```
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
               COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                        2
                                                                                          INDEX
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW
                                                                              PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
                DEPARTMENT 304
                                                                              CUSHMAN, Dennis
                                                                                                   984
                                                                                                         1026 1097
                                                                                                                      1101
      SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                        5
                                                                              DENHAM, Dan
                                                                                                 1102
                                                                                                        1127 1150
        Petitioner and Plaintiff, ) Case No.
                       ) CPF-10-510830
                                                                                        EXHIBITS
                        ) CPF-12-512466
                                                                        8
                                                                              NUMBER DESCRIPTION
                                                                                                                 FOR ID EVIDENCE
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                                  Letter to John Foley 12/6/96
                                                                                                               993
                                                                                                                    993
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL
      PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE
                                                                       10
                                                                                                              996
                                                                                  Letter to Gastelum 9/8/99
                                                                                                                   996
      VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY ) Volume VII
                                                                       11
                                                                              65
                                                                                  2003 Exchange Agreement
                                                                                                                1002 1002
      THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT )
                                                                       12
      OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL )
                                                                                  Minutes of Board of MWD 3/11/08
                                                                              71
                                                                                                                   1058 1058
      10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY)
                                                                       13
                                                                              20
                                                                                  Memo from Gastelum 6/18/04
                                                                                                                 1010 1010
      1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and )
                                                                       14
                                                                                                                1031 1031
                                                                              128 2008 implementation strategy
      DOES 1-10,
                         Pages 966 - 1156
                                                                       15
                                                                                                              1096
                                                                                  Notice of Default 6/12/12
        Respondents and Defendants. )
                                                                       16
                                                                              314 US Dept. of Interior Accounting '03 1111
                                                                                                                       1111
                                                                       17
                                                                              315 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2004 "
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                                                       18
                                                                              316 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2005 "
               San Francisco Superior
                                                                       19
               San Francisco, California
                                                                              317 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2006 "
               Monday, March 30, 2015
                                                                       20
                                                                              318 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2007 "
                                                                       21
      Reported By:
                                                                                  US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2008 "
      TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR #3374
                                                                       22
                                                                              320 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2009 "
                                                                       23
                                                                              321 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2010 "
               JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
          WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                       24
                                                                              322 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2011 "
       701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                       25
                                                                              323 US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2012 "
            (415) 981-3498 or (800) 522-7096
                                                             966
                                                                                                                                     968
          APPEARANCES
                                                                                   SDCWA document 5/18/07
                                                                                                                   1070 1070
2
      For Petitioner and Plaintiff:
                                                                                        EXHIBITS (CONTINUED)
3
      KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                              430
                                                                                   US Dept. of Interior Accounting 2013 1110 1110
      BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ
                                                                              469
                                                                                   Metropolitan Invoices
                                                                                                               1109 1109
5
      BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                        5
                                                                                   Excel workbook summary
                                                                              471
                                                                                                                  1107 1109
      BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                                   Section 135 Preferential Right
                                                                                                                  1124 1124
      633 Battery Street
                                                                                   Spreadsheet - Adjusted Preferential
                                                                              473
      San Francisco, California
                                                                                                        1124 1125
                                                                                  Rights
      415.391.5400
      Email: ahadlock@kvn.com
                                                                              506 San Diego WSR payments chart
                                                                                                                     1015 1015
8
      Email: dpurcell@kvn.com
                                                                        9
      Email: jkeker@kvn.com
                                                                              507 Exchange agreement deliveries chart 1015 1015
10
      For Respondent and Defendant Metropolitan Water District
                                                                              508 2011 Overcharge calculation
                                                                                                                  1114 1114
      of Southern California:
                                                                       11
11
                                                                              509 2012 Overcharge calculation
                                                                                                                  1116 1116
      QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
                                                                       12
12
      BY: JOHN B. QUINN, ESQ.
                                                                              510 2013 Overcharge calculation
                                                                                                                  1118 1118
      865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
                                                                       13
13
      Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
                                                                              511 2014 Overcharge calculation
                                                                                                                  1119 1120
      213.443.3000
                                                                       14
14
      Email: johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com
                                                                              512 Summary of contract damages under
           and
                                                                       1.5
                                                                                  exchange agreement 2011-2014
                                                                                                                  1121 1121
15
      OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
                                                                       16
                                                                              794 Letter from Stapleton to
      BY: JOSEPH VANDERHORST, ESQ.
                                                                                  Gastelum 2/10/03
                                                                                                             1038 1038
      700 North Alameda Street
                                                                       17
      Los Angeles, California 90012
                                                                              843 Email to Liarakos from Cushman
17
      213.217.6000
                                                                       18
                                                                                                         1029 1029
18
                                                                                  9/27/03
                                                                       19
                                                                              1130 Email from Denham to Chen 3/28/12 1076 1077
19
                                                                       20
20
                                                                       21
21
                                                                       22
22
23
                                                                       23
                                                                       24
24
                                                                       25
25
                                                             967
                                                                                                                                     969
```

1 San Francisco, California will be calling either Chen or Stapleton this week 2 2 unless we run out of witnesses. That is not our Monday, March 30, 2015 3 3 10:00 a.m. 4 THE COURT: Is 48 hours' notice agreeable to 5 5 THE COURT: Plan to go without a break to noon you? 6 6 but, by the same token, anybody who needs a break, MR. QUINN: We would frankly prefer 24, your 7 7 including the court reporter, should give me a Honor. That's what we got for today was 24. That's 8 8 meaningful look and we will take one. The answer to a what we had discussed with them. 9 9 request for a break is always yes. THE COURT: Can you put your witnesses in 10 10 Did people want to start with any oral order? I think that will help for planning purposes, 11 11 the order in which you'll call them. presentations? 12 12 MR. KEKER: Yes, your Honor. MR. QUINN: We can try to do that, your Honor. 13 13 Things -- things happen during the course of the trial But there are two matters I would like to bring 14 14 up before we begin with the oral presentation, which in that will require us to juggle things. But we can try 15 15 my case will be very brief, and that is that we move to to do that in good faith. 16 16 exclude witnesses, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure. THE COURT: Twenty-four hours' notice and each 17 17 Our corporate representative will be side --18 18 Mr. Cushman, who will also be our first witness. He MR. QUINN: Can we see how far we get today, 19 19 will be here, but we move to exclude witnesses. your Honor --20 2.0 THE COURT: Let's pause any objection to that. MR. KEKER: We would like to --21 21 MR. OUINN: -- and revisit the issue at the end MR. QUINN: No, there's no objection to that. 22 2.2 THE COURT: Excuse me. Feel free. You can of the day? 23 23 have whoever your representatives are in the courtroom. THE COURT: Think about it over lunch, and we 24 24 The motion is granted. Witnesses are excluded. will take it up at 1:30, if necessary. Right now my 2.5 25 MR. KEKER: The second related issue is we have proposal is we have the witnesses at least in order. 970 972 1 1 That can be done 24 hours' notice. Let's continue. sought to reach an agreement about giving each other 2 2 witness order and who is coming next. We have gotten as MR. KEKER: And Miss Stapleton and Miss Chen 3 3 far as one-day notice. That's not sufficient for us. are still on their witness list, in good faith, so we 4 4 We're asking you to order them to tell us now who they need to ask them to leave. Is that my understanding? 5 5 THE COURT: Right. Unless they are corporate plan to call this week, among other things. They put 6 6 Miss Stapleton, the general manager, Miss Chen of the representatives or the equivalent. If you are in the 7 7 Water Authority on their witness list. They are here. courtroom and may be testifying, unless you are the 8 8 If they are not going to call them this week, first witness this morning, I would ask you to leave 9 9 they are going to go home. There is just no reason -until after you've testified, then you will be welcome 10 10 we told them who we intend to call in our case, back in the courtroom. 11 11 Mr. Cushman, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Slater, end of story. MR. KEKER: The answer is, yes, I would like to 12 12 THE COURT: Do you have a list that shows the make a very brief opening statement recognizing it comes 13 13 order in which they plan to call? out of our time. 14 14 MR. KEKER: No. We don't have anything except Your Honor, this is a trial, as you know, about 15 15 those witness statements that you required before. contract and preferential rights. I know you've read 16 16 the trial brief. I urge you to interrupt both me and THE COURT: Okay. 17 17 any of the witnesses as we go along, since this is an MR. KEKER: So we'd like the order and the 18 18 actual list. If they are not going to call Miss important trial, if there is something that doesn't make 19 19 Stapleton, for example, she would like to listen to the sense or you want to clarify. So we're open, open 20 20 invitation. opening statements. 21 21 MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I guess I'm a little The contract case we believe is very simple. 22 22 The exchange agreement allows San Diego to move water it surprised by this. I thought we had an agreement 24 23 2.3 hours' notice. Indeed, mid-morning yesterday they gave purchased from IID and water it is entitled to because 24 24 us their notice of who they were calling today. We are it lined the canals through Metropolitan's Colorado 25 25 prepared to live by that same rule. I don't think we River Aqueduct.

973

Your Phase 1 finding establishes the exchange agreement was breached in that Section 5.2 of the 2003 exchange agreement expressly limits the price term for that transportation to charges set by the Met board, quote, pursuant to applicable law and regulation.

1.0

2.1

2.4

Phase 1 established that the price charged under the exchange agreement from 2003 on was the sum of the system access rate, the system power rate and the water stewardship rate.

Your opinion found that all three of those violated Prop 26, the wheeling statute, Government Code 5499.7(a) and the common law, i.e., they are not -- "They are not pursuant to applicable law." You found, "Those Rates over-collect from wheelers because a significant portion of the State Water Project and local conservation costs are attributable to supply, not transportation."

And I am referencing the last page of your opinion, page 65.

For this trial we believe all of that is done and the remaining issue is damages on the contract. San Diego is not seeking to be paid everything it paid to Met under the exchange agreement during the years these rates were illegal. It is not seeking anything before 2011. It is seeking only the portion of those rates

charges is 136 to 164.

The next portion is the State Water Project costs that are in the system power rate and system access rate. And Mr. Denham will add this up for you. And it shows the amount there and depending on the year ranges from 195 to \$274 which we say should not have been included in the rate and equal the damages for that.

And then the top portion is the water stewardship rate, which we are contending should be returned to San Diego Water Authority because it is not related to the cost of transportation on the Colorado River. And it is a tax, and that ranged from 41 to \$43 an acre-foot for the four years. We can't anticipate Met's response because they simply refused to talk about damages, which is what this trial is supposed to be about. I expect they are going to seize on that portion of your opinion that says there is no substantial evidence to include 100 percent of the illegal rate in Met's transportation rates, and they will then use that to drive a truck through to try to establish that some other rate, some other way of doing it would be -- would have been proper and would have passed legal scrutiny. We will be objecting to that effort.

Instead, we will be agreeing with their earlier

that made them illegal, and then only for those four years, 2011 through '14 for the system access rate and the system power rate. That's the portion of the rates from 2011 through 2014 that are attributable to State Water Project costs.

For the water stewardship rate, it's all that we made for those four years, first, because the local conservation projects have nothing to do with the cost of transporting water on the Colorado River and, second, because the water stewardship rate is an illegal tax under Propr 26.

Dan Denham, who is the Colorado River program director for San Diego Water Authority County Water Authority, he testified in Phase 1, and he will testify again. And he will show the total damages are -- can we put up those up? -- \$188,295,602 plus interest. The contract provides for prejudgment -- provides for interest.

And this chart explains what we did. There is a certain amount of charges that are not disputed and that's the bottom. They are in brown. And then there's -- that is 136 to 164 acre-feet, depending on what year you are talking about. This is a summary of the four years.

During those years that range of undisputed

vociferous position and speculation about what Met's staff would have recommended with respect to rates to the board. And what the board would have done is simply irrelevant, because it's too speculative and because it would be improper for you to imagine a different rate structure in calculating damages.

You have only one rate structure, the one they adopted before you. That's the one you determined was illegal, and that portion of that rate structure is what we're using to calculate damages.

To the extent their imagined speculative rate structure is one that is designed to punish San Diego, which comes through from some of their other briefing such as coming up with a maximum lawful rate or a maximum power rate they could have charged that is irrelevant for an additional reason besides speculation, and that is because California law prohibits discriminating against wheeling since that would violate all the same cost of service legal principles that made the actual rates unlawful.

As you know from reading the wheeling statute in the Phase I trial, rates have to be set for conveyance of water and encouraged, and not discouraged, such transportation.

We do know from the witness statements and from

their affirmative defenses that Met will argue waiver, estoppel, consent in order to avoid paying contract damages. In that regard Met will have to avoid certain inconvenient facts, most of which are already before the Court in Phase 1.

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.3

up.

First of all, the Phase 1 testimony that San Diego was complaining about, even before 2003 and continuously, is that the rates were invalid, improper, illegal is in the record.

You will recall Dennis Cushman, the assistant general manager's testimony from Phase 1. He testified to the myriad occasions that San Diego told Met its rates were invalid, that the State Water Project costs shouldn't be included in the costs and so on.

We will bring them back in this phase to remind you and deal with what we think is the fairy tale they put in their brief about this contract.

You will remember June Skillman, who was the Met budget director, and she's the one who helped write the cost of service study that Mr. Raphael put his name on. The reason she was helping write it, she said, is because she expected to get sued in 2010.

She knew perfectly well that San Diego was unhappy and when the cooling off period was over, they were going to sue.

conveyance. Second --"

That's one reason, all the testimony you already have.

Second, the negotiated five-year timeout, the cooling off period, about which you found in connection with denying their summary judgment on this issue, you found it says, "The five-year cooling off period in the exchange agreement supports the inference that San Diego intended to retain the ability to challenge [Met's] rates under applicable law after the end of that period."

I'm quoting you. You also went on to say, "San Diego paid its bills under the contract and did not bring a legal challenge to the 2003-2007 rates" and said some other words, and then "is not a concession that the rates complied with law, only that San Diego was complying with the five-year hiatus agreement."

We are not seeking, I emphasize, we are not seeking as contract damages the millions of dollars that were paid under -- improperly paid under this agreement from 2003 to 2011. Those are -- those are waived by the five-year period, maybe. But what we're seeking is 2011 on.

San Diego respected the cooling-off period, and finally sued when it became apparent that only a lawsuit

Indeed, the whole purpose behind the rate structure integrity clause, which you know about from Phase 1 because of all the motion practice and your rulings on that, the whole purpose behind it in 2004 was to deter San Diego from what Met knew they were going to do, namely, sue over the rates if they didn't change their practices when the five-year cooling period was

In fact, their Phase 1 trial brief -- we have new lawyers now -- but the Phase 1 trial brief that was filed before you, asserted that, quote, the threat of future litigation was made explicit by San Diego County Water Authority in the context of negotiating, closed

And then they went on to say that San Diego, quote, reserved its right to challenge the validity of MWD's rates, closed quote. And, quote, openly threaten to litigate over MWD's existing rate structure and destabilize MWD's rates, closed quote.

They put that in their trial brief. And then in this phase they are saying this is all consent and waiver and so on.

quote, the exchange agreement.

In this brief, even in this brief it says on page two at line 12, "San Diego had long objected to the inclusion of the State Water Project and the cost of could change Met's ways.

And third, these defenses simply ignore the contract which says in 13.9, Section 13.9, "No waiver" -- I apologize but this is in the record and these are such huge points that it seems to me they have to just stay front and center.

"13.9 of the contract: No waiver of a breach, a failure, condition or any right or remedy contained in or granted by the provisions of this agreement is effective unless it is in writing and signed by the party waiving the breach, failure, right or remedy."

And Section 12.5 of the very contract that we're talking about, the exchange agreement said, "If the nonbreaching party fails to exercise or delays in exercising such right or remedy, it does not thereby waive that right or remedy."

The evidence will show that San Diego has not waived its right to seek contract damages for 2011 through '14.

Finally, moving from contract to preferential rights, you will be asked to decide this issue of preferential rights which arises under Section 135 of the Met act. Met claims that when San Diego buys water from Imperial Irrigation District or develops itself by lining the canals and entitling itself for more water

from the Colorado River, and it pays Met to transport that water on the Colorado River aqueducts, those contractual payments are actually payments for the purchase of Met water.

2.5

That is nonsense. We will have Mr. Cushman explain how preferential rights work and Mr. Denham qualify why it matters. If the exchange agreement -- if the exchange agreement is not a contract for the purchase of water, as we believe it certainly is not, then San Diego's preferential rights to water would go up 28 percent from -- their current number of 18 point something to 23 point something, an increase of 28 percent.

Our witnesses, as I said before, will be Mr. Cushman, Mr. Denham and Scott Slater who helped negotiate the 2003 agreement, and in that order, and we're ready to proceed with testimony.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. QUINN: I will make a couple of remarks really by way of placeholders.

First, Met does not agree that the issue of breach is off the table at this point for reasons that I think will become very apparent. We believe that breach still needs to be established.

And I think the Court will see under the

C-U-S-H-M-A-N.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

Q. What is your occupation?

- A. Assistant general manager of the San Diego
- County Water Authority.

BY MR. PURCELL:

- Q. How long have you held that position?
- A. A little over 12 years.
- Q. Prior to the position as assistant general manager do you have a prior stint being employed by the Water Authority?
  - A. Yes, from July of 1997 to 2001, January, I was the director of public affairs of the water board.
- Q. I know you already testified about this in the first phase of the trial but just to reorient the Court, can you tell us what your responsibilities are as assistant general manager?
  - A. As assistant general manager I oversee the Water Authority's externally focused water policy work. I oversee the Metropolitan Water District's program and the supplies that we obtain from the Metropolitan that it obtains from the Colorado River and the State Water Project. I oversee the Water Authority's advocacy programs in Sacramoento, California, and Washinton, D.C.

evidence that the meaning of that five-year cooling off period was really something very different than what San Diego has told the Court, that the parties understood it in a different way than it's now being characterized and, indeed, the language itself, if you read it, says something quite different.

And I believe that will become apparent in the course of the trial, your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Mr. Keker.

MR. KEKER: Mr. Purcell, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, as our first witness the San Diego Water Authority calls Dennis Cushman.

DENNIS CUSHMAN,

called as a witness by the Plaintiff, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated state and spell your first and last name.

THE WITNESS: Dennis Cushman. D-E-N-N-I-S.

D.C. and oversee the public outreach and conservation programs for the Water Authority.

Q. In your role as assistant general manager of the Water Authority have you worked on issues relating to the Water Authority's agreement with Metropolitan?

A. Yes.

Q. Your responsibilities include the implementation of that agreement?

A. Yes.

Q. What do you do to carry out your responsibilities in implementing the exchange agreement?

A. To ensure water we receive from IID and the canal lining is delivered to Metropolitan in accordance with the schedule and the payments we make as an agency to IID for the water and — to insure that the payments we make to Metropolitan under the exchange agreement conform to the terms of the exchange agreement.

Q. In your role in working with the exchange agreement, have you become familiar with the terms of that agreement?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you first become familiar with the exchange agreement and its terms?

A. When it was being negotiated and in '02 and '03.

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

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. What was your responsibility, if any, during the negotiations of the exchange agreement?

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I supported the work of the general manager and her negotiating team on the exchange agreement. I did public outreach and relations work, spokesperson work on the exchange agreement and supported the general manager and her team on that effort.
- Q. And what is your understanding, if you have one, of the Water Authority's obligations under the exchange agreement?
- A. Our obligations are to pay Metropolitan Water District the exchange price under the exchange agreement for each acre-foot of water transported from Metropolitan to San Diego under the exchange agreement.
- Q. Does the Water Authority also have responsibilities to make water available under the exchange agreement?
- A. Yes, sir. We make water available to Metropolitan through our water transportation agreement with the Imperial Irrigation District and our investment in the canal lining projects.

The water we make available to Metropolitan at its intake at Lake Havasu is in exchange for the Water Authority at its service delivery points in northern San Diego County, about six miles south of the County line.

Irrigation District that is 100,000 acre-feet of water this year. And third, we receive water by means of our investment and responsibility to line the All-American and Coachella Canals in the Imperial Valley Desert and that is 800,000 acre feet this year.

- Q. Does the Water Authority itself have the means to transport the IID and canal lining water to San Diego County?
  - A. No.
- Q. Has the Water Authority arranged to move the IID canal lining water to San Diego County?
- A. Yes, we have, through the exchange agreement with Metropolitan.
- Q. Why did the Water Authority contract with Metropolitan to move the IID and canal lining water?
- A. Because Metropolitan had the only facilities that connect Colorado River to the Water Authority's aqueduct system in San Diego County.
- O. In entering into the exchange agreement with Metropolitan, what services was the Water Authority seeking to have Metropolitan provide?
  - A. Transportation services.
- Q. Did the Water Authority understand it was contracting for a water supply from Metropolitan?
  - A. No.

986 988

- Q. Has the Water Authority performed all of its obligations under the exchange agreement?
  - A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Are you aware of any present assertion by 5 Metropolitan that the Water Authority has failed to 6 perform any obligation under the exchange agreement? 7

  - Q. Mr. Cushman, you testified in Phase 1 of this case; correct?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Was one of the subjects you testified about the various sources of water that the Water Authority imports into its service area?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. Just briefly to reorient the Court, how much of the Water Authority's water supply is imported from outside its service area?
  - A. About 80 percent of all water used to service San Diego's water needs are imported in the San Diego County.
    - Q. What are the water sources of imported water?
  - A. Our supplies we purchase from Metropolitan and that comprises about 50 percent of all water demands in San Diego County. Second, we purchase water under the long-term water transport agreement from the Imperial

- Q. Why not?
- A. Because we already contracted for the water supply from the Imperial Irrigation District and already obtained the water supply by taking on the All-American, Coachella Canal lining projects.
- Q. You mentioned this earlier, but under the exchange agreement does the Water Authority make the IID and canal water available to Metropolitan?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. How so?
  - A. It is delivered to Metropolitan at its take-out at Lake Havasu.
    - O. Is that on the Colorado River?
    - A. Yes.
- Q. Does Metropolitan transport to San Diego the same molecules via the canal lining water that the Water Authority makes available to Metropolitan and Lake Havasu?
  - A. No.
  - O. Why not?
- A. Because the water the Water Authority makes available to Metropolitan and Lake Havasu is commingled with the other water Metropolitan has taken off the Colorado River, its own water it is selling to its member agencies.

989

- Q. Is there any way for Metropolitan to get the Water Authority's IID and canal lining water to San Diego other than through an exchange?
  - A. No.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Did you testify in Phase 1 about the specific objections that the Water Authority has made to the Metropolitan rates at issue in this case?
  - A. Yes. I testified extensively to that.
- Q. And I don't want you to repeat it in full detail, but just to orient the Court, can you briefly describe the substance of the Water Authority's objections to the Metropolitan rates being challenged in this case?
  - A. Yes. The Water Authority has been objecting to the inclusion of State Water Project water in the wheeling rate of Metropolitan since 1996 and continuously since then. We have done so on countless occasions, both in writing, both through multiple processes that Metropolitan put forth on its long-range finance plan; alternatively, its cost of service review study process; alternatively, its rate refinement processes, and other efforts both in monthly general manager meetings on those processes, the work groups that they created on those processes I participated and other staff participated, in testimony by our

- Q. Has the Water Authority suffered harm as a result of Metropolitan charging the Water Authority the water stewardship rate?
- A. Yes, the Water Authority is paying millions to tens of millions of dollars each year under the water stewardship rate to Metropolitan.
- Q. Mr. Cushman, did you instruct anyone at the Water Authority to calculate the Water Authority's damages from these overcharges?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And whom did you instruct to perform that task?
- A. Dan Denham, our Colorado River program director.
- Q. Can you briefly describe your instructions to Mr. Denham as far as calculating the Water Authority's damages?
- A. I instructed Mr. Denham to back out of the Metropolitan wheeling charges the State Water Project costs and the water stewardship rate costs.
- Q. Did Mr. Denham perform that calculation?
- A. Yes, he did.
- Q. The objections to Metropolitan's rates that you just outlined, that the Water Authority is raising in this case, are those new objections?
  - A. No.

990 992

- Metropolitan Water District Board members at MWD board
   and committee meetings, and the list goes on and on and
   on.
  - Q. Had the Water Authority also objected to Metropolitan's water stewardship rate?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. Why is that?
  - A. Because the water stewardship rate, it collects revenues into a fund that Metropolitan creates to subsidize water supply, development projects at the local level and to conserve water supply at the local level. They are water supply oriented subsidies.
  - Q. Were these the objections that were litigated in the first phase of this trial?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Has the Water Authority suffered harm as the result of Metropolitan's inclusion of the State Water Project costs to its transportation rates?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. And what harm has the Water Authority suffered?
  - A. We have been overcharged tens of millions of dollars annually in improper allocations of State Water Project supply costs to the transportation rate in Metropolitan's wheeling rate we are paying under the exchange agreement.

- Q. How long has the Water Authority been objecting to Metropolitan's inclusion of State Water Project charges in its transportation rates?
  - A. Since at least the mid-1990s.
  - Q. Prior to establishing -- strike that.

At some point did Metropolitan establish a wheeling rate?

- A. Yes. They developed a wheeling rate in 1996 and established it or adopted it, in effect, in '97.
- Q. Prior to establishing that wheeling rate, did Metropolitan have a separate transportation rate?
  - A. No.
- Q. How did Metropolitan charge for delivery of water prior to establishing the wheeling rate?
- A. Before establishing the wheeling rate it had a bundled or uniform water rate where all the costs that it incurred were rolled up into a single water rate.
- Q. How long has the Water Authority been objecting to the stewardship rate?
- A. Since it was cited and developed in, I believe, 2001.
- Q. I would like to show you PTX 22 which is in evidence from Phase 1. It should be in your binder and also in the binder with the judge.

THE COURT: State the exhibit number.

1 MR. PURCELL: PTX 22. Q. Did the Water Authority have any involvement in 2 2 Q. Do you recognize this document? that court proceeding? 3 3 A. Yes. A. The Water Authority along with other parties 4 4 O. What is it? entered that case as defendants in that litigation, in 5 5 A. It is a letter to John Foley, who is chairman the validation action. 6 6 of the Metropolitan board of directors, from the Water Q. What position did the Water Authority take in 7 7 Authority's general counsel at the time, Vincent Biando. that case? 8 8 Q. What is the subject of the letter? A. The Water Authority's position is that wheeling 9 9 A. The proposed resolution establishing short-term rate was not legal. 10 10 wheeling rates. Q. I would like to show you PTX 38 which is also 11 11 in evidence. Do you recognize this document? Q. Can you turn to page 2? 12 12 Could you read the paragraph starting with "In A. Yes. 13 13 short summary"? Q. What is this document, Mr. Cushman? 14 14 A. "In short summary the Authority objects to A. A letter dated September 8, 1999, addressed to 15 15 Metropolitan's imposition of costs upon a party Mr. Ronald R. Gastelum, who is the general manager of 16 16 requesting the use of excess capacity because the costs Metropolitan, from Maureen Stapleton, the general 17 17 bear no relationship to the actual incremental cost of manager of the Water Authority. 18 18 Q. As of September 1999 do you recall what the wheeling the water through the conveyance 19 19 facility/system." status of the validation lawsuit was? 20 20 Q. And slightly farther down the page, could you A. It was still -- I'm not sure a trial court 21 21 read the paragraph that starts "the authority believes"? verdict had been reached in that case. 22 22 A. "The authority believes the intended result of Q. It hadn't finally been resolved? 23 23 A. I don't recall. Metropolitan's pricing approach is to remove any 24 24 incentive for its customers or member agencies to Q. This September 8, 1999, letter, can you take a 25 25 look at the paragraph at the bottom of the first page request the use of excess capacity. In turn, this will 994 1 1 with the heading "cost shifting"? allow Metropolitan to sustain its monopoly on imported 2 2 water supplies within its boundaries. As such, the 3 3 proposed resolution is contrary to the policy behind the Q. Can you read that paragraph? 4 4 wheeling statute and raises state and federal antitrust A. "There are significant problems with the 5 5 issues in the process." division of cost categories in the rate model between 6 6 Q. How, if at all, does the argument the Water supply, conveyance and distribution. Inappropriate 7 7 Authority made in this December 1996 letter compare to allocations between these categories shift costs and 8 8 the objections the Water Authority has raised in this make it appear that Metropolitan is designing the model 9 9 case about including State Water Project costs in to predetermine the outcome and achieve two goals: One, 10 10 Metropolitan transportation rates? artificially suppress supply costs to appear competitive 11 11 A. They are the same objections. with potential alternative suppliers; and two, inflate 12 12 Q. At some point after December 1996 did conveyance costs to effectively preclude wheeling in 13 13 Metropolitan publish the wheeling rate? Metropolitan's system." 14 14 A. Yes. Q. Mr. Cushman, how, if at all, did the objections 15 15 Q. Was there a court proceeding regarding the in the September '99 letter compare to the Water 16 16 Authority's objections to Metropolitan's rates in this validity of that wheeling rate? 17 17 case? A. Yes. Shortly after publishing its wheeling 18 18 rate, Metropolitan itself filed a validation action A. They are the same. 19 19 seeking to validate that rate. Q. At some point after this letter did 20 20 Q. That lawsuit was initiated by Metropolitan? Metropolitan consider a proposal to adopt an unbundled 21 21 rate structure? A. Yes. 22 22 A. Yes. Q. What did Metropolitan contend in its validation 23 23 suit? Q. During what time period did that unbundled rate 24 24 A. Metropolitan contended that the wheeling rate structure proposal get evaluated by Metropolitan? 25 25 they established was valid in accordance with the law. A. Up to and including 2001 they evaluated the

Pages 994 to 997

997

996

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

#### unbundled rate structure and it was approved and put into effect January 1, 2003.

- Q. Did the Water Authority participate in the administrative process at the Metropolitan board regarding the unbundled rate structure?
  - A. Yes.

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

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. Did the Water Authority support or oppose the unbundled rate structure?
  - A. We opposed it.
- Q. Did the Water Authority communicate its opposition to Metropolitan in writing?
  - A. Yes, it did.
- Q. What was the substance of the Water Authority's objections to the unbundled rate structure?
- A. The substance of the objections were that Metropolitan was improperly including State Water Project supply costs and State Water Project costs in the wheeling rate and that it was improperly including water stewardship rate and local water subsidy and conservation program costs in the wheeling rate.
- Q. Did the Metropolitan board vote on the proposed unbundled rate structure?
  - A. Yes, they did.
- Q. How did the Water Authority delegates vote on the unbundled rate structure?

proposal?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What was that position?
- A. That --

MR. QUINN: Objection, your Honor. Hearsay.

THE COURT: How do you know about this? 7 THE WITNESS: I was in attendance at the 8 meeting.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: They were in support of moving those costs from transportation to supply.

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Did the Metropolitan board take any action on the proposal to move the dry-year storage costs from transportation to supply?
- A. The Met board deferred action on it and referred it to the then ongoing long-range finance plan rate refinement process that was going on at the time.
- Q. Was any further action taken by the Met board on the dry-year storage reallocation proposal after the question was referred to the long-range finance plan rate refinement process?
  - A. No. never.
- Q. We will talk a little bit more about the refinement process later. Other than that dry-year

998

1000

- A. They opposed.
- Q. Did Metropolitan adopt the unbundled rate structure anyway?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Since the Metropolitan board adopted the unbundled rate structure has there been any action at the Metropolitan board level to reconsider any aspect of that rate structure?
  - A. There was once in 2009 as a result of ongoing discussions at that time during the rate refinement process. Metropolitan management brought a proposal to the board in November of 2009 to take costs of its dry-year water storage costs in what's called flex storage in Lake Castaic and Lake Perris, two of the terminal reservoirs of the State Water Project system.

These are dry-year storage supplies available to Metropolitan under the flex program. They were being charged to transportation, whereas, other dry-year storage costs that Metropolitan was incurring were charged to supply. And management went to the board and recommended that the costs of the flex dry-year storage in fact be moved from the transportation rate category to the supply rate category.

Q. And did the Water Authority's delegates at the Metropolitan board articulate a position to this

- storage issue, has it reconsidered any aspect of its unbundled rate structure since that rate structure was enacted?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Since Metropolitan adopted its unbundled rate structure has the Metropolitan board periodically voted on increases to its individual rates within the rate structure for a given calendar year?
    - A. Yes.
  - O. Does a vote on an annual rate increase constitute a vote on the rate structure itself?
    - A. No.
  - Q. If a majority of the Metropolitan board were to vote against a rate increase for a particular year, would that have any effect on the underlying rate structure?
    - A. No.
  - Q. Have the Water Authority delegates cast votes on the Metropolitan board on proposals for periodic rate increase?
  - - Q. How have they voted on those proposals?
  - A. In some years they opposed rate increases and other years they supported them
    - Q. As far as the rate -- strike that.

1001

2.3

Has anyone from the Water Authority, to your knowledge, ever taken a public position in favor of the Metropolitan rate structure?

A. No.

2.2

2.5

- Q. You testified earlier you supported the Metropolitan general manager during negotiations of the curren exchange agreement.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Did the exchange agreement contain any provisions designed to preserve the Water Authority's objections to the Metropolitan rate structure?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. I would like to show you PTX 65, which is in evidence.
  - Mr. Cushman, do you recognize PTX 65?
  - A. Yes.
- O. What is PTX 65?
- A. It is the 2003 exchange agreement between Metropolitan and the Water Authority.
- Q. Can you turn to page 16, in particular, Section 5.2.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. It spills over on to page 17. What is Section 5.2 of the 2003?
  - A. It is the price provision of the agreement.

5.2 regarding the price to be charged by Metropolitan.

What is the price term that Section 5.2 requires?

- A. It establishes the initial price at \$253.

  Thereafter, the price shall be equal to the charge or charges set by Metropolitan's board of directors pursuant to applicable law and regulation and generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies.
- Q. In the Water Authority's view, what does the phrase "pursuant to applicable law and regulation" mean?
  - A. That the rates be lawful.
- Q. And what about the phrase "generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies"? What does that mean in the Water Authority's view?
- A. That means that whatever charge Metropolitan develops for the Water Authority will be the same charge they would charge any of the member agencies. It wouldn't be a one a one-off rate for the water.
- Q. Was the ability to sue after five years the reason why the Water Authority was willing to agree to the floating price term in section 5.2?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Without the right to sue after five years would the Water Authority agree to the floating price term?

- Q. Did the Water Authority design this provision to preserve its objections to the Metropolitan's rate structure?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. How does the price term do that? How does it preserve the Water Authority's objections?
  - A. It contains a provision on page 17, starting at A, midway down the page, it reads, "After the conclusion of the first five years nothing herein shall preclude SDCWA from contesting an administrative or judicial forum whether such charge or charges have been set in accordance with applicable law and regulation. And, B, SDCWA and Metropolitan policy may agree in writing at any time to exempt any specified matter from the foregoing limitation.

"In the event that SDCWA contests a matter pursuant to the foregoing sentence, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recovery of reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting or defending against such contest."

- Q. How does the language you just read preserve the Water Authority's objections to Metropolitan?
- A. After the five-year litigation timeout, the Water Authority is free to sue at any time thereafter.
  - Q. Let's look at the earlier language in Section

- A. No.
- Q. Why not?
- A. Because it left a completely unbounded ability for Metropolitan to establish rates of any amount without regard to whether they were lawful or not.
- Q. In negotiating the 2003 exchange agreement did the Water Authority agree to take on a canal lining project?
  - A. Could you repeat the question?
- Q. During the course of negotiating the 2003 exchange agreement did the Water Authority agree to take on a project to line the All-American and Coachella canals?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. When the Water Authority agreed to take on the canal lining project, did it give up its right to invalidiate Metropolitan's rates after five years?
  - A. No.
- Q. Is there anything in its exchange agreement that says the Water Authority gave up its rights to sue as a result of taking on the canal lining project?
  - A. No.
- Q. At the time of the negotiations over the 2003 exchange agreement, was there a prior exchange agreement in effect between Metropolitan and the Water Authority?

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. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

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

- Q. When had that agreement been signed?
- A. In 1998.
- Q. As of 2003 had the Water Authority actually made any water available to Metropolitan under the 1998 agreement?
  - A. No.
- Q. And likewise, I assume, Metropolitan hadn't delivered any water to the Water Authority under the '98 10 agreement?
  - A. No, they had not.
  - Q. Once the 2003 exchange agreement was signed, was there a schedule for delivery of water to the Water Authority?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Have you prepared a chart showing the schedule for water deliveries under the 2003 exchange agreement?

    - Q. Is this the chart you prepared, Mr. Cushman?
    - A. Yes.

THE COURT: Is this a demonstrative exhibit? MR. PURCELL: For now.

THE COURT: Read the bottom letters.

MR. PURCELL: Source material for this is PTX 8. PTX 469 and PTX 473A.

completed the projects. So the Coachella Canal lining project was completed first. You see that tranche of water coming in in the 2006-2007 time frame. The All-American Canal lining project was completed in, I want to say, 2011, and you see all that water ramping in that period of time.

- Q. Did the Water Authority take any risk in agreeing to paying Metropolitan's wheeling rate for the first five years of the exchange agreement without making a judicial challenge?
- A. Yes. We faced risks but those risks were bounded in the first five years by the ability to sue after five years and also by virtue that the quantity of water being moved over the first five years was a comparatively small amount of water, in total 150,000 acre-feet of water, over the first five years. So we had risk in the price.

We knew we had the right to challenge it thereafter if the processes we were going through Metropolitan were unsuccessful, and our dollar exposure was bounded in part by the small quantity of water being moved over that period.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question about the first sentence of 5.2.

It says the price is \$253. You were not going

1006

1008

- Q. Mr. Cushman, what does this chart show?
- A. It shows the ramp-up in the delivery schedule of the Imperial Irrigation District water transfer and then the introduction as the projects were completed of the lining of first the Coachella Canal and then the All-American Canal.
- Q. Describe how the ramp-up of the IID water worked under the exchange.
- A. It started in the first increment of 10,000 acre-feet in 2003, and that it increased by 10,000 acre-foot increments going forward for the first five years of the agreement, such that in the fifth year of the agreement 50,000 acre feet of water, IID water, was being transferred to San Diego.
  - Q. Does it continue to ramp up after that?
- A. It does. And then presently we are at 100,000 acre-feet. There is a plateau in the delivery schedule at 100,000 acre-feet, which is shown by the flat line we are presently in right now. And then it begins picking up between in 2018 and 2019 and 2020 until it reaches the ultimate 200,000 acre-feet of transfer in 2021.
- Q. Can you describe how the ramp-up of the canal lining water works under the exchange agreement?
- A. The water became available to the Water Authority under the canal lining projects as we

to challenge that; right?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: And then it says thereafter, and we have this language. When does the thereafter start? What was your view of that?

THE WITNESS: The next calendar year.

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Mr. Cushman, how, if at all, did the risk the Water Authority faced under the 2003 exchange agreement compare to the risk it had faced under the previously existing 1998 exchange agreement?
  - A. It was a smaller risk.
  - Q. Why do you say that?
- A. Because in the 1998 agreement the only agreement we had from Metropolitan on price was the first 30 years of our 45-year transfer with the Imperial Irrigation District. We had unbounded risk for the final 15 years of IID transfer on the transfer on the price we would pay Metropolitan under that exchange agreement.

Purchasing that last 15 years of the 45-year deal we're moving 200,000 acre-feet of water per year, so that is a risk on price for three million acre-feet of water.

O. And what was the volume subject to the risk during the five-year litigation timeout in 2003?

1009

- A. 150,000 acre-feet.
- Q. After the 2003 exchange agreement was signed, did Metropolitan ever state publicly it was concerned the Water Authority would sue over Metropolitan's
- 5 transportation rates?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Did Metropolitan take any steps to discourage the Water Authority from filing suit?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What steps did Metropolitan take?
- A. Well, shortly after we signed the exchange agreement in 2003 in October, six months or so later, Metropolitan concocted the rate structure integrity provision which was directly targeting San Diego and intended to discourage San Diego by punishing it monetarily if we filed -- merely filed suit to challenge Metropolitan's rates.
- Q. I would like to show you PTX 80, which is also in evidence.

Mr. Cushman, do you recognize PTX 80?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What is this document?
- A. That is a memo from Ron Gastelum, who was the general manager and chief executive officer of Metropolitan --

THE COURT: Is this 80 or 81, in your view?

structure in order to convey water at a lesser cost than as required to properly maintain the system's integrity and reliability. This challenge is not presented by deficiencies in the rate structure but by the continuing economic attraction of lower cost based on agricultural transfer water if it can be conveyed into our service area at marginal cost.

"Historically, this has specifically meant challenges to the system access rate and in the future perhaps the water stewardship change."

- Q. Mr. Cushman, how, if at all, does the statement Mr. Gastelum made in that paragraph relate to the Water Authority's objections in that lawsuit?
- A. Our objections to the inclusion of State Water Project costs and the water stewardship rate costs were well-known and well-articulated by the Water Authority at Metropolitan and with Metropolitan over the course of many years by this point in time.
  - Q. Can you read the second paragraph?
- A. "One indication that such concerns are still valid was the San Diego County Water Authority's position in the QSA agreement reserving their right to challenge Metropolitan's uniform wheeling rates after five years from the date of execution of the QSA."
  - Q. Did Metropolitan adopt the rate structure

MR. PURCELL: This is 80. THE WITNESS: Eighty is not in the binder. THE COURT: I think -- that's okay. We will just read it from the screen. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. PURCELL: I am happy to give you my copy. THE COURT: I am happy to follow on the screen. It is more important you have yours. 

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Sorry, Mr. Cushman. What was PTX 80, the document on the screen?

A. It's a memo from Ron Gastelum to the Metropolitan member agencies managers, the general managers of this 26-member agency.

- Q. Is the member agency manager group referred in the "to" line, does that include the Water Authority managers?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you read the first paragraph of Mr. Gastelum's memo?
- A. "For several years we have discussed the continuing financial risk to Metropolitan and the member agencies from the threat of legal or legislative actions undermining our rate structure. As in the past, some entities for their own gain may challenge the rate

integrity program?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And did the water -- strike that.

Did Metropolitan begin including rate structure integrity language in subsequent local programs, subsidy contracts with the water authorities?

- A. Yes. They began including rate structure integrity provisions in all local resource program agreements and water conservation program agreements after the effective date of that provision.
  - Q. When did the Water Authority file this lawsuit?
  - A. In June of 2010.
- Q. After the Water Authority filed this case, did Metropolitan invoke the rate structure integrity clause to take any action against the Water Authority?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What did Metropolitan do with regard to the rate structure integrity?
- A. It served formal notice to the Water Authority that it intended to terminate then in effect, in progress, local resource program, local water supply agreements that contain the rate structure integrity provision and also to terminate water conservation program agreements with the Water Authority that had the rate structure integrity provision.

```
Q. Did Metropolitan take any action to -- did
2
                                                                       2
       Metropolitan take any action respecting the Water
3
                                                                       3
       Authority's eligibility for future local resource
                                                                       4
 4
       programs?
 5
                                                                       5
         A. Yes, sir. Metropolitan also took action to
                                                                       6
 6
       refuse to take action on the then pending additional
                                                                       7
       agreements that had been negotiated between the Water
 8
                                                                       8
       Authority and Metropolitan for additional programs. And
                                                                       9
 9
       also the board took action to bar the Water Authority
10
                                                                      10
       from receiving any new local resource program funding
11
                                                                      11
       under this provision.
                                                                      12
12
         Q. After declaring the Water Authority eligible
13
                                                                      13
       for future funding, did the Water Authority continue to
                                                                      14
14
       charge the water stewardship rate to the Water
15
                                                                      15
       Authority?
                                                                      16
16
         A. Yes.
17
         Q. Did the Water Authority continue to pay that
                                                                      17
18
      rate?
                                                                      18
19
                                                                      19
         A. Yes.
20
                                                                      20
         Q. Did you prepare a demonstrative showing the
                                                                      21
21
       Water Authority's payment under the water stewardship
22
                                                                      2.2
       rate from 2011 to 2014, the years affected by this law
                                                                      23
23
       suit?
24
                                                                      24
         A. Yes.
                                                                      25
25
         Q. Is this the chart you prepared, Mr. Cushman?
                                                          1014
1
                                                                       1
         A. Yes.
 2
                                                                       2
            THE COURT: This is just a demonstrative?
 3
                                                                       3
             MR. PURCELL: Correct.
 4
             THE COURT: And it is San Diego WSR Payments
                                                                       4
 5
                                                                       5
       and Demand Management Program Benefits, 2011 to 2014.
 6
             MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, I would like to mark
                                                                       6
 7
                                                                       7
       these two demonstratives we have used for identification
 8
                                                                       8
       and make them part of the record as demonstratives.
 9
             THE COURT: Why don't we do it one by one?
                                                                       9
1.0
             MR. PURCELL: Let's do this one first.
                                                                      10
11
                                                                      11
             THE COURT: Okay.
12
             What are we going to mark this as?
                                                                      12
13
             MR. PURCELL: PTX 506.
                                                                      13
14
                                                                      14
             (Exhibit PTX 506 was marked for
15
             identification.)
                                                                      15
16
             THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                                      16
17
                                                                      17
             MR. QUINN: No objection.
18
             THE COURT: It is admitted.
                                                                      18
19
             MR. PURCELL: The previous chart on the
                                                                      19
20
       exchange agreement deliveries, we would like to mark
                                                                      20
21
       that as PTX 507. Previous chart on exchange agreement
                                                                      21
22
       deliveries we would like to mark as PTX 507.
                                                                      22
2.3
            MR. QUINN: No objection.
                                                                      23
24
             THE COURT: 507 is admitted.
                                                                      24
25
```

(Exhibit 507 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Taking a look at PTX 506, during the period at issue in this case, 2011 through 2014, how much money did the Water Authority pay to Metropolitan in the water stewardship?

#### A. Just under \$77 million.

Q. Under that -- just under \$77 million, how much of that water stewardship rate money was paid for purchases of Metropolitan water?

#### A. 48.3 million.

Q. Is the Water Authority seeking that amount as damages in this proceeding?

#### A. No.

Q. Why not?

#### A. Because it's not covered under our exchange agreement contract with Metropolitan.

Q. How much of the just under \$77 million was charged in water stewardship rate charges for conveyance of third-party water?

#### A. About 27 point -- excuse me. \$38.7 million.

Q. Is the Water Authority seeking that amount as damages?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Finally, how much money did the Water Authority receive in local resource project funding from Metropolitan during 2011 through 2014?

1016

#### A. \$22.3 million.

Q. And how much more has the Water Authority paid in water stewardship rate charges as compared to the local resource project funding it's got now?

#### A. \$54.6 million.

Q. How does that \$54.6 million deficit compare to the damages the Water Authority is seeking here?

#### A. It is nearly twice the amount we are seeking in damages.

MR. PURCELL: You can take that down. Thanks.

Q. You testified about this in Phase 1 and a little bit earlier today, so I don't want to take a lot of time.

During the five-year litigation timeout did the Water Authority continue to object to Metropolitan about the Metropolitan transportation rates at issue here?

#### A. Yes. Regularly so.

Q. How did the Water Authority communicate its objections to Metropolitan during the five-year timeout?

A. During the long-range finance plan update processes during the rate refinement processes, during the other cost of service review processes, that Metropolitan developed and created work groups around in that period of time, in testimony at Metropolitan board and committee meetings by our directors on the

1017

1015

- Metropolitan board, any communications between the Water Authority and management and Metropolitan staff and management.
  - Q. And I think you mentioned earlier that the one rate structure issue the Metropolitan board had considered about dry-year storage had been referred to the rate refinement process?
    - A. Correct.

2.3

- Q. What happened to the rate refinement process?
- A. All of those processes came to a quiet close and end in the summer of 2012. Metropolitan simply ended all work on those efforts.
- Q. How did the Water Authority learn that Metropolitan had ended the rate refinement process?
- A. In a conversation I had with Metropolitan's chief financial officer Gary Breaux and during a break in the regular monthly Metropolitan member agency managers meeting, I asked Mr. Breaux, when are we going to restart these meetings on this effort. And he said Metropolitan has decided to simply end the effort altogether.
- Q. Mr. Cushman, in 2014, after this Court's tentative decision in Phase 1 of this case, did Metropolitan set rates to be imposed for water deliveries in calendar years 2015 and 2016?

- has as a percentage of all water available by Metropolitan at any given time.
  - Q. And under that statute how are Metropolitan member agencies' preferential rights to Metropolitan water calculated?
- A. They are calculated based on each agency's total financial contributions to Metropolitan over time, accepting the purchase of water, that becomes a dollar figure that is a percentage of all dollars Metropolitan has collected under that definition from all of its member agencies, and that creates a percentage for each agency, percentage of whatever available water Metropolitan has at any given time.
- Q. What does the Water Authority's preferential right entitle the Water Authority to do?
- A. Entitles the Water Authority to make use of its amount of preferential rights to water at Metropolitan at any time.
- Q. Has the Water Authority ever demanded delivery of its preferential rights under the allotment of water from Metropolitan?
- A. No.
- Q. Does the Water Authority believe its preferential rights have value?
  - A. Yes.

1018 1020

A. Yes.

Q. Was the Water Authority involved in that process?

A. Yes.

- Q. Setting the 2015 and '16 rates did it make any adjustments to its rate structure in response to this Court's Phase 1 decision?
  - A. No.
- Q. Did Metropolitan take any steps in setting the 2015 and 2016 rates to modify any rates invalidated by this Court's decision?
  - A. No.
- Q. And the last area I would like to cover with you today, are you familiar with the term "preferential rights"?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you use that term in your work at the Water Authority?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What is your understanding of what the term "preferential rights" mean?
  - A. Preferential rights is a statutory right embodied in the Metropolitan Water District Act itself, Section 135. And it delineates the preferential right to Metropolitan Water that each of its member agencies

O. How so?

A. Water and a water right has economic value, significant economic value. The Water Authority knows in its preferential right and believes in its preferential right with Metropolitan it has a right to a significant amount of acre-feet of water every year from Metropolitan. That becomes the core foundation of all long-term water resource planning the Water Authority does to ensure we have and provide to our region all of the water necessary to support our economy and quality of life.

Metropolitan is the single largest source of supply for the Water Authority and for the San Diego region, about half of all water supply. When we make our long-term water supply plans we count on and quantify what we believe our preferential right to water would be in future years, what the total demands for water will be in those future years, what the gap may be between demands and that supply, and that's what we and the member agencies fill by making investments in other water resource programs and projects.

Q. During your time as assistant general manager of the Water Authority, how has the Water Authority's preferential right to Metropolitan water informed the Water Authority's imported water portfolio strategy?

Pages 1018 to 1021

#### A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

Q. That was a little confusing.

During your time as Metropolitan's assistant general manager how, if at all, has Metropolitan -- has the Water Authority used its preferential right to Metropolitan water to inform its overall strategy for acquiring imported water?

A. Well, it's foundational to the Water
Authority's not only long-term water resource planning
but our water supply allocation planning or dry-year or
drought-year water planning. We know we have a
statutory right to a certain amount of Metropolitan
water, and that if that's insufficient to meet the
demands on the Water Authority, then we will have either
to acquire additional supplies, remove water we have in
storage or do our own shortage allocation to our member
agencies.

- Q. Are you aware of any dispute between the Water Authority and Metropolitan related to the calculation of preferential rights?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Could you describe that dispute?
- A. Yes. Fundamentally, the payments we have been making to Metropolitan under the exchange agreement since 2003 are payments for transportation of water.

- Q. How much total water is Metropolitan projected to deliver to its member agencies this year, in 2015?
- A. That hasn't been finally determined, but the discussions have been around 1.7 million acre-feet of Metropolitan water in 2015.
- Q. Assuming Metropolitan provides 1.7 million acre-feet of water to its member agencies, has the Water Authority quantified in acre-feet the difference between its calculation of its preferential rights and Metropolitan's calculation of the Water Authority's preferential rights?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What is that difference?
- A. A little over 80,000 acre-feet of water. Not only this year but every year that they had that amount of water available.
- Q. So assuming sales at 1.7 million acre-feet by Metropolitan in future years, the Water Authority would be entitled to an extra 80,000 acre-feet every year?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. How much canal lining water is the Water Authority projected to receive this year?
  - A. 80,000 acre-feet.
- Q. How much water is the Water Authority projected to receive this year as a result of the IID transfer?

- That's many hundreds of millions of dollars of payments to Metropolitan that Metropolitan has excluded from the calculation of the Water Authority's preferential right to Met water.
- Q. Have you instructed anyone at the Water
  Authority to quantify the extent to which the Water
  Authority believes Metropolitan is undercalculating its
  preferential rights?
  - A. Yes. Dan Denham.
  - Q. Did Mr. Denham provide a calculation to you?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Do you have an understanding of the basis of that calculation?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. What is your understanding?
    - A. Mr. Denham went back, took Metropolitan's version of its calculation of the preferential rights of its 26 member agencies.

He added into the total financial contribution of the Water Authority shown on that calculation all of the payments the Water Authority has made under the exchange agreement to Metropolitan since 2003, and then recalculated each of the 26 agencies' preferential right to water, including the Water Authority's. That raises the Water Authority's preferential right to Met water.

- A. 100,000 acre-feet.
- Q. If the Water Authority were to buy 80 new acre-feet in water supply from Metropolitan, how much would that cost?
  - A. Between 48 million and \$58 million.
- Q. Is that calculation based on Metropolitan's current 2015 water rates?
  - A. Yes. It's based on Metropolitan's untreated Tier 1 and Tier 2 water rates. That's the range.
  - Q. Has the Water Authority recently undertaken any major capital expenditures to increase its local water supply?
  - A. Yes. The Water Authority committed in its water purchase agreement for the Carlsbad desalination project to invest a billion dollars in capital for the Carlsbad desalination project now under construction.
  - Q. When the Carlsbad desalination project comes on line, how much water supply is it projected to generate each year?
    - A. Up to 56,000 acre-feet of water per year.

MR. PURCELL: Pass the witness.
THE COURT: Off the record.
We will take five minutes.
(Recess.)

Pages 1022 to 1025

#### 1 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** and that issue that was live at that time; correct? 2 2 BY MR. QUINN: A. Yes. 3 3 Q. Good morning, Mr. Cushman. My name is John Q. You were involved in the negotiations of the 4 4 Quinn, and I represent the Metropolitan Water District. exchange agreement when those were happening in 2003? 5 5 A. I was supporting the general manager and her A. Good morning. 6 6 Q. Let's begin where you started. Counsel showed team on that. 7 7 you a document, Exhibit 22, dated back December 6, 1996. Q. And you knew at the time that that exchange 8 8 If we can put it up on the screen. agreement was negotiated that the then existing wheeling 9 9 rates that Metropolitan employed included the systems This was in the context of you talking about 10 10 the fact that San Diego had objected to the inclusion of access rate and the system power rate; correct? 11 11 certain costs, a cost structure that Met had employed. A. In 2003? 12 12 Do you recall that discussion? Q. Yes. 13 13 A. Yes. A. Yes. 14 14 Q. You said this had been going on for a long Q. You knew that both those rates included these 15 15 time. Do you recall that? State Water Project costs? 16 16 17 17 Q. If we could look at the bottom of this Exhibit Q. You knew at that time the rate included the 18 22, the last paragraph, there is a reference to a 18 water stewardship rate, as well? 19 19 postage stamp system; do you see that? A. Yes. 20 20 A. Yes. Q. At the time of this exchange agreement we are 21 21 Q. That is something that the San Diego Water here talking about was being negotiated, San Diego knew 22 22 Authority objected to the use of that postage stamp that those rates that it now objects to were built into 23 23 system; correct? that conveyance rate; correct? 24 24 A. Yes. A. Yes. 25 25 Q. And that was something that was of concern at Q. And you anticipated at the time, or I should 1026 1028 1 1 the time of this document that we're looking at? say San Diego anticipated at the time, that the system 2 2 access rate would increase in 2004, isn't that true? 3 3 Q. I think you mentioned there was some litigation A. I don't recall what the rate increase in 2004 4 as a result of that, that brought a validation 4 was. 5 5 proceeding, and San Diego intervened as a defendant. Do Q. At the time that you were negotiating this 6 6 you recall that? agreement, you anticipated there would be an increase in 7 7 A. Yes. the system access rate; that would go up in 2004; 8 8 Q. What was the outcome of that litigation? correct? 9 A. At the trial court it was a bifurcated trial so 9 A. It would go up, perhaps, annually thereafter. 10 10 the Court ruled on Phase 1 of that trial. The Phase I Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit -- Defense Exhibit 11 11 ruling at the trial court level was that Metropolitan 843. 12 12 could not develop or charge a postage stamp rate. THE COURT: This isn't already in evidence? 13 13 Metropolitan appealed that ruling, and the MR. OUINN: We would offer that. 14 14 THE COURT: Any objection? Do we know what appellate court overturned that ruling and remanded the 15 15 case back to the trial court for a trial on Phase II. that is? 16 16 MS. HADLOCK: This is Exhibit 843. This is an And Phase II of the case was whether or not the 17 17 rate Metropolitan adopted was lawful. email that you sent on September 17, 2003. 18 18 THE COURT: Is there any objection? Q. So that litigation, at least the Court of 19 19 Appeal -- the trial court determination that the postage MR. PURCELL: I said no objection. 20 20 stamp rate was improper, that was reversed and remanded THE COURT: 843 is admitted. 21 21 by the Court of Appeal? (Exhibit 843 was received in evidence.) 22 22 A. Yes. It was remanded back to the trial court Q. BY MR. QUINN: The date of this is September 23 23 for a Phase II trial. 17, 2003. This is at the time you are negotiating this 24 24 O. So what is referenced here, this objection on exchange agreement; correct? 25 25 the bottom of the page here, is this postage stamp rate A. Yes. 1027 1029

Q. What you wrote is, "Please let Gig know that A. Yes. 2 2 Met's wheeling rate for 2004 is comprised of three Q. Do you recognize this document? 3 3 charges: The 163-dollar system access rate; the \$30 is A. Yes. 4 4 the water stewardship rate, and \$60 is the power rate. Q. It is a San Diego document? 5 5 These three charges add up to \$253 an acre-foot." A. Yes. 6 6 Q. This was prepared at the time the exchange 7 Q. We know, because we looked at it, that was the agreement was being negotiated; correct? 8 8 initial price that ends up going into the exchange A. I can't recall whether it was -- it was -- no, 9 9 agreement; correct? there was -- this was developed in 2008. 10 10 A. Yes. Q. Prepared in 2008? 11 11 Q. In fact, that was San Diego's idea; correct? A. Yes. 12 12 A. What was San Diego's idea? Q. San Diego knew both in 2008 and during the 13 13 Q. There was something called option two. Do you negotiations of the exchange agreement that 14 14 recall an option one and an option two? Metropolitan's system power rate was lower than the 1.5 15 A. Yes. incremental power rate; correct? 16 Q. And San Diego came up with this idea, we can 16 A. At that time, yes. 17 17 either go under the old exchange agreement that the O. You knew that in 2008? 18 18 parties had negotiated a couple of years before; right? A. Yes. 19 19 A. Yes. Q. As we've seen, you already knew that back at 20 20 Q. That was option one. the time you were negotiating the exchange rate; 21 21 A. I believe it was. correct? 2.2 22 Q. And then option two was we'll pay your existing A. That the system power rate was lower than the 23 23 wheeling rate; correct? incremental rate in 2003? 24 A. Yes. 24 Q. Yes. 2.5 2.5 Q. That was San Diego's idea? A. I don't recall. 1030 1032 1 1 A. That we would pay Metropolitan's lawful Q. You don't recall that? 2 2 wheeling rate, which their wheeling rate at the time was A. I don't recall what the rates were, the 3 3 \$253 an acre-foot. incremental rate would have been in 2003. 4 4 Q. That was something that San Diego proposed; Q. But you're not denying that you knew that at 5 5 correct? the time; you just don't recall? 6 6 A. I don't know what an incremental rate would 7 7 Q. And specifically San Diego proposed we will pay have been because Metropolitan never charged it. 8 8 this \$243, which is your present rate, correct, San Q. You knew back in 2008 it was lower; you just 9 9 don't recall whether you knew in 2003? Diego's idea? 10 10 A. As part of the overall negotiations, yes. A. I had no basis to know in 2003. 11 11 Q. Yes. Q. As I understand your testimony, sir, San Diego 12 12 You understood, looking at this email, you claims that Met first breached the exchange agreement in 13 13 understood in September 2003 that the system access rate 2008 when it adopted rates to be effective in 2009; is 14 14 would increase from \$141 in 2003 to \$163 in 2004; right? that correct? 15 15 A. Yes. A. I believe so. 16 16 Q. And, again, I think you've already told us that Q. And Metropolitan similarly breached the 17 17 these costs that San Diego is objecting to as being in exchange agreement in 2009 when it adopted rates to be 18 18 the conveyance rate, you already knew at this time those effective in 2010? 19 19 were built into those rates; correct? A. Possibly, yes. Uh-huh. 20 20 Q. I'm -- do you recall that was your testimony at A. Yes. 21 21 your deposition? Q. Would you take a look at Defense Exhibit 128. 22 This is in evidence. You see in number one, just above 22 A. Yes.

Pages 1030 to 1033

1033

Q. And specifically that alleged breach was the

to San Diego, misallocated the system access, system

adoption of those rates in those years which, according

1031

23

24

25

23

24

25

see that?

exchange rate, it says higher power rate, incremental

power as to -- as opposed to system power rate. Do you

1 power and water stewardship charges; correct? were breaches of contract were the same allocations that 2 2 A. Correct. have been included in Metropolitan's conveyance charges 3 3 Q. Isn't it true that in 2008 and 2009 the San since 2003; correct? 4 4 Diego delegates on the Metropolitan board of directors A. Could you repeat the question? 5 actually voted for those acts, those rates that San 5 Q. The allocations of costs that San Diego claims 6 6 Diego contends constitute the breach? were breaches of contract, that is the State Water 7 A. I believe they voted yes on the rate increases Project and the water stewardship charges, were the same 8 in those two years as well as several others. 8 allocations that had been included in Met's conveyance 9 9 Q. So, is it your testimony, sir, that when they charges since 2003; correct? 10 10 voted at those times, you've said it was the adoption of A. Yes. 11 those rates. You just told us a moment ago it was the 11 Q. There was nothing different in 2008 as opposed 12 adoption of those rates that were the breaches; right? 12 to prior years with regard to how Met allocated State 13 13 Water Project costs; true? 14 Q. 2008, 2009 adopted rates, those were breaches; 14 A. I believe that's true. 15 right? 15 Q. There was nothing different in 2008 as opposed 16 A. Yes. 16 to prior years as to how Met allocated the water 17 Q. Isn't it true that the San Diego delegates 17 stewardship rate; correct? 18 voted in favor of those very acts which you are telling 18 A. Since 2003? 19 us were breaches of the contract? 19 O. Yes. 20 A. They voted yes on the rates for those following 20 A. Yes. 21 21 years. Q. And before San Diego filed this lawsuit you 2.2 Q. I wasn't sure from your direct testimony. 22 never contended, you, sir, never contended to anyone 23 A little unclear on this. Were you saying 23 outside of San Diego that Met had not complied with the 24 there was no opportunity at the time of that vote for 24 exchange agreement; true? 2.5 San Diego to make any objection to the rate structure, 25 A. Prior to when? 1034 1036 1 1 that the only thing being voted on were the increases; Q. Prior to San Diego filing this lawsuit, you 2 2 is that your testimony, sir? personally had never contended to anyone outside of San 3 3 A. No. Diego that Met had not complied with the exchange 4 4 Q. Because you know that those rate packages go to agreement? 5 5 the board with a full cost of service study and backup; A. No. I don't believe I --6 6 correct? Q. My statement is correct? I don't want to get 7 7 A. It goes with a cost of study service. caught in a double-negative. 8 8 A. I am just trying to pay attention to your Q. Including these very costs that San Diego is 9 9 challenging here? question. 10 1.0 Q. I appreciate that. A. Yes. 11 11 O. Those are laid out and submitted to the board? It is true to say that prior to filing this 12 12 lawsuit you never contended to anyone outside of San 13 13 O. And the board resolutions, the resolutions that Diego that Met had not complied with the exchange 14 14 the board actually adopts aren't limited to rate agreement; correct? 15 15 increases. The board approves the rate structure for A. Correct. 16 16 the next year; isn't that true? Q. Before 2010 you never contended to anyone 17 A. I don't recall what the resolutions say 17 inside San Diego that Met had not complied with the 18 18 specifically. exchange agreement; correct? 19 19 Q. You wouldn't want to leave the impression that A. Correct. 20 20 everything voted on and approved there is a rate O. If we could take a look at Defense Exhibit 794. 21 21 increase because you just don't recall what the terms of This is not in evidence. It is a letter from 22 22 the resolution were; is that true? Miss Stapleton to Mr. Gastelum. 23 23 A. I don't recall what the terms of the resolution I hope I'm pronouncing it right. 2.4 24 MR. QUINN: I don't think there's an objection are. 25 to it, your Honor. Q. The allocations of costs which San Diego claims

1037

1 MR. PURCELL: We don't have an objection. I Q. BY MR. QUINN: Can you identify for me, sir, a 2 2 think this is in evidence or at least the same document single document, a single written communication going 3 3 is, but it can come in. from San Diego to Metropolitan after the rates are 4 4 THE COURT: 794 is admitted. unbundled effective January 1, 2003, prior to the filing 5 5 of this lawsuit, where San Diego informs Met that San (Exhibit 794 was received in evidence.) 6 6 Diego believes the rates are unlawful? Can you identify MR. QUINN: If we can put this on the screen. 7 Q. This is a letter from Maureen Stapleton to Ron a single document? 8 8 A. Is that right unlawful? Gastelum dated February 10, 2003; correct? 9 9 O. Yes. A. Yes. 10 10 A. Not offhand, no. Q. And they are, Miss Stapleton --11 11 Q. Have you looked to see if there were any such Will you remind us who Miss Stapleton is and 12 documents? 12 Mr. Gastelum was? 13 13 A. No. A. Miss Stapleton was the general manager of the 14 O. You know it's an issue in this case that Met 14 San Diego Water Authority. And Mr. Gastelum was the 15 had asserted an affirmative defense of mistake. There 15 general manager or the president and CEO of the 16 was a mistake between the parties, either mutual or 16 Metropolitan Water District at the time. 17 17 unilateral, as to the legality of the rate. Are you Q. Metropolitan's rate structure was unbundled, I 18 aware of that? 18 think you've told us, effective as of January 1, 2003? 19 19 A. Yes. Correct? 20 Q. Would it be important to find out, knowing 20 A. Yes. 21 that, wouldn't it be important to find out whether San 21 Q. This letter was written shortly thereafter in 22 Diego had given Met notice prior to the unbundling of 22 February 2003? 23 the rates, prior to the filing of this lawsuit, that San 23 A. Yes. 24 Diego thought the rates were illegal? 24 Q. In this letter Miss Stapleton conveys a number 2.5 Wouldn't you want to find out if there was such 25 of concerns that San Diego has about proposed rates and 1038 1040 1 1 a written document? charges; do you see that? 2 2 A. The words the Water Authority used over the A. Yes. 3 3 Q. And you actually -- I don't want to go through time to communicate our concerns to Metropolitan, I 4 4 this in detail now because I actually read the trial don't recall ever using the word "illegal" in written 5 5 transcript of Phase 1, and you were asked about this in communications. 6 6 your testimony during Phase 1; correct? It was more improper allocation of State Water 7 7 A. Yes. Project supply costs to the wheeling rate. Improper 8 8 Q. Do you recall the questions about the only allocation or misallocation of the water stewardship 9 rate to the wheeling rate. I don't recall that it said 9 thing in here about the -- was that the water 10 1.0 stewardship rate or the system power rate is positive; the illegal misallocation or the unlawful misallocation 11 11 do you recall that? of those costs to the wheeling rate. 12 12 I simply don't recall that being communicated A. I recall what the letter says under item one. 13 13 Q. That the only thing said in this letter about in the fashion you've asked. 14 14 the system power rate is that it is positive. It says Q. Do you recall it ever being communicated orally 15 15 the system power rate provides an excellent system of prior to filing of the lawsuit where San Diego says 16 16 these rates are illegal after unbundling and before the rate component transparency; do you see that? 17 17 A. Yes. filing of this lawsuit? 18 18 Q. There is nothing in here about these rates A. That's just not the way we communicated our 19 19 concerns. That is less businesslike than the Water being illegal, is there? 20 MR. PURCELL: Objection. This is asked and 20 Authority communicates its concerns. I think we said 21 21 answered from Phase 1. they were improper, orally. I was not a lead 22 THE COURT: Overruled. 22 negotiator. 2.3 23 Go ahead. I am not in a position to say what was 24 24 THE WITNESS: No, there's not, not in this communicated by our negotiators.

Pages 1038 to 1041

1041

Q. There is a difference between saying something

1039

25

letter.

is improper and something is illegal?

A. Sure.

- Q. Especially when we're talking about --
- A. It can be.
- Q. -- a defense of mistake of law and whether or not San Diego put Met on notice that the rates were illegal. There's a difference; right?

MR. PURCELL: Objection, your Honor. He is asking the witness to draw a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: I will not take this as a legal discussion. This is going to the validity of this witness to recall some specific sort of conclusions, specific writing, and actually back about four questions to whether or not he has looked for certain documents. I will allow it in this context.

You agree there is some distinction between those two terms?

THE WITNESS: Between doing something improper and something that's illegal? Yes. There may not be. They may be both improper and illegal.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: In terms of whether San Diego put Met on notice that San Diego believed the rates were illegal, that's an important distinction in that context; would you agree with that?

A. Put Met on notice. Can you --

A. Yes.

- Q. It doesn't say that, does it?
- A. It says it could be according to applicable -- pursuant to applicable law and regulation.
- Q. It said it would be set by Metropolitan's board pursuant to applicable law and regulation. That is different than saying the rates shall be lawful? Would you agree there is a distinction between those two?
  - A. Not in my mind.
  - Q. To you, those mean the same?
- A. Yes.
- Q. It goes on to say, "And generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Is there any instance that you're aware of where a similarly situated party to San Diego has been discriminated against or treated differently in terms of the conveyance that Met charged?
- A. Metropolitan has developed other transactions and other agreements to convey water through its facilities that are different than that.
- Q. My question is, are you aware of any party that is similarly situated to San Diego where Met has charged

Q. Told Met that San Diego believed the rates were illegal?

THE COURT: I will sustain my own objection to that question as argumentative.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: You testified in response to counsel's questions about the language in the exchange agreement, which is in evidence as Exhibit 65 -- if we can put up on the screen page 16 -- the price term counsel called your attention to, language at 4.2 at the bottom of page 16.

#### A. It's in the binder.

O. It's in the other binder, their binder.

MR. PURCELL: Mr. Cushman, it is PTX 51 in the other binder, in the Metropolitan binder.

MR. QUINN: It is up on the screen.

Q. Do you see the price term, and counsel called your attention to that second sentence, "Thereafter the price shall be equal to the charge or charges set by Metropolitan's board of directors pursuant to applicable law and regulation." And then it goes on.

Do you recall counsel asking you what your understanding of that phrase was?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And your answer was -- and I jotted this down -- that the rates would be lawful; right?

for transportation differently than the way San Diego has been charged?

A. Yes.

Q. Tell us which ones you are thinking of.

A. Metropolitan developed an agreement with Los
Angeles Department of Water and Power to allow LADWP to
use a Metropolitan pipeline -- I believe it's called the
north feeder or the west valley feeder -- to convey
LADWP water through that facility to LADWP customers'
turnouts through a capacity lease agreement between
LADWP and Metropolitan.

That is transporting third-party water, in this case LADWP water, through a Metropolitan facility in a manner that's quite different than this and under financial terms that are quite different from this.

- Q. You say a manner that is quite different. Is that situation on all fours with the situation San Diego has under the exchange agreement?
- A. I don't know the meaning of the phrase "all fours."
- Q. Are you saying that Los Angeles, the city of Los Angeles, is in the same situation as San Diego is under the exchange agreement?
- A. L.A. wanted to move independent water through a Metropolitan facility from one point to another point.

## In that case it is very similar to this, this arrangement.

Q. Has San Diego ever asserted that that was a breach of this provision of the exchange agreement? In other words, this wasn't something that San Diego was being discriminated here? This particular term in the exchange agreement was violated and breached by that transaction?

## A. I believe that agreement predated this agreement.

Q. Right. So let's talk then about agreements, transactions after the exchange agreement was entered into

Are you aware of any party that was in the same situation as San Diego who has been treated, say, worse off than San Diego has been under the exchange agreement?

#### A. No.

2.5

1.0

2.1

2.4

Q. And then to go back to that first phrase about, you know, that the charge or charges set pursuant to applicable law and regulations, does San Diego contend that the process, the process by which Met adopted its rates, that it charges San Diego under the exchange agreement was illegal or legally improper in any way?

#### A. You mean like the public notice provisions, the

designated person most knowledgeable, you don't know whether San Diego would necessarily be better off under some of those alternative rate structures that Metropolitan could lawfully adopt; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. There might be other lawful rate structures, as far as you know, that Met could adopt for conveying water where San Diego would be worse off; correct?

#### A. Possibly.

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. QUINN: I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: Possibly.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: You just don't know?

#### A. We don't know.

Q. One thing you do know is that if you move costs from transportation and put them all onto supply, the costs of supply, water supply, will go up. You know that; right?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And you know that if all these costs, the State Water Project costs and the water stewardship costs, are all moved over to supply, San Diego is going to pay more for water, supply of water; correct?

#### A. In its purchase of water from Metropolitan,

#### public hearing?

Q. Anything about the process by which the rates were adopted, has San Diego ever contended that there was something unlawful or wrong about the process?

# A. Not the administrative process of rate making, no.

THE CLERK: That last exhibit, was it 51 or 65? MR. QUINN: Sixty-five.

Q. You were designated by San Diego as the person most knowledgeable to testify on various subjects, and your deposition was taken on those subjects; do you recall that?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Among those subjects was breach of contract and damages; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. As the person designated by San Diego as the person most knowledgeable to testify on those subjects, you agree that Met can adopt a variety of different rate structures that are lawful?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Including a variety of different rate structures for conveying water that are lawful?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And you don't know -- I mean as San Diego's

#### assuming no other changes, yes.

Q. And did you have any conversations with San Diego's expert Mr. Denham about his expert work that he did in this case?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Did you have any conversations with him about whether he should run some numbers about what the increase in San Diego's supply costs would be?

#### A. Under that scenario, yes.

Q. And what did you tell him on that subject?

A. I said take the water supply — the State Water Project supply costs and the water stewardship costs that you removed from the transportation rate, now assign them over to the supply rate, and run what we would have paid in the supply costs to Metropolitan from the supplies we purchased from Metropolitan.

Q. Did he do that?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you have any understanding about why he didn't include that information in his expert report?

A. No.

Q. Did you instruct him not to include that information in his expert report?

A. No.

Q. Do you know whether anyone instructed him not

to include that information in his expert report?

#### A. No.

2.2

1.0

2.4

Q. To calculate an overcharge, you have to start with the amount that was actually charged, would you agree with that?

#### A. Can you repeat the question?

Q. To figure out what San Diego was overcharged, what its damages are, you have to begin with an understanding of what San Diego was actually charged; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And you have to calculate what San Diego should have been charged; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And the difference between those two would be San Diego's damages; correct?

# A. The removal of the improper charges from what we were charged would be the damages.

Q. Well, the difference between what you were charged and what you should have been charged, that's the damages; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. So you've already said, you've already told us that there may be several different lawful rate structures that Met could adopt. You just told us that

#### A. Correct.

Q. All right. And so until someone actually comes up and presents what those alternative lawful conveyance rate structures are, we're not in a position to measure what San Diego's damages are; right?

#### A. No, I don't agree with that.

Q. Because you're telling us now that the only lawful structure, your testimony now is the only lawful structure that Met could adopt is what it charged minus the State Water Project charges and the water stewardship rate charges; is that what you're telling us?

A. No. What I'm telling you is that damages in this case is what Met charged us for the transportation and what Met should have charged us for the transportation. Those are two different figures. And the difference between those two figures is our estimate of the damages in this case.

As to the question of could Met adopt all other transportation rates that could be lawful, the answer to that question is, yes, they could. Those are two different questions, in my mind.

Q. All right. So you're not a lawyer, I don't think.

A. No, I'm not.

1050 1052

#### A. Yes.

Q. You just don't know what they are; correct?

#### A. Correct.

a few moments ago; right?

Q. And until you know, until you know what those other lawful conveyance rate structures are that Met could adopt, you can't calculate San Diego's damages; correct?

#### A. No, I don't think so.

Q. You can't do it?

# A. If you removed the illegal charges off the charges they charged us, that's the damages.

Q. Are you now telling us that there are no other lawful conveyance rate structures that Met could adopt? Are you changing your testimony?

#### A. No, I'm not.

Q. Because you told us before, and correct me if I'm wrong, that you believe there are such other lawful conveyance rate structures Met could adopt; you just don't know what they are?

#### A. Correct.

Q. If you don't know that, you cannot calculate the difference between what San Diego was charged and what it could be charged on some of these other lawful rate structures which you don't know about; right?

Q. So you wouldn't know under California law what the measure of damages are for a breach of contract claim?

#### A. No.

Q. And as San Diego's person most knowledgeable, and you understand because the Court invalidated Met's rates, Met will have to go back and adopt lawful rates, some other lawful rate structure, you understand that; right?

#### A. That's our expectation.

Q. And how Met goes back and adopts lawful rates and what rates it adopts is something at this point which is unknown; correct?

#### A. Because it's in the future, yes.

Q. And also because Met had several different alternatives; correct?

#### A. I'm not aware of any other alternatives.

Q. You said earlier there are alternative rate structures that Met could adopt; do you recall that testimony?

#### A. Yes, that Met could adopt.

Q. So how San Diego's damages would be affected by the Court's ruling in Phase 1 in validating rates is unknown until Met goes back and adopts lawful rates; correct?

```
MR. PURCELL: Objection. This again calls for
                                                                                 MR. KEKER: Correct.
 2
                                                                      2
       a legal conclusion.
                                                                                 MR. QUINN: The issue -- our understanding --
 3
                                                                      3
             THE COURT: Sustained. Why don't we stop here
                                                                            nobody can remember on our side whether we are required
 4
                                                                      4
       and get together again at 1:30. I will see you at 1:30
                                                                            to give an order in Phase 1. It was 24 hours' notice.
 5
                                                                      5
       sharp.
                                                                                 My issue with this, your Honor, at this point,
 6
                                                                      6
             (Noon recess.)
                                                                            it is completely asymmetrical. They have three
                                                                      7
                                                                            witnesses.
 8
                                                                      8
                                                                                  THE COURT: Can you give them a list in order
 9
                                                                      9
                                                                            today?
10
                                                                     10
                                                                                 MR. QUINN: That seems unfair to me if that
11
                                                                     11
                                                                            wasn't the case in Phase 1, and that's something we
12
                                                                     12
                                                                            ought to be able to determine. Because our folks say
13
                                                                     13
                                                                            they don't remember that, and Mr. Keker remembers it.
14
                                                                     14
                                                                            Surely, it can be determined.
15
                                                                     15
                                                                                 If neither side was required to give an order
16
                                                                     16
                                                                            in Phase 1, why at this point, if it is so asymmetrical,
17
                                                                     17
                                                                            would we change the rule?
18
                                                                     18
                                                                                 THE COURT: Because it is helpful to plan. You
19
                                                                     19
                                                                            are able to plan. We know what his order is and he
20
                                                                     20
                                                                            should know what your order is. So we have 24 hours'
21
                                                                     21
                                                                            notice and exchange lists in order.
2.2
                                                                     22
                                                                                 Let's proceed with the questions.
23
                                                                     23
                                                                                 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, just one other caveat.
24
                                                                     24
                                                                            The witness exclusion order includes them not reading
2.5
                                                                     25
                                                                            the transcript, I assume?
                                                         1054
                                                                                                                              1056
 1
                                                                      1
                  San Francisco, California
                                                                                 THE COURT: Of course. Although, I say "of
                                                                      2
 2
                    March 30, 2015
                                                                            course." I have heard of a case in which it was not "of
                                                                      3
 3
                      1:30 p.m.
                                                                            course," and the attorneys provided the transcripts,
                                                                      4
 4
                                                                            despite a witness exclusion order to the subsequently
 5
                                                                      5
                     DENNIS CUSHMAN,
                                                                            appearing witnesses. And the judge wasn't -- it wasn't
                                                                      6
                                                                            me, but the judge was shocked. I'm sure we won't have
 6
       resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
                                                                      7
 7
                                                                            that here. It includes reading transcripts.
                                                                      8
 8
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
                                                                                 Let's go ahead.
                                                                      9
 9
             MR. KEKER: Before Mr. Quinn proceeds, could I
                                                                     10
1.0
       ask the Court to revisit -- you said after lunch we will
                                                                                     CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)
                                                                     11
11
       talk about this witness order issue.
                                                                            BY MR. QUINN:
                                                                     12
12
                                                                              O. Good afternoon, Mr. Cushman.
             THE COURT: Yes, okay.
                                                                     13
13
             MR. KEKER: And can we get it -- we would like
                                                                              A. Good afternoon.
14
                                                                     14
                                                                              Q. You told us about the first occasion when Met
       an order that they give us forthwith a good-faith
                                                                     15
15
       witness order. And we would remind the Court that in
                                                                            reached the exchange agreement in 2008 when they adopted
16
                                                                     16
       Phase 1, over the Metropolitan's objection, we used 48
                                                                            the rates for 2009.
17
                                                                     17
                                                                                 Do you recall that?
       hours' notice. We would ask you to order that.
                                                                     18
18
             I beg your pardon. I misspoke. There was an
                                                                              A. Yes.
                                                                     19
19
       order 48 hours --
                                                                              Q. Isn't it the case that, when those rates were
20
                                                                     20
             A VOICE: Twenty-four hours.
                                                                            adopted, the party who actually made the motion at Met,
                                                                     21
2.1
             THE COURT: Let's go off the record for a
                                                                            who approved those rates that you tell us was a breach
                                                                     22
22
                                                                            of contract, was San Diego?
       moment. Let's find out.
                                                                     2.3
23
             (Discussion held off the record.)
                                                                              A. I don't recall.
2.4
                                                                     24
             THE COURT: Back on the record. The first
                                                                              O. Is there an individual named James Bond -- not
                                                                     25
25
                                                                            the Ian Fleming individual -- but is there a person
       question --
                                                         1055
                                                                                                                              1057
```

2.3

affiliated with San Diego named James Bond?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Is he a San Diego delegate on the Met board, or has he been?

#### A. He has been in the past.

Q. If we can look at Defense Exhibit 71, page 9, in evidence, and down there at the bottom you will see the motion there.

"Chairman Bond moved that the water rates effective for January 1, shown in the table," et cetera, "would be approved."

