```
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                        1
                                                                                      CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX OF WITNESSES
             COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                        2
                                                                                                        PAGE VOLUME
     BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS A. E. KARNOW, JUDGE PRESIDING
                                                                        3
                                                                               DENNIS CUSHMAN
              DEPARTMENT NUMBER 304
                                                                        4
                                                                               Direct Examination by MR. BRAUNIG
                                                                                                                            159
                                                                                                                                     I
                                                                        5
     SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                        6
                                                                        7
                                                                                            INDEX OF EXHIBITS
         Plaintiff.
                        ) Case No. 510830
                                                                        8
                                                                               No.
                                                                                            Description
                                                                                                                 Ident. Evid.
                      ) Trial
     VS
                      )
                                                                               Exhibit PTX 348 Map of water
                                                                                                                               164
                      ) Volume I
                                                                       10
                                                                                         conveyance facilities
     METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                       11
                                                                               Exhibit PTX 348A "Cleaned up" version
                                                                                                                                   164
     SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
                                   ) Pages 1 - 181
                                                                                         of PTX 348
         Defendant,
                                                                               Exhibit PTX 382 Pie chart of San Diego
                                                                                                                                  177
                                                                       13
                                                                                         water purchase
                                                                                         percentages
          Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
                                                                       14
            Tuesday, December 17, 2013
                                                                       15
                                                                       16
                                                                       17
                                                                       18
     Reported by:
                                                                       19
     CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, CSR 6137
                                                                       20
     CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER
                                                                       21
                                                                       22
             JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                       23
        WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                       24
      701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                       25
           (415) 981-3498 OR (800) 522-7096
                                                                1
                                                                                                                                      3
      APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
                                                                        1
                                                                                                                  MORNING SESSION
                                                                               DECEMBER 17, 2013
2
      For Plaintiff:
                                                                        2
                                                                                         PROCEEDINGS
 3
         KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                        3
                                                                                             ---000----
         633 Battery Street
         San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
                                                                        4
                                                                                    THE COURT: Good morning.
         (415) 391-5400
                                                                        5
                                                                                    Couple of things I think we want to do just
         By: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.
                                                                        6
                                                                              before we get started.
           DANIEL PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                        7
           WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESO.
                                                                                    I have a stipulation and order regarding
           DAN JACKSON, ESQ.
                                                                        8
                                                                              introduction of evidence at final hearing. I think the
                                                                        9
                                                                              parties want me to sign this. Correct?
8
      For Defendant Metropolitan Water District:
 9
         BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
                                                                       10
                                                                                    MR. KEKER: Yes, your Honor.
         Three Embarcadero Center
                                                                       11
                                                                                    MR. HIXSON: Yes, your Honor.
         San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
                                                                       12
                                                                                    MR. PURCELL: Yes, your Honor.
         (415) 393-2422
11
         By: THOMAS S. HIXSON, ESQ.
                                                                       13
                                                                                    THE COURT: I've done that. There are two of
           COLIN C. WEST, ESQ.
                                                                       14
                                                                              them.
12
                                                                       15
        METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
                                                                                    With respect to courtesy copies in the future,
         700 N. Alameda Street
                                                                       16
                                                                              I only need one set. I know everybody's filing the same
14
         Los Angeles, CA 90012
                                                                      17
                                                                              thing in both cases but if that's the situation, continue
         (213) 217-6000
                                                                      18
15
         By: HEATHER C. BEATTY, ESQ.
                                                                              to do that kind of filing but in terms of courtesy
16
                                                                       19
                                                                              copies, I just need one.
17
                                                                       20
                                                                                    And we have also San Diego's motion in limine
18
                                                                       21
19
                                                                              regarding Christopher Woodcock. It's my view, I think,
20
                                                                       22
                                                                              which is the view that was expressed by both San Diego
21
                                                                       23
                                                                              and Metropolitan, that we should have a level playing
                                                                       24
23
                                                                              field and I should have the same rules for everybody. So
24
                                                                       25
                                                                              if I'm going to exclude a certain type of evidence from
25
                                                                2
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

one side, I would be excluding the same thing from the other side.

And I think that takes care of the issue but I'm happy to have either side comment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, Tom Hixson for Metropolitan.

We agree with a level playing field. We go second so we would like to see what San Diego puts on consistent with the Court's order, and we will comply with similar guidelines ourselves.

THE COURT: That sounds reasonable.

Anything else anybody wants to talk before we get started?

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, we filed a request for judicial notice of several items: Provisions of the MWD Act, provisions of the MWD Administrative Code and certain pleadings and other actions.

I think the request for judicial notice is straightforward, but I did want to call that to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: Is that opposed?

MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, we don't have any objection to the Court taking notice of the fact that these documents exist and were filed. The truth of the matter in the documents is another matter but as far as

court trial. If something doesn't make sense to you, needs to be clarified, our position isn't clear, I would be happy to be interrupted. I know what I want to cover, so it's not going to cause a problem.

THE COURT: Yeah. I will tend to do that more at the end than at the beginning.

MR. KEKER: Fair enough.

But, anyway I'm just saying, please don't worry about me.

As you know, this case involves Met Water Districts's rates for system access, water stewardship and system power for the years 2011 and '12, that's the 2010 case, and 2013, '14, that's the case that was filed in 2012.

When those rates were set, Met effectively set the rate for conveying non-Metropolitan water through its water facilities. That's a service called wheeling. It's provided for in the Metropolitan Administrative Code and it clearly sets the rates for -- this is current code. The rates for wheel is service shall include System Access Rate, Water Stewardship Rate, charge for power, and that's been in the Administrative Code for some time.

At the outset, there are three important things we hope the Court keeps in mind as we go through this.

5

7

taking notice of the fact that their public filings are on the record, that's not objectionable.

THE COURT: Okay. I have -- I'm going to ask Mr. Hixson to give me two original orders with respect to that to make sure I'm looking at exactly what you want me to look at.

I have one copy marked "Chambers Copy." I'm going to ask you to provide two originals and I will sign that whenever you bring that.

MR. HIXSON: We will, your Honor.

THE COURT: Shall we start with San Diego?

MR. KEKER: Thank you, your Honor.

And good morning. I'm John Keker on behalf of San Diego and I plan over the next approximately hour and a half to lay out our case in a way, since we have realtime reporting and daily transcripts, that I hope at the end of it will be like a brief. And at the end, I'm going to be showing some exhibits under the stipulation they will be admitted into evidence.

And we will provide a package of those of what we're showing you at the end so together, between the transcript and that, you will have what we believe is the best case we have to put on today.

And I -- the other preliminary thing I would like to say is that I welcome interruptions. This is a The first is what San Diego is asking the Court to do. We are not asking the Court to set rates or to substitute your judgment for some factual determination that Metropolitan has made. We are asking for a pretty straightforward application of California law. There aren't any seriously disputed facts. There's serious dispute about how to interpret certain things, but the facts are not disputed.

We're asking the Court to apply the law and find the rates Met charges for non Met water through its own facilities invalid, and tell Met that what they did violated the law, how it violated the law and send them back to do what they should do, do it again.

Second, we recognize that Met must collect its revenue, enough revenue to pay all of its costs. That's a given, it's in the statute, so that establishing a lawful conveyance rate for non-Met water not just may, will have, we believe, an impact on other rates that -and other ways that Met collects money.

But again, we're not asking you to figure that out. We're asking Met to figure that out once they establish a lawful rate for transportation. Certainly that will have an effect on other rates and that's for them to figure out once they lose this case.

The third important thing that we're asking you

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

to keep in mind is the legal standard, your Honor, and I think your Honor's on it already because we've been in here a lot, you've remarked a couple times, more than a couple times that the various standards in this case sort of collapse to reasonable cost of service under the various statutes, whether Met is recovering more than its reasonable costs of providing these transportation services.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

it provides.

We agree with that. Basically that's Prop. 26, that's Prop. 13, that's the wheeling statute, that's the Government Code, that's the common law.

But Prop. 26 is particularly important because it expressly requires that the manner in which Met allocates its cost to its members bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits Met provides. And as you've said, it is their burden to show that.

And I'm putting up a part of Prop. 26 just to emphasize in that last sentence, the local government bears the burden of proving that it's not a tax, the last sentence talks about they have to show that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor's burdens or benefits received from the governmental activity.

We're going to come back to this idea of proportionality as I talk through. We think Met imposes water distribution facilities to service Southern

2 California areas would place a wasteful and unnecessary 3 financial burden upon all of the people of California and

particularly the residents of California. And that was

4 5 agreed to by Ms. Skillman in her deposition. She is the

6 Manager of Financial Planning and Budgets at Met and she was asked whether San Diego has any choice in getting

8 water to San Diego other than using Met's conveyance 9 system and she said no, her understanding was that they 10 don't have any way to get water except through the Met

facilities.

The Met facilities, I think you've seen, I'll go through it quickly, are in yellow down there. That's the Metropolitan District. And the places it gets water is from the State Water Project, which is there to the north. And you can see in the legend -- Jeff, can you blow up the legend up at the top? The pink is federal aqueduct, the green is state aqueduct and the sort of dark is local aqueduct.

And let's go back.

So the pink and the green are federal, and -federal and State Department of Water Resources.

And then the Los Angeles aqueduct, which brings water to Los Angeles from the Owens River Valley, is over there on the right. And then down below from the

charges -- I'll be getting more specific about that -imposing charges far in excess of its cost of providing transportation services and that Met imposes those transportation charges completely out of any reasonable proportion, fair or reasonable proportion to the services

As I think you know, San Diego sued timely. Suit was the culmination of a dispute that's been going on since the 1990s when Metropolitan -- excuse me, when San Diego first decided that it needed to look elsewhere for some supplemental water and began to talk about and propose buying non-Met water and using Met's conveyance system to get that water to San Diego from the Colorado River to Southern California.

First point I want to make is that Met has a de facto monopoly -- if not a De jour monopoly but at least a de facto monopoly on conveying waters based on what's called the Laguna Declaration, which is embodied in their Met Administrative Code 4202(b). And there, Met put into its regulations the fact that the taxpayers and water users in the district already have obligated themselves for the construction of an aqueduct supply and distribution system.

And then it goes on to say establishment of overlapping and regulating government authorities and Colorado River coming across is the Colorado River aqueduct, and those are the ways that water gets into this service area other than by God causing it to rain, which sometimes he doesn't do as we're now in the third year of a drought.

And you can see that if you want to get water from somewhere else into there, you've got to use the Met facilities, either State Water Project or the Colorado River Act.

The idea that has been expressed that somehow these rates are voluntary, you have a choice, if you want water you have a choice is just plain wrong. These rates are imposed. The Big Horn case, you've seen before, talks about that. But San Diego has no choice but to use Met's conveyance facilities if it wants to bring in non-Met water to San Diego.

After the drought from 1987 to 1992, Met didn't have enough water, or during the drought they didn't have enough water for its members' needs and San Diego was famously cut up to 31 percent of their supply was

After that happened, they decided they had to find additional resources. They didn't want that to happen to them again.

In 1998, San Diego entered -- when I say "San

12

11

Diego," I mean San Diego County Water Authority, I won't say it all. 1998, it entered the transfer agreement with the Imperial Irrigation District to provide up to and still ramping up but up to 200,000 acre-feet of water per year to Southern California from Imperial's allocation of Colorado River water. San Diego, as I said, had no choice but to use the Met system to transport this IID water and the issue arose how should Met charge for it?

2.3

At the time and to this day, Met has a huge fixed cost contract with the Department of Water Resources for the State Water Project and that requires Met to pay hundreds of millions of dollars per year for 75 years to the Department of Water Resources for up to approximately two million acre-feet of water per year whether or not Met wants it. It's a take-or-pay contract.

If one -- and you can see the problem. If one of Met's 26 member agencies began buying water from someone else, all of the members would have to figure out how to pay those fixed costs by paying higher rates for the water that they bought from Met. Costs are fixed and if one of them begins to buy from somebody else, the volume of water that is bought from Met goes down, the price to everybody goes up because they have to pay the fixed cost.

general rate for wheeling service results in a rate that charges fair compensation, and they cite the 1997 resolution.

So, we are going to look at that in a moment but it's important to know Met bases its charges for conveying non-Met water today in 2011, '12, '13 and '14 on a finding it made and conclusions its reached back in this resolution of 1997. There's no better description.

I'm going to get to the '97 resolution in just a minute but there's no better description of the issues that they faced, that Met faced in deciding what to charge for wheeling than a consultant's report in December of 1995. Research Management Group had a consulting report. This is in both the administrative records. And I'm going to go through it in some I hope not tedious but in some detail because it's the important explanation for what was the basis of the decision that became the 1997 resolution.

So, this -- the RMI in December of 1995, the Resource Management International wrote this paper which was an assessment of principals for pricing water wheeling services by Met.

First page, next page shows why they do it.

They wanted to assist in the development of this policy.

Resource Management, RMI has prepared the following paper

I'm going to talk about what happened in the '90s when the wheeling issue first came up. And the reason I'm going back that far is because what Met charges today is based on decisions that it made back in the '90s. Met says so, there's really no dispute about this. In their answer, they say that SDCWA's claims challenge features of Metropolitan's rate structure that have been in place for a decade and a half.

In January, 1997, Metropolitan's board of directors voted to adopt a, quote, wheel rate, close quote, effective January 15, 1997. In their briefs before you there they make the same points.

When MWD -- this is the first trial brief that you've seen recently. When MWD adopts its general wheeling rate, it made written findings that supported the rate's reasonableness. And what they cite to there is records document number 82, is this 1997 resolution of the board of directors of Met, which we're going to look at in a minute.

And the next one, MWD second trial brief, they say contrary to San Diego contentions, DTX23, which is another copy of 82 and is the 1997 resolution, shows that MWD has made written findings that support its determination that allocating State Water Project transportation cost and water stewardship rate to its

on options for pricing Metropolitan's water wheeling services.

And then in the executive summary, next page, Metropolitan's current volumetric rate, meaning you pay for what you use, design makes it particularly important to ensure that wheeling rates do not lead to unrecovered costs. Since virtually all expenditures are fixed, the volumetric rate design makes revenue recovery highly sensitive to the quantity of water sold to member agencies.

Indeed, absent increased sales to other member agencies or offsetting revenues from wheeling, if sales to a member agency are displaced by wheeling, Metropolitan will experience a revenue under collection. To maintain Metropolitan's financial integrity, such under collections would need to be reallocated to member agencies or financed out of reserves. That's what I was just explaining.

Here comes the important part.

This would be inconsistent with the San Pedro Integrated Resources Plan Assembly Statement that the use of Metropolitan's system for wheeling must -- quote, must not negatively impact the rates or charges to any other Member Agency, close quote.

Given Metropolitan's volumetric rate design,

1.5

the, quote, hold harmless principle is perhaps the single most important constraint on pricing Metropolitan's wheeling services.

2.3

Goes on to say if Metropolitan retains its current volumetric rate design -- and by the way, to jump ahead and spoil the story, they did and this is what we have today. If they retain the current volumetric rate design, initial wheeling rates for Metropolitan agencies should be computed by subtracting incremental state water power and fish costs from Metropolitan's firm sales rates. Under Metropolitan's contracts with SWP, these are the only company's costs that would be avoided in the short run if Metropolitan did not purchase State Water Project water.

Under this approach, the wheeling customer charge would pay this wheeling rate plus incremental power fish costs, \$95 per acre-foot, plus the purchase price of water. Since the first two components sum to Metropolitan's current sales rate, the delivered cost of wheeled water would always be higher than the current sales rate.

We'll get -- again, jumping ahead, we'll get to the provision in the Water Code that says you have to facilitate wheeling and so on.

But this is what they're talking about.

potential for revenue losses due to displace of Metropolitan sales by wheeling.

For example, if Metropolitan established a fixed monthly or annual demand charge to recover the bulk of its fixed costs, in short that's going to each Member Agency and saying, you have to commit to what you're going to buy this year and we'll set the rates based on those commitments and make sure that we are going to have enough money to pay for the State Water Project, and based the demand charge on the volume of water denominated by member agencies' displace of sales by water would not impair recovery by providing greater insurance. Such alternative rate designs could also provide more flexibility in pricing wheeling water service.

Now I'm going to jump ahead in this document to evaluation of the options and that appears beginning on -- well, we begin on 51.

Let's go to 51 first, Jeff, the one before and just highlight the options.

They're going to look at four options. And I'm only going to talk about three but option I -- let's go to the next page. Option I is the option that they ended up doing, which is basically putting all of the State Water Project fixed costs into the rate for wheeling the

They're talking about under this option, the volumetric rate design, we're going to have a price that's always going to be higher, more expensive to wheel than it is to buy from Met. This would ensure -- the next paragraph, I mean it's plain as day. This would ensure that member agencies do not have an economic incentive to displace Metropolitan's sales and thereafter satisfy the San Pedro Integrated Plan assembly requirement that member agencies be held harmless from cost shifting due to water wheeling.

Then it goes on to say fairly obvious that such rates are likely to be criticized as excessive by member agencies and others desiring to wheel water. Read San Diego.

But they go on to sort of say that's tough.
But the next paragraph, by jeopardizing full recovery of Metropolitan's revenues, lowering the wheeling rate to address such concerns would conflict with the "hold harmless" requirement. In other words, if we're going to do this, if we're going to conflict, the other agencies are going to have to pay more and we can't do that. That's the rationale.

Now, in six, Paragraph 6, the RMI recognized an alternative, another way to do it, establishment of demand volumetric rate design to substantially lessen the

-- all the transportation costs into the rate for wheeling.

You'll see that the member taking untreated water, the wheeling rate for that situation would be \$285. And then the plan says, note that under this option, the delivered cost of non-Metropolitan water to a Member Agency would always be higher than Metropolitan's firm sales rate by the price paid to the water supplier. By removing any economic incentive to displace Metropolitan sales, the potential for revenue loss due to wheeling are reduced significantly.

Option II suggested figuring out a wheeling rate, subtracting out the State Water Project and CRA, Colorado River Aqueduct supply costs from the rate and that results, if you look at the next page, in a charge instead of \$285, it's \$151.

And -- but it has the following problem, look down at the bottom, if Metropolitan can't -- this would encourage wheeling some. If Metropolitan could not reasonably forecast at least 17 million in incrementally revenues from wheeling or design other mechanisms to recover the lost revenues from the members agencies responsible for displacing its sales, the wheeling tariff would fail to satisfy the requirement that Member Agency be "held harmless" against the negative rate impacts of

lariniess against the negative rate impacts of

Pages 17 to 20

wheeling.

2.3

And then finally, the next page, the incremental cost approach, which is just that, it would be basing the wheeling rate on the variable costs in the system, how much more does it cost us to use unused capacity to move this water. The member taking untreated water there would only pay \$100.

And then here's how they evaluated it. Under option III, member agencies would have no economic incentive to displace Metropolitan's sales whenever the market price of water fell below \$244 per acre-foot. This would create substantially greater opportunities for displacement than either of the previous two options.

And it goes on to evaluate that and say that could cost as much as \$26 million a year.

And then they say if Metropolitan can't reasonably forecast at least 26 million in incremental revenues from wheeling or design other mechanisms to recover the lost revenues from the member agencies responsible for displacing its sales, the wheeling tariff would fail to satisfy the requirement that member allegations be "held harmless" against the negative rate impact of wheeling.

And I'm almost done with this document, I promise, but I wanted to look at one other -- a couple of

say basically the same thing: That depending on the market price of water, this could lead to displacement of Metropolitan sales, violating the hold harmless principle. And then they say the lower rate is likely to be more favorably received because it's lower although some Member Agency may perceive the rate as excessive for the type of service provided.

And finally, option III, this could lead to substantial displacement of Metropolitan sales and reallocate revenues among agencies, lead to pressures for other incremental rate for Metropolitan services, could be perceived as reasonable rate for wheeling, and it could give Member Agency a powerful tool for displacing Metropolitan sales supporting the formation of a market for water.

And then finally -- I'm spending so much time on this because this flows right into the 1997 resolution -- the assessment and recommendations.

They recommend that option I as the only rate method evaluating that would not give Member Agencies an economic incentive to displace Metropolitan water sales under certain market conditions. As a consequence, the only option that could satisfy the requirement of "hold harmless."

And then in the second paragraph, they go --

other points.

Later on, they evaluate -- evaluation of alternative wheeling and here's what they say about option I, which is the one they adopted.

The wheeling rates developed under option I would support the full recovery of Metropolitan's revenue requirements by eliminating an economic incentive for the displacement of Metropolitan's sales by wheeling. Delivered cost of non-Metropolitan water to a Member Agency would generally be higher than Metropolitan's sales rate. This is the one that says put all the state water fixed costs for transportation into the wheeling rate.

Reasonableness. And this is in -- they are perfectly aware of 1813(d), which we'll look at in a minute, which says we're supposed to be facilitating wheeling.

The rate could be perceived as excessive. Member Agencies will likely argue that the rate includes costs not incurred to provide wheel services.

Last sentence: Marketers may argue that the rate will distort the market for water transfers and discourage the transfer of water from low value to high value uses.

And then when they looked at option II. They

they recognize that the incremental power cost method, however, is likely to be perceived as highly unsatisfactory by member agencies and others that strongly desire to wheel water.

And then it goes on in the last sentence of that paragraph to address those such arguments, the people who are complaining and saying this is not a proper wheeling rate, to address such arguments by establishing a lower wheeling rate would jeopardize revenue recovery and conflict with the hold harmless requirement.

Then the last paragraph, again they come back to the alternative that's out there as an alternative to wheeling rates based on avoided costs: Establishment of a demand volumetric rate design could substantially lessen the potential for revenue losses due to displacement Of Metropolitan's sales by the wheeling of third party water.

For example, if Met established a fixed monthly or annual demand charge to recover the bulk of its fixed cost and based the demand charge on the volume of water committed to by agencies, displacement of sales by wheeling would not necessarily impair recovery by providing greater assurance of revenue recovery, alternative rate designs could also provide more

flexibility in pricing water wheeling services.

2.3

So, I've been mentioning 1813. Let's put it up, please.

Section 1813 of the Water Code, the Court is very familiar with but it requires that public agency shall act in a reasonable manner consistent with the requirements of law to facilitate the voluntary sale, lease and exchange of water and shall support its determination by written findings. That's what we're about to look at.

The Court shall give due consideration in making the decision under all relevant evidence, the Court should give due consideration to the purpose and policies of this article, which is to facilitate wheeling, we believe.

So, at the same time Los Angeles -- before this was all fixed, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and Orange County hired their own experts to weigh in and those experts called MBS Lawry agreed that Met's plan to load State Water Project costs on to the wheeling rate, which they called the equivalent margin method but it's the same thing, would discourage wheeling contrary to what Water Code section 1813 requires.

The MBS Lawry report is in both administrative records. When I say -- I should clarify. 2010 record,

He put in his memorandum -- the entire memorandum is in the record but on page 7, I think there's a matrix which goes through and recognizes clearly that the commitments method is the only one that encourages wheeling, whereas the equivalent margin method, the one that's designed to hold everybody else harmless, discourages wheeling.

So, what did Met do? It chose, of course, the equivalent margin method. That's why we're here, which discourage wheeling.

And this 1997 resolution remains today the basis of the transportation rate. I won't show again the briefs and the slides that we looked at before about saying that the 1997 resolution are the findings of fact, but I'll just tell you there's been nothing since.

And let's look at the 1997 resolution. Let's go right to that, Jeff.

And this is another one that I'm going to go through in some detail. And I promise, this is -- there's not going to be anymore like this but these are the two biggest ones.

So, the 1997 resolution is in both records, needless to say. It's the same as document 82 we looked at before, PTX 23. Thing I'm quoting is a slightly different version, which is the 2010-A-R2446. You can

if it's in the 2010 record, it's in the '12 record because all of 2010 is in '12. And when I say it's in both, it means in both. If I say it is only in 2012, which I'll get to in a minute, that's what it means, not in 2010. But this is in both, just as the RMI report was.

And they say the -- this is Orange County in LA's experts -- the equivalent margin method, while having a positive financial impact on Metropolitan and City of Los Angeles, is according to our legal analysis probably illegal and incorrectable.

And Met's own staff recognized that loading State Water Project fixed costs on to the wheeling rate would discourage wheeling.

In a memorandum from Brian Thomas, which is -- this is only in the 2012 record, not 2010. Brian Thomas, who was both -- various points an assistant general manager and the chief financial officer Met, and he is distinguishing between the equivalent margin method, which loads all the State Water Project fixed costs on the transportation rate, and a commitment's method, which is this demand method, rate structure where you make fixed commitments to buy water and rates are set accordingly to cover the fixed costs.

Could we see that matrix?

see the Bates stamps on here. But I'll go through.

So the second paragraph makes claim that the Metropolitan -- the titles, I should -- we should go to. This is a resolution of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California fixing and adopting wheeling rates. And as we've said, this is the basis of today's wheeling rates, findings of fact.

So among the whereas clauses, I'm not going to read them all but one points out they have a contract with the State of California which requires them on a take-or-pay basis; in other words, a fixed cost, fixed costs contract with the State of California.

The next paragraph is the one where the rabbit just jumps right into the hat. Whereas under its contract with the State of California, Metropolitan has an entitlement to water and associated transportation thereof by the SWP and the right to use SWP transport facilities for its own purposes subject to certain conditions. Metropolitan's conveyance systems -- system and its right to the use of the SWP conveyance system shall hereinafter be referred to as the conveyance system.

Just asserted it. It's their conveyance system is our conveyance system.

Then they go on in the -- in section 13, couple

pages later, excuse me, section -- I beg your pardon, page 2. Page 2, they recognize the fair compensation definition in the Water Code at section 1811(c). They recognize that it requires them to account for any reasonable credit for the benefits for the use of the conveyance system, benefits to the -- to Met by -- or Met's members by wheeling water.

2.3

The next paragraph first went to 1810 and 1812 of the Water Code, use of the Metropolitan -- again, if you want to find where the rabbit goes into the hat, this is one too.

The use of Metropolitan's water conveyance system is to be made without injuring any legal user of water from that system, including financial injury, words that are nowhere in the statute as we'll see in a minute.

So having said that, having said that state water project's conveyance system is our conveyance system and that we can't have any financial injury to our members, in the last paragraph on that page, whereas they decide that they are going to adopt a charge for the use of the conveyance system for wheeling -- its conveyance system for wheel that will recover fair compensation for such use of its conveyance system, that such charge should include the properly allocable transmission costs and unavoidable supply, storage and other costs necessary

to a particular wheeling transaction. And regional benefits, if any, shall be calculated by Metropolitan in the same manner as it does benefits for the local projects, groundwater recovery program.

And then finally, Section 13, they make a finding. You're seeing everything that it's based on. The board finds such charges are reasonable and consistent with all applicable requirements of law, including any requirement to facilitate the voluntary sale, lease or exchange of water while ensuring that the use of Metropolitan's conveyance system is fairly compensated and does not injure any other legal user of Metropolitan's water and conveyance system.

So, as you can see, Metropolitan simply assumed in this resolution, assumed the answer that the State Water Project fixed costs were met on transportation costs and set up a transportation rate with one goal, one goal only, that is rate stability, making sure that its members were held harmless and that the rates stayed stable. None of the non-wheeling member agencies would see their rates go up. That was the sole reason for the 1997 resolution.

As you know, Met sued to validate the rate and the trial court concluded, Judge Kay concluded that the system-wide costs couldn't be included in wheeling rates

to avoid financial injury to its member agencies from such use.

So, by assertion, they are saying we're going to call the State Water Project fixed costs part of our conveyance system and we're going to set a rate that makes sure -- they're taking option I. That makes sure that our members are not going to be affected.

Section 5 on page 4, the allocation of costs is shown in detachment 1 to Metropolitan's transmission functionally reflects the cost incurred by Metropolitan to convey water to its member agencies through Metropolitan's conveyance system, including Metropolitan's rights to the State Water Project system and including those costs in Metropolitan's wheeling rate as is necessary to ensure recovery of fair compensation for the use of the system.

Again, paragraph 7 makes the point again. The unavoidable cost in the wheeling rate is necessary in order to protect Metropolitan's member agencies from financial injury by avoiding the shifting of those costs from the wheeling party to Metropolitan's other agencies.

Then they say, make a promise, in Section 10, that the wheeling rates shall be reduced to reflect the regional water supply benefits provided to Metropolitan service area, if any, on a case-by-case basis in response

as a matter of law. Court of Appeal in Met v. IID reversed and remanded the case to see whether, quote, Met quoted properly included specific costs in its wheeling rate calculation or has adopted a rate that violates the statutory mandate to facilitate wheeling.

That hearing, as you know, never took place. Rate based on the 1997 resolution was never validated. Met dismissed the case because it unbundled its rates in 2001, or it dismissed the case in anticipation of unbundling the rates. And that unbundling happened in 2001 to become effective until 2003. And since then, just remind the Court what you already know, in 2010, Prop. 26 became law and applies to the 2012 rate setting for '13 and '14.

In the same year that the unbundled rates went into effect, 2003, San Diego entered into an amended exchange agreement -- they had an exchange agreement from back in 1998 -- 2003, an amended exchange agreement with Met setting the price for transporting the IID water to Met's facilities in the future at the rate -- at rate, quote, generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Met or member agencies. And we believe that that issue is for the next case, not this case, what that means.

And at the same time, as the Court knows, San Diego agreed not to sue for five years. They said, okay,

we've made this deal, we will accept what you've done for five years, but at the conclusion of the first five years, nothing herein shall prevent San Diego from bringing the action that it brought.

2.3

So, what are we talking about? Let's -- if we could see the rates, this is the 2013 rates but it basically applies to any of them. More than 50 percent of Met's costs are collected through what it calls its Transportation Rate. You see the Water Stewardship Rate, you see System Power Rate and you see System Access Rate in this chart. More than 50 percent.

And from the same -- from the beginning of this wheeling rate issue, San Diego has made the same big picture point, which is that it was being required to subsidize, illegally subsidize other Met members by paying more and getting less.

Here's what San Diego said about the 2010 rates. This was a response to -- in April of -- response to Met's staff recommendation for the -- for the rates that were going to be put in effect in 2003.

San Diego says although a new series of labels is created for various rate-setting concepts -- this is referring to the unbundling -- the necessary economic impact of the proposal differs. It is from the existing status quo, uniform volumetric water rate that's the

Met's facilities should not include Met's fixed cost, paying non-Met water through the facilities, shouldn't include Met's fixed cost from the State Water Project. That's one.

Two is that paying to convey non-Met water through Met's facilities should not include 100 percent of the Water Stewardship Rate which pays for the cost of legal water supply and conservation projects for Met members.

And, three, that paying to convey water through the Met facilities should not include a subsidy for Met members, most notably Los Angeles, who effectively get free drought insurance from Met by depending inordinately on Met in dry years only without paying for that dependence in wet years, without paying for that insurance.

So, going back to slide 152, our position is that the System Access Rate, the System Power Rate and the Water Stewardship Rate, using them to charge for transportation of non-Met water ends up overcharging for transportation with the result that the supply cost for people who have to buy Met water is under collected. So that that's where the shift would be, recognizing that the pie still has to be round.

And the results -- because San Diego wheels,

heart of Metropolitan's water problems, including but not limited to the fair access distribution system that serves Southern California.

Under cost of service, they say cost of service is standard for the basis of most rate setting in the regulated and publicly owned utility sectors, however the staff recommendation fails to establish a nexus between the cost of service and the proposed rates for those services.

And on the next page, they raise various things but I'll call your attention to one. The staff recommendation does not provide a nexus between the cost of providing dry-year capacity and rates or charges to access this capacity. While dry-year capacity is not required to meet base-load demands during average or wet years, the cost of providing it is proposed to be recovered primarily through sales-based rates and fees assessed against those base-load demands.

In other words, as we'll see later, there's no charge for the insurance in wet years of knowing that in a dry year, you're going to be able to get a lot more water than you have to pay for this year. There's no paying for that benefit.

But more specifically, San Diego's issues were and always have been that paying to convey water through

the result is that anybody who wheels water, uses the transportation system is penalized and the members who don't but buy water from Met are subsidized.

In order to show the order of magnitude about what this problem is, if -- and if improper State Water Project fixed costs and the Water Stewardship Rate were properly allocated to the supply rate instead of the Transportation Rate, what you would pay for transporting water would be far less. Mr. Denham, our expert who works for San Diego, will come in and explain this chart but basically today -- or I think this is for today. Maybe it's last year but \$372 is the -- excuse me, 2011, it says.

So the actual wheeling rate was \$372 to transport non-Met water and that's because they loaded in this Water Stewardship Rate and all of the fixed costs from the State Water Project for power and system access. If you took out those fixed costs, the proper rate, instead of \$372 an acre-foot, would be \$136 because you would have no charge for Water Stewardship Rate. You would have a vastly reduced charge for System Power Rate, only Met's own power and you would have a reduced System Access Rate because you would have taken out the State Water Project fixed cost.

So, highlight of all this, so what? Well, the

so what is the rate is the -- these rates are illegal because it's higher than necessary to recover the reasonable cost of service provided and the rate for wheeling bears no fair or reasonable relationship between the benefits received and the burdens imposed.

2.2

Those relationships by the way have not even been studied. They admit them, admit that. It didn't analyze its actual costs and revenues to determine whether it had under- or over-collected for any given rate. It did not analyze its actual revenues collected from each Member Agency to assess proportionality.

And then the third reason is that the wheeling rate discourage instead of facilitates wheeling in violation of Water Code section 1813.

So, going back to the RMI report, which leads up to the 1997 resolution, the evidence shows that the reason State Water Project costs were allocated to the wheeling rate was to achieve the goal of rate stability, to prevent any changes to Met's existing rates for things other than wheeling.

There's no analysis of these so called findings, there's no data. There's nothing that shows Met's cost of the wheeling service provided or the benefits from the wheeling service. There's just a handful of conclusions and the statement that Met set its

affecting the overall economy or the environment of the county from which the water is being transferred.

Legislative history of this talks about depleting groundwater and, you know, depleting the quality of the water, all kinds of things like that and does not include at all this concept of financial injury by causing rate shifting. But we don't have to worry about legislative history.

There's a case right on point, Morro Bay.

Morro Bay, which the Court is familiar from my earlier briefing, was a case where the school district wanted to use the city system to bring in some water that it -- from the county that it thought would be cheaper. City didn't want to do it because it was going to require that it raise rates to other people, didn't want its conveyance system to be used to displace sales and raise money.

And the Court made short work of that. Morro Bay claims it cannot let the school district use conveyance facility without injuring other legal user of waters within the city. Morro Bay's argument is based on the rate increase it claims other customers will have to bear if it loses the school district as a customer. But we do not believe the loss of income from a customer is the sort of injury to a legal user of water the

wheeling rate not according to cost of service but for purposes of rate stability.

Met started with the answer it wanted and worked backwards to make sure its rates didn't change. Here's what they say in their brief about the 1997 findings.

Inclusion of State Water Project costs in MWD's general rate for wheeling service is something that was contemplated and endorsed by RMI in 1995 because, quote, it is the only rate method examined that would satisfy the requirement that Member Agency be held harmless from any cost shifting due to wheeling.

They cite various things, including down at the bottom DTX23, which is the 1997 resolution. And that's a quote from the December RMI report, which you just saw.

Setting rates by choosing rate stability over cost of service illegal. First of all, rate stability is not and financial injury is not the injury to any legal users of water. That's referred to in the Water Code section 1810(d).

This is that section. And they talk about that use of the water conveyance facility is part of wheeling, is to be made without injuring any legal user of water and without unreasonably affecting fish, wildlife and other upstream beneficial uses and without unreasonably

Legislature had in mind. If you look at the Court of Appeal, which I think you have to accept, legislative history certainly supports them.

So, there's nothing in the statute about hold harmless principle, this no functional injury to other users and using that is improperly and illegal, particularly when it -- when it conflicts with a cost of service analysis. When a water agency has a choice between rates that reflect the actual costs of service and rates that are designed for rate stability, the agency cannot choose rate stability.

Here, I've said it a couple times. They set their rates too high, they possibly will avoid having to increase their rates for other services. This means that agencies which wheel water are recovering the costs of unrelated services to other agencies that don't wheel. That's the Palmdale case.

And the City of Palmdale v. Palmdale Water District, another case we discussed in prior hearings, Palmdale hires our friend Raftelis. Mr. Raftelis was the consultant later in 2010. We will be hearing more about him in a minute. Hired Raftelis's firm to recommend a new rate. He found one that was consistent with the cost of service requirements but that would lead to revenue fluctuation, everybody's been worried about, violate the

Pages 37 to 40

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

hold harmless, another rate afforded rate stability but charged some customers' disproportionate rates just as here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

The Palmdale Water District chose the rate stability option and the Court said no, you don't have any choice to do that. That was a 218 case, the Prop. 29 case. But you cannot do that, you cannot choose rate stability over cost of service. Cost of service is the rule.

THE COURT: We should take a ten-minute recess at some point that's convenient.

MR. KEKER: Right now is convenient. THE COURT: Just want make sure the court reporter can continue to take down everything. (Brief break.)

> THE COURT: All right. Let's continue. MR. KEKER: Thank you, your Honor.

I was talking about ways in which the Met's rates for transporting non-Met water through its facilities violate the law, and another way is that Met failed to analyze in its supposed findings, the 1997 findings or anywhere, and never took into account any cost of service study the fact that San Diego's wheeling of non-Met water creates benefits for both Metropolitan Water District and its members.

additional supplies of surplus water at near 0 cost and resolution of longstanding disputes regarding the Colorado River supplies.

Earlier in 1997, the negotiating committee, Met's negotiating committee in a report on wheeling, this is exhibit 26, PTX 26, said notwithstanding what we consider to be fundamental shortcomings in the San Diego proposal, the underlying premises of this proposal, that the region could benefit from both the conservation and storage of 200,000 acre-feet of IID water, and from the adoption of a favorable California plan for Colorado River water use based on the availability of the conserved IID water are sound.

The next page of that same document concludes -- this is the negotiating committee's notes, this is Met staff document. We concluded that Met should seek to promote the regional benefits of IID conservation and storage so long as those benefits would cost MWD's customers no more than if MWD were to undertake the same conservation and storage effort as San Diego. On this basis, our draft recommendation suggested that MWD offer San Diego a discount of more than 50 percent from Met's average cost wheeling rate.

Of course, they never did. And at the same time, around the same time the staff actually quantified

41

43

Both fair compensation and Prop. 26 require that be considered. We looked at Prop. 26 before. Look at it again. And one of the things that Prop. 26 says is that you've got to take a look at the benefits received from the government activity, from the -- in this case the wheeling. Water Code section 1811(c), we've also looked at. Talks about fair compensation requiring reasonable credit for any offsetting benefits for the use of the conveyance system.

The next exhibits that I'm about to cite are plaintiff's exhibits. They are not in the administrative record, next four, but they are relevant to your legal determination that benefits of wheeling were ignored. And we'll argue about that later but in making the legal determination, you can take into account what's in this information.

The first is Brian Thomas remember is the CFO of Met and in 1998, he created some talking points when they were talking about what the -- how they should charge for this transportation over Met system of non-Met water. And among the things that his memorandum, which is Exhibit 30, PTX30, which was Member Agency's benefit from a full Colorado River Aqueduct.

In other words, this water that was going to come through there was going to keep it full with the the benefit -- this is in PTX 25. I said four exhibits.

I'm only talking about three.

In PTX 25, Shane Chapman wrote to Dan Rodrigo in 1997, and you see there that they are -- they calculated that current you sometimes indicate without a California plan for the Colorado River supplies Metropolitan may have to raise its water rate by as much as \$65 per acre-foot in order to maintain a full Colorado River Aqueduct.

In other words, for the Colorado River Aqueduct to do its job and provide enough water to southern California, it's got to be full. If we don't put IID water in there to fill it up, we're going to go buy water from somebody else that has Colorado River water and put that in there and that could cost as much as \$65 per acre-foot more than putting in IID water.

They go on to analyze the average person who depends -- a household who depends on Met for 50 percent of its water will be paying \$41 per month more, a person or family or household that depends on Met for all of its water will be paying \$2.82 per month more. And then it works out to \$37 a year for the rate payers.

Down at the bottom, S, who we take to be Shane Chapman who wrote the memo, wrote to Dan, who we take to be Rodrigo, but says how is this being used? Let's not

44

Pages 41 to 44

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

put ourselves in a position where San Diego County Water Authority can say, see, the SDCWA IID transfer is worth 141 per month to 282 per month for Southern California. These are offsetting benefits that nowhere appear in the administrative record. Met knew there were offsetting benefits. They are estimating the magnitude but chose to ignore them when they set the wheeling rate.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Nothing in the 1997 board resolution about the non-Met supplies of water being conveyed through Met's facilities although the resolution itself, you will remember that paragraph that said we're going to calculate that on a case-by-case basis, it recognized they needed to do it but they ignoring that promise, never did it. That's not a reasonable cost of service analysis.

Violates Prop. 26, Prop. 13, the wheeling statute, the Government Code, common law, all.

Another reason that Met's rates are unreasonable and therefore illegal is because the State Water Project's fixed costs have nothing to do with the cost of conveying water within Met's own conveyance system. And by that, I mean Met's own conveyance system. The Met conveyance system does not include the State Water Project conveyance system. Met doesn't own it, met doesn't control it.

doesn't own, doesn't control, doesn't have ownership over

And they've admitted, with respect to the State Water Project water that comes in through the California aqueduct, that it doesn't own -- that Met doesn't own the state water project, doesn't operate the State Water Project, doesn't transport State Water Project within the State Water Project. State Water Project is owned by the California Department of Water Resources.

And this is -- actually, in case law, Supreme Court has said that Met has no ownership of any State Water Project facilities. They are two separate systems. It has, as we'll see in a minute, a supply contract with the Department of Water Resources for State Water Project water. The State Water Project provides Met with a water supply. That's what their contract is called. It's a contract for a water supply.

And it's always been that way. In 1969 -- this is a study that's in the 2012 record only, not the 2010 record. 1969, there was a study done by Met when they were trying to figure out how to charge for rates and it makes claims that their supply system includes State Water Project facilities. They don't own them, they don't operate them. That's part of their supply system.

The -- RMI did another -- excuse me. Second

45

1

page, the other page I wanted to show of the 1969 study shows very clearly that they are putting the State Water Project charges, they pay the delta water charge and they

pay a transportation charge to DWR. Those are supply charges, supply costs to Met and that's how they classify

In October of 1995, RMI, getting ready for its big assessment that it did in December, issued another report and they were talking about categorization. This is in both records. They classify State Water Project

In their December study, which we looked at before, they are still classifying State Water Project supply costs as supply costs. There's not -- they're not transportation costs, they're supply, they're buying supply under their contract with DWR.

supply as purchases of water. That's where it belongs.

Now, the question you're going to have to decide is it reasonable to include most of the State Water Project fixed costs, that cost of service analysis for transporting non-Met water through its facilities, the yellow part of the system, and we believe that the answer is no.

Met is pointing to the record and asking you for deference and asking you for deference since we first started this case, but there is absolutely nothing in the

And could we see in connection with

THE COURT: Are you distinguishing in the Met that you earlier showed me, the yellow area which would be Met's and then the other lines, including the statement of federal supply into Met as being the state's

MR. KEKER: Absolutely.

Could we go back to that, Jeff, that map.

THE COURT: Yeah. I think I recall the map, but that's the distinction you are making.

MR. KEKER: The distinction I'm making, the Met's owned and built conveyance system is that conveyance system which is inside the yellow area. It begins when it gets its water supply from certain reservoirs. In one case, the Colorado River Aqueduct comes into a reservoir and that's where Met picks up the Colorado River water.

And the State Water Project comes into a reservoir that is in the north of the region and that's where it picks up -- and actually comes into a couple places, and that's where it picks up -- that's where Met's conveyance system picks it up. And I'm definitely and vociferously distinguishing between what Met's conveyance system is in the yellow area and what it

46

48

record on this point to give deference to. They rely on a few documents, which you'll see over and over again. Those documents state conclusions, not analysis. They're I want see discourage wheeling it, if so, it's because we say it's so. It is not reasonable. They're assertions, not proof of anything.

Nothing in this record justifies putting state water supply -- State Water Project costs for supply and the Water Stewardship Rate for local conservation projects on the Transportation Rate for conveying non-Met water through its owned facilities in the yellow area.

The entire record contains 0 substantive evidence, but it -- in favor of that, and it contains a lot to invalidate it.

One example, the -- in 2010, Raftelis did what he claims was an independent cost of service study, and Met is relying on that study today. That study is not only wafer thin, it is thin air. It doesn't even pretend to quantify the cost of moving non-Met water through Met facilities. It simply assumes, as did the 1997 resolution, that the State Water Project conveyance system is Met's conveyance system.

Raftelis based his assumption on the fact that the Department of Water Resources breaks out its transportation costs in the bill that it sends to Met and Functionalizing SWF costs in this manner is appropriate because DWR invoices in a very detailed manner that allows MWD staff to functionalize costs and DWR does not aggregate invoices to MWD on a per acre-foot basis.

First of all, that is a statement of Raftelis, it is not a cost of service analysis. It is simply saying that the supply contractor, the people that we have a supply contract with say that, break you out their costs that way.

But let's see where that language came from. Could we see Plaintiff's Exhibit 116? And this is not in the record.

His service -- his cost of service analysis, by the way, is in both records.

So start at the bottom. And the bottom e-mail is from June Skillman to Jamie Roberts and she says, "Jamie, I need to get something to RFC pretty quickly. What about the following?

And then she puts in language, which I'm going to show you this in a minute, is virtually identical to what independent Mr. Raftelis ends up putting in his report.

So, she sends -- so the -- and Ms. Skillman, you will remember from that deposition, is the head of

that somehow how they break out their bill matters. Our position is how DWR breaks out its bill is completely irrelevant to whether the state water supply project is a cost to Met.

But we also have discovered, as we work through this, that it's an argument that was made up by Met staff, Met legal staff actually in anticipation of litigation and it was force fed to Raftelis.

So if we could look at the 2010 cost of service study, this is what Raftelis said on April 6, 2010, calls it independent and on the next page, but the page I wanted to show you, he said this is his reasoning, this is the sole basis for what he's saying.

It should be noted a major portion of the revenue requirement and the supply category is the State Water Project for which the Department of Water Resources provides an annual statement of charges to the state water contractors.

This invoice is categorized as Delta water charge, transportation charge, variable power and off aqueduct power facilities.

Based on this invoice, MWD, Met has indicated they have assigned those components to the respective functional categories such as supply and conveyance and aqueduct. budget planning and financial analysis.

She sends it on to Sidney Bennion, who the record shows is an assistant general counsel at Met.

Ms. Bennion acknowledges I understand that -- says June, we should limit this to conclusions that Raftelis is able to make based on the research they've done. I understand that they have not reviewed our methodology, but they should be able to conclude whether the functionalized SWC charges can be passed along to similar functional charges in our rate structure.

And then she writes out essentially the same thing with some minor changes as Ms. Skillman had written.

And if we look at the next slide, comparing the language, this makes plain that essentially the general counsel and the head of budget, the people at Met who were trying to defend these rates, are the ones that came up with this rationale which the so called independent expert put into his report.

But, that's sort of a gotcha. But the big point is what difference does it make? It's not a -- what the State Water Project is not Met's conveyance system, it is not Met's cost except as a source of water supply.

And by the way, the Met staff has been riding

This by the way, the week stall has been frame

this horse for quite a while. They did the same thing back to RMI back in 1985.

Remember in December of 1995, we just looked at RMI classified the State Water Project. This is actually October, RMI started out saying state water project was a supply cost. But then in a -- and they did it again in December. Supply cost. But then after consulting with Met staff -- and I put consulting in quotes -- they came up with a report in 1996 which is only in the 2012 record. The other two were in both records.

And in that, we can see -- this is the 1996 report -- we can see about -- they talk about the consultation, the resulting preliminary functionalizations were presented to Met's functionalization, are you going to put them here or put them there, put them in supply or transportation?

The resulting preliminary functionalizations which you've just seen work to supply were presented to Metropolitan's planning staff for review after incorporating changes suggested by Met's planning commission staff. RMI presented the preliminary functionalization to water quality operations, finance and engineering divisions for additional review. Resulting functionalized revenue requirements were used herein for the cost classification and cost allocation

And again, we say in terms of reasonable cost of service analysis, so what? Met is free to charge the Department of Water Resources wheeling rate, which is an incremental charge. This is from the contract between Metropolitan and the Department of Water Resource and makes plain that transporting non-project water through the state water process -- State Water Project system is charged for incremental -- on an incremental basis.

What are the additional charges? But that doesn't justify charging most of the State Water Project fixed costs to conveying water through Met's own system, the yellow area. That makes the wheeler pay twice. You pay the Department of Water Resource wheeling charges and then once you get to the yellow area, where Met owns the system, you have to pay for all of the State Water Project costs. So you're paying -- you're paying twice. It is not a justification.

And then in any event, this concept of wheeling through the State Water Project is de minimis. Only 1.6 percent only of the water that comes through the State Water Project system can be called non-project water and only a tiny part of that is San Diego's.

But in any event, the State Water Project, the wheeling or using the State Water Project conveyance system for water other than its own is only 1.6 percent.

procedures.

2.3

Then you go over to the next page. They have now changed the State Water Project from supply, after consulting with staff, to transportation. And it says Metropolitan pays SWP costs on the basis of billings from the Department of Water Resources. Those expenses were functionalized as either sources supply or transmission distribution. Distinction was drawn on the basis of the nature of the expense. DWR breaks the SWP bills into a number of different categories. Two categories are clearly transmission related, namely the capital charges for transmission facilities and the operation and maintenance charges for transmission facilities and those expenses were functionalized as transmission distribution.

So they did the -- staff did the same thing. These are staff arguments that they've been making since 1995 but they are meaningless in terms of any reasonable cost of service analysis.

Another example of Met's hand waving arguments, which don't amount to substantive evidence, is that they argue that some, including San Diego have used the State Water Project facilities to wheel water from other -- have used to take non-Met and non-State Water Project water and used those facilities to wheel.

So that can't provide a justification for putting a vast majority of State Water Project costs on what Met charges to move water through its own system in Southern California. And it certainly has no application whatsoever to the Colorado River Aqueduct and the Colorado River water.

The vast majority of wheeling that Met does is on the Colorado river aqueduct for San Diego. That's the -- that's one big complaint that San Diego has had forever, is that there's a disconnect. It is unreasonable to put State Water Project fixed charges, transportation charges for conveyance, things that you don't own, and that is actually a water supply charge on the wheeling rate.

What about the Water Stewardship Rate, I'm shifting to that, that's used to fund local supply and conservation projects? And Met's position is 100 percent of those costs should go on the rate for transporting non-Met water.

Is that reasonable when everybody agrees that these projects, these local conservation projects, desalination, groundwater projection and so on generate local supply benefits. Raftelis in their consultant, in his textbook, which is in the 2012 record and which you took judicial notice of in your November ruling, in his

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

textbook, he allocates conservation costs to supply. Source of apply includes various things, including conservation costs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Once he started working for Met, he did a report in 1999, which is in the 2012 record, and there he decided that he should allocate conservation charges to -- he said it's appropriate to consider all or at least a portion of the demand side management programs, which assists local agencies in the development of conservation. At least a portion of them would be supply costs. So he didn't say all of them need to be supply costs by '99 but he said at least a portion of them should be.

But he also said in that same report that another way to think about it is that it's appropriate to consider all or -- excuse me. Next -- as an alternative, he said the cost of service approach to study benefits, yeah, there it is. There are alternatives to this simple allocation approach. What he's saying there is he's going to -- in '99 he's going to charge half of the conservation projects to supply and half to transmission, to transportation.

But then he says there's alternatives to this simple allocation approach. One such alternative would be to conduct the detailed cost benefit analysis,

cost of service was an alternative approach -- cost was an alternative in 1999, but since Prop. 26 passed in 2010, it's not an alternative, we believe it's required.

This idea that Raftelis says we can split it 50/50, that's arbitrary. They should have to do analysis.

But here, it's pretty easy because they didn't do any arbitrary division. They put 100 percent on the Water Stewardship Rate. And again, you've got to ask yourself is it reasonable as a cost of service matter to load all conservation costs on transportation and none to supply?

We've argued and continue to argue that the Water Stewardship Rate is a tax, plain and simple. It's included in the wheeling rate for the exact reason that Met stated in 1997 rate stability. It's levied equally on all the member agencies or general revenue purpose, which is to provide program funding. Nothing in the record makes the connection between the Water Stewardship Rate and transporting non-Met water over Met's facilities, its conveyance system.

And then there's the further point that the law requires proportionality between the charges member agencies pay and the benefits it receives. There's no proportionality here. It's never been studied.

57

something that we believe, since the passage of Prop. 26, is compelled, not just a choice. Nothing like -- but nobody did. Nothing like that happened here.

And Met admitted in its discovery responses that it has never calculated any benefit to its transportation system from any of the projects or from all of these water conservation projects together.

And here is the admissions. It's never calculated the benefit to its service region generally or to its conveyance system from any individual project funded through the water stewardship rate. And it's -and it's never calculated the benefit to its service region generally or to its conveyance system from all of the Water Stewardship Rate funded projects in the aggregate. It just hasn't looked at it. And to us, your Honor, that is game, set, match on the Water Stewardship Rate.

You have to make a legal decision whether it is reasonable to put 100 percent of these conservation projects on the Transportation Rate for non-Met water moving through the system, and they have admitted that they don't have -- that they have not studied it and they have not considered it, whether or not there's any benefit, what the benefits are and so on.

As I said, Raftelis might have thought that the

And in fact, you know that Met has declared San Diego, because it had the temerity to bring this lawsuit, completely ineligible for future program funding under the Water Stewardship Rate as revenge for filing the lawsuit so that San Diego is paying millions of dollars to the Water Stewardship Rate each year and getting absolutely nothing for it.

Another point about conservation that I've made, a little bit, is that conservation has been functionalized in the past as supply. As we just saw in the Raftelis slides that we just looked at in the 1999 report, one of the things industry standards supports its classification of costs and we believe that's false.

In addition, the Raftelis textbook and report we've been looking at relies on NARUC, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. And it says that they complied with NARUC, but they don't.

Could we see the Bartle and Wells report?

This is a report, expert report commissioned by San Diego that's in both administrative records and criticizes the Met board in 2010 for saying that its functional categories developed for Metropolitan's cost of service process are consistent with the American Water Works Association rate setting guidelines, a standard chart of accounts for utilities developed by the National

60

59

Association -- by NARUC and National Council of Governmental Accounting.

2.3

Next page, they point out that -- we'll get to AWWA in a minute but they point out that for NARUC, purchased water should be -- the account for purchased water is supply. As described in our March 5th opinion, all the cost Met pays the State Department of Water Resources under Met's agreement with DWR are water supply costs should be assigned to purchased water or supply account. Met does not account for those costs in that manner and, as described, those costs to the rates it imposes for the cost of transporting water across its own system in Southern California.

The rate structure clearly does not follow the NARUC standard.

Met's rate consultant opines it is appropriate for Met to divide its DWR supply costs into functional categories such as supply, conveyance and aqueduct and hydroelectric because DWR provides sufficient detail that Met may do so and Met's contract with DWR staff recommendation does not provide for aggregate per foot pricing -- per acre-foot pricing.

This amounts to a statement that Met may deviate from industry standards requiring all supply costs to be characterized as such because it has received have to be that accounting should not dictate how we charge for services and that generally we follow NARUC. They don't follow NARUC with respect to classifying supply properly.

I've talked about the illegality of loading
State Water Project fixed costs and the water
resource-water stewardship rates on Met's transportation
of non-Met water. Now I want to move to a third reason
the transportation rates are illegal and that is that
nowhere in its rates does Met account for dry year
peaking, the benefit that is provided when an occasional
user of Met water in dry years doesn't have to pay
anything for that insurance that it will be there in dry
years during years it doesn't need as much Met water.

Met admits it doesn't account for that benefit and the cost of dry year peaking is at least in part in the System Access Rate, which is part of what is being charged here.

Response to interrogatory number 15, we asked identify all facts, documents, data, analyses, calculations, studies or other information used by MWD to calculate the cost associated with maintaining supplies, storage and transportation capacity to accommodate MWD, Member Agency's dry year peaking demands.

The answer was: No such information exists.

an itemized billing statement of costs incurred by its water supplier and perhaps just because it is possible to do so.

Met's approach is incorrect. Industry standards require that Met's financial obligation to the DWR be counted as supply costs, as demonstrated by the very authorities on which Met's rate consultant claims to rely.

And again, we found an e-mail, not in the record, PTX 168, which sheds light on this. This is June Skillman, starting at the book, receiving an e-mail from somebody who says that the cost of service report states that functional categories are consistent with the standard chart of accounts for utilities developed by NARUC.

Can we blow up the NARUC?

And this guy doesn't have a copy. "Doest either of you have a copy of the chart of acts that can be forwarded to me?"

And Ms. Skillman replies that she doesn't have a copy of the NARUC chart. She checked on the Web site. They sell it. They were hoping to get it from Mr. Raftelis.

But was pointing out this is central to the argument used by San Diego. Our argument is going to

And it goes on to say in January 2003, MWD unbundled its rates, which include the supply rate, the System Access Rate and the Readiness-to-Serve Charge among others. The cost of which this interrogatory refers are collected through those rate elements, including the System Access Rate.

You know that they've admitted in their joint statement that was filed back in August that Met did not separately allocate costs related to dry year peaking to its rates. And you've relied on that admission in your -- in a recent order on the motions in limine. You said the misrepresentation from Metropolitan was that it did not make a separate allocation of dry year peaking, so arguably a subject to judicial estoppel, fairest approach here is to hold Metropolitan to its recommendation.

What Metropolitan is going to do when it gets a chance is talk about what it does do about other kinds of peaking, weekly peaking, daily peaking and so on such as charging for the water that's actually used, tiered pricing, tier 1, tier 2, charging the Readiness-to-Serve Charge, capacity charge.

But they admit they don't even try to calculate the benefits to, say, Los Angeles or the burden to steady customers like San Diego of the fact as much as 511,000

acre-feet, more than \$30 million worth of water is available to Los Angeles in a dry year when it doesn't buy nearly that much water in other years. And the cost of keeping that capacity available for those dry years is borne in those other years by other rate payers.

1.3

2.2

This chart, Mr. Denham will talk about, but this says three things. They took an everything, which is the dotted line that says one, and took an average of water use from 1994 to 2000. That is one.

And then they show from 2000 on through 2012 how the member agencies react to that average. And you can see the blue line is all member agencies except San Diego and Los Angeles, and they're -- that's reasonably flat. Sometimes they use more than the average but not that much more. San Diego's about the same as the average, a little bit different in places but basically the average.

And the difference, the dry year peaking is Los Angeles, pink line. And you can see that in some years, Los Angeles uses very little Met water and some years, it uses a lot of Met water. They've quantified that for us recently in a bond document that they issued in 2013, this is PTX 244 offered to show the volume, sort of what we're talking about.

This is a 2013 bond issue for \$104 million that

supplies from Metropolitan, the point being that that tremendous insurance for Los Angeles is paid for by everyone else except Los Angeles. Benefit to Los Angeles has never been studied, has never been calculated and has never been properly put into cost of service analysis in the rates.

And there's no question that when agencies -when agencies provide for dry year peaking, that requires a considerable investment in storage facilities by Met.

The group hired by FCS Group, hired by San Diego made a report which is in the 2012 record, and I'll just -- I'll point out some of the highlights of the report. And this was submitted to Met about this issue of dry year peaking.

In an attempt to provide an order of magnitude estimate of the value of MWD's peak demand capacity, an allocation of the fixed asset records was developed. Based on this allocation, the investment is estimated to be roughly three billion for peak demand capacity. Appropriate recovery of capital and operating costs related to these facilities could easily represent hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

Next page.

MWD's volumetric rate structure allows agency to roll on and off the system with little financial cost

Met put out and on --in it describes the Los Angeles variance and says the parts that I want to highlight --

the whole thing is interesting but the -- from fiscal

year 2001 to fiscal year 2010-11 is the first highlighted part, portion, approximately 32 to 71 percent of the

city's, that's Los Angeles' total water requirements were met by Metropolitan. So some years, only -- they only

needed 32 percent and got the rest from the Los Angeles Aqueduct and other sources and in some years, they had to

get 71 percent from Met.

For the five fiscal years ending June 30th 2012, the city's water deliveries from Met averaged approximately 301,000 acre-feet per year, which constituted approximately 51 percent of the city's total water supply. But this is the point: Delivers from Metropolitan to the city during this period varied from approximately 116,000 acre-feet and approximately 433,000 acre-feet. So some years they needed two and a half times as much water as they needed in some other year.

And then down -- the last highlighting is however, the city may still purchase up to 511,000 acre-feet per year or 82 percent of its dry year supplies from Metropolitan over the next 25 years. This corresponds to an increase from normal to dry years of approximately 255,000 acre-feet in potential demand for

to those individual Member Agencies.

What that means is you don't have to -- if you don't want to use us this year, don't need to use us this year, we rolled off. We need you next year, we roll back on.

And instead, requires all system users to bear the cost burden for standby capacity. In effect, NWD spends billions of dollars on drought insurance but does not require the beneficiaries of that insurance to pay it until they actually use it. And then they're not paying for it. What they're paying for is water in those years. They're not paying more. It does so by requiring other customers whose demand is more stable to subsidize those whose use of the MWD system is highly variable.

So, Met's transportation rates are designed to force steady customers like San Diego to subsidize agencies that role on and off the system. They do that by loading State Water Project fixed costs on transportation rates that have nothing to do with the actual cost of conveying non-Met water through its own system. That makes the rates illegal.

The remedy is to have Met actually conduct analysis of who gets the benefits of the costs of dry year peaking, account for it in setting cost of service rates instead of ignoring it, as they do now.

2.3

Now, Met's staff did a portion of this job. I thought this would be interesting. In preparation for setting the 2010 rates, it had an action item in 2010. This came from the office of the CFO, who's Brian Thomas, and they were going to consider the change in the cost of service methodology.

Mr. Thomas recognized that storing water with the State Water Project for use in dry years, paying the State Water Project for storage capacity was a supply benefit, yet it was charged to transportation. And here's -- here's one of the things that the staff was suggesting. This agreement provides a dry year supply benefit to Metropolitan, the flex storage in the State Water Project.

Next page.

2.3

The drought storage provides increased dry year supply reliability. Drought storage costs are assigned to the supply function and recovered through Metropolitan supply rates for the Diamond Valley Lake, but for other reservoirs that they're paying for, in this case, Castaic and Perris, the cost of that storage are recovered through the System Access Rate and Readiness-to-Serve Charge.

So, the staff is suggesting an alternative approach. Drought storage component could be included in

The -- 19 of the member agencies signed this letter and if we could look at the first page of the letter, it is to the general -- it's to the general manager of Met. And what these member agencies are saying is that during the rate setting process for 2010 and '11, San Diego contended that Met's water rates were unlawful and that Met's cost of service methodology does not comply with industry standards.

In a letter to Metropolitan dated March 8, 2010, the water authority demands changes in the cost of service methodology that would shift all costs associated with the State Water Project and all costs currently recovered through the Water Stewardship Rate to Metropolitan's tier 1 supply rate. This dramatic shift in cost to supply would result in a savings to the water authority of over 26 million in calendar year 2010 and over \$800 million over the next 20 years and a corresponding increase in costs shared by Metropolitan's other member agencies.

If we could look at the attachment A, shows it's even more stark than that. First column is the cost shift and then down at the bottom, it shows 26 million that they're referring to.

Then the cost -- the net present value of that cost shift over 20 years is the next one down at the

the supply function. It says that approximately \$10 million would be assigned to the supply function instead of to the transportation, conveyance function.

And they analyze as they always do how that would affect the member agencies. Voters. They conclude the initial impacts would be minor. San Diego would save less than \$600,000 per year in wheeling and exchange water. Other agencies would have to pay more, but nobody would have to pay more than \$100,000 based on the budgeted sales level of the previous year.

So, next page.

The board options are assigns a portion of the cost associated with this -- this DWR flexible storage to the apply function.

Option II is to make no changes, keep doing what we're doing.

And option III is direct staff to do the whole thing. I mean go figure this out again.

The recommendation was option I, which is apply it to supply. And of course, the board did nothing.

Your Honor, the reason that the Met board refuses to change its rate structure and has since 1997 should by now be obvious. Nothing sums it up better than a letter sent to Met in 2010 signed by 19 of its members. This is PTX 71. It is not in the record.

 bottom. That's 803 million. Cost next shift over 40 years is a million 7.

THE COURT: I don't think that's a million 7. MR. KEKER: I'm sorry, a billion 7. I don't think it's a million 7 either. 800 million, then a billion 7 over 40 years. And net present value over 67 years is almost \$3 billion, \$2.94 billion.

So, that's what explains the board's reluctance to do what the law requires, which is appropriate cost of service analysis, apply reasonable costs to that cost of service, evaluate the benefits and the burdens of the rates that are charged and the service and so on. That's the motivation.

THE COURT: Would this be a good time to stop?

MR. KEKER: I was going to -- sure, this is a good time to stop.

THE COURT: Unless you've got just a couple more minutes. It is the noon hour.

MR. KEKER: I don't have long. But this is a good time to stop. Let's stop now.

THE COURT: I'll see everybody at 1:30. Thank you so much.

(Noon recess taken.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

DECEMBER 17, 2013 AFTERNOON SESSION 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 ---000---THE COURT: Good afternoon. 5 MR. KEKER: Good afternoon, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Let's go ahead. 7 MR. KEKER: I'm happy to say I'm coming to the 8 end. 9 THE COURT: No need to apologize. This is 10 important and it's very helpful from both sides. 11 MR. KEKER: But I am coming to the end. So I'm 12 going to sum up and go back to what I said at the outset. 13 We are not asking in this phase of the trial or 14 in any phase of the trial, actually, but we're certainly 15 not asking the Court to set a rate. We're just asking 16 you to tell Met that its transportation rate is illegal 17 and tell them why. 18 The current transportation rate is illegal 19 because, number one, it unreasonably includes fixed State 20 Water Projects in the System Access Rate and System Power 21 Rate that have nothing to do with the use of Met's owned 22 conveyances, which are those in the yellow on the map 23 and, of course, the Colorado River Aqueduct. 24 Number two, it unreasonably charges in the 25 Water Stewardship Rate, which makes this Water 1

reasonable cost of that activity.

And they also have to show that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor, the people who are transporting bear a fair and reasonable relationship to the payor's burden on or benefits received from the government activity.

And we've emphasized that they've never even studied that or thought about it, or they thought about it but they've never studied it or tried to apply it. That's illegal. It is not a factual decision, we believe, for you to make based on your independent review.

Another legal issue for you to decide de novo is under Prop. 13. And Prop. 13, as the Court is well aware, was codified with an implementing statute, 50076 of the Government Code, which requires that if you want to get out of it being a tax, that you have to have a two-thirds vote on, that you not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged and which is not levied for general revenue purposes.

We believe under your rulings our job is to make a prima facie case under Prop. 13, that we've done that, that the wheeling rate is invalid because it exceeds the reasonable cost of providing the service and

73

Stewardship Rate illegal as to transportation of non-Met water. It applies to local conservation projects that have nothing to do with charging for non-Met water.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Number three, it unreasonably ignores the benefits to Los Angeles and others of being able to count on more water in dry years.

And, number four, it discourages rather than facilitates wheeling in violation of the Water Code; therefore, the System Access Rate is unlawful, System Power Rate is unlawful and the Water Stewardship Rate, all of which goes to the transportation rates, is laid on the transportation rate, is unlawful.

Choosing rate stability, as they are doing here, continue to do here as they have done since 1997 or when the rates were set in 2003, choosing rate stability over cost of service is not an option that's available to Met under the law.

And applying your pretrial rulings, without recognizing we had some objections to some of them, but we're now living with your pretrial rulings, are going to try the case based on what you told us the rules were.

Met cannot carry its burden under Proposition 26. They have to show that the amount that they charge for transportation of Met water through its conveyance system is no more than necessary than to cover the

in the case of the Water Stewardship Rate, because it is levied for general revenue purposes rather than for some specific service.

Met cannot show -- the burden of production you said shifts to them and they cannot show that its transportation rate, which includes State Water Project fixed costs and this Water Stewardship Rate does not exceed the reasonable cost of providing transportation service over its own facilities.

Then moving on to the wheeling statute, the legal issue is whether the statute bars inclusion of any component of the rate. I think we've all agreed, both sides have agreed that's a legal issue for you to decide.

You've raised another issue of whether the wheeling statute applies. We believe there's no question the wheeling statute applies.

This is a challenge to a new wheeling rate that was established in 2010 and then again in 2012. Every time they set what the System Access Rate or Power Rate or Stewardship Rate, given their language, those components going into a wheeling rate, every time they do it, they are setting a wheeling rate. So 2010, they did it and 2012 they did it.

There is another part of this trial which you have severed which is the interpretation of the 2003

76

exchange agreement between Met and San Diego and our contention, as the Court knows, is that the price set in that exchange agreement, which is not a wheeling agreement, there's no dispute about that, it's not a wheeling agreement under the definition of wheeling but the price set in it, we assert, is the wheeling rate, using that language in 5.2 about generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Met on behalf of its member agencies.

2.2

But the point about that is that that is not for this case, that's for the breach of contract case to be held later. And we'll call witnesses and we'll -- you'll eventually figure out what that language covers and what it doesn't.

We have seen the slides because we exchanged them. And I anticipate they're going to spend a lot of time talking about the exchange agreement, whether it's a wheeling agreement and we said it's not and what price -- what the price term means. Our position is that's irrelevant to this part of the case. We brought declaratory relief, we brought other claims this wheeling rate that was set, including the System Access Rate and so on, those are illegal and we are entitled to a declaration saying so. So, our position is all of that is irrelevant to this phase.

public agency for a public utility service, which this is, shall not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the public utility service.

This is part -- and 66013 says the same thing, requires rates no more than the cost of service.

The Met Act, its -- what they point to us, uniformity of rates. They keep talking about how these rates are uniform and our position is that the -- the way they charge for wheeling is charging for different classes of service. They charge everybody the same thing and they should be charging at a minimum for transportation of Colorado River water. That's a different class of service than perhaps something else. And certainly it's different from transporting State Water Project water, so we're in a different class of service.

And then the common law, which outlaws discriminatory rates, we've cited there the City of Inyo case but basically that the -- if a water rate under the common law is not based on cost of service or some other reasonable basis, the rate is invalid. The public utilities don't have the right under the common law or under public utility law to charge anything they feel like.

We believe all of these are legal questions on

They ask that this contract claim be tried later for some reason. I expect that they want to try part of it here. So we're asking you to just ask yourself as they're talking about that, why are we listening to that in this phase of the case? Our position is that it's irrelevant.

And we believe that the evidence shows, the evidence that's in the administrative record that I've cited so far, without anything more shows that Met's rate discourage wheeling in violation of 1813 and that it's neither fair nor reasonable to include charges unrelated to the cost of conveying non-Met water through Met-owned facilities.

They've known that for years. We can see that matrix again that their CFO put up. They've known for years that this way of charging discourages wheeling and that the only way to not discourage wheeling is to follow the commitments pay out where your fixed costs are taken care of because people have to line up at the beginning of the year and say, "We promise to take this much water and now you figure out how much it's going to cost us."

Finally, under the Government Code -- couple more. 54999.7(c) --

MR. PURCELL: (a).

MR. KEKER: I take it back. (a), a fee from a

which you must exercise your independent judgment.

Your pretrial rulings mention various presumptions and deference but you recognized also that ultimately you have to decide what the law means. And here, I emphasize what I started with. The facts are really undisputed. It's -- these are legal judgments that you have to make about what the law requires.

We believe Met's rates have been shown and will be shown to be unreasonable as a matter of law under each and all of these statutes and that's it. I appreciate your attention.

We're going to call -- after the other side has a chance to speak, our first witness will be Dennis Cushman, who's the assistant general manager of the San Diego County Water Authority, and we look forward to putting him on.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

I plan to take a break around 3:00 o'clock but if the attorney who's speaking at the time wants to call a break a little bit sooner or later, depending where you are in the presentation, please feel free to suggest it.

MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor.

Good afternoon, your Honor. Tom Hixson for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

California courts have recognized that rate setting is one of the most complicated issues facing administrative agencies and that judicial review of rate setting decisions is likewise one of the most challenging tasks.

2.3

Rate setting involves questions of technical expertise, such as how are water facilities used, what role do they play operationally, how does a water agency benefit from the mix of facilities that it has and how are costs appropriately allocated to related functions?

In addition, rate setting entities differ from each other in significant ways. This is especially true in the water industry, which presents a vast spectrum from relatively simple retail water agencies that sell to households and businesses, to the Met Water District with its enormous infrastructure over large distances in Southern California and the need to transport water from distant locations.

For these reasons, including these technical questions and the large differences and rate setting entities, courts apply a standard of reasonableness in reviewing a water agency's rates and so although San Diego asserts a number of different claims in this case, ultimately none of them require more than a standard of reasonableness.

there are surely any number of different rate structures which would satisfy the legal standard of reasonableness. And as I said, we will be closely trained to show that Met's rates are reasonable.

Before I turn to San Diego's claims, I would like to talk about Metropolitan.

Met was established in 1928 by the California Legislature. It is a collective of member agencies in Southern California, a water wholesaler. Met is what's called a supplemental water provider. That means it provides its member agencies with water that they decide to buy beyond the local resources they already have, such as their own groundwater or other sources of water available to them. They can turn to Met as a supplemental provider.

Today, Metropolitan has 26 member agencies, they are shown here on the screen, and it serves a territory where approximately 19 million Californians reside.

I'm showing now a map of the Metropolitan service area, which covers a large area in Southern California. It stretches from Calleguas and Los Angeles on the west and the north to the Eastern Municipal Water District on the east and to San Diego on the south. That service area extends all the way to the border with

Prop. 26, for example, requires a reasonable relationship for costs or to benefits. The courts have interpreted Prop. 13 as requiring a reasonableness inquiry as well. This is true as well under the common law in the wheeling statute and other claims. So while we contend a number of these statutes, constitutional provisions are inapplicable, ultimately ones that do apply boil down to the standard of reasonableness.

In this proceeding, we will demonstrate that Metropolitan's rates are reasonable. We will show that the State Water Project transportation costs are reasonably allocated to Metropolitan's transportation rates. We will show the Water Stewardship Rate is reasonably allocated to transportation rates, and we will show that San Diego's claim concerning dry year peak has no merit.

Throughout this demonstration, we will be closely trained on this standard of reasonableness. We will not attempt to show that Metropolitan's rates are the only possible rates it could have, that there is no other way it could be done, that this is the best and greatest way and nothing else could be done differently because first, that loses sight of the government -- the governing legal standard and, second, given Metropolitan's size and complexities of its operation,

Mexico.

Metropolitan obtains its water from two principal sources of supply. Chronologically, the Colorado River came first. With the construction of the Hoover Dam and other dams starting in the late 1920s and continuing into the 1930s, a series of lakes were created along the Colorado River that became sources of water supply for the surrounding states, including California.

To get Colorado River water to Met, Met constructed and continues to own and operate its 242-mile long Colorado River Aqueduct, which takes water from Lake Havasu on the Colorado River and transports it to Met service area.

We've depicted the Colorado River Aqueduct as a red line on this map.

On the right-hand side of the screen is the Colorado River, which is the border between California and Arizona, and Lake Havasu is the ending point for Met's Colorado River Aqueduct.

I would like to point out San Diego this morning in their opening when they said the Colorado River Aqueduct is a federal facility, that's erroneous. Met created, built and today owns the Colorado River Aqueduct. That's the reason it was formed. The individual cities in the area couldn't themselves have

had the resources to construct the aqueduct and so they joined together to form Metropolitan to accomplish something none of them could have done by themselves. They issued bonds and assessed property taxes for the construction of this enormous aqueduct.

2.3

Second, in terms of chronology is the California State Water Project. Metropolitan signed its contract with the Department of Water Resources in November of 1960. Met was the first of the state water contractors.

The source of water supply for the State Water Project is the Feather River, which is impounded at Oroville to form Lake Oroville. We've shown that here in Northern California with a blow out indicating where Lake Oroville is.

To transport this water to the 29 state water contractors located throughout the state, the Department of Water Resources built enormous transportation facilities from Northern to Southern California, the most prominent of which is the California Aqueduct.

We've shown the California Aqueduct in blue on this slide and you can see it going down the center of California. And then as it approaches Met, it divides into a west branch and then an east branch connecting into Met service area. generally a blend of State Water Project and Colorado River water. That's why we show the distribution system in purple.

San Diego is one of the member agencies that receives a blend of State Water Project and Colorado River water. That's actually an issue that's very important in this case because throughout San Diego's opening, they have talked as if it were true that they have Colorado River water running through Met's system to San Diego. That is factually untrue. Water that San Diego gets from Met is a blend of State Water Project and Colorado River water and that incurs those State Water Project costs to have that water to provide to San Diego.

We've also shown on this map where the San Diego County Water Authority is. If you look toward the bottom of the purple lines, you see a dotted line going from left to right. That's the border with San Diego County. And then a few miles south of that, we show the line turning to black and those depict the pipelines owned by San Diego.

To understand the rate challenge, it's important to understand Met's rates and charges and how they're interrelated. We've listed here the various sources of revenue that Met has. On the left, we've listed the water rates. These are volume metric charges.

THE COURT: That's owned by the state? MR. HIXSON: That is owned by the state, correct.

This slide here shows a blowup of Metropolitan's service area. In this lighting, it is a little hard to distinguish between blue and purple but at the top, those are the blue lines showing the State Water Project, the west branch and east branch connecting down.

On the right, you can see in red the Colorado River Aqueduct coming in from the east, and we've shown Met's distribution and infrastructure facilities in purple. And you can see this is a large network of pipes and other facilities in Metropolitan's service area that transport the water to its member agencies in this large area in Southern California. When we refer to the distribution network, we mean those purple areas there that move the water to Met's member Agencies through the various counties and the cities in different locations within Metropolitan.

Let me explain our color coding on this slide.
Purple is what you get when you mix blue with
red. We've depicted the State Water Project in blue and
the Colorado River Aqueduct in red. With some exceptions
from member agencies that are Met's far western service
area, the water that Met's member agencies receive is

What that means is that each rate is a unit charge for each acre-foot of water delivered. And an acre-foot is the amount of water that will cover an acre one foot deep. It's approximately the amount of water that two Southern California households would use in one year.

And so, on the right we've listed the fixed charges. Fixed charges mean that the amount of that charge doesn't depend in a given calendar year on how much water the member agency buys from Metropolitan.

Now, I should be clear that fixed doesn't mean the charge stays the same forever. Fixed charges in fact are calculated on past Member Agency uses. And I'll explain later the two fixed charges later in this presentation, other minor revenues such as investment income.

And then in the bottom in green, Met receives ad valorem property taxes. Residents in that area pay property taxes. Those supply about five percent of Metropolitan's revenues.

Now, let me turn to Met's rate structure. When we say the rate structure, this is what we mean. We mean the volumetric water rates and the fixed charges. Current structure, the one that is shown up here in this chart was adopted by Met's board of directors in October of 2001 and it became effective on January 1st, 2003.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

And so for any given year, Met's rate structure has both a mix of variable charges, namely the water rates and then certain fixed charges. As between the ratio, which is more and which is less, the large majority fall into the water rates, variable or volumetric water charges.

Now, let's focus on the particular rate components that are at issue in this lawsuit.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Met's volumetric water rates pay for different things. Indeed, one of the purposes of the unbundled rate structure was to provide transparency to when member agencies see their bills and see what the different rates are, they know what charges are for what. And so the supply rates, the tier one and tier two supply rates pay for the water resource itself.

We know that Met has three transportation charges. Those are the System Access Rate, the System Power Rate and the Water Stewardship Rate. And those are charged on each acre-foot of water that Met delivers to its member agencies.

And then beneath that, the last of the volumetric charges is the treatment surcharge. Met sells both treated water and untreated water. We use that estimation as a term of art. Treated means you can drink it. If it's untreated, the Member Agency would have to treat it themselves before they could obviously sell it

January. That's broken out between tier one supply, tier two supply, and then it's got the three transportation rates beneath that. And you can see for the full service untreated water rate, that's listed as being no longer applicable because Met got rid of that and had just the unbundled rates.

Now, there have been some minor adjustments to this rate structure since 2003 but none relevant to this case. So except for those, this is the rate structure that has been in effect since that time.

This particular lawsuit happens to challenge the rates for 2011 and 2012, '13 and '14. Or I should say these two cases. There's nothing different about the challenges that happened in those four years from what took effect in 2003 because these cost allocations were implemented in Met's rates as of that time. It just happened that San Diego sued in 2010 and 2012. We're talking about those rates because that's when the lawsuit was, not because the rate structure was different from 2003.

Now I want to walk through the unbundled rates and explain in a bit more detail what they would cover.

Focusing on tier 1 and tier 2 supply rates, I identified earlier that Met has two principal sources of water supply, State Water Project and Colorado River.

89 91

to households or businesses. So there's an extra per acre-foot charge if the water is going to be treated.

Now I would like to spend some time going over this slide here because this covers an issue that's important in this case and it's one that I think may have gotten lost during San Diego's opening when they showed you a study from 1969, which is that Met's unbundled rate structure has not always been this way. It took effect in January of 2003.

Before 2003, Met didn't have a supply rate and it didn't have a transportation rate. It had what's known as a bundled rate. And here, we've put up a chart from the administrative record. This is the March 2002 board action letter, where the board was being asked to approve the new rates under the new rate structure that would go into effect in 2003.

And so the staff presented the board with a comparison showing these are the rates in 2002 versus 2003. And you can see in 2002, there was a full service untreated water rate of \$349. And then above that, the individual unbundled rates are labeled not applicable because there hasn't been any division between supply and transportation previously.

Then on the right-hand side, you can see the proposed new rate structure that would be effective in Met's supply rates recover the cost of those facilities and programs maintaining and developing the water supplies in those purchases, supply associated with drought storage and Met's reservoirs. And the logic for that is drought storage is one way Met makes sure they have water supply available in years double to service territory.

Down here in right on red, we have a notation that the tier one and tier two supply rates per acre-foot are the same for all member agencies. This is true for all of Met's volumetric rates, that the unit charge for each of the rates is uniform across all the member agencies.

Now, if one Member Agency purchases more water, obviously its supply cost goes up, but that's just a function of the quantity of the water. We'll see it is the same to transportation rates. Everyone has the same rate, called a postage stamp rate. If you put a postage stamp on a letter, you can mail it anywhere in the U.S. Met has postage stamp rates. It doesn't matter how far is the agency is, but it is based on delivery to the member agencies.

The System Access Rate recovers most of the cost associated with the facilities for the

transportation of water, so it's going to cover most of

92

the facilities' cost for the State Water Project, transportation facilities for the Colorado River Aqueduct, which transports Colorado River from its own system. There's the purple lines I showed you earlier, transport to deliver the water to the Member Agency.

The System Access Rate also recovers regulatory storage costs. That refers to Met uses the storage in its distribution system to regulate its delivery of water to its member agencies to free up capacity and so those are also in the System Access Rate. The System Power Rate is the energy cost for pumping water to Southern California.

Met, of course, is south of the Tehachapi Mountains, at least on the east branch so water has to be pumped over those mountains to get to Met. In addition, power costs to move water from Colorado River to Met so these energy costs are recovered in the System Power Rate recovery.

The third of the transportation charges is the Water Stewardship Rate. This rate covers the cost of the demand management programs. What those programs do is incentivize local water development for conservation with the emphasis being on local as in where that particular Member Agency is.

So if you think about Met's distribution

board of directors. They adopted the structure in 2001. Then in March of 2012, the board signed formal numbers to each of the elements of each of these rates. Met had begun considering a new rate structure in 1998 after several years of discussions and participation by the member agencies. The rate structure was adopted in 2001 and then that went into effect in 2003.

And here, we've just highlighted the transportation charges in this board of directors' action item.

At the same time that Met documented this unbundled rate structure, the board redefined the rate for wheeling service that Met charges. This rate is defined in Metropolitan's Administrative Code at Section 4405 and it states wheeling -- as the Court knows is conveying non-Met water through Met's distribution system to the Member Agency.

And Met defined the wheel -- the rate for wheeling service as including the System Access Rate and Water Stewardship Rate. And as you've just seen, these are two of the transportation rates. If it's treated water, there's a treatment surcharge, and then wheeling parties must pay for their own costs of power.

There are a couple of things that are significant about this rate program that I think are

facility that has lines going all over Southern
California, for instance, for Santa Monica, one would
have to develop a local power supply in Santa Monica so
Met doesn't have to deliver it. Local in this context
means within the geographic area of that agency that's
doing it. And of course, the benefit for them, for Met
is it doesn't have to move water through its distribution

system to the member agencies.

And those programs at the local resources development program which encourages things like recycling of water and treating of contaminated water, provide conservation credits if the agency consumes less water and then desalination.

THE COURT: Those are given out on an agency-by-agency basis?

MR. HIXSON: Agencies will apply to the demand management for funding to programs that incentivize if they have a program they want to run in the Member Agency that would clean up water and make more available, so yeah, those are funded on agency-by-agency basis or there would be credits given to consumers in the area of the Member Agency to incentivize low flow toilets or something like that as part of the incentive credits in the conservation program.

So these rates were documented by Metropolitan

important to emphasize.

First, San Diego misdescribed the rate for wheeling service in their opening statement. It is not the same as the transportation rates. Transportation rates have three components: The System Access Rate, the System Power Rate and the Water Stewardship Rate. Only two of those are in the rate for wheeling service and those are the System Access Rate and the Water Stewardship Rate. The System Power Rate isn't part of the rate for wheeling service. Instead, it says the cost of power associated with that particular wheeling transaction.

There is another feature of the rate that's important as well that's in Administrative Code 4119. That defines what Met's wheeling service is. It means the use of Met's facilities, including its rights to use State Water Project facilities, to transport water not owned or controlled by Met to its member public agencies and transactions entered into by Met for a period of up to one year.

In other words, the rate for wheeling service applies to transactions with the Member Agency for one year or less. If the wheeling service is not with the Member Agency for longer than a year, for example, a multiyear agreement, there isn't a published wheeling

rate for that transaction.

Now, Met does enter into contracts such as that but those are negotiated separately. For example, if a non-Member Agency wants to negotiate or the transaction is larger than one year, this rate wouldn't be applicable under its own terms, the parties would have to sit down and negotiate and agree upon one.

Here, I have to emphasize as well something that San Diego did in their opening statement, which the rate for wheeling service includes two of the rates that are also in the rate components that are in the -- in fact full service rate, because you have the System Access Rate and stewardship rate are here and they are also in the bundled transportation rate for agency both supplying and transportation.

In the opening statement, San Diego took the total amount of money that the System Access Rate, System Power Rate and structures take in revenue and said look at the huge amount of money being charged to the wheeling rate. That's not a very fair comparison because yes, this is the System Access Rate and Stewardship Rate also in the full service rates that constitute the large majority of Metropolitan's water sales.

To give an analogy of why that's an unfair comparison, imagine an argument by someone saying that

nature of the cost and the proper characterization of the expense. They are to move water.

Second, Met can use the State Water Project facilities as an extension of its own facilities. In other words, although it does not own or operate the California Aqueduct, it can and does use it to convey non-project water and for other purposes as well.

Met's system is integrated with the State Water Project. It can store water in different places and pull it back out all because it has these rights to use the California Aqueduct and those facilities by virtue of its contract with the AWR. It is not a passive recipient of water supply.

In addition, this allocation is consistent with industry guidance regarding proper cost allocation. And it's also reasonable, as I said earlier, because the exchange water San Diego receives, in fact the water that San Diego receives and the bulk of what member agencies receive is a blend of the State Water Project and Colorado River Aqueduct water.

Let's look at the contract that Met has with DWR for the State Water Project.

I put up on the screen the 2005 amended version of the contract. There's the original one in 1960, but then because the contract has been amended so many times

people who buy origami posters on Amazon pay shipping charges and then they showed your Honor the total amount of shipping charges that Amazon charged in a given year and they say look, this is an enormous burden on people who buy origami posters.

Surely the response would be yes, people who buy that particular product do pay shipping charges but so do people who buy everything else on Amazon. And when you put the total amount of dollars up on the screen, that includes the everything else. And so the numbers that San Diego is putting up there about the percentage of Met's revenue that comes from the System Access Rate, System Power Rate and Stewardship Rate, that includes the everything else, the non-wheeling transactions, the ones that have nothing to do with the wheeling rate because they're paying the supply and transportation rates.

Now I would like to make a transition in terms of the subjects I'm addressing and talk about the first of the rate challenges that San Diego is bringing.

They are challenging the allocation of State Water Project transportation costs to Met's transportation rates. But there are a number of reasons why this allocation is imminently reasonable.

First, the State Water Project transportation costs are Met's transportation costs. That's the true

since then, the State Water Project analysis office has for each of the contractors the up to date one that has the strike here and everything. So if you read that, that's what it reads like now so that's why I'm putting this one up on the screen.

And we can call out article 22.

The State Water Project has a specific charge for water supply. It's called the Delta water charge, and that is the payments by each contractor for the project water. And it says here the designated Delta water charge and these payments are to recover the cost of project conservation facilities. Let me explain what the word "conservation" means there because it means something different than it does in every day life.

We normally think of conservation as not using quite as much something, take steps to make something last longer. In the State Water Project contract, conservation is the acquisition of the water supply, the collecting it into the dams rather than letting it run out into the ocean. It is the capturing of the water resource is the conservation charge.

The Delta water charge is uniform for each state water contractor regardless of distance from the source of supply, so no matter where we are, the Delta water charge is calculated on the basis that is a uniform

thing. Just a supply cost, doesn't matter how far it takes to get to the contractor.

The cost of Delta water charge recovers relate to supply. We have put here on the screen a picture of Lake Oroville in Northern California, the principal source of supply for State Water Project. There are costs associated with maintaining this lake, the reservoir, dam cost, the maintenance, the electricity costs. Those types of costs are in the Delta water charge for water supply.

Separate from that, Met incurs transportation costs under its contract with the state. Article 23 of the contract states that these transportation charges are allocated to the contractor. DWR is not ultimately responsible for them, the state water contractor such as Metropolitan are the ones responsible to pay these transportation charges.

Let's talk now about the different types of transportation charges that there are.

I put up here on the screen, on the left it's a graphic of the State of California with the aqueduct and on the right, you can see a picture of the physical aqueduct as well as some operations and maintenance being performed.

There are three types of transportation charges

transportation variable charges. Those are different from the first two and they do vary year by year depending on the amount of power that is used to deliver water to Metropolitan.

Now let's talk about how the State Water Project expenses go into Met's rates.

They go into two different types of Metropolitan's transportation rates. On the left, you have the System Access Rate and, as I said before, that's a facilities expense so it is going to be covered, the transportation capital costs and transportation operations maintenance costs because those costs are related to the project transportation facilities.

On the right, you have the System Power Rate and that's where the State Water Project variable costs, power costs go.

I want to be clear to avoid a misunderstanding. The State Water Project costs aren't the only cost that these charges recover, also the Colorado River Aqueduct and Met's own distribution facilities. I'm just telling where the state water cost end up. This is their destination.

Under its contract with DWR, Met receives separate bills for its supply and transportation charges reflecting the underlying reality that they recover

101 103

for State Water Project. First two are what's called take-or-pay.

The first type is capital expenses for the State Water Project transportation facilities. Those are construction and expansion expenses associated with those facilities.

The second is operations and maintenance because there's a lot of the maintenance in this enormous facility going from Northern to Southern California. These are take-or-pay expenses, meaning Metropolitan must pay the transportation, capital and operations and maintenance charges no matter the amount of water supply or if there's any water supply delivered to Met.

Take-or-pay is a funny term. What it really means is you got to pay whether or not you get to take any water. But these are called take-or-pay. These expenses are allocated based on distance and so the transportation charges are different from a supply charge in that way. Met as the southernmost contractor in the state has a proportionately much greater share of these State Water Project transportation expenses.

The third type of transportation charge is for power. It is the charge of moving the water over the Tehachapi mountains to Southern California. Depending on the contractor, however far it might be, those are the

different types of costs, and these are allocated to the contractors differently. And particularly, the transportation ones are much, much larger because of the distance.

We've put up on the screen here an excerpt from an invoice from DWR to Met, from the Department of Water Resources, and then we highlighted certain areas here.

You can see that there are costs for the capital cost component and DWR breaks out beneath that the Delta water charge. And if you look to the right, there's a bill for \$27 million.

And then beneath that, you can see that there's a transportation charge that's part of the capital costs, and if you look to the right, that's just over \$62 million.

And then if you go down and look at the minimum operation maintenance power and replacement component, the state has again done the same thing. It's called out the Delta water charge, supply charge at 51 million, and then it has the transportation charge at 99 million.

THE COURT: So is it -- are you suggesting these are the only two components of the dollars that Met pays?

MR. HIXSON: For the state water. THE COURT: For state water.

Pages 101 to 104

MR. HIXSON: Those are essentially the only components, the Delta.

2.0

2.2

2.5

2.3

THE COURT: So conservation charge, which is comprehended by the idea of the Delta water charge, is the cost of the water?

MR. HIXSON: The cost of the water resource, exactly.

And the point of showing you this invoice is that Met doesn't have to guess how much of its costs are associated with the transportation facilities or the cost to move water as opposed to supply. Met knows. It is totaled, it is itemized, it is broken out. It is not a speculative exercise. In fact, Met is told precisely how much it has to pay.

Met, under its State Water Project contract, also has certain contractual rights to use the State Water Project facilities to move non-project water. That's one of the benefits of being a state water contractor and paying for the reaches of the aqueduct. A reach means a part of the aqueduct. There's the two branches you saw in the earlier slide, the east branch and west branch. Those are called the reach by virtue of paying for those and other transportation expenses. Met can use the state project facilities without paying additional fees to move non-project water.

to 10,000 acre-feet of water not owned or controlled by Met. So that's wheeling because wheeling is moving water that's not Met water.

Then they say subject to your determination of availability system capacity because, as your Honor knows, the wheeling statute only applies if you've got the extra capacity. So they reference that.

Then they say including Met's rights to use the State Water Project facilities.

And then they go along and mention Met's Admin Code that describes the definition of wheeling. And San Diego specifically says since Met's wheeling services include the right of a Member Agency to use Metropolitan's rights to State Water Project facilities, I also ask that you provide the necessary coordination with DWR and state water contractors to assure all issues, including delivery schedules through Delta conveyance capacity, temporary storage and any other operational matters are timely addressed.

This is a significant letter. And it shows San Diego's own understanding that the wheeling service Metropolitan provides includes this right to use the State Water Project facilities and San Diego itself asked Met to use that right for San Diego's benefit.

And this undermines their contention that

105 107

And so we've highlighted for you here a letter to the board of directors from Met staff responding to some arguments that San Diego made in proceedings before the board pointing out that one of the reasons why Met considers the State Water Project transportation expenses to be transportation expenses, beyond the fact that's what they do is that Met itself can use them to move water and not just by receiving state water.

So Met isn't like a household or even a retail water agency that just passively sits there and has water sent to it. Met has much greater rights to access and use the State Water Project facilities in ways that would be unusual for an ordinary purchaser of a water supply.

In addition, San Diego itself is familiar with Metropolitan's ability to use the State Water Project and San Diego has in fact asked Met to do so.

This -- let me see if -- this is a document worth focusing on and reading in some detail. It is a letter from the San Diego County Water Authority in December of 2008, and I'm just showing you an example. There are others.

To Jeffrey Kightlinger, the general manager of Met, and it's a request for wheeling services. And the letter says that on behalf of San Diego, the letter is requesting wheeling service during 2009 to transport up

wheeling service shouldn't recover any of the cost of the State Water Project. They know that the wheeling service Met provides includes the State Water Project rights and they have asked to invoke that.

So that's the first of the challenges that San Diego has, which concerns the allocation of the State Water Project transportation costs.

I want to turn now to the second argument, which is the Water Stewardship Rate. This is the rate that recovers the cost for Met's demand management programs. And I explained before a little bit about what those are. There's the local resource programs which encourage the local development of water such as cleaning up water that's been contaminated, or groundwater recovery programs.

There's the conservation credits program, which provides incentives for ways to use less water, and there's desalination. The key point here is the meaning of the word "local." These programs are designed to promote development of water or different conservation of water in the area where the Member Agency is.

Met's service area is enormous and covers a large part of Southern California and Met has this huge distribution facility to transport water to its Member Agency and these reduce the drain or demand, sorry, on

the distribution facility.

2.0

2.2

2.5

There are three reasons why it was reasonable and continues to be reasonable for Met to allocate the cost of the Water Stewardship Rate to transportation rather than supply.

The first is that these demand management programs funded by the Water Stewardship Rate reduce transportation costs. Second is that they free up capacity for transporting and facilitate wheeling, and the third is putting the Water Stewardship Rate in supply would permit users of transportation services to avoid the costs that they are currently paying and receive unwanted subsidy.

The key to understanding the reduction in transportation cost is to go back to Metropolitan's integrated water resources plan. This was a plan that developed in the mid-1990s and led to the first publication of Met's integrated water resources plan in 1996. And this is something that has been updated in years since then.

The initial 1996 IRP looked at a number of things. It did a forward look at the capital facilities Met would need to construct in the decades to come and that's how Met does plan capital things. Like many entities, it look at the decades to come because that's a

capital costs related to its distribution facilities, related to the cost of expanding the distribution network to transport water to the Member Agency, including the central pool augmentation, the West Valley projects and San Diego Pipeline No. 6.

And then Met did a comparison of the forward-looking expenses, base case, when no additional funded by the Water Stewardship Rate and then the preferred case in which there would be this Water Stewardship Rate to fund the demand management programs and Met concluded the difference in capital expenses would be \$2.4 billion over the coming decade.

So again, these capital expense estimates were based on forward looking projections of demand on Met system. And here, we've identified a number that specifically related to transportation for the distribution system.

As part of the integrated water resources plan,
Met then identified what would the factors be that could
affect the future demand on Metropolitan system. And one
of them was clearly identified, was greater than expected
local development could decrease the expected demands on
Met's system, and Met specifically identified that
capital infrastructure is something that might be
deferred or avoided if there is greater local supply and

109 111

long term. They were trying to predict what would be the sales they would have to meet. And one of the -- two of the scenarios they considered are especially relevant for the Water Stewardship Rate.

Met looked at something called the base case. Base case was what if there were no further demand management programs in the future? So you assume Met's not going to have these programs to promote local resource development or conservation, just no additional ones. What would the demands on Met system be?

The other one was the preferred case, and the preferred case, as its name suggests, was what Met was planning to do and that was if there are additional demands management programs. And Met did an analysis to see is there a difference in the projected capital expenses between the base case and the preferred case.

And here, we're showing on the screen a 1996 economic study on the benefits of local water market programs.

And Met did identify that there would be effects on infrastructure requirements by comparing the base case to the preferred case in the coming decades. It identified a number of facilities, including constructing a 400,000 acre-foot reservoir and regional ocean desalination plants. But Met also identified

that's one of the programs that's promoted by the Water Stewardship Rate.

And this report went further and specifically called out projects such as the central pool augmentation projects and San Diego Pipeline No. 6 were more sensitive to demands. Those were infrastructure projects within Met's distribution system that would transport water to the member agencies.

Lets turn forward, then, to the adoption of the unbundled rates and the Water Stewardship Rate and how it fits in with these forward looking projections from the IRP

I'm putting up on the screen the June 2002 final report on rates and charges that were in place before, leading up to the effect of the unbundling of rates in January of 2003.

There's a section on the Stewardship Rate and a paragraph describing the benefits of the Water Stewardship Rate. And here in Met's final report on rates and charges, Met called out what these benefits would be. It noted that investment in conservation and recycling would do a number of things, including reduce and defer system capacity expansion costs and create available capacity to be used to complete water transfers.

Pages 109 to 112

The reference to reducing and deferring system capacity costs comes right out of this IRP that did not forward, look on the comparison between the base case and preferred case and identify certain capital costs for Met's distribution system that were sensitive to demand.

1.0

2.3

But there's something else that is identified here as being a benefit of the Water Stewardship Rate. It is the reference to creating available capacity to be used to complete water transfers.

Wheeling is a type of water transfer. And in some ways, this is just common sense. If the demand market programs free up capacity, then Met doesn't have to build out additional capacity in distribution system but also means there is no capacity.

Wheeling is something an entity can do only if there is unused capacity within a network such as Metropolitan's and this is called out and identified as a specific benefit of these demand management programs funded by the Water Stewardship Rate. is freeing up capacity which will help facilitate water transfers.

So we think here, and then in additional evidence we will show during the course of these proceedings, shows the link between the Water Stewardship Rate and the transportation related benefits, including benefits to wheelers funded by that rate.

to meet peak demands. What that means for Met and for any other kind of water agency that has to have these pipelines and capacity is that there's a certain amount of capacity that exists that is used at peak times of year and not at other times of the year. And there are costs associated with that capacity. So those are traditionally referred to as peaking costs.

Met calculates what are the peaking costs for its distribution system, means the costs of the facilities to meet the peak of the system.

The way Met recovers the peaking costs for the distribution system is one of the fixed charges. That's called the Capacity Charge and the Capacity Charge is allocated to member agencies based on each member agency's peak summer day over the three prior years.

Met has figured out what it needs to have the peak capacity in the system and looked back at what are the causal locations that, on the peak summer day, which is the causal relationship for the way Met has costed its distribution system.

The San Diego reference is to an annual variation unfairly changes the denominator, by making the denominator so big and including the entire calendar year, San Diego flushes away all of the distinctions that peaking charges are supposed to recognize. Peaking isn't

Now I would like to turn to the third of the challenges that San Diego has in this case. This is what they call their dry year peak claim.

We've put on the screen here paragraph 65 of the Third Amended Complaint in the 2012 action, and this is what they're alleging. They claim that Met fails to fully act for the cost of dry year peaking, that is buying more water from Metropolitan in dry years or when local water supplies are otherwise reduced or otherwise unavailable.

This is where San Diego points the finger to L.A. and said L.A. is doing worse than other agencies and, quote, they're rolling off the system in supposed contrast to other Member Agency but wherein there's a kind of benefit. I think they called it drought insurance this morning in terms of what the dry year peaking relates to.

First, I would like to address what peaking actually means. When you build a water system, you don't build it to handle just the average demands on your system because then what happens during the summer. Right? You have to build pipes and other facilities in your distribution system that can handle the busiest time of the year.

So Metropolitan sizes its distribution facility

supposed to look at the whole calendar year, but when in the calendar year recognizing that some of that capacity and some of those costs are due to the heavier demands at particular times of the year. So if you just focus on the whole calendar year and you average January and February with -- equate it with August, that's not the right way to go about calculating peak.

So San Diego instead accounts for annual variations. Met does account for and appropriately allocates the cost associated with annual variations. Those should be the cost of selling more or less water because that's what San Diego is really focusing on, the greater or lesser quantities of water in different calendar years.

And here, Met acts for those in a variety of ways. First and most obviously are the volumetric rates.

And I went through those earlier. You've got the supply rates, the System Access Rate, System Power Rate and Water Stewardship Rate. These recover large amounts of the facilities' expenses, the power expenses and so on, that for Met's overall cost of water.

The tiered water supplies, tiered supply rates in particular account for peaking. The tier two rate is higher and number of things that happen before an agency moved into tier two, but those are higher rates to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

reflect greater volume of water consumption by a member agency.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Also a fixed rate that is affected -- or fixed charge that's affected by annual variation, that's called the readiness to serve charge, and that is one that covers the cost of standby service, in other words, the value to the member agency that Metropolitan is standing by.

What if there's an earthquake or an emergency? There is a benefit to the member agencies of the fact that Metropolitan is there. And Metropolitan accounts for their standby costs, which are system costs because it has to build out the facilities to handle emergencies by allocating them into a ten-year rolling average. And so if the City of L.A., for example, buys a large amount of water in one year, then for the next decade, its Readiness-to-Serve Charge is going to be higher. And that's true for all of the member agencies.

So it's not true that the Member Agency can supposedly roll on and roll off, that will impact the readiness to serve charge because that is calculated by this ten-year look back.

THE COURT: This is the ten-year rolling average?

MR. HIXSON: Yeah, exactly.

average ratio where for each member agencies, they divided the peak year by the average year and they came up with that number. And then they submitted that to the next board.

But what's interesting is the results. If you look at Met's largest customers, namely those that buy more than 100,000 acre-foot per year in the years of the subject of this study and they together account for more than 70 percent of the Met's total water deliveries, every single one of them had a peak to arching ratio between 1.07 and 1.32.

In other words, it wasn't the case that some of them had, you know, peaks that were like double the average or triple the average as would seem to be suggested by San Diego's claim. In fact, the peaks were only slightly above the averages for the large agencies.

San Diego itself had a peak to average of 1.11. That was higher than West Basin's and other member agencies, which is 1.07. The same as Calleguas at 1.11 and lower than Los Angeles, which was 1.31.

But if you look at the difference, the two peak average between L.A. and San Diego, it is pretty unimpressive. Not a big variation.

You don't just focus on all of Metropolitan, not just the largest customers but all of them. The only

117

San Diego dry year peaking claim has another problem. It assumes a factual predicate that's untrue. Namely, it assumes that the City of Los Angeles or perhaps other member agencies jump up and jump down in their annual water consumption and that San Diego itself is relatively flat and that the supposed differences create an unfair allocation of expenses.

But San Diego's own experts have disproven that factual predicate not once, but twice. They did it first in the administrative record.

This is an expert report by the FCS Group, retained by the San Diego group provided review of the Metropolitan's cost of service of the -- let me walk you through a little bit about what the FCS Group did. They looked back at the prior ten years of water purchases by all of 26 Metropolitan's member agencies.

Let me pull out a few here.

They -- what they did is they did -- they calculated an average over the span of a decade, meaning on average for that decade, how much did each of the member agencies buy in terms of water?

And then FCS looked at the peak year during that decade. What was the highest year for each of the member agencies?

And then FCS did what's called a peak to

customer in the FCS Group that had an outlier peak to average, which was a member in San Fernando, which had a 3.0 and they were literally the smallest of Metropolitan agency, 0.1 percent of Met water. Every other agency had a peak to average ratio 1.07 to 1.32. None of them hit a two to one. A fairly narrow band. Largest ones were closer together in the agency when considered as a whole.

I said San Diego disproved its claim not once by twice. The second time was in this litigation when they hired their expert Dan Denham. He put as an exhibit to his report the sales for the member agencies of -sales from Met to the member agencies, including for San Diego its exchange water.

What we did is we took the data in Mr. Denham's report and we created this demonstrative simply taking his numbers and plugging them in. The timeframe, we chose and we'll see why this is significant in a minute, was the entire time the rate structure has existed.

In other words, we looked at 2003 to the present because San Diego is challenging Met's existing rate structure, and we ran the numbers in Mr. Denham's appendix and said for when this rate structure existed, this one that's being challenged, what were the difference between the member agencies?

And so we put them up here on this chart. And

120

119

what this chart shows in simple terms is in each year, what's the quantity of acre-feet of water each member agency purchased from Met -- that blue line at the top is San Diego -- in every single year.

THE COURT: This is just purchases?

MR. HIXSON: Yeah. It includes the exchange water.

THE COURT: It does?

2.2

2.3

MR. HIXSON: Yes. So we fight about whether or not that's wheeling, but it's in the charge, yeah.

So every year, San Diego is the highest amount. Los Angeles in most years is number two but in some years, MWDOC, that is the Municipal Water District of Orange County, takes over.

But there are a number of things interesting about this. First, the peak is usually San Diego. And second, if you're talking about what really matters, San Diego kind of changed it mind. Maybe you can say it is not the peak, it is the gap between the top and bottom. Maybe that's what matters.

But if you look at the charts, the gap between the top and bottom is basically the same for San Diego and Los Angeles. It's a little over 250,000 acre-feet. So they're both doing the same thing. In fact, if you look at the chart, L.A. and San Diego are peaking and data, shows there really isn't a significant difference between San Diego and L.A. for the time period.

Now, you will be hearing more about Raftelis later on. You already heard San Diego's side of the story. But Met retained Raftelis in 2010 to perform an evaluation of Met's rate setting methodology and cost of service structure and asked Raftelis to review whether the rate setting methodology and cost of service are consistent with industry guidance, and called out here one of the sources of guidance, the Emergency and Water Works Association's M1 manual. And Raftelis did a review of Met's rates and charges and cost of service methodology and concluded that they were consistent with industry guidelines as well as with board principles that had been established previously and with applicable data requirement. And we will be fleshing out in our later presentation of the administrative record further what Raftelis fleshed out.

They said San Diego's side of the story is one big sham. But if you actually look at the e-mail that San Diego picked up and pointed to the Raftelis report, it is very interesting what they did.

Section 4 of the Raftelis report describes Met's cost of service methodology, describes what it does. And it is true that Met staff contributed language

{} troughing roughly around the same time. Their annual variations aren't very different from each other.

So if you're focusing on is the existing rate structure an appropriate one or not, looking at this chart, you would never conclude that Los Angeles is engaging in very different behavior from San Diego.

Now, earlier this morning, San Diego showed you a different chart that they say was also based on Mr. Denham's data. I found that chart extremely interesting because San Diego went back in time. They went back before the rate structure existed. They looked at 1994 to 2000. That's several years before the existing rate structure was in effect and they called that the baseline.

And then they showed L.A.'s behavior in recent years against that old baseline and San Diego's behavior in recent years against the old baseline and they showed that L.A.'s behavior today is much more different than how it used to be in the 1990s, than how different San Diego's is from the 1990. And I sat there scratching my head thinking, "So what?" If you want to see if the existing rate structure is reasonable, presumably you would look at the party's behavior under the existing rate structure. The before and after isn't relevant. And we think that this chart, based on Mr. Denham's own

that ended up in that description of what Met does. That's because Met has to provide information to a consultant so that they can conduct their review of Met's operation.

Section 5 of the Raftelis report was Raftelis's independent review. They set forth the evidence. Met didn't contribute any language to section 5. They point to an entirely innocuous e-mail and tried imply it mirrors the entire Raftelis report.

There is nothing wrong with Met describing what their operations are and letting the consultants do their own review to see if that's consistent within industry guidelines.

And despite San Diego's claims, Raftelis report's analysis in this 2010 review of Met's rates and cost of service methodology was entirely consistent with Raftelis reports prior work years before for Met.

We pull up here Raftelis' Comprehensive Guide to Wastewater, Financing, Pricing, here discussed the concept of how you functionalize and classify different costs.

San Diego's position in this case is that the State Water Project supply and transportation costs can't be separated out, they all have to be thrown together into supply. But what Raftelis recognized is that supply

and transportation are different functions for purposes. He started here with the water costs and Met requirements, and Met starts there as well.

He then identified by functional categories and listed different functions. So supply was one. That's on the left. Pumping and conveyance is a different one. And we don't have a treatment but that was one. And then transmission and distribution, all classified as different functions for purposes of rate making.

Then what he showed -- that's consistent with what Met has done and what Raftelis validated in the 2010 study. Met doesn't have extra source of supply with the transmission charges, for example.

He then discusses allocation of customer classes and lists out the different customer classes. And you heard toward the end San Diego's attorney stating that in effective terms, Met has different customer classes. In reality, all of Met's 26 member agencies are consumers or purchasers of wholesale water. They buy wholesale water from Met and they resell it and they're all government entities.

Here, consistent with the Raftelis report or Raftelis guide, you can see him identifying government utilities as their own class of customer. He separates out residential from commercial, from industrial from NARUC chart of accounts is accounting procedures. That's what it's about.

They go on to say that this accounting guidance allows regulators to distinguish capital expenditures from operating and maintenance expenses and to separate utility activities from non-utility operations. So again, this accounting guidance, regulators they can look at the costs and know what it is.

They go on to say utility management, shareholders and creditors find uniformity and consistency important in their use of this accounting information. So it is accounting information and its primary benefit is for the regulators.

Met isn't a regulated utility. In California, the California Public Utilities Commission regulates investor owned utility or private use utilities. So the NARUC chart of accounts are not applicable to Met in the first instance.

But there's also something more fundamental and it is the move that San Diego makes when they say look at this accounting book and it tells you how you should account for purchase of water. And then they jump to water rates and say that's what that's supposed to reflect.

That move is problematic. And here, we show

institutional, calls out and identifies other government utilities as class and outside city and fire protection. Again, this is consistent with the way that Metropolitan treats its 26 member agencies as one customer class.

San Diego has also made other attempts to suggest that there is industry guidance out there that Met is not complying with. You will hear that throughout this proceeding, I'm sure.

One of the things they refer to is the NARUC chart of accounts. That was the National Association of Regulatory Commissioners. And they say that the NARUC chart of accounts says when you are accounting for the costs, source and supply means all the cost to point of delivery. So San Diego said aha, when you are setting your rates, that should mean all the costs to the point of delivery should be from -- to have say how far set up rates. There are a couple problems with this. First off, San Diego is ignoring what the NARUC chart of accounts is and what types of entities that applies to.

Here is a description from the American Water Works Association's Water Utility Accounting Manual about the NARUC chart of accounts, and it says here that the NARUC committee on accounts through its interpretations has also defined accounting procedures in detail for the uniform system of accounts. So we can see here that the

the American Water Works Association Manual M1. We focus on the chapter, again fixed versus variable charges where the manual explains that fixed and variable charges for cost recovery in a cost of service water rate analysis is not the same as recovering fixed and variable costs from an accounting standpoint. In other words, accounting is valuable and important and you want the regulators who are regulating privately owned utilities to be able to do their job.

But what the American Water Works Association manual states here, accounting is also a different thing from cost of service rate. You wouldn't want the cost of service rates to be dictated by accounting principles of water rates, fees and charges. Nothing unusual about this point of view about the difference between rate making and accounting.

So we cite another manual. This is the Water Environmental Federation Manual, financing and charges for waste water systems. And WEF has the same statement here. They say that rates should reflect cost causation and not be determined by replication of the fixed and variable nature of costs from an accounting or budgeting perspective. In some ways, this is common sense. California courts have recognized the complexity of rate setting and various factors that have to be taken into

2.3

account

San Diego's reliance on a chart of acts to say that's the way rates should be set has been rejected by agency guidance.

I'm about ready to move to a new topic so maybe we should take a break and then come back.

THE COURT: That's fine.

I'll see everybody in 10.

(Brief Break.)

THE COURT: Let's continue.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I meant to provide you with a chambers copy of the opening presentation. May I approach?

THE COURT: Please.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, we're going to do that tomorrow morning, putting together all the slides I showed you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, San Diego has a very different view of this case than we do. Their counsel must have said the word "wheeling" at least 100 times during his opening presentation today. Their entire focus was on the wheeling rate that Met first adopted in January 1997. They discussed at length the development of that and they presented their point of view on certain

in 1998. We've put this on the screen here on the far left. This is the November 10, 1998, exchange agreement with San Diego and Met. It was amended in 2003.

The essence of the exchange agreement is that San Diego provides to Metropolitan a quantity of conserved water and canal lining water from Lake Havasu and makes it available on the Colorado River and Metropolitan provides to San Diego a quantity of exchange water at Met's point of delivery in San Diego.

The exchange agreement originally had a price term of \$90 per acre-foot for the exchange water. In other words, the water that Met provided to San Diego was \$90 an acre-foot, and that rate had nothing to do with what Metropolitan's rates were. It was just fixed. \$90. It is a contract. The parties can enter into contracts, they can decide what the price was. That was the price they had decided. In the later years, it would become \$80 an acre-foot. And that was a 30-year fixed term contracts. So had it not been amended, it would still be in effect today and for several decades to come.

Then what happened, in January 2003, Met's unbundled rate structure took effect. Supply rates, we developed the System Access Rate, System Power Rate and Water Stewardship Rate. That's the rate structure that we talked earlier today came back.

129 131

documents that Metropolitan will address later in this proceeding.

It's safe to say that wheeling is the overwhelming theme of the opening statement we heard from the plaintiff today. They talked at lengths about the movement of non-project water through Met's facilities to San Diego. They talked about their agreement with RWD. They said San Diego purchases a quantity of Colorado River transports to Met.

They are referring in their own mischaracterized ways to the exchange agreement that San Diego has with Metropolitan, the one they provide a certain amount of conserved water from IID to Met and in return obtain a quantity of exchange from Met.

Peppered throughout the opening statement from the other side was the occasional conception that technically that's not a wheeling agreement. That's what their entire case is. They are arguing they bring in a quantity of Colorado River water and wheel it through to the Met's system and this is the transaction. There's nothing else they have identified factually that would be a wheeling transaction that San Diego met.

We believe the agreement San Diego has with Metropolitan is totally irrelevant to the challenge under the exchange agreement that was originally entered into In October 2003, San Diego and Met amended the exchange rate between them. It amended a number of things, also changed the price. Instead of being \$90-acre at the time, it would be Met's generally applicable conveyance rates. In other words, the rates that had been in effect since January of that year, as of October, rather than 90, it would just be what those rates were.

The price term for the exchange water was pegged at Metropolitan's generally applicable transportation rates. In our view, and we think this is the correct view, that was just a price term in a contract that the parties had adopted. They both knew what generally applicable rates were because they had took effect earlier in that year. They decided for their various reasons to move from a fixed price of \$90 into have it be the price of the generally applicable rates for most transportation rates.

We believe San Diego's entire focus on the rate was misplaced and the value of the benefits received and referred to the value of the benefits under the wheeling statutes to the water coming in.

And he asked you to compare the value of those benefits to the cost that San Diego was being asked to pay. We think that is a completely invalid comparison.

Pages 129 to 132

What San Diego and Met did in the Met exchange agreement was to have a contract and they simply pegged the price for the exchange water to the generally applicable rates rather than to a fixed dollar amount.

Let me give an analogy for what San Diego is doing when they want you to look at the value they received for the exchange water and the offsetting benefits under Prop. 26.

2.3

San Diego is like someone that borrows money from a friend and agrees to pay the prevailing rate of return on treasury bills for that amount that they owe. Then they complain that the interest rate they're paying doesn't fairly reflect the time value of the money they borrowed. Response you would make is no, the prevailing rate on treasury bills reflects the fair value of rate of return on treasury bills, reason why it's fair to charge you that rate is because the parties agreed to that as a matter of contract.

We believe that the reasonableness of Metropolitan's rates should be evaluated on their own terms, looking at Met's rates, looking at its cost of service, looking at what it returns rather than looking at the exchange agreement and the value of consideration to San Diego in determining whether that is a fair price.

THE COURT: So, you're not -- I take it you're

statement and that they have made on the -- and continue to make throughout this case.

And first is focusing on this change in the exchange agreement, how before the rates were unbundled, there was the fixed price, and then the rates were unbundled and then the parties agreed to peg the price of the exchange water to the unbundled transportation rates. And I'm going to go more into what else happened with that because obviously the unbundled transportation rate is higher than the \$90 before. What was going on?

THE COURT: I take it Metropolitan can change its rates what, on an annual basis?

MR. HIXSON: In recent years it set its rates on a biannual basis. Before that, did it on an annual basis.

So in other words -- maybe I'm anticipating your question -- when they signed an agreement saying they would pay the generally applicable conveyance rates, they would know in the future years, those would be set by the future board and what it would provide is that whatever -- San Diego would pay whatever the other member agencies were paying under those rates.

In brief, going into the negotiations in the 2003 amendments, parties considered option I and option II. Option I was to keep things as is, the 1998 exchange

not suggesting that the analysis stops after -- if I determine that this is just a freely entered into contract, that's not the end of the analysis. Your position is not look here, two responsibility entities, they agreed on \$5, that's their deal, I should just

they agreed on \$5, that's their deal, I should just enforce the contract, I'm not going to look behind the contract. That's not your position?

MR. HIXSON: What we're saying is take the contract, put it aside and don't look at it when you decide if Met's rates are reasonable.

You should look at Met's rates, look at the cost that they recover, look at how they're designed and that's where the reasonableness inquiry should be. Whether that is a fair contractual rate or not is just not relevant to your analysis. It is not part of analyzing whether Met's rates are lawful or not.

In other words, the breach of contract action has been severed. Courts in any event don't really look at the fairness of contracts, they look at the signature line to see people made them and did someone hold a gun to their head. The comparison of San Diego to their benefits has no role in their rate challenge.

And but because San Diego has raised this a number of times, I do want to address some of the arguments that have been built into their opening

agreement which had the initial \$98 per acre-foot for exchange water for the first 20 years, and then the price would go down to \$80 for the last ten years of the contract.

San Diego proposed something called option II and it was a consideration package and it is worth going through these various different parts.

One thing under option II was that Met would assign to San Diego \$235 million in state funding for canal lining and conjunctive use programs, and I'm going to explain what that means in a minute, and that Met would also assign to San Diego 77,000 acre-feet per year of canal lining water for 110 years. And then the third component of option II was that San Diego would pay the Met's conveyance rates for the exchange water.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. I hate to interrupt. He says this is irrelevant. We said it is irrelevant. And now they're going to go through 18 slides about what we've all agreed is irrelevant. I don't really get it.

THE COURT: It may -- this is the benefit of time limits. They impose their own discipline. So if he wants to spend his time doing this, that's fine.

MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor. I would like to explain what the canal lining

water is so you get a sense of what is the water that San Diego is providing to Met under the exchange agreement. And here, I put up a map of a number of canals in Southern California and it is worth explaining what these are.

2.3

On the right, as we've seen before, we've got the Colorado River on the border between California and Arizona. There's the in-take at Lake Havasu and that's Colorado River Aqueduct. This is slide 42.

And the Colorado River Aqueduct goes west, connects to the service area. And you can see on the left-hand side the State Water Project Aqueduct going down the two reaches and Met's distribution system, down further along, continues downward south to the green, the All American Canal comes off the back. So the Colorado River goes into the All American Canal. And off the All American Canal is the Coachella Canal, also green, and it goes almost all the way up to San Diego.

Canals leak water and the amount of water they leak can be affected by the lining that they have. So the canal lining water is the amount of water that would be saved and not leaked when the canal lining is put in with that \$235 million, state funded.

So when we're talking about the canal lining with water in option II, that's what we're talking about,

Met normally when it pays the full service water -- pays full service water. San Diego pays the supply rate for the water resource and they pay the System Access Rate, the System Power Rate and Water Stewardship Rate for the transportation.

But then for the exchange water, there's a credit because San Diego is providing Met a quantity of Colorado River water, so Met does a price discount when it gives the exchange water to San Diego and takes off the exchange charge.

What San Diego is paying are the three transportation rates. And the statement that San Diego made earlier today that although the exchange agreement may not itself be an agreement, supposedly the parties agreed that San Diego would pay the wheeling rate, that's not true.

And we discussed this earlier today, the wheeling rate for transactions of one year or less is the System Access Rate and the Water Stewardship Rate but not the System Power Rate, whereas the transportation rates are what San Diego is paying here, full service minus this, so this isn't -- the wheeling rate is not being paid.

The other reason it doesn't exist, the transaction for a decade, Met's published wheeling rate,

is the water that wouldn't leak, that the Bureau of Reclamation would determine was conserved. This is the package that was in option II. And again, what that did is it changed the price term that initially San Diego paid \$90 per year -- exchange water per acre-foot and Met changed to \$80. And this is the original 1998 exchange agreement.

And we showed here how that changed in the amended 2003 agreement. This is section 5.2, and what it says is that the price of that exchange water shall be \$253 per acre-foot. Thereafter, the price shall be equal to the charge or charges set forth by Met's board of directors pursuant to applicable law and regulation and generally applicable through the conveyance of water by Met.

Now, the \$253 amount, we've explained that by pointing to the final cost of service study over there showing the unbundling of the rates. That was if you add up the System Access Rate and the System Power Rate and Water Stewardship Rate, that's the 253 because in '03, these rates were in effect and saying from that point forward, it would be whatever those rates are going to be set.

We've broken this out into a chart that explains the difference between what San Diego pays to

those are transactions for one year or less. So this is just the full service rate minus supply. It is not a contract to pay the wheeling rate.

San Diego proposed option II because they thought it was a good deal. And this is certainly relevant to the wheeling statute requirement that San Diego receive fair compensation. They are contending in this case they are not fairly compensated under the exchange agreement because the generally applicable conveyance rates they allege are too high.

So Metropolitan took the person most knowledgeable on this question at San Diego and they designated Mark Slater, who is the attorney who negotiated the amendments to the exchange agreement, and Mr. Slater testified that San Diego proposed option II. He outlined what were the elements of option II. And then San Diego chose option II because it believed it was a good deal, and that's relevant to the fair compensation inquiry under the wheeling statute.

I would like to play these clips from Mr. Slater's deposition.

(Video played.)

MR. HIXSON: We believe San Diego has no wheeling statute claim as a matter of law. But if they did, this is the answer to the fair compensation inquiry.

They thought this was absolutely a good deal, this consideration package that they had proposed.

Let's talk more about why San Diego at last acknowledges that the exchange agreement is not a wheeling transaction and that's -- one reason is because it involves an exchange of different water.

Under the exchange agreement, Metropolitan provides exchange water. We quoted from the exchange agreement in the slide itself. The exchange water may have be whatever source or sources and shall be delivered using such facilities as may be determined by Metropolitan.

So there isn't a wheeling of water through Met's system, there isn't a conveyance of non-Met water by San Diego that's delivered to them. What Met gives to San Diego can be from any of Metropolitan's sources, State Water Project, Colorado River. It is not at all the same water or even from the same source that San Diego is provided.

Further, the exchange agreement does not condition the exchange on there being unused capacity, which is again one of the provisions of the wheeling statute. It is uninterruptible, it is firm capacity.

We have another graphic up here, similar to one we showed before that explains how the actual exchange of

on a certain amount of water that's finally determined, the amount after the fact as part of that agreement. It's not different water, it is all the same water and just a price discount reflecting that transaction.

But again, this isn't -- the exchange agreement doesn't transport anything to anyone. It is a way of reducing the price on the quantity of water. But regardless of when San Diego provides that water to Met, Met is constantly 24/7 supplying water to San Diego.

Here, we have a blowup that shows more specifically the facilities involved. We've got Met's distribution system here in purple, and we've got the east branch of the state aqueduct coming in, and then you've got the Colorado River coming in from the east. You can see there's Diamond Valley Lake, which is after both the State Water Project and Colorado River have come into the Met system.

Lake Skinner, which is a blend of State Water Project water and Colorado River water, water that goes to San Diego comes from the Lake Skinner area, or it goes through the Lake Skinner area to get to San Diego. That's where the pipe comes from to get to San Diego and it carries that blend of the water.

THE COURT: Are you going to be introducing any evidence of other situations in California which you

water works, your Honor, approximated exchange agreement and why the wheeling statute is inapplicable.

On the right, you have the San Diego point of delivery and that's at Lake Havasu on the Colorado River and that's where San Diego makes available to Met the conserved water and the canal lining water. And then Met takes it into the Colorado River Aqueduct.

On the bottom left, you see the MWD point of delivery for exchange water in purple and that's where Met delivers exchange water to San Diego.

The timing of these deliveries are different.

Met delivers water to San Diego 24/7, around the year.

It doesn't wait until it gets the water on the Colorado
River to then deliver exchange water to San Diego. What
happened is San Diego makes an estimate of how much water
it's likely to provide in the next calendar year to Met.

Met just continues going on along delivery of water
throughout the year and then after the year is over,
there's a final determination of how much water San Diego
actually did provide to Met and then there may be an
after-the-fact reconciliation.

In other words, Met is just delivering all the same water to San Diego, its blend of State Water Project and Colorado River water 24/7, around the year.

The exchange agreement is just a price discount

would contend truly are wheeling in which it is exactly the same water?

MR. HIXSON: We'll have to consider the evidence. There are a lot of wheeling transactions as entered into, but I don't want to bog down our 12 hours on things that aren't going to be factually similar to this

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HIXSON: So, wheeling under the California Water Code, which is one of the claims that San Diego is alleging in this case, alleging that Met has not been complying with the wheeling statute, wheeling involves the actual conveyance of water. That's what wheeling is defined as in the statute. But as we can see, what is actually happening under the exchange agreement isn't the conveyance of anything, it's not the transportation, it is just a swap of different types of water.

Wheeling under the California Code is only conveyance of unused capacity. But that's not true with the exchange agreement.

And another reason the wheeling statute isn't applicable, wheeling is only when water is provided to whoever. In other words, one party will provide another supplier of water, "please wheel this through your system." But as we see here, it is not what happened.

stem. But as we see here, it is not what happened

It is more an exercise for price discount.

2.3

San Diego has also previously testified about why the exchange agreement is not a wheeling transaction and that testimony is consistent with this slide that we have up here today.

When San Diego entered into its deal with IID to get that conserved water from IID, San Diego and IID need to get approval from the State Water Resources Control Board concerning that change in water. And so the state board held a hearing to evaluate that. And this is a quote from a public hearing before the State Water Board in April of 2002 concerning the approval of that petition.

At that hearing, one person who testified is Maureen Stapleton. She was and is the general manager of San Diego County Water Authority and she was put on the stand by Mr. Slater, who was their attorney and their person most knowledgeable. And you heard an excerpt of his deposition a few minutes ago.

And he asked her to explain the difference between an exchange and a wheeling agreement. And here, we've excerpted her testimony to the state board where she explained that an exchange is radically different than a wheeling agreement. And she identified that it wasn't for space available, it was for firm deliveries.

Project.

And here, I'm citing to an April 5th, 2012 letter to Met's board of directors, and this is from the general manager and the general counsel and they are responding to some of the comments by the San Diego County Water Authority before the board.

And in particular, they're responding to the argument that it is unfair to charge San Diego State Water Project transportation costs because San Diego says that its transaction doesn't have anything to do with the State Water Project. And they respond by saying, wait a second. Metropolitan's ability to blend water from various sources means that the exchange water delivered to San Diego is less saline than the conserved water transferred to Metropolitan at Lake Havasu.

In other words, Colorado River has higher saline, so the blend that Met gives San Diego, including in that exchange water that provides has valuable benefits because it's a combination of these two sources. This is not just Metropolitan's position, it is also San Diego's.

We put up here a presentation by San Diego staff to their board of directors in August of this year, so four months ago in which they provide an update on the Colorado River salinity control, and this is before the

And using the word radical there, she described the differences.

And then Mr. Slater continued to ask her about that. He said, "So in effect, it is different from a Katz Wheeling Law transfer in two regards." Katz was the Assembly member who sponsored the wheeling law. That's -- one is water supply to another. And second, it is firm capacity as opposed to space available. And Ms. Stapleton's answer was, "That's correct."

So we think this helps underscore why San Diego has no wheeling claim in this case. And although they talk about it at length this morning, the wheeling statute at length and they talk a lot about the movement of non-Met water through Met system, they are not pointing to anything factual when they say that. They're not referring to actual transactions within the wheeling statute. This exchange agreement is not one of those transactions. It doesn't come within the terms of the wheeling statute.

I talked a lot about the blend of the water that Met provides to San Diego and how Met blends water from the State Water Project, from the Colorado River Aqueduct. Reason -- there's a reason I'm talking about that. That's because there are differences in water quality between the Colorado River and the State Water

imported water committee at the San Diego board of directors.

In it, the staff summarized the following. Colorado River has relatively high salinity. And the San Diego staff estimated that this excess salinity in the Colorado River causes about \$375 million a year in economic damage.

And then the San Diego staff also identified high salinity can create environmental impacts. And they put up a picture of a rusted-through pipe. I guess we're supposed to infer that was due to the high salinity. And then the farmland with the salt caked into it illustrating the damage that high salinity can cause.

And then the San Diego staff demonstrated how San Diego can control the salinity of the water it gets. They identified that San Diego's goal is to maintain salinity no greater than 500 million grams per liter. And then they specifically noted that the salinity depends on the mix of the State Water Project and the Colorado River water. And this is exactly consistent with what the Metropolitan staff said in San Diego when they said why it is fair to charge San Diego for the State Water Project transportation costs.

And so, when San Diego has talked today about cost causation and about how Metropolitan should provide

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

charges that are commensurate with the cost or benefits it provides, here is an important thing they're overlooking. That water that San Diego receives, that blend of water, including under the exchange agreement isn't the Colorado River water that San Diego provided to Met. Met didn't simply wheel that through its system. What Met provided is something different and more valuable, blend of water that's less saline, which is something that San Diego benefits from and desires to have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

What San Diego is trying to do in this lawsuit is to not have to pay for the cost of the water it receives because in order for Met to provide that blend of water to San Diego, that valuable blend that's less saline, Met must purchase State Water Project water and incur the State Water Project costs to move it down. So it is entirely fair to San Diego to pay those payments.

Again, we think Met's rates should be evaluated on their own. But if you're going to look at the particular transaction with San Diego and address their contention that they're moving Colorado River water, part of the analysis should go into that, what are the real costs Metropolitan incurs to provide the benefits to San Diego and the blend does have benefits and they do have State Water Project costs that Met incurs.

that want to provide an opening statement?

I should at least offer that no one else has volunteered, but I know there are other parties involved.

I take it the answer is no so San Diego will start with their case.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, with your permission, I was going to take another ten minutes of talk, of our time to talk because I think the issues are joined and I think it would be useful time in the case to say exactly how the issues have been joined. But again, with your permission.

THE COURT: Go ahead, although if Mr. Hixson wants to respond, we can go back and forth.

MR. KEKER: We agree with Met's rates in this phase of the case should be evaluated on their own. We agree with that.

We agree with Met that the exchange agreement is irrelevant to this phase of the case. The issue in the first three causes of action is whether or not the System Access Rate, System Power Rate, Water Stewardship Rate as they were set and used as transportation rates in 2010 and again in 2012 were lawful rates when this happened.

Any Southern California member agency, any Southern California rate payor could be here standing in

149

151

I would like to end where I began, which is on the standard of reasonableness because at the end of the day, that is the nature of the Court's inquiry. The Court is not here to decide what is the best rate structure Metropolitan could have or whether this is the only one which could be, or if better one could be imagined.

For an entity Met's size and geographic reach and complexity and given its 26 different member agencies, there are undoubtedly a lot of different ways for Metropolitan to structure its rates. Court should focus whether the rates satisfy the reasonableness and we believe they do and intend to show you that Met's rates should be upheld.

THE COURT: Appreciate that very much. Thank you.

Why don't we take one more short recess of ten minutes and then we'll --

MR. KEKER: What time are you planning to go tonight?

THE COURT: 4:30. We can't go further than that.

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir.

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: First of all, any other parties

front of you saying these rates are not proper, you should send them back and tell them to do that -- do them again. So, if it's San Diego versus L.A., San Diego versus -- this is a challenge to the efficacy of those rates.

We disagree strenuously, though, that this emphasis only on some abstract idea of reasonableness is enough. The law requires reasonable cost of service analysis, it requires reasonable application of cost of service principles. It's not just reasonable in some intergalactic sense.

So, with respect to the water -- State Water Project, very, very briefly could we put back up slide 22 that Mr. Hixson just showed you.

And, Jeff, if you would, this is the State Water Project bill. Would you highlight the tiny type that's illegible? This is a statement of charges. Do you see that line? Blow that up, please.

And it says the statement -- still hard to read. This is a statement of charges referred to in article 29 of your agency's contract for a water supply from the State Water Project. This is a bill for a water supply. Only evidence that they have in this entire record is what they have been beating on, which is the

Department of Water Resources in their bill for their

152

water supply divides Delta water charges from conveyance charges.

2.3

The question -- and our point is this is what I say we're joined. I'm not going to argue this, I'm just going to say it again. Our point is who cares what Department of Water Resources says. Is it reasonable that all of these fixed costs related to the State Water Project are for -- are loaded on to the rate that they're setting for conveying non-Met water through their own system in the -- through the Colorado River Aqueduct and in the yellow?

We think we've shown the only reason that they've loaded that on, the only reason is so that for rate stability so the non-wheelers won't have to pay any more, and we think we've shown that that is an illegal reason.

Now, this distinction about bundling versus unbundling, irrelevant to what we're trying to decide here

We've seen in the 1997 resolution that they decided to keep as much of the State Water Project fixed cost as possible in the -- in the rates. When they're figuring out what to charge for transportation, for non-Met water, let's put the fixed cost in there for the State Water Project. When they unbundled the rates, they

allotment enters, there's water in there. When the Placer water we want to wheel comes in, there's somebody else's water in there. You can't be too literal. Transportation of somebody's water means putting it in a pipe with other people's water and then moving that -- those fungible molecules someplace. And at the other end, you take out what you're entitled to.

So, that's State Water Project. I'm going to stop talking about it.

Water Stewardship Rate joined issue, they didn't address at all. How can 100 percent of conservation be conveyed conveyance to transportation. Can we see their slide 29 and just read it? It's hard for me to read from here, but this is what they said supports them. It says investments in conservation and recycling decrease the region's overall -- investments and conservation recycling decrease the region's overall dependence on imported water supplies from environmentally sensitive areas like the Bay Delta, increasing the overall level of water supply reliability in Southern California.

These are people citing this to prove that putting 100 percent of conservation costs into the transportation rate that you're charging for non-Met water is a reasonable cost of service analysis. And we

did the same thing. They said this is -- we're going to call all of this transportation and we're going to put that into the -- so when -- and when they unbundled, they've admitted over and over again, we've shown the briefs, we've shown the slides and they still say our findings of fact under the wheeling statute that says this is a fair rate is that '97 resolution which is based on rate stability.

Their second argument about using the state -look, they used the state water resources project to
wheel, notwithstanding it's a tiny amount. Answer to
that is feel free to charge anybody that's asking you to
do that what the Department of Water Resources charged
you, which we showed in the contract is an incremental
rate. Instead, they used that, that tiny amount of
wheeled water to justify taking the entire fixed cost in
the State Water Project and dumping them on
transportation rates, including the place where the vast
amount of transportation takes place, the Colorado River
Aqueduct, which doesn't connect with the State Water
Project.

So, in answer by the way to your question about is there any wheeling transaction that doesn't involve blending water, the answer quite obviously is no. These pipes aren't empty. When the orange water that's IID's

submit that they haven't even addressed the issue of the fact that it's a general revenue to pay for local projects and that in terms of proportionality, the fact that they cut San Diego out completely means San Diego's burden is 100 percent and benefit is zero.

And then finally, on dry creek -- dry year peaking, there's a lot of obfuscation there. We assert they agree and they've never addressed the issue that they've never studied it, that they don't know what it is, they don't know what the benefits are. They agree there's no analysis of it. They don't dispute that it is a huge benefit to Los Angeles.

Their answer seems to be well, it looks -- we have got some that says maybe it is a benefit to San Diego as well. Well, so what? If dry year peaking is -- should be calculated and the benefits and the burdens should be analyzed, that affects the supply -- the System Access Rate, where it appears. That means the System Access Rate is wrong and somebody ought to go back and study the benefits from dry year peaking to whoever gets them and figure out how to allocate that when you set the System Access Rate.

So, that's what we're saying. We're saying it is substantial. And we're saying do it right. Their argument is well, San Diego probably gets some benefit

1 1 from it too. So what for this purpose -- for purposes of MR. BRAUNIG: I have a copy for you as well, 2 2 this particular phase of the trial. your Honor. We've also provided a copy to counsel, 3 3 That's all I have. Thank you very much. And opposing counsel. 4 4 now we're going to call --DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 THE COURT: Let me just ask Met if they wanted 5 BY MR. BRAUNIG: 6 6 to also take the opportunity at this moment to say any Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cushman. 7 further words. A. Good afternoon. 8 8 Q. How are you presently employed? MR. HIXSON: No, your Honor. We made our 9 9 opening statement. A. Assistant general manager of the San Diego 10 10 THE COURT: Thank you very much. County Water Authority. 11 Q. How long have you held that position? 11 MR. KEKER: Okay. 12 12 MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, before we bring A. A little over 11 years. 13 13 Q. What responsibilities does that entail, being Mr. Cushman up, I would like to move some exhibits into 14 14 evidence pursuant to the parties' stipulation. the assistant general manager? 15 15 A. My areas of responsibility include the THE COURT: All right, go ahead. 16 16 MR. PURCELL: I don't know what the easiest way externally focused policy areas for the Water Authority, 17 17 our Metropolitan district program, including our imported to do this is. I can list them. 18 18 THE COURT: Is there a stipulation that I water supplies that we obtain from Metropolitan Water 19 19 signed already? District. I oversee the agency's public outreach and 20 20 MR. PURCELL: This is the stipulation about conservation department as well as its lobbying programs 21 21 admissibility of evidence used in the parties' pretrial in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. 22 22 briefs or opening statement. Q. In those roles, have you become familiar with 23 23 San Diego's purchase and transportation of water from THE COURT: I suggest you just read -- you can 24 24 stand here and read it if you want, but reduce it to a third parties other than MWD? 25 25 piece of writing, I'll sign it. A. Yes. 157 159 1 1 MR. HIXSON: We're doing the same thing. O. How so? 2 2 MR. PURCELL: I think writing is easier, your A. First, I supported the general manager {} and 3 3 Honor. We won't waste the time. her team during much of the negotiations for the IID 4 THE COURT: I don't want to use up your time. 4 water transfer agreement, the canal lining agreement as 5 5 MR. BRAUNIG: Good afternoon, your Honor. well as serving as the Water Authority's lead negotiator 6 6 Warren Braunig for San Diego. San Diego calls as its for dry year water transfers. We negotiated with 7 first witness Dennis Cushman. Northern California entities. 8 8 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you will join Q. Have you had any involvement in the setting of 9 9 us up here. Metropolitan's rates over the last -- over the last few 10 10 DENNIS CUSHMAN, years? 11 11 having been called as a witness by the Plaintiff and A. Yes. I've been an active participant at 12 having been duly sworn under the standard oath, was 12 Metropolitan in a series of processes at Metropolitan 13 examined and testified as follows: 13 involving rates, refinement, cost of service discussions, 14 14 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor -general manager monthly meetings with Metropolitan with 15 THE CLERK: If you will please adjust the 15 the other member agency managers. 16 16 microphone and state and spell your first and last name I attend Metropolitan board of directors and 17 17 for the record. committee meetings regularly. I've been involved in --18 18 THE WITNESS: Dennis Cushman, D-E-N-N-I-S, THE COURT: Are you on the board? 19 C-U-S-H-M-A-N. 19 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not a member of the board 20 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, sir. 20 of directors. I am the Water Authority's chief 21 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, I have a binder of 21 representative to a series of processes or committees 22 documents that we're -- rather than having to approach 22 that Metropolitan puts together of representatives from 23 and hand them to him, I'm going to take that up now if 23 member agencies that are not members of the board of 24 that's all right. 24 directors. 25 THE COURT: Please. Appreciate that. 25 // 158 160

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. Through the -- I'm sorry.

A. I also testified extensively at the rate setting hearings in 2010 in which Metropolitan adopted rates for 2011 and 2012, provided written and oral testimony at the public hearing.

I did the same in 2012 during the rate setting hearing held at Metropolitan for the setting of the 2013, 2014 rates and oversaw the efforts of our staff to provide information to the board of directors of Metropolitan.

- Q. Okay. Through those activities, have you become familiar with Metropolitan and its finances?
- A. Yes. I've been involved in Metropolitan matters for approximately 15 years in various processes, particularly more intensive over the last 11 years as the assistant general manager involved in a host of discussions, debates about Metropolitan rates, the appropriateness of those rates, what costs should go into various allocations among the rates throughout those processes at Metropolitan.
- Q. Did you have any involvement in Metropolitan's long-range finance planning?
- A. Yes. In 2007, Metropolitan began an effort to develop a new long-range finance plan that was a process

that

How does Metropolitan provide water to its member agencies that comes from the State Water Project?

A. Metropolitan has a long-term water supply contract with the State of California that it signed in November of 1960.

It became the basis of all subsequent State Water Project contracts that the state Department of Water Resources signed with 27, 28 contractors that entitle Metropolitan up to earn 1.91 million-acre feet of water under that water supply contract. That today is commonly referred to as its Table A Entitlements of the State Water Project water.

- Q. Where does Metropolitan receive that water?
- A. Metropolitan receives that water at two terminal reservoirs on State Water Project system, Castaic Lake on the west branch of the State Water Project and Lake Perris on the east branch of the State Water Project system.
- Q. What about the second category that you mentioned, Colorado River water? How does Metropolitan get Colorado River water into its service territory?
- A. Metropolitan built, constructed, maintains the Colorado River Aqueduct, which takes water off the Colorado River at Lake Havasu, moves it approximately 242

that went through fits and starts over a number of years. There were periods of time where there was an intensive level of activity, a number of regular meetings, monthly, perhaps more than once a month in an attempt to address water rates issues, allocation issues as part of the broader Metropolitan long-range finance plan.

They also had a process such as rate refinement process in which they attempted to grapple with the issues involving where Metropolitan's cost should appropriately be allocated ultimately with a long-range finance plan that went through a series of fits and starts with activity, flurry of activity to no activity.

And ultimately in 2012, they abandoned all efforts to develop a long-range finance plan. And ultimately, no changes came out of any of the rate refinement processes that they undertook, and there's no activity on those today.

- Q. Okay. Based on your knowledge and experience, what service does Metropolitan provide for the citizens of Southern California?
- A. Metropolitan supplies imported water to its 26 member agencies from its two primary sources of supply: The State Water Project and the Colorado River.
- Q. Let's take those in turn. How does Metropolitan supply water to -- state water -- strike

miles to Lake Matthews, the terminal reservoir in the county where the Colorado River flows into and distributes by Metropolitan there to its member agencies.

Q. Can I ask Mr. Dahm to put up PTX 348, which you should have that also in your book, Mr. Cushman, PTX 348.

What does PTX 348 represent?

- A. It is a map of the major water conveyance facilities in California.
 - Q. Where did San Diego obtain this map?
 - A. From the Metropolitan Water District Web site.
- Q. I want to ask you also to take a look at PTX 348, which is a different version -- 348A, I'm sorry. Of the PTX 348A just a cleaned up version of PTX 348?
- A. Yes. It's been reoriented and they deleted the call out of the Bay Delta area.
- Q. Is this a true and correct representation of the major water conveyance facilities in California?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. We would move PTX 348 and 348A into evidence.

MR. WEST: No objection, your Honor.
THE COURT: 348 and 348A are admitted.
(Whereupon Exhibit 348 was
admitted into Evidence.)
(Whereupon Exhibit PTX 348A
was admitted into Evidence.)

//

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

2.3

Q. Mr. Cushman, there's a laser pointer up there. Could you please point the Court on the screen to the Metropolitan's Colorado River Aqueduct?

- A. Yes. The Colorado River Aqueduct is depicted in black, picking up at Lake Havasu and going all the way to Lake Matthews in the Metropolitan service area.
- Q. And when you look up in the legend, how is the Colorado River Aqueduct identified?
 - A. As a local aqueduct.
- Q. And what do you understand that to mean, that it's a local aqueduct?
- A. That it is not a -- neither a state aqueduct or a federal aqueduct.
- Q. Can you use the pointer to direct the Court to the State Water Project and the California Aqueduct?
- A. The State Water Project begins at Lake Oroville and on this map, the line is depicted in green as the California aqueduct in various spurs along the path through Southern California off the State Water Project System, the California aqueduct. And it comes into this area in two locations, Castaic Lake over on the west branch and Lake Perris here, over here. So Castaic and Perris.
 - Q. How is the California Aqueduct identified in

A. No. The only facilities are through State Water Project and ultimately through Metropolitan's facility and Colorado River Aqueduct.

- Q. What are the different mechanisms that Met uses to collect revenues to pay for its costs?
- A. Metropolitan sets various fees and charges, rates and charges. They include rates discussed earlier today, commodity rates such as the Water Supply Rate, System Access Rate, System Power Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate. They have some fixed charges, including the readiness to serve charge, which is commonly referred to as the RTS and Capacity Charge.

They have some property taxes that it collects from within the service area. Then it has small amounts of miscellaneous revenue like interest income and small amounts of de minimis sources of income.

- Q. What you described as commodity rates, could those also be described as volumetric rates?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What is a volumetric rate?

A. It is a rate charged based upon the volume or increment of the commodity you're buying, in this case water and the increments that we sell and buy water at our level as acre-feet of water.

Q. So of the three sources that you described,

the legend?

- A. It's identified in green as a state aqueduct.
- Q. What does it mean to call a State Water Project in California aqueduct a state aqueduct?
 - A. It means it's owned by the State of California.
- Q. Can you use the pointer to direct the Court to the Los Angeles aqueduct?
- A. Yes. The Los Angeles aqueduct is identified in black, begins at the Mono Lake basis and Owens Valley and traverses southward to where it reaches the City of Los Angeles facilities in the City of Los Angeles.
 - Q. And how is that identified on the map?
- A. It's depicted in black and indicates it's a local aqueduct.
- Q. And who gets the benefit of water conveyed through the Los Angeles aqueduct?
- A. The City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power.
- Q. Other than Los Angeles, do any of Metropolitan member agencies have means for importing water into the Met service area?
 - A. No.
- Q. Are there any other ways for a member agency like San Diego to get water into the -- into its own service area, imported water?

fixed charges, property taxes and volumetric rates, how do Metropolitan's revenues break down between those three sources?

A. Metropolitan's volumetric rates generate approximately 80 percent, a little bit over 80 percent of all of Metropolitan -- its revenues come from the volumetric rates. Property taxes generates approximately 5 percent of the Metropolitan's overall revenues.

The RTS and Capacity Charge comprise the rest of the small amount of fixed charges that Metropolitan has along with that miscellaneous income, the interest and income and other small sources of income.

- Q. From your experience working with Met on finance-related issues, does Metropolitan's decision to collect 80 percent of its costs through volumetric rates affect Met's year-to-year finances?
- A. Yes. Metropolitan is heavily reliant on variable sources of revenue in the sale of the commodity. But conversely, its expenses are largely fixed. So 80 percent or more of all Metropolitan's expenses in any given year are fixed expenses, the mortgage, if you will, on its investments and obligation.

And only about 15, 17 percent, perhaps, of their revenues are fixed. So they have this significant disconnect between fixed obligations and fixed sources of

2.3

revenues and instead have heavily fixed obligations and largely variable sources of revenue.

Q. Is it --

1.8

2.3

A. And that becomes an issue in years in which it's wet in the Met service areas and member agencies buy less water. Then Met may budget, and many times has budgeted, and they run a significant deficit in their water sales revenues.

Conversely, in dry years when member agencies that rely on Met for dry year supplies roll onto Metropolitan, Metropolitan may generate more revenue than it budgeted in its budget, so they have wild swings in hundreds of millions of dollars from year to year or over the course of very few short years in their water sales revenues.

- Q. Is Met obligated to collect 80 percent of its revenues through volumetric rates?
 - A. No.
 - Q. What else could they do?

A. They could do any number of things to improve their sources of fixed revenues. They could increase the fixed sources of fixed charges they have today, like their RTS charge, Capacity Charge. They could adopt new fixed charges, customer service charge, demand charges. They could obtain take-or-pay contracts with their 26

member agencies a safe and reliable water supply to support our region's economy and the quality of life for 3.1 million people.

THE COURT: It is just limited to Diego County, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, its service area is roughly the one third of the western portion of San Diego County.

THE COURT: I see.

THE WITNESS: But all service territory is within San Diego County.
BY MR. BRAUNIG:

- Q. Did the Water Authority come to be a member of Metropolitan?
- A. Through annexation. In 1946, during World War II, President Roosevelt ordered the United States Navy to build a pipeline to connect San Diego Navy industrial complex to the recently completed Met Colorado River Aqueduct.

San Diego was short on water. They wanted for the war effort to have imported water brought to San Diego. Navy built that pipeline, and the president encouraged Metropolitan and the San Diego County Water Authority to enter into negotiations for annexation, which ultimately occurred at the end of 1946.

MR. WEST: Your Honor, I'm going to object to

member agencies in which those agencies would make commitments to buy Metropolitan water in the same manner in which Metropolitan is under a take-or-pay contract to buy State Water Project water through its long-term take-or-pay contract.

- Q. Does a member agency have any discretion about paying Met's rates?
 - A. No, not if they want to buy Met water.
- Q. And has San Diego ever asked to opt out from any Met rates?
- A. Yes. In the battle over the rate structure integration in 2011 and after the Water Authority was disqualified from receiving any of the money that it pays in through the Water Stewardship Rate, the Water Authority in formal correspondence to Metropolitan asked Metropolitan that if it was going to deny us the benefit of the money raised through the Water Stewardship Rate, that we should be relieved of paying the Water Stewardship Rate. And Metropolitan's response to that was no, that's not optional. You pay.
- Q. Turning your attention now to San Diego County Water Authority, what's the public mission of the water authority?
- A. The mission of the Water Authority is to provide the San Diego region service area and its 24

this. San Diego presented they wouldn't be presenting evidence about history.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. A little bit of background won't hurt.

MR. BRAUNIG: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. How -- what input does San Diego have to the Metropolitan Board?
- A. The Water Authority appoints four members of the Metropolitan board of directors. Board of directors has 37 members. The Water Authority has four of those members.

Voting on the Metropolitan Water District is not one person, one vote, however. It is a weighted voting system based upon the assessed value of property within the agency from which your directors are appointed and it is a percentage of the whole.

So in the case that San Diego Water Authority, I think our weighted voting percentage this year is about 17 and a half percent.

- Q. Are San Diego's appointed delegates able to bind the Water Authority?
- A. No.
- Q. Who can bind the Water Authority?
- A. The Water Authority board of directors can bind the Water Authority.

Q. Historically where has San Diego gotten its water?

1.5

1.0

2.3

- A. Over the most of its existence, from mid-1940's up until about ten years ago, the vast majority of water that the Water Authority served was purchased water from the Metropolitan water districts.
- Q. Was there an event that caused San Diego to change its approach to where it gets its water?
- A. Yes. California, 1987 to 1992, experienced a prolonged six-year drought on the watershed that serves the State Water Project, produces water for the State Water Project. The Metropolitan Water District imposed water shortages to its member agencies that to the Water Authority amounted to a 31 percent shortage in water supplies to the Water Authority.

Metropolitan was providing 95 percent of all water used in San Diego County, so missing 31 percent of 95 percent of your water supplied, missing about a third of your water supply, those shortages from Met lasted for 13 months. And it was a seriously detrimental period of time for our economy and our quality of life in San Diego. And from that, the Water Authority embarked on a water supply diversification and water supply reliability improvement program.

MR. WEST: Your Honor, I'm going to object and

Our annual reports delineate in great detail in the tables of the reports sources of supply, where we got the water and even how we sell it and divide it among our sales to our member agencies in each and every year.

- Q. And is learning that information and reviewing that information part of your role as the assistant general manager?
- A. Yes, we have all of those records at the Water Authority.
- Q. Have you reviewed those reports in preparing PTX 382?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, what does -- what's the pie chart on the left, the 1991 pie chart? What does that represent?
- A. That represents San Diego County's water supply portfolio in 1991. 95 percent of all the water used in San Diego County in that year came from the Water Authority's purchase of water from the Metropolitan Water District and 5 percent were local supplies. Almost all of that was surface water run-off into local reservoirs owned by other member agencies.
- Q. Okay. Can we get the second pie chart?

 Okay. And the second pie chart, what does the pie chart on the right represent?
 - A. The pie chart on the right represents San Diego

move to strike that testimony. Lacks foundation. It has not been established that the witness was even at the Water Authority at the time in question, or that he has any basis upon which to give the narrative he gave about events that happened in 1987 to 1991. I think that the testimony should be stricken.

THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead.

MR. BRAUNIG: Thank you.

Q. Is there a chart that you developed that conveys the change in San Diego supply portfolio over the years?

A. Yes. It's recreated the water supply pie chart that shows that.

Q. Okay. We've -- you've got in front of you an exhibit that's marked PTX 382. I may also say it's at the very back because it's also a -- it's a new exhibit. It also says SWA 051. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

THE COURT: In view of the objection, you might want to just lay a little bit of a foundation.

MR. BRAUNIG: Sure.

- Q. And how are you knowledgeable about San Diego's water portfolio, supply portfolio from 1991, versus the present?
 - A. Through the records of the Water Authority.

County' water supply portfolio in 2013 and it depicts the diversification of San Diego County's water supply assets over that period of time, a little over two decades.

Q. Okay. Can you walk the Court through some of the -- let's take a couple of them. Take them one at a time.

What percentage in 2013 of San Diego's water was purchased as Met water?

- A. Depicted in light blue on the right, 46 percent.
- Q. Okay. What about the 16 percent, what does the 16 percent that's in the sort of pink part of the chart?
- A. Yeah, down at the bottom of the pie, that 16 percent is our purchases in 2013 of water from Imperial Irrigation District.
- Q. What about the next piece of the pie, the green piece of the pie?
- A. That's the water supply from the canal lining project, lining the All American and Coachella canals.
- Q. And does this chart accurately reflect the change in San Diego's supply portfolio from 1991 to 2013 based on the data that you've reviewed?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. BRAUNIG: We would move PTX 382 into

water is moved by Metropolitan. Does Metropolitan evidence. 2 2 MR. WEST: No objection, your Honor. deliver the exact molecules of water that San Diego 3 3 THE COURT: PTX 382 is admitted. purchases from IID? (Whereupon Exhibit PTX 382 was A. No, that's not possible. admitted into Evidence.) 5 Q. Why not? 5 BY MR. BRAUNIG: 6 A. Well, when the water goes into the Colorado 6 Q. Let's talk a little bit about what's listed 7 River Aqueduct, it goes into the aqueduct along with 7 there as Imperial Irrigation District transfer. 8 Metropolitan's own water off the Colorado River. And What does that refer to? What water does that 9 from there, Metropolitan takes control of the water and 9 10 has total control over the delivery of what water shows 10 A. That refers to the long-term water conservation 11 up at our service connections in San Diego County, except 11 and transfer agreement that the Water Authority and the 12 it has to be a like quantity of water and like quality of 12 Imperial Irrigation District entered into in October of 13 water as that water that was delivered to Metropolitan at 13 2003. 14 Lake Havasu. 14 Under that agreement, the water transfers from 15 Q. Does the IID water -- does the IID transfer 15 IID, that is the Imperial Irrigation District to the 16 water go through the State Water Project? 16 Water Authority ramps up to 200,000 acre-feet of water 17 A. No. 17 per year when it is fully ramped in in 2021. 18 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, I'm looking at the 18 Q. Does San Diego pay for that water from IID? 19 clock and seeing it is 4:30. This is probably a decent 19 A. Yes, we make a payment for each acre-foot of 20 20 place to stop. water to IID under the terms of our contract with IID for 21 THE COURT: We'll get back together at 10:00 21 that water. 22 o'clock. 22 Q. How does the Water Authority get the Imperial 23 2.3 MR. WEST: We have a housekeeping matter for Irrigation District water to San Diego County? 24 24 the Court. We had filed and served a glossary to be use A. We executed the 2003 exchange agreement with 25 25 in the trial and filed and served an amend pretrial brief Metropolitan Water District and under that agreement, set 179 177 1 1 the terms and conditions for Metropolitan to move that in which we put hyperlinks to .pdf's. And we wanted to 2 2 water from the Colorado River to us in San Diego at our provide your Honor chambers copies of those items that 3 3 service connections located approximately six miles into have been filed and served. 4 4 San Diego County from the north -- northern part of THE COURT: Okay. You have a CD? 5 San Diego County. Any objection? 6 6 Q. Is there any other way that San Diego could get MR. KEKER: We would like to look at the 7 7 that Imperial Irrigation District water to San Diego? glossary because I think some of it is argumentative. We 8 8 A. No. will have some objections. 9 9 THE COURT: Have a look and let me know what Q. Can we pull -- can we pull the map back up? 10 10 348A? you think. 11 11 Okay. And can you -- can you, maybe using your See you tomorrow at 10:00. 12 12 laser pointer again, show the Court sort of where the (Proceedings concluded.) 13 13 Imperial Irrigation District, how the Imperial Irrigation ---000---14 14 District water is conveyed to San Diego? 15 15 A. Okay. So the Imperial Irrigation District is 16 16 located in eastern -- southeastern corner of California, 17 17 generally in this area, south of the Salton Sea. 18 18 Imperial Irrigation District's take off the 19 19 Colorado River is located down here. But under the 20 20 exchange agreement, the United States Bureau of 21 21 Reclamation makes that water available, the transfer 22 22 water from the IID, and canal lining water is made 23 2.3 available and diverted at Lake Havasu into the Colorado 24 24 River Aqueduct here. 25 25 Q. Does -- you testified a moment ago that the

180

. 1		
•	State of California)	
) ss.	
2	County of San Francisco)	
3	-	
4		
5	I, Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137, do hereby	
6	certify that I am a certified shorthand reporter; that I	
7	was personally present in the above-mentioned	
8	proceedings; that I took down in shorthand the	
9	proceedings and thereafter transcribed said notes into	
10	longhand; that the forgoing pages constitute a full, true	
11	and correct transcript of the said notes in said	
12	proceedings; and that I have no interest in the outcome	
13		
14	of the case.	
15	Data I. Danami. 10, 2012	
16	Dated: December 18, 2013	
17 18		
19		
20 21	G : I.B. 1	
22	Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137	
23 24		
25		
23		
	181	
	101	

· A	account 29:4 41:22	addressing 98:18	25:5 37:11 38:11	37:17 75:3 81:10
§10 70:1	42:15 61:5,10,10	adjust 158:15	40:8,11 67:24 79:1	82:12,14 101:14
6100 21:7	63:10,15 68:24 116:9	adjustments 91:7	81:8 88:9,12 89:24	102:17 104:1 115:14
6100,000 70:9	116:23 119:8 127:22	Admin 107:10	92:14,21 93:5,24 94:5	162:10
6104 65:25	129:1	administrative 5:16	94:12,18,22 95:17	allocates 9:14 57:1
6136 36:19	accounting 61:2 63:1	7:18,22 10:19 15:14	96:22,24 97:4,14	116:10
6151 20:16	126:12,21,24 127:1,3	25:24 42:11 45:5	106:10 107:13 108:21	allocating 14:24 117:1
2.4 111:12	127:7,11,12,21 128:6	60:20 78:8 81:3	108:25 111:3 114:14	allocation 13:5 30:8
52.82 44:21	128:6,11,13,16,22	90:13 95:14 96:14	115:2 116:24 117:2,7	53:25 57:19,24 64:13
§2.94 72:7	accounts 60:25 62:14	118:10 123:17	117:19 120:4,4,7	67:17,18 98:20,23
§235 136:9 137:23	116:8 117:11 126:10	admissibility 157:21	121:3 129:4 151:24	99:14,15 108:6 118:3
\$244 21:11	126:12,19,22,23,25	admission 64:10	160:15 166:23 170:6	125:14 162:5
\$253 138:11,16	127:1,17	admissions 58:8	172:15	allocations 91:15
\$26 21:15	accurately 176:20	admit 37:7,7 64:23	agency's 42:22 63:24	161:20
	achieve 37:18	admits 63:15	81:22 115:15 152:21	allotment 155:1
527 104:11	acknowledges 52:4	admitted 6:19 47:3	159:19	allows 51:3 67:24 127:
§285 20:5,16	141:4	58:4,21 64:7 154:4	agency-by-agency	alternative 18:24 19:13
§3 72:7	acquisition 100:18	164:22,23,24 177:3,4	94:15,20	22:3 24:13,13,25
630 65:1	acre 88:3	adopt 14:10 29:20	aggregate 51:4 58:15	57:16,24 59:1,2,3
3349 90:20	acre-feet 13:4,14 43:10	169:23	61:21	69:24
837 44:22	65:1 66:13,17,18,22	adopted 22:4 32:4	ago 145:19 147:24	alternatives 57:18,23
\$372 36:12,14,19	66:25 107:1 121:2,23	88:24 95:1,6 129:23	173:4 178:25	Amazon 98:1,3,8
\$375 148:6	136:12 167:24 177:16	132:13 161:4	agree 5:7 9:9 97:7	amend 179:25
§41 44:19	acre-foot 17:17 21:11	adopting 28:6	151:14,16,17 156:8	amended 32:16,18
\$5 134:5	36:19 44:8,16 51:5	adopting 28.0 adoption 43:11 112:9	156:10	99:23,25 114:5 131:3
\$600,000 70:7	61:22 88:2,2 89:18	adopts 14:14	agreed 11:5 25:19	131:19 132:1,2 138:9
\$62 104:15	90:2 92:9 110:24	affect 70:5 111:20	32:25 76:12,13	amendments 135:24
865 44:8,15	119:7 131:11,13,18	168:16	133:17 134:5 135:6	140:14
\$80 131:18 136:3 138:6		afforded 41:1	136:19 139:15	American 60:23 126:2
8800 71:17	136:1 138:5,11 177:19			
\$90 131:11,13,14		after-the-fact 142:21	agreement 13:2 32:17	128:1,10 137:15,16
132:16 135:10 138:5	act 5:16 12:9 25:6 79:6	afternoon 73:1,4,5	32:17,18 61:8 69:12	137:17 176:19
\$90-acre 132:4	114:7	80:24 158:5 159:6,7	77:1,3,4,5,17,18	amount 54:21 74:23
895 17:17	action 33:4 69:3 90:14	agencies 13:18 16:10	96:25 130:7,11,17,23	88:3,4,7 97:17,19
\$98 136:1	95:9 114:5 134:17	16:12,17 17:8 18:6,8	130:25 131:2,4,10	98:2,9 102:12 103:3
abandoned 162:13	151:19	18:13,20 19:11 20:22	133:1,23 135:4,17	115:3 117:15 121:11
ability 106:15 147:12	actions 5:17	21:9,19 22:19 23:10	136:1 137:3 138:7,9	130:13 133:4,11
able 34:21 52:5,8 74:5	active 160:11	23:20 24:3,22 30:1,11	139:13,14 140:9,14	137:19,21 138:16
128:8 172:20	activities 127:6 161:12	30:19,21 31:20 32:22	141:4,7,9,20 142:1,25	143:1,2 154:11,15,19
above-mentioned	activity 9:23 42:5 75:1	40:15,16 57:9 59:17	143:2,5 144:15,20	168:10
181:7	75:6 162:3,12,12,12	59:24 65:11,12 67:7,8	145:3,21,24 146:17	amounted 173:14
absent 16:11	162:17	68:1,17 70:5,8 71:1,4	149:4 151:17 160:4,4	amounts 61:23 116:20
absolutely 46:8 48:25	acts 62:18 116:15 129:2	71:19 77:9 81:3,14	177:11,14,24,25	167:14,16
60:7 141:1	actual 36:14 37:8,10	83:8,11,16 86:14,17	178:20	analogy 97:24 133:5
abstract 152:7	40:9 68:20 141:25	86:24,25 87:4 89:11	agrees 56:20 133:10	analyses 63:20
accept 33:1 40:2	144:13 146:16	89:19 92:10,13,22	aha 126:14	analysis 26:10 37:21
access 7:11,21 33:10	ad 88:17	93:9 94:8,16 95:6	ahead 17:6,22 19:16	40:8 45:15 48:19
34:2,14 35:18 36:17	add 138:18	96:18 99:18 112:8	73:6 151:12 157:15	49:3 51:7,14 52:1
36:23 63:17 64:2,5	addition 60:14 81:11	114:12 115:14 117:10	174:7	54:19 55:2 57:25
69:22 73:20 74:9	93:15 99:14 106:14	117:18 118:4,16,21	air 49:18	59:6 67:5 68:23
76:19 77:22 89:16	additional 12:23 43:1	118:24 119:1,16,19	Alameda 2:13	72:10 100:1 110:14
92:23 93:6,10 95:19	53:23 55:9 105:25	120:11,12,24 125:18	allegations 21:22	124:15 128:4 134:1,
96:5,8 97:13,17,21	110:9,13 111:7	126:4 135:22 150:10	allege 140:10	134:15 149:22 152:9
98:12 103:9 106:11	113:13,21	160:23 162:22 163:3	alleging 114:6 144:11	155:25 156:11
116:18 131:23 138:19	address 18:18 24:6,8	164:3 166:20 169:5,9	144:11	analyze 37:8,10 41:21
139:3,19 151:20	114:18 130:1 134:24	170:1,1 171:1 173:13	allocable 29:24	44:17 70:4
*	149:20 155:11 162:4	175:4,21	allocate 57:6 64:9	analyzed 156:17
156:18,19,22 167:9				
	addressed 107:19	agency 16:13,24 19:6	109:3 156:21	analyzing 134:16
156:18,19,22 167:9 accommodate 63:23 accomplish 85:2		agency 16:13,24 19:6 20:7,24 22:10 23:6,13	109:3 156:21 allocated 9:21 36:7	analyzing 134:16 Angeles 2:14 11:23,24

25:16,17 26:10 35:12	116:9 162:10	Arizona 84:18 137:8	80:11 170:21	band 120:6
64:24 65:2,13,19,20	appropriateness	arose 13:8	attorney 80:20 125:16	bars 76:11
66:1,6,8 67:2,3,3 74:5	161:19	art 89:23	140:13 145:17	Bartle 60:18
83:22 118:3 119:20	approval 145:8,12	article 25:14 100:6	augmentation 111:4	base 110:5,6,16,22
121:12,23 122:5	approve 90:15	101:12 152:21	112:4	111:7 113:3
156:12 166:7,8,11,11	approximated 142:1	aside 134:9	August 64:8 116:6	base-load 34:15,18
166:16,17,19	approximately 6:14	asked 11:7 63:19 90:14	147:23	based 10:17 14:4 19:7
annexation 171:14,23	13:14 66:5,13,14,17	106:16 107:23 108:4	authorities 10:25 62:7	19:10 24:14,21 31:6
annual 19:4 24:20	66:17,25 70:1 83:18	123:7 132:23,24	authority 1:6 13:1 45:2	32:7 39:21 43:12
50:17 115:21 116:8	88:4 161:15 163:25	145:20 170:9,15	71:10,16 80:15 87:15	49:23 50:22 52:6
116:10 117:4 118:5	168:5,7 178:3	asking 8:1,2,4,9,20,21	106:19 145:16 147:6	67:18 70:9 74:21
122:1 135:12,14	April 33:18 50:10	8:25 48:23,24 73:13	159:10,16 170:12,15	75:11 79:20 92:21
175:1	145:12 147:2	73:15,15 78:3 154:12	170:22,23,24 171:12	102:17 111:14 115:14
answer 14:6 31:15 38:3	aqueduct 10:22 11:18	assembly 16:21 18:8	171:23 172:8,10,17	122:8,25 154:7
48:22 63:25 140:25	11:18,19,23 12:2	146:6	172:21,23,24,25	162:18 167:21 172:14
146:9 151:4 154:11	20:14 42:23 44:9,10	assert 77:6 156:7	173:5,14,15,22 174:3	176:22
154:22,24 156:13	46:16 47:5 50:21,25	asserted 28:23	174:25 175:9 177:11	baseline 122:14,16,17
anticipate 77:16	56:5,8 61:18 66:9	assertion 30:3	177:16,22	bases 15:5
anticipating 135:16 anticipation 32:9 50:7	73:23 84:11,14,19,22	assertions 49:5 asserts 81:23	Authority's 160:5,20 175:18	basically 9:9 19:24 23:1 33:7 36:11
anucipation 32:9 50:7 anybody 5:12 36:1	84:24 85:1,5,20,21 86:10,23 93:3 99:6,11	asserts 81:23 assess 37:11	availability 43:12	65:16 79:19 121:22
154:12	99:20 101:21,23	assessed 34:18 85:4	107:5	Basin's 119:18
anymore 27:20	103:19 105:19,20	172:14	available 65:2,4 74:16	basing 21:4
anymore 27.20 anyway 7:8	137:9,10,12 142:7	assessment 15:21 23:18	83:14 92:6 94:19	basis 15:17 27:12 28:7
apologize 73:9	143:13 146:23 153:10	48:8	112:24 113:8 131:7	28:11 30:25 34:5
Appeal 32:1 40:2	154:20 163:24 165:4	asset 67:17	142:5 145:25 146:8	43:21 45:12 50:13
appear 45:4	165:5,9,10,12,13,14	assets 176:2	178:21,23	51:5 54:5,8 55:8
APPEARANCES 2:1	165:16,19,21,25	assign 136:9,12	average 34:15 43:23	79:21 94:15,20
appears 19:17 156:18	166:2,4,4,7,8,14,16	assigned 50:23 61:9	44:17 65:8,11,14,16	100:25 135:12,14,15
appendix 120:22	167:3 171:18 178:24	69:17 70:2	65:17 114:20 116:5	163:7 166:9 174:4
applicable 31:8 32:21	179:7,7	assigns 70:12	117:14,24 118:19,20	Bates 28:1
77:7 90:21 91:5 97:5	arbitrary 59:5,8	assist 15:24	119:1,2,14,14,17,22	Battery 1:24 2:3
123:15 127:17 132:5	arching 119:10	assistant 26:17 52:3	120:2,5	battle 170:11
132:10,14,17 133:3	area 12:3 30:25 46:4,7	80:14 159:9,14	averaged 66:12	Bay 39:9,10,19 155:19
135:18 138:13,14	46:14,25 49:11 55:12	161:17 175:6	averages 119:16	164:15 Payla 20:21
140:9 144:22	55:14 83:21,21,25	assists 57:9	avoid 30:1 40:13	Bay's 39:21
application 8:5 56:4 152:9	84:13,25 85:25 86:5 86:13,15,25 88:17	associated 28:16 63:22 70:13 71:11 92:3,24	103:17 109:11 avoided 17:12 24:14	bear 9:14,21 39:23 68:6 75:4
applies 32:13 33:7 74:2	94:5,21 108:21,22	96:11 101:7 102:5	111:25	bears 9:19 37:4
76:15,16 96:22 107:6	137:11 143:20,21	105:10 115:6 116:10	avoiding 30:20	beating 152:24
126:19	164:15 165:7,22	ASSOCIATES 1:22	aware 22:15 75:15	BEATTY 2:15
apply 8:9 57:2 70:14,19	166:21,25 167:14	Association 60:16,24	AWR 99:12	beg 29:1
72:10 75:9 81:21	170:25 171:6 178:17	61:1 126:10 128:1,10	AWWA 61:4	began 10:11 13:18
82:8 94:16	areas 11:2 86:16 104:7	Association's 123:11		150:1 161:24
applying 74:18	155:19 159:15,16	126:21	B	beginning 7:6 19:17
appointed 172:15,20	169:5	assume 110:7	back 8:13 9:24 11:20	33:12 78:19
appoints 172:8	arguably 64:14	assumed 31:14,15	14:3,4 15:7 24:12	begins 13:22 46:15
appreciate 80:10	argue 22:19,21 42:14	assumes 49:20 118:2,3	32:18 35:17 37:15	165:17 166:9
150:15 158:25 172:3	54:22 59:13 153:4	assumption 49:23	46:9 53:2,2 64:8 68:4	begun 95:4
approach 17:15 21:3	argued 59:13	assurance 24:24	73:12 78:25 99:10	behalf 6:13 77:8 106:24
57:17,19,24 59:1 62:4	arguing 130:18	assure 107:16	109:15 115:17 117:22	behavior 122:6,15,16
64:15 69:25 129:13	argument 39:21 50:6	attachment 71:20	118:15 122:10,11	122:18,23
158:22 173:8	62:25,25 97:25 108:8	attempt 67:15 82:19	129:6 131:25 137:15	believe 6:22 8:18 25:15
approaches 85:23	147:8 154:9 156:25	162:4	151:13 152:2,13	32:22 39:24 48:21
appropriate 51:2 57:7	argumentative 180:7	attempted 162:8	156:19 174:16 178:9 179:21	58:1 59:3 60:13
57:15 61:16 67:20 72:9 122:4	arguments 24:6,8 54:17,20 106:3	attempts 126:5 attend 160:16	background 172:4	75:11,22 76:15 78:7 79:25 80:8 130:23
appropriately 81:10	134:25	attention 5:20 34:11	backwards 38:4	132:19 133:19 140:23
appropriately 01.10	137.23	accidion 3.20 34.11	Date in at as Ju.T	132.17 133.17 140.23
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l
				Page 2

150:13
believed 140:17
belongs 48:11
beneath 89:20 91:3
104:9,12
,
beneficial 38:25
beneficiaries 68:9
benefit 34:23 42:22
43:9 44:1 57:25 58:5
58:9,12,24 63:11,15
67:3 69:10,13 81:9
94:6 107:24 113:7,18
114:15 117:10 127:13
114.13 117.10 127.13
136:21 156:5,12,14
114:15 117:10 127:13 136:21 156:5,12,14 156:25 166:15 170:16
benefits 9:15,23 29:5,6
20.24 21.2 2 27.5 24
30:24 31:2,3 37:5,24
41:24 42:4,8,13 43:17
43:18 45:4,6 56:23
57:17 58:24 59:24
64.24 69.22 72 11
64:24 68:23 72:11
74:5 75:5 82:2
105:18 110:18 112:18
112:20 113:24,25
132:20,21,24 133:8
134:22 147:19 149:1
149:9,23,24 156:10
156:16,20
Bennion 52:2,4
best 6:23 82:21 150:4
better 15:8,10 70:23
150:6
beyond 83:12 106:6
biannual 135:14
big 12:13 33:13 48:8
52:20 56:9 115:23
119:23 123:20
biggest 27:21
bill 49:25 50:1,2 104:11
152.16.22.25
152:16,22,25
billing 62:1
billings 54:5
billion 67:19 72:4,6,7,7
111:12
billions 68:8
bills 54:9 89:11 103:24 133:11,15,16
133:11,15,16
bind 172:21,23,24
binder 158:21
BINGHAM 2:9
bit 60:9 65:16 80:21
91:22 108:11 118:14
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20 177:6
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20 177:6 black 87:19 165:6
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20 177:6 black 87:19 165:6 166:9,13
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20 177:6 black 87:19 165:6 166:9,13 blend 87:1,5,11 99:19
91:22 108:11 118:14 168:5 172:3 174:20 177:6 black 87:19 165:6 166:9,13

```
146:20 147:12,17
 149:4,8,13,14,24
blending 154:24
blends 146:21
blow 11:17 62:16 85:14
 152:18
blowup 86:4 143:10
blue 65:12 85:21 86:6.7
 86:21,22 121:3 176:9
board 14:9,18 28:4
 31:7 45:8 60:21
 70:12,20,21 88:24
 90:14,14,17 95:1,2,9
 95:12 106:2,4 119:4
 123:14 135:20 138:12
 145:9,10,12,22 147:3
 147:6,23 148:1
 160:16,18,19,23
 161:10 172:7,9,9,24
board's 72:8
bog 144:5
boil 82:8
bond 65:22,25
bonds 85:4
book 62:11 127:21
 164:5
border 83:25 84:17
 87:17 137:7
borne 65:5
borrowed 133:14
borrows 133:9
bottom 20:18 38:14
 44:23 51:16,16 71:22
 72:1 87:16 88:16
 121:20,22 142:8
 176:13
bought 13:21,23
branch 85:24,24 86:8,8
 93:14 105:21,22
 143:13 163:17,18
 165:23
branches 105:21
Braunig 2:6 3:4 158:5
 158:6,14,21 159:1,5
 161:1 165:1 171:11
 172:5 174:8,21
 176:25 177:5 179:18
breach 77:11 134:17
break 41:15 50:1 51:9
 80:19,21 129:6,9
 150:24 168:2
breaks 49:24 50:2 54:9
  104:9
Brian 26:15,16 42:17
 69:4
```

brief 6:17 14:13,20

38:5 41:15 129:9

135:23 150:24 179:25

briefing 39:11 **briefly** 152:13 **briefs** 14:11 27:13 154:5 157:22 **bring** 6:9 12:15 39:12 60:2 130:18 157:12 **bringing** 33:4 98:19 **brings** 11:23 broader 162:6 **broken** 91:1 105:12 138:24 **brought** 33:4 77:20,21 171:20 **BROWN** 1:22 **budget** 52:1,16 169:6 169:12 **budgeted** 70:10 169:7 169:12 budgeting 128:22 **Budgets** 11:6 **build** 113:13 114:19,20 114:22 117:13 171:16 **built** 46:13 84:23 85:18 134:25 163:23 171:21 bulk 19:4 24:20 99:18 **bundled** 90:12 97:14 **bundling** 153:17 **burden** 9:16,19 11:3 64:24 68:7 74:22 75:5 76:4 98:4 156:5 **burdens** 9:22 37:5 72:11 156:16 Bureau 138:1 178:20 **busiest** 114:23 **businesses** 81:15 90:1 **buy** 13:22 18:4 19:7 26:23 35:22 36:3 44:13 65:3 83:12 98:1,5,7,8 118:21 119:6 125:19 167:23 169:5 170:2,4,8 buying 10:12 13:18 48:15 114:8 167:22 buvs 88:9 117:15 \mathbf{C} C 2:11,15 4:2 73:2

C 2:11,15 4:2 73:2 C-U-S-H-M-A-N 158:19 CA 1:24 2:4,10,14 caked 148:12 calculate 45:12 63:22 64:23 calculated 31:2 44:5 58:5,9,12 67:4 88:12 100:25 117:21 118:19 156:16 calculates 115:8

calculating 116:7 calculation 32:4 calculations 63:21 calendar 71:16 88:8 115:23 116:1,2,5,14 142:16 **California** 1:1,9 2:13 8:5 10:14 11:2.3.4 13:5 28:5,10,12,15 34:3 43:11 44:6,12 45:3 47:4,9 56:4 61:13 80:25 81:1,17 83:7,9,22 84:8,17 85:7,14,19,20,21,23 86:15 88:5 93:12 94:2 99:6,11 101:5,21 102:9,24 108:23 127:14,15 128:24 137:4,7 143:25 144:9 144:18 151:24,25 155:21 160:7 162:20 163:5 164:8,17 165:16,19,20,21,25 166:4,5 173:9 178:16 181:1 Californians 83:18 call 5:19 30:4 34:11 77:12 80:12,20 100:6 114:3 154:2 157:4 164:15 166:3 called 7:17 10:18 25:19 25:21 37:21 47:16 52:18 55:21 83:10 92:18 100:8 102:1,16 104:18 105:22 110:5 112:4,20 113:17 114:15 115:13 117:4 118:25 122:13 123:9 136:5 158:11 Calleguas 83:22 119:19 calls 33:8 50:10 126:1 158:6 canal 131:6 136:10,13 136:25 137:15,16,17 137:17,21,22,24 142:6 160:4 176:18 178:22 canals 137:4,19 176:19 capacity 21:6 34:13,14 34:14 63:23 64:22 65:4 67:16,19 68:7 69:9 93:9 107:5,7,18 109:9 112:23,24 113:2,8,12,13,14,16 113:20 115:3,4,6,13

115:13,17 116:2

141:21,23 144:19

146:8 167:12 168:9

169:23 capital 54:11 67:20 102:3,11 103:11 104:9,13 109:22,24 110:15 111:1.11.13 111:24 113:4 127:4 capturing 100:20 care 5:3 78:19 cares 153:5 **carries** 143:23 carry 74:22 case 1:7 6:15,23 7:10 7:13,13 8:24 9:4 12:13 32:2,8,9,23,23 39:9,11 40:17,19 41:6 41:7 42:5 46:16 47:10 48:25 69:20 74:21 75:23 76:1 77:11,11,20 78:5 79:19 81:23 87:7 90:5 91:9 110:5,6,11 110:12,16,16,22,22 111:7,9 113:3,4 114:2 119:12 124:22 129:20 130:18 135:2 140:8 144:11 146:11 151:5 151:9,15,18 167:22 172:17 181:13 case-by-case 30:25 45:12 cases 4:17 91:13 Castaic 69:20 163:17 165:22,23 **categories** 50:24 54:10 54:10 60:22 61:18 62:13 125:4 categorization 48:9 categorized 50:19 **category** 50:15 163:20 causal 115:18,19 causation 128:20 148:25 cause 7:4 148:13 **caused** 173:7 causes 148:6 151:19 causing 12:3 39:7 **CD** 180:4 center 2:9 85:22 central 62:24 111:4 112:4 certain 4:25 5:17 8:7 23:22 28:18 46:15 89:3 104:7 105:16 113:4 115:3 129:25 130:13 143:1 **certainly** 8:22 40:3 56:4 73:14 79:14 140:5

certified 1:20 181:6
certify 181:6
CFO 42:17 69:4 78:15
challenge 14:7 76:17
87:21 91:11 130:24
134:22 152:4
challenged 120:23
challenges 91:14 98:19
108:5 114:2
challenging 81:4 98:20
120:20
chambers 6:7 129:12
180:2
chance 64:18 80:13
change 38:4 69:5 70:22
135:3,11 145:9 173:8
174:10 176:21
changed 54:3 121:18
132:3 138:4,6,8
changes 37:19 52:12
53:20 70:15 71:10
115:22 162:15
Chapman 44:3,24
chapter 128:2
characterization 99:1
characterized 61:25
charge 7:21 13:8 15:12
17:16 19:4,10 20:15
24:20,21 29:20,23
34:20 35:19 36:20,21
42:20 47:21 48:3,4
50:20,20 55:2,4 56:13
57:20 63:2 64:3,22,22
69:23 74:23 79:9,10
79:23 88:1,8,11 90:2
92:11 100:7,8,11,21
100:22,25 101:3,10
102:18,22,23 104:10
104:13,19,19,20
105:3,4 115:13,13
105:3,4 115:13,13 117:4,5,17,21 121:10
133:16 138:12 139:10
147:8 148:22 153:23
154:12 167:11,12
168:9 169:23,23,24
charged 41:2 55:8
63:18 69:10 72:12
75:20 89:18 97:19
98:3 154:13 167:21
charges 8:10 10:1,2,4
14:4 15:2,5 16:23
31:7 34:13 48:3,5
50:17 52:9,9 54:11,13
55:9,13 56:2,11,12
57:6 59:23 73:24
78:11 87:22,25 88:7,7
78:11 87:22,25 88:7,7 88:11,13,22 89:2,3,5
89:12,16,21 93:19

```
95:9,13 98:2,3,7
  101:13,17,19,25
  102:12,18 103:1,19
  103:24 112:14,20
  115:12,25 123:12
  125:13 128:2,3,14,18
  138:12 149:1 152:17
  152:20 153:1.2 167:6
  167:7,10 168:1,10
  169:22,24,24
charging 55:10 64:20
  64:21 74:3 78:16
  79:9.11 155:24
chart 3:12 33:11 36:10
  60:25 62:14,18,21
  65:6 88:24 90:12
  120:25 121:1,25
  122:5,8,9,25 126:10
  126:12,18,22 127:1
  127:17 129:2 138:24
  174:9,12 175:13,14
  175:22,23,24,25
  176:12,20
charts 121:21
cheaper 39:13
checked 62:21
chief 26:18 160:20
choice 11:7 12:11,12,14
  13:7 40:8 41:6 58:2
choose 40:11 41:7
choosing 38:16 74:13
  74:15
chose 27:8 41:4 45:6
  120:17 140:17
Christopher 4:21
CHRONOLOGICAL
Chronologically 84:3
chronology 85:6
cite 14:16 15:2 38:13
  42:10 128:17
cited 78:9 79:18
cities 84:25 86:18
citing 147:2 155:22
citizens 162:19
city 26:10 39:12,13,21
  40:18 66:16,21 79:18
  117:15 118:3 126:2
  166:10,11,17
city's 66:6,12,14
claim 28:2 78:1 82:15
  114:3,6 118:1 119:15
  120:8 140:24 146:11
claims 14:6 39:19,22
  47:22 49:16 62:7
  77:21 81:23 82:5
  83:5 124:14 144:10
```

clarified 7:2

```
clarify 25:25
class 79:13,15 125:24
  126:2,4
classes 79:10 125:15,15
  125:18
classification 53:25
  60:13
classified 53:4 125:8
classify 48:5,10 124:20
classifying 48:13 63:3
clauses 28:8
clean 94:19
cleaned 3:11 164:13
cleaning 108:13
clear 7:2 88:10 103:17
clearly 7:19 27:4 48:2
  54:11 61:14 111:21
CLERK 158:15
clips 140:20
clock 179:19
close 14:10 16:24
closely 82:18 83:3
closer 120:7
Coachella 137:17
  176:19
code 5:16 7:18,20,22
  9:11 10:19 17:23
  25:4,23 29:3,9 37:14
  38:19 42:6 45:17
  74:8 75:16 78:22
  95:14 96:14 107:11
  144:10,18
codified 75:15
coding 86:20
COLIN 2:11
collapse 9:5
collect 8:14 167:5
  168:15 169:16
collected 33:8 35:22
  37:10 64:4
collecting 100:19
collection 16:14
collections 16:16
collective 83:8
collects 8:19 167:13
color 86:20
Colorado 10:13 12:1,1
  12:8 13:6 20:14
  42:23 43:3,11 44:6,8
  44:10,14 46:16,18
  56:5,6,8 73:23 79:12
  84:4,7,9,11,12,14,17
  84:19,21,23 86:9,23
  87:1,5,9,12 91:25
  93:2,3,16 99:20
  103:19 130:8,19
  131:7 137:7,9,10,15
  139:8 141:17 142:4,7
```

```
142:13,24 143:14,16
  143:19 146:22,25
  147:16,25 148:4,6,20
  149:5,21 153:10
  154:19 162:23 163:21
  163:22,24,25 164:2
  165:4,5,9 167:3
  171:17 178:2.19.23
  179:6.8
column 71:21
combination 147:19
come 9:24 24:12 36:10
  42:25 109:23,25
  129:6 131:20 143:16
  146:18 168:6 171:12
comes 16:19 46:17.19
  46:21 47:4 55:20
  98:12 113:2 137:15
  143:20,22 155:2
  163:3 165:21
coming 12:1 73:7,11
  86:10 110:22 111:12
  132:22 143:13,14
commensurate 149:1
comment 5:4
comments 147:5
commercial 125:25
commission 53:21
  127:15
commissioned 60:19
Commissioners 60:16
  126:11
commit 19:6
commitment's 26:21
commitments 19:8
  26:23 27:4 78:18
  170:2
committed 24:22
committee 43:4,5
  126:23 148:1 160:17
committee's 43:15
committees 160:21
commodity 167:8,17,22
  168:18
common 9:11 45:17
  79:17,20,22 82:4
  113:11 128:23
commonly 163:12
  167:12
company's 17:12
compare 132:23
comparing 52:14
  110:21
comparison 90:18
  97:20,25 111:6 113:3
  132:25 134:21
compelled 58:2
compensated 31:12
```

```
140:8
compensation 15:2
  29:2,22 30:15 42:1,7
  140:7,18,25
complain 133:12
complaining 24:7
complaint 56:9 114:5
complete 112:24 113:9
completed 171:17
completely 10:4 50:2
  60:3 132:25 156:4
complex 171:17
complexities 82:25
complexity 128:24
  150:9
complicated 81:2
complied 60:17
comply 5:9 71:8
complying 126:7
  144:12
component 69:25 76:12
  104:9,17 136:14
components 17:18
  50:23 76:21 89:7
  96:5 97:11 104:22
  105:2
comprehended 105:4
Comprehensive 124:18
comprise 168:9
computed 17:9
concept 39:6 55:18
  124:20
conception 130:16
concepts 33:22
concerning 82:15 145:9
  145:12
concerns 18:18 108:6
conclude 52:8 70:5
  122:5
concluded 31:24,24
  43:16 111:11 123:13
  180:12
concludes 43:15
conclusion 33:2
conclusions 15:7 37:25
  49:3 52:5
condition 141:21
conditions 23:22 28:19
  178:1
conduct 57:25 68:22
  124:3
conflict 18:18,20 24:10
conflicts 40:7
conjunctive 136:10
connect 154:20 171:16
connecting 85:24 86:8
connection 46:1 59:19
connections 178:3
```

170.11
179:11
connects 137:11
Connie 1:19 181:5,21
consequence 23:22
conservation 35:8 43:9
43:17,20 49:9 56:17
56:21 57:1,3,6,10,21
58:7,19 59:11 60:8,9
74:2 93:22 94:12,24
100:12,13,15,18,21
105:3 108:16:20
105:3 108:16,20 110:9 112:21 155:12
155:15,17,23 159:20
177:10
conserved 43:13
130:13 131:6 138:2
142:6 145:7 147:14
consider 43:7 57:7,16
69:5 144:3
considerable 67:9
consideration 25:11,13
133:23 136:6 141:2
considered 42:2 58:23
110:3 120:7 135:24
considering 95:4
considers 106:5
consistency 127:11
consistent 5:9 25:6 31:8
40:23 60:23 62:13
99:14 123:9,13
124:12,16 125:10,22
126:3 145:4 148:20
constantly 143:9
constitute 97:22 181:10
constituted 66:14
aaa4'44'aa1 92.6
constitutional 82:6
constraint 17:2
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21 125:19
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21 125:19 consumes 94:12
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21 125:19 consumes 94:12 consumption 117:1
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21 125:19 consumes 94:12 consumption 117:1 118:5
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21 125:19 consumes 94:12 consumption 117:1 118:5 contains 49:12,13
constraint 17:2 construct 85:1 109:23 constructed 84:10 163:23 constructing 110:24 construction 10:22 84:4 85:5 102:5 consultant 40:21 56:23 61:16 62:7 124:3 consultant's 15:12 consultants 124:11 consultation 53:13 consulting 15:14 53:7,8 54:4 consumers 94:21 125:19 consumes 94:12 consumption 117:1 118:5

```
contemplated 38:9
contend 82:6 144:1
contended 71:6
contending 140:7
contention 77:2 107:25
  149:21
contentions 14:21
context 94:4
continue 4:17 41:14,16
  59:13 74:14 129:10
  135:1
continued 146:3
continues 84:10 109:3
  137:14 142:17
continuing 84:6
contract 13:10,16 28:9
  28:12,15 47:13,16,17
  48:16 51:9 55:4
  61:20 77:11 78:1
  85:8 99:12,21,24,25
  100:17 101:12,13
  103:23 105:15 131:15
  132:13 133:2,18
  134:3,6,7,9,17 136:4
  140:3 152:21 154:14
  163:5,11 170:3,5
  177:20
contractor 51:8 100:9
  100:23 101:2,14,15
  102:19,25 105:19
contractors 50:18
  85:10,17 100:2 104:2
  107:16 163:9
contracts 17:11 97:2
  131:15,19 134:19
  163:8 169:25
contractual 105:16
  134:14
contrary 14:21 25:22
contrast 114:14
contribute 124:7
contributed 123:25
control 45:25 47:1
  145:9 147:25 148:15
  179:9,10
controlled 96:18 107:1
convenient 41:11,12
conversely 168:19
  169:9
convey 30:11 34:25
  35:5,10 99:6
conveyance 3:10 8:17
  10:12 11:8 12:15
  28:19,20,21,23,24
  29:6,12,17,17,21,21
  29:23 30:5,12 31:11
  31:13 32:21 38:22
```

39:16,20 42:9 45:21

```
45:22,23,24 46:13,14
  46:23,25 49:21,22
  50:24 52:22 55:24
  56:12 58:10,13 59:21
  61:18 70:3 74:24
  77:8 107:18 125:6
  132:5 135:18 136:15
  138:14 140:10 141:14
  144:13,16,19 153:1
  155:12 164:7,17
conveyances 73:22
conveyed 45:9 155:12
  166:15 178:14
conveying 7:16 10:17
  15:6 45:21 49:10
  55:11 68:20 78:12
  95:16 153:9
conveys 174:10
coordination 107:15
copies 4:15,19 180:2
copy 6:7,7 14:22 62:17
  62:18,21 129:12
  159:1,2
corner 178:16
correct 4:9 86:3 132:12
  146:9 164:16 171:5
  181:11
correspondence 170:15
corresponding 71:18
corresponds 66:24
cost 9:5,14 10:2 13:10
  13:25 14:25 17:19
  18:9 20:6 21:3,5,15
  22:9 24:1,21 28:11
  30:10,18 34:4,4,8,12
  34:16 35:1,3,7,21
  36:24 37:3,23 38:1,12
  38:17 40:7,23 41:8,8
  41:23 43:1,18,23
  44:15 45:14,21 48:19
  49:16,19 50:4,9 51:7
  51:14 52:23 53:6,7,25
  53:25 54:19 55:1
  57:17,25 59:1,1,10
  60:22 61:7,12 62:12
  63:16,22 64:4 65:3
  67:5,25 68:7,20,24
  69:5,21 70:13 71:7,10
  71:15,21,24,25 72:1,9
  72:10 74:16 75:1,19
  75:25 76:8 78:12,21
  79:2,5,20 91:15 92:1
  92:15,24 93:1,11,20
  96:10 99:1,15 100:11
  101:1,3,8 103:18,21
  104:9 105:5,6,10
  108:1,10 109:4,15
  111:2 114:7 116:10
```

```
116:11,21 117:6
  118:13 123:6,8,12,24
  124:16 126:13 128:4
  128:4,12,12,20
  132:24 133:21 134:12
  138:17 148:25 149:1
  149:12 152:8,9
  153:22.24 154:16
  155:25 160:13 162:9
costed 115:19
costs 8:15 9:7,21 13:20
  13:21 16:7 17:10,12
  17:17 19:5,25 20:1,14
  21:4 22:12,20 24:14
  25:20 26:13,20,24
  28:12 29:24,25 30:4,8
  30:14,20 31:16,17,25
  32:3 33:8 36:6,16,18
  37:8,17 38:7 40:9,15
  45:20 48:5,14,14,15
  48:19 49:8,25 51:1,4
  51:10 54:5 55:11,16
  56:2,18 57:1,3,11,12
  59:11 60:13 61:9,10
  61:11,17,25 62:1,6
  63:6 64:9 67:20
  68:18,23 69:17 71:11
  71:12,18 72:10 75:3
  76:7 78:18 81:10
  82:2.11 87:13 93:7.16
  93:17 95:23 98:21,25
  98:25 101:7,9,9,12
  103:11,12,12,15,16
  103:18 104:1,8,13
  105:9 108:7 109:8,12
  111:1 112:23 113:2,4
  115:6,7,8,9,11 116:3
  117:12,12 124:21,23
  125:2 126:13,15
  127:8 128:5,22 147:9
  148:23 149:16,23,25
  153:7 155:23 161:19
  167:5 168:15
Council 61:1
counsel 2:1 52:3,16
  129:20 147:4 159:2,3
count 74:5
counted 62:6
counties 86:18
county 1:2,6 13:1 25:18
  26:7 39:2,13 45:1
  80:15 87:15,18
  106:19 121:14 145:16
  147:6 159:10 164:2
  170:21 171:4,7,10,22
  173:17 175:17 176:1
  177:23 178:4,5
  179:11 181:2
```

County's 175:15 176:2 **couple** 4:5 9:3,4 21:25 28:25 40:12 46:21 72:17 78:22 95:24 126:17 176:5 course 27:8 43:24 70:20 73:23 93:13 94:6 113:22 169:14 **court** 1:1 4:4,13 5:11 5:21,23 6:3,11 7:1,5 7:25 8:1,2,9 25:4,11 25:13 31:24 32:1,12 32:24 39:10,18 40:1 41:5,10,13,13,16 46:3 46:10 47:11 72:3,14 72:17,21 73:4,6,9,15 75:14 77:2 80:18 86:1 94:14 95:15 104:21,25 105:3 117:23 121:5,8 129:7 129:10,14,18 133:25 135:11 136:21 143:24 144:8 150:4,11,15,21 150:25 151:12 157:5 157:10,15,18,23 158:4,8,20,25 160:18 164:22 165:3,15 166:6 171:4,8 172:3 174:7,19 176:4 177:3 178:12 179:21,24 180:4,9 Court's 5:9,20 150:3 **courtesy** 4:15,18 courts 81:1,21 82:2 128:24 134:18 **cover** 7:3 26:24 74:25 88:3 91:22 92:25 **covered** 103:10 covers 77:13 83:21 90:4 93:20 108:22 117:6 **CRA** 20:13 create 21:12 112:23 118:7 148:9 created 33:22 42:18 84:6,23 120:15 creates 41:24 creating 113:8 **credit** 29:5 42:8 139:7 creditors 127:10 credits 94:12,21,23 108:16 creek 156:6 criticized 18:12 criticizes 60:21 CSR 1:19 181:5.21 culmination 10:8 current 7:19 16:4 17:5

17:7,19,20 44:5 73:18 88:23 currently 71:12 109:12 CURTIS 1:3 **Cushman** 3:3 80:14 157:13 158:7,10,18 159:6 164:5 165:2 customer 17:15 39:23 39:24 120:1 125:14 125:15,17,24 126:4 169:24 **customers** 39:22 41:2 43:19 64:25 68:13,16 119:6,25 cut 12:20 156:4

D

D 4:2 73:2 **D-E-N-N-I-S** 158:18 **D.C** 159:21 **Dahm** 164:4 daily 6:16 64:19 dam 84:5 101:8 damage 148:7,13 dams 84:5 100:19 **Dan** 2:6 44:3,24 120:10 DANIEL 2:5 dark 11:19 data 37:22 63:20 120:14 122:9 123:1 123:15 176:22 date 100:2 dated 71:9 181:15 day 13:9 18:5 100:14 115:15,18 150:3 **de** 10:15,16,17 55:19 75:13 167:16 deal 33:1 134:5 140:5 140:18 141:1 145:6 **debates** 161:18 decade 14:8 111:12 117:16 118:19,20,23 139:25 decades 109:23,25 110:22 131:20 176:3 **December** 1:14 4:1 15:13,19 38:15 48:8 48:12 53:3,7 73:1 106:20 181:15 decent 179:19 decide 29:20 48:18 75:13 76:13 80:4 83:11 131:16 134:10 150:4 153:18 decided 10:10 12:22 57:6 131:17 132:15 153:21 deciding 15:11

decision 15:17 25:12 58:18 75:10 168:14 decisions 14:4 81:4 declaration 10:18 77:24 declaratory 77:21 declared 60:1 decrease 111:22 155:16 155.17 **deep** 88:4 defend 52:17 **Defendant** 1:10 2:8 defer 112:23 **deference** 48:24,24 49:1 80:3 deferred 111:25 deferring 113:1 deficit 169:7 defined 95:14,18 126:24 144:14 defines 96:15 definitely 46:23 **definition** 29:3 77:5 107:11 delegates 172:20 **deleted** 164:14 delineate 175:1 deliver 93:5 94:4 103:3 142:14 179:2 delivered 17:19 20:6 22:9 88:2 102:13 141:10,15 147:13 179:13 **deliveries** 66:12 119:9 142:11 145:25 delivering 142:22 delivers 66:15 89:18 142:10.12 delivery 92:21 93:8 107:17 126:14,16 131:9 142:4,9,17 179:10 delta 48:3 50:19 100:8 100:10,22,24 101:3,9 104:10,19 105:2.4 107:17 153:1 155:19 164:15 demand 18:25 19:4,10 24:15,20,21 26:22 57:8 66:25 67:16,19 68:13 93:21 94:16 108:10,25 109:6 110:6 111:10,14,20 113:5,11,18 169:24 demands 34:15,18 63:24 71:10 110:10 110:14 111:22 112:6

114:20 115:1 116:3

demonstrate 82:9 demonstrated 62:6 148:14 demonstration 82:17 demonstrative 120:15 **Denham** 36:9 65:6 120:10 **Denham's** 120:14.21 122:9.25 Dennis 3:3 80:13 158:7 158:10.18 denominated 19:11 denominator 115:22.23 deny 170:16 **department** 1:4 11:22 13:10,13 25:17 47:9 47:14 49:24 50:16 54:6 55:3,5,13 61:7 85:8,17 104:6 152:25 153:6 154:13 159:20 163:8 166:17 depend 88:8 dependence 35:15 155:18 **depending** 23:1 35:13 80:21 102:24 103:3 depends 44:18,18,20 148:19 **depict** 87:19 **depicted** 84:14 86:22 165:5,18 166:13 176:9 depicts 176:1 depleting 39:4,4 **deposition** 1:23 11:5 51:25 140:21 145:19 desalination 56:22 94:13 108:18 110:25 described 61:6,11 146:1 167:17,18,25 describes 66:1 107:11 123:23,24 describing 112:18 124:10 **description** 3:8 15:8,10 124:1 126:20 design 16:5,8,25 17:5,8 18:2,25 20:21 21:18 24:15 designated 100:10 140:13 **designed** 27:6 40:10 68:15 108:19 134:12 designs 19:13 24:25 desire 24:4

destination 103:22 detachment 30:9 detail 15:16 27:19 61:19 91:22 106:18 126:24 175:1 detailed 51:2 57:25 determination 8:3 14:24 25:9 42:13.15 107:4 142:19 **determine** 37:8 134:2 138:2 determined 128:21 141:11 143:1 determining 133:24 detrimental 173:20 develop 94:3 161:25 162:14 **developed** 22:5 60:22 60:25 62:14 67:17 109:17 131:23 174:9 developing 92:2 development 15:24 57:9 93:22 94:10 108:13,20 110:9 111:22 129:24 deviate 61:24 **Diamond** 69:19 143:15 dictate 63:1 dictated 128:13 **Diego** 1:6 3:12 4:22 5:8 6:11,14 8:1 10:7,10 10:13 11:7,8 12:14,16 12:19,25 13:1,1,6 14:21 18:14 32:16,25 33:3,13,17,21 35:25 36:10 43:7,20,22 45:1 54:22 56:8,9 60:2,5 60:20 62:25 64:25 65:13 67:11 68:16 70:6 71:6 77:1 80:15 81:23 83:24 84:20 87:4,10,11,13,15,18 87:20 91:17 96:2 97:9,16 98:11,19 99:17,18 106:3,14,16 106:19,24 107:12,23 108:6 111:5 112:5 114:2,11 115:21,24 116:8,12 118:1,5,12 119:17,22 120:8,13 120:20 121:4,11,16 121:18,22,25 122:6,7 122:10 123:2,21 126:5,14,18 127:20 129:19 130:7,8,12,22 130:23 131:3,5,8,9,12 132:1,24 133:1,5,9,24 134:21,23 135:21

136:5,9,12,14 137:2 137:18 138:4,25 139:2,7,9,11,12,15,21 140:4,7,12,15,17,23 141:3.15.16.19 142:3 142:5,10,12,14,15,19 142:23 143:8,9,20,21 143:22 144:10 145:2 145:6,7,16 146:10,21 147:5,8,9,14,17,22 148:1,5,8,14,15,21,22 148:24 149:3.5.9.11 149:14,17,20,24 151:4 152:3,3 156:4 156:15,25 158:6,6 159:9 164:9 166:24 170:9,21,25 171:4,7 171:10,16,19,21,22 172:1,6,17 173:1,7,17 173:22 174:10 175:15 175:17,25 176:2 177:18,23 178:2,4,5,6 178:7,14 179:2,11 Diego's 4:20 34:24 41:23 55:22 65:15 82:15 83:5 87:7 90:6 107:21,24 118:8 119:15 122:16,20 123:4,19 124:14,22 125:16 129:2 132:19 147:21 148:16 156:4 159:23 172:20 174:22 176:7.21 differ 81:11 difference 52:21 65:18 110:15 111:11 119:21 120:24 123:1 128:15 138:25 145:20 differences 81:20 118:6 146:2,24 **different** 27:25 54:10 65:16 79:9,13,14,15 81:23 83:1 86:18 89:8,11 91:13,19 99:9 100:14 101:18 102:18 103:1,7 104:1 108:20 116:13 122:2,6,8,18 122:19 124:20 125:1 125:5,6,9,15,17 128:11 129:20 136:7 141:6 142:11 143:3 144:17 145:23 146:4 149:7 150:9,10 164:12 167:4 **differently** 82:22 104:2 differs 33:24

direct 3:4 70:17 159:4

165:15 166:6

desires 149:9

desiring 18:13

despite 124:14

directors 14:10,18 28:4
88:24 95:1,9 106:2
138:13 147:3,23
148:2 160:16,20,24
161:10 172:9,9,15,24
disagree 152:6
discipline 136:22
disconnect 56:10
168:25
discount 43:22 139:8
142:25 143:4 145:1
discourage 22:23 25:22
26:14 27:10 37:13
49:4 78:10,17
discourages 27:7 74:7 78:16
discovered 50:5
discovery 58:4
discretion 170:6
discriminatory 79:18
discussed 40:19 124:19
129:24 139:17 167:7
discusses 125:14
discussions 95:5 160:13
161:18
dismissed 32:8,9
displace 18:6 19:1,11
20:9 21:10 23:21
39:16
displaced 16:13
displacement 21:13
22:8 23:2,9 24:17,22
displacing 20:23 21:20
23:13
disproportionate 41:2 disproved 120:8
disproved 120.8 disproven 118:8
dispute 8:7 10:8 14:5
77:4 156:11
disputed 8:6,8
disputes 43:2
disqualified 170:13
distance 100:23 102:17
104:4
distances 81:16
distant 81:18
distinction 46:11,12
54:8 153:17
distinctions 115:24
distinguish 86:6 127:4 distinguishing 26:19
46:3,24
40.5,24 distort 22:22
distributes 164:3
distribution 10:23 11:1
34:2 54:8,15 86:11,16
87:2 93:8,25 94:7
95:16 103:20 108:24

