 19:22 20:10
(C)(3) 22:5	200 72:4	
	 2005 11:2	5
4	2009 42:5	5.2 11:17 12:11
000 3:4 80:8	2010 11:14 37:12	50 72:4
	2013 11:14	54 8:16,17
1	2014 4:17 5:3 6:10,24 7:7,24 8:9,	55-year-old 78:1
1 8:21 59:20 79:3	19 10:22 11:23 12:13,24 14:4 38:17	5625 79:3
1,000 7:20	2015 4:18 7:9 8:21 12:15	5:20 3:5
1,061 13:11	2015-2-DWR 27:3	
1,500 79:21	2016 5:4	6
10 3:3 18:16 37:24 80:6	2030 55:2 56:1	6 13:6
100 47:5	2074 56:1	66 52:8
1052 28:24 39:24 40:16	21 23:9	
12 13:5	22 5:3	7
120 6:9	23 10:20 11:23,25	7.3 9:22,25
13 21:14 22:22	24 20:7 23:10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
13.5 5:21	270 21:15 23:25	. 8
14 21:14 22:22 23:24	275 39:15	856 39:6
15 20:9	28 22:13 23:4	
16 5:20	2:00 3:2	86 63:15 875 28:13
16th 22:21		
17 6:2		879 23:2,11

879(a) 23:20 activities 63:6 agonizing 58:3 879(c) 14:16,17 16:14 21:13,18 actual 9:25 10:6 11:12 16:4 agree 29:4 41:6 51:20 67:11 22:12,20 23:4,16,23 30:12 61:23 62:23 879(c)(1)(c) 69:5 add 45:16 agreement 78:16,21 79:9 879(c)(2) 69:6 added 23:4,17 agricultural 18:24 addition 8:24 ahead 13:16 62:25 9 aids 18:12 additional 10:24 13:24 22:6 40:18 55:12 61:1 79:4 9 3:2 37:23 Akroyd 33:7 38:10,12 address 5:9 6:9 17:6 30:3,6 41:5 allay 64:22 9,000 7:23 47:8 62:16 allegations 17:4 25:16 35:7,10 90 11:2,3 addressing 24:17 39:8.10.11 94 11:5 13:5,9,10,12,13 45:15 adequate 78:18 alleges 25:3 52:5 adjudication 34:15 48:25 49:5 alleging 14:20,22 15:5 24:10,17 950 8:15 50:11 78:19 25:15 98 52:10 adjusted 12:24 allocate 5:7 30:12 adjustments 62:25 allocation 5:10 Α administer 55:12 allowed 38:19 48:4 ability 29:5 39:5,12 53:9 72:12, administration 37:20 38:3 allowing 17:24 18 administrative 17:25 18:5,7,18 alphabetically 59:23 absence 13:3 65:5 39:23 alternate 6:14 8:14 9:19 10:2 Absent 60:6 admissions 53:1 amazing 59:6 abuse 46:12 63:23 66:13 admonitions 53:11 **amount** 9:14,15 10:6 11:12 abuts 63:17 adopt 5:5 21:8 28:22 44:13 57:17 71:20 72:20 79:22 accent 29:15 adopted 14:16 17:19 22:20 **analysis** 6:16,17,18 8:5 11:16 23:2,9 28:11 46:19 56:14 accidentally 50:22 18:15,17,20,21 20:14 37:10 44:11 71:4 77:25 adopting 40:17 accomplish 32:2 39:23 68:15 analyst 29:21 adoption 22:25 accurately 18:13 advance 7:13 61:9 62:1,13 analyzing 7:20 achieve 47:12 affected 18:24 20:20 and/or 6:23 10:25 79:10 acknowledge 68:9,10 affirmed 78:8 Andrew 3:13.15.16 4:1.5 14:12. Ackroyd 38:13 13 23:1 24:1 25:8 56:18,21 57:7, afternoon 27:19 **ACLS** 18:5 9 58:14.22 agencies 4:13 18:22,23,25 19:1, acquiring 5:9 Ann 60:3 77:21 12.13.16 20:3 22:11.14 39:17 acre-feet 11:18,19,24 12:11 52:7 64:5 76:15 answers 31:19,21 34:3 acres 45:7 agency 32:8 38:11 41:2 45:3 Antelope 23:7 46:10 act 5:4 28:19 32:6,12,15 anticipated 16:12 agency's 20:17 action 10:23 28:4,17 31:1 34:15 anticipating 19:2 36:8,20 40:4,9,11,12 56:12,16 agenda 21:1 apparently 45:25 actions 10:24 18:10 30:25 31:2

aggressive 53:21

39:13,16 40:2 65:10

appeal 53:17

appealing 52:18 appears 42:16,18 appellate 53:4 Appendix 18:16 applications 78:11 79:2 applied 30:25 45:7 61:14 apply 17:10 19:5 31:5 appointed 42:8 approach 36:17 appropriateness 78:12 appropriation 16:11 appropriations 50:25 approval 16:15,19 approved 22:21 65:15 67:24 68:23 69:13 April 12:17 21:13,14 22:22 23:24 apropos 10:15 aqueduct 63:17 area 4:22 5:21 43:5 62:19 63:15, 16 area-of-origin 79:17 areas 43:20 argues 44:24

areas 43:20
argues 44:24
argument 25:5
Article 23:10
artificially 46:14
assisting 45:10

assume 20:17 73:8,10 76:18

assumptions 37:15 attached 59:21 attention 53:10,11

attorney 3:16 28:25 40:1,3 56:10

attorneys 26:13

AUE 69:24 70:1,7 73:7,14,20

authenticating 16:23

authority 5:5 15:1 22:15 27:12, 21,23 33:10,11 38:23 39:1 40:16,

19 46:25 51:22 52:2,16 55:9,10 68:18

availability 26:22 32:13 42:2

avenue 8:10

average 7:11 11:15 12:23 13:14

averaged 20:9 avoid 73:12 avoided 78:20

aware 18:17

awareness 72:18

В

back 5:23 9:6 29:5 34:4 37:8 39:9 42:5 67:8 76:20 79:24

background 4:24 5:25 6:4

backup 19:16 bad 51:16 68:2 badmitten 36:23

Baker 60:3 **Banos** 63:15

Banta-carbona 22:19 65:25

barrier 64:7

based 4:11 26:10 37:12 44:8

57:14

basic 52:8

basically 66:18

Basin 8:6

basing 69:9

basis 6:14 10:2 19:9 22:2 26:9, 11 30:20 35:1 36:2,7 37:1 45:21

55:7

beings 74:18 **belabor** 66:16

belaboring 46:11

believes 27:23 31:9

beneficial 49:1

benefit 12:9 32:3 44:7

bet 50:8

bigger 34:11

biggest 51:6

bit 3:18 5:25 12:16 34:2 35:6,11 38:12 53:15 73:7 75:5 76:2

blue 12:23

Board 3:7,16 4:3 5:8 6:23 13:8, 15,17 14:3,9 16:16 18:13 21:8 23:8,15,21 24:14 26:19 27:20,24 28:11 29:25 30:3,16,21 31:1,5,8, 10,23,24 32:21 33:22,23 34:4 36:4 37:4,25 38:19,23,25 39:4,7, 12,15,18,19,20,22 40:3,7,8,10, 15,17,18 45:9 50:9 52:5 54:6,12, 19 56:2 58:6,10,12,18 60:12,14, 24 61:24 65:8 67:24 68:10,23 69:1,13 71:6,10 73:25 75:20 78:3 79:1,4,8,15,18

Board's 5:5 36:11,13,14 39:7 46:1 68:4

bolster 18:11

bolt 15:9 **bolts** 14:14

books 23:23

bottom 70:20

boxes 42:25

brand 23:10

break 3:11

Brian 3:21 4:9,10 9:9,12,22 10:10,13,17 11:9,11 12:5,8 13:10,16,21 14:11 17:5 61:18 62:11 63:3

briefly 14:15 21:22 23:6 41:9

bring 24:4 37:8 68:20

broad 46:24

broader 18:20

Broadly 24:21

broken 79:15

brought 65:20

brown 5:2 11:13

build 38:15

bullet 15:12 20:25

Bulletin 6:9

bullets 16:14

bully 53:9

bunch 75:12

burden 60:7 76:16 80:1

burdensome 59:8

Bureau 31:11 73:25 76:23 78:2

79:22

Bureau's 78:7

button 65:5

buy-in 6:17

buzzer 77:13

C

Cal 25:2

calculated 79:20

calculation 70:18

California 5:3 30:6,8,16 32:22.