Does this refresh your recollection it was actually a San Diego delegate that moved the adoption of those rates which you contend was the first breach of contract?

A. Yes, it does. And as a matter of process of Metropolitan, when committee action items come to the board of directors at Metropolitan, each committee chair reports out the recommended action from the committees. And that's what that reflects.

Q. In this case that was a San Diego delegate?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, during the years 2002 to 2009, was it your understanding that San Diego's delegates to the Metropolitan board had a fiduciary duty to the board?

to not disclose the fact that they thought adopting rates would be a breach of contract?

### A. I don't know what those directors thought at that time.

Q. So you don't know whether the San Diego directors at that time in 2008 thought it would be a breach of contract to adopt those rates; is that true?

#### A. I don't know.

Q. Do you think that, in your understanding of that fiduciary duty, do you believe that San Diego's members had a duty to advise the board if they thought that the rates that the board was voting on were illegal?

#### A. When?

Q. At the time they were voting, do you believe that if San Diego's delegates on the Met board had a belief that the rates were illegal, do you believe that consistent with their fiduciary duties they have an obligation to advise the board they thought the rates being voted on were illegal?

## A. I don't know what the directors thought at that time.

Q. So you don't know whether or not they thought those rates were illegal at the time?

A. I don't.

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Overruled. Not yet.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe they have a duty to -- to Metropolitan.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Did you have an understanding that San Diego's delegates, as part of that fiduciary duty, would have a duty to advise the board that adopting those rates in 2008 for 2009 would be a breach of contract?

#### A. I really don't know.

Q. You don't know one way or another?

#### A. No.

Q. Was it -- would it be consistent with your understanding, and the fiduciary duty which you understood that San Diego delegates to the Met board had, that they could vote for rates and secretly maintain that adopting those rates would be a breach of contract by Met?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Argumentative. THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do you think it would be consistent with your understanding of the fiduciary duties that San Diego's delegates to the Met board had

Q. Do you believe it would be consistent with the fiduciary duties that the San Diego delegates had in your understanding that they could vote for rates secretly believing they were illegal and not disclose that fact?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Argumentative. THE COURT: Sustained. Also on relevancy grounds, his understanding of what would or would not constitute a violation of fiduciary duty probably isn't relevant.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Well, did you attend these meetings yourself, sir, when these rates were voted on, say, in 2008 for 2009?

# A. I don't recall whether I was there at that time. I attend a lot of meetings at Metropolitan, but I don't keep records about every meeting I attend.

Q. Do you recall in any of the meetings you attended at the time of voting on rates that any of the San Diego delegates ever said that the rates, if adopted, would be a breach of contract or would be illegal?

#### A. I don't recall that.

Q. Now, this morning you told us that you had instructed Mr. Denham to determine how much San Diego's water supply costs would go up if these costs we have

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

been discussing were moved from transportation to supply. Do you recall that?

#### A. Yes.

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

Q. Tell me if I'm right about this. The reason you asked him to do that was because you couldn't give a complete picture about what San Diego's damages were unless you took that into account.

#### A. No, not exactly.

We had maintained for many, many years that the costs that we're contesting in this litigation belonged on the supply rate. And I asked for a calculation of what that would look like if they moved those costs from transportation to the supply rate.

- Q. And would it be true to say that part of the reason you asked him to do that was that you thought in order to give a fair -- in order to have a fair understanding of what the impact on San Diego would be, you needed to know how much San Diego's supply costs would go up?
- A. I asked them to look retrospectively at Metropolitan's rates to calculate what if Met had adopted -- had rates that moved those costs from the transportation rates onto the supply rate, what that would have looked like.
  - Q. And why did you want to know that?

Q. Actually, that was a spectacularly good deal for San Diego, wasn't it?

- A. Yes. We received 80,000 acre feet of water a vear for 110 years, I believe.
- Q. San Diego had long wanted its own independent source of water supply, isn't that true?
- A. We wanted a reliable supply of water. We could get reliable supply of water from the single supplier, but we didn't. And we were pursuing diversifying our sources of water, including diversifying our sources of imported water supply.

And the water transfer yield with Imperial Irrigation District accomplished that. It was higher priority water on the Colorado River than Metropolitan's priority on the Colorado River. We accomplished that by accepting the responsibility for the canal lining projects, which is also higher reliable supply, the Colorado River water and the Metropolitan supply of Colorado River water, so it accomplished it.

Q. Are you done?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it true that San Diego had long sought its own independent supply of water?

A. Yes.

Q. And as part of this deal, San Diego received

1062

1064

#### A. Because that's what we have been maintaining for many years, that those belonged on the supply rate.

- Q. Why did you -- why did you want to know how much the supply rate would go up?
- A. To understand what the impact would be if Met adopted those supply rates for all of his member agencies, how much would we pay for the supply rate versus how much less we would pay for the transportation
- Q. You needed that to get the complete economic impact of moving these costs from transportation to supply?
  - A. A calculation of those particular years, yes.
- Q. Do you recall how much historically that determination showed that San Diego's supply costs went
- A. I don't recall precisely. I think it was on the magnitude of 15 percent, something along those
- Q. This morning on your direct exam I think I heard you say that San Diego, as part of the exchange agreement and some related agreements, that San Diego assumed responsibility for canal lining.

Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

hundreds of millions of dollars?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. San Diego received hundreds of millions of dollars to accomplish the lining of the canal?

A. Yes, from the State of California.

Q. As part of this deal, San Diego got the canal lining water, the water saved, as a result of that for, what, 110 years?

A. Correct.

Q. I think you said on direct that just this year alone it's estimated to be about 80,000 acre-feet of water per year?

A. Yes.

Q. When you say that you assumed that San Diego assumed responsibility for lining the canal, that wasn't just a favor that San Diego was doing for Met. San Diego got some very substantial benefits as a part of doing this deal; correct?

#### A. Yes. Many parties I should say got a lot of benefits.

Q. The exchange agreement, the agreement pursuant to which the canal lining water was done, this transfer we're just talking about were all done as part of the same deal essentially?

A. In what we broadly refer to as the Colorado

1065

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

- River Quantification Settlement Agreement in 2003, 2 there's a specific agreement that's called the 3 "Quantification Settlement Agreement," but more broadly, 4 in lay terms, it really refers to a collection of many 5 agreements.
  - Q. And there was the exchange agreement, that was one of them; right?
    - A. Yes.

6

7

8

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

- 9 Q. Another one was the quantification settlement 10 agreement?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Another one was something called an allocation agreement?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. And all these were part of the same transaction, essentially?
  - A. Well -- they were signed -- each of the agreements is distinct and different because they include different parties. For example, the Water Authority's transfer agreement with the Imperial Irrigation District is a two-party agreement. The exchange agreement between the Water Authority and Metropolitan is a two-party agreement. The quantification settlement agreement was a different agreement that had Metropolitan IID, Coachella and I

- Q. You already had in place an exchange agreement from a few years before; right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And the price in that was considerably lower than the \$253; right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And why did San Diego then agree to pay substantially more in a new exchange agreement in 2003?
- A. Because we accomplished those other -- in all of those objectives in the new exchange agreement. That included trading 15 years of complete uncertainty as to what the wheeling rate would be in years 36 through 45 in return for five years of paying whatever rate Metropolitan asked without being able to challenge it in the legislature or challenge it in court, but had that bound risk around 150,000 acre-feet of water rather than three million acre-feet of water.
- Q. Among the things you were able to accomplish at the time you entered into the exchange agreement was also to do this allocation agreement where you got the canal lining water and the couple hundred million dollars to line the canal?
- A. I want to be clear. Nobody wrote the Water Authority a check for \$235 million at the time. We got the allocation agreement and got the canal lining and

1066

1068

think the Federal Government. Those were individual

Q. Individual agreements but, for example, in the exchange agreement, that price, the \$253 price that San Diego agreed to initially, San Diego only agreed to that because they knew they were getting the canal lining water and a couple million dollars to line the canal; right?

A. I wouldn't characterize it as that. Water Authority accomplished a lot of objectives in the exchange agreement beyond the transportation of the canal lining water which is in the agreement. The Water Authority covered -- reduced its risk exposure to the transportation of the out years of the water transfer, those last 15 years which were not covered under price provision in the 1998 exchange agreement. That was three million acre-feet of water that we had no price on. That would be a risk exposure for the Water Authority in those out years.

We were able to bracket our risk exposure in the exchange agreement to those first five years in agreeing to the starting price of the \$253, and then all the rates thereafter.

So we accomplished actually quite a bit in the exchange agreement.

with that came considerable risk in carrying out the project, risks that many people at the time understood would face whichever party constructed the All-American Canal.

Those risks including risks of getting the legislature to appropriate any of that \$235 million to the Water Authority, to reimburse Water Authority for expenditures on the construction project, engineering risks of the project of building line canals of that size and magnitude. The All-American Canal itself is one of the largest canals in the world. There were engineering risks of building it through sand dunes, which were in the eastern-most region of that canal lining project.

There were environmental risks on the environmental mitigation and the environmental approvals for the project. There were litigation risks. There were a great deal of risks in accepting that project.

- Q. As I understood your testimony, you thought it was a spectacularly good deal for San Diego?
- A. As you look back and you look at the success we had in the project and then we secured the 80,000 acre-feet of water per year for 110 years by contract with the United States Secretary of the Interior, yes, it was a good deal for the Water Authority.

1.5

2.2

2.5

2.3

Q. Let me ask you some questions about the rate integrity provision that you were -- contracts that you were asked about on direct exam. There was a period of time when San Diego was declining to sign agreements that had this rate integrity provision in it. Isn't that true?

#### A. Yes.

2.2

2.5

2.3

Q. And then there came a point where San Diego decided to sign the rate provision contracts that had the rate integrity provision in them; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. At that time, the Water Authority decided it did not intend to litigate MWD's current rate structure;

#### A. At what time?

O. Well, isn't it true --

Let me ask this question. In 2007, okay, so we're six -- we're four years after the exchange agreement has been signed. In 2007, isn't it true that the Water Authority did not intend to litigate MWD's current rate structure?

#### A. That's correct. In 2007, it did not.

MR. QUINN: Let's take a look at Defense Exhibit 355. Is this in evidence?

It's in evidence.

A. Yes.

Q. 2011?

A. Yes.

Q. So the structure itself had not changed. In each -- each of those periods is still included the State Water Project costs, as well as the water stewardship rate; correct?

#### A. Can you repeat the question?

Q. Okay. This rate structure that existed in 2007, San Diego said it didn't intend to litigate. That structure in all those years that I just mentioned included the State Water Project costs, as well as the water stewardship charges; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. For each of those years?

A. Each -- I'm sorry. Each of which years?

Q. All those years from 2003 to 2011.

A. Yes.

Q. In fact, to date --

A. Yes.

Q. -- the structure has been the same in that respect as it relates to the State Water Project and the water stewardship; correct?

A. Yes. And what this memo says is at that time

Q. This is a San Diego County Water Authority document dated April 18, 2007.

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes.

Q. If we could go to the second page of the document and blow up the last part of the -- there's a paragraph that begins "At the same time." Blow up the last sentence there.

It says, "The Water Authority does not intend to litigate MWD's current rate structure, but it cannot know what future actions the MWD board may take since the MWD rates are established annually and subject to change by the MWD's board of directors."

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes.

Q. It is true, isn't it, in terms of the structure, MWD rate structure, as it relates to these transportation charges, was the same in 2007 as it had been in 2003; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And the structure was the same in 2008?

A. Yes.

Q. 2009?

A. Yes.

Q. 2010?

the Water Authority does not intend to litigate the rates.

Q. Right. And this rate structure integrity clause, that is something that when -- for a while, I think you told us, San Diego was declining to sign those agreements, but then later decided it would sign them with those clauses in it; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And that is the bargain that San Diego agreed to; correct?

# A. San Diego at a point decided to sign those agreements and expressed and reserved its objections to the legality of the rate structure integrity provision.

Q. Sir, that is the agreement, the bargain that San Diego agreed to; correct?

## A. We signed those agreements with that structure integrity provision in it.

Q. It would be possible to write a clause that says you can bring a challenge to our rates, and if you win, then the rate structure integrity bar does not apply. You could write it that way; would you agree with that?

#### A. Anyone could write it that way, yes.

Q. But that's not the deal that these parties entered into, is it?

2.5

- A. No. Metropolitan's language, which was nonnegotiable, said that the mere filing of a challenge would trigger reunification of the rate structure integrity provision.
- Q. Was there any discussion -- did San Diego ask let's change this provision so that says if we bring a rate challenge and we prevail, then we will not be barred from participating in these programs? Did San Diego ask for that?
- A. There was tremendous discussion around the rate structure integrity provision at Metropolitan leading up to that final language. It was hotly controversial.
  - Q. I'm not a clock.

My question is, did San Diego ask for that term? Did San Diego say, no, let's change this so that it says if we challenge and we win, we find your rates are invalid, then we're not subject to this bar? Did San Diego ask for that?

A. We expressed our objections throughout the process leading up to the objection -- leading up to the adoption of that language to our objection to the entire concept of a rate structure integrity provision, some provision that would punish an agency for exercising its lawful rights to challenge Metropolitan's rates and whether they were lawful or not.

Q. Let me get the distinction you are making between buying Metropolitan water and transporting water, and let's make that clear.

Let's start first with buying Metropolitan water.

San Diego also buys water from Metropolitan, does it not?

- A. Yes.
- Q. When it does, it pays the full service rate?
- A. Yes.
- Q. That full service rate consists -- includes a system access rate, a system power rate, and a water stewardship rate; correct?
  - A. Yes. And it includes a water supply rate.
- Q. Right. These are the same rates -- those are the same rates that San Diego pays for conveyance under the exchange agreement; correct?
  - A. The three rates that comprise the transportation rate, yes.
  - Q. Now, let me show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 357. MR. QUINN: I am told it is in evidence. I'm sorry. Exhibit 1130. That is not in evidence.
    - Q. Do you have that before you, sir?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. Can you identify that?

#### We were very clear on that --

THE COURT: The question is whether you asked for some specific language that counsel has asked about. Did you ask for that language?

THE WITNESS: I don't believe we asked for that language, no.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Let's turn to preferential rights. I believe in discovery, in your deposition, you were designated as the person most knowledgeable concerning the preferential rights issue?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And as I understand it, San Diego maintains that the payments it makes under the exchange agreement should be counted towards its preferential rights; is that correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And as I believe you have said, that San Diego wants those payments to count towards preferential rights because, according to you, we are not buying water from Metropolitan. We're paying the Imperial Irrigation District for the water supply and getting the other Colorado River supplies through the lining of the All-American, Coachella Canals through the allocation agreement; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

A. It's a Metropolitan invoice to the Water Authority, a monthly invoice.

MR. QUINN: I offer that into evidence.

MR. PURCELL: No objection.

THE COURT: 1130 is admitted.

(Exhibit 1130 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: If we could display that on the screen.

That has the breakdown for the full service rates. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. One of those components in the full service rates is transportation; right?

#### A. Where it says under "full service" --

Q. I'm sorry. At the top. It has those rates, the Tier 1 supply rate, system access rate, water stewardship rate, system power rate and treatment surcharge.

Those are all charges that go into that full service rate; correct?

# A. Yes. And to the extent on the treatment that we were purchasing treated water from Metropolitan.

- Q. When San Diego buys Met water, it pays for transportation?
  - A. It pays all four rates: The supply rate,

Pages 1074 to 1077

# system access rate, water stewardship rate and system power rate, and, if applicable, the treatment rate.

- Q. Those payments do not count towards preferential rights when you are purchasing full service water; correct?
  - A. Correct.

1.3

2.2

2.3

- Q. In fact, San Diego had claimed that they should count towards preferential rights at one point and filed a lawsuit about that; correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And San Diego did not prevail; it lost in that lawsuit? Correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And you understand that the rule is that when Met delivers Met water, the costs of conveyance, these particular -- including these particular components, do not count towards preferential rights; correct?
  - A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. When Met delivers Met water, the cost of these components that go into conveyance do not count towards preferential rights?
  - A. It does not include them, that's correct.
- Q. That is true for water from any source, including the Colorado River, if you are buying the water; correct?

- Q. The price, we looked at that this morning in Section 5.2, includes the price of conveyance like all the other Colorado River water that San Diego receives; correct?
- A. It includes three components of the upper rate, system access rate, system power rate and the --
  - Q. Water stewardship?
  - A. Thank you. Water stewardship rate.
- Q. Those components are the same whether you are buying water or exchanging water, san Diego is paying for those components; correct?
- A. The distinction is there are three rates we are paying for the transportation service, and there are four rates that we're paying for untreated Met water.
  - Q. What's the fourth one for untreated Met water?
- A. Supply rate.
- Q. Let's set that aside. Those other components, San Diego is paying for both of them whether you are buying water or exchanging water?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. For Colorado River water, the conveyance rate is the same for both the full service water and the exchange water, the conveyance rate being those three elements?
  - A. Yes.

1078 1080

- A. Buying Met water, yes.
- Q. When Met delivers Colorado River water to San Diego, the water originates at Lake Havasu?
- A. That's where Metropolitan takes delivery of Colorado River water.
- Q. It is conveyed down the Colorado River Aqueduct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And the San Diego payments include the cost of conveying the water down that aqueduct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And payments for conveyance down the aqueduct don't count towards preferential rights either; correct?
- A. When we're buying Metropolitan water, they do not.
- Q. Let's talk now -- we're talking about buying water

Now let's turn to the exchange water. The exchange water comes out of Lake Havasu, just like all the other Colorado River water that San Diego receives; correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And San Diego must pay for the exchange water pursuant to the exchange agreement?
  - A. Yes.

Q. But as I understand it, you are saying that even though the conveyance is exactly the same for the exchange water and the full service water, the Court should treat those payments differently for preferential rights purposes; is that true?

A. Yes.

- Q. Every member agency that buys full service water is paying the same conveyance charge for the same conveyance as San Diego pays for its exchange water, isn't that true?
- A. They are paying those three same rates as three of the components they are paying in the Met water.
- Q. None of the member agencies who pay the conveyance charge for full service water get credit for preferential rights, do they?
  - A. No, not the way Met calculates it.
- Q. You are saying even though the conveyance charges for full service and conveyance water are composed of the same elements, San Diego should get greater preferential rights for exchange water than it and everyone else receives for full service water. That's what you're saying?
- A. Yes. There are two different and distinct services. One is for purchasing water from Metropolitan. And the second is requiring Metropolitan

# for transportation service to transport independently purchased water supply.

Q. But that transportation service, those charges, I think you told me a couple of times, they are the same under both columns, whether you are buying or you're exchanging; right?

#### A. Yes.

2.2

2.5

2.3

Q. The preferential rights, that means that each member agency is entitled to a certain percentage of Met water?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And the greater the percentage, the more Met water that agency is entitled to when there is a shortage of water?

#### A. A greater amount at any time.

Q. Is it your position from a preferential rights standpoint, wheeled water, water which -- or exchange water should be treated -- strike that.

Is it your position that, from a preferential rights standpoint, wheeled water should be treated the same as exchange water?

# A. Wheeled water -- I don't understand the question. I'm sorry.

Q. Well, if someone wheels water through the Met conveyance system, do they also get preferential rights

rights that you are maintaining that San Diego should get for exchange water?

## A. If that entity is a member agency of Metropolitan, yes, they should.

Q. Because San Diego is exchanging water, it contends that its payments are for conveyance -- San Diego maintains that its conveyance of -- because it's paying for conveyance, it gets to increase its preferential rights --

#### A. Yes.

Q. -- essentially?

Whenever San Diego's percentage -- and preferential rights is expressed as a percentage. Is that how it works?

# A. Metropolitan does a calculation once a year after it recalculates all the contributions made to Metropolitan, including changes in property tax assessments, and it produces a chart that shows not only percentages but total dollars paid into Metropolitan in the aggregate over all time.

Q. But if San Diego's percentage of claim on preferential rights expressed as a percentage goes up, then that of some other agency has to go down. Does that follow?

A. There would be a recalculation of all 26 of

because they wheeled water through the Met conveyance system?

# A. Well, only Metropolitan member agencies have preferential rights. There have been instances where Met has wheeled water for entities that aren't member agencies of Metropolitan, and they don't have preferential rights.

Q. Suppose one of the agencies, one of the member agencies, wheels water through the Met conveyance system. Do they also get preferential rights for doing that?

#### A. Not the way Metropolitan calculates that, no.

Q. Do you have any issue with that? Is it San Diego's position that someone who just simply wheels water through Met's conveyance system should get credit for preferential rights for that water that's wheeled?

A. We and that agency should be treated the same. And, yes, they should get credit to the preferential rights.

If they are transporting independently purchased water supply, they are not buying from Metropolitan.

Q. You are saying from a preferential rights standpoint, some agency that merely wheels through the conveyance system should get the same preferential

Metropolitan's member agencies' preferential rights.

Q. Isn't it true that every other member agency is helping to pay for the conveyance system through the full service rate?

#### A. Yes.

Q. But their preferential rights aren't changed based on the conveyance charges they pay?

#### A. Correct. Not as Metropolitan calculates it.

Q. But you claim San Diego's contention, that when San Diego is transporting non-Met water, then San Diego's preferential rights should go up?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Let's discuss whether the exchange agreement is, in fact, transportation. Do you believe that under the exchange agreement all San Diego gets is transportation? That's all it gets?

#### A. I'm not sure I understand what you're after.

Q. I mean, one of the things that San Diego clearly gets is this -- you have got the rights to this water up at Lake Havasu. You told us San Diego didn't have its own conveyance system. One of the things that San Diego gets under this is that water gets credit, get exchanged for water, then downward San Diego can use it.

#### A. I'm sorry.

Yes, correct.

1 Q. But san Diego gets some other benefits from 1 agreement; right? 2 2 that agreement. It's not just transportation. Isn't A. I think it's in there as a schedule, but I 3 3 that true? don't recall. 4 4 A. Possibly. I -- it's fundamentally a Q. The 2003 agreement, there is no index? 5 5 A. That's correct. transportation agreement. That's the key element for 6 6 San Diego. It contains a lot of different provisions in Q. There is nothing in the 2003 agreement other 7 7 it. What we went to Metropolitan for was transportation than the terms that we've looked at and the price term 8 8 that sort of says the agreement -- the price can only go service to move the water to San Diego. 9 9 up by a certain amount each year; there's nothing in Q. If all that was happening was water was being 10 10 there? transported, the molecules were being transported, then 11 11 you'd have a wheeling agreement; right? A. That is correct. 12 12 Q. Like there was in the earlier agreement? A. Not necessarily. 13 13 A. Correct. Q. That would be -- that is one description of a 14 Q. So between 1998 and 2003 San Diego agreed to 14 wheeling agreement? If you are just transporting the 15 15 pay a considerably higher price and agreed to a price same water from one place to another place, that would 16 term which wasn't indexed; correct? 16 be a wheeling agreement; right? 17 A. Yes. 17 A. It can be, certainly. But Metropolitan wanted 18 Q. I don't want to talk about all the differences 18 to characterize this as an exchange agreement. 19 19 between wheeling water and exchanging water, but I just O. It's true that, back in 1995, when San Diego 20 want to focus for a minute on the 2003 exchange 20 first acquired IID water, San Diego tried to reach an 21 agreement terms regarding quantity and timing of 21 agreement for wheeling with Met? Do you recall that? 22 delivery. Okay? 22 A. Yes. 23 A. Okay. 23 Q. And the 1995 transfer agreement between San 24 Q. In a pure wheeling transaction, no water is 24 Diego and IID was, in fact, contingent on a wheeling 2.5 delivered until the wheeler makes it available; correct? 25 agreement being put in place; correct? 1086 1088 1 1 A. I don't recall. I wasn't there at the time. A. The transaction begins when the entity that's 2 2 O. San Diego -- you know that San Diego and wheeling it starts taking delivery of the molecules. 3 3 Metropolitan never agreed to a wheeling agreement. In Q. Right. Takes delivery of the molecules and 4 4 1998, they agreed to an exchange agreement. Right? wheels them through a transport system? 5 5 A. That's what it's called, yes. A. Right. 6 6 Q. They amended and restated that exchange Q. And the amount of water delivered under a pure 7 7 agreement in 2003? wheeling agreement is the amount that the wheeler has 8 8 A. Yes. made available to be transported; right? 9 9 Q. At a much, much higher price? A. Presumably it would depend on whatever the 10 10 terms of the particular agreement said. For instance, A. At a higher price. 11 11 Q. Well, what was it in the 1998 agreement? Was there are transfers where you take carriage losses. And 12 12 it like a \$90 number? the amount that you received, the net amount at the end 13 13 A. Yes, \$90. of the transfer, is less than the amount that it started 14 14 Q. 2003 it was the \$253 number? with. So it might be a different quantity, and it would 15 15 A. That was the start pricing, yes. be a different quality in some respects. 16 16 Q. Under the earlier agreement, for the first 30 Q. Carriage loss might include evaporation or 17 17 years, the price could only go up by certain defined seeping into the ground, things like that? 18 18 amounts? A. Yes. And environmental losses necessary to 19 19 A. It had -- I can't remember -- there's a first support the environment. 20 20 duration where it started at 90, escalated by an index, Q. But setting those aside, in a pure wheeling 21 21 agreement, the amount of water that's delivered is the if you will. 22 22 amount that the wheeler has made available, subject to Q. Right. 23 2.3 any of these losses that you referred to? A. And then it reset and went up to 80, I think,

A. Well, they could have different terms. I -- I honestly don't understand the description of a pure  ${\bf P}$ 

1089

1087

24

25

24

25

and escalated at a different percentage index rate.

Q. There was a defined index in that earlier

#### wheeling agreement. I don't understand.

- Q. The idea is that someone who is a wheeler makes water available, and they want to have it transported, so they make it available at one end of the pipe and want to have it transported to the other end of the pipe.
- A. Each wheeling transaction is typically going to have an agreement that specifically the things that you mentioned: Losses --
  - Q. Right.

2.3

- A. -- water quality, timing, when the water can be moved, when the restrictions on -- other restrictions on conveyance might be in place and can't move, what would happen if it were interrupted. Those are typically detailed in agreements.
- Q. If San Diego were wheeling water, if San Diego had a deal with Met where they were just wheeling water from Lake Havasu to San Diego's pipes in San Diego County, nothing would move unless and until San Diego had water to wheel; correct?

#### A. Correct.

- Q. And that's not what happened under the exchange agreement, is it?
- A. We have an agreement where water is made available to Metropolitan under the terms of the

water is delivered until water is made available, actually, under the exchange agreement, the 2003 exchange agreement, one of the benefits that San Diego had is that Met is committed to deliver water in 12 equal amounts, without regard to what San Diego has made available, isn't that true?

#### A. Yes.

Q. So if the IID, for example, transferred no water to San Diego in a particular month, say April, Met would still have to deliver and it would simply be deemed that the exchange water was made available at Lake Havasu whether, in fact, a like quantity was made available by San Diego; correct?

#### A. I believe that's correct.

Q. And it may happen that the amount IID can deliver to San Diego, and accordingly the amount that San Diego could exchange with Met, is substantially less than San Diego agreed or projected; correct?

# A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Could you repeat it?

Q. In any given month San Diego may have no IID water to exchange.

#### A. That's possible.

Q. Nonetheless, under the exchange agreement, Met still has to deliver the quantity specified; true?

exchange agreement, and Metropolitan makes a like amount

and a like quality of that water available at the Water

Authority's service area. It doesn't happen instantaneously.

Q. And it's more than that, isn't it? The exchange agreement requires that Met deliver water in 12 equal monthly installments; right?

#### A. Correct.

- Q. And Met is required to deliver water in 12 equal monthly installments regardless of the amount, regardless of the amount that San Diego actually makes available. Isn't that true?
- A. It is reconciled with the amount of water San Diego makes available, but the agreement between the Water Authority and Metropolitan requires equal deliveries in 1/12th increments over the course of a calendar year.
- Q. When you say it is reconciled, that means after the fact there's a reconciliation that is done?
- A. Yes. The United States Bureau of Reclamation approves water orders before the calendar year and then reconciles what water was delivered or taken out after the conclusion of the calendar year. There is a before approved order and later on a reconciliation.
  - Q. Unlike a pure wheeling agreement, where no

A. Yes.

Q. And that would never happen under a pure wheeling contract where there's no water delivered until there's water made available at the other end of the pipe?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: In other wheeling transactions, no, that would not happen.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: If IID water is not made available, San Diego will still get its water just like it will get the water that it buys from them; right?

#### A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

Q. If IID water is not made available, San Diego, in the exchange agreement, will still get for any given month that 1/12th that Metropolitan has committed to deliver: correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Just like it would if it were buying water from Met, it gets that quantity of water?

# A. If we buy water from Met, and Met has it available, Met makes it available.

Q. So isn't it true, would you agree, sir, that San Diego, under the exchange agreement, is paying for

1 Q. If we could look at Defense Exhibit 256, which more than just transporting water? 2 2 A. No. I'm told is in evidence. It is a letter from Met to San 3 3 Q. If you were only transporting water that San Diego. This is a notice of default. 4 4 Diego owned, if that's all you were doing, you wouldn't Do you see that? 5 have a commitment that Met would deliver water to San 5 A. I do. 6 6 Diego even if San Diego didn't deliver it to be wheeled, Q. And this is an instance where San Diego didn't 7 7 would you? have the exchange water it was supposed to have. You 8 8 A. It depends on the terms of the agreement. But are familiar with this? 9 9 in many instances, no. A. Yes, I am. 10 10 Q. I mean, it is true that San Diego has wheeled Q. What happened here is that San Diego ended up 11 11 water? paying the full service rate; correct? 12 12 A. Yes. A. Yes. 13 13 Q. And let's look at how San Diego is billed for Q. Just like it had purchased the water without 14 14 water. Met charges each month, isn't that true, for all any trade-in or credit for exchange water; correct? 15 1.5 the water it delivers and gives a credit for the A. Yes. 16 exchanged water that San Diego makes available? 16 Q. So I mean, if you don't have water to exchange, 17 17 then you are purchasing; right? That's what happened A. Yes. 18 18 MR. QUINN: And here's an example. Let's take here? a look at Defense Exhibit 1130. It is an invoice. I 19 19 A. Yes. 20 20 understand this is in evidence. Q. And purchased water is excluded from 21 21 Any objection? preferential rights? 2.2 22 MR. PURCELL: No. I think we just looked at A. Right. On the way Met calculates it. 23 23 this. MR. QUINN: I have nothing further. 24 THE COURT: You did just look at it. 24 Thank you. 2.5 25 MR. QUINN: I am offering it. THE COURT: Redirect. 1094 1096 1 1 MR. PURCELL: I think it's in, but we don't REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 2 have any objection. BY MR. PURCELL: 3 3 THE COURT: 1130 is admitted. Q. PTX 65, if we can go to the price terms on 4 Q. BY MR. QUINN: So what happens -- this is an 4 pages 16 and 17. 5 example of a -- can you describe for us what this is, Mr. Cushman, specifically at the bottom of page 6 6 16, do you recall Mr. Quinn's questions about the sir? 7 7 A. That's one page of a monthly invoice from meaning of the term "charges set by the Metropolitan's 8 8 Metropolitan to the Water Authority. board of directors pursuant to applicable law and 9 9 regulation"? Q. And it sort of indicates on there, Met 10 1.0 indicates the amounts delivered and the charges for it; A. Yes. 11 11 Q. Did the Water Authority bargain only for right? 12 12 procedural protections relating to the procedure at A. Yes. 13 13 Q. And then a credit for exchange water? Metropolitan's board in this term? 14 14 A. No. 1.5 15 Q. So the exchange water in effect is like a Q. Would that have provided the Water Authority 16 16 trade-in. Met delivers water and charges the full with any legitimate, meaningful protection regarding 17 17 service rate, and then gives a credit for the water that unlawful rates? 18 18 San Diego trades in. Isn't that accurate? A. No. Metropolitan could go through the public 19 19 A. Yes. noticing process to set rates and adopt completely 20 Q. That's how it works? 20 unlawful rates. 21 2.1 A. That is how they treat it on the invoice, yes. Q. I would like to talk a little bit about the 22 22 board delegate votes on Metropolitan's yearly rate Q. And isn't it true that there was a time when, 23 23 in fact, San Diego didn't have the exchange water that increases. Does the Water Authority have an interest in 2.4 24 it was supposed to have? the amount of periodic Met rate increases? 25 25 A. Yes. A. Yes. 1095 1097

```
Q. Why is that?
                                                                            charged its State Water Project costs to its
2
                                                                      2
                                                                            transportation rates?
         A. Because the Metropolitan water rate is the
                                                                      3
3
      single largest input into what the Water Authority's
                                                                               A. No.
 4
                                                                      4
       rates are to its member agencies. So whatever rate
                                                                               Q. This is just for clarification. I apologize.
 5
                                                                      5
      increases Metropolitan adopts can have a profound impact
                                                                                  Do you recall when Mr. Quinn was asking you
                                                                      6
 6
      on the rates that the Water Authority subsequently
                                                                            about calculating the increase in supply costs to San
                                                                      7
       adopts and charges our 24 member agencies.
                                                                            Diego resulting from reallocation of the State Water
                                                                      8
 8
         Q. Does the Water Authority's interest in the
                                                                            Project?
                                                                      9
 9
      amount of periodic rate increases exist no matter what
                                                                               A. Yes.
10
                                                                     10
      rate structure is in effect?
                                                                               Q. I believe you said the increase would be about
11
                                                                     11
         A. Yes.
                                                                            15 percent?
                                                                     12
12
         Q. Was there any way for Water Authority board
                                                                               A. Yes.
13
                                                                     13
       delegates in 2008 or 2009 to cast votes, yeah or nay, on
                                                                               Q. And so the question is 15 percent of what?
                                                                     14
14
       the annual rate increases but oppose the rate structure?
                                                                            What would the increase apply to?
                                                                     15
15
         A. No.
                                                                               A. It would have increased in those years the
                                                                     16
16
         Q. Is there any alternative rate structure
                                                                            calculation was done on it. If Metropolitan had adopted
                                                                     17
17
      proposal on the table in 2008?
                                                                            those supply rates, the Water Authority's supply
                                                                     18
18
         A. No.
                                                                            purchase costs at Metropolitan would have gone up by
19
                                                                     19
         Q. And at the Metropolitan board in 2009, was
                                                                            about 15 percent.
                                                                     20
20
       there an alternative rate proposal structure on the
                                                                               Q. That would have been on purchases of Met water?
                                                                     21
21
      table?
22
                                                                     22
         A. No.
                                                                                  MR. PURCELL: Nothing further.
                                                                     23
23
         Q. In 2008 or 2009 at the Metropolitan board, were
                                                                                  THE COURT: Recross.
24
                                                                     24
      there any alternative allocations the State Water
25
       Project costs on the table?
                                                                     25
                                                                            //
                                                          1098
                                                                                                                               1100
 1
                                                                      1
                                                                                         RECROSS-EXAMINATION
          A. No.
 2
                                                                      2
          Q. During those board years at Met, was there any
                                                                             BY MR. OUINN:
                                                                      3
 3
       alternative allocation of water stewardship proposals on
                                                                               Q. Is it your testimony that a member of the Met
                                                                      4
 4
       the table?
                                                                             board cannot make a motion, propose a different rate or
 5
                                                                      5
          A. No.
                                                                             rate structure, that they can't do that?
                                                                      6
 6
          Q. Have you seen anything -- since Metropolitan
                                                                               A. No.
 7
                                                                      7
       adopted the alternative rate structure, have you seen
                                                                               Q. Is there anything in the exchange agreement
                                                                      8
 8
       anything in any Metropolitan document proposing an
                                                                             that required the San Diego delegates to vote in favor
                                                                      9
 9
       alternative rate structure?
                                                                             of the rate structures and rate increases we have been
                                                                     10
10
                                                                             talking about?
          A. No.
                                                                     11
11
          Q. In your instructions to Mr. Denham, is there
                                                                               A. No.
                                                                     12
12
       basis in anything Metropolitan has generated that would
                                                                                   MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation.
13
                                                                     13
       allow the Water Authority to calculate some alternative
                                                                                   THE COURT: Overruled.
14
                                                                     14
       damage amount based on some alternative rate structure?
                                                                                   THE WITNESS: No.
                                                                     15
15
          A. No.
                                                                               Q. BY MR. QUINN: Is it true that board members
16
                                                                     16
          Q. You were asked whether San Diego could have
                                                                             can put other options on the table, different rate
17
                                                                     17
       been charged even more under some alternative rate
                                                                             structures, and make proposals for consideration of the
18
                                                                     18
       structure. Do you recall that?
                                                                             board? Isn't that true?
19
                                                                     19
                                                                               A. Yes.
          A. Yes.
20
                                                                     20
                                                                               Q. I think you have been candid that you yourself
          Q. Are you aware of any rate structure proposal
21
                                                                     21
       consistent with cost causation principles that would
                                                                             don't put yourself out as a rate-making expert?
22
                                                                     22
       have charged San Diego more money?
                                                                               A. Correct.
                                                                     23
23
                                                                                   THE COURT: Off the record.
          A. No.
24
                                                                     24
          Q. Are you aware of any way, consistent with cost
                                                                                   (Discussion held off the record.)
```

THE COURT: Why don't we call our next witness.

1099

25

25

causation principles, that Metropolitan could have

1 We will go for about 15 minutes. 2 2 3 3 DAN DENHAM, 4 4 called as a witness by the Plaintiff, was sworn and 5 testified as follows: 5 6 6 7 7 MS. HADLOCK: The Water Authority calls Dan 8 8 Denham. 9 9 THE WITNESS: I do. public finance. 10 10 THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. 11 11 THE WITNESS: My name is Dan Denham. D-A-N 12 12 D-E-N-H-A-M. transportation rates? 13 1.3 14 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 15 BY MS. HADLOCK: 16 16 Q. Hello, Mr. Denham. Could you tell us how you 17 17 are currently employed? 18 18 A. I am currently the Colorado River program 19 19 director at the San Diego County Water Authority. Metropolitan is overcharging? 20 20 Q. You testified in this case before about a 21 21 year-and-a-half ago; correct? 2.2 22 Q. Because it's been a while, let's briefly A. Yes, I did. 23 23 Q. Has anything about your role at the Water 24 24 Authority changed since you were last testifying? 25 25 A. Back then I was the active director of the 1102 1 1 Colorado River program, and my role in the -- as the rates? 2 2 chief administrative officer of the QSA Joint Powers A. Absolutely. 3 3 Authority has slightly changed. I am now an alternate 4 4 commissioner, essentially being an outvoting member now. 5 5 Q. Can you tell us briefly what types of work you 6 6 have done at the time at the Water Authority that 7 7 involved finance analysis and modeling? 8 8 A. Yes. So my role as the director of the Colorado River program involves responsibility of all of 9 9 10 10 the economic aspects related to the QSA transfers and 11 11 canal lining projects. So this is roughly a quarter of 12 12 our current supply portfolio; potentially it will be a 13 13 third. 14 14 In addition to those responsibilities, I work 15 1.5 pretty closely with our finance department on the Water 16 16 A. That's correct. Authority's own rates and charges, rate modeling and 17 17 debt issuance. 18 18 Q. Do you also have, though, experience other than 19 19 for the Water Authority with financial analysis and 20 20 modeling? 21 21 A. Yes, I do. 22 22 Prior to the Water Authority I was the finance from the transportation rate. 23 23 rates and bonds manager for the City of San Diego 24 24 Metropolitan Wastewater Department.

City of San Diego, as well, I was the capital improvements program coordinator, essentially responsible for coordinating all capital projects within

- Q. And what's your educational background?
- A. I have a bachelor's degree in public administration, a minor in economics, and a master's degree in public administration with a concentration in
- Q. When you testified in December 2013, can you remind us the gist of that testimony about Met's
- A. Yes. I was able to conclude that the range you see on the screen of \$232 to \$315 per acre-foot were overcharged for transportation services.
- Q. You have also been asked to calculate San Diego's damages under the exchange agreement for the year 2011 to 2012. Based on what you have calculated,
- A. Yes, I have. I have calculated those damages as \$188,295,602 under the exchange agreement.
- summarize the analysis you already gave in December 2013. Can you remind us what process you used to determine corrected Metropolitan transportation

1104

So the Court recalls, as part of approving -or as part of Metropolitan's board's approved rates and charges, there is a cost of service study that supports those rates and charges. I was able to take a look at those documents, determine -- identify revenue requirements for the State Water Project and local water supply development, reallocate those revenue requirements for the system access, system power and water stewardship rate. Removed those components, those supply components out of the transportation rate, and recalculated the transportation rate based on the sales assumption contained in the cost of service report.

- Q. So you were working with Met's cost of service?
- Q. And the specific rates, just to be crystal clear, you removed State Water Project costs from which
- A. The system access rate and system power rate. And then I completely removed the water stewardship rate
- Q. I would refer the Court to Mr. Denham's more detailed analysis about that process, and just ask, Mr. Denham, was there anything about that analysis you

1105

1103

25

25

Prior to that, on a more microlevel, for the

conducted, would it be different if you gave the same testimony today?

#### A. No, nothing has changed.

THE COURT: When you say you refer me, you are referring to the record in the first trial?

MS. HADLOCK: Yes. Yes, the Phase 1 testimony that Mr. Denham gave.

- Q. And you said in addition to calculating those corrected rates, you were asked to calculate how much Metropolitan has overcharged the Water Authority for transporting water under the 2003 agreement from the years 2011 through '14; correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Are you offering opinions about what rates are lawful or unlawful here?
  - A. I am not.

2.0

2.5

- Q. Have you prepared a spreadsheet reflecting your analysis and calculations of the amount of San Diego damages under the exchange agreement?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. We'll walk through those calculations year by year. Let's --

We have Exhibit PTX 471 on the screen. You also have that in your binder, the first document in the small binder in front of you.

Q. And where specifically did you assemble these exchange volume figures from?

# A. The exchange volume figures reflect the compilation of invoices from Metropolitan during that period.

Q. And you -- is the information in the column headed "Exchange Volume" an accurate summary of information that you gathered from those records?

#### A. Yes, it is.

Q. Turning now to Exhibit PTX 469, can you take a look at that? This one is in a binder, the largest binder, a four-inch binder next to you. Can you tell us what's contained in PTX 469?

# A. Yes. This appears -- it does represent the invoices that allowed me to calculate the volumes on the previous exhibit.

MS. HADLOCK: We would move PTX 469 into evidence. It's the large binder.

THE COURT: The obvious question is whether the summary is going to be contested. If it is not, you just move the summary in, as far as I'm concerned.

We can do it either way. Do you know if you contest the summary or not?

MS. HADLOCK: Will you have objections? MR. QUINN: We have no objection.

Can you explain what PTX 471 is?

A. Yes. PTX 471 is an Excel workbook that I developed based on actual exchange volumes. And the exchange volume being the Water Authority's QSA supplies, the IID transfer, and the canal lining projects. This is based on actual Metropolitan invoices from the period 2011 through '14. Those are separated by month alongside the actual charges contained in those invoices.

Q. We will walk through that a little more step by step.

To clarify, you mentioned QSA supplies. Is that another phrase for the water that is delivered under the exchange agreement?

# A. All of the Water Authority QSA supplies are delivered under the exchange agreement.

- Q. Looking at the exhibit up on the screen, if you look at the column headed "Exchange Volume," is that the exchange volume you just described?
- A. Yes. The exchange volume, it is highlighted there in yellow, is the QSA supplies I mentioned.
- Q. And that's month-by-month data from January 2011 to December 2013, the highlighted column?
- A. The entire workbook goes to December '14, but yes.

THE COURT: To the summary?

MR. QUINN: No objection to the summary.

MS. HADLOCK: Then we'll move the summary in.

4 THE COURT: PTX 471?

MS. HADLOCK: Yes.

THE COURT: 471 is admitted.

(Exhibit 471 is received into evidence.)

MS. HADLOCK: We would like to move 469 in.

THE COURT: What do you think I would do with

that? The trees have already been slaughtered.

MS. HADLOCK: We can leave it out.

THE COURT: We are here already. Any objection to 469?

MR. QUINN: No objection.

THE COURT: 469 is also admitted.

(Exhibit 469 was received into evidence.)

- Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Did you use any other documents besides the Metropolitan invoices in gathering the exchange volume and charges information in PTX 471?
- A. What's called official decree accounting from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, oftentimes that may different only slightly from the Metropolitan bills.

So, yes, I did refer back to that as the official Colorado River accounting.

Q. If you turn to the middle binder, the

Pages 1106 to 1109

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

```
medium-size binder, Volume II, you will see PTX 314
2
     through 430. Are you in that binder? Can you tell us
3
     what those are?
        A. These reports represent the reference I was
     making to official decree accounting. They are issued
6
     typically in May of each calendar year, and represent
```

MS. HADLOCK: We would move PTX 314 through PTX 423 into evidence.

THE COURT: This is 314 through 323, but not through 430. So only 314 through 323 are admitted without objection.

the -- like I said, the official accounting of Colorado

MS. HADLOCK: And the next exhibit is PTX 430, which is another of the same.

Any objection to that one?

(Exhibits 314 through 323 were received

into evidence.)

River water.

THE COURT: Any objection to that?

MR. QUINN: No objection.

THE COURT: Similar format, PTX 430 is

admitted.

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

(Exhibit 430 was received into evidence.)

1110

Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Looking back at PTX 471, and just to be clear, the "Actual Charges" column in this

overcharges labeled as "Overcharge Credits" in the three columns you see there for the system access, system power and water stewardship rates.

- Q. So the system access rate column in 471 is what, for example?
- A. The system access rate column represents the total overcharge by that rate category for 2011 through
- Q. It is multiplying your overcharge by the exchange volume?
- A. Yes. It's the difference between board-approved rate, the recalculated rate multiplied by the exchange volume, actual exchange volume during that month and calendar year.
  - Q. We'll walk through the specifics in a moment.

First, just a little more background on the data shown in PTX 471.

When you first prepared your overcharge calculations for this case, did you have the actual complete exchange volume and charges information for the full time period through the end of 2014?

A. I did not. When we were here last, the data that was available was through September of 2013. I have updated actual exchange volumes in the corresponding charges through December '14 for this time

1112

document, what does that show?

- A. The actual charges represent invoices received from Metropolitan for exchange volumes by month as displayed and as summarized by calendar years '11 through '14.
- Q. Monthly totals and then an annual total for each year. Since that's in evidence. We won't take time to go through those.

Next, can you explain how did you use the exchange volume and Met's actual charges to calculate the total annual overcharges that the Water Authority has paid on each of Metropolitan's transportation rates under the exchange agreement?

A. In the process that I described a bit earlier, where I took a look at the cost of service reports, the supported -- any given rate year, in this case 2011 through '14, the process by which I removed the supply rates or supply components of the system access rates, system power rate from the transportation rate, as well as the water stewardship rate, I was able to recalculate an exchange rate.

The document that we're speaking of currently, PTX 0471, is simply a reflection of the board-approved rate. The difference between the board-approved rate and that recalculated rate, the difference being the

period.

O. Has anything else about this calculation changed because of updating the numbers to actual figures?

A. The grand total that you see as 188,295,602 has gone down by roughly \$40,000.

THE COURT: Let's take our afternoon recess. I will see everybody in about ten minutes. Thank you very much.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Let's continue, please. Thank you. MS. HADLOCK: Thank you, your Honor.

Q. Have you prepared a series of slides summarizing your calculations that are shown in PTX 471?

A. Yes, I have.

O. Let's have the 2011 slides.

THE COURT: PTX 471, that's the source. So these are just the demonstrative exhibits now?

MS. HADLOCK: We would like to mark this as 508, which I believe is the next in order, PTX 508. Is there any objection?

MR. QUINN: No. No objection.

MS. HADLOCK: We would move this into evidence, as well as a summary.

MR. QUINN: No objection.

1113

1 THE COURT: 508 is admitted. Diego on the system power rate in 2012? 2 2 (Exhibit 508 is received in evidence.) A. \$17,004,351. 3 3 Q. And the amount of overcharge per acre-foot on Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Just to walk through the 4 4 explanation here, in 2011, how much did Metropolitan -the system power rate was how much in 2012? 5 how much water did Metropolitan transport for San Diego 5 A. \$91. 6 6 Q. What was the total overcharge on the water under the exchange agreement? 7 stewardship rate in 2012 under the exchange agreement? A. 143,240 acre-feet. 8 8 A. \$8,035,023. Q. How much did Metropolitan overcharge San Diego 9 Q. And I believe you testified already, but that's 9 for that service? 10 10 the total amount of water stewardship rate that was paid A. \$33,805,324. 11 under the exchange agreement for each of these years? 11 Q. And that was a total overcharge per acre-foot 12 A. That's correct, the entire \$43 per acre-foot. 12 of how much? 13 MS. HADLOCK: We would move PTX 509 into 1.3 A. \$236 per acre-foot. 14 evidence. 14 Q. Going by rate element, how much did 15 15 MR. QUINN: No objection. Metropolitan overcharge San Diego on the system access 16 THE COURT: 509 is admitted. 16 rate in 2011? 17 (Exhibit 509 is received in evidence.) 17 A. \$14,467,533. 18 THE CLERK: Tell me what year 508 was. 18 Q. And per acre-foot that was how much? 19 THE COURT: 2011. 19 A. \$101 per acre-foot. 20 MS. HADLOCK: 2011. 20 Q. And on the system power rate, what was the 21 Q. Next slide, please. We would -- what's this 21 total overcharge in 2011 under the exchange agreement? 22 slide, Mr. Denham? 2.2 A. \$13,464,833. 23 A. This slide represents the 2013 overcharge 23 Q. And that amount overcharged per acre-foot was 24 calculation of \$56,780,640. 24 how much? 2.5 Q. That was based on Met transporting how much 25 A. \$94 per acre-foot. 1114 1116 1 1 Q. And what was the total overcharge on the water water under the exchange agreement in the year 2013? 2 2 stewardship rate in 2011 under the exchange agreement? A. 180,256 acre-feet. 3 3 A. \$5,872,959. Q. And the total amount of overcharge you used per 4 4 Q. And we can turn to the next slide, please. acre-foot in 2013 was how much? 5 5 We would mark this as PTX 509. A. \$315 per acre-foot. 6 6 And, Mr. Denham, is this a summary of your Q. Looking at the system access rate, how much did 7 7 calculations for 2012? Metropolitan overcharge San Diego in 2013 under the 8 8 A. Yes. exchange rate? 9 9 Q. What are the total damages that you calculated A. \$19,647,904. 10 1.0 for San Diego under the exchange agreement in 2012? Q. And the amount of that overcharge per 11 11 A. \$43.351.752. acre-foot? 12 12 Q. That's based on Metropolitan transporting how A. \$109 per acre-foot. 13 13 much water for the Water Authority in that year? Q. How much did Metropolitan overcharge San Diego 14 14 on the system power rate in 2013 under the exchange A. 186,861 acre-feet. 15 15 Q. What was the total amount of overcharge per agreement? 16 16 acre-foot in 2012? A. \$29,742,0240. 17 17 A. \$232 per acre-foot. Q. And per acre-foot, the amount of that 18 18 Q. Looking again at the system access rate, the overcharge is how much? 19 19 first row of your calculations, what was the overcharge A. \$165 per acre-foot. 20 20 under the exchange agreement in 2012? Q. And what was the total overcharge on the water 21 2.1 A. \$18,312,378. stewardship rate in 2013? 22 Q. And that was an overcharge per acre-foot of how 22 A. \$7,390,496. 23 23 much on the system access rate? MS. HADLOCK: And we would move this into 24 2.4 A. \$98. evidence as PTX 510. 25 25 Q. And how much did Metropolitan overcharge San THE COURT: Any objection? 1115 1117

1 Q. And how much is from misallocation of State MR. QUINN: No objection. 2 2 THE COURT: 510 is admitted. It's the slide Water Project costs? 3 3 A. \$159,617,411. that refers to 2013. 4 4 (Exhibit 510 was received into evidence.) Q. And how much does that leave that San Diego 5 Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Is this a similar summary for 5 paid under the exchange agreement during these years but 6 6 2014? is not challenging or claiming as damages here? 7 A. Yes, it is. A. That amount is \$100,740,565. 8 8 MS. HADLOCK: We would mark this as PTX 512, Q. Let me mark this slide as 511, PTX 511, 9 9 the slide headed "Summary of Contract Damages under overcharge calculation 2014. 10 10 Exchange Agreement." In 2014 how much water did Metropolitan 11 11 transport under the exchange agreement? MR. QUINN: No objection. 12 12 THE COURT: She is just marking it. There is A. 179,993 acre-feet. 13 1.3 no objection to people marking things. You also want it Q. And how much did Metropolitan overcharge San 14 14 admitted? Diego for doing that? 15 15 MS. HADLOCK: Yes. Move this into evidence. A. \$54,357,886. 16 16 Q. What was the total amount of overcharge per MR. QUINN: No objection to either. 17 17 THE COURT: 512 is admitted. Thank you. acre-foot in 2014? 18 18 (Exhibit 512 was received into evidence.) A. \$302 per acre-foot. 19 19 Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Mr. Denham, does San Diego pay Q. On the system access rate, how much did 20 20 Met's supply rate under the exchange agreement? Metropolitan overcharge San Diego in 2014 under the 21 21 exchange agreement? A. No. 2.2 22 A. \$20,879,188. Q. Have you calculated -- estimated how much the 23 23 Water Authority might have paid on Metropolitan's supply Q. Per acre-foot that was how much? 24 24 A. \$116 per acre-foot. rate if Metropolitan had allocated disputed costs in 25 25 Q. On the system power rate for 2014, what were this case from transportation onto supply? Have you 1118 1120 1 1 estimated that? San Diego's damages under the exchange agreement? 2 2 A. \$26,098,985. A. Yes, I have. 3 3 Q. What was that amount per acre-foot? Q. And, roughly, how much would San Diego's 4 4 A. \$145 per acre-foot. damages change if hypothetically -- strike that. 5 5 What impact would -- if you were to include Q. And what were San Diego's total damages for the 6 6 water stewardship rate in 2014 under the exchange that in your calculations here, roughly how much impact 7 7 agreement? would that have on the damages that you calculated 8 8 A. \$7,379,713. assuming --9 9 MS. HADLOCK: We move PTX 511 into evidence. MR. QUINN: Your Honor. I'm sorry. 10 10 MR. QUINN: No objection. MS. HADLOCK: Go ahead. 11 11 THE COURT: 511 is admitted. THE COURT: Why don't we have the full 12 12 (Exhibit 511 was received into evidence.) question, and he can make a statement or an objection. 13 13 Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Looking briefly back at PTX Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: How does the number, the 14 14 471, can you tell us what was the total amount that increase in amounts that San Diego might have paid, 15 15 Metropolitan charged the Water Authority under the hypothetically, on supplier rates, if these costs were 16 16 exchange agreement for the years 2011 through 2014? moved over, how does that amount compare to the amount 17 17 A. The total amount charged based on actual that you calculated as San Diego's damages here? 18 18 invoices was \$289,036,167. MR. QUINN: I object. At deposition and in his 19 19 Q. Based on your calculations, what are the Water report he testified that as part of his expert work he 20 20 Authority's total damages under the exchange agreement did not do this. It turns out there are some documents 21 21 for all four years from 2011 through 2014? indicating, in fact, he had. He was quite clear that 22 22 A. \$188,295,602. it's not part of his report and it is not part of his 23 2.3 Q. And how much of that amount is from overcharges expert work. 24 24 on the water stewardship rate? I object to them affronting us in this way. 25 25 A. \$28,678,191. THE COURT: Are you going to get into it in

1121

1 cross-examination? And if so, why don't we defer it to inclusion of Water Authority's QSA water in addition to 2 2 other non-Metropolitan water. then? 3 3 MS. HADLOCK: We will move PTX 473 into I will sustain the objection for now, but you 4 4 are free on redirect, if it comes up on evidence 5 5 cross-examination, to ask your questions. Any objection? 6 6 MS. HADLOCK: They went into this issue, and we MR. QUINN: No objection. 7 would like to clarify a little bit. THE COURT: 473 is admitted. 8 8 (Exhibit 473 was received in evidence.) THE COURT: Is it part of his expert report? 9 9 MS. HADLOCK: It is not, but we can clarify Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Looking at the bottom right of 10 10 this chart, can you explain, first, what amount did you that or we can --11 11 THE COURT: I will sustain the objection. add in to calculate the adjusted preferential rates if 12 12 those wheeling payments were included? MS. HADLOCK: In that case, we will move on to 13 13 a different topic. A. The amount added in is what you see there in 14 14 Q. Are you familiar, Mr. Denham, with the column entitled "SDCWA, QSA and Placer." The dollar 15 15 Metropolitan's calculation of preferential rates? amount is \$409,517,198. 16 16 Q. And how does that -- how does adding that 17 17 number in change the calculation of preferential rights? Q. And you are aware that Metropolitan excludes 18 18 payments under the exchange agreement in calculating If you could, just explain the math you've done here. 19 19 preferential rates? A. Yes. The addition of the 409.5 million 20 20 A. Yes. included as part of the Water Authority's existing 21 21 Q. They also exclude wheeling payments made under 1.2 billion, that you see in the non-shaded area 2.2 22 wheeling agreements in calculating preferential rights? highlighted there in yellow, increased the Water 23 23 Authority's preferential rights from 18.27 percent to A. Yes. 24 24 Q. Has Mr. Cushman asked you to calculate how the 23.02 percent, roughly four-and-three-quarters percent. 25 25 Water Authority's preferential rights would be different Q. And your column is -- you mentioned Placer 1122 1124 1 if Met did not exclude those amounts? 1 County. What does that refer to? 2 2 A. Yes. A. Placer County was a dry-year transfer of 3 3 Q. Have you done that? non-Metropolitan water. It was transported for the 4 A. Yes. 4 Water Authority. 5 Q. Let's turn to PTX 472. What is PTX 472? Q. A wheeling transaction? 6 6 A. PTX 472 is a document that is created and A. Yes. 7 7 calculated by Metropolitan staff for preferential rights Q. And if you look back at the first page of this 8 8 as of the period ending 6/30/14. exhibit, 473, you have two charts there. Is the first 9 9 Q. This is Metropolitan's calculation? one a breakdown of your calculations of exchange 10 10 A. That's correct. agreement delivery? 11 11 MS. HADLOCK: We move PTX 472 into evidence. I A. Yes. The exchange agreement deliveries, the 12 12 believe there was no objection. column is entitled "IID Transfer and Canal Linings," and 13 13 THE COURT: We will find out. then summarized into annual totals, represent the 14 14 MR. QUINN: No objection. exchange agreement deliveries based on Metropolitan 15 15 THE COURT: 472 is admitted. invoices during that period. 16 16 (Exhibit 472 was received into evidence.) Q. And the total payments in that time period, 17 17 Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: In Exhibit 472, what 2004 through 2014, under the exchange agreement is how 18 18 percentage did Metropolitan calculate as San Diego's much, roughly? 19 19 share of preferential rights? A. 403.8 million. 20 20 A. 18.27 percent. Q. The whole transaction with Placer County you 21 21 Q. Let's turn now to PTX 473, the second page of mentioned, how much is that? 22 22 A. That is at the bottom there, and the total is this exhibit. Can you tell us what PTX 473 is? 23 2.3 A. 473 is my attempt to take the document that was 5.7 million. 24 24 Q. You approximated a ballpark figure of how much produced by Metropolitan, which you can essentially see 25 water an acre-foot, acre-feet, the change you calculated in the non-shaded area, and recalculate it based on the 1123 1125

you actually presented your opinion in the arbitration?

1

2

in preferential rights would amount to?

A. Yes, it's roughly 80,000 acre-feet. A. I was deposed where my expert opinion was 3 3 Q. And it would depend on the sales projection? given. The legalese of what actually occurred, I A. That's correct. Metropolitan's sales couldn't tell you. But I gave my expert opinion under 5 5 projections. oath. 6 6 THE COURT: Just to be clear, that is Q. In a deposition? 7 attributable to the distinction or the difference A. Yes, that's correct. 8 between 23.02 and 18.27? 8 Q. You have been forthright that you don't 9 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 9 actually -- you're not a water rate-making expert; Q. BY MS. HADLOCK: Let's go back to the second 10 10 right? 11 page of this exhibit, 473. Just briefly, to make sure 11 A. That's correct. 12 we're clear, at the bottom right portion, the bottom 12 Q. Are you familiar with something called the 13 right of this, where you added in the 409, you have 13 M1 manual? 14 added that into San Diego's contributions and also into 14 A. Yes. 15 the total contributions of all member agencies; right? 15 Q. And that's published by the AWWA? 16 A. That's correct. The 408.5 million was added to 16 17 the total of seven billion you see on the bottom there. 17 Q. What is the M1 manual? 18 Q. And then you recalculate the percentages of all 18 A. I would characterize it as a summary of, you 19 member agencies based on those new totals for each 19 know, a way to go about calculating rates and charges 20 member agencies? 20 for a public water or wastewater, for that matter, 21 A. That's correct. The addition of 409 million 21 utility. 2.2 necessitates a recalculation of all other member 22 Q. Would you regard it as an authoritative source 23 agencies. 23 on that subject? 24 MS. HADLOCK: Pass the witness. 24 A. Not the source. It's -- it is a good source. 2.5 THE COURT: Cross-examination. 25 It's a well-known source. 1126 1128 1 1 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** Q. Did you participate at all in writing that 2 2 BY MR. OUINN: manual? 3 3 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Denham. My name is John A. No. 4 4 Ouinn. Q. You were asked to make certain assumptions, 5 5 A. Good afternoon. isn't that correct --6 6 Q. You told us you have a minor in economics in an A. Yes. 7 7 undergraduate degree? Q. -- in doing your work? 8 8 A. That's correct. Counsel told you to assume that all the State 9 9 Q. You don't have any publications that you've Water Project costs which are on transport should be 10 1.0 published? moved over to supply; right? 11 11 A. Correct. A. None worth noting. 12 12 Q. And you have never actually served as a damages Q. And they also told you to assume that all water 13 13 expert on any occasion except there was an arbitration stewardship costs should be moved over to supply; 14 14 when you were designated to be an expert; is that right? correct? 15 15 A. That's correct. A. The water stewardship costs should be removed 16 16 Q. And in terms of coming and testifying in a from transportation to supply, yes. 17 17 court about damages opinion or that type of opinion, Q. And you took those assumptions and you 18 18 you've never done that before? basically did --19 19 A. That's correct. You did some calculations; right? 20 20 Q. Or even been retained as a damages expert in A. Yes. 21 21 any court proceeding as opposed to the arbitration? Q. I mean, you essentially were -- with probably a 22 22 computer, a guy with a computer or computer program, you A. That's correct. 23 23 Q. Even in that arbitration -- it wasn't clear did these calculations with? 2.4 24 from your deposition -- do I understand correctly that A. I took one bucket of revenue and moved it to 25 25 actually you are -- that resolved in some fashion before another area. 1127 1129

Q. So you didn't -- you looked at some documents to get this data.

I think you mentioned cost of service reports and invoices and other Metropolitan documents; right?

### A. Yes.

1.3

2.2

2.3

Q. And from those you isolated these costs that you were going to move over to supply; right?

### A. Yes. After reviewing the cost of service report, as you know, it's a pretty good-sized document.

Q. Right. So you had to find where those numbers were and isolate them, I think you said?

### A. That's correct.

Q. In terms of your expert report, what you did in your expert analysis in this case, you didn't actually otherwise do any kind of an analysis of those costs; is that correct?

MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Unclear. Vague. THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: You know, I'm not sure that that's a fair statement. I think that what was provided as a public record, that supports the rates and charges for Metropolitan and its board-approved rates. To the extent that's the document that's available, you know, that's what I used.

THE COURT: Yes.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: You were given these assumptions that these costs don't belong in transport, and you moved them over to supply. You did not do anything to, yourself, to test those assumptions; correct?

## A. If by test you mean run through a model, a rate model, for instance, no.

Q. Well, I mean, in fact, you didn't --You testified in your deposition you didn't actually test these assumptions; right?

### A. That's correct.

Q. And you didn't analyze whether there was any beneficial or causal relationship with these costs, did you? Are you familiar with that --

Let me withdraw that question.

Are you familiar with the concept of beneficial and causal relationship?

### A. More generally cost causation.

Q. You didn't do any type of analysis yourself as to whether there was a beneficial or causal relationship with these costs to where they had been burdened?

### A. That was outside the scope of my work, so no.

Q. You didn't look at the state water -- the contract Met has with the State Water Project?

A. No, I did not.

1130 | 1132

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Right. I mean, you didn't go behind those published documents and do any kind of analysis of the numbers?

A. I only used data that was available as a part of cost of service, part of board records, board correspondence, only public information that was available. So, yeah.

Q. In doing these calculations, you didn't actually form any judgments about any of those costs, about whether the costs were appropriately charged or anything like that?

### A. That's correct.

Q. And you didn't actually form any opinions on that subject either? You basically were the guy with the computer and you ran some numbers after you had extracted this data; right?

### A. Yes.

Q. So let's -- let's talk about some other things that really aren't within the scope of your expert work here.

MS. HADLOCK: Objection to anything beyond the expert work.

THE COURT: That is a terrible way to introduce cross-examination.

MR. QUINN: Should I try that again?

Q. That contract, obviously, then, didn't play any part in your analysis; correct?

# A. Well, to the extent that Metropolitan's rates and charges for the State Water Project are based off that report, and that's what the cost of service is based off of, I think it is foundational.

Q. Beyond that, your analysis didn't take into account any of the terms of the state water contract?

### A. No.

MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Relevance. THE COURT: Overruled.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: There was something that Met has called the financial planning model. Are you familiar with that?

### A. Yes.

Q. Could you tell the Court what that is?

A. The Met financial planning model is a complex Excel spreadsheet. Probably would take an individual years to understand, a career to understand. It is very complex and it produces rates.

Q. That was -- at San Diego's request, that was made available on two computers to San Diego. You are familiar with that?

### A. Yes.

Q. But you made no -- in doing your expert work,

you made no use of that financial planning model. Is that true?

- A. I reviewed the financial planning model. It is not included in my analysis. The way the rates were calculated in the model were based on a goal seek function, which you cannot back into for the cost of service study, the report.
- Q. Just to be clear, this is something that was provided to San Diego. And at least in terms of your expert work, you didn't make use of that financial planning model; is that true?
- A. That's true. For my report, I did not use the financial planning model.
- Q. You didn't make any analysis as to whether the state, putting these State Water Project costs in transportation, whether that was right or wrong, as part of your expert work in this case?
  - A. That's correct.

- O. And the same for the water stewardship?
- A. Correct. I was asked to move supply components related to those rate -- or functionalized revenue requirements to the supply rate.
- Q. And these water stewardship costs, you didn't take into account what those expenditures by Met paid for as part of your expert work?

any analysis on whether the supply costs would go up -- that if -- I'm sorry.

Your expert report in this case does not include any information or analysis about whether if supply costs went up, demand would go down?

- A. If supply -- let me make sure I heard you correctly. If supply goes up, demand goes down?
- Q. As part of your expert work here, you assumed revenue neutrality; correct?
  - A. Revenue neutrality, correct.
- Q. What I'm asking here, isn't it true that as part of your expert work, you didn't look into or consider whether if the supply costs went up, the demand would go down?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. You assumed it would actually -- everything would stay the same?
- A. Well, in fact, all I did was, as you mentioned, move supply costs to supply rate.
- Q. So you did nothing to test the assumption that if supply costs went up, everything else would remain the same; the demand would remain the same? You didn't do anything to test that?
  - A. No tests.
  - Q. You didn't consider whether it would be a good

A. I'm not sure I understand that one.

What I did do was take the revenue requirement and all of the background information for the water stewardship rate as contained in every available document that I could find and moved that to the supply rate.

- Q. Exactly. But you didn't actually look into what those -- what that revenue was applied to in terms of the water stewardship rate as part of your analysis, your expert opinion in this case?
- A. The water stewardship rate move was an all or nothing. There's no detail provided in any Met document as to what it is other than a local water supply development revenue requirement.
- Q. And another thing that you were asked to assume was that moving these costs for transportation, from transportation to supply, would be revenue neutral; correct?
- A. To the extent that you want to move, let's just round number, \$100 million from transportation to supply, you would make that 100-million-dollar move, yes, I consider that revenue neutral.
- Q. For example, you didn't undertake any analysis about -- as part of your expert work -- I'm focusing on your expert report in the case -- that doesn't include

idea to do a price elasticity analysis either?

- A. Again, it's not what I was tasked with doing. Metropolitan has a revenue requirement that it identified for State Water Project costs. Moving that to supply is what I did.
- Q. Okay. And in your report, your expert report that we provided, there is no analysis about how moving transportation costs from transportation to supply, how that would increase supply costs?
  - A. In my expert report, no.
- Q. You would agree, though, other things being equal, supply costs will go up if you move costs from transportation to supply, it stands to reason?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Did anybody instruct you not to include in your report any information on the impact of supply costs, of moving costs from transportation to supply?
  - A. No.
- Q. Was that a subject that you discussed with anyone as to whether your report should include information about the impact on supply costs of moving costs from transportation to supply?
  - A. As part of my report, no.
- Q. Nobody discussed whether your report should address that?

2.2

1.0

2.4

### A. That's correct.

1.3

2.2

Q. So your report is not actually the -- the report that was provided to us in this case is not actually a calculation of net damages for a net impact of moving costs from transportation to supply; correct?

### A. That's correct.

Q. And you don't have any -- in your report, you don't address how much San Diego would pay if there had been no breach in this case?

## A. Yeah. I make no report if what you're referring to is a net. I think that was the term you used.

Q. Yes.

### A. That's not addressed in my report.

Q. As part of your expert report, you didn't make any determination about how much San Diego would have paid if there had been no breach?

### A. That's correct.

Q. And you reached no conclusion as to whether or not San Diego would have been better off as a general matter if there had been no breach?

MS. HADLOCK: Objection; relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled. It goes to the scope of the report.

Go ahead.

A. I identified the State Water Project costs that were functionalized, as a term of art, in rate making -- not my term -- in the exchange rate, that being the system power rate, system access rate.

Q. And then you removed those State Water Project costs from the cost pool and divided the remaining number by the accrued sales in each calendar year to derive a corrected rate; correct?

## A. No. What you're saying is close, but not sales. It is the cost of service sales assumption, the sales assumption by which the rates are based.

Q. So you removed those costs from the cost pool and divided that by the sales assumption; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. For each calendar year; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. That yielded for you a corrected rate; correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And then you subtracted that corrected rate from the rate that was charged; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And multiplied that by the exchange water to derive the damages rate; correct?

A. Yes.

1138 1140

THE WITNESS: Overall betterment, I think that's very vague. You know, there are a lot of possible outcomes as to how you measure betterment. To answer your question directly, that's not included in my report.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Right. You reached no conclusion as part of your expert work here as to whether San Diego would be better off as a general matter if these costs were moved from transportation to supply?

### A. That's correct. It's impossible to tell.

Q. You say it is impossible to tell, but, in fact, you believe that it would be possible to do some -- make some reasonable assumptions about whether San Diego would be better off or not? Do you believe that?

## A. Yes. I can -- I can make a number of assumptions about a future outcome of a lot of different scenarios. I do that frequently.

Q. But you didn't include anything like that in your expert report?

### A. Correct.

Q. You calculated -- in calculating the analysis of overcharges, I think you said you identified the State Water Project costs that were included in the cost basis; is that correct?

Q. So the first part of that, the smaller the number, the smaller your corrected rate, the bigger the Delta would be between the corrected rate and what was actually charged; correct?

### A. Could you restate that?

Q. The smaller the corrected -- you came up with a corrected rate by doing that division we just talked about.

### A. Yes.

Q. The smaller that number, the larger the Delta is going to be between the corrected rate and the rate that was actually charged; correct?

### A. Yes.

Q. And the larger that Delta, the larger San Diego's damages are going to be under your approach; correct?

### A. That's correct.

Q. San Diego doesn't just exchange water with Metropolitan. San Diego also purchases some water; correct? You are aware of that?

### A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware -- so far as you're aware, San Diego has no issue with including State Water Project costs in the costs for water that it purchases; correct?

MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Ambiguous.

Pages 1138 to 1141

1 THE COURT: Do you understand the question? Q. So in the denominator you include not just what 2 2 THE WITNESS: I believe I do. It was not San Diego is buying but all water in the till is the 3 3 something I considered in my report. assumption of what everybody is buying? 4 4 THE COURT: Overruled. A. That's correct. 5 Q. BY MR. QUINN: There's no issue -- there's 5 Q. The larger the denominator, the more you 6 6 really no issue here that -- the price for the water include there, the smaller that corrected rate is going 7 7 that San Diego purchases, not talking about the exchange to be: correct? 8 water, but the purchased water, that also includes State 8 A. Yes. The denominator has an impact like that, 9 9 Water Project costs; right? as you mentioned. 10 10 A. Yes, to the extent that State Water Project is Q. And the larger San Diego's damages under your 11 11 included in the Tier 1 supply area, ves. approach will be; correct? 12 Q. As far as you know, San Diego has no issue with 12 A. My approach is based on the Met sales 13 being charged in Tier 1 water for those State Water 13 assumption, so I would say it's the Met approach. 14 Project costs; correct? 14 Q. But in terms of doing the analysis that you 15 A. Correct. 15 did -- we talked about the fact that San Diego exchanges 16 Q. When you did this arithmetic, this arriving at 16 water but also buys water where they include these 17 the corrected rate, you included as the denominator all 17 charges, these State Water Project charges, where, so 18 the water that San Diego gets from Met, both the 18 far as you know, San Diego has no issue with the 19 exchange water and the purchase water, isn't that true? 19 inclusion of those charges for purchasing Tier 1 water. 20 A. Yes, that's --20 A. Yes. 21 MS. HADLOCK: Objection --21 Q. All of that is included in the denominator in 2.2 THE COURT: I'm sorry. 2.2 your damages analysis; correct? 23 MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Misstates testimony. 23 A. Yes. 24 THE COURT: Overruled. 24 Q. Your view was that all the exchange water could 2.5 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's the basis by which 25 or should have been delivered through the Colorado River 1142 1144 1 1 aqueducts and not involve the State Water Project, isn't Metropolitan calculates its rates. It's not my 2 2 calculation methodology. It's re-creating the basis by that true? 3 3 which the rates were derived. MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Beyond the scope and 4 4 Q. BY MR. QUINN: So you are trying to arrive at a irrelevant. 5 5 corrected rate for what exchange water should be; THE COURT: Is this part -- was this one of the 6 6 assumptions you made in coming up with your opinions? correct? 7 7 A. Yes. THE WITNESS: It was not. 8 8 O. And that's that fraction we discussed a moment THE COURT: Sustained. 9 9 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Can you tell us whether or not ago; correct? 10 1.0 A. Yes. you have an opinion as to whether all the exchange water 11 11 Q. And you included in the denominator not just could or should have been delivered through the Colorado 12 12 the exchange water, but all the water that Met purchases River aqueducts and not involved the State Water Project 13 13 from San Diego; correct? Yes or no? at all? 14 14 A. Yes, as I mentioned, that's the basis. MS. HADLOCK: Objection. 15 15 MR. KEKER: Met purchases from San Diego? THE COURT: Sustained. Beyond the scope. 16 16 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Isn't it true that your MR. QUINN: I'm sorry. 17 17 Q. That San Diego purchases from Met. calculations assume that all the exchange water could or 18 18 should have been delivered through the Colorado River A. Yes, I believe what you're referring to is 19 19 what's typically known as a sales assumption of two aqueducts? 20 20 MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Misstates. million or so of acre-feet of an exchange volume. The 21 21 share of that is about 180. That's included in how THE COURT: Overruled. 22 22 Metropolitan sets its rates and charges. THE WITNESS: My calculation is based simply 23 23 off the Met sales assumption, not knowing what the basis To make a corrected rate, I would need to 2.4 24 spread the revenue requirement over the same sales by which they split the State Water Project or Colorado 25 25 River aqueducts. I know they give rough percentage. assumption.

Pages 1142 to 1145

1145

Again, this is simply taking a revenue requirement and spreading it over the same denominator. What is in the cost of service report is what I used.

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: You actually have responsibility for the Colorado River function at the San Diego Water Authority, don't you?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

2.3

Q. And what is your responsibility for?

### A. Implementation of the Water Authority's QSA programs.

Q. Your use of the total in that denominator, the total Met sales to divide the Colorado River revenue requirements, is incorrect and inconsistent with your theory that the State Water Project and Colorado River aqueducts should bear separate costs, isn't that true?

MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Beyond the scope. THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not quite sure I even understand what you're asking.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Can you tell us whether or not, in your view, based upon the work that you did as an expert, are you assuming that the State Water Project and the Colorado River aqueduct should bear separate cost structure?

A. Separate cost structures? You know, I don't

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: The extent to which you change the denominator in a calculation, you are correct. Variations up and down, that would be expected.

Again, what I said is that I'm trying to replicate a very simple process for comparison purposes.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: You acknowledge it could be done a different way and get very different results?

### A. There are numerous results, yes.

Q. You presented on direct examination some information. Exhibits came in about preferential rights and analysis and numbers and calculations you had done on preferential rights.

### A. Yes.

Q. None of that was in the expert report that we were provided before trial; is that correct?

### A. That's correct.

Q. You agree, I take it, that Met does, in fact, need to recover these costs that you are excluding? The State Water Project costs, the water conservation costs, Met has to recover them from some customer? You agree with that?

MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Beyond the scope. THE COURT: I will allow it.

Go ahead.

1146 1148

### believe that that's what my opinion was in the report.

Q. If you had used as the denominator in that arriving at that corrected rate, if you had used total sales minus State Water Project sales to obtain the appropriate number -- let me withdraw that.

Wouldn't it be more accurate and consistent with your theory if you had used total sales minus State Water Project sales in the denominator to arrive at the appropriate number?

A. I would answer that as not necessarily. You know, big picture, my intent here was to take a process that was developed by Met, and, to the greatest extent possible, not change that process. So to the extent that you're suggesting I do other things, include, exclude, calculate rates in a different manner, that's not what I was tasked with doing, nor did I do.

I tried to create the most simple replication of Metropolitan's rate setting process.

Q. You say "not necessarily."

It would make a very big difference in the denominator and, therefore, the damages function as to whether you used total sales minus State Water Project sales in the denominator versus all sales? That would make a big difference?

MS. HADLOCK: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Yes, assuming that it is a revenue requirement and they have a need to recover that revenue. It should be recovered somewhere.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Right. And you don't challenge the costs that are described in the cost of service reports as being inappropriate. You just challenge whether certain of those costs should have been charged to San Diego for exchange water. Correct?

## A. My opinion is that they are supply costs on the transportation rate.

Q. In terms of your expert report, you were asked simply to assume that, and you didn't do any analysis of it; correct?

### A. Correct. I moved supply off of transportation.

Q. In terms of whether the costs should be charged as described in the cost of service reports, whether they were appropriate, you don't challenge whether or not those costs were appropriately incurred?

### A. Maybe if you could help me with clarifying it a little more. I'm not following.

Q. You are not saying any of these costs should not be incurred by Met, the costs that you moved?

### A. That's correct.

THE COURT: That's not part of what you were hired to do, what you did as an expert; right?

THE WITNESS: There is some confusion on what charged on the transportation costs; correct? 2 2 exactly is being asked on my behalf. 3 3 THE COURT: Well, part of it has to do with the 4 phraseology of the question. My understanding is, for 5 example, you were not asked to investigate the bases of 5 that's what I used. 6 6 the assumptions that these costs should be moved. 7 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 8 MR. QUINN: Nothing further, your Honor. 8 9 9 THE COURT: Any redirect? 10 10 MS. HADLOCK: If I can have just a moment? supply rate impacts; right? 11 THE COURT: Sure. 11 A. Yes. 12 12 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 13 14 BY MS. HADLOCK: 14 15 15 Q. Mr. Denham, does San Diego pay Metropolitan 16 exchange rates under the exchange agreement? 16 2014? 17 17 A. No. A. Yes. 18 Q. Would changes to Metropolitan's supply rates 18 19 change Metropolitan's charges to San Diego under the 19 20 exchange agreement? 20 21 A. No. 21 2.2 Q. You calculated what San Diego would have paid 22 23 here if Metropolitan had not breached the agreement by 23 24 putting the costs that you've described onto 24 assuming they were lawfully assessed? 2.5 transportation rates that you then backed out; correct? 25 1150 1 1 A. Correct. supply rate increased, all member agencies would pay, 2 2 O. You used the denominator in the system of 3 3 calculating rates that Met uses as much as it was 4 4 available to you? 5 5 A. Yes. 6 6 Q. Just to clarify, there were some questions 7 7 asked about Metropolitan's rate model. And would it be 8 8 possible for you to use that to back out the costs as 9 9 you've described and set new rates, or was that not estimated those amounts? 10 10 possible, given how that model works? 11 11 A. It -- my opinion is that it is not possible 12 12 without intimate knowledge of how the model works. I report. 13 13 have worked in models as complex as the Metropolitan THE COURT: I understand. The objection is 14 14 financial planning model. There are things going on in sustained. 15 15 the background of that model that make it very difficult MS. HADLOCK: Your Honor, they did ask 16 16 to, quote/unquote, "back into rates." 17 17 Q. So essentially without data that you didn't 18 18 have, that Met didn't make available, that was not a 19 19 useful model for you? get into it. 20 A. It is not. 20 21 21 Q. And you have made the best reasonable 22 22

- A. Correct. I think the assumption I took overall is that this is the best available information provided to support rates. This is what I have to work with, and
- Q. And Met has never created any other rate structures that you could have analyzed, has it?
- Q. You were asked some questions about analyzing
- Q. If you included supply rate impacts in your analysis of damages in this case, wouldn't that mean that San Diego would end up paying a higher rate than other member agencies for calendar years 2011 through
  - Q. Is that a reason for not counting it here?
- Q. If Metropolitan were to recover what you described as the overcharges by assigning those prospectively to different rates, would all of Met's member agencies pay their fair share of those rates
  - A. Assuming the Tier 1 rate, for instance, the

1152

approximation that you could with available data of how San Diego -- how San Diego's payments under the exchange agreement would have changed if these State Water Project costs and water stewardship rates were not

23

24

25

Q. And because Metropolitan got into this on cross-examination with the prior witness, have you approximated what impacts on supply would be if the costs that are at issue here, the State Water Project and water stewardship charges, if those were hypothetically included in a supply rate? Have you

MR. QUINN: Objection, your Honor. It is not in his report. I only asked him whether it was in his

Mr. Cushman about this analysis and --

THE COURT: He didn't report on it. This isn't within the scope of direct. We are just not going to

MS. HADLOCK: Fair enough. We certainly don't think it should have come into the analysis.

THE COURT: That's what I think you're thinking.

MS. HADLOCK: All right. I have nothing further.