```
109:1 111:1,2,17
 112:7 113:5,13
 114:23,25 115:9,12
 115:20 125:8 137:13
 143:12
district 1:9 2:8,13
 10:21 11:14 13:3
 28:5 39:11.19.23
 40:19 41:4,25 80:25
 81:15 83:24 121:13
 159:17,19 164:10
 172:12 173:12 175:19
 176:15 177:7,12,15
 177:23,25 178:7,13
 178:14,15
District's 178:18
districts 173:6
Districts's 7:11
diversification 173:23
 176:2
diverted 178:23
divide 61:17 175:3
divided 119:2
divides 85:23 153:1
division 59:8 90:22
divisions 53:23
document 14:17 19:16
 21:24 27:23 43:14,16
 65:22 106:17
documented 94:25
 95:11
documents 5:24,25
 49:2,3 63:20 130:1
 158:22
Doest 62:17
doing 19:24 70:15,16
 74:13 94:6 114:12
 121:24 133:6 136:23
 158:1
dollar 133:4
dollars 13:12 60:5
 67:22 68:8 98:9
 104:22 169:13
dotted 65:8 87:16
double 92:6 119:13
downward 137:14
draft 43:21
drain 108:25
dramatic 71:14
drawn 54:8
drink 89:23
drought 12:5,17,18
 35:13 68:8 69:16,17
 69:25 92:4,5 114:15
 173:10
dry 34:21 35:14 63:10
 63:12,13,16,24 64:9
 64:13 65:2,4,18 66:22
```

66:24 67:8,14 68:23 69:8,12,16 74:6 82:15 114:3,7,8,16 118:1 156:6,6,15,20 160:6 169:9.10 dry-year 34:13,14 **DTX23** 14:21 38:14 due 18:9 19:1 20:10 24:16 25:11.13 38:12 116:3 148:11 duly 158:12 **dumping** 154:17 **DWR** 48:4,16 50:2 51:2 51:4 54:9 61:8,17,19 61:20 62:6 70:13 99:22 101:14 103:23 104:6,9 107:16 E

E 1:3 4:2,2 73:2,2 e-mail 51:16 62:9,11 123:20 124:8 earlier 39:10 43:4 46:4 91:24 93:4 99:16 105:21 116:17 122:7 131:25 132:15 139:13 139:17 167:7 earn 163:10 earthquake 117:9 easier 158:2 **easiest** 157:16 easily 67:21 east 83:24 85:24 86:8 86:10 93:14 105:21 143:13,14 163:18 eastern 83:23 178:16 easy 59:7 economic 18:6 20:9 21:9 22:7 23:21 33:23 110:18 148:7 economy 39:1 171:2 173:21 effect 8:23 32:16 33:20 68:7 90:8,16 91:10,15 95:7 112:15 122:13 131:20,22 132:6,15 138:21 146:4 **effective** 14:11 32:11 88:25 90:25 125:17 **effectively** 7:15 35:12 effects 110:21 efficacy 152:4 effort 43:20 161:24 171:20 efforts 161:9 162:14 either 5:4 12:8 21:13 54:7 62:18 72:5 electricity 101:8

elements 64:5 95:3 140:16 eliminating 22:7 else's 155:3 Embarcadero 2:9 embarked 173:22 embodied 10:18 emergencies 117:13 emergency 117:9 123:10 emphasis 93:23 152:7 **emphasize** 9:18 80:5 96:1 97:8 emphasized 75:7 employed 159:8 empty 154:25 encourage 20:19 108:13 encouraged 171:22 **encourages** 27:5 94:10 ended 19:23 124:1 endorsed 38:9 ends 35:20 51:22 energy 93:11,17 enforce 134:6 engaging 122:6 engineering 53:23 **enormous** 81:16 85:5 85:18 98:4 102:8 108:22 ensure 16:6 18:4,5 30:15 ensuring 31:10 entail 159:13 enter 97:2 131:15 171:23 entered 12:25 13:2 32:16 96:19 130:25 134:2 144:5 145:6 177:12 **enters** 155:1 entire 27:1 49:12 115:23 120:18 124:9 129:22 130:18 132:19 152:23 154:16 entirely 124:8,16 149:17 entities 81:11,21 109:25 125:21 126:19 134:4 160:7 **entitle** 163:10 entitled 77:23 155:7 entitlement 28:16 **Entitlements** 163:12 entity 113:15 150:8 environment 39:1 environmental 128:18

environmentally 155:19 equal 138:11 equally 59:16 equate 116:6 equivalent 25:21 26:8 26:19 27:5.9 erroneous 84:22 **especially** 81:12 110:3 **ESQ** 2:5,5,6,6,11,11,15 essence 131:4 essentially 52:11,15 105:1 establish 8:22 34:7 **established** 19:3 24:19 76:18 83:7 123:15 174:2 establishing 8:16 24:9 establishment 10:24 18:24 24:14 estimate 67:16 142:15 **estimated** 67:18 148:5 estimates 111:13 estimating 45:6 estimation 89:23 estoppel 64:14 evaluate 21:14 22:2 72:11 145:10 evaluated 21:8 133:20 149:18 151:15 evaluating 23:20 **evaluation** 19:17 22:2 123:6 event 55:18,23 134:18 173:7 **events** 174:5 eventually 77:13 everybody 4:24 13:24 27:6 56:20 72:21 79:10 129:8 everybody's 4:16 40:25 **Evid** 3:8 evidence 4:8,25 6:19 25:12 37:16 49:13 54:21 78:7,8 113:22 124:6 143:25 144:4 152:23 157:14,21 164:20,23,24 172:2 177:1,4 exact 59:15 179:2 **exactly** 6:5 105:7 117:25 144:1 148:20 151:9 **Examination** 3:4 159:4 examined 38:10 158:13 **example** 19:3 24:19

49:15 54:20 82:1

96:24 97:3 106:20

148:9

117:15 125:13 exceed 75:18 76:8 79:2 exceeds 75:25 exceptions 86:23 excerpt 104:5 145:18 excerpted 145:22 excess 10:2 148:5 excessive 18:12 22:18 23.6 **exchange** 25:8 31:10 32:17,17,18 70:7 77:1 77:3,17 99:17 120:13 121:6 130:11,14,25 131:2,4,8,10,11 132:2 132:9 133:1,3,7,23 135:4,7,25 136:2,15 137:2 138:5,6,10 139:6,9,10,13 140:9 140:14 141:4,6,7,8,8 141:9,20,21,25 142:1 142:9,10,14,25 143:5 144:15,20 145:3,21 145:23 146:17 147:13 147:18 149:4 151:17 177:24 178:20 exchanged 77:15 exclude 4:25 excluding 5:1 excuse 10:9 29:1 36:12 47:25 57:16 136:16 executed 177:24 executive 16:3 exercise 80:1 105:13 145:1 exhibit 3:9,11,12 42:22 43:6 51:12 120:10 164:23,24 174:15,16 177:4 exhibits 3:7 6:18 42:10 42:11 44:1 157:13 exist 5:24 139:24 existed 120:18,22 122:11 existence 173:3 **existing** 33:24 37:19 120:20 122:3,13,22 122:23 exists 63:25 115:4 expanding 111:2 expansion 102:5 112:23 expect 78:2 expected 111:21,22 expenditures 16:7 127:4 expense 54:9 99:2 103:10 111:13 expenses 54:6,14 102:3

102:5,10,17,21 103:6 105:23 106:5,6 110:16 111:7,11 116:20,20 118:7 127:5 168:19,20,21 expensive 18:3 experience 16:14 162:18 168:13 experienced 173:9 **expert** 36:9 52:19 60:19 118:11 120:10 expertise 81:7 experts 25:18,19 26:8 118:8 **explain** 36:10 86:20 88:13 91:22 100:12 136:11,25 145:20 explained 108:11 138:16 145:23 **explaining** 16:18 137:4 explains 72:8 128:3 138:25 141:25 explanation 15:17 expressed 4:22 12:10 expressly 9:13 extends 83:25 extension 99:4 extensively 161:3 externally 159:16 extra 90:1 107:7 125:12 extremely 122:9

faced 15:11,11 facie 75:23 facilitate 17:24 25:7,14 31:9 32:5 109:9 113:20 **facilitates** 37:13 74:8 facilitating 22:16 facilities 3:10 7:17 8:11 11:1,11,12 12:8,15 28:18 32:20 35:1,2,6 35:11 41:20 45:10 47:12.23 48:20 49:11 49:20 50:21 54:12,13 54:23,25 59:21 67:9 67:21 76:9 78:13 81:7,9 85:19 86:11,13 92:1,24 93:1,2 96:16 96:17 99:4,4,11 100:12 102:4,6 103:10,13,20 105:10 105:17,24 106:12 107:9,14,23 109:22 110:23 111:1 114:22 115:10 116:20 117:13

130:6 141:11 143:11 164:8,17 166:11 167:1 facility 38:22 39:20 84:22 94:1 102:9 108:24 109:1 114:25 167:3 facing 81:2 fact 5:23 6:1 10:20 27:14 28:7 41:23 49:23 60:1 64:25 88:11 97:12 99:17 105:13 106:6,16 117:10 119:15 121:24 143:2 154:6 156:2,3 facto 10:16.17 factors 111:19 128:25 facts 8:6,8 63:20 80:5 factual 8:3 75:10 118:2 118:9 146:15 factually 87:10 130:21 144:6 fail 20:24 21:21 failed 41:21 fails 34:7 114:6 fair 7:7 9:21 10:5 15:2 29:2,22 30:15 34:2 37:4 42:1,7 75:4 78:11 97:20 133:15 133:16.24 134:14 140:7,18,25 148:22 149:17 154:7 fairest 64:14 fairly 18:11 31:11 120:6 133:13 140:8 fairness 134:19 fall 89:4 **false** 60:13 familiar 25:5 39:10 106:14 159:22 161:13 family 44:20 famously 12:20 far 5:25 10:2 14:3 36:9 78:9 86:24 92:20 101:1 102:25 126:16 131:1 farmland 148:12 favor 49:13 favorable 43:11 favorably 23:5

46:6 84:22 165:14 Federation 128:18 fee 75:19 78:25 feel 79:23 80:22 154:12 fees 34:17 105:25 128:14 167:6 **feet** 163:10 fell 21:11 Fernando 120:2 **field** 4:24 5:7 **fight** 121:9 **figure** 8:20,21,24 13:19 47:21 70:18 77:13 78:21 156:21 **figured** 115:16 **figuring** 20:12 153:23 **filed** 5:14,24 7:13 64:8 179:24,25 180:3 filing 4:16,18 60:4 filings 6:1 **fill** 44:13 **final** 4:8 112:14,19 138:17 142:19 finally 21:2 23:8,16 31:5 78:22 143:1 156:6 finance 53:22 161:23 161:25 162:6,11,14 finance-related 168:14 financed 16:17 finances 161:13 168:16 **financial** 11:3,6 16:15 26:9,18 29:14,18 30:1 30:20 38:18 39:6 52:1 62:5 67:25 financing 124:19 128:18 find 8:10 12:23 29:10 127:10 **finding** 15:7 31:6 **findings** 14:15,23 25:9 27:14 28:7 37:22 38:6 41:21,22 154:6 **finds** 31:7 fine 129:7 136:23 finger 114:11 fire 126:2 **firm** 17:10 20:8 40:22 141:23 145:25 146:8 **first** 8:1 10:10,15 14:2 14:13 15:23 17:18 19:19 29:8 33:2 38:17 42:17 48:24 51:6 66:4 71:2,21 80:13 82:23 84:4 85:9 96:2 98:18.24 102:1,3 103:2 108:5 109:6,17 114:18

116:16 118:9 121:16 126:17 127:18 129:23 135:3 136:2 150:25 151:19 158:7,16 160:2 fiscal 66:3,4,11 **fish** 17:10,17 38:24 fits 112:11 162:1.11 **five** 32:25 33:2,2 66:11 88:18 **fixed** 13:10,20,21,25 16:7 19:4,5,25 22:12 24:19,20 25:17 26:13 26:20,23,24 28:11,11 30:4 31:16 35:1,3 36:6,16,18,24 45:20 48:19 55:11 56:11 63:6 67:17 68:18 73:19 76:7 78:18 88:6,7,10,11,13,22 89:3 115:12 117:3,3 128:2,3,5,21 131:14 131:18 132:16 133:4 135:5 153:7,21,24 154:16 167:10 168:1 168:10,19,21,24,25 168:25 169:1,21,22 169:22,24 fixing 28:5 **flat** 65:14 118:6 **fleshed** 123:18 fleshing 123:16 flex 69:13 **flexibility** 19:14 25:1 flexible 70:13 **Floor** 1:24 flow 94:22 flows 23:17 164:2 fluctuation 40:25 flurry 162:12 flushes 115:24 focus 89:6 116:4 119:24 128:1 129:23 132:19 150:12 focused 159:16 focusing 91:23 106:18 116:12 122:3 135:3 **follow** 61:14 63:2,3 78:17 following 15:25 20:17 51:19 148:3 **follows** 158:13 foot 61:21 88:3 force 50:8 68:16 forecast 20:20 21:17 forever 56:10 88:11 forgoing 181:10 form 85:2,13

FCS 67:10 118:11,14

118:22,25 120:1

Feather 85:12

feature 96:13

features 14:7

fed 50:8

February 116:6

federal 11:17,21,22

formal 95:2 170:15 141:20 150:21 157:7 179:6,7 guide 124:18 125:23 119:18 135:10 147:16 formation 23:14 **future** 4:15 32:20 60:3 going 4:25 6:3,8,18 7:4 **guidelines** 5:10 60:24 highest 118:23 121:11 **formed** 84:24 110:7 111:20 135:19 9:24 10:8 14:1,3,18 123:14 124:13 highlight 19:20 36:25 forth 124:6 138:12 135:20 15:4,9,15 18:2,3,19 gun 134:20 66:2 152:16 highlighted 66:4 95:8 151:13 18:20,21 19:5,7,8,16 guy 62:17 forward 80:15 109:22 \mathbf{G} 104:7 106:1 19:21,22 27:18,20 Н 111:14 112:9,11 **G** 4:2 73:2 highlighting 66:20 28:8 29:20 30:3,5,7 113:3 138:22 game 58:16 33:20 34:21 35:17 **half** 6:15 14:8 57:20,21 highlights 67:12 gap 121:19,21 forward-looking 111:7 37:15 39:14 42:24.25 66:18 172:19 **highly** 16:8 24:2 68:14 general 14:14 15:1 hand 54:20 158:23 hired 25:18 40:22 forwarded 62:19 44:13 45:11 48:17 26:17 38:8 52:3,15 51:20 53:15 57:20,20 handful 37:25 **found** 40:23 62:9 122:9 67:10,10 120:10 **foundation** 174:1.20 59:17 71:3,3 75:20 62:25 64:17 69:5 handle 114:20,23 hires 40:20 four 19:21 42:12 44:1 76:2 80:14 106:22 72:15 73:12 74:20 117:13 **Historically** 173:1 74:7 91:14 147:24 145:15 147:4,4 156:2 76:21 77:16 78:21 happen 12:24 116:24 history 39:3,8 40:3 172:8,10 159:9,14 160:2,14 80:12 85:22 87:17 happened 12:22 14:1 172:2 Francisco 1:2,24 2:4,10 90:2,3 92:25 94:1 32:10 58:3 91:14.17 hit 120:5 161:17 175:7 generally 22:10 32:21 102:9 103:10 110:8 131:21 135:8 142:15 181:2 Hixson 2:11 4:11 5:5,5 144:25 151:23 174:5 free 35:13 55:2 80:22 58:9,13 63:2 77:7 117:17 129:15 134:6 5:14 6:4,10 80:23,24 93:9 109:8 113:12 87:1 132:4,10,14,17 135:8,10,23 136:6,10 happening 144:15 86:2 94:16 104:24 133:3 135:18 138:14 154:12 136:18 137:12 138:22 happens 91:11 114:21 105:1,6 117:25 121:6 140:9 178:17 happy 5:4 7:3 73:7 **freeing** 113:19 121:9 129:11,19 142:17 143:24 144:6 generate 56:22 168:4 hard 86:6 152:19 freely 134:2 149:19 151:7 153:4,5 134:8 135:13 136:24 friend 40:20 133:10 169:11 154:1,2 155:8 157:4 155:13 140:23 144:3,9 front 152:1 174:14 generates 168:7 158:23 165:6 170:16 harmless 17:1 18:9,19 151:12 152:14 157:8 20:25 21:22 23:3,24 **full** 18:16 22:6 42:23,25 **geographic** 94:5 150:8 171:25 173:25 158:1 getting 10:1 11:7 33:16 24:10 27:7 31:19 44:8,12 90:19 91:3 **good** 4:4 6:13 72:14,16 **hold** 17:1 18:18 23:3,23 97:12,22 139:1,2,21 48:7 60:6 24:10 27:6 40:4 41:1 72:20 73:4,5 80:24 38:11 40:5 41:1 give 6:4 23:13,20 25:11 140:5,18 141:1 158:5 hat 28:14 29:10 140:2 181:10 64:15 134:20 25:13 49:1 97:24 fully 114:7 177:17 159:6,7 Honor 4:10,11,12 5:5 hate 136:16 function 69:18 70:1.2.3 133:5 174:4 gotcha 52:20 Havasu 84:12,18 131:6 5:14,22 6:10,12 9:1 70.14 92.16 given 8:16 16:25 37:9 gotten 90:6 173:1 137:8 142:4 147:15 41:17 58:16 70:21 76:20 82:24 88:8 **functional** 40:5 50:24 governing 82:24 163:25 165:6 178:23 73:5 80:17,23,24 98:2 52:9 60:22 61:17 89:1 94:14,21 98:3 government 9:11,18 179:14 107:5 129:11,15,19 62:13 125:4 150:9 168:21 10:25 42:5 45:17 head 51:25 52:16 136:16,24 142:1 functionalization 53:15 gives 139:9 141:15 75:6,16 78:22 82:23 122:21 134:21 151:6 157:8,12 158:3 147:17 125:21,23 126:1 hear 126:7 53:22 158:5,14,21 159:2 glossary 179:24 180:7 **functionalizations** governmental 9:23 heard 123:4 125:16 164:21 171:25 172:5 53:14.17 go 5:7 7:25 11:13,20 61:2 130:4 145:18 173:25 177:2 179:18 functionalize 51:3 15:15 18:15 19:19,22 grams 148:17 hearing 4:8 32:6 40:21 180.2 23:25 27:17,18 28:1,3 graphic 101:21 141:24 123:3 145:10,11,14 124:20 Honor's 9:2 functionalized 52:8 28:25 31:21 44:13,17 grapple 162:8 161:6,8 **HONORABLE** 1:3 53:24 54:7,14 60:10 great 175:1 hearings 40:19 161:4 46:9 54:2 56:18 Hoover 84:5 70:18 73:6,12 90:16 **heart** 34:1 **Functionalizing** 51:1 greater 19:12 21:12 hope 6:16 7:25 15:15 103:6,7,16 104:16 **HEATHER** 2:15 functionally 30:10 24:24 102:20 106:11 hoping 62:22 functions 81:10 125:1,5 107:10 109:15 116:7 111:21,25 116:13 heavier 116:3 Horn 12:13 125:9 127:3.9 135:8 136:3 117:1 148:17 heavily 168:17 169:1 horse 53:1 136:18 149:22 150:19 held 18:9 20:25 21:22 fund 56:16 111:10 greatest 82:22 host 161:17 31:19 38:11 77:12 fundamental 43:7 150:21 151:12,13 green 11:18,21 88:16 hour 6:14 72:18 156:19 157:15 161:19 137:14,17 165:18 145:10 159:11 161:8 127:19 hours 144:5 **funded** 58:11,14 94:20 174:7 179:16 166:2 176:16 **help** 113:20 **household** 44:18,20 109:7 111:8 113:19 **goal** 31:17,18 37:18 groundwater 31:4 39:4 **helpful** 73:10 106:9 113:25 137:23 148:16 56:22 83:13 108:14 helps 146:10 **households** 81:15 88:5 funding 59:18 60:3 God 12:3 **group** 15:13 67:10,10 hereinafter 28:21 90:1 94:17 136:9 goes 10:24 13:23,24 118:11,12,14 120:1 high 22:23 40:13 housekeeping 179:23 fungible 155:6 140:10 148:4,9,11,13 huge 13:9 97:19 108:23 17:4 18:11 21:14 guess 105:9 148:10 funny 102:14 24:5 27:3 29:10 64:1 guidance 99:15 123:9 higher 13:20 17:20 156:12 further 59:22 110:6 74:11 92:15 137:10 123:10 126:6 127:3,7 18:3 20:7 22:10 37:2 hundreds 13:12 67:22 137:16,18 143:19,20 116:24,25 117:17 169:13 112:3 123:17 137:14 129:4

hurt 172:4
hydroelectric 61:19
hyperlinks 180:1

idea 9:24 12:10 59:4 105:4 152:7 Ident 3:8 identical 51:21 identified 91:24 110:23 110:25 111:15,19,21 111:23 113:6,17 125:4 130:21 145:24 148:8,16 165:9,25 166:2,8,12 identifies 126:1 identify 63:20 110:20 113:4 identifying 125:23 ignore 45:7 ignored 42:13 ignores 74:4 **ignoring** 45:13 68:25 126:18 II 20:12 22:25 70:15 135:25 136:5,8,14 137:25 138:3 140:4 140:15,16,17 171:15 **IID** 13:7 32:1,19 43:10 43:13,17 44:12,16 45:2 130:13 145:6,7,7 160:3 177:15,18,20 177:20 178:22 179:3 179:15,15 IID's 154:25 III 21:9 23:8 70:17 illegal 26:11 37:1 38:17 40:6 45:19 63:9 68:21 73:16,18 74:1 75:10 77:23 153:15 illegality 63:5 illegally 33:15 illegible 152:17 illustrating 148:13 imagine 97:25 imagined 150:7 imminently 98:23 **impact** 8:18 16:23 21:23 26:9 33:24 117.20impacts 20:25 70:6 148:9 **impair** 19:12 24:23 **Imperial** 13:3 176:15 177:7,12,15,22 178:7 178:13,13,15,18

Imperial's 13:5

implemented 91:16

implementing 75:15 imply 124:8 **important** 7:24 8:25 9:12 15:5,16 16:5,19 17:2 73:10 87:7.22 90:5 96:1,14 127:11 128:7 149:2 imported 148:1 155:18 159:17 162:21 166:25 171.20 importing 166:20 impose 136:22 **imposed** 12:13 37:5 173:12 **imposes** 9:25 10:3 61:12 imposing 10:2 impounded 85:12 improper 36:5 improperly 40:6 **improve** 169:20 improvement 173:24 in-take 137:8 inapplicable 82:7 142:2 incentive 18:6 20:9 21:10 22:7 23:21 94:23 incentives 108:17 incentivize 93:22 94:17 94.22include 7:20 29:24 35:1 35:3,6,11 39:6 45:23 48:18 64:2 78:11 107:13 159:15 167:7 included 31:25 32:3 59:15 69:25 includes 22:19 47:22 57:2 73:19 76:6 97:10 98:10,13 107:22 108:3 121:6 including 29:14 30:12 30:14 31:9 34:1 38:13 46:5 54:22 57:2 64:5 77:22

81:19 84:8 95:19

110:23 111:3 112:22

113:24 115:23 120:12

147:17 149:4 154:18

167:15,16 168:11,12

96:16 107:8,17

159:17 167:11

inclusion 38:7 76:11

income 39:24 88:15

inconsistent 16:20

incorporating 53:20

incorrectable 26:11

168:12

incorrect 62:4

increase 39:22 40:14 66:24 71:18 169:21 increased 16:11 69:16 increasing 155:20 increment 167:22 incremental 17:9,16 21:3,17 23:11 24:1 55:4.8.8 154:14 incrementally 20:20 increments 167:23 incur 149:16 incurred 22:20 30:10 62:1 incurs 87:12 101:11 149:23.25 independent 49:16 50:11 51:22 52:18 75:11 80:1 124:6 **INDEX 3:1,7** indicate 44:5 indicated 50:22 indicates 166:13 indicating 85:14 individual 58:10 68:1 84:25 90:21 industrial 125:25 171:16 industry 60:12 61:24 62:4 71:8 81:13 99:15 123:9.14 124:12 126:6 ineligible 60:3 infer 148:11 information 42:16 63:21,25 124:2 127:12,12 161:10 175:5,6 infrastructure 81:16 86:11 110:21 111:24 112:6 initial 17:8 70:6 109:21 136:1 initially 138:4 **injure** 31:12 **injuring** 29:13 38:23 39:20 **injury** 29:14,18 30:1,20 38:18,18 39:6,25 40:5 innocuous 124:8 inordinately 35:13 **input** 172:6 inquiry 82:4 134:13 140:19,25 150:3 inside 46:14 instance 94:2 127:18 institutional 126:1

integrated 16:21 18:8 99:8 109:16,18 111:18 integration 170:12 integrity 16:15 **intend** 150:13 intensive 161:16 162:2 interest 133:12 167:15 168:11 181:12 **interesting** 66:3 69:2 119:5 121:15 122:10 123.22 intergalactic 152:11 **International** 15:20 interpret 8:7 interpretation 76:25 interpretations 126:23 interpreted 82:3 interrelated 87:23 interrogatory 63:19 64:4 interrupt 136:17 interrupted 7:3 interruptions 6:25 introducing 143:24 introduction 4:8 invalid 8:11 75:24 79:21 132:25 invalidate 49:14 investment 67:9.18 88:14 112:21 **investments** 155:15,16 168:22 investor 127:16 invoice 50:19,22 104:6 105:8 invoices 51:2,4 invoke 108:4 **involve** 154:23 involved 143:11 151:3 160:17 161:14,17 involvement 160:8 161:22 involves 7:10 81:6 141:6 144:12 involving 160:13 162:9 Invo 79:18 IRP 109:21 112:12 113:2 **irrelevant** 50:3 77:20 77:25 78:6 130:24 136:17,18,19 151:18 153:18 **Irrigation** 13:3 176:15 177:7,12,15,23 178:7

178:13,13,15,18

issue 5:3 13:8 14:2

68:8,9 114:16

32:22 33:13 65:25 67:13 75:13 76:11,13 76:14 87:6 89:7 90:4 151:18 155:10 156:1 156:8 169:4 issued 48:8 65:22 85:4 issues 15:10 34:24 81:2 107:17 151:8,10 162:5,5,9 168:14 item 69:3 95:10 itemized 62:1 105:12 items 5:15 180:2

J 1:19 181:5,21 **JACKSON 2:6** Jamie 51:17,18 **JAN** 1:22 **January** 14:9,11 64:1 88:25 90:9 91:1 112:16 116:5 129:24 131:21 132:6 **Jeff** 11:16 19:19 27:17 46:9 152:15 **Jeffrey** 106:22 jeopardize 24:9 jeopardizing 18:16 **job** 44:11 69:1 75:22 128:9 **John** 2:5 6:13 ioin 158:8 joined 85:2 151:8,10 153:4 155:10 **joint** 64:7 jour 10:16 Judge 1:3 31:24 judgment 8:3 80:1 judgments 80:6 judicial 5:15,18 56:25 64:14 81:3 jump 17:5 19:16 118:4 118:4 127:22 **jumping** 17:22 jumps 28:14 **June** 51:17 52:4 62:10 66:11 112:13 justification 55:17 56:1 iustifies 49:7 justify 55:10 154:16

K

KARNOW 1:3 Katz 146:5,5 Kay 31:24 keep 9:1 42:25 70:15 79:7 135:25 153:21 keeping 65:4 keeps 7:25

insurance 19:13 34:20

35:13,16 63:13 67:2

Keker 2:3,5 4:10 6:12 6:13 7:7 41:12,17 46:8,12 72:4,15,19 73:5,7,11 78:25 129:15 136:16 150:19 150:23 151:6,14 157:11 180:6 kev 108:18 109:14 Kightlinger 106:22 **kind** 4:18 114:15 115:2 121:18 kinds 39:5 64:18 knew 45:5 132:13 **know** 4:16 7:3,10 10:7 15:5 31:23 32:6,12 39:4 60:1 64:7 89:12 89:15 108:2 119:13 127:8 135:19 151:3 156:9,10 157:16 180:9 **knowing** 34:20 knowledge 162:18 knowledgeable 140:12 145:18 174:22 known 78:14,15 90:12 knows 32:24 77:2 95:15 105:11 107:6 L

L.A 114:12,12 117:15 119:22 121:25 122:15 122:18 123:2 152:3 LA's 26:8 labeled 90:21 labels 33:21 Lacks 174:1 **Laguna** 10:18 laid 74:11 lake 69:19 84:11,18 85:13,14 101:5,7 131:6 137:8 142:4 143:15,18,20,21 147:15 163:17,18,25 164:1 165:6,7,17,22 165:23 166:9 178:23 179:14 lakes 84:6 language 51:11,20 52:15 76:20 77:7,13 123:25 124:7 large 81:16,20 83:21 86:12,14 89:4 97:22 108:23 116:19 117:15 119:16 largely 168:19 169:2 larger 97:5 104:3

largest 119:6,25 120:6

laser 165:2 178:12

late 84:5 law 8:5,9,12,12 9:11 25:7 31:8 32:1,13 41:20 45:17 47:10 59:22 72:9 74:17 79:17,20,22,23 80:4,7 80:9 82:5 138:13 140:24 146:5,6 152:8 lawful 8:17,22 134:16 151:22 Lawry 25:19,24 lawsuit 60:2,5 89:7 91:11,18 149:11 lay 6:15 174:20 lead 16:6 23:2,8,10 40:24 160:5 leading 112:15 leads 37:15 leak 137:19,20 138:1 leaked 137:22 learning 175:5 lease 25:8 31:10 led 109:17 left 87:17,24 101:20 103:8 125:6 131:2 142:8 175:14 **left-hand** 137:12 **legal** 9:1 26:10 29:13 31:12 35:8 38:18,23 39:20,25 42:12,14 50:7 58:18 75:13 76:11,13 79:25 80:6 82:24 83:2 **legend** 11:16,17 165:8 166:1 **legislative** 39:3,8 40:2 Legislature 40:1 83:8 length 129:24 146:12 146:13 lengths 130:5 lessen 18:25 24:16 lesser 116:13 let's 11:20 19:19,22 25:2 27:16,16 33:5 41:16 44:25 51:11 72:20 73:6 89:6 99:21 101:18 103:5 129:10 141:3 153:24 162:24 176:5 177:6 **letter** 70:24 71:2,3,9 90:14 92:19 106:1,19 106:24,24 107:20 147:3 **letting** 100:19 124:11 level 4:23 5:7 70:10 155:20 162:3 167:24 levied 59:16 75:20 76:2

lasted 173:19

life 100:14 171:2 173:21 light 62:10 176:9 lighting 86:5 likewise 81:4 limine 4:20 64:11 limit 52:5 limited 34:2 171:4 limits 136:22 line 65:8,12,19 78:19 84:15 87:16,19 121:3 134:20 152:18 165:18 lines 46:5 86:7 87:16 93:4 94:1 lining 131:6 136:10,13 136:25 137:20,21,22 137:24 142:6 160:4 176:18,19 178:22 link 113:23 list 157:17 listed 87:23,25 88:6 91:4 125:5 177:6 listening 78:5 lists 125:15 liter 148:17 literal 155:3 literally 120:3 **litigation** 50:8 120:9 little 60:9 65:16,20 67:25 80:21 86:6 108:11 118:14 121:23 159:12 168:5 172:3 174:20 176:3 177:6 living 74:20 LLP 2:9 load 25:20 59:11 **loaded** 36:15 153:8,13 **loading** 26:12 63:5 68:18 loads 26:20 **lobbying** 159:20 local 9:18 11:19 31:3 49:9 56:16,21,23 57:9 74:2 83:12 93:22,23 94:3,4,9 108:12,13,19 110:8,18 111:22,25 114:9 156:2 165:10 165:12 166:14 175:19 175:20 located 85:17 178:3,16 178:19 locations 81:18 86:18 115:18 165:22 logic 92:4 long 43:18 72:19 84:11 110:1 159:11 long-range 161:23,25

long-term 163:4 170:4 177:10 longer 91:4 96:24 100:17 **longhand** 181:10 longstanding 43:2 **look** 6:6 10:10 14:18 15:4 19:21 20:15.17 21:25 22:15 25:10 27:16 40:1 42:2,4 50:9 52:14 71:2,20 80:15 87:15 97:18 98:4 99:21 104:10,14 104:16 109:22,25 113:3 116:1 117:22 119:6.21 121:21.25 122:23 123:20 127:7 127:20 133:6 134:4,6 134:9,11,11,12,18,19 149:19 154:10 164:11 165:8 180:6,9 looked 22:25 27:13,23 42:2,7 48:12 53:3 58:15 60:11 109:21 110:5 115:17 118:15 118:22 120:19 122:11 **looking** 6:5 60:15 111:14 112:11 122:4 133:21,21,22,22 179:18 looks 156:13 Los 2:14 11:23,24 25:16,17 26:10 35:12 64:24 65:2,13,18,20 66:1,6,8 67:2,3,3 74:5 83:22 118:3 119:20 121:12,23 122:5 156:12 166:7,8,10,11 166:16,17,19 lose 8:24 loses 39:23 82:23 loss 20:10 39:24 losses 19:1 24:16 lost 20:22 21:19 90:6 **lot** 9:3 34:21 49:14 65:21 77:16 102:8 144:4 146:13,20 150:10 156:7 low 22:23 94:22 lower 23:4,5 24:9 119:20 lowering 18:17 M

M1 123:11 128:1 magnitude 36:4 45:6 67:15 mail 92:19 maintain 16:15 44:8 148:16 maintaining 63:22 92:2 101:7 maintains 163:23 maintenance 54:13 101:8,23 102:7,8,12 103:12 104:17 127:5 major 50:14 164:7,17 majority 56:2,7 89:4 97:23 173:4 making 25:12 31:18 42:14 46:11,12 54:17 115:22 125:9 128:16 management 15:13,20 15:25 57:8 93:21 94:17 108:10 109:6 110:7,14 111:10 113:18 127:9 manager 11:6 26:18 71:4 80:14 106:22 145:15 147:4 159:9 159:14 160:2,14 161:17 175:7 managers 160:15 mandate 32:5 manner 9:13,20 25:6 31:3 51:1,3 61:11 75:2 170:2 manual 123:11 126:21 128:1,3,11,17,18 map 3:9 46:9,10 73:22 83:20 84:15 87:14 137:3 164:7,9 165:18 166:12 178:9 March 61:6 71:9 90:13 95:2 margin 25:21 26:8,19 27:5,9 Mark 140:13 marked 6:7 174:15 market 21:11 22:22 23:2,14,22 110:18 113:12 Marketers 22:21 match 58:16 matrix 26:25 27:3 78:15 matter 5:25,25 32:1 59:10 80:9 92:20 100:24 101:1 102:12 133:18 140:24 179:23 matters 50:1 107:19 121:17,20 161:15 **Matthews** 164:1 165:7 **Maureen** 145:15 MBS 25:19,24 McCUTCHEN 2:9

162:6,10,14

mean 13:1 18:5 45:22 70:18 86:16 88:7,10 88:21,21 126:15 165:11 166:3 meaning 16:4 102:10 108:18 118:19 meaningless 54:18 means 26:3.4 32:23 40:14 68:2 77:19 80:4 83:10 88:1 89:23 94:5 96:15 100:13,13 102:15 105:20 113:14 114:19 115:1,9 126:13 136:11 147:13 155:4 156:4,18 166:5,20 meant 129:11 mechanisms 20:21 21:18 167:4 meet 34:15 110:2 115:1 115:10 meetings 160:14,17 162:3 member 13:18 16:9,11 16:13,16,24 18:5,8,12 19:5,11 20:3,7,24 21:6,9,19,21 22:9,19 23:6,13,20 24:3 30:1 30:11,19 31:20 32:22 37:11 38:11 42:22 59:17,23 63:24 65:11 65:12 68:1 70:5 71:1 71:4,19 77:8 83:8,11 83:16 86:14,17,24,25 87:4 88:9,12 89:10,19 89:24 92:10,12,14,22 93:5,9,24 94:8,18,22 95:6,17 96:18,22,24 99:18 107:13 108:21 108:24 111:3 112:8 114:14 115:14,14 117:1,7,10,18,19 118:4,16,21,24 119:1 119:18 120:2,11,12 120:24 121:2 125:18 126:4 135:21 146:6 150:9 151:24 160:15 160:19,23 162:22 163:3 164:3 166:20 166:23 169:5,9 170:1 170:6 171:1,12 173:13 175:4,21 members 9:14 12:19 13:19 20:22 29:7,19 30:7 31:19 33:15 35:9.12 36:2 41:25 70:24 160:23 172:8 172:10,11

memo 44:24 memorandum 26:15 27:1,2 42:21 mention 80:2 107:10 mentioned 163:21 mentioning 25:2 merit 82:16 met 7:10,15 8:10,10,11 8:14,19,21 9:6,13,15 9:25 10:3,15,19,19 11:6,10,12 12:7,17 13:7,8,9,12,15,21,23 14:3,5,18 15:5,11,22 18:4 24:19 26:18 27:8 29:6 31:16,23 32:1,2,8,19,22 33:15 35:8,11,11,13,14,22 36:3 37:25 38:3 41:20 42:18,20 43:16 43:16 44:18,20 45:5 45:23,24,24 46:3,6,17 47:5,11,15,20 48:5,23 49:17,19,25 50:4,6,7 50:22 52:3,16,25 53:8 55:2,14 56:2,7 57:4 58:4 59:16 60:1,21 61:7,10,17,20,23 63:10,12,14,15 64:8 65:20,21 66:1,7,10,12 67:9.13 68:22 70:21 70:24 71:4 73:16 74:17,22,24 76:4 77:1 77:8 79:6 81:15 83:7 83:9,14 84:9,9,12,23 85:9,23,25 87:11,24 88:16 89:15,18,21 90:10 91:5,24 92:5,20 93:7,13,15,16 94:4,6 95:3,11,13,18 96:18 96:19 97:2 99:3,21 101:11 102:13,19 103:23 104:6,22 105:9,11,13,15,23 106:2,4,7,9,11,16,23 107:2,3,24 108:3,23 109:3,23,24 110:5,10 110:12,14,20,25 111:6,11,14,19,23 112:20 113:12 114:6 115:1,8,11,16,19 116:9,15 120:4,12 121:3 123:5,25 124:1 124:2,6,10,17 125:2,3 125:11,12,17,20 126:7 127:14,17 129:23 130:9,13,14 130:22 131:3,12 132:1 133:1,1 136:8

136:11 137:2 138:5 138:15 139:1,7,8 141:15 142:5,6,10,12 142:16,17,20,22 143:8,9,17 144:11 146:14,21,21 147:17 149:6,6,7,13,15,25 151:17 157:5 166:21 167:4 168:13 169:5,6 169:10,16 170:8,10 171:17 173:19 176:8 Met's 10:12 11:8 12:15 13:18 25:19 26:12 29:7 32:20 33:8,19 35:1,1,3,6 36:22 37:19,23 41:18 43:5 43:22 45:9,18,21,22 46:5,13,23,24 49:22 52:22,23 53:14,20 54:20 55:11 56:17 59:20 61:8,16,20 62:4 62:5,7 63:7 68:15 69:1 71:6,7 73:21 78:9 80:8 83:4 84:19 86:11,17,24,25 87:9 87:22 88:20,24 89:1,8 90:7 91:16 92:1,4,11 93:25 95:16 96:15,16 98:12,21,25 99:8 103:6.20 107:8.10.12 108:10,22 109:18 110:7 111:23 112:7 112:19 113:5 116:21 119:6,9 120:20 123:6 123:12,24 124:3,15 125:18 130:6,20 131:9,21 132:4 133:21 134:10,11,16 136:15 137:13 138:12 139:25 141:14 143:11 147:3 149:18 150:8 150:13 151:14 168:16 170:7 Met-owned 78:12 method 23:20 24:1 25:21 26:8,19,21,22 27:4,6,9 38:10 methodology 52:7 69:6 71:7,11 123:6,8,13,24 124:16 **metric** 87:25 Metropolitan 1:9 2:8 2:13 4:23 5:6 7:18 8:4 10:9 11:14 16:14 17:4,8,13 19:2,3 20:10,18,19 21:16 23:3,9,11,14,21 26:9

44:7 54:5 55:5 64:12 64:15,17 66:7,16,23 67:1 69:13,18 71:9 80:25 83:6.16.20 84:2 85:2,7 86:19 88:9 94:25 101:16 102:10 103:4 107:22 111:20 114:8,25 117:7,11,11 119:24 120:3 126:3 130:1,12,24 131:5,8 135:11 140:11 141:7 141:12 147:15 148:21 148:25 149:23 150:5 150:11 159:17,18 160:12,12,14,16,22 161:4,8,11,13,14,18 161:21,24 162:6,19 162:21,25 163:2,4,10 163:14,15,21,23 164:3,10 165:7 166:19 167:6 168:6 168:10,17 169:11,11 170:2,3,15,16 171:13 171:22 172:7,9,12 173:6,12,16 175:18 177:25 178:1 179:1,1 179:9,13 Metropolitan's 14:7,9 16:1,4,15,22,25 17:2 17:10,11,19 18:7,17 20:7 21:10 22:6,8,10 24:17 28:19 29:12 30:9.12.13.14.19.21 31:11,13 34:1 53:19 60:22 71:14,18 82:10 82:12,19,25 86:5,13 88:19 95:14 97:23 103:8 106:15 107:14 109:15 113:17 118:13 118:16 131:14 132:10 133:20 141:16 147:12 147:20 160:9 161:22 162:9 165:4 167:2 168:2,4,8,14,20 170:19 179:8 Mexico 84:1 microphone 158:16 mid-1940's 173:3 mid-1990s 109:17 miles 87:18 164:1 178:3 million 13:14 20:20 21:15,17 65:1,25 70:2 71:16,17,22 72:1,2,3 72:5,5 83:18 104:11 104:15,19,20 136:9 137:23 148:6,17 171:3

30:24 31:2,14 41:25

million-acre 163:10 millions 13:12 60:5 67:22 169:13 mind 7:25 9:1 40:1 121:18 minimis 55:19 167:16 minimum 79:11 104:16 minor 52:12 70:6 88:14 91.7 minus 139:21 140:2 minute 14:19 15:10 22:16 26:4 29:15 40:22 47:13 51:21 61:4 120:17 136:11 minutes 72:18 145:19 150:18 151:7 **mirrors** 124:9 miscellaneous 167:15 168:11 mischaracterized 130:11 misdescribed 96:2 misplaced 132:20 misrepresentation 64:12 missing 12:21 173:17 173:18 mission 170:22,24 misunderstanding 103:17 mix 81:9 86:21 89:2 148:19 molecules 155:6 179:2 moment 15:4 157:6 178:25 money 8:19 19:9 39:17 97:17,19 133:9,13 170:13.17 Monica 94:2,3 Mono 166:9 monopoly 10:16,16,17 **month** 44:19,21 45:3,3 162:4 monthly 19:4 24:19 160:14 162:3 months 147:24 173:20 morning 4:1,4 6:13 84:21 114:16 122:7 129:16 146:12 Morro 39:9,10,18,21 mortgage 168:21 **motion** 4:20 **motions** 64:11 motivation 72:13 mountains 93:14,15 102:24 move 21:6 56:3 63:8 86:17 93:16 94:7

28:3,5,15 29:9 30:10

99:2 105:11,17,25 106:7 127:20,25 129:5 132:16 149:16 157:13 164:19 174:1 176:25 178:1 moved 116:25 179:1 movement 130:6 146:13 moves 163:25 moving 49:19 58:21 76:10 102:23 107:2 149:21 155:5 multiyear 96:25 Municipal 83:23 121:13 **MWD** 5:15,16 14:13,14 14:20,23 43:19,21 50:22 51:3,4 63:21,23 64:1 68:14 142:8 159:24 MWD's 38:7 43:18 67:16,24 **MWDOC** 121:13

N N 2:13 4:2 73:2 name 110:12 158:16 narrative 174:4 **narrow** 120:6 NARUC 60:15,17 61:1 61:4,15 62:15,16,21 63:2,3 126:9,11,18,22 126:23 127:1,17 National 60:15,25 61:1 126:10 nature 54:9 99:1 128:22 150:3 Navy 171:15,16,21 near 43:1 nearly 65:3 necessarily 24:23 necessary 29:25 30:15 30:18 33:23 37:2 74:25 107:15 need 4:16,19 16:16 51:18 57:11 63:14 68:3,4 73:9 81:17 109:23 145:8 needed 10:10 45:13 66:8,18,19 needless 27:23 needs 7:2 12:19 115:16 negative 20:25 21:22 negatively 16:23 negotiate 97:4,7 negotiated 97:3 140:14 160:6 **negotiating** 43:4,5,15

negotiations 135:23 160:3 171:23 negotiator 160:5 neither 78:11 165:13 **NEST 2:3** net 71:24 72:6 network 86:12,16 111:2 113:16 never 32:6,7 41:22 43:24 45:14 58:5,8,12 59:25 67:4,4,5 75:7,9 122:5 156:8.9 new 33:21 40:23 76:17 90:15,15,25 95:4 129:5 161:25 169:23 174:16 nexus 34:7,12 non 8:10 non-Member 97:4 non-Met 8:17 10:12 12:16 15:6 35:2,5,20 36:15 41:19,24 42:20 45:9 48:20 49:10,19 54:24 56:19 58:20 59:20 63:8 68:20 74:1,3 78:12 95:16 141:14 146:14 153:9 153:24 155:24 non-Metropolitan 7:16 20:6 22:9 non-project 55:6,21 99:7 105:17,25 130:6 non-State 54:24 non-utility 127:6 non-wheelers 153:14 non-wheeling 31:20 98:14 noon 72:18.23 normal 66:24 normally 100:15 139:1 north 11:16 46:20 83:23 178:4 northern 85:14,19 101:5 102:9 160:7 178:4 notably 35:12 notation 92:8 note 20:5 noted 50:14 112:21 148:18 notes 43:15 181:9,11 notice 5:15,18,23 6:1 56:25 notwithstanding 43:6 154:11 **November** 56:25 85:9

131:2 163:6

novo 75:13

number 1:4 14:17
54:10 63:19 73:19,24
74:4,7 81:23 82:6
83:1 98:22 109:21
110:23 111:15 112:22
116:24 119:3 121:12
121:15 132:2 134:24
137:3 162:1,3 169:20
numbers 95:2 98:10
120:16,21
NWD 68:7

0 O 4:2 73:2 o'clock 80:19 179:22 **o0o** 4:3 72:24 73:3 180:13 oath 158:12 obfuscation 156:7 **object** 171:25 173:25 objection 5:23 164:21 174:19 177:2 180:5 objectionable 6:2 **objections** 74:19 180:8 **obligated** 10:21 169:16 **obligation** 62:5 168:22 obligations 168:25 169:1 **obtain** 130:14 159:18 164:9 169:25 obtains 84:2 **obvious** 18:11 70:23 obviously 89:25 92:15 116:16 135:9 154:24 occasional 63:11 130:16 occurred 171:24 ocean 100:20 110:25 **October** 48:7 53:5 88:24 132:1,7 177:12 offer 43:21 151:2 offered 65:23 office 69:4 100:1 **officer** 26:18 offsetting 16:12 42:8 45:4,5 133:7 okay 6:3 32:25 144:8 157:11 161:12 162:18 164:19 174:14 175:22 175:23 176:4,11,24 178:11,15 180:4 old 122:16,17 once 8:21,24 55:14 57:4 118:9 120:8 162:4 ones 27:21 52:17 82:7 98:14 101:16 104:3

129:12,22 130:4,15 134:25 151:1 157:9 157:22 operate 47:6,24 84:10 99:5 operating 67:20 127:5 **operation** 54:12 82:25 104:17 124:4 operational 107:19 operationally 81:8 operations 53:22 101:23 102:7,11 103:12 124:11 127:6 **opines** 61:16 opinion 61:6 opportunities 21:12 opportunity 157:6 opposed 5:21 105:11 146:8 opposing 159:3 opt 170:9 option 18:1 19:22,23,23 20:6,12 21:9 22:4,5 22:25 23:8,19,23 30:6 41:5 70:15,17,19 74:16 135:24,24,25 136:5,8,14 137:25 138:3 140:4.15.16.17 **optional** 170:20 options 16:1 19:17,20 19:21 21:13 70:12 oral 161:5 orange 25:18 26:7 121:14 154:25 order 4:7 5:9 30:19 36:4.4 44:8 64:11 67:15 149:13 **ordered** 171:15 orders 6:4 ordinary 106:13 origami 98:1,5 original 6:4 99:24 138:6 originally 130:25 131:10 originals 6:8 **Oroville** 85:13,13,15 101:5 165:17 ought 156:19 **outcome** 181:12 outlaws 79:17

outlier 120:1

outlined 140:16

outreach 159:19

outset 7:24 73:12

outside 126:2

opening 84:21 87:8

90:6 96:3 97:9,16

over-collected 37:9 overall 39:1 116:21 155:16,17,20 168:8 overcharging 35:20 overlapping 10:25 overlooking 149:3 Overruled 174:7 oversaw 161:9 oversee 159:19 overwhelming 130:4 owe 133:11 Owens 11:24 166:9 owned 34:6 46:13 47:8 49:11 73:21 86:1,2 87:20 96:18 107:1 127:16 128:8 166:5 175.21 ownership 47:1,11 owns 55:14 84:23

I

P 4:2 73:2 package 6:20 136:6 138:3 141:2 page 3:2 15:23,23 16:3 19:23 20:15 21:2 27:2 29:2,2,19 30:8 34:10 43:14 48:1,1 50:11,11 54:2 61:3 67:23 69:15 70:11 71:2 pages 1:9 29:1 181:10 paid 20:8 67:2 138:5 139:23 Palmdale 40:17,18,18 40:20 41:4 paper 15:20,25 paragraph 18:4,16,23 23:25 24:6,12 28:2,13 29:8,19 30:17 45:11 112:18 114:4 Parchman 1:19 181:5 181:21 pardon 29:1 part 9:17 16:19 30:4 38:22 47:24 48:21 55:22 63:16,17 66:5 76:24 77:20 78:3 79:4 94:23 96:9 104:13 105:20 108:23 111:18 134:15 143:2 149:21 162:5 175:6 176:12 178:4 participant 160:11 participation 95:5 **particular** 31:1 89:6 91:11 93:23 96:11 98:7 116:4,23 147:7

110:10 120:6

oOo 1:5

149:20 157:2
particularly 9:12 11:4
16:5 40:7 104:2
161:16
parties 4:9 95:23 97:6
131:15 132:13 133:17
135:6,24 139:14
150:25 151:3 157:14
157:21 159:24
parts 66:2 136:7
party 24:18 30:21
144:23
party's 122:23
passage 58:1
passed 52:9 59:2
passive 99:12
passively 106:10
path 165:19
pay 8:15 13:12,20,24
16:4 17:16 18:21
19:9 21:7 34:22 36:8
48:3,4 55:12,13,15
59:24 63:12 68:9
70:8,9 78:18 88:17
89:8,13 95:23 98:1,7
101:16 102:11,15
105:14 132:25 133:10
135:18,21 136:14
139:3,15 140:3
140.12 17 152.14
149:12,17 153:14
156:2 167:5 170:20
177:18
payers 44:22 65:5
paying 13:20 33:16
34:23,25 35:2,5,10,14
35:15 44:19,21 55:16
55:16 60:5 68:10,11
68:12 69:8,20 98:16
105:19,23,24 109:12
133:12 135:22 139:11
139:21 170:7,18
139.21 1/0./,10
payment 177:19
payments 100:9,11
149:17
payor 9:21 75:3 151:25
payor's 9:22 75:5
payor 3 9.22 13.3
pays 35:7 54:5 61:7
104:23 138:25 139:1
139:1,2 170:13
pdf's 180:1
peak 67:16,19 82:15
114:3 115:1,4,10,15
115:17,18 116:7
118:22,25 119:2,10
119:17,21 120:1,5
121:16,19
peaking 63:11,16,24
64:9,13,19,19,19
04.7,13,17,17,17

```
65:18 67:8,14 68:24
  114:7,17,18 115:7,8
  115:11,25,25 116:23
  118:1 121:25 156:7
  156:15.20
peaks 119:13,15
Pedro 16:20 18:7
peg 135:6
pegged 132:10 133:2
penalized 36:2
people 11:3 24:7 35:22
  39:15 51:8 52:16
  75:3 78:19 98:1,4,6,8
  134:20 155:22 171:3
people's 155:5
Peppered 130:15
perceive 23:6
perceived 22:18 23:12
  24:2
percent 12:20 33:7,11
  35:6 43:22 44:18
  55:20,25 56:17 58:19
  59:8 66:5,8,10,14,22
  88:18 119:9 120:4
  155:11,23 156:5
  168:5,5,8,15,20,23
  169:16 172:19 173:14
  173:16,17,18 175:16
  175:19 176:10,11,12
  176:14
percentage 98:11
  172:16,18 176:7
percentages 3:13
perfectly 22:15
perform 123:5
performed 101:24
period 66:16 96:19
  123:2 173:20 176:3
periods 162:2
permission 151:6,11
permit 109:11
Perris 69:21 163:18
  165:23,24
person 44:17,19 140:11
  145:14,18 172:13
personally 181:7
perspective 128:23
petition 145:13
phase 73:13,14 77:25
  78:5 151:15,18 157:2
physical 101:22
picked 123:21
picking 165:6
picks 46:17,21,22,23
picture 33:14 101:4,22
  148:10
pie 3:12 35:24 174:12
  175:13,14,22,23,24
```

```
175:25 176:13,16,17
piece 157:25 176:16,17
pink 11:17,21 65:19
  176:12
pipe 143:22 148:10
  155:5
pipeline 111:5 112:5
  171:16.21
pipelines 87:20 115:3
pipes 86:12 114:22
  154:25
place 11:2 14:8 32:6
  112:14 154:18,19
  179:20
Placer 155:2
places 11:14 46:22
  65:16 99:9
plain 12:12 18:5 52:15
  55:6 59:14
plaintiff 1:7 2:2 130:5
  158:11
plaintiff's 42:11 51:12
plan 6:14 16:21 18:8
  20:5 25:19 43:11
  44:6 80:19 109:16,16
  109:18,24 111:18
  161:25 162:6,11,14
planning 11:6 52:1
  53:19,20 110:13
  150:19 161:23
plants 110:25
play 81:8 140:20
played 140:22
playing 4:23 5:7
pleadings 5:17
please 7:8 25:3 80:22
  129:14 144:24 152:18
  158:15,25 165:3
plugging 120:16
plus 17:16,17
point 10:15 30:17
  33:14 39:9 41:11
  49:1 52:21 59:22
  60:8 61:3,4 66:15
  67:1,12 77:10 79:6
  84:18,20 105:8
  108:18 124:7 126:13
  126:15 128:15 129:25
  131:9 138:21 142:3,8
  153:3,5 165:3
pointed 123:21
pointer 165:2,15 166:6
  178:12
pointing 48:23 62:24
  106:4 138:17 146:15
points 14:12 22:1 26:17
  28:9 42:18 114:11
policies 25:14
```

```
policy 15:24 159:16
pool 111:4 112:4
portfolio 174:10,23,23
  175:16 176:1,21
portion 50:14 57:8,10
  57:12 66:5 69:1
  70:12 171:7
position 7:2 35:17 45:1
  50:2 56:17 77:19,24
  78:6 79:8 124:22
  134:4,7 147:20
  159:11
positive 26:9
possible 62:2 82:20
  153:22 179:4
possibly 40:13
postage 92:18,18,20
posters 98:1,5
potential 19:1 20:10
  24:16 66:25
power 7:12,22 17:10,17
  24:1 25:17 33:10
  35:18 36:17,21,22
  50:20,21 73:20 74:10
  76:19 89:17 93:10,16
  93:17 94:3 95:23
  96:6,9,11 97:18 98:13
  102:23 103:3,14,16
  104:17 116:18,20
  131:23 138:19 139:4
  139:20 151:20 166:18
  167:9
powerful 23:13
precisely 105:13
predicate 118:2,9
predict 110:1
preferred 110:11,12,16
  110:22 111:9 113:4
preliminary 6:24 53:13
  53:17,21
premises 43:8
preparation 69:2
prepared 15:25
preparing 175:10
present 71:24 72:6
  120:20 174:24 181:7
presentation 80:22
  88:14 123:17 129:12
  129:22 147:22
presented 53:14,18,21
  90:17 129:25 172:1
presenting 172:1
presently 159:8
presents 81:13
president 171:15,21
PRESIDING 1:3
pressures 23:10
presumably 122:22
```

presumptions 80:3 **pretend** 49:18 pretrial 74:18,20 80:2 157:21 179:25 pretty 8:4 51:18 59:7 119:22 **prevailing** 133:10,14 **prevent** 33:3 37:19 **previous** 21:13 70:10 previously 90:23 123:15 145:2 **price** 13:24 17:18 18:2 20:8 21:11 23:2 32:19 77:2,6,18,19 131:10,16,16 132:3,9 132:12,16,17 133:2 133:24 135:5,6 136:2 138:4,10,11 139:8 142:25 143:4,7 145:1 pricing 15:21 16:1 17:2 19:14 25:1 61:22,22 64:21 124:19 prima 75:23 primarily 34:17 **primary** 127:13 162:22 principal 84:3 91:24 101:5 principals 15:21 **principle** 17:1 23:4 40:5 principles 123:14 128:13 152:10 **prior** 40:19 115:15 118:15 124:17 **private** 127:16 privately 128:8 **probably** 26:11 156:25 179:19 **problem** 7:4 13:17 20:17 36:5 118:2 problematic 127:25 problems 34:1 126:17 procedures 54:1 126:24 127:1 **proceeding** 82:9 126:8 130:2 **proceedings** 1:13 106:3 113:23 180:12 181:8 181:9,12 process 55:7 60:23 71:5 161:25 162:7,8 processes 160:12,21 161:15,21 162:16 produces 173:11 product 98:7 production 76:4 **program** 31:4 59:18

60:3 94:10,18,24

141:22

95:25 108:16 159:17
173:24
programs 57:8 92:2
93:21,21 94:9,17
93.21,21 94.9,17
108:11,12,15,19
109:7 110:7,8,14,19
111:10 112:1 113:12
111:10 112:1 113:12
113:18 136:10 159:20
project 11:15 12:8
13:11 14:24 17:14
19:9,25 20:13 25:20
26:13,20 30:4,13
20.13,20 30.4,13
31:16 35:3 36:6,17,24 37:17 38:7 45:24
37·17 38·7 45·24
46.10 47.4 6 7 7 9 9
46:19 47:4,6,7,7,8,8
47:12,14,15,23 48:3
48:10,13,19 49:8,21
50:3,16 52:22 53:4,5
54:3,23,24 55:7,10,16
55:19,21,23,24 56:2
56:11 58:10 63:6
68.18 69.8 9 14 71.12
56:11 58:10 63:6 68:18 69:8,9,14 71:12
/6:6 /9:13 82:11
85:7,12 86:8,22 87:1
87:5,11,13 91:25 93:1
96:17 98:21,24 99:3,9
99:19,22 100:1,7,10
100:12,17 101:6
102:1,4,21 103:6,13
102-15 19 105-15 17
103:15,18 105:15,17
105:24 106:5,12,15
107:9,14,23 108:2,3,7
124.22 127.12 141.17
124:23 137:12 141:17
142:23 143:16,19
146:22 147:1,9,11
148:19,23 149:15,16
149:25 152:13,16,22
152.0 21 25 154.10
153:8,21,25 154:10
154:17,21 155:8
162:23 163:3,8,13,16
162.25 105.5,0,15,10
163:18,19 165:16,17
165:20 166:3 167:2
170:4 173:11,12
176:19 179:16
project's 29:17 45:20
projected 110:15
projection 56:22
projections 111:14
112:11
projects 31:4 35:8
49:10 56:17,21,21
57:21 58:6,7,14,20
73:20 74:2 111:4
112:4,5,6 156:3
prolonged 173:10
prominent 85:20
prominent 85:20
prominent 85:20 promise 21:25 27:19
prominent 85:20

```
promote 43:17 108:20
  110.8
promoted 112:1
proof 49:6
Prop 9:9,10,12,17
  32:13 41:6 42:1,2,3
  45:16,16 58:1 59:2
  75:14,14,23 82:1,3
  133:8
proper 24:8 36:18 99:1
  99:15 152:1
properly 29:24 32:3
  36:7 63:4 67:5
property 85:4 88:17,18
  167:13 168:1,7
  172:14
proportion 10:5,5
proportionality 9:25
  37:11 59:23,25 156:3
proportionately 102:20
proposal 33:24 43:8,8
propose 10:12
proposed 34:8,16 90:25
  136:5 140:4,15 141:2
Proposition 74:22
protect 30:19
protection 126:2
prove 155:22
provide 6:8,20 13:3
  19:14 22:20 24:25
  34:12 44:11 56:1
  59:18 61:21 67:8,15
  87:13 89:10 94:12
  107:15 124:2 129:11
  130:12 135:20 142:16
  142:20 144:23 147:24
  148:25 149:13,23
  151:1 161:10 162:19
  163:2 170:25 180:2
provided 7:18 23:7
  30:24 37:3,23 63:11
  118:12 131:12 141:19
  144:22 149:5,7 159:2
  161:5
provider 83:10,15
provides 9:15 10:6
  47:15 50:17 61:19
  69:12,16 83:11
  107:22 108:3,17
  131:5,8 141:8 143:8
  146:21 147:18 149:2
providing 9:7 10:2
  19:12 24:24 34:13,16
  75:19,25 76:8 79:2
  137:2 139:7 173:16
proving 9:19
provision 17:23
provisions 5:15,16 82:7
```

```
PTX 3:9,11,11,12
  27:24 43:6 44:1,3
  62:10 65:23 70:25
  164:4,5,6,11,13,13,19
  164:24 174:15 175:11
  176:25 177:3,4
PTX30 42:22
public 6:1 25:5 79:1,1,3
  79:21,23 96:18
  127:15 145:11 159:19
  161:6 170:22
publication 109:18
publicly 34:6
published 96:25 139:25
pull 99:9 118:17 124:18
  178:9.9
pumped 93:15
pumping 93:11 125:6
PURCELL 2:5 4:12
  5:22 78:24 157:12,16
  157:20 158:2
purchase 3:13 17:13,17
  66:21 127:22 149:15
  159:23 175:18
purchased 61:5,5,9
  121:3 173:5 176:8
purchaser 106:13
purchasers 125:19
purchases 48:11 92:3
  92:14 118:15 121:5
  130:8 176:14 179:3
purple 86:6,12,16,21
  87:3,16 93:4 142:9
  143:12
purpose 25:13 59:17
  157:1
purposes 28:18 38:2
  75:21 76:2 89:9 99:7
  125:1,9 157:1
pursuant 138:13
  157:14
put 6:23 10:19 22:11
  25:2 27:1 33:20
  44:12,14 45:1 52:19
  53:8,15,15,16 56:11
  58:19 59:8 66:1 67:5
  78:15 90:12 92:18
  98:9 99:23 101:4,20
  104:5 114:4 120:10
  120:25 131:1 134:9
  137:3,22 145:16
  147:22 148:10 152:13
  153:24 154:2 164:4
  180:1
puts 5:8 51:20 160:22
putting 9:17 19:24
  44:16 48:2 49:7
```

```
51:22 56:1 80:16
98:11 100:4 109:10
112:13 129:16 155:4
155:23
```

Q
quality 39:5 53:22
146:25 171:2 173:21
179:12
quantified 43:25 65:21
quantify 49:19
quantities 116:13
quantity 16:9 92:16
121:2 130:8,14,19
131:5,8 139:7 143:7
179:12
question 48:17 67:7
76:15 135:17 140:12
153:3 154:22 174:3
questions 79:25 81:6,20
quickly 11:13 51:18
quite 53:1 100:16
154:24
quo 33:25
quote 14:10,11 16:22
16:24 17:1 32:2,21
38:9,15 114:13
145:11
quoted 32:3 141:8
quotes 53:8
quoting 27:24

quoting 27:24 R R 4:2 73:2 rabbit 28:13 29:10 radical 146:1 radically 145:23 **Raftelis** 40:20,20 49:15 49:23 50:8,10 51:6,22 52:5 56:23 58:25 59:4 60:11,14 62:23 123:3,5,7,11,18,21,23 124:5,9,14,17,18,25 125:11,22,23 **Raftelis's** 40:22 124:5 rain 12:3 raise 34:10 39:15,16 44:7 raised 76:14 134:23 170:17 ramped 177:17 ramping 13:4 ramps 177:16 ran 120:21 rate 7:16,21,21 8:17,22 14:7,10,15,25 15:1,1 16:4,8,25 17:5,7,16 17:19,21 18:2,17,25

19:13,25 20:1,4,8,13 20:14,25 21:4,22 22:11,13,18,19,22 23:4,6,11,12,19 24:8 24:9,15,25 25:20 26:13,21,22 27:12 30:5,14,18 31:17,18 31:23 32:4.4.7.13.20 32:20 33:9,9,10,10,13 33:25 34:5 35:7,18,18 35:19 36:6,7,8,14,16 36:18,20,21,23 37:1,3 37:10,13,18,18 38:1,2 38:8,10,16,17 39:7,22 40:10,11,23 41:1,1,4 41:7 43:23 44:7,22 45:7 49:9,10 52:10 55:3 56:14,15,18 58:11,14,17,20 59:9 59:14,15,16,20 60:4,6 60:24 61:14,16 62:7 63:17 64:2,3,5,6 65:5 67:24 69:22 70:22 71:5,13,14 73:15,16 73:18,20,21,25 74:1,9 74:10,10,12,13,15 75:24 76:1,6,7,12,17 76:19,19,20,21,22 77:6,22,22 78:9 79:19 79:21 81:1,3,6,11,20 82:13 83:1 87:21 88:1,20,21 89:1,6,10 89:16,17,17 90:7,10 90:11,12,15,20,25 91:4,8,9,19 92:18,18 92:23 93:6,10,11,17 93:20,20 95:4,6,12,12 95:13,18,19,20,25 96:2,5,6,6,7,8,9,9,10 96:13,21 97:1,5,10,11 97:12,13,13,14,17,18 97:20,21,21 98:12,13 98:13,15,19 103:9,14 108:9,9 109:4,7,10 110:4 111:8,10 112:2 112:10,17,19 113:7 113:19,24,25 116:18 116:19,19,23 117:3 120:18,21,22 122:3 122:11,13,22,24 123:6,8 125:9 128:4 128:12,15,24 129:23 131:13,22,23,23,24 131:24 132:2,19 133:10,12,15,15,17 134:14,22 135:9 138:19,19,20 139:2,3 139:4,4,15,18,19,19

120 20 22 25 140 2 2
139:20,22,25 140:2,3 150:4 151:20,20,21
151:25 153:8,14
154:7,8,15 155:10,24
156:18,19,22 161:3,7
162:7,15 167:8,9,9,10
167:20,21 170:11,14 170:17,19
rate's 14:16
rate-setting 33:22
rates 7:11,15,19,20 8:2
8:10,18,23 12:11,12
13:20 16:6,23 17:8,11 18:12 19:7 22:5
24:14 26:23 28:6,7
30:23 31:19,21,25
32:8,10,15 33:6,6,18 33:19 34:8,13,17 37:1 37:19 38:4,16 39:15
33:19 34:8,13,17 37:1
37:19 38:4,16 39:15 40:9,10,13,14 41:2,19
45:18 47:21 52:17
61:11 63:7,9,10 64:2
64:10 67:6 68:15,19
68:21,25 69:3,19 71:6
72:12 74:11,15 79:5,7
79:8,18 80:8 81:22 82:10,13,14,19,20
83:4 87:22,25 88:22
89:2,5,8,11,13,13
90:15,18,21 91:3,6,12
91:16,18,21,23 92:1,9
92:11,12,17,20 94:25 95:3,21 96:4,5 97:10
97:22 98:16,22 103:6
103:8 112:10,14,16
112:20 116:16,18,22
116:25 123:12 124:15 126:15,17 127:23
128:13,14,20 129:3
131:14,22 132:5,5,8
132:11,14,17,18
133:3,20,21 134:10
134:11,16 135:4,5,7 135:12,13,18,22
136:15 138:18,21,22
139:12,20 140:10
149:18 150:11,12,13
151:14,21,22 152:1,5
153:22,25 154:18
160:9,13 161:5,9,18 161:19,20 162:5
167:7,7,8,17,18 168:1
168:4,7,15 169:17
170:7,10
ratio 89:3 119:1,10 120:5
rationale 18:22 52:18
reach 105:20,22 150:8
<u> </u>

```
reached 15:7
reaches 105:19 137:13
  166:10
react 65:11
read 18:13 28:9 100:3
  152:20 155:13,14
  157:23,24
readiness 117:5,21
  167.11
Readiness-to-Serve
  64:3,21 69:22 117:17
reading 106:18
reads 100:4
ready 48:7 129:5
real 149:22
reality 103:25 125:18
reallocate 23:10
reallocated 16:16
really 14:5 80:6 102:14
  116:12 121:17 123:1
  134:18 136:20
realtime 1:20 6:16
reason 14:3 31:21
  37:12,17 45:18 59:15
  63:8 70:21 78:2
  84:24 133:16 139:24
  141:5 144:21 146:23
  146:23 153:12,13,16
reasonable 5:11 9:5,7
  9:14,22 10:4,5 23:12
  25:6 29:5 31:7 37:3,4
  42:8 45:14 48:18
  49:5 54:18 55:1
  56:20 58:19 59:10
  72:10 75:1,4,18,25
  76:8 78:11 79:2,21
  82:1,10 83:4 98:23
  99:16 109:2,3 122:22
  134:10 152:8,9,10
  153:6 155:25
reasonableness 14:16
  22:14 81:21,25 82:3,8
  82:18 83:2 133:19
  134:13 150:2,12
  152:7
reasonably 20:20 21:17
  65:13 82:12,14
reasoning 50:12
reasons 81:19 98:22
  106:4 109:2 132:16
recall 46:10
receive 86:25 99:19
  109:12 140:7 163:14
received 9:23 23:5 37:5
  42:4 61:25 75:6
  132:20 133:7
receives 59:24 87:5
  88:16 99:17,18
```

```
103:23 149:3,13
  163:15
receiving 62:11 106:8
  170:13
recess 41:10 72:23
  150:17
recipient 99:12
Reclamation 138:2
  178.21
recognize 8:14 24:1
  29:2,4 115:25
recognized 18:23 26:12
  45:12 69:7 80:3 81:1
  124:25 128:24
recognizes 27:3
recognizing 35:23
  74:19 116:2
recommend 23:19
  40:22
recommendation 33:19
  34:7,12 43:21 61:21
  64:16 70:19
recommendations
  23:18
reconciliation 142:21
record 6:2 25:25 26:1,1
  26:16 27:2 42:12
  45:5 47:19,20 48:23
  49:1,7,12 51:13 52:3
  53:10 56:24 57:5
  59:19 62:10 67:11
  70:25 78:8 90:13
  118:10 123:17 152:24
  158:17
records 14:17 15:15
  25:25 27:22 48:10
  51:15 53:10 60:20
  67:17 174:25 175:8
recover 19:4 20:22
  21:19 24:20 29:22
  37:2 92:1 100:11
  103:19,25 108:1
  116:19 134:12
recovered 34:17 69:18
  69:21 71:13 93:17
recovering 9:6 40:15
  128:5
recovers 92:23 93:6
  101:3 108:10 115:11
recovery 16:8 18:16
  19:12 22:6 24:10,23
  24:24 30:15 31:4
  67:20 93:18 108:15
  128:4
recreated 174:12
recycling 94:11 112:22
  155:16,17
red 84:15 86:9,22,23
```

92:8
redefined 95:12
reduce 108:25 109:7
112:22 157:24
reduced 20:11 30:23
36:21,22 114:9
reducing 113:1 143:7
reduction 109:14
refer 86:15 126:9 177:8
177:9
reference 107:7 113:1
113:8 115:21
referred 28:21 38:19
115:7 132:21 152:20 163:12 167:12
referring 33:23 71:23
130:10 146:16
refers 64:4 93:7 177:10
refinement 160:13
162:7,16
reflect 30:23 40:9
117:1 127:24 128:20
133:13 176:20
reflecting 103:25 143:4
reflects 30:10 133:15
refuses 70:22
regarding 4:7,21 43:2
99:15
regardless 100:23
143:8
regards 146:5 region 43:9 46:20 58:9
58:13 170:25
region's 155:16,17
171:2
regional 30:24 31:1
43:17 110:24
regular 162:3
regularly 160:17
regulate 93:8
regulated 34:6 127:14
regulates 127:15
regulating 10:25 128:8
regulation 138:13
regulations 10:20
regulators 127:4,7,13
128:7
regulatory 60:16 93:6
126:11 rejected 129:3
relate 101:3
related 54:11 64:9
67:21 81:10 103:13
111:1,2,16 113:24
153:7
relates 114:17
relationship 9:15,22
37:4 75:5 82:2

115.10
115:19
relationships 37:6
relatively 81:14 118:6
148:4
relevant 25:12 42:12
91:8 110:3 122:24
134:15 140:6,18
reliability 69:17 155:20
172.24
173:24
reliable 171:1
reliance 129:2
reliant 168:17
relied 64:10
relief 77:21
relies 60:15
relieved 170:18
reluctance 72:8
rely 49:1 62:8 169:10
relying 49:17
remains 27:11
remanded 32:2
remarked 9:3
remedy 68:22
remember 42:17 45:11
51:25 53:3
122.12
remind 32:12
removing 20:9
reoriented 164:14
replacement 104:17
renlication 128:21
replication 128:21
replies 62:20
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representation 164:16
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representation 164:16 representative 160:21
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representative 160:21 representatives 160:22
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representation 164:16 representative 160:21
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representation 164:16 representative 160:21 represents 175:15,25
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representative 160:21 representatives 160:22 represents 175:15,25 request 5:14,18 106:23
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representative 160:21 representatives 160:22 represents 175:15,25 request 5:14,18 106:23 requesting 106:25
replies 62:20 report 15:12,14 25:24 26:5 37:15 38:15 43:5 48:9 51:23 52:19 53:9,12 57:5,14 60:12,14,18,19,19 62:12 67:11,13 112:3 112:14,19 118:11 120:11,15 123:21,23 124:5,9 125:22 report's 124:15 Reported 1:18 reporter 1:20 41:14 181:6 Reporter's 1:13 reporting 6:16 reports 124:17 175:1,2 175:10 represent 67:21 164:6 175:14,24 representative 160:21 representatives 160:22 represents 175:15,25 request 5:14,18 106:23

required 33:14 34:15 59:3
requirement 18:8,19
20:24 21:21 23:23 24:11 31:9 38:11
50:15 123:16 140:6
requirements 22:7 25:7
31:8 40:24 53:24
66:6 110:21 125:3
requires 9:13 13:11
25:5,23 28:10 29:4
59:23 67:8 68:6 72:9
75:16 79:5 80:7 82:1 152:8,9
requiring 42:7 61:24
68:12 82:3
research 15:13 52:6
resell 125:20
reserves 16:17
reservoir 46:17,20
101:8 110:24 164:1 reservoirs 46:16 69:20
92:4 163:16 175:20
reside 83:19
residential 125:25
residents 11:4 88:17
resolution 14:17,22
15:3,8,9,18 23:18
27:11,14,16,22 28:4 31:15,22 32:7 37:16
38:14 43:2 45:8,10
49:21 153:20 154:7
resource 15:20,25 55:5
55:13 89:14 100:21
105:6 108:12 110:9
139:3 resource-water 63:7
resources 11:22 12:23
13:11,13 16:21 47:9
47:14 49:24 50:16
54:6 55:3 61:8 83:12
85:1,8,18 94:9 104:7
109:16,18 111:18
145:8 152:25 153:6
154:10,13 163:9 respect 4:15 6:4 47:3
63:3 152:12
respective 50:23
respond 147:11 151:13
responding 106:2
147:5,7
response 30:25 33:18 33:18 63:19 98:6
133:14 170:19
responses 46:2 58:4
responsibilities 159:13
responsibility 134:4
159:15

```
responsible 20:23
  21:20 101:15,16
rest 66:8 168:9
result 35:21 36:1 71:15
resulting 53:13,17,24
results 15:1 20:15
  35:25 119:5
retail 81:14 106:9
retain 17:7
retained 118:12 123:5
retains 17:4
return 130:14 133:11
  133:16
returns 133:22
revenge 60:4
revenue 8:15,15 16:8
  16:14 19:1 20:10
  22:6 24:10,16,24
  40:24 50:15 53:24
  59:17 75:20 76:2
  87:24 97:18 98:12
  156:2 167:15 168:18
  169:2,11
revenues 16:12 18:17
  20:21,22 21:18,19
  23:10 37:8,10 88:14
  88:19 167:5 168:2,6,8
  168:24 169:1,8,15,17
  169:21
reversed 32:2
review 53:19,23 75:12
  81:3 118:12 123:7,11
  124:3,6,12,15
reviewed 52:7 175:10
  176:22
reviewing 81:22 175:5
RFC 51:18
rid 91:5
riding 52:25
right 11:25 23:17 27:17
  28:14,17,20 39:9
  41:12,16 79:22 86:9
  87:17 88:6 92:8
  101:22 103:14 104:10
  104:14 107:13,22,24
  113:2 114:22 116:7
  137:6 142:3 156:24
  157:15 158:24 175:24
  175:25 176:9
right-hand 84:16 90:24
rights 30:13 96:16
  99:10 105:16 106:11
  107:8,14 108:3
river 10:14 11:24 12:1
  12:1,9 13:6 20:14
  42:23 43:3,12 44:6,9
  44:10,14 46:16,18
```

56:5,6,8 73:23 79:12

```
84:4,7,9,11,12,14,17
  84:19,22,23 85:12
  86:10,23 87:2,6,9,12
  91:25 93:2,3,16 99:20
  103:19 130:9.19
  131:7 137:7,9,10,16
  139:8 141:17 142:4,7
  142:14.24 143:14.16
  143:19 146:22,25
  147:16,25 148:4,6,20
  149:5,21 153:10
  154:19 162:23 163:21
  163:22,24,25 164:2
  165:4,5,9 167:3
  171:17 178:2,19,24
  179:7.8
RMI 15:19,25 18:23
  26:5 37:15 38:9,15
  47:25 48:7 53:2,4,5
  53:21
Roberts 51:17
Rodrigo 44:3,25
role 68:17 81:8 134:22
  175:6
roles 159:22
roll 67:25 68:4 117:20
  117:20 169:10
rolled 68:4
rolling 114:13 117:14
  117:23
Roosevelt 171:15
roughly 67:19 122:1
  171:6
round 35:24
RTS 167:12 168:9
  169:23
rule 41:9
rules 4:24 74:21
ruling 56:25
rulings 74:18,20 75:22
run 17:13 94:18 100:19
  169:7
run-off 175:20
running 87:9
rusted-through 148:10
RWD 130:7
s 2:11 4:2 44:23 73:2
  122:15,18
Sacramento 159:21
safe 130:3 171:1
sale 25:7 31:10 168:18
sales 16:11,12 17:10,19
  17:21 18:7 19:2,11
  20:8,10,23 21:10,20
```

```
24:17,22 39:16 70:10
  97:23 110:2 120:11
  120:12 169:8,14
  175:4
sales-based 34:17
saline 147:14,17 149:8
  149:15
salinity 147:25 148:4,5
  148:9,11,13,15,17,18
salt 148:12
Salton 178:17
San 1:2,6,24 2:4,10
  3:12 4:20,22 5:8 6:11
  6:14 8:1 10:7,10,13
  11:7,8 12:14,16,19,25
  12:25 13:1,6 14:21
  16:20 18:7,13 32:16
  32:24 33:3,13,17,21
  34:24 35:25 36:10
  41:23 43:7,20,22 45:1
  54:22 55:22 56:8,9
  60:1,5,20 62:25 64:25
  65:12,15 67:11 68:16
  70:6 71:6 77:1 80:14
  81:22 82:15 83:5,24
  84:20 87:4,7,10,10,13
  87:15,18,20 90:6
  91:17 96:2 97:9,16
  98:11,19 99:17,18
  106:3,14,16,19,24
  107:12,20,23,24
  108:5 111:5 112:5
  114:2,11 115:21,24
  116:8,12 118:1,5,8,12
  119:15,17,22 120:2,8
  120:12,20 121:4,11
  121:16,18,22,25
  122:6,7,10,16,20
  123:2,4,19,21 124:14
  124:22 125:16 126:5
  126:14,18 127:20
  129:2,19 130:7,8,11
  130:22,23 131:3,5,8,9
  131:12 132:1,19,24
  133:1,5,9,24 134:21
  134:23 135:21 136:5
  136:9,12,14 137:2,18
  138:4,25 139:2,7,9,11
  139:12,15,21 140:4,6
  140:12,15,17,23
  141:3,15,16,18 142:3
  142:5,10,12,14,15,19
  142:23 143:8,9,20,21
  143:22 144:10 145:2
  145:6,7,16 146:10,21
  147:5,8,9,14,17,21,22
  148:1,5,8,14,15,16,21
  148:22,24 149:3,5,9
```

149:11,14,17,20,23 151:4 152:3,3 156:4,4 156:14,25 158:6,6 159:9,23 164:9 166:24 170:9,21,25 171:7,10,16,19,20,22 172:1,6,17,20 173:1,7 173:17,22 174:10,22 175:15,17,25 176:2,7 176:21 177:18,23 178:2,4,5,6,7,14 179:2,11 181:2 Santa 94:2,3 sat 122:20 satisfy 18:7 20:24 21:21 23:23 38:10 83:2 150:12 save 70:6 saved 137:22 **savings** 71:15 saw 38:15 60:10 105:21 saying 7:8 19:6 24:7 27:14 30:3 50:13 51:8 53:5 57:19 60:21 71:5 77:24 97:25 134:8 135:17 138:21 147:11 152:1 156:23,23,24 says 14:5 17:23 20:5 22:11,16 33:21 36:13 42:3 44:25 51:17 52:4 54:4 57:23 59:4 60:17 62:12 65:7,8 66:2 70:1 79:4 96:10 100:10 106:24 107:12 126:12,22 136:17 138:10 147:9 152:19 153:6 154:6 155:15 156:14 174:17 scenarios 110:3 schedules 107:17 school 39:11,19,23 scratching 122:20 screen 83:17 84:16 98:9 99:23 100:5 101:4,20 104:5 110:17 112:13 114:4 131:1 165:3 **SDCWA** 45:2 **SDCWA's** 14:6 Sea 178:17 second 5:8 8:14 14:20 23:25 28:2 47:25 82:24 85:6 99:3 102:7 108:8 109:8 120:9 121:17 146:7

147:12 154:9 163:20

175:22,23

22:8,11 23:3,9,14,21

section 25:4,23 28:25
29.1 3 30.8 22 31.5
25.1,5 50.0,22 51.5
29:1,3 30:8,22 31:5 37:14 38:20,21 42:6 95:14 112:17 123:23
05.14 112.17 123.23
93.14 112.17 123.23
124:5,7 138:9
sectors 34:6
see 5:8 11:16 12:6
13:17 20:3 26:25
28:1 29:15 31:14,21
32:2 33:6,9,10,10
32.2 33.0,5,10,10
34:19 44:4 45:2 46:1
47:13 49:2,4 51:11,12
47.13 49.2,4 31.11,12
53:11,12 60:18 65:12
65:19 72:21 78:14
85:22 86:9,12 87:16
89:11,11 90:19,24
91:3 92:16 101:22
104:8,12 106:17
101.0,12 100.17
110:15 120:17 122:21
124:12 125:23 126:25
124.12 123.23 120.23
129:8 134:20 137:11
142:8 143:15 144:14
144:25 152:18 155:13
171:8 174:17 180:11
seeing 31:6 179:19
seek 43:17
seen 11:12 12:13 14:14
52.10 77.15 05.20
33.16 //.13 93.20
53:18 77:15 95:20 137:6 153:20
sell 62:22 81:14 89:25
I Sell 67.77 XI.IA X9.75
SCII 02.22 01.17 07.23
167:23 175:3
167:23 175:3
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25 180:3
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25 180:3 serves 34:3 83:17
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25 180:3 serves 34:3 83:17 173:10
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25 180:3 serves 34:3 83:17 173:10
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25 180:3 serves 34:3 83:17 173:10 service 7:17,20 9:5 11:1
167:23 175:3 selling 116:11 sells 89:21 send 8:12 152:2 sends 49:25 51:24 52:2 sense 7:1 113:11 128:23 137:1 152:11 sensitive 16:9 112:5 113:5 155:19 sent 70:24 106:11 sentence 9:18,20 22:21 24:5 separate 47:12 64:13 101:11 103:24 127:5 separated 124:24 separately 64:9 97:3 separates 125:24 series 33:21 84:6 160:12,21 162:11 serious 8:6 seriously 8:6 173:20 serve 117:5,21 167:11 served 173:5 179:24,25 180:3 serves 34:3 83:17 173:10

```
30:25 34:4,4,8 37:3
  37:23,24 38:1,8,17
  40:8,9,24 41:8,8,23
  45:14 48:19 49:16
  50:9 51:7,14,14 54:19
  55:2 57:17 58:9,12
  59:1,10 60:23 62:12
  67:5 68:24 69:6 71:7
  71:11 72:10,11,12
  74:16 75:19,25 76:3,9
  79:1,3,5,10,13,16,20
  83:21,25 84:13 85:25
  86:5,13,24 90:19 91:3
  92:6 95:13,19 96:3,7
  96:10,15,21,23 97:10
  97:12,22 106:25
  107:21 108:1,2,22
  117:6 118:13 123:7,8
  123:12,24 124:16
  128:4,12,13 133:22
  137:11 138:17 139:1
  139:2,21 140:2 152:8
  152:10 155:25 160:13
  162:19 163:22 165:7
  166:21,25 167:14
  169:5,24 170:25
  171:6,9 178:3 179:11
services 1:23 9:8 10:3,5
  15:22 16:2 17:3
  22:20 23:11 25:1
  34:9 40:14,16 63:2
  106:23 107:12 109:11
serving 160:5
SESSION 4:1 73:1
set 4:16 7:15,15 8:2
  19:7 26:23 30:5
  31:17 37:25 40:12
  45:7 58:16 73:15
  74:15 76:19 77:2,6,22
  124:6 126:16 129:3
  135:13,19 138:12,23
  151:21 156:21 177:25
sets 7:19 167:6
setting 32:13,19 34:5
  38:16 60:24 68:24
  69:3 71:5 76:22 81:2
  81:4,6,11,20 123:6,8
  126:14 128:25 153:9
  160:8 161:4,7,8
severed 76:25 134:18
sham 123:20
Shane 44:3,23
share 102:20
shared 71:18
shareholders 127:10
```

sheds 62:10

71:25 72:1

shift 35:23 71:11,14,22

```
shifting 18:9 30:20
  38:12 39:7 56:16
shifts 76:5
shipping 98:1,3,7
short 17:13 19:5 39:18
  150:17 169:14 171:19
shortage 173:14
shortages 173:13,19
shortcomings 43:7
shorthand 181:6,8
show 9:16,20 27:12
  36:4 48:1 50:12
  51:21 65:10,23 74:23
  75:2 76:4,5 82:10,13
  82:15,19 83:3 87:2,19
  113:22 127:25 150:13
  178:12
showed 46:4 90:6 93:4
  98:2 122:7,15,17
  125:10 129:17 138:8
  141:25 152:14 154:14
showing 6:18,21 83:20
  86:7 90:18 105:8
  106:20 110:17 138:18
shown 30:9 80:8,9
  83:17 85:13,21 86:10
  87:14 88:23 153:12
  153:15 154:4,5
shows 14:22 15:23
  37:16,22 48:2 52:3
  71:20,22 78:7,9 86:4
  107:20 113:23 121:1
  123:1 143:10 174:13
  179:10
side 5:1,2,4 57:8 80:12
  84:16 90:24 123:4,19
  130:16 137:12
sides 73:10 76:13
Sidney 52:2
sight 82:23
sign 4:9 6:8 157:25
signature 134:19
signed 70:24 71:1 85:7
  95:2 135:17 157:19
  163:5,9
significant 81:12 95:25
  107:20 120:17 123:1
  168:24 169:7
significantly 20:11
similar 5:10 52:9
  141:24 144:6
simple 57:18,24 59:14
  81:14 121:1
simply 31:14 49:20
  51:7 120:15 133:2
  149:6
```

```
sir 150:23 158:8,20
sit 97:6
site 62:21 164:10
sits 106:10
situation 4:17 20:4
situations 143:25
six 18:23 178:3
six-vear 173:10
size 82:25 150:8
sizes 114:25
Skillman 11:5 51:17,24
  52:12 62:11,20
Skinner 143:18,20,21
Slater 140:13,15
  145:17 146:3
Slater's 140:21
slide 35:17 52:14 85:22
  86:4,20 90:4 105:21
  137:9 141:9 145:4
  152:13 155:13
slides 27:13 60:11
  77:15 129:16 136:19
  154:5
slightly 27:24 119:16
small 167:14,15 168:10
  168:12
smallest 120:3
sold 16:9
sole 31:21 50:13
somebody 13:22 44:14
  62:12 155:2 156:19
somebody's 155:4
someplace 155:6
sooner 80:21
sorry 72:4 108:25
  161:2 164:12
sort 9:4 11:18 18:15
  39:25 52:20 65:23
  176:12 178:12
sound 43:13
sounds 5:11
source 52:23 57:2
  85:11 100:24 101:6
  125:12 126:13 141:10
  141:18
sources 54:7 66:9 83:13
  84:3,7 87:24 91:24
  123:10 141:10,16
  147:13,19 162:22
  167:16,25 168:3,12
  168:18,25 169:2,21
  169:22 175:2
south 83:24 87:18
  93:13 137:14 178:17
southeastern 178:16
southern 1:9 2:13
  10:14 11:1 13:5 28:5
  34:3 44:11 45:3 56:3
```

61:13 80:25 81:17 83:9,21 85:19 86:15 88:5 93:11 94:1 102:9,24 108:23 137:4 151:24.25 155:21 162:20 165:20 southernmost 102:19 southward 166:10 space 145:25 146:8 **span** 118:19 **speak** 80:13 speaking 80:20 **specific** 10:1 32:3 76:3 100:7 113:18 specifically 34:24 107:12 111:16,23 112:3 143:11 148:18 spectrum 81:13 speculative 105:13 **spell** 158:16 spend 77:16 90:3 136:23 spending 23:16 **spends** 68:8 split 59:4 **spoil** 17:6 sponsored 146:6 spurs 165:19 ss 181:1 **stability** 31:18 37:18 38:2,16,17 40:10,11 41:1,5,8 59:16 74:13 74:15 153:14 154:8 stable 31:20 68:13 staff 26:12 33:19 34:7 34:11 43:16,25 50:7,7 51:3 52:25 53:8,19,21 54:4,16,17 61:20 69:1 69:11,24 70:17 90:17 106:2 123:25 147:23 148:3,5,8,14,21 161:9 stamp 92:18,19,20 stamps 28:1 stand 145:17 157:24 **standard** 9:1 34:5 60:24 61:15 62:14 81:21,24 82:8,18,24 83:2 150:2 158:12 standards 9:4 60:12 61:24 62:5 71:8 standby 68:7 117:6,12 standing 117:7 151:25 standpoint 128:6 Stapleton 145:15 Stapleton's 146:9 stark 71:21 start 6:11 51:16 151:5

started 4:6 5:13 38:3

single 17:1 119:10

121:4

I		1	I	I
48:25 53:5 57:4 80:5	101:13 128:11 171:15	70:22 88:20,21,23	45:9 63:22 66:22	surplus 43:1
125:2	178:20	89:1,10 90:8,15,25	67:1 92:3 114:9	surrounding 84:8
starting 62:11 84:5	stating 125:16	91:8,9,19 95:1,4,6,12	116:22 155:18 159:18	SWA 174:17
starts 125:3 162:1,12	status 33:25	120:18,21,22 122:4	162:21 169:10 173:15	swap 144:17
state 11:15,18,22 12:8	statute 8:16 9:10 29:15	122:11,13,22,24	175:19	SWC 52:8
13:11 14:24 17:9,13	40:4 45:17 75:15	123:7 131:22,24	supply 10:22 12:20	SWF 51:1
19:9,24 20:13 22:11	76:10,11,15,16 82:5	150:5,11 170:11	20:14 29:25 30:24	swings 169:12
25:20 26:13,20 28:10	107:6 140:6,19,24	structures 83:1 97:18	35:8,21 36:7 46:6,15	sworn 158:12
28:12,15 29:16 30:4	141:23 142:2 144:12	studied 37:7 58:22	47:13,16,17,22,24	SWP 17:11 28:17,17,20
30:13 31:15 35:3	144:14,21 146:13,17	59:25 67:4 75:8,9	48:4,5,11,14,14,15,16	54:5,9
36:5,17,23 37:17 38:7	146:19 154:6	156:9	49:8,8 50:3,15,24	system 7:11,12,21
45:19,23 46:19 47:3,6	statutes 9:6 80:10 82:6	studies 63:21	51:8,9 52:24 53:6,7	10:13,23 11:9 13:7
47:6,7,8,8,11,14,15	132:22	study 41:23 47:19,20	53:16,18 54:3,7 56:13	16:22 21:5 28:19,20
47:22 48:2,10,13,18	statutory 32:5	48:1,12 49:16,17,17	56:16,23 57:1,10,11	28:22,23,24 29:6,13
49:3,7,8,21 50:3,15	stayed 31:19	50:10 57:17 90:7	57:21 59:12 60:10	29:14,17,18,21,22,23
50:17 52:22 53:4,5	stays 88:11	110:18 119:8 125:12	61:6,8,9,17,18,24	30:5,12,13,16 31:11
54:3,22 55:7,7,10,15	steady 64:24 68:16	138:17 156:20	62:6 63:4 64:2 66:15	31:13 33:10,10 34:2
55:19,20,23,24 56:2	steps 100:16	subject 28:18 64:14	69:9,12,17,18,19 70:1	35:18,18 36:2,17,21
56:11 61:7 63:6	stewardship 7:11,21	107:4 119:8	70:2,20 71:14,15 84:3	36:22 39:12,16 42:9
68:18 69:8,9,13 71:12	14:25 33:9 35:7,19	subjects 98:18	84:8 85:11 88:18	42:20 45:22,22,23,24
73:19 76:6 79:14	36:6,16,20 49:9 56:15	submit 156:1	89:13,13 90:10,22	46:13,14,23,25 47:22
82:11 85:7,9,11,16,17	58:11,14,16 59:9,14 59:19 60:4,6 63:7	submitted 67:13 119:3	91:1,2,23,25 92:1,3,6	47:24 48:21 49:22,22
86:1,2,7,22 87:1,5,11 87:12 91:25 93:1	71:13 73:25 74:1,10	subsequent 163:7 subsidize 33:15,15	92:9,15 94:3 98:16 99:13 100:8,18,24	52:23 55:7,11,15,21 55:25 56:3 58:6,10,13
96:17 98:20,24 99:3,8	76:1,7,20 82:13 89:17	68:13,16	101:1,4,6,10 102:12	58:21 59:21 61:13
99:19,22 100:1,7,17	93:20 95:20 96:6,9	subsidized 36:3	101:1,4,0,10 102:12	63:17 64:2,5 67:25
100:23 101:6,12,15	97:13,21 98:13 108:9	subsidy 35:11 109:13	104:19 105:11 106:13	68:6,14,17,21 69:22
101:21 102:1,4,20,21	109:4,7,10 110:4	substantial 23:9 156:24	109:5,10 111:25	73:20,20 74:9,9,25
103:5,15,18,21	111:8,10 112:2,10,17	substantially 18:25	116:18,22 124:23,25	76:19 77:22 87:2,9
104:18,24,25 105:15	112:19 113:7,19,23	21:12 24:15	124:25 125:5,12	89:16,16 92:23 93:4,6
105:16,18,24 106:5,8	116:19 131:24 138:20	substantive 49:12	126:13 131:22 139:2	93:8,10,10,17 94:8
106:12,15 107:9,14	139:4,19 151:20	54:21	140:2 146:7 152:21	95:16,19 96:5,6,8,9
107:16,23 108:2,3,6	155:10 167:10 170:14	substitute 8:2	152:23 153:1 155:20	97:12,17,17,21 98:12
124:23 136:9 137:12	170:17,19	subtracting 17:9 20:13	156:17 162:22,25	98:13 99:8 103:9,14
137:23 141:17 142:23	stipulation 4:7 6:18	sue 32:25	163:4,11 167:8 171:1	107:5 110:10 111:15
143:13,16,18 145:8	157:14,18,20	sued 10:7 31:23 91:17	173:19,23,23 174:10	111:17,20,23 112:7
145:10,11,22 146:22	stop 72:14,16,20,20	sufficient 61:19	174:12,23 175:2,15	112:23 113:1,5,13
146:25 147:8,11	155:9 179:20	suggest 80:22 126:6	176:1,2,18,21	114:13,19,21,23
148:19,23 149:15,16	stops 134:1	157:23	supplying 97:15 143:9	115:9,10,12,17,20
149:25 152:12,15,22	storage 29:25 43:10,18	suggested 20:12 43:21	support 14:23 22:6	116:18,18 117:12
153:7,21,25 154:9,10	43:20 63:23 67:9	53:20 119:15	25:8 171:2	126:25 130:20 131:23
154:17,20 155:8	69:9,13,16,17,21,25	suggesting 69:12,24	supported 14:15 160:2	131:23 137:13 138:19
158:16 162:23,25	70:13 92:4,5 93:7,7	104:21 134:1	supporting 23:14	138:19 139:3,4,19,20
163:3,5,7,8,13,16,17	107:18	suggests 110:12	supports 40:3 60:12	141:14 143:12,17
163:18 165:13,16,17	store 99:9	Suit 10:8	155:15	144:25 146:14 149:6
165:20 166:2,3,4,5	storing 69:7	sum 17:18 73:12	supposed 22:16 41:21	151:20,20 153:10
167:1 170:4 173:11	story 17:6 123:5,19	summarized 148:3	114:13 115:25 116:1	156:17,18,22 163:16
173:11 179:16 181:1	straightforward 5:19	summary 16:3	118:6 127:23 148:11	163:19 165:21 167:9
state's 46:6	8:5	summer 114:21 115:15	supposedly 117:20	167:9 172:14
stated 59:16	Street 1:24 2:3,13	115:18	139:14	system-wide 31:25
statement 16:21 37:25	strenuously 152:6	sums 70:23	Supreme 47:10	systems 28:19 47:12
46:6 50:17 51:6 61:23 62:1 64:8 96:3	stretches 83:22 stricken 174:6	SUPERIOR 1:1 supplemental 10:11	surcharge 89:21 95:22	128:19
97:9,16 128:19 130:4	strike 100:3 162:25	83:10,15	sure 6:5 19:8 30:6,6 31:18 38:4 41:13	
130:15 135:1 139:12	174:1	83.10,13 supplied 173:18	72:15 92:5 126:8	Table 163:12
151:1 152:17,19,20	strongly 24:4	supplier 20:8 62:2	174:21	tables 175:2
	ou ongry 44.4			
	structure 14.7 26.22	144.24	surely 83+1 98+6	fake 4 · () 4 47 ·4 5
157:9,22 states 62:12 84:8 95:15	structure 14:7 26:22 52:10 61:14 67:24	144:24 supplies 43:1,3 44:6	surely 83:1 98:6 surface 175:20	take 41:10,14 42:4,15 44:23,24 54:24 78:20

78:25 80:19 97:18	138:4	42:17 69:4,7	traditionally 115:7	139:5,12,20 144:16
100:16 102:15 129:6	terminal 163:16 164:1	thought 39:13 58:25	trained 82:18 83:3	147:9 148:23 151:21
133:25 134:8 135:11	terms 4:18 54:18 55:1	69:2 75:8,8 140:5	transaction 31:1 96:12	153:23 154:2,18,19
150:17 151:4,7 155:7	85:6 97:6 98:17	141:1	97:1,4 130:20,22	155:4,12,24 159:23
157:6 158:23 162:24	114:16 118:21 121:1	three 2:9 7:24 19:22	139:25 141:5 143:4	transporting 32:19
164:11 176:5,5	125:17 133:21 146:18	35:10 44:2 65:7	145:3 147:10 149:20	36:8 41:19 48:20
178:18	156:3 177:20 178:1	67:19 74:4 89:15	154:23	55:6 56:18 59:20
take-or-pay 13:15	territory 83:18 92:7	91:2 96:5 101:25	transactions 96:19,22	61:12 75:4 79:14
28:11 102:2,10,14,16	163:22 171:9	109:2 115:15 139:11	98:14 139:18 140:1	109:9
169:25 170:3,5	testified 140:15 145:2	151:19 167:25 168:2	144:4 146:16,18	transports 84:12 93:3
taken 36:23 72:23	145:14 158:13 161:3	thrown 124:24	transcribed 181:9	130:9
78:18 128:25	178:25	tier 64:21,21 71:14	transcript 1:13 6:22	traverses 166:10
takes 5:3 84:11 101:2	testimony 145:4,22	89:13,13 91:1,1,23,23	181:11	treasury 133:11,15,16
121:14 139:9 142:7	161:6 174:1,6	92:9,9 116:23,25	transcripts 6:16	treat 89:25
154:19 163:24 179:9	textbook 56:24 57:1	tiered 64:20 116:22,22	transfer 13:2 22:23	treated 89:22,23 90:2
talk 5:12 9:25 10:11	60:14	time 7:23 13:9 23:16	45:2 113:10 146:5	95:21
14:1 19:22 38:21	Thank 6:12 41:17	25:16 32:24 43:25,25	160:4 177:7,11	treating 94:11
53:12 64:18 65:6	72:21 80:17,18,23	72:14,16,20 76:19,21	178:21 179:15	treatment 89:21 95:22
83:6 98:18 101:18	129:18 136:24 150:15	77:17 80:20 90:3	transferred 39:2	125:7
103:5 141:3 146:12	157:3,10 158:8,20	91:10,16 95:11	147:15	treats 126:4
146:13 151:7,8 177:6	172:5 174:8	114:23 120:9,18	transfers 22:22 112:25	tremendous 67:2
talked 63:5 87:8 130:5	theme 130:4	122:1,10 123:2 132:4	113:9,20 160:6	trial 1:7 7:1 14:13,20
130:7 131:25 146:20	thereof 28:17	133:13 136:22,23	177:14	31:24 73:13,14 76:24
148:24	thin 49:18,18	150:19 151:8,9 158:3	transition 98:17	157:2 179:25
talking 17:25 18:1 33:5	thing 4:17 5:1 6:24	158:4 162:2 173:21	transmission 29:24	tried 75:9 78:1 124:8
41:18 42:18,19 44:2	8:25 23:1 25:22	174:3 176:3,6	30:9 54:7,11,12,13,14	triple 119:14
48:9 65:24 77:17	27:24 52:12 53:1	timeframe 120:16	57:21 125:8,13	troughing 122:1
78:4 79:7 91:18	54:16 66:3 70:18	timely 10:7 107:19	transparency 89:10	true 81:12 82:4 87:8
121:17 137:24,25	79:4,10 101:1 104:18	times 9:3,4 40:12 66:19	transport 13:7 28:17	92:10 98:25 117:18
146:23 155:9	121:24 128:11 136:8	99:25 115:4,5 116:4	36:15 47:7 81:17	117:19 123:25 139:16
talks 9:20 12:14 39:3	149:2 154:1 158:1	129:21 134:24 169:6	85:16 86:14 93:5	144:19 164:16 181:10
42:7	things 4:5 7:24 8:7	timing 142:11	96:17 106:25 108:24	truly 144:1
tariff 20:23 21:20	34:10 37:19 38:13	tiny 55:22 152:16	111:3 112:7 143:6	truth 5:24
tasks 81:5	39:5 42:3,21 56:12	154:11,15	transportation 8:22 9:7	try 64:23 74:21 78:2
tax 9:19 59:14 75:17	57:2 60:12 65:7	titles 28:3	10:3,4 14:25 20:1	trying 47:21 52:17
taxes 85:4 88:17,18	69:11 89:9 94:10	today 6:23 14:4 15:6	22:12 26:21 27:12	110:1 149:11 153:18
167:13 168:1,7	95:24 109:22,24	17:7 27:11 36:11,11	28:16 31:16,17 33:9	Tuesday 1:14
taxpayers 10:20	112:22 116:24 121:15	49:17 83:16 84:23	35:20,21 36:2,8 42:20	turn 83:5,14 88:20
team 160:3	126:9 132:3 135:25	122:18 129:22 130:5	48:4,15 49:10,25	108:8 112:9 114:1
technical 81:6,19	144:6 169:20	131:20,25 139:13,17	50:20 53:16 54:4	162:24
technically 130:17	think 4:5,8,21 5:3,18	145:5 148:24 162:17	56:12 57:22 58:6,20	turning 87:19 170:21
tedious 15:16	9:2,25 10:7 11:12	163:11 167:8 169:22	59:11 63:7,9,23 68:15	twice 55:12,16 118:9
Tehachapi 93:13	27:2 36:11 40:2	today's 28:7	68:19 69:10 70:3	120:9
102:24	46:10 57:15 72:3,5	toilets 94:22	73:16,18 74:1,11,12	two 4:13 6:4,8 13:14
tell 8:11 27:15 73:16,17	76:12 90:5 93:25	told 74:21 105:13	74:24 76:6,8 79:12	17:18 21:13 27:21
152:2	95:25 100:15 113:21	Tom 5:5 80:24	82:11,12,14 85:18	35:5 47:12 53:10
telling 103:20	114:15 122:25 132:11	tomorrow 129:16	89:15 90:11,23 91:2	54:10 66:18 73:24
tells 127:21	132:25 146:10 149:18	180:11	92:17,25 93:2,19 95:9	84:2 88:4,13 89:13
temerity 60:2	151:8,9 153:12,15	tonight 150:20	95:21 96:4,4 97:14,15	91:2,13,24 92:9 95:21
temporary 107:18	158:2 172:18 174:5	tool 23:13	98:16,21,22,24,25	96:7 97:10 102:1
ten 118:15 136:3	180:7,10	top 11:17 86:7 121:3,19	101:11,13,17,19,25	103:2,7 104:22
150:17 151:7 173:4	thinking 122:21	121:22 tonic 120:5	102:4,11,18,21,22	105:20 110:2 116:23
ten-minute 41:10	third 8:25 12:4 24:18	topic 129:5 total 66:6,14 97:17	103:1,8,11,11,13,24	116:25 119:21 120:6
ten-year 117:14,22,23 tend 7:5	37:12 63:8 93:19 102:22 109:10 114:1	98:2,9 119:9 179:10	104:3,13,20 105:10 105:23 106:5,6 108:7	121:12 134:4 137:13 146:5 147:19 162:22
term 77:19 89:23	114:5 136:13 159:24	totaled 105:12	109:4,8,11,15 111:16	163:15 165:22 176:3
102:14 110:1 131:11	171:7 173:18	totally 130:24	113:24 124:23 125:1	two-thirds 75:18
131:18 132:9,12	Thomas 2:11 26:15,16	tough 18:15	132:11,18 135:7,9	type 4:25 23:7 102:3,22
131.10 132.7,12	2.11 20.10,10	tough 10.10	152.11,10 155.7,7	Upe 1.20 25.7 102.5,22
	1	<u> </u>	I	I

types 101:9,18,25 103:7 104:1 126:19 144:17 U U.S 92:19 ultimately 80:4 81:24 82:7 101:14 162:10 162:13,15 167:2 171:24 unavailable 114:10 unavoidable 29:25 30:18 **unbundled** 32:8,15 64:1 89:9 90:7,21 91:6,21 95:12 112:10 131:22 135:4,6,7,9 153:25 154:3 **unbundling** 32:10,10 33:23 112:15 138:18 153:18 **underlying** 43:8 103:25 undermines 107:25 underscore 146:10 understand 52:4,6 87:21,22 165:11 understanding 11:9 107:21 109:14 undertake 43:19 undertook 162:16 undisputed 80:6 undoubtedly 150:10 unfair 97:24 118:7 147:8 unfairly 115:22 uniform 33:25 79:8 92:12 100:22,25 126:25 **uniformity** 79:7 127:10 unimpressive 119:23 uninterruptible 141:23 unit 88:1 92:11 **United** 171:15 178:20 unlawful 71:7 74:9,10 74:12 unnecessary 11:2 unreasonable 45:19 56:11 80:9 unreasonably 38:24.25 73:19,24 74:4 unrecovered 16:6 unrelated 40:16 78:11 unsatisfactory 24:3 **untreated** 20:3 21:6 89:22,24 90:20 91:4 untrue 87:10 118:2 unused 21:5 113:16 141:21 144:19

113:10 152:16

unusual 106:13 128:14 unwanted 109:13 **update** 147:24 **updated** 109:19 upheld 150:14 upstream 38:25 use 12:7.14 13:7 16:5 16:21 21:5 28:17.20 29:5,9,12,20,23 30:2 30:16 31:11 38:22 39:12,19 42:8 43:12 65:9,14 68:3,3,10,14 69:8 73:21 88:5 89:22 96:16,16 99:3,6 99:10 105:16,24 106:7,12,15 107:8,13 107:22,24 108:17 127:11,16 136:10 158:4 165:15 166:6 179:24 **useful** 151:9 user 29:13 31:12 38:23 39:20,25 63:12 users 10:21 38:19 40:6 68:6 109:11 uses 22:24 36:1 38:25 65:20,21 88:12 93:7 167:4

usually 121:16

utilities 60:25 62:14

127:15,16 128:8

127:9,14,16

utility 34:6 60:16 79:1

79:3,23 126:21 127:6

79:22 125:24 126:2

V v 32:1 40:18 validate 31:23 validated 32:7 125:11 Valley 11:24 69:19 111:4 143:15 166:9 valorem 88:17 valuable 128:7 147:18 149:8,14 value 22:23,24 67:16 71:24 72:6 117:7 132:20,21,23 133:6 133:13,15,23 172:14 VAN 2:3 variable 21:4 50:20 68:14 89:2,5 103:1,15 128:2,3,5,22 168:18 169:2

variance 66:2

119:23

variation 115:22 117:4

variations 116:9,10

122:2 **varied** 66:16 variety 116:15 various 9:4,6 26:17 33:22 34:10 38:13 57:2 80:2 86:18 87:23 128:25 132:16 136:7 147:13 161:15 161:20 165:19 167:6 vary 103:2 vast 56:1,7 81:13 154:18 173:4 vastly 36:21 version 3:11 27:25 99:23 164:12,13 versus 90:18 128:2 152:3,4 153:17 174:23 Video 140:22 **VIDEOGRAPHY** 1:23 view 4:21,22 128:15 129:20,25 132:11,12 174:19 violate 40:25 41:20 violated 8:12,12 violates 32:4 45:16 violating 23:3 **violation** 37:14 74:8 78:10 virtually 16:7 51:21 virtue 99:11 105:22 vociferously 46:24 volume 1:8 3:2 13:23 19:10 24:21 65:23 87:25 117:1 167:21 volumetric 16:4,8,25 17:5,7 18:1,25 24:15 33:25 67:24 88:22 89:5,8,21 92:11 116:16 167:18,20 168:1,4,7,15 169:17 voluntary 12:11 25:7 31:9 volunteered 151:3 vote 75:18 172:13 voted 14:10 Voters 70:5 voting 172:12,14,18 vs 1:8 W

W 2:5 wafer 49:18 wait 142:13 147:11 walk 91:21 118:13 176:4 want 4:5,9 5:19 6:5 7:3 10:15 12:6,11,23

29:10 39:14,15 41:13 49:4 63:8 66:2 68:3 75:16 78:2 91:21 94:18 103:17 108:8 122:21 128:7.12 133:6 134:24 144:5 151:1 155:2 157:24 158:4 164:11 170:8 174.20 wanted 15:24 21:25 38:3 39:11 48:1 50:12 157:5 171:19 180.1 wants 5:12 12:15 13:15 80:20 97:4 136:23 151:13 war 171:14,20 **Warren** 2:6 158:6 Washington 159:21 wasn't 119:12 145:25 waste 128:19 158:3 wasteful 11:2 Wastewater 124:19 water 1:6,9 2:8,13 3:9 3:13 7:10,11,16,17,21 8:10,17 10:11,12,13 10:20 11:1,8,10,14,15 11:22,24 12:2,6,8,12 12:16,18,19 13:1,4,6 13:8.10.11.13.14.18 13:21,23 14:24,25 15:6,21 16:1,9 17:9 17:13,14,18,20,23 18:9,13 19:9,10,12,14 19:25 20:4,6,8,13 21:6,7,11 22:9,12,22 22:23 23:2,15,21 24:4 24:18,21 25:1,4,8,17 25:20,23 26:13,20,23 28:5,16 29:3,7,9,12 29:14,17 30:4,11,13 30:24 31:10,13,16 32:19,21 33:9,25 34:1 34:22,25 35:2,3,5,7,8 35:10,19,20,22 36:1,3 36:5,6,9,15,16,17,20 36:24 37:14,17 38:7 38:19,19,22,23 39:2,5 39:12,25 40:8,15,18 41:4,19,24,25 42:6,21 42:24 43:1,10,12,13 44:7,11,13,13,14,16 44:19,21 45:1,9,20,21 45:24 46:15,18,19 47:4,4,6,6,7,8,8,9,12 47:14,14,15,15,15,17 47:23 48:2,3,10,11,13 48:19,20 49:8,8,9,11

49:19,21,24 50:3,16 50:16,18,19 52:22,23 53:4,5,22 54:3,6,23 54:23,24,25 55:3,5,6 55:7.7.10.11.13.15.19 55:20,21,21,23,24,25 56:2,3,6,11,13,15,19 58:7.11.14.16.20 59:9 59:14,19,20 60:4,6,23 61:5,6,7,8,9,12 62:2 63:6,6,8,12,14 64:20 65:1,3,9,20,21 66:6 66:12,15,19 68:11,18 68:20 69:7,8,9,14 70:8 71:6,10,12,13,15 73:20,25,25 74:2,3,6 74:8,10,24 76:1,6,7 77:8 78:12,20 79:12 79:15,15,19 80:15,25 81:7,8,13,14,15,17,22 82:11,13 83:9,10,11 83:13,23 84:2,7,9,11 85:7,8,9,11,11,16,16 85:18 86:7,14,17,22 86:25 87:1,2,5,6,9,10 87:11,12,12,13,15,25 88:2,3,4,9,22 89:2,5,5 89:8,14,17,18,22,22 90:2,20 91:4,25,25 92:2,6,14,16,25 93:1 93:5,8,11,14,16,20,22 94:7,11,11,13,19 95:16,20,22 96:6,8,17 96:17 97:23 98:21,24 99:2,3,7,8,9,13,17,17 99:19,20,22 100:1,7,8 100:8,10,11,17,18,20 100:22,23,25 101:3,6 101:9,10,15 102:1,4 102:12,13,16,21,23 103:4,5,15,18,21 104:6,10,19,24,25 105:4,5,6,11,15,17,17 105:18,25 106:5,8,8 106:10,10,12,13,15 106:19 107:1,2,3,9,14 107:16,23 108:2,3,7,9 108:13,14,17,20,21 108:24 109:4,7,10,16 109:18 110:4,18 111:3,8,9,18 112:1,7 112:10,18,24 113:7,9 113:10,19,20,23 114:8,9,19 115:2 116:11,13,19,21,22 117:1,16 118:5,15,21 119:9 120:4,13 121:2 121:7,13 123:10

104 00 105 0 10 00
124:23 125:2,19,20
126:20,21 127:22,23
128:1,4,10,14,17,19
120.1,1,10,11,17,17
130:6,13,19 131:6,6,9
121.11 12 24 122.0
131.11,12,24 132.9
132-22 133-3 7 135-7
132.22 133.3,7 133.7
131:11,12,24 132:9 132:22 133:3,7 135:7 136:2,13,15 137:1,1
137:12,19,19,21,21
137.12,19,19,21,21
137:25 138:1,5,10,14
120 20 120 1 2 2 4 6
138:20 139:1,2,3,4,6
139:8,9,19 141:6,8,9
139.6,9,19 141.0,6,9
141:13,14,17,18
140 1 6 6 0 10 10 12
142:1,6,6,9,10,12,13 142:14,15,17,19,23 142:23,24 143:1,3,3,7
142.14 15 17 19 23
172.17,13,17,13,23
142:23,24 143:1,3,3,7
143:8,9,16,18,19,19
143.6,9,10,16,19,19
143:19,23 144:2,10
144:13,17,22,24
145:7,8,9,12,16 146:7
146:14,20,21,22,24
146 05 145 60 11 12
146:25 147:6,9,11,12
147.12 14 10 140.1
147.13,14,16 146.1
146:25 147:6,9,11,12 147:13,14,18 148:1 148:15,19,20,23
140.2.4.5.0.12.14.15
149:3,4,5,8,12,14,15
149:15,16,21,25
151:20 152:12,12,16
152:21,22,22,25
153:1,1,6,7,9,21,24
133.1,1,0,7,21,24
153:25 154:10,13,16
154.17 20 24 25
154:17,20,24,25
155:1,2,3,4,5,8,10,18 155:20,25 159:10,16
155.1,2,5,1,5,0,10,10
155:20,25 159:10,16
159:18,18,23 160:4,5
160:6,20 162:5,21,23
162:25,25 163:2,3,4,8
163:9,11,11,13,13,14
103.9,11,11,13,13,14
163:15,16,17,19,21
,-,-,-,
162.22 24 164.7 10
163:22,24 164:7,10
163:22,24 164:7,10
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14 176:18 177:8,10,11 177:14,16,16,18,20 177:21,22,23,25
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14 176:18 177:8,10,11 177:14,16,16,18,20 177:21,22,23,25
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14 176:18 177:8,10,11 177:14,16,16,18,20 177:21,22,23,25 178:2,7,14,21,22,22
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14 176:18 177:8,10,11 177:14,16,16,18,20 177:21,22,23,25
163:22,24 164:7,10 164:17 165:16,17,20 166:3,15,17,20,24,25 167:2,8,9,23,23,24 169:6,8,14 170:2,4,4 170:8,12,14,14,17,18 170:22,22,24 171:1 171:12,19,20,22 172:8,10,12,17,21,23 172:24,25 173:2,4,5,5 173:6,8,11,11,12,12 173:13,13,14,15,17 173:18,19,22,23,23 174:3,12,23,25 175:3 175:8,15,16,17,18,18 175:20 176:1,2,7,8,14 176:18 177:8,10,11 177:14,16,16,18,20 177:21,22,23,25 178:2,7,14,21,22,22

```
179:13,13,15,16,16
waters 10:17 39:21
watershed 173:10
waving 54:20
way 6:15 11:10 17:5
  18:24 37:6 41:20
  47:18 51:10,15 52:25
  57:15 78:16.17 79:8
  82:21,22 83:25 90:8
  92:5 102:19 115:11
  115:19 116:7 126:3
  129:3 137:18 143:6
  154:22 157:16 165:6
  178:6
ways 8:19 12:2 41:18
  81:12 106:12 108:17
  113:11 116:16 128:23
  130:11 150:10 166:23
we'll 17:22,22 19:7
  22:15 29:15 34:19
  42:14 47:13 61:3
  77:12,12 92:16
  120:17 144:3 150:18
  179:21
we're 6:21 8:9,20,21,25
  9:24 12:4 14:18 18:2
  18:19,20 22:16 25:9
  27:9 30:3,5 44:13
  45:11 65:24 70:16
  73:14.15 74:20 78:3
  79:15 80:12 91:17
  110:17 129:15 134:8
  137:24,25 148:10
  153:4,18 154:1,2
  156:23,23,24 157:4
  158:1,22
we've 9:2 28:6 33:1
  42:6 59:13 60:15
  75:7,23 76:12 79:18
  84:14 85:13,21 86:10
  86:22 87:14,23,24
  88:6 90:12 95:8
  104:5 106:1 111:15
  114:4 131:1 136:19
  137:6,6 138:16,24
  143:11,12 145:22
  153:12,15,20 154:4,5
  159:2 174:14
Web 62:21 164:10
weekly 64:19
WEF 128:19
weigh 25:18
weighted 172:13,18
welcome 6:25
Wells 60:18
```

went 29:8 32:15 95:7

122:11 162:1,11

112:3 116:17 122:10

```
west 2:11 83:23 85:24
  86:8 105:22 111:4
  119:18 137:10 163:17
  164:21 165:22 171:25
  173:25 177:2 179:23
western 86:24 171:7
wet 34:15,20 35:15
  169:5
whatsoever 56:5
wheel 7:20 14:10 18:3
  18:13 22:20 24:4
  29:22 40:15,16 54:23
  54:25 95:18 130:19
  144:24 149:6 154:11
  155:2
wheeled 17:20 154:16
wheeler 55:12
wheelers 113:25
wheeling 7:17 9:10
  14:2,15 15:1,12,22
  16:1,6,12,13,22 17:3
  17:8,15,16,24 18:10
  18:17 19:2,14,25 20:2
  20:4,11,12,19,21,23
  21:1,4,18,20,23 22:3
  22:5,8,12,17 23:12
  24:8,9,14,17,23 25:1
  25:15,20,22 26:13,14
  27:5,7,10 28:6,7 29:7
  29:21 30:14.18.21.23
  31:1,25 32:3,5 33:13
  36:14 37:4,12,13,18
  37:20,23,24 38:1,8,12
  38:22 41:23 42:6,13
  43:5,23 45:7,16 49:4
  55:3,13,18,24 56:7,14
  59:15 70:7 74:8
  75:24 76:10,15,16,17
  76:21,22 77:3,5,5,6
  77:18,21 78:10,16,17
  79:9 82:5 95:13,15,19
  95:22 96:3,7,10,11,15
  96:21,23,25 97:10,19
  98:15 106:23,25
  107:2,2,6,11,12,21
  108:1,2 109:9 113:10
  113:15 121:10 129:21
  129:23 130:3,17,22
  132:21 139:15,18,22
  139:25 140:3,6,19,24
  141:5,13,22 142:2
  144:1,4,9,12,12,13,18
  144:21,22 145:3,21
  145:24 146:5,6,11,12
  146:16,19 154:6,23
wheels 35:25 36:1
wholesale 125:19,20
wholesaler 83:9
```

```
wild 169:12
wildlife 38:24
witness 80:13 158:7,11
  158:18 160:19 171:6
  171:9 174:2
witnesses 3:1 77:12
Woodcock 4:21
word 100:13 108:19
  129:21 146:1
words 18:19 28:11
  29:14 34:19 42:24
  44:10 96:21 99:5
  117:6 119:12 120:19
  128:6 131:12 132:5
  134:17 135:16 142:22
  144:23 147:16 157:7
work 39:18 50:5 53:18
  124:17
worked 38:4
working 57:4 168:13
works 36:10 44:22
  60:24 123:11 126:21
  128:1,10 142:1
World 171:14
WORLDWIDE 1:23
worried 40:25
worry 7:8 39:7
worse 114:12
worth 45:2 65:1 106:18
  136:6 137:4
wouldn't 97:5 128:12
  138:1 172:1
writes 52:11
writing 157:25 158:2
written 14:15,23 25:9
  52:13 161:5
wrong 12:12 124:10
  156:19
wrote 15:20 44:3,24,24
          X
yeah 7:5 46:10 57:18
  94:20 117:25 121:6
  121:10 176:13
year 12:5 13:5,12,14
  19:7 21:15 32:15
```

34:21,22 36:12 44:22

60:6 63:10,16,24 64:9

64:13 65:2,18 66:4,4

66:13,19,22,22 67:8

67:14,22 68:3,4,4,24 69:12,16 70:7,10

88:5,8 89:1 96:20,23

103:2,2 114:3,7,16,24

71:16 78:20 82:15

96:24 97:5 98:3

115:5,5,24 116:1,2,4 116:5 117:16 118:1 118:22,23 119:2,2,7 121:1,4,11 132:6,15 136:12 138:5 139:18 140:1 142:12,16,18 142:18,24 147:23 148:6 156:6.15.20 160:6 168:21 169:10 169:13,13 172:18 175:4,17 177:17 year-to-year 168:16 years 7:12 13:13 32:25 33:2,3 34:16,20 35:14 35:15 63:12,14,14 65:3,4,5,19,20 66:7,9 66:11,18,23,24 68:11 69:8 71:17,25 72:2,6 72:7 74:6 78:14,16 91:14 92:6 95:5 109:20 114:8 115:15 116:14 118:15 119:7 121:12,13 122:12,16 122:17 124:17 131:17 135:13,19 136:2,3,13 159:12 160:10 161:15 161:16 162:1 169:4,9 169:14 173:4 174:11 yellow 11:13 46:4,14 46:25 48:21 49:11 55:12,14 73:22 153:11 \mathbf{Z} zero 156:5 0 0 43:1 49:12 **0.1** 120:4 **03** 138:20 **051** 174:17 91:23

1
1 1:9 30:9 64:21 71:14
91:23
1.07 119:11,19 120:5
1.11 119:17,19
1.31 119:20
1.32 119:11 120:5
1.6 55:19,25
1.91 163:10
1:30 72:21
10 30:22 129:8 131:2
10,000 107:1
10:00 179:21 180:11
100 35:6 56:17 58:19
59:8 129:21 155:11
155:23 156:5

	1	I	i
100,000 119:7	49:20 59:16 70:22	24 170:25	5 30:8 124:5,7 168:8
11 71:6 159:12 161:16	74:14 129:24 153:20	24/7 142:12,24 143:9	175:19
110 136:13	1998 12:25 13:2 32:18	242 163:25	5.2 77:7 138:9
116 51:12	42:18 95:4 131:1,2	242-mile 84:10	50 33:7,11 43:22 44:18
116,000 66:17	135:25 138:6	244 65:23	50/50 59:5
12 7:12 15:6 26:1,2	1999 57:5 59:2 60:11	25 44:1,3 66:23	500 148:17
144:5	1st 88:25	250,000 121:23	50076 75:15
13 9:10 15:6 28:25 31:5		253 138:20	51 19:18,19 66:14
32:14 45:16 75:14,14	2	255,000 66:25	104:19
75:23 82:3 91:12	2 29:2,2 64:21 91:23	26 9:9,12,17 13:18	510830 1:7
173:20	20 71:17,25 136:2	21:17 32:13 42:1,2,3	511,000 64:25 66:21
14 7:13 15:6 32:14	200,000 13:4 43:10	43:6,6 45:16 58:1	522-7096 1:25
91:12	177:16	59:2 71:16,22 74:23	54999.7(c) 78:23
141 45:3	2000 65:9,10 122:12	82:1 83:16 118:16	5th 61:6 147:2
15 14:11 63:19 161:15	2001 32:9,11 66:4	125:18 126:4 133:8	
168:23	88:25 95:1,6	150:9 162:21 169:25	6
152 35:17	2002 90:13,18,19	27 163:9	6 18:23 50:10 111:5
159 3:4	112:13 145:12	28 163:9	112:5
16 176:11,12,14	2003 32:11,16,18 33:20	282 45:3	6137 1:19 181:5,21
164 3:9,11	64:1 74:15 76:25	29 41:6 85:16 152:21	633 2:3
168 62:10	88:25 90:9,10,16,19	155:13	65 114:4
17 1:14 4:1 20:20 73:1	91:8,15,20 95:7	3	66013 79:4
168:23 172:19	112:16 120:19 131:3		67 72:6
177 3:12	131:21 132:1 135:24	3.0 120:3	7
18 136:18 181:15	138:9 177:13,24	3.1 171:3	
181 1:9	2005 99:23	3:00 80:19	7 27:2 30:17 72:2,3,4,5
1810 29:8	2007 161:24	30 42:22	72:6 70 119:9
1810(d) 38:20 1811(e) 20:3 42:6	2008 106:20 2009 106:25	30-year 131:18	70 119:9 700 2:13
1811(c) 29:3 42:6 1812 29:8	2010 7:13 25:25 26:1,2	301,000 66:13 304 1:4	700 2.13 701 1:24
1813 25:2,4,23 37:14	26:5,16 32:12 33:17	30th 66:11	71 66:5,10 70:25
78:10	40:21 47:19 49:15	31 12:20 173:14,17	75 13:13
1813(d) 22:15	50:9,10 59:3 60:21	32 66:5,8	77,000 136:12
19 70:24 71:1 83:18	69:3,3 70:24 71:5,10	348 3:9,11 164:4,5,6,12	7.,000 130.12
1920s 84:5	71:16 76:18,22 91:17	164:13,19,22,23	8
1928 83:7	123:5 124:15 125:11	348A 3:11 164:12,13	8 71:9
1930s 84:6	151:22 161:4	164:19,22,24 178:10	80 168:5,5,15,20
1946 171:14,24	2010-11 66:4	37 172:10	169:16
1960 85:9 99:24 163:6	2010-A-R2446 27:25	382 3:12 174:15 175:11	800 1:25 72:5
1969 47:18,20 48:1	2011 7:12 15:6 36:12	176:25 177:3,4	803 72:1
90:7	91:12 161:5 170:12	391-5400 2:4	82 14:17,22 27:23
1985 53:2	2012 7:14 26:3,16	393-2422 2:10	66:22
1987 12:17 173:9 174:5	32:13 47:19 53:9	3rd 1:24	
1990 122:20	56:24 57:5 65:10		9
1990s 10:9 122:19	66:12 67:11 76:18,23	4	90 132:7
1991 174:5,23 175:14	91:12,17 95:2 114:5	4 30:8 123:23	90012 2:14
175:16 176:21	147:2 151:22 161:5,7	4:30 150:21 179:19	90s 14:2,5
1992 12:17 173:9	162:13	40 72:1,6	94111 1:24
1994 65:9 122:12	2013 1:14 4:1 7:13 33:6	400,000 110:24	94111-1809 2:4
1995 15:13,19 38:9	65:22,25 73:1 161:8	4119 96:14	94111-4067 2:10
48:7 53:3 54:18	176:1,7,14,21 181:15	415 1:25 2:4,10	95 173:16,18 175:16
1996 53:9,11 109:19,21	2014 161:9	42 137:9	97 15:9 154:7
110:17	2021 177:17	4202(b) 10:19	981-3498 1:25
1997 14:9,11,17,22	213 2:14	433,000 66:17	99 57:12,20 104:20
15:2,8,18 23:17 27:11	217-6000 2:14	4405 95:15	
27:14,16,22 31:22	218 41:6	46 176:10	
32:7 37:16 38:5,14	22 100:6 152:13	5	
41:21 43:4 44:4 45:8	23 27:24 101:12	3	
			l

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                       1
                                                                                    CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX OF WITNESSES
                                                                       2
             COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                                                     PAGE VOLUME
     BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS A. E. KARNOW, JUDGE PRESIDING
                                                                              DENNIS CUSHMAN
                                                                       3
              DEPARTMENT NUMBER 304
                                                                              Direct Examination by MR. BRAUNIG
                                                                                                                       185
                                                                       4
                                                                              Cross-Examination by MR. WEST
                                                                                                                     224
                                                                                                                           II
     SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                              Redirect Examination by MR. BRAUNIG 258
                                                                                                                              II
                                                                       5
                                                                              Recross-Examination by MR. WEST
                                                                                                                     263
                                                                                                                            II
         Plaintiff.
                       ) Case No. 510830
                                                                       6
                                                                              DAN DENHAM
                     ) Trial
                                                                       7
                                                                                                                       300
                                                                              Direct Examination by MR. BRAUNIG
                                                                                                                              II
                      )
                                                                              Cross-Examination by MR. WEST
                                                                                                                     334
                                                                                                                           II
                     ) Volume II
                                                                       8
     METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                       9
                                                                                         INDEX OF EXHIBITS
     SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
                                  ) Pages 182 - 366
                                                                      10
                                                                                        Description
                                                                                                             Ident. Evid.
                                                                              No
                                                                      11
         Defendant,
                                                                              Exhibit 123 Board Memo dated April
                                                                                                                           197
                                                                      12
                                                                                       10, 2007
                                                                      13
                                                                              Exhibit 179 Letter dated 8/25/2010
                                                                                                                         202
                                                                                      from Kightlinger to
          Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
                                                                      14
                                                                                       Stapleton
            Wednesday, December 18, 2013
                                                                      15
                                                                              Exhibit 201 Letter dated 6/23/11
                                                                                                                        204
                                                                                      from Lightlinger to
                                                                      16
                                                                                       Stapleton
                                                                      17
                                                                              Exhibit 383
                                                                                           Raw data file
                                                                                                                     318
     Reported by:
                                                                      18
                                                                              Exhibit 384
                                                                                           Summary of evidence
                                                                                                                          322
     CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, CSR 6137
                                                                      19
                                                                                                                    336
                                                                              Exhibit 701
                                                                                           Slide 34
     CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER
                                                                      20
                                                                      21
                                                                      22
             JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                      2.3
        WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
      701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                      25
          (415) 981-3498 OR (800) 522-7096
                                                            182
                                                                                                                                  184
      APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
                                                                       1
                                                                              DECEMBER 18, 2013
                                                                                                                 MORNING SESSION
2
      For Plaintiff:
                                                                       2
                                                                                        PROCEEDINGS
         KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                       3
         633 Battery Street
                                                                                            ---O0O---
 4
        San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
                                                                       4
                                                                                    THE COURT: Good morning.
         (415) 391-5400
                                                                       5
                                                                                    Yes, sir?
         By: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.
           DANIEL PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                       6
                                                                                    MR. KEKER: Your Honor, to begin, can I hand up
           WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESO.
                                                                       7
                                                                              a set of the slides that we showed yesterday --
           DAN JACKSON, ESQ.
                                                                       8
                                                                                    THE COURT: Of course.
           AUDREY WALTON-HADLOCK, ESQ.
      For Defendant Metropolitan Water District:
                                                                       9
                                                                                    MR. KEKER: -- in the opening? And this is
        BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
                                                                      10
                                                                              just what I showed you. It's not full documents in some
         Three Embarcadero Center
10
                                                                      11
        San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
                                                                              cases.
         (415) 393-2000
                                                                      12
                                                                                    THE COURT: I appreciate that.
11
         By: THOMAS S. HIXSON, ESQ.
                                                                      13
                                                                                    Are we ready to start up with our questions?
           COLIN C. WEST, ESQ.
12
                                                                      14
                                                                                       DIRECT EXAMINATION (Cont.)
13
         METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
                                                                      15
                                                                              BY MR. BRAUNIG:
         700 North Alameda Street
                                                                      16
        Los Angeles, CA 90012
                                                                                 Q. Good morning, Mr. Cushman.
        (213) 217-6000
                                                                      17
                                                                                 A. Good morning.
15
        By: HEATHER C. BEATTY, ESQ.
                                                                      18
                                                                                 Q. When we left off yesterday, you had just
           BETTY KUO BRITTON, ESQ.
16
                                                                      19
                                                                              finished talking to the Court about the IID transfer
17
      Reported by: Connie J. Parchman, CSR 6137
                                                                      20
                                                                              water and how that gets to San Diego. I want to turn
                                                                      21
19
                                                                              your attention now to what you referred to as the canal
20
                                                                      22
                                                                              lining water. Can you explain to the Court what the
22
                                                                      2.3
                                                                              canal water -- canal lining water is?
23
                                                                      24
                                                                                 A. The canal lining water is water that's
24
                                                                      25
25
                                                                              conserved by the Water Authority building modern
                                                            183
                                                                                                                                  185
```

2.3

- concrete-lined canals in the Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley desert to replace unlined earthen canals. The Federal Government calculated the amount of water saved from not seeping into the ground anymore and that conserves water. About 80,000 acre-feet of that saved water goes to San Diego by the United States per year, 80,000 acre-feet per year, and we get that for the 110-year term of that agreement.
- Q. Can you adjust your microphone a little bit?
 Can we pull up Exhibit 348A, please, PTX 348A.
 Mr. Cushman, can you, using your laser pointer, direct the Court to where these canals are that were lined as part of the canal lining project?
- A. Yes. This is the All-American Canal which connects to -- takes water off of the Colorado River at this point. And the All-American Canal for most of its length hugs the U.S. Mexican border on the U.S. side for approximately 82 miles heading due east. The Coachella branch of the All-American Canal is a spur off the All-American Canal at this location and travels up to the Coachella Valley in this lotion.
- Q. How does the Water Authority get canal lining water to the citizens of the San Diego?
- A. Met conveys that water to the San Diego, which is delivered by the United States to Met at this location

Joaquin Bay Delta.

- Q. Turning your attention now to Met's wheel rate, why does San Diego believe that Met's rates are unlawful in connection with State Water Project costs?
- A. Because Metropolitan adds to the price it charges for using the Metropolitan transportation facility, the Metropolitan aqueduct, Metropolitan pipelines. They add into the cost of using those pipelines the unrelated cost of purchasing the water supply through the State of California through its water supply contract with the Department of Water Resources.

When we go to Metropolitan to purchase transportation service for moving our third party water, we're not going to Metropolitan to buy Metropolitan water supplies and yet Metropolitan is adding the cost of the State Water Project supplies into the cost, into the charges they're charging us to move our independent IID and canal lining water.

- Q. Putting aside for now Met's transportation of IID and canal lining water, which is the subject of a later trial, does San Diego engage in any wheel transactions with Met?
- A. Yes. We have executed several one-year dry year water transfers for water supplies to supplement available supplies during water shortage allocations from

and travels through the aqueduct and ultimately to San Diego service connections in northern San Diego County.

- Q. And when you said "the aqueduct," which aqueduct are you referring to?
 - A. The Colorado River Aqueduct.
- Q. Does the canal lining water travel through the State Water Project?
 - A. No.

1.5

- Q. How does the reliability of the canal lining water and the IID water compare to buying Met water?
- A. Both of them are more reliable than Metropolitan Colorado River water. IID water is priority 3 water on the Colorado River. Metropolitan has lower priorities on the Colorado River. They have priority 4 and priority 5. Metropolitan's priority 5 Colorado River water is surplus only water, water only available in times of surplus on the Colorado River.

The canal lining water is simply provided under a contract with the United States Secretary of the Interior so it's superior reliability and the water shall be delivered over the term of that agreement. It's a commitment for the investments we made in lining the canals. And both of those supplies are more reliable than Bay Delta water that Metropolitan gets from San

Metropolitan. We executed three agreements in 2008 and 2009 for supplemental dry year transfer supplies to supplement the supplies we're receiving overall and from Metropolitan.

- Q. And why does San Diego enter into these kind of transactions?
- A. Because we were in a water shortage allocation for nearly two years from Metropolitan. Metropolitan was in a shortage allocation from July 2008 to April of 2010, I believe mid-April 2010. And we went out into the market to buy additional water to help cover those shortages and serve our customers' needs.
- Q. When Metropolitan transports this third party water for San Diego, what rate does Metropolitan charge?
 - A. It's wheeling rates.
- Q. In the next drought cycle will San Diego seek to have Metropolitan once again transport third party water for it?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And what rate would you expect to be charged for that?
 - A. The wheeling rate.
- Q. You said that there were a few times over the last few years when San Diego wheeled water -- or strike that.

2.3

When San Diego engages in these wheeling transactions with Met, can they be on the Colorado River or involving the State Water Project?

A. Yes.

2.3

- Q. Over the last decade, how many times has San Diego wheeled water that went through the State Water Project?
 - A. About three times.
 - Q. What were those?
 - A. In 2008, we negotiated water sale agreements with the Butte Water District and the Sutter Extension Water District. Those were for 10,000 acre-feet and about 13,000 acre-feet respectively.

In that agreement, we also executed an agreement with Metropolitan Water District to transport that water. That water also involved an exchange with Metropolitan where Metropolitan took the water and served it, moved it all the way down to the service area and moved it and exchanged the amount of that water in the other storage aqueduct in the Semitropic Groundwater Storage Bank.

That water remains in that storage bank. Under the terms of that wheeling agreement, at such time the Water Authority calls upon that water, Metropolitan will transport that water from the storage bank through the Q. I want to ask you a couple questions about the Placer County Water -- Placer County Water Agency transfer.

How much did San Diego pay to purchase that water from Placer County?

- A. \$275 an acre-foot.
- Q. When Metropolitan delivered that water to you, was it the same molecules of water that San Diego had purchased from Placer County?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Why not?
- A. Because that small amount of water is intermingled with all the water that's in the Bay Delta itself that enters into the Banks Pumping Plant and State Water Project, the northern part of the California aqueduct and commingled with all the water that's flowing through the aqueduct, California Aqueduct itself and ultimately mingled with the water that's in the Metropolitan facility when we're moving it through the Metropolitan facility.
 - Q. So was the mechanism an exchange?
- A. An exchange is the practical way which all water transfers are conducted. Unless you have a completely empty pipeline and aqueduct and there's no transfers involved, or that we're talking about today

State Water Project public facilities, through the Metropolitan facilities and to the Water Authority and charge us the wheeling rate in effect at that time in the year of that transfer.

- Q. Okay.
- A. In 2009, we executed an agreement with the Placer County Water Agency for 20,000 acre-feet of water and that agreement was executed with Placer. A separate wheeling agreement was executed with Metropolitan and that water was fully conveyed by Metropolitan through the State Water Project, through the State Water Project by DWR, by Metropolitan through its system and to us in San Diego by the end of 2009.
- Q. Over the last decade how many total acre-feet of water have those transactions involved, those transactions involving wheeling that goes through the State Water Project?
 - A. About 33,000 acre-feet.
- Q. And during that same period of time, how much Met water has San Diego bought?
 - A. About 5 million acre-feet.
- Q. And in that same period of time, how much IID and canal lining water has San Diego paid to have Metropolitan convey through the Colorado River Aqueduct?
 - A. A little over a million acre-feet.

where that existed, all transfers are functionally executed through an exchange.

- Q. And just so we're clear, what rate did you pay in connection with this Placer County transfer? What rate did you pay to Metropolitan?
 - A. The wheeling rate.
- Q. You mentioned as part of the -- this transaction, Metropolitan had to wheel the Placer County water through DWR's facilities. Through your interactions with Met, have you gained an understanding of what Metropolitan pays DWR when it wheels water through the State Water Project?
- A. Yes. They pay the incremental cost of moving that water through the DWR facilities.
- Q. Is that on top of Met's take-or-pay contract for State Water Project water?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Was the Water Authority charged only those incremental costs that DWR charged to Met?
- A. We were charged the Metropolitan wheeling rate so no, not just the DWR incremental cost.
 - Q. What else were you charged for?
- A. We were charged Metropolitan System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate and the power necessary to move the water through DWR and Metropolitan's

facilities.

1.5

- Q. When San Diego engages in wheeling transactions that include State Water Project facilities, does San Diego object to paying the costs it causes DWR to incur in wheeling that water?
- A. No, we don't. We believe we ought to pay the cost of service of actually moving the water either from DWR's facilities and Metropolitan's facilities.
- Q. Still keeping aside the exchange agreement, does San Diego have any open or pending wheeling transactions with Met?
- A. Yes. Butte Water District, Sutter Extension
 Water District water transfer agreement with Metropolitan
 is still an open and active agreement. It only
 terminates after we have called upon the water and
 Metropolitan has delivered all of the water in that
 agreement to our service connections in Diego County.
 - Q. Where is that water right now?
- A. It's in storage underground in the Semitropic Water Storage Bank in the Central Valley.
- Q. When -- and when Metropolitan delivers that water to you, what rate will San Diego pay?
- A. The agreement calls for Metropolitan to charge us the wheeling rate that is then in effect in the year that transfer water moves.

acre-foot of water that Metropolitan sells -- excuse me, that Metropolitan transports through the Metropolitan facilities. It is a transportation charge.

- Q. How does Metropolitan decide how to -- based on your experience and knowledge working with Metropolitan, how does Metropolitan divvy up the funds collected through the Water Stewardship Rate?
- A. They receive applications from their member agencies to provide subsidy funds for local water supply development and they evaluate those and they bring those that they want to fund to the board of directors for approval.
- Q. Okay. How much -- what's the size of the subsidy that Metropolitan provides?
- A. It is a sliding scale, subsidy of up to \$250 acre-foot produced by the local water supply project or program. And that sliding scale is dependent on the difference between the cost of producing that water, that local water supply and whatever the cost of Metropolitan's water is at that time.

So, such that over time, as the Metropolitan water rates increase and Delta, the difference between that and the local supply development decrease, the subsidy decreases, that's why it is called a sliding scale.

- Q. I want to ask you to turn your attention now to Metropolitan's Water Stewardship Rate. What is San Diego's complaint about the Water Stewardship Rate in the context of Met's wheeling rate?
- A. Metropolitan includes 100 percent of the Water Stewardship Rate as a Transportation Rate for the use of Metropolitan's facilities. The water stewardship revenues recovered from the Water Stewardship Rate pay for water supply projects and programs.

Water recycling programs, groundwater recovery programs, water conservation programs and devices, sea water desalination development, whenever they pay a subsidy under that, all of those are local water supplies, all of those are the supply development or supply conservation programs, yet they charge 100 percent of those costs to the Transportation Rate and zero to Metropolitan's Water Supply Rate.

- Q. Is water stewardship a service that Metropolitan provides?
- A. No, a way to charge acre-feet that Metropolitan redistributes to its -- the member agencies it chooses to provide subsidy funds to.
- Q. How are member agencies charged for the Water Stewardship Rate?
 - A. It is added -- it is a charge added to every

Q. Do you know the standards Metropolitan uses in evaluating these applications?

- A. Yes. They call it the open and sliding scale evaluation.
- Q. Are you aware of -- let's -- can I ask the -- Mr. Dahm to bring up -- actually, first can I ask you to turn in your binder to PTX 123. PTX 123 is the April 10th, 2007 board action.

Mr. Cushman, what is PTX 123?

A. It is a board memo from the Metropolitan Water District staff to its board of directors Water Planning and Stewardship Committee dated April 10th, 2007 and entitled "Authorized and Updated Policy and Procedure for Local Resources Program."

MR. BRAUNIG: Plaintiff's would move PTX 123 into evidence.

MR. HIXSON: No objection. THE COURT: 123 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit PTX 123 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

- Q. So what events at Metropolitan are reflected in PTX 123, this board meeting -- this board memo?
- A. This is an action item presented to the committee and to the board to approve how Metropolitan will consider and award subsidy money under the local

Pages 194 to 197

resources program.

1.5

- Q. And was Metropolitan considering various options for how to do -- how to disburse these funds?
- A. Yes. There are two alternatives delineated in the memo and its attachments.
- Q. Can you go to attachment 3, please, which is the -- attachment 3 is 156 at the bottom.
- Mr. Cushman, is this one of the -- this alternative number one, open program with sliding scale incentive, is this one of the options that was being considered?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And can you describe this option, please?
- A. Yes. Under this option, Metropolitan would accept applications on an open and continuous basis and they would award subsidy agreements to projects on -- basically based on readiness to proceed basis.
- Q. And what was the second option -- let's go to alternative number two, which is the next page.
- A. Alternative number two was called the priority selection with fixed incentive schedule and it had a set of specific evaluation or selection criteria under which applications under this alternative would be evaluated.
 - Q. Okay. What were the selection criteria on

A. Just what they put in the program, which are those four criteria as listed on the memo.

Q. I'll move on, then.

Which approach was taken, alternative number one or alternate number two?

- A. Alternative one, the open and sliding scale alternative.
- Q. In the course of your job, do you review Met board memoranda prepared in support of specific local resource programs and conservation programs?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. In reading those memoranda, does Metropolitan indicate the avoided costs it believes those specific programs will generate?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. To the best of your knowledge, does Metropolitan attempt to monitor what benefits there might be from those specific programs?
- MR. WEST: I'm going to object again as calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Overruled. This is just a question based on his information. It may be incomplete and I understand that.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: No. The only monitoring or

alternative two?

- A. The four selection criteria were probability of success, which was weighted with a 40 percent weighting factor in the evaluation, regional water supply and facility benefits, which was weighted at 30 percent, cost to Metropolitan was weighted at 20 percent, and regional water quality and environmental benefits was weighted at ten percent.
- Q. And I want to draw your attention to two paragraphs down where regional water supply benefits are sort of broken out. What -- in this evaluation, what did Metropolitan understand regional water supply benefits to be as a selection criteria?

MR. WEST: I'm going to object. Calls for speculation. He's testifying about what Metropolitan believed.

THE COURT: Well, are you just asking him to read this, basically? Does he have anything to add to what I might read? I'm not sure what your question is.

MR. BRAUNIG: I was asking if he understands what Metropolitan was considering as the water supply benefits as a criteria.

THE COURT: Why would he know? BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. Do you know, Mr. Cushman?

auditing that Metropolitan does is to assure that the acre-foot produced by the project or the program that

³ Metropolitan provides the subsidy for, subsidy payment

for was actually produced. So there's a reconciliation of that but there isn't an evaluation or reconciliation

of what benefits provided to Metropolitan in terms of

regional water supply or facilities.

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

- Q. Is the Water Authority allowed to receive benefits under the local resource program?
- A. No. We've been barred from receiving funding from the program.
 - Q. Why?
- A. Through Metropolitan's execution of the rate structure integrity provision in 2011, they canceled existing agreements that were in place that had that provision in it.

They deferred any action and refused to consider three specific pending agreements that were pending for final execution by Metropolitan at the time and they barred us from any future subsidy money from future applications to Metropolitan.

Q. I think I asked that question in the context of the local resources program but is the same true for the Water Authority's ability to participate in the

> Pages 198 to 201

conservation or sea water desalination programs? termination of agreements. 2 2 MR. BRAUNIG: We would move it into evidence as A. Yes. 3 3 Q. Can I ask you to turn to PTX 179 in your well 4 4 THE COURT: That includes the attachments, binder, please? 5 5 And, Mr. Cushman, what is PTX 179? which is agreements, for example 94278? 6 6 A. It is a letter dated August 25th, 2010 from MR. BRAUNIG: Yes. I believe it was all one 7 7 Metropolitan's general manager Jeffrey Kightlinger to the document. 8 8 MR. WEST: No objection. Water Authority's general Maureen Stapleton titled 9 9 THE COURT: 201 is admitted. "Notice of intent to initiate process to consider 1.0 1.0 MR. BRAUNIG: Thank you. termination of incentive agreements with the Water 11 11 Authority." (Whereupon Exhibit 201 was 12 MR. BRAUNIG: We would move PTX 179 into admitted into Evidence.) 12 13 evidence. BY MR. BRAUNIG: 14 13 MR. WEST: No objection. Q. Drawing your attention to the paragraph at the 15 14 THE COURT: 179 is admitted. bottom of the first page with 323 at the bottom, starting 15 16 (Whereupon Exhibit PTX 179 was with "pursuant," what is it that Metropolitan informed 16 admitted into Evidence.) the Water Authority in this June 23rd, 2011 letter? 17 17 BY MR. BRAUNIG: A. That it's terminating in item number one at the 18 Q. Is this the letter that was sent at the 18 bottom of the agreement, ECP24-2007, effective on the 19 19 beginning of the RSI process? date noted, July 25th, 2011, terminates agreement 94278 20 20 A. Yes. effective August 8, 2011, and that it would modify or 21 21 Q. Okay. And can you look -- looking at sort of issue addendas to two other agreements to eliminate 22 22 the list of programs there, did Metropolitan identify approval of funding for the Water Authority's member 23 23 specific programs that it intended to cancel that agency administered conservation programs -- or projects, 24 otherwise would provide subsidy benefits to San Diego? 24 rather. 25 25 A. Yes. They're listed in that table with the Q. Okay. Did Metropolitan give any indication of 202 204 1 1 agreement numbers in the right-hand column. whether or not it would consider from San Diego any 2 2 Q. And did Metropolitan in PTX 179, did future requests to participate in these local resource 3 Metropolitan also identify the programs that it would no program, conservation and desalination programs? longer consider that were pending before the board at 4 A. Yes. It's on page 2 of the letter. Item 4 5 that time? listed at the top says that pending incentive agreements 6 that have been or may be submitted to Metropolitan will A. Yes. They're on page 2 in a similar table and 7 they're listed there: Conservation, innovative not be executed prior to further action and direction 8 conservation and sea water desalination, and the from the Metropolitan board. 9 Q. Since June of 2011, when the Water Authority agreement numbers were shown in the right-hand column. 10 10 received this letter, has San Diego submitted any Q. Did Metropolitan ultimately follow through on 11 11 applications for local resource program conservation or its threats to cancel San Diego's LRP and conservation 12 12 desalination programs? programs and desalination programs? 13 13 A. No. A. Yes. They canceled the local resource program, 14 14 Q. Why not? recycling agreement and most of the conservation 15 15 A. They would be dead on arrival. Metropolitan agreements and deferred -- they canceled the agreements. 16 16 has told us they will not be executed. They retooled some of the conservation for payments 17 17 Q. If Met had not declared that San Diego couldn't directly to consumers but by and large, they were 18 18 participate in these programs, would San Diego have canceled. 19 applied for funding for local resource conservation and 19 Q. Can I ask you to turn in your binder to PTX 20 sea water programs? 20 201? 21 21 A. Yes. We always did. What is PTX 201? 22 22 Q. Does San Diego still have to pay into the Water A. It is a letter dated June 23rd, 2011, from MWD 23 Stewardship Rate though? 2.3 general manager Jeffrey Kightlinger to Water Authority 24 A. Yes. 24 general manager Maureen Stapleton regarding board action 25 Q. How much did San Diego pay in Water Stewardship 25 regarding rate structure integrity provisions and 203 205

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

rates in 2012, including payments under the exchange agreement?

A. Between 15 and \$20 million. Probably closer to \$20 million.

Q. When San Diego received money from Met for local resource program and conservation programs, who benefited from those programs?

MR. WEST: Objection. This calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Overruled. He may have some idea.

THE WITNESS: The agencies that received the funding from the agreements and their rate payers. BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. So when San Diego received those funds, who do you -- who benefited from those?

A. San Diego.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Q. When Metropolitan funds local resource program and conservation programs within other member agencies, does San Diego benefit from those?

A. No, not directly.

THE COURT: Does it benefit indirectly by increased water supply or something like that?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Theoretically, development of local water supplies, as long as an agency is actually

Q. In this case --

A. They're peaking in that dry year. Excuse me.

O. Excuse. I'm sorry.

In this case, what does San Diego believe Met has done or not done with respect to dry year peaking?

- A. They have not collected revenues from the agencies that cause the dry year peaking on Metropolitan proportionate to their burdens on Metropolitan for that dry year peaking, so they don't recover revenues on that
- Q. How do the dry year peaking allegations that San Diego are making relate to Met's wheeling rate?
- A. To the extent that Metropolitan is not recovering the costs caused by that dry year peaking from those who are causing the dry year peaking, they're recovering the revenues to pay for those benefits to those agencies through their volumetric rates that include the rates they're charging for wheeling.
- Q. Do you have any factual basis for asserting that Metropolitan is collecting dry year peaking costs through its volumetric rates?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What is that?
- A. Well, first Metropolitan told us they do that in response to interrogatory -- special interrogatory 15

206 208

deferring the purchase of Metropolitan supplied water, there could be a benefit to it, but it's never been calculated or analyzed by Metropolitan that it actually does that.

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. You testified earlier that Metropolitan charges the Water Stewardship Rate as part of its wheeling rate. Have you seen any report or study that connects wheeling with Metropolitan's need to spend \$60 million a year on conservation and water supply programs?

A. No.

Q. Are you aware of any Metropolitan analysis or report that attempts to determine whether Metropolitan collects the Water Stewardship Rate rate proportionately to the agencies who benefit from Water Stewardship Rate funding?

A. No.

Q. I want to turn your attention now to dry year peaking. What does the "term dry year peaking" refer to?

A. Refers to the practice of some member agencies at Metropolitan who rely on methodology in normal or wet years for comparatively less water but in dry years, roll on to Metropolitan with far greater demands for water from Metropolitan in the dry year.

in this litigation.

Secondly, they demonstrated that and told that to their board of directors in November of 2009 when they came to the board and recommended the board change their cost allocation to move the cost of their dry year storage in the terminal reservoirs from their transportation charge which is charged on wheeling to their supply rate.

And third, we know that through the engineer's report attached to Metropolitan's rate setting board memos and which describes the RTS charge and what the RTS charge recovers and doesn't recover.

- Q. And how does that -- how did that engineer's report shed light on this question of whether Metropolitan recovers dry year peaking costs through its rate agreement?
- A. Shows Metropolitan calculated the standby needs of the certain categories recovered by the RTS, they came up with a number and then they only recovered less than half of that number from the RTS.

So to the extent that they're recovering less than half of the actual charge that they calculated for the RTS from the RTS itself, they were recovering the rest of those revenues through their commodity rates that included the transportation rates that they --

209

2.3

MR. WEST: Belated objection, your Honor. Best evidence rule. He's testifying to the contents of a document. Best evidence of the content of the document is the document itself.

THE COURT: I agree. I'm just going to take this as sort of a summary of the allegations. I'll be relying on the actual document and we'll figure out what that actually says.

MR. BRAUNIG: Of course, your Honor. That's a document in the administrative record and we're going to be talking about that more later.

Q. I would like to -- Mr. Cushman, I would like to direct your attention in your binder to the tab AR2010-10753 and that's in the administrative record document. Let's go ahead and put it up on the board.

Mr. Cushman, you were referring -- you were testifying a few moments ago about a November -- or fall of 2009 presentation made to Metropolitan's board of directors that addressed dry year peaking related issues. Is this the document that you were referring to?

A. Yes. This is the Metropolitan staff presentation to its board on that issue.

Q. Okay. I would like to turn your attention to page 4 of this document, and this is the page that has at the top "one adjustment is recommended, State Water

Q. How currently does Metropolitan recover the costs associated with this State Water Project flex storage?

A. Through the transportation charges at Metropolitan.

Q. Okay. Can we turn to page 6 of this document?

Is that fact reflected on page 6 of this document?

A. Yes, on the first bullet, that Castaic and Perris reservoir costs are included in the conveyance function.

Q. Does this document indicate the specific rates or charges through which these costs are recovered?

A. Yes. The second sub bullet says the costs are recovered in the System Access Rate and RTS charge.

Q. And in this presentation, what is it that Metropolitan staff was recommending?

A. In this presentation, Metropolitan staff was recommending moving the costs of flex storage from the conveyance function or from the SAR and RTS charge to the Water Supply Rate at Metropolitan.

Q. Turning your attention to page 7, is page 7 where the Metropolitan staff laid this out?

A. Yes. On page 7, they are saying that a portion of the Castaic and Perris reservoirs is used for drought

210 212

Project flex storage."

2.2

1.5

There is a reference in this document to

Castaic Lake and Lake Perris. What are Castaic lake And

Lake Perris?

A. Castaic Lake and Lake Perris are the terminal reservoirs on the State Water Project System in Southern California.

Castaic Lake is the terminal reservoir on the west branch of the State Water Project and Lake Perris is the terminal reservoir on the east branch of the State Water Project.

- Q. And what's your understanding of what flex storage refers to?
- A. Flex storage is Metropolitan's dry year storage that it maintains in those two reservoirs for use in the dry year supply needs.
- Q. There is a reference in the second bullet below the second sub bullet that says this agreement provides a dry year supply benefit to Metropolitan. What do you understand that to mean?
- A. That means in dry years, Metropolitan is able to withdraw water from this flex storage in each of those two reservoirs to meet the dry year supply needs of its member agencies in the year in which they're withdrawing the water.

storage and their costs should be treated as a supply cost as discussed in the first bullet on page 7.

- Q. As part of this -- as part of this approach that the Met staff was recommending, was it able to calculate the portion of costs that are associated with a dry year benefit?
- A. Yes. In the second sub bullet to the second bullet the drought share or the flex storage amount of the total storage in those two reservoirs was 219,000 acre-feet out of 454,000 acre-feet of total storage.
- Q. And did the Met staff indicate in any way whether taking that -- that change to the allocation of these costs would be consistent with its -- with other decisions that it makes in its cost of service analysis?

MR. WEST: I'm going to object, your Honor. Can we clarify the record whether the witness is talking about the document itself or the representation made at the board meeting, which I don't believe we've established he's been there.

THE COURT: I agree. I take it we're just walking through the document here. Is that what's going on?

MR. BRAUNIG: For the moment, yes. THE COURT: That's the way I'll take it. Go ahead.

Pages 210 to 213

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the A. June 19th, 2013. 2 2 question? Q. What's the -- do you have experience with 3 3 BY MR. BRAUNIG: official statements in your role as a assistant general 4 Q. Yeah. The question was during this process -manager at San Diego County Water Authority? 5 let me ask you this. Were you involved at all in the 5 A. Yes. I reviewed quite a number of official 6 6 cost of service review that led -- that led up to this statements, both of Metropolitan and the Water Authority. decision? Q. What's the purpose of an official statement? 8 8 A. Yes. I was involved in quite a number of A. Official statement's purpose is to disclose to 9 9 meetings and discussions at Metropolitan during those bond buyers or investors the various risks and public 10 10 various processes: The long-range finance plan potential issues they should be aware of when evaluating 11 11 discussions, the rate refinement process discussions at whether to invest in or buy these bonds. 12 12 Metropolitan in which the Water Authority was identifying O. Okay. In Metropolitan's official statement, 13 13 these and other costs do not belong on the transportation did it disclose information about Los Angeles's dry year 14 14 charges and belong on Metropolitan's supply rate. And in peaking behavior? 15 15 this instance, Metropolitan took this item to the board A. Yes, they quantified it in this document. 16 16 with the acknowledgment it's in the wrong category and Q. Okay. Can I ask to you turn to page A30. 17 17 recommended putting it in the supply rate category. Let's blow up -- let's go to A29 and the 18 18 Q. And do you know how -- how the board ultimately header. This is -- what's the header in which 19 19 responded to this proposal by the Met staff? Metropolitan did this -- in which Metropolitan disclosed 20 20 this information? A. They did not take the action to make the change 21 21 so the change was not made. A. It's a section of the bond disclosure titled 22 22 Q. As far as you know, were these dry year drought "Los Angeles Aqueduct." 23 23 storage costs still on Metropolitan's System Access Rate? Q. Okay. And now turning your attention to page 24 24 A30, is this the page you're referring to in which you A. Yes. 25 25 Q. Let me ask you this as well. Is San Diego testified Metropolitan disclosed information about Los 214 216 1 1 challenging Met's Capacity Charge in this case? Angeles's dry year peaking? 2 2 A. Yes. 3 3 Q. Does San Diego claim that Met has failed to Q. Okay. Can we blow up the second paragraph, 4 account for the costs of peak day capacity? 4 please? 5 A. No. And what specifically were you referring to in 6 6 Q. Let me ask you another question relating to giving the testimony that you just gave about 7 7 peaking. Are you aware of any other Metropolitan --Metropolitan's disclosure? 8 8 documents where Metropolitan has spelled out the amount A. They disclosed that during a ten-year period, 9 9 of annual variation or peaking that any of its member from fiscal year 2000-2001 through fiscal year 2010-'11, 10 10 agencies engage in? that the City of Los Angeles has total requirements from 11 11 A. Yes. Their official statement in their bond Metropolitan varied from approximately 32 percent to 12 offering quantified the dry year peaking done by the Los 12 71 percent of the city's total water needs. 13 Angeles Department of Water and Power. 13 It discloses later on in the paragraph that 14 14 MR. WEST: Best evidence objection, your Honor. deliveries from Metropolitan to the city during the 15 THE COURT: Overruled. He's just describing 15 period varied between approximately 167,000 acre-feet per 16 the document. 16 year and approximately 433,000 acre-feet per year. 17 BY MR. BRAUNIG: 17 Q. Did Metropolitan disclose any information about 18 Q. Okay. The document is, per the parties' 18 long-term expectations of Los Angeles's peaking? 19 stipulation, in evidence, PTX 244. 19 A. Yes. At the very end, the last couple of 20 Mr. Cushman, is this the official statement you 20 sentences in the paragraph talked about the city may 21 are referring to? 21 still purchase up to 511,000 acre-feet or 82 percent of 22 A. Yes. 22 its dry year supplies from Metropolitan over the next 25 23 Q. If you look at the date in the bottom left 23 years and corresponds to their normal or dry year 24 corner of the first page, when was this generated by 24 purchases from Metropolitan of 255,000 acre-feet over

217

215

25

that period.

25

Metropolitan?

- Q. And in your view, what does this document demonstrate about Metropolitan's dry year peak -- or about dry year peaking issues?
- A. That the purchases from L.A. Department of Water and Power vary greatly in multiples of twice to two and a half times their demands in dry years compared to their wet or normal year demands.
- Q. Which rates -- which rates is San Diego challenging in these two chases?
- A. Challenging the System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate and the Power Rate.
 - Q. In what specific years?
 - A. In calendar years 2011 through '14 inclusive.
 - Q. When were the rates set for 2011 and 2012?
- A. They were adopted by the Metropolitan board in 2010.
- Q. Did the San Diego County Water Authority oppose those rates?
 - A. Yes.

1.5

1.5

- Q. How so?
- A. The Water Authority submitted testimony, both written testimony, oral testimony, cost of service reports conducted by -- produced by experts. We provided oral testimony at the public hearing in March of 2013, written testimony at the public hearing, additional

Met's allocation of State Water Project costs to its transportation rates?

- A. As far back as the 1990s. We have a rich and lengthy catalog of correspondence to Metropolitan on this subject of allocation of State Water Project rates to its transportation rates. We have participated in countless processes and committees of both management as well as board committees by our directors at Metropolitan putting forth our opposition to how Metropolitan misallocates its rates among its various rates and charges and how it misallocates State Water Project supply costs to its transportation rates.
- Q. What about Metropolitan's inclusion of the Water Stewardship Rate in its transportation rates?
- A. Yes, we've made clear our opposition to charging 100 percent of local water supply development and conservation costs on transportation and zero of those costs on the Water Supply Rate at Metropolitan. We've made clear those are water supply costs that should be recovered through Metropolitan's Water Supply Rate.
- Q. How about the dry year peaking issue? Is that an issue that San Diego has been raising for a long period of time?
- A. Yes. Similar to the other objections we've had, we've raised the issue that Metropolitan is not

written and oral correspondence at the April board of directors meeting at Metropolitan before Metropolitan adopted these rates.

- Q. How did San Diego's delegates to the Met board vote on Met's 2011 and 2012 rates?
 - A. They voted no.
- Q. When were the rates set for calendar years 2013 and 2014?
- A. Metropolitan adopted those rates in April of 2012.
- Q. Did San Diego -- did San Diego County Water Authority oppose those rates?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Again, how so?
- A. Just as we did in 2010, we submitted quite a lot of correspondence and documents to the Metropolitan board of directors, we provided written and oral testimony at the public hearing in March of 2012, again at the April board meeting, Metropolitan submitted additional testimony and documents. We were well on the record opposing those rates.
- Q. Okay. How did San Diego delegates vote on the 2013-2014 rates?
 - A. They voted no.
 - Q. How long has San Diego been complaining about

recovering the cost of dry year peaking from those entities that are causing the dry year peaking costs and that they're recovering those costs through their other rates and charges, which again burden inappropriately the transportation charges for using Met's transportation system.

- Q. Metropolitan unbundled its rates in 2003. Without asking you to disclose attorney-client information within the Water Authority, why didn't San Diego sue before 2010?
- A. Because we have in the exchange agreement with Metropolitan a five-year litigation time out provision under which the Water Authority agreed not to challenge Metropolitan's rates for a period of five years from the execution of that agreement.
- Q. Okay. What about after five years? Were there any reasons that San Diego didn't sue before 2010?
- A. Yes. We were involved throughout 2008 and '-9 in various internal process at Metropolitan, both within the Metropolitan general managers of its member agencies, the rate requirement process, the long-range finance plan process where Metropolitan said it was going to address these concerns and these issues about the allocation of its costs among its rates. So we worked in good faith with Metropolitan both from a staff to staff, management

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Vol. II - December 18, 2013 1 to management and at the board of directors by our (Brief break.) 2 2 THE COURT: Let's continue with delegates to try to get these issues addressed by 3 3 Metropolitan. cross-examination. 4 4 Q. Does San Diego take the decision to bring this MR. WEST: Your Honor, we have a binder of 5 5 documents and also a copy for Mr. Cushman's deposition we lawsuit lightly? 6 6 would like to provide your Honor. A. No. It's a very serious, costly endeavor. It 7 was made aafter considerable discussion by our board. THE COURT: I appreciate it. 8 8 Q. San Diego has alleged in this case that MR. HIXSON: Thank you. 9 9 MR. WEST: No problem. Metropolitan's wheeling rates include costs that are 10 10 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** unrelated to wheeling. And how does that affect 11 11 BY MR. WEST: San Diego? 12 12 A. Well, first it results in tens of millions of Q. Good morning, Mr. Cushman. Good to see you 13 13 dollars of overcharges to the Water Authority each year again. 14 14 and to our rate payers. A. Good morning. 15 15 Q. Remember, I deposed you a couple months ago; It also overburdens improperly the wheeling 16 16 rate and discourage us from doing more wheeling right? 17 17 transactions where we could acquire additional water A. Yes. 18 18 Q. And at your deposition, you admitted you were supplies from other parties. 19 19 Q. Let me ask you this as well. Do any other not a rate allocation expert; right? 20 20 member agencies besides San Diego use Met to provide A. Correct. 21 transportation services for third party water? 21 Q. And I think you testified that MWD adopted its 22 22 A. No, not really. current unbundled rate structure in January of 2003; is 23 23 Q. You understand that you're testifying today that right? 24 24 about primarily about Metropolitan's wheeling rates but A. That's when it first took effect. 25 does San Diego also challenge Met's transportation rates 25 Q. But it was actually voted on in -- earlier than 222 1 1 that, in 2001; is that right? more broadly? 2 2 A. Yes. We're challenging the System Access Rate, A. Yes. The Metropolitan unbundled its rates in 3 3 the Water Stewardship Rate and the System Power Rate. 2001 for -- to take effect in January of 2003. 4 Q. Is that for the same reasons you've articulated 4 THE COURT: If you could just keep your voice 5 5 today? up a little bit. Thank you. 6 6 BY MR. WEST: A. Yes. They've overburdened the System Access 7 7 Rate, the System Power Rate with their cost of their Q. I want do direct your attention to an exhibit 8 8 water supply from the State Water Project. And they which is Defendants' Exhibit 49, which is tab 4 in your 9 9 burdened the transportation charge with 100 percent of binder. 10 10 the costs of developing local water supplies and Do you recognize this document, Mr. Cushman? 11 11 conservation, and they burdened the Transportation Rate A. Yes. 12 with that -- with all of those costs. 12 O. What is it? 13 MR. BRAUNIG: Pass the witness. 13 A. It's a board of directors memo from 14 THE COURT: Your understanding is that no other 14 Metropolitan staff to its board of directors Budget 15 member agency wheels water through the Metropolitan 15 16 system? 16 17

THE WITNESS: No. The Water Authority is the only agency that goes to Metropolitan every year to buy separate transportation service for independent supplies. Metropolitan, I'm not aware in the last ten years of them doing any transactions for any other parties.

THE COURT: Would you like to take a recess now before cross?

MR. WEST: Sounds good, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ten minutes.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finance and Investment Committee dated March 11th, 2003 titled "Adopt recommended water rates and charges and resolutions to impose charges for fiscal year 2003 and '04."

Q. And turn to Bates number 7121 in the bottom right corner. Do you see that?

Q. Do you recognize that document also?

A. Yes.

O. What is that?

A. That is a letter to Ron Gastelum, who was then

225

224

223

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

1 the president and CEO of Metropolitan Water District, these goals can be met without unnecessarily increasing 2 2 from Maureen Stapleton, the engineering manager of the the system access charge and the Water Stewardship Rate 3 3 Water Authority. this year. 4 4 Q. And at the time, you were assistant general This letter says nothing else about the Water 5 5 manager of the Water Authority; correct? Stewardship Rate; correct? 6 6 A. Yes. A. Without having read the entire letter, as I sit 7 THE CLERK: I'm sorry. This a different here, I don't see that. 8 exhibit or part of the first exhibit? 8 Q. You can take your time to read it, sir. 9 9 MR. WEST: It is part of the first exhibit. A. Okay. 10 10 Q. And that's the document we were talking about, THE COURT: Do you want him to read the whole 11 11 the letter from Ms. Stapleton? letter now? It's up to you. 12 12 A. Yes. MR. WEST: Yeah. It is not that long of a 13 13 Q. And this letter says, if you see the first letter. 14 14 line, the Water Authority has identified issues in the THE WITNESS: Not that I can see, no. 15 15 setting and adoption of proposed rates and charges BY MR. WEST: 16 16 deserving of comment? Q. As far as you were aware, in terms of how it 17 17 A. Yes. allocated the Water Stewardship Rate, the transportation 18 18 Q. Do you see that? rates, MWD did nothing differently in 2003 than it is 19 19 currently doing with respect to those transportation A. Yes. 20 20 Q. This letter was laying out the Water rates; correct? 21 21 Authority's issue with the rates that were then in A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question, 22 22 effect; correct? please? 23 23 A. It is laving out the issues with the rates that Q. Sure. As far as you were aware, MWD allocated 24 24 were being considered at the time, yes. the Water Stewardship Rate to transportation rates back 25 25 then just like it is doing now; correct? Q. And I want to direct your attention -- I want 226 228 1 1 to talk about the Water Stewardship Rate. This letter A. Correct, yes. 2 2 talks about the Water Stewardship Rate, doesn't it? O. I want to talk about -- this talks about the 3 3 If you go to the page ending 7122, the last System Power Rate; correct? 4 4 paragraph there, do you see that? A. Yes. 5 Q. And if you go to the -- it's actually in the A. Yes. 6 6 middle of the page. You see the heading there, the Q. And this is after the Water Stewardship Rate 7 7 had been adopted: correct? System Power Rate? 8 8 A. When -- it was after, when the rates were A. Yes. 9 9 unbundled but before the rates were adopted. Q. And at this point in time, the San Diego Water 10 10 Q. The rates were adopted on January 1, 2003. Authority knew that the System Power Rate included State 11 11 This is --Water Project power costs, didn't it? 12 12 A. Yes. A. I'm sorry. Yes, you're right. 13 13 Q. This letter says the Water Authority supports Q. And this letter says the System Power Rate 14 14 the goal of increasing the production of recycled water provides an excellent example of rate component 15 15 and increasing support for economic water conservation transparency. As energy markets have returned to near 16 16 programs, requiring an increase in the Water Stewardship normal prices, the anticipated costs of energy for 17 17 Rate. pumping operations have decreased dramatically. The 18 18 Water Authority supports the decrease in System Power (Interruption by court reporter.) 19 19 BY MR. WEST: 20 20 This letter says nothing else about the System Q. The Water Authority wants to continue to 21 21 support local resource management and development Power Rate; correct? 22 22 programs like these and the emerging sea water A. Not that I can see, no. 2.3 2.3 desalination program as valuable contributions to the Q. Then again -- strike that. 24 24 region's long-term water stability. I want to jump ahead a few months. You are 25 25 However, the Water Authority believes that familiar with the 2003 exchange rate; correct?

229

1 A. No. A. Yes. 2 2 Q. And the price that San Diego pays under the Q. And if you could go to Plaintiff's Exhibit 65, 3 3 exchange agreement has three components: The System Barbara. 4 4 Mr. Cushman, it's tab 6 in your binder. Access Rate, the System Power Rate and Water Stewardship 5 And MWD and San Diego entered into this 5 Rate; correct? 6 6 agreement in October of 2003; right? A. Well, it refers to the rate generally 7 A. Yes. applicable to the conveyance of water to Metropolitan to 8 Q. Nine months after these unbundled rates were 8 its member allegations, doesn't specify those three 9 9 first implemented? rates, but today those three rates are the System Access 10 10 A. Ten months, yeah. Rate, the System Power Rate and Water Stewardship Rate. 11 11 Q. Eight months after Ms. Stapleton's letter? Q. And that's been the case since the agreement 12 12 A. Yes. was first executed; correct? 13 13 Q. And if you go to article 5.2, which is at page A. Yes. 14 16 of 17 of this letter --14 Q. There's no language in this agreement which 1.5 15 THE COURT: Of this agreement? purports to give San Diego any benefit from Colorado 16 MR. WEST: I'm sorry. Thank you, your Honor. 16 River Aqueduct; right? 17 17 Of this agreement. A. I'm not sure I understand the question. 18 Q. That's the price provision; correct? 18 Q. Your counsel referred to some sort of benefit 19 A. Yes. 19 that the region gets by virtue of the Colorado River 20 Q. There's no fixed price in this agreement, 20 Aqueduct water. Are you aware of any language in this 21 right, like a dollar per acre-foot? 21 agreement which purports to give San Diego an additional 2.2 A. Yes. The initial price is a specific number, 22 benefit or break on the price for Colorado River Aqueduct 23 \$253. 23 water? 24 Q. And that price at that time -- well but 24 A. No. 2.5 thereafter, there's no fixed price; correct? 25 Q. And the word "wheel" does not -- wheeling is 230 232 1 1 A. Correct. not mentioned once in this agreement, is it? 2 2 Q. The price is what? A. I don't recall. I could review it but I don't 3 3 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, I object. I mean the think so. 4 Metropolitan moved to bifurcate. They sought a 4 Q. And the word "wheel" was not mentioned? 5 bifurcation that would keep the exchange agreement out of A. Again, I don't know for certain. 6 6 this phase of the trial and I object to this line of THE COURT: I'm a little concerned the time 7 7 questioning. we're spending on the language of this agreement. 8 8 THE COURT: Overruled. Is this part of your case, is to do something 9 9 BY MR. WEST: with this agreement and the terms? I think the people 10 10 Q. I'm sorry. What was -- could I have the who opened up on both sides agreed that we were going to 11 11 question read back, madame reporter? be looking at these rates regardless of what the impact 12 12 THE COURT: I think it's helpful if I just tell of the contract was but maybe I'm mistaken. 13 13 you that you were looking at the word thereafter and MR. WEST: We are going to be looking at these 14 14 trying to get him to discuss how the price was fixed rates. 1.5 15 after the initial dollar number. THE COURT: Okay. 16 16 BY MR. WEST: MR. WEST: But I'm addressing a couple of 17 17 Q. And what's the price reflected there? points, first off the contention that this is a wheeling 18 18 agreement, which was made by the plaintiff. A. The price shall be equal to the charge or 19 19 charges set by Metropolitan's board of directors pursuant MR. KEKER: By whom? 20 to applicable law and regulation and generally applicable 20 THE COURT: Excuse me. I'll take care of this. 21 21 to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of I don't think the thought is that this 22 22 its member agencies. agreement is a wheeling agreement. I think the thought 23 23 Q. And to your understanding, the exchange is that the rates that they're paying are wheeling 24 24 agreement does not require adoption of a specific rate charges. But why don't you just go ahead with your 25 25 structure, does it? questions. I want to alert you to the time you're taking 231 233

1 on this. 2 2 Go ahead. 3 3 MR. WEST: Sure. 4 4 Q. Are you familiar with the concept of losses 5 associated with wheeling? 5 6 6 A. With losses? 7 Q. Yes, the concept. 8 A. Like conveyance losses? 8 9 9 Q. Yes. 10 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. It means when you move something through a 11 12 facility, water from the facility, you lose some water; 12 13 13 right? 14 14 A. Yeah, you may, yes. 15 Q. There's no provision for losses in the 15 16 exchange, is there? 16 17 A. Not that I'm aware of. 17 18 Q. And there's nothing in there making MWD's 18 Havasu. 19 obligations contingent on any capacity being available 19 20 anywhere, is there? 20 21 A. No. 21 2.2 Q. Now, you talked earlier about IID water and 22 23 canal lining water. Do you remember that? 23 24 A. Yes. 24 2.5 Q. Now, under the exchange agreement, San Diego 25 234 1 1 makes a certain amount of water available at one place in 2 2 the State of California to MWD; correct? 3 3 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? 4 Q. Sure. Under the exchange agreement, San Diego 4 5 5 makes a certain amount of water available to MWD at one 6 6 place in California; right? 7 7 A. Yes. 8 8 Q. And MWD makes an equivalent amount of water 9 9 available to San Diego in another place in California; 10 right? 10 11 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And there's no provision in the agreement 12 13 requiring that MWD move that water through the Colorado 13 14 14 River Aqueduct, is there? 15 MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for legal 15 16 conclusion. 16 17 THE COURT: Overruled. I don't think this is 17 18 seriously in dispute. 18 19 THE WITNESS: The agreement gives Metropolitan 19 20 the total discretion in what facilities it uses to 20 21 transport the water to San Diego and San Diego does not 21 22 get the use of any Metropolitan facilities. 22 2.3 BY MR. WEST: 23 24 Q. The terms of the agreement specifically 24 25 contemplate MWD will provide State Water Project water to 25

San Diego under it, doesn't it?

A. What the Water Authority bargained for was water of a like quality and a like quantity of water at our service connection to what we provide to Metropolitan at the intake at Lake Hayasu.

Metropolitan asked for and received total discretion what actual molecules of water it provides to the Water Authority and it could be from any sources available to Metropolitan.

- Q. You understand, don't you, that Metropolitan provides a blend of State Water Project water and Colorado River water to San Diego under this exchange agreement?
- A. The agreement allows Metropolitan at its sole discretion to provide any blend of water so long as it meets the same quality, at least the same quality of the water they deliver -- we deliver to Metropolitan at Lake Hovery
- Q. I'm not talking about what the agreement provides for, I'm talking about what Met actually does. MWD actually provides exchange water under the exchange agreement that is a blend of State Water Project water and Colorado River Aqueduct water?
- A. I've never seen a break out by Metropolitan.

 Metropolitan has a separate duty to the Water Authority

236

under the water we purchase from Metropolitan to provide a blend of State Water Project and Colorado River water. That's a provision in the Metropolitan Water District Aqueduct.

So Metropolitan does produce reports that show the blend in any given time, month or year of the water blend they provided to us from Metropolitan, but I'm not aware that Metropolitan distinguishes between the water we're buying from Metropolitan under which it has a duty to provide us a blend of State Water Project water, 50 percent to the -- to what water blend they were at the same time providing under the exchange agreement.

- Q. You don't have any basis to believe, following your answer, that MWD provides different water under the exchange agreement than it does to San Diego otherwise, do you, as far as the blend is concerned?
- A. No. I believe the blend comes into San Diego with all the molecules mixed, but Metropolitan has a separate duty to the Water Authority to blend the water we're buying from Metropolitan. We're still buying more Metropolitan water than we're buying exchange water.
- Q. And I want to be clear. When you refer to "separate duty," what are you referring to?
- A. The provision in the Met Act that requires

 Metropolitan to provide a blend of State Water Project

237

1 A. Yes. water to its customers and Water Authority. That's a 2 2 Q. And you've read it? provision in the Met Act. I think it's section 136 of 3 3 the Met Act. A. Yes. 4 4 Q. And it is your understanding this provides a Q. And if you could -- I want to focus on this 5 legal obligation for MWD to provide this blend? 5 deals with when MWD cannot -- circumstances in which MWD 6 6 A. Well it is in the Met Act and Met Act is might not be able to provide exchange water; right? statute. MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, can I make a 8 8 continuing objection to this line of questioning as Q. I just want to make sure. To your 9 9 beyond the scope of what this trial is supposed to be understanding, this creates a legal obligation for MWD to 10 10 provide this blend? about? 11 11 A. Yeah. THE COURT: It may be but I'm going to let them 12 12 Q. And the only way MWD can make State Water use their time as they wish in this context. 13 13 Project available under the exchange agreement or This is -- it is harmless if you're right and 14 14 otherwise to San Diego is if it pays the cost to bring it is useful to them if you're wrong. 1.5 15 that water down the aqueduct to Met service area; Go ahead. 16 16 correct? THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the 17 17 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? question? 18 18 Q. Sure. Only way MWD can provide State Water BY MR. WEST: 19 19 Project water to its member agencies is if it pays the Q. Sure. This is the provision that deals with 20 20 when MWD due to shut down of MWD facilities might be cost of transporting that water down the Colorado River 21 21 Aqueduct; correct? unable to provide exchange water? 2.2 22 A. Yes. A. They have to pay all of the costs of that water 23 23 Q. And the second sentence of that provision says, supply from the State Water Project. 24 24 Q. And that includes transportation charges; San Diego understands that any number of factors, 25 25 including emergencies, inspections, maintenance or repair correct? 240 238 1 1 A. Includes DWR's transportation charges. of Metropolitan facilities or State Water Project 2 2 Q. I want to get back to a question I was asking facilities may result in temporary and incidental 3 3 earlier. modification of the delivery schedule contemplated under The agreement itself, the exchange agreement 4 Section 3.2? 5 specifically contemplates that some of the water that A. Yes. 6 6 San Diego will get is from the State Water Project? Q. And that's been -- that was part of the 1998 7 7 A. It gives Metropolitan total and sole discretion agreement too; correct? 8 8 to provide any water from any of its sources to the Water A. I don't recall. 9 9 Authority so long as it meets the quality and quantity Q. I want to jump to tab 8, which is 10 10 provided to Metropolitan at Lake Havasu. Defendants' -- this exhibit has already been entered in 11 11 Q. If you could go to -- back to the exchange evidence, I believe. 12 12 agreement, paragraph 3.2, which is at page 12 of the THE COURT: For the record, which exhibit is 13 13 agreement, Bates ending 701. this? 14 14 Do you see that, sir? MR. WEST: I will tell you in a moment, your 15 15 A. Yes. Honor. 16 16 Q. And this is the provision of the exchange I apologize. Exhibit 128. 17 17 agreement dealing with what water MWD will provide; THE COURT: All right. 18 18 correct? BY MR. WEST: 19 19 A. Yes. Q. Defendants' 128, this is an internal -- have 20 20 Q. The term "exchange water" is a defined term in you seen this document? 21 21 the contract? A. Yes. 22 A. Yes. 22 Q. What is it? 23 2.3 Q. And this is -- this -- if you go ahead to A. It's an internal Water Authority document 24 24 paragraph 3.3 of the contract, on the next page -- have titled "Water Authority's 2008 Northern California's

241

239

25

Transfers Implementation Strategy."

25

you seen this provision before?

1 Q. And this document -- and at the bottom of the It says San Diego has requested that 2 2 page -- will you pull that up, please, Barbara? Metropolitan convey, wheel these transfer supplies in an 3 3 This document tasks certain San Diego employees amount -- the amount to be determined by the California 4 with certain jobs relating to that implementation Department of Water Resources for transfer less Delta 5 5 strategy; correct? carriage and conveyances losses. 6 6 There's a specific reference to wheeling in A. And the Water Authority directors. 7 Q. And these included you? this document; right? 8 8 A. Yes. A. Yes. 9 9 Q. And if you go back to the top of the page Q. And it appears several times in this document; 10 10 again, this agreement, does it not, distinguishes between right? 11 11 wheeling services on the one hand, wheeling service A. Yes. 12 12 agreements on the one hand and exchange agreements on the Q. And it specifically refers to MWD's 13 13 other? Administrative Code, which is the Administrative Code 14 14 A. Yes. addressing the price for wheeling; right? 15 15 Q. And it gives us an example of an exchange A. Yes. 16 16 agreement as opposed to a wheeling agreement, a proposal Q. If you go to paragraph G, see the part that 17 similar to the IID exchange agreement; right? 17 begins Metropolitan will uses best efforts? See that 18 A. Yes. 18 sentence there? 19 19 Q. And that's the agreement, the exchange A. Yes. 20 20 agreement we were just talking about; right? Q. Will use best efforts consistent with its 21 21 A. Similar to it, yes. historic delivery procedures to beneficially use and 22 22 Q. It's -- is there another IID exchange agreement avoid loss through the spill of the full amount of the 23 23 other than the 2003 exchange agreement? transfer water. 24 24 A. The exchange agreement between the Water And it goes on to say in the second part of 25 25 Authority for -- no, not that I'm aware of. that, that MWD promptly advise San Diego in advance if 242 244 1 1 Q. I want to talk about one of the agreements you Metropolitan reasonably anticipates there will be 2 2 talked about this morning, tab 9, Defendants' 698, and it insufficient capacity in its system for delivery of 3 is right after page 13 of the document. transfer water? What is this agreement? Do you recognize it? 4 A. Yes, I see that. 5 A. Yes, I do. This is the agreement between Q. So unlike the exchange agreement, which 6 specifically refers to capacity constraints and Metropolitan Water District, Placer County Water Agency 7 and the Department of Water Resources for the conveyance specifically refers to losses; right? 8 8 and storage of the Water Authority's Placer County Water A. Yes. 9 Q. I want to talk now about the dry year peaking Agency transfer water. 1.0 10 issue. This is an important issue to San Diego; correct? Q. And if you go to page -- right after page 13 of 11 11 the document, it starts up again at page 1. 12 12 Q. And you are very familiar with San Diego's And do you recognize this agreement, 13 13 claims in this case; right? Mr. Cushman? 14 14 A. I'm sorry. I'm familiar with what? 15 15 Q. San Diego's claims in this case? Q. And this is an agreement between MWD on the one 16 16 hand and San Diego on the other regarding wheeling on the 17 17 Q. And you give regular presentations about this State Water Project? 18 lawsuit on television, at board meetings, all sorts of 18 A. Yes. 19 different forums? 19 Q. On San Diego's behalf? 20 A. Yes. 20 A. Well, it's for the -- the transaction, yes. 21 Q. And you talked earlier about public hearings 21 Q. And that's the Placer County transaction you 22 that occurred in 2010 for rates that were going to be 22 were testifying about this morning? 23 adopted in 2011 and 2012; right? 2.3 A. One of them. Yes, I believe so, yes. 2.4 A. That were implemented in '11 and '12, yes. 24 Q. And if you go to bullet -- all of paragraph A, 25 25 Q. And you talked earlier about some submissions please, Barbara. 243 245

that San Diego made in connection with that board hearing 1457. That is a Bartle Wells report that was attached to 2 2 regarding rates and charges to be adopted in 2011 and your letter; right? 3 3 2012; right? A. Yes. 4 A. Yes. Q. And the Bartle Wells letter is completely 5 Q. And I want to direct your attention to tab 10, 5 silent on dry year peaking too, isn't it? 6 6 which is Defendants' Exhibit 90. A. Yeah. I don't recall without relooking at it. 7 Do you recognize this document, Mr. Cushman? Q. Well, you testified at your deposition that it 8 8 was completely silent in dry year peaking. If you like, A. Yes. 9 9 O. What is it? I think we can play the clip. 10 10 A. It's the board package that Met staff put A. Sure. 11 11 together in presenting to its board for the April 13th MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Improper impeachment. 12 12 board of directors meeting at which Met adopted rates for THE COURT: That's improper. You can -- you 13 13 '11 and '12. don't have an agreement between the two of you whether 14 14 Q. And you made a written submission that was you want to play a clip or not? 15 15 attached to this board packet; correct? MR. WEST: Well --16 16 THE COURT: There may be other reasons why you 17 17 Q. And if you could go to Bates ending 11454, that can play it but --18 18 is what you -- once you get there. BY MR. WEST: 19 19 That's your written submission to the board O. Take your time. 20 20 concerning the rates that were under consideration at This letter is silent on dry year peaking, 21 that period of time; right? 21 isn't it, this report? 22 22 A. Yes. A. The report? Yes, it appears it is. 23 23 Q. And this letter articulated San Diego's Q. At the same time, San Diego engaged some 24 24 positions about allocating state water project costs to lawyers to look at MWD's rates? 25 transportation rates; right? 25 A. Yes. 246 248 1 1 Q. And those were Colantuono & Levin? A. Yes. 2 2 Q. And allocating the Water Stewardship Rate to A. Colantuono & Levin, yes. 3 3 the transportation rates too; right? Q. If you could turn to tab 11 of your binder. 4 A. Yes. 4 And do you recognize this document? 5 Q. And you were allowed to put in letters like A. Yes. 6 Q. It's Defendants' 89? this all issues that you believe are important to the 7 7 rate -- rates that are then under consideration; right? A. Yes. 8 8 A. Allowed to at the Met meetings? O. And this is the letter that Colantuono & Levin 9 9 submitted in connection with the rates then submitted; Q. I mean these letters, you can -- there's no 1.0 1.0 page limit on them, for example; right? right? 11 11 A. No, there's no page limits. A. Yes. 12 Q. This letter is completely silent on dry year 12 Q. And this letter lays out some issues with the 13 13 peaking, isn't it? rates; right? 14 14 A. Yes. A. Yes. 15 1.5 Q. And your letter attached a report from Bartle Q. And there's no mention of the dry year peaking 16 16 Wells Associates: correct? in this letter either; right? 17 17 A. No, it doesn't appear to. A. Yes. 18 18 Q. And San Diego had engaged Bartle Wells Q. It is nonetheless San Diego's contention that 19 19 Associates to look at MWD's rates in connection with the rates adopted -- I'll put it a different way. 20 20 their consideration in 2010 or 2011 and 2012? Isn't it nonetheless San Diego's contention 21 2.1 that the rates adopted in 2011 and 2012 are unlawful for 22 22 their failure to address an issue that neither your Q. And according to you, Bartle Wells are experts 23 23 in public utility rates? letter nor the Bartle Wells report nor the letter from 2.4 24 A. Yes. your counsel submitted to the board? 25 Q. I want to turn your attention to Bates ending A. Yes.

249

1 Q. I want to go back to March 8th, 2010, which is Q. The Bartle Wells study does list a number of 2 2 tab 10, the Bates ending 11454. Do you see that? people, both contractors whose information they looked 3 3 And again, that's Exhibit 90. at; right? 4 4 A. I believe so. 5 Q. And this letter doesn't say -- this memo 5 Q. Do you want to look at that, which is the 6 6 doesn't mention the exchange rate at all? attachment at 11459? We're still on Exhibit 90. 7 THE COURT: What's the question? A. I don't think so. 8 8 Q. And it lays out some reasons why it's improper MR. WEST: I'm not there yet. I just wanted to 9 9 in your opinion to include State Water Project costs in reference him to it. 10 10 MWD's transportation rates? Q. And this letter says that Bartle Wells received 11 11 information from three other State Water Project A. Yes. 12 12 Q. And if you go to the second par -- second contractors; correct? 13 13 sentence. We're going to 11455. A. Yes. 14 14 And if you go to the second sentence in the Q. Do you know how many State Water Project 15 15 contractors there are? second paragraph and you are talking about the reasons 16 why it is inappropriate to include State Water Project 16 A. I believe 29. 17 17 costs in MWD's transportation rates; right? Q. So three out of 29. How many of them have an 18 18 A. Yes. unbundled rate structure like MWD, do you know? 19 19 Q. And one of the things you say is in fact, it's A. No. 20 20 State Water Project supply costs are to Metropolitan the Q. How many of them even pay a Transportation 21 21 Rate, do you know? same as Metropolitan's cost to its member agencies, 2.2 2.2 they're plainly and solely a cost of supply. Do you see A. To DWR? 23 23 that? O. Yeah. 24 24 A. Yes. A. My understanding is that all state water 2.5 25 Q. But MWD gets its water from the State Water contractors pay transportation rates as part of their 250 1 1 Project under a take-or-pay contract with the Department supply contracts. 2 2 of Water Resources; right? O. Aren't there contractors north of the Delta who 3 3 A. Yes. pay none at all? 4 4 Q. And MWD doesn't have take-or-pay contracts with A. I don't know. 5 its member agencies for delivery of water, does it? Q. Do you know how many of these -- certain of the 6 6 A. No. State Water Project contractors don't have rates they 7 Q. Had you read the State Water Project contract charge at all, right, they just get -- they get paid 8 8 before you sent this letter? through property taxes? 9 9 A. No. Not in its entirety, no. A. I don't know how all state water contractors 10 1.0 Q. Had you read article 23 of it? recover the cost of the State Water Project's supply 11 11 A. No. contracts. 12 12 Q. You go on to refer to -- in the -- going back Q. I want to get back to an issue we talked about 13 13 to your letter, it says, the last sentence of that a little earlier today, salinity and the board. I want 14 14 paragraph, indeed neither Bartle Wells nor the Water to talk about a board meeting that happened on 15 15 Authority's own professional staff have been able to find August 22nd of this year. Do you recall that, at 16 16 any other State Water Project contractor that allocates San Diego? 17 17 payments for SWP water in a manner similar to A. I was in attendance. 18 18 Metropolitan's practice? Q. And you gave two presentations at this 19 19 A. Yes. meeting -- or one, actually; right? 20 20 Q. Your letter doesn't identify any specific State A. I can't recall from board meeting to board 21 21 Water Project contractor's information you reviewed, does meeting how many presentation I've given. I'm sorry. 22 22 it? Q. No problem at all. 23 2.3 Halla Razak was at the time San Diego Water 24 24 Q. Or how many of them you reviewed? Authority's Colorado River program director; right?

Pages 250 to 253

253

252

251

25

A. Yes.

25

A. No.

```
1
                                                                              San Diego from that blend of State Water Project and
           Q. And at this meeting, she gave a presentation
 2
                                                                       2
        called Colorado River Salinity Control Update?
                                                                              Colorado River water.
 3
                                                                       3
                                                                                    THE COURT: Their knowledge is relevant?
           A. Yes.
 4
                                                                       4
           Q. And I want to direct your attention to the
                                                                                    MR. WEST: It is, your Honor.
 5
        PowerPoint for that presentation. Do you recall she gave
                                                                       5
                                                                                    THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead.
                                                                       6
 6
        a PowerPoint presentation?
                                                                                    (Audio file played.)
                                                                       7
           A. Yes.
                                                                              BY MR. WEST:
 8
                                                                       8
           Q. It's Defendants' 116, which is tab 14.
                                                                                 Q. And that's true to your understanding too,
                                                                       9
 9
              And do you recall Ms. Razak -- if you go to
                                                                              isn't it?
10
                                                                      10
        page 2, Ms. Razak's presentation was talking about the
                                                                                 A. That Metropolitan blends the water doesn't
                                                                      11
11
        salinity control background. The Colorado River has
                                                                              always achieve keeping it under 500 million grams per
                                                                      12
12
        relatively high salinity and excess salinity causes
                                                                              liter
                                                                      13
1.3
        375 million a year in economic damages and high salinity
                                                                                     MR. WEST: And one quick point. My counsel
                                                                      14
14
        can create environmental impact.
                                                                              reminded me that they stipulated to no hearsay objections
                                                                      15
15
              That's all true as far as you understand;
                                                                              to the exhibit that were on the exhibit list, including
                                                                      16
16
        right?
                                                                              this one so for the Court's consideration.
                                                                      17
17
           A. Yes.
                                                                                  Q. Now, I want to get back to the wheeling
                                                                      18
18
           Q. And if you go to page 17 of this PowerPoint
                                                                              agreement regarding Placer County that we spoke about
                                                                      19
19
        presentation, it talks about the salinity of the
                                                                              earlier. Okay. It is Exhibit 698.
20
                                                                      20
        San Diego supply. It says the Water Authority goal to --
                                                                                    THE COURT: Which tab is that?
                                                                      21
21
        is to maintain salinity no greater than 500 million grams
                                                                                    MR. WEST: That is tab 9, your Honor.
2.2
                                                                      22
        per liter and salinity depends on the mix of State Water
                                                                                    THE COURT: Okay.
                                                                      23
23
        Project and Colorado River water?
                                                                              BY MR. WEST:
24
                                                                      24
           A. Yes.
                                                                                 Q. And again, the pagination starts after page 13.
25
                                                                      25
                                                                              And I want to direct your attention to that particular
           Q. And all of this is true to your understanding;
                                                            254
                                                                                                                                   256
 1
                                                                       1
                                                                             agreement between MWD and San Diego regarding the MWD and
        right?
 2
                                                                       2
                                                                             State Water Project. And if you go to paragraph H, which
           A. Yes.
                                                                             is on page 2 of this agreement, that is the price
 3
           Q. And Ms. Razak took questions after her
 4
        presentation, didn't she?
                                                                             provision; correct?
 5
                                                                       5
           A. I don't recall.
                                                                                A. Payment provision, yes.
 6
                                                                       6
           Q. Do you recall she said that one of the -- these
                                                                                Q. Payment provision.
 7
                                                                       7
        presentations are recorded; right?
                                                                                   And those -- that lays out the payments that
 8
                                                                       8
           A. Yes.
                                                                             San Diego is going to make to MWD for the wheeling of
 9
           Q. And I would like to play a portion of that
                                                                       9
                                                                             this water on the State Water Project; right?
10
                                                                      10
        recording. They're on San Diego's Web site, Defendants'
                                                                                A. For the wheeling of the water the entire
11
                                                                      11
        Exhibit 319.
                                                                             distance.
12
                                                                      12
              MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Hearsay.
                                                                                Q. And it says the System Assess Rate, the Water
13
              MR. WEST: Not offered for the truth, your
                                                                      13
                                                                             Stewardship Rate, the treatment surcharge and -- if
14
                                                                      14
        Honor.
                                                                             applicable, and it says in addition, San Diego will pay
15
              THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                      15
                                                                             actual costs of power DWR charged Metropolitan to convey
16
              MR. WEST: 5344 through 5432.
                                                                      16
                                                                             the transfer water from Banks Pumping Plant to
17
              (Audio file played.)
                                                                      17
                                                                             Metropolitan's turnouts.
18
              THE COURT: What is it offered for?
                                                                      18
                                                                                   That's your understanding of what San Diego
19
              MR. WEST: Pardon me?
                                                                      19
                                                                             paid to MWD pursuant to this?
20
              THE COURT: What is it offered for?
                                                                      20
                                                                                A. Yes.
21
              MR. WEST: I'm sorry?
                                                                      21
                                                                                   MR. WEST: I have no further questions.
22
              THE COURT: If it's not for the truth, what is
                                                                      22
                                                                                   THE COURT: I'll see everybody at 1:30. Thank
23
        it offered for?
                                                                      23
                                                                             you.
24
              MR. WEST: It's to show San Diego's knowledge
                                                                      24
                                                                                       (Noon recess taken.)
25
        that they, MWD, provides a blend and the benefit to
                                                                      25
                                                                                          ---o0o---
                                                            255
                                                                                                                                   257
```

DECEMBER 18, 2013 AFTERNOON SESSION allocation of State Water Project costs to the system 2 2 PROCEEDINGS power rate in connection with 2010 rate hearing? 3 3 ---O0O----A. Yes. 4 THE COURT: Some redirect? MR. BRAUNIG: Can we bring up administrative 5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 5 record page 11454? 6 6 BY MR. BRAUNIG: Q. Is this document, a letter, March 8, 2010, is 7 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cushman. this a letter written by you to Tim Brick, the chairman 8 8 of the Metropolitan Water District? A. Good afternoon. 9 9 Q. You recall you were asked during A. Yes. 10 10 cross-examination some questions about a 2003 letter from MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. And let's turn to the 11 11 Ms. Stapleton to Mr. Gastelum? second page, please. 12 12 A. Yes. Q. Is the second paragraph, the paragraph that 13 13 MR. BRAUNIG: Can you pull that up, please, DTX starts "Met does not own," is this an example of a 14 14 49? situation -- a place in which San Diego was specifically 15 And specifically on the page that's got 7122 at 15 complaining about the allocation of State Water Project 16 16 the bottom, can we blow up the first paragraph? I'm costs to Metropolitan's System Power Rate? 17 sorry, the paragraph with the number one. 17 A. To its --18 Q. Okay. Mr. Cushman, you recall you were asked 18 Q. To its transportation rates. 19 19 some questions about this particular paragraph that talks A. Yes, to transportation rates. 20 20 about rate component transparency? Q. Okay. You were asked -- you were asked 21 21 A. Yes. questions about -- do you recall you were asked questions 22 22 Q. Do you recall that? during cross-examination about whether submissions in 23 23 What -- what was -- what did San Diego mean 2010 included reference to dry year peaking? 24 24 when it says the System Power Rate is transparent? A. Yes. 25 25 A. This is time that Metropolitan showed Q. Okay. When Metropolitan was unbundling its 258 260 1 1 rates back in the early 2000's, did San Diego raise separately and gave visibility to the cost of power to 2 2 import water into the Metropolitan service area. concerns about dry year peaking? 3 3 A. Yes. Q. In 2003 was San Diego raising concerns about 4 4 the allocation of State Water Project costs? MR. BRAUNIG: Can we please pull up PTX 044? 5 5 Q. Okay. What is PTX 044? A. Yes. 6 6 MR. BRAUNIG: Can we actually blow up the next A. It is the water board's response to 7 7 paragraph, please? Metropolitan's district staff recommendation regarding 8 8 Q. And is this -- is this paragraph in the same the composite rate structure framework. 9 9 letter, DTX 49? Q. And this was a document submitted by San Diego 10 10 Is this the same place San Diego was raising to the -- to Metropolitan in April of 2000? 11 11 concerns with Met about the allocation of State Water A. Yes. 12 12 Project costs to its transportation rates? MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. Can we please turn to the 13 13 A. Yes. second page under the heading "most notably" sort of at 14 14 the very top, just the first -- just isolate the first Q. Did San Diego raise concerns with the 15 15 allocation of State Water Project costs to the System paragraph. 16 16 Power Rate between 2003 and when it filed suit in 2010? Q. Okay. Mr. Cushman, is PTX 044 an example of 17 17 where San Diego was raising concerns with Metropolitan A. Yes. 18 18 about dry year peaking as early as 2000? O. Did -- in what forums? 19 19 A. Yes. A. In the meetings, I believe in providing 20 20 feedback to Metropolitan on that issue, also engaged in Q. Did -- and what specifically was San Diego 21 21 rate discussions throughout the development of the raising concerns about? 22 22 unbundled rate structure and expressed our concerns at A. The fact that they were recovering the cost of 23 23 that time in those meetings, and we made that clear dry year peaking on its rates and charges and not charged 24 24 throughout the process. on the basis of those that are causing the dry year 25 25 Q. Okay. Did San Diego raise concerns with the peaking. 259 261

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Between 2000 and 2010, when San Diego filed 2 this first lawsuit, did San Diego continue to raise 3 concerns about Metropolitan's failure to account for dry year peaking costs? A. Yes. 6 Q. In what forums? A. In our meetings with Metropolitan and meetings 8 that involved the Metropolitan member agencies to discuss 9 and debate the issues around the rates, the rate 10 structure, the various proposals being advanced and 11 debated and discussed about the proper allocation of 12 rates. The Water Authority made clear continuously about 13 our objections to and concerns with failure to account 14 for and collect for the dry year peaking costs at 1.5 Metropolitan. 16 Q. Did San Diego make allegations in its 2010 17 complaint about dry year peaking? 18 A. Yes. 19 MR. BRAUNIG: Can we pull up the complaint, 20 please, the third and -- thank you. 21 Q. And specifically, paragraph 56, is paragraph 56 22 in the 2010 complaint a place where San Diego explicitly 23 called out its concerns about dry year peaking in -- in 24 the 2010 complaint? 25 A. Yes. 1 Q. Now, what did San Diego do in connection with 2 the 2013 and 2014 rate hearing to bring -- to try to 3 bring the dry year peaking issue to the Met board's 4

A. Yes.

Q. And you knew that. San Diego knew that; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And there was no complaint in that letter about that at all, was there?

A. Not in that letter.

Q. And the same thing with the System Power Rate. San Diego knew that the System Power Rate included State Water Project power costs; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And there was no complaint about that in that letter, was there?

A. No, not in that letter.

Q. And we're going to talk -- the dry year peaking issue, we've seen a document from 2000 when you raised this issue. This was before the adoption of the unbundled rate structure; correct?

A. It was during discussions about the unbundling of the rate structure but before it was adopted.

Q. Right. And then Ms. Stapleton's letter in 2003, February 10th, 2003 doesn't talk specifically about annual variations in purchases causing costs to be incurred by other member agencies, does it?

A. No, that letter does not.

Q. So we have a 12-year gap as far as the record

262

264

attention?

A. It brought it to the Met board attention in documents and studies that we submitted to the Met board as part of the public hearing and other hearings during the establishment of the rate by Metropolitan for 2013 and 2014.

Q. Did that -- sorry?

A. That included a study by a rate expert that we hired whose report addressed the dry year peaking issue as parts of its -- part of its report.

Q. Is that report from your expert in the record in this case?

A. Yes, it is.

MR. BRAUNIG: Pass the witness.

THE COURT: Any recross?

MR. WEST: Just a couple.

THE COURT: All right.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WEST:

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. To be clear, Mr. Cushman, in 2003 when Ms. Stapleton sent that letter, the Water Stewardship

Rate was being allocated to transportation; right?

before the board is concerned, beginning with the time before the rates were even adopted and ending in 2012 where this issue is not mentioned by San Diego?

A. No, I don't believe that's correct, in fact. The Water Authority -- the Water Authority during that period of time was continuously engaged in the various processes at Metropolitan where we were communicating to Metropolitan our concerns over that and the other misallocation issues.

Q. Not reflected in a document in that 12-year gap, though, is it? Not that we've seen today?

A. None that we've seen today.

MR. WEST: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Anything else?

MR. BRAUNIG: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. You are excused

MR. PURCELL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Before we call our next witness, I would like to use a little bit of our time to present some of the evidence that's in the administrative record and discuss it. I think both parties are planning to present some of

their evidence through --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

265

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

MR. PURCELL: -- discussion by counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So, what I'm hoping is that this is going to be a targeted focused presentation that's going to address some narrow issues that might go to questions in your Honor's mind based on what the parties have talked about

And I have four specific issues that I want to talk about.

The first is this issue of storage, which relates to the dry year peaking question. Met had suggested in its opening that dry year peaking doesn't actually impose costs on Met's system but Met's own documents show that it buys and stores massive amounts of water in order to have supplies on hand in order to meet dry year demands.

The document I would like to point you to is the 1996 integrated resources plan, which is an important foundational document that Met discussed in its opening. And this is in the administrative record in the -- well, in both cases. This is A-R1465 and -66 and it says it pretty plainly. It says storage is a critical element of Southern California's water resources strategy. Because Southern California experiences dramatic swings in water and hydrology, storage is important to regulate those swings and mitigate against possible supply short answer.

as a peaker is Los Angeles. There's not any discussion of San Diego or any other agency in there. And though Met has suggested everybody peaks, you will hear more from Mr. Denham on that, but the only agency they saw fit to mention in this document was Los Angeles.

Now, this is a 1996 document so your Honor might ask well, what's the situation like today? So I would like to go to a more recent document that shows that it's basically the same. And this is PTX 244, which I think is either in the record or will be because it was used in opening and earlier today.

And this is Met's official statement to its bond holders, June of 2013. I would like to go to page --

MR. WEST: Your Honor, I'm going to object. This was presented as a presentation of administrative record documents. This is not an administrative record document.

MR. PURCELL: It wasn't presented. THE COURT: Is it in the record of this trial? MR. WEST: It is an exhibit in this trial but it is not an administrative record document.

23 THE COURT: I'll make a note of that. Thank 24 you. 25

MR. PURCELL: Yeah, your Honor. I didn't mean

268

266

Simply put, storage provides a means of storing surplus water during normal and wet weather years for later use during dry years when imported supplies are limited. Like water transfers, storage is a flexible supply. However unlike many transfers, it can require large capital investments. When identifying the need for storage, it is important to understand the different benefits storage provides.

This same document, which is in the record, also talks about L.A.'s roll on and roll off of Met's systems and quantifies specifically the acre-feet per year that this storage benefit is providing to L.A.

This is 1487 in the administrative record. And here, you see when runoff conditions in the Owens Valley are above normal, L.A. deliveries increase, reducing the reliance -- the City of los Angeles's reliance on Met's system.

Conversely, below normal runoff in the Owens Valley increases the need for Metropolitan's deliveries. And it's quantified up there at the top. It says that Los Angeles aqueduct deliveries have varied from 200,000 acre-feet per year to about 500,000 acre-feet per year. So you've got about a 300,000 acre-foot gap between the high and the low.

And the only agency that's mentioned in the IRP

any confusion. This is not in the administrative record, but the parties' stipulation didn't distinguish between record documents and non-record documents for purposes of presentation of counsel.

So, if we can go to page A30, remember that 300,000 acre-foot gap that you saw in the previous document? Well, you've seen this before. We talked about this in opening.

Here, the gap that is mentioned -- and this is different. This is not the flows off the L.A. aqueduct, this the converse. This is Metropolitan sales to L.A., but you see again 167 there in the middle of the paragraph is the low acre-feet per year and then 433 is the high so not quite 300,000 but getting there.

And then down at the bottom of paragraph, you see 511,000 acre-feet as a potential high in the future, 255 as a low. So again, you're talking about close to 300.000 acre-feet.

So, what does Met do to accommodate this? Well, they keep a lot of water in storage. And I would like to go back to a document that is in the record. This is in the 2012 record only, it's page 16518. This is an April 10, 2012 board memo and this is a table of Metropolitan's water storage capacity and water and storage.

267

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

And if we can go to the bottom of the page, there you see -- and actually, Jeff, maybe you can highlight the headers of the columns so we can see what these columns consist of.

Perfect

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So, you see that Metropolitan's total storage capacity as of the end of 2012 is just shy of six million acre-feet. It's got close to three million acre-feet in storage so that's ten times. It is fairly easy math. It's ten times 300,000. And it's been ramping up substantially over the previous three years, 2011, 2010 and 2012.

The bond document that we looked at before -by the way, PTX 244 has a figure as of the end of -- or the beginning of 2013, which is even higher than that. It's about 3.3 acre-feet, and that's at page A26 of that document.

So, again, how much is three million acre-feet? Well, it's a lot. It's ten times the variance in Los Angeles's take between wet and dry years.

And if we could go actually back to the bond statement, PTX 244, A46, this is a summary of water sold and water sales receipts by Metropolitan. This is their total sales over these fiscal years. You can see first off that their sales have been decreasing substantially

So Met's fallback position is it's not captured in the volumetric rates, it is captured in the RTS charge. And the first answer to that is well, their interrogatory answer number 15 says that peaking costs are spread across the System Access Rate and other rate elements. But I would like to go to the administrative record and show you their engineer's reports from their 2010, 2012 rate setting cycles.

Mr. Cushman discussed this a little bit earlier in his testimony. I would like to show you the best evidence of it.

So, this is an April 2010 engineer's report prepared by Met as part of the rate setting cycle for 2011 and 2012. This is page 11509 in the administrative record. And I would like to forward to page 11512, fourth page of the report, and you see a section on the Readiness-to-Serve Charge.

The first thing I would like to say is just, you know, the beginning paragraph describes what the charge is. Metropolitan levies the RTS charge on its member agency to recover a portion of the debt service on bonds issued to finance capital facilities needed to meet existing demands on Metropolitan's system.

There's nothing in there about peaking

270 272

from 2.3 million acre-feet in fiscal 2008 to 1.67 acre-feet, a fairly steady downward trend over five years.

So the 3 million acre-feet in storage that Met had in the end of 2012 was enough to essentially satisfy two 2012s of complete Met sales. So there is an awful lot of infrastructure that Met has invested in to maintain those levels of storage. That's the significance of peaking.

Now, the second thing I want to talk about is the Readiness-to-Serve Charge and the way Met doesn't recover for peaking.

Met has pointed to a couple of things in this case when they've said well, peaking doesn't matter and if it did, we recover for it. They point to their volumetric rate. That doesn't get at the point. The point is that the volumetric rates are charged only when water is purchased. And dry year peaking is insurance. It is a benefit that's given when water is not being purchased. It's a benefit that's given to have the water ready when you need it in years when you're not taking it.

So the volumetric rates don't capture that. The volumetric rates, you only pay them when you actually take the water, not when you may need it but don't take

specifically, but Met might say capital facilities, that captures peaking somehow.

Couple of things are important. One thing that Mr. Cushman mentioned, you see that the total benefit there in paragraph 1 is \$330 million.

What is the next paragraph say? It starts off by saying although the RTS charge could be set to recover the entire potential benefit, the general manager is recommending that the RTS charge only recover a portion of the total potential benefit. For fiscal year 2010-2011, this amount is estimated to be \$123,500,000. So the RTS charge, whatever it is recovering, is recovering only about 37.4 percent by my math of the 330 million, just 123 and a half million.

The second point about the RTS charge, which is down near the bottom, it explains how it's calculated. It says the RTS charge for fiscal 2010-'11 is allocated to each member agency on the basis of a ten-year rolling average of historic water purchases. And there was a discussion of this in the parties' opening but this is important because a ten-year average by its very nature doesn't capture the entire peak. An average smooths out peaks. So you're not measuring the variance between the average and the peak, you are just taking the total and you're averaging it per year.

273

And so that's where the RTS charge isn't really designed to capture dry year peaking. But if it were, as you can see, it doesn't recover anywhere near the costs that are incurred.

I would like to briefly go to the engineer's report from 2012. This is from March of 2012. It is pretty much the same thing so I will do it more quickly.

There you see it. This is in the 2012 record. This is 15122 is the page and 15125 is the relevant page.

Again, you see the Readiness-to-Serve Charge heading. Paragraphs look pretty similar. Most of the text is the same, numbers are a little bit different. This time the estimated potential benefits in the first paragraph, they exceed \$322 million and Met has set the RTS charge to recover between 142 and 146 million, so a little bit higher percentage but still about 45 percent, still less than half.

Now, the third thing I want to mention is Met's usage of the State Water Project to wheel. Met's made a very big deal about the fact that it can wheel water, non-project water on the State Water Project. In our openings, we put up a slide that I would like to put up again. And really, the purpose of this is I just want to explain to the Court where these numbers come from so your Honor can double check them and make sure that we

And the reason 2009 is the last year is that that's the last year for which data is available. The 2009 report, which I believe is PTX 341, that was published in June of this year.

Now, these are long, thick documents and really, we thought it would be useful to point the Court's attention to the place in the document where there's actually a table that shows this information.

And so we've prepared excerpts from these documents which we've marked and shown to Met as Exhibit 328A through 341A and 380A.

And what those documents are is a single table which shows the water deliveries Met makes to each of the State Water Project contractors. There's a line item for Metropolitan and there's columns for project water, project water to storage, transactions with other contractors and then non-project water. So it involves a little bit of arithmetic, but that's where the backup data is for this slide. Again, we're talking about 13 million acre-feet of project water and 216,000 acre-feet, 1.6 percent of non-project water.

Another thing about those documents that is interesting is that they show out of the 15 years, that there's nine years where Met didn't actually wheel any state -- non-State Water Project water through the State

274 276

got them right.

What this slide shows --

THE COURT: Which slide number is this?
MR. PURCELL: Sorry. This is 6202. I don't know that they're in order in the book.

THE COURT: But I think -- I had some -- you're right.

That's fine. Go ahead.

MR. PURCELL: Okay. What this shows is the water that's moved through the State Water Project and delivered to Met, it's either delivered to Met or stored by Met. That's 97.3 percent of the water. Another 1.1 percent of the water, that's still State Water Project water but it's transfers and exchanges with other State Water Project contractors. So, that's one of the other 20 some contractors giving their water to Met in exchange for some other benefit but still State Water Project water.

And then third party water, non-project water is 1.6 percent, so it really is de minimis.

And where did we get these numbers? We got them from the State Water Project. The PTX exhibits at the bottom, 328 through 341 and 380 are 15 years' worth of reports from the State Water Project from 1995 to 2009.

Water Project facilities. So to the extent Met is relying on this right it has, it's not exercised all that often, six out of 15 years.

The fourth thing and final thing I want to mention is the Water Stewardship Rate. And I would just like to discuss a few documents again.

The first thing, I would like to go back to the IRP because it is a pretty important historical document and it shows what Met was thinking around the time that it first set its wheeling rate. This is in the record, page 1448. And in the middle of the page, you've got a section on water conservation, which of course that's what the Water Stewardship Rate funds is, water conservation projects.

Here's what Met said in 1996. It says the relationship between urban water conservation and projection of water demands was discussed in section 2. However, during the IRP conservation was also considered as a supply option, much like any other traditional supply project. And of course conservation does provide a water supply. It provides a certain number of acre-feet of water conserved, which is San Diego's point. Met has allocated all of that expense to its transportation rates rather than to its supply rate.

The next document I would like to show is PTX

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

41. This is a preliminary report on the rate structure framework proposal, March of 2000 generated by Met. If we go to the next page, we can see that it was prepared by Shane Chapman in March of 2000. Shane Chapman, you might have heard his name yesterday, he was the one who wrote PTX 25, the memo and handwritten note to Dan Rodrigo about how the IID San Diego transfer arrangement, exchange arrangement would potentially reduce Met's cost by \$65 an acre-foot.

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

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

So, here's what Mr. Chapman said. Let's go to page 15 of the document and let's go to the first paragraph first.

So he's explaining the Water Stewardship Rate here and what he's saying is the cost of continuing to provide financial support for the development of local resources and conservation are recovered by the Water Stewardship Rate. WSR is a uniform commodity charge applied to every acre-foot of water that moves through the Metropolitan system, including wheeled water. The surcharge is applied to wheeled water as well as water sold by Metropolitan in order to ensure the continued strong regional support of local resources and conservation investments and to create a level playing field between sellers of wheeled water and Metropolitan.

So that's again the rate stability purpose that

Metropolitan that demonstrates the relationship between the costs and benefits of local resourcing conservation investments. Such assist and properly implemented should generate regionally efficient resource investment decisions and reduce, if not altogether eliminate perceived and/or real customer equity issues.

So here, Metropolitan is saying we could evaluate the costs and benefits of these programs. If we did, that would lead to a greater perception of fairness and perhaps actual fairness, the customers wouldn't be upset about it.

And then the next paragraph says table 6.1 provides a summary example of such an accounting mechanism. We can go to the next page, which has table 6.1 on it.

And this is obviously a model but what it shows is a couple of things. Number one, Metropolitan could do this type of analysis if it wanted to. It has the data. It could calculate the costs and benefits of each program. It hasn't done it. It's admitted it hasn't done it. That's in the responses to our request for admission.

The second interesting thing about this is what metric does Metropolitan use to measure the effect of these local resource programs? Well, it's supply. It is

278 280

Met is very -- they're not bashful about stating it, that they want to basically prevent wheeled water from having a competitive advantage with them.

Now, let's go to the third paragraph. One up, actually.

There we go.

And this really goes to a point which I don't think is in dispute. It's about the monopoly nature of Metropolitan's distribution system and the fact that their rates are imposed, which I know Met has disputed but I don't think it's really in dispute.

The ultimate consumer is captive within Metropolitan system, Mr. Chapman writes. That means with respect to the purchase of imported water, the retail purveyor only has two choices. It can buy imported water from Metropolitan or it can acquire imported supplies from another source and have the water wheeled through the system. So, that, again, shows the monopoly point.

But, really the key part of this document is the next page. And I would like to go to this second paragraph and the top of the third paragraph of this page.

So, Mr. Chapman writes therefore in addition to implementing the WRS, it is proposed that the framework also contain an accounting mechanism administered by

not transportation benefit, it's supply. You see at the bottom there, net change in total supply of 100,000 acre-feet and the table speaks in terms of supply.

Now, this is pretty critical, this sort of analysis for Prop. 26 purposes in particular because what you're really dealing with here is the question of who benefits and who's paying. And that's not just a rate by rate issue. You know, is the rate supply, is the rate transportation? It also has to do with what agencies are benefiting from these projects. As Mr. Cushman said, these projects are handed out agency to agency. Some agencies got a lot, others get less. Everybody pays the volumetric Water Stewardship Rate.

When an agency gets a benefit -- a program for local conservation, the acre-feet of water that are conserved are conserved locally in that agency's service area. They're not conserved in any other agency's service area. That supply benefit is felt locally.

Metropolitan says there are also distribution benefits that are regional. It admits it hasn't ever quantified those, so it hasn't done enough to meet any sort of burden it might have. But in any event, it needs to account for the local supply benefit and give credit for that in the way it assesses its rates.

So where is the analysis? Metropolitan hasn't

281

done it.

2.3

One document that I would like to show you. The Water Authority actually has done analysis of the money that's paid into the WSR and the money that's doled out in these subsidy programs, and that's PTX 214. This is for four years and I would like to go through them year by year. The data on this comes from Metropolitan. It was forwarded to San Diego, and that's PTX 209.

Here, we have --

MR. WEST: Your Honor, sorry to interrupt counsel. If this regards Prop. 26, this court has already determined this is administrative record only for Prop. 26, so this document's irrelevant to the Court's inquiry into Prop. 26. This is not.

THE COURT: This is being used for which claim? MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, this is being used for all claims. This is being shown that these -- proportionality is not merely an inquiry under Prop. 26. Prop. 26 makes it explicit. Proportionality is a requirement of law generally.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled. But these sorts of objections, generally speaking I'm going to be overruling them. It doesn't mean you're wrong, it just means let's make the record in this trial. And when we get to subsequent briefing stages, if people are using

Rate. That's the in column. And then the amount of money disbursed by Met to each agency.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. PURCELL: Under the local resource projects conservation credit programs and desalination programs that are funded by the Water Stewardship Rate.

So when you go to 2008, again you see people are all over the map. Some are way up, some are way down. San Diego is way down at \$5.8 million in the hole. Western down at the bottom, 1.8 million to the good.

2009 and 2010 show similar figures. There's 2009. San Diego deficit here has increased to \$10.5 million. And then 2010, looking forward, it's about the same, \$10.6 million. And Western down at the bottom is 2 million -- coming out \$2 million ahead.

Now, the reason I'm mentioning Western is that Western actually created their own analysis which was produced to us in this case of the benefit that they received under the Water Stewardship Rate from the local resource programs, and that's PTX 266. This is already in the record. It's also in the administrative record so we won't separately mark it. You can't really read it too well on the screen, unfortunately.

Let's go to page 2. So, this is unfortunately very hard to read.

evidence in the wrong way for the wrong claim, I invite you to point that out.

MR. WEST: I appreciate that, your Honor. Thank you for that clarification.

MR. PURCELL: Under the Metropolitan Act, it speaks to providing similarly situated customers under Prop. 13 and other constitutional requirements the idea of providing a huge benefit to one and a penalty to another is still unconstitutional.

What this shows again is an in out. The in is the Water Stewardship Rate payments, the out is the program funding. You see people are all over the map. San Diego is taking the worst of it. They're at minus \$4.3 million for 2007.

Western, you see at the bottom is one of the big winners there. They're 2.1.

I'll come back to Western in a minute.

You go to 2008.

THE COURT: Tell me again what you said that this represents? I'm unclear.

MR. PURCELL: Sorry. This is -- that's my fault, your Honor.

So this is a chart provided -- that San Diego created based on data provided to it by Met of the amount of each agency's payments under the Water Stewardship

Jeff, can you highlight just the very bottom?

So this is eight fiscal years' of payments under the Water Stewardship Rate by Western in 2003 to 2010. And the payments of the Water Stewardship Rate, it's hard to read, but it's about \$14.3 million.

THE COURT: 14.

MR. PURCELL: 14.833.

So let's go to the last page. Western actually calculated how much money it got out for its \$14.8 million payments. Page 9.

And this is a little clearer. That's good.

So there's the same \$14.8 million figure on the top, fees paid to MWD under the Water Stewardship Rate, which they call a fee, which it is. And then you add up all of the regional program funding that they received and the net benefit is \$23.2 million. So that's how much more they got out of it than they paid in.

And now briefly, just a couple of documents on the Water Stewardship Rate that shows really the Water Stewardship Rate is not even collecting all of the costs of the desalination conservation local resource programs.

PTX 142, this is a Met document. It's a memo, July 6th, 2009 from Stathis Kostopoulos, one of the people who administered Met's financial planning model to Tom DeBacker, I believe is the comptroller.

And Mr. DeBacker asked Mr. Kostopoulos to calculate how much money Met collected from the Water Stewardship Rate and their costs of providing those, I guess you could call them services, the subsidy programs.

Fiscal 2008-2009, the second paragraph says that Metropolitan from its sales of water and its volumetric Water Stewardship Rate generated \$52.8 million in WSR revenue. But, in the next paragraph, total demand management costs were about \$93.9 million for fiscal 2009.

Scroll down to the bottom.

2.3

Demand management cost exceeded receipts from the Water Stewardship Rate by \$41.2 million during fiscal 2008-2009. So those costs had to be borne elsewhere. We're not sure where they were put but they're not put on the Water Stewardship Rate. It is not aligned to the costs of the service being provided.

And then just briefly, 173, PTX 173, basically the same memo from the following year, June 22, 2010, again Mr. Kostopoulos writing to Mr. DeBacker. The format's the same.

