## STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD BOARD MEETING/HEARING (Portion)

MAY 20, 2015

Coastal Hearing Room - Second Floor

1001 I Street

Sacramento, California 95814

scribed by: Thresha Spencer, CSR No. 11788



## STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD BOARD MEETING/HEARING (Portion)

MAY 20, 2015

Coastal Hearing Room - Second Floor

1001 I Street

Sacramento, California 95814

Transcribed by: Thresha Spencer, CSR No. 11788

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

## PORTION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

(File 11 - all)

--000--

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Jennifer Spaletta followed by Jeanne Zolezzi.

JENNIFER SPALETTA: Thank you. First of all, I want to thank staff and the Board Members for working very hard this year to try and get additional information, better information than we had last year and for encouraging the regulative water community to do its part through voluntary agreements, and I think we've made a lot of progress this year. I know I've had some very good conversations, not just with people in this room, but with other people associated with the export projects and the contractors that we hadn't had before, and I think they've been really, really good at moving the ball forward on a lot of difficult factual and legal issues that we can narrow and, I think we can all agree, need to be resolved.

Unfortunately, the more we talk and the more we learn and even through the process of gathering better data about water availability, I think the more we realize that when you get down to the nitty-gritty at any individual point of diversion, the risk of being wrong with broad brush analysis is very, very high.

And that's why, regardless of these big legal

\_

issues, that we know we need to resolve. We also know they won't be resolved this week, and they probably won't be resolved this summer.

And that's why many of us in the Delta who have clients who are sitting here biting their nails wondering if they're going to plant something and cultivate it for three months only to receive a curtailment order have said, "Can we offer something voluntarily that saves water, helps us all get through the summer collectively," moves the ball forward without waving our rights on these bigger legal issues. And that is what we've proposed at this 25 percent voluntary program.

And we've worked with Michael George, obviously, and Tom Howard to put kind of the meat on what the program would look like. But, essentially, it would be farmers who say, "Okay. I'm still at a point in my cropping planning for the summer where I can make adjustments. I can either do some water conservation here, I can choose a different crop or I can plow a certain land and achieve a 25 percent reduction. We'll keep track of it, we'll document it, we'll make sure that it can be verified. We may actually learn something about the way the Delta works for those that participate in the program.

You, in exchange, will get four months of 25 percent reduction, which is a lot of water, if we're talking about

the system.

And they, in exchange, of course, receive some regulatory certainty that they can irrigate their other acreage, as they have been, and get through the summer from a business perspective. So it's really a practical solution.

It's a voluntary program, obviously, we hope get a lot of growers to sign up, but it's a practical solution. It's an on-the-ground practical solution to get people through the summer, achieve water savings, which is important to the system, and save this dialogue and these important legal issues to be resolved, but to a time where they can be resolved properly.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: It's -- it's interesting.

And again, not an opinion yet, but interesting to contemplate. We are in this funny -- funny is not the right word. We are in this challenging -- I think the word "unprecedented" has been used a lot, and recently a situation both hydrologically but also in terms of actually exercising the water right system to an extent it has not been exercised before. And so the challenge is on all sorts of fronts. So it's interesting to think interestingly about it and look at other options.

But I have a specific question that's sort of prompted by Mr. Nomellini's point. Which is one of the

things, at least for me, that I'd like to see is that we do resolve some of these issues that have been hanging around. Because my perspective, just dancing in and out of it over the decades, is that there's a -- there are very strongly-held views about the law or -- and other things, even the hydrology, about the law, let alone what's right and wrong. And those same arguments have gone for decades without helping us resolve anything.

And it strikes me that there's a moment where when I left, people seemed very comfortable in their rhetorical certainty and they take their chances on what might happen out in the world, and that seemed to be in a place of comfort. What I'm seeing in this crisis is people saying, "Let's resolve some of these things finally and move on."

But I guess I'd like us to resolve them in a way.

One thing I'd be concerned about is buying time and then punting. So in your conversation --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: -- there has been a strategy for how to lay out -- maybe there's ten, maybe there's twenty, maybe there's seven key issues that need to be resolved. And I'm hoping -- I'm hoping certainly with the assistance of our Delta Water Master and his acumen and energy on this, to be able to tee up those issues for

JENNIFER SPALETTA: We don't want to do that, no.

discussion in the nearer future rather than the later

3 4

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is that a part of your conversation?

JENNIFER SPALETTA: I would like to meet today, I wish that we -- I wish that there's evidentiary hearing and that I could have asked questions of the people who put the charts up on your screen today.

I mean, frankly, we have to get to the bottom of it because there's a lot of people who put up information, but we've never had the opportunity to ask each other the hard questions about those graphs and really get down to the nitty-gritty of the spreadsheet.

I mean, I heard what Terry said about missing 35 percent of the stored water, and we need to get to the bottom of that. The projects have to be able to operate and account for their stored water. And if they can't account for it now, there's a problem, we need to understand it.

So the way I view this voluntary program and any voluntary program that you would enter into to get through this year is it is just that. It is an emergency agreement to get operations through this year that operates on a parallel track with resolving these tough issues. And they really are two different things. One is operations, making a difference on the ground to get us through the year. And then the second is rolling up our sleeves and digging in on the tough legal and factual issues. We should be doing

both; we should be doing both at the same time.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

The reason that we like these practical voluntary

programs is there are literally hundreds of individual farmers who are having a very hard time this year making basic decisions, and I have a fear that if you roll out a curtailment in the middle of the summer, that the compliance with that curtailment will be sparse. And, frankly, that's not good for the system. It's not good for their mental health, it's not good for the economy of the area, and it doesn't achieve your goal. It may help us resolve the legal issues, but it doesn't actually do what we need to do, which is save water and make the system work better.

So I think what we're offering with this program is an opportunity to do both, to actually do some water savings and allow these people to operate in a way that makes some business sense. And, at the same time, let's dig in on these legal and factual issues and get to the bottom of them one way or the other.

> CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you.

JENNIFER SPALETTA: Thank you.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Question, Tam?

BOARD MEMBER TAM M. DODUC: Actually, I do have a few questions. Actually, the proposal is very intriquing. So just a couple of questions just to clarify in my mind. I'm sure I will get the details later on, but as far as what

A voluntary 25 percent in, I guess I understand it, either reduction in diversion or 25 percent fallowing of land that would normally be put into production in the critical three months.

So with respect to the first one, a 25 percent reduction in diversion, are you thinking that will be 25 percent less -- I think you're talking about a 2013 baseline, so that would be reduction from actual diversion or reduction from the water rights of diversion?

JENNIFER SPALETTA: Well, I don't think there will be an impact on water rights with just one year's activity, but there will be an impact on how much water is actually taken out of the river, I guess.