23 43:23 63:17 73:25 79:10

California's 31:25

call 3:7 52:18 66:2 71:24

calls 75:11

canal 63:20

capture 51:12

careful 74:22

CAREN 63:2

cares 30:8

case 53:4 58:20 68:12

cases 18:11 19:8,15 20:6 50:2

categories 17:2

category 24:2

caused 12:12 24:18 25:18,21

35:11

causing 25:19 27:25

caution 53:20

cautioned 48:12

cease 18:4.6 41:17

Central 30:4,7 40:23 46:9 47:4,

22 50:14 59:18 60:1

certificates 48:9

certification 8:13 9:2 19:2

CFS 44:2 79:20.22

Chair 3:5,9,14,15,23 9:6,10,20 10:8,11,15 11:8,10 12:2,6 13:20 22:24 23:18 25:4 27:8,17,19 29:4,11,17 32:18,21 33:6 35:18 36:21 38:10 40:22 46:6 49:9 51:18,22 55:1,22 56:2 57:13,24 58:2 64:19 65:22 66:2,5 69:14, 17,25 72:16 73:6,13,19,22,24 74:13 76:8 77:15,20 80:4

Chairlady 41:1

chairperson's 53:11

challenge 76:22

change 20:24 21:7 30:16 34:8

56:4 68:14

changed 21:4,5 37:14

channels 32:9

charge 64:9

chase 57:14,15,16

chasing 31:25

circumstances 15:16 16:3.7

civil 17:25 18:5,7 39:23

claim 6:13 9:19 10:2 15:16 16:10 19:17 26:6 49:19 52:24

claimant 14:21

claimants 14:18

claimed 8:13,16 19:10

claiming 10:3 15:21,25 51:11

claims 15:23 19:23 30:11.23,24.

25 31:24 39:14

clarification 68:24

clarified 50:3

clarify 64:21

clear 43:14,17 44:9 74:6,10 76:1

clickable 62:24

client 49:4 59:17 63:14

clients 33:24 34:25 37:9 42:6,9

47:11 59:5

climate 30:15

close 27:13

Club 29:12 32:22

co-counsel 46:9

Coast 4:22 38:11

Coats 3:21 4:10 9:9,12,22 10:10, 13,17 11:9,11 12:5,8 13:10,16,21 14:11 61:18 62:11 65:12

code 17:20 18:4 24:16 28:7,21, 24 39:14.19 69:3

codified 28:13

coffee 3:11

coherent 54:20

collect 34:21

collecting 19:20 34:19,20 74:4

collects 29:25

color 4:18

color-blind 11:14

column 9:12 10:18

comfort 64:22

comfortable 34:13

comment 21:18 22:12,16 24:6 27:22 32:17 38:9 49:10,12 50:18

61:2

commenters 21:17,24 22:13 24:4 25:25

commenting 62:22

comments 13:24 21:17,20,22. 23 22:18 24:2.3 25:9 26:18.20 27:9.15 29:22 33:12 34:23 37:5 38:15,16,24 41:8,21 53:24 62:3 65:13

Commission 47:21

commit 61:8.25

commitments 5:12

committed 47:4

common 22:3 24:6

commonly 24:13

communicate 38:5

community 35:15

comparing 15:10 64:21 conducted 8:16 cost 19:1 20:16 44:22 64:10 comparison 13:13 conflated 25:12 Costa 79:12 confusion 31:22.24 35:11 60:23 costing 64:5 competent 53:21 compile 10:14 13:25 19:21,24 consensus 42:5 costly 78:19 71:12 conservative 20:19 costs 20:20 44:11 compiled 12:1 conservatively 19:19 20:2 counsel 27:20 compiling 11:21 13:7 considered 8:4 count 50:19 complainant 25:20 counting 22:24 23:1 consisted 6:11 complaint 10:22 14:20 17:15 consistently 78:8 **County** 79:12 24:7,10,13,15 25:17,24 26:8,11 39:10 41:20,24 56:15,25 57:15, constructing 30:2 couple 6:1 11:5 18:15 25:24 16 59:11,15 60:10,11,20 64:3,8 26:23 34:9 37:14 45:16 56:9 69:2 consult 65:17 66:11 67:2 court 68:12 consumed 11:19 **complaints** 5:10 15:4,14 17:3 courts 53:5 68:10 24:17,21,23,24 25:1,3,6,13,15,16 consummate 58:25 26:2,5,12,14 56:11 62:8 65:19 cover 50:8 contact 45:2 68:24 Crabtree's 22:18 context 33:19 34:4 35:3 36:1,3 complete 45:23 37:7 79:16 crazy 9:11 completely 50:3 continue 65:21 created 46:14,15 50:25 compliance 16:14 17:13 20:10 continued 40:14 79:1 creating 57:19 22:7 45:15 52:14 59:5 67:23 68:3 72:24 77:7,10 continuing 4:25 65:14 77:8 Creek 23:7 complicated 49:24 50:22 Contra 79:12 criteria 71:3 72:11 complies 71:3 72:10 critical 33:1 contract 15:22 16:20 69:10 comply 19:12 44:23 54:14,15,16 critically 40:8 contractors 43:15 44:6 46:7 76:24 77:3 55:4,6 78:22 criticisms 61:11 comprehensively 78:14 contracts 78:25 criticized 50:24 conceivably 70:15 contributed 7:14 crops 14:4 concept 25:24 26:22 contrivance 63:25 current 5:14 14:17 16:12,13,24 concern 37:6 68:5,8,21 69:14 control 31:15.16 78:3 79:6 80:2 17:11 21:13 74:24 75:1 controlled 19:13.23 curtail 12:13 13:2 concerned 60:9 66:14 67:9.18 conversation 10:16 curtailed 6:13 7:6 8:4 9:4,14,18, 75:3 76:11 23 10:1,4,5 37:17 71:21 convey 74:6 concerns 41:10 43:4 56:3,9 curtailing 76:7 63:14 65:11 conveyed 74:9 curtailment 5:10 6:10,21,24 concerted 47:12 convoluted 3:18 7:1,3,18,23 8:3,11,12,23 9:2 concisely 69:22 cooperative 79:14 11:15 15:18,19 17:3,6,7,14,15,16 23:5,13,14 36:16 38:20,21 48:15 conclude 32:6 copy 61:9 53:8,22 67:15 70:2 71:12 76:6 concludes 27:6 77:4,23,25 79:16 corporation 32:7 condition 24:9 25:12 curtailment's 7:11 correct 14:10 76:19 conditions 14:19 16:8,9 24:19 correction 21:6.9 curtailments 7:7,13 18:14 28:18 79:5 20:20

curve 12:22.23 36:11

curves 30:2

D

D'amano 3:7 13:17 14:3 54:6,12 58:6,10 60:12,14 61:24 69:1 71:6,10

D'amato 58:12

D-990 78:4

dad 75:23

dairy 59:18

Dam 10:21

DANIEL 73:24.74:15 76:9

Danny 65:23 73:25

Dante 46:8 49:11 51:20 52:1,11 54:10,15 60:2

Dante's 46:4

darker 4:18,23

data 6:25 7:9,12 13:6,24 19:20, 25 22:10 29:25 47:16 74:4

database 47:15,25 48:9 53:15 54:11 59:3.9

dataset 6:19

date 6:2 13:3 16:11 22:22,25 23:2 48:19,21,22 49:17,19,20

DAVID 23:6,20 65:12 72:15,22

day 17:24 23:19 43:4 75:10,13 77:5

days 6:1 11:5 21:2,3,15 22:6 23:25 45:1 74:19,20

deactivated 45:18

deadline 21:18

deal 29:6 75:17

dealing 33:2 41:9 53:18 75:10, 16

deals -41:23 43:5 45:21

decades 51:19

deceased 59:23

December 5:3

decide 29:7 70:16 72:25

decision 40:7 41:16 57:5,6

decisions 17:6,8 44:8 46:1

67:16

decline 13:18 14:6

deeply 27:3

Deer 23:7

defensive 35:6

define 24:7

defined 78:14

defining 46:24

definition 24:14,15

definitive 25:17

degrades 43:10

Deirdre 73:23 77:18,22

delegation 46:25

Delta 7:22 11:2,20 22:14 26:22, 23,25 27:1 29:22 30:9 31:16 32:5,6,10,13 40:23 41:1 42:20 43:7,10,21,23 44:2 46:9 47:4,5, 23,24 50:5,14,15 52:23,25 59:18 60:1 66:20,22 77:23 78:3,10,23 79:6,11