This time, in the second paragraph, Met's volumetric Water Stewardship Rate netted at \$62.9 million. Its total management costs in the following paragraph were 85.7 million. And this led in the last

costs bear no relationship to the actual implemental cost of wheeling the water through the conveyance facility slash system. That's pretty much exactly what we're talking about today.

And two paragraphs later, San Diego explained in more specificity what it was talking about, and this again goes to this sort of protectionist approach, this hold harmless approach.

The Authority believes the intended result of Metropolitan's pricing approach is to remove any incentive for its customers or member agencies to request the use of excess capacity. In turn, this will allow Metropolitan to sustain its monopoly on imported water supplies within its boundaries. As such the proposed resolution is contrary to the policy behind the wheeling statute and raises state and federal antitrust issues in the process.

So, we know from the documents already reviewed that Met set its wheeling rate with this rate stability purpose in mind and couldn't overcome it, and that's exactly what San Diego is complaining about.

PTX 38, this is a September 1999 letter from San Diego to Ron Gastelum. He succeeded Mr. Foley as general manager of Met. And if you look at the bottom of the first page, there's a paragraph called cost shifting.

286 288

paragraph to a deficit of \$21.8 million for fiscal 2009-2010. Those costs were spread over Metropolitan's other rates.

So hopefully that was helpful, your Honor.

Before I sit down, actually one other thing that was raised on Mr. Cushman's cross-examination was this idea that Metropolitan was sort of taken unawares that San Diego hasn't really complained too much about Metropolitan's practices. That's not right.

And I would just like to point out a few documents that provide this history. First is PTX 22. These objections really have been persistent and they stretch back pretty much in all phases of this case, before the wheeling rate was set, during the pendency of the first wheeling rate before unbundling, after unbundling. This is a 1996 document, December of 1996.

1996, it is a letter to John Foley who had been the chairman of Met. This is about Met's proposed resolution establishing a short term wheel rate so right at the beginning when Met was first establishing the wheeling rate.

Let's go to page 2 of this.

Here is the key paragraph. So in short summary the Authority objects to most imposition of costs upon a party requesting the use of excess capacity because the Now September of 1999, this was before the unbundling, but the wheeling, the prior wheeling litigation was ongoing.

And here's what San Diego said about cost shifting. It said there's significant problems with the division of cost categories in the rate model between supply, conveyance and distribution.

Inappropriate allocation between these categories shift costs and make it appear that Metropolitan is designing the model to predetermine the outcome and achieve two goals: One, artificially suppress supply costs to appear competitive with potential alternative suppliers and to inflate conveyance costs to effectively preclude wheeling within Metropolitan's system.

The next page, again, more specificity, we see exactly what sort of costs are being shifted in the first paragraph. And San Diego talks about the State Water Project. The State Water Project, SWP, is a Metropolitan water supply cost but model assumption assign only 15 to 20 percent of Metropolitan's water supply contract with the SWP, the Delta water charge, as a water supply costs. The model should treat the SWP as a supply cost to the point where water is introduced to Metropolitan's service area.

And this paragraph really lays out San Diego's complaints in this case. It could have been taken from our complaint.

2.2

2.3

So, there's no question these complaints were being made back then.

Mr. Cushman, Mr. Braunig showed you on Mr. Cushman's redirect PTX 244, which was the 2000 letter. I won't get into that. You've already looked at that. But that -- I will just say once again that that document did call out the dry year peaking issue in some detail.

So, March 2002, Met adopted the rate allocation that's in effect today and became effective in January 2003.

And during the process of leading up to that unbundling and the current rate allocation, San Diego again made its objections explicit. This document is in the record. This is in both records. 6294 is the number. March 2012, 2002 board meeting. This is the proposal for the 2003 rates. And if we go to page 6300, which is page 7 of the document, you see number 7 there at the bottom of the page. And this goes on for several pages more.

Bob Campbell, who's in the courtroom today, the executive assistant to the general manager for San Diego

PTX 25, you've seen Mr. West used that on cross with Mr. Cushman. I won't go through it in detail but there's a number of specific complaints in February of 2003, although not as specific apparently as Met feels we should have been.

And then PTX 81, it's the last document I want to show you, and this makes perfectly clear. This is during the five-year litigation time out. This is a memo from Kevin Hunt, who was the general manager of MWDOC, the Metropolitan Water District of Orange County to his own board of directors in June of 2004.

The subject is a telephone conversation he had with Maureen Stapleton, San Diego general manager. And Paragraph 2 is the interesting part of this document.

Ms. Stapleton asked about the status of section 7 of the LRP agreement. She said that she was surprised by the hostile tone of Mr. Gastelum. That's Met's general manager, Mr. Gastelum's June 18, 2004 letter on rate structure integrity. She said that her board had just approved a \$1.9 billion capital improvement plan addition and that they were not intimidated by financial threats nor swayed by financial offers.

And then there's the underlined part. This is Mr. Hunt's underlining. I asked whether SDCWA would be pursuing legal or legislative remedies at the end of the

submitted written comments and made it clear that San Diego opposed the rate structure. San Diego appreciates this opportunity to comment.

Metropolitan's board adopted a rate structure plan, including a concept for proposed rate structure on December 12th, 2000, then established the work plan.

And if we go to the next page, and there in the second paragraph, the Water Authority opposed the proposed rate structure for a number of reasons that have previously been presented to the board. However, the Water Authority has continued to work with Metropolitan and its member agencies in an effort to develop implementation approaches that would be consistent with the objective stated in Metropolitan by Metropolitan's board and also address the Water Authority's stated objectives and concerns.

THE COURT: Off the record for a moment.

MR. PURCELL: All right. The point here is the complaints were well known. Metropolitan on the one hand says we should have worked with the board. We were duty bound to work with the board, we shouldn't have run off and sued. We worked with the board for a long time. This was right before the five-year litigation stand still came into effect. Obviously there couldn't be a lawsuit during that period of time.

five years QSA delay. She said absent any negotiated changes, yes.

So this was no secret that San Diego objected to the rate structure, reserved all rights, planned to litigate if they couldn't resolve it in the Met boardroom. Couldn't resolve it in the Met boardroom, filed suit. Nobody is surprised by any of this, including the specific complaints that San Diego is making in this case. Even if that were an issue with respect to these rate claims, which we think it's not, because the rates were set anew in 2010 and 2012, statute of limitations started running then, we sued timely.

But to the extent the Court is interested in this and thinks this is meaningful, there is not any question that San Diego complained about this incessantly.

That's all I've got, your Honor.

Before I sit down, I would like to raise the issue of deposition designations, which both parties submitted on Monday. We would like to submit those as part of our case-in-chief. There have been objections. Your Honor hasn't ruled. Not rushing you at all but we don't want to lose the right to submit those.

THE COURT: Sure. Let's go off the clock.

The -- I'm not going to be ruling on them tonight, tomorrow morning or any time in time to do you any good. So my suggestion is that those be submitted with the objections. And the odds are, I will say if past experience is any guide, that not all of them will be used by me in my proposed statement of decision.

1.0

2.3

So there are two ways to go about this. I'll look at the volume of objections and if it's just as easy to go through them and rule on them, this will be after we've terminated the court proceedings, I might do that.

The other thing I've done in the past is to the extent I found them useful, I go ahead and I incorporate them and -- but as I incorporate them, I in effect rule. So if they're in the statement of decision, then the objections have been overruled.

Now, maybe for your record and for appellate purposes you think it's best if I actually walk through all of the objections, so I'm open to doing that. I don't know what the volume of objections are.

MR. PURCELL: I think your Honor's plan is fine with us as far as if you cite them, you've overruled the objection.

THE COURT: What do you think?
MR. WEST: That's fine by us too, your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's just make sure before we wrap

see A, B, C was admitted. So you can do it by written stipulation or we can walk through it on the record at some point.

MR. WEST: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, in the nature of housekeeping, you just mentioned briefing. Can you give us some idea of what you picture happening at the end of this?

THE COURT: Well, I'm -- eventually I'm more interested in what the parties want to do. So I think the parties ought to think about it.

But what might be typical, one idea would be to have some briefing after this is finished where you in effect lay out the evidence that has been -- that is in the record and wrap it up with the positions that you have in the case, final post-trial brief. That would probably be pretty helpful. And it would also be submitted in a Word editable format so I could crib.

There are a lot of pages and lot of record citations and the parties are in the best position to sort of glue together what those citations are with what their arguments are. After a session like this, typically you would probably want to have an opportunity to do that. But I think you ought to talk about it and

up in court at the end of the week or on Monday, whenever it is, that I know that I have what you want me to have. I want to make sure that you've seen what I got because I don't see them right here. So I want to make sure I have what you think I've got with respect to the objections.

MR. PURCELL: They should have been filed on Monday, I believe, both sides.

THE COURT: I'm sure they were, I'm sure they were but I want to make sure all of us sort of stare at them at the same time.

MR. WEST: Another minor housekeeping matter, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WEST: I apologize. I meant to at the end of Mr. Cushman's cross-examination to move the exhibits I presented to him in connection with that cross-examination into evidence to the extent they were not already.

THE COURT: Well, let's go through them. I don't know what --

MR. KEKER: We have no objection.

MR. PURCELL: We have objection to them and --THE COURT: We need to have a clear record. I don't usually say everything you said was admitted. I

actually want a record so somebody who's reading it can

see what you think is in your interests.

MR. PURCELL: We'll talk about it.

In talking about it, could you give us some -the day we finish is the 23rd. Next day is the 24th and then the 25th and then there's -- do you have any sense of when you want this? I mean --

THE COURT: No, no, I have no schedule. It's a question of how much time you need to get it done. There's also a little bit of press of time that I've heard not from my part but from your part that you want to try to get some resolution of some of --

MR. KEKER: April rates.

THE COURT: So that's not my concern, it's your concern. I would like to attend to it but you're in the best position to know what the timetable would be like that would accommodate your interests.

MR. KEKER: We will talk amongst ourselves. THE COURT: I will defer to you on this. I really will.

MR. KEKER: Then the other thing is yesterday they submitted a glossary. We have significant objections to the glossary. It's argumentative and so on.

Ms. Walton-Hadlock can give you specifics, but basically we just object to the glossary. We don't need

1 a glossary. Everybody can argue what they think the THE WITNESS: My first name is Dan, D-A-N, 2 2 evidence shows. Denham, D-E-N-H-A-M. 3 3 THE COURT: Okay. THE COURT: Okay. 4 4 MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, if they don't agree MR. BRAUNIG: Thank you, your Honor. 5 5 Mr. Purcell, if it's okay, will hand up a with our glossary, they believe we've misdefined 6 6 something, why don't they put it in writing? We would binder of some documents and which has also been provided 7 7 like the chance to submit to the Court our glossary that to opposing counsel. 8 8 we believe is accurate but we have no objection to them And, Mr. Denham, do you have the binder in 9 9 front of you? submitting something different or putting it in writing 10 10 THE WITNESS: I do. so you can hear from both sides. 11 11 THE COURT: I haven't seen it but what MR. BRAUNIG: All right. Thank you. 12 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION sorts of --13 13 MR. KEKER: Peaking is defined their way, BY MR. BRAUNIG: 14 14 wheeling is defined their way. It's just this Q. Mr. Denham, how are you presently employed? 15 15 argumentative list of things about this case. A. I am currently employed by San Diego County 16 16 MR. HIXSON: Your Honor --Water Authority. 17 17 MR. KEKER: And it doesn't seem -- it doesn't Q. Okay. In what role? 18 18 seem to make any sense to have a separate fight. It's A. I am the acting Colorado River program 19 19 just a waste of time to try to agree with them on what -director. I'm also the chief administrative officer for 20 20 they say peaking means one thing, we say dry year peaking the Joint Powers Authority environmental program in 21 means another thing. 21 Imperial Valley. 22 22 THE COURT: Why don't you make sure at the end Q. I think maybe you may want to speak into your 23 23 microphone and speak up a little bit for the court of the day I have a copy of your glossary, working copy. 24 24 I'll look at it tonight and I'll figure out the extent to reporter. 25 25 which it looks argumentative. If it is, we'll just throw Can you describe, Mr. Denham, for the Court any 300 298 1 1 it out. portions of your role at the Water Authority that involve 2 2 MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, our other housekeeping financial analysis and modeling? 3 3 matter along those lines, we had a version of our A. Sure. 4 pretrial brief where we put in hyperlinks in .pdfs and 4 There's certainly portions of the two roles 5 5 the clerk said we should check with you if you would like that I previously described as the CAO of the Joint 6 6 a chambers copy. We think it is helpful in reading Powers Authority and the acting Colorado River program 7 7 through. director of the Water Authority. There's multiple 8 8 THE COURT: Oh, yes. I think .pdf with links financial resource problems that I administer and 9 and electronic format is helpful, obviously with a copy 9 oversee. 10 to the other side. 10 In addition to those, I work collaboratively 11 Shall we take a recess now or do you want to 11 with our own finance department on rate modeling issues 12 call your next witness now? 12 as well as debt issuance. 13 MR. BRAUNIG: Why don't we break? 13 Q. Anything else beyond that? 14 THE COURT: I'll see everybody in ten minutes. 14 A. At the Water Authority? 15 (Brief break.) 15 Q. Yeah. 16 THE COURT: Let's continue. 16 A. That sums it up. 17 MR. BRAUNIG: San Diego calls as its next 17 Q. Okay. Prior to working for the Water 18 witness, Dan Denham. 18 Authority, what experience did you have with respect to 19 DAN DENHAM, 19 financial analysis and modeling? 20 having been called as a witness by the Plaintiff, and 20 A. Prior to the Water Authority, I worked for the 21 having been duly sworn under the standard oath, was 21 City of San Diego. Just before, I was the finance rates 22 examined and testified as follows: 22 and bonds manager for the city's Waste Water Department. 2.3 THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. 23 In that capacity, I had a team of financial analysts that 24 If you would adjust the microphone and state 24 I oversaw, more debt rates, bonds, financial forecasting. 25 and spell your first and last name. 25 Prior to that, I worked in the Financial

301

2.3

Management Department in the City of San Diego. We were sort of the analytical arm of the City Manager's Office where I was the capital improvements program coordinator for the entire city.

1.8

- Q. Can you describe your educational background?
- A. Yes. I have a bachelor's degree in public administration with a minor in economics. I also have a master's degree in public administration with a concentration in public finance.
- Q. Are you working toward board certifications relating to financial analysis and modeling?
- A. There's a group called the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts, NACVA. The certification there is a certified valuation analyst. It really involves asset valuation. I have done course work in that and in let's characterize it as a test or so away from completing that certification.
- Q. Have you ever given testimony as an expert in the field of financial analysis and modeling?
- A. I have. Approximately three to four years ago, I served as an expert witness in an arbitration that the San Diego County Water Authority had on a price dispute with the Imperial Irrigation District. In that capacity, I gave testimony and did various calculations related to the price paid for water.

Are you saying that between 232 and 315 acre-feet is -- was erroneously put into the transportation charge?

THE WITNESS: If I'm saying yes, that's the overcharge.

THE COURT: That's the overcharge?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. BRAUNIG: And, your Honor, we will develop that obviously for you to explain that.

Q. Have you developed, Mr. Denham, a slide to show how you went about backing State Water Project costs out of the transportation rates?

A. I did.

MR. BRAUNIG: Can I ask to pull up document 162-01.

Q. Before you get into this, can you maybe describe for the Court how you -- how you identified the costs that are State Water Project costs associated with the different rates?

A. Sure.

As part of Metropolitan's board approved rate and charges for any given year, there's a cost of service report that is produced to support those rates. Contained in that cost of service report are various

Q. Are you a member of any professional associations relating to public finance?

A. The America Water Works Association and by virtue of the fact that I'm in the process of training for that certification, the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts as well as the American Water Works. I can't remember if I actually just said that. Yeah.

Q. You understand you're not being asked today to offer opinions about contractual damages?

A. I do.

Q. Were you asked to perform an analysis of what Metropolitan's transportation rates would look like if you backed out State Water Project costs from the System Access Rate and System Power Rate and removed the Water Stewardship Rate as a cost?

- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. What did you conclude based on that analysis?
- A. Based on that analysis, I concluded that there was a range of from approximately \$232 an acre-foot to \$315 an acre-foot worth of transportation services that were misallocated.
- Q. Have you developed a slide --THE COURT: Excuse me. I'm not -- if I could, I don't really understand the testimony.

assumptions, including deliveries to member agencies, supply assumptions and most certainly revenue requirements.

Based on those assumptions, I was able to go in and take a look at State Water Project costs and isolate them and apply them to the System Access Rate and System Power Rate.

- Q. Okay. And so looking at 162-01, the slide that's up here right now, what's the total amount of costs in Metropolitan's revenue requirements associated with the State Water Project?
- A. The revenue requirement for the transportation and supply elements as displayed on the screen is 407 million.

I would note -- I would pause there because there are additional revenue requirements as part of the State Water Project that are not contained on this slide, which are not relevant to the transportation.

- Q. Okay. What's the amount of state water -- this is for fiscal year 2011. What was the amount of State Water Project costs that was assigned to the System Access Rate based on your analysis and review?
- A. You see the number there in yellow, 195,000,205,670.
 - Q. And what was the amount of State Water Project

1.8

costs that were assigned to Metropolitan System Power Rate in 2011?

2.3

A. The System Power Rate revenue requirement for the State Water Project was 181,389,515.

- Q. And what is the column -- let's look at the System Access Rate. There's a column on the right that says "Other District Requirements." What are other district requirements, say, for the System Access Rate? What does that generally refer to?
- A. I think the easiest way to explain what other district requirements are is to take a look at the column labeled "Total" and you'll see 387 million for the total System Access Rate.

The other district requirements are simply the total amount of 387 less the State Water Project amount of 195, essentially the balance of the revenue requirement for the System Access Rate. I chose to place it in that category as allocated catchall for lack of a better word.

- Q. For purposes of your analysis, did you assume that State Water Project costs that are on the System Access Rate and System Power Rate shouldn't be on that rate -- shouldn't be on those rates?
- A. Yes, that's correct. And so the approach that I took was the 195 million for the System Access Rate and

System Power and Water Stewardship Rate.

I would draw your attention to the number in the second column in yellow, \$372 in acre-foot. That would be the board approved rate in calendar year 2011.

Based on the analysis that I did of the cost of service study, the previously identified revenue requirements for the System Access Rate and System Power Rate, I removed those from the overall rate elements for those two categories to develop a corrected rate, which in this case is \$136 an acre-foot.

In the end, the difference between the two columns, the column labeled "Current" and column labeled "Corrected" is the \$236 I previously referenced.

THE COURT: Are these part of an exhibit, what PTX 357?

MR. BRAUNIG: I believe PTX 357 is the source of the current rates.

THE COURT: What exhibits are these?

MR. BRAUNIG: These -- this is a demonstrative

showing his analysis.

THE COURT: Okay. So we're not going to mark

it as an exhibit?

MR_RRALINIG: We can mark it as an exhibit if

MR. BRAUNIG: We can mark it as an exhibit if it will be helpful to the Court.

nd 25 MR. HIXSON: We object because it is not

181 million for the System Power Rate, I removed those.

Q. Okay. How did you go about identifying and backing out the Transportation Rate costs associated with local water development and conservation?

A. The local water supply development and conservation is a little bit straightforward, a little bit more straightforward.

The revenue requirement for that function is completely collected under the Water Stewardship Rate and so there was no method of isolating different functional costs.

- Q. Were you able to take these amounts that you -that you backed out and reduce them to a per acre-foot amount in each fiscal year?
- A. Yes, I was. And I was able to do that based on the sales assumptions contained in the cost of service report from which I gathered these revenue requirements.
- Q. Do you have a slide that shows how you calculated this on a per acre-foot basis?

A. Yes, I do.

MR. BRAUNIG: Can you please pull up 170-01?

- Q. All right. Can you explain to the Court what -- how this slide, 170-01, explains your analysis?
- A. Yes. So, this slide is for the calendar year 2011, rates and charges, specifically the System Access

evidence.

THE COURT: We'll just use it as a demonstrative.

Go ahead.

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. Sorry.

So, let's talk about these one at a time. The System Access Rate, what is the current rate for the System Access Rate as of -- let me ask that a different way. What was the System Access Rate, the Met System Access Rate in 2011?

- A. The System Access Rate in 2011 was \$204 an acre-foot.
- Q. And how did you establish the corrected System Access Rate that's in the next column?
- A. As I sort of previously described, the revenue requirements that you saw in the previous slide that were labeled in a different court, I removed that revenue requirement as it was related to State Water Project costs of the System Access Rate. By removing that revenue requirement and then taking the rate and spreading it across the sales assumption in the 2011 cost of service study, you get to an approximation of a corrected rate.
 - Q. Okay. What was the corrected rate that you

1 calculated for the System Access Rate in 2011? Q. Did you --2 2 THE COURT: Just make sure to keep your voice A. \$103 an acre-foot. 3 3 O. And what was the difference between the up. 4 4 actual -- the charged rate and the -- and what you THE WITNESS: Sure. 5 5 calculated as the corrected rate for the System Access BY MR. BRAUNIG: 6 6 Q. Mr. Denham, did you perform a similar analysis Rate? 7 for calendar years 2012, '13 and '14? A. \$101 an acre-foot. 8 8 A. I did. I provided the exact analysis, the same Q. Okay. Let's move down to the next row. 9 9 approach for 2012, '13 and '14. What was Metropolitan's System Power Rate in 10 10 MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. Can we pull up slide 2011? 11 170-02. 11 A. In 2011, the System Power Rate was \$127. 12 12 O. Does this demonstrative exhibit indicate the Q. Okay. And --13 13 rates that you calculated as Metropolitan's A. An acre-foot. 14 transportation rates for 2012? 14 Q. Per acre-foot? 15 15 A. It does. A. Yes. 16 Q. Okay. And what were Metropolitan's combined 16 Q. When you backed out the State Water Project 17 17 transportation rates as charged in 2012? costs from the System Power Rate, what was the remaining 18 A. The 2012 board approved rate was \$396 an 18 -- what was the corrected rate? 19 acre-foot. 19 A. The corrected rate for the System Power Rate 20 Q. When you -- you know, I'm actually -- I'll just 20 was \$33 an acre-foot. 21 say this for the record so that we don't -- so we're 21 Q. And what was the difference between those two? 22 clear for later. I'm seeing the PTX down at the bottom 22 A. \$94 an acre-foot. 23 is 244. I believe that's actually supposed to be 224, so 23 Q. Going down to the next row, Water Stewardship 24 if we may -- and we'll seek at the end to move 224 into 24 Rate, the 2011 Water Stewardship Rate was how much? 25 the record. It's one that's subject to our stipulation. 25 A. \$41 an acre-foot. 310 312 1 1 Q. And where is there a zero or sort of a little THE COURT: Okay. 2 2 hyphen under corrected rate? THE CLERK: So which is exhibit --3 3 A. The Water Stewardship Rate is 100 percent THE COURT: No, this is not. We're still 4 4 charged to the transportation rates, so I removed that. looking at demonstrative exhibits. The parties are not 5 Q. And the difference therefore is \$41? entering them into evidence at this time. 6 6 A. That's correct. BY MR. BRAUNIG: 7 Q. Okay. So at the bottom, the combined Q. When you did the analysis that you did and took 8 8 transportation rates of Metropolitan in 2011, the actual out from transportation rates State Water Project costs 9 9 rates charged were what? and local water supply development costs, what was the 10 10 A. \$236 an acre-foot. resulting total corrected rate for 2012? 11 11 A. The total corrected rate for 2012 was \$164 an Q. Let me make sure I've got the record really 12 12 acre-foot. clear. 13 13 The rates that were charged by Metropolitan in Q. And what was the calculated difference between 14 14 those -- between the current rates and corrected rates? 2011, the current rates --15 15 A. Excuse me. A. The calculated difference in 2012 was \$232 an 16 16 Q. -- were what in totals? acre-foot. 17 17 MR. BRAUNIG: Can we please pull up 170-03? A. Yes. Total rate charged by Metropolitan was 18 18 Q. Mr. Denham, is this demonstrative reflective of \$372 an acre-foot. 19 19 Q. And your corrected rate, adding up the numbers the data that you calculated for calendar year 2013? 20 20 that you calculated as a corrected rate was what? A. Yes, it is. 21 21 A. \$136 an acre-foot. Q. Okay. And what were the -- what was 22 22 Q. And therefore, the difference between the Metropolitan's Transportation Rate in 2013, combining the 23 2.3 actual rate and what you calculated is the corrected rate System Access Rate, System Power Rate and Water 24 24 for 2011 was what amount? Stewardship Rate? 25 25 A. \$236 an acre-foot. A. That rate was \$453 an acre-foot. 311 313

3 3 development, what was the resulting corrected rate for 4 4 2013? 5 5 A. The resulting corrected rate for 2013 was \$138 6 6 an acre-foot. 7 O. And what was the difference between those? 8 8 A. The difference being \$315 an acre-foot. 9 9 MR. BRAUNIG: Let's pull up 170-04. 10 10 I promise, your Honor, this will be the last 11 11 one. 12 12 THE COURT: That's all right. 13 13 BY MR. BRAUNIG: 14 14 Q. The -- for 2014, what -- based on 15 15 Metropolitan's approved boards and charges, what will 16 16 Metropolitan's 2014 transportation rates be, combining 17 17 the System Access Rate, System Power Rate and Water 18 18 Stewardship Rate? 19 19 A. It will be \$445 an acre-foot. 20 20 Q. When you removed State Water Project and local 21 supply and local water development costs, what was the 21 2.2 22 corrected rate that you calculated? 23 23 A. \$143 an acre-foot. 24 24 O. And what's the difference between those two? 25 25 A. The difference is \$302 an acre-foot. 314 1 1 Q. Let's switch gears now and talk about dry year 2 2 peaking. What do you understand dry year peaking to 3 3 mean, Mr. Denham? 4 4 A. I understand dry year peaking to mean annual 5 5 variations based on dry years in Metropolitan's member 6 6 agencies' purchases and deliveries. 7 7 Q. Have you developed an opinion about the 8 8 benefits to member agencies of dry year peaking under 9 9 Metropolitan's current rates? 10 10 A. I have. The opinion that I've developed is 11 11 that there's a substantial benefit to member agencies 12 12 that peak above an average or above the peaking profile, 13 13 if you will, of a normal Metropolitan member agency. 14 14 Q. Were you asked to assume for purposes of 15 15 forming an opinion that Metropolitan recovers some of its 16 16 dry year peaking costs through its volumetric rates? 17 17 A. Yes, I was. 18 18 Q. Do you have a slide that shows the steps you 19 19 went through in forming your dry year peaking opinion? 20 20 A. Yes, I do. 21 21 MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. Could I ask Mr. Dahm to 22 22 pull up 164-01? 2.3 2.3 Q. All right. And without reading this to the 24 24 judge because he can read it himself, could you please 25 25 explain to the Court in general terms the steps you took 315

Q. When you removed from that State Water Project

costs and water -- and the costs of local water supply

1

2

in developing your dry year peaking opinion?

A. Yes. So what I did was take some data from Metropolitan's Web site, operational data as well as data provided by Met staff, and I tried to develop in many ways the average peaking profile of all Met member agencies.

Then I removed the Los Angeles Department of Water Power, who has been well known as Met's largest peaker, and essentially what I'm doing is solving for the impact of LADWP. By comparing the average peaking profile to that of LADWP, you can determine some level of benefit from LADWP peaking above an average member agency.

THE COURT: When you were doing the average, did you include Los Angeles in that calculation?

THE WITNESS: No. I removed Los Angeles. MR. BRAUNIG: And we'll talk about that in a minute.

- Q. Let's start with the first step where you measured member agencies' dry year peaking. Did you develop a data file that allowed you to analyze member agency annual sales?
- A. Yes. This data file, what I alluded to earlier, where we frequently have data exchange between Metropolitan staff and Water Authority staff, so we have

316

- Q. That along with information obtained from
 Metropolitan's Web site?
 A. I was able to manipulate that data and cr
 - A. I was able to manipulate that data and create averages and this peaking profile that I was describing.
 - Q. Let's take those one step at a time.Can I ask you to turn in your binder to PTX 383.

a running sort of tab on data, historical data.

Mr. Denham, is PTX 383 the raw data file from when you performed some of your analyses?

- A. Yes, that's correct. That's the file that I created.
- Q. Okay. And was this developed -- was this developed based on the categories of information that you described earlier, Metropolitan data that's been exchanged with the Water Authority and Metropolitan data that you were able to take from their Web site?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And there are exhibit numbers down here at the bottom. Do those exhibit numbers reflect the data sources that you relied on?
 - A. The PTX 203, 347, those?
- Q. Yes.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. We would move Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit 383

317

Pages 314 to 317

into evidence. A. That's correct. 2 2 THE COURT: Any objection? Q. And where it -- when it dips back down sort of 3 3 MR. WEST: We have no objection to this in 2012 and looks like it's right near 1 again, would 4 particular document. 4 that mean that those sales were back at 500,000? 5 THE COURT: 383 is admitted. 5 A. If it dips below the dotted line, that's 6 (Whereupon Exhibit 383 was 6 indicative of a member agency, in this case San Diego, admitted into Evidence.) 7 purchasing less than its average that I established, or 7 BY MR. BRAUNIG: 8 its baseline average. 8 Q. In measuring member agency's dry year peaking, 9 Q. Why did you use a multiyear average instead of 9 did you develop a baseline against which to measure 10 just picking a date? 10 peaking? 11 A. I believe that, you know, creating a baseline, 11 A. I did and I created a slide for that. 12 it is a good approach from which to measure future 12 MR. BRAUNIG: Can we please pull up slide 13 results. I think it prevents selection bias when you are 13 171-01? 14 doing this type of analysis. 14 Q. Okay. Can you explain to the Court what 171-01 15 If I was to choose 2003 a starting point, for 15 represents? 16 instance, you would lose a basis from which to compare. 16 A. This slide is a graphical representation or 17 In addition, I believe that this period that I've 17 intended to be one that shows the peaking behavior, which 18 captured, it takes into account different hydrology, 18 you see in front of you, of San Diego. And I'll further 19 things of that nature. 19 develop this peaking profile for LADWP and, as I 20 20 Q. All right. Did you -- did you create a similar mentioned, this composite member agency. 21 analysis for a composite of all member agencies other 21 What I've done is for the period 1994 to 2000, 22 than San Diego and Los Angeles? 22 is I've created a baseline from which to measure the 23 A. I did, and there's a slide for that. 23 period 2001 through '12. 24 24 MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. Can we please pull up So this is to say that any member agency in 25 25 171-02? this five-year period in which I created a baseline 318 320 1 1 Q. All right. So what's represented by the blue starts at 1. 2 2 Going from this baseline, I measured the line on this current slide? 3 3 agencies peaking for the period 2001 through '12 based on A. The blue line is as the box there represents, 4 the index you see on the Y axis to your left. 4 is all member agencies except San Diego and L.A., and it 5 5 Q. Mr. Denham, when you said you measured the was calculated in the same manner that I described 6 6 peaking, are those -- are you measuring sales against the San Diego calculation. 7 7 Q. Did you add all those member agencies together 8 8 A. That's correct, I'm measuring the peak year to create the composite? 9 sales compared to this average period of '94 to 2000. 9 A. That's correct. 10 That '94 to 2000 is intended to be a baseline from which 10 Q. And is it accurate to say that the profile of 11 to compare the period 2001 through '12. 11 purchases from 2000 to 2012 at points is a little bit 12 Q. So, if San Diego let's say purchased 500,000 12 below San Diego, at points appears to be about even and 13 acre-feet a year on average between 1994 and 2000, how 13 toward the end, even appears to be a little bit higher 14 14 would that be represented on this chart? relative to the index? 1.5 A. That 500,000 acre-feet would be reflected as 1 15 A. Yes. It tracks very closely with San Diego. 16 in the baseline. 16 Q. Okay. And how do you interpret that? 17 Q. Okay. So when San Diego by 2002 looks like 17 A. The tracking with San Diego? I think perhaps 18 it's buying about -- sort of the line appears to be near 18 when you compare -- when you look at this compared to the 19 1.4, what does that represent or what does that signify? 19 demand Los Angeles places on it, which we're going to see 20 A. For 2002, it is, as you noted, 1.5 as the 20 soon, you can see the fluctuations with the L.A. average 21 peaking index. That is to say that they purchased 1.5 21 compared to the San Diego and all other member agencies. 22 times more water in that period, 50 percent. 22 That's how I would answer it. 23 Q. So that would mean that in 2002, they bought 40 2.3 Q. According to -- is it your opinion that based 24 or 50 percent more than they did over the '94 to 2000 24 on this data, San Diego's peaking is similar to that of 25 average? 25 other member agencies except L.A.?

321

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

```
1
          A. Yes, that's correct.
2
          Q. Okay. Did you do this analysis for Los Angeles
 3
       as well?
 4
          A. I did, and there's --
 5
             MR. BRAUNIG: Can we please pull up 173?
 6
          Q. We also have this marked as PTX 384, which you
 7
       can find in your binder, Mr. Denham.
 Q
             You see that; right?
 9
          A. I do.
10
          Q. Is PTX 384 the same as what's displayed on the
11
       screen right now?
12
          A. Yes, it is.
13
          Q. And is PTX 384 a summary of the evidence that
14
       you collected through your various data collection?
15
          A. Yes, it is.
16
             MR. BRAUNIG: We would move PTX 384 into
17
       evidence.
18
             MR. WEST: We object. It's a demonstrative.
19
             THE COURT: Objection's overruled.
2.0
                       (Whereupon Exhibit 384 was
                        admitted into Evidence.)
21
             THE COURT: It comes in to explain his
22
       testimony.
23
       BY MR. BRAUNIG:
24
          Q. Okay. Now you have PTX 384, which is in
2.5
       evidence in front of you. What -- how does Los Angeles's
                                                          322
1
       behavior or peaking behavior, sales behavior compare to
2
       that of San Diego and other member agencies?
 3
          A. Well, I think the obvious point is that it's
 4
       much higher, but I do think that there are two really big
 5
       take aways from this data, one of which is that as you
 6
```

If you were to cut off a portion of this graph, you don't see the variations or the baseline from which to give it real understanding of how this works.

THE COURT: But is it also true if you take a different set of years other than 1994 to 2000, you would have gotten a different baseline as well; right?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. Okay. You -- turning back to the -- turning back to the -- sorry. One second.

Going to the second and third steps of your slide in which you tried to create a member agency average profile, average peaking profile and compare that to Los Angeles, why are you doing that analysis?

- A. I'm sorry. I'm just trying to get back to the slide, if you don't mind.
 - Q. Yeah, no problem.
 - A. Okay. Would you repeat the question?
- Q. Yeah. Question is in the second and third pieces of your analysis where you're creating a member agency average peaking profile and comparing that to Los Angeles, why are you -- why do you do that?
- A. You do that to determine the benefit that Los Angeles receives. Benefit is the amount of water and capacity held in reserve for Los Angeles above that

324

can see, everybody peaks. And the point here is that we are trying to measure how much Los Angeles in this case peaks above an average.

This time period that I have, 2001 through '12, takes into account different hydrology. I would note that.

THE COURT: What do you mean by that phrase, "takes into account different hydrology"?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think the best way to describe it, if you look at the period 2001 through 2004 for not only Los Angeles but San Diego and all other member agencies, you do see that increase in the height of the lines there. Those are dry years. And it's no coincidence that there is a spike in the lines.

When you take a look at 2006 and 2011, those are dry years -- sorry, wet years.

THE COURT: Wet --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE WITNESS: Yes. And there's no coincidence there. That's what I mean by fluctuations in hydrology.

Now, I talked about selection bias previously.

average of a normal, or the composite member agency. That water, when Los Angeles comes on and off the system, which I think the Court has heard, there's a value to

Q. Okay. Do you have a slide that displays how you created this average peaking profile?

A. Yes, I do.

MR. BRAUNIG: Could you please pull up 165.01?

Q. Now this is a busy slide so I'm going to ask you to walk through it fairly slowly.

First, in the first column, what are the entities that are going down the left side?

- A. Those entities are Metropolitan's member agencies.
- Q. And then what about the next two columns? Average annual sales and peak sales, what are those?
- A. The average annual sales, in this case you see the title in the upper left hand there. This is the 20-year analysis from 1994 to 2013 and that's simply the average, the first column of that time period. The peak sales represent the highest single year during that period.
- Q. From that data, did you calculate a peak factor?
 - A. I did.

325

- Q. Okay. Can you explain to the Court what you mean by "peak factor"?
- A. So, the peak factor in terms of its actual calculation is simply peak sales divided by average annual sales.

In the case of Anaheim, if we look at that line for an example, 31,271 acre-feet divided by an average sales figure of 22,018 acre-feet gets you to a peak factor of 1.42. Quite simply, that 1.42 is to say that peak sales are 42 percent higher than the annual average sales.

- Q. And to calculate that, you did peak sales over average annual sales?
 - A. That's correct.

1.5

- Q. When you did that calculation, what was Los Angeles's peak factor?
- A. In that calculation, Los Angeles's peak factor was 1.6752 or nearly 68 percent higher.
 - Q. What was San Diego's peak factor?
- A. San Diego's peak factor during that time was 1.2652 percent or nearly 27 percent higher than average.
- Q. What about the Municipal Water District of Orange County or MWDOC?
 - A. It was 1.4635.
 - Q. Can you describe sort of what you did to get to

weighting factors.

- Q. Why is Los Angeles excluded from the weighting factors?
- A. This is, as I previously described, because we are attempting to solve for the impact of Los Angeles. We want to compare a composite member agency profile which in this case, the far right column, is 1.3592, to the Los Angeles peaking factor of 1.6752.
- Q. Okay. And when you did that, what was -- so we're clear, what was the member agency's weighted average peak factor that you calculated?
- A. The member agency's weighted average peak factor was 1.3592.
- Q. And that's compared to Los Angeles's peak factor of 1.675?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you perform this analysis over five and ten-year spans as well?
- A. I did. I produced five, ten and 20-year results and they're quite similar.
 - Q. Do you have a slide that displays the results?
- A. Yes, I do.

MR. BRAUNIG: Can we please pull up 166-01?

Q. Okay. Are these the results that you calculated as member agency weighted average peaking

326 328

a member agency's weighted average peak factor and why you did that?

Why don't we ask that question first. Why did you create a weighted average member agency peak factor?

A. Generally when you weight something, you're giving significance to, in this case, a member agency's impact on a total. So, it's important to weight the sales because you want to get rid of the outliers in this case.

And I would draw your attention to the line for San Fernando. If you look at the peaking factor of 3.5866 percent, that is suggesting that they peak much greater than any other Met member agency. But drawing your attention to their average annual sales of 251 and the peak sales of 902 acre-feet, it's statistically insignificant and therefore, you want to make sure that you weight your data according to outliers such as San Fernando.

- Q. In order to weight the data, how did you use average annual sales to do that?
- A. To weight the data, I took the average annual sales again let's use Anaheim as an example of 22,018 acre-feet and divided that by the total you see at the very bottom of column one of 1.671459 acre-feet. And you will note that Los Angeles is excluded from these

factor versus Los Angeles average peaking factor in each of your five year, ten year and 20 year analyses?

- A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Okay. When you did the five-year analysis, what was the member agency weighted average peaking factor?
- A. In the five year, the weighted average peaking factor for member agencies was 1.18.
 - Q. And what was Los Angeles's peaking factor?
 - A. 1.49.
- Q. In the ten-year analysis, what was the member agency weighted average peaking factor?
 - A. 1.28.
 - Q. Compared to Los Angeles's peaking factor?
- A. 1.45.
- Q. And then the 20-year analysis which we talked about on the other slide, what was the member agency weighted average peak factor?
 - A. 1.36.
 - Q. And Los Angeles's peaking factor?
- A. 1.67.
 - Q. Now, I want to discuss step 4 of your analysis where you tried to quantify the benefit to Los Angeles from Metropolitan's failure to account for dry year peaking costs. Is what you calculated a damage

calculation?

- A. No, it was not.
- Q. What were you trying to do?
- A. I'm trying to reasonably estimate the amount of capacity held in reserve, some volume that's set aside for Metropolitan to -- excuse me, for Los Angeles to come on and off of Metropolitan's system.
- Q. Okay. And what did you conclude was the benefit to Los Angeles in quantifiable terms?
- A. I have some slides to help answer that question. If you --

MR. BRAUNIG: Sure. Can we pull up 168-01.

- Q. So start us off with this. First of all, is this under your 20-year analysis?
- A. Yes, this is reflective of the 20 year analysis.
- Q. Okay. And what do the yellow lines going across the X axis represent?
- A. The top line you see there is the L.A. peak demand during this 20-year period. So this would be the single high year during the period of 1994 to 2013.

During that same period, the average demand is 259,000 acre-feet. What this is indicative of is a 1.67 or 67 percent variance from peak to average.

Q. Did you attempt to calculate or did you analyze

agencies.

THE COURT: Are you suggesting that that black area on the slide, that difference between the member composite and the L.A. number is to suggest that only Los Angeles benefits from that capacity?

THE WITNESS: That is capacity, yes. That's what I'm suggesting. Capacity held in reserve. What's important is it's capacity held in reserve in excess to the average member agency.

THE COURT: Right. But are you suggesting through this -- and you may not be so don't let me put words in your mouth.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: But are you trying to suggest through this that only Los Angeles benefits from that what I'll call surplus capacity, surplus over the member average?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.

BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. Did you perform this analysis again under the -- let me ask you a question first before we do that.

Would every member agency under this analysis show up as having a benefit?

A. No, not necessarily.

Member agencies that peak at a level below the

what Los Angeles's average demand would be if it behaved like a norm -- like an average member agency?

- A. Yes, I did. The next slide gets to that.
- Q. Okay. And so on this new slide, there's a dashed line that appears to go off to 319,000 acre-feet. Can you explain to the Court what that represents?
- A. Yes. So if you recall from the sort of busy slide that you have with all the data before, you saw the composite member agency peaking profile of 1.36.

And I have said a couple times that I'm solving for the impact of Los Angeles. What this 319 represents is what Los Angeles would look like if it behaved as a normal member agency. And so, when we try to measure what the impact is of the benefit to L.A., if we can go to the next slide, the volumetric estimate for this average 20-year period is roughly 60,000 acre-feet.

- Q. And that's 60,000 acre-feet per year?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And why is that -- why do you characterize that as a -- a benefit to Los Angeles?
- A. Well, the -- I characterize it as such because this represents 60,000 acre-feet that is available to Los Angeles, as we've described, coming on and off of Metropolitan's system. It is a benefit that is there when Los Angeles needs it at a cost to other member

composite or below the average are, in effect, subsidizing those agencies that peak above the average. So, in this case, a member agency under this composite of 1.36 would subsidize an agency such as Los Angeles at 1.67.

- Q. Did you perform this analysis on a five-year, ten-year and -- on a five-year and ten-year schedule as well as the 20-year analysis?
 - A. Yes, I did. And I have a slide for that.
- Q. Okay. We're looking at 169-01. When you calculated this using the five-year analysis, how many acre-feet per year did you calculate as the quantified benefit to Los Angeles from having this dry year peaking capacity available?
- A. The five-year analysis indicates that on average 77,540 acre-feet are available.
 - Q. What about when you did the ten-year analysis?
 - A. Under the ten-year, 39,166,000 [sic] acre-feet.
- Q. Would you say that again? I think you said 166,000 acre-feet.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. What's the amount -- hold on. What's the amount under the ten-year analysis?
- A. The amount under the ten-year analysis is 39,166 acre-feet.

```
1
          Q. Per year?
                                                                                MR. WEST: Your Honor, I move to enter slide 34
 2
                                                                   2
          A. Per year.
                                                                          in evidence.
                                                                   3
 3
                                                                                MR. BRAUNIG: No objection.
          Q. Thank you.
                                                                   4
 4
                                                                                THE COURT: Slide 34 is admitted.
             And what about under the 20-year analysis?
                                                                   5
 5
                                                                                What exhibit number are you calling this?
          A. Under the 20 year analysis, 60,331 acre-feet
                                                                   6
                                                                          Slide 34, surely not.
 6
       per year.
                                                                   7
                                                                                MR. BRAUNIG: 701. Defendants' -- I'm sorry.
             MR. BRAUNIG: Pass the witness.
                                                                   8
                                                                          Your Honor, I'm sorry. It says DTX 691.
 8
             THE COURT: Why don't we take a ten-minute
                                                                   9
                                                                                MR. WEST: That's the source of the material.
 9
       recess. Thank you.
                                                                   10
                                                                                MR. BRAUNIG: I'm sorry. Okay. So this is --
10
             (Brief break.)
                                                                   11
                                                                          you are seeking to put this in as 701?
11
             THE COURT: Cross-examination.
                                                                   12
                                                                                THE COURT: That's my understanding.
12
             MR. WEST: Thank you, your Honor.
                                                                   13
                                                                                MR. WEST: Yes, 701 is fine by me.
1.3
                   CROSS-EXAMINATION
                                                                   14
                                                                                THE COURT: 701 is admitted.
       BY MR. WEST:
14
                                                                   15
                                                                                          (Whereupon Exhibit 701 was
15
          Q. Mr. Denham, good to see you again.
                                                                                           admitted into Evidence.)
16
          A. Good to see you.
                                                                   16
                                                                          BY MR. WEST:
17
          Q. You recall I deposed you a month and a half
                                                                   17
                                                                             Q. I want to talk a little bit more about your dry
18
       ago, something like that?
                                                                   18
                                                                          year peaking opinion.
19
          A. Yes.
                                                                   19
                                                                                You recall when I deposed you earlier this
20
          Q. Seems like a lifetime.
                                                                   20
                                                                          year, one of the things counsel asked you to do during
21
             And we went through your expert report at that
                                                                   21
                                                                          his direct examination is he asked you to assume -- he
2.2
       deposition. Do you remember that?
                                                                   22
                                                                          pointed out that you were asked to assume that MWD
23
          A. I do.
                                                                   23
                                                                          recovers some of its dry year peaking costs through its
24
          Q. And there was some calculations that you had
                                                                   24
                                                                          volumetric rates. Do you recall that assumption?
25
       done of member agency purchases over a roughly 20-year
                                                                   25
                                                                             A. I do.
                                                         334
                                                                                                                            336
 1
                                                                   1
       period. Do you remember that?
                                                                             Q. And you, yourself, tested none of the
                                                                   2
 2
          A. I do.
                                                                          assumptions upon which you based your expert testimony;
                                                                   3
 3
          Q. And those calculations are reflected in -- do
                                                                          is that correct?
                                                                   4
 4
       you have Exhibit 383 of your -- in your binder there that
                                                                                MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Vague.
 5
                                                                   5
       counsel for the plaintiffs have given you?
                                                                                THE COURT: Sustained.
                                                                   6
 6
          A. If you don't mind giving me a second.
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Could you explain what you mean
                                                                   7
 7
          O. Absolutely.
                                                                   8
 8
             THE COURT: What was the number you said?
                                                                                THE COURT: That's okay. We're going to
                                                                   9
 9
             MR. WEST: Plaintiff's 383.
                                                                          slightly rephrase it.
                                                                   10
1.0
             THE WITNESS: Yes, I do see this.
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Okay.
                                                                   11
11
       BY MR. BRAUNIG:
                                                                          BY MR. WEST:
12
                                                                   12
          Q. You were here during the opening statement,
                                                                             Q. You can make a certain assumption in coming up
                                                                   13
13
       yes?
                                                                          with an expert opinion; right?
                                                                   14
14
                                                                             A. That's correct.
                                                                   15
15
          Q. And you recall we used your numbers that you
                                                                             Q. One might -- but one could test whether that
16
                                                                   16
       had provided to create a graph. Do you remember that?
                                                                          assumption is in fact true.
17
                                                                   17
          A. Yes.
                                                                                For example, if I wanted to test my assumption
                                                                   18
18
             MR. WEST: Could we show slide 34?
                                                                          that it was raining outside, I would look out the window.
                                                                   19
19
                                                                             A. Yes.
          Q. This is a demonstrative that shows sales by --
20
                                                                   20
       purchases by member agency from 2003 forward; right?
                                                                             O. I would undertake some sort of critical
                                                                   21
2.1
                                                                          analysis to determine the validity of your assumptions.
                                                                   22
22
          Q. And it accurately depicts, at least for this
                                                                             A. Correct.
                                                                   23
23
       time period those sales such as are reflected in Exhibit
                                                                             Q. Do you understand what I mean by test now?
                                                                   24
2.4
       383?
                                                                             A. Yes, I do.
                                                                   25
25
                                                                             Q. Did you test any of the assumptions that you
          A. Yes, it accurately depicts sales.
                                                         335
                                                                                                                            337
```

1 made in connection with offering your expert opinion? MR. WEST: -- of Mr. Denham. We've already 2 2 MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Vague. provided copies to opposing counsel. I have my own copy 3 3 THE COURT: Sustained. 4 4 The problem with the question is that we're not Your Honor, may I approach? 5 sure what you mean by "assumptions." There are a lot of 5 THE COURT: Please. 6 6 different things that he could have assumed like math MR. WEST: This is yours. 7 works and things like that. THE COURT: Thank you. 8 8 BY MR. WEST: So, I'm not sure exactly which assumptions. 9 9 Maybe it's the one that you had in mind. Q. So you don't believe it's accurate to say you 10 10 MR. WEST: Your Honor, thank you for that completed your work with regard to your opinions 11 11 clarification. contained in your expert report? 12 12 Q. Did you test that assumption? A. If I can clarify my previous statement, what I 13 13 A. I'm sorry. What was -inferred from your question is I would be providing 14 14 THE COURT: Which one? additional analysis or opinions today if asked and so 15 15 BY MR. WEST: therefore, I deemed that not complete. 16 16 Q. The assumption that MWD recovers some of its Q. Okay. So this -- I want to talk about your 17 17 dry year peaking costs through volumetric rates. annual demand versus index opinion. Do you recall that? 18 18 A. Yes. A. I did not personally attest -- test that 19 19 assumption because Metropolitan indicated that it itself Q. That was the calculation you did where you 20 20 did not test that assumption. And that was referred to, established a baseline for -- from 1994 through 2000 and 21 21 I believe, in a couple cases today and yesterday in then you calculated some variation from that. 22 22 interrogatory responses number 15 to be exact, that those A. Yes, I recall that. 23 23 Q. That wasn't part of your expert report or were just collected in general on rates. The data does 24 24 not exist. Assumptions do not exist from which to test opinion at the time of your deposition, was it? 25 25 that. A. That graphic? 338 340 1 1 Q. So your assumption is based on those Q. Yes. 2 2 interrogatory responses? A. It was not included as part of my expert 3 3 A. No, it's not. report. 4 4 Q. What is it based on? Q. And that calculation was not reflected in your 5 5 A. My assumption for the L.A. peaking analysis? expert report directly, was it? 6 6 Q. No. I'm talking about the assumption that MWD A. The data contained in that graphic that you 7 7 recovers some of its dry year peaking costs through saw, the peaking factors that were presented just moments 8 8 volumetric rates. You were asked to assume that? ago were in that report. They are in the data tables. 9 9 Q. But you didn't do an index against an annual A. Yes, I was asked by counsel to assume that. 10 1.0 Q. But as part of your expert opinion, you didn't demand, did you? 11 11 test that particular assumption? A. Oh, I see what you're saying. The baseline. 12 12 A. Test whether or not -- I'm still failing to 13 13 A. This is what you're referring to? No, I did understand. 14 14 Q. Let's move on. 1.5 15 You can leave that up there a little while. Q. So this is something you've done since your 16 16 You did a new -- well, at your expert deposition? 17 17 deposition, I had asked you, do you remember whether you A. Yes. 18 18 completed your work with regard to the opinion contained Q. So I apologize. I'm going to ask some 19 19 in your report. Do you remember that? questions about it, but I want to know -- so with this 20 20 and what you've testified to, now we have pretty much A. I recall that. 21 21 O. And you said that you had? your expert opinion? 22 22 A. I don't believe that's what I said. A. Yes, unless -- I'll serve the right if I'm 23 2.3 Q. Let's -- your Honor, I would like to provide asked later to provide more of my expert opinion. 24 24 the deposition --Q. Okay. So getting back to your annual demand 25 25 versus index, you recall you started with 1994 through THE COURT: All right.

341

1 2000; right? A. I can't be certain. 2 2 O. You didn't do that calculation? A. Yes, I recall that. 3 3 Q. And you didn't testify as part of your direct A. No, I did not. 4 4 examination -- strike that. Q. And when you talked today about your expert 5 Your Honor asked if you changed that baseline, 5 opinion, you didn't offer any testimony regarding how you 6 6 you would change the -- you change the years, you could arrived at 1994 through 2000 as representative years? 7 change the baseline? A. Representative years? 8 8 A. Yes. Q. You chose those years? 9 9 Q. And the years you chose, 1994 through 2000, A. I -- I chose those years based on the data that 10 10 were years in which the unbundled rate structure at issue I had available. 1994 was the beginning year. 11 11 in this case wasn't in effect? Q. You could have moved it up to 2003 to establish 12 12 A. That's correct. It went into effect in 2003. your average; right? 13 13 Q. And if you moved that baseline up to 2003, how A. No. 14 14 would it affect the variation? Q. You couldn't have done that? 15 15 A. You would cut off a significant piece of what's A. I could have done that, yes. I chose not to. 16 16 going on, the true picture of peaking. MR. WEST: Okay. Would you put up 34 again? 17 17 Q. But the variations would look smaller, would Q. Now, this accurately depicts the information 18 they not? 18 contained in your expert report? 19 19 A. When you exclude or have selection bias, as I A. No, it does not. 20 20 alluded to earlier, over the period in which you analyze O. It doesn't? 21 your data, in the case that you're referring to, 2003 21 A. Well, I --22 22 Q. It --through present, that would slice out a significant 23 23 portion of a variability in L.A.'s peaking behavior. A. What I said was it accurately reflects volumes, 24 24 Q. So, as depicted on that graph, which is 171.03, it inaccurately reflects peaking. 25 which I think is 394 -- would you mind throwing that up? 25 O. I understand that. 342 344 1 1 THE COURT: 384, perhaps? But this actually reflects purchase volumes 2 2 MR. WEST: Your Honor, may I walk to the jury during the time period at issue; right? 3 3 box? I don't have a pointer. A. Yes. One's take away from this slide is 4 4 THE COURT: We're talking about Plaintiff's 384 San Diego is Metropolitan's largest purchaser of water. 5 5 now. I have another laser pointer if you want it. Q. Yes. 6 6 MR. WEST: I'm very bad with a laser pointer. THE COURT: Just so the record is clear, we're 7 7 I might hurt somebody too, so I don't want to do that. actually looking at 701. 8 8 I'm going to make shadow puppets here. Go ahead, please. 9 9 MR. WEST: 701. Q. So if you move this baseline up to including 10 1.0 2003, when the actual rate structure at issue in this Q. Okay. Now, another thing you did in connection 11 11 with coming up with your expert report, is you did that case, you capture a lot of the variation that happened --12 12 that is the basis of your baseline; right? 20-year timeframe, that ten-year timeframe and that 13 13 A. Yes, you do but that's not the point of this five-year timeframe; right? 14 14 A. That's correct. 15 15 Q. I understand that. But my selection bias is I MR. WEST: Barbara, if you could put up 16 16 want to focus on the years since this unbundled rate Mr. Denham's expert report itself, PTX 686. 17 17 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, I believe we objected structure has been in effect. 18 18 to this coming into evidence. Obviously it can be used So, this line of variation, if you include 19 19 those years would look significantly smaller, would it as impeachment if they try to do that. 20 20 THE COURT: We're looking at 687. He hasn't not, for Los Angeles? 21 2.1 A. By slicing off the baseline and years prior to moved it in vet. 22 22 MR. WEST: I have not moved it in yet. I just 2003, it would look different. 23 23 Q. It would be included in your average. If you want to use it as a demonstrative at this point. 24 2.4 included those amounts in your average, L.A.'s variation THE COURT: Absolutely. 25 25 I'm looking at Defendants' 687, which is the would look very different, wouldn't it? 343 345

1 declaration. A. That's correct. 2 2 O. And for each of the timeframes listed here, the MR. WEST: Yes. I'm going slightly out of 3 3 difference between San Diego's average sales and its peak order, your Honor, because of this new chart that we saw. 4 4 THE COURT: Absolutely. sales as an absolute number is higher than any other 5 MR. WEST: Yes, it is. 5 member agency, than Los Angeles; correct? 6 6 And I apologize, your Honor. You might have to MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Vague. blow that up a little bit. And I believe it is -- what THE COURT: Overruled. 8 8 tab number is that? Do you understand the question? 9 9 It is the second tab in your binder. And this THE WITNESS: Yeah. It -- I do understand the 10 10 chart itself is actually the third to the last page. question. 11 11 I want to talk about some of the data reflected THE COURT: What's the answer? 12 12 in this. Do you see that, your Honor? It is called peak THE WITNESS: The answer's yes. 13 1.3 sales calculation by MWD member agency. BY MR. WEST: 14 14 THE COURT: It is the third to last page of Q. And, Mr. Denham, you're not an engineer? 15 15 Exhibit 687. A. No. 16 16 Thank you. Q. You didn't do any sort of engineering analysis 17 17 BY MR. WEST: as part of your expert opinion? 18 Q. And for each -- San Diego's peak sales for each 18 A. No, I did not. 19 19 of these periods, the 20-year, the ten-year and Q. So you didn't do an engineering analysis to 20 20 five-year, is substantially higher than Los Angeles'; determine how MWD sizes its facilities to meet peaks? 21 21 correct? A. The point of my analysis was not an engineering 2.2 MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Misstates the 22 analysis, it's a variation in sales analysis. 23 23 Q. But my question was you didn't do any sort of document. 24 24 THE COURT: If you could rephrase that. I'm engineering analysis to determine how MWD sizes its 25 25 facilities to meet peaks? not clear what the question is. 346 348 1 1 MR. WEST: Sure. A. I did not. 2 2 Q. Now before you did this expert opinion, you've O. There is a peak sales column, do you see that, 3 3 reflecting the peak sales of each member agency. Do you never performed an analysis of the cost to a water agency 4 see that? 4 associated with peaking, have you? 5 5 A. Yes. A. As I indicated in my deposition, peaking, no. 6 6 Q. And the peak sales for the 20-year period for In terms of math and peaking factors, weighted averages 7 7 San Diego is 667,000 feet, acre-feet roughly; right? and things of that nature, absolutely. 8 8 A. I see that number. Q. And I don't deny that you've done math before 9 Q. And that's the highest of any member agency? 9 this and done weighted average. My question was, you've 10 10 A. In terms of sales volume, it is. never done an analysis, performed an analysis of the cost 11 11 Q. As far as what you call peak sales volume, it to a water agency associated with peaking before you did 12 12 is, right, in your chart? your expert report? 13 13 A. That's the highest single year purchased from A. That's correct. 14 14 Q. And you didn't review any literature about Metropolitan in any year on this chart. 15 15 quantifying the impact of annual sales variation with a Q. And you call that peak sales; correct? 16 16 water agency before coming up with your expert report, A. That's correct. 17 17 Q. And for the ten-year period, peak sales, did you? 18 18 San Diego, the highest of anybody; right? A. Could you repeat that? 19 19 A. Yes. Q. Sure. In doing the calculation reflecting your 20 20 expert report, you didn't actually review any literature Q. And for the five-year period too; right? 21 21 A. The sales volume, San Diego is the largest about quantifying the impact of annual sales variation on 22 22 purchaser. That's not surprising. a water agency? 23 2.3 Q. And for each one of these timeframes, L.A. A. I would say that that is sort of a broad 24 24 never has the highest peaking -- peak -- what do you call statement that isn't exactly true. 25 25 Q. We talked about that at your deposition. Do it, peak factor; right?

349

1 you remember that? should be the years in which Los Angeles doesn't pay. 2 2 Q. I understand that. Your calculation doesn't A. I do. 3 3 Q. I would like to play 216, 19 through 23. consider the -- on its terms and your testimony and 4 4 MR. BRAUNIG: Hold it. expert report doesn't consider the Readiness-to-Serve 5 5 Your Honor, can we -- before we object --Charge? 6 6 THE COURT: The page is 216. A. No, it does not. MR. WEST: I apologize for playing too soon, Q. Or the Capacity Charge? 8 8 A. It does not. your Honor. 9 9 MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. Q. Or tier 2 supply rates? 10 10 THE COURT: Ready to go. Thank you. A. It does not. 11 11 (Video played.) Q. I might have a couple other questions about 12 12 BY MR. WEST: your dry year peaking analysis but I want to go back to 13 13 Q. You didn't run any part of your opinion past an your other opinion regarding the costs, the reallocation 14 14 expert in economics, cost benefit analysis, financial of State Water Project and the Water Stewardship Rate 15 15 planning or any other relevant field; right? computation to supply. 16 16 A. That's correct. Now, at your deposition, you told me that you 17 17 Q. And you've never seen somebody undertake the intended to offer expert opinions about contract damages 18 exact same steps to determine the economic impact 18 and about dry year peaking; correct? 19 19 resulting from dry year peaking that you are talking A. That's correct. 20 20 about as expert of your expert opinion; is that correct? Q. And you said those opinions were contained in 21 A. The steps that I took are presenting -- or 21 your expert report? 22 2.2 creating a ratio. I most certainly have seen someone and A. Yes. 23 23 I have in the past created ratios. Q. And you completed all the work that you were 24 24 When I say that a peaking factor is going to do as far as you thought? 25 25 A. Yes. 1.67 percent, that is math and that is 67 percent higher 352 350 1 1 Q. And you relied on certain assumptions in coming than average. Whether it's peaking factor or rating 2 2 factor, call it what you want, yes, I have seen that and up with your expert report. Do you remember that? 3 3 done that. A. Yes. 4 Q. I'm not talking about whether you've done math Q. And that's still true? 5 to do ratios, you've seen other people do math or other A. Certain assumptions I made, yes. 6 6 people do ratios. I'm talking about using this type of Q. You're not -- with regard to this opinion, 7 calculation that you did either in your expert report or you're not testifying about damages per se, right, you're 8 8 in this new chart -- I don't mean that pejoratively, it doing impact? 9 9 You're testifying -- you're not saying that is new to me -- to come up with a measuring impact of 10 10 annual variation on a member agency on -- strike that. these represent contractual damages, are you? 11 11 You've never seen any other -- anyone else do A. I'm not testifying about contractual damages. 12 12 this kind of calculation in order to determine the impact Q. But you're applying the same contractual 13 13 on annual variations on cost to a water agency? damages analysis that you did to measure impact; right? 14 14 MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Vague. A. I've seen similar things. The exact approach 15 15 as mine, not necessarily. THE COURT: Overruled. 16 16 Q. I think I asked you this before. You are not a Is there a relation between the contractual 17 17 rate expert, are you? damage analysis you did and what we saw today? 18 18 THE WITNESS: The analysis that I presented A. I'm not a rate expert. 19 19 Q. And you kind of -- strike that. today was the overcharge or difference between what I 20 20 And it's true that if Los Angeles purchases go determined to be a corrected rate and the board approved 21 21 up in a particular year, L.A. has to pay more through its rate. There are some other steps in the contractual 22 22 volumetric rates; right? damage component of my analysis that were not addressed 23 2.3 today. A. In the year that it purchases more water, L.A. 24 24 certainly pays more, but I don't believe that to be the BY MR. WEST: 25 25 important focus of a peak analysis. Important focus Q. But in your contractual damages analysis, you

353

2.3

moved over certain State Water Project costs from the Transportation Rate to the supply rate; right?

- A. I removed them from the transportation rates, yes.
- Q. And you put them on -- well, you moved them somewhere. You removed them entirely?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And you took water stewardship and you moved that off transportation entirely; right?
 - A. Yes.

1.5

- Q. And those costs have to go somewhere, don't they?
- A. Absolutely, if Metropolitan wants to maintain a revenue requirement that it approved its rates on.
- Q. For example, they have to go over to some other rate, like a supply rate; right?
- A. It could be the supply rate or it could be a rate that no one knows about yet, but that's certainly a reasonable assumption.
- Q. And so when you said earlier, you talked about these amounts were misallocated, again you're not a rate expert so you're saying -- you're not offering an opinion whether they should be allocated to transportation, you're just saying what if we just moved them all over; right?

analysis and now they're asking questions about his contractual damages.

THE COURT: Not exactly.

I interpret these questions as trying to make sure that they understand the limits of the testimony that he's presenting today. So in that spirit, it's overruled.

MR. WEST: And my in limine lost, your Honor, so I think I'm allowed to --

- Q. So, your -- you -- you didn't account for how much more other member agencies might have to pay if you moved these all out to some other rate, did you, in your expert opinion?
 - A. That's not what I was asked to do.
 - Q. You were asked to just take them out and not opine on where they might go?
 - A. I'm not a lawyer.
 - Q. You didn't opine on where these costs might go?
 - A. How such?
 - Q. You didn't say they went to the tier 1 supply rate or tier two supply rate?

THE COURT: I think the record is clear that he doesn't have an opinion, at least today as to where they should go. I heard him saying that they might go in a half variety of places, including rates that may or may

354 356

A. What I did is based on the direction I was given by counsel and what San Diego is alleging in this case.

- Q. I understand that. But my question was, you are not -- you don't have an expert opinion as to the propriety of allocating these to transportation rates, you're just moving them over; is that right?
- A. As I stated, I'm not a rate expert and that's what I did based on the direction from counsel.
- Q. But my specific question, you're not opining about the propriety of these being allocated to the transportation rates. You just went through the exercise of taking these costs out; right?
- A. If I can, there's a bit more to it than simply taking costs and moving them. But to directly answer that portion, yes, I moved revenues from the Transportation Rate over to the supply rate after a thorough analysis of Metropolitan's cost of service assumptions, things of that nature.
- Q. And you don't -- you didn't do a calculation as to how much more any other member agency might pay if you did you this; right?

MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, I object. I feel like a broken record here but they moved in limine to prevent him from testifying about his contractual damage

¹ not exist.

BY MR. WEST:

Q. And you didn't make any effort to -- thank you, your Honor.

You didn't make any effort just generally to determine whether San Diego would have been better off had these been moved over, did you?

- A. In the analysis that I did, I was not asked to do that.
 - Q. And you didn't?
 - A. In my analysis, no, I did not.
- Q. And you didn't actually determine whether it's -- your report is not a projection of Met damages and Met impact to San Diego, is it?
- A. It is a -- my expert report is an estimation of money that should be placed in what I term the escrow account, which is the interest bearing account per the terms of the exchange agreement.
- Q. The escrow account. You didn't talk about that during your direct examination?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. That's a somewhat different opinion, isn't it?
- A. I'm not sure I understand what you're talking about.

THE COURT: Let's continue with another

Q. And as we saw, on your own chart attached to question. 2 2 MR. WEST: Sure, absolutely. your expert opinion, for many of those years, individual 3 3 O. Just a couple more questions, Mr. Denham. variations by member agencies exceeded Los Angeles'; 4 Annual variations can occur for a lot of correct? 5 5 different reasons; right? A. Yes. I believe your chart, which shows all of 6 6 A. Absolutely. those member agencies, would show them within this type 7 Q. For example, the economy can lead to annual of band. 8 8 MR. WEST: Throw up the chart again, if you variations --9 9 A. Yes. could, please. 701. 10 10 Q. -- in purchases. Did you take that into Q. You do see some spiking down there at the 11 11 account at all in your expert opinion? bottom, don't you? 12 12 A. I do but they're not statistically relevant. A. In the economy as a whole, the U.S. economy? 13 13 Unfortunately, I didn't. May I explain that? 14 14 Q. For example, if the economy's bad, people might Q. Sure. 15 not have enough money to buy stuff, like water; right? 15 A. The important thing to point out in your slide 16 16 A. That's accurate. is the slope from high to low, here to here. 17 17 Q. And you didn't take that into account. You Here to here. 18 just assumed it was because of, quote, dry years? 18 Here to here. 19 19 A. I believe that the graphic representation that That is an indicator of peaking, not sales 20 20 I made, there's a statistically valid correlation between volume. 21 dry year peaking or hydrology and weather, one that is by 21 These slopes are not statistically relevant. 22 22 far the greatest impact on, in this case, Los Angeles's This line here, my hand is steady and I have the ability 23 23 to draw this line. You would see that this slope and peaking behavior. 24 24 To put a number on how the U.S. economy impacts this slope are what you want to be looking at, not volume 25 25 household sales, that's a large task. increases or decreases. 358 360 1 1 Q. And you see that big slope going down for Q. And it's one you didn't do? 2 2 A. No, it is not. San Diego; right? 3 3 Q. Before we throw up this -- I apologize. A. It's a big -- it's a slope for San Diego. It's 4 4 Can you throw up that chart again, his annual a larger slope for Los Angeles. And I think what I said 5 5 demand versus index chart? earlier is that everybody peaks and there's no denying 6 6 Now, putting aside the other issues we talked that. It's what you peak above an average is what's 7 7 about, the blue line at the bottom -important. 8 8 THE COURT: So we're looking at 701? MR. WEST: Thank you. I have no further 9 9 MR. WEST: 701. Thank you, your Honor. questions. 10 1.0 THE COURT: Any redirect? MR. BRAUNIG: I believe this is actually 384. 11 11 MR. BRAUNIG: May I have just a moment to THE COURT: All right. 12 12 MR. WEST: Yeah. 701 is the chart we made, confer? 13 13 THE COURT: Of course. your Honor. 14 14 MR. BRAUNIG: Nothing further. Thank you. THE COURT: Right. Thank you. I appreciate 15 15 that. I just want to make sure we get the record THE COURT: Thank you very much. You are 16 16 correct. 384. excused. 17 17 BY MR. WEST: MR. KEKER: Your Honor, we are very close to 18 18 resting. We want to move in our discovery responses, Q. The blue line, that is an average of all member 19 19 which I believe are being prepared in a document. agencies on the bottom; right? 20 20 We also, on reflection, believe that since A. Yes. I've been describing it as a composite. 21 2.1 there's going to be briefing at the end of the case, It's an average. 22 22 Q. So as an average, it is going to obscure which we think is a good idea and we heard what you said, 23 23 that we would like you to rule on the deposition individual variations by individual member agencies; 2.4 24 designations so that we know what the record is that right? 25 25 we're providing briefs on. You can do it at your --A. Yes.

361

1 whenever is convenient for you but if we're going to be accommodate counsel. If we run out of time on my 2 2 calendar, I'll find some other time that's convenient so filing, we want to make sure that we're referring to what 3 3 is going to be part of the record in the case. everybody gets the time I promised. That's fine. 4 4 The other request -- we don't have any other Just so you have it, the plaintiff is now at a 5 witnesses now but we would like tonight, given that it's 5 couple minutes past five hours and the defendant has used 6 6 4:15, tonight to be able to think about and review and almost exactly three hours of time. 7 make sure that we put in everything that we need to put Let me make sure that I have what I need to 8 in without prejudice. But other than that, we're 8 look at this evening. 9 9 prepared to rest. I've got the amended -- second pretrial brief 10 10 THE COURT: Okay. from San Diego and a glossary. 11 MR. KEKER: I guess the only other thing I want 11 MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan. 12 to say is that we think there's plenty of time, but I 12 THE COURT: I'm sorry, from Metropolitan. 13 13 just want to bring to the Court's attention we're getting Thank you. 14 about four hours and 15 -- we're going to end up with 14 And the glossary, and I'll have a look at that 15 15 about 21 hours of trial time over the five days and I tonight, see if --16 hope what the Court will do is instead of telling us 16 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, with respect to that 17 you've got a fixed 24 hours, which we're not going to get 17 glossary, we have such strenuous objections to it that we 18 in these five days, you tell us split the 21 hours, which 18 would appreciate greatly if you would wait until tomorrow 19 we're prepared to do. 19 to look at it so that we could file something objecting 20 THE COURT: I'm not tracking. 20 to it because it really is argumentative. 21 I'm sorry? 21 THE COURT: I think you should reserve that 2.2 MR. KEKER: You told us before that each side 22 right. Let me look at it tonight. I think I can decide 23 had 12 hours. 23 it appears argumentative. If I think it is, I just won't 24 THE COURT: Right. 24 accept it. If my tentative thought is it doesn't appear 2.5 MR. KEKER: And I think we're not going to get 25 argumentative, of course I'll let you have a chance to --362 364 1 1 24 hours of actual time. Given the breaks and the MR. KEKER: Look at peaking, look at wheeling. 2 2 schedule, we're going to get about 21 hours. Yesterday THE COURT: All the sensitive terms. 3 3 MR. KEKER: Yeah. The sensitive terms are all we had four hours --4 THE COURT: I see. 4 done for them. 5 5 MR. KEKER: -- 15 minutes. It's going to work THE COURT: Okay. With respect to the depo 6 6 out to about 21. We're happy to split the 21 so that designations, if you can make sure with the clerk that I 7 7 each side gets ten hours -- 10.5 hours but we just want have a stack which is the deposition designations that 8 8 to make sure that everybody understands that we're you want me to rule on, and I have courtesy copies of 9 9 getting this thing done within the time that we have, that. They're probably somewhere in here but work with 10 1.0 which is going to be about 21 hours total. the clerk on that. 11 11 THE COURT: Okay. We have a little bit of time today if we stop 12 12 MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I would like to now and I will see you at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow. 13 13 respond. Thank you. 14 14 THE COURT: Yes. (Proceedings concluded.) 15 15 MR. HIXSON: As you know, Metropolitan ---000---16 16 requested a substantially more greater amount of time to 17 17 present its case and San Diego had represented that it 18 18 could be done in a much shorter period of time. 19 19 San Diego prevailed and we are limited to the 20 20 time that we have. We were very protective of the time 21 2.1 that the Court had allocated to us and we feel it is 22 22 important for us to present our case and our defense and 23 23 we don't want to be cut short of our 12 hours. 2.4 24 THE COURT: I don't want to cut you short. If

365

363

25

we have to go past Monday, we'll find some time to

. 1	0.100	
2	State of California)	
3) ss. County of San Francisco)	
4	County of San Francisco)	
5		
6	I, Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137, do hereby	
7	certify that I am a certified shorthand reporter; that I	
8	was personally present in the above-mentioned	
9	proceedings; that I took down in shorthand the	
10	proceedings and thereafter transcribed said notes into	
11	longhand; that the forgoing pages constitute a full, true	
12	and correct transcript of the said notes in said	
13	proceedings; and that I have no interest in the outcome	
14	of the case.	
15		
16	Dated: December 19, 2013	
17		
18		
19 20	Ω	
21	Come Parahman	
22	Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137	
23	Colline J. Falcillian, CSK #015/	
24		
25		
	366	

· A	absolutely 265:25	action 197:8,23 201:18	agencies 195:21,23	257:3 292:16 357:18
\$1.9 292:20	335:7 345:24 346:4	203:24 205:7 214:20	196:9 206:12,19	agreements 189:1
\$10.5 284:13	349:7 354:13 358:2,6	active 194:14	207:16,21 208:7,17	190:10 198:17 201:16
\$10.6 284:14	accept 198:16 364:24	actual 209:22 210:7	211:24 215:10 221:20	201:19 202:10 203:15
\$101 310:7	access 193:23 212:15	236:7 257:15 280:10	222:20 231:22 238:19	203:15 204:1,5,21
\$103 310:2	214:23 218:10 223:2	288:1 310:4 311:8,23	250:21 251:5 262:8	205:5 206:13 242:12
\$123,500,000 273:11	223:6 228:2 232:4,9	326:3 343:10 363:1	264:23 281:9,12	242:12 243:1
\$127 310:11	272:6 303:15 305:6	add 188:8 199:18	288:11 291:12 305:1	ahead 200:24 206:11
\$136 308:10 311:21	305:22 306:6,8,13,17	285:14 321:7	315:6,8,11 316:6,20	210:15 213:25 229:24
\$138 314:5	306:22,25 307:25	added 195:25,25	319:3 320:21 321:4,7	233:24 234:2 239:23
\$14.3 285:5	308:7 309:8,9,10,11	addendas 204:21	321:21,25 323:2,17	240:15 256:5 275:8
\$14.8 285:9,12	309:12,15,20 310:1,5	adding 188:15 311:19	325:14 329:8 332:1	284:15 294:12 304:8
\$143 314:23	313:23 314:17	addition 257:14 279:23	332:25 333:2 356:11	309:4 345:8
\$164 313:11	accommodate 269:19	292:21 301:10 320:17	359:19,23 360:3,6	Alameda 183:13
\$2 284:15	297:16 364:1	additional 189:11	agency 191:7 192:2	alert 233:25
\$20 206:3,4	account 215:4 262:3,13	218:25 219:20 222:17	204:23 206:25 223:15	aligned 286:16
\$204 309:12	281:23 320:18 323:10	232:21 305:16 340:14	223:18 243:6,9	All-American 186:14
\$21.8 287:1	323:13 329:24 356:10	address 221:22 249:22	267:25 268:2,4	186:16,19,20
\$23.2 285:16	357:17,17,19 358:11	266:3 291:15	272:22 273:18 281:11	allegations 208:11
\$232 303:20 313:15	358:17	addressed 210:19	281:11,14 284:2	210:6 232:8 262:16
\$236 308:13 311:10,25	accounting 279:25	222:2 263:12 353:22	315:13 316:13,22	alleged 222:8
\$250 196:15	280:13	addressing 233:16	318:20,24 320:6	alleging 355:2
\$253 230:23	accurate 298:8 321:10	244:14	324:12,21 325:1	allocated 228:17,23
\$275 192:6	340:9 358:16	adds 188:5	327:4,13 328:6,25	263:25 273:17 277:23
\$302 314:25	accurately 335:22,25	adjust 186:9 299:24	329:5,12,17 331:2,9	306:18 354:23 355:11
\$315 303:21 314:8	344:17,23	adjustment 210:25	331:13 332:9,22	363:21
\$322 274:14	achieve 256:11 289:11	administer 301:8	333:3,4 334:25	allocates 251:16
\$33 310:20	acknowledgment	administered 204:23	335:20 346:13 347:3	allocating 246:24 247:2
\$330 273:5	214:16	279:25 285:24	347:9 348:5 349:3,11	355:6
\$372 308:3 311:18	acquire 222:17 279:16	administration 302:7,8	349:16,22 351:10,13	allocation 189:7,9
\$396 312:18	acre-feet 186:5,7	administrative 210:10	355:21	209:5 213:12 220:1,5
\$4.3 283:14	190:12,13 191:7,14	210:14 244:13,13	agency's 281:16,17	221:23 224:19 259:4
\$41 310:25 311:5	191:18,21,25 195:20	260:4 265:22 266:19	283:25 318:8 327:1,6	259:11,15 260:1,15
\$41.2 286:13	213:10,10 217:15,16	267:13 268:16,17,22	328:10,12	262:11 289:8 290:12
\$445 314:19	217:21,24 267:11,22	269:1 272:7,15	ago 210:17 224:15 302:20 334:18 341:8	290:16
\$453 313:25	267:22 269:13,16,18	282:12 284:21 300:19		allocations 188:25
\$5.8 284:9	270:8,8,16,18 271:1,2	admission 280:22	agree 210:5 213:20	allow 288:12
\$52.8 286:7	271:4 276:20,21	admits 281:20 admitted 197:18,19	298:4,19 agreed 221:13 233:10	allowed 201:9 247:5,8 316:21 356:9
\$60 207:10	277:22 281:3,15		agreement 186:8	allows 236:14
\$62.9 286:23	304:2 319:13,15 326:7,8 327:15,23,24	202:15,16 204:9,11 224:18 280:20 295:24	187:22 190:14,15,23	alluded 316:23 342:20
\$65 278:9	330:23 331:5,16,17	296:1 318:5,6 322:20	191:6,8,9 194:9,13,14	alternate 200:5
\$93.9 286:9	331:22 333:12,16,18	336:4,14,15	194:17,23 203:1,9,14	alternative 198:9,20,21
\$94 310:22	333:20,25 334:5	Adopt 225:16	204:18,19 206:2	198:24 199:1 200:4,6
A-R1465 266:20	347:7	adopted 218:15 219:3,9	209:16 211:18 221:11	200:7 289:13
A26 270:16	acre-foot 192:6 196:1	224:21 227:7,9,10	221:15 230:6,15,17	alternatives 198:4
A29 216:17	196:16 201:2 230:21	245:23 246:2,12	230:20 231:5,24	altogether 280:5
A30 216:16,24 269:5	267:23 269:6 278:9	249:19,21 264:19	232:3,11,14,21 233:1	amended 364:9
A46 270:22	278:18 303:20,21	265:2 290:12 291:4	232:3,11,14,21 233:1	America 303:3
aafter 222:7	307:13,19 308:3,10	adoption 226:15	234:25 235:4,12,19	American 303:6
ability 201:25 360:22	309:13 310:2,7,13,14	231:24 264:16	235:24 236:13,14,19	amount 186:3 190:19
able 211:21 213:4	310:20,22,25 311:10	advance 244:25	236:22 237:12,15	192:12 213:8 215:8
240:6 251:15 305:4	311:18,21,25 312:19	advanced 262:10	238:13 239:4,4,12,13	235:1,5,8 244:3,3,22
307:12,15 317:4,17	313:12,16,25 314:6,8	advantage 279:3	239:17 241:7 242:10	273:11 283:24 284:1
362:6	314:19,23,25	advise 244:25	242:16,16,17,19,20	305:9,19,20,25
above-mentioned	Act 237:24 238:2,3,6,6	affect 222:10 342:14	242:10,10,17,19,20	306:15,15 307:14
366:8	283:5	afternoon 258:1,7,8	242.22,25,24 245.4,5 243:12,15 245:5	311:24 324:24 330:4
			4TJ.14.1J 4TJ.J	・・・・シェエ・ムオ・フムオ・フラリ・オ
absent 293:1 absolute 348:4	acting 300:18 301:6	265:19	248:13 256:18 257:1	333:22,23,24 363:16

235:14 236:23 237:4

amounts 266:13 307:12
343:24 354:21
Anaheim 326:6 327:22
analyses 317:10 329:2
analysis 207:13 213:14
280:18 281:5,25
282:3 284:17 301:2
301:19 302:11,19 303:12,18,19 305:22
303:12,18,19 305:22 306:20 307:23 308:5
308:20 312:6,8 313:7
320:14,21 322:2
324:14,20 325:19
328:17 329:4,11,16
329:22 330:14,16 332:20,22 333:6,8,11
332:20,22 333:6,8,11
333:15,17,23,24
334:4,5 337:21 339:5
340:14 348:16,19,21
348:22,22,24 349:3
349:10,10 350:14 351:25 352:12 353:13
353.17 18 22 25
353:17,18,22,25 355:18 356:1 357:8
357:11
analyst 302:14
analysts 301:23 302:13
303:6
analytical 302:2
analyze 316:21 330:25
342:20
analyzed 207:3
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16.17
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20 331:1 358:22
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20 331:1 358:22 annual 215:9 264:22
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20 331:1 358:22 annual 215:9 264:22 315:4 316:22 325:16
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20 331:1 358:22 annual 215:9 264:22 315:4 316:22 325:16 325:17 326:5,10,13 327:14,20,21 340:17
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20 331:1 358:22 annual 215:9 264:22 315:4 316:22 325:16 325:17 326:5,10,13 327:14,20,21 340:17 341:9,24 349:15,21
analyzed 207:3 and/or 280:6 anew 293:11 Angeles 183:14 215:13 216:22 217:10 267:21 268:1,5 316:7,15,16 320:22 321:19 322:2 323:7,16 324:14,22 324:24,25 325:2 327:25 328:2,5,8 329:1,23 330:6,9 331:11,12,20,23,25 332:5,15 333:4,13 343:20 346:20 348:5 351:20 352:1 360:3 361:4 Angeles's 216:13 217:1 217:18 267:16 270:20 322:25 326:16,17 328:14 329:9,14,20 331:1 358:22 annual 215:9 264:22 315:4 316:22 325:16 325:17 326:5,10,13 327:14,20,21 340:17

```
359:4
answer 237:14 266:25
  272:4,5 321:22
  330:10 348:11 355:15
answer's 348:12
anticipated 229:16
anticipates 245:1
antitrust 288:16
anybody 347:18
anymore 186:4
apologize 241:16
  295:14 341:18 346:6
  350:7 359:3
apparently 292:4
appear 249:17 289:9
  289:12 364:24
APPEARANCES
  183:1
appears 244:9 248:22
  319:18 321:12,13
  331:5 364:23
appellate 294:16
applicable 231:20,20
  232:7 257:14
applications 196:8
  197:2 198:16,24
  201:22 205:11
applied 205:19 278:18
  278:20
apply 305:6
applying 353:12
appreciate 185:12
  224:7 283:3 359:14
  364:18
appreciates 291:3
approach 200:4 213:3
  288:7,8,10 306:24
  312:9 320:12 340:4
  351:14
approaches 291:13
approval 196:12
  204:22
approve 197:24
approved 292:20
  304:22 308:4 312:18
  314:15 353:20 354:14
approximately 186:18
  217:11,15,16 302:20
  303:20
approximation 309:23
April 184:11 189:9
  197:8,12 219:1,9,19
  246:11 261:10 269:23
  272:13 297:12
aqueduct 187:1,4,5,6
  188:7 190:20 191:24
```

192:16,17,17,24

216:22 232:16,20,22

```
238:15,21 267:21
  269:10
AR2010-10753 210:14
arbitration 302:21
area 190:18 238:15
  259:2 281:17,18
  289:25 332:3
argue 298:1
argumentative 297:22
  298:15,25 364:20,23
  364:25
arguments 296:23
arithmetic 276:18
arm 302:2
arrangement 278:7,8
arrival 205:15
arrived 344:6
article 230:13 251:10
articulated 223:4
  246:23
artificially 289:11
aside 188:19 194:9
  330:5 359:6
asked 201:23 236:6
  258:9,18 260:20,20
  260:21 286:1 292:15
  292:24 303:9,12
  315:14 336:20,21,22
  339:8,9,17 340:14
  341:23 342:5 351:16
  356:14,15 357:8
asking 199:17,20 221:8
  239:2 356:1
asserting 208:19
Assess 257:12
assesses 281:24
asset 302:15
assign 289:20
assigned 305:21 306:1
assist 280:3
assistant 216:3 226:4
  290:25
associated 212:2 213:5
  234:5 304:19 305:10
  307:3 349:4,11
Associates 182:22
  247:16,19
Association 302:12
  303:3.5
associations 303:2
assume 306:20 315:14
  336:21,22 339:8,9
assumed 338:6 358:18
assumption 289:20
  309:22 336:24 337:12
  337:16,17 338:12,16
  338:19,20 339:1,5,6
```

```
339:11 354:19
assumptions 305:1,2,4
  307:16 337:2,21,25
  338:5,8,24 353:1,5
  355:19
assure 201:1
attached 209:10 246:15
  247:15 248:1 360:1
attachment 198:6,7
  252:6
attachments 198:5
  204:4
attempt 200:17 330:25
attempting 328:5
attempts 207:14
attend 297:14
attendance 253:17
attention 185:21 188:2
  195:1 199:9 204:13
  207:19 210:13,23
  212:22 216:23 225:7
  226:25 246:5 247:25
  254:4 256:25 263:4,5
  276:7 308:2 327:10
  327:14 362:13
attest 338:18
attorney-client 221:8
Audio 255:17 256:6
auditing 201:1
AUDREY 183:7
August 202:6 204:20
  253:15
Authority 182:6 185:25
  186:22 190:24 191:2
  193:18 201:9 202:11
  203:23 204:16 205:9
  214:12 216:4,6
  218:17,21 219:12
  221:9,13 222:13
  223:17 226:3,5,14
  227:13,20,25 229:10
  229:18 236:2,8,25
  237:19 238:1 239:9
  241:23 242:6,25
  254:20 262:12 265:5
  265:5 282:3 287:24
  288:9 291:8,11
  300:16,20 301:1,6,7
  301:14,18,20 302:22
  316:25 317:16
Authority's 201:25
  202:8 204:22 226:21
  241:24 243:8 251:15
  253:24 291:15
Authorized 197:13
available 187:17
  188:25 234:19 235:1
  235:5,9 236:9 238:13
```

276:2 331:22 333:14 333:16 344:10 average 273:19,21,22 273:24 315:12 316:5 316:10.12.14 319:9 319:13,25 320:7,8,9 321:20 323:8 324:13 324:13.21 325:1.6.16 325:17,20 326:4,7,10 326:13,21 327:1,4,14 327:20,21 328:11,12 328:25 329:1,5,7,12 329:18 330:22,24 331:1,2,16 332:9,17 333:1,2,16 343:23,24 344:12 348:3 349:9 351:1 359:18,21,22 361:6 averages 317:5 349:6 averaging 273:25 avoid 244:22 avoided 200:13 award 197:25 198:17 aware 197:5 207:13 215:7 216:10 223:20 228:16,23 232:20 234:17 237:8 242:25 aways 323:5 **awful** 271:6 axis 319:4 330:18

B

bachelor's 302:6

B 296:1

back 220:3 228:24 231:11 239:2,11 242:9 250:1 251:12 253:12 256:17 261:1 269:21 270:21 277:7 283:17 287:13 290:5 320:2,4 324:9,10,15 341:24 352:12 backed 303:14 307:13 310:16 background 254:11 302:5 **backing** 304:12 307:3 **backup** 276:18 **bad** 343:6 358:14 **balance** 306:16 **band** 360:7 bank 190:21,22,25 194:20 Banks 192:14 257:16 Barbara 230:3 242:2 243:25 345:15 bargained 236:2

barred 201:11,21

	I	1	1	•
Bartle 247:15,18,22	benefit 206:20,22 207:2	210:18,22 213:18	320:24 322:5,16,23	311:20,23 312:13
248:1,4 249:23	207:16 211:19 213:6	214:15,18 218:15	324:8 325:8 328:23	313:13,15,19 314:22
251:14 252:1,10	232:15,18,22 255:25	219:1,4,17,19 220:8	330:12 332:19 334:7	321:5 328:11,25
based 196:4 198:18	267:12 271:19,20	222:1,7 225:13,14	335:11 336:3,7,10	329:25 333:11 340:21
200:22 266:5 283:24	273:4,8,10 275:17	231:19 245:18 246:1	337:4 338:2 345:17	calculation 316:15
303:18,19 305:4,22	281:1,14,18,23 283:8	246:10,11,12,15,19	346:22 348:6 350:4,9	321:6 326:4,15,17
307:15 308:5 314:14	284:18 285:16 315:11	249:24 253:13,14,20	353:14 355:23 359:10	330:1 340:19 341:4
315:5 317:14 319:3	316:12 324:23,24	253:20 263:5,6 265:1	361:11,14	344:2 346:13 349:19
321:23 337:2 339:1,4	329:23 330:9 331:14	269:23 290:19 291:4	break 224:1 232:22	351:7,12 352:2
344:9 355:1,9	331:20,24 332:23	291:10,15,20,21,22	236:24 299:13,15	355:20
baseline 318:9,22,25	333:13 350:14	292:11,19 302:10	334:10	calculations 302:24
319:2,10,16 320:8,11	benefited 206:7,16	304:22 308:4 312:18	breaks 363:1	334:24 335:3
324:2,6 340:20	benefiting 281:10	353:20	Brick 260:7	calendar 218:13 219:7
341:11 342:5,7,13	benefits 199:5,7,10,12	board's 261:6 263:3	brief 224:1 296:17	307:24 308:4 312:7
343:9,12,21	199:22 200:17 201:6	boardroom 293:6,6	299:4,15 334:10	313:19 364:2
bashful 279:1	201:10 202:24 208:16	boards 314:15	364:9	California 182:1,9
basically 198:18 199:18	267:8 274:13 280:2,8	Bob 290:24	briefing 282:25 296:7	183:13 188:10 192:15
268:9 279:2 286:18	280:19 281:7,20	bond 215:11 216:9,21	296:14 361:21	192:17 211:7 235:2,6
297:25	315:8 332:5,15	268:13 270:13,21	briefly 274:5 285:18	235:9 244:3 266:23
basis 198:16,18 208:10	best 200:16 210:1,3	bonds 216:11 272:23	286:18	366:1
208:19 237:13 261:24	215:14 244:17,20	301:22,24	briefs 361:25	California's 241:24
273:18 307:19 320:16	272:11 294:17 296:21	book 275:5	bring 196:10 197:6	266:22
343:12 Potes 225:10 220:12	297:15 323:14	border 186:17	222:4 238:14 260:4	call 197:3 265:20
Bates 225:19 239:13	better 306:19 357:6	borne 286:14	263:2,3 362:13	285:14 286:4 290:10
246:17 247:25 250:2	BETTY 183:15	bottom 198:7 204:14	BRITTON 183:15	299:12 332:16 347:11
Battery 182:24 183:3 Bay 187:25 188:1	beyond 240:9 301:13 bias 320:13 323:25	204:14,18 215:23 225:19 242:1 258:16	broad 349:23 broadly 223:1	347:15,24 351:2 called 194:15 196:24
192:13	342:19 343:15	269:15 270:1 273:16	broken 199:11 355:24	198:21 254:2 262:23
bear 288:1	bifurcate 231:4	275:23 281:2 283:15	brought 263:5	288:25 299:20 302:12
bearing 357:17	bifurcation 231:5	284:10,15 285:1	BROWN 182:22	346:12
BEATTY 183:15	big 274:20 283:16	286:11 288:24 290:22	Budget 225:14	calling 336:5
beginning 202:19 265:1	323:4 361:1,3	311:7 312:22 317:20	building 185:25	calls 190:24 194:23
270:15 272:20 287:20	billion 292:20	327:24 359:7,19	bullet 211:17,18 212:9	199:14 200:19 206:8
344:10	binder 197:7 202:4	360:11	212:14 213:2,7,8	235:15 299:17
begins 244:17	203:19 210:13 224:4	bought 191:20 319:23	243:24	Campbell 290:24
behalf 231:21 243:19	225:9 230:4 249:3	bound 291:21	burden 221:4 281:22	canal 185:21,23,23,24
behaved 331:1,12	300:6,8 317:7 322:7	boundaries 288:14	burdened 223:9,11	186:13,14,16,19,20
behavior 216:14	335:4 346:9	box 321:3 343:3	burdens 208:8	186:22 187:7,10,19
318:17 323:1,1,1	BINGHAM 183:9	branch 186:19 211:9	busy 325:9 331:7	188:18,20 191:23
342:23 358:23	bit 186:9 225:5 265:21	211:10	Butte 190:11 194:12	234:23
Belated 210:1	272:10 274:12,16	Braunig 183:6 184:3,4	buy 188:14 189:11	canals 186:1,3,12
believe 188:3 189:10	276:18 297:9 300:23	184:7 185:15 197:15	216:11 223:18 279:15	187:24
194:6 204:6 208:4	307:6,7 321:11,13	197:20 199:20,24	358:15	cancel 202:23 203:11
213:18 237:13,17	336:17 346:7 355:14	201:8 202:12,17	buyers 216:9	canceled 201:15 203:13
241:11 243:23 247:6	365:11	204:2,6,10,12 206:14	buying 187:11 237:9,20	203:15,18
252:4,16 259:19	black 332:2	207:5 210:9 213:23	237:20,21 319:18	CAO 301:5
265:4 276:3 285:25	blend 236:11,15,22	214:3 215:17 223:13	buys 266:13	capacity 215:1,4
295:7 298:5,8 308:16	237:2,6,7,10,11,16,17	231:3 240:7 248:11		234:19 245:2,6
312:23 320:11,17	237:19,25 238:5,10	255:12 258:6,13	C	269:24 270:7 287:25
338:21 339:22 340:9	255:25 256:1	259:6 260:4,10 261:4	C 183:11,15 185:2	288:12 301:23 302:23
345:17 346:7 351:24	blends 256:10	261:12 262:19 263:17	258:2 296:1	324:25 330:5 332:5,6
358:19 359:10 360:5	blow 216:17 217:3	265:16 290:6 299:13	CA 182:24 183:4,10,14	332:7,8,16 333:14
361:19,20	258:16 259:6 346:7	299:17 300:4,11,13	calculate 213:5 280:19	352:7
believed 199:16	blue 321:1,3 359:7,18	304:9,15 307:21	286:2 325:23 326:12	capital 267:6 272:23
believes 200:13 227:25	board 184:11 196:11	308:16,19,23 309:5	330:25 333:12	273:1 292:20 302:3
288:9	197:8,10,11,22,22,24	312:5,10 313:6,17	calculated 186:3 207:3	captive 279:12
belong 214:13,14	200:9 203:4,24 205:8	314:9,13 315:21	209:17,22 273:16	capture 271:23 273:22
beneficially 244:21	209:3,4,4,10 210:15	316:17 318:7,12	285:9 307:19 310:1,5	274:2 343:11
	•		•	

continued 272.2.2
captured 272:2,3
320:18
captures 273:2
care 233:20 carriage 244:5
case 182:7 208:1,4
215:1 222:8 232:11
233:8 245:13,15
263:15 271:14 284:18
287:13 290:2 293:9
296:17 298:15 308:10
320:6 323:7 325:17
326:6 327:6,9 328:7
333:3 342:11,21
343:11 355:3 358:22
361:21 362:3 363:17
363:22 366:14
case-in-chief 293:21
cases 185:11 266:20
338:21
Castaic 211:3,3,5,8
212:9,25
catalog 220:4
catchall 306:18
categories 209:18
289:6,9 308:9 317:14
category 214:16,17
306:18
cause 208:7
caused 208:14
causes 194:4 254:12
causing 208:15 221:2
261:24 264:22
Center 183:9
Central 194:20
CEO 226:1
certain 209:18 233:5
235:1,5 242:3,4 253:5
277:21 337:12 344:1
353:1,5 354:1
certainly 301:4 305:2 350:22 351:24 354:18
certification 302:14,17
303:5
certifications 302:10
certified 182:20 302:13
302:14 303:6 366:7
certify 366:7 chairman 260:7 287:18
challenge 221:13
222:25
challenging 215:1 218:9,10 223:2
chambers 299:6
chance 298:7 364:25 change 209:4 213:12
214:20,21 281:2
342:6,6,7
3-2.0,0,7
i e

```
changed 342:5
changes 293:2
Chapman 278:4,4,10
  279:13,23
characterize 302:16
  331:19.21
charge 189:14 191:3
  194:23 195:15.20.25
  196:3 209:7,11,12,22
  212:15,20 215:1
  223:9 228:2 231:18
  253:7 271:11 272:4
  272:18,21,21 273:7,9
  273:12,15,17 274:1
  274:10,15 278:17
  289:22 304:3 352:5,7
charged 189:20 193:18
  193:19,20,22,23
  195:23 209:7 257:15
  261:23 271:17 310:4
  311:4,9,13,17 312:17
charges 188:6,17 207:7
  212:4,13 214:14
  220:11 221:4,5
  225:16,17 226:15
  231:19 233:24 238:24
  239:1 246:2 261:23
  304:23 307:25 314:15
charging 188:17
  208:18 220:16
chart 283:23 319:14
  346:3,10 347:12,14
  351:8 359:4,5,12
  360:1.5.8
chases 218:9
check 274:25 299:5
chief 300:19
choices 279:15
choose 320:15
chooses 195:21
chose 306:17 342:9
  344:8,9,15
CHRONOLOGICAL
  184:1
circumstances 240:5
citations 296:21,22
cite 294:21
citizens 186:23
city 217:10,14,20
  267:16 301:21 302:1
  302:2,4
city's 217:12 301:22
claim 215:3 282:15
  283:1
claims 245:13,15
```

282:17 293:10

clarification 283:4

338:11

```
clarify 213:16 340:12
clear 193:3 220:15,19
  237:22 259:23 262:12
  263:23 291:1 292:7
  295:23 311:12 312:22
  328:10 345:6 346:25
  356:22
clearer 285:11
clerk 226:7 299:5,23
  313:2 365:6,10
clip 248:9,14
clock 293:25
close 269:17 270:8
  361:17
closely 321:15
closer 206:3
Coachella 186:2,18,21
Code 244:13,13
coincidence 323:19,23
Colantuono 249:1,2,8
COLIN 183:11
collaboratively 301:10
collect 262:14
collected 196:6 208:6
  286:2 307:9 322:14
  338:23
collecting 208:20
  285:20
collection 322:14
collects 207:15
Colorado 186:15 187:6
  187:13,14,15,16,18
  190:2 191:24 232:15
  232:19,22 235:13
  236:12,23 237:2
  238:20 253:24 254:2
  254:11,23 256:2
  300:18 301:6
column 203:1,9 284:1
  306:5,6,11 308:3,12
  308:12 309:15 325:11
  325:20 327:24 328:7
  347:2
columns 270:3,4
  276:15 308:12 325:15
combined 311:7 312:16
combining 313:22
  314:16
come 274:24 283:17
  330:6 351:9
comes 237:17 282:7
  322:21 325:2
coming 284:15 331:23
  337:12 345:11,18
  349:16 353:1
comment 226:16 291:3
comments 291:1
```

```
commitment 187:23
committee 197:12,24
  225:15
committees 220:7,8
commodity 209:24
  278:17
communicating 265:7
comparatively 207:23
compare 187:11 319:11
  320:16 321:18 323:1
  324:13 328:6
compared 218:6 319:9
  321:18,21 328:14
  329:14
comparing 316:10
  324:21
competitive 279:3
  289:12
complained 287:8
  293:15
complaining 219:25
  260:15 288:21
complaint 195:3
  262:17,19,22,24
  264:4,11 290:3
complaints 290:2,4
  291:19 292:3 293:8
complete 271:6 340:15
completed 339:18
  340:10 352:23
completely 192:24
  247:12 248:4,8 307:9
completing 302:17
component 229:14
  258:20 353:22
components 232:3
composite 261:8
  318:20 320:21 321:8
  325:1 328:6 331:9
  332:4 333:1,3 359:20
comptroller 285:25
computation 352:15
concentration 302:9
concept 234:4,7 291:5
concern 297:13,14
concerned 233:6
  237:16 265:1
concerning 246:20
concerns 221:23 259:3
  259:11,14,22,25
  261:2,17,21 262:3,13
  262:23 265:8 291:16
conclude 303:18 330:8
concluded 303:19
  365:14
conclusion 235:16
concrete-lined 186:1
conditions 267:14
```

```
conducted 192:23
 218:23
confer 361:12
confusion 269:1
connection 188:4 193:4
  236:4 246:1 247:19
  249:9 260:2 263:1
  295:16 338:1 345:10
connections 187:2
  194:17
connects 186:15 207:9
Connie 182:19 183:17
  366:6,22
conservation 195:11,15
  200:10 202:1 203:7,8
  203:11,14,16 204:23
  205:3,11,19 206:6,19
  207:10 220:17 223:11
  227:15 277:12,14,16
  277:18,20 278:16,23
  280:2 281:15 284:5
  285:21 307:4,6
conserved 185:25
  277:22 281:16,16,17
conserves 186:5
consider 197:25 201:19
  202:9 203:4 205:1
  352:3,4
considerable 222:7
consideration 246:20
 247:7,20 256:16
considered 198:11
 226:24 277:18
considering 198:2
  199:21
consist 270:4
consistent 213:13
  244:20 291:13
constitute 366:11
constitutional 283:7
constraints 245:6
consumer 279:12
consumers 203:17
Cont 185:14
contain 279:25
contained 304:25
  305:17 307:16 339:18
  340:11 341:6 344:18
  352:20
contemplate 235:25
contemplated 241:3
contemplates 239:5
content 210:3
contention 233:17
  249:18,20
contents 210:2
context 195:4 201:23
```

240:12

commingled 192:16

contingent 234:19
continue 224:2 227:20
262:2 299:16 357:25
continued 278:21
291:11
continuing 240:8
278:14
continuous 198:16
continuously 262:12
265:6
contract 187:20 188:11
193:15 233:12 239:21
239:24 251:1,7
239:24 251:1,7 289:21 352:17
contractor 251:16
contractor's 251:21
contractors 252:2,12
252:15,25 253:2,6,9
275:15,16 276:14,17
contracts 251:4 253:1
253:11
contractual 303:10
353:10,11,12,16,21
353:25 355:25 356:2
contrary 288:15
contributions 227:23
control 254:2,11
convenient 362:1 364:2
conversation 292:12
converse 269:11
Conversely 267:18
convey 191:24 244:2
257:15
conveyance 212:10,20
231:21 232:7 234:8
243:7 288:2 289:7,13
conveyances 244:5
conveyed 191:10
conveys 186:24
coordinator 302:3
copies 340:2 365:8
copy 224:5 298:23,23
299:6,9 340:2
*
corner 215:24 225:20
correct 224:20 226:5
226:22 227:7 228:5 228:20,25 229:1,3,21 229:25 230:18,25
228:20,25 229:1,3,21
229:25 230:18,25
231:1 232:5,12 235:2
238:16,21,25 239:18
241:7 242:5 245:10
246:15 247:16 252:12
257:4 264:17 265:4
306:24 311:6 317:11
317:18 319:8 320:1
321:9 322:1 324:7
326:14 328:16 337:3
337:14,22 342:12
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

```
345:14 346:21 347:15
  347:16 348:1,5
  349:13 350:16,20
  352:18,19 359:16
  360:4 366:12
corrected 308:9,13
  309:14,24,25 310:5
  310:18.19 311:2.19
  311:20,23 313:10,11
  313:14 314:3,5,22
  353:20
correlation 358:20
correspondence 219:1
  219:16 220:4
corresponds 217:23
cost 188:8,9,15,16
  193:13,21 194:7
  196:18,19 199:5
  209:5,5 213:2,14
  214:6 218:22 221:1
  223:7 238:14,20
  250:21,22 253:10
  259:1 261:22 278:8
  278:14 286:12 288:1
  288:25 289:4,6,20,23
  303:16 304:23,25
  307:16 308:5 309:22
  331:25 349:3,10
  350:14 351:13 355:18
costly 222:6
costs 188:4 193:19
  194:4 195:16 200:13
  208:14,20 209:15
  212:2,10,13,14,19
  213:1,5,13 214:13,23
  215:4 220:1,12,17,18
  220:19 221:2,3,24
  222:9 223:10,12
  229:11,16 238:22
  246:24 250:9,17,20
  257:15 259:4,12,15
  260:1,16 262:4,14
  264:9,22 266:12
  272:5 274:3 280:2,8
  280:19 285:20 286:3
  286:9,14,17,24 287:2
  287:24 288:1 289:9
  289:12,14,17,22
  303:14 304:12,19,19
  305:5,10,21 306:1,21
  307:3,11 309:20
  310:17 313:8,9 314:2
  314:2,21 315:16
  329:25 336:23 338:17
  339:7 352:13 354:1
  354:11 355:13,15
  356:18
counsel 183:1 232:18
```

```
249:24 256:13 266:1
  269:4 282:11 300:7
  335:5 336:20 339:9
  340:2 355:2,9 364:1
countless 220:6
County 182:2,6 187:3
  191:7 192:2,2,5,9
  193:4.8 194:17 216:4
  218:17 219:11 243:6
  243:8,21 256:18
  292:10 300:15 302:22
  326:23 366:3
couple 192:1 217:19
  224:15 233:16 263:19
  271:13 273:3 280:17
  285:18 331:10 338:21
  352:11 358:3 364:5
course 185:8 200:8
  210:9 277:12,20
  302:15 361:13 364:25
court 182:1 185:4,8,12
  185:19,22 186:12
  197:18 199:17,23
  200:21 202:15 204:4
  204:9 206:10,22
  210:5 213:20,24
  215:15 223:14,22,25
  224:2,7 225:4 227:18
  228:10 230:15 231:8
  231:12 233:6.15.20
  235:17 240:11 241:12
  241:17 248:12,16
  252:7 255:15,18,20
  255:22 256:3,5,20,22
  257:22 258:4 263:18
  263:20 265:14,17,25
  268:20,23 274:24
  275:3,6 282:11,15,21
  283:19 284:3 285:6
  291:17 293:13,24
  294:10,23,25 295:1,8
  295:13,19,23 296:5
  296:10 297:7,13,18
  298:3,7,11,22 299:8
  299:14,16 300:3,23
  300:25 303:24 304:6
  304:8,18 307:22
  308:14,18,21,24
  309:2,18 312:2 313:1
  313:3 314:12 315:25
  316:14 318:2,5,14
  322:19,21 323:12,22
  324:4 325:3 326:1
  331:6 332:2,10,14
  334:8,11 335:8 336:4
  336:12,14 337:5,8
  338:3,14 339:25
  340:5,7 343:1,4 345:6
```

```
345:20,24 346:4,14
  346:24 348:7,11
  350:6,10 353:15
  356:3,22 357:25
  359:8,11,14 361:10
  361:13,15 362:10,16
  362:20,24 363:4,11
  363:14,21,24 364:12
  364:21 365:2,5
Court's 256:16 276:7
  282:13 362:13
courtesy 365:8
courtroom 290:24
cover 189:11
create 254:14 278:23
  317:4 320:20 321:8
  324:12 327:4 335:16
created 283:24 284:17
  317:12 318:11,22,25
  325:6 350:23
creates 238:9
creating 320:11 324:20
  350:22
credit 281:23 284:5
crib 296:19
criteria 198:23,25
  199:2,13,22 200:2
critical 266:21 281:4
  337:20
cross 223:23 292:1
cross-examination
  184:4,7 224:3,10
  258:10 260:22 287:6
  295:15,17 334:11,13
CSR 182:19 183:17
  366:6,22
current 224:22 290:16
  308:12,17 309:8
  311:14 313:14 315:9
  321:2
currently 212:1 228:19
  300:15
CURTIS 182:3
Cushman 184:2 185:16
  186:11 197:9 198:8
  199:25 202:5 210:12
  210:16 215:20 224:12
  225:10 230:4 243:13
  246:7 258:7,18
  261:16 263:23 272:10
  273:4 281:10 290:6
  292:2
Cushman's 224:5 287:6
  290:7 295:15
customer 280:6
customers 189:12
  238:1 280:10 283:6
  288:11
```

```
cycle 189:16 272:14
cycles 272:9
          D
D 185:2 258:2
D-A-N 300:1
D-E-N-H-A-M 300:2
Dahm 197:6 315:21
damage 329:25 353:17
  353:22 355:25
damages 254:13 303:10
  352:17 353:7,10,11
  353:13,25 356:2
  357:13
Dan 183:6 184:6 278:6
  299:18,19 300:1
DANIEL 183:5
dashed 331:5
data 184:17 276:2,19
  280:18 282:7 283:24
  313:19 316:2,3,3,21
  316:23,24 317:1,1,4,9
  317:15,16,20 321:24
  322:14 323:5 325:23
  327:17,19,21 331:8
  338:23 341:6,8
  342:21 344:9 346:11
date 204:19 215:23
  320:10
dated 184:11,13,15
  197:12 202:6 203:22
  225:15 366:16
day 215:4 297:4,4
  298:23
days 362:15,18
de 275:20
dead 205:15
deal 274:20
dealing 239:17 281:6
deals 240:5,19
DeBacker 285:25 286:1
  286:20
debate 262:9
debated 262:11
debt 272:22 301:12,24
decade 190:5 191:14
December 182:14
  185:1 258:1 287:16
  291:6 366:16
decide 196:4 364:22
decision 214:7 222:4
  294:6,14
decisions 213:14 280:5
declaration 346:1
declared 205:17
decrease 196:23 229:18
```

cut 324:1 342:15

363:23,24

denv 349:8

316:7

344:17

depo 365:5

336:19

denying 361:5

department 182:4

301:11,22 302:1

dependent 196:17 depends 254:22

depicted 342:24

depicts 335:22,25

deposition 182:23

224:5,18 248:7

349:5,25 352:16

361:23 365:7

285:21

326:25

331.23

272:20

desert 186:2

describes 209:11

describing 215:15

Description 184:10

317:5 359:20

deserving 226:16

361:24 365:6,7

designed 274:2

designing 289:10

detail 290:11 292:2

348:20,24 350:18

351:12 357:6,12

determined 244:3

282:12 353:20

developed 303:23

317:13,14

316:1

304:11 315:7,10

developing 223:10

318:19

determine 207:14

1 1220 17
decreased 229:17
decreases 196:24 360:25
decreasing 270:25
deemed 340:15
defendant 182:10
183:8 364:5
Defendants 225:8
241:10,19 243:2
246:6 249:6 254:8
255:10 336:7 345:25
defense 363:22
defer 297:18
deferred 201:18 203:15
deferring 207:1 deficit 284:12 287:1
defined 239:20 298:13
298:14
degree 302:6,8
delay 293:1
delegates 219:4,22
222:2
delineated 198:4
deliver 236:17,17
delivered 186:25
187:22 192:7 194:16
275:11,11
deliveries 217:14
267:15,19,21 276:13
305:1 315:6
delivers 194:21 delivery 241:3 244:21
245:2 251:5
Delta 187:25 188:1
192:13 196:22 244:4
253:2 289:22
demand 286:8,12
321:19 330:20,22
331:1 340:17 341:10
341:24 359:5
demands 207:24 218:6
218:7 266:15 272:24
277:17
demonstrate 218:2
demonstrated 209:2
demonstrates 280:1 demonstrative 308:19
309:3 312:12 313:4
313:18 322:18 335:19
345:23
Denham 184:6 268:4
299:18,19 300:2,8,14
300:25 304:11 312:6
313:18 315:3 317:9
319:5 322:7 334:15 340:1 348:14 358:3
Denham's 345:16
DENNIS 184:2

```
188:11 215:13 218:4
 243:7 244:4 251:1
deposed 224:15 334:17
 293:19 334:22 339:17
 339:24 340:24 341:16
desalination 195:12
 202:1 203:8,12 205:3
 205:12 227:23 284:5
describe 198:13 300:25
 302:5 304:18 323:15
described 301:5 309:16
 317:15 321:5 328:4
designations 293:19
 316:11 324:23 337:21
develop 291:12 304:9
 308:9 316:4,21 318:9
                           311:5,22 313:13,15
development 195:12,14
                           314:7,8,24,25 332:3
```

```
196:10,23 206:24
  220:16 227:21 259:21
  278:15 307:4,5 313:9
  314:3,21
devices 195:11
Diego 182:6 185:20
  186:6,23,24 187:2,2
  188:3,21 189:5,14,16
  189:24 190:1,6
  191:13,20,23 192:4,8
  194:2,4,10,17,22
  202:24 205:1,10,17
  205:18,22,25 206:5
  206:15,17,20 208:4
  208:12 214:25 215:3
  216:4 218:8,17
  219:11,11,22,25
  220:22 221:10,17
  222:4,8,11,20,25
  229:9 230:5 232:2,15
  232:21 234:25 235:4
  235:9,21,21 236:1,12
  237:15,17 238:14
  239:6 240:24 242:3
  243:16 244:1,25
  245:10 246:1 247:18
  248:23 253:16,23
  254:20 256:1 257:1,8
  257:14,18 258:23
  259:3.10.14.25
  260:14 261:1,9,17,20
  262:1,2,16,22 263:1
  264:2,8 265:3 268:2
  278:7 282:8 283:13
  283:23 284:9,12
  287:8 288:5,21,23
  289:4,18 290:16,25
  291:2,2 292:13 293:3
  293:8,15 299:17
  300:15 301:21 302:1
  302:22 318:18 319:12
  319:17 320:6,22
  321:4,6,12,15,17,21
  323:2,16 345:4 347:7
  347:18,21 355:2
  357:6,14 361:2,3
  363:17,19 364:10
Diego's 195:3 203:11
  219:4 243:19 245:12
  245:15 246:23 249:18
  249:20 255:10,24
  277:22 290:1 321:24
  326:19,20 346:18
  348:3
difference 196:18,22
  308:11 310:3,21
```

```
348:3 353:19
different 226:7 237:14
  245:19 249:19 267:7
  269:10 274:12 298:9
  304:20 307:10 309:9
  309:18 320:18 323:10
  323:13 324:5,6 338:6
  343:22,25 357:22
  358:5
differently 228:18
dips 320:2,5
direct 184:3,7 185:14
  186:12 210:13 225:7
  226:25 246:5 254:4
  256:25 300:12 336:21
  342:3 357:20
direction 205:7 355:1,9
directly 203:17 206:21
  341:5 355:15
director 253:24 300:19
  301:7
directors 196:11
  197:11 209:3 210:19
  219:2,17 220:8 222:1
  225:13,14 231:19
  242:6 246:12 292:11
disburse 198:3
disbursed 284:2
disclose 216:8,13
  217:17 221:8
disclosed 216:19,25
  217:8
discloses 217:13
disclosure 216:21
  217:7
discourage 222:16
discovery 361:18
discretion 235:20 236:7
  236:15 239:7
discuss 231:14 262:8
  265:22 277:6 329:22
discussed 213:2 262:11
  266:18 272:10 277:17
discussion 222:7 266:1
  268:1 273:20
discussions 214:9,11,11
  259:21 264:18
displayed 305:13
  322:10
displays 325:5 328:21
dispute 235:18 279:8
  279:11 302:22
disputed 279:10
distance 257:11
distinguish 269:2
distinguishes 237:8
  242:10
distribution 279:9
```

```
281:19 289:7
district 182:9 183:8,13
  190:11,12,15 194:12
  194:13 197:11 226:1
  237:3 243:6 260:8
 261:7 292:10 302:23
  306:7,8,11,14 326:22
divided 326:4,7 327:23
division 289:6
divvy 196:6
document 204:7 210:3
  210:3,4,7,10,15,20,24
  211:2 212:6,8,12
 213:17,21 215:16,18
  216:15 218:1 225:10
 225:22 226:10 241:20
  241:23 242:1,3 243:3
  243:11 244:7,9 246:7
  249:4 260:6 261:9
  264:15 265:10 266:16
  266:18 267:9 268:5,6
  268:8,18,22 269:7,21
  270:13,17 276:7
  277:8,25 278:11
  279:19 282:2 285:22
  287:16 290:10,17,21
  292:6,14 304:15
  318:4 346:23 361:19
document's 282:13
documents 185:10
  215:8 219:16,20
  224:5 263:6 266:13
  268:17 269:3,3 276:5
  276:9,12,22 277:6
  285:18 287:11 288:18
  300:6
doing 222:16 223:21
  228:19,25 294:18
  316:9,14 320:14
  324:14 349:19 353:8
doled 282:4
dollar 230:21 231:15
dollars 222:13
dotted 320:5
double 274:25
downward 271:2
dramatic 266:23
dramatically 229:17
draw 199:9 308:2
  327:10 360:23
drawing 204:13 327:13
drought 189:16 212:25
  213:8 214:22
dry 188:23 189:2
  207:19,20,23,25
  208:2,5,7,9,11,14,15
  208:20 209:5,15
```

210:19 211:14,16,19

211:21,23 213:6
214:22 215:12 216:13
217:1,22,23 218:2,3,6
220:21 221:1,2 245:9
247:12 248:5,8,20
249:15 260:23 261:2
261:18,23,24 262:3
262:14,17,23 263:3
263:12 264:14 266:10
266:11,15 267:3
270:20 271:18 274:2
290:10 298:20 315:1
315:2,4,5,8,16,19
316:1,20 318:8
323:18,21 329:24
333:13 336:17,23
338:17 339:7 350:19
352:12,18 358:18,21
DTX 258:13 259:9
336:8
due 186:18 240:20
duly 299:21
duty 236:25 237:9,19
237:23 291:20
DWR 191:12 193:11,14
193:19,21,25 194:4
252:22 257:15
DWR's 193:9 194:8
239:1
F

E 182:3 185:2,2 258:2,2 earlier 207:6 224:25 234:22 239:3 245:21 245:25 253:13 256:19 268:11 272:10 316:24 317:15 336:19 342:20 354:20 361:5 early 261:1,18 earthen 186:2 **easiest** 306:10 east 186:18 211:10 easy 270:9 294:8 economic 227:15 254:13 350:18 economics 302:7 350:14 economy 358:7,12,12 358:24 economy's 358:14 ECP24-2007 204:18 editable 296:19 educational 302:5 effect 191:3 194:24 224:24 225:3 226:22 280:24 290:13 291:24

294:13 296:15 333:1

342:11,12 343:17

```
290:13
effectively 289:14
efficient 280:4
effort 291:12 357:3,5
efforts 244:17,20
eight 230:11 285:2
either 194:7 249:16
  268:10 275:11 351:7
electronic 299:9
element 266:21
elements 272:7 305:13
  308.8
eliminate 204:21 280:5
Embarcadero 183:9
emergencies 240:25
emerging 227:22
employed 300:14,15
employees 242:3
empty 192:24
endeavor 222:6
energy 229:15,16
engage 188:21 215:10
engaged 247:18 248:23
  259:20 265:6
engages 190:1 194:2
engineer 348:14
engineer's 209:9,13
  272:8,13 274:5
engineering 226:2
  348:16,19,21,24
ensure 278:21
enter 189:5 336:1
entered 230:5 241:10
entering 313:5
enters 192:14
entire 228:6 257:10
  273:8,22 302:4
entirely 354:6,9
entirety 251:9
entities 221:2 325:12
  325:13
entitled 197:13
environmental 199:7
  254:14 300:20
equal 231:18
equity 280:6
equivalent 235:8
erroneously 304:2
escrow 357:16,19
ESQ 183:5,5,6,6,7,11
  183:11,15,15
essentially 271:5
  306:16 316:9
establish 309:14 344:11
established 213:19
  291:6 320:7 340:20
establishing 287:19,20
```

effective 204:18,20

```
establishment 263:8
estimate 330:4 331:15
estimated 273:11
  274:13
estimation 357:15
evaluate 196:10 280:8
evaluated 198:24
evaluating 197:2
  216:10
evaluation 197:4
  198:23 199:4,11
  201:5
evening 364:8
event 281:22
events 197:21
eventually 296:10
everybody 257:22
  268:3 281:12 298:1
  299:14 323:6 361:5
  363:8 364:3
Evid 184:10
evidence 184:18 197:16
  197:19 202:13,16
  204:2,11 210:2,3
  215:14,19 241:11
  265:22,24 272:12
  283:1 295:17 296:15
  298:2 309:1 313:5
  318:1,6 322:13,17,20
  322:25 336:2.15
  345:18
exact 312:8 338:22
  350:18 351:14
exactly 288:3,21
  289:17 338:8 349:24
  356:3 364:6
examination 184:3,4,7
  185:14 258:5 300:12
  336:21 342:4 357:20
examined 299:22
example 204:5 229:14
  242:15 247:10 260:13
  261:16 280:13 326:7
  327:22 337:17 354:15
  358:7,14
exceed 274:14
exceeded 286:12 360:3
excellent 229:14
excerpts 276:9
excess 254:12 287:25
  288:12 332:8
exchange 190:16
  192:21,22 193:2
  194:9 206:1 221:11
  229:25 231:5,23
  232:3 234:16,25
  235:4 236:12,21,21
  237:12,15,21 238:13
```

```
239:4,11,16,20 240:6
  240:21 242:12,15,17
  242:19,22,23,24
  245:5 250:6 275:17
  278:8 316:24 357:18
exchanged 190:19
  317:16
exchanges 275:14
exclude 342:19
excluded 327:25 328:2
excuse 196:1 208:2,3
  233:20 303:24 311:15
  330.6
excused 265:18 361:16
executed 188:23 189:1
  190:14 191:6,8,9
  193:2 205:7,16
  232:12
execution 201:14,20
  221:15
executive 290:25
exercise 355:12
exercised 277:2
exhibit 184:11,13,15,17
  184:18,19 186:10
  197:19 202:16 204:11
  225:7,8 226:8,8,9
  230:2 241:10,12,16
  246:6 250:3 252:6
  255:11 256:15.15.19
  268:21 276:10 308:14
  308:22,23 312:12
  313:2 317:19,20,25
  318:6 322:20 335:4
  335:23 336:5,15
  346:15
exhibits 184:9 275:22
  295:15 308:18 313:4
exist 338:24,24 357:1
existed 193:1
existing 201:16 272:24
expect 189:20
expectations 217:18
expense 277:23
experience 196:5 216:2
  294:5 301:18
experiences 266:23
expert 224:19 263:11
  263:14 302:18,21
  334:21 337:2,13
  338:1 339:10,16
  340:11,23 341:2,5,21
  341:23 344:4,18
  345:11,16 348:17
  349:2,12,16,20
  350:14,20,20 351:7
  351:17,18 352:4,17
  352:21 353:2 354:22
```

```
357:15 358:11 360:2
experts 218:23 247:22
explain 185:22 274:24
  304:10 306:10 307:22
  315:25 318:14 322:21
  326:1 331:6 337:6
  360:13
explained 288:5
explaining 278:13
explains 273:16 307:23
explicit 282:19 290:17
explicitly 262:22
expressed 259:22
Extension 190:11
  194:12
extent 208:13 209:21
  277:1 293:13 294:12
  295:17 298:24
           F
facilities 191:1,2 193:9
  193:14 194:1,3,8,8
  195:7 196:3 201:7
  235:20,22 240:20
  241:1,2 272:23 273:1
  277:1 348:20,25
facility 188:7 192:19,20
  199:5 234:12,12
  288:2
fact 212:7 250:19
  261:22 265:4 274:20
  279:9 303:4 337:16
factor 199:4 325:24
  326:2,3,9,16,17,19,20
  327:1,4,11 328:8,11
  328:13,15 329:1,1,6,8
  329:9,12,14,18,20
  347:25 350:24 351:1
  351:2
factors 240:24 328:1,3
  341:7 349:6
factual 208:19
failed 215:3
failing 339:12
failure 249:22 262:3,13
  329:24
fairly 270:9 271:2
  325:10
fairness 280:9,10
faith 221:24
fall 210:17
fallback 272:2
familiar 229:25 234:4
  245:12,14
far 207:24 214:22
  220:3 228:16,23
  237:16 254:15 264:25
```

355:5,8 356:13

funding 201:11 204:22

fund 196:11

funded 284:6

266:6 294:21 328:7
347:11 352:24 358:22
fault 283:22
February 264:21 292:3
federal 186:3 288:16
fee 285:14
feedback 259:20
feel 355:23 363:21
feels 292:4
fees 285:13
feet 347:7
felt 281:18
Fernando 327:11,18
field 278:24 302:19
350:15
fight 298:18
figure 210:7 270:14
285:12 298:24 326:8
figures 284:11
file 184:17 255:17
256:6 316:21,23
317:9,11 364:19
filed 259:16 262:1
293:7 295:6
filing 362:2
final 201:20 277:4
296:17
finance 214:10 221:21
225:15 272:23 301:11
301:21 302:9 303:2
financial 278:15 285:24
292:21,22 301:2,8,19
301:23,24,25 302:11
302:19 350:14 find 251:15 322:7
363:25 364:2
fine 275:8 294:20,24
336:13 364:3
finish 297:4
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20 327:3 330:13 332:21
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20 327:3 330:13 332:21 fiscal 217:9,9 225:17
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20 327:3 330:13 332:21 fiscal 217:9,9 225:17 270:24 271:1 273:10
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20 327:3 330:13 332:21 fiscal 217:9,9 225:17 270:24 271:1 273:10 273:17 285:2 286:5,9
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20 327:3 330:13 332:21 fiscal 217:9,9 225:17 270:24 271:1 273:10
finish 297:4 finished 185:19 296:14 first 197:6 204:14 208:24 212:9 213:2 215:24 222:12 224:24 226:8,9,13 230:9 232:12 233:17 258:16 261:14,14 262:2 266:9 270:24 272:4 272:19 274:13 277:7 277:10 278:11,12 287:11,15,20 288:25 289:17 299:25 300:1 316:19 325:11,11,20 327:3 330:13 332:21 fiscal 217:9,9 225:17 270:24 271:1 273:10 273:17 285:2 286:5,9

I = . =
fit 268:4
five 221:14,16 271:2
293:1 328:17,19
329:2,7 362:15,18 364:5
five-year 221:12 291:23 292:8 318:25
329:4 333:6,7,11,15
345:13 346:20 347:20
fixed 198:22 230:20,25
231:14 362:17
flex 211:1,12,14,22 212:2,19 213:8
flexible 267:4
Floor 182:24
flowing 192:16
flows 269:10
fluctuations 321:20
323:24
focus 240:4 343:16
351:25,25
focused 266:3
Foley 287:17 288:23
follow 203:10
following 237:13
286:19,24
follows 299:22
forecasting 301:24
forgoing 366:11
format 296:19 299:9 format's 286:21
forming 315:15,19
forth 220:9
forums 245:19 259:18
262:6
forward 272:16 284:13
335:20
forwarded 282:8
found 294:12
foundational 266:18
four 199:2 200:2 266:7
282:6 302:20 362:14
363:3
fourth 272:17 277:4
framework 261:8
278:2 279:24
Francisco 182:2,24
183:4,10 366:3
frequently 316:24
front 300:9 318:18
322:25
full 185:10 244:22 366:11
fully 191:10
function 212:11,20
307:8
functional 307:10

functionally 193:1

```
205:19 206:13 207:17
  283:12 285:15
funds 195:22 196:6,9
  198:3 206:15,18
  277:13
further 205:7 257:21
  265:13,16 318:18
  361:8.14
future 201:21.22 205:2
  269:16 320:12
          G
G 185:2 244:16 258:2
gained 193:10
gap 264:25 265:11
  267:23 269:6,9
Gastelum 225:25
  258:11 288:23 292:17
Gastelum's 292:18
gathered 307:17
gears 315:1
general 202:7,8 203:23
  203:24 216:3 221:20
  226:4 273:8 288:24
  290:25 292:9,13,18
  315:25 338:23
generally 231:20 232:6
  282:20,22 306:9
  327:5 357:5
generate 200:14 280:4
generated 215:24 278:2
  286:7
getting 269:14 341:24
  362:13 363:9
give 204:25 232:15,21
  245:17 281:23 296:7
  297:3,24 324:2
given 237:6 253:21
  271:19,20 302:18
  304:23 335:5 355:2
  362:5 363:1
gives 235:19 239:7
  242:15
giving 217:6 275:16
  327:6 335:6
glossary 297:21,22,25
  298:1,5,7,23 364:10
  364:14,17
glue 296:22
go 188:12 198:6,19
  200:24 206:11 210:15
  213:25 216:17 227:3
  229:5 230:2,13
  233:24 234:2 239:11
  239:23 240:15 242:9
```

243:10,24 244:16 246:17 250:1,12,14 251:12 254:9,18 256:5 257:2 266:4 268:8,13 269:5,21 270:1,21 272:7 274:5 275:8 277:7 278:3,10 278:11 279:4.6.20 280:14 282:6 283:18 284:7,24 285:8 287:22 290:20 291:7 292:2 293:25 294:7.9 294:12 295:19 304:8 305:4 307:2 309:4 331:5,14 345:8 350:10 351:20 352:12 354:11,15 356:16,18 356:24,24 363:25 goal 227:14 254:20 goals 228:1 289:11 goes 186:6 191:16 223:18 244:24 279:7 288:7 290:22 going 188:14 199:14 200:19 210:5,10 213:15,21 221:22 233:10,13 240:11 245:22 250:13 251:12 257:8 264:14 266:2,3 268:15 282:22 294:1 308:21 310:23 319:2 321:19 324:11 325:9 325:12 330:17 337:8 341:18 342:16 343:8 346:2 352:24 359:22 361:1,21 362:1,3,14 362:17,25 363:2,5,10 **good** 185:4,16,17 221:24 223:24 224:12 224:12,14 258:7,8 265:19 284:10 285:11 294:3 320:12 334:15 334:16 361:22 **gotten** 324:6 **Government** 186:3 grams 254:21 256:11 graph 324:1 335:16 342:24 graphic 340:25 341:6 343:14 358:19 graphical 318:16 greater 207:24 254:21 280:9 327:13 363:16 greatest 358:22 greatly 218:5 364:18 **ground** 186:4 groundwater 190:20 195:10

group 302:12 guess 286:4 362:11 **guide** 294:5 Н H 257:2 half 209:20,22 218:6 273:14 274:17 334:17 356:25 Halla 253:23 hand 185:6 242:11,12 243:16 266:14 291:19 300:5 325:18 360:22 handed 281:11 handwritten 278:6 happened 253:14 343:11 happening 296:8 happy 363:6

hard 284:25 285:5 harmless 240:13 288:8 Havasu 236:5,18 239:10 header 216:18,18 headers 270:3 heading 186:18 229:6 261:13 274:11 hear 268:3 298:10 heard 278:5 297:10 325:3 356:24 361:22 hearing 218:24,25 219:18 246:1 260:2 263:2,7 hearings 245:21 263:7 hearsay 255:12 256:14 **HEATHER** 183:15 height 323:17

296:18 299:6,9 308:24 **high** 254:12,13 267:24 269:14,16 330:21 360:16

held 324:25 330:5

help 189:11 330:10

helpful 231:12 287:4

332:7,8

higher 270:15 274:16 321:13 323:4 326:10 326:18,21 346:20 348:4 350:25

highest 325:21 347:9 347:13,18,24 highlight 270:3 285:1 hired 263:12

historic 244:21 273:19 historical 277:8 317:1 history 287:11

HIXSON 183:11

intent 202:9

197:17 224:8 298:4 298:16 299:2 308:25 363:12,15 364:11 hold 288:8 333:22 350:4 holders 268:13 hole 284:9 Honor 185:6 210:1.9 213:15 215:14 223:24 224:4,6 230:16 231:3 240:7 241:15 255:14 256:4,21 265:19 268:6,15,25 274:25 282:10,16 283:3,22 287:4 293:17,22 294:24 295:12 296:4 296:6 298:4,16 299:2 300:4 304:9 314:10 334:12 336:1,8 338:10 339:23 340:4 342:5 343:2 345:17 346:3,6,12 350:5,8 355:23 356:8 357:4 359:9,13 361:17 363:12 364:16 **Honor's** 266:5 294:20 **HONORABLE** 182:3 hope 362:16 hopefully 287:4 hoping 266:2 hostile 292:17 hours 362:14,15,17,18 362:23 363:1,2,3,7,7 363:10,23 364:5,6 household 358:25 housekeeping 295:11 296:7 299:2 huge 283:8 hugs 186:17 Hunt 292:9 Hunt's 292:24 hurt 343:7 hydrology 266:24 320:18 323:10,13,24 358:21 hyperlinks 299:4 **hyphen** 311:2

idea 206:10 283:7 287:7 296:8,13 361:22 Ident 184:10 identified 226:14 304:18 308:6 identify 202:22 203:3 251:20 identifying 214:12

267:6 307:2 II 182:8 184:3,4,4,5,7,7 **IID** 185:19 187:11,13 188:17,20 191:22 234:22 242:17.22 278:7 **impact** 233:11 254:14 316:10 327:7 328:5 331:11,14 349:15,21 350:18 351:9,12 353:8,13 357:14 358:22 **impacts** 358:24 impeachment 248:11 345:19 Imperial 186:1 300:21 302:23 implemental 288:1 implementation 241:25 242:4 291:13 implemented 230:9 245:24 280:3 implementing 279:24 **import** 259:2 important 245:10 247:6 266:17,24 267:7 273:3,21 277:8 327:7 332:8 351:25 351:25 360:15 361:7 363:22 **imported** 267:3 279:14 279:15,16 288:13 **impose** 225:17 266:12 **imposed** 279:10 imposition 287:24 improper 248:11,12 250:8 improperly 222:15 improvement 292:20 improvements 302:3 inaccurately 344:24 inappropriate 250:16 289:8 inappropriately 221:4 incentive 198:10,22 202:10 205:5 288:11 incessantly 293:16 incidental 241:2 include 194:3 208:18 222:9 250:9,16 316:15 343:18 included 209:25 212:10 229:10 242:7 260:23 263:11 264:8 341:2 343:23,24

includes 195:5 204:4

including 206:1 240:25

238:24 239:1

256:15 278:19 291:5 293:8 305:1 343:9 356:25 inclusion 220:13 inclusive 218:13 incomplete 200:22 **incorporate** 294:12,13 increase 196:22 227:16 267.15 323.17 increased 206:23 284:12 increases 267:19 360:25 **increasing** 227:14,15 228:1 **incremental** 193:13,19 193:21 incur 194:5 incurred 264:23 274:4 independent 188:17 223:19 index 184:1,9 319:4,7 319:21 321:14 340:17 341:9,25 359:5 indicate 200:13 212:12 213:11 312:12 indicated 338:19 349:5 indicates 333:15 indication 204:25 indicative 320:6 330:23 indicator 360:19 indirectly 206:22 **individual** 359:23,23 360:2 **inferred** 340:13 **inflate** 289:13 information 200:22 216:13.20.25 217:17 221:9 251:21 252:2 252:11 276:8 317:2 317:14 344:17 **informed** 204:15 infrastructure 271:7 initial 230:22 231:15 initiate 202:9 innovative 203:7 inquiry 282:14,18 insignificant 327:16 inspections 240:25 instance 214:15 320:16 insufficient 245:2 insurance 271:18 **intake** 236:5 integrated 266:17 integrity 201:15 203:25 292:19 intended 202:23 288:9 318:17 319:10 352:17

interactions 193:10 interest 357:17 366:13 interested 293:13 296:11 interesting 276:23 280:23 292:14 **interests** 297:1.16 Interior 187:21 intermingled 192:13 internal 221:19 241:19 241:23 **interpret** 321:16 356:4 interrogatory 208:25 208:25 272:5 338:22 339:2 interrupt 282:10 **Interruption 227:18** intimidated 292:21 introduced 289:24 invest 216:11 invested 271:7 investment 225:15 280:4 investments 187:23 267:6 278:23 280:3 investors 216:9 **invite** 283:1 involve 301:1 involved 190:16 191:15 192:25 214:5,8 221:18 262:8 involves 276:17 302:15 involving 190:3 191:16 IRP 267:25 277:8,18 irrelevant 282:13 Irrigation 302:23 isolate 261:14 305:5 isolating 307:10 issuance 301:12 issue 204:21 210:22 220:21,22,25 226:21 245:10,10 249:22 253:12 259:20 263:3 263:12 264:15,16 265:3 266:9 281:8 290:10 293:9,19 342:10 343:10 345:2 issued 272:23 issues 210:19 216:10 218:3 221:23 222:2 226:14,23 247:6 249:12 262:9 265:9 266:4,7 280:6 288:16 301:11 359:6 item 197:23 204:17 205:4 214:15 276:14

J 182:19 183:17 366:6 366:22 **JACKSON** 183:6 JAN 182:22 **January** 224:22 225:3 227:10 290:14 Jeff 270:2 285:1 **Jeffrey** 202:7 203:23 Joaquin 188:1 **job** 200:8 jobs 242:4 John 183:5 287:17 **Joint** 300:20 301:5 judge 182:3 315:24 July 189:9 204:19 285:23 jump 229:24 241:9 June 203:22 204:16 205:9 216:1 268:13 276:4 286:19 292:11 292:18 jury 343:2

K **KARNOW** 182:3 keep 225:4 231:5 269:20 312:2 keeping 194:9 256:11 **KEKER** 183:3,5 185:6 185:9 233:19 235:15 295:21 296:6 297:12 297:17,20 298:13,17 361:17 362:11.22.25 363:5 364:16 365:1,3 Kevin 292:9 key 279:19 287:23 **Kightlinger** 184:13 202:7 203:23 **kind** 189:5 351:12,19 knew 229:10 264:2.2.8 know 197:1 199:23,25 209:9 214:18,22 233:5 252:14,18,21 253:4,5,9 272:20 275:5 279:10 281:8

363:15 knowledge 196:5 200:16 255:24 256:3 known 291:19 316:8 knows 354:18 Kostopoulos 285:23 286:1,20 KUO 183:15

288:18 294:19 295:2

295:20 297:15 312:20

320:11 341:19 361:24

200:9 201:10,24

<u> </u>
L.A 218:4 267:10,12,15
269:10,11 321:4,20
321:25 330:19 331:14
332:4 339:5 342:23 343:24 347:23 351:21
351:23
labeled 306:12 308:12
308:12 309:18
lack 306:18
LADWP 316:10,11,12
318:19
laid 212:23
lake 211:3,3,3,4,5,5,8,9 236:5,17 239:10
language 232:14,20
233:7
large 203:17 267:6
358:25
larger 361:4
largest 316:8 345:4
347:21
laser 186:11 343:5,6
law 231:20 282:20
lawsuit 222:5 245:18
262:2 291:25
lawyer 356:17
lawyers 248:24 lay 296:15
laying 226:20,23
lays 249:12 250:8 257:7
290:1
lead 280:9 358:7
leading 290:15
leave 339:15
led 214:6,6 286:25
left 185:18 215:23
319:4 325:12,18
legal 235:15 238:5,9
292:25 legislative 292:25
length 186:17
lengthy 220:4
let's 197:5 198:19
210:15 216:17,17
224.2.256.5.260.10
278:10,11 279:4 282:24 284:24 285:8
282:24 284:24 285:8
287:22 293:25 294:25
295:19 299:16 302:16
306:5 309:7 310:8
314:9 315:1 316:19
317:6 319:12 327:22
339:14,23 357:25 letter 184:13,15 202:6
202:18 203:22 204:16
205:4,10 225:25
226:11,13,20 227:1
, , , ,

ER'S TRANSCRIPT OF
227:13 228:4,6,11,13 229:13,20 230:11,14 246:23 247:12,15 248:2,4,20 249:8,12 249:16,23,23 250:5 251:8,13,20 252:10
258:10 259:9 260:6,7 263:24 264:4,6,12,13 264:20,24 287:17 288:22 290:8 292:18 letters 247:5,9 level 278:23 316:11
332:25 levels 271:8 levies 272:21 Levin 249:1,2,8 lifetime 334:20 light 209:14
Lightlinger 184:15 lightly 222:5 limine 355:24 356:8 limit 247:10 limitations 293:12 limited 267:4 363:19
limits 247:11 356:5 line 226:14 231:6 240:8 276:14 319:18 320:5 321:2,3 326:6 327:10 330:19 331:5 343:18 359:7,18 360:22,23
lined 186:13 lines 299:3 323:18,19 330:17 lining 185:22,23,24 186:13,22 187:7,10 187:19,23 188:18,20
191:23 234:23 links 299:8 list 202:22 252:1 256:15 298:15 listed 200:2 202:25 203:7 205:5 348:2
liter 254:22 256:12 literature 349:14,20 litigate 293:5 litigation 209:1 221:12 289:2 291:23 292:8
little 186:9 191:25 225:5 233:6 253:13 265:21 272:10 274:12 274:16 276:18 285:11 297:9 300:23 307:6,6 311:1 321:11,13 336:17 339:15 346:7 365:11
LLP 183:9

local 195:13 196:9,16

196:19,23 197:14,25

```
203:13 205:2,11,19
  206:6,18,25 220:16
  223:10 227:21 278:15
  278:22 280:2.25
  281:15,23 284:4,19
  285:21 307:4,5 313:9
  314:2,20,21
locally 281:16,18
location 186:20,25
long 206:25 219:25
  220:22 228:12 236:15
  239:9 276:5 291:22
long-range 214:10
  221:21
long-term 217:18
  227:24
longer 203:4
longhand 366:11
look 202:21 215:23
  247:19 248:24 252:5
  274:11 288:24 294:8
  298:24 303:13 305:5
  306:5,11 321:18
  323:15,20 326:6
  327:11 331:12 337:18
  342:17 343:19,22,25
  364:8,14,19,22 365:1
  365:1
looked 252:2 270:13
  290:8
looking 202:21 231:13
  233:11,13 284:13
  305:8 313:4 333:10
  345:7,20,25 359:8
  360:24
looks 298:25 319:17
  320:3
los 183:14 215:12
  216:13,22,25 217:10
  217:18 267:16,21
  268:1,5 270:19 316:7
  316:15,16 320:22
  321:19 322:2,25
  323:7,16 324:14,21
  324:23,25 325:2
  326:15,17 327:25
  328:2,5,8,14 329:1,9
  329:14,20,23 330:6,9
  331:1,11,12,20,22,25
  332:4,15 333:4,13
  343:20 346:20 348:5
  351:20 352:1 358:22
  360:3 361:4
lose 234:12 293:23
  320:16
loss 244:22
losses 234:4,6,8,15
```

```
244:5 245:7
lost 356:8
lot 219:16 269:20
  270:19 271:7 281:12
  296:20,20 338:5
  343:11 358:4
lotion 186:21
low 267:24 269:13.17
  360:16
lower 187:14
LRP 203:11 292:16
          M
madame 231:11
maintain 254:21 271:8
  354:13
maintains 211:15
maintenance 240:25
making 208:12 234:18
  293:9
management 220:7
  221:25 222:1 227:21
  286:9,12,24 302:1
manager 202:7 203:23
  203:24 216:4 226:2,5
  273:8 288:24 290:25
  292:9,13,18 301:22
Manager's 302:2
managers 221:20
manipulate 317:4
manner 251:17 321:5
map 283:12 284:8
March 218:24 219:18
  225:15 250:1 260:6
  274:6 278:2,4 290:12
  290:19
mark 284:22 308:21,23
marked 276:10 322:6
market 189:11
markets 229:15
massive 266:13
master's 302:8
material 336:9
math 270:9 273:13
  338:6 349:6,8 350:25
  351:4.5
matter 271:14 295:11
  299:3
Maureen 202:8 203:24
  226:2 292:13
McCUTCHEN 183:9
mean 211:20 231:3
  247:9 258:23 268:25
  282:23 297:6 315:3,4
  319:23 320:4 323:12
  323:24 326:2 337:6
  337:23 338:5 351:8
```

meaningful 293:14

```
means 211:21 234:11
  267:1 279:13 282:24
  298:20,21
meant 295:14
measure 280:24 318:9
  318:22 320:12 323:7
  331:13 353:13
measured 316:20 319:2
  319:5
measuring 273:23
  318:8 319:6,8 351:9
mechanism 192:21
  279:25 280:14
meet 211:23 266:14
  272:23 281:21 348:20
  348:25
meeting 197:22 213:18
  219:2,19 246:12
  253:14,19,20,21
  254:1 290:19
meetings 214:9 245:18
  247:8 259:19,23
  262:7,7
meets 236:16 239:9
member 195:21,23
  196:8 204:22 206:19
  207:21 211:24 215:9
  221:20 222:20 223:15
  231:22 232:8 238:19
  250:21 251:5 262:8
  264:23 272:22 273:18
  288:11 291:12 303:1
  305:1 315:5,8,11,13
  316:5,12,20,21 318:8
  318:20,24 320:6,21
  321:4,7,21,25 323:2
  323:17 324:12,20
  325:1,13 327:1,4,6,13
  328:6,10,12,25 329:5
  329:8,11,17 331:2,9
  331:13,25 332:3,9,16
  332:22,25 333:3
  334:25 335:20 346:13
  347:3,9 348:5 351:10
  355:21 356:11 359:18
  359:23 360:3,6
memo 184:11 197:10
  197:22 198:5 200:2
  225:13 250:5 269:23
  278:6 285:22 286:19
  292:8
memoranda 200:9,12
memos 209:11
mention 249:15 250:6
  268:5 274:18 277:5
mentioned 193:7 233:1
  233:4 265:3 267:25
  269:9 273:4 296:7
```

219,20
318:20 mentioning 284:16
merely 282:18
met 186:24,25 187:11
188:22 190:2 191:20
193:10,19 194:11
200:8 205:17 206:5
208:4 213:4,11
214:19 215:3 219:4 222:20 228:1 236:20
222:20 228:1 236:20 237:24 238:2,3,6,6,15
246:10,12 247:8
259:11 260:13 263:3
263:5,6 266:10,18
268:3 269:19 271:4,6
271:7,11,13 272:14
273:1 274:14 275:11
275:11,12,16 276:10 276:13,24 277:1,9,15
276:13,24 277:1,9,15
277:23 278:2 279:1 279:10 283:24 284:2
285:22 286:2 287:18
287:20 288:19,24
290:12 292:4 293:5,6
309:10 316:4,5
327:13 357:13,14
Met's 188:2,3,19
193:15 195:4 208:12
215:1 219:5 220:1 221:5 222:25 266:12
266:12 267:10,16
268:12 272:2 274:18
274:19 278:8 285:24
286:22 287:18 292:17
316:8
method 307:10
methodology 207:22 metric 280:24
Metropolitan 182:9
183:8,13 187:13,14
187:25 188:5,6,7,7,12
188:14,14,15 189:1,4
189:8,8,13,14,17
190:15,17,17,24
191:2,9,10,12,24
192:7,19,20 193:5,8 193:11,20,23 194:13
194:16,21,23 195:5
195:19,20 196:1,2,2,4
196:5,6,14,21 197:1
197:10,21,24 198:2 198:15 199:6,12,15
198:15 199:6,12,15
199:21 200:12,17
201:1,3,6,20,22 202:22 203:2,3,10
204:15,25 205:6,8,15
206:18 207:1,3,6,13
207:14,22,24,25

```
208:7,8,13,20,24
 209:15,17 210:21
 211:19,21 212:1,5,17
 212:18,21,23 214:9
 214:12,15 215:7,8,25
 216:6,19,19,25
 217:11,14,17,22,24
 218:15 219:2.2.9.16
 219:19 220:4,8,9,18
 220:25 221:7,12,19
 221:20,22,25 222:3
 223:15,18,20 225:2
 225:14 226:1 231:4
 231:21 232:7 235:19
 235:22 236:4,6,9,10
 236:14,17,24,25
 237:1,3,5,7,8,9,18,20
 237:21,25 239:7,10
 241:1 243:6 244:2,17
 245:1 250:20 256:10
 257:15 258:25 259:2
 259:20 260:8,25
 261:10,17 262:7,8,15
 263:8 265:7,8 269:11
 270:23 272:21 276:15
 278:19,21,24 279:13
 279:16 280:1,7,17,24
 281:19,25 282:7
 283:5 286:6 287:7
 288:13 289:10.19
 291:11,14,19 292:10
 306:1 311:8,13,17
 315:13,15 316:25
 317:15,16 330:6
 338:19 347:14 354:13
 363:15 364:11,12
Metropolitan's 187:16
 193:25 194:8 195:2,7
 195:17 196:20 201:14
 202:7 207:9 209:10
 210:18 211:14 214:14
 214:23 216:12 217:7
 218:2 220:13,20
 221:14 222:9,24
 231:19 250:21 251:18
 257:17 260:16 261:7
 262:3 267:19 269:24
 270:6 272:24 279:9
 287:2,9 288:10
 289:15,21,24 291:4
 291:14 303:13 304:22
 305:10 310:9 312:13
 312:16 313:22 314:15
 314:16 315:5,9 316:3
 317:3 325:13 329:24
 330:7 331:24 345:4
 355:18
Mexican 186:17
```

```
microphone 186:9
  299:24 300:23
mid-April 189:10
middle 229:6 269:12
  277:11
miles 186:18
million 191:21,25 206:3
  206:4 207:10 254:13
  254:21 256:11 270:7
  270:8,18 271:1,4
  273:5,14,14 274:14
  274:15 276:20 283:14
  284:9,10,13,14,15,15
  285:5,10,12,16 286:7
  286:9,13,24,25 287:1
  305:14 306:12,25
  307:1
millions 222:12
mind 266:5 288:20
  324:16 335:6 338:9
  342:25
mine 351:15
mingled 192:18
minimis 275:20
minor 295:11 302:7
minus 283:13
minute 283:17 316:18
minutes 223:25 299:14
  363:5 364:5
misallocated 303:22
  354:21
misallocates 220:10,11
misallocation 265:9
misdefined 298:5
Misstates 346:22
mistaken 233:12
mitigate 266:25
mix 254:22
mixed 237:18
model 280:16 285:24
  289:6,10,20,23
modeling 301:2,11,19
  302:11,19
modern 185:25
modification 241:3
modify 204:20
molecules 192:8 236:7
  237:18
moment 213:23 241:14
  291:17 361:11
moments 210:17 341:7
Monday 293:20 295:1
  295:7 363:25
money 197:25 201:21
  206:5 282:4,4 284:2
  285:9 286:2 357:16
```

```
monitoring 200:25
monopoly 279:8,18
  288:13
month 237:6 334:17
months 224:15 229:24
  230:8,10,11
morning 185:1,4,16,17
  224:12,14 243:2,22
  294.2
mouth 332:12
move 188:17 193:25
  197:15 200:3 202:12
  204:2 209:5 234:11
  235:13 295:15 310:8
  312:24 317:25 322:16
  336:1 339:14 343:9
  361:18
moved 190:18,19 231:4
  275:10 342:13 344:11
  345:21,22 354:1,5,8
  354:24 355:16,24
  356:12 357:7
moves 194:25 278:18
moving 188:13 192:19
  193:13 194:7 212:19
  355:7,15
multiple 301:7
multiples 218:5
multiyear 320:9
Municipal 326:22
MWD 203:22 224:21
  228:18,23 230:5
  235:2,5,8,13,25
  236:21 237:14 238:5
  238:9,12,18 239:17
  240:5,5,20,20 243:15
  244:25 250:25 251:4
  252:18 255:25 257:1
  257:1,8,19 285:13
  336:22 338:16 339:6
  346:13 348:20,24
MWD's 234:18 244:12
  247:19 248:24 250:10
  250:17
MWDOC 292:9 326:23
N 185:2 258:2
NACVA 302:13
name 278:5 299:25
  300:1
narrow 266:4
National 302:12 303:5
nature 273:21 279:8
  296:6 320:19 349:7
  355:19
near 229:15 273:16
```

274:3 319:18 320:3

```
nearly 189:8 326:18,21
necessarily 332:24
  351:15
necessary 193:24
need 207:9 267:6,19
 271:21,25 295:23
  297:8,25 362:7 364:7
needed 272:23
needs 189:12 209:17
  211:16,23 217:12
  281:22 331:25
negotiated 190:10
  293:1
neither 249:22 251:14
NEST 183:3
net 281:2 285:16
netted 286:23
never 207:2 236:24
  347:24 349:3,10
  350:17 351:11
new 331:4 339:16
  346:3 351:8,9
nine 230:8 276:24
non-project 274:21
  275:19 276:17,21
non-record 269:3
non-State 276:25
Noon 257:24
norm 331:2
normal 207:22 217:23
  218:7 229:16 267:2
  267:15,18 315:13
  325:1 331:13
north 183:13 253:2
northern 187:2 192:15
 241:24
notably 261:13
note 268:23 278:6
  305:15 323:10 327:25
noted 204:19 319:20
notes 366:10,12
Notice 202:9
November 209:3
  210:17
number 182:4 198:9,20
  198:21 200:4,5
  204:17 209:19,20
  214:8 216:5 225:19
  230:22 231:15 240:24
  252:1 258:17 272:5
  275:3 277:21 280:17
  290:19,21 291:9
  292:3 305:23 308:2
  332:4 335:8 336:5
  338:22 346:8 347:8
  348:4 358:24
numbers 203:1,9
  274:12,24 275:21
```

358:15

monitor 200:17

311:19 317:19,20	198:13,25 200:16	opposing 219:21 300:7	296:20 366:11	356:11
335:15	202:21 204:25 210:23	340:2	pagination 256:24	payers 206:13 222:14
333.13	212:6 215:18 216:12	opposition 220:9,15	paid 191:23 253:7	paying 194:4 233:23
0	216:16,23 217:3	option 198:13,15,19	257:19 282:4 285:13	281:7
O 185:2 258:2	219:22 221:16 228:9	277:19	285:17 302:25	payment 201:3 257:5,6
o'clock 365:12	233:15 256:19,22	options 198:3,10	par 250:12	payments 203:16 206:1
o0o 185:3 257:25 258:3	258:18 259:25 260:10	oral 218:22,24 219:1	paragraph 204:13	251:17 257:7 283:11
365:15	260:20,25 261:5,12	219:17	217:3,13,20 227:4	283:25 285:2,4,10
oath 299:21	261:16 275:9 296:5	Orange 292:10 326:23	239:12,24 243:24	pays 193:11 232:2
object 194:4 199:14	298:3 300:3,5,17	order 266:14,14 275:5	244:16 250:15 251:14	238:14,19 281:12
200:19 213:15 231:3	301:17 305:8,19	278:21 327:19 346:3	257:2 258:16,17,19	351:24
231:6 268:15 297:25	307:2 308:21 309:25	351:12	259:7,8 260:12,12	pdf 299:8
308:25 322:18 350:5	310:8,12 311:7	ought 194:6 296:12,25	261:15 262:21,21	pdfs 299:4
355:23	312:10,16 313:1,21	outcome 289:11 366:13	269:13,15 272:20	peak 215:4 218:2
objected 293:3 345:17	315:21 317:13 318:14	outliers 327:8,17	273:5,6 274:14	273:22,24 315:12
objecting 364:19	319:17 320:24 321:16	outside 337:18	278:12 279:4,21,21	319:8 325:16,20,23
objection 197:17	322:2,24 324:9,18	overall 189:3 308:8	280:12 286:5,8,22,25	326:2,3,4,8,10,12,16
202:14 204:8 206:8	325:5 326:1 328:9,24	overburdened 223:6	287:1,23 288:25	326:17,19,20 327:1,4
210:1 215:14 235:15	329:4 330:8,17 331:4	overburdens 222:15	289:18 290:1 291:8	327:12,15 328:11,12
240:8 248:11 255:12	333:10 336:10 337:8	overcharge 304:5,6	292:14	328:14 329:18 330:19
282:21 294:22 295:21	337:10 340:16 341:24	353:19	paragraphs 199:10	330:24 332:25 333:2
295:22 298:8 318:2,3	344:16 345:10 350:9	overcharges 222:13	274:11 288:5	346:12,18 347:2,3,6
336:3 337:4 338:2	362:10 363:11 365:5	overcome 288:20	Parchman 182:19	347:11,15,17,24,25
346:22 348:6 353:14	once 189:17 233:1	overruled 200:21	183:17 366:6,22	348:3 351:25 361:6
Objection's 322:19	246:18 290:9	206:10 215:15 231:8	Pardon 255:19	peaker 268:1 316:9
objections 220:24	One's 345:3	235:17 255:15 282:21	part 186:13 192:15	peaking 207:20,20
256:14 262:13 282:22	one-year 188:23	294:15,21 322:19	193:7 207:7 213:3,3	208:2,5,7,9,11,14,15
287:12 290:17 293:21	ongoing 289:3	348:7 353:15 356:7	226:8,9 233:8 241:6	208:20 209:15 210:19
294:4,8,15,18,19	oOo 182:5	overruling 282:23	244:16,24 252:25	215:7,9,12 216:14
295:5 297:22 364:17	open 194:10,14 197:3	oversaw 301:24	263:7,13 272:14	217:1,18 218:3
objective 291:14	198:9,16 200:6	oversee 301:9	279:19 292:14,23	220:21 221:1,2 245:9
objectives 291:16	294:18	Owens 267:14,18	293:21 297:10,10	247:13 248:5,8,20
objects 287:24	opened 233:10		304:22 305:16 308:14	249:15 260:23 261:2
obligation 238:5,9	opening 185:9 266:11	P	339:10 340:23 341:2	261:18,23,25 262:4
obligations 234:19	266:18 268:11 269:8	P 185:2 258:2	342:3 348:17 350:13	262:14,17,23 263:3
obscure 359:22	273:20 335:12	package 246:10	362:3	263:12 264:14 266:10
obtained 317:2	openings 274:22	packet 246:15	participate 201:25	266:11 271:9,12,14
obvious 323:3	operational 316:3	page 184:2 198:20	205:2,18	271:18 272:5,25
obviously 280:16	operations 229:17	203:6 204:14 205:4	participated 220:6	273:2 274:2 290:10
291:24 299:9 304:10	opine 356:16,18	210:24,24 212:6,7,22	particular 256:25	298:13,20,20 315:2,2
345:18	opining 355:10	212:22,24 213:2	258:19 281:5 318:4	315:4,8,12,16,19
occur 358:4	opinion 250:9 315:7,10	215:24 216:16,23,24	339:11 351:21	316:1,5,10,12,20
occurred 245:22	315:15,19 316:1	227:3 229:6 230:13	parties 215:18 222:18	317:5 318:8,10,17,19
October 230:6	321:23 336:18 337:13	239:12,24 242:2,9	223:21 265:23 266:5	319:3,6,21 321:24
odds 294:4	338:1 339:10,18	243:3,10,10,11	269:2 273:20 293:19	323:1 324:13,21
offer 303:10 344:5	340:17,24 341:21,23	247:10,11 254:10,18	296:11,12,21 313:4	325:6 327:11 328:8
352:17	344:5 348:17 349:2	256:24 257:3 258:15	parts 263:13	328:25 329:1,5,7,9,12
offered 255:13,18,20	350:13,20 352:13	260:5,11 261:13	party 188:13 189:13,17	329:14,20,25 331:9
255:23	353:6 354:22 355:5	268:14 269:5,22	222:21 275:19 287:25	333:13 336:18,23
offering 215:12 338:1	356:13,23 357:22	270:1,16 272:15,16	Pass 223:13 263:17	338:17 339:5,7 341:7
354:22	358:11 360:2	272:17 274:9,9	334:7	342:16,23 344:24
offers 292:22	opinions 303:10 340:10	277:11,11 278:3,11	pause 305:15	347:24 349:4,5,6,11
Office 302:2	340:14 352:17,20	279:20,22 280:14	pay 192:4 193:3,5,13	350:19,24 351:1
officer 300:19	opportunity 291:3	284:24 285:8,10	194:6,22 195:8,12	352:12,18 358:21,23
official 215:11,20 216:3	296:24	287:22 288:25 289:16	205:22,25 208:16	360:19 365:1
216:5,7,8,12 268:12	oppose 218:17 219:12	290:20,21,22 291:7	238:22 252:20,25	peaks 268:3 273:23
Oh 299:8 341:11	opposed 242:16 291:2	346:10,14 350:6 pages 182:9 290:23	253:3 257:14 271:24	323:6,8 348:20,25
okay 191:5 196:13	291:8	pages 102.7 270.23	351:21 352:1 355:21	361:5
•	-	-		-

pejoratively 351:8
penalty 283:8 pendency 287:14
pending 194:10 201:19
201:20 203:4 205:5
people 233:9 252:2
282:25 283:12 284:7
282:25 283:12 284:7 285:24 351:5,6
358:14
perceived 280:6
percent 195:5,15 199:3
199:5,6,8 217:11,12
217:21 220:16 223:9
237:11 273:13 274:16
275:12,13,20 276:21 289:21 311:3 319:22
319:24 326:10,18,21
326:21 327:12 330:24
350:25,25
percentage 274:16
perception 280:9
Perfect 270:5
perfectly 292:7
perform 303:12 312:6 328:17 332:20 333:6
328:17 332:20 333:6
performed 317:10 349:3,10
period 191:19,22 217:8
217:15,25 220:23
221:14 246:21 265:6
291:25 318:21,23,25
319:3,9,11,22 320:17
323:9,15 325:20,22 330:20,21,22 331:16
330:20,21,22 331:16
335:1,23 342:20
345:2 347:6,17,20
363:18
periods 346:19
Perris 211:3,4,5,9 212:10,25
persistent 287:12
personally 338:18
366:8
phase 231:6
phases 287:13
phrase 323:12
picking 320:10
picture 296:8 342:16
piece 342:15
pieces 324:20
pipeline 192:24 pipelines 188:8,9
place 201:16 235:1,6,9
259:10 260:14 262:22
276:7 306:17
placed 357:16
Placer 191:7,8 192:2,2
192:5,9 193:4,8 243:6

```
243:8,21 256:18
places 321:19 356:25
plainly 250:22 266:21
plaintiff 182:7 183:2
  233:18 299:20 364:4
Plaintiff's 197:15 230:2
  317:25 335:9 343:4
plaintiffs 335:5
plan 214:10 221:21
  266:17 291:5,6
  292:20 294:20
planned 293:4
planning 197:11
  265:23 285:24 350:15
Plant 192:14 257:16
play 248:9,14,17 255:9
  350:3
played 255:17 256:6
  350:11
playing 278:23 350:7
please 186:10 198:6,14
  202:4 217:4 228:22
  242:2 243:25 258:13
  259:7 260:11 261:4
  261:12 262:20 299:23
  307:21 313:17 315:24
  318:12 320:24 322:5
  325:8 328:23 340:5
  345:8 360:9
plenty 362:12
point 186:16 229:9
  256:13 266:16 271:15
  271:16,17 273:15
  276:6 277:22 279:7
  279:18 283:2 287:10
  289:24 291:18 296:3
  320:15 323:3,6
  343:13 345:23 348:21
  360:15
pointed 271:13 336:22
pointer 186:11 343:3,5
  343:6
points 233:17 321:11
  321:12
policy 197:13 288:15
portion 212:24 213:5
  255:9 272:22 273:9
  324:1 342:23 355:16
portions 301:1,4
position 272:2 296:21
  297:15
positions 246:24
  296:16
possible 266:25
post-trial 296:17
potential 216:10
```

269:16 273:8,10

274:13 289:13

```
potentially 278:8
power 193:24 215:13
  218:5,11 223:3,7
  229:3,7,10,11,13,18
  229:21 232:4,10
  257:15 258:24 259:1
  259:16 260:2,16
  264:7,8,9 303:15
  305:7 306:1,3,22
  307:1 308:1,7 310:9
  310:11,17,19 313:23
  314:17 316:8
PowerPoint 254:5,6,18
Powers 300:20 301:6
practical 192:22
practice 207:21 251:18
practices 287:9
preclude 289:14
predetermine 289:10
prejudice 362:8
preliminary 278:1
prepared 200:9 272:14
  276:9 278:3 361:19
  362:9,19
present 265:21,23
  342:22 363:17,22
  366:8
presentation 210:18,22
  212:16,18 253:21
  254:1,5,6,10,19 255:4
  266:3 268:16 269:4
presentations 245:17
  253:18 255:7
presented 197:23
  268:16,19 291:10
  295:16 341:7 353:18
presenting 246:11
  350:21 356:6
presently 300:14
president 226:1
PRESIDING 182:3
press 297:9
pretrial 299:4 364:9
pretty 266:21 274:7,11
  277:8 281:4 287:13
  288:3 296:18 341:20
prevailed 363:19
prevent 279:2 355:25
prevents 320:13
previous 269:6 270:11
  309:17 340:12
previously 291:10
  301:5 308:6,13
  309:16 323:25 328:4
price 188:5 230:18,20
  230:22,24,25 231:2
  231:14,17,18 232:2
  232:22 244:14 257:3
```

```
302:22,25
prices 229:16
pricing 288:10
primarily 222:24
prior 205:7 289:2
  301:17,20,25 343:21
priorities 187:15
priority 187:13,15,16
  187:16 198:21
probability 199:2
probably 206:3 296:18
  296:24 365:9
problem 224:9 253:22
  324:17 338:4
problems 289:5 301:8
Procedure 197:13
procedures 244:21
proceed 198:18
proceedings 182:13
  294:10 365:14 366:9
  366:10,13
process 202:9,19 214:4
  214:11 221:19,21,22
  259:24 288:17 290:15
  303:4
processes 214:10 220:7
  265:7
produce 237:5
produced 196:16 201:2
  201:4 218:23 284:18
  304:24 328:19
producing 196:18
production 227:14
professional 251:15
  303:1
profile 315:12 316:5,11
  317:5 318:19 321:10
  324:13,13,21 325:6
  328:6 331:9
program 196:17
  197:14 198:1,9 200:1
  201:2,10,12,24
  203:13 205:3,11
  206:6,18 227:23
  253:24 280:20 281:14
  283:12 285:15 300:18
  300:20 301:6 302:3
programs 195:9,10,11
  195:11,15 200:10,10
  200:14,18 202:1,22
  202:23 203:3,12,12
  204:23 205:3,12,18
  205:20 206:6,7,19
  207:11 227:16,22
  280:8,25 282:5 284:5
  284:5,20 285:21
  286:4
project 186:13 187:8
```

188:4,16 190:3,7 191:1,11,11,17 192:15 193:12,16 194:3 196:16 201:2 211:1,6,9,11 212:2 220:1,5,11 223:8 229:11 235:25 236:11 236:22 237:2.10.25 238:13,19,23 239:6 241:1 243:17 246:24 250:9,16,20 251:1,7 251:16,21 252:11,14 253:6 254:23 256:1 257:2,9 259:4,12,15 260:1,15 264:9 274:19,21 275:10,14 275:15,18,22,24 276:14,15,16,20,25 277:1,20 289:19,19 303:14 304:12,19 305:5,11,17,21,25 306:4,15,21 309:19 310:16 313:8 314:1 314:20 352:14 354:1 **Project's 253:10** projection 277:17 357:13 **projects** 195:9 198:17 204:23 277:14 281:10 281:11 284:4 **promise** 314:10 promised 364:3 **promptly** 244:25 **Prop** 281:5 282:11,13 282:14,18,19 283:7 proper 262:11 properly 280:3 property 253:8 proportionality 282:18 282:19 proportionate 208:8 proportionately 207:15 proposal 214:19 242:16 278:2 290:20 proposals 262:10 proposed 226:15 279:24 287:18 288:14 291:5,9 294:6 propriety 355:6,11 protectionist 288:7 protective 363:20 provide 195:22 196:9 202:24 222:20 224:6 235:25 236:4,15 237:1,10,25 238:5,10 238:18 239:8,17 240:6,21 277:20

278:15 287:11 339:23

241.22
341:23 provided 187:19 201:6
218:23 219:17 237:7
239:10 283:23,24
286:17 300:6 312:8
316:4 335:16 340:2
provides 195:19 196:14
201:3 211:18 229:14 236:7,11,20,21
237:14 238:4 255:25
267:1,8 277:21
280:13
providing 237:12
259:19 267:12 283:6
283:8 286:3 340:13
361:25 provision 201:15,17
221:12 230:18 234:15
235:12 237:3,24
238:2 239:16,25
240:19,23 257:4,5,6
provisions 203:25
PTX 186:10 197:7,7,9 197:15,19,22 202:3,5
202:12,16 203:2,19
203:21 215:19 261:4
261:5,16 268:9
270:14,22 275:22
276:3 277:25 278:6
282:5,8 284:20
285:22 286:18 287:11
288:22 290:7 292:1,6 308:15,16 312:22
317:7,9,22 322:6,10
322:13,16,24 345:16
public 191:1 216:9
218:24,25 219:18
245:21 247:23 263:7
302:6,8,9 303:2 published 276:4
pull 186:10 242:2
258:13 261:4 262:19
304:15 307:21 312:10
313:17 314:9 315:22
318:12 320:24 322:5
325:8 328:23 330:12
pumping 192:14 229:17 257:16
puppets 343:8
Purcell 183:5 265:19
266:1 268:19,25
275:4,9 282:16 283:5
283:21 284:4 285:7
291:18 294:20 295:6
295:22 297:2 300:5 purchase 188:12 192:4
207:1 217:21 237:1
279:14 345:1

purchased 192:9 271:18,20 319:12,21 347:13 purchaser 345:4 347:22 purchases 217:24 218:4 264:22 273:19 315:6 321:11 334:25 335:20 351:20,23 358:10 purchasing 188:9 320:7 purports 232:15,21 **purpose** 216:7,8 274:23 278:25 288:20 **purposes** 269:3 281:5 294:17 306:20 315:14 pursuant 204:15 231:19 257:19 pursuing 292:25 purveyor 279:15 put 200:1 210:15 246:10 247:5 249:19 267:1 274:22,22 286:15,15 298:6 299:4 304:2 332:11 336:11 344:16 345:15 354:5 358:24 362:7,7 **putting** 188:19 214:17 220:9 298:9 359:6

0

OSA 293:1 quality 199:7 236:3,16 236:16 239:9 quantifiable 330:9 quantified 215:12 216:15 267:20 281:21 333.12 quantifies 267:11 quantify 329:23 quantifying 349:15,21 quantity 236:3 239:9 question 199:19 200:21 201:23 209:14 214:2 214:4 215:6 228:21 231:11 232:17 235:3 238:17 239:2 240:17 252:7 266:10 281:6 290:4 293:15 297:8 324:18,19 327:3 330:11 332:21 338:4 340:13 346:25 348:8 348:10,23 349:9 355:4,10 358:1 questioning 231:7 240:8

questions 185:13 192:1

233:25 255:3 257:21 258:10,19 260:21,21 266:4 341:19 352:11 356:1,4 358:3 361:9 quick 256:13 quickly 274:7 quite 214:8 216:5 219:15 269:14 326:9 328.20 **quote** 358:18

R

R 185:2 258:2 **raining** 337:18 raise 259:14,25 261:1 262:2 293:18 raised 220:25 264:15 287:6 raises 288:16 raising 220:22 259:3,10 261:17,21 **ramping** 270:10 range 303:20 rate 188:2 189:14,20 189:22 191:3 193:3,5 193:6,20,24,24 194:22,24 195:2,3,4,6 195:6,8,16,17,24 196:7 201:14 203:25 205:23 206:13 207:7 207:8,15,15,16 208:12 209:8,10,16 212:15,21 214:11,14 214:17,23 218:10,11 218:11 220:14,18,20 221:21 222:14,16 223:2,3,3,7,7,11 224:19,22 227:1,2,6 227:17 228:2,5,17,24 229:3,7,10,13,14,19 229:21,25 231:24 232:4,4,5,6,10,10,10 247:2,7 250:6 252:18 252:21 257:12,13 258:20,24 259:16,21 259:22 260:2,2,16 261:8 262:9 263:2,8 263:11,25 264:7,8,17 264:19 271:16 272:6 272:6,9,14 277:5,10 277:13,24 278:1,13 278:17,25 281:7,8,8,8 281:13 283:11 284:1 284:6,19 285:3,4,13 285:19,20 286:3,7,13 286:16,23 287:14,15 287:19,21 288:19,19

291:2,4,5,9 292:19 293:4,10 301:11 303:15,15,16 304:22 305:6,7,22 306:2,3,6 306:8,13,17,22,22,23 306:25 307:1,3,9 308:1,4,7,8,8,9 309:8 309:8,9,10,11,12,15 309:20,21,24,25 310:1,4,5,6,9,11,17 310:18,19,19,24,24 311:2,3,17,19,20,23 311:23 312:18 313:10 313:11,22,23,23,24 313:25 314:3,5,17,17 314:18,22 342:10 343:10,16 351:17,18 352:14 353:20,21 354:2,2,16,16,17,18 354:21 355:8,17,17 356:12,21,21 rates 188:3 189:15 196:22 206:1 208:17 208:18,21 209:24,25 212:12 218:8,8,14,18 219:3,5,7,9,12,21,23 220:2,5,6,10,10,12,14 221:4,7,14,24 222:9 222:24,25 225:2,16 226:15,21,23 227:8,9 227:10 228:18,20,24 230:8 232:9,9 233:11 233:14,23 245:22 246:2,12,20,25 247:3 247:7,19,23 248:24 249:9,13,19,21 250:10,17 252:25 253:6 259:12 260:18 260:19 261:1,23 262:9,12 265:2 271:17,23,24 272:3 277:24 279:10 281:24 287:3 290:20 293:11 297:12 301:21,24 303:13 304:13,20,24 306:23 307:25 308:17 311:4,8,9,13,14 312:13,14,17 313:8 313:14,14 314:16 315:9,16 336:24 338:17,23 339:8 351:22 352:9 354:3 354:14 355:6,12 356:25 **rating** 351:1 ratio 350:22 reconciliation 201:4,5 ratios 350:23 351:5,6 record 210:10,14

raw 184:17 317:9

Razak 253:23 254:9 255:3 Razak's 254:10 read 199:18,19 228:6,8 228:10 231:11 240:2 251:7,10 284:22,25 285:5 315:24 readiness 198:18 Readiness-to-Serve 271:11 272:18 274:10 352:4 reading 200:12 295:25 299:6 315:23 ready 185:13 271:21 350:10 real 280:6 324:3 reallocation 352:13 really 222:22 274:1,23 275:20 276:6 279:7 279:11,19 281:6 284:22 285:19 287:8 287:12 290:1 297:19 302:15 303:25 311:11 323:4 364:20 **REALTIME** 182:20 reason 276:1 284:16 reasonable 354:19 reasonably 245:1 330:4 reasons 221:17 223:4 248:16 250:8.15 291:9 358:5 recall 233:2 241:8 248:6 253:15,20 254:5,9 255:5,6 258:9 258:18,22 260:21 331:7 334:17 335:15 336:19,24 339:20 340:17,22 341:25 342:2 receipts 270:23 286:12 receive 196:8 201:9 received 205:10 206:5 206:12,15 236:6 252:10 284:19 285:15 receives 324:24 receiving 189:3 201:11 recess 223:22 257:24 299:11 334:9 recognize 225:10,22 243:4,12 246:7 249:4 recommendation 261:7 recommended 209:4 210:25 214:17 225:16 recommending 212:17 212:19 213:4 273:9

213:16 219:21 241:12

289:6 290:12,16

260:5 263:14 264:25
265:22 266:19 267:9
267:13 268:10,17,17
268:20,22 269:1,3,21
260:22 272:9 16
269:22 272:8,16 274:8 277:10 282:12
274:8 277:10 282:12
282:24 284:21,21
290:18 291:17 294:16
295:23,25 296:2,16
296:20 311:11 312:21
312:25 345:6 355:24
256.22 250.15 261.24
356:22 359:15 361:24
362:3
recorded 255:7
recording 255:10
records 290:18
recover 208:9 209:12
212:1 253:10 271:12
271:15 272:22 273:7
273:9 274:3,15
recovered 195:8 209:18
209:19 212:13,15
220:20 278:16
recovering 208:14,16
209:21,23 221:1,3
261:22 273:12,13
recovers 209:12,15
315:15 336:23 338:16
339:7
recovery 195:10
recross 263:18
Recross-Examination
184:5 263:21
recycled 227:14
recycling 195:10
203:14
redirect 184:4 258:4,5
290:7 361:10
redistributes 195:21
reduce 278:8 280:5
307:13
reducing 267:15
refer 207:20 237:22
251:12 306:9
231.12 300.9
0 011015
reference 211:2,17
244:6 252:9 260:23
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2 refers 207:21 211:13
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2 refers 207:21 211:13 232:6 244:12 245:6,7
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2 refers 207:21 211:13 232:6 244:12 245:6,7 refinement 214:11
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2 refers 207:21 211:13 232:6 244:12 245:6,7
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2 refers 207:21 211:13 232:6 244:12 245:6,7 refinement 214:11 reflect 317:20
244:6 252:9 260:23 referenced 308:13 referred 185:21 232:18 338:20 referring 187:5 210:16 210:20 215:21 216:24 217:5 237:23 341:13 342:21 362:2 refers 207:21 211:13 232:6 244:12 245:6,7 refinement 214:11

```
231:17 265:10 319:15
  335:3,23 341:4
  346:11
reflecting 347:3 349:19
reflection 361:20
reflective 313:18
  330:15
reflects 344:23.24
  345.1
refused 201:18
regard 339:18 340:10
  353:6
regarding 203:24,25
  243:16 246:2 256:18
  257:1 261:7 344:5
  352:13
regardless 233:11
regards 282:11
region 232:19
region's 227:24
regional 199:4,6,10,12
  201:7 278:22 281:20
  285:15
regionally 280:4
regular 245:17
regulate 266:24
regulation 231:20
relate 208:12
related 210:19 302:24
  309:19
relates 266:10
relating 215:6 242:4
  302:11 303:2
relation 353:16
relationship 277:16
  280:1 288:1
relative 321:14
relatively 254:12
relevant 256:3 274:9
  305:18 350:15 360:12
  360:21
reliability 187:10,21
reliable 187:12,24
reliance 267:16,16
relied 317:21 353:1
relooking 248:6
rely 207:22
relving 210:7 277:2
remaining 310:17
remains 190:22
remedies 292:25
remember 224:15
  234:23 269:5 303:7
  334:22 335:1,16
  339:17,19 350:1
  353:2
```

reminded 256:14

remove 288:10

```
removed 303:15 307:1
  308:8 309:18 311:4
  314:1,20 316:7,16
  354:3,6
removing 309:20
repair 240:25
repeat 214:1 228:21
  235:3 238:17 240:16
  324:18 349:18
rephrase 337:9 346:24
replace 186:2
report 207:8,14 209:10
  209:14 247:15 248:1
  248:21,22 249:23
  263:12,13,14 272:13
  272:17 274:6 276:3
  278:1 304:24,25
  307:17 334:21 339:19
  340:11,23 341:3,5,8
  344:18 345:11,16
  349:12,16,20 351:7
  352:4,21 353:2
  357:13,15
Reported 182:18
  183:17
reporter 182:20 227:18
  231:11 300:24 366:7
Reporter's 182:13
reports 218:23 237:5
  272:8 275:24
represent 319:19
  325:21 330:18 353:10
representation 213:17
  318:16 358:19
representative 344:6,7
represented 319:14
  321:1 363:17
represents 283:20
  318:15 321:3 331:6
  331:11,22
request 280:21 288:11
  362:4
requested 244:1 363:16
requesting 287:25
requests 205:2
require 231:24 267:5
requirement 221:21
  282:20 305:12 306:3
  306:17 307:8 309:19
  309:21 354:14
requirements 217:10
  283:7 305:3,10,16
  306:7,8,11,14 307:17
  308:7 309:17
requires 237:24
requiring 227:16
  235:13
reserve 324:25 330:5
```

```
332:7,8 364:21
reserved 293:4
reservoir 211:8,10
  212:10
reservoirs 209:6 211:6
  211:15,23 212:25
  213:9
resolution 287:19
  288:15 297:11
resolutions 225:17
resolve 293:5.6
resource 200:10 201:10
  203:13 205:2,11,19
  206:6,18 227:21
  280:4,25 284:4,20
  285:21 301:8
resources 188:11
  197:14 198:1 201:24
  243:7 244:4 251:2
  266:17,22 278:16,22
resourcing 280:2
respect 208:5 228:19
  279:14 293:10 295:5
  301:18 364:16 365:5
respectively 190:13
respond 363:13
responded 214:19
response 208:25 261:6
responses 280:21
  338:22 339:2 361:18
rest 209:24 362:9
resting 361:18
result 241:2 288:9
resulting 313:10 314:3
  314:5 350:19
results 222:12 320:13
  328:20,21,24
retail 279:14
retooled 203:16
returned 229:15
revenue 286:8 305:2,10
  305:12,16 306:3,16
  307:8,17 308:6
  309:16,18,21 354:14
revenues 195:8 208:6,9
  208:16 209:24 355:16
review 200:8 214:6
  233:2 305:22 349:14
  349:20 362:6
reviewed 216:5 251:21
  251:24 288:18
rich 220:3
rid 327:8
right 194:18 224:16,19
  224:23 225:1,20
  227:12 230:6,21
  232:16 234:13 235:6
  235:10 240:6,13
```

241:17 242:17,20 243:3,10 244:7,10,14 245:7,13,23 246:3,21 246:25 247:3,7,10 248:2 249:10.13.16 250:17 251:2 252:3 253:7,19,24 254:16 255:1.7 256:5 257:9 263:20,25 264:2,9,20 275:1,7 277:2 287:9 287:19 291:18,23 293:23 295:4 300:11 305:9 306:6 307:22 314:12 315:23 320:3 320:20 321:1 322:8 322:11 324:6 328:7 332:10 335:20 337:13 339:25 341:22 342:1 343:12 344:12 345:2 345:13 347:7,12,18 347:20,25 350:15 351:22 353:7,13 354:2,9,16,25 355:7 355:13,22 358:5,15 359:11,14,19,24 361:2 362:24 364:22 **right-hand** 203:1,9 **rights** 293:4 risks 216:9 **River** 186:15 187:6.13 187:14,15,16,18 190:2 191:24 232:16 232:19,22 235:14 236:12,23 237:2 238:20 253:24 254:2 254:11,23 256:2 300:18 301:6 Rodrigo 278:7 role 216:3 300:17 301:1 roles 301:4 roll 207:23 267:10,10 **rolling** 273:18 Ron 225:25 288:23 roughly 331:16 334:25 347:7 row 310:8,23 **RSI** 202:19 **RTS** 209:11,11,18,20 209:23,23 212:15,20 272:3,21 273:7,9,12 273:15,17 274:1,15 rule 210:2 294:9,13 361:23 365:8 ruled 293:22 **ruling** 294:1 run 291:21 350:13 364:1

running 293:12 317:1

runoff 267:14,18
rushing 293:22

S

s 183:11 185:2 258:2 267:10 342:23 343:24 sale 190:10 sales 269:11 270:23,24 270:25 271:6 286:6

307:16 309:22 316:22 319:6,9 320:4 323:1 325:16,16,17,21 326:4,5,8,10,11,12,13 327:8,14,15,20,22 335:19,23,25 346:13 346:18 347:2,3,6,10 347:11,15,17,21 348:3,4,22 349:15,21

358:25 360:19 **salinity** 253:13 254:2 254:11,12,12,13,19 254:21,22

San 182:2,6,24 183:4 183:10 185:20 186:6 186:23,24 187:2,2,25 188:3,21 189:5,14,16 189:24 190:1,6

189:24 190:1,6 191:13,20,23 192:4,8 194:2,4,10,22 195:3 202:24 203:11 205:1

205:10,17,18,22,25 206:5,15,17,20 208:4 208:12 214:25 215:3

216:4 218:8,17 219:4 219:11,11,22,25 220:22 221:10,17

222:4,8,11,20,25 229:9 230:5 232:2,15 232:21 234:25 235:4

235:9,21,21 236:1,12 237:15,17 238:14 239:6 240:24 242:3

243:16,19 244:1,25 245:10,12,15 246:1 246:23 247:18 248:23

249:18,20 253:16,23 254:20 255:10,24

256:1 257:1,8,14,18 258:23 259:3,10,14 259:25 260:14 261:1

259:25 260:14 261:1 261:9,17,20 262:1,2 262:16,22 263:1

264:2,8 265:3 268:2 277:22 278:7 282:8

283:13,23 284:9,12 287:8 288:5,21,23

289:4,18 290:1,16,25

291:2,2 292:13 293:3

293:8,15 299:17 300:15 301:21 302:1 302:22 318:18 319:12 319:17 320:6,22 321:4,6,12,15,17,21 321:24 323:2,16 326:19,20 327:11,17 345:4 346:18 347:7 347:18,21 348:3 355:2 357:6,14 361:2 361:3 363:17,19 364:10 366:3

SAR 212:20 **satisfy** 271:5 **saved** 186:4,6

saw 268:4 269:6 309:17 331:8 341:7 346:3 353:17 360:1

saying 212:24 273:7 278:14 280:7 304:1,4 341:11 353:9 354:22 354:24 356:24

says 205:5 210:8 211:18 212:14 226:13 227:13 228:4 229:13 229:20 240:23 244:1 251:13 252:10 254:20

257:12,14 258:24 266:20,21 267:20 272:5 273:17 277:15

280:12 281:19 286:5 291:20 306:7 336:8 scale 196:15,17,25

197:3 198:9 200:6 **schedule** 198:22 241:3

297:7 333:7 363:2 scope 240:9

screen 284:23 305:13 322:11

Scroll 286:11 SDCWA 292:24

se 353:7

sea 195:11 202:1 203:8 205:20 227:22

seated 299:23

second 198:19 211:17 211:18 212:14 213:7 213:7 217:3 240:23 244:24 250:12,12,14 250:15 260:11 12

250:15 260:11,12 261:13 271:10 273:15 279:20 280:23 286:5

286:22 291:8 308:3 324:10,11,19 335:6 346:9 364:9

Secondly 209:2 secret 293:3 Secretary 187:20 section 216:21 238:2 241:4 272:17 277:12 277:17 292:15 see 224:12 225:20

226:13,18 227:4 228:7,14 229:6,22 239:14 244:16,17 245:4 250:2,22

257:22 267:14 269:12 269:16 270:2,3,6,24 272:17 273:4 274:3,8

274:10 278:3 281:1 283:12,15 284:3,7

289:16 290:21 295:4 296:1 297:1 299:14 305:23 306:12 318:18

319:4 321:19,20 322:8 323:6,17 324:2

325:17 327:23 330:19 334:15,16 335:10 341:11 346:12 347:2

347:4,8 360:10,23 361:1 363:4 364:15

365:12

seeing 312:22 seek 189:16 312:24

seeking 336:11 seen 207:8 236:24

239:25 241:20 264:15 265:11,12 269:7 292:1 295:3 298:11

350:17,22 351:2,5,11 351:14

seeping 186:4 selection 198:22,23,25

199:2,13 320:13 323:25 342:19 343:15 **sellers** 278:24

sells 196:1 **Semitropic** 190:20

194:19 sense 297:5 298:18 sensitive 365:2.3

sent 202:18 251:8 263:24

sentence 240:23 244:18 250:13,14 251:13

sentences 217:20 separate 191:8 223:19 236:25 237:19,23

298:18 **separately** 259:1

284:22 **September** 288:22

289:1 serious 222:6

seriously 235:18 **serve** 189:12 341:22

served 190:17 302:21 **service** 187:2 188:13

190:18 194:7,17 195:18 213:14 214:6 218:22 223:19 236:4

238:15 242:11 259:2 272:22 281:16,18

286:17 289:24 304:23 304:25 307:16 308:6 309:23 355:18

services 182:23 222:21 242:11 286:4 303:21

session 185:1 258:1 296:23

set 185:7 198:22 218:14 219:7 231:19 273:7 274:14 277:10 287:14 288:19 293:11 324:5

330:5 setting 209:10 226:15

272:9,14 shadow 343:8 Shane 278:4,4 share 213:8

shed 209:14 shift 289:9

shifted 289:17 **shifting** 288:25 289:5

short 266:25 287:19,23 363:23,24

shortage 188:25 189:7 189:9

shortages 189:12 **shorter** 363:18 **shorthand** 366:7,9 **show** 237:5 255:24

266:13 272:8,11 276:23 277:25 282:2 284:11 292:7 304:11

332:23 335:18 360:6 **showed** 185:7,10 258:25 290:6

showing 308:20 **shown** 203:9 276:10

shows 209:17 268:8 275:2,9 276:8,13 277:9 279:18 280:16 283:10 285:19 298:2 307:18 315:18 318:17

335:19 360:5 **shut** 240:20 **shy** 270:7

282:17

sic 333:18 side 186:17 299:10 325:12 362:22 363:7

sides 233:10 295:7 298:10 significance 271:9 327:6 significant 289:5 297:21 342:15,22

significantly 343:19 signify 319:19 silent 247:12 248:5,8

248:20 similar 203:6 220:24 242:17,21 251:17

274:11 284:11 312:6 320:20 321:24 328:20 351:14

similarly 283:6 simply 187:19 267:1 306:14 325:19 326:4 326:9 355:14

single 276:12 325:21 330:21 347:13

sir 185:5 228:8 239:14 265:17

sit 228:6 287:5 293:18 site 255:10 316:3 317:3 317:17

situated 283:6 situation 260:14 268:7 six 270:7 277:3

size 196:13 sizes 348:20,24

slash 288:3 slice 342:22

slicing 343:21 **slide** 184:19 274:22 275:2,3 276:19

> 303:23 304:11 305:8 305:17 307:18,23,24 309:17 312:10 315:18 318:11,12,16 320:23 321:2 324:12,16

325:5,9 328:21 329:17 331:3,4,8,15 332:3 333:9 335:18 336:1,4,6 345:3

360:15 **slides** 185:7 330:10 **sliding** 196:15,17,24 197:3 198:9 200:6

slightly 337:9 346:2 **slope** 360:16,23,24 361:1,3,4

slopes 360:21 slowly 325:10 small 192:12 smaller 342:17 343:19

smaner 342.17 343 smooths 273:22 sold 270:22 278:21

sole 236:14 239:7 **solely** 250:22

solve 328:5
solving 316:9 331:10
somebody 295:25
solitebouy 293.23
343:7 350:17
somewhat 357:22
soon 321:20 350:7
sorry 208:3 214:1
226:7 227:12 228:21
230:16 231:10 235:3
238:17 240:16 245:14
253-21 255-21 258-17
253:21 255:21 258:17 263:10 275:4 282:10
203.10 2/3.4 282.10
283:21 309:6 323:21
324:10,15 336:7,8,10
338:13 362:21 364:12
sort 199:11 202:21
210:6 232:18 261:13
281:4,22 287:7 288:7
289:17 295:9 296:22
302:2 309:16 311:1
317:1 319:18 320:2
317:1 319:18 320:2
326:25 331:7 337:20
348:16,23 349:23
sorts 245:18 282:22
298:12
sought 231:4
Sounds 223:24
source 279:17 308:16
336:9
sources 236:8 239:8
317:21
Southern 182:9 183:13
211:6 266:22,23
spans 328:18
speak 300:22,23
speaking 282:22
speaking 202.22
speaks 281:3 283:6
special 208:25
specific 198:23 200:9
200:13,18 201:19
202:23 212:12 218:12
230:22 231:24 244:6
251:20 266:7 292:3,4
293:8 355:10
specifically 217:5
225.24.220.5.244.12
235:24 239:5 244:12
245:6,7 258:15
260:14 261:20 262:21
264:21 267:11 273:1
307:25
specificity 288:6
289:16
289:16 specifics 297:24
289:16 specifics 297:24 specify 232:8
289:16 specifics 297:24 specify 232:8 speculation 199:15
289:16 specifics 297:24 specify 232:8
289:16 specifics 297:24 specify 232:8 speculation 199:15 200:20 206:9
289:16 specifics 297:24 specify 232:8 speculation 199:15

```
spend 207:9
spending 233:7
spike 323:19
spiking 360:10
spill 244:22
spirit 356:6
split 362:18 363:6
spoke 256:18
spread 272:6 287:2
spreading 309:22
spur 186:19
ss 366:2
stability 227:24 278:25
  288:19
stack 365:7
staff 197:11 210:21
  212:17,18,23 213:4
  213:11 214:19 221:25
  221:25 225:14 246:10
  251:15 261:7 316:4
  316:25,25
stages 282:25
stand 291:23
standard 299:21
standards 197:1
standby 209:17
Stapleton 184:14,16
  202:8 203:24 226:2
  226:11 258:11 263:24
  292:13.15
Stapleton's 230:11
  264:20
stare 295:9
start 185:13 316:19
  330:13
started 293:12 341:25
starting 204:14 320:15
starts 243:11 256:24
  260:13 273:6 319:1
state 187:8 188:4,10,16
  190:3,6 191:1,11,11
  191:17 192:14 193:12
  193:16 194:3 210:25
  211:6,9,10 212:2
  220:1,5,11 223:8
  229:10 235:2,25
  236:11,22 237:2,10
  237:25 238:12,18,23
  239:6 241:1 243:17
  246:24 250:9,16,20
  250:25 251:7,16,20
  252:11,14,24 253:6,9
  253:10 254:22 256:1
  257:2,9 259:4,11,15
  260:1,15 264:8
  274:19,21 275:10,13
  275:15,17,22,24
  276:14,25,25 288:16
```

```
289:18,19 299:24
  303:14 304:12,19
  305:5,11,17,19,20,25
  306:4,15,21 309:19
  310:16 313:8 314:1
  314:20 352:14 354:1
  366:1
stated 291:14.15 355:8
statement 215:11,20
  216:7,12 268:12
  270:22 294:6,14
  335:12 340:12 349:24
statement's 216:8
statements 216:3,6
States 186:6,25 187:20
Stathis 285:23
stating 279:1
statistically 327:15
  358:20 360:12,21
status 292:15
statute 238:7 288:16
  293:11
steady 271:2 360:22
step 316:19 317:6
  329:22
steps 315:18,25 324:11
  350:18,21 353:21
stewardship 193:24
  195:2,3,6,7,8,18,24
  196:7 197:12 205:23
  205:25 207:7,15,16
  218:11 220:14 223:3
  227:1,2,6,16 228:2,5
  228:17,24 232:4,10
  247:2 257:13 263:24
  277:5,13 278:13,17
  281:13 283:11,25
  284:6,19 285:3,4,13
  285:19,20 286:3,7,13
  286:16,23 303:16
  307:9 308:1 310:23
  310:24 311:3 313:24
  314:18 352:14 354:8
stipulated 256:14
stipulation 215:19
  269:2 296:2 312:25
stop 365:11
storage 190:20,21,22
  190:25 194:19,20
  209:6 211:1,13,14,14
  211:22 212:3,19
  213:1,8,9,10 214:23
  243:8 266:9,21,24
  267:1,4,7,8,12 269:20
  269:24,25 270:6,9
  271:4,8 276:16
stored 275:11
stores 266:13
```

```
storing 267:1
straightforward 307:6
  307:7
strategy 241:25 242:5
  266:22
Street 182:24 183:3,13
strenuous 364:17
stretch 287:13
strike 189:24 229:23
  342:4 351:10,19
strong 278:22
structure 201:15
  203:25 224:22 231:25
  252:18 259:22 261:8
  262:10 264:17,19
  278:1 291:2,4,5,9
  292:19 293:4 342:10
  343:10,17
studies 263:6
study 207:8 252:1
  263:11 308:6 309:23
stuff 358:15
sub 211:18 212:14
  213:7
subject 188:20 220:5
  292:12 312:25
submission 246:14,19
submissions 245:25
  260:22
submit 293:20.23 298:7
submitted 205:6,10
  218:21 219:15,19
  249:9,9,24 261:9
  263:6 291:1 293:20
  294:3 296:19 297:21
submitting 298:9
subsequent 282:25
subsidize 333:4
subsidizing 333:2
subsidy 195:13,22
  196:9,14,15,24
  197:25 198:17 201:3
  201:3,21 202:24
  282:5 286:4
substantial 315:11
substantially 270:11,25
  346:20 363:16
succeeded 288:23
success 199:3
sue 221:10,17
sued 291:22 293:12
suggest 332:4,14
suggested 266:11 268:3
suggesting 327:12
  332:2,7,10
suggestion 294:3
suit 259:16 293:7
summary 184:18 210:6
```

```
270:22 280:13 287:23
  322:13
sums 301:16
superior 182:1 187:21
supplement 188:24
  189:3
supplemental 189:2
supplied 207:1
suppliers 289:13
supplies 187:24 188:15
  188:16,24,25 189:2,3
  195:14 206:25 217:22
  222:18 223:10,19
 244:2 266:14 267:3
  279:16 288:14
supply 188:10,11 195:9
  195:14,15,17 196:9
  196:16,19,23 199:4
  199:10,12,21 201:7
  206:23 207:10 209:8
  211:16,19,23 212:21
  213:1 214:14,17
  220:12,16,18,19,20
  223:8 238:23 250:20
  250:22 253:1,10
  254:20 266:25 267:5
  277:19,20,21,24
  280:25 281:1,2,3,8,18
  281:23 289:7,12,20
  289:21,22,23 305:2
  305:13 307:5 313:9
  314:2,21 352:9,15
  354:2,16,17 355:17
  356:20,21
support 200:9 227:15
  227:21 278:15,22
  304.24
supports 227:13 229:18
supposed 240:9 312:23
suppress 289:12
surcharge 257:13
  278:20
sure 199:19 228:23
  232:17 234:3 235:4
  238:8,18 240:19
  248:10 274:25 286:15
  293:24 294:25 295:3
  295:4,8,8,9,13 298:22
  301:3 304:21 311:11
  312:2,4 327:16
  330:12 332:13 338:5
  338:8 347:1 349:19
  356:5 357:23 358:2
  359:15 360:14 362:2
  362:7 363:8 364:7
  365:6
surely 336:6
surplus 187:17,18
```

267:2 332:16,16 surprised 292:16 293:7 surprising 347:22 sustain 288:13 **Sustained** 337:5 338:3 **Sutter** 190:11 194:12 swayed 292:22 swings 266:23,25 switch 315:1 sworn 299:21 **SWP** 251:17 289:19,22 289:23 system 191:12 193:23 211:6 212:15 214:23 218:10 221:6 223:2,3 223:6,7,16 228:2 229:3,7,10,13,18,20 232:3,4,9,10 245:2 257:12 258:24 259:15 260:1,16 264:7,8 266:12 267:17 272:6 272:24 278:19 279:9 279:13,18 288:3 289:15 303:14,15 305:6,6,21 306:1,3,6 306:8,13,17,21,22,25 307:1,25 308:1,7,7 309:8,9,10,10,12,14 309:20 310:1,5,9,11 310:17,19 313:23,23 314:17,17 325:2 330:7 331:24 systems 267:11 T tab 210:13 225:8 230:4

241:9 243:2 246:5 249:3 250:2 254:8 256:20,21 317:1 346:8,9 table 202:25 203:6 269:23 276:8,12 280:12,14 281:3 **tables** 341:8 take 210:5 213:20,24 214:20 222:4 223:22 225:3 228:8 233:20 248:19 270:20 271:25 271:25 299:11 305:5 306:11 307:12 316:2 317:6,17 323:5,20 324:4 334:8 345:3 356:15 358:10,17 take-or-pay 193:15 251:1,4 taken 200:4 257:24 287:7 290:2

takes 186:15 320:18

323:10,13 talk 227:1 229:2 243:1 245:9 253:14 264:14 264:21 266:8 271:10 296:25 297:2.17 309:7 315:1 316:17 336:17 340:16 346:11 357:19 talked 217:20 234:22 243:2 245:21,25 253:12 266:5 269:7 323:25 329:16 344:4 349:25 354:20 359:6 talking 185:19 192:25 210:11 213:16 226:10 236:19,20 242:20 250:15 254:10 269:17 276:19 288:4,6 297:3 339:6 343:4 350:19 351:4,6 357:23 talks 227:2 229:2 254:19 258:19 267:10 289:18 targeted 266:3 task 358:25 tasks 242:3 taxes 253:8 team 301:23 telephone 292:12 television 245:18 tell 231:12 241:14 283:19 362:18 telling 362:16 temporary 241:2 ten 199:8 223:20,25 230:10 270:9,10,19 299:14 328:19 329:2 363:7 ten-minute 334:8 ten-year 217:8 273:18 273:21 328:18 329:11 333:7,7,17,18,23,24 345:12 346:19 347:17 tens 222:12 tentative 364:24 term 186:8 187:22 207:20 239:20,20 287:19 357:16 terminal 209:6 211:5,8 211:10 terminated 294:10 terminates 194:15 204:19 terminating 204:17

termination 202:10

terms 190:23 201:6

228:16 233:9 235:24

204:1

281:3 315:25 326:3 330:9 347:10 349:6 352:3 357:18 365:2,3 test 302:16 337:15,17 337:23,25 338:12,18 338:20,24 339:11,12 **tested** 337:1 testified 207:6 216:25 224:21 248:7 299:22 341:20 testify 342:3 testifying 199:15 210:2 210:17 222:23 243:22 353:7,9,11 355:25 testimony 217:6 218:21 218:22,22,24,25 219:18,20 272:11 302:18,24 303:25 322:22 337:2 344:5 352:3 356:5 text 274:12 thank 204:10 224:8 225:5 230:16 257:22 262:20 265:14,17 268:23 283:4 296:4 299:23 300:4,11 304:8 334:3,9,12 338:10 340:7 346:16 350:10 357:3 359:9 359:14 361:8.14.15 364:13 365:13 Theoretically 206:24 thick 276:5 thing 264:7 271:10 272:19 273:3 274:7 274:18 276:22 277:4 277:4,7 280:23 287:5 294:11 297:20 298:20 298:21 345:10 360:15 362:11 363:9 things 250:19 271:13 273:3 280:17 298:15 320:19 336:20 338:6 338:7 349:7 351:14 355:19 think 201:23 224:21 231:12 233:3,9,21,22 235:17 238:2 248:9 250:7 265:23 268:10 275:6 279:8,11 293:10 294:17,20,23 295:5 296:11,12,25 297:1 298:1 299:6,8 300:22 306:10 320:13 321:17 323:3,4,14 325:3 333:19 342:25 351:16 356:9,22 361:4,22 362:6,12,25

364:21,22,23 thinking 277:9 thinks 293:14 third 188:13 189:13,17 209:9 222:21 262:20 274:18 275:19 279:4 279:21 324:11,19 346:10.14 **THOMAS** 183:11 thorough 355:18 thought 233:21,22 276:6 352:24 364:24 threats 203:11 292:22 three 183:9 189:1 190:8 201:19 232:3,8 232:9 252:11,17 270:8,11,18 302:20 364:6 throw 298:25 359:3,4 360:8 throwing 342:25 tier 352:9 356:20,21 Tim 260:7 time 190:23 191:3,19 191:22 196:20,21 201:20 203:5 220:23 221:12 226:4,24 228:8 229:9 230:24 233:6,25 237:6,12 240:12 246:21 248:19 248:23 253:23 258:25 259:23 265:1,6,21 274:13 277:9 286:22 291:22,25 292:8 294:2,2 295:10 297:8 297:9 298:19 309:7 313:5 317:6 323:9 325:20 326:20 335:23 340:24 345:2 362:12 362:15 363:1,9,16,18 363:20,20,25 364:1,2 364:3,6 365:11 timeframe 345:12,12 345:13 timeframes 347:23 348:2 timely 293:12 times 187:18 189:23 190:5,8 218:6 244:9 270:9,10,19 319:22 331:10 timetable 297:15 title 325:18 titled 202:8 216:21 225:16 241:24 today 192:25 222:23 223:5 232:9 253:13 265:11,12 268:7,11

288:4 290:13,24 303:9 338:21 340:14 344:4 353:17,19,23 356:6,23 365:11 told 205:16 208:24 209:2 352:16 362:22 Tom 285:25 tomorrow 294:2 364.18 365.12 tone 292:17 tonight 294:2 298:24 362:5,6 364:15,22 top 193:15 205:5 210:25 242:9 261:14 267:20 279:21 285:13 330:19 total 191:14 213:9,10 217:10,12 235:20 236:6 239:7 270:6,24 273:4,10,24 281:2 286:8,24 305:9 306:12,12,15 311:17 313:10,11 327:7,23 363:10 totals 311:16 tracking 321:17 362:20 tracks 321:15 traditional 277:19 training 303:4 transaction 193:8 243:20,21 transactions 188:22 189:6 190:2 191:15 191:16 194:2,11 222:17 223:21 276:16 transcribed 366:10 transcript 182:13 366:12 transfer 185:19 189:2 191:4 192:3 193:4 194:13,25 243:9 244:2,4,23 245:3 257:16 278:7 transfers 188:24 192:23,25 193:1 241:25 267:4,5 275:14 transparency 229:15 258:20 transparent 258:24 transport 189:17 190:15,25 235:21 transportation 188:6 188:13,19 195:6,16 196:3 209:7,25 212:4 214:13 220:2,6,12,14

220:17 221:5,5

222:21,25 223:9,11

222 10 220 17 10 24
223:19 228:17,19,24
238:24 239:1 246:25
247:3 250:10,17 252:20,25 259:12
260:18 19 263:25
260:18,19 263:25 277:24 281:1,9
303:13,21 304:3,13
305:12,18 307:3
311:4,8 312:14,17
313:8,22 314:16
354:2,3,9,23 355:6,12
355:17
transporting 238:20
transports 189:13
196:2 travel 187:7
travels 186:20 187:1
treat 289:23
treated 213:1
treatment 257:13
trend 271:2
trial 182:7 188:21
231:6 240:9 268:20
268:21 282:24 317:25
362:15
tried 316:4 324:12
329:23
true 201:24 254:15,25
256:8 324:4 337:16 342:16 349:24 351:20
353:4 366:11
truth 255:13,22
try 222:2 263:2 297:11
298:19 331:13 345:19
trying 231:14 323:7
324:15 330:3,4
332:14 356:4
turn 185:20 195:1
197:7 202:3 203:19
207:19 210:23 212:6 216:16 225:19 247:25
249:3 260:10 261:12
288:12 317:7
turning 188:2 212:22
216:23 324:9,9
turnouts 257:17
twice 218:5
two 189:8 198:4,20,21
199:1,9 200:5 204:21
211:15,23 213:9
218:5,9 248:13 253:18 271:6 279:15
288:5 289:11 294:7
301:4 308:9,11
310.21 314.24 323.4
325:15 356:21
type 280:18 320:14
351:6 360:6

typical 296:13

typically 296:24 U **U.S** 186:17,17 358:12 358:24 ultimate 279:12 ultimately 187:1 192:18 203:10 214:18 **unable** 240:21 unawares 287:7 unbundled 221:7 224:22 225:2 227:9 230:8 252:18 259:22 264:17 342:10 343:16 unbundling 260:25 264:18 287:15,16 289:1 290:16 unclear 283:20 unconstitutional 283:9 underground 194:19 underlined 292:23 underlining 292:24 understand 199:12 200:23 211:20 222:23 232:17 236:10 254:15 267:7 303:9,25 315:2 315:4 337:23 339:13 343:15 344:25 348:8 348:9 352:2 355:4 356:5 357:23 understanding 193:10 211:12 223:14 231:23 238:4,9 252:24 254:25 256:8 257:18 324:3 336:12 understands 199:20 240:24 363:8 undertake 337:20 350:17 unfortunately 284:23 284:24 358:13 uniform 278:17 **United** 186:6,25 187:20 unlawful 188:3 249:21 unlined 186:2 unnecessarily 228:1 unrelated 188:9 222:10 **Update 254:2 Updated** 197:13 **upper** 325:18 upset 280:11 **urban** 277:16

usage 274:19

use 195:6 211:15

222:20 235:22 240:12

267:3 280:24 287:25

244:20,21 265:21

288:12 309:2 320:9 327:19,22 345:23 useful 240:14 276:6 294:12 uses 197:1 235:20 244:17 **usually 295:24 utility** 247:23

Vague 337:4 338:2 348:6 353:14 valid 358:20 validity 337:21 Valley 186:1,2,21 194:20 267:14,19 300:21 valuable 227:23 valuation 302:13,14,15 303:6 value 325:3 VAN 183:3 variability 342:23 variance 270:19 273:23 330:24 variation 215:9 340:21 342:14 343:11,18,24 348:22 349:15,21 351:10 variations 264:22 315:5 324:2 342:17 351:13 358:4,8 359:23 360:3 varied 217:11,15 267:21 **variety** 356:25 various 198:2 214:10 216:9 220:10 221:19 262:10 265:6 302:24 304:25 322:14 vary 218:5 version 299:3 versus 329:1 340:17 341:25 359:5 Video 350:11 VIDEOGRAPHY 182:23 view 218:1 virtue 232:19 303:4 visibility 259:1 voice 225:4 312:2 **volume** 182:8 184:2 294:8,19 330:5 347:10,11,21 360:20

272:3 281:13 286:7 286:23 315:16 331:15 336:24 338:17 339:8 351:22 vote 219:5,22 **voted** 219:6,24 224:25 vs 182:8

W **W** 183:5 wait 364:18 walk 294:17 296:2 325:10 343:2 walking 213:21 Walton-Hadlock 183:7 297:24 want 185:20 192:1 195:1 196:11 199:9 207:19 225:7 226:25 226:25 228:10 229:2 229:24 233:25 237:22 238:8 239:2 240:4 241:9 243:1 245:9 246:5 247:25 248:14 250:1 252:5 253:12 253:13 254:4 256:17 256:25 266:7 271:10 274:18,23 277:4 279:2 292:6 293:23 295:2,3,4,9,25 296:11 296:24 297:6,10 299:11 300:22 327:8 327:16 328:6 329:22 336:17 340:16 341:19 343:5,7,16 345:23 346:11 351:2 352:12 359:15 360:24 361:18 362:2,11,13 363:7,23 363:24 365:8 wanted 252:8 280:18 337:17 wants 227:20 354:13 **WARREN** 183:6 wasn't 268:19 340:23 342.11 waste 298:19 301:22 water 182:6,9 183:8,13 185:20,22,23,23,24 185:24,25 186:4,5,6 186:15,22,23,24 187:7,8,11,11,11,13 187:13,14,17,17,17 187:19,21,25 188:4,9 188:10,11,13,14,16

188:18,20,24,24,25

190:16,16,17,19,22

190:3,6,6,10,11,12,15

189:7,11,14,18,24

191:7,7,10,11,11,15 191:17,20,23 192:2,2 192:5,7,8,12,13,15,16 192:18,23 193:9,11 193:12,14,16,16,18 193:24,25 194:3,5,7 194:12,13,13,15,16 194:18,20,22,25 195:2,3,5,7,8,9,10,11 195:12,13,17,18,23 196:1,7,9,16,18,19,20 196:22 197:10,11 199:4,7,10,12,21 201:7,9,25 202:1,8,10 203:8,23 204:16,22 205:9,20,22,25 206:23,25 207:1,7,10 207:15,16,23,24 210:25 211:6,9,11,22 211:25 212:2,21 214:12 215:13 216:4 216:6 217:12 218:5 218:10,17,21 219:11 220:1,5,11,14,16,18 220:19,20 221:9,13 222:13,17,21 223:3,8 223:8,10,15,17 225:16 226:1,3,5,14 226:20 227:1,2,6,13 227:14,15,16,20,22 227:24,25 228:2,4,17 228:24 229:9,11,18 231:21 232:4,7,10,20 232:23 234:12,12,22 234:23 235:1,5,8,13 235:21,25,25 236:2,3 236:3,7,8,11,11,12,15 236:17,21,22,22,23 236:25 237:1,2,2,3,6 237:8,10,10,11,14,19 237:19,21,21,25 238:1,1,12,15,18,19 238:20,22,23 239:5,6 239:8,8,17,20 240:6 240:21 241:1,23,24 242:6,24 243:6,6,7,8 243:8,9,17 244:4,23 245:3 246:24 247:2 250:9,16,20,25,25 251:2,5,7,14,16,17,21 252:11,14,24 253:6,9 253:10,23 254:20,22 254:23 256:1,2,10 257:2,9,9,10,12,16 259:2,4,11,15 260:1,8 260:15 261:6 262:12

190:24,24,25 191:1,2

263:24 264:9 265:5,5

volumes 344:23 345:1

volumetric 208:17,21

271:16,17,23,24

360:24

283:1 284:8,8,9 298:13,14 306:10 309:10 323:14 ways 294:7 316:5 we'll 210:7 297:2 298:25 309:2 312:24 316:17 363:25
298:13,14 306:10 309:10 323:14 ways 294:7 316:5 we'll 210:7 297:2 298:25 309:2 312:24
· -

```
362:14,17,19,25
  363:2,6,8
we've 201:11 213:18
  220:15,19,24,25
  264:15 265:11,12
  276:9,10 294:10
  298:5 331:23 340:1
weather 267:2 358:21
Web 255:10 316:3
  317:3,17
Wednesday 182:14
week 295:1
weight 327:5,7,17,19
  327:21
weighted 199:3,5,6,7
  327:1,4 328:10,12,25
  329:5,7,12,18 349:6,9
weighting 199:3 328:1
  328:2
Wells 247:16,18,22
  248:1,4 249:23
  251:14 252:1,10
went 189:10 190:6
  304:12 315:19 334:21
  342:12 355:12 356:20
west 183:11 184:4,5,7
  199:14 200:19 202:14
  204:8 206:8 210:1
  211:9 213:15 215:14
  223:24 224:4.9.11
  225:6 226:9 227:19
  228:12,15 230:16
  231:9,16 233:13,16
  234:3 235:23 240:18
  241:14,18 248:15,18
  252:8 255:13,16,19
  255:21,24 256:4,7,13
  256:21,23 257:21
  263:19,22 265:13
  268:15,21 282:10
  283:3 292:1 294:24
  295:11,14 296:4
  318:3 322:18 334:12
  334:14 335:9,18
  336:1,9,13,16 337:11
  338:10,15 340:1,6,8
  343:2,6 344:16 345:9
  345:15,22 346:2,5,17
  347:1 348:13 350:7
  350:12 353:24 356:8
  357:2 358:2 359:9,12
  359:17 360:8 361:8
Western 283:15,17
  284:10,14,16,17
  285:3,8
wet 207:22 218:7 267:2
  270:20 323:21,22
wheel 188:2,21 193:8
```

```
232:25 233:4 244:2
  274:19,20 276:24
  287:19
wheeled 189:24 190:6
  278:19,20,24 279:2
 279:17
wheeling 189:15,22
  190:1.23 191:3.9.16
  193:6,20 194:2,5,10
  194:24 195:4 207:8,9
  208:12,18 209:7
  222:9,10,15,16,24
  232:25 233:17,22,23
  234:5 242:11,11,16
  243:16 244:6,14
  256:17 257:8,10
  277:10 287:14,15,21
  288:2,15,19 289:2,2
  289:14 298:14 365:1
wheels 193:11 223:15
window 337:18
winners 283:16
wish 240:12
withdraw 211:22
withdrawing 211:24
witness 200:25 206:12
  206:24 213:16 214:1
  223:13,17 228:14
  235:19 240:16 263:17
  265:20 299:12.18.20
  300:1,10 302:21
  304:4,7 312:4 316:16
  323:14,23 324:7
  332:6,13,18 334:7
  335:10 337:6,10
  348:9,12 353:18
witnesses 184:1 362:5
word 231:13 232:25
  233:4 296:19 306:19
words 332:12
work 291:6,11,21
  301:10 302:15 339:18
  340:10 352:23 363:5
  365:9
worked 221:24 291:20
  291:22 301:20,25
working 196:5 298:23
  301:17 302:10
works 303:3,7 324:3
 338:7
WORLDWIDE 182:23
worst 283:13
worth 275:23 303:21
wouldn't 280:10
  343:25
wrap 294:25 296:16
writes 279:13,23
writing 286:20 298:6,9
```

```
260:7 291:1 296:1
wrong 214:16 240:14
  282:23 283:1,1
wrote 278:6
WRS 279:24
WSR 278:17 282:4
  286:8
          X
X 330:18
Y 319:4
yeah 206:24 214:4
  228:12 230:10 234:14
  238:11 248:6 252:23
  268:25 301:15 303:8
  324:17,19 348:9
  359:12 365:3
year 186:7,7 188:24
  189:2 191:4 194:24
  207:10,19,20,25
  208:2,5,7,9,11,14,15
  208:20 209:5,15
  210:19 211:14,16,19
  211:23,24 213:6
  214:22 215:12 216:13
  217:1,9,9,16,16,22,23
  218:2,3,7 220:21
  221:1,2 222:13
  223:18 225:17 228:3
  237:6 245:9 247:12
  248:5,8,20 249:15
  253:15 254:13 260:23
  261:2,18,23,24 262:4
  262:14,17,23 263:3
  263:12 264:14 266:10
  266:11,15 267:12,22
  267:22 269:13 271:18
  273:10,25 274:2
  276:1,2,4 282:7,7
  286:19 290:10 298:20
  304:23 305:20 307:14
  307:24 308:4 313:19
  315:1,2,4,8,16,19
  316:1,20 318:8 319:8
  319:13 325:21 329:2
  329:2,2,7,24 330:15
  330:21 331:17 333:12
  333:13 334:1,2,5,6
  336:18,20,23 338:17
  339:7 344:10 347:13
  347:14 350:19 351:21
  351:23 352:12,18
  358:21
years 189:8,24 207:23
```

written 218:22,25

219:1,17 246:14,19

```
218:6,12,13 219:7
  221:14,16 223:20
  267:2,3 270:11,20,24
  271:3,21 275:23
  276:23,24 277:3
  282:6 285:2 293:1
  302:20 312:7 315:5
  323:18,21,21 324:5
  342:6,9,10 343:16,19
  343:21 344:6,7,8,9
  352:1 358:18 360:2
yellow 305:23 308:3
  330:17
vesterday 185:7,18
  278:5 297:20 338:21
  363:2
           Z
zero 195:16 220:17
  311:1
           0
04 225:18
044 261:4,5,16
1 227:10 243:11 273:5
  319:1,15 320:3
  356:20
1.1 275:13
1.18 329:8
1.2652 326:21
1.28 329:13
1.3592 328:7,13
1.36 329:19 331:9
  333:4
1.4 319:19
1.42 326:9,9
1.45 329:15
1.4635 326:24
1.49 329:10
1.5 319:20,21
1.6 275:20 276:21
1.67 271:1 329:21
  330:23 333:5 350:25
1.671459 327:24
1.675 328:15
1.6752 326:18 328:8
1.8 284:10
1:30 257:22
10 184:12 246:5 250:2
  269:23
10,000 190:12
10.5 363:7
10:00 365:12
100 195:5,15 220:16
  223:9 311:3
```