BOARD MEMBER TAM M. DODUC: No, no, no. I meant, were you doing the calculation of the 25 percent --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: 25 percent of what?

JENNIFER SPALETTA: Of the riparian rights.

THOMAS HOWARD: Perhaps I can answer because we're the ones that are actually writing it up, and I had discussions with staff about that issue. And it seemed to me that what we do is this year in the information order, we asked the 90 percent largest diverters to tell us what they intended to use this year.

And so we have, for a large fraction of the

diverters in the Central Valley, an estimate that they provided us saying, "Here's what we intend to use."

We also have some of the data of 2013 use, and we will certainly have more as these statements roll in over the year. So we'll ask the parties, "If you want the 25 percent reduction, you should have two numbers available to you. You should have what you already told us you were going to do last year — that you were going to do this year as you were projecting this year's diversions, and you have what you did in 2013, take the lower of those two and take off 25 percent." That's what the form said.

JENNIFER SPALETTA: And that would be a major problem if that's what the form said because the projected numbers for this year, in many cases, already accounted for conservation measures that were being implemented by the farmers. So that, of course, would be very unfair.

But if we're talking about a 2013 baseline -- CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Uh-huh. That's what I assume.

JENNIFER SPALETTA: It's a very basic concept. If you had a 100-acre field that was irrigated in alfalfa and they put on five acre feet of water during the summer month period, and since that time they have invested in drip irrigation and they are planting a shorter crop, maybe cucumbers for 60 days on drip, there's going to be obviously

fallowing or reductions in use already.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: Yeah. I would think

a substantial difference in the amount of water that's diverted and used on that property, probably more than 25 percent savings on that particular property.

So we would have to compare apples to apples with what was -- how they computed their diversions in use in 2013 with how they compute their diversions in use in 2015. If there's measurement devices in place, that's relatively easy, otherwise we have to use the same methology, you know, to make it an apples-to-apples comparison.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: You would have to have some kind of real number to base it on?

JENNIFER SPALETTA: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER TAM M. DODUC: And --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: And I want to talk about that. Taking the lower -- that doesn't seem right to me. I'm sorry, Tom. It doesn't seem fair. I'm not saying that it's 2013/2014 -- but it doesn't -- I'm not getting it, so...

BOARD MEMBER TAM M. DODUC: Do you have a rough

BOARD MEMBER TAM M. DODUC: And I guess -- oh, go

JENNIFER SPALETTA: So I was going to say, though,

but this type of program is going to teach us a lot about

think could actually be a springboard for other programs

that maybe could lead to ideas about how to change stream

flow or how to effectuate transfers, you know, using the

Delta. And so it's an opportunity to learn for the future

to help me understand this in context, and so will you just

say your growers, how many are we talking about, how much

water are we talking about potentially?

JENNIFER SPALETTA: Yep. So --

BOARD MEMBER TAM M. DODUC: And my last question is,

the effect of taking these activities in the Delta, which I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ahead.

as well.

estimate?

The other thing --

Between the south and central Delta, there are about

//www.yeslaw.net/help

2.4

\$300,000 acres. Do I think that all of them will sign up for this program? Probably not. It's just, frankly, too late to do that kind of outreach and accomplish that result.

But I do think that we'll get a critical number to sign up, and that's real -- that's real water. That's a lot of water, you know. Even if we had 10 or 10,000 acres sign up, it's still real water.

So I think that the program will achieve water savings if we get it moving so we can get people signed up. It's really a matter, though, of days here and getting it moving, because farmers are still making some planting decisions for the summer and they need to be able to figure out what they're doing so that we can achieve some savings.

Thank you all very much.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: Well, hang on just one second. Because the point that I was going to make is just the ability to glean additional information as a result of this, the whole issue of consumptive use in the Delta and that sort of thing.

And looking at what staff had suggested on Slide 25 as far as going forward with curtailment inspections, at the top of the list is Nonresponsive to Curtailment Certification Form.

So assuming that the growers that would be participating in this would have some sort of certification

form on file, not that they would be ignored, but the focus
would really be in other areas allowing allowing its
staff to move forward perhaps in some of these issues that
we're trying to get to the bottom of. So it's just a way to
narrow down the focus.

KATHERINE MROWKA: As I understand, the focus would shift to obtaining the information that the fallowing had occurred, that the reductions had occurred, so that there would be a shift in focus.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: The monitoring.

JENNIFER SPALETTA: All right. Thank you.

THOMAS HOWARD: Chair Marcus, just for clarification. I've been telling staff that we have to make a decision on this and get it out by Friday because it's supposed to start on June 1st. And, you know, every day that we wait, as the previous speaker had indicated, you know, people are making their decisions. And so this isn't something that I think is going to age well, and we need to make a decision and --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Right. And then you -- so you need to put in front of us individually, since it won't be tonight, what the -- what the parameters are and let us give you feedback.

THOMAS HOWARD: Sure. Of course --

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Between now and then.

5

6

7

already, but --

THOMAS HOWARD: I've sent you a couple of things

2

3 CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: I mean, we've had a general

conversation, but we got into a set of details that we need

to understand if you want our feedback, otherwise someone --

someone is going to challenge it.

THOMAS HOWARD: Sure.

8

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: And then it will come back,

9 so I just -- I think the onus is on you all collectively to

lay it out, give us the details, pros and cons where the

warts are, et cetera.

12

10

11

it given that we're not going to resolve everything. 13

14

do want to hear what the blow back will be or the cons.

15 16 we've had a general conversation, but we -- the devil is in the details, so -- you know, I'll look forward to seeing it.

I mean, in general concept I'll say I'm intrigued by

17

BOARD MEMBER STEVEN MOORE: That's fine. Yeah.

18

don't -- I don't mind discussing it a little bit, my 19 impressions of it are, you know, there's a choice we need to

20

make about the baseline and maybe one of the -- you know, in

thinking out loud -- if we wanted to really accomplish real

21

22 water savings in this context, you know, it's tempting to

23

24 conservation targets and -- but I realize, you know, in

25

terms of realizing real water savings in an emergency

use 2013 because we've used that for our urban water

2.0

So, you know, I'm at a point where, you know, I really realize the time sensitive nature of this, and I'm willing to, you know, take on some risk in setting up kind of a system to encourage this voluntary approach. You know, in terms of when I say that, I mean, knowing that I don't have all the answers to those questions, but there's a timeliness to this.

So I think, on the one hand, 2013, there's compelling reasons to use that for consistency in a state-wide story about conservation relative to a couple years back. And then, you know, then I ask staff, you know, is that giving too much credit for things that have happened already, and it won't make a significant difference this year in terms of making critical acre feet of water available.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: Well, isn't -- isn't part of it based on calculations of the supply and demand

curves that John O'Hagan is working on? I mean, whether it's 25 percent or whatever the number is, the idea is to get roughly equivalent savings as what would have occurred with a correlative reduction for riparians.