1153

1151

23

24

```
1
             THE COURT: Any re-cross?
                                                                      1
                                                                                     REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
                                                                      2
 2
             MR. QUINN: No, your Honor.
                                                                      3
                                                                           STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 3
             THE COURT: Thank you. We will end for today.
                                                                                             ) ss
 4
       I have another matter at four o'clock. I will see you
                                                                           COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA.
 5
       at ten o'clock.
                                                                      5
 6
             MR. QUINN: We found in the record in Phase 1
                                                                      6
       what the rules were. That is 24 hours' notice and you
                                                                      7
                                                                             I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Shorthand
 8
       have to give notice of the order within the next day the
                                                                      8
                                                                           Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of
 9
       witnesses would be called. That is in the transcript
                                                                      9
                                                                           California, hereby certify:
10
       December 10, 2013, page 216, lines six to 11.
                                                                     10
                                                                              That the court proceedings were taken down by me in
11
             I think it is unfair to change the rules now.
                                                                     11
                                                                           stenotype at the time and place herein named and
12
             THE COURT: The rules are exactly the same. I
                                                                     12
                                                                           thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided
13
       don't see where you and I are different. I think 24
                                                                     13
                                                                           transcription under my direction.
14
                                                                     14
       hours' notice is fine. I agree with you. And I think
                                                                              I further certify that I am not interested in the
                                                                     15
15
                                                                           event of the action.
       giving the order of witnesses is a good idea. Surely,
                                                                     16
                                                                              WITNESS my hand this 13th day of April,
16
       you already have it.
                                                                     17
17
                                                                           2015, at San Francisco, California.
             MR. QUINN: For that day, for that day 24
                                                                     18
18
       hours' notice. That is not the way this case was tried
                                                                     19
19
       in Phase 1. We found it in the transcript. The rules
                                                                     20
20
       were you give 24 hours' notice and you say what order
                                                                     21
21
                                                                                       Jun Jundy
Tara Sandford, RPR, CSR No. 3374
       people will be called that day.
                                                                     22
2.2
             Now what they are asking, when it is completely
                                                                     23
23
       assymetric, at the end of the case, that we give them
                                                                     24
                                                                                       Certified Shorthand Reporter
24
       our entire line up through the end of April.
                                                                     25
                                                                                       State of California
2.5
             THE COURT: You don't know what the order is
                                                         1154
                                                                                                                              1156
 1
       you will be calling people?
 2
             MR. QUINN: Honestly, no. But if you order us
 3
       to, we will come up with it. Honestly, no. My
 4
       objection is not one about whether we could do it. My
       objection is fair is fair. That's the way the case was
 6
       tried, and now it's our case and we change the rules?
 7
       And I've got to give him notice to the end of April the
 8
       sequence we are going to call everybody?
 9
             THE COURT: Yes, you do. You've got the same
1.0
       thing from him. He gets the same thing from you. I
11
       don't think we're having a tempest in a teapot. I will
12
       see everybody at ten o'clock tomorrow.
13
             MR. KEKER: Not tomorrow, your Honor.
14
             THE COURT: Wednesday.
1.5
             (Evening recess.)
16
17
1.8
19
20
2.1
22
23
2.4
25
                                                         1155
```

· A	
<b>\$100</b> 1135:20	
<b>\$100,740,565</b> 1120:7	
<b>\$101</b> 1114:19	
<b>\$109</b> 1117:12	
<b>\$116</b> 1118:24	
<b>\$13,464,833</b> 1114:22 <b>\$14,467,533</b> 1114:17	
<b>\$141</b> 1031:14	
<b>\$145</b> 1119:4	
<b>\$159,617,411</b> 1120:3	
<b>\$163</b> 1031:14	
<b>\$165</b> 1117:19	
<b>\$17,004,351</b> 1116:2	
<b>\$18,312,378</b> 1115:21	
<b>\$188,295,602</b> 975:16	
1104:21 1119:22 <b>\$19,647,904</b> 1117:9	
<b>\$20,879,188</b> 1118:22	
<b>\$20,3</b> 1017:1	
<b>\$232</b> 1104:14 1115:17	7
<b>\$235</b> 1068:24 1069:6	
<b>\$236</b> 1114:13	
<b>\$243</b> 1031:8	
<b>\$253</b> 1004:3 1008:25	
1030:5 1031:3 1067	:4
1067:22 1068:5 1087:14	
<b>\$26,098,985</b> 1119:2	
<b>\$274</b> 976:6	
<b>\$28,678,191</b> 1119:25	
<b>\$289,036,167</b> 1119:18 <b>\$29,742,0240</b> 1117:16	3
	•
<b>\$30</b> 1030:3 <b>\$302</b> 1118:18	
<b>\$315</b> 1104:14 1117:5	
<b>\$33,805,324</b> 1114:10	
<b>\$38.7</b> 1016:19	
<b>\$40,000</b> 1113:6	
<b>\$409,517,198</b> 1124:15	,
<b>\$43</b> 976:13 1116:12	
<b>\$43,351,752</b> 1115:11 <b>\$5,872,959</b> 1115:3	
\$5,872,959 1115:3 \$54,357,886 1118:15	
<b>\$54.6</b> 1017:5,6	
<b>\$56,780,640</b> 1116:24	
<b>\$58</b> 1025:5	
<b>\$60</b> 1030:4	
<b>\$7,379,713</b> 1119:8	
\$7,390,496 1117:22	
\$77 1016:5,6,16 \$9.035.023 1116:9	
<b>\$8,035,023</b> 1116:8 <b>\$90</b> 1087:12,13	
<b>\$91</b> 1116:5	
<b>\$94</b> 1114:25	
<b>\$98</b> 1115:24	
<b>a.m</b> 970:3	
ability 980:9 1004:20	

```
1005:3 1008:12
able 1056:12,19
  1067:20 1068:14,18
  1104:13 1105:6
  1111:20
Absolutely 1105:2
accepting 1020:8
  1064:16 1069:18
access 974:8 975:2
  976:4 1012:9 1028:10
  1029:2,7 1030:3
  1031:13 1033:25
  1076:12 1077:16
  1078:1 1080:6
  1105:10,20 1111:18
  1112:2,4,6 1114:15
  1115:18,23 1117:6
  1118:19 1140:4
accomplish 1065:4
  1068:18
accomplished 1064:13
  1064:15,19 1067:10
  1067:24 1068:9
account 1062:7 1133:8
  1134:24
accounting 968:16,17
  968:18,19,20,21,22
  968:23,24,25 969:3
  1109:20,24 1110:5,7
accrued 1140:7
accurate 1095:18
  1108:7 1147:6
achieve 997:9
acknowledge 1148:7
acquire 1022:15
acquired 1086:20
acquiring 1022:7
acre 988:5 1007:13
  1064.3
acre-feet 975:22 988:1
  1007:10,17,18,21
  1008:16 1009:21,22
  1010:1 1021:6 1024:4
  1024:7,8,14,17,19,23
  1025:1,3,20 1065:11
  1067:17 1068:16,17
  1069:23 1114:7
  1115:14 1117:2
  1118:12 1125:25
  1126:2 1143:20
acre-foot 976:14
  986:13 1007:11
  1030:5 1031:3
  1104:14 1114:11,13
  1114:18,19,23,25
  1115:16,17,22 1116:3
  1116:12 1117:4,5,11
```

1117:12,17,19

```
1118:17,18,23,24
  1119:3,4 1125:25
act 981:23 1019:23
action 995:18 996:5
  999:6 1000:14.16.19
  1013:15 1014:1,2,5,6
  1014:9 1058:17,19
  1156:15
actions 1011:24
  1071:11
active 1102:25
acts 1034:5.18
actual 971:18 977:20
  994:17 1107:3,6,8
  1110:25 1111:2,10
  1112:13,19,24 1113:3
  1119:17
add 976:4 1030:5
  1124:11
added 1023:19 1124:13
  1126:13,14,16
adding 1124:16
addition 1103:14
  1106:8 1124:1,19
  1126:21
additional 977:16
  1014:6,8 1022:15
address 1137:25
  1138:8
addressed 996:14
  1138:14
adjusted 969:7 1124:11
adjustments 1019:6
administration 1104:7
  1104.8
administrative 998:4
  1003:10 1047:5
  1103:2
admitted 1015:18,24
  1029:20 1038:4
  1077:5 1095:3 1109:6
  1109:15 1110:12,22
  1114:1 1116:16
  1118:2 1119:11
  1120:14,17 1123:15
  1124:7
adopt 997:20 999:2
  1012:25 1047:19
  1048:4,7 1050:25
  1051:7,14,19 1052:9
  1052:19 1053:7,19,21
  1060:7 1097:19
adopted 966:10 977:8
  993:9 999:5 1001:5
  1027:17 1033:13,17
  1034:14 1046:22
  1047:3 1057:15,20
  1061:20 1062:22
```

```
1063:6 1099:7
  1100:16
adopting 1059:10,19
  1060:1
adoption 1033:24
  1034:10,12 1058:13
  1074:21
adopts 1035:14
  1053:11,12,24 1098:5
  1098:7
advise 1059:9 1060:11
  1060:19
advocacy 984:24
affairs 984:14
affiliated 1058:1
affirmative 978:1
  1040:15
affronting 1121:24
afternoon 1055:8
  1057:12,13 1113:7
  1127:3,5
agencies 989:25 994:24
  1004:8,14,18 1011:13
  1011:23 1019:25
  1020:4,11 1021:20
  1022:17 1023:18,23
  1024:2,7 1044:14
  1063:7 1081:13
  1083:3,6,8,9 1085:1
  1098:4,7 1126:15,19
  1126:20,23 1152:15
  1152:23 1153:1
agency 985:14 1011:14
  1011:15 1018:17
  1020:12 1074:23
  1081:7 1082:9,13
  1083:17,24 1084:3,23
  1085:2
agency's 1020:6
aggregate 1084:20
ago 1034:11 1051:1
  1102:21 1143:9
agree 982:21 1003:13
  1004:21,25 1005:7,11
  1042:16,24 1044:8
  1047:19 1050:5
  1052:6 1068:7
  1073:21 1093:24
  1137:11 1148:18,21
  1154:14
agreeable 972:4
agreed 1005:15 1067:5
  1067:5 1073:9,15
  1087:3,4 1088:14,15
  1092:18
agreeing 976:25 1008:8
  1067:22
agreement 968:11
```

969:9,15 971:1,22 973:22 974:2,3,7,23 979:14 980:8,17,20 981:9,13 982:7,8,16 985:5.8.11.16.17.19 985:20,23 986:2,4,6 986:10,12,14,17,19 987:2.6.25 988:12.19 989:7 991:25 1002:7 1002:9,18,25 1005:6 1005:11,19,24,24 1006:2,6,10,12,17 1007:12,13,23 1008:9 1009:9,10,13,14,19 1010:2,12 1012:22 1015:20,21 1016:15 1022:24 1023:22 1025:14 1028:4,8,20 1029:6,24 1030:9,17 1032:7,13 1033:12,17 1036:24 1037:4,14,18 1043:7 1045:5,10,18 1045:23 1046:4,7,9 1046:10,12,17,24 1057:15 1063:22 1065:21,21 1066:1,2 1066:3,6,10,13,20,21 1066:22,23,24,25 1067:4,11,12,16,21 1067:25 1068:1,8,10 1068:19,20,25 1070:19 1073:14 1075:13,24 1076:17 1079:24 1085:13,15 1086:2,5,11,14,16,18 1086:21,23,25 1087:3 1087:4,7,11,16 1088:1,4,6,8,12,21 1089:7,10,21 1090:1 1090:8,23,24 1091:1 1091:6,14,25 1092:2 1092:3,24 1093:16,25 1094:8 1101:7 1104:17,21 1106:11 1106:19 1107:14,16 1111:13 1114:6,21 1115:2,10,20 1116:7 1116:11 1117:1,15 1118:11,21 1119:1,7 1119:16,20 1120:5,10 1120:20 1122:18 1125:10,11,14,17 1150:16,20,23 1151:24 agreements 1013:9,9 1013:22,24 1014:7 1044:22 1046:11

1063:22 1066:5,18

	1		1	1
1067:2,3 1070:4	1120:7 1121:16,16	1037:10	1147:25 1149:11	979:13 983:16 984:7
1073:6,12,16 1090:15	1124:10,13,15 1126:1	approach 994:23	1150:2,5 1151:7	984:12 985:2,4
1122:22	amounts 1087:18	1141:15 1144:11,12	1150:2,5 1151:7	986:15,24 987:1,5,12
agricultural 1012:5	1092:5 1095:10	1144:13	asking 971:4 1042:9	988:6,10,14,20,23
	1121:14 1123:1		1043:21 1100:5	989:7,17,21 990:6,14
ahadlock@kvn.com 967:7		appropriate 1069:6		
	1153:9	1147:5,9 1149:17	1136:11 1146:19	991:4,16,20 992:1,2,4
ahead 1000:10 1039:23	analysis 1103:7,19	appropriately 1131:10	1154:22	992:8,23 993:1,18
1057:8 1059:4	1104:23 1105:24,25	1149:18	aspect 999:7 1001:1	994:14,21,22 995:7,8
1121:10 1138:25	1106:18 1130:14,15	approvals 1069:16	aspects 1103:10	996:1,3,6,17 998:3,7
1148:25	1131:3 1132:19	approved 998:1	assemble 1108:1	998:10,24 1001:18
Alameda 967:16	1133:2,7 1134:4,14	1035:20 1057:21	asserted 979:11	1002:1,19 1003:1,24
All-American 988:3	1135:9,23 1136:1,4	1058:11 1091:24	1040:15 1046:3	1004:17,21,25 1005:7
989:4 1005:12 1007:6	1137:1,7 1139:22	1105:4	assertion 987:4	1005:11,15,20,25
1008:4 1069:3,10	1144:14,22 1148:12	<b>approves</b> 1035:15	assessed 1152:24	1006:4,9,14 1007:25
1075:23	1149:12 1152:13	1091:21	assessments 1084:18	1008:7 1009:8 1010:4
<b>alleged</b> 1033:23	1153:16,21	approving 1105:3	assign 1049:14	1010:8 1011:16
allocated 1036:12,16	<b>analyze</b> 1132:12	approximated 1125:24	assigning 1152:21	1012:16 1013:11,13
1120:24	analyzed 1152:7	1153:5	assistant 978:10 984:6	1013:15,19,24 1014:8
<b>allocation</b> 1022:10,16	analyzing 1152:9	approximation	984:10,18,19 985:3	1014:9,12,13,15,17
1041:6,8 1066:12	<b>Angeles</b> 967:13,16	1151:22	1021:22 1022:3	1016:3,10,20,23
1068:20,25 1075:23	1045:6,21,22	<b>April</b> 966:11 1071:2	ASSOCIATES 966:22	1017:2,7,15,18
1099:3	ANN 1156:7	1092:9 1154:24	assume 1006:8 1056:25	1018:2,13 1019:2,18
allocations 991:22	annual 1001:10	1155:7 1156:16	1129:8,12 1135:15	1020:15,16,19,23
997:7 1035:25 1036:1	1098:14 1111:6,11	aqueduct 973:25	1145:17 1149:12	1021:3,8,13,23
1036:5,8 1098:24	1125:13	988:18 1079:7,10,12	assumed 1063:23	1022:5,14,19 1023:6
allotment 1020:20	annually 991:22 1029:9	1146:23	1065:14,15 1136:8,16	1023:7,20,21 1024:8
<b>allow</b> 995:1 1042:15	1071:12	aqueducts 982:2	assuming 1024:6,17	1024:18,22,24 1025:2
1045:6 1099:13	answer 970:8 973:11	1145:1,12,19,25	1049:1 1121:8	1025:10,13 1026:22
1148:24	1043:24 1052:20	1146:15	1146:22 1149:1	1038:14 1041:2,20
allowed 1108:15	1139:4 1147:10	<b>arbitration</b> 1127:13,21	1152:24,25	1066:22 1067:10,13
allows 973:22	answered 1039:21	1127:23 1128:1	assumption 1105:14	1067:19 1068:24
alongside 1107:8	1147:25	area 987:13,17 1012:7	1136:20 1140:10,11	1069:7,7,25 1070:12
alternate 1103:3	anticipate 976:14	1019:13 1091:3	1140:13 1143:19,25	1070:20 1071:1,9
alternative 997:11	anticipated 1028:25	1123:25 1124:21	1144:3,13 1145:23	1073:1 1077:2
1048:3 1052:3	1029:1,6	1129:25 1142:11	1152:2	1091:15 1095:8
1053:18 1098:16,20	antitrust 995:4	argue 978:1	assumptions 1129:4,17	1097:11,15,23 1098:6
1098:24 1099:3,7,9	anybody 970:6 1137:15	argument 995:6	1132:2,5,10 1139:14	1098:12 1099:13
1099:13,14,17	anyway 999:3	argumentative 1043:4	1139:17 1145:6	1102:7,19,24 1103:3
alternatively 990:20,21	<b>apologize</b> 981:4 1100:4	1059:21 1061:6	1150:6	1103:6,19,22 1106:10
alternatives 1053:16,17	apparent 980:25	arises 981:22	assymetric 1154:23	1107:15 1111:11
altogether 1018:21	982:23 983:7	arithmetic 1142:16	asymmetrical 1056:6	1115:13 1119:15
Ambiguous 1141:25	<b>Appeal</b> 1027:19,21	arranged 988:10	1056:16	1120:23 1125:4
amended 1087:6	appealed 1027:13	arrangement 1046:2	attempt 1123:23	1146:6
amount 975:20 976:5	appear 997:8,10	arrive 1143:4 1147:8	attend 1061:11,15,16	<b>Authority's</b> 984:20,24
1005:4 1008:15	APPEARANCES	arriving 1142:16	attendance 1000:7	985:5 986:9 987:16
1016:10,20 1017:8	967:1	1147:3	attended 1061:18	988:17 990:2,11
1020:17 1021:6	appearing 1057:5	art 1140:2	attention 1037:8	992:8,15 994:7 996:8
1022:12 1024:15	appears 1108:14	articulate 999:25	1043:9,17	997:16 998:13 999:24
1050:4 1082:15	appellate 1027:14	artificially 997:10	attorney's 1003:19	1002:10 1003:6,22
1088:9 1089:6,7,12	applicable 974:5,13	aside 1080:17 1089:20	attorneys 1057:3	1004:9,15 1012:13,21
1089:12,13,21,22	980:10 1003:12	asked 981:21 1018:18	attraction 1012:5	1014:3,21 1020:14
1091:1,10,11,13	1004:6,7,10,12	1039:5,20 1041:13	attributable 974:16	1021:23,25 1022:9
1092:15,16 1097:24	1043:19 1044:3,4,6	1062:5,11,15,20	975:4 1126:7	1023:3,24,25 1024:10
1098:9 1099:14	1044:12 1046:21	1068:14 1070:3	<b>AUDREY</b> 967:5	1066:20 1091:3
1106:18 1114:23	1078:2 1097:8	1075:2,3,5 1099:16	authoritative 1128:22	1098:3,8 1100:17
1115:15 1116:3,10	applied 1135:8	1104:16 1106:9	authorities 1013:6	1103:16 1107:4
1117:3,10,17 1118:16	apply 1073:21 1100:14	1122:24 1129:4	authority 966:6 971:7	1119:20 1122:25
1119:3,14,17,23	appreciate 983:10	1134:20 1135:15	975:13,14 976:11	1124:1,20,23 1146:9
., , .,	**			, -,
	ı	I	1	I

available 986:16,18,22
989:8,17,22 999:16
1006:5 1007:24
1020:1,12 1024:16
1088:25 1089:8,22
1090:3,4,25 1091:2
1091:12,14 1092:1,6
1092:11,13 1093:4,12
1093:15,23,23
1094:16 1112:23
1130:23 1131:4,7
1133:22 1135:4
1151:4,18,22 1152:3
avoid 978:2,3
aware 987:4 1022:18
1040:18 1044:17,24
1046:14 1053:17
1099:20,24 1122:17
1141:20,22,22
<b>AWWA</b> 1128:15
-

В **B** 967:12 1003:12 bachelor's 1104:6 back 973:10 978:15 992:17 1023:16 1026:7 1027:15,22 1032:19 1033:8 1042:13 1046:19 1053:7,11,24 1055:24 1069:21 1086:19 1102:25 1109:23 1110:24 1119:13 1125:7 1126:10 1134:6 1151:8,16 backed 1150:25 background 1104:5 1112:16 1135:3 1151:15 **backup** 1035:5 **ballpark** 1125:24 bar 1014:9 1073:20 1074:17 **Barbara** 1156:4,8 bargain 1073:9,14 1097:11 **barred** 1074:8 based 1012:5 1020:6 1025:6.8 1085:7 1099:14 1104:18 1105:13 1107:3,6 1115:12 1116:25 1119:17,19 1123:25 1125:14 1126:19 1133:4,6 1134:5 1140:11 1144:12 1145:22 1146:21 bases 1150:5

basically 1129:18 1131:14 basis 1023:12 1033:10 1099:12 1139:25 1142:25 1143:2.14 1145:23 **Battery** 966:24 967:6 bear 994:17 1146:15,23 beg 1055:18 **began** 1013:7 begins 1007:19 1071:7 1089:1 **behalf** 1004:8,13 1044:13 1150:2 belief 1060:17 believe 973:21 974:20 982:9,23 983:7 993:20 1020:23 1021:16 1030:21 1033:15 1034:7 1036:14 1037:5 1045:7 1046:9 1051:18 1059:5 1060:10,15,17 1061:1 1064:4 1075:5,8,17 1085:14 1092:14 1100:10 1113:20 1116:9 1123:12 1139:13,15 1142:2 1143:18 1147:1 **believed** 1042:22 1043:1 believes 994:21,22 1021:4 1023:7 1040:6 believing 1061:4 belong 1132:3 **belonged** 1062:10 1063:2 beneficial 1132:13,16 1132:20 benefits 1015:5 1065:17,20 1086:1 1092:3 best 1151:21 1152:3 better 1048:2 1138:20 1139:8,15 **betterment** 1139:1,3 beyond 1067:11 1131:21 1133:7 1145:3,15 1146:16 1148:23 **Biando** 994:7 bifurcated 1027:9 big 1147:11,20,24 bigger 1141:2 billed 1094:13 **billion** 1025:15 1124:21

1126:17

**bills** 980:13 1109:22 binder 993:23,24 1011:3 1043:11,12,12 1043:14,14 1106:24 1106:25 1108:11.12 1108:12,18 1109:25 1110:1.2 **bit** 1000:24 1017:12 1067:24 1097:21 1111:14 1122:7 **blow** 1071:6,7 **board** 968:12 974:4 977:3,3 984:14 991:1 991:1 994:6 998:4,21 999:5,7,12,20,25 1000:13,16,19 1001:6 1001:13,19 1004:5 1014:9 1017:24 1018:1,5 1034:4 1035:5,11,13,14,15 1043:19 1044:5 1058:3,18,25,25 1059:9,17,25 1060:11 1060:12,16,19 1071:11,13 1097:8,13 1097:22 1098:12,19 1098:23 1099:2 1101:4,15,18 1131:5 1131:5 board's 1105:4 board-approved 1111:23,24 1112:12 1130:22 **Bond** 1057:24 1058:1,9

1130:22 **Bond** 1057:24 1058:1,9 **bonds** 1103:23 **bottom** 975:21 996:25 1006:23 1026:17 1027:25 1043:10 1058:7 1097:5 1124:9 1125:22 1126:12,12 1126:17 **bound** 1068:16 **boundaries** 995:2

boundaries 995:2 bounded 1008:12,21 bracket 1067:20 breach 981:7,11 982:22 982:23 1033:23 1034:6 1046:4 1047:14 1053:2 1057:21 1058:14 1059:10,19 1060:2,7 1061:20 1138:9,17,21 breached 974:2

breached 974:2 1033:12,16 1046:7 1150:23

breaches 1034:12,14 1034:19 1036:1,6 break 970:5,6,9

1018:16 breakdown 1077:9 1125:9 **Breaux** 1018:16,18 brief 970:15 973:12,16 978:17 979:9,10,20 979:23.23 **briefing** 977:13 **briefly** 987:15 990:10 992:14 1103:5 1104:22 1119:13 1126:11 **bring** 970:13 978:15 980:14 1073:19 1074:6 broadly 1065:25 1066:3 brought 999:11 1027:4 brown 966:22 975:21 bucket 1129:24 **budget** 978:19 **building** 1069:9,12 built 1028:22 1031:19 **bundled** 993:16 **burdened** 1132:21 **Bureau** 1091:20 1109:21 businesslike 1041:19 **buy** 1025:2 1093:22 **buying** 1075:19 1076:2 1076:4 1078:24 1079:1,14,16 1080:10 1080:19 1082:5 1083:21 1093:20 1144:2,3 buys 981:23 1076:6 1077:23 1081:7 1093:13 1144:16

C
C-U-S-H-M-A-N 984:1
CA 966:24
calculate 977:10 992:8
1050:3,12 1051:7,22
1062:21 1099:13
1104:16 1106:9
1108:15 1111:10
1122:24 1123:18
1124:11 1147:15
calculated 1020:5,6
1104:18,20 1115:9
1120:22 1121:7,17
1123:7 1125:25
1134:5 1139:22

1150:22

calculates 1081:16

1083:12 1085:8

1096:22 1143:1

calculating 977:6 992:15 1100:6 1106:8 1122:18,22 1128:19 1139:22 1151:3 **calculation** 969:10.11 969:12,13 992:20 1022:19 1023:3,10,13 1023:17.20 1024:9.10 1025:6 1062:11 1063:13 1084:15 1100:16 1113:2 1116:24 1118:9 1122:15 1123:9 1124:17 1138:4 1143:2 1145:22 1148:3 calculations 1106:18 1106:21 1112:19 1113:14 1115:7,19 1119:19 1121:6 1125:9 1129:19,23 1131:8 1145:17 1148:12 calendar 1001:8 1009:6 1018:25 1091:17,21 1091:23 1110:6 1111:4 1112:14

1140:7,16 1152:15

California 966:1,9,11
966:17 967:6,10,13
967:16 970:1 977:17
984:25 1053:1 1055:1
1065:5 1156:3,9,17
1156:25

call 971:5,8,10,13,18 972:11 1101:25 1155:8 called 983:19 999:13

called 983:19 999:13 1030:13 1043:9,16 1045:7 1066:2,12 1087:5 1102:4 1109:20 1128:12 1133:13 1154:9,21

**calling** 971:24 972:1 1155:1 **calls** 983:16 1054:1

1059:1 1093:6 1102:7

canal 985:13 986:21

988:7,11,15 989:5,8

989:16 990:2 1005:7

1005:16,21 1007:5,6

1007:22,25 1008:1,4

1024:21 1063:23

1064:16 1065:4,6,15

1065:22 1067:6,7,12

1068:21,22,25 1069:4 1069:10,13 1103:11 1107:5 1125:12

	1	Ī	I	1
canals 973:24 981:25	980:14 1008:10,18	1105:5,6 1107:8	989:13,24 992:12	1151:13
988:4 1005:13 1069:9	1009:1 1010:16	1109:19 1110:25	1064:14,15,18,19	complied 980:16
1069:11 1075:23	1011:25 1012:3,23	1111:2,10 1112:20,25	1065:25 1075:22	1036:23 1037:3,13,17
candid 1101:20	1068:14,15 1073:19	1128:19 1130:21	1078:24 1079:2,5,6	complying 980:17
capacity 994:16,25	1074:2,7,16,24	1133:4 1143:22	1079:20 1080:3,21	component 1039:16
1045:10	1149:4,6,17	1144:17,17,19	1102:18 1103:1,9	components 1077:12
capital 1025:11,15	challenged 990:12	1150:19 1153:7	1109:24 1110:7	1078:16,20 1080:5,9
1104:1,3	challenges 1012:9	charging 992:2	1144:25 1145:11,18	1080:11,17 1081:12
career 1133:19	challenging 1035:9	<b>chart</b> 969:8,9 975:19	1145:24 1146:5,12,14	1105:11,12 1111:18
Carlsbad 1025:14,16	1120:6	1006:16,19 1007:1	1146:23	1134:20
1025:17	<b>change</b> 979:6 981:1	1014:25 1015:19,21	column 1107:18,23	<b>composed</b> 1081:19
carriage 1089:11,16	1012:10 1056:17	1084:18 1124:10	1108:6 1110:25	comprise 1076:18
carry 985:10	1071:13 1074:6,15	charts 1125:8	1112:4,6 1124:14,25	comprised 1030:2
carrying 1069:1	1121:4 1124:17	check 1068:24	1125:12	comprises 987:23
case 966:7 970:15	1125:25 1147:13	Chen 969:19 971:6	columns 1082:5 1112:2	computer 1129:22,22
971:10 973:21 987:9	1148:2 1150:19	972:1 973:2 <b>chief</b> 1010:24 1018:16	come 1038:3 1058:17	1129:22 1131:15
990:7,13 992:24	1154:11 1155:6		1153:21 1155:3	computer-aided
995:9 996:4,7,21	changed 1072:4 1085:6	1103:2 cited 993:20	comes 973:12 977:13	1156:12
997:17 1013:13 1016:2 1018:23	1102:24 1103:3 1106:3 1113:3	city 1045:21 1103:23	1025:17 1052:2 1079:19 1122:4	computers 1133:22 concentration 1104:8
1016:2 1018:23	1151:24	1104:1,4	coming 971:2 977:14	concept 1074:22
1045:13 1046:1	changes 1049:1	Civil 970:16	1008:3 1127:16	1132:16
1049:4 1052:14,18	1084:17 1150:18	claim 1053:3 1084:21	1145:6	concern 1026:25
1056:11 1057:2,19	changing 1051:15	1085:9	commingled 989:22	concerned 1010:3
1058:21 1102:20	characterize 1067:9	claimed 1078:7	commissioner 1103:4	1108:21
1111:16 1112:19	1086:18 1128:18	claiming 1120:6	commitment 1094:5	concerning 1075:10
1120:25 1122:12	characterized 983:4	claims 981:23 1033:12	committed 1025:13	concerns 1012:20
1130:14 1134:17	<b>charge</b> 993:13 1003:11	1035:25 1036:5	1092:4 1093:17	1038:25 1041:3,19,20
1135:10,25 1136:3	1004:4,16,17,18	clarification 1100:4	committee 991:2	concession 980:15
1138:3,9 1152:13	1014:14 1027:12	<b>clarify</b> 973:19 1107:12	1017:25 1058:17,18	conclude 1104:13
1154:18,23 1155:5,6	1043:18 1046:20	1122:7,9 1151:6	committees 1058:19	conclusion 1003:8
cast 1001:18 1098:13	1081:8,14	clarifying 1149:19	common 974:12	1042:9 1054:2 1059:2
Castaic 999:14	<b>charged</b> 974:6 977:15	clause 979:2 1013:14	communicate 998:10	1091:23 1138:19
categories 997:5,7	999:18,20 1004:1	1073:4,18	1017:18 1041:3	1139:7
category 999:22,23	1016:17 1033:7	clauses 1073:7	communicated 1041:12	conclusions 1042:12
1112:7	1044:20,25 1045:2	<b>clear</b> 1068:23 1075:1	1041:14,18,24	concocted 1010:13
<b>caught</b> 1037:7	1050:4,9,13,18,20,20	1076:3 1105:18	communicates 1041:20	condition 981:8
causal 1132:13,17,20	1051:12,23,24 1052:9	1110:25 1121:21	communication 1040:2	conducted 1106:1
causation 1099:21,25	1052:14,15 1099:17	1126:6,12 1127:23	communications	conform 985:17
1132:18	1099:22 1100:1	1134:8	1018:1 1041:5	confusing 1022:2
caveat 1056:23	1119:15,17 1131:10	clearly 1085:19	comparatively 1008:15	confusion 1150:1
center 981:6	1140:21 1141:4,12	CLERK 983:23 1047:7	compare 995:7 997:15	connect 988:17
CEO 1038:15	1142:13 1149:7,15	1102:10 1116:18	1009:9 1017:6	connection 980:5
certain 975:20 978:3	1152:1	clock 1074:13	1121:16	consent 978:2 979:21
1022:12 1026:11	charges 974:4 975:20	close 1018:10 1140:9	compared 1017:3	<b>conservation</b> 974:16
1042:14 1082:9	976:1 992:18 993:3	closed 979:13,17,19	comparison 1148:6	975:8 985:1 998:20
1087:17 1088:9	1003:11 1004:5	closely 1103:15	competitive 997:10	1013:9,23 1148:20
1129:4 1149:7 certainly 982:9	1016:17 1017:3 1030:3,5 1034:1	Coachella 988:4 989:5 1005:12 1007:5	compilation 1108:4 complaining 978:7	conserve 991:11 consider 997:20
1086:17 1153:20	1036:2,7,9 1039:1	1003.12 1007.3	complete 1062:6	1135:22 1136:13,25
CERTIFICATE	1030.2,7,9 1039.1	1075:23	1063:10 1068:11	considerable 1069:1
1156:1	1043.18 1040.20,23	Code 970:16 974:11	1112:20	considerably 1068:4
Certified 1156:7,24	1050:17 1051:11,12	collected 1020:10	completed 1007:4	1088:15
certify 1156:9,14	1072:13 1077:19	collection 1066:4	1008:1,2,4	consideration 1101:17
cetera 1058:10	1081:18 1082:3	collects 991:8	completely 1005:3	considered 1018:6
chair 1058:18	1085:7 1094:14	<b>Colorado</b> 973:24 975:9	1056:6 1097:19	1142:3
<b>chairman</b> 994:5 1058:9	1095:10,16 1097:7	975:12 976:12 982:1	1105:21 1154:22	consistent 1059:15,24
<b>challenge</b> 979:16 980:9	1098:7 1103:16	982:2 984:23 988:17	complex 1133:17,20	1060:18 1061:1
			1,	
	I	1	I	ı

1000 01 04 11 47 6	Ι.
1099:21,24 1147:6	
consists 1076:11	coı
constitute 1001:11	coı
1034:6 1061:9	cor
constructed 1069:3	coı
construction 1025:16	1
	_
1069:8	coi
<b>contain</b> 1002:9 1013:22	9
contained 981:8	9
1105:14 1107:8	
	1
1108:13 1135:4	]
contains 1003:7 1086:6	1
contend 995:22	1
1046:21 1058:14	]
contended 995:24	]
1036:22,22 1037:2,12	1
1037:16 1047:3	1
contending 976:10	1
contends 1034:6	1
1084:6	
	COI
contention 1085:9	]
contest 1003:20	coı
1108:23	1
contested 1108:20	coı
contesting 1003:10	coo
1062:10	Ç
contests 1003:16	cod
context 979:13 1026:9	coo
1042:15,24	coc
contingent 1086:24	co
	_
<b>continue</b> 973:1 1007:15	coı
1014:13,17 1017:15	coi
1113:11	coı
CONTINUED 969:2	
	1
continuing 1011:22	1
	1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4	1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8	1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17	1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17	1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17	1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19	1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20	1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19	1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15	1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6	1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24 contracts 1013:6	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24 contracts 1013:6 1070:2,9	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24 contracts 1013:6 1070:2,9 contractual 982:3	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24 contracts 1013:6 1070:2,9 contractual 982:3 contrary 995:3	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24 contracts 1013:6 1070:2,9 contractual 982:3 contribution 1023:19	
continuing 1011:22 1012:4 continuously 978:8 990:17 contract 969:14 973:15 973:21 974:21 975:17 978:2,17 980:13,19 981:3,7,12,18,20 982:8 988:14 1016:15 1034:19 1036:1,6 1047:14 1053:2 1057:22 1058:15 1059:11,20 1060:2,7 1061:20 1069:23 1093:3 1120:9 1132:24 1133:1,8 contracted 989:2 contracting 988:24 contracts 1013:6 1070:2,9 contractual 982:3 contrary 995:3	

```
1084:16 1126:14,15
ntroversial 1074:12
nversation 1018:15
nversations 1049:2,6
nvey 1012:1 1044:22
1045:8
nveyance 977:23
980:1 994:18 997:6
997:12 1004:7,13
1016:17 1028:23
1031:18 1036:2,8
1044:13,20 1051:6,14
1051:19 1052:3
1076:16 1078:15,20
1079:12 1080:2,21,23
1081:2,8,9,14,17,18
1082:25 1083:1,9,15
1083:25 1084:6,7,8
1085:3,7,21 1090:13
nveyed 1012:6
1079:6
nveying 1047:23
1048:7 1079:10
nveys 1038:24
oling 978:24 979:7
980:5,7 983:1
oling-off 980:24
ordinating 1104:3
ordinator 1104:2
py 1011:7
re 1021:7
rporate 970:17 973:5
rrect 987:9 1009:2
1015:3 1018:8
1026:23 1028:1,10,23
1029:8,24 1030:9,11
1030:23 1031:5,8,19
1032:7,15,21 1033:14
1034:1,2 1035:6
1036:3,9,17 1037:6
1037:14,15,18,19
1038:8,19 1039:6
1047:15,16 1048:4,5
1048:8,24 1050:10,13
1050:16,21 1051:3,4
1051:8,17,21 1052:1
1053:13,16,25 1056:1
1065:9,18 1070:10,14
1070:22 1071:19
1072:7,13,24 1073:10
1073:15 1075:15,24
1075:25 1076:13,17
1077:20 1078:5,6,9
1078:12,13,17,22,25
1079:13,21 1080:4,11
1085:8,25 1086:25
1088:5,11,13,16,25
1090:20,21 1091:8
```

```
1092:13,14,18
  1093:18 1096:11,14
  1101:22 1102:21
  1105:16 1106:12,13
  1116:12 1123:10
  1126:4,9,16,21
  1127:8,15,19,22
  1128:7.11 1129:5.11
  1129:14 1130:12,16
  1131:12 1132:5,11
  1133:2 1134:18,20
  1135:18 1136:9,10,15
  1138:1,5,6,18
  1139:11,21,25 1140:8
  1140:14,16,18,19,24
  1141:4,12,16,17,20
  1141:24 1142:14,15
  1143:6,9,13 1144:4,7
  1144:11,22 1148:3,16
  1148:17 1149:8,13,14
  1149:23 1150:7,25
  1151:1 1152:1,2
corrected 1104:25
  1106:9 1140:8,18,20
  1141:2,3,6,7,11
  1142:17 1143:5,23
  1144:6 1147:3
correctly 1127:24
  1136:7
correspondence 1131:6
corresponding 1112:25
cost 975:8 976:12
  977:19 978:20 979:25
  990:20 994:17 997:1
  997:5 1012:1,5,7
  1017:22 1025:4
  1026:11 1035:5,7
  1078:19 1079:9
  1099:21,24 1105:5,14
  1105:15 1111:15
  1130:3,8 1131:5
  1132:18 1133:5
  1134:6 1139:24
  1140:6,10,12 1146:3
  1146:24,25 1149:5,16
costs 974:16 975:5
  976:3 978:13,14
  991:18,23 992:19,19
  993:16 994:15,16
  995:9 997:7,10,12
  998:17,17,20 999:12
  999:13,19,21 1000:12
  1000:15 1003:18
  1012:15,15 1026:11
  1028:15 1031:17
  1035:8,25 1036:5,13
  1041:7,11 1048:16,18
  1048:21,22,22 1049:8
```

```
1049:12,12,15
  1061:25,25 1062:10
  1062:12,18,22
  1063:11,15 1072:6,12
  1078:15 1098:25
  1100:1,6,18 1105:18
  1120:2,24 1121:15
  1129:9.13.15 1130:6
  1130:15 1131:9,10
  1132:3,13,21 1134:15
  1134:23 1135:16
  1136:1,5,13,19,21
  1137:4,8,9,12,12,16
  1137:17,21,22 1138:5
  1139:9,24 1140:1,6
  1140:12 1141:24,24
  1142:9,14 1146:15
  1148:19,20,20 1149:5
  1149:7,9,15,18,21,22
  1150:6,24 1151:8,25
  1152:1 1153:6
counsel 967:15 994:7
  1026:6 1043:9,16,21
  1075:3 1129:8
counsel's 1043:6
count 1021:15 1075:18
  1078:3,8,17,20
  1079:13
counted 1075:14
counting 1152:18
countless 990:17
County 966:2 975:13
  979:12 984:7 986:25
  986:25 987:20,24
  988:8,11,18 1012:21
  1071:1 1090:19
  1102:19 1125:1,2,20
  1156:4,8
couple 982:19 1030:18
  1067:7 1068:21
  1082:4
course 972:13 983:8
  1005:10 1012:17
  1057:1,2,3 1091:16
court 966:1 970:5,7,20
  970:22 971:12,16
  972:4,9,16,23 973:5
  978:5 982:18,25
  983:3,10,14 984:16
  987:15 990:10 993:25
  995:15 996:2,20
  1000:6,9 1006:21,23
  1008:23 1009:3
  1011:1,4,8 1015:2,4,9
  1015:11,16,18,24
  1025:22 1027:9,10,11
  1027:14,15,18,19,21
  1027:22 1029:12,14
```

1029:18,20 1038:4 1039:22 1042:10 1043:3 1048:11 1053:6 1054:3 1055:8 1055:10,12,15,21,24 1056:8,18 1057:1 1059:3,22 1061:7 1068:15 1075:2 1077:5 1081:3 1093:8 1094:24 1095:3 1096:25 1100:23 1101:13,23,25 1105:3 1105:23 1106:4 1108:19 1109:1,4,6,9 1109:12,15 1110:11 1110:19,21 1113:7,11 1113:17 1114:1 1116:16,19 1117:25 1118:2 1119:11 1120:12,17 1121:11 1121:25 1122:8,11 1123:13,15 1124:7 1126:6,25 1127:17,21 1130:18 1131:23 1132:1 1133:11,16 1138:23 1142:1,4,22 1142:24 1145:5,8,15 1145:21 1146:17 1148:1,24 1149:24 1150:3,9,11 1153:13 1153:17,22 1154:1,3 1154:12,25 1155:9,14 1156:10 Court's 1018:22 1019:7 1019:11 1053:23 courtroom 970:23 973:7,10 cover 1019:13 **covered** 1016:14 1067:13,15 CPF-10-510830 966:7 **CPF-12-512466** 966:8 create 1147:17 created 990:24 1017:23 1123:6 1152:6 creates 991:9 1020:11 **credit** 1081:14 1083:15 1083:18 1085:22 1094:15 1095:13,17 1096:14 **Credits** 1112:1 CROSS 968:3 cross-examination 1026:1 1057:10 1122:1,5 1126:25 1127:1 1131:24 1153:4

crystal 1105:17

CSR 966:20 1156:7,23 curren 1002:7 current 982:11 1025:7 1070:13,21 1071:10 1103:12 currently 1102:17,18 1111:22 **CURTIS** 966:3 **Cushman** 968:4 969:17 970:18 971:11 978:10 982:5,15 983:16,18 983:25 987:8 992:7 996:13 997:14 1002:15 1006:19 1007:1 1009:7 1010:20 1011:10 1012:11 1014:25 1018:22 1026:3 1043:13 1055:5 1057:12 1097:5 1122:24 1153:16 **customer** 1148:21 customers 994:24 1045:9 D

**D-A-N** 1102:11 **D-E-N-H-A-M** 1102:12 **D-E-N-N-I-S** 983:25 **D.C** 984:25 985:1 damage 1099:14 damages 969:14 974:21 975:15 976:7,16 977:6,10 978:3 980:19 981:18 992:9 992:16 1016:11,21 1017:7,9 1047:15 1050:8,16,18,21 1051:7,12 1052:5,13 1052:18 1053:2,22 1062:6 1104:17,20 1106:19 1115:9 1119:1,5,20 1120:6,9 1121:4,7,17 1127:12 1127:17.20 1138:4 1140:24 1141:15 1144:10,22 1147:21

**D** 968:2

**Dan** 967:5 968:5 975:12 992:12 1023:9 1102:3,7,11 data 1107:22 1112:17 1112:22 1130:2 1131:4,16 1151:17,22

1152:13

date 1012:24 1013:10 1029:22 1072:20

dated 996:14 1026:7

1038:8 1071:2 day 972:22 1154:8,17 1154:17,21 1156:16 deal 978:16 1009:21 1064:1.25 1065:6.18 1065:24 1069:18,20 1069:25 1073:24 1090:17

debt 1103:17 **December** 995:7,12 1026:7 1104:10,24 1107:23,24 1112:25 1154:10 decide 981:21

**decided** 1018:20 1070:9,12 1073:6,11 **decision** 1018:23

1019:7,11 declaring 1014:12 declining 1070:4 1073:5

decree 1109:20 1110:5 deemed 1092:11 default 968:15 1096:3 defendant 967:10 1027:5

defendants 966:14 996:4

defending 1003:19 **defense** 1029:10 1031:21 1037:20 1040:15 1042:5 1058:6 1070:23

1094:19 1096:1 defenses 978:1 981:2

defer 1122:1 **deferred** 1000:16 deficiencies 1012:4 **deficit** 1017:6

defined 1087:17,25 definition 1020:10 degree 1104:6,8 1127:7

delavs 981:14

delegate 1058:3,13,21 1097:22 delegates 998:24

999:24 1001:18 1034:4,17 1058:24 1059:8,17,25 1060:16 1061:2,19 1098:13

1101:8 delineates 1019:24 deliver 1024:2 1091:6,9 1092:4,10,16,25 1093:18 1094:5,6

delivered 985:13 989:11 1006:9 1088:25 1089:6,21

1091:22 1092:1 1093:3 1095:10 1107:13,16 1144:25 1145:11,18

deliveries 969:9 1006:17 1015:20,22 1018:25 1091:16 1125:11.14

**delivers** 1078:15.19 1079:2 1094:15 1095:16

delivery 986:24 993:13 1006:13 1007:2,17 1020:19 1079:4 1088:22 1089:2,3 1125:10

**Delta** 1141:3,10,14 demand 1015:5 1136:5 1136:7,13,22

demanded 1020:19 demands 987:23 1021:17,19 1022:14

demonstrative 1006:21 1014:20 1015:2 1113:18

demonstratives 1015:7 1015:8

**Denham** 968:5 969:19 975:12 976:4 982:6 982:15 992:12.15.17 992:20 1023:9,10,16 1049:3 1061:24 1099:11 1102:3,8,11 1102:16 1105:25 1106:7 1115:6 1116:22 1120:19

1150:15 **Denham's** 1105:23 **Dennis** 968:4 971:11 978:10 983:16,18,25 1055:5

1122:14 1127:3

denominator 1142:17 1143:11 1144:1,5,8 1144:21 1146:2,11 1147:2,8,21,23 1148:3 1151:2

denying 980:6 1033:4 department 966:4 1045:6 1103:15,24 **depend** 1089:9 1126:3

depending 975:22 976:5 depends 1094:8

deposed 1128:2 deposition 966:23

1033:21 1047:11 1075:8 1121:18

1127:24 1128:6 1132:9

**Dept** 968:16,17,18,19 968:20,21,22,23,24

968:25 969:3 derive 1140:8.24 **derived** 1143:3

desalination 1025:14 1025:16.17

describe 990:11 992:14 1007:7,22 1022:22 1095:5

described 1107:19 1111:14 1149:5,16 1150:24 1151:9 1152:21

description 968:8 1086:13 1089:25

**Desert** 988:4 design 1003:1

**designated** 1047:9,17 1048:1 1075:9 1127:14

designed 977:12 1002:10 designing 997:8

**despite** 1057:4 destabilize 979:19 detail 990:10 1039:4

1135:12 detailed 1090:15 1105:24

deter 979:5 determination 1027:19

1063:15 1138:16 determine 1056:12 1061:24 1104:25

1105:7 determined 977:8 1024:3 1056:14 develop 1027:12

**developed** 993:8,20 1017:23 1032:9 1044:21 1045:5

1107:3 1147:12 development 991:10 1105:9 1135:14

develops 981:24 1004:17 **Diego** 966:6 969:8

973:22 974:22 975:13 976:11 977:12 978:7 978:12,23 979:5,12 979:15,24 980:8,13 980:16,24 981:17,23 983:3,16 984:6

986:14,25 987:19,24 988:7,11,18 989:15

990:3 1007:14 1010:14,15 1012:21 1015:4 1021:13 1026:10,21 1027:5 1028:21 1029:1 1030:16 1031:4,7,17 1032:4,12 1033:11,25 1034:4.6.17.25 1035:8,25 1036:5,21 1036:23 1037:1,3,13 1037:17 1038:14,25 1040:3,5,6,22,24 1041:15 1042:6,21,22 1043:1 1044:18,25

1045:1,17,22 1046:3 1046:5,15,16,21,23 1047:3,9,17 1048:2,8 1048:23 1050:7,9,12

1051:23 1057:22 1058:1,3,13,21 1059:17 1060:5 1061:2,19 1062:17

1063:21,22 1064:2,5 1064:22,25 1065:3,6 1065:14,16,17 1067:5 1067:5 1068:7

1069:20 1070:4,8 1071:1 1072:10 1073:5,9,11,15 1074:5.9.14.15.18

1075:12,17 1076:6,16 1077:23 1078:7,11 1079:3,9,20,23

1080:3,10,18 1081:9 1081:19 1084:1,5,7 1085:10,15,18,20,22

1085:23 1086:1,6,8 1086:19,20,24 1087:2 1087:2 1088:14

1090:16,16,18,19 1091:11,14 1092:3,5 1092:9,13,16,17,18 1092:21 1093:12,15

1093:25 1094:4,6,6 1094:10,13,16

1095:18,23 1096:3,6 1096:10 1099:16,22 1100:7 1101:8 1102:19 1103:23

1104:1 1106:18 1114:5,8,15 1115:10 1116:1 1117:7,13

1118:14,20 1120:4,19 1121:14 1133:22 1134:9 1138:8,16,20

1139:8,14 1141:18,19 1141:23 1142:7,12,18 1143:13,15,17 1144:2

	1		1	<u> </u>
1144:15,18 1146:5	disclose 1060:1 1061:4	1141:7 1144:14	1079:13 1108:22	1071:12
1149:8 1150:15,19,22	discourage 1010:7,15	1147:16	1120:16 1131:14	establishes 974:1
1151:23 1152:14	discouraged 977:23	dollar 1008:20 1020:8	1137:1	1004:3
<b>Diego's</b> 982:10 987:19	discovery 1075:8	1124:14	elasticity 1137:1	establishing 993:5,10
1030:11,12,25 1031:9	discriminated 1044:19	dollars 980:19 991:22	element 1086:5	993:14,15 994:9
1047:25 1049:3,8	1046:6	992:5 1020:9 1023:1	1114:14	estimate 1052:17
1050:16 1051:7	discriminating 977:18	1025:15 1065:1,4	elements 1080:24	estimated 1065:11
1052:5 1053:5,22	discuss 1085:13	1067:7 1068:22	1081:19	1120:22 1121:1
1058:24 1059:8,25	discussed 972:8	1084:19	eligibility 1014:3	1153:9
1060:10,16 1061:24	1011:21 1137:19,24	double-negative 1037:7	eligible 1014:12	estoppel 978:2
1062:6,18 1063:15	1143:8	downward 1085:23	email 967:7,8,8,14	et 1058:10
1083:14 1084:12,21	discussing 1062:1	dpurcell@kvn.com	969:17,19 1029:17	evaluated 997:24,25
1085:9,11 1090:18	discussion 1026:12	967:8	1031:12	evaporation 1089:16
1104:17 1119:1,5	1042:11 1055:23	draw 1042:9	<b>EMANUEL</b> 967:11	<b>Evening</b> 1155:15
1121:3,17 1123:18	1074:5,10 1101:24	<b>drive</b> 976:21	embodied 1019:23	event 1003:16 1156:15
1126:14 1133:21	discussions 999:10	drought-year 1022:11	emphasize 980:18	everybody 1113:8
1141:15 1144:10	1024:4	dry-year 999:13,16,18	employed 984:11	1144:3 1155:8,12
1151:23	display 1077:7	999:21 1000:14,20,25	1026:11 1028:9	evidence 968:8 976:19
difference 1024:8,13	displayed 1111:4	1018:6 1022:10	1102:17	981:17 983:1 993:23
1041:25 1042:7	dispute 1022:18,22	1125:2	enacted 1001:3	996:11 1002:14
1050:15,19 1051:23	disputed 975:20	dunes 1069:12	encouraged 977:23	1010:19 1015:25
1052:17 1111:24,25	1120:24	duration 1087:20	ended 1018:12,14	1029:12,21 1031:22
1112:11 1126:7	<b>distinct</b> 1066:18	duties 1059:25 1060:18	1096:10	1037:21 1038:2,5
1147:20,24	1081:23	1061:2	ends 1030:8	1043:7 1058:7
differences 1088:18	<b>distinction</b> 1042:16,23	duty 1058:25 1059:5,9	engineering 1069:8,12	1070:24,25 1076:21
different 977:5 983:2,4	1044:8 1076:1	1059:9,16 1060:10,11	ensure 985:12 1021:9	1076:22 1077:3,6
983:6 1036:11,15	1080:12 1126:7	1061:9	entered 996:4 1046:12	1094:20 1096:2
1044:7,23 1045:14,15	distribution 997:6		1068:19 1073:25	1108:18 1109:7,16
1045:16 1047:19,22	<b>District</b> 966:9,11	E	entering 988:19	1110:10,18,23 1111:7
1050:24 1052:16,22	967:10 981:24 986:12	E 966:3 968:2	entire 1074:21 1107:24	1113:23 1114:2
1053:15 1066:18,19	986:20 988:1 989:3	earlier 976:25 989:6	1116:12 1154:24	1116:14,17 1117:24
1066:24 1081:23	991:1 1007:3 1009:16	1002:5 1003:25	entities 1011:25 1083:5	1118:4 1119:9,12
1086:6 1087:24	1019:23 1026:4	1017:12 1018:4	entitle 1020:15	1120:15,18 1123:11
1089:14,15,24 1101:4	1038:16 1064:13	1053:18 1087:16,25	entitled 973:23 1003:18	1123:16 1124:4,8
1101:16 1106:1	1066:21 1075:21	1088:12 1111:14	1024:19 1082:9,13	exactly 1062:8 1081:2
1109:22 1122:13,25	District's 984:21	eastern-most 1069:13	1124:14 1125:12	1135:7 1150:2
1139:17 1147:15	diversifying 1064:9,10	economic 1012:5	<b>Entitles</b> 1020:16	1154:12
1148:8,8 1152:22	divide 1146:12	1021:2,3 1063:10	entitling 981:25	exam 1063:20 1070:3
1154:13	divided 1140:6,13	1103:10	entity 1084:3 1089:1	examination 984:3
differently 1044:19	division 997:5 1141:7	economics 1104:7	environment 1089:19	1097:1 1102:14
1045:1 1081:4	document 969:1 994:2	1127:6	environmental 1069:15	1148:10 1150:13
difficult 1151:15	996:11,13 1010:22	economy 1021:10	1069:16,16 1089:18	example 971:19
direct 968:3 984:3	1011:11 1026:7	educational 1104:5	<b>equal</b> 976:7 1004:4	1066:19 1067:3
1034:22 1063:20	1027:1 1032:2,4	effect 993:9 998:2	1043:18 1091:7,10,15	1092:8 1094:18
1065:10 1070:3	1038:2 1040:2,7	1001:15 1005:25	1092:5 1137:12	1095:5 1112:5
1102:14 1148:10	1041:1 1071:2,6	1013:20 1095:15	equivalent 973:6	1135:23 1150:5
1153:18	1099:8 1106:24	1098:10	escalated 1087:20,24	Excel 969:5 1107:2
direction 1156:13	1111:1,22 1123:6,23	<b>effective</b> 966:12 981:10	Especially 1042:3	1133:18
directly 1010:14	1130:9,23 1135:5,12	1013:10 1033:13,18	<b>ESQ</b> 967:4,5,5,15	excellent 1039:15
1139:4	documents 1040:12	1038:18 1040:4	essentially 1065:24	excess 994:16,25
director 975:13 978:19	1042:14 1105:7	1058:10	1066:16 1084:11	<b>exchange</b> 968:11 969:9
984:14 992:13	1109:18 1121:20	effectively 997:12	1103:4 1104:2	969:15 973:22 974:1
1102:19,25 1103:8	1130:1,4 1131:2	effort 976:24 986:7	1123:24 1129:21	974:3,7,23 979:14
directors 994:6 1004:5	doing 976:22 1042:18	1018:19,20	1151:17	980:8 981:13 982:7,8
1017:25 1034:4	1065:16,18 1083:10	efforts 990:22 1018:12	establish 976:21 993:6	985:11,16,17,18,23
1043:19 1058:18	1094:4 1118:14	<b>Eighty</b> 1011:3	1005:4	986:2,4,6,10,12,12,14
1060:3,6,21 1071:13	1129:7 1131:8	either 972:1 1022:14	established 974:6	986:17,23 987:2,6
1097:8	1133:25 1137:2	1030:17 1040:16	982:24 993:9 995:25	988:12,19 989:7

990:3 991:25 1002:7
1002:9,18 1005:6,11
1002.9,10 1003.0,11
1005:19,24,24
1006:12,17 1007:8,23
1000.0 1000.0 10 10
1008:9 1009:9,10,18
1010:2,11 1015:20,21
1016:14 1022:24
1023:22 1028:4,7,20
1029:24 1030:8,17
1029.24 1030.8,17
1031:23 1032:6,13,20
1031:23 1032:6,13,20 1033:12,17 1036:24
1033.12,17 1030.24
1037:3,13,18 1043:6
1045:18,23 1046:4,7
1045.16,25 1040.4,7
1046:12,16,23
1056:21 1057:15
1063:21 1065:21
1066:6,22 1067:4,11
1067:16,21,25 1068:1
1068:8,10,19 1070:18
1000.0,10,17 10/0.10
1075:13 1076:17 1079:18,19,23,24
1079-18 19 23 24
1000.22 1001 2 0 20
1080:23 1081:3,9,20
1082:17,21 1084:2
1005.12 15 1006.10
1085:13,15 1086:18
1087:4,6 1088:20
1090:22 1091:1,6
1092:2,3,11,17,22,24
1002.16 25 1005.12
1093.10,23 1093.13
1093:16,25 1095:13 1095:15,23 1096:7,14
1096:16 1101:7
1104:17,21 1106:19
1107:3,4,14,16,18,19
1107:20 1108:2,3,7
1109:19 1111:3,10,13
1111:21 1112:10,13
1112:13,20,24 1114:6
1112.13,20,24 1114.0
1114:21 1115:2,10,20
1116:7,11 1117:1,8
1117:14 1118:11,21
1119:1,6,16,20
1120:5,10,20 1122:18
1125:9,11,14,17
1140:3,23 1141:18
1142:7,19 1143:5,12
11/13.20 11/1/.24
1143:20 1144:24 1145:10,17 1149:8
1145:10,17 1149:8
1150:16,16,20
1151:23
exchanged 1085:23
1094:16
exchanges 1144:15
<b>exchanging</b> 1080:10,19
1082:6 1084:5
1088:19
<b>exclude</b> 970:16,19
1122:21 1123:1
1147:15

```
1023:2 1096:20
excludes 1122:17
excluding 1148:19
exclusion 1056:24
  1057:4
excuse 970:22 1016:19
execution 1012:24
executive 1010:24
exempt 1003:14
exercise 981:14
exercising 981:15
  1074:23
exhibit 993:25 1006:21
  1015:14,25 1026:7,17
  1029:10,10,16,21
  1031:21 1037:20
  1038:5 1043:7 1047:7
  1058:6 1070:24
  1076:20,22 1077:6
  1094:19 1096:1
  1106:23 1107:17
  1108:10,16 1109:7,16
  1110:14,23 1114:2
  1116:17 1118:4
  1119:12 1120:18
  1123:16,17,22 1124:8
  1125:8 1126:11
exhibits 968:7 969:2
  1110:17 1113:18
  1148:11
exist 1098:9
existed 1072:9
existing 979:18
  1009:10 1028:8
  1030:22 1124:20
expect 976:17
expectation 1053:10
expected 978:22 1148:4
expenditures 1025:11
  1069:8 1134:24
experience 1103:18
expert 1049:3,3,20,23
  1050:1 1101:21
  1121:19,23 1122:8
  1127:13,14,20 1128:2
  1128:4,9 1130:13,14
  1131:19,22 1133:25
  1134:10,17,25
  1135:10,24,25 1136:3
  1136:8,12 1137:6,10
  1138:15 1139:7,20
  1146:22 1148:15
  1149:11,25
explain 982:6 1107:1
  1111:9 1124:10,18
explains 975:19
explanation 1114:4
```

explicit 979:12

exposure 1008:20
1067:13,18,20
expressed 1073:12
1074:19 1084:13,22
expressly 974:3
extensively 990:8
extent 977:11 1023:6
1077:21 1130:23
1133:3 1135:19
1142:10 1147:12,13
1148:2
externally 984:20
extra 1024:19
extracted 1131:16
F

face 1069:3 faced 1008:11 1009:8,9 facilities 988:16 1044:23 facility 1045:9,13,25 facility/system 994:19 fact 979:9 999:22 1026:10 1030:11 1060:1 1061:5 1072:20 1078:7 1085:14 1086:24 1091:19 1092:12 1095:23 1121:21 1132:8 1136:18 1139:12 1144:15 1148:18 facts 978:4 **failed** 987:5 fails 981:14 failure 981:8,11 fair 1062:16,16 1130:20 1152:23 1153:20 1155:5,5 fairy 978:16 faith 972:15 973:3 familiar 985:19,22 1019:14 1096:8 1122:14 1128:12 1132:14,16 1133:13 1133:23 far 971:3 972:18 992:15 1001:25 1048:7 1108:21 1141:22 1142:12 1144:18 farther 994:20 **fashion** 1041:13 1127:25 favor 1002:2 1034:18 1065:16 1101:8 February 1038:8,22

feeder 1045:8,8 Feel 970:22 fees 1003:19 **feet** 988:5 1007:13 1064:3 **fiduciary** 1058:25 1059:8,16,24 1060:10 1060:18 1061:2.9 fifth 1007:12 Figueroa 967:12 **figure** 1020:9 1050:7 1125:24 figures 1052:16,17 1108:2,3 1113:4 file 1013:11 **filed** 979:11 995:18 1010:16,16 1013:13 1036:21 1078:8 **filing** 1010:8 1037:1,11 1040:4,23 1041:15,17 1074:2 **fill** 1021:20 final 1009:17 1074:12 finally 980:25 981:20 996:22 1016:23 1024:3 finance 990:20 1000:17 1000:21 1017:20 1103:7,15,22 1104:9 financial 1011:22 1018:16 1020:7 1023:19 1045:15 1103:19 1133:13,17 1134:1,3,10,13 1151:14 find 1040:20,21,25 1055:22 1074:16 1123:13 1130:10 1135:5 **finding** 974:1 fine 1154:14 first 970:18 973:8 975:7 978:6 982:21 983:15,24 984:16 985:22 991:14 996:25 1003:9 1007:5,9,11 1008:2,9,12,14,16,24 1009:15 1011:19 1015:10 1033:12 1046:19 1055:24 1057:14 1058:14 1067:21 1076:4 1086:20 1087:16,19 1106:5,24 1112:16,18 1115:19 1124:10 1125:7,8 1141:1 five 1003:9 1004:20,24 1005:17 1007:11

1008:9,12,13,14,16 1012:24 1025:23 1067:21 1068:13 five-year 979:7 980:4,7 980:17.22 983:1 1003:23 1009:25 1017:14.19 **flat** 1007:18 **Fleming** 1057:25 flex 999:13,17,21 **floating** 1004:22,25 Floor 966:24 967:12 focus 1088:20 **focused** 984:20 **focusing** 1135:24 Foley 968:9 994:5 folks 1056:12 **follow** 1011:8 1084:24 **following** 1034:20 1149:20 follows 983:20 1055:6 1102:5 foregoing 1003:15,17 form 1131:9,13 formal 1013:19 format 1110:21 forth 990:19 forthright 1128:8 **forthwith** 1055:14 forum 1003:11 **forward** 1007:11 **found** 974:10,13 980:5 980:7 1154:6,19 foundation 1021:7 1048:10 1101:12 foundational 1022:8 1133:6 four 975:1,7,24 976:14 1042:13 1070:18 1077:25 1080:14 1119:21 1154:4 four-and-three-quar... 1124:24 **four-inch** 1108:12 fours 1045:17,20 fourth 1080:15 fraction 1143:8 frame 1008:3 Francisco 966:2,16,17 966:24 967:6 970:1 1055:1 1156:17 frankly 972:6 free 970:22 1003:24 1122:4 frequently 1139:18 front 981:6 1106:25 full 990:9 1035:5 1076:9,11 1077:9,12

federal 995:4 1067:1

1077:14,19 1078:4 1080:22 1081:3,7,14 1081:18,21 1085:4 1095:16 1096:11 1112:21 1121:11 **function** 1134:6 1146:5 1147:21 functionalized 1134:21 1140.2 fund 991:9 fundamentally 1022:23 1086:4 **funding** 1014:10,13 1016:24 1017:4 further 1000:19 1055:6 1096:23 1100:22 1150:8 1153:25 1156:14 **future** 979:12 1012:9 1014:3,13 1021:17,18 1024:18 1053:14 1071:11 1139:17 G gain 1011:25

gap 1021:18 Gary 1018:16 Gastelum 968:10,13 969:16 996:15 1010:23 1011:12 1012:12 1037:22 1038:8,12,14 **Gastelum's** 1011:20 gathered 1108:8 gathering 1109:18 general 967:15 971:6 978:11 984:6,10,18 984:19 985:3 986:3.6 990:22 994:7 996:15 996:16 1002:6 1010:24 1011:13 1021:22 1022:4 1028:5 1038:13,15 1138:20 1139:8 generally 1004:6,12 1044:12 1132:18 generate 1025:18 generated 1099:12 **getting** 1067:6 1069:5 1075:21 **Gig** 1030:1 gist 1104:11 give 970:7 1005:16 1011:7 1055:14 1056:4,8,15 1062:5 1062:16 1145:25 1154:8,20,23 1155:7 given 1001:8 1020:2,13

1040:22 1092:21 1093:16 1111:16 1128:3 1132:2 1151:10 gives 1094:15 1095:17 **giving** 971:1 1154:15 go 970:5 971:9 973:17 982:10 1000:10 1029:7,9 1030:17 1035:4 1039:3,23 1046:19 1048:18 1053:7 1055:21 1057:8 1059:4 1061:25 1062:19 1063:4 1071:5 1077:19 1078:20 1084:23 1085:11 1087:17 1088:8 1097:3,18 1102:1 1111:8 1121:10 1126:10 1128:19 1131:1 1136:1,5,14 1137:12 1138:25 1148:25 goal 1134:5 goals 997:9 goes 991:2 1035:7 1043:20 1044:12 1053:11,24 1084:22 1107:24 1136:7,7 1138:23 going 971:8,9,18 976:17 978:25 979:5 1000:18 1007:11 1008:19,25 1015:12 1018:18 1026:14 1030:8 1040:2 1042:11 1048:23 1090:7 1108:20 1114:14 1121:25 1130:7 1141:11,15 1144:6 1151:14 1153:18 1155:8 **good** 972:15 973:3 1026:3,5 1055:8 1057:12,13 1064:1 1069:20,25 1127:3,5 1128:24 1136:25 1154:15 good-faith 1055:14 good-sized 1130:9 **gotten** 971:2 Government 974:11 1067:1 grand 1113:5 granted 970:24 981:9 great 1069:18

greater 1081:20

1082:12,15 greatest 1147:12 ground 1089:17 grounds 1061:8 group 1011:15 groups 990:23 1017:23 guess 971:21 guy 1129:22 1131:14

H

**HADLOCK** 967:5

1029:16 1102:7,15 1106:6 1108:17,24 1109:3,5,8,11,17 1110:9,14,24 1113:12 1113:19,23 1114:3 1116:13,20 1117:23 1118:5 1119:9,13 1120:8,15,19 1121:10 1121:13 1122:6,9,12 1123:11,17 1124:3,9 1126:10,24 1130:17 1131:21 1133:10 1138:22 1141:25 1142:21,23 1145:3,14 1145:20 1146:16 1147:25 1148:23 1150:10,14 1153:15 1153:20,24 half 1021:14 hand 1156:16 happen 972:13 1090:14 1091:3 1092:15 1093:2,10 **happened** 1018:9 1090:22 1096:10,17 happening 1028:4 1086:9 happens 1095:4 happy 1011:7,8 harm 991:16,20 992:1 Havasu 986:23 989:12 989:18,22 1079:3,19 1085:20 1090:18 1092:12 headed 1107:18 1108:7 1120:9 heading 997:1 heard 1057:2 1063:21 1136.6 hearing 1047:1 Hearsay 1000:5 held 984:8 1055:23 1101:24 Hello 1102:16 help 972:10 1149:19 helped 978:19 982:15

helping 978:21 1085:3 hiatus 980:17 higher 1031:23 1064:13,17 1087:9,10 1088:15 1152:14 **highlighted** 1107:20,23 1124:22 hired 1149:25 historically 1012:8 1063:14 home 971:9 honestly 1089:25 1155:2.3 **Honor** 970:12 971:21 972:7,12,19 973:14 983:8,13,15 1000:5 1015:6 1037:25 1042:8 1056:5,23 1113:12 1121:9 1150:8 1153:10,15 1154:2 1155:13 **HONORABLE** 966:3 hope 1037:23 hotly 1074:12 hours 971:23 972:4,16 973:1 1055:17,19,20 1056:4,20 1154:7,14 1154:18,20 huge 981:5 hundred 1068:21 hundreds 1023:1 1065:1,3 hypothetically 1121:4 1121:15 1153:8

i.e 974:12 Ian 1057:25 **ID** 968:8 idea 1030:11,12,16,25 1031:9 1090:2 1137:1 1154:15 identification 1015:7 1015:15 identified 1137:4 1139:23 1140:1 **identify** 1040:1,6 1076:25 1105:7 **ignore** 981:2 II 1027:15,16,23 1110:1 **IID** 973:23 985:12,15 988:7,11,15 989:7 990:2 1007:7,13 1009:17 1024:25 1066:25 1086:20,24 1092:8,15,21 1093:11 1093:15 1107:5

1125:12 illegal 974:24 975:1,10 976:19 977:9 978:9 1039:19 1040:24 1041:4.10.16 1042:1 1042:7,19,20,23 1043:2 1046:24 1051:11 1060:13.17 1060:20,24 1061:4,21 **imagine** 977:5 imagined 977:11 **impact** 1062:17 1063:5 1063:11 1098:5 1121:5,6 1137:16,21 1138:4 1144:8 impacts 1152:10,12 1153:5 **Imperial** 981:24 986:20 987:25 988:4 989:3 1007:3 1009:15 1064:12 1066:20 1075:20 implementation 968:14 985:8 1146:9 implementing 985:11 important 973:18 1011:9 1040:20,21 1042:23 **imported** 987:16,19,21 995:1 1021:25 1022:7 1064.11 **imports** 987:13 **imposed** 1018:24 imposition 994:15 **impossible** 1139:11,12 impression 1035:19 **improper** 977:5 978:8 991:22 1027:20 1041:6,7,21 1042:1 1042:18,20 1046:24 1050:17 improperly 980:20 998:16,18 improvements 1104:2 inappropriate 997:6 1149:6 incentive 994:24 include 976:19 985:7 1011:16 1049:20,22 1050:1 1066:19 1078:22 1079:9 1089:16 1121:5 1135:25 1136:4 1137:15,20 1139:19 1144:1,6,16 1147:14 included 976:7 978:14 1028:9,14,17 1036:2

1036:8 1068:11

helpful 1056:18

1072:5,12 1124:12,20
1134:4 1139:4,24
11/2.11 17 11/2.11
1142:11,17 1143:11 1143:21 1144:21
1143:21 1144:21
1152:12 1153:8
includes 1056:24
1057:7 1076:11,14
1080:2,5 1142:8
including 970:7 995:9
997:25 998:16,18
1013:4 7 1023:24
1013:4,7 1023:24 1035:8 1047:22
1055.6 1047.22
1064:10 1069:5
1078:16,24 1084:17
1141:23
inclusion 979:25
990:15 991:17 993:2
1012:14 1026:10
1124:1 1144:19
inconsistent 1146:13
inconvenient 978:4
incorrect 1146:13
increase 982:12
1001:10,14,20
1001.10,14,20
1025:11 1029:2,3,6
1031:14 1035:21
1049:8 1084:8 1100:6
1100:10,14 1121:14
1137:9
increased 1007:10
1100:15 1124:22
1153:1
increases 1001:7,23
1034:7 1035:1,15
1097:23,24 1098:5,9
1098:14 1101:9
1098:14 1101:9 increment 1007:9
incremental 994:17
1031:23 1032:15,23
1000 0 6
1033:3,6
1033:3,6 increments 1007:11
increments 1007:11
increments 1007:11 1091:16
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16 indicates 1095:9,10
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16 indicates 1095:9,10 indicating 1121:21
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16 indicates 1095:9,10 indicating 1121:21 indication 1012:20
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16 indicates 1095:9,10 indicating 1121:21 indication 1012:20 individual 1001:7
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16 indicates 1095:9,10 indicating 1121:21 indication 1012:20
increments 1007:11 1091:16 incurred 993:17 1003:19 1149:18,22 incurring 999:19 independent 1045:24 1064:5,23 independently 1082:1 1083:20 index 1087:20,24,25 1088:4 indexed 1088:16 indicates 1095:9,10 indicating 1121:21 indication 1012:20 individual 1001:7

```
inference 980:8
inflate 997:11
inform 1022:6
information 1049:20
  1049:23 1050:1
  1108:6,8 1109:19
  1112:20 1131:6
  1135:3 1136:4
  1137:16,21 1148:11
  1152:3
informed 1021:24
informs 1040:5
initial 1004:3 1030:8
initially 1067:5
initiated 995:20
input 1098:3
inside 1037:17
installments 1091:7,10
instance 1044:17
  1089:10 1096:6
  1132:7 1152:25
instances 1083:4
  1094:9
instantaneously 1091:4
instruct 992:7,11
  1049:22 1137:15
instructed 992:17
  1023:5 1049:25
  1061:24
instructions 992:14
  1099.11
insufficient 1022:13
insure 985:15
intake 986:23
integrity 979:2 1010:13
  1012:2 1013:1,5,8,14
  1013:18,22,25 1070:2
  1070:5,10 1073:3,13
  1073:17,20 1074:4,11
  1074:22
intend 971:10 1070:13
  1070:20 1071:9
  1072:10 1073:1
intended 980:9 994:22
  1010:15 1013:20
intent 1147:11
intention 972:3
interest 975:16,18
  1097:23 1098:8
interested 966:10
  1156:14
Interior 968:16,17,18
  968:19,20,21,22,23
  968:24,25 969:3
  1069:24
interrupt 973:16
```

interrupted 1090:14

intervened 1027:5

**intimate** 1151:12 **introduce** 1131:23 introduction 1007:4 **invalid** 978:8,13 1074:17 invalidated 1019:10 1053:6 invalidiate 1005:17 invest 1025:15 investigate 1150:5 investment 986:20 988:3 investments 1021:20 invitation 973:20 invoice 1077:1,2 1094:19 1095:7.21 invoices 969:4 1107:6,9 1108:4,15 1109:18 1111:2 1119:18 1125:15 1130:4 invoke 1013:14 **involve** 1145:1 involved 1019:2 1028:3 1103:7 1145:12 involvement 996:1 involves 1103:9 **irrelevant** 977:4,16 1145:4 Irrigation 981:24 986:20 988:1 989:3 1007:3 1009:16 1064:13 1066:21 1075:21 isolate 1130:11 isolated 1130:6 **issuance** 1103:17 issue 970:25 972:21 974:21 980:6 981:21 982:21 990:7 1001:1 1016:2 1017:16 1018:5 1028:1 1040:14 1055:11 1056:2,5 1075:10 1083:13 1122:6 1141:23 1142:5,6,12 1144:18 1153:6 issued 1110:5 issues 985:4 995:5 item 1039:12 items 1058:17

James 1057:24 1058:1 JAN 966:22 January 966:12,12 984:13 998:2 1038:18 1040:4 1058:10 1107:23 jkeker@kvn.com 967:8 John 967:4,12 968:9 994:5 1026:3 1127:3 johnquinn@quinne... 967:14 Joint 1103:2 **JOSEPH** 967:15 iotted 1043:24 judge 993:24 1057:5,6 judgment 980:6 judgments 1131:9 iudicial 1003:10 1008:10 juggle 972:14 July 984:13 June 978:18 1013:12

K **KARNOW** 966:3 keep 1061:16 Keker 967:3,4 970:12 970:25 971:14,17 972:20 973:2,11 983:12,13 1055:9,13 1056:1,13,23 1143:15 1155:13 kev 1086:5 kind 1130:15 1131:2 knew 978:23 979:5 1008:18 1028:7,14,17 1028:21 1031:18 1032:12,17,19 1033:4 1033:8,9 1067:6 know 973:14,15 977:21 977:25 979:2 984:15 1000:6 1022:11 1029:14 1030:1,7 1033:6.10 1035:4 1040:14 1045:19 1046:20 1047:25 1048:1,7,14,15,16,18 1048:21 1049:25 1051:3,5,5,20,22,25 1053:1 1056:19,20 1059:12,13 1060:3,5 1060:8,21,23 1062:18 1062:25 1063:3 1071:11 1087:2 1108:22 1128:19 1130:9,19,23 1139:2 1142:12 1144:18 1145:25 1146:25 1147:11 1154:25 knowing 1040:20 1145:23 knowledge 1002:2 1151:12 knowledgeable

1047:10,18 1048:1 1053:5 1075:9 known 1143:19 knows 1021:3

L.A 1045:24

**labeled** 1112:1

**LADWP** 1045:6,9,9,11 1045:13 laid 1035:11 Lake 986:23 989:12,17 989:22 999:14,14 1079:3,19 1085:20 1090:18 1092:12 language 983:5 1003:21,25 1009:4 1013:5 1043:6,9 1074:1,12,21 1075:3 1075:4.6 large 1108:18 larger 1141:10,14,14 1144:5,10 largest 1021:12 1069:11 1098:3 1108:11 law 974:5,12,13 977:17 980:10,16 995:25 1003:12 1004:6,10 1014:22 1042:5 1043:20 1044:4,6 1046:21 1053:1 1097:8 lawful 977:14 1004:11 1005:5 1027:17 1031:1 1043:25 1044:7 1047:20,23 1048:6 1050:24 1051:6,14,18,24 1052:3,8,8,20 1053:7 1053:8,11,24 1074:24 1074:25 1106:15 lawfully 1048:4 1152:24 lawsuit 980:25 995:20 996:19 1012:13 1013:11 1036:21 1037:1,12 1040:5,23 1041:15,17 1078:9,12 lawyer 1052:23 lawyers 979:10 lav 1066:4 lead 1041:21 leading 1074:11,20,20 learn 1018:13 lease 1045:10 leave 973:4,8 1035:19

1109:11 1120:4

	1			<u> </u>
left 1005:3	1075:22 1103:11	1090:9	1139:9 1154:4	1000:16,19 1023:4,25
legal 976:23 977:19	1107:5	lost 1078:11	matters 970:13 982:7	1026:11 1033:12
980:14 996:9 1011:23	Linings 1125:12	lot 1017:12 1061:15	<b>Maureen</b> 996:16	1036:12,16,23 1037:3
1042:9,10 1054:2	list 971:7,12,18 973:3	1065:19 1067:10	1038:7	1037:13,17 1040:5,14
1059:1	991:2 1056:8	1086:6 1139:2,17	maximum 977:14,15	1040:22 1042:6,22,25
legalese 1128:3	listen 971:19	lower 1012:5 1032:14	mean 1004:10,14	1043:1 1044:20,25
legality 1040:17	lists 1056:21	1032:22 1033:8	1019:21 1044:10	1046:22 1047:19
1073:13	litigate 979:18 1070:13	1068:4	1046:25 1047:25	1048:7 1050:25
legally 1046:24	1070:20 1071:10	lunch 972:23 1055:10	1085:18 1094:10	1051:6,14,19 1052:9
legislative 1011:23	1072:10 1073:1	runen 9 / 2:23 1033:10	1096:16 1129:21	1052:14,15,19 1053:7
legislature 1068:15	litigated 991:13		1131:1 1132:6,8	1053:11,15,19,21,24
1069:6	litigation 979:12 996:4	M1 1128:13,17	1152:13	1057:14,20 1058:3
legitimate 1097:16	1003:23 1009:25	magnitude 1063:18	meaning 983:1 1045:19	1059:17,20,25
lesser 1012:1	1017:14 1027:3,8,18	1069:10	1097:7	1060:16 1062:21
let's 970:20 973:1	1062:10 1069:17	maintain 1012:2	meaningful 970:8	1063:5 1065:16
1003:25 1015:10	little 971:21 984:9	1059:19	1097:16	1077:23 1078:15,15
1026:6 1029:10	1000:24 1017:12	maintained 1062:9	means 988:2,6 1004:16	1078:19,19 1079:1,2
1046:11 1055:21,22	1022:2 1024:14	maintaining 1063:1	1082:8 1091:18	1080:14,15 1081:12
1056:22 1057:8	1034:23 1097:21	1084:1	meant 1012:8	1080:14,13 1081:12
1070:23 1074:6,15	1107:10 1112:16	maintains 1075:12	measure 1052:4 1053:2	1083:1,5,9 1086:21
1075:7 1076:3,4	1122:7 1149:20	1084:7	1139:3	1090:17 1091:6,9
1079:16,18 1080:17	live 971:25 1028:1	major 1025:11	medium-size 1110:1	1092:4,9,17,24
1085:13 1094:13,18	local 974:15 975:7	majority 1001:13	meet 1022:13	1093:21,22,22,23
1104:22 1106:22	991:11,11 998:19	making 1008:10	meeting 1000:8	1094:5,14 1095:9,16
1113:7,11,16 1123:5	1013:5,8,21,21	1021:20 1022:24	1018:18 1061:16	1096:2,22 1097:24
1123:21 1126:10	1014:3,10 1016:24	1047:5 1076:1 1110:5	meetings 990:23 991:2	1099:2 1100:20
1131:18,18 1135:19	1017:4 1025:11	1140:2	1017:25 1018:19	1101:3 1116:25
letter 968:9,10 969:16	1105:8 1135:13	management 999:11,20	1061:12,15,17	1123:1 1132:24
994:5,8 995:7 996:14	long 979:24 984:8	1015:5 1018:2,3	member 989:25 994:24	1133:12,17 1134:24
996:24 997:15,19	993:1,18 1026:14	manager 971:6 984:6	1004:8,14,18 1011:13	1135:12 1142:18
1037:21 1038:7,21,24	1064:5,22	984:11,18,19 985:3	1011:15,23 1018:17	1143:12,15,17
1039:12,13,25 1096:2	long-range 990:19	986:3,6 990:23	1019:25 1020:4,11	1144:12,13 1145:23
letters 1006:23	1000:17,21 1017:20	996:15,17 1002:6	1021:20 1022:16	1146:12 1147:12
level 991:11,12 999:7	long-term 987:25	1010:24 1011:15	1023:18 1024:2,7	1148:18,21 1149:22
1027:11	1021:8,15 1022:9	1021:22 1022:4	1044:14 1063:6	1151:3,18 1152:6
Liarakos 969:17	look 970:8 996:25	1028:5 1038:13,15	1081:7,13 1082:9	Met's 976:15,20 977:1
life 1021:11	1003:25 1016:1	1103:23	1083:3,5,8 1084:3	980:9 981:1 1030:2
likewise 1006:8	1026:17 1029:10	manager's 978:11	1085:1,2 1098:4,7	1036:8 1053:6
limitation 1003:15	1031:21 1037:20	managers 1011:13,14	1101:3 1103:4	1083:15 1104:11
limited 1035:14	1058:6 1062:12,20	1011:17 1018:18	1126:15,19,20,22	1105:15 1111:10
limits 974:3	1069:21,21 1070:23	manner 1045:14,16	1152:15,23 1153:1	1120:20 1152:22
line 979:24 986:25	1094:13,19,24 1096:1	1147:15	members 991:1	methodology 1143:2
988:3 1005:12	1105:6 1107:18	manual 1128:13,17	1060:11 1101:15	Metropolitan 966:9,11
1007:18 1011:16	1108:11 1111:15	1129:2	memo 968:13 1010:23	967:10 969:4 984:21
1025:18 1067:7	1125:7 1132:23	March 966:18 970:2	1011:12,20 1072:25	984:22 985:5,13,16
1068:22 1069:9	1135:7 1136:12	1055:2	mentioned 989:6	986:11,14,19,22
1154:24	looked 1030:7 1040:11	marginal 1012:7	1018:4 1027:3	987:5,22 988:13,15
lined 973:24	1042:14 1062:24	mark 1015:6,12,20,22	1072:11 1090:9	988:16,20,21,24
lines 1063:19 1154:10	1080:1 1088:7	1113:19 1115:5	1107:12,21 1124:25	989:8,11,15,17,22,23
lining 981:25 985:13	1094:22 1130:1	1118:8 1120:8	1125:21 1130:3	990:1,7,12,16,19
986:21 988:7,11,15	looking 1027:1 1031:12	marked 1015:14	1136:18 1143:14	991:1,9 992:2,6,18
989:5,16 990:2	1107:17 1110:24	marking 1120:12,13	1144:9	993:6,11,13 994:6
1005:7,16,21 1007:5	1115:18 1117:6	master's 1104:7	mere 1074:2	995:1,10,13,18,20,22
1007:23,25 1008:1,4	1119:13 1124:9	material 1006:24	merely 1010:16	995:24 996:16 997:8
1024:21 1063:23	Los 967:13,16 1045:5	math 1124:18	1083:24	997:20,24 998:4,11
1064:16 1065:4,7,15	1045:21,22	matter 1003:14,16	Met 974:4,23 978:1,3	998:16,21 999:2,5,7
1065:22 1067:6,12	loss 1089:16	1058:16 1098:9	978:12,19 979:5	999:11,17,19,25
1068:21,25 1069:14	losses 1089:11,18,23	1128:20 1138:21	981:23,23 982:1,4,21	1000:13 1001:5,6,13
	•	-	-	-