207:23 211:21 217:23

	I	1	I	I
100,000 281:2	170-04 314:9	2003 221:7 224:22	314:4,5 325:19	319 255:11 331:11
10th 197:8,12 264:21	171-01 318:13,14	225:3,15,17 227:10	330:21 366:16	319,000 331:5
11 217:9 245:24 246:13	171-02 320:25	228:18 229:25 230:6	2013-2014 219:23	32 217:11
249:3 273:17	171.03 342:24	242:23 258:10 259:3	2014 219:8 263:2,9	322 184:18
110-year 186:8	173 286:18,18 322:5	259:16 263:23 264:21	314:14,16	323 204:14
11454 246:17 250:2	179 184:13 202:3,5,12	264:21 285:3 290:14	202 184:13	328 275:23
260:5	202:15,16 203:2	290:20 292:4 320:15	203 317:22	328A 276:10
11455 250:13	18 182:14 185:1 258:1	335:20 342:12,13,21	204 184:15	33,000 191:18
11459 252:6	292:18	343:10,22 344:11	209 282:8	330 273:13
11509 272:15	181 307:1	2004 292:11,18 323:15	21 362:15,18 363:2,6,6	334 184:7
11512 272:16	181,389,515 306:4	2006 323:20	363:10	336 184:19
116 254:8	182 182:9	2007 184:12 197:8,12	213 183:14	34 184:19 335:18 336:1
11th 225:15	185 184:3	283:14	214 282:5	336:4,6 344:16
12 239:12 245:24	19 350:3 366:16	2008 189:1,9 190:10	216 350:3,6	341 275:23 276:3
246:13 318:23 319:3	195 306:16,25	221:18 241:24 271:1	216,000 276:20	341A 276:11
319:11 323:9 362:23	195,000,205,670	283:18 284:7	217-6000 183:14	347 317:22
363:23	305:24	2008-2009 286:5,14	219,000 213:9	348A 186:10,10
12-year 264:25 265:10	197 184:11	2009 189:2 191:6,13	22 286:19 287:11	357 308:15,16
123 184:11 197:7,7,9	1990s 220:3	209:3 210:18 275:25	22,018 326:8 327:22	366 182:9
197:15,18,19,22	1994 318:21 319:13	276:1,3 284:11,12	224 184:4 312:23,24	37.4 273:13
273:14	324:5 325:19 330:21	285:23 286:10	22nd 253:15	375 254:13
128 241:16,19	340:20 341:25 342:9	2009-2010 287:2	23 251:10 350:3	38 288:22
12th 291:6	344:6,10	201 184:15 203:20,21	232 304:1	380 275:23
13 243:3,10 256:24	1995 275:24	204:9,11	23rd 203:22 204:16	380A 276:11
276:20 283:7 312:7,9	1996 266:17 268:6	2010 189:9,10 202:6	297:4	383 184:17 317:8,9,25
13,000 190:13	277:15 287:16,16,17	217:9 218:16 219:15	24 362:17 363:1	318:5,6 335:4,9,24
136 238:2 13th 246:11	1998 241:6 1999 288:22 289:1	221:10,17 245:22 247:20 250:1 259:16	244 215:19 268:9	384 184:18 322:6,10,13
14 218:13 254:8 285:6	1949 288.22 289.1 19th 216:1	260:2,6,23 262:1,16	270:14,22 290:7 312:23	322:16,20,24 343:1,4 359:10,16
312:7,9	19th 210.1	262:22,24 270:11	24th 297:4	387 306:12,15
14.833 285:7	2	272:9,13 273:17	25 217:22 278:6 292:1	39,166 333:25
14.833 285.7 142 274:15 285:22	2 203:6 205:4 254:10	284:11,13 285:4	251 327:14	39,166,000 333:18
142 274.13 283.22 1448 277:11	257:3 277:17 284:15	286:19 293:11	251 327.14 255 269:17	391-5400 183:4
1448 277.11 1457 248:1	284:24 287:22 292:14	2010-2011 273:11	255,000 217:24	393-2000 183:10
146 274:15	352:9	2010 -2011 273.11 2011 201:15 203:22	258 184:4	394 342:25
1487 267:13	2.1 283:16	204:16,19,20 205:9	259,000 330:23	3rd 182:24
15 206:3 208:25 272:5	2.3 271:1	218:13,14 219:5	25th 202:6 204:19	102.2
275:23 276:23 277:3	20 199:6 275:16 289:21	245:23 246:2 247:20	297:5	4
278:11 289:20 338:22	329:2 330:15 334:5	249:21 270:11 272:15	26 281:5 282:11,13,14	4 187:15 205:4 210:24
362:14 363:5	20-year 325:19 328:19	305:20 306:2 307:25	282:18,19	225:8 329:22
15122 274:9	329:16 330:14,20	308:4 309:11,12,22	263 184:5	4:15 362:6
15125 274:9	331:16 333:8 334:4	310:1,10,11,24 311:8	266 284:20	40 199:3 319:23
156 198:7	334:25 345:12 346:19	311:14,24 323:20	27 326:21	407 305:14
16 230:14	347:6	2012 206:1 218:14	29 252:16,17	41 278:1
162-01 304:16 305:8	20,000 191:7	219:5,10,18 245:23		415 182:25 183:4,10
164-01 315:22	200,000 267:21	246:3 247:20 249:21	3	42 326:10
165.01 325:8	2000 261:10,18 262:1	265:2 269:22,23	3 187:14 198:6,7 271:4	433 269:13
16518 269:22	264:15 278:2,4 290:7	270:7,12 271:5 272:9	3.2 239:12 241:4	433,000 217:16
166-01 328:23	291:6 318:21 319:9	272:15 274:6,6,8	3.3 239:24 270:16	45 274:16
166,000 333:20	319:10,13,24 321:11	290:19 293:11 312:7	3.5866 327:12	454,000 213:10
167 269:12	324:5 340:20 342:1,9	312:9,14,17,18	30 199:5	49 225:8 258:14 259:9
167,000 217:15	344:6	313:10,11,15 320:3	300 184:7	
168-01 330:12	2000's 261:1	321:11	300,000 267:23 269:6	5
169-01 333:10	2000-2001 217:9	2012s 271:6	269:14,18 270:10	5 187:16,16 191:21
17 230:14 254:18	2001 225:1,3 318:23	2013 182:14 185:1	304 182:4	5.2 230:13
170-01 307:21,23	319:3,11 323:9,15	216:1 218:24 219:7	31,271 326:7	50 237:11 319:22,24
170-02 312:11	2002 290:12,19 319:17	258:1 263:2,8 268:13	315 304:1	500 254:21 256:11
170-03 313:17	319:20,23	270:15 313:19,22	318 184:17	500,000 267:22 319:12

	1	1	I	l
319:15 320:4	90 246:6 250:3 252:6			
510830 182:7	90012 183:14			
511,000 217:21 269:16	902 327:15			
522-7096 182:25	94 319:9,10,24			
5344 255:16	94111 182:24			
5432 255:16	94111-1809 183:4			
56 262:21,21	94111-4067 183:10			
	94278 204:5,19			
6	97.3 275:12			
6 212:6,7 230:4	981-3498 182:25			
6.1 280:12,15				
6/23/11 184:15				
60,000 331:16,17,22				
60,331 334:5				
6137 182:19 183:17				
366:6,22				
6202 275:4		1		
6294 290:18				
6300 290:20		1		
		1		
633 183:3		1		
65 230:2		1		
66 266:20		1		
667,000 347:7				
67 330:24 350:25				
68 326:18				
686 345:16				
687 345:20,25 346:15				
691 336:8				
698 243:2 256:19				
6th 285:23				
7				
7 212:22,22,24 213:2				
290:21,21 292:16				
700 183:13				
701 182:24 184:19				
239:13 336:7,11,13				
336:14,15 345:7,9				
359:8,9,12 360:9				
71 217:12		1		
7121 225:19				
7122 227:3 258:15		1		
77,540 333:16		1		
		1		
8				
		1		
8 204:20 241:9 260:6		1		
8/25/2010 184:13				
80,000 186:5,7		1		
		1		
800 182:25				
81 292:6				
82 186:18 217:21		1		
85.7 286:25		1		
89 249:6				
8th 250:1		1		
9				
9 221:18 243:2 256:21		1		
		1		
285:10		1		
		1		
	1	1	1	1

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                        1
                                                                              MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY:
              COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                        2
                                                                                 ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
      BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS A. E. KARNOW, JUDGE PRESIDING
                                                                                 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
               DEPARTMENT NUMBER 304
                                                                        3
                                                                                 Irvine, CA 92612
                                                                                 (949)223-1170
     SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                        4
                                                                                 By: PATTY J. QUILIZAPA, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                      ) Case No. CPF-10-510830
                                                                        5
         Plaintiff.
                        ) Case No. CPF-12-512466
                                                                        6
                      ) Trial
                                                                        7
     VS
                                                                        8
                      ) Volume III
                                                                              Reported by: Connie J. Parchman, CSR 6137
     METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                        9
     SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
                                  ) Pages 367 - 549
                                                                       11
          Defendant,
                                                                       12
                                                                       13
                                                                       14
           Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
                                                                       15
             Thursday, December 19, 2013
                                                                       16
                                                                       17
                                                                       18
     Reported by:
                                                                       19
     CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, CSR 6137
                                                                       20
     CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER
                                                                       21
                                                                       22
              JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                       23
         WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                       24
     701 Battery St., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, California 94111
                                                                       25
           (415) 981-3498 OR (800) 522-7096
                                                             367
                                                                                                                                   369
      APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
                                                                                            INDEX OF WITNESSES
      For Plaintiff:
2
                                                                        2
                                                                                                         PAGE VOLUME
        KEKER & VAN NEST
        633 Battery Street
                                                                        3
                                                                               BRENT YAMASAKI
        San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
                                                                        4
                                                                                Direct Examination by MR. HIXON
                                                                                                                             503
                                                                                                                                    III
        (415) 391-5400
        By: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.
                                                                                Cross-Examination by MR. PURCELL
                                                                                                                              534
                                                                                                                                       III
           DANIEL PURCELL, ESQ.
           WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ.
           DAN JACKSON, ESQ.
                                                                        6
           AUDREY WALTON-HADLOCK, ESQ.
      For Defendant Metropolitan Water District:
                                                                        8
        BINGHAM McCÛTCHEN LLP
        Three Embarcadero Center
                                                                        9
10
        San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
        (415) 393-2000
                                                                       10
11
        By: THOMAS S. HIXSON, ESQ.
                                                                       11
           COLIN C. WEST, ESQ.
12
                                                                       12
13
        METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
                                                                       13
        700 North Alameda Street
                                                                       14
14
        Los Angeles, CA 90012
        (213) 217-6000
                                                                       1.5
15
        By: HEATHER C. BEATTY, ESQ.
                                                                       16
           BETTY KUO BRINTON, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
16
           MARCIA SCULLY, ESQ.
                                                                       17
17
        MORRISON & FOERSTER
                                                                       18
        425 Market Street
18
        San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
                                                                       19
        (415)268-7000
                                                                       2.0
19
        By: RAJ CHATTERJEE, ESQ.
20
      CITY OF TORRANCE:
                                                                       21
      JOHN FELLOWS, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                       22
21
      THREE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT:
                                                                       23
22
      STEVEN M. KENNEDY, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                       24
23
24
                                                                       25
25
                                                             368
                                                                                                                                   370
```

1 INDEX OF EXHIBITS	submission of evidence, Mr. Braunig has a few things that
² No. Description Ident. Evid. Refused	we're going to put in now and then we're prepared to rest
Exhibit 94 Review of Storage 534	subject to reviewing things over the weekend.
4 Management 5 Exhibit 102 Water Resources 511	4 THE COURT: Okay.
Management Report	5 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, good morning. Warren
Exhibit 120 Skinner 2003-2013 532	Braunig for San Diego.
7 Treatment Blends 8 Exhibit 125 Water Distribution 534	Some of the things I'm going to do are going to
System diagram	be just to make sure we make a record of putting things
Exhibit 221 Presentation titled 381	111.
Quantification Settlement Agreement	So yesterday, we provided to Metropolitan the excerpts of we had previously given to them the
11	excerpts of we had previously given to them the excerpts of discovery responses that we're going to ask
Exhibit 227 Letter from SDCWA to MWD 381	to be included in the record. And so we would officially
Exhibit 235A Letter from SDCWA to MWD 373	move into evidence Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit 235A, 237A,
Exhibit 237A Letter from SDCWA to MWD 373	¹⁵ 245A, 246A, 247A, 250A and 381A.
Exhibit 245A Letter from SDCWA to MWD 373	MR. WEST: And just to clarify, Counsel, if I
15	may, these are just excerpts of discovery responses?
Exhibit 246A Letter from SDCWA to MWD 373	MR. BRAUNIG: That's correct, these are
Exhibit 247A Letter from Bureau of 373	excerpts of discovery responses.
Reclamation to IID Exhibit 250A Letter from IID to 373	MR. WEST: Then we have no objection.
Bureau of Reclamation	THE COURT: The following exhibits are
Exhibit 252 Letter from SDCWA to MWD 381	22 admitted: 235A, 237A, 245A, 246A, 247A, 250A, 381A. (Whereupon Exhibits 235A
Exhibit 381A Board letter 373	23 (Whereupon Exhibits 235A, 237A, 245A, 246A, 247A, 250A
21 22	23/A, 245A, 240A, 24/A, 250A and 381A were admitted into
23	Evidence.)
24 25	MR. BRAUNIG: The next order of business is if
	The Branch of the North of the State of the
371	373
¹ DECEMBER 19 2013 MORNING SESSION	1 I may hand up to the judge PTX what's been marked PTX
BECEMBER 17, 2013 MORUM O BESSION	I may hand up to the judge PTX what's been marked PTX 385, and maybe Mr. Dahm can pull this up as well.
PROCEEDINGS 3000	Thank you. I apologize that we didn't have
THE COURT: Good morning. I've had a chance to	access to a color printer this morning, so the version
look at the glossary prepared by Metropolitan and I am	that we submit when we submit all the admitted exhibits
6 going to reject it. I think it's there are lots of	6 will include a color version.
parts of it are very helpful, I don't think there's any	7 This is a slide that your Honor has seen
8 question about that, but there are other parts which more	before. What's changed about it is that we removed the
9 embody Metropolitan's views on some of the issues on the	9 argumentative title from it so what it reflects is
merits. It doesn't mean they're wrong, it just means	10 Metropolitan's use of State Water Project facilities from
that I think instead of spending time going back and	11 1995 to 2009.
forth and arguing about it, it is better for me to reject	The PTX documents are lengthy bulletins by the
it and ask Metropolitan to express its views in	Department of Water Resources. And yesterday, we
post-trial briefing. It's just I just don't want to	yesterday we provided and discussed and therefore we move
spend the time on it frankly. That's all it comes down	into evidence A versions of some of these of all of
spend the time of it trankly. That's an it comes down	these documents down here at the bottom that include the
17 Again a lot of it is extremely helpful. There	critical page. But the data even still is voluminous,
are explanations for acronyms, for example, which are	documents are voluminous. And this is a we believe an
very helpful but as a matter of record, I think I should	appropriate summary of voluminous evidence and would be
reject it at this point so we don't have to have a	useful potentially to the Court and so we would move PTX
sideshow on competing definitions of terms. That's all.	21 385 into evidence on that basis.
So let's proceed with any further work that	MR. WEST: We object for lack of foundation,
23 San Diego would like to get done.	your Honor.
MR. KEKER: Your Honor, subject to gathering	This is the first we've seen this version of
ourselves over the weekend and making one final	this document. We are not able to determine whether it
Substitute of the motivated and making one mid	and document. We are not dote to determine whether it
372	374

is, in fact, a summary or an accurate summary of the information that is purported to be contained within it and thus we object to its introduction at this point.

THE COURT: Would you like to get back to me on your position on, for example, on Monday? Would that be helpful?

MR. WEST: That would be fine, your Honor.
THE COURT: Why don't we postpone a ruling and ask San Diego to take it up again Monday.

MR. BRAUNIG: We will remember to do that.
The next item of business, your Honor, this is something that we've talked about a little bit before and Mr. Purcell alluded to and others have alluded to as well.

The idea that when Metropolitan seeks approval of these local resource programs, the programs that are funded by the Water Stewardship Rate, it provides to the board a summary of "here's what the program is and here's what it's going to create." And because we've alluded to this, I wanted to present just a few of these to the Court so that the Court can see what we're talking about and we'll have these in evidence for consideration.

These are all documents that are subject to the parties' stipulation and have been provided before.

THE COURT: So these are sample programs?

will lose the amount of subsidies. And then below that, it says kind of here's the business case for it.

It says in 2007, the board established a goal of 174,000 acre-feet per year of new LRP, Local Resources Program, yield. The board has approved a bunch of projects, those have created 74,000 acre-feet per year and Metropolitan, as it says, provides financial assistance for the production of new water supplies and has done that to the tune of about 206,000 acre-feet in the prior year.

THE COURT: So your view of this, just so I understand, is that this is an example of a situation in which Metropolitan is spending money to produce water.

MR. BRAUNIG: That's right. They're spending money to produce water and not just produce water for Metropolitan, produce water within particular member agencies. So this goes to the point that these are supply costs, not -- they should not be allocated to Metropolitan's transportation rate because what they're doing is creating new supply.

And I think that becomes even clearer in PTX 227, which is another one of these board action memos to approve a -- in this case another recycled water system expansion project, this one in Orange County. And as your Honor can see, the subject, you know, sort of says

375 377

MR. BRAUNIG: These are sample programs and the board memos in which they are approved.

So the first one is PTX 221. And PTX 221, this is a March 13, 2012 board action memo of Metropolitan's relating to authorized entering into a local resources program agreement with Eastern Municipal Water District for a recycled water system expansion project.

And can we blow up the first paragraph of that description?

So as it says, this is seeking authorization. The project, as it says, would provide up to 5,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water within Eastern's service area. Eastern would own and operate the project. And it says simply that the project would strengthen regional water supply reliability.

You will notice that it says here's -- here are the standards that it needs to meet in order to be approved by Metropolitan.

And there's no reference in that to it avoids facility costs, even that it avoids particular water supply costs on a regional basis. It simply says we're going to pay you for performance, you'll get up to \$250 per acre-foot, there will be a termination for nonperformance if you don't start construction and if the -- you'll lose money if the project falls short, you

precisely that.

And then the executive summary lays it out.

The executive summary says look, here's what we want to do, here's the agreement. This project would provide up to 1175 acre-feet per year of recycled water for landscape irrigation within El Toro's service area. El Toro is part of the Municipal Water District of Orange County.

And then it says this project would help achieve Metropolitan's LRP goal of 174,000-acre-feet of new supply. Again, sort of at the end of that detailed paragraph it says the project would strengthen regional water supply reliability.

And when your Honor has this back in chambers and is looking at it, what you'll see is there's no reference anywhere in this document to particular avoided supply -- even avoided supply costs, much less avoided conveyance or transportation costs or avoided facilities costs. And I think that sort of goes to the point that it's not that these programs couldn't conceivably have regional benefits, San Diego isn't taking that position either in this litigation or in the Metropolitan process, it's that Metropolitan hasn't even begun to assess that on a case-by-case basis.

And the last one I want to draw your Honor's

2.0

2.5

attention to is PTX 252. PTX 252 is, again, this time authorizing entering into three local resources programs agreements -- Local Resources Program agreements with the Three Valleys Municipal Water District, which is again one of Metropolitan's member agencies. And again, they lay it out in the description in that first paragraph.

If we can highlight that, please.

2.3

They're seeking authorization to enter into three separate LRP agreements. These are going to be again about regional recycled water projects. And then it says the 8,867 acre-feet per year project would increase regional water supply reliability by replacing demand for imported water supply and increasing groundwater in the Fuente and Spadra groundwater basins.

Benefits to Metropolitan include improved regional supply reliability and reduced regional costs for water importation.

This is Metropolitan admitting, acknowledging when it tells its board, here's why we should approve it, it's going to create supply and it's going to avoid supply costs.

Now, they haven't even articulated what specifically those avoided supply costs are, because without knowing whether or not you would have had to -- you know, whether or not there was a capacity constraint

acre-feet, acre-feet of supply created, which is what they're doing.

So those are the -- those are the ones that I wanted to talk about and we'll move all of those three into evidence, 221, 227 and 252.

MR. WEST: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: 385, 221 -- I'm sorry, not 385 at this point.

221, 227 and 252?
 MR. BRAUNIG: Yes.
 THE COURT: Those 8

THE COURT: Those are admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit 221, 227 and 252 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. BRAUNIG: Thank you.

The last thing I wanted to raise before I sit down is with the deposition designations that your Honor is reviewing or will be reviewing, there are documents that are authenticated and discussed with those witnesses. And so to be clear, any of those that are in there -- anything that is on there is also on the PTX list. It is also a trial exhibit that's been designated as part of our stipulation with Metropolitan, but to the extent that those deposition designations include a discussion of plaintiff's trial exhibits, we will ask the Court to move those into evidence, assuming those depo

that would require you to go out and buy new supply, you can't even say for sure that you've avoided a supply cost.

But certainly the notion that the costs associated with this program, which is all about increasing supply, should be allocated 100 percent to Metropolitan's transportation rates, just makes no sense. Just doesn't make any sense. And it is certainly not supported by the record that Metropolitan made in asking for approval of these projects.

Let me see if there was anything else that I -- let's do --

And this is just a summary of some of the -some of the other projects, similar type projects that Metropolitan has entered into, you know, under the LRP program and again, as your Honor can see, the only thing that they're tracking is the ultimate yield.

Can we maybe blow up the top two or three lines of that?

THE COURT: Which exhibit is this?
MR. BRAUNIG: This is still within 252. And it's laying out the selected projects, says here's the title, here's the member agency, here's the type of project, project is groundwater, recycled water.

What's the yield? The yield is an in

designations are accepted.

THE COURT: That's a little too vague for me right now.

MR. BRAUNIG: I wanted to make it clear. And we'll end up discussing this with counsel and when we put together a stipulation of exhibits that are admitted, I just wanted to make clear that that's our intention and --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRAUNIG: -- hopefully that won't be an issue.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. BRAUNIG: And with that, subject to Mr. Keker's explanation that we're going to rest subject to issues around the admission of documents, we rest.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Why don't we turn it over to Metropolitan.

MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor.

First a housekeeping matter. The first day of trial, the Court granted our request for judicial notice and asked us to provide a proposed order. We have one here that I've provided to San Diego and they've signed off on that so I would like to approach and hand it to the Court.

THE COURT: Please. I would be happy to sign

that.

2.2

2.3

All right. Let's continue.

MR. HIXSON: The next thing, your Honor, is that we are going to do a presentation of evidence in the administration record and if I can provide the Court with a chambers copy.

THE COURT: Great. Thanks.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, as the Court is aware, the rate challenge is almost entirely an administrative record only proceeding. The Wheeling Statute claim has been carved out and the Court is accepting extra record evidence, but the remaining claims that are in the rate challenge are admin record only and so in this presentation, I'm going to highlight key evidence in the administrative record that is relevant on the claims in this case.

The admin record itself is enormous. It is more than 22,000 pages long. This reflects the multiple years spanning over a decade and a half, nearly two decades and Metropolitan's lengthy deliberative process and rate setting. And so one of the goals of this presentation is to highlight those documents in this lengthy record that are of particular importance for the claims in this case.

Before I go in, I would like to explain the

ones that stand out, that may be documents that the Court can focus on, recognizing the review extends to the entire record.

First let me talk about the ten topics that I intend to address to in the presentation.

The first is to go into some detail about Metropolitan's rate setting process, the requirements in the MWD Act and in the Administrative Code, the steps that Met should go through to set its rates and charges.

And then I want to spend some time on Metropolitan's cost of service methodology which gets into the nuts and bolts of how different costs are functionalized and how they're classified and how those dollar amounts get allocated to rate elements because I think it's important to go into that level of detail, particularly because this case is a rate challenge.

Then I'm going to discuss the rates and charges that result from this cost of service methodology. I'm going to talk about the three elements of the rate challenge: The State Water Project transportation costs, the Water Stewardship Rate, and the peaking -- the dry year peaking claims.

I'm also going to focus on the Raftelis report review. I alluded to it briefly in the opening statement, but it is something that is important and that

citation format that is in the footer on each page.

In this presentation, I will be citing only to documents in the administrative record, or to statutes like the MWD Act or the MWD Administrative Code.

In the footer we have put citation to the administrative record. They are sometimes in the format DTX, defense trial exhibit, or JTX 1 and 2, which are the two administrative records. And then we've briefly identified what the item is that we're referring to. The intent there is if your Honor later wants to go back in chambers and review it, you know what we were talking about in this particular document.

Often what I will do is have a document on the screen that is from the 2010 or 2012 rate setting cycle and then in the footer, we'll have the equivalent document from the other rate setting cycle. For example, in a cost of service study, the basic elements or the content are similar and so rather than showing you the same document twice from different rate setting cycles, I would show one and then in the footer we would have the equivalent in the other rate setting cycle.

At various times in this presentation, I will call out particular documents that I think are especially important. Obviously the Court has the entire administrative record and the goal is simply to identify

courts look to in reviewing an administrative record only case to see what kind of review an agency has had of its rates.

Then I'm going to turn to a number of documents that San Diego added to the administrative record. In the spring of 2012, San Diego, being members of the board, they are entitled to, like anyone can, put documents in the record and they added a number of documents in the administrative record, such as a 1969 study by Brown and Caldwell and a number of other documents from the 1990s.

It -- because anyone, any member agency or participant in the board meetings can put documents in the record, it sometimes might not be clear; for example, if you see something in the record that says 1969 on it, when did it become part of the record. But I do want to -- because those items are in the record and/or available for the board to consider at least at the 2012 meeting, I do want to speak to them as well.

I want to briefly address the issue of written determinations under the Wheeling Statute, something that was in dispute earlier in this case and I'm not sure if it still is, and then to wrap up with some other references why the exchange agreement doesn't undermine Metropolitan's rates.

First let me turn to Metropolitan's rate setting process and its cost of service methodology. And so this -- we're focused here today on cost allocations that were decided in October of 2001, that became effective in January 2003. And just as a recap, prior to 2003, Met had a bundled inclusive charge that included conveyance and supply. There wasn't a distinction between supply and transportation and so these arguments about where should State Water Project transportation costs go or where should Water Stewardship Rate costs go, those wouldn't have been relevant at the time. We're talking about the unbundling.

1.0

2.4

This was a multiyear process that led to the unbundling again in 1998 with Met's evaluation of strategic processes and discussions with a number of agencies.

In December of 99, there was strategic and planned policy principles that were adopted. I'll talk a little bit more about what those were and how they informed the rate making.

In October of 2001, the Met board voted to adopt the unbundled rate structure. That means putting the cost allocations in different categories. There's then the next step of doing cost of service and deciding what dollar amounts go in those different categories.

resources, develops local resources and implements or conserves or demands they don't require Met services.

This is significant for a couple reasons. One is it highlights the difference between Met and a retail water agency, because a retail water agency normally does have an exclusive right to serve. They are the only ones that can serve in a particular area. But Met doesn't have that with respect to its service area. Each of its member agencies or their subagencies may have that right as retail providers, but Met is just a wholesaler beyond that.

This is also significant because it gets into Prop. 26 issues, which is what exactly is the service that Metropolitan is providing? Because under certain cost of service methodologies, you're supposed to compare the cost or benefits of the service that's being provided.

What Met is providing is supplemental water service. And it has 26 member agencies that have varying demands. Those demands can be different at each moment in time and they can change over time.

And the service Met is providing is being able to handle their supplemental demands as they may change. In particular, this becomes relevant to San Diego's dry year peaking claim, where they say that the member

387 389

And so the vote on particular dollar amounts was March 12, 2002 and those were effective then the following year in January 2003.

On the bottom right you'll see our footer here. It is a busy one because we've summarized a number of documents in the administrative record, but those refer to the different events that are depicted in this timeline.

In terms of the rate setting process, the cornerstone, obviously, is the board of directors. This is the MWD Act, Section 134, this is a statute passed by the California Legislature, the enabling act for Metropolitan that vests the authority in the board to fix the rates or rates for water. And so this becomes the starting point for Met's rate setting process.

I would like to address some of the principles that the board follows. Here I've cited an April 2012 memorandum to the board that's in the administrative record, and it helps to explain what Metropolitan is and the services it's providing.

It explains that Metropolitan system is a wholesale system and that it provides supplemental supplies.

Met has no exclusive right to serve in its service area to the degree a member agency has local

agencies are quite differently situated. And we don't agree with that factual predicate, but Met in its role as a supplemental provider has the reality that it has member agencies that are differently situated and that Met's role is to be a supplemental provider, that's the nature of the service that is provided.

In addition, as a supplemental provider, there is the basic truth that Met's member agencies aren't obligated to purchase water from Met. If they have their own resources, their own groundwater resources or other resources available to them, there's no requirement that they purchase water from Met in the way that there would be a requirement that a household or a business purchase retail water from their local retail water provider.

For operational convenience, most of Met's member agencies have entered into voluntary ten-year water supply purchase orders. I didn't want to leave that part of it out because it's true that they don't have to purchase water from Met but for planning purposes, often they do enter into purchase orders that are forward looking for about ten years.

Another principle that comes through in rate making, and here I said I would refer to the strategic planned policy principles in December of 1999, is that Met is a voluntary cooperative. It was created for the

Pages 387 to 390

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

member agencies that have a common purpose of developing, storing and distributing water.

We are often accused of making up the voluntary cooperative language for purposes of litigation because of the Prop. 26 issue that Prop. 26 applies only to rate surcharges that are imposed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So that's why I wanted to highlight this document in the administrative record from 14 years ago at the time that unbundling was being considered that highlighted this principle that Met is a voluntary cooperative of member public agencies.

Let's turn now more into the specific way that Metropolitan is governed, according to its enabling statute.

Section 51 of the MWD Act -- I should clarify. All of the provisions of the MWD Act and Administrative Code that I'm citing to during the presentation today were included in our request for judicial notice that's before the Court.

So section 51 provides that the board has a -at least one representative from each member public agency. This ensures representation by each of the members. Each of them is entitled to vote on every question that comes before the vote -- that comes before the board. Their votes of course are weighted according to make recommendations of rates, and then listed here are the various different water rates at issue that the general manager must make recommendations concerning.

We can then turn to a later provision in Section 4304 that provides that not later than its regular April meeting, the finance and insurance committee shall make its determination regarding the revenue requirements from the water rates.

It also provides in Subsection F that proposals for changes in water rates would ordinarily become effective on January 1. If that would be otherwise, then there has to be adequate notice to the public that rates are taking effect at a different time.

And finally we come to Section 2109 dealing with the board agenda, that the board shall make a provision for public appearances of the board on matters on which action is taken. This emphasizes the open and deliberative nature of the board, that it is required to conduct these proceedings in public.

THE COURT: Are all the meetings of the board in public?

MR. HIXSON: Yes, all of the meetings of the board are public unless there are things taken up in closed session such as attorney-client privilege matters.

I would like to spend some time on the cost of

391

to the assessed value in each of the member agencies.

Section 57 is an important part of Metropolitan's Act because it provides that the affirmative votes of members representing more than 50 percent of the total number of votes shall be necessary to carry a resolution. In other words, this establishes that basic democratic mechanism within Metropolitan's board that votes are by a majority vote. That is intentional, it's by design, it's a requirement of the act passed by the California Legislature.

Separate from the MWD Act, Metropolitan has its own Administrative Code. This is a law. It is -- but it is a law adopted by Metropolitan's board and governs a lot of the processes and procedures that Metropolitan follows.

In particular there are a number of requirements in here concerning the rate making process. Section 4304 provides that not later than at the February meeting, the general manager shall provide to the board determinations of revenue requirements and cost of service analysis. So we see here that Met in its own Administrative Code requires cost of service analysis and requires a determination of revenue requirements going beyond the requirements in the MWD enabling act.

And then the general manager is also required

service document, to explain what it is and the role it has in Metropolitan's rate setting.

I said earlier that I would flag if there are certain documents that are of particular importance during Metropolitan's reviewing rates. This is one of them. This is a key document for the Court to analyze in evaluating the rate challenge.

Let me explain what this particular document

When the general manager makes a recommendation to the board, it takes the form of a board action letter that would set forth the recommendation for the rates and charges. The action letter is supported by a cost of service document that is literally attached to it. And so, there are these in every rate setting cycle.

The one that I've attached here is from the 2012 rate setting cycle, and you'll see -- let me explain some of the words on the page there.

The 2012 is a biannual rate setting cycle, meaning that it set rates that were in effect in 2013 and 2014 and so there was a separate cost of service report for each of those different years.

In addition, the general manager made -proposed three different options: Option I, option II and option III.

394

393

I've shown here Option II for the fiscal year 2012, 2013 cost of service. And the reason I chose option II is because the board opted for option II so this is the one that was adopted, but there were a total of six cost of service studies that went before the board.

And again, this is an example why I print out a document from the 2012 rate setting cycle, and of course there was one in 2010 and then for each of the years from the unbundling in '04, '05, '06, '07 and so on, there's a cost of service analysis.

THE COURT: Is this done every year?
MR. HIXSON: It's done every rate setting cycle.

THE COURT: Which is one or two years?
MR. HIXSON: In 2010, it was for two years. In 2012, it was for two years.

THE COURT: Right.

1.3

2.2

2.3

MR. HIXSON: And before that, it was every year.

At a high level there are four basic steps in Metropolitan's cost of service process. Step number one is that Met determines its revenue requirements for the coming fiscal year. Let's talk about what that means.

The cost of service study identifies the money

to provide and then how much money is necessary to have the revenue to provide those services.

Met does have an amount of revenue that comes in from property taxes. Those are about five percent of its total revenue requirement. But for the remainder, Met is proceeding in this direction of what revenues does it need to provide the services. This becomes significant in the Prop. 13 and Prop. 26 context where courts doing analysis of did the government entity just have an arbitrary amount of money they were going to charge or was that an amount that was estimated to cover the cost of a service.

And so that's why it's important to see that Metropolitan does its rate setting in this way, starting with what are the costs it needs to be able to pay for and then how should it raise the revenue that will prospectively pay for those costs.

And as I just said, it's a prospective measure. Met looks at the upcoming fiscal year and asks what is the best estimate of what it will need to raise in water rates that will pay prospectively for that.

And as part of step 1 of the revenue requirement, Met doesn't stop with the total amount of 1.49 billion. It breaks that down into what is it for, looking forward to the next fiscal year, what does Met

that Met's going to need to raise to fund its operations. And here we see in this cost of service study that the -- it's looking at the estimated revenue requirements for fiscal year 2012 and 2013.

Met does conduct its finances on a fiscal year basis, so that's July 1 of each year as opposed to a calendar year basis, which is January 1. And the total revenue requirements this coming fiscal year were approximately 1.49 billion.

The fact that Met starts its rate setting process with the revenue requirement is significant for a couple of reasons because it's different from how people often think of government entities as doing their budgeting process.

If you think about a city or about the state legislature, what they often do is start with how much money is coming in through taxes, and then they figure well, how much can they afford to spend? They look at what's available and then try to figure out how that will be spent and then do they need to borrow more money or do they need to raise taxes. In recent years, it seems like they're always looking at with the revenue end, how much do they have to cut from the budget.

Metropolitan proceeds in the opposite direction. It looks at what are the services it's going

need to raise revenue to pay for.

And these are the general district requirements in Schedule 1. You can see that the State Water Project is the largest item here that Met is going to need to pay for at 593 million or 36.7 percent of Met's revenue requirement in the upcoming fiscal year.

Second to the State Water Project is Met's capital financing program, which in that year was 396 million or about 24.5 percent of the revenue requirement. There's a total after that at the bottom and then there are some revenue offsets for money that comes in for other revenue offsets. And then you have the net revenue requirement: What does Met need to raise going forward, and it has broken that down into what are the various items it needs to pay for.

Having determined its revenue requirements, Met then looked at the next step in the cost of service process, which is the functionalization of costs.

Functionalization sounds like a dry accounting word. This is actually where the big fight is between the parties concerning the State Water Project transportation costs because in the functionalization stage, Metropolitan has to decide do you take those State Water Project costs, what functions do you say they're performing?

San Diego says they all perform the function of water supply and so they should all be allocated to that function. Metropolitan says no, some of those State Water Project costs perform the function of supply, but others perform the function of transportation.

2.3

And so it's at this step in the cost of service process that the State Water Project costs are disaggregated and some go down the path that will lead them in steps three and four of the cost of service process to be in the supply rates and others go down the path that would lead them to be recovered in the transportation rates.

But I wanted to highlight to the Court from a technical perspective and a cost of service perspective where is this happening, and it's happening in step two when the costs are functionalized.

And let me show a chart from the cost of service. This is Schedule 4 where Met breaks down its revenue requirements by service function. The functions that it identifies are source of supply, and you can see Colorado River Aqueduct and State Water Project beneath that.

You can see -- or I hope you can see, there's a lot of information on the chart -- conveyance and aqueduct and there's again, Colorado River and State

This is where the board can look at these State Water Project costs and the board can see that the power costs of 270 million are almost three times as much as the water -- as the Delta water charge, the water supply charge.

And that the transportation costs, the construction, the maintenance, the replacement of parts and the aqueduct and the other transportation facilities are \$201 million or slightly more than twice the cost of the water resource. And so the board can look at these costs from DWR and see their magnitude.

And so in looking at the functionalization function or what it's doing in functionalization, the board can disaggregate and see here, are huge amounts of the State Water Project bill really not for the water resource?

And this helps to illustrate that yeah, actually, large amounts of that bill are dealing with the transportation facilities and for the power that's required to move to Southern California, the water to Southern California rather than the cost of the water resource itself. And that's information the board can take into account in deciding realistically what is the right function that this costs are associated with and here it has broken them down between supply and

Water Project and so -- okay, thank you.

And so there's this division here.

In addition, let me scroll back, there are other functions. There's storage, there's treatment, there's distribution and demand management. Those are the different functions listed on the left. And here, you can see where Met is allocating amounts of money to those different functions.

This is something worth focusing on as well in terms of what the board is looking at when it decides what functions are being performed by the State Water Project. For example, if you look at source of supply for the State Water Project, as we've discussed that's the Delta water charge or the charge from DWR for the water resource. And you can see here that that's \$98 million for this year. That's under source of supply, SWP, and you look to the right under fiscal year and you see the 98 million.

Beneath that you see the conveyance and aqueduct function. That's the transportation of these water resources to Met service area. And then under State Water Project, you can see there's State Water Project power and then State Water Project, all other. Those are the things like the capital and the operations and the maintenance expenses.

transportation.

This is also a response to the plaintiff's argument that what you should do is look at the narrow chart of accounts and it says the purchase of water is the cost to have it at the point of delivery and then the inquiry supposedly over because you know it should all be water supply.

The board can look at its costs and say it really seems like a lot of them are actually for transportation, in fact an enormous amount of them are rather than for the water resource itself. So that's information's available to the board.

THE COURT: Though, this document is prepared by staff based on other documents and this reflects a judgment call, does it not?

MR. HIXSON: Yes.

THE COURT: That is that we're going to have -for example, when it comes to \$270 million, somebody's
made a judgment that this power is required for state
conveyance.

MR. HIXSON: Well, DWR has sent Metropolitan a bill and said this is your bill for the conveyance of water to Metropolitan. And so, yes, Met has received that water bill. But Met has -- in terms of how Met characterizes that, putting it into this function, that's

,1

2.3

correct, it is a judgment call.

2.3

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HIXSON: Let's turn to step three. This is the classification of costs.

What classification means is distinguishing costs from costs associated with average use from those associated with peak use and from those associated with standby. And so this gets into the peaking issues that the parties have been talking about.

Step three is a cost of service, is where Met distinguishes between these different types of costs and allocates some to average, some to peak and some to standby.

I'm going to pull up Schedule 7 here, which shows the service function revenue requirements by classification category. Those categories are fixed demand, commodity, standby and variable commodity. These terms require explanation because otherwise they may look just like words on a page, but I want to explain how they are related to distinguishing between average, peak and standby.

The cost of service study explains what demand costs are, and it says that demand costs are incurred to meet peak demands. And it goes on to explain that only the direct capital financing costs were included in the

And so these -- the principle components of standby costs are the emergency storage capacity within Met and then the standby capacity in the State Water Project conveyance system. But that's what we mean when we say standby, is that there's costs associated with Met systems that are there in case a terrible, you know, earthquake or other emergency happens and Met needs to be able to provide that essential water.

And then to round out the picture, variable commodity costs are defined similar to the other commodity costs. Those are associated with average system demands. So again, this is the stage where Met has taken its total cost, the revenue requirement, it has assigned what functions they're for and then within that, it decides which are those are related to average, which for the peak and then which are related to the more emergency or standby costs.

Having done this, Metropolitan then moves to the fourth step, which is allocating costs to the rate design elements. This is where it decides what costs end up in which of the rates.

This is Schedule 8. It is a chart with a lot of detail and may be difficult to read. This is probably the most important chart in the cost of service study.

What this chart does is it shows on the

403 405

demand classification category, and it goes on to explain other costs there.

This is intended to help the Court see what the word "demand" means in this context. It is referring to costs that are associated with higher than average years or to peak demands.

Next I would like to explain what the word "commodity" means. Here it explains that commodity costs are generally associated with average system demands. So commodity is just a term of art that means average level of uses. And then there's some more explanation here about what is generally included in average use, variable commodity costs, including costs of chemicals, most power costs, because those vary with how much water is being delivered and other cost components that increase or decrease in relation to the volume of water supplied.

The third category here is standby. Standby is something that is important for Metropolitan that is -- might be of different or lesser importance to other water agencies because it relates to Met's role in ensuring system reliability during something like an emergency, like an earthquake or a severing of the aqueduct in Southern California that Met, because of its huge geographic size, has a certain standby role that would be unusual for, say, a municipal water utility.

left-hand side the service functions of the classification category. The service functions are the various different functions that Met considers itself to be performing in this cost of service.

You can see there's the supply function that is broken out on top, there's the conveyance and aqueduct function and again, that's the movement of water from the sources of supply to Met service area.

Beneath that, Metropolitan has identified a storage function that it performs. It has a treatment function and that means taking the untreated water it receives and treating that so it can be drunk.

There's a distribution function. This refers to Metropolitan's in basin distribution system, namely the network of pipes and other infrastructure to move the water to the member agencies, the connections to this 26 different member agencies. That's called the distribution function.

THE COURT: How is that different from conveyance?

MR. HIXSON: Conveyance and aqueduct refers to the State Water Project transportation facilities and the Colorado River Aqueduct that move the water from the source of supply to Metropolitan's service area. The distribution function is then the moving of the water to

the member agencies through Metropolitan's distribution network.

2.2

2.3

And then if you may recall from the opening, we had the blue lines for the State Water Project, the red for the Colorado River. That's conveyance and aqueduct, and the purple was distribution.

Beneath that is demand management. Those are the costs of the local resource programs, the conservation credits and the desalination programs are all in the demand management function, and those, as the Court knows, are recovered through the water storage rates. And beneath that is the total of all these different functions.

Then what you can see on the top right going from left to right are the rates where everything is recovered in. I think that's in particular what makes this chart so useful. You can see the supply rates and what goes into it. You have the commodity charges that go into the supply rates and then -- and also there are certain storage costs there that go into supply rates.

And then you can see to the right the three transportation rates. There's the System Access Rate and you can see that there are conveyance aqueduct where they're called fixed commodity costs that go into there. Those are facilities expenses for the State Water Project

you can see how the Capacity Charge covers those peaking costs.

And then you've got the Readiness-to-Serve Charge. That recovers all the standby costs. So the cost of the Metropolitan system standing by in case of an earthquake or some other terrible event of recovery and the Readiness-to-Serve Charge there.

And then there's the treatment surcharge. All of the costs you can see under the treatment function flow to the right-hand column are in the treatment surcharge.

So what makes Schedule 8 so useful is that you see all the different functions and you have all the rates laid out there and you can see exactly which one of them flows into which rates. So for convenience, we've been giving you PowerPoint slides that kind of summarize where these different things end up. Schedule 8 is the ultimate resource so the Court can look to see for yourself what costs are flowing into which rates so it doesn't have to be a source of mystery, as laid out here, as in all of the cost of service rates that Metropolitan does.

Where Schedule 8 then leads to, once you've got the different rates and the dollars flowing into them, is Schedule 9, the rates and charges summary.

transportation facilities and the Colorado River Aqueduct.

You can see there are certain storage costs going into the System Access Rate and the distribution costs, so the facilities costs here should go into the System Access Rate. Next to it you can see the Water Stewardship Rate and that carries all the way down and recovers the cost of demand management function.

And then you can see the System Power Rate and it recovers variable commodity and as we saw on a previous slide, those are the energy -- the variable commodity or power costs for moving water to Southern California, and you can see how they flow right into the System Power Rate on the Schedule 8.

There's then the Capacity Charge that recovers certain fixed demand for storage, and we saw before fixed demand is a term of art that means peaking costs and so it refers to the certain peaking storage capacity.

And then going down in Capacity Charge, you can see fixed commodity costs under -- or fixed demand for distribution.

I hope I now have done a decent enough job of explaining the Metropolitan lingo, that distribution is how the system that pushes the water out to member agencies, and then fixed demand are the peaking costs so You know something happens between Schedule 8 and 9, or a couple things happen. One of them is a projection of the amount of water that Metropolitan expects to sell in the next fiscal year. Because certain dollar amounts have been allocated to the supply rates and to the transportation rates to turn those into acre-feet of water, Met has to have an expected sales level and so that's -- although that's not the only thing that happens between Schedules 8 and 9, that's the principal step that is being made there, the estimated amount of sales.

I should explain a couple things on this chart. There's the supply rates. There's the tier 1 supply rate, tier two. There's a reference to the Delta supply surcharge. This was something that's no longer in effect. It was called out separately in 2012 and before, and you can see the little asterisk marks for 2013 and 2014. It's no longer broken out as a separate supply cost, it is folded within the other supply rates.

So these -- these are the rates and charges that result from cost of service process.

What happens then after the cost of service study goes to the board is that the board in a series of meetings opens up the proposed rates for discussion in its public board and committee meetings at workshops,

meetings that are open to all member agency managers and other member agency staff. As we saw from Met's Administrative Code, there are noticed public hearings of proposed rate and charges. You may not have known this but Metropolitan board meetings are publicly Web cast live and there's on demand video streaming of the meetings for people who would like to watch the meetings on their computer. And Metropolitan staff provides data supporting each of the rate proposals and each of the options throughout all of these discussions.

This then culminates in a board action item letter before the rate vote that goes to each board member and is a public document, a final letter setting forth the details of the proposed rate option, a staff recommendation and that's backed up by the cost of service studies.

The board action letter for April 2012 is quite a hefty document because it's got the three different options and the two different fiscal years, so there's this huge stack of six cost of service studies that analyze each one of those for two years, so that would be -- and so that's more options than may often be submitted, but that's typical information that backs up the board action letter.

So from here, we get to, then, Metropolitan's

So we saw the cost of service process and how the costs are functionalized, classified and allocated. And what comes out of it is Met's rate structure, the volumetric rates, the supply transportation treatment and then the fixed charges, the Capacity Charge and Readiness-to-Serve charge, and this chart will be familiar to the Court.

We have what the supply rates recover. We saw this flowing through in Schedule 8, the cost to supply water from the State Water Project to the Colorado River Aqueduct, and also the storage costs that are allocated and show up in Schedule 8 being recovered in the supply rates.

Then we saw the System Access Rate, which is best understood as the facilities expense for those facilities that transported water. That would be both the conveyance and aqueduct function and the distribution function. So you have the State Water Project transportation facilities, Colorado River Aqueduct and the distribution facilities that would then move the water out to the member agencies.

And we saw that the System Power Rate in Schedule 8 is literally a flow through of the energy costs that move water to Southern California. That's -- they would get assigned under the System Power Rate.

411 413

rates and charges that are at issue.

THE COURT: Would this be good time to take our break?

MR. HIXSON: Absolutely.

THE COURT: I'll see everybody in ten minutes.

Thank you.

1.0

2.3

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: All right. Let's continue, please.

MR. WEST: Your Honor, one small thing. With the Court's permission, we noticed that your clerk is sitting behind the screen unable to see the presentation. If -- if it would be okay with the Court, we would like to provide him a copy of the presentation so he can look at it and follow along.

THE COURT: It is okay.

MR. WEST: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, now I would like to discuss Met's rates and charges at issue.

I have two goals in this section. One is to explain the difference between Met's transportation rates and its wheeling rate, and the other is to explain exactly where the State Water Project costs are all; ending up and to be technically precise about that because I do think it's important to the Court's understanding of the case.

And then the Water Stewardship Rate we saw is that it -- 100 percent of that is budgeted to recover the costly demand management programs. There aren't other pieces of things that end up in the Water Stewardship Rate, that is what it recovers. And as for all of these rates, the volumetric rates, these are uniform among the member agencies and they are acre-foot charge.

For member agencies that buy what's called full service water, meaning the water they buy is from Met and they pay the transportation rates, they pay the supply and the transportation rates that are listed up here.

And here is where I want to focus on wheeling service and how it's different from transportation.

This is the rate for wheeling service. It was redefined in March of 2002 under Metropolitan unbundled rate structure, and it says what the elements of it are.

The rates for wheeling service shall include the System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate for treated water, the treatment surcharge and wheeling parties pay for their own costs of power.

So the System Access Rate we saw recovers those facilities expenses that Metropolitan has that has the State Water Project transportation facilities, Colorado River Aqueduct and then Met's distribution system that are all collectively used to move water. Water storage

rate recovers the demand management cost.

2.3

But I wanted to highlight what's not in the wheeling -- the rate program service and that's the System Power Rate. Earlier when we saw the different state water projects costs, we saw that about 98 million were for the water supply costs, the Delta water charge. We saw that a little over twice that, about 200 million were for the capital and operations and maintenance costs.

But we also saw that the largest share by far were the variable power costs. That was the \$270 million in energy costs to move water to Southern California. Those energy costs are then allocated to the System Power Rate. They're not in the rate for wheeling service. So, the single largest item of expense, the single largest chunk of the State Water Project Transportation Bill doesn't go into the rate for wheeling service.

And recall that the way Met classifies the energy costs is it assigns them as a 100 percent variable commodity. Those are pure variable charges that go up or down depending on the amount of power that is used to transport water to Southern California, whereas the other ones that are in the rate program service are not in the cost and that's certain fixed expenses for the facilities and how it operates.

of power service utilized for delivery of the wheeled water.

So yes, the rate for wheeling service does recover the actual power cost or the wheeler can provide their own power. The point I wanted to make is that the System Power Rate, as such, that's not just automatically allocated to the rate for wheeling service. It could be different depending on what the actual power costs are associated with that.

THE COURT: Doesn't that suggest the System Power Rate is not something which is the actual cost of transporting that particular volume of water?

MR. HIXSON: The -- it doesn't. The system Power Rate takes into account various offsets. For example, the State Water Project, in addition to delivering water, part of delivering water, it has recovery power plants. When water flows downhill, it can be -- goes through hydroelectric facilities and those generate power. So the System Power Rate is a net offset that takes into account the other things so it's a specific type of power rate.

And so anyway, the point here though is that the transportation rates that the member agencies pay are going to reflect that system power rate and the various different offsets and credits that are involved in State

415 417

But I think in this case, we talk about as a shorthand that the State Water Project transportation costs recovered and that's transportation rates. And I wanted to clarify that for the rate for wheeling service, the single biggest ticket item isn't part of the rate for wheeling service. This also gets through if the distinction between what a transportation rate is and the rate for wheeling service is.

When you've got a member agency buying full service water from Metropolitan, they pay the supply rates and they pay all three of the transportation rates, including the System Power Rate. So they are going to pay part of the pro rata expense of having that State Water Project moved and the power costs associated with that to Southern California. But the rate for wheeling service carves out and doesn't include that huge variable power cost. That isn't part of the published rate.

THE COURT: There's still power -- obviously there's power involved in wheeling water.

MR. HIXSON: Yes.

THE COURT: So it's recovered some other way.

MR. HIXSON: It is recovered. Here it provides that the wheeling parties must pay for their own cost of power if such power can be scheduled by the district or pay the district for the actual cost, not system average,

Water Project, whereas the rate for wheeling service is a different type of thing. And power can be different depending on the issue.

But your Honor is right that it does recover power costs. For example, when on the occasions when Met has wheeled water through the State Water Project for San Diego, there are additional variable power costs specific for that transaction that would then have to be paid for and the wheeling rate does contemplate that. It doesn't wholesale throw the System Power Rate into the regular wheeling service because of its variable nature.

Let's turn then to the first aspect of San Diego's rate challenge which is about the allocation of certain State Water Project transportation charges to Met's own transportation rates.

We've talked before about how the -- Met has a contract that has separate supply and transportation charges that -- the Delta water charge on the supply side and the transportation charges on the transportation side.

Focusing first on the supply charge, this is a pass through. So from the Delta water charge we saw for those costs are functionalized to the supply function. They are then classified as commodity, meaning associated with average demand and then allocated to Met's supply

Pages 415 to 418

rates. So that's where they flow through, that's where the costs end up in Metropolitan's rate structure.

2.2

2.3

The transportation charges as I've alluded to are a little bit more complicated. The energy costs do flow through to the System Power Rate but as I've just explained and as part of the transportation rates and as I've just explained that isn't automatically part of the rate for wheeling service.

The facilities expenses, though, are a little bit different. In the step three of the cost of service process, basically Met has a distribution system that is sized to meet peak demand, meaning busier times of year it has to have more capital costs. That same thing is true to a certain extent with the State Water Project. Its facilities are also sized to meet busier times of the year.

So when Met looks at its State Water Project capital costs and State Water Project operations and maintenance costs, it does classify them. It classifies the large majority to commodity, but it also classifies some to peak and some to standby. So, once those are classified to peak and standby, they are allocated to the Readiness-to-Serve charge.

This may be way more detailed than you were ever hoping to hear, but I did want to get it out there

contract for water supply. San Diego likes to point to the title of the contract. We ask the Court to look beyond the face page and to see the content of it, but those words are right there on the title of the page.

More important, though, is the separation of the costs that's at the heart of the contract between Met and the state. So the Delta water charge here, this is the charge for project water. This was the 98 million-dollar figure that we looked at earlier in one of the cost of service schedules in that particular year, so the cost of developing that water resource.

And that relates to the -- I'm showing again a picture of Lake Oroville with the dam and the other facilities there. This is basically the \$98 million. That's what we're looking at in terms of the State Water Project's supply costs.

Transportation costs are allocated to Met but they're allocated to other contractors under article 23 of the State Water Project contract. This is going to be the \$470 million so that the 200 million that is the capital and the operation maintenance and then the larger chunk, the 270 for the power costs that ultimately are not assigned to the wheeling rate.

And these expenses, again, are for the facilities expenses, for the California Aqueduct

that it's not true that all of the transportation capital and operations and maintenance expenses end up in the System Access Rate. Some of them end up in the Readiness-to-Serve charge because they're classified as being associated with peak or standby usage. It would

simply be the large majority end up in the System Access

And here I've covered where those two rates are here.

There are essentially five reasons supported by the administrative record why it was reasonable and continues to be reasonable for the board to allocate the State Water Project transportation costs that it does to Met's transportation rates.

The first is the nature of the cost. The second is Met's ability to use the State Water Project as an extension of its own system. The third is the integrated nature of the system.

The fourth is the consistency with industry guidance. And here, I'm going to expand on that a bit more in this presentation and talk about the nature of that guidance. And then the fifth is the blended water that ends up being provided by Metropolitan to San Diego and to the other member agencies as well.

Focusing on the contract, it is indeed titled a

operations and maintenance and power.

These are defined further in the contract. And I wanted to walk through the contract language that discusses each of trees transportation expenses and define what they cover.

Article 24(a) defines the capital cost component. And it says that that charge shall be sufficient to return to the state the capital cost of the project transportation facilities necessary to deliver the water to the contractor and which are allocated to the contractor pursuant to subdivision (b) of this article.

And so as with all of these provisions with the transportation charge, there's an explicit allocation of the cost to Metropolitan for this cost. This is the capital cost here that return these funds to the state.

There's then the article 25 defines the minimum operation maintenance power and replacement cost. These are ongoing operations and maintenance. And again, Article 25 says that this charge shall be sufficient to return to the state these costs, and it clarifies that like with Article 24, the charge is irrespective of the amount of project water that's delivered to the contractor.

So Article 24 and 25 are take-or-pay. If you

Pages 419 to 422

get a lot of water, Met, or if you get no water at all, nonetheless you're on the hook for these facilities expenses.

2.3

So here between Articles 24 and 25, that flows through to become the -- about 200 million that we saw earlier in the 2012 cost of service study.

Next we come to the variable charge. This is principally the power charge. And your Honor I think asked earlier is that -- you know, are we talking actual cost of power here? This is where Article 26 defines how it is calculated. There are certain costs of power, then there are offsets of cost of power from the state's own hydroelectric facilities and those end up being the bill. But these are variable costs. They return to the state the power costs necessary to move project water and these are specifically allocated to Met and the other contractors.

So here we've put up a graphic explaining with Met these variable expenses are enormous and it is south of Tehachapi Mountains and so the power to move the water over the mountain is a significant chunk of money.

In addition to simply culling out the supply and transportation costs, the State Water Project from the beginning drew a pretty fundamental distinction between them and I would like to go into that and a aqueduct reached in the year following the year in which construction of that reach is completed.

Now, large scale construction of the California aqueduct as a matter of public record began in 1963. So starting in 1964, these transportation expenses became coming due for Met for constructing these facilities and maintaining them.

By contrast, water supply started later.

Article 6 of the State Water Project contract stated that the initial water delivery to the district was presently estimated to be 1972. So from the beginning, there was a distinction between supply and transportation, a recognition that transportation facilities would have to be constructed to go to Metropolitan, that Met would have to pay for those, that those would not be contingent on the delivery of water and would in fact precede it by almost a decade.

And here, we've put a graphic showing the different -- the California aqueduct as it goes down to Met.

We think that this distinction in the State Water Project contract between supply and transportation, the clear characterization of certain facilities and power costs as being associated with transportation is a sufficient basis for the board to conclude that when it

423 425

little bit of the history about what's forth in the language of the contract itself.

The -- you can see here this is the original November 1960 contract. It is in the administrative record. You can see that Metropolitan here is defined as the district. And it provides that the district shall pay all of the costs of delivery structures for the delivery of project water to it.

From the beginning, Met was on the hook for the delivery costs. And it's delivery structure so it is not just a monthly bill for variable costs. The project transportation facilities, the California aqueduct, the sizable structures that would be needed to move water to Southern California, from the beginning Met had to pay those and agreed to pay them in the contract, but they're quite distinct from supply charges and distinct for another reason as well and that has to do with timing.

Article 29 of the State Water Project contract provided that payments by the district, we saw previously that was defined by Met, under the capital costs component of the transportation charge shall commence in the year following the year in which the state commences construction of the project transportation facilities, and then payments -- these are now turning to Article 25 -- the O and M expenses shall commence for each

is buying water from the state on behalf of its 26 member agencies as a collective, it is appropriate to view these costs as serving a transportation function and they're appropriately recovered in its transportation rates, simply due to the nature of those expenses, that it can functionalize them that way in its cost of service studies.

But we won't stop there. There are other reasons as well why it's appropriate to call them transportation.

Here we're citing a staff letter from the general manager and the general counsel to Metropolitan's board of directors. This is in April 5th, 2010. Like everything else in this presentation, it is in the administrative record. And here, Met staff are responding to comments from San Diego and others in the public war process in which San Diego is arguing Met had improperly treated State Water Project costs.

I'm going to pull out here and quote a part of the response that went to Met's board explaining reasons for the -- reasons for the cost allocations.

And some -- one of the explanation here is that Metropolitan allocates State Water Project costs among the various functions, including conveyance and aqueduct, supply and standby because the SWP provides different

Pages 423 to 426

2.5

functions.

2.3

You have heard San Diego state quite correctly that Met does not own the State Water Project. It doesn't. Met owns the Colorado River Aqueduct but it doesn't own the State Water Project.

But you've also seen that Met's cost of service studies and the second step that looks at functionalization. It considers what do these things actually do. And Met has functionalized the State Water Project and the Colorado River Aqueduct in the same way, assigning them both to conveyance and aqueduct because despite the differences in ownership, as far as Met is concerned, they're doing the same thing, they're performing the same function.

And here Met goes further to say that Met can use the State Water Project as a conveyance facility, it can use it to move project water and non-project water from Met and its member agencies. Project water of course is water that is supplied by DWR and non-project water is water that isn't. And they cite some examples in here, including one of them a 2001 water transfer for some 14,000 acre-feet of water from the Placer County Water Agency to San Diego County Water Authority.

The point I'm making here is not that 14,000 acre-feet of water is a tremendous amount of water.

Project and the only way -- if you want to talk about cost causation as part of cost of service, the only way that's possible is if Met is buying this water from the State Water Project. But I wouldn't say the argument depends on that. That provides further support for it.

Let's turn to the provision of the State Water Project contract that discusses Metropolitan's ability to use the project transportation facilities.

The contract is enormous us so I put up portions of Article 55 here and recognize that even these are quite lengthy.

And 55-A, states that contractors shall have the right to receive services from any of the project transportation facilities to transport water procured from them -- by them from non-project sources for delivery to their service areas.

And there are certain conditions on that, like there has to be available capacity but that sets forth the basic proposition that Met is able to use the project transportation facilities to move water that's not from DWR.

Subsection 55-B is interesting in that it states that Metropolitan doesn't have to pay what's called a facilities fee to do this. Met has to pay incremental power costs, for example, for moving that

427 429

Obviously San Diego takes issue with the amount of non-project water that Met is transporting, says it is not significant enough.

The point I'm making here is that Met's ability to use the pipes owned by its supplier to move water through them is an unusual feature. It's not something that a business or a household or a consumer would have with respect to their water supplier. Met's ability to reach out and actually use those facilities and pipes owned by DWR to move water from other people is a different -- distinguishes Met from the more typical situation when you think of a someone who's merely passively purchasing water supply. Met has greater contractual rights to use the State Water Project facilities.

THE COURT: Does your argument depend at all on the extent to which the water which is sent to San Diego actually is using the SWP as a conveyance facility? Does it depend on that?

MR. HIXSON: It doesn't depend on that, but that provides additional support for the notion that this water comes from State Water Project.

As we'll talk about later and as the Court will hear evidence, the water that San Diego receives, a substantial amount in fact comes from the State Water water but subsection 55(b) provides that only those contractors not participating in the repayment of a reach shall be required to pay for a use of facilities charge for delivery of non-project water from or through that reach.

Reach is a term of art referring to a portion of the aqueduct. So earlier, we saw the west reach and the east reach where the State Water Project connects into Metropolitan.

And what it's saying here is that the contractors that don't repay the cost of those reach, they have to pay a facilities charge if they're going to be moving non-project water through. But for contractors that had paid for those reaches and, in other words they have paid the money for those capital expenses, they don't have to pay that facilities fee. And this emphasizes that Metropolitan's transportation charges, where it is paying those capital expenses and those zone M expenses, gives them this ability to use those same facilities to move other water as well.

So again, they're not just purchasing a water supply. What comes with that is a right and ability to use those facilities to move other water without having to pay an additional use of facilities fee and only paying the variable power costs for that one.

And so just to provide a visual for what that means is again, Metropolitan can then use the aqueduct. And in green, we show water being transported down to its service area in one of these Article 55 transactions.

2.3

We talked a lot about the unbundling of Metropolitan's rates, that before 2003 there was one full service rate and then in 2003, Met separated supply from transportation. However, it's important to note that this practice of allocating State Water Project transportation costs actually preceded the unbundling and it did so in the 1997 wheeling rate that Metropolitan had adopted.

The '97 wheeling rate was adopted in January 1997, and here we've put the board resolution up here. This was resolution 8520. And in Section 1, it says that the board of directors hereby affixes and adopts wheeling charges effective January 15, 1997.

The board had developed this wheeling rate, the '97 wheeling rate in cooperation with its member agencies. It was a postage stamp rate like Metropolitan's other volumetric rates, meaning it was the same regardless of the distance the water was transported.

The minutes of the board meeting indicate what the vote was in favor of this wheeling rate. The ayes the State Water Project costs. I now want to turn to the evidence in the administrative record about the -- concerning the Water Stewardship Rate and how that was developed and allocated to transportation.

First just some background about the Water Stewardship Rate.

Recovers as we saw from Schedule 8 and the cost of service study, it recovers costs for the demand management programs, and those are three types of programs. There's the local resource programs and those are the ones that incentivize each member agency to develop local resources within the space of their own member agency. And so that's what's meant by local here. It's not Met service area as a whole but local within that particular member agency.

Second are the conservation credits and those are different. Those are not like the local resources. They can be throughout Met service area, but those reduce the amount of demand on Metropolitan that it would then have to send through its distribution system. And third are the desalination programs.

But collectively when I say the demand management programs, I'm referring to these three items together, those items, and then under cost of service, those are all allocated to the Water Stewardship Rate.

were more than 72,000 of the votes. These are of course the weighted votes, and the nos are 13,000 so it passed overwhelmingly to adopt this 1997 wheeling rate.

This '97 wheeling rate included Metropolitan's -- certain of Metropolitan's State Water Project transportation costs. You can see it in Section 5 where it refers to the allocation of costs that are shown in the attachment to include the costs incurred by Metropolitan to convey water to its member agencies through Metropolitan's conveyance system, including Metropolitan's rights in the State Water Project system.

And so from the beginning of Metropolitan's establishing a rate for wheeling service, it has had this consistent practice that certain of the State Water Project costs, using the facilities costs are included in the rate for wheeling service.

In terms of timeframe, the 1997 wheeling rate was in effect as of January 15th, 1997. And then we saw earlier that the wheeling rate was redefined in 2003 in terms of the unbundled rates. But the point of this slide and the take away here is that Met has been consistent with its allocation of State Water Project costs to the rate for wheeling service for over 16 years.

And so we think that these elements establish -- well, we've gone through the allocation of

There are essentially three reasons why the Water Stewardship Rate appropriately is allocated to transportation.

The first is that these demand management programs that it funds reduce transportation costs. The Water Stewardship Rate also frees up capacity for transportation and facilitates wheeling. And allocating the Water Stewardship Rate in a different manner would permit users to receive an unfair subsidy. And so I want to go through some of the evidence in the administrative record that bears on these issues.

First, about Water Stewardship Rate reducing transportation costs. Here the dispute between San Diego and Met largely concerns the level of generality. You're going to hear this today when I talk about the administrative record evidence and compare it to Mr. Braunig's discussion at the close of San Diego's case-in-chief.

They are very focused on particular demand management programs. They point to specific local resources programs and they say "look at this particular project and you don't see an estimate of how that project will cause Met to not incur additional capital expenses. And they are -- implicitly they are implying that that's the level of specificity that Metropolitan would need to

have. Are you going to construct an entire facility or not construct one just based on this -- these individual local resource plans.

2.3

However, Metropolitan has also considered the demand management programs as a higher level of generality so one of the questions before the Court is when an entity like Metropolitan engages in capital planning, at what level of generality is it appropriate to do so?

And I'm going to walk through some of the capital planning that Metropolitan did and how it looked at demand management programs, referring to evidence in the administrative record. But we would underscore that it's entirely reasonable when an entity of Met's size is looking at hundreds of millions or billions of dollars of expenses in capital facilities, that it does so on a forward look over a span of decades or a decade or couple of decades at a higher level of generality, asking what are the general types of expenses that could result in cost being deferred or avoided.

And then trying to link each specific local resources program that might concern a few thousand acre-feet of water to a cost of an enormous expansion of the distribution facility is too fine a level of detail and not an appropriate way that an agency like Met would

water out to the member agencies, and the cost for the distribution system are largely recovered in one of the transportation rates, the System Access Rate because we saw it in the cost of service.

And that was looking at what are the peak demands on the treatment and distribution system. And it did an analysis by comparing projected flows to existing capacities; in other words, looking forward, you know, what kind of capacity do we have and what do we think we might need in the years to come.

And then the remainder of the section refers to Met's distribution system, peak demands and projected system needs going forward.

Metropolitan then identified looking forward that certain conveyance capacity would be needed going forward, that current analyses indicate that additional conveyance is required in the future to reliably deliver available State Water Project to storage. And they flag this idea that there would have been to be additional conveyance capacity constructed.

And they identified specifically in this water resources plan a number of different projects that would have to be -- that would have to be considered. And so when San Diego says that Metropolitan has never quantified the capital expenses it's talking about, never

435 437

engage in capital facilities planning.

So let's look at what Metropolitan actually did in terms of capital planning.

If we turn to the integrated water resources plan, both parties have cited this document to the Court. This is dated March of 1996 and in this -- in the integrated water resources plan, Metropolitan was looking at a long-term look at the types of supply conveyance facilities that would be needed in the years going forward.

And Metropolitan determined that the needs be based on two major factors: The availability of water supplies and then supplemental water demands, the total amount of water demands that Met would be facing on the system. Those include consumptive demands as well as deliveries to storage during wet periods, required dry year demands. So looking at a high level of two big factors: The availability of water supplies and then the demands on Met's system.

Met then identified that future peak demands on its treatment and distribution system are projected and used to evaluate the adequacy of Met's existing treatment and distribution system.

So again, the distribution system was that system in purple. Those are the facilities that move the

identified particular ones, in fact it did do so. This 1996 integrated water resources plan identified a number of specific facilities and costs associated with each.

We highlighted a couple here. You can see on the left-hand side under "Description," Met was identifying a number of different types of projects: supply distribution, storage projects, and then further down, a number of them were specifically called out as distribution facilities. In other words, those are costs associated with this system that moves the water out to the member agencies and the cost of that system are recovered under the transportation rates, the System Access Rate principally.

And Met identified two particular projects: San Diego Pipeline No. 6 and the central pool augmentation conveyance projects, and those numbers there escalated over the next 25 years if those expansions were to take place, would total to more than 1.24 billion dollars.

So there was a forward look. There was an analysis of the additional capital expenses, specifically on the distribution side and an estimate of what types of funds might be necessary to pay for those expansions.

The next thing Metropolitan did was to identify what are the types of changes that might defer or avoid

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

specific types of expenses, and it specifically identified greater than expected local supply development which could decrease the demands on Met's system and it identified that deferment of capital infrastructure is one of those things that provide the result.

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

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

But more than that, Metropolitan tied the link back, and this is clearly shown in the administrative record. It specifically identified capital expenses associated with the distribution system as ones that were sensitive to the changes in demand. And I've highlighted here the central pool augmentation project and the San Diego Pipeline No. 6. Those are the ones that totaled to 1.2 or more than 1.2 billion dollars and Metropolitan specifically called those out as being more sensitive to demands than other capital project costs that it was considering at the time.

Next, Met did a sensitivity analysis. A sensitivity analysis was used to determine realistically yes, things can be variable based on changes in demand in the future. That's a high level of generality, but realistically how much variation would need to happen before Met could start to defer or avoid particular expenses.

And Met looked at sensitivity at a very granular level, identifying specific projects that were three parts of the demand management programs.

And the rate refinement committee identified a number of principles that should guide a local resources program. It identified key goals of the LRP and I've listed a number of them. We've called out a couple on this chart.

One is to assist local projects that improved regional water supply reliability and avoid or defer MWD capital expenditures. There was also some consideration about what preference should be given to different projects and one of the factors, meriting factors was MWD facility benefits, projects that would avoid or defer or reduce the cost of MWD's treatment and distribution system.

These goals of the --

THE COURT: Are you going to be discussing the link between what is "E" here, that is projects that have this aspect, to the specific projects that, for example, San Diego has been putting up on the board?

In other words, is it your position that as a matter of practice, that in fact the projects that were funded this way did reduce the cost of the treatment and distribution for MWD?

MR. HIXSON: We are going to show and argue that the demand management programs as a whole have had a

439 441

sensitive to a 5 percent decrease in retail demands. So at this time in 1996, Met was doing an estimate what if demand was reduced simply by five percent? Would that have an -- an effect on the capital facilities necessary for the distribution system.

And again, Met called out two particular -- or a number of items that were sensitive to 5 percent. It says a 5 percent decrease in retail demands would allow several projects to be delayed and called out two of them specifically relating to costs on the distribution system: San Diego Pipeline No. 6 and the Central Pool Augmentation Conveyance Extension project which could be delayed to beyond 2025.

So again, there was analysis of what was likely, of what was probable, particularly capital expenses on the distribution side with relatively small changes in projected demand.

In the year that follows and leading up to the unbundling of the rates and development of the Water Stewardship Rate, Metropolitan identified certain local resources program principles.

There was a rate refinement committee that was a committee of member agencies that were looking at rate refinements in the years leading up to the unbundling. The local resources program there, that's one of the

substantial effect on the amount of water that Metropolitan has to deliver that has allowed it to avoid these capital expenditures, but a lot of that is outside the admin record.

THE COURT: Your view is that you shouldn't have to be forced to justify each one?

MR. HIXSON: Right.

THE COURT: Your view is this 50,000 foot view which is that you've got to look at these programs as a group or as a whole.

MR. HIXSON: Yes, exactly.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HIXSON: And to highlight here the members of the committee that endorsed these principles, the local resources programs was to reduce or defer capital expenditures, one of them was the San Diego County Water Authority that endorsed those principles.

These principles then directly led into the unbundled rates. Here we're showing the final report on Met's rates or charges. This is a cost of service study from June 28, 2002 of -- in the months before the unbundled rates took effect the following year.

And the cost of the service study calls out the Water Stewardship Rate and describes explicitly what

benefits Metropolitan receives in adopting it. There are

440

1 obviously a number of benefits that Metropolitan saw in Another one is the engineer's report. These 2 2 the Water Stewardship Rate, but one of them that was engineer's reports come out associated with each rate 3 3 called out was reducing and deferring system capacity setting cycle as part of the cost of service process. 4 4 expansion costs. And this does flow out of the 1996 IIP, This one was issued in connection with the program to 5 5 which was identified, and numbers were put on them and a levy a Readiness-to-Serve Charge. 6 6 sensitivity analysis was done and it provided changes in And the engineer's report goes through a number 7 7 local supply could have an effect on the demand that of discussions about the capital expenses and capital 8 8 might be needed to incur those costs. facilities within Metropolitan's system, and this is from 9 9 THE COURT: Is this a good break time? April 2010 for that rate setting cycle. There are 10 10 obviously ones for different years. MR. HIXSON: Sure. 11 11 THE COURT: Okay. See everybody at 1:30. And I wanted to highlight in the engineer's 12 12 Thank you so much. report the discussion of the facilities, again the 13 13 (Noon recess taken.) observation that investments in the demand side 14 14 ---o0o--management programs, so that's a reference to the 15 15 programs that are funded by the Water Stewardship Rate. 16 16 And then it calls a couple of them out. Conservation, 17 17 water recycling and groundwater recovery reduce the need 18 18 to provide additional imported water supplies and help 19 19 defer the need for additional conveyance, distribution 20 20 and storage facilities. 21 21 And then the engineer's report goes on to note 22 22 the same thing below, that conservation is a critical 23 23 element of Met's demand management programs, effectively 24 24 increasing the reliability of existing water supplies by 25 25 lessening the need to import additional water while at 445 443 1 DECEMBER 19, 2013 AFTERNOON SESSION 1 the same time deferring the need to expand system 2 2 PROCEEDINGS capacity. And so we see these engineer's reports. And 3 3 ---000---I've picked one here. There are engineer reports in 4 4 THE COURT: Let's continue. every rate setting cycle, again drawing a link between 5 MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor. the demand management programs and the capital expenses 6 6 I was discussing the allocation of the Water for Met's distribution system. 7 7 Stewardship Rate, the Transportation Rate again at the I highlighted before three reasons why the 8 8 programmatic level at which Met planned its capital Water Stewardship Rate is reasonably allocated to 9 9 expenditures rather than the detailed project level that transportation rates. Now let's turn to the second one, 10 10 San Diego believes is the required analysis. which is freeing up capacity for transportation and 11 11 And we had gone through the 1996 integrated facilitating wheeling. 12 12 resources plan and moved to the unbundling of Met's rates And again, we can see this concept called out 13 13 and the description and the cost of service of the in the cost of service, June 2002, the final report 14 14 benefits that the Water Stewardship Rate would provide before the unbundling of the rates. And again, when the 1.5 15 and the final cost of the service in 2002. There were a benefits of the Water Stewardship Rate are brought out, 16 16 number of benefits and one that had been called out and there's discussions here about more capacity being 17 17 identified was the reduction and deferral of system available in existing facilities for a longer period of 18 18 capacity expansion costs in this cost of service report. time, this capacity made available by conservation and 19 19 There are many, many places within the recycling is open to all system users and can be used to 20 20 administrative record where this principle is reaffirmed complete water transfers. 21 21 during the rate setting process as a basis of the This goes to the accusation made by San Diego 22 22 allocation of the Water Stewardship Rate to throughout this lawsuit that Met is trying to clamp down 23 23 transportation. Perhaps to the Court's relief, I won't and to stop water transfers and to stop its system being 24 24 walk through them all, but I do want to highlight a used for wheeling. And we can see here the recognition 25 25 couple of other examples. in the unbundling of the rates that these demand

446

management programs were to produce benefits that would facilitate water transfers and such as wheeling by having more capacity available in Met's system.

As the Court knows, the wheeling statute obligates wheeling only if there's unused capacity in the system, and so the cost of service that is drawing this connection between the demand management programs, reducing the quantity of water going through Met's system and freeing up additional capacity that would be available for these water transfer transactions through Met's system.

Let's turn then to the third one about the subsidy issue, about what would happen if Metropolitan put the Water Stewardship Rate only in supply rather than in transportation because the transportation expenses are paid by all system users, where supply would only be by those who purchased the supply from Met itself.

There's an important consideration here and I don't know that we've touched on it so far in this lawsuit, which is SB60. That's Senate Bill 60. It is a statute that the California Legislature enacted and what it did is it amended Metropolitan's Government Act, the MWD Act and it inserted Section 130.5 into the MWD Act stating that the Legislature finds and declares the following:

reasons why the Water Stewardship Rate was placed on all users of the system. Metropolitan noted that it is mandated under SB60 to fund water supply programs like conservation and recycling and said it was appropriate to recover the costs of supporting these programs on all water moved through the system.

And again, I don't want to be misunderstood. We're not saying that SB60 by its plain language automatically requires Met to allocate Water Stewardship Rate this way. We're saying that it is a reasonable method of implementing this statutory directive to spread the Water Stewardship Rate to all system users to maximize the benefits of that statutory goal.

And Metropolitan's staff have reiterated that not just in the 2002 cost of service before the unbundling of the rates but more recently as well again in an April 2012 letter to the board, responding again to San Diego's complaints about cost allocations.

So this is an April 5th, 2002 memo in the administrative record. And again, Metropolitan noted the benefits of the Water Stewardship Rate and also highlighted here the subsidy issue that would be raised if people who wheel water didn't have to pay the demand management programs.

They noted that otherwise, member agencies

One, that it's the intent that Met expand water conservation, recycling and groundwater recovery efforts.

And then it states that Met shall place increased emphasis on sustainable, environmentally sound and cost-effective water conservation, recycling and groundwater storage and replenishment measures.

Now this directive can be implemented in a number of ways. It is a general directive by the Legislature to Met that it shall place increased emphasis on this.

But we submit that a reasonable way of promoting these goals as mandated by the Legislature is to have the Water Stewardship Rate be applied to all the users of the system rather than just those purchasing supply. This serves to maximize the benefit to this legislative goal here of promoting conservation and recycling and groundwater storage and the other objects that are promoted by the demand management programs. They all serve this laudable goal, and not just a goal but requirement by Metropolitan in a statute that it increases these conservation efforts. And by having a broader reach for the Water Stewardship Rate, it helps to promote that.

And Metropolitan noted -- cited this statute specifically in the final rates and charges as one of the

could avoid providing revenues to support regional demand management activities through wheeling while still being able to realize the benefits of the program to fund local activities. And then below, they noted that Met's rates are designed to ensure the agencies that receive the same services pay the same amount. Exempting the wheeling transactions from the transportation costs would mean that we would get the same service but paying different amounts.

And so this is the core of the subsidy issue, that these demand management programs free up capacity in the system which benefits all those who want to transport water through the system. And this benefits wheeling parties in particular because unlike the member agencies buying ordinary full service water, wheeling parties rely only on the unused capacity to support their right to wheel water and so it would be an inequitable result if they didn't also have to share in the expenses that make that capacity available in Metropolitan's system.

I would like to turn now to another important topic and one that is a significant one in particular for the claims that are to be decided solely based on the administrative record. We would say this is also quite significant for all of the claims, including the wheeling claim but it goes to how courts look at an administrative

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

record and what they're reviewing it for.

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

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

The essential standard is reviewing the administrative record to see if there is substantial evidence that supports the board's -- the reasonableness of the board's decision. I'm using that of course as a shorthand because the case law is going to be different with the different statutes. That's a general description of what the Court is reviewing it for.

And when courts look for substantial evidence, one thing they focus on is whether there has been a review, an internal review and analysis of the agencies' determinations, comparing it to applicable industry guides and providing relevant opinion and whether that by itself can be substantial evidence that supports the reasonableness of the board's determinations.

And so here I would like to walk through, it is the April 6th, 2010, review by Raftelis Financial Consultants of Metropolitan's rates and charges. This was a review by Raftelis.

Dear Mr. Thomas -- that's Brian Thomas, who was then the chief financial officer transmitting the Raftelis Financial Consultant's review of Met's rates and charges. And what I want to do is I want to walk through what Raftelis was engaged to do and what conclusions they came back with to Metropolitan.

with.

First, they concluded that Metropolitan's 2010 cost of service and rate methodology is consistent with California law, and they cite a number of provisions in there referring to the MWD Act under the Government Code, under Metropolitan's Administrative Code.

And in particular, I would like to draw the Court's attention to the last sentence there, noting that Met's own admin code requires that its rates and charges be reflective of Met's major service functions, which includes supply, conveyance, power, storage, distribution and treatment. Those are the functions we saw earlier today in the cost of service studies and so that was the allocation of the cost of those service functions was what Raftelis was reviewing.

And then we can turn to the second conclusion that Raftelis had, which was that Met's 2010 cost of service and rate methodology follows the process as prescribed in the AWWA Manual M1, principles of water rates, fees and charges, and they identify how that was set out. Specifically Met's methodology is consistent with M1's four-step process.

And that was the process you walked through this morning: The development of the revenue requirement, the functionalization, the classification

453 451

Let's look at here. This is in the introduction what MWD engaged RFC to do. They engaged Raftelis to review whether the proposed 2010 rates were still consistent with the rate structure framework, so that was the -- after the unbundling.

And then Raftelis also evaluated the cost of service and rate methodologies' consistency, and so that was what I went through, the cost of service and rate setting methodology. And they were reviewing it to see consistency with water industry's best practices. And then they call out one particular manual there such as the American Waterworks Association's Manual M1. And later on we'll be going through a few more pages from the M1 manual.

And then they also looked at the 2010 model for accuracy and consistency with the 2001 model, and then they identify potential opportunities for improving Met's cost of service and rate structure, something that Metropolitan is always looking at in considering and evaluating.

Raftelis came back with four conclusions. I'm going to walk through each of those.

This is Section 5 of the Raftelis report is their review process and results. And so in Section 5 of the report, they state the four issues they came back

and the allocation of costs to rate design elements. And there, Raftelis is confirming that that's a traditional and consistent way of allocating a water agency's costs to its functions.

And then you can turn to the third conclusion in Section 5 of the report, that the current rate structure continues to address the statement of common interests and rate structure framework. This is a statement that Metropolitan's 2010 cost of service is consistent with what had been done before, consistent with the purposes behind the rates as they were set during the unbundling.

And then we can turn to Section 4 -- I'm sorry, the fourth conclusion, which is that the 2010 model has followed the same structure as the 2001 model but includes some modifications to allocation factors. And then Raftelis notes these modifications should be expected given the changes in growth, member agency peaking, hydrological conditions and other factors.

We submit that the Raftelis review is an important piece of evidence for the Court to look at in the administrative record and is highly relevant to the question of whether there is substantial evidence that the board's decision was reasonable.

What I would like to do now is to shift focus

452

away from Metropolitan's view in the documents that we have relied on and instead turn to what San Diego has argued. I'm going to address a number of the documents that San Diego has focused on in their pretrial briefs and then others that they have focused on so far in trial in the administrative record and explain why they don't undermine the reasonableness of MWD's rates.

At a high level, the first point I want to address is that if there are -- I'm going to explain why these documents don't support San Diego at all, but I want to address the antecedent question of what happens if there are documents pointing both ways in the administrative record.

If some documents would argue for a certain cost allocation and others point into a different cost allocation, under the principles of reasonableness and reasonable cost allocations, Met's board can make choices. And in an agency like Met with 26 member agencies, the Court can and should expect differences in points of view. The Court should expect perhaps as many as 26 points of view on various different issues. The Court should also expect that in open public board meetings, there will be disagreement and people will serve different positions.

San Diego has a tendency to point to any

associated with the source of water supply.

But we think that when the Court reads the entire page, without giving you the entire manual, it becomes clear that San Diego is not fairly characterizing the Raftelis guide, that in fact that guide broke out the different functions that a water agency can perform. Obviously supply is one of them, but then Raftelis separately identified pumping and conveyance, transmission and distribution lights -- or distribution as separate and distinct functions in the process of functionalizing rates.

And so only looking at the supply one and not looking at the other functions that Raftelis identified presents a cramped and inaccurate view. In fact, Raftelis' 2010 review is entirely consistent with his guide and with the way that Met has chosen to functionalize its costs.

San Diego does a similar thing, picking and choosing parts of a document, when it comes to the October 1995 RMI cost of service and rate study.

Met had retained RMI in -- a few years before the unbundling to look at a variety of issues with respect to its rate structure and RMI presented several different types of analysis. I think RMI is Resource Management International.

455 457

suggestion or recommendation that something could be done a different way and treat that as an admission by Metropolitan that it has to do something a different way.

But in fact, Metropolitan with its democratic structure and more than two dozen member agencies, of necessity, will have different points of view and has to make choices between different items. And so I think that's the appropriate perspective to take when looking at argument that San Diego has presented based on the administrative record.

Let's look first -- San Diego has cited a guide that Raftelis wrote and San Diego argues this is significant because as you just saw, Raftelis Financial Consulting was brought in in 2010 to do a review of Met's cost of service and rate methodology.

And San Diego says that this Raftelis guide supports their position. They asserted in their pretrial brief that Raftelis had already conceded in his textbook on water rates that costs associated with the source of supply, including water rate purchases should all be attributable to supply rather than transportation. And they pointed to a portion of a page in Raftelis's guide -- sorry, that defines supply.

There is the definition of source of supply that they point to, the operating capital costs

San Diego points to the October 1995 RMI cost of service and San Diego asserts that if we pick up this RMI study, what we will see is it says that State Water Project costs should be allocated to water supply and purchases of water, not to transportation and the wheeling rate. In reality, San Diego has grossly misread what the RMI report in fact states.

Again, if we turn to the section of the RMI report that deals with the functionalization of costs and different rates, we see that RMI's functionalization is entirely consistent with what Met does.

RMI defined the supply function as the cost of operating and maintaining water supply facilities such as dams and associated reservoirs, wells and desalination plants and the cost of purchasing water from wholesale water suppliers.

So -- and what RMI then did is they distinguished that from the transmission function. And I think it's important to look at how they defined the transmission function there. RMI defined the transmission function as the cost of operating and maintaining the aqueducts to move water from sources of supply to major centers of demand. The term "aqueducts" is clear from Metropolitan, is the State Water Project aqueduct and the Colorado River Aqueduct. That's where

2.5

they broke off and called the transmission function and distinguished it from supply.

And sources of supply and major centers of demand, those are also keywords. Major center of demand doesn't mean a household in the city of Los Angeles or a person living in Santa Monica. Southern California is a major center of demand. I would submit it is disingenuous for San Diego to point to this RMI document as saying that Met should classify all State Water Project costs as supply.

In fact, they distinguish transmission costs and define them in a way that's consistent with what Met does, taking the costs associated with the aqueducts that move water from sources of supply to major centers of demand and say that's different from supply. So far from supporting San Diego, this RMI report supports what Metropolitan has done.

San Diego used to argue -- they did this in their first pretrial brief -- that the 1996 RMI cost of service study also supported them. San Diego specifically cited this document and they stated that classifying State Water Project costs as purchase of water, and again in addition to all resources of supply. San Diego must not have read this document very closely, though, because they later reversed themselves at trial

transmission-related, namely the capital charges for transmission facilities and the operations and maintenance charges for transmission facilities.

This was clearly distinguished, disaggregating State Water Project costs, saying some of them were supply but then stating that clearly others of them were for transportation and that's exactly how Met disaggregates its costs in the billings.

THE COURT: Of course I don't have the cost of service. I'm sure I have it here somewhere.

But in this context, is the RMI author suggesting that these two categories are clearly transmission-related in the context of what the State Water Project does or in the context of what Met does?

MR. HIXSON: In the context of what Met does. They were analyzing -- and that's why we have the citation here, so your Honor can pull up the whole RMI study and read it for yourself. Of necessity, I'm showing you excerpts of the document.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. HIXSON: But they were looking at how Metropolitan should functionalize costs for purposes of its own rate making.

What San Diego then did at trial was to reverse course and claim that Met basically bullied RMI into

and here is why.

2.3

This RMI report also identifies what the source of supply function is and defined it as we saw in the prior document, the dams and reservoirs, the wells, desal plants and cost of purchasing water from wholesale water suppliers.

Then it went and defined transmission and again, it was maintaining the aqueducts to move water from sources of supply to major centers of demand. This by itself was clear enough, aqueducts meaning the California Aqueduct, the Colorado River Aqueduct. And similarly, there was distribution, there was pumping. These were all separated out and broken out from a source of supply.

But here's the kicker, here's the part that San Diego must not have read before their pretrial brief, is that RMI then went on to discuss the State Water Project in particular.

RMI noted that Met pays State Water Project costs on the basis of billings from the Department of Water Resources. These expenses were functionalized to either source of supply or to transmission distribution. They said that DWR breaks the State Water Project bills into a number of different categories, and then here's the key sentence: Two categories are clearly

putting this conclusion into their 1996 study. There's no evidence to suggest that that's the case. But it was interesting, having seen this language later, they reversed course and rather than relying on it and now accuse Met of having negotiated that without any basis. But clearly RMI was breaking apart State Water Project costs and saying that some could clearly be allocated to transportation. But again, your Honor can read the whole item for yourself.

There is another -- there is a chart that I do want to get to in this '96 study. Again, the print is tiny but it's in that same RMI study where at the top, they identify sources of supply, they talk about State Water Project and then over on the right, we've circled the box in red, they talk about transmission and distribution, so you can see they're breaking out the different functions.

And then if you go down toward the bottom of the page, they have State Water Project. And I realize the print is tiny here, but for Delta water charges, they've taken 100 percent and they've put that in supply. And if you go beneath that to transportation and go over to the right, RMI took 100 percent and they put that into transportation. And so this is just a chart that provides a visual demonstration of what RMI had been

r

doing, functionalizing some State Water Project costs to transportation.

2.3

Another document that San Diego has relied on and that they added to the administrative record in March or April of 2012 is this uniform system of accounts by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. I will refer to them as the NARUC accounts.

And we've quoted here the argument that
San Diego makes. They say that the NARUC system on which
Raftelis relies provides that the cost at the point of
delivery of water purchased for resale must be accounted
for as a supply cost. And they say that that is
instructive for rate making purposes and implies -- even
though that language doesn't really say it, they say it
implies, that when you are functionalizing costs, you
should treat everything associated with the State Water
Project as if it were supply and none of it as
transportation.

And then San Diego points to the definition of purchased water and the chart of accounts. And we've highlighted here on the screen the language that San Diego relies on. It's Section 610 of the NARUC chart of accounts and it says purchased water. This account shall include the cost at the point of delivery of water

this is in the administrative record.

The M1 manual describes its purpose stating that the purpose of the manual is to describe and present issues associated with developing water rates and charges to enumerate the advantages and disadvantages of various alternatives and to provide information to help users determine water rates and charges that are most relevant to a particular situation.

I'm calling this language out for a reason, which is that the parties have different ways that we talk about industry guidance. San Diego talks about industry standards in very strong terms as if there are clear rules that should be followed in every case and they say that Met's rates are illegal for violating these clear rules.

I wanted to put on the screen the actual language that's in the Manual M1 that San Diego itself relies on because you can see it's different from that.

We tend to use the term "industry guidance" when we talk about how these different authorities speak in terms of water rates because on their own terms, these manuals recognize that rate making entities are very different, that they have -- they can be -- have very different circumstances and sizes or scale and so what these manuals tend to do is to provide guidance and

463 465

purchased for resale.

And then the argument that San Diego makes is that this should dictate rate making and they say -- they quoted the Raftelis textbook which says that if the NARUC chart of accounts is effectively integrated into the utility accounting system, identification of costs by functional category is provided by the accounting system.

And they go on to say that this detailed chart of accounts, quoting the M1 manual, provides a breakdown of expenses for costs of service allocation and appropriate distribution of functionally allocated expenses.

So that's San Diego's argument. They focus on the NARUC chart of accounts and how it defines the purchase of water as being for delivery.

We have a couple of responses. And here, I do want to turn to the American Waterworks Association Manual M1. That was the industry guidance that the Raftelis April 2010 review pointed to. It's not the be all, end all, it is a relevant data point in industry guidance. I don't want to oversell it while also not disputing its relevance.

So this is the M1 manual. This is the fifth edition. This was the edition that was published when Met voted for its rates in April 2010 and April 2012 and

advice.

So there's a difference of philosophy that I wanted to call your attention to that the plaintiff uses very strong terms to imply that there are these binding rules, whereas we use the term industry guidance because we think that more accurately captures what these different manuals are in fact describing.

But let's look and see what the Manual M1 has to say about the NARUC chart of accounts. So this is again the fifth edition of the Manual M1.

And they refer to the NARUC system saying that NARUC has recommended a uniform system of accounts which is widely used by regulated utilities and can be modified for government owned utilities, and then the M1 manual recommends another AWWA manual, water utility accounting to talk about that further.

Met isn't a regulated utility. A regulated utility in California means an entity regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission, so PG&E, SoCal Edison, companies like that.

The distinction in California is generally that privately owned utilities are regulated utilities, whereas government owned utilities aren't. But perhaps another way of saying it is that Met is accountable to its board of directors who are composed of

Pages 463 to 466

representatives from its member agency customers.

2.3

And so -- and we can see that NARUC of course is short for the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. So San Diego is pointing at a type of accounting guidance that's directed at a different type of entity, at entities that are regulated, that have their finances audited by public utility commissions. And here, the M1 is pointing out that sure, NARUC is used by regulated utilities. In fact M1 says it is widely used by them but then notes that it can be modified for government owned utilities, drawing that distinction that NARUC isn't directly applicable.

But there's another part of the M1 manual that's important to look at. We directed the Court here to Chapter 14, Fixed Versus Variable Charges where the manual points out that rate making and water rate setting is different from how you account for things from an accounting perspective, which is what the NARUC chart of accounts is doing.

And the M1 manual points out that fixed and variable charges for cost recovery and a cost of service water rate analysis is not the same as doing that from an accounting standpoint.

And so we think this is -- it may be that for regulated utilities, the way you might want to describe

There is no suggestion in here that there is a formula or a code that should be followed that dictates how rate setting should be done. Instead, it is a complex issue. And this goes back to issues the Court is familiar with about the complexity under the law, evaluating rate analysis and that it is complicated. And Metropolitan's unique size and its need to import water from distant locations make it very different from other type of water agencies and the M1 manual recognizes and acknowledges that rate setting has to account for complexities such as that.

Now, let me turn to another document that San Diego added to the 2012 administrative record in the spring of 2012, and this is a 1969 Brown and Caldwell water pricing policy study. And you can see down at the bottom where it came from. It says San Diego County Water Authority Library. Looks like they dug that one up. Hopefully they put it into the administrative record.

And San Diego points to that and says that the 1969 study accounted for State Water Project costs as water supply costs. And they go on in more detail to cite the particular page in Brown and Caldwell. And Brown and Caldwell did look at the functional cost allocation and they defined the supply system. And for

467 469

purchase of water for purposes of being audited by public utilities commissions so they can see whether the shareholders are getting an appropriate rate of return or to analyze expenses. That's a certain type of activity and that's what the NARUC chart of account is directed to. But rate setting is simply a different type of activity and the accounting principles aren't meant to control that.

And as further evidence of that, we would turn to Chapter 9 of the AWWA M1 manual, and this chapter speaks directly to questions before the Court, which is selecting rate structures and that's really the issue that we're talking about here, not accounting guidance.

And here, the AWWA M1 manual notes that the process of selecting the most appropriate rate structure for a particular utility is not simple. And the M1 manual goes on to state that the selection is complex because there are so many types of rate structures.

No one rate structure meets all utility objectives equally and not all objectives are valued the same by the utility or its customers. In some ways this is a statement of common sense that yes, of course rate setting is complex and the case law has recognized it, but it's important to go back to this industry guidance and advice and see it written right here as well.

Met, they did define the supply system as inclusive of the State Water Project facilities, including the terminal reservoirs of that system. So in 1969, there was that study published that did characterize Met supply costs in that manner.

And then there's another chart that San Diego has pointed to which has in the 1969 study as we've highlighted the words water purchase. And beneath that is State of California, Delta water charge and transportation. And you can see that in the functional categories, it is true that the 1969 study looked at that and put them all into supply.

We think that San Diego is over relying on this 1969 study in basically two big ways. First, this study was decades before Metropolitan drew a distinction between its own supply and transportation rates. Recall that before 2003, Met didn't have a supply rate and it didn't have transportation rates, it simply had a full service bundled rate for water.

Now, in the years leading up to the unbundling, obviously there were a number of different consultants that were putting in opinions and looking at how you might functionalize those differently. So I get why San Diego was pointing to the 1995 RMI studies even though these are a few years before the unbundling or

other documents from the late 1990s.

2.3

The issue with the 1969 study is that it's so old, that it precedes the unbundling by so many decades. There's no indication that Met was even thinking or contemplating about drawing a distinction between supply and transportation rates and even evaluating the question of what would go into each rate.

And we put the citation to the 1969 study in the footnote here so your Honor can read it for yourself. There's no indication that Brown and Caldwell was evaluating that question either. But that's the issue before the Court today, is when Met draws a distinction between supply and transportation costs for its own rates, what should go into what bundle.

And a document this dated, that doesn't purport to analyze that question simply has limited relevance. I mean, in 1969 Met wasn't even receiving any water from the State Water Project. That was still when the aqueduct was being built out. And so the age of this document and the fact that it wasn't considering or looking into the issue before the Court casts doubt on its relevance.

In fact, the principal subject that the Brown and Caldwell study was looking at was whether there should be peaking costs, meaning whether there should be

wheeling rate, and that RMI concluded that Met's wheeling rate could be perceived as excessive for including these State Water Project costs.

San Diego then noted that RMI proposed -discussed four different wheeling options that could be
considered, the first one having the highest wheeling
rate. And San Diego has argued that that was the one
that you may recall the reference to Los Angeles and
Orange County stating that a rate might likely be illegal
and stating that this was the one that Met had adopted.

One of the errors in San Diego's reasoning is that Metropolitan didn't adopt any of the four options for the wheeling proposal that were in the 1995 RMI study, it adopted none of them. San Diego has pointed at length to option I in their RMI proposal while ignoring how option I actually defined the proposed wheeling charge.

And here, we quote the language from the RMI report that defines option I. And it says the under this option, Met's wheeling rate would be based on the differential between Met's firm sales rate and Readiness-to-Serve Charge and estimating these charges for incremental power and other power costs.

And then they summarize it by saying that a wheeling member agency paying the firm sales rate plus

such a category recognized at all. The study actually divided cost of service into two different steps and the essential analysis was in the second step, mainly how Met should allocate costs, the costs component rate formulation.

I'm not going to go into too much detail here, because I think it quickly loses focus. They were just looking at a completely different issue, whether there should be -- what should be allocated to average demand versus peak demand, but the issue before the Court, namely what should be supply versus what should be transportation, it was not on anybody's horizon back at that time and isn't something that Brown and Caldwell was attempting to discuss.

Let me then turn to another document. This one deals with the wheeling rate and so it's different from these things we just looked at, which were about the State Water Project transportation costs.

And this is one that San Diego has made a big deal of in this case, including at length in the opening statement it was a December 1995 RMI assessment for pricing water wheeling services. And we have the administrative record down there at the bottom. And San Diego says the RMI concurred that State Water Project costs are supply costs, they can't be included in a

the RTS, that's a reference to the Readiness-to-Serve Charge minus avoided costs. That was option I. This was the one that was the subject of an extended discussion by San Diego. But that isn't Met's wheeling rate, it never was Met's wheeling rate because Met never included the Readiness-to-Serve Charge in the wheeling rate.

Here we quote Metropolitan's Administrative Code Section 4405. You've seen this provision before that defines what the rate for wheeling service is. It includes a System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate and if the water is treated, the treatment surcharge. And then there's the own cost of power, actual cost of power. But Met never had the Readiness-to-Serve Charge in its rate for wheeling service. And so this discussion about option I and 1995 RMI report is discussing a proposal that had never been adopted.

What RMI -- RMI also didn't characterize all State Water Project costs as supply costs in the course of evaluating the four different options that were before it. It stated that a wheeling rate could be designed by subtracting all State Water Project and Colorado River supply costs.

San Diego is kind of spinning that by saying that RMI was opining that all such State Water Project are supply. What they were really saying is if you took

the full service rate and took out the State Water Project and Colorado River supply costs, you could come up with a wheeling rate that consisted of what was left.

2.3

Ultimately what RMI was doing, goes back to a point I made this afternoon, is they were evaluating the pros and cons of four different options for a wheeling rate. Met didn't end up adopting any of them. There were criticisms of some of the options, in particular option number one, by member agencies. There were notations by RMI itself that some people might perceive it as excessive.

RMI recommended that Met should adopt option I because it was the only one that would satisfy the hold harmless requirement, but Met didn't end up adopting that anyway.

But this all goes back to the notion that in an entity like Met with its public board proceedings and various consultants it hires and its 26 member agencies, there will be disagreement, there will be proposals, there will be different proposals over time.

It's important to drill down and to notice which proposals actually became Metropolitan's rates, and it's important to look at criticisms to say whether there is any weight or merit to them. But pointing to a document that proposes something that never happened and

operation, maintenance, replacement costs and other costs. But then Water Code Section 1813 does go on to say that the public agency shall support its determinations by written findings.

Here, Metropolitan made those written findings. And I turn to resolution 8520. This is the January 1997 resolution establishing the wheeling rate and it states now therefore the board of directors find and determine and order as follows.

And there's a Section 3 that states that in order to recover fair compensation for the use of its conveyance system for wheeling, it is necessary for Met to adopt wheeling rates according to the methodology set forth in attachment one.

There's Section 4, which states that a uniform rate is appropriate because of the integrated nature of Met's conveyance system. And the wheeling rate continues to be uniform postage stamp rate like all Met's volumetric rates. And they go on to note additional reasons because Water Code Section 1811 defines fair compensation to include reasonable charges for the use of the entire conveyance system.

THE COURT: Again, just so I remember correctly, the rate here means that regardless of the distance that the water's going to get wheeled, it's

saying the others might criticize it, that's not a persuasive way of using the administrative record to say that Met has done something inappropriate, let alone unlawful.

So now I've discussed the documents that
San Diego has pointed to in the administrative record
concerning the wheeling rate. I want to go to a related
issue, which is that at certain times in this case,
San Diego has contended that Met never made the written
determinations of fair compensation that are required
under the wheeling statute. They haven't asserted that
claim at trial and have in fact asserted that Met's
wheeling rate is a continuation of the policies behind
the 1997 wheeling rate, which we don't fundamentally
disagree with. So they may have been abandoned, this
element, but I do want to cover it because when the Court
reviews the administrative record, I want you to see that
there were written determinations of fair compensation.

And here, we quote what the wheeling statute says.

1810 says that a public agency can't deny a bona fide transfer of water, the use of a conveyance facility which has unused capacity and fair compensation is paid. It defines fair compensation in expansive terms. It's not just incremental costs, it's capital,

going to be the same dollar per acre-foot.

MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's right.

And then we're still on the 1997 resolution, 8520, establishing the wheeling rate. And Section 5 notes that the allocation of costs as shown in attachment 1 includes the costs of -- by Metropolitan to convey water to its member agencies through Met's conveyance system, including Met's rights in the State Water Project system.

And so from the beginning, the written findings under the wheeling statute that Met made explicitly called out and identified the appropriateness, including State Water Project costs.

I assume San Diego will say well, that was illegal then, it is illegal now. I'm speaking though to the question of did Met not make written findings and determinations that this is a legal thing to do and here, they are in writing determined by the board.

And then Section 9 set the wheeling rate at a certain per acre dollar foot (sic) effective in 1997. But then it said that, you know, thereafter they shall be set annually as part of Metropolitan's rate setting process, a reference to the Administrative Code. And Met continues to set the rates under its Administrative Code under those provisions that are cited there and then in

the wheeling resolution.

2.3

And then Section 15 delegated the unused capacity determination to the general manager to decide on a case-by-case basis.

THE COURT: I don't know if you're going to be getting into this or whether it is part of the record or not, but is it part of the case one way or the other as to whether or not there ever was a situation in which there was no capacity to wheel?

MR. HIXSON: I am -- there's no indication in the administrative record and also, I'm not aware of a situation in which Met refused to wheel for somebody who asked.

THE COURT: Is this a new subject for slide 130?

MR. HIXSON: Yes, we are on a new subject now. It's a brief one. Do you want me to good ahead or --

THE COURT: I thought this might be a convenient time for a short break.

MR. HIXSON: Sure.

THE COURT: Ten minutes.

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: Let's continue, please.

MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor.

concerning the blend of water that --

THE COURT: Concerning the what?

MR. HIXSON: The blend of water that San Diego receives from Metropolitan under the exchange agreement, and I did want to call that out to the extent that the Court is interested.

This is -- I'm pointing to an April 2012 letter to the board of directors, and this is one of several responding to board letters by San Diego in which they are disputing Met's cost allocations.

This is from the general manager and the general counsel providing response to San Diego arguments. And in the context of this response, they are providing some explanations for why it's appropriate that the exchange water bear some of the cost associated with the State Water Project transportation facilities.

And there's a notation here that Metropolitan's ability to blend the water from various sources means that the exchange water delivered to the Water Authority -- and that's the reference to San Diego County Water Authority -- is less saline than the conserved water transferred to Metropolitan at Lake Havasu.

So we do see this reference in the administrative record to the differences in water quality between the two sources of water and that the blend

I was about to begin a new topic, so let's jump right in. This is the topic that is that the exchange agreement does not undermine MWD's rates.

As the Court knows, there's an exchange agreement between San Diego and Met. The exchange agreement is not in the administrative record and so there's no particular reason why it would be. Met sets its rates and charges. The administrative record is a record of proceedings before the board and that the board considered in cost of service issues and so -- and this issue just isn't part of that process.

Recall in terms of timeframe, that in '98 -- 1998, Met began the process of analyzing the unbundling rate structures, and October of 2001, the board voted to adopt a new structure. March 2002, they adopted specific rates to take effect in January of 2003 and the exchange agreement postdates all of that.

Now, the parties have their various arguments about whether and to what extent the exchange agreement is relevant to other issues in this case but as a presentation of evidence in the administrative record, I'm just going to note that that's not one of the things that's in the administrative record, "it" meaning the exchange agreement.

There is evidence in the administrative record

enables San Diego to receive water that's less saline than the conserved water delivered by --

THE COURT: But I take it you're in agreement with San Diego's position that the exchange agreement, which I think this is their position, that the exchange agreement is not part of what I should be looking at in this phase.

MR. HIXSON: I'm going to have to maybe be a little more blunt than I wanted to.

Whenever San Diego talks about the exchange agreement, they seem to think it's relevant. But whenever we talk about it, they say that it's not.

They presented an argument that the exchange agreement was irrelevant and objected to it when I talked about it in opening. And then Mr. Cushman took the stand and talked about how they buy water from IID through Metropolitan. And I thought, you know, that's the exchange agreement. And so they are definitely raising it

And they talk a lot about the transportation of non-project water and every time they do that, they -- we don't think this is really a transportation of non-project water, they're referring to the exchange agreement and so it comes in in everything they say.

And there is huge emphasis on wheeling in this

case. They are constantly talking about the exchange agreement, so I don't believe them when they say they think it's irrelevant. It's the whole perspective they're bringing to this case and that's what their witnesses testified about.

2.3

And so we are in the position of having to respond to it simply because that their contention, the implication of the plaintiff's case is that San Diego is moving a bunch of non-Met water through Met's systems to San Diego. That could only be a reference to the exchange agreement, it's not anything else. So that's why we feel compelled as the defendant in this action to dispute that that's the right characterization of the exchange agreement, to say that that's not really what it's about. But we're doing this because the plaintiffs are talking about it and it's really part of the demands in their case.

So now I wanted to turn to a different topic, which is the dry year peaking claim that San Diego has brought.

They call it by various different terms. Sometimes they call it the cost of drought storage or dry year storage. The essence of the allegation is in paragraph 65 of the 2012 complaint, where they point the finger at the City of Los Angeles and say that L.A. has

costs, is to show that Met does look at the costs that it incurs to obtain the water, to have that water transported to a service area, the cost of storage for treatment, distribution, it allocates them to the functions and then it appropriately recovers them in its volumetric rates. Those aren't just hollow numbers, they reflect a thorough analysis of how those costs should be recovered and then recommended as appropriate. And so the volumetric rates and the pure supply rates recover a lot of those costs.

The Readiness-to-Serve Charge is one that, as we discussed, is allocated based on a ten-year rolling average.

THE COURT: Just, I think it hasn't been made explicit but the difference between tier 1 and tier 2 is after a certain volume is ordered, the other price kicks in?

MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's right.

And that depends. There is a fair amount of detail in that because I mentioned earlier that there are purchase orders that member agencies can place with Metropolitan and if they hit above a certain percent of the purchase order, then they go into tier 2. And so that's -- you can think of it as a peak-related expense for going over a certain level of water consumption, but

483 485

much higher annual variations than other member agencies and allegedly that this is a cost that L.A. imposed on the system that other member agencies are forced to subsidize.

I discussed this issue a bit earlier when I walked through the cost of service study about how Metropolitan deals with true peaking charges, that in step three of the cost of service study Met analyzes its costs and classifies them according to whether they're for average use or for peak use or for standby use, focusing on busy times within a year. And so Met does classify costs associated with standby use to its Readiness-to-Serve Charge and then their cost for the peak use on the distribution system and those are under the Capacity Charge.

When it comes to the other costs that's going to be recovered by Met's volumetric supply and transportation rates, we view that as the act of selling more or less water and distinguish that from actual peaking costs. But regardless of terminology, Metropolitan accounts for the costs that are at issue here.

The -- one of the purposes in walking the Court through the cost of service study and its various different steps, and Metropolitan functionalizing the yes, tier 2 is higher than tier 1.

And then the Readiness-to-Serve means that when member agencies buy enough water in a particular year, that has a decade long impact on their fixed charge whenever necessary, so they can't just roll on and roll off without having there be long-term consequences to reflect the value of having that system there to provide service.

THE COURT: Has something like that happened with respect to Los Angeles?

MR. HIXSON: You mean has something like --THE COURT: A tax or a ten-year revision of their rates or rate revision based on a ten-year rolling average?

MR. HIXSON: Oh, sure. For the Readiness-to-Serve Charge, every single member agency has that charge calculated based on their rolling ten-year average. So every year, there's a look back for the entire decade for every single one of the member agencies. That is in the cost of service studies in Schedule 11. And so what Metropolitan does is it looks at its total cost associated with standby and allocates them by percentage. So for every agency, it has that ten-year look back.

And then with respect to the distribution side

peaking costs, what we think are actual peaking costs, those are collected as a Capacity Charge and that's allocated based on the member agency's peak summer day consumption over the prior three years.

So if there's a high peak during the summer, that will set a new Capacity Charge Rate and then that gets allocated and stays with that member agency for the next three years.

At the bottom here, we have cited the 2010 cost of service studies and the 2012 cost of service studies that explain in more detail how the Readiness-to-Serve Charges are allocated and how the other volumetric rates are applied.

I want to turn to San Diego's factual contention. They say that there are some member agencies that roll on and roll off the Met system. So this is their factual assertion that L.A. has different peaking behavior than other member agencies.

In reality, San Diego has misrepresented the differences between the member agencies' annual variations. And San Diego tends to talk as if it were self-evident that in the relevant time period, meaning when the unbundled rate structure went into effect, somehow everybody just knows that L.A. is rolling on and rolling off more than other member agencies, and that's

variations aren't that different, that would tend to undermine San Diego's claim. And if it looks like they're significantly different, that could tend to strengthen San Diego's claim. But here's where I want to underscore that what's in the admin record actually is much narrower than the factual information you're getting at this hearing that's outside of it.

And there are -- and to make a related point, San Diego has pointed to two of their own letters. They had a 2000 letter to Met, the board of directors, I'm not going to show them now, and a 2012 letter in which San Diego has argued and contended that Met doesn't account for dry year peaking. That's not really evidence of anything, that's just citing a letter to prove that they argued or contended something.

What your Honor should be looking for on the dry year peaking issue is data, factual evidence that shows whether or not there is evidence to support a dry year peaking plan. And here, we think there isn't. The only real data that San Diego can point to, meaning actual numbers and uses is their own FCS report which, if anything, tends to support Metropolitan.

This is the FCS report that was submitted to the administrative record in 2012 where the FCS Group, San Diego's expert, looked at a decade-long period of

not an assertion that needs to be proven or demonstrated.

We think that that is not the case. In fact San Diego's variations themselves is much larger than L.A. and puts greater demands on Met's systems.

But in any event, in the administrative record there is a report submitted by San Diego's expert that tended to show that there isn't this large disparity between the member agencies over a decade long period.

And I'm going to focus on this FCS report and underscore here the difference between administrative record review and going outside the administrative record because I do think it's particularly important on the peaking charge issue.

San Diego has submitted evidence outside the administrative record, and you saw it from Mr. Denham in which he had his analysis of peaking charges. And then we took some of Mr. Denham's data, we made it into our own chart and showed that back. And so both sides outside of the record are putting factual information before the Court.

But for the claims that are in the record, that's not available to the Court. It would be just what is in the record and the Court would need to see factual information, some data concerning member agency usage and if it looks like the member agency water -- the annual water sales for each member agency. They calculated the highest annual water purchase for each member agency and they calculated the average annual water use for each member agency and then they computed a peak to average ratio and attempted to use that as a measure of the peaking differences between the member agencies.

But their peak to average ratios in fact tended to confirm that at least for the time period covered by this report, that the differences were unimpressive. MWD's largest customers, those purchasing more than 100,000 acre-feet of water per year all had the ratio between 1.07 and 1.32, not a very large drop. There wasn't a member agency that was peaking at two or three times its average, they were all within a very narrow band. San Diego's was higher than West Basin, a little lower than Los Angeles. This is true that L.A. had one that was a little bit higher.

If you expand the view from just the largest ones to all of the member agencies, then there was one that was an outlier, San Fernando. They account for 0.000176 percent of Met's projected water sales, a very tiny and insignificant amount. They were the outlier at 3.0. The other 25 member agencies all had peak to average ratios between 1.07 and 1.72, so none of them seriously out of line.

Pages 487 to 490

What we did then is we looked elsewhere in the administrative record to see if we could find any guidance and advice on whether this type of spread in peak to average issue is meaningful or whether it's not a meaningful distinction.

2.2

2.3

And one source that we turned to is the American Waterworks Association's M1 manual in the administrative record. And we looked at Chapter 31 on wholesale rates. Although the M1 manual is principally about retail service, there's a chapter that deals with wholesale rates.

And we looked to peak to average ratios within the class. And M1 puts forth illustrative ratios of peak to averages within customer classes. There's the residential customer class, commercial, industrial. We have it here wholesale. And what they did here -- and we put the citations at the bottom of the page so that your Honor can go back and read it all to yourself and get the context here. I wanted to put the highlight on the screen, which is that within different -- each class, there are spreads of -- within peak to average ratios.

As we've said, we think that the right way -THE COURT: Are these spreads in context, what
I see, that these are spreads which are based on some
empirical study or are these just made up numbers?

we think that San Diego's focus on more variation is out of place, but we were trying to put some kind of guidance in the industry of what might be relevant.

And as you see here, that the spreads and peak to average ratios are much larger than the spreads of peak to average ratios than Met's member agencies have in their annual water usage.

In any event, even if it were true that there was some significant variation between the member agencies in terms of how much water, meaning some vary much more wildly than others, which we don't think they've demonstrated in the unbundling effect, Met's and charges still reasonably account for the annual variations in water agency usage.

And in some ways the purpose is served by the cost of service studies that are done in every single rate setting cycle, is that they're an effort to analyze Metropolitan's costs and decide how they should be allocated to different rates. And obviously, the cost of service is used to develop the various different rates. They recover costs associated with water purchases.

You've seen these slides before so I'm going to take you through them quickly. But tier 1 and tier 2 rates recover the cost of water supply, certain finance and drought storage costs. The tier 2 rates as we notice

491 493

MR. HIXSON: These are presented as illustrative spreads for those classes. They're not intended to be a prescriptive or an empirical analysis. For example, it is a statistically average spread.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me. I object. It also has nothing to do with dry year peaking. These are weekly spreads that he's talking about. This is just irrelevant.

THE COURT: That's a matter of argument. Let's reserve on that.

But in terms of this particular context, are these numbers the result of -- at least purportedly the result of some analysis of what's going on in the real world or --

MR. HIXSON: No. The M1 manual works different from that. They tend to present illustrative examples or ways of doing things. So this isn't an analysis, this is the most common spread of ratios.

THE COURT: So in the real world the ratios could be completely different.

MR. HIXSON: That could be the case, that's right.

And Mr. Keker is right that this is looking at max day and max hour. As we said, we think the better way of looking at peaking is smaller periods of time and

are higher.

The System Access Rate recovers certain facility costs for distribution, for conveyance and aqueduct.

System Power Rate recovers the energy costs for pumping, moving water to southern California, and we have the Water Stewardship Rate recovering the cost of management programs. And then the treatment surcharge here recovering the treatment cost.

The entire exercise of having this cost of service studies is an attempt to take Metropolitan's costs, to look forward and to allocate them appropriately to the volumetric rate, to make sure that they're properly recovering those costs. And so jumping to annual variations and not looking at the cost of service process is a flawed way to proceed. Met has carefully looked at those costs before coming up with these rates.

THE COURT: If I looked at the sources that are cited for example on slide 146, would I find that drought storage, however you want to describe this, dry year storage costs, or if you want to call them dry year peaking, or if you want to call them more episodic peaking rates, would I find that that specifically is being accounted for by these mechanisms, by the supply rates?

Pages 491 to 494

MR. HIXSON: Yes. We've cited the relevant pages from the cost of service studies which state that these are the costs that are recovered by the supply rates here. And I presented them in more summary fashion.

THE COURT: Sure. I understand that.
MR. HIXSON: Or my presentation would be even longer.

And so -- but yes, that's the purpose for these footnotes here, is to show that's where these costs are recovered.

Okay. And in addition to the volumetric rates, I wanted to click ahead to slide 152 and talk a bit more about the Readiness-to-Serve Charge. Here, we've shown -- this is Schedule 9. This is a page from the cost of service study and the Readiness-to-Serve charge that we've highlighted there.

This also accounts for annual variations in water usage. As I said, they're allocated to member agencies based on a ten-year rolling average. And what this means, the Readiness-to-Serve Charge recovers emergency and regulatory storage and that's reservoirs, and certain capital costs for State Water Project and Colorado River facilities to meet peak monthly deliveries.

And, in addition, the volumetric rates themselves recover appropriately the cost of this supply, the transportation, the treatment rates, the Water Stewardship Rate and the other costs that Metropolitan recovers allocating its cost of service process.

I would now like to circle back a little bit.

I began with the board process, the MWD Act and the Administrative Code that define Met as having an open and deliberative board process where the public is invited to participate and all the member agencies get to vote.

It should be noted that San Diego has always been an active participant in these board proceedings and they've been vigorous and vocal of course in some cases criticizing them, but at other times, they've been supportive of Met and have cast a number of votes over the years in favor of rates under this unbundled rate structure.

THE COURT: Do you think that affects any of the decisions that I need to make?

MR. HIXSON: I think that it provides context that's useful for the Court. Ultimately you're reviewing the legality of Met's rates or whether they complied with substantial evidence in the administrative record and thus the duty they were performing and not -- rather than looking into motives or --

495 497

And the key punch line here is that if the member agency's water usage goes up or down annually, that continues to affect its Readiness-to-Serve allocation for the next decade. And that's true for all of them. It's true for Los Angeles, for San Diego, for all of them, because the standby costs represent the value of that service of standing by. And looking at a past ten-year roll-on average is a way of getting at what's the value to them of having that system available to them over that period of time.

And finally, there's the Capacity Charge. Variations in water use also affect the Capacity Charge.

To be clear, that's not based on annual variations. As I said, peak summer day is the mechanism by way that the Capacity Charge is accounted for, but that does have a two-year look back. And this recovers the cost of MWD's distribution system associated with peak usage.

The punch line here is that San Diego is complaining that L.A. is rolling on and rolling off the Met system but in fact it's not possible to roll on and roll off the Met system without paying for its cost. The Readiness-to-Serve Charge lingers with the agency for the next decade and the Capacity Charge for peak summer usage lingers for the next three years.

THE COURT: And I take it that if San Diego had voted for everything that Met has done 100 percent, I would still have to do the work that I need to do on this case; right? I would still be addressing the same issues?

MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's correct.

We did want to put this slide up here as well. This will show that there have been times, most of the time when San Diego voted for rates under Met's unbundling rate structure.

In January of 2002, they voted to approve a resolution that initiated the adoption of the new rates.

In March, they were the key rate vote that set the rate amounts that took effect in January of 2003.

In fact, the majority of the years since the unbundling, they voted to approve rates under the same rate structure, and we think this demonstrates the -- it's factual evidence that demonstrates the reasonableness of the rates, although we don't dispute that ultimately the Court has to review the administrative record for substantial evidence.

I did want to point to something that concerned Mr. Cushman's testimony, when he said that in April of 2012, San Diego voted against the rates.

As I mentioned earlier, in 2012, Met's staff

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

proposed three options for the rates that had different levels of cost increases. One of them, Option II, was a 5 percent increase and that was the one that was adopted. And it's true that San Diego voted against that. Another one, which was a three percent increase, San Diego actually did vote for. Those weren't differences in the rate structure, those were simply differences in dollar amounts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So technically that may be true, that they voted against the rates, but I think the more important point is that they still voted for one of the options under the structure that's being challenged in this litigation.

To wrap up on the administrative record, most of the claims before the Court in the rate challenge are limited to the administrative record and that will affect the evidence that the Court can consider and the Court should consider in ruling on these claims.

We think the administrative record establishes that Met's rates were reasonable under the governing legal standards, that under MWD Act, Section 134, Met's rates are uniform for like classes of service. Indeed there seems to be barely any dispute or argument about uniformity. The rates are issued by postage stamp rates or RTS and Capacity Charge calculated in a uniform way rights to use the State Water Project and showed the Court the contract that provides the contractual rights

And then under the wheeling statute, I've showed the Court the written determination that Metropolitan made concerning fair compensation, the ones that specifically address this question of State Water Project costs.

And of course the wheeling statute claim is before the Court as determined. It may also go outside the administrative record.

And so with that, your Honor, I would like to conclude the admin record presentation and perhaps after a short break we would like to call our first witness.

MR. KEKER: Could I respond for ten minutes about particularly item 7, which I didn't object to, but the slides that they presented and the things he said about a lot of that was extremely misleading and we would like to respond right now.

MR. HIXSON: I object to that. This is our case-in-chief.

MR. KEKER: Well it's their case-in-chief, but he's been accusing us of misrepresentations, he's been filibustering for several hours. I would like to have ten minutes to respond.

499

among the member agencies.

Under the common law and the Government Code. Metropolitan's rates are reasonable and reflect a fair charge for the services that are being provided.

Under Prop. 13 and Prop. 26, you've seen the process that Met uses to develop its rates. It's this forward look at the revenue requirement and the revenues that it needs to recover for each of its functions and Met performs its rate design in that direction, looking at what are the funds that are necessary to recover the costs of those particular services, and the case law interpreting Prop. 13 and Prop. 26 endorses that method of estimating the expected cost of the service and using that as the basis for assessing the rate and that's the process that Metropolitan follows here.

We also think that the administrative record demonstrates that Met's rates aren't imposed in the legal sense of that term, meaning that Met is a voluntary cooperative of member agencies that have chosen to join, a point that I began at the start of the presentation.

And that Metropolitan's rates and charges all relate to a different exception to Prop. 26, which is that purchase or use of government property, which would be either the water itself or Metropolitan's facilities. I've talked about the distribution facilities and Met's

MR. HIXSON: We were quiet during their

THE COURT: Please, we don't have to discuss this any further. Let's finish Metropolitan's case. I have a pretty good memory. I think I will be able to track what San Diego has to say in response when we get back to San Diego's rebuttal case. So let's just keep San Diego off the stand for a moment and put Metropolitan in the driver's seat.

> You would like a short break at this point? MR. HIXSON: Yes, please.

THE COURT: Great. I will see everybody in ten.

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: Sir?

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, Metropolitan calls Brent Yamasaki to the stand.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

BRENT YAMASAKI,

having been called as a witness by the Defense, and having been duly sworn under the standard oath, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: If you would adjust the microphone and then state and spell your first and last name.

THE WITNESS: My name is Brent Yamasaki,

502

501

. 1	B-R-E-N-T, Y-A-M-A-S-A-K-I.	¹ Project. It includes reservoirs and pipelines to deliver
2	THE COURT: Thank you.	water to our member agencies.
3	MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I would like to	Q. Does Metropolitan ever use the State Water
4	provide the Court and the witness a binder of exhibits.	Project facilities to transport non-project water?
5	I provided these to San Diego already.	5 A. Yes, it does.
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION	Q. And can you explain what non-project water
7	BY MR. HIXSON:	⁷ means?
8	Q. Mr. Yamasaki, good afternoon.	8 A. That's water that's outside of that which is
9	A. Good afternoon.	allocated by the State Water Project, Department of Water
10	Q. Who do you work for?	10 Resources every year.
11	A. Metropolitan Water District.	Q. What do State Water Project water transfers and
12	Q. How long have you worked at Metropolitan?	exchanges refer to?
13	A. 22 years.	A. Those are typically short-term transactions
14	Q. Can you maybe raise the microphone. We will be	where Metropolitan and other contractors procure water to
15	able to hear you a little better.	mitigate dry year shortage conditions.
16	A. How's that?	Q. Okay. In general, who are the sellers in these
17	Q. Great.	non-project transactions you just referred to?
18	What position do you hold at Metropolitan?	A. They're typically agricultural districts,
19	A. I'm the section manager of operations and	mainly north of the Delta.
20	planning at Metropolitan.	Q. And so are you referring to sellers different
21	Q. Can you give us a general description of your	than the state itself?
22	job responsibilities?	22 A. Yes, that's correct.
23	A. I'm responsible for the 24-7 operations of	Q. What does Met have to pay the state to do these
24	Metropolitan, the system operators in the distribution	non-project water exchanges?
25	system, also responsible for operational planning and	25 A. Metropolitan pays power and power related
	system, also responsible for operational planning and	A. Metropontan pays power and power related
	503	505
1	storage management as well as system automation, shutdown	¹ costs.
2	planning and emergency management.	Q. Does Met have to pay a facilities fee to the
3	Q. Okay. Do your job responsibilities involve	state to do the non-project water transfers?
4	Met's use of State Water Project facilities for	4 A. Not specifically for transfers, no.
5	transportation and storage?	⁵ Q. And can you explain why not?
6	A. Yes, they do.	A. Those costs are covered as fixed charges by the
7	Q. Can you explain in general terms what those	State Water Project for transportation.
8	State Water Project facilities are?	⁸ Q. Are you referring to charges that Met pays?
9	A. Yeah. Starting up north, there's Lake	9 A. Yes, that's correct.
10	Oroville. That's north of the Delta.	Q. During the time that you've worked at Met,
11	And then there are there's a Banks Pumping	under what circumstances did Met engage in these
12	Plant that's at the south end of the Delta and that pumps	non-project water transfers and exchanges?
13	water into the California Aqueduct.	A. The period between 2008 and 2010 is the most
14	There's a San Louis reservoir in central	14 recent.
15	California that stores water, and then the California	Q. And can you describe what about that time
16	Aqueduct continues its way down to Metropolitan service	period caused Met to engage in those non-water project
17	area.	transfers and exchanges?
18	Q. Do your responsibilities also involve Met's	A. That was a period where we experienced multiple
19	internal distribution system?	dry years on state water projects. It was also a period
20	A. Yes, they do.	where we drafted significant quantities of storage from
21	Q. And can you explain in general terms what that	our storage accounts.
22	distribution system is?	Q. Please go to DTX 102 in your binder.
23	A. Yes. That's the distribution system that	Can you describe what this document is?
24	conveys and distributes water from both of our imported	A. Yes. This is a report to our board of
0.5		
25		directors that described the transactions that
25	water supply on the Colorado River and the State Water	directors that described the transactions that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Metropolitan and other parties took during that timeframe 2 between 2008 and 2010. 3 O. And so does it contain a description of these

- non-project water transfers you were just talking about?
 - A. Yes, it does.

6

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

refers to?

- Q. Will you explain generally how the water Met purchases from the sellers gets to Met?
- A. Yes. It originates generally north of the Delta and it travels through the Delta down to the Banks Pumping Plant, where it's pumped into the California Aqueduct and transmitted by the California Aqueduct down to Metropolitan service area.
- Q. How much water did Met purchase through these non-project water transfers and exchanges in 2008?
 - A. It was approximately 41,000 acre-feet.
- Q. And were you looking at a particular place in this document for that number?
- A. Yes. It would be table 1 on page 2 of the report.
- Q. And how much water did Met purchase for these non-project water transfers and exchanges in 2009?
 - A. It was approximately 61,000 acre-feet.
 - Q. How about in 2010?
 - A. Approximately 228,000 acre-feet.
 - Q. Now, focusing on the 228,000 acre-feet of

facilitated bringing buyers and sellers together to -for parties that were interested in buying supplemental water supply in that year.

- Q. Okay. And how much water did Metropolitan purchase in this 2010 transaction?
 - A. It was approximately 88,000 acre-feet.
 - Q. And who did Met purchase this water from?
- A. It was parties -- agricultural districts north of the Delta.
- Q. And how did Metropolitan get that water to its service area?
- A. The water originated north of the Delta, it traveled through the Delta and was pumped into the California Aqueduct where it traveled southward to southern California, to Met service area.
 - Q. Please turn to the next page.

There's a reference to a Shasta exchange supply. Can you describe in general terms what that transaction was?

A. Yes. That was a dry year purchase that Metropolitan did in 2003 and because of a change in circumstances, Metropolitan did not move that water in 2003, but we entered into agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation to transfer that water to them and take it at a later date. And in 2010, that's when conditions were

509 507

non-project water that Met got in 2010, how does that compare to the amount of State Water Project water Met got in that same year?

- A. Metropolitan's final allocation or the final allocation for all the contractors that year was 50 percent, so that represented roughly one million acre-feet.
- Q. And so was this 228,000 acre-feet of non-project water in addition to that one million acre-feet?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Okay. And approximately what percentage addition was it?
- A. It was about 23 percent over what Metropolitan was allocated.
 - O. You mean allocated from the state?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. I would like to talk about some of the specific transfers and exchanges that are described in this exhibit.

Can you turn to attachment one, page 1? Can you describe in general terms what the state water contractors buyers group transfers supply

A. Yes. The state water contractors that year

ripe actually to move the water from Bureau facilities and into the State Water Project where it was conveyed to Metropolitan.

- Q. Okay. And did that movement happen in 2010?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, I don't want to walk through every example in this report, but are there other examples of these kinds of transfers and exchanges in this report that Met has engaged in?
 - A. Yes, there are.
- Q. And in all of these transfers and exchanges described in this report, how did this non-project water get to Met?
- A. It was transported over the State Water Project in the California Aqueduct down to the Met service area.
- Q. Okay. Is the ability to do these transfers and exchanges an important water management tool for Met?
 - A. Yes, it is.
 - Q. Can you describe how so?
- A. In times of shortage, particularly severe shortage where we're having to use our storage reserves to meet our member agency demands, purchasing water, additional water supplies is very helpful to shore up imported supplies in general to meet our deliveries to member agencies.

508

1 MR. HIXSON: Okay. Your Honor, DTX 102 is Q. And when Met takes water out of the storage 2 2 subject to the parties' stipulation and at this time facilities, how does it get to Met? 3 3 Metropolitan moves it into evidence. A. Typically through pumping. The agricultural 4 MR. PURCELL: No objection. 4 districts have pumps that convey water through their 5 THE COURT: 102 is admitted, DTX 102. 5 service areas back to the California Aqueduct, where it 6 (Whereupon Exhibit 102 was 6 enters the State Water Project and is delivered to admitted into Evidence.) 7 Metropolitan. 7 BY MR. HIXSON: 8 Q. Are the parties able to monitor the quality of 8 Q. I would like to turn to a different subject and 9 the water that comes out of these facilities for storage? 9 talk about how Met stores the water it moves through 10 A. Yes, they are. 10 State Water Project facilities. 11 Q. Can you describe how they are able to do so? 11 Can you turn to DTX 94 in your binder. 12 A. Yes. There's a water sampling taken of the 12 Can you explain what this document is? 13 pump ins as well as upstream and downstream where the 1.3 A. This was a presentation provided to the board 14 pumping activity is taking place on the California 14 of directors at Metropolitan that described our storage 15 Aqueduct. 15 management strategy. 16 Q. Does this monitoring allow the parties to know 16 Q. Please turn to page 3. What does this graphic 17 the source of the water that comes out of the storage? 17 show? 18 18 A. This is a graphic showing the storage programs 19 Q. Okay. And can you describe how that is so? 19 that Metropolitan has throughout the state. 20 20 A. Okay. Each of the pumping programs kind of has Q. What does the area shaded in yellow in this 21 21 a water quality signature, if you will, a different graph show? 22 chemical composition and generally speaking, the pumping 22 A. That represents Metropolitan service area. 23 23 programs have, say, lower total organic carbon than State Q. And what is the blue line going through 24 24 California to Met service area? Water Project supply. So that's one indicator of the 25 2.5 differences in water quality in the pumped in water. A. That's the California Aqueduct. 511 513 1 1 Q. And does this monitoring allow the parties to Q. Some of the storage facilities on this slide 2 2 know the source of the water that comes out of the are labeled as banking programs. Can you describe what 3 3 those are? storage? 4 4 A. Yes. Those are groundwater storage programs A. Yes. 5 5 where Metropolitan has partnered with agricultural water Q. Is the water that comes out of these banking 6 6 storage districts in the Central Valley to store water in programs often different from the project water that went 7 7 surplus times and withdraw water in dry years. 8 8 Q. Okay. And can you describe how Met uses the A. Yes. 9 Central Valley storage programs? 9 Q. And how do you know that? 10 10 A. Yes. In a dry year where we've taken a look at A. Just by again the chemical signature of the 11 11 various water supplies to shore up, say, a shortfall in water that's pumped in. There's a difference between 12 12 State Water Project supplies, we'll call on these what's upstream in the pump-in programs and downstream in 13 13 programs to extract water from the ground, provide it the pump-in programs. 14 14 back to the California Aqueduct and deliver it to Q. And in general what kind of water comes out of 1.5 Metropolitan service area. 15 the storage? 16 16 Q. And who are the parties that provide the A. It's generally groundwater that's extracted 17 17 storage to Met? from the ground in the Central Valley. 18 18 A. Semi, Arvin-Edison and Kern Delta Water Storage THE COURT: When you are placing water, in 19 Districts in the Central Valley. 19 effect, into these areas, are you literally -- not you, 20 Q. Physically, how does Met get the water to these 20 but are these local agencies literally pumping water into 21 storage programs? 21 groundwater? 22 A. In a wet year, we would deliver water through a 22 THE WITNESS: They do it in a variety of ways. 23 portion of the California Aqueduct and request that the 23 They can store -- some of the agricultural districts have 24 water be stored in these banking programs for later 24 spreading basins where they put the water on the ground 25 withdrawal. 25 and it percolates in the groundwater basin.

514

1 They can also exchange supplies. So they can A. Yes, I am. 2 2 O. How does Met decide which ones to use? take Metropolitan water for storage and instead of 3 3 A. We have a -- what's known as a water surplus pumping water for their own agricultural irrigation, 4 4 these just utilize the Metropolitan water and leave their and drought management plan. It's a plan that was 5 5 water in the ground. developed jointly by Metropolitan and its member agencies 6 6 BY MR. HIXSON: and it describes how storage should be used in both 7 Q. Looking back at this slide on page 3 of PTX 94, surplus years and shortage years. 8 can you explain what SWP carryover is? 8 Q. And how did you become familiar with this water 9 9 surplus and drought management plan? A. Yes. That's storage that's located in San Luis 10 10 Reservoir, which is in central California where A. When I moved to operations, part of my 11 11 responsibility was to help with the planning of how the contractors can store carryover supplies from one year to 12 12 another. storage is moved and what it's used for and so the WSDM 13 13 Q. And who does Met contract with to store the plan is a very important piece of that. 14 14 water? Q. Can you describe a little bit more about what 15 15 A. Department of Water Resources. the water storage and water surplus and drought 16 16 Q. Okay. How does the water get to Metropolitan management plan is? 17 17 A. Yes. The water surplus and drought management service area from that storage? 18 18 plan provided a framework for which Metropolitan's A. It's delivered out of the reservoir where it 19 19 numerous storage programs would be exercised both in wet enters the California Aqueduct and it's conveyed 20 20 southerly to Metropolitan service area. years and in dry years. 21 21 Q. Why does Met use SWP carryover storage? There was analysis in the report that talked 22 22 A. We use that because oftentimes our State Water about the frequency of surplus and shortage and how 23 23 Project allocation starts out very low, for example for storage would be used to blunt the effects of shortage, 24 24 this year, going into 2014, and by storing carryover, we for example. 25 25 Q. Let's go back DTX 94. Please turn to the fifth can supplement those supplies in case the allocation 515 517 1 1 stays low. And we have done that in the past. page of this exhibit. 2 2 O. There's a reference on the slide to flexible Turning to the fifth page of this exhibit, can 3 3 storage. Can you describe where that is? you explain what this is describing? 4 A. Yes. That's contractual storage that we have 4 A. Yes. This is a graphic from the WSDM plan that 5 5 with DWR and it's located in two of the terminal shows how storage would be utilized or should be utilized 6 6 reservoirs at Castaic Lake and Lake Perris. in the event of varying agrees of shortage. So for 7 7 O. Are those lakes. Castaic Lake and Lake Perris. instance, when we have a shortage on the State Water 8 8 part of the State Water Project? Project, it would advise taking water from Diamond Valley 9 9 A. Yes, they are. Lake, for example, under very shallow shortage. And 10 Q. And can you describe how flexible storage 10 there's other actions that can take place, as you've seen 11 works? 11 in recent depth of storage -- shortage. 12 A. Metropolitan for a number of reasons, dry year, 12 THE COURT: You've used an acronym, W-S-D-M; 13 operational flexibility and other reasons, can withdraw 13 correct? 14 14 water out of those two terminal reservoirs up to a THE WITNESS: Correct. 15 specific amount by contract but we have up to five years 15 BY MR. HIXSON: 16 to pay that water back. 16 Q. It's an acronym for what? 17 Q. What kind of water does Met borrow from Castaic 17 A. Water Surplus and Drought Management Plan, 18 Lake and Lake Perris? 18 WSDM. 19 A. It is State Water Project water. 19 Q. And so then these actions that are listed on 20 Q. What kind of water can Met use to pay it back? 20 the fifth page of the exhibit, in general what are these 21 A. Any of our supplies. 21 actions? 22 Q. Now I would like to change topics and ask you 22 A. These are actions involving the operation of 23 about storage generally. 23 Metropolitan storage portfolio. So for instance, it 24

Pages 515 to 518

518

gives guidance as far as what type of programs one should

exercise as you see differing levels or increasing levels

516

24

25

Are you familiar with Met's use of its storage

25

facilities?

of shortage. Q. And does an allocation plan affect all the 2 2 Q. Okay. The first one is take from Diamond member agencies? 3 3 Valley Lake. What is Diamond Valley Lake? A. That's correct. 4 A. Diamond Valley Lake is a reservoir that was O. And how is that? 5 constructed and put online in 1999. It's located in 5 A. The allocation plan was developed in 6 6 Riverside County. And it's 810,000 acre-feet. It conjunction with the member agencies, but it looked at 7 provides storage. One of the uses for Diamond Valley historical demand levels by all the member agencies and 8 Lake is dry year storage. based on the severity of the shortage, a certain 9 9 Q. Does Diamond Valley Lake serve multiple percentage or a certain amount of water was limited for 10 10 purposes? all -- each member agency. 11 11 A. Yes, it does. Q. Is Met's ability to use the State Water Project 12 12 O. And can you describe what those are? facilities to move water to and from the Central Valley 13 13 A. Yes. Diamond Valley Lake provides operational storage to flexible storage and to move non-project water 14 14 flexibility. It has a dry year storage component. It an important tool in trying to avoid an allocation plan? 15 15 also has emergency storage. A. Yes, it is. 16 16 Q. Are the Central Valley storage programs that Q. Now I would like to ask you about a related 17 17 you testified about a few minutes ago part of this WSDM issue. 18 plan? 18 Does Met have principles that guide storage 19 19 A. Yes, they are. operations? 20 20 Q. And can you describe what role they play? A. Yes, they do. 21 A. In a shortage that is a little more than just a 21 Q. Does Met store water to accommodate the 22 22 shallow shortage, for example, the WSDM plan would advice variations in demand just from a single member agency? 23 23 to take water from Central Valley storage to supplement, 24 24 say, a deficit in imported supplies. Q. Please turn to the next page of this exhibit. 25 25 Q. Okay. And do the flexible storage programs Does this exhibit list what Met storage 519 1 1 that you testified about a few minutes ago also play a operations principles are? 2 2 role in this WSDM plan? A. Yes, it does. 3 3 Q. Can you explain for us what the operational A. Yes, they do. 4 4 Q. Is it similar to the Central Valley storage flexibility principle means? 5 5 role? A. Yes. That means that in following the WSDM 6 6 plan, that we would follow the principles of the WSDM A. It is similar but according to the plan, you 7 7 would take these actions or withdraw from these programs plan but operate the storage programs in a way that 8 8 to make up for an increasing level of shortage. So they looked at the total storage portfolio and the different 9 9 would come after the decision to take water from Diamond storages in the various pieces of the portfolio. So we 10 10 Valley Lake or Central Valley storage. would manage it as a unit as opposed to taking a look at 11 11 Q. What role do transfers of non-project water one storage and having a pre-described level that had to 12 12 through the State Water Project facilities play in this be taken out of Diamond Valley Lake, for instance, before 13 13 water surplus and drought management plan? we took another action. 14 14 So, it would take a holistic view of the whole A. Well, when you get to an extreme level of 1.5 15 shortage or when your storage reserves are very depleted, portfolio and we would take actions that were 16 16 you would go out on the market and look and engage in complimentary with the WSDM plan. 17 17 transfer activity to shore up a very low imported supply. Q. Can you explain what the system reliability 18 18 Q. Okay. Now, at the bottom of this list, this principle means? 19 19 page 5 of this exhibit, there's a reference to

20

21

22

23

24

25

implementing an allocation plan. Can you please describe

extreme conditions it would be where a limit is placed on

the amount of water that a member agency can buy at our

A. Yes. An allocation plan is under the most

what an allocation plan is?

regular full service rates.

A. Yes. That means that we would use storage and manage storage in such a way that was mindful of the entire system in maintaining reliability throughout the system. For instance, there are areas in our distribution system that can only be served by State Water Project supplies, typically, and there are also 522 Pages 519 to 522

521

520

20

21

22

23

24

areas that can only be served by Colorado River Aqueduct supplies.

Q. Okay. Please turn to Page 9 of this exhibit. Is this the continuation of the list of the storage operating principles?

A. Yes, it is.

2.3

- Q. Can you explain for us what the invasive species management principle is?
- A. Yes. Invasive species management means that in Colorado River water, for instance, there are invasive Quagga mussels that have infested the Colorado River supplies and so some of our reservoirs have those mussels in it. And in managing storage, we look to not further the spread of the invasive mussels. So for instance, Diamond Valley Lake does not have Quagga mussels so for right now, we don't put any Colorado River water into it.
- Q. And can you explain how water quality factors into Met's storage operating principles?
- A. Yes. When we look at drafting from storage, we are always mindful of water quality parameters such as salinity or trying to meet other water quality objectives when we're exercising water storage programs.
- Q. Please turn to the next page.
 Can you explain what emergency storage refers to?

when to implement a water supply allocation.

One example from recent history was that as we saw storage depleted over several years, we didn't wait until the storage was empty then to allocate water. We, in conversation and collaboration with our member agencies, opted for a shallow, say, five or ten percent order magnitude shortage as the shortage was being drafted, not waiting until the storage was all gone and having a very draconian allocation, let's say, that cut very deeply.

- Q. Okay. Now I would like to change topics.

 Are you familiar with capacity issues regarding
 Met's distribution system?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And how are capacity issues related to your job responsibilities?
- A. Well, first and foremost, our delivery responsibilities are meeting the member agency demands for water.

We also have other operational priorities, which include managing, say, water quality objectives like blending. And also we're also in charge of making storage decisions and moving water around the system to facilitate storage and certain of our water storage programs.

A. Yeah. Emergency storage is a piece of our storage that's intended for use only when you have, say, a catastrophic event like a large earthquake that severs an aqueduct or shuts down the State Water Project for a time.

So, unlike dry year storage that is exercised, you know, to offset droughts or move water in times of surplus, the emergency management is specifically for catastrophic events.

- Q. So does Met use emergency storage in dry years?
- A. No.
- Q. What reservoirs are specifically used for emergency storage?
- A. It would be Diamond Valley Lake, Lake Skinner, Lake Matthews, Lake Perris, Castaic Lake and Pyramid Lake.
- Q. So some of those are State Water Project reservoirs, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And can you explain what the sixth operating principle is?
- A. Yes. Minimizing extreme and volatile supply allocations. The idea there is that we would take a look at the use of storage and the rate of storage withdrawals in making decisions on which storages to use and also

- Q. What sort of peaking does Met consider in sizing the distribution system?
 - A. It's typically a peak week.
- Q. What are some of the reasons that Met moves water through its pipelines?
- A. Again, first and foremost, it would be to meet member agency demands. But we also use the pipelines to implement other operational strategies, like blending, managing salinity, for instance, and facilitating storage throughout our system.
- Q. Have there ever been times when the pipelines in Met's distribution system have been at or near capacity?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Can you give us an example of that?
- A. One example is our Rialto feeder. It's a pipeline that is in the northeastern end of our system. It's connected to the Lake Silverwood system of the State Water Project and it delivers State Water Project to customers that are connected to that pipeline.

But in addition, we also use that pipeline to supply blend water to our Weymouth and Diemer treatment plants. And member agencies and Metropolitan also use that to facilitate groundwater storage in the region.

Q. Can you give us another example of when

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

527

- pipelines in your distribution system have been at or near capacity?
 - A. More recently the San Diego pipelines 3 and 5 that convey untreated water to the San Diego County Water Authority area and to agencies in the Riverside area were at maximum capacity.
- Q. When a pipeline is at or near capacity, does that affect how Met addresses the other operational reasons for moving water?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. And can you describe in general terms how it affects that?
- A. Okay. Generally, going back to the Rialto feeder, if we are meeting member agency demands and supplying water to the plants for blending, if the member agency demands on that pipeline increase, then we would reduce the amount of water supply available to those two treatment plants for blends and the net result would be everybody's demands would be met but the blends to the treatment plants would be reduced.
- Q. Okay. And have capacity constraints in, for example, the Rialto feeder caused Metropolitan to take some of those actions?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. In your role as system operations section

- Q. How many of those pipes that go from Met to San Diego go through a treatment plant?
- A. There are three pipelines that are delivering treated water from the Skinner Treatment Plant in San Diego.
 - Q. And which pipelines are those?
 - A. Those are pipelines 1, 2 and 4.
- Q. How many of the pipelines from Met to San Diego are for untreated water?
 - A. There are two pipelines, No. 3 and 5.
- Q. Does all of the water that Met sends to San Diego go through the Skinner area?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Physically speaking, is there any difference between the water that goes through the Skinner Treatment Plant and the untreated water that Met sends to San Diego?
 - A. Not normally, no.
 - Q. Are you aware that Met has an exchange agreement with San Diego?
 - A. Yes, I am.
 - Q. Does Met provide exchange water to San Diego under this agreement?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Physically speaking, is there any difference

529

manager, are you familiar with how water from Met gets to San Diego?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you have DTX -- sorry. You have DTX 125 in your binder.

Your Honor, this is a large map. We have an easel next to the witness and I would like to put up a blowup of that and hand him a pointer so that it will be easier to follow.

First, can you identify for us what DTX 125 is?

- A. This is a cope of our distribution system schematic. It's known as the L-1212 map.
- Q. Can you tell us what pipes deliver water from Metropolitan to San Diego?
 - A. Yes. San Diego San pipelines 1 through 5.
- Q. And can you identify for us on this map where those pipes are that go to San Diego?
 - A. Yes.

This is Lake Skinner and the Skinner Treatment Plant. And from this facility, there are five treatment -- or five pipelines that deliver water to San Diego.

- Q. Okay. We'll keep it blown up on the screen but you can sit down now.
 - A. Okay.

between the exchange water and the other water that Met provides to San Diego?

- A. None that I know of.
- Q. Is the water that Met sends to San Diego a blend from different sources?
 - A. Yes, it is.
 - O. Okay. And what are those different sources?
- A. The water from the State Water Project and water from the Colorado River Aqueduct.
- Q. At any given point in time, is the treated water, untreated water and exchange water that Met sends to San Diego usually all the same level of blend?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Does Met monitor the blend of water in the Skinner Treatment Plant that goes to San Diego?
 - A. Yes, we do.
- Q. And can you describe in general terms how Met monitors that blend?
- A. Yes. We take water samples on the influence of the Skinner Treatment Plant and take routine measurements of the water quality as well as measurements of the blend.
- Q. What section of the Metropolitan does that monitoring?
 - A. It's our water quality section.

530

```
1
          Q. Does the water quality section record those
                                                                            Water Project water, you might see the blends at Skinner
2
                                                                      2
       blend records in a database?
                                                                            increase significantly.
 3
                                                                      3
          A. Yes, they do.
                                                                                  And when we have a shortage of State Water
 4
                                                                      4
          Q. Are those records entered in the database at or
                                                                            Project water, you will see the blends drop. There are
 5
       near the time the monitoring took place?
                                                                      5
                                                                            other different operational reasons, such as pipeline
                                                                      6
 6
          A. Yes, they are.
                                                                            capacities and other things like that that influence the
 7
                                                                      7
          Q. Does Met have a regular practice to record
                                                                            blends but primarily supply driven.
 8
                                                                      8
       those readings in the database?
                                                                               Q. Okay. Early this year, approximately how much
                                                                      9
 9
                                                                            of the water that San Diego was receiving was State Water
          A. Yes.
                                                                     10
10
          Q. Does Met retain those records?
                                                                            Project water?
          A. Yes, we do.
                                                                     11
11
                                                                               A. It was approximately 90 percent.
                                                                     12
12
          Q. Did you obtain the Skinner blend records from
                                                                               Q. And why was that?
13
                                                                     13
       2003 forward?
                                                                               A. At the late last year and early into this year,
                                                                     14
14
          A. Yes, I did.
                                                                            we had the highest storage, dry year storage in
15
                                                                     15
          Q. Did you create a chart that reflects those
                                                                            Metropolitan's history, so our storage reserves were
                                                                     16
16
       data?
                                                                            fairly full.
17
                                                                     17
          A. Yes.
                                                                                  We also had some very early rain, very high
18
          Q. Please turn to DTX 120 in your binder.
                                                                     18
                                                                            amounts of rain that was an indication to us that the
19
                                                                     19
             Did you create a graph reflected in DTX 120?
                                                                            water supply from the State Water Project would be very
20
                                                                     20
          A. Yes, I did.
                                                                            high, so we took steps to move that water into our system
21
          Q. And what data did you use to create it?
                                                                     21
                                                                            and as a result, the blends at the Skinner Plant were
2.2
                                                                     22
          A. This was daily data from our lab sheet program.
                                                                            very high.
23
                                                                     23
                                                                               Q. But did 2013 prove to be a wet year?
       That's the database that tracks water quality, including
24
                                                                     24
       blend.
                                                                               A. No, it did not.
                                                                     25
25
          Q. Is this the Skinner blend record you just
                                                                                  MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, at this time I'm also
                                                           531
                                                                                                                               533
1
                                                                      1
                                                                            going to move in DTX 94 and DTX 125, which were the
       described?
 2
                                                                      2
                                                                            subject of the parties' stipulation.
          A. Yes, it is.
                                                                      3
 3
                                                                                  MR. PURCELL: No objection.
          Q. And can you explain what this slide depicts?
                                                                      4
                                                                                  THE COURT: DTX 94 is admitted.
 4
          A. This shows daily blends at the Skinner
                                                                      5
 5
                                                                                  MR. HIXSON: Okay.
       Treatment Plant in percentage of State Water Project
                                                                      6
                                                                                             (Whereupon Exhibit 94 was
 6
       water on the Y axis.
                                                                                             admitted into Evidence.)
 7
          Q. Okay. And so if the blue line is near
                                                                      7
                                                                                  THE COURT: DTX 125 is admitted.
 8
       50 percent, approximately what percentage of the water
                                                                                  MR. HIXSON: That's right.
 9
       that Met is sending to San Diego comes from the State
                                                                      9
                                                                                             (Whereupon Exhibit 125 was
10
       Water Project?
                                                                                             admitted into Evidence.)
11
          A. It's about 50 percent.
                                                                     10
                                                                                  MR. HIXSON: Pass the witness.
12
          Q. Okay. Is this graph in DTX 120 an accurate
                                                                     11
                                                                                   THE COURT: Cross-examination? Do you need a
13
       depiction of the Skinner blend records from the database?
                                                                     12
                                                                            break?
14
          A. Yes, it is.
                                                                     13
                                                                                  MR. PURCELL: Five minutes?
15
             MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, at this time
                                                                     14
                                                                                  THE COURT: Five minutes it is.
16
       Metropolitan moves the admission of DTX 120.
                                                                     15
                                                                                  Thank you.
17
             MR. PURCELL: No objection.
                                                                     16
                                                                                  (Brief break.)
18
             THE COURT: DTX 120 is admitted.
                                                                     17
                                                                                  THE COURT: Let's continue.
19
                       (Whereupon Exhibit 120 was
                                                                     18
                                                                                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
                        admitted into Evidence.)
                                                                     19
                                                                            BY MR. PURCELL:
20
       BY MR. HIXSON:
                                                                     20
                                                                               O. Good afternoon, Mr. Yamasaki.
21
          Q. Why does the percentage of the blend that comes
                                                                     21
                                                                               A. Good afternoon.
22
       from the State Water Project vary?
                                                                     22
                                                                               Q. Met's facilities are connected to the State
23
          A. It varies for a number of reasons. The primary
                                                                     23
                                                                            Water Project facilities; correct?
24
       reason would be to reflect the water supply conditions.
                                                                     24
                                                                               A. That's correct.
25
       So for instance, when we have a high amount of State
                                                                     25
                                                                               Q. And Met doesn't have any control over the State
                                                           532
                                                                                                                               534
```

. 1 2 3 4 5 6	Water Project facilities, does it? A. Well, I mean depends on what you mean by "control." Q. Well, Met doesn't operate State Water Project facilities; correct? A. We do a fair amount of coordination with the Department of Water Resources. We schedule water and we	1 2 3 4 5 6	distribution system at the terminal reservoirs; correct? A. Generally correct, yes. Q. Met doesn't blend water in the State Water Project pipes? A. It doesn't blend Colorado River water in the State Water Project pipes. Q. When Met moves non-project water through the
8	have a number of activities to coordinate our operations.	8	State Water Project, it has to enter into a contract with
9	And in rare circumstances, we do operate portions of the	9	the State Water Project to do that; correct?
10	State Water Project.	10	A. I believe there might be a contract.
11	Q. Met doesn't have a switch or anything that it	11	Q. I mean it can't just call up DWR and have them
12	can turn to move water through the State Water Project	12	send down 50,000 acre-feet without some paperwork; right?
13	system?	13	A. I believe there's paperwork involved, yes.
14	A. Occasionally we do.	14	Q. And before Met can move non-project water
15	Q. In emergencies?	15	through the State Water Project, the State Water Project
16	A. No, not only in emergencies.	16	has to determine that it has capacity available in its
17	Q. All right. Now, I would like to put up the map	17	facilities, doesn't it?
18	that was shown in Met's opening, if we could, slide 5.	18	A. I suppose it does.
19	If we could focus on that's good.	19	Q. And the Department of Water Resources has to
20	Mr. Yamasaki, the California Aqueduct is coming	20	determine that there wouldn't be any negative
21	down there in blue and at the far left, upper corner of	21	environmental effects or anything like that involved with
22	the screen, there's one of the State Water Project	22	the water transfer?
23	terminal reservoirs, Castaic Lake; is that right?	23	A. Yeah. That's beyond my experience.
24	A. Yes.	24	Q. All right. But DWR has to make at least a
25	Q. And then the east branch is coming down and	25	determination of the capacity available before it can
	535		537
1		1	
1	over in the right-hand part of the screen, there's Lake	1	move water to Met?
2	Perris, the other terminal reservoir; is that right?	2	A. Yes.
3	A. Yes.	3	Q. And Met and DWR engage in a process of
4	Q. Now, when the water comes down through the	4	negotiations to formalize that arrangement?
5	State Water Project, Met doesn't physically take	5	A. I don't know if there's negotiations involved
6	possession of the water until the State Water Project	6	with that, no.
7	delivers it from the terminal reservoirs; correct?	7	Q. All right. But there is paperwork?
8	A. Yes, that's correct. There's also a Silverwood	8	A. Paperwork, yes, most likely.
9	Lake on the map where Met takes delivery of water.	9	Q. Now, Met's not the only party who can ask DWR
10	Q. All right. And then at that point Met takes	10	to move non-project water through the State Water
11	delivery of that water supply from the State Water	11	Project; right?
1.2	Project?	12	A. That's correct.
13	A. Yes.	13	Q. That's just wheeling, right, wheeling on the
14	Q. Now and at that point, Met has	14	State Water Project system?
15	responsibility for treating the water?	15	A. I'm not sure if it is or not. I'm not an
16	A. Yes, for water that agencies want to take	16	expert in wheeling.
17	that's treated.	17	Q. All right. It is moving water through the
18	Q. And Met can run the water through its	18	pipes of the State Water Project; correct?
19	distribution system?	19	A. Yes, it is.
20	A. Yes.	20	Q. All right. Other State Water Project
21	Q. And Met can combine or blend that water with	21	contractors can also have DWR move water through the DWR
22	water from other sources?	22	facilities?
23	A. Yes.	23	A. Yes.
24	Q. But Met can't do any of those things until the	24	Q. And San Diego could arrange separately with DWR
25	State Water Project delivers the water to Met's	25	to move water through the DWR facilities, couldn't it?
	536		538
			Pages 535 to 538

1 blend it delivers? A. I'm not sure that it can. 2 2 Q. All right. You don't know one way or the A. Yes. 3 3 other? Q. And the same is true with respect to the water 4 4 A. That's correct. Met delivers to San Diego under its exchange agreement 5 Q. Now the wheeling -- are you familiar with 5 with IID; correct? Met has complete control over that 6 6 Metropolitan's wheeling rate? blend? 7 A. Vaguely familiar. A. I suppose so, yes. 8 Q. You don't know the components of it or how it's 8 Q. San Diego doesn't have any ability to dictate 9 9 charged? to Met what sort of blend it needs to provide in terms of 10 10 A. No. IID water? 11 Q. All right. I would like to put up DTX 120, 11 A. Not that I know of. 12 which there is a black binder that I put up there. It 12 Q. And again all that blending happens within 13 should be in there. It should also be in the white 13 Met's distribution system; correct? 14 binder your counsel handed you. 14 A. Generally, yes. 15 You testified about this on direct examination. 15 Q. After the water supplies are delivered into the 16 You recall this chart; correct? 16 distribution system? 17 A. Yes. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. This is a measurement of the blend of State 18 Q. Now --19 Water Project and Colorado River at Met's Skinner 19 THE COURT: Keep your voice up. 20 **Treatment Plant?** 20 BY MR. PURCELL: 21 A. That's correct. 21 Q. Now, DTX 120 doesn't show the specific blend of 2.2 Q. And Met controls the blend of water at the 22 water that Met delivers to San Diego, does it? 23 Skinner Treatment Plant; correct? 23 A. I'm sorry? 24 A. Yes. 24 Q. DTX 120, the blend at the Skinner Treatment 2.5 Q. No Met member agencies control the blend of 25 Plant doesn't show the specific blend that Met actually 539 541 1 1 water at the Skinner Treatment Plant? delivers to San Diego, does it? 2 2 A. I think it does, yes. A. No. 3 3 Q. The member agencies don't dictate to Met what Q. It does. So the blend at the Skinner Treatment 4 sort of blend Met needs to have at the Skinner plant? 4 Plant, your testimony is in fact the blend that's 5 A. Not directly, no. delivered to San Diego? 6 Q. Or at any of Met's plants. Member agencies 6 A. Yes. 7 don't dictate the blend at any of Met's treatment plants? O. All right. And so this -- strike that. 8 8 A. No. Now, Met doesn't incur different costs 9 Q. Met has five treatment plants? 9 depending on what sort of blend of water it delivers to 1.0 10 A. Yes. San Diego, does it? 11 11 Q. Different plants deliver water to different A. It could. 12 agencies? 12 Q. Do you know? 13 A. Yes, that's correct. 13 A. One of the components we use for blending water 14 14 Q. And there's a different blend of Colorado River is delivery of water from, say, Diamond Valley Lake as 15 versus State Water Project water at each of the five 15 well. It's -- we use State Water Project water, Colorado 16 plants; correct? 16 River water and at times withdrawals from Diamond Valley 17 A. Two of the plants deliver only State Water 17 Lake to create blends at the Skinner Treatment Plant. 18 Project water. 18 Q. Has Met ever done any study as to how its costs 19 Q. All right. But the other three plants, the 19 fluctuate depending on what blend of water it's 20 blend is different at each of them? 20 delivering to member agencies? 2.1 21 MR. HIXSON: Objection. Calls for speculation, 22 Q. And those differently blended sources of water 22 lack of personal knowledge. 23 are then delivered to different Met member agencies? 23 THE COURT: Overruled. We'll find out if he 2.4 A. That's correct. 24 knows or not. He may not. 25 Q. And Met has complete control over what sort of Go ahead.

542

1 THE WITNESS: I don't know of any. providing California with dry year supply reliability; 2 2 correct? BY MR. PURCELL: 3 3 Q. You are not aware of any hard data on that A. Yes. 4 4 issue? Q. And that's an important policy with 5 5 Metropolitan; isn't it? A. Not that I know of. 6 6 Q. Now, Met provides dry year storage; right? A. Yes. MR. PURCELL: No further questions. 8 8 Q. And Met incurs costs to provide dry year MR. HIXSON: No redirect. 9 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. storage? 10 10 Excused. Thank you so much. A. Yes. 11 11 Do you want to use up another 15 minutes today? Q. Met incurs capital costs to provide dry year 12 12 How would you like to proceed? storage? 13 13 MR. HIXSON: We would like to call our next A. I believe it does. 14 14 Q. And Met rents out space in other storage witness tomorrow morning. 15 1.5 facilities for dry year storage? MR. KEKER: Your Honor, I'm concerned about 16 16 A. I don't know if renting is a -- is the right time. We've been -- why can't they start their next 17 17 term. witness? 18 18 Q. Maybe I was too colloquial. Met obtains THE COURT: It's 15 minutes. That's okay. 19 19 Well, we're not off the record, but off the storage space at storage facilities for dry year storage? 20 20 clock. Let me just have you think about two dates in A. That sounds right. 21 21 case we need to at least allocate a little bit more time Q. And that costs money? 22 22 if we run out of time by Monday. A. I think it does. 23 23 Q. The storage space isn't free? And you can -- you don't have to tell me your 24 24 reaction to this now but the 17th and 23rd of January are A. Correct. 25 25 Q. Currently Met has over three million acre-feet probably available so if we need another two or three 543 545 1 1 of water in storage; right? hours or something like that to get this done, just put 2 2 A. Yes. that in your pipe and smoke it and we can talk about it 3 3 Q. And Met's never sold three million acre-feet of tomorrow or on Monday. 4 4 water in a calendar year, has it? Anything else we can do of a housekeeping 5 5 A. Not three million acre-feet. nature at this point? 6 6 Q. No matter how dry the year has been, Met's MR. KEKER: Yeah. 7 7 never sold three million acre-feet? THE COURT: Yes. sir. 8 8 MR. KEKER: Just the time. I mean I hate to A. That's correct. 9 9 Q. Met's water sales have been steadily declining see this linger on from your point of view, from our 10 1.0 over the past five or so years; isn't that right? point of view. We can get briefs filed by the 17th of 11 11 January. A. This year we saw an increase. 12 12 Q. An increase? What's Met's projected water They have, as I understand it, one, two, three 13 13 sales this year? more witnesses. They've got two days to -- and they 14 14 may -- they say they may be calling Mr. Woodcock, who we A. Calendar year, roughly two million acre-feet. 15 15 Q. Two million acre-feet. object to because he was the expert but we'll see what 16 16 And in 2008, you were up at about 2.3 million they say. 17 17 But, if they only have three witnesses, plus acre-feet. 18 18 A. I would have to check my records. some small part for Woodcock, the idea that we can't get 19 19 Q. All right. I would like to just back to a this done in the next two days is wrong. We ought to be 20 20 document your counsel put up, DTX 102. able to do it. 21 2.1 And, Jeff, can you blow up the first paragraph? And if we just sort of push through, we would 22 22 So the first sentence of the summary says that really appreciate it rather than let it all go away for a 2.3 23 following the 1986 to 1991 drought, Metropolitan month and so on. I mean I know you've been relaxed about 24 2.4 intensified its strategic planning efforts towards it but it does seem to me your original idea let's get 25 25 diversification of supplies as the methodology for this done in five days is exactly right.

546

```
1
              And there's really no excuse that we can't put
                                                                              State of California )
2
       on the next three witnesses. We'll be quick in our
                                                                                              ) Ss.
                                                                       2
 3
                                                                              County of Alameda
       cross. We're not going to take -- you know, consume lots
                                                                       3
 4
        of time parading around the courtroom, waving papers and
                                                                       4
 5
        stuff like that. We'll get it done.
                                                                       5
                                                                                     I, Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137, do hereby
 6
              So, I guess I would just like the Court to push
                                                                       6
                                                                              certify that I am a certified shorthand reporter; that I
 7
        us a little bit more and get this thing done Monday
                                                                       7
                                                                              was personally present in the above-mentioned
 8
       night.
                                                                       8
                                                                              proceedings; that I took down in shorthand the
 9
              THE COURT: Yes, sir.
                                                                              proceedings and thereafter transcribed said notes into
10
              MR. HIXSON: The plaintiffs had a chance to put
                                                                      10
                                                                              longhand; that the forgoing pages constitute a full, true
11
       on their case without being unduly pressured. We would
                                                                      11
                                                                              and correct transcript of the said notes in said
12
        like the same chance. We plan to be efficient and we
                                                                      12
                                                                              proceedings; and that I have no interest in the outcome
13
        would just like the opportunity to do that.
                                                                      13
                                                                              of the case.
14
              MR. KEKER: We did it in two days and we want
                                                                      14
15
        them to take the same opportunity and do it in two days.
                                                                      15
                                                                                    Dated: December 20, 2013
16
       They're taking three, that's fine but not four.
                                                                      16
17
              THE COURT: Mr. Keker, I'm completely
                                                                      17
18
       sympathetic with your sense of urgency. I have the same,
                                                                      1.8
                                                                                            Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137
19
        but I feel like I made a promise to both sides. And I
                                                                      19
20
                                                                      20
        think Metropolitan may feel rightfully that they have to
21
        walk me through the record, they have to show me what's
                                                                      21
22
        in the record, and I feel an obligation to adhere to the
                                                                      23
23
        promise I made to the attorneys.
                                                                      2.4
24
              MR. KEKER: Could we go a little bit longer at
                                                                      25
25
        any of these -- tomorrow or the next day?
                                                            547
                                                                                                                                  549
1
              THE COURT: It's not going to make much
2
        difference. There's always another ten minutes or so.
 3
       but we have agreements with unions that hamper us a
 4
        little bit.
 5
              When I first got to this court some years ago,
 6
       I remember thinking that we could go on Saturdays and
 7
        Sundays and I could have two trials a day and we could go
 8
        until 7:00 o'clock. But it turns out with that Article
 9
       III standing there's nothing I could do.
1.0
              MR. KEKER: Even with Article III standing,
11
        that's tough sometimes.
12
              THE COURT: It is tough but there's certain
13
        flexibility.
14
              MR. KEKER: I'm glad you didn't prevail, your
15
       Honor, for all of our sakes.
16
              THE COURT: This is probably a little more
17
       civilized.
18
              I look forward to seeing you tomorrow.
19
                 (Proceedings concluded.)
20
                      ---000---
21
22
2.3
24
25
                                                            548
```

<u>A</u>
\$201 401:9 \$250 376:22
\$270 402:18 415:11
\$470 421:20
\$98 400:16 421:14
abandoned 476:15
ability 420:16 428:4,8 429:7 430:19,22
481:18 510:16 521:11
541:8
able 374:25 389:22
397:15 405:8 429:19
450:3 502:5 503:15
513:8,11 546:20 above-mentioned
549:7
Absolutely 412:4
accepted 382:1
accepting 383:11
access 374:4 407:22 408:4,6 413:14
414:18,21 420:3,6
437:3 438:13 474:10
494:2
accommodate 521:21 account 401:23 417:14
417:20 463:24 467:17
468:5 469:10 489:13
490:20 493:13
accountable 466:24
accounted 463:12 469:21 494:24 496:15
accounting 398:19
464:6,7 466:15 467:5
467:18,23 468:7,13
accounts 402:4 463:5,8
463:21,24 464:5,9,14 466:9,12 467:19
484:21 495:18 506:21
accuracy 452:16
accurate 375:1 532:12
accurately 466:6
accusation 446:21
accuse 462:5 accused 391:3
accusing 501:23
achieve 378:10
acknowledges 469:10
acknowledging 379:18
acre 478:20 acre-feet 376:12 377:4
377:6,9 378:5 379:11
381:1,1 410:7 427:22
427:25 435:23 490:11
507:15,22,24,25 508:7,8,10 509:6
519:6 537:12 543:25
017.0007.12013.23

```
544:3,5,7,14,15,17
acre-foot 376:23 414:7
  478:1
acronym 518:12,16
acronyms 372:18
act 384:4 385:8 388:11
  388:12 391:15.16
  392:3.10.11.24
  447:22,23,23 453:5
  484:18 497:7 499:21
action 376:4 377:22
  393:17 394:11,13
  411:11,17,24 483:12
  522:13
actions 518:10,19,21,22
  520:7 522:15 527:23
active 497:12
activities 450:2,4 535:8
activity 468:4,7 513:14
  520:17
actual 416:25 417:4,8
  417:11 423:9 465:16
  474:12 484:19 487:1
  489:21
added 386:5,8 463:4
  469:13
addition 390:7 394:23
  400:3 417:15 423:22
  459:23 495:12 497:1
  508:9.13 526:21
additional 418:7
  428:21 430:24 434:23
  437:16,19 438:21
  445:18,19,25 447:9
  477:19 510:23
address 385:5 386:20
  388:16 454:7 455:3,9
  455:11 501:7
addresses 527:8
addressing 498:4
adequacy 436:22
adequate 393:12
adhere 547:22
adjust 502:23
admin 383:13,17 442:4
  453:9 489:5 501:13
administration 383:5
administrative 383:9
  383:15 384:3,4,6,8,25
  385:8 386:1,5,9 388:6
  388:18 391:8,16
  392:12,22 411:3
  420:11 424:4 426:15
  433:2 434:10,16
  435:13 439:7 444:20
  449:20 450:23,25
  451:3 453:6 454:22
  455:6,13 456:10
```

```
463:4 465:1 469:13
  469:18 472:23 474:7
  476:2,6,17 478:23,24
  479:11 480:6,8,21,23
  480:25 481:24 488:5
  488:10,11,15 489:24
  491:2,8 497:8,23
  498:21 499:14.16.19
  500:16 501:11
admission 382:15 456:2
  532:16
admitted 373:22,24
  374:5 381:11,12
  382:6 511:5,6 532:18
  532:19 534:4,6,7,9
admitting 379:18
adopt 387:22 432:3
  473:12 475:12 477:13
  480:15
adopted 387:18 392:13
  395:4 431:12,13
  473:10,14 474:16
  480:15 499:3
adopting 442:25 475:7
  475:14
adoption 498:12
adopts 431:17
advantages 465:5
advice 466:1 468:25
  491:3 519:22
advise 518:8
affect 496:3,12 499:16
  521:1 527:8
affirmative 392:4
affixes 431:16
afford 396:18
afternoon 444:1 475:5
  503:8,9 534:20,21
age 471:19
agencies 377:17 379:5
  387:16 389:9,19
  390:1,4,8,16 391:1,11
  392:1 404:20 406:16
  406:17 407:1 408:25
  413:21 414:7,8
  417:23 420:24 426:2
  427:18 431:20 432:9
  437:1 438:11 440:23
  449:25 450:5,14
  451:11 455:19 456:5
  469:9 475:9,18 478:7
  484:1,3 485:21 486:3
  486:20 487:15,18,20
  487:25 488:8 490:6
  490:19,23 493:6,10
  495:20 497:10 500:1
  500:19 505:2 510:25
  514:20 517:5 521:2,6
```

```
521:7 525:6 526:23
  527:5 536:16 539:25
  540:3,6,12,23 542:20
agency 380:23 386:2,12
  388:25 389:5,5
  391:22 411:1,2 416:9
  427:23 433:11,13,15
  435:25 454:18 455:18
  457:6 467:1 473:25
  476:21 477:3 486:16
  486:23 487:7 488:24
  488:25 490:1,2,4,13
  493:14 496:23 510:22
  520:24 521:10,22
  525:18 526:7 527:14
  527:16
agency's 454:3 487:3
  496:2
agenda 393:15
ago 391:8 519:17 520:1
  548:5
agree 390:2
agreed 424:15
agreement 371:10
  376:6 378:4 386:24
  480:3,5,6,17,19,24
  481:4 482:3,4,6,11,14
  482:18,24 483:2,11
  483:14 509:23 529:20
  529:23 541:4
agreements 379:3,3,9
  548:3
agrees 518:6
agricultural 505:18
  509:8 512:5 513:3
  514:23 515:3
ahead 479:17 495:13
  542:25
Alameda 368:13 549:2
ALESHIRE 369:2
allegation 483:23
allegedly 484:2
allocate 420:12 449:9
  472:4 494:12 525:4
  545:21
allocated 377:18 380:6
  385:14 399:2 410:5
  413:2,11 415:13
  417:7 418:25 419:22
  421:17,18 422:10
  423:16 433:4,25
  434:2 446:8 458:4
  462:7 464:11 472:9
  485:12 487:3,7,12
  493:19 495:19 505:9
  508:15,16
allocates 403:12 426:23
  485:4 486:22
```

```
allocating 400:7 405:19
  431:9 434:7 454:3
  497:5
allocation 418:13
  422:14 432:7,22,25
  444:6,22 453:14
  454:1,16 455:15,16
  464:10 469:25 478:5
  496:4 508:4,5 515:23
  515:25 520:20,21,22
  521:1,5,14 525:1,9
allocations 387:3,23
  426:21 449:18 455:17
  481:10 524:23
allow 440:8 513:16
  514:1
allowed 442:2
alluded 375:13,13,19
  385:24 419:3
alternatives 465:6
amended 447:22
American 452:12
  464:17 491:7
amount 377:1 397:3,10
  397:11,23 402:10
  410:3,11 415:21
  422:23 427:25 428:1
  428:25 433:19 436:14
  442:1 450:6 485:19
  490:22 508:2 516:15
  520:24 521:9 527:17
  532:25 535:6
amounts 385:14 387:25
  388:1 400:7 401:14
  401:18 410:5 450:9
  498:14 499:8 533:18
analyses 437:16
analysis 392:21,22
  395:11 397:9 437:7
  438:21 439:17,18
  440:14 443:6 444:10
  451:11 457:24 467:22
  469:6 472:3 485:7
  488:16 492:3,13,17
  517:21
analyze 394:6 411:21
  468:4 471:16 493:17
analyzes 484:8
analyzing 461:16
  480:13
and/or 386:17
Angeles 368:14 459:5
  473:8 483:25 486:10
  490:16 496:5
annual 484:1 487:20
  488:25 490:2,3 493:7
  493:13 494:15 495:18
  496:13
```

annually 478:22 496:2
antecedent 455:11
anybody's 472:12
anyway 417:22 475:15
apart 462:6
apologize 374:3
appearances 368:1
393:16
applicable 451:12
467:12
applied 448:13 487:13
applies 391:5
appreciate 546:22
approach 382:23
appropriate 374:19
426:2,9 435:8,25
449:4 456:8 464:11
468:3,15 477:16
481:14 485:8
appropriately 426:4
434:2 485:5 494:12
497:2
appropriateness
478:12
approval 375:15
380:10
approve 377:23 379:19
498:11,16
approved 376:2,18
377:5
377:5 approximately 396:9
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13 16
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20 aqueducts 458:22,23
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20 aqueducts 458:22,23 459:13 460:8,10
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20 aqueducts 458:22,23 459:13 460:8,10 arbitrary 397:10
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20 aqueducts 458:22,23 459:13 460:8,10 arbitrary 397:10
377:5 approximately 396:9 507:15,22,24 508:12 509:6 532:8 533:8,11 April 388:17 393:6 411:17 426:13 445:9 449:17,19 451:17 463:5 464:19,25,25 481:7 498:23 aqueduct 399:21,25 400:20 401:8 404:22 406:6,21,23 407:5,23 408:2 413:11,17,19 414:24 421:25 424:12 425:1,4,19 426:24 427:4,10,11 430:7 431:2 458:25,25 460:11,11 471:19 494:4 504:13,16 507:11,11 509:14 510:15 511:25 512:14 512:23 513:5,15 515:19 523:1 524:4 530:9 535:20 aqueducts 458:22,23 459:13 460:8,10

```
400:21 406:8,24
  431:4 433:14,18
  485:3 504:17 507:12
  509:11,15 510:15
  511:20,22,24 512:15
  515:17,20 527:5,5
  529:12
areas 429:16 513:5
  514:19 522:23 523:1
argue 441:24 455:14
  459:18
argued 455:3 473:7
  489:12,15
argues 456:12
arguing 372:12 426:17
argument 402:3 428:16
  429:4 456:9 463:9
  464:2,13 482:13
  492:9 499:23
argumentative 374:9
arguments 387:8
  480:18 481:13
arrange 538:24
arrangement 538:4
art 404:10 408:17
  430:6
article 421:18 422:6,12
  422:17,20,22,25
  423:10 424:18,24
  425:9 429:10 431:4
  548:8,10
Articles 423:4
articulated 379:22
Arvin-Edison 512:18
asked 382:21 423:9
  479:13
asking 380:9 435:18
asks 397:19
aspect 418:12 441:18
asserted 456:17 476:11
  476:12
assertion 487:17 488:1
asserts 458:2
assess 378:23
assessed 392:1
assessing 500:14
assessment 472:21
assigned 405:14 413:25
  421:23
assigning 427:11
assigns 415:19
assist 441:7
assistance 377:8
associated 380:5
  401:24 403:6,7,7
  404:5,9 405:5,11
```

416:14 417:9 418:24

420:5 425:24 438:3

```
438:10 439:9 445:2
  456:19 457:1 458:14
  459:13 463:17 465:4
  481:15 484:12 486:22
  493:21 496:17
ASSOCIATES 367:22
Association 463:6
  464:17 467:3
Association's 452:12
  491.7
assume 478:14
assuming 381:25
asterisk 410:17
attached 394:14,16
attachment 432:8
  477:14 478:5 508:21
attempt 494:11
attempted 490:5
attempting 472:14
attention 379:1 453:8
  466:3
attorney-client 393:24
attorneys 547:23
attributable 456:21
audited 467:7 468:1
AUDREY 368:7
augmentation 438:16
  439:11 440:12
authenticated 381:18
author 461:11
authorities 465:20
authority 367:6 388:13
  427:23 442:17 469:17
  481:20,21 527:5
authorization 376:10
  379:8
authorized 376:5
authorizing 379:2
automatically 417:6
  419:7 449:9
automation 504:1
availability 436:12,18
available 386:18
  390:11 396:19 402:12
  429:18 437:18 446:17
  446:18 447:3,10
  450:19 488:22 496:9
  527:17 537:16,25
  545:25
Avenue 369:2
average 403:6,12,20
  404:5,9,10,12 405:11
  405:15 416:25 418:25
  472:9 484:10 485:13
  486:14,18 490:3,4,7
  490:14,24 491:4,12
  491:21 492:4 493:5,6
  495:20 496:8
```

```
averages 491:14
avoid 379:20 438:25
  439:22 441:8,12
  442:2 450:1 521:14
avoided 378:16.17.17
  378:18 379:23 380:2
  435:20 474:2
avoids 376:19.20
aware 383:8 479:11
  529:19 543:3
AWWA 453:19 466:15
  468:10.14
axis 532:6
aves 431:25
          В
b 422:11
```

B-R-E-N-T 503:1 back 372:11 375:4 378:14 384:10 400:3 439:7 451:25 452:21 452:25 468:24 469:4 472:12 475:4,16 486:18,24 488:18 491:18 496:16 497:6 502:7 512:14 513:5 515:7 516:16.20 517:25 527:13 544:19 **backed** 411:15 background 433:5 backs 411:23 **band** 490:15 banking 512:2,24 514:5 Banks 504:11 507:9 barely 499:23 based 402:14 435:2 436:12 439:19 450:22 456:9 473:20 485:12 486:13,17 487:3 491:24 495:20 496:13 521:8 basic 384:17 390:8 392:7 395:21 429:19 basically 419:11 421:14 461:25 470:14 **basin** 406:14 490:15 514:25 basins 379:14 514:24 basis 374:21 376:21 378:24 396:6,7 425:25 444:21 460:20 462:5 479:4 500:14 **Battery** 367:24 368:3 bear 481:15 bears 434:11 **BEATTY** 368:15 began 425:4 480:13 497:7 500:20

beginning 423:24 424:9 424:14 425:12 432:12 478:10 begun 378:23 **behalf** 426:1 behavior 487:18 **believe** 374:18 483:2 537:10.13 543:13 **believes** 444:10 beneath 399:21 400:19 406:9 407:7,12 462:22 470:8 **benefit** 448:15 **benefits** 378:21 379:15 389:16 441:12 442:25 443:1 444:14,16 446:15 447:1 449:13 449:21 450:3,12,13 best 397:20 413:15 452:10 better 372:12 492:24 503:15 **BETTY** 368:15 beyond 389:10 392:24 421:3 440:13 537:23 **biannual** 394:19 big 398:20 436:17 470:14 472:19 biggest 416:5 **bill** 401:15.18 402:22 402:22,24 415:16 423:13 424:11 447:20 **billings** 460:20 461:8 billion 396:9 397:24 438:18 439:13 **billions** 435:15 bills 460:23 **binder** 503:4 506:22 511:11 528:5 531:18 539:12,14 **binding** 466:4 **BINGHAM** 368:9 **bit** 375:12 387:19 419:4 419:10 420:20 424:1 484:5 490:17 495:13 497:6 517:14 545:21 547:7,24 548:4 black 539:12 **blend** 481:1,3,18,25 526:22 530:5,12,14 530:18,22 531:2,12 531:24,25 532:13,21 536:21 537:3,5 539:18,22,25 540:4,7 540:14,20 541:1,6,9

541:21,24,25 542:3,4

blended 420:22 540:22

542:9.19

blending 525:22 526:8
527:15 541:12 542:13
blends 371:7 527:18,19
532:4 533:1,4,7,21
542:17
blow 376:8 380:18
544:21
blown 528:23
blowup 528:8
blue 407:4 511:23
532:7 535:21
blunt 482:9 517:23
hand 271.20 275.10
board 371:20 375:18
376:2,4 377:3,5,22
379:19 386:7,13,18
387:21 388:10,13,17
388:18 391:20,25
392:8,13,19 393:15
393:15,16,18,20,23
394:11,11 395:3,6
400:10 401:1,2,10,14
401:22 402:8,12
410.22 22 25 411.5
410:23,23,25,411:5
411:11,12,17,24
420:12 425:25 426:13
426:20 431:14,16,18
431:24 441:19 449:17
455:17,22 466:25
475:17 477:8 478:18
480:9,9,14 481:8,9
489:10 497:7,9,12
506:24 511:13
board's 451:4,5,15
454:24
bolts 385:12
bona 476:22
borrow 396:20 516:17
bottom 374:16 388:4
DOLLOHI 3/4.10 388.4
398:10 462:18 469:16
472:23 487:9 491:17
520:18
box 462:15
branch 535:25
Braunig 368:6 373:1,5
373:6,18,25 375:10
376:1 377:14 380:21
381:10,14 382:4,10
382:13
Braunig's 434:17
break 412:3,7 443:9
479:20,23 501:14
502:10,14 534:12,16
breakdown 464:9
breaking 462:6,16
breaks 397:24 399:18
460:23
Brent 370:3 502:17,19
502:25
302.23

```
Brian 451:20
brief 412:7 456:18
  459:19 460:16 479:17
  479:23 502:14 534:16
briefing 372:14
briefly 384:8 385:24
  386:20
briefs 455:4 546:10
bringing 483:4 509:1
BRINTON 368:15
broader 448:22
broke 457:5 459:1
broken 398:14 401:25
  406:6 410:18 460:13
brought 446:15 456:14
  483:20
Brown 367:22 386:10
  469:14,23,24 471:10
  471:23 472:13
budget 396:23
budgeted 414:2
budgeting 396:14
built 471:19
bulletins 374:12
bullied 461:25
bunch 377:5 483:9
bundle 471:14
bundled 387:6 470:19
Bureau 371:16,18
  509:23 510:1
busier 419:12.15
business 373:25 375:11
  377:2 390:13 428:7
busy 388:5 484:11
buy 380:1 414:8,9
  482:16 486:3 520:24
buyers 508:23 509:1
buying 416:9 426:1
  429:3 450:15 509:2
          \mathbf{C}
```

C 368:11,15 372:2 444:2 **CA** 368:4,10,14,18 369:3 calculated 423:11 486:17 490:1,3 499:25 Caldwell 386:10 469:14,23,24 471:10 471:24 472:13 calendar 396:7 544:4 544:14 **California** 367:1,9,24 368:13 388:12 392:10 401:20,21 404:23 408:13 413:24 415:12 415:22 416:15 421:25

```
424:12,14 425:3,19
  447:21 453:4 459:6
  460:11 466:18,19,21
  470:9 494:6 504:13
  504:15,15 507:10,11
  509:14,15 510:15
  511:24,25 512:14,23
  513:5.14 515:10.19
  535:20 545:1 549:1
call 384:23 402:15
  403:1 426:9 452:11
  466:3 481:5 483:21
  483:22 494:21,22
  501:14 512:12 537:11
  545:13
called 406:17 407:24
  410:16 414:8 429:24
  438:8 439:14 440:6,9
  441:5 443:3 444:16
  446:12 459:1 478:12
  502:20
calling 465:9 546:14
calls 442:23 445:16
  502:16 542:21
capacities 437:8 533:6
capacity 379:25 405:2
  405:3 408:15,18,19
  409:1 413:5 429:18
  434:6 437:9,15,20
  443:3 444:18 446:2
  446:10,16,18 447:3,5
  447:9 450:11,16,19
  476:23 479:3,9
  484:15 487:2,6
  496:11,12,15,24
  499:25 525:12,15
  526:13 527:2,6,7,21
  537:16,25
capital 398:8 400:24
  403:25 415:8 419:13
  419:18 420:1 421:21
  422:6,8,16 424:20
  430:15,18 434:23
  435:7,11,16 436:1,3
  437:25 438:21 439:4
  439:8,15 440:4,15
  441:9 442:3,15 444:8
  445:7,7 446:5 456:25
  461:1 476:25 495:23
  543:11
captures 466:6
carbon 513:23
carefully 494:16
carries 408:7
carry 392:6
carryover 515:8,11,21
  515:24
carved 383:11
```

```
carves 416:16
case 367:6,7 377:2,23
  383:16,24 385:16
  386:2,22 405:6 409:5
  412:25 416:1 451:6
  462:2 465:13 468:23
  472:20 476:8 479:7
  480:20 483:1.4.8.17
  488:2 492:21 498:4
  500:11 502:4,7
  515:25 545:21 547:11
  549:13
case-by-case 378:24
  479:4
case-in-chief 434:18
  501:21.22 502:2
cases 497:13
cast 411:5 497:15
Castaic 516:6,7,17
  524:15 535:23
casts 471:21
catastrophic 524:3,9
categories 387:23,25
  403:16 460:24,25
  461:12 470:11
category 403:16 404:1
  404:17 406:2 464:7
  472:1
causation 429:2
cause 434:23
caused 506:16 527:22
center 368:9 459:4,7
centers 458:23 459:3
  459:14 460:9
central 438:15 439:11
  440:11 504:14 512:6
  512:9,19 514:17
  515:10 519:16,23
  520:4,10 521:12
certain 389:14 394:4
  404:24 407:20 408:3
  408:16,18 410:4
  415:24 418:14 419:14
  423:11 425:23 429:17
  432:5,14 437:15
  440:20 455:14 468:4
  476:8 478:20 485:16
  485:22,25 493:24
  494:2 495:23 521:8,9
  525:24 548:12
certainly 380:4,8
certified 367:20 549:6
certify 549:6
challenge 383:9,13
  385:16,20 394:7
  418:13 499:15
challenged 499:12
chambers 378:14 383:6
```

```
384:11
chance 372:4 547:10,12
change 389:21,23
  509:21 516:22 525:11
changed 374:8
changes 393:10 438:25
  439:10,19 440:17
  443:6 454:18
chapter 467:15 468:10
  468:10 491:8,10
characterization
  425:23 483:13
characterize 470:4
  474:17
characterizes 402:25
characterizing 457:4
charge 387:6 397:11
  400:14,14 401:4,5
  408:15,19 409:1,4,7
  413:5,6 414:7 415:6
  418:18,21,22 419:23
  420:4 421:7,8 422:7
  422:14,20,22 423:7,8
  424:21 430:3,12
  445:5 470:9 473:17
  473:22 474:2,6,13
  484:13,15 485:11
  486:4,16,17 487:2,6
  488:13 495:14,16,21
  496:11,12,15,23,24
  499:25 500:4 525:22
charged 539:9
charges 385:9,17
  394:13 407:18 409:25
  410:20 411:4 412:1
  412:18 413:5 415:20
  418:14,18,19 419:3
  424:16 430:17 431:17
  442:20 448:25 451:18
  451:23 453:9,20
  461:1,3 462:20 465:4
  465:7 467:15,21
  473:22 477:21 480:8
  484:7 487:12 488:16
  493:13 500:21 506:6
  506:8
chart 399:17,24 402:4
  405:22,24,25 407:17
  410:12 413:6 441:6
  462:10,24 463:21,23
  464:5,8,14 466:9
  467:18 468:5 470:6
  488:18 531:15 539:16
CHATTERJEE 368:19
check 544:18
chemical 513:22
  514:10
chemicals 404:13
```

chief 451:21	close 434:17	common 391:1 454:7	520:23 532:24	contemplate 418:9
choices 455:18 456:7	closed 393:24	468:22 492:18 500:2	conduct 393:19 396:5	contemplating 471:5
choosing 457:19	closely 459:24	companies 466:20	confirm 490:8	contemplating 171:3
chose 395:2	code 384:4 385:8	compare 389:15 434:16	confirming 454:2	489:12,15
chosen 457:16 500:19	391:17 392:12,22	508:2	conjunction 521:6	content 384:18 421:3
chunk 415:16 421:22	411:3 453:5,6,9 469:2	comparing 437:7	connected 526:18,20	contention 483:7
423:21	474:8 477:2,20	451:12	534:22	487:15
circle 497:6	478:23,24 497:8	compelled 483:12	connection 445:4 447:7	context 397:8 404:4
circled 462:14	500:2	compensation 476:10	connections 406:16	461:11,13,14,15
circumstances 465:24	COLIN 368:11	476:18,23,24 477:11	connects 430:8	481:13 491:19,23
506:11 509:22 535:9	collaboration 525:5	477:21 501:6	Connie 367:19 369:8	492:11 497:20
citation 384:1,5 461:17	collected 487:2	competing 372:21	549:5,21	contingent 425:16
471:8	collective 426:2	complaining 496:20	cons 475:6	continuation 476:13
citations 491:17	collectively 414:25	complaint 483:24	consequences 486:6	523:4
cite 427:20 453:4	433:22	complaints 449:18	conservation 407:9	continue 383:2 412:8
469:23	colloquial 543:18	complete 446:20	433:16 445:16,22	444:4 479:24 534:17
cited 388:17 436:5	color 374:4,6	540:25 541:5	446:18 448:2,5,16,21	continues 420:12 454:7
448:24 456:11 459:21	Colorado 399:21,25	completed 425:2	449:4	477:17 478:24 496:3
478:25 487:9 494:19	406:23 407:5 408:1	completely 472:8	conserved 481:21	504:16
495:1	413:10,19 414:23	492:20 547:17	482:2	contract 418:17 420:25
citing 384:2 391:17	427:4,10 458:25	complex 468:17,23	conserves 389:2	421:1,2,6,19 422:2,3
426:11 489:14	460:11 474:21 475:2	469:4	consider 386:18 499:17	424:2,4,15,18 425:9
city 368:20 396:15	495:24 504:25 523:1	complexities 469:11	499:18 526:1	425:22 429:7,9 501:2
459:5 483:25	523:10,11,16 530:9	complexity 469:5	consideration 375:22	515:13 516:15 537:8
civilized 548:17	537:5 539:19 540:14	complicated 419:4	441:9 447:18	537:10
claim 383:10 389:25	542:15	469:6	considered 391:9 435:4	contractor 422:10,11
450:25 461:25 476:12	column 409:10	complied 497:22	437:23 473:6 480:10	422:24
483:19 489:2,4 501:9	combine 536:21	complimentary 522:16	considering 439:16	contractors 421:18
claims 383:12,15,24	come 393:14 423:7	component 422:7	452:19 471:20	423:17 429:12 430:2
385:22 450:22,24	437:10 445:2 475:2	424:21 472:4 519:14	considers 406:3 427:8	430:11,13 505:14
488:21 499:15,18	520:9	components 404:15	consisted 475:3	508:5,23,25 515:11
clamp 446:22	comes 372:15 390:22	405:1 539:8 542:13	consistency 420:19	538:21
clarifies 422:21 clarify 373:16 391:15	391:24,24 397:3	composed 466:25	452:7,10,16	contractual 428:14
416:4	398:12 402:18 413:3 428:22,25 430:22	composition 513:22 computed 490:4	consistent 432:14,22 452:4 453:3,21 454:3	501:2 516:4 contrast 425:8
class 491:13,15,20	428:22,25 430:22 457:19 482:24 484:16	computed 490:4 computer 411:8	452:4 453:5,21 454:5	contrast 425:8 control 468:8 534:25
classes 491:14 492:2	513:9,17 514:2,5,14	conceded 456:18	454.10,10 457.15 458:11 459:12	535:3 539:25 540:25
499:22	532:9,21 536:4	conceivably 378:20	constantly 483:1	541:5
classification 403:4,5	coming 395:24 396:8	concept 446:12	constitute 549:10	controls 539:22
403:16 404:1 406:2	396:17 425:6 494:17	concern 435:22	constraint 379:25	convenience 390:15
453:25	535:20,25	concerned 427:13	constraints 527:21	409:15
classified 385:13 413:2	commence 424:21,25	498:22 545:15	construct 435:1,2	convenient 479:20
418:24 419:22 420:4	commences 424:22	concerning 392:17	constructed 425:14	conversation 525:5
classifies 415:18 419:19	comments 426:16	393:3 398:21 433:3	437:20 519:5	convey 432:9 478:6
419:20 484:9	commercial 491:15	476:7 481:1,2 488:24	constructing 425:6	513:4 527:4
classify 419:19 459:9	Commission 466:19	501:6	construction 376:24	conveyance 378:18
484:12	Commissioners 463:7	concerns 434:14	401:7 424:23 425:2,3	387:7 399:24 400:19
classifying 459:22	467:4	conclude 425:25	Consultant's 451:22	402:20,22 405:4
clear 381:19 382:4,7	commissions 467:8	501:13	consultants 451:18	406:6,20,21 407:5,23
386:14 425:23 457:4	468:2	concluded 453:2 473:1	470:21 475:18	413:17 426:24 427:11
458:24 460:10 465:13	committee 393:7	548:19	Consulting 456:14	427:16 428:18 432:10
465:15 496:13	410:25 440:22,23	conclusion 453:16	consume 547:3	436:8 437:15,17,20
clearer 377:21	441:2 442:14	454:5,14 462:1	consumer 428:7	438:16 440:12 445:19
clearly 439:7 460:25	commodity 403:17,17	conclusions 451:24	consumption 485:25	453:11 457:8 476:22
461:4,6,12 462:6,7	404:8,8,10,13 405:10	452:21	487:4	477:12,17,22 478:7
	405:11 407:18,24	concurred 472:24	consumptive 436:15	494:3
clerk 412:10 502:23			-	1
click 412:10 502:23 click 495:13	408:10,12,20 415:20	conditions 429:17	contain 507:3	conveyed 510:2 515:19
	408:10,12,20 415:20 418:24 419:20	conditions 429:17 454:19 505:15 509:25	contain 507:3 contained 375:2	conveyed 510:2 515:19 conveys 504:24

r	
	ı
cooperation 431:19	
cooperative 390:25	
391:4,11 500:19	
coordinate 535:8	
coordination 535:6	(
cope 528:11	
copy 383:6 412:13	(
core 450:10	١,
corner 535:21	
cornerstone 388:10	
correct 373:18 403:1	
498:6 505:22 506:9	
508:11,17 510:5	
518:13,14 521:3	
524:18 534:23.24	
535:5 536:7,8 537:1,2 537:9 538:12,18	
537.9 538.12 18	
539:4,16,21,23	
540:13,16,24 541:5	
541:13 543:24 544:8	
545:2 549:11	
correctly 427:2 477:24	
cost 380:3 384:17	
385:11,18 387:2,3,23 387:24 389:15,16	
387:24 389:15,16	
392:20,22 393:25	
394:13,21 395:2,5,11	
395:22,25 396:2	
397:12 398:17 399:6	
399:9,14,17 401:9,21	
402:5 403:10,22	
404:15 405:13,24	
406:4 408:8 409:5,21	
410:19,21,22 411:15	
411:20 413:1,9 415:1	
415:24 416:17,23,25	
417:4,11 419:10	
420:15 421:10,11	
422:6,8,15,15,16,18	
423:6,10,12 426:6,21	
427:6 429:2,2 430:11 433:7,24 435:20,23	
437:1,4 438:11	
441:13,22 442:20,23	
444:13,15,18 445:3	
446:13 447:6 449:15	
449:18 452:6,8,18	
453:3,13,14,17 454:9	
455:15,15,17 456:15 457:20 458:1,12,15	
457:20 458:1 12 15	
458:21 459:19 460:5	
461:9 463:11,13,25	
467:21,21 469:24	
472:2 474:12,12	l
480:10 481:10,15	9
483:22 484:2,6,8,13	
484:24 485:3 486:20	1
486:22 487:9,10	(
i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	

```
493:16,19,24 494:7,9
 494:10,15 495:2,15
 496:17,22 497:2,5
 499:2 500:13
cost-effective 448:5
costly 414:3
costs 376:20,21 377:18
 378:17.18.19 379:16
 379:21,23 380:4
 385:12,20 387:10,10
 397:15,17 398:18,22
 398:24 399:4,7,16
 401:2,3,6,11,24 402:8
 403:4,6,6,11,23,23,25
 404:2,5,8,13,13,14
 405:2,5,10,11,17,19
 405:20 407:8,20,24
 408:3,5,5,12,17,20,25
 409:2,4,9,19 412:22
 413:2,11,24 414:20
 415:5,6,9,11,12,13,19
 416:3,14 417:8 418:5
 418:7,23 419:2,4,13
 419:18,19 420:13
 421:6,16,17,22
 422:21 423:11,14,15
 423:23 424:7,10,11
 424:20 425:24 426:3
 426:18,23 429:25
 430:25 431:10 432:6
 432:7,8,15,15,23
 433:1,8 434:5,13
 438:3,9 439:15
 440:10 443:4,8
 444:18 449:5 450:7
 454:1,3 456:19,25
 457:17 458:4,9
 459:10,11,13,22
 460:20 461:5,8,22
 462:7 463:1,16 464:6
 464:10 469:21,22
 470:5 471:13,25
 472:4,4,18,25,25
 473:3,23 474:2,18,18
 474:22 475:2 476:25
 477:1,2 478:5,6,13
 484:9,12,16,20,21
 485:1,1,7,10 487:1,1
 493:18,21,25 494:3,5
 494:12,14,17,21
 495:3,10,23 496:6
 497:4 500:11 501:8
 506:1,6 542:8,18
 543:8,11,21
counsel 368:1 373:16
 382:5 426:12 481:12
 539:14 544:20
County 367:2,6 369:1
```

```
377:24 378:8 427:22
  427:23 442:16 469:16
  473:9 481:20 519:6
  527:4 549:2
couple 389:3 396:12
  410:2,12 435:17
  438:4 441:5 444:25
  445:16 464:16
course 391:25 395:8
  427:19 432:1 451:5
  461:9,20,25 462:4
  467:2 468:22 474:18
  497:13 501:9
court 367:1 372:4
  373:4,21 374:20
  375:4,8,21,21,25
  377:11 380:20 381:7
  381:11,25 382:2,9,12
  382:16,20,24,25
  383:5,7,8,11 384:24
  385:1 391:19 393:20
  394:6 395:12,15,18
  399:13 402:13,17
  403:2 404:3 406:19
  407:11 409:18 412:2
  412:5,8,12,15 413:7
  416:18,21 417:10
  421:2 428:16,23
  435:6 436:5 441:16
  442:5,8,12 443:9,11
  444:4 447:4 451:8
  454:21 455:19,20,22
  457:2 461:9,20
  467:14 468:11 469:4
  471:12,21 472:10
  476:16 477:23 479:5
  479:14,19,22,24
  480:4 481:2,6 482:3
  484:23 485:14 486:9
  486:12 488:20,22,23
  491:23 492:9,19
  494:18 495:6 497:18
  497:21 498:1,20
  499:15,17,17 501:2,5
  501:10 502:3,12,15
  502:18 503:2,4 511:5
  514:18 518:12 532:18
  534:4,7,11,14,17
  541:19 542:23 545:9
  545:18 546:7 547:6,9
  547:17 548:1,5,12,16
Court's 412:10,24
  444:23 453:8
CourtCall 368:15,20
  368:22 369:4
courtroom 547:4
courts 386:1 397:9
```

```
cover 397:11 422:5
 476:16
covered 420:8 490:8
  506:6
covers 409:1
CPF-10-510830 367:6
CPF-12-512466 367:7
cramped 457:14
create 375:19 379:20
  531:15,19,21 542:17
created 377:6 381:1
  390:25
creating 377:20
credits 407:9 417:25
  433:16
critical 374:17 445:22
criticisms 475:8,23
criticize 476:1
criticizing 497:14
cross 547:3
Cross-Examination
  370:4 534:11,18
CSR 367:19 369:8
  549:5,21
culling 423:22
culminates 411:11
current 437:16 454:6
Currently 543:25
CURTIS 367:3
Cushman 482:15
Cushman's 498:23
customer 491:14,15
customers 467:1
  468:21 490:10 526:20
cut 396:23 525:9
cycle 384:14,16,21
  394:15,17,19 395:8
  395:14 445:3,9 446:4
  493:17
cycles 384:19
          D
D 372:2 444:2
Dahm 374:2
daily 531:22 532:4
dam 421:13
```

```
dates 545:20
day 382:19 487:3
  492:24 496:14 547:25
  548:7
days 546:13,19,25
  547:14,15
deal 472:20
dealing 393:14 401:18
deals 458:9 472:16
  484:7 491:10
Dear 451:20
decade 383:19 425:17
  435:17 486:4,19
  488:8 496:4,24
decade-long 489:25
decades 383:20 435:17
  435:18 470:15 471:3
December 367:14
  372:1 387:17 390:24
  444:1 472:21 549:15
decent 408:22
decide 398:23 479:3
  493:18 517:2
decided 387:4 450:22
decides 400:10 405:15
  405:20
deciding 387:24 401:23
decision 451:5 454:24
  520:9
decisions 497:19
  524:25 525:23
declares 447:24
declining 544:9
decrease 404:16 439:3
  440:1,8
deeply 525:10
defendant 367:10
  368:8 483:12
defense 384:7 502:20
defer 438:25 439:22
  441:8,12 442:15
  445:19
deferment 439:4
deferral 444:17
deferred 435:20
deferring 443:3 446:1
deficit 519:24
define 422:5 459:12
  470:1 497:8
defined 405:10 422:2
  424:5,20 458:12,19
  458:20 460:3,7
  469:25 473:16
defines 422:6,17
  423:10 456:23 464:14
  473:19 474:9 476:24
```

477:20

definitely 482:18

450:25 451:9

definition 456:24	456:4	determination 392:23	529:12,17,20,22	500:9
463:20	demonstrated 488:1	393:7 479:3 501:5	530:2,4,12,15 532:9	directive 448:7,8
definitions 372:21	493:12	537:25	533:9 538:24 541:4,8	449:11
degree 388:25	demonstrates 498:17	determinations 386:21	541:22 542:1,5,10	directly 442:18 467:12
delayed 440:9,13	498:18 500:17	392:20 451:12,15	Diego's 389:24 418:13	468:11 540:5
delegated 479:2	demonstration 462:25	476:10,18 477:4	434:17 449:18 464:13	directors 388:10
deliberative 383:20	Denham 488:15	478:17	473:11 482:4 487:14	426:13 431:16 466:25
393:18 497:9	Denham's 488:17	determine 374:25	488:3,6 489:2,4,25	477:8 481:8 489:10
deliver 422:9 437:17	deny 476:21	439:18 465:7 477:8	490:15 493:1 502:7	506:25 511:14
442:2 505:1 512:14	Department 367:4	537:16,20	Diemer 526:22	disadvantages 465:5
512:22 528:13,21	374:13 460:20 505:9	determined 398:16	difference 389:4	disaggregate 401:14
540:11,17	515:15 535:7 537:19	436:11 478:18 501:10	412:20 466:2 485:15	disaggregated 399:8
delivered 404:15	depend 428:16,19,20	determines 395:23	488:10 514:11 529:14	disaggregates 461:8
422:23 481:19 482:2	depending 415:21	develop 433:12 493:20	529:25 548:2	disaggregating 461:4
513:6 515:18 540:23	417:8 418:3 542:9,19	500:6	differences 427:12	disagree 476:15
541:15 542:5	depends 429:5 485:19	developed 431:18	455:19 481:24 487:20	disagreement 455:23
deliveries 436:16	535:2	433:4 517:5 521:5	490:6,9 499:6,7	475:19
495:25 510:24	depicted 388:7	developing 391:1	513:25	discovery 373:12,17,19
delivering 417:16,16	depiction 532:13	421:11 465:4	different 384:19 385:12	discuss 385:17 412:18
529:3 542:20	depicts 532:3	development 439:2	387:23,25 388:7	460:17 472:14 502:3
delivers 526:19 536:7	depleted 520:15 525:3	440:19 453:24	389:20 393:2,13	discussed 374:14
536:25 541:1,4,22	depo 381:25	develops 389:1	394:22,24 396:12	381:18 400:13 473:5
542:1,9	deposition 367:23	diagram 371:8	400:6,8 403:11	476:5 484:5 485:12
delivery 402:5 417:1	381:16,23	Diamond 518:8 519:2,3	404:19 406:3,17,19	discusses 422:4 429:7
424:7,8,10,10 425:10	depth 518:11	519:4,7,9,13 520:9	407:13 409:13,17,24	discussing 382:5
425:16 429:16 430:4	desal 460:4	522:12 523:15 524:14	411:18,19 414:13	441:16 444:6 474:15
463:12,25 464:15	desalination 407:9	542:14,16	415:4 417:8,25 418:2	discussion 381:24
525:17 536:9,11	433:21 458:14	dictate 464:3 540:3,7	418:2 419:10 425:19	410:24 434:17 445:12
542:14	describe 465:3 467:25	541:8	426:25 428:11 433:17	474:3,14
Delta 400:14 401:4	494:20 506:15,23	dictates 469:2	434:8 437:22 438:6	discussions 387:15
410:14 415:6 418:18	508:22 509:18 510:19	Diego 367:6 372:23	441:10 445:10 450:8	411:10 445:7 446:16
418:22 421:7 462:20	512:2,8 513:11,19	373:6 375:9 378:21	451:6,7 455:15,21,24	disingenuous 459:8
470:9 504:10,12	516:3,10 517:14	382:22 386:5,6 399:1	456:2,3,6,7 457:6,24	disparity 488:7
505:19 507:9,9 509:9	519:12,20 520:20	418:7 420:23 421:1	458:10 459:15 460:24	dispute 386:22 434:13
509:12,13 512:18	527:11 530:17	426:16,17 427:2,23	462:17 465:10,18,20	483:13 498:19 499:23
demand 379:13 400:5	described 506:25	428:1,17,24 434:13	465:23,24 466:7	disputing 464:22
403:17,22,23 404:1,4	508:19 510:12 511:14	437:24 438:15 439:12	467:6,17 468:6 469:8	481:10
407:7,10 408:8,16,17	532:1	440:11 441:19 442:16	470:21 472:2,8,16	distance 431:22 477:25
408:20,25 411:6	describes 442:24 465:2	444:10 446:21 455:2	473:5 474:19 475:6	distant 469:8
414:3 415:1 418:25	517:6	455:4,10,25 456:9,11	475:20 483:18,21	distinct 424:16,16
419:12 433:8,19,22	describing 466:7 518:3	456:12,16 457:4,18	484:25 487:17 489:1	457:10
434:4,19 435:5,12	description 371:2	458:1,2,6 459:8,16,18	489:3 491:20 492:15	distinction 387:7 416:7
439:10,19 440:3,17	376:9 379:6 438:5	459:20,24 460:16	492:20 493:19,20	423:24 425:12,21
441:1,25 443:7	444:13 451:8 503:21	461:24 463:3,10,20	499:1 500:22 505:20	466:21 467:12 470:15
445:13,23 446:5,25	507:3	463:23 464:2 465:11	511:8 513:21 514:6	471:5,12 491:5
447:7 448:18 449:23	design 392:9 405:20	465:17 467:4 469:13	522:8 530:5,7 533:5	distinguish 459:11
450:1,11 458:23	454:1 500:9	469:16,20 470:6,13	540:11,11,14,20,23	484:19
459:4,4,7,15 460:9	designated 381:21	470:24 472:19,24	542:8	distinguished 458:18
472:9,10 521:7,22	designations 381:16,23	473:4,7,14 474:4,23	differential 473:21	459:2 461:4
demands 389:2,20,20	382:1	476:6,9 478:14 480:5	differently 390:1,4	distinguishes 403:11
389:23 403:24 404:6	designed 450:5 474:20	481:3,9,12,20 482:1	470:23 540:22	428:11
404:9 405:12 436:13	despite 427:12	482:10 483:8,10,19	differing 518:25	distinguishing 403:5,20
436:14,15,17,19,20	detail 385:6,15 405:23	487:19,21 488:14	difficult 405:23	distributes 504:24
437:6,12 439:3,15	435:24 469:22 472:6	489:9,12,20 496:5,19	direct 370:4 403:25	distributing 391:2
440:1,8 483:16 488:4	485:20 487:11	497:11 498:1,9,24	503:6 539:15	distribution 371:8
510:22 525:18 526:7	detailed 378:11 419:24	499:4,5 502:6,8 503:5	directed 467:5,14	400:5 406:13,14,18
527:14,16,19	444:9 464:8	527:3,4 528:2,14,15	468:5	406:25 407:1,6 408:4
democratic 392:7	details 411:14	528:17,22 529:2,5,8	direction 396:25 397:6	408:21,23 413:17,20
	l			

414:24 410:11 422:20	dogon 456.5	Eastaunis 276:12	anguna 450:5	443:11 487:24 502:12
414:24 419:11 433:20	dozen 456:5	Eastern's 376:12	ensure 450:5	
435:24 436:21,23,24	draconian 525:9	Edison 466:20	ensures 391:22	everybody's 527:19
437:2,6,12 438:7,9,22	drafted 506:20 525:8	edition 464:24,24	ensuring 404:20	Evid 371:2
439:9 440:5,10,16	drafting 523:19	466:10	enter 379:8 390:20	evidence 373:1,14,24
441:13,23 445:19	draw 378:25 453:7	effect 393:13 394:20	537:8	374:15,19,21 375:22
446:6 453:11 457:9,9	drawing 446:4 447:6	410:16 432:18 440:4	entered 380:15 390:16	381:5,13,25 383:4,12
460:12,22 462:16	467:11 471:5	442:1,22 443:7	509:23 531:4	383:14 428:24 433:2
464:11 484:14 485:4	draws 471:12	480:16 487:23 493:12	entering 376:5 379:2	434:10,16 435:12
486:25 494:3 496:17	drew 423:24 470:15	498:14 514:19	enters 513:6 515:19	451:4,9,14 454:21,23
500:25 503:24 504:19	drill 475:21	effective 387:5 388:2	entire 384:24 385:3	462:2 468:9 480:21
504:22,23 522:24	driven 533:7	393:11 431:17 478:20	435:1 457:3,3 477:22	480:25 488:14 489:13
525:13 526:2,12	driver's 502:9	effectively 445:23	486:19 494:10 522:21	489:17,18 497:23
527:1 528:11 536:19	drop 490:12 533:4	464:5	entirely 383:9 435:14	498:18,21 499:17
537:1 541:13,16	drought 483:22 493:25	effects 517:23 537:21	457:15 458:11	511:3,6 532:19 534:6
district 367:9 368:8,13	494:19 517:4,9,15,17	efficient 547:12	entities 396:13 465:22	534:9
368:21 369:1 376:6	518:17 520:13 544:23	effort 493:17	467:6	exactly 389:13 409:14
378:7 379:4 398:2	droughts 524:7	efforts 448:2,21 544:24	entitled 386:7 391:23	412:22 442:11 461:7
416:24,25 424:6,6,19	drunk 406:12	either 378:22 460:22	entity 397:9 435:7,14	546:25
425:10 503:11	dry 385:21 389:24	471:11 500:24	466:18 467:6 475:17	examination 370:4
districts 505:18 509:8	398:19 436:16 483:19	El 378:6,6	enumerate 465:5	503:6 539:15
512:6,19 513:4	483:22 489:13,17,18	element 445:23 476:16	environmental 537:21	examined 502:22
514:23	492:6 494:20,21	elements 384:17 385:14	environmentally 448:4	example 372:18 375:5
diversification 544:25	505:15 506:19 509:20	385:19 405:20 414:16	episodic 494:22	377:12 384:16 386:14
divided 472:2	512:7,10 516:12	432:24 454:1	equally 468:20	395:7 400:12 402:18
division 400:2	517:20 519:8,14	Embarcadero 368:9	equivalent 384:15,21	417:15 418:5 429:25
document 374:25	524:6,10 533:14	embody 372:9	errors 473:11	441:18 492:4 494:19
378:16 384:12,13,16	543:6,8,11,15,19	emergencies 535:15,16	escalated 438:17	510:7 515:23 517:24
384:19 391:8 394:1,6	544:6 545:1	emergency 404:21	especially 384:23	518:9 519:22 525:2
394:8,14 395:8	DTX 384:7 506:22	405:2,7,17 495:22	ESQ 368:5,5,6,6,7,11	526:15,16,25 527:22
402:13 411:13,18	511:1,5,11 517:25	504:2 519:15 523:24	368:11,15,15,16,19	examples 427:20
436:5 457:19 459:8	528:4,4,10 531:18,19	524:1,8,10,13	368:20,22 369:4	444:25 492:16 510:7
459:21,24 460:4	532:12,16,18 534:1,1	emphasis 448:4,9	essence 483:23	exception 500:22
461:19 463:3 469:12	534:4,7 539:11	482:25	essential 405:8 451:2	excerpts 373:11,12,17
471:15,20 472:15	541:21,24 544:20	emphasizes 393:17	472:3	373:19 461:19
475:25 506:23 507:17	due 425:6 426:5	430:17	essentially 420:10	excessive 473:2 475:11
511:12 544:20	dug 469:17	empirical 491:25 492:3	434:1	exchange 386:24 480:2
documents 374:12,16	duly 502:21	empty 525:4	establish 432:25	480:4,5,16,19,24
374:18 375:23 381:17	duty 497:24	enables 482:1	established 377:3	481:4,15,19 482:4,5
382:15 383:22 384:3	DWR 400:14 401:11	enabling 388:12 391:13		482:10,13,18,23
384:23 385:1 386:4,8	402:21 427:19 428:10	392:24	499:19	483:1,11,14 509:17
386:9,11,13 388:6	429:21 460:23 516:5	enacted 447:21	establishing 432:13	515:1 529:19,22
394:4 402:14 455:1,3	537:11,24 538:3,9,21	endorsed 442:14,17	477:7 478:4	530:1,11 541:4
455:10,12,14 471:1	538:21,24,25	endorses 500:12	estimate 397:20 434:22	exchanges 505:12,24
476:5	, , , -	ends 420:23	438:22 440:2	506:12,17 507:14,21
doing 377:20 381:2	\mathbf{E}	energy 408:11 413:23	estimated 396:3 397:11	508:19 510:8,11,17
387:24 396:13 397:9	E 367:3 372:2,2 441:17	415:12,13,19 419:4	410:10 425:11	exclusive 388:24 389:6
401:13 427:13 440:2	444:2,2	494:5	estimating 473:22	excuse 492:5 547:1
463:1 467:19,22	earlier 386:22 394:3	engage 436:1 506:11,16	500:13	Excused 545:10
475:4 483:15 492:17	415:4 421:9 423:6,9	520:16 538:3	evaluate 436:22	executive 378:2,3
dollar 385:14 387:25	430:7 432:19 453:12	engaged 451:24 452:2	evaluated 452:6	Exempting 450:6
388:1 410:5 478:1,20	484:5 485:20 498:25	452:2 510:9	evaluating 394:7	exercise 494:10 518:25
499:7	early 533:8,13,17	engages 435:7	452:20 469:6 471:6	exercised 517:19 524:6
dollars 409:24 435:15	earthquake 404:22	engineer 446:3	471:11 474:19 475:5	exercising 523:22
438:19 439:13	405:7 409:6 524:3	engineer's 445:1,2,6,11	evaluation 387:14	exhibit 371:3,5,6,8,9,11
doubt 471:21	easel 528:7	445:21 446:2	event 409:6 488:5	371:12,13,14,15,16
downhill 417:17	easier 528:9	enormous 383:17	493:8 518:6 524:3	371:18,19,20 373:14
downstream 513:13	east 430:8 535:25	402:10 423:19 429:9	events 388:7 524:9	380:20 381:12,21
514:12	Eastern 376:6,13	435:23	everybody 412:5	384:7 508:20 511:6
	ĺ			1

518:1,2,20 520:19	478:11
521:24,25 523:3	express 372:13
532:19 534:6,9	extended 474:3
exhibits 371:1 373:21	
	extends 385:2
373:23 374:5 381:24	extension 420:17
382:6 503:4	440:12
existing 436:22 437:7	extent 381:23 419:14
445:24 446:17	428:17 480:19 481::
expand 420:20 446:1	extra 383:11
448:1 490:18	extract 512:13
expansion 376:7	extracted 514:16
377:24 435:23 443:4	extreme 520:14,23
444:18	524:22
expansions 438:17,23	extremely 372:17
expansive 476:24	501:18
expect 455:19,20,22	
expected 410:7 439:2	F
454:18 500:13	F 393:9
expects 410:4	face 421:3
expenditures 441:9	facilitate 447:2 525:24
442:3,16 444:9	526:24
expense 413:15 415:15	facilitated 509:1
416:13 485:24	facilitates 434:7
expenses 400:25 407:25	facilitating 446:11
414:22 415:24 419:9	526:9
420:2 421:24,25	facilities 374:10 378:1
· ·	
422:4 423:3,19	401:8,19 406:22
424:25 425:5 426:5	407:25 408:1,5
430:15,18,19 434:23	413:15,16,19,20
435:16,19 437:25	414:22,23 415:24
438:21 439:1,8,23	417:18 419:9,15
440:16 445:7 446:5	421:14,25 422:9
447:15 450:18 460:21	423:2,13 424:12,23
464:10,12 468:4	425:6,14,23 428:9,1
experience 537:23	429:8,14,20,24 430:
experienced 506:18	430:12,16,20,23,24
expert 488:6 489:25	432:15 435:16 436:
538:16 546:15	436:9,25 438:3,9
explain 383:25 388:19	440:4 445:8,12,20
394:1,8,17 403:19,24	446:17 458:13 461:2
404:1,7 410:12	461:3 470:2 481:16
412:20,21 455:6,9	495:24 500:24,25
487:11 504:7,21	504:4,8 505:4 506:2
505:6 506:5 507:6	510:1 511:10 512:1
511:12 515:8 518:3	513:2,9 516:25
522:3,17 523:7,17,24	520:12 521:12 534:2
524:20 532:3	534:23 535:1,5
explained 419:6,7	537:17 538:22,25
explaining 408:23	543:15,19
423:18 426:20	facility 376:20 427:16
explains 388:21 403:22	428:18 435:1,24
404:8	441:12 476:23 494:
explanation 382:14	528:20
403:18 404:11 426:22	facing 436:14
	fact 375:1 396:10
explanations 372:18	400.10 407 17 400 4
explanations 372:18 481:14	402:10 425:17 428:2
explanations 372:18	402:10 425:17 428:2 438:1 441:21 456:4 457:5,14 458:7