THOMAS HOWARD: That is information that is used to inform the question of whether it is reasonable to offer a 25 percent reduction, but it's not necessarily the sole determining factor. I can't guarantee -- because, for example, if we did a reduction, and it could very possibly be we'd send out curtailment notices in August or even the beginning of September --

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: Uh-huh.

THOMAS HOWARD: -- for riparians, and it might be a much larger reduction. And so, you know, you're looking at, well, you have four months now of a reduction as opposed to, you know, maybe the two months you'd have if you sent out a riparian notice.

And so if you're somewhere in the area of 25 to 50 percent of the supply/demand curves, then, you know, it seems as though this is a reasonable thing to offer for the purpose of ensuring that we, you know, we provide assurances to people and the assurance that we actually see some real water.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: And I guess what I'm saying is you could compare that number to the various

THOMAS HOWARD: Of course.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: -- you're talking about.

THOMAS HOWARD: That's exactly what I was doing, yes.

Member D'Adamo, I think this is a very healthy exercise, but there's a time sensitivity to it. And I'm comfortable moving forward not having all the answers, but knowing if you do a reasonably quick analysis of water savings, that —that it's worthwhile in building the team effort and — and then keeping an eye on it. The monitoring will be important. I'm very favorable to moving forward with something this week.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you. Ms. Zolezzi followed by Jennifer Buckman.

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: Good evening, Board Members.

Jeanne Zolezzi representing Patterson Irrigation District and Banta-Carbona Irrigation District. And I just want to mention those are both pre-1914 water right holders on the San Joaquin River. We have also been talking to the Delta Water Master and your staff about a potential voluntary curtailment agreement. We'd very much like to explore that. We're waiting for numbers because we feel very strongly that

a voluntary curtailment is much preferred to the chaos and the litigation that would follow a mandatory curtailment.

And I agree with Ms. Spaletta that we'd like to have something voluntary for this year while we still pursue getting answers to those legal questions that must be answered for us to continue in this yenue.

I just wanted to go through a few of the reasons why we don't believe that pre-'14 curtailments across the board are appropriate at this time or legal at this time, just some things for you to think about.

Regarding data, I think everyone has done it that's come up here. We really do want to commend your staff.

They have taken the information we have provided and they have just made extraordinary efforts in trying to take those comments into consideration and come up with the best data they can come up with. It's been a herculean effort, and they've done a great job.

The problem is in the San Joaquin River System there are just no answers to some of the anomalies that we're finding. Even the top experts on the San Joaquin system who usually have all the answers don't have those answers this time.

For example, just looking at the seven-day running average from last week working with the experts on the San Joaquin River we went through, we looked at all the gauges,

we looked at all the reservoir releases, and we looked at actual diversions from the river that were taking place, came up with the number that we expected to see at Vernalis.

Well, that wasn't the number that showed up. The number at Vernalis was 200 CFSs higher than that. And nobody, including the expert on the San Joaquin River, can explain why that is the case at this point.

So there are things that simply cannot be answered in the San Joaquin River. And when you enforce a curtailment against a water right holder, you have the burden to demonstrate that no water is available. And when we don't have the answers as to what water is there and where it comes from, we can't make those conclusions.

Regarding the right to divert, again, imposing curtailments based on an assumption that a senior water right holder is being injured somewhere downstream, it's simply not authorized and not within the State Board's power, frankly. A junior water right appropriator in California has the right to continue to divert as long as there is water at their facility and a senior water right holder is not being significantly injured.

It's not enough to say -- it's not enough for the State Water Project contractors to get up here and say, "We are losing 30 percent of our water, curtail everyone." It just doesn't work that way. They have some burden of

showing where that 30 percent is going. They have no idea. Frankly, that's why we need data, that's why we need some questions answered.

And as Dante mentioned, curtailments are based upon site specific and time specific determinations, and they also depend upon specific priority at a specific location. We simply don't have those facts. We haven't even attempted to get those facts, and we haven't had a factual hearing — we haven't had an evidentiary hearing to glean those.

Just as an example, if you have a senior water right holder in the Delta who has a certain water right for a CFS diversion and it's for irrigation. They don't divert water 30 days out of the month; they divert water a few days to irrigate and then a few days later in the month to irrigate.

When they are not irrigating, the junior water right holder has the opportunity to take that very same water legally. Your staff's information is based on a 30-day use of that water that's been reported. That's not correct. That's not the way junior and senior water rights work. If it was, it would never work. Even in the wet years we couldn't get that done. It's because we have seniors turning on and off and juniors using that this whole system we have with the over appropriations that you keep hearing about, that's how it works.

Another issue. When you're talking about my

how what you're saying doesn't mean we just can't do it at

25

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: That would be my legal conclusion.

3

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: I'm trying to understand what you're saying, that you have no authority over pre-'14s.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: And that's one of the reasons is that you don't have a permit that you can look to and say, "This pre-'14 has a right to take this water at this time."

The courts have very clearly said very recently that you do have the authority to determine if a pre-'14 is They have said that you have to do that in order to determine if they're legally taking water, but the court also said, "You can't go beyond that. You can't regulate that water right."

And once you determine a pre-'14's right vis-a-vis another pre-'14, you're regulating. Once you tell that pre-'14, "Okay, you have a valid right, but you have to stop taking it because other water right holders need the water, you're regulating." And I would ask you to ask the hard questions of your staff because we know that your legal counsel is telling you something different, that you do have that authority.

And, obviously, we will get the answer to that because, you know, if we have broad brush curtailments, we will bring that up and have the legal answer.

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Right. I'm assuming that one

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: But I don't want to see the list, frankly.

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: And that's how you get to it, because how can you curtail me as a pre-'14 when I have data, I have a posted notice from 1911 that shows I have a valid right to divert, and someone else just says, "Oh, I have a pre-'14 right" with -- with no proof and no determination or fact finding by this Board that that's the case.

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: So what you're saying is that we don't have jurisdiction over pre's, and that, in addition, that we need to wait until we get a complaint?

Someone has to be injured --

JEANNE ZOLEZZI: Well, as to pre, absolutely. That is the law as well. You could -- if you could determine without a complaint that there's an injury, obviously you could perceive that way.

But again, the courts have been very specific, and the California Supreme Court has stated that a threat of harm, which is what we are hearing staff telling us, that we are curtailing in order to protect, John O'Hagan told us, "Well, there's a threat that these senior water right holders will be injured because you're taking their water."

\_

The California Supreme Court has said a threat is not enough. You have to prove that the senior water right holder has actually been substantially injured or materially injured.