1001:19 1002:3,6,11
1002:19 1003:13,22 1004:1,7,13,16
1005:4,25 1006:5,8
1008:20 1009:14,18 1010:3,7,10,13,25
1010:3,7,10,13,25 1011:13,22 1012:17 1012:17,25 1013:4,14 1013:17 1014:1,2,5,8
1013:17 1014:1,2,5,8 1016:4,8,15,25
1017:15,16,19,23,24
1018:1,2,5,11,14,17 1018:20,24 1019:9,23
1019:25 1020:2,3,4,7
1020:9,13,17,21 1021:5,7,12,24
1022:4,6,12,19,24 1023:2,2,7,22 1024:1
1024:5,6,18 1025:3 1026:4 1027:11,13,17
1028:9 1033:7,16
1034:4 1038:16 1040:3 1041:3
1043:14 1044:13,21 1045:5,7,11,13,25
1048:4,25 1049:15,16 1058:17,18,25 1059:6
1061:15 1064:18
1066:23,25 1068:14 1074:11 1075:20
1076:2,4,6 1077:1,22 1079:4,14 1081:25,25
1083:3,6,12,22
1084:4,15,17,19 1085:8 1086:7,17
1087:3 1090:25 1091:1,15 1093:17
1095:8 1097:18 1098:2,5,19,23
1099:6,8,12,25
1100:16,18 1103:24 1104:19,25 1106:10
1107:6 1108:4 1109:18,22 1111:3
1114:4,5,8,15
1115:12,25 1117:7,13 1118:10,13,20
1119:15 1120:24 1122:17 1123:7,18,24
1122:17 1123:7,18,24 1125:14 1130:4,22 1137:3 1141:19
1143:1,22 1150:15,23
1151:13 1152:20 1153:3
<b>Metropolitan's</b> 973:24 991:5,17,24 992:22
993:2 994:15,23 997:13,16 1003:2
997:13,16 1003:2

```
1004:5 1005:17
  1008:8 1010:4,17
  1012:23 1018:15
  1022:3 1023:16
  1024:10 1025:6.8
  1031:1 1032:14
  1036:2 1038:17
  1043:19 1044:5
  1055:16 1062:21
  1064:14 1074:1,24
  1085:1 1097:7,13,22
  1105:4 1111:12
  1120:23 1122:15
  1123:9 1126:4 1133:3
  1147:18 1150:18,19
  1151:7
microlevel 1103:25
mid-1990s 993:4
mid-morning 971:23
middle 1109:25
midway 1003:8
miles 986:25
million 1009:22 1016:5
  1016:6,9,16,19
  1017:1,5,6 1024:4,6
  1024:17 1025:5,5
  1067:7,17 1068:17,21
  1068:24 1069:6
  1124:19 1125:19,23
  1126:16,21 1135:20
  1143.20
millions 980:19 991:21
  992:4,5 1023:1
  1065:1.3
mind 1044:9 1052:22
minor 1104:7 1127:6
minus 1052:9 1147:4,7
  1147:22
minute 1088:20
minutes 968:12
  1025:23 1102:1
  1113:8
misallocated 1033:25
misallocation 1041:8
  1041:10,10 1120:1
misspoke 1055:18
Misstates 1142:23
  1145:20
mistake 1040:15,16
  1042:5
mitigation 1069:16
model 997:5,8 1132:6,7
  1133:13,17 1134:1,3
  1134:5,11,13 1151:7
  1151:10,12,14,15,19
modeling 1103:7,16,20
models 1151:13
```

modify 1019:10

```
molecules 989:16
  1086:10 1089:2,3
moment 1034:11
  1055:22 1112:15
  1143:8 1150:10
moments 1051:1
Monday 966:18 970:2
monetarily 1010:16
money 1016:3,7,23
  1099:22
monopoly 995:1
month 1092:9,21
  1093:17 1094:14
  1107:8 1111:3
  1112:14
month-by-month
  1107:22
monthly 990:22
  1018:17 1077:2
  1091:7,10 1095:7
  1111:6
months 1010:12
morning 973:8 1026:3
  1026:5 1061:23
  1063:20 1080:1
motion 970:24 979:3
  1057:20 1058:8
  1101:4
move 970:15,19 973:22
  988:10.15 1000:14
  1045:24 1048:16
  1086:8 1090:13,19
  1108:17,21 1109:3,8
  1110:9 1113:23
  1116:13 1117:23
  1119:9 1120:15
  1122:12 1123:11
  1124:3 1130:7
  1134:20 1135:11,19
  1135:21 1136:19
  1137:12
moved 999:22 1008:14
  1008:22 1048:23
  1058:9,13 1062:1,12
  1062:22 1090:12
  1121:16 1129:10,13
  1129:24 1132:4
  1135:5 1139:9
  1149:14,22 1150:6
moving 981:20 1000:11
  1009:21 1063:11
  1135:16 1137:4,7,17
  1137:21 1138:5
multiple 990:18
multiplied 1112:12
  1140:23
multiplying 1112:9
mutual 1040:16
```

```
MWD 968:12 991:1
  1071:11,12,17
MWD's 979:17,18,19
  1070:13,20 1071:10
  1071:13
myriad 978:12
N 968:2
name 978:20 983:24
  1026:3 1102:11
  1127:3
named 1057:24 1058:1
  1156:11
nay 1098:13
nearly 1017:8
necessarily 1048:2
necessary 972:24
  1021:10 1089:18
necessitates 1126:22
need 973:4 1143:23
  1148:19 1149:2
needed 1062:18
  1063:10
needs 970:6 982:24
  987:19
negotiate 982:16
negotiated 980:4
  1028:21 1030:18
```

1086:12 1147:10,19 985:24 1014:7 1028:8 1032:7 negotiating 979:13 986:4 1005:6,10 1029:5,23 1032:20 negotiations 986:2 1002:6 1005:23 1028:3 1031:10 1032:13 negotiator 1041:22 negotiators 1041:24 neither 1056:15 **NEST** 967:3 net 1089:12 1138:4,4 1138:11 neutral 1135:17,22 **neutrality** 1136:9,10 never 1000:23 1033:7 1036:22,22 1037:2,12 1037:16 1087:3 1093:2 1127:12,18 1152:6 new 979:10 992:24 1014:10 1025:2 1068:8,10 1126:19 1151:9 non-Met 1085:10 non-Metropolitan

1124:2 1125:3 **non-shaded** 1123:25 1124:21 nonbreaching 981:14 nonnegotiable 1074:2 nonsense 982:5 noon 970:5 1054:6 **north** 967:16 1045:8 northern 986:24 **notice** 968:15 971:3,23 971:24 972:4,16 973:1 1013:19 1040:22 1042:6,22,25 1046:25 1055:17 1056:4,21 1096:3 1154:7,8,14,18,20 1155:7 **noticing** 1097:19 noting 1127:11 November 999:12 number 968:8 982:11 993:25 1031:22 1038:24 1087:12,14 1121:13 1124:17 1135:20 1139:16 1140:7 1141:2,10 1147:5,9 **numbers** 1049:7 1113:3 1130:10 1131:3,15 1148:12 numerous 1148:9

1155:12 oath 1128:5 **object** 1017:15 1121:18 1121:24 **objected** 979:24 991:4 1026:10,22 objecting 976:24 990:14 993:1,18 1031:17 objection 970:20,21 1000:5 1015:16,17,23 1027:24 1029:14,18 1029:19 1034:25 1037:24 1038:1 1039:20 1042:8 1043:3 1048:10 1054:1 1055:16 1059:1,21 1061:6 1074:20,21 1077:4 1093:6 1094:21 1095:2 1101:12 1108:25 1109:2,12,14

1110:13,16,19,20

1113:21,22,25

0

o'clock 1154:4,5

1111:11 1112:1

1152:21

1119:23 1139:23

1039:22 1048:11

1101:13 1130:18

1133:11 1138:23

1146:17 1148:1

994:11,20 996:25

1002:20,23 1003:7,8

1058:6 1071:5 1095:7

1027:25 1043:8,10

1097:5 1123:21

1125:7 1126:11

980:20,20 1016:7

1017:2 1049:15

1084:19 1111:12

1121:14 1134:24

1138:17 1150:22

996:25 997:3 1011:19

1012:12,19 1026:18

1031:10 1059:8

1062:14 1063:21

1066:15 1071:6

1121:22 1122:8

1124:20 1131:4.5

1137:23 1138:15

1149:24 1150:3

participating 1074:8

1129:1

1133:2 1134:16,25

1135:9,24 1136:8,12

1139:7 1141:1 1145:5

1064:25 1065:6,17,23

1105:3,4 1121:19,22

1071:7

1116:10 1120:5,23

1154:10

985.1

1142:4,24 1145:21

1059:3 1093:8

1117.15 1117.25	
1116:15 1117:25	ongoing 999:9 1000
1118:1 1119:10	open 973:19,19
1120:11,13,16 1121:12 1122:3,11	opening 971:20 973
	openly 979:17
1123:12,14 1124:5,6	opinion 974:10,19
1130:17 1131:21	976:18 1127:17,1
1133:10 1138:22	1128:1,2,4 1135:1
1141:25 1142:21,23	1145:10 1147:1
1145:3,14,20 1146:16	1149:9 1151:11
1147:25 1148:23	opinions 1106:14
1153:10,13 1155:4,5 <b>objections</b> 990:6,12	1131:13 1145:6
991:13 992:22,24	<b>opportunity</b> 1034:2 <b>oppose</b> 998:7 1098:
991.13 992.22,24 995:8,11 997:14,16	opposed 998:9 999:
998:14,15 1002:11	1001:23 1031:24
1003:2,6,22 1012:13	1036:11,15 1127:
1012:14 1017:19	opposition 998:11
1073:12 1074:19	<b>option</b> 1030:13,14,1
1108:24	1030:20,22
objectives 1067:10	options 1101:16
1068:10	oral 970:10,14
objects 994:14 1028:22	orally 1041:14,21
obligation 987:6	order 971:2,4,13,17
1060:19	972:10,11,25 978
obligations 986:9,11	982:16 1012:1
987:2	1055:11,14,15,17
obtain 984:22 1147:4	1056:4,8,15,19,20
obtained 989:4	1056:24 1057:4
<b>obtains</b> 984:23	1062:16,16 1091:
<b>obvious</b> 1108:19	1113:20 1154:8,1
obviously 1133:1	1154:25 1155:2
occasion 1057:14	orders 1091:21
1127:13	orient 990:10
occasions 978:12	oriented 991:12
990:18	originates 1079:3
occupation 984:5	ought 1056:12
occurred 1128:3	outcome 997:9 102
October 1010:12	1139:17
offer 1029:13 1077:3	outcomes 1139:3
offering 1094:25	outlined 992:23
1106:14	outreach 985:1 986
offhand 1040:10 OFFICE 967:15	outside 987:17 1030 1037:2,12 1132:2
officer 1010:24	outvoting 1103:4
1018:16 1103:2	over-collect 974:14
official 1109:20,24	overall 1022:6 1031
1110:5,7	1139:1 1152:2
oftentimes 1109:21	overcharge 969:10,
okay 971:16 1011:4,6	969:12,13 1050:3
1015:11 1055:12	1112:1,7,9,18 111
1070:17 1072:9	1114:11,15,21 11
1088:22,23 1137:6	1115:15,19,22,25
old 1030:17	1116:3,6,23 1117
once 999:9 1006:12	1117:10,13,18,20
1084:15	1118:9,13,16,20
one-day 971:3	overcharged 991:2
one-off 1004:19	1050:7 1104:15
ones 1045:4	1106:10 1114:23

```
000:17
         overcharges 992:9
973:12
9
         overcharging 1104:19
7,17
         Overruled 1000:9
5:10
4:24
98.14
         oversee 984:19,21,24
99:1
24
         overturned 1027:14
27:21
         owned 1094:4
1
4,14
         p.m 1055:3
         packages 1035:4
         page 974:18,19 979:24
,17
78:2
17,19
,20,21
91:24
         pages 966:13 1097:4
         paid 974:22,22 980:13
8,15,20
027:8
         paragraph 994:12,21
986:5
         pardon 1055:18
         part 1008:21 1015:8
036:23
2:22
14
031:10
10,11
0:3
1114:8
1115:1
25
17:3,7
20
0
         participate 998:3
:21
         participated 990:24,25
```

```
particular 1001:14
  1002:20 1046:6
  1063:13 1078:16,16
  1089:10 1092:9
parties 983:3 996:3
  1030:18 1040:16
  1065:19 1066:19
  1073:24
party 981:11,14 994:15
  1003:17 1044:18,24
  1046:14 1057:20
  1069:3
Pass 1025:21 1126:24
passed 976:23
pause 970:20
pay 986:11 1009:18
  1014:17 1016:3
  1030:22 1031:1,7
  1037:8 1048:23
  1063:7,8 1068:7
  1079:23 1081:13
  1085:3,7 1088:15
  1120:19 1138:8
  1150:15 1152:23
  1153:1
paving 978:2 991:24
  992:4 1008:8 1068:13
  1075:20 1080:10,13
  1080:14,18 1081:8,11
  1081:12 1084:8
  1093:25 1096:11
  1152:14
payment 1014:21
payments 969:8 982:3
  982:3 985:14,15
  1015:4 1022:23,25
  1023:1,21 1075:13,18
  1078:3 1079:9,12
  1081:4 1084:6
  1122:18,21 1124:12
  1125:16 1151:23
pays 982:1 1076:9,16
  1077:23,25 1081:9
pending 1014:6
people 970:10 1069:2
  1120:13 1154:21
  1155:1
percent 976:19 982:11
  982:13 987:18,23
  1063:18 1100:11,13
  1100:19 1123:20
  1124:23,24,24
percentage 1020:1,9,11
  1020:12 1082:9,12
  1084:12,13,21,22
  1087:24 1123:18
  1145:25
percentages 1084:19
```

```
1126:18
perfectly 978:23
perform 987:6 992:11
  992:20
performed 987:1
period 978:24 979:7
  980:5,7,11,22,24
  983:2 997:23 1008:6
  1008:22 1016:2
  1017:24 1070:3
  1107:7 1108:5
  1112:21 1113:1
  1123:8 1125:15,16
periodic 1001:19
  1097:24 1098:9
periodically 1001:6
periods 1072:5
Perris 999:14
person 1047:9,17,18
  1048:1 1053:5
  1057:25 1075:9
personally 1037:2
PERSONS 966:10
Petitioner 966:7 967:2
phase 974:1,6 975:14
  977:22 978:5,6,11,15
  979:3,9,10,21 984:16
  987:8 990:5 991:14
  993:23 1017:11
  1018:23 1019:7
  1027:10,10,15,16,23
  1039:5,6,21 1053:23
  1055:16 1056:4,11,16
  1106:6 1154:6,19
phrase 1004:10,12
  1043:22 1045:19
  1046:19 1107:13
phraseology 1150:4
picking 1007:19
picture 1062:6 1147:11
pipe 1090:4,6 1093:5
pipeline 1045:7
pipes 1090:18
place 1068:1 1086:15
  1086:15,25 1090:13
  1156:11
placeholders 982:20
Placer 1124:14,25
  1125:2,20
Plaintiff 966:7 967:2
  983:19 1102:4
Plaintiff's 968:3
  1076:20
plan 970:5 971:5,13
  990:20 1000:17,21
  1017:20 1056:18,19
planning 972:10
  1021:8 1022:9,10,11
```

<u> </u>
1133:13,17 1134:1,3
1134:11,13 1151:14
plans 1021:15
<b>plateau</b> 1007:17
play 1133:1
please 983:23 1030:1
1102:10 1113:11
1115:4 1116:21
plus 975:16
point 982:11,12,22
993:6 995:12 997:19
1012:18 1016:19
1045:25,25 1053:12
1056:5,16 1070:8
1073:11 1078:8
points 981:5 986:24
policy 984:20 995:3
1003:13
pool 1140:6,12
portfolio 1021:25
1103:12
portion 974:15,25
975:3 976:2,9,17
977:9 1126:12
<b>position</b> 977:1 984:8,10
996:6,8 999:25
1000:3 1002:2
1012:22 1041:23
1052:4 1082:16,19
1032.4 1082.10,19
positive 1039:10,14
possible 1073:18
1092:23 1139:3,13
1147:13 1151:8,10,11
<b>Possibly</b> 1033:19
1048:9,13 1086:4
postage 1026:19,22
1027:12,19,25
potential 997:11
potentially 1103:12
power 974:8 975:3
976:3 977:15 1028:10
1030:4 1031:23,24,24
1030:4 1031:23,24,24
1032:14,13,22 1034:1
1076:12 1077:17
1078:2 1080:6
1105:10,20 1111:19 1112:3 1114:20
1116:1,4 1117:14
1118:25 1140:4
Powers 1103:2
practice 979:3
practices 979:7
precisely 1063:17
preclude 997:12 1003:9
predated 1046:9
predetermine 997:9
•
1

```
prefer 972:6
preferential 969:6,7
  973:15 981:20,22
  982:6,10 1019:14,21
  1019:22,24 1020:4,14
  1020:17,20,24 1021:4
  1021:5,16,24 1022:5
  1022:20 1023:3.8.17
  1023:23,25 1024:9,11
  1075:7,10,14,18
  1078:4,8,17,21
  1079:13 1081:4,15,20
  1082:8,16,19,25
  1083:4,7,10,16,18,23
  1083:25 1084:9,13,22
  1085:1,6,11 1096:21
  1122:15,19,22,25
  1123:7,19 1124:11,17
  1124:23 1126:1
  1148:11,13
prejudgment 975:17
prepare 1014:20
prepared 971:25
  1006:16,19 1014:25
  1032:6,10 1106:17
  1112:18 1113:13
present 987:4 1031:8
presentation 970:14
presentations 970:11
presented 1012:3
  1128:1 1148:10
presently 1007:16,19
presents 1052:3
preserve 1002:10
  1003:2,6,21
president 1038:15
Presumably 1089:9
pretty 1103:15 1130:9
prevail 1074:7 1078:11
prevailing 1003:17
previous 1015:19,21
  1108:16
previously 1009:10
price 974:3,6 986:12
  1002:25 1003:5
  1004:1,2,3,4,22,25
  1008:17,25 1009:14
  1009:18,22 1030:8
  1043:8,16,18 1067:4
  1067:4,15,17,22
  1068:4 1080:1,2
  1087:9,10,17 1088:7
  1088:8,15,15 1097:3
  1137:1 1142:6
pricing 994:23 1087:15
principles 977:19
  1099:21,25
```

**prior** 984:10,11 993:5

```
993:10,14 1005:24
  1036:12,16,25 1037:1
  1037:11 1040:4,22,23
  1041:15 1103:22,25
  1153:4
priority 1064:14,15
probably 1061:9
  1129:21 1133:18
problems 997:4
procedural 1097:12
procedure 970:16
  1097:12
proceed 982:17
  1056:22
proceeding 995:15
  996:2 1016:11 1027:5
  1127:21
proceedings 966:15
  1156:10
proceeds 1055:9
process 990:21 995:5
  998:4 999:11 1000:18
  1000:22,25 1018:7,9
  1018:14 1019:3
  1046:22,22 1047:2,4
  1047:5 1058:16
  1074:20 1097:19
  1104:24 1105:24
  1111:14,17 1147:11
  1147:13,18 1148:6
processes 990:19,22,23
  990:24 1008:19
  1017:21,21,22
  1018:10
produced 1123:24
produces 1084:18
  1133:20
profound 1098:5
program 975:12
  984:21 992:12 998:20
  999:17 1013:1,8,9,21
  1013:24 1014:10
  1015:5 1102:18
  1103:1,9 1104:2
  1129:22
programs 984:25 985:2
  1013:5 1014:4,8
  1021:21 1074:8
  1146:10
progress 1013:21
prohibits 977:17
project 974:15 975:5
  976:2 978:13 979:25
  984:24 990:15 991:18
  991:23 992:18 993:2
  995:9 998:17,17
  999:15 1005:8,12,16
  1005:21 1008:2,4
```

```
1012:15 1016:24
  1017:4 1025:15,16,17
  1028:15 1036:7,13
  1041:7 1048:22
  1049:12 1052:10
  1069:2,8,9,14,17,18
  1069:22 1072:6,12,23
  1098:25 1100:1.8
  1105:8.18 1120:2
  1129:9 1132:24
  1133:4 1134:15
  1137:4 1139:24
  1140:1,5 1141:23
  1142:9,10,14 1144:17
  1145:1,12,24 1146:14
  1146:22 1147:4,8,22
  1148:20 1151:25
  1153:6
projected 1024:1,22,24
  1025:18 1092:18
projection 1126:3
projections 1126:5
projects 975:8 986:21
  989:5 991:10 1007:4
  1007:25 1008:1
  1021:21 1064:17
  1103:11 1104:3
  1107:6
pronouncing 1037:23
Prop 974:11
proper 976:23
properly 1012:2
property 1084:17
proposal 972:25 997:20
  997:24 999:11 1000:1
  1000:14,20 1098:17
  1098:20 1099:20
proposals 1001:19,22
  1099:3 1101:17
propose 1101:4
proposed 994:9 995:3
  998:21 1031:4,7
  1038:25
proposing 1099:8
Propr 975:11
prosecuting 1003:19
prospectively 1152:22
protection 1097:16
protections 1097:12
provide 988:21 1021:9
  1023:10
provided 1057:3
  1097:15 1130:20
  1134:9 1135:12
  1137:7 1138:3
  1148:16 1152:3
provides 975:17,17
  1024:6 1039:15
```

provision 1002:25 1003:1,7 1010:14 1013:10,23,25 1014:11 1046:4 1067:16 1070:2.5.9 1070:10 1073:13,17 1074:4,6,11,22,23 provisions 981:9 1002:10 1013:8 1046:25 1086:6 PTX 993:22 994:1 996:10 1002:13,15,17 1006:24,25,25 1010:18,20 1011:11 1015:13,14,21,22 1016:1 1043:13 1097:3 1106:23 1107:1,2 1108:10,13 1108:17 1109:4,19 1110:1,9,9,14,21,24 1111:23 1112:17 1113:14,17,20 1115:5 1116:13 1117:24 1118:8 1119:9,13 1120:8 1123:5,5,6,11 1123:21,22 1124:3 public 984:14 985:1 986:5 1002:2 1046:25 1047:1 1097:18 1104:6.8.9 1128:20 1130:21 1131:6 publications 1127:9 **publicly** 1010:3 **publish** 995:13 **published** 1127:10 1128:15 1131:2 publishing 995:17 punish 977:12 1074:23 punishing 1010:15 Purcell 967:5 983:13 983:15 984:4 994:1 1000:13 1006:22,24 1009:7 1011:2,7,10 1015:3,6,10,13,19 1016:1 1017:10 1025:21 1029:19 1038:1 1039:20 1042:8 1043:13 1048:10 1054:1 1059:1,21 1061:6 1077:4 1093:6 1094:22 1095:1 1097:2 1100:22 1101:12 purchase 982:4,9 987:22,24 1020:8 1025:14 1048:25 1100:18 1142:19

purchased 973:23 1049:16 1082:2 1083:21 1096:13,20 1142:8 purchases 1016:8 1100:20 1141:19,24 1142:7 1143:12,15,17 purchasing 1009:20 1077:22 1078:4 1081:24 1096:17 1144:19 pure 1088:24 1089:6 1089:20,25 1091:25 1093:2 purpose 979:1,4 **purposes** 972:10 1081:5 1148:6 pursuant 970:16 974:5 974:13 1003:17 1004:6,10 1043:19 1044:4,6 1046:20 1065:21 1079:24 1097:8 **pursuing** 1064:9 put 971:5 972:9 975:16 978:17,20 979:20 990:19 998:1 1026:8 1038:6 1042:6,22,25 1043:8 1048:17 1086:25 1101:16,21 **putting** 1134:15 1150:24 O

**OSA** 1012:22,24 1103:2,10 1107:4,12 1107:15,21 1124:1,14 1146:9 qualify 982:7 quality 1021:10 1089:15 1090:11 1091:2 quantification 1066:1,3 1066:9,24 quantified 1024:8 **quantify** 1021:16 1023:6 quantity 1008:13,21 1088:21 1089:14 1092:12,25 1093:21 **quarter** 1103:11 **question** 1000:21 1005:9 1008:23 1036:4 1037:9 1043:4 1044:24 1050:6

1052:19,21 1055:25

1070:17 1072:8

1074:14 1075:2

1078:18 1082:23 1092:19 1100:13 1108:19 1121:12 1132:15 1139:4 1142:1 1150:4 questions 1039:8 1042:13 1043:6 1052:22 1056:22 1070:1 1097:6 1122:5 1151:6 1152:9 quiet 1018:10 Quinn 967:11 970:21 971:21 972:6,12,18 972:21 982:19 1000:5 1015:17,23 1026:2,4 1029:13,22 1037:24 1038:6 1040:1 1042:21 1043:5,15 1047:8 1048:12,14 1055:9 1056:2,10 1057:11 1059:7,23 1061:11 1070:23 1075:7 1076:21 1077:3,7 1093:11 1094:18,25 1095:4 1096:23 1100:5 1101:2,15 1108:25 1109:2,14 1110:20 1113:22,25 1116:15 1118:1 1119:10 1120:11,16 1121:9,18 1123:14 1124:6 1127:2,4 1131:1,25 1132:2 1133:12 1139:6 1142:5 1143:4 1143:16 1145:9,16 1146:4,20 1148:7 1149:4 1150:8 1153:10 1154:2,6,17 1155:2 **Quinn's** 1097:6 **QUINN,ESQ** 967:12 quite 983:6 1045:14,15 1045:16 1067:24 1121:21 1146:18

### R

quote 974:5 979:11,14

quote/unquote 1151:16

979:16,17,17,19

**quoting** 980:12

R 996:15 raised 995:8 raises 995:4 1023:24 raising 992:23 ramp 1007:15 ramp-up 1007:2,7,22 ramping 1008:5

ran 1131:15 range 975:25 1025:9 1104:13 ranged 976:13 ranges 976:6 **Raphael** 978:20 rate 974:8,8,9 975:2,3 975:6.10 976:3.4.7.10 976:19,22 977:5,7,9 977:11,14,15 979:1 979:18 990:16,21 991:5,8,23,24 992:3,6 992:19 993:7,8,10,11 993:14,15,16,17,19 995:13,16,18,19,24 996:9 997:5,21,23 998:1,5,8,14,18,19,20 998:22,25 999:2,6,8 999:10,22,23 1000:18 1000:22 1001:2,2,5,7 1001:10,11,14,15,19 1001:23,25 1002:3,11 1003:2 1004:19 1008:8 1010:13 1011:24,25 1012:4,9 1012:15,25 1013:4,7 1013:14,18,22,25 1014:14,18,22 1016:7 1016:17 1017:3,21 1018:5.7.9.14 1019:6 1027:12,17,20,25 1028:10,10,17,18,23 1029:2,3,7 1030:2,3,4 1030:4,23 1031:2,2,8 1031:13,18,23,23,24 1032:14,15,20,22,23 1033:3,6 1034:7,25 1035:4,14,15,20 1036:17 1038:17 1039:10,10,14,15,16 1040:17 1041:7,9,9 1041:11 1047:5,19,22 1048:3,6 1049:13,14 1050:24 1051:6,14,19 1051:25 1052:4,11 1053:8,18 1062:11,13 1062:23 1063:2,4,7,9 1068:12,13 1070:1,5 1070:9,10,13,21 1071:10,17 1072:7,9 1073:3,13,20 1074:3 1074:7,10,22 1076:9 1076:11,12,12,13,14 1076:19 1077:16,16 1077:17,17,20,25 1078:1,1,2,2 1080:5,6 1080:6,8,16,21,23 1085:4 1087:24

1095:17 1096:11 1097:22,24 1098:2,4 1098:9,10,14,14,16 1098:20 1099:7,9,14 1099:17,20 1101:4,5 1101:9,9,16 1103:16 1105:11,12,13,20,20 1105:21.22 1111:16 1111:19,19,20,21,24 1111:24,25 1112:4,6 1112:7,12,12 1114:14 1114:16,20 1115:2,18 1115:23 1116:1,4,7 1116:10 1117:6,8,14 1117:21 1118:19,25 1119:6,24 1120:20,24 1132:6 1134:21,22 1135:4,6,9,11 1136:19 1140:2,3,4,4 1140:8,18,20,21,24 1141:2,3,7,11,11 1142:17 1143:5,23 1144:6 1147:3,18 1149:10 1151:7 1152:6,10,12,14,25 1153:1,8 rate-making 1101:21 1128:9 rates 966:10 974:14,24 974:25 975:3 976:20 977:2,20,22 978:8,13 979:6,17,19 980:10 980:14,16 990:7,12 991:18 992:22 993:3 994:10 995:10 997:16 1001:7 1004:11 1005:4,17 1010:5,17 1012:23 1017:16 1018:24 1019:5,10,10 1025:7,9 1028:9,14 1028:22 1031:19 1033:2,13,17,24 1034:5,11,12,14,20 1038:25 1039:18 1040:3,6,23,24 1041:16 1042:6,22 1043:1,25 1044:7 1046:23 1047:2 1052:20 1053:7,7,11 1053:12,23,24 1057:16,19,21 1058:9 1058:14 1059:10,18 1059:19 1060:2,7,12 1060:17,19,24 1061:3 1061:12,18,19 1062:21,22,23 1063:6 1067:23 1071:12 1073:2,19 1074:16,24

1076:15,16,18 1077:10,13,15,25 1080:12,14 1081:11 1097:17,19,20 1098:4 1098:6 1100:2.17 1103:16,23 1104:12 1105:1,4,6,17,19 1106:9.14 1111:12.18 1111:18 1112:3 1121:15 1122:15,19 1124:11 1128:19 1130:21,22 1133:3,20 1134:4 1140:11 1143:1,3,22 1147:15 1150:16,18,25 1151:3 1151:9,16,25 1152:4 1152:22,23 re-creating 1143:2 re-cross 1154:1 reach 971:1 1086:20 reached 996:21 1057:15 1138:19 1139:6 reaches 1007:20 read 973:15 983:5 994:12,21 997:3 1003:21 1006:23 1011:5,19 1012:19 1039:4 **reading** 977:21 1056:24 1057:7 reads 1003:8 ready 982:17 reallocate 1105:9 reallocation 1000:20 1100:7 really 982:20 983:2 1059:12 1066:4 1131:19 1142:6 reason 971:9 977:16 978:21 980:2 1004:21 1062:4,15 1137:13 1152:18 reasonable 1003:18 1139:14 1151:21 reasons 982:22 recalculate 1111:20 1123:25 1126:18 recalculated 1023:23 1105:13 1111:25 1112:12 recalculates 1084:16 recalculation 1084:25 1126:22 recall 978:10 996:18,23 1026:12,15 1027:6

1029:3 1030:14

1032:8,25 1033:1,2,5

	1	1	1	I
1033:9,20 1035:17,21	1097:1 1122:4 1150:9	reliability 1012:3	require 972:14	retrospectively
1035:23 1039:8,11,12	1150:13	reliable 1064:7,8,17	required 971:15 1012:2	1062:20
1041:4,9,12,14	reduced 1067:13	remain 1136:21,22	1056:3,15 1091:9	return 1068:13
1042:12 1043:21	1156:12	remaining 974:21	1101:8	returned 976:11
1047:12 1053:19	refer 1065:25 1105:23	1140:6	requirement 1135:2,14	reunification 1074:3
1057:17,23 1061:14	1106:4 1109:23	remanded 1027:14,20	1137:3 1143:24	revenue 1105:7,9
1061:17,22 1062:2	1125:1	1027:22	1146:1 1149:2	1129:24 1134:21
1063:14,17,24	reference 1026:18	remarks 982:19	requirements 1105:8	1135:2,8,14,17,22
1086:21 1087:1	1110:4	remedy 981:8,11,15,16	1105:10 1134:22	1136:9,10 1137:3
1088:3 1097:6	referenced 1027:24	remember 978:18	1146:13	1143:24 1146:1,12
1099:18 1100:5	referencing 974:18	1056:3,13 1087:19	requires 1004:2 1091:6	1149:2,3
recalls 1105:3	referred 1000:17,21	remembers 1056:13	1091:15	revenues 991:9
receive 985:12 988:2	1011:15 1018:6	remind 978:15 1038:11	requiring 1081:25	reversed 1027:20
1016:24 1024:22,25	1089:23	1055:15 1104:11,24	reserved 979:16	review 990:20 1017:22
received 1015:25	referring 1106:5	removal 1050:17	1073:12	reviewed 1134:3
1029:21 1038:5	1138:11 1143:18	remove 994:23 1022:15	reserving 1012:22	reviewing 1130:8
1064:3,25 1065:3	refers 1066:4 1118:3	removed 1049:13	reservoirs 999:15	revisit 972:21 1055:10
1077:6 1089:12	refinement 990:21	1051:11 1105:11,18	reset 1087:23	right 969:6 972:24
1109:7,16 1110:17,23	999:10 1000:18,22,25	1105:21 1111:17	resolution 994:9 995:3	973:5 979:16 981:8
1111:2 1114:2	1017:21 1018:7,9,14	1129:15 1140:5,12	1035:22,23	981:11,15,16,18
1116:17 1118:4	reflect 1108:3	reorient 984:16 987:15	resolutions 1035:13,13	1004:24 1005:16
1119:12 1120:18	reflecting 1106:17	repeat 990:9 1005:9	1035:17	1007:19 1008:18
1123:16 1124:8	reflection 1111:23	1022:1 1036:4 1050:6	resolved 996:22	1009:1 1012:22
receives 1079:20	reflects 1058:20	1072:8 1078:18	1127:25	1019:22,24 1020:15
1080:3 1081:21	refresh 1058:12	1092:20 1093:14	resource 1013:8,21	1021:2,4,5,5,16,24
receiving 1014:10	refuse 1014:6	replicate 1148:6	1014:3,10 1016:24	1022:5,12 1023:3,23
recess 1025:24 1054:6	refused 976:15	replication 1147:17	1017:4 1021:8,21	1023:25 1030:18
1113:7,10 1155:15	regard 978:3 1005:5	report 1049:20,23	1022:9	1031:14 1034:12,15
Reclamation 1091:20	1013:17 1036:12	1050:1 1105:14	respect 977:2 1072:23	1037:23 1040:8
1109:21	1092:5 1128:22	1121:19,22 1122:8	respected 980:24	1042:7 1043:25
recognize 994:2 996:11	regarding 995:15 998:5	1130:9,13 1133:5	respecting 1014:2	1046:11 1048:19
1002:15 1010:20 1032:2	1004:1 1088:21	1134:7,12 1135:25	respects 1089:15	1051:1,25 1052:2,5
	1097:16	1136:3 1137:6,6,10	Respondent 967:10 Respondents 966:14	1052:23 1053:9 1062:4 1066:7 1067:8
recognizing 973:12 recollection 1058:12	regardless 1091:10,11 region 1021:9,14	1137:16,20,23,24 1138:2,3,7,10,14,15	response 976:15 1019:6	1062.4 1066.7 1067.8
recommended 977:2	1069:13	1138:24 1139:5,20	1043:5	1076:15 1077:13
999:21 1058:19	regular 1018:17	1142:3 1146:3 1147:1	responsibilities 984:17	1070:13 1077:13
reconciled 1091:13,18	Regularly 1017:17	1142.5 1140.5 1147.1	985:7,11 986:16	1082:0 1080:11,10
reconciles 1091:22	regulation 974:5	1153:11,12,17	1103:14	1089:3,5,8 1090:10
reconciliation 1091:19	1003:12 1004:6,10	<b>Reported</b> 966:19	responsibility 986:1	1091:7 1093:13
1091:24	1043:20 1044:4,6	reporter 970:7 1156:8	988:3 1063:23	1095:11 1096:17,22
reconsider 999:7	1097:9	1156:24	1064:16 1065:15	1124:9 1126:12,13,15
reconsidered 1001:1	regulations 1046:21	<b>REPORTER'S</b> 966:15	1103:9 1146:4,8	1127:14 1128:10
record 978:9 981:4	reimburse 1069:7	1156:1	responsible 1104:3	1129:10,19 1130:4,7
1015:8 1025:22	relate 1012:12	reports 1058:19 1110:4	restart 1018:19	1130:10 1131:1,16
1055:21,23,24	related 970:25 976:12	1111:15 1130:3	restate 1141:5	1132:10 1134:16
1101:23,24 1106:5	1022:19 1063:22	1149:6,16	restated 1087:6	1139:6 1140:21
1130:21 1154:6	1103:10 1134:21	represent 1026:4	restrictions 1090:12,12	1142:9 1149:4,25
records 1061:16 1108:8	relates 1071:17	1108:14 1110:4,6	result 991:17 992:2	1152:10 1153:24
1131:5	1072:23	1111:2 1125:13	994:22 999:9 1005:21	rights 969:7 973:15
recover 1148:19,21	relating 985:4 1097:12	representative 970:17	1024:25 1027:4	981:21,22 982:6,10
1149:2 1152:20	relations 986:5	representatives 970:23	1065:7	1005:20 1019:15,21
recovered 1149:3	relationship 994:17	973:6	resulting 1100:7	1019:22 1020:4,17,20
recovery 1003:18	1132:13,17,20	represents 1112:6	results 1148:8,9	1020:24 1022:20
Recross 968:3 1100:23	relevance 1133:10	1116:23	resumed 1055:6	1023:8,17 1024:9,11
RECROSS-EXAMI	1138:22	request 970:9 994:25	1057:10	1074:24 1075:8,10,14
1101:1	relevancy 1061:7	1133:21	<b>retain</b> 980:9	1075:19 1078:4,8,17
redirect 968:3 1096:25	relevant 1061:10	requesting 994:16	retained 1127:20	1078:21 1079:13

1081:5,15,20 1082:8	1140:10,11,13	1086:6,8,19,20,23	1026:8 1038:6 1043:8	1127:12
1082:16,20,25 1083:4	1143:19,24 1144:12	1087:2,2 1088:14	1043:15 1077:8	service 977:19 978:20
1083:7,10,16,19,23	1145:13,24 1144:12	1090:16,16,18,18,19	1104:14 1106:23	986:24 987:13,17,18
1084:1,9,13,22	1147:4,4,7,8,22,23,23	1090:10,10,10,10,10	1107:17	990:20 1012:6
1084:1,9,13,22	san 966:2,6,16,17,24	1092:9,13,16,17,18	scrutiny 976:23	1017:22 1035:5,7
1096:21 1122:22,25	967:6 969:8 970:1	1092:9,13,10,17,18	SDCWA 969:1 1003:10	1076:9,11 1077:9,12
1123:7,19 1124:17,23	973:22 974:21 975:13	1092:21 1093:12,13	1003:13,16 1124:14	1077:14,20 1078:4
1126:1 1148:11,13	976:11 977:12 978:6	1093.23 1094.3,3,0	seated 983:23 1102:10	1080:13,22 1081:3,7
risk 1008:7,17 1009:8,9	978:12,23 979:5,12	1095:18,23 1096:2,6	second 970:25 975:9	1080:13,22 1081:3,7
1009:11,16,22,24	979:15,24 980:8,13	1095:18,23 1096:2,0	980:1,4 987:24	1081:14,18,21 1082:1
1011:22 1067:13,18	980:16,24 981:17,23	1100:6 1101:8	1012:19 1043:17	1091:3 1095:17
1067:20 1068:16	982:10 983:2,16	1102:19 1103:23	1071:5 1081:25	1096:11 1105:5,14,15
1067:20 1008:10	984:6 986:14,24	1102:17 1103:23	1123:21 1126:10	1111:15 1114:9
risks 1008:11,11	987:19,19,24 988:7	1114:5,8,15 1115:10	Secretary 1069:24	1130:3,8 1131:5
1069:2,5,5,9,12,15,17	988:11,18 989:15	1115:25 1117:7,13	secretly 1059:18	1133:5 1134:7
1069:18	990:2 1007:14	1118:13,20 1119:1,5	1061:4	1140:10 1146:3
River 973:25 975:9,12	1010:14,15 1012:21	1120:4,19 1121:3,14	section 969:6 974:2	1149:5,16
976:13 982:1,2	1015:4 1021:13	1121:17 1123:18	981:3,12,22 1002:20	services 966:23 988:20
984:23 988:17 989:13	1026:10,21 1027:5	1126:14 1133:21,22	1002:23 1003:25	988:22 1081:24
989:24 992:12	1028:21 1029:1	1134:9 1138:8,16,20	1002:23 1003:23	1104:15
1064:14,15,18,19	1028.21 1029.1	1139:8,14 1141:14,18	1080:2	set 974:4 977:22
1064:14,13,18,19	1030:11,12,10,23	1141:19,22 1142:7,12	secured 1069:22	1003:11 1004:5
1078:24 1079:2,5,6	1031:4,7,6,17 1032:4	1142:18 1143:13,15	see 972:18 982:25	1018:24 1043:18
1079:20 1080:3,21	1032:12 1033:11,23	1143:17 1144:2,10,15	1008:2,5 1026:19	1044:5 1046:20
1102:18 1103:1,9	1035:8,25 1036:5,21	1144:18 1146:5	1031:22,25 1039:1,16	1080:17 1097:7,19
1109:24 1110:8	1036:23 1037:1,2,12	1149:8 1150:15,19,22	1040:11 1043:16	1151:9
1144:25 1145:12,18	1037:17 1038:14,25	1151:23,23 1152:14	1044:15 1054:4	sets 1143:22
1145:25 1146:5,12,14	1040:3,5,5,21,23	1156:17 <sup>°</sup>	1058:7 1071:3,14	setting 1019:5,9
1146:23	1041:15 1042:6,21,22	sand 1069:12	1077:10 1096:4	1089:20 1147:18
role 985:3,18 1102:23	1043:1 1044:18,25	SANDFORD 966:20	1104:14 1110:1	settlement 1066:1,3,9
1103:1,8	1045:1,17,22 1046:3	1156:7,23	1112:2 1113:5,8	1066:24
rolled 993:17	1046:5,15,16,21,23	Santa 1156:4,8	1123:24 1124:13,21	seven 1126:17
<b>Ron</b> 1010:23 1011:12	1047:3,9,17,25	saved 1065:7	1126:17 1154:4,13	<b>share</b> 1123:19 1143:21
1038:7	1048:2,8,23 1049:2,8	<b>saying</b> 979:21 1034:23	1155:12	1152:23
<b>Ronald</b> 996:15	1050:7,9,12,16	1041:25 1044:7	seek 981:18 1134:5	<b>sharp</b> 1054:5
rough 1145:25	1051:7,23 1052:5	1045:21 1081:1,17,22	seeking 974:22,24,25	shift 997:7
roughly 1103:11	1053:5,22 1055:1	1083:23 1140:9	980:18,19,22 988:21	shifting 997:1
1113:6 1121:3,6	1057:22 1058:1,3,13	1149:21	995:19 1016:10,20	shocked 1057:6
1124:24 1125:18	1058:21,24 1059:8,17		1017:7,8	short 994:13,14
1126:2	1059:25 1060:5,10,16	980:7 981:3 983:5	seen 1032:19 1099:6,7	short-term 994:9
round 1135:20	1061:2,19,24 1062:6	1005:20 1008:25	seeping 1089:17	shortage 1022:16
row 1115:19	1062:17,18 1063:15	1009:3 1031:23	seize 976:17	1082:14
RPR 966:20 1156:23	1063:21,22 1064:2,5	1039:12,14 1041:15	selling 989:24	Shorthand 1156:7,24
rule 971:25 1056:17	1064:22,25 1065:3,6	1044:3 1071:9	sense 973:19	shortly 995:17 1010:11
1078:14	1065:14,16,16 1067:4	1072:25 1073:19	sent 1029:17	1038:21
ruled 1027:10	1067:5 1068:7	1074:6,16 1077:14	sentence 1003:17	show 975:15 981:17
rules 1154:7,11,12,19 1155:6	1069:20 1070:4,8	1088:8	1008:24 1043:17 1071:8	993:22 996:10
	1071:1 1072:10 1073:5,9,11,15	scenario 1049:9 scenarios 1139:18		1002:13 1007:1 1010:18 1076:20
ruling 1027:11,13,14 1053:23		schedule 985:14	separate 993:11 1146:15,23,25	1111:1
rulings 979:4	1074:5,8,14,15,18 1075:12,17 1076:6,16	1006:13,16 1007:2,17	separated 1107:7	showed 1026:6 1063:15
run 972:2 1049:7,14	1077:23 1078:7,11	1000.13,10 1007.2,17	<b>September</b> 996:14,18	showing 1006:16
1132:6	1077:2,9,20,23	scope 1131:19 1132:22	996:24 997:15	1014:20
1102.0	1079.2,9,20,23	1138:23 1145:3,15	1029:17,22 1031:13	shown 1007:18 1023:20
S	1081:19 1083:13	1146:16 1148:23	1112:23	1058:10 1112:17
Sacramoento 984:25	1084:1,5,6,12,21	1153:18	sequence 1155:8	1113:14
sales 1024:17 1105:13	1085:9,10,10,15,18	Scott 982:15	series 1113:13	shows 971:12 976:5
1126:3,4 1140:7,10	1085:20,22,23 1086:1	screen 1011:5,8,11	served 1013:19	1007:2 1084:18
	, ,			
	•	•	•	•

sort 1042:12 1088:8	975:4 976:2 978:13	stint 984:11
		<b>stop</b> 1054:3
e e		storage 999:13,14,16
		999:19,21 1000:15,20
		1001:1 1018:6
		1022:16
		story 971:11
		strategy 968:14
		1021:25 1022:6
		Street 966:24 967:6,12
*		967:16
		strike 993:5 1001:25
		1013:3 1082:18
		1121:4
		structure 977:6,7,9,12
		979:2,18 997:21,24
		998:1,5,8,14,22,25
		999:3,6,8 1001:2,2,6
		1001:8,11,16 1002:3 1002:11 1003:3
		1002:11 1003:3
		1010:13 1011:24 1012:1,4,25 1013:4,7
		1012:1,4,23 1013:4,7
		1013:14,18,22,23
		1018.3 1019.6
		1020:11 1034:23
-		1052:8,9 1053:8
		1070:13,21 1071:10
		1070:13,21 1071:10
		1071:17,17,21 1072:4
		1072.9,11,22 1073.3
		1073:13,10,20 1074:3
	•	1098:14,16,20 1099:7
		1099:9,14,18,20
		1101:5 1146:24
		structures 1047:20,23
ss 1156:4		1048:3,6 1050:25
staff 977:2 990:25		1051:6,14,19,25
1018:2 1123:7		1052:4 1053:19
stamp 1026:19,22		1101:9,17 1146:25
1027:12,20,25	993:19 998:19	1152:7
	1012:10,15 1014:14	study 978:20 990:21
standpoint 1082:17,20		1035:5,7 1105:5
1083:24	1017:3 1028:18	1134:7
stands 1137:13	1030:4 1034:1 1036:7	subject 994:8 1009:24
<b>Stapleton</b> 969:16 971:6	1036:17 1039:10	1049:10 1071:12
971:19 972:1 973:2	1041:8 1048:22	1074:17 1089:22
996:16 1037:22	1049:12 1052:11	1128:23 1131:14
1038:7,10,11,13,24	1072:7,13,24 1076:13	1137:19
start 970:10 1009:4	1077:17 1078:1	subjects 987:11
1050:3 1076:4	1080:7,8 1099:3	1047:10,11,14,18
1087:15	1105:11,21 1111:20	submitted 1035:11
started 1007:9 1026:6	1112:3 1115:2 1116:7	subsequent 1013:5
1087:20 1089:13	1116:10 1117:21	subsequently 1057:4
starting 994:12 1003:7	1119:6,24 1129:13,15	1098:6
starting 22 1.12 1003.7		
1067:22	1134:19,23 1135:4.9	subsidies 991:12
0	1134:19,23 1135:4,9 1135:11 1151:25	subsidies 991:12 subsidize 991:10
	sought 971:1 1064:22 source 1006:24 1021:12 1064:6 1078:23 1113:17 1128:22,24,24,25 sources 987:12,21 1064:10,10 south 967:12 986:25 Southern 966:9,11 967:10 speaking 1111:22 specific 990:5 1042:12 1042:13 1066:2 1075:3 1105:17 specifically 1012:8 1031:7 1033:23 1035:18 1090:8 1097:5 1108:1 specified 1003:14 1092:25 spectacularly 1064:1 1069:20 speculation 977:1,16 1093:7 speculative 977:4,11 spell 983:24 spills 1002:23 split 1145:24 spokesperson 986:5 spread 1143:24 spreadsheet 969:7 1106:17 1133:18 ss 1156:4 staff 977:2 990:25 1018:2 1123:7 stamp 1026:19,22 1027:12,20,25 stand 1055:6 standpoint 1082:17,20 1083:24 stands 1137:13 Stapleton 969:16 971:6 971:19 972:1 973:2 996:16 1037:22 1038:7,10,11,13,24 start 970:10 1009:4 1050:3 1076:4 1087:15 started 1007:9 1026:6	1095:9   sought 971:1 1064:22   source 1006:24   1021:12 1064:6   1078:23 1113:17   1128:22,242,42.5   sources 987:12,21   1064:10,10   south 967:12 986:25   Southern 966:9,11   967:10   speaking 1111:22   specific 990:5 1042:12   1042:13 1066:2   1075:3 1105:17   specifically 1012:8   1031:7 1033:23   1031:7 1033:23   1035:18 1090:8   1097:5 1108:1   specified 1103:14   1092:25   spectacularly 1064:1   1069:20   speculation 977:1,16   1093:7   speculative 977:4,11   spel 1983:24   spills 1002:23   spilt 1145:24   specading 1146:2   spread 1143:24   spreading 1146:2   spread 1143:24   spreading 1146:2   spread 1143:24   spreading 1146:2   spreadsheet 969:7   1106:17 1133:18   ss 1156:4   staff 977:2 990:25   1018:2 1123:7   stamp 1026:19,22   1027:12,20,25   stand 1055:6   standpoint 1082:17,20   1083:24   stands 1137:13   Stapleton 969:16 971:6   971:19 972:1 973:2   996:16 1037:22   1038:7,10,11,13,24   started 1007:9 1026:6   started 1007:9 1026:6   112:3 1115:2 1116:7   1080:7,8 1099:3   1099:15,8 1099:3   1099:15,12,1 1111:20   1112:3 1115:2 1116:7   1112:3

substance 990:11 998:13,15 :13,14,16 substantial 976:18 1000:15,20 1065:17 18:6 substantially 1068:8 1092:17 subtracted 1140:20 8:14 success 1069:21 022:6 sue 978:25 979:6 24 967:6,12 1003:24 1004:20,24 1005:20 1008:12 1001:25 1010:4 sued 978:22 980:25 82:18 **suffered** 991:16,20 77:6,7,9,12 992:1 997:21,24 sufficient 971:3 14,22,25 suggesting 1147:14 1001:2,2,6 suit 995:23 1010:8,16 ,16 1002:3 1014:23 003:3 **SULLIVAN** 967:11 011:24 sum 974:7 25 1013:4,7 summarize 1104:23 8,22,25 summarized 1111:4 19:6 1125:13 034:25 summarizing 1113:14 038:17 summary 969:5,14 1053:8 975:23 980:6 994:13 1 1071:10 994:14 1108:7,20,21 7,21 1072:4 1108:23 1109:1,2,3 ,22 1073:3 1113:24 1115:6 6,20 1074:3 1118:5 1120:9 2 1098:10 1128:18 6,20 1099:7 summer 1018:11 ,18,20 **Superior** 966:1,16 46:24 supplier 1064:8 047:20,23 1121:15 1050:25 suppliers 997:11 ,19,25 **supplies** 984:22 987:22 53:19 995:2 999:16 1022:15 1146:25 1049:16 1075:22 1107:5,12,15,21 0 990:21 **supply** 974:16 987:16 1105:5 988:24 989:3,4 991:10,11,12,23 8 1009:24 997:6,10 998:17 071:12 999:20,23 1000:12,15 089:22 1013:21 1021:13,14 131:14 1021:15,19 1022:10 1025:3,12,18 1041:7 7:11 1048:17,18,18,23,24 1,14,18 1049:8,11,12,14,15 1061:25 1062:2,11,13 035:11 1013:5 1062:18,23 1063:2,4 ly 1057:4 1063:6,7,12,15 1064:6,7,8,11,17,18 91:12 1064:23 1075:21

1076:14 1077:16,25

1080:16 1082:2

1083:21 1100:6,17,17	1111:18,19 1112:2,2	1116:18 1119:14	1154:3	1028:1,7,17,20,25
1103:12 1105:9,12	1112:4,6 1114:15,20	1123:22 1128:4	Thanks 1017:10	1029:1,5,23 1031:2
1111:17,18 1120:20	1115:18,23 1116:1,4	1133:16 1139:11,12	theory 1146:14 1147:7	1031:18 1032:6,16,20
1120:23,25 1129:10	1117:6,14 1118:19,25	1145:9 1146:20	thing 1035:1 1039:9,13	1033:5 1034:24
1129:13,16 1130:7	1140:4,4 1151:2	telling 1034:18 1051:13	1048:16 1135:15	1038:16 1041:3
1132:4 1134:20,22	system's 1012:2	1052:7,11,13	1155:10,10	1060:4,6,15,22,24
1135:5,13,17,21	systems 1028:9	tempest 1155:11	things 971:5 972:13,13	1061:15,18 1068:19
1136:1,5,6,7,13,19,19		ten 1113:8 1154:5	972:14 1068:18	1068:24 1069:2
1136:21 1137:5,8,9	T	1155:12	1085:18,21 1089:17	1070:4,12,15 1071:7
1137:12,13,16,17,21	table 982:22 1058:10	tens 991:21 992:5	1090:8 1120:13	1072:25 1082:15
1137:22 1138:5	1098:17,21,25 1099:4	tentative 1018:23	1131:18 1137:11	1084:20 1087:1
1139:10 1142:11	1101:16	term 974:3 1003:5	1147:14 1151:14	1095:22 1103:6
1149:9,14 1150:18	take 970:8 972:24	1004:2,22,25 1019:14	think 971:25 972:10,23	1111:8 1112:21,25
1152:10,12 1153:1,5	996:6,24 999:12	1019:17,20 1043:8,16	978:16 982:23,25	1125:16 1156:11
1153:8	1000:14 1005:7,11,15	1046:6 1074:15	1011:4 1018:4 1027:3	timeout 980:4 1003:23
support 998:7 1000:11	1008:7 1010:7,10	1088:7,16 1097:7,13	1031:16 1037:24	1009:25 1017:14,19
1021:10 1089:19	1013:15 1014:1,2,6			times 1034:10 1082:4
		1138:11 1140:2,3 terminal 999:15	1038:2,18 1041:20	
1152:4	1017:10,12 1019:9		1051:9 1052:24	timing 1088:21
supported 986:3,6	1025:23 1029:10	terminate 1013:20,23	1059:23 1060:9	1090:11
1001:24 1002:5	1031:21 1037:20	terms 985:17,19,23	1063:17,20 1065:10	today 971:24 972:7,18
1111:16	1042:10 1049:11	1035:21,23 1042:17	1067:1 1073:5 1082:4	1017:12 1019:14
supporting 1028:5	1070:23 1071:11	1042:21 1044:19	1087:23 1088:2	1056:9 1106:2 1154:3
<b>supports</b> 980:8 1105:5	1089:11 1094:18	1045:15 1066:4	1094:22 1095:1	token 970:6
1130:21	1105:6 1108:10	1071:16 1088:7,21	1101:20 1109:9	told 971:10 978:12
Suppose 1083:8	1111:7 1113:7	1089:10,24 1090:25	1130:3,11,20 1133:6	983:3 1031:16
supposed 976:16	1123:23 1133:7,18	1094:8 1097:3	1138:11 1139:1,23	1034:11 1038:18
1095:24 1096:7	1134:24 1135:2	1127:16 1130:13	1152:2 1153:21,22	1043:1 1050:23,25
suppress 997:10	1147:11 1148:18	1133:8 1134:9 1135:8	1154:11,13,14	1051:17 1057:14
surcharge 1077:18	take-out 989:11	1144:14 1149:11,15	1155:11	1061:23 1073:5
sure 996:20 1034:22	taken 989:23 1000:19	terrible 1131:23	thinking 1045:4	1076:21 1082:4
Suit 770.20 1034.22	taken 707.23 1000.17	terrible 1131.23	thinking 1073.7	10/0.21 1002.7
1042:2 1057:6	1002:2 1047:11	test 1132:5,6,10	1153:23	1085:20 1096:2
1042:2 1057:6			1153:23	1085:20 1096:2
	1002:2 1047:11	test 1132:5,6,10	o .	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14	1153:23 <b>third</b> 981:2 988:2 1103:13	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15	1153:23 <b>third</b> 981:2 988:2 1103:13 <b>third-party</b> 1016:18	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 <b>tomorrow</b> 1155:12,13 <b>top</b> 976:9 1077:15
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 <b>takes</b> 1079:4 1089:3 <b>tale</b> 978:16 <b>talk</b> 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 <b>Surely</b> 1056:14 1154:15	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11 Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trades 1095:18
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trades 1095:18 trading 1068:11
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16 1077:17 1078:1,1	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11 tell 971:4 984:17	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23 tests 1136:24	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24 1005:23 1008:3,6	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trading 1068:11 tranche 1008:2
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trades 1095:18 trading 1068:11
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16 1077:17 1078:1,1	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11 tell 971:4 984:17	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23 tests 1136:24	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24 1005:23 1008:3,6	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trading 1068:11 tranche 1008:2
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16 1077:17 1078:1,1 1080:6,6 1082:25	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11 tell 971:4 984:17 1045:4 1049:10	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23 tests 1136:24 Thank 982:18 983:9,10	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24 1005:23 1008:3,6 1012:18 1017:13,24	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 1114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trades 1095:18 trading 1068:11 tranche 1008:2 transaction 1046:8
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16 1077:17 1078:1,1 1080:6,6 1082:25 1083:2,10,15,25	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11 tell 971:4 984:17 1045:4 1049:10 1057:21 1062:4	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23 tests 1136:24 Thank 982:18 983:9,10 983:14,23 1080:8	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24 1005:23 1008:3,6 1012:18 1017:13,24 1020:2,7,13,18	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trades 1095:18 trading 1068:11 tranche 1008:2 transaction 1046:8 1066:16 1088:24
1042:2 1057:6 1085:17 1092:19 1126:11 1130:19 1135:1 1136:6 1146:18 1150:11  Surely 1056:14 1154:15 surprised 971:22 sustain 995:1 1043:3 1122:3,11 sustained 1054:3 1059:22 1061:7 1145:8,15 1153:14 sworn 983:19 1102:4 system 974:8,8 975:2,3 976:3,3 988:18 997:13 999:15 1012:9 1026:19,23 1028:10 1029:1,7 1030:3 1031:13,24 1032:14 1032:22 1033:25,25 1039:10,14,15,15 1076:12,12 1077:16 1077:17 1078:1,1 1080:6,6 1082:25 1083:2,10,15,25 1085:3,21 1089:4	1002:2 1047:11 1091:22 1156:10 takes 1079:4 1089:3 tale 978:16 talk 976:15 1000:24 1046:11 1055:11 1079:16 1088:18 1097:21 1131:18 talked 1141:7 1144:15 talking 975:23 981:13 1026:9 1028:21 1042:3 1065:23 1079:16 1101:10 1142:7 TARA 966:20 1156:7 1156:23 targeting 1010:14 task 992:11 tasked 1137:2 1147:16 tax 975:10 976:13 1084:17 team 986:4,7 1028:6 teapot 1155:11 tell 971:4 984:17 1045:4 1049:10 1057:21 1062:4 1102:16 1103:5	test 1132:5,6,10 1136:20,23 testified 973:9 975:14 978:11 983:20 984:15 987:8,11 990:8 1002:5 1017:11 1043:5 1055:6 1102:5 1102:20 1104:10 1116:9 1121:19 1132:9 testify 975:14 990:5 1047:10,18 testifying 973:7 1102:24 1127:16 testimony 978:6,11 980:2 982:17 990:25 1017:24 1033:11,20 1034:9,22 1035:2 1039:6 1051:15 1052:8 1053:20 1069:19 1101:3 1104:11 1106:2,6 1142:23 tests 1136:24 Thank 982:18 983:9,10 983:14,23 1080:8 1096:24 1102:10	1153:23 third 981:2 988:2 1103:13 third-party 1016:18 1045:12 thought 971:22 1040:24 1060:1,3,6 1060:11,19,21,23 1062:15 1069:19 threat 979:11 1011:23 threaten 979:17 three 974:10 1009:22 1030:2,5 1056:6 1067:17 1068:17 1076:18 1080:5,12,23 1081:11,11 1112:1 Tier 1025:9,9 1077:16 1142:11,13 1144:19 1152:25 till 1144:2 time 973:13 994:7 997:23 999:10 1000:18 1003:14,24 1005:23 1008:3,6 1012:18 1017:13,24 1020:2,7,13,18 1021:22 1022:3	1085:20 1096:2 1127:6 1129:8,12 tomorrow 1155:12,13 top 976:9 1077:15 topic 1122:13 total 975:15 1008:15 1020:7 1021:17 1023:19 1024:1 1084:19 1111:6,11 1112:7 1113:5 114:11,21 1115:1,9 1115:15 1116:6,10 1117:3,20 1118:16 1119:5,14,17,20 1125:16,22 1126:15 1126:17 1146:11,12 1147:3,7,22 totals 1111:6 1125:13 1126:19 trade-in 1095:16 1096:14 trades 1095:18 trading 1068:11 tranche 1008:2 transaction 1046:8 1066:16 1088:24 1089:1 1090:7 1125:5

transactions 1044:21	treated 1044:19	typewriting 1156:12	1047:4 1097:17,20	1112:10,13,13,20
1046:12 1093:9	1046:15 1077:22	typically 1090:7,14	1106:15	1143:20
transcript 966:15	1082:18,20 1083:17	1110:6 1143:19	unsuccessful 1008:20	volumes 1107:3
1039:5 1056:25	treatment 1077:17,21	1110.0 11 13.17	untreated 1025:8	1108:15 1111:3
1154:9,19	1078:2	U	1080:14,15	1112:24
transcription 1156:13	trees 1109:10	U.S 1109:21	update 1017:20	vote 998:21,24 1001:10
transcripts 1057:3,7	tremendous 1074:10	Uh-huh 1033:19	updated 1112:24	1001:11,14 1034:24
transfer 1007:3,21	trial 972:13 973:14,16	ultimate 1007:21	updating 1113:3	1059:18 1061:3
1009:15,17,17 1012:6	973:18 974:20 976:16	unbounded 1005:3	upper 1080:5	1101:8
1024:25 1064:12	977:22 979:9,10,20	1009:16	urge 973:16	voted 1001:6,22 1034:5
1065:22 1066:20	983:8 984:16 991:14	unbundled 997:20,23	URQUHART 967:11	1034:7,10,18,20
1067:14 1086:23	996:20 1027:9,9,10	998:1,5,8,14,22,25	use 976:20 994:16,25	1035:1,20 1060:20
1089:13 1107:5	1027:11,15,15,19,22	999:2,6 1001:2,5	1019:17 1020:16	1061:12
1125:2,12	1027:23 1039:4	1038:17 1040:4	1026:22 1045:7	votes 1001:18 1097:22
transferred 1007:14	1106:5 1148:16	unbundling 1040:22	1085:23 1109:17	1098:13
1092:8	tried 1086:20 1147:17	1041:16	1111:9 1134:1,10,12	voting 1060:12,15
transfers 1089:11	1154:18 1155:6	uncertainty 1068:11	1146:11 1151:8	1061:18
1103:10	trigger 1074:3	unclear 1034:23	useful 1151:19	vs 966:8
transparency 1039:16	truck 976:21	1130:17	uses 1151:3	
transport 982:1 987:25	true 1029:2 1034:3,17	undercalculating	utility 1128:21	W
988:7 989:15 1082:1	1035:16,22 1036:13	1023:7		waive 981:16
1089:4 1114:5	1036:14,24 1037:11	undergraduate 1127:7	V	waived 980:21 981:18
1118:11 1129:9	1060:7 1062:14	underlying 1001:15	vague 1130:17 1139:2	waiver 978:1 979:22
1132:3	1064:6,22 1070:6,16	undermining 1011:24	valid 995:25 1012:21	981:4,7
transportation 974:4	1070:19 1071:16	understand 988:23	validate 995:19	waiving 981:11
974:17 976:12,20	1078:23 1081:5,10	1033:11 1053:6,8	validating 1053:23	walk 1106:21 1107:10
977:24 986:19 988:22	1085:2 1086:3,19	1063:5 1075:12	validation 995:18,22	1112:15 1114:3
991:18,23 993:3,11	1091:12 1092:6,25	1078:14 1081:1	996:5,19 1027:4	want 970:10 973:19
995:10 999:18,22	1093:24 1094:10,14	1082:22 1085:17	validity 966:10 979:16	990:9 1008:5 1017:12
1000:12,15 1010:5	1095:22 1101:15,18	1089:25 1090:1	995:16 1042:11	1035:19 1037:6
1017:16 1022:25	1134:2,11,12 1136:11	1092:19 1094:20	valley 988:4 1045:8	1039:3 1040:25
1045:1 1048:17	1142:19 1145:2,16	1127:24 1133:19,19	value 1020:24 1021:2,3	1062:25 1063:3
1049:13 1052:14,16	1146:15	1135:1 1142:1	VAN 967:3	1068:23 1088:18,20
1052:20 1062:1,13,23	try 972:12,14 976:21	1146:19 1153:13	VANDERHORST	1090:3,5 1120:13
1063:8,11 1067:11,14	1131:25	understanding 973:4	967:15	1135:19
1071:18 1076:19	trying 1037:8 1143:4	986:8 1019:20	Variations 1148:4	wanted 1045:24 1064:5
1077:13,24 1080:13	1148:5	1023:12,15 1043:22	variety 1047:19,22	1064:7 1086:17
1082:1,3 1085:14,16	turn 994:11,25 1002:20	1049:19 1050:9	various 987:12 1047:10	wants 1075:18
1086:2,5,7 1100:2	1075:7 1079:18	1056:2 1058:24	verdict 996:21	Washinton 984:25
1104:12,15,25	1109:25 1115:4	1059:7,16,24 1060:9	version 1023:17	wasn't 1034:22 1046:5
1105:12,13,22	1123:5,21	1061:3,8 1062:17 1150:4	versus 1063:8 1147:23	1056:11 1057:5,5
1111:12,19 1120:25 1129:16 1134:16	Turning 1108:10 turnouts 1045:10	understood 983:3	VIDEOGRAPHY 966:23	1064:2 1065:15 1087:1 1088:16
1135:16,17,20 1137:8	turns 1121:20	1031:12,13 1059:17	view 1004:9,15 1009:5	1127:23
1137:8,13,17,22	Twenty-four 972:16	1069:2,19	1011:1 1144:24	wastewater 1103:24
1137.8,13,17,22	1055:20	undertake 1135:23	1146:21	1128:20
1149:10,14 1150:25	twice 1017:8	undertaken 1025:10	VII 966:10	water 966:6,9,11
1152:1	two 970:13 979:24	undisputed 975:25	Vincent 994:7	967:10 971:7 973:22
transported 986:13	997:9,11 999:14	unfair 1056:10 1154:11	violate 977:18	973:23 974:9,15
1086:10,10 1089:8	1015:7 1030:13,14,22	unhappy 978:24	violated 974:11 1046:7	975:5,6,9,10,13,13
1090:3,5 1125:3	1034:8 1042:17	uniform 993:16	violation 1061:9	976:2,9,11 977:23
transporting 975:9	1044:8 1050:15	1012:23	virtue 1008:13	978:13 979:13,25
1045:12 1076:2	1052:16,17,21	unilateral 1040:17	vociferous 977:1	981:23,25 982:2,4,9
1083:20 1085:10	1081:23 1125:8	United 1069:24	VOICE 1055:20	982:10 983:16 984:7
1086:14 1094:1,3	1133:22 1143:19	1091:20	volume 966:10 1009:24	984:12,14,20,20,21
1106:11 1115:12	two-party 1066:21,23	unknown 1053:13,24	1107:4,18,19,20	984:23,24 985:2,4,5
1116:25	type 1127:17 1132:19	unlawful 977:20	1108:2,3,7 1109:19	985:12,15 986:9,11
treat 1081:4 1095:21	types 1103:5	1040:6,8 1041:10	1110:1 1111:10	986:13,15,16,18,19
	**	,		

1013:9,11,13,15,19 1013:21,23,24 1014:2 1014:7,9,12,13,14,14 1014:17,21,21 1016:3 1016:4,7,8,10,17,18 1016:20,23 1017:2,3 1017:7,15,18 1018:1 1018:13,24 1019:2,17 1019:23,25 1020:1,5 1020:8,12,14,15,16	1013:21,23,24 1014:2 1014:7,9,12,13,14,14 1014:17,21,21 1016:3 1016:4,7,8,10,17,18 1016:20,23 1017:2,3 1017:7,15,18 1018:1 1018:13,24 1019:2,17
, , , , -, -	1021:13,14,15,16,18 1021:21,23,23,24,25 1021:25 1022:5,6,7,8 1022:9,10,11,13,14 1022:15,18,25 1023:3 1023:4,5,6,20,21,24 1023:24,25,25 1024:1 1024:5,7,7,10,14,16 1024:18,21,21,24,24 1025:2,3,7,9,10,11,13 1025:14,18,20 1026:4 1026:21 1028:15,18

```
1041:2,6,8,19
1044:13,22 1045:6,9
1045:12,13,24
1047:23 1048:8,18,22
1048:22,24,24,25
1049:11,11,12
1052:10,10 1058:9
1061:25 1064:3.6.7.8
1064:10,11,12,14,18
1064:19,23 1065:7,7
1065:12,22 1066:19
1066:22 1067:7,9,12
1067:12,14,17,18
1068:16,17,21,23
1069:7,7,23,25
1070:12,20 1071:1,9
1072:6,6,12,13,23,24
1073:1 1075:20,21
1076:2,3,5,6,12,14
1077:1,16,22,23
1078:1,5,15,19,23,25
1079:1,2,3,5,10,14,17
1079:18,19,20,23
1080:3,7,8,10,10,14
1080:15,19,19,21,22
1080:23 1081:3,3,8,9
1081:12,14,18,20,21
1081:24 1082:2,10,13
1082:14,17,17,18,20
1082:21.22.24 1083:1
1083:5,9,15,16,21
1084:2,5 1085:10,20
1085:22,23 1086:8,9
1086:15,20 1088:19
1088:19,24 1089:6,21
1090:3,11,11,16,17
1090:20,24 1091:2,2
1091:6,9,13,15,21,22
1092:1,1,4,9,11,22
1093:3,4,11,12,13,15
1093:20,21,22 1094:1
1094:3,5,11,14,15,16
1095:8,13,15,16,17
1095:23 1096:7,13,14
1096:16,20 1097:11
1097:15,23 1098:2,3
1098:6,8,12,24
1099:3,13 1100:1,7
1100:17,20 1102:7,19
1102:23 1103:6,15,19
1103:22 1105:8,8,11
1105:18,21 1106:10
1106:11 1107:4,13,15
1110:8 1111:11,20
1112:3 1114:5 1115:1
1115:13,13 1116:6,10
1117:1,20 1118:10
1119:6,15,19,24
```

```
1120:2,23 1122:25
  1124:1,1,2,20,22
  1125:3,4,25 1128:9
  1128:20 1129:9,12,15
  1132:23,24 1133:4,8
  1134:15,19,23 1135:3
  1135:9,11,13 1137:4
  1139:24 1140:1.5.23
  1141:18,19,23,24
  1142:6,8,8,9,10,13,13
  1142:18,19,19 1143:5
  1143:12,12 1144:2,16
  1144:16,17,19,24
  1145:1,10,12,17,24
  1146:5,9,14,22
  1147:4,8,22 1148:20
  1148:20 1149:8
  1151:24,25 1153:6,7
way 976:22 982:20
  983:4 990:1 1041:18
  1045:1 1046:24
  1059:13 1073:21,23
  1081:16 1083:12
  1096:22 1098:12
  1099:24 1108:22
  1121:24 1128:19
  1131:23 1134:4
  1148:8 1154:18
  1155:5
wavs 981:1
we'll 1030:22 1106:21
  1109:3 1112:15
we're 971:4 973:19
  977:10 980:22 981:13
  982:17 1009:21
  1027:1 1042:3 1052:4
  1062:10 1065:23
  1070:18,18 1074:17
  1075:20 1079:14,16
  1080:14 1111:22
  1126:12 1155:11
we've 1032:19 1088:7
Wednesday 1155:14
week 971:5,8 972:1
welcome 973:9
well-articulated
  1012:16
well-known 1012:16
  1128:25
went 979:15 980:12
  999:20 1023:16
  1063:15 1086:7
  1087:23 1122:6
  1136:5,13,21
west 1045:8
wheel 1090:20
wheeled 1082:17,20,22
  1083:1,5,16 1094:6
```

```
1094:10
wheeler 1088:25
  1089:7,22 1090:2
wheelers 974:14
wheeling 974:11
  977:18,21 990:16
  991:24 992:18 993:7
  993:8.10.14.15
  994:10,18 995:4,13
  995:16,17,24 996:8
  997:12 998:18,20
  1008:8 1012:23
  1028:8 1030:2,23
  1031:2,2 1041:7,9,11
  1068:12 1086:11,14
  1086:16,21,24 1087:3
  1088:19,24 1089:2,7
  1089:20 1090:1,7,16
  1090:17 1091:25
  1093:3,9 1122:21,22
  1124:12 1125:5
wheels 1082:24 1083:9
  1083:14,24 1089:4
whichever 1069:3
willing 1004:21
win 1073:20 1074:16
withdraw 1132:15
  1147:5
witness 970:18 971:2,7
  971:15 973:3,8
  977:25 983:15,19,22
  983:25 1000:7,11
  1009:2,6 1011:3,6
  1025:21 1039:24
  1042:9,12,18 1048:13
  1055:11,15 1056:24
  1057:4 1059:5 1075:5
  1093:9 1101:14.25
  1102:4,9,11 1126:9
  1126:24 1130:19
  1139:1 1142:2,25
  1145:7,22 1146:18
  1148:2 1149:1 1150:1
  1150:7 1153:4
  1156:16
witnesses 968:3 970:16
  970:19,24 972:2,9,25
  973:17 982:14 1056:7
  1057:5 1154:9,15
word 1041:4
words 980:15 1041:2
  1046:5
work 982:6 984:20
  986:3,5,5 990:23
  1017:23 1018:12
  1019:17 1049:3
  1103:5,14 1121:19,23
  1129:7 1131:19,22
```

```
1132:22 1133:25
  1134:10,17,25
  1135:24 1136:8,12
  1139:7 1146:21
  1152:4
workbook 969:5
  1107:2.24
worked 985:4 1007:8
  1151:13
working 985:18
  1105:15
works 1007:23 1084:14
  1095:20 1151:10,12
world 1069:11
WORLDWIDE 966:23
worse 1046:15 1048:8
worth 1127:11
wouldn't 1004:19
  1035:19 1040:21,25
  1053:1 1067:9 1094:4
  1147:6 1152:13
write 978:19,21
  1073:18,21,23
writing 981:10 990:18
  998:11 1003:13
  1042:13 1129:1
written 1038:21 1040:2
  1041:1,4
wrong 1047:4 1051:18
  1134:16
wrote 1030:1 1068:23
WSR 969:8 1015:4
          X
X 968:2
          Y
yeah 1098:13 1131:7
  1138:10 1146:18
year 975:23 976:5
  988:2,5 992:5 1001:8
  1001:14 1007:12
  1009:6,21 1021:6
  1024:2,15,15,19,22
  1024:25 1025:19,20
  1035:16 1064:4
  1065:10,12 1069:23
  1084:15 1088:9
  1091:17,21,23
  1104:18 1106:21,22
  1110:6 1111:7,16
  1112:14 1115:13
  1116:18 1117:1
  1140:7,16
year-and-a-half
  1102:21
yearly 1097:22
years 974:23 975:2,7
```