Delta-mendota 27:11,21

demand 6:12 7:9,11,12 11:15,25 12:2,12,14,23,25 30:2 31:9 32:3 36:11 37:15 44:14,25 70:18

demanding 47:3

demands 13:14

dent 56:7

department 16:16 31:11 65:18

depleted 46:15

deployed 8:2

Deputy 16:9 22:5

DES 77:18,22

describe 58:20 73:16

description 54:21 57:11

desist 18:4,6 41:17

Desjardins 73:23

detail 53:7,22 73:20

detailed 53:23

determination 26:1 42:23 57:1

determinations 36:15 37:16

determine 39:5 59:14 68:11,13

determined 31:17 67:3

determining 32:12 36:6 41:13

50:11

developed 65:12

development 65:9

dialog 56:4

difficult 61:13 62:9 77:11

dig 63:21

digest 15:9 18:16 21:2 35:20

diggings 49:22

digress 75:25

diligence 51:5,9

direct 24:23

directly 17:24

Director 16:9 22:5

disagreement 43:14,15

disappointment 45:13

discouraged 48:16

discuss 7:1,2,17

discussion 28:5,8 47:7 55:14

discussions 28:10

distinction 17:9

distribution 12:19

district 33:8 38:14 40:24 45:3 55:2 65:25 66:6

Districts 56:1

diversion 9:23 14:22 16:5,15 17:5 18:8 19:19,25 20:17 22:10 26:6 36:7 37:13 39:21 40:6 45:23 47:18 60:5 72:5 73:3,11

diversions 5:11 10:25 11:23 12:16 16:12 19:13 20:10,12 27:25 28:4,20 29:3 38:24 39:2 40:10

divert 30:25 32:9 70:15 diverted 10:6 49:21 diverter 15:6,13 16:6 24:11 25:22 36:2 39:14 42:21 45:2.3 71:25 diverter's 72:1 diverters 22:11 39:13 42:7,8 diverting 10:6 70:25 division 6:24 7:9,13,15,19 8:1, 14,18 10:20 14:21 17:1 24:22 25:13,14 26:1 35:21,23 41:15 documents 42:12 45:6 dollars 44:19 64:5 **DORENE** 3:7 13:17 14:3 54:6.12 58:6,10,12 60:12,14 61:24 69:1 71:6.10 double 50:16 doubt 58:11 download 61:21 downloading 7:20

downstream 10:21 drought 4:16,19 5:2,7 16:24 17:20 29:24 31:2 33:3 36:11,15 37:21 39:25 41:4 42:3 43:21 63:5

droughts 30:13 31:25 33:4 40:14

drunken 49:20

dry 25:18 28:18

due 3:18,20 4:25 5:12 7:7 8:2 13:6 31:4 34:14 40:11 41:9 51:5, 9 52:14 67:5 71:14

DWR 4:12 77:24

déjà 41:3

Ε

e-mail 7:4 e-mailed 19:10 earlier 4:12 13:2 14:5 36:10 39:9 74:8 76:2

early 21:13 67:14

ease 32:4
easily 20:4
easy 54:23
economic 18:21

edges 44:1

effect 18:18 20:22 21:13 25:25 31:3 46:1

effective 5:9 7:5 52:17 effectiveness 6:22

effects 5:7 efficacy 57:2,6

effort 6:10,21,24 47:12 56:6 59:14 74:5 75:22

effort's 6:22 efforts 79:14

eight-station 5:17,21

eliminate 31:5 embodied 56:13

emergency 4:25 5:6,14 7:24 8:9 14:14,25 17:20 20:15 22:20 28:10,22 29:24 31:1,3 33:14,17, 19 34:4,9,22 35:5 37:7,21 38:8, 19 39:2,3 40:18 41:4 44:25 46:11,12,19,23 47:2 52:2,15,21 53:18 55:7,10 67:12 74:23 75:2

enabled 59.4 enables 40:3 enacted 38:18

encompassed 71:15

encourage 30:2 31:10 38:25 64:24

end 3:2 5:1 21:5 37:23 39:24 50:22 77:13 80:6

enforceable 8:1,11 15:4 17:21 **enforcement** 3:17 6:11 8:22

anforcement 3:17 6:11 8:22 10:16,23 17:2,23 18:2,3,10,12 30:24 31:2 34:15 36:8,20 52:9

enforcing 5:11 6:22 **engineer** 20:13 **engineers** 59:4 79:23

English 64:12 enjoy 54:20 58:4 ensure 71:3

ensuring 6:21 36:18

enters 30:16

entire 3:3

entitled 32:11

Environmental 5:4

EO 39:22 EPA 25:2

equal 31:4 **era** 30:15

Erlewine 46:7 55:1,3,4

essentially 19:7

establishes 49:18,22

estimate 12:4 19:18 20:12,13,19 **estimated** 19:11 20:2.3 79:23

ether 23:23

evening 3:13,14 29:20 32:21 36:10 38:12 40:25 55:3

event 10:5 61:7,17,25 65:15

events 3:19 7:4,8

evidence 26:5 44:14 58:20 67:3

evident 25:14 evidentiary 41:13

examination 20:21

examinations 26:7

examine 18:18 examples 51:7

exceedence 6:8

exception 4:21

excess 55:14

excuse 31:6 38:12 39:19 43:12 75:19

excuses 75:18 **executive** 5:2 39:16 **exercise** 27:24 51:4

exist 23:24 32:5 51:12 failing 6:23 filing 8:22 60:10 64:8 existence 73:1 failure 10:23,24 filings 50:451:1,6 existing 14:16 38:22 39:1 40:15 fairly 15:11 fill 19:8 61:12,14,23 62:2 71:24 72:7 78:10,15 faith 51:15 **filling** 61:22 expand 67:22 72:8 fall 15:19 67:8 finally 16:3,22 17:12 18:12 expands 14:25 32:12 62:9 fallowed 72:19 expansion 67:10,18 find 47:11,17,20 51:2 57:11 Farm 73:25 76:23 63:22 64:1 **expect** 51:16 fashion 37:11 38:7 finding 33:14,16 35:25 44:1 expedited 41:10 43:2 **faster** 17:18 59:2,8 61:3 62:14,18 expensive 60:7 fear 64:23 65:4 66:10 findings 38:7 58:19 experience 57:14 fears 64:22 fine 41:11 51:16 63:1 expert 57:9,12 finger 58:3 February 7:10 11:2 19:4 22:4,13 experts 31:17 23:4 27:2 fingertips 37:3 **expire** 22:22 23:3,25 federal 18:19 20:23 43:16 49:21 firm 50:1 78:18 51:7 52:23 **expired** 22:13 23:21 firmly 37:19 Federation 74:1 expires 21:14,16 fiscal 18:15 20:14,15 76:12,14, feed 36:10 37:15 explain 33:17,18 49:15 16 feeds 33:20 34:3 explained 36:6 56:22 fisheries 23:3 feel 34:13 35:6 65:10 explanation 49:12,14 54:23 fit 31:12 feeling 46:13 five-station 5:19 **export** 32:13 FELICIA 3:5,9,14,23 9:6,10,20 exported 32:14 flexible 53:18 10:8,11,15 11:8,10 12:2,6 13:20 Exports 31:17 floating 23:23 22:24 23:18 25:4 27:8,17 29:4, 11,17 32:18 33:6 35:18 36:21 express 45:13 flood 51:3 38:10 40:22 46:6 49:9 51:18,22 55:1,22 57:13,24 58:2 64:19 **extended** 5:5 21:19 flows 43:9 65:22 66:2,5 69:14,17,25 72:16 extending 5:3 focus 17:1 33:14 41:22 73:6,13,19,22 74:13 76:8 77:15, extension 51:8 20 80:4 folks 25:4 37:9 60:3 63:16 64:15 69:19 74:9 75:7.8 76:17.24 ferret 60:8 **extent** 51:24 follow 70:11 field 48:20 extinguished 31:1 Forecast 6:5.6 **fifty** 11:18 extra 46:4 75:20 79:25 forecasting 16:23 fight 43:19 44:8 46:22 54:17 extreme 65:5 forecasts 6:7 fights 44:16 extremely 78:18 foregoing 29:5 figure 61:13 F foremost 29:6 figured 34:18 76:17 forget 53:4 file 3:2,3 8:20 19:17 37:23,24 face 9:5,7,14,18,24,25 13:8 52:20 60:10 64:3 66:7 80:6 forgetting 22:17 faced 28:3 filed 8:18 10:22 50:8 70:4 78:11 forgiveness 75:20 fact 23:21 25:14 60:9 62:23 73:2 files 59:11 form 8:13 9:2 10:9,12 11:21 19:2,3,7,8,12,25 25:3 47:11