So if you're just taking water that they weren't going to divert that day, you're legally entitled to it. If you've inconvenienced them, you're entitled to it. If we have taken, you know, one acre foot from the projects, that's not a substantial injury, and they cannot show what water we're taking, if any, that we're not entitled to. So, yes, our point is that you simply don't have the site specific information that's needed to do this.

And again, as we've said it before, it's also the due process issue. You know, we're getting double-speak, very frankly, from your staff. We receive in the mail -- the post-'14s received a letter that said, "You are immediately to cease diverting, and within seven days you will file under penalty of perjury a certification that you have stopped diverting. But it's just a notice and it's not enforceable."

You know, we can't have it both ways. It's either a binding notice to cease diverting or it's just a letter saying, "There might not be enough water for you, you better consider what you do or we'll come after you."

What you sent out is a notice. It is an order to

stop diverting, and you cannot do that without a due process hearing. You can't do that without an evidentiary hearing.

And that's why your staff is not calling it an order; it's just a notice. Because, as you well know, you can't have a binding order affecting your property rights without some kind of due process, without a hearing, right to be heard evidence, which we've had none of. We simply have staff, based upon a graph that we haven't been able to cross-examine or correctly verify saying, "Someone might be injured in the future. You have to stop diverting."

It simply doesn't work, which is why we are asking, "Let's see if we can work out something voluntary and still pursue these legal issues to get them answered," or let's take a different approach and wait until we have complaints and you can do that site specific determination through a hearing. And then we'll get our answers and we'll know who needs to be curtailed and who doesn't need to be, so --

But we hope -- we hope to get some numbers from your staff and, hopefully, we can work out some voluntary curtailment so that we don't have the chaos that follows and we can come up with some kind of orderly way to get these questions answered. I know that Mr. George has been working very hard on that to try to get some of these questions answered in an orderly way rather than the chaos result. So I do thank your staff for its efforts. Thank you.

3

housekeeper vacuumed that well.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER DORENE D'ADAMO: I just wish my

CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Some -- can you hear that? It's like someone is vacuuming in the hallway behind us for 15 minutes. I don't know. Sorry. We are listening, it's iust --

JENNIFER BUCKMAN: And, for some reason, I'm always last at these things. Jennifer Buckman. I'm here on behalf of the Friant Water Authority.

And I just wanted to clear up -- I want to -- it's late, and I don't want to repeat any of the comments and be repetitive of comments that have already been made for us by others, but I did want to clear up the comment in reference to Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, which is a Friant Division contractor and a member of the Friant Water Authority.

They are not transferring 150,000-acre feet of CVP water this year. The Friant Division contractors, as this Board is painfully aware, got a zero allocation this year like we got last year. They don't -- we didn't, as a whole division, we didn't get 150,000-acre feet of water either this year or last year or the two years in combination.

So our hydrology this year is even more challenging than it was last year because the local streams have

basically very, very little supply to augment.

So the folks in our division that have other sources of supply are in an even worse situation this year than they were last year. As a result of that, we put together a complicated package of exchanges and transfers in order to develop a water supply for the Friant Division contractors.

And as you all know from some of the prior workshops and such we've had on the TUCPs, within our service area, we have thousands of families who are still out of water 10, 12 months later after their wells ran out. It's primarily impacting low-income families, folks who can't afford to drill the well deeper or move.

And in response to the comment earlier that there are no endangered farmers, well, there are in our area in Terra Bella and Lindsey and Strathmore and Orange Cove. I know plenty of endangered farmers. A lot of our guys are growers that have been on the same land for multiple generations, and right now their lives and livelihoods are on the line. We've got 15,000 small family farms. Within the Friant Division, the average farm size is less than 200 acres. These aren't guys that can weather a long multi-year drought like that.

As I've mentioned to the Board before, within the Friant Division is a little bit unique in the fact that we are a conjunctive use system, planned that way under the

California Water Plan and operated that way, which means that our M&I contractors, those who have municipal and industrial needs within the Friant Division are served by a Class 1 contract, not a specific M&I contract.

So it's critically important for us to develop some Class 1 supply for those contractors this year because we've got six cities, including the City of Fresno, that are Friant contractors and need that water.

A lot of people worked very, very hard to get what is essentially a replacement of the Class 1 supply we would otherwise get, and it's not just Arvin-Edison, we have other Friant Division contractors who worked on that. Delano Earlimart and Kern and Tulare were both involved in the transactions, as were a number of our neighbors, the exchange contractors and Westlands Water District was very helpful to us in making some water and deferring -- taking some water out of San Luis so that we could avoid a low point problem and make the water available behind Millerton, we were able to back it up through a multi-party exchange.

It's a really complicated package of transactions that we've put together, and that's why it may be confusing to folks who just read, "Oh, there's 150,000-acre feet of water that's going to change hands at some point, but that's not this year and it's not CVP supply."

We're developing a minimal supply for the Friant

Division contractors. We're getting a total of less than 30,000-acre feet for the entire division. So I also want to echo the comments that a bunch of other folks have made about how the State Board staff has been really helpful this year, and we appreciate that. It's a much more iterative process this year than last, and we're very thankful for the, you know, discussions we've been able to have with Kathy and Michael and a bunch of other folks. CHAIR FELICIA MARCUS: Thank you very much. (Whereupon, end of transcribed portion.) --000--2.2 

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	State of California )
4	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 transcribed
13	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,
L6	nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named
L7	in said hearing.
L8	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
19	2nd day of September, 2015.
20	
21	THRESHA SPENCER
22	Certified Shorthand Reporter Certificate No. 11788
23	Certificate No. 11/88
24	
25	