075:24.25.076:14	10 000 1007 0 10	15 1000.17 20 10(2.10	2007.079.10	212 217 (000 0(7.17
975:24,25 976:14	<b>10,000</b> 1007:9,10	<b>15</b> 1009:17,20 1063:18	<b>2006</b> 968:19	<b>213.217.6000</b> 967:17
984:9 1001:23,24	<b>10:00</b> 970:3	1067:15 1068:11	<b>2006-2007</b> 1008:3	<b>213.443.3000</b> 967:13
1003:9 1004:20,24	100 976:19	1100:11,13,19 1102:1	<b>2007</b> 968:20 1070:17	<b>216</b> 1154:10
1005:17 1007:12	100-million-dollar	<b>150,000</b> 1008:15	1070:19,22 1071:2,18	<b>22</b> 968:9 993:22 994:1
1008:9,12,13,14,16	1135:21	1010:1 1068:16	1072:10	1026:7,18
1009:15,17,20	<b>100,000</b> 988:1 1007:16	<b>16</b> 1002:20 1019:5	<b>2008</b> 968:14,21 1032:9	<b>23</b> 982:12
1011:21 1012:18,24	1007:18 1025:1	1043:8,10 1097:4,6	1032:10,12,17 1033:8	<b>23.02</b> 1124:24 1126:8
1014:22 1018:25	<b>1002</b> 968:11,11	<b>163-dollar</b> 1030:3	1033:13 1034:3,14	<b>24</b> 971:22 972:6,7
1021:17,18 1024:18	<b>1010</b> 968:13,13	<b>164</b> 975:22 976:1	1036:11,15 1057:15	973:1 1056:4,20
1030:18 1033:24	<b>1015</b> 969:8,8,9,9	<b>17</b> 1002:23 1003:7	1059:10 1060:6	1098:7 1154:7,13,17
1034:8,21 1036:12,16	<b>1026</b> 968:4	1029:17,23 1097:4	1061:13 1071:21	1154:20
1058:23 1062:9	<b>1029</b> 969:18,18	<b>179,993</b> 1118:12	1098:13,17,23	<b>256</b> 968:15 1096:1
1063:2,13 1064:4	<b>1031</b> 968:14,14	<b>18</b> 982:11 1071:2	<b>2009</b> 968:22 999:9,12	<b>26</b> 974:11 975:11
1065:8 1067:14,15,19	<b>1038</b> 969:16,16	<b>18.27</b> 1123:20 1124:23	1033:13,17 1034:3,14	1023:18,23 1084:25
1067:21 1068:2,11,12	<b>1058</b> 968:12,12	1126:8	1057:16 1058:23	<b>26-member</b> 1011:14
1068:13 1069:23	<b>1070</b> 969:1,1	<b>180</b> 1143:21	1059:10 1061:13	<b>27</b> 1016:19
1070:18 1072:11,15	<b>1076</b> 969:19	<b>180,256</b> 1117:2	1071:23 1098:13,19	<b>28</b> 982:11,13
1072:17,18 1087:17	<b>1077</b> 969:19	<b>186,861</b> 1115:14	1098:23	
1099:2 1100:15	<b>1096</b> 968:15,15	<b>188,295,602</b> 1113:5	<b>2010</b> 968:23 978:22	3
1106:12 1111:4	<b>1097</b> 968:4	<b>195</b> 976:6	1013:12 1033:18	<b>3/11/08</b> 968:12
1116:11 1119:16,21	<b>10th</b> 967:12	<b>1995</b> 1086:19,23	1037:16 1071:25	<b>3/28/12</b> 969:19
1120:5 1133:19	<b>11</b> 1111:4 1154:10	<b>1996</b> 990:16 993:8	<b>2011</b> 968:24 969:10	<b>30</b> 966:18 970:2
1152:15	<b>110</b> 1064:4 1065:8	995:7,12 1026:7	974:25 975:2,4	1009:15 1055:2
yellow 1107:21	1069:23	<b>1997</b> 984:13	980:21,22 981:18	1087:16
1124:22	<b>1101</b> 968:4	<b>1998</b> 1006:3,5 1009:10	1008:5 1014:22	<b>304</b> 966:4
yesterday 971:23	<b>1102</b> 968:5	1009:13 1067:16	1015:5 1016:2,25	<b>314</b> 968:16 1110:1,9,11
yield 1064:12	<b>1107</b> 969:5	1087:4,11 1088:14	1072:2,18 1104:18	1110:12,17
yielded 1140:18	<b>1109</b> 969:4,4,5	<b>1999</b> 996:14,18,24	1106:12 1107:7,23	<b>315</b> 968:17
	1110 969:3,3		1111:16 1112:7	<b>316</b> 968:18
$\overline{z}$	<b>1111</b> 968:16,16		1113:16 1114:4,16,21	<b>317</b> 968:19
	<b>1114</b> 969:10,10	<b>2</b> 994:11 1025:9	1115:2 1116:19,20	<b>318</b> 968:20
0	<b>1116</b> 969:11,11	<b>2/10/03</b> 969:16	1119:16,21 1152:15	<b>319</b> 968:21
<b>02</b> 985:24	<b>1118</b> 969:12,12	<b>200,000</b> 1007:21	<b>2011-2014</b> 969:15	<b>320</b> 968:22
<b>03</b> 968:16 985:25	<b>1119</b> 969:13	1009:21	<b>2012</b> 966:12 968:25	<b>321</b> 968:23
<b>0471</b> 1111:23	<b>1120</b> 969:13	<b>2001</b> 984:13 993:21	969:11 1018:11	<b>322</b> 968:24
1	<b>1121</b> 969:15,15	997:25	1104:18 1115:7,10,16	<b>323</b> 968:25 1110:11,12
1	1124 969:6,6,7	<b>2002</b> 1058:23	1115:20 1116:1,4,7	1110:17
1 966:12,12 974:1,6	<b>1125</b> 969:7	<b>2003</b> 968:11 974:2,7	<b>2013</b> 966:12 969:3,12	<b>3374</b> 966:20 1156:7,23
975:14 978:5,6,11	1127 968:5	978:7 980:21 982:16	1104:10,24 1107:23	<b>355</b> 969:1 1070:24
979:3,9,10 987:8	<b>1130</b> 969:19 1076:22	998:2 1002:18,24	1112:23 1116:23	<b>357</b> 1076:20
990:5 993:23 998:2	1077:5,6 1094:19	1005:6,10,23 1006:4	1117:1,4,7,14,21	<b>36</b> 1068:12
1017:11 1018:23	1095:3	1006:12,17 1007:10	1118:3 1154:10	<b>38</b> 968:10 996:10
1017:11 1010:25	<b>1150</b> 968:5	1000:12,17 1007:10	<b>2014</b> 966:12 969:13	3rd 966:24
1027:10 1038:18	<b>1156</b> 966:13	1022:25 1023:22	975:4 1014:22 1015:5	31 <b>u</b> 300.24
1039:5,6,21 1040:4	<b>12</b> 979:24 984:9 1091:6	1022:23 1023:22	1016:3,25 1018:22	4
1053:23 1055:16	1091:9 1092:4	1028.4,11 1029.17,23	1112:21 1118:6,9,10	<b>4.2</b> 1043:9
1056:4,11,16 1058:10	<b>12.5</b> 981:12	1031:13,14 1032:23	1118:17,20,25 1119:6	<b>403.8</b> 1125:19
1077:16 1106:6	<b>12.5</b> 981.12 <b>12/6/96</b> 968:9	1035:3,9,10 1030:3,9	1119:16,21 1125:17	<b>408.5</b> 1126:16
1142:11,13 1144:19	<b>12/6/96</b> 968.9 <b>128</b> 968:14 1031:21	1030.18 1038.8,18,22	1152:16	<b>409</b> 1126:13,21
1152:25 1154:6,19	<b>13.9</b> 981:3,3,7	1071:19 1072:18	<b>2015</b> 966:18 970:2	<b>409</b> 1120.13,21 <b>409.5</b> 1124:19
<b>1-10</b> 966:13	<b>13.9</b> 981.3,3,7 <b>135</b> 969:6 981:22	1071.19 1072.18	1018:25 1019:5,10	<b>41</b> 976:13
<b>1.2</b> 1124:21	1019:24	1087.7,14 1088.4,6	1018.23 1019.3,10	<b>415</b> 966:25
<b>1.7</b> 1024:4,6,17			1024:2,5 1025:7	<b>415.391.5400</b> 967:7
1/12th 1091:16 1093:17	136 975:22 976:1	1106:11		<b>423</b> 1110:10
1:30 972:24 1054:4,4	13th 1156:16	<b>2003-2007</b> 980:14	<b>2016</b> 1018:25 1019:10	<b>430</b> 969:3 1110:2,12,14
1055:3	<b>14</b> 975:2 981:19	<b>2004</b> 968:17 979:4	<b>2018</b> 1007:20	1110:21,23
<b>10</b> 966:12 1038:8	1106:12 1107:7,24	1029:2,3,7 1030:2	<b>2019</b> 1007:20	<b>45</b> 1068:12
1154:10	1111:5,17 1112:8,25	1031:14 1125:17	<b>2020</b> 1007:20	45 1008:12 45-year 1009:15,20
1134.10	<b>143,240</b> 1114:7	<b>2005</b> 968:18	<b>2021</b> 1007:21	75-year 1009.15,20

460.060.4.1006.27	F1 0/0 10 1070 /	[		
<b>469</b> 969:4 1006:25	<b>71</b> 968:12 1058:6			
1108:10,13,17 1109:8	<b>794</b> 969:16 1037:20			
1109:13,15,16	1038:4,5			
<b>471</b> 969:5 1106:23				
1107:1,2 1109:4,6,7	8			
1109:19 1110:24	<b>8</b> 996:14,24 1006:25			
	<b>80</b> 968:13 987:18			
1112:4,17 1113:14,17				
1119:14	1010:18,20 1011:1,2			
<b>472</b> 969:6 1123:5,5,6	1011:11 1025:2			
1123:11,15,16,17	1087:23			
<b>473</b> 969:7 1123:21,22	<b>80,000</b> 1024:14,19,23			
1123:23 1124:3,7,8	1064:3 1065:11			
1125:8 1126:11	1069:22 1126:2			
<b>473A</b> 1006:25	<b>800</b> 966:25			
<b>48</b> 972:4 1025:5	<b>800,000</b> 988:5			
1055:16,19	<b>81</b> 1011:1			
<b>48.3</b> 1016:9	<b>843</b> 969:17 1029:11,16			
1010.7	1029:20,21			
5	<b>865</b> 967:12			
<b>5.2</b> 974:2 1002:21,24	003 707.12			
	9			
1004:1,2,22 1008:24				
1080:2	9 1058:6			
<b>5.7</b> 1125:23	9/27/03 969:18			
<b>5/18/07</b> 969:1	<b>9/8/99</b> 968:10			
<b>50</b> 987:23	<b>90</b> 1087:20			
<b>50,000</b> 1007:13	<b>90012</b> 967:16			
<b>506</b> 969:8 1015:13,14	<b>90017-2543</b> 967:13			
1016:1	<b>94111</b> 966:24			
<b>507</b> 969:9 1015:21,22	<b>966</b> 966:13			
1015:24,25	<b>97</b> 993:9			
<b>508</b> 969:10 1113:20,20	<b>98</b> 1006:9			
1114:1,2 1116:18	<b>981-3498</b> 966:25			
<b>509</b> 969:11 1115:5	<b>984</b> 968:4			
1116:13,16,17	<b>99</b> 997:15			
<b>51</b> 1043:13 1047:7	<b>993</b> 968:9,9			
<b>510</b> 969:12 1117:24	<b>996</b> 968:10,10			
1118:2,4				
<b>511</b> 969:13 1118:8,8				
1119:9,11,12				
<b>512</b> 969:14 1120:8,17				
1120:18				
<b>522-7096</b> 966:25				
<b>5499.7(a)</b> 974:12				
<b>56,000</b> 1025:20				
6				
<b>6</b> 1026:7				
<b>6/12/12</b> 968:15				
<b>6/18/04</b> 968:13				
<b>6/30/14</b> 1123:8				
<b>633</b> 967:6				
<b>65</b> 968:11 974:19				
1002:13,15,17 1043:7				
1047:7 1097:3				
7				
<b>700</b> 967:16				
<b>701</b> 966:24				
	1	1	1	1

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                                         INDEX
               COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                             PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW
                                                                             SLATER, Scott
                                                                                                1161 1203
                 DEPARTMENT 304
                                                                             CUSHMAN, Dennis
      SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                                            1257 1258 1260
                                                                             (recalled)
                                                                        5
         Petitioner and Plaintiff, ) Case No.
                                                                             Plaintiff Rests: Page 1265
                       ) CPF-10-510830
                        ) CPF-12-512466
                                                                             DEFENDANT'S WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                        9
                                                                             KIGHTLINGER, Jeff
                                                                                                 1269 1316
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL
      PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE
                                                                       10
      VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY ) Volume VIII
                                                                       11
                                                                                         EXHIBITS
      THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT )
                                                                       12
                                                                             Number
                                                                                                    For ID Evidence
      OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL )
                                                                       13
                                                                                  2/19/03 email
                                                                                                      1344
                                                                                                              1344
      10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY)
                                                                             56
      1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and )
                                                                       14
                                                                             246B Interrogatory Responses
                                                                                                          1265
                                                                                                                   1265
      DOES 1-10,
                                                                       15
                                                                             247B Interrogatory Responses
                                                                                                         1265
                                                                                                                   1265
                         Pages 1157 - 1352
                                                                       16
                                                                             398
                                                                                   2/19/03 email
                                                                                                       1343
                                                                                                              1343
         Respondents and Defendants. )
                                                                       17
                                                                             481
                                                                                   "Suggestions Regarding
                                                                                  Wheeling Rate"
                                                                                                      1171
                                                                                                              1171
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                                                       18
                San Francisco Superior
                                                                             513 through 517
               San Francisco, California
               Wednesday, April 1, 2015
                                                                       19
                                                                                                               1263
                                                                                  Deposition Excerpts
                                                                                                       1263
                                                                      20
                                                                                  7/8/03 email
                                                                                                      1181
                                                                                                              1181
      Reported By:
                                                                      21
      TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR #3374
                                                                       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
                                                           1157
                                                                                                                                 1159
         APPEARANCES
                                                                                        San Francisco, California
     For Petitioner and Plaintiff:
                                                                        2
                                                                                        Wednesday, April 1, 2015
     KEKER & VAN NEST
     BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ.
BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                        3
                                                                                             10:00 a.m.
     BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                        4
                                                                               Department 304
                                                                                                      Hon. Curtis E. A. Karnow, Judge
     BY: WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ.
                                                                        5
     BY: NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG, ESQ.
                                                                        6
     633 Battery Street
                                                                                    THE COURT: Good morning. Call a witness.
     San Francisco, California
                                                                        7
                                                                                    MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, the Water Authority
     415.391.5400
     Email: ahadlock@kvn.com
                                                                        8
                                                                               calls as its next witness, Scott Slater.
     Email: dpurcell@kvn.com
                                                                        9
                                                                                    THE COURT: Thank you.
     Email: jkeker@kvn.com
     Email: wbraunig@kvn.com
                                                                       10
10
                                                                       11
     For Respondent and Defendant Metropolitan Water District
                                                                                         SCOTT SLATER, ESQ.,
     of Southern California
                                                                       12
                                                                               called as a witness by the Plaintiff, was sworn and
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
                                                                       13
                                                                               testified as follows:
     BY: JOHN B. QUINN, ESQ.
                                                                       14
     BY: ERIC J. EMANUEL, ESQ
13
     865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
                                                                       15
                                                                                    THE WITNESS: I do.
     Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
14
                                                                       16
     213.443.3000
                                                                                     THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. If
     Email: johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com
                                                                       17
                                                                              you would state and spell your first and last name.
15
          and
     OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
                                                                       18
                                                                                    THE WITNESS: My name is Scott Slater. Spelled
     BY: JOSEPH VANDERHORST, ESQ.
16
                                                                       19
                                                                              S-L-A-T-E-R.
     700 North Alameda Street
17
     Los Angeles, California 90012
                                                                       20
                                                                                    THE CLERK: I need you to spell your first
     213.217.6000
                                                                       21
18
                                                                              name, as well.
19
                                                                       22
                                                                                     THE WITNESS: S-C-O-T-T.
20
                                                                       2.3
22
                                                                       24
                                                                              //
23
24
                                                                       25
                                                                              ///
25
                                                           1158
                                                                                                                                 1160
```

#### 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION the negotiations of the 2003 exchange agreement with 2 2 BY MR. PURCELL: Metropolitan? 3 3 Q. What is your occupation? A. Principally Maureen Stapleton, who was the 4 4 A. I'm a lawyer. general manager. Bob Campbell, Robert Campbell, who was 5 5 Q. How are you currently employed? the CFO. James Taylor, who was in the general counsel's 6 6 A. I'm employed by the law firm of Brownstein office. And for a time, Dan Hentschke in the general 7 **Hyatt Farber Schreck.** counsel's office, as well as Dennis Cushman. 8 8 Q. When did you receive your law degree? Q. Who were your negotiating counterparts on the 9 9 2003 exchange agreement with Metropolitan? A. 1984. 10 10 A. I believe that the list includes Dennis Q. Since 1984 have you focused on any particular 11 11 area of law in your day-to-day legal practice? Underwood, Brian Thomas, Jeff Kightlinger, Paul 12 12 Cunningham, Carl Kaseman, Ron Gastelum. A. My practice has been limited exclusively to 13 13 water work since 1984. Q. At the time you negotiated the 2003 exchange 14 14 Q. Have you ever published any books on water law, agreement with Metropolitan, was there a previously 15 15 existing exchange agreement in effect between the Water water work issues? 16 16 A. I wrote a two-volume treatise called Authority and Metropolitan? 17 17 A. There was. "California Water Law and Policy," initially published 1.8 18 in 1994 and updated annually every year since 1994. Q. When was that first exchange agreement signed? 19 19 Q. And have you ever taught any courses on water A. The first exchange agreement was negotiated and 20 20 law at any educational institutions? executed in 1998. 21 21 A. I taught environmental water law and water law Q. Did you negotiate the 1998 exchange agreement 22 22 and policy at universities in California, Australia, with Metropolitan? 23 23 A. I did. China, Texas. 24 24 Q. In your water law practice, what types of Q. What was your role in negotiating that 25 25 agreement? clients do you serve? 1161 1163 1 1 A. A mix of private and public clients. On the A. I was the lead negotiator for the San Diego 2 2 private side there will be anything from publicly traded Water Authority. 3 3 companies to agricultural interests, industrial Q. At the time you negotiated the 2003 exchange 4 4 utilities. agreement with Metropolitan, did the Water Authority 5 5 And on the public side, it's usually special have concerns about the terms of the 1998 exchange 6 6 districts, but commonly cities, as well. agreement? 7 7 Q. What type of work do you do for your public A. It did. 8 8 agency clients? Q. What were those concerns? 9 9 A. The initial continuing concern between 1998 and A. Traditional business counseling on water 10 10 strategy and business negotiation. But for about 20, 25 2003 was a discrepancy in the length of the exchange 11 11 years I also was responsible for litigating groundwater agreement as compared to the water transfer agreement 12 12 and service water adjudication cases in California. that had been negotiated with the Imperial Irrigation 13 13 Q. Have you ever done any legal work for the San District. The Imperial Irrigation District term was 45 14 14 Diego County Water Authority? years and the --15 15 A. I have. THE COURT: It was for how many years? 16 16 Q. Did you participate in the negotiations between THE WITNESS: Forty-five with a renewal right 17 17 the Water Authority and Metropolitan for an amended for an additional 30. The exchange agreement was for 30 18 18 exchange agreement in 2003? vears. 19 19 A. I did. Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Did Metropolitan have any 20 20 Q. What was your role in those negotiations? obligation under the 1998 exchange agreement to move IID 21 21 A. I was the lead negotiator for the San Diego water for the Water Authority after year 30? 22 22 County Water Authority in negotiating all of the A. It did not.

Pages 1161 to 1164

1164

Q. Was there a price schedule in the 1998 exchange

agreement with Metropolitan?

A. There was.

1162

23

24

25

23

24

25

exchange agreement.

agreements pursuant to the QSA, and specifically the

Q. Who at the Water Authority did you work with on

1 Q. What was the term of the price schedule? 1998. And for shorthand, we refer to this as the '98 2 2 A. The price schedule lasted for 30 years or the agreement. 3 3 length of the agreement. Q. Is this the 1998 exchange agreement we have 4 4 Q. Was there any commitment from Metropolitan to been talking about so far? 5 charge a particular price for deliveries of IID water 5 A. It is. 6 6 after year 30? Q. Could we turn to page 23. I would like to 7 A. There was not. focus on the bottom half of the page, the section 8 O. Did this create concerns for the Water 8 "Conditions Precedent." 9 9 Authority? Mr. Slater, do you see that section? 10 10 A. It did. 11 11 Q. What concerns did the lack of a price term Q. Does this section, 8.1, state Metropolitan's 12 12 after year 30 create for the Water Authority? conditions precedent? 13 13 A. Again, if San Diego was to be obliged to pay A. It does. 14 14 Imperial for water being produced over a 45-year period, Q. If we could go to the next page, I would like 15 15 and San Diego did not have the ability to move the water to focus on the second half of the page, subsection D. 16 16 through the Met system, that would create a substantial Mr. Slater, was this one of the conditions 17 17 financial exposure to the Authority going forward. precedent that Metropolitan included in the exchange 18 18 Q. How much water was scheduled to be delivered by agreement in 1998? 19 19 IID in the last 15 years of the transfer agreement where A. It was. 20 20 there was no corresponding obligation on Metropolitan's Q. Could you just read the first sentence of 21 part to deliver the water? 21 subparagraph D? 22 22 A. During the back 15 years, the transfer would A. "There shall have been legal authorization, 23 23 reach its full maximum and it would be 200,000 acre-feet appropriation and a legally binding commitment of the 24 24 in each year of the 15 years. State of California to provide the sum of \$235 million 25 25 Q. So 200,000 times 15 years? for the purposes described in subparagraphs 1 and 2 1165 1167 1 1 A. Correct. below." 2 2 Q. That's 3 million acre-feet of water? Q. Did this condition precedent relate to the 3 3 A. Correct. canal lining project? 4 Q. Would the Water Authority have executed any new 4 A. It did. 5 5 exchange agreement in 2003 that did not match the term Q. Who was the \$235 million required to be 6 6 of the IID transfer agreement? appropriated for under this condition precedent? 7 7 A. No. A. The money was to be appropriated by the State 8 8 Q. At the time you negotiated the 2003 exchange for the benefit of the Metropolitan to implement the 9 9 agreement, did the Water Authority have concerns about canal lining project and some related projects. 10 10 Metropolitan's performance of even the 30-year Q. During negotiations of the 2003 exchange 11 11 obligation under the original 1998 exchange agreement? agreement, did Metropolitan take any position as to 12 12 A. Yes. whether this condition precedent had been satisfied? 13 13 Q. Did the 1998 exchange agreement contain any A. It did. 14 14 conditions precedent that needed to be satisfied before Q. What position did Metropolitan take? 15 15 Metropolitan had an obligation to move IID water for the A. That it was deeply concerned about the State's 16 16 Water Authority? ability to fund this commitment and to execute legally 17 A. There was a condition precedent, yes. 17 binding authorization at that time. 18 18 MR. PURCELL: Can we put on the screen PTX 31. Q. As of the negotiation of the 2003 exchange 19 19 agreement, was there any contract in effect between the This is in evidence. 20 20 Q. Do you recognize this document? State and Metropolitan that obligated the State to pay 21 21 the \$235 million? A. Yes. 22 Q. What is it? 22 A. Not to my knowledge. 23 2.3 A. It is an agreement between Metropolitan Water Q. Did Metropolitan suggest that this lack of a 24 24 District of Southern California and the San Diego County legally binding commitment might have an effect on 25

1168

whether it had any obligation to perform the IID water

1166

Water Authority for the exchange of water, executed in

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

1169

transfer under the 1998 exchange agreement?

A. It did.

2

3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- O. What did Metropolitan say about that?
- 4 A. It was reported that -- if I can explain 5 briefly. It was the summer of 2003, and the State was 6 in a pretty historic budget crisis. And there had been 7 runs on various funds that had been set aside, and my 8 understanding was, based upon a presentation that had 9 been made by Ron Gastelum in the Governor's office 10 during July and August, that Metropolitan's invoices 11 were not being paid, and that there was a -- pertinent 12 to the canal lining were not being reimbursed by the

There being no binding commitment, the condition precedent for the exchange agreement would not have been satisfied.

Q. Did Mr. Gastelum tell you anything about how this might affect Metropolitan's obligation to perform the '98 exchange agreement?

State. And there was a continuing concern that the

State would be able to fund this.

A. Yes. The condition precedent was a requirement to give rise to Metropolitan's obligation to exchange the water. And if there was a failure of this provision, we understood there would be no ability to exchange the water pursuant to the agreement.

(Exhibit 481 was marked for identification.)

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Do you recognize PTX 481?
- A. I do.
  - Q. What is PTX 481?
- A. This is a letter from the director of the
- 6 Department of Water Resources, David Kenny, to the 7
  - Chairperson Chris Frahm and Chairman Jack Foley of their respective agencies regarding the wheeling rate.
    - Q. In your capacity as counsel for the Water Authority, did you receive a copy of this letter around the time it was sent to Ms. Frahm?
    - A. I did.

MR. PURCELL: I would like to move PTX 481 into evidence.

MR. QUINN: No objection. THE COURT: It is admitted.

(Exhibit 481 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: You said Mr. Kenny was the director of the California Department of Water

20 Resources.

A. Yes.

Q. Had he previously been the general manager of

Metropolitan?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Could you read the first paragraph of this

1171

- Q. If Metropolitan had no obligation to move the 2 IID water under the 1998 exchange agreement, what value, 3 if any, would that agreement have for the Water 4 Authority?
  - A. Well, then there wouldn't be value.
  - Q. Did the Water Authority come up with a proposal to deal with the condition precedent regarding the \$235 million for the canal lining?
    - A. It did.
  - Q. What proposal did the Water Authority come up with to deal with that problem?
  - A. The proposal was that given Metropolitan's insecurity over funding and other issues related to implementing the canal lining, San Diego ostensibly agreed to flip the obligation and assume the role of implementing the canal lining project under the theory that if Met did not believe that this was capable of being implemented or that there were limitations, then San Diego would take that risk.
  - Q. I would like to ask just a couple more questions about the 1998 agreement. I'd like to put up on the screen PTX 481.

THE COURT: Is this in evidence?

MR. PURCELL: This is not in evidence yet.

THE CLERK: 481.

1 letter? 2

A. Out loud?

O. Yes.

A. "Your two agencies have now been negotiating for considerable time on conditions under which Metropolitan would wheel water that San Diego proposes to buy from Imperial Irrigation District. There have been many meetings and exchange of information and position statements. In spite of these efforts, representatives of both agencies have expressed frustration that there is little evidence of finding common ground for bringing the matter to resolution.

"In addition, the legislature and the Governor have expressed concern that successful development of California's 4.4 Plan for the Colorado River depends on early resolution of the wheeling issue."

- Q. Does Mr. Kennedy's statement in the first paragraph accurately reflect the state of the negotiations between the Water Authority and Metropolitan as of January 5, 1998?
  - A. I think it is a fair representation, ves.
- 22 Q. How did Mr. Kennedy get involved in the 23 negotiations between the Water Authority and 24 Metropolitan?
  - A. My understanding is that the legislature, via a

1172

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

special addition to Water Code Section 1810, et seq., 2 which was known as the Katz wheeling Law, the 3 legislature adopted a special law applicable to the transportation of water through the Colorado River Aqueduct by San Diego, and that code section, I believe, 6 was 1812.5. It was of limited duration. That law required the director of the 8 Department of Water Resources to intercede and to make a 9 recommendation on how the conflict between San Diego and 10 Metropolitan could be resolved. 11 Q. Does Mr. Kennedy's January 5 letter contain a 12 price proposal for a wheeling rate that Metropolitan 13 would charge the Water Authority for wheeling IID water 14 through the Colorado River Aqueduct?

A. It did.

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PURCELL: Could you put page three up on the screen?

Q. Mr. Slater, does the chart on page three of Mr. Kennedy's letter contain a proposal for a wheeling rate?

#### A. It does.

Q. If you look at the fourth row of the chart, there's a line item that says, "SD pays to MWD for wheeling."

Do you see that?

65. This is in evidence.

Q. Is PTX 65 the 2003 wheeling agreement between the Water Authority and Metropolitan?

A. Yes

MR. PURCELL: Could we turn to page 16 and 17, bottom of page 16, Section 5.2.

Q. Mr. Slater, what is Section 5.2?

A. Section 5.2 is the portion of the 2003 exchange agreement which established the methodology for determining price under — as Met conveyed, transported San Diego's water.

Q. Did you negotiate this price term for the Water Authority?

A. With input from my client, yes.

Q. Is the price term in the 2003 exchange agreement fixed, or is it floating?

A. It is fixed for the first five years and then thereafter it is a variable price.

Q. Is it fixed for the first five years?

A. The 2003 agreement?

O. Yes.

A. I believe it was five years. But it's just the initial price and then escalated pursuant to a fixed escalator.

Sorry. Apologize.

1173

A. I do.

Q. What is the proposed wheeling rate Mr. Kennedy recommends in this letter?

A. \$80.

Q. That's \$80 an acre-foot?

A. \$80 per acre-foot.

Q. What was the starting wheeling price the parties agreed to in the 1998 exchange agreement?

A. \$90 an acre-foot.

Q. From your perspective, as lead negotiator for the Water Authority, did Mr. Kennedy's letter have any effect on the negotiations?

A. It did.

Q. What effect?

A. David was an extremely well-regarded person, state bureaucrat. He was well-regarded among the seven states. He was well-regarded in California. He was well-regarded at Met. The Governor trusted him. The legislature trusted him.

And when he proposed this memo, this letter, as an independent party, I think it had influence on public sentiment about what was an appropriate wheeling charge and set an environment for negotiation of the wheeling rate.

MR. PURCELL: All right. Can you put up PTX

Q. So is there language in the floating price term that puts limits on Metropolitan's discretion to set rates?

A. Yes, there is language that limits the exercise of discretion.

Q. Could you read the second sentence of Section 5.2?

A. "After the initial start price of 253, thereafter, the price shall be equal to the charge or charges set by Metropolitan's board of directors pursuant to applicable law and regulation and generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies."

Q. I want to take this sentence in a couple of pieces.

I would like to first ask you about the phrase, "Set by Metropolitan's board of directors pursuant to applicable law and regulation."

During negotiations did you discuss the meaning of that phrase with Metropolitan?

A. Yes.

Q. And with whom on Metropolitan's negotiating team did you discuss the meaning of that phrase?

A. This phrase and phrases like it were part of a consistent dialogue between at least January of '03 and

1176

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- August of '03. And people involved in those communications would have been Dennis Underwood, Brian Thomas, Jeff Kightlinger, Paul Cunningham, Carl Kaseman, and maybe others, but at least those.
- Q. Did Metropolitan's negotiations ask you about the meaning of that term, "applicable law and regulation," what that referred to?

2

3

6

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. Between January of '03 and August of '03 multiple conversations around this language or comparable language.
- Q. What did Metropolitan's negotiators ask you about what applicable law and regulation referred to?

MR. QUINN: Objection. Vague. Who are we talking about?

THE COURT: Understood. Do you have anybody specific in mind?

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Let's start with Mr. Kightlinger.

Did Mr. Kightlinger ever ask you the meaning of the term "applicable law and regulation"?

- A. Yes. Yes, we had several discussions around applicable law and regulation.
  - Q. What did he ask you about what that term meant?
- A. Well, it was more of a discussion. So the question was what does it mean. And my response, as I

actual list of every law that applied under the applicable law and regulation term?

- A. I did not, and I'm not aware of any tender of a proposal to list them.
- Q. Was it important to the Water Authority to have an open-ended obligation for Metropolitan to comply with applicable law and regulation?
- A. Well, I didn't view it as open-ended. I viewed it as the touchstone being applicable law, and I could be certain, based upon life experience, that whatever we thought was the universe of applicable law in the field of water was going to be evolving, and that whatever we did had to capture the evolution in the law.

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I move to strike. Nonresponsive to the question.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Did Metropolitan ever make a proposal for some narrower category of law that would govern their obligations to set rates?
- A. My recollection is the initial proposal for this language was limited to Met code, the Met Administrative Code, and that there were earlier similar iterations of this language in other contexts that tried to limit San Diego's ability to challenge anything other than what was adopted in their code.

1177

1 Q. Did San Diego respond to that proposal by 2 Metropolitan? 3

A. We did.

Q. What did you do with it?

- A. We consistently rejected the notion that it was only the code.
- Q. Would a price term that required Metropolitan only to comply with the requirements of its Administrative Code have been acceptable to the Water Authority?
- A. We would not have accepted a provision that said notwithstanding applicable law, we'll pay what the administrative code process determine -- is established.
  - Q. Why not?
- A. That would be an unbounded standard where somebody could set any rate they wanted.
- Q. Would the Water Authority have agreed to a floating price term without a requirement that the rate had to comply with all applicable law and regulations?
  - A. No.
- Q. You have sort of alluded to this already, but did you discuss with Metropolitan whether applicable law and regulation was limited to the state of the law in effect at the time the exchange agreement was signed?
  - A. Yes.

1179

understood it, is we were really looking at two things: We were looking at a process and a sideboard on what would be done.

A process which would afford San Diego to -for Metropolitan to set a rate pursuant to its code, which was a process point. What would be the process? I can explain why, but process point.

And then, secondly, a substantive point as to what were the parameters that would be limitations on a rate. And I understood that, the parameters would be the fabric of the law that pertained to rates and whatever that would be, all of it.

MR. QUINN: I move to strike everything after "what I understood."

THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. And you can rephrase the question.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Sure.

Mr. Slater, what, if anything, did you tell Metropolitan -- strike that.

What, if anything, did you tell Mr. Kightlinger about what laws fit within the ambit of applicable law and regulation?

- A. All law on the date of execution and whatever they would be over the life of the agreement.
  - Q. Did either party make any effort to create an

1180

```
1
 1
            MR. QUINN: Objection. Vague as to who is
                                                                                  "Under your new draft, San Diego would be able
 2
                                                                      2
       speaking with --
                                                                            to do much more than that; i.e., it would be free also
                                                                      3
 3
            Is this Mr. Kightlinger?
                                                                            to contend that existing interpretations of applicable
 4
                                                                      4
            THE COURT: I think we will get that cleared up
                                                                            law and regulation were incorrect or had become outmoded
 5
                                                                      5
       in the next question. So the objection is overruled.
                                                                            and they should now be overturned, even though
 6
                                                                      6
            Go ahead.
                                                                            Metropolitan's charges might have been set in accordance
                                                                      7
         Q. BY MR. PURCELL: With whom at Metropolitan did
                                                                            with those pre-amendment interpretations."
 8
                                                                      8
                                                                              Q. Did Mr. Kaseman's email accurately capture the
       you have discussions about whether the applicable law
 9
                                                                      9
                                                                            Water Authority's position about the meaning of the
       term would be limited to the state of affairs at the
10
                                                                      10
                                                                            applicable law and regulation term as of July 28, 2003?
       time the agreement was signed?
11
                                                                      11
                                                                              A. It's a fair summary.
         A. Initially that dialogue occurred between me and
                                                                     12
12
                                                                              Q. Did the Water Authority's position on that term
       Carl Kaseman. Carl was a very experienced, very adroit
13
                                                                     13
                                                                            ever change prior to the negotiation and execution of
       draftsperson, and we would have these exchanges about
14
                                                                     14
       the language confining our right to object to the status
                                                                            the exchange agreement?
                                                                     15
15
       of the law that existed on the date we were executing
                                                                              A. No.
                                                                      16
16
       the agreement.
                                                                              Q. Let's go back to the price term, PTX 65.
17
                                                                     17
                                                                                 MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, I would like to move
            I think I consistently made it clear to Carl
                                                                     18
18
                                                                            DTX 811 into evidence.
       that was not a tolerable standard. So, conversations
19
                                                                      19
       with Carl and also conversations with Jeff during the
                                                                                 MR. QUINN: No objection.
                                                                      20
20
                                                                                 THE COURT: PTX 811 is admitted.
       summer of '03.
                                                                      21
21
            MR. PURCELL: Ben, can we put up DTX 811.
                                                                                 MR. PURCELL: It is DTX 811.
22
                                                                      22
         Q. Do you recognize this document?
                                                                                 THE COURT: I'm sorry?
                                                                      23
23
                                                                                 MR. PURCELL: It is DTX 811.
            MR. PURCELL: This is not yet in evidence, your
                                                                      24
24
       Honor.
                                                                                 THE COURT: Thank you. DTX.
                                                                      25
25
            (Exhibit 811 was marked for identification.)
                                                                                 (Exhibit 811 was received in evidence.)
                                                          1181
                                                                                                                               1183
 1
                                                                      1
            THE WITNESS: I do.
                                                                               Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Getting back to the second
 2
                                                                      2
         Q. BY MR. PURCELL: What is DTX 811?
                                                                            sentence, the one that starts "Thereafter."
 3
                                                                      3
         A. This is the end of an email exchange which
                                                                                  There's also language at the very top of page
                                                                      4
 4
       pertains to the concept of San Diego not contesting
                                                                             17 that says, "Generally applicable to the conveyance of
 5
                                                                      5
       Met's adoption of a wheeling rate. But this -- and at
                                                                            water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies."
                                                                      6
 6
                                                                                  Do you see that?
       this point the question was how preclusive or how
 7
                                                                      7
       limiting the right to contest was going to be.
                                                                               A. I do.
                                                                      8
 8
         Q. And this is an email chain between you and who?
                                                                               Q. Who proposed that language in the 2003 exchange
                                                                      9
 9
         A. This is Carl Kaseman at law firm of Harkins and
                                                                            agreement?
                                                                      10
10
       Cunningham.
                                                                               A. San Diego.
                                                                      11
11
         Q. Mr. Kaseman is the
                                                                               Q. Did you tell Metropolitan what San Diego
12
                                                                      12
       ack@harkinsandcunningham.com?
                                                                            intended that language to mean?
13
                                                                     13
         A. Yes.
                                                                               A. Yes. We were -- we were trying to create a
                                                                      14
14
         Q. The cc's on this email, are those negotiators
                                                                            context for the rate and that being conveyance,
                                                                      15
15
       for both the Water Authority and Metropolitan?
                                                                            transportation, wheeling.
16
                                                                      16
         A. They are.
                                                                               Q. And who at Metropolitan did you communicate
17
                                                                      17
                                                                            that to?
         Q. Can you read the second paragraph of
18
                                                                      18
       Mr. Kaseman -- it's the third paragraph -- Ben is about
                                                                               A. At least Jeff Kightlinger.
                                                                      19
19
       to highlight it -- of Mr. Kaseman's email to you.
                                                                               Q. Was it important for the Water Authority to
20
                                                                      20
         A. "I thought San Diego was going to be limited in
                                                                            have Metropolitan charge a rate that was generally
21
                                                                      21
       any judicial or administrative challenge to the issue
                                                                            applicable to other Metropolitan member agencies?
22
                                                                      22
       whether MWD, in establishing its charges, had done so in
                                                                               A. It was.
23
                                                                      2.3
       accordance with applicable law and regulation as in
                                                                               Q. Why was that important?
24
                                                                      24
       effect, including interpretations thereof, as of the
                                                                               A. We were surrendering a fixed price schedule for
25
                                                                      25
       date of the amendment.
                                                                            30 years, and, in part, we were relying upon the idea in
```

- setting a rate it would not be discriminatory towards San Diego, but it would be generally applicable to all member agencies. We didn't want to have a one-off rate that would apply only to San Diego.
- Q. At the time you were negotiating this language, did you have in mind, did San Diego have in mind a particular Metropolitan rate that was generally applicable to the conveyance of water on behalf of member agencies?
  - A. What we know collectively as the wheeling rate.
- Q. Throughout negotiations, did you consistently tell Metropolitan that the exchange agreement had to require Metropolitan to charge a lawful wheeling rate?
- A. Between -- throughout -- whenever we discussed the period between the 30-year and 45-year, because we had the schedule for the first -- first 30 years. So when we were addressing what should be done between years 31 and 45, we continually made that point.

And then when we began to explore the option of taking the canal lining and moving to a variable rate, we, again, used the words "lawful rate."

Q. I'd like to put up PTX 57, which is in evidence.

Mr. Slater, do you recognize, not the top email, but do you recognize the email that is appended A. I believe it was on the precipice of being presented, and we wanted assurance before we went to the board that we understood the terms.

MR. PURCELL: Can we put up DTX 841, which is not yet in evidence.

(Exhibit 841 was marked for identification.)

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Mr. Slater, what is this document?
- A. The cover page is from a legal assistant who was working for me at this time named Olga Rittershaus -- spelled R-I-T-T-E-R-S-H-A-U-S -- to a broad list of negotiators involved in the QSA.
- Q. Ms. Rittershaus, her email says, "Ladies and gentlemen, per Scott's request, please see attached."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Does "Scott" refer to you?
- A. It does.
- Q. What does Ms. Rittershaus attach to this cover email?
  - A. Can we show the --
- Q. Yes. Mr. Slater, it is also in the binder.
- A. This is great. I can actually read it without eyeglasses.
  - Q. Go to the next page. What is this that

to it? It starts with "from Scott Slater."

A. I do.

- Q. Did you send that email to Mr. Kightlinger on or about August 27, 2003?
  - A. I did.
  - Q. Can we scroll down to Point Number 4? Could you just read the first sentence of Point Number 4, Mr. Slater?
  - A. "San Diego will pay the lawful wheeling rate on all water in the CRA and no lobbying, per language, Jeff, you previously proposed and agreed in the exchange
  - agreement."

    Q. This is you speaking to Mr. Kightlinger on August 27, 2003?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. What was the state of the negotiations between the parties as of August 27, 2003?
    - A. We were at a difficult impasse, and I feared that we were not going to succeed if we didn't -- if we did not reach an agreement on what to do. And the proposal was the option of San Diego securing the canal lining and implementing that project and agreeing to pay the lawful wheeling rate.
- Q. At this point had the deal been presented to San Diego's board for approval?

Ms. Rittershaus attached?

A. This was a summation of the outline of the canal lining option, as it was understood by me and the San Diego team for their evaluation.

Again, we were trying to confirm with everybody that they understand the elements prior to moving forward.

- Q. At this point, September 16, 2003, had the deal been presented to the San Diego board?
  - A. I -- I believe that it had been.
- Q. And do you have an understanding as of the time you sent this that Metropolitan had agreed to these terms?
- A. My understanding is that we had an agreement on these terms.
- Q. Would you have presented the deal to San Diego's board if you didn't think Metropolitan had agreed to the terms?
- A. I would not have.
- Q. Could you read Point Number 2 under the "Conditions" heading?
- A. Number 2 says, "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."

MR. PURCELL: I would like to move DTX 841 into evidence.

the validation action, or were they the same? MR. QUINN: No objection. 2 2 THE COURT: DTX 841 is admitted. A. On substance they were principally the same, 3 3 yes. (Exhibit 841 was received into evidence.) 4 4 Q. BY MR. PURCELL: At the time of the 2003 Q. During negotiations of the 2003 exchange 5 exchange agreement -- at the time the 2003 exchange 5 agreement, did any of the Water Authority's negotiators 6 6 agreement was being negotiated, did the Water Authority tell any of Metropolitan's negotiators that they 7 understand what the components of Metropolitan's objected to the way Metropolitan was allocating costs to 8 8 its wheeling rates? wheeling rate were? 9 9 A. They did. A. It did. 10 10 Q. Who from Water Authority's negotiating team Q. Do you recall, as you sit here today, what 11 11 those components were in 2003? said that to Metropolitan's? 12 12 A. Bob Campbell, the CFO for the San Diego County A. Yes. There was power, water stewardship and 13 13 system access. Water Authority, was quite an ardent advocate of the 14 14 Q. Did the Water Authority have objection, as of point that there were improper cost allocations 15 15 the negotiation of the 2003 exchange agreement, as to occurring. 16 16 the way Metropolitan allocated costs that went into And his counterpart at Metropolitan was a guy 17 17 those rates? named Brian Thomas. And the two of them met frequently 18 18 A. It did. and consistently discussed the subject of the cost 19 19 Q. Do you recall what the Water Authority's allocation. 20 20 MR. QUINN: Objection. Move to strike. Lacks objections to Metropolitan's cost allocations to its 21 wheeling rate were as of the time of the negotiations in 21 foundation. 2.2 22 2003? THE COURT: Were you there during those 23 23 discussions? A. In the briefest of summation, they believed 24 24 that ascribing costs not attributable to the service THE WITNESS: I saw them personally, observed 25 25 them discuss cost allocation between 1998 and 2003. being provided was improper. And an example of that 1189 1191 1 1 would be the allocation of State Water Project supply THE COURT: I will overrule the objection. 2 2 costs on parties who were wheeling water. MR. OUINN: He said he observed it. 3 3 Q. Had there been any prior litigation over the THE COURT: When you say "observed," do you 4 4 validity of the way Metropolitan allocated its costs to mean hear or looking at bodies in the distance? 5 5 its wheeling rates? THE WITNESS: I saw them and listened to them 6 6 and participated in discussions consistently between '98 A. There had been. 7 Q. Did the Water Authority participate in that and 2003. Brian sort of left the negotiating team in 8 8 litigation? 2003 for periods of time. 9 9 A. It did. But I personally observed them on a whiteboard 10 10 Q. What position did the Water Authority take in calculating the inputs in the Governor's office in the 11 11 that prior litigation? spring of 2003. 12 12 A. The Authority came in and opposed the THE COURT: Overruled. 13 13 validation of the Met wheeling rates on the basis of Q. BY MR. PURCELL: During these negotiations, 14 14 process points and substance. We didn't -- so based on these discussions between Mr. Thomas and Mr. Campbell, 15 15 the process points and substance. did Mr. Thomas take the position that Metropolitan's 16 16 cost allocations were lawful? Q. And had there been any definitive resolution to 17 17 A. Yes. that suit? Was there any judgment in that suit 18 18 validating Metropolitan's wheeling rate? Q. Was there any definitive resolution as of the 19 19 A. There was not. negotiation of the 2003 agreement to the question 20 20 whether Metropolitan's cost allocations were valid or Q. At the time it negotiated the 2003 exchange 21 21 agreement, did the Water Authority still object to the invalid? 22 22 way Metropolitan allocated costs to its wheeling rates? A. In my opinion, no. 2.3 Q. And why not? Why did you hold that opinion 2.3 A. It objected to the cost allocation, correct. 24 24 O. Were the objections the Water Authority was that there was no definitive answer to that question? 25 25 raising in 2003 different than the ones it had raised in MR. QUINN: I object. This is an expert

1192

opinion. He is not offered as an expert.

THE COURT: This is just his personal opinion. I don't think this is a statement of expertise.

Overruled.

2.2

THE WITNESS: The -- the existence of law and evolution was particularly pertinent to wheeling.

We had two Court of Appeal decisions that were trying to construe the Katz wheeling Law, and one of the opinions was a validation case, Appellate Court opinion which was on appeal from the case that we had tried.

And the summation of that, as the Court of Appeal ruled that, as a matter of law, that it wasn't unlawful to set a system-wide charge, to set it by rates and thereby protect against lost sales.

There was, almost within 30 to 60 days of that opinion, a different opinion from a different division within the district, District 2. And it was out of San Luis Obispo. Morro Bay was the case. And the Court concluded that including provisions to protect against lost sales was an appliment to the wheeling legislation and that it was to be on the basis of costs incurred in terms of compensation.

To me, there was a lot more to be done. There had been also a couple of efforts at the legislature to try to provide clarification to what the Katz wheeling

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. What was that language intended to accomplish?
- A. This was a five-year timeout, and it said for the initial five years there would not be a contest. But at the end of the five-year period, San Diego would be free to challenge whether the rate adopted by Metropolitan was consistent with applicable law.
  - Q. Was this term subject to negotiation with Met?
- A. It was.
  - Q. Who proposed the five-year timeout period?
- A. That was a San Diego proposal.
- Q. Was that a response to a prior proposal by Metropolitan?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What was Metropolitan's prior proposal?
- A. That the period would be co-terminus with the agreement. Meaning, 45 years or in this -- the length of the exchange agreement.
- Q. So just to be clear, Met proposed that San Diego wouldn't be able to challenge the rates during the duration of the exchange agreement?
- A. They would be limited to challenging only the adoption procedural points pursuant to the Administrative Code, and then evolve to no challenge at

law meant. That was unsettled.

And then I think those of us who have watched the evolution of Article 10 Section 2 of the California Constitution and its influence on rate setting were seeing entities, local agencies making reference to the maximization of using water and transferring it.

There had been probably a half dozen efforts by the legislature to encourage and facilitate water transfers in the State. And so, in my view, the law was going to move towards trying to encourage water transfers and remove barriers to those transfers.

Q. Mr. Slater, did the 2003 exchange agreement contain any provisions for resolving the uncertainty about whether Met's wheeling rates were valid?

A. Yes.

MR. PURCELL: Let's put Section 5.2 back on the screen. Page 17, the last part of the section.

THE COURT: We are looking at 65? MR. PURCELL: Yes. PTX 65.

Q. Mr. Slater, about eight lines from the bottom there's a small letter (a). And it says, "After the conclusion of the first five years, nothing herein shall preclude SDCWA from contesting in an administrative or judicial forum whether such charge or charges have been set in accordance with applicable law and regulation."

all for 30 -- or for the length of the deal.

And our counter was five years.

- Q. Did Metropolitan accept that counter?
- A. It did.
  - Q. That's what's in the contract?
- A. It did -- it is.
  - Q. Why was San Diego willing to agree not to sue for five years?

A. First and foremost, San Diego had been through a sort of an unprecedented campaign to acquire the conserved water from Imperial. Spent really countless, unbelievable hours. In my experience, I've never seen anything like the commitment that was necessary to secure this deal. Seven states, two presidents, two governors and a couple of secretaries of interior, special intervention litigation.

It was an unbelievable, unbelievable Herculean task to put the plan in place, and this was the lynchpin for the 4.4 plan.

An agency that has put that kind of effort in now reaches an agreement. Our thought was that we needed to turn our attention and protect the agreements during the five-year period against people who are going to be attacking it and who might attack it. We were looking at Mexico. We were looking at potentially

ang at Mexico. We were looking at potentially

farming interests in Imperial. We were looking at environmental groups and, indeed, litigation immediately ensured.

2.3

So if you characterize it as circling the wagons among those people who were participating in the QSA, we felt like we didn't need to be suing or engaged in a dispute resolution process with Met.

We also had a dispute resolution process with the Imperial Irrigation District, which was not held in abeyance. So for many reasons pertinent to circling the wagons there was that element. There was a sheer exhaustion element.

But I think the most -- single-most important reason is this was a really historic transaction. It was the largest ag-to-urban transfer in the history of the United States. Billions of dollars were going to exchange hands to allow that to occur.

My opinion was so much goodwill was going to come from the resolution of the conflicts that there would be ample opportunity over a five-year period to bury the hatchet and to allow a negotiation of what I will call a lawful rate, perhaps, less than Met's posted rate and more than the scheduled rate.

Q. You mean the scheduled rate in the 1998 agreement?

non-breaching party does not thereby waive that right or remedy.

"In addition, no single or partial exercise of any right, power or privilege precludes any other or further exercise of a right, power or privilege granted by this agreement or otherwise."

- Q. From your perspective, as San Diego's lead negotiator, what was the purpose of that language?
- A. Well, initially it's boilerplate, and boilerplate borrowed from, more or less, the standard custom available to public agencies and public agency agreements.

The theory being that an entity the size of San Diego or Metropolitan would have a lot on their plates and might be negotiating or dealing with a lot of variable matters at one time. They may make a strategic decision in the best interests of their rate payers not to initiate litigation, but wanted not to, at the same time, waive their rights by virtue of not pursuing litigation.

Q. Does this term apply to only one of the parties or is it symmetrical?

## A. No. It is symmetrical.

Q. During negotiations, did Metropolitan object to the inclusion of this in the contract?

1197 | 1199

A. Correct.

MR. PURCELL: Could we go to page 24, Ben, and Section 11. 1.

Q. This section is entitled "Dispute Resolution." Mr. Slater, does this section contain another reference to the five-year timeout?

## A. It does.

Q. It says, "SDCWA shall not dispute whether the price determined pursuant to paragraph 5.2 for the first five years of this agreement was determined in accordance with applicable law or regulation."

And then it defines the term "a price dispute." Do you see that?

## A. I do.

Q. I would like to turn to page 27. I think it is PTX 65.

So Section 12.5 at the bottom of the page, and spilling over into the next page, so it is at the top of page 27, Mr. Slater. Sorry for confusing you.

Can you read the last two sentences of Section 12.5?

A. The last two sentences beginning with the word "if."

"If the nonbreaching party fails to exercise or delays in exercising any such right or remedy, the A. No, I believe they drafted it.

Q. Section 13.9 of the same exhibit, can you read Section 13.9?

A. "No waiver of a breach, failure of condition or any right or remedy contained in or granted by the provisions of this agreement is effective unless it is in writing and signed by the party waiving the breach, failure, right, or remedy. No waiver of breach, failure of condition or right of remedy is or may be deemed a waiver of any other breach, failure, right or remedy, whether similar or not. In addition, no waiver will constitute a continuing waiver unless the writing so specifies."

Q. Is this provision symmetrical?

A. It is.

Q. Did Metropolitan object to including this provision in the 2003 exchange agreement?

A. It did not.

Q. Did anyone from San Diego ever tell Metropolitan during negotiations of the 2003 exchange agreement that it thought Metropolitan's wheeling rate was valid?

MR. QUINN: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Although you can limit to as far as he knows, I

1 suppose. THE WITNESS: A limitation is all I meant. 2 2 MR. PURCELL: I will do that. I didn't intend THE COURT: Did you want to follow up on that 3 3 to go broader than that. at all? 4 4 Q. Did anyone, as far as you're aware, Mr. Slater, MR. PURCELL: I didn't. 5 5 from the Water Authority ever tell anyone from THE COURT: Let's go ahead with 6 6 Metropolitan during negotiations of the 2003 exchange cross-examination. 7 7 agreement that the Water Authority believed MR. QUINN: Can I quickly go down to the end of 8 8 Metropolitan's wheeling rate was valid? the hall? 9 9 A. I did not, and I never heard anybody from San THE COURT: Let's take a five-minute recess. 10 10 Diego say that. And let the clerk know when you're ready. Thank you so 11 11 Q. As far as you know, did anyone from San Diego much. 12 12 ever tell anyone from Metropolitan during negotiations (Recess.) 13 13 of the 2003 exchange agreement that San Diego did not THE COURT: Cross-examination. 14 14 intend to file a lawsuit after the five-year timeout 15 15 period expired? **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 16 A. No. 16 BY MR. QUINN: 17 17 Q. Are you aware of any writing that was ever Q. Good morning, Mr. Slater. 18 18 created by the Water Authority to Metropolitan giving up A. Good morning, sir. 19 19 Q. We looked at that letter from Mr. Kennedy, who San Diego's right to file a lawsuit after the five-year 20 20 time-out expired? was with the State, dated back in 1998, where he had a 21 21 A. I am not aware of any. schedule and had a suggested wheeling price of, I think 2.2 22 MR. PURCELL: Pass the witness, your Honor. it was, \$80. 23 23 THE COURT: Let me just ask you one question. Do you recall that? 24 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. A. I do. 25 2.5 THE COURT: Did you use the word "sideboard"? Q. At the time that letter was written, there was 1203 1201 1 1 ongoing litigation regarding Met's wheeling rate; isn't THE WITNESS: I did. 2 2 THE COURT: Can you just briefly explain that? that true? 3 3 You were juxtaposing that to the process piece. You A. Yes, it is. 4 4 were juxtaposing "sideboard" and "process." Q. That was what was referred to as the postage 5 5 What do you mean by this word "sideboard"? stamp wheeling rate that was then in dispute? 6 6 THE WITNESS: There were -- my understanding is A. Yes. 7 7 that the language as negotiated did two things: First, Q. And then in the negotiation of the exchange 8 8 it set a process that both sides would know -- would be agreement that the parties signed in 1998, Met dropped 9 9 used to set a rate and that referred to the its rate to a compromise amount of, what was it, \$90? 10 1.0 Administrative Code. A. Correct. 11 11 You have to remember that San Diego had sued O. With a fixed inflator? 12 12 A. Correct. Metropolitan in 1998 saying you couldn't do it by rate. 13 13 You could only do it in an administrative process, Q. And the State, as part of that deal, or at that 14 14 determine what your costs were and then charge. But time, the State made Met whole by committing 15 15 Metropolitan chose to proceed by rate. \$235 million for canal lining to get more water to Met; 16 16 So that was the first thing we did, identify a correct? 17 17 specific process. A. No. 18 18 The second thing we did was substantive. The Q. That didn't happen? 19 19 question is, what are the limitations on the exercise of A. No, it happened. 20 20 discretion in setting a rate. Q. So you -- you represent -- you're a lawyer for 21 21 the San Diego Water Authority? THE COURT: I understand that. I didn't want 22 22 to get into too much detail because it is really the A. I am. 23 2.3 lawyers who will walk through that. Q. How long have you represented the San Diego 24 2.4 Is there just a brief answer as to how you used Water Authority? 25 25 the term "sideboard"? A. I believe since the fall the 1997. 1202 1204

1 Q. And you're also CEO of something called Cadiz? Q. So in this case, so far as you're aware, San 2 2 A. "Cadiz," I am. Diego is not claiming that Met's rates are illegal based 3 3 Q. That is a public company? on anything that it didn't already know at the time it 4 4 A. It is. signed the exchange agreement; correct? 5 Q. You at Cadiz own tens of thousands of acres out 5 A. I don't know. 6 6 in eastern San Bernardino; correct? Q. Well, so far as you're aware, is San Diego 7 7 A. It's "Cadiz." claiming that there is anything illegal about Met's 8 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Irrelevant. 8 rates that it didn't already know at the time it signed 9 9 THE COURT: Overruled. the exchange agreement? 10 10 Could spell that for us? MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation. 11 THE WITNESS: C-A-D-I-Z. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 13 Q. BY MR. QUINN: A key part of your business 13 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Well, you were the person 14 plan, maybe the purpose of Cadiz, actually, is to tap 14 designated by San Diego to testify as the person most 15 15 into a water aquifer out there in that underground in knowledgeable on those various topics I listed earlier; 16 that desert; right? 16 correct? 17 A. That is correct. 17 A. I was designated, and I do know that there were 18 Q. You want to transport tens of thousands of 18 charges and cost allocation that were contested in 2003 19 acre-feet of water on the Colorado River Aqueduct; 19 and before and continued to be contested now. I do not 20 correct? 20 know if there are additional. 21 A. That's correct. 21 Q. My question, sir, was whether you were the 2.2 Q. You would benefit from low wheeling rates, your 22 person who was designated as most knowledgeable to 23 company; correct? 23 testify on those various subjects. 24 A. No. 24 A. I was. 2.5 Q. Do you intend to use the Colorado River 25 Q. You understand I'm not a clock, in my 1207 1205 1 1 Aqueduct if you get permission to do your business plan? examination of you. And I request that if my questions 2 2 A. Our project participants do. can fairly be answered yes or no, that you do that. 3 3 Q. You were designated by San Diego to be the Would you do that, please? 4 4 person most knowledgeable to testify on various subjects A. I will do my best. 5 in your deposition; correct? Q. Thank you. 6 6 In fact, those rates, those various rates that A. Correct. 7 7 Q. Among those subjects were the negotiation and San Diego is contesting were actually public 8 8 terms of the exchange agreement, the consideration for information, they were in Metropolitan's Administrative 9 9 the exchange agreement, San Diego's interpretation of Code back in 2003; correct? 10 10 the exchange agreement, the parties' course of dealing A. Correct. 11 11 under the exchange agreement and, lastly, mistake of Q. And you recall -- we looked at it during your 12 12 law: correct? direct examination -- that the initial price in the 13 13 A. Correct. exchange agreement was specified at \$253; right? 14 14 Q. Isn't it true that, at the time of the exchange A. Correct. 15 15 agreement, the 2003 exchange agreement, was signed in Q. And you knew when you negotiated the exchange 16 16 agreement, that that initial price included those October, San Diego knew every single fact about the 17 17 components of Met's rate structure that it contends in various costs which San Diego is challenging in this 18 18 this lawsuit made it illegal; isn't that true? case: correct? 19 19 A. I believe that's true. A. Correct. 20 20 Q. And that was known before the -- in the months Q. And that price represented the sum of those 21 21 as you were negotiating that exchange agreement? costs; that is, the system access rate, the power rate, 22 22 and the water stewardship rate; correct? A. Yes. 23 23 Q. It was known at the time the exchange agreement A. Correct. 24 2.4 was signed up? Q. And San Diego consented to paying those 25 25 A. Yes. charges?

1208

## A. Correct.

2.2

Q. Now, you have been a lawyer for how many years? Twenty, 25 years?

## A. Thirty.

Q. Thirty years. You would never advise a client to enter into an agreement that you knew was illegal; isn't that true?

#### A. That is true.

Q. And you would, furthermore, never advise a client to enter into an agreement which you knew in either its implementation or its performance would be illegal; isn't that true?

## A. That's true.

Q. And if you had any doubt, sir, about the legality about the implementation or performance in the agreement, that is something you would want to investigate and you would do a forensic analysis of?

## A. It's due diligence, yes.

Q. You certainly wouldn't recommend to a client that it enter into an agreement if you had any doubts about the legality of either of the parties' performance contemplated under that agreement; true?

## A. True.

Q. You would want to satisfy yourself if you had any doubt that the anticipated performance and

correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. And that is not something you did in this case?

# A. I asked that the allocation be reviewed by the CFO from San Diego.

Q. Again, you have told us, as a lawyer, if you had any doubt at all about the legality of something, either contemplated performance or the implementation, you would want to do a forensic analysis of that yourself. You told us that; correct?

## A. I am not a competent -- I'm not a competent accountant, sir.

Q. Well, you are an expert on water law?

#### A. Yes

Q. And you knew this was a live issue between the parties --

#### A. Indeed.

Q. -- in terms of the appropriateness of the allocation of these rates?

#### A. Yes

Q. So you didn't have any doubt at the time, or at least enough doubt, to justify in your own mind it was necessary to do that type of forensic analysis yourself before you recommended to the client, your client, that the client enter into this agreement; is that true?

implementation of the agreement by the parties was legal; correct?

### A. Correct.

Q. And we know that you didn't have any doubts about the legality of the implementation and performance of the exchange agreement because, as you said, you didn't feel it necessary to do a forensic exercise in this case; correct?

## A. I don't understand.

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation. THE COURT: Do you -- do you not understand it because he uses the word "forensic exercise"?

THE WITNESS: No. I tried to listen and I didn't understand the question.

THE COURT: Could you rephrase it? MR. OUINN: Okav.

Q. At the time this agreement was negotiated and signed up, you did not do a forensic exercise to break down the components and whether it was in compliance with the law, these various rates?

#### A. I personally did not.

Q. And you've told us that you would, certainly, if you had any doubts at all about it, you would do that forensic exercise and break it down and make a determination as to whether it was legal or not;

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Individually, personally, no.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: And you did not -- you're not telling us that you delegated your professional duties in that regard in terms of the legal analysis of the implementation and performance of the rates to somebody else.

You are not telling us that you did that?

## A. The legal aspect, no.

Q. And you understand that San Diego's contentions in this case relate to the legal aspect of the rates.

You understand that, don't you, sir?

## A. The legality of apportioning certain costs, correct.

Q. You knew that those rates, the \$253, the inclusion of the State Water Project cost and the water stewardship rates, you know those have all been set by Met pursuant to Met's administrative code; correct?

#### A. I did.

Q. And San Diego consented to paying those rates?

A. San Diego agreed to a start price of 253.

Q. San Diego agreed to that start price knowing it included that rate structure?

Pages 1209 to 1212

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Vol. VIII - April 1, 2015 1 A. Correct. 235 million to accomplish that lining; correct? 2 2 Q. Consented to that and was satisfied with it; A. Correct. 3 3 correct? Q. And we will pay your full wheeling rate; 4 4 A. We signed the contract. correct? 5 Q. Sir, we were satisfied and consented to paying 5 A. No. 6 6 Q. That was the deal? that rate. Wasn't that your testimony as the person 7 most knowledgeable? A. No. 8 A. Yes. 8 MR. QUINN: Well, let's take a look at 9 9 O. Satisfied? Defendant's Exhibit 50. I don't think there's --10 10 A. Satisfied. This is in evidence, your Honor. 11 Q. Let's talk about the 1998 exchange agreement. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 I think you indicated the price initially of that was 12 Q. BY MR. QUINN: You have seen this document 13 \$90 per acre-foot, and there was an indexed increase for 13 before? 14 the first 30 years; correct? 14 A. I'm catching up with you. 15 A. Correct. 15 Q. There should be a binder in front of you, if 16 Q. And there was the last 15 years -- I mean, you 16 you want to look at the hard copy. It is a memorandum 17 had -- San Diego had an additional 15 years where it 17 from Robert Campbell to the San Diego Board of 18 would get water from the IID, but that agreement didn't 18 Directors, dated September 16, 2003. 19 cover what the wheeling rate would be for that period of 19 A. Yes, I see it. 20 time, correct, or the conveyance rate? 20 Q. Who is Robert Campbell? 21 A. Correct. 21 A. Robert Campbell was the executive assistant to 2.2 Q. And you've indicated it was important to San 2.2 the general manager. 23 Diego to amend the 1998 agreement to cover that last 15 23 Q. You have seen this memorandum before? 24 years; correct? 24 A. I have. 2.5 A. Correct. 25 Q. And in that first paragraph it discusses 1213 1 1 Q. Now, in the negotiation of the 1998 agreement, Option-2 and Option-1; correct? 2 2 there came a point where the parties were discussing two A. I see that, ves. 3 3 different options that became known as Option-1 and 4 4 Option-2; correct? A. Can I read it for a second? 5 5 A. Correct. 6 6 Q. And, in fact, that was your brainchild, you 7 7 personally? A. Yes. 8 8 A. Yes. 9 9 Q. You came up with the idea? 10 1.0 A. Yes. 11 11 Q. Option-1 was let's just go forward under that 12 12 1998 agreement; correct? 13 13

A. It -- more than that, but yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Q. And Option-2 was a much more complicated deal where basically L.A. would assign to San Diego the rights to that canal lining water that we talked about earlier and San Diego would also get that \$235 million from the State of California: correct?

A. You mean Metropolitan?

Q. Yes. Metropolitan, yes.

A. And the answer is yes.

Q. As part of Option-2, your proposal was, hey, we'll take responsibility for lining the canal; we'll get that canal lining water, 80,000 acre-feet of water per year, whatever the number was, and we'll take the Q. It accurately describes those two options.

Q. Sure. In general terms it describes those two options which were your ideas; correct?

Q. And you will see there in the first paragraph it says that Option-2 is the assignment of MWD's canal lining water project rights to SDW in consideration for SDWA paying MWD's wheeling rate in lieu of the exchange agreement -- and it goes on -- in order to transport the water; correct?

A. Correct.

Q. So the assignment of Met's canal lining project rights included -- I think we've already acknowledged the payment of some \$35 million by the State to San Diego?

A. I'm confused. Thirty-five million?

O. 235 million.

A. 235 million.

22 Q. And about 77,000 acre-feet per year of -- for 23 110 years of canal lining water?

24 A. Correct.

Q. Met's wheeling right was \$253 per acre-foot,

1216

1215

Pages 1213 to 1216

1214

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.3

which included those components that are challenged now?

#### A. Yes.

2.3

Q. And the consideration for Met under Option-2 was the payment of Met's wheeling rate at the time, which at the time was that \$253 number?

#### A. Correct.

Q. Which was much, much higher than the \$90 even with the escalator under the existing exchange agreement?

#### A. Correct.

Q. Certainly San Diego would never have agreed to pay that larger number if it wasn't also getting this water for 110 years and the \$235 million to accomplish the canal lining; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. That was kind of the whole point. They are doing a swap here. San Diego is agreeing to pay more in return for getting some spectacular benefits; correct?

## A. I don't think it was that simple, no.

Q. Well, you do agree this was a great deal for San Diego?

#### A. I do.

Q. And you -- you continue to hold that belief today?

## A. I do.

A. That is what it appears to say, yes.

Q. Right. This is a memorandum that went to the board of directors on September 16, 2003?

#### A. Yes

Q. Had -- the exchange agreement was signed up like three weeks later?

## A. I believe the first or second week of October, yes.

Q. And then it says, "Thus the current 253-dollar rate was escalated for inflation and arranged between two percent and five percent which is the historical range of escalation and MWD rates depending upon the period assumed. The present value difference in the total payments under the exchange agreement as compared to the total escalated wheeling payments, assuming the various inflation rates, is shown on the table below and ranges between \$423 million and \$907 million."

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. So, under the first valuation approach that the San Diego staff used in evaluating Option-2, the cost to San Diego of conveying the IID water would increase by some amount in the range of 423 million to 907 million; correct?

#### A. Correct.

1217 | 1219

Q. Because getting an independent source of water at San Diego, that was a consummation that had been devoutly wished for a long time. That is something that San Diego really wanted to get?

## A. It did.

Q. In the memorandum below, the table on page 1 says that you'll see the staff used two approaches to evaluate the costs of both options.

Do you see that?

## A. I do.

Q. If you look at the third paragraph there on page 1, in the third sentence, in discussing the first approach it says, "The MWD wheeling rate is established annually by the MWD Board of Directors and is assumed to escalate over time."

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. So San Diego assumed, in doing its analysis of these two options, that its payments under Option-2 which started at \$253 and would escalate over time; correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. And in doing that, in doing this analysis, San Diego assumed that the rate structure would be the same; isn't that true?

Q. And then below the table, there still on page 2, the memorandum discusses the second approach to evaluate the cost of Option-2.

Do you see that?

## A. I'm reading it, yes.

Q. It says, "Under the second approach, a 20-year demand forecast model was constructed and melded the supply components for each option were modeled and the total escalated costs were then compared for each option."

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. So the San Diego staff analyzed the potential costs under Option-2 assuming the price started at \$253 and escalated over time and concluded that Option-2 would cost in the range of 500 to 900 million more than Option-1; right?

#### A. Right.

Q. And that -- that's the additional amount that San Diego would have to pay Met over the course of the contract; right?

## A. Pursuant to this projection, yes.

Q. And then, reciprocally, that is the consideration that Met would receive for assigning the canal lining water and the \$235 million to San Diego;

1 A. The IID water could not be transferred without correct? 2 2 the Quantification Settlement Agreement, so it was a A. The right to receive a wheeling fee was part of 3 3 the consideration Met received, yes. predicate. 4 4 Q. And San Diego in assessing this deal -- I think Q. The answer to my question is "yes"? 5 you've said this was an historic deal, the largest 5 A. Yes. 6 6 transfer of water rights from agriculture to urban use Q. You made the proposal in Option-2 as to what 7 7 in U.S. history? the price should be; correct? 8 A. That's correct. 8 A. Sorry. Which option is the canal lining 9 9 Q. In doing the projections and making this option? 10 decision, at least as reflected in this memorandum, San 10 Q. In Option-2? 11 Diego didn't just look at the next five years, did it? 11 A. Option-2. 12 12 A. No. Q. Of the exchange agreement. You made the 13 13 Q. It projected that wheeling rate, the \$253, proposal as to what the price, conveyance price should 14 using the same rate structure, going forward for the 14 be; correct? 15 life of the contract; correct? 15 A. No. 16 16 A. It made -- yes, it made projections. Q. Take a look at your deposition. 17 Q. And this transaction, this consideration, this 17 A. Okay. 18 larger deal we've been talking about, you didn't look 18 MR. QUINN: Page 200, lines 18 to 20, your 19 just at the exchange agreement to find all these terms, 19 Honor. I would request permission to read that. 20 can you? 20 THE COURT: I don't have that, do I? 21 A. What terms? 21 MR. QUINN: It's in the back of the binder. 2.2 Q. Well, like the swapping of the canal lining 22 THE COURT: Volume 1? 23 water and the 235 million. You have to look at several 23 MR. QUINN: Page 200, lines 18 to 20. 24 documents together to understand what the transaction 24 MR. PURCELL: I would request, your Honor, that 2.5 was the parties were agreeing to; correct? 25 he read the following question and answer as well. It 1221 1223 1 1 A. Correct. provides important context. 2 2 Q. And another agreement that you have to look at MR. QUINN: I have no objection to reading 3 3 is the -- is it the allocation agreement? that, your Honor. 4 4 A. Correct. THE COURT: Let's do both. 5 Q. Between San Diego and Met? 5 MR. QUINN: (Reading:) 6 6 A. Correct. "Q Did you make any proposal 7 Q. That was a key part of this transaction? at all as part of the option as 8 8 A. The allocation agreement enables the -- enables to what the price would be? 9 9 the canal lining. "A Yes. 10 10 Q. It is a key part of the transaction. "Q So what was your proposal 11 11 A. It was a condition precedent to the '98. as part of the Option-2 as to 12 12 Q. And then there is something called the Quantum what the price should be? 13 13 Settlement Agreement. That's another key part of it "A We would not use the 14 14 that you have to understand. schedule which was an Option-1 15 15 A. Quantification -which was the exchange 16 16 O. Ouantification. agreement, and we would 17 17 A. -- settlement agreement. substitute -- we would 18 18 substitute in exchange for a Q. That is a key part of this transaction, as 19 19 well? lawful rate, which became then 20 20 the articulation that was a new A. It is not in this transaction. It was a 21 21 exchange agreement." contemporaneous agreement. 22 22 Q. But it is important that that had to be THE WITNESS: I agree with that. 23 23 accomplished in order to accomplish the parties' Q. BY MR. QUINN: The number that went into that 24 24 objectives in the exchange agreement and the allocation agreement, the initial number, was the \$253 number; 25 25 agreement; correct? correct. 1222 1224

#### A. That's correct.

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, in your discussions with him, he agreed that after that first year the price would be set in accordance with the Administrative Code; correct?

#### A. Correct.

2.0

2.5

2.3

Q. You did not tell Mr. Kightlinger during the discussions about the exchange agreement that you believed that any of these rates were illegal; isn't that true?

## A. I never used the word "illegal" in my life in reference to a water rate.

Q. So you're negotiating this historic agreement with Mr. Kightlinger --

## A. Right.

Q. -- you say you are telling him it needs to be a lawful rate.

#### A. Yes.

Q. You know the rate is \$253; right?

## A. Yes.

Q. And at no point during your discussions with him did you tell him that that rate or any other rate or the components of it were illegal; isn't that true?

## A. That's true.

Q. And during the course of the negotiation of the exchange agreement, neither you nor, to your knowledge,

forensic exercise to break down those components and analyze them to determine whether they complied with some legal standard outside the Met code; correct?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Asked and answered. THE COURT: Not quite in that form. Overruled. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Did I ever take an analysis? I undertook a general legal analysis of framework. And as I testified on direct, I believe the area of law was uncertain.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Sir, you didn't do a forensic exercise during those negotiations to break down the components of the rate to determine whether they complied with some other legal standard? I mean outside the code, outside the Met code. You didn't do some type of analysis to look at legal standards outside the Met code to see whether the proposed wheeling rate complied with that?

## A. I under -- I understood, again, the case law that existed at the time that was pertinent to allocation of costs, but I did not unpack or unbundle the various elements that had been ascribed.

MR. QUINN: I would request permission to read, your Honor, from the deposition, page 68, lines 5 through 20, Volume I.

did anyone at San Diego ever propose excluding State Water Project costs from the wheeling rate or the price; isn't that true?

## A. That's not true.

MR. QUINN: Request permission to read, your Honor, from page 64 of the deposition, which I assume is Volume I, lines 19 to 24.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. PURCELL: No objection.
MR. QUINN: (Reading:)
"Q 2003, the negotiations for the 2003 agreement, was it ever discussed excluding -- did any party ever propose excluding
State Water Project costs from the price -- the contract price to be charged under the agreement?

"A I do not recall that, no."

Q. The bottom line is that, in signing the exchange agreement, San Diego consented to pay the amount for conveyance charges calculated pursuant to the Met Administrative Code; isn't that correct?

## A. That is -- calculated pursuant, true.

Q. You didn't undertake at that time any type of

MR. PURCELL: This is not proper impeachment, your Honor. This is not contradicting anything he said. THE COURT: Is this coming in for impeachment? Is that the idea?

MR. QUINN: I think it is impeachment, but I would also offer it as the PMK.

MR. PURCELL: If it's being offered as PMK, then we don't object.

THE COURT: Go ahead, please. MR. QUINN: (Reading:)

"Q And to your understanding, at this point in time, did San Diego believe the charges for conveyance of water that Met had adopted in that period of time was consistent with applicable law and regulation?

"A I believe that -- that San Diego thought that they were consistent with the application of the Administrative Code that

-- that then prevailed, and that San Diego was willing to pay that charge as designated

under the context of the

Pages 1225 to 1228

1 THE COURT: It is relevant to at least one of agreement -- the set of 2 2 agreements that were charged. the many theories that's being offered in the defense of 3 3 the case, so it is relevant to the defense of the case. So they consented. I don't 4 4 recall doing a forensic The objection is overruled. 5 5 Q. BY MR. QUINN: The allocation agreement, this exercise like we had done in 6 6 '97 -- or '98 during the is the agreement that provides for the assignment of the 7 wheeling case to break down the \$235 million and the canal lining water, that is San 8 8 Diego's consideration under Option-2; correct? components to determine whether 9 9 it complied with some other A. This is a portion of the consideration under 10 10 Option-2, correct. standard. But on its face, I'm 11 Q. And then part of Met's consideration was 11 certain it complied with the 12 that -- the payment of the conveyance rate that we've 12 Met Administrative Code." 13 1.3 been discussing; correct? Q. In any event, under Option-2, you agreed the 14 14 A. Payment of a lawful rate, correct. price in the exchange agreement be set pursuant to the 1.5 15 (Exhibit 884 was received into evidence.) Met Administrative Code; correct? 16 Q. BY MR. QUINN: You have no reason to believe 16 A. Correct. 17 that Met thought that its conveyance rate was illegal in 17 Q. And your expectation and understanding of the 18 2003, do you? 18 agreement was that whatever rates were set had to comply 19 A. No. 19 with the Met Administrative Code; correct? 20 Q. And as we've discussed, you never told Met in 20 A. Correct, unless they -- the Met administrative 21 2003 that you thought that rate or any of the components 21 code was unlawful. 22 of that rate were illegal or unlawful; correct? 2.2 Q. Well, when San Diego entered into the contract, 23 A. In 2003? 23 it understood that Met would have to comply with its 24 Q. Yes, sir. In 2003 you never told Met that you 24 administrative code as a matter of law and as a matter 2.5 thought the wheeling rate or any of its components was 25 of contract; correct? 1229 1231 1 1 A. Correct. illegal or unlawful? 2 2 O. And you're familiar with the -- if we could A. I don't recall whether I did. 3 3 take a look at Exhibit 1149, the Met administrative Q. Let's take a look at your deposition. Well, 4 code, paragraph 4405. This should be flagged in your 4 you say you don't recall whether you did, or you don't 5 exhibit book. If you look at paragraph (b) there. recall doing it? 6 6 Again, you told us -- you understood that Met's rates A. I don't recall whether I did during 2003. 7 7 Q. But this was -- this was an important issue, I had to comply -- whatever wheeling rate was charged had 8 8 to comply with the Met administrative code. You will think you told us; correct? 9 9 A. Correct. see in paragraph (b) it says, in the administrative 10 10 code, "The rates for wheeling service shall include the Q. In fact, you don't even recall any instance in 11 11 system access rate, water stewardship rate," and then it 2003 whether -- where you used either the word 12 12 "unlawful" or "illegal"; correct? goes on. 13 13 Do you see that? MR. PURCELL: Objection. Overbroad. 14 14 THE COURT: Overruled. Maybe that's his A. I do. 15 15 Q. You understood the \$253 initial rate had been testimony. 16 16 properly adopted by Met and pursuant to the THE WITNESS: I certainly never said "illegal." 17 17 administrative code? And I think the expression was always in the 18 18 affirmative, we will pay the lawful rate. A. I did. 19 19 Q. We made reference to the allocation agreement. Q. BY MR. QUINN: So the answer to my question is 20 20 I don't believe that's in evidence, your Honor. That is you don't recall any instance where you ever said 21 21 Defense Exhibit 884 and I would offer that, your Honor. illegal or unlawful? 22 THE COURT: 884? 22 A. Me personally, I do not. 23 23 MR. QUINN: 884. THE COURT: You need to wait for him to finish 24 24 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Relevance. his question. Thank you. 25 25 (Exhibit 884 was marked for identification.) Q. BY MR. QUINN: So they're telling you this is

1232

```
our wheeling rate, this is what we are going to charge
                                                                      1
                                                                                    that they were not -- that they
 2
      you, it is the $253. And you never, to your
                                                                                    were either, A, illegal, or, B,
 3
                                                                      3
      recollection, ever say that's illegal or that's
                                                                                    not set in accordance with
                                                                      4
      unlawful? Your response to that always is we will pay a
                                                                                    applicable law. I am informed
      lawful rate? Is that what your testimony is, sir?
                                                                      5
                                                                                    on the basis of constant
 6
                                                                      6
        A. My response is that is my -- what I
                                                                                    contact with Maureen over the
                                                                      7
      communicated. There were other people on our team that
                                                                                    last 20 years that there had
 8
      communicated with regard to the cost allocations.
                                                                                    been continuous communication
                                                                      9
 9
        Q. The bottom line is that during these many
                                                                                    between the San Diego
10
                                                                     10
      communications leading up to the execution of the
                                                                                    delegation and the Met
11
                                                                     11
      exchange agreement, during those negotiations between
                                                                                    delegation, that there had been
                                                                    12
12
                                                                                    efforts to reach out to the
      San Diego and Met, you have no specific knowledge that
                                                                    13
13
                                                                                    City of Los Angeles delegation
      anyone from San Diego told anyone from Met that Met's
14
                                                                    14
                                                                                    at various points, and that
      wheeling rates had not been set in accordance with
                                                                    15
15
                                                                                    there were meetings among the
      applicable law and regulations; isn't that true?
16
                                                                     16
                                                                                    delegates, and that there were
        A. I have specific knowledge that Bob Campbell had
                                                                    17
17
      meetings with Brian Thomas and Maureen had meetings with
                                                                                    multiple efforts to try to
                                                                    18
1.8
      Dennis Underwood in which they made the point that the
                                                                                    convey that the rate structure
                                                                    19
19
                                                                                    was objectionable, and that if
      rates were unlawful.
                                                                    20
20
                                                                                    it was not resolved, it would
           MR. QUINN: Let's take a look at your
                                                                    2.1
21
      deposition, page 117, line eight to 12. And I would
                                                                                    lead to litigation.
                                                                    22
22
                                                                                    "Q You're not sure that it
      request permission to read that, your Honor, Volume I.
                                                                    23
23
                                                                                    was conveyed that these rates
           THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                                    2.4
                                                                                    were not set -- strike that.
24
           MR. PURCELL: I think you need to read the
                                                                    25
25
                                                                                    "A I have --
      prior question and answer starting on page 116, line
                                                        1233
                                                                                                                            1235
 1
                                                                     1
                                                                                 "Q You were not sure that it
       ten, for context.
 2
                                                                     2
            THE COURT: Do you want to do that, Mr. Quinn,
                                                                                 was conveved that these rates
                                                                     3
 3
       or not?
                                                                                 were not set in accordance --
 4
            MR. QUINN: I am just reading it, your Honor.
                                                                     4
                                                                                 THE COURT: I hate to interrupt. Question, you
 5
                                                                     5
            THE COURT: Okay.
                                                                           were not sure.
 6
                                                                     6
            MR. QUINN: I have no objection to reading
                                                                                 MR. QUINN: Sorry.
 7
                                                                     7
       that, your Honor.
                                                                                 "O You're not sure that it
 8
                                                                     8
            THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead.
                                                                                 was conveyed that these rates
 9
                                                                     9
                                                                                 were not set -- strike that.
            MR. QUINN: Beginning at 116, line ten.
10
                                                                    1.0
       (Reading.)
                                                                                 "A I have --
                                                                    11
11
             "Question after the 2007 discussions you
                                                                                 "Q You were not sure that it
12
                                                                    12
       referred to earlier, can you point to any specific
                                                                                 was conveyed that these rates
13
                                                                    13
       situation in which San Diego conveyed to Met a belief
                                                                                 were not set in accordance with
14
                                                                    14
                                                                                 the applicable law and
       that the rates then in effect they were charging San
15
       Diego pursuant to the exchange agreement were not set in
                                                                    15
                                                                                 regulation?
16
                                                                    16
       accordance with the applicable law and regulation?"
                                                                                 "A I have no -- no specific
17
                                                                    17
          O. So I did not --
                                                                                 knowledge that that was
18
                                                                    18
             THE COURT: He wants you to read the answer.
                                                                                 conveyed."
19
                                                                    19
                                                                                 THE WITNESS: This is referencing after 2007 --
             MR. QUINN: Answer, I'm sorry.
20
                                                                    20
                                                                                 THE COURT: There's no question.
            THE COURT: Somebody is going to be reading
21
                                                                    21
       this in a couple of years.
                                                                                 THE WITNESS: Sorry.
22
                                                                    22
             Answer.
                                                                              Q. BY MR. QUINN: Let's turn -- if we could look
                                                                    23
2.3
                                                                           at Exhibit 51, the 2003 exchange agreement. And if we
            MR. QUINN: (Reading:)
24
                                                                    2.4
             "A So I did not participate
                                                                           could look at Section 5.2, which is on pages 16 and 17.
                                                                    25
25
                                                                                 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, can the record show --
            directly in any communication
                                                         1234
                                                                                                                            1236
```

1 this is Plaintiff's 65. We are using this agreement. MR. PURCELL: No objection. 2 2 THE COURT: Please. MR. QUINN: It is a 2003 exchange agreement. 3 3 MR. QUINN: (Reading.) Is it 65? 4 4 MR. KEKER: Plaintiff's 65. We ought to use "Q Do you understand the 5 5 provision to prohibit San one number 6 6 Diego's going into a judicial MR. QUINN: I agree. THE COURT: Okay. forum and seeking a change in 8 8 the interpretation of the law Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do you see on page 17, starting 9 that was in effect as of the at line 2, I would like to call your attention to the 10 10 time of this agreement? paragraph that says "For the term of this agreement, 11 11 neither SDCWA nor Metropolitan shall seek or support in "A I think that's what the 12 12 plain meaning of the language any legislative, administrative or judicial form any 13 13 says." change in the form, substance or interpretation of any 14 14 Q. That was your testimony, sir? applicable law or regulation (including the 1.5 15 A. It was. Administrative Code). 16 16 Q. And then this general language that we have "In effect on the date of this agreement and 17 been looking at is then followed by two provisoes, two 17 pertaining to the charge or charges set by 18 exceptions, in the paragraph; right? 18 Metropolitan's Board of Directors and generally 19 There are two "provided however" clauses 19 applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan on 20 following. 20 behalf of its member agencies." And then it goes on. 21 A. Catching up. I see it. 21 Do you see that, sir? 22 Q. You recall one of the concerns that San Diego 2.2 A. I do. 23 had was that it not be singled out, it be subject to the 23 Q. And do you recall the origins of this 24 same rules as everyone else, that it not be 24 provision? 25 discriminated against. 25 A. I do. 1237 1239 1 1 Q. And the origins were that Met had conveyed to Do you recall that? 2 2 you that it did not want after the exchange agreement A. I do. 3 3 was signed for San Diego the next day to be in Q. Another concern, I think you mentioned this in 4 4 Sacramento trying to change the provisions of Met's your direct testimony, another concern San Diego had was 5 5 Administrative Code or restrict its ability to do things you are concerned about evolution and changes in the law 6 6 and thereby undercut the transaction; correct? and how this might affect San Diego's rights; correct? 7 7 A. Correct. A. Correct. 8 8 Q. In terms of the judicial forum that is referred Q. At one point during these negotiations, when 9 9 to in that language, you understood that San Diego would you were saying you wanted to add this language, 10 10 be restricted from seeking a change, a change in the Mr. Kightlinger asked you, you recall, "Jeff, is there 11 11 interpretation of applicable law; correct? something you aren't telling me? Is there a dog in the 12 12 A. Correct. manger?" 13 13 Q. And in your understanding, the plain meaning of Do you recall that? 14 14 this language is to prohibit San Diego from going to a A. No, I do not. 15 15 judicial forum and seeking to change the interpretation MR. QUINN: Let's take a look at your 16 16 of the law that was in effect at the time the agreement deposition -- before I do that, let's go to that 17 17 was signed; right? deposition, page 179. 18 18 A. I think -- no, I think the primary focus was on THE COURT: Whenever you get to a good stopping 19 19 keeping San Diego out of Sacramento trying to modify the point, sir. 20 Met act. The element was not going to a judicial forum 20 MR. QUINN: Almost there, your Honor. Volume 21 21 to seek an interpretation of the law too. 22 22 MR. QUINN: Request to read from the Q. Just to refresh your recollection, if you could 23 23 deposition, Volume I, page 89, line 14 to line 19. look at page 180 of your deposition --24 24 MR. PURCELL: What lines on page 89? A. I'm sorry. Where is it? 25 25 MR. QUINN: Fourteen to 19. Q. 180, in Volume I. That's in the back of the

1240