49:14 61:2,9,19,23 62:13,14,15 63:3,8 65:9,13

form-in-process 24:20

format 24:25 62:21

forms 9:10,13,15,23 49:13

formulate 48:15

formulating 79:5

fortunately 47:16

fortune 48:6 59:2,7

forward 33:3 61:7 71:11

found 8:7,16 22:3 31:23 53:14

64:8

four-year 7:10 11:15 12:22

13:14

fourth 41:4 43:21

frequent 6:20

frequently 34:3

Friant 10:21

fruition 62:21

frustrated 61:5,13

full 51:24

fundamental 78:5

funded 57:16

funding 18:19 20:23

funny 29:19

future 30:5 33:4 40:14 50:20

65:10

G

gaining 6:17

gather 16:18 19:19 20:1,8 22:1

47:14

gathered 17:7

gathering 14:23 17:1 45:10

gave 48:2 53:15

general 6:8 24:2 27:20 28:25

40:1,4 42:5

generally 77:24

gentleman 59:13

Gentlemen 40:25

George 55:2,25 56:19 57:5,8,10, 22 58:1,9,11,21,25 60:13 63:12

giant 57:19

give 40:18 42:20 45:23 47:5 48:13 52:8,11 54:3 59:4 64:22

67:7

giving 49:3

glad 67:17

glazed 76:13

gleaning 36:5

qo-ahead 65:16

goal 7:14 36:24 37:19

goals 6:11

gold 49:21

good 3:13,14 11:9 22:6 27:19 29:9,20 32:21 34:1 38:12 40:25

51:15 52:5,19 53:15 54:23 55:3,

11 67:15 74:7 75:21 76:5

goodness 42:15

government 18:19,23 20:22

governmental 76:15

governments 18:25 19:24

76:15

Governor 5:2

grant 22:5

graph 12:18 37:11

graphed 12:21

graphs 5:16 11:7

grasp 50:2

gravel 49:22

great 34:10 40:21 59:2,5 64:16,

19

greater 34:19 35:14

green 12:15,24

ground 62:4

groundwater 63:19,25

group 63:8

guess 14:3 34:23 43:13

guidelines 57:8

gun 52:12

guys 35:13 44:7 54:16 64:24

69:22 73:21

Н

half 13:7 20:3,7,9

hand 14:11

handle 41:6 75:11

happen 35:9 57:20

happened 45:4 46:5 66:15

happening 37:7 63:24

happy 27:16 54:2 63:7,10

hard 76:23 77:11

hard-working 75:15

harm 24:17 25:15

harmed 25:11

Hartman 55:2,23,25 56:19 57:5, 8,10,22 58:1,9,11,21,25 60:13

63:12

harvesting 14:6

head 52:13

headings 4:6

hear 26:21,24 52:15 61:6 64:20

heard 23:8 29:19 35:20 36:9,13 51:9 60:22 61:4 62:8 63:24 70:8 74:3 75:7 76:21

hearing 41:13 65:2

nouning Transco.

hearings 44:17

held 36:23 37:19

hell 46:21

helped 47:8,12 64:15

helpful 33:21 34:12

helping 33:1 76:4 77:9,10

helps 18:13 26:13 63:11

heritage 30:9

Herrick 38:11 40:22,25 41:1

hey 35:1 47:1 51:2 12 8:7 10:13 12:7,20 14:22,24 1 16:10,18,22 17:1,7,17,18 18:12 high 54:8 19:10,16,20 20:1,4,8,18,21 22:2, higher 45:15 4 29:6 30:1 31:9 32:25 33:23 identified 18:23 31:7 34:6,8,20,25 35:2,16,23 36:4,14 highlight 28:2,17 illegal 28:5,19 29:3 38:24 39:2.6. 37:2,10,13 38:1,2 39:4 41:19 13.21 40:9 42:6.8 historic 5:2 42:20 45:7,9,10 47:3,13,20 48:7, 13 52:8 53:12,15,19,25 54:4 illegally 52:12 historically 14:9 55:12 56:24 58:16 59:3 60:4,8 illness 3:20 61:1 62:10 66:12,15,18,19,21,24 history 45:23 67:2,11,14,19,22,23 68:6,25 imagine 58:6 65:15 hit 26:18 66:8 69:9,10,12,20 70:21 71:2,12,13 immediately 17:21,23 37:1 72:2,3,6,9,13 73:17 74:21,25 holder 15:6,13 16:6 24:11 25:7, 73:10 77:6 76:5,18,24 77:5 impact 18:15,21 20:15 67:16 informational 7:21 10:21 11:1, holders 11:3,4,20 12:20 13:11 76:12,14,16 16,22 12:1,9,10 14:17 17:14 30:4,7,18 78:15,17 19:4,5 23:15 27:1 36:19 59:16,20 impacts 18:21 honest 75:15 61:18 62:23 64:6 65:16 imperative 78:14 honestly 74:10 **informs** 36:11 implementing 7:4 honor 38:9 initial 8:21 14:1 16:11 23:6 42:22 importance 29:2 hook 46:20 initially 7:16 12:23 23:2,8 79:18 important 9:8 12:6 17:9,19 hope 37:8,18 51:13 53:24 64:16 injunction 40:5 20:16 27:23 28:17 33:19 35:24 hopeful 21:12 53:3 38:6 39:25 40:8 41:25 66:8 75:14 injunctive 40:2 hopes 36:22 importantly 66:11 injury 25:11,21 horribly 44:12 impossible 59:9 **input** 63:9 host 7:16 improve 6:25 insert 68:6 69:15 hosted 6:25 7:2 improving 6:11 inspection 8:15 56:24 hot 14:5 in-house 56:14 **inspections** 8:3 15:19 hour 19:19,24 20:13 23:21 inability 36:13 institute 40:2 hours 20:5,7,9,11 42:11,20 inadequately 17:22 instituted 78:4 Howard 3:6 inches 5:20 insufficient 5:1 huge 76:16 include 13:21 intending 72:22 human 74:18 included 23:9,11 78:24 intent 16:18 **humble** 48:19 including 32:4 40:6 78:11 intents 38:6 hundred 11:18 incorrect 44:23 interested 35:23 36:4 hundreds 42:11,12,13 44:18 increase 31:22 interesting 9:13 10:18 hunting 51:1 increased 6:16 7:14 interference 14:20 15:5 24:10 husband 59:18 index 5:18,19 47:22 48:3,6 interferor 15:13 husband's 59:23 indexed 47:16 59:24 Internet 56:25 hyperlink 62:15 indicating 4:15 5:19 interpretation 79:17 individual 47:17 48:18 investigate 15:4 30:21 38:23 39:7,11,20 42:9 64:2 66:23 73:10 information 4:11,24 5:9,25 6:4,

investigated 70:2,17 investigates 25:15

investigating 25:13

investigation 15:18 26:10 41:24 42:11 47:2 57:3,4

investigations 17:2 26:12,14 39:5,12

involve 44:17

involved 57:17 59:5

involves 17:16

irrigation 13:19 45:3 55:15 65:25 66:6

issue 7:25 8:10 13:4 16:9 30:3,7 33:13 36:19 38:19 41:22 42:2 43:6 49:24 54:21 60:22 61:3,17 62:7,11 65:16 68:22 70:1