```
459:11 466:7 467:9
  471:20,23 476:12
  488:2 490:7 496:21
  498:15 542:4
factors 436:12.18
  441:11,11 454:16,19
  523:17
factual 390:2 487:14.17
  488:19,23 489:6,17
  498:18
fair 476:10,18,23,24
  477:11,20 485:19
  500:3 501:6 535:6
fairly 457:4 533:16
falls 376:25
familiar 413:7 469:5
  516:24 517:8 525:12
  528:1 539:5,7
far 415:10 427:12
  447:19 455:5 459:15
  518:24 535:21
fashion 495:5
favor 431:25 497:16
FCS 488:9 489:21,23
  489:24
feature 428:6
February 392:18
fee 429:24 430:16,24
  506:2
feeder 526:16 527:14
  527:22
feel 483:12 547:19,20
  547:22
fees 453:20
FELLOWS 368:20
Fernando 490:20
fide 476:22
fifth 420:22 464:23
  466:10 517:25 518:2
  518:20
fight 398:20
figure 396:17,19 421:9
filed 546:10
filibustering 501:24
final 372:25 411:13
  442:19 444:15 446:13
  448:25 508:4,4
finally 393:14 496:11
finance 393:6 493:24
finances 396:5 467:7
financial 377:7 451:17
  451:21,22 456:13
financing 398:8 403:25
find 477:8 491:2
  494:19,23 542:23
findings 477:4,5 478:10
  478:16
finds 447:24
```

fine 375:7 382:12 435:24 547:16 finger 483:25 **finish** 502:4 firm 473:21.25 **first** 374:24 376:3,8 379:6 382:19.19 385:4.6 387:1 418:12 418:21 420:15 433:5 434:4,12 453:2 455:8 456:11 459:19 470:14 473:6 501:14 502:24 519:2 525:17 526:6 528:10 544:21,22 548:5 fiscal 395:1,24 396:4,5 396:8 397:19,25 398:6 400:17 410:4 411:19 **five** 397:4 420:10 440:3 516:15 525:6 528:20 528:21 534:13,14 540:9,15 544:10 546:25 **fix** 388:13 fixed 403:16 407:24 408:16,16,20,20,25 413:5 415:24 467:15 467:20 486:4 506:6 **flag** 394:3 437:18 **flawed** 494:16 flexibility 516:13 519:14 522:4 548:13 flexible 516:2.10 519:25 521:13 Floor 367:24 **flow** 408:13 409:10 413:23 419:1,5 443:4 flowing 409:19,24 413:9 flows 409:15 417:17 423:4 437:7 fluctuate 542:19 **focus** 385:2,23 414:12 451:10 454:25 464:13 472:7 488:9 493:1 535:19 focused 387:3 434:19 455:4,5 focusing 400:9 418:21 420:25 484:11 507:25 **FOERSTER** 368:17 **folded** 410:19 follow 412:14 522:6 528:9 **followed** 454:15 465:13 469:2 following 373:21 388:3

424:22 425:1 442:22 447:25 522:5 544:23 **follows** 388:17 392:15 440:18 453:18 477:9 500:15 502:22 foot 442:8 478:20 **footer** 384:1,5,15,20 388:4 footnote 471.9 footnotes 495:10 forced 442:6 484:3 foremost 525:17 526:6 **forgoing** 549:10 form 394:11 formalize 538:4 format 384:1.6 **formula** 469:2 formulation 472:5 forth 372:12 394:12 411:14 424:1 429:18 477:14 491:13 **forward** 390:21 397:25 398:14 435:17 436:10 437:8,13,14,16 438:20 494:12 500:7 531:13 548:18 foundation 374:22 **four** 395:21 399:9 452:21,25 473:5,12 474:19 475:6 547:16 **four-step** 453:22 **fourth** 405:19 420:19 454:14 framework 452:4 454:8 517:18 **Francisco** 367:2,24 368:4,10,18 **frankly** 372:15 free 450:11 543:23 freeing 446:10 447:9 frees 434:6 frequency 517:22 **Fuente** 379:14 full 414:8 416:9 431:6 450:15 470:18 475:1 520:25 533:16 549:10 **function** 399:1,3,4,5,19 400:20 401:13,24 402:25 403:15 406:5 406:7,10,11,13,18,25 407:10 408:8 409:9 413:17,18 418:23 426:3 427:14 458:12 458:18,20,21 459:1 460:3 functional 464:7 469:24 470:10 functionalization

government 396:13

398:18,19,22 401:12 401:13 427:8 453:25 458:9,10 functionalize 426:6 457:17 461:22 470:23 functionalized 385:13 399:16 413:2 418:23 427:9 460:21 **functionalizing** 457:11 463:1,16 484:25 functionally 464:11 functions 398:24 399:19 400:4,6,8,11 405:14 406:1,2,3 407:13 409:13 426:24 427:1 453:10,12,14 454:4 457:6,10,13 462:17 485:5 500:8 **fund** 396:1 449:3 450:3 fundamental 423:24 fundamentally 476:14 **funded** 375:17 441:22 445:15 **funds** 422:16 434:5 438:23 500:10 further 372:22 422:2 427:15 429:5 438:7 466:16 468:9 502:4 523:13 545:7 **future** 436:20 437:17 439:20 G

G 372:2 444:2 gathering 372:24 general 392:19,25 393:3 394:10,23 398:2 426:12.12 435:19 448:8 451:7 479:3 481:11,12 503:21 504:7,21 505:16 508:22 509:18 510:24 514:14 518:20 527:11 530:17 generality 434:14 435:6,8,18 439:20 generally 404:9,12 466:21 507:6,8 513:22 514:16 516:23 527:13 537:2 541:14 generate 417:19 geographic 404:24 **getting** 468:3 479:6 489:6 496:8 give 503:21 526:15,25 given 373:11 441:10 454:18 530:10 gives 430:19 518:24

giving 409:16 457:3 **glad** 548:14 glossary 372:5 **go** 380:1 383:25 384:10 385:6.9.15 387:10.10 387:25 399:8,10 407:19,20,24 408:5 415:17.20 423:25 425:14 434:10 462:18 462:22,22 464:8 468:24 469:22 471:7 471:14 472:6 476:7 477:2,19 485:23 491:18 501:10 506:22 517:25 520:16 528:17 529:1,2,12 542:25 546:22 547:24 548:6 548:7 goal 377:3 378:10 384:25 448:16,19,19 449:13 goals 383:21 412:19 441:4,15 448:12 goes 377:17 378:19 403:24 404:1 407:18 410:23 411:12 417:18 425:19 427:15 445:6 445:21 446:21 450:25 468:17 469:4 475:4 475:16 496:2 529:15 530:15 going 372:6,11 373:2,7 373:7,12 375:19 376:22 379:9,20,20 382:14 383:4,14 385:17,19,23 386:4 392:23 396:1,25 397:10 398:4,14 402:17 403:14 407:14 408:4,19 416:12 417:24 420:20 421:19 426:19 430:12 434:15 435:1,10 436:9 437:13,15 441:16,24 447:8 451:6 452:13 452:22 455:3,9 472:6 477:25 478:1 479:5 480:22 482:8 484:16 485:25 488:9.11 489:11 492:13 493:22 511:23 515:24 527:13

534:1 547:3 548:1

good 372:4 373:5 412:2

443:9 479:17 502:5

503:8,9 534:20,21

governed 391:13

governing 499:20

535:19

397:9 447:22 453:5 466:14,23 467:11 500:2,23 **governs** 392:13 granted 382:20 granular 439:25 **graph** 511:21 531:19 532:12 graphic 423:18 425:18 511:16,18 518:4 **Great** 383:7 502:12 503:17 greater 428:13 439:2 488:4 green 431:3 grossly 458:6 ground 512:13 514:17 514:24 515:5 groundwater 379:14 379:14 380:24 390:10 445:17 448:2,6,17 512:4 514:16,21,25 526:24 **group** 442:10 489:24 508:23 growth 454:18 guess 547:6 **guidance** 420:20,22 464:18,21 465:11,19 465:25 466:5 467:5 468:13,24 491:3 493:2 518:24 guide 441:3 456:11,16 456:23 457:5,5,16 521:18 guides 451:13 Н

half 383:19 **hamper** 548:3 hand 374:1 382:23 528:8 handed 539:14 handle 389:23 happen 410:2 439:21 447:13 510:4 happened 475:25 486:9 happening 399:15,15 happens 405:7 410:1,9 410:22 455:11 541:12 happy 382:25 hard 543:3 harmless 475:14 hate 546:8 Havasu 481:22 hear 419:25 428:24 434:15 503:15

heard 427:2 hearing 489:7 hearings 411:3 heart 421:6 **HEATHER** 368:15 hefty 411:18 help 378:9 404:3 445:18 465:6 517:11 helpful 372:7,17,19 375:6 510:23 helps 388:19 401:17 448:22 high 395:21 436:17 439:20 455:8 487:5 532:25 533:17,20,22 higher 404:5 435:5,18 484:1 486:1 490:15 490:17 494:1 **highest** 473:6 490:2 533:14 **highlight** 379:7 383:14 383:22 391:7 399:13 415:2 442:13 444:24 445:11 491:19 highlighted 391:10 438:4 439:10 446:7 449:22 463:22 470:8 495:17 highlights 389:4 highly 454:22 hires 475.18 historical 521:7 history 424:1 525:2 533:15 hit 485:22 HIXON 370:4 HIXSON 368:11 382:18 383:3.8 393:22 395:13,16,19 402:16,21 403:3 406:21 412:4,17 416:20,22 417:13 428:20 441:24 442:7 442:11,13 443:10 444:5 461:15,21 478:2 479:10,16,21 479:25 481:3 482:8 485:18 486:11,15 492:1,15,21 495:1,7 497:20 498:6 501:20 502:1,11,16 503:3,7 511:1.7 515:6 518:15 532:15,20 533:25 534:5,8,10 542:21 545:8,13 547:10 hold 475:13 503:18

holistic 522:14

hollow 485:6

Honor 372:24 373:5 374:7,23 375:7,11 377:25 378:14 380:16 381:6,16 382:18 383:3.8 384:10 412:9 412:16,17 418:4 423:8 444:5 461:17 462:8 471:9 479:25 489:16 491:18 501:12 502:16 503:3 511:1 528:6 532:15 533:25 545:15 548:15 Honor's 378:25 **HONORABLE** 367:3 hook 423:2 424:9 hope 399:23 408:22 hopefully 382:10 469:18 hoping 419:25 horizon 472:12 hour 492:24 hours 501:24 546:1 household 390:13 428:7 459:5 housekeeping 382:19 546:4 How's 503:16 huge 401:14 404:23 411:20 416:16 482:25 **hundreds** 435:15 hydroelectric 417:18 423:13 hydrological 454:19

idea 375:15 437:19 524:23 546:18,24 **Ident** 371:2 identification 464:6 **identified** 384:9 406:9 436:20 437:14,21 438:1,2,14 439:2,4,8 440:20 441:2,4 443:5 444:17 457:8,13 478:12 identifies 395:25 399:20 460:2 identify 384:25 438:24 452:17 453:20 462:13 528:10.16 identifying 438:6 439:25 **ignoring** 473:15 II 394:24 395:1,3,3 499:2 **IID** 371:17,18 482:16 541:5,10 III 367:8 370:4,4

394:25 548:9,10 increase 379:12 404:15 interest 549:12 **IIP** 443:4 499:3,5 527:16 533:2 **interested** 481:6 509:2 illegal 465:14 473:9 544:11,12 interesting 429:22 478:15,15 increased 448:4,9 462:3 increases 448:21 499:2 interests 454:8 illustrate 401:17 internal 451:11 504:19 illustrative 491:13 increasing 379:13 492:2.16 380:6 445:24 518:25 **International** 457:25 **impact** 486:4 520.8 interpreting 500:12 **implement** 525:1 526:8 incremental 429:25 introduction 375:3 452:2 implemented 448:7 473:23 476:25 implementing 449:11 incur 434:23 443:8 invasive 523:7,9,10,14 520:20 542:8 investments 445:13 implements 389:1 incurred 403:23 432:8 invited 497:9 implication 483:8 incurs 485:2 543:8,11 involve 504:3,18 implicitly 434:24 **INDEX** 370:1 371:1 involved 416:19 417:25 implies 463:14,16 indicate 431:24 437:16 537:13,21 538:5 imply 466:4 **indication** 471:4,10 involving 518:22 **implying** 434:24 479:10 533:18 irrelevant 482:14 483:3 import 445:25 469:7 indicator 513:24 492:8 importance 383:23 individual 435:2 irrespective 422:22 394:4 404:19 industrial 491:15 **irrigation** 378:6 515:3 important 384:24 industry 420:19 451:12 **Irvine** 369:3 385:15,25 392:2 464:18,20 465:11,12 issue 382:11 386:20 397:13 404:18 405:24 465:19 466:5 468:24 391:5 393:2 412:1,18 412:24 421:5 431:8 493:3 418:3 428:1 447:13 industry's 452:10 447:18 450:20 454:21 449:22 450:10 468:12 inequitable 450:17 458:19 467:14 468:24 469:4 471:2,11,21 475:21,23 488:12 infested 523:11 472:8,10 476:8 499:10 510:17 517:13 **influence** 530:19 533:6 480:11 484:5,21 521:14 545:4 information 375:2 488:13 489:17 491:4 importation 379:17 399:24 401:22 411:23 521:17 543:4 **imported** 379:13 465:6 488:19,24 issued 445:4 499:24 445:18 504:24 510:24 489:6 issues 372:9 382:15 information's 402:12 519:24 520:17 389:13 403:8 434:11 **imposed** 391:6 484:2 **informed** 387:20 452:25 455:21 457:22 infrastructure 406:15 500:17 465:4 469:4 480:10 439:4 improperly 426:18 480:20 498:5 525:12 **improved** 379:15 441:7 initial 425:10 525:15 improving 452:17 initiated 498:12 item 375:11 384:9 inaccurate 457:14 inquiry 402:6 398:4 411:11 415:15 inappropriate 476:3 ins 513:13 416:5 462:9 501:16 inserted 447:23 incentivize 433:11 items 386:17 398:15 insignificant 490:22 433:23,24 440:7 include 374:6,16 379:15 381:23 414:17 **instance** 518:7,23 456:7 416:16 432:8 436:15 522:12,23 523:10,14 J 463:25 477:21 525:21 526:9 532:25 included 373:13 387:6 **J** 367:19 369:4,8 549:5 instructive 463:14 549:21 391:18 403:25 404:12 insurance 393:6 432:4,15 472:25 **JACKSON** 368:6 integrated 420:18 474:5 436:4,7 438:2 444:11 JAN 367:22 includes 453:11 454:16 464:5 477:16 **January** 387:5 388:3 474:10 478:6 505:1 **intend** 385:5 393:11 396:7 431:14 intended 404:3 492:3 including 404:13 431:17 432:18 477:6 416:12 426:24 427:21 524:2 480:16 498:11,14 intensified 544:24 545:24 546:11 432:10 450:24 456:20 470:2 472:20 473:2 intent 384:10 448:1 Jeff 544:21 job 408:22 503:22 478:8,12 531:23 intention 382:7 504:3 525:15 inclusive 387:6 470:1 intentional 392:9

JOHN 368:5,20 join 500:19 **jointly** 517:5 **JTX** 384:7 judge 367:3 374:1 judgment 402:15,19 403:1 iudicial 382:20 391:18 **July 396:6** jump 480:1 jumping 494:14 **June** 442:21 446:13 justify 442:6 K **Karman** 369:2 **KARNOW** 367:3 keep 502:7 528:23 541:19 Keker 368:3,5 372:24 492:5,23 501:15,22 545:15 546:6,8 547:14,17,24 548:10 548:14 Keker's 382:14 **KENNEDY** 368:22 Kern 512:18 **key** 383:14 394:6 441:4 460:25 496:1 498:13 keywords 459:4 kicker 460:15 kicks 485:16 kind 377:2 386:2 409:16 437:9 474:23 493:2 513:20 514:14 516:17,20 kinds 510:8 know 377:25 379:25 380:15 384:11 402:6 405:6 410:1 423:9 437:8 447:19 478:21 479:5 482:17 513:16 514:2,9 524:7 530:3

> **knowing** 379:24 knowledge 542:22 known 411:4 517:3 528.12 knows 407:11 447:4 480:4 487:24 542:24 **KUO** 368:15 L L-1212 528:12 L.A 483:25 484:2

> > 487:17,24 488:4

538:5 539:2,8 541:11

542:12 543:1,5,16

546:23 547:3

490:16 496:20 lab 531:22 labeled 512:2 lack 374:22 542:22 laid 409:14.20 Lake 421:13 481:22 504:9 516:6,6,7,7,18 516:18 518:9 519:3.3 519:4,8,9,13 520:10 522:12 523:15 524:14 524:14,15,15,15,16 526:18 528:19 535:23 536:1,9 542:14,17 lakes 516:7 landscape 378:6 language 391:4 422:3 424:2 449:8 462:3 463:15,22 465:9,17 473:18 large 401:18 419:20 420:6 425:3 488:7 490:12 524:3 528:6 largely 434:14 437:2 larger 421:21 488:3 493:5 largest 398:4 415:10,15 415:15 490:10,18 late 471:1 533:13 **laudable** 448:19 law 392:12.13 451:6 453:4 468:23 469:5 500:2.11 lawsuit 446:22 447:20 lav 379:6 laying 380:22 lays 378:2 lead 399:8,11 leading 440:18,24 470:20 leads 409:23 leave 390:17 515:4 led 387:13 442:18 **left** 400:6 407:15 475:3 535:21 left-hand 406:1 438:5 legal 478:17 499:21 500:17 legality 497:22 legislative 448:16 legislature 388:12 392:10 396:16 447:21 447:24 448:9,12 length 472:20 473:15 **lengthy** 374:12 383:20 383:23 429:11 lessening 445:25 lesser 404:19

let's 372:22 380:12

383:2 391:12 395:24			-	
	377:4 379:2,3 388:25	482:20 485:10 501:18	525:21 526:9	mechanisms 494:24
403:3 412:8 418:12	389:1 390:14 407:8	lots 372:6 547:3	mandated 448:12	meet 376:17 403:24
429:6 436:2 444:4	433:10,12,13,14,17	Louis 504:14	449:3	419:12,15 495:24
446:9 447:12 452:1	434:20 435:3,21	low 515:23 516:1	manner 434:8 470:5	510:22,24 523:21
456:11 466:8 479:24	439:2 440:20,25	520:17		526:6
	,		manual 452:11,12,14	
480:1 492:9 502:4,7	441:3,7 442:15 443:7	lower 490:16 513:23	453:19 457:3 464:9	meeting 386:19 392:19
517:25 525:9 534:17	450:3 514:20	LRP 377:4 378:10	464:18,23 465:2,3,17	393:6 431:24 525:18
546:24	located 515:9 516:5	379:9 380:15 441:4	466:8,10,14,15	527:14
letter 371:11,12,13,14	519:5	Luis 515:9	467:13,16,20 468:10	meetings 386:13
371:15,16,18,19,20	locations 469:8		468:14,17 469:9	393:20,22 410:24,25
394:11,13 411:12,13	long 383:18 486:4	M 368:22 424:25	491:7,9 492:15	411:1,5,7,7 455:23
411:17,24 426:11	488:8 503:12		manuals 465:22,25	meets 468:19
449:17 481:7 489:10	long-term 436:8 486:6	430:19	466:7	member 377:16 379:5
489:11,14	longer 410:15,18	M1 452:12,14 453:19	map 528:6,12,16	380:23 386:12 388:25
letters 481:9 489:9	446:17 495:8 547:24	464:9,18,23 465:2,17	535:17 536:9	389:9,19,25 390:4,8
level 385:15 395:21	longhand 549:10	466:8,10,14 467:8,9	March 376:4 388:2	390:16 391:1,11,21
404:10 410:8 434:14	look 372:5 378:3 386:1	467:13,20 468:10,14	414:15 436:6 463:4	392:1 406:16,17
434:25 435:5,8,18,24	396:18 400:12,17	468:16 469:9 491:7,9	480:15 498:13	407:1 408:24 411:1,2
436:17 439:20,25	401:1,10 402:3,8	491:13 492:15	MARCIA 368:16	411:13 413:21 414:7
444:8,9 455:8 485:25	403:18 409:18 412:13	M1's 453:22	marked 374:1	414:8 416:9 417:23
520:8,14 522:11	421:2 434:21 435:17	magnitude 401:11	market 368:17 520:16	420:24 426:1 427:18
530:12	436:2,8 438:20 442:9	525:7	marks 410:17	431:19 432:9 433:11
levels 499:2 518:25,25	450:25 451:9 452:1	maintaining 425:7	matter 372:19 382:19	433:13,15 437:1
521:7	454:21 456:11 457:22	458:13,22 460:8	425:4 441:21 492:9	438:11 440:23 449:25
levy 445:5	458:19 466:8 467:14	522:21	544:6	450:14 454:18 455:18
Library 469:17	469:24 475:23 485:1	maintenance 400:25	matters 393:16,24	456:5 467:1 473:25
lights 457:9	486:18,24 494:12	401:7 415:8 419:19	Matthews 524:15	475:9,18 478:7 484:1
likes 421:1	496:16 500:7 512:10	420:2 421:21 422:1	max 492:24,24	484:3 485:21 486:3
limit 520:23	520:16 522:10 523:13	422:18,19 461:3	maximize 448:15	486:16,19 487:3,7,15
limited 471:16 499:16	523:19 524:23 548:18	477:1	449:13	487:18,20,25 488:8
521:9	looked 398:17 421:9	major 436:12 453:10	maximum 527:6	488:24,25 490:1,2,4,6
line 490:25 496:1,19	435:11 439:24 452:15	458:23 459:3,4,7,14	McCUTCHEN 368:9	490:13,19,23 493:6,9
511:23 532:7	470:11 472:17 489:25	460:9	mean 372:10 405:4	495:19 496:2 497:10
lines 380:18 407:4	491:1,8,12 494:17,18	majority 392:8 419:20	450:7 459:5 471:17	500:1,19 505:2
linger 546:9	521:6 522:8	420:6 498:15	486:11 508:16 535:2	510:22,25 517:5
lingers 496:23,25	looking 378:15 390:21	making 372:25 387:20	535:2 537:11 546:8	520:24 521:2,6,7,10
lingo 408:23	396:3,22 397:25	390:23 391:3 392:17	546:23	521:22 525:5,18
link 435:21 439:6	400:10 401:12 421:15	427:24 428:4 461:23	meaning 394:20 414:9	526:7,23 527:14,15
441:17 446:4	435:15 436:7,17	463:14 464:3 465:22	418:24 419:12 431:21	539:25 540:3,6,23
list 381:21 520:18	437:5,8,14 440:23	467:16 524:25 525:22	460:10 471:25 480:23	542:20
521:25 523:4	452:19 456:8 457:12	manage 522:10,20	487:22 489:20 493:10	members 386:6 391:23
listed 393:1 400:6	457:13 461:21 470:22	management 371:4,5	500:18	392:4 442:13
414:11 441:5 518:19	471:21,24 472:8	400:5 407:7,10 408:8	meaningful 491:4,5	memo 376:4 449:19
literally 394:14 413:23	482:6 489:16 492:23	414:3 415:1 433:9,23	means 372:10 387:22	memorandum 388:18
514:19,20	492:25 494:15 496:7	434:4,20 435:5,12	395:24 403:5 404:4,8	memory 502:5
litigation 378:22 391:4	497:25 500:9 507:16	441:1,25 445:14,23	404:10 406:11 408:17	memos 376:2 377:22
499:13	515:7	446:5 447:1,7 448:18	431:2 466:18 477:24	mentioned 485:20
little 375:12 382:2	looks 396:25 397:19	449:24 450:2,11	481:18 486:2 495:21	498:25
387:19 410:17 415:7	419:17 427:7 469:17	457:25 494:8 504:1,2	505:7 522:4,5,18,19	merely 428:12
419:4,9 424:1 482:9	486:21 488:25 489:2	510:17 511:15 517:4	523:9	merit 475:24
490:15,17 497:6	Los 368:14 459:5 473:8	517:9,16,17 518:17	meant 433:13 468:7	meriting 441:11
503:15 517:14 519:21	483:25 486:10 490:16	520:13 523:8,9 524:8	measure 397:18 490:5	merits 372:10
545:21 547:7,24	496:5	manager 392:19,25	measurement 539:18	met 385:9 387:6,21
548:4,16	lose 376:25 377:1	393:3 394:10,23	measurements 530:20	388:24 389:2,4,7,10
	loses 472:7	426:12 479:3 481:11	530:21	389:18,22 390:2,9,12
live 411:6	10868 4 / 2. /			207.10,== 270.=,7,1=
live 411:6 living 459:6	lot 372:17 392:14	503:19 528:1	measures 448:6	390:19,25 391:10
live 411:6 living 459:6 LLP 368:9 369:2	lot 372:17 392:14 399:24 402:9 405:22	503:19 528:1 managers 411:1	measures 448:6 mechanism 392:7	390:19,25 391:10 392:21 395:23 396:5
live 411:6 living 459:6	lot 372:17 392:14	503:19 528:1	measures 448:6	390:19,25 391:10

524:10 526:1,4 527:8 527:19 528:1 529:1,8 529:11,16,19,22 530:1,4,11,14,17 531:7 10 532:9	530:1,4,11,14,17 531:7,10 532:9 534:25 535:4,11 536:5,9,10,14,18,21 536:24 537:3,7,14 538:1,3 539:22,25 540:3,4,9,23,25 541:4 541:5,9,22,25 542:8 542:18 543:6,8,11,14 543:18,25 Met's 387:14 388:15
	534:25 535:4,11 536:5,9,10,14,18,21 536:24 537:3,7,14 538:1,3 539:22,25 540:3,4,9,23,25 541:4 541:5,9,22,25 542:8 542:18 543:6,8,11,14 543:18,25

```
414:24 418:15,25
 420:14,16 426:20
 427:6 428:4,8 435:14
 436:19,22 437:12
 439:3 442:20 444:12
 445:23 446:6 447:3,8
 447:11 450:4 451:22
 452:17 453:9.10.17
 453:21 455:17 456:14
 465:14 473:1,20,21
 474:4,5 476:12
 477:17,18 478:7,8
 481:10 483:9 484:17
 488:4 490:21 493:6
 493:12 497:22 498:9
 498:25 499:20,21
 500:17,25 504:4,18
 516:24 521:11 523:18
 525:13 526:12 534:22
 535:18 536:25 538:9
 539:19 540:6,7
 541:13 544:3,6,9,12
method 449:11 500:12
methodologies 389:15
 452:7
methodology 385:11,18
 387:2 452:9 453:3,18
 453:21 456:15 477:13
 544:25
Metropolitan 367:9
 368:8,13 372:5,13
 373:10 375:15 376:18
 377:7,13,16 378:22
 378:23 379:15,18
 380:9,15 381:22
 382:17 388:13,19,21
 389:14 391:13 392:11
 392:14 396:24 397:14
 398:23 399:3 402:21
 402:23 404:18 405:18
 406:9 408:23 409:5
 409:21 410:3 411:5,8
 414:15,22 416:10
 420:23 422:15 424:5
 425:15 426:23 429:23
 430:9 431:2,11 432:9
 433:19 434:25 435:4
 435:7,11 436:2,7,11
 437:14,24 438:24
 439:6,13 440:20
 442:2,25 443:1
 447:13 448:20,24
 449:2,20 451:25
 452:19 456:3,4
 458:24 459:17 461:22
 470:15 473:12 477:5
 478:6 481:4,22
```

482:17 484:7,21,25

```
485:22 486:21 489:22
  497:4 500:15 501:6
  502:8,16 503:11,12
  503:18,20,24 504:16
  505:3,14,25 507:1,12
  508:14 509:4,10,21
  509:22 510:3 511:3
  511:14.19.22 512:5
  512:15 513:7 515:2,4
  515:16,20 516:12
  517:5 518:23 526:23
  527:22 528:14 530:23
  532:16 544:23 545:5
  547:20
Metropolitan's 372:9
  374:10 376:4 377:19
  378:10 379:5 380:7
  383:20 385:7,11
  386:25 387:1 392:3,8
  392:13 394:2,5
  395:22 406:14,24
  407:1 411:25 419:2
  426:12 429:7 430:17
  431:6,21 432:5,5,10
  432:11,12 445:8
  447:22 449:14 450:19
  451:18 453:2,6 454:9
  455:1 469:7 474:7
  475:22 478:22 481:17
  493:18 494:11 500:3
  500:21,24 502:4
  508:4 517:18 533:15
  539:6
microphone 502:23
  503:14
million 398:5,9 400:16
  400:18 401:3,9
  402:18 415:5,7,11
  421:14,20,20 423:5
  508:6,9 543:25 544:3
  544:5,7,14,15,16
million-dollar 421:9
millions 435:15
mindful 522:20 523:20
Minimizing 524:22
minimum 422:17
minus 474:2
minutes 412:5 431:24
  479:22 501:15,25
  519:17 520:1 534:13
  534:14 545:11,18
  548:2
misleading 501:18
misread 458:6
misrepresentations
  501:23
misrepresented 487:19
misunderstood 449:7
```

```
mitigate 505:15
model 452:15,16
  454:14,15
modifications 454:16
  454:17
modified 466:13
  467:11
moment 389:20 502:8
Monday 375:5,9
  545:22 546:3 547:7
money 376:25 377:13
  377:15 395:25 396:17
  396:20 397:1,10
  398:11 400:7 423:21
  430:15 543:21
Monica 459:6
monitor 513:8 530:14
monitoring 513:16
  514:1 530:24 531:5
monitors 530:18
month 546:23
monthly 424:11 495:24
months 442:21
morning 372:1,4 373:5
  374:4 453:24 545:14
MORRISON 368:17
motives 497:25
mountain 423:21
Mountains 423:20
move 373:14 374:14.20
  381:4,25 401:20
  406:15,23 413:20,24
  414:25 415:12 423:15
  423:20 424:13 427:17
  428:5,10 429:20
  430:20,23 436:25
  458:22 459:14 460:8
  509:22 510:1 521:12
  521:13 524:7 533:20
  534:1 535:12 537:14
  538:1,10,21,25
moved 416:14 444:12
  449:6 517:10,12
movement 406:7 510:4
moves 405:18 438:10
  511:3,9 526:4 532:16
  537:7
moving 406:25 408:12
  429:25 430:13 483:9
  494:6 525:23 527:9
  538:17
multiple 383:18 506:18
  519:9
multiyear 387:13
municipal 368:21 369:1
  376:6 378:7 379:4
  404:25
mussels 523:11,12,14
```

523:15

MWD 371:11,12,13,14

371:15,19 384:4,4

385:8 388:11 391:15

391:16 392:11,24

441:8,11,23 447:23

447:23 452:2 453:5

497:7 499:21

MWD's 441:13 455:7

480:3 490:10 496:17

mystery 409:20

N 372:2 444:2 name 502:24,25 narrow 402:3 490:14 narrower 489:6 NARUC 463:7,10,23 464:4,14 466:9,11,12 467:2,9,12,18 468:5 **National** 463:6 467:3 nature 390:6 393:18 418:11 420:15,18,21 426:5 477:16 546:5 near 526:12 527:2,7 531:5 532:7 nearly 383:19 necessary 392:6 397:1 422:9 423:15 438:23 440:4 477:12 486:5 500:10 necessity 456:6 461:18 need 396:1,20,21 397:7 397:20 398:1,4,13 434:25 437:10 439:21 445:17,19,25 446:1 469:7 488:23 497:19 498:3 534:11 545:21 545:25 needed 424:13 436:9 437:15 443:8 needs 376:17 397:15 398:15 405:7 436:11 437:13 488:1 500:8 540:4 541:9 negative 537:20 negotiated 462:5 negotiations 538:4,5 **NEST 368:3** net 398:13 417:19 527:18 network 406:15 407:2 never 437:24,25 474:4

474:5,13,16 475:25

476:9 544:3,7 **new** 377:4,8,20 378:11

380:1 479:14,16

480:1,15 487:6

night 547:8 non-Met 483:9 non-project 427:17,19 428:2 429:15 430:4 430:13 482:21,23 505:4,6,17,24 506:3 506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	odo 372:3 443:14 444:3 548:20 oath 502:21 object 374:22 375:3 492:5 501:16,20 546:15 objected 482:14 objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14 occasions 418:5	opening 385:24 407:3 472:20 482:15 535:18 opens 410:24 operate 376:13 522:7 535:4,9 operating 456:25 458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	488:14,19 489:7 501:10 505:8 Overruled 542:23 oversell 464:21 overwhelmingly 432:3 owned 428:5,10 466:14 466:22,23 467:11 ownership 427:12 owns 427:4 P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	486:3 492:11 500:11 507:16 particularly 385:16 440:15 488:12 501:16 510:20 parties 375:24 398:21 403:9 414:20 416:23 436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
non-Met 483:9 non-project 427:17,19 428:2 429:15 430:4 430:13 482:21,23 505:4,6,17,24 506:3 506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	oath 502:21 object 374:22 375:3 492:5 501:16,20 546:15 objected 482:14 objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	opens 410:24 operate 376:13 522:7 535:4,9 operates 415:25 operating 456:25 458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	Overruled 542:23 oversell 464:21 overwhelmingly 432:3 owned 428:5,10 466:14 466:22,23 467:11 ownership 427:12 owns 427:4 P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	particularly 385:16 440:15 488:12 501:16 510:20 parties 375:24 398:21 403:9 414:20 416:23 436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
non-project 427:17,19 428:2 429:15 430:4 430:13 482:21,23 505:4,6,17,24 506:3 506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	object 374:22 375:3 492:5 501:16,20 546:15 objected 482:14 objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operate 376:13 522:7 535:4,9 operates 415:25 operating 456:25 458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	oversell 464:21 overwhelmingly 432:3 owned 428:5,10 466:14 466:22,23 467:11 ownership 427:12 owns 427:4 P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	440:15 488:12 501:16 510:20 parties 375:24 398:21 403:9 414:20 416:23 436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
428:2 429:15 430:4 430:13 482:21,23 505:4,6,17,24 506:3 506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	492:5 501:16,20 546:15 objected 482:14 objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	535:4,9 operates 415:25 operating 456:25 458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	overwhelmingly 432:3 owned 428:5,10 466:14	510:20 parties 375:24 398:21 403:9 414:20 416:23 436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
430:13 482:21,23 505:4,6,17,24 506:3 506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	546:15 objected 482:14 objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operates 415:25 operating 456:25 458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	owned 428:5,10 466:14 466:22,23 467:11 ownership 427:12 owns 427:4 P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	parties 375:24 398:21 403:9 414:20 416:23 436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
505:4,6,17,24 506:3 506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	objected 482:14 objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operating 456:25 458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	466:22,23 467:11 ownership 427:12 owns 427:4 P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	403:9 414:20 416:23 436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
506:12 507:4,14,21 508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	objection 373:20 381:6 511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	458:13,21 523:5,18 524:20 operation 421:21 422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	ownership 427:12 owns 427:4 P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	436:5 450:14,15 465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
508:1,9 510:12 520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	511:4 532:17 534:3 542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	524:20 operation 421:21	P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	465:10 480:18 507:1 509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
520:11 521:13 537:7 537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	542:21 objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operation 421:21	P P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	509:2,8 511:2 512:16 513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
537:14 538:10 non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	objectives 468:20,20 523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	422:18 477:1 518:22 operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	513:8,16 514:1 534:2 partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
non-water 506:16 nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	523:21 525:21 objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operational 390:15 503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	P 372:2 444:2 page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	partnered 512:5 parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
nonperformance 376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	objects 448:17 obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	503:25 516:13 519:13 522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	page 370:2 374:17 384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	parts 372:7,8 401:7 441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
376:24 Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	obligated 390:9 obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	522:3 525:20 526:8 527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	384:1 394:18 403:19 421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	441:1 457:19 party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
Noon 443:13 normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	obligates 447:5 obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	527:8 533:5 operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	421:3,4 456:22 457:3 462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	party 538:9 pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
normally 389:5 529:18 north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	obligation 547:22 observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operations 396:1 400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	462:19 469:23 491:17 495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	pass 418:22 534:10 passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
north 368:13 504:9,10 505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	observation 445:13 obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	400:24 415:8 419:18 420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	495:15 507:18 508:21 509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	passed 388:11 392:10 432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
505:19 507:8 509:8 509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	obtain 485:2 531:12 obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	420:2 422:1,19 461:2 503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	509:16 511:16 515:7 518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	432:2 passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
509:12 northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	obtains 543:18 obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	503:19,23 517:10 521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	518:1,2,20 520:19 521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	passively 428:13 path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
northeastern 526:17 nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	obviously 384:24 388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	521:19 522:1 527:25 535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	521:24 523:3,23 pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	path 399:8,11 PATTY 369:4
nos 432:2 notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	388:10 416:18 428:1 443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	535:8 operators 503:24 opining 474:24	pages 367:9 383:18 452:13 495:2 549:10	PATTY 369:4
notation 481:17 notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	443:1 445:10 457:7 470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	operators 503:24 opining 474:24	452:13 495:2 549:10	
notations 475:10 note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	470:21 493:19 Occasionally 535:14	opining 474:24		
note 431:8 445:21 477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	Occasionally 535:14	1 0		pay 376:22 397:15,17
477:19 480:22 noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11		oninion 451.12	paid 418:9 430:14,15	397:21 398:1,4,15
noted 448:24 449:2,20 449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11	occasions 418:5	opinion 451:13	447:16 476:24	414:10,10,20 416:10
449:25 450:4 460:19 473:4 497:11		opinions 470:22	papers 547:4	416:11,13,23,25
473:4 497:11	October 387:4,21	opportunities 452:17	paperwork 537:12,13	417:23 424:7,14,15
	457:20 458:1 480:14	opportunity 547:13,15	538:7,8	425:15 429:23,24
notes 454:17 467:10	officer 451:21	opposed 396:6 522:10	parading 547:4	430:3,12,16,24
	officially 373:13	opposite 396:24	paragraph 376:8	438:23 449:23 450:6
468:14 478:5 549:9	offset 417:19 524:7	opted 395:3 525:6	378:12 379:6 483:24	505:23 506:2 516:16
549:11	offsets 398:11,12	option 394:24,24,25	544:21	516:20
notice 376:16 382:20	417:14,25 423:12	395:1,3,3 411:14	parameters 523:20	paying 430:18,25 450:8
391:18 393:12 475:21	oftentimes 515:22	473:15,16,19,20	Parchman 367:19	473:25 496:22
	Oh 486:15	474:2,15 475:9,12	369:8 549:5,21	payments 424:19,24
noticed 411:3 412:10	okay 373:4 382:9,12,16	499:2	part 378:7 381:22	pays 460:19 505:25
noting 453:8	400:1 403:2 412:12	options 394:24 411:10	386:16 390:18 392:2	506:8
notion 380:4 428:21	412:15 442:12 443:11	411:19,22 473:5,12	397:22 416:5,13,17	peak 403:7,12,20,24
475:16	495:12 504:3 505:16	474:19 475:6,8 499:1	417:16 419:6,7	404:6 405:16 419:12
November 424:4	508:12,18 509:4	499:11	426:19 429:2 445:3	419:21,22 420:5
number 367:4 386:4,8	510:4,6,16 511:1	Orange 369:1 377:24	460:15 467:13 478:22	436:20 437:5,12
386:10 387:15 388:5	512:8 513:19,20	378:7 473:9	479:6,7 480:11 482:6	472:10 484:10,14
392:5,16 395:22	515:16 519:2,25	order 373:25 376:17	483:16 516:8 517:10	487:3,5 490:4,7,23
437:22 438:2,6,8	520:18 523:3 525:11	382:21 477:9,11	519:17 536:1 546:18	491:4,12,14,21 493:4
440:7 441:3,5 443:1	527:13,21 528:4,23	485:23 525:7	participant 386:13	493:6 495:24 496:14
444:16 445:6 448:8	528:25 530:7 532:7	ordered 485:16	497:12	496:18,24 526:3
453:4 455:3 460:24	532:12 533:8 534:5	orders 390:17,20	participate 497:10	peak-related 485:24
470:21 475:9 497:15	545:9,18	485:21	participating 430:2	peaking 385:21,22
	old 471:3	ordinarily 393:10	particular 376:20	389:25 403:8 408:17
	once 409:23 419:21	ordinary 450:15	377:16 378:16 383:23	408:18,25 409:1
	ones 381:3 385:1 389:6	organic 513:23	384:12,23 388:1	454:19 471:25 483:19
485:6 489:21 491:25	415:23 433:11 438:1	original 424:3 546:24	389:7,24 392:16	484:7,20 487:1,1,17
492:12	439:9,12 445:10	originated 509:12	394:4,8 407:16	488:13,16 489:13,17
numerous 517:19	490:19 501:6 517:2	originates 507:8	417:12 421:10 433:15	489:19 490:6,13
nuts 385:12	ongoing 422:19	Oroville 421:13 504:10	434:19,21 438:1,14	492:6,25 494:22,23
	online 519:5	ought 546:19	439:22 440:6 450:14	526:1
0	oOo 367:5	outcome 549:12	450:21 452:11 453:7	people 396:12 411:7
	open 393:17 411:1	outlier 490:20,22	460:18 465:8 468:16	428:10 449:23 455:23
o'clock 548:8	446:19 455:22 497:8	outside 442:3 488:11	469:23 475:8 480:7	475:10
				ī.

			_
perceive 475:10	place 438:18 448:3,9	pointed 456:22 464:19	predicate 390:2
perceived 473:2	485:21 493:2 507:16	470:7 473:14 476:6	preference 441:10
percent 380:6 392:5	513:14 518:10 531:5	489:9	prepared 372:5 373
397:4 398:5,9 414:2	placed 449:1 520:23	pointer 528:8	402:13
415:19 440:1,3,7,8	Placer 427:22	pointing 455:12 467:4	prescribed 453:19
462:21,23 485:22	places 444:19	467:8 470:24 475:24	prescriptive 492:3
490:21 498:2 499:3,5	placing 514:18	481:7	present 375:20 465:
-			_
508:6,14 525:6 532:8	plain 449:8	points 455:20,21 456:6	492:16 549:7
532:11 533:11	plaintiff 367:7 368:2	458:1 463:20 467:16	presentation 371:9
percentage 486:23	466:3	467:20 469:20	383:4,14,22 384:2
508:12 521:9 532:5,8	plaintiff's 373:14	policies 476:13	385:5 391:17 412:
532:21	381:24 402:2 483:8	policy 387:18 390:24	412:13 420:21 426
percolates 514:25	plaintiffs 483:15	469:15 545:4	480:21 495:7 500:
perform 399:1,4,5	547:10	pool 438:15 439:11	501:13 511:13
457:6	plan 436:5,7 437:22	440:11	presented 456:9 457
performance 376:22	438:2 444:12 489:19	portfolio 518:23 522:8	482:13 492:1 495:
performed 400:11	517:4,4,9,13,16,18	522:9,15	501:17
performing 398:25	518:4,17 519:18,22	portion 430:6 456:22	presently 425:11
406:4 427:14 497:24	520:2,6,13,20,21,22	512:23	presents 457:14
performs 406:10 500:9	521:1,5,14 522:6,7,16	portions 429:10 535:9	PRESIDING 367:3
period 446:17 487:22	547:12	position 375:5 378:21	pressured 547:11
488:8 489:25 490:8	planned 387:18 390:24	441:20 456:17 482:4	pretrial 455:4 456:1
496:10 506:13,16,18	444:8	482:5 483:6 503:18	459:19 460:16
506:19	planning 390:19 435:8	positions 455:24	pretty 423:24 502:5
periods 436:16 492:25	435:11 436:1,3	possession 536:6	prevail 548:14
permission 412:10	503:20,25 504:2	possible 429:3 496:21	previous 408:11
permit 434:9	517:11 544:24	post-trial 372:14	previously 373:11
Perris 516:6,7,18	plans 435:3	postage 431:20 477:18	424:19
524:15 536:2	plant 504:12 507:10	499:24	price 485:16
person 459:6	528:20 529:2,4,16	postdates 480:17	pricing 469:15 472:2
personal 542:22	530:15,20 532:5	postpone 375:8	primarily 533:7
personally 549:7	533:21 539:20,23	potential 452:17	primarly 533.7 primary 532:23
perspective 399:14,14	540:1,4 541:25 542:4	potentially 374:20	principal 410:10
456:8 467:18 483:3	542:17	power 400:23 401:2,19	471:23
persuasive 476:2	plants 417:17 458:15	402:19 404:13 408:9	principally 423:8
PG&E 466:19	460:5 526:23 527:15	402.19 404.13 408.9 408:12,14 413:22,25	438:13 491:9
phase 482:7		414:20 415:4,11,13	
philosophy 466:2	527:18,20 540:6,7,9	415:21 416:12,14,17	principle 390:22 391:10 405:1 444:
	540:11,16,17,19	, ,	
physically 512:20	play 519:20 520:1,12	416:18,19,24,24	522:4,18 523:8
529:14,25 536:5	please 379:7 382:25	417:1,4,5,6,8,11,14	524:21
pick 458:2	412:8 479:24 502:3	417:17,19,19,21,24	principles 387:18
picked 446:3	502:11 506:22 509:16	418:2,5,7,10 419:5	388:16 390:24 440
picking 457:18	511:16 517:25 520:20	421:22 422:1,18	441:3 442:14,17,1
picture 405:9 421:13	521:24 523:3,23	423:8,10,11,12,15,20	453:19 455:16 468
piece 454:21 517:13	531:18	425:24 429:25 430:25	521:18 522:1,6 52
524:1	plus 473:25 546:17	453:11 473:23,23	523:18
pieces 414:4 522:9	point 372:20 375:3	474:12,13 494:5	print 395:7 462:11,2
pipe 546:2	377:17 378:19 381:8	505:25,25	printer 374:4
pipeline 438:15 439:12	388:15 402:5 417:5	PowerPoint 409:16	prior 377:10 387:5
440:11 526:17,20,21	417:22 421:1 427:24	practice 431:9 432:14	460:4 487:4
527:7,16 533:5	428:4 432:20 434:20	441:21 531:7	priorities 525:20
pipelines 505:1 526:5,7	455:8,15,25 456:25	practices 452:10	privately 466:22
526:11 527:1,3	459:8 463:11,25	pre-described 522:11	privilege 393:24
528:15,21 529:3,6,7,8	464:20 475:5 483:24	precede 425:17	pro 416:13
529:10	489:8,20 498:22	preceded 431:10	probable 440:15
pipes 406:15 428:5,9	499:11 500:20 502:10	precedes 471:3	probably 405:23
528:13,17 529:1	530:10 536:10,14	precise 412:23	545:25 548:16
	*		
537:4,6 538:18	546:5,9,10	precisely 378:1	procedures 392:14

proceed 372:22 494:16 :10 545:12 373:2 proceeding 383:10 397:6 :19 proceedings 367:13 2:3 393:19 475:17 480:9 465:3 497:12 548:19 549:8 549:9.12 71:9 proceeds 396:24 84:2,22 process 378:22 383:20 412:11 385:7 387:2,13 388:9 388:15 392:17 395:22 1 426:14 500:20 396:11,14 398:18 399:7,10 410:21 3 9 457:23 413:1 419:11 426:17 495:4 444:21 445:3 452:24 453:18,22,23 457:10 468:15 478:23 480:11 480:13 494:16 497:5 67:3 497:7,9 500:6,15 538:3 11 456:17 processes 387:15 392:14 502:5 **procure** 505:14 procured 429:14 **produce** 377:13,15,15 11 377:16 447:1 production 377:8 **program** 375:18 376:6 472:22 377:5 379:3 380:5,16 398:8 415:3,23 435:22 440:21,25 0 441:4 445:4 450:3 531:22 8:8 programmatic 444:8 programs 375:16,16,25 22 376:1 378:20 379:2 444:20 407:8,9 414:3 433:9 8: 433:10,10,21,23 434:5,20,21 435:5,12 18 441:1,25 442:9,15 4 440:21 445:14,15,23 446:5 ,17,18 447:1,7 448:18 449:3 6 468:7 449:5,24 450:11 ,6 523:5 494:8 511:18 512:2,4 512:9,13,21,24 :11,20 513:20,23 514:6,12 514:13 517:19 518:24 37:5 519:16,25 520:7 522:7 523:22 525:25 0 **project** 374:10 376:7 22 376:11,13,14,25 4 377:24 378:4,9,12 379:11 380:24,24 5 385:20 387:9 398:3,7 23 398:21,24 399:4,7,21 6 400:1,12,13,22,23,23

401:2,15 405:4

	_
406.22 407.4 25	
406:22 407:4,25	
412:22 413:10,18	
414:23 415:16 416:2	
416:14 417:15 418:1	
418:6,14 419:14,17	
419:18 420:13,16	
421:8,19 422:9,23	
423:15,23 424:8,11	
424:18,23 425:9,22	
426:18,23 427:3,5,10	
427:16,17,18 428:14	
428:22 429:1,4,7,8,13	
429:19 430:8 431:9	
432:6,11,15,22 433:1	
434:22,22 437:18	
439:11,15 440:12	
444:9 458:4,24	
459:10,22 460:18,19	
460:23 461:5,14	
462:6,14,19 463:1,18	
469:21 470:2 471:18	
472:18,24 473:3	
474:18,21,24 475:2	
478:8,13 481:16	
495:23 501:1,8 504:4	
504:8 505:1,4,9,11	
506:7,16 508:2 510:2	
510:14 511:10 512:12	
513:6,24 514:6	
515:23 516:8,19	
518:8 520:12 521:11	
522:25 524:4,17	
526:19,19 530:8	
532:5,10,22 533:1,4	
533:10,19 534:23	
535:1,4,10,12,22	
536:5,6,12,25 537:4,6 537:8,9,15,15 538:11	
537:8,9,15,15 538:11	
538:14,18,20 539:19	
540:15,18 542:15	
Project's 421:16	
projected 436:21 437:7	
437:12 440:17 490:21	
544:12	
projection 410:3	
projects 377:6 379:10	
380:10,14,14,22	
415:5 437:22 438:6,7	
438:14,16 439:25	
440:9 441:7,11,12,17	
441:18,21 506:19	
promise 547:19,23	
promote 448:23	
promoted 448:18	
promoting 448:12,16	
Prop 389:13 391:5,5	
397:8,8 500:5,5,12,12	
500:22	
	J

```
properly 494:14
property 397:4 500:23
proposal 473:13,15
  474:16
proposals 393:9 411:9
  475:19,20,22
proposed 382:21
  394:24 410:24 411:4
  411:14 452:3 473:4
  473:16 499:1
proposes 475:25
proposition 429:19
pros 475:6
prospective 397:18
prospectively 397:17
  397:21
prove 489:14 533:23
proven 488:1
provide 376:11 378:4
  382:21 383:5 392:19
  397:1,2,7 405:8
  412:13 417:4 431:1
  439:5 444:14 445:18
  465:6,25 486:7 503:4
  512:13,16 529:22
  541:9 543:8,11
provided 373:10
  374:14 375:24 382:22
  389:17 390:6 420:23
  424:19 443:6 464:7
  500:4 503:5 511:13
  517:18
provider 390:3,5,7,14
providers 389:10
provides 375:17 377:7
  388:22 391:20 392:3
  392:18 393:5,9 411:8
  416:22 424:6 426:25
  428:21 429:5 430:1
  462:25 463:11 464:9
  497:20 501:2 519:7
  519:13 530:2 543:6
providing 388:20
  389:14,18,22 450:1
  451:13 481:12,14
  545:1
provision 393:4,16
  429:6 474:8
provisions 391:16
  422:13 453:4 478:25
PTX 374:1,1,12,20
  376:3,3 377:21 379:1
  379:1 381:20 515:7
public 391:11,21
  393:12,16,19,21,23
  410:25 411:3,13
  425:4 426:17 455:22
```

466:19 467:7 468:1

```
475:17 476:21 477:3
  497:9
publicly 411:5
published 416:17
  464:24 470:4
pull 374:2 403:14
  426:19 461:17
pump 513:13
pump-in 514:12,13
pumped 507:10 509:13
  513:25 514:11
pumping 457:8 460:12
  494:6 504:11 507:10
  513:3,14,20,22
  514:20 515:3
pumps 504:12 513:4
punch 496:1,19
Purcell 368:5 370:4
  375:13 511:4 532:17
  534:3,13,19 541:20
  543:2 545:7
purchase 390:9,12,13
  390:17,19,20 402:4
  459:22 464:15 468:1
  470:8 485:21,23
  490:2 500:23 507:13
  507:20 509:5,7,20
purchased 447:17
  463:12,21,24 464:1
purchases 456:20
  458:5 493:21 507:7
purchasing 428:13
  430:21 448:14 458:15
  460:5 490:10 510:22
pure 415:20 485:9
purple 407:6 436:25
purport 471:15
purported 375:2
purportedly 492:12
purpose 391:1 465:2,3
  493:15 495:9
purposes 390:20 391:4
  454:11 461:22 463:14
  468:1 484:23 519:10
pursuant 422:11
push 546:21 547:6
pushes 408:24
put 373:2 382:5 384:5
  386:7,13 423:18
  425:18 429:9 431:14
  443:5 447:14 462:21
  462:23 465:16 469:18
  470:12 471:8 491:17
  491:19 493:2 498:7
  502:8 514:24 519:5
  523:16 528:7 535:17
  539:11,12 544:20
  546:1 547:1,10
```

```
puts 488:4 491:13
putting 373:8 387:22
  402:25 441:19 462:1
  470:22 488:19
Pyramid 524:15
Quagga 523:11,15
quality 481:24 513:8
  513:21,25 523:17,20
  523:21 525:21 530:21
  530:25 531:1,23
Quantification 371:10
quantified 437:25
quantities 506:20
quantity 447:8
question 372:8 391:24
  454:23 455:11 471:6
  471:11,16 478:16
  501:7
questions 435:6 468:11
  545:7
quick 547:2
quickly 472:7 493:23
quiet 502:1
OUILIZAPA 369:4
quite 390:1 411:17
  424:16 427:2 429:11
  450:23
quote 426:19 473:18
  474:7 476:19
quoted 463:9 464:4
quoting 464:9
R 372:2 444:2
Raftelis 385:23 451:17
  451:19,22,24 452:3,6
  452:21,23 453:15,17
  454:2,17,20 456:12
  456:13,16,18 457:5,7
  457:13,15 463:11
  464:4,19
Raftelis's 456:22
rain 533:17,18
raise 381:15 396:1,21
  397:16,20 398:1,13
  503:14
raised 449:22
raising 482:18
RAJ 368:19
rare 535:9
```

Q

R

rata 416:13

rate 375:17 377:19

383:9,12,21 384:14

384:16,19,21 385:7

387:1,10,20,22 388:9

385:14,16,19,21

```
388:15 390:22 391:5
  392:17 394:2,7,15,17
  394:19 395:8,13
  410:14 411:4,9,12,14
  412:21 413:3,14,22
  413:25 414:1.5.14.16
  414:18,18,21 415:1,3
  415:4,14,14,17,23
  416:4,5,7,8,12,15,17
  417:3,6,7,11,14,19,21
  417:24 418:1,9,10,13
 419:2,5,8 420:3,7
  421:23 431:7,11,13
  431:18,19,20,25
  432:3,4,13,16,17,19
  432:23 433:3,6,25
  434:2,6,8,12 437:3
  438:13 440:20,22,23
  441:2 442:24 443:2
  444:7,7,14,21,22
  447:14 448:13,22
  449:1,10,12,21 452:4
  452:7,8,18 453:3,18
  454:1,6,8 456:15,20
  457:20,23 458:6
  461:23 463:14 464:3
  465:22 467:16.16.22
  468:3,6,12,15,18,19
  468:22 469:3,6,10
  470:17,19 471:7
  472:4,16 473:1,2,7,9
  473:20,21,25 474:4,5
  474:6,9,10,10,14,20
  477:7,16,17,18,24
  478:4,19,22 480:14
  486:13 487:6,23
  493:17 494:2,5,7,13
  497:4,16 498:10,13
  498:14,17 499:7,15
  500:9,14 524:24
  539:6
rates 380:7 385:9,17
  386:3,25 388:14,14
  394:12,20 397:21
  399:10,12 405:21
  407:12,15,17,19,20
  407:22 409:14,15,19
  409:21,24,25 410:5,6
  410:13,19,20,24
  412:1,18,20 413:4,8
  413:13 414:6,6,10,11
```

414:17 416:3,11,11

417:23 418:15 419:1

	1	1	1	l
419:6 420:8,14 426:4	reasonable 420:11,12	456:10 463:4 465:1	referring 384:9 404:4	relying 462:4 470:13
431:6,21 432:20	435:14 448:11 449:10	469:13,19 472:23	430:6 433:23 435:12	remainder 397:5
437:3 438:12 440:19	454:24 455:17 477:21	476:2,6,17 479:6,11	453:5 482:23 505:20	437:11
442:19,20,22 444:12	499:20 500:3	480:6,8,9,21,23,25	506:8	remaining 383:12
446:9,14,25 448:25	reasonableness 451:4	481:24 488:5,11,11	refers 406:13,21	remember 375:10
449:16 450:4 451:18	451:15 455:7,16	488:15,19,21,23	408:18 432:7 437:11	477:23 548:6
451:22 452:3 453:9	498:19	489:5,24 491:2,8	508:24 523:24	removed 374:8
453:20 454:11 455:7	reasonably 446:8	497:23 498:21 499:14	refinement 440:22	renting 543:16
456:19 457:11 458:10	493:13	499:16,19 500:16	441:2	rents 543:14
464:25 465:4,7,14,21	reasoning 473:11	501:11,13 531:1,7,25	refinements 440:24	repay 430:11
470:16,18 471:6,14	reasons 389:3 396:12	545:19 547:21,22	reflect 417:24 485:7	repayment 430:2
475:22 477:13,19	420:10 426:9,20,21	records 384:8 531:2,4	486:7 500:3 532:24	replacement 401:7
478:24 480:3,8,16	434:1 446:7 449:1	531:10,12 532:13	reflected 531:19	422:18 477:1
484:18 485:6,9,9	477:20 516:12,13	544:18	reflective 453:10	replacing 379:12
486:13 487:12 491:9	526:4 527:9 532:23	recover 413:8 414:2	reflects 374:9 383:18	replenishment 448:6
491:11 493:19,20,24	533:5	417:4 418:4 449:5	402:14 531:15	report 371:5 385:23
493:25 494:17,23,25	rebuttal 502:7	477:11 485:9 493:21	refused 371:2 479:12	394:21 442:19 444:18
495:4,12 497:1,3,16	recall 407:3 415:18	493:24 497:2 500:8	regarding 393:7 525:12	445:1,6,12,21 446:13
497:22 498:9,12,16	470:16 473:8 480:12	500:10	regardless 431:22	452:23,25 454:6
498:19,24 499:1,10	539:16	recovered 399:11	477:24 484:20	458:7,9 459:16 460:2
499:20,22,24,24	recap 387:5	407:11,16 413:12	region 526:24	473:19 474:15 488:6
500:3,6,17,21 520:25	receive 429:13 434:9	416:3,21,22 426:4	regional 376:15,21	488:9 489:21,23
ratio 490:5,11	450:5 482:1	437:2 438:12 484:17	378:12,21 379:10,12	490:9 506:24 507:19
ratios 490:7,24 491:12	received 402:23	485:8 495:3,11	379:16,16 441:8	510:7,8,12 517:21
491:13,21 492:18,19	receives 406:12 428:24	recovering 494:7,9,14	450:1	Reported 367:18 369:8
493:5,6	442:25 481:4	recovers 408:8,10,15	regular 393:6 418:11	reporter 367:20 549:6
reach 425:2 428:9	receiving 471:17 533:9	409:4 414:5,21 415:1	520:25 531:7	Reporter's 367:13
430:2,5,6,7,8,11	recess 443:13	433:7,8 485:5 494:2,5	regulated 466:13,17,17	reports 445:2 446:2,3
448:22	Reclamation 371:17,18	495:21 496:16 497:5	466:18,22 467:6,9,25	represent 496:6
reached 425:1	509:24	recovery 409:6 417:17	regulatory 463:6 467:3	representation 391:22
reaches 430:14	recognition 425:13	445:17 448:2 467:21	495:22	representative 391:21
reaction 545:24	446:24	recycled 376:7,12	reiterated 449:14	representatives 467:1
read 405:23 459:24	recognize 429:10	377:23 378:5 379:10	reject 372:6,12,20	represented 508:6
460:16 461:18 462:8	465:22	380:24	relate 500:22	representing 392:4
471:9 491:18	recognized 468:23	recycling 445:17	related 403:20 405:15	represents 511:22
Readiness-to-Serve	472:1	446:19 448:2,5,17	405:16 476:7 489:8	request 382:20 391:18
409:3,7 413:6 419:23	recognizes 469:9	449:4	505:25 521:16 525:15	512:23
420:4 445:5 473:22	recognizing 385:2	red 407:4 462:15	relates 404:20 421:12	require 380:1 389:2
474:1,6,13 484:13	recommendation	redefined 414:15	relating 376:5 440:10	403:18
485:11 486:2,16	394:10,12 411:15	432:19	relation 404:16	required 392:25 393:18
487:11 495:14,16,21	456:1	redirect 545:8	relatively 440:16	401:20 402:19 430:3
496:3,23	recommendations	reduce 433:18 434:5	relaxed 546:23	436:16 437:17 444:10
readings 531:8	393:1,3	441:13,22 442:15	relevance 464:22	476:10
reads 457:2	recommended 466:12	445:17 527:17	471:16,22	requirement 390:11,13
reaffirmed 444:20	475:12 485:8	reduced 379:16 440:3	relevant 383:15 387:11	392:9 396:11 397:5
real 489:20 492:13,19	recommends 466:15	527:20	389:24 451:13 454:22	397:23 398:6,10,13
realistically 401:23	record 372:19 373:8,13	reducing 434:12 443:3	464:20 465:7 480:20	405:13 448:20 453:25
439:18,21	380:9 383:5,10,11,13	447:8	482:11 487:22 493:3	475:14 500:7
reality 390:3 458:6	383:15,17,23 384:3,6	reduction 444:17	495:1	requirements 385:7
487:19	384:25 385:3 386:1,5	refer 388:6 390:23	reliability 376:15	392:17,20,23,24
realize 450:3 462:19	386:8,9,14,15,16,17	463:7 466:11 505:12	378:13 379:12,16	393:8 395:23 396:3,8
really 401:15 402:9	388:6,19 391:8	reference 376:19	404:21 441:8 445:24	398:2,16 399:19
463:15 468:12 474:25	420:11 424:5 425:4	378:16 410:14 445:14	522:17,21 545:1	403:15
482:22 483:14,16	426:15 433:2 434:11	473:8 474:1 478:23	reliably 437:17	requires 392:22,23
489:13 546:22 547:1	434:16 435:13 439:8	481:20,23 483:10	relied 455:2 463:3	449:9 453:9
REALTIME 367:20	442:4 444:20 449:20	509:17 516:2 520:19	relief 444:23	resale 463:12 464:1
reason 395:2 424:17	450:23 451:1,3	references 386:24	relies 463:11,23 465:18	reserve 492:10
465:9 480:7 532:24	454:22 455:6,13	referred 505:17	rely 450:15	reserves 510:21 520:15

533:15	396:11,22 397:2,3,5	459:8,16,19 460:2,17	478:14 480:5 481:3,9	SDCWA 371:11,12,13
reservoir 504:14	397:16,22 398:1,5,9	460:19 461:11,17,25	481:12,20 482:1,4,10	371:14,15,19
515:10,18 519:4	398:11,12,13,16	462:6,12,23,25	483:8,10,19 487:14	seat 502:9
536:2	399:19 403:15 405:13	470:24 472:21,24	487:19,21 488:3,6,14	second 398:7 420:16
reservoirs 458:14	453:24 500:7	473:1,4,13,15,18	489:2,4,9,12,20,25	427:7 433:16 446:9
460:4 470:3 495:22	revenues 397:6 450:1	474:15,17,17,24	490:15,20 493:1	453:16 472:3
505:1 516:6,14	500:7	475:4,10,12	496:5,19 497:11	section 388:11 391:15
523:12 524:12,18	reverse 461:24	RMI's 458:10	498:1,9,24 499:4,5	391:20 392:2,18
535:23 536:7 537:1	reversed 459:25 462:4	role 390:2,5 394:1	502:6,7,8 503:5	393:5,14 412:19
residential 491:15	review 371:3 384:11	404:20,24 519:20	504:14 515:9 527:3,4	431:15 432:6 437:11
resolution 392:6	385:2,24 386:2	520:2,5,11 527:25	528:2,14,15,15,17,22	447:23 452:23,24
431:14,15 477:6,7	451:11,11,17,19,22	roll 486:5,5 487:16,16	529:2,5,8,12,17,20,22	454:6,13 458:8
478:3 479:1 498:12	452:3,24 454:20	496:21,22	530:2,4,12,15 532:9	463:23 474:8 477:2
resource 375:16 400:15	456:14 457:15 464:19	roll-on 496:8	533:9 538:24 541:4,8	477:10,15,20 478:4
401:10,16,22 402:11	488:11 498:20	rolling 485:12 486:13	541:22 542:1,5,10	478:19 479:2 499:21
407:8 409:18 421:11	reviewing 373:3 381:17	486:17 487:24,25	Santa 459:6	503:19 527:25 530:23
433:10 435:3 457:24	381:17 386:1 394:5	495:20 496:20,20	satisfy 475:13	530:25 531:1
resources 371:5 374:13	451:1,2,8 452:9	roughly 508:6 544:14	Saturdays 548:6	see 375:21 377:25
376:5 377:4 379:2,3	453:15 497:21	round 405:9	saw 408:10,16 411:2	378:15 380:11,16
389:1,1 390:10,10,11	reviews 476:17	routine 530:20	413:1,8,14,22 414:1	386:2,15 388:4
400:21 433:12,17	revision 486:12,13	RTS 474:1 499:25	414:21 415:4,5,7,10	392:21 394:17 396:2
434:21 435:22 436:4	RFC 452:2	rules 465:13,15 466:5	418:22 423:5 424:19	397:13 398:3 399:20
436:7 437:22 438:2	Rialto 526:16 527:13	ruling 375:8 499:18	430:7 432:18 433:7	399:23,23 400:7,15
440:21,25 441:3	527:22	run 536:18 545:22	437:4 443:1 453:12	400:18,19,22 401:2
442:15 444:12 459:23	right 377:14 382:3		456:13 460:3 488:15	401:11,14 404:3
460:21 505:10 515:15	383:2 388:4,24 389:6	S	525:3 544:11	406:5 407:14,17,21
535:7 537:19	389:9 395:18 400:17	S 368:11 372:2 444:2	saying 430:10 449:8,10	407:23 408:3,6,9,13
respect 389:8 428:8	401:24 407:14,15,21	sakes 548:15	459:9 461:5 462:7	408:20 409:1,9,13,14
457:23 486:10,25	408:13 412:8 418:4	sales 410:7,11 473:21	466:11,24 473:24	409:18 410:17 412:5
541:3	421:4 429:13 430:22	473:25 490:1,21	474:23,25 476:1	412:11 421:3 424:3,5
respond 483:7 501:15	442:7 450:16 462:14	544:9,13	says 376:10,11,14,16	432:6 434:22 438:4
501:19,25	462:23 468:25 478:2	saline 481:21 482:1	376:21 377:2,3,7,25	443:11 446:2,12,24
responding 426:16	480:2 483:13 485:18	salinity 523:21 526:9	378:3,9,12 379:11	451:3 452:9 458:3,10
449:17 481:9	491:22 492:22,23	sample 375:25 376:1	380:22 386:15 399:1	462:16 465:18 466:8
response 402:2 426:20	498:4 501:19 523:16	samples 530:19	399:3 402:4 403:23	467:2 468:2,25
481:12,13 502:6	534:8 535:17,23	sampling 513:12	414:16 422:7,20	469:15 470:10 476:17
responses 373:12,17,19 464:16	536:2,10 537:12,24	San 367:2,6,24 368:4 368:10,18 372:23	428:2 431:16 437:24 440:8 456:16 458:3	481:23 488:23 491:2 491:24 493:4 502:12
responsibilities 503:22	538:7,11,13,17,20 539:2,11 540:19	373:6 375:9 378:21	463:24 464:4 467:9	518:25 533:1,4 546:9
504:3,18 525:16,18	542:7 543:6,16,20	382:22 386:5,6	469:16,20 472:24	546:15
responsibility 517:11	544:1,10,19 546:25	389:24 399:1 418:7	473:19 476:20,21	seeing 548:18
536:15	right-hand 409:10	418:13 420:23 421:1	544:22	seeking 376:10 379:8
responsible 503:23,25	536:1	426:16,17 427:2,23	SB60 447:20 449:3,8	seeks 375:15
rest 373:2 382:14,15	rightfully 547:20	428:1,17,24 434:13	scale 425:3 465:24	seen 374:7,24 427:6
result 385:18 410:21	rights 428:14 432:11	434:17 437:24 438:15	schedule 398:3 399:18	462:3 474:8 493:22
435:19 439:5 450:17	478:8 501:1,2	439:11 440:11 441:19	403:14 405:22 408:14	500:5 518:10
492:12,13 527:18	ripe 510:1	442:16 444:10 446:21	409:12,17,23,25	selected 380:22
533:21	River 399:21,25 406:23	449:18 455:2,4,10,25	410:1 413:9,12,23	selecting 468:12,15
results 452:24	407:5 408:1 413:10	456:9,11,12,16 457:4	433:7 486:21 495:15	selection 468:17
retail 389:4,5,10	413:19 414:24 427:4	457:18 458:1,2,6	535:7	self-evident 487:22
390:14,14 440:1,8	427:10 458:25 460:11	459:8,16,18,20,24	scheduled 416:24	sell 410:4
491:10	474:21 475:2 495:24	460:16 461:24 463:3	schedules 410:9 421:10	sellers 505:16,20 507:7
retain 531:10	504:25 523:1,10,11	463:10,20,23 464:2	schematic 528:12	509:1
retained 457:21	523:16 530:9 537:5	464:13 465:11,17	screen 384:14 412:11	selling 484:18
return 422:8,16,21	539:19 540:14 542:16	467:4 469:13,16,20	463:22 465:16 491:20	Semi 512:18
423:14 468:3	Riverside 519:6 527:5	470:6,13,24 472:19	528:23 535:22 536:1	Senate 447:20
revenue 392:20,23	RMI 457:20,21,23,24	472:24 473:4,7,11,14	scroll 400:3	send 433:20 537:12
393:8 395:23 396:3,8	458:1,3,7,8,12,17,20	474:4,23 476:6,9	SCULLY 368:16	sending 532:9

sends 529:11,16 530:4 530:11 sense 380:7,8 468:22 500:18 547:18 sensitive 439:10,14 440:1,7 sensitivity 439:17,18 439:24 443:6 sent 402:21 428:17 sentence 453:8 460:25 544:22 separate 379:9 392:11 394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15 444:18 445:3 446:13
500:18 547:18 sensitive 439:10,14 440:1,7 sensitivity 439:17,18 439:24 443:6 sent 402:21 428:17 sentence 453:8 460:25 544:22 separate 379:9 392:11 394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
440:1,7 sensitivity 439:17,18 439:24 443:6 sent 402:21 428:17 sentence 453:8 460:25 544:22 separate 379:9 392:11 394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
sensitivity 439:17,18 439:24 443:6 sent 402:21 428:17 sentence 453:8 460:25 544:22 separate 379:9 392:11 394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
sent 402:21 428:17 sentence 453:8 460:25 544:22 separate 379:9 392:11 394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
separate 379:9 392:11 394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
394:21 410:18 418:17 457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
457:10 separated 431:7 460:13 separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
separately 410:16 457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
457:8 538:24 separation 421:5 series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
series 410:23 seriously 490:25 serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
serve 388:24 389:6,7 448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
448:19 455:24 519:9 served 493:15 522:24 523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
523:1 serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
serves 448:15 service 376:13 378:6 384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
384:17 385:11,18 387:2,24 388:25 389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
389:8,13,15,16,19,22 390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
390:6 392:21,22 394:1,14,21 395:2,5 395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
395:11,22,25 396:2 397:12 398:17 399:6 399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
399:9,14,18,19 400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
400:21 403:10,15,22 405:24 406:1,2,4,8,24 409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
409:21 410:21,22 411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
411:16,20 413:1 414:9,13,14,17 415:3 415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
415:14,17,23 416:4,6 416:8,10,16 417:1,3,7 418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
418:1,11 419:8,10 421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
421:10 423:6 426:6 427:6 429:2,16 431:4 431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
431:7 432:13,16,23 433:8,14,18,24 437:4 442:20,23 444:13,15
442:20,23 444:13,15
117.6 110.15 150.0
447:6 449:15 450:8 450:15 452:7,8,18
453:3,10,13,14,18 454:9 456:15 457:20
458:2 459:20 461:10 464:10 467:21 470:19
472:2 474:9,14 475:1
480:10 484:6,8,24 485:3 486:8,20
487:10,10 491:10

1
493:16,20 494:11,15
495:2,16 496:7 497:5
499:22 500:13 504:16
507:12 509:11,15 510:15 511:22,24
512:15 513:5 515:17
515:20 520:25
services 367:23 388:20 389:2 396:25 397:2,7
429:13 450:6 472:22
500:4,11
serving 426:3
session 372:1 393:24
444:1
set 385:9 394:12,20
453:21 454:11 477:13
478:19,22,24 487:6 498:13
498:13 sets 429:18 480:7
setting 383:21 384:14
384:16,19,21 385:7
387:2 388:9,15 394:2
394:15.17.19 395:8
394:15,17,19 395:8 395:13 396:10 397:14
411:13 444:21 445:3
445:9 446:4 452:9
467:16 468:6,23
469:3,10 478:22
493:17
Settlement 371:10
severe 510:20
severing 404:22 severity 521:8
severs 524:3
shaded 511:20
shallow 518:9 519:22
525:6
share 415:10 450:18
shareholders 468:3
Shasta 509:17
sheet 531:22
shift 454:25
shore 510:23 512:11 520:17
short 376:25 467:3
479:20 501:14 502:10
short-term 505:13
shortage 505:15 510:20
510:21 517:7,22,23
518:6,7,9,11 519:1,21
519:22 520:8,15
521:8 525:7,7 533:3
shortfall 512:11
shorthand 416:2 451:6
549:6,8
show 384:20 399:17
413:12 431:3 441:24

485:1 488:7 489:11

```
495:10 498:8 511:17
  511:21 541:21,25
  547:21
showed 488:18 501:1,5
showing 384:18 421:12
  425:18 442:19 461:19
  511:18
shown 395:1 432:8
  439:7 478:5 495:14
  535:18
shows 403:15 405:25
  489:18 518:5 532:4
shutdown 504:1
shuts 524:4
sic 478:20
side 406:1 418:18,20
  438:5,22 440:16
  445:13 486:25
sides 488:18 547:19
sideshow 372:21
sign 382:25
signature 513:21
  514:10
signed 382:22
significant 389:3,12
  396:11 397:8 423:21
  428:3 450:21,24
  456:13 493:9 506:20
significantly 489:3
  533:2
Silverwood 526:18
  536.8
similar 380:14 384:18
  405:10 457:18 520:4
  520:6
similarly 460:12
simple 468:16
simply 376:14,21
  384:25 420:6 423:22
  426:5 440:3 468:6
  470:18 471:16 483:7
  499:7
single 415:15,15 416:5
  486:16,19 493:16
  521:22
sir 502:15 545:9 546:7
  547:9
sit 381:15 528:24
sitting 412:11
situated 390:1,4
situation 377:12 428:12
  465:8 479:8,12
six 395:5 411:20
sixth 524:20
sizable 424:13
size 404:24 435:14
  469:7
sized 419:12,15
```

```
sizes 465:24
sizing 526:2
Skinner 371:6 524:14
  528:19,19 529:4,12
  529:15 530:15,20
  531:12,25 532:4,13
  533:1,21 539:19,23
  540:1,4 541:24 542:3
  542.17
slide 374:7 408:11
  432:21 479:14 494:19
  495:13 498:7 512:1
  515:7 516:2 532:3
  535:18
slides 409:16 493:22
  501:17
slightly 401:9
small 412:9 440:16
  546:18
smaller 492:25
smoke 546:2
SoCal 466:19
sold 544:3,7
solely 450:22
somebody 479:12
somebody's 402:18
sorry 381:7 454:13
  456:23 528:4 541:23
sort 377:25 378:11,19
  526:1 540:4.25 541:9
  542:9 546:21
sound 448:4
sounds 398:19 543:20
source 399:20 400:12
  400:16 406:24 409:20
  456:19,24 457:1
  460:2,13,22 491:6
  513:17 514:2
sources 406:8 429:15
  458:22 459:3,14
  460:9 462:13 481:18
  481:25 494:18 530:5
  530:7 536:22 540:22
south 423:19 504:12
southerly 515:20
southern 367:9 368:13
  401:20,21 404:23
  408:12 413:24 415:12
  415:22 416:15 424:14
  459:6 494:6 509:15
southward 509:14
space 433:12 543:14,19
  543:23
Spadra 379:14
span 435:17
spanning 383:19
speak 386:19 465:20
speaking 478:15
                         starts 396:10 515:23
```

513:22 529:14,25 speaks 468:11 **species** 523:8,9 **specific** 391:12 417:21 418:8 434:20 435:21 438:3 439:1,25 441:18 480:15 508:19 516:15 541:21,25 specifically 379:23 423:16 437:21 438:8 438:21 439:1,8,14 440:10 448:25 453:21 459:21 494:23 501:7 506:4 524:8,12 specificity 434:25 speculation 542:21 spell 502:24 spend 372:15 385:10 393:25 396:18 spending 372:11 377:13,14 spent 396:20 **spinning** 474:23 spread 449:11 491:3 492:4,18 523:14 spreading 514:24 spreads 491:21,23,24 492:2,7 493:4,5 spring 386:6 469:14 Ss 549:1 St 367:24 stack 411:20 staff 402:14 411:2,8,14 426:11,15 449:14 498:25 stage 398:23 405:12 **stamp** 431:20 477:18 499:24 stand 385:1 482:15 502:8,17 standard 451:2 502:21 standards 376:17 465:12 499:21 standby 403:8,13,17,21 404:17,17,24 405:2,3 405:5,17 409:4 419:21,22 420:5 426:25 484:10,12 486:22 496:6 **standing** 409:5 496:7 548:9,10 standpoint 467:23 start 376:24 396:16 439:22 500:20 545:16 started 425:8 starting 388:15 397:14 425:5 504:9

state 374:10 385:20
387:9 396:15 398:3,7
398:21,23 399:3,7,21
399:25 400:11,13,22
400:22,23 401:1,15 402:19 405:3 406:22
407:4,25 412:22
413:10,18 414:23
415:5,16 416:2,13
417:15,25 418:6,14 419:14,17,18 420:13
419:14,17,18 420:13 420:16 421:7,15,19
420:10 421.7,13,19 422:8,16,21 423:14
423:23 424:18,22
425:9,21 426:1,18,23
427:2,3,5,9,16 428:14
428:22,25 429:4,6
430:8 431:9 432:5,11 432:14,22 433:1
437:18 452:25 458:3
458:24 459:9,22
460:17,19,23 461:5
461:13 462:6,13,19
463:1,17 468:17 469:21 470:2,9
471:18 472:18,24
473:3 474:18,21,24
475:1 478:8,13
481:16 495:2,23
501:1,7 502:24 504:4 504:8,25 505:3,9,11
505:21,23 506:3,7,19
508:2,16,23,25 510:2
510:14 511:10,19
510:14 511:10,19 512:12 513:6,23 515:22 516:8,19
515:22 516:8,19 518:7 520:12 521:11
522:24 524:4,17
526:18,19 530:8
532:5,9,22,25 533:3,9
533:19 534:22,25
535:4,10,12,22 536:5
535:4,10,12,22 536:5 536:6,11,25 537:3,6,8 537:9,15,15 538:10
538:14,18,20 539:18
540:15,17 542:15
549:1
state's 423:12
stated 425:10 459:21 474:20
statement 385:25 454:7
454:9 468:22 472:21
states 429:12,23 448:3
458:7 477:7,10,15 stating 447:24 461:6
465:2 473:9,10
statistically 492:4
statute 383:10 386:21

```
388:11 391:14 447:4
  447:21 448:20,24
  476:11,19 478:11
  501:4,9
statutes 384:3 451:7
statutory 449:11,13
stays 487:7 516:1
steadily 544:9
step 387:24 395:22
  397:22 398:17 399:6
  399:15 403:3,10
  405:19 410:10 419:10
  427:7 472:3 484:8
steps 385:8 395:21
  399:9 472:2 484:25
  533:20
STEVEN 368:22
Stewardship 375:17
  385:21 387:10 408:7
  414:1,4,18 433:3,6,25
  434:2,6,8,12 440:20
  442:24 443:2 444:7
  444:14,22 445:15
  446:8,15 447:14
  448:13,22 449:1,9,12
  449:21 474:10 494:7
  497:4
stipulation 375:24
  381:22 382:6 511:2
  534:2
stop 397:23 426:8
  446:23,23
storage 371:3 400:4
  405:2 406:10 407:11
  407:20 408:3,16,18
  413:11 414:25 436:16
  437:18 438:7 445:20
  448:6,17 453:11
  483:22,23 485:3
  493:25 494:20,21
  495:22 504:1,5
  506:20,21 510:21
  511:14,18 512:1,4,6,9
  512:17,18,21 513:1,9
  513:17 514:3,15
  515:2,9,17,21 516:3,4
  516:10,23,24 517:6
  517:12,15,19,23
  518:5,11,23 519:7,8
  519:14,15,16,23,25
  520:4,10,15 521:13
  521:13,18,25 522:7,8
  522:11,19,20 523:5
  523:13,18,19,22,24
  524:1,2,6,10,13,24,24
  525:3,4,8,23,24,24
  526:9,24 533:14,14
```

533:15 543:6,9,12,14

```
543:15,19,19,19,23
  544:1
storages 522:9 524:25
store 512:6 514:23
  515:11.13 521:21
stored 512:24
stores 504:15 511:9
storing 391:2 515:24
strategic 387:15,17
  390:23 544:24
strategies 526:8
strategy 511:15
streaming 411:6
Street 368:3,13,17
strengthen 376:14
  378:12 489:4
strike 542:7
strong 465:12 466:4
structure 387:22 413:3
  414:16 419:2 424:10
  452:4,18 454:7,8,15
  456:5 457:23 468:15
  468:19 480:15 487:23
  497:17 498:10,17
  499:7,12
structures 424:7,13
  468:12,18 480:14
studies 395:5 411:16,20
  426:7 427:7 453:13
  470:24 486:20 487:10
  487:10 493:16 494:11
  495:2
study 384:17 386:10
  395:25 396:2 403:22
  405:24 410:23 423:6
  433:8 442:20,23
  457:20 458:3 459:20
  461:18 462:1,11,12
  469:15,21 470:4,7,11
  470:14,14 471:2,8,24
  472:1 473:14 484:6,8
  484:24 491:25 495:16
  542:18
stuff 547:5
subagencies 389:9
subdivision 422:11
subject 372:24 373:3
  375:23 377:25 382:13
  382:14 471:23 474:3
  479:14,16 511:2,8
  534:2
submission 373:1
submit 374:5,5 448:11
  454:20 459:7
submitted 411:23 488:6
  488:14 489:23
subsection 393:9
```

```
subsidies 377:1
subsidize 484:4
subsidy 434:9 447:13
  449:22 450:10
substantial 428:25
  442:1 451:3,9,14
  454:23 497:23 498:21
subtracting 474:21
sufficient 422:8,20
  425:25
suggest 417:10 462:2
suggesting 461:12
suggestion 456:1 469:1
Suite 369:2
summarize 409:16
  473:24
summarized 388:5
summary 374:19 375:1
  375:1,18 378:2,3
  380:13 409:25 495:4
  544:22
summer 487:3,5 496:14
  496:24
Sundays 548:7
SUPERIOR 367:1
supplement 515:25
  519:23
supplemental 388:22
  389:18,23 390:3,5,7
  436:13 509:2
supplied 404:16 427:19
supplier 428:5,8
suppliers 458:16 460:6
supplies 377:8 388:23
  436:13,18 445:18,24
  510:23,24 512:11,12
  515:1,11,25 516:21
  519:24 522:25 523:2
  523:12 541:15 544:25
supply 376:15,21
  377:18,20 378:11,13
  378:17,17 379:12,13
  379:16,20,21,23
  380:1,2,6 381:1 387:7
  387:8 390:17 399:2,4
  399:10,20 400:12,17
  401:4,25 402:7 406:5
  406:8,24 407:17,19
  407:20 410:5,13,13
  410:14,18,19 413:4,8
  413:9,12 414:10
  415:6 416:10 418:17
  418:18,21,23,25
  421:1,16 423:22
  424:16 425:8,12,22
  426:25 428:13 430:22
  431:7 436:8 438:7
  439:2 441:8 443:7
```

```
447:14,16,17 448:15
  449:3 453:11 456:20
  456:21,23,24 457:1,7
  457:12 458:4,12,13
  458:23 459:2,3,10,14
  459:15,23 460:3,9,14
  460:22 461:6 462:13
  462:21 463:13.18
  469:22,25 470:1,4,12
  470:16,17 471:5,13
  472:11,25 474:18,22
  474:25 475:2 484:17
  485:9 493:24 494:24
  495:3 497:2 504:25
  508:23 509:3,18
  513:24 520:17 524:22
  525:1 526:22 527:17
  532:24 533:7,19
  536:11 545:1
supplying 527:15
support 428:21 429:5
  450:1,16 455:10
  477:3 489:18,22
supported 380:9
  394:13 420:10 459:20
supporting 411:9 449:5
  459:16
supportive 497:15
supports 451:4,14
  456:17 459:16
suppose 537:18 541:7
supposed 389:15
supposedly 402:6
surcharge 409:8,11
 410:15 414:19 474:11
  494:8
surcharges 391:6
sure 373:8 380:2
  386:22 443:10 461:10
  467:8 479:21 486:15
  494:13 495:6 538:15
  539:1
surplus 512:7 517:3,7,9
  517:15,17,22 518:17
  520:13 524:8
sustainable 448:4
switch 535:11
sworn 502:21
SWP 400:17 426:25
  428:18 515:8,21
sympathetic 547:18
system 371:8 376:7
  377:23 388:21,22
  404:9,21 405:4,12
  406:14 407:22 408:4
  408:6,9,14,24 409:5
  413:14,22,25 414:18
```

414:21,24 415:4,13

429:22 430:1

416:12,25 417:6,10 417:13,19,24 418:10 419:5,11 420:3,6,17 420:18 432:10,11 433:20 436:15.19.21 436:23,24,25 437:2,3 437:6,12,13 438:10 438:11,12 439:3,9 440:5,11 441:14 443:3 444:17 445:8 446:1,6,19,23 447:3,6 447:8,11,16 448:14 449:2,6,12 450:12,13 450:19 463:5,10 464:6,7 466:11,12 469:25 470:1,3 474:10 477:12,17,22 478:8,9 484:3,14 486:7 487:16 494:2,5 496:9,17,21,22 503:24,25 504:1,19 504:22,23 522:17,21 522:22,24 525:13,23 526:2,10,12,17,18 527:1,25 528:11 533:20 535:13 536:19 537:1 538:14 541:13 541:16 systems 405:6 483:9

488:4

T

table 507:18 take 375:9 398:23 401:23 412:2 432:21 438:18 456:8 480:16 482:3 493:23 494:11 498:1 509:24 515:2 518:10 519:2,23 520:7,9 522:14,15 524:23 527:22 530:19 530:20 536:5,16 547:3,15 take-or-pay 422:25 taken 393:17,23 405:13 443:13 462:21 512:10 513:12 522:12 takes 394:11 417:14,20 428:1 513:1 536:9.10 talk 381:4 385:4,19 387:18 395:24 416:1 420:21 428:23 429:1 434:15 462:13,15 465:11,20 466:16 482:12,20 487:21 495:13 508:18 511:9 546:2 talked 375:12 418:16

387:12 403:9 423:9 437:25 468:13 483:1 483:16 492:7 507:4 talks 465:11 482:10 tax 486:12 taxes 396:17,21 397:4 technical 399:14 technically 412:23 499:9 Tehachapi 423:20 tell 528:13 545:23 tells 379:19 ten 385:4 390:21 412:5 479:22 501:15,25 502:13 525:6 548:2 ten-year 390:16 485:12 486:12,13,17,24 495:20 496:8 tend 465:19,25 489:1,3 492:16 tended 488:7 490:7 tendency 455:25 tends 487:21 489:22 term 404:10 408:17 430:6 458:23 465:19 466:5 500:18 543:17 terminal 470:3 516:5 516:14 535:23 536:2 536:7 537:1 termination 376:23 terminology 484:20 terms 372:21 388:9 400:10 402:24 403:18 421:15 432:17,20 436:3 465:12,21,21 466:4 476:25 480:12 483:21 492:11 493:10 504:7,21 508:22 509:18 527:11 530:17 541:9 terrible 405:6 409:6 testified 483:5 502:22 519:17 520:1 539:15 testimony 498:23 542:4 textbook 456:18 464:4 thank 374:3 381:14 382:16,18 400:1 412:6,16 443:12 444:5 479:25 502:18 503:2 534:15 545:9 545:10 **Thanks** 383:7 thing 380:16 381:15 383:3 410:8 412:9 418:2 419:13 427:13

431:5 482:14,16

talking 375:21 384:11

500:25 517:21

438:24 445:22 451:10 457:18 478:17 547:7 things 373:1,3,7,8 393:23 400:24 409:17 410:2.12 414:4 417:20 427:8 439:5 439:19 467:17 472:17 480:22 492:17 501:17 533:6 536:24 think 372:6,7,11,19 377:21 378:19 384:23 385:15 396:13.15 407:16 412:24 416:1 423:8 425:21 428:12 432:24 437:9 456:7 457:2,24 458:19 466:6 467:24 470:13 472:7 482:5,11,22 483:3 485:14,24 487:1 488:2,12 489:19 491:22 492:24 493:1,11 497:18,20 498:17 499:10,19 500:16 502:5 542:2 543:22 545:20 547:20 **thinking** 471:4 548:6 third 404:17 420:17 433:20 447:12 454:5 **Thomas** 368:11 451:20 451:20 thorough 485:7 thought 479:19 482:17 thousand 435:22 three 368:9,21 379:2,4 379:9 380:18 381:4 385:19 394:24 399:9 401:3 403:3,10 407:21 411:18 416:11 419:10 433:9,23 434:1 441:1 446:7 484:8 487:4,8 490:13 496:25 499:1,5 529:3 540:19 543:25 544:3 544:5,7 545:25 546:12,17 547:2,16 throw 418:10 Thursday 367:14 ticket 416:5 tied 439:6 tier 410:13,14 485:15 485:15,23 486:1,1 493:23,23,25 time 372:11,15 379:1 385:10 387:11 389:21 389:21 391:9 393:13 393:25 412:2 439:16 440:2 443:9 446:1,18 472:13 475:20 479:20

482:21 487:22 490:8 492:25 496:10 498:9 506:10,15 511:2 524:5 530:10 531:5 532:15 533:25 545:16 545:21,22 546:8 547:4 timeframe 432:17 480:12 507:1 timeline 388:8 times 384:22 401:3 419:12,15 476:8 484:11 490:14 497:14 498:8 510:20 512:7 524:7 526:11 542:16 timing 424:17 tiny 462:12,20 490:22 title 374:9 380:23 421:2 421:4 titled 371:9 420:25 today 387:3 391:17 434:15 453:13 471:12 545:11 **tomorrow** 545:14 546:3 547:25 548:18 tool 510:17 521:14 top 380:18 406:6 407:14 462:12 topic 450:21 480:1,2 483:18 topics 385:4 516:22 525:11 **Toro** 378:7 **Toro's** 378:6 **TORRANCE** 368:20 total 392:5 395:4 396:7 397:5,23 398:10 405:13 407:12 436:13 438:18 486:22 513:23 522:8 totaled 439:12 **touched** 447:19 tough 548:11,12 track 502:6 tracking 380:17 tracks 531:23 traditional 454:2 transaction 418:8 509:5,19 transactions 431:4 447:10 450:7 505:13 505:17 506:25 transcribed 549:9 transcript 367:13 549:11 transfer 427:21 447:10 476:22 509:24 520:17 537:22

transferred 481:22 transfers 446:20,23 447:2 505:11 506:3,4 506:12,17 507:4,14 507:21 508:19.23 510:8,11,16 520:11 transmission 457:9 458:18.20.21 459:1 459:11 460:7,22 461:2,3 462:15 transmission-related 461:1.13 transmitted 507:11 transmitting 451:21 transport 415:22 429:14 450:12 505:4 transportation 377:19 378:18 380:7 385:20 387:8,9 398:22 399:5 399:12 400:20 401:6 401:8,19 402:1,10 406:22 407:22 408:1 410:6 412:20 413:4 413:19 414:10,11,13 414:23 415:16 416:2 416:3,7,11 417:23 418:14,15,17,19,19 419:3,6 420:1,13,14 421:17 422:4,9,14 423:23 424:12.21.23 425:5,13,13,22,24 426:3,4,10 429:8,14 429:20 430:17 431:8 431:10 432:6 433:4 434:3,5,7,13 437:3 438:12 444:7,23 446:9,10 447:15,15 450:7 456:21 458:5 461:7 462:8,22,24 463:2,19 470:10,16 470:18 471:6,13 472:12,18 481:16 482:20,22 484:18 497:3 504:5 506:7 transported 413:16 431:3,23 485:3 510:14 transporting 417:12 428:2 traveled 509:13,14 travels 507:9 treat 456:2 463:17 treated 414:19 426:18 474:11 529:4 530:10 536:17 **treating** 406:12 536:15 treatment 371:7 400:4 406:10 409:8,9,10

413:4 414:19 436:21
436:22 437:6 441:13
441:22 453:12 474:11
485:4 494:8,9 497:3
526:22 527:18,20 528:19,21 529:2,4,15
530:15,20 532:5 539:20,23 540:1,7,9
539:20,23 540:1,7,9 541:24 542:3,17
541:24 542:5,17 trees 422:4
tremendous 427:25
trial 367:7 373:14
381:21,24 382:20 384:7 455:5 459:25
461:24 476:12
trials 548:7
true 390:18 419:14 420:1 470:11 484:7
490:16 493:8 496:4,5
499:4,9 541:3 549:10
truth 390:8 try 396:19
trying 435:21 446:22
493:2 521:14 523:21
tune 377:9 turn 382:17 386:4
387:1 391:12 393:4
403:3 410:6 418:12
429:6 433:1 436:4
446:9 447:12 450:20
453:16 454:5,13 455:2 458:8 464:17
468:9 469:12 472:15
477:6 483:18 487:14
508:21 509:16 511:8 511:11,16 517:25
521:24 523:3,23
531:18 535:12
turned 491:6 turning 424:24 518:2
turns 548:8
twice 384:19 401:9
415:7 two 380:18 383:19
384:8 395:15,16,17
399:15 410:14 411:19
411:21 412:19 420:8
436:12,17 438:14 440:6,9 456:5 460:25
461:12 470:14 472:2
481:25 489:9 490:13
516:5,14 527:17 529:10 540:17 544:14
544:15 545:20,25
546:12,13,19 547:14
547:15 548:7
two-year 496:16 type 380:14,23 417:21
JPC 500.11,25 717.21

```
418:2 467:5,6 468:4,6
 469:9 491:3 518:24
types 403:11 433:9
 435:19 436:8 438:6
 438:22,25 439:1
 457:24 468:18
typical 411:23 428:11
typically 505:13,18
 513:3 522:25 526:3
```

U **ultimate** 380:17 409:18 ultimately 421:22 475:4 497:21 498:20 unable 412:11 unbundled 387:22 414:15 432:20 442:19 442:22 487:23 497:16 **unbundling** 387:12,14 391:9 395:10 431:5 431:10 440:19,24 444:12 446:14,25 449:16 452:5 454:12 457:22 470:20,25 471:3 480:13 493:12 498:10,16 undermine 386:24 455:7 480:3 489:2 underscore 435:13 488:10 489:5 understand 377:12 495:6 546:12

understanding 412:25 understood 413:15 unduly 547:11 unfair 434:9 uniform 414:6 463:5 466:12 477:15,18 499:22,25 uniformity 499:24 unimpressive 490:9 **unions** 548:3 **unique** 469:7 unit 522:10 unlawful 476:4 untreated 406:11 527:4

529:9,16 530:11 unused 447:5 450:16 476:23 479:2 unusual 404:25 428:6

upcoming 397:19 398:6 upper 535:21

upstream 513:13 514:12

urgency 547:18 usage 420:5 488:24 493:7,14 495:19

496:2,18,24

use 374:10 403:6,7 404:12 420:16 427:16 427:17 428:5,9,14 429:8,19 430:3,19,23 430:24 431:2 465:19 466:5 476:22 477:11 477:21 484:10,10,10 484:12.14 490:3.5 496:12 500:23 501:1 501:3 504:4 505:3 510:21 515:21,22 516:20,24 517:2 521:11 522:19 524:2 524:10,24,25 526:7 526:21,23 531:21 542:13,15 545:11 useful 374:20 407:17 409:12 497:21 users 434:9 446:19 447:16 448:14 449:2 449:12 465:6 uses 404:11 466:3 489:21 500:6 512:8 519:7 usually 530:12 utilities 466:13,14,19 466:22,22,23 467:9 467:11,25 468:2 utility 404:25 463:6 464:6 466:15,17,18 467:4,7 468:16,19,21

utilized 417:1 518:5,5

utilize 515:4

vague 382:2 Vaguely 539:7 Valley 368:21 512:6,9 512:19 514:17 518:8 519:3,3,4,7,9,13,16 519:23 520:4,10,10 521:12 522:12 523:15 524:14 542:14,16 Valleys 379:4 value 392:1 486:7 496:7.9 valued 468:20 VAN 368:3 variable 403:17 404:12 405:9 408:10,11 415:11,19,20 416:16 418:7,11 423:7,14,19 424:11 430:25 439:19 467:15,21 variation 439:21 493:1 493:9

various 384:22 393:2 398:15 406:3 417:14 417:24 426:24 455:21 465:5 475:18 480:18 481:18 483:21 484:24 493:20 512:11 522:9 vary 404:14 493:10 532:22 varying 389:19 518:6 version 374:4,6,24 versions 374:15 versus 467:15 472:10 472:11 540:15 vests 388:13 video 411:6 **VIDEOGRAPHY** 367:23 view 377:11 426:2 442:5,8,8 455:1,20,21 456:6 457:14 484:18 490:18 522:14 546:9 546:10 views 372:9,13 **vigorous** 497:13 violating 465:14 visual 431:1 462:25 vocal 497:13 voice 541:19 volatile 524:22 **volume** 367:8 370:2 404:16 417:12 485:16 **volumetric** 413:4 414:6 431:21 477:19 484:17 485:6,9 487:12 494:13 495:12 497:1 **voluminous** 374:17,18 374:19 voluntary 390:16,25 391:3,10 500:18 Von 369:2 vote 388:1 391:23,24 392:8 411:12 431:25 497:10 498:13 499:6 voted 387:21 464:25 480:14 498:2,9,11,16 498:24 499:4,10,11 votes 391:25 392:4,5,8 432:1,2 497:15 vs 367:8

W W 368:5 W-S-D-M 518:12 wait 525:3

493:14 494:15 495:18 waiting 525:8 496:12,14 521:22 walk 422:3 435:10 varies 532:23 444:24 451:16,23 variety 457:22 514:22 452:22 510:6 547:21 walked 453:23 484:6 **walking** 484:23 WALTON-HADLO... 368:7 want 372:14 378:3,25 385:10 386:16,19,20 390:17 403:19 414:12 419:25 429:1 433:1 434:9 444:24 449:7 450:12 451:23,23 455:8,11 462:11 464:17,21 467:25 476:7,16,17 479:17 481:5 487:14 489:4 494:20,21,22 498:7 498:22 510:6 536:16 545:11 547:14 wanted 375:20 381:4 381:15 382:4,7 391:7 399:13 415:2 416:4 417:5 422:3 445:11 465:16 466:3 482:9 483:18 491:19 495:13 wants 384:10 war 426:17

Warren 368:6 373:5 wasn't 387:7 471:17,20 490.13watch 411:7 water 367:6,9 368:8,13 368:21 369:1 371:5,8 374:10,13 375:17 376:6,7,12,15,20 377:8,13,15,15,16,23 378:5,7,13 379:4,10 379:12,13,17 380:24 385:20,21 387:9,10 388:14 389:5,5,18 390:9,12,14,14,17,19 391:2 393:2,8,10 397:20 398:3,7,21,24 399:2,4,7,21 400:1,11 400:13,14,15,21,22 400:22,23 401:2,4,4,4 401:10,15,15,20,21 402:4,7,11,23,24 404:14,16,19,25 405:3,8 406:7,11,16 406:22,23,25 407:4 407:11,25 408:6,12 408:24 410:3,7 412:22 413:10,10,16 413:18,21,24 414:1,4 414:9,9,18,19,23,25

487:21 488:3 489:1

variations 484:1

414:25 415:5,6,6,12
415:16,22 416:2,10
416:14,19 417:2,12
417:15,16,16,17
418:1,6,6,14,18,22
419:14,17,18 420:13
120:16 22 121:1 7 8
420:16,22 421:1,7,8 421:11,15,19 422:10
421:11,15,19 422:10
422:23 423:1,1,15,20
423:23 424:8,13,18
425:8,9,10,16,22
426:1,18,23 427:3,5,9
427:16,17,17,18,19
427:20,20,21,22,23
427:23,25,25 428:2,5
428:8,10,13,14,17,22
428.8,10,13,14,17,22
428:22,24,25 429:3,4
429:6,14,20 430:1,4,8
430:13,20,21,23
431:3,9,22 432:5,9,11
432:14,22 433:1,3,5
433:25 434:2,6,8,12
435.23 436.4 7 12 13
435:23 436:4,7,12,13 436:14,18 437:1,18
430.14,18 43 / .1,18
437:21 438:2,10
440:19 441:8 442:1
442:16,24 443:2
444:6,14,22 445:15
445:17,18,24,25
446:8,15,20,23 447:2
447:8,10,14 448:1,5
449.12.22.440.1.2.6.0
448:13,22 449:1,3,6,9 449:12,21,23 450:13
449:12,21,23 450:13
450:15,17 452:10
453:19 454:3 456:19
456:20 457:1,6 458:3
458:4,5,13,15,16,22
458:24 459:9,14,22
459:23 460:5,5,8,17
460:19,21,23 461:5
461.14.462.6.14.10
461:14 462:6,14,19
462:20 463:1,12,17
463:21,24,25 464:15
465:4,7,21 466:15
467:16,22 468:1
469:7,9,15,17,21,22
470:2,8,9,19 471:17
471:18 472:18,22,24
473:3 474:10,11,18
474:21,24 475:1
476:22 477:2,20
478:7,8,13 481:1,3,15
481:16,18,19,19,21
481:22,24,25 482:1,2
482:16,21,23 483:9
484:19 485:2,2,25
486:3 488:25 490:1,2
400.2 11 21 402.7 10
490:3,11,21 493:7,10

```
493:14,21,24 494:6,7
 495:19,23 496:2,12
 497:3 500:24 501:1,7
 503:11 504:4,8,13,15
 504:24,25,25 505:2,3
 505:4,6,8,9,9,11,11
 505:14,24 506:3,7,12
 506:19 507:4,6,13,14
 507:20,21 508:1,2,2,9
 508:23,25 509:3,4,7
 509:10,12,22,24
 510:1,2,12,14,17,22
 510:23 511:9,10
 512:5,6,7,11,12,13,18
 512:20,22,24 513:1,4
 513:6,9,12,17,21,24
 513:25,25 514:2,5,6
 514:11,14,18,20,24
 515:2,3,4,5,14,15,16
 515:22 516:8,14,16
 516:17,19,19,20
 517:3,8,15,15,17
 518:7,8,17 519:23
 520:9,11,12,13,24
 521:9,11,12,13,21
 522:25 523:10,16,17
 523:20,21,22 524:4,7
 524:17 525:1,4,19,21
 525:23,24 526:5,19
 526:19,22 527:4,4,9
 527:15,17 528:1,13
 528:21 529:4,9,11,15
 529:16,22 530:1,1,4,8
 530:8,9,11,11,11,14
 530:19,21,25 531:1
 531:23 532:5,6,8,10
 532:22,24 533:1,1,3,4
 533:9,9,10,19,19,20
 534:23 535:1,4,7,7,10
 535:12,12,22 536:4,5
 536:6,6,9,11,11,15,16
 536:18,21,22,25,25
 537:3,3,5,6,7,8,9,14
 537:15,15,19,22
 538:1,10,10,14,17,18
 538:20,21,25 539:19
 539:22 540:1,11,15
 540:15,17,18,22
 541:3,10,15,22 542:9
 542:13,14,15,15,16
 542:19 544:1,4,9,12
water's 477:25
Waterworks 452:12
 464:17 491:7
waving 547:4
way 390:12 391:12
 397:14 408:7 415:18
 416:21 419:24 426:6
```

```
427:10 429:1,2
  435:25 441:22 448:11
  449:10 454:3 456:2,3
  457:16 459:12 466:24
  467:25 476:2 479:7
  491:22 492:25 494:16
  496:8,15 499:25
  504:16 522:7,20
  539:2
ways 448:8 455:12
  465:10 468:21 470:14
  492:17 493:15 514:22
we'll 375:22 381:4
  382:5 384:15 428:23
  452:13 512:12 528:23
  542:23 546:15 547:2
  547:5
we're 373:2,2,12
  375:21 376:21 382:14
  384:9 387:3,11
  402:17 421:15 426:11
  442:19 449:8,10
  468:13 478:3 483:15
  510:21 523:22 525:22
  545:19 547:3
we've 374:24 375:12,19
  384:8 388:5 400:13
  409:15 418:16 423:18
  425:18 431:14 432:25
  441:5 447:19 462:14
  463:9,21 470:7
  491:22 495:1,14,17
  512:10 545:16
Web 411:5
week 526:3
weekend 372:25 373:3
weekly 492:6
weight 475:24
weighted 391:25 432:2
wells 458:14 460:4
went 395:5 426:20
  452:8 460:7,17
  487:23 514:6
weren't 499:6
west 368:11 373:16,20
  374:22 375:7 381:6
  412:9,16 430:7
  490:15
wet 436:16 512:22
  517:19 533:23
Wevmouth 526:22
wheel 449:23 450:17
  479:9.12
wheeled 417:1 418:6
  477:25
wheeler 417:4
wheeling 383:10
  386:21 412:21 414:12
```

```
414:14,17,19 415:3
  415:14,17 416:4,6,8
  416:15,19,23 417:3,7
  418:1,9,11 419:8
  421:23 431:11.13.17
  431:18,19,25 432:3,4
  432:13,16,17,19,23
  434:7 446:11.24
  447:2,4,5 450:2,6,13
  450:15,24 458:6
  472:16,22 473:1,1,5,6
  473:13,16,20,25
  474:4,5,6,9,14,20
  475:3,6 476:7,11,13
  476:14,19 477:7,12
  477:13,17 478:4,11
  478:19 479:1 482:25
  501:4,9 538:13,13,16
  539:5,6
white 539:13
wholesale 388:22
  418:10 458:15 460:5
  491:9,11,16
wholesaler 389:10
widely 466:13 467:10
wildly 493:11
withdraw 512:7 516:13
  520:7
withdrawal 512:25
withdrawals 524:24
  542:16
witness 501:14 502:20
  502:25 503:4 514:22
  518:14 528:7 534:10
  543:1 545:14,17
witnesses 370:1 381:19
  483:5 546:13,17
  547:2
Woodcock 546:14,18
word 398:20 404:4,7
words 392:6 394:18
  403:19 421:4 430:14
  437:8 438:9 441:20
  470:8
work 372:22 498:3
  503:10
worked 503:12 506:10
works 492:15 516:11
workshops 410:25
world 492:14,19
WORLDWIDE 367:23
worth 400:9
wouldn't 387:11 429:4
  537:20
wrap 386:23 499:14
writing 478:18
written 386:20 468:25
  476:9,18 477:4,5
```

```
478:10,16 501:5
wrong 372:10 546:19
wrote 456:12
WSDM 517:12 518:4
  518:18 519:17,22
  520:2 522:5,6,16
WYNDER 369:2
          X
          Y
Y 532:6
Y-A-M-A-S-A-K-I
  503:1
Yamasaki 370:3 502:17
  502:19,25 503:8
  534:20 535:20
yeah 401:17 504:9
  524:1 537:23 546:6
year 376:12 377:4,6,10
  378:5 379:11 385:22
  388:3 389:25 395:1
  395:12,20,24 396:4,5
  396:6,7,8 397:19,25
  398:6,8 400:16,17
  410:4 419:12,16
  421:10 424:22.22
  425:1,1 436:17
  440:18 442:22 483:19
  483:23 484:11 486:3
  486:18 489:13.17.19
  490:11 492:6 494:20
  494:21 505:10,15
  508:3,5,25 509:3,20
  512:10,22 515:11,24
  516:12 519:8,14
  524:6 533:8,13,13,14
  533:23 543:6,8,11,15
  543:19 544:4,6,11,13
  544:14 545:1
years 383:19 390:21
  391:8 394:22 395:9
  395:15,16,17 396:21
  404:5 411:19,21
  432:23 436:9 437:10
  438:17 440:24 445:10
  457:21 470:20,25
  487:4,8 496:25
  497:16 498:15 503:13
  506:19 512:7 516:15
  517:7,7,20,20 524:10
  525:3 544:10 548:5
yellow 511:20
yesterday 373:10
  374:13,14
```

yield 377:5 380:17,25

380:25

7	18881 369:2	396:4 410:16 411:17	304 367:4	633 368:3
<u>Z</u>	19 367:14 372:1 444:1	423:6 449:17 463:5	31 491:8	65 483:24
zone 430:18	1960 424:4	464:25 469:13,14	36.7 398:5	6th 451:17
0	1963 425:4	481:7 483:24 487:10	367 367:9	6th 431.17
0.000176 490:21	1964 425:5	489:11,24 498:24,25	373 371:12,13,14,15,16	7
0.000176 490:21 04 395:10	1969 386:9,15 469:14	2013 367:14 372:1	371:18,20	7 403:14 501:16
05 395:10	469:21 470:3,7,11,14	394:20 395:2 396:4	381 371:9,11,19	7:00 548:8
06 395:10	471:2,8,17	410:17 444:1 533:23	381A 371:20 373:15,22	700 368:13
07 395:10	1972 425:11	549:15	373:24	701 367:24
0 7 393.10	1986 544:23	2014 394:21 410:18	385 374:2,21 381:7,7	72,000 432:1
1	1990s 386:11 471:1	515:24	391-5400 368:4	74,000 377:6
1 384:7 393:11 396:6,7	1991 544:23	2025 440:13	393-2000 368:10	
397:22 398:3 410:13	1995 374:11 457:20	206,000 377:9	396 398:9	8
431:15 478:6 485:15	458:1 470:24 472:21	2109 393:14	3rd 367:24	8 405:22 408:14 409:12
486:1 493:23 507:18	473:13 474:15	213 368:14		409:17,23 410:1,9
508:21 528:15 529:7	1996 436:6 438:2 440:2	217-6000 368:14	4	413:9,12,23 433:7
1.07 490:12,24	443:4 444:11 459:19	22 503:13	4 399:18 454:13 477:15	8,867 379:11
1.2 439:13,13	462:1	22,000 383:18	529:7	800 367:25
1.24 438:18	1997 431:11,14,17	221 371:9 376:3,3	41,000 507:15	810,000 519:6
1.32 490:12	432:3,17,18 476:14	381:5,7,9,12	415 367:25 368:4,10	8520 431:15 477:6
1.49 396:9 397:24	477:6 478:3,20	227 371:11 377:22	415)268-7000 368:18	478:4
1.72 490:24	1998 387:14 480:13	381:5,9,12	425 368:17	88,000 509:6
1:30 443:11	1999 390:24 519:5	228,000 507:24,25	4304 392:18 393:5	9
100 380:6 414:2 415:19	<u> </u>	508:8	4405 474:8	
462:21,23 498:2	2 294.7 495.15 22	23 421:18 508:14	5	9 409:25 410:2,9
100,000 490:11	2 384:7 485:15,23	235A 371:12 373:14,22		468:10 478:19 495:15
102 371:5 506:22 511:1	486:1 493:23,25	373:23	5 432:7 440:1,7,8 452:23,24 454:6	523:3 90 533:11
511:5,5,6 544:20	507:18 529:7	237A 371:13 373:14,22 373:23	478:4 499:3 520:19	90012 368:14
11 486:21	2.3 544:16 20 549:15	23rd 545:24	527:3 528:15 529:10	92612 369:3
1175 378:5	200 415:7 421:20 423:5	25ru 343.24 24 422:22,25 423:4	535:18	94 371:3 511:11 515:7
12 388:2	2000 413.7 421.20 423.3 2000 489:10	24 422.22,23 423.4 24-7 503:23	5,000 376:11	517:25 534:1,4,6
120 371:6 531:18,19	2001 387:4,21 427:21	24(a) 422:6	50 392:5 508:6 532:8	94105-2482 368:18
532:12,16,18,19	452:16 454:15 480:14	24.5 398:9	532:11	94111 367:24
539:11 541:21,24	2002 388:2 414:15	245A 371:14 373:15,22	50,000 442:8 537:12	94111-1809 368:4
125 371:8 528:5,10 534:1,7,9	442:21 444:15 446:13	373:23	503 370:4	94111-4067 368:10
13 376:4 397:8 500:5	449:15,19 480:15	246A 371:15 373:15,22	51 391:15,20	949)223-1170 369:3
500:12	498:11	373:23	511 371:5	96 462:11
13,000 432:2	2003 387:5,6 388:3	247A 371:16 373:15,22	522-7096 367:25	97 431:13,19 432:4
130 479:15	431:6,7 432:19	373:23	532 371:6	98 400:18 415:5 421:9
130.5 447:23	470:17 480:16 498:14	25 422:17,20,25 423:4	534 370:4 371:3,8	480:12
134 388:11 499:21	509:21,23 531:13	424:25 438:17 490:23	549 367:9	981-3498 367:25
14 391:8 467:15	2003-2013 371:6	250A 371:18 373:15,22	55 429:10 431:4	99 387:17
14,000 427:22,24	2007 377:3	373:23	55-A 429:12	
146 494:19	2008 506:13 507:2,14	252 371:19 379:1,1	55-B 429:22	
15 431:17 479:2 545:11	544:16	380:21 381:5,9,12	55(b) 430:1	
545:18	2009 374:11 507:21	26 389:13,19 391:5,5	57 392:2	
152 495:13	2010 384:14 395:9,16	397:8 406:16 423:10	593 398:5	
15th 432:18	426:13 445:9 451:17	426:1 455:18,21	5th 426:13 449:19	
16 432:23	452:3,15 453:2,17	475:18 500:5,12,22		
1700 369:2	454:9,14 456:14	270 401:3 421:22	6	
174,000 377:4	457:15 464:19,25	28 442:21	6 425:9 438:15 439:12	
174,000-acre-feet	487:9 506:13 507:2	29 424:18	440:11	
378:10	507:23 508:1 509:5	3	60 447:20	
17th 545:24 546:10	509:25 510:4 2012 276:4 284:14	3 477:10 511:16 515:7	61,000 507:22 610 463:23	
1810 476:21	2012 376:4 384:14	527:3 529:10	610 463:23 6137 367:19 369:8	
1811 477:20	386:6,18 388:17 394:17,19 395:2,8,17	3.0 490:23	549:5,21	
1813 477:2	374.11,17 373.4,0,11	J.U 470.43	J77.J,41	
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                      1
                                                                            MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY:
              COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                      2
                                                                               ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
      BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS A. E. KARNOW, JUDGE PRESIDING
                                                                               18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
              DEPARTMENT NUMBER 304
                                                                      3
                                                                               Irvine, CA 92612
                                                                               (949)223-1170
     SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                      4
                                                                               By: PATTY J. QUILIZAPA, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                     ) Case No. CPF-10-510830
                                                                      5
         Plaintiff.
                       ) Case No. CPF-12-512466
                                                                      6
                     ) Trial
                                                                      7
     VS
                      )
                                                                      8
                     ) Volume IV
                                                                            Reported by: Connie J. Parchman, CSR 6137
     METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                      9
     SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
                                  ) Pages 550 - 749
                                                                     11
         Defendant,
                                                                     12
                                                                     13
                                                                     14
           Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
                                                                     15
            Friday, December 20, 2013
                                                                     16
                                                                     17
                                                                     18
     Reported by:
                                                                     19
     CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, CSR 6137
                                                                     20
     CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER
                                                                     21
                                                                     22
             JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                     23
        WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                     24
     701 Battery St., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, California 94111
                                                                     25
           (415) 981-3498 OR (800) 522-7096
                                                           550
                                                                                                                                552
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
                                                                                         INDEX OF WITNESSES
     For Plaintiff:
                                                                      2
                                                                                                      PAGE VOLUME
        KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                      3
                                                                             DEVENDRA UPADHYAY
        633 Battery Street
        San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
                                                                      4
                                                                             Direct Examination by MR. HIXSON
                                                                                                                          558
                                                                                                                                  4
        (415)391-5400
                                                                             Cross-Examination by MR. KEKER
                                                                                                                                  4
                                                                                                                         624
        By: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.
                                                                      5
          DANIEL PURCELL, ESQ
                                                                             Redirect Examination by MR. HIXON
                                                                                                                          665
                                                                                                                                  4
          WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ.
                                                                             Recross-Examination by KEKER
                                                                                                                        668
          DAN JACKSON, ESQ.
                                                                      6
                                                                             Redirect Examination by MR. HIXSON
                                                                                                                          671
                                                                                                                                   4
          AUDREY WALTON-HADLOCK, ESQ.
     For Defendant Metropolitan Water District:
                                                                      7
                                                                             JUNE SKILLMAN
        BINGHAM McCÛTCHEN LLP
                                                                      8
                                                                             Direct Examination by MR. HIXSON
                                                                                                                          672
                                                                                                                                  4
        Three Embarcadero Center
10
        San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
                                                                             Cross-Examination by MR. KEKER
                                                                                                                         703
                                                                                                                                  4
        (415)393-2422
                                                                      9
11
        By: THOMAS S. HIXSON, ESQ.
                                                                     1.0
          COLIN C. WEST, ESQ.
12
                                                                     11
13
        METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
                                                                     12
        700 N. Alameda Street
                                                                     13
14
        Los Angeles, CA 90012
        (213)217-6890
                                                                     14
15
        By: HEATHER C. BEATTY, ESQ.
                                                                     1.5
          BETTY KUO BRINTON, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                     16
16
          MARCIA SCULLY, ESQ.
17
        MORRISON & FOERSTER
                                                                     17
        425 Market Street
                                                                     18
18
        San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
        (415)268-7189
                                                                     19
19
        By: RAJ CHATTERJEE, ESQ.
                                                                     20
20
     CITY OF TORRANCE:
                                                                     21
     JOHN FELLOWS, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
21
                                                                     22
     THREE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT:
                                                                     23
22
     STEVEN M. KENNEDY, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                     24
23
24
                                                                     25
25
                                                           551
                                                                                                                                553
```

1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS		¹ INDEX OF EXHIBITS (cont.)
2	No. Description Ident. Evid		² No. Description Ident. Evid.
3	Exhibit 18 The Economic Benefits of	569	SDCWA to MWD
4	Local Management		Exhibit DTX-246 10/21/2013 LETTER FROM 617
5	Programs		5 SDCWA TO MWD
6	Exhibit DTX-20 MWD Integrated Water	577	6 Exhibit DTX-309 6/2005 US Bureau of 619 Reclamation Report
7	Resources Plan, Vol. 2 Exhibit DTX-27 MWD Board Letter 7-4	580	Exhibit DTX-310 6/2006 US Bureau of 619
8	Exhibit DTX-518 5/26/1998 Board letter Exhibit DTX-519 6/9/1998 Board Meeting	581 583	8 Reclamation Report
	Minutes	363	9 Exhibit DTX-311 12/2006 US Bureau of 619 Reclamation Report
10	Exhibit DTX-557 2/10/2009 MWD Board	585	10
11 12	letter		Exhibit DTX-312 12/2008 US Bureau of 619 11 Reclamation Report
13	Exhibit DTX-704 Desalination Proposal Exhibit DTX-383 2/27/2008 letter to CA	587 589	Exhibit DTX-313 12/2008 US Bureau of 619 Reclamation Report
14	State Lands Commission		Exhibit DTX-314 8/2009 US Bureau of 619
	Exhibit DTX-85 1/200/2010 letter from	593	14 Reclamation Report
15	Kightlinger & Stapleton to CA Coastal Commission		Exhibit DTX-315 5/2010 US Bureau of 619 Reclamation Report
16		507	Exhibit DTX-316 5/2011 US Bureau of 619
17	Exhibit DTX-705 MWD Table of contracts	597	17 Reclamation Report
18	Exhibit DTX-702 Yearend document for	600	Exhibit DTX-317 5/2012 US Bureau of 619 Reclamation Report
19	fiscal year 2010-2011 Exhibit DTX-454 2/2013 MDW Progress	608	Exhibit DTX-318 5/2013 US Bureau of 619
20	Report		20 Reclamation Report
	Exhibit DTX-226 12/30/2003 letter from	617	Exhibit DTX-256 6/12/2012 letter from 623 MWD to SDCWA
21 22	SDCWA to MWD Exhibit DTX-227 5/24/2004 letter from	617	22
23	SDCWA to MWD		Exhibit DTX-706 Board Report 667
	Exhibit DTX-228 12/22/2004 letter from	617	Exhibit DTX-707 Board Minutes, November 667
24 25	SDCWA to MWD Exhibit DTX-229 6/20/2005 letter from	617	Exhibit DTX-697 Graph titled MWD As 690 Billed Sales with
	Exhibit D174-229 0/20/2005 letter from		Diffed Sales with
		554	556
1			
2	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (cont) No. Description Ident. Evid.		DECEMBER 20, 2013 MORNING SESSION PROCEEDINGS
3	Exhibit DTX-230 10/24/2005 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	TROCLEDINGS
4		(17	
5	Exhibit DTX-231 4/05/2006 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	THE COOKT. Good morning. Trice to see
6	Exhibit DTX-232 10/9/2006 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	everyone. Ready to continue?
7		617	7 MR. HIXSON: We are, your Honor.
8	Exhibit DTX-233 3/27/2007 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	8 Metropolitan calls Devendra Upadhyay to the
9	Exhibit DTX-234 10/27/2007 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	9 stand.
10		c.=	THE COURT: Thanks very much.
11	Exhibit DTX-235 3/31/2008 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	DEVENDRA UPADHYAY,
12	Exhibit DTX-236 11/19/2008 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	having been called as a witness by the Defense, and
13			having been duly sworn under the standard oath, was
14	Exhibit DTX-237 4/14/2009 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	examined and testified as follows:
15	Exhibit DTX-238 11/14/2009 letter from	617	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
16	SDCWA to MWD		16 If you would adjust the microphone and state
17	Exhibit DTX-239 3/26/2010 letter from SDCWA to MWD	617	and spell your first and last name.
18	Exhibit DTX-240 11/16/2010 letter from	617	THE WITNESS: My name is Devendra Upadhyay,
19	SCDWA to MWD		¹⁹ D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A, U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-Y.
20	Exhibit DTX-241 4/6/2011 letter from SCDWA to MWD	617	THE COURT: If you would just make sure you do
21	Exhibit DTX-242 11/1/2011 letter from	617	speak into the microphone. Assume you're talking to the
22	SCDWA to MWD		people in the back of the room.
23	Exhibit DTX-243 10/31/12 letter from	617	THE WITNESS: Sure.
24		617	MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, the witness has a
25	SDCWA to MWD		binder of documents in front of him. I would like to
		555	557

2.3

provide one to your Honor as well.

THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate it.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. Good morning.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. Who do you work for?
- A. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
 - Q. How long have you worked for Met?
- A. I've worked for Metropolitan since 1995 with a brief spell from 2005 to 2008 where I worked for another agency.
 - Q. What position do you currently hold at Met?
- A. I am the water resource management group manager for Metropolitan.
- Q. And can you give a description of your job responsibilities?
- A. Sure. My group manages contracts for water supply on the Colorado River with the Bureau of Reclamation and other parties we have water contracts with. We also administer the state water contract with the State of California and Department of Water Resources.

We run demand management programs, conservation

Q. What are Metropolitan's demand management programs?

- A. Our demand management programs consist of a conservation program and a local resources program and a seawater desalination program where the intent of those programs is to reduce the demands for imported water to move through the Metropolitan system.
- Q. Can you describe what types of projects are funded by the local resources program?
- A. The local resources program provides incentives for recycled water facilities and groundwater recovery facilities, or groundwater recovery is the cleanup of groundwater supplies that have been contaminated or may be too salty to simply pull out of the ground and use immediately.
- Q. And so are these member agency programs that are being funded through the local resources program?
 - A. Yes, they are.
 - Q. Do the member agencies apply for them?
- A. Yes. Member agencies would submit applications under the local resources programs. Under our conservation program, we are providing incentives to entities throughout the service area.
- Q. Has every member agency applied for program incentives from the local resources program?

programs for businesses and residents throughout Southern California. We run a local resources program as part of our demand management programs that provide incentives for recycled water development and groundwater recovery development.

I also have a section that deals with forecasting of needs for resources to meet demands in our service area out into the future, so that's a planning group.

- Q. What was your position before your current one?
- A. Before I came into this position, I was section manager in the CFO's office overseeing budgets and financial planning.
- Q. And can you describe what your responsibilities were in that position?
- A. Yes. We prepared the budget for Metropolitan and put together long-range finance plans and prepared rate recommendations.
- Q. And turning to the 1995 through 2005 timeframe, can you describe what your job responsibilities were at that time?
- A. At that time I was in what was known as the planning and resources division largely doing analysis related to Metropolitan's long-range plans for resources and facilities.

- A. No, they have not.
- Q. Are there any member agencies that have no local resources programs being funded?
- A. Yes. There's four or five. Fullerton as an example, Pasadena, San Marino, San Fernando. There are some agencies or cities that don't necessarily have the contaminated groundwater or access to wastewater supplies to provide recycled water or groundwater recovery facilities.
- Q. Okay. Was there an initial acre-foot target for the local resources program?
- A. Yes. There was a target that came out of our integrated resources plan. The initial target was for 500,000 acre-feet to be developed -- that's an annual number -- by 2020.
 - Q. Okay. And was that initial target met?
- A. Yes. Based on projections, we signed contracts with folks that should produce 500,000 acre-feet by 2021.
 - Q. Was the target increased at some point?
- A. Yes. Metropolitan's board in 2007 considered a change to the local resources program to increase the target and they basically wiped the slate clean and set a new target from 2007 forward for an additional 174,000 acre-feet.
 - Q. Is that again an annual amount?

e. 15 that again an aimean aimeant.

A. That is an annual amount.

2.3

- Q. Can you describe the seawater desalination program?
- A. Seawater desalination program is a program that really mirrors the local resources program and that was targeting seawater desalination project.
- Q. And can you describe the conservation credits program?
- A. Yes. The conservation credits program is a program through which Metropolitan is providing incentives throughout the region to buy down the costs of devices that might be used in businesses or in residences that are more efficient, so things like high efficiency toilets, high efficiency clothes washers.

Recently we focused much more on outdoor water use, so we're focusing on things like weather-based irrigation controllers and efficient irrigation devices around the home or around the business. So we're providing incentives to buy down the cost of those devices.

- Q. And when you refer to credits throughout the region, what do you mean by "regional"?
- A. Well, the majority of that program is managed through a regional approach, a regional vendor that we actually have whereby consumers, a resident somewhere

our member agencies are able to design their own programs and use the funds to be able to provide incentives to their own programs.

- Q. Was there an original acre-foot target for the conservation credits program?
- A. Yes. IRP, the original IRP, integrated resources plan, had a target in 2020 that was somewhere north of a million acre-feet.
 - Q. Okay. How is the target expressed now?
- A. In 2009, there was a legislative package that -- in the State of California that focused on per capita water reduction use in the state.

And so when we adopted our 2010 integrated resources plan, we sort of updated our previous ones. We then started to express the target for our conservation saves as a per capita of water use reduction to reflect where the state had moved in terms of talking about conservation. And so that target is now a 20 percent reduction that we need to achieve by 2020.

- Q. And 20 percent less than what?
- A. There's a baseline that we're able to calculate, agencies throughout the state can calculate and so for Metropolitan, that baseline is a ten-year period of water use from 1996 to 2005.

THE COURT: So are you saying 20 percent

will be able to go -- they'll be able to purchase, say, a high efficiency toilet if they apply for incentive through Metropolitan and they would receive a rebate from us for that.

So, what I mean by regional is it's available throughout our service area.

- Q. Is that distinct from the local resources program?
- A. That's correct. Local resources program is available to our member agencies. They have to apply for incentives for a given project.
- Q. Turning again to the conservation credits, how do people obtain those incentives?
- A. An example. Let's say somebody wanted to buy a high efficiency clothes washer. They could go to Lowe's, Home Depot, they would purchase that clothes washer. They would go online and they would submit for a rebate incentive. They would submit their receipt showing that they had purchased the clothes washer, that they would document online that they live in a particular service area that's within our boundaries, and then we would provide a rebate to them.
- Q. Do people sometimes receive those incentives through a particular member agency?
 - A. Yes. There is a portion of the program whereby

reduction in what the total distribution of Met water was during that period on an annual basis?

THE WITNESS: It's actually a 20 percent reduction in the per capita water use over that time.

THE COURT: I see.

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. How does Metropolitan recover the budget and expenses of its demand management programs?
- A. The demand management program budget is recovered through our Water Stewardship Rate.
- Q. I would like to ask you some questions about the integrated resources plan and first, what is the integrated resources plan?
- A. The integrated resources plan is really a reference to both a process and a document that Metropolitan has for planning out the demands, the resources that are necessary in order to meet those demands and provide for reliability within our service area.

And also, a look at the facility needs that are required in order to be able to provide that reliability also. And it looks out 25 years.

- Q. Uh-huh. When did Met first adopt the integrated resources plan?
 - A. The first integrated resources plan was adopted

back in 1996.

1.5

1.5

- Q. Has Met revised the integrated resources plan since then?
- A. Yes, a couple times. We reviewed it in 2004 and the board adopted an updated version in 2004. And then more recently near the end of 2010, we adopted what we referred to as our 2010 integrated resources plan update.
- Q. As part of the integrated resources plan, in the 1990s, did Met undertake an economic study of benefits of local water management programs?
 - A. Yes, we did.
 - Q. Please turn to DTX-18 in your binder. Can you identify what this is?
- A. This is that economic study that I just mentioned.
- Q. As part of this study, did Met evaluate anticipated capital expenses under different demand scenarios?
 - A. Yes, that's one of the things that was studied.
 - Q. What was the base case?
- A. The base case in this analysis was a scenario that looked at Metropolitan not having demand management programs going forward and a scenario where increases in conservation and local resources within the region would

Did Met identify any infrastructure requirements or any anticipated infrastructure requirements in the base case?

A. Yes. In the base case, Metropolitan identified a number of infrastructure requirements that would be needed, including things like an additional reservoir and reservoir capacity, even an ocean desal facility in the region, distribution and treatment facilities including what we referred to as our central pool augmentation project which included a major tunnel that would have gone through the Santa Ana mountains.

The West Valley and Inland Feeder projects were also distribution projects. San Diego Pipeline No. 6 as an example. So there were a number of infrastructure projects identified.

- Q. And were any of those that you've identified here capital costs for capacity to transport water?
- A. Yes. A few of the ones that I just mentioned. CPA, which is Central Pool Augmentation, West Valley, Inland Feeder, San Diego Pipeline No. 6, they're all part of that analysis.
- Q. Okay. And did Met identify any infrastructure cost savings that could be obtained in the preferred case?
 - A. Yes. There was a comparison of the base case

not meet the targets that were identified in the integrated resources plan.

- Q. Okay. What was the preferred case?
- A. The preferred case was an alternative scenario where those targets were Met, so increases in local resources in the region, increases in efficiency through conservation in the region, and the assumption was that the demand management programs would hit those IRP targets.
- Q. And so what did the preferred case assume about the future of the demand management programs?
- A. The demand management programs would be there to be able to meet those targets.
- Q. Okay. So did the base case and the preferred case meet different assumptions relating to project demands on Met's system?
- A. Yes. The base case and the preferred case had differences in the local resources that would be produced and the conservation that would occur. And in the preferred case, because we were assuming those demand management programs were in place, conservation would happen, so would local resource development, that would mean that there's a lower need for water to move through the Met system.
 - Q. Please turn to page 9 of this document.

and the preferred case and the capital improvement programs that would have been necessary and the expenditures under those programs and what we found was that under the base case, you would have to spend more money on infrastructure than in the preferred case and the savings was on the order of two billion dollars — actually north of two billion dollars.

- Q. Okay. Why did Met project different capital needs for the base case as opposed to the preferred case?
- A. Fundamentally because we were showing that you didn't need to move as much water through the system so you didn't need as large a system.

MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-18 into evidence.

MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX-18 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-18 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. Please turn to DTX-20 in your binder. Can you identify what this is?
- A. Yes. This is one of the volumes of the integrated resources plan that was adopted by our board in 1996.

This is Volume 2 which dealt with our system. And we refer to it as our system overview study, so it looked at the facilities.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

- 1 Q. Did Met quantify its anticipated capital 2 expenses in this Volume 2 of the integrated resources 3 4 A. Yes. That was part of what we were doing with 5 this volume. 6 Q. Can you show us where in this document that 7 quantification exists? 8
 - A. It's near the back, Section 6, Table 6-1.
 - Q. Is it on page 250?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- A. That's correct, 250.
- Q. Earlier you referred to base case and preferred case and Table 6-1. Was Met modeling one of those case?
- A. Yes. The expenditures that are identified in Table 6-1 were associated with the preferred case. That came out of the IRP.
- Q. And so what does this chart in Table 6-1 assume about future demand management programs?
- A. It assumes that demand management programs would be in place to achieve the integrated resources plan targets for local resources in conservation.
- Q. Did any of the anticipated capital costs listed in Table 6-1 relate to capacity in Met's distribution system?
- A. Yes. It -- if you look in this center part of that table, the section referring to distribution

capital costs listed in Table 6-1 were sensitive to demand?

- A. Yes. And I think this gets a little bit to your question. We did look at sensitivity to whether the change in demands in the future would impact the need for the facilities or the timing for the facilities.
- Q. And can you show us where the integrated resources plan does that?
- A. Yes. It's -- the sensitivity analysis is described on page 252.
- Q. And did Met determine if any of these anticipated capital costs related to the distribution system were in fact sensitive to the demand?
- A. Yes. We looked at demands that were higher or lower and we looked at a range of 5 percent change in demand.

And it may be easiest to look at Figure 6-4 where you can see a number of these projects. Center line on this graphic for each of the projects is what was projected as the potential online date and when the capacity would be needed.

But then looking at a change in demands of 5 percent lower or higher, we saw that some of these projects, if you had demands that were lower, would move out in time, some pretty significantly and then others,

570 572

facilities, you can see the projected capital costs associated with those facilities.

THE COURT: So this table, though, is talking about the preferred case; right?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: This assumes that the water conservation projects have kicked in and are producing results?

THE WITNESS: Out into the future; right.

THE COURT: Right. But nevertheless, it shows, for example, costs associated with San Diego Pipeline No.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: So that would not be avoided by the preferred case, the building of that pipeline?

THE WITNESS: The preferred case showed that it would happen later in time.

THE COURT: Got it. Thank you.

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. And for these anticipated capital costs relating to the distribution system, what did they total up to over 25 years?
- A. The distribution facility component was over a billion dollars.
 - Q. Did Metropolitan identify in any of these

if you saw an increase in demands, would move forward in time. So we're recognizing that the need for the project, online dates for the projects is related to demand for water to move through Met's system.

Q. Please turn to page 254.

Did Met identify any anticipated capital expenses that could be deferred due to a 5 percent decrease in retail demands?

- A. Yes. There are a number of facilities listed here.
- Q. Can you identify if any of these listed facilities relate to Met's distribution system?
- A. Yes. San Diego Pipeline 6, West Valley, the Central Pool Augmentation Tunnel and Pipeline and Conveyance Extension would all be part of Metropolitan's distribution system.
- Q. Has Metropolitan been able to defer building the San Diego Pipeline No. 6?
 - A. Yes, we have.
 - Q. Why is that?

A. Projected demands have been lower and as a result of those projected demands, we have not needed to build that facility. We've had demand management programs in place to meet the targets that were identified in the IRP.

571

2.0

- Q. Has Met been able to defer the Central Pool Augmentation Conveyance Extension project?
 - A. Yes, for the same reasons.

- Q. Okay. Since this 1996 integrated resources plan, has Met continued to evaluate the need for additional capital expenses for the distribution system?
- A. Yes. We periodically review projections of demand and compare those projections of demand to the capacity that we have in our system to see if there is a projection in time as to when we would need to expand facilities.
- Q. Okay. How does Met decide whether to incur additional capital expenses for the distribution system?
- A. It's based on a prospective look forward at what demand scenarios we see and whether those demands look like they're going to peak up to the capacity of the system. And if we see that, then that gives us a sense of when in time we would need to expand parts of our system.
- Q. Let's change topics from the integrated resources plan.

Does the California aqueduct deliver water to Metropolitan?

A. Yes, it does. California Aqueduct is the State Water Project.

like demands will peak up and test the capacity of that reach of the State Water Project so it's something that we've been monitoring and having discussions with DWR and other contractors about.

- Q. Would Met have been responsible for a portion of the costs associated with an east branch expansion?
- A. Yes. We're by far the largest contractor in that reach of the aqueduct and would likely need to pay about 70 percent of the costs were it to be expanded.
- Q. During what time period did Met discuss this potential expansion with DWR?
- A. We've been discussing the timing and need for that expansion with DWR on an ongoing basis really since the mid-'90s, even as recently as 2013.
- Q. Okay. And what position did Met take concerning this potential expansion?
- A. Our position at this point is that our demand projections are low enough that we think that the Department of Water Resources can hold off on proceeding with additional design and engineering work for the expansion but we want to continue monitoring on an ongoing basis and if conditions change, we may need to move forward.

THE COURT: Have there been situations in the past where Met has actually paid part of the cost of

574 576

Q. Okay. How many -- go ahead. How many branches of the aqueduct connect with Met?

A. There are two branches of the California Aqueduct that connect to Metropolitan, one on the west side of our system that connects to Castaic Lake, that's the terminal reservoir, and then there's another aqueduct we refer to as the east branch that connects to Silverwood and then connects to our system.

Q. Has Met evaluated whether it may need to incur additional capital expenses related to one of those branches?

- A. Yes. We've had an ongoing discussion with the Department of Water Resources about the capacity needs on the east branch of the State Water Project.
- Q. And can you describe in general terms the nature of the expansion that was considered?
- A. Yes. Capacity on the east branch was initially expanded in the early '80s. And there was recognition that as demands change over time, there may need to be an additional expansion of the east branch at some point in the future.

So, the east branch runs from the tunnel that's just after the Tehachapi Mountains down to Lake Silverwood. And as we have projected demands over the years, there are occasionally situations where it looks

building out some of the aqueducts or other infrastructures that's actually owned by SWP?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. You know, generally Metropolitan is the largest contractor and we're at the end of the line in terms of the conveyance system so we actually pay the largest portion of the fixed costs for conveyance on the SWP.

THE COURT: That's part of your annual bill that you pay; right?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HIXSON: All right. I'm going to switch topics.

Met moves DTX-20 into evidence.

MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX-20 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-20 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Around the time of the 1996 integrated resources plan, did Met develop any principles for the local resources program?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. And is the local resources program part of Met's demand management programs?

A. Yes, it is.

Pages 574 to 577

Q. Please turn to DTX-27 in your binder. Municipal Water District, City of Los Angeles and the 2 2 Can you explain what this is? cities of Anaheim, Long Beach, Las Virgenes and the 3 3 Metropolitan District itself. A. This is a letter that went to our board of 4 Q. Did Met's board adopt these recommended local directors that was recommending a set of principles that 5 resources program principles? would guide the local resources program. 6 6 A. Yes, these principles were adopted by the Q. And are there recommended principles attached 7 board. to this letter? 8 Q. And do these remain being principles for the 8 A. Yes. I believe they're at the end of the 9 local resources program today? 9 letter, Attachment A. 10 A. Yes, the LRP today has its foundation in these 10 Q. And focusing on Attachment A, what was the 11 principles. 11 first of the key goals of the local resources program? 12 MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-27 into evidence. 12 A. The first key goal was to assist local projects 13 MR. KEKER: No objection. 13 that would improve regional water supply reliability and 14 THE COURT: DTX-27 is admitted. 14 avoid or defer Metropolitan capital expenditures. 15 (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-27 was 1.5 Q. Can you explain what it means to improve admitted into Evidence.) 16 regional water supply reliability? 16 BY MR. HIXSON: 17 A. Generally it would mean that we're reducing the 17 O. Please turn to DTX-518 in your binder. 18 likelihood and severity of shortage in Southern 18 Can you describe what this document is? 19 California. 19 A. This is a letter that went to Metropolitan's 20 Q. Is that a supply benefit? 20 board in May of 1998 that was recommending that the board 21 A. Yes, it is. 21 establish the local resources program as a follow on to 22 Q. Can you explain what it means to avoid or defer 22 those principles that were adopted earlier. 23 23 capital expenditures? Q. Okay. And can you summarize what the staff 24 24 A. That would refer to the notion that were recommending here? 25 Metropolitan would not have to spend as much money going 25 A. Yes. Staff recommendation was generally to 578 580 1 1 forward on its capital infrastructure as a result of the develop a local resources program that would provide 2 2 incentives to projects that were producing recycled water 3 Q. Is that a capital benefit? or groundwater recovery, and those incentives would A. It is. 4 provide financial assistance up to \$250 an acre-foot. 5 Q. What was the rate refining committee? Q. Please turn to page 2. 6 A. The rate refinement committee was a committee In making this recommendation, did staff 7 of member agencies and representatives from the member identify the benefits to Met from the local resources 8 agencies that were looking at potential changes to program? 9 A. Yes. Board letter identified regional benefits Metropolitan's rates and the way that they could look 10 10 to Metropolitan associated with the development of these going forward. 11 11 local resources. Q. Okay. Did the rate refinement committee 12 12 Those included things like the reduction in develop the recommended principles we're looking at now? 13 13 capital investments that Metropolitan would need to make A. Yes. This was an outgrowth of the rate 14 14 through the deferral or downsizing of our infrastructure refinement committee. In fact, you can see that 15 15 needs, reduction in operating costs for treatment and ultimately this was a set of principles that were 16 16 distribution of imported supplies, reduction in cost for proposed by that rate refinement committee and they 17 17 developing alternative supplies also. signed on to these principles. 18 Q. Did Met's board adopt the local resources 18 Q. Okay. And can you identify who -- what member 19 program as recommended in DTX-518? 19 agencies were on the rate refinement committee? 20 A. Yes, when -- following this recommendation, the 20 A. Sure. Last page of this document shows that 21 board did adopt the LRP. 21 there were a number of member agencies that were 22 22 MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-518 into evidence. represented here: Western Municipal Water District, 23 MR. KEKER: No objection. 2.3 Central Basin Municipal Water District, Calleguas 24 THE COURT: DTX-518 is admitted. 24 Municipal Water District, the Municipal Water District of 25 (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-518 was 25 Orange County, San Diego County Water Authority, Foothill

581

BY MR. HIXSON: incentives for projects submitted by our member agencies 2 2 Q. Please turn to DTX-519 in your binder. up to \$250 an acre-foot and to start that by releasing a 3 3 Can you describe what this is? request for proposals to our member agencies that they 4 A. This document is the minutes from a meeting of would then submit proposals for seawater desalination 5 5 Metropolitan's board of directors that was in June of facilities that could be considered under the program. 6 6 Q. Would the benefits from this seawater 7 Q. Can you please turn to page 14? desalination program be similar to the benefits from the 8 8 Can you describe what item 43021 related to? local resources program? 9 9 A. Yes. This minute is documenting that the board A. Yes. 10 10 ultimately did approve the local resources program Q. Does this recommendation describe any policy 11 11 recommendation that was made in May of 1998, which was principles for the seawater desalination plan? 12 12 the letter that we just reviewed. A. It does. I believe it also has principles 13 13 Q. I'm sorry, you just said that. Did the minutes later in the document. 14 14 show the board did adopt it? Q. Please turn to Attachment 1. 15 15 A. The minutes showed the board did adopt it. Can you direct us to the policy principles for 16 16 Q. According to the minutes, did any agency vote the Seawater Desalination Program? 17 17 against adopting the local resources program? A. The policy principles are identified in section 18 18 A. No, the minutes don't show any member agency A of the administrative guidelines. It's on page 2 of 19 19 voting no on this program. Attachment 1. 20 20 Q. If you turn to the preceding item number 43020, And you can see the first goal there is very 21 do you see whether a director requested to be recorded as 21 similar to the goals in the local resources program: To 22 22 voting no? assist local projects that improve regional supply 23 23 A. Yes. Well, that was a different item. There reliability and avoid or defer Metropolitan capital 24 24 is a record of the director that had requested to vote expenditure. 25 25 Q. Did the board approve this recommendation? no. 582 584 1 1 Q. Okay. But with respect to item 43021, is there A. Yes, the board approved this program. 2 2 any such notation of a director requesting to be shown as Q. Did Met then request proposals from the member 3 3 voting no? agencies for seawater desalination projects? 4 A. No, there is not. A. That's correct. But following this, the 5 5 Q. Do the minutes indicate whether any San Diego approval of this program, we released an RFP, or request 6 6 members were present during this vote? for proposals, from member agencies. 7 7 A. Yes. MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-557 into evidence. 8 MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. This is 8 MR. KEKER: No objection. 9 9 irrelevant, completely irrelevant. THE COURT: Admitted. 10 10 THE COURT: Sustained. (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-557 was 11 MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-519 into evidence. admitted into Evidence.) 11 12 MR. KEKER: No objection. BY MR. HIXSON: 13 12 THE COURT: DTX-519 is admitted. Q. Please turn to DTX-704 in your binder. 13 14 (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-519 was Did San Diego submit a seawater desalination 14 admitted into Evidence.) proposal? 1.5 1.5 BY MR. HIXSON: A. Yes. This is San Diego's proposal that was 16 16 Q. Please turn to DTX-527 in your binder. submitted under that program. 17 17 Can you explain what this is? O. And can you describe in general terms what this 18 18 A. This is a board letter similar to the board proposal related to? 19 19 letter we saw on the local resources program but this one A. This proposal related to a seawater 20 was seeking approval of the board for the development of 20 desalination facility that could be built in Carlsbad. 21 21 a seawater desalination program. Q. Was this submitted for Met's consideration in 22 22 Q. And can you summarize what the staff its demand management programs? 23 23 recommendation was? A. It was. 2.4 2.4 A. The staff recommendation was to support a Q. Please turn to page 17. 25 25 seawater desalination program that would provide In this proposal, did San Diego identify any 583 585

regional facility benefits from this specific demand management project?

A. Yes. Proposal calls out facility benefits for Metropolitan and it refers to, in Paragraph 2B(i), offsetting about 77 CFS in conveyance capacity need for Metropolitan and additional treatment plant capacity.

Later, it refers to this project contributing to the deferral of the authority's need for Pipeline 6, which is a reference to San Diego Pipeline 6, thereby reducing or deferring Metropolitan's capital expenditures.

Q. Referring to San Diego Pipeline 6, was this one of the anticipated capital expenses in the distribution system that had been identified in the 1996 integrated resources plan?

A. It was.

1.5

MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-704 into evidence.

MR. KEKER: I object to the appendix as containing a lot of hearsay. I haven't read them but there's a lot of newspaper articles and so on, but up to the appendix we don't have any objection.

THE COURT: That's fine. The media -- what's it called, the media clips here?

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir, media clips and some letters. And I haven't really had a chance to go through

Q. Okay. Would a one-for-one offset from this project benefit member agencies other than San Diego?

A. Yes. To the extent that this project resulted in a reduction in the need for imported water from Metropolitan's system, then other agencies would both have the access to the capacity in the system if they wanted to purchase supplies from other sources and move that water through our system.

They would also have the access to the supply that otherwise isn't necessary to provide to San Diego.

Q. Was it part of the regional benefits that the demand management programs provide?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. The last sentence of that paragraph states: "This is supported by Metropolitan Water District's seawater desalination program that requires program funding recipients to offset a demand for imported water, which this project does."

And my question is, do Met's demand management programs require funding recipients to offset a demand for imported water?

A. That's correct. That's ultimately what we're paying for is for a reduction in demand for imported

them but apparently they don't care about anything except what's before the appendix and that's what we would not object to.

MR. HIXSON: We withdraw the appendix and move in the rest.

THE COURT: DTX-704 is admitted as modified. (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-704 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Please turn to DTX-383 in your binder.

Can you describe what this document is?

A. This is a letter from the San Diego County Water Authority to the California State Lands Commission regarding the proposed Carlsbad Desalination Project.

- Q. To your understanding, did San Diego need the approval of the California State Lands Commission for the completion of that project?
 - A. That's my understanding, yes.
 - Q. Please turn to the second page.

In this letter, did San Diego refer to a one-for-one benefit from this project?

A. Yes. In the top paragraph, on the second page, there is a sentence that refers to the availability of water from the Carlsbad Desalination Project will result in a one-for-one offset in the use of imported water for those agencies participating in the project.

water from Metropolitan's system.

Q. And why does Metropolitan input that?

A. That's ultimately the benefit Metropolitan is getting, the reduced need for water to move through our system. Whether it is the Metropolitan's supply or supply someone else acquires and moves through our system, the benefit that the system is receiving is reduced capacity, the capital deferral, some own in benefits, the notion that we don't need to necessarily go out and acquire additional supplies. Those are all regional benefits.

MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan moves DTX-383. MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX-383 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-383 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Please turn to DTX-385 in your binder. Can you describe what this document is?

A. This document is a letter to the California Coastal Commission and it's a letter that responds to questions that the California Coastal Commission had about the Carlsbad Seawater Desalination Project.

It's actually a joint letter, so it was a letter that was drafted and signed by both the Metropolitan Water District and the San Diego County

Water Authority.

1.5

- Q. To your understanding, did San Diego need the approval of the California Coastal Commission for the that project?
 - A. Yes, that's my understanding.
 - Q. Please turn to the first paragraph on page 1.

Did Metropolitan and San Diego in this letter jointly refer to a regional benefit from this proposed demand management program?

- A. Yes. In the first paragraph, the letter refers to a regional benefit from this program that's similar to that of other new recycling projects and groundwater recovery projects and water use efficiency gains that are developed under Metropolitan's and Water Authority's local resources conservation programs.
- Q. And are the local resource and conservation programs part of Met's other demand management programs?
 - A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Please turn to page 2 of this document. Does this letter have a list of Metropolitan costs that would be avoided from this project?
- A. In the center part of page 2, the letter refers to the incentive that would be provided avoiding Metropolitan's cost in a number of areas, including acquisition of newly reported supplies, State Water

agreement changed and by the time that things were finalized in the San Diego area as to how that agreement would play out, we were already in discussions with the board about rate structure integrity language, that that language had been triggered in other agreements because of this litigation, which ultimately resulted in no agreement coming back to our board for approval again.

Q. I would like to switch now and ask you about funds that are provided under the demand management programs.

Does -- but first let me move in DTX-385.

MR. KEKER: No objection to the letter, your Honor. Again a lot of things attached to it that we would like to see stripped off. I don't even really know what they are. They're press clips and so on.

THE COURT: There's an e-mail.

MR. KEKER: Yeah, there's an e-mail and then there are some external affairs clip sheets and letters, but we don't have any objection to what he talked about, which is that letter.

MR. HIXSON: How about I read the Bates numbers that we're moving in?

THE COURT: That would be fine.

MR. HIXSON: MWD2010-00236446 through 6448 and strike the remainder.

590 592

Project energy consumption for pumping, treated imported supplies and Metropolitan's distribution system expansions.

- Q. And referring to that last bullet point, what is Met's distribution system?
- A. Metropolitan's distribution system is, you know, generally a system of pipes, aqueducts that we use to transport water to our member agencies.
- Q. Did Met's board initially approve the Carlsbad project?
- A. Met's board did approve an agreement for the Carlsbad project.
- Q. Does Met currently have a seawater desalination program contract with San Diego for Carlsbad?
- A. Metropolitan has a seawater desalination program. We do not have an agreement for the Carlsbad project, no.
 - Q. Why not?

A. While Met's board ultimately approved an agreement in a particular form for the Carlsbad facility, the negotiations that the San Diego County Water Authority had with Poseidon and its local agencies ultimately changed the form of that agreement.

So, we submitted an agreement to the Water Authority that we could sign. The nature of that

MR. KEKER: Fine.

THE COURT: DTX-85 as modified is admitted.
(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-85 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. Does Met pay back to each member agency the same amount of money they paid in for the demand management programs?
 - A. No, we don't.
 - Q. Why not?
- A. The demand management programs are not designed to simply take money from the member agencies and provide the exact amount of money back.

The philosophy we have in the demand management programs is a regional one and we recognize and our member agencies recognize that not everyone has the same capability to develop contaminated groundwater and turn it into drinkable groundwater. They don't all have that situation.

Not all agencies have the same access to waste water extremes to recycle the waste water and use it within their service area. And similarly, not all agencies have the same ability to have conservation in their area.

Our program is designed on a regional basis, and the member agencies and the Metropolitan board have

- determined that agencies that may not have a project in their backyard are benefiting from projects that are occurring in the other agencies' service areas, because it frees up capacity in our system and reduces the need for additional supplies that might need to be developed in the future.
- Q. How much money has San Diego received in demand management program funding?
- A. Through June of this year, San Diego County Water Authority has received approximately \$114 million.
- Q. Does San Diego continue to receive demand management program funds today?
 - A. Yes, they do.

- Q. Through what programs does San Diego continue to receive demand management funds today?
- A. The County Water Authority service area is receiving funds through our conservation programs. Residents and businesses throughout the service area are able to submit for rebates, incentives for the conservation programs and buy down the costs of those conserving devices.

There are also a series of local resources program agreements, about 14 agreements that we have with the San Diego County Water Authority that continue to exist. They existed before the board adopted any rate

residents and businesses in the service area.

- Q. Any other demand management programs today for which the San Diego County Water Authority is itself the party in active contract?
- A. Yes. I had mentioned a series of local resources program agreements that continue. Those are local resource program agreements that did not have rate structure integrity language in them because they were adopted before rate structure integrity language was adopted.
 - Q. Please turn to DTX-705 in your binder. Can you describe what this is?
- A. This is a table that shows a listing of the various contracts that we have with the County Water Authority that continue in the local resources program contract.

You can see it's broken up into two sections, one titled Sliding Scale and one titled Fixed. That refers to the type of incentive that they receive. Older contracts at Metropolitan provided a fixed incentive per acre-foot and the newer contracts provide an incentive that's based on a sliding scale. It basically compares the cost of the produced water to Metropolitan's rate and we pay an incentive if the cost of that water is above our rate.

594 596

structure integrity language, and we are providing funding under those agreements as those projects are producing supply.

- Q. Are you familiar with the rate structure integrity clause in Met's demand management program contracts?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. When Met invoked the rate structure integrity clause, did Met staff provide a recommendation regarding San Diego's demand management contracts?
- A. Yes. We provided a recommendation to terminate the contracts that had rate structure integrity language.
 - Q. Did the board adopt the staff recommendation?
 - A. No, the board did not.
 - Q. Can you describe what the board did instead?
- A. The board chose a different option that ended up terminating two of the local resources program contracts but preserving the contracts that provided conservation incentives to residents and businesses throughout San Diego service area.
- Q. And with respect to those conservation credits, is San Diego County Water Authority the direct recipient of those funds?
- A. No, the County Water Authority is not the direct recipient. The recipient of those incentives are

A cap of \$250 per acre-foot is applied, so this shows those contracts that I was referring to that continue to exist today.

- Q. How much money are the projects that are listed in DTX-705 eligible to receive?
- A. No, not all of these contracts are producing at the contract yield. These projects are difficult to do and pursue. But if they were producing the contract yield, which is what they're eligible for, they would receive up to \$7 million a year.

MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-705 into evidence.

MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX-705 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-705 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Now I would like to switch topics a little bit and ask about the overall funding for the demand management programs.

Does the Water Stewardship Rate always recover the full cost of the demand management programs in each year?

- A. No, it doesn't necessarily recover it in each year.
 - Q. Please turn to PTX-142 in your binder. Can you describe what this document is?

Pages 594 to 597

1.0

1.8

- A. This is an internal memo, a Metropolitan memo that compares the estimated revenue that was generated by the Water Stewardship Rate to the costs that occurred for demand management programs in a given year. In this case it's fiscal year 2008-2009.
- Q. Does Met have a regular practice of writing Water Stewardship Rate yearend transfer update memos?
 - A. Yes, it does.

- Q. And is this an example of an instance where the Water Stewardship Rate did not collect the entire cost of the demand management programs?
- A. Yes. In this year it shows that the demand management costs exceeded the estimated receipts of the Water Stewardship Rate by more than \$40 million.
- Q. Okay. Is a discrepancy of this size an outlier?
- A. Yes. This is the largest discrepancy that I can recall.
 - Q. Why was this year an outlier?
- A. In 2008-2009, in that time period, the State of California was experiencing a drought, Metropolitan was experiencing a significant drought.

And in 2009, we actually had to implement our water supply allocation plan which, you know, really is a signal to the region that the supply situation is pretty

funds collected by the Water Stewardship Rate and the actual costs of the demand management programs?

- A. Yeah. That's natural to occur. I mean, you're looking at a project for a year and the rates are set based on projected water sales and delivery amounts so you never get the exact water sales that you would expect so some discrepancy is natural.
 - Q. Is that because budgeting is prospective?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Turning to the 1.6 million dollar discrepancy in DTX-702, is that closer to what is normal than the \$41 million in the prior exhibit?
- A. Yes. I think if you look at history, the \$41 million was an outlier.

MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-702 into evidence.

MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX-702 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-702 was admitted into Evidence.)

THE COURT: Did you want 142 also in evidence?

MR. KEKER: No objection to that either.

MR. HIXSON: No, we don't.

THE COURT: It's not moved in.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I'm about to switch topics. Do you mind if we take a short break?

THE COURT: Not at all. I'll see everybody in

dire and that we need to batten down the hatches, we need people to conserve, that we need to pull through.

And so we were sending messages via media. We had done a pretty extensive outreach campaign to try to get people in the region, businesses in the region to invest in conservation devices. We were really promoting those incentives, and we saw a similar increase in the expenditures in those programs as people responded.

- Q. When the demand management expenses exceed the funding provided by the Water Stewardship Rate, how are they paid for?
- A. The same way that expenses associated with any of our rates that might be higher is dealt with. We pull it out of our general reserves to cover the cost.
- Can you identify what that document is?

 A. This is a similar yearend document to the one

Q. Please turn to DTX-702 in your binder.

- A. This is a similar yearend document to the one before but it's for a different year. It's for fiscal year 2010-2011.
 - Q. Was there an over collection in this year?
- A. Yes. In contrast, this year the Water Stewardship Rate revenues that were estimated in that year actually exceeded the cost that we saw in that year by about a million and a half dollars.
 - Q. Is there usually some discrepancy between the

ten minutes.

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: Let's continue. Thank you.

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. Does Metropolitan prepare regular reports describing its demand management programs?
 - A. Yes, we do.
 - Q. What are those called?
- A. Those reports, we refer to them as our SB60 reports but they are reports that we file on an annual basis in response to a Senate bill passed a number of years ago that asks us to describe our achievements in the areas of development of local resources and conservation.
 - Q. Please turn to DTX-454 in your binder. Can you describe what this is?
- A. This is an example of that report that I just mentioned. It's for fiscal year 2011-'12.
 - Q. Please turn to page 6 of the SB60 report.

Does this achievement scorecard indicate how many acre-feet of water were saved in that service area from this year for Met's conservation credits program?

A. Yes. Under this scorecard, in the conservation section near the top, this report shows that 156,000 acre-feet of water are saved as a result of our

conservation credits program up through this year, so it's an annual figure.

- Q. So is that figure referring to this fiscal ear?
 - A. Fiscal year 2011-2012, yes.

1.5

- Q. Does this achievement scorecard indicate how many acre-feet of water were produced in Met's service area from that year from Met's local resource program?
- A. Yes. It's actually broken up into two sections, one for recycled water. And you can see in the middle of the table, fiscal year 2011-'12 production for recycled water is 171,000 acre-feet and that's production through our local resources program.

And then the groundwater recovery is reported separately. That's 40,000 acre-feet for 2011-'12. So if you were to combine those two, it's about 211,000 acre-feet of production for our local resource program in that fiscal year.

- Q. And this particular report is about fiscal year 2011-'12; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Were the acre-feet of water conserved or produced by Met's demand management programs similar in quantity in the other years since 2011?
 - A. You know, the amount actually changes in each

people.

And example here is, say, ultra low flow toilets back in the early '90s. Then we go through a cycle of providing those incentives, getting them into the marketplace and then starting to advocate for standard changes within the state so that new plumbing code regulations then require those devices.

And as those plumbing codes actually change, like they did for ultra low flow toilets, we remove the incentive for the devices and they no longer show up here as savings for the active program, because it is now a standard that's in place and its not reported in this number.

We've done that a number of times with ultra low flow toilets, with low flow showerheads. Now with high efficiency toilets, the next generation of more efficient toilets in 2014, they will be the only type of toilet you can buy in the State of California because we along with other folks, we've advocated for plumbing code changes.

Those things don't show up in this number but our philosophy is we use that conservation credits program to help achieve those things. So I do believe it's a conservative estimate.

Q. If there were less recycling and conservation

602 604

year. Generally the trend is upward.

Q. Turning back to this record about fiscal year 2011-'12, what were the demands from Met's supply for that year?

A. The demand was in 2011-'12, it was approximately 1.7 million acre-feet.

- Q. In the absence of Met's demand management programs how much more water would Met have had to deliver to the member agencies in that year?
- A. If you look at these figures, it's about 370 -- just shy of 400,000 acre-feet of additional demands that would have been on the system.
 - Q. What percentage increase would that be?
- A. Its a little bit more than a 20 percent increase in demands on that system.
 - Q. In saying that, are you being conservative?
- A. Well, yes, it's a conservative figure and the reason is that the conservation number here, the 156,000 acre-feet is only representative of the savings associated with the direct incentives that we provide.

And one of the things that underlies our conservation credits program going back to the beginning when we started the program is that we provide incentives for devices that save water. And as those devices become more commonplace in the market, they're more available to

of water in Met service area, would the member agencies necessarily have to buy the additional water supply from Met?

- A. No, they wouldn't.
- Q. Whose distribution system would they have to use to transfer the water to them?
- A. To the extent that they're acquiring additional imported supplies from someone else, they would have to move it through Met's system.
- Q. If Met had to deliver 20 percent more water than it does now, would that be different from the demands it was projecting when it decided to defer or avoid capital expenses to its distribution system?
- A. That would be on the high end. If you look at calendar year 2013, we're delivering about 2 million acre-feet of water. If you are looking at a 20 percent decrease, that would put us up in the range of 2.4 million acre-feet, which is right up with the highest years that we've had.
- Q. But I want to focus back when Met made decisions concerning central pool augmentation, San Diego Pipeline No. 6 and the other items mentioned in the integrated resources plan. If Met's -- if Met today had to deliver 20 percent more water than it currently does, would that be different from the demands that had been

projected back at the time those capital decision were made?

A. Yes, it would. It would represent that we're not meeting the goals in the integrated resources plan.

- Q. And in your view, would it be different to a significant degree?
- A. Yes. We looked at sensitivity in the IRP of 5 percent. Twenty percent difference is significant.
- Q. Does Met quantify the specific deferred or avoided capital costs related to each particular demand management program?
 - A. No, we don't.

1.5

1.5

- Q. Has Met done a backwards look to identify specific capital facilities it would have had to build or expand in the absence of its demand management programs?
 - A. No, we haven't.
- Q. Are Met's decisions whether to build or expand capital facilities forward looking?
- A. Yes. We discuss the -- we looked forward at the projected demands and compared that with the capacity we have in the system to estimate whether we need expansion or not.
- Q. Is there a single biggest factor that influences Met's decisions whether to build out more capital facilities or expand them through to the

demand management programs from the things that are covered by its supply rates?

A. Yes. Supply rates that Metropolitan has are there to recover the cost of supplies, facilities, programs that develop supplies that we're then able to move through our system and sell to our customers and generate revenue.

And the demand management programs do not produce supply that Met is able to move through its system. In fact, what we're paying for is a reduction in demand on our imported system.

MR. HIXSON: Met moves DTX-454 in evidence.

MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX-454 is admitted.
(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-454 was admitted into Evidence.)

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. I'm now going to switch to a different topic and I would like to ask you questions concerning whether San Diego moves non-Metropolitan water through Metropolitan's system.

Are you familiar with how San Diego makes water available to Met under the exchange agreement?

MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. I object. Mr. Upadhyay was designated to testify concerning the relationship between the Water Stewardship Rate and costs

606 608

distribution system?

A. There are many factors, but I would say the biggest is projected demands for the water we have moving through the system.

- Q. If Met had to incur additional capital costs to build out its system, which water rate would recover most of those costs?
 - A. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Sure. If Met had to incur additional capital costs to build out its distribution system, which water rate would recover most of those costs?
 - A. It would be the System Access Rate.
- Q. Even if there were no deferred capital expenses as a result of the demand management programs, is Met's available capacity affected in other ways by the demand management programs?
- A. Yes. Even if we don't have to expand the system, the fact that there is a reduced need to move water through the system means that there is net capacity to the system that wouldn't have been there otherwise. So, to the extent that an agency would want to move supply through that system, that means there's additional capacity in the system that wouldn't have been there otherwise.
 - Q. Is Met getting something different from its

associated with transportation, such as MWD's ability to defer or avoid increased costs for capacity due to the avoided need for additional imported water to be transported to member agencies.

I'm reading from the second pretrial brief. Your order was tell us what the proposed witnesses are going to talk about. That's what he was to talk about. He shouldn't be able to go beyond that.

MR. HIXSON: We offer his testimony as rebuttal to Mr. Cushman's testimony stating that San Diego moves water through Metropolitan's system, and we would offer this to counter that and provide rebuttal to that.

THE COURT: I'm going to let him testify.

I want to say I'm not sure there any factual disputes. I understand there are different inferences parties take from the facts, but are you going to be talking about the identity or non-identity of the water as it's delivered and then as it comes out the other end down to San Diego?

MR. HIXSON: We would like to talk about the mechanics of the exchange and to counter Mr. Cushman's testimony, and your Honor can draw the appropriate inferences that you can under the circumstances.

MR. KEKER: He has -- I don't think -- first of all, I think it's a little disingenuous to say that

1 they're countering Mr. Cushman's testimony. He's got 2 this many exhibits, I'm indicating several inches of 3 material which Mr. Cushman didn't say one word about if 4 he wants to be very, very specific about what the 5 rebuttal is, but it is improper rebuttal to come in and 6 just start chatting about the -- about the subject and that's what he's trying to do. 8 I think rebuttal, if it's legitimate, if you're 9 going allow it should be very, very focused, Mr. Cushman 10 says what and what's he going to say about that. 11 THE COURT: Maybe you can let me know what it 12 is that Mr. Cushman said that you would like to rebut. 13 MR. HIXSON: Mr. Cushman testified that 14 San Diego moves the IID conserved water and the canal 15 lining water through Met's system to San Diego, and we 16 would like to show that that is not the actual nature of 17 the transaction. 18 Most of the exhibits I plan to move in bulk 19 after having the witness describe in category what they 20 relate to, but we believe this evidence is important to 21 showing that factually Mr. Cushman's testimony was 2.2 erroneous. 23 MR. KEKER: Could we get an offer of proof? We 24 may be able to stipulate. Could we get an offer of proof 25 of what he thinks is wrong about that testimony? 610 1 THE COURT: Well, you know, it will be faster 2 for me to just let him put it on. If we were at lunch 3 time, I would suggest you talk about it over lunch. 4 MR. KEKER: I don't think it will, your Honor. 5 You can't -- look at this. 6 MR. HIXSON: I can be done by noon and then 7 your Honor will see what the evidence is. 8 THE COURT: It is your time to spend. 9 Why don't you go ahead. Objection is 10 overruled. 11 BY MR. HIXSON: 12 Q. Are you familiar with how San Diego makes water 13 available to Met under the exchange agreement? 14 A. Yes, I am. 15 Q. Please turn to DTX-51 in your binder. 16 MR. KEKER: This is in evidence. 17 MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, he's being disruptive. 18 MR. KEKER: I'm being disruptive because this 19 is not the trial procedure that we set up ahead of time. 20 We've seen this document. What's the point of this 21 testimony? Not just let's look at the exchange agreement

THE COURT: Objection's overruled.

Q. Can you identify what DTX-51 is?

22

2.3

24

25

again.

BY MR. HIXSON:

```
MR. KEKER: It is the exchange agreement.
 2
       We'll stipulate to it.
 3
            MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, please.
            THE COURT: Mr. Keker.
 5
            MR. KEKER: This is absurd.
 6
            THE COURT: Mr. Keker, it's not helpful. Thank
 7
 8
            Let's proceed.
 9
      BY MR. HIXSON:
10
         Q. Mr. Upadhyay, can you identify what DTX-51 is?
11
         A. This is the exchange agreement between the San
12
      Diego County Water Authority and Metropolitan Water
13
      District.
14
          Q. Does this describe how San Diego makes water
15
      available to Met?
16
            MR. KEKER: Stipulated.
17
            THE WITNESS: It does.
18
      BY MR. HIXSON:
19
          Q. Okay. And can you identify what article does
20
      that?
21
         A. Article 3.1.
22
         Q. Can you describe the process in general?
23
          A. Under the exchange agreement, the County Water
24
      Authority has the ability to receive supplies from the
25
       Imperial Irrigation District via their transfer,
                                                           612
 1
      All-America and Coachella canal lines. That water is
 2
      then provided to Metropolitan and exchanged to
 3
      Metropolitan on the Colorado River. At that point,
 4
      Metropolitan uses that water as is appropriate in our
 5
      system and we deliver a like amount of water to San Diego
 6
      at their service connections.
 7
         O. And can you please describe how Met in turn
 8
      makes like amount of water available to San Diego?
 9
         A. We operate the system in order to meet demands
10
      and provide the water supply at San Diego's connections
11
      as it's demanded within the year. And we credit their
12
      invoices in an amount that is equivalent to the estimated
13
      San Diego exchange for a given year in 1/12th increments
14
      each month through the year.
15
         Q. Does San Diego let Met know how much water it
16
```

- expects to make available each year to Met?
- A. It is a provision of this agreement that before the calendar year starts, typically in November, San Diego provides us with notification of what the expected exchange amount would be for that following
- Q. Please turn to DTX-226 in your binder. Can you explain what this document is?
- A. This is an example of that notification that the San Diego Water Authority provides to Metropolitan.

613

611

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Vol. IV - December 20, 2013 In this case it's providing an estimate of the delivery, it's not accurate to describe that as a 2 2 water that would be exchanged for calendar year 2004. movement of water. 3 3 O. Are there similar notice letters from San Diego THE COURT: Again I don't think there's any 4 4 to Met from 2003 to the present? factual dispute about any of this. I mean everybody 5 5 agrees on what the facts are. A. Yes, there are. 6 6 Q. Have you reviewed all of those notice letters? MR. HIXSON: Your Honor --7 A. I and my staff received these letters and we've THE COURT: Water comes in here and it is not 8 8 the same -- you are saying these are not the same reviewed them, yes. 9 9 Q. After the calendar year is over, does San Diego molecule of water? 10 10 MR. HIXSON: No. We're saying the timing of do a followup to Met concerning the water that was made 11 11 deliveries is sufficiently different. And I intend to available? 12 ask similar follow-up questions about that. 12 A. Yes. In fact there's a similar requirement in 13 13 But if the facts aren't in dispute, I would the exchange agreement, that San Diego notify 14 14 like to make a factual record and the Court can rule Metropolitan of the amount of water and the method in 15 1.5 appropriately. I don't think it's necessary for which it was conserved. 16 16 Mr. Keker to constantly interrupt. Q. Please turn to DTX-227 in your binder. 17 17 MR. KEKER: Why doesn't he just say what he Can you explain what this document is? 18 wants to say and I think we probably agree with it. 18 A. Yes. This is an example of the confirmation 19 19 Exchange agreement speaks for itself, these 12 -- if he letter that we received after a calendar year is done 20 just says it, I think we'll agree with it. 20 where the Water Authority is communicating the amount of 21 And plus, we think this whole exchange 21 water that was exchanged. 2.2 agreement issue is irrelevant to what you're deciding. 22 Q. Are there similar confirmation letters from 23 THE COURT: I understand, I understand. 23 San Diego to Met from 2003 to the present? 24 The objection is over ruled, the exhibits are 24 A. Yes, there are. 25 admitted, 226 through 246. 25 Q. Have you reviewed all of those confirmation 614 1 1 MR. HIXSON: 226 to 246? letters? 2 2 THE COURT: 226? A. Yes. I have a group that works on the 3 3 MR. HIXSON: Yes. accounting for the Colorado River so we've reviewed all 4 THE COURT: Through 246? 4 of these letters. 5 5 MR. HIXSON: That's right. Q. Are DTX numbers 226 through 246 in your binder 6 6 the notice letters and confirmation letters from 7 DTX. 7 San Diego to Met from 2003 forward? 8 8 MR. KEKER: We'll stipulate that they are, your 9 Honor. We object on the grounds that it's outside the 9 into Evidence.) 10 designation, that it's irrelevant, but otherwise we 10 BY MR. HIXSON: 11 stipulate that these are the letters. He doesn't need to 11 12 spend a lot of time looking at them. 12 13 MR. HIXSON: If the witness can identify them, 13 14 I would like to --14

THE COURT: Of DTX. They're all preceded by (Whereupon Exhibits 226 through 246 were admitted Q. Does IID have a reporting obligation to your understanding to the State Water Resources Control Board concerning how much water was actually conserved? 1.5 16 17 18

- A. Yes. Each year IID submits a report to the State Water Resources Control Board that provides pure information regarding how much water was conserved and
- O. Who makes the final determination of how much conserved water and canal lining water was actually made available to Met?
- A. The final determination actually rests with the United States Bureau of Reclamation. They issue an accounting -- they refer to it as the decree accounting report -- roughly in May of each calendar year and that refers or that report applied to the previous calendar

615

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KEKER: Oh.

of DTX-226 through 246.

THE WITNESS: Yes, this is a combination of

MR. HIXSON: These are to demonstrate that

MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan moves the admission

both the notice letters and confirmation letters.

MR. KEKER: Same objection.

THE COURT: Tell me the purpose.