\$	Λ	agreement 7:19 19:24
<b>J</b>	4	agreements 3:11
<b>\$300,000</b> 14:1	<b>40,000</b> 13:21	ahead 13:3
		alfalfa 10:21
-	5	allocation 28:20
<b>000</b> 3:3 31:11	<b>50</b> 18:19	allowing 15:2
		amount 11:1 13:24
1	6	analysis 3:24 19:11
<b>1</b> 30:4,6,10	<b>60</b> 10:25	anomalies 20:19
<b>10</b> 14:6 29:9		answers 17:14 19:10 20:5,19,2
<b>10,000</b> 14:6	9	21:12 27:16
<b>100-acre</b> 10:21	<b>90</b> 9:23	apples 11:4
11 3:2		apples-to-apples 11:9 approach 17:12 27:14
<b>12</b> 29:10	Α	approach 17:12 27:14 appropriations 22:23
<b>14s</b> 23:18	ability 14:17	
<b>15</b> 28:6	absolutely 12:23 13:19 25:16	appropriator 21:18
<b>15,000</b> 29:19	accomplish 14:3 16:21	area 8:9 18:18 29:8,14 areas 15:2
<b>150,000-acre</b> 28:18,22 30:22	account 7:15	
<b>1911</b> 25:7	accounted 10:14	argument 23:13 arguments 6:7
<b>1st</b> 15:15	achieve 4:19 5:10 8:10 14:8,13	Arvin-edison 28:15 30:11
	acre 10:22 17:22 26:8	assistance 6:23
2	acreage 5:4	assume 10:19
<b>200</b> 21:5 29:20	acres 13:21,24 14:1,6 29:21	assuming 14:24 24:25
<b>2013</b> 9:8 10:3,10,17 11:6,21	activities 13:6	assumption 21:15
16:23 17:16	activity 9:12	assurance 18:22
<b>2013/2014</b> 11:17	actual 9:9 21:2	assurances 18:21
<b>2014</b> 11:21 17:4	acumen 6:23	attempted 22:7
<b>2015</b> 11:6,22	addition 25:14	augment 29:1
<b>25</b> 4:11,19,24 9:2,3,6,8,16,17 10:6,11 11:3 12:4 14:20 18:2,7,	additional 3:8 14:17	August 18:10
10.6,14 11:3 12:4 14:20 18:2,7,	adjudicate 24:1	authority 24:4,9,21 28:10,17
	adjudicated 23:14,20	authorized 21:17
3	adjustments 4:17	availability 3:21
<b>30</b> 21:24 22:1,13	affecting 27:5	average 20:24 29:20
<b>30,000-acre</b> 31:2	afford 29:11	avoid 30:17
<b>30-day</b> 22:17	age 15:18	aware 28:20
<b>35</b> 7:13	agree 3:18 20:3	27410 20.20

В	С	clients 4:5
hack 16:0 14 17:2 10 20:10	edeuletien 0.40	collectively 4:9 16:9 combination 28:23
back 16:8,14 17:3,19 30:19 ball 3:16 4:9	calculation 9:16	comfort 6:13
	calculations 17:25	
Banta-carbona 19:20	California 21:19 25:21 26:1 30:1	
base 11:11	calling 27:3	commend 20:12
based 17:25 21:15 22:4,17 27:8	case 21:7 25:11	comment 28:14 29:13
<b>baseline</b> 9:9 10:17 11:21,22 16:20 17:1	cases 10:14 23:21,22	comments 20:15 28:12,13 31:3
baselines 19:1	<b>cease</b> 26:17,22	community 3:10
<b>basic</b> 8:5 10:20	central 10:1 13:25	<b>compare</b> 11:4 18:25
basically 12:16 23:13 29:1	certainty 5:3 6:11	comparing 17:3,4
basis 13:20	certification 14:23,25 26:18	comparison 11:9
beginning 18:11	<b>cetera</b> 16:1 <b>1</b>	compelling 17:17
behalf 28:9	<b>CFS</b> 22:11	complaint 25:14,18
Bella 29:15	<b>CFSS</b> 21:5	complaints 27:14
	<b>Chair</b> 3:4 5:14 6:19 8:19,21 9:17	compliance 8:6
big 3:25	10:18 11:10,14 12:20 15:12,20, 25 16:3,8 19:16 23:12,19,24	complicated 29:5 30:20
bigger 4:10	24:3,25 25:3 28:1,4 31:9	compute 11:6
binding 26:22 27:5	challenge 5:21 16:6	computed 11:5
bit 16:18 29:24	challenged 23:11	<b>concept</b> 10:20 16:12
biting 4:5	challenging 5:17 28:24	concerned 6:16
<b>blow</b> 16:14	chances 6:11	conclusion 24:2
<b>board</b> 3:7 8:22 9:15 11:13,25 12:5,7,8,18 13:2,12,17 14:15	<b>change</b> 13:8 30:23	conclusions 21:13
15:10 16:17 17:24 18:12,24 19:3,	<b>chaos</b> 20:1 27:20,24	confusing 30:21
7,18 20:8 25:10,12 28:2,20 29:23 31:4	charts 7:6	conjunctive 29:25
Board's 21:17	choice 16:19	<b>cons</b> 16:10,14
<b>bottom</b> 7:7,14 8:17 15:4	choose 4:18	conservation 4:18 10:15 16:24
bring 24:24	cities 30:7	17:18
broad 3:23 24:23	City 30:7	consideration 20:15
brush 3:23 24:23	claimants 23:5	consistency 17:17
Buckman 19:17 28:8,9	clarification 15:13	consumptive 14:18
building 19:12	clarify 8:24	contemplate 5:16
bunch 31:3,8	Class 30:4,6,10	context 13:13 16:22
burden 21:11,25	clear 28:11,14	continue 20:6 21:19
business 5:5 8:16	cleared 12:12	contract 30:4
	client's 23:1	contractor 28:16
buying 6:16		contractors 3:14 21:23 28:19

29:6 30:2,6,8,12,15 31:1 day 15:15 26:6 divert 21:14,19 22:12,13 25:8 26:6 conversation 6:17 7:2 16:4.15 days 10:25 14:10 22:13,14 26:17 diverted 11:2 conversations 3:12 dealing 23:17 diverters 9:23 10:1 correct 11:12 22:18 decades 6:4,7 diverting 26:17,19,22 27:1,10 correctly 27:9 decision 15:14,19 division 28:16,19,22 29:2,6,20, correlative 18:4 decisions 8:5 14:12 15:17 24 30:3,12 31:1,2 counsel 24:20 deeper 29:12 document 4:20 couple 8:24 16:1 17:18 deferring 30:16 **DODUC** 8:22 9:15 11:13 12:5.8. court 24:11 25:21 26:1 Delano 30:12 18 13:2,12,17 courts 24:8 25:20 **Delta** 4:4,22 6:23 13:6,10,21,25 **DORENE** 11:25 12:7 14:15 14:18 19:22 22:11 23:3.4 15:10 17:24 18:12,24 19:3 25:12 Cove 29:15 28:2 demand 17:25 credit 17:20 double-speak 26:14 demonstrate 21:11 crisis 6:13 downstream 21:16 23:9 depend 22:6 critical 9:5 14:4 17:22 drill 29:12 details 8:25 16:4.10.16 critically 30:5 drip 10:23,25 determination 25:10 27:15 crop 4:18 10:24 drought 29:22 determinations 22:5 cropping 4:16 due 26:14 27:1.6 determine 24:9,11,14 25:17 cross-examine 27:9 **determined** 23:5,7,23 cucumbers 10:25 E determining 18:8 cultivate 4:6 earlier 29:13 develop 29:6 30:5 curtail 21:24 23:8,20 25:6 Earlimart 30:13 developing 30:25 curtailed 23:2 27:17 easy 11:8 devices 11:7 curtailing 25:23 echo 31:3 devil 16:15 curtailment 4:7 8:6,7 14:21,22 economy 8:9 18:10 19:24 20:1,2 21:10 27:20 dialogue 5:11 effect 13:6 curtailments 20:8 21:15 22:4 difference 7:23 11:1 17:2.21 23:14 24:23 effectuate 13:9 difficult 3:16 **curves** 18:1,19 effort 19:12 20:16 difficulty 23:3 CVP 28:18 30:24 efforts 20:14 27:25 dig 8:16 **emergency** 7:19 16:25 digging 7:24 D encourage 17:12 discussing 16:18 **D'adamo** 11:25 12:7 14:15 encouraging 3:9 discussion 6:25 15:10 17:24 18:12,24 19:3,8 end 31:10 discussions 9:21 31:7 25:12 28:2 endangered 29:14,16 dancing 6:3 **District** 19:19,20 28:15 30:15 energy 6:24 12:1 **Dante** 22:4 diversion 3:23 9:3,7,9,10 22:12 enforce 21:9 diversions 10:9 11:5,6 12:14 data 3:20 10:3 20:11,15 22:2 25:7 21:2 enforceable 26:20