issued 7:2,24 8:23 10:20 11:1 17:15 19:4,5 26:2 27:2 35:25 58:16 59:16 79:2,18

issues 26:24 36:25 41:9 42:1,17 50:11 56:5 60:15 66:7

issuing 24:9 58:22

item 3:6,12 21:11 23:14,15

J

JARDINS 77:18,22

Jeanne 55:23 58:7 60:18 65:24 66:3,4,6 69:2,5,16 70:5,21 71:8,

Jeannie 55:23 66:3

Jennifer 60:17

Joaquin 5:18 6:6 7:17,22 11:4, 20 22:15 27:1 32:10 33:10,11 66:22 79:6

job 59:6 63:11 64:16

jobs 54:4

John 38:10 40:25 41:1 46:8 49:11 51:20 52:1,11 54:10,15

join 41:21

joining 44:7

ioke 45:19

Jon 3:24 4:3 27:11,15,19,20 29:10 38:15,17,22 39:24

Jones .29:11 32:19,21,22 33:6

judgment 57:14,17

judicial 39:17

Julie 77:21

July 8:21 13:18 14:8,16 22:21 23:4 38:17

jump 54:6

jumping 53:21

June 13:18 70:14 79:21

jurisdiction 67:20 68:4 79:2

justification 19:9

K

Kelsey 60:3

key 44:21

kicking 3:19

Kincaid 32:20 33:7,9

kind 4:4 10:18 17:17,25 64:25 73:12

kinds 18:10 26:7

knew 53:14 54:13

knowing 69:21

knowledge 43:20°

Kyle 29:11 32:21,22

L

lack 8:6 36:14 47:7

lacking 38:2

Ladies 40:25

lady 59:17

Lake 8:6

land 45:4 49:21

Lands 47:21 59:3

language 4:4 24:8 25:25 58:8, 13 60:15,19 65:3 67:1 71:7

72:14,23

languages 26:4

large 50:23

laryngitis 38:13

lastly 6:20 8:9

late 10:20 33:13 56:1 77:14,22

LAUFFER 35:19

law 8:22 16:15 18:18 22:15 50:2, 25 68:3,18 71:5 72:24 78:10

laws 67:23 76:25

lawsuit 68:20

lawyer 48:20 49:4

lead 34:14 36:8

leadership 54:8

leap 73:12

learned 37:25

leave 72:22

led 75:5

left 4:17 11:13

legality 68:7

legislation 42:7

legislative 39:16

leisure 61:22

lengthy 78:18

lesser 12:14

lessons 37:25

letter 21:3 58:8 60:18 62:15,16 66:18 69:3

letter's 66:7

letters 74:16

level 4:16 6:15,16 13:2 45:25 59:12 71:4 72:11

levels 6:7

liabilities 18:6

liability 17:25 18:7 39:23

license 24:19 51:1

licenses 19:15

lift 7:6,7

lifting 7:3

likewise 36:9

limit 22:1 49:1

limited 5:8,13 8:2,10 14:19,23

linger 4:5

link 62:14,23

list 21:20 26:20 59:21 61:4

listed 32:4 62:19

listen 35:1

litigations 52:22

live 63:4

lived 58:2

living 58:4

local 8:5 18:19,25 19:23 20:22

22:13 76:14

location 48:17

logical 73:12

long 26:12 33:4 36:23 44:23

63:22 76:4

longer 3:11 20:6

looked 8:15 50:2 59:21

Los 63:14

loser 64:12

lost 54:1

lot 10:17 20:6 26:24 45:5 46:22 53:16 54:2,8 55:17 59:5 60:22

61:4,11 62:8 66:9 76:16

lots 42:13 45:10 51:6

low 9:11

luck 53:16 54:10 59:2.8

lucked 53:14

Luis 27:11,20

M

Madam 27:19 56:2

made 3:10 16:12 21:17 22:16 23:16 25:18 29:20 38:16 41:8 42:22 62:25 65:13 74:6

main 21:23 26:18 68:21

make 26:1 36:15 41:16 43:3 44:8 47:8 49:18 55:19 56:6 57:21 59:13 62:3 66:24 67:15 72:10,21 73:14 75:19

makes 15:1 57:5 67:17 68:1

making 47:10

management 37:15 62:12

manager 46:9

managing 74:5

manner 36:21

March 4:17 5:20 13:5,6 59:20

79:3

Marcus 3:5,9,14,15,23 9:6,10,20 10:8,11,15 11:8,10 12:2,6 13:20 22:24 23:18 25:4 27:8,17 29:4, 11,17 32:18 33:6 35:18 36:21 38:10 40:22 46:6 49:9 51:18,22 55:1,22 57:13,24 58:2 64:19 65:22 66:2,5 69:14,17,25 72:16 73:6,13,19,22,24 74:13 76:8 77:15,20 80:4

MARIANNA 69:24 70:1,7 73:7,

14,20

matches 36:24

materiality 59:14 64:2

matter 36:22

matters 27:4

meaning 9:18 10:1 20:4 22:8

meaningful 31:9

means 7:25 12:3 22:9 52:18 73:9

measure 32:24

mechanism 27:25 28:5,18,23

mechanisms 27:24 28:6

meet 8:8 26:5 32:14 43:24 46:16

60:7 64:16

meeting 7:16 55:17 60:24

meetings 6:18,25 7:2 42:12,13

MEMBER 3:7 4:3 13:8,15,17 14:3,9 37:4,25 52:5 54:6,12,19 58:6,10,12 60:12,14 61:24 65:8 69:1 71:6,10

members 3:15 27:19 41:1 56:2 73:24 75:10 77:3,6,10

mention 14:15

mentioned 63:4 66:10 67:5

69:2,8

merit 56:15 64:9

Merkley 65:23 73:23,24,25

74:15 76:9

Merum 22:18

met 16:9 63:15

method 5:9 7:3,4 16:5 17:5 43:2

68:19 77:24

MICHAEL 35:19

middle 43:18

Mill 23:7

million 11:17,24 12:11

mind 49:4 62:7 67:6

mine 59:17

miner 49:20

minimum 26:5 43:24

minute 41:5 45:22 76:13

mirrors 38:7

missed 76:13

misuse 39:8,11

mitigate 5:7

moment 54:24

money 42:16

month 12:21 23:16 60:25 71:19

monthly 12:19

months 9:3 34:9 48:2 79:8

MOORE 4:3 13:8,15 14:9 37:4, 25 52:5 54:19 65:8

morning 27:16 29:23 35:22 45:6

Mother 75:16,22

mousetrap 57:19

move 27:9 71:11

Moving 74:21

multiple 30:19 31:14 51:19

Multiply 20:11 notion 42:19 44:12,22,24 oppose 46:1 municipal 18:25 now-proposed 34:8 opposed 17:10 25:7 77:1 number 3:6,12 9:4,7 11:8 12:11, options 62:5 N 14 21:17 22:13 23:10 24:2 25:1 order 5:2 6:23 7:21 8:8,11 11:1, 33:24 35:22 45:16 52:6 56:9 16,22 12:1,9,10 16:10 17:14 76:25 narrowed 70:22 72:24 18:5,6 19:4 20:18,24 22:4 23:5, numbers 12:3 54:8 69:19 13,15 27:2 30:1 35:24 36:1 38:21 natural 30:9 40:5,7 41:5,17 46:23 47:2 56:24 nuts 14:14 nature 57:1 75:16,22 57:12 58:18,19,22 59:16,20,21 60:23 61:7,17,19 62:23 64:16 necessarily 18:9 25:22 26:19 0 66:15 27:3 48:21 52:22 56:21 74:9 76:10 ordered 47:24 O'hagan's 3:20 needed 33:18 55:12 67:10,12, orderly 37:20 38:3 O'laughlin 32:19 13,15 79:20 orders 7:25 8:23 10:21 14:17 OAL 21:12 22:21,25 23:22 negative 74:13 18:9 19:5 20:21 24:10 36:19 38:20 39:4 58:16,18 65:17 66:21 negotiations 79:9 **object** 68:19 organization 29:22 newspapers 44:20 objected 51:9 outflow 55:17 nice 59:17 objection 62:12 outline 4:7 nobody's 45:14 objectives 31:14 outlined 61:20 Nomellini 40:23 46:6,8,9 49:11 obligated 43:11 51:20 52:1,11 54:10,15 59:1 overflow 48:10 observation 77:23 noncompliance 45:18 overlap 50:22 obstinate 50:12 nonenforcement 35:3 overlapping 50:10,18 54:22 obtain 20:5 nonthreatening 35:3 overtime 43:3 obtainable 20:4 noon 21:19 owned 19:13,23 obtains 31:9 normal 5:13 6:2 30:15,16 31:13 occur 26:12 29:3 45:21 P occurred 20:25 21:1 North 4:22 22:14 43:23 60:1 odd 13:18 42:21 package 23:6,8 northern 79:11 offensive 44:12 pages 61:20 notably 25:2 paid 43:3 53:10 63:20 office 3:17 18:18 49:14 59:4,20 note 17:19 20:16 21:22 paired 38:18 older 75:8 noted 11:22 17:5 open 27:13 panic 35:12 **notice** 5:16 6:23 17:14,15,16 21:1 45:24 47:6 70:2 77:4 open-ended 51:19 paper 30:3,10 noticed 11:22 68:23 69:13 opening 75:3 paragraph 62:17 notices 7:2.23.25 8:24 15:20 operates 59:18 paraphrase 16:17 17:3 48:16 74:16 76:6 pardon 22:18 operation 31:15 notification 7:5 part 34:11 35:8 36:17 43:14 70:6 **operations** 7:1 31:12 notifying 7:5 75:15 **opinion** 48:20 57:9,12 noting 6:13 parties 7:6 8:12,19 10:21 13:9