water isn't actually moved through Met's system in

witness that because of the disjuncture in time of

conjunction with other testimony developed from the

617

616

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
1
       year. And that report, basically, tabulates the amount
                                                                           exchanged in a given calendar year before the calendar
 2
                                                                     2
       of water that was available and ultimately delivered by
                                                                           year starts. We use that estimate to credit San Diego on
                                                                     3
 3
                                                                           their invoice each month. What we charge them on the
       entities on the Colorado River.
                                                                     4
 4
          Q. Please turn to DTX-309 in your binder.
                                                                           invoice is the exchange rate, which is a rate that's
 5
                                                                     5
             Can you describe what this is?
                                                                           lower than our full service rate because it doesn't
                                                                     6
 6
          A. Yes. This is an example of the decree
                                                                           include our supply component of our rates.
                                                                     7
 7
       accounting report that I just described. In this case,
                                                                                 So to the extent that that amount of water that
 8
                                                                     8
       it's the Bureau's report that describes 2003, calendar
                                                                           was estimated for a calendar year was not actually
                                                                     9
 9
       vear 2003.
                                                                           exchanged, we delivered water to meet San Diego's needs,
10
                                                                    10
          Q. Have you reviewed the U.S. Bureau of
                                                                           then that means that we did not bill them for an amount
                                                                    11
11
       Reclamation decree accounting reports from 2003 to
                                                                           that was appropriate for our full service rate, because
                                                                    12
12
       present?
                                                                           they didn't exchange all of the water. We delivered the
                                                                    13
1.3
          A. Yes. This is one of the responsibilities of my
                                                                           water but what we billed them was at the exchange rate.
                                                                    14
14
       group.
                                                                              Q. Has that happened in recent years?
15
                                                                    15
          Q. Are DTX-309 through 318 in your binder the U.S.
                                                                              A. It did. It happened in 2011.
                                                                    16
16
       Bureau of Reclamation accounting reports from the time
                                                                              Q. Okay. Please go back to DTX-240 in your
                                                                    17
17
       span 2003 to the present?
                                                                           binder.
                                                                    18
18
             MR. KEKER: Stipulate to that, your Honor.
                                                                                 In this 2010 letter how much IID transfer water
                                                                    19
19
             THE WITNESS: Yes, they are.
                                                                           did San Diego notify Met that it would be exchanging for
20
                                                                    20
             MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan moves DTX No. 309
                                                                           exchange water in 2011?
                                                                    21
21
       through 318 into evidence.
                                                                              A. In this letter the Water Authority was
2.2
                                                                    22
                                                                           notifying Metropolitan that they were scheduled to
             MR. KEKER: Same objection we made before,
                                                                    23
23
                                                                           receive 80,000 acre-feet via the IID transfer and that
       outside the scope of his designation, irrelevant. That's
24
                                                                    24
       it.
                                                                           that would be exchanged to us in calendar year 2011.
25
                                                                    25
                                                                              Q. Please turn to DTX-256 in your binder.
             MR. HIXSON: Same responses. And I'm almost
                                                          618
 1
                                                                     1
                                                                                 THE COURT: I'm not sure it is in the binder.
       done.
 2
                                                                     2
             THE COURT: Just remind me again why I'm going
                                                                                 (Multiple speakers.)
 3
                                                                     3
       to be walking myself through these reports?
                                                                                 THE COURT: We have three people talking at
 4
             MR. HIXSON: These show that after the calendar
                                                                     4
                                                                           once
 5
       year is over is when Metropolitan learns retroactively
                                                                     5
                                                                                 MR. HIXSON: It's the very last document in the
 6
       how much water was made available to it under the
                                                                     6
                                                                           binder, you will be happy to know.
 7
       exchange agreement, which is counter to the notion that
                                                                     7
                                                                                 THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
       there's a movement of water through Metropolitan's
                                                                     8
                                                                           BY MR. HIXSON:
 9
       system.
                                                                     9
                                                                              Q. Can you identify what this document is?
10
             THE COURT: I think I understand. This is in
                                                                    10
                                                                              A. Yes. This is a letter from Metropolitan to the
11
       support of your theory. I'll admit these records 309
                                                                    11
                                                                           County Water Authority in mid-2012 and it is a notice to
12
       through 318. And we can have an argument later the
                                                                    12
                                                                           the Water Authority that they are in default of their
13
       extent to which they're essential to my review.
                                                                    13
                                                                           obligations under the exchange agreement.
14
                       (Whereupon Exhibits 309
                                                                    14
                                                                              Q. And can you explain what the basis was for
                        through 318 were admitted
                                                                    15
                                                                           stating they were in default?
15
                        into Evidence.)
                                                                    16
                                                                              A. They were in default as they did not provide a
16
       BY MR. HIXSON:
                                                                    17
                                                                           report to Metropolitan that showed that the exchange
17
          Q. Mr. Upadhyay, does the Bureau's final
                                                                    18
                                                                           amount had actually occurred until 2011.
18
       accounting always match up with San Diego's estimates?
                                                                    19
                                                                              Q. Did Met make available to San Diego 80,000
19
          A. No, it does not.
                                                                    20
                                                                           acre-feet of exchange water in 2011?
20
          Q. If the final amount of conserved water in canal
                                                                    21
                                                                              A. Yes, we did.
21
       lining water turns out to be less than what San Diego
```

Q. Was that a determination that was made by the

Q. But did San Diego make available to Met 80,000

acre-feet of IID transfer water in 2011?

A. No, they did not.

Pages 618 to 621

621

620

619

22

23

24

25

22

23

24

25

said it would be, what is the implication for Met?

A. The implication for Met is based on the

exchange agreement. And the way that this works is

San Diego provides us with an estimate of what will be

2.5

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation?

- A. Yes. The final decree accounting for calendar year 2011 that the Bureau produced showed that in fact the amount of water that had been exchanged at Metropolitan was less than 80,000 acre-feet.
 - Q. What was the quantity of the shortfall?
- A. The shortfall was about 17,000 acre-feet. 16,722 acre-feet.
- Q. So if San Diego did not provide the full 80,000 acre-feet of IID transfer water, what water had Met been providing to San Diego?
- A. Well, we made deliveries to San Diego's connections to meet their needs and it turns out that that shortfall was actually Metropolitan's supplies that had been delivered to the Water Authority.
- Q. And so had -- what price Met had charged on that shortfall water at the time?
- A. We had charged the Water Authority at the exchange rate, which was assuming that the exchange amount would be delivered under their obligations.
 - Q. And was that lower than the full service rate?
- A. Yes, because the exchange rate does not include Metropolitan's supply rate.
- Q. What position did Met take with respect to this shortfall in 2011?

THE COURT: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEKER:

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Upadhyay.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. Is it U or U?
- A. It's U.
- Q. The Water Stewardship Rate covers the cost of these -- of this local resource program, the desalination program, the conservation program, that you have been talking about; right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And in the -- those programs, you measure what's being conserved or replaced by acre-feet. The sort of the metric is an acre-foot metric; isn't it?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And -- and here, the member agencies can get up to \$250 per acre-foot for conserving water or reducing the need for imported water supplies; right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And every acre-foot that you conserve is a reduction in the need for imported water supplies?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And every acre-foot that's a reduction in imported water supplies means Met needs to deliver less

622 624

- A. We took the position that since the water was not exchanged to us, that meant that that shortfall amount was actually delivery of Met's supply so in mid-2012, we reinvoiced the Water Authority for the difference to reflect that they needed to pay the full service rate.
- Q. And how was this issue concerning the shortfall eventually resolved.
- A. Eventually we came to an agreement with the Water Authority that that shortfall amount, if they could make it up in 2012 and conserve via the transfer with IID more than what they had originally estimated for 2012 to make up for the 2011 shortfall, then we would honor that and exchange that amount in 2012 and charge them the exchange rate on that higher amount in 2012. That would allow them to make up for the shortfall.
 - Q. And is that what happened?
- A. Ultimately that's what happened in calendar year 2012.

MR. HIXSON: Okay. Met moves DTX-256 in evidence.

MR. KEKER: No objection. THE COURT: 256 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-256 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. HIXSON: I pass the witness.

water from the Colorado River or less water that it gets from the State Water Project; right?

- A. Or less water that member agency chooses to acquire from another source and move through our system.
- Q. Now, does the Water Stewardship Rate therefore provide a supply benefit to various people -- various agencies?
- A. The Water Stewardship Rate, the demand management programs that it funds provide a supply reliability benefit as one component of the benefits the region receives.
- Q. Okay. If you're the member agency that has one of these conservation programs, you don't have to buy as much water from Met or from anybody else; right?
 - A. That's true.
 - Q. That's a supply benefit locally; right?
- A. It may be a supply benefit. In the case of conservation, it's simply a reduced demand.
- Q. Well, in the sense that rather than have to spend money on supply, you have to spend less money on supply if you conserve water or somehow replace it with groundwater that's been treated or so on; right? Isn't that a supply benefit?
 - A. They're reducing their use of water, yes.
 - Q. Which is a supply benefit, isn't it?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

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

- A. To the extent that they are purchasing supplies from an entity like Metropolitan, they're paying less for a supply. They're also paying less for moving water through our system if they're acquiring it from somebody else.
- Q. Fair enough. They don't have to pay as much transportation, but they also don't have to pay you for supply because they're just not buying as much water; right?

A. That's correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Q. And then there's also a regional benefit. Everybody that deals with Met is in some ways better off because Met's not as burdened. I mean their supplies are going to go further, right, because somebody's conserving water?

A. The supplies will go further and there's capacity in the system to move additional water.

Q. Okay. Now, Met makes absolutely no effort at this -- and let's say -- let's start with the 5,000 foot level.

They made no effort to quantify the local supply benefit that a member agency gets when it gets money from the Water Stewardship Rate to reduce the burden on its supplies; right?

A. We're paying for acre-feet, either saved or

A. I do.

Q. Yeah. And do you remember being asked at line 13 on 105, "And what -- does Metropolitan make an effort to quantify what the local benefits are associated with the LRP funding?"

What's LRP funding?

A. Local resources program funding provided by Metropolitan, the incentives.

Q. "Answer: No. LRP funding is associated with the regional benefits. The reason Metropolitan is providing the incentives is because of the regional benefits it accrued. "Okay. but there's also a local benefit that Metropolitan doesn't make an effort to quantify? "Answer: We're not -- we're not quantifying a local benefit per se. Obviously the acre-feet represent the benefit that people in the area might receive but it's also a benefit for the region."

Was that your testimony?

A. It was.

Q. Do you make -- does Met make any effort to

626

628

produced at the local level so we are quantifying that.

Q. So you quantify it by this \$250 or less payment that you make per acre-foot?

A. We quantify the acre-feet themselves.

Q. But the acre-feet, that has nothing to do with how much money the local agency saves by not having to buy water from Met at \$600 an acre-foot, does it?

A. The acre-foot amount, sure, sure. There's a relation there.

Q. Does Met -- simple question. Does Met make -does Met make an effort to quantify local supply benefit in these conservation programs?

A. Yes. We quantify the amount of water that is saved or produced.

Q. Could we give Mr. Upadhyay a binder and the judge a binder and everybody a binder?

And in the binder at tab one, you should be able to find your deposition.

I'm sorry. Tab 28. Beg your pardon. Tab 28 is the place where your deposition is.

And I want to direct your attention to page 105, line 13 through 25.

Do you remember having your deposition taken in this case not too long ago, September 13 of this year, by Mr. Braunig here?

quantify the avoided supply cost when you do a -- one of these local programs?

A. On a go forward basis, we're not quantifying that for each project, no.

Q. And is that because -- you are not quantifying it for each project on a going forward basis. Are you quantifying it on a looking backwards basis?

A. We are not.

Q. You don't quantify it at all, do you?

A. We quantified it at the beginning at the outset of the program prospectively looking forward.

Q. Okay. You don't have any -- I think you said in your deposition you don't have any business need to do that?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Now, at the -- move to the 50,000 foot level.

Met didn't make any effort to calculate the regional benefit for 2011 or 2012, did it?

A. For 2011 or 2012, we reported the regional benefit of the acre-feet that was either saved or produced by these programs.

Q. Okay. In some requests for admission that were propounded to Met -- and, your Honor, if I could read into the record number 40.

629

1 "Admit that MWD has not calculated the water management programs, the final draft. 2 2 Okay. If you look at page 9, it talks about -regional benefit to MWD, including but 3 3 let's actually go over to page 10. And it talks about as not limited to any additional 4 4 transportation or conveyance capacity a result of local -- at the bottom, bottom paragraph. 5 5 or additional water supply created by Put that up. 6 6 the aggregate group of local water As a result of local seasonal shift and 7 7 supply projects, seawater desalination long-term contractual conjunctive use storage programs, 8 projects or conservation programs 8 Metropolitan would be able to eliminate the need for an 9 9 funded or subsidized with revenue additional 400,000 acre-foot reservoir. 10 10 collected through the Water Now, a 400 acre-foot reservoir is a supply 11 11 Stewardship Rate in calendar year cost, isn't it? 12 12 2011." A. It probably would be. 13 13 There's an incorporation of objections, but the Q. Okay. So they would be -- so as a result of 14 14 answer is "Admit." the economic benefits of conservation would include being 15 15 MR. HIXSON: Objection. No prior able to eliminate a 400,000 acre-foot reservoir, which is 16 16 inconsistency. a supply cost. 17 THE COURT: He's still allowed to read in an 17 Downsizing an ocean desalination plant, that's 18 RFA. Overruled. 18 a supply cost, isn't it? 19 BY MR. KEKER: 19 A. I don't know that it's wholly a supply cost. 2.0 Q. Is it your testimony that Met did calculate the 20 I'm sure that there are components that would be 21 regional benefit to Met of -- of all of that? 21 considered less too. 22 Are you contradicting this RFA, this request 22 Q. Let's look -- look at the next in your binder, 23 for admission which Ms. Skillman, sitting back here, 23 DTX-20, which is the volume 2 of the integrated resources 24 signed? 24 plan and the chart that you were talking about before at 25 25 A. No. In fact, if you look at my deposition, I page 250. 630 632 1 1 If we could get that up. am reporting to you that we report the acre-feet that is 2 2 either saved or produced by these programs. This is -- you told us that 6.1 was the capital 3 3 Q. Okay. And -- but there is no -- all right. expenditures that could be avoided or if not avoided, 4 Okay, fair enough. 4 delayed by all these conservation programs? 5 5 Would you look at Tab 18? A. These were actually the capital expenditures 6 6 You were shown this document earlier and it that were projected with the preferred resource. 7 7 is -- not Tab 18, DTX-18 which is in your binder at Q. The biggest ones have to do with supply, not 8 8 page -- at Tab 9. conveyance, don't they? 9 9 Do you see that? A. There are significant expenditures in each 10 10 A. I don't have a Tab 9. category. 11 Q. This is the economic benefits of local water 11 Q. I mean let's -- east side reservoir project, 12 management programs that you testified about earlier. 12 that's a apply project, two billion dollars, delayed; 13 It's Tab 9 in the binder I just gave you. 13 right? 14 14 THE COURT: It may be a different tab number. 15 MR. KEKER: Tab 9 in the binder. I just handed 15 A. East side reservoir project is the alternative 16 to him. 16 name for Diamond Valley Lake, which was ultimately built. 17 17 THE COURT: I think it's probably a different Q. Okay. All right. Diamond Valley Lake was a 18 number than that. We just don't have a 9. 18 supply cost, wasn't it? 19 MR. KEKER: Can I just -- could I approach the 19 A. It -- if you look at our cost of service, 20 witness and look and see -- I beg your pardon. I fouled 20 Diamond Valley Lake and the cost of Diamond Valley Lake 21 21 are not wholly supply costs. 22 Q. Would you go back to the binder, Mr. Upadhyay, 22 Q. Look down in the text, the bottom of 250. 23 go back to the binder that Mr. Hixson gave you and look 23 Regional water -- in the second sentence. 24 at the very first exhibit, which is the one I want you to 24 Could we blow up, regional water management 25 talk about. And that's the economic benefits of local 25 facilities under this first category. And the first

633

1 category refers to supply, right, previous sentence? **DECEMBER 20, 2013** AFTERNOON SESSION 2 2 Let me finish. Supply, distribution and PROCEEDINGS 3 3 storage categories. ---000---4 4 Regional water management facilities under this THE COURT: Let's continue, please. 5 5 MR. KEKER: Thank you, your Honor. first category include several groundwater conjunctive 6 6 use projects estimated to cost 176 million over the next BY MR. KEKER: 7 7 ten years, the east side reservoir project estimated to Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Upadhyay. 8 8 cost 1.28 billion over the next ten years. A. Good afternoon. 9 9 Q. The San Diego County Water Authority is charged And that's the same you say as the Diamond Lake 10 10 the Water Stewardship Rate when it moves water through that was built? 11 11 Met's system; isn't that right? A. It's just a different name. 12 12 Q. Okay. Do you know how Diamond Lake was A. That's correct. 13 13 accounted for in the functionalization --Q. And it doesn't matter -- it's -- that's part of 14 14 functionalization process that goes on at Met? the Transportation Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate is? 15 15 A. I -- sitting here now, I can't tell you exactly A. Water Stewardship Rate is charged on any water 16 16 that's moved through the system. 17 17 Q. But it's part of the transportation -- it is Q. We're going to look at that. 18 18 THE COURT: Mr. Keker, if you could let him treated as transportation by Met? 19 19 finish his answer. He had a few more words. A. Sure. For any water that moves through the 20 20 Go ahead, sir. system, yeah. 21 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Sitting here, I can't Q. And any wheeling -- wheeled water that moves 22 22 recount for you how it was accounted for. through the system, they charge the Water Stewardship 23 23 Rate; correct? BY MR. KEKER: 24 24 Q. Do you remember in 2009 advocating for a change A. That's correct. 25 in the cost of service methodology where you wanted some 25 Q. When San Diego moves this IID water through the 634 636 1 1 reservoirs to be moved from the Transportation Rate to system, they charge the Water Stewardship Rate? 2 2 the supply rate? A. San Diego doesn't move IID water through our 3 3 A. I do remember speaking with our member agencies system. 4 4 and the board about that. They were not Diamond Valley Q. When IID water is brought to the -- from the 5 5 Colorado River to the terminal, the eastern terminal of Lake. 6 6 Q. Do you remember one of the arguments that you the Colorado River Aqueduct and put into the system where 7 7 used and a set of slides that we'll look at after lunch it moves with other molecules of water that might not be 8 8 was the Diamond Valley Lake was accounted for under the completely similar and at the other end when Met provides 9 9 supply function, not conveyance? to San Diego an equivalent amount of water, they charge 10 10 A. I don't recall that but that's not to say I the Water Stewardship Rate, don't they, sir? 11 11 MR. HIXSON: Objection; compound. didn't say that. 12 12 Q. And what you were arguing for there is that THE COURT: Overruled. 13 13 these other lakes, which were allocated to THE WITNESS: The Water Stewardship Rate is 14 14 transportation, would be more appropriately allocated part of the exchange rate structure. 15 15 under cost of service analysis to supply; right? BY MR. KEKER: 16 16 Q. But desalination and these local resource A. Again, I don't recall. 17 17 Q. We'll go over it after lunch. I'll give you a programs are not, as I think you've said, available to 18 18 the San Diego Water Authority, are they? chance to look at it. 19 19 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, what's your pleasure? A. I think I mentioned earlier that the county 20 20 THE COURT: Whenever is a good time for you. Water Authority has a number of contracts that are LRP 21 21 MR. KEKER: This is a good time. contracts that have been available to them and continue 22 22 THE COURT: All right. 1:30. to be paid. 23 2.3 See everybody then. Q. As of sometime in 2011, the board instructed 24 24 Thank you. that no more -- no new projects, at least, for 25 25 (Noon recess taken.) desalination or local resource program conservation would 635 637

be funded for San Diego; is that right or wrong?

2.3

A. I believe the board recognized that the RSI provision had been triggered in the contracts that included it. Any new contracts would have an RSI provision in them, but the board didn't say forever more that Water Authority wouldn't be able to participate in the programs.

- Q. Did the board instruct the staff not to approve any new programs?
 - A. Absent further board guidance.
- Q. Okay. Until the board told you otherwise, the board instructed the staff: Do not let San Diego in on these local conservation programs; right?
- A. The conservation programs, as I mentioned earlier, continued to be --
 - Q. Sorry, I misspoke.
 - A. -- available within the San Diego service area.
- Q. The local conservation program that -- I was speaking too generally.

The local resource program and desalination program at the board's instruction was no longer available to San Diego until further decision by the board; right?

A. The -- any contract under the LRP program would require the RSI language, so we are in a proceeding right

desalination?

O. I am.

A. That Carlsbad desalination would have been a significant facility and investment.

- Q. And the board instructed that you're not going to enter into a contract for that desalination facility because of the RSI clause; right?
- A. Until we're done with this proceeding, an agreement for that, another agreement for that would not come back to the board.
- Q. Do you expect that if we rest on -- if the case is over on Monday, Met is going to start funding San Diego again? Is that your testimony?
 - A. I can't speculate, sir.
- Q. The -- let's just get it clear. The board has instructed that until further noise from the board, no new programs for local resource programs or desalination for San Diego; right?
 - A. That's where we are right now.
 - Q. Okay. And -- but San Diego, as we've established, continues to pay into this fund which is used to dole out money to other member agencies; right?
 - A. And themselves.
 - Q. And that fund -- as you've established on direct examination, you were shown some exhibits.

638 640

now that triggers the RSI language.

Q. And that's a fairly complicated way of saying something I think is fairly simple.

San Diego, according to the board of Met, is ineligible until further notice for any of this money that is doled out for local resource programs or desalination; right?

- A. That is not correct.
- Q. Okay. What's it -- what new programs are they allowed to participate in?
- A. For new programs, I believe that's correct, they are continuing to receive money under the current contracts.
- Q. Okay. Under old programs, they still get some money. You've listed -- and they are all sort of trivial, aren't they, the old programs?
 - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. The old programs are fairly trivial compared to what we were talking about, for example the desalination program, small amounts of acre-feet of water?
- A. I believe some of them are in the thousands of acre-feet.
- Q. Okay. Desalination program was a big ticket; ight?
 - A. The -- are you referring to the Carlsbad

Sometimes that fund is negative, ends up negative after a year. We saw one example of I think 40 or \$45 million negative, and sometimes it ends up positive, a couple million dollars positive; right?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And when it's negative, the general reserves of Met fill it up again; right?
- A. I wouldn't say they fill it up again. General reserves are used to pay for the costs.
- Q. Okay. But it would be fair to call this fund, the Water Stewardship Rate funds a general fund for the use of the agency to dole out projects; right?
- A. Our rates go into our general reserves and those reserves are used to pay our costs when our overall revenues are below what's necessary to pay for those costs.
- Q. But there's certainly no one-to-one -- you've already testified it's not like you pay in a dollar and you get back a dollar or the equivalent?
 - A. That's not the design of the program.
- Q. All right. Now, I think we've agreed before lunch that the conservation programs -- and by "conservation programs," can I use that word to cover all three? What you call conservation by giving people rebates for low flow toilets and so on and the local

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

resource programs and the desalination programs, can I call them conservation programs?

- A. My preference is to use the term demand management programs.
 - Q. Demand -- okay, I will.
 - A. Conservation can be confusing.
 - Q. Demand management programs.

THE COURT: If we could not talk on top of each other, it would be easier for the court reporter.

Go ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. KEKER: I'm going to use demand management programs to cover the conservation programs, the local resource programs and the desalinization, your Honor and Mr. Upadhyay.

- Q. Have we agreed that those programs provide a supply benefit both to the local agencies that get them and to the region?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And they are measured -- the only measurement of those programs you were going through on direct is a measure of acre-feet. We're getting a number of acre feet of conservation, a number of acre-feet of new water, right?
 - A. That's the measure we report annually, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And acre-foot is a measure of supply,

The other aspect is even if the you didn't have to expand the facilities, that there is a net capacity available in the system because not as much water is moving through the system.

- Q. Okay.
- A. So someone that wanted to move water through our system would have additional capacity to do so.
- Q. But one suspect is that you're avoiding capital costs that are related not just to acquire supply but also to moving the water?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And even though it's not measured -well, let me ask you, the Met does not calculate what percentage of the cost of conservation avoids supply costs versus what percentage avoids conveyance costs; does it?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Now, you could do that, couldn't you?
- A. On a retrospective basis if we were to look back, I suppose we could.
 - Q. Well, you used to do it, didn't you?
- A. What we originally did was we looked forward and projected what the capital needs would be under a demand set that didn't have the demand management programs and a preferred resource mix that did.

642 644

isn't it?

A. In this case, it's a measure of demand reduction.

Q. Okay. And demand reduction is another way of saying supply?

A. It's reduction in the demand on Metropolitan's system.

Q. But there's no measurement that anybody makes that an acre-foot of conserved water is going to equal for this year's rates, for 2011-'12 this much avoided cost of supply or this much avoided cost of conveyance. That's not measured, is it?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now, it's Met's position that in addition to the supply benefit that these DMD programs provide, there's also a benefit by increasing the system capacity; is that right?

A. That's correct.

- Q. And by increasing the system capacity, what you mean is the same capacity will -- you will be using it less and so you don't -- and so maybe you don't have to expand it as much. That's an advantage; right?
- A. That's one aspect of it, which is that you don't have to expand the facilities to the same degree you would otherwise.

Q. Didn't you used to in the early '90s figure out what percentage of the conservation avoided supply costs versus what percentage avoided conveyance costs?

A. I don't recall that.

Q. Okay. Could we look at your deposition, page 126?

Maybe, Jeff, will you play it? MR. HIXSON: Hold on. What lines?

MR. KEKER: 126, 4 through 16.

Don't play it yet until counsel has had a chance to look at it.

THE COURT: This is in your materials, isn't it?

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir, it should be. The deposition should be the first tab.

Should be the last tab. I knew I was right, one end or the other.

THE COURT: The page cite is?

MR. KEKER: 126, 4 through 16. THE COURT: Any objection?

21 MR. HIXSON: That's fine, go ahead. 22

(Video played.)

BY MR. KEKER:

Q. Mr. Upadhyay, every single penny that's collected in the -- by the Water Stewardship Rate is

645

643

Pages 642 to 645

1 loaded on to the Transportation Rate or the wheeling rate MR. KEKER: Then it was my mistake, too. 2 2 as the case may be and not a penny of it is put on to the Q. This is part of the administrative record. 3 3 supply rate. Am I right about that? It's the integrated resources plan. It's MWD record 4 4 A. It's not included in the supply rate, it is 0014016 is the first page and I'm asking about 1448. 5 5 Are you there, sir? included in our full service rates and our wheeling 6 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Now, since 1996 when this integrated resource Q. And then under water conservation, do you see 8 8 plan was being worked on, conservation was recognized as the first two sentences there in the middle of the page? 9 9 a supply option like any other traditional supply It says "The relationship between urban water 10 10 conservation and the projection of water demands was project, wasn't it? 11 11 discussed in section 2. However, during the IRP" -- that MR. HIXSON: Object to "conservation." It's 12 stands for integrated water -- or resources plan; right, 12 vague. 13 13 IRP. MR. KEKER: Excuse me. DMD. 14 14 A. Correct. MR. HIXSON: Demand management. 15 Q. -- "conservation was also considered as a 15 MR. KEKER: Demand management. 16 supply option much like any other traditional supply 16 THE COURT: Do you have the question in mind? 17 17 project." MR. KEKER: I'll ask it again if you want me 18 Right? 18 to 19 19 A. That's what it reads. THE COURT: He's got it. 20 Q. Now, this idea that somehow part of the benefit 20 THE WITNESS: Demand management programs were 21 of DMD projects, part of the justification of why they 21 included in the integrated resources plan as providing a 22 should be on the Transportation Rate is this idea that 22 regional benefit. In fact, my response that was just 23 they increase capacity within the system; right? 23 played was a reference to the economic study that we had 24 A. That's correct. 24 done that tabulated a supply and a conveyance benefit 2.5 Q. Okay. But Met doesn't need increased capacity 25 associated with those programs. 646 648 1 1 BY MR. KEKER: right now, does it? 2 2 O. Okay. If you'd just bear with me for a second. A. What do you mean by "right now"? 3 3 Look, if you would, at the integrated tab 8 of Q. Well, I mean over the last few years. 4 your binder. 4 A. The last few years demands for water moved 5 5 Do you have it? through Metropolitan system have been relatively low. 6 6 You should have in tab 8 the Southern Q. And demand has been shrinking, it's been going 7 7 California integrated resources plan, volume 1 and volume down since 2008; right? 8 8 2. And I'm going to ask you to look at page 298. A. Demands are lower now than they were in 2008. 9 THE COURT: What exhibit number is this for the 9 Q. And you haven't operated at full capacity for 10 1.0 record? Is this 256? at least the last few years; right? 11 11 A. I believe that there are portions of our No. 12 12 MR. KEKER: This is DTX-256. system, even in that period since 2008 that were operated 13 13 THE COURT: This may be the page number. That at capacity for times of the year. 14 14 Q. Okay. Well, let's go through this slowly to might be my fault. 15 15 This is part of the administrative record? make sure that we got it straight. 16 16 MR. KEKER: Yes, sir, it is part of the At tab 17 in your binder, there is a recent 17 17 bond issue, and this is PTX-244 which is in evidence, has administrative record, for sure. And the page in the 18 18 administrative record is 1448 and it's a part of both been moved into evidence. And the page I'm going to ask 19 19 administrative -- I mean it was 2010 and carried over. you about is A46, which at the bottom is a table of water 20 20 THE COURT: 1448? sold and water sales receipts for the years 2008 through 21 21 MR. KEKER: 1448 are the last four numbers. 2012. Do you see that? 22 22 MR. HIXSON: And I'm going to object to A. I do. counsel's statement that this is DTX-256. It might be 23 23 Q. And what that shows is that in 2008, 2.3 24 24 million acre-feet were sold; the next year, 2009, 2.16 but there's no DTX number on it. 25 25 acre-feet, million acre-feet. THE COURT: I understand. That was my mistake.

649

The next year, it went down to 1,857,000 acre-feet. 2011, it was down to 1,632,000 acre-feet and last year, it went up a tiny bit to 1,676,000 acre-feet.

Is that right? Does that look right to you?

A. Looks right to me.

Q. And it's going to go even lower as this requirement that the 2010 IRP revision of reducing per capita consumption by 20 percent clicks in over the years, isn't it?

A. I don't agree with that.

Q. You don't think that the requirement that you reduce per capita consumption of water by 20 percent was designed to and will reduce the demand for Met water in the future?

A. The water that Metropolitan has to deliver in the future will be reduced compared to an alternative where we don't achieve those objectives.

But if you look over time, you see a fluctuation in the water that Metropolitan has to deliver that's within this range. In fact, if you looked at the '90's, we went from water sales that were in the 2.3 to 2.5 million acre-feet range all the way down to deliveries that were in the 1.5 million acre-feet range. And lo and behold, in the early 2000s they popped back up again. And there are a lot of factors that play into

Diamond Valley Lake. It is currently the largest surface water reservoir in Southern California.

- Q. And that's a supply. At least part of that is allocated to supply, drought supply, peak year supply; right?
- A. The reservoir functionally is broken up into a number of different elements and one of them is supply, one of them is capacity, conveyance, system capacity, and one of them is standby capacity.
 - Q. But none of them is conveyance?
 - A. I'm not sure that none of them are conveyance.
- Q. Well, you just mentioned that -- what you just mentioned did not include conveyance, did it?
- A. Again, I think that the reservoir is split up into three different components. One of them is supply, one of them is the regulatory capacity of the system so it's contributing to the capacity to deliver, and one of them is standby capacity for emergency purposes.
- Q. Would you look at tab 27 please, sir? This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 386.

And this is an e-mail from you to Mr. Thomas. Will you tell us on August 6th, 2009 who is Mr. Thomas?

- A. This is referring to Brian Thomas. He was the chief financial officer at Metropolitan at the time.
 - O. And the title is COS observations. Is this

what those deliveries are required to be in a given year.

- Q. Does Met have any responsibility in setting the Water Stewardship Rate for these conservation projects, to take into account when it's doing that whether or not it actually needs extra capacity over the next couple of years -- or the next few years?
- A. The goal of our program is to help reach the integrated resources plan targets which are long-term in nature.
- Q. You mentioned earlier this east branch State Water Project expansion program that was -- turns out not to have been needed. That was a supply program, wasn't it?
 - A. It was not a supply program.
- Q. Did it have anything to do with creating supply, a reservoir to create supply?
- A. No. I was referring to the expansion of the east branch of the conveyance system on the State Water Project.
- Q. Okay. But the reservoir that was going to be built there, it was going to cost a couple billion dollars. That didn't need to be -- didn't need to be built either, did it?
- A. Metropolitan built a completely separate facility than what you're referring to that is known as

cost of service observations?

- A. I believe so, yes.
- Q. And then Sydney Bennion, who is she?
- A. Syd Bennion is in our legal counsel's office.
- Q. She's an assistant general counsel?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. If you look over on the next page, you write to Mr. Thomas in the next to the last full paragraph, "Currently the distribution function has no costs classified as standby. This seems strange to me as it would seem that we have not operated at full capacity in the past few years."

Was that a true statement when you said it in 2009, we haven't operated at full capacity in the last few years?

- A. I believe that at that time, that it was hard to look at the system as a whole and say that all of the system was used at full capacity.
- Q. Okay. So when they're setting the 2010 rates, one of the things that you have to consider in trying to figure out whether or not there was any benefit to increasing system capacity is whether or not you needed it, whether or not it was of value to the system; right?
- A. What this is speaking to is whether or not costs of the system would be allocated to certain rate

components or functions. And the function that's being discussed there is standby capacity, so capacity in the system is standing by to provide service in the future.

Q. Okay. The last sentence says, "Moving the Castaic and Perris costs to the supply function."

2.3

Castaic and Perris costs are what? These are terminal reservoirs that take in the water from the State Water Project?

- A. I'm not sure where you are in the letter.
- Q. I'm sorry. Last sentence of the e-mail, right above "food for thought."
- A. So you're -- I'm sorry. Can you repeat your question?
 - Q. Would you tell us what Castaic and Perris are?
- A. Castaic Lake and Lake Perris are the terminal reservoirs in DWR's State Water Project conveyance system.
- Q. Okay. And that's where Met's own conveyance system begins, bringing water out of those lakes?
 - A. That's when our distribution system begins.
- Q. Okay. And you don't own anything north of that?
- A. No. We're simply obligated to pay for the fixed costs.
 - Q. You're obligated to the State Water Project to

A. This was looking at a portion of Castaic and Perris that could be allocated to the supply function from a transportation function.

Q. And so previous -- at the time you were writing the memo, they were allocated to the transportation function and now you were -- the -- there's a possibility of thinking about moving them to supply?

- A. That's correct.
- O. We'll look at that more in a minute.

But then at the end of that, it says "which may help the politics of the package." What did you mean by the politics of the package?

A. The reference there is to changing fixed revenues.

One of the things that the board was looking at at the time and had asked us as staff to look at was whether there were ways to change or consider a different level of fixed revenues as part of Metropolitan's overall rate structure.

- Q. More like a commitment program where people had to commit to buy a certain amount of water?
- A. Some folks had mentioned that. Others had mentioned other ways to change fixed revenues.
- Q. Now, going back to the 1996 IRP, by 2009 when you were writing that memo, you knew and Met knew that

654 656

pay -- the State Water Project brings you the and provides you the supply in these two lakes, maybe among other places, and what you're suggesting is that the cost of those two lakes should move to the supply function?

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I'm going to object as outside the scope of the direct. It has nothing to do with demand management or the exchange agreement.

THE COURT: You may be right. I'm going to take this as impeachment of some of his earlier statements and I'll let it in for that purpose.

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question? BY MR. KEKER:

- Q. Yeah. What -- what do you mean by moving the -- where were you moving from and why did -- why were you talking about moving the Castaic and Perris cost to the supply function?
- A. The -- at the time Metropolitan's board had asked staff to look at options and review the cost of service, to look at our rates overall and what this was looking at was whether there were other ways to take a look at our cost of service and assign costs and there were.
- Q. And Castaic and Perris costs, it says "moving to the supply function." Where would they be moving from?

the IRP projections about the increasing demand had been -- had turned out to be very, very wrong, didn't you?

- A. At the time in 2009, we were in an allocation plan. So we were asking people to reduce demand on Metropolitan's system in an extraordinary fashion. We were seeing a response to that that was a delivery in our system that was much lower.
- Q. Would you go back to Tab 8, which is the 1996 IRP. I want to direct your attention to Table 4.1, which is at page 339 of the exhibit.

And this is in the record, your Honor, and the page number in the record is 1489.

When I say "in the record" in the administrative record.

THE COURT: Appreciate it. BY MR. KEKER:

- Q. Do you see that? Do you see Table 4.1?
- A. I do.
- Q. Do I read this correct?

What is -- what is the 1996 IRP projecting for the period 2009 and 2010 to be the total demand on Metropolitan? How much water it's going to be selling?

A. It's projecting under normal conditions just under 2.5 million acre-feet.

- Q. In fact, what they sold that year was around million six instead of the 2.5; right?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. So by 2009, 2010 did you understand -- did you believe that the DMD projects, the effect on avoiding costs for new conveyance systems, would be different than it had been in 1996?
 - A. In -- the time you're referring to is 2009?
 - Q. '09, '10.
- A. During that time period, we were seeing a reduction in demand in our system as a result of the conditions that I had described before, which would be consistent with projections lower than this. If you knew those conditions were going to hit and you were calling for people to reduce their demands in an extraordinary fashion -- we expected demands to be lower.
- Q. And as a result of this problem with water supply, the -- there was plenty of capacity in the system. Capacity wasn't the issue; right?
- A. Depends where you're looking in the system. Part of the issue we were facing was that, in fact, there wasn't capacity to move water into the State Water Project system as a result of restrictions that were being placed in the Delta that wasn't allowing water to move.

A. The water was available. The capacity to move the water was not available.

THE COURT: In that last answer, what do you mean by the word "capacity"? Do you mean the functioning of pumps or do you mean the tube?

THE WITNESS: The ability to use the pumps to move the water.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. KEKER:

- Q. And the reason you couldn't use the pumps is that environmental folks were saying, don't let them pump so much water out of the Delta; right?
- A. There were restrictions being placed on the use.
- Q. So it is not that the pumps didn't work or the pumps couldn't pump 24 hours a day or the pumps needed to be replaced or the pumps needed to have better pumps built in Germany, it's that you couldn't run them all day; right?
 - A. They couldn't run to move the water.
 - Q. And you call that a capacity problem?
 - A. It's an inability to move supply, so it's a capacity constraint.
 - Q. All right. I promised you I would show you this later on.

658 660

- Q. Okay. But that's a different kind of capacity. What you're saying is -- the aqueduct hasn't gotten smaller all of a sudden, has it?
 - A. No.
 - Q. What you're saying is the supply wasn't there to fill up this conveyance system, right, because of environmental concerns and other concerns?
 - A. No. To -- in order to be able to move water, you have to be able to have the capacity in the pumps. Part of the capacity of the pumps is regulated -- based on regulations that allow you to either run the pumps or not and there wasn't capacity to move water at the time. That's part of the reason we had to call for conservation and ultimately implement an allocation plan.
 - Q. But the problem was -- is that the state wasn't letting the amount of water go into the system that Met wanted to get for its customers in Southern California, right, that's why they were limiting the use of the pumps and so on?
 - A. They were facing restrictions related to environmental constraints.
 - Q. They were saying you're not taking -- the problem was not capacity of the conveyance system, the problem was the state wouldn't let you have the amount of water that you needed; right?

Would you look at Tab 5 of your binder please,

And this is a little bit after the e-mail you wrote about you talked about we haven't been running at full capacity for several years.

THE COURT: This is record 1753? MR. KEKER: Yes, sir. And it's in the

administrative record. And it's action item 8-1, change to cost of service methodology, November 9, 2009, from the office of CFO.

- O. CFO at the time was Mr. Thomas?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Were you in the office as an assistant then?
- A. I was a section manager.
- Q. Was this your project? Was this pretty much your baby, this proposal?
 - A. This was in my area of responsibility.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I'm going to renew my objection. This is far outside the scope of direct.

MR. KEKER: This goes right to -- he's talked about Diamond Lake and so on.

THE COURT: I honestly don't know yet. Let's reserve your objections to some questions as we see it going forward. I can't tell if it is or not.

25 //

BY MR. KEKER:

2.2

1.0

Q. Okay. On page 4, which has the record citation 10756, this is a reference to an adjustment that's being recommended for State Water Project flex storage and it says Metropolitan has the ability to borrow water out of Castaic Lake and Lake Perris in dry years, and this agreement provides a dry year supply benefit to Metropolitan.

And it goes on to say DWR charges for these facilities as transportation facilities, terminal reservoirs.

And the next slide, 5, talks about Diamond Valley Lake is treated differently and then mentions what I think you've already said, drought storage provides increased dry year supply, drought storage costs are a supply to -- assigned to the supply function.

Now, why were you talking about this? What was the issue and what was the circumstance? What were you trying to achieve by talking about this?

- A. Well, we had been asked by our board of directors to take a look at our cost of service and various options related to the cost of service.
- Q. And had they asked anything specific about these charges or is this something you all came up with?
 - A. This was part of an overall effort where they

except direct staff to keep thinking; right?

- A. Option II was for us to not make a change in the cost of service at that time, to continue with our integrated resources plan process which was going through an update at the time and to full discussion into our long-range finance plan, which is a broader look at overall long-range finances, rates and impact in the long term.
 - Q. And Option III was to direct the staff to make other changes to the cost of service methodology as well; right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And then the next page, page 12, staff recommends Option I?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. What happened?
- A. The board, as I mentioned, chose option II and directed us to look in the integrated resources plan and long-range finance plan as an overall, overarching effort to review things going forward.
- Q. They didn't want anybody to do anything to destabilize the rates, did they?
 - A. I can't speculate as to that.
 - Q. They didn't tell you that?
 - A. I don't recall that.

662 664

were looking at fixed revenues, cost of service.

I believe if you look earlier on in this presentation, there were a number of different things being considered at the time. The cost of service categories was one element of it.

Q. Okay. Then the next page, page 6, it says SWP current approach. Castaic and Perris are included in the conveyance function and costs are recovered in the System Access Rate and the Readiness-to-Serve Charge; is that right?

A. That's true.

Q. Okay. Then item 7, you're suggesting an alternative approach, that since they're used for drought storage, that a portion of their costs should be treated as supply costs and the drought storage component should be included in the supply function and that would move about ten million dollars to the supply function instead of conveyance; right? That was a suggestion that you were making?

A. That was this alternative approach.

- Q. And then you -- you -- in page 10 and 11, you gave three options for the board. One was to do what you wanted them to do. That's Option I; right?
 - A. Option I was this alternative approach.
 - Q. And Option II was to do absolutely nothing

Q. Did you believe they were for political reasons, as you mentioned in the e-mail, the political aspect of this?

A. I don't believe there was any ignoring of cost of service principles. We were presenting another option.

MR. KEKER: That's all I have. Thank you, Mr. Upadhyay.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, may I have a few minutes to review my notes?

THE COURT: Of course. What would you like?

MR. HIXSON: Five minutes.

THE COURT: See you in five.

(Brief break.)

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I have two exhibits I would like to ask the witness about and I would like to provide them to the Court.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. HIXSON: Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Mr. Upadhyay, do you still have the binder that the other side gave you for cross-examination?

A. I do.

Pages 662 to 665

1 Q. Can you turn to Tab 5? THE COURT: Of course. 2 2 A. Yes. **RECROSS-EXAMINATION** 3 3 Q. And do you recall that on cross-examination, BY MR. KEKER: 4 4 you were asked questions about this PowerPoint Q. Looking at 706, board report from Mr. Thomas, 5 5 did you write this up? Is this yours? presentation concerning action item 8-1? 6 6 A. This came out of the CFO. I believe it was my A. Yes, I do. 7 O. And did that concern this issue that Mr. Keker responsibility. 8 8 asked you about concerning the reservoirs and the cost of Q. Okay. And one of the things in the bottom of 9 9 the second paragraph, you're saying as a result the 10 10 A. Yes, it did. System Access Rate would be reduced and the supply rate 11 11 would increase. Q. Can you please look at DTX No. 706? 12 12 And can you describe what DTX-706 is? Do you see that? 13 13 A. DTX-706 is a board letter that went to our A. I do. 14 14 board that the presentation that we discussed earlier was Q. And then on the next page, actually gone to 15 15 in regards to. It was a board letter looking at the cost some trouble to list exactly what would happen if the 16 16 of service allocation and the flexible storage components board made this change that you're recommending in the 17 17 cost of service methodology and moved some of this of Castaic and Lake Perris. And it also described other 18 18 flexible storage components over to supply and they -potential changes that may happen in the future, things 19 19 like fixed costs, ad valorem tax rates and other items that's what's depicted here; right? 20 20 that could happen down the road. A. That is a characterization of what would happen 21 21 Q. Could you please turn to DTX-707 in front of before and after the change. 22 22 you? Q. Okay. And for example -- and it's got -- so 23 23 And can you identify what DTX-707 is? San Diego would get an advantage, would pay \$600,000 24 24 A. These are the minutes of the board of directors less; right? 25 meeting from Metropolitan in November that considered 25 A. That's what's shown in this table. 666 668 1 1 Q. Los Angeles would have to pay \$100,000, that action item. 2 2 Q. Please turn to page 8 and look at the first top approximately more; right? 3 3 item. A. That's what this table shows. 4 Does item number 48082 relate to DTX-706 and 4 Q. And nobody else -- and there's other 5 that board presentation? 5 differences but they're not enough to even appear on this 6 A. Yes, it does. 6 chart because of the rounding. I mean basically Q. And do the minutes indicate what action the 7 everybody else stays even; right? 8 board took on that item? 8 A. That's correct. 9 A. Yes. The minutes show that the board adopted 9 Q. And so then -- so the board -- you get to the 10 Option II in that board letter and directed staff to not 10 board with this fairly modest change and it's voted down. 11 make changes to the cost of service methodology at that 11 Instead, they decide not change anything; right? 12 time but to continue work with the member agencies on the 12 A. Not at that time. 13 cost of service methodology through our integrated 13 O. How did L.A. vote? 14 resources plan and the long-range financial planning 14 A. I don't recall. 15 process at Metropolitan. 15 Q. Was there any discussion about the need to keep 16 MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan moves DTX-706 and 707 16 rates stable? 17 into evidence. 17 A. I do not recall. 18 MR. KEKER: No objection. 18 Q. Was there any discussion about the "hold 19 THE COURT: 706 and 707 are admitted. They're 19 harmless" principle? That whatever happens, we can't let 20 both DTX. 20 other members' rates go up? 21 (Whereupon Exhibits DTX-706 21 A. I don't recall specifically anything along and DTX-707 were admitted 22 22 those lines. Although I do know that historically, when into Evidence.) 23 23 things are considered about Metropolitan's rates, we tend MR. HIXSON: That's all I have. 24 2.4 MR. KEKER: Just a couple questions about to show the adjustments that might be occurring on an

669

agency basis so that our board is aware of what those

667

25

those, your Honor.

changes might do.

1.3

2.2

2.3

Q. Fair enough. And you heard historically since you've been there. You started in 1995, I think you said.

Have you heard about this San Pedro "hold harmless" principle, that no -- that you can't have rates that cause any member a financial injury because of some change?

A. I've heard of that general concept, yes.

Q. And that's -- that's out of some San Pedro declaration and the idea is that when we're setting -- when we're changing our rates, we've got to not -- we have to protect the member agencies that aren't going to have their rates affected by what they're doing.

That's a bad question.

For example, when the wheeling issue came up, it was a very important principle back in the '90s that no member who wasn't wheeling have any financial injury as a result of wheeling within the Met system; right?

MR. HIXSON: Objection. Vague and now we're way outside the scope.

THE COURT: You're outside the scope at this point. I'll sustain that objection.

MR. KEKER: Thank you.
MR. HIXSON: Some redirect.

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

If you will adjust the microphone and then state and spell your first and last name, please?

THE WITNESS: My name first name is June, J-U-N-E, my last name is Skillman, S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N.

THE COURT: If you could actually talk into the microphone. Adjust it so that it's convenient, about four inches away from your mouth. IF talk into it, people will be able to hear you.

Thank you.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I would like to provide your Honor and the witness with this binder.

THE COURT: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Skillman. Who do you work for?

A. I work for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Q. And how long have you worked for Met?

A. I've been employed by Metropolitan since May of 2005. And prior to that, I worked for Metropolitan from January 1995 through January of 1997.

Q. Can you provide a general description of your job responsibilities?

THE COURT: All right.
 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
 BY MR. HIXSON:

Q. Turning back to Exhibit 707, the board minutes on the top of page 8, with respect to the flex storage proposal that was being proposed to the board, would you characterize that as a proposed incremental change to Met's rate structure?

A. Yes, I would.

Q. And when the board directed staff to work on cost of service in the long-range finance plan, was that a more holistic look at Met's rate structure?

A. The board was asking us to look at things in the broader context.

MR. HIXSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. You're excused. Thank you so much.

Sir?

MR. HIXSON: We will call our next witness, June Skillman.

THE COURT: Thank you.

JUNE SKILLMAN,

Having been called as a witness by the Defense, and having been duly sworn under the standard oath, was examined and testified as follows:

A. I'm the current manager of the budget and financial planning section and I'm responsible for Metropolitan's development, presentation and implementation of the biennial budget and rates and charges that support that budget.

Q. Does your work at Met involve Met's cost of service studies?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. And can you describe how so?

A. My group is responsible for taking the prospective budget and our costs and performing cost of service study, which basically takes those costs and allocates them into rates and charges to generate the revenues we need.

Q. Does Metropolitan undertake a cost of service study in each rate setting cycle?

A. It does.

Q. I would like to ask you some questions about how Met recovers peaking and standby expenses.

Can you please turn to DTX-110 in your binder?

Can you identify what DTX-110 is?

A. This is a board action letter that was from April of 2012 and it was proposing to the board our biennial budget for fiscal year 2013 and 2014 and the rates and charges that would support that budget. It

included the resolutions for the Readiness-to-Serve Charge and the passive charge as well.

2.2

Q. Please turn to the page containing the Bates number 16674.

Is this an attachment to the board letter?

A. This is. The board letter that we provided to the board in April of 2012 had three different rate options for the board to consider and because it was a biennial budget and biennial rates proposal, each of those three options had two cost of service studies associated with them.

And the document that starts with Bates number 16674 is the first year of the biennial budget and rates to support it. It's the cost of service study and it's the first year for Option II, which was the option that the board selected.

- Q. Does this cost of service study show the steps in Met's cost of service analysis?
- A. It does. It is on page 6 of 29 and it's figure 1. It's Bates 16679.
- Q. In which step does Met identify which costs are associated with peaking or standby expenses?
- A. That is done in step number 3, which is the classification of costs.
 - Q. Okay. For cost of service purposes, how does

A. When we talk about peaking on the system, what we're talking about is the behavior, a member agency's demands over average within that year.

So we're specifically looking at the summer period, which is when we incur peak demands, and that's when we expect that peak week period to occur.

So, while the usage over the year will help us understand average usage of the system, when we want to understand peaking, we look at what's going on at the member agency during their highest day.

- Q. For cost of service purposes, what does standby mean?
- A. Within Metropolitan's cost of service study, standby refers to the portion of the system that meets emergency requirements such as an earthquake. Or it may also meet the demands if, say, we have an extended outage on one of our main conveyance systems. And it also refers to the portion of the system that's standing by to meet variability in demand.
- Q. For cost of service purposes, how does Met decide if something is a standby cost as opposed to a cost associated with average or peak use?
- A. Well, we do the -- we do the analysis of looking at how the system is used and first determine the portion of the system that's used to meet average

674 676

Met decide if something is a peaking cost as opposed to a cost associated with average use?

A. Well, we look at the system characteristics, how the member agencies are using the system. The portion of the system that's used to meet average demands over the fiscal year is attributed to average demands.

The portion of the system that is being used to meet peaking needs, which are basically driven in the summer, are identified as being demand costs or peaking costs, and the portion of the system that's left over, standby.

- Q. Okay. For characterizing a cost as peaking for cost of service purposes, does it matter how Met's distribution system is sized?
- A. Met's distribution system is not sized to meet average demands, it's actually sized to meet peak week demands, and that's because that's how our member agencies use the system.
- Q. And so does that peak week sizing affect how Met characterizes cost as peak versus average?
- A. It does, and that's demonstrated in the classification portion of the cost of service.
- Q. Okay. When you refer to peak usage for cost of service purposes, why don't you look at historical usages over the span of an entire calendar year?

demands. We then next look at the portion of the system that's been used to meet peaking and whatever is left over is standby.

- Q. Does this cost of service study have a chart showing the classification percentages of cost to average, peak and standby?
- A. It does and it's is page 18 of 29, Bates 16691, schedule 6.
- Q. I would like you to explain this chart. In the middle column, the headings say Commodity, Demand and Standby.

In this context, what does "commodity" mean?

- A. Commodity refers to costs that are classified as meeting average demands on the system.
 - Q. And in this context, what does "demand" mean?
- A. It means the portion of the system that's associated with meeting peaking.
- Q. Okay. And does standby mean what you were talking about before in terms of standby?
- A. It is the portion of the system that's not being used to meet average or peak demands.
- Q. On the left column, the heading is Function and at the bottom, there is a reference to distribution. What is the distribution function?
 - A. The distribution function refers to

Metropolitan's in basin system that meets — that actually has the customer connection on it, and that's been designed to meet peak week demand.

- Q. And in this cost of service study, how are the distribution function costs classified?
- A. It was determined from looking at the system usage that 43 percent of the costs reflected by distribution were associated with meeting average demands, 37 percent of the system is associated with meeting peaking and 20 percent of the distribution system was standing by.
- Q. Okay. Also, in the function column there's a source of supply function. For the State Water Project, under source of supply, what -- how is that classified?
- A. 100 percent of the State Water Project supply costs are classified as commodity because it provides a reliable annual yield throughout the whole year.
- Q. Under the conveyance and aqueduct function, there's also reference to State Water Project. How are those State Water Project costs classified?
- A. These are the State Water Project transportation costs. And again, we look at the conveyance and aqueduct system and determine how it's being used by the member agencies. And 52 percent of the State Water Project conveyance system was being used to

peak summer day?

A. It is a proxy for the peak week.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS: It's a proxy.

THE COURT: Proxy.

THE WITNESS: For the peak week, designed criteria.

BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. So if a member agency takes a lot of water on its maximum summer day, how long does that affect its Capacity Charge?
 - A. Three years.
- Q. In this cost of service study, which member agency had the highest Capacity Charge?
 - A. It was the San Diego County Water Authority.
- Q. Why was San Diego's Capacity Charge the highest?
- A. Because they had the highest peak day usage of the system.

THE COURT: By "usage," do you mean the number of -- volumetric?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It is measured in cubic feet per second, which is a measure of volume -- or measure of flow in, specific time per second.

MR. KEKER: I can't hear, your Honor.

meet average demands, 22 percent was being used to meet summer peaking demands, seasonal demands, and 22 percent -- or 26 percent is standing by.

Q. Okay. Now, let's talk about the charges that recover these peaking and standby costs.

For capital expenses associated with Met's distribution system, what charge covers peaking costs?

- A. It's the Capacity Charge.
- Q. When did Met first adopt a charge to recover peaking costs associated with its distribution system?
- A. That charge was first implemented in January of 2003 with the unbundling rate structure.
- Q. Is there a schedule in this cost of service study showing the Capacity Charge for each member agency?
- A. There is. It's on page 25 of 29, Bates number 16698. It's schedule 10, Capacity Charge by a member agency.
- Q. How is the Capacity Charge allocated to the member agencies?
- A. Metropolitan calculates each member agency's peak day for a 15-month period, so it's the period May 1st through September 30th through -- for the three preceding years. And that peak day determines each member agency's assessment of the Capacity Charge.
 - Q. Why is the Capacity Charge allocated based on

THE WITNESS: It's a measure of capacity. It's a measure of cubic feet per second it says at the top, peak day demand measured in cubic feet per second. BY MR. HIXSON:

- Q. What charge recovers Met's standby costs?
- A. The standby costs are shown on page 26 of 29. It's Bates number 16699, Schedule 11.
 - Q. Okay. And what charge is that?
- A. The Readiness-to-Serve Charge is a charge that recovers the standby costs and the emergency storage costs. They're again in classification.
- Q. When Metropolitan first adopt its Readiness-to-Serve Charge?
 - A. In fiscal year 1996.
- Q. Does the Readiness-to-Serve Charge also recover any peaking costs?
- A. There is some peaking costs that are associated with the conveyance system and they're included in here as about.
- Q. As between standby and peaking costs, what does the Readiness-to-Serve Charge mostly recover?
- A. It mostly recovers standby costs.
- Q. And does Schedule 11 show the allocation of the Readiness-to-Serve Charge to the member agencies?
 - A. It does.

- Q. How is the Readiness-to-Serve Charge allocated to the member agencies?
- A. Metropolitan calculates each member agency's average for a ten-year period and that ten-year period rolls. And their percentage of the total is calculated and it's applied to the amount that needs to be recovered through the Readiness-to-Serve Charge.
- Q. Why is the Readiness-to-Serve Charge allocated that way?
- A. The member agencies felt that ten years was a reasonable period to capture all of the demand variations that were likely to occur.
- Q. If a member agency buys a lot of water in a particular year, for how long does that affect its Readiness-to-Serve Charge?
 - A. Ten years.

- Q. In this cost of service study, which member agency had the highest Readiness-to-Serve Charge?
- A. In this particular cost of service study, it was the San Diego County Water Authority.
 - Q. And why was San Diego's the highest?
- A. Because their ten-year average of firm demands was the highest.
- Q. I would like to ask you some questions about San Diego's dry year peaking claim.

year when it's wet, locally, we'll sell less water because the groundwater's naturally recharge and the reservoirs end up with a lot of runoff.

In a year when it's dry, locally, we'll have more demand. So there's any number of reasons.

- Q. Can environmental contamination also affect a member agencies' water purchases from Met?
- A. Yes. We had an instance where we had a member agency who had MTBE contamination and they had to shut down the wells.
- Q. Okay. In your experience, did the member agencies each have different circumstances affecting how much water they buy from Met?
- A. All of them are different. Different sizes. They have different local resources. They've developed conservation programs and local resources programs at different levels and so they all have a different mix of customers so they're all very different.
- Q. Is Metropolitan the exclusive provider of water to any of its member agencies?
- A. Metropolitan is only a supplemental provider. We do not have an exclusive right to serve.
- Q. When a member agency buys more water in a given year from Met, does it have to pay more money?
 - A. Metropolitan has volumetric rates and so to the

First, does Metropolitan have a separate cost allocation or rate associated with dry year peaking?

- A. No, we don't.
- Q. Under Met's rate structure, does the reason why a member agency buys more water in a given year affect what it pays?
 - A. No.
- Q. Based on your experience, what are some of the reasons Met sells more or less water to a member agency in a given year?
- A. There could be many reasons. The economy can be one. If the economy's poor, we'll see people have less disposable income. They don't tend to water their lawns, our demands go down. If the economy is good, we'll see water demands increase.

Frankly, the operations at the member agencies have a great deal of impact on demands from year to year, so if we have a member agency leave the well field, they'll come back on to Metropolitan and their demands will be higher.

They could also be doing local projects where they're maybe doing some construction on a recycling plant or -- and they have it off line, they'll come back to Metropolitan.

Frankly, hydrology is also a big impact. In a

degree that a member agency buys more water, they'll pay more in volumetric charges.

- Q. And can you identify which of Metropolitan's rates are volumetric in that way?
- A. The tier 1 and tier 2 supply rate are volumetric, as is the System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate, the System Power Rate. And to the degree that a member agency takes treated water, the treating surcharge is also volumetric.
- Q. Can you explain the difference between the tier 1 and tier 2 supply rates?
- A. The tier 2 supply rate is set at the cost of a water transfer from north of the Delta and it is basically to incent member agencies to develop conservation local resource programs.

The tier 1 supply rate recovers the bulk of Metropolitan's supply costs.

- Q. Is the tier 2 supply rate higher than the tier 1 rate?
- A. Yes. For calendar year 2013, the tier 2 supply rate was \$150 an acre-foot higher.
- Q. Okay. What causes a member agency to go into the tier 2 supply rate?
- A. Each member agency is allocated a certain amount of water that they can purchase at the tier 1

1 supply rate and when they exceed that amount, they go 2 2 into tier 2. 3 3 Q. Are there any member agencies paying the tier 2 4 4 supply rate in this year? 5 A. In -- as of November, 2013 there are three 5 6 6 member agencies who are in the tier 2 supply rate or 7 paying tier 2 supply rate. 8 8 Q. And can you identify which ones they are? 9 9 A. Those are Eastern Municipal Water District, Las 10 10 Virgenes Municipal Water District and City of Los 11 11 Angeles, Department of Water and Power. 12 12 Q. Do annual variations in member agency water 13 13 sales affect any of Metropolitan's fixed charges? 14 14 A. To the degree that a member agency buys more 15 15 water and it occurs during the May through September 16 16 timeframe, it could increase their Capacity Charge for 17 17 the three future years. 18 18 And to the degree that they buy more water 19 19 throughout the year, it would increase their 20 20 Readiness-to-Serve Charge allocation. 21 21 Q. As part of your job, do you have access to 22 22 information quantifying Met's water sales to each member 23 23 agency from year to year? 24 24 A. I do. 25 25 Q. Does this information include water exchanges 686 1 1 with the member agencies? 2 2 A. It does. 3 3 O. How are these records of water sales stored 4 within Met? 4 5 A. Metropolitan has a proprietary system that 6 6 tracks water transactions. We call it Water Information 7 7 System or WIS. 8 8 Q. Does Met record information about water sales 9 9 at or near the time of the sale? 10 10 A. Metropolitan has an automated meter reading 11 11 system. We collect data from each of the member agency 12 12 connections daily and we store that. At the end of the 13 13 month that information is used to determine how much 14 14 water a member agency took through their connection. 15 15 Q. Does Metropolitan record that information about 16 16 water sales in a database? 17 17 A. Yes. It's maintained in the WIS system. 18 18 Q. And does Metropolitan have a regular practice 19 19 to retain those records? 20 20 A. Yes, we do. 21 21 Q. Have you obtained the records showing the 22 22 amount of Met water sales to each member agency from 2003 23 23 to 2013? 24 24 A. I did. 25 25 Q. Please turn to exhibit DTX-697 in your binder.

Did you create this document?

A. I did.

Q. Can you please turn to the third page.

Can you explain what the third page shows?

A. This shows by member agency, by fiscal year, fiscal 2003 through 2013 all sales that were billed to that member agency, including the San Diego County Water Authority Exchange.

It also includes a calculation of the 11-year average. It identifies the peak sale from that 11-year period. It calculates also the amount of the peak over the average. And finally, it calculates a statistical measure called standard deviation.

Q. And is this data from the sales records you were just testifying about?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you go back to the first page of this document?

Is this page a graphical representation of the data contained in the third page?

A. It is.

Q. And is it an accurate graphical representation?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you turn to the second page? Is the second page also a graphical

688

representation of the data from the third page?

Q. Is it likewise an accurate representation?

A. Yes.

A. It is.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, Metropolitan moves DTX-697 in evidence.

MR. KEKER: Yeah, we object on the grounds of undisclosed expert testimony, your Honor.

They didn't -- they didn't designate in her -- in the description of what she was going to say, they didn't designate her as an expert, they didn't mention this and we object on that ground.

MR. HIXSON: We're not offering her as an expert witness.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection. This doesn't necessarily call for expertise. I understand it calls for some expertise in how to manipulate a spreadsheet.

MR. KEKER: Standard deviation is in there, your Honor. That's more expertise than I have.

MR. HIXSON: That's not the standard.

THE COURT: I also will say I think Mr. Keker knows what standard deviation is.

I'll accept it and we can argue about it later as to what its impact is. DTX-697 is admitted.

689

1 (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-697 was Authority. 2 admitted into Evidence.) Q. Can you explain what the standard deviation 2 3 BY MR. HIXSON: reflects in this chart? 3 Q. Ms. Skillman, please turn back to the first 4 A. The standard deviation is a measure of the 4 page of Exhibit 697. 5 variability around the average so it doesn't matter 5 And can you describe what this first page 6 whether the data -- the difference is positive or 6 illustrates? 7 negative, it's an expression of variability. 7 A. This illustrates for each member agency, each 8 Q. Which two member agencies had the higher 8 of Metropolitan's 26 member agencies graphically and 9 standard deviation in their annual water stales in this 9 comparatively their sales by year for the 13-year period. 10 time period? 10 Q. Does this chart contain all of the years since 11 A. The City of Los Angeles, Department of Water 11 the current unbundled rate structure has been in effect? 12 and Power, and the San Diego County Water Authority. 12 13 Q. And were L.A. and San Diego standard deviations 13 Q. Which agency is depicted in the blue line on 14 roughly similar during this time period? 14 top? 15 A. They're very similar. 15 A. That is the San Diego County Water Authority. 16 Q. Please turn to the third page. 16 Q. What agency is the orange line below? 17 What was the highest annual sales to San Diego 17 A. That is the City of Los Angeles, Department of 18 during this time period, 2003 though 2013? 18 Water and Power. 19 A. It's identified in the third column from the 19 Q. What member agency bought the most water from 20 20 right. It's 667,900 acre-feet. Met during this time period? 21 21 Q. What was the lowest annual sales to San Diego A. That was the San Diego County Water Authority. 22 during this time period? 22 Q. Was that true in every year since the 23 23 A. I believe it is 407,372 acre-feet. unbundling? 24 24 Q. What was the gap between the highest and lowest A. They -- that was true for every year since the 2.5 25 sales to San Diego during this time period? unbundling. 692 690 1 Q. Please turn back to the second page. A. About 260,000 acre-feet. 2 2 Can you describe what this second page Q. What was the highest annual sales to 3 3 illustrates? Los Angeles in this time period? 4 A. The second page takes the data that was on the 4 A. The highest was 435,129 acre-feet. 5 far right-hand side of the third page, so the red bar Q. What was the lowest annual sales to Los Angeles 6 6 shows for each member agency their peak water sales with in this time period? 7 7 exchange in that 11-year period. The blue bar shows A. That looks like it was 166,912 acre-feet. 8 8 their average of that 11-year period, and the green bar Q. What was the gap between the highest and the 9 9 lowest sales to Los Angeles in this time period? represents the statistical measure of standard deviation. 10 1.0 THE COURT: This peak that you're showing here A. 268,000 acre-feet. 11 11 in the red bar, that's --Q. Are the gaps between the highest and the lowest 12 12 THE WITNESS: The highest year. annual sales in this time period approximately the same 13 13 THE COURT: So that's a total volume for a for Los Angeles and San Diego? 14 14 vear? A. Yes. 1.5 15 THE WITNESS: Correct, so --Q. I'm going to turn to a couple different topics 16 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 17 THE WITNESS: It's basically on page 3, it's THE COURT: Let me just pause for a moment. 18 18 the third column over. (Brief interruption.) 19 19 BY MR. HIXSON: BY MR. HIXSON: 20 20 Q. Which member agency had the highest peak annual Q. Please turn to Exhibit PTX-2110 in your binder. 21 21 sales during this time period? Can you describe what this is? 22 A. That was the San Diego County Water Authority. 22 THE CLERK: Did you say PTX just now? 23 23 Q. Which member agency had the highest average MR. HIXSON: PTX, yes. 24 24 annual sales in this time period? THE WITNESS: This is an e-mail exchange 25 25 A. That was also the San Diego County Water between myself and Michael Hurley. 691 693

BY MR. HIXSON: 2 2 Q. And who did Mr. Hurley work for? 3 3 A. He worked for a subsidiary of Arcadis, which is 4 4 a consulting firm. 5 5 Q. Did Met retain them as consultants? 6 6 A. Yes, we did. 7 Q. I would like to work backwards through this 8 e-mail. Turning to your bottom e-mail to Mr. Hurley, can 8 9 9 you describe what you were saying there? 10 10 A. We were -- he was specifically addressing 11 11 treatment issues, treatment cost recovery issues and I 12 12 was telling him that I had found some interesting 13 13 examples of what -- how LADWP was addressing treatment 14 14 costs. 15 15 Q. And what did you say in your next e-mail 16 16 exchange? 17 17 A. My next e-mail, I was basically telling him 1.8 18 that what L.A. was doing was similar to what other 19 19 investor owned utilities in the state were doing, in 20 20 terms of ensuring that they had adequate revenues to 21 cover a particular cost item. 21 22 22 Q. And what did he write back to you in the e-mail 23 23 that follows? 24 24 A. He wrote at the top, "It is a wonder sometimes 25 how MWD has gotten by with this structure for so long. 25 694 1 1 Growing demands cover up a lot, I guess." 2 2 Q. Were you discussing anything other than the 3 3 treatment surcharge in these e-mails? 4 A. No. We were strictly talking about the 4 5 5 treatment surcharge and how we could recover our costs. 6 6 Q. And what was the issue you were discussing with 7 7 respect to the treatment surcharge? 8 8 A. A significant portion of our treatment costs 9 9 are fixed but we recover 100 percent of it through 10 10 volumetric charge. 11 11 Q. Is the treatment surcharge one of Met's 12 12 transportation rates? 13 13 A. No, it's not. 14 14 Q. Are there any fixed charges that recover any of 15 15 Met's transportation costs? 16 16 A. The Capacity Charge and the Readiness-to-Serve 17 17 Charge. 18 18 Q. Does this e-mail have anything to do with Met's 19 19 peaking costs? 20 20 A. No. 21 21 Q. Please turn to PTX 255 in your binder? 22 22 A. Yes. 23 2.3 Q. Can you identify what this is? 24 24 A. This is an e-mail exchange between myself and 25 25 Tom DeBacker.

O. Who was Tom DeBacker? A. Tom DeBacker was the controller and he still is

the controller.

- Q. And what did Mr. DeBacker's e-mail to you say?
- A. He wanted to know if I had a copy of the NARUC chart of accounts.
 - Q. How did you respond?

A. I didn't have a copy of the NARUC chart of accounts. I had a copy of the uniform system of accounts for the California Public Utilities Commission, Class A water utilities.

- Q. To your understanding, what is the NARUC chart of accounts?
- A. NARUC stands for National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners and they have developed a uniform system of accounts to be used by regulated utilities, primarily retail utilities who have an exclusive right to serve.
- Q. To your understanding, what type of entity is the NARUC chart of accounts generally directed to?
 - A. It's directed at regulated utilities.
 - Q. Is Metropolitan such a utility?
- A. Metropolitan is not a regulated utility. We do not -- we are not under the direction of the California Public Utilities Commission. Our board regulates

696

Metropolitan.

Q. In your e-mail, you refer to an argument by SDCWA. What were you saying there?

- A. Generally my point was that as a supplemental provider who didn't have exclusive right to serve and who had made a decision to unbundle rates and charges for transparency or to encourage water transfers or any number of reasons, that we needed to be very thoughtful and deliberate and accurate in how we functionalized costs because that was going to carry through to our rate structure.
- Q. And did that relate to any questions about the source of supply?
- A. The -- in our functionalization of costs, we functionalized State Water Project, Delta water charge to
- Q. Okay. Was there a problem with simply using the NARUC chart of accounts in the rate setting in your
- A. I did not believe that the NARUC chart of accounts accurately covered or captured the way Metropolitan realizes cost to meet our services.
- Q. During your time at Metropolitan, did Met hire an outside consultant to evaluate its cost of service process?

697

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

- A. We did. 2 Q. When did that happen? 3 4 5 6 8 10 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 1 2 5 8 10 11 12

 - A. That happened in early 2010.
 - Q. And who did Metropolitan retain?
 - A. Metropolitan retained Raftelis Financial Consulting. They were the consultants who had done the original cost of service for us.
 - Q. Did you personally work with Raftelis Financial Consultants?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. Is Raftelis Financial Consulting an expert firm in this field to your understanding?
 - A. To my understanding, they are.

The firm was formed by George Raftelis and he has over 45 years of experience in water and wastewater rate making, and he's known nationally and internationally and has served on the American Water Works Association Rates and Charges Subcommittee for many vears.

- Q. When Raftelis Financial Consultants was hired in 2010, what did Metropolitan ask them to do?
- A. We asked them to review the cost of service model that we were using and to ensure that it was consistent with the cost of service they had developed.
- And we also asked them to review whether our cost of

What information were you suggesting giving to RFC in this e-mail?

- A. I needed to give them some background information on the State Water Project. They needed a little bit more information than what they had at hand.
- Q. Okay. In the response to that e-mail, there's a statement by Ms. Bennion, quote, June, we should limit this to conclusions that Raftelis is able to make based on the research they've done. I understand that they have not reviewed our methodology, but they should be able to conclude whether the functionalized SWC charges can be passed along to similar functional charges in our rate structure, end quote.

Was there some part of Met's methodology that Raftelis Financial Consultants did not review?

- A. The Department of Water Resources invoices for the State Water Project are on a calendar year basis but Metropolitan prepares its budgets and its rates on a fiscal year basis and so we rely on our water resource management staff to take the schedules from the Department of Water Resource and convert them into fiscal year information so we can use it in our budgeting and forecasting. And that was not provided to him.
- Q. With respect to the functionalization of State Water Project costs, what did Met ask Raftelis to review?

700 698

service methodology and our rate methodology was consistent with the American Water Works Association M1 Manual guidelines.

- Q. What information did you provide to Raftelis Financial Consultants?
- A. We provided them with background information on the board's strategic planning process. We also provided them with some information on the member agency manager's rate proposal that was actually the one that was adopted by the board.

We provided them with some financial information that they needed in order to verify the calculations that were being done in the cost of service model, and we did provide them with the cost of service model itself.

- Q. Did you contribute any language that ended up in the Raftelis Financial Consultants financial report?
 - A. I did.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. Please turn to PTX-167. Can you identify what this is?
- A. This is an e-mail exchange between myself, Jamie Roberts and Syd Bennion.
- Q. In your March 29, 2010 e-mail, at the bottom, you wrote to Jamie Roberts, I need to get something to RFC pretty quickly.

- A. We asked them to make sure that what we were doing was consistent with what they had done for us originally.
- Q. And did you also ask them to consult with industry guidelines?
 - A. We did.
- Q. Okay. Did a version of your language in your March 29 e-mail end up in the final April 6th, 2010 Raftelis report?
 - A. Portions of that language ended up in the Raftelis report.
 - Q. Please turn to DTX-88. Can you identify what DTX-88 is?
 - A. This is the review of the 2011 cost of service that was prepared by Raftelis for us.
 - Q. Can you show us where the language you provided, an adapted version was included in this report?
 - A. It was included on page 7 and it's toward the bottom of page 7, toward the bottom third. There's two indented numbered items and that is where the language that Raftelis chose to incorporate is.
 - Q. What section of the Raftelis report did your language end up in?
 - A. It ended up in Section IV, Roman numeral IV, which begins on page 6, which is the background

701 Pages 698 to 701

information on the cost of service. MR. KEKER: I don't think it is, your Honor. 2 2 Q. Can you direct us to language in the report THE COURT: Overrule the objection. Go ahead, 3 3 describing the background information? please. 4 A. It says specifically at the beginning of THE WITNESS: I was a low level employee back 5 Section IV, "Before discussing the results of the review 5 in 1995, 1996 and I wasn't involved in that. 6 6 process, it's necessary to understand Metropolitan's cost BY MR. KEKER: of service and rate setting methodology." Q. Since you've become -- since you've risen in 8 Q. What does Section V of the Raftelis report 8 the ranks -- since you returned in 2005, you've risen 9 9 contain? through the ranks to your current position, have you 10 10 heard about the San Pedro resolution, the hold harmless A. Section V begins on page 10 and actually 11 11 includes their findings and conclusions. principle? 12 12 Q. And can you direct us to language showing that A. No. No one in my group relies on that. 13 13 Section V contains Raftelis's findings and conclusions? Q. Okay. You have -- you believe, though, that 14 14 A. So in Section V, there's the introductory any challenge or change to any one component of the 15 paragraph. And the first sentence immediately after the 15 existing rate structure affects and upsets the careful 16 16 introductory paragraph says "Our findings and conclusions balance of the rate structure and invites a 17 17 related to each of these tasks are discussed below." reconsideration of the entire rate structure resulting, 18 18 Q. Okay. Did you contribute any language to in your word, "destabilization"; right? 19 19 Section V of the Raftelis report? A. Yes. 20 20 A. I did not. Q. What do you mean by destabilization, 21 Q. Are you aware of anybody at Metropolitan 21 Ms. Skillman? 22 22 contributing language to Section V of the Raftelis A. The board has a very deliberate process to 23 23 report? develop Metropolitan's rate structure and they developed 24 24 A. I am not. the policies and principles that they felt were 25 MR. HIXSON: I pass the witness. 25 important, and there were a number of things that were 702 704 1 1 THE COURT: Why don't we take a break? balanced in that -- in coming up with that rate schedule. 2 2 MR. KEKER: Your choice, your Honor. I'm ready Q. And do you think -- I'm sorry, excuse me. 3 3 to go. A. They considered how much of a rate structure 4 THE COURT: Is everybody okay? 4 they thought should be fixed, how much they thought 5 5 How are you doing, ma'am? should be variable and how those -- and how our costs 6 6 THE WITNESS: Maybe I could get some water. should be recovered. 7 7 MR. KEKER: Could we get Ms. Skillman some more Q. And you thought that if any change -- any small 8 8 water? change was made anywhere in this structure, that would 9 9 THE COURT: Why don't we take a break in about cause destabilization; right? 10 10 15 or 20 minutes, something like that. A. I think it would need to be considered. 11 11 MR. KEKER: Okay. Q. And destabilization in your view is bad; right? 12 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION A. I -- yeah, I think it would need to be 13 13 BY MR. KEKER: considered. 14 14 Q. Ms. Skillman, I'm John Keker for San Diego. Q. In 2010 when you started working with 15 15 You were at Met from January of 1995 to January Mr. Raftelis on his cost of study -- cost of service 16 16 of 1997? study that we just looked at, at that time, your -- you 17 17 and the staff and the board had already come up with what A. Yes. 18 18 Q. Were you there when they passed the 1997 you planned to do about the rates; right? 19 19 resolution about wheeling? A. We had made a proposal in January of 2009. 20 20 A. I believe that was after I left. Q. Right. And that proposal was that just like 21 21 O. Okay. Were you there -- while you were there always, the State Water Project transportation portion of 22 22 back then, did you learn about the San Pedro resolution, the bill should be loaded onto the transportation --23 23 the "hold harmless" requirement that the board had should be treated as Met's own conveyance system; right? 24 24 imposed? 25 25 MR. HIXSON: Objection. Way outside the scope. Q. And another decision you made is that the Water

705

Stewardship Rate should be loaded on the transportation portion of the bills; right?

A. We made no change to the Water Stewardship Rate as far as I recall.

- Q. And the answer is yes, it was going to be loaded on the transportation section of the bill; right?
 - A. Yes.

2.3

- Q. And the other thing you decided is that you would not analyze the benefits that some member agencies got by this -- by the fact that you all did not measure or charge for or have any kind of accounting for dry year peaking. That had already been decided too; right?
 - A. We don't do that in cost of service studies.
- Q. All of that had been decided before you hired Raftelis to do what you call an independent cost of service study; right?
- A. Mr. Raftelis was hired to review our cost of service to make sure it was consistent with the methodology that he had developed and that was finalized in 2002.
- Q. He was hired in the words that he used to validate what you had already done; right? By "you," I mean you and your staff.
- A. He was validating that the cost of service that we were using was consistent with the model that he had

A. That is not true.

- Q. When did you decide to study dry year peaking?
- A. I had not heard the concept dry year peaking until it was raised by the Water Authority in March of 2012.
- Q. 2012. You hadn't seen the letters that they sent in as part of the unbundling process back in 2001, the court has seen them, talking about dry year peaking. You've never seen those?
 - A. I wasn't working at Metropolitan at that time.
- Q. Okay. You just didn't know that there was an issue; is that what you're saying?
 - A. Yeah, that's correct.
- Q. But by the time -- okay. You didn't even know there was an issue about dry year peaking when Mr. Raftelis worked on the cost of service study in 2010?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. We're going to look at that in just a second.

So anyway, the job that he was given was to validate what you had already decided and he had already done ten years before; right?

A. We asked him to validate that the methodology we were using was consistent with what he had developed before.

706 708

developed.

- Q. Wait a minute. I'm sorry. Say that again?
- A. Mr. Raftelis was hired by Metropolitan to develop the original cost of service and the original unbundling. And in 2010, we hired him to validate that the way we were doing the cost of service was consistent with what he had originally developed.
- Q. So you're referring back to the work that he did in 1999 when he did some work in connection with the unbundling, the Raftelis report from '99?
 - A. The final report was in 2002.
- Q. Okay. And that was -- back when he did that work, the decision had already been made to put the State Water Project's -- the component of the bill that the Department of Water Resources gave that says transportation, to call that Met's conveyance system, right?
 - A. We functionalized the conveyance.
- Q. And once you unbundled the rates and created this Water Stewardship Rate, the decision way back when was made to put that on the transportation rates; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And you have always recognized that there was such a thing as dry year peaking and have always decided neither to study it nor account for it; right?

Q. Okay. Would you look at -- can we give Ms. Skillman a binder and the Court and my colleagues.

And would you look at Tab 11 in that binder, which is Plaintiff's Exhibit 164 and it is, itself, in the record, in the administrative record.

Do you have that in front of you, Ms. Skillman?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And this is something dated March 2nd, 2010 that's called cost of service validation project and it's on your -- it's on Met's paper. It's got Met's logo on it; right?

A. I believe this was prepared by Raftelis Financial Consultants.

Q. I see. It's got RFC at the bottom.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Mr. Keker, I'll just ask you not to talk over the witness.

MR. KEKER: Beg your pardon, your Honor.

- Q. It's got RFC down at the bottom?
- A. Correct.
- Q. On page 3, in the numerals, there's two slides to a page so page 3 is the second page of the exhibit.

So it's objectives of study, and one of them is validation of cost of service and rate process.

And on page -- and page 6, he notes that the January 12, 2010 board letter establishing proposed

1 rates -- that's what you were referring to. The board had any concerns about Met's rates and the way they were 2 2 had already said what they were planning to do; right? 3 3 A. The board hadn't already said what they were A. That's a very general statement. 4 4 planning to do. The staff made a proposal. Q. Did you -- had you known as long as you worked 5 5 Q. Okay. at Met that San Diego thought that loading the state 6 6 water resources costs on to the transportation rates was A. The board hadn't adopted anything at this time. 7 Q. And that -- they made the proposal in that wrong and unfair? 8 8 A. They may have brought it up from time to time, January letter? 9 9 A. The staff made the proposal. but I don't recall any specific instances where they said 10 10 Q. Okay. And then over at 10, Raftelis raises 11 11 potential opportunities for consideration and he says Q. Had you known as long as you worked there that 12 12 reevaluate cost of service rate framework, do new factors San Diego thought that the Water Stewardship Rate being 13 13 encourage MWD to update its framework? loaded on to the transportation rates was wrong and 14 14 And among the issues are SWP issues. Do you improper? 15 15 know what those were? A. They may have included it in letters. 16 16 A. I don't recall what they were. Q. Did you talk to Raftelis about San Diego's 17 17 Q. And then peaking considerations, do you know concerns? 18 18 what that refers to? A. Again, we were asking him to validate the cost 19 19 A. That refers to system peaking as in member of service and we weren't asking him to address any 20 20 agency demand peaking. particular member agency's issues. 21 21 Q. Not dry year peaking? Q. Did you anticipate a lawsuit at that time, at 22 22 A. It was not dry year peaking to my recollection. the time you were doing this work on this cost of service 23 23 Q. Okay. On page 13, he raises the question under study? 24 24 potential opportunities for consideration should wheeling A. Yes. 25 charge internal and external to MWD service area be 25 Q. And who was the lawsuit going to be brought by? 710 712 1 split. What does that mean? A. The Water Authority. 2 2 A. I would have to -- I would have to say I don't Q. And what was the basis of the lawsuit going to 3 3 know without asking. be? 4 Q. Okay. And another potential opportunity for 4 MR. HIXSON: I'm going to object on privilege 5 5 consideration is there in slide 14, develop fixed grounds to the extent she learned from inside counsel. 6 6 component to System Access Rate. What does that mean? BY MR. KEKER: 7 A. I would have to speculate that --Q. Don't tell me what counsel told you. 8 8 Q. Well, don't speculate if you don't know. Let Did you -- well how about this? Did you talk 9 9 to Mr. Raftelis about the fact this cost of service study me ask you --10 10 was going to have to withstand a lawsuit because it was A. I don't know. 11 11 Q. Does that refer to an idea that's been floating pretty obvious San Diego was going to sue? 12 12 around for 15 years, which is go out to the member A. I don't believe we said that to Mr. Raftelis. 13 13 agencies, make -- ask them to make a commitment to a We asked him to review the cost of service study. 14 14 certain amount of water and make -- and set the rates THE COURT: Did you say to somebody else in his 15 15 based on that fixed commitment? office or somebody that was working with him? I hear a 16 16 A. I wouldn't interpret that to be what you just "but" in your voice somehow. 17 17 said. THE WITNESS: Okay. I think internally we 18 18 O. You would not? talked about it but I don't think we divulged that with 19 19 A. I would not. Raftelis. 20 20 Q. Okay. Is that an idea you've ever heard THE COURT: Okay, fair enough. 21 21 before, fix rates to -- in order to take -- cover your BY MR. KEKER: 22 fixed costs by getting people to make commitments? 22 Q. Well, who was -- who's Sydney -- or Sanjay 23 2.3 A. Yes. Gaur, G-A-U-R. 24 24 O. Had you talked to Raftelis about San Diego's --A. He's a consultant for Raftelis. 25 25 were you aware at the time of this report that San Diego Q. He works for -- he's the manager of

713

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

714

1 Mr. Raftelis's office? 2 A. Could be his title. 3 Q. And who's Sydney Bennion? 4 A. Sydney Bennion is the assistant general 5 counsel. 6 Q. And would you look at Exhibit -- at Tab 12, 7 which is Exhibit 165 in your binder, please, ma'am? 8 A. Sure. 9 O. See that e-mail? 10 A. Uh-huh. 11 Q. There is an e-mail from Gaur to Bennion, 12 Subject, draft report, March 23rd, 2010. "Hope all is 13 well with you and as might know, we are working for Brian 14 and June on evaluating MWD cost of service. Given the 15 concerns from SDCWA, I'm advised to e-mail you the draft 16 report, which you can send to June. I appreciate your 17 assistance. Thanks, Sanjay Gaur, manager, Raftelis 18 Financial Consultants." 19 Is the June there you? 20 A. It is me. 21 Q. And who's Brian? 2.2 A. Brian Thomas, who was the CFO at the time. 23 Q. And when he says that Raftelis is working with 24 the two of you on the cost of service, was this a 25 collaborative deal here? 1 A. I was working with Sanjay. 2 Q. Okay. You wouldn't call Mr. Raftelis an 3 independent consultant in this endeavor, would you? 4 A. Mr. Raftelis was -- had been hired by us, his 5 firm had been hired by us. 6 Q. Given the concerns from SDCWA. What concerns 7 8 from SDCWA? A. Well, this e-mail exchange is between 9 10 11 to say that I knew the extent of their conversation. 12 Q. Okay. Well, don't speculate. But do you 13 know -- it says I'm advised to e-mail you the draft 14 15 send the draft instead of directly to you, a non-lawyer, 16 17 Did you talk to anybody about that? 18 THE COURT: Outside of an attorney that's 19 representing you, aside from that. 20 THE WITNESS: No. 21 BY MR. KEKER: 22 Q. Okay. Do you recall that you got from Mr. Gaur 23 24

up says Bennion sends back Sanjay, Sanjay, please provide a clean copy of the report with all changes accepted.

Did you all mark up the report and send it back?

- A. We may have.
- Q. What parts did you change?
- A. I would have to -- I can't recall at this point.
- Q. And then Ms. Gaur sends -- Mr. Gaur sent it back to Ms. Bennion, it's apparently clean, and then attached to it -- attached to this very e-mail is the draft report he sent back; right, all cleaned up with the changes all cleaned up; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And on the first page, we see a lot of, you know, all that computer mumbo jumbo about deletions and changing things, but then we don't see that for the rest of the report.

Was this document somehow changed in order to avoid showing the changes that you all made?

A. I'm unclear.

Q. Okay. Well, would you look at -- okay. If you look through this document -- tell me if I'm wrong but if you look over at page 7, the total -- the only explanation, the only mention of this concept of taking

716

- -- do you know what Mr. Gaur was referring to, concerns
- Ms. Bennion and Sanjay, so I think I would be speculating
- report. For some reason Raftelis thinks that he ought to he ought to send it through a lawyer. What's that about?

a draft report -- or, excuse me, you got from Ms. Bennion a draft report which you then changed?

Just keep looking at the e-mail. The next one

25

state water resource's fixed charges and loading some of them on to the -- and calling them Met's conveyance system and loading them on to the transportation rates is here in this paragraph third from the bottom that begins "The conveyance and aqueduct category includes SWP and CRA."

Do you see that paragraph, Ms. Skillman?

A. Yes.

Q. Goes on to say "In this function are the capital operations maintenance and overhead costs for SWP and CRA facilities to convey water through MWD's system. It should be noted that the Department of Water Resources bills SWP by the following components: Supply, power and transmission for commodity, demand and standby and transmission for commodity. These components are allocated to each of the functional categories."

That is the sum total of Mr. Raftelis's analysis of whether or not this makes sense or meets cost causation principles, isn't it, total?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And then let me show you another -that's in Section IV.

But then in Section V, where there's no mention of -- no effort to justify State Water Project charges or the Water Stewardship Rate, under the validation process

717

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

1 results, number one. Can you see down there on Page 9 2 down at the bottom? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Says, "Confirming that the 2010 COS and rate 5 methodology is consistent with California law, 6 specifically section XXX, paren, info will be written up 7 based on the CA law," close quote. 8 So when you got that, that draft, Raftelis 9 says -- he's confirming that the study meets California 10 law but nobody has sort of said why; right? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Okay. Who wrote what eventually became the 13 rationale for why it confirms with -- conforms with 14 California law? 15 A. The specific section of the California law is 16 the one that requires agencies to do a cost of service 17 once every ten years. And my recollection is that 18 Mr. Gaur put that information in. He was the one who 19 raised that issue. 20 Q. Okay. We'll look at it in just a second. 21 But in any event, when you got this, this 22 draft, you were expecting to be sued? 23 A. My recollection is that the 5-year standstill 24 was up. 25 Q. And therefore you expected to be sued because 718 1 2 5-year standstill; right? 3 A. Approximately, yes. 4

about the draft Raftelis report that had been sent over and you -- and you had said that they -- you concluded they needed a little more information about the State Water Project than they had.

That draft report was dated March 23rd, Tab 12. So now I want to ask you about a March 29th e-mail exchange you had with Ms. Bennion and that appears at Tab 13 and it's an e-mail that Mr. Hixson showed you before.

THE COURT: PTX-167.

MR. KEKER: PTX-167, yes, your Honor.

Q. And at the bottom of that e-mail, you say "I need to get" -- this is to Jamie Roberts with copies to Ms. Bennion, the lawyer and the subject is language for RFC report, importance is high.

You say "I need to get something to RFC pretty quickly. What about the following?"

And then you go on and say -- I don't need to read the whole thing. You say a lot of the details that are there about functionalizing SWP costs in this manner is appropriate and then you go on to talk about the way DWR bills; right?

A. Correct.

Q. Now, is that something that you thought that Mr. -- you had to kind of spoon feed to Mr. Raftelis, he didn't know about?

720

```
the only reason they hadn't sued you before was the --
```

Q. All right.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Any time you want to find a convenient break, let me know.

MR. KEKER: If I could just a couple more along this line.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

BY MR. KEKER:

Q. You said in your earlier testimony on direct that they needed -- in explaining what you did to this paragraph, you said they needed a little more information about the State Water Project than they had.

Do you remember that testimony?

A. Yes, I do.

MR. KEKER: Okay. That's a good place to break, your Honor. We'll come back to that.

THE COURT: See everybody in ten minutes. Thank you.

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: All right. Let's continue.

MR. KEKER: Thank you, your Honor.

BY MR. KEKER:

Q. Ms. Skillman, when we broke, we were talking

A. He had asked me for some information about the Department of Water Resources and the invoicing specifically and so I provided this information to him.

Q. He asked you about it or did you decide that you needed to get this report changed all on your own?

A. No, he asked me for the information.

Q. You're sure. Who asked you?

A. I believe Sanjay Gaur asked me.

Q. If Sanjay Gaur had written in his draft report perfectly satisfactory paragraph and when he sent it on -- when he sent it back to you, he didn't ask you for any information about -- to fill in that paragraph, he just said what he said; right?

You looked at it before.

A. Uh-huh. He said what he said.

Q. He didn't say anything about it being appropriate or anything, he just said --

MR. HIXSON: I don't think she's finished with her answer.

MR. KEKER: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Are you finished with your answer? THE WITNESS: I wasn't finished.

I believe he in this draft, he attempted to summarize the State Water Project functionalization and his understanding was not quite correct.

721

BY MR. KEKER:

- Q. He didn't say anything about it being appropriate, did he, he just said this is what they do?
 - A. So you're talking about the draft?
 - Q. Yeah.
- A. Yes, his description of what they do wasn't exactly correct.
- Q. Okay. But all he said was here's what they do, he didn't say it's appropriate?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. And then did he ask you if it was appropriate? Where did this language about it being appropriate come from?
 - A. In summary information that I provided to him.
- Q. But where did the -- somebody -- somebody decided to say this is very appropriate because. Who decided that?
- A. Well, I'm the one who drafted the language, so it's my language.
- Q. Did he ask you to write something that says how appropriate it all was?
 - A. That was my choice of words.
 - Q. At a time you knew you were going to be sued?
 - A. I thought it was a proper description.
 - Q. At a time you knew you were going to be sued?

that we were still using a consistent methodology.

So what he needed to look at was simply how we were functionalizing the cost. He didn't need to take the invoices themselves and do the calculation.

- Q. What does that have to do with this fiscal year, calendar year business? Nothing, does it?
 - A. Yeah. That was actually his question.
- Q. They have not reviewed our methodology. What methodology are you referring to, your cost of service analysis?
- A. The methodology that the Water Resource Management uses to take the State Water Project invoice, which is actually very detailed, and convert it to fiscal year costs.
- Q. Okay. She goes on to describe in a long paragraph all this business. You can read it there.

She's not -- they're not talking there about fiscal year versus calendar year, are they?

- A. It looks like the language I had below without numbers.
- Q. Ms. Bennion is trying to perk up this language about why it's appropriate to charge state water resources fixed costs to Met's conveyance costs, right, that's what she's trying to do. It has nothing to do with this calendar year, fiscal year business.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And then you sent it on to Ms. Bennion and Ms. Bennion writes back in the e-mail above, and Ms. Bennion, the lawyer, says "June, we should limit this to conclusions that Raftelis is able to make based on the research they've done. I understand that they have not reviewed our methodology, but they should be able to conclude whether the functionalized SWC charges can be passed along to similar functional charges in our rate structure."

First, can you tell me what that meant to you when you got it?

- A. As I explained previously, DWR invoices on a calendar year basis, we budget on a fiscal year basis so our water resource management staff converts those calendar year charges to fiscal year charges. Mr. Gaur wanted to look at that methodology, but we didn't think that that was something that he needed to review.
- Q. And so that the problem was trying to change from fiscal year to calendar year rather than to try to figure out whether or not the functionalization of the State Water Project as Met's own conveyance system was a proper analysis?
- A. Raftelis had done the previous cost of service study and what we had asked them to do was to validate

- A. That was -- that was the issue of the methodology, and it appears to me that what she did was take what I had written below and rewrite it a little bit.
- Q. Were you trying -- were you and Ms. Bennion trying to justify the fact that the rate structure was going to stay the way it always had been in order to avoid destabilization of rates?
 - A. No.
- Q. Were you trying -- was this an honest cost of service study that you were trying to help Mr. Raftelis write or was it just some kind of made for litigation document?
- A. We -- this was a legitimate cost of service study, and we wanted them to validate that it was consistent with what they had done previously.
 - Q. Which would keep the rates stable?
- A. Mr. Raftelis had done the original cost of service study and we wanted to make sure that we was being consistent with what we were doing in 2010.
- Q. Okay. Would you look at Tab 14, please, ma'am? And so the final report comes out on April 6th. This is the same as the one that you looked at before, which was DTX-88.

And it has your -- first of all, on the second

page, this -- the cover letter from Raftelis to Brian
Thomas, the chief financial officer down there, second
line from the -- second paragraph from the bottom,
"Special thanks go to Ms. June Skillman and MWD staff who
have worked so diligently to provide us with information
and explanations as we completed our assignment."

And then your language works in on page 7. You get your language in at the bottom of the page and with the statement that it's appropriate because the DWR invoice is this way, therefore it's okay to load the costs on the Transportation Rate; right?

A. My recollection is that Raftelis did not use my language exactly. They reviewed it and used what they wanted.

Q. And then somebody -- on page 10, somebody's filled in the California law portion down at the bottom; right?

Do you think that was Mr. Gaur? It wasn't Ms. Bennion?

A. I don't know who did that.

- Q. Okay. And did you consider that an independent review of work at the -- an independent review?
- A. I think -- that was consistent with what we asked them to do, which was to validate the cost of service and determine whether it was consistent with the

Q. But your accounting system doesn't even allow you to attribute -- when you bring revenues in, to attribute it to any particular component, does it?

A. We do not have an accounting system that tracks revenues and costs by cost of service.

Q. Other than the statement on page 7 about it being appropriate because of the DWR bill, does the Raftelis cost of study -- cost of service study in any place in it explain why State Water Project costs are causally related to wheeling on the Colorado River Aqueduct?

A. No.

Q. Anywhere in that report, does he explain why all demand management projects should be charged to transportation and not supply rates, transportation rates such as System Access or Water Stewardship?

A. No.

Q. At anywhere in this so-called cost of service study, does he acknowledge that Met does not account for the benefits of dry year peaking?

A. That is not true.

O. That's not what?

A. No.

Q. Now, he does say that the classification is consistent with American Water Works Association

¹ AWWA M1 manual guidelines.

Q. Did you tell the board that you and Ms. Bennion had helped Mr. Raftelis write this cost of service study?

A. We presented it to the board.

- Q. Did you tell the board --
- A. No.

1.0

2.4

Q. -- that you and Ms. Bennion had helped him write it?

A. We did not tell the board that.

Q. Did Raftelis or anybody that worked for him review Met data to allocate actual expenditures that had occurred in the past to the -- to rate components?

A. No.

Q. No?

A. No.

Q. And that's because Met has no documents or existing information that allocates actual expenditures to rate components?

A. Metropolitan sets its rates and charges prospectively based on forecasted costs.

Q. And you don't look back to see how you've done, whether you've over collected or under collected?

A. Each your our controller provides a yearend review and that is the basis for any variances that we have.

guidelines, doesn't he?

A. He does.

Q. And that's not true, is it?

A. I believe it's true.

Q. Well, look at, if you would, Tab 16, which are board minutes, April 13, 2010. This is the report to the board for the rates for 2011 and 2012, and if you go over to -- this is in the record, your Honor. If you go over to page --

THE COURT: Let me just for the record say that it's 11443.

Go ahead.

MR. KEKER: Say it again, sir.

THE COURT: I'm just trying to make a record on our record here so that somebody reading it five years from now knows what pages we're looking at.

MR. KEKER: The page -- what I'm referring to in Tab 16 is a April 13, 2010 board meeting business and finance committee minutes and the Bates stamp ends at 11443.

And the page that I'm referring to is attached to a -- first we can go over 11467. It's the 2010, 2011 cost of service. April 2010 is the date on it.

And what I want to call the witness's attention to is 11474 where the board is told that the functional

- category -- second paragraph below service function costs, the functional categories developed for Metropolitan's cost of service process are consistent with the American Water Works Association rate setting guidelines, a standard chart of accounts for utilities developed by the National Association of Regulatory Commissioners, NARUC, and the National Council of Government Accounting.
 - Q. Does the standard chart of accounts for utilities developed by NARUC get incorporated into the AWWA rate setting guidelines?

A. I believe it's referenced in the AWWA.

Q. The guidelines are based on the NARUC standards, right?

A. Uh-huh.

2.2

THE COURT: You have to say yes or no. We have a court reporter taking the words down.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. KEKER:

- Q. And NARUC says pretty plainly put water supply costs functionalizing as supply. Water purchases equal supplies says NARUC; right?
- A. I believe that's the definition in the NARUC chart of accounts.
 - Q. Okay. And under NARUC, that means that the

that

But let me just ask the question -- let me just ask the witness to try to answer it yes or no if you can and then to explain your answer if you like.

THE WITNESS: The -- I don't want to answer yes or no.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: The NARUC chart of accounts captures accounting information. For purposes of Metropolitan's cost of service, Raftelis Financial Consulting determined service function categories that were appropriate and recognized the unique circumstances that Metropolitan has.

The NARUC chart of accounts are primarily directed at retail utilities, not wholesale utilities and so while that might be an appropriate classification for a retail water agency, it's not appropriate for Metropolitan.

BY MR. KEKER:

Q. Okay. But as -- as the dude says in the Big Lebowski, that's just your opinion; right?

The -- just let's go back to what NARUC says. If you classified the State Water Project under NARUC, you would put it into supply, all of it; right?

A. We would functionalize the State Water Project

State Water Project costs, all the fixed costs because it's water supply go into the supply account, right, if you applied NARUC?

A. NARUC system of accounts is a set of accounts used to aggregate accounting data and it doesn't dictate rate making.

In Metropolitan's case, Raftelis Financial Consulting developed our cost of service study and they determined which functional service categories were appropriate, given Metropolitan's unique system. And --

THE COURT: Excuse me, ma'am. I'm not sure you're answering the question.

Would you like the question read back? MR. KEKER: No, I'll just -- let me ask again.

Q. Under NARUC, if you applied NARUC, the State Water Project costs 100 percent would go into the supply function; right or wrong?

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I object. I believe the witness was trying to answer the question but it's not yes or no.

MR. KEKER: Well I asked her to answer it yes or no, then explain.

THE COURT: And let me just say that even when I rephrase a question, it is perfectly appropriate to object to my questions too. I don't have a problem with

costs according to the service functions that they provide for Metropolitan, and so we would divide it up between supply and conveyance.

Q. Got it. But if you followed NARUC explicitly, you would put it in supply?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And here, you're telling -- this is the staff's cost of service analysis. You're telling the board that you're following -- the cost of service process is consistent with NARUC even though it's not; right?

A. It's -- we have taken the NARUC service functions and adjusted them to meet Metropolitan's unique circumstances.

So, again, the NARUC chart of accounts is really primarily directed at retail water agencies and doesn't really fit precisely Metropolitan's own circumstances.

Q. At the time you provided this cost of service study to the board, which was April 13th, we were just looking at it, you didn't know what NARUC was, did you?

A. I did know what NARUC was. We don't have the chart of accounts in our office.

Q. Let's look at Exhibit 15 -- I mean excuse me, Tab 15, which is Exhibit 168, Plaintiff's Exhibit 168.

It's an e-mail that Mr. Hixson showed you?

A. Yes.

2.3

Q. It's at Tab 15, your Honor.

And so somebody at Mr. DeBacker on the 29th of April, 2010 asks you -- it says on page 8 of cost of service report, it states that the functional categories are consistent with the standard chart of accounts for utilities developed by NARUC. And he asks the sensible question, do either of you have a copy of that chart of accounts that can be forwarded to me?

And you write back in the e-mail that's in the middle there, and you say no.

You went on their Web site. They sell it. You didn't want to buy it.

But then you go on to say this is central to the argument used by SDCWA. What did you mean, Ms. Skillman?

- A. I believe this is exactly what you're suggesting. The Water Authority has suggested that State Water Project costs at least might not have been the Water Authority, might have been a consultant for the Water Authority. State Water Project costs should be functionalized as supply.
 - Q. Should be functionalized as supply?
 - A. Yes.

consistent with the NARUC chart of accounts; is that right?

- A. We were generally consistent with the NARUC chart of accounts, but we also say in there that we recognize the unique circumstances of Metropolitan and have developed service functions that recognize that.
- Q. Were you trying to create -- when you talk about our argument is going to be to have, were you trying to development arguments that would keep San Diego from, in your term, destabilizing the rates?
 - A. No.
- Q. I have some questions about peaking.

 First of all, you spent a good deal of time in your direct examination talking about something called peak summer demand.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Does peak demand -- is peak summer demand the same as dry year peaking?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Why were you talking about it?
- A. What we were talking about is the peaking behavior on our system that's relevant to Metropolitan, is that particular behavior -- because our agencies don't take water at an average rate throughout the year, most of them take additional amounts in the summer periods, so

734 736

- Q. And so -- and then you say our argument is going to have to be that accounting should not dictate how we charge for services and that generally we follow NARUC; right?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Explain that a little bit more.
 - A. Again --
 - Q. Who are you going to be arguing with, start with that.
 - A. I would say we're going to be presenting a position.

I actually explained it before and I actually have it in here. When I say we generally follow the NARUC chart of account, NARUC chart of accounts is really designed for retail utilities. And when Metropolitan developed its -- or when Raftelis developed Metropolitan's cost of service study, there were service functions that we provide that weren't recognized in the NARUC chart of accounts.

So, we generally follow it in that we modified it to meet our unique circumstances.

Q. So in terms of at least this very big issue, big dollar issue of the State Water Project fixed costs, you don't follow the NARUC chart of accounts but you still think it's fine to say to the Board that you're

- we have to build extra capacity to meet those additional summer demands. And so when we talk about peaking, that's the -- that's the peaking that Metropolitan experiences on its system.
- Q. And so dry year peaking is irrelevant to Metropolitan?
- A. It's not a cost or a rate item that we recover specifically. We recover the cost that you were talking about for other rate components.
- Q. You recover all the costs of dry year peaking through these other rates?
- A. Metropolitan recovers 100 percent of its costs, a revenue requirement through rates and charges, so all of our costs are in those rates and charges.
 - Q. Fair enough. I misspoke.

If dry year peaking has some benefits to some member agencies and not other member agencies, then if you don't take dry year peaking into account, the burden is going to fall -- the burden is going to fall on the rate payers who don't get the benefits of this dry year peaking; right?

A. In periods where member agencies demand increase, as I stated, they'll pay more in volumetric rates. Additionally, they'll pay a higher Readiness-to-Serve Charge for ten years. And to the

2.5

degree that that behavior occurs in the summer, they'll pay a higher Capacity Charge for three years.

So, through Metropolitan's rates and charges, we'll recover the cost to the -- to Metropolitan of that behavior.

Q. Well, okay. But that's -- you'll recover because you are going to recover rates. You will recover all your charges one way or the other, but what I'm asking, is there anything in your rates that takes into account the benefits to some member agencies of dry year peaking and the burdens that are put on other member agencies by the fact that some people get benefits of dry year peaking?

I understand the sum total is going to be you will get all your costs.

A. No.

2.2

- Q. Okay. And you haven't done it because you think it's irrelevant?
- A. We haven't done it because we believe our current structure of rates and charges adequately captures the costs that are associated with that behavior.
- Q. Have you attempted in your cost of service analysis to identify the benefits to some member agencies of their ability to roll on and off the system and peak

don't calculate it?

A. We don't calculate it.

Q. That was a true answer when you gave it in the interrogatory; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And then is it true that the costs of dry year peaking are not allocated to each member agency in a manner that is proportional to the benefit each member agency receives?

A. That's -- that would be true, we don't calculate the benefits.

- Q. Okay. Are you aware of any one agency that benefits a lot -- I won't even say the most but a lot from Met's failure to charge for the benefit of dry year peaking?
 - A. No.
- Q. How about Los Angeles?
 - A. I believe that's your position.
- Q. Well, it's certainly our position.

But what about Los Angeles? I'm asking you, does Los Angeles benefit from its ability to rely in a wet year on its Los Angeles aqueduct through the -- and its own ground supplies and not buy much from Met and then in a dry year, to buy up to 80 percent of its needs from Met?

in dry years and not take much water in wet years?

- A. No.
- Q. Do you know if that's a substantial benefit to any member agency?
- A. In our cost of service study what we focus on are the costs of the system and we do a cost of service study to allocate those rates and charges. So, we don't perform the cost of service study based on benefits.
- Q. Okay. And you have not, Met has not calculated the costs associated with maintaining supplies, storage and transportation capacity to accommodate Met's member agencies' dry year peaking demands; right?

A. Metropolitan has various rates and charges that capture components of what is in what you described.

- Q. Okay. Did you sign an interrogatory that answered the question I just gave you as saying no such information exists, we don't calculate it?
- A. We don't calculate cost of benefits of dry year peaking.
- Q. And did you sign an interrogatory that asks you essentially has Met calculated the costs associated with maintaining supplies, storage and transportation capacity to accommodate Met member agencies' dry year peaking demands and you, June Skillman, verified the answers to interrogatory number 15, no such information exists, we

A. All of the member agencies benefit from being able to do that.

Q. Okay. Does Los Angeles benefit more than others?

A. Well, I actually just testified that we don't do a calculation of the benefits so I don't know how I would know that.

Q. Okay. You were shown -- and you can look at Tab 20, you were shown this e-mail before by Mr. Hixson. And it's an e-mail exchange that you had in 2011 with the consultant Michael Hurley.

THE COURT: PTX-211.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me. PTX-211.

Q. And I didn't quite understand what you said. You said I found -- your first e-mail down at the bottom, you sent it do Mr. Upadhyay and to others, including Hurley.

You said, "I found these Los Angeles Department of Water and Power board agenda -- found these on the agenda October 4 and found them interesting. They are volumetric examples of costs that we might be able to break out in our cost of service study and develop charges for. I like the revenue shortfall adjustment."

Now, what did you say that you were writing about?

uoout:

- A. The Department of -- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has a specific schedule in which they lay out regulatory and other costs that they've incurred on their forward treatment expenses.
 - O. On their --

- A. For treatment expenses.
- Q. Okay, for treatment expense. So they -- and what is the revenue shortfall and adjustment?
- A. In -- they have identified debt service and O & M costs that they incur that are associated with water quality mandates and having to provide security at various facilities, including treatment facilities. And those costs are primarily fixed. So, to the degree that they don't recover them in a year, they can make an adjustment in the rate the next year.
- Q. So these are volumetric rates and they can have a revenue shortfall because the -- one of their member agencies hasn't bought as much water as they hoped?
- A. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is a retail agency.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Or the customers.
- Q. Oh, I see. So they can -- so then they can charge the customer some more money if the customer doesn't buy enough -- if the customers in toto don't buy

particular rate item to provide more certainty.

- Q. Okay. 80 percent of your revenues are volumetric, aren't they?
 - A. Approximately.
- Q. Okay. So what he's saying there is -When he says, "I'm sure they", being L.A.,
 "would be willing to provide MWD a water revenue
 adjustment factor," he's referring to the fact that some
 years Los Angeles doesn't buy as much volume of water as

it does other years; right?
 It's not just talking about treatment.

- A. Well, we were specifically talking about treatment in this e-mail and that's specifically the project he was working on.
 - Q. Well, let's -- I mean let's check. Look at the next e-mail up.

You say "I love that. This is basically what the electric IOU's in this state do to make up for lost revenues from conservation."

What you're referring to is the electric companies, if you end up -- if a customer ends up conserving a lot of electricity, they have a way of making up their revenues by some kind of fixed charge, a service charge; right?

A. Actually, it's not quite that.

enough money to recover all these fixed treatment charges?

A. Correct.

- Q. And the reason they need to -- they're suggesting doing that is because they usually just bill the customer on volume?
- A. They -- the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has strictly a volumetric rate, they don't have a customer charge.
- Q. Okay. And so then Mr. Hurley writes back and says I'm sure that you're willing to provide MWD with the same kind of water revenue adjustment factor.

What's he referring to as you understood it?

- A. We were talking about treatment so, in years where L.A. didn't buy as much treated water from us, perhaps we would be able to come up with some sort of adjustment.
- Q. Well, but what he's talking about is there's -with a volumetric rate, if you don't buy as much water, then you don't get the revenues back. And treatment is not the only MWD volumetric rate, is it?
- A. No, but at this particular time we were working on it because this is the one cost area where 100 percent of our revenues are volumetric. And we've long been looking at how we can structure -- restructure that

Q. Okay. Go ahead.

- A. The electric IOU's, in order to incent them to encourage conservation, the California Public Utilities Commission has decoupled their rates and revenues from conservation.
- Q. Let's go to the next sentence. We could charge L.A. based on what they aren't buying from us due to high flows off the L.A. aqueduct.

Is that just talking about some treatment charge?

- A. We were talking about treatment. They can vary the amount of treatment they take based on what they're -- what they're doing on their own system.
- Q. But they can also base how much water -- how much volume of water they take based on high flows in the L.A. Aqueduct; right?
 - A. I'm not sure I understand your question.
- Q. Well, Ms. Skillman, if the -- if they're high flows on the L.A. Aqueduct, meaning it's wet up in the Owens Valley, and then L.A. is not buying as much water from Met; right?
- A. They may not be buying as much treated water from us because they'll be running it through their own treatment plant.
 - Q. They are also not buying as much water, are

, 1	they?	1 MR. KI	EKER: Yes, your Honor.
2	A. That could be the situation.		OURT: See you at 9:00 o'clock sharp.
3	Q. Okay. And what you're saying is if they're not		oceedings concluded.)
4	buying as much water, treated or untreated, we could	4	000
5	charge L.A. based on what they aren't buying; right?	5	
6	A. Yeah. We would still we were just talking	6	
7	about a way to try to cover our fixed treatment costs.	7	
8	Q. This is something that is well known within Met	8	
9	and has been for a long time that L.A.'s rolling on and	9	
10	off the program is a benefit without a burden attached to	.0	
11	it, there is no charge for it. It's free to L.A. not to	1	
12	buy you water from Met; right?	2	
13	This isn't the first time you've talked about	.3	
14	that, is it?	.4	
15	A. To a degree that Los Angeles buys Metropolitan	.5	
16	water from Metropolitan, it's going to be in the	.6	
17	Readiness-to-Serve Charge and it will stay with them for	.7	
18		.8	
19	ten years. So, it isn't free for them to just come on and off.	.9	
20	Q. Does the Readiness we've seen documents.	0	
21	Readiness-to-Serve Charge captures less than half of	1	
22	these dry year peaking costs, right, less than half?	2	
23		3	
24	A. It covers a significant portion of the standby	4	
25	charges, it covers 100 percent of the standby charges and	5	
20	so to the degree that a member agency's demands vary,		
	746		748
1	they'll end up paying more of the RTS.	State of California	rnia)
2	Q. And then he writes back, it's a wonder) Ss.
3	sometimes how MWD has gotten by with this structure for	² County of San	Francisco)
4	so long.	3	
5	What did you understand the structure was that	4	Y D
6	he's talking about?		e J. Parchman, CSR #6137, do hereby
7	A. The volumetric structure of our treatment	-	m a certified shorthand reporter; that I
8	surcharge.	was personally	y present in the above-mentioned
9	Q. And he wasn't talking about something more	proceedings, u	hat I took down in shorthand the
10	general, the volumetric structure of what L.A. buys or		nd thereafter transcribed said notes into the forgoing pages constitute a full, true
11	doesn't buy in any given year?		nscript of the said notes in said
12	A. No. We were specifically talking about	and correct train	nd that I have no interest in the outcome
13	treatment in this example.	of the case.	and I have no interest in the outcome
14	MR. KEKER: That's it. Thank you,	4	
15	Ms. Skillman.	5	
16	THE COURT: Okay. Any redirect, or what's your	6	
17	thought on the amount of time you would like to spend on	7	
18	redirect?	8	a 0
19	MR. HIXSON: No redirect, your Honor.	9	Canana Rand on
20	THE COURT: Thank you very much, ma'am. You're	0	onnie J. Parchman, CSR #6137
21	excused. Thank you so much.	1 Co	onnie J. Parchman, CSR #6137
22	We should leave things until Monday. I can	2	
23	start at 9:00 o'clock on Monday. Will that work for	3	
24	counsel?	4	
25	MR. WEST: Fine by us.	5	
	747		749
	, 11		7 1 9

<u>· A</u>
\$100,000 669:1
\$114 594:10
\$150 685:21
\$250 581:4 584:2 597:1
624:18 627:2
\$40 598:14
\$41 600:12,14
\$45 641:2
\$600 627:7
\$600,000 668:23
\$7 597:10
A46 649:19
ability 593:22 609:1
612:24 660:6 662:5
738:25 740:21
able 563:1,1 564:1,2,21
565:21 567:13 573:17
574:1 594:19 608:5,9
609:8 610:24 627:18
632:8,15 638:6 659:8
659:9 672:9 700:8,11
723:5,7 741:2,21
743:16
above-mentioned
749:7
absence 603:7 606:15
Absent 638:10
absolutely 626:18
663:25 719:9
absurd 612:5
accept 689:24
accepted 716:2
access 561:7 588:6,9
593:19 607:12 663:9
668:10 685:6 686:21
711:6 728:16
accommodate 739:11
739:23
account 651:4 707:25
728:19 731:2 735:14
737:18 738:10
accounted 634:13,22
635:8
accounting 615:3
617:23,23 618:7,11
618:16 619:18 622:2
706:11 728:1,4 730:8
731:5 732:9 735:2
accounts 696:6,9,9,13
696:16,20 697:18,21
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4 732:8,14 733:15,23
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4 732:8,14 733:15,23 734:7,10 735:14,19
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4 732:8,14 733:15,23 734:7,10 735:14,19 735:24 736:1,4
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4 732:8,14 733:15,23 734:7,10 735:14,19
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4 732:8,14 733:15,23 734:7,10 735:14,19 735:24 736:1,4 accrued 628:13
696:16,20 697:18,21 730:5,9,24 731:4,4 732:8,14 733:15,23 734:7,10 735:14,19 735:24 736:1,4

```
accurately 697:21
achieve 564:19 570:19
  604:23 650:17 662:19
achievement 601:20
  602:6
achievements 601:12
acknowledge 728:19
acquire 589:10 625:4
  644.9
acquires 589:6
acquiring 605:7 626:4
acquisition 590:25
acre 642:22
acre-feet 561:14,18,24
  564:8 601:21,25
  602:7,12,15,17,22
  603:6,11,19 605:16
  605:18 620:23 621:20
  621:23 622:5,7,8,10
  624:14 626:25 627:4
  627:5 628:19 629:21
  631:1 639:20,22
  642:21,22 649:24,25
  649:25 650:2,2,3,22
  650:23 657:25 692:20
  692:23 693:1,4,7,10
acre-foot 561:10 564:4
  581:4 584:2 596:21
  597:1 624:15,18,21
  624:24 627:3.7.8
  632:9,10,15 642:25
  643:9 685:21
action 661:8 666:5
  667:1,7 673:22
active 596:4 604:11
actual 600:2 610:16
  727:11,17
ad 666:19
adapted 701:17
addition 643:14
additional 561:23
  568:6 574:6,13
  575:10,20 576:20
  586:6 589:10 594:5
  603:11 605:2,7 607:5
  607:9,22 609:3
  626:17 630:3,5 632:9
  644:7 736:25 737:1
Additionally 737:24
address 712:19
addressing 694:10,13
adequate 694:20
adequately 738:20
adjust 557:16 672:2,7
adjusted 733:13
adjustment 662:3
  741:23 742:8,15
  743:12,17 744:8
```

```
adjustments 669:24
administer 558:22
administrative 584:18
  647:15,17,18,19
  648:2 657:15 661:8
  709:5
admission 615:18
  629:23 630:23
admit 619:11 630:1,14
admitted 569:15,16
  577:16,17 580:14,15
  581:24 583:13,14
  585:9,10 587:6,7
  589:14,15 593:2,3
  597:13,14 600:17,18
  608:14,15 616:25
  617:8 619:14 623:23
  623:24 667:19,21
  689:25 690:1
adopt 565:23 580:4
  581:18,21 582:14,15
  595:13 679:9 681:12
adopted 564:13 565:25
  566:5,6 569:21 580:6
  580:22 594:25 596:9
  596:10 667:9 699:9
  710:6
adopting 582:17
advantage 643:22
  668:23
advised 714:15 715:13
advocate 604:5
advocated 604:19
advocating 634:24
affairs 592:18
affect 675:19 680:10
  682:14 683:5 684:6
  686:13
afternoon 636:1,7,8
  672:16
agencies 560:19,20
  561:2,6 563:10 564:1
  564:22 579:7,8,19,21
  584:1,3 585:3,6
  587:25 588:2,5 591:8
  591:22 593:11,15,19
  593:22,25 594:1,3
  603:9 605:1 609:4
  624:17 625:7 635:3
  640:22 642:16 667:12
  670:13 675:4,18
  678:24 679:19 681:24
  682:2,10 683:16
  684:7,12,20 685:14
  686:3,6 687:1 690:8
  692:8 706:9 711:13
  718:16 733:16 736:23
  737:17,17,22 738:10
```

```
738:12,24 739:12,23
  741:1 742:18
agency 558:13 560:16
  560:24 563:24 582:16
  582:18 593:5 607:21
  625:3,12 626:22
  627:6 641:12 669:25
  676:10 679:14.17
  680:9,14 682:13,18
  683:5,9,18 684:9,23
  685:1,8,22,24 686:12
  686:14,23 687:11,14
  687:22 688:5,7 690:7
  690:13,16,19 691:6
  691:20,23 699:8
  710:20 732:17 739:4
  740:7,9,12 742:20
agency's 676:2 679:20
  679:24 682:3 712:20
  746:25
agenda 741:19,20
aggregate 630:6 731:5
ago 601:12 627:24
agree 616:18,20 650:10
agreed 641:21 642:15
agreement 591:11,16
  591:20,23,24 592:1,2
  592:7 608:22 611:13
  611:21 612:1,11,23
  613:17 614:13 616:19
  616:22 619:7,24
  621:13 623:9 640:9,9
  655:7 662:7
agreements 592:5
  594:23,23 595:2
  596:6,7
agrees 616:5
ahead 575:1 611:9,19
  634:20 642:10 645:21
  704:2 729:12 732:7
  745:1
Alameda 551:13
ALESHIRE 552:2
All-America 613:1
allocate 727:11 739:7
allocated 635:13,14
  652:4 653:25 656:2,5
  679:18,25 682:1,8
  685:24 717:16 740:7
allocates 673:13 727:17
allocation 598:24 657:4
  659:14 666:16 681:23
  683:2 686:20
allow 610:9 623:16
  659:11 728:1
allowed 630:17 639:10
allowing 658:24
alternative 567:4
```

```
581:17 633:15 650:16
  663:13,20,24
American 698:17 699:2
  728:25 730:4
amount 561:25 562:1
  593:6,12 602:25
  613:5,8,12,20 614:14
  614:20 618:1 619:20
  620:7,10 621:18
  622:4,20 623:3,10,14
  623:15 627:8,13
  637:9 656:21 659:16
  659:24 682:6 685:25
  686:1 687:22 688:11
  711:14 745:12 747:17
amounts 600:5 639:20
 736:25
Ana 568:11
Anaheim 580:2
analysis 559:23 566:22
  568:21 572:9 635:15
  674:18 676:23 717:18
  723:23 724:10 733:8
  738:24
analyze 706:9
Angeles 551:14 580:1
  669:1 686:11 690:17
  692:11 693:3,5,9,13
  740:17,20,21,22
  741:3,18 742:1,19
  743:7 744:9 746:15
annual 561:14,25 562:1
  565:2 577:8 601:10
  602:2 678:17 686:12
  691:20,24 692:9,17
  692:21 693:2,5,12
annually 642:24
answer 628:9,17
  630:14 634:19 660:3
  706:5 721:19,21
  731:19,21 732:3,4,5
  740:3
answered 739:16
answering 731:12
answers 739:24
anticipate 712:21
anticipated 566:18
  568:2 570:1,21
  571:20 572:12 573:6
  586.13
anybody 625:14 643:8
  664:21 702:21 715:17
  727:10
anyway 708:20
apparently 587:1
  716:10
appear 669:5
APPEARANCES
```

			l .	1
551:1	aside 715:19	Authority 550:6 579:25	691:1 694:22 703:22	639:11,21 649:11
appears 720:7 725:2	asked 628:2 655:18	587:12 590:1 591:22	704:4 707:8,12,20	653:2,6,16 658:5
appendix 586:18,21	656:16 662:20,23	591:25 594:10,16,24	708:7 716:1,4,10,12	663:2 665:1,4 668:6
587:2,4	666:4,8 698:22,25	595:22,24 596:3,15	719:18 721:11 723:3	692:23 697:20 703:20
applications 560:20	701:1 708:23 713:13	612:12,24 613:25	727:21 731:13 732:22	704:13 709:12 713:12
applied 560:24 597:1	721:1,4,6,7,8 723:25	614:20 620:21 621:11	734:11 743:10,20	721:8,23 729:4
617:25 682:6 731:3	726:24 731:21	621:12 622:15,18	747:2	730:12,23 731:18
731:15	asking 648:4 657:5	623:4,10 636:9	background 699:6	734:18 738:19 740:18
apply 560:19 563:2,10	671:13 711:3 712:18	637:18,20 638:6	700:3 701:25 702:3	benefit 578:20 579:3
633:12	712:19 738:9 740:20	680:15 682:20 688:8	backwards 606:13	587:20 588:2 589:3,7
appreciate 558:2	asks 601:12 734:5,8	690:15,21 691:22	629:7 694:7	590:8,11 625:6,10,16
657:16 714:16	739:20	692:1,12 708:4 713:1	backyard 594:2	625:17,23,25 626:11
approach 562:24	aspect 643:23 644:1	734:19,21,22	bad 670:15 705:11	626:22 627:11 628:15
631:19 663:7,13,20	665:3	authority's 586:8	balance 704:16	628:18,20,21 629:19
663:24	assessment 679:24	590:14	balanced 705:1	629:21 630:2,21
appropriate 609:22	assign 655:21	automated 687:10	bar 691:5,7,8,11	642:16 643:15,16
613:4 620:11 720:20	assigned 662:16	availability 587:22	base 566:21,22 567:14	646:22,24 648:20
721:17 722:3,9,11,13	assignment 726:6	available 563:5,10	567:17 568:3,4,25	653:21 662:7 739:3
722:16,21 724:22	assist 578:12 584:22	603:25 607:15 608:22	569:4,9 570:11	740:8,14,21 741:1,3
726:9 728:7 731:10	assistance 581:4 714:17	611:13 612:15 613:8	745:14	746:10
731:24 732:12,16,17	assistant 653:5 661:13	613:16 614:11 617:20	based 561:17 574:14	benefiting 594:2
appropriately 616:15	714:4	618:2 619:6 621:19	596:22 600:5 619:23	benefits 554:3 566:11
635:14	associated 570:14	621:22 637:17,21	659:10 679:25 683:8	581:7,9 584:6,7 586:1
approval 583:20 585:5	571:2,11 576:6	638:17,22 644:3	700:8 711:15 718:7	586:3 588:11 589:9
587:15 590:3 592:7	581:10 599:12 603:20	660:1,2	723:5 727:20 730:13	589:11 625:10 628:4
approve 582:10 584:25	609:1 628:4,10	Avenue 552:2	739:8 745:7,12,15	628:10,13 631:11,25
591:9,11 638:8	646:25 674:11,22	average 675:2,5,6,16	746:5	632:14 706:9 728:20
approved 585:1 591:19	675:2 676:22 677:17	675:20 676:3,8,22,25	baseline 564:21,23 basically 561:22 596:22	737:16,20 738:10,12 738:24 739:8,18
approximately 594:10 603:6 669:2 693:12	678:8,9 679:6,10 681:17 683:2 738:21	677:6,14,21 678:8 679:1 682:4,22	618:1 669:6 673:12	740:11,13 741:6
719:3 744:4	739:10,21 742:10	688:10,12 691:8,23	675:8 685:14 691:17	Bennion 653:3,4
April 673:23 674:7	ASSOCIATES 550:22	692:5 736:24	694:17 744:17	699:22 700:7 714:3,4
701:8 725:22 729:6	Association 696:14	avoid 578:14,22 584:23	basin 579:23 678:1	714:11 715:10,23
729:18,23 733:20	698:18 699:2 728:25	605:13 609:2 716:20	basis 565:2 576:13,22	716:1,10 720:7,13
734:5	730:4,6	725:8	593:24 601:11 621:14	723:2,3,4 724:21
aqueduct 574:22,24	assume 557:21 567:10	avoided 571:14 590:21	629:3,6,7 644:19	725:5 726:19 727:2,7
575:2,4,6 576:8 637:6	570:16	606:10 609:3 629:1	669:25 700:17,19	better 626:12 660:17
659:2 678:18,23	assumes 570:18 571:6	633:3,3 643:10,11	713:2 723:14,14	BETTY 551:15
717:5 728:11 740:22	assuming 567:20	645:2,3	727:24	beyond 609:8
745:8,16,19	622:19	avoiding 590:23 644:8	Bates 592:21 674:3,12	biennial 673:4,24 674:9
aqueducts 577:1 591:7	assumption 567:7	658:5	674:20 677:7 679:15	674:9,13
Arcadis 694:3	assumptions 567:15	avoids 644:14,15	681:7 729:19	big 639:23 683:25
area 559:8 560:23	attached 578:6 592:13	aware 669:25 702:21	batten 599:1	732:20 735:22,23
563:6,21 565:19	716:11,11 729:21	711:25 740:12	Battery 550:24 551:3	biggest 606:23 607:3
592:2 593:21,23	746:10	AWWA 727:1 730:11	Beach 580:2	633:7
594:16,18 595:20	attachment 578:9,10	730:12	bear 647:2	bill 577:8 601:11
596:1 601:21 602:8	584:14,19 674:5		BEATTY 551:15	620:10 705:22 706:6
605:1 628:20 638:17	attempted 721:23	B	beg 627:19 631:20	707:14 728:7 743:5
661:17 710:25 743:23	738:23	baby 661:16	709:17	billed 556:25 620:13
areas 590:24 594:3	attention 627:21	back 557:22 566:1	beginning 603:22	688:6
601:13	657:10 729:24	570:8 592:7 593:5,12	629:10 702:4	billion 569:6,7 571:24
argue 689:24	attorney 715:18	603:2,22 604:3	begins 654:19,20	633:12 634:8 651:21
arguing 635:12 735:8	attribute 728:2,3	605:20 606:1 620:16	701:25 702:10 717:4	bills 706:2 717:13
argument 619:12 697:2	attributed 675:6	630:23 631:22,23	behavior 676:2 736:22	720:21
734:16 735:1 736:8	AUDREY 551:7	640:10 641:19 644:20	736:23 738:1,5,22	binder 557:25 566:13
arguments 635:6 736:9	augmentation 568:9,19	650:24 656:24 657:9	behold 650:24	569:18 578:1 580:17
article 612:19,21	573:14 574:2 605:21	670:17 671:4 683:19	believe 578:8 584:12	582:2 583:16 585:12
articles 586:20	August 652:22	683:23 688:17 690:3	604:23 610:20 638:2	587:9 589:17 596:11
1	I	I	I	

 \mathbf{C}

746:15 747:10

C 551:11,15 557:2

CA 551:4,10,14,18

552:3 554:13,15

calculate 564:22,22

739:17,18 740:1,2,11

calculated 630:1 682:5

calculates 679:20 682:3

calculations 699:13

613:21 614:2,9,19

619:4 620:1,1,8,24

622:2 623:18 630:11

723:14,16,20 724:6

California 550:1,9,24

559:2 564:11 574:22

574:24 575:3 578:19

587:12,15 589:19,21

590:3 598:21 604:18

718:5,9,14,15 726:16

687:6 689:16 706:15

707:16 715:2 729:24

601:8 671:23 688:13

called 557:12 586:23

709:9 736:14

Calleguas 579:23

calls 557:8 586:3

campaign 599:4

canal 610:14 613:1

617:19 619:20

capability 593:16

capacity 568:7,17

570:22 572:21 574:9

576:1 586:5,6 588:6

589:8 594:4 606:20

607:15,19,23 609:2

574:16 575:13,17

689:17

cap 597:1

calling 658:14 717:2

647:7 652:2 659:17

672:19 696:10,24

call 641:10,24 642:2

745:3 749:1

551:13 558:9,23

724:18,25

617:24,25 618:8

636:2

718:7

739:9.21

688:11,12

741.6

597:24 599:15 601:15
611:15 613:22 614:16
615:5 618:4,15
620:17,25 621:1,6
627:15,16,16,17
631:7,13,15,22,23
632:22 647:4 649:16
032.22 047.4 049.10
661:1 665:23 672:12
673:20 687:25 693:20
695:21 709:2,3 714:7
BINGHAM 551:9
bit 572:3 597:16 603:14
650:3 661:3 700:5
725:4 735:6
blow 633:24
blue 690:13 691:7
board 554:7,8,9,10
556:22,23 561:20
566:5 569:21 578:3
580:4,7,20,20 581:9
581:18,21 582:5,9,14
582:15 583:18,18,20
584:25 585:1 591:9
584:25 585:1 591:9 591:11,19 592:4,7
591.11,19 592.4,7
593:25 594:25 595:13
595:14,15,16 617:12
617:15 635:4 637:23
638:2,5,8,10,11,12,23
639:4 640:5,10,15,16
655:17 656:15 662:20
663:22 664:17 666:13 666:14,15,24 667:5,8
666:14,15,24 667:5,8
667:9,10 668:4,16
669:9,10,25 671:4,6
671:10,13 673:22,23
674.5 6 7 9 16 606.25
674:5,6,7,8,16 696:25
699:10 703:23 704:22
705:17 709:25 710:1
710:3,6 727:2,4,5,9
729:6,7,18,25 733:9
733:20 735:25 741:19
board's 638:21 699:7
bond 649:17
borrow 662:5
bottom 632:4,4 633:22
649:19 668:8 677:23
694:8 699:23 701:19
701:19 709:14,18
717:4 718:2 720:11
726:3,8,16 741:15
bought 690:19 742:18
boundaries 563:21
branch 575:7,14,17,20
575:22 576:6 651:10
651:18
branches 575:1,3,11
Braunig 551:6 627:25
break 600:24 601:2

```
665:15 703:1,9 719:6
  719:18,21 741:22
Brian 652:23 714:13,21
  714:22 726:1
brief 558:12 601:2
  609:5 665:15 693:18
  719:21
bring 728:2
bringing 654:19
brings 655:1
BRINTON 551:15
broader 664:6 671:14
broke 719:25
broken 596:17 602:9
  652:6
brought 637:4 712:8,25
BROWN 550:22
budget 559:16 565:7,9
  673:1,4,5,11,24,25
  674:9,13 723:14
budgeting 600:8
  700:22
budgets 559:12 700:18
build 573:23 606:14,17
  606:24 607:6,10
  737:1
building 571:15 573:17
  577:1
built 585:20 633:16
  634:10 651:21,23,24
  660:18
bulk 610:18 685:16
bullet 591:4
burden 626:24 737:18
  737:19 746:10
burdened 626:13
burdens 738:11
Bureau 556:6,7,9,10,12
  556:13,15,16,18,19
  558:20 617:22 618:10
  618:16 622:1,3
Bureau's 618:8 619:17
business 562:18 629:13
  724:6,16,25 729:18
businesses 559:1
  562:12 594:18 595:19
  596:1 599:5
buv 562:11,19 563:14
  594:20 604:18 605:2
  625:13 627:7 656:21
  684:13 686:18 734:14
  740:23,24 742:25,25
  743:15,19 744:9
  746:12 747:11
buying 626:8 745:7,20
  745:22,25 746:4,5
buys 682:13 683:5
  684:23 685:1 686:14
```

```
626:17 630:4 643:16
                           643:19,20 644:2,7
                           648:23,25 649:9,13
                           652:18 653:11,14,18
                           653:22 654:2,2
                           660:21,23 661:5
  629:18 630:20 644:13
                           680:11,14,16 681:1
                           686:16 695:16 737:1
                           738:2 739:11,22
                         capita 564:12,16 565:4
                           650:8,12
calculation 688:9 724:4
                         capital 566:18 568:17
                           569:1,8 570:1,21
                           571:1,20 572:1,12
calendar 605:15 613:18
                           573:6 574:6,13
                           575:10 578:14,23
                           579:1,3 581:13
                           584:23 586:10,13
                           589:8 605:13 606:1
  675:25 685:20 700:17
                           606:10,14,18,25
                           607:5,9,13 633:2,5
                           644:8,23 679:6
                           717:10
                         capture 682:11 739:14
                         captured 697:21
                         captures 732:9 738:21
                           746:21
                         care 587:1
                         careful 704:15
                         Carlsbad 585:20
                           587:13,23 589:22
                           591:9,12,14,16,20
                           639:25 640:3
  659:13 660:21 671:19
                         carried 647:19
                         carry 697:10
                         case 550:6,7 566:21,22
                           567:3,4,10,14,15,17
                           568:25 569:1,4,5,9,9
                           570:11,12,12,14
                           571:4,15,16 598:4
                           614:1 618:7 625:17
                           627:24 640:11 643:2
                           646:2 731:7 749:13
                         Castaic 575:5 654:5,6
                           654:14,15 655:15,23
                           656:1 662:6 663:7
                           666:17
                         categories 634:3 663:5
                           717:16 730:2 731:9
                           732:11 734:6
```

```
651:5 652:8,8,9,16,17
  658:18,19,22 659:1,9
  659:10,12,23 660:1,4
  679:8,14,16,18,24,25
  567:17,20 568:3,4,24
category 610:19 633:10
  633:25 634:1,5 717:5
  730:1
```

causally 728:10 causation 717:19 cause 670:7 705:9 causes 685:22 center 551:9 570:24 572:18 590:22 central 568:9.19 573:14 574:1 579:23 605:21 734:15 certain 653:25 656:21 685:24 711:14 certainly 641:17 740:19 certainty 744:1 certified 550:20 749:6 certify 749:6 **CFO** 661:10,11 668:6 714:22 CFO's 559:12 **CFS** 586:5 challenge 704:14 **chance** 586:25 635:18 645:11 **change** 561:21 572:5 572:15,22 574:20 575:19 576:22 604:8 634:24 656:17,23 661:8 664:2 668:16 668:21 669:10,11 670:8 671:7 704:14 705:7,8 706:3 716:6 723:19 **changed** 591:23 592:1 715:24 716:19 721:5 **changes** 579:8 602:25 604:6,20 664:10 666:18 667:11 670:1 716:2,13,20 changing 656:13 670:12 716:17 characteristics 675:3 characterization 668:20 characterize 671:7 characterizes 675:20 characterizing 675:12 **charge** 620:3 623:14 636:22 637:1,9 663:9 674:2,2 679:7,8,9,11 679:14,16,18,24,25 680:11,14,16 681:5,8 681:9,9,13,15,21,24 682:1,7,8,15,18 686:16,20 695:10,16 695:17 697:15 706:11 710:25 724:22 735:3

737:25 738:2 740:14

742:24 743:9 744:23

744:24 745:6,10
746:5,11,17,21
sharrad (22.16.19
charged 622:16,18
636:9,15 728:14
030.7,13 720.14
charges 662:9,24 673:5
673:13,25 679:4
685:2 686:13 695:14
697:6 698:18 700:11
700:12 717:1,24
723:8,9,16,16 727:19
727.12.14.720.2.0.20
/3/:13,14 /38:3,8,20
737:13,14 738:3,8,20 739:7,13 741:23
742.0.746.04.04
743:2 746:24,24
chart 570:16 632:24
669:6 677:4,9 690:10
692:3 696:6,8,12,20
697:18,20 730:5,9,24
732:8,14 733:15,23
734:7,9 735:14,14,19
735:24 736:1,4
CHATTED IEE 551.10
CHATTERJEE 551:19
chatting 610:6
check 744:15
chief 652:24 726:2
choice 703:2 722:22
chooses 625:3
chose 595:16 664:17
701:21
circumstance 662:18
circumstances 609:23
684:12 732:12 733:14
733:18 735:21 736:5
733:18 735:21 736:5
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18 clips 586:23,24 592:15
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18 clips 586:23,24 592:15 close 718:7
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18 clips 586:23,24 592:15 closer 600:11
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18 clips 586:23,24 592:15 close 718:7
733:18 735:21 736:5 citation 662:2 cite 645:18 cities 561:6 580:2 City 551:20 580:1 686:10 690:17 692:11 claim 682:25 Class 696:10 classification 674:24 675:22 677:5 681:11 728:24 732:16 classified 653:10 677:13 678:5,14,16 678:20 732:23 clause 595:5,9 640:7 clean 561:22 716:2,10 cleaned 716:12,13 cleanup 560:12 clear 640:15 CLERK 557:15 672:1 693:22 clicks 650:8 clip 592:18 clips 586:23,24 592:15 closer 600:11

```
563:16,19
Coachella 613:1
Coastal 554:15 589:20
  589:21 590:3
code 604:7.19
codes 604:8
COLIN 551:11
collaborative 714:25
colleagues 709:2
collect 598:10 687:11
collected 600:1 630:10
  645:25 727:22.22
collection 599:20
Colorado 558:20 613:3
  615:3 618:3 625:1
  637:5,6 728:10
column 677:10,22
  678:12 691:18 692:19
combination 615:16
combine 602:16
come 610:5 640:10
  683:19,23 705:17
  719:18 722:13 743:16
  746:18
comes 609:18 616:7
  725:22
coming 592:7 705:1
Commission 554:13,15
  587:12,15 589:20,21
  590:3 696:10.25
  745:4
Commissioners 696:15
  730:7
commit 656:21
commitment 656:20
  711:13,15
commitments 711:22
committee 579:5,6,6,11
  579:14,16,19 729:19
commodity 677:11,12
  677:13 678:16 717:14
  717:15
commonplace 603:25
communicating 614:20
companies 744:21
comparatively 690:9
compare 574:8
compared 606:20
  639:18 650:16
compares 596:22 598:2
comparison 568:25
completed 726:6
completely 583:9 637:8
  651:24
completion 587:16
complicated 639:2
component 571:23
```

620:6 625:10 663:15

```
704:14 707:14 711:6
  728:3
components 632:20
  652:15 654:1 666:16
  668:18 717:13.15
  727:12,18 737:9
  739:14
compound 637:11
computer 716:16
concept 670:9 708:3
  716:25
concern 666:7
concerning 576:16
  605:21 608:18,24
  614:10 617:13 623:7
  666:5.8
concerns 659:7,7 712:1
  712:17 714:15 715:6
  715:6.7
conclude 700:11 723:8
concluded 720:2 748:3
conclusions 700:8
  702:11,13,16 723:5
conditions 576:22
  657:24 658:12,14
confirmation 614:18
  614:22,25 615:6,17
confirming 718:4,9
confirms 718:13
conforms 718:13
confusing 642:6
conjunction 615:24
conjunctive 632:7
  634:5
connect 575:2.4
connection 678:2
  687:14 707:9
connections 613:6.10
  622:13 687:12
connects 575:5,7,8
Connie 550:19 552:8
  749:5,21
conservation 558:25
  560:4,22 562:7,9
  563:12 564:5,15,18
  566:25 567:7,19,21
  570:20 571:7 590:15
  590:16 593:22 594:17
  594:20 595:19,21
  599:6 601:14,22,23
  602:1 603:18,22
  604:22,25 624:10
  625:13,18 627:12
  630:8 632:14 633:4
  637:25 638:13,14,18
  641:22,23,24 642:2,6
  642:12,22 644:14
  645:2 646:8,11 648:7
```

```
648:10,15 651:3
  659:13 684:16 685:15
  744:19 745:3,5
conservative 603:16,17
  604:24
conserve 599:2 623:11
  624:21 625:21
conserved 602:22
  610:14 614:15 617:13
  617:16,19 619:20
  624:14 643:9
conserving 594:21
  624:18 626:14 744:22
consider 653:20 656:17
  674:8 726:21
consideration 585:21
  710:11,24 711:5
considerations 710:17
considered 561:20
  575:16 584:5 632:21
  648:15 663:4 666:25
  669:23 705:3,10,13
consist 560:3
consistent 658:13
  698:24 699:2 701:2
  706:18,25 707:6
  708:24 718:5 724:1
  725:16,20 726:23,25
  728:25 730:3 733:10
  734:7 736:1.3
constantly 616:16
constitute 749:10
constraint 660:23
constraints 659:21
construction 683:22
consult 701:4
consultant 697:24
  713:24 715:3 734:21
  741:11
consultants 694:5
  698:6,9,20 699:5,17
  700:15 709:13 714:18
consulting 694:4 698:6
  698:11 731:8 732:11
consumers 562:25
consumption 591:1
  650:8,12
cont 555:1 556:1
contain 690:10 702:9
contained 688:20
containing 586:19
  674:3
contains 702:13
contaminated 560:13
  561:7 593:16
contamination 684:6.9
context 671:14 677:12
  677:15
```

```
continue 557:6 576:21
  594:11,14,24 596:6
  596:15 597:3 601:3
  636:4 637:21 664:3
  667:12 719:22
continued 574:5 638:15
continues 640:21
continuing 639:12
contract 558:22 591:14
  596:4,16 597:7,8
  638:24 640:6
contractor 576:7 577:4
contractors 576:4
contracts 554:16
  558:19,21 561:17
  595:6,10,12,18,18
  596:14,20,21 597:2,6
  637:20,21 638:3,4
  639:13
contractual 632:7
contradicting 630:22
contrast 599:21
contribute 699:16
  702:18
contributing 586:7
  652:17 702:22
Control 617:12,15
controller 696:2,3
  727:23
controllers 562:17
convenient 672:7 719:6
conversation 715:11
convert 700:21 724:13
converts 723:15
convey 717:11
conveyance 573:15
  574:2 577:5,7 586:5
  630:4 633:8 635:9
  643:11 644:15 645:3
  646:24 651:18 652:8
  652:10,11,13 654:16
  654:18 658:6 659:6
  659:23 663:8,18
  676:17 678:18,23,25
  681:18 705:23 707:16
  707:18 717:2,5
  723:22 724:23 733:3
copies 720:12
copy 696:5,8,9 716:2
  734:9
correct 563:9 570:10
  571:5,13 577:10
  585:4 588:24 600:9
  602:20,21 624:12,16
  624:20,23 626:10
  629:15 636:12,23,24
  639:8,11 641:5
```

643:13,18 644:11,17

648:14,24 656:8 657:20 658:3 664:15 669:8 691:15 708:13 709:19 720:22 721:25 722:7 735:5 743:3 749:11 COS 652:25 718:4
cost 562:19 568:23 576:25 581:16 590:24 596:23,24 597:20 598:10 599:14,23 608:4 624:8 629:1
632:11,16,18,19 633:18,19,20 634:6,8 634:25 635:15 643:11 643:11 644:14 651:21 653:1 655:3,15,18,21 661:9 662:21,22
663:1,4 664:3,10 665:4 666:8,15 667:11,13 668:17 671:11 673:6,11,15 674:10,14,17,18,25 675:1,2,12,13,20,22
675:23 676:11,13,20 676:21,22 677:4,5 678:4 679:13 680:13 682:17,19 683:1 685:12 694:11,21 697:22,24 698:7,22
698:24,25 699:13,14 701:14 702:1,6 705:15,15 706:13,15 706:17,24 707:4,6 708:16 709:9,23 710:12 712:18,22
713:9,13 714:14,24 717:18 718:16 723:24 724:3,9 725:10,14,18 726:24 727:3 728:5,8 728:8,18 729:23 730:3 731:8 732:10
733:8,9,19 734:5 735:17 737:7,8 738:4 738:23 739:5,6,8,18 741:22 743:23 costs 562:11 568:17 570:21 571:1,11,20
572:1,12 576:6,9 577:7 581:15 590:21 594:20 598:3,13 600:2 606:10 607:5,7 607:10,11 608:25 609:2 633:21 641:9
641:14,16 644:9,15 644:15 645:2,3 653:9 653:25 654:5,6,24 655:21,23 658:6

```
662:15 663:8,14,15
  666:19 673:11,12
  674:21,24 675:9,10
  677:13 678:5,7,16,20
  678:22 679:5,7,10
  681:5,6,10,11,16,17
  681:20,22 685:17
  694:14 695:5.8.15.19
  697:10,14 700:25
  705:5 711:22 712:6
  717:10 720:19 724:14
  724:23,23 726:11
  727:20 728:5,9 730:2
  730:21 731:1,1,16
  733:1 734:20,22
  735:23 737:10,12,14
  738:15,21 739:6,10
  739:21 740:6 741:21
  742:3,10,13 746:7,22
Council 730:7
counsel 551:1 645:10
  653:5 713:5,7 714:5
  747:24
counsel's 647:23 653:4
counter 609:12,21
  619:7
countering 610:1
county 550:2,6 552:1
  579:25,25 587:11
  589:25 591:21 594:9
  594:16,24 595:22,24
  596:3,14 612:12,23
  621:11 636:9 637:19
  680:15 682:20 688:7
  690:15,21 691:22,25
  692:12 749:2
couple 566:4 641:3
  651:5,21 667:24
  693:15 719:7
course 665:12,19 668:1
court 550:1 557:4,10
  557:20 558:2 564:25
  565:5 569:15 571:3,6
  571:10,14,18 576:24
  577:8,11,16 580:14
  581:24 583:10,13
  585:9 586:22 587:6
  589:14 592:16,23
  593:2 597:13 600:17
  600:19,22,25 601:3
  608:14 609:13 610:11
  611:1,8,23 612:4,6
  615:21 616:3,7,14,23
  617:2,4,6 619:2,10
  621:1,3,7 623:23
  624:1 630:17 631:14
  631:17 634:18 635:20
```

635:22 636:4 637:12

```
642:8,9 645:12,18,20
  646:16,19 647:9,13
  647:20,25 655:8
  657:16 660:3,8 661:6
  661:22 665:9,12,14
  665:18,19 667:19
  668:1 670:22 671:1
  671:16.21 672:6.13
  680:3,5,20 689:15,22
  691:10,13,16 693:17
  703:1,4,9 704:2 708:8
  709:2,15 713:14,20
  715:18 719:5,9,19,22
  720:9 721:21 729:10
  729:14 730:16,17
  731:11,23 732:7
  741:12 747:16,20
  748:2
CourtCall 551:15,20
  551:22 552:4
cover 599:14 641:23
  642:12 694:21 695:1
  711:21 726:1 746:7
covered 608:2 697:21
covers 624:8 679:7
  746:23,24
CPA 568:19
CPF-10-510830 550:6
CPF-12-512466 550:7
CRA 717:6.11
create 651:16 688:1
  736:7
created 630:5 707:19
creating 651:15
credit 613:11 620:2
credits 562:7,9,21
  563:12 564:5 595:21
  601:22 602:1 603:22
  604:22
criteria 680:7
cross-examination
  553:4,8 624:2 665:24
  666:3 703:12
CSR 550:19 552:8
  749:5,21
cubic 680:22 681:2,3
current 559:10 639:12
  663:7 673:1 690:11
  704:9 738:20
currently 558:14
  591:13 605:24 652:1
  653:9
CURTIS 550:3
Cushman 610:3,9,12
  610:13
Cushman's 609:10,21
```

```
744:21
customers 608:6
  659:17 684:18 742:22
  742:25
cycle 604:4 673:16
          D
D 557:2 636:2
D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A
  557:19
daily 687:12
DAN 551:6
DANIEL 551:5
data 687:11 688:14,20
  689:1 691:4 692:6
  727:11 731:5
database 687:16
date 572:20 729:23
dated 709:8 720:5
dates 573:3
day 660:16,19 676:10
  679:21,23 680:1,10
  680:18 681:3
deal 683:17 714:25
  736:13
deals 559:6 626:12
dealt 569:23 599:13
DeBacker 695:25 696:1
  696:2 734:4
DeBacker's 696:4
debt 742:9
December 550:14
  557:1 636:1
decide 574:12 669:11
  675:1 676:21 708:2
  721:4
decided 605:12 706:8
  706:12,14 707:24
  708:21 722:16,17
deciding 616:22
decision 606:1 638:22
  697:6 705:25 707:13
  707:20
decisions 605:21
  606:17.24
declaration 670:11
decoupled 745:4
decrease 573:8 605:17
decree 617:23 618:6.11
  622:2
default 621:12,15,16
Defendant 550:10
  551:8
Defense 557:12 671:23
defer 573:17 574:1
  578:14,22 584:23
  605:12 609:2
```

742:24 743:6,9

deferral 581:14 586:8 589:8 deferred 573:7 606:9 607:13 deferring 586:10 definition 730:23 **degree** 606:6 643:24 685:1.8 686:14.18 738:1 742:13 746:15 746:25 delayed 633:4,12 deletions 716:16 deliberate 697:9 704:22 deliver 574:22 603:9 605:10,24 613:5 624:25 650:15,19 652:17 **delivered** 609:18 618:2 620:9,12 622:15,20 deliveries 616:11 622:12 650:23 651:1 delivering 605:15 delivery 600:5 616:1 623:3 657:7 **Delta** 658:24 660:12 685:13 697:15 demand 558:25 559:3 560:1,3 565:8,9 566:18,23 567:8,11 567:12,20 570:17,18 572:2,13,16 573:4,23 574:8,8,15 576:17 577:24 585:22 586:1 588:12,18,21,22,25 590:9,17 592:9 593:6 593:10,13 594:7,11 594:15 595:5,10 596:2 597:17,20 598:4,11,12 599:9 600:2 601:6 602:23 603:5,7 606:10,15 607:14,15 608:1,8,11 625:8,18 642:3,5,7,11 643:2,4,6 644:24,24 646:14,15,20 649:6 650:13 655:7 657:1,5 657:22 658:11 675:9 676:19 677:11,15 678:3 681:3 682:11 684:5 710:20 717:14 728:14 736:15,17,17 737:22 demanded 613:11 demands 559:7 560:6 565:16,18 567:16 572:5,14,22,24 573:1 573:8,21,22 574:15

customer 678:2 742:24

610:1,21

	Ī	İ		İ
575:19,24 576:1	designate 689:9,11	592:2 594:7,9,11,14	599:25 600:7,10	doled 639:6
603:3,11,15 605:12	designated 608:24	594:24 595:20,22	discuss 576:10 606:19	dollar 600:10 641:18
605:25 606:20 607:3	designation 615:10	596:3 605:21 608:19	discussed 648:11 654:2	641:19 735:23
613:9 648:10 649:4,8	618:23	608:21 609:10,19	666:14 702:17	dollars 569:6,7 571:24
658:15,16 675:5,6,16	designed 593:10,24	610:14,15 611:12	discussing 576:12	599:24 633:12 641:4
675:17 676:3,5,16	650:13 678:3 680:6	612:12,14 613:5,8,13	695:2,6 702:5	651:22 663:17
7 7			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
677:1,14,21 678:9	735:15	613:15,19,25 614:3,9	discussion 575:12	downsizing 581:14
679:1,2,2 682:22	destabilization 704:18	614:13,23 615:7	664:5 669:15,18	632:17
683:14,15,17,19	704:20 705:9,11	619:21,25 620:2,19	discussions 576:3 592:3	draft 632:1 714:12,15
695:1 737:2 739:12	725:8	621:19,22 622:9,11	disingenuous 609:25	715:13,15,23,24
739:24 746:25	destabilize 664:22	636:9,25 637:2,9,18	disjuncture 615:25	716:12 718:8,22
demonstrate 615:22	destabilizing 736:10	638:1,12,17,22 639:4	disposable 683:13	720:1,5 721:9,23
demonstrated 675:21	detailed 724:13	640:13,18,20 668:23	dispute 616:4,13	722:4
Department 550:4	details 720:18	680:15 682:20 688:7	disputes 609:15	drafted 589:24 722:18
558:23 575:13 576:19	determination 617:18	690:15,21 691:22,25	disruptive 611:17,18	draw 609:22
686:11 690:17 692:11	617:21 621:25	692:12,13,17,21,25	distinct 563:7	drinkable 593:17
700:16,21 707:15	determine 572:11	693:13 703:14 711:25	distribution 565:1	driven 675:8
717:12 721:2 741:18	676:24 678:23 687:13	712:5,12 713:11	568:8,13 570:22,25	drought 598:21,22
742:1,1,19 743:7	726:25	736:9	571:21,23 572:12	652:4 662:14,15
Depends 658:20	determined 594:1	Diego's 585:15 595:10	573:12,16 574:6,13	663:13,15
depicted 668:19 690:13	678:6 731:9 732:11	613:10 619:18 620:9	581:16 586:13 591:2	dry 662:6,7,15 682:25
deposition 550:23	determines 679:23	622:12 680:16 682:21	591:5,6 605:5,13	683:2 684:4 706:11
627:18,20,23 629:13	develop 577:20 579:12	682:25 711:24 712:16	607:1,10 634:2 653:9	707:24 708:2,3,8,15
630:25 645:5,15	581:1 593:16 608:5	difference 606:8 623:5	654:20 675:14,15	710:21,22 728:20
Depot 563:16	685:14 704:23 707:4	685:10 692:6	677:23,24,25 678:5,8	736:18 737:5,10,16
desal 568:7	711:5 741:22	differences 567:18	678:10 679:7,10	737:18,20 738:10,12
desalination 554:12	developed 561:14	669:5	District 550:9 551:8,13	739:1,12,18,23 740:6
560:5 562:2,4,6	590:14 594:5 615:24	different 566:18 567:15	551:21 552:1 558:8	740:14,24 746:22
583:21,25 584:4,7,11	684:15 696:15 698:24	569:8 582:23 595:16	579:22,23,24,24	DTX 615:5 617:6,7
584:16 585:3,13,20	704:23 706:19 707:1	599:18 605:11,25	580:1,3 589:25	618:20 647:24 666:11
587:13,23 588:16	707:7 708:24 730:2,6	606:5 607:25 608:17	612:13,25 672:18	667:20
589:22 591:13,15	730:10 731:8 734:8	609:15 616:11 631:14	686:9,10	DTX-110 673:20,21
624:9 630:7 632:17	735:16,16 736:6	631:17 634:11 652:7	District's 588:16	DTX-18 566:13 569:13
637:16,25 638:20	developing 581:17	652:15 656:17 658:6	divide 733:2	569:15,16 631:7
639:7,19,23 640:1,3,6	development 559:4,5	659:1 663:3 674:7	division 559:23	DTX-20 554:5 569:18
640:17 642:1	567:22 581:10 583:20	684:12,14,14,15,17	divulged 713:18	577:14,16,17 632:23
desalinization 642:13	601:13 673:3 736:9	684:17,18 693:15	DMD 643:15 646:13	DTX-226 554:20
describe 559:14,20	Devendra 553:3 557:8	differently 662:13	648:21 658:5	613:22 615:19
560:8 562:2,7 575:15	557:11,18	difficult 597:7	document 554:17	DTX-227 554:22
580:18 582:3,8	deviation 688:13	diligently 726:5	563:20 565:15 567:25	614:16
584:10 585:17 587:10	689:19,23 691:9	dire 599:1	570:6 579:20 580:18	DTX-228 554:23
589:18 595:15 596:12	692:2,4,9	direct 553:4,8 558:3	582:4 584:13 587:10	DTX-229 554:25
597:25 601:12,16	deviations 692:13	584:15 595:22,25	589:18,19 590:19	DTX-230 555:3
610:19 612:14,22	devices 562:12,17,20	603:20 627:21 640:25	597:25 599:16,17	DTX-231 555:4
613:7 616:1 618:5	594:21 599:6 603:24	642:21 655:6 657:10	611:20 613:23 614:17	DTX-232 555:6
666:12 673:9 690:5	603:24 604:7,10	661:19 664:1,9	621:5,9 631:6 674:12	DTX-233 555:7
691:2 693:21 694:9	Diamond 633:16,17,20	672:14 702:2,12	688:1,18 716:19,23	DTX-234 555:9
724:15	633:20 634:9,12	719:11 736:14	725:13	DTX-235 555:10
described 572:10 618:7	635:4,8 652:1 661:21	directed 664:18 667:10	documenting 582:9	DTX-236 555:12
	*			
658:12 666:17 739:14	662:12	671:10 696:20,21	documents 557:25	DTX-237 555:13
describes 618:8	dictate 731:5 735:2	732:15 733:16	727:16 746:20	DTX-238 555:15
describing 601:6 702:3	Diego 550:6 568:13,20	direction 696:24	doing 559:23 570:4	DTX-239 555:16
description 554:2	571:11 573:13,18	directly 715:15	651:4 670:14 683:21	DTX-240 555:18
555:2 556:2 558:17	579:25 583:5 585:13	director 582:21,24	683:22 694:18,19	620:16
672:24 689:10 722:6	585:25 586:9,12	583:2	701:2 703:5 707:6	DTX-241 555:19
722:24	587:11,14,19 588:2	directors 578:4 582:5	712:22 725:20 743:5	DTX-242 555:21
design 564:1 576:20	588:10 589:25 590:2	662:21 666:24	745:13	DTX-243 555:22
641:20	590:7 591:14,21	discrepancy 598:15,17	dole 640:22 641:12	DTX-244 555:24
1				
	I	I	1	I

DTX-245 556:3	726:9 728:7	employee 704:4	623:21,24 649:17,18	600:12,18 608:15
DTX-246 556:4	DWR's 654:16	encourage 697:7	667:17,22 689:6	623:24 631:24 647:9
DTX-256 556:21		710:13 745:3	690:1	652:20 657:11 671:4
620:25 623:20,24		endeavor 715:3	exact 593:12 600:6	687:25 690:1,4
647:12,23	E 550:3 557:2,2 636:2,2	ended 595:16 699:16	exactly 634:15 668:15	693:20 709:4,21
DTX-27 554:7 578:1	e-mail 592:16,17	701:10,24	722:7 726:13 734:18	714:6,7 733:24,25,25
580:12,14,15	652:21 654:10 661:3	ends 641:1,3 729:19	examination 553:4,5,6	exhibits 554:1 555:1
DTX-309 556:6 618:4	665:2 693:24 694:8,8	744:21	553:8 558:3 640:25	556:1 610:2,18
618:15	694:15,17,22 695:18	energy 591:1	665:21 671:2 672:14	616:24 617:8 619:14
DTX-310 556:7	695:24 696:4 697:2	engineering 576:20	736:14	640:25 665:16 667:21
DTX-310 556:9	699:21,23 700:2,6	ensure 698:23	examined 557:14	exist 594:25 597:3
DTX-312 556:10	701:8 714:9,11,15	ensuring 694:20	671:25	existed 594:25
DTX-313 556:12	715:9,13,25 716:11	enter 640:6	example 561:5 563:14	existing 704:15 727:17
DTX-314 556:13	720:6,8,11 723:3	entire 598:10 675:25	568:14 571:11 598:9	exists 570:7 739:17,25
DTX-314 556:15	734:1,11 741:9,10,15	704:17	601:17 604:2 613:24	expand 574:10,18
DTX-316 556:16	744:13,16	entities 560:23 618:3	614:18 618:6 639:19	606:15,17,25 607:17
DTX-310 556:18	e-mails 695:3	entity 626:2 696:19	641:2 668:22 670:16	643:22,24 644:2
				*
DTX-318 556:19	earlier 570:11 580:22	environmental 659:7	747:13	expanded 575:18 576:9
DTX-383 554:13 587:9	631:6,12 637:19	659:21 660:11 684:6	examples 694:13	expansion 575:16,20
589:12,14,15 DTV 395 590:17	638:15 651:10 655:9	equal 643:9 730:21	741:21	576:6,11,13,16,21
DTX-385 589:17	663:2 666:14 719:11	equivalent 613:12	exceed 599:9 686:1	606:22 651:11,17
592:11	early 575:18 604:3	637:9 641:19	exceeded 598:13	expansions 591:3
DTX-454 554:19	645:1 650:24 698:3	erroneous 610:22	599:23	expect 600:6 640:11
601:15 608:12,14,15	earthquake 676:15	ESQ 551:5,5,6,6,7,11	exchange 608:22	676:6
DTX-51 611:15,25	easier 642:9	551:11,15,15,16,19	609:21 611:13,21	expected 613:20 658:16
612:10	easiest 572:17	551:20,22 552:4	612:1,11,23 613:13	718:25
DTX-518 554:8 580:17	east 575:7,14,17,20,22	essential 619:13	613:20 614:13 616:19	expecting 718:22
581:19,22,24,25	576:6 633:11,15	essentially 739:21	616:21 619:7,24	expects 613:16
DTX-519 554:9 582:2	634:7 651:10,18	establish 580:21	620:4,12,13,20	expenditure 584:24
583:11,13,14	eastern 637:5 686:9	established 640:21,24	621:13,17,20 622:19	expenditures 569:3
DTX-527 583:16	economic 554:3 566:10	establishing 709:25	622:19,22 623:14,15	570:13 578:14,23
DTX-557 554:10 585:7	566:15 631:11,25	estimate 604:24 606:21	637:14 655:7 688:8	586:11 599:8 633:3,5
585:10	632:14 646:23	614:1 619:25 620:2	691:7 693:24 694:16	633:9 727:11,17
DTX-697 556:24	economy 683:11,14	estimated 598:2,13	695:24 699:21 715:9	expense 742:7
687:25 689:6,25	economy's 683:12	599:22 613:12 620:8	720:7 741:10	expenses 565:8 566:18
690:1	effect 658:5 690:11	623:12 634:6,7	exchanged 613:2 614:2	570:2 573:7 574:6,13
DTX-702 554:17	efficiency 562:13,14	estimates 619:18	614:21 620:1,9,24	575:10 586:13 599:9
599:15 600:11,15,17	563:2,15 567:6	evaluate 566:17 574:5	622:4 623:2	599:12 605:13 607:13
600:18	590:13 604:16	697:24	exchanges 686:25	673:19 674:22 679:6
DTX-704 554:12	efficient 562:13,17	evaluated 575:9	exchanging 620:19	742:4,6
585:12 586:17 587:6	604:17	evaluating 714:14	exclusive 684:19,22	experience 683:8
587:7	effort 626:18,21 627:11	event 718:21	696:18 697:5	684:11 698:15
DTX-705 554:16	628:3,16,25 629:18	eventually 623:8,9	excuse 608:23 646:13	experiences 737:4
596:11 597:5,11,13	662:25 664:19 717:24	718:12	705:2 715:23 731:11	experiencing 598:21,22
597:14	either 600:20 626:25	everybody 600:25	733:24 741:13	expert 689:8,11,14
DTX-706 556:22	629:21 631:2 651:23	616:4 626:12 627:16	excused 671:17 747:21	698:11
666:12,13 667:4,16	659:11 734:9	635:23 669:7 703:4	exhibit 554:3,5,7,8,9,10	expertise 689:16,17,20
667:21	electric 744:18,20	719:19	554:12,13,14,16,17	explain 578:2,15,22
DTX-707 556:23	745:2	Evid 554:2 555:2 556:2	554:19,20,22,23,25	583:17 613:23 614:17
666:21,23 667:21	electricity 744:22	evidence 569:13,16	555:3,4,6,7,9,10,12	621:14 677:9 685:10
DTX-85 554:14 593:2,3	element 663:5	577:14,17 580:12,15	555:13,15,16,18,19	688:4 692:2 728:9,13
DTX-88 701:12,13	elements 652:7	581:22 583:11,14	555:21,22,24 556:3,4	731:22 732:4 735:6
725:24	eligible 597:5,9	585:7,10 586:17	556:6,7,9,10,12,13,15	explained 723:13
dude 732:20	eliminate 632:8,15	587:7 589:15 593:3	556:16,18,19,21,22	735:12
due 573:7 609:2 745:7	Embarcadero 551:9	597:11,14 600:15,18	556:23,24 569:16	explaining 719:12
duly 557:13 671:24	emergency 652:18	600:19 608:12,15	577:17 580:15 581:25	explanation 716:25
	676:15 681:10	610:20 611:7,16	583:14 585:10 587:7	explanations 726:6
DWK 3/0.3,11,13	0,0110 001110			
DWR 576:3,11,13 662:9 720:21 723:13	employed 672:21	617:9 618:21 619:15	589:15 593:3 597:14	explicitly 733:4

express 564:15 expressed 564:9 expression 692:7 extended 676:16 Extension 573:15 574:2 extensive 599:4 extent 588:3 605:7 607:21 619:13 620:7 626:1 713:5 715:11 external 592:18 710:25 extra 651:5 737:1 extraordinary 657:6 658:15 extremes 593:20

facilities 559:25 560:11

560:12 561:9 568:8 569:25 571:1,2 572:6 572:6 573:9,12 574:11 584:5 606:14 606:18,25 608:4

F

633:25 634:4 643:24 644:2 662:10,10 717:11 742:12,12

facility 565:20 568:7 571:23 573:23 585:20 586:1,3 591:20 640:4 640:6 651:25

facing 658:21 659:20 fact 572:13 579:14 607:18 608:10 614:12 622:3 630:25 646:22

650:20 658:1,21 706:10 713:9 725:6 738:12 744:8

factor 606:23 743:12 744:8

factors 607:2 650:25 710:12

facts 609:16 616:5,13 factual 609:14 616:4,14

factually 610:21 **failure** 740:14

fair 626:6 631:4 641:10 670:2 713:20 737:15

fairly 639:2,3,18

669:10

fall 737:19.19

familiar 595:4 608:21 611:12

far 576:7 661:19 691:5 706:4

fashion 657:6 658:16 **faster** 611:1

fault 647:14 feed 720:24

Feeder 568:12,20

feet 642:22 680:23 681:2.3

FELLOWS 551:20

felt 682:10 704:24 Fernando 561:5

field 683:18 698:12 figure 572:17 602:2,3 603:17 645:1 653:21

674:19 723:21

figures 603:10 **file** 601:10

fill 641:7,8 659:6 721:12

filled 726:16

final 617:18,21 619:17 619:20 622:2 632:1

701:8 707:11 725:22 finalized 592:2 706:19

finally 688:12

finance 559:17 664:6 664:19 671:11 729:19

finances 664:7 financial 559:13 581:4

652:24 667:14 670:7 670:18 673:2 698:5,8

698:11,20 699:5,11 699:17,17 700:15 709:13 714:18 726:2

731:7 732:10

find 627:18 719:5 findings 702:11,13,16 fine 586:22 592:23

> 593:1 645:21 735:25 747:25

finish 634:2,19 finished 721:18,21,22 firm 682:22 694:4

698:11,14 715:5

first 557:17 565:12,23 565:25 578:11,12

584:20 590:6,10 592:11 609:24 631:24

633:25,25 634:5 645:15 648:4,8 667:2

672:3,4 674:13,15 676:24 679:9,11

681:12 683:1 688:17

690:3,5 702:15 716:15 723:11 725:25

729:22 736:13 741:15 746:13

fiscal 554:18 598:5 599:18 601:18 602:3 602:5,11,18,19 603:2

673:24 675:6 681:14 688:5.6 700:19.21 723:14,16,20 724:5

724:13,18,25

fit 733:17 **five** 561:4 665:13,14

729:15 fix 711:21

fixed 577:7 596:18.20 654:24 656:13.18.23 663:1 666:19 686:13

695:9.14 705:4 711:5 711:15,22 717:1

724:23 731:1 735:23 742:13 743:1 744:23

746:7

flex 662:4 671:5 flexible 666:16 668:18

floating 711:11 Floor 550:24

flow 604:2,9,15,15

641:25 680:24 flows 745:8,15,19

fluctuation 650:19 focus 605:20 739:5

focused 562:15 564:11 610:9

focusing 562:16 578:10 **FOERSTER** 551:17

folks 561:18 604:19 656:22 660:11

follow 580:21 735:3,13 735:20,24

follow-up 616:12 followed 733:4

following 581:20 585:4 613:20 717:13 720:16

733.9 follows 557:14 671:25 694:23

followup 614:10 food 654:11

foot 626:19 629:16 Foothill 579:25

forecasted 727:20

forecasting 559:7 700:23

forever 638:5

forgoing 749:10 form 591:20,23 formed 698:14

forward 561:23 566:24

573:1 574:14 576:23 579:1,10 606:18,19

615:7 629:3,6,11 644:22 661:24 664:20

742:4 forwarded 734:10

fouled 631:20

found 569:3 694:12 741:15,18,19,20

foundation 580:10

four 561:4 647:21 672:8

framework 710:12,13 **Francisco** 550:2,24

551:4.10.18 749:2 Frankly 683:16,25

free 746:11,18 frees 594:4

Friday 550:14

front 557:25 666:21 709:6

full 597:20 620:5.11 622:9,21 623:5 646:5

649:9 653:8,11,14,18 661:5 664:5 749:10

Fullerton 561:4 function 635:9 653:9

654:1,5 655:4,16,24 656:2,3,6 662:16

663:8,16,17 677:22 677:24,25 678:5,12 678:13,18 717:9

730:1 731:17 732:11 functional 700:12

717:16 723:9 729:25 730:2 731:9 734:6

functionalization 634:13,14 697:14

700:24 721:24 723:21 functionalize 732:25

functionalized 697:9 697:15 700:11 707:18 723:8 734:23,24

functionalizing 720:19 724:3 730:21

functionally 652:6 functioning 660:4 **functions** 654:1 733:1

733:13 735:18 736:6 fund 640:21,24 641:1 641:10,11

Fundamentally 569:10 funded 560:9,17 561:3

630:9 638:1 **funding** 588:17,22 594:8 595:2 597:17 599:10 628:5,6,7,9

640:12 funds 564:2 592:9 594:12,15,17 595:23

600:1 625:9 641:11 further 626:14,16

638:10,22 639:5 640:16 671:2 future 559:8 567:11

570:17 571:9 572:5 575:21 594:6 650:14

650:16 654:3 666:18

686:17

G

G 557:2 636:2 G-A-U-R 713:23

gains 590:13 gap 692:24 693:8 gaps 693:11

Gaur 713:23 714:11,17 715:7,22 716:9,9 718:18 721:8,9

723:16 726:18 general 575:15 585:17 599:14 612:22 641:6 641:8,11,13 653:5 670:9 672:24 712:3

714:4 747:10 generally 577:4 578:17 580:25 591:7 603:1 638:19 696:20 697:4 735:3,13,20 736:3

generate 608:7 673:13 generated 598:2 generation 604:16 George 698:14

Germany 660:18 getting 589:4 604:4

607:25 642:21 711:22 give 558:17 627:15 635:17 700:3 709:1

given 563:11 598:4 613:13 620:1 651:1 683:5,10 684:23

708:20 714:14 715:6 731:10 747:11 gives 574:17

giving 641:24 700:1 **go** 563:1,15,17 575:1 586:25 589:9 604:3

609:8 611:9 620:16 626:14,16 629:3 631:22,23 632:3

634:20 635:17 641:13 642:10 645:21 649:14

650:6 657:9 659:16 669:20 683:14 685:22 686:1 688:17 703:3

704:2 711:12 720:17 720:20 726:4 729:7.8

729:12,22 731:2,16 732:7,22 734:15 745:1,6

goal 578:12 584:20 651:7

goals 578:11 584:21 606:4

goes 634:14 661:20 662:9 717:9 724:15

		(10.10.(11.(11.15		l
going 566:24 574:16	happen 567:22 571:17	610:13 611:6,11,17	identifies 688:10	include 620:6 622:22
577:12 578:25 579:10	666:18,20 668:15,20	611:24 612:3,9,18	identify 566:14 568:1	632:14 634:5 652:13
603:22 608:17 609:7	698:2	615:13,18,22 616:6	568:22 569:19 571:25	686:25
609:13,16 610:9,10	happened 620:14,15	616:10 617:1,3,5,10	573:6,11 579:18	included 568:10 581:12
619:2 626:14 629:6	623:17,18 664:16	618:20,25 619:4,16	581:7 585:25 599:16	638:4 646:4,5,21
634:17 640:5,12	698:3	621:5,8 623:20,25	606:13 611:25 612:10	663:7,16 674:1
642:11,20 643:9	happens 669:19	630:15 631:23 637:11	612:19 615:13 621:9	681:18 701:17,18
647:8,22 649:6,18	happy 621:6	645:8,21 646:11,14	666:23 673:21 674:21	712:15
650:6 651:20,21	hard 653:16	647:22 655:5 661:18	685:3 686:8 695:23	includes 688:9 702:11
655:5,8 656:24	harmless 669:19 670:6	665:10,13,16,20,22	699:20 701:13 738:24	717:5
657:23 658:14 661:18	703:23 704:10	667:16,23 670:20,25	identity 609:17	including 568:6,8
661:24 664:4,20	hatches 599:1	671:3,15,19 672:11	ignoring 665:4	590:24 630:2 688:7
670:13 676:9 689:10	heading 677:22	672:15 680:8 681:4	II 663:25 664:2,17	741:16 742:12
689:15 693:15 697:10	headings 677:10	689:5,13,21 690:2	667:10 674:15	income 683:13
706:5 708:18 712:25	hear 672:9 680:25	691:19 693:19,23	IID 610:14 617:11,14	inconsistency 630:16
713:2,4,10,11 722:23	713:15	694:1 702:25 703:25	620:18,23 621:23	incorporate 701:21
722:25 725:7 735:2,8	heard 670:2,5,9 704:10	713:4 720:8 721:18	622:10 623:11 636:25	incorporated 730:10
735:10 736:8 737:19	708:3 711:20	731:18 734:1 741:9	637:2,4	incorporation 630:13
737:19 738:7,14	hearsay 586:19	747:19	III 664:9	increase 561:21 573:1
746:16	HEATHER 551:15	hold 558:14 576:19	illustrates 690:6,7	599:7 603:13,15
good 557:4 558:5,6	help 604:23 651:7	645:8 669:18 670:5	691:3	648:23 668:11 683:15
624:4,5 635:20,21	656:11 676:7 725:11	703:23 704:10	immediately 560:15	686:16,19 737:23
636:7,8 672:16	helped 727:3,7	holistic 671:12	702:15	increased 561:19 609:2
683:14 719:17 736:13	helpful 612:6	home 562:18 563:16	impact 572:5 664:7	648:25 662:15
gotten 659:2 694:25	high 562:13,14 563:2	honest 725:10	683:17,25 689:25	increases 566:24 567:5
747:3	563:15 604:16 605:14	honestly 661:22	impeachment 655:9	567:6
Graph 556:24	720:14 745:7,15,18	honor 557:7,24 558:1	Imperial 612:25	increasing 643:16,19
Graph 556:24	higher 572:14,23 599:13 623:15 683:20	577:3 583:8 592:13 600:23 608:23 609:22	implement 598:23 659:14	653:22 657:1 incremental 671:7
graphic 572:19				
graphical 688:19,22,25	685:18,21 692:8	611:4,7,17 612:3	implementation 673:4	increments 613:13
graphically 690:8 great 683:17	737:24 738:2 highest 605:18 676:10	615:9 616:6 618:18 623:13 629:24 635:19	implemented 679:11 implication 619:22,23	incur 574:12 575:9 607:5,9 676:5 742:10
green 691:8	680:14,17,18 682:18	636:5 642:13 655:5	importance 720:14	incurred 742:3
ground 560:14 689:12	682:21,23 691:12,20	657:12 661:18 665:10	important 610:20	indented 742.3
740:23	691:23 692:17,24	665:16 667:25 672:11	670:17 704:25	independent 706:15
grounds 615:9 689:7	693:2,4,8,11	672:12 680:25 689:5	imported 560:6 581:16	715:3 726:21,22
713:5	hire 697:23	689:8,20 703:2 704:1	587:24 588:4,19,23	INDEX 553:1 554:1
groundwater 559:4	hired 698:20 706:14,17	709:17 719:18,23	588:25 591:1 605:8	555:1 556:1
560:11,12,13 561:7,8	706:21 707:3,5 715:4	720:10 729:8 731:18	608:11 609:3 624:19	indicate 583:5 601:20
581:3 590:12 593:16	715:5	734:3 747:19 748:1	624:22,25	602:6 667:7
593:17 602:14 625:22	historical 675:24	HONORABLE 550:3	imposed 703:24	indicating 610:2
634:5	historically 669:22	Hope 714:12	improper 610:5 712:14	industry 701:5
groundwater's 684:2	670:2	hoped 742:18	improve 578:13,15	ineligible 639:5
group 558:15,19 559:9	history 600:13	hours 660:16	584:22	inferences 609:15,23
615:2 618:14 630:6	hit 567:8 658:14	Hurley 693:25 694:2,8	improvement 569:1	influences 606:24
673:10 704:12	HIXON 553:5	741:11,17 743:10	inability 660:22	info 718:6
Growing 695:1	Hixson 551:11 553:4,6	hydrology 683:25	incent 685:14 745:2	information 617:16
guess 695:1	553:8 557:7,24 558:4	nyurology 003.23	incentive 563:2,18	686:22,25 687:6,8,13
guidance 638:10	565:6 569:13,17	I	590:23 596:19,20,21	687:15 699:4,6,8,12
guide 578:5	571:19 577:12,18	idea 648:20,22 670:11	596:24 604:10	700:1,4,5,22 702:1,3
guidelines 584:18	580:12,16 581:22	711:11,20	incentives 559:3 560:10	718:18 719:13 720:3
699:3 701:5 727:1	582:1 583:11,15	Ident 554:2 555:2	560:22,25 562:11,19	721:1,3,6,12 722:14
729:1 730:5,11,13	585:7,11 586:17	556:2	563:11,13,23 564:2	726:5 727:17 732:9
	587:4,8 589:12,16	identified 567:1 568:4	581:2,3 584:1 594:19	739:17,25
Н	592:21,24 593:4	568:15,16 570:13	595:19,25 599:7	infrastructure 568:1,2
half 599:24 746:21,22	597:11,15 600:15,21	573:25 581:9 584:17	603:20,23 604:4	568:5,14,22 569:5
hand 700:5	600:23 601:4 608:12	586:14 675:9 692:19	628:8,12	579:1 581:14
handed 631:15	608:16 609:9,20	742:9	inches 610:2 672:8	infrastructures 577:2
	<u> </u>			
l	•	•	•	•

initial 561:10,13,16 **initially** 575:17 591:9 injury 670:7,18 Inland 568:12,20 input 589:2 **inside** 713:5 instance 598:9 684:8 instances 712:9 instruct 638:8 instructed 637:23 638:12 640:5,16 instruction 638:21 integrated 554:5 561:13 564:6,13 565:12,13,14,24,25 566:2,7,9 567:2 569:21 570:2,19 572:7 574:4,20 577:19 586:14 605:23 606:4 632:23 646:7 646:21 647:3,7 648:3 648:12 651:8 664:4 664:18 667:13 integrity 592:4 595:1,5 595:8,12 596:8,9 intend 616:11 **intent** 560:5 **interest** 749:12 interesting 694:12 741:20 internal 598:1 710:25 internally 713:17 internationally 698:17 interpret 711:16 interrogatory 739:15 739:20,25 740:4 interrupt 616:16 interruption 693:18 **introductory** 702:14,16 **invest** 599:6 investment 640:4 investments 581:13 **investor** 694:19 **invites** 704:16 invoice 620:3,4 724:12 726.10 invoices 613:12 700:16 723:13 724:4 invoicing 721:2 invoked 595:8 **involve** 673:6 involved 704:5 **IOU's** 744:18 745:2 IRP 564:6,6 567:8 570:15 573:25 606:7 648:11,13 650:7 656:24 657:1,10,21 irrelevant 583:9,9

615:10 616:22 618:23 737:5 738:18 **irrigation** 562:17,17 612:25 **Irvine** 552:3 issue 616:22 617:22 623:7 649:17 658:19 658:21 662:18 666:7 670:16 695:6 708:12 708:15 718:19 725:1 735:22.23 issues 694:11,11 710:14 710:14 712:20 item 582:8,20,23 583:1 661:8 663:12 666:5 667:1,3,4,8 694:21 737:7 744:1 items 605:22 666:19 701:20 IV 550:8 701:24,24 702:5 717:22

J

J 550:19 552:4,8 749:5

749:21 **J-U-N-E** 672:5 JACKSON 551:6 Jamie 699:22,24 720:12 JAN 550:22 **January** 672:23,23 679:11 703:15,15 705:19 709:25 710:8 **Jeff** 645:7 job 558:17 559:20 672:25 686:21 708:20 John 551:5,20 703:14 joint 589:23 **jointly** 590:8 judge 550:3 627:16 jumbo 716:16 **June** 553:7 582:5 594:9 671:20,22 672:4 700:7 714:14,16,19 723:4 726:4 739:24 iustification 648:21 justify 717:24 725:6

Karman 552:2 KARNOW 550:3 keep 664:1 669:15 715:25 725:17 736:9 Keker 551:3,5 553:4,5 553:8 569:14 577:15 580:13 581:23 583:8 583:12 585:8 586:18 586:24 589:13 592:12

K

592:17 593:1 597:12 600:16,20 608:13,23 609:24 610:23 611:4 611:16,18 612:1,4,5,6 612:16 615:8.15.20 616:16,17 618:18,22 623:22 624:3 630:19 631:15.19 634:18.23 635:19,21 636:5,6 637:15 642:11 645:9 645:14,19,23 646:13 646:15,17 647:1,12 647:16,21 648:1 655:12 657:17 660:9 661:7,20 662:1 665:7 666:7 667:18,24 668:3 670:24 680:25 689:7,19,22 703:2,7 703:11,13,14 704:1,6 709:15,17 713:6,21 715:21 719:7,10,17 719:23,24 720:10 721:20 722:1 729:13 729:17 730:19 731:14 731:21 732:19 741:13 747:14 748:1 **KENNEDY** 551:22 key 578:11,12 **kicked** 571:7 **Kightlinger** 554:15 kind 659:1 706:11 720:24 725:12 743:12 744:23 knew 645:16 656:25.25 658:13 715:11 722:23 722:25 know 577:3 591:7 592:14 598:24 602:25 610:11 611:1 613:15 621:6 632:19 634:12 661:22 669:22 696:5 708:11,14 710:15,17 711:3,8,10 714:13 715:7,13 716:16 719:6 720:25 726:20 733:21,22 739:3 741:6,7 known 559:22 651:25 698:16 712:4,11

L.A 669:13 692:13 694:18 743:15 744:6 745:7,8,16,19,20

746:5,9,11 747:10

knows 689:23 729:16

746:8

KUO 551:15

LADWP 694:13 Lake 575:5,23 633:16 633:17,20,20 634:9 634:12 635:5,8 652:1 654:15.15 661:21 662:6,6,13 666:17 lakes 635:13 654:19 655:2.4 **Lands** 554:13 587:12 587:15 language 592:4,5 595:1 595:12 596:8,9 638:25 639:1 699:16 701:7,10,16,20,23 702:2,12,18,22 720:13 722:12,18,19 724:19,21 726:7,8,13 large 569:12 largely 559:23 largest 576:7 577:4,6 598:17 652:1 Las 580:2 686:9 **law** 718:5,7,10,14,15 726:16 lawns 683:14 lawsuit 712:21,25 713:2,10 lawver 715:16 720:13 723:4 lav 742:2 learn 703:22 learned 713:5 learns 619:5 leave 683:18 747:22 Lebowski 732:21 **left** 675:10 677:2,22 703:20 legal 653:4 legislative 564:10 **legitimate** 610:8 725:14 let's 563:14 574:20 601:3 611:21 612:8 626:19,19 632:3,22 633:11 636:4 640:15 649:14 661:22 679:4 719:22 732:22 733:24 744:15,15 745:6 **letter** 554:7,8,11,13,14 554:20,22,23,25 555:3,4,6,7,9,10,12 555:13,15,16,18,19 555:21,22,24 556:3,4 556:21 578:3,7,9 580:19 581:9 582:12 583:18,19 587:11,19 589:19,20,23,24 590:7,10,20,22 592:12,20 614:19

620:18,21 621:10 654:9 666:13,15 667:10 673:22 674:5 674:6 709:25 710:8 726:1 letters 586:25 592:18 614:3,6,7,22 615:1,4 615:6,6,11,17,17 708:6 712:15 **letting** 659:16 level 626:20 627:1 629:17 656:18 704:4 levels 684:17 likelihood 578:18 likewise 689:3 limit 700:7 723:4 **limited** 630:3 **limiting** 659:18 line 572:19 577:5 627:22 628:2 683:23 690:13,16 719:8 726:3 lines 613:1 645:8 669:22 lining 610:15 617:19 619:21 list 590:20 668:15 listed 570:21 572:1 573:9,11 597:4 639:15 **listing** 596:13 **litigation** 592:6 725:12 little 572:3 597:16 603:14 609:25 661:3 700:5 719:13 720:3 725:3 735:6 live 563:20 LLP 551:9 552:2 lo 650:24 load 726:10 loaded 646:1 705:22 706:1,6 712:13 loading 712:5 717:1,3 local 554:4 559:2 560:4 560:9,10,17,21,25 561:3,11,21 562:5 563:7,9 566:11,25 567:5,18,22 570:20 577:21,23 578:5,11 578:12 580:4,9,21 581:1,7,11,18 582:10 582:17 583:19 584:8 584:21,22 590:15,16 591:22 594:22 595:17

596:5,7,15 601:13

602:8,13,17 624:9

626:21 627:1,6,11

628:4,7,14,18 629:2

630:6 631:11,25
632:4,6 637:16,25
638:13,18,20 639:6
640:17 641:25 642:12
642:16 683:21 684:15
684:16 685:15
locally 625:16 684:1,4
logo 709:10
long 558:10 580:2
627:24 664:7 672:20
680:10 682:14 694:25
712:4,11 724:15
743:24 746:9 747:4
long-range 559:17,24
664:6,7,19 667:14
671:11
long-term 632:7 651:8
longer 604:10 638:21
longhand 749:10
look 565:20 570:24
572:4,17 574:14,16
579:9 600:13 603:10
605:14 606:13 611:5
611:21 630:25 631:5
631:20,23 632:2,22
632:22 633:19,22
634:17 635:7,18
644:19 645:5,11
647:3,8 650:4,18
652:19 653:7,17
655:18,19,21 656:9
656:16 661:1 662:21
663:2 664:6,18
666:11 667:2 671:12
671:13 675:3,24
676:9 677:1 678:22
708:18 709:1,3 714:6
716:22,23,24 718:20
723:17 724:2 725:21
727:21 729:5 733:24 741:8 744:16
looked 566:23 569:25
572:14,15 606:7,19
644:22 650:20 705:16
721:14 725:23
looking 572:22 579:8
579:12 600:4 605:16
606:18 615:12 629:7
629:11 655:20 656:1
656:15 658:20 663:1
666:15 668:4 676:4
676:24 678:6 715:25
729:16 733:21 743:25
looks 565:22 575:25
650:5 693:7 724:19
Los 551:14 580:1 669:1
686:10 690:17 692:11
693:3,5,9,13 740:17
, , ,

```
740:20,21,22 741:3
  741:18 742:1,19
  743:7 744:9 746:15
lost 744:18
lot 586:19,20 592:13
  615:12 650:25 680:9
  682:13 684:3 695:1
  716:15 720:18 740:13
  740:13 744:22
love 744:17
low 576:18 604:2,9,15
  604:15 641:25 649:5
  704:4
Lowe's 563:15
lower 567:23 572:15,23
  572:24 573:21 620:5
  622:21 649:8 650:6
  657:8 658:13,16
lowest 692:21,24 693:5
  693:9,11
LRP 580:10 581:21
  628:5,6,9 637:20
  638:24
lunch 611:2,3 635:7,17
  641:22
```

M **M** 551:22 742:10 M1 699:2 727:1 ma'am 703:5 714:7 725:21 731:11 747:20 main 676:17 maintained 687:17 **maintaining** 739:10,22 maintenance 717:10 major 568:10 majority 562:23

making 581:6 663:19 698:16 731:6 744:23 managed 562:23 management 554:4 558:15,25 559:3 560:1,3 565:8,9 566:11,23 567:8,11 567:12,21 570:17,18 573:23 577:24 585:22 586:2 588:12,21 590:9,17 592:9 593:7 593:10,13 594:8,12 594:15 595:5,10 596:2 597:18,20 598:4,11,13 599:9 600:2 601:6 602:23 603:7 606:11,15

607:14,16 608:1,8

625:9 631:12 632:1

633:24 634:4 642:4,7

642:11 644:24 646:14

646:15,20 655:7 700:20 723:15 724:12 728:14 manager 558:16 559:12 661:14 673:1

713:25 714:17 manager's 699:8 **manages** 558:19 mandates 742:11 manipulate 689:18 manner 720:19 740:8 manual 699:3 727:1 March 699:23 701:8

708:4 709:8 714:12 720:5.6 **MARCIA** 551:16

Marino 561:5 mark 716:3 market 551:17 603:25 marketplace 604:5 match 619:18 material 610:3 materials 645:12 matter 636:13 675:13 692:5

maximum 680:10 McCUTCHEN 551:9 MDW 554:19

mean 562:22 563:5 567:23 578:17 600:3 616:4 626:13 633:11 643:20 647:19 649:2 649:3 655:13 656:11 660:4,4,5 669:6 676:12 677:12,15,18 680:20 704:20 706:23 711:1,6 733:24 734:16 744:15 meaning 745:19

means 578:15,22 607:19,22 620:10 624:25 677:16 730:25 meant 623:2 723:11

measure 624:13 642:21 642:24,25 643:2 680:23,24 681:1,2 688:13 691:9 692:4 706:10

measured 642:19 643:12 644:12 680:22 681:3

measurement 642:20 643:8

mechanics 609:21 media 586:22,23,24 599:3

meet 559:7 565:17 567:1,13,15 573:24

675:5,8,15,16 676:16 676:19,25 677:2,21 678:3 679:1,1 697:22 733:13 735:21 737:1

meeting 554:9 582:4 606:4 666:25 677:14 677:17 678:8.10 729:18

717:18 718:9 member 560:16.19.20 560:24 561:2 563:10 563:24 564:1 579:7,7 579:18,21 582:18 584:1,3 585:2,6 588:2

591:8 593:5,11,15,25 603:9 605:1 609:4 624:17 625:3,12 626:22 635:3 640:22 667:12 670:7,13,18 675:4,17 676:2,10 678:24 679:14,16,19 679:20,24 680:9,13

681:24 682:2,3,10,13 682:17 683:5,9,16,18 684:7,8,11,20,23 685:1,8,14,22,24 686:3,6,12,14,22

687:1,11,14,22 688:5 688:7 690:7,8,19 691:6,20,23 692:8 699:8 706:9 710:19

711:12 712:20 737:17 737:17,22 738:10,11 738:24 739:4,11,23 740:7,8 741:1 742:17

746:25 members 583:6 669:20 memo 598:1,1 656:5,25 memos 598:7

mention 689:11 716:25 717:23

mentioned 566:16 568:18 596:5 601:18 605:22 637:19 638:14 651:10 652:12,13 656:22,23 664:17 665:2

mentions 662:13 messages 599:3 met 558:10,14 561:16 565:1,23 566:2,10,17 567:5,24 568:1,22 569:8,13 570:1,12 572:11 573:6 574:1,5 574:12 575:2,9 576:5

576:10,15,25 577:14

613:9 620:9 622:13 meets 676:14 678:1

598:6 600:15 603:8 605:1,3,10,20,23 606:9,13 607:5,9,25 608:9.12.22 611:13 612:15 613:7,15,16 614:4,10,23 615:7 617:20 619:22,23 620:19 621:19,22 622:10,16,24 623:20 624:25 625:14 626:12 626:18 627:7,10,10 627:11 628:25 629:18 629:24 630:20,21 634:14 636:18 637:8 639:4 640:12 641:7 644:13 648:25 650:13 651:2 656:25 659:16 670:19 672:20 673:6 673:19 674:21 675:1 675:20 676:20 679:9 683:9 684:7,13,24 687:4,8,22 690:20 694:5 697:23 700:25 703:15 712:5 727:11 727:16 728:19 739:9 739:21,23 740:23,25 745:21 746:8,12 Met's 567:16 570:22 573:4,12 577:24

577:20 580:12 581:7

581:22 583:11 585:2

585:7 586:17 591:13

593:5 595:8,9 597:11

580:4 581:18 585:21 588:21 590:17 591:5 591:9,11,19 595:5 601:22 602:7,8,23 603:3,7 605:9,23 606:17,24 607:14 610:15 615:23 623:3 626:13 636:11 643:14 654:18 671:8,12 673:6 674:18 675:13 675:15 679:6 681:5 683:4 686:22 695:11 695:15,18 700:14 705:23 707:16 709:10 709:10 712:1 717:2 723:22 724:23 739:11 740:14

meter 687:10 method 614:14 methodology 634:25 661:9 664:10 667:11 667:13 668:17 699:1 699:1 700:10,14 702:7 706:19 708:23 718:5 723:7,17 724:1

724:8,9,11 725:2
metric 624:15,15
Metropolitan 550:9
551:8,13 557:8 558:8
558:11,16 559:16
560:7 562:10 563:3
564:23 565:7,16
560:7 562:10 563:3 564:23 565:7,16 566:23 568:4 571:25
573:17 574:23 575:4
577:4 578:14,25
580:3 581:10,13
584:23 586:4,6
588:15 589:2,3,12,25
590:7,20 591:15
593:25 596:20 598:1
598:21 601:5 608:3 612:12 613:2,3,4,25
612:12 613:2,3,4,25
614:14 615:18 618:20
619:5 620:22 621:10
621:17 622:5 626:2
628:3,8,11,15 632:8
649:5 650:15,19
651:24 652:24 657:23
662:5,8 666:25 667:15,16 672:18,21
672:22 673:15 679:20
681:12 682:3 683:1
683:19,24 684:19,21
684:25 687:5,10,15
687:18 689:5 696:22
696:23 697:1,22,23 698:4,5,21 700:18 702:21 707:3 708:10 727:19 732:13,18
702:21 707:2 709:10
727:10 722:12 19
733:2 735:15 736:5
736:22 737:3,6,12
738:4 739:13 746:15
746:16
Metropolitan's 559:24
560·1 561·20 573·15
560:1 561:20 573:15 579:9 580:19 582:5
586:10 588:5 589:1,5
590:14,24 591:2,6
596:23 608:20 609:11
619:8 622:14,23
643:6 655:17 656:18
657:6 669:23 673:3
676:13 678:1 685:3
685:17 686:13 690:8
702:6 704:23 730:3
731:7,10 732:10
733:13,17 735:17
738:3
Michael 693:25 741:11
microphone 557:16,21
672:2,7
mid 576:14
mid-2012 621:11 623:4

```
middle 602:11 648:8
  677:10 734:12
million 564:8 594:10
  597:10 598:14 599:24
  600:10.12.14 603:6
  605:15,18 634:6
  641:2,4 649:24,25
  650:22.23 657:25
  658:2 663:17
mind 600:24 646:16
minute 582:9 656:9
  707:2
minutes 554:9 556:23
  582:4,13,15,16,18
  583:5 601:1 665:11
  665:13 666:24 667:7
  667:9 671:4 703:10
  719:19 729:6,19
mirrors 562:5
misspoke 638:16
  737:15
mistake 647:25 648:1
mix 644:25 684:17
model 698:23 699:14
  699:15 706:25
modeling 570:12
modest 669:10
modified 587:6 593:2
  735:20
molecule 616:9
molecules 637:7
moment 693:17
Monday 640:12 747:22
  747:23
money 569:5 578:25
  593:6,11,12 594:7
  597:4 625:20,20
  626:23 627:6 639:5
  639:12,15 640:22
  684:24 742:24 743:1
monitoring 576:3,21
month 613:14 620:3
  687:13
morning 557:1,4 558:5
  558:6 624:4,5
MORRISON 551:17
mountains 568:11
  575:23
mouth 672:8
move 560:7 567:23
  569:11 572:24 573:1
  573:4 576:23 587:4
  588:7 589:4 592:11
  605:9 607:18,21
  608:6,9 610:18 625:4
  626:17 629:16 637:2
  644:6 655:4 658:22
  658:25 659:8,12
```

```
660:1,7,20,22 663:16
moved 564:17 600:22
  615:23 635:1 636:16
  649:4,18 668:17
movement 616:2 619:8
moves 569:13 577:14
  580:12 581:22 583:11
  585:7 586:17 589:6
  589:12 597:11 600:15
  608:12,19 609:10
  610:14 615:18 618:20
  623:20 636:10.19.21
  636:25 637:7 667:16
  689:5
moving 592:22 607:3
  626:3 644:4,10 654:4
  655:13,14,15,23,24
  656:7
MTBE 684:9
Multiple 621:2
mumbo 716:16
Municipal 551:21
  552:1 579:22,23,24
  579:24 580:1 686:9
  686:10
MWD 554:5,7,10,16,21
  554:22,24 555:3,5,6,8
  555:9,11,12,14,15,17
  555:18,20,21,23,24
  556:3,5,21,24 630:1,2
  648:3 694:25 710:13
  710:25 714:14 726:4
  743:11,21 744:7
  747:3
```

MWD's 609:1 717:11 **MWD2010-00236446** 592:24

N 551:13 557:2 636:2

name 557:17,18 633:16 634:11 672:3,4,4,5 **NARUC** 696:5,8,12,14 696:20 697:18,20 730:7,10,13,20,22,23 730:25 731:3,4,15,15 732:8,14,22,23 733:4 733:10,12,15,21,22 734:8 735:4.14.14.19 735:24 736:1.3 National 696:14 730:6 730:7 nationally 698:16 natural 600:3,7 naturally 684:2 nature 575:16 591:25 610:16 651:9 near 566:6 570:8

601:24 687:9 necessarily 561:6 589:9 597:22 605:2 689:16 necessary 565:17 569:2 588:10 616:15 641:15 702:6 need 564:19 567:23 569:11.12 572:5 573:2 574:5,10,18 575:9,19 576:8,12,22 581:13 586:5,8 587:14 588:4 589:4,9 590:2 594:4,5 599:1,1 599:2 606:21 607:18 609:3 615:11 624:19 624:22 629:13 632:8 648:25 651:22,22 669:15 673:14 699:24 705:10,12 720:12,15 720:17 724:3 743:4 needed 568:6 572:21 573:22 623:5 651:12 653:22 659:25 660:16 660:17 697:8 699:12 700:3,4 719:12,13 720:3 721:5 723:18 724:2 needs 559:7 565:20 569:9 575:13 581:15 620:9 622:13 624:25 644:23 651:5 675:8 682:6 740:24 negative 641:1,1,3,6 692:7 negotiations 591:21 **neither** 707:25 **NEST 551:3 net** 607:19 644:2 never 600:6 708:9 nevertheless 571:10 new 561:23 590:12 604:6 637:24 638:4,9 639:9,11 640:17 642:23 658:6 710:12 newer 596:21 newly 590:25 newspaper 586:20 Nice 557:4 noise 640:16 non-identity 609:17

non-lawyer 715:15

non-Metropolitan

noon 611:6 635:25

north 564:8 569:7

654:21 685:13

notation 583:2

normal 600:11 657:24

608:19

noted 717:12 notes 665:11 709:24 749:9,11 **notice** 614:3,6 615:6,17 621:11 639:5 **notification** 613:19,24 **notify** 614:13 620:19 notifying 620:22 **notion** 578:24 589:9 619:7 November 556:23 613:18 661:9 666:25 686:5 **number** 550:4 561:15 568:5,14 572:18 573:9 579:21 582:20 590:24 601:11 603:18 604:13,14,21 629:25 631:14,18 637:20 642:21,22 647:9,13 647:24 652:7 657:13 663:3 667:4 674:4,12 674:23 679:15 680:20 681:7 684:5 697:8 704:25 718:1 739:25 **numbered** 701:20 numbers 592:21 615:5 647:21 724:20 numeral 701:24 numerals 709:20 0 **O** 557:2 636:2 742:9 o'clock 747:23 748:2 **o0o** 557:3 636:3 748:4 oath 557:13 671:24 object 586:18 587:3 608:23 615:9 646:11 647:22 655:5 689:7 731:25

689:12 713:4 731:18 objection 569:14 577:15 580:13 581:23 583:8,12 585:8 586:21 589:13 592:12 592:19 597:12 600:16 600:20 608:13 611:9 615:20 616:24 618:22 623:22 630:15 637:11 645:20 661:19 667:18 670:20,23 689:16 703:25 704:2 Objection's 611:23 objections 630:13 661:23 objectives 650:17 709:22 **obligated** 654:23,25

11: 4: 617.11
obligation 617:11
obligations 621:13
622:20
observations 652:25
653:1
obtain 563:13
obtained 568:23 687:21
obvious 713:11
Obviously 628:19
occasionally 575:25
occur 567:19 600:3
676:6 682:12
occurred 598:3 621:18
727:12
occurring 594:3 669:24
occurs 686:15 738:1
ocean 568:7 632:17
October 741:20
offer 609:9,11 610:23
610:24
offering 689:13
office 559:12 653:4
661:10,13 713:15
714:1 733:23
officer 652:24 726:2
offset 587:24 588:1,18
588:22
offsetting 586:5
Oh 615:15 742:23
okay 561:10,16 564:9
567.2 14 569.22
567:3,14 568:22
569:8 574:4,12 575:1
576:15 577:11 579:11
579:18 580:23 583:1
588:1 598:15 612:19
620:16 623:20 625:12
626:18 628:14 629:12
629:16,23 631:3,4
632:2,13 633:17
634:12 638:11 639:9
639:14,23 640:20
641:10 642:5,19,25
643:4 644:5,12 645:5
647:2 648:25 649:14
651:20 653:19 654:4
654:18,21 659:1
660:8 662:2 663:6,12
668:8,22 674:25
675:12,23 677:18
678:12 679:4 681:8
684:11 685:22 691:16
697:17 700:6 701:7
697:17 700:6 701:7 702:18 703:4,11,21 704.13 707:12 708:11
704.13 707.12 708.11
704:13 707:12 708:11 708:14,18 709:1
700.14,10 /09.1
710:5,10,23 711:4,20
713:17,20 715:2,12
715:22 716:22,22

717:21 718:12,20 719:17 722:8,10 723:2 724:15 725:21 726:10,21 730:25 732:20 733:7 738:6 738:17 739:9,15 740:12 741:3.8 742:7 742:21 743:10 744:2 744:5 745:1 746:3 747:16 **old** 639:14,16,18 **Older** 596:19 once 621:4 707:19 718:17 one-for-one 587:20,24 588:1 one-to-one 641:17 ones 564:14 568:18 633:7 686:8 ongoing 575:12 576:13 576:22 online 563:17,20 572:20 573:3 oOo 550:5 operate 613:9 operated 649:9,12 653:11,14 operating 581:15 operations 683:16 717:10 **opinion** 732:21 opportunities 710:11 710:24 opportunity 711:4 opposed 569:9 675:1 676:21 **option** 595:16 646:9 648:16 663:23,24,25 664:2,9,14,17 665:6 667:10 674:15,15 options 655:18 662:22 663:22 674:8,10 orange 552:1 579:25 690:16 order 565:17,21 569:6 609:6 613:9 659:8 699:12 711:21 716:19 725:7 745:2 original 564:4,6 698:7 707:4,4 725:18 originally 623:12 644:22 701:3 707:7 ought 715:14,16 outage 676:16 outcome 749:12 **outdoor** 562:15 outgrowth 579:13

outlier 598:16,19

600:14 outreach 599:4 outset 629:10 outside 615:9 618:23 655:6 661:19 670:21 670:22 697:24 703:25 715:18 overall 597:17 641:14 655:19 656:18 662:25 664:7.19 overarching 664:19 overhead 717:10 overrule 689:15 704:2 **overruled** 611:10,23 630:18 637:12 overseeing 559:12 overview 569:24 Owens 745:20 owned 577:2 694:19

P 557:2 636:2 package 564:10 656:11 656:12 page 553:2 567:25 570:9 572:10 573:5 579:20 581:5 582:7 584:18 585:24 587:18 587:21 590:6,19,22 601:19 627:21 631:8 632:2,3,25 645:5,18 647:8,13,17 648:4,8 649:18 653:7 657:11 657:13 662:2 663:6.6 663:21 664:13,13 667:2 668:14 671:5 674:3,19 677:7 679:15 681:6 688:3,4 688:17,19,20,24,25 689:1 690:4,5 691:1,2 691:4,5,17 692:16 701:18,19,25 702:10 709:20,21,21,21,24 709:24 710:23 716:15 716:24 718:1 726:1,7 726:8,15 728:6 729:9 729:17,21 734:5 pages 550:9 729:16 749:10 paid 576:25 593:6 599:11 637:22 paper 709:10 paragraph 586:4 587:21 588:14 590:6 590:10 632:4 653:8 668:9 702:15,16 717:4,7 719:13

Parchman 550:19 552:8 749:5,21 pardon 627:19 631:20 709:17 paren 718:6 part 559:2 566:9,17 568:20 570:4.24 573:15 576:25 577:8 577:23 588:11 590:17 590:22 636:13,17 637:14 647:15,16,18 648:2,20,21 652:3 656:18 658:21 659:10 659:13 662:25 686:21 700:14 708:7 participate 638:6 639:10 participating 587:25 particular 563:20,24 591:20 602:19 606:10 682:14,19 694:21 712:20 728:3 736:23 743:22 744:1 parties 558:21 609:16 parts 574:18 716:6 party 596:4 Pasadena 561:5 pass 623:25 702:25 passed 601:11 700:12 703:18 723:9 passive 674:2 **PATTY 552:4** pause 693:17 pay 576:8 577:6,9 593:5 596:24 623:5 626:6,7 640:21 641:9 641:14,15,18 654:23 655:1 668:23 669:1 684:24 685:1 737:23 737:24 738:2 payers 737:20 paying 588:25 608:10 626:2,3,25 686:3,7 747:1 payment 627:2 pays 683:6 peak 574:16 576:1 652:4 675:16,19,20 675:23 676:5,6,22 677:6,21 678:3 679:21,23 680:1,2,6 680:18 681:3 688:10 688:11 691:6,10,20 736:15,17,17 738:25 peaking 673:19 674:22 675:1,8,9,12 676:1,9 677:2,17 678:10

726:3 730:1

679:2,5,7,10 681:16 681:17,20 682:25 683:2 695:19 706:12 707:24 708:2,3,8,15 710:17.19.20.21.22 728:20 736:12,18,21 737:2,3,5,10,16,18,21 738:11,13 739:12,19 739:23 740:7,15 746:22 **Pedro** 670:5,10 703:22 704:10 penny 645:24 646:2 **people** 557:22 563:13 563:23 599:2,5,8 604:1 621:3 625:6 628:20 641:24 656:20 657:5 658:15 672:9 683:12 711:22 738:12 percent 564:18,20,25 565:3 572:15,23 573:7 576:9 603:14 605:10,16,24 606:8,8 650:8,12 678:7,9,10 678:15,24 679:1,3,3 695:9 731:16 737:12 740:24 743:23 744:2 746:24 percentage 603:13 644:14,15 645:2,3 682:5 percentages 677:5 perfectly 721:10 731:24 perform 739:8 performing 673:11 period 564:24 565:2 576:10 598:20 649:12 657:22 658:10 676:5 676:6 679:21,21 682:4,4,11 688:11 690:9,20 691:7,8,21 691:24 692:10,14,18 692:22,25 693:3,6,9 693:12 periodically 574:7 **periods** 736:25 737:22 perk 724:21 **Perris** 654:5,6,14,15 655:15,23 656:2 662:6 663:7 666:17 personally 698:8 749:7 philosophy 593:13 604:22 pipeline 568:13,20 571:11,15 573:13,14 573:18 586:8,9,12 605:22

721:10,12 724:16

pipes 591:7
place 567:21 570:19
573:24 604:12 627:20
719:17 728:9
placed 658:24 660:13
places 655:3
plainly 730:20
Plaintiff 550:7 551:2
Plaintiff's 652:20 709:4
733:25
plan 554:6 561:13
564:7,14 565:12,13
565 14 24 25 566 2 7
565:14,24,25 566:2,7
566:9 567:2 569:21
570:3,20 572:8 574:5
574:21 577:20 584:11
586:15 598:24 605:23
606:4 610:18 632:24
646:8,21 647:7 648:3
648:12 651:8 657:5
659:14 664:4,6,18,19
667:14 671:11
planned 705:18
planning 559:8,13,23
565:16 667:14 673:2
699:7 710:2,4
plans 559:17,24
plant 586:6 632:17
683:23 745:24
play 592:3 645:7,10
650:25
played 645:22 646:23
please 557:15 566:13
567:25 569:18 573:5
578:1 580:17 581:5
582:2,7 583:16
584:14 585:12,24
587:9,18 589:17
590:6,19 596:11
597:24 599:15 601:15
601:19 611:15 612:3
613:7,22 614:16
618:4 620:16,25
636:4 652:19 661:1
666:11,21 667:2
672:1,3 673:20 674:3
687:25 688:3 690:3
691:1 692:16 693:20
695:21 699:19 701:12
704:3 714:7 716:1
725:21
pleasure 635:19
plenty 658:18
plumbing 604:6,8,19
plus 616:21
point 561:19 575:20
576:17 591:4 611:20
613:3 670:23 697:4

```
716:8
policies 704:24
policy 584:10,15,17
political 665:1,2
politics 656:11.12
pool 568:9,19 573:14
  574:1 605:21
poor 683:12
popped 650:24
portion 563:25 576:5
  577:6 656:1 663:14
  675:5,7,10,22 676:14
  676:18,25 677:1,16
  677:20 695:8 705:21
  706:2 726:16 746:23
portions 649:11 701:10
Poseidon 591:22
position 558:14 559:10
  559:11,15 576:15,17
  622:24 623:1 643:14
  704:9 735:11 740:18
  740:19
positive 641:3,4 692:6
possibility 656:6
potential 572:20
  576:11,16 579:8
  666:18 710:11,24
  711:4
power 685:7 686:11
  690:18 692:12 717:13
  741:19 742:2,19
  743:8
PowerPoint 666:4
practice 598:6 687:18
preceded 617:6
preceding 582:20
  679:23
precisely 733:17
preference 642:3
preferred 567:3,4,10
  567:14,17,20 568:23
  569:1,5,9 570:11,14
  571:4,15,16 633:6
  644:25
prepare 601:5
prepared 559:16,17
  701:15 709:12
prepares 700:18
present 583:6 614:4,23
  618:12,17 749:7
presentation 663:3
  666:5,14 667:5 673:3
presented 727:4
presenting 665:5
  735:10
```

preserving 595:18

press 592:15

PRESIDING 550:3

```
pretrial 609:5
pretty 572:25 598:25
  599:4 661:15 699:25
  713:11 720:15 730:20
previous 564:14 617:25
  634:1 656:4 723:24
previously 723:13
  725:16
price 622:16
primarily 696:17
  732:14 733:16 742:13
principle 669:19 670:6
  670:17 704:11
principles 577:20 578:4
  578:6 579:12,15,17
  580:5,6,8,11,22
  584:11,12,15,17
  665:5 704:24 717:19
prior 600:12 630:15
  672:22
privilege 713:4
probably 616:18
  631:17 632:12
problem 658:17 659:15
  659:23,24 660:21
  697:17 723:19 731:25
procedure 611:19
proceed 612:8
proceeding 576:19
  638:25 640:8
proceedings 550:13
  748:3 749:8,9,12
process 565:15 612:22
  634:14 664:4 667:15
  697:25 699:7 702:6
  704:22 708:7 709:23
  717:25 730:3 733:10
produce 561:18 608:9
produced 567:18
  596:23 602:7,23
  622:3 627:1,14
  629:22 631:2
producing 571:7 581:2
  595:3 597:6,8
production 602:11,12
  602:17
program 559:2 560:4,4
  560:5,9,10,17,22,24
  560:25 561:11,21
  562:3,4,4,5,8,9,10,23
  563:8,9,25 564:5
  565:9 577:21,23
  578:5,11 580:5,9,21
  581:1,8,19 582:10,17
  582:19 583:19,21,25
  584:5,7,8,16,21 585:1
  585:5,16 588:17,17
  590:9,11 591:14,16
```

```
593:24 594:8,12,23
  595:5,17 596:6,7,15
  601:22 602:1,8,13,17
  603:22,23 604:11,23
  606:11 624:9.10.10
  628:7 629:11 637:25
  638:18,20,21,24
  639:20.23 641:20
  651:7,11,12,14
  656:20 746:10
programs 554:4 558:25
  559:1,3 560:2,3,6,16
  560:21 561:3 564:1,3
  565:8 566:11,24
  567:8,11,12,21 569:2
  569:3 570:17,18
  573:24 577:24 579:2
  585:22 588:12,22
  590:15,17,17 592:10
  593:7,10,14 594:14
  594:17,20 596:2
  597:18,20 598:4,11
  599:8 600:2 601:6
  602:23 603:8 606:15
  607:14,16 608:1,5,8
  624:13 625:9,13
  627:12 629:2,22
  630:8 631:2,12 632:1
  632:7 633:4 637:17
  638:7.9.13.14 639:6.9
  639:11,14,16,18
  640:17,17 641:22,23
  642:1,1,2,4,7,12,12
  642:13,15,20 643:15
  644:25 646:20,25
  684:16,16 685:15
Progress 554:19
project 562:6 563:11
  567:15 568:10 569:8
  573:3 574:2,25
  575:14 576:2 586:2,7
  587:13,16,20,23,25
  588:2,3,19 589:22
  590:4,21 591:1,10,12
  591:17 594:1 600:4
  625:2 629:4,6 633:11
  633:12,15 634:7
  646:10 648:17 651:11
  651:19 654:8,16,25
  655:1 658:23 661:15
  662:4 678:13,15,19
  678:20,21,25 697:15
  700:4,17,25 705:21
  709:9 717:24 719:14
  720:4 721:24 723:22
  724:12 728:9 731:1
  731:16 732:23,25
  734:20,22 735:23
```

744:14 **Project's** 707:14 **projected** 571:1 572:20 573:21,22 575:24 600:5 606:1.20 607:3 633:6 644:23 projecting 605:12 657:21.24 projection 574:10 648:10 projections 561:17 574:7,8 576:18 657:1 658:13 projects 560:8 568:12 568:13,15 571:7 572:18,19,24 573:3 578:12 581:2 584:1 584:22 585:3 590:12 590:13 594:2 595:2 597:4,7 630:7,8 634:6 637:24 641:12 648:21 651:3 658:5 683:21 728:14 **promised** 660:24 promoting 599:6 proof 610:23,24 **proper** 722:24 723:23 proportional 740:8 **proposal** 554:12 585:14 585:15,18,19,25 586:3 661:16 671:6 674:9 699:9 705:19 705:20 710:4,7,9 proposals 584:3,4 585:2,6 **proposed** 579:16 587:13 590:8 609:6 671:6,7 709:25 proposing 673:23 propounded 629:24 proprietary 687:5 prospective 574:14 600:8 673:11 prospectively 629:11 727:20 **protect** 670:13 **provide** 558:1 559:3 561:8 563:22 564:2 565:18,21 581:1,4 583:25 588:10,12 593:11 595:9 596:21 603:20,23 609:12 613:10 621:16 622:9 625:6,9 642:15 643:15 654:3 665:18 672:12,24 699:4,14 716:1 726:5 733:2

735:18 742:11 743:11

744:1,7 provided 590:23 592:9 595:11,18 596:20 599:10 613:2 628:7 674:6 699:6.7.11 700:23 701:17 721:3 722:14 733:19 provider 684:19.21 697.5 provides 560:10 613:19 613:25 617:15 619:25 637:8 655:2 662:7,14 678:16 727:23 providing 560:22 562:10,19 595:1 604:4 614:1 622:11 628:11 646:21 **provision** 613:17 638:3 638:5 proxy 680:2,4,5 PTX 693:22,23 695:21 PTX-142 597:24 **PTX-167** 699:19 720:9 720:10 PTX-211 741:12,13 PTX-2110 693:20 PTX-244 649:17 Public 696:10,25 745:3 **pull** 560:14 599:2,13 pump 660:11.16 **pumping** 591:1 pumps 659:9,10,11,18 660:5,6,10,15,16,16 660:17,17 PURCELL 551:5 purchase 563:1,16 588:7 685:25 purchased 563:19 purchases 684:7 730:21 purchasing 626:1 pure 617:15 purpose 615:21 655:10 **purposes** 652:18 674:25 675:13,24 676:11,20 732:9 **pursue** 597:8 put 559:17 605:17 611:2 632:5 637:6 646:2 707:13,21 718:18 730:20 732:24 733:5 738:11

0

quality 742:11 quantification 570:7 quantified 629:10 quantify 570:1 606:9

626:21 627:2,4,11,13 628:4,16 629:1,9 quantifying 627:1 628:18 629:3,5,7 686:22 quantity 602:24 622:6 question 572:4 588:21 607:8 627:10 646:16 654.13 655.11 670.15 710:23 724:7 731:12 731:13,19,24 732:2 734:9 739:16 745:17 questions 565:11 589:21 608:18 616:12 661:23 666:4 667:24 673:18 682:24 697:12 731:25 736:12 quickly 699:25 720:16 QUILIZAPA 552:4 quite 721:25 741:14 744:25

R

quote 700:7,13 718:7

R 557:2 636:2 Raftelis 698:5,8,11,14 698:20 699:4.17 700:8,15,25 701:9,11 701:15,21,22 702:8 702:19,22 705:15 706:15,17 707:3,10 708:16 709:12 710:10 711:24 712:16 713:9 713:12,19,24 714:17 714:23 715:2,4,14 718:8 720:1,24 723:5 723:24 725:11,18 726:1,12 727:3,10 728:8 731:7 732:10 735:16 Raftelis's 702:13 714:1 717:17 raised 708:4 718:19 raises 710:10,23 **RAJ** 551:19 range 572:15 605:17 650:20,22,23 ranks 704:8.9 rate 559:18 565:10 579:5,6,11,13,16,19 592:4 594:25 595:4,8 595:12 596:7,9,23,25 597:19 598:3,7,10,14 599:10,22 600:1 607:6,11,12 608:25 620:4,4,5,11,13 622:19,21,22,23 623:6,15 624:8 625:5

625:8 626:23 630:11 635:1,2 636:10,14,14 636:15,23 637:1,10 637:13,14 641:11 645:25 646:1.1.3.4 648:22 651:3 653:25 656:19 663:9 668:10 668:10 671:8.12 673:16 674:7 679:12 683:2,4 685:5,6,7,7 685:12,16,18,19,21 685:23 686:1,4,6,7 690:11 697:10,18 698:16 699:1,9 700:13 702:7 704:15 704:16,17,23 705:1,3 706:1,3 707:20 709:23 710:12 711:6 712:12 717:25 718:4 723:9 725:6 726:11 727:12,18 730:4,11 731:6 736:24 737:7,9 737:20 742:15 743:8 743:19,21 744:1 rates 579:9 599:13 600:4 608:2,3 620:6 641:13 643:10 646:5 646:6 653:19 655:19 664:7,22 666:19 669:16.20.23 670:6

670:12,14 673:4,13 673:25 674:9,13 684:25 685:4,11 695:12 697:6 698:18 700:18 705:18 707:19 707:21 710:1 711:14 711:21 712:1,6,13 717:3 725:8,17 727:19 728:15,15 729:7 736:10 737:11 737:13,14,24 738:3,7 738:9,20 739:7,13 742:16 745:4

rationale 718:13 reach 576:2,8 651:7 read 586:19 592:21 629:24 630:17 657:20 720:18 724:16 731:13 Readiness 746:20

Readiness-to-Serve 663:9 674:1 681:9,13 681:15,21,24 682:1,7 682:8,15,18 686:20 695:16 737:25 746:17 746:21

reading 609:5 687:10 729:15

reads 648:19

ready 557:6 703:2 realizes 697:22 really 562:5 565:14 576:13 586:25 592:14 598:24 599:6 733:16 733:17 735:14 **REALTIME 550:20** reason 603:18 628:11 659:13 660:10 683:4 715:14 719:1 743:4 reasonable 682:11 reasons 574:3 665:2

683:9,11 684:5 697:8 rebate 563:3,17,22 rebates 594:19 641:25 rebut 610:12

rebuttal 609:9,12 610:5 610:5,8

recall 598:18 635:10,16 645:4 664:25 666:3 669:14,17,21 706:4 710:16 712:9 715:22 716:7 receipt 563:18

receipts 598:13 649:20 receive 563:3,23 594:11,15 596:19 597:5,10 612:24 620:23 628:21 639:12

received 594:7.10 614:7.19

receives 625:11 740:9 receiving 589:7 594:17 recess 635:25

recharge 684:2 recipient 595:22,25,25 recipients 588:18,22 **Reclamation** 556:6,8,9

556:11,12,14,15,17 556:18,20 558:21 617:22 618:11,16 622:1

recognition 575:18 recognize 593:14,15 736:5,6

recognized 638:2 646:8 707:23 732:12 735:18

recognizing 573:2 recollection 710:22 718:17,23 726:12

recommendation 580:25 581:6,20 582:11 583:23,24 584:10,25 595:9,11 595:13

recommendations 559.18

recommended 578:6

579:12 580:4 581:19 662:4

recommending 578:4 580:20,24 668:16

recommends 664:14 reconsideration 704:17 record 582:24 603:2

616:14 629:25 647:10 647:15,17,18 648:2,3 657:12,13,14,15 661:6,8 662:2 687:8 687:15 709:5,5 729:8 729:10,14,15

recorded 582:21 records 619:11 687:3 687:19.21 688:14

recount 634:22

recover 565:7 597:19 597:22 607:6,11 608:4 679:5,9 681:15 681:21 695:5,9,14 737:7,8,10 738:4,6,7 738:7 742:14 743:1

recovered 565:10 663:8 682:6 705:6 recovers 673:19 681:5

681:10,22 685:16 737:12 recovery 559:4 560:11

560:12 561:8 581:3 590:13 602:14 694:11

Recross-Examination 553:5 668:2

recycle 593:20 recycled 559:4 560:11 561:8 581:2 602:10

602:12 recycling 590:12 604:25 683:22

red 691:5,11

redirect 553:5,6 665:21 670:25 671:2 747:16 747:18,19

reduce 560:6 626:23 650:12,13 657:5 658:15

reduced 589:4,8 607:18 625:18 650:16 668:10

reduces 594:4 reducing 578:17 586:10 624:18 625:24

650:7 reduction 564:12,16,19 565:1,4 581:12,15,16 588:4,25 608:10

624:22,24 643:3,4,6 658:11

reevaluate 710:12

refer 562:21 569:24
575:7 578:24 587:19
590:8 601:9 617:23
675:23 697:2 711:11
reference 565:15 586:9
646:23 656:13 662:3
677:23 678:19
referenced 730:12
referred 566:7 568:9
570:11
referring 570:25
586:12 591:4 597:2
602:3 639:25 651:17
651:25 652:23 658:8
707:8 710:1 715:7
724:9 729:17,21
724.9 729.17,21
743:13 744:8,20
refers 586:4,7 587:22
590:10,22 596:19
617:25 634:1 676:14
676:18 677:13,25
710:18,19
refinement 579:6,11,14
579:16,19
refining 579:5
reining 5/9.5
reflect 564:16 623:5
reflected 678:7
reflects 692:3
regarding 587:13 595:9
617:16
regards 666:15
regards 666:15
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3 reinvoiced 623:4
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3 reinvoiced 623:4
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3 reinvoiced 623:4 relate 570:22 573:12
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3 reinvoiced 623:4 relate 570:22 573:12 610:20 667:4 697:12
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3 reinvoiced 623:4 relate 570:22 573:12 610:20 667:4 697:12 related 559:24 572:12
regards 666:15 region 562:11,22 566:25 567:6,7 568:8 598:25 599:5,5 625:11 628:22 642:17 regional 562:22,24,24 563:5 578:13,16 581:9 584:22 586:1 588:11 589:11 590:8 590:11 593:14,24 626:11 628:10,13 629:19,20 630:2,21 633:23,24 634:4 646:22 regular 598:6 601:5 687:18 regulated 659:10 696:16,21,23 regulates 696:25 regulations 604:7 659:11 regulatory 652:16 696:15 730:6 742:3 reinvoiced 623:4 relate 570:22 573:12 610:20 667:4 697:12

```
585:18,19 606:10
  644:9 659:20 662:22
  702:17 728:10
relating 567:15 571:21
relation 627:9
relationship 608:25
  648:9
relatively 649:5
released 585:5
releasing 584:2
relevant 736:22
reliability 565:18,21
  578:13,16 584:23
  625:10
reliable 678:17
relies 704:12
rely 700:19 740:21
remain 580:8
remainder 592:25
remember 627:23
  628:2 634:24 635:3,6
  719:15
remind 619:2
remove 604:9
renew 661:18
repeat 607:8 654:12
  655:11
rephrase 731:24
replace 625:21
replaced 624:14 660:17
report 554:19 556:6,8,9
  556:11,12,14,15,17
  556:18,20,22 601:17
  601:19,24 602:19
  617:14,24,25 618:1,7
  618:8 621:17 631:1
  642:24 668:4 699:17
  701:9,11,17,22 702:2
  702:8,19,23 707:10
  707:11 711:25 714:12
  714:16 715:14,23,24
  716:2,3,12,18 720:1,5
  720:14 721:5,9
  725:22 728:13 729:6
  734:6
reported 550:18 552:8
  590:25 602:14 604:12
  629:20
reporter 550:20 642:9
  730:17 749:6
Reporter's 550:13
reporting 617:11 631:1
reports 601:5,9,10,10
  618:11,16 619:3
represent 606:3 628:19
representation 688:19
```

688:22 689:1,3

representative 603:19

```
representatives 579:7
represented 579:22
representing 715:19
represents 691:9
request 584:3 585:2,5
  630:22
requested 582:21,24
requesting 583:2
requests 629:23
require 588:22 604:7
  638:25
required 565:21 651:1
requirement 614:12
  650:7,11 703:23
  737:13
requirements 568:2,3,5
  676:15
requires 588:17 718:16
research 700:9 723:6
reserve 661:23
reserves 599:14 641:6
  641:9,13,14
reservoir 568:6,7 575:6
  632:9,10,15 633:11
  633:15 634:7 651:16
  651:20 652:2,6,14
reservoirs 635:1 654:7
  654:16 662:11 666:8
  684:3
residences 562:12
resident 562:25
residents 559:1 594:18
  595:19 596:1
resolution 703:19,22
  704:10
resolutions 674:1
resolved 623:8
resource 558:15 567:22
  590:16 596:7 602:8
  602:17 624:9 633:6
  637:16,25 638:20
  639:6 640:17 642:1
  642:13 644:25 646:7
  685:15 700:19,21
  723:15 724:11
resource's 717:1
resources 554:6 558:24
  559:2,7,23,24 560:4,9
  560:10,17,21,25
  561:3,11,13,21 562:5
  563:7,9 564:7,14
  565:12,13,14,17,24
  565:25 566:2,7,9,25
  567:2,6,18 569:21
  570:2,19,20 572:8
  574:4,21 575:13
  576:19 577:20,21,23
  578:5,11 580:5,9,21
```

```
581:1,7,11,18 582:10
  582:17 583:19 584:8
  584:21 586:15 590:15
  594:22 595:17 596:6
  596:15 601:13 602:13
  605:23 606:4 617:12
  617:15 628:7 632:23
  646:21 647:7 648:3
  648:12 651:8 664:4
  664:18 667:14 684:15
  684:16 700:16 707:15
  712:6 717:12 721:2
  724:23
respect 583:1 595:21
  622:24 671:5 695:7
  700:24
respond 696:7
responded 599:8
responds 589:20
response 601:11 646:22
  657:7 700:6
responses 618:25
responsibilities 558:18
  559:14,20 618:13
  672:25
responsibility 651:2
  661:17 668:7
responsible 576:5
  673:2,10
rest 587:5 640:11
  716:17
restrictions 658:23
  659:20 660:13
restructure 743:25
rests 617:21
result 573:22 579:1
  587:23 601:25 607:14
  632:4,6,13 658:11,17
  658:23 668:9 670:19
resulted 588:3 592:6
resulting 704:17
results 571:8 702:5
  718:1
retail 573:8 696:17
  732:15,17 733:16
  735:15 742:20
retain 687:19 694:5
 698:4
retained 698:5
retroactively 619:5
retrospective 644:19
returned 704:8
revenue 598:2 608:7
  630:9 737:13 741:23
  742:8,17 743:12
  744:7
revenues 599:22
  641:15 656:14,18,23
```

663:1 673:14 694:20 728:2,5 743:20,24 744:2,19,23 745:4 review 574:7 619:13 655:18 664:20 665:11 698:22,25 700:15,25 701:14 702:5 706:17 713:13 723:18 726:22 726:22 727:11,24 reviewed 566:4 582:12 614:6,8,25 615:3 618:10 700:10 723:7 724:8 726:13 revised 566:2 revision 650:7 rewrite 725:3 RFA 630:18,22 **RFC** 699:25 700:2 709:14,18 720:14,15 **RFP** 585:5 **right** 571:4,9,10 577:9 577:12 605:18 617:5 624:11,19 625:2,14 625:16,22 626:9,14 626:24 631:3 633:13 633:14,17 634:1 635:15,22 636:11 638:1,13,23,25 639:7 639:24 640:7,18,19 640:22 641:4,7,12,21 642:23 643:17,22 645:16 646:3 648:12 648:18,23 649:1,2,7 649:10 650:4,4,5 652:5 653:23 654:10 655:8 658:2,19 659:6 659:18,25 660:12,19 660:24 661:20 663:10 663:18,23 664:1,11 668:19,24 669:2,7,11 670:19 671:1 684:22 692:20 696:18 697:5 704:18 705:9,11,18 705:20,23 706:2,6,12 706:16,22 707:17,21 707:25 708:22 709:11 710:2 716:12,13 718:10 719:2,4,22 720:21 721:13 724:23 726:11,17 730:14,22 731:2,17 732:7,21,24 733:11 735:4 736:2 737:21 739:12 740:4 744:10,24 745:16,21 746:5,12,22 right-hand 691:5 risen 704:7,8 River 558:20 613:3

615:3 618:3 625:1 637:5,6 728:10 road 666:20 Roberts 699:22,24 720:12 roll 738:25 rolling 746:9 rolls 682:5 Roman 701:24 room 557:22 roughly 617:24 692:14 rounding 669:6 **RSI** 638:2,4,25 639:1 640:7 RTS 747:1 rule 616:14 ruled 616:24 run 558:25 559:2 659:11 660:18,20 running 661:4 745:23 runoff 684:3 runs 575:22

S

s 551:11 557:2 636:2 746:9 S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N 672:5 sale 687:9 688:10 sales 556:25 600:5,6 649:20 650:21 686:13 686:22 687:3,8,16,22 688:6,14 690:9 691:6 691:21,24 692:17,21 692:25 693:2,5,9,12 salty 560:14 San 550:2,6,24 551:4 551:10,18 561:5,5 568:13,20 571:11 573:13,18 579:25 583:5 585:13,15,25 586:9,12 587:11,14 587:19 588:2,10 589:25 590:2,7 591:14,21 592:2 594:7,9,11,14,24 595:10,20,22 596:3 605:21 608:19.21 609:10.19 610:14.15 611:12 612:11,14 613:5,8,10,13,15,19 613:25 614:3,9,13,23 615:7 619:18,21,25 620:2,9,19 621:19,22 622:9,11,12 636:9,25 637:2,9,18 638:1,12 638:17,22 639:4 640:13,18,20 668:23

670:5,10 680:15,16 682:20,21,25 688:7 690:15,21 691:22,25 692:12,13,17,21,25 693:13 703:14.22 704:10 711:24,25 712:5,12,16 713:11 736:9 749:2 Sanjay 713:22 714:17 715:1,10 716:1,1 721:8.9 Santa 568:11 satisfactory 721:10 save 603:24 saved 601:21,25 626:25 627:14 629:21 631:2 saves 564:16 627:6 savings 568:23 569:6 603:19 604:11 saw 572:23 573:1 583:19 599:7,23 641:2 saying 564:25 603:16 616:8,10 639:2 643:5 659:2,5,22 660:11 668:9 694:9 697:3 708:12 739:16 744:5 746:3 says 610:10 616:20 648:9 654:4 655:23 656:10 662:5 663:6 681:2 702:4,16 707:15 710:11 714:23 715:13 716:1 718:4.9 722:20 723:4 730:20 730:22 732:20,22 734:5 743:11 744:6 SB60 601:9,19 scale 596:18,22 SCDWA 555:18,20,21 scenario 566:22,24 567:4 scenarios 566:19 574:15 schedule 677:8 679:13 679:16 681:7,23 705:1 742:2 scheduled 620:22 schedules 700:20 **scope** 618:23 655:6 661:19 670:21,22 703:25 scorecard 601:20,23 602:6 SCULLY 551:16

SDCWA 554:21,22,24

555:3,5,6,8,9,11,12

555:14,15,17,23,24

556:3,5,21 697:3 714:15 715:6,8 734:16 se 628:18 seasonal 632:6 679:2 seated 557:15 672:1 seawater 560:5 562:2,4 562:6 583:21.25 584:4,6,11,16 585:3 585:13,19 588:16 589:22 591:13,15 630:7 second 587:18,21 609:5 633:23 647:2 668:9 680:23,24 681:2,3 688:24,25 691:1,2,4 708:19 709:21 718:20 725:25 726:2,3 730:1 section 559:6,11 570:8 570:25 584:17 601:24 648:11 661:14 673:2 701:22,24 702:5,8,10 702:13,14,19,22 706:6 717:22,23 718:6,15 sections 596:17 602:10 security 742:11 see 557:4 565:5 571:1 572:18 574:9,15,17 579:14 582:21 584:20 592:14 596:17 600:25 602:10 611:7 631:9 631:20 635:23 648:7 649:21 650:18 657:18 657:18 661:23 665:14 668:12 683:12,15 709:14 714:9 716:15 716:17 717:7 718:1 719:19 727:21 742:23 748:2 seeing 657:7 658:10 **seeking** 583:20 seen 611:20 708:6,8,9 746:20 selected 674:16 sell 608:6 684:1 734:13 **selling** 657:23 sells 683:9 Senate 601:11 send 714:16 715:15.16 716:3 sending 599:3 sends 716:1,9 sense 574:17 625:19 717:18 sensible 734:8 sensitive 572:1,13 sensitivity 572:4,9

606:7 sent 708:7 716:9,12 720:1 721:10,11 723:2 741:16 sentence 587:22 588:14 633:23 634:1 654:4 654:10 702:15 745:6 sentences 648:8 separate 651:24 683:1 separately 602:15 September 627:24 679:22 686:15 series 594:22 596:5 serve 684:22 696:18 697:5 served 698:17 service 559:8 560:23 563:6,20 565:18 593:21 594:3,16,18 595:20 596:1 601:21 602:7 605:1 613:6 620:5,11 622:21 623:6 633:19 634:25 635:15 638:17 646:5 653:1 654:3 655:19 655:21 661:9 662:21 662:22 663:1,4 664:3 664:10 665:5 666:9 666:16 667:11,13 668:17 671:11 673:7 673:12,15 674:10,14 674:17,18,25 675:13 675:22,24 676:11,13 676:20 677:4 678:4 679:13 680:13 682:17 682:19 697:24 698:7 698:22,24 699:1,13 699:14 701:14 702:1 702:7 705:15 706:13 706:16,18,24 707:4,6 708:16 709:9,23 710:12,25 712:19,22 713:9,13 714:14,24 718:16 723:24 724:9 725:11,14,19 726:25 727:3 728:5,8,18 729:23 730:1,3 731:8 731:9 732:10,11 733:1,8,9,12,19 734:6 735:17,17 736:6 738:23 739:5,6,8 741:22 742:9 744:24 services 550:23 697:22 735:3 **SESSION** 557:1 636:1 set 561:22 578:4 579:15 600:4 611:19 635:7 simple 627:10 639:3 644:24 685:12 711:14

712:2 731:4 sets 727:19 setting 651:2 653:19 670:11 673:16 697:18 702:7 730:4.11 severity 578:18 sharp 748:2 sheets 592:18 shift 632:6 short 600:24 shortage 578:18 **shortfall** 622:6,7,14,17 622:25 623:2,7,10,13 623:16 741:23 742:8 742:17 **shorthand** 749:6.8 show 570:6 572:7 582:14,18 604:10,21 610:16 619:4 660:24 667:9 669:24 674:17 681:23 701:16 717:21 **showed** 571:16 582:15 621:17 622:3 720:8 734:1 showerheads 604:15 **showing** 563:18 569:10 610:21 677:5 679:14 687:21 691:10 702:12 716:20 shown 583:2 631:6 640:25 668:25 681:6 741:8.9 **shows** 571:10 579:20 596:13 597:2 598:12 601:24 649:23 669:3 688:4,5 691:6,7 shrinking 649:6 **shut** 684:9 shy 603:11 side 575:5 633:11,15 634:7 665:24 691:5 sign 591:25 739:15,20 signal 598:25 signed 561:17 579:17 589:24 630:24 significant 598:22 606:6,8 633:9 640:4 695:8 746:23 significantly 572:25 **Silverwood** 575:8,24 similar 583:18 584:7,21 590:11 599:7,17 602:23 614:3,12,22 616:12 637:8 692:14 692:15 694:18 700:12 723:9 similarly 593:21

	I	1	1	I
simply 560:14 593:11	speaking 635:3 638:19	626:19 640:12 735:8	739:22	Suite 552:2
625:18 654:23 697:17	653:24	747:23	store 687:12	sum 717:17 738:14
724:2	speaks 616:19	started 564:15 603:23	stored 687:3	summarize 580:23
single 606:23 645:24	Special 726:4	670:3 705:14	straight 649:15	583:22 721:24
sir 586:24 634:20	specific 586:1 606:9,14	starting 604:5	strange 653:10	summary 722:14
637:10 640:14 645:14	610:4 662:23 680:24	starts 613:18 620:2	strategic 699:7	summer 675:9 676:4
647:16 648:5 652:19	712:9 718:15 742:2	674:12	Street 551:3,13,17	679:2 680:1,10
661:2,7 665:9 671:16	specifically 669:21	state 554:13 557:16	strictly 695:4 743:8	736:15,17,25 737:2
671:18 729:13	676:4 694:10 702:4	558:22,23 564:11,12	strike 592:25	738:1
site 734:13	718:6 721:3 737:8	564:17,22 574:24	stripped 592:14	SUPERIOR 550:1
sitting 630:23 634:15	744:12,13 747:12	575:14 576:2 587:12	structure 592:4 595:1,4	supplemental 684:21
634:21	speculate 640:14	587:15 590:25 598:20	595:8,12 596:8,9	697:4
situation 593:18 598:25	664:23 711:7,8	604:6,18 617:12,15	637:14 656:19 671:8	supplies 560:13 561:7
746:2	715:12	625:2 651:10,18	671:12 679:12 683:4	581:16,17 588:7
situations 575:25	speculating 715:10	654:7,16,25 655:1	690:11 694:25 697:11	589:10 590:25 591:2
576:24	spell 557:17 558:12	658:22 659:15,24	700:13 704:15,16,17	594:5 605:8 608:4,5
six 658:2	672:3	662:4 672:3 678:13	704:23 705:3,8	612:24 622:14 624:19
size 598:15	spend 569:4 578:25	678:15,19,20,21,25	723:10 725:6 738:20	624:22,25 626:1,13
sized 675:14,15,16	611:8 615:12 625:20	694:19 697:15 700:4	743:25 747:3,5,7,10	626:16,24 730:22
sizes 684:14	625:20 747:17	700:17,24 705:21	studied 566:20	739:10,22 740:23
sizing 675:19	spent 736:13	707:13 712:5 717:1	studies 673:7 674:10	supply 558:20 578:13
Skillman 553:7 630:23	split 652:14 711:1	717:24 719:14 720:3	706:13	578:16,20 584:22
671:20,22 672:5,16	spoon 720:24	721:24 723:22 724:12	study 566:10,15,17	588:9 589:5,6 595:3
690:3 703:7,14	spreadsheet 689:18	724:22 728:9 731:1	569:24 646:23 673:12	598:24,25 603:3
704:21 709:2,6 717:7	Ss 749:1	731:15 732:23,25	673:16 674:14,17	605:2 607:22 608:2,3
719:25 726:4 734:17	St 550:24	734:19,22 735:23	676:13 677:4 678:4	608:9 613:10 620:6
739:24 745:18 747:15	stable 669:16 725:17	744:18 749:1	679:14 680:13 682:17	622:23 623:3 625:6,9
slate 561:22 slide 662:12 711:5	staff 580:23,25 581:6	stated 737:23	682:19 705:15,16 706:16 707:25 708:2	625:16,17,20,21,23
slides 635:7 709:20	583:22,24 595:9,13 614:7 638:8,12	statement 647:23 653:13 700:7 712:3	708:16 709:22 712:23	625:25 626:3,8,22 627:11 629:1 630:5,7
sliding 596:18,22	655:18 656:16 664:1	726:9 728:6	713:9,13 718:9	-
slowly 649:14	664:9,13 667:10	statements 655:10	723:25 725:11,15,19	632:10,16,18,19 633:7,18,21 634:1,2
small 639:20 705:7	671:10 700:20 705:17	states 588:14 617:22	727:3 728:8,8,19	635:2,9,15 642:16,25
smaller 659:3	706:23 710:4,9	734:6	731:8 733:20 735:17	643:5,11,15 644:9,14
so-called 728:18	723:15 726:4	stating 609:10 621:15	739:5,7,8 741:22	645:2 646:3,4,9,9,24
sold 649:20,24 658:1	staff's 733:8	statistical 688:12 691:9	Subcommittee 698:18	648:16,16 651:12,14
somebody 563:14	stales 692:9	stay 725:7 746:17	subject 610:6 714:12	651:16,16 652:3,4,4,4
626:4 713:14,15	stamp 729:19	stays 669:7	720:13	652:7,15 654:5 655:2
722:15,15 726:15	stand 557:9	step 674:21,23	submit 560:20 563:17	655:4,16,24 656:2,7
729:15 734:4	standard 557:13 604:6	steps 674:17	563:18 584:4 585:13	658:18 659:5 660:22
somebody's 626:14	604:12 671:24 688:13	STEVEN 551:22	594:19	662:7,15,16,16
726:15	689:19,21,23 691:9	Stewardship 565:10	submits 617:14	663:15,16,17 668:10
sorry 582:13 627:19	692:2,4,9,13 730:5,9	597:19 598:3,7,10,14	submitted 584:1 585:16	668:18 678:13,14,15
638:16 639:17 654:10	734:7	599:10,22 600:1	585:21 591:24	685:5,11,12,16,17,18
654:12 680:3 705:2	standards 730:14	608:25 624:8 625:5,8	subsidiary 694:3	685:20,23 686:1,4,6,7
707:2 709:15 721:20	standby 652:9,18	626:23 630:11 636:10	subsidized 630:9	697:13,16 717:13
sort 564:14 624:15	653:10 654:2 673:19	636:14,15,22 637:1	substantial 739:3	728:15 730:20,21
639:15 718:10 743:16	674:22 675:11 676:11	637:10,13 641:11	sudden 659:3	731:2,2,16 732:24
source 625:4 678:13,14	676:14,21 677:3,6,11	645:25 651:3 685:7	sue 713:11	733:3,5 734:23,24
697:13	677:18,19 679:5	706:1,3 707:20	sued 718:22,25 719:1	support 583:24 619:11
sources 588:7	681:5,6,10,20,22	712:12 717:25 728:16	722:23,25	673:5,25 674:14
Southern 550:9 551:13	717:14 746:23,24	stipulate 610:24 612:2	sufficiently 616:11	supported 588:15
558:8 559:1 578:18	standing 654:3 676:18	615:8,11 618:18	suggest 611:3	suppose 644:20
647:6 652:2 659:17	678:11 679:3	Stipulated 612:16	suggested 734:19	surcharge 685:9 695:3
672:19	stands 648:12 696:14	storage 632:7 634:3	suggesting 655:3	695:5,7,11 747:8
span 618:17 675:25	standstill 718:23 719:2	662:4,14,15 663:14	663:12 700:1 734:19	sure 557:20,23 558:19
speak 557:21	Stapleton 554:15	663:15 666:16 668:18	743:5	579:20 607:9 609:14
speakers 621:2	start 584:2 610:6	671:5 681:10 739:10	suggestion 663:18	621:1 627:8,8 632:20
	I			

636:19 647:17 649:15 652:11 654:9 701:1
706:18 714:8 721:7 725:19 731:11 743:11 744:6 745:17
surface 652:1 suspect 644:8
sustain 670:23 Sustained 583:10 SWC 700:11 723:8
switch 577:12 592:8 597:16 600:23 608:17
sworn 557:13 671:24 SWP 577:2,7 663:6 710:14 717:5,10,13
720:19 Syd 653:4 699:22
Sydney 653:3 713:22 714:3,4
system 560:7 567:16,24 569:11,12,23,24 570:23 571:21 572:13
573:4,12,16 574:6,9 574:13,17,19 575:5,8
577:6 586:14 588:5,6 588:8 589:1,5,7,7 591:2,5,6,7 594:4
603:12,15 605:5,9,13 606:21 607:1,4,6,10
607:12,18,19,20,22 607:23 608:6,10,11
608:20 609:11 610:15 613:5,9 615:23 619:9 625:4 626:4,17
636:11,16,20,22 637:1,3,6 643:7,16,19
644:3,4,7 648:23 649:5,12 651:18 652:8,16 653:17,18
653:22,23,25 654:3 654:17,19,20 657:6,8
658:11,19,20,23 659:6,16,23 663:8 668:10 670:19 675:3
675:4,5,7,10,14,15,18 676:1,8,14,18,24,25
677:1,14,16,20 678:1 678:6,9,10,23,25 679:7,10 680:19
681:18 685:6,7 687:5 687:7,11,17 696:9,16
705:23 707:16 710:19 711:6 717:3,11
723:22 728:1,4,16 731:4,10 736:22 737:4 738:25 739:6
745:13 systems 658:6 676:17

ER'S TRANSCRIPT OF
T
tab 627:17,19,19 631:5
631:7,8,10,13,14,15
645:15,16 647:3,6
649:16 652:19 657:9
661:1 666:1 709:3
714:6 720:5,7 725:21
729:5,18 733:25
734:3 741:9
table 554:16 570:8,12 570:14,16,22,25
571:3 572:1 596:13
602:11 649:19 657:10
657:18 668:25 669:3
tabulated 646:24
tabulates 618:1
take 576:15 593:11
600:24 609:16 622:24
651:4 654:7 655:9,20 662:21 700:20 703:1
703:9 711:21 724:3
724:12 725:3 736:24
736:25 737:18 739:1
745:12,15
taken 627:23 635:25
733:12
takes 673:12 680:9
685:8 691:4 738:9
talk 609:7,7,20 611:3
631:25 642:8 672:6,8 676:1 679:4 709:16
712:16 713:8 715:17
720:20 736:7 737:2
talked 592:19 661:4,20
711:24 713:18 746:13
talking 557:21 564:17
571:3 609:17 621:3
624:11 632:24 639:19
655:15 662:17,19 676:2 677:19 695:4
708:8 719:25 722:4
724:17 736:14,20,21
737:8 743:14,18
737:8 743:14,18 744:11,12 745:9,11 746:6 747:6,9,12
746:6 747:6,9,12
talks 632:2,3 662:12
target 561:10,12,13,16
561:19,22,23 564:4,7
564:9,15,18 targeting 562:6
targeting 562:6 targets 567:1,5,9,13
570:20 573:24 651:8
tasks 702:17
tax 666:19
Tehachapi 575:23
tell 609:6 615:21
621.15 652.22 651.11

634:15 652:22 654:14

661:24 664:24 713:7

```
716:23 723:11 727:2
  727:5,9
telling 694:12,17 733:7
  733:8
ten 601:1 634:7,8
  663:17 682:10,16
  708:22 718:17 719:19
  737:25 746:18
ten-year 564:23 682:4
  682:4,22
tend 669:23 683:13
term 642:3 664:8
  736:10
terminal 575:6 637:5,5
  654:7,15 662:10
terminate 595:11
terminating 595:17
terms 564:17 575:15
  577:5 585:17 677:19
  694:20 735:22
test 576:1
testified 557:14 610:13
  631:12 641:18 671:25
  741:5
testify 608:24 609:13
testifying 688:15
testimony 609:9,10,22
  610:1,21,25 611:21
  615:24 628:23 630:20
  640:13 689:8 719:11
  719:15
text 633:22
Thank 557:15 558:2
  571:18 577:11 601:3
  612:6 621:7 624:1
  635:24 636:5 665:7,9
  665:20 670:24 671:15
  671:16,17,21 672:1
  672:10,13 719:20,23
  747:14,20,21
thanks 557:10 714:17
  726:4
theory 619:11
thing 706:8 707:24
  720:18
things 562:13,16
  566:20 568:6 581:12
  592:1,13 603:21
  604:21,23 608:1
  653:20 656:15 663:3
  664:20 666:18 668:8
  669:23 671:13 704:25
  716:17 747:22
think 572:3 576:18
  600:13 609:24,25
  610:8 611:4 616:3,15
  616:18,20,21 619:10
  629:12 631:17 637:17
```

```
637:19 639:3 641:2
  641:21 650:11 652:14
  662:14 670:3 689:22
  704:1 705:2,10,12
  713:17,18 715:10
  721:18 723:17 726:18
  726:23 735:25 738:18
thinking 656:7 664:1
thinks 610:25 715:14
third 688:3,4,20 689:1
  691:5,18 692:16,19
  701:19 717:4
Thomas 551:11 652:21
  652:22,23 653:8
  661:11 668:4 714:22
  726:2
thought 654:11 705:4,4
  705:7 712:5,12
  720:23 722:24 747:17
thoughtful 697:8
thousands 639:21
three 551:9,21 621:3
  641:24 652:15 663:22
  674:7,10 679:22
  680:12 686:5,17
  738:2
ticket 639:23
tier 685:5,5,10,11,12
  685:16,18,18,20,23
  685:25 686:2,3,6,7
time 559:21,22 565:4
  571:17 572:25 573:2
  574:10,18 575:19
  576:10 577:19 592:1
  598:20 606:1 611:3,8
  611:19 615:12,25
  618:16 622:17 635:20
  635:21 650:18 652:24
  653:16 655:17 656:4
  656:16 657:4 658:8
  658:10 659:12 661:11
  663:4 664:3,5 667:12
  669:12 680:24 687:9
  690:20 691:21,24
  692:10,14,18,22,25
  693:3,6,9,12 697:23
  705:16 708:10,14
  710:6 711:25 712:8,8
  712:21,22 714:22
  719:5 722:23,25
  733:19 736:13 743:22
  746:9,13 747:17
timeframe 559:19
  686:16
times 566:4 604:14
  649:13
timing 572:6 576:12
  616:10
```