ensuring 18:21	families 29:9,11	Friday 15:14
enter 7:18	family 29:19	front 15:21
entire 31:2	farm 13:21 29:20	fronts 5:22
<b>entitled</b> 26:6,7,10	farmers 4:15 8:4 10:16 14:11	fully 23:20
equitable 23:10	29:14,16	<b>funny</b> 5:16
equivalent 18:3	farms 29:19	future 6:25 7:1 13:10 27:10
essentially 4:15 30:10	favor 23:8	
established 23:9	favorable 19:14	G
estimate 10:1 13:18	fear 8:5	gathering 3:20
evening 19:18	feedback 15:23 16:5	gauges 20:25
evidence 27:7	<b>feel</b> 19:25	general 16:3,12,15
evidentiary 7:4 22:9 27:2	<b>feet</b> 10:22 17:22 28:18,22 30:22 31:2	generations 29:18
exchange 4:24 5:2 30:15,19	FELICIA 3:4 5:14 6:19 8:19,21	<b>George</b> 4:13 27:22
exchanges 29:5	9:17 10:18 11:10,14 12:20 15:20,	give 15:23 16:10
exercise 19:8	25 16:3,8 19:16 23:12,19,24 24:3,25 25:3 28:1,4 31:9	giving 17:20
exercised 5:21	field 10:21	glean 14:17 22:9
exercising 5:20	figure 14:12	goal 8:10
expected 21:3	file 3:2 15:1 26:18	good 3:12,16 8:8,9 19:18
expert 21:6	finally 6:14	graph 27:8
experts 20:20,24	•	graphs 7:10
explain 21:7	finding 20:20 25:10	great 20:17
explore 19:24	fine 16:17	ground 7:23
export 3:14	finish 12:6	growers 5:8 13:14,21 14:24
expressed 13:23	<b>fish</b> 17:6	29:17
extent 5:20	flow 13:9	guarantee 18:8
extraordinary 20:14	focus 15:1,5,6,9	guess 6:15 9:2,14 13:2 18:24
eye 19:13	folks 29:2,11 30:22 31:4,8	<b>guys</b> 29:16,21
	follow 20:2 23:12	
F	foot 26:8	Н
facility 04:00	<b>form</b> 10:11,13 14:23 15:1	hallway 28:5
facility 21:20	<b>forward</b> 3:16 4:10 14:21 15:3 16:16 19:10,14	hand 17:16
fact 25:10 29:24	fraction 9:25	hands 30:23
factor 18:8	frankly 7:4,7 8:7 14:2 21:18 22:2	hang 14:15
facts 22:7,8	25:4 26:15	hanging 6:2
factual 3:17 7:25 8:17 <b>22:8</b>	Fresno 30:7	happen 6:11
fair 11:16	Friant 28:10,15,16,19 29:6,20,24	happened 17:20
fallowing 9:3 11:24 12:13 15:7	30:3,8,12,25	nappened 17.20

hard 3:7 7:9 8:4 24:18 27:23 include 11:23 28:8,9 30:9 including 21:6 30:7 Joaquin 19:22 20:18,20,25 21:6, harm 25:22 9 23:1 inconvenienced 26:7 health 8:9 job 20:17 individual 3:22 8:3 healthy 19:8 John 18:1 25:23 individually 15:21 hear 16:14 28:4 **June** 15:15 industrial 30:3 heard 7:12 11:20 27:7 junior 21:18 22:15,19 inform 18:6 hearing 7:5 22:8,9,23 25:22 juniors 22:22 information 3:8,9 7:8 9:22 27:2,6,16 14:17 15:7 18:5 20:13 22:17 jurisdiction 25:13 helpful 30:16 31:5 26:12 helping 6:8 17:6 injured 21:16,21 25:15,25 26:3,4 K 27:10 helps 4:8 **KATHERINE** 15:6 injury 25:18 26:9 herculean 20:16 Kathy 31:8 inspections 14:21 high 3:24 keeping 19:13 intend 10:2 higher 21:5 Kern 30:13 intended 9:24 holder 21:10,16,21 22:11,16 key 6:21 26:3 interest 13:23 kind 4:14 11:11 14:3 17:11 27:6, holders 17:7 19:21 23:1 24:17 interested 13:22 21 25:25 **interesting** 5:14,15,22 knowing 17:13 19:10 hope 5:7 27:18 interestingly 5:22 hoping 6:22 intrigued 16:12 L housekeeper 28:3 intriguing 8:23 land 4:19 9:4 29:17 Howard 4:14 9:19 15:12,24 invested 10:23 16:1,7 18:5,13 19:2,5 landowners 12:24 involved 30:13 hundreds 8:3 large 9:25 irrigate 5:3 22:14 hydrologically 5:19 larger 18:14 irrigated 10:21 hydrology 6:6 28:24 largest 9:23 irrigating 22:15 late 14:3 28:12 L irrigation 10:24 19:19,20 22:12 law 6:5,6 25:17 issue 9:21 14:18 22:25 26:14 idea 13:19 18:2 22:1 23:17 lay 6:20 16:10 issues 3:17 4:1,11 5:12 6:2,21, ideas 13:8 lead 13:8 24 7:21,25 8:11,17 15:3 27:13 immediately 26:17 learn 3:20 4:21 13:10 iterative 31:6 **impact** 9:12,13 left 6:10 J impacting 29:11 legal 3:17,25 4:10 5:12 7:25 8:10,17 20:5,9 23:10 24:2,19,24 implemented 10:15 **Jeanne** 3:5 19:18,19 23:16,23 27:13 **important** 5:11,12 19:14 30:5 24:2,5 25:2,5,16 legally 22:17 24:11 26:6 imposing 21:14 Jennifer 3:4,6 6:18 7:3 8:20 let alone 6:6 9:11,18 10:12,20 11:12,19 12:16, impressions 16:19 19,22 13:4,16,19 15:11 19:17