opportunity 32:16 66:13

15:15,16,21

partner 52:6 pertaining 32:25 Power 74:8 party 6:22 15:23 17:21 petition 27:5 66:16 practical 30:10 50:13 51:12 passed 59:18 76:25 77:2 petitions 26:25 practicing 48:20 passing 55:8 Phillips 77:21 pre-'14 19:23 68:11 72:4 73:4 password 65:18 phone 24:23 pre-'14s 17:11 19:22 Past 39:12 phoning 24:24 pre-1914 14:18 30:18 44:14 49:20.23 patent 16:11 48:19 49:17 pictorial 4:16 precedent 56:7 patents 48:8 piece 48:23 precipitation 5:17,19 Patrick's 43:4 pile 27:14 precursor 38:17 **pattern** 13:19 **pithy** 73:18 preliminary 11:6 40:5 Patterson 66:1.6 place 18:3 48:23 62:9 65:19 68:15 70:14 prepared 27:24 38:25 40:9 pay 53:9,11 42:14 places 69:7 payment 48:1 preparing 7:16 plan 12:25 31:12 34:11,19 35:14 pays 64:13 40:15 62:2 prescribed 79:4 peak 13:17 planned 11:19 31:17 present 5:15 21:10 22:10 38:18 penalties 18:2 39:25 planning 62:20 pending 10:25 presentation 3:19,22 4:8 14:12 plans 33:23 61:16 21:11 27:6 34:6 35:20 36:9 67:25 people 10:11 12:13 35:6 42:9,17 plea 34:24 44:19 46:18 50.7 51:1,13,16 presentations 4:12 pleased 64:17 52:3,15 53:9,12,16,19,21 54:17 presented 21:9 23:15 42:15 58:2,4 61:2,4 62:2,22 63:18,24 point 14:11 15:12 21:16 25:21 64:22 65:4 66:9,24 72:17 74:11, presenters 76:22 27:6 29:9 33:20 36:18 46:11 13 75:15 76:4 47:17 57:20 58:13,14 63:1 74:7,8 pretty 4:22 11:9 43:14,17 44:9 percent 6:2 8:17 9:5,6,13,17,22. 64:14 65:7 pointed 38:17 23,24,25 10:9 11:2,3,5,23,25 prevail 53:6 13:5,9,10,12,13 45:15,17 47:5 pointing 58:3 52:8.10 prevent 39:17 points 16:14 43:13 60:5 72:5 percent's 52:5 previous 20:14 33:15 76:21 policy 29:21 32:7 78:8 percentage 9:10 previously 15:17,22 67:25 poor 44:4 69:12 perfect 51:5 **PORTION** 3:1 principally 13:19 period 41:12,18 **position** 29:7 40:13 prior 7:11 12:9 21:11 32:25 permanent 7:7 40:5 post-'14 17:10 19:14 42:24 permanently 31:1,5 post-1914 6:13 8:10 10:4,5 **priority** 48:22 49:17,19,25 permit 24:18 51:4 79:19 30:18 50:4 private 32:8 permits 19:15 79:2 post-1994 8:24 problem 48:12,14 50:13 54:11 permittee 79:7,11 posted 7:9 21:2 62:24 62:13 permittees 79:10 posting 7:12 problems 41:5 49:6 51:13 person 32:7 64:7,10 potential 7:13,17 71:12 procedural 52:14 perspective 33:21 35:10,12 potentially 17:23 18:24 36:8 proceeding 79:16

proceedings 3:1 39:16,21 78:7 purchases 15:22 reading 44:19 process 5:13 6:11 7:15,19 21:12 purpose 43:2 44:7 45:8 68:15 readopted 23:21 26:15 31:4 34:14 40:11 41:9,11 69:17 79:5 reads 15:7 42:22 45:21 52:14 53:23 purposes 15:2 36:5 42:3,23 ready 3:6 programs 18:20 20:23 63:5 pursuant 79:2 real 50:13 51:13 74:2 75:1 76:1, progress 79:9,13 22 77:18 pursue 8:1 project 7:1 51:7,8 55:16 reality 30:10 pursuing 5:12 42:17,23 projected 12:15 put 29:7 35:6 40:12 52:12 57:18 realize 53:3 76:4 projects 43:16 44:6 46:15 52:23 60:4 63:7 65:18 76:10 reams 53:25 prolong 63:13 putting 56:22 61:1 63:19 reason 12:6,8 41:25 58:20 66:14 property 16:11 48:24 63:17 **puzzle** 54:21 reasonable 26:2 49:1 63:23 proposal 15:10 28:12 64:25 65:7 67:4 Q propose 21:7 reasons 26:23 35:22 37:3 Rebecca 33:7 38:12.13 proposed 14:14,25 17:9 19:6 qualifications 57:11 22:4 25:25 26:4,16 28:9 33:16 receipt 24:10 quality 5:4 7:1 31:16 38:1 43:11 38:21 39:3 67:21 receive 24:23 34:7 62:22 quantifiable 48:25 proposing 15:2 received 11:4 14:20 15:24 21:20 quantify 48:25 protect 43:11 78:9 23:13 26:8,10 34:5 37:6,10,13 quantity 49:3 50:23 protecting 55:13 62:16 question 28:4 30:21,23 31:8 **protection** 32:6 67:7 receives 14:22:20:18 33:24 52:17 70:9 protections 31:4 recent 7:21 9:1 19:3 questions 10:18 27:7,8 30:17 prove 64:10 recently 11:1 31:18.21 38:5 40:20 61:15.20 provide 35:2 41:19 44:14 47:22 Reclamation 31:12 56:1 78:2 quick 4:14 74:2 48:7 53:25 61:10,19 63:9 70:24 recognize 46:21 78:9 quickly 18:13 28:19 37:7 44:10 72:13 78:2,17 recommend 21:8 28:16 71:7 quit 53:2 54:20 provided 6:8 7:25 66:12 recommendation 71:8 providing 6:15,18,20 47:13 R 55:11 62:12 reconsideration 26:25 66:17 provision 17:24 60:20 reconvened 3:5 rainfall 5:1 7:4.8 provisions 17:20 18:3 40:16 record 46:13 55:19 raising 58:13 52:10 records 19:14 ranch 75:24 public 6:16,20 18:21,24 19:12. recurring 36:12 13 25:15 30:8 32:4,8 42:6 64:5 rapid 37:11 red 11:13 pulpit 53:9 rased 26:24 red-lined 15:9 rate 11:5 13:12 45:15 pump 72:4 reduce 31:22,24 72:20 reach 78:16,21 pumped 72:5 Reduced 32:3 reaching 74:17 pumping 63:19 71:19,20,21 reducing 31:23 purchase 16:20 48:10 reaction 27:15 reduction 11:23,25 12:2 read 74:13 purchased 15:24 redundant 4:11 31:5,6

refer 60:16 remember 60:24 reference 63:2 remembers 42:4 referenced 62:15 render 57:12 referral 28:24 40:1 repeat 74:3 referring 61:24 repetitive 21:10 refine 17:7 18:13 65:14.21 report 57:4 64:5 79:8 refined 6:12 reported 6:12 11:23 refinement 37:11 50:16 refining 65:9 reg 71:18 regard 46:23 53:6,19 regs 34:22 35:5 regular 55:9 regulate 68:14 69:18,19 65:25 regulating 68:17 69:15 73:4 regulation 14:15,25 17:10,17,19 19:6 20:15 21:12,16 22:5,8,20 23:3 28:9,10,14,15,22 34:8 38:18,19,21 39:4 44:25 46:2 52:21 58:17 67:7,10,12,13,21 68:21 69:7 70:6,22 71:24 72:8 regulation's 45:20 regulations 5:67:248:924:7, 16 29:24 31:2,3 36:3,17 39:2,7, 19 40:18 41:4 46:12 56:13 58:15 74:23 75:2 77:1 regulatory 18:16 reiterate 55:20