```
tiny 650:3
title 652:25 714:2
titled 556:24 596:18,18
today 580:9,10 594:12
  594:15 596:2 597:3
  605:23
toilet 563:2 604:18
toilets 562:14 604:3.9
  604:15,16,17 641:25
told 633:2 638:11 713:7
  729:25
Tom 695:25 696:1,2
top 587:21 601:24
  642:8 667:2 671:5
  681:2 690:14 694:24
topic 608:17
topics 574:20 577:13
  597:16 600:24 693:15
TORRANCE 551:20
total 565:1 571:21
  657:22 682:5 691:13
  716:24 717:17,19
  738:14
toto 742:25
tracks 687:6 728:4
traditional 646:9
  648:16
transaction 610:17
transactions 687:6
transcribed 749:9
transcript 550:13
  749:11
transfer 598:7 605:6
  612:25 620:18,23
  621:23 622:10 623:11
  685.13
transferred 617:17
transfers 697:7
transmission 717:14,15
transparency 697:7
transport 568:17 591:8
transportation 609:1
  626:7 630:4 635:1,14
  636:14,17,18 646:1
  648:22 656:3,5
  662:10 678:22 695:12
  695:15 705:21,22
  706:1,6 707:16,21
  712:6,13 717:3
  726:11 728:15,15
  739:11,22
transported 609:4
treated 591:1 625:22
  636:18 662:13 663:14
  685:8 705:23 743:15
  745:22 746:4
treating 685:9
treatment 568:8 581:15
```

586:6 694:11,11,13 695:3,5,7,8,11 742:4 742:6,7,12 743:1,14 743:20 744:11,13 745:9.11.12.24 746:7 747:7.13 trend 603:1 trial 550:7 611:19 **triggered** 592:5 638:3 triggers 639:1 trivial 639:16,18 trouble 668:15 true 625:15 653:13 663:11 690:22,24 708:1 728:21 729:3,4 740:3,6,10 749:10 try 599:4 723:20 732:3 746:7 trying 610:7 653:20 662:19 723:19 724:21 724:24 725:5,6,10,11 729:14 731:19 736:7 736:9 **tube** 660:5 tunnel 568:10 573:14 575:22 turn 566:13 567:25 569:18 573:5 578:1 580:17 581:5 582:2,7 582:20 583:16 584:14 585:12,24 587:9,18 589:17 590:6,19 593:16 596:11 597:24 599:15 601:15.19 611:15 613:7,22 614:16 618:4 620:25 666:1,21 667:2 673:20 674:3 687:25 688:3,24 690:3 691:1 692:16 693:15,20 695:21 699:19 701:12 turned 657:2 turning 559:19 563:12 600:10 603:2 671:4 694:8 turns 619:21 622:13 651:11 **Twenty** 606:8 two 569:6,7 575:3 595:17 596:17 602:9 602:16 633:12 648:8 655:2,4 665:16 674:10 692:8 701:19 709:20 714:24 usage 675:23 676:7,8 type 596:19 604:17 696:19 usages 675:24 types 560:8 use 560:14 562:16 typically 613:18

U U 624:6,6,7 U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-Y 557:19 U.S 618:10,15 622:1 **Uh-huh** 565:23 714:10 721:15 730:15 736:16 ultimately 579:15 582:10 588:24 589:3 591:19,23 592:6 618:2 623:18 633:16 659:14 ultra 604:2,9,14 unbundle 697:6 unbundled 690:11 707:19 unbundling 679:12 690:23,25 707:5,10 708:7 unclear 716:21 underlies 603:21 understand 609:15 616:23,23 619:10 647:25 658:4 676:8,9 689:17 700:9 702:6 723:6 738:14 741:14 745:17 747:5 understanding 587:14 587:17 590:2,5 617:12 696:12,19 698:12,13 721:25 understood 743:13 undertake 566:10 673:15 undisclosed 689:8 **unfair** 712:7 uniform 696:9.16 unique 731:10 732:12 733:13 735:21 736:5 **United** 617:22 untreated 746:4 **Upadhyay** 553:3 557:8 557:11,18 608:24 612:10 619:17 624:4 627:15 631:22 636:7 642:14 645:24 665:8 665:23 741:16 **update** 566:8 598:7 664:5 710:13 **updated** 564:14 566:5 upsets 704:15 **upward** 603:1 **urban** 648:9

678:7 680:18.20

564:2,12,16,24 565:4

587:24 590:13 591:7 593:20 604:22 605:6 620:2 625:24 632:7 634:6 641:12,23 642:3.11 659:18 660:6,10,14 675:2,18 676:22 700:22 726:12 uses 613:4 724:12 usually 599:25 743:5 utilities 694:19 696:10 696:11,17,17,21,25 730:5,10 732:15,15 734:8 735:15 745:3 utility 696:15,22,23

V 702:8,10,13,14,19,22 717:23 vague 646:12 670:20 validate 706:22 707:5 708:21,23 712:18 723:25 725:15 726:24 validating 706:24 **validation** 709:9,23 717:25 Valley 551:21 568:12 568:19 573:13 633:16 633:17,20,20 635:4,8 652:1 662:13 745:20 valorem 666:19 value 653:23 VAN 551:3 variability 676:19 692:5,7 variable 705:5 variances 727:24 variations 682:11 686:12 various 596:14 625:6,6 662:22 739:13 742:12 vary 745:11 746:25 vendor 562:24 verified 739:24 verify 699:12 version 566:5 701:7,17 versus 644:15 645:3 675:20 724:18 Video 645:22 VIDEOGRAPHY 550.23 view 606:5 697:19 705:11 Virgenes 580:2 686:10 voice 713:16 Vol 554:6 volume 550:8 553:2

680:23 691:13 743:6 744:9 745:15 **volumes** 569:20 volumetric 680:21 684:25 685:2.4.6.9 695:10 737:23 741:21 742:16 743:8.19.21 743:24 744:3 747:7 747.10 Von 552:2 **vote** 582:16,24 583:6 669:13 voted 669:10 voting 582:19,22 583:3 vs 550:8

W **W** 551:5 Wait 707:2 walking 619:3 WALTON-HADLO... 551.7 want 576:21 600:19 605:20 607:21 609:14 627:21 631:24 646:17 657:10 664:21 676:8 719:5 720:6 729:24 732:5 734:14 wanted 563:14 588:7 634:25 644:6 659:17 663:23 696:5 723:17 725:15,19 726:14 wants 610:4 616:18 **WARREN** 551:6 washer 563:15,16,19 washers 562:14 wasn't 633:18 646:10 651:12 658:19.22.24 659:5,12,15 670:18 704:5 708:10 721:22 722:6 726:18 747:9 waste 593:19,20 wastewater 561:7 698:15 water 550:6,9 551:8,13 551:21 552:1 554:5 558:8,15,19,21,22,23 559:4 560:6,11 561:8 562:15 564:12.16.24 565:1,4,10 566:11 567:23 568:17 569:11 571:6 573:4 574:22 574:25 575:13,14 576:2,19 578:13,16 579:22,23,24,24,25 580:1 581:2 587:12 587:23,24 588:4,8,16 588:19,23 589:1,4,25

591:21,24 593:20,20 594:10,16,24 595:22 595:24 596:3,14,23 596:24 597:19 598:3 598:7,10,14,24 599:10,21 600:1,5,6 601:21,25 602:7,10 602:12,22 603:8,24 605:1,2,6,10,16,24 607:3,6,10,19 608:19 608:21,25 609:3,11 609:17 610:14,15 611:12 612:12,12,14 612:23 613:1,4,5,8,10 613:15,25 614:2,10 614:14,20,21 615:23 616:2,7,9 617:12,13 617:15,16,19,19 618:2 619:6,8,20,21 620:7,9,12,13,18,20 620:21 621:11,12,20 621:23 622:4,10,10 622:15,17,18 623:1,4 623:10 624:8,18,19 624:22,25 625:1,1,2,3 625:5,8,14,21,24 626:3,8,15,17,23 627:7,13 630:5,6,10 631:11 632:1 633:23 633:24 634:4 636:9 636:10,10,14,15,15 636:19,21,22,25 637:1,2,4,7,9,10,13 637:18,20 638:6 639:20 641:11 642:23 643:9 644:3,6,10 645:25 648:7,9,10,12 649:4,19,20 650:12 650:13,15,19,21 651:3,11,18 652:2 654:7,8,16,19,25 655:1 656:21 657:23 658:17,22,22,24 659:8,12,16,25 660:1 660:2,7,12,20 662:4,5 672:18 678:13,15,19 678:20,21,25 680:9 680:15 682:13,20 683:5,9,13,15 684:1,7 684:13,19,23 685:1,6 685:8,13,25 686:9,10 686:11,12,15,18,22 686:25 687:3,6,6,8,14 687:16,22 688:7 690:15,18,19,21 691:6,22,25 692:9,11

590:1,13,14,25 591:8

692:12 696:11 697:7

569:23 570:2,5

632:23 647:7,7

697:15,15 698:15,17
699:2 700:4,16,17,19
700:21,25 703:6,8
705:21,25 706:3
707:14,15,20 708:4
711:14 712:6,12
712:1 717:1 11 12 24
713:1 717:1,11,12,24
717:25 719:14 720:4
721:2,24 723:15,22
724:11,12,22 728:9
728:16,25 730:4,20
730:21 731:1,2,16
732:17,23,25 733:16
732.17,23,23 733.10
734:19,20,21,22,22
735:23 736:24 739:1
741:19 742:2,10,18
742:19 743:7,12,15
743:19 744:7,9
745:14,15,20,22,25
746:4,12,16
way 579:9 599:12
619:24 639:2 643:4
650:22 670:21 682:9
685:4 697:21 703:25
707:6,20 712:1
720:20 725:7 726:10
738:8 744:22 746:7
ways 607:15 626:12
655:20 656:17,23
we'll 612:2 615:8
WC II 012.2 013.0
616.20 625.7 17
616:20 635:7,17
656:9 683:12,15
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13 week 675:16,19 676:6
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13 week 675:16,19 676:6 678:3 680:2,6
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13 week 675:16,19 676:6 678:3 680:2,6 wells 684:10
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13 week 675:16,19 676:6 678:3 680:2,6 wells 684:10 went 578:3 580:19
656:9 683:12,15 684:1,4 718:20 719:18 738:4 we're 562:16,18 564:21 573:2 576:7 577:5 578:17 579:12 588:24 592:22 605:15 606:3 608:5,10 616:10 626:25 628:17,17 629:3 634:17 640:8 642:21 654:23 670:11 670:12,20 676:2,4 689:13 708:18 729:16 735:10 we've 573:23 575:12 576:3,12 604:14,19 605:19 611:20 614:7 615:3 640:20 641:21 670:12 743:24 746:20 weather-based 562:16 Web 734:13 week 675:16,19 676:6 678:3 680:2,6 wells 684:10

```
weren't 712:19 735:18
west 551:11 568:12,19
  573:13 575:4 747:25
Western 579:22
wet 684:1 739:1 740:22
  745:19
wheeled 636:21
wheeling 636:21 646:1
  646:5 670:16,18,19
  703:19 710:24 728:10
wholesale 732:15
wholly 632:19 633:21
willing 743:11 744:7
wiped 561:22
WIS 687:7,17
withdraw 587:4
withstand 713:10
witness 557:12,18,23
  557:24 565:3 571:5,9
  571:13,16 577:3,10
  610:19 612:17 615:13
  615:16,25 618:19
  623:25 631:20 634:21
  637:13 646:20 655:11
  660:6 665:17 671:19
  671:23 672:4,12
  680:4,6,22 681:1
  689:14 691:12,15,17
  693:24 702:25 703:6
  704:4 709:16 713:17
  715:20 721:22 730:18
  731:19 732:3,5,8
witness's 729:24
witnesses 553:1 609:6
wonder 694:24 747:2
word 610:3 641:23
  660:4 704:18
words 634:19 706:21
  722:22 730:17
work 558:7 576:20
  660:15 667:12 671:10
  672:17,18 673:6
  694:2,7 698:8 707:8,9
  707:13 712:22 726:22
  747:23
worked 558:10,11,12
  646:8 672:20,22
  694:3 708:16 712:4
  712:11 726:5 727:10
working 705:14 708:10
  713:15 714:13,23
  715:1 743:22 744:14
works 615:2 619:24
  698:18 699:2 713:25
  726:7 728:25 730:4
WORLDWIDE 550:23
wouldn't 605:4 607:20
```

607:23 638:6 641:8

```
659:24 711:16 715:2
write 653:7 668:5
  694:22 722:20 725:12
  727:3,8 734:11
writes 723:3 743:10
  747:2
writing 598:6 656:4,25
  741:24
written 718:6 721:9
  725:3
wrong 610:25 638:1
  657:2 712:7,13
  716:23 731:17
wrote 661:4 694:24
  699:24 718:12
WYNDER 552:2
          X
XXX 718:6
yeah 592:17 600:3
```

628:2 634:21 636:20 655:13 689:7 705:12 708:13 722:5 724:7 746:6 year 554:18 594:9 597:10,21,23 598:4,5 598:12,19 599:18,19 599:20,21,23,23 600:4 601:18.22 602:1,4,5,8,11,18,19 603:1,2,4,9 605:15 613:11,13,14,16,18 613:21 614:2,9,19 617:14,24 618:1,9 619:5 620:1,2,8,24 622:3 623:19 627:24 630:11 641:2 649:13 649:24 650:1,3 651:1 652:4 658:1 662:7,15 673:24 674:13,15 675:6,25 676:3,7 678:17 681:14 682:14 682:25 683:2,5,10,17 683:17 684:1,4,24 685:20 686:4,19,23 686:23 688:5 690:9 690:22,24 691:12,14 700:17,19,22 706:11 707:24 708:2,3,8,15 710:21,22 723:14,14 723:16,16,20,20 724:6,6,14,18,18,25 724:25 728:20 736:18 736:24 737:5,10,16 737:18,20 738:10,13 739:12,18,23 740:6

740:14,22,24 742:14 742:15 746:22 747:11 year's 643:10 yearend 554:17 598:7 599:17 727:23 years 565:22 571:22 575:25 601:12 602:24 605:19 620:14 634:7 634:8 649:3,4,10,20 650:9 651:6,6 653:12 653:15 661:5 662:6 679:23 680:12 682:10 682:16 686:17 690:10 698:15,19 708:22 711:12 718:17 729:15 737:25 738:2 739:1,1 743:14 744:9,10 746:18 yield 597:7,9 678:17 \mathbf{Z} 0 0014016 648:4 **09** 658:9 1 584:14,19 590:6 647:7 674:20 685:5 685:11,16,19,25 **1.632.000** 650:2 **1,676,000** 650:3

1,857,000 650:1 **1.28** 634:8 **1.5** 650:23 **1.6** 600:10 **1.7** 603:6 1/12th 613:13 1/200/2010 554:14 **1:30** 635:22 **10** 632:3 658:9 663:21 679:16 702:10 710:10 726:15 10/21/2013 556:4 **10/24/2005** 555:3 10/27/2007 555:9 10/31/12 555:22 **10/9/2006** 555:6 **100** 678:15 695:9 731:16 737:12 743:23 746:24 **105** 627:22 628:3 **10756** 662:3 **11** 663:21 681:7,23 709.3**11-year** 688:9,10 691:7 691:8 **11/1/2011** 555:21

11/14/2009 555:15 11/16/2010 555:18 **11/19/2008** 555:12 **11443** 729:11,20 11467 729:22 11474 729:25 **12** 601:18 602:11,15,20 603:3.5 616:19 643:10 664:13 709:25 714:6 720:5 **12/2006** 556:9 **12/2008** 556:10.12 **12/22/2004** 554:23 **12/30/2003** 554:20 **126** 645:6,9,19 **13** 627:22,24 628:3 710:23 720:8 729:6 729:18 13-year 690:9 **13th** 733:20 **14** 582:7 594:23 711:5 725:21 **142** 600:19 **1448** 647:18,20,21 648:4 **1489** 657:13 **15** 703:10 711:12 733:24,25 734:3 739:25 **15-month** 679:21 **156,000** 601:24 603:18 **16** 645:9,19 729:5,18 **16,722** 622:8 **164** 709:4 **165** 714:7 **166,912** 693:7 **16674** 674:4,13 **16679** 674:20 **16691** 677:7 **16698** 679:16 **16699** 681:7 **168** 733:25,25 17 585:24 649:16 **17,000** 622:7 **1700** 552:2 **171,000** 602:12 **174,000** 561:23 **1753** 661:6 **176** 634:6 **18** 554:3 631:5,7 677:7 **18881** 552:2 **1990s** 566:10 **1995** 558:11 559:19 670:3 672:23 703:15 704:5 **1996** 564:24 566:1 569:22 574:4 577:19 586:14 646:7 656:24

	I	I	I	I
657:9,21 658:7	621:20,23 622:3,25	619:14	587 554:12	8
681:14 704:5	623:13 629:19,20	339 657:11	589 554:13	8 647:3,6 657:9 667:2
1997 672:23 703:16,18	630:12 637:23 643:10	37 678:9	593 554:14	671:5 734:5
1998 580:20 582:6,11	650:2 701:14 729:7	370 603:10	597 554:16	8-1 661:8 666:5
1999 707:9	729:22 741:10	386 652:20		8/2009 556:13
1st 679:22	2011-2012 602:5	3rd 550:24	6	80 740:24 744:2
	2012 623:11,12,14,15		6 568:13,20 570:8	80,000 620:23 621:19
2	623:19 629:19,20	4	571:12 573:13,18	621:22 622:5,9
2 554:6 569:23 570:2	649:21 673:23 674:7	4 553:4,4,5,5,6,8,8	586:8,9,12 601:19	800 550:25
581:5 584:18 590:19	708:5,6 729:7	645:9,19 662:2	605:22 663:6 674:19	80s 575:18
590:22 605:15 632:23	2013 550:14 557:1	741:20	677:8 701:25 709:24	003 3 7 3 . 10
647:8 648:11 685:5	576:14 605:15 636:1	4.1 657:10,18	6-1 570:8,12,14,16,22	9
685:11,12,18,20,23	673:24 685:20 686:5	4/05/2006 555:4	572:1	9 567:25 631:8,10,13
686:2,3,6,7	687:23 688:6 692:18	4/14/2009 555:13	6-4 572:17	631:15,18 632:2
2.16 649:24	2014 604:17 673:24	4/6/2011 555:19	6.1 633:2	661:9 718:1
2.3 649:23 650:21	2020 561:15 564:7,19	40 629:25 641:2	6/12/2012 556:21	9:00 747:23 748:2
2.4 605:17	2021 561:18	40,000 602:15	6/20/2005 554:25	90's 650:21
2.5 650:22 657:25	211,000 602:16	400 632:10	6/2005 556:6	90012 551:14
658:2	213)217-6890 551:14	400,000 603:11 632:9	6/2006 556:7	90s 576:14 604:3 645:1
2/10/2009 554:10	22 679:1,3	632:15	6/9/1998 554:9	670:17
2/2013 554:19	226 615:5 616:25 617:1	407,372 692:23	600 554:17	92612 552:3
2/27/2008 554:13	617:2,8	415 550:25	608 554:19	94105-2482 551:18
20 550:14 557:1 564:18	23rd 714:12 720:5	415)268-7189 551:18	6137 550:19 552:8	94111 550:24
564:20,25 565:3	24 660:16	415)391-5400 551:4	749:5,21	94111-1809 551:4
603:14 605:10,16,24	246 615:5,19 616:25	415)393-2422 551:10	617 554:20,22,23,25	94111-4067 551:10
636:1 650:8,12	617:1,4,8	425 551:17	555:3,4,6,7,9,10,12	949)223-1170 552:3
678:10 703:10 741:9	25 565:22 571:22	43 678:7	555:13,15,16,18,19	981-3498 550:25
2000s 650:24	627:22 679:15	43020 582:20	555:21,22,24 556:3,4	99 707:10
2001 708:7	250 570:9,10 632:25	43021 582:8 583:1	619 556:6,7,9,10,12,13	
2002 706:20 707:11	633:22	435,129 693:4	556:15,16,18,19	
2003 614:4,23 615:7	252 572:10	45 698:15	623 556:21	
618:8,9,11,17 679:12	254 573:5	48082 667:4	624 553:4	
687:22 688:6 692:18	255 695:21	5	633 551:3	
2004 566:4,5 614:2	256 623:23 647:10		6448 592:24	
2005 558:12 559:19	26 679:3 681:6 690:8	5 572:15,23 573:7	665 553:5	
564:24 672:22 704:8	260,000 693:1	606:8 661:1 662:12	667 556:22,23	
2007 561:20,23	268,000 693:10	666:1 5 year 719:22 710:2	667,900 692:20	
2008 558:12 649:7,8,12	27 652:19	5-year 718:23 719:2 5,000 626:19	668 553:5	
649:20,23 2008-2009 598:5,20	28 627:19,19 29 674:19 677:7 679:15	5/16/2013 556:3	671 553:6 672 553:8	
2008-2009 598.5,20 2009 564:10 598:23	681:6 699:23 701:8	5/2010 556:15	690 556:24	
634:24 649:24 652:22	298 647:8	5/2010 550.15 5/2011 556:16	697 690:4	
653:14 656:24 657:4	29th 720:6 734:4	5/2012 556:18	6th 652:22 701:8	
657:22 658:4,8 661:9	2B(i) 586:4	5/2012 556:19	725:22	
705:19	2nd 709:8	5/24/2004 554:22	723.22	
2010 564:13 566:6,7	2nu 709.8	5/26/1998 554:8	7	
620:18 647:19 650:7	3	50,000 629:16	7 663:12 701:18,19	
653:19 657:22 658:4	3 674:23 691:17 709:20	500,000 561:14,18	716:24 726:7 728:6	
698:3,21 699:23	709:21	52 678:24	7-4 554:7	
701:8 705:14 707:5	3.1 612:21	522-7096 550:25	70 576:9	
708:16 709:8,25	3/26/2010 555:16	550 550:9	700 551:13	
714:12 718:4 725:20	3/27/13 555:24	558 553:4	701 550:24	
729:6,18,22,23 734:5	3/27/2007 555:7	569 554:3	703 553:8	
2010-2011 554:18	3/31/2008 555:10	577 554:5	706 666:11 667:19	
599:19	304 550:4	580 554:7	668:4	
2011 601:18 602:11,15	309 618:20 619:11,14	581 554:8	707 667:16,19 671:4	
602:20,24 603:3,5	30th 679:22	583 554:9	749 550:9	
620:15,20,24 621:18	318 618:15,21 619:12	585 554:10	77 586:5	
i e				

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                                       1
                                                                                               MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY:
                 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                                       2
                                                                                                   ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
        BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS A. E. KARNOW, JUDGE PRESIDING
                                                                                                   18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
                  DEPARTMENT NUMBER 304
                                                                                       3
                                                                                                   Irvine, CA 92612
                                                                                                   (949)223-1170
      SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                                       4
                                                                                                   By: PATTY J. QUILIZAPA, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                          ) Case No. CPF-10-510830
                                                                                       5
           Plaintiff.
                             ) Case No. CPF-12-512466
                                                                                       6
                          ) Trial
                                                                                       7
      VS
                                                                                       8
                          ) Volume V
                                                                                               Reported by: Connie J. Parchman, CSR 6137
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                                       9
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
                                          ) Pages 750 - 847
                                                                                      11
            Defendant.
                                                                                      12
                                                                                      13
                                                                                      14
             Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
                                                                                      15
                Monday, December 23, 2013
                                                                                      16
                                                                                      17
                                                                                      18
      Reported by:
                                                                                      19
      CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, CSR 6137
                                                                                      20
      CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER
                                                                                      21
                                                                                      22
                 JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                                      23
           WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                                      24
      701 Battery St., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, California 94111
                                                                                      25
             (415) 981-3498 OR (800) 522-7096
                                                                          750
                                                                                                                                                               752
        APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
                                                                                                     INDEX OF EXHIBITS
                                                                                           No.
                                                                                                                     Ident. Evid
                                                                                                    Description
2
       For Plaintiff:
          KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-218 MWD 2003-2012 invoices
                                                                                                                                     761
          633 Battery Street
                                                                                           to SDCWA
Exhibit DTX-28 11/10/1998 MWD/SDCWA
          San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
                                                                                            Agreement
Exhibit DTX-51 10/10/2003 MWD/SDCWA
          (415) 391-5400
                                                                                                                                       763
          By: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.
                                                                                                    Amended and Restated
             DANIEL PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                                                    Agreement
             WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ.
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-72 9/9/2008MWD Board Action
                                                                                                                                     763
             DAN JACKSON, ESQ.
                                                                                                   Letter 8-3
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-143 3/24/1975 Coop Water
Exchange Agreement
             AUDREY WALTON-HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                                                                                   763
       For Defendant Metropolitan Water District:
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-144 11/4/1977 MWD/Castaic
                                                                                                                                    763
          BINGHAM McCÛTCHEN LLP
                                                                                                    Lake Agreement
          Three Embarcadero Center
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-145 1/14/1992 MWD/Castaic
                                                                                                                                    763
10
          San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
                                                                                                    Lake MOU
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-146 12/31/1992 Agreement
          (415) 393-2422
                                                                                                                                   763
                                                                                           No. 3335
Exhibit DTX-147 3/2/2009 MWD/Castaic
11
          By: THOMAS S. HIXSON, ESQ.
                                                                                                                                    763
             COLLIN C. WEST, ESQ.
                                                                                                    Lake Agreement
12
                                                                                           Exhibit DTX-149 11/6/1990 MWD Board letter
                                                                                     13
                                                                                                                                    763
13
          METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-150 4/22/1964 letter to MWD
Exhibit DTX-151 12/8/1966 letter from
          700 N. Alameda Street
                                                                                                                                    763
14
          Los Angeles, CA 90012
                                                                                     15
                                                                                                   MWD to Board
          (213) 217-6890
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-152 12/21/1966 letter from
                                                                                                                                  763
15
          By: HEATHER C. BEATTY, ESQ.
                                                                                     16
                                                                                                    MWD to Desert Water
             BETTY KUO BRINTON, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                                            Agency
Exhibit DTX-153 1/17/1967 MWD/Desert
16
             MARCIA SCULLY, ESQ.
                                                                                                                                    763
                                                                                                    Water Contract
17
          MORRISON & FOERSTER
                                                                                     18
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-154 3/10/1967 letter from
MWD to Desert Water
                                                                                                                                 763
          425 Market Street
18
          San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
                                                                                           Exhibit DTX-155 9/7/1967 letter from MWD to Board
                                                                                                                                 763
          (415) 268-7000
                                                                                     20
                                                                                            Exhibit DTX-156 10/13/1967
MWD/Coachella Valley
19
          By: RAJ CHATTERJEE, ESQ.
                                                                                                                               763
20
        CITY OF TORRANCE:
                                                                                           Contract
Exhibit DTX-157 11/9/1967 letter to DWR
Exhibit DTX-158 3/14/1972 1st Amendment
        JOHN FELLOWS, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                                                                                   763
21
                                                                                     22
                                                                                                                                     763
        THREE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT:
                                                                                                    to MWD/Desert Water
                                                                                     23
22
       STEVEN M. KENNEDY, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                                           Contract
Exhibit DTX-159 5/3/1972 Letter to
                                                                                                                                763
23
                                                                                            Bureau of Reclamation
Exhibit DTX-160 5/3/1972 letter to DWR
24
25
                                                                          751
                                                                                                                                                               753
```

		T
1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (cont.)	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (cont.)
· 2	No. Description Ident. Evid.	² No. Description Ident. Evid.
	Exhibit DTX-161 5/24/1972 transmittal 763	Exhibit DTX-204 4/24/2006 Joint 763 Connections & Water
4	letter Exhibit DTX-162 7/23/1972 letter to 763	4 Exchange Agreement No. AO-5059
5	Desert Water Agency	5 Exhibit DTX-205 6/14/1972 Contract for 763
6	Exhibit DTX-163 4/26/1983 memo from MWD 763 to Board	Temporary Emergency Delivery to IB at
7	Exhibit DTX-164 7/7/1983 MWD/Desert 763 Water Agreement	Tijuana 7 Exhibit DTX-206 10/1/1976 Amendment & 763
8	Exhibit DTX-165 6/28/1984 MWD/Desert 763	Supplement No. 1 to
	Water Advance Delivery Agreement	Delivery
9	Exhibit DTX-166 7/12/2001 Letter 763 Agreement	9 Exhibit DTX-207 8/14/1978 Amendment 3 to 763 Supplemental Contract
10	Exhibit DTX-167 10/10/2003 MWD/Coachella 763	10 for Temporary Emergency
11	Delivery & Exchange Agreement	Delivery 11 Exhibit DTX-208 11/13/1979 Amend to 763
12	Exhibit DTX-168 10/10/2003 Amendment 18 763 to DWR/CVWD Contract	Contract for Temporary Emergency Delivery
13	Exhibit DTX-169 10/24/2003 MWD/CVWD & 763	Exhibit DTX-209 9/15/1980 Amendment to 763 Contract for Temporary 763
	Desert Water Exchange Agreement	Emergency Delivery
14	Exhibit DTX-170 10/24/2003 Amendment 27 763 to DWR/MWD Contract	Exhibit DTX-210 8/10/1981 Amendment to 763 Contract for Temporary
15	Exhibit DTX-171 11/19/2007 Agreement re 763 operating criteria	Emergency Delivery Exhibit DTX-211 9/14/1982 Amendment to 763
16	Exhibit DTX-172 10/17/2008 CVWD/MWD 763	16 Contract for Temporary
17	Letter Agreement Exhibit DTX-173 9/14/2011 MWD/CVWD 763	Emergency Delivery Exhibit DTX-212 8/1/1990 Letter 763
18	Supplemental Agreement Exhibit DTX-174 2/1/2012 Amendment to 763	Agreement 18 Exhibit DTX-213 1/27/1993 Letter 763
19	10/17/2008 Letter	Agreement
	Agreement Exhibit DTX-175 6/14/2013 2nd MWD/CVWD 763	Temporary Emergency
20	Supplemental Agreement Exhibit DTX-176 11/14/2006 MWD Board 763	Delivery Exhibit DTX-215 11/26/2008 Amendment to 763
21	Action Letter	21 Agreement for Temporary
22	Exhibit DTX-177 6/15/2003 763 MWD/SDCWA/Fallbrook	Emergency Delivery 22 Exhibit DTX-216 8/17/2010 MWD Board 763
23	Agreement Exhibit DTX-178 2/5/2005 SDCWA/Fallbrook 763	Action Letter 8-5 Exhibit DTX-217 8/17/2010 MWD Board 763
24	Agreement	Meeting Minutes
	Exhibit DTX-179 7/13/2010 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 8-7	Exhibit DTX-53 2/3/2004 Respondent's 773
25	Exhibit DTX-180 6/6/2011 MWD/Irvine 763	brief in Rincon del
	754	756
1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (cont.)	¹ Exhibit DTX-78 4/2/2009 MWD & SDCWA 773
1 2 3	INDEX OF EXHIBITS (cont.) No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763	Joint Motion for Summary
2	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP
2 3 4	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
3	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
2 3 4	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief
2 3 4	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293
2 3 4 5	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 779
2 3 4 5 6	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. AOS146	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293
2 3 4 5 6 7	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/71/985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. AO5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 784 Exhibit PTX-391
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. AO5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 7 Exhibit PTX-392 7 84
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 1/2/01990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AOS146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San Bernardino Valley Agreement	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 784 Exhibit PTX-393 784
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 17/10/2000 MWD/San Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action T63	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-101 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 763 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 1 to Agreement No. 1597 763 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. A05146 763 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 763 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San Bernardino Valley Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board Action Letter 9-6 763 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action Letter 9-1 763 Exhibit DTX-189 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-101 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 841 Exhibit PTX-709
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. AOS146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 ACS146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 763 Letter 9-11 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-101 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-185 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-199 4/10/2001 Board Action 763 Action Letter 9-1 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-191 8/4/2008 letter to 763 SBVMWD 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-101 PExhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 841
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AC5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-1 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 1 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 1 Exhibit DTX-198 4/10/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-192 3/22/2010 letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-192 3/22/2010 letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-192 3/22/2010 letter to 763 SBVMWD	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 3/10/2001 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-199 3/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Letter 9-11 Exhibit DTX-199 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-199 18/4/2008 letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-192 3/22/2010 letter to 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County 763 Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement No. 1597 763 Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 763 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 1597 763 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. A05146 763 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 763 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San Bernardino Valley Agreement Sultivity Agreement Action Letter 9-1 763 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action Letter 9-1 763 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD Agreement Sultivit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD Agreement Sultivit DTX-191 8/4/2008 letter to 763 763 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board Action Letter 7-3 763 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board Action Letter 7-3 763 Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AO5146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 763 Letter 9-11 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 Board Action 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-191 8/4/2008 letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-195 11/7/2013 7th Amendment 763	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Additional of the deficiency of the second of the sec
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 MWD/San Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 763 Action Letter 9-1 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD Agreement Exhibit DTX-191 8/4/2008 letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD Agreement Agreement Agreement Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD Agreement Agreement Agreement Exhibit DTX-195 1/1//2013 7th Amendment To Cyclic Storage Agreement Agreement Exhibit DTX-195 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Cyclic Storage Agreement Exhibit DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull DTX-196 1/1//2013 9th Amendment To Sull	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Adjudication in JCCP 4353 773 Appellants' Reply and 779 FX4 FX4 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-183 2/30/2009 Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 363 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-8 Action Letter 9-8 Action Letter 9-8 Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2008 Letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 1/7/2013 7th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 1/7/2013 7th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 1/7/2013 7th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-196 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-196 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-196 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-196 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-196 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-196 1/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Action Lett	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-709 Adjudication in JCCP 4353 773 Appellants' Reply and 779 Exhibit PTX-386 784 Exhibit PTX-389 844 Exhibit PTX-391 854 Exhibit PTX-799 841 Control of Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 773 Appellants' Reply and 779 844 Exhibit PTX-389 FX4 Exhibit PTX-391 FX4 Exhibit PTX-799 FX4 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX1 EXHIBIT PTX-709 FX
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	No. Description Ident. Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 AoS146 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AOS146 250/2009 Agreement No. Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 25 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-187 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 25 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-191 8/4/2008 letter to 763 SBVMWD 763 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763 Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-194	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Material PTX-709 Adjudication in JCCP 4353 773 Appellants' Reply and 779 FX4 FX4 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101 FX-101
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern 763 County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Agreement Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-183 2/30/1990 Amendment 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-185 6/13/2000 MWD Board Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-188 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 763 Action Letter 9-1 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD Agreement Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 11/7/2013 7th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-195 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-197 10/10/2003 MWD Agreement 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-197 10/10/2003 MWD Agreement 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-197 10/10/2003 MWD Agreement 763 Action Letter 7-1 Exhibit DTX-198 11/6/1990 Memo 763 Action Letter 7-1	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-101 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-709 Adjudication in JCCP 4353 773 Appellants' Reply and 773 Appellants' Reply and 779 Exhibit PTX-389 784 Exhibit PTX-390 784 Exhibit PTX-391 784 Exhibit PTX-709 841 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	No. Description Ident Evid	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-709 PEXHIBIT PTX-709 B41 B11 B12 B13 B14 B15 B16 B17 B18 B19 B20 B21 B22 B23 B24
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-709 Additional Total Combined
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	No. Description Ident Evid. Exhibit DTX-181 4/18/2012 DWR/MWD/Kern County/Santa Barbara County Exhibit DTX-182 4/18/2012 763 DWR/MWD/Antelope Valley/Kern County Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-183 2/7/1985 MWD Agreement 763 No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-184 12/20/1990 Amendment 1 763 to Agreement No. 1597 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AOS146 Exhibit DTX-185 8/30/2009 Agreement No. 763 AOS146 Exhibit DTX-186 6/13/2000 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-7 Exhibit DTX-187 7/10/2000 MWD/San 763 Bernardino Valley Agreement Exhibit DTX-183 3/13/2001 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 9-6 Exhibit DTX-189 4/10/2001 Board Action 763 Letter 9-11 Exhibit DTX-190 5/14/2001 MWD/SBVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-191 8/4/2008 letter to 763 SBVMWD Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-193 8/20/2013 MWD Board 763 Action Letter 7-3 Exhibit DTX-194 9/6/2013 MWD/SGVMWD 763 Agreement Exhibit DTX-195 11/7/2013 7th Amendment 10 Cyclic Storage Agreement Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 10 Cyclic Storage Agreement Exhibit DTX-196 11/7/2013 9th Amendment 10 Cyclic Agreement Exhibit DTX-197 10/10/2003 MWD Agreement 763 Exhibit DTX-198 11/16/1990 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-199 10/2/11998 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-199 10/2/11998 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-199 10/2/11998 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-199 10/2/11998 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-199 10/2/11998 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-199 10/2/11998 Memo 763 Exhibit DTX-201 2008 MWD/SDCWA Agreement Exhibit DTX-201 2008 MWD/SDCWA Agreement	Joint Motion for Summary Adjudication in JCCP 4353 Exhibit DTX-655 1/7/2011 Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Respondents Brief in Case No. C0634293 Exhibit PTX-386 Exhibit PTX-389 Exhibit PTX-390 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-391 Exhibit PTX-392 Exhibit PTX-393 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-394 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-710 Exhibit PTX-709 Exhibit PTX-709 PEXHIBIT PTX-709 B41 B11 B12 B13 B14 B15 B16 B17 B18 B19 B20 B21 B22 B23 B24

1 DECEMBER 23, 2013 MORNING SESSION MR. WEST: Your Honor, we next have a brief 2 2 PROCEEDINGS presentation of evidence, a number of documents that are 3 3 ---O0O---covered under the parties' stipulation, provided they are 4 4 THE COURT: Good morning. Let's get started. mentioned during presentation of evidence by counsel and 5 MR. HIXSON: Good morning, your Honor. We have 5 it should only take about 15 minutes. 6 6 a housekeeping matter first. And I have a binder of the documents that are 7 THE COURT: Sure. going to be referenced except for one, which is too large 8 MR. HIXSON: The Court's December 17th 8 to include in a binder. 9 9 stipulation and order provided for the introduction of May I approach, your Honor? 10 10 evidence at this final hearing. It was referenced in the THE COURT: I appreciate it, yes. Yes. 11 11 party's pretrial briefs or in connection with the MR. WEST: The first document I'm going to talk 12 12 hearing. about today is Defendant's Exhibit 218. 13 13 Over the weekend, the parties went through This document is the entirety, the full set of 14 14 their pretrial briefs and the evidence that was referred invoices that MWD has provided to San Diego since the 15 15 to at the hearing and so we have a stipulation and unbundling of the rates in January, 2013 up through the 16 16 proposed order that itemizes specific documents that end of last year. 17 17 would be in evidence. I would like to ask Barbara pull up the page 18 18 THE COURT: Okay. ending 4642. 19 19 MR. HIXSON: And so this is in addition to THE COURT: Are these for any sales and/or 20 20 items that were admitted on the record or that transfers of water? 21 21 Metropolitan may produce later today, but we did want to MR. WEST: Yes, these include sales and 22 22 present this stipulation. exchanges. 23 23 THE COURT: Bring it up and I'll take care of Counsel corrects me. I said since 2013. I 24 24 it. Thank you. meant 2003, when the rate unbundling occurred. 25 25 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, just further And if you could blow up the entire top through 758 760 1 1 housekeeping. We agreed over the weekend, and I wanted exchanges, wheeling and other deliveries. 2 2 to put it on the record and see if this meets with your And the top part of this document -- actually, 3 3 approval. if I might use the laser pointer. 4 4 We agreed over the weekend that I would do some This is the part of the invoice that reflects 5 5 -- I told them I would do some rebuttal to the the sales of full service water, meaning mainly the 6 6 administrative record presentation, but that we would not non-exchange water. 7 7 have clothing arguments, instead we would file briefs. And under exchanges, wheeling and other 8 8 The briefs would be due January 17. We would file them deliveries, it refers to the deliveries under the 9 9 simultaneously and then we would come, if it's still exchange agreement or the exchange water. 10 10 open, on the 23rd and do either argument or asking But a key take away here is counsel's argument 11 11 questions or whatever but that the process of responding and Mr. Cushman's testimony suggests that San Diego 12 12 to the other guys' brief and saying what's wrong with it primarily used MWD for transportation services for 13 13 and listening to -- answering any questions you have or delivery of water under the exchange agreement, and the 14 14 concerns would happen on the 23rd and then the matter take away from this, first off, we don't believe, 15 15 would be taken under submission. I believe that's the obviously that the exchange agreement involves 16 16 agreement that we made over the weekend. transportation services, it involves an exchange. 17 17 MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's correct. And this -- and the other invoices show that 18 18 MR. KEKER: And I meant January, January 17th the great majority of the water that San Diego has 19 19 and 23rd if I didn't say that. purchased from MWD during the relevant period is full 20 THE COURT: All right. 9:00 A.M. on the 23rd, 20 service water as opposed to exchange water. 21 21 will that work for you? And we, accordingly, move Exhibit 218 --22 22 MR. KEKER: Yes. Defendant's Exhibit 218 in evidence. 23 2.3 MR. HIXSON: Sure. MR. PURCELL: No objection. 24 24 THE COURT: I will reserve the time. Thank you THE COURT: DTX-218 is admitted. 25 25 (Whereupon Exhibit DTX-218 was very much. 759 761

1 MR. WEST: The next document I want to talk Exhibit 709, which is -- I'm sorry, 708, which is this 2 2 about is in Tab 2 of the binder. This is Defendant's demonstrative itself which, as I indicated earlier, 3 3 Exhibit 708. merely lists the defendant's exhibits by their title and 4 4 Barbara, if you could please pull up. This is by the defendant's exhibit number. 5 at this point a demonstrative. 5 MR. PURCELL: That, we do object to. It is a 6 6 It's been suggested by -- through arguments demonstrative, it is not evidence. from counsel and by Mr. Cushman's testimony that THE COURT: The objection is sustained. You 8 San Diego is the only party who obtains wheeling or 8 can certainly refer to it and I will keep it and use it 9 9 exchange services from MWD over the last ten years. as a matter of reference but it doesn't have to be part 10 10 And, your Honor, the exhibits listed on this of the record. 11 demonstrative are documents that reflect wheeling and 11 MR. WEST: Okay. 12 exchange transactions that have -- that Metropolitan has 12 One --13 13 engaged in over the last several decades up until now. THE COURT: Let's put it this way. The words 14 If you will see on the left side of the 14 that you've just uttered on the record are exactly 15 15 document, it lists all of the -- these documents tantamount or equivalent to the contents of 708 so, I 16 reflecting wheeling and exchange transactions by 16 think you've got the record you need. 17 defendant's exhibit number. And this demonstrative 17 MR. WEST: Thank you, your Honor. 18 merely lists the title of the document and the date the 18 The next document I want to discuss is in Tab 3 19 document was executed. 19 of the binder. 20 The key take away from this series of documents 20 Barbara, if you could pull that up, please. 21 is that MWD does in fact facilitate wheeling and 21 It's Defendant's 177. This is a wheeling 2.2 exchanges. 22 service agreement between the Metropolitan Water District 23 And, your Honor, I move to submit the exhibits 23 of Southern California, San Diego County Water Authority 24 listed on this demonstrative in evidence. They're 24 and Fallbrook Public Utility District. 2.5 Defendant's Exhibits 28, 51, 72, 143, 147, 149 through 25 And, Barbara, if you could blow up the first 764 762 1 1 201, and 203 through 217. paragraph under that. 2 2 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Were you just As indicated on this document, this was an 3 purporting to read off all the exhibits that are listed 3 agreement under which MWD agreed to wheel a certain 4 4 on this DTX-708? amount of water for the Fallbrook Public Utility 5 MR. WEST: I was. 5 District, which is a member agency of San Diego County 6 THE COURT: It's a lot more than what you just 6 Water Authority. 7 uttered, isn't it? 7 You can see by the date here, June 15th, 2003, 8 MR. WEST: 143 -- no. It is 28, 51, 72, 143 8 which is why people don't use laser pointers. This was 9 through 147, 149 through 201, and 203 through 217. 9 entered into after MWD adopted the unbundled rate 10 THE COURT: Did you include 169 and 170 in 10 structure January 1, 2004. The reason why San Diego is a 11 that? 11 party to this agreement -- if you would go to paragraph 12 MR. WEST: Yes. That would be included in 149 12 4A, please, Barbara. 13 through 201. These were all defendant's exhibits. 13 Next page, please, Barbara. 14 THE COURT: Do you think it's important to 14 Explained in paragraph 4A, is that the 15 introduce every one of those exhibits? 15 agreement provided that San Diego would take that amount 16 MR. WEST: We believe it does show the full 16 of wheeled water that Fallbrook itself wasn't able to 17 amount of exchanges and wheeling transaction-related 17 take and they would exchange it. But the wheeling in 18 documents that Metropolitan has entered into over the 18 this document is reflected -- is on behalf of Fallbrook. 19 last several decades. 19 And a couple of key take aways from this 20 MR. PURCELL: We don't have any objection. 20 document. 21 THE COURT: All right. Those exhibits are 21 Barbara, if you could blow up paragraph 1B. 22 admitted. 22 2.3 Actually, I'm sorry, paragraph 1E. (Whereupon Exhibits 28, 51, 23 First off, it specifically provides that 72, 143-147, 149-201, 203-217 24 24 Metropolitan will provide wheeling service through its was admitted into Evidence.)

765

763

MR. WEST: And we also move into evidence

25

25

facilities.

And, Barbara, if you could blow up paragraph 2(b). It provides that Metropolitan will provide this wheeling service, actually using its facilities, to move water so long as there is capacity in excess of that needed by Metropolitan to meet the water supply needs of its member agencies.

2.3

We believe that these are two factors that indicate actual wheeling as opposed to the transaction exchange that's -- that's contemplated under the exchange agreement, those being the actual movement of water through MWD's facilities is contemplated in part by the agreement itself and that there was a capacity limitation.

THE COURT: Let me just ask you something. You don't have to answer it now but this is something which I suppose the parties are going to talk about in their briefs.

Is it your position that the dollars that are paid to Met by San Diego for the exchange water is to be measured -- is not to be measured by the law that applies to wheeling, because it's not wheeled water and it's just a contract made by two grown ups who are entitled to enter into any contract they want to for whatever dollar value they seek to place on it?

MR. WEST: I don't want to oversimplify it, but

```
provided in the Administrative Code section 4119. It applies to wheeling on behalf of member agencies up to one year. Other agreements are separately negotiated.
```

And lastly, this is not in your binder, your Honor, because of its size. It's Exhibit 2 -- Defendant's Exhibit 269, and that is a collection of documents that constitute the series of documents known as the quantification settlement agreement.

And the quantification settlement agreement is -- I just want to make it clear on the record that there's a -- there is -- it's possible to oversimplify what it is. It's a very broad series of agreements, but it's a series of agreements that, among other things, define the amount of water that parties may take from the Colorado River and which, among other things, allow the transfer of water from IID to San Diego County Water Authority.

And there is a very good definition of it, both the quantification settlement agreement documents and the Quantification Settlement Agreement cases which is at 201 Cal.App.4th 758.

We direct the Court's attention to this exhibit, which is Defendant's 269, because it defines terms that -- in agreements that have been mentioned in this case, particularly terms in the exchange agreement.

that is generally our position.

THE COURT: I understand I'm oversimplifying. I want to make a distinction. Is that a distinction you're going to be making?

MR. WEST: We believe so in our post-trial briefs.

And, Barbara, if you could also blow up paragraph 6A.

Just the point of this is this agreement is subject to a term of ten years and thus, it continued in operation until June 15th of this year.

We accordingly move Exhibit 177 into evidence.

Actually, it's actually covered under the other stipulation -- the other series of wheeling exchange agreements.

THE COURT: It's part of that?

MR. WEST: Yes. THE COURT: All right.

MR. WEST: And one point of clarification, your Honor, which is evidenced in certain of the wheeling and exchange agreements that we've talked about on that demonstrative is, as Mr. Hixson observed during his presentation, Met's wheeling rate is specified in Administrative Code section 4405, but there's a

limitation on that wheeling rate's application, which is

For example, it defines conserved water, which is the water that San Diego makes available to MWD under the exchange agreement.

And this series of agreements that constitute the quantification settlement agreements, the series of documents that constitute the quantification settlement agreement includes documents that the exchange agreement references, which are conditions precedent for it. For example, the allocation condition is a condition precedent for San Diego's obligation under the exchange agreement.

THE COURT: The quantification settlement agreement, is that entered into with the federal government pursuant to the lawsuit that set up the possibility of diverting water from the Colorado?

MR. WEST: There are two QSAs, federal and state one. We're referring to the state one.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. WEST: Accordingly, for completeness of the record we move Exhibit 269 in evidence.

MR. PURCELL: Objection, your Honor, relevance. The exchange agreement, which isn't really even at issue in this case, is an integrated agreement. It's got its own definitions in it. It's complete in and of itself and it's already in the record.

THE COURT: So I guess the -- I'm going to assume just for today's purposes that the exchange agreement is something that we need to discuss and that the parties want to discuss.

2.2

But are you suggesting that I have to look at the Quantification Settlement Agreement's use of terms to figure out what the exchange agreement means?

MR. WEST: In order to define terms in the exchange agreement, you can't just look at the -- you can't just look at the exchange agreement itself.

For example, the definition section in paragraph 1 defines conserved water as that term is defined in the Quantification Settlement Agreements.

THE COURT: That's how it reads in the exchange agreement?

MR. WEST: That's how it reads in the exchange agreement.

And under -- there is a provision dealing with San Diego's conditions precedent, which says one of its conditions precedent is the execution and delivery of the allocation agreement, which is part of the quantification settlement agreements.

One point of clarification. There is -counsel reminds me there is only one QSA itself. There are two QSA cases. There's the federal QSA and the state proposition.

Another document that we showed the Court was DTX-78. This was a joint brief that was filed by the San Diego County Water Authority and the Metropolitan Water District in the QSA cases contending that the wheeling statute has no application to the exchange agreement between Metropolitan and San Diego.

And then a third document that the Court took judicial notice of is DTX-655. This is an appellate brief filed by San Diego also in the QSA cases stating the similar position, that the wheeling statute has no application to the exchange agreement.

The Court granted judicial notice of these items among others. Judicial notice allows a court to take notice of the fact that something was filed and what it says. However, judicial notice by itself does not solve the hearsay problem, that statements that are made in a brief have to have an independent basis for the Court to accept them for the truth.

We are now moving DTX-53, DTX-78, and DTX-655 into evidence based on California Evidence Code section 1220, which provides that admissions by a party opponent fall within an exception to the hearsay rule and therefore can be considered for the truth of the matters asserted.

770 772

QSA. But these -- there is one quantification settlement agreement that the parties will include.

MR. PURCELL: And we still maintain our objection. The definition of conserved water isn't relevant for purposes of this phase of the case.

THE COURT: I'll admit 269 for the limited purpose of looking at it if the exchange agreement has terms which are defined as set forth in the quantification settlement agreement, so for that limited purpose.

(Whereupon Exhibit DTX-269 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. WEST: And with that, I'm done with this part of the presentation. I'm going to hand it to my colleague Mr. Hixson.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, on the first day of trial, the Court took judicial notice of several briefs that had been filed in other matters. One of them is -can we pull up DTX-53.

DTX-53 is a brief filed by San Diego in the Rincon Del Diablo case and we sought judicial notice and that wasn't opposed and the judicial notice was granted concerning statements in that brief by San Diego that Proposition 13 does not apply to water rates, because they are commodity rates and outside the scope of that

Judicial notice has taken care of authenticity functions and now we are simply asserting that these fall within an exception to the hearsay rule and can be considered as admissible evidence for the statements that are made therein and so we move those exhibits into evidence.

MR. PURCELL: I'm not sure what this is relevant to, your Honor, but we don't have any objection on hearsay grounds.

THE COURT: Okay. DTX-53, DTX-78, DTX-655 are admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibits 53, 78 and 655 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor.

At this point, Metropolitan reserves rights to put on any rebuttal as may be necessary following San Diego's rebuttal. But other than that, we rest.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, I'm going to make a rebuttal presentation, but we have some -- first some housekeeping and then a couple documents we would like to move in.

Mr. Braunig is going first, the latter is going to be done by Mr. Purcell and then I'm going to talk for a while.

Pages 770 to 773

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 MR. BRAUNIG: Good morning, your Honor. Warren 3 Braunig for San Diego. 4 Just a few housekeeping matters. 5 First, over the weekend we filed a request for 6 judicial notice that was electronically filed and served 7 on counsel. 8 We've also provided them with a courtesy copy 9 here today in Court. 10 We've asked the Court to take judicial notice 11 of two things. 12 First, the legislative history of the wheeling 13 statute, which is obviously one of the grounds on which 14 we've sought relief in this case. 15 The second is the Metropolitan Administrative 16 Code, which is -- while generally you don't have to take 17 -- ask the Court to take judicial notice of statutes, 18 that statute is not available on West Law or Lexus and so 19 to avoid your Honor having to search around for it, we've 20 provided a true and correct copy of it. 21 These are both items that the Court has taken 22 judicial notice of earlier in the case, but out of an 23 abundance of caution, we wanted to ask the Court to do so 24 in connection with this trial. And I've got a copy of a 25 binder containing those that I can hand up to the Court.

Department of Water Resources has published this information.

And we believe that certainly it's a fact that these -- this document is accurate in terms of the summing up, but we also believe it would be helpful to the Court in -- you know, in its evaluation. So as a summary of voluminous evidence, we would move in once more PTX-0385, and I do have a copy now that has a stamp

THE COURT: This is what I suggested last week we give Met a chance to have a look at, see if they agreed as to the relationship between the cited materials and this demonstrative.

What is your position on that?

MR. WEST: We continue to object to this document. And if your Honor would like to hear argument regarding it, I can provide you with it.

THE COURT: Probably I think this is a good time to get this resolved.

MR. WEST: Absolutely. May I approach, your Honor?

THE COURT: Please.

Do you have a copy of this for San Diego?

MR. WEST: That is their own document. It's a plaintiff's exhibit.

776

774

THE COURT: I would appreciate it.

Any opposition from Met?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan doesn't oppose the request for judicial notice.

THE COURT: The request is granted.

MR. BRAUNIG: The second item, your Honor, is a carryover issue from last week, which was an exhibit marked as Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit 385, which maybe we can pull up again, slide 6204.

So your Honor, you will recall this one. This was a slide that using documents which have been admitted to -- into evidence pursuant to the parties' stipulation but that appear in, you know, these massive, you know, sort of 200 page documents each, we've taken the relevant information from a table that appears in each one of those that shows here's the amount of water that Metropolitan gets from the State Water Project either as table A deliveries or for storage purposes.

And those tables also track the amount of transfers or exchanges with other State Water Project contractors as well as the transportation or wheeling of non-project water.

And what this slide does is it sums up that information for the years 1995 to 2009, which are the only years -- which are the last 15 years for which the MR. BRAUNIG: Oh, is it? THE COURT: 340-A?

MR. WEST: Yes. This is one of the documents that San Diego's purported Exhibit 385 purports to summarize. Our issue is that it excludes a category of information which is included in that document.

I believe this is covered under Evidence --Evidence Code 1521, which addresses the summary of voluminous writings which provides that the Court should not consider such a summary if a genuine dispute exists concerning material terms of the writing.

And the issue we have is if you look at that column, there is a column under non-SWP water and it -that excludes -- if you see that, under that column, it talks about two different kinds of non-SVP water: Water bank recovery water and other non-SVP water. This excludes the first category, water bank recovery water, but only includes the other non-SVP water. You can see that under the column.

And if you see, your Honor, it is done by State Water Project contractors broken, out and there is a reference there for MWD.

And if water bank recovery water is included in this calculation, as indicated in the document itself that it purports to summarize, then the percentage of

non-SVP water that's delivered rises from 1.6 to 4.6 and thus, we believe that this doesn't fairly summarize the documents it purports to summarize, for that reason and therefore, we object to its inclusion.

2.2

2.5

We don't -- we don't -- you know counsel can argue in their briefs the content of this but we don't believe any particular summary, particularly a summary that excludes a large amount of the water that's included in this table should be admitted.

THE COURT: Well if you look at the -- if you look at this diagram, basically we've got a circle that suggests that out of 100 percent of water, we have about 1.1 for exchanges or transfers with other contractors and about 1.6 of the total volume is received from SWP.

Now, if we accommodated the numbers on PTX-340-A, how much of a difference would it make to these percentages?

MR. WEST: The 1.6 would go to 4.6.

MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, the issue of that is that that's not transportation or wheeling of non-State Water Project water. That's -- my understanding is that the water bank recovery is water that Metropolitan has purchased from the State Water Project and put into

Honor, is depo designations, designations of various depositions which your Honor has under submission with the parties' various exhibits to them.

And before evidence is closed, we want to make sure that -- well, we would hope that we will be able to put those designations into evidence subject to whatever modifications -- subject to whatever modifications your Honor might make.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BRAUNIG: And so, I guess what I would like to do is sort of establish exhibit numbers for each of the individual deposition designations that we would then provide to the Court as admitted subject to Your Honor's modification and conferring with counsel that we've gotten it right based on your Honor's -- based on your Honor's rulings on them.

So I think what we would like to do is -- and I don't know if that -- we haven't had an opportunity to confer about this but I don't know if that sounds appropriate, your Honor.

THE COURT: How many depositions are there? MR. BRAUNIG: There are six.

THE COURT: Okav.

MR. BRAUNIG: And so I think our next in order would be 389 for the designations of the deposition of

storage. So it's not -- I think it's accurate to say that the amount of non-State Water Project water that is transported for wheeling purposes is that 1.6 number, so we think it's accurate.

And my understanding is that there -- I didn't hear anything from Mr. West -- that this is actually -- falls into the category of transportation or wheeling of non-project water.

THE COURT: The best way to handle this in the interest of time is to deny the request that this be admitted, which is what I'm going to do. And I suggest you just put it in the brief.

MR. WEST: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. BRAUNIG: I have a couple of other things.

The next item is Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit 386 which Mr. Keker used with the witness Mr. Upadhyay and we believe was authenticated.

It is actually a copy of an exhibit that was part of the parties' stipulation, but it was marked with a different exhibit number and so for the sake of the record, we would move PTX-386 into the record.

MR. HIXSON: No objection to PTX-386.

THE COURT: PTX-386 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit PTX-386 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. BRAUNIG: The last item that I have, your

Steve Arakawa, A-R-A-K-A-W-A.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 390 for the excerpts of the deposition of Stathis, S-T-A-T-H-I-S, Kostopoulos, K-O-S-T-O-P-O-U-L-O-S.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 391 for the excerpts of the deposition of June Skillman, S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 392 for the designations of the deposition of Brian Thomas, B-R-I-A-N.

Exhibit -- Plaintiff's Exhibit 393 would be excerpts of the deposition of Devan -- or Devendra, D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A, Upadhyay, U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-Y.

And Exhibit 394 would be the designations of the deposition of Arnout, A-R-N-O-U-T, Van Den Berg, V-A-N space D-E-N space B-R-G -- B-E-R-G.

And in connection with those depositions, there were documents that are part of the -- they're authenticated and sort of explained by the witness as part of those depositions and those exhibits are part of the plaintiff's trial exhibit list and part of the parties' stipulation and so I wanted to -- I got a little thrown off when Mr. West made me leave the podium. Let me go back and grab my list of what those are.

THE COURT: Those are already in -- have already been admitted?

MR. BRAUNIG: These are not documents that have

been admitted, so in connection with the deposition designations, if those sections are approved, then we would move -- I guess right now I would conditionally move them into evidence.

2.2

1.0

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, I don't mean to be an obstructionist but we didn't get a chance to meet and confer and this is a lot to drop on us. And I don't have all the exhibits they're moving in evidence in front of me at this time. I would like the parties to meet and confer on both sides about designations and entry of exhibits rather than forcing me to respond.

THE COURT: Have you met and conferred on the objections to the depositions?

MR. HIXSON: Before trial, the parties did meet and confer and that's what was filed with the Court, but this larger procedure that is going on right now, this is something that's being sprung on us.

MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, if I may respond briefly. We mentioned this last week, that we were going to do this and the documents were part of the deposition and they're also part of the parties' stipulation so there's already a stipulation in place that these documents, if they're mentioned during the hearing, come into evidence. So I'm not sure what further meet and confer is necessary but --

these subject to rulings on the admissibility in specific locations of the designations for 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, and 394?

MR. HIXSON: We reassert all the objections we previously filed with respect to those depo designations, so we just restate those.

THE COURT: Okay. Subject to my ruling on those, then.

MR. HIXSON: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Those are admitted subject to further rulings. That is 389 through 394 inclusive.

(Whereupon Exhibit PTX-389 to PTX-394 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. BRAUNIG: Thank you, your Honor. I have nothing further. I'm going to hand the podium over now to Mr. Purcell.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, we would like to, as well, move in some depo desalination designations. I didn't realize the plaintiff was going to do this today. I can wait until they're done with their case or go ahead right now.

THE COURT: Why don't we wait until they're done and then I'll turn the floor over to you.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask Mr. Hixson, if a witness said a particular location refers to a document and if I decide that the testimony itself is admissible, might you still have an objection to the document coming in?

MR. HIXSON: If the document is on the parties' prior stipulation, then no, that would be fine.

What we would like to do -- I guess we're used to writing a mutual stip and proposed order that the Court rather than just sort of doing it orally right now.

THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead and do that. If there's a dispute as to a document, just briefly, as with the depo designations, state in a short sentence what your positions are and I'll rule on it based on that.

MR. BRAUNIG: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.
Just so that the record -- just so the record
is clear as to which exhibits we're talking about here -THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BRAUNIG: -- these would be PTX-57, 58, 63, 77, 80, 105, 128, 140, 180, 202, 228 and 231.

And actually 281, which is just the -- and 281 as well.

THE COURT: So with respect to the depo designations, does Met have any objection to admitting

MR. PURCELL: Thank you, your Honor. I'll be relatively brief. I know that's a

relief.

I wanted to respond to a couple things Mr. West just mentioned in his presentation this morning and then there's one other document I want to direct your Honor's attention to briefly.

So the binder Mr. West handed up to you, the first document, the very big thick document, DTX-218, the invoices, I just wanted to correct something Mr. West said.

He made the point that most of the water that's delivered by Met to San Diego is delivered from Met, it's not exchange water from IID. We've never contested that. And Mr. Cushman's testimony actually quantified it and made it clear that that's the case. He testified that there were about 5 million acre-feet of water that San Diego's bought from Met as opposed to one million acre-feet of exchange water. So that's not in dispute and there's nothing in those invoices that's at all inconsistent with anything Mr. Cushman said.

The second document, this list of agreements, it's a lot to dump on the Court and I just wanted to cut through a little bit of the clutter by making a few points about it.

One thing you'll notice, this is the demonstrative DTX-708, this is 50 years of agreements. First agreement in there dates from 1964 so, if you're talking about wheeling on Met's system, you're talking about 50 years of wheeling.

2.3

The second thing which goes to something Mr. West said again is that Mr. Cushman did not say that San Diego was the only party that wheeled on Met's system. What he said was San Diego's the only member agency that's done a substantial amount of wheeling on Met's system in the past ten years or so since the unbundling rate happened. That's true.

And most of these agreements, the vast majority of them do not involve Met member agencies, they involve other State Water Project contractors or other third parties. There's really only about a half dozen of the agreements that have to do with other Met member agencies. There's a couple with upper San Gabriel, there's a couple with MWDOC, there's I think one with Calleguas which was back in the '70s but really, it's San Diego or third parties.

And the last thing I would like to mention on this is that none of these other agreements with Met member agencies, the few of them that there are, are long-term agreements like the Met IID exchange. They're expected to develop 408,000 acre-feet of supplied by 2013, 2014.

So to the extent Met did quantify, it wasn't about saved capacity, it wasn't about easing strain on facilities, it was about delivery of a specific amount of acre-feet of new supply.

The bottom of the page, there's more, the sentence starting "as a result."

Fourth line from the bottom, Jeff.

As a result the yield from the LRP is expected to increase from 169,000 acre-feet in '04, '05 to 408,thousand acre-feet in 2013-14. That's the same figure from up at the top of the page.

The IRP and rate forecast includes 166,000 acre-feet of supply from new water recycling and seawater desalination programs.

As part of the -- go to the next page -- part of the rate forecast and the ten-year financial forecast, 126,000 acre-feet of this new supply is assumed to come from proposed desalination programs -- sorry, projects.

Figure 5 shows the expected supply from projects. And then if we go back to the page, we can blow up figure 5 there, again, a quantification and nice upward sloping graph in terms of acre-feet of supply created.

786 788

not agreements that span decades, they're not agreements for deliveries of really substantial multimillion dollar acre-foot capacity. They tend to be one offs, temporary, one-time water transfers for pretty small quantities of water. So again, we don't think anything in here calls into question anything Mr. Cushman said.

And then there's one additional document I would like to direct your Honor's attention to and move into evidence before I sit down, and that is PTX-101, which is Met's long-range finance plan, October 11, 2004. This was shortly after the unbundling of the rate and it's an interesting document that has to do with pretty much every issue we've been talking about. And I would like to direct the Court's attention just to the few snippets from it.

The first is on page 14.

Jeff, you can blow up the second -- the bottom half of the page there.

This relates to the Water Stewardship Rate issue. As you see the heading is number eight, local resources.

And right there in the first paragraph, again, it's quantified and quantified in terms of acre-feet, second sentence starting with financial incentives by Metropolitan will support local projects that are

The bottom of this page, the next section is also interesting but on a different issue on a State Water Project issue.

Number nine, imported supplies, you see the section, first section 9.1 is on the Colorado River.

If we go to the next page, page 16 of the document.

If you can blow up the text on the top of the page.

There is a discussion of figure 6 five lines down. Figure 6 shows the different projects that will be delivered through to the Colorado River Aqueduct. Of note is the fact that the transfer between the Imperial Irrigation District and the San Diego County Water Authority will move water through the Colorado River Aqueduct and water will be delivered through Metropolitan's system to the San Diego County Water Authority, SDCWA.

SDCWA will be responsible for all costs associated with the transfer, including the full cost of transporting the water through Metropolitan system capacity. And then this sentence is pretty interesting.

While these supplies are not Metropolitan supplies, they are delivered by Metropolitan and will serve demands in Metropolitan's service area.

2.3

And then figure 6, if you scroll down, this is a graph of all of the different Colorado River supply sources that Metropolitan has. The big one there at the bottom is the state purchase, and then you see the IID SDCWA transfer and canal lining are both items ramping up there at the bottom.

I know it may be hard to see with the shading of the gray, but those are significant items in that chart.

2.2

2.3

2.4

And then finally, on the peaking issue, this is pretty brief, but on page 24 of the document, in section 11.1.3, Northern California supply programs. This goes to the issue of storage and dry year storage and the cost that Met incurs to have that additional dry year supply available for agency that need it.

The IRP, you remember the integrated resources plan from 1996, this section starts out the IRP sets forth a goal of requiring 300,000 acre-feet of dry year supply through water transfer and storage programs by 2010. Several programs have already been established to achieve this goal.

And then the next couple of pages list a number of storage programs that Met is engaged in at different storage facilities that actually do maintain the dry year supply.

have to say in rebuttal for that brief.

But as I mentioned a few days ago when I tried to stand up after Mr. Hixson's administrative record presentation, there are things that were said there about Met's case that demand a response. And again, we're far enough along in the trial. If you want to interrupt me or have questions or say something as I go along, please feel free. It doesn't bother me.

So here's what I plan to address in this rebuttal presentation to Mr. Hixson's AR presentation.

First of all, the assertion that the series of reports prepared by RMI in the mid-1990s support Met's position, we will show that they do not.

Second, Met's made for litigation position that it's -- it is appropriate, I put that in quotes, to place State Water Project costs on Met's transportation rates because that's how Met is invoiced by DWR.

Third, Met's unlawful decision to put all of the cost of its local resources, programs, conservation, and desalination programs, which are primarily about creating local supply and regional benefits of supply on 100 -- 100 percent on Met's transportation rates.

And fourth and finally, Met's refusal to evaluate dry year peaking costs for which member agencies benefit when Met develops and stores hundreds of

790 792

And again, the point here is that, you know, this is not made up, this is a real thing. Met's own documents show it. We had pointed to documents and I believe Mr. Yamasaki testified that Met has over three million acre-feet of water in storage right now. This document, the 2004 projection, quantifies the dry year portion of that as 300,000 acre-feet and tells you exactly how Met was planning to do it, which in fact they have done.

And I'll turn it over to Mr. Keker.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. KEKER: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. PURCELL: Oh, sorry.

And your Honor, I apologize. Before I sit down, we would like to move PTX 101 into evidence subject to the parties' stipulation.

THE COURT: It's PTX?

MR. PURCELL: Correct.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. HIXSON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: PTX-101 is admitted.

(Whereupon Exhibit PTX-101 was admitted into Evidence.)

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, there's going to be

post-trial briefing so I'm going to save a lot of what I

thousands of acre-feet of water per dry year drought insurance.

Those are the four things. So I'm going to start with what Mr. Hixson said about these RMI reports, because that record has to be corrected.

Met's slide 124 said that the December 1995 report, which remember I emphasized in my opening and read a lot from. Slide 124 says RMI does not address transportation related SWP costs. That is flat wrong.

RMI addressed all of the SWP costs, State Water Project costs, including transportation, including power. Everything that they spent on the State Water Project was included in the supply costs in this RMI report. And it couldn't be more clear this -- I want you to focus, if you would. This is the December 1995 report and at page 1233 and 1234, 1233 it says the major expenditure categories are State Water Project supply costs of 287 million. And then they have a table. There's a table 1 in there that shows supply costs, State Water Project fixed costs and they -- and then they add to that the variable power costs, subtotal, 287 million and change.

That number is the entire amount of what the State Water Project costs are and they're being classified in this report as supply.

2.2

That includes -- as you can tell, it includes what they charged for power. And I'm going to show you in a second that there's just no question it includes the Delta water charge, it includes what the DWR bill says is for transportation and so on. It's the whole thing.

Looking at AR 1244 of that report, which I just mentioned, you will see that Option I -- this is Option II. Let me for back to Option I.

Option I reads -- this is the equivalent margin rate of that report and it leaves all that 287 million in the wheeling rate. That's what it says, that's what it does.

Option II, which we have up here, takes out all of that \$287 million. Option II computes the wheeling rate by subtracting all SWP and CRA supply costs from the firm sales rate. And as indicated in table 1, that's the table we just looked at. Those annual SWP costs are 287.5 million.

That's everything.

2.3

The assertion that the December '95 report does not address transportation related SWP costs is simply false. This -- the 287 is the whole bill.

The same is true for the earlier report, the October 1995 report, which you've looked at, which is in the record. It classifies all the charges, whether it's it.

That's why when we talked about -- when I talked in opening about that May '96 report, I explained that it had the same fatal defect that the Raftelis 2010 report has. It is simply Met's litigation position parroted back by a supposedly independent expert. It's the opposite of substantial evidence.

So, let's look at one of the tables, though, first in the '96 report that makes it clear that this 287 million --

Jeff, if you would blow up -- I'm referring to page 1893, referring to the AR2012, 6288, page 1893.

And it shows the -- under non-departmental O and M, it shows State Water Project.

And you can see by the -- everything below that until you get down to the Colorado River Aqueduct involves the State Water Project and they carved it up various ways, but the total is \$287 million. But now, you can see that they've broken it out. Let's go back to the -- they put it in two different columns, one under supply, part of it under supply and part of it under transmission, which is what they hadn't done before.

Why the change in RMI's position?

Because Met told RMI to categorize

Because Met told RMI to categorize the supply costs as transportation just like it told Raftelis

Delta water charge, power charge, whatever as all the costs of the State Water Project are categorized under supply.

Now, Mr. Hixson then made a big deal about the RMI's '96 report in May and I want to show you that that report still lists the State Water Project at 287 million. But as you'll remember now, after the prodding by the Met staff, RMI has now separated it out between supply and transmission but that 287 is still in there and we'll look at it in a minute.

Before I show you that, I want to clear the record about this big deal about we must not have read the '96 report because we specifically cited it in the pretrial brief. Completely wrong. We didn't mention the '96 report in the pretrial brief. We never cited it. We cited the October and December 1995 RMI reports because they do allocate the State Water Project costs to supply, just as I just showed.

We didn't cite the '96 -- the May '96 report because the -- because they changed their story in the 1996 report. After the parties filed their first pretrial briefs, Met added this '96 RMI report to the administrative record. We weren't using it as -- they hadn't designated it as part of the administrative record. And in their second pretrial brief, they cited

report, just like Ms. Skillman told Raftelis report in 2010 to say that the allocation was appropriate.

RMI changed its position about the nature of that transportation charge, which was supply in December and then became divided up in May, only after incorporating -- as they said, incorporating changes suggested by Metropolitan staff.

And I showed you this on opening. The May 1996 RMI report says after they had taken their December report, their preliminary functionalization, which remember was all supply. They're presenting that to Metropolitan's planning division staff for review. After incorporating changes suggested by Metropolitan's planning division staff, RMI presented the preliminary functionalization to Metropolitan's water quality, operations, finance, and engineering divisions for additional review.

The resulting functionalized revenue requirements were used herein for the cost classification and cost allocation procedures.

That's exactly what happened with Ms. Skillman and Mr. Raftelis report many years later.

And they don't really dispute that they did the same thing with Raftelis. We have direct proof, we've seen those e-mails.

Mr. Hixson said that it was perfectly appropriate for staff to provide information to these so-called independent consultants, but that's not what they were providing. They weren't providing information, they were dictating results, they were telling them what the conclusion was that they were looking for and it's the conclusion that they want this court to adopt, that it is appropriate, I put in quotes, to call State Water Project expenses, at least some of them, the ones that DWR bills as transportation to be Met's own expenses for transportation.

2.3

And looking at -- just to remind you of what we looked at with Ms. Skillman and in opening, Ms. Skillman basically told Mr. Raftelis report in 2010 what to say and indeed he said it. He didn't say it was appropriate, he didn't say anything in his draft report. She tells him what to write, just like they did with RMI before.

So, our position is that what happened here is undisputed and it is obvious. Historically, Met followed industry standards and they followed simple logic and they classified the State Water Project costs as a supply cost, just like Colorado River water, wherever they get their supply.

DWR from the beginning of the relationship in their bills separated out Delta water charges from

load those onto the cost of wheeling non-project water through the Met's internal system.

All they did when they unbundled is made it even more obvious. They took -- they took the transportation costs and began to call them different things because before they had one water rate, and now that they were going to have -- they were going to have wheeling, they were going to charge people these -- they call it transparency but they were going to call it these other waters rates.

And I'm going to get to this in a second, but there's no dispute that from -- unbundling has nothing to do with it. This transportation, putting the State Water Project DWR claimed conveyance costs on to the wheeling rate began in 1997 and has never changed.

And that's what caused them to change -- when you ask why did they change their historic position and industry standard position and so on, why did they stop calling it supply, the answer is they were faced with a member agency that wanted to buy water from somebody else and they wanted to convey it through Met's system, the only game in town. And that's when they made up this construct that somehow Met's State Water Project transportation system was their own transportation system and they could charge for it when they were charging for

798 800

conveyance, but that didn't -- Met treated it as supply. It was a supply cost.

Like any purchaser of commodity, the buyer doesn't care about the producer's cost breakdown, it was buying a supply of water. They did it for years. That's the way they did it in the 1969 study, which sure it's old but that's the way they were doing it then.

They did it in October RMI study, they did it in December 1995. That's the way NARUC says to do it, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, and that's how a proper cost causation study would account for it.

THE COURT: You don't think it was the 2003 unbundling that led to this division or split?

MR. KEKER: No, absolutely not. I'm going to get to that.

The continuity in this is that from the very beginning, they said let's take transportation costs off of that DWR bill. From 1997 on, unbundling had -- let's take those costs and we're going to say they're our conveyance costs and we're going to load them in.

So from 1997 on, when they were thinking about wheeling, they took out the transportation that you just saw. They take out the transportation costs, saying that those becomes Met's transportation costs, we're going to

transportation.

And that's what they say. I mean, again, I -in their brief, the -- down near the DTX-23 cite is the
1997 resolution. But inclusion of the State Water
Project costs in MWD's general rate for wheeling is
something that was contemplated and endorsed by RMI in
1995 because it's the only rate method examined that
could satisfy the requirement that member agencies be
held harmless from any cost shifting due to wheeling.
That is the entire analytic support for what they did.

The San Pedro resolution became the primary factor in allocating costs to set rates, the constraint that a member agency who doesn't wheel water can't have its rates go up, this whole hold harmless principle we've talked about, the no, quote, no financial injury, close quote standard of the 1997 board resolution.

Now, during this trial, Met has doubled down on its approach to this -- during the trial presentation. Although Mr. Hixson, when he first tried to distinguish Option I in that 'RMI, December '95's RMI report, he distinguished it on irrelevant grounds, including the fact that the rates were unbundled. But then he -- he reiterated that RMI's option I, the 1997 wheeling rate and the current wheeling rate, all have in common the feature that you just asked about. They include the

State Water Project transpor -- the part that the DWR bills as transportation.

2.3

Could we see slide 65 that Met put up?

This is his big point. It goes back to 1997.

They -- they -- in 1997, they decided to put MWD's -- the transportation costs were going to include what DWR said in its bills were conveyance costs and that was the way it was up til when they unbundling. And when they unbundled, they just made it more explicit by -- and then they made it worse by adding the Water Stewardship Rate. At least before, it was just what DWR was charging. Now they're charging the Water Stewardship Rate when they unbundled.

So, this isn't something that was affected by unbundling except it was made worse by the Water Stewardship Rate.

Mr. Thomas, who they never called, Brian Thomas, the CFO, recognized that Option I, this including the State Water Project costs, Option I discouraged wheeling.

Could we see that matrix again, that -- no, the matrix in his memo. Yeah, there.

The equivalent margin method was Option I. The commitments method was a fixed cost where people would make a long-term commitment to buy water so that you

The San Pedro integrated resource plan assembly statement, July 1994, stated that Metropolitan should develop an explicit policy on wheeling.

And let's go on. And the policy to avoid financial injury to other member agencies, wheeling member agencies must contribute to Metropolitan's fixed costs on the same basis as member agencies purchasing Metropolitan supplies; therefore, member agencies requesting only wheeling service would pay for all transmission costs and unavoidable storage and supply costs. That's State Water Project fixed costs for transportation.

That's what -- I mean that's what they said they were doing, that's what they did.

They haven't disputed that the reason and the only reason in the record for the wheeling rate from 1997 to the present is rate stability.

Remarkably, they also haven't disputed, at least in this trial presentation that the choice of rate stability over a proper cost of service analysis that facilitates wheeling is illegal under -- Morro Bay and Palmdale as we said in our opening.

Mr. Hixson showed you slide 127 and he emphasized in the second paragraph fair compensation is defined as the reasonable charges. I want to emphasize

would be sure that you get the revenues for it.

And the only one that would encourage wheeling, and we believe encourage and facilitate wheeling are the same, is the commitments method, the equivalent margin method didn't do it.

And they go back -- again, it's not unbundling that they're pointing to when they come to the findings of fact. The findings of fact that support -- according to Met that support loading State Water Project transportation -- the DWR claimed conveyance costs and treating them as Met's own transportation costs, they say -- we say where does that come from? They say the 1997 resolution.

We see there -- this is -- this is the beginning of the -- first let's look at Met's slide 128, Jeff, and then we'll look at this.

Yeah, Met's slide 128 and then 129 are what Mr. Hixson showed you as the written findings under the wheeling statutes that support what's going on today.

And now if we could go to the actual finding, this is document 82 in the administrative record, that's cited a lot. And you haven't -- I've shown you the actual 1997 resolution, but this is the board memo that goes with it. And in it, it -- I mean it can't be more clear.

what's after that, incurred by the owner of the conveyance system.

Met has its own conveyance system. It knows perfectly well what its conveyance system costs. Its conveyance system includes -- well, and it knows that it doesn't own the State Water Project conveyance system.

Could we see 206-1, Jeff, please.

You've seen this slide before. These are the response to admissions. It doesn't operate the State Water Project, it doesn't own the State Water Project, it doesn't transport State Water Project within the State Water Project, it's not its.

So the owner of the conveyance system is -- is a reference to Met's own conveyance system, which includes the Colorado River Aqueduct and its internal -- the system that it has to pick up water from its suppliers, either from the Colorado River or from these reservoirs that the State Water Project brings down, and then deliver it to people. That's its conveyance system. And the only reason it incurs any costs due to the State Water Project is because it buys a supply of water from the State Water Project and delivers it to these reservoirs.

Could we quickly look at the map again and look at the bottom?

And your Honor is very familiar with it. That's -- I mean the State Water Project brings the water down, they put it in reservoirs, the Colorado River Aqueduct picks up water at the Colorado River. That's Met's internal owned conveyance system. All the functionalization in the world doesn't justify what is a purely arbitrary decision to call water supply costs transportation costs.

2.2

1.0

2.3

THE COURT: In the regulations adopted by Met, and again this may be something that's best left for the briefs, and if so, just tell me.

But, the regulations themselves passed by Met suggest that this is how you map out the constituents of the wheeling rate that has all those pieces in it.

Is it going to be your position that I should basically ignore that because it's in conflict with California law?

MR. KEKER: No, you don't have to ignore that. We're not saying it's not reasonable for them to in a cost causation study, to try to -- first you have to figure out how much money do you have to collect, what are we have going to collect? Then you have to functionalize costs. They're making a big deal about functionalizing costs.

What we're saying is that if the

Prop. 26 and the various laws. And if the System Access Rate, or the Water Stewardship Rate are -- are improperly calculated so that they don't facilitate wheeling and are -- aren't supported by substantial evidence in terms of the cost of transporting water through Mets own conveyance system, then the adopted wheeling rate by Met is illegal. We're not challenging their administrative code in that regard --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEKER: -- as saying that's what our wheeling rate's going to be. What we're saying, the -- that's fine but you have to have a lawful System Access Rate and a lawful -- it doesn't even have to be lawful,

lawfully computed.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEKER: Now, the one thing I just as a caveat, I don't know if it's going to matter, but the one thing that we don't agree with is that by -- that they can put in their Administrative Code this limitation of up to one year.

The wheeling rate under the Water Code is the rate for conveying water, somebody else's water through your system, and there's no limitation that those agreements have to be one year agreements.

The fact that Met calls them the only wheeling

functionalization of the costs is a completely arbitrary decision in order to reach a predetermined communication, then you're not doing an honest reasonable cost of service analysis, and that's what we say happened here.

THE COURT: I was under the impression -- and I may have misremembered but that in the regulations that Met has adopted, that it defines wheeling rate as having a series of components, for example Water Stewardship Rate, power rate and so on, that it's sort of written into their regulations that these things are to be considered and are in fact part of the M1 manual in fact part of how you're going to be calculating wheeling.

MR. KEKER: There's no question. Let's put up 4405B, the administrative record.

You're absolutely right. And what they have said in their Administrative Code 405-B, think I've got the number right, is that the System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate and the -- and then something about treatment charges.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KEKER: -- applies. And the incremental cost of power will be the wheeling rate.

And our position is that a lawful wheeling rate has to comply with the requirements of the wheeling statute. It also has to comply with all these other --

rate can be a one-year agreement, nothing else is a wheeling rate, and therefore nothing else has to comply with the water -- the state Water Code, we disagree with that but we're not there yet. We'll explain -- I don't know how important that's going to turn out to be.

But it's probably going to be important for the next trial, contract trial, the interpretation of what does it mean to be in compliance with California law when you have a price. Today I don't think we need to go there.

Have I answered your question, your Honor, because I think it's important?

THE COURT: I think so. I think your answer is that it doesn't matter for the purposes of this trial what's in Met's administrative code or not, it really doesn't matter.

MR. KEKER: Correct. Correct. We're -- we're saying -- what we want at the end is for you to say that the calculation of the water -- the System Access Rate, the loading on of the Water Stewardship Rate are -- they're both improperly calculated and Met has to go back and either do it right by taking the Water Stewardship Rate out of the transportation cost and adjusting the System Access Rate properly by taking State Water Project costs out and fixing the dry year peaking problem, or

because you're just the judge and not the administrative agency, or do something else that complies with the law. You can change your rate structure completely, but what you've done is illegal and that's what we're going to ask for is our -- as relief.

So, our position is the only justification anywhere in the record for loading these State Water Project costs on Met's own and owned conveyance system is that -- that given in the 1997 RMI report and in the 1997 resolution and that is simply if it did other twice, the rates of non-wheeling member agencies might go up or a whole new rate structure might have to be adopted, or in Ms. Skillman's plaintive expression, the things would be destabilized. They might have to go back and think about this.

This is neither reasonable nor cost of service. It's illegal for all the reasons I gave in openings and we'll go over again in our closing brief.

So, unless the Court has questions about our rebuttal to the State Water Project piece of this, I'm going to go on to the Water Stewardship Rate.

THE COURT: Maybe this would be a good time for a short recess.

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: See everybody in ten. Thank you.

They used that to justify disproportionate rates. Court found no reason why conservation, and I quote, cannot be harmonized with Prop -- Proposition 218 and its mandate for proportionality.

And of course, it can. Conservation and the requirements of the law can be fit together. No evidence in this record indicates otherwise. The only thing in the record that Met points to is saying rate stability excuses that Palmdale rejected.

It should by now be very apparent that the water Stewardship Rate is a general tax. It is collected from Met's member agencies according to their water use and then it is distributed to other member agencies as Met sees fit for whatever political purposes, I suppose it needs to get votes without considering who benefits from the distribution of this tax money, who benefits from the projects they fund.

It should also be quite apparent, especially since the testimony of Mr. Upadhyay, that the legal resource programs, the conservation programs, the desalination programs have a supply benefit to Met and that probably because Met has plenty of capacity today, the only benefit that demand management programs have is supply benefit. But we're not arguing that. We're just saying the idea of 100 percent transportation for the

310 812

(Brief break.)

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KEKER: Thank you, your Honor.

I'm going to move on to the Water Stewardship Rate briefly.

And since I just mentioned the Palmdale case, I begin by pointing out that Palmdale itself refutes another argument that Mr. Hixson presented and that is that it's somehow appropriate to charge 100 percent of the Water Stewardship Rate to transportation because Met is required by law to expand water conservation under Senate Bill 60. And he put up a couple of slides claiming that.

Can we see the next one referring to the -because Metropolitan's mandated under Senate Bill 60 to fund water supply programs like conservation and recycling, it's appropriate to recover the cost of supporting these programs on all water moved through the system.

Palmdale explicitly condemned that argument as an excuse for violating cost of service principles in favor of rate stability because that's what happened there.

The Palmdale Water District, like Met, appealed to legal mandates that it had to support conservation.

Water Stewardship Rate rate is ridiculous, and that Met ought to go back and figure it out.

It follows that Met's decision to allocate 100 percent of those costs to its Transportation Rate violates Proposition 26t, Proposition 13, the wheeling statute, the statutory provisions we've cited and the common law.

Mr. Hixson, himself, in the presentation he made proved this through documents that he cited in the administrative record. He would point to one part of them but right there in the same document would be something that would show that there was a tremendous supply benefit to each of these programs.

Virtually all the documents he cited concerning the demand management program confirmed that these programs have a strong supply benefit. Let's begin with this slide about the local resources program principles. You will recall this. And he pointed to and underlined the part that says assist local projects that improve regional water supply and reliability and avoid or defer MWD capital expenditures.

He emphasized that "avoid and defer" and we're emphasizing "water supply reliability."

This is the one you'll remember they made a big deal of the fact that San Diego's Bob Campbell signed on

to these principles. He went through that. But let's look at the principles.

2.2

2.5

2.3

This is in 2010 administrative record, page 2868. We'll start with -- this is the front page.

This is the local resources program principles developed by the rate refinement participants, and at page 2870, there you have it. Key goals of the proposed local resources program are to assist local projects that improve regional water supply reliability and avoid or defer MWD capital expenditures. They emphasize cost efficient participation in developing local water resources.

Let's look over at 2871, the next page. This is the projects that are going to get a preference.

Ones that set up diversity of supply, projects that increase the diversity of supply at the local level.

They show -- and then C, regional water supply benefits, projects that offset a demand for imported supplies or increase regional reliability during periods of shortage and/or emergencies.

And this so called functionalization, the idea that these projects end up 100 percent as part of the conveyance system is -- we believe is ridiculous.

Could we see slide 81?

Another one that he pointed and underlined. He

mention or explanation or justification for treating the Water Stewardship Rate as transportation.

But back in 1999, when Mr. Raftelis did his work, he said then in the cost of service model, half of the DSM costs demands supply management costs, which is what we're charging under the Water Stewardship Rate. Half of the DSM costs are included in the source of supply function and the other half are included in the transmission function. So he arbitrarily split it 50/50.

But then he goes on. There are alternatives to this simple allocation approach. One such alternative would be to conduct a detailed cost benefit analysis.

So, they've completely ignored that. The 50/50 division is arbitrary and would; be unlawful.

But Met here has one upped Mr. Raftelis by putting everything on transportation, which makes no sense. Water Stewardship Rate is an unlawful tax that bears no reasonable relationship to cost of service and it's illegal and it shouldn't be in the wheeling rate.

Now, I'm going to shift again to this time to dry year peaking.

Met's response is a combination of it doesn't matter and we've got it covered. The record shows that they're wrong on both counts with respect to dry year peaking.

814 816

underlined the part about reduce and defer, but just look at what's right above that. Right above it, it says "investments in conservation and recycling decrease the region's overall dependence on imported water supplies from environmentally endangered areas.

You don't -- I mean just look at the document he showed and you see -- you see that there's supply benefit cited.

And then one more that they used, slide 83.

In that one, down at the bottom says conservation is a critical element of Metropolitan's demand management program's collectively increasing the reliability of existing water supplies by lessening the need to import additional water while at the same time deferring the need to expand system capacity.

And a little bit higher up it talks about investments and demand side programs like conservation, water recycling and groundwater recovery reduce the need to provide additional imported water supplies.

And Met, in putting in its case completely ignored the earlier guidance of the -- this expert George Raftelis that we've heard about.

Keep in mind that the 2010 cost of service study that Mr. Raftelis validated, which Ms. Skillman, you will remember, helped to write, didn't include any It should be clear by now that dry year peaking refers to variations in annual demand, wet years, dry years, not summer demand, not peak day demand, not peak week.

THE COURT: Is there anybody -- I guess one of the points that they're making is that this notion that there is such a concept as dry year peaking in the first place is just your invention, it doesn't come from anywhere and that you're in effect just sort of making this up as a category of issues that have to be addressed by the rates.

MR. KEKER: Well, we're not making it up because San Diego's been complaining about it going back as you know --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. KEKER: -- to 2000. We showed you that. But that's what I want -- yes, they're saying it doesn't matter because it doesn't exist is what they're saying.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KEKER: They're saying we didn't study it, we haven't studied it, we don't know -- we can't quantify it, we haven't figured out any benefits of it and by the way, it's trivial or somehow San Diego and Los Angeles are the same. So I want to deal exactly with that.

First of all, dry year peaking and the process

of, the practice of rolling on and off the system is inherent to Met's structure as a supplemental water supplier, albeit one that has a monopoly on conveyance but it's inherent to their supplemental structure.

2.3

One of the very first slides they showed -- put up slide six -- emphasized that to the degree a member agency has local resources, develops local resources, implements conservation or otherwise reduces demand, that member agency does not require Metropolitan's services.

So, the parties roll on and off, that they do that in significant measure shouldn't be in dispute at this point. They try to air brush over this by saying it doesn't matter.

But let's look at -- I mean it does matter.

Look at what one of the key planning documents they cite over and over is this integrated resources plan, which is back in 1996. Back in 1996, they recognize that -- and this is dry year peaking. Los Angeles Aqueduct deliveries, for example, have varied from 200,000 acre-feet per year to about 500,000 acre-feet per year due to runoff conditions in the Owens Valley.

Now, what that means is if the Owens Valley is dry, they get 200,000 acre-feet from the Owens Valley. Where did they get the rest of their water? They get it from Met.

Now, they argue -- and your question goes to the testimony from Ms. Skillman that peaking, because it can be ignored because everybody peaks within a narrow band and they put up this slide.

And the first thing I want -- and pointed out that San Diego, for example, is at 1.11, the ratio average to peak. And L.A. is at 1.31. There's another outlier that's at 1.72.

Start with this. The difference between ten percent and 30 percent, or 11 percent and 31 percent increase for an agency that sells 2 million acre-feet of water a year is 400 -- is 20 percent, and 20 percent of that two million is 400,000 acre-feet of water. That's a lot of water. It's more than 35 -- I can't do the math. 35 or 40,000 dollars' worth of water that has to be held in reserve every year so that this dry year peaking phenomenon can be satisfied when the demand arises.

But if you want to understand the difference between Los Angeles and other member agencies in terms of peaking, you've got to look not just at these absolute numbers, but at some baseline comparison. And that was the point of Mr. Denham's testimony, and we put up the slide. And you asked a question about it. This is the slide we put up to show Los Angeles was significant compared to the other members and to San Diego.

818 820

In a good year, 500,000 feet. So we're talking about a recognized -- for Los Angeles, and again it sounds like we're making on them but we're saying this is a real phenomenon, it is not just -- people ought to pay for this drought insurance. But they're recognizing in 1996 300,000 acre-feet. That's in the record.

More recently, the documents that -- the bond document that we've shown, which are PTX-244 and 352, these 2013 bond documents recognize that this swing for -- and now we're not talking about what L.A. is getting from the Owens Valley, we're talking about what Los Angeles is projected to buy from Metropolitan. And that swing is between 167,000 acre-feet per year and approximately 433,000 acre-feet per year.

When we look at the next one, same document, of course they're talking about in the future, they may purchase up to 511,000 acre-feet or 82 percent of its dry year supplies from Metropolitan over the next 25 years. This corresponds to an increase from normal to dry years of approximately 255,000 acre-feet of -- in potential demand for supplies from Metropolitan. Water rates are around 600 -- \$600 an acre-foot. I mean we're talking about more than \$30 million of -- in -- that is available for a dry year that you're not going to buy in a wet year.

You asked the question about well, what -- and they criticized. They criticized the slide because oh, we used as the baseline '94 to -- 1994 to 2000.

You asked some questions about it. They said it was unfair because we used the wrong baseline average.

So, over the weekend, we went back to the same data and using that same data file that's in evidence, which is PTX-383, we ran the numbers again and the results are the same.

And they show the conclusion of this, is that L.A.'s peaking is an order of magnitude different from other agencies, including San Diego.

So here, this one, we took Met's criticism, because of the type of hydrology that happened up to 2003, and created the baseline as the average of 1994 to 2003 and compared that. It looks different from the other chart, but it still shows, without any doubt, that some member agencies peak in dry years or peak more than other member agencies, significantly different by an order of magnitude.

The most on this chart San Diego gets to is about 1.3 or 4 and Los Angeles gets up to two times average. It's a significant difference.

Now, somebody could argue well, this is misleading because it's the wrong baseline. So we did it

again. We took all of the -- we made an average. The baseline became '94 to the present.

This chart shows an entire 20-year average. One represents the average sales between 1994 and 2013. And what you see is that while San Diego and the member agencies wobble around plus or minus, at the maximum 20 percent above the line, maybe 1.2, Los Angeles in the late '90s was buying 70 percent less than their 20-year average while in the late 2000, it was buying 60 percent more than their average.

We've marked that, your Honor, as 302-03 and the one before we marked as 301-03 and later I'm going to move them -- well, I'll move them now, both into evidence.

MR. HIXSON: And we will object. These are demonstrative.

MR. BRAUNIG: 387 and 388.

MR. KEKER: 387 is 301-03 and 388 is 302-03.

And what these are are summaries.

THE CLERK: I got confused there.

THE COURT: So the exhibits that are being

moved in are in short --

2.3

MR. KEKER: PTX-387 and PTX-388.

Go back. Can we -- PTX-387, it says on there is -- which one -- is that one. That's the one using the

just -- is not about Los Angeles specifically. If San Diego gets some benefits that other agencies don't get out of dry year peaking, San Diego -- the rates should reflect that and San Diego pays.

It's -- our objection to this is it is real, it is substantial. We've been telling them to look at it, asking them to look at it and deal with it under cost of service analysis for at least 13 years and they won't do it

I mean this -- this argument that they're making now that San Diego peaks too is simply a non sequitur.

So, that's the argument on dry year peaking. They say it doesn't exist. We say nonsense. That argument's nonsense. We proved it exists. It's a material matter that has benefits and it has burdens and it should be taken into account when a rate maker is considering a fair rate. It's a great benefit to some agencies to be able to count on a storage system that has three million acre-feet sitting there waiting for the dry year when they need water and then being able not to pay for that benefit all the years when they don't need water.

Meanwhile, somebody's paying for that storage and the people that are paying for the storage are the

average 1994 to 2003 as the baseline.

And 388 is the one using as the baseline average water deliveries over a 20-year period, '94 to 2000. And that's the one that shows rather significant differences between the way Los Angeles uses the supplemental system of Metropolitan and the other members, including San Diego use it.

But --

THE COURT: Let's just handle the evidentiary issue.

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir.

MR. HIXSON: We object. There's no testimony connecting these demonstratives to the data they purport to represent. They appear to be attorney-created documents. The underlying document's in evidence, but we object to the demonstrative.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

But I encourage San Diego if it wants, to include these as part of its argument in the argument submission, for example post-trial brief if you wish.

MR. KEKER: While much of the -- I mean I got to straighten this out too.

It seems like we're talking about Los Angeles a lot because they -- they exhibit this behavior in the most extreme way. But the dry year peaking claim is not

people that use the system more uniformly for their water needs. That's our -- so that's where the benefit and the burden is. They ought to measure it and they ought to put the costs where they properly belong.

Now, what about Met's claim -- so that's the part -- I've answered the part where they say it doesn't matter. Now I want to move to the part where they say oh, we've taken care of it, that they still reasonably account for annual variations in Met -- in member agency water use.

And this is their slide 145. That's their claim. Met's rates and charges still reasonably account for annual variations in member agency water usage.

It's hard to imagine how they can assert that, since their cost of service report doesn't break out or even identify dry year peaking as an issue. And Ms. Skillman has admitted and their interrogatories have admitted that they haven't identified the benefits or how much from having this drought insurance available. That should be the end of the argument.

But let me deal with the arguments that they're making about, oh, well, we're taking care of at least some of it.

First, they say they recover dry year peaking costs through their volumetric rates, including the

Pages 822 to 825

System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate so when member agencies buy more water in dry years, they pay more.

For starters, let's just be clear that that puts the end to any argument that this dry year peaking issue is unrelated to the wheeling rate because it's directly related to these volumetric rates. System Access Rate and Water Stewardship, they're in the wheeling rate. They've admitted that in response to their interrogatories. Interrogatory number 15, which you've seen before, says System Access Rate among others is where all these costs go.

They acknowledge that in the -- that flexible storage presentation that I went through with Mr. Upadhyay, the one where they're talking about moving -- moving some costs from transportation to conveyance for storage, that it recovers dry year peaking costs through the System Access Rate, a component of the wheeling rate.

But they also ignore this point raised by Mr. Denham. The problem is not what you pay in dry years, which is where the volumetric rate makes it up, when you roll on to the system. The problem is what you don't pay when you're not buying Met water. Remember the e-mail Ms. Skillman was -- with Mr. Hurley was talking

THE COURT: Do you think that if tier 2 rates might sufficient -- if sufficiently backed up, might be adequate? For the same reason, why wouldn't the volumetric rates themselves be enough? Is that because everybody's paying the same dollar?

MR. KEKER: Yes. It's because in year 1, when some of the agencies are off the system, then I'm paying for -- then people that are on the system are paying volumetrically. We're buying water and we're paying for all that storage and it's only -- and we pay the next year, the next year and then all of a sudden when somebody needs that storage and wants to come back on the system, all they pay for is the same thing that we're paying for that year. So nobody has picked up the cost of the fact that the insurance is there.

THE COURT: Well, again I don't know if the record supports this, but it might be postponement of the cost. In other words, it might be that if L.A., for example, picks up enormous costs three years down the road, that they've in effect paid for the, what you call drought insurance for the time leading up to that. So it could be a postponement of the premium if you want to think of it that way.

MR. KEKER: But you're -- I'm sorry. Excuse me.

826 828

about it's amazing Met's gotten away with this so long, why don't they pay for -- why didn't L.A. pay when they're off the says stem for water that they don't buy?

Member agencies that peak a lot, including Los Angeles, get drought insurance and aren't required to pay the premiums, so volumetric rates don't solve the problem.

Second, they argue that their tier 2 accounting, their tier 2 supply rate which kicks in when certain member agencies buy more than the base amount of water down there at the bottom, if a member agency's water purchases in a calendar year exceed a base amount, then it must pay a higher tier 2 supply rate.

Well, it's conceivable -- we're not denying, it's conceivable that a tier 2 supply rate could recover some of Mets's costs associated with maintaining all this huge storage capacity in a dry year, because they would be paying -- into of one, they would be paying into two.

But this argument has to be backed up by some analysis. I mean there's got to be -- they haven't taken steps to identify what the dry year peaking costs are, they haven't taken any steps to try to identify how the tier 2 rate applies to those dry year peaking costs, and so the cost of service analysis has not been done in violation of the law.

THE COURT: The second thing is to the extent people that are paying a tremendous amount or paying money for a tremendous amount of water, let's say in a year where you have these peaks, if the incremental cost of supplying the water, you know, if you get more and more profit, in effect, goes to Met, for really substantial or very high amounts of water that are being delivered, so their incremental profits are going up as the amount of water is being delivered, might that -- if those -- if the record supported that, might that be a way in which somebody like L.A. is in fact, at least retrospectively paying for the cost of drought insurance?

MR. KEKER: No. In --

THE COURT: I don't know if any of this is supported by the record.

MR. KEKER: In the dry -- well, I think it's the opposite is supported by the record.

The way the volumetric rate works is that when you need the full capacity of the system, the three million acre-feet that is in storage, it's very expensive to hold and to keep, everybody pays for it equally that year.

And, but the costs of having it sitting there for that year is only paid by the people who are buying water in the years when that's not needed.

So, what you pay in the dry year is not picked up by all those -- you know, I'm paying for those reservoirs. The three million acre-feet just sit there for that drought storage in all the years that the peakers are getting water somewhere else, from their own groundwater, from the L.A. aqueduct and so on. And then in the year that we all need water and we're using the entire system capacity, we're all paying the same thing. So somebody's getting a raw deal here.

2.3

And the -- I don't know about the incremental profits. In the dry year, you're just running the system. I mean to take an extreme, you're running the system down to 0, you're using up all your storage and that watt -- I mean that's all being paid for and that -- you're either using it or you're not using it. The incremental cost of moving it is already taken into account in the power rate.

So I don't -- I mean there's no -- I think the record supports that this -- this benefit of knowing that you have enough water for the dry years is not picked up ever by the person who gets the benefit and it's paid for by the people who are less likely to get the benefit.

And unless everybody experiences peaking the same way, if everybody were average and everybody peaked and not peaked at the same time, if the lines of those service analysis. I mean, what does tier 2 mean when you don't even have to buy up your tier 1 quota in all those years? Where's the benefit and burden fall, and does the tiering help that at all?

Nobody's thought about it. Nobody's studied it. There's nothing in the record to support it. That's what Prop. 26th requires, says they have to do and so on.

And then finally, they point to this Capacity Charge and the readiness-to-serve charge that are things that could capture dry year peaking costs. This slide talks about the Capacity Charge. It is allocated based on member agencies' maximum summer day demand over the course of a 3-year period.

And our answer is so what? That isn't doing it. That doesn't recover any of the costs of acquiring water for use in dry years or building or maintaining these storage reservoirs.

They're talking about distribution capacity for the highest summer peak day and sizing the pipes according to that. That's not what we're talking about here. What we're talking about here is the cost of storing more than three billion acre-feet of water in anticipation of dry year demands.

So that's the Capacity Charge. Doesn't do it for them.

830 832

graph were all kind of on top of each other, then it wouldn't make any difference.

What we've shown, at least for Los Angeles, and maybe there's -- if you did it by an agency-by-agency basis, we'd find out that there were other people. A cost of service analysis would show that some member agencies get more benefit from this drought insurance in this supplemental system than others. That's all we're saying. And they've got to study it. And, you know, it's significant and it's not picked up.

And I'm about to go on -- now the other part of that is you said what about the tiered rate? Maybe? That would be what a cost of service analysis might do. Is there a way for a tiered rate to take into account something -- some part of this dry-year peaking? But -- and the answer is we don't know. I mean we don't know, for example, for Los Angeles, to get into tier 2, how much is it going to take for them to get into tier 2 and what difference is it going to make? The fact that they have a lot of water where they'll still be in tier one, but they don't even have to buy it in year one, two, three or four. They don't have to buy their tier 1 allocation.

How are these things set? That's what you would want to do if you were analyzing this on a cost of

What about the Readiness-to-Serve Charge? Met says that annual variations in water uses are reflected in the Readiness-to-Serve Charge. And let's think about that.

And there's the slide in which they said it. RTS recovers -- down at the bottom, it says if a member agency's water use goes up and down annually, that affects its RTS, Readiness-to-Serve Charge allocation for the next decade, so ten-year look back.

With respect to it, again, it's possible that some of Met's dry year peaking costs could be recovered there. But again, how would they know? They've never identified the specific costs associated with dry year peaking.

But, regardless, we know that from the record, that they are not recovering the full costs of standby storage through the Readiness-to-Serve Charge. We pointed this out in our case-in-chief.

Met simply ignored it. This is the engineer's report about a program to levy a Readiness-to-Serve Charge from March of 2012.

It's in the record or not in the record?

It's in the record, it's in the 2012 record.

And if you look at page 16807, Mr. Purcell showed you this before. Could we blow up just the

highlighted part so it's easier to read, Jeff?

1.3

2.2

2.3

As noted above, Metropolitan levies the RTS charge on its member agencies to recover a portion of the debt service on bonds issued to finance capital facilities needed to meet existing demands on Metropolitan's system. The estimated potential benefits that could be paid by an RTS charge in fiscal year so and so were, I can't read it, 322 million as shown in table

Although the RTS charge could be set to recover the entire potential benefit amount, the general manager is recommending that the RTS charge only recover a portion of the total potential benefit.

Now, remember the total beneficial amount is 322 million. The general manager for fiscal year 2012 is recommending that the amount of total potential benefit to be recovered by the RTS charge fall in the range of 142 to 146 million. So the general manager is suggesting that the RTS charge cover less than half of the cost of this standby storage.

So, to the extent that any part of this is recovering dry year peaking costs, less than -- it's less than half of the RTS.

But the other failure, the more important failure of the Readiness-to-Serve Charge --

it's negative. It's based on a ten-year rolling average. That's all it's recovering.

The average doesn't account for peaks, it smooths them out. And I have a demonstrative to show that. This is just a made up chart but the made up chart shows that two member agencies with peaking profiles that you see up there would have -- if you do the math and figure it out, they have exactly the same ten-year average. And that's -- this is the problem of the statistician who drowned walking through a river, the average depth of which is three feet.

They -- the Readiness-to-Serve Charge based on a ten-year average smooths out and ignores, or it doesn't take into account the differences between those two profiles, which we say are significant in terms of cost and burden. And that's why we put up this demonstrative exhibit, something your Honor can I'm sure figure out for himself.

So you can vary -- I mean in this example, you've got one that's going up, one year they're down, they're buying 200 million acre-feet, the other they're going up to 700 million acre-feet. The other guy is sort of bouncing along sort of close to 400 million acre-feet but somehow they end up with the same ten-year average and the same Readiness-to-Serve Charge. That's not

THE COURT: Excuse me. Do you think the standby storage, in your view, is that equivalent to the dry year peaking costs? No, it couldn't. It's not the same thing in your view?

MR. KEKER: It's not the same thing, but it includes it. And less than half of it is --

THE COURT: Right. Which includes which?
MR. KEKER: I think the -- they classify some
of it as emergency storage. They -- and then some of it
is dry year storage. And we don't know, based on the
record that's before us and the analysis that they
haven't done, how that breaks out. The answer is we
don't know.

And that's really -- the big answer here is dry year peaking is a real thing, it exists, and they've got to study it. That's -- that's our bottom line.

And then our sub bottom line, subpart is what I'm talking about now, which is these -- these answers that they have about oh, we must be picking up some of it someplace aren't good enough answers to get them out, having to study it and apply it correctly under costs of service analysis as required by the law.

So, but a bigger failure is that the Readiness-to-Serve Charge is based on -- they make a point that this is positive. We want to point out that taking into account dry year peaking.

Met hasn't pointed to any substantial evidence, much less met its burden under Prop. 26 that establishes its rates allocate dry year peaking costs to the payors who cause Met to incur those costs and benefit from the availability of dry year supplies and storage.

So to sum up, your Honor, Met argues that because its staff and consultants bless its rates, each round of rate setting, that therefore its rate setting should get some respect. But the record shows that Met's decision in the records that we've been talking about doesn't involve judgment. Instead, it's a process that's basically a shell game that implements an illegal decision.

They were obligated to answer a question that was -- to ask the question required by the law, what are the costs actually caused by wheeling, by moving non-project water through Met's system and how can we recover those costs and still facilitate wheeling as required by the Water Code, and they were required to implement the answer to that.

It never even tried to do that. Instead, they came up with an arbitrary answer which was loading all the transportation costs and the DWR bill and 100 percent of the conservation programs on to its transportation

rates in order to satisfy the San Pedro, the hold harmless principle, the no injury principle and keep its rates stable.

1.0

2.4

That's the original sin in this case. All of the tables and schedules showing functionalization and classification are just Met's implementation of that arbitrary decision. They don't add any legitimacy because Met preordained the answer.

The record shows that Met's System Access Rate, its Water Stewardship Rate, its System Power Rate and its wheeling rate are all illegal as a result.

You asked a question at the end of a presentation this morning about wheeled water -- is wheeled water related to the exchange agreement or are you saying that that's not wheeled water?

Our position in this case is that that's for the next case. I mean our position is going to be yes, because the way we worked that out. I mean, and what the contract was meant to mean, that is wheeled water and that's how you should interpret that provision of the contract.

But you don't need to decide that in this case. What you need to decide, we believe, and what we're asking you to decide is that the System Access Rate, the Water Stewardship Rate, the System Power Rate as Met has designation issue, that plaintiffs have identified a number of additional PTX's.

We are designating as DTX-709 the deposition designations for Scott Slater. These are the ones that were previously filed with the Court so that your Honor has both our designations and San Diego's objections. Once the Court rules, then we would include those in DTX-709.

And likewise, DTX-710 are the deposition designations for Dennis Cushman that have been previously filed. And the Court has before it both our deposition designations and plaintiff's objections. And then to the extent that the Court allows in testimony for either of them, then also our DTX that they were referring to in that deposition testimony, which are also in the parties' stipulation, we would move in as well. So I wanted to add those additional DTX numbers.

THE COURT: Any objection to 709 and 710 under the same conditions as the others were admitted?

MR. BRAUNIG: Subject to preserving all of our objections and following the same approach your Honor took with respect to our designations, no, we have no objection.

THE COURT: All right. So 709 and 710 are admitted subject to further rulings on specific

formulated them for the years in question, from 2011 to 2014, are all illegal and need to be redone in -- according to costs of service principles in accord with Prop. 26, Prop. 13, the wheeling statutes and the various statutory provisions.

And that's what we'll be asking for in our brief.

THE COURT: Thank you. MR. KEKER: Thank you.

MR. HIXSON: If plaintiffs are done with the rebuttal, we have auto few brief comments.

THE COURT: I appreciate it.

MR. HIXSON: The parties agreed not to present closing arguments today and so, I'm not going to do a full rebuttal to Mr. Keker presentation.

Just now, Met has presented a substantial amount of evidence and a lot of argument to the Court during the course of this proceeding and we will address these points further in our post-trial briefing. And then in argument before the Court on January 23rd, including the various legal and factual points that have been raised today. So I'm not going to do a counter presentation based on the administrative record at this time.

I did want to address that the deposition

objections.

(Whereupon Exhibit PTX-709 and PTX-710 were admitted into Evidence.)

THE CLERK: Could you tell me the name of 709 again?

THE COURT: Sure. Scott Slater, S-L-A-T-E-R. MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's fine.

I don't have anything to add in terms of evidence beyond that. I did want, and I think both parties want to discuss with the Court how we have brought trial exhibits that have been admitted into evidence to provide to your Honor and to the clerk so they can be made formally a part of the record and then you physically have them.

THE COURT: They're here in the courtroom, I take it.

MR. BRAUNIG: Yes, your Honor. I think ours are here.

MR. HIXSON: Ours are here except we will also add 709 and 710.

THE COURT: I don't know what to say, except to put them in a box and leave them here.

MR. HIXSON: But we have more than one box, your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, dear. Say it's not so.

To the extent that you've got electronic versions of documents, that would be welcome.

2.2

2.5

2.3

So I think the record has already been -- the AR, what I've been thinking of as the administrative record, I think that's already been done.

The deposition extracts that we've talked about today, the designations, those should be in a separate box, clearly labeled because I want to get to those as soon as I can.

You should not assume that I will finish reviewing the objections. I don't know how many there are but you should not assume that I will finish reviewing them before you start drafting your briefs that are due on the 23rd. I may or may not.

And I think -- just to be practical about it, I think you're just going to have to use what you think you need from those depositions and throw it in there and hope that I don't exclude it.

That's a frustrating way to proceed, but I think we're going to have to do this on parallel as when I go through it as time permits and you get working on the briefs so that we can get this done as expeditiously as possible.

MR. HIXSON: That's fine. Just to clarify, I think the briefs are due on the 17th of January.

take home originals, if that's what you've got in the courtroom, the working copy is something I can use, mark up and throw away when I'm done. And you will have the originals. I mean that's what we normally do in a normal trial. I'm not sure the difference between originals and copies is highly meaningful.

But, do you have multiple versions of the same thing here in the courtroom?

MR. HIXSON: We do, your Honor. We are going to provide your Honor with a complete set of the DTXs that were admitted and provide San Diego with them.

MR. BRAUNIG: Maybe what your Honor is looking for is a version that's the official court version and the version that's a working version for yourself?

THE COURT: I personally only need the working version. So I don't need the originals of anything. And in fact, the parties might want to stipulate on the record that the proponents of the exhibits, the originals, will be holding on to them for example for purposes of appeal.

Is that all right? MR. HIXSON: Yes.

MR. BRAUNIG: That is all right, yes.

THE COURT: And so what you should do then is remove the originals, don't let me touch them, and just

THE COURT: I see. January 17th, that's right, and the 23rd is for the argument.

MR. HIXSON: Do you want us to file and serve through Lexus Nexus the trial exhibits? We weren't planning to but we want to ask the Court's preference.

THE COURT: I'm not sure it's going to -except for the fact that it transmutes them into
electronic files, I'm not sure that's going to help. But
I know that people run into problems with voluminous
documents when you try and file and serve those things.

So, if you're satisfied that it's in the record and the Court of Appeal will have access to it, I don't think you need to have any further filings of it. But again, if you have CD-ROMs that are searchable, that can be helpful.

Also, it will probably be helpful to forward to me, after you have consulted with the court reporters, a transcript of the trial. It's especially useful for me as I go through it. I have my notes, but I can really clearly see the positions that the people are taking on individual issues and it provides a good roadmap for me.

Are there -- if there are copies of exhibits as opposed to original exhibits, I don't need -- I don't need more than one copy of anything.

So, if you leave a working copy here and you

provide me with working copies that I can destroy when I'm done.

I phrase it that way to make it clear whatever you give to me, you will never see again.

But again, the deposition transcripts should be in paper format, I'm sure they already are, so that I can physically move through the pages. And if you could leave those there in a way that the clerk knows exactly where they are, I can get it working on that.

MR. KEKER: I believe those are them on the table.

MR. HIXSON: Yeah.

THE COURT: Make sure you both stare at that pile and it is the pile that I need, including the ones that Metropolitan has just referred to. Are they in here?

MR. HIXSON: They are as well. We will also submit to you DTX numbers but they are already there and you will have them.

THE COURT: Perfect, perfect.

Anything else you would like to do at this particular juncture?

MR. KEKER: We both have extra time, your Honor. If you would like us to just talk some more, we can.

Pages 842 to 845

```
1
             THE COURT: I have to tell you that I enjoyed
 2
       working with these two firms just enormously. This is
 3
       one of the great pleasures of this department, is working
 4
       with people of nationwide caliber.
 5
              So if you have more to say, you can or you can
 6
       reserve your time for the 23rd.
             MR. KEKER: We'll reserve, your Honor.
 8
             MR. HIXSON: Thank you, your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: Thank you so much.
10
             MR. KEKER: Thank you.
11
             MR. PURCELL: Thank you.
12
                 (Proceedings concluded.)
13
                      ---000----
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
2.5
                                                         846
 1
        State of California )
                      ) Ss.
 2
        County of San Francisco )
 3
 4
              I, Connie J. Parchman, CSR #6137, do hereby
 6
        certify that I am a certified shorthand reporter; that I
 7
        was personally present in the above-mentioned
 8
        proceedings; that I took down in shorthand the
 9
        proceedings and thereafter transcribed said notes into
10
        longhand; that the forgoing pages constitute a full, true
11
        and correct transcript of the said notes in said
12
        proceedings; and that I have no interest in the outcome
13
        of the case.
14
15
              Dated: December 24, 2013
16
17
18
19
20
                    Connie J. Parchman, CSR 6137
21
22
23
24
25
                                                         847
```

· A
\$287 794:14 796:18
\$30 819:23
\$600 819:22
A-R-A-K-A-W-A
781:1
A-R-N-O-U-T 781:13 A.M 759:20
able 765:16 780:5
824:19,21
above-mentioned
847:7
absolute 820:20
absolutely 776:20
799:15 807:15
abundance 774:23
accept 772:19
access 807:17 808:1,12
809:19,24 826:1,8,11
826:18 838:9,24 843:12
accommodated 778:15
accord 839:3
account 799:12 824:17
825:9,12 830:17
831:14 836:3,14
837:1
accounting 827:9
accurate 776:4 779:1,4
achieve 790:21
acknowledge 826:13 acquiring 832:15
acre-feet 785:17,19
787:23 788:1,6,11,12
788:15,19,24 790:18
791:5,7 793:1 818:20
818:20,23 819:6,13
819:14,17,20 820:11
820:13 824:20 829:20
830:3 832:22 836:21
836:22,23
acre-foot 787:3 819:22
Action 753:7 754:21,24
755:10,12,13,17
756:22 actual 766:8,10 803:20
803:23
add 793:20 838:7
840:17 841:8,20
added 795:22
adding 802:10
addition 758:19
additional 787:7
790:14 797:17 815:14
815:19 840:2,17
address 792:9 793:8
794:21 839:18,25 addressed 793:10
audiesseu /93.10

```
817:10
addresses 777:8
adequate 828:3
Adjudication 757:2
adjusting 809:23
administrative 759:6
  767:24 768:1 774:15
  792:3 795:23.24
  803:21 807:14,16
  808:7,19 809:15
  810:1 813:10 814:3
  839:23 842:4
admissibility 784:1
admissible 773:4 783:3
admissions 772:22
  805:9
admit 771:6
admitted 758:20
  761:24 763:22,24
  771:11 773:11,12
  775:11 778:9 779:11
  779:23,24 780:13
  781:24 782:1 784:10
  784:13 791:22,23
  825:17,18 826:9
  840:19,25 841:2,11
  844:11
admitting 783:25
adopt 798:7
adopted 765:9 806:9
  807:7 808:6 810:12
Advance 754:8
agencies 766:6 768:2
  786:14,18,24 792:24
  801:8 804:5,6,7,8
  810:11 812:12,13
  820:19 821:12,18,19
  822:6 824:2,19 826:2
  827:4,10 828:7 831:7
  832:12 834:3 836:6
agency 753:16 754:5
  765:5 786:10 790:15
  800:20 801:13 810:2
  818:7,9 820:11 825:9
  825:13
agency's 827:11 833:7
agency-by-agency
  831:4
ago 792:2
agree 808:18
agreed 759:1,4 765:3
  776:12 839:13
agreement 753:5,6,8,9
  753:11,12 754:7,8,9
  754:11,13,15,16,17
  754:19,20,22,23
  755:6,6,8,8,11,14,18
```

755:20,21,21,24,24

```
756:4,17,18,19,21
  759:16 761:9,13,15
  764:22 765:3,11,15
  766:10,12 767:9
  768:8,9,19,20,25
  769:3,7,7,11,13,22,23
  770:3,7,9,10,15,17,21
  771:2.7.9 772:6.12
  786:3 809:1 838:14
Agreement's 770:6
agreements 756:24
  767:15,21 768:3,12
  768:13,24 769:4,5
  770:13,22 785:22
  786:2,13,17,23,25
  787:1,1 808:24,24
ahead 783:11 784:22
air 818:12
Alameda 751:13
albeit 818:3
ALESHIRE 752:2
allocate 795:17 813:3
  837:4
allocated 832:11
allocating 801:12
allocation 769:9 770:21
  797:2,20 816:11
  831:23 833:8
allow 768:15
allows 772:14 840:13
alternative 816:11
alternatives 816:10
amazing 827:1
Amend 756:11
Amended 753:6
Amendment 753:22
  754:11,14,18 755:7
  755:19,20 756:7,9,12
  756:14,15,20
amount 763:17 765:4
  765:15 768:14 775:16
  775:19 778:8 779:2
  786:10 788:5 793:23
  827:10,12 829:2,3,9
  834:11,14,16 839:17
amounts 829:7
analysis 804:20 807:4
  816:12 824:8 827:20
  827:24 831:6,13
  832:1 835:11,22
analytic 801:10
analyzing 831:25
and/or 760:19 814:20
Angeles 751:14 817:23
  818:18 819:2,12
  820:19,24 821:22
  822:7 823:5,23 824:1
  827:5 831:3,17
```

```
annual 794:17 817:2
  825:9,13 833:2
annually 833:7
answer 766:15 800:19
  809:13 831:16 832:14
  835:12,14 837:15,21
  837:23 838:8
answered 809:11 825:6
answering 759:13
answers 835:18,20
anticipation 832:23
anybody 817:5
AO-5059 756:4
AO5146 755:9
apologize 791:15
apparent 812:10,18
appeal 843:12 844:20
appealed 811:24
appear 775:13 823:14
APPEARANCES
  751:1
appears 775:15
Appellants 757:3
appellate 772:9
application 767:25
  772:6,12
applies 766:20 768:2
  807:21 827:23
apply 771:24 835:21
appreciate 760:10
  775:1 839:12
approach 760:9 776:21
  801:18 816:11 840:21
appropriate 780:20
  792:15 797:2 798:2,8
  798:15 811:9,17
approval 759:3
approved 782:2
approximately 819:14
  819:20
aqueduct 789:12,16
  796:16 805:15 806:4
  818:18 830:6
AR 792:10 794:6 842:4
AR2012 796:12
Arakawa 781:1
arbitrarily 816:9
arbitrary 806:7 807:1
  816:14 837:23 838:7
area 789:25
areas 815:5
argue 778:6 820:1
  821:24 827:8
argues 837:7
arguing 812:24
argument 759:10
  761:10 776:16 811:8
```

811:20 823:19,19

824:10,13 825:20 826:5 827:19 839:17 839:20 843:2 argument's 824:15 arguments 759:7 762:6 825:21 839:14 arises 820:17 **Arnout** 781:13 asked 774:10 801:25 820:23 821:1,4 838:12 asking 759:10 824:7 838:24 839:6 assembly 804:1 assert 825:14 asserted 772:25 asserting 773:2 assertion 792:11 794:20 assist 813:19 814:8 associated 789:20 827:16 833:13 **ASSOCIATES** 750:22 **Association** 799:10 assume 770:2 842:10 842:12 assumed 788:19 attention 768:22 785:7 787:8,14 attorney-created 823:14 **AUDREY** 751:7 authenticated 779:17 781:17 authenticity 773:1 **Authority** 750:6 764:23 765:6 768:17 772:4 789:15.18 auto 839:11 availability 837:6 available 769:2 774:18 790:15 819:23 825:19 **Avenue** 752:2 average 820:7 821:5,15 821:23 822:1,3,4,9,10 823:1,3 830:24 836:1 836:3,9,11,13,24 avoid 774:19 804:4 813:20,22 814:9 aways 765:19

В

B-E-R-G 781:14 B-R-G 781:14 B-R-I-A-N 781:8 back 781:22 786:20 788:22 794:8 796:6 796:19 802:4 803:6

-
809:21 810:14 813:2
816:3 817:13 818:17
818:17 821:6 822:24
828:12 833:9
backed 827:19 828:2
band 820:4
bank 777:16,17,23
778:24
Barbara 755:3 760:17
762:4 764:20,25
765:12,13,21 766:1
767:7
base 827:10,12
based 772:21 780:15,15
783:14 832:11 835:10
835:24 836:1,12
839:23
baseline 820:21 821:3,5
821:15,25 822:2
823:1,2
basically 778:11 798:14
806:16 837:13
basis 772:18 804:7
831:5
Battery 750:24 751:3
Bay 804:21
bears 816:18
Dears 810.18
BEATTY 751:15
began 800:5 15
began 800:5,15
beginning 798:24
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6 Berg 781:13 Bernardino 755:11
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6 Berg 781:13 Bernardino 755:11 best 779:9 806:10
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6 Berg 781:13 Bernardino 755:11 best 779:9 806:10 BETTY 751:15
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6 Berg 781:13 Bernardino 755:11 best 779:9 806:10
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6 Berg 781:13 Bernardino 755:11 best 779:9 806:10 BETTY 751:15 beyond 841:9
beginning 798:24 799:18 803:15 behalf 765:18 768:2 behavior 823:24 believe 759:15 761:14 763:16 766:7 767:5 776:3,5 777:7 778:2,7 779:17 791:4 803:3 814:23 838:23 845:10 belong 825:4 beneficial 834:14 benefit 792:25 812:21 812:23,24 813:13,16 815:8 816:12 824:18 824:22 825:2 830:19 830:21,22 831:7 832:3 834:11,13,16 837:5 benefits 792:21 812:15 812:16 814:18 817:22 824:2,16 825:18 834:6 Berg 781:13 Bernardino 755:11 best 779:9 806:10 BETTY 751:15

813:24 835:14 bigger 835:23 bill 794:4,22 799:19 811:12,15 837:24 billion 832:22 bills 798:10,25 802:2,7 **binder** 760:6.8 762:2 764:19 768:4 774:25 785.8 **BINGHAM** 751:9 bit 785:24 815:16 bless 837:8 **blow** 760:25 764:25 765:21 766:1 767:7 787:17 788:23 789:8 796:11 833:25 board 753:7,13,15,19 754:6,20,24 755:9,12 755:13,17,25 756:22 756:23 801:16 803:23 **Bob** 813:25 bond 819:7,9 bonds 834:4 **bother** 792:8 **bottom** 787:17 788:7,9 789:1 790:4,6 805:25 815:10 827:11 833:6 835:16,17 **bought** 785:18 **bouncing** 836:23 box 841:22,23 842:8 **Braunig** 751:6 773:23 774:2,3 775:6 777:1 778:19,21 779:14,25 780:10,22,24 781:25 782:18 783:16,20 784:15 822:17 840:20 841:17 844:12.23 break 811:1 825:15 breakdown 799:4 breaks 835:12 **Brian** 781:8 802:17 brief 756:25 757:4 759:12 760:1 771:20 771:23 772:3,10,18 779:12 785:2 790:11 792:1 795:14,15,25 801:3 810:18 811:1 823:20 839:7,11 **briefing** 791:25 839:19 **briefly** 782:19 783:12 785:7 811:5 briefs 758:11,14 759:7 759:8 766:17 767:6 771:17 778:6 795:22 806:11 842:13,22,25 **Bring** 758:23 brings 805:18 806:2

BRINTON 751:15 broad 768:12 broken 777:21 796:19 **brought** 841:11 **BROWN** 750:22 **brush** 818:12 **building** 832:16 burden 825:3 832:3 836.16 837.3 **burdens** 824:16 Bureau 753:24 **buv** 800:20 802:25 819:12,24 826:2 827:3,10 831:21,22 832:2 **buver** 799:3 buying 799:5 822:8,9 826:24 828:9 829:24 836:21 buys 805:21

 \mathbf{C} C 751:11,15 758:2 814:17 C0634293 757:4 **CA** 751:4,10,14,18 752:3 Cal.App.4th 768:21 calculated 808:3 809:21 calculating 807:12 calculation 777:24 809:19 calendar 827:12 caliber 846:4 California 750:1,9,24 751:13 764:23 772:21 790:12 806:17 809:8 847:1 call 798:8 800:5,9,9 806:7 828:20 called 802:17 814:21 Calleguas 786:20 calling 800:19 calls 787:5 808:25 **Campbell** 813:25 canal 790:5 capacity 766:4,12 787:3 788:4 789:22 812:22 815:15 827:17 829:19 830:8 832:8 832:11,18,24 capital 813:21 814:10 834:4 **capture** 832:10 care 758:23 773:1

carved 796:17 case 750:6,7 757:4 768:25 769:23 771:5 771:21 774:14,22 784:22 785:16 792:5 811:6 815:20 838:4 838:16,17,22 847:13 case-in-chief 833:18 cases 768:20 770:25 772:5,10 categories 793:17 categorize 796:24 categorized 795:2 category 777:5,17 779:7 817:10 causation 799:11 806.20 cause 837:5 caused 800:16 837:17 **caution** 774:23 caveat 808:17 CD-ROMs 843:14 **Center** 751:9 certain 765:3 767:20 827:10 certainly 764:8 776:3 certified 750:20 847:6 certify 847:6 CFO 802:18 challenging 808:7 **chance** 776:11 782:6 change 793:22 796:23 800:16,17 810:3 changed 795:20 797:3 800:15 **changes** 797:6,13 **charge** 794:4 795:1,1 797:4 800:8,25 811:9 832:9,9,11,24 833:1,3 833:8,17,21 834:3,7 834:10,12,17,19,25 835:24 836:12,25 charged 794:2 **charges** 794:25 798:25 804:25 807:19 825:12 charging 800:25 802:11,12 816:6 chart 790:9 821:17,21 822:3 836:5.5 **CHATTERJEE** 751:19 **choice** 804:19 circle 778:11 cite 795:19 801:3 818:15 cited 776:12 795:13,15 795:16,25 803:22 813:6,9,14 815:8

CITY 751:20

claim 823:25 825:5,12 **claimed** 800:14 803:10 claiming 811:13 clarification 767:19 770:23 **clarify** 842:24 classification 797:19 838:6 classified 793:25 798:21 classifies 794:25 classify 835:8 clear 768:10 783:18 785:16 793:14 795:11 796:9 803:25 817:1 826:4 845:3 clearly 842:8 843:20 clerk 822:20 841:4,12 845:8 close 801:15 836:23 **closed** 780:4 closing 810:18 839:14 clothing 759:7 **clutter** 785:24 code 767:24 768:1 772:21 774:16 777:8 807:16 808:8,19,21 809:3,15 837:20 colleague 771:14 collect 806:21.22 collected 812:11 collection 768:6 collectively 815:12 **COLLIN 751:11** Colorado 768:15 769:15 789:5,12,15 790:2 796:16 798:22 805:15,17 806:3,4 column 777:13,13,14 777:19 **columns** 796:20 combination 816:22 Combined 757:3 come 759:9 782:23 788:19 803:7,12 817:8 828:12 **coming** 783:4 comments 839:11 Commissioners 799:11 commitment 802:25 commitments 802:24 803:4 commodity 771:25 799:3 common 801:24 813:7 communication 807:2 compared 820:25 821:16

799:4 825:8,22

carryover 775:7

comparison 820:21
compensation 804:24
complaining 817:13
complete 769:24
844:10
completely 795:14
807:1 810:3 815:20
816:13
completeness 769:19
compliance 809:8
complies 810:2
comply 807:24,25
809:2
component 826:18
components 807:8
computed 808:14
computes 794:14
conceivable 827:14,15
concept 817:7
concerning 771:23
777:11 813:14
concerns 759:14
concluded 846:12
conclusion 798:6,7
821:10
condemned 811:20
condition 769:9,9
conditionally 782:3
conditions 769:8
770:19,20 818:21
840:19
conduct 816:12
confer 780:19 782:7,10
782:15,25
conferred 782:12
conferring 780:14
confirmed 813:15
conflict 806:16
confused 822:20
connecting 823:13
connection 758:11
774:24 781:15 782:1
Connections 756:3
Connie 750:19 752:8
847:5,20
conservation 792:19
811:11,16,25 812:2,5
812:20 815:3,11,17
818:8 837:25
conserved 769:1
770:12 771:4
consider 777:10
considered 772:24
773:4 807:11
considering 812:15
824:18
constituents 806:13 constitute 768:7 769:4
Constitute /08./ /09:4
-

```
769:6 847:10
constraint 801:12
construct 800:23
consultants 798:3
  837:8
consulted 843:17
cont 754:1 755:1 756:1
containing 774:25
contemplated 766:9,11
  801:6
contending 772:5
content 778:6
contents 764:15
contested 785:14
continue 776:15
continued 767:10
continuity 799:17
contract 753:17,21,23
  754:12,14 756:5,8,9
  756:11,13,14,16
  766:22,23 809:7
  838:19,21
contractors 775:21
  777:21 778:13 786:15
contribute 804:6
convey 800:21
conveyance 799:1,21
  800:14 802:7 803:10
  805:2,3,4,5,6,13,14
  805:19 806:5 808:6
  810:8 814:23 818:3
  826:16
conveying 808:22
Coop 753:8
copies 843:22 844:6
  845:1
copy 774:8,20,24 776:8
  776:23 779:18 843:24
  843:25 844:2
correct 759:17 774:20
  785:10 791:19 809:17
  809:17 847:11
corrected 793:5
correctly 835:21
corrects 760:23
corresponds 819:19
cost 789:20 790:13
  792:19 797:19,20
  798:22 799:2,4,11
  800:1 801:9 802:24
  804:20 806:20 807:3
  807:22 808:5 809:23
  810:16 811:17,21
  814:10 815:23 816:4
  816:12,18 824:7
  825:15 827:24 828:14
  828:18 829:4,12
  830:16 831:6,13,25
```

832:21 834:19 836:15 costs 789:19 792:16,24 793:9,10,11,13,17,19 793:20,21,24 794:15 794:17,21 795:2,17 796:25 798:21 799:18 799:20,21,24,25 800:5.14 801:5.12 802:6,7,19 803:10,11 804:7,10,11,11 805:4 805:20 806:7,8,23,24 807:1 809:25 810:8 813:4 816:5,5,7 825:4 825:25 826:12,16,17 827:16,21,23 828:19 829:23 832:10,15 833:11,13,16 834:22 835:3,21 837:4,5,17 837:19,24 839:3 counsel 751:1 760:4,23 762:7 770:24 774:7 778:5 780:14 counsel's 761:10 count 824:19 **counter** 839:22 counts 816:24 County 750:2,6 752:1 755:4,5 764:23 765:5 768:16 772:4 789:14 789:17 847:2 County/Santa 755:3 couple 765:19 773:21 779:14 785:4 786:18 786:19 790:22 811:12 course 812:5 819:16 832:13 839:18 court 750:1 758:4,7,18 758:23 759:20,24 760:10,19 761:24 763:2,6,10,14,21 764:7,13 766:14 767:2,16,18 769:12 769:18 770:1,14 771:6,15,17 772:2,8 772:13,14,19 773:10 773:18 774:1,9,10,17 774:21,23,25 775:1,5 776:6,10,18,22 777:2 777:9 778:10,20 779:9,23 780:9,13,21 780:23 781:23 782:12 782:15 783:1,10,11 783:19,24 784:7,10 784:18,24 785:23 791:11,13,18,20,22 798:7 799:13 806:9 807:5,20 808:9,15 809:13 810:19,22,25

811:2 812:1 817:5,15 817:19 822:21 823:9 823:17 828:1,16 829:1,14 835:1,7 839:8,12,17,20 840:5 840:7,11,13,18,24 841:6,10,15,21,25 843:1,6,12,17 844:13 844:15,24 845:13,20 846:1.9 Court's 758:8 768:22 787:14 843:5 CourtCall 751:15,20 751:22 752:4 courtesy 774:8 courtroom 841:15 844:2,8 cover 834:19 covered 760:3 767:13 777:7 816:23 **CPF-10-510830** 750:6 **CPF-12-512466** 750:7 **CRA** 794:15 created 788:25 821:15 creating 792:21 criteria 754:15 critical 815:11 criticism 821:13 criticized 821:2,2 **Cross-Respondents** 757:4 CSR 750:19 752:8 847:5,20 **current** 801:24 **CURTIS** 750:3 Cushman 785:21 786:7 787:6 840:10 **Cushman's** 761:11 762:7 785:15 cut 785:23 **CVWD/MWD** 754:16 Cyclic 755:19,21 D

D
D 758:2
D-E-N 781:14
D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A
781:11
DAN 751:6
DANIEL 751:5
data 821:7,7 823:13
date 762:18 765:7
Dated 847:15
dates 786:3
day 771:16 817:3
832:12,19
days 792:2
deal 795:4,12 806:23

813:25 817:24 824:7 825:21 830:9 **dealing** 770:18 dear 841:25 **debt** 834:4 **decade** 833:9 decades 762:13 763:19 787:1 **December** 750:14 758:1,8 793:6,15 794:20 795:16 797:4 797:9 799:9 801:20 847:15 decide 783:3 838:22,23 838:24 decided 802:5 decision 792:18 806:7 807:2 813:3 837:11 837:14 838:7 decrease 815:3 **defect** 796:4 Defendant 750:10 751:8 defendant's 760:12 761:22 762:2,17,25 763:13 764:3,4,21 768:6,23 defer 813:20,22 814:10 815:1 deferring 815:15 **define** 768:14 770:8 defined 770:13 771:8 804:25 defines 768:23 769:1 770:12 807:7 definition 768:18 770:11 771:4 definitions 769:24 **degree** 818:6 del 756:25 771:21 **deliver** 805:19 **delivered** 778:1 785:13 785:13 789:12,16,24 829:8,9 **deliveries** 761:1.8.8 775:18 787:2 818:19 823:3 delivers 805:22 delivery 754:8,10 756:6 756:8,10,12,13,15,16 756:20,21 761:13 770:20 788:5 **Delta** 794:4 795:1 798:25 demand 792:5 812:23

813:15 814:18 815:12

818:8 819:21 820:17

815:17 817:2,3,3

022.12	764 22 765 5 10 15	002.21.012.11.015.6	DEN 150 752 22	DEN 445 55 (44
832:12	764:23 765:5,10,15	803:21 813:11 815:6	DTX-158 753:22	DTX-217 756:23
demands 789:25 816:5	766:19 768:16 769:2	819:8,15	DTX-159 753:23	DTX-218 753:3 761:24
832:23 834:5	771:20,23 772:4,7,10	document's 823:15	DTX-160 753:24	761:25 785:9
demonstrative 762:5	774:3 776:23 785:13	documents 758:16	DTX-161 754:3	DTX-23 801:3
762:11,17,24 764:2,6	786:8,21 789:14,17	760:2,6 762:11,15,20	DTX-162 754:4	DTX-269 756:24
767:22 776:13 786:2	817:23 820:6,25	763:18 768:7,7,19	DTX-163 754:5	771:11
822:16 823:16 836:4	821:12,21 822:5	769:6,7 773:21	DTX-164 754:6	DTX-28 753:4
836:16	823:7,18 824:2,3,4,11	775:11,14 777:3	DTX-165 754:7	DTX-51 753:5
demonstratives 823:13	844:11 Diagram 760:10 770:10	778:3 781:16,25	DTX-166 754:9	DTX-53 756:24 771:19
Den 781:13	Diego's 769:10 770:19 773:17 777:4 785:18	782:20,23 791:3,3 813:9,14 818:15	DTX-167 754:10 DTX-168 754:11	771:20 772:20 773:10
Denham 826:21	786:9 813:25 817:13	819:7,9 823:15 842:2		DTX-655 757:3 772:9
Denham's 820:22 Dennis 840:10	840:6	843:10	DTX-169 754:12 DTX-170 754:14	772:20 773:10 DTX-708 763:4 786:2
deny 779:10	difference 778:16	doing 783:10 799:7	DTX-170 754:14 DTX-171 754:15	DTX-709 840:3,8
denying 827:14	820:9,18 821:23	804:14 807:3 832:14	DTX-171 754.15 DTX-172 754:16	DTX-710 840:9
department 750:4	831:2,19 844:5	dollar 766:23 787:2	DTX-172 754:10 DTX-173 754:17	DTX-710 840.9 DTX-72 753:7
776:1 846:3	differences 823:5	828:5	DTX-174 754:18	DTX-78 757:1 772:3,20
dependence 815:4	836:14	dollars 766:18 820:15	DTX-175 754:19	773:10
depo 780:1 783:13,24	different 777:15 779:20	doubled 801:17	DTX-176 754:20	DTXs 844:10
784:5,20	789:2,11 790:2,23	doubt 821:17	DTX-170 754:20 DTX-177 754:21	due 759:8 801:9 805:20
deposition 750:23	796:20 800:5 821:11	dozen 786:16	DTX-178 754:23	818:21 842:14,25
780:12,25 781:3,6,8	821:16,19	draft 798:16	DTX-179 754:24	dump 785:23
781:10,13 782:1,20	direct 768:22 785:6	drafting 842:13	DTX-180 754:25	DWR 753:21,24 792:17
839:25 840:3,9,11,15	787:8,14 797:24	drop 782:7	DTX-181 755:3	794:4 798:10,24
842:6 845:5	directly 826:7	drought 793:1 819:5	DTX-182 755:4	799:19 800:14 802:1
depositions 780:2,21	disagree 809:3	825:19 827:5 828:21	DTX-183 755:6	802:6,11 803:10
781:15,18 782:13	discouraged 802:19	829:12 830:4 831:7	DTX-184 755:7	837:24
842:17	discuss 764:18 770:3,4	drowned 836:10	DTX-185 755:8	DWR/CVWD 754:12
depth 836:11	841:10	dry 790:13,14,18,24	DTX-186 755:9	DWR/MWD 754:14
desalination 784:20	discussion 789:10	791:6 792:24 793:1	DTX-187 755:10	DWR/MWD/Antelope
788:16,20 792:20	disproportionate 812:1	809:25 816:21,24	DTX-188 755:12	755:5
812:21	dispute 777:10 783:12	817:1,2,7,25 818:18	DTX-189 755:13	DWR/MWD/Kern
Description 753:2	785:19 797:23 800:12	818:23 819:17,19,24	DTX-190 755:14	755:3
754:2 755:2 756:2	818:11	820:16 821:18 823:25	DTX-191 755:15	
Desert 753:16,18 754:5	disputed 804:15,18	824:3,13,20 825:16	DTX-192 755:16	E
754:13	distinction 767:3,3	825:24 826:2,5,17,21	DTX-193 755:17	E 750:3 758:2,2
designated 795:24	distinguish 801:19	827:17,21,23 829:16	DTX-194 755:18	e-mail 826:25
designating 840:3	distinguished 801:21	830:1,11,20 832:10	DTX-195 755:19	e-mails 797:25
designation 840:1	distributed 812:13	832:16,23 833:11,13	DTX-196 755:20	earlier 764:2 774:22
designations 780:1,1,6	distribution 812:16	834:22 835:3,10,14	DTX-197 755:21	794:23 815:21
780:12,25 781:7,12	832:18	837:1,4,6	DTX-198 755:22	easier 834:1
782:2,10 783:13,25	District 750:9 751:8,13	dry-year 831:15	DTX-199 755:23	easing 788:4
784:2,5,20 840:4,6,10	751:21 752:1 764:22	DSM 816:5,7	DTX-200 755:23	effect 817:9 828:20
840:12,22 842:7	764:24 765:5 772:5	DTX 840:14,17 845:18	DTX-201 755:24	829:6
destabilized 810:14	789:14 811:24	DTX-143 753:8	DTX-203 755:25	efficient 814:11 eight 787:20
destroy 845:1	diversity 814:15,16	DTX-144 753:9	DTX-204 756:3	either 759:10 775:17
detailed 816:12	diverting 769:15	DTX-145 753:10	DTX-205 756:5	805:17 809:22 830:15
Devan 781:10 develop 788:1 804:3	divided 797:5 division 797:12,14	DTX-146 753:11 DTX-147 753:12	DTX-206 756:7 DTX-207 756:9	840:13
developed 814:6	799:14 816:14	DTX-147 753:12 DTX-149 753:13	DTX-207 756:31 DTX-208 756:11	electronic 842:1 843:8
developing 814:11	divisions 797:16	DTX-149 753:15 DTX-150 753:14	DTX-209 756:12	electronically 774:6
develops 792:25 818:7	document 760:11,13	DTX-150 753:14 DTX-151 753:14	DTX-210 756:14	element 815:11
Devendra 781:10	761:2 762:1,15,18,19	DTX-151 753:14 DTX-152 753:15	DTX-210 756:15	else's 808:22
Diablo 771:21	764:18 765:2,18,20	DTX-152 753:15 DTX-153 753:17	DTX-211 756:17	Embarcadero 751:9
diagram 778:11	772:2,8 776:4,16,24	DTX-154 753:18	DTX-213 756:18	emergencies 814:20
dictating 798:5	777:6,24 783:2,4,6,12	DTX-155 753:19	DTX-214 756:19	emergency 756:5,8,10
Diego 750:6 760:14	785:6,9,9,22 787:7,12	DTX-156 753:20	DTX-215 756:20	756:12,13,15,16,19
761:11,18 762:8	789:7 790:11 791:6	DTX-157 753:21	DTX-216 756:22	756:21 835:9
	1	1	1	1

amnhasiaa 904:25
emphasize 804:25 814:10
emphasized 793:7
804:24 813:22 818:6
emphasizing 813:23
encourage 803:2,3
823:18
endangered 815:5
endorsed 801:6
engaged 762:13 790:23 engineer's 833:19
engineering 797:16
enjoyed 846:1
enormous 828:19
enormously 846:2
enter 766:23
entered 763:18 765:9
769:13
entire 760:25 793:23
801:10 822:3 830:8 834:11
entirety 760:13
entitled 766:22
entry 782:10
environmentally 815:5
equally 829:21
equivalent 764:15
794:9 802:23 803:4
835:2
especially 812:18 843:18
ESQ 751:5,5,6,6,7,11
751:11,15,15,16,19
751:20,22 752:4
establish 780:11
established 790:20
establishes 837:3
estimated 834:6
evaluate 792:24
evaluation 776:6
everybody 810:25 820:3 829:21 830:23
830:24,24
everybody's 828:5
Evid 753:2 754:2 755:2
756:2
evidence 758:10,14,17
760:2,4 761:22
762:24 763:24,25
764:6 767:12 769:20
771:11 772:21,21
773:4,6,13 775:12 776:7 777:7,8 779:24
780:4,6 782:4,8,24
784:14 787:9 791:16
791:23 796:7 808:4
812:6 821:7 822:14
823:15 837:2 839:17

```
841:3,9,12
evidenced 767:20
evidentiary 823:9
exactly 764:14 791:8
  797:21 817:24 836:8
  845:8
examined 801:7
example 769:1.9
  770:11 807:8 818:19
  820:6 823:20 828:19
  831:17 836:19 844:19
exceed 827:12
exception 772:23 773:3
excerpts 781:2,5,10
excess 766:4
exchange 753:8 754:10
  754:13 756:4 761:9,9
  761:13,15,16,20
  762:9,12,16 765:17
  766:9,9,19 767:14,21
  768:25 769:3,7,10,22
  770:2,7,9,10,14,16
  771:7 772:6,12
  785:14,19 786:25
  838:14
exchanges 760:22
  761:1,7 762:22
  763:17 775:20 778:13
exclude 842:18
excludes 777:5,14,17
  778:8
excuse 811:21 828:24
  835:1
excuses 812:9
executed 762:19
execution 770:20
exhibit 753:3,4,5,7,8,9
  753:10,11,12,13,14
  753:14,15,17,18,19
  753:20,21,22,23,24
  754:3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11
  754:12,14,15,16,17
  754:18,19,20,21,23
  754:24,25 755:3,4,6,7
  755:8,9,10,12,13,14
  755:15,16,17,18,19
  755:20,21,22,23,23
  755:24,25 756:3,5,7,9
  756:11,12,14,15,17
  756:18,19,20,22,23
  756:24,24 757:1,3,5,5
  757:6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9
  760:12 761:21,22,25
  762:3,17 764:1,4
  767:12 768:5,6,23
  769:20 771:11 775:7
  775:8 776:25 777:4
  779:15,18,20,24
```

780:11 781:2,5,7,9,9
780:11 781:2,5,7,9,9 781:12,19 784:13
791:23 823:24 836:17
841:2
exhibits 753:1 754:1
755:1 756:1 762:10
762:23,25 763:3,13 763:15,21,23 764:3 773:5,12 780:3
763:15 21 23 764:3
773:5.12 780:3
781:18 782:8,11
783:18 822:21 841:11
843:4,22,23 844:18
exist 817:18 824:14
existing 815:13 834:5
exists 777:10 824:15
835:15
expand 811:11 815:15
expected 788:1,10,21
expected 788.1,10,21 expeditiously 842:22
expenditure 793:16
expenditures 813:21 814:10
expenses 798:9,10
expensive 829:20
experiences 830:23
expert 796:6 815:21
explain 809:4
explained 765:14
781:17 796:3
explanation 816:1
explicit 802:9 804:3
explicitly 811:20
expression 810:13
extent 788:3 829:1
834:21 840:13 842:1
extra 845:23
extracts 842:6
extreme 823:25 830:12
TC .

faced 800:19 facilitate 762:21 803:3 808:3 837:19 facilitates 804:21 facilities 765:25 766:3 766:11 788:5 790:24 834:5 fact 762:21 772:15 776:3 789:13 791:8 801:22 803:8,8 807:11,11 808:25 813:25 828:15 829:11 831:19 843:7 844:17 factor 801:12 factors 766:7 factual 839:21 failure 834:24,25 835:23

fair 804:24 824:18 **fairly** 778:2 fall 772:23 773:2 832:3 834:17 **Fallbrook** 764:24 765:4 765:16.18 **falls** 779:7 false 794:22 familiar 806:1 far 792:5 fatal 796:4 favor 811:22 **feature** 801:25 federal 769:13,16 770:25 feel 792:8 feet 819:1 836:11 **FELLOWS** 751:20 **figure** 770:7 788:13,21 788:23 789:10,11 790:1 806:21 813:2 836:8,17 **figured** 817:22 **file** 759:7,8 821:7 843:3 843:10 **filed** 771:18,20 772:3 772:10,15 774:5,6 782:15 784:5 795:21 840:5,11 files 843:8 **filings** 843:13 **final** 758:10 **finally** 790:10 792:23 832:8 finance 787:10 797:16 834:4 financial 787:24 788:18 801:15 804:5 find 831:5 **finding** 803:20 **findings** 803:7,8,18 fine 783:7 808:12 841:7 842:24 finish 842:10,12 firm 794:16 firms 846:2 first 758:6 760:11 761:14 764:25 765:23 771:16 773:20,23 774:5,12 777:17 785:9 786:3 787:16 787:22 789:5 792:11 795:21 796:9 801:19 803:15 806:20 817:7 817:25 818:5 820:5 825:24 **fiscal** 834:7,15

five 789:10 fixed 793:20 802:24 804:6,11 **fixing** 809:25 **flat** 793:9 **flexible** 826:13 **floor** 750:24 784:25 focus 793:14 **FOERSTER** 751:17 **followed** 798:19,20 following 773:16 840:21 **follows** 813:3 **forcing** 782:11 forecast 788:14,18,18 **forgoing** 847:10 **formally** 841:13 format 845:6 formulated 839:1 forth 771:8 790:18 **forward** 843:16 found 812:2 four 793:3 831:22 fourth 788:9 792:23 **Francisco** 750:2,24 751:4,10,18 847:2 free 792:8 front 782:8 814:4 frustrating 842:19 full 760:13 761:5.19 763:16 789:20 829:19 833:16 839:15 847:10 **function** 816:8,9 **functionalization** 797:10,15 806:6 807:1 814:21 838:5 functionalize 806:23 functionalized 797:18 functionalizing 806:24 functions 773:2 fund 811:16 812:17 further 758:25 782:24 784:11,16 839:19 840:25 843:13 **future** 819:16

G

G 758:2 Gabriel 786:18 game 800:22 837:13 general 801:5 812:11 834:11,15,18 generally 767:1 774:16 genuine 777:10 George 815:21 getting 819:11 830:5,9 give 776:11 845:4 given 810:9

fit 812:6,14

go 765:11 778:18
781:22 783:11 784:22
788:17,22 789:6
792:7 796:19 801:14
803:6,20 804:4 809:9
809:21 810:11,14,18
810:21 813:2 822:24 826:12 831:11 842:21
826:12 831:11 842:21
843:19
goal 790:18,21
goals 814:7
goes 786:6 790:12
802:4 803:24 816:10
820:1 829:6 833:7
going 760:7,11 766:16
767:4 770:1 771:13
773:19,23,23,24
779:11 782:16,19
784:16,21 791:24,25
793:3 794:2 799:15
799:20,21,25 800:7,7
800:8,9,11 802:6
803:19 806:15,22
807:12 808:11,17
809:5,6 810:4,21
811:4 814:14 816:20
817:13 819:24 822:12
829:8 831:18,19
836:20,22 838:17
839:14,22 842:16,20
843:6,8 844:9
good 758:4,5 768:18
774:2 776:18 791:12
791:13 810:22 819:1
835:20 843:21
gotten 780:15 827:1
government 769:14
grab 781:22
granted 771:22 772:13
775:5
graph 788:24 790:2
831:1
gray 790:8
great 761:18 824:18
846:3
grounds 773:9 774:13
801:21
groundwater 815:18
830:6
grown 766:22
grown /00.22
guess 770:1 780:10
782:3 783:8 817:5
guidance 815:21
guy 836:22
guys 759:12
5-75 757.12
Н

half 786:16 787:18

```
816:4,7,8 834:19,23
  835:6
hand 771:13 774:25
  784:16
handed 785:8
handle 779:9 823:9
happen 759:14
happened 786:12
  797:21 798:18 807:4
  811:22 821:14
hard 790:7 825:14
harmless 801:9,14
  838:2
harmonized 812:3
heading 787:20
hear 776:16 779:6
heard 815:22
hearing 758:10,12,15
  782:23
hearsay 772:17,23
  773:3,9
HEATHER 751:15
held 801:9 820:15
help 832:4 843:8
helped 815:25
helpful 776:5 843:15
  843:16
high 829:7
higher 815:16 827:13
highest 832:19
highlighted 834:1
highly 844:6
historic 800:17
Historically 798:19
history 774:12
Hixson 751:11 758:5,8
  758:19 759:17,23
  767:22 771:14.16
  773:14 775:3 779:22
  782:5,14 783:1,6
  784:4,9,19 791:21
  793:4 795:4 798:1
  801:19 803:18 804:23
  811:8 813:8 822:15
  823:12 839:10,13
  841:7,19,23 842:24
  843:3 844:9,22
  845:12,17 846:8
Hixson's 792:3,10
hold 801:14 829:21
  838:1
holding 844:19
home 844:1
honest 807:3
Honor 758:5,25 760:1
  760:9 762:10.23
  764:17 767:20 768:5
  769:21 771:16 773:8
```

```
773:14,19 774:2,19
  775:6,10 776:16,21
  777:20 778:19,21
  779:13 780:1,2,8,20
  782:5.18 783:16
  784:15,19 785:1
  791:12,15,21,24
  806:1 809:11 811:3
  822:11 836:17 837:7
  840:5,21 841:12,17
  841:24 844:9,10,12
  845:24 846:7,8
Honor's 780:13,15,16
  785:6 787:8
HONORABLE 750:3
hope 780:5 842:18
housekeeping 758:6
  759:1 773:21 774:4
huge 827:17
hundreds 792:25
Hurley 826:25
hydrology 821:14
```

IB 756:6 idea 812:25 814:21 **Ident** 753:2 754:2 755:2 756:2 identified 825:18 833:13 840:1 identify 825:16 827:21 827:22 ignore 806:16,18 826:20 ignored 815:21 816:13 820:3 833:19 **ignores** 836:13 II 794:8.13.14 IID 768:16 785:14 786:25 790:4 illegal 804:21 808:7 810:4,17 816:19 837:13 838:11 839:2 **imagine** 825:14 Imperial 789:13 implement 837:21 implementation 838:6 implements 818:8 837:13 **import** 815:14 important 763:14 809:5,6,12 834:24 **imported** 789:4 814:18 815:4,19 impression 807:5 improperly 808:2 809:21 **improve** 813:19 814:9

763:10 771:2 801:25 802:6 815:25 823:19 840:7 included 763:12 777:6 777:23 778:8 793:13 816:7.8 includes 769:7 777:18 788:14 794:1,1,3,4 805:5,15 835:6,7 including 789:20 793:11,11 801:21 802:18 821:12 823:7 825:25 827:4 839:21 845:14 inclusion 778:4 801:4 inclusive 784:12 inconsistent 785:21 incorporating 797:6,6 797:13 increase 788:11 814:16 814:19 819:19 820:11 increasing 815:12 incremental 807:21 829:4,8 830:10,16 incur 837:5 incurred 805:1 incurs 790:14 805:20 independent 772:18 796:6 798:3 INDEX 753:1 754:1 755:1 756:1 indicate 766:8 indicated 764:2 765:2 777:24 794:16 indicates 812:7 individual 780:12 843:21 industry 798:20 800:18 **information** 775:15,24 776:2 777:6 798:2,4 inherent 818:2,4 injury 801:15 804:5 838:2 insurance 793:2 819:5 825:19 827:5 828:15 828:21 829:12 831:7 integrated 769:23 790:16 804:1 818:16 interest 779:10 847:12 interesting 787:12 789:2.22 internal 800:2 805:15 806:5 interpret 838:20 interpretation 809:7

interrogatories 825:17

incentives 787:24

include 760:8,21

826:10 **Interrogatory** 826:10 interrupt 792:6 introduce 763:15 introduction 758:9 invention 817:8 investments 815:3,17 invoice 761:4 invoiced 792:17 invoices 753:3 760:14 761:17 785:10,20 involve 786:14,14 837:12 involves 761:15,16 796:17 IRP 788:14 790:16,17 irrelevant 801:21 **Irrigation** 789:14 **Irvine** 752:3 issue 769:22 775:7 777:5,12 778:21 787:13,20 789:2,3 790:10,13 823:10 825:16 826:6 840:1 **issued** 834:4 issues 817:10 843:21 item 775:6 779:15,25 itemizes 758:16 items 758:20 772:14 774:21 790:5.8

J 750:19 752:4,8 847:5 847:20

847:20 **JACKSON** 751:6 JAN 750:22 **January** 759:8,18,18 760:15 765:10 839:20 842:25 843:1 **JCCP** 757:2 **Jeff** 787:17 788:9 796:11 803:16 805:7 834:1 **JOHN** 751:5,20 joint 756:3 757:1,3 772:3 judge 750:3 810:1 judgment 837:12 judicial 771:17,21,22 772:9,13,14,16 773:1 774:6,10,17,22 775:4 **July** 804:2 juncture 845:22 June 765:7 767:11 781:6 justification 810:6

816:1

justify 806:6 812:1

K

K-O-S-T-O-P-O-U-L... 781:4 Karman 752:2 **KARNOW** 750:3 keep 764:8 815:23 829:21 838:2 Keker 751:3,5 758:25 759:18,22 773:19 779:16 791:10,12,24 799:15 806:18 807:13 807:21 808:10.16 809:17 810:24 811:3 817:12,16,20 822:18 822:23 823:11,21 828:6,24 829:13,16 835:5,8 839:9,15 845:10,23 846:7,10 **KENNEDY** 751:22 key 761:10 762:20 765:19 814:7 818:15 kicks 827:9 kind 831:1 kinds 777:15 know 775:13,13 776:6 778:5 780:18.19 785:2 790:7 791:1 808:17 809:5 817:14 817:21 828:16 829:5 829:14 830:2,10 831:9,16,16 833:12 833:15 835:10,13 841:21 842:11 843:9 **knowing** 830:19 known 768:7 **knows** 805:3,5 845:8

L

Kostopoulos 781:3

KUO 751:15

L.A 819:10 820:7 821:11 827:2 828:18 829:11 830:6 labeled 842:8 Lake 753:9,10,12 large 760:7 778:8 larger 782:16 laser 761:3 765:8 lastly 768:4 late 822:8,9 law 766:20 774:18 806:17 809:8 810:2 811:11 812:6 813:7 827:25 835:22 837:16 lawful 807:23 808:12 808:13.13 lawfully 808:14 laws 808:1

lawsuit 769:14 **leading** 828:21 leave 781:21 841:22 843:25 845:8 leaves 794:10 led 799:14 **left** 762:14 806:10 legal 811:25 812:19 839.21 legislative 774:12 legitimacy 838:7 lessening 815:13 let's 758:4 764:13 796:8,19 799:18,19 803:15 804:4 807:13 813:16 814:1.13 818:14 823:9 826:4 829:3 833:3 letter 753:7,13,14,14 753:15,18,19,21,23 753:24 754:4,4,9,16 754:18,21,24 755:10 755:12,13,15,16,17 756:17,18,22 level 814:16 **levies** 834:2 levv 833:20 Lexus 774:18 843:4 likewise 840:9 limitation 766:13 767:25 808:19,23 limited 771:6,9 line 788:9 822:7 835:16 835:17 lines 789:10 830:25 lining 790:5 **list** 781:19,22 785:22 790:22 listed 762:10,24 763:3 listening 759:13 lists 762:15,18 764:3 795:6 **litigation** 792:14 796:5 little 781:20 785:24 815:16 LLP 751:9 752:2 load 799:21 800:1 loading 803:9 809:20 810:7 837:23 local 787:20,25 792:19 792:21 813:17,19 814:5,8,8,11,16 818:7 818:7 location 783:2 locations 784:2 logic 798:20

long 766:4 827:1

long-range 787:10

long-term 786:25 802:25 **longhand** 847:10 look 770:5,9,10 776:11 777:12 778:10.11 795:10 796:8 803:15 803:16 805:24,24 814:2.13 815:1.6 818:14,15 819:15 820:20 824:6,7 833:9 833:24 looked 794:17,24 798:13 looking 771:7 794:6 798:6,12 844:12 looks 821:16 Los 751:14 817:23 818:18 819:2,12 820:19,24 821:22 822:7 823:5,23 824:1 827:4 831:3,17 lot 763:6 782:7 785:23 791:25 793:8 803:22 820:14 823:24 827:4 831:20 839:17 LRP 788:10

M

M 751:22 796:14 M1 807:11 magnitude 821:11,20 maintain 771:3 790:24 maintaining 827:16 832:16 major 793:16 majority 761:18 786:13 maker 824:17 making 767:4 785:24 806:23 817:6,9,12 819:3 824:11 825:22 management 812:23 813:15 815:12 816:5 manager 834:11,15,18 mandate 812:3 mandated 811:15 mandates 811:25 manual 807:11 map 805:24 806:13 March 833:21 **MARCIA** 751:16 margin 794:9 802:23 803:4 mark 844:2 marked 775:8 779:19 822:11,12 Market 751:17 massive 775:13 material 777:11 824:16

materials 776:12 math 820:14 836:7 matrix 802:21,22 matter 758:6 759:14 764:9 808:17 809:14 809:16 816:23 817:18 818:13,14 824:16 825:7 matters 771:18 772:24 774.4 maximum 822:6 832:12 McCUTCHEN 751:9 mean 782:5 801:2 803:24 804:13 806:2 809:8 815:6 818:14 819:22 823:21 824:10 827:20 830:12,14,18 831:16 832:1,1 836:19 838:17,18,19 844:4 meaning 761:5 meaningful 844:6 means 770:7 818:22 meant 759:18 760:24 838:19 measure 818:11 825:3 measured 766:20,20 meet 766:5 782:6,9,14 782:24 834:5 **Meeting** 756:23 meets 759:2 member 765:5 766:6 768:2 786:9,14,17,24 792:24 800:20 801:8 801:13 804:5,6,7,8 810:11 812:12,13 818:6,9 820:19 821:18,19 822:5 825:9,13 826:2 827:4 827:10,11 831:6 832:12 833:6 834:3 836:6 members 820:25 823:7 memo 754:5 755:22,23 802:22 803:23 mention 786:22 795:14 816:1 mentioned 760:4 768:24 782:19,23 785:5 792:2 794:7 811:6 merely 762:18 764:3 met 766:19 775:2 776:11 782:12 783:25 785:13,13,18 786:14 786:17,23,25 788:3 790:14,23 791:4,8 792:17,25 795:8,22

796:24 798:19 799:1 801:17 802:3 803:9 805:3 806:9,12 807:7 808:6,25 809:21 811:10.24 812:8.14 812:21,22 813:1 815:20 816:15 818:25 825:9 826:24 829:6 833:1,19 837:2,3,5,7 838:8,25 839:16 **Met's** 767:23 786:4,8 786:11 787:10 791:2 792:5,12,14,16,18,22 792:23 793:6 796:5 798:10 799:25 800:2 800:21,23 803:11,15 803:17 805:14 806:5 809:15 810:8 812:12 813:3 816:22 818:2 821:13 825:5,12 827:1 833:11 837:10 837:18 838:6,9 method 801:7 802:23 802:24 803:4,5 Metropolitan 750:9 751:8,13 758:21 762:12 763:18 764:22 765:24 766:2,5 772:4 772:7 773:15 774:15 775:3.17 778:24 787:25 789:21,23,24 790:3 797:7 804:2,8 819:12,18,21 823:6 834:2 845:15 Metropolitan's 789:17 789:25 797:12,13,15 804:6 811:15 815:11 818:9 834:6 Mets 808:5 Mets's 827:16 mid-1990s 792:12 million 785:17,18 791:5 793:18,21 794:10,14 794:18 795:7 796:10 796:18 819:23 820:11 820:13 824:20 829:20 830:3 834:8,15,18 836:21,22,23 mind 815:23 minus 822:6 minute 795:10 minutes 756:23 760:5 misleading 821:25 misremembered 807:6 model 816:4 modification 780:14 modifications 780:7,7 Monday 750:14

money 806:21 812:16 829:3 monopoly 818:3 morning 758:1,4,5 774:2 785:5 791:12 791:13 838:13 **MORRISON** 751:17 Morro 804:21 Motion 757:1 MOU 753:10 move 761:21 762:23 763:25 766:3 767:12 769:20 773:5,22 776:7 779:21 782:3,4 784:20 787:8 789:15 791:16 811:4 822:13 822:13 825:7 840:16 845:7 moved 811:18 822:22 **movement** 766:10 moving 772:20 782:8 826:15,16 830:16 837:17 multimillion 787:2 multiple 844:7 **MUNICIPAL** 751:21 752:1 mutual 783:9 **MWD** 753:3,13,14,15 753:16.18.19 754:5 754:20,24 755:6,9,12 755:17,21,25 756:22 756:23 757:1 760:14 761:12,19 762:9,21 765:3,9 769:2 777:22 813:21 814:10 **MWD's** 766:11 801:5 802:5 MWD/Castaic 753:9 753:10,12 MWD/Coachella 753:20 754:10 MWD/CVWD 754:12 754:17,19 MWD/Desert 753:17 753:22 754:6.7 MWD/Irvine 754:25 MWD/San 755:10 MWD/SBVMWD 755:14 MWD/SDCWA 753:4 753:5 755:24 MWD/SDCWA/Fall... 754:22 MWD/SGVMWD 755:18 MWD/Western 755:23 **MWDOC** 786:19

N N 751:13 758:2 name 841:4 narrow 820:3 **NARUC** 799:9 National 799:10 nationwide 846:4 nature 797:3 near 801:3 necessary 773:16 782:25 need 764:16 770:3 790:15 809:9 815:14 815:15,18 824:21,22 829:19 830:7 838:22 838:23 839:2 842:17 843:13,23,24 844:15 844:16 845:14 needed 766:5 829:25 834:5 needs 766:5 812:15 825:2 828:12 negative 836:1 negotiated 768:3 **neither** 810:16 **NEST 751:3** never 785:14 795:15 800:15 802:17 833:12 837:22 845:4 new 788:6,15,19 810:12 Nexus 843:4 nice 788:23 nine 789:4 Nobody's 832:5,5 non 824:11 non-departmental 796:13 non-exchange 761:6 non-project 775:22 779:8 800:1 837:18 non-State 778:22 779:2 non-SVP 777:15,16,18 778:1 non-SWP 777:13 non-wheeling 810:11 nonsense 824:14,15 normal 819:19 844:4 normally 844:4 Northern 790:12 note 789:13 noted 834:2 notes 843:19 847:9,11 notice 771:17,21,22 772:9,13,14,15,16 773:1 774:6,10,17,22

775.4 786.1

notion 817:6

number 750:4 760:2 762:17 764:4 779:3 779:20 787:20 789:4 790:22 793:23 807:17 826:10 840:2 numbers 778:15 780:11 820:21 821:8 840:17 845:18 \mathbf{o} O 758:2 796:13 **o0o** 758:3 846:13 **object** 764:5 776:15 778:4 822:15 823:12 823:16 objection 761:23 763:20 764:7 769:21 771:4 773:8 779:22 783:4,25 791:20 823:17 824:5 840:18 840:23 objections 782:13 784:4 840:6,12,21 841:1 842:11 obligated 837:15 obligation 769:10 observed 767:22 obstructionist 782:6 obtains 762:8 obvious 798:19 800:4 obviously 761:15 774:13 occurred 760:24 **October** 787:10 794:24 795:16 799:8 **official** 844:13 offs 787:3 offset 814:18 841:25

oh 777:1 791:14 821:2 825:8,22 835:19 Okay 758:18 764:11 773:10 780:23 783:16 784:7 808:9,15 old 799:7 once 776:7 840:7 one-time 787:4 one-year 809:1 ones 798:9 814:15 840:4 845:14 **oOo** 750:5 open 759:10 opening 793:7 796:3 797:8 798:13 804:22 **openings** 810:17 operate 805:9 operating 754:15 operation 767:11

operations 797:16 **opponent** 772:22 opportunity 780:18 **oppose** 775:3 opposed 761:20 766:8 771:22 785:18 843:23 **opposite** 796:7 829:17 opposition 775:2 **option** 794:7,7,8,9,13 794:14 801:20,23 802:18,19,23 orally 783:10 **ORANGE** 752:1 order 758:9,16 770:8 780:24 783:9 807:2 821:11.20 838:1 original 838:4 843:23 originals 844:1,4,5,16 844:19,25 ought 813:2 819:4 825:3,3 **outcome** 847:12 **outlier** 820:8 outside 771:25 overall 815:4 oversimplify 766:25 768:11 oversimplifying 767:2 Owens 818:21,22,23 819:11 owned 806:5 810:8 owner 805:1,13 P 758:2

page 760:17 765:13 775:14 787:16,18 788:7,13,17,22 789:1 789:6,6,9 790:11 793:15 796:12,12 814:3,4,7,13 833:24 pages 750:9 790:22 845:7 847:10 paid 766:19 828:20 829:24 830:14,21 834:7 Palmdale 804:22 811:6 811:7,20,24 812:9 paper 845:6 paragraph 765:1,11,14 765:21,22 766:1 767:8 770:12 787:22 804:24 parallel 842:20 Parchman 750:19 752:8 847:5,20 parroted 796:6 part 761:2,4 764:9

771:13 779:19 781:16 781:18,18,19 782:20 782:21 788:17,17 795:24 796:21.21 802:1 807:11.12 813:10.19 814:22 815:1 823:19 825:6.6 825:7 831:11.15 834:1,21 841:13 participants 814:6 participation 814:11 particular 778:7 783:2 845:22 particularly 768:25 778:7 parties 758:13 760:3 766:16 768:14 770:4 771:2 775:12 779:19 780:3 781:20 782:9 782:14,21 783:6 786:16,21 791:17 795:21 818:10 839:13 840:15 841:10 844:17 party 762:8 765:11 772:22 786:8 partv's 758:11 passed 806:12 **PATTY** 752:4 pay 804:9 819:4 824:21 826:2,21,24 827:2,2,5 827:13 828:10,13 830:1 paying 824:24,25 827:18,18 828:5,7,8,9 828:14 829:2,2,12 830:2,8 **payors** 837:4 pays 824:4 829:21 peak 817:3,3 820:7 821:18,18 827:4 832:19 peaked 830:24,25 peakers 830:5 peaking 790:10 792:24 809:25 816:21,25 817:1,7,25 818:18 820:2,16,20 821:11 823:25 824:3,13 825:16,24 826:5,17 827:21,23 830:23 831:15 832:10 833:11 833:14 834:22 835:3 835:15 836:6 837:1,4 peaks 820:3 824:11 829:4 836:3 Pedro 801:11 804:1 838:1

766:11 767:16 770:21

people 765:8 800:8
802:24 805:19 819:4
824:25 825:1 828:8
829:2,24 830:22
831:5 843:9,20 846:4
percent 778:12 792:22
811:9 812:25 813:4
814:22 819:17 820:10
820:10,10,10,12,12
822:7,8,9 837:24
percentage 777:25
percentages 778:17
perfect 845:20,20
perfectly 798:1 805:4
period 761:19 823:3
832:13
periods 814:19
permits 842:21
person 830:21
personally 844:15
847:7
phase 771:5
phenomenon 819:4
820:17
phrase 845:3
physically 841:14
845:7
pick 805:16
picked 828:14 830:1,20
831:10
picking 835:19
picks 806:4 828:19
piece 810:20
pieces 806:14
pile 845:14,14
pipes 832:19
place 766:24 782:22
792:15 817:8
plaintiff 750:7 751:2
784:21
plaintiff's 775:8 776:25
779:15 781:2,5,7,9,19
840:12
plaintiffs 839:10 840:1
plaintive 810:13
plan 787:10 790:17
792:9 804:1 818:16
planning 791:8 797:12
797:14 818:15 843:5
please 762:4 764:20
765:12,13 776:22
792:7 805:7
pleasures 846:3
plenty 812:22
plus 822:6
podium 781:21 784:16
point 762:5 767:9,19
770:23 773:15 785:12
Ī

```
791:1 802:4 813:10
  818:12 820:22 826:20
  832:8 835:25,25
pointed 791:3 813:18
  814:25 820:5 833:18
  837:2
pointer 761:3
pointers 765:8
pointing 803:7 811:7
points 785:25 812:8
  817:6 839:19,21
policy 804:3.4
political 812:14
portion 791:7 834:3,13
position 766:18 767:1
  772:11 776:14 792:13
  792:14 796:5,23
  797:3 798:18 800:17
  800:18 806:15 807:23
  810:6 838:16,17
positions 783:14
  843:20
positive 835:25
possibility 769:15
possible 768:11 833:10
  842:23
post-trial 767:5 791:25
  823:20 839:19
postponement 828:17
  828:22
potential 819:20 834:6
  834:11,13,16
power 793:11,21 794:2
  795:1 807:9,22
  830:17 838:10,25
practical 842:15
practice 818:1
precedent 769:8,10
  770:19,20
predetermined 807:2
preference 814:14
  843:5
preliminary 797:10,14
premium 828:22
premiums 827:6
preordained 838:8
prepared 792:12
present 758:22 804:17
  822:2 839:13 847:7
presentation 759:6
  760:2,4 767:23
  771:13 773:20 785:5
  792:4,10,10 801:18
  804:19 813:8 826:14
  838:13 839:15,23
presented 797:14 811:8
  839:16
```

presenting 797:11

```
preserving 840:20
PRESIDING 750:3
pretrial 758:11,14
  795:14,15,22,25
pretty 787:4,12 789:22
  790:11
previously 784:5 840:5
  840:10
price 809:9
primarily 761:12
  792:20
primary 801:11
principle 801:14 838:2
  838:2
principles 811:21
  813:17 814:1,2,5
  839:3
prior 783:7
probably 776:18 809:6
  812:22 843:16
problem 772:17 809:25
  826:21,23 827:7
  836:9
problems 843:9
procedure 782:16
procedures 797:20
proceed 842:19
proceeding 839:18
proceedings 750:13
  846:12 847:8.9.12
process 759:11 817:25
  837:12
prodding 795:8
produce 758:21
producer's 799:4
profiles 836:6,15
profit 829:6
profits 829:8 830:11
program 813:15,17
  814:5,8 833:20
program's 815:12
programs 788:16,20
  790:12,19,20,23
  792:19,20 811:16,18
  812:20,20,21,23
  813:13,16 815:17
  837:25
Project 775:17,20
  777:21 778:23,25
  779:2 786:15 789:3
  792:16 793:11,12,17
  793:20,24 795:2,6,17
  796:14,17 798:9,21
  800:14,23 801:5
  802:1,19 803:9
  804:11 805:6,10,10
  805:11,12,18,21,22
  806:2 809:24 810:8
```

```
810:20
projected 819:12
projection 791:6
projects 787:25 788:20
  788:22 789:11 812:17
  813:19 814:8,14,15
  814:18,22
proof 797:24
Prop 808:1 812:3 832:7
  837:3 839:4,4
proper 799:11 804:20
properly 809:24 825:4
proponents 844:18
proportionality 812:4
proposed 758:16 783:9
  788:20 814:7
proposition 771:24
  772:1 812:3 813:5,5
proved 813:9 824:15
provide 765:24 766:2
  776:17 780:13 798:2
  815:19 841:12 844:10
  844:11 845:1
provided 758:9 760:3
  760:14 765:15 768:1
  774:8,20
provides 765:23 766:2
  772:22 777:9 843:21
providing 798:4,4
provision 770:18
  838:20
provisions 813:6 839:5
PTX 791:16,18
PTX's 840:2
PTX-0385 776:8
PTX-101 757:8 787:9
  791:22,23
PTX-244 819:8
PTX-340-A 778:16
PTX-383 821:8
PTX-386 757:5 779:21
  779:22,23,24
PTX-387 822:23,24
PTX-388 822:23
PTX-389 757:5 784:13
PTX-390 757:6
PTX-391 757:6
PTX-392 757:7
PTX-393 757:7
PTX-394 757:8 784:13
PTX-57 783:20
PTX-709 757:9 841:2
PTX-710 757:9 841:2
Public 764:24 765:4
published 776:1
pull 760:17 762:4
  764:20 771:19 775:9
Purcell 751:5 761:23
```

763:20 764:5 769:21 771:3 773:7,24 784:17 785:1 791:14 791:19 833:24 846:11 purchase 790:4 819:17 purchased 761:19 778:25 purchaser 799:3 purchases 827:12 purchasing 804:7 **purely** 806:7 **purport** 823:13 purported 777:4 purporting 763:3 purports 777:4,25 778:3 purpose 771:7,10 purposes 770:2 771:5 775:18 779:3 809:14 812:14 844:20 pursuant 769:14 775:12 put 759:2 764:13 773:16 778:25 779:12 780:6 792:15,18 796:20 798:8 802:3,5 806:3 807:13 808:19 811:12 818:5 820:4 820:22,24 825:4 836:16 841:22 puts 826:5 putting 800:13 815:20 816:16

0 **QSA** 756:24 770:24,25 770:25 771:1 772:5 772:10 **QSAs** 769:16 **quality** 797:15 quantification 768:8,9 768:19,20 769:5,6,12 770:6,13,21 771:1,9 788:23 quantified 785:15 787:23,23 quantifies 791:6 quantify 788:3 817:21 quantities 787:4 question 787:6 794:3 807:13 809:11 820:1 820:23 821:1 837:15 837:16 838:12 839:1 questions 759:11,13 792:7 810:19 821:4 quickly 805:24 **QUILIZAPA** 752:4 **quite** 812:18

quote 801:15,16 812:2 quotes 792:15 798:8 R R 758:2 Raftelis 796:4,25 797:1 797:22,24 798:14 815:22,24 816:3,15 raised 826:20 839:22 **RAJ** 751:19 ramping 790:5 ran 821:8 range 834:17 rate 760:24 765:9 767:23 786:12 787:11 787:19 788:14,18 794:10,11,15,16 800:6,15 801:5,7,23 801:24 802:10,12,16 804:16,17,19 806:14 807:7,9,9,17,18,22,23 808:2,2,6,13,21,22 809:1,2,19,20,23,24 810:3,12,21 811:5,10 811:22 812:8,11 813:1,1,4 814:6 816:2 816:6,17,19 824:17 824:18 826:1,1,6,8,9 826:11,18,19,22 827:9,13,15,23 829:18 830:17 831:12 831:14 837:9,9 838:9 838:10,10,11,24,25 838:25 rate's 767:25 808:11 rates 760:15 771:24,25 792:16,22 800:10 801:12,14,22 810:11 812:1 817:11 819:21 824:3 825:12,25 826:7 827:6 828:1,4 837:4,8 838:1,3 ratio 820:6 raw 830:9 reach 807:2 read 763:3 793:8 795:12 834:1,8 readiness-to-serve 832:9 833:1.3.8.17.20 834:25 835:24 836:12 836:25 reads 770:14,16 794:9 real 791:2 819:4 824:5 835:15 realize 784:21 really 769:22 786:16,20

787:2 797:23 809:15

quota 832:2

829:6 835:14 843:19 **REALTIME** 750:20 reason 765:10 778:3 804:15,16 805:20 812:2 828:3 reasonable 804:25 806:19 807:3 810:16 816.18 reasonably 825:8,12 reasons 810:17 reassert 784:4 rebuttal 759:5 773:16 773:17,20 792:1,10 810:20 839:11,15 recall 775:10 813:18 received 778:14 recess 810:23 Reclamation 753:24 recognize 818:17 819:9 recognized 802:18 819:2 recognizing 819:5 recommending 834:12 834:16 record 758:20 759:2,6 764:10,14,16 768:10 769:20,25 779:21,21 783:17,17 792:3 793:5 794:25 795:12 795:23.25 803:21 804:16 807:14 810:7 812:7,8 813:10 814:3 816:23 819:6 828:17 829:10,15,17 830:19 832:6 833:15,22,22 833:23,23 835:11 837:10 838:9 839:23 841:13 842:3,5 843:11 844:18 records 837:11 recover 811:17 825:24 827:15 832:15 834:3 834:10,12 837:19 recovered 833:11 834:17 recovering 833:16 834:22 836:2 recovers 826:17 833:6 recovery 777:16,17,23 778:24 815:18 recycling 788:15 811:17 815:3,18 redone 839:2 reduce 815:1,18 reduces 818:8 refer 764:8 reference 764:9 777:22 805:14

referenced 758:10 760:7 references 769:8 **referred** 758:14 845:15 referring 769:17 796:11,12 811:14 840:14 refers 761:8 783:2 817.2 refinement 814:6 reflect 762:11 824:4 reflected 765:18 833:2 reflecting 762:16 reflects 761:4 refusal 792:23 refutes 811:7 regard 808:8 regarding 776:17 regardless 833:15 region's 815:4 regional 792:21 813:20 814:9,17,19 regulations 806:9,12 807:6,10 Regulatory 799:10 reiterated 801:23 rejected 812:9 related 793:9 794:21 826:7 838:14 **relates** 787:19 relationship 776:12 798:24 816:18 relatively 785:2 relevance 769:21 relevant 761:19 771:5 773:8 775:14 reliability 813:20,23 814:9,19 815:13 relief 774:14 785:3 810:5 Remarkably 804:18 remember 790:16 793:7 795:7 797:11 813:24 815:25 826:24 834:14 remind 798:12 reminds 770:24 remove 844:25 **Reply** 757:3 report 793:7,13,15,25 794:6,10,20,23,24 795:5,6,13,15,19,21 795:22 796:3,5,9 797:1,1,9,10,22 798:14,16 801:20 810:9 825:15 833:20 **Reported** 750:18 752:8 reporter 750:20 847:6

Reporter's 750:13 reporters 843:17 reports 792:12 793:4 795:16 represent 823:14 represents 822:4 request 774:5 775:4,5 779:10 requesting 804:9 require 818:9 required 811:11 827:5 835:22 837:16,20,20 requirement 801:8 requirements 797:19 807:24 812:6 requires 832:7 requiring 790:18 reserve 759:24 820:16 846:6,7 reserves 773:15 reservoirs 805:18,23 806:3 830:3 832:17 resolution 801:4,11,16 803:13,23 810:10 resolved 776:19 resource 804:1 812:20 resources 776:1 787:21 790:16 792:19 813:17 814:5,8,12 818:7,7,16 respect 783:24 784:5 816:24 833:10 837:10 840.22 respond 782:11,18 785:4 Respondent's 756:24 responding 759:11 response 792:5 805:9 816:22 826:9 responsible 789:19 rest 773:17 818:24 restate 784:6 Restated 753:6 result 788:8,10 838:11 resulting 797:18 results 798:5 821:9 retrospectively 829:12 revenue 797:18 revenues 803:1 review 797:12,17 reviewing 842:11,13 ridiculous 813:1 814:23 right 759:20 763:21 767:18 780:15 782:3 782:16 783:10 784:10 784:23 787:22 791:5 807:15,17,20 809:22 813:11 815:2,2

817:19 835:7 840:24 843:1 844:21,23 rights 773:15 Rincon 756:25 771:21 rises 778:1 river 768:15 789:5,12 789:15 790:2 796:16 798:22 805:15.17 806:3.4 836:10 **RMI** 792:12 793:4,8,10 793:13 795:8,16,22 796:24 797:3,9,14 798:17 799:8 801:6 801:20,20 810:9 RMI's 795:5 796:23 801:23 road 828:20 **roadmap** 843:21 roll 818:10 826:23 rolling 818:1 836:1 round 837:9 **RTS** 833:6,8 834:2,7,10 834:12,17,19,23 rule 772:23 773:3 783:14 rules 840:7 ruling 784:7 rulings 780:16 784:1 784:11 840:25 run 843:9 running 830:11,12 runoff 818:21

S s 751:11 758:2 821:11 S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N

781:6

S-L-A-T-E-R 841:6 **S-T-A-T-H-I-S** 781:3 sake 779:20 sales 760:19,21 761:5 794:16 822:4 San 750:2,6,24 751:4 751:10,18 760:14 761:11,18 762:8 764:23 765:5.10.15 766:19 768:16 769:2 769:10 770:19 771:20 771:23 772:3.7.10 773:17 774:3 776:23 777:4 785:13,18 786:8,9,18,21 789:14 789:17 801:11 804:1 813:25 817:13,23 820:6,25 821:12,21 822:5 823:7,18 824:2 824:3,4,11 838:1 840:6 844:11 847:2

satisfied 820:17 843:11
satisfy 801:8 838:1
save 791:25
saved 788:4
saw 799:24
saying 759:12 799:24
806:19,25 808:10,11
809:18 812:8,25
817:17,18,20 818:12
817:17,18,20 818:12
819:3 831:9 838:15
says 770:19 772:16
793:8,16 794:4,11
797:9 799:9 813:19
815:2,10 822:24
826:11 827:3 832:7
833:2,6
SBVMWD 755:15,16
schedules 838:5
scope 771:25
Scott 840:4 841:6
scroll 790:1
SCULLY 751:16
SDCWA 753:4 757:1
789:18,19 790:5
SDCWA/Fallbrook
754:23
search 774:19
searchable 843:14
seawater 788:15
second 774:15 775:6
785:22 786:6 787:17
787:24 792:14 794:3
795:25 800:11 804:24
827:8 829:1
section 767:24 768:1
770:11 772:21 789:1
789:5,5 790:11,17
sections 782:2
see 759:2 762:14 765:7
776:11 777:14,18,20
787:20 789:4 790:4,7
794:7 796:15,19
802:3,21 803:14
805:7 810:25 811:14
814:24 815:7,7 822:5
836:7 843:1,20 845:4
seek 766:24
seen 797:25 805:8
826:11
sees 812:14
sells 820:11
Senate 811:12,15
sense 816:17
sentence 783:13 787:24
788:8 789:22
separate 842:7
separated 795:8 798:25
separately 768:3
separately 700.5
i

```
seguitur 824:12
series 762:20 767:14
  768:7,12,13 769:4,5
  792:11 807:8
serve 789:25 843:3.10
served 774:6
service 761:5,20 764:22
  765:24 766:3 789:25
  804:9,20 807:4
  810:16 811:21 815:23
  816:4,18 824:8
  825:15 827:24 831:6
  831:13 832:1 834:4
  835:22 839:3
services 750:23 761:12
  761:16 762:9 818:9
SESSION 758:1
set 760:13 769:14 771:8
  801:12 814:15 831:24
  834:10 844:10
sets 790:17
setting 837:9,9
settlement 768:8,9,19
  768:20 769:5,6,12
  770:6,13,22 771:1,9
shading 790:7
shell 837:13
shift 816:20
shifting 801:9
short 783:13 810:23
  822:22
shortage 814:20
shorthand 847:6,8
shortly 787:11
show 761:17 763:16
  791:3 792:13 794:2
  795:5,11 813:12
  814:17 820:24 821:10
  831:6 836:4
showed 772:2 795:18
  797:8 803:18 804:23
  815:7 817:16 818:5
  833:25
showing 838:5
shown 803:22 819:8
  831:3 834:8
shows 775:16 788:21
  789:11 793:19 796:13
  796:14 816:23 821:17
  822:3 823:4 836:6
  837:10 838:9
side 762:14 815:17
sides 782:10
signed 813:25
significant 790:8
  818:11 820:24 821:23
  823:4 831:10 836:15
significantly 821:19
```

```
similar 772:11
simple 798:20 816:11
simply 773:2 794:21
  796:5 810:10 824:11
  833:19
simultaneously 759:9
sin 838:4
sir 771:15 773:18
  778:20 810:24 823:11
sit 787:9 791:15 830:3
sitting 824:20 829:23
six 780:22 818:6
size 768:5
sizing 832:19
Skillman 781:6 797:1
  797:21 798:13.13
  815:24 820:2 825:17
  826:25
Skillman's 810:13
Slater 840:4 841:6
slide 775:9,11,23 793:6
  793:8 802:3 803:15
  803:17 804:23 805:8
  813:17 814:24 815:9
  818:6 820:4,23,24
  821:2 825:11 832:10
  833:5
slides 811:12 818:5
sloping 788:24
small 787:4
smooths 836:4,13
snippets 787:15
so-called 798:3
solve 772:17 827:6
somebody 800:20
  808:22 821:24 828:12
  829:11
somebody's 824:24
  830:9
someplace 835:20
soon 842:9
sorry 763:2 764:1
  765:22 788:20 791:14
  828:24
sort 775:14 780:11
  781:17 783:10 807:9
  817:9 836:22,23
sought 771:21 774:14
sounds 780:19 819:3
source 816:7
sources 790:3
Southern 750:9 751:13
  764:23
space 781:14,14
span 787:1
specific 758:16 784:1
  788:5 833:13 840:25
specifically 765:23
```

```
795:13 824:1
specified 767:23
spent 793:12
split 799:14 816:9
sprung 782:17
Ss 847:1
St 750:24
stability 804:17.20
  811:22 812:8
stable 838:3
staff 795:8 797:7,12,14
  798:2 837:8
stamp 776:8
stand 792:3
standard 800:18
  801:16
standards 798:20
standby 833:16 834:20
  835:2
stare 845:13
start 793:4 814:4 820:9
  842:13
started 758:4
starters 826:4
starting 787:24 788:8
starts 790:17
state 769:17,17 770:25
  775:17,20 777:20
  778:25 783:13 786:15
  789:2 790:4 792:16
  793:10,12,17,19,24
  795:2,6,17 796:14,17
  798:8,21 800:13,23
  801:4 802:1,19 803:9
  804:11 805:6,9,10,11
  805:11,18,20,22
  806:2 809:3,24 810:7
  810:20 847:1
stated 804:2
statement 804:2
statements 771:23
  772:17 773:4
Stathis 781:3
stating 772:10
statistician 836:10
statute 772:6,11 774:13
  774:18 807:25 813:6
statutes 774:17 803:19
  839:4
statutory 813:6 839:5
stem 827:3
steps 827:21,22
Steve 781:1
STEVEN 751:22
Stewardship 787:19
  802:10,12,16 807:8
  807:18 808:2 809:20
  809:22 810:21 811:4
```

```
811:10 812:11 813:1
  816:2,6,17 826:1,8
  838:10,25
stip 783:9
stipulate 844:17
stipulation 758:9,15,22
  760:3 767:14 775:12
  779:19 781:20 782:21
  782:22 783:7 791:17
  840:16
stop 800:18
storage 755:19 775:18
  779:1 790:13,13,19
  790:23,24 791:5
  804:10 824:19,24,25
  826:14,17 827:17
  828:10,12 829:20
  830:4,13 832:17
  833:17 834:20 835:2
  835:9,10 837:6
stores 792:25
storing 832:22
story 795:20
straighten 823:22
strain 788:4
Street 751:3,13,17
strong 813:16
structure 765:10 810:3
  810:12 818:2,4
studied 817:21 832:5
study 799:6,8,12
  806:20 815:24 817:20
  831:9 835:16,21
sub 835:17
subject 767:10 780:6,7
  780:13 784:1,7,11
  791:16 840:20,25
submission 759:15
  780:2 823:20
submit 762:23 845:18
subpart 835:17
substantial 786:10
  787:2 796:7 808:4
  824:6 829:7 837:2
  839:16
subtotal 793:21
subtracting 794:15
sudden 828:11
sufficient 828:2
sufficiently 828:2
suggest 779:11 806:13
suggested 762:6 776:10
  797:7,13
suggesting 770:5
  834:18
suggests 761:11 778:12
Suite 752:2
sum 837:7
```

summaries 822:19 summarize 777:5,25 778:2,3 summary 757:1 776:7 777:8,10 778:7,7 summer 817:3 832:12 832:19 **summing** 776:5 sums 775:23 SUPERIOR 750:1 Supplement 756:7 supplemental 754:17 754:20 755:22 756:9 818:2,4 823:6 831:8 supplied 788:1 supplier 818:3 suppliers 805:17 supplies 789:4,23,24 804:8 814:19 815:4 815:13,19 819:18,21 837:6 supply 766:5 788:6,15 788:19,21,24 790:2 790:12,14,19,25 792:21,21 793:13,17 793:19,25 794:15 795:3,9,17 796:21,21 796:24 797:4,11 798:21,23 799:1,2,5 800:19 804:10 805:21 806:7 811:16 812:21 812:24 813:13,16,20 813:23 814:9,15,16 814:17 815:7 816:5,8 827:9,13,15 supplying 829:5 **support** 787:25 792:12 801:10 803:8,9,19 811:25 832:6 supported 808:4 829:10,15,17 supporting 811:18 supports 828:17 830:19 **suppose** 766:16 812:14 supposedly 796:6 sure 758:7 759:23 773:7 780:5,9 782:24 783:19 799:6 803:1 817:15 836:17 841:6 843:6,8 844:5 845:6 845:13 sustained 764:7 823:17 swing 819:9,13 **SWP** 778:14 793:9,10 794:15,17,21 system 786:4,9,11 789:17,21 800:2,21 800:24,24 805:2,3,4,5 805:6,13,14,16,19 806:5 807:17 808:1,6 808:12,23 809:19,24 810:8 811:19 814:23 815:15 818:1 823:6 824:19 825:1 826:1,7 826:11,18,23 828:7,8 828:13 829:19 830:8 830:12,13 831:8 834:6 837:18 838:9 838:10,24,25

T **Tab** 762:2 764:18 table 775:15,18 778:9 793:18,19 794:16,17 834:8 845:11 tables 775:19 796:8 838:5 take 758:23 760:5 761:10,14 762:20 765:15,17,19 768:14 772:15 774:10,16,17 799:18,20,24 830:12 831:14,18 836:14 841:16 844:1 taken 759:15 773:1 774:21 775:14 797:9 824:17 825:8 827:20 827:22 830:16 takes 794:13 talk 760:11 762:1 766:16 773:24 845:24 talked 767:21 796:2,3 801:15 842:6 talking 783:18 786:4,4 787:13 819:1,10,11 819:16,22 823:23 826:15,25 832:18,20 832:21 835:18 837:11 talks 777:15 815:16 832:11 tantamount 764:15 tax 812:11,16 816:17 tell 794:1 806:11 841:4 846:1 telling 798:5 824:6 tells 791:7 798:16 temporary 756:5,10,11 756:13,14,16,19,21 787:3 ten 762:9 767:10 786:11 810:25 820:9 ten-year 788:18 833:9

836:1,8,13,24

term 767:10 770:12

terms 768:24,25 770:6

tend 787:3

770:8 771:8 776:4 777:11 787:23 788:24 808:4 820:19 836:15 841:8 testified 785:16 791:4 testimony 761:11 762:7 783:3 785:15 812:19 820:2.22 823:12 840:13.15 text 789:8 Thank 758:24 759:24 764:17 769:18 771:15 773:14,18 774:1 779:13 783:16 784:15 784:18 785:1 791:11 810:25 811:3 839:8.9 846:8,9,10,11 thick 785:9 thing 786:1,6,22 791:2 794:5 797:24 808:16 808:18 812:7 820:5 828:13 829:1 830:8 835:4,5,15 844:8 things 768:13,15 774:11 779:14 785:4 792:4 793:3 800:6 807:10 810:13 831:24 832:9 843:10 think 763:14 764:16 776:18 779:1.4 780:17,24 786:19 787:5 799:13 807:16 809:9,12,13,13 810:14 828:1,23 829:16 830:18 833:3 835:1,8 841:9,17 842:3,5,15,16,16,20 842:25 843:13 thinking 799:22 842:4 third 772:8 786:15,21 792:18 **Thomas** 751:11 781:8 802:17,18 thought 832:5 thousands 793:1 three 751:9,21 791:4 824:20 828:19 829:19 830:3 831:22 832:22 836:11 throw 842:17 844:3 thrown 781:21 tier 827:8,9,13,15,23 828:1 831:17,18,20 831:22 832:1,2 tiered 831:12,14 tiering 832:4

779:10 782:9 810:22 815:14 816:20 828:21 830:25 839:24 842:21 845:23 846:6 times 821:22 title 762:18 764:3 today 758:21 760:12 774:9 784:21 803:19 809:9 812:22 839:14 839:22 842:7 today's 770:2 told 759:5 796:24,25 797:1 798:14 top 760:25 761:2 788:13 789:8 831:1 **TORRANCE** 751:20 total 778:14 796:18 834:13,14,16 touch 844:25 town 800:22 track 775:19 transaction 766:8 transaction-related 763:17 transactions 762:12,16 transcribed 847:9 transcript 750:13 843:18 847:11 transcripts 845:5 transfer 768:16 789:13 789:20 790:5,19 transfers 760:20 775:20 778:13 787:4 transmission 795:9 796:22 804:10 816:9 transmittal 754:3 transmutes 843:7 transparency 800:9 transpor 802:1 transport 805:11 transportation 761:12 761:16 775:21 778:22 779:7 792:16,22 793:9,11 794:5,21 796:25 797:4 798:10 798:11 799:18,23,24 799:25 800:5,13,24 800:24 801:1 802:2,6 803:10.11 804:12 806:8 809:23 811:10 812:25 813:4 816:2 816:16 826:16 837:24 837:25 transported 779:3 transporting 789:21 808:5 treated 799:1

treating 803:11 816:1

treatment 807:19 tremendous 813:12 829:2,3 trial 750:7 771:17 774:24 775:8 779:15 781:19 782:14 792:6 801:17,18 804:19 809:7.7.14 841:11 843:4,18 844:5 tried 792:2 801:19 837:22 trivial 817:23 true 774:20 786:12 794:23 847:10 truth 772:19,24 try 806:20 818:12 827:22 843:10 turn 784:25 791:10 809:5 twice 810:10 two 766:7,22 769:16 770:25 774:11 777:15 796:20 820:13 821:22 827:18 831:21 836:6 836:14 846:2 type 821:14 U

U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-Y 781:11 unavoidable 804:10 unbundled 765:9 800:3 801:22 802:9,13 unbundling 760:15,24 786:12 787:11 799:14 799:19 800:12 802:8 802:15 803:6 underlined 813:18 814:25 815:1 underlying 823:15 understand 767:2 820:18 understanding 778:23 779:5 undisputed 798:19 **unfair** 821:5 uniformly 825:1 unlawful 792:18 816:14.17 unrelated 826:6 Upadhyay 779:16 781:11 812:19 826:15 **upped** 816:15 upper 786:18 ups 766:22 upward 788:24 usage 825:13 use 761:3 764:8 765:8

Tijuana 756:6

time 759:24 776:19

770:6 812:12 823:7 825:1,10 832:16 833:7 842:16 844:2 **useful** 843:18 uses 823:5 833:2 Utility 764:24 765:4 799:10 uttered 763:7 764:14

V

V 750:8 V-A-N 781:14 validated 815:24 Valley 751:21 753:20 755:11 818:21,22,23 819:11 Valley/Kern 755:5 value 766:24 Van 751:3 781:13 variable 793:21 variations 817:2 825:9 825:13 833:2 varied 818:19 various 780:1,3 796:18 808:1 839:4,21 vary 836:19 vast 786:13 version 844:13,13,14 844:14,16 versions 842:2 844:7 **VIDEOGRAPHY**

750:23 view 835:2,4 violates 813:5 violating 811:21 violation 827:25 Virtually 813:14 volume 750:8 778:14 volumetric 825:25 826:7,22 827:6 828:4 829:18

volumetrically 828:9 voluminous 776:7 777:9 843:9 Von 752:2 votes 812:15 vs 750:8

W

W 751.5 wait 784:22,24 **waiting** 824:20 **walking** 836:10 WALTON-HADLO... 751:7 want 758:21 762:1 764:18 766:23.25

767:3 768:10 770:4

780:4 785:6 792:6 793:14 795:5,11 798:7 804:25 809:18 817:17,24 820:5,18 825:7 828:22 831:25 835:25 839:25 841:9 841:10 842:8 843:3,5 844:17 wanted 759:1 774:23 781:20 785:4,10,23 800:20,21 840:16 wants 823:18 828:12 Warren 751:6 774:2 wasn't 765:16 771:22 788:3.4 water 750:6,9 751:8,13 751:21 752:1 753:8 753:16,17,18,22 754:5,7,8,13 755:22 755:24 756:3 760:20 761:5,6,9,13,18,20,20 764:22,23 765:4,6,16 766:4,5,10,19,21 768:14,16,16 769:1,2 769:15 770:12 771:4 771:24 772:4,4 775:16,17,20,22 776:1 777:13,15,15 777:16,16,17,17,18 777:21.23.23 778:1.8 778:12,23,23,24,24 778:25 779:2,2,8 785:12,14,17,19 786:15 787:4,5,19 788:15 789:3,14,15 789:16,17,21 790:19 791:5 792:16 793:1 793:10,12,17,19,24 794:4 795:1,2,6,17 796:14,17 797:15 798:8,21,22,25 799:5 800:1,6,13,20,23 801:4,13 802:1,10,12 802:15,19,25 803:9 804:11 805:6,10,10 805:11,12,16,18,21 805:21,22 806:2,2,4,7 807:8,18 808:2,5,21 808:22,22 809:3,3,19 809:20,22,24 810:7 810:20,21 811:4,10 811:11,16,18,24 812:11,12 813:1,20 813:23 814:9,11,17 815:4,13,14,18,19 816:2,6,17 818:2,24 819:21 820:12,13,14 820:15 823:3 824:21

824:23 825:1,10,13 826:1,2,8,24 827:3,11 827:12 828:9 829:3,5 829:7,9,25 830:5,7,20 831:20 832:16.22 833:2,7 837:18,20 838:10,13,14,15,19 838:25 waters 800:10 watt 830:14 way 764:13 779:9 799:6,7,9 802:7 817:23 823:5,25 828:23 829:11,18 830:24 831:14 838:18 842:19 845:3,8 ways 796:18 we'll 795:10 803:16 809:4 810:18 814:4 839:6 846:7 we're 769:17 783:8,18 792:5 799:20,21,25 806:19,25 808:7,11 809:4,17,17 810:4 812:24,24 813:22 816:6 817:12 819:1,3 819:3,10,11,22 823:23 825:22 827:14 828:9,9,13 830:7,8 831:8 832:20.21 838:23 842:20 we've 767:21 774:8,10 774:14,19 775:14 778:11 780:14 785:14 787:13 797:24 801:14 813:6 815:22 816:23 819:8 822:11 824:6 825:8 831:3 837:11 842:6 week 775:7 776:10 782:19 817:4 weekend 758:13 759:1 759:4,16 774:5 821:6 welcome 842:2 went 758:13 814:1 821:6 826:14 weren't 795:23 798:4 843:4 West 751:11 760:1,11 760:21 762:1 763:5,8 763:12,16,25 764:11 764:17 766:25 767:5 767:17,19 769:16,19 770:8,16 771:12

wet 817:2 819:24 wheel 765:3 801:13 wheeled 765:16 766:21 786:8 838:13,14,15 838:19 wheeling 761:1,7 762:8 762:11,16,21 763:17 764:21 765:17.24 766:3,8,21 767:14,20 767:23,25 768:2 772:5,11 774:12 775:21 778:22 779:3 779:7 786:4,5,10 794:11,14 799:23 800:1,8,14 801:5,9,23 801:24 802:20 803:2 803:3,19 804:3,5,9,16 804:21 806:14 807:7 807:12,22,23,24 808:3,6,11,21,25 809:2 813:5 816:19 826:6,9,19 837:17,19 838:11 839:4 wish 823:20 witness 779:16 781:17 783:2 **wobble** 822:6 words 764:13 828:18 work 759:21 816:4 worked 838:18 working 842:21 843:25 844:2,14,15 845:1,9 846:2,3 works 829:18 world 806:6 **WORLDWIDE** 750:23 worse 802:10,15 worth 820:15 wouldn't 828:3 831:2 write 798:17 815:25 writing 777:11 783:9 writings 777:9 written 803:18 807:9 wrong 759:12 793:9 795:14 816:24 821:5 821:25 **WYNDER** 752:2 X Yamasaki 791:4 Yeah 784:9 802:22 803:17 845:12

year 760:16 767:11

793:1 808:20,24

819:18,24,25 820:12 820:16.16 823:25 824:3,13,21 825:16 825:24 826:5,17 827:12.17.21.23 828:6,11,11,14 829:4 829:22,24 830:1,7,11 831:21 832:10,23 833:11,13 834:7,15 834:22 835:3,10,15 836:20 837:1,4,6 years 762:9 767:10 775:24,25,25 786:2,5 786:11 797:22 799:5 817:2,3 819:18,19 821:18 824:8,22 826:2,22 828:19 829:25 830:4,20 832:3,16 839:1 yield 788:10 0 830:13 04 788:11 **05** 788:11 **1** 755:7 756:7 765:10 770:12 793:19 794:16 828:6 831:22 832:2 834.9 **1.1** 778:13 1.11 820:6 **1.2** 822:7 **1.3** 821:22 **1.31** 820:7 **1.6** 778:1,14,18 779:3 **1.72** 820:8 **1/14/1992** 753:10 **1/17/1967** 753:17 1/27/1993 756:18 1/7/2011 757:3 10/1/1976 756:7 10/10/2003 753:5 754:10,11 755:21 10/13/1967 753:20 10/9/2000 755:23 768:3 790:13,14,18 790:24 791:6 792:24

 \mathbf{Z}

0

1

809:25 816:21,24

817:1,7,25 818:18,20 818:20 819:1,13,14

10/17/2008 754:16,18 **10/24/2003** 754:12,14 10/27/1998 755:23 **100** 778:12 792:22,22 811:9 812:25 813:4 814:22 837:24

774:18 776:15,20,24

777:3 778:18 779:6

785:8,10 786:7

779:13 781:21 785:4

101 791:16	1893 796:12,12	203-217 763:23	388 822:17,18 823:2	60 811:12,15 822:9
105 783:21	1964 786:3	206-1 805:7	389 780:25 784:2,11	600 819:22
11 787:10 820:10	1969 799:6	213 751:14	390 781:2 784:2	6137 750:19 752:8
11.1.3 790:12	1994 804:2 821:3,15	217 763:1,9	391 781:5 784:2	847:5,20
11/10/1998 753:4	822:4 823:1	217-6890 751:14	391-5400 751:4	6204 775:9
11/13/1979 756:11	1995 775:24 793:6,15	218 760:12 761:21,22	392 781:7 784:2	6288 796:12
11/14/2006 754:20	794:24 795:16 799:9	812:3	393 781:9 784:3	63 783:20
11/16/1990 755:22	801:7	228 783:21	393-2422 751:10	633 751:3
11/19/2007 754:15	1996 790:17 795:21	23 750:14 758:1	394 781:12 784:3,11	65 802:3
11/26/2008 756:20	797:8 818:17,17	231 783:21	3rd 750:24	655 773:12
11/4/1977 753:9	819:6	23rd 759:10,14,19,20	J 4 4 7 5 5 . 2 .	6A 767:8
11/6/1990 753:13	1997 799:19,22 800:15	839:20 842:14 843:2	4	
11/7/2013 755:19,20	801:4,16,23 802:4,5	846:6	4 821:22	7
11/9/1967 753:21	803:12,23 804:16	24 790:11 847:15	4.6 778:1,18	7-3 755:17
12/20/1990 755:7	810:9,9	25 819:18	4/10/2001 755:13	7/10/2000 755:10
12/21/1966 753:15	1999 816:3	255,000 819:20	4/18/2012 755:3,4	7/12/2001 754:9
1 2/31/1992 753:11	1B 765:21	26 808:1 837:3 839:4	4/2/2009 757:1	7/13/2010 754:24
12/8/1966 753:14	1E 765:22	268-7000 751:18	4/22/1964 753:14	7/23/1972 754:4
1 220 772:22	1st 753:22	269 768:6,23 769:20	4/24/2006 756:3	7/7/1983 754:6
1233 793:16,16	180 755.22	771:6	4/26/1983 754:5	70 822:8
1234 793:16	2	26t 813:5	40,000 820:15	700 751:13 836:22
124 793:6,8	2 762:2 768:5 820:11	26th 832:7	400 820:12 836:23	700 751:15 656:22 701 750:24
124 793:0,8 1244 794:6	827:8,9,13,15,23	27 754:14	400,000 820:13	701 750.24 708 762:3 764:1,15
126,000 788:19	828:1 831:17,18	28 762:25 763:8,23	405-B 807:16	709 764:1 840:18,24
127 804:23	832:1	281 783:22,22	408,000 788:1	841:4,20
127 804.23 128 783:21 803:15,17	2(b) 766:2	286 8 814:4	408,thousand 788:12	70s 786:20
129 803:17	2/1/2012 754:18	287 793:18,21 794:10	4119 768:1	710 840:18,24 841:20
13 771:24 813:5 824:8	2/1/2012 /34.18 2/14/2006 755:25	794:22 795:7,9	415 750:25 751:4,10,18	72 762:25 763:8,23
839:4	2/3/2004 756:24	796:10	425 751:17	750 750:9
14 787:16	2/5/2005 754:23	287.5 794:18	433,000 819:14	758 768:21
140 783:21	2/7/1985 755:6	2870 814:7	4353 757:2	761 753:3
140 783.21 142 834:18	20 820:12,12 822:7	2871 814:13	4405 767:24	763 753:4,5,7,8,9,10,11
142 654.16 143 762:25 763:8,8	20-year 822:3,8 823:3	2nd 754:19	4405B 807:14	753:12,13,14,14,15
143 -147 763:23	200 775:14 836:21	2110 /34.19	4642 760:18	753:17,18,19,20,21
145 825:11	200,000 818:19,23	3	4A 765:12,14	753:22,23,24 754:3,4
146 834:18	200, 000 818.19,23 2000 817:16 821:3	3 756:9 764:18	4A /03.12,14	754:5,6,7,9,10,11,12
140 834.18 147 762:25 763:9	822:9 823:4	3-year 832:13	5	754:14,15,16,17,18
147 762:25 763:9,12	2003 760:24 765:7	•	5 785:17 788:21,23	754:19,20,21,23,24
		3/10/1967 753:18		
149-201 763:23	799:13 821:15,16	3/13/2001 755:12	5/14/2001 755:14 5/24/1972 754:3	754:25 755:3,4,6,7,8
15 760:5 775:25 826:10	823:1	3/14/1972 753:22		755:9,10,12,13,14,15
1521 777:8	2003-2012 753:3	3/2/2009 753:12	5/3/1972 753:23,24	755:16,17,18,19,20
1597 755:7,8	2004 765:10 787:10	3/22/2010 755:16	50 786:2,5	755:21,22,23,23,24
15th 765:7 767:11	791:6	3/24/1975 753:8	50/50 816:9,13	755:25 756:3,5,7,9,11
16 789:6	2008 755:24	30 820:10	500,000 818:20 819:1	756:12,14,15,17,18
166,000 788:14	2009 775:24	300,000 790:18 791:7	51 762:25 763:8,23	756:19,20,22,23
167,000 819:13	201 763:1,9,13 768:21	819:6	511,000 819:17	77 783:21
16807 833:24	2010 790:20 796:4	301-03 822:12,18	522-7096 750:25	771 756:24
169 763:10 169,000 788:11	797:2 798:14 814:3	302-03 822:11,18	53 773:12	773 756:24 757:1,3
169 mm /xx·	815:23 2011 839:1	304 750:4	58 783:20	779 757:5
		31 820:10	6	78 773:12
17 759:8		222 024.0 17	i U	784 757:5,6,6,7,7,8
17 759:8 170 763:10	2012 833:21,23 834:15	322 834:8,15		
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1	3335 753:11	6 789:10,11 790:1	791 757:8
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2 177 764:21 767:12	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1 760:15,23 788:2	3335 753:11 340-A 777:2	6 789:10,11 790:1 6/13/2000 755:9	
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2 177 764:21 767:12 17th 758:8 759:18	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1 760:15,23 788:2 819:9 822:4 847:15	3335 753:11 340-A 777:2 35 820:14,15	6 789:10,11 790:1 6/13/2000 755:9 6/14/1972 756:5	791 757:8 7th 755:19
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2 177 764:21 767:12 17th 758:8 759:18 842:25 843:1	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1 760:15,23 788:2 819:9 822:4 847:15 2013-14 788:12	3335 753:11 340-A 777:2 35 820:14,15 352 819:8	6 789:10,11 790:1 6/13/2000 755:9 6/14/1972 756:5 6/14/2013 754:19	791 757:8 7th 755:19
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2 177 764:21 767:12 17th 758:8 759:18 842:25 843:1 18 754:11	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1 760:15,23 788:2 819:9 822:4 847:15 2013-14 788:12 2014 788:2 839:2	3335 753:11 340-A 777:2 35 820:14,15 352 819:8 385 775:8 777:4	6 789:10,11 790:1 6/13/2000 755:9 6/14/1972 756:5 6/14/2013 754:19 6/15/2003 754:21	791 757:8 7th 755:19 8 8-3 753:7
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2 177 764:21 767:12 17th 758:8 759:18 842:25 843:1 18 754:11 180 783:21	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1 760:15,23 788:2 819:9 822:4 847:15 2013-14 788:12 2014 788:2 839:2 202 783:21	3335 753:11 340-A 777:2 35 820:14,15 352 819:8 385 775:8 777:4 386 779:15	6 789:10,11 790:1 6/13/2000 755:9 6/14/1972 756:5 6/14/2013 754:19 6/15/2003 754:21 6/28/1984 754:7	791 757:8 7th 755:19 8 8-3 753:7 8-5 756:22
17 759:8 170 763:10 1700 752:2 177 764:21 767:12 17th 758:8 759:18	2012 833:21,23 834:15 2013 750:14 758:1 760:15,23 788:2 819:9 822:4 847:15 2013-14 788:12 2014 788:2 839:2	3335 753:11 340-A 777:2 35 820:14,15 352 819:8 385 775:8 777:4	6 789:10,11 790:1 6/13/2000 755:9 6/14/1972 756:5 6/14/2013 754:19 6/15/2003 754:21	791 757:8 7th 755:19 8 8-3 753:7

	1		1
8/1/1990 756:17			
8/10/1981 756:14			
8/14/1978 756:9			
8/17/2010 756:22,23			
8/20/2013 755:17			
8/30/2009 755:8			
8/4/2008 755:15			
80 783:21			
800 750:25			
81 814:24			
82 803:21 819:17			
83 815:9			
841 757:9,9			
847 750:9			
047 730.9			
9			
9-11 755:13			
9-6 755:12			
9-7 755:10			
9.1 789:5			
9/14/1982 756:15			
9/14/2011 754:17			
9/15/1980 756:12			
9/27/2003 756:19			
9/6/2013 755:18			
9/7/1967 753:19			
9/9/2008MWD 753:7			
9:00 759:20			
90012 751:14			
90s 822:8			
92612 752:3			
94 821:3 822:2 823:3			
94105-2482 751:18			
94111 750:24			
94111-1809 751:4			
94111-4067 751:10			
949)223-1170 752:3			
95 794:20			
95's 801:20			
96 795:5,13,15,19,19			
795:22 796:3,9			
981-3498 750:25			
9th 755:20			
1			
1	I		
i .			

```
1
                                                                               APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL(Continued)
         IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                         2
                                                                               MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF ORANGE COUNTY:
            IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                         3
                                                                                     ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS KARNOW, JUDGE
                                                                                      18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700
                 DEPARTMENT NO. 304
                                                                         4
                                                                                     Irvine, CA 92612
                    ---000---
                                                                                     (949) 223-1170
      SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                         5
                                                                                     By: PATTY J. QUILIZAPA ESQ. (CourtCall):
                                                                         6
               Plaintiff,
                         ) Case No. CPF-10-510830
                                                                                               ---000---
                         ) Case No. CPF-12-512466
                                                                         8
              Trial
      VS.
                                                                         9
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF ) Volume VI
                                                                        11
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
                                                                        12
                         ) Pages 848 - 965
                                                                        13
               Defendant.
                                                                        14
                                                                        15
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                                                        16
            GEORGE E. MCDONALD HALL OF JUSTICE
                                                                        17
                SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
                                                                        18
               Thursday, January 23, 2014
                                                                        19
                                                                        20
      Reported By: RHONDA R. HARRIS, CSR No. 7414
              Registered Professional Reporter No. 36409
                                                                        21
                                                                        22
                JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                        23
          WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                        24
      701 Battery St., 3rd floor, San Francisco, California 94111
                                                                        25
             (415) 981-3498 or (800) 522-7096
                                                              848
                                                                                                                                     850
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
                                                                         1
                                                                                               CONTENTS
     For Plaintiff:
                                                                         2
          KEKER & VAN NEST
          633 Battery Street
                                                                         3
                                                                                CLOSING ARGUMENT
                                                                                                                                    PAGE
          San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
          (415) 391-5400
                                                                         4
                                                                                                                           853
                                                                                By Mr. Keker
          By: JOHN W. KEKER, ESQ.
                                                                         5
           DANIEL PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                                By Mr. Hixson
                                                                                                                           899
            WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ.
                                                                         6
           DAN JACKSON, ESQ.
                                                                         7
           AUDREY WALTON-HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                         8
     For Defendant Metropolitan Water District:
                                                                                REBUTTAL ARGUMENT
                                                                         9
                                                                                                                           956
                                                                                By Mr. Keker
          BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
10
                                                                        10
          Three Embarcadero Center
          San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
          (415) 393-2422
         By: THOMAS S. HIXSON, ESQ.
COLLIN C. WEST, ESQ.
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF
                                                                        12
                                                                        13
          SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
14
                                                                        14
          700 N. Alameda Street
         Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 217-6890
                                                                        15
15
          By: HEATHER C. BEATTY, ESQ.
                                                                        16
16
          BETTY KUO BRINTON, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
                                                                        17
          MARCIA SCULLY, ESQ.
17
                                                                        18
          MORRISON & FOERSTER
18
          425 Market Street
                                                                        19
          San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
                                                                        20
          (415) 268-7000
          By: RAJ CHATTERJEE, ESQ.
                                                                        21
20
21
     CITY OF TORRANCE:
                                                                        22
     JOHN FELLOWS, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
22
                                                                        23
     THREE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT:
                                                                        24
23
     STEVEN M. KENNEDY, ESQ. (Via CourtCall)
24
                                                                        25
25
                                                              849
                                                                                                                                     851
```

PROCEEDINGS

Thursday, January 22, 2014, 9:12 A.M.

---oOo---

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Good morning. Everybody got my questions? Great.

MR. KEKER: What questions?

THE COURT: Probably the same things that you had already thought about, but again I wanted to emphasize that some of those questions may have been really misguided. Feel free to sort of point out that I've missed something, that's really the other way around.