**letter** 26:16,22 Master 6:23 19:23 multiple 29:17 Lindsey 29:15 materially 26:3 municipal 30:2 list 14:22 25:1,4 matter 14:10 N listening 28:6 means 30:1 literally 8:3 **meant** 9:15 nails 4:5 litigation 20:2 measurable 17:2 narrow 3:17 15:5 livelihoods 29:18 measurement 11:7 **nature** 17:10 lives 29:18 measures 10:15 nearer 6:25 local 28:25 meat 4:14 necessarily 18:7 location 22:6 **meet** 7:3 needed 26:12 logics 23:12 member 8:22 9:15 11:13,25 neighbors 30:14 12:5,7,8,18 13:2,12,17 14:15 long 21:19 29:21 nitty-gritty 3:22 7:11 15:10 16:17 17:24 18:12,24 19:3, looked 20:25 21:1 7,8 25:12 28:2,16 Nomellini's 5:25 **Members** 3:7 19:18 losing 21:24 Nonresponsive 14:22 mental 8:8 **lot** 3:11,16 4:25 5:8,18 7:8 13:5 **notice** 18:17 25:7 26:19,22,25 14:5 29:16 30:9 27:4 mention 19:21 loud 16:21 notices 18:10 mentioned 22:4 29:23 low 30:17 **number** 11:11 14:4 18:2,25 methology 11:8 21:3,4,5 30:14 low-income 29:11 Michael 4:13 31:8 **numbers** 10:6,14 19:25 27:18 lower 10:10 11:15 middle 8:6 **Luis** 30:17 Millerton 30:18 0 mind 8:24 16:18 М O'hagan 18:1 25:23 minimal 30:25 obtaining 15:7 **M&i** 30:2,4 minutes 28:6 occurred 15:8 18:3 made 3:11 20:14 28:13 31:4 missing 7:12 offer 4:8 18:6,20 mail 26:15 moment 6:9 offering 8:13 **major** 10:12 monitoring 15:10 19:13 on-the-ground 5:9 make 4:17,20 8:12 11:9 12:21,25 month 10:22 22:13,14 14:16 15:13,19 16:20 17:2,21 onus 16:9 months 4:7,24 9:5 17:3 18:15,16 21:13 30:18 operate 7:14 8:15 29:10 **makes** 8:15 **MOORE** 16:17 19:7 operated 30:1 making 7:22 8:4 14:11 15:17 operates 7:20 move 6:14 12:8 15:3 29:12 17:6,22 30:16 operations 7:20,22 moves 4:9 mandatory 20:2 opinion 5:15 moving 3:16 14:9,11 19:10,14 Marcus 3:4 5:14 6:19 8:19,21 9:17 10:18 11:10,14 12:20 15:12, opportunity 7:9 8:14 13:10 MROWKA 15:6 20,25 16:3,8 19:16 23:12,19,24 22:16 multi-party 30:19 24:3,25 25:3 28:1,4 31:9 opposed 18:15 multi-year 29:21

options 5:23 planting 10:24 14:11 projected 10:13 **Orange** 29:15 plenty 29:16 projecting 10:9 order 4:7 9:22 24:10 25:23 26:25 plow 4:19 projections 11:22,23 27:4,5 29:5 point 3:23 4:16 5:25 14:16 17:9 projects 3:14 7:14 26:8 orderly 27:21,24 21:7 26:11 30:18,23 prompted 5:25 outcome 17:5 portion 3:1 31:10 proof 25:9 outreach 14:3 possibly 18:9 properly 5:13 post 23:18 property 11:2,3 27:5 P post-'14s 26:16 proposal 8:23 posted 25:7 package 29:5 30:20 propose 12:23,24 potential 19:23 painfully 28:20 proposed 4:11 potentially 13:15 parallel 7:21 pros 16:10 power 21:18 parameters 15:22 protect 23:2 25:23 practical 5:5,8,9 8:2 part 3:10 7:2 17:25 prove 26:2 pre 25:16 participate 4:22 provide 18:21 pre's 25:13 participating 14:25 provided 10:2 20:13 pre-'14 20:8 23:1,4,6 24:7,9,15, parties 10:5 punting 6:17 16 25:6,9 Patterson 19:19 purpose 18:21 pre-'14's 24:14 penalty 26:18 **pursue** 20:4 27:13 pre-'14s 23:8,9 24:4 **people** 3:13 5:9 6:10,13 7:5,8 put 4:14 7:6,8 9:4 10:22 15:21 pre-1914 19:21 23:2 8:15 13:23 14:9 15:17 18:22 30:9 29:4 30:21 predicted 17:3 perceive 25:19 preferred 20:1 Q percent 4:11,19,24 7:13 9:2,3,6, 8,16,17,23 10:6,11 11:3 18:2,7 previous 15:16 19 21:24 22:1 question 5:24 8:21 12:4,6 13:12 previously 11:20 perfectly 12:11 primarily 29:10 questions 7:5,10 8:23,24 17:5, period 10:23 8,14 20:5 22:3 24:19 27:22,23 prior 29:7 perjury 26:18 quick 19:11 priority 22:6 permit 24:6 **problem** 7:16 10:13 20:18 30:18 R personally 13:20 PROCEEDINGS 3:1 perspective 5:5 6:3 ran 29:10 process 3:20 26:14 27:1,6 31:6 place 6:12 11:7 21:2 read 30:22 production 9:4 **Plan** 30:1 real 11:11 12:20,22,24 14:5,7 **program** 4:12,14,23 5:7 7:17,18 planned 29:25 16:21,25 18:22 23:3 8:13 12:23 13:5,22 14:2,8 planning 4:16 realize 3:21 16:24 17:10 programs 8:3 13:7 plans 11:23 realizing 16:25 progress 3:11 plant 4:6 Project 21:23 reason 8:2 28:8