```
1
                                                                   1
       book. In the back of the exhibit book, Volume I.
                                                                                say that I didn't, but I think
 2
                                                                   2
         A. Volume I.
                                                                                he understood -- I think we
 3
                                                                   3
            THE COURT: Page 180.
                                                                                both understood the magnitude
 4
                                                                   4
            MR. QUINN: There is an answer beginning on
                                                                                of the moment. You probably --
 5
                                                                   5
       line 4.
                                                                                in a lawyer's life, you do
 6
                                                                   6
         Q. My question to you is, do you recall at one
                                                                                something like this once, maybe
       point in the negotiations with Mr. Kightlinger, in
                                                                                twice, if you're lucky, and
 8
       response to the language that you were proposing here,
                                                                                that -- a lot was riding on
 9
                                                                   9
       he said to you, "Jeff, is there something you aren't
                                                                                coming to closure on this
10
                                                                  10
       telling me? Is there a dog in the manger?"
                                                                                point. And we were working on
11
            Do you now recall that?
                                                                  11
                                                                                trying to wordsmith in a way
12
                                                                  12
         A. I'm reading; okay?
                                                                                that was acceptable to both
13
                                                                  13
         Q. Okay.
                                                                                sides. I can't recall saying
14
                                                                  14
         A. Okay, I've read it.
                                                                                it was illegal."
15
                                                                  15
         Q. Do you recall that Mr. Kightlinger said to
                                                                                Is now a good time, your Honor?
16
       you, "Jeff, is there something you aren't telling me?
                                                                  16
                                                                                THE COURT: It is a good time. I will see
17
                                                                  17
       Is there a dog in the manger?"
                                                                          everybody at 1:30 sharp. Thank you very much.
18
                                                                  18
            Do you recall that?
                                                                                (Noon recess.)
19
                                                                  19
         A. Okay.
20
                                                                  20
         Q. Neither at that point in time nor at any other
                                                                  21
21
       point in the negotiations did you tell him that you
22
       thought the inclusion of these costs was illegal; isn't
                                                                  22
23
                                                                  23
       that true?
24
         A. No. That's not true.
                                                                  24
2.5
                                                                  2.5
            MR. QUINN: Page 104, line seven to 21, Volume
                                                       1241
                                                                                                                         1243
 1
                                                                   1
      I.
                                                                                 San Francisco, California
 2
                                                                   2
            THE WITNESS: What page again?
                                                                                    April 1, 2015
 3
                                                                   3
            MR. QUINN: Page 104. Request permission to
                                                                                      1:30 p.m.
 4
                                                                   4
                                                                         Department No. 304
       read that.
                                                                                                Hon. Curtis E. A. Karnow, Judge
 5
                                                                   5
            THE COURT: Down to what?
                                                                   6
 6
            MR. QUINN: Line 21.
                                                                                     SCOTT SLATER, ESQ.,
                                                                   7
            MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, this is the end of a
                                                                         resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
                                                                   8
 8
       long colloquy about this subject and it starts on page
                                                                   9
 9
       102, line 21.
                                                                              THE COURT: Let's continue with our questions.
                                                                  10
10
            THE COURT: Why don't we go ahead and read this
                                                                              MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I would like to move
                                                                  11
11
       now, and if you want to read in the other portions for
                                                                         into evidence the Administrative Code passage that I
                                                                  12
12
       context later, we can do that.
                                                                         referred to as Exhibit 1149.
                                                                  13
13
            MR. PURCELL: Okay.
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: The entire exhibit or just that
                                                                  14
14
            THE COURT: Go ahead, sir.
                                                                         passage?
                                                                  15
15
            MR. QUINN: (Reading.)
                                                                              THE COURT: Can you create an exhibit --
16
                                                                  16
            "Q When you told -- when you
                                                                              MR. QUINN: With just those pages, yes.
17
                                                                  17
            told that -- when you conveyed
                                                                              THE COURT: And remember to move that in.
18
                                                                  18
            that to Jeff, did you convey
                                                                              MR. OUINN: I will do that.
19
                                                                  19
            the belief the rates then in
                                                                              THE COURT: I would appreciate that.
20
                                                                  20
            effect were illegal?"
                                                                  21
21
            There's an objection.
                                                                                  CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)
22
                                                                  22
            "A I think we went through --
                                                                         BY MR. QUINN:
                                                                  23
2.3
            again, I don't recall saying
                                                                           Q. If we could put up PTX 481, the letter from
24
                                                                  24
            they were illegal. I don't
                                                                         Mr. Kennedy, dated January 5, 1998, we were talking
25
                                                                  25
            remember using that. Not to
                                                                         about in your direct exam.
                                                       1242
                                                                                                                         1244
```

2.2

I would like to call your attention to Table 1 at the back, Bates Number 19. Counsel asked you about that \$80 number for wheeling. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. San Diego. There are two columns there, the first column, Condition A, space is not available in the aqueduct, and Condition B, space is available. Do you see that? A. I do. Q. And so what this says under Condition A when space is not available, it says "zero." Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. Q. If space is available, what Mr. Kennedy is proposing or suggesting is an \$80 wheeling charge; right? A. That's correct. 

Q. That's a very, very different transaction if you only have the right to wheel water on a space-available basis. That's very different than the exchange agreement that San Diego had with Met; correct?

A. No.

Q. Your understanding is under the 2003 exchange

wrote a letter or an email or any type of written communication to Met saying the rates were unlawful prior to filing a complaint; isn't that true?

#### A. I don't know.

Q. Even though San Diego voted to approve these rates repeatedly and then claimed a breach for Met's use of the rate components that San Diego had voted to adopt, you are aware of no written communication from San Diego, prior to the filing of this lawsuit, after the execution of the exchange agreement, saying the rates are unlawful; isn't that true?

#### A. That is true.

Q. And during that time, since 2003, San Diego had the benefits that it negotiated for in the exchange agreement and the allocation agreement; correct?

#### A. It received its benefits.

Q. And those benefits are worth hundreds of millions of dollars; correct?

#### A. That would be --

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation. THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: Do you know what they're worth?
THE WITNESS: It's a guess. An educated guess is arithmetically multiply the value of an acre-foot

agreement, San Diego only has a right to get water on a space-available basis. Is that what you're saying?

A. No.

Q. So you think it's essentially the same deal as what Mr. Kennedy is talking about here?

A. Mr. Kennedy is using a zero because he's assuming that there would be no space so the water would not move. Right? So no water is moving; therefore, there is no wheeling charge to be paid.

And in 1998 you were forced, then, to forecast what was the prospect for there being space available in the Met-Colorado River Aqueduct and take that into account when you negotiated a rate. The projections at that time, which proved to be true, is the aqueduct would rarely, if ever, be full again and so it influenced negotiation. It was not determinative.

Q. Under the 2003 exchange agreement which the parties entered into, Met commits to deliver a fixed --make available a fixed amount of water every single month: correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. So going back to your testimony this morning, for years after the execution of the exchange agreement, while Met set its rates and charged its member based upon its published conveyance rate, San Diego never once

over that time period and you'd probably conclude it is north of 100 million.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: This is a -- actually, San Diego's entitlement to that water goes on for 110 years?

## A. That's correct.

Q. And San Diego continues to enjoy all those benefits it negotiated for under the exchange agreement to this day; correct?

## A. Correct.

MR. QUINN: Nothing further. THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, I had made an objection to a deposition excerpt, and I wanted to read it

THE COURT: We will take this for context and because you think this is necessary for a fair understanding for what was read.

MR. PURCELL: Yes. What I am proposing to read is page 101, line 15, through 104, line six, which is immediately before the excerpt Mr. Quinn read from 101, line 7 through 21.

THE COURT: Let Mr. Quinn take a look at that and see his position on that --

MR. QUINN: No objection.

Pages 1245 to 1248

. 1	THE COURT: please. Remember the question	1	negotiating team, but was	
2	and the answer so we can distinguish it in the court	2	always an active part of the	
3	reporter's transcript.	3	dialogue at the board level.	
4	MR. PURCELL: I will. And I know I will be	4	"Q At San Diego's board	
5	corrected if I don't.	5	level?	
6	(Reading:)	6	"A Yes.	
7	· •	7		
8	"Q Do you recall anybody on	8	"Q Did anybody convey that	
9	the San Diego side conveying a	9	belief strike that.	
10	belief they would sue after the		Did anybody on San Diego's	
11	expiration of five years under	10	negotiating team convey that	
12	any circumstances?	11	belief to MWD?"	
	"A I do believe that they	12	"A Yes, I did personally to	
13	conveyed the belief that, if	13	Jeff when we negotiated this	
14	the rate was not set in	14	provision.	
15	accordance with applicable law,	15	"Q What did you say?	
16	they would avail themselves of	16	"A I said exactly that, that	
17	their remedies, whatever they	17	the rate would be set in	
18	may be.	18	accordance with Metropolitan's	
19	"Q Which would be suing?	19	administrative code and the	
20	"A It could be.	20	language is very specific that	
21	"Q Who said that, to your	21	it's not going to be by junta	
22	recollection?	22	or by contract sorry.	
23	"A On the negotiating team,	23	"It's not going to be done in	
24	each of the three people in the	24	any way other than by the code.	
25	negotiating team, Jim Taylor,	25	It can't be a one-off	
	1249			1251
1	Maureen Stapleton, Bob	1	operation. It has to be in	
2	Campbell. And as part of the	2	operation. It has to be in accordance with whatever	
3	the rationale for why they	3	administrative procedures are	
4	couldn't accept"	4	established uniformly pursuant	
5	Strike that.	5	to code so there's protection	
6		6		
7	"the rationale for why they	7	by devising the method into	
8	could accept the arrangement	8	which that was going to be established.	
9	because they would not be	9		
10	discriminated against by	10	There was also the	
11	Metropolitan if the law	11	understanding that that process	
12	provided the conveyance should	12	had to take into account	
13	be provided at a certain price. They shouldn't be in a position	13	evolution and the law, and that	
14	rney snoman r be in a position		Met or San Diego specifically	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 4	apuld not be singled for	
	where Metropolitan	14	could not be singled out for	
15	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates	15	differential treatment on the	
15 16	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and	15 16	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a	
15 16 17	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its	15 16 17	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a	
15 16 17 18	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would	15 16 17 18	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was	
15 16 17 18 19	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law	15 16 17 18 19	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San	
15 16 17 18 19 20	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain	15 16 17 18 19 20	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain contact or conduct that San	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have the right to test what they did	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain contact or conduct that San Diego should not be precluded	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have the right to test what they did if the law evolved. And I	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain contact or conduct that San Diego should not be precluded from pursuing those remedies.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have the right to test what they did if the law evolved. And I so I think that was absolute	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain contact or conduct that San Diego should not be precluded from pursuing those remedies. "A Yes, I think that not	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have the right to test what they did if the law evolved. And I so I think that was absolute that absolutely was conveyed	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain contact or conduct that San Diego should not be precluded from pursuing those remedies.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have the right to test what they did if the law evolved. And I so I think that was absolute	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where Metropolitan Metropolitan could adopt rates for all its member agencies and San Diego would have a its own unique rate. There would be circumstances that the law evolved to prohibit certain contact or conduct that San Diego should not be precluded from pursuing those remedies. "A Yes, I think that not	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	differential treatment on the basis the code spit out a number or they made a determination this rate was going to be applicable to San Diego and that we had to have the right to test what they did if the law evolved. And I so I think that was absolute that absolutely was conveyed	1252

. 1	in there.	<sup>1</sup> Q whether the statute of limitations continued
2	"Q Do you remember anything	to run during those five years.
3	else regarding what you	<sup>3</sup> Do you see that?
4	conveyed to Mr. Kightlinger in	4 A. I see the question.
5	that respect?	<sup>5</sup> Q. And then your real concern, as expressed in the
6	"A If you ask me questions,	6 answer that counsel just read, was that rates be adopted
7	it might bring stuff back,	in accordance with the Met code and that San Diego not
8	but we talked about a lot of	be discriminated against. And that's why you wanted the
9	things, but I can't the two	ability to take action after five years; correct?
10	things that I remember most is	A. A reason we wanted, correct.
11	conveying how difficult it was	Q. In the answer that counsel just read, you refer
12	for us, for San Diego, to	to not being discriminated against, no unique rate, not
13	absorb the no advocacy	done in a way other than by code, uniformly pursuant to
14	provision and the requirement	code, take into account evolution of law, differential
15	that the Administrative Code	treatment, we would have the right to test what they did
16	was acceptable as a methodology	if the law evolved. Those are all phrases you used in
17	to set the rate, but it had to	that answer as to explaining why you wanted certain
18	be within the umbrella of the	rights after five years; correct?
19	state statute and case law and	19 A. Correct.
20	constitutional law."	MR. QUINN: Nothing further.
21	I don't have any further questions, your Honor.	21 THE COURT: Redirect.
22	r don't have any raidier questions, your frontier.	22
23	RECROSS-EXAMINATION	23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. QUINN:	BY MR. PURCELL:
25	Q. In that passage that counsel just read, you are	Q. Mr. Slater, has the law evolved regarding the
	Q. In that pussage that counselfust road, you are	(
	1253	1255
1		1 propriety of water rates in 2003?
1 2	asked about what the discussion was in your	propriety of water rates in 2005.
3	understanding about that five-year period, what that	The I believe it mas.
4	was the purpose of that, why you wanted the right to	Q. What evolutions have taken place in the law
5	do some things after five years; right?	Since 2005 :
6	A. I	71. We have a lot of ease law around 1 top 210, but
7	Q. Take a look at page 99	more particularly reposition 20. And we still do not
8	A. Thank you.	have an answer from the court of Appeals on wheeling,
	Q beginning at line 17. This is a question by	but certainly 1 top 20 and 1 toposition 216.
9	Mr. West, and this sort of leads into the testimony that	Wik. I OKCLEL. Nothing further.
10	counsel read.	10
11	Do you see that reference to the statute of	11 RECROSS-EXAMINATION
12	limitations?	BY MR. QUINN:
13	A. I'm catching up. I'm catching up.	Q. That's why this lawsuit was brought? Only
14	Q. All right.	because of changes in the law that have happened since
15	Page 99, line 17 to 20.	then? Is that what you're telling us, the laws changed?
16	A. Got it. Sorry.	16 A. I'm not
17	Q. The context here is you are actually talking	MR. PURCELL: Foundation, your Honor. He's not
18	about that five-year what you refer to or the	the lawyer.
19	questioner refers to as the statute of limitations	THE COURT: Sustained.
20	period; right?	Q. BY MR. QUINN: All the facts on which San Diego
21	A. I believe the context is the statute of	bases its claim of illegality in this case were known to
22	1, 1.1 1	San Diego when the exchange agreement was signed in
	limitations and the subject of tolling.	
23	Q. It refers to five years; right? Do you see	23 2003?
24	Q. It refers to five years; right? Do you see that? The question is	MR. PURCELL: Objection. Asked and answered.
	Q. It refers to five years; right? Do you see	2003:
24	Q. It refers to five years; right? Do you see that? The question is	MR. PURCELL: Objection. Asked and answered.

1 MR. QUINN: Nothing further. information about the increase in the cost of supply, 2 THE COURT: Thank you very much. You are 2 that is based on something that Mr. Denham did. You 3 3 asked him to do some calculations; is that true? 4 4 MR. KEKER: May Mr. Slater be excused, your A. Yes. 5 5 Q. You asked him to do that because you knew to Honor? 6 6 THE COURT: I believe so. give a complete picture of the economic impact to San 7 MR. KEKER: We are about to rest. We have Diego of moving these costs to supply, you'd want to 8 8 informed counsel for Met we want to recall Dennis take that into account; true? 9 9 Cushman to correct an answer he gave yesterday. It will A. We wanted to know what the difference in the 10 take about a minute. So I would like to do that and 10 price would be. The difference between the cost of the 11 then move in some exhibits and we can rest. 11 transportation with those costs and the cost of the 12 May I recall Dennis Cushman? 12 transportation without those costs. 13 THE COURT: Any objection? 13 Q. I don't think that answers my question. My 14 MR. QUINN: No objection, your Honor. 14 question was: The reason that you asked Mr. Denham to 15 15 do those calculations was that you knew that to give a 16 DENNIS CUSHMAN, 16 complete picture of the economic impact on San Diego of 17 resumed the stand and testified further as follows: 17 moving those costs to supply, you would have to take 18 18 that into account; that is to say, the increase in the 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 cost of supply; correct? 20 BY MR. KEKER: 20 A. If Met were to charge those costs on supply, 21 Q. Mr. Cushman, yesterday on cross-examination at 21 that would provide a picture of that. 22 page 98 of the transcript and then on redirect 22 Q. So the answer to my question is, yes, you need 23 examination at page 135 of the transcript you were asked 23 to take that into account? 24 about a number of 15 percent. Do you recall that? 24 A. You are asking would it be financial impact on 2.5 A. I do. 25 the water? In a hypothetical world, possibly, but that 1257 1259 1 1 Q. And you gave an answer about what the would be only if Met had done it that way. 2 2 15 percent was 15 percent of. Q. You don't have any work papers with you that 3 3 A. Yes. supports this analysis that Mr. Denham did for you, do 4 4 Q. Was that a correct statement as you reviewed you? 5 the transcript? A. No. 6 6 A. No. Q. Why didn't you instruct Mr. Denham to include 7 7 Q. What is the 15 percent of? this information in his damages report? 8 8 A. The 15 percent is if the water supply -- State A. That didn't occur to me. 9 9 Water Project costs are moved off of transportation and MR. QUINN: Nothing further. 10 1.0 onto supply, it would reduce the damages by about 11 11 15 percent. REDIRECT EXAMINATION 12 12 Q. If it were proper to deduct that from the BY MR. KEKER: 13 13 damages? Q. You were asked about damages. Have you been 14 14 asking -- excuse me. A. If it were proper to do that. 15 15 Q. You had been asking for at least 20 years that Has the Water Authority been asking Met for 16 16 they move those State Water Project -nigh on 20 years to move State Water Project costs from 17 17 MR. QUINN: I object. transportation to supply? 18 18 MR. KEKER: I'll stop. That's fine. MR. QUINN: Objection. Outside the scope. 19 19 Thank you, your Honor. MR. KEKER: This is exactly what he asked 20 THE COURT: Thank you. Would you like to cross 20 about. 21 21 on that? THE COURT: It is a little outside. Let's go 22 22 ahead and get this answer. 23 2.3 CROSS-EXAMINATION The objection is overruled. 24 24 BY MR. QUINN: THE WITNESS: Yes. 25 25 Q. As I recall your testimony yesterday, sir, this Q. BY MR. KEKER: Did they ever do it? 1258 1260

```
1
                                                                              B-E-R-G
          A. No.
 2
                                                                        2
          O. So when the Court determined certain rates that
                                                                                   We would like to move those designated
                                                                        3
 3
       were illegal and had been -- were illegal and improper
                                                                              transcripts into evidence.
                                                                        4
 4
       under the law, and Mr. Denham calculated damages, was
                                                                                   THE COURT: Any objection other than the
 5
                                                                        5
                                                                              designated objections?
       there any reason except to speculation, pure
 6
                                                                        6
                                                                                   MR. QUINN: No. Assuming -- assuming that
       speculation, to deduct what an increased supply cost
 7
       might have been?
                                                                              those are the passages designated in the pretrial
                                                                        8
 8
                                                                              procedure that we both followed, subject to the
             MR. QUINN: Objection.
                                                                        9
 9
                                                                              objections we filed, we have no further objections, your
             THE WITNESS: No.
10
                                                                       10
                                                                              Honor
             MR. QUINN: Argumentative.
                                                                       11
11
                                                                                   THE COURT: PTX 517, 516, 515, 514 and 513 are
             Move to strike.
                                                                       12
12
                                                                              admitted subject to subsequent ruling.
             THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                       13
13
                                                                                   (Exhibits 513 through 517 were
             MR. KEKER: No further questions, your Honor.
                                                                       14
14
                                                                                   received into evidence.)
             THE COURT: All right.
                                                                       15
15
                                                                                   MR. GOLDBERG: Second, and your Honor may
             MR. KEKER: Your Honor, with that, we would
                                                                       16
16
       rest subject to Mr. Goldberg taking care of business.
                                                                              recall, during the first phase of trial we moved into
17
                                                                       17
                                                                              evidence responses to certain interrogatories and
             MR. GOLDBERG: Nick Goldberg of Keker and Van
                                                                       18
18
       Nest for the Water Authority to take care of business.
                                                                              requests for admissions. Those were previously admitted
                                                                       19
19
             THE COURT: Yes, sir.
                                                                              as PTX 235A, PTX 237A, PTX 245A, PTX 246A, PTX 247A, PTX
                                                                       20
20
                                                                              250A, and PTX 381A. And I just wanted to point out to
             MR. GOLDBERG: If I could pass some exhibits to
                                                                       21
21
       your clerk.
                                                                              the Court that those interrogatory responses and RFA
                                                                       22
22
             THE COURT: Yes.
                                                                              responses are still relevant to this phase.
                                                                       23
23
             MR. GOLDBERG: Before we conclude our
                                                                                   We are not going to re-enter them. They are
                                                                       24
24
       case-in-chief. I would like to take a few moments to
                                                                              already in evidence.
                                                                       25
25
       offer into evidence a couple of item.
                                                                                   In addition, there is one interrogatory
                                                           1261
                                                                                                                                   1263
1
                                                                        1
            First are the deposition designations of
                                                                              response we would like to enter.
2
                                                                        2
       Metropolitan most qualified witnesses. We submitted
                                                                                    THE COURT: Do I have copies of these
 3
                                                                        3
       those deposition designations to the Court along with
                                                                              responses?
                                                                        4
 4
       the marked-up transcripts excerpted last week. There
                                                                                    MR. GOLDBERG: You should. They should already
 5
                                                                        5
       are five deposition transcripts. We would like to
                                                                              be in evidence from the first phase, but if you don't
                                                                        6
 6
       introduce them into evidence, of course, subject to the
                                                                              have them, we would be happy to provide them.
 7
                                                                        7
       Court's later determination of any evidentiary
                                                                                    THE COURT: I would ask for courtesy copies of
                                                                        8
 8
       objections that Met has interposed, which were submitted
                                                                              those so I have everything for this phase in one place.
                                                                        9
 9
       with the designations we filed last week.
                                                                                    MR. GOLDBERG: I can certainly do that.
10
                                                                       10
            The first is the designated transcript of Met's
                                                                                    In addition to the ones that have already been
                                                                       11
11
       witness Stephen Arakawa, last name spelled
                                                                              entered into evidence, there is one additional
                                                                       12
12
       A-R-A-K-A-W-A. First name is S-T-E-P-H-E-N. And I
                                                                              interrogatory response in both the 2010 and 2012 cases
13
                                                                       13
       believe that's going to be PTX 513.
                                                                               we would like to move into evidence. That interrogatory
14
                                                                       14
                                                                              response will be marked as PTX 246B. "A" was the one
            The second is the transcript of June Skillman,
                                                                       15
15
       J-U-N-E, last name S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N, which I understand
                                                                               from the first phase, and that's an interrogatory
16
                                                                       16
       is going to be 514.
                                                                              response from the 2012 case. And then 246B and 247B is
17
                                                                       17
            The deposition of Brian Thomas, B-R-I-A-N,
                                                                              the identical interrogatory response from the 2010 case
18
                                                                       18
       T-H-O-M-A-S, is 515.
                                                                              and they are excerpted.
19
                                                                       19
            The deposition, for an expert, of Deven
                                                                                    You will see here, if you look at 246B,
20
                                                                       20
       Upadhyah, D-E-V-E-N, last name U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-H.
                                                                              Interrogatory Number 7 is highlighted and Interrogatory
21
                                                                       21
            And then PTX 518 would be the transcript of
                                                                               Number 13 in the response is highlighted. 7 is already
22
                                                                       22
       Arnout Van Den Berg. First name A-R-N-O-U-T. Last name
                                                                              in evidence. 13 is the one that's not. But we
                                                                       23
23
       V-A-N, D-E-N, B-E-R-G.
                                                                              highlighted 7 because 13 refers back to seven.
24
                                                                       24
            THE CLERK: The last name.
                                                                                    The same is true for 247B, but the numbers are
25
                                                                       25
            MR. GOLDBERG: V-A-N, space, D-E-N, space,
                                                                              slightly different. The substance of the interrogatory
                                                           1262
                                                                                                                                   1264
```

1 is exactly the same. We would move those two exhibits your Honor. 2 2 San Diego, of course, concedes it's its burden into evidence, as well. 3 3 THE COURT: Any objection? to prove damages, and as part of that is required to 4 4 MR. QUINN: No objection. prove what should have been charged. But it has not 5 THE COURT: 246B and 247B are admitted. 5 made any proof at all about the alternative rate 6 6 MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, your Honor. structure, notwithstanding the fact that San Diego's 7 (Exhibit 246B and Exhibit 247B were witnesses have acknowledged there would be alternative 8 8 received into evidence.) lawful rate structures. 9 9 MR. GOLDBERG: We rest. And then second, your Honor, Mr. Denham's 10 10 THE COURT: Mr. Quinn, would you like a short assumptions are not based on the evidence and are 11 11 recess, or are you prepared to proceed? What would you contradicted by this Court's findings in Phase 1. 12 12 like? Mr. Denham assumed all the conveyance costs at issue are 13 1.3 MR. QUINN: We have a motion we would like to properly simply moved to supply. 14 14 make at this point. We actually have fresh off the This Court indicated in Phase 1 that wasn't 15 15 printer a brief in support of a motion for a partial necessarily the case, that the Court lacked evidence, 16 16 judgment. I don't know how the Court prefers to deal but that some of those charges might well properly be 17 17 with this, but we would -- I do not believe that properly allocated to transportation and conveyance. 18 18 Plaintiff has made out the elements of its case. And it was San Diego's burden to address that issue, and 19 19 THE COURT: Why don't you briefly make a record San Diego hasn't addressed that issue at all. It has 20 20 so we know at what point in the litigation it occurred; simply wholesale moved all those costs over to supply 21 21 the proper point, that is. It is unlikely I will rule and claimed that as damages. 2.2 22 on it right this second. That's the basis of the motion, your Honor. It 23 23 MR. QUINN: Right. is more fully set forth in the brief. 24 24 Well, I can -- rather than spending time THE COURT: I appreciate that. I will take it 25 25 under submission, and the other side can let me know at orally, I can file the brief. 1265 1267 1 1 THE COURT: Why don't you briefly state for the the end of the day, next week, or the week after next 2 2 how they plan to respond to it. But for now -record, a minute or so, on what the nature of the motion 3 3 is so we all -- when we read the transcript, we know it MR. KEKER: Your Honor, I can respond. My 4 4 came at the appropriate time. response -- I can tell you right now if you want me to. 5 5 THE COURT: I haven't read their papers. I MR. QUINN: The motion we would make, your 6 6 Honor, is a motion in support of a motion for partial just wanted to make a record right now that this motion 7 7 has been filed at this juncture. I'm not going to be summary judgment on the fourth cause of action for 8 8 breach of contract. The basis -reading it or evaluating the motion at this moment. I 9 9 THE COURT: A motion for partial summary think we should proceed --10 10 MR. KEKER: Yes, sir. judgment? 11 11 MR. QUINN: Sorry. Partial judgment on the THE COURT: -- with the Met's case. Would you 12 12 fourth cause of action for breach of contract. like a recess or are you prepared? 13 13 The bases for the motion, basically two heads MR. QUINN: We're ready to proceed, your Honor. 14 14 for the motion, your Honor. San Diego has not proved So Met calls Jeff Kightlinger, who is out in 15 15 breach because San Diego paid what it agreed to pay, and the hall, your Honor. 16 16 thus, as a matter of law, has failed to prove breach. THE COURT: Absolutely. 17 17 And San Diego proposed and agreed to a price 18 18 that included the water stewardship rate and the State JEFF KIGHTLINGER, 19 19 Water Project costs. There was no agreement that these called as a witness by the Defendant, was sworn and 20 20 conveyance charges, that this particular rate structure, testified as follows: 21 21 would only last for five years. On that basis there was 22 22 THE WITNESS: I do. no breach has been proven. 23 23 Second, San Diego failed to present evidence of THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. 24 24 a proper measure of damages, has failed to make out its Please state and spell you full name for the 25 25 damages case. Two heads to that part of the motion, record.

1268

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE WITNESS: My name is Jeffrey, 2 J-E-F-F-R-E-Y, Kightlinger, K-I-G-H-T-L-I-N-G-E-R. 3 MR. EMANUEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Eric 4 Emanuel. 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. EMANUEL: 8 Q. You are employed by Metropolitan, isn't that 9 true? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. What is your position there? 12 A. I am the general manager and chief executive 13 14 Q. How long have you been general manager and 15 chief executive officer? 16 A. Since 2006. 17 Q. How long have you been with Metropolitan? 18 A. Since 1995. 19 Q. Do you report to the board of directors? 20 A. Yes, I do. 21 Q. How many directors are there at Metropolitan? 22 A. Thirty-seven directors. 23 Q. How many of those are representatives of San 24 Diego? 25 A. Four. 1269 1 Q. How many agencies are members? 2 A. We have 26 member agencies. 3 Q. It sounds like some agencies get more votes 4 than others. 5 A. We operate on a weighted vote system, and some 6 agencies do get more directors than one. Everybody gets 7 at least one. And then for every five percent of the 8 assessed valuation, you get additional board members. 9 So we have three agencies that have four board members 10 each. San Diego is one of them. 11 Q. Out of all the agencies, is San Diego the 12 second largest? 13 A. Yes, they are. 14 Q. So they have the second-most votes on the 15 board; is that right? 16 A. Correct. 17 Q. We are here, Mr. Kightlinger, because of a 2003 18 exchange agreement. You know that, don't you? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. The subject of that agreement involves the 21 exchange of water, some of which is called the IID 22 transfer water and some of it is the canal lining water. 23 You are familiar with that; right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Let's start, so we are all on the same page,

with what IID transfer water is. Can you tell me what that refers to, please?

- A. Yes. The Water Authority and IID entered into an agreement by which IID conserves water by several different methods and makes that water available to San Diego, and San Diego pays for it.
- Q. Mr. Kightlinger, I have to step back because in this era of apparent water shortages, how is it that IID, the Imperial Irrigation District, has water to sell or transfer?
- A. They have a very large entitlement to Colorado River water. And there are methods by which they could more efficiently use that water, conserve it, and then make it available for transfer and still continue to farm.
- Q. If we went back a few years, is it the case that the IID was actually -- I don't want to say wasting water. I don't want to -- they were not using water most efficiently; is that true?
- A. We have -- at Metropolitan, we have always contended that IID is a very profligate in their use of water. The State Board actually held hearings in 1984 and actually reached the conclusion that the Imperial Irrigation District was, indeed, wasting water.
  - Q. What was the solution to that problem?

1271

- A. The initial solution was that Imperial and
  Metropolitan should do a transfer arrangement. We did
  that We entered into an arrangement in 1988 to
  - that. We entered into an arrangement in 1988 to transfer water from IID to Metropolitan.

What we did was we paid IID a method -- to line certain canals, to build some regulating reservoirs, to operate another gate system where they deliver water more efficiently.

We pay for all that, and they now transfer to us every year about 105,000 acre-feet.

- Q. In addition to Metropolitan, San Diego, the County Water Authority also made a deal with IID; isn't that true?
- A. Yes. About a decade later, San Diego Water Authority also entered into a similar type program with IID.
- Q. Can you give us a rough estimate of the volume of water that IID transferred to the Water Authority?
- A. The program calls for a ramp-up, a build-up over time in which each year they would be transferring more water. And eventually it tops out at 200,000 acre-feet.
- Q. To your knowledge, does that transfer agreement between IID and the Water Authority, was that contingent on entering into a wheeling agreement with Metropolitan?

1272

Pages 1269 to 1272

- A. It was contingent on reaching an arrangement with Metropolitan to deliver that water to the Water Authority because San Diego had no independent means of getting delivery of the water.
  - Q. Was a wheeling agreement ever reached?
  - A. No, it was not.
  - Q. Why not?

2.3

- A. The number one issue that San Diego wanted was guaranteed capacity, which wheelers are not entitled to, so that was a sticking point. And then we began discussing an exchange agreement instead.
- Q. Before we get to the exchange agreement, let's get one other piece of background, which will all come together eventually, and that's the canal lining water that is also the subject of the 2003 exchange agreement.

Are you familiar with the canal lining water?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Let's back up. Was that something Metropolitan was trying to obtain itself?
- A. Yes. We -- at the time of the State water board order, and when we entered into our agreement with IID in 1988, we began working on how best to -- other methods to get water reductions out of the Imperial Valley. And one of the projects that was very appealing to us, and we began researching, was the potential

A. Our feasibility analysis showed there was a significant amount of water that could be conserved. Obviously, you can look around and see California, we need significant chunks of water. They are not easy to come by. Our estimates were to be 70- to 80,000 acre-feet of water, perhaps more, was leaking out of those canals. They are earthen lined, turn-of-the-century construction.

So 70- to 80,000 acre-feet, perhaps more, significant amount of water that could be conserved and could be done pretty cost-effectively, as well.

THE COURT: Is that per year? THE WITNESS: Yes, per year.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: You anticipated my next question. When you say "cost effectiveness," obviously there are costs and benefits to these projects. Please explain what the costs and risks are, and then we'll talk about what the benefits are.
- A. Some of the challenges would be how you would be able to do the construction while delivering the water 24/7. You could not turn off the water and then line all the canals and then put it back into operation.

So we looked at various methods of either lining in place with the water, and there are ways to do that, or simply dividing the canal in half and lining

lining of the Coachella and All-American Canals.

- Q. Who owns them?
- A. The United States, the Bureau of Reclamation.
- Q. For a deal to obtain canal lining water, who did Metropolitan have to deal with?
- A. We did a feasibility analysis and determined that it was feasible to construct, cost-effective to build, and then we approached the United States and reached a proposal with the United States to do that.

And then we went to Congress and got Congress to pass an act enabling us to go and line the canals in the 1996 time frame.

- Q. How long was this process?
- A. It took us about seven, eight years to work our way through that up until we got Congress to act on that
- Q. It sounds to me like this is a project that Metropolitan sought with a great deal of interest, and it was not, shall we say, some sort of albatross or risk that Metropolitan was unwilling to take; is that correct?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Explain to the Court, if you will, why Metropolitan was interested in this project.

half and going back and lining the other half and putting the water in the other half.

There were some construction-type challenges.

All in all, it looked to be about a \$200 million or less project in 1999 dollars. It would save that water for decades and hundreds of years, so it was a very cost-effective and attractive proposal.

- Q. Had Metropolitan done feasibility studies?
- A. Yes, we had.
- Q. What were the results of those feasibility studies?
- A. Like I said, it could be done in the range of a couple hundred million dollars and generate 75- to 80,000 acre-feet, perhaps more, per year forever, essentially, so that was very attractive.
- Q. Let's switch. We have -- we have talked about the IID water and the canal lining water.

Finally, there's a deal with the Water Authority to exchange the IID transfer water; correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What year was that reached?
- A. We reached agreement in 1998, but that agreement had a number of conditions precedent before it could go into effect.
  - Q. What were those conditions?

- A. Probably the most significant one was we had to reach agreement on quantification of the agricultural users of Colorado River water who weren't quantified at that time. And until we did that, it was almost impossible to really do an effective transfer because no one really knew who the water would be coming from, what amount another agricultural user would just increase their use. So we needed to get the agricultural users quantified before we could have effective transfer.
- Q. Of course, California has been taking water out of the Colorado River for quite some time; isn't that right?
  - A. Yes.

1.5

1.8

- Q. Do you know what California's rights to the Colorado River were?
- A. Yes. California has a basic apportionment of 4.4 million acre-feet. They can use more water than that when it's either unused by another state or there is excess or surplus water available on the river.
- Q. Was there a time when it was unused by other states?
- A. Yes. Up until around 2000 California was able to always use water not used by Arizona and Nevada, and Metropolitan has a fourth priority of 550,000 acre-feet. That is within the 4.4 million acre-feet. That only

which is a collection of a number of agreements.

- Q. And was the quantification settlement agreement a central condition to the performance of the Water Authority's agreement with the Imperial Irrigation
- 5 District?
  - A. Yes, it was.

    Q. Why is that?
  - A. The other parties along the river and within California, Coachella, Metropolitan, who have rights to Colorado River water, would not agree to any transfer between San Diego and Imperial until there was a clear quantification as to what exactly IID's rights were.
  - Q. There was a quantification settlement agreement, sir?
    - A. We did reach agreement, yes.
    - Q. What year was that?
  - A. 2003.
    - Q. How many parties and how many contracts would you estimate were involved in that?
    - A. Depending on how you count them, there were over 30-some agreements as part of the overall package, each with most of the parties along the Colorado River, sometimes the United States and the State of California, as well.
      - Q. As part of that quantification settlement

fills up half our aqueduct which can hold 1.2 million acre-feet. It is beyond that fourth priority. So we were only able to have a full aqueduct by using Arizona and Nevada unused water up until 2000.

- Q. The total consumption in round numbers in or about 2000 was how many million acre-feet?
- A. California was using about five million acre-feet. Some years as high as 5.2 acre-feet. We were using anywhere from 500- to 800,000 acre-feet, more than our base apportionment of 4.4.
- Q. At some point did the Federal Government tell Metropolitan and all the users of the Colorado River Basin you have to get down to 4.4 million?
- A. Yes. It was a significant concern among the other six basin states we share the Colorado River with, that California would get used to this overreliance, and at some point politically it would become very difficult to turn California off when Arizona and Nevada needed that water.
- Q. What is the name given to the negotiations to apportion Colorado water among the Colorado River water users?
- A. Originally we called it the California 4.4 Plan as we were working throughout the '90s, and eventually this became the quantification settlement agreement,

agreement, was the exchange agreement that is the subject of this lawsuit, was that also negotiated?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Was there time pressure on the parties to reach a quantification settlement agreement?
  - A. Yes. California --
  - Q. Please explain what that was.
- A. The Secretary of Interior actually put a deadline of December 31, 2002, for California to reach conclusions of the quantification settlement agreement or and there was a stick involved. The Secretary of Interior would just reduce California immediately down to 4.4 million acre-feet.

The Secretary of Interior did that because we failed to reach agreement by December 31. Metropolitan went from a full aqueduct in 2002 to roughly a half aqueduct in 2003. We took the hit from the United States of — a loss of about 5-, 600,000 acre-feet of water overnight.

Then the negotiations continued in earnest throughout 2003 to reach closure, and the State eventually did.

- Q. It sounds like the parties were motivated in a way they hadn't been before.
  - A. The motivation had always been there, but this

1.5

certainly carried an added impetus to the discussions.

Q. When we get -- when we get to the negotiation of the 2003 exchange agreement, there's another series of historical events that come in to play. And I want to go back and talk about those so when we get to 2003, we can see all the pieces.

One of them is bundled rates. Would you explain to the Court what bundled rates are?

A. Yes. Metropolitan's rates, since the beginning when we first began to deliver water in 1941, up until around 2000, was a very simple approach. We had a full system rate.

And so it was simply we had a rate for treated water and a rate for untreated water. And those were two different prices, and that was pretty much all there was to it. It was just an all-in rate. We just bundled all the costs into just that one simple rate.

- Q. And in coming up with a bundled cost was it necessary to do any sort of allocation between supply and conveyance?
- A. No. We had to know what the costs were, but then we just bundled everything together so everything would be in that rate: Supply, conveyance, staff, labor, paper clips, everything was -- would go into it.
  - Q. Just so you don't overlook one of the big ones,

discussion that there was going to be much more water marketing out there in the world.

There was going to be a number of other wheeling-type arrangements that might be coming Metropolitan's way.

Up until then we had been developing a specific rate effectively ad hoc when these transactions came up. The idea is we would actually unbundle our rates, and people would know what they would have to pay to use the system.

- Q. When you say "ad hoc," does that -- to make sure I understand the way you meant it, is that as each request came in, a rate was determined for that particular request; is that right?
- A. That's right. I mean, we did have a couple of other small wheeling requests that were made in the late 1990s, early 2000 time frame involving Orange County. And so we developed specific wheeling agreements for those with a rate for that charge.
- Q. Part of the process of unbundling the rates would establish a wheeling rate that wheelers would know in advance; isn't that correct?
  - A. That's right.
- Q. How long did this process take to unbundle the rates?

1281 | 1283

the State Water Project costs?

- A. All our costs. State Project Water is roughly almost a third of all Metropolitan's costs. It is a tremendous cost to Metropolitan, and those costs had to be recovered.
- Q. You say a third, but can you give a ballpark of what -- the millions we are talking about?
- A. Metropolitan's annual budget is about 1.7, \$1.8 billion a year. And this past year we paid to the State of California a little over \$500 million for State Water Project costs. It is usually in that range of 450- to \$550 million a year at this point in time.
- Q. Then Metropolitan decided to make a decision to unbundle their rates; is that correct?
  - A. That's right.
  - Q. When was that?
- A. Late 1990s we began the process and the discussion on how to do that.
  - Q. Why was that?
- A. Part of the impetus was the agreement that we had executed with San Diego, even though the conditions precedent hadn't been satisfied yet, but it was going to be a new way -- a new conveying of water, so we had to develop rates. We were going to -- we already had a rate in that 1998 agreement, but there was a lot of

A. It took a little over two years, almost three years, to actually go through working with our member agencies and working with all their staff. We had numerous workshops. We took a number of proposals and worked through them.

And even then, when we actually took a vote on that, on the new rate structure and the approach, the idea that we would take that into the -- we did take that in 2001, but that we wouldn't set rates until the next cycle, which we did in 2002, on the new structure, which wouldn't go into effect until January 1, 2003.

It was a long, detailed process with a lot of lead-in time.

- Q. Who made this decision to unbundle?
- A. The Metropolitan Board of Directors.
- Q. Including the San Diego representatives on the board, I assume?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And this information and workshop, was that disseminated to all the member agencies?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Are you aware of any misinformation that was given to any of the member agencies about the unbundling the rates, the cost, including the State Project Water costs?

- A. No. No. There was quite a bit of information.
- Q. I take it some members were not in favor of unbundling; is that correct?

- A. I don't know if people said they were in -that they didn't like unbundling. But there was a
  number of different proposals and we -- the people had
  different ideas on how best to do it. I think most
  people thought unbundling was a sound idea, but there
  was all sorts of different ideas on how best it should
  be done and what types of policies it should encourage
  or discourage.
- Q. And would the right phrase be "rate structure"? In other words, they are in favor of unbundling and in favor of seeing what the elements of a rate was, but they didn't agree with the rate structure?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Leading.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: There -- there were concerns about exactly how to unbundle. What types of costs should go into which pot, for instance. So a lot of people had different ideas. And we actually allowed member agencies to make their own proposals to be considered. And some of them actually did that, and some of them -- different people had different views depending on how it would affect their area.

Q. I understand Mr. Underwood is deceased now; is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Who were your counterparts with the Water Authority?
- A. Their lead negotiators were Maureen Stapleton, then and current general manager, and Scott Slater, their outside counsel.
- Q. Can you give an approximation of when the negotiations specific to the -- that would ultimately be the 2003 agreement, when did they get started?
- A. We already had in place the 1998 agreement. And discussions on what changes and updates, if any, to the 2003 exchange agreement didn't really begin until mid-summer of 2003. And at that point we made significant progress on the quantification agreement with IID. So now people turned back to see what changes had to be made.
- Q. Would you explain why there was -- you just said there was a 1998 agreement. Why was there a need to amend that?
- A. There -- there probably wasn't much that had to be changed. We actually thought it was pretty much good enough. A few of the conditions precedent had to be updated.

1285 | 1287

A big issue always within Metropolitan's -- and we're a collective. Everyone voluntarily belongs to Metropolitan.

So some of our agencies have access to very significant groundwater reserves and basins. They had different ideas on how the rate structure should help us work with groundwater, and others, without access to groundwater, had different views. All these views were worked through during the course of the entire unbundling process.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: When was the vote that put unbundled rates in the rate structure in place?
  - A. In 2001.
  - Q. When did the rates actually go into effect?
  - A. January 1, 2003.
- Q. Was it 2003 in which the 2003 exchange agreement was both negotiated and agreed upon?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Were you part of a negotiating team?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Who was your -- did you have teammates?
  - A. The lead negotiators for Metropolitan in this process were myself, as chief counsel at the time, and Dennis Underwood, vice president to our president, CEO at the time.

There was one significant issue we had to tackle, and that was the 1998 agreement term of the exchange was for 30 years and the actual IID San Diego transfer was for 45 years. And between year 31 and year 45, the 1998 agreement was just silent. So we were going to tackle how we were going to address those last 15 years.

- Q. Mr. Kightlinger, I think I skipped over one part that occurred back in the negotiation, the '98 agreement. The price for that was a low \$90 an acre-foot; correct?
  - A. With inflation, yes.
- Q. And at that time, did Metropolitan believe that the true cost of performing that contract would be higher?
  - A. Yes. We felt it was significantly higher.
- Q. Did Metropolitan go to the California State legislature to try and cover that gap?
- A. San Diego and IID were effectively at loggerheads as to what should be the correct price for conveying water. They felt the marginal rate was sufficient, and we felt it should really take into account all the capital costs of building the structure. We were 100-and-some-odd dollars per acre-foot apart.

At some point, because they didn't seem to be

- making progress, and California was in a concern the 4.4 plan would not be resolved without San Diego and IID reaching agreement, the State of California actually approached both parties and said that we would be interested in helping bridge that gap.
- Q. That gap, be more specific. What is the gap that the State of California offered to help bridge?

A. Metropolitan believed that the true cost of conveying the water to San Diego was somewhere around \$250 an acre-foot, and San Diego's view was it was somewhere around 80, \$90 an acre-foot.

That gap over time amounted to a significant amount of money. And that is what the State of California offered to come in and help bridge that gap.

- Q. Did they give it to you no strings attached, or did it come with a purpose that Metropolitan had to use it for?
- A. The State of California dictated that while they were going to bridge the gap, they weren't just going to provide money for California. They wanted to make sure that it was used for a purpose that would benefit both Metropolitan and California.
  - Q. And that purpose was?
- A. It was to help line the -- to help fund the lining of the All-American and Coachella Canal projects.

come through with that. We did put it in as a condition precedent in the exchange agreement.

- Q. Turning to the negotiation, without going through all the other elements, at some point is it not true that San Diego County Water Authority came to Metropolitan with two options; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And what was the first option?
- A. The first option was based on the 1998 exchange agreement that they would continue to pay for the exchange of water based on the cost structure that was put in place in the 1998 agreement.

THE COURT: Which exhibit is this? MR. EMANUEL: DTX 050, your Honor.

Q. This is a document that purports -- by the county -- by the Water Authority that purports to summarize the QSA options.

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. If you look at the line "Option-1 is the original IID/SDCWA water transfer."
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is that what we have been referring to as the 1998 exchange agreement?
  - A. Yes.

1289 | 1291

- And there was a portion of it that also Metropolitan would be using for groundwater projects in the hope that we would have Colorado River water to store. These would be storage programs.
  - Q. Moving now to 2003. At the time of your negotiation with the Water Authority, did you -- did Metropolitan, in fact, have an agreement with the State of California for a sum of money to be used to line the canals?
    - A. Yes, we did.
    - Q. What was the sum of money?
  - A. \$235 million. 200 million to line the canals.\$35 million for groundwater storage programs.
- Legislation was passed appropriating the funds. And we had a signed agreement with the California Department of Water Resources to deliver those funds.
  - Q. And you went so quickly, I want to make sure. This wasn't a handshake deal with the State?
- $\boldsymbol{A}.\;\;No,$  no. We had both legislation and signed agreements.
- Q. And at the time of the negotiation with the Water Authority, did Metropolitan believe that the 235 million already appropriated was a contingency that was a high risk of not receiving?
  - A. No. We were very confident the State would

Q. And as you look at it, does that price look roughly in the ballpark?

- A. Yes. It started at 1998 -- in 1998 it was \$90 an acre-foot, and my recollection is this is updated for inflation to 2003 from '97.
- Q. If you look at the sentence, it is already highlighted, Option-2, is this the essence of what the Water Authority proposed to Metropolitan?
- A. Yes. Although I don't see -- in addition to signing the canal lining project water rights, we also were to assign over the \$235 million from the State of California. And they would then pay our full in conveyance costs of \$253 an acre-foot.
- Q. It is accurately stated there, system access, water stewardship and power costs?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. When this proposal was given to Metropolitan's negotiating team, did you take it to the Metropolitan board?
  - A. We took it first to what we called our negotiating team, which was a subset of our board. And we then eventually took it to our full board.
    - Q. What was the decision by the full board?
  - A. Well, the eventual decision was, after analysis, that both Option-1 and Option-2 would work for

1 Metropolitan, and then what we did was tell San Diego A. It was agreed it would start at 253. 2 2 that it was their choice. Q. And was there a discussion of how they arrived 3 3 THE COURT: When you say "the full board," is at 253? 4 4 that everybody including the San Diego representatives? A. Yes. 5 5 THE WITNESS: When we were doing the MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation. Who is 6 6 negotiations, San Diego did not participate in those "they"? 7 7 THE COURT: Sustained. Why don't you just discussions. 8 8 rephrase the question. Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Did they participate in the 9 MR. EMANUEL: I will. Thank you. vote for this? 10 10 Q. You are having conversations with the A. They did not. 11 negotiating team for the Water Authority; is that 11 Q. Is that because they had a conflict of 12 correct? 12 interest? 13 A. Yes. 1.3 A. Yes. 14 Q. And on that Water Authority negotiating team, 14 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Calls for a legal 15 15 the two individuals were whom? conclusion. 16 A. Scott Slater and Maureen Stapleton. 16 THE COURT: I will take it not as a legal 17 Q. As you sit here today, can you remember which 17 statement but his understanding as to why. 18 of the two made the proposal to you? 18 Go ahead. 19 A. Scott --19 MR. EMANUEL: Very well. 20 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Foundation. 20 Q. Was it your mission, then, to convey that 21 THE COURT: Overruled. 21 decision back to the Water Authority's negotiating team? 2.2 THE WITNESS: Scott Slater. 2.2 A. Yes. 23 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: When Mr. Slater made the 23 Q. What was their reaction to it? 24 proposal to the Metropolitan water negotiating team, 24 A. They were pleased, but then they had to go to 25 including you, did he at that time say Option-2 is for 25 their board and determine which option they would 1293 1295 1 1 253? choose. 2 2 O. What was the time period so far -- and A. No, he did not. 3 3 Q. What did he say about the price when he offered ultimately they chose Option-2; correct? 4 4 A. Correct. Option-2 the first time? 5 5 Q. What was the time period between when it was A. That the Water Authority would pay 6 6 first proposed to Metropolitan and the Water Authority Metropolitan's full conveyance cost. 7 7 came back to Metropolitan and said, "We choose Q. At some point did you and Mr. Slater, along 8 8 Option-2"? with others, but at least you and Mr. Slater, sit down 9 9 and say what is the full cost? A. It was very short. It was a matter of weeks. 10 10 It was in September of 2003. A. Scott and I discussed what were the components 11 11 MR. EMANUEL: And, Mike, would you put that that would make up the full cost. We then asked other 12 12 exhibit back up again because I wanted to -people, in my case Brian Thomas, our then chief 13 13 Q. That sentence there, where it says "The financial officer, and I believe he sat down with Bob 14 14 wheeling rate is set at 253," do you see that? Campbell working for the Water Authority. It might have 15 15 A. Yes. been other people. They agreed that the right number, 16 16 Q. Was that 253 proposed by the Water Authority doing the math, which is pretty simple math, was \$253 an 17 17 acre-foot. negotiators? 18 18 Q. Was there any dissent or dispute from A. It was agreed to by the Water Authority because 19 19 it was the sum of the system access, the then current Mr. Slater or anyone else from the Water Authority when 20 20 system access, water stewardship rate and power cost. that 253 number was calculated? 21 21 We summed up those three costs and agreed it was 253. 22 22 Q. Was there any dissent or disagreement from the Q. I want to be clear, though. When they made the 23 23 proposal to Metropolitan and said Option-2, did Option-2 Water Authority as to how it was calculated? 24 24 come with 253, or did it come with we'll pay wheeling or A. No. 25 25 Q. Was there any dissent as to elements that went conveyance or something like that?

1296

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 into it?

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

#### A. No.

- 3 Q. When this proposal was taken to the 4 Metropolitan board, which I understand is before it went 5 to the Water Authority board, when it went to the -- was 6 that number already determined and disclosed to the 7 board? 8
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. When the board decided San Diego could decide, was that number already disclosed and included in the choice that San Diego -- the Water Authority had?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Now, going back then to the question, between the time it was proposed, Option-2 by Mr. Slater, and between the time you received the information that it had been agreed to by the Water Authority, how much time had elapsed?
    - A. My recollection was a couple of weeks.
    - O. What step was -- had to occur next then?
  - A. Well, once we have concurrence by both of our boards of directors, we had to revise the exchange agreement, the 2003 exchange agreement, to reflect that. We had to then work with the other parties to the allocation agreement of how rights were quantified because we had to update that the canal lining water

that already had been appropriated and was under contractual obligation to Metropolitan? Was that assigned to the Water Authority?

- A. That would be assigned to the Water Authority.
- Q. Were state representatives parties to these agreements or at least to the agreements to which the allocation or the re-allocation of the State appropriation?
- A. Yes. The State of California did execute these agreements, as well.
- Q. We talked before about how long this QSA negotiation was going on. You are already past the December 2002 deadline. We are now, from what I saw in Exhibit 50, into September of 2003. What -- how long did it take to finalize the agreement?
- A. We -- we moved pretty quickly. Once the boards had reached agreement, we got everything finalized within less than two weeks, and we executed everything, my recollection is, early October, October 10 or something like that.
- Q. Was the idea that when you say "everything," that these 30-some agreements would all be executed by all parties on or about the same time?
- A. Yes. We had a signing event at Metropolitan in our boardroom where all the parties came in to Los

1297

1299

- would now be moved from Metropolitan to San Diego. We had to revise the construction agreements. There were agreements on how to construct the canal lining projects, so we had to revise all those agreements.
- Q. Because of the acceptance of Option-2, other agreements necessarily had to be negotiated and agreed upon; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. One of them you mentioned was the allocation agreement; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What was the provisions in the allocation agreement that had to change?
  - A. The rights to the canal lining water.
- Q. And by that I take it you mean Metropolitan's rights would be transferred to the Water Authority; correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. What about that state appropriation, where did that switch hands, in what document?
  - A. Metropolitan had to then withdraw from its funding agreement with the Department of Water Resources and San Diego had to then step into our shoes, get their own agreement with the State.
    - Q. And what about the appropriation of the 235

Angeles, and we signed all 30-some agreements and everybody that had to sign them.

- Q. Would it be accurate to say that without agreement on the exchange agreement and the allocation agreement, that the quantification settlement agreement might not have happened?
  - A. It would not have happened, yes.
  - Q. Thank you.

Now, one of the terms that was included in the 2003 exchange agreement is a five-year provision. Are you familiar with that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What was the motivation behind including a five-year provision?
- A. When we first briefed our negotiating team on this Option-2 that San Diego proposed, our analysis was that even though the water was extremely valuable and the \$235 million from the State of California, those were extremely valuable assets. If our full conveyance costs were covered, Option-1 and Option-2 were net, neutral to Metropolitan.

The board members on our negotiating team, though, had suggested -- some of them suggested that if there were future litigation and it was changed, then it would no longer be neutral to Metropolitan, and we would

1300

have already given up the canal lining water, the \$235 million.

2.3

So they asked should we not get a provision that for the life of the agreement, 45 years and any 30-year renewal, there be an agreement not to challenge the rates.

- Q. And this arose out of a -- I don't want to put words in your mouth -- a certain distrust between the parties?
- A. That was no secret. We had a tough relationship for the eight years -- for a number of years leading up to the 2003 exchange agreement.
- Q. And I take it the Water Authority had some distrust of Metropolitan; is that correct, sir?
  - A. I would say it was, yes.
  - Q. Did they express those concerns to you?
  - A. Yes, during the negotiations.
- Q. Let me lay a foundation. And when I say "they," did Scott Slater express those concerns to you?
- A. Yes. When we had the discussions on our counter that there should be another clause in there, that there can be no challenge to the rates for the life of this agreement, the comeback I got from Scott Slater was that San Diego was very concerned that Metropolitan might then change its rate structure and do something

Q. If we do the flip side, that the Water Authority in the form of Mr. Slater says to you, we have a concern about Metropolitan's performance; right?

### A. That's right.

- Q. What was the performance that he thought Metropolitan might not do?
- A. Well, we had just completed the unbundling of our rates and coming up with a new rate structure. And, obviously, it was within the power of the board to come up yet with another rate structure at some point down the road and do things in a different fashion.

And San Diego expressed the view we could very well do so during this 45-year period in a way that harmed them and they would be powerless to do anything about it because they would have signed something saying we can't challenge it.

Q. The five-year provision is the bargain that worked this out; correct?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Leading.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes. That was -- that was their proposal. We discussed it with our board. There was a fair amount of concern, but that became eventually what we agreed to.

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And the agreement, based on

that would discriminate against San Diego and harm it in some fashion.

Q. It sounds to me, then, that on Metropolitan's side there was the concern that you were parting immediately with \$235 millions and 110 years of canal lining water, and in exchange you have a 45-year agreement, which the concern was it may or may not be performed by the Water Authority; correct?

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Counsel is testifying.

THE COURT: It is a little compound. If you could redo that, please. And sometime in the next five or ten minutes, why don't you pick a nice time to break.

MR. EMANUEL: Let me finish this line of thought, and that would be a good time.

THE COURT: Any time.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: We have on the one side Metropolitan's concern because it was giving the Water Authority something. That something was?
- A. The canal lining water for the 110 years of that project and the \$235 million from the State of California.
  - Q. The concern is the Water Authority might what?
- A. In some fashion renege on its commitment to pay the full conveyance cost.

your discussions with Mr. Slater, was that something could be challenged. What was the something the Water Authority could challenge?

## A. Well, what I was told by both Mr. Slater --

MR. PURCELL: Objection. This is parol evidence, your Honor. I know there has been a lot of it, but we are not waiving our argument that the contract is clear on its face. I would like to make the objection this is veering from terms of the contract.

THE COURT: You are not objecting to parol evidence in this case, are you, as a matter of practice?

MR. PURCELL: We realize there has been parol evidence offered, and we do maintain the contract is clear on its face.

THE COURT: I think your side also extracted some parol evidence in this case. The objection is overruled.

Go ahead.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: We were talking about what the Water Authority could challenge. Please tell us what Mr. Slater said the Water Authority wanted the right to challenge.
- A. I asked Mr. Slater and Ms. Stapleton point blank, are you going to be challenging our rate structure, in which case we can't have agreement.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

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

1305

They stated we have no objection to the rate structure. We agree to pay that. What we are concerned about are changes Metropolitan might make in the future, and we want to reserve the right to challenge those.

- Q. The flip side, then, you walk away with -- what was your understanding of what they would not challenge?
  - A. The existing rate structure.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. Was there also expressed a concern that Metropolitan might discriminate against San Diego Water Authority?
  - A. Yes. That was the concern, that we might change the rate structure in a way that would be discriminatory to wheelers or San Diego or something that they had an ultimate interest.
  - Q. The purpose of that five-year was to address both parties' concerns; correct?
  - A. The idea of what we negotiated was there was not supposed to be challenges to the existing rate structure. As understood, that Metropolitan would be amending its process or could amend its process from time to time as conditions change, its rates and its rate structure, and that the Water Authority, after five years, could challenge, should those changes be made by Metropolitan.
    - Q. In the course of your negotiations with the

A. And possibly if there were a 30-year renewal for the length of the exchange agreement, yes.

MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, a break would be good now.

5 THE COURT: Let's take about a ten-minute 6 break. Thank you very much.

MR. EMANUEL: Thank you, your Honor. (Recess.)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Let's get started.

MR. EMANUEL: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. We have been talking about a rate structure that was agreed to in 2003. Did it change since then?
  - A. Did the exchange agreement change since 2003?
- Q. The rate structure that was agreed upon in 2003, was it changed since then?
- A. No. The rate structure was agreed upon in 2001, and it has not been changed since.
- 19 O. Very well. I understand. 20 The rate structure that was put into the 2003 21 agreement --
  - A. Has not.
    - Q. -- it is still the same rate structure today?
- 24 A. Yes.
  - Q. When the Option-2 was brought to the

1307

Water Authority, with Mr. Slater and Ms. Stapleton, did 2 they ever come to you and say in so many words this 3 five-year provision is just a cooling-off period?

- A. No. They never used those words.
- Q. Did they say in substance this was some sort of a timeout, placeholder, we are going to agree to disagree?
  - A. Not to me, no, they never said that.
- Q. Let me put it this way, sir. If Mr. Slater had said to you or you understood the deal to be only a five-year agreement to be on the rate structure, would Metropolitan have made the deal?

THE COURT: I don't understand the question. MR. EMANUEL: All right.

- Q. If Metropolitan understood the deal to be we only have an agreement on five years of the rate structure, that after five years, even though you agreed to pay these rates, we can sue you on what we had proposed, would Metropolitan have agreed to a 45-year deal?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Would it have agreed to any deal?
- A. No.
- Q. Wasn't part of the purpose to reach an agreement on what the rate would be for 45 years?

Metropolitan Board of Directors, were financial projections done as to the costs and revenues?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What period of time was used for those financial projections?
  - A. The 45 and 75 years.
- Q. In the five years since the execution of the 2003 agreement, that five-year period which some have called a cooling-off or a timeout, in that five-year period, did anyone come from the Water Authority to renegotiate?
  - A. No.
- Q. Did anyone come from the Water Authority and say the five years are running, we have to do something about the rate structure?
- Q. I would like to go to another topic. And this agreement is called an exchange agreement; correct?
- Q. Prior to '98, there was an effort to make a wheeling agreement, but ultimately the 1998 agreement was also an exchange agreement; correct?
  - A. Correct. Yes.
  - O. You understand the differences between a wheeling agreement and an exchange agreement?

1308

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

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

1309

#### A. Yes.

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

Q. Is that a mere technicality, or are there different benefits to a wheeling agreement and an exchange agreement?

#### A. There are very significant differences.

Q. I want you to explain to the Court the benefits to the Water Authority of having an exchange agreement, the 2003 exchange agreement, as opposed to a wheeling agreement. Are you able to do that, sir?

#### A. Absolutely.

Now, there are a number of benefits, but the primary benefit, first and foremost, was the guaranteed space. A wheeler would only have space as it was available, and you'd have to look on an annual basis and determine is there space to move a wheeler's water.

But San Diego's transfer with the Imperial Irrigation District called for a firm transfer to be made every single year. They would -- in some years, if Metropolitan had a full aqueduct, they would simply have to pay for the water, but lose it, not be able to access

It was -- probably their number one priority was to get guaranteed access and guaranteed capacity in our system. But then there's a number of other benefits that are smaller, but also significant. One of those is

carriage losses. There is water that's lost to evaporation and system loss, and those losses now accrue to Metropolitan.

If San Diego's transfer with IID calls for 100,000 acre-feet, they get delivered 100,000 acre-feet credit, even though there has been losses that have occurred. Those now are Metropolitan's losses.

- Q. Sir, are you saying if a wheeler would typically -- there would be a deduction between the amount of water the wheeler made available and the amount of water at the other end that was delivered?
- A. Yes. When we have had wheeling arrangements with San Diego and with others on our state project system, we have debited those losses from their transfer.
- Q. By contrast, under this exchange agreement, your testimony is, I take it, the amount they make available or deem available -- a topic we will talk about in a second -- is the amount that's delivered?

20 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Leading. 21

THE COURT: It is leading.

I'll overrule it in this is case.

There have been quite a lot of leading questions. I tend to allow them, obviously, when it's undisputed material but some of the stuff is very

1311

power. Metropolitan -- a wheeler would pay actual power at the market rate when they moved the water.

Metropolitan has a melded power rate that is available to our member agencies.

But then there are number of other benefits that are smaller, but also significant. Metropolitan has a melded power rate, and this melded power is much lower because it is a beneficiary of long-term hydroelectric power contracts we have with Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, and on the State Water Project with Hyatt-Thermalito Generating Station. That hydroelectric power, which is essentially at cost, is significantly below the market rate and our members get the benefit of that melded power.

San Diego wanted that and that is something they negotiated for.

- Q. I want to make sure we are clear. The wheeler doesn't get melded power?
  - A. No.
  - Q. The wheeler pays market rate?

A third benefit would be because, by virtue of the exchange agreement, Metropolitan takes the water at our -- at our system, at Lake Havasu, at our intake. We then, it being Metropolitan's water, we take all the

obviously leading.

Go ahead, please.

MR. EMANUEL: I am trying to be efficient. I can do it the other way.

- Q. We talk about guaranteed space, carriage losses, power. What about water quality?
- A. A couple other benefits, one of them being water quality. The Water Authority gets access to -because it becomes our water, we deliver to them Metropolitan water. This is our -- Colorado River water is higher in salinity than our State project water and we have a blending policy at Metropolitan.

So what San Diego is receiving is blended water, not pure Colorado River water that's being made available by IID, but it is actually blended water. And that has a significant water quality benefit which has a significant financial benefit because it really cuts down on corrosion, et cetera.

But another major benefit is the advantage of Metropolitan's regulating capacity.

What that means is when IID conserves water, it's usually doing it in the agricultural season. So it doesn't necessarily match up with San Diego's demands for an urban area. So as the water is conserved throughout the course of the year, what we've agreed to

1312

do is Metropolitan will just, based on the contract amount San Diego has with IID, we will deliver 1-12th of that water every single month through Metropolitan's regulating capacity and its facilities. And the water may not be available yet from IID when we make those deliveries. At some point it may catch up and at some point it may get ahead.

All of that we take that onto ourselves and regulate the deliveries from IID and make deliveries to the Water Authority in 1/12th equal installments regardless of whether it actually shows up from IID.

- Q. The contract uses the phrase "deemed made available"; correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Your explanation is that is different from actually being made available?
  - A. Yes.

2.3

- Q. What is the difference between "deemed made available" and "actually made available"?
- A. We don't actually know when that water has been made available by IID exactly. They have to go and conserve it. And then they have to prove up what they conserved to the Bureau of Reclamation. It does an accounting process to confirm it's actually been conserved.

explained between wheeling and this exchange agreement
 was the power rate.

- A. Yes.
- Q. The wheeling agreement, I think you said, would have been at the market and the exchange agreement was the system power rate; is that right?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. Who asked for the system power rate to be part of the price?
- A. San Diego.
- Q. Did they give a reason why they wanted the system power rate?
  - A. It was cheaper.
  - Q. At the time they requested the system power rate, had it been disclosed to the member agencies, the component of the system power rate?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. And by that I mean -- and one of those components was?
  - A. It was both -- it was really all of Metropolitan's power costs, which includes actually what we are paying the State Water Project to deliver water, as well.
  - Q. You are familiar with the contract that says that they will -- that Metropolitan would charge lawful

All those things don't happen in realtime. They happen down the road.

We're making the deliveries in realtime to San Diego, deeming that it's made available, and then we'll adjust the accounting later.

- Q. Please contrast that with what would happen with a wheeling contract.
- A. With a wheeling, the water would actually have to be delivered to Metropolitan. We would have to be able to measure it, meter it, and then we would deliver that amount, minus any losses.

MR. EMANUEL: May I have two minutes? THE COURT: Did you want to take a little recess?

MR. EMANUEL: A short one, just to make sure I covered everything.

THE COURT: Is it a minute or five minutes?

MR. EMANUEL: Five minutes would be better.

THE COURT: Five minutes it is. Let's take a five-minute recess.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Anything else on direct?
MR. EMANUEL: Just a couple. Although every

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, one of the differences you

attorney says that and it turns out to be more.

conveyance rates; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. At the time of this negotiation, at the establishment of these rates, did you, sir, have any doubt as to the lawfulness of the rates?

A. No. We can only charge lawful rates.

- Q. At the time of this negotiation, did Mr. Slater come to you and say, "I'm only going to do this but realize, Mr. Kightlinger, after five years there's going to be a lawsuit"?
  - A. No.
- Q. What would have happened if you had -- someone had come to you and said, "We have a problem here. These rates aren't lawful"?

THE COURT: You mean during the negotiations? MR. EMANUEL: Yes.

- Q. Would we have a deal?
- A. No. We would not have had a deal.

MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, no more questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Cross-examination.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PURCELL:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Kightlinger.

#### A. Good afternoon.

2.5

1.0

2.4

Q. My name is Dan Purcell. I'll be asking you a few questions today.

I am going to start off by doing something your counsel didn't do, and we will actually look at the contract

MR. PURCELL: So, Ben, if I could get PTX 65 up on the screen. Before I do that, I actually have a binder.

Can we go to page 16, Section 5.2.

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, this is the price term of the 2003 exchange agreement; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And I'm reading the second sentence. There's language in this section that says, "Thereafter, after the first year, the price shall be equal to the charge or charges set by Metropolitan's Board of Directors pursuant to applicable law and regulation and generally applicable to conveyance of water by Metropolitan on behalf of its member agencies."

Do you see that? Do you see that language that is highlighted?

#### A. Yes.

Q. You were testifying for an hour or so. You didn't mention this language, did you?

crime. I am not trying to establish a mens rea here.

Met can set an unlawful rate even if it doesn't intend to; correct?

#### A. It could be mistaken, yes.

Q. It could include costs and certain rates that don't belong there, and that could render those rates unlawful; correct?

#### A. That's correct.

Q. That is what this term prohibits Met from doing; correct?

## A. I still would say we are prohibited from doing it either by this term or just by general law.

Q. This term gives San Diego contract remedies in the event that Met sets an unlawful rate; correct?

# A. I don't see anything in here about a remedy. It just says we will set our rates pursuant to applicable law and regulation.

Q. This term here gives San Diego a right under the contract to have Met set a lawful rate?

MR. EMANUEL: Objection. This is argument and seeking a legal opinion.

THE COURT: Overruled for now.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: You are a lawyer; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. At the time --

#### A. No.

Q. We didn't discuss that.

This language requires Metropolitan's Board of Directors to set charges that are pursuant to applicable law and regulation; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And generally applicable to conveyance of water by member agencies?

#### A. Yes. That part, yes.

Q. This contract requires Metropolitan to set a lawful rate; correct?

## A. We have to set a lawful rate. We cannot set unlawful rates.

Q. Are you saying it is impossible for Metropolitan to set an unlawful rate?

## A. Yes. It would -- we might be mistaken, but we cannot go out and set unlawful rates.

THE COURT: I don't understand exactly what you're saying. You are saying no matter what you do, by definition, it can't be unlawful if Met does it?

THE WITNESS: I am saying we can't go out and say we will set an unlawful rate. We may be mistaken as to what the law is, but we can't go out and set an unlawful rate as something we intend to do.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: This isn't a specific intent

MR. EMANUEL: I am going to object. He is not here as a lawyer. He is here as a percipient witness.

THE COURT: Understood. The fact that he is a lawyer, it is not objectionable to extract that information.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: In fact, when this contract was negotiated, you were Metropolitan's general counsel?

#### A. That's correct.

Q. You were the top lawyer within the Metropolitan organization?

#### A. Yes.

Q. You had other lawyers at Metropolitan working for you?

#### A. Correct.

Q. You were their boss?

#### A. Correct.

Q. And you were the lead negotiator on this contract for Metropolitan; correct?

#### A. Along with Dennis Underwood.

Q. Along with Dennis Underwood.

Your testimony is, as I gathered from your direct, that this price term sets a guaranteed price; it provides a price guarantee for Metropolitan for 45 and potentially for 75 years; is that right?

A. It would be inflated by time. So that's how we

#### would -- that's what was the purpose of this sentence, it was how that would go up. Q. Was to provide a guaranteed price that San Diego would have to pay to Metropolitan for conveyance for up to 75 years? A. As --Q. That's your testimony about what this means? A. Yes. Q. All right. Could we go to Section 11.1. I think it's page 27. THE COURT: Page 24. MR. PURCELL: Twenty-four. Thank you, your Honor. Q. Mr. Kightlinger, this section is called "Dispute Resolution"; correct? A. Yes.

- Q. It provides for various things the parties have to do in the event there is a dispute?
  - A. Yes.

2.5

1.0

2.4

- Q. One of the things, in fact, the only specific type of dispute that this section culls out is price disputes; correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Why would you need to have a dispute resolution section dealing with price disputes if the contract was

section.

- Q. All right. We will do that in a minute. In this section there is no mention of changes to the rate structure; correct?
  - A. No.
- Q. There is nothing about San Diego being only able to challenge a newly set price as opposed to the older price?
- A. No. There's nothing in there. It doesn't say that.
- Q. In this section there is no limitation whatsoever on San Diego's ability to raise the price dispute other than the five-year timeout; correct?
- MR. EMANUEL: Object to the phrase, "five-year timeout" is argumentative, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sorry?

MR. EMANUEL: Counsel is arguing by calling it a five-year timeout.

THE COURT: You know, I can keep the positions of the parties straight.

The objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: What was the question?

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: The question is: There is no limitation in this section whatsoever on San Diego's ability to raise a price dispute other than the

designed to provide a guaranteed price for 75 years?

- A. Disputes arise, and we wouldn't have to have -- it -- it is usually a good form to have a dispute resolution process when they arise.
- Q. Even though the contract was designed and understood by the parties, in your testimony, to provide for a guaranteed price for 75 years, there still might be a price dispute?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. This section talks about the five-year window that we were discussing earlier. "San Diego shall not dispute whether the price determined pursuant to paragraph 5.2 for the first five years of this agreement was determined in accordance with applicable law or regulation."

Do you see that language?

- A. I do.
- Q. San Diego is entitled to raise the price dispute after the first five years?
- A. They are entitled to -- certainly, if we made changes to the structure, they are entitled to bring that up as part of the dispute, yes.
- Q. There is nothing in this section that refers to changes in the structure, is there?
  - A. No. I think you have to go back to the other

five-year timeout; correct?

#### A. That is correct.

Q. Let's go back to 5.2 on 16 and 17. I think your testimony, Mr. Kightlinger, is to understand that this -- San Diego's ability to challenge pricing would be limited to new rate structures. I think you said that you need to look at this section to make that conclusion.

Is that your testimony earlier, a couple minutes ago?

- A. It was that you should look at this section in conjunction with the other.
- Q. There is nothing in this section, is there, Mr. Kightlinger, that talks about new rate structures?

A. It talks -- I am not quite sure how to point it

out to you, but if you talk through the second proviso, halfway through on page 17, "provided, however, that Metropolitan may at any time amend the Administrative Code in accordance with paragraphs 13.12, the Administration Code thereby amended shall be included within the foregoing restriction."

The reference in the Administrative Code was to changing Metropolitan's pricing.

Q. There is nothing that says that San Diego can only sue if Metropolitan changed its rate structure.

Where does it say that?

1.0

#### A. That proviso is saying that.

MR. PURCELL: Can we scroll down, Ben? Can you scroll up a little bit so we can see the remainder of the section on the screen?

Q. The proviso immediately after that says, "And provided further, A, after the conclusion of the first five years, nothing herein shall preclude San Diego from contesting an administrative or judicial forum whether such charge or charges have been set in accordance with applicable law and regulation."

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes, sir.

Q. That sentence says that nothing in this section shall limit San Diego's ability to challenge the price after five years. Isn't that what it says, the plain language? Yes?

## A. That's what that part says, and then you have to read it in conjunction with the whole sentence.

Q. The part I just read, Mr. Kightlinger, says "Nothing herein shall limit San Diego's ability to challenge whether Met has set its price in accordance with applicable law and regulation."

"Nothing herein," that's the language; correct?

A. And if you go to the top of it, it says, "For

frustrated.

Just ask a question and I want you to just -if you can answer it yes or no, and if that isn't fair,
you can explain it.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: This allows Metropolitan to amend its Administrative Code; correct?

#### A. The second proviso, yes.

Q. The first proviso under -- regardless of whether Met can amend its Administrative Code, this section provides that nothing in the section shall preclude San Diego from raising a challenge under applicable law after five years?

#### A. The first part does say that.

Q. It does. "Nothing herein" means nothing else in this section shall restrict San Diego from doing that?

# A. Well, actually, I disagree with that. I actually think those three sections actually lay out a process by which San Diego and Metropolitan both have to follow.

Q. How does that process work, Mr. Kightlinger?

A. So, for the term of the agreement, neither San Diego nor Metropolitan may challenge the rate structure. Neither party. That is that first sentence.

The second part does say that Metropolitan may

the term of this agreement."

Now you're saying "Metropolitan shall seek or support any legislative, administrative, or judicial forum, any change in the form, substance or interpretation of any applicable law or regulation including the admin code, which is where our rate structure is placed, in effect, on the date of this agreement, pertaining to the charges or charges set by Metropolitan's Board of Directors generally applicable to the conveyance of water by Metropolitan."

- Q. And then there's a proviso that carves out from that and says, "Nothing herein shall preclude San Diego from challenging in an administrative or judicial forum whether Met's charges have been set in accordance with applicable law."
- A. There is the second proviso first that says, "Metropolitan may amend it -- may amend its Administrative Code."
  - Q. Nobody is saying they can't.
- A. I understand that. That is what the second proviso says.

MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, Counsel is interrupting the answer.

THE COURT: What is happening is the witness isn't answering the question, so counsel is getting

amend its admin code, changing its price structure at some point in the future.

## The third part says that after five years San Diego may challenge that.

- Q. So your view is that the third part is limited to challenges to what is authorized -- Metropolitan is authorized to do in the second part?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And was that communicated to San Diego?
- A. These were the discussions I had with Mr. Slater, where he said San Diego has no intention of challenging our rate structure. We are concerned, though, that Metropolitan may make changes to its rate structure in the future.
- Q. So your position, Mr. Kightlinger, is that the language "nothing herein" doesn't have any meaning; it is meaningless and surplusage?

## A. No. I believe it just has to be read in context with the rest of the provisions above it.

- Q. It refers to the other provisions above it when it says "nothing herein." It provides that the other provisions above it don't apply. Correct?
- A. That's what the words say, "Nothing herein." I still think they have to be read together in the three sections.

Pages 1325 to 1328