reporting 13:5 17:13 23:12 49:7 reports 42:14 50:21 79:13 representations 4:16 representatives 78:8 represented 49:4 representing 12:22,24 55:25 represents 9:25 repulsion 79:24 request 36:2 40:3.17 44:14 48:4 68:25 74:21 requested 12:20 requesting 60:8 68:5 requests 64:6 require 17:13 18:20 39:7,19 53:25 65:1 67:22 required 5:12 8:20 18:17 25:13 39:10 52:9 71:5 78:3,17 requirement 24:20,25 66:12 67:4,22 78:1 related 20:20 25:23 requirements 22:8 23:12 32:15 relating 26:21 53:18 relations 5:15 requires 39:15 58:18 relative 79:5,9 reauirina 16:10 released 44:3 research 31:18 76:20 releases 43:9 reserves 79:1 relevant 16:22 21:17 reservoir 31:15 reliability 31:22 resolution 15:7 21:8 55:6,8,20 relief 40:2 resolve 36:25 37:1 65:10 relying 12:3 resolving 36:22 remaining 11:3 resource 76:16

resources 5:8 8:2 16:16 31:11 32:4 33:2 respect 37:6 67:5 71:15 respects 40:11 respond 6:23 10:24 17:22 36:15 38:7 51:16 61:16 64:6 responded 13:13 responders 8:13 22:3 responding 5:10 41:12 44:13 responds 17:22 response 7:3 9:2 11:5 13:12 15:17,21 17:3,15 36:11 47:5 52:8 responses 7:20 11:21 **responsive** 48:4 61:1 rest 22:7 **restate** 46:13 Restore 22:14 29:21 restraining 40:4 restricts 8:22 result 8:25 10:22 57:3 results 11:6 12:1,10 14:2 return 10:12 returned 8:12 9:5,7,11,13,15,16, 23,24 10:9 revamp 62:20 revisions 65:14 rhetorical 36:23 **rights** 6:13 8:10.24 15:17 17:10 19:14 24:22 25:6 26:22 30:11,19 31:6,23 32:25 33:1 34:14 37:20 41:14,15 42:4,18 48:17 50:6,8, 10,19,23,25 53:8,13,22 54:22 55:13 78:9,13,15,16 79:1,18 riparian 14:18 30:18 33:1 39:14 48:24 49:3,25 70:3 73:4 78:11 80.5 riparians 17:11 19:22 river 6:6 7:17 8:7 11:4 51:3 66:22 78:19

rivers 30:8 63:24

road 34:16 separate 39:3 49:21 60:22 65:3 situation 46:14,15 48:18 robust 65:18 **September** 12:17 47:15 size 8:15 room 37:9 series 3:19 skip 24:3 **ROSE** 23:6,20 72:15,22 set 7:10.12 28:7 46:18 56:7 Skipping 78:24 57:10 rough 13:23 slander 42:6 settlement 48:22 78:22 roughly 13:8 20:3 slide 4:5,15 16:8 21:22 64:4 severe 4:19 round 35:5 49:13 **slides** 4:7,10 18:15 76:12 **shade** 4:23 route 8:2,8 slightly 38:15 **shape** 4:20 Rubin 27:11,15,19,20 29:10 **slowly** 43:10 shared 21:23 **Rubin's 38:16 small** 20:25 44:22 Shasta 44:3 rule-making 5:13 solutions 8:5 she'll 60:18 run 73:21 somebody's 41:14,18 52:13 **sheet** 21:7 someone's 66:19 S shepard 26:13 sophisticated 50:7 shift 80:1 sort 18:3 24:1 25:11 50:15 73:18 Sacramento 5:17,21 6:5 7:21 **shoot** 52:13 9:17 11:3,20 27:1 32:9 78:9,19, sorted 50:21 22 **short** 41:12 44:13 48:5 49:5 sorts 31:18 61:15 51:15 54:1 55:16 Sacramento/san 79:6 sound 64:25 68:1 short-term 7:3,8 48:4 safeguard 56:14 58:23,25 59:12 sounds 14:10 29:19 shortness 47:6 Salinas 8:7 source 8:14 25:17 **show** 12:21 32:23 45:4 salinity 31:16 43:11 78:2 79:6. **south** 38:11 41:1 47:5,23 50:15 24 80:1.2 showed 43:8 64:4 66:22 sample 8:15 showing 11:6 12:14 22:6 75:21 **Spaletta** 22:15 41:21 60:17 **San** 5:18 6:5 7:17,22 11:4,20 shown 17:6 22:15 27:1,11,20 32:10 33:10,11 Spaletta's 67:1 **shows** 13:17 66:22 speak 37:19 60:18 shut 44:2 scary 74:12 speakers 64:20 Sierra 29:12 32:21,22 scheduled 44:17 speaking 3:24 24:21 60:21 **sian** 4:3 season 55:15 species 32:4 signed 5:2 section 16:17 21:18 22:12 23:11 **specific** 24:5,15 25:21 26:20 24:8,16 28:13,24 39:6,15,24 significant 15:11 33:15 36:1,2 48:17 58:12,15 78:24 40:16 49:10,12 69:3 similar 28:14 32:3 38:20 70:8 **specifically** 28:24 72:23 sections 23:10 67:21 similarly 70:1 spelled 66:3 74:21 segregate 50:17 simple 25:3 spend 42:19 44:13 selling 63:25 simplified 62:4 spent 42:11 44:18 45:10 senior 8:11,14,16,20 10:3,7 single 7:12 45:2 spring 8:5 15:17.24.25 **sense** 47:9 sir 56:11 St 43:4 sit 63:9 staff 3:19 6:24 7:9 13.15.19 8:1. **sentence** 15:6,12 14 10:20 20:5,7,13 21:11 24:23

25:25 26:7 27:6 28:9 33:23 34:2 35:21 37:9 41:23 46:25 47:7,20 49:7,15 50:15,17 51:14 53:20 56:10,11 57:7,13 58:11 59:12 60:23,25 61:6 67:4,5,25 74:8,17

staff's 26:9 28:12

stage 46:22

stakeholder 6:17,25 7:16 33:21 35:14 65:13

stakeholders 34:12,24 61:8 62:1 63:8

stand 5:20 28:16

standard 18:3 26:5 49:13 68:19

standards 43:24 46:17,18

standing 6:2 25:5,9,10,11

start 18:4 41:24 74:4

started 47:14 48:23

state 5:8 18:19,25 19:23 20:16, 17,22,23 27:24 28:1 30:3 31:8 32:7,8 33:22,24 34:4 43:16 46:7 47:21,25 51:7 52:22 55:4,5 59:3 68:4,10 78:10 79:1,10

state's 5:1 30:8

state-wide 23:5,14

stated 38:22 39:24

statement 8:17,21,22 11:2,4,20 12:20 13:10,11 70:4

statements 7:22 37:12 45:17

states 32:2,7,9 78:15

statewide 27:1

status 16:1 21:18 30:23,24

stealing 66:20

step 3:10 55:11

steps 21:10 33:25

STEVEN 4:3 13:8,15 14:9 37:4, 25 52:5 54:19 65:8

sticky 53:22

stop 27:25 28:4,19 29:3 38:23 39:2,13,21 40:9

stopped 10:1

storage 14:10 46:15

storages 13:22

stored 14:22 55:13

stories 75:7

stream 25:18 43:9 70:19

streams 30:9

stress 29:2

strike-out 15:9.10

Stro-shane 29:17,18

strong 32:23 33:5

Stroshane 27:18 29:15,18,21

stuff 74:10 75:6,9 76:17

stumbled 47:21

stupid 45:19

style 62:21

subdivisions 23:11

subject 16:15 17:23 27:4

submit 19:16,21,25 22:9 79:8

submitted 13:24 29:22 33:11

49:13 53:12 60:5

submitting 33:25 79:13

Subsection 21:4

subsequent 4:7 36:8

substantial 22:7

substantiality 59:14

substantiated 26:3

substantiating 66:19

substantiation 26:9

substitute 41:13

success 47:13 54:3

sudden 52:24

sufficient 36:14 42:18 45:24

46:16 66:24

suggestion 58:7 60:17

suggestions 61:10 64:21 65:6

suit 52:20

summarize 29:23

summary 6:8 12:17 37:10

summation 13:23

summer 8:23 15:18

supplemental 78:17 79:21

supplementing 28:8

supplies 16:24

supply 6:5,6,7 31:10,15 43:5

78:18

support 19:17 22:2 26:5 32:23 33:5 55:6,10 58:19 70:6

supported 67:3

supporting 8:6 20:1 55:17

supportive 55:20

supposed 61:21

supreme 53:5

surplus 43:20,22,25

surveys 48:10

swamp 48:10

swift 40:11,12

system 7:5 37:22 64:12 65:19

70:19 74:5

T

tab 62:21 63:3

table 9:2

tabulate 21:21

tag 3:21

takes 44:23 45:5 56:12 76:19

taking 40:12 71:9

talk 15:2 63:10

talked 34:2 49:15 56:11 59:13

talking 39:10 52:15 56:5 70:12 71:22 73:1 76:12.14

tallying 13:13

task 59:8

Tauriainen 3:13,15,16 4:1,5 14:13 23:1 24:1 25:8 35:21 36:6 56:18,21 57:7,9 58:14,22

teaching 54:24

teaming 3:21 technical 34:23 temperature 31:15 template 61:19 temporary 7:6 40:4 46:19 ten 21:2 term 24:7,13,18 48:5 78:24 terms 24:19 37:11 79:5 Terry 46:7 55:3 **tested** 37:22 thanked 45:14 theme 22:3 36:12

thing 4:4 44:11 47:14 51:17 52:6 63:7 64:4 67:9 74:14

things 3:24 37:6 41:6 43:13 45:21 52:23 70:13 74:3 76:25

thinking 52:21 65:1 71:16

thinks 43:22

thought 27:12,13 45:24 54:22 62:6 74:7

thousand 11:18 42:20 64:5 66:21

thousands 42:12 44:19,20

threat 45:11 threatened 10:25 threatening 74:12

threats 16:4

threshold 42:22 60:10

threw 42:25 thrilled 75:2

throw 64:12 70:18

thrown 35:7

tighten 58:8 60:19

tightened 60:16

Tim 27:17 29:11,15,18,21 32:19

time 5:12 13:25 19:11 20:6,7,10 21:25 22:6 23:17 25:17,20 26:13 29:14 30:5 37:8 41:12,18 42:16 44:4,13,24 45:10 46:4,5 47:6

52:25 54:2 57:15 62:20 66:5 73:14 75:21 76:19 77:4 78:11 79:4

timeline 51:15 54:1 timeliness 38:2 timely 36:21,25

times 69:3

title 49:18

today 4:12 28:3,16 34:6 38:24

75:12

today's 32:1

tomorrow's 32:1

tone 74:16

tool 14:23 15:1.4 16:25 17:18 39:25 54:13

tools 36:19 39:23 51:24

top 11:2,3 12:22 27:14 70:19

total 20:9,15 72:3

totally 70:5

touched 41:23

tough 53:14

TRANSCRIPT 3:1

transfer 15:25 16:15,20 67:23 68:16,19 69:9,12,16,21,22 71:3, 22,25 72:9,10,24 73:9,18

transfer's 71:23

transferred 72:19,20 73:2

transfers 15:22 67:24 68:1,3,7, 22 69:2,7 70:7 71:16

transparency 6:15,17 7:14

treated 50:6

trespass 28:1

TRGOVCICH 63:2

tributaries 22:15 33:10,11

78:20

trigger 59:10,11

triggering 16:8 24:9

triggers 74:22

true 23:17 65:8

trued 12:3

truncated 41:11

trust 25:15 32:4 42:24

Tulare 8:6

turmoil 50:5

turn 4:9 5:23 37:9

turned 36:16

turns 41:12

type 14:21,24 19:3 38:5 73:17

types 24:17 36:4 typically 39:22

typo 20:25

U

ultimately 28:11 unasserted 15:17

unauthorized 5:11 10:25 18:7 40:6 73:3

unclear 35:1

uncomfortable 52:9

underlined 15:10

underlying 16:1,19 20:1

understand 33:2,22 34:13,17 35:9,15,16 51:14 52:3,24 54:23 69:18,25 75:6,9 76:3 77:6

understanding 14:4 28:21 34:5 35:13 72:16

understood 24:13

undertake 39:5

unfamiliarity 75:6

unfortunate 3:18

Unintelligible 35:18 51:19,25

unit 24:22

United 32:8 78:15

units 14:10

unlawful 14:22 16:5 26:6 52:18

73:11

unnecessarily 46:24

unnecessary 26:17 45:20

unnoticed 15:22 68:1

unrealistic 44:15

unreasonable 16:4,5 17:4

25:16 39:17 63:23

unsubstantiated 66:10

unverified 15:21 67:25

unwrap 50:10

update 9:1,3

updates 6:21 42:14 65:14

upgrade 63:3

upstream 25:19 55:18

urge 30:16 53:7 79:15

URL 62:16

USBR 4:13

user 15:6,14 16:6 24:12 47:1

72:4

users 32:10 76:9 78:23 79:11

80:2

utilize 38:25

utilized 12:11

V

vague 34:3

Valerie 32:19 33:7.9

valid 22:23 31:23 38:4 43:13

validity 68:11,13 69:18

Valley 30:4,7

variety 37:3

vectors 25:1

verbal 24:24

verify 16:1 56:15 72:13

verifying 68:22

version 15:9,10 16:13 17:11 20:14 21:13 23:3 33:16

versus 7:11 12:4 37:13 49:25

vesting 48:21 49:18

vets 56:11

vetting 57:1

violation 18:1 40:6 60:6

violations 18:6 24:18

visit 6:6

voice 3:20 4:1

volumes 34:6,7

voluntary 8:5

volunteering 67:14

vote 3:8

vu 41:3

W

wait 10:8

waiver 5:4

wanted 3:24 25:5,6 27:13 44:10

48:1 55:5,19 79:15

wanting 69:4

warrant 56:15

waste 16:4 17:4 25:15 39:17

wasted 42:16

water 5:8,9,14 8:24 11:12 13:19 14:20,23 15:5,13 16:6,16 17:10, 13,20 18:4,25 19:1,10,14 24:11,

22 25:6,9,10 26:22 27:12,21,23, 24 28:7,21,23 30:3,4,7,10,11,12, 15,17,25 31:6,8,11,15,16,23,25

32:3,13 33:8,22 34:4 37:16,20 38:11,13 39:6,8,11,14,18,19

40:23 41:2,14,15 42:2,4,18,21 43:8,10,11,20,22,25 45:7 46:7,

10,16 48:17,20,23 49:21,23 50:6, 23,25 51:2,3,7,12 52:7,25 53:8,

13,22 54:22 55:4,5,12,13,14,16

63:23 66:20 70:12,13 72:19 73:4, 9 75:19 78:2,9,17,18 79:1,11,21,

25

water's 46:20

watering 14:7

watermaster 42:8,10,14,24

45:25

waters 28:1 78:19

watershed 6:5,6,18,25 7:17 8:7 9:17 78:10,22

watersheds 8:4

ways 37:5 64:21

web 11:21 25:3 62:15

web-based 19:7

website 7:10 25:2 61:19 62:8,

18,20,24 63:3

week 13:7

weekends 54:2

weeks 14:1 37:14

western 32:2

Westlands 33:8 38:13

Westlands's 38:24

whichever 32:5

wholly 17:22

wide 20:16

wildest 64:22

willingly 6:19

win 53:1

window 5:14

wondering 60:21

word 21:3,5

words 44:21 73:16

work 34:24 43:3 45:5,14 50:15 51:14 60:2 61:8 62:1 63:5 75:23

worked 76:23

working 6:3 56:6,8 73:5 75:24

works 50:1 75:22

worried 59:1,10

worse 4:20

worthy 41:16

WR 27:2

wrap 63:12

written 57:11 79:8

wrong 29:13 44:12 66:5

Υ

yada 79:3

year 4:21 5:14 7:12 8:19 10:20 12:25 14:4 16:12,24 22:21 23:9, 19 28:3,9 36:13,18 38:1 40:12,13 41:4,8 43:21 47:15 51:3,23 52:7 54:13 55:15 67:14 74:23 75:2,4 77:5

year's 7:11 15:11 20:14 23:2 30:2

years 30:14,15 44:18 50:5 58:3 59:19 63:15

years' 42:10

yesterday 5:20 21:19 29:22 63:15

Z

Zolezzi 41:22 55:23,24 58:7 60:18 65:22,24 66:3,4,6 69:5,16 70:5,21 71:8,14