reasonable 18:6,20 river 9:14 19:22 20:18,25 21:2,6, signed 14:9 9 23:2 reasons 17:17 20:7 24:5 significant 17:21 roll 8:5 10:4 receive 4:7 5:2 26:15 significantly 21:21 rolling 7:24 received 26:16 simply 21:8,17 22:7 23:5,10 room 3:13 26:11 27:7,11 recently 5:18 24:8 rough 13:17 site 22:5 26:11 27:15 reduced 12:13 roughly 18:3 sitting 4:5 reduction 4:19,25 9:3,7,9,10 10:6 18:4,7,9,14,15 running 20:23 **situation** 5:19 17:1 29:3 reductions 11:24 15:8 **size** 29:20 S reference 28:14 sleeves 7:24 regulate 24:12 Slide 12:4 14:20 **San** 19:22 20:18,20,24 21:6,9 23:1 30:17 **small** 29:19 regulating 24:15,18 save 5:11 8:12 regulative 3:10 sole 18:7 saves 4:8 regulatory 5:3 **solution** 5:6,8,9 **savings** 5:10 8:14 11:3 12:13 relative 17:18 sort 5:24 14:19,25 14:9,13 16:22,25 18:3 19:11 releases 21:1 **sorts** 5:21 screen 7:6 remain 12:16 sources 29:2 send 18:10 repeat 28:12 south 13:25 senior 17:7 21:15,20 22:10,19 repetitive 28:13 **Spaletta** 3:4,6 6:18 7:3 8:20 23:2,9 25:24 26:2 9:11,18 10:12,20 11:12,19 12:16, replacement 30:10 seniors 22:21 23:20 19,22 13:4,16,19 15:11 20:3 reported 17:4 22:18 **sense** 8:16 12:21,25 sparse 8:7 represent 13:23 sensitive 17:10 speaker 15:16 representing 19:19 sensitivity 19:9 **specific** 5:24 22:5,6 25:20 26:12 reservoir 21:1 27:15 30:4 September 18:11 spreadsheet 7:11 resolve 4:1 6:2,8,14,15 8:10 served 30:3 16:13 springboard 13:7 service 29:8 resolved 3:18 4:2,3 5:12,13 6:22 staff 3:7 9:21 12:4 14:20 15:3,13 set 16:4 resolving 7:21 17:19 19:23 20:12 24:19 25:22 setting 17:11 26:15 27:3,8,19,25 31:4 respect 9:6 seven-day 20:23 staff's 22:17 response 29:13 **shift** 15:7,9 **start** 15:15 result 14:3,17 27:24 29:4 shorter 10:24 State 21:17,23 31:4 rhetorical 6:10 **show** 26:9 state-wide 17:18 rights 4:10 9:10,12,18 22:19 showed 21:4 **stated** 25:21 23:6.10 27:5 showing 22:1 statements 10:4 riparian 9:18 18:17 **shows** 25:7 **states** 23:21 riparians 18:4,13 sign 5:8 14:1,5,6 risk 3:23 17:11 **STEVEN** 16:17 19:7

stick 12:1,2 team 19:12 turning 22:22 stop 24:16 27:1,10 tee 6:24 twenty 6:21 stopped 26:19 telling 15:13 24:20 25:22 type 13:5 Storage 28:15 tempting 16:22 U **stored** 7:13,15 ten 6:20 **story** 17:18 terms 5:19 16:25 17:5,6,13,22 **Uh-huh** 10:18 18:12 strategy 6:19 **Terra** 29:15 understand 7:16 9:2 13:13 15:6 16:5 23:24 24:3 Strathmore 29:15 **Terry** 7:12 understood 12:11 stream 12:17 13:8 thankful 31:7 **unfair** 10:16 **streams** 28:25 thing 6:16 13:1 14:19 18:20 unique 29:24 strikes 6:9 **things** 6:1,5,14 7:22 16:1 17:20 20:10 21:8 28:9 unprecedented 5:18 **strong** 13:23 thinking 9:1,7 16:21 upstream 23:8 strongly 19:25 **THOMAS** 9:19 15:12,24 16:1,7 urban 16:23 strongly-held 6:5 18:5,13 19:2,5 users 23:3,4 substantial 11:1 26:9 thousands 29:9 substantially 26:3 threat 25:21,24 26:1 V suggested 14:20 **time** 5:12 6:16 8:1,4,16 10:23 17:10 19:9 20:9,22 22:5 24:7 vacuumed 28:3 **summer** 4:3,9,17 5:4,10 8:6 10:22 14:12 timeliness 17:15 vacuuming 28:5 supply 17:25 29:1,3,6 30:6,10, valid 23:6,17 24:10,16 25:8 today 7:3,6 24,25 Valley 10:1 told 10:7 25:23 supply/demand 18:19 venue 20:6 Tom 4:14 11:16 supposed 15:15 verified 4:21 tonight 15:22 **Supreme** 25:21 26:1 verify 27:9 top 14:22 20:20 **system** 5:1,11,20 8:8,12 17:12 Vernalis 21:3.5 20:18,20 22:22 23:15 24:1 29:25 topic 12:9 view 7:17 total 31:1 T views 6:5 tough 7:21,25 vis-a-vis 24:14 track 4:20 7:21 taking 11:15 13:6 21:2 24:11,17 25:25 26:5,10 30:16 voluntarily 4:8 transactions 30:14,20 talk 3:19 11:14 13:20 voluntary 3:10 4:12 5:7 7:17,18 transcribed 31:10 8:2 9:2 17:12 19:23 20:1,4 27:12, talked 11:20 TRANSCRIPT 3:1 19 talking 4:25 9:8 10:17 13:14,15 transfer 12:15 19:3,22 22:25 W transferring 28:18 Tam 8:21,22 9:15 11:13 12:5,8, transfers 13:9 29:5 18 13:2,12,17 wait 15:16 25:14 27:14 **TUCPS** 29:8 targets 16:24 waiting 19:25 **Tulare** 30:13 teach 13:5 wanted 16:21 20:7 28:11

warts 16:11

water 3:10,21 4:8,18,25 5:10,20 6:23 7:13,15 8:12,14 9:10,12,13 10:22 11:1 12:13,14,16,20,22,25 13:15 14:5,6,7,8 16:22,23,25 17:7,22 18:23 19:11,21,23 21:10, 11,12,15,18,20,23,24 22:10,11, 12,13,15,16,18,19 23:1,2,4,6 24:7,11,13,17 25:24,25 26:2,5, 10,23 28:10,15,16,19,22 29:6,9 30:1,8,15,16,17,18,23

waving 4:10

ways 26:21

weather 29:21

week 4:2 19:15 20:24

weekly 13:20

wells 29:10

western 23:21

Westlands 30:15

wet 22:20

wildlife 17:6

wondering 4:5

word 5:17

**work** 8:12 21:25 22:19,20 27:11, 12,19

worked 4:13 12:3 30:9,12

**working** 3:7 12:2 18:1 20:24 27:22

works 4:22 22:24

workshops 29:7

**world** 6:12

worse 29:3

worthwhile 19:12

writing 9:20

wrong 3:23 6:7

Υ

year 3:8,9,12 7:19,20,23 8:4 9:22,24 10:5,8,14 17:22 20:4 28:19,20,21,23,24,25 29:3,4 30:6,24 31:5,6

year's 9:12 10:9

years 17:19 22:20 28:23

Z

**Zolezzi** 3:5 19:16,18,19 23:16,23 24:2,5 25:2,5,16