```
1
         Q. Mr. Kightlinger, I think you testified --
                                                                        after he reads this into the record. He may have
 2
                                                                  2
       strike that.
                                                                        questions.
                                                                  3
 3
            Let me do something else first. You were
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: I hope it's a question of did I
                                                                  4
 4
       supported in the negotiations of the 2003 exchange
                                                                        read that correctly.
                                                                  5
 5
       agreement by a gentleman named Brian Thomas?
                                                                              THE COURT: I do, too.
 6
                                                                  6
         A. Correct.
                                                                              Let's go ahead, Please.
                                                                  7
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: Thank you.
         Q. He was Metropolitan's chief financial officer?
                                                                  8
 8
                                                                              I would like to read from Mr. Thomas'
         A. Yes, sir.
 9
                                                                  9
         Q. He was Met's CFO until when, 2010, 2011?
                                                                        deposition from page 122, line six to page 124, line 25.
10
                                                                 10
                                                                              THE COURT: I don't have that in front of me.
         A. About 2010, I believe.
                                                                 11
11
         Q. He was a long-time Met employee?
                                                                        You have it there on the screen.
12
                                                                 12
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: (Reading:)
         A. Correct.
13
                                                                 13
         Q. And you trusted him?
                                                                              "Q And Metropolitan's
                                                                 14
14
                                                                              understanding at the time it
         A. Yes.
15
                                                                 1.5
         Q. And he was intimately familiar with the
                                                                              signed the exchange agreement
16
       negotiations on Met's side?
                                                                 16
                                                                              was that after five years the
17
                                                                 17
                                                                              Water Authority could file a
18
                                                                 18
         Q. And you would have kept him informed about
                                                                              lawsuit to challenge its
       important deal points --
                                                                 19
19
                                                                              rates."
20
                                                                 20
         A. Yes.
                                                                              There is an objection.
                                                                 21
21
         Q. -- related to the exchange agreement?
                                                                              "A That's what it said, that
                                                                 2.2
2.2
            Were you aware that Mr. Thomas was
                                                                              the Water Authority would be
23
                                                                 23
       Metropolitan's person most knowledgeable in this case to
                                                                              afforded that opportunity to
24
       testify about issues related to the negotiations of the
                                                                 24
                                                                              address its concerns.
2.5
                                                                 2.5
       exchange agreement?
                                                                              "O That was Met's
                                                      1329
                                                                                                                       1331
 1
         A. Yes.
                                                                                understanding at the time it
 2
                                                                  2
         Q. You were still the Metropolitan general manager
                                                                                signed the exchange agreement?
 3
       when Mr. Thomas was designated; correct?
                                                                                "A Yes. And that's what it
 4
                                                                  4
 5
                                                                  5
         Q. You were comfortable with Mr. Thomas being
                                                                                "O So this Section 5.2 allows
 6
                                                                  6
       designated as the person most knowledgeable?
                                                                                the Water Authority to do what
 7
                                                                  7
                                                                                it has done in this case so
 8
                                                                  8
         Q. You thought he understood the issues and would
                                                                                long as it waited five years to
 9
                                                                  9
       give accurate testimony?
                                                                                do so?
10
         A. Yes.
                                                                 10
                                                                                "A Yes.
11
         O. I would like to read from Mr. Thomas'
                                                                 11
                                                                                "Q Now I want to draw your
12
                                                                 12
       deposition.
                                                                                attention to Section 11.1,
13
            MR. EMANUEL: I don't think this is impeachment
                                                                 13
                                                                                which is on page -- it looks
14
       or anything to do with this witness. He is just reading
                                                                                like you found it before I did.
15
       depo transcripts which I believe, if I'm not mistaken,
                                                                 15
                                                                                Section -- page 24. This is a
16
                                                                 16
       are in evidence. He can read them at any time.
                                                                                paragraph under a heading
17
                                                                 17
            MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, the deposition of a
                                                                                called 'Dispute Resolution';
18
                                                                 18
       party can be used for any purpose.
                                                                                right?
19
            MR. EMANUEL: Of course it can be used for any
                                                                 19
                                                                                "A Yes.
20
                                                                 20
       purpose.
                                                                                "Q Okay. And this paragraph
21
                                                                 2.1
            MR. PURCELL: That is what I want to do.
                                                                                also includes the language that
22
            MR. EMANUEL: We have a witness on the stand.
                                                                 22
                                                                                "Provided, however, that SDCWA
23
       I do not think it is courteous to the witness to be
                                                                 23
                                                                                shall not dispute whether the
24
                                                                 24
       reading depo transcripts.
                                                                                price determined pursuant to
25
            THE COURT: My guess is there may be a question
                                                                                paragraph 5.2 for the first
                                                      1330
                                                                                                                       1332
```

. 1	five years of this agreement	1	allocation of sister State
2	was determined in accordance	2	Water Project costs to
3	with applicable law or	3	Metropolitan's system access
4	regulation."	4	rate; right?
5	"That's what that's what it	5	"A Yes, in this letter.
6	says. My question is: Why did	6	"Q The five-year limitation
7	why did the parties put this	7	
8		8	on the Water Authority's ability to file a lawsuit was
9	language in Section 11.1, as	9	
10	well?	10	aimed at delaying or strike
11	"A I believe this section was	11	that.
12	intended to encourage the	12	In seeking or obtaining, as
13	parties to try and resolve any	13	part of the exchange agreement,
14	price disputes either through	14	the five-year limitation on
	negotiation or other forums,		filing a lawsuit, Metropolitan
15	but clearly that it provided	15	prevented the Water Authority
16	that if that failed, San Diego	16	from filing a lawsuit about
17	still had its the rights	17	State Water Project costs for
18	that were provided to it in the	18	five years; isn't that right?
19	prior section.	19	"A Yeah. It was agreed they
20	"Q Section 11.1 makes clear	20	would not file a lawsuit, but
21	that the Water Authority could	21	they could raise their concerns
22	only do that, could only	22	and they obviously did.
23	challenge the determination of	23	"Q But they wouldn't be able
24	price under the exchange	24	to file a lawsuit concerning
25	agreement after five years;	25	this issue for five years?
			·
	1333		1335
1	correct?	1	"A But they could point out
2	"A Well, it says San Diego	2	if it were legal or not legal;
3	shall not dispute whether the	3	they just couldn't file a
4	price determined for the first	4	lawsuit."
5	five years is determined in	5	Q. Mr. Kightlinger, the Water Authority had been
6	accordance with applicable law.	6	
7		7	objecting about Metropolitan
8	It could raise issues, could	8	MR. EMANUEL: I am going to object and move to
9	raise concerns, could have and	9	strike. There wasn't a question at the end of all that.
10	often did raise issue with how	10	THE COURT: I think we are going to have a
11	rates and charges were	11	question.
	assessed. But after five years		MR. PURCELL: I was in the middle of a
12	they could avail themselves of	12	question.
13	legal remedies."	13	Q. Mr. Kightlinger, the Water Authority had been
14	Q. My question, Mr. Kightlinger, is Mr. Thomas	14	objecting to Metropolitan's inclusion of State Water
15	wrong?	15	Project costs in its transportation rates for years by
16	A. I would reach a different conclusion than	16	this point, hadn't it?
17	Mr. Thomas on some of his points. On some of them they	17	A. At which point?
18	are pretty fair.	18	Q. 2003, when they signed the exchange agreement.
19	MR. PURCELL: I would like to read to you	19	MR. EMANUEL: I'm sorry, your Honor. I need to
20	another section of Mr. Thomas' deposition, page 135,	20	make sure there is clarity. The transcript referred to
21	line 17 through page 136, line 16.	21	February 2003 and now counsel has jumped forward to the
22	(Reading:)	22	end of 2003. I think there should be a time frame
23	"Q As of February 2003, the	23	should be specified.
24	Water Authority had raised	24	THE COURT: Overruled.
25	concerns about Metropolitan's	25	Go ahead.
	1334		1336
·			

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Mr. Kightlinger, by the time the exchange agreement was being negotiated, let's start in early 2003, the Water Authority had been complaining about Metropolitan's allocation of the State Water Project costs through its transportation rates for years, hadn't it.
- A. They complained when we were unbundling the rates, yes.
- Q. Metropolitan was aware, because the Water Authority had made them aware, that the Water Authority viewed Metropolitan State Water Project costs as supply costs; correct?
- A. During the unbundling process they made that point, yes. They felt it should -- all the State Water Project costs should go into the supply rate.
  - Q. Rather than the transportation rates?
- A. Rather than being divvied up into different bundles, the electricity, the electric rate, the transportation and so forth.
- Q. So do you agree with Mr. Thomas that after five years the Water Authority would be able to file a lawsuit based on its concerns about Metropolitan's allocation of the State Water Project cost through transportation rates?

Mr. Kightlinger: There wasn't a single piece of paper transmitted from the Water Authority to Metropolitan where the Water Authority said we're waiving all our previous objections to State Water Project costs and we will pay them on the transportation rates going forward?

- A. They never said we are waiving anything. They did say we will pay those costs.
- Q. I think your testimony on direct was that Mr. Slater agreed to pay, quote, full conveyance costs, unquote, of Metropolitan?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. That was the phrase you used, "full conveyance costs"?
  - A. When I testified moments ago?
- Q. Yes.
  - A. That is my recollection. That's the phrase I used.
- Q. That is what you say Mr. Slater told you; right? You used that phrase, "full conveyance costs"?
  - A. Basically, full costs for moving water. I don't exactly know exactly what words he used.
  - Q. That's what the deal was --
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. -- full conveyance costs?
    - A. Yes.

1337 | 1339

```
A. No.
```

2.2

Q. And that is because --

MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, objection.

THE COURT: Had you finished answering?

THE WITNESS: No.

option. It was their proposal.

THE COURT: Let's finish the answer first.

MR. EMANUEL: Could I ask the witness be --

THE COURT: Do you have the question in mind?

THE WITNESS: I have the question in mind.

THE COURT: We have the question in mind.

THE WITNESS: No. The Water Authority

basically said Option-2 is that we will agree to pay your costs as proposed by Metropolitan, and we will put down our objections to issues like such as the State Water project, et cetera. We would agree to how you construct your conveyance charges. That was their

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: That was never communicated to Metropolitan in writing, was it?
- A. What we did when we developed Option-2 is Scott Slater and I sat down and prepared a term sheet. And they were emailed to that effect, where he basically laid out what Option-2 and the various components were.
- Q. I have those emails and will be showing them to you in a second. What I am saying to you,

MR. PURCELL: Could we have PTX 56 up on the screen.

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, this a February 19, 2003, email sent on your behalf to Brian Thomas.

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. And it forwards a proposal from Scott Slater?

A. Okay.

Q. Is that accurate?

## A. All I see is it says San Diego's latest proposal.

- Q. And then the email that is attached to it, the subject line is from Scott Slater?
  - A. Yes, from Pam Wilson.
- Q. It is sent by someone who worked for Hatch and Parent, which is Mr. Slater's firm at the time?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. You don't have any reason to disbelieve that this is Mr. Slater's proposal to you, do you?
- A. No.
- Q. Could you look at the next page. Just looking at the heading there, this is titled "SDCWA Proposal to Address Exchange Agreement Issues, PDID Costs and Term Years 31 to 45."

Do you see that?

2.2

#### A. Yes.

1.0

Q. You mentioned that was one of the issues the parties were trying to resolve in early 2003 was matching up the terms of the IID agreement with the exchange agreement?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Let's go to the next page. And, actually, let's go -- sorry -- to the page after that. There is a heading midway down the page that says "Term."

This is Mr. Slater's proposal on how to true up the terms of the IID transfer agreement with the exchange agreement; correct?

## A. This was never adopted, so I would have to read through it and remember. I assume that is what it says.

Q. Let me know when you're done.

MR. EMANUEL: I'm sorry. Which parts?
THE COURT: He is looking at the section called "Term." It's on the third page of the proposal. It's on the third page of the proposal. Go ahead.

MR. EMANUEL: All the paragraphs?

THE COURT: He wants him to give it a scan and tell him when he's ready.

MR. PURCELL: This is in evidence, by the way. I wanted to make that statement.

MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, I haven't seen an

Mr. Kightlinger, there appears to be an email from Brian Thomas to you and Kathy Cole dated February 19, 2003.

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes.

MR. PURCELL: I would like to admit PTX 398 into evidence.

MR. EMANUEL: I am going to object to relevancy grounds with the proposal of February 2003. That is not what the parties agreed to. I didn't see any connection to the suit.

THE COURT: I think people are introducing a lot more documents than just the specific ones that happen to be the agreement. People are looking at documents that are evidence to what people are thinking at the time.

Are you objecting because this isn't actually the agreement?

MR. EMANUEL: I am objecting it is irrelevant because we are talking about a proposal prior to the Option-1, Option-2 which is the issue in this case.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled. 398 is admitted.

(Exhibit 398 was received into evidence.) MR. PURCELL: I was mistaken. PTX 56, the prior e-mail is not in evidence. I would like to move

indication by the witness he finished reading it.

THE COURT: He has. He so indicated with a gesture with his head. Let's proceed.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Taking a look at paragraph C, at the very bottom of the page, Mr. Slater writes, "If the financial equivalency of the exchange fee established by an independent DWR review is no greater than 15 percent of the lawful wheeling rate generally equivalent to the continuation of the exchange rate identified in the exchange agreement described in the IID/SDCWA transfer, then San Diego will agree to pay the exchange fee," and it goes on.

Mr. Slater, here in this proposal, is using the phrase "lawful wheeling rate" to describe the proposed charge that Metropolitan will levy; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And in fact, he specifies that the lawful wheeling rate in his view should be defined as generally equivalent to the continuation of the exchange rate identified in the exchange agreement; correct?

#### A. That is his proposal.

Q. And there is nothing in there about lawful conveyance costs or -- full conveyance costs, is there?

#### A. Not in this proposal.

Q. I would like to show you PTX 398.

that in.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. EMANUEL: The same objections. I would submit, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same ruling. Fifty-six is admitted.

(Exhibit 56 was received into evidence.)

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: This is Mr. Thomas writing to you. The subject line is "Latest Slater Proposal."

#### A. Yes.

Q. This is later in the same day as the previous email that you sent, PTX 56, transmitting Mr. Slater's proposal?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Thomas, at the end of paragraph A, writes, "It is clear where SDCWA is headed when they write that the, quote, 'lawful wheeling rate generally equivalent to the continuation of the exchange rate identified in the exchange agreement," end quote.

That's the language I read earlier from Mr. Slater's proposal; correct?

#### A. I think so, yes.

Q. That's the language where Mr. Slater defines the lawful wheeling rate as generally equivalent to the exchange rate in the prior exchange agreement?

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

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

A. Right.

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

Q. Mr. Thomas concludes, "This implies they believe that any rate different than the favorable rate they have received is not lawful and they are already arguing their case in their proposal."

Do you see that?

A. I do.

Q. This is an email from you to Dennis Underwood and Brian Thomas forwarding an email from Scott Slater?

A. Yes.

Q. The date is August 27, 2003?

A. Yes.

Q. This was during the negotiations and what became the final 2003 exchange agreement?

A. Correct.

Q. It was three weeks or a month or so before it got approved?

A. Yes.

Q. So here Mr. Slater is giving you a number of deal points. And this does relate to the Option-2 proposal on the canal line; correct?

A. Not this part here, but maybe further down.

Q. Let's scroll down to the point -- points three and four.

So Point 3 does lay out Option-2, a version of

if that's all right.

Let's look at Point 4. Mr. Slater's proposal is "San Diego will pay the lawful wheeling rate on all water in the CRA and no lobbying per the language, Jeff, you previously proposed and agreed in the exchange agreement."

A. Yes.

Q. What Mr. Slater is proposing is a lawful wheeling rate; correct? That is what San Diego is going to pay?

A. Those are the words he's using.

Q. The words he is not using is full conveyance cost; correct?

A. People throughout this process have used "wheeling" and "conveyance" almost as synonyms for each other. They aren't, but people throughout have used it as shorthand. So you will see in proposals where we say an exchange agreement, yet people call it a wheeling agreement. It's clearly an exchange agreement and not a wheeling agreement.

Often, you will see in the PowerPoints -- I know San Diego in some of their PowerPoints -- would put wheeling at the start of it to describe the exchange agreement. I know I did the same myself when I would talk to the board. It just became a colloquialism to be

1347

1345

Option-2, the canal lining deal; correct?

## A. Part of it. The part about the 82 million is a completely separate issue.

Q. But it does sketch out the terms of the canal lining, the assignment of canal lining to San Diego, the State sending 235 million -- I think he means to San Diego for the canal lining.

A. Yes.

Q. So by this point, Mr. Slater was getting Option-2 on the table as something for Metropolitan to consider; correct?

A. Well, we were still debating deal points. If the part about the 82 million is separate and ended up not being in the agreement, the part about (f) MWD will also move the --

THE COURT REPORTER: You'll have to say that again.

THE COURT: Can you start that again? What you are doing is squishing your words together when you think what you are saying is not as important as what you are about to say. But the court reporter still has to get every single word down.

Let's have the question one more time and the answer.

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Let me just move on, actually,

synonymous with each other, wheeling and conveyance, but they do have different meanings.

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, Mr. Slater here is proposing that the rate San Diego pay be lawful; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. He doesn't say anything about providing Met with its full conveyance costs; he says lawful rate?

A. He does use the word "lawful."

Q. Let's look at DTX 841. So, Mr. Kightlinger, this is an email from -- and it is in evidence from this morning -- from Olga Rittershaus at Hatch and Parent. It is to a number of people, including you.

Do you see your email address there?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Underwood, your co-lead negotiator?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Slater, for that matter, is one of the two recipients, as well?

A. Yes.

Q. And right after Mr. Slater, Ms. Stapleton, who is Mr. Slater's co-lead negotiator for the Water Authority?

A. Yes.

Q. This is really sending -- the recipient list on this basically includes all the significant parties

1348

involved in the negotiation; correct?  A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes.  10  Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting ready to present this to its board?  A. Yesh, I believe so. The third week of  September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  13  "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.  The Week of September, Somewhere in that time frame.
A. Yes.  Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  A. Yes.  Q. And this's not to be too obvious about it, but that's two-and-a-half weeks or so after the previous email we looked at?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes.  Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting ready to present this to its board?  A. Yesh, I believe so. The third week of September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben. Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  13
Q. And this is dated December 16, 2003?  4
4 A. Yes.  Q. And that's not to be too obvious about it, but that's two-and-a-half weeks or so after the previous email we looked at?  A. Yes. Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes. Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting ready to present this to its board?  A. Yesh, I believe so. The third week of September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben. Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions," Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement." Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes. Q. That's Option-2? A. It's an outline of it, yes. Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  13 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  2 Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  A Cyes, actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  "San Tiego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  "San Tiego affects or so after the previous of 66  66  67  68  88  9  10  11  12  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  18  19  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  19  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  38  49  40  41  41  41  41  41  41  41  41  41
but that's two-and-a-half weeks or so after the previous email we looked at?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes.  Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting ready to present this to its board?  A. Yesh, I believe so. The third week of  September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  13  A. Ido.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
mail we looked at?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting ready to present this to its board?  A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of  September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  Table 1  "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  The Canal Lining Assignment agreement; correct?  A. It's an Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  Table 3  Table 4  Table 4  Table 4  Table 4  Table 5  Table 6  Table 7  Table
A. Yes.  Q. Farther along in the negotiations?  10 A. Yes.  11 Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting 11 ready to present this to its board?  A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of 13 September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  16 MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben. 17 Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions." 18 Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement." 20 Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct? 21 A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes. 22 Q. That's Option-2? 23 Q. That's Option-2? 24 A. It's an outline of it, yes. 25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 Do you see that?  3 A. I do.  8 B 9 10 11 12 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 18 19 19 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 20 21 21 22 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 20 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 20 21 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 21 22 23 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 21 22 23 21 24 25 27 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 21 22 23 23 21 24 25 27 28 29 29 20 20 21 21 21 21 22 22 23 23 21 21 21 22 23 23 21 24 25 27 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 21 21 21 21 22 22 23 23 21 21 21 22 23 23 21 21 21 21 21 22 23 23 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21
9 Q. Farther along in the negotiations? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting 12 ready to present this to its board? 13 A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of 14 September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame. 15 time frame. 16 MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben. 17 Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions." 18 Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline 19 of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement." 20 Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal 21 lining assignment agreement; correct? 22 A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes. 23 Q. That's Option-2? 24 A. It's an outline of it, yes. 25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions," 2
A. Yes.  10 A. Yes.  11 Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting  12 ready to present this to its board?  13 A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of  14 September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  15 MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  16 MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  17 Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  18 Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline  19 of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  20 Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal  21 lining assignment agreement; correct?  22 A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  23 Q. That's Option-2?  24 A. It's an outline of it, yes.  25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  20  21  21  22  23  24  24  25  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  25  1349  138  14  15  16  17  28  29  21  21  22  23  24  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  20  20  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  20  20  21  21  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  2
11 Q. This is around the time San Diego was getting 12 ready to present this to its board? 13 A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of 14 September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that 15 time frame. 16 MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben. 17 Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions." 18 Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline 19 of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement." 20 Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal 21 lining assignment agreement; correct? 22 A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes. 23 Q. That's Option-2? 24 A. It's an outline of it, yes. 25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions," 2
ready to present this to its board?  A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of  September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben. Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  O. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  O. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  13  14  15  16  17  18  19  20  20  21  21  21  22  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes. 22  23  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes. 24  25  O. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  135  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
A. Yeah, I believe so. The third week of  September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.  MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  Take the description of the Canal lining agreement in that time frame.  A. I do.  REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
September, fourth week of September, somewhere in that time frame.    16
time frame.  15
Idine Hand.  16 MR. PURCELL: Can we go to page 3, Ben.  17 Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  18 Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline  19 of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  20 Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal  21 lining assignment agreement; correct?  22 A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  23 Q. That's Option-2?  24 A. It's an outline of it, yes.  25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  2 Do you see that?  3 A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  5 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  6 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  7 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
17 Can you blow up Number A under "Conditions."  18 Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline  19 of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  20 Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal  21 lining assignment agreement; correct?  22 A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  23 Q. That's Option-2?  24 A. It's an outline of it, yes.  25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  27  28  29  29  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  29  20  20  20  20  20  20  20
Actually, can we get the heading, "The Outline  of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal  lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  The Conditions is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal is provided in
Actually, call we get the heading. The Outline  of the Canal Lining Assignment Agreement."  Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal  lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Q. So this is Mr. Slater's outline of the canal lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  1349  138  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
lining assignment agreement; correct?  A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  Q. That's Option-2?  A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  3  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  3  3  3  21  22  23  24  25  27  28  29  29  20  21  22  23  24  25  25  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  25  26  27  28  29  29  20  20  21  20  21  22  23  24  25  25  25  26  27  28  28  29  29  20  20  21  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  25  25  26  27  28  28  29  29  29  20  20  21  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  25  25  27  28  28  29  29  20  20  20  21  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  25  25  27  28  28  29  29  20  20  20  21  21  22  23  24  25  25  25  27  28  28  29  29  20  20  20  21  20  20  20  21  20  20
A. Yes, I assume that's from him, yes.  22 23 Q. That's Option-2? 24 A. It's an outline of it, yes. 25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate." Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  3 A. I do.
23 Q. That's Option-2? 24 A. It's an outline of it, yes. 25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate." 2 Do you see that? 3 A. I do.  23 24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 21 21 22 25 25 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 25 25 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 25 25 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 25 25 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 25 25 26 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
24 A. It's an outline of it, yes. 25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate." 2 Do you see that? 3 A. I do.  24 25 26 27 28 29 29 20 21 21 22 25 25 25 27 28 29 20 21 21 22 25 25 25 25 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 25 25 27 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 24 25 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 22 24 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
A. It's an outline of it, yes.  Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate." Do you see that?  A. I do.  24 25 25 27 28 29 24 25 25 25 27 28 3 A. I do.
25 Q. Right. And Point Number 2 under "Conditions,"  1349  135  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  3 3
1349  1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate."  Do you see that?  A. I do.  1349  REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  3
1 "San Diego agrees to pay the lawful wheeling rate." 2 Do you see that? 3 A. I do. 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )
Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Do you see that?  A. I do.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
3 A. I do. STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
A. 1 uo.
A O A sain Mr. Clater is social that Can Diago is
Q. Again, Mr. Stater is saying that San Diego is
going to pay a lawful rate?
6 A. Yes.
Q. In exchange for Option-2; correct?  I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Short
8 <b>A. Correct.</b> Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of
Q. It doesn't say anything about paying conveyance California, hereby certify:
10 costs? That the court proceedings were taken down by me in
11 <b>A.</b> No.  10 stenotype at the time and place herein named and 11 thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided
Q. And then in paragraph 4, he says, "No judicial thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided transcription under my direction.
or administrative challenge to the board-established 13 I further certify that I am not interested in the
rate for the first five years."  14 event of the action.
Do you see that?  Do you see that?  Do you see that?  Vitness my hand this 13th day of April,
16 A. That is what it says.  16 2015, at San Francisco, California.
Q. He doesn't say anything about challenges to new 17
18 rate structures?
19 <b>A. No.</b>
MR. PURCELL: Your Honor. I know you have a 20
21 four delease hearing. We are about five minutes short
22 July Survey
THE COLDT. This is a good time. Well break
24 Certified Shorthand Reporter 25 State of California
I will see everybody tomorrow at ten o'clock.
1350

	1225.2	- 11 1 12(7.10	1215.15 1217.20	1004/04 1005/7 10 05
<u>A</u>	1335:3	addressed 1267:19	1315:15 1317:20 1318:8	1224:24 1225:7,12,25
<b>\$1.8</b> 1282:9	accomplish 1195:3	addressing 1185:17		1226:12,18,21 1229:1
<b>\$200</b> 1276:4	1215:1 1217:13 1222:23	adjudication 1162:12	agency 1162:8 1196:20	1229:14,18 1230:19
<b>\$235</b> 1167:24 1168:5		adjust 1314:5	1199:11	1231:5,6 1233:11
1168:21 1170:7	accomplished 1222:23	admin 1326:6 1328:1	<b>ago</b> 1324:10 1339:14	1234:15 1236:23
1204:15 1214:17	account 1246:13	Administration	agree 1196:7 1217:20	1237:1,2,10,16
1217:13 1220:25	1252:11 1255:14	1324:20	1224:22 1237:6	1238:2,16 1239:10
1231:7 1290:12	1259:8,18,23 1288:23	administrative 1179:22	1279:10 1285:15 1305:2 1306:6	1245:23 1246:1,17,23
1292:11 1300:18	accountant 1211:12	1180:9,13 1182:21 1194:23 1195:25		1247:10,15,15 1248:8
1301:2 1302:5,21	accounting 1313:24 1314:5	1202:10,13 1208:8	1337:21 1338:12,15 1342:11	1256:22 1266:19
<b>\$250</b> 1289:10	accrue 1311:2	1202.10,13 1208.8	agreed 1170:15 1174:8	1270:18,20 1271:4 1272:23,25 1273:5,11
<b>\$253</b> 1208:13 1212:17	accurate 1300:3 1330:9	1212.20 1223.4	1180:17 1186:11	1272.23,23 1273.3,11
1216:25 1217:5	1340:9	1229:12,15,19,20,24	1188:12,18 1212:23	1275:12,13,21
1218:20 1220:14	accurately 1172:18	1230:3,8,9,17	1212:24 1217:11	1278:25 1279:2,4,14
1221:13 1224:24	1183:8 1216:3	1237:12,15 1238:5	1225:3 1229:13	1279:15 1280:1,1,5
1225:18 1230:15	1292:14	1244:11 1251:19	1266:15,17 1286:17	1280:10,15 1281:3
1233:2 1292:13	ack@harkinsandcun	1252:3 1253:15	1294:18,21 1295:1	1280:10,13 1281:3
1296:16	1182:12	1324:18,22 1325:9	1294.18,21 1293.1	1287:11,12,14,16,20
\$35 1216:17 1290:13	acknowledged 1216:16	1326:3,13,18 1327:6	1298:6 1303:24	1288:2,5,10 1289:3
\$423 1219:17	1267:7	1327:9 1350:13	1306:17,19,22	1290:7,15 1291:2,10
\$500 1282:10	acquire 1196:10	admissions 1263:18	1307:13,15,17	1290:7,13 1291:2,10 1291:12,24 1297:22
\$550 1282:12	acre-feet 1165:23	admit 1343:5	1312:25 1335:19	1297:22,24 1298:10
<b>\$80</b> 1174:4,5,6 1203:22	1166:2 1205:19	admitted 1171:16	1339:9 1343:9 1347:5	1298:13,22,24
1245:3,17	1214:24 1216:22	1183:20 1189:2	agreeing 1186:22	1299:15,17 1300:4,4
<b>\$90</b> 1174:9 1204:9	1272:10,22 1275:6,9	1263:12,18 1265:5	1217:17 1221:25	1300:5,5,10 1301:4,5
1213:13 1217:7 1288:10 1289:11	1276:14 1277:17,24	1343:22 1344:6	agreement 1162:18,24	1301:12,23 1302:7
1292:3	1277:25 1278:2,6,8,8	adopt 1247:8 1250:15	1163:1,9,14,15,18,19	1303:25 1304:25
<b>\$907</b> 1219:17	1278:9 1280:13,18	adopted 1157:10	1163:21,25 1164:4,6	1306:11,16,25 1307:2
A-R-A-K-A-W-A	1311:5,5	1173:3 1179:25	1164:11,11,17,20,24	1307:14,21 1308:8,18
1262:12	acre-foot 1174:5,6,9	1195:7 1228:15	1165:3,19 1166:5,6,9	1308:18,21,21,22,25
A-R-N-O-U-T 1262:22	1213:13 1216:25	1230:16 1255:6	1166:11,13,23 1167:2	1308:25 1309:3,4,7,8
<b>a.m</b> 1160:3	1247:25 1288:11,24	1341:13	1167:3,18 1168:11,19	1309:9 1310:23
abeyance 1197:10	1289:10,11 1292:4,13	adoption 1182:5	1169:1,16,20,25	1311:16 1315:1,4,5
ability 1165:15 1168:16	1296:17	1195:24	1170:2,3,21 1174:8	1317:12 1322:13
1169:24 1179:24	acres 1205:5	adroit 1181:12	1175:2,9,16,20	1326:1,8 1327:22
1238:5 1255:9	act 1238:20 1274:11,15	advance 1283:22	1178:24 1180:24	1329:5,21,25 1331:15
1323:12,25 1324:5	action 1191:1 1255:9	advantage 1312:19	1181:10,16 1183:14	1332:2 1333:1,25
1325:15,21 1335:8	1266:7,12 1352:14	advise 1209:5,9	1184:9 1185:12	1335:12 1336:18
able 1169:14 1183:1	active 1251:2	advocacy 1253:13	1186:12,20 1188:14	1337:3 1340:23
1195:21 1275:20	actual 1179:1 1288:3	advocate 1191:13	1189:5,6,15 1190:21	1341:4,5,11,12
1277:22 1278:3	1310:1	<b>affairs</b> 1181:9	1191:5 1192:19	1342:10,20 1343:13
1309:9,20 1314:10	ad 1283:7,11	affect 1169:19 1240:6	1194:12 1195:18,19	1343:17 1344:19,25
1323:7 1335:23	add 1240:9	1285:25	1195:22 1196:21	1345:14 1346:14
1337:22	added 1281:1	affirmative 1232:18	1197:25 1198:10	1347:6,18,19,19,20
absolute 1252:23	addition 1172:13	afford 1178:4	1199:6 1200:6,17,21	1347:24 1349:19,21
absolutely 1252:24	1173:1 1199:3	afforded 1331:23	1201:7,13 1204:8	agreements 1162:23
1268:16 1309:10	1200:11 1263:25	afternoon 1269:3	1206:8,9,10,11,15,15	1196:22 1199:12
<b>absorb</b> 1253:13	1264:10 1272:11	1316:25 1317:1	1206:21,23 1207:4,9	1229:2 1279:1,21
accept 1196:3 1250:4,7	1292:9 additional 1164:17	<b>ag-to-urban</b> 1197:15 <b>agencies</b> 1171:8 1172:4	1208:13,16 1209:6,10 1209:16,20,22 1210:1	1283:18 1290:20 1298:2,3,4,6 1299:6,6
acceptable 1180:9	1207:20 1213:17	1172:10 1176:13	1209.16,20,22 1210.1	1298.2,3,4,6 1299.6,6 1299:10,22 1300:1
1243:12 1253:16	1207.20 1213.17	1184:5,21 1185:3,9	1210.0,17 1211.23	agrees 1188:22 1350:1
acceptance 1298:5	1270:8	1194:5 1199:11	1213:11,16,23 1214:1	agricultural 1162:3
accepted 1180:11	address 1267:18	1237:20 1250:16	1217:9 1219:5,14	1277:2,7,8 1312:22
access 1189:13 1208:21	1288:6 1305:15	1270:1,2,3,6,9,11	1221:19 1222:2,3,8	agriculture 1221:6
1230:11 1286:4,7	1331:24 1340:23	1284:3,20,23 1285:22	1222:13,17,21,24,25	ahadlock@kvn.com
1292:14 1294:19,20 1309:20,23 1312:8	1348:13	1286:4 1310:4	1223:2,12 1224:16,21	1158:7
1307.40,43 1314.0			,,-1	
	•	•	1	1

ahead 1181:6 1203:5	analyzed 1220:13	applied 1179:1	arrived 1295:2	Authority 1157:6
1227:6 1228:9 1234:8		appliment 1193:20	Article 1194:3	1160:7 1162:14,17,22
1242:10,14 1260:22	1235:13 1300:1	apply 1185:4 1199:21	articulation 1224:20	1162:25 1163:16
1293:18 1304:18	ANN 1352:6	1328:22	ascribed 1227:22	1164:2,4,21 1165:9
1312:2 1313:7 1331:6	annual 1282:8 1309:14	apportion 1278:21	ascribing 1189:24	1165:12,17 1166:4,9
1336:25 1341:19	annually 1161:18	apportion 1276.21 apportioning 1212:15	aside 1169:7	1166:16,25 1170:4,6
aimed 1335:9	1218:14	apportionment	asked 1211:4 1227:4	1170:10 1171:10
<b>Alameda</b> 1158:16	answer 1192:24	1277:16 1278:10	1240:10 1245:3	1172:19,23 1173:13
albatross 1274:19	1202:24 1214:21	appreciate 1244:19	1254:1 1256:24	1174:11 1175:3,13
All-American 1274:1	1223:4,25 1232:19	1267:24	1257:23 1259:3,5,14	1179:5 1180:10,17
1289:25	1233:25 1234:18,19	approach 1218:13	1260:13,19 1296:11	1182:15 1184:19
all-in 1281:16	1234:22 1241:4	1219:20 1220:2,6	1301:3 1304:23	1189:6,14 1190:7,10
allocated 1189:16	1249:2 1255:6,11,17	1281:11 1284:7	1315:8	1190:12,21,24
1190:4,22 1267:17	1256:7 1257:9 1258:1	approached 1274:8	asking 1258:15	1191:13 1201:5,7,18
allocating 1191:7	1259:22 1260:22	1289:4	1259:24 1260:14,15	1204:21,24 1260:15
allocation 1190:1,23	1326:23 1327:3	approaches 1218:7	1317:2	1261:18 1271:3
1191:19,25 1207:18	1338:6 1346:24	appropriate 1174:22	aspect 1212:11,13	1272:12,15,18,24
1211:4,19 1222:3,8	answered 1208:2	1266:4	assessed 1270:8	1273:3 1276:19
1222:24 1227:21	1227:4 1256:24	appropriated 1168:6,7	1334:11	1287:5 1290:6,22
1230:19 1231:5	answering 1326:25	1290:23 1299:1	assessing 1221:4	1291:5,16 1292:8
1247:15 1281:19	1338:4	appropriateness	assets 1300:19	1294:6,16,18 1295:11
1297:24 1298:9,12	answers 1259:13	1211:18	assign 1214:15 1292:11	1295:14 1296:5,14,19
1299:7 1300:4 1335:1	anticipated 1209:25	appropriating 1290:14	assigned 1299:3,4	1296:23 1297:5,11,16
1337:5,24	1275:14	appropriation 1167:23	assigning 1220:24	1298:16 1299:3,4
allocations 1189:20	anybody 1177:15	1298:19,25 1299:8	assignment 1216:9,15	1301:13 1302:8,19,23
1191:14 1192:16,20	1201:9 1249:7 1251:7	approval 1186:25	1231:6 1346:5	1303:2 1304:3,20,21
1233:8	1251:9	approve 1247:5	1349:19,21	1305:10,22 1306:1
<b>allow</b> 1197:17,21	apart 1288:24	approved 1345:17	assistant 1187:9	1308:10,13 1309:7
1311:24	Apologize 1175:25	approximation 1287:9	1215:21	1312:8 1313:10
allowed 1285:21	apparent 1271:8	<b>April</b> 1157:11,17	ASSOCIATES	1331:17,22 1332:6
allows 1327:5 1332:5	<b>appeal</b> 1193:7,10,12	1160:2 1244:2	1157:22	1333:21 1334:24
alluded 1180:21	appealing 1273:24	1352:15	assume 1170:15 1226:6	1335:15 1336:5,13
alternative 1267:5,7	Appeals 1256:7	aqueduct 1173:5,14	1284:17 1341:14	1337:4,11,11,22
ambit 1178:21	APPEARANCES	1205:19 1206:1	1349:22	1338:11 1339:2,3
amend 1213:23	1158:1	1245:8 1246:12,14	assumed 1218:14,18,24	1348:22
1287:21 1305:20	appears 1219:1 1343:1	1278:1,3 1280:16,17	1219:13 1267:12	<b>Authority's</b> 1183:9,12
1324:18 1326:17,17	Appellate 1193:9	1309:19	assuming 1219:15	1189:19 1191:5,10
1327:6,9 1328:1	appended 1185:25	aquifer 1205:15	1220:14 1246:7	1279:4 1293:21
amended 1162:17	applicable 1173:3	Arakawa 1262:11 ardent 1191:13	1263:6,6	1335:7 authorization 1167:22
1324:20	1176:11,12,18 1177:6		assumptions 1267:10 assurance 1187:2	
amending 1305:20 amendment 1182:25	1177:12,20,22 1178:21 1179:2,7,9	area 1161:11 1227:9 1285:25 1312:24	attach 1187:19	1168:17 authorized 1328:6,7
amount 1204:9	1179:11 1180:12,19	arguing 1323:17	attached 1187:14	avail 1249:16 1334:12
1219:23 1220:19	1180:22 1181:8	1345:5	1188:1 1289:15	available 1199:11
1226:22 1246:19	1182:23 1183:3,10	argument 1304:7	1340:12	1245:8,9,13,16
1275:2,10 1277:7	1184:4,21 1185:2,8	1319:20	attack 1196:24	1245:8,9,13,10
1289:13 1303:23	1194:25 1195:8	argumentative 1261:10	attack 1170.24	1277:19 1309:14
1311:10,11,17,19	1194.23 1193.8	1323:15	attention 1196:22	1310:3 1311:10,18,18
1313:2 1314:11	1233:15 1234:16	arithmetically 1247:25	1237:9 1245:1	1312:15 1313:5,13,16
amounted 1289:12	1235:4 1236:14	<b>Arizona</b> 1277:23	1332:12	1313:19,19,21 1314:4
ample 1197:20	1237:14,19 1238:11	1278:3,18	attorney 1314:24	aware 1179:3 1201:4
analysis 1209:17	1249:15 1252:19	Arnout 1262:22	attractive 1276:7,15	1201:17,21 1207:1,6
1211:9,23 1212:7	1317:18,19 1318:4,7	arose 1301:7	attributable 1189:24	1247:8 1284:22
1218:18,23 1227:7,8	1319:17 1322:14	arranged 1219:10	<b>AUDREY</b> 1158:4	1329:22 1337:10,11
1227:16 1260:3	1325:11,23 1326:5,9	arrangement 1250:7	August 1169:10 1177:1	
1274:6 1275:1	1326:15 1327:12	1272:2,3 1273:1	1177:8 1186:4,14,17	B
1292:25 1300:16	1333:3 1334:6	arrangements 1283:4	1345:11	<b>b</b> 1158:12 1230:5,9
analyze 1227:2	application 1228:20	1311:12	Australia 1161:22	1235:2 1245:9
	:=			

D E D C 12(2-22	1175.33 1107.1	1202-25 1207-4 5 7 0	hundler 1227-10	agnal 1160.2 0 1160.12
<b>B-E-R-G</b> 1262:23	1175:22 1187:1	1293:25 1297:4,5,7,9	bundles 1337:19	canal 1168:3,9 1169:12
1263:1 P.D.LA. N. 1262:17	1188:10 1200:1	1300:22 1303:9,22	<b>burden</b> 1267:2,18	1170:8,14,16 1185:20
<b>B-R-I-A-N</b> 1262:17	1204:25 1206:19	1308:1 1317:17	Bureau 1274:3 1313:23	1186:21 1188:3
back 1165:22 1183:16	1219:7 1227:9	1318:3 1326:9	<b>bureaucrat</b> 1174:16	1204:15 1214:16,23
1184:1 1194:16	1228:13,18 1230:20	1347:25 1349:12	bury 1197:21	1214:24 1216:9,15,23
1203:20 1208:9	1231:16 1249:12	board-established	business 1162:9,10	1217:14 1220:25
1223:21 1240:25	1254:21 1256:2	1350:13	1205:13 1206:1	1221:22 1222:9
1241:1 1245:2	1257:6 1262:13	boardroom 1299:25	1261:16,18	1223:8 1231:7
1246:22 1253:7	1265:17 1288:13	boards 1297:21	<b>buy</b> 1172:7	1270:22 1273:14,16
1264:23 1271:7,16	1290:22 1296:13	1299:16 <b>Bob</b> 1163:4 1191:12	C	1274:4 1275:25
1273:18 1275:22	1328:18 1329:10		C 1342:4	1276:17 1289:25 1292:10 1297:25
1276:1 1281:5 1287:17 1288:9	1330:15 1333:10 1345:3 1349:13	1233:16 1250:1 1296:13	C-A-D-I-Z 1205:11	
1287:17 1288:9	believed 1189:23	bodies 1192:4	C-A-D-1-Z 1205:11 CA 1157:24	1298:3,14 1301:1 1302:5,20 1345:21
1293:21 1294:7,12 1297:13 1322:25	1201:7 1225:8 1289:8	boilerplate 1199:9,10	CA 1137:24 Cadiz 1205:1,2,5,7,14	1346:1,4,5,7 1349:19
1324:3	belong 1319:6	book 1230:5 1241:1,1	calculated 1226:22,24	1349:19
background 1273:13	belongs 1286:2	books 1161:14	1261:4 1296:20,23	canals 1272:6 1274:1
ballpark 1282:6 1292:2	Ben 1181:21 1182:18	borrowed 1199:10	calculating 1192:10	1274:11 1275:7,22
Barbara 1352:3,7	1198:2 1317:7 1325:3	boss 1320:15	calculations 1259:3,15	12/4.11 12/3.7,22 1290:9,12
bargain 1303:17	1349:16	<b>bottom</b> 1167:7 1175:6	California 1157:1,9,11	capable 1170:17
barriers 1194:11	beneficiary 1310:8	1194:20 1198:17	1157:17 1158:6,10,13	capacity 1171:9 1273:9
base 1278:10	benefit 1168:8 1205:22	1226:20 1233:9	1158:17 1160:1	1309:23 1312:20
based 1169:8 1179:10	1289:22 1309:12	1342:5	1161:17,22 1162:12	1313:4
1190:14 1207:2	1310:13,22 1312:16	brainchild 1214:6	1166:24 1167:24	capital 1288:23
1246:24 1259:2	1310:13,22 1312:10	BRAUNIG 1158:5	1171:19 1174:17	capture 1179:13
1240:24 1237:2	benefits 1217:18	breach 1200:4,7,8,10	1194:3 1214:18	1183:8
1303:25 1313:1	1247:14,16,17 1248:8	1247:6 1266:8,12,15	1244:1 1275:3	care 1261:16,18
1337:23	1275:16,18 1309:3,6	1266:16,22	1277:10,16,22 1278:7	Carl 1163:12 1177:3
bases 1256:21 1266:13	1309:11,24 1310:5	break 1210:18,24	1278:16,18,23 1279:9	1181:12,12,17,19
basic 1277:16	1312:7	1227:1,12 1229:7	1279:23 1280:6,9,12	1182:9
basically 1214:15	Berg 1262:22	1302:13 1307:3,6	1282:10 1288:17	carriage 1311:1 1312:5
1266:13 1338:12,22	Bernardino 1205:6	1350:23	1289:1,3,7,14,18,20	carried 1281:1
1339:20 1348:25	best 1199:17 1208:4	<b>Brian</b> 1163:11 1177:2	1289:22 1290:8,15	carves 1326:11
basin 1278:13,15	1273:22 1285:7,9	1191:17 1192:7	1292:12 1299:9	case 1157:7 1193:9,10
basins 1286:5	better 1314:18	1233:17 1262:17	1300:18 1302:22	1193:18 1207:1
basis 1190:13 1193:21	beyond 1278:2	1296:12 1329:5	1352:2,8,16,25	1208:18 1210:8
1235:5 1245:22	big 1281:25 1286:1	1340:4 1343:1 1345:9	California's 1172:15	1211:3 1212:13
1246:2 1252:16	<b>billion</b> 1282:9	bridge 1289:5,7,14,19	1277:14	1227:19 1229:7
1266:8,21 1267:22	<b>Billions</b> 1197:16	brief 1202:24 1265:15	call 1160:6 1197:22	1231:3,3 1253:19
1309:14	binder 1187:22	1265:25 1267:23	1237:9 1245:1	1256:5,21 1264:16,17
Bates 1245:2	1215:15 1223:21	<b>briefed</b> 1300:15	1347:18	1265:18 1266:25
<b>Battery</b> 1157:24	1317:9	briefest 1189:23	called 1160:12 1161:16	1267:15 1268:11
1158:6	<b>binding</b> 1167:23	briefly 1169:5 1202:2	1205:1 1222:12	1271:16 1296:12
Bay 1193:18	1168:17,24 1169:15	1265:19 1266:1	1268:19 1270:21	1304:11,16,25
began 1185:19 1273:10	bit 1285:1 1325:4	bring 1253:7 1322:21	1278:23 1292:20	1311:22 1329:23
1273:22,25 1281:10	blank 1304:24	bringing 1172:12	1308:9,18 1309:17	1332:7 1343:20
1282:17	blended 1312:13,15	<b>broad</b> 1187:12	1321:14 1332:17	1345:5
beginning 1198:22	blending 1312:12	broader 1201:3	1341:17	case-in-chief 1261:24
1234:9 1241:4 1254:8	<b>blow</b> 1349:17	brought 1256:13	<b>calling</b> 1323:17	cases 1162:12 1264:12
1281:9	<b>board</b> 1176:10,17	1307:25	calls 1160:8 1268:14	catch 1313:6
behalf 1176:13 1184:5	1186:25 1187:3	BROWN 1157:22	1272:19 1293:14	catching 1215:14
1185:8 1237:20	1188:9,17 1215:17	Brownstein 1161:6	1311:4	1239:21 1254:13,13
1317:20 1340:4	1218:14 1219:3	<b>budget</b> 1169:6 1282:8	campaign 1196:10	category 1179:18
belief 1217:23 1234:13	1237:18 1251:3,4	<b>build</b> 1272:6 1274:8	<b>Campbell</b> 1163:4,4	cause 1266:7,12
1242:19 1249:9,13	1269:19 1270:8,9,15	<b>build-up</b> 1272:19	1191:12 1192:14	cc's 1182:14
1251:8,11	1271:22 1273:21	<b>building</b> 1288:23	1215:17,20,21	central 1279:3
<b>believe</b> 1163:10	1284:15,17 1292:19	<b>bundled</b> 1281:7,8,16,18	1233:16 1250:2	CEO 1205:1 1286:24
1170:17 1173:5	1292:21,22,23 1293:3	1281:22	1296:14	<b>certain</b> 1179:10

1212 15 1220 11	1245 17 1246 0	l 1201.24	1222 0 1220 0	1 1261 22
1212:15 1229:11	1245:17 1246:9	clips 1281:24	1233:8 1328:9	1261:23
1250:12,20 1255:17	1259:20 1283:19	clock 1207:25	1338:18	concluded 1193:19
1261:2 1263:17	1315:25 1316:6	closure 1243:9 1280:21	communication	1220:15
1272:6 1301:8 1319:5	1317:16 1325:10	<b>co-lead</b> 1348:15,21	1234:25 1235:8	concludes 1345:2
certainly 1209:19	1342:15	co-terminus 1195:17	1247:2,8	conclusion 1194:22
1210:22 1217:11	<b>charged</b> 1226:17	Coachella 1274:1	communications	1271:23 1293:15
1232:16 1256:8	1229:2 1230:7	1279:9 1289:25	1177:2 1233:10	1324:8 1325:7
1264:9 1281:1	1246:24 1267:4	<b>code</b> 1173:1,5 1178:5	companies 1162:3	1334:16
1322:20	<b>charges</b> 1176:10	1179:21,22,25 1180:6	company 1205:3,23	conclusions 1280:10
CERTIFICATE	1182:22 1183:6	1180:9,13 1195:25	comparable 1177:10	concurrence 1297:20
1352:1	1194:24 1207:18	1202:10 1208:9	compared 1164:11	condition 1166:17
<b>Certified</b> 1352:6,24	1208:25 1226:22	1212:20 1225:4	1219:14 1220:9	1168:2,6,12 1169:16
certify 1352:8,13	1228:13 1237:17	1226:23 1227:3,15,15	compensation 1193:22	1169:21 1170:7
cetera 1312:18 1338:15	1266:20 1267:16	1227:17 1228:21	competent 1211:11,11	1200:4,9 1222:11
<b>CFO</b> 1163:5 1191:12	1317:17 1318:4	1229:12,15,19,21,24	complained 1337:8	1245:8,9,12 1279:3
1211:5 1329:9	1325:10 1326:8,8,14	1230:4,8,10,17	complaining 1337:4	1291:1
<b>chain</b> 1182:8	1334:10 1338:16	1237:15 1238:5	complaint 1247:3	conditions 1166:14
Chairman 1171:7	charging 1234:14	1244:11 1251:19,24	complete 1259:6,16	1167:8,12,16 1172:5
Chairperson 1171:7	chart 1173:18,22	1252:5,16 1253:15	completed 1303:7	1188:21 1276:23,25
challenge 1179:24	cheaper 1315:13	1255:7,13,14 1324:19	completely 1346:3	1282:21 1287:24
1182:21 1195:7,21,25	chief 1269:12,15	1324:20,22 1326:6,18	compliance 1210:19	1305:21 1349:17,25
1301:5,22 1303:16	1286:23 1296:12	1327:6,9 1328:1	complicated 1214:14	conduct 1250:21
1304:3,20,22 1305:4	1329:7	Cole 1343:2	complied 1227:2,14,17	confident 1290:25
1305:6,23 1323:7	China 1161:23	collection 1279:1	1229:9,11	
1303.6,23 1323.7	choice 1293:2 1297:11		comply 1179:6 1180:8	confining 1181:14 confirm 1188:5
		collective 1286:2		1313:24
1327:11,23 1328:4	choose 1294:1,7	collectively 1185:10	1180:19 1229:18,23	conflict 1173:9 1293:11
1331:18 1333:23	chose 1202:15 1294:3	colloquialism 1347:25	1230:7,8	
1350:13	Chris 1171:7	colloquy 1242:8	component 1315:16	conflicts 1197:19
challenged 1217:1	chunks 1275:4	Colorado 1172:15	components 1189:7,11	confused 1216:19
1304:2	circling 1197:4,10	1173:4,14 1205:19,25	1206:17 1210:19	confusing 1198:19
challenges 1275:19	circumstances 1249:11	1271:11 1277:3,11,15	1217:1 1220:8	Congress 1274:10,10
1276:3 1305:18	1250:19	1278:12,15,21,21	1225:22 1227:1,13	1274:15
1328:6 1350:17	cities 1162:6	1279:10,22 1290:3	1229:8 1231:21,25	conjunction 1324:12
challenging 1195:23	City 1235:13	1312:10,14	1247:7 1296:10	1325:19
1208:17 1304:24	claim 1256:21	<b>column</b> 1245:7	1315:19 1338:23	connection 1343:9
1326:13 1328:12	claimed 1247:6	columns 1245:7	compound 1302:11	consented 1208:24
<b>change</b> 1183:13	1267:21	come 1170:6,10	compromise 1204:9	1212:22 1213:2,5
1237:13 1238:4,10,10	<b>claiming</b> 1207:2,7	1197:19 1273:13	computer-aided	1226:21 1229:3
1238:15 1239:7	clarification 1193:25	1275:5 1281:4	1352:11	<b>conserve</b> 1271:13
1298:13 1301:25	<b>clarity</b> 1336:20	1289:14,16 1291:1	concedes 1267:2	1313:22
1305:12,21 1307:13	clause 1301:21	1294:24,24 1303:9	concept 1182:4	conserved 1196:11
1307:14 1326:4	clauses 1239:19	1306:2 1308:10,13	concern 1164:9	1275:2,10 1312:24
<b>changed</b> 1256:15	<b>clear</b> 1181:17 1195:20	1316:8,13	1169:13 1172:14	1313:23,25
1287:23 1300:24	1279:11 1294:22	comeback 1301:23	1240:3,4 1255:5	conserves 1271:4
1307:16,18 1324:25	1304:8,14 1310:17	comfortable 1330:5	1278:14 1289:1	1312:21
changes 1240:5	1333:20 1344:16	coming 1228:3 1243:9	1302:4,7,18,23	consider 1346:11
1256:14 1287:13,17	cleared 1181:4	1277:6 1281:18	1303:3,23 1305:8,11	considerable 1172:5
1305:3,23 1322:21,24	clearly 1333:15	1283:4 1303:8	concerned 1168:15	consideration 1206:8
1323:3 1328:13	1347:19	commitment 1165:4	1240:5 1301:24	1216:10 1217:3
changing 1324:23	clerk 1160:16,20	1167:23 1168:16,24	1305:2 1328:12	1220:24 1221:3,17
1328:1	1170:25 1203:10	1169:15 1196:13	concerning 1335:24	1231:8,9,11
characterize 1197:4		1302:24	concerns 1164:5,8	considered 1285:23
Characterize 11974	1 1261:21 1262:24	1302.24		
	1261:21 1262:24 1268:23			
<b>charge</b> 1165:5 1173:13	1268:23	commits 1246:18	1165:8,11 1166:9	consistent 1176:25
<b>charge</b> 1165:5 1173:13 1174:22 1176:9	1268:23 client 1175:14 1209:5	commits 1246:18 committing 1204:14	1165:8,11 1166:9 1239:22 1285:18	consistent 1176:25 1195:8 1228:16,20
<b>charge</b> 1165:5 1173:13 1174:22 1176:9 1184:20 1185:13	1268:23 <b>client</b> 1175:14 1209:5 1209:10,19 1211:24	commits 1246:18 committing 1204:14 common 1172:12	1165:8,11 1166:9 1239:22 1285:18 1301:16,19 1305:16	consistent 1176:25 1195:8 1228:16,20 consistently 1180:5
<b>charge</b> 1165:5 1173:13 1174:22 1176:9 1184:20 1185:13 1193:13 1194:24	1268:23 client 1175:14 1209:5 1209:10,19 1211:24 1211:24,25	commits 1246:18 committing 1204:14 common 1172:12 commonly 1162:6	1165:8,11 1166:9 1239:22 1285:18 1301:16,19 1305:16 1331:24 1334:8,25	consistent 1176:25 1195:8 1228:16,20 consistently 1180:5 1181:17 1185:11
<b>charge</b> 1165:5 1173:13 1174:22 1176:9 1184:20 1185:13	1268:23 <b>client</b> 1175:14 1209:5 1209:10,19 1211:24	commits 1246:18 committing 1204:14 common 1172:12	1165:8,11 1166:9 1239:22 1285:18 1301:16,19 1305:16	consistent 1176:25 1195:8 1228:16,20 consistently 1180:5

	I		İ	I
constitute 1200:12	1313:12 1314:7	1213:15,20,21,24,25	1284:24 1288:14	1312:7 1314:23
Constitution 1194:4	1315:24 1317:6	1214:4,5,12,18	1289:8 1291:11	1324:9
constitutional 1253:20	1318:10 1319:13,19	1215:1,2,4 1216:1,6	1294:20 1296:6,9,11	course 1206:10
construct 1274:7	1320:6,18 1321:25	1216:13,14,24 1217:6	1302:25 1310:12	1220:20 1225:24
1298:3 1338:16	1322:5	1217:10,14,15,18	1337:24 1347:13	1262:6 1267:2
constructed 1220:7	contracts 1279:18	1218:21,22 1219:24	cost-effective 1274:7	1277:10 1286:9
construction 1275:8,20	1310:9	1219:25 1221:1,8,15	1276:7	1305:25 1312:25
1298:2	contractual 1299:2	1221:25 1222:1,4,6	cost-effectively	1330:19
construction-type	contradicted 1267:11	1222:25 1223:7,14	1275:11	courses 1161:19
1276:3	contradicting 1228:2	1224:25 1225:1,4,5	costs 1189:16,24	court 1157:1 1160:6,9
construe 1193:8	contrast 1311:16	1226:23 1227:3	1190:2,4,22 1191:7	1164:15 1170:23
consummation 1218:2	1314:6	1229:15,16,19,20,25	1193:21 1202:14	1171:16 1177:15
consumption 1278:5	conversations 1177:9	1230:1 1231:8,10,13	1208:17,21 1212:15	1178:15 1179:16
contact 1235:6 1250:21	1181:18,19 1295:10	1231:14,22 1232:8,9	1218:8 1220:9,14	1181:4 1183:20,22,24
contain 1166:13	convey 1235:18	1232:12 1238:6,7,11	1226:2,15 1227:21	1189:2 1191:22
1173:11,19 1194:13	1242:18 1251:7,10	1238:12 1240:6,7	1241:22 1258:9	1192:1,3,12 1193:2,7
1198:5	1293:20	1245:19,23 1246:20	1259:7,11,12,17,20	1193:9,11,18 1194:18
contained 1200:5	conveyance 1176:12	1246:21 1247:15,18	1260:16 1266:19	1200:24 1201:23,25
contemplated 1209:22	1184:4,14 1185:8	1248:6,9,10 1255:9	1267:12,20 1275:16	1200:24 1201:23,23
1211:8	1213:20 1223:13	1255:10,18,19 1257:9	1275:17 1281:17,21	1202.2,21 1203.2,3,9
contemporaneous	1226:22 1228:14	1258:4 1259:19	1282:1,2,3,4,11	1207:11 1210:11,15
1222:21	1231:12,17 1237:19	1270:16 1274:21	1284:25 1285:19	1212:3 1215:11
contend 1183:3	1246:25 1250:11	1276:10 1274:21	1288:23 1292:13,15	1223:20,22 1224:4
contended 1271:21	1266:20 1267:12,17	1283:22 1284:18	1294:21 1300:20	1226:8 1227:5 1228:3
contends 1206:17	1281:20,23 1292:13	1285:3 1287:2,3	1308:2 1315:21	1228:9 1230:22
contentions 1212:12	1294:25 1296:6	1288:11,20 1292:16	1319:5 1335:2,17	1231:1 1232:14,23
contest 1182:7 1195:5	1300:19 1302:25	1294:3,4 1295:12	1336:15 1337:6,12,13	1233:23 1234:2,5,8
contested 1207:18,19	1316:1 1317:19	1298:7,8,17,18	1337:16 1338:13	1234:18,20 1236:4,20
contesting 1182:4	1318:7 1321:4	1301:14 1302:8	1339:4,7,9,13,19,20	1237:7 1239:2
1194:23 1208:7	1326:10 1338:16	1303:18 1305:16	1339:24 1340:23	1240:18 1241:3
1325:9	1339:9,12,19,24	1308:18,22,23	1342:23,23 1348:7	1242:5,10,14 1243:16
context 1184:14 1224:1	1342:23,23 1347:12	1313:13 1315:7	1350:10	1244:9,15,17,19
1228:25 1234:1	1347:15 1348:1,7	1316:1 1317:12	counsel 1158:15 1171:9	1247:21,23 1248:3,12
1242:12 1248:16	1350:9	1318:5,11 1319:3,7,8	1245:3 1253:25	1248:16,23 1249:1,2
1254:17,21 1328:19	conveyed 1175:10	1319:10,14,23 1320:8	1254:10 1255:6,11	1255:21 1256:7,19,25
contexts 1179:23	1234:13 1235:23	1320:14,16,18	1257:8 1286:23	1257:2,6,13 1258:20
contingency 1290:23	1234:13 1233:23	1321:15,22 1322:9	1287:8 1302:9 1317:5	1260:21 1261:2,12,14
contingent 1272:24	1238:1 1242:17	1323:4,13 1324:1,2	1320:7 1323:17	1261:19,22 1262:3
1273:1	1249:13 1252:24	1325:24 1327:6	1326:22,25 1336:21	1263:4,11,21 1264:2
continually 1185:18	1253:4	1328:22 1329:6,12	counsel's 1163:5,7	1264:7 1265:3,5,10
continuation 1342:9,19	conveying 1219:22	1330:3 1334:1	counseling 1162:9	1265:16,19 1266:1,9
1344:18	1249:8 1253:11	1337:13 1341:12	count 1279:20	1267:14,15,24 1268:5
<b>continue</b> 1217:23	1282:23 1288:21	1342:15,20 1344:21	counter 1196:2,3	1268:11,16 1274:23
1244:9 1271:14	1289:9	1345:15,21 1346:1,11	1301:21	1274:24 1275:12
1291:10	cooling-off 1306:3	1347:9,13 1348:4	counterpart 1191:16	1281:8 1285:17
continued 1207:19	1308:9	1349:1,21 1350:7,8	counterparts 1163:8	1291:13 1293:3,16
1255:1 1280:20	copies 1264:2,7	corrected 1249:5	1287:4	1295:7,21 1302:11,16
continues 1248:7	copy 1171:10 1215:16	correctly 1331:4	countless 1196:11	1303:20 1304:10,15
continuing 1164:9	correct 1166:1,3	corresponding 1165:20	county 1157:2 1162:14	1306:13 1307:5,9
1169:13 1200:12	1190:23 1198:1	corresion 1312:18	1162:22 1166:24	1309:6 1311:21
continuous 1235:8	1204:10,12,16 1205:6	cost 1189:20 1190:23	1191:12 1272:12	1314:13,17,19,22
contract 1168:19	1205:17,20,21,23	1191:14,18,25	1283:17 1291:5,16	1316:15,21 1318:18
1196:5 1199:25	1206:5,6,12,13	1192:16,20 1207:18	1352:3,7	1319:22 1320:3
1213:4 1220:21	1207:4,16 1208:9,10	1212:18 1219:21	couple 1170:20	1321:11 1323:16,19
1221:15 1226:16	1208:14,18,19,22,23	1220:3,16 1233:8	1176:14 1193:24	1326:24 1330:25
1229:22,25 1251:22	1200:14,16,17,22,23	1259:1,10,11,19	1196:15 1234:21	1331:5,10 1336:9,24
1266:8,12 1288:14	1211:1,2,10 1212:16	1261:6 1275:15	1261:25 1276:13	1331:3,10 1330:3,24
1304:8,9,13 1313:1	1212:20 1213:1,3,14	1281:18 1282:4	1283:15 1297:18	1341:17,21 1342:2
1301.0,7,13 1313.1	1212.20 1213.1,3,14	1201.10 1202.T	1205.15 127/.10	15 11.17,21 1572.2
	I		I	I

1343:11,21 1344:2,5 1346:16,18,21 1350:23 1352:9 Court's 1262:7 1267:11 courteous 1330:23 courtesy 1264:7 cover 1187:9,19 1213:19.23 1288:18 **covered** 1300:20 1314:16 **CPF-10-510830** 1157:7 **CPF-12-512466** 1157:8 **CRA** 1186:10 1347:4 create 1165:8,12,16 1178:25 1184:13 1244:15 created 1201:18 credit 1311:6 crime 1319:1 crisis 1169:6 cross 1159:2,8 1258:20 cross-examination 1203:6,13,15 1244:21 1257:21 1258:23 1316:21,23 CSR 1157:20 1352:6 1352:23 culls 1321:21 Cunningham 1163:12 1177:3 1182:10 current 1219:9 1287:7 1294:19 currently 1161:5 Curtis 1157:3 1160:4 1244.4 **Cushman** 1159:4 1163:7 1257:9,12,16 1257:21 custom 1199:11 cuts 1312:17 cycle 1284:10

### D

**D** 1159:1 1167:15,21 **D-E-N** 1262:23,25 **D-E-V-E-N** 1262:20 **Dam** 1310:9,10 damages 1258:10,13 1260:7,13 1261:4 1266:24,25 1267:3,21 **Dan** 1158:4 1163:6 1317:2 date 1178:23 1181:15 1182:25 1237:16 1326:7 1345:11 dated 1203:20 1215:18 1244:24 1343:2 1349:3

**David** 1171:6 1174:15 day 1238:3 1248:9 1268:1 1344:11 1352:15 day-to-day 1161:11 days 1193:15 deadline 1280:9 1299:13 deal 1170:7,11 1186:24 1188:8,16 1196:1,14 1204:13 1214:14 1215:6 1217:20 1221:4,5,18 1246:4 1265:16 1272:12 1274:4,5,18 1276:18 1290:18 1306:10,12 1306:15,20,22 1316:17,18 1329:19 1339:22 1345:20 1346:1,12 **dealing** 1199:15 1206:10 1321:25 **debating** 1346:12 debited 1311:14 decade 1272:14 decades 1276:6 deceased 1287:1 **December** 1280:9,15 1299:13 1349:3 decide 1297:9 decided 1282:13 1297:9 decision 1199:17 1221:10 1282:13 1284:14 1292:23,24 1293:21 decisions 1193:7 deduct 1258:12 1261:6 deduction 1311:9 deem 1311:18 deemed 1200:9 1313:12,18 **deeming** 1314:4 deeply 1168:15 **Defendant** 1158:10 1268:19 **Defendant's** 1159:8 1215:9 Defendants 1157:14 defense 1230:21 1231:2 1231:3 **defined** 1342:18 defines 1198:12 1344:23 definition 1318:20

definitive 1190:16

1192:18,24

degree 1161:8

delaying 1335:9 delays 1198:25 delegated 1212:6 delegates 1235:16 **delegation** 1235:10,11 1235:13 deliver 1165:21 1246:18 1272:7 1273:2 1281:10 1290:16 1312:9 1313:2 1314:10 1315:22 delivered 1165:18 1311:5,11,19 1314:9 deliveries 1165:5 1313:6,9,9 1314:3 delivering 1275:20 delivery 1273:4 demand 1220:7 demands 1312:23 Den 1262:22 **Denham** 1259:2,14 1260:3,6 1261:4 1267:12 **Denham's** 1267:9 **Dennis** 1159:4 1163:7 1163:10 1177:2 1233:18 1257:8,12,16 1286:24 1320:19,20 1345:8 Department 1157:4 1160:4 1171:6,19 1173:8 1244:4 1290:15 1298:22 depending 1219:12 1279:20 1285:25 depends 1172:15 depo 1330:15,24 deposition 1157:23 1159:19 1206:5 1223:16 1226:6 1227:24 1232:3 1233:21 1238:23 1240:16,17,23 1248:14 1262:1,3,5 1262:17,19 1330:12 1330:17 1331:9 1334:20 **describe** 1342:14 1347:23 described 1167:25 1342:10 **describes** 1216:3,5 desert 1205:16 designated 1206:3 1207:14,17,22 1228:24 1262:10

designations 1262:1,3,9 **designed** 1322:1,5 detail 1202:22 **detailed** 1284:12 determination 1210:25 1252:18 1262:7 1333:23 determinative 1246:16 determine 1180:13 1202:14 1227:2,13 1229:8 1293:25 1309:15 **determined** 1198:9,10 1261:2 1274:6 1283:13 1297:6 1322:12.14 1332:24 1333:2 1334:4,5 determining 1175:10 develop 1282:24 developed 1283:18 1338:20 developing 1283:6 development 1172:14 **Deven** 1262:19 devising 1252:6 devoutly 1218:3 **dialogue** 1176:25 1181:11 1251:3 **dictated** 1289:18 **Diego** 1157:6 1162:14 1162:21 1164:1 1165:13,15 1166:24 1170:14,19 1172:6 1173:5,9 1178:4 1180:1 1182:4,20 1183:1 1184:10,11 1185:2,4,6 1186:9,21 1188:4,9,22 1191:12 1195:6,12,21 1196:7 1196:9 1199:14 1200:19 1201:10,11 1201:13 1202:11 1204:21,23 1206:3,16 1207:2,6,14 1208:7 1208:17,24 1211:5 1212:22,23,24 1213:17,23 1214:15 1214:17 1215:17 1216:18 1217:11,17 1217:21 1218:2,4,18 1218:24 1219:21,22 1220:13,20,25 1221:4 1221:11 1222:5 1226:1,21 1228:13,19 1228:23 1229:22 1233:12,13 1234:13 1234:15 1235:9 1238:3,9,14,19

1239:22 1240:4 1245:6,23 1246:1,25 1247:5,7,9,13 1248:7 1249:8 1250:17,22 1252:13.20 1253:12 1255:7 1256:20,22 1259:7,16 1266:14,15 1266:17.23 1267:2.19 1269:24 1270:10,11 1271:6,6 1272:11,14 1273:3,8 1279:11 1282:21 1284:16 1288:3,19 1289:2,9 1291:5 1293:1,4,6 1297:9,11 1298:1,23 1300:16 1301:24 1302:1 1303:12 1305:9,13 1310:15 1311:13 1312:13 1313:2 1314:4 1315:10 1319:13,18 1321:4 1322:11,18 1323:6 1324:24 1325:8 1326:12 1327:11,15,19,23 1328:4,9,11 1333:16 1334:2 1342:11 1346:5,7 1347:3,9,22 1348:4 1349:11 1350:1.4 **Diego's** 1175:11 1179:24 1186:25 1188:17 1199:7 1201:19 1206:9 1212:12 1231:8 1239:6 1240:6 1248:5 1251:4,9 1267:6,18 1289:10 1309:16 1311:4 1312:23 1323:12,24 1324:5 1325:15,21 1340:10 difference 1219:13 1259:9,10 1313:18 differences 1308:24 1309:5 1314:25 different 1190:25 1193:16,16 1214:3 1245:20,22 1264:25 1271:5 1281:15 1285:6,7,9,21,24,24 1286:6,8 1303:11 1309:3 1313:15

1334:16 1337:18

1345:3 1348:2

**difficult** 1186:18

1255:14

differential 1252:15

1253:11 1278:17

1263:2,5,7 1330:3,6

diligence 1209:18	1296:18 1321:15,18	1195:22	email 1158:7,8,8,9,14	1344:17,24
direct 1159:2,8 1161:1	1321:21,24 1322:3,8	duties 1212:6	1159:13,16,20 1182:3	era 1271:8
1208:12 1227:9	1322:12,19,22	DWR 1342:7	1182:8,14,19 1183:8	Eric 1158:12 1269:3
1240:4 1244:25	1323:13,25 1332:17	D W K 1542.7	1185:25,25 1186:3	escalate 1218:15,20
1257:19 1269:6	1332:23 1334:3		1187:13,20 1247:1	escalated 1175:23
1314:22 1320:22	disputes 1321:22,25	E 1157:3 1159:1 1160:4	1340:4,12 1343:1	1219:10,15 1220:9,15
1339:8	1322:2 1333:13	1244:4	1344:12 1345:8,9	escalation 1219:12
direction 1352:12	disseminated 1284:20	e-mail 1343:25	1348:10,13 1349:7	escalator 1175:24
directly 1234:25	dissent 1296:18,22,25	earlier 1179:22	emailed 1338:22	1217:8
director 1171:5,19	distance 1192:4	1207:15 1214:17	emails 1338:24	<b>ESQ</b> 1158:3,4,4,5,5,12
1173:7	distinguish 1249:2	1234:12 1322:11	Emanuel 1158:11,12	1158:16 1160:11
directors 1176:10,17	district 1157:9,11	1324:9 1344:20	1269:3,4,7 1274:24	1244:6
1215:18 1218:14	1158:10 1164:13,13	early 1172:16 1283:17	1275:14 1286:11	essence 1292:7
1219:3 1237:18	1166:24 1172:7	1299:19 1337:4	1291:14 1293:8,19	essentially 1246:4
		1341:3	-	•
1269:19,21,22 1270:6	1193:17,17 1197:9		1294:11 1295:9,23	1276:15 1310:12
1284:15 1297:21	1271:9,24 1279:5	earnest 1280:20	1302:14,17 1303:25	establish 1283:21
1308:1 1317:17	1309:17	earthen 1275:7	1304:19 1306:14	1319:1
1318:4 1326:9	districts 1162:6	eastern 1205:6	1307:3,7,11 1312:3	established 1175:9
disagree 1306:7	distrust 1301:8,14	easy 1275:4	1314:12,15,18,23	1180:13 1218:13
1327:17	dividing 1275:25	economic 1259:6,16	1316:16,19 1319:20	1252:4,8 1342:7
disagreement 1296:22	division 1193:16	educated 1247:24	1320:1 1323:14,17	establishing 1182:22
disbelieve 1340:18	divvied 1337:18	educational 1161:20	1326:22 1330:13,19	establishment 1316:4
disclosed 1297:6,10	document 1166:20	effect 1163:15 1168:19	1330:22 1331:3	estimate 1272:17
1315:15	1181:22 1187:8	1168:24 1174:12,14	1336:7,19 1338:3,7	1279:19
discourage 1285:11	1215:12 1291:15	1180:24 1182:24	1341:16,20,25 1343:7	estimates 1275:5
discrepancy 1164:10	1298:20	1234:14 1237:16	1343:18 1344:3	et 1173:1 1312:18
discretion 1176:2,5	documents 1221:24	1238:16 1239:9	employed 1161:5,6	1338:15
1202:20	1343:12,14	1242:20 1276:24	1269:8	evaluate 1218:8 1220:3
discriminate 1302:1	dog 1240:11 1241:10	1284:11 1286:14	employee 1329:11	evaluating 1219:21
1305:9	1241:17	1326:7 1338:22	<b>enables</b> 1222:8,8	1268:8
discriminated 1239:25	doing 1217:17 1218:18	effective 1157:12	enabling 1274:11	evaluation 1188:4
1250:9 1255:8,12	1218:23,23 1221:9	1200:6 1277:5,9	<b>encourage</b> 1194:8,10	evaporation 1311:2
discriminatory 1185:1	1229:4 1232:5 1293:5	effectively 1283:7	1285:10 1333:11	evening 1351:1,2
1305:13	1296:16 1312:22	1288:19	<b>ended</b> 1346:13	event 1229:13 1299:24
discuss 1176:19,23	1317:4 1319:10,11	effectiveness 1275:15	engaged 1197:6	1319:14 1321:18
1180:22 1191:25	1327:15 1346:19	efficient 1312:3	<b>enjoy</b> 1248:7	1352:14
1318:2	dollars 1197:16	efficiently 1271:13,19	ensured 1197:3	events 1281:4
discussed 1185:14	1247:18 1276:5,13	1272:8	enter 1209:6,10,20	eventual 1292:24
1191:18 1226:13	1288:24	effort 1178:25 1196:20	1211:25 1264:1	eventually 1272:21
1231:20 1296:10	doubt 1209:14,25	1308:20	<b>entered</b> 1229:22	1273:14 1278:24
1303:22	1211:7,21,22 1316:5	efforts 1172:9 1193:24	1246:18 1264:11	1280:22 1292:22
discusses 1215:25	doubts 1209:20 1210:4	1194:7 1235:12,17	1271:3 1272:3,15	1303:23
1220:2	1210:23	eight 1194:20 1233:21	1273:21	everybody 1188:5
discussing 1214:2	dozen 1194:7	1274:14 1301:11	entering 1272:25	1243:17 1250:25
1218:12 1231:13	dpurcell@kvn.com	either 1178:25 1209:11	entire 1244:13 1286:9	1270:6 1293:4 1300:2
1273:11 1322:11	1158:8	1209:21 1211:8	entities 1194:5	1350:25
discussion 1177:24	<b>draft</b> 1183:1	1232:11 1235:2	entitled 1198:4 1273:9	evidence 1159:12
1254:1 1282:18	drafted 1200:1	1275:23 1277:18	1322:18,20,21	1166:19 1170:23,24
1283:1 1295:2	draftsperson 1181:13	1319:12 1333:13	entitlement 1248:5	1171:14,17 1172:11
discussions 1177:21	draw 1332:11	<b>elapsed</b> 1297:17	1271:11	1175:1 1181:23
1181:8 1191:23	dropped 1204:8	electric 1337:19	entity 1199:13	1183:18,25 1185:23
1192:6,14 1225:2,7	DTX 1181:21 1182:2	electricity 1337:19	environment 1174:23	1187:5 1188:25
1225:20 1234:11	1183:18,21,23,24	element 1197:11,12	environmental 1161:21	1189:3 1215:10
1281:1 1287:13	1187:4 1188:24	1238:20	1197:2	1230:20 1231:15
1293:7 1301:20	1189:2 1291:14	elements 1188:6	equal 1176:9 1313:10	1244:11 1261:25
1304:1 1328:10	1348:9	1227:22 1265:18	1317:16	1262:6 1263:3,14,17
dispute 1197:7,8	due 1209:18	1285:14 1291:4	equivalency 1342:6	1263:24 1264:5,11,13
1198:4,8,12 1204:5	duration 1173:6	1296:25	equivalent 1342:9,19	1264:22 1265:2,8
				<u> </u>
	•	-	•	•

1266:23 1267:10,15	1238:2 1245:23,25	1257:11 1261:20	fairly 1208:2	1163:18,19 1167:20
		1263:13 1265:1	fall 1204:25	· ·
1304:6,11,13,16	1246:17,23 1247:10			1171:25 1172:17
1330:16 1341:23	1247:14 1248:8	existed 1181:15	familiar 1230:2	1175:17,19 1176:16
1343:6,14,23,25	1256:22 1270:18,21	1227:20	1270:23 1273:16	1185:16,16 1186:7
1344:7 1348:10	1273:11,12,15	existence 1193:5	1300:11 1315:24	1194:22 1196:9
evidentiary 1262:7	1276:19 1280:1	existing 1163:15	1329:15	1198:9 1202:7,16
evolution 1179:13	1281:3 1286:16	1183:3 1217:8 1305:7	far 1167:4 1200:25	1213:14 1215:25
1193:6 1194:3 1240:5	1287:14 1288:3	1305:18	1201:4,11 1207:1,6	1216:8 1218:12
1252:12 1255:14	1291:2,9,11,24	expectation 1229:17	1294:2	1219:7,20 1225:3
evolutions 1256:3	1297:21,22 1300:4,10	experience 1179:10	<b>Farber</b> 1161:7	1245:7 1262:1,10,12
evolve 1195:25	1301:12 1302:6	1196:12	<b>farm</b> 1271:15	1262:22 1263:16
evolved 1250:20	1307:2,14 1308:18,22	experienced 1181:12	farming 1197:1	1264:5,15 1281:10
1252:22 1255:16,25	1308:25 1309:4,7,8	expert 1192:25 1193:1	Farther 1349:9	1291:8,9 1292:20
evolving 1179:12	1310:23 1311:16	1211:13 1262:19	fashion 1302:2,24	1294:6 1296:4
exactly 1251:16	1315:1,5 1317:12	expertise 1193:3	1303:11	1300:15 1309:12
1260:19 1265:1			favor 1285:2,13,14	1317:16 1322:13,19
	1329:4,21,25 1331:15	expiration 1249:10		
1279:12 1285:19	1332:2 1333:24	expired 1201:15,20	favorable 1345:3	1325:7 1326:16
1313:21 1318:18	1335:12 1336:18	<b>explain</b> 1169:4 1178:7	feared 1186:18	1327:8,13,24 1329:3
1339:21,21	1337:3 1340:23	1202:2 1274:24	feasibility 1274:6	1332:25 1334:4
exam 1244:25	1341:5,12 1342:6,9	1275:17 1280:7	1275:1 1276:8,10	1338:6 1350:14
examination 1161:1	1342:10,12,19,20	1281:8 1287:19	feasible 1274:7	<b>fit</b> 1178:21
1208:1,12 1255:23	1344:18,19,25,25	1309:6 1327:4	February 1334:23	<b>five</b> 1175:17,19,22
1257:19,23 1260:11	1345:14 1347:5,18,19	explained 1315:1	1336:21 1340:3	1194:22 1195:5
1269:6	1347:23 1350:7	explaining 1255:17	1343:2,8	1196:2,8 1198:10
<b>example</b> 1189:25	exchanges 1181:13	explanation 1313:15	Federal 1278:11	1219:11 1221:11
exceptions 1239:18	excluding 1226:1,13,14	<b>explore</b> 1185:19	fee 1221:2 1342:6,12	1249:10 1254:4,23
excerpt 1248:14,21	exclusively 1161:12	exposure 1165:17	feel 1210:7	1255:2,9,18 1262:5
excerpted 1262:4	excuse 1260:14	express 1301:16,19	felt 1197:6 1288:16,21	1266:21 1270:7
1264:18	excused 1257:3,4	expressed 1172:10,14	1288:22 1337:15	1278:7 1302:12
	execute 1168:16 1299:9	1255:5 1303:12	field 1179:11	1305:22 1306:16,17
Excerpts 1159:19				-
excess 1277:19	executed 1163:20	1305:8	Fifty-six 1344:5	1308:7,14 1314:17,18
exchange 1162:18,24	1166:4,25 1282:21	expression 1232:17	Figueroa 1158:13	1314:19 1316:9
1163:1,9,13,15,18,19	1299:18,22	extract 1320:4	file 1201:14,19 1265:25	1322:13,19 1325:8,16
1163:21 1164:3,5,10	executing 1181:15	extracted 1304:15	1331:17 1335:8,20,24	1327:12 1328:3
1164:17,20,23 1166:5	execution 1178:23	extremely 1174:15	1336:3 1337:22	1331:16 1332:8
1166:8,11,13,25	1183:13 1233:10	1300:17,19	<b>filed</b> 1262:9 1263:9	1333:1,25 1334:5,11
1167:3,17 1168:10,18	1246:23 1247:10	eyeglasses 1187:24	1268:7	1335:18,25 1337:21
1169:1,16,20,22,25	1308:7		<b>filing</b> 1247:3,9 1335:14	1350:14,21
1170:2 1172:8 1174:8	executive 1215:21	F	1335:16	five-minute 1203:9
1175:8,15 1180:24	1269:12,15	<b>f</b> 1346:14	fills 1278:1	1314:20
1182:3 1183:14	exercise 1176:4	<b>fabric</b> 1178:11	final 1345:14	<b>five-year</b> 1195:4,6,11
1184:8 1185:12	1198:24 1199:3,5	face 1229:10 1304:8,14	finalize 1299:15	1196:23 1197:20
1186:11 1189:5,5,15	1202:19 1210:7,12,18	facilitate 1194:8	finalized 1299:17	1198:6 1201:14,19
1190:20 1191:4	1210:24 1227:1,12	facilities 1313:4	Finally 1276:18	1254:2,18 1300:10,14
1194:12 1195:19,22	1229:5	fact 1206:16 1208:6	financial 1165:17	1303:17 1305:15
1197:17 1200:17,20	exercising 1198:25	1214:6 1232:10	1259:24 1296:13	
1201:6,13 1204:7	exhaustion 1197:12	1267:6 1290:7 1320:3	1308:1,5 1312:17	1306:3,11 1308:8,9 1322:10 1323:13,14
		1320:6 1321:20	•	,
1206:8,9,10,11,14,15	exhibit 1171:1,17		1329:7 1342:6	1323:18 1324:1
1206:21,23 1207:4,9	1181:25 1183:25	1342:17	find 1221:19	1335:6,13
1208:13,15 1210:6	1187:6 1189:3 1200:2	facts 1256:20	finding 1172:11	fixed 1175:16,17,19,23
1213:11 1216:11	1215:9 1230:3,5,21	failed 1266:16,23,24	findings 1267:11	1184:24 1204:11
1217:8 1219:5,14	1230:25 1231:15	1280:15 1333:16	fine 1258:18	1246:18,19
1221:19 1222:24	1236:23 1241:1	fails 1198:24	finish 1232:23 1302:14	flagged 1230:4
1223:12 1224:15,18	1244:12,13,15 1265:7	<b>failure</b> 1169:23 1200:4	1338:6	flip 1170:15 1303:1
1224:21 1225:7,25	1265:7 1291:13	1200:8,8,10	<b>finished</b> 1338:4 1342:1	1305:5
1226:21 1229:14	1294:12 1299:14	fair 1172:21 1183:11	firm 1161:6 1182:9	<b>floating</b> 1175:16
1233:11 1234:15	1343:23 1344:7	1248:17 1303:23	1309:17 1340:16	1176:1 1180:18
1236:23 1237:2	exhibits 1159:11	1327:3 1334:18	first 1160:17,20	Floor 1157:24 1158:13
			<u> </u>	
			1	•

focus 1167:7,15	frequently 1191:17	1217:18 1218:1	good 1160:6 1203:17	head 1342:3
1238:18	fresh 1265:14	1273:4 1326:25	1203:18 1240:18	headed 1344:16
focused 1161:10	front 1215:15 1331:10	1346:9 1349:11	1243:15,16 1269:3	heading 1188:21
Foley 1171:7	frustrated 1327:1	give 1169:22 1259:6,15	1287:23 1302:15	1332:16 1340:22
follow 1203:2 1327:20	frustration 1172:11	1272:17 1282:6	1307:3 1316:25	1341:9 1349:18
followed 1239:17	full 1165:23 1215:3	1287:9 1289:15	1317:1 1322:3	heads 1266:13,25
1263:8	1246:15 1268:24	1315:11 1330:9	1350:22,23 1351:1	hear 1192:4
<b>following</b> 1223:25	1278:3 1280:16	1341:21	goodwill 1197:18	heard 1201:9
1239:20	1281:11 1292:12,22	given 1170:12 1278:20	govern 1179:19	hearing 1350:21
follows 1160:13 1244:7	1292:23 1293:3	1284:23 1292:17	Government 1278:11	hearings 1271:22
1257:17 1268:20	1296:6,9,11 1300:19	1301:1	<b>Governor</b> 1172:13	held 1197:9 1271:22
forced 1246:10	1302:25 1309:19	gives 1319:13,18	1174:18	help 1286:6 1289:7,14
forecast 1220:7	1339:9,12,19,20,24	giving 1201:18 1302:18	<b>Governor's</b> 1169:9	1289:24,24
1246:10	1342:23 1347:12	1345:19	1192:10	helping 1289:5
foregoing 1324:21	1348:7	go 1167:14 1181:6	governors 1196:15	Hentschke 1163:6
foremost 1196:9	fully 1267:23	1183:16 1187:25	granted 1199:5 1200:5	Herculean 1196:17
1309:12	fund 1168:16 1169:14	1198:2 1201:3 1203:5	great 1187:23 1217:20	hey 1214:22
forensic 1209:17	1289:24	1203:7 1214:11	1274:18	high 1278:8 1290:24
1210:7,12,18,24	funding 1170:13	1203.7 1214.11	greater 1342:7	higher 1217:7 1288:15
1211:9,23 1227:1,11	1298:22	1240:16 1242:10,14	ground 1172:12	1288:16 1312:11
1229:4	funds 1169:7 1290:14	1240.10 1242.10,14	grounds 1343:8	highlight 1182:19
forever 1276:14	1290:16	1276:24 1281:5,24	groundwater 1162:11	highlighted 1264:20,21
form 1227:5 1237:12	further 1199:5 1244:7	1284:2,11 1285:20	1286:5,7,8 1290:2,13	1264:23 1292:7
1237:13 1303:2	1248:11 1253:21	1286:14 1288:17	groups 1197:2	1317:22
1322:3 1326:4	1255:20 1256:9	1293:18,24 1304:18	guarantee 1320:23	historic 1169:6 1197:14
forth 1267:23 1337:20	1257:1,17 1260:9	1308:17 1312:2	guaranteed 1273:9	1221:5 1225:12
Forty-five 1164:16	1261:13 1263:9	1313:21 1317:10	1309:12,23,23 1312:5	historical 1219:11
forum 1194:24 1238:8	1325:7 1345:22	1318:17,21,23 1321:2	1320:22 1321:3	1281:4
1238:15,20 1239:7	1352:13	1321:9 1322:25	1322:1,7	history 1197:15 1221:7
1325:9 1326:4,13	furthermore 1209:9	1324:3 1325:25	guess 1247:24,24	hit 1280:17
forums 1333:14	future 1300:24 1305:3	1331:6 1336:25	1330:25	hoc 1283:7,11
forward 1165:17	1328:2,14	1337:16 1341:7,8,19	guy 1191:16	hold 1192:23 1217:23
1188:7 1214:11	1520:2,11	1349:16	guy	1278:1
1221:14 1336:21	G	goes 1216:12 1230:12	H	Hon 1160:4 1244:4
1339:5	gap 1288:18 1289:5,6,6	1237:20 1248:5	HADLOCK 1158:4	Honor 1160:7 1179:14
forwarding 1345:9	1289:12,14,19	1342:12	half 1167:7,15 1194:7	1181:24 1183:17
forwards 1340:7	<b>Gastelum</b> 1163:12	going 1165:17 1179:12	1275:25 1276:1,1,2	1201:22 1215:10
found 1332:14	1169:9,18	1182:7,20 1186:19	1278:1 1280:16	1223:19,24 1224:3
foundation 1191:21	gate 1272:7	1194:10 1196:23	halfway 1324:17	1226:6 1227:24
1200:23 1207:10	gathered 1320:21	1197:16,18 1221:14	hall 1203:8 1268:15	1228:2 1230:20,21
1210:10 1247:20,22	general 1158:15 1163:4	1233:1 1234:20	hand 1352:15	1233:22 1234:4,7
1256:17 1295:5,20	1163:5,6 1171:22	1238:14,20 1239:6	hands 1197:17 1298:20	1236:25 1240:20
1301:18	1215:22 1216:5	1246:22 1251:21,23	handshake 1290:18	1242:7 1243:15
four 1269:25 1270:9	1227:8 1239:16	1252:7,19 1256:25	happen 1204:18 1314:1	1244:10 1248:13
1345:24 1350:21	1269:12,14 1287:7	1262:13,16 1263:23	1314:2,6 1343:13	1253:21 1256:17
Fourteen 1238:25	1319:12 1320:7	1268:7 1276:1	happened 1204:19	1257:5,14 1258:19
fourth 1173:22 1266:7	1330:2	1282:22,24 1283:1,3	1256:14 1300:6,7	1261:13,15 1263:10
1266:12 1277:24	generally 1176:11	1288:6,6 1289:19,20	1316:12	1263:15 1265:6
1278:2 1349:14	1184:4,20 1185:2,7	1291:3 1297:13	happening 1326:24	1266:6,14 1267:1,9
Frahm 1171:7,11	1237:18 1317:18	1299:12 1304:24	happy 1264:6	1267:22 1268:3,13,15
frame 1274:12 1283:17	1318:7 1326:9 1342:8	1306:6 1316:8,9	hard 1215:16	1269:3 1291:14
1336:22 1349:15	1342:18 1344:17,24	1317:4 1320:1 1336:7	Harkins 1182:9	1304:6 1307:3,7,11
framework 1227:8	generate 1276:13	1336:9 1339:5 1343:7	harm 1302:1	1316:19 1321:13
Francisco 1157:2,16,17	Generating 1310:11	1347:9 1350:5	harmed 1303:14	1323:15 1326:22
1157:24 1158:6	gentleman 1329:5	Goldberg 1158:5	Hatch 1340:15 1348:11	1330:17 1336:19
1160:1 1244:1	gentlemen 1187:14	1261:16,17,17,20,23	hatchet 1197:21	1338:3 1341:25
1352:16	gesture 1342:3	1262:25 1263:15	hate 1236:4	1344:4 1350:20
free 1183:2 1195:7	getting 1184:1 1217:12	1264:4,9 1265:6,9	Havasu 1310:24	HONORABLE 1157:3
J& 1100.B 1170.1	5	120,,, 1200.0,,		
	I	l	I	I

Hoover 1310:9 hope 1290:2 1331:3 hour 1317:24 hours 1196:12 **hundred** 1276:13 **hundreds** 1247:17 1276:6 Hvatt 1161:7 **Hyatt-Thermalito** 1310:11 hydroelectric 1310:9 1310:11 hypothetical 1259:25 I i.e 1183:2 **ID** 1159:12 idea 1184:25 1214:9

1228:4 1283:8 1284:8 1285:8 1299:21 1305:17 ideas 1216:6 1285:7,9 1285:21 1286:6 **identical** 1264:17 identification 1171:1 1181:25 1187:6 1230:25 **identified** 1342:10,20 1344:18 **identify** 1202:16 IID 1164:20 1165:5,19 1166:6,15 1168:25 1170:2 1173:13 1213:18 1219:22 1223:1 1270:21 1271:1,3,4,9,17,21 1272:4,5,12,16,18,24 1273:22 1276:17,19 1287:17 1288:3,19 1289:2 1311:4 1312:15,21 1313:2,5 1313:9,11,21 1341:4 1341:11 **IID's** 1279:12 **IID/SDCWA** 1291:21 1342:11 illegal 1206:18 1207:2 1207:7 1209:6,12 1225:8,10,22 1231:17 1231:22 1232:1,12,16 1232:21 1233:3 1235:2 1241:22 1242:20,24 1243:14 1261:3,3 illegality 1256:21 immediately 1197:2 1248:21 1280:12

1302:5 1325:6

impact 1259:6,16,24 impasse 1186:18 impeachment 1228:1,3 1228:5 1330:13 **Imperial** 1164:12.13 1165:14 1172:7 1196:11 1197:1.9 1271:9.23 1272:1 1273:23 1279:4,11 1309:16 **impetus** 1281:1 1282:20 implement 1168:8 implementation 1209:11,15 1210:1,5 1211:8 1212:8 implemented 1170:18 implementing 1170:14 1170:16 1186:22 **implies** 1345:2 important 1179:5 1184:19,23 1197:13 1213:22 1222:22 1224:1 1232:7 1329:19 1346:20 impossible 1277:5 1318:14 **improper** 1189:25 1191:14 1261:3 include 1230:10 1260:6 1319.5 **included** 1167:17 1208:16 1212:25 1216:16 1217:1 1266:18 1297:10 1300:9 1324:20 **includes** 1163:10 1315:21 1332:21 1348:25 including 1182:24 1193:19 1200:16 1237:14 1284:16,24 1293:4 1295:25 1300:13 1326:6 1348:12 **inclusion** 1199:25 1212:18 1241:22 1336:14

incorrect 1183:4

**increase** 1213:13

increased 1261:6

**incurred** 1193:21

indexed 1213:13

independent 1174:21

indicated 1213:12,22

1218:1 1273:3 1342:7

1277:7

1219:22 1259:1,18

1267:14 1342:2 indication 1342:1 **Individually** 1212:4 individuals 1295:15 industrial 1162:3 **inflated** 1320:25 **inflation** 1219:10,16 1288:12 1292:5 **inflator** 1204:11 **influence** 1174:21 1194:4 **influenced** 1246:16 information 1172:8 1208:8 1259:1 1260:7 1284:19 1285:1 1297:15 1320:5 **informed** 1235:4 1257:8 1329:18 initial 1164:9 1175:23 1176:8 1179:20 1195:5 1208:12,16 1224:24 1230:15 1272:1 **initially** 1161:17 1181:11 1199:9 1213:12 **initiate** 1199:18 **input** 1175:14 **inputs** 1192:10 insecurity 1170:13 installments 1313:10 instance 1232:10,20 1285:20 institutions 1161:20 **instruct** 1260:6 intake 1310:24 intend 1201:2,14 1205:25 1318:24 1319:3 **intended** 1184:12 1195:3 1333:11 intent 1318:25 **intention** 1328:11 intercede 1173:8 **interest** 1274:18 1293:12 1305:14 interested 1157:10 1274:25 1289:5 1352:13 interests 1162:3 1197:1 1199:17 **interior** 1196:15 1280:8,12,14 interposed 1262:8 interpretation 1206:9 1237:13 1238:11,15

interpretations 1182:24 1183:3,7 interrogatories 1263:17 interrogatory 1159:14 1159:15 1263:21,25 1264:12,13,15,17,20 1264:20.25 interrupt 1236:4 interrupting 1326:23 intervention 1196:16 intimately 1329:15 introduce 1262:6 introducing 1343:11 invalid 1192:21 investigate 1209:17 **invoices** 1169:10 involved 1172:22 1177:1 1187:12 1279:19 1280:11 1349:1 **involves** 1270:20 involving 1283:17 irrelevant 1205:8 1343:18 **Irrigation** 1164:12,13 1172:7 1197:9 1271:9 1271:24 1279:4 1309:17 issue 1172:16 1182:21 1211:15 1232:7 1267:12,18,19 1273:8 1286:1 1288:1 1334:9 1335:25 1343:20 1346:3 issues 1161:15 1170:13 1329:24 1330:8 1334:7 1338:14 1340:23 1341:2 item 1173:23 1261:25 iterations 1179:23 **J** 1158:12 J-E-F-F-R-E-Y 1269:2 J-U-N-E 1262:15 Jack 1171:7 James 1163:5 JAN 1157:22

January 1157:12,12 1172:20 1173:11 1176:25 1177:8 1244:24 1284:11 1286:15 Jeff 1159:9 1163:11 1177:3 1181:19 1184:18 1186:11 1240:10 1241:9,16

1242:18 1251:13 1268:14,18 1347:4 **Jeffrey** 1269:1 Jim 1249:25 ikeker@kvn.com 1158:8 **JOHN** 1158:3,12 johnquinn@quinne... 1158:14 **JOSEPH** 1158:16 **Judge** 1160:4 1244:4 **judgment** 1190:17 1265:16 1266:7,10,11 judicial 1182:21 1194:24 1237:12 1238:8,15,20 1239:6 1325:9 1326:3,13 1350:12 July 1169:10 1183:10 jumped 1336:21 juncture 1268:7 June 1262:14 junta 1251:21 justify 1211:22 juxtaposing 1202:3,4

K K-I-G-H-T-L-I-N-G-... 1269:2 Karnow 1157:3 1160:4 1244:4 Kaseman 1163:12 1177:3 1181:12 1182:9,11,18 Kaseman's 1182:19 1183:8 **Kathy** 1343:2 Katz 1173:2 1193:8,25 keep 1323:19 keeping 1238:19 Keker 1158:3,3 1236:25 1237:4 1257:4,7,20 1258:18 1260:12,19,25 1261:13,15,17 1268:3 1268:10 Kennedy 1172:22 1174:2 1203:19 1244:24 1245:16 1246:5.6 Kennedy's 1172:17

1173:11,19 1174:11 Kenny 1171:6,18 kept 1329:18 key 1205:13 1222:7,10 1222:13,18 Kightlinger 1159:9 1163:11 1177:3,18,19

1238:21 1239:8

1326:5

1178:20 1181:3	1195:3 1199:8 1202:7	lawfulness 1316:5	1260:21 1270:25	1270:22 1273:14,16
	1238:9,14 1239:12,16			
1184:18 1186:3,13		laws 1178:21 1256:15	1273:12,18 1276:16	1274:1,4 1275:24,25
1225:2,6,13 1240:10	1240:9 1241:8	lawsuit 1201:14,19	1307:5,10 1314:19	1276:1,17 1289:25
1241:7,15 1253:4	1251:20 1252:25	1206:18 1247:9	1324:3 1331:6 1337:3	1292:10 1297:25
1268:14,18 1269:2	1317:15,21,25 1318:3	1256:13 1280:2	1338:6 1341:7,8	1298:3,14 1301:1
1270:17 1271:7	1322:16 1325:17,24	1316:10 1331:18	1342:3 1345:23	1302:6,20 1346:1,5,5
1288:8 1314:25	1328:16 1332:21	1335:8,14,16,20,24	1346:23 1347:2	1346:7 1349:19,21
1316:9,25 1317:11	1333:8 1344:20,23	1336:4 1337:23	1348:9	list 1163:10 1179:1,4
1321:14 1324:4,14	1347:4	lawyer 1161:4 1204:20	letter 1171:5,10 1172:1	1187:12 1348:24
1325:20 1327:21	large 1271:11	1209:2 1211:6	1173:11,19 1174:3,11	listed 1207:15
1328:15 1329:1	larger 1217:12 1221:18	1256:18 1319:23	1174:20 1194:21	listen 1210:13
1334:14 1336:5,13	largest 1197:15 1221:5	1320:2,4,9	1203:19,25 1244:23	listened 1192:5
1337:2 1339:1 1340:3	1270:12	lawyer's 1243:5	1247:1 1335:5	litigating 1162:11
1343:1 1348:3,9	lasted 1165:2	lawyers 1202:23	level 1251:3,5	litigation 1190:3,8,11
kind 1196:20 1217:16	lastly 1206:11	1320:12	levy 1342:15	1196:16 1197:2
knew 1206:16 1208:15	late 1282:17 1283:16	lay 1301:18 1327:18	lieu 1216:11	1199:18,20 1204:1
1209:6,10 1211:15	latest 1340:10 1344:9	1345:25	life 1178:24 1179:10	1235:21 1265:20
1212:17 1259:5,15	law 1161:6,8,11,14,17	lead 1162:21 1164:1	1221:15 1225:10	1300:24
1277:6	1161:20,21,21,24	1174:10 1199:7	1243:5 1301:4,22	little 1172:11 1260:21
know 1185:10 1201:11	1173:2,3,7 1176:11	1235:21 1286:22	limit 1179:24 1200:25	1282:10 1284:1
1202:8 1203:10	1176:18 1177:6,12,20	1287:6 1320:17	1325:15,21	1302:11 1314:13
1207:3,5,8,12,17,20	1177:22 1178:11,21	lead-in 1284:13	limitation 1203:1	1325:4
1210:4 1212:19	1178:23 1179:1,2,7,9 1179:11,13,18	leading 1233:10 1274:22 1285:16	1323:11,24 1335:6,13	live 1211:15 lobbying 1186:10
1225:18 1247:4,23 1249:4 1259:9	1180:12,19,22,23	1301:12 1303:19	limitations 1170:18 1178:9 1202:19	1347:4
1265:16,20 1266:3	1181:8,15 1182:9,23	1311:20,21,23 1312:1	1254:12,19,22 1255:1	local 1194:5
1267:25 1270:18	1183:4,10 1193:5,8	leads 1254:9	limited 1161:12 1173:6	loggerheads 1288:20
1277:14 1281:21	1193:12 1194:1,9,25	leaking 1275:6	1179:21 1180:23	long 1204:23 1218:3
1283:9,21 1285:4	1195:8 1198:11	left 1192:7	1181:9 1182:20	1242:8 1269:14,17
1304:6 1313:20	1206:12 1210:20	legal 1161:11 1162:13	1195:23 1324:6	1274:13 1283:24
1323:19 1339:21	1211:13 1227:9,19	1167:22 1187:9	1328:5	1284:12 1299:11,14
1341:15 1347:22,24	1228:17 1229:24	1210:2,25 1212:7,11	limiting 1182:7	1332:8
1350:20	1233:15 1234:16	1212:13 1227:3,8,14	limits 1176:2,4	long-term 1310:8
knowing 1212:24	1235:4 1236:14	1227:16 1293:14,16	line 1173:23 1226:20	long-time 1329:11
knowledge 1168:22	1237:14 1238:11,16	1319:21 1334:13	1233:9,21,25 1234:9	longer 1300:25
1225:25 1233:12,16	1238:21 1239:8	1336:2,2	1237:9 1238:23,23	look 1173:22 1215:8,16
1236:17 1272:23	1240:5 1249:15	legality 1209:15,21	1241:5,25 1242:6,9	1218:11 1221:11,18
knowledgeable 1206:4	1250:10,19 1252:12	1210:5 1211:7	1248:20,20,22 1254:8	1221:23 1222:2
1207:15,22 1213:7	1252:22 1253:19,20	1212:15	1254:15 1272:5	1223:16 1227:16
1329:23 1330:6	1255:14,16,25 1256:3	legally 1167:23	1274:11 1275:22	1230:3,5 1232:3
known 1173:2 1206:20	1256:5,14 1261:4	1168:16,24	1289:24 1290:8,12	1233:20 1236:22,24
1206:23 1214:3	1266:16 1317:18	legislation 1193:20	1291:20 1302:14	1240:15,23 1248:23
1256:21	1318:5,23 1319:12,17	1290:14,19	1331:9,9 1334:21,21	1254:6 1264:19
knows 1200:25	1322:14 1325:11,23	legislative 1237:12	1340:13 1344:9	1275:3 1291:20
т	1326:5,15 1327:12	1326:3	1345:21	1292:1,1,6 1309:14
<u>L</u>	1333:3 1334:6	legislature 1172:13,25	lined 1275:7	1317:5 1324:7,11
L.A 1214:15	lawful 1185:13,21	1173:3 1174:19	lines 1194:20 1223:18	1340:21 1342:4
labor 1281:24	1186:9,23 1188:23	1193:24 1194:8	1223:23 1226:7	1347:2 1348:9
lack 1165:11 1168:23	1192:16 1197:22	1288:18	1227:24 1238:24	looked 1203:19
lacked 1267:15 Lacks 1191:20	1224:19 1225:16 1231:14 1232:18	length 1164:10 1165:3 1195:18 1196:1	<b>lining</b> 1168:3,9 1169:12 1170:8,14,16 1185:20	1208:11 1275:23 1276:4 1349:7
Lacks 1191.20 Ladies 1187:13	1231.14 1232.18 1233:5 1267:8	1307:2	1186:22 1188:3	looking 1178:1,2
laid 1338:23	1315:25 1316:6,14	let's 1177:17 1183:16	1204:15 1214:16,23	1192:4 1194:18
Lake 1310:24	1318:11,12 1319:19	1194:16 1203:5,9	1214:24 1215:1	1196:25,25 1197:1
language 1176:1,4	1342:8,14,17,22	1213:11 1214:11	1214:24 1213:1	1239:17 1340:21
1177:9,10 1179:21,23	1344:17,24 1345:4	1215:8 1224:4 1232:3	1217:14 1220:25	1341:17 1343:13
1181:14 1184:3,8,12	1347:3,8 1348:4,7,8	1233:20 1236:22	1221:22 1222:9	looks 1332:13
1185:5 1186:10	1350:1,5	1240:15,16 1244:9	1223:8 1231:7	Los 1158:13,17
1	ĺ	ĺ		l ´

1235:13 1299:25
lose 1309:20
loss 1280:18 1311:2
losses 1311:1,2,6,7,14
1312:6 1314:11
lost 1193:14,20 1311:1
lot 1193:23 1199:14,15
1243:8 1253:8 1256::
1282:25 1284:12
1285:20 1304:6
1311:23 1343:12
loud 1172:2
low 1205:22 1288:10
lower 1310:8
lucky 1243:7
Luis 1193:18
lynchpin 1196:18
M

### magnitude 1243:3 **maintain** 1304:13 major 1312:19 making 1194:5 1221:9 1289:1 1314:3 **manager** 1163:4 1171:22 1215:22 1269:12,14 1287:7 1330:2 manger 1240:12 1241:10,17 marginal 1288:21 marked 1171:1 1181:25 1187:6 1230:25 1264:14 marked-up 1262:4 market 1310:2,13,20 1315:5 marketing 1283:2 match 1166:5 1312:23 matching 1341:4 material 1311:25 math 1296:16,16 matter 1172:12 1193:12 1229:24,24 1266:16 1294:9 1304:11 1318:19 1348:17 matters 1199:16 **Maureen** 1163:3 1233:17 1235:6 1250:1 1287:6 1295:16 maximization 1194:6 maximum 1165:23 mean 1177:25 1184:12 1192:4 1197:24 1202:5 1213:16 1214:19 1227:14

```
1283:15 1298:15
  1315:18 1316:15
meaning 1176:19,23
  1177:6,19 1183:9
  1195:18 1238:13
  1239:12 1328:16
meaningless 1328:17
meanings 1348:2
means 1273:3 1312:21
  1321:7 1327:14
  1346:6
meant 1177:23 1194:1
  1203:1 1283:12
measure 1266:24
  1314:10
meetings 1172:8
  1233:17,17 1235:15
melded 1220:7 1310:3
  1310:7,7,14,18
member 1176:13
  1184:5,21 1185:3,9
  1237:20 1246:24
  1250:16 1270:2
  1284:2,20,23 1285:22
  1310:4 1315:15
  1317:20 1318:8
members 1270:1,8,9
  1285:2 1300:22
  1310:13
memo 1174:20
memorandum 1215:16
  1215:23 1218:6
  1219:2 1220:2
  1221:10
mens 1319:1
mention 1317:25
  1323:3
mentioned 1240:3
  1298:9 1341:2
mere 1309:2
met 1165:16 1170:17
  1174:18 1175:10
  1179:21,21 1190:13
  1191:17 1195:9,20
  1197:7 1204:8,14,15
  1212:20 1217:3
  1220:20,24 1221:3
  1222:5 1226:23
  1227:3,15,16 1228:14
  1229:12,15,19,20,23
  1230:3,8,16 1231:17
  1231:20,24 1233:12
  1233:13 1234:13
  1235:10 1238:1,20
  1245:23 1246:18,24
  1247:2 1252:13
  1255:7 1257:8
  1259:20 1260:1,15
```

```
1262:8 1268:14
  1318:20 1319:2,9,14
  1319:19 1325:22
  1327:9 1329:11
  1348:6
Met's 1182:5 1194:14
  1197:22 1204:1
  1206:17 1207:2.7
  1212:20 1216:15,25
  1217:4 1230:6
  1231:11 1233:13
  1238:4 1247:6
  1262:10 1268:11
  1326:14 1329:9,16
  1331:25
Met-Colorado 1246:12
meter 1314:10
method 1252:6 1272:5
methodology 1175:9
  1253:16
methods 1271:5,12
  1273:23 1275:23
Metropolitan 1157:9
  1157:11 1158:10
  1162:17 1163:2,9,14
  1163:16,22 1164:4,19
  1164:24 1165:4
  1166:15,23 1167:17
  1168:8,11,14,20,23
  1169:3 1170:1
  1171:23 1172:6,20,24
  1173:10,12 1175:3
  1176:12,20 1178:5,19
  1179:6,17 1180:2,7
  1180:22 1181:7
  1182:15 1184:5,11,16
  1184:20,21 1185:7,12
  1185:13 1188:12,17
  1189:16 1190:4,22
  1191:7,16 1195:8,14
  1196:3 1199:14,24
  1200:16,20 1201:6,12
  1201:18 1202:12,15
  1214:19,20 1237:11
  1237:19 1250:10,14
  1250:15 1262:2
  1269:8,17,21 1271:20
  1272:2,4,11,25
  1273:2,18 1274:5,18
  1274:20,25 1276:8
  1277:24 1278:12
  1279:9 1280:15
  1282:4,13 1284:15
  1286:3,22 1288:13,17
  1289:8,16,22 1290:1
  1290:7,22 1291:6
  1292:8,18 1293:1
  1294:6,7,23 1295:24
```

1297:4 1298:1,21 1299:2,24 1300:21,25 1301:14,24 1303:6 1305:3,9,19,24 1306:12,15,19 1308:1 1309:19 1310:1,3,6 1310:23 1311:3 1312:10,12 1313:1 1314:9 1315:25 1317:19 1318:10,15 1320:9,12,18,23 1321:4 1324:18,25 1326:2,10,17 1327:5 1327:19,23,25 1328:6 1328:13 1330:2 1335:14 1336:6
1337:10,12 1338:13
1338:19 1339:2,10 1342:15 1346:10
Metropolitan's
1165:20 1166:10 1167:11 1169:10,19 1169:22 1170:12
1176:2,10,17,22 1177:5,11 1183:6
1189:7,20 1190:18
1191:6,11 1192:15,20 1195:16 1200:21
1201:8 1208:8
1237:18 1251:18
1281:9 1282:3,8 1283:5 1286:1
1292:17 1296:6
1298:15 1302:3,18
1303:3 1310:25 1311:7 1312:20
1313:3 1315:21
1313:3 1315:21 1317:17 1318:3 1320:7 1324:23
1320:7 1324:23 1326:9 1329:7,23
1331:13 1334:25
1335:3 1336:14
1337:5,23 <b>Mexico</b> 1196:25
mid-summer 1287:15
middle 1336:11
midway 1341:9 Mike 1294:11
million 1166:2 1167:24
1168:5,21 1170:8
1204:15 1214:17 1215:1 1216:17,19,20
1216:21 1217:13
1216:21 1217:13 1219:17,17,23,23 1220:16,25 1221:23
1231:7 1248:2 1276:5
1276:13 1277:17,25
1278:1,6,7,13

1280:13 1282:10,12 1290:12,12,13,23 1292:11 1300:18 1301:2 1302:21 1346:2.6.13 millions 1247:18 1282:7 1302:5 mind 1177:16 1185:6.6 1211:22 1338:8,9,10 minus 1314:11 minute 1257:10 1266:2 1314:17 1323:2 minutes 1302:13 1314:12,17,18,19 1324:10 1350:21 **Mischaracterizes** 1212:1 misinformation 1284:22 mission 1293:20 mistake 1206:11 mistaken 1318:16,22 1319:4 1330:15 1343:24 mix 1162:1 model 1220:7 **modeled** 1220:8 modify 1238:19 moment 1243:4 1268:8 moments 1261:24 1339:14 money 1168:7 1289:13 1289:20 1290:8,11 month 1246:20 1313:3 1345:16 months 1206:20 morning 1160:6 1203:17,18 1246:22 1348:11 Morro 1193:18 motion 1265:13,15 1266:2,5,6,6,9,13,14 1266:25 1267:22 1268:6,8 motivated 1280:23 motivation 1280:25 1300:13 mouth 1301:8 move 1164:20 1165:15 1166:15 1170:1 1171:13 1178:13 1179:14 1183:17 1188:24 1191:20 1194:10 1244:10,17 1246:8 1257:11 1258:16 1260:16 1261:11 1263:2 1264:13 1265:1

1000 15 100 5
1309:15 1336:7
1343:25 1346:15,25
moved 1258:9 1263:16
1267:13,20 1298:1
1299:16 1310:2
moving 1185:20 1188:6
1246:8 1259:7,17
1290:5 1339:20
multiple 1177:9
1235:17
multiply 1247:25
<b>MWD</b> 1173:23 1182:22
1218:13,14 1219:12
1251:11 1346:14
<b>MWD's</b> 1216:9,11
N

### N 1159:1 name 1160:17,18,21 1262:11,12,15,20,22 1262:22,24 1268:24 1269:1 1278:20 1317:2 named 1187:10 1191:17 1329:5 1352:10 narrower 1179:18 nature 1266:2 necessarily 1267:15 1298:6 1312:23 necessary 1196:13 1210:7 1211:23 1248:17 1281:19 need 1160:20 1197:6 1232:23 1233:24 1259:22 1275:4 1287:20 1321:24 1324:7 1336:19 needed 1166:14 1196:22 1277:8 1278:18 needs 1225:15 negotiate 1163:21 1175:12 **negotiated** 1163:13,19 1164:3,12 1166:8 1189:6 1190:20 1202:7 1208:15 1210:17 1246:13 1247:14 1248:8 1251:13 1280:2 1286:17 1298:6 1305:17 1310:16 1320:7 1337:3 negotiating 1162:22 1163:8,24 1172:4 1176:22 1185:5

1191:10 1192:7

```
1199:15 1206:21
  1225:12 1249:23,25
  1251:1,10 1286:19
  1292:18,21 1293:21
  1295:11,14,24
  1300:15,22
negotiation 1162:10
  1168:18 1174:23
  1183:13 1189:15
  1192:19 1195:9
  1197:21 1204:7
  1206:7 1214:1
  1225:24 1246:16
  1281:2 1288:9 1290:6
  1290:21 1291:3
  1299:12 1316:3,7
  1333:14 1349:1
negotiations 1162:16
  1162:20 1163:1
  1168:10 1172:19,23
  1174:12 1176:19
  1177:5 1185:11
  1186:16 1189:21
  1191:4 1192:13
  1199:24 1200:20
  1201:6,12 1226:11
  1227:12 1233:11
  1240:8 1241:7,21
  1278:20 1280:20
  1287:10 1293:6
  1301:17 1305:25
  1316:15 1329:4,16,24
  1345:13 1349:9
negotiator 1162:21
  1164:1 1174:10
  1199:8 1320:17
  1348:15,21
negotiators 1177:11
  1182:14 1187:12
  1191:5,6 1286:22
  1287:6 1294:17
neither 1225:25
  1237:11 1241:20
  1327:22,24
Nest 1158:3 1261:18
net 1300:20
neutral 1300:21,25
Nevada 1277:23 1278:4
  1278:18
never 1196:12 1201:9
  1209:5,9 1217:11
  1225:10 1231:20,24
  1232:16 1233:2
  1246:25 1306:4,8
  1338:18 1339:6
  1341:13
new 1166:4 1183:1
```

1224:20 1282:23,23

```
1284:7,10 1303:8
  1324:6,14 1350:17
newly 1323:7
nice 1302:13
NICHOLAS 1158:5
Nick 1261:17
nigh 1260:16
non-breaching 1199:1
nonbreaching 1198:24
Nonresponsive 1179:15
Noon 1243:18
north 1158:16 1248:2
notion 1180:5
notwithstanding
  1180:12 1267:6
number 1159:12
  1186:6,7 1188:20,22
  1214:25 1217:5,12
  1224:23,24,24 1237:5
  1245:2,3 1252:17
  1257:24 1264:20,21
  1273:8 1276:23
  1279:1 1283:3 1284:4
  1285:6 1296:15,20
  1297:6,10 1301:11
  1309:11,22,24 1310:5
  1345:19 1348:12
  1349:17,25
numbers 1264:24
  1278:5
numerous 1284:4
          0
```

o'clock 1350:21,25
<b>Obispo</b> 1193:18
<b>object</b> 1181:14 1190:21
1192:25 1199:24
1200:16 1228:8
1258:17 1320:1
1323:14 1336:7
1343:7
objected 1190:23
1191:7
objecting 1304:10
1336:6,14 1343:16,18
objection 1171:15
1177:13 1181:1,5
1183:19 1189:1,14
1191:20 1192:1
1200:23 1205:8
1207:10 1210:10
1212:1 1224:2 1226:8
1226:9 1227:4
1230:24 1231:4
1232:13 1233:23
1234:6 1239:1
1242:21 1247:20,22
1248:14,25 1256:24

1257.12 14 1260.19
1257:13,14 1260:18
1260:23 1261:8
1263:4 1265:3,4
1274.22.1205.5,4
1274:22 1285:16 1293:14 1295:5,20
1293:14 1295:5,20
1302:9 1303:19
1304:5,9,16 1305:1
1311:20 1319:20
1323:21 1331:20
1338:3 1343:21
1344:2
objectionable 1235:19
1320:4
objections 1189:20
1190:24 1262:8
1263:5,9,9 1338:14
1339:4 1344:3
objectives 1222:24
obligated 1168:20
obligation 1164:20
1165 20 1166 11 15
1165:20 1166:11,15
1165:20 1166:11,15 1168:25 1169:19,22
1170:1,15 1179:6
1299:2
obligations 1179:19
obliged 1165:13
observed 1191:24
1192:2,3,9
obtain 1273:19 1274:4
Obtain 12/3.17 12/7.7
1 4 4 4 4 1005 11
obtaining 1335:11
<b>obvious</b> 1349:5
<b>obvious</b> 1349:5 <b>obviously</b> 1275:3,15
<b>obvious</b> 1349:5 <b>obviously</b> 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24
<b>obvious</b> 1349:5 <b>obviously</b> 1275:3,15
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7 14
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7 14
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7 14
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7 okay 1210:16 1223:17
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7 okay 1210:16 1223:17 1234:5 1237:7
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7 okay 1210:16 1223:17 1234:5 1237:7 1241:12,13,14,19
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7 okay 1210:16 1223:17
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7 okay 1210:16 1223:17 1234:5 1237:7 1241:12,13,14,19 1242:13 1332:20
obvious 1349:5 obviously 1275:3,15 1303:9 1311:24 1312:1 1335:22 occupation 1161:3 occur 1197:17 1260:8 1297:19 occurred 1181:11 1265:20 1288:9 1311:7 occurring 1191:15 October 1206:16 1219:7 1299:19,19 offer 1228:6 1230:21 1261:25 offered 1193:1 1228:7 1231:2 1289:7,14 1296:3 1304:13 office 1158:15 1163:6,7 1169:9 1192:10 officer 1269:13,15 1296:13 1329:7 okay 1210:16 1223:17 1234:5 1237:7 1241:12,13,14,19

```
Olga 1187:10 1348:11
once 1243:6 1246:25
  1297:20 1299:16
one-off 1185:3 1251:25
ones 1190:25 1264:10
  1281:25 1343:12
ongoing 1204:1
open-ended 1179:6,8
operate 1270:5 1272:7
operation 1252:1
  1275:22
opinion 1192:22,23
  1193:1,2,9,16,16
  1197:18 1319:21
opinions 1193:9
opportunity 1197:20
  1331:23
opposed 1190:12
  1309:8 1323:7
option 1185:19 1186:21
  1188:3 1220:8,10
  1223:8,9 1224:7
  1291:8,9 1293:25
  1338:17
Option-1 1214:3,11
  1216:1 1220:17
  1224:14 1291:20
  1292:25 1300:20
  1343:20
Option-2 1214:4,14,22
  1216:1,9 1217:3
  1218:19 1219:21
  1220:3,14,15 1223:6
  1223:10,11 1224:11
  1229:13 1231:8,10
  1292:7,25 1294:3,8
  1294:23,23 1295:25
  1296:4 1297:14
  1298:5 1300:16,20
  1307:25 1338:12,20
  1338:23 1343:20
  1345:20,25 1346:1,10
  1349:23 1350:7
options 1214:3 1216:3
  1216:6 1218:8,19
  1291:6,17
orally 1265:25
Orange 1283:17
order 1216:12 1222:23
  1273:21
organization 1320:10
original 1166:11
  1291:21
Originally 1278:23
origins 1237:23 1238:1
ostensibly 1170:14
ought 1237:4
outline 1188:2 1349:18
```

1349:20,24 outmoded 1183:4 outside 1227:3,14,15 1227:16 1260:18,21 1287:8 overall 1279:21 Overbroad 1232:13 overlook 1281:25 overnight 1280:19 overreliance 1278:16 overrule 1192:1 1311:22 overruled 1179:16 1181:5 1192:12 1193:4 1205:9 1207:11 1212:3 1227:5 1231:4 1232:14 1248:3 1260:23 1261:12 1285:17 1295:21 1303:20 1304:17 1319:22 1323:21 1336:24 1343:21 overturned 1183:5 owns 1274:2

**p.m** 1244:3 package 1279:21 page 1159:6 1167:6,7 1167:14,15 1173:16 1173:18 1175:5,6 1184:3 1187:9,25 1194:17 1198:2,15,17 1198:18,19 1218:6,12 1220:1 1223:18,23 1226:6 1227:24 1233:21,25 1237:8 1238:23,24 1240:17 1240:23 1241:3,25 1242:2,3,8 1248:20 1254:6,15 1257:22,23 1270:25 1317:10 1321:10,11 1324:17 1331:9,9 1332:13,15 1334:20,21 1340:21 1341:7,8,9,18,19 1342:5 1349:16 pages 1157:13 1236:24 1244.16 paid 1169:11 1246:9 1266:15 1272:5 1282:9 Pam 1340:14 paper 1281:24 1339:1 papers 1260:2 1268:5 paragraph 1171:25 1172:18 1182:17,18

1230:4,5,9 1237:10 1239:18 1322:13 1332:16,20,25 1342:4 1344:15 1350:12 paragraphs 1324:19 1341:20 **parameters** 1178:9,10 Parent 1340:16 1348:11 Parker 1310:10 parol 1304:5,10,12,16 part 1165:21 1176:24 1184:25 1194:17 1204:13 1205:13 1214:22 1221:2 1222:7,10,13,18 1224:7,11 1231:11 1250:2 1251:2 1266:25 1267:3 1279:21,25 1282:20 1283:20 1286:19 1288:9 1306:24 1315:8 1318:9 1322:22 1325:18,20 1327:13,25 1328:3,5 1328:7 1335:12 1345:22 1346:2,2,13 1346:14 partial 1199:3 1265:15 1266:6,9,11 participants 1206:2 participate 1162:16 1190:7 1234:24 1293:6,8 participated 1192:6 participating 1197:5 particular 1161:10 1165:5 1185:7 1266:20 1283:14 particularly 1193:6 1256:6 parties 1174:8 1186:17 1190:2 1199:21 1204:8 1206:10 1209:21 1210:1 1211:16 1214:2 1221:25 1222:23

1246:18 1279:8,18,22

1297:23 1299:5,23,25

1280:4,23 1289:4

1301:9 1305:16

1321:17 1322:6

1341:3 1343:9

1348:25

parting 1302:4

1323:20 1333:7,12

1198:9 1215:25

1216:8 1218:11

parts 1341:16 party 1174:21 1178:25 1198:24 1199:1 1200:7 1226:14 1327:24 1330:18 pass 1201:22 1261:20 1274:11 passage 1244:11,14 1253:25 passages 1263:7 passed 1290:14 Paul 1163:11 1177:3 pay 1165:13 1168:20 1180:12 1186:9,22 1188:22 1215:3 1217:12,17 1220:20 1226:21 1228:24 1232:18 1233:4 1266:15 1272:9 1283:9 1291:10 1292:12 1294:24 1296:5 1302:24 1305:2 1306:18 1309:20 1310:1 1321:4 1338:12 1339:5,7,9 1342:11 1347:3,10 1348:4 1350:1,5 payers 1199:17 paying 1208:24 1212:22 1213:5 1216:11 1315:22 1350:9 payment 1216:17 1217:4 1231:12,14 **payments** 1218:19 1219:14,15 pays 1173:23 1271:6 1310:20 **PDID** 1340:23 people 1177:1 1196:23 1197:5 1233:7 1249:24 1283:9 1285:4,6,8,21,24 1287:17 1296:12,15 1343:11,13,14 1347:14,16,18 1348:12 percent 1219:11,11 1257:24 1258:2,2,7,8 1258:11 1270:7 1342:8 percipient 1320:2 perform 1168:25 1169:19 performance 1166:10

1279:3 1303:3,5 performed 1302:8 performing 1288:14 period 1165:14 1185:15 1195:6,11,17 1196:23 1197:20 1201:15 1213:19 1219:13 1228:15 1248:1 1254:2,20 1294:2,5 1303:13 1306:3 1308:4,8,10 **periods** 1192:8 permission 1206:1 1223:19 1226:5 1227:23 1233:22 1242:3 person 1174:15 1206:4 1207:13,14,22 1213:6 1329:23 1330:6 personal 1193:2 personally 1191:24 1192:9 1210:21 1212:4 1214:7 1232:22 1251:12 **PERSONS** 1157:10 perspective 1174:10 1199:7 pertained 1178:11 pertaining 1237:17 1326:8 pertains 1182:4 **pertinent** 1169:11 1193:6 1197:10 1227:20 Petitioner 1157:7 1158:2 phase 1263:16,22 1264:5,8,15 1267:11 1267:14 **phrase** 1176:17,20,23 1176:24 1285:12 1313:12 1323:14 1339:12,16,19 1342:14 phrases 1176:24 1255:16 pick 1302:13 **picture** 1259:6,16,21 piece 1202:3 1273:13 1339:1 pieces 1176:15 1281:6 place 1196:18 1256:3 1264:8 1275:24 1286:12 1287:12 1291:12 1352:10 placed 1326:7 placeholder 1306:6 **plain** 1238:13 1239:12

1325:16 **Plaintiff** 1157:7 1158:2 1159:6 1160:12 1265:18 Plaintiff's 1159:2 1237:1.4 **plan** 1172:15 1196:18 1196:19 1205:14 1206.1 1268.2 1278:23 1289:2 plates 1199:14 play 1281:4 please 1160:16 1187:14 1208:3 1228:9 1239:2 1249:1 1268:23,24 1271:2 1275:16 1280:7 1302:12 1304:20 1312:2 1314:6 1331:6 pleased 1293:24 PMK 1228:6,7 **point** 1178:6,7,8 1182:6 1185:18 1186:6,7,24 1188:8,20 1191:14 1214:2 1217:16 1225:20 1228:12 1233:18 1234:12 1240:8,19 1241:7,20 1241:21 1243:10 1263:20 1265:14.20 1265:21 1273:10 1278:11,17 1282:12 1287:15 1288:25 1291:4 1296:7 1303:10 1304:23 1313:6,7 1324:15 1328:2 1336:1,16,17 1337:15 1345:23,25 1346:9 1347:2 1349:25 points 1190:14,15 1195:24 1235:14 1329:19 1334:17 1345:20,23 1346:12 **policies** 1285:10 policy 1161:17,22 1312:12 politically 1278:17 **portion** 1175:8 1231:9 1290:1 **portions** 1242:11 position 1168:11,14 1172:9 1183:9,12 1190:10 1192:15 1248:24 1250:13 1269:11 1328:15 **positions** 1323:19

**possibly** 1259:25

1209:11,15,21,25

1210:5 1211:8 1212:8

	1	1	1	ı
1307:1	price 1164:23 1165:1,2	1286:10,23 1305:20	1345:5,21 1347:2	1262:13,21 1263:11
postage 1204:4	1165:5,11 1173:12	1305:20 1313:24	proposals 1284:4	1263:19,19,19,19,19
posted 1197:22	1174:7 1175:10,12,15	1322:4 1327:19,21	1285:6,22 1347:17	1263:19,20 1264:14
pot 1285:20	1175:18,23 1176:1,8	1337:14 1347:14	propose 1226:1,14	1317:7 1340:1
potential 1220:13	1176:9 1180:7,18	produced 1165:14	proposed 1174:2,20	1342:25 1343:5,24
1273:25	1183:16 1184:24	professional 1212:6	1184:8 1186:11	1344:12
potentially 1196:25	1198:9,12 1203:21	profligate 1271:21	1195:11,20 1227:17	public 1162:1,5,7
1320:24	1208:12,16,20	program 1272:15,19	1266:17 1292:8	1174:21 1199:11,11
power 1189:12 1199:4	1212:23,24 1213:12	programs 1290:4,13	1294:6,16 1297:14	1205:3 1208:7
1199:5 1208:21	1220:14 1223:7,13,13	progress 1287:16	1300:16 1306:19	publicly 1162:2
1292:15 1294:20	1224:8,12 1225:3	1289:1	1338:13 1342:14	published 1161:14,17
1303:9 1310:1,1,3,7,7	1226:2,16,16 1229:14	prohibit 1238:14	1347:5	1246:25
1310:9,12,14,18	1250:12 1259:10	1239:5 1250:20	proposes 1172:6	<b>Purcell</b> 1158:4 1160:7
1312:6 1315:2,6,8,12	1266:17 1288:10,20	prohibited 1319:11	proposing 1241:8	1161:2 1164:19
1315:14,16,21	1292:1 1296:3 1315:9	prohibits 1319:9	1245:17 1248:19	1166:18 1170:24
powerless 1303:14	1317:11,16 1320:22	<b>project</b> 1168:3,9	1347:8 1348:3	1171:2,13,18 1173:16
PowerPoints 1347:21	1320:22,23 1321:3,21	1170:16 1186:22	Proposition 1256:6,8	1174:25 1175:5
1347:22	1321:25 1322:1,7,8	1190:1 1206:2	propriety 1256:1	1177:17 1178:17
practice 1161:11,12,24	1322:12,18 1323:7,8	1212:18 1216:10,15	prospect 1246:11	1179:17 1181:7,21,23
1304:11	1323:12,25 1325:15	1226:2,15 1258:9,16	protect 1193:14,19	1182:2 1183:17,21,23
pre-amendment 1183:7	1325:22 1328:1	1260:16 1266:19	1196:22	1184:1 1187:4,7
precedent 1166:14,17	1332:24 1333:13,24	1274:17,25 1276:5	protection 1252:5	1188:24 1189:4
1167:8,12,17 1168:2	1334:4	1282:1,2,11 1284:24	<b>prove</b> 1266:16 1267:3,4	1192:13 1194:16,19
1168:6,12 1169:16,21	prices 1281:15	1292:10 1302:21	1313:22	1198:2 1201:2,22
1170:7 1222:11	pricing 1324:5,23	1310:10 1311:13	proved 1246:14	1203:4 1205:8
1276:23 1282:22	primary 1238:18	1312:11 1315:22	1266:14	1207:10 1210:10
1287:24 1291:2	1309:12	1335:2,17 1336:15	proven 1266:22	1212:1 1223:24
precipice 1187:1	principally 1163:3	1337:6,12,16,24	provide 1167:24	1226:9 1227:4 1228:1
preclude 1194:23	1191:2	1338:15 1339:4	1193:25 1259:21	1228:7 1230:24
1325:8 1326:12	printer 1265:15	projected 1221:13	1264:6 1289:20	1232:13 1233:24
1327:11	prior 1183:13 1188:6	projection 1220:22	1321:3 1322:1,6	1238:24 1239:1
precluded 1250:22	1190:3,11 1195:13,16	projections 1221:9,16	provided 1189:25	1242:7,13 1244:13
precludes 1199:4	1233:25 1247:3,9	1246:13 1308:2,5	1239:19 1250:11,12	1247:20,22 1248:13
preclusive 1182:6	1308:20 1333:19	projects 1168:9	1324:17 1325:7	1248:19 1249:4
predicate 1223:3	1343:19,25 1344:25	1273:24 1275:16	1332:22 1333:15,18	1255:24 1256:9,17,24
prefers 1265:16	priority 1277:24	1289:25 1290:2	provides 1224:1 1231:6	1274:22 1285:16
prepared 1265:11	1278:2 1309:22	1298:4	1320:23 1321:17	1293:14 1295:5,20
1268:12 1338:21	private 1162:1,2	proof 1267:5	1327:10 1328:21	1302:9 1303:19
present 1219:13 1266:23 1349:12	privilege 1199:4,5 probably 1194:7	<b>Prop</b> 1256:5,8 <b>proper</b> 1228:1 1258:12	providing 1348:6 provision 1169:24	1304:5,12 1311:20 1316:24 1317:2,7
	1243:4 1248:1 1277:1	1258:14 1265:21	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
presentation 1169:8 presented 1186:24	1243.4 1248.1 1277.1 1287:22 1309:22	1238.14 1203.21	1180:11 1200:14,17 1237:24 1239:5	1318:25 1319:23 1320:6 1321:12
1187:2 1188:9,16	problem 1170:11	properly 1230:16	1251:14 1253:14	1323:23 1325:3
president 1286:24,24	1271:25 1316:13	1267:13,16,17	1300:10,14 1301:3	1323:23 1323:3
presidents 1196:14	procedural 1195:24	proposal 1170:6,10,12	1303:17 1306:3	1327.3 1330.17,21
pressure 1280:4	procedure 1263:8	1173:12,19 1179:4,18	provisions 1193:19	1336:11 1337:2
pretrial 1263:7	procedures 1252:3	1179:20 1180:1	1194:13 1200:6	1338:18 1340:1
pretty 1169:6 1275:11	proceed 1202:15	1186:21 1195:12,13	1238:4 1298:12	1341:23 1342:4
1281:15 1287:23	1265:11 1268:9,13	1195:16 1214:22	1328:19,20,22	1343:5,24 1344:8
1296:16 1299:16	1342:3	1223:6,13 1224:6,10	proviso 1324:16 1325:2	1346:25 1349:16
1334:18	proceedings 1157:15	1274:9 1276:7	1325:6 1326:11,16,21	1350:20
prevailed 1228:22	1352:9	1292:17 1294:23	1327:7,8	pure 1261:5 1312:14
prevented 1335:15	process 1178:2,4,6,6,7	1295:18,24 1297:3	provisoes 1239:17	purports 1291:15,16
previous 1339:4	1180:13 1190:14,15	1303:22 1338:17	PTX 1166:18 1170:22	purpose 1199:8
1344:11 1349:6	1197:7,8 1202:3,4,8	1340:7,11,19,22	1171:2,4,13 1174:25	1205:14 1254:3
previously 1163:14	1202:13,17 1252:10	1341:10,18,19	1175:2 1183:16,20	1289:16,21,23
1171:22 1186:11	1274:13 1282:17	1342:13,21,24 1343:8	1185:22 1194:19	1305:15 1306:24
1263:18 1347:5	1283:20,24 1284:12	1343:19 1344:9,13,21	1198:16 1244:23	1321:1 1330:18,20
<del></del>				

purposes 1167:25
pursuant 1162:23
1169:25 1175:23
1176:11,18 1178:5
1195:24 1198:9
1212:20 1220:22
1226:22,24 1229:14
1230:16 1234:15
1252:4 1255:13
1317:18 1318:4
1319:16 1322:12
1332:24
pursuing 1199:19
1250:23
<b>put</b> 1166:18 1170:21
1173:16 1174:25
1181:21 1185:22
1187:4 1194:16
1196:18,20 1244:23
1275:22 1280:8
1286:11 1291:1,12
1294:11 1301:7
1306:9 1307:20
1333:7 1338:13
1347:22
puts 1176:2
-
putting 1276:2
0
OSA 1162:22 1197:12

**OSA** 1162:23 1187:12 1197:6 1291:17 1299:11 qualified 1262:2 quality 1312:6,8,16 quantification 1222:15 1222:16 1223:2 1277:2 1278:25 1279:2,12,13,25 1280:5,10 1287:16 1300:5 quantified 1277:3,9 1297:24 **Quantum** 1222:12 question 1177:25 1178:16 1179:15 1181:5 1182:6 1192:19,24 1201:23 1202:19 1207:21 1210:14 1223:4.25 1232:19,24 1233:25 1234:11 1236:4,20 1241:6 1249:1 1254:8 1254:24 1255:4 1259:13,14,22 1275:15 1295:8 1297:13 1306:13

1323:22,23 1326:25

1327:2 1330:25

```
1331:3 1333:6
 1334:14 1336:8,10,12
 1337:1 1338:8,9,10
 1346:23
questioner 1254:19
questions 1170:21
 1208:1 1244:9 1253:6
 1253:21 1261:13
 1311:24 1316:19
 1317:3 1331:2
quickly 1203:7 1290:17
  1299:16
Quinn 1158:11 1171:15
 1177:13 1178:13
 1179:14 1181:1
 1183:19 1189:1
 1191:20 1192:2,25
 1200:23 1203:7,16
 1205:13 1207:13
 1210:16 1212:5
 1215:8,12 1223:18,21
 1223:23 1224:2,5,23
 1226:5,10 1227:11,23
 1228:5,10 1230:23
 1231:5,16 1232:19,25
 1233:20 1234:2,4,6,9
 1234:19,23 1236:6,22
 1237:2,6,8 1238:22
 1238:25 1239:3
 1240:15,20 1241:4,25
 1242:3,6,15 1244:10
 1244:16,18,22 1248:4
 1248:11,21,23,25
 1253:24 1255:20
 1256:12,20 1257:1,14
 1258:17,24 1260:9,18
 1261:8,10 1263:6
 1265:4,10,13,23
 1266:5,11 1268:13
QUINN,ESQ 1158:12
quite 1191:13 1227:5
  1277:11 1285:1
  1311:23 1324:15
quote 1339:9 1344:17
 1344:19
```

R R-I-T-T-E-R-S-H-A-... 1187:11 raise 1322:18 1323:12 1323:25 1334:7,8,9 1335:21 raised 1190:25 1334:24 raising 1190:25 1327:11 ramp-up 1272:19 range 1219:12,23 1220:16 1276:12

```
1282:11
ranges 1219:17
rarely 1246:15
rate 1159:17 1171:8
  1173:12,20 1174:2,24
  1178:5,10 1180:16,18
  1182:5 1184:14,20
  1185:1.3.7.10.13.20
  1185:21 1186:9,23
  1188:23 1189:8,21
  1190:18 1194:4
  1195:7 1197:22,23,23
  1197:24 1199:17
  1200:21 1201:8
  1202:9,12,15,20
  1204:1,5,9 1206:17
  1208:21,21,22
  1212:25 1213:6,19,20
  1215:3 1216:11
  1217:4 1218:13,24
  1219:10 1221:13,14
  1224:19 1225:11,16
  1225:18,21,21 1226:2
  1227:13,17 1230:7,11
  1230:11,15 1231:12
  1231:14,17,21,22,25
  1232:18 1233:1,5
  1235:18 1246:13,25
  1247:7 1249:14
  1250:18 1251:17
  1252:18 1253:17
  1255:12 1266:18,20
  1267:5,8 1281:12,13
  1281:14,16,17,23
  1282:25 1283:7,13,19
  1283:21 1284:7
  1285:12,14,15 1286:6
  1286:12 1288:21
  1294:14,20 1301:25
  1303:8,10 1304:24
  1305:1,7,12,18,22
  1306:11,16,25
  1307:12,15,17,20,23
  1308:15 1310:2,3,7
  1310:13,20 1315:2,6
  1315:8,12,15,16
  1318:11,12,15,22,24
  1319:2,14,19 1323:3
  1324:6,14,25 1326:6
  1327:23 1328:12,13
  1335:4 1337:16,19
  1342:8,9,14,18,19
  1344:17,18,24,25
  1345:3,3 1347:3,9
  1348:4,7 1350:1,5,14
  1350:18
rates 1157:10 1176:3
  1178:11 1179:19
```

1189:17 1190:5,13,22 1191:8 1193:13 1194:14 1195:21 1205:22 1207:2,8 1208:6.6 1210:20 1211:19 1212:8,13,17 1212:19,22 1219:12 1219:16 1225:8 1229:18 1230:6,10 1233:14,19 1234:14 1235:23 1236:2,8,12 1242:19 1246:24 1247:2,6,11 1250:15 1255:6 1256:1 1261:2 1281:7,8,9 1282:14 1282:24 1283:8,20,25 1284:9,24 1286:12,14 1301:6,22 1303:8 1305:21 1306:18 1316:1,4,5,6,14 1318:13,17 1319:5,6 1319:16 1331:19 1334:10 1336:15 1337:6,9,17,25 1339:5 rationale 1250:3,6 re-allocation 1299:7 re-enter 1263:23 rea 1319:1 reach 1165:23 1186:20 1235:12 1277:2 1279:15 1280:4,9,15 1280:21 1306:24 1334:16 reached 1271:23 1273:5 1274:9 1276:21,22 1299:17 reaches 1196:21 reaching 1273:1 1289:3 **reaction** 1293:23 read 1167:20 1171:25 1176:6 1182:17 1186:7 1187:23 1188:20 1198:20 1200:2 1216:4 1223:19,25 1226:5 1227:23 1233:22,24 1234:18 1238:22 1241:14 1242:4,10,11 1248:14,18,19,21 1253:25 1254:10 1255:6,11 1266:3 1268:5 1325:19,20 1328:18,24 1330:11 1330:16 1331:4,8 1334:19 1341:13 1344:20 reading 1220:5 1224:2

1224:5 1226:10 1228:10 1234:4,6,10 1234:20,23 1239:3 1241:12 1242:15 1249:6 1268:8 1317:14 1330:14,24 1331:12 1334:22 1342:1 reads 1331:1 ready 1203:10 1268:13 1341:22 1349:12 real 1255:5 realize 1304:12 1316:9 really 1178:1 1196:11 1197:14 1202:22 1218:4 1277:5,6 1287:14 1288:22 1312:17 1315:20 1348:24 realtime 1314:1,3 reason 1197:14 1231:16 1255:10 1259:14 1261:5 1315:11 1340:18 reasons 1197:10 recall 1189:10,19 1203:23 1208:11 1226:19 1229:4 1232:2,4,5,6,10,20 1237:23 1239:22 1240:1,10,13 1241:6 1241:11,15,18 1242:23 1243:13 1249:7 1257:8,12,24 1258:25 1263:16 recalled 1159:4 receive 1161:8 1171:10 1220:24 1221:2 received 1171:17 1183:25 1189:3 1221:3 1231:15 1247:16 1263:14 1265:8 1297:15 1343:23 1344:7 1345:4 receiving 1290:24 1312:13 recess 1203:9,12 1243:18 1265:11 1268:12 1307:8 1314:14,20,21 1351:2 recipient 1348:24 recipients 1348:18 reciprocally 1220:23 **Reclamation** 1274:3 1313:23 recognize 1166:20 1171:2 1181:22

1185:24,25	1198:11 1228:17	1227:23 1233:22	1298:4	1282:2 1292:2
recollection 1179:20	1234:16 1236:15	1238:22 1242:3	<b>RFA</b> 1263:21	round 1278:5
1233:3 1240:22	1237:14 1317:18	1283:13,14	riding 1243:8	row 1173:22
1249:22 1292:4	1318:5 1319:17	requested 1315:14	right 1164:16 1174:25	RPR 1157:20 1352:23
1297:18 1299:19	1322:15 1325:11,23	requests 1263:18	1181:14 1182:7	rule 1265:21
1339:16	1326:5 1333:4	1283:16	1198:25 1199:1,4,5	ruled 1193:12
recommend 1209:19	regulations 1180:19	require 1185:13	1200:5,8,9,10	rules 1239:24
recommendation	1233:15	required 1168:5 1173:7	1201:19 1205:16	ruling 1263:12 1344:5
1173:9	reimbursed 1169:12	1180:7 1267:3	1208:13 1216:25	run 1255:2
recommended 1211:24	rejected 1180:5	requirement 1169:21	1219:2 1220:17,18,21	running 1308:14
recommends 1174:3	relate 1168:2 1212:13	1180:18 1253:14	1221:2 1225:14,18	runs 1169:7
record 1236:25	1345:20	requirements 1180:8	1238:17 1239:18	
1265:19 1266:2	related 1168:9 1170:13	requires 1318:3,10	1245:18,21 1246:1,8	$\overline{\mathbf{S}}$
1268:6,25 1331:1	1329:21,24	researching 1273:25	1252:21 1254:3,4,14	S 1158:5
recovered 1282:5	relationship 1301:11	reserve 1305:4	1254:20,23 1255:15	S-C-O-T-T 1160:22
<b>RECROSS</b> 1159:2,8	Relevance 1230:24	reserves 1286:5	1261:14 1265:22,23	S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N
RECROSS-EXAMI	relevancy 1343:7	reservoirs 1272:6	1268:4,6 1270:15,23	1262:15
1253:23 1256:11	relevant 1231:1,3	resolution 1172:12,16	1277:12 1282:15	<b>S-L-A-T-E-R</b> 1160:19
redirect 1159:2,8	1263:22	1190:16 1192:18	1283:14,15,23	S-T-E-P-H-E-N
1248:12 1255:21,23	relying 1184:25	1197:7,8,19 1198:4	1285:12 1291:6	1262:12
1257:22 1260:11	remainder 1325:4	1321:15,24 1322:4	1296:15 1298:10	Sacramento 1238:4,19
redo 1302:12	remedies 1249:17	1332:17	1303:3,4 1304:21	sales 1193:14,20
reduce 1258:10	1250:23 1319:13	resolve 1333:12 1341:3	1305:4 1306:14	salinity 1312:11
1280:12	1334:13	resolved 1173:10	1307:9 1315:6	San 1157:2,6,16,17,24
reduced 1352:11	remedy 1198:25 1199:2	1235:20 1289:2	1319:18 1320:24	1158:6 1160:1
reductions 1273:23	1200:5,8,9,10	resolving 1194:13	1321:9 1323:2	1162:13,21 1164:1
refer 1167:1 1187:17	1319:15	<b>Resources</b> 1171:6,20	1332:18 1335:4,18	1165:13,15 1166:24
1254:18 1255:11	remember 1202:11	1173:8 1290:16	1339:19 1345:1	1170:14,19 1172:6
reference 1194:5	1242:25 1244:17	1298:22	1347:1 1348:20	1173:5,9 1175:11
1198:6 1225:11	1249:1 1253:2,10	respect 1253:5	1349:25	1178:4 1179:24
1230:19 1254:11	1295:17 1341:14	respective 1171:8	<b>rights</b> 1199:19 1214:16	1180:1 1182:4,20
1324:22	remove 1194:11	respond 1180:1 1268:2	1216:10,16 1221:6	1183:1 1184:10,11
referencing 1236:19	render 1319:6	1268:3	1240:6 1255:18	1185:2,4,6 1186:9,21
referred 1177:7,12	renege 1302:24	Respondent 1158:10	1277:14 1279:9,12	1186:25 1188:4,9,16
1202:9 1204:4	renegotiate 1308:11	Respondents 1157:14	1292:10 1297:24	1188:22 1191:12
1234:12 1238:8	renewal 1164:16	response 1177:25	1298:14,16 1333:17	1193:17 1195:6,12,20
1244:12 1336:20	1301:5 1307:1	1195:13 1233:4,6	rise 1169:22	1196:7,9 1199:7,13
referring 1291:23	repeat 1337:1	1241:8 1264:1,12,14	risk 1170:19 1274:19	1200:19 1201:9,11,13
refers 1254:19,23	repeatedly 1247:6	1264:16,17,21 1268:4	1290:24	1201:19 1202:11
1264:23 1271:2	rephrase 1178:16	responses 1159:14,15	risks 1275:17	1204:21,23 1205:6
1322:23 1328:20	1210:15 1295:8	1263:17,21,22 1264:3	Rittershaus 1187:11,13	1206:3,9,16 1207:1,6
reflect 1172:18 1297:22	report 1260:7 1269:19	responsibility 1214:23	1187:19 1188:1	1207:14 1208:7,17,24
reflected 1221:10	reported 1157:19	responsible 1162:11	1348:11 river 1172:15 1173:4	1211:5 1212:12,22,23
refresh 1240:22	1169:4	rest 1257:7,11 1261:16		1212:24 1213:17,22
regard 1212:7 1233:8 regarding 1159:17	reporter 1346:16,21	1265:9 1328:19	1173:14 1205:19,25	1214:15,17 1215:17 1216:17 1217:11,17
1170:7 1171:8 1204:1	1352:7,24	restrict 1238:5 1327:15 restricted 1238:10	1246:12 1271:12	1217:17 1217:11,17
1253:3 1255:25	reporter's 1157:15 1249:3 1352:1	restriction 1324:21	1277:3,11,15,19 1278:12,15,21 1279:8	1217.21 1218.2,4,18
regardless 1313:11	represent 1204:20	Rests 1159:6	1279:10,22 1290:3	1220:13,20,25 1221:4
1327:8	representation 1172:21	results 1276:10	1312:10,14	1220:13,20,23 1221:4
regulate 1313:9	representatives	resumed 1244:7,21	road 1303:11 1314:2	1226:1,21 1228:12,18
regulating 1272:6	1172:10 1269:23	1257:17	<b>Robert</b> 1163:4 1215:17	1228:23 1229:22
1312:20 1313:4	1284:16 1293:4	return 1217:18	1215:20,21	1231:7 1233:12,13
regulation 1176:11,18	1299:5	revenues 1308:2	role 1162:20 1163:24	1234:13,14 1235:9
1177:7,12,20,22	represented 1204:23	review 1342:7	1170:15	1238:3,9,14,19
1178:22 1179:2,7	1208:20	reviewed 1211:4	Ron 1163:12 1169:9	1239:5,22 1240:4,6
1180:23 1182:23	request 1187:14 1208:1	1258:4	rough 1272:17	1244:1 1245:6,23
1183:4,10 1194:25	1223:19,24 1226:5	revise 1297:21 1298:2	roughly 1280:16	1246:1,25 1247:5,7,9
	•	•	•	•

1247:13 1248:4,7	1245:12,13 1294:13	section 1167:7,9,11	separate 1346:3,13	sideboard 1178:2
1247:13 1248:4,7	1303:2 1314:24	1173:1,5 1175:6,7,8	September 1188:8	1201:25 1202:4,5,25
1249.8 1250.17,21	1315:24 1317:15	1175:1,5 1175:0,7,8	1215:18 1219:3	sides 1202:8 1243:13
1251:4,9 1252:15,19	1319:16 1324:24	1170.0 1194.3,10,17	1294:10 1299:14	sign 1300:2
1256:20,22 1259:6,16	1325:6,14,16,18,20	1200:2,3 1236:24	1349:14,14	signed 1163:18 1180:24
1266:14,15,17,23	1325:25 1326:12,16	1317:10,15 1321:9,14	seq 1173:1	1181:10 1200:7
1267:2,6,18,19	1326:21 1328:3,21	1321:21,25 1322:10	series 1281:3	1204:8 1206:15,24
1269:23 1270:10,11	1332:4 1333:6 1334:2	1322:23 1323:1,3,11	serve 1161:25	1207:4,8 1210:18
1271:5,6 1272:11,14	1340:10 1341:9,14	1323:24 1324:7,11,13	service 1162:12	1213:4 1219:5 1238:3
1273:3,8 1279:11	1348:7 1350:12,16	1325:5,14 1327:10,10	1189:24 1230:10	1238:17 1256:22
1282:21 1284:16	scan 1341:21	1327:15 1332:5,12,15	<b>SERVICES</b> 1157:23	1290:15,19 1300:1
1288:3,19 1289:2,9	schedule 1164:23	1333:8,10,19,20	set 1169:7 1174:23	1303:15 1331:15
1289:10 1291:5	1165:1,2 1184:24	1334:20 1341:17	1176:2,10,17 1178:5	1332:2 1336:18
1293:1,4,6 1297:9,11	1185:16 1203:21	sections 1327:18	1179:19 1180:16	<b>significant</b> 1275:2,4,10
1298:1,23 1300:16	1224:14	1328:25	1183:6 1193:13,13	1277:1 1278:14
1301:24 1302:1	scheduled 1165:18	secure 1196:14	1194:25 1202:8,9	1286:5 1287:16
1303:12 1305:9,13	1197:23,24	securing 1186:21	1212:19 1225:4	1288:1 1289:12
1309:16 1310:15	Schreck 1161:7	see 1167:9 1173:25	1229:1,14,18 1233:14	1309:5,25 1310:6
1311:4,13 1312:13,23	scope 1260:18	1184:6 1187:14,15	1234:15 1235:3,24	1312:16,17 1348:25
1313:2 1314:3	Scott 1159:3 1160:8,11	1195:1 1198:13	1236:3,9,13 1237:17	significantly 1288:16
1315:10 1319:13,18	1160:18 1186:1	1215:19 1216:2,8	1246:24 1249:14	1310:12
1321:3 1322:11,18	1187:17 1244:6	1218:7,9,16 1219:18	1251:17 1253:17	signing 1226:20
1323:6,12,24 1324:5	1287:7 1295:16,19,22	1220:4,11 1227:17	1267:23 1284:9	1292:10 1299:24
1324:24 1325:8,15,21	1296:10 1301:19,23	1230:9,13 1237:8,21	1294:14 1317:17	silent 1288:5
1326:12 1327:11,15	1338:20 1340:7,13	1239:21 1243:16	1318:4,10,12,12,15	similar 1179:22
1327:19,22 1328:3,9	1345:9	1245:4,10,14 1248:24	1318:17,22,23 1319:2	1200:11 1272:15
1328:11 1333:16	Scott's 1187:14	1254:11,23 1255:3,4	1319:16,19 1323:7	simple 1217:19
1334:2 1340:10	screen 1166:18 1170:22	1264:19 1275:3	1325:10,22 1326:8,14	1281:11,17 1296:16
1342:11 1346:5,6	1173:17 1194:17	1281:6 1287:17	sets 1319:14 1320:22	simply 1267:13,20
1347:3,9,22 1348:4	1317:8 1325:5	1291:18 1292:9	setting 1185:1 1194:4	1275:25 1281:13
1349:11 1350:1,4	1331:11 1340:2	1294:14 1317:21,21	1202:20	1309:19
1352:16	scroll 1186:6 1325:3,4	1319:15 1322:16	settlement 1222:13,17	single 1199:3 1206:16
<b>SANDFORD</b> 1157:20	1345:23	1325:4,12 1340:5,10	1223:2 1278:25	1246:19 1309:18
1352:6,23	<b>SD</b> 1173:23	1340:25 1343:3,9	1279:2,13,25 1280:5	1313:3 1339:1
Santa 1352:3,7	<b>SDCWA</b> 1194:23	1345:6 1347:17,21	1280:10 1300:5	1346:22
sat 1296:13 1338:21	1198:8 1237:11	1348:13 1350:2,15,25	seven 1174:16 1196:14	single-most 1197:13
satisfied 1166:14	1332:22 1340:22	seeing 1194:5 1285:14	1241:25 1264:23	singled 1239:23
1168:12 1169:17	1344:16	seek 1237:11 1238:21	1274:14	1252:14
1213:2,5,9,10	SDW 1216:10	1326:2	share 1278:15	sir 1201:24 1203:18
1282:22	SDWA 1216:11	seeking 1238:10,15	sharp 1243:17	1207:21 1209:14
satisfy 1209:24	season 1312:22	1239:7 1319:21	sheer 1197:11	1211:12 1212:14
save 1276:5	seated 1160:16 1268:23	1335:11	sheet 1338:21	1213:5 1227:11
saw 1191:24 1192:5	second 1167:15 1176:6	seen 1196:12 1215:12	shoes 1298:23	1231:24 1233:5
1299:13	1182:17 1184:1	1215:23 1341:25	short 1265:10 1294:9	1237:24 1239:14
saying 1202:12 1240:9	1202:18 1216:4	sell 1271:9	1314:15 1350:21	1240:19 1242:14
1242:23 1243:13	1219:7 1220:2,6	send 1186:3	shortages 1271:8	1258:25 1261:19
1242:23 1243:13	1262:14 1263:15	send 1180.5 sending 1346:6	shorthand 1167:1	1268:10 1279:14
1303:15 1311:8	1265:22 1266:23	1348:24	1347:17 1352:6,24	1301:14 1306:9
1318:14,19,19,21	1267:9 1270:12	sent 1171:11 1188:12	show 1187:21 1236:25	1309:9 1311:8
1325:2 1326:2,19	1311:19 1317:14	1340:4,15 1344:12	1342:25	1313:14 1316:4
1338:25 1346:20	1324:16 1326:16,20	sentence 1167:20	showed 1275:1	1325:13 1329:8
1350:25 1340:20	1327:7,25 1328:7	1176:6,14 1184:2	showing 1338:24	sister 1335:1
says 1173:23 1184:4	1338:25	1186:7 1218:12	shown 1219:16	sit 1189:10 1295:17
1187:13 1188:22	second-most 1270:14	1292:6 1294:13	shows 1313:11	1296:8
1194:21 1198:8	secondly 1178:8	1317:14 1321:1	side 1162:2,5 1249:8	situation 1234:13
1216:9 1218:7,13	secret 1301:10	1317.14 1321.1	1267:25 1302:4,17	six 1248:20 1278:15
1219:9 1220:6 1230:9	secretaries 1196:15	sentences 1198:20,22	1303:1 1304:15	1331:9
1237:10 1239:13	Secretary 1280:8,11,14	sentiment 1174:22	1305:5 1329:16	size 1199:13
1237.10 1239.13	50010taly 1200.0,11,14	Sentiment 11/7.22	1303.3 1347.10	GIEN 11//,1J
	I	I	I	I

sketch 1346:4	1245:22 1246:2	1167:11,24 1168:7,20	1158:13,16	sufficient 1288:22
Skillman 1262:14		1168:20 1169:5,13,14	strike 1178:13,19	
	speaking 1181:2			suggest 1168:23
skipped 1288:8	1186:13 special 1162:5 1173:1,3	1172:18 1174:16	1179:14 1191:20	suggested 1203:21 1300:23,23
Slater 1159:3 1160:8	1 -	1180:23 1181:9	1235:24 1236:9	*
1160:11,18 1167:9,16	1196:16	1186:16 1190:1	1250:5 1251:8	suggesting 1245:17
1173:18 1175:7	specific 1177:16	1194:9 1203:20	1261:11 1329:2	Suggestions 1159:17
1178:18 1185:24	1202:17 1233:12,16	1204:13,14 1212:18	1335:9 1336:8	suing 1197:6 1249:19
1186:1,8 1187:7,22	1234:12 1236:16	1214:18 1216:17	strings 1289:15	suit 1190:17,17
1194:12,20 1198:5,19	1251:20 1283:6,18	1226:1,15 1253:19	structure 1206:17	1343:10
1201:4 1203:17	1287:10 1289:6 1318:25 1321:20	1258:8,16 1260:16	1212:25 1218:24	SULLIVAN 1158:11
1244:6 1255:25		1266:1,18 1268:24	1221:14 1235:18	sum 1167:24 1208:20
1257:4 1287:7	1343:12	1271:22 1273:20	1266:20 1267:6	1290:8,11 1294:19
1295:16,22,23 1296:7	specifically 1162:23 1252:13	1277:18 1279:23	1284:7,10 1285:12,15	summarize 1291:17
1296:8,19 1297:14		1280:21 1282:1,2,10	1286:6,12 1288:23	summary 1183:11
1301:19,23 1303:2	specified 1208:13	1282:10 1284:24	1291:11 1301:25	1266:7,9 summation 1188:2
1304:1,4,21,23	1336:23	1288:17 1289:3,7,13	1303:8,10 1304:25	1189:23 1193:11
1306:1,9 1316:7 1328:11 1338:21	specifies 1200:13 1342:17	1289:18 1290:7,18,25	1305:2,7,12,19,22	
		1292:11 1298:19,24	1306:11,17 1307:12	summed 1294:21
1339:9,18 1340:7,13 1342:5,13 1344:9,23	spectacular 1217:18 speculation 1261:5,6	1299:5,7,9 1300:18 1302:21 1310:10	1307:15,17,20,23 1308:15 1322:21,24	summer 1169:5 1181:20
1345:9,19 1346:9 1347:8 1348:3,17,20	<b>spell</b> 1160:17,20 1205:10 1268:24	1311:13 1312:11 1315:22 1335:1,17	1323:4 1324:25 1326:7 1327:23	<b>Superior</b> 1157:1,16 <b>supply</b> 1190:1 1220:8
1350:4	spelled 1160:18	1315.22 1335.1,17	1328:1,12,14	1258:8,10 1259:1,7
Slater's 1340:16,19	1187:11 1262:11	1337:24 1338:14	structures 1267:8	1259:17,19,20
1341:10 1344:12,21	spending 1265:24	1339:4 1346:6 1352:2	1324:6,14 1350:18	1260:17 1261:6
1347:2 1348:21	Spent 1196:11	1352:7,25	studies 1276:8,11	1267:13,20 1281:19
1349:20	spilling 1198:18	State's 1168:15	stuff 1253:7 1311:25	1281:23 1337:12,16
slightly 1264:25	spit 1252:16	stated 1292:14 1305:1	subject 1191:18 1195:9	support 1237:11
small 1194:21 1283:16	spite 1172:9	statement 1172:17	1239:23 1242:8	1265:15 1266:6
smaller 1309:25 1310:6	spring 1192:11	1193:3 1258:4	1254:22 1261:16	1326:3
solution 1271:25	squishing 1346:19	1293:17 1341:24	1262:6 1263:8,12	supported 1329:4
1272:1	ss 1352:3	statements 1172:9	1270:20 1273:15	supports 1260:3
somebody 1180:16	staff 1218:7 1219:21	states 1174:17 1196:14	1280:2 1340:13	suppose 1201:1
1212:8 1234:20	1220:13 1281:23	1197:16 1274:3,8,9	1344:9	supposed 1305:18
sorry 1175:25 1183:22	1284:3	1277:21 1278:15	subjects 1206:4,7	sure 1178:17 1216:5
1198:19 1223:8	stamp 1204:5	1279:23 1280:18	1207:23	1235:22 1236:1,5,7
1234:19 1236:6,21	stand 1244:7 1257:17	<b>Station</b> 1310:11	submission 1267:25	1236:11 1283:12
1240:24 1247:21	1330:22	status 1181:14	submit 1344:4	1289:21 1290:17
1251:22 1254:16	standard 1180:15	<b>statute</b> 1253:19	submitted 1262:2,8	1310:17 1314:15
1266:11 1323:16	1181:18 1199:10	1254:11,19,21 1255:1	subparagraph 1167:21	1324:15 1336:20
1336:19 1341:8,16	1227:3,14 1229:10	stenotype 1352:10	subparagraphs	surplus 1277:19
sort 1180:21 1192:7	standards 1227:16	step 1271:7 1297:19	1167:25	surplusage 1328:17
1196:10 1254:9	Stapleton 1163:3	1298:23	subsection 1167:15	surrendering 1184:24
1274:19 1281:19	1250:1 1287:6	<b>Stephen</b> 1262:11	subsequent 1263:12	sustain 1256:25
1306:5	1295:16 1304:23	stewardship 1189:12	subset 1292:21	<b>Sustained</b> 1178:15,15
sorts 1285:9	1306:1 1348:20	1208:22 1212:19	substance 1190:14,15	1200:24 1256:19
sought 1274:18	start 1176:8 1177:17	1230:11 1266:18	1191:2 1237:13	1274:23 1295:7
sound 1285:8	1212:23,24 1270:25	1292:15 1294:20	1264:25 1306:5	swap 1217:17
sounds 1270:3 1274:17	1295:1 1317:4 1337:3	stick 1280:11	1326:4	swapping 1221:22
1280:23 1302:3	1346:18 1347:23	sticking 1273:10	substantial 1165:16	switch 1276:16 1298:20
source 1218:1	started 1218:20	stop 1258:18	substantive 1178:8	sworn 1160:12 1268:19
South 1158:13	1220:14 1287:11	stopping 1240:18	1202:18	symmetrical 1199:22
<b>Southern</b> 1157:9,11 1158:10 1166:24	1292:3 1307:10	storage 1290:4,13 store 1290:3	substitute 1224:17,18 succeed 1186:19	1199:23 1200:14
space 1245:8,9,13,16	starting 1174:7 1233:25 1237:8	store