I suggest we just start with San Diego, which is challenging, and then turn to Met and then allow San Diego to maybe have some rebuttal, and we can go back and forth about maybe roughly an hour for each side total.

MR. KEKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Yes, we did get questions. We appreciate them. I have a presentation to make that is -- is designed to answer all of those questions. If you get impatient that I'm not getting to the one that you want me to talk about, just tell and I'm happy to be interrupted.

But I'm going to begin --

they come up, the Court is right to zero in on cost causation because it is the standard that's common to all of the claims in this case, and it's why Met's rates violate all of the laws that San Diego has alleged.

Just a list of Prop 26, Prop 13, the Wheeling statutes, the Government Code, the Met Act and the Common Law.

Cost causation also provides the answer to the first question that the Court asks, and I realize -about SWP costs, State Work Project costs, and I realize that the Court asked that to Met, but San Diego's answer is that Met is -- that cost causation precludes -forbids Met -- Met from simply passing along Department of Water Resources charges and calling them transportation in Met systems. All of the documents in the record that have analyzed the question, those are the NARUC standards that Ms. Gilman talked about, the 1969 Brown and Caldwell study, the October 1995 and October -- and December 1995 RMI reports, the 2010 Bartles and Wells report, the 2012 FCS report, all of which are in the record, say that because Met doesn't own the State Water Project, as it is traditionally and incontrovertibly true, the SWP cost, State Water Project cost, must be categorized as supply cost. The only document contrary to that on Met's side of the ledger, other than things that are written by their general

THE CLERK: Start by stating your name, ase.

MR. KEKER: John Keker for San Diego. CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. KEKER: I'm going to begin with the Question No. 3, that you posed to the parties; whether the parties agree that the rates are -- needed to be based on cost causation. The answer from San Diego is a resounding yes. We believe that Met agrees with that as its trial presentation made clear. This is one of their opening slides, Slide 39, and they -- they told you that rates should reflect cost causation and not be determined by and so on. So we think we agree.

The record also makes clear what cost causation means. The American Water Works Association, which both parties take as authoritative --

Jeff, we can take that down --

-- defines it to mean that quote, "Water rates are established so that users generally pay an amount equal or proportional to the cost the system incurs to provide them service."

I'm citing the administrative record, 2010 at Pages 4185 and '86, which is the AWWA annual. Although Prop 26, of course, has specific statutory language and procedural requirements, that I'm going to discuss as counsel, is the 2010 Raftelis report, which we now know was written in critical part, this part, by Met staff. Told them what to say and told them to say it was appropriate, and the 1996 RMI report where the same thing happened, where they switched from '95 to -- December 95 to a different report because they consulted quote, "with staff."

And parenthetically, Met continues to assert that RMI never changed its position regarding how State Water Project cost should be allocated. They said that in their brief at page 57. That's completely false. I showed that it's false at the end of the trial. RMI allocated all SWP supply costs in October and December as supply, and it wasn't until they quote, "consulted with Met staff" that they changed things and said that they could be done a different way in 1996.

I don't think I need to go through that. If you want me to, I will, but the idea that they say that they didn't -- that RMI didn't change position has proven is wrong.

Furthermore, the cost causation --

THE COURT: So is it your thought that it is not until 2010 that there is anything in the record that suggests that rates set by Met before 2010 had a basis? In other words, the only basis is one that shows up in

Pages 852 to 855

2010.

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.4

MR. KEKER: No. Our position is that all of the rates set by Met since their findings of fact in 1997 had a basis, and the basis is exactly what they said the basis is. We're setting the rates, not because of cost causation, not because it is reasonable, but because we need to follow the hold harmless principle, we need to make sure that people that don't wheel, don't have their rates go up. That's the entire basis. And it's the entire basis -- they still -- they doubled down on that. They go back. That's the basis of the rates from 1997 on, before unbundling, after unbundling, and all of the way to the present.

THE COURT: You don't think that there is anything in the record before 2010 that suggests that they had a different basis than the one that you just articulated; that is, that they have got a cost causation basis that's actually based on something that they are going to -- or that they are suggesting is actually based on the cost of transporting water?

MR. KEKER: No, Your Honor. In the sense that the only -- that the basis that they had -- the all-important rabbit goes into the hat is the finding or the "whereas" clause of the 1997 resolution where they just say, if C. Dixon, if we feel like saying it, state

say that's just as conclusory and just as worthless and just as non-substantial evidence as the "whereas" clauses. So -- and that's all that's in the record.

So it's the upshot -- Ms. Gilman admitted that if Met followed NARUC, the regulatory accounting rules, they'd put all of these State Water Project costs into supply. That's in the transcript at 732 and 733 and 735 and 736. The whole reason that the American Water Works Association recommends following NARUC is precisely because it is designed with cost causation in mind and Ms. Gilman says, we don't follow it.

This is one of their slides, their slide in the presentation of the administrative record 112, and they talk about the NARUC guide -- AWWA says NARUC guidelines provide for adequate breakdown of expenses for cost of service allocation and appropriated -- appropriate distribution of functionally allocated expenses. So --

THE COURT: But it's also true that they don't have to follow this -- there is no particular reason why they have to follow this way of accounting.

MR. KEKER: No. That's true. I guess they don't. But, now, they are outside of -- and this is industry standard. They are not following industry standards. What they have to do under the law is follow

856 858

water costs are our costs. Transportation of water by the Department of Water Resources is our transportation --

THE COURT: Right. And I'm willing to agree with you in the next couple of minutes, at least, that the "whereas" clauses alone aren't worth anything; just looking at a "whereas" clause is not helpful and that I need to see something that that "whereas" clause is based upon.

And your position is that there is nothing in the record that shows that those "whereas" clauses have a basis; is that right?

MR. KEKER: Yes, that's correct. And what they would claim is in the record is they got -- they got RMI to change, they consulted with RMI, and they said, hey, look, guys, here's our position, and RMI said that's their position. That's the 1995/1996 thing after RMI -- and they had been real clear that this should be a supply cost. And then the same thing happened in 2000 later on with Mr. Raftelis, the same thing. They said Mr. Raftals says whatever he said, and they came back and stayed, no, no, no, the general counsel and the Ms. Gilman wrote, No, you got to say that is appropriate to use those.

Those -- I mean, that's their basis, and we

cost causation. They claim that they are following cost causation. In order to follow cost causation, you look -- I mean, there is one thing is to look at what does that mean in the industry, and another place to look is just your commonsense. What does it mean? A cost is caused by something else. They got to somehow put these things together and they haven't, and I guess that's our point.

Our point is until they decided to discourage wheeling, until they decided to go for rate stability over wheeling, they had no problem with the industry standard and their consultant's advice that State Water Project was a source of supply. That's what it is. If you are going to do a cost causation analysis, that's how you would functionalize it and so on.

It was only when they decided that they needed rate stability at all costs to avoid, quote, "financial injury to the members," they came up with what we believe is not appropriately identified as cost causation. It is just -- it is untethered.

And, in fact, in their brief, they spent 130 pages, what they really are talking about, Oh, whatever we do is reasonable. I mean, look how hard we work. It is reasonable. They are not really talking about cost causation. They don't even try. It is just, this is --

we're doing it because we want to do it this way.

2.2

2.5

1.5

2.4

THE COURT: One of the issues here -- and I don't know if there is an answer to this -- and one of sort of the themes of my questions is to what extent and how detailed does the cost causation analysis have to be to be upheld for Met to do it? How closely tethered does it have to be?

So, for example -- and I use the phrase "to some extent" quote, unquote in some of my questions. If it's true that, at least, to some extent both supply and transportation costs reflected in a certain rate, how much more work do you think Met has to do to make it a valid tether, as it were? How -- do they have to get it down to the penny? I mean, probably not.

MR. KEKER: No, no. And that's why they cite the second "Griffith" case that says, You don't have to get it down to the penny. You have to get it down to something reasonable. What we say -- and this is about as far as this case goes -- you can't just ignore it. You can't -- it is not a question of getting something down to the penny. You can't just make up that State Water Resources fixed costs, get dumped on transportation rates without making any connection between cost causation. You can't take Water Stewardship Rate and these \$100 million desalinization

isn't within the realm of the reasonableness, reasonable cost of service, cost causation, then you should look at it again and tell them they didn't do it right. That's where we think we're going. That's where we want to go, but we're not asking you now -- because you don't have anything before you to do this -- to tell them how to do it. We're asking you to tell them they have to do it, because they haven't.

And, I mean, they -- you know the excuses. I mean, they talk about they can deviate from industry standard because the Met specifically paid for reaches of aqueducts or other state water -- State Water Projects conveyance infrastructure, that's at their brief at 48; but we pointed out that the DWR contract specifically says that State of California shall be and remain the owner of such project transportation facilities and so on.

And the California Supreme Court, 40 years ago in "Marchant", took this argument about, sort of, oh, we equitably should be treated as an owner of the system, and said no, no, no, that's not right. They made arguments about moving non-state water -- project water through the system, doing some minimal wheeling or blending State Water Project water with Colorado River water, but that is irrelevant to the cost on this

projects, these water recycling projects that cost huge amounts of money, local -- you know, don't-flush-your-toilet-so-much programs and just say, that gets loaded on to the wheeling costs. There has gone to be some effort at making a connection.

And then you can't simply ignore what you say over and over -- I'll get to this in a second -- is a real phenomena, namely dry year peaking that affects members differently. And they admit, they just blow it off. I mean, they just ignore it.

So your question -- and I'm going to talk about that more -- is exactly the right question, but it is not necessarily for this trial.

To what extent do they have to do it? How granular do they have to get? What we're saying, since they haven't done it at all, you should issue a writ of mandate that says, go back, do a real cost of service study. You don't have to say it, but I recognize as a judge that there may be arguments in the administrative record about how to do it correctly and how granular to get and all that, but that's not the case that we have before us. Here, they haven't done it at all, and that's what we're asking you to fix in this case. And we're asking you to keep continuing jurisdiction, because if they don't fix it right or in some way that

record. It is irrelevant to the cost of moving water through Met's conveyance system. It is not connected in any way. Neither causes those costs, and nothing in the record suggests otherwise, but to show how open-minded we are. I mean, we can imagine a situation where that -- where there is a bunch of -- maybe somebody can show a benefit from blending that is it goes over to somebody else. I mean, if they could show that and show the benefit and quantify it and put that into a cost --

THE COURT: They haven't quantified it, but they have shown that. I mean, right? They have talked about some of the benefits of blending. When you got a lower desalination in the water, that's a benefit.

MR. KEKER: Well, they say it is a benefit. What we say is that we're asking to wheel Colorado River water -- or somebody is asking to wheel water. You are not telling us that you're going to blend it -- if they choose to do some blending, it is completely up to them. They are completely in charge of what happens when they wheel water -- when they move water through their conveyance system. The idea that somehow a benefit -- an unquantified benefit of blending to reduce salinity is an advantage to somebody who doesn't have any guarantee that he's going to get it -- I mean, it's just --

THE COURT: Is part of your problem that they haven't quantified it? In other words, that they just sort of put it out there as a benefit, but we have to idea what that's worth; and, therefore, it is not possible to use that as a factor in setting a rate?

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.4

is.

MR. KEKER: They haven't even shown that it has a monetary benefit to anybody. They haven't shown that the cost -- I mean, they haven't shown that the water that San Diego gets or anybody else gets, when they wheel, is any different from --

It is a little bit like saying a gold-plated ring contains some gold molecules, and so it is fair to charge the same price for the gold-plated ring as it would be for a 24 carat ring, we're going to charge you for all of that. I mean, it's worse because at least the ring buyer wants and gets something that looks like gold, and all San Diego wants here is the Colorado River water conveyed through the system. They are not asking for, bargaining for, or getting, in many cases -- in most cases. We have no idea. They say there is some benefit, but it is not -- it is not connected to the transportation of water through their system. It is what they want to do. If they want to blend these blend water and reservoirs, that's fine.

And I guess the other thing I wanted to say in

not. And I think the answer is, it doesn't have anything to do with that. I mean, either what Met does in terms of its rates is reasonable or it is not. It doesn't matter whether the Administrative Code --

In other words, the Administrative Code, as I understand it, isn't an independent source of justification for how the rates are structured. It just describes what they are.

MR. KEKER: We agree with that.

THE COURT: Is that right?

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir. That's what we think. That's exactly right from our point of view.

I'm going to talk about your questions about the exchange agreement a little bit later when it's appropriate.

So the question arises why -- and we sort of answered this. Why did Met allocate the State Water Project cost to transportation when all of the industry standards, all of the early studies say they are supply costs? And you raise the issue of what documents do they rely on.

What about these documents cited at page 19, lines 3 through 12 of Met's brief. Those are the documents they rely on, and they are all related to Met's purported findings back in 1997. That's all they

response to one of your questions is that inclusion of these State Water Project costs is common to all the transportation rates in this case.

And you asked about Administrative Code Section 4405, whether or not that's relevant or irrelevant. We believe it is very relevant because as defined it is a system access rate, the Water Stewardship Rate, and then incremental cost of power, but it is what defines Met's wheeling rate and established that -- establishes what it includes. We believe it is illegal, but also -- certainly relevant to -- it's -- that's how we know what the wheeling rate

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KEKER: Our position at the end is going to be system access rate is illegal, Water Stewardship Rate is improperly set and, therefore, illegal, System Power Rate is illegal, and the wheeling rate of 4405 is illegal; all of them are illegal on this record.

THE COURT: I was just trying to figure out whether Met thought that the fact that the Administrative Code exists and that it has those formulations in it is somehow a defense, in that sense that it goes to the merits, that it's useful in trying to figure out whether what Met has done is reasonable or

are. But they are not substantial evidence; they are erroneous legal conclusions.

They simply assert that the State Water
Project conveyance system is Met's conveyance system and
that Met can charge unavoidable costs, like a supply
cost, to the wheeling rate because doing so quote, "is
necessary in order to protect the hold harmless
principle." You got to protect the people who aren't
wheeling. All of them are written findings on page 19,
they are written findings and board meeting minutes at
which they were adopted. That's what Met is listing in
their brief.

And under the law -- and I'm quoting from the "Livermore" case -- "a conclusory resolution which does not contain any evidence or factual information, does not constitute substantial evidence." "Livermore" case is "184 Cal App. 3rd, 531 at 552." It's a 1986 case.

When you look back to see what the documents that Met put in its own record to support the wheeling rate, they are the very documents we pointed out in pages 4 through 10 of our Post-Trial Brief. They consist of things like the December 1995 RMI report, which I spent so much time on, which says, you know, blatantly "in order to satisfy the requirement that member agencies be held harmless from any cost-shifting

due to wheeling -- that's a quote -- "wheelers should be charged," quote, "fixed SWP costs, quote, "water management conservation cost," close quote, quote, "the cost of acquiring new dry year water supplies."

2.2

2.5

That's language straight out of RMI. We detailed for this -- this in the Posttrial Brief. As I said, they raised the hold harmless principle at page 76 of their Brief.

And their argument is simply that if we don't do it this way, then non-wheeling, full-service water users will have to pay more. That's not cost of service. It is arbitrarily deciding not to use cost of service because it believes -- because of the hold harmless principle.

Now, unless the Court wants me to go somewhere else, I was going to turn to the second question the Court posed about the fundamental documents that show how to reasonably calculate wheeling charges. And, of course, the first thing -- and I know I'm preaching to somebody who understands this fully, but the first thing is to look at the wheeling statute. The statutory definition of fair compensation, which is defined as the reasonable charges incurred by the owner of the conveyance system and it goes on.

And it also says, "including reasonable credit

Post-Trial Brief. First, at AR2010, page 1165 and 1166, it talks about Met paying member agencies up to \$250 per acre-foot to develop water, so that Met doesn't have to buy it. They are spending \$250 to avoid a supply charge. The record is replete with references to the fact that the local resource programs called LRP and other projects funded by the Water Stewardship Rate prevent Met from having to buy more imported water supplies.

When a member agency buys its own imported water from wheeling, it also saves Met imported water costs, but Met does not factor that into the wheeling rate. That's one.

Second, consistent with that idea, you have got PTX-25 --

Could we put that up, Jeff.

This is that Shane Chapman memo from Met and talks about the 65-dollar per acre-foot benefit to everybody else, to Met when San Diego bought IID water. So he's quantified it. You remember this is they're -- talking about how much -- how much this is going to help the cost of water in the system. \$65 per acre-foot.

Third, PTX-26, Met staff in a memo decided that -- they concluded that MWD should seek to promote regional benefits of the IID conservation and storage.

for any offsetting benefits for the use of the conveyance system," Water Code 1811C. In determining fair compensation Met, quote, "shall act in a reasonable manner consistent with the requirement of law to facilitate the wheeling," and that's 1813. And 1813

also says, the Court should give due consideration to

the purposes and policies of this article.

So the first thing to notice is that fair compensation is limited to charges incurred by the owner of the system that somebody is asking to use. This is an independent statutory basis why Met cannot lawfully charge DWR costs because they don't own it.

The second thing to note is that Met's wheeling rate doesn't give the credit for offsetting benefits that the definition of fair compensation requires, and you asked the question about that, too. That's your last question.

What are the -- what's the evidence of offsetting benefits? The answer is that San Diego has cited -- and here we're in the -- since we're in the wheeling statute, we're talking about all relevant evidence under your ruling.

San Diego cited four documents in evidence showing that Met gets such benefits, and these are detailed at page 47 and 48 of our Brief, san Diego

They realize they're were regional benefits. And on that basis they recommended that MWD offer San Diego a discount of more than 50 percent from MWD's average cost wheeling rate. In other words, to offset that regional benefit that we were going to get, let's give them a 50 percent reduction.

And then, fourth, finally, Met's CFO, Brian Thomas, stated in PTX-30 that Met's member agencies benefit from a full Colorado River aqueduct, and obviously the full Colorado River aqueduct is what the IID deal helped promote to keep the Colorado River aqueduct full.

All of this establishes, we believe, that wheeling can be beneficial to Met, to all of the members of Met. Yet, Met did not bother to calculate the benefits of wheeling when it set its rates in 2011, '12, '13, and '14.

You also ask whether or not the prior Met versus IID decision held that Met need not implement an incremental wheeling rate. And we believe that -- that's not what that case -- that case doesn't go that far. The holding in that case was simply that Met is not required to have an incremental wheeling rate, point-to-point rate as a matter of law; that the fair compensation statute doesn't establish that as a matter

of law. But there what the Court said -- and as you remember sent back for determination -- was, you know, give me a set of facts, and then we'll decide whether or not that's fair compensation. Just don't try to do it on a matter of law basis. That's this case. That's why we're here. We have got a set of facts, and we're talking whether or not fair compensation statutes apply to that.

2.2

2.5

2.3

Now, we're not taking the position -- and you asked this question, too. We're not taking the position that as a matter of law Met has to adopt an incremental cost, an incremental wheeling rate. We recognize that it is possible -- don't know what it is, but it is possible that some other kind of wheeling rate could satisfy the statutory definition of the three -- three things. It would have to -- it couldn't unlawfully prioritize rate stability, as Morrow Bay says. It would have to satisfy the definition of fair compensation, and it would have to facilitate wheeling. Maybe there is some non-incremental wheeling rate that could do that. We don't -- we don't know and aren't taking a position of that. But it is significant, we think, that the only wheeling rates in evidence in the administrative record that satisfy these requirements are incremental rates. So we think that question is sort of pointing

locked into that.

And then there is the DWR wheeling rate, that's important too. That's Met AR slide 58. We talked to you about this. This is the way the Department of Water Resources charges for wheeling within the State Water Project, and it's clearly an incremental rate. You pay for incremental power; you pay for the power that it takes; you pay incremental costs that would not be incurred if non-project water were not scheduled for or delivered to Met.

And in this instance, Met doesn't have to pay for the facility's charges for parts of the aqueduct that it helped finance. I mean, they go that far in the DWR rate. It is a true incremental rate.

Translated to our case, this would mean that San Diego would pay only the incremental costs for wheeling, which would not include facility's fees because San Diego has been, quote, "participating in the repayment of Met's facility since 1946."

But, again, we're not saying that you should -- or we're urging you to adopt some wheeling rate. We're saying exactly the way to do it. The point is that -- is that the wheeling rate that Met has adopted, unlike DWR's wheeling rate, other incremental rates and, perhaps, other kind of rates that somebody

872 874

on the right track. That's what Brian Thomas' memo about what the evolution -- the evaluation matrix showed. That's San Diego opening slide 64.

The commitments, you remember the equivalent margin method was just loading everything on it so that nobody got hurt. The commitment's method was making everybody promise to buy a certain amount of water and promise to pay for it whether they need it or not and would that kind of rate structure encouraged wheeling, yes, said Mr. Thomas, if you could figure out the incremental costs.

It's also what RMI's December '95 report shows. I talked about this at length in the opening and in the trial. Option 3 in the 95 RMI study was wheeling rate based on incremental costs, and they made the observation that this could lead to substantial displacement of Met sales. I need to reallocate revenues among member agencies.

And it was the reasonableness, it could be perceived as a very reasonable rate for wheeling service. And the supply impact is that it could give member agencies a powerful tool for displacing Met sales to support the formation of a market for water. So all of those studies said the only way to facilitate wheeling is to use an incremental rate. We're not

could think up, fails the statutory test of fair compensation. It fails by design -- it fails by design to facilitate wheeling. That's why they did it. They didn't want people to wheel; they wanted to make it more expensive so that people wouldn't do it.

So in the face of overwhelming evidence that Met's rates have the purpose and effect of discouraging wheeling, Met's primary answer is to assert that San Diego never alleged a violation of that requirement and instead raised it, quote, "for the first time, closed quote at trial. That's what they said in their brief. Met has been on -- that's just nonsense.

Met has been on continuing notice of the allegation since MWD versus IID left that issue expressly unresolved. San Diego alleged in both of the present cases that Met's wheeling rates unlawfully force wheelers to subsidize non-wheelers. That was the Third Amended Complaint paragraphs 23 through 29, 41 through 43. We've emphasized throughout the case that the effect and express purpose of this is to discourage wheeling in violation of Section 1813. And one example of that is our July 13 -- excuse me -- July 23rd, 2012, Discovery Brief at pages 2 and 9 where we were talking about exactly that. So this is not the first time.

Similarly, Met asserts that San Diego's

arguments about rate stability, the hold harmless principle, quote, "is a theory that SDCWA never articulated before, not in any of its petitions, complaints, and not even in its pretrial briefs."

That's a quote from their brief. It's obviously false.

Just go back and read the first page of San Diego's Reply Pretrial Brief, and you will see that it's false.

We have been -- that is the point we are making there.

1.5

2.2

1.0

1.5

2.4

Aside from that, and while acknowledging repeatedly that the '97 findings are the bases for its wheeling rates, they tried to distinguish Morrow Bay on the grounds that Met only intends to prevent a full-service customer from subsidizing costs that wheelers should properly be paying. That's in their Brief at page 78. That's revisionist history, we say.

Met's concern is to protect Metropolitan member agencies from financial injury by including all unavoidable -- well, you can read it, it is in the findings. Their attempt to distinguish Palmdale is equally unavailing. They simply assert that they have fully justified the rate, they say, but its justification for the rate is, as I have said five times now, rate stability; and under Palmdale, that is no justification at all.

So unless -- I'm going to turn now to the

acre feet of water in reserve when we only need 3 million-acre feet in any given year.

So, conceptually could it evolve -- if they could prove that there were a line of wheelers saying, we want to wheel and they said, well, in order to let people wheel, we're going to have expand our capacity. If there were evidence in the record like that, that's possible; and you can analyze it and say that the capacity component -- but on this record, there is myriad examples of this being a supply benefit, a significant supply benefit, always recognizes supply benefit. And we believe no evidence that it actually has provided a capacity benefit. We certainly recognize the possibility of that, but we don't see it in this record. And I guess that's my point. They have no evidence that these programs have any capacity benefits that can be attributed to wheelers under principles of cost causation.

And let me just quote from their IRP, which is one of the most important documents that they've cited a lot of times. The IRP states that, quote, "additional conveyance is required, close quote, in order to, quote, deliver water to storage in wet and normal periods so dry year demands could be met as well as capacity required in a dry year to deliver available supplies."

876 878

```
Water Stewardship Rate and try to answer the questions that you asked about the Water Stewardship Rate. The Court is absolutely right that the water stewardship programs has supplied benefits, yet Met charges 100 percent of the Water Stewardship Rate to transportation. This is the -- in answer to the Court's question, the record does not tell us how much, to what extent such projects, quote, "free up capacity" as Met is asserting in their brief. But there is absolutely no evidence in the record that it has freed up capacity or even that it's necessary. They haven't provided evidence showing to what extent these programs have transportation or capacity freeing up benefits.
```

THE COURT: Well, they've shown that it frees up -- to some extent, it frees up capacity; right?

MR. KEKER: No, we believe not. We have not seen any capacity -- any evidence that capacity has been affected because of wheeling in any way. The capacity -- the evidence -- and this is what I am about to talk about -- all the evidence about capacity is that it's caused by dry year peaking. It is not caused by wheeling. It is not caused by the need to move water, when we have system available. All of the capacity evidence in this case is about dry year peaking, the need for dry year supplies, the need to hold 6-million

That's in the record at page 1591. So that's what the IRP says it is about.

They are not saying that we need extra capacity so that we could wheel other people's water; they are saying, we need -- the capacity benefit is dry year benefit.

And it doesn't make a lot of sense really to claim that additional conveyance capacity is attributable to wheeling because under Met's Administrative Code, wheelers can't even count on the conveyance capacity because they come last. In a dry year, everybody else who gets -- who has a right to the water, gets the water. It's only if there's capacity left over after that, which we don't have any examples of, that the wheelers would use it. So --

THE COURT: Is it your understanding that San Diego is in that position with respect to the water that's being wheeled from the IID water, that you are last in line?

MR. KEKER: I'm not sure I understand the question.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. KEKER: Yeah. Excuse me. No. No we're not last in line --

THE COURT: Right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

1

2

8

MR. KEKER: -- because of the exchange agreement. I'm going to talk about the exchange agreement -- the exchange agreement is really a different contractual thing than what I'm talking about right now. What I'm talking about now is a wheeling rate, which I will show in a minute, san Diego uses without regard -- you can forget about the exchange agreement, we would still have standing. We use the wheeling rate. We're going to use the wheeling rate in future. So without the exchange agreement, we would still be here making this claim.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

But -- and we have a pending deal with -- it is in the record, and Mr. Cushman testified about it. There is a pending deal where the next time we wheel water on their system, we will use their wheeling rate. And since these dry years are getting extreme, that may be coming up very, very fast. We have had another deal where we have used their wheeling rate, quite independent of the exchange agreement of the Colorado River water.

So who knows what's going to happen in the future except it is extremely likely, I would say 100 percent, that San Diego and others will want to use Met's conveyance system to buy water from somebody else because of limitations on their water supply, and

which is relevant here. Regulatory fees don't follow the same rules as California Farm Bureau and Sinclair Paint made clear.

The second "Griffith" case is -- goes to your question about how granular do you have to get. And there the landlord, or whoever it was, was saying you have got to get almost a point of service and you can't group people together. And the California Court of Appeal said, No, no, no. These grouping are reasonable. You don't have to go -- there may be another way to do it, but the groupings that you've made and related to what people are getting and what they are not getting, then I think that case talks about some people were getting water from wells, some people were getting water from meters, lots of different -- those groupings were reasonable is what they said. And our point here is that Met doesn't do any groupings about anything. They are treating wheelers as though they are full-service -almost full-service water users because they are loading all of these costs on the wheelers. And they refuse to group similar users together, which is what Griffith 2 said was, okay, if it was done reasonably. Well, they are not. They are lumping everybody in and throwing all of these costs in.

So as for the Court's question about whether

880

they'll have to use the wheeling rate.

And as I said, we're not saying that you can never imagine a situation where wheeling might cause conveyance costs; but we are saying there is nothing in the record, there is no evidence of it here, and certainly it is not what happened so far.

So -- and we think that the Court is right to wonder whether there is -- whether there is evidence in the record and to what extent that evidence shows that projects under the Water Stewardship Rate provide benefits to wheelers. And we have said, there is no -we don't think there is any evidence inside the record or out of it.

Yet, Prop 26 requires Met to prove that it doesn't collect any more than wheeling, quote, directly, close quote, cost, as a, quote, specific government service, closed quote. And that those costs be allocated fairly according to the benefits and burdens of that service. Since they can't make a record on that, they lose is our view.

I've talked about the two "Griffith" cases. We've talked about them in the brief. They have come up with a "Griffith" case. The first "Griffith" case, has nothing to do with anything. It is about regulatory fees, and we made that point. It is E3, not E2 or E4,

or not our position is that Met must allocate its Water Stewardship Rate on a project-by-project basis,

3 San Diego's answer is not necessarily. We're not taking 4

the position that Met could not possibly develop

substantial evidence for allocating some Water

6 Stewardship Costs to supply and some to transportation 7

on a more general level than a project-by-project analysis. But I would point out that -- I mean, maybe

9 that could work, we don't know what could work. But

10 maybe that could work for general conservation projects

11 with regional benefit. But when you comes to this huge, 12

hundred-million-dollar, tens of million-dollars

13 desalination plants or waste water recycling plants, you 14 have to wonder whether or not you could really come up

15 with a principle that would lump it together and apply

16 as Mr. Raftelis did. Mr. Raftelis said you should study 17

on a project-by-project basis; but then in his '99 18 report, he went ahead and said, well, since you haven't

19 done that, let's just split it 50/50. We think that was

20 completely arbitrary. But we're not saying that an 21 appropriate analysis couldn't have some of these

22 conservation projects split between supply and

23 conveyance, based on appropriate analysis. But that

24 isn't what has happened here, and it's not for this 25

case.

883

882

It is what -- if they're going to do it, is what they should do when the case -- when it goes back to them and they are told that rates are invalid and they have to set rates according to a valid cost of service, cost causation study.

2.2

2.5

2.3

And -- but it is also worth noting, because they tried to fuss this up, we think, that Met doesn't have to recover these conservation costs by volumetric rates if it doesn't want to; that's their choice. And if they don't, they don't necessarily have to quantify benefits in terms of transportation versus supply. The Met Act gives them explicit statutory authority to impose a standby charge, in other words, an assessment, which it can recover from its member agencies or from individual parcels or based on, quote, zones or areas of benefit within the Met region or particular member agencies.

This is laid out in Sections 134.5 to 134.9 of the Met Act. It's a procedure expressly subject to the requirements of Prop 218. And if they followed those procedures, they would -- they would satisfy Prop 26 by definition.

In fact, it's what their own engineer's report recognized, that the more equitable way to recover, quote, what they called investments in demand side

specific questions you answered, I want to make sure -- I want to step back and say what San Diego's dry-year-peaking claim, because Met keeps trying to confuse it. Here's our position. Most Met member agencies increase their purchases from Met in dry years and reduce them in average or wet years. In order to accommodate dry year peaking, Met has to incur cost to be ready for dry year increases. And those -- in water demand. Those are water purchase costs; they are storage costs; they are costs in investing and conservation and groundwater storage.

THE COURT: These are costs that are incurred looking forward; right? People are predicting, well, in the future, we're going to have this problem, we need now to spend money and, therefore, to collect money today for these costs that we're going to estimate --

Well, for these needs that we're estimating we're going to have in the future.

MR. KEKER: We don't think -- we don't think that they are all future-looking costs. They are water contracts to buy water from other people. They are the cost of maintaining -- I mean, it could be -- it could be present costs, it could be future costs, but it is the cost of getting ready -- of having a system that can be a supplemental system, a system that in a dry year

884 886

management programs like conservation, water recycling, and groundwater recovery, because these programs run with the land based on the availability of water, not on whether or how much one actually buys water. So the Met engineers say that the use of water rates as a primary source of revenue has placed an increasing burden on rate payers, which might more equitably be paid in part by assessments on land that in part derive its value from the availability of water. We're not saying that's what they have to do, but they have options in how to can charge for these programs.

And the last point I'll make about this Water Stewardship Rate is to address the argument that it's appropriate to charge 100 percent of these costs to its transportation rate because they are required by California law to expand and incentivize conservation. That is just run slam into the Palmdale case, which recognize that you can do both, you can incentivize conservation without violating cost of the service principles.

So I'm going to turn to the third big subject, dry year peaking, unless the Court -- and eventually I'm going to get to the exchange agreement and talk about why it doesn't matter in this case.

But dry year peaking, before I address the

can provide its member agencies with what they need and in a wet year will sit sort of fallow, idle, won't be able to sell as much water and not have as much revenue. That's what we -- and let me cite again the integrated resource plan, which they say is a foundation document, that 1996 IRP. That particularly culls it out. I mean, that's how they describe what they are trying to do in that document.

Now, the next point is that they are -- the record has shown that there are substantial differences in the peaking behavior of Met member agencies. Some peak a little, some peak a lot. San Diego and Met disagree about what the data shows. I'm going to address that in a second. But there is no evidence in the record at all that suggests that all of the members are the same or anywhere near the same.

And then finally, the final point of our claim, is that Met does not recover its dry year peaking costs based on which member agencies cause it to incur those costs or which agencies benefit from Met having this drought insurance available. In Met's brief they've quoted me over and over saying that San Diego doesn't know what dry year peaking costs are. They are intentionally misstating what -- the point I was trying to make, and I would ask you to go back to the record if

there is any question about it.

2.5

But more importantly take a look at the San Diego Post-Trial Brief, pages 30 through 36 and 53 through 58. We identify multiple categories of costs that Met itself acknowledges are caused by dry year peaking across both record evidence and the extra record evidence.

Start with the IRP, the 1996 IRP. They state in that quote, "storing surplus water during normal and wet weather years for later use during dry years can require large capital investments." They identify the 2 billion-dollar East Side reservoir project, half of which was identified as providing drought storage, dry year storage. The IRP also identifies groundwater recovery and conservation as investments that need to be made in planning for dry years. The cost of those programs, of course, are under the Water Stewardship Rate.

Both sides talked about this 2009 Board presentation. Do you remember the flex storage issue where they -- Met identified 10 million in costs associated with flex storage at the Castiak Lake and Lake Paris reservoirs which provided Met a dry year supply benefit. The staff said, We really should categorize this as supply, not as transportation. The

that there is no meaningful variation between the member agencies, sort of these -- they are already naturally spread equally. But that's not true. They told their bond holders in 2012 -- and this is in the record at 16521 -- just what we have been saying. Some agencies depend on Metropolitan to supply 100 percent of their water needs regardless of whether other agencies with local service reservoir aqueducts to capture rain or snow fall rely on Met more in dry years than years with heavy rainfall. And they go on in that same report to talk about Los Angeles' annual variations have differed and will continue to differ by 250,000-acre feet a year.

And the FCS report talks about the difference in peaking between the member agencies. Some of them peaking 7 percent, in other words, from their average, how high do they go 7 percent, some of them 72 percent. So -- I guess I'll come back to that because I want to --

THE COURT: I do want to make sure that Met gets some time this morning also. So maybe another ten minutes or something.

MR. KEKER: Okay. Let me jump over some of that just to get to the point that you have raised, and you'll remember -- I'm not going to show you again the slides that show this peaking behavior. They are all in

Board, as you will remember, said, no.

And then another citation is the -- in the 2012 record is the FCS report. They did an analysis and concluded that Met spent billions -- this is a quote from AR2012, it's page 16178. FCS did an analysis that concluded that, quote, Met spent billions of dollars on drought insurance that -- close quote, that are recovered through Met volumetric water rates. They haven't refuted any of this in the record.

THE COURT: I don't think they disagree that all of this cost a lot of money and that these are real charges and real costs. The issue is whether they reasonably allocated it, for example, through Tier 2 or some other way of handling this, that's a reasonable way to spread those costs out, I think.

MR. KEKER: Okay. Then we're in a much better place than I thought we were. I thought they were still -- so all right. Fine. If that's what -- if that's their position, that's certainly is our position that these are real, and they are large costs and that they've admitted that they've never studied them, they have never tried to figure out who they benefit among the member -- where the benefits flow among the member agencies.

And one of their arguments they make there is

the record.

But the point that you were just asking about, about whether or not they account -- should be required to account for peaking on a dry year basis as opposed to some kind of other rates as a dry year proxy. And this comes back to the foundation principle of cost causation.

Met needs to account for dry year peaking in a way that identifies the costs and assigns those costs proportionately. So the first question is what are the costs, and we've talked about that to some extent. And the -- you know, we talked -- the matrix or the court question about this summer day usage or ten-year rolling average water purchases, neither of those were designed to identify yearly peaks and measure yearly peaks. The amount of water we buy on the hottest summer day has nothing to do with the amount of water that you need over the year.

THE COURT: How do I know that? I mean, maybe it is a reasonable proxy.

MR. KEKER: Well, I guess that's something that actually doing a cost-of-service study, using cost causation principles would give you the answer to; and that's precisely what we don't know. We know that there is a large elephant in the room. We know that nobody

has studied what the elephant is or how it affects different member agencies. We know that it affects different member agencies differently. And that is telling you don't ignore the elephant in the room. We're saying you can't ignore the elephant in the room. The elephant in the room actually is what drives an awful lot of these problems.

1.5

2.3

They are various ways that they could charge for it -- let me get to -- what I'm trying to get to is -- is some of their excuses for it. I mean, they say they have got a Tier 2 rate. There is nothing in the record whatsoever to say that this Tier 2 rate picks up anything having to do with dry year peaking. There is no evidence that shows when it's used, there is no evidence -- just there is no evidence that a Tier 2 rate accounts in any way for dry year peaking.

You'll remember then there is the readiness to serve charge, which in their brief concedes, recovers only a portion of the standby costs. We put that up. It talks about less than 50 percent, I think. Even if a readiness to serve charge covered some dry year cost, Met has not rebutted the argument that the ten-year rolling average fails to account for peaks.

Can we put up 3031 just for a second, Jeff. You'll remember this slide. This is a made-up

admitted this, basically. I mean, look at 738, 739.

Rush through this.

So I'm just -- what we're asking you to do is to -- on dry year peaking is to order Met to do a cost-of-service study that includes and identifies the cost of dry year peaking, allocates the cost based on principles of cost causation and proportionality as the law requires.

What they ultimately do is a fight for another day. That's all we're asking for now. What we are saying is they can't keep ignoring it, which they have been doing.

Finally, the exchange agreement -- or next to finally, and ultimately, the exchange agreement. The Court asks Met to explain whether the Met Administrative Code wheeling rate matters in this case, and I said it does.

And I said -- I mean, even if we never entered into the exchange agreement, we've brought a claim or breach of it. As an entity that pays that rate, we have been saying that we're entitled to challenge it. We've complaining about it since the third -- look at paragraph 72 in the Third Amended Complaint.

Mr. Cushman, as I said, testified. You can find his trial testimony at 190 through 194. One of the

slide. I mean, those two -- ten-year average for both of those member agencies is exactly the same, and you can see the different -- one has drought insurance and one doesn't. They are not buying water in a lot of those years, and the other member agency is buying water in every year. The ten-year average does not do the trick.

They spent the entire page talking about the capacity charge, but what that does is recover for variations within a year. We were not challenging the capacity charge. It doesn't recover any of the costs of acquiring water for use in dry years. It has to do with sizing pipes for the peak summer day.

And so the question is whether or not it's enough that the rates might recover some -- to some extent these dry year peaking costs. The answer is no, it is not enough. The answer is cost causation. They have got to look at it, they have got to tell us that either it doesn't matter or it matters, and here's how we're going to fix it.

They've admitted that they capture these dry year peaking costs through the transportation rates when they say this all built into the system access rate, so on. There is no evidence in the administrative record that they've accounted for it. And June Skillman has

agreements that Met -- that San Diego paid the wheeling rate on is in evidence. That's PTX-698. We talked about a pending wheeling arrangement where we'll have to pay the wheeling rate.

The issue of whether or not the price term in the exchange agreement is the Met wheeling rate is for another time. That's the contract case. That's an issue of contract interpretation. They asked that that be put off to a separate. It will improper, I think, to get to it in this case.

And if you want this laid out in more detail, we would ask you to look at the October 28, 2013, Opposition to Met's Motion in Limine No. 5, which does lay it out.

You asked about judicial estoppel from prior statements by San Diego. Again, the Opposition to Motion in Limine 2000 -- No. 5, we said the wheeling -- the 2003 Exchange Agreement is not a wheeling agreement, but that doesn't mean what the price term means. The price term says that the price will be equal to the charge or charges set by Metropolitan's Board of Directors. First it went to applicable law and regulations, and generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies. What that means is the subject of the next

2.2

trial, not this trial.

2.2

1.5

2.4

THE COURT: Your point now is that you are paying wheeling charges completely separate and apart from whatever price is in the Exchange Agreement?

MR. KEKER: Yes. And we have -- and because we will have to pay wheeling charges in the future, we and any other rate payer has standing to challenge them, just like IID did.

We've already debunked the notion that we should be judicially estopped. They've cited the State Water Resources Control Board statements by Met's general manager, Ms. Stapleton, in 2002. That was before the 2003 Exchange Agreement that had this term in it. So that has nothing to do with anything. It did include this price language that I just quoted.

Then they've also cited the 2009 QSA case from which they quote language concerning an entirely different issue, whether Imperial County had the procedural right to approve the QSA by making environmental impact findings under the wheeling statutes. That did not implicate or address San Diego's rights under the Exchange Agreement or the interpretation of the price term. It had nothing to do with the interpretation of the price term. So there is no judicial estoppel. There's no inconsistency. The

following a procedure set up in 218, notice and protest process related for -- to property related assessments. I won't go into it now, but that's all sort of laid out.

But the point I wanted to add was that the Met Act itself makes a real distinction between the Met Board and its members and the electorate. The electorate means the people who have the vote. This notice and protest process applies to retail water suppliers. They admit that. And the Met Act allows for various voting by the electorate to approve things under Proposition 218.

They also -- under Met Act Section 200 and 352, both dealing with bond proposals or -- and one is bond proposals. That's 200. 352 deals with annexation of another water agency. The procedure in both is the Board approves something, and then the electorate, different from the board, votes on it.

And then finally they've done it before. In 1966 they went to the voters for bond issues. They went back again later. This is all in the administrative record. PTX-352 talks about some of this at 00206075. So there is a lot of evidence within the Met Act, as well as commonsense, that says electorate is not of a vote of two-thirds of the Board.

And with that, Your Honor, I appreciate your

Exchange Agreement is not a wheeling agreement. It doesn't trigger the procedural requirements of the Wheeling Statute, but the Exchange Agreement's price term effectively references the Wheeling Statute, but that's for you to do in another day and not this case.

The final thing, Your Honor, is that the -- I have not talked about and had time to talk about, and I won't much -- the Prop 26, legal issues, because in our briefs, I think we've covered, basically, all of their arguments thoroughly, all of their arguments about why it doesn't apply. We have talked about the imposition -- and you've dealt with some of these in your prior ruling on the judgment of the pleadings.

One argument I want to expand on a little bit, though, is why the Met Board isn't the electorate. You've already tentatively rejected that notion in your September 19 order at page 4, but I want to clarify our position on it since the Met Brief misstates it at page 105 of their Brief. We aren't saying that the voters always have to vote on Met rates or anyone else's, only that the voters have to approve rates that are actually disguised as taxes. Met can avoid popular votes on its rates by following cost-of-service principles and imposing proper rates. I mean, that's fairly obvious. They can also avoid popular votes by

attention. We've submitted a statement of -- proposed Statement of Decision, which we laid out fairly clearly what we believe the appropriate relief should be. And with that, I will sit down. And hopefully you will give me a little bit of time for rebuttal.

THE COURT: I appreciate this very much. Why don't we take a ten-minute recess, and let people's fingers have a little bit of a break.

(Recess taken 10:20 a.m. until 10:32 a.m.) CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. HIXSON: Tom Hixson for Metropolitan.

San Diego spoke for about an hour and ten minutes this morning, so I will try to use a similar amount of time for my remarks. I'm going to use as the organizing principle the Court's questions from yesterday. And I'll go through them.

What I wanted to do, because I think there is an issue where some clarification is needed, to start with the Court's questions about contracts. Your Honor asked about the role of Admin Code Sections 4119 and 4405. And then you stated that there was some confusion based on the apparent facts that the transactions between Met and San Diego seemed to be governed by a contract. And Your Honor posed a question, aren't all water rates pursuant to some sort of a contract. And I

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

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

wanted to jump to that first because the answer is no. In general, Metropolitan does not have contracts with its member agencies for the sale of water. The majority of transactions between Met and San Diego are also not governed about any sort of contract.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

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

And so Metropolitan provides the member agencies with water. The Met board sets the rates --And can we pull up slides.

THE COURT: I think I finally got this clarified in my mind. I think that you agree with Mr. Keker, which is that there is this agreement out there, we're not talking about it today, and we aren't talking about wheeling under -- let's say, agreements that are not contracts or understandings or arrangements that are not actually the subject of a written contract.

MR. HIXSON: I don't agree with what Mr. Keker said, and I think that San Diego is being -- they are playing both sides of the field on the Exchange Agreement, and I do want to come back to that in a few minutes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HIXSON: But I wanted to start with the rate structure here. Met's Board adopts these rates pursuant to Section 134 of the MWD Act. On the left-hand side, we have the water rates there. So those

And so, again, there aren't particular contracts. Member agencies place orders during the course of a year. They can change the order that they want, and then they simply pay the volumetric rates on the quantity of water that's delivered to them.

Separate from this is the wheeling rate, and let's turn to Slide 15, if we can.

So wheeling is a different service. If a member agency has purchased a source of water supply from somebody other than Metropolitan and they want to move it through Metropolitan's facilities to the member agency, then they can purchase wheeling service. This is Met's prepublished wheeling rate, meaning it was created in the abstract.

One of the issues in dispute in the prior wheeling case, MWD v. IID is whether Met can have a prepublished wheeling rate. San Diego's position was, no. Each time there's a specific wheeling transaction, you should look at that particular transaction and see what the incremental costs are. And the Court of Appeal said it was fine for Met to have a prepublished wheeling rate, and they don't have to limit themselves to incremental costs. So that's -- the significance of Section 4405 is that it is the prepublished abstract wheeling rate that recover certain costs and so --

900 902

are the full-service water rates, which account for the overwhelming majority of Met's water sales, where each member agency pays the supply rates and this is then the transportation rates, this is an access rate, System Power Rate and Water Stewardship Rate.

San Diego sometimes -- and it's happening again this morning -- talks as though you have all of these State Water Project costs and Water Stewardship Rate costs that are thrown onto the wheeling rate. And the point I want to make here is that State Water Project transportation costs and Water Stewardship Rates are part of the transportation rates, which are also part of the full-service water rate. So when San Diego itself buys whole service water and the City of Los Angeles buys whole service water, when any of Met's 26-member agencies buy whole service water that accounts for the vast majority of sales, that is going to recoup the vast bulk of their state water transportation costs and the Water Stewardship Rate costs go as well. Because two of the costs components are also part of the wheeling rate, a fraction of those costs are part of the

wheeling rate, but it is not -- when he keeps continuing

talking about -- they make it sounds like this huge

level of costs are only paid by wheelers, and that's

just not the case at all.

THE COURT: And, in fact, the postage -- we referred to this rate, is what, a postage rate?

MR. HIXSON: Right.

THE COURT: Which I guess in the sense by definition can't possibly be one, which is exactly commensurate with the precise costs of wheeling in any given situation, because the distances to be traveled are going to be different in each situation.

MR. HIXSON: That's right. And that's one of the issues the Court of Appeal confronted and then upheld, I guess, to cover system wide costs.

What San Diego is doing in this case is making such a facial challenge to wheeling rate in Section 4405. So, yes, this provision of the Administrative Code is relevant, because otherwise they would say their wheeling rate is illegal, and we would say, Well, how do you know? Because there isn't one. So this defines the wheeling rate that they are challenging.

I do want to talk about the scale issue, all of it, and about what the administrative records shows about the scale of the transactions. I said that the huge majority of Met sales are full-service water sales.

Can we pull up Volume 58 of the administrative record. And if we could go to page 141.

901

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

This is a document in the administrative record where Met quantified the amount of wheeling and exchange charges in certain calendar years, and you can see that in the middle of this paragraph, in fiscal year 2008 and '09, there was about 26.8 million, 53.7 in the next fiscal, and 21.8 million during fiscal year 2010 to 2011. So that's the total amount of charges that comes into Met for the wheeling and exchange charges. Now, let's compare this to water sales generally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

And we can go the page 135 of this document. And, again, focusing on fiscal year 2011, you will see that it is nearly a billion dollars in receipts from water sales generally. And if you can compare the two fiscal years in question for both wheeling and exchanges and full-service water sales, the wheeling and

15 16 exchanges are approximately 5 percent of the annual 17 water sale revenue. The total ends up averaging around 18 a billion. 19

And so when Your Honor is considering the question, where do the vast bulk of State Water Project and transportation costs and water Stewardship Rate Costs are recouped to, it is for the whole service water

So I wanted to talk now about something that Mr. Keker said a moment ago about the claimed difference

That's why it's significant that the Exchange Agreement isn't a wheeling transaction, that that is not subject to the Wheeling Statute, because then the facts that they are trying to point to don't relate to an actual wheeling transaction at all. What they are really doing is making a facial change to the wheeling rate.

Now, it is true that aside, leaving aside the Exchange Agreement, which we believe is not a wheeling transaction, they could simply make a facial challenge to the Wheeling Statute or the wheeling provision, which they have done here; but that again is a claim in the abstract. There aren't particular facts or a transaction with associated cost before Your Honor. It's simply looking in general can Met incur these types of costs in a wheeling transaction with a member agency for one year or less. Outside of their scenario, Met doesn't have a prepublished wheeling rate.

Let me turn to a question you asked, which is that does Met claim that you shouldn't apply the Wheeling Statute because of the way the Administrative Code is written, or are we saying that you shouldn't apply the Wheeling Statute when there is a contract? We're not saying either of those things.

We're saying if you look at the Exchange

904

between the MWD/IID case in this one. He said that case dealt with the abstract question of Metropolitan's going rate, but supposedly this case is different. Actually, the two cases aren't different in that respect at all, because in both, San Diego is making a facial challenge to Metropolitan's wheeling rate. They aren't putting before Your Honor a particular wheeling transaction and contending that the costs in that are unrelated to Metropolitan's wheeling rate.

And here is where I do need to cull out what San Diego is doing, and I said I think they are playing both sides of the field. Sometimes they say that they agree that the Exchange Agreement is not a wheeling transaction; they say the Wheeling Statute isn't applicable; but then when they talk about the supposed facts in this case about a wheeling transaction, they are always talking about the Exchange Agreement. They talk all of the time about how San Diego supposedly wheels water for the Colorado River aqueduct. They talk about the purchase of the IID water, and they put up some slides today and talked about supposedly offsetting benefits that Met supposedly receives from the IID water. Those are all references to the Exchange Agreement, and so that's -- they are trying to make it central to their rate challenge.

Agreement, you can tell it's not a wheeling transaction. We've submitted evidence on that, and San Diego is not really disagreeing with that. And so that's why the Wheeling Statute is inapplicable to the Exchange Agreement.

Outside of that, the Wheeling Statute applies whenever there is a wheeling transaction. If there is a contract for moving of water when there is available capacity and if it falls within the other provisions of the Wheeling Statute, sure, you can evaluate the contract under the Wheeling Statute. And we're not saying that Met's Administrative Code defines the wheeling rate in such a way that it removes it from the Wheeling Statute. We're saying that's how you would know what the prepublished wheeling rate is to determine if it complies with the Wheeling Statute.

So I hope that provides some clarity. THE COURT: It is helpful. I appreciate that. MR. HIXSON: Okay. You also asked us to explain our statement at page 118 of our Brief about the exchange price not being part of this proceeding. And --

THE COURT: I think you've done that. MR. HIXSON: Okav.

THE COURT: I think I get it now. All of

907

906

those questions were really based on one simple type of confusion, which I think I understand now.

MR. HIXSON: Okay. Thanks.

2.2

2.3

I want to pull up Slide 45 of the opening again, just reiterate the issue here.

So when San Diego buys full-service water and most of the water it buys is full-service, it's paying the full suite of the transportation and supply rates just like the other member agencies. Under the Exchange Agreement, which is for a portion of the water that they buy, they are just paying the transportation rates there.

Counsel for San Diego said this morning that whether San Diego is paying the wheeling rate or whether it is paying something different from the wheeling rate, under the Exchange Agreement, it is supposedly for a later time in the case. But we think that's not true. We submitted the deposition testimony of San Diego's person most knowledgable on the subject, and the Court has overruled their objections to that where they admitted that they don't pay the wheeling rate. They pay the transportation rates, this system access rate, the System Power Rate, and the Water Stewardship Rate, which are not equal to wheeling rate as defined in Section 4405.

components, they don't appear separately itemized, they are just --

THE COURT: They could. I mean, Apple selling an iPod could break it out so that there is the cost of transportation from the factory in China, there's a cost of a product that's been mined in Africa. You could break all of these things out, and I would pay them, I suppose, if I wanted an iPod. But that doesn't tell me that Apple -- it is not -- it is not connected to what I'm buying. I'm just buying a product, even though it's been made up of all of sorts of overhead and all sorts of other costs that have gone into it from the perspective of the manufacturer.

But why are those my overhead costs? They're not.

MR. HIXSON: Metropolitan is different from an ordinary purchaser of water in a couple of respects. One of them is that Met has the ability to use the pipes owned by its supplier to move water through them. Water not provided by DWR, that's an extremely unusual ability, because a purchaser doesn't usually have the ability to go out and use the transportation facilities owned by the seller. That's just a highly unusual situation.

To pick up on the iPod analogy, you have no

Having addressed that, I wanted to then turn to the Court's first question of Metropolitan, which is a series of questions about allocating state water project costs to transportation. And Your Honor's first question was, if the State Water Project didn't break down the cost in invoices, would Met still allocate the costs in the same way? And the answer is yes, Met would do that.

Met allocates these costs because of the functions that they are related to. That the supply costs are related to the function of providing Metropolitan with water; whereas, the transportation costs are allocated -- are related to the function of moving the water from the source of supply to Metropolitan's service area.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. I understand that there is transportation in both of those situations, but I don't understand why somebody else's transportation costs is your transportation cost.

MR. HIXSON: Sure. Oftentimes transactions will have a purchaser buying a bundled product, meaning they buy something at the supermarket or a consumer would buy water at their home, and what they are getting is simply that product, and they can't purchase elements of it separately. And so in that case, the various cost

ability to use Apple's transportation facilities or whatever mechanism you have. All you can do is buy the end product. That's different. Metropolitan explicitly has an ability to go out and use DWR's transportation facilities to move non-project water.

THE COURT: But I take it, there is nothing in the record that tells us what that's worth, in a sense. There is no study that says what that -- what that benefit is. It is just every now and then you get to do that.

MR. HIXSON: The record -- a lot of evidence on this point in the record. One key document is Article 55 of the contract between Met and the State, which explains what Met pays to have this right to move the water through its supplier's pipes. And the reference there is to the fixed transportation costs generally.

And, of course, these are then what are put into the transportation rates. The payment of these fixed transportation costs that covers the expenses associated with the regions, not only covers the transportation bill, but gives Met this right to use the facility without paying an additional facilities' fee. So what Met gets in return -- and we showed this in the cost of services for these transportation fees that it's

paying every year -- is this combination of rates. The paying for the transportation bill, but then also the right of access, the right to use the supplier's pipes to move its own water.

2.3

And then if you turn around and think about the wheeling transactions, the only examples of true wheeling transactions by member agencies before you in this case, other ones that were done for San Diego, using the State Water Project where San Diego asked Met, pursuant to Admin Code 4405, to use its rights under the State Water Project contract to wheel water from a non-project source to San Diego.

And Met -- the reason San Diego asked Met to do that is because San Diego is not a State Water Project contractor. So if they went to DWR and said, we want to move water through your facilities, they would have to pay a large facilities' fee to go use that as any non-contractor would.

THE COURT: It's still true, isn't it, that we just have no -- there is nothing in the record that tells us what those rights are worth. And maybe that's 25 cents per gallon sometimes, and maybe it doesn't cost you anything in other situations, where you're wheeling, doesn't cost you anything at all, and you are not using those transportation facilities. And yet in every

acre-foot basis, that kind of necessarily allocates the cost based on the quantify of water.

THE COURT: I think -- again, I don't want to belabor this, because there just may not be much more to say, but I think what you've done is you've described what actually happens in real life. And unquestionably, it is correct that the issue, I think, is why; and what's the basis in the record for thinking that that's a reasonable thing to do.

MR. HIXSON: Well, let me address that in two ways. There are two scenarios in which the member agency will end up paying part of these State Water Project transportation costs through the transportation rate. The first scenario, and the most common one by far, is for the full-service water rate. And so in that scenario, which we've seen is 95 percent of the sales, it actually doesn't matter how the costs are allocated between the supply and transportation because they pay it on both. Now, it's accurate to call it a transportation cost if you are trying to value what's the total cost of moving the water to the member agency. So that's going to recover both the costs of moving from the distribution facility and the cost of getting it to Met; but it is just from Met's perspective, when they send somebody a bill, what percentage of that is

912 914

single case in which there is wheeling going on, these dollars are being imposed on the other party.

MR. HIXSON: Well, a couple of responses. We did quantify the ability to move non-project water. For example, PTX-102 shows guarantees in 2008, 2009, 2010. In 2010, for example, it was 228,000, which was 23 percent -- it was a large chunk, 23 percent over the entire allocation from the State. And PTX-102 also shows the amounts of money that were involved in those transactions, the tens of millions of dollars, but I guess -- so there is that type of quantification.

More than that, it's the way Met's wheeling rate is established, that if there is a wheeling transaction, the State Water Project transportation costs go into the system access rate and then go -- on a per acre-foot basis is how they are charged to the member agency. So the quantification is how many acre feet of water was San Diego using Met access rates to move through the system, and that would be the percentage of allocation that they would have to then pay.

That's -- I guess, the answer to the quantification is that when Met allocates these State Water Project transportation costs to which transportation rates and then charges them on a per

actually attributable to the movement of water versus supply. And so that would accurately reflect that.

The other scenario in which somebody would end up paying the State Water Project transportation costs, as part of transportation rates, are these 5 percent, the wheeling transactions. But in that situation -- and again the only the examples before you are ones that have actual wheeling, but once they have gone on the State Water Project, that's also a situation in which they are getting the benefit of the State Water Project system and receiving the benefit of the transportation fees that Metropolitan pays under Article 55 that have these kind of access rates. So in both scenarios it is logical and reasonable to characterize those as transportation costs for purposes of what's being billed to the member agencies.

And I also wanted to go to the MWD, the IID case, because I think that that hits on a critical issue here which -- and relates to the issue of cost causation that we are talking about. The issue in the past case, and the reason why the Court of Appeals rejected San Diego's incremental argument, is that Metropolitan has certain unavoidable fixed costs due to the way it's governed by the member agencies. It enters into, for example, the State Water Project, long-term contract,

and a lot of those costs are then fixed, whether Met received any water from the State Water Project, whether it receives a lot of water, it's just irrelevant to the fixed transportation costs.

2.3

And San Diego will argue that's all in the past, that happened before, and you, Met, have to show going forward a causal link between those transportation costs and on what's being charged to wheelers. And the Court of Appeals said, No, that's wrong. The causal link is that the member agencies are the reason why Metropolitan entered into that State Water Project contract and why it now has those fixed transportation costs, and that was a key reason in rejecting the incremental approach that San Diego advocated here.

They are saying it is cost causation and, again, it is worth remembering that the wheeling rate applies -- the prepublished wheeling rate applies to transactions for the member agencies, and that was a key fact for the Court of Appeals when they said, hold on, we can tell that you are a member agency. And even in this transaction, you are buying your water from somewhere else, you are using that system, and more importantly, the member agencies were the reason why Met was incurring these costs. And the Court says that's why it is fair and consistent with cost causation to

because Met's fixed costs, its system-wide costs were, in fact, incurred on behalf of member agencies and that's who the prepublished wheeling rate applies to.

THE COURT: Is that an argument that suggests that -- I'm just trying to see how far that argument goes.

Does it suggest that, for example, if Met forecasts it's going to buy "X" amount of water from the state, let's say, just fixed, it's unavoidable, it's take it or leave it sort of deal, it's got to do that, does that then translate into -- is that a justification for charging a portion of those fixed costs to all the wheelers as well as the people who are buying them or just buying water at the full rate? In other words, the fact that you have got these unavoidable, fixed costs, whether it is the cost of infrastructure or the fact that you have to buy "X" amount of water from the State, does that, therefore -- is that an alone enough for Met to impose some portion of all of those costs also on wheelers?

MR. HIXSON: It is a justification if wheelers are member agencies.

THE COURT: Okay. So wheelers who are member agencies are going to be treated differently than wheelers who are not member agencies? Is that what you

916 918

pass on those system-wide, unavoidable costs. And that is how Metropolitan calculated its wheeling rate. It's in the 1997 resolution. The full text is at TDX680, which is in evidence and also in the administrative record.

That what Met did in calculating the wheeling rate was to say what of its costs are avoidable, meaning if it sold less water, it would not have to incur that cost. And what are the fixed and unavoidable costs. And then they said, well, this wheeling rate is going to apply to transactions of one year or less by a number of agencies, what is the fair and equitable way of allocating fixed, unavoidable costs that were incurred on behalf of the member agencies. And so the -- and that's what led Met to include the unavoidable, fixed costs in its wheeling rate, the system access rate, the Water Stewardship Rate, because those don't vary depending on the quality of water that Met sales. And that's also why Met took out the System Power Rate and Met pointed out in that resolution that if Met doesn't sell any water or have water transported to or from DWR, then it doesn't pay a power rate. Well, that's unavoidable, so we're going to put it in wheeling rate.

But, again, this is a key point that the Court of Appeals looked at in saying, there is cost causation

mean?

MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's right. The member agencies are the permanent part of Metropolitan, and long-term fixed costs are -- it incurs those on behalf of the member agencies. That's why I keep going back to the idea that the prepublished wheeling rate in Section 4405 only applies to transactions by member agencies. Nonmember agencies -- I don't want to reach out and say how Met would deal with -- we put in a bunch of evidence about transactions with nonmember agencies in wheeling, and you can see that the price terms are all very different. But I do think when the wheeler is a member agency, then Met has a strong basis for saying that this -- the fixed costs, the long-term costs it incurred to be met, to have this long-term service for the member agencies, those can be apportioned to member agencies, and the Court of Appeal agreed with that idea of cost causation; but I also would say that if you have some other party that isn't a long-term part of Met, if they are nonmembers, that would be different. And Met recognizes that to be different, because Section 4405 doesn't say what the billing rate would be.

So, again, the distinction between member agencies is not -- is a significant one, as the Court of Appeal indicated, and it also goes to the '97 wheeling

resolution, which is not just a series of "whereas" clauses. It is also the Exhibit 1 to it, and that's in DPN 680 where Met went through this distinction between the avoidable and unavoidable costs and said the unavoidable ones that were incurred on behalf of the member agencies, those are properly part of the wheeling rate charged to those member agencies. And so that's logic, that's analysis, it is not just a pronouncement. And more importantly, the Court of Appeal agreed with that principle of cost causation, and we ask Your Honor to do that as well here, too. I also want to identify another distinction

1.0

2.4

between bundled and unbundled products. You mentioned the issue of buying an iPod and Apple rolls up into the price all of its various costs. Normally when you are -- you buy a product, you either get the whole bundle of product or you don't get it at all. You can't say, I want to buy just the transportation aspect of it or I want to buy an iPod, but I want to have somebody else ship it to me, but Met does have two different services. There is the full-water service and then there is transportation service. And so it is aggregated the a sense, and Met can get transportation service separate from -- from the actual water. And, in fact, Met had to pay transportation costs for a decade

Colorado River aqueduct. That's not at all what the Exchange Agreement says. What it says is that Met can provide that water from any of its sources. And as you heard at the trial, Met is under a legal obligation under Met Act, Section 136, to blend State Water Project with other water to the extent actionable.

So when you were taking a real practical look at what are the actual expenses that Metropolitan incurs to provide water to it member agencies, including the San Diego, including under the Exchange Agreement with San Diego, the State Water Project transportation costs are there. They are a result of the way the Metropolitan system is designed. And the Court should be looking at Met's actual costs, the costs that are actually incurred to provide these services, not imagining, Well, maybe Met wouldn't need to run the system this way and we could just only move Colorado River water to San Diego. That's not what's actually being provided there.

Your Honor asked the question, is there something in the record that tells you why this is a reasonable accounting method for Metropolitan or generally for water rates. I want to take issue with the word "accounting" there; that accounting is different from rate setting in a couple of respects.

920 922

before it got any water, literally before it got any water supply from the State at all. So its obligation to pay for transportation costs doesn't depend on water supply, and its ability to use its transportation facilities doesn't depend on water supply. It is also buying a disaggregated product. And then when it turns around to its member agencies, they consolidate a full-service water or just the transportation service. But that's why it is reasonable to -- on both ends, the services are disaggregated from each other.

San Diego has taken issue with this idea of blending. They say that -- they acknowledge sometimes through clenched teeth that the water that Metropolitan provides to San Diego is a blend and it comes from the State Water Project and Colorado River. And that's true for the full service water. It is true for the exchange water, as well. And they dismiss that saying, well, that's Metropolitan's choice, but Metropolitan has two principal sources of water, the State Water Project and the Colorado River. And San Diego, year after year, as we've shown at the hearing, is consistently the largest purchaser. Of course, Met delivers a combination of the two water sources to San Diego. And, in fact, in the Exchange Agreement, Mr. Keker said this morning that San Diego just wants to wheel all of the water through

Accounting is a historical exercise that's important for auditing purposes, where companies will make sure they record things in proper categories.

We put on evidence at the hearing that rate setting is for a different purpose. And actually counsel for San Diego put up a slide today showing one of the positions we've taken, which is that rate setting should be based on cost causation, not simply accounting standards. And that's one of the issues we have the charted of account. It is not purporting to say how rates should be set. What it is saying how regulated utilities should have costs on their balance sheet so that regulators can go and audit them to see are they getting the fair rate of return on their expenses, what's being passed onto the shareholders, what's being charged to rate payers.

Rate setting serves a different function. It is who should pay for these costs, and how much should they pay? We cited the AWWA M-1 manual, which is PTX-30, the WEF manual on this point, and we addressed it in page 60 of our Post-Trial brief.

To give an example of the differences between accounting and rate setting, say for employees' salaries, for accounting purposes, you would generally lump them all together. You would say, here are the

there.

funds we're paying to employees generally, but you really wouldn't do that for rate setting. You would want to see who is working on what and how it's related to the costs. And you wouldn't expect that the way employees' salaries are calculated for accounting purposes wouldn't be based on rate setting. And the same thing is true for Met's costs. If you want to account for what are the total expenses from the State Water Project, sure, you would list them all up, you know, supply the transportation rate; but then for rate setting, you would want to look at what functions were actually performed. And Metropolitan -- that's why Metropolitan covers them differently from supply and transportation rates.

2.5

2.3

And you asked for what are key documents in the record. We do address these in our Brief on pages 17 through 20 and then 45 through 61 and 74 through 87. But I want to highlight a few of them because there are a number that substantiate the way Met has allocated the State Water Project costs. There are the RMI reports in 1995 and '96. Both of those reports separated supply and transportation and identified aqueduct costs, which reference the State Water Project, the Colorado River as transportation-related costs. There, of course, is the 2010 report. And despite the

Met's Colorado River Act, which Met owns and operates, has an intake right on the river. It's a free-flowing river and that diverts the water there. So Met has to pay a supply cost that it pays to the Bureau of Reclamation for the water, but it doesn't pay any kind of transportation cost to the Federal Government.

THE COURT: It pays money to the Federal Government?

MR. HIXSON: Only for the supply costs. THE COURT: Right, but it pays money. I was just using this as an offhand example. You pay a bill, but I suppose the Federal government could say that they're transporting water to your intake location. I suppose they could say it, and they could have a transportation piece in there. They could say, well, you know, it is \$100 a gallon per acre feet, and we've decided that it's going to be now \$90 plus a \$10 to get it from the northern part of the United States down to you. Would that make -- I'm just throwing this out. Obviously, it is a ludicrous example. But would that then entitle you to take some of that 10-dollar transportation fee and consider it to be your transportation costs?

MR. HIXSON: I think it would be crazy for the Federal government to bill us for the function of

move water from the source of supply.

endless accusations from San Diego, the key analysis in the report in Section 5, the Raftelis independent review, was not... There is also the Raftelis treatise in 1993, that, consistent with the 2010 report, divides between supply and transportation as far as what Met has done here. And there is the 1999 Raftelis report, which plaintiffs themselves submitted, PTX-36 and -37, which allocated State Water Project transportation costs to Metropolitan's transportation rates.

So it is not true that in 2010, on the eve of being sued, Met ran out and commissioned some report that said this is all fine. Since the 1990s Met's consultants and experts in rate-making design had recommended what the State Water Project transportation cost be covered in Met's transportation rates. And this is, again, consistent also with the 1997 wheeling resolution, as well as the cost of service reports that Met has in every rate-setting cycle.

I now want to turn -- you asked a question about the Federal Government and what if the Federal government did aggregate the invoices for Colorado River water, could Met have charged those differently. I think there might be a misunderstanding that I wanted to get to. Met doesn't pay the Federal Government any money to transport Colorado River water to Metropolitan.

gravity and moving water through a free-flowing stream. There is no -- the transportation costs would be zero because nature is moving the water upstream and downstream. It is not at all analogous to the State Water Project, which is spending, you know, large amounts of money to artificially move and expensively

So I can't imagine the Federal government saying, when you go there and you can take the water yourselves, somehow they're transporting it. That's taking the water out of the river. There is nothing

THE COURT: Well, again, I don't want to get bogged down in just an example. My guess is the Federal Government does, in fact, spend some money on that watershed in some way. There may be dams, maybe various things that the government does to help that water move. But in any event, the only point I was trying to make was just to see whether your theory sort of carries across these other sorts of situations in which somebody else's transportation costs becomes your transportation costs. That's all.

MR. HIXSON: Okay. Let me actually -- I want to go to a different point, which is that Met functionalizes State Water Project and Colorado River

costs the same way.

So let me turn to your example of does the Federal government spend money associated with the water supply and the Colorado River building dams and stuff like that. Yeah, they do. DWR does the same thing at the state level, and DWR puts those into supply charges. So in both sources Met is treating those as supply costs. And, yes, there's money that the State spends on those dams.

And in both situations, the transportation costs of moving that water to Met's surface area are functionalized the same way through Met's transportation rates.

Now, Met owns the Colorado River aqueduct, so it is out there buying power and repairing the aqueduct and has that service costs. And where the State owns the California aqueduct that is allocated a fraction of that cost to -- for essentially the same types of things. And what Met is doing consistent with the AWWA manual is looking past ownership and it's saying, how do you functionalize? What do these things do? And Met determined -- there is cost of service analysis -- that they do the same thing. The Colorado River aqueduct and California River aqueduct are both moving water to Met's service area. And so it functionalizes them the same

Constitutional provisions before the Court speaks in terms of the service. Prop 26, for example, asked about the cost reasonably related to the service. The Government Code talks about service, Met's governing act talks about a service.

We think the most important thing for you to do first is to identify the service that's being provided. Met provides two services. It provides water service, and it provides transportation of water service. Water service is the billion dollars a year numbers that I just showed you. That's the full-service water rate. It is the water that Metropolitan transports to the member agencies. Then you have transportation-only service. Those are two distinct services.

San Diego likes to drill down and say that every item in the bill is a separate service. For example, demand management, and they talk about the cost associated with these conservation and staffing programs and local research programs, and they quibble about whether it is allocated in the right way.

Demand management isn't a separate service that Metropolitan provides. You can't go in and say, I would like to purchase some demand management, just like you can't purchase the System Access Rate Service or

928 930

way.

So I guess as to your question, is there is a disconnect between how Met is looking at the State Water Project and looking the Colorado River. No, it is treating them both the same way, treating both functions the same way, appropriately.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. HIXSON: Okay. I'm reminded by my colleague that one of the issues under the State Water Project contract -- and we should show this to Your Honor, as well -- is how the costs are allocated under Articles 23, 24, 25 and 26 to Met.

And Your Honor posed a question, why does it matter what the contract says. And it partly it matters because it's taking those costs and saying, here, Met, there's yours, we're explicitly allocating this to you as a transportation cost. And, of course, Met has to pay that regardless of any of the water that it receives.

Let me turn to cost causation. Your Honor asked the question, do the parties agree rates should reflect cost causation? We would have to, "yes, but," there is a serious dispute between the parties about what costs causation means, and the parties disagree on a number of things. The relevant statutes and

System Power Rate Service. These are simply parts of the bill. They are components of the cost that Metropolitan charges for water service. So we think that San Diego is looking at the wrong thing when they focus on each individual item.

And the second important principle is what costs the service has to be related to. Here the case law makes clear that it's aggregate cost across all rate payers. This was always true in the Prop 13 context. And then in the "Griffith I" case, the Court of Appeals came along and says that the language in Prop 26 mirrors the language in the case law talking about Prop 13. And so once again you look in the aggregate that all of the rate payers.

So you don't look at how much is San Diego paying in under the Water Stewardship Rate and how much money does San Diego get back. In fact, it focuses on Met's water rates as a whole for full-service Water Transportation Rates as a whole and looking at all of those rates collectively. It is a higher level inquiry, and that's cost of service that we showed that this is satisfied because Met determines what its rates and charges will be by looking the revenue requirements it needs to provide these services and then developing rates that, in effect, provide for that. And that's

exactly what the "Griffith" Court said is the appropriate way of doing something, by backing into those rates by what they need to recover costs. So it is a higher level inquiry.

And I think both the Griffith I and Griffith II cases illustrate our view about cost causation, that's correct. Griffith I dealt with a fee that is charged to landlords to do inspections of apartments, to make sure that they are up to code and stuff like that, and the Court looked at the total amount of money that the City would raise for that fee, and that was a reasonable estimate of the total cost of administering the program.

Obviously, the benefits to individual payers could be dramatically different. For a lot of those members, it might just be a hassle if they're ever going to have to come up to Code. And for others it could be a significant benefit to the tenants if the apartments were up to code, but the Court didn't conduct the inquiry at a broad level. It looked at everyone all together. It also looked at prospective estimate and what is the estimated cost going forward of administering the program. And so this is a large part of the answer to San Diego's attempt to focus on just what they pay in Water Stewardship Rates without looking

I mean, it is being allocated exactly in accordance to how much use they are putting on the system and taking a cost -- a collective cost of Met's transportation facilities, and then allocating the per acre-foot basis.

And actually the Griffith II case helps support that as well. That was a case where there was a fee in question for supplemental water. And the reason why the agency wanted to have that fee for supplemental water was because coastal areas and coastal owners were depleting the groundwater supply, and so seawater was leaching in. And so the idea was that they would use the supplemental water primarily at land near the coast and they wouldn't use it more inland because it wasn't necessary there. And so the plaintiff sued challenging that supplemental water bill, saying that he was one of the inland people and all of those costs to acquire all of that supplemental water that was putting into the groundwater, none of it went to him. He wasn't one of the payers, and the Court of Appeal says, no, you got it all wrong. What you do is you look at the systemwide costs. You say, what is the total cost the agency is incurring to provide this water and then allocating it straight up to every purchaser by parcel was an appropriate and fair way to do so, regardless of whether they in particular received the benefit of that water.

932 934

at the whole regional benefit. You have to look more broadly. Likewise --

THE COURT: I guess the question is how do we -- how do we do this classification? Is that one group of folks who need water at that sort of very high level, or do we basically have two groups of folks, some of whom are buying water, some of whom are wheeling water? The question, I guess, is simply, well, why is it that the wheelers have to pick up part of the cost of those benefits?

In Griffith I, I suppose you could have had people who were apartment dwellers and people who were condo dwellers or something like that, and you might have had a debate as to whether both of those classes should be subject to the same fees and so on.

MR. HIXSON: Because the volumetric rates are charged on a per acre-foot basis. Meaning that you take the transportation costs, recover them through the transportation rate, and then somebody buying full-service water, both pay those transportation rates in exact proportion to the quantity of water that's moving through the system for them, and the same thing is true of the wheeling parties; that they -- it's per acre-foot basis in Exhibit A for the wheeling charge, based on the amount of acre feet. And so it is being --

The theory was that they all ultimately received the benefit.

Likewise, Met has certain transportation costs, and the cost of service model allocates them to the various transportation rates. So each of them assessed on a per acre-foot basis, so it is entirely proportional and fair for those who get full-service water.

I would like to turn now to one of the arguments or one of the questions you posed to San Diego, which is that they had previously taken the position that the exchange agreement was not the wheeling transaction, and here are they bound by that. And their position wasn't just that it's not a wheeling transaction; their position was that the wheeling statute simply has no application to the Exchange Agreement between San Diego and IID. And the reason why they made that argument was because in entering into that agreement, IID didn't conduct the type of environmental review that would be required under the statute. And so they didn't argue any kind of nuance or middle ground. They were essentially forced into the position that the Statute had simply no applicability at all to the Exchange Agreement. And they said that in the written briefing, DTX78 and 126, and we also

provided the Court with Maureen Stapleton's testimony from the State Water Resource Control. Said that it wasn't a wheeling transaction subject to the wheeling statute. San Diego made efforts to distinguish that, but they missed a key point.

2.5

2.3

They say, well, under the '98 agreement, there was one price term; and then the 2000 agreement, the price term changed. And it is true that the price term changed. That has nothing to do with San Diego's arguments for why the exchange agreement wasn't a wheeling transaction. Ms. Stapleton's testimony and the argument San Diego advanced, successfully enough to prevail on that position, is that wheeling relates to unused capacity, so wheeling is interruptible. If there is no space in the pipes, then the wheelers aren't allowed to wheel. And San Diego said, they are not in that position with respect to Metropolitan, and that's actually correct.

You posed the question to Mr. Keker this morning. You said, "Well, are you guys last in line?" He said, "No, because this is firm delivery." And that was a fact that San Diego seized on accurately, we believe, to exhibit case in point, because wheeling by definition, under the statute, is uninterruptible and this isn't.

River aqueduct. There's constant references to the Exchange Agreement.

If you put that completely out of mind, what you are left with is a facial challenge to Metropolitan's wheeling rate and the only wheeling transactions by a member agency in front of you, all used the State Water Project; they all went through the State Water Project facilities. And so we think that in this facial challenge with the only examples of true wheeling up to the State Water Project, we have got an awesome case that we can include the State Water Project, transportation costs in the facial challenge.

So, yeah, if you forget it, forget it all of the way. But we do think the Exchange Agreement is irrelevant to Met's rate.

Also for a more logical reason, the rates went into effect in January 2003; whereas, the Exchange Agreement came afterwards. And there is a whole package of consideration in there. It is not just that they pay the transportation rates for a certain quantity of water; they also got 77,000, you know, acre-feed of water for 110 years. They got \$235 million. It was a State funding that Met allocated to them. It was a contract deal where they sat down, and there were a bunch of different terms for that. That is a different

936 938

And the other issue that San Diego highlighted is that wheeling is the movement of water through a water facility; whereas, here what San Diego was doing was swapping water supply; that they trade quantity of Colorado River water to Metropolitan. And in exchange they received a different source of water from different sources of supply.

THE COURT: Under the Exchange Agreement. MR. HIXSON: Yes, that's exactly right.

THE COURT: But I think your position is that you want me to forget the about the Exchange Agreement at this point; right? We're not talking about whether -- it doesn't matter what happens under the Exchange Agreement, that I should decide the issues as posed by this particular trial, this phase.

MR. HIXSON: We think that's right, but we want you to really forget it and not just forget it when we're talking about it.

So when San Diego talked about offsetting benefits, they say, look at all of this great value from the IID water. We want you to not hear them when they say that either because that's part of the whole exchange issue. And when they say the people wheeling through the Colorado River water, nobody is doing that, Your Honor. Nobody is wheeling through the Colorado

creature. It is not a wheeling transaction. It is a bunch of different things put together.

Another thing you asked is whether Met agrees that the reasonableness of its rates is not properly a function of the extent to which member agencies may have their rates or charges affected. In other words, the hold harmless issue. We don't see holding harmless as a problem, and we also reject the notion that Met's wheeling rate is based on, quote, rate stability. That phrase was literally invented by San Diego. It has no appearance in the '97 wheeling resolution, or as far as I'm aware, in any of the Metropolitan documents.

Here's the extent of our disagreement, and it lines up with the Court of Appeals holding in MWD/IID. The member agencies, their governance of Met, caused Met to incur certain fixed, unavoidable long-term costs that Met now has to recoup. We think there is cost causation to the member agencies that have to go back and repay those. If one member agency later decides it wants to wheel water and doesn't want to pay its fair share of those fixed, unavoidable long-term costs, those could get shifted to a different member agency. That's where we think that's unfair. That's subsidizing a wheeling transaction by a member agency.

THE COURT: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

2.2

2.3

THE COURT: Back on the record.

So let's say that Met had a third thing it did. Met sells, No. 1, full-service water, No. 2, does some wheeling, and then, No. 3 -- let's make it up -you know, Met also helps distribute low-flow toilets, or something like that, just one of those things that you think you can get from Met. And let's say a member agency decides to participate in that third program, would they, too, under this reasoning have to pay some portion of these fixed costs, and why is it that the existence of these fixed costs, which have to be paid by the member agencies, which is generally done through the rates that are imposed for full-service water, why does it also require the wheeling member agency, or the member agency as wheeler, to have to pick up some portion of these system-wide fixed costs? Why does that follow?

MR. HIXSON: Because they were incurred for the benefit of the member agencies. Met is -- Met is, well, first of all, using the State Water Project in the example to actually perform the wheeling for these member agencies, but also they are fixed and unavoidable. Met is stuck with them year after year based on the fact that it entered into those

of those facts. That's a completely different situation. The question here is the one faced by the Court of Appeal before, which is can that include any of these fixed, unavoidable system-wide costs, and the answer is yes.

I want to talk now about allocation, which is the question about -- or in quantification, whether Met has quantified the benefits from -- due to the Water Stewardship Rate and poses the question, do we all agree to some extent Met has properly quantified those included in the Water Transportation Rates. We think Met has quantified this to a large extent and in two basic ways. First Met quantified the avoided capacity cost that would be needed to build out more of its distribution facility in the absence of the demand management programs. Metropolitan quantified that in DTX18. That was the March 1996 economics that literally did the comparison of the preferred case with the management programs and the base case without them and identified billions of dollars of difference in anticipated cost and was, in fact, due to the distribution facilities. This was later incorporated into the 1996 Integrated Resources Plan, which likewise, did the same comparison and then went further to do a sensitivity analysis, a much more granular type of

940 942

transactions. This goes to the heart of the issue in the MWD/IID case, which is whether Met can include a system-wide cost in its wheeling rate. And the answer there was emphatically, yes, because Met has to recoup its costs from its member agencies. So again this goes to the --

Okay. And just to clarify, we weren't intending to say that a member agency's decision to wheel as opposed to buying that water would itself be unfair to the other member agencies; that's not it at all. Our point is that they shouldn't be allowed to get out of their fair share of the fixed, unavoidable costs that were incurred for their benefit to the detriment of the other member agencies. So that's -- that would be subsidizing the member agency insofar as it's doing wheeling. There is no problem with them.

The more base situation one is where the town simply refused to allow the wheeling transactions. Met isn't doing anything like that. Met, of course, is facilitating wheeling. There is zero evidence of any wheeling transaction that Met turned down, which was the situation in Morrow Bay. And the wheeling rate doesn't include the supply rate, and it doesn't include the avoidable cost such a system power rate. So it is, of course, lower than the full-service water in recognition

analysis of whether a 5 percent reduction in demand could cost, and they determined that even that small change in demand could postpone hundreds of millions of dollars in the capacity costs.

And you've heard the testimony of Mr. Upadhyay, indicating that Met was, in fact, able to defer a lot of its capacity costs. That's one type of quantification where Met really did put numbers down and come up with that.

Another type of quantification was the SB60 reports, and one of those is at PTX-454, and you also heard Mr. Upadhyuay's testimony about that. That's where Met quantifies on an annual basis the number of acre-feet of water that were conserved or that were developed before the Demand Management Program. So it does put specific numbers on that, and that's water that would otherwise have to go through the system.

Can we pull up --

THE COURT: In either of these situations, this quantification, did it sort of locally then translate into an estimate of what a fair rate would be for wheeling? In other words, is there a link between these estimates, these calculations to avoid the costs and so on to what the actual rate ought to be?

MR. HIXSON: Yes. Here's the link. We're

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

putting up a San Diego document. This dealt with one of the proposed Demand Management Programs of the Carlsbad program, and you can see here that they say that the availability of water from the Carlsbad desalinization project will result in a one-for-one offset in the use imported water for those agencies participating in the project.

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

1

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is true as a part of commonsense, but it is also documented here in evidence that the less of water that Met has to transport is a one-for-one benefit. The cost of those demand management programs are then allocated in the cost of service study to the Water Stewardship Rate and then divided out by the number of acre-feet. So that's how the rate is calculated or computed, is that it is the estimated expenses of the entire Demand Management Program. You can see that in PTX-110, the cost of service study, and then that's divided on a per acre-foot basis into the Water Stewardship Rate. That's the nature of the calculation to arrive at what the rate is.

Now, San Diego has said that there is a supply benefit here, as well. And Your Honor has raised the question, well, why is 100 percent of this in transportation and rather than some of it in supply. There are a couple of reasons for that. One is that as

supply benefit at all is speculative.

The next question you pose is actually to San Diego, which is does Met have to quantify the benefit for each project under Demand Management Program. And we would answer that no. They have half-heartedly said, no; but the benefit to Metropolitan is in the aggregate from all of the projects collectively. That's how Met is able to avoid or defer capacity costs, is by the aggregate benefit. It is not because it's -- you know, one member agency says, 50-acre feet of water is one year and another 70 in a different year. What Met did -- and this is the analysis it performed, was to look at all of the Demand Management Programs collectively to see what types of capacity costs they would defer, and that aggregate use is the appropriate one. And that's been the one sanctioned and endorsed by the case law, including the case law in 1996.

If you look at the costs that the agency incurs overall and not just on the individual project-by-project or payer-by-payer basis, it is the aggregate basis under California Farm Bureau and the Griffith case as well.

THE COURT: So let's say you had one project, just a single project that costs a tremendous amount of

944 946

we have seen, the transportation benefit is documented. 2 There is documented capacity costs that were avoided. 3 There are documented quantities of water that Met

doesn't have to move and there is this one-to-one benefit that the parties agree on of not having to move

5 6 that water.

> A supply benefit by contrast is speculative, and one reason is the existence of wheeling. Say a member agency doesn't have their management program and they still need to buy water, they then need to have a greater quantity of imported water, and that's what we saw San Diego acknowledging in DTX383. They don't have to buy that water from Met; they can buy it through any seller. But they move the water through Metropolitan's facilities.

So in every case we know that there is a transportation benefit to Metropolitan, but whether there would be a supply benefit is unknown. There is -that would just be speculation. And, furthermore, under the Demand Management Program, as Met explained at trial, Met isn't acquiring the type of thing that its supply rates recover. It is not acquiring a source of supply that it can then go give to its member agencies. What it's definitely avoiding are the increased transportation costs. And whether there would be any

money and it generated water for only Los Angeles, for example, and it was supported by millions of dollars of Met money, and then that -- under your reasoning, you --Met would be able to allocate all of those dollars and recoup them as rates imposed on every member agency who buys water and/or wheels through Met.

MR. HIXSON: It's your hypothetical that Met has only one Demand Management Program?

THE COURT: Yeah, let's say there is just one, you know, and it benefits one member, but everybody -that's just the way Met decides that's going to be done. Under that reasoning, you would still have the sort of aggregate and you could still look at the general benefit and you would just say, well, the fact that one member agency is now using this water is, at least, indirectly something that benefits everybody. So therefore, every member agency is going to be picking up this tab.

MR. HIXSON: You don't have to say that if there is only one Demand Management Program that the benefit can be -- that's a very different scenario from what Metropolitan has.

THE COURT: Sure. I'm just trying to get a sense of how the reasoning goes. And your reasoning is that if you have a group of these programs that benefit,

at least, directly or generate water for a handful of the members, it's fair for all of the members to pay for it.

MR. HIXSON: That's right. But I'm not willing to walk the plank and say if only one member agency had some huge amount and nobody else did. That would be materially different from what Metropolitan has, and that's not the situation here at all. What it has is a generally available Demand Management Program that many member agencies participate in, in various different locations; and system-wide this reduces and defers the development of the Metropolitan system, but you are giving an extreme hypothetical. --

THE COURT: I am. I guess from San Diego's point of view, I guess they sort of feel that they are somewhat in that position since they were putting money in, which is helping other people, other members build out some of these projects; but at least they are not getting any direct benefit. But your position is that they are getting some kind of system-wide, indirect benefit; and, therefore, that's why it is fair?

MR. HIXSON: Well, both. First of all, it is not true that they don't get any benefit. They are still eligible for millions of dollars a year --

THE COURT: Yeah.

of the member agencies.

Simply the fact that Met sells more water in some years than in other years, so that member agencies buy more or less water in dry years, those don't give rise to any kind of cognizable dry year peaking cost. What San Diego has relied on, and what Mr. Keker pretty much acknowledge here today, is they're trying to make the argument, it proceeds in two stages, that the member agencies differ from each other with respect to dry year peaking patterns and that these differences result in costs being incurred by Metropolitan. We disagree with both of those propositions, but we really disagree with the second one, which is that their assertion that the different claimed differences between the member agencies result in costs to Metropolitan. There is simply no evidence about it at all. And, in fact, we're affirmatively disproved that.

We showed that the way Metropolitan billed out the capacity and distribution system is to meet peak week demands. We had two witnesses testify to that and demonstrated that in the administrative record as well. So there is no cost causation between variances and annual purchases.

We also showed that there are any number of reasons why member agencies change their purchases on a

MR. HIXSON: -- from Demand Management Funds. So they keep saying the benefit is cut out, that's factually untrue. But even if that were true, yes, we would say the regional benefit is sufficient. There are a number of Metropolitan member agencies that don't have any Demand Management Programs that are funded. And in that hypothetical, San Diego would be similar to that.

And for the case on point, I would point to "Griffith v. Paupereaux" (phonetic), that San Diego is claiming they are like the position of the landowner there, who said, you are going out, and you are buying all of the supplemental water, well, you don't give any benefit of that to me, and the Court of Appeal said, yeah, but the benefit is reachable. It benefits everyone. Yeah, we would say the regional benefit is an entirely adequate basis; whereas, here it is a general applicable Demand Management Program.

I do want to briefly turn to dry year peaking and whether the dry year peaking costs exist. I think that depends on what you think they are. And San Diego goes back and forth, and they are not very clear on this. But Met has a uniform rate structure. So the same volumetric rates are charged to each of its member agencies, and then readiness surcharge, the capacity charge are recovered under a similar formula from each

year-by-year basis. The economy is a big one. We pointed this out in our Post-trial Brief. One of the biggest years of drought in the recent memory was the year 2010. And both Mr. Denham and Ms. Gilman, at trial, pointed out that in calendar year 2010, member agency purchases of water plunged. They dropped dramatically.

This was a chart that we put together based on the plaintiff's expert data. And look here at 2010, the dry year. And what you see is that Los Angeles and San Diego's purchases dropped significantly. So this factual predicate of dry year peaking claim, which is that in the dry years the member agencies all buy more water, we proved that's not true; that there are other factors. In a dry year, I don't think there is less water; there simply might be less water to sell. And we also said there were other years where, you know, the economy and other factors, environmental considerations, that would enter into the amount of water purchased. This is again related to cause causation. They haven't demonstrated that there is any differences between the amount of water, in fact, associated with the dry years.

Of course, Metropolitan incurs storage costs for dry years and for other reasons as well for emergency storage, but San Diego hasn't shown, and the

evidence shows the contrary, that any of these storage costs are incurred due to the particular peaking need of any one member agency.

And you heard Mr. Yamasaki's testimony about how the reservoirs Met fails, which are long-term projects, aren't intended to meet any one member agency's need. So, again, this goes to the absence of cost causation, that the claimed differences in behavior between member agencies simply don't have any causation to the storage cost that Met incurs.

Your Honor did raise the question about how Met incurs storage costs, and you wondered if we can show where that's done. And I do want to bring that up now.

Can we pull...

1.0

Because I think one question Your Honor asked is, quote, did anything link these actual charges and rates to the actual cost of maintaining storage for the customers who need it. Here we go. This is an extra for the cost of service study. This is storage here, and it shows how it's allocated. There's emergency storage and drought storage --

THE COURT: Which exhibit is this?
MR. HIXSON: This is DTX110. And we're looking at page 98 for that document.

service study and should have looked at how these costs are allocated. Met has done a cost of service study. And in every rate cycle, there's a tremendous amount of information in the administrative record about the development of the annual rates for '98 to 2001.

And in doing those cost of service studies, Met looked at all of the reasons why it incurs these various different costs, not just dry year, but it certainly did include the cost of storage, of drought storage, and how the cost would be recovered. This issue has been analyzed. It is not mysterious where the costs are recovered from, and it's all mentioned in Met's rate structure. So we don't think that should be an outstanding issue.

And so this issue at the end of the day where they say that they want you to order Met to do a cost of service study, we've done that, and Met has done that on every rate-setting circle.

I would also add that that's not much of a legal claim. To have a legal claim, San Diego would have to show that there is, in fact, a cost being misallocated. There is no law that says, go out and study something and look at it further because we think you didn't look at it quite closely enough.

So we think we've disproven this idea that

And here you see emergency storage allocated 100 percent to standby. And on the right, you can see it is recovered by the readiness to serve charge.

Drought storage, which is what San Diego is focused on, for dry years, is 100 percent commodity to be recovered by supply, and then there is regulatory storage.

Let's go two pages earlier in this document to page 86 just to see the description of what those are.

There's a reference here to "Drought carryover storage serves to provide reliable supplies by carrying over surplus supplies for periods of above-normal precipitation in snow pack to drought areas when supply decrease, drought storage create supply and is one component of a portfolio of resources that results in a reliable and annual system supplies," And then it shows you that that 's recovered supply rate.

Your Honor should not have any question in your mind about where these drought storage costs are recovered. It is through Metropolitan's supply rates. And Metropolitan's cost of service study, which we are looking at here, that itemizes everything else and where those are incurred in those rates.

So the issue that San Diego ended on here was that they claimed that Met should have done a cost of

there is any cost causation in the sense that San Diego is looking to. But the various statutes in the constitutional provisions they have sued under only addresses the reasonable recovery of costs. There isn't some kind of, you know, go out and study things more. And we think we have studied it and have in every rate-setting cycle.

But for San Diego just to say, they don't know if they can prove this part of their case, that means they lose. And we think we have affirmed that the case doesn't have any merit because of how various different costs

Finally, a few clean up questions, Your Honor asked about the reasonableness of the wheeling rates and whether the documents or the written findings or those of substantial evidence, that was towards the end of your list of questions, the written findings are in PTX 680 and Attachment 1 to PTX 680. That's the 1997 wheeling resolution and the explanation for it, but the substantial evidence is not limited to that by any means. The substantial evidence always supports Metropolitan's wheeling. Those are contained, as I said earlier, on page 18 through 20 and 74 through 87 with respect to wheeling charges that are in our Trial Brief and the transportation charges generally, pages 17 and

2.3

18 and 45 to 61.

1.0

So this substantial evidence is a broad inquiry and would also, as Your Honor determined, testimony that was presented at trial. But there is no requirement that the substantial evidence be in the written findings. We have written findings there in PTX 680 and are broader than that.

And so, I believe I addressed the principal points in Your Honor's questions. And as to the other issues that San Diego has raised today, we filed a very long Post-Trial Brief, so I don't want to burden --

THE COURT: I've read it twice, and I will be reading it again.

MR. HIXSON: It is good reading. I encourage everyone to read that. All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: I think it does qualify as the longest brief I have had since I have been on this job.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, could I respond, ten minutes?

THE COURT: All right. Let's do that. REBUTTAL ARGUMENT

MR. KEKER: On the last point about dry year peaking, the only evidence in the record is that there are differences between the agencies. There is no evidence in the record that there are no differences.

costs go into a wheeling rate. And the answer was that because your member agency -- maybe you couldn't if you are not a member agency, but because the member agencies are there when things started, it's okay for us to make sure to apply the hold harmless principle and make sure that no member agencies ever gets out of buying full price Met water. But that's okay. That's a decent way to have things work.

They cite the American Water Works
Association, which talks about rates should reflect cost causation and not be determined by replication of the fixed and variable nature of costs from any accounting or budgeting perspective. It also comes up in the AWW manual. The point -- this is exactly what you can't do under cost causation analysis. You can't go back and sort of generalize and say, because we have gotten fixed costs and because you were there at some point in the past, it is okay for us to charge them and apply the hold harmless principle.

Remember that these fixed costs, they thought about taking care of these fixed cost in another way. It's called the "commitments way." It is in the evaluation metrics -- matrix. And there instead of letting people slide on and off the system willy-nilly, you could say, you have got to commit to pay our portion

956 958

And they have admitted in their interrogatory answers that these drought storage facilities are in the System Access Rate and they have admitted in their Slide 147 -- I won't bother to put it up -- they say it, just go look at their administrative record Slide 147, they say, regulatory storage, dry year storage -- there it is at the bottom.

A portion of regulatory storage costs goes into the System Access Rate. So the points that were just made are flat out wrong. And our point again is they go do a cost of service study and tell us what the answer is.

Now, I think we really joined the argument. The question is can Met set a wheeling rate without reference to cost of service causation principles. What we know that the System Access Rate is greater than it should be, if they use cost of service principles. The Water Storage Rate shouldn't be there if they use cost of service principles. That's the big question. And now we have the answer. It was just given.

Could I see Met Slide 1339. And this was joined with --

It is the opening slide, Jeff, first one.

And this was joined when you -- you were asking questions about this. How can all of the fixed

of fixed costs and whether or not you buy our water, just like they do in the State Water Project. And what Mr. Thomas, the CFO, decided in his matrix was that that was the only way to do it that would encourage wheeling, would facilitate wheeling.

This argument completely ignores the Water Code and the command to facilitate wheeling, to charge fair compensation, which is limited to the costs of the owner, it just -- they are just making it up, and it completely ignores Prop 26, Prop 13, which says there's got to be a cost causation connection between them, but so -- and I think this argument has been joined in a very meaningful way. You can see exactly what they are saying. You can say, it's okay for us to take costs that cannot be causally related to anything except the fact that we need to pay them and if we don't do something about it, some of our member agencies who don't wheel are going to have to pay more.

And he spent a long time in the beginning talking about how much wheeling is small compared to what they buy from the State Water Project. And we -- that's -- that is almost exactly the point.

Most of the water -- most of their revenues come from sales of water from the State Water Project to their member agencies. And they get a billion dollars

for that. Wheelers are a small piece, but remember what the member agencies complained about when they began the -- when they saw what San Diego's position was. This is PTX 171, you remember the Los Angeles -- 19 of the member agencies say, hey, wait a minute, if you do cost causation, the way San Diego wants you to, it is going to shift to supply costs and cost us \$30 million a year. It's going to be 30 million-dollar a year benefit to San Diego. Over 20 years it's going to be an 800 million cost-shifting onto supply from transportation. And over the life of the exchange agreement, it's going to be \$3 billion. And all of that is because, yes, most of the time everybody pays full service, and it doesn't matter how it's allocated. 1.5

2.2

2.5

2.3

We're talking about that shift. And what they are saying is, we don't have to shift at all. And what we're saying is, yes, you do. You have to have a fair and meaningful and reasonable cost of service analysis from wheeling. So it is what the Water Code tells you to do; it is what Prop 26 tells you to do; it is what common law said and so on. And I think by now we all get it.

And if this right to wheel in the State Water Project is meaningful at all -- we said it's de minimus; we have said it is not meaningful; but go evaluate it, here we are. We're saying the wheeling rate is unreasonably high.

This idea that they have quantified something about capacity, about the relationship of the water stewardship rate to capacity, and what he listed were the capacity charge, which is irrelevant because it deals with the size of the pipes in summer capacity, not -- the dry year peaking is not a question of the size of the pipes; the dry year peaking is a question of how much water do you have to keep around and save year to year so that when people hit you.

They cited a couple of exhibits, 18 and 154 that are not the administrative record, I might add; but what they talked about is a one-to-one saving, if you could save; but when you can save one-to-one on imported water, that's a supply saving. That doesn't prove anything about a capacity saving. I forgot to mention before the FCS report, which is in the 2012 record, which says specifically that Tier 2 pricing doesn't solve the problem of no quantification.

So there is nothing in this record that shows that they have saved a nickel in building out the program, building out the conveyance system because of -- because of the Water Stewardship Rate and Conservation Program. Certainly there is a lot in the

960 962

go figure it out, go tell us what it's worth; whether it is worth a quarter or dollar or whatever. They haven't begun to try to do that.

The "Griffith" -- they've misrepresented "Griffith," as far as we're concerned. The first "Griffith" I said dealt with regulatory fees and the second "Griffith," regulatory fees, which are completely different. We've done that in the brief. But the second "Griffith," I have got a quote from page 601 of "220 Cal App. 4th." The plaintiff acknowledges defendant apportioned the augmentation charge among different categories of users; metered wells, unmetered wells, wells within the delivered water zone. But he argues that Palmdale holds at Prop 218 proportionality compares a parcel-by-parcel proportionality analysis, and that they disagreed with that.

They said that that's not -- some disparate treatment is okay, but that's all they said. And the description of "Griffith" that was just given was unrecognizable.

And the reason -- by the way, just so it is obvious, the reason wheeling is so de minimus and people don't go out and buy water is because the rate has been set unfairly high. San Diego made a deal to deal with that over that five-year, no-suit provision. But now

record that shows they've saved tremendously on having to buy imported water, the supply charge.

And with that, I want to thank you for your patience and sit down.

THE COURT: Very critical. Thanks for the help.

I would appreciate counsel arranging for the transcript of today's argument to be delivered to me. I will find that very helpful as I have the other items. And I'll get something out to you when I can. Obviously, it is not going to be within the standard 15 days. I think it will probably take a little bit longer than that. But what I do send out will be a tentative ruling and combined with a proposed Statement of Decision, essentially the same document as far as I'm concerned, and it frees up the time period for the parties to file objections.

If the parties believe that they need more than the time period allocated for objections, which I think is 15 days, feel free to ask me for more time. We have the flexibility under the rule to do that. But have a look at it first and see what you think you need, and we'll take it from there.

Thank you so much of for your help.

. 1	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 12:05
2	p.m.)
3	oOo
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11 12	
13	
13	
15	
16	
16	
18	
18	
20	
21	
22	
23	
23	
25	
	964
1	DEDODMER CERTIFICATION
_	REPORTER CERTIFICATE
2	REPORTER CERTIFICATE
	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
2	
2	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
2 3 4	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for
2 3 4 5	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as
2 3 4 5	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter
2 3 4 5 6 7	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my hand this 24th day of January 2014.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my hand this 24th day of January 2014.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my hand this 24th day of January 2014.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my hand this 24th day of January 2014.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I, RHONDA R. HARRIS, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that I am an Official Pro Tem Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, and that as such I reported the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter at the time and place set forth herein. That my stenographic notes were thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages is a true record of the proceedings and constitute a full, true and correct transcription of my said notes. That I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which the foregoing proceedings were taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunder subscribed my hand this 24th day of January 2014.

<u> </u>
\$10 926:17
\$100 860:25 926:16
\$235 938:22
\$250 870:2,4
\$3 960:12
\$30 960:7
\$65 870:22 \$90 926:17
a.m 852:2 899:9,9
ability 910:18,21,22
911:1,4 913:4 921:4
able 887:3 943:6 946:8
947:4
above-entitled 965:6
above-normal 953:12
absence 942:15 952:7
absolutely 877:3,9
abstract 902:14,24
905:2 906:13
access 865:7,16 893:23
901:4 908:22 912:3
913:15,18 915:13
917:16 930:25 957:3
957:9,16
accommodate 886:7 account 891:3,4,8
892:23 901:1 923:10
924:8
accounted 893:25
accounting 858:5,21
922:22,24,24 923:1,8
923:23,24 924:5
958:12
accounts 892:16 901:16
accurate 914:19
accurately 915:2
936:22
accusations 925:1
acknowledge 921:12
950:7
acknowledges 888:5 961:10
acknowledging 876:9
945:12
acquire 934:16
acquiring 868:4 893:12
945:21,22
acre 878:1 913:17
926:16 933:25
acre-feed 938:21
acre-feet 943:14 944:14
acre-foot 870:3,18,22
913:16 914:1 933:17
933:24 934:4 935:6
944:18
act 854:6 869:3 884:12
884:19 898:5,9,12,22

```
900:24 922:5 926:1
action 965:14,18
actionable 922:6
actual 906:5 915:8
  920:24 922:8,14
  943:24 952:17.18
add 898:4 954:19
additional 878:21
  879:8 911:23
address 885:13,25
  887:14 896:21 914:10
addressed 909:1
  923:20 956:8
addresses 955:4
adequate 858:15
Admin 899:20 912:10
administering 932:12
administrative 853:22
  858:13 861:19 865:4
  865:22 866:4,5
  872:23 879:10 893:24
  894:15 898:20 903:15
  903:21,24 904:1
  906:21 907:12 917:4
  950:21 954:4 957:5
admit 861:9 898:9
admitted 858:4 889:21
  893:21 894:1 908:21
adopt 872:11 874:21
adopted 867:11 874:24
adopts 900:23
advanced 936:12
advantage 863:23
advocated 916:14
affirmatively 950:17
affirmed 955:10
agencies 867:25 870:2
  871:9 873:18,22
  876:17 884:14,17
  886:5 887:1,11,19,20
  889:24 890:2,5,7,14
  892:2,3 893:2 895:25
  900:3,7 901:16 902:2
  908:9 912:7 915:16
  915:24 916:10,18,23
  917:12,14 918:2,22
  918:24,25 919:3,5,8,8
  919:10,16,17,24
  920:6,7 921:7 922:9
```

930:4

962.13

924:16

949:16

932:23

962:13

957:1,3

advice 859:12

Africa 910:6

```
930:13 939:5,15,18
  940:13,20,23 941:5
  941:10,14 944:6
  945:23 948:10 949:5
  949:24 950:1.3.9.15
  950:25 951:13 952:9
  956:24 958:3,6
  959:17.25 960:2.5
agency 870:10 893:5
  898:15 901:3 902:9
  902:12 906:16 913:17
  914:12,21 916:20
  919:13 934:8,21
  938:6 939:19,22,24
  940:9,15,16 941:15
  945:9 946:10,19
  947:5,15,17 948:6
  951:6 952:3 958:2,3
agency's 941:8 952:7
aggregate 925:21 931:8
  931:13 946:7,9,15,22
  947:13
aggregated 920:23
ago 862:18 904:25
agree 853:7,13 857:4
  866:9 900:10,16
  905:13 929:21 942:9
  945:5
agreed 919:17 920:9
agreement 866:14
  880:2,3,3,8,10,19
  885:23 894:13,14,19
  895:6,18,18 896:4,13
  896:22 897:1,1
  900:11,19 905:13,17
  905:24 906:2,9 907:1
  907:5 908:10,16
  921:24 922:2,10
  935:12,17,19,24
  936:6,7,10 937:8,11
  937:14 938:2,14,18
  960:12
Agreement's 897:3
agreements 895:1
  900:13
agrees 853:9 939:3
ahead 883:18
Alameda 849:14
ALESHIRE 850:3
all-important 856:23
allegation 875:14
alleged 854:4 875:9,15
allocate 866:17 883:1
  909:6 947:4
allocated 855:10,13
  858:17 881:18 889:13
  909:13 914:17 924:20
  925:8 928:17 929:11
```

```
930:21 934:1 938:23
  944:12 952:21 953:1
  954:2 960:14 963:19
allocates 894:6 909:9
  913:23 914:1 935:4
allocating 883:5 909:3
  917:13 929:16 934:4
allocation 858:16 913:8
  913:20 942:6
allow 852:14 941:18
allowed 936:16 941:11
allows 898:9
Amended 875:18
  894:23
American 853:15 858:8
  958:9
amount 853:19 873:7
  891:16,17 899:14
  904:2,7 918:8,17
  932:10 933:25 946:25
  948:6 951:19,22
  954:3
amounts 861:2 913:9
  927:6
analogous 927:4
analogy 910:25
analysis 859:14 860:5
  883:8,21,23 889:3,5
  920:8 925:1 928:22
  942:25 943:1 946:13
  958:15 960:18 961:15
analyze 878:8
analyzed 854:15
  954:11
and/or 947:6
Angeles 849:14 890:11
  901:15 947:1 951:10
  960.4
annexation 898:14
annual 853:23 890:11
  904:16 943:13 950:23
  953:16 954:5
answer 852:21 853:8
  854:7,10 860:3 866:1
  869:19 875:8 877:1,6
  883:3 891:23 893:16
  893:17 900:1 909:7
  913:22 932:24 941:3
  942:5 946:5 957:12
  957:20 958:1
answered 866:17 886:1
answers 957:2
anticipated 942:21
anybody 864:7,9
apart 896:3
apartment 933:12
apartments 932:8,18
```

App 867:17 961:10 apparent 899:22 **Appeal** 882:9 902:20 903:10 919:17,25 920:9 934:19 942:3 949:13 **Appeals** 915:21 916:9 916:19 917:25 931:10 939.14 **appear** 910:1 appearance 939:11 **APPEARANCES** 849:1 850:1 **Apple** 910:3,9 920:14 **Apple's** 911:1 applicability 935:23 **applicable** 895:22,23 905:15 949:17 application 935:16 applies 898:8 907:6 916:17,17 918:3 919:7 apply 872:7 883:15 897:11 906:20,23 917:11 958:5,18 apportioned 919:16 961:11 appreciate 852:19 898:25 899:6 907:18 909:16 963:7 approach 916:14 appropriate 855:4 857:23 858:17 866:15 883:21,23 885:14 899:3 932:2 934:24 946:16 appropriated 858:16 appropriately 859:19 929:6 approve 896:19 897:21 898:10 approves 898:16 approximately 904:16 agueduct 871:9,10,12 874:12 905:19 922:1 924:23 928:14,15,17 928:23,24 938:1 aqueducts 862:12 890:8 **AR** 874:3 AR2010 870:1 AR2012 889:5 arbitrarily 868:12 arbitrary 883:20 area 909:15 928:11,25 areas 884:15 934:9 953:13 argue 916:5 935:21

argues 961:14
argument 851:3,8
853:4 862:19 868:9
885:13 892:22 897:14
899:10 915:22 918:4
918:5 935:18 936:12
950:8 956:21 957:13
959:6,12 963:8
arguments 861:19
862:22 876:1 889:25
897:10,10 935:10
936:10
arises 866:16
arrangement 895:3
arrangements 900:14
arranging 963:7
arrive 944:20
article 869:7 911:13
915:12
Articles 929:12
articulated 856:17
876:3
artificially 927:6
aside 876:9 906:8,8
asked 854:10 865:4
869:16 872:10 877:2
895:8,15 899:20
906:19 907:19 912:9
912:13 922:20 924:15
925:19 929:21 930:2
939:3 952:16 955:14
asking 861:23,24 862:5
862:7 863:15,16
864:18 869:10 891:2
894:3,10 957:25
asks 854:8 894:15
aspect 920:18
assert 855:8 867:3
875:8 876:20
asserting 877:9
assertion 950:13
asserts 875:25
assessed 935:6
assessment 884:13
assessments 885:8
898:2
assigns 891:9
associated 888:22
00611011 51 056 -
906:14 911:21 928:3
930:19 951:22
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22
930:19 951:22
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22 Association 853:15 858:9 958:10
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22 Association 853:15 858:9 958:10 Attachment 955:18
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22 Association 853:15 858:9 958:10 Attachment 955:18 attempt 876:19 932:24
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22 Association 853:15 858:9 958:10 Attachment 955:18 attempt 876:19 932:24 attention 899:1
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22 Association 853:15 858:9 958:10 Attachment 955:18 attempt 876:19 932:24 attention 899:1 attorney 965:16
930:19 951:22 ASSOCIATES 848:22 Association 853:15 858:9 958:10 Attachment 955:18 attempt 876:19 932:24 attention 899:1

915:1 attributed 878:17 audit 923:13 auditing 923:2 **AUDREY** 849:7 augmentation 961:11 authoritative 853:16 authority 848:7 884:12 availability 885:3,9 944:4 available 877:23 878:25 887:21 907:8 948:9 **Avenue** 850:3 average 871:3 886:6 890:15 891:14 892:23 893:1.6 averaging 904:17 avoid 859:17 870:4 897:22,25 943:23 946:8 avoidable 917:7 920:4 941:24 avoided 942:13 945:2 avoiding 945:24 aware 939:12 awesome 938:11 awful 892:7 AWW 958:13 **AWWA** 853:23 858:14 923:19 928:19

В

back 852:16 856:11 857:22 861:17 866:25 867:18 872:2 876:6 884:2 886:2 887:25 890:17 891:6 898:20 900:19 919:5 931:17 939:18 940:2 949:21 958:15 backing 932:2 **balance** 923:12 bargaining 864:19 **Bartles** 854:19 base 941:17 942:19 based 853:8 856:18,20 857:9 873:15 883:23 884:15 885:3 887:19 894:6 899:22 908:1 914:2 923:8 924:6 933:25 939:9 940:25 951:8 bases 876:10 basic 942:13 basically 894:1 897:9 933:6

basis 855:24,25 856:4,4

856:5,9,10,11,16,18 856:22 857:12,25 869:11 871:2 872:5 883:2,17 891:4 913:16 914:1,8 919:13 933:17,24 934:4 935:6 943:13 944:18 946:21.22 949:16 951:1 **Battery** 848:24 849:3 **Bay** 872:17 876:11 941:22 **BEATTY** 849:15 began 960:2 beginning 959:19 **begun** 961:3 behalf 895:24 917:14 918:2 919:4 920:5 behavior 887:11 890:25 952:8 belabor 914:4 **believe** 853:9 859:19 865:6,11 871:13,20 877:16 878:12 899:3 906:9 936:23 956:8 963:18 **believes** 868:13 beneficial 871:14 benefit 863:7,9,13,14 863:21,22 864:3,7,21 870:18 871:5,9 878:10,11,12,13 879:5,6 883:11 884:16 887:20 888:24 889:22 911:9 915:10 915:11 932:18 933:1 934:25 935:2 940:20 941:13 944:11,22 945:1,5,7,17,18 946:1 946:4,6,9 947:14,21 947:25 948:19,21,23 949:2,4,13,14,15 960:8 benefits 863:12 869:1 869:15,19,24 870:25 871:1,16 877:4,13 878:16 881:11,18 884:11 889:23 905:22 932:14 933:10 937:20 942:8 947:10,16 949:14 **better** 889:16 **BETTY** 849:16 big 885:21 951:1 957:19 biggest 951:3 bill 911:22 912:2 914:25 926:11,25

930:17 931:2 934:15 **billed** 915:15 950:18 **billing** 919:22 billion 904:12,18 930:10 959:25 960:12 billion-dollar 888:12 billions 889:4.6 942:20 **BINGHAM** 849:9 **bit** 864:11 866:14 897:14 899:5,8 963:12 blatantly 867:24 blend 863:17 864:23,23 921:14 922:5 **blending** 862:24 863:7 863:12,18,22 921:12 blow 861:9 **board** 867:10 888:19 889:1 895:21 896:11 897:15 898:6,16,17 898:24 900:7,23 **bogged** 927:14 bond 890:4 898:13,14 898:19 bother 871:15 957:4 **bottom** 957:7 **bought** 870:19 **bound** 935:13 **BRAUNIG** 849:6 breach 894:20 break 899:8 909:5 910:4,7 breakdown 858:15 **Brian** 871:8 873:1 brief 855:11 859:21 862:14 866:23 867:12 867:21 868:6,8 869:25 870:1 875:12 875:23 876:5,7,15 877:9 881:22 887:21 888:3 892:18 897:18 897:19 907:20 923:21 924:16 951:2 955:24 956:11,17 961:8 briefing 935:25 **briefly** 949:18 **briefs** 876:4 897:9 **bring** 952:13 **BRINTON** 849:16 broad 932:20 956:2 broader 956:7 broadly 933:2 **brought** 894:19 **Brown** 848:22 854:17 budgeting 958:13 **build** 942:14 948:17

building 928:4 962:22

962:23

built 893:23 **bulk** 901:18 904:20 **bunch** 863:6 919:9 938:25 939:2 **bundle** 920:17 **bundled** 909:21 920:13 **burden** 885:6 956:11 **burdens** 881:18 Bureau 882:2 926:4 946:22 **buy** 870:4,8 873:7 880:24 886:21 891:16 901:16 908:11 909:22 909:23 911:2 918:8 918:17 920:16,18,19 945:10,13,13 950:4 951:13 959:1,21 961:23 963:2 **buver** 864:16 buying 893:4,5 909:21 910:10,10 916:21 918:13,14 920:14 921:6 928:15 933:7 933:19 941:9 949:11 958:6 buvs 870:10 885:4 901:14,15 908:6,7 947:6 \mathbf{C} C 849:12,15 851:1

852:1 856:25 **CA** 849:4,10,14,18 850:4 Cal 867:17 961:10 calculate 868:18 871:15 **calculated** 917:2 924:5 944.15 calculating 917:6 calculation 944:20 calculations 943:23 Caldwell 854:17 calendar 904:3 951:5 California 848:2,11,16 848:24 849:13 862:15 862:18 882:2,8 885:16 928:17,24 946:22 965:5 call 914:19 called 870:6 884:25 958:22 **calling** 854:13 capacity 877:8,10,13 877:15,17,17,19,20 877:23 878:6,9,13,16 878:24 879:4,5,8,11 879:13 893:9,11

007:0 026:14 042:12	
907:9 936:14 942:13	C
943:4,7 945:2 946:9	ce
946:15 949:24 950:19	ce
962:4,5,6,7,17	ce
capital 888:11	
capture 890:8 893:21	
carat 864:14	ce
care 958:21	
Carlsbad 944:2,4	
carries 927:19	\mathbf{C}
carrying 953:11	\mathbf{C}
carryover 953:10	ce
case 848:8,9 854:3	C
860:16,19 861:21,23	ch
865:3 867:14,16,17	
865:3 867:14,16,17 871:21,21,22 872:5	
874:15 875:19 877:24	ch
881:23,23 882:4,13	
883:25 884:2 885:17	ماد
	ch
885:24 894:16 895:7	
895:10 896:16 897:5	
901:25 902:16 903:12	ch
905:1,1,3,16 908:17	
909:25 912:8 913:1	\mathbf{C}
915:18,20 931:7,10	ch
931:12 934:5,6	ch
	CI
936:23 938:11 941:2	
942:18,19 945:16	
946:17,18,23 949:8	
955:9,10	
cases 864:19,20 875:16	
Lases 604.13.20 6/3.10	
881:21 905:4 932:6	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25	
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7	ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25	ch ch ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10	ch ch ch ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24	ch ch ch Ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22	ch ch ch C: C:
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1	ch ch ch CC ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15	ch ch ch ch ch ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15	ch ch ch CC ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15	ch ch ch ch ch ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15	ch ch ch ch ch ch ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15 959:11 960:6 cause 881:3 887:19	ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ci ci
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15 959:11 960:6 cause 881:3 887:19 951:20 caused 859:6 877:21,21	ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ch
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15 959:11 960:6 cause 881:3 887:19 951:20 caused 859:6 877:21,21 877:22 888:5 939:15	ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ci ci
881:21 905:4 932:6 Castiak 888:22 categories 888:4 923:3 961:12 categorize 888:25 categorized 854:23 causal 916:7,9 causally 959:15 causation 853:8,12,15 854:2,7,11 855:21 856:6,18 858:10 859:1,2,2,14,20,25 860:5,24 862:2 878:18 884:5 891:7 891:23 893:17 894:7 915:19 916:15,25 917:25 919:18 920:10 923:8 929:20,22,24 932:6 939:17 950:22 951:20 952:8,9 955:1 957:15 958:11,15 959:11 960:6 cause 881:3 887:19 951:20 caused 859:6 877:21,21	ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ci ci ci

TER'S TRANSCRIPT O
Center 849:10 central 905:25
central 905:25 cents 912:22
certain 860:11 873:7
902:25 904:3 915:23
935:3 938:20 939:16
certainly 865:11 878:13 881:6 889:19
954:9 962:25 CERTIFICATE 965:1
Certified 965:3
certify 965:4
CFO 871:7 959:3
challenge 894:21 896:7 903:13 905:5,25
905.13 905.3,23
challenging 852:14 893:10 903:19 934:14
change 855:19 857:15 902:3 906:6 943:3
950:25
,
changed 855:9,15
936:8,9
Chapman 870:17
characterize 915:14
charge 863:19 864:13
864:14 867:5 869:12
870:5 884:13 885:11
885:14 892:8,18,21
893:9,11 895:21
933:24 949:25 953:3
958:18 959:7 961:11
962:6 963:2 charged 868:2 913:16
916:8 920:7 923:16
925:22 932:8 933:17
949:23
charges 854:13 868:18
868:23 869:9 874:5
874:12 877:4 889:12 895:21 896:3,6 904:3
904:7,8 913:25 928:6
931:3,23 939:6
952:17 955:24,25
charging 918:12
chart 951:8
charted 923:10
CHATTERJEE 849:19
China 910:5
choice 884:9 921:18
choose 863:18
chunk 913:7
circle 954:18
citation 889:2
cite 860:15 887:4 958:9
cited 866:22 869:20,23
878:20 896:10,16
022:10 062:12

923:19 962:12

```
citing 853:22
City 849:21 901:14
  932:11
claim 857:14 859:1
  879:8 880:11 886:3
  887:18 894:19 906:12
  906:20 951:12 954:20
  954:20
claimed 904:25 950:14
  952:8 953:25
claiming 949:10
claims 854:3
clarification 899:18
clarified 900:10
clarify 897:17 941:7
clarity 907:17
classes 933:14
classification 933:4
clause 856:24 857:7,8
clauses 857:6,11 858:3
  920:2
clean 955:13
clear 853:10,14 857:18
  882:3 931:8 949:21
clearly 874:6 899:2
clenched 921:13
CLERK 853:1
close 868:3 878:22
  881:16 889:7
closed 875:11 881:17
closely 860:6 954:24
CLOSING 851:3 853:4
  899:10
coast 934:12
coastal 934:9,9
code 854:6 865:4,22
  866:4,5 869:2 879:10
  894:16 899:20 903:15
  906:22 907:12 912:10
  930:4 932:9,17,19
  959:7 960:19
cognizable 950:5
colleague 929:9
collect 881:15 886:15
collective 934:3
collectively 931:20
  946:8,14
COLLIN 849:12
Colorado 862:24
  863:15 864:17 871:9
  871:10,11 880:19
  905:19 921:15,20
  922:1,17 924:24
  925:21,25 926:1
  927:25 928:4,14,23
  929:4 937:5.24.25
```

```
combined 963:14
come 854:1 879:11
  881:22 883:14 890:17
  900:19 932:17 943:9
  959:24
comes 883:11 891:6
  904:7 921:14 958:13
coming 880:17
command 959:7
commensurate 903:6
commissioned 925:11
commit 958:25
commitment's 873:6
commitments 873:4
  958:22
commodity 953:5
common 854:2,6 865:2
  914:14 960:21
commonsense 859:5
  898:23 944:8
companies 923:2
compare 904:9,13
compared 959:20
compares 961:15
comparison 942:18,24
compensation 868:22
  869:3,9,15 871:25
  872:4,7,18 875:2
  959:8
complained 960:2
complaining 894:22
Complaint 875:18
  894:23
complaints 876:4
completely 855:11
  863:18,19 883:20
  896:3 938:3 942:1
  959:6,10 961:7
complies 907:16
component 878:9
  953:15
components 901:20
  910:1 931:2
computed 944:15
concedes 892:18
conceptually 878:3
concern 876:16
concerned 961:5
  963:16
concerning 896:17
concluded 870:24
  889:4,6 964:1
conclusions 867:2
conclusory 858:1
  867:14
condo 933:13
conduct 932:19 935:19
confronted 903:10
```

confuse 886:4 confusion 899:21 908:2 connected 863:2 864:21 910:9 connection 860:23 861:5 959:11 conservation 868:3 870:25 883:10.22 884:8 885:1,16,19 886:11 888:15 930:19 962:25 conserved 943:14 consider 926:22 consideration 869:6 938:19 considerations 951:18 considering 904:19 **consist** 867:22 consistent 869:4 870:14 916:25 925:4,16 928:19 consistently 921:21 consolidate 921:7 constant 938:1 constitute 867:16 965:11 constitutional 930:1 955:3 consultant's 859:12 consultants 925:13 consulted 855:6,14 857:15 consumer 909:22 **contain** 867:15 contained 955:22 **contains** 864:12 contending 905:8 context 931:9 **continue** 890:12 continues 855:8 continuing 861:24 875:13 901:22 contract 862:14 895:7 895:8 899:24,25 900:5,15 906:23 907:8,11 911:13 912:11 915:25 916:12 929:10,14 938:24 contractor 912:15 contracts 886:21 899:19 900:2,14 902:2 contractual 880:4 contrary 854:24 952:1 contrast 945:7 Control 896:11 936:2 conveyance 862:13

863:2,21 867:4,4

combination 912:1

921:22

868:24 869:2 878:22
879:8,11 880:24
881:4 883:23 895:23
962:23
conveyed 864:18
correct 857:13 914:7
932:7 936:18 965:11
correctly 861:20
cost 853:8,12,14,20
854:1,7,11,22,23,23
855:10,21 856:6,17
856:20 857:19 858:10
858:16 859:1,1,2,6,14
859:19,24 860:5,24
861:1,17 862:2,2,25
863:1,9 864:8 865:8
866:18 867:6 868:3,4
868:11,12 870:22
871:3 872:12 878:18
881:16 884:4,5
885:19 886:7,22,24
888:16 889:11 891:6
891:22 892:21 893:17
894:6,6,7 906:14
909:6,19,25 910:4,5
911:25 912:22,24
914:2,20,21,23
915:19 916:15,25
917:9,25 918:16
919:18 920:10 923:8
925:15,17 926:4,6
928:18,22 929:17,20
929:22 930:3,18
931:2,8,21 932:6,12
932:22 933:9 934:3,3 934:21 935:4 939:17
941:3,24 942:14,21
943:2 944:11,12,17
950:5,22 952:8,10,18
952:20 953:21,25
954:2,6,9,10,16,21
955:1 957:11,15,17
957:18 958:10,15,21
959:11 960:6,7,18
cost-of-service 891:22
894:5 897:23
cost-shifting 867:25
-
960:10
costs 854:9,9 855:13
857:1,1 858:6 859:17
860:11,22 861:4
863:3 865:2 866:20
867:5 868:2 869:12
870:12 873:11,15
874:9,16 876:13
881:4,17 882:20,24
883:6 884:8 885:14
886:9,10,10,12,16,20
l '

```
886:23,23 887:19,20
  887:23 888:4,21
  889:12,15,20 891:9,9
  891:11 892:19 893:11
  893:16,22 901:8,9,11
  901:18,19,20,21,24
  902:20,23,25 903:6
  903:11 904:21.22
  905:8 906:16 909:4,7
  909:9,11,13,19
  910:12,14 911:16,20
  913:15,24 914:13,17
  914:22 915:4,15,23
  916:1,4,8,13,24 917:1
  917:7,9,13,16 918:1,1
  918:12,15,19 919:4
  919:14,14 920:4,15
  920:25 921:3 922:11
  922:14,14 923:12,18
  924:4,7,20,23,24
  925:8 926:9,23 927:2
  927:21,22 928:1,8,11
  928:16 929:11,15,24
  931:7 932:3 933:18
  934:16,21 935:4
  938:12 939:16,21
  940:11,12,17 941:5
  941:12 942:4 943:4,7
  943:23 945:2,25
  946:9,15,19,25
  949:19 950:11,15
  951:23 952:2,12
  953:19 954:1,8,12
  955:4,12 957:8 958:1
  958:12,17,20 959:1,8
  959:14 960:7
counsel 849:1 855:1
  857:22 908:13 923:6
  963:7 965:13,16
COUNSEL(Continu...
  850:1
count 879:10
County 848:3,7 850:2
  896:18
couple 857:5 910:17
  913:3 922:25 944:25
  962:12
course 853:24 868:19
  888:17 902:3 911:18
  921:22 924:25 929:17
  941:19,25 951:23
court 848:2 852:4,7
  854:1,8,10 855:22
  856:14 857:4 858:19
  860:2 862:18 863:10
  864:1 865:14,20
  866:10 868:15,17
  869:6 872:1 877:3,14
```

```
879:16,22,25 881:7
  882:8 885:22 886:12
  889:10 890:19 891:12
  891:19 894:15 896:2
  899:6 900:9.21
  902:20 903:1,4,10
  907:18,23,25 908:19
  909:16 910:3 911:6
  912:19 914:3 915:21
  916:9,19,24 917:24
  918:4,23 919:17,24
  920:9 922:13 926:7
  926:10 927:13 930:1
  931:10 932:1,10,19
  933:3 934:19 936:1
  937:8,10 939:14,25
  940:2 942:3 943:19
  946:24 947:9,23
  948:14,25 949:13
  952:23 956:12,16,20
  963:5 965:5
Court's 877:6 882:25
  899:15,19 909:2
CourtCall 849:16,21
  849:23 850:5
cover 903:11
covered 892:21 897:9
  925:15
covers 911:20,21
  924:13
CPF-10-510830 848:8
CPF-12-512466 848:9
crazy 926:24
create 953:14
created 902:14
creature 939:1
credit 868:25 869:14
critical 855:2 915:18
  963:5
CSR 848:19 965:22
cull 905:10
culls 887:6
CURTIS 848:4
Cushman 880:13
  894:24
customer 876:13
customers 952:19
cut 949:2
cycle 925:18 954:3
  955:7
```

D 852:1 dams 927:16 928:4,9 DAN 849:6 DANIEL 849:5 data 887:13 951:9 day 891:13,16 893:13

894:10 897:5 954:15 965:20 days 963:12,20 de 960:24 961:22 deal 871:11 880:12.14 880:17 918:10 919:9 938:24 961:24,24 **dealing** 898:13 deals 898:14 962:7 dealt 897:12 905:2 932:7 944:1 961:6 **debate** 933:14 debunked 896:9 decade 920:25 **December** 854:18 855:6.13 867:22 873:12 decent 958:7 decide 872:3 937:14 decided 859:9,10,16 870:23 926:17 959:3 decides 939:19 940:9 947:11 deciding 868:12 decision 871:19 899:2 941:8 963:15 decrease 953:14 defendant 848:12 849:8 961:11 **defense** 865:23 **defer** 943:7 946:8,15 defers 948:12 defined 865:7 868:22 908:24 defines 853:18 865:9 903:18 907:12 definitely 945:24 definition 868:22 869:15 872:15,18 884:22 903:5 936:24 deliver 878:23,25 **delivered** 874:10 902:5 961:13 963:8 delivers 921:22 delivery 936:21 demand 884:25 886:9 930:18,22,24 942:15 943:1,3,15 944:2,11 944:16 945:20 946:4 946:13 947:8,20 948:9 949:1,6,17 demands 878:24 950:20 demonstrated 950:21 951:21 **Denham** 951:4 **Department** 848:5

854:12 857:2 874:5

depend 890:6 921:3,5 depending 917:18 **depends** 949:20 depleting 934:10 deposition 848:23 908:18 derive 885:8 desalination 863:13 883.13 desalinization 860:25 944:4 describe 887:7 described 914:5 describes 866:8 description 953:9 961:19 design 875:2,2 925:13 **designed** 852:21 858:10 891:14 922:13 **despite** 924:25 **detail** 895:11 **detailed** 860:5 868:6 869:25 determination 872:2 determine 907:15 determined 853:13 928:22 943:2 956:3 958:11 determines 931:22 determining 869:2 detriment 941:13 develop 870:3 883:4 developed 943:15 developing 931:24 development 948:12 954:5 deviate 862:10 **Diego** 848:7 852:13,15 853:3,8 854:4 864:9 864:17 869:19,23,25 870:19 871:2 873:3 874:16,18 875:9,15 879:17 880:6,23 887:12,22 888:3 895:1,16 899:12,23 900:4,17 901:6,13 903:12 905:5,11,18 907:2 908:6,13,14 912:8,9,12,13,14 913:18 916:5,14 921:11,14,20,23,25 922:10,11,18 923:6 925:1 930:16 931:4 931:15,17 935:11,17 936:4,12,16,22 937:1 937:3,19 939:10 944:1,21 945:12 946:3 949:7,9,20

950:6 951:25 953:4	dispute 902:15 929:23	886:25 887:18,23	employee 965:16	everybody 852:4
		-		
953:24 954:20 955:1	distances 903:7	888:5,10,13,16,23	employees 923:23	870:19 873:7 879:12
955:8 956:10 960:6,9	distinct 930:14	890:9 891:4,5,8	924:1,5	882:23 947:10,16
961:24 D :	distinction 898:5	892:13,16,21 893:12	encourage 956:14	960:13
Diego's 854:10 875:25	919:23 920:3,12	893:16,21 894:4,6	959:4	evidence 858:2 867:1
876:6 883:3 886:2	distinguish 876:11,19	949:18,19 950:4,5,9	encouraged 873:9	867:15,16 869:18,22
896:21 902:17 908:18	936:4	951:10,12,13,15,22	ended 953:24	869:23 872:23 875:6
915:22 932:24 936:9	distribute 940:6	951:24 953:5 954:8	endless 925:1	877:10,12,17,19,20
948:14 951:11 960:3	distribution 858:17	956:22 957:6 962:8,9	endorsed 946:17	877:24 878:7,12,16
differ 890:12 950:9	914:23 942:15,22 950:19	dry-year-peaking 886:3	ends 904:17 921:9	881:5,8,9,12 883:5
differed 890:11	District 848:10 849:8		engineer's 884:23 engineers 885:5	887:14 888:6,7 892:14,15,15 893:24
difference 890:13 904:25 942:20		DTX110 952:24 DTX18 942:17	enter 951:19	895:2 898:22 907:2
differences 887:10	849:13,22 850:2 diverts 926:3	DTX383 945:12	enter 931.19 entered 894:18 916:11	911:11 917:4 919:10
923:22 950:10,14	divided 944:13,18	DTX78 935:25	940:25	923:4 941:20 944:9
951:21 952:8 956:24	divides 925:4	due 868:1 869:6 915:23	entering 935:18	950:16 952:1 955:16
956:25	Dixon 856:25	942:8,21 952:2	entering 955.18 enters 915:24	955:20,21 956:2,5,23
different 855:6,16	document 854:24 887:5			956:25
856:16 864:10 880:4	887:8 904:1,10	dumped 860:22 dwellers 933:12,13	entire 856:9,10 893:8 913:8 944:16	930:23 evolution 873:2
882:15 892:2,3 893:3	911:12 944:1 952:25	DWR 862:14 869:12	entirely 896:17 935:6	evolve 878:3
896:18 898:17 902:8	953:8 963:15	874:2,14 910:20	949:16	exact 933:21
903:8 905:3,4 908:15	documented 944:9	912:15 917:21 928:5	entitle 926:21	exactly 856:4 861:12
910:16 911:3 919:12	945:1,2,3	928:6	entitled 894:21	866:12 874:22 875:24
919:20,21 920:20	documents 854:14	DWR's 874:24 911:4	entity 894:20	893:2 903:5 932:1
922:25 923:5,17	866:20,22,24 867:18	D W K \$ 674.24 711.4	environmental 896:20	934:1 937:9 958:14
927:24 932:15 937:6	867:20 868:17 869:23		935:20 951:18	959:13,22
937:6 938:25,25	878:20 924:15 939:12	E 848:15 851:1 852:1,1	equal 853:20 895:20	example 860:8 875:21
939:2,22 942:1	955:15	E2 881:25	908:24	889:13 913:5,6
946:12 947:21 948:7	doing 860:1 862:23	E3 881:25	equally 876:20 890:3	915:25 918:7 923:22
948:11 950:14 954:8	867:6 891:22 894:12	E4 881:25	equitable 884:24	926:11,20 927:14
955:11 961:8,12	903:12 905:11 906:6	earlier 953:8 955:23	917:12	928:2 930:2,18
differently 861:9 892:3	928:19 932:2 937:3	early 866:19	equitably 862:20 885:7	940:22 947:2
918:24 924:13 925:22	937:24 941:15,19	East 888:12	equivalent 873:4	examples 878:10
direct 948:19	954:6	economics 942:17	erroneous 867:2	879:14 912:6 915:7
direction 965:9	dollar 961:2	economy 951:1,18	ESQ 849:5,5,6,6,7,11	938:9
directly 881:15 948:1	dollars 889:6 904:12	effect 875:7,20 931:25	849:12,15,16,16,19	exchange 866:14 880:1
Directors 895:22	913:2,10 930:10	938:17	849:21,23 850:5	880:2,3,7,10,19
disaggregated 921:6,10	942:20 943:4 947:2,4	effectively 897:4	essentially 928:18	885:23 894:13,14,19
disagree 887:13 889:10	948:24 959:25	effort 861:5	935:22 963:15	895:6,18 896:4,13,22
929:24 950:11,12	don't-flush-your-toil	efforts 936:4	establish 871:25	897:1,3 900:18 904:3
disagreed 961:16	861:3	either 866:2 893:19	established 853:19	904:8 905:13,17,23
disagreeing 907:3	doubled 856:10	906:24 920:16 937:22	865:10 913:13	906:1,9,25 907:4,21
disagreement 939:13	downstream 927:4	943:19	establishes 865:10	908:9,16 921:16,24
disconnect 929:3	DPN 920:3	electorate 897:15 898:6	871:13	922:2,10 935:12,16
discount 871:3	dramatically 932:15	898:7,10,16,23	estimate 886:16 932:12	935:24 936:10 937:5
discourage 859:9	951:7	elements 909:24	932:21 943:21	937:8,11,14,23 938:2
875:20	drill 930:16	elephant 891:25 892:1	estimated 932:22	938:14,17 960:11
discouraging 875:7	drives 892:6	892:4,5,6	944:15	exchanges 904:15,16
Discovery 875:23	dropped 951:6,11	eligible 948:24	estimates 943:23	excuse 875:22 879:23
discuss 853:25	drought 887:21 888:13	else's 897:21 909:18	estimating 886:17	excuses 862:9 892:10
Discussion 929:7 940:1	889:7 893:3 951:3	927:21	estopped 896:10	exercise 923:1
disguised 897:22	952:22 953:4,10,13	Embarcadero 849:10	estoppel 895:15 896:25	exhibit 920:2 933:24
dismiss 921:17	953:14,19 954:9	emergency 951:25	evaluate 907:10 960:25	936:23 952:23
disparate 961:17	957:2	952:21 953:1	evaluation 873:2	exhibits 962:12
displacement 873:17 displacing 873:22	dry 861:8 868:4 877:21 877:24,25 878:24,25	emphasize 852:9 emphasized 875:19	958:23 eve 925:10	exist 949:19 existence 940:12 945:8
dispracing 873:22 disproved 950:17	877:24,25 878:24,25 879:5,11 880:16	emphatically 941:4	event 927:18	existence 940:12 945:8 exists 865:22
disproved 950.17 disproven 954:25	885:22,25 886:5,7,8	emphatically 941.4 employed 965:14,17	eventually 885:22	exists 803.22 expand 878:6 885:16
uispi 0 ven 954.25	003.44,43 000.3,1,0	Cimpioyeu 703.14,17	CVCHILIANY 005.22	слрани 0/0.0 003.10
			<u> </u>	l

897:14 **expect** 924:4 expenses 858:15,18 911:20 922:8 923:14 924:8 944:16 expensive 875:5 expensively 927:6 **expert** 951:9 **experts** 925:13 **explain** 894:15 907:20 explained 945:20 explains 911:14 explanation 955:19 explicit 884:12 **explicitly** 911:3 929:16 **express** 875:20 expressly 875:15 884:19 extent 860:4,9,10 861:14 877:8,12,15 881:9 891:11 893:16 922:6 939:5,13 942:10,12 extra 879:3 888:6 952:19 extreme 880:16 948:13 extremely 880:22 910:20

F

face 875:6 faced 942:2 facial 903:13 905:5 906:6,10 938:4,9,12 facilitate 869:5 872:19 873:24 875:3 959:5,7 facilitating 941:20 facilities 862:17 902:11 910:22 911:1,5,23 912:16,17,25 921:5 934:4 938:8 942:22 945:15 957:2 facility 874:19 911:23 914:23 937:3 942:15 facility's 874:12,17 fact 856:3 859:21 865:21 870:6 884:23 903:1 916:19 918:2 918:15.16 920:25 921:23 927:15 931:17 936:22 940:25 942:21 943:6 947:14 950:2 950:16 951:22 954:21 959:16 factor 864:5 870:12 factors 951:15,18 factory 910:5 facts 872:3,6 899:22

fair 864:12 868:22 869:3.8.15 871:24 872:4,7,18 875:1 916:25 917:12 923:14 934:24 935:7 939:20 941:12 943:21 948:2 948:21 959:8 960:17 fairly 881:18 897:25 899:2 fall 890:9 fallow 887:2 falls 907:9 false 855:11,12 876:5,7 far 860:19 871:22 874:13 881:6 914:15 918:5 925:5 939:11 961:5 963:15 Farm 882:2 946:22 fast 880:17 **FCS** 854:19 889:3,5 890:13 962:18 Federal 925:20,20,24 926:6,7,12,25 927:8 927:14 928:3 fee 911:23 912:17 926:22 932:7,11 934:7,8 feel 852:10 856:25 948:15 963:20 fees 874:17 881:25 882:1 911:25 915:12 933:15 961:6,7 feet 878:1,2 890:12 913:18 926:16 933:25 946:11 **FELLOWS** 849:21 field 900:18 905:12 **fight** 894:9 figure 865:20,25 873:10 889:22 961:1 file 963:17 filed 956:10 final 887:17 897:6 finally 871:7 887:17 894:13,14 898:18 900:9 955:13 **finance** 874:13 financial 859:17 876:17 financially 965:17 find 894:25 963:9

finding 856:23

findings 856:3 866:25

905:16 906:3,13

factual 867:15 951:12

fails 875:1.2.2 892:23

factually 949:3

942:1

952:5

867:9,10 876:10,19 896:20 955:15,17 956:6,6 fine 864:24 889:18 902:21 925:12 fingers 899:8 firm 936:21 first 854:8 868:19.20 869:8 870:1 875:10 875:24 876:6 881:23 891:10 895:22 900:1 909:2.4 914:14 930:7 940:21 942:13 948:22 957:23 961:5 963:22 fiscal 904:4,6,6,11,14 five 876:22 five-year 961:25 fix 861:23,25 893:20 fixed 860:22 868:2 911:16,20 915:23 916:1,4,12 917:9,13 917:15 918:1,9,12,15 919:4,14 939:16,21 940:11,12,17,23 941:12 942:4 957:25 958:12,16,20,21 959:1 flat 957:10 flex 888:20,22 flexibility 963:21 floor 848:24 flow 889:23 focus 931:5 932:24 focused 953:5 focuses 931:17 **focusing** 904:11 **FOERSTER** 849:17 folks 933:5,6 follow 856:7 858:11,20 858:21,25 859:2 882:1 940:18 followed 858:5 884:20 following 858:9,24 859:1 897:23 898:1 forbids 854:12 force 875:16 forced 935:22 forecasts 918:8 **foregoing** 965:10,15 forget 880:7 937:11,17 937:17 938:13,13 forgot 962:17 formation 873:23 formula 949:25 formulations 865:23 forth 852:16 949:21 965:7

932:22 foundation 887:5 891:6 four 869:23 fourth 871:7 fraction 901:21 928:17 Francisco 848:3,16,24 849:4.10.18 free 852:10 877:8 963.20 free-flowing 926:2 927:1 freed 877:10 **freeing** 877:13 frees 877:14,15 963:16 front 938:6 full 871:9.10.12 908:8 917:3 918:14 921:16 958:6 960:13 965:11 full-service 868:10 876:13 882:18,19 901:1,13 903:23 904:15 908:6,7 914:15 921:8 930:11 931:18 933:20 935:7 940:4,14 941:25 full-water 920:21 fully 868:20 876:21 function 909:11,13 923:17 926:25 939:5 functionalize 859:15 928.21 functionalized 928:12 functionalizes 927:25 928:25 functionally 858:17 functions 909:10 924:11 929:5 fundamental 868:17 funded 870:7 949:6 **funding** 938:23 funds 924:1 949:1 further 942:24 954:23 965:15 furthermore 855:21 945:19 fuss 884:7 future 880:10,22 886:14,18,23 896:6 future-looking 886:20 \mathbf{G} **G** 852:1 gallon 912:22 926:16 general 854:25 857:22

883:7,10 896:12

generalize 958:16

949:16

900:2 906:15 947:13

911:17 922:23 923:24 924:1 940:13 948:9 955:25 generate 948:1 generated 947:1 **GEORGE** 848:15 getting 852:22 860:20 864:19 880:16 882:12 882:12,14,14 886:24 909:23 914:23 915:10 923:14 948:19,20 **Gilman** 854:16 857:23 858:4,11 951:4 give 869:6,14 871:5 872:3 873:21 891:23 899:4 923:22 945:23 949:12 950:4 given 878:2 903:7 957:20 961:19 gives 884:12 911:22 giving 948:13 go 852:15 855:17 856:9 856:11 859:10 861:17 862:4 868:15 871:21 874:13 876:6 882:10 887:25 890:10,16 898:3 899:16 901:19 903:25 904:10 910:22 911:4 912:17 913:15 913:15 915:17 923:13 927:9,24 930:23 939:18 943:17 945:23 952:19 953:8 954:22 955:5 957:5,11 958:1 958:15 960:25 961:1 961:1.23 goes 856:23 860:19 863:7 865:24 868:24 882:4 884:2 918:6 919:25 941:1,5 947:24 949:21 952:7 957:8 going 852:25 853:5,25 856:19 859:14 861:11 862:4 863:17,24 864:14 865:15 866:13 868:16 870:21 871:5 876:25 878:6 880:2,9 880:21 884:1 885:21 885:23 886:14,16,18 887:13 890:24 893:20 899:14 901:17 903:8 905:2 913:1 914:22 916:7 917:10,23 918:8,24 919:5

generally 853:19

895:23 904:9,13

926:17 932:16,22

forward 886:13 916:7

947:11,17 949:11 959:18 960:7,8,9,12 963:11 gold 864:12,17 **gold-plated** 864:11.13 good 852:4 956:14 gotten 958:16 governance 939:15 governed 899:23 900:5 915:24 governing 930:4 government 854:6 881:16 925:20,21,24 926:6,8,12,25 927:8 927:15,17 928:3 930:4 granular 861:15,20 882:5 942:25 gravity 927:1 great 852:5 937:20 greater 945:11 957:16 **Griffith** 860:16 881:21 881:23,23 882:4,21 931:10 932:1,5,5,7 933:11 934:5 946:23 949:9 961:4,5,6,7,9 961:19 ground 935:22 grounds 876:12 groundwater 885:2 886:11 888:14 934:10 934.18 group 882:8,21 933:5 947:25 grouping 882:9 groupings 882:11,15 882:17 groups 933:6 guarantee 863:24 guarantees 913:5 guess 858:22 859:7 864:25 878:15 890:17 891:21 903:4,11 913:11,22 927:14 929:2 933:3,8 948:14 948:15 guide 858:14 guidelines 858:15 guys 857:16 936:20 H half 888:12 half-heartedly 946:6 **HALL** 848:15

half 888:12 half-heartedly 946: HALL 848:15 hand 965:20 handful 948:1 handling 889:14 happen 880:21

happened 855:5 857:19 881:6 883:24 916:6 happening 901:6 happens 863:19 914:6 937:13 happy 852:23 hard 859:23 harmless 856:7 867:7 867:25 868:7,14 876:1 939:7,7 958:5 958:19 HARRIS 848:19 965:3 965:22 hassle 932:16 hat 856:23 hear 937:21 heard 922:4 943:5,12 952:4 hearing 921:21 923:4 heart 941:1 **HEATHER** 849:15 heavy 890:10 held 867:25 871:19 help 870:21 927:17 963:6,24 **helped** 871:11 874:13 **helpful** 857:7 907:18 963:9 **helping** 948:17 helps 934:5 940:6 hereto 965:17 hereunder 965:19 hey 857:16 960:5 high 890:16 933:5 961:24 962:2 higher 931:20 932:4 highlight 924:18 highlighted 937:1 highly 910:23 historical 923:1 **history** 876:15 hit 962:11 hits 915:18 Hixson 849:11 851:5 899:11,11 900:16,22 903:3,9 907:19,24 908:3 909:20 910:16 911:11 913:3 914:10 918:21 919:2 926:9 926:24 927:23 929:8 933:16 937:9,16 940:19 943:25 947:7 947:19 948:4,22 949:1 952:24 956:14 hold 856:7 867:7 868:7 868:13 876:1 877:25 916:19 939:7 958:5

958:19

holders 890:4 holding 871:22 939:7 939:14 holds 961:14 home 909:23 Honor 852:18 856:21 897:6 898:25 899:19 899:24 904:19 905:7 906:14 920:10 922:20 929:11,13,20 937:25 944:22 952:11,16 953:18 955:13 956:3 956.18 Honor's 909:4 956:9 **HONORABLE** 848:4 hope 907:17 hopefully 899:4 hottest 891:16 hour 852:16 899:12 huge 861:1 883:11 901:23 903:23 948:6 hundred-million-doll... 883:12

I

hundreds 943:3

hypothetical 947:7

948:13 949:7

hurt 873:6

idea 855:18 863:21 864:4,20 870:14 919:6,17 921:11 934:11 954:25 962:3 identified 859:19 888:13,21 924:22 942:20 identifies 888:14 891:9 894:5 identify 888:4,11 891:15 920:12 930:7 idle 887:2 ignore 860:19 861:6,10 892:4,5 ignores 959:6,10 **ignoring** 894:11 II 932:6 934:5 IID 870:19,25 871:11 871:19 875:14 879:18 896:8 902:16 905:20 905:22 915:17 935:17 935:19 937:21 illegal 865:11,16,17,18 865:19,19 903:16 illustrate 932:6 imagine 863:5 881:3 927:8 imagining 922:16 impact 873:21 896:20

impatient 852:22 **Imperial** 896:18 **implement** 871:19 implicate 896:21 important 874:3 878:20 923:1 930:6 931:6 importantly 888:2 916:23 920:9 **imported** 870:8,10,11 944:6 945:11 962:15 963:2 **impose** 884:13 918:19 **imposed** 913:2 940:14 947:5 **imposing** 897:24 imposition 897:12 improper 895:9 improperly 865:17 inapplicable 907:4 **incentivize** 885:16,18 include 874:17 896:15 917:15 938:11 941:2 941:23,23 942:3 954:9 **included** 942:11 includes 865:10 894:5 including 868:25 876:17 922:9,10 946:17 inclusion 865:1 inconsistency 896:25 incontrovertibly 854:22 incorporated 942:22 increase 886:5 increased 945:24 increases 886:8 increasing 885:6 incremental 865:8 871:20,23 872:11,12 872:24 873:11,15,25 874:7,7,8,14,16,24 902:20,23 915:22 916:14 incur 886:7 887:19 906:15 917:8 939:16 incurred 868:23 869:9 874:9 886:12 917:13 918:2 919:15 920:5 922:15 940:19 941:13 950:11 952:2 953:23 incurring 916:24 934:22 incurs 853:20 919:4 922:8 946:20 951:23 952:10,12 954:7

independent 866:6

869:11 880:19 925:2 indicated 919:25 indicating 943:6 indirect 948:20 indirectly 947:16 individual 884:15 931:5 932:14 946:20 industry 858:24.24 859:4.11 862:10 866.18 information 867:15 954.4 infrastructure 862:13 918:16 injury 859:18 876:17 inland 934:13,16 inquiry 931:20 932:4 932:20 956:3 inside 881:12 insofar 941:15 inspections 932:8 instance 874:11 insurance 887:21 889:7 893:3 intake 926:2,13 integrated 887:4 942:23 intended 952:6 intending 941:8 **intends** 876:12 intentionally 887:24 interested 965:18 interpretation 895:8 896:23.24 interrogatory 957:1 interrupted 852:24 interruptible 936:14 invalid 884:3 invented 939:10 investing 886:10 investments 884:25 888:11.15 invoices 909:6 925:21 involved 913:9 iPod 910:4,8,25 920:14 920:19 IRP 878:19,21 879:2 887:6 888:8,8,14 irrelevant 862:25 863:1 865:6 916:3 938:15 962:6 **Irvine** 850:4 issue 861:16 866:20 875:14 888:20 889:12 895:5,8 896:18 899:18 903:20 908:5

914:7 915:18,19,20

920:14 921:11 922:23

937:1,23 939:7 941:1 953:24 954:11,14,15 issues 860:2 897:8 898:19 902:15 903:10 923:9 929:9 937:14 956:10 item 930:17 931:5 itemized 910:1 itemizes 953:22 items 963:9

J J 850:5 **JACKSON** 849:6 JAN 848:22 January 848:17 852:2 938:17 965:20 Jeff 853:17 870:16 892:24 957:23 job 956:17 John 849:5,21 853:3 joined 957:13,22,24 959:12 judge 848:4 861:19 **judgment** 897:13 judicial 895:15 896:25 judicially 896:10 July 875:22,22 jump 890:22 900:1 June 893:25

K

876:22,24 918:11,21

jurisdiction 861:24

JUSTICE 848:15

justification 866:7

justified 876:21

Karman 850:3 **KARNOW** 848:4 keep 861:24 871:11 894:11 919:5 949:2 962:10 keeps 886:3 901:22 **Keker** 849:3,5 851:4,9 852:6,18 853:3,3,5 856:2.21 857:13 858:22 860:15 863:14 864:6 865:15 866:9 866:11 877:16 879:20 879:23 880:1 886:19 889:16 890:22 891:21 896:5 900:11,16 904:25 921:24 936:19 950:6 956:18,22 **KENNEDY** 849:23 key 911:12 916:13,18 917:24 924:15 925:1

936:5

kind 872:14 873:9 874:25 891:5 914:1 915:13 926:5 935:21 948:20 950:5 955:5 know 855:1 860:3 861:2 862:9 865:12 867:23 868:19 872:2 872:13.21 883:9 887:23 891:12,19,24 891:24,25 892:2 903:17 907:15 924:10 926:16 927:5 938:21 940:6 945:16 946:10 947:10 951:17 955:5 955:8 957:16 knowledgable 908:19 knows 880:21

KUO 849:16

laid 884:18 895:11

898:3 899:2 Lake 888:22,23 land 885:3,8 934:12 landlord 882:6 landlords 932:8 landowner 949:10 language 853:24 868:5 896:15,17 931:11,12 large 888:11 889:20 891:25 912:17 913:7 927:5 932:23 942:12 largest 921:21 law 854:6 858:25 867:13 869:4 871:24 872:1,5,11 885:16 894:8 895:22 931:8 931:12 946:17,18 954:22 960:21 lawfully 869:11 laws 854:4 lay 895:14 leaching 934:11 lead 873:16 leave 918:10 leaving 906:8 led 917:15 ledger 854:24 **left** 875:14 879:14 938.4 **left-hand** 900:25 legal 867:2 897:8 922:4 954:20,20 length 873:13 let's 871:5 883:19 900:13 902:7 904:9 918:9 940:3,5,8 946:24 947:9 953:8

956:20 **letting** 958:24 level 883:7 901:24 928:6 931:20 932:4 932:20 933:6 life 914:6 960:11 likes 930:16 likewise 933:2 935:3 942.23 Limine 895:13,17 limit 902:22 limitations 880:25 limited 869:9 955:20 959:8 line 878:4 879:19,24 936:20 lines 866:23 939:14 link 916:7,10 943:22,25 952:17 list 854:5 924:9 955:17 **listed** 962:5 **listing** 867:11 literally 921:1 939:10 942:18 little 864:11 866:14 887:12 897:14 899:5 899:8 963:12 **Livermore** 867:14,16 LLP 849:9 850:3 loaded 861:4 **loading** 873:5 882:19 local 861:2 870:6 890:8 930:20 locally 943:20 **location** 926:13 locations 948:11 **locked** 874:1 logic 920:8 logical 915:14 938:16 long 956:11 959:19 long-term 915:25 919:4 919:14,15,19 939:16 939:21 952:5 longer 963:12 longest 956:17 look 857:16 859:3,3,5 859:23 862:2 867:18 868:21 888:2 893:18 894:1,22 895:12 902:19 906:25 922:7 924:11 931:13,15 933:1 934:20 937:20 946:13,19 947:13 951:9 954:23,24 957:5 963:22 looked 917:25 932:10

906:15 922:14 928:20 929:3,4 931:4,19,23 932:25 952:25 953:22 955:2 looks 864:16 Los 849:14 890:11 901:15 947:1 951:10 960.4 lose 881:20 955:10 lot 878:21 879:7 887:12 889:11 892:7 893:4 898:22 911:11 916:1 916:3 932:15 943:7 962:25 lots 882:15 **low-flow** 940:6 lower 863:13 941:25 LRP 870:6 ludicrous 926:20 lump 883:15 923:25 **lumping** 882:23 M M 849:23 M-1 923:19 made-up 892:25 maintaining 886:22 952:18 majority 900:3 901:2 901:17 903:23 making 860:23 861:5 873:6 876:8 880:11 896:19 903:12 905:5 906:6 959:9 management 868:3 885:1 930:18,22,24 942:16,19 943:15 944:2,11,16 945:9,20 946:4,14 947:8,20 948:9 949:1,6,17 manager 896:12 mandate 861:17 manner 869:4

manual 923:19,20

928:20 958:14

Marchant 862:19

MARCIA 849:16

materially 948:7

958:23 959:3

March 942:17

margin 873:5

manufacturer 910:13

market 849:18 873:23

matrix 873:2 891:12

872:5,11 885:24

matter 866:4 871:24,25

893:19 914:17 929:14

937:13 960:14 965:7

861:10 862:9.10 863:5,8,11,24 864:8 864:15 866:2 874:13 874:15 883:8 886:22 887:6 891:19 892:10 893:1 894:1,18 895:19 897:24 910:3 919:1 934:1 meaning 902:13 909:21 917:7 933:17 meaningful 890:1 959:13 960:18,24,25 means 853:15 895:19 895:25 898:7 929:24 955:9,21 measure 891:15 mechanism 911:2 meet 950:19 952:6 **meeting** 867:10 member 867:25 870:2 870:10 871:8 873:18 873:22 876:17 884:14 884:16 886:4 887:1 887:11,19 889:23,23 890:1,14 892:2,3 893:2,5 895:24 900:3 900:6 901:3 902:2,9 902:11 906:16 908:9 912:7 913:17 914:11 914:21 915:16,24 916:10,18,20,23 917:14 918:2,22,23 918:25 919:2,5,7,13 919:16,16,23 920:6,7 921:7 922:9 930:13 938:6 939:5,15,18,19 939:22,24 940:8,13 940:15,16,20,23 941:5,8,10,14,15 945:9,23 946:10 947:5,10,15,17 948:5 948:10 949:5,23 950:1,3,8,14,25 951:5 951:13 952:3,6,9 958:2,3,3,6 959:17,25 960:2.5 members 859:18 861:9 871:14 887:15 898:6 932:16 948:2,2,17 memo 870:17,23 873:1

matters 893:19 894:16

McCUTCHEN 849:9

MCDONALD 848:15

859:3,4,5,23 860:14

mean 853:18 857:25

929:14

Maureen 936:1

memory 951:3

932:20,21 954:1,7

looking 857:7 886:13

mention 962:17
mentioned 920:13
954:12
merit 955:11
merits 865:24
met 852:14 853:9 854:6
854:10,11,12,12,14
854:20 855:2,8,15,24
856:3 858:5 860:6,12
862:11 865:21,25
866:2,17 867:5,11,19
869:3,11,24 870:2,3,8
870:11,12,17,19,23
870:11,12,17,19,23 871:14,15,15,18,19
871:22 872:11 873:17
873:22 874:3,10,11
874:23 875:12,13,25
876:12 877:4,8
878:24 881:14 882:17
883:1,4 884:7,12,16
884:19 885:4 886:3,4
886:5,7 887:11,12,18
887:20 888:5,21,23
007.20 000.5,21,25
889:4,6,8 890:9,19
891:8 892:22 894:4
894:15,15 895:1,6
897:15,18,20,22
898:4,5,9,12,22
899:23 900:4,7
902:16,21 903:23
904:2,8 905:22
906:15,17,20 909:6,7
909:9 910:18 911:13
911:14,22,24 912:9
912:13,13 913:18,23
914:24 916:1,6,23
917:6,15,18,19,20,20
918:7,18 919:9,13,15
919:19,20 920:3,20
920:23,25 921:22
922:2,4,5,16 924:19
922.2,4,3,10 924.19
925:5,11,18,22,24
926:1,3 927:24 928:7
928:14,19,21 929:3
929:12,15,17 930:8
931:22 935:3 938:23
939:3,15,15,17 940:3
040.4 6 9 20 20 24
940:4,6,8,20,20,24
941:2,4,18,19,21
942:7,10,12,13 943:6
943:8,13 944:10
945:3,13,20,21 946:3
946:8,12 947:3,4,6,7
947:11 949:22 950:2
052.5 10 12 052.25
952:5,10,12 953:25 954:2,7,16,17 957:14
057.21 050.7
957:21 958:7
Met's 854:3,24 863:2

```
865:9 866:23,25
  867:4 869:13 871:7,8
  874:19 875:7,8,16
  876:16 879:9 880:24
  887:21 895:13 896:11
  900:23 901:2.15
  902:13 907:12 913:12
  914:24 918:1 922:14
  924:7 925:12,15
  926:1 928:11,12,24
  930:4 931:18 934:3
  938:15 939:8 954:13
metered 961:12
meters 882:15
method 873:5,6 922:22
metrics 958:23
Metropolitan 848:10
  849:8,13 876:16
  890:6 895:24 899:11
  900:2,6 902:10 909:2
  909:12 910:16 911:3
  915:12,22 916:11
  917:2 919:3 921:13
  921:18 922:8,13,22
  924:12,13 925:25
  930:12,23 931:3
  936:17 937:5 939:12
  942:16 945:17 946:6
  947:22 948:7,12
  949:5 950:11,15,18
  951:23
Metropolitan's 895:21
  902:11 905:2,6,9
  909:15 921:18 925:9
  938:5 945:14 953:20
  953:21 955:22
middle 904:4 935:22
million 860:25 888:21
  904:5,6 938:22 960:7
  960:10
million-acre 878:2
million-dollar 960:8
million-dollars 883:12
millions 913:10 943:3
  947:2 948:24
mind 858:10 900:10
  938:3 953:19
mined 910:6
minimal 862:23
minimus 960:24 961:22
minute 880:6 960:5
minutes 857:5 867:10
  890:21 899:13 900:20
  956:19
mirrors 931:11
misallocated 954:22
misguided 852:10
```

misrepresented 961:4

```
missed 852:11 936:5
misstates 897:18
misstating 887:24
misunderstanding
  925:23
model 935:4
molecules 864:12
moment 904:25
monetary 864:7
money 861:2 886:15,15
  889:11 913:9 925:25
  926:7,10 927:6,15
  928:3,8 931:17
  932:10 947:1,3
  948:16
morning 852:4 890:20
  899:13 901:7 908:13
  921:24 936:20
MORRISON 849:17
Morrow 872:17 876:11
  941:22
Motion 895:13,17
move 863:20 877:22
  902:11 910:19 911:5
  911:14 912:4,16
  913:4,19 922:17
  927:6,7,17 945:4,5,14
movement 915:1 937:2
moving 862:22 863:1
  907:8 909:14 914:21
  914:22 927:1,3
  928:11,24 933:22
multiple 888:4
MUNICIPAL 849:22
  850:2
MWD 870:24 871:2
  875:14 900:24 902:16
  915:17
MWD's 871:3
MWD/IID 905:1
  939:14 941:2
myriad 878:10
mysterious 954:11
          N
```

N 849:14 851:1,1 852:1 name 853:1 NARUC 854:16 858:5 858:9,14,14 naturally 890:2 nature 927:3 944:19 958:12 near 887:16 934:12 nearly 904:12 necessarily 861:13 883:3 884:10 914:1 necessary 867:7 877:11

need 855:17 856:7,8 857:8 871:19 873:8 873:17 877:22,25,25 878:1 879:3,5 886:14 887:1 888:15 891:17 905:10 922:16 932:3 933:5 945:10.10 952:2.7.19 959:16 963:18.22 needed 853:7 859:16 899:18 942:14 needs 886:17 890:7 891:8 931:24 neither 863:3 891:14 965:13 **NEST** 849:3 never 855:9 875:9 876:2 881:3 889:21 889:22 894:18 new 868:4 nickel 962:22 no-suit 961:25 non-contractor 912:18 non-incremental 872:20 non-project 874:9 911:5 912:12 913:4 non-state 862:22 non-substantial 858:2 non-wheelers 875:17 non-wheeling 868:10 nonmember 919:8,10 nonmembers 919:20 nonsense 875:12 normal 878:23 888:9 Normally 920:15 **northern** 926:18 note 869:13 notes 965:8,12 notice 869:8 875:13 898:1,8 **noting** 884:6 notion 896:9 897:16 939:8 nuance 935:21 **number** 917:11 924:19 929:25 943:13 944:14 949:5 950:24 numbers 930:11 943:8 943:16 0

O 851:1 852:1 objections 908:20 963:17,19 obligation 921:2 922:4 observation 873:16 obvious 897:25 961:22 **obviously** 871:10 876:5 926:20 932:14 963:11 **October** 854:17,18 855:13 895:12 offer 871:2 offhand 926:11 Official 965:4 **offset** 871:4 944:5 offsetting 869:1,14,19 905:21 937:19 Oftentimes 909:20 oh 859:22 862:19 okay 882:22 889:16 890:22 900:21 907:19 907:24 908:3 918:23 927:23 929:8 941:7 958:4,7,18 959:14 961:18 once 915:8 931:13 **one-for-one** 944:5,10 **one-to-one** 945:4 962:14,15 ones 912:8 915:7 920:5 **oOo** 848:6 850:7 852:3 964:3 open-minded 863:4 **opening** 853:11 873:3 873:13 908:4 957:23 operates 926:1 opposed 891:4 941:9 **Opposition** 895:13,16 **Option** 873:14 options 885:10 **ORANGE** 850:2 order 859:2 867:7,24 878:5,22 886:6 894:4 897:17 902:3 954:16 orders 902:2 ordinary 910:17 organizing 899:15 ought 943:24 **outcome** 965:18 outside 858:23 906:17 907:6 outstanding 954:14 overall 946:20 overhead 910:11,14 overruled 908:20 overwhelming 875:6 901:2 owned 910:19,23 owner 862:16,20 868:23 869:9 959:9 owners 934:9 ownership 928:20 owns 926:1 928:14,16

P 852:1	Paupereaux 949:9	perform 940:22	portfolio 953:15	895:20,20 896:4,15
p.m 964:2	pay 853:19 868:11	performed 924:12	portion 892:19 908:10	896:23,24 897:3
pack 953:13	873:8 874:7,8,8,11,16	946:13	918:12,19 940:11,17	907:21 919:11 920:15
package 938:18	895:4 896:6 902:4	period 963:16,19	957:8 958:25	936:7,8,8 958:7
page 851:3 855:11	908:21,22 910:7	periods 878:23 953:12	pose 946:2	pricing 962:19
866:22 867:9 868:7	912:17 913:21 914:18	permanent 919:3	posed 853:6 868:17	primarily 934:12
869:25 870:1 876:6	917:22 920:25 921:3	person 908:19	899:24 929:13 935:10	primary 875:8 885:5
876:15 879:1 889:5	923:18,19 925:24	perspective 910:13	936:19 937:15	principal 921:19 956:8
893:8 897:17,19	926:4,5,11 929:18	914:24 958:13	poses 942:9	principle 856:7 867:8
903:25 904:10 907:20	932:25 933:20 938:19	petitions 876:3	position 855:9,19 856:2	868:7,14 876:2
923:21 952:25 953:9	939:20 940:10 948:2	phase 937:15	857:10,16,17 865:15	883:15 891:6 899:15
955:23 961:9	958:25 959:16,18	phenomena 861:8	872:9,10,21 879:17	920:10 931:6 958:5
pages 848:11 853:23	payer 896:7	phonetic 949:9	883:1,4 886:4 889:19	958:19
859:22 867:21 875:23	payer-by-payer 946:21	phrase 860:8 939:10	889:19 897:18 902:17	principles 878:17
888:3 924:17 953:8	payers 885:7 923:16	pick 910:25 933:9	935:12,14,15,23	885:20 891:23 894:7
955:25 965:10	931:9,14 932:14	940:16	936:13,17 937:10	897:24 957:15,17,19
paid 862:11 885:7	934:19	picking 947:17	948:16,19 949:10	prior 871:18 895:15
895:1 901:24 940:12	paying 870:2 876:14	picks 892:12	960:3	897:13 902:15
Paint 882:3	896:3 908:7,11,14,15	piece 926:15 960:1	positions 923:7	prioritize 872:17
Palmdale 876:19,23	911:23 912:1,2	pipes 893:13 910:18	possibility 878:14	Pro 965:4
885:17 961:14	911:23 912:1,2	911:15 912:3 936:15	possible 864:5 872:13	probably 852:7 860:14
paragraph 894:23	931:16	962:7,9	872:14 878:8	963:12
904:4	payment 911:19	place 859:4 889:17	possibly 883:4 903:5	problem 859:11 864:1
paragraphs 875:18	pays 894:20 901:3	902:2 965:7	Post-Trial 867:21	886:14 939:8 941:16
parcel 934:23	911:14 915:12 926:4	placed 885:6	870:1 888:3 923:21	962:20
parcel-by-parcel	926:7,10 960:13	plaintiff 848:8 849:2	951:2 956:11	problems 892:7
961:15	peak 887:12,12 893:13	934:14 961:10	postage 903:1,2	procedural 853:25
parcels 884:15	950:19	plaintiff's 951:9	postpone 943:3	896:19 897:2
parenthetically 855:8	peaking 861:8 877:21	plaintiffs 925:7	Posttrial 868:6	procedure 884:19
Paris 888:23	877:24 885:22,25	plan 887:5 942:23	power 865:8,18 874:7,8	898:1,15
part 855:2,2 864:1	886:7 887:11,18,23	plank 948:5	901:5 908:23 917:19	procedures 884:21
885:7,8 901:12,13,20	888:6 890:14,15,25	plank 948.3 planning 888:16	917:22 928:15 931:1	proceeding 907:21
901:21 907:21 914:12	891:4,8 892:13,16	plants 883:13,13	941:24	proceedings 848:14
915:5 919:3,19 920:6	893:16,22 894:4,6	playing 900:18 905:11	powerful 873:22	964:1 965:6,10,15
926:18 932:23 933:9	949:18,19 950:5,10	pleadings 897:13	practical 922:7	proceeds 950:8
937:22 944:8 955:9	951:12 952:2 956:23	please 853:2	preaching 868:19	process 898:2,8
participate 940:9	962:8,9	plunged 951:6	precipitation 953:13	product 909:21,24
948:10	peaks 891:15,15 892:23	plus 926:17	precise 903:6	910:6,10 911:3
participating 874:18	pending 880:12,14	point 852:10 859:8,9	precise 903.0 precisely 858:9 891:24	920:16,17 921:6
944:6	895:3	866:12 874:22 876:8	precludes 854:11	products 920:13
particular 858:20	penny 860:14,17,21	878:15 881:25 882:7	predicate 951:12	Professional 848:20
884:16 902:1,19	penny 860.14,17,21 people 856:8 867:8	882:16 883:8 885:12	predicate 931.12 predicting 886:13	
905:7 906:13 934:25	875:4,5 878:6 882:8			program 932:13,23 940:9 943:15 944:3
	,	887:9,17,24 890:23	preferred 942:18	
937:15 952:2	882:12,13,14 886:13	891:2 896:2 898:4	prepublished 902:13	944:16 945:9,20
particularly 887:6	886:21 898:7 918:13	901:10 906:4 911:12	902:17,21,24 906:18	946:5 947:8,20 948:9
parties 853:6,7,16	933:12,12 934:16	917:24 923:20 927:18	907:15 916:17 918:3	949:17 962:23,25
929:21,23,24 933:23	937:23 948:17 958:24	927:24 936:5,23	919:6	programs 861:3 870:6
945:5 963:17,18	961:22 962:11	937:12 941:11 948:15	present 856:13 875:16	877:4,12 878:16
965:14,17	people's 879:4 899:8	949:8,8 956:22	886:23	885:1,2,11 888:17
partly 929:14	perceived 873:20	957:10 958:14,17	presentation 852:20	930:19,20 942:16,19
parts 874:12 931:1	percent 871:3,6 877:5	959:22	853:10 858:13 888:20	944:2,11 946:14
party 913:2 919:19	880:23 885:14 890:6	point-to-point 871:24	presented 956:4	947:25 949:6
pass 917:1	890:15,16,16 892:20	pointed 862:14 867:20	pretrial 876:4,7	project 854:9,21,22
passed 923:15	904:16 913:7,7	917:20 951:2,5	pretty 950:6	855:10 858:6 859:13
passing 854:12	914:16 915:5 943:1	pointing 872:25	prevail 936:13	862:16,22,24 865:2
	044.00 050.0 5	points 956:9 957:9	prevent 870:8 876:12	866:18 867:4 874:6
patience 963:4	944:23 953:2,5			
patience 963:4 patterns 950:10 PATTY 850:5	944:23 953:2,5 percentage 913:20 914:25	policies 869:7 popular 897:22,25	previously 935:11 price 864:13 895:5,19	888:12 901:8,11 904:20 909:4,5 912:9

912:11,15 913:14,24 906:11 961:25 quantifies 943:13 **provisions** 907:9 930:1 914:13 915:4,9,10,25 quantify 863:9 884:10 913:4 914:2 946:3 916:2,11 921:15,19 955:3 922:5,11 924:9,20,23 proxy 891:5,20 quantities 945:3 quantity 902:5 933:21 925:8,14 927:5,25 **PTX** 955:18,18 956:7 937:4 938:20 945:11 929:4,10 938:7,8,10 960:4 938:12 940:21 944:5 quarter 961:2 PTX-102 913:5,8 944:7 946:4.24.25 PTX-110 944:17 **auestion** 853:6 854:8 959:2,21,24 960:24 PTX-25 870:15 854:15 860:20 861:11 PTX-26 870:23 861:12 866:16 868:16 project-by-project 883:2,7,17 946:21 **PTX-30** 871:8 923:20 869:16,17 872:10,25 projects 861:1,1 862:13 PTX-352 898:21 877:7 879:21 882:5 870:7 877:8 881:10 PTX-36 925:7 882:25 888:1 891:10 883:10,22 946:7 PTX-454 943:11 891:13 893:14 899:24 948:18 952:6 PTX-698 895:2 904:14,20 905:2 pull 900:8 903:24 908:4 906:19 909:2.5 promise 873:7,8 943:18 952:15 922:20 925:19 929:2 **promote** 870:24 871:11 929:13,21 933:3,8 pronouncement 920:8 PURCELL 849:5 **Prop** 853:24 854:5,5 purchase 886:9 902:12 934:7 936:19 942:2,7 881:14 884:20,21 905:20 909:24 930:24 942:9 944:23 946:2 897:8 930:2 931:9,11 930:25 952:11,16 953:18 931:12 959:10,10 purchased 902:9 957:14,19 962:8,9 951:19 questions 852:5,6,9,19 960:20 961:14 **proper** 897:24 923:3 purchaser 909:21 852:21 860:4,9 865:1 properly 876:14 920:6 910:17,21 921:22 866:13 877:1 886:1 939:4 942:10 934:23 899:15,19 908:1 property 898:2 purchases 886:5 909:3 935:10 955:13 proportion 933:21 891:14 950:23,25 955:17 956:9 957:25 proportional 853:20 951:6,11 **quibble** 930:20 purported 866:25 935:7 **OUILIZAPA** 850:5 proportionality 894:7 purporting 923:10 quite 880:18 954:24 961:14,15 **purpose** 875:7,20 923:5 quote 853:18 855:7,14 proportionately 891:10 purposes 869:7 915:15 859:17 860:9 867:6 proposals 898:13,14 923:2,24 924:6 868:1,2,2,3,3 869:3 **proposed** 899:1 944:2 pursuant 899:25 874:18 875:10,11 963:14 900:24 912:10 876:2,5 877:8 878:19 **Proposition** 898:11 **put** 858:6 859:7 863:9 878:21,22,22 881:15 propositions 950:12 864:3 867:19 870:16 881:16,16,17 884:15 892:19,24 895:9 884:25 888:9 889:4,6 prospective 932:21 905:20 911:18 917:23 **protect** 867:7,8 876:16 889:7 896:17 939:9 protest 898:1,8 919:9 923:4,6 938:3 952:17 961:9 prove 878:4 881:14 939:2 943:8,16 951:8 quoted 887:22 896:15 955:9 962:16 957:4 **quoting** 867:13 **proved** 951:14 puts 928:6 R putting 905:6 934:2,17 proven 855:20 provide 853:21 858:15 944:1 948:16 **R** 848:19 852:1 965:3 965:22 881:10 887:1 922:3,9 Q rabbit 856:23 922:15 931:24,25 **OSA** 896:16.19 **Raftals** 857:21 934:22 953:11 **qualify** 956:16 **Raftelis** 855:1 857:20 provided 877:11 878:13 888:23 910:20 **quality** 917:18 883:16,16 925:2,3,6 922:19 930:8 936:1 quantification 913:11 rain 890:8 **provides** 854:7 900:6 913:17,23 942:7 rainfall 890:10 907:17 921:14 930:8 943:8,10,20 962:20 raise 866:20 932:11 930:8,9,23 quantified 863:10 952:11 providing 888:13 864:2 870:20 904:2 raised 868:7 875:10 909:11 942:8,10,12,13,16 890:23 944:22 956:10 962:3 **RAJ** 849:19 provision 903:14

ran 925:11 rate 859:10,17 860:11 860:25 864:5 865:7,8 865:9,12,16,17,18,18 867:6.20 869:14 870:7,13 871:4,20,23 871:24 872:12.14.17 872:20 873:9.15.20 873:25 874:2,7,14,14 874:22,23,24 876:1 876:21,22,23 877:1,2 877:5 880:6,9,9,15,18 881:1,10 883:2 885:7 885:13,15 888:18 892:11,12,16 893:23 894:16,20 895:2,4,6 896:7 900:23 901:4,5 901:5,9,9,13,19,21,22 902:6,13,17,22,25 903:2,2,13,16,18 904:21,23 905:3,6,9 905:25 906:7,18 907:13,15 908:14,15 908:21,22,23,23,24 913:13,15 914:14,15 916:16,17 917:2,7,10 917:16,16,17,19,22 917:23 918:3,14 919:6,22 920:7 922:25 923:4.7.14.16 923:17,23 924:2,6,10 924:10 930:12,25 931:1,8,14,16 933:19 938:5,15 939:9,9 941:3,22,23,24 942:9 943:21,24 944:13,14 944:19,20 949:22 953:17 954:3,13 957:3,9,14,16,18 958:1 961:23 962:1,5 962:24 rate-making 925:13 rate-setting 925:18 954:18 955:7 rates 853:7,12,18 854:3 855:24 856:3,5,9,11 860:23 865:3 866:3,7 871:16 872:23,24 874:25,25 875:7,16 876:11 884:3,4,9 885:5 889:8 891:5 893:15,22 897:20,21 897:23,24 899:25 900:7,23,25 901:1,3,4 901:11,12 902:4 908:8,11,22 911:19 912:1 913:18,25 915:5,13 922:23

923:11 924:14 925:9 925:15 928:13 929:21 931:18,19,20,22,25 932:3,25 933:16,20 935:5 938:16.20 939:4,6 940:14 942:11 945:22 947:5 949:23 952:18 953:20 953:23 954:5 955:14 958:10 reach 919:8 reachable 949:14 reaches 862:11 read 876:6,18 956:12 956:15 readiness 892:17,21 949:24 953:3 reading 956:13,14 ready 886:8,24 real 857:18 861:8,17 889:11,12,20 898:5 914:6 922:7 realize 854:8,9 871:1 reallocate 873:17 really 852:10,11 859:22 859:24 879:7 880:3 883:14 888:24 906:6 907:3 908:1 924:2 937:17 943:8 950:12 957:13 realm 862:1 reason 858:8,20 912:13 915:21 916:10,13,23 934:7 935:17 938:16 945:8 961:21,22 reasonable 856:6 859:23,24 860:18 862:1 865:25 866:3 868:23,25 869:3 873:20 882:9,16 889:14 891:20 914:9 915:14 921:9 922:22 932:12 955:4 960:18 reasonableness 862:1 873:19 939:4 955:14 reasonably 868:18 882:22 889:13 930:3 reasoning 940:10 947:3 947:12,24,24 reasons 944:25 950:25 951:24 954:7 rebuttal 851:8 852:15 899:5 956:21 rebutted 892:22 receipts 904:12 received 916:2 934:25

935:1 937:6

receives 905:22 916:3

	I	1	I	I
929:19	referred 903:2	Reply 876:7	right 854:1 857:4,12	875:9,15,25 876:6
receiving 915:11	reflect 853:12 915:2	report 854:19,19 855:1	861:12,25 862:3,21	879:17 880:6,23
recess 899:7,9	929:22 958:10	855:4,6 867:22	863:11 865:14 866:10	883:3 886:2 887:12
Reclamation 926:5	reflected 860:11	873:12 883:18 884:23	866:12 873:1 877:3	887:22 888:3 895:1
recognition 941:25	refuse 882:20	889:3 890:10,13	877:15 879:12,25	895:16 896:21 899:12
recognize 861:18	refused 941:18	924:25 925:2,4,6,11	880:5 881:7 886:13	899:23 900:4,17
872:12 878:13 885:18	refuted 889:9	962:18	889:18 896:19 903:3	901:6,13 902:17
recognized 884:24	regard 880:7	reported 848:19 965:6	903:9 911:14,22	903:12 905:5,11,18
recognizes 878:11	regarding 855:9	Reporter 848:20 965:1	912:3,3 919:2 926:2	907:2 908:6,13,14,18
919:21	regardless 890:7	965:3,4	926:10 930:21 937:9	912:8,9,12,13,14
recommended 871:2	929:18 934:24	REPORTER'S 848:14	937:12,16 948:4	913:18 915:22 916:5
925:14	region 884:16	reports 854:18 924:21	953:2 956:15,20	916:14 921:11,14,20
recommends 858:9	regional 870:25 871:1	924:21 925:17 943:11	960:23	921:23,25 922:10,11
record 853:14,22	871:4 883:11 933:1	require 888:11 940:15	rights 896:22 912:10	922:18 923:6 925:1
854:15,20 855:23	949:4,15	required 871:23 878:22	912:21	930:16 931:4,15,17
856:15 857:11,14	regions 911:21	878:25 885:15 891:3	ring 864:12,13,14,16	932:24 935:11,17
858:3,13 861:20	Registered 848:20	935:20	rise 950:5	936:4,9,12,16,22
863:1,4 865:19	regulated 923:11	requirement 867:24	river 862:24 863:15	937:1,3,19 939:10
867:19 870:5 872:23	regulations 895:23	869:4 875:9 956:5	864:17 871:9,10,11	944:1,21 945:12
877:7,10 878:7,9,15	regulators 923:13	requirements 853:25	880:20 905:19 921:15	946:3 948:14 949:7,9
879:1 880:13 881:5,9	regulatory 858:5	872:24 884:20 897:2	921:20 922:1,18	949:20 950:6 951:11
881:12,19 887:10,15	881:24 882:1 953:6	931:23	924:24 925:21,25	951:25 953:4,24
887:25 888:6,6 889:3	957:6,8 961:6,7	requires 869:16 881:14	926:1,2,3 927:11,25	954:20 955:1,8
889:9 890:4 891:1	reiterate 908:5	894:8	928:4,14,23,24 929:4	956:10 960:3,6,9
892:12 893:24 898:21	reject 939:8	research 930:20	937:5,24 938:1	961:24
903:25 904:2 911:7	rejected 897:16 915:21	reserve 878:1	RMI 854:18 855:4,9,12	sanctioned 946:17
911:11,12 912:20	rejecting 916:13	reservoir 888:12 890:8	855:19 857:15,15,16	sat 938:24
914:8 917:5 922:21	relate 906:4	reservoirs 864:24	857:18 867:22 868:5	satisfied 931:22
923:3 924:16 929:7	related 866:24 882:11	888:23 952:5	873:14 924:21	satisfy 867:24 872:15
939:25 940:1,2	898:2,2 909:10,11,13	resolution 856:24	RMI's 873:12	872:18,24 884:21
950:21 954:4 956:23	924:3 930:3 931:7	867:14 917:3,20	role 899:20	save 962:10,15,15
956:25 957:5 962:13	951:20 959:15 965:13	920:1 925:17 939:11	rolling 891:13 892:23	saved 962:22 963:1
962:18,21 963:1 965:10	relates 915:19 936:13	955:19	rolls 920:14 room 891:25 892:4,5,6	saves 870:11
records 903:21	relationship 962:4 relative 965:16	resounding 853:9 resource 870:6 887:5	roughly 852:16	saving 962:14,16,17 saw 945:12 960:3
recoup 901:17 939:17	relevant 865:5,6,11	936:2	rule 963:21	saw 943.12 900.3 saying 856:25 861:15
941:4 947:5	869:21 882:1 903:15	resources 854:13 857:2	rules 858:5 882:2	864:11 874:20,22
recouped 904:22	929:25	860:22 874:5 896:11	ruling 869:22 897:13	878:4 879:3,5 881:2,4
recover 884:8,14,24	reliable 953:11,16	942:23 953:15	963:14	882:6 883:20 885:9
887:18 893:9,11,15	relied 950:6	respect 879:17 905:4	run 885:2,17 922:16	887:22 890:5 892:5
902:25 914:22 932:3	relief 899:3	936:17 950:9 955:24	Rush 894:2	894:11,21 897:19
933:18 945:22	rely 866:21,24 890:9	respects 910:17 922:25		906:22,24,25 907:12
recovered 889:8 949:25	remain 862:16	respond 956:18	S	907:14 916:15 917:25
953:3,6,17,20 954:10	remarks 899:14	response 865:1	s 849:11 851:1 852:1	919:13 921:17 923:11
954:12	remember 870:20	responses 913:3	953:17	927:9 928:20 929:15
recovers 892:18	872:2 873:4 888:20	result 922:12 944:5	salaries 923:24 924:5	934:15 949:2 959:14
recovery 885:2 888:15	889:1 890:24 892:17	950:10,15	sale 900:3 904:17	960:16,17 962:1
955:4	892:25 958:20 960:1	results 953:15	sales 873:17,22 901:2	says 857:21 858:11,14
recycling 861:1 883:13	960:4	retail 898:8	901:17 903:23,23	860:16 861:17 862:15
885:1	remembering 916:16	return 911:24 923:14	904:9,13,15 914:16	867:23 868:25 869:6
reduce 863:22 886:6	reminded 929:8	revenue 885:6 887:3	917:18 959:24	872:17 879:2 895:20
reduced 965:9	removes 907:13	904:17 931:23	salinity 863:22	898:23 911:8 916:24
reduces 948:11	repairing 928:15	revenues 873:18	san 848:3,7,16,24 849:4	922:2,2 929:14
reduction 871:6 943:1	repay 939:18	959:23	849:10,18 852:13,15	931:11 934:19 946:10
reference 911:16	repayment 874:19	review 925:3 935:20	853:3,8 854:4,10	954:22 959:10 962:19
924:23 953:10 957:15	repeatedly 876:10	revisionist 876:15	864:9,17 869:19,23	SB60 943:10
references 870:5 897:4	replete 870:5	RHONDA 848:19	869:25 870:19 871:2	scale 903:20,22
905:23 938:1	replication 958:11	965:3,22	873:3 874:16,18	scenario 906:17 914:14
	l		l	l

_
914:16 915:3 947:21
scenarios 914:11
915:13
scheduled 874:10
SCULLY 849:16
SDCWA 876:2
seawater 934:10
second 860:16 861:7
868:16 869:13 870:14
882:4 887:14 892:24
931:6 950:13 961:7,9
Section 865:5 875:21
898:12 900:24 902:24
903:14 908:25 919:7
919:21 922:5 925:2
Sections 884:18 899:20
see 857:8 867:18 876:7
878:14 893:3 902:19
904:4,12 918:5
919:11 923:13 924:3
927:19 939:7 944:3
944:17 946:14 951:10
953:1,2,9 957:21
959:13 963:22
seek 870:24
seen 877:17 914:16
945:1
seized 936:22
sell 887:3 917:21
951:16
seller 910:23 945:14
selling 910:3
sells 940:4 950:2
send 914:25 963:13 sense 856:21 865:23
879:7 903:4 911:7
920:23 947:24 955:1
sensitivity 942:25
sent 872:2
separate 895:9 896:3
902:6 920:24 930:17
930:22
separated 924:22
separately 909:25
910:1
September 897:17
series 909:3 920:1
serious 929:23
serve 892:18,21 953:3
serves 923:17 953:11
service 853:21 858:16
861:17 862:2 868:12
868:13 873:21 881:17
881:19 882:7 884:5
885:19 890:8 901:14
901:15,16 902:8,12
904:22 909:15 919:15
920:21,22,24 921:8

```
921:16 925:17 928:16
 928:22,25 930:2,3,4,5
 930:7,9,10,10,14,17
 930:22,25 931:1,3,7
 931:21 935:4 944:12
 944:17 952:20 953:21
 954:1,2,6,17 957:11
 957:15,17,19 960:14
 960.18
services 848:23 911:25
 920:21 921:10 922:15
 930:8,15 931:24
set 855:24 856:3 865:17
 871:16 872:3,6 884:4
 895:21 898:1 923:11
 957:14 961:24 965:7
sets 900:7
setting 856:5 864:5
 922:25 923:5,7,17,23
 924:2,6,11
Shane 870:17
share 939:20 941:12
shareholders 923:15
sheet 923:12
shift 960:7,15,16
shifted 939:22
ship 920:20
Shorthand 965:3
show 863:4,7,8,8
 868:17 880:6 890:24
 890:25 916:6 929:10
 952:13 954:21
showed 855:12 873:3
 911:24 930:11 931:21
 950:18,24
showing 869:24 877:12
 923:6
shown 863:11 864:6,7,8
 877:14 887:10 921:21
 951:25
shows 855:25 857:11
 873:13 881:9 887:13
 892:14 903:21 913:5
 913:9 952:1,21
 953:16 962:21 963:1
side 852:16 854:24
 884:25 888:12 900:25
sides 888:19 900:18
 905:12
significance 902:23
significant 872:22
 878:11 906:1 919:24
 932:18
significantly 951:11
```

similar 882:21 899:13

949:7,25

simple 908:1

Similarly 875:25

```
simply 854:12 861:6
  867:3 868:9 871:22
  876:20 902:4 906:10
  906:15 909:24 923:8
  931:1 933:8 935:16
  935:23 941:18 950:2
  950:16 951:16 952:9
Sinclair 882:2
single 913:1 946:25
sir 866:11
sit 887:2 899:4 963:4
situation 863:5 881:3
  903:7,8 910:24 915:6
  915:9 941:17,22
  942:2 948:8
situations 909:18
  912:23 927:20 928:10
  943:19
size 962:7,9
sizing 893:13
Skillman 893:25
slam 885:17
slide 853:11 858:12
  873:3 874:3 892:25
  893:1 902:7 908:4
  923:6 957:4,5,21,23
  958:24
slides 853:11 858:12
  890:25 900:8 905:21
small 943:2 959:20
  960:1
snow 890:9 953:13
sold 917:8
solve 962:20
somebody 863:6,8,16
  863:23 868:20 869:10
  874:25 880:24 902:10
  909:18 914:25 915:3
  920:19 927:20 933:19
somewhat 948:16
sort 852:10 860:4
  862:19 864:3 866:16
  872:25 887:2 890:2
  898:3 899:25 900:5
  918:10 927:19 933:5
  943:20 947:12 948:15
  958:16
sorts 910:11,11 927:20
sounds 901:23
source 859:13 866:6
  885:6 902:9 909:14
  912:12 927:7 937:6
  945:22
sources 921:19,23
  922:3 928:7 937:7
SOUTHERN 848:11
  849:13
```

```
speaks 930:1
specific 853:24 881:16
  886:1 902:18 943:16
specifically 862:11,15
  962:19
speculation 945:19
speculative 945:7 946:1
spend 886:15 927:15
  928.3
spending 870:4 927:5
spends 928:8
spent 859:21 867:23
  889:4,6 893:8 959:19
split 883:19,22
spoke 899:12
spread 889:15 890:3
St 848:24
stability 859:10,17
  872:17 876:1,23
  939:9
staff 855:2,7,15 870:23
  888:24
staffing 930:19
stages 950:8
standard 854:2 858:24
  859:12 862:11 963:11
standards 854:16
  858:25 866:19 923:9
standby 884:13 892:19
  953:2
standing 880:8 896:7
Stapleton 896:12
Stapleton's 936:1,11
start 852:13 853:1
  888:8 899:18 900:22
started 958:4
state 848:2 854:9,21,22
  855:9 856:25 858:6
  859:12 860:21 862:12
  862:12,15,24 865:2
  866:17 867:3 874:6
  888:8 896:10 901:8
  901:10,18 904:20
  909:3,5 911:13 912:9
  912:11,14 913:8,14
  913:23 914:12 915:4
  915:9,10,25 916:2,11
  918:9,17 921:2,15,19
  922:5,11 924:8,20,23
  925:8,14 927:4,25
  928:6,8,16 929:3,9
  936:2 938:7,8,10,11
  938:23 940:21 959:2
  959:21,24 960:23
  965:5
stated 871:8 899:21
statement 899:1,2
  907:20 963:14
```

space 936:15

talking 859:22,24

908:18 925:7
subscribed 965:19
subsidize 875:17
subsidizing 876:13
939:23 941:15
substantial 867:1,16
873:16 883:5 887:10
955:16,20,21 956:2,5
substantiate 924:19
successfully 936:12
sued 925:11 934:14
955:3
sufficient 949:4
suggest 852:13 918:7
suggesting 856:19
suggests 855:24 856:15
863:4 887:15 918:4
suite 850:3 908:8
summer 891:13,16
893:13 962:7
Superior 848:2 965:5
supermarket 909:22
supplemental 886:25
934:7,8,12,15,17
949:12
supplied 877:4
supplier 910:19
supplier's 911:15 912:3
suppliers 898:9
supplies 868:4 870:9
877:25 878:25 953:11
953:12,16
supply 854:23 855:13
855:14 857:19 858:7
859:13 860:10 866:19
867:5 870:4 873:21
1 00/30/040/321
878:10,11,11 880:25
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6 supported 947:2
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6 supported 947:2 supports 955:21
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6 supported 947:2 supports 955:21
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6 supported 947:2
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6 supported 947:2 supports 955:21 suppose 910:8 926:12 926:14 933:11
878:10,11,11 880:25 883:6,22 884:11 888:24,25 890:6 901:3 902:9 908:8 909:10,14 914:18 915:2 921:2,4,5 924:10,13,22 925:5 926:4,9 927:7 928:4,6 928:7 934:10 937:4,7 941:23 944:21,24 945:7,18,22,23 946:1 953:6,13,14,17,20 960:7,10 962:16 963:2 support 867:19 873:23 934:6 supported 947:2 supports 955:21 suppose 910:8 926:12

```
905:22 908:16
Supreme 862:18
surcharge 949:24
sure 856:8 879:20
  886:1 890:19 907:10
  909:20 923:2 924:9
  932:9 947:23 958:5,5
surface 928:11
surplus 888:9 953:12
swapping 937:4
switched 855:5
SWP 854:9,22 855:13
  868:2
system 853:20 862:20
  862:23 863:2,21
  864:18,22 865:7,16
  865:17 867:4,4
  868:24 869:2,10
  870:22 877:23 880:15
  880:24 886:24,25,25
  893:23 901:4 903:11
  908:22,23 913:15,19
  915:11 916:22 917:16
  917:19 922:13,17
  930:25 931:1 933:22
  934:2 941:24 943:17
  948:12 950:19 953:16
  957:3,9,16 958:24
  962:23
system-wide 917:1
  918:1 940:17 941:3
  942:4 948:11,20
```

T 851:1,1 tab 947:18 take 853:16,17 860:24 888:2 899:7 911:6 918:10 922:23 926:21 927:9 933:17 959:14 963:12,23 taken 899:9 921:11 923:7 935:11 965:15 takes 874:8 talk 852:23 858:14 861:11 862:10 866:13 877:20 880:2 885:23 890:11 897:7 903:20 904:24 905:15,18,19 930:18 942:6 talked 854:16 863:11 873:13 874:4 881:21 881:22 888:19 891:11 891:12 895:2 897:7 897:11 905:21 937:19 962:14

systems 854:14

systemwide 934:20

T

809:21 8/0:21 8/2:/
875:23 880:4,5 893:8
875:23 880:4,5 893:8 900:12,13 901:23
905:17 915:20 931:12
937:12,18 959:20
960:15
talks 870:2,18 882:13
890:13 892:20 898:21
901:7 930:4,5 958:10
taxes 897:22
TDX680 917:3
teeth 921:13
tell 852:23 862:3,6,7
877:7 893:18 907:1
910:8 916:20 957:11
961:1
telling 863:17 892:4
tells 911:7 912:21
022:21 060:10 20
922:21 960:19,20 Trans 065:4
Tem 965:4
ten 890:20 899:12
956:18
ten-minute 899:7
ten-year 891:13 892:22
893:1,6
tenants 932:18
tens 883:12 913:10
tentative 963:13
tentatively 897:16
term 895:5,19,20
896:13,23,24 897:4
936:7,8,8
terms 866:3 884:11
919:11 930:2 938:25
test 875:1
testified 880:13 894:24
testify 950:20
testimony 894:25
908:18 936:1,11
943:5,12 952:4 956:4
tether 860:13
tethered 860:6
text 917:3
thank 852:18 956:15
963:3,24
Thanks 908:3 963:5
themes 860:4
theory 876:2 927:19
935:1
they'd 858:6
thing 855:5 857:17,19
857:20 859:3 864:25
868:19,20 869:8,13
880:4 897:6 914:9
924:7 928:5,23 930:6
021.4 022.22 020.2
931:4 933:22 939:3
931:4 933:22 939:3 940:3 945:21

```
things 852:7 854:25
  855:15 859:7 867:22
  872:16 898:10 906:24
  910:7 923:3 927:17
  928:19.21 929:25
  939:2 940:7 955:5
  958:4.8
think 853:13 855:17
  856:14 860:12 862:4
  866:1,11 872:22,25
  875:1 881:7,12
  882:13 883:19 884:7
  886:19,19 889:10,15
  892:20 895:9 897:9
  899:17 900:9,10,17
  905:11 907:23,25
  908:2,17 912:5 914:3
  914:5,7 915:18
  919:12 925:23 926:24
  930:6 931:3 932:5
  937:10,16 938:8,14
  939:17,23 940:8
  942:11 949:19,20
  951:15 952:16 954:13
  954:23,25 955:6,10
  956:16 957:13 959:12
  960:21 963:12,20,22
thinking 914:8
third 870:23 875:17
  885:21 894:22.23
  940:3.9
Thomas 849:11 871:8
  873:1,10 959:3
thoroughly 897:10
thought 852:8 855:22
  865:21 889:17,17
  958:20
three 849:10,22 872:15
  872:15
throwing 882:23
  926:19
thrown 901:9
Thursday 848:17 852:2
Tier 889:13 892:11,12
  892:15 962:19
time 867:23 875:10,24
  880:14 890:20 895:7
  897:7 899:5,14
  902:18 905:18 908:17
  959:19 960:13 963:16
  963:19,20 965:7
times 876:22 878:21
today 886:16 900:12
  905:21 923:6 950:7
  956:10
today's 963:8
toilets 940:6
told 853:11 855:3,3
```

```
884:3 890:3
Tom 899:11
tool 873:22
TORRANCE 849:21
total 852:17 904:7.17
  914:21 924:8 932:10
  932:12 934:21
town 941:17
track 873:1
trade 937:4
traditionally 854:21
transaction 902:18,19
  905:7,14,16 906:2,5
  906:10,14,16 907:1,7
  913:14 916:21 935:13
  935:15 936:3,11
  939:1,24 941:21
transactions 899:22
  900:4 903:22 909:20
  912:6,7 913:10 915:6
  916:18 917:11 919:7
  919:10 938:6 941:1
  941:18
transcript 848:14
  858:7 963:8
transcription 965:11
translate 918:11
  943:21
Translated 874:15
transport 925:25
  944:10
transportation 854:14
  857:1,3 860:11,23
  862:16 864:22 865:3
  866:18 877:6,13
  883:6 884:11 885:15
  888:25 893:22 901:4
  901:11,12,18 904:21
  908:8,11,22 909:4,12
  909:17,19,19 910:5
  910:22 911:1,4,16,19
  911:20,22,25 912:2
  912:25 913:14,24,25
  914:13,13,18,20
  915:4,5,11,15 916:4,7
  916:12 920:18,22,23
  920:25 921:3,4,8
  922:11 924:10,14,22
  925:5,8,9,14,15 926:6
  926:15,22,23 927:2
  927:21,21 928:10,12
  929:17 930:9 931:19
  933:18,19,20 934:3
  935:3,5 938:12,20
  942:11 944:24 945:1
  945:17,25 955:25
  960:11
transportation-only
```

930:14 transportation-related 924:24 transported 917:21 transporting 856:20 926:13 927:10 transports 930:13 traveled 903:7 treated 862:20 918:24 treating 882:18 928:7 929:5,5 treatise 925:3 treatment 961:18 tremendous 946:25 954:3 tremendously 963:1 trial 848:9 853:10 855:12 861:13 873:14 875:11 894:25 896:1 896:1 922:4 937:15 945:21 951:5 955:24 956:4 trick 893:7 tried 876:11 884:7 889:22 trigger 897:2 true 854:22 858:19,22 860:10 874:14 890:3 906:8 908:17 912:6 912:19 921:15.16 924:7 925:10 931:9 933:23 936:8 938:9 944:8 948:23 949:3 951:14 965:10.11 try 859:25 872:4 877:1 899:13 961:3 trying 865:20,24 886:3 887:7.24 892:9 905:24 906:4 914:20 918:5 927:18 947:23 950:7 turn 852:14 868:16 876:25 885:21 902:7 906:19 909:1 912:5 925:19 928:2 929:20 935:9 949:18 turned 941:21 turns 921:6 twice 956:12 two 881:21 893:1 901:20 904:14 905:4 914:10,11 920:20 921:18,23 930:8,14 933:6 942:12 950:8 950:20 953:8 two-thirds 898:24 type 908:1 913:11 935:19 942:25 943:7

943:10 945:21 **types** 906:15 928:18 946:14 **typewriting** 965:9

ultimately 894:9,14 935:1 unavailing 876:20 unavoidable 867:5 876:18 915:23 917:1 917:9,13,15,23 918:9 918:15 920:4,5 939:16,21 940:24 941:12 942:4 **unbundled** 920:13 **unbundling** 856:12,12 understand 866:6 879:20 908:2 909:16 909:18 understanding 879:16 understandings 900:14 understands 868:20 unfair 939:23 941:10 unfairly 961:24 uniform 949:22 uninterruptible 936:24 **United 926:18** unknown 945:18 unlawfully 872:16 875:16 unmetered 961:12 unquantified 863:22 unquestionably 914:6 unquote 860:9 unreasonably 962:2 unrecognizable 961:20 unrelated 905:8 unresolved 875:15 untethered 859:20 untrue 949:3 unused 936:14 unusual 910:20,23 Upadhyay 943:6 Upadhyuay's 943:12 upheld 860:6 903:11 upshot 858:4 upstream 927:3 **urging** 874:21 usage 891:13 use 857:24 860:8 864:5 868:12 869:1,10 873:25 879:15 880:8 880:9,15,23 881:1

885:5 888:10 893:12

899:13,14 910:18,22

911:1,4,22 912:3,10

912:17 921:4 934:2

934:11,13 944:5 946:15 957:17,18 useful 865:24 users 853:19 868:11 882:19,21 961:12 uses 880:6 usually 910:21 utilities 923:12

utilities 923:12 v 902:16 949:9 valid 860:13 884:4 VALLEY 849:22 value 885:8 914:20 937:20 VAN 849:3 variable 958:12 variances 950:22 variation 890:1 variations 890:11 893.10 various 892:8 898:10 909:25 920:15 927:16 935:5 948:10 954:8 955:2,11 vary 917:17 vast 901:17,18 904:20 versus 871:19 875:14 884:11 915:1 VI 848:10 **VIDEOGRAPHY** 848:23 view 866:12 881:20 932:6 948:15 violate 854:4 violating 885:19 violation 875:9,21 Volume 848:10 903:24 **volumetric** 884:8 889:8 902:4 933:16 949:23 Von 850:3 vote 897:20 898:7,24 voters 897:20,21 898:19 votes 897:23,25 898:17 **voting** 898:10 vs 848:9

W

W 849:5

wait 960:5 walk 948:5 WALTON-HADLO... 849:7 want 852:22 855:18 860:1 862:4 864:23 864:23 875:4 878:5

880:23 884:9 886:1,2

890:17,19 895:11 897:14,17 900:19 901:10 902:4,10 903:20 908:4 912:16 914:3 919:8 920:12 920:18,19,19 922:23 924:3,7,11,18 925:19 927:13.23 937:11.17 937:21 939:20 942:6 949:18 952:13 954:16 956:11 963:3 wanted 852:8 864:25 875:4 898:4 899:17 900:1,22 904:24 909:1 910:8 915:17 925:23 934:8 wants 864:16,17 868:15 921:25 939:19 960:6 **WARREN** 849:6 wasn't 855:14 934:13 934:18 935:14 936:3 936:10 waste 883:13 water 848:7,10 849:8 849:13,22 850:2 853:15,18 854:13,21 854:22 855:10 856:20 857:1,1,2 858:6,8 859:12 860:22.24 861:1 862:12,12,22 862:22,24,24,25 863:1,13,16,16,20,20 864:9,18,22,24 865:2 865:7,16 866:17 867:3 868:2,4,10 869:2 870:3,7,8,11,11 870:19,22 873:7,23 874:5,6,9 877:1,2,3,5 877:22 878:1,23 879:4,13,13,17,18 880:15,20,24,25 881:10 882:14,14,19 883:1,5,13 885:1,3,4 885:5,9,12 886:8,9,20 886:21 887:3 888:9 888:17 889:8 890:7 891:14,16,17 893:4,5 893:12 895:24 896:11 898:8,15 899:25 900:3,7,25 901:1,2,5 901:8,8,10,11,13,14 901:15,16,18,19 902:5,9 903:23 904:9 904:13,15,17,20,21

904:22 905:19,20,23

907:8 908:6,7,10,23

909:3,5,12,14,23

910:17,19,19 911:5 911:15 912:4,9,11,11 912:14,16 913:4,14 913:18,24 914:2,12 914:15.21 915:1.4.9 915:10,25 916:2,2,3 916:11,21 917:8,17 917:18.21.21 918:8 918:14,17 920:24 921:1,2,3,5,8,13,15 921:16,17,19,19,23 921:25 922:3,5,6,9,11 922:18,23 924:9,20 924:23 925:8,14,22 925:25 926:3,5,13 927:1,3,5,7,9,11,17 927:25 928:3,11,24 929:3,9,18 930:8,9,10 930:12,12 931:3,16 931:18,18 932:25 933:5,7,8,20,21 934:7 934:9,12,15,17,22,25 935:8 936:2 937:2,3,4 937:5,6,21,24 938:7,8 938:10,11,21,22 939:20 940:4,14,21 941:9,25 942:8,11 943:14,16 944:4,6,10 944:13,19 945:3,6,10 945:11.13.14 946:11 947:1,6,15 948:1 949:12 950:2,4 951:6 951:14,16,16,19,22 957:18 958:7,9 959:1 959:2,6,21,23,24,24 960:19,23 961:13,23 962:4,10,16,24 963:2 watershed 927:16 way 852:11 855:16 856:13 858:21 860:1 861:25 863:3 868:10 873:24 874:4,22 877:18 882:10 884:24 889:14,14 891:9 892:16 906:21 907:13 909:7 913:12 915:23 917:12 922:12,17 924:4,19 927:16 928:1,12 929:1,5,6 930:21 932:2 934:24 938:14 947:11 950:18 958:7,21,22 959:4,13 960:6 961:21 ways 892:8 914:11 942:13 we'll 872:3 895:3

963:23

we're 856:5 860:1

862:7 863:15 864:14
869:20,20,21 872:6,6
872:9,10 873:25
874:20,21,22 878:6
879:23 880:9 881:2
883:3,20 885:9
886:14,16,17,18
889:16 892:5 893:20
894:3,10,21 900:12
906:24,25 907:11,14
917:23 924:1 929:16
917:23 924:1 929:16 937:12,18 943:25
050 16 052 24 060 15
950:16 952:24 960:15
960:17 961:5 962:1
we've 875:19 881:22
891:11 894:19,21
896:9 897:9 899:1
907:2 914:16 921:21
923:7 926:16 954:17
954:25 961:8
weather 888:10
week 950:20
WEF 923:20
wells 854:19 882:14
961:12,13,13
went 883:18 895:22
898:19,19 912:15
920:3 934:18 938:7
938:16 942:24
730.10 772.27
weren't 941:7
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12
weren't 941:7
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21 869:5,14,21 870:11
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21 869:5,14,21 870:11 870:12 871:4,14,16
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21 869:5,14,21 870:11 870:12 871:4,14,16
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21 869:5,14,21 870:11 870:12 871:4,14,16 871:20,23 872:12,14
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21 869:5,14,21 870:11 870:12 871:4,14,16 871:20,23 872:12,14 872:19,20,23 873:9
weren't 941:7 WEST 849:12 wet 878:23 886:6 887:2 888:10 whatsoever 892:12 wheel 856:8 863:15,16 863:20 864:10 875:4 878:5,6 879:4 880:14 912:11 921:25 936:16 939:20 941:9 959:18 960:23 wheeled 879:18 wheeler 919:12 940:16 wheelers 868:1 875:17 876:14 878:4,17 879:10,15 881:11 882:18,20 901:24 916:8 918:13,20,21 918:23,25 933:9 936:15 960:1 wheeling 854:5 859:10 859:11 861:4 862:23 865:9,12,18 867:6,9 867:19 868:1,18,21 869:5,14,21 870:11 870:12 871:4,14,16 871:20,23 872:12,14

```
874:17,21,23,24
 875:3,8,16,21 876:11
 877:18,22 879:9
 880:5,9,9,15,18 881:1
 881:3,15 894:16
 895:1,3,4,6,17,18
 896:3,6,20 897:1,3,4
 900:13 901:9.21.22
 902:6,8,12,13,16,17
 902:18,21,25 903:6
 903:13,16,18 904:2,8
 904:14,15 905:6,7,9
 905:13,14,16 906:2,3
 906:5,6,9,11,11,16,18
 906:21,23 907:1,4,6,7
 907:10,11,13,14,15
 907:16 908:14,15,21
 908:24 912:6,7,23
 913:1,12,13 915:6,8
 916:16,17 917:2,6,10
 917:16,23 918:3
 919:6,11,25 920:6
 925:16 933:7,23,24
 935:13,14,15 936:3,3
 936:11,13,14,23
 937:2,23,25 938:5,5
 938:10 939:1,9,11,23
 940:5,15,22 941:3,16
 941:18,20,21,22
 943:22 945:8 955:14
 955:19,22,24 957:14
 958:1 959:4,5,7,20
 960:19 961:22 962:1
wheels 905:19 947:6
WHEREOF 965:19
wide 903:11
willing 857:4 948:5
willy-nilly 958:24
WITNESS 965:19
witnesses 950:20
wonder 881:8 883:14
wondered 952:12
word 922:24
words 855:25 864:2
 866:5 871:4 884:13
 890:15 918:14 939:6
 943:22
work 854:9 859:23
 860:12 883:9,9,10
 958:8
working 924:3
Works 853:15 858:8
 958:9
WORLDWIDE 848:23
worse 864:15
worth 857:6 864:4
```

884:6 911:7 912:21

916:16 961:1,2

```
worthless 858:1
wouldn't 875:5 922:16
  924:2,4,6 934:13
writ 861:16
written 854:25 855:2
  867:9,10 900:15
  906:22 935:25 955:15
  955:17 956:6.6
wrong 855:20 916:9
  931:4 934:20 957:10
wrote 857:23
WYNDER 850:3
          X
X 918:8,17
          Y
Yamasaki's 952:4
yeah 879:23 928:5
  938:13 947:9 948:25
  949:14,15
year 861:8 868:4
  877:21,24,25 878:2
  878:24,25 879:6,12
  885:22,25 886:7,8,25
  887:2,18,23 888:5,14
  888:23 890:12 891:4
  891:5,8,18 892:13,16
  892:21 893:6,10,16
  893:22 894:4,6 902:3
  904:4.6.11 906:17
  912:1 917:11 921:20
  921:20 930:10 940:24
  940:24 946:11,12
  948:24 949:18,19
  950:5,9 951:4,5,10,12
  951:15 954:8 956:22
  957:6 960:8,8 962:8,9
  962:10,11
year-by-year 951:1
yearly 891:15,15
years 862:18 880:16
  886:5,6 888:10,10,16
  890:9,9 893:5,12
  904:3,14 938:22
  950:3.3.4 951:3.13.17
```

951:22,24 953:)
960:9	
yesterday 899:16	
Z	
zero 854:1 927:2	
941:20	
zone 961:13	
zones 884:15	
U	
00206075 898:21	

09 904:5 1 1 920:2 940:4 955:18 10 867:21 888:21 10-dollar 926:21 10:20 899:9 10:32 899:9 100 877:5 880:23 885:14 890:6 944:2 953:2,5 105 897:19 110 938:22 112 858:13

885:14 890:6 944:23 **112** 858:13 **1165** 870:1 **1166** 870:1 118 907:20 **12** 866:23 871:16 **12:05** 964:1 **126** 935:25 **13** 854:5 871:17 875:22 931:9,12 959:10 **130** 859:21 **1339** 957:21 **134** 900:24 **134.5** 884:18 **134.9** 884:18 **135** 904:10 **136** 922:5 **14** 871:17 141 903:25 **147** 957:4,5 **15** 902:7 963:11,20 **154** 962:12 **1591** 879:1 **16178** 889:5 **16521** 890:5 17 924:17 955:25 **1700** 850:3 **171** 960:4 **18** 955:23 956:1 962:12

1811C 869:2 1813 869:5,5 875:21 184 867:17 18881 850:3 19 866:22 867:9 897:17 960:4 190 894:25 194 894:25 1946 874:19

1966 898:19 **1969** 854:17 **1986** 867:17 **1990s** 925:12

1993 925:4 **1995** 854:17,18 867:22 924:21

1995/1996 857:17

1996 855:4,16 887:6 888:8 942:17,23 946:18 1997 856:4,12,24 866:25 917:3 925:16 955:18 1999 925:6

2 **2** 875:23 882:21 888:12 889:13 892:11,12,15 940:4 962:19 **20** 924:17 955:23 960:9 **200** 898:12,14 **2000** 857:20 895:17 936:7 **2001** 954:5 2002 896:12 **2003** 895:18 896:13 938:17 **2008** 904:5 913:5 **2009** 888:19 896:16 913:5 2010 853:22 854:18 855:1,23,24 856:1,15 904:6 913:5,6 924:25 925:4,10 951:4,5,9 **2011** 871:16 904:7,11 **2012** 854:19 875:22 889:3 890:4 962:18 **2013** 895:12 **2014** 848:17 852:2 965:20 **21.8** 904:6 **213** 849:15 **217-6890** 849:15 **218** 884:20 898:1,11 961:14 **22** 852:2 **220** 961:10 **223-1170** 850:4 **228,000** 913:6 **23** 848:17 875:18 913:7 913:7 929:12 **23rd** 875:22 **24** 864:14 929:12 24th 965:20 **25** 912:22 929:12 **250.000-acre** 890:12 **26** 853:24 854:5 881:14 884:21 897:8 929:12 930:2 931:11 959:10 960:20 **26-member** 901:16 **26.8** 904:5 **268-7000** 849:19

28 895:12

29 875:18

	<u> </u>
3	7
3 853:6 866:23 873:14	7 890:15,16
878:2 940:5	70 946:11
80 888:3 960:8	700 849:14
8031 892:24	701 848:24
804 848:5	72 890:16 894:23
352 898:13,14	732 858:7
36 888:3	733 858:7
86409 848:20	735 858:7
37 925:7	736 858:8
39 853:11	738 894:1
391-5400 849:4	739 894:1
893-2422 849:11	74 924:17 955:23
Brd 848:24 867:17	7414 848:19 965:22
	76 868:7
4	77,000 938:21
1 867:21 897:17	78 876:15
10 862:18	
11 875:18	8
1119 899:20	800 848:25 960:10
115 848:25 849:4,11,19	848 848:11
1185 853:23	853 851:4
	86 853:23 953:9
125 849:18	
13 875:19	87 924:18 955:23
1405 865:5,18 899:21	899 851:5
902:24 903:14 908:25	9
912:10 919:7,21	
15 908:4 924:17 956:1	9 875:23
17 869:25	9:12 852:2
18 862:14 869:25	90012 849:14
lth 961:10	92612 850:4
	94105-2482 849:18
5	94111 848:24
5 895:13,17 904:16	94111-1809 849:4
915:5 925:2 943:1	94111-4067 849:10
50 871:3,6 892:20	949 850:4
50-acre 946:11	95 855:5,6 873:12,14
50/50 883:19	914:16
522-7096 848:25	956 851:9
53 888:3	96 924:21
5 3.7 904:5	965 848:11
531 867:17	97 876:10 919:25
55 911:13 915:12	939:11
552 867:17	98 936:6 952:25 954:5
57 855:11	981-3498 848:25
58 874:3 888:4 903:24	99 883:17
6	
5-million 877:25	
60 923:21	
501 961:9	
61 924:17 956:1	
633 849:3	
54 873:3	
65-dollar 870:18	
580 920:3 955:18,18	
956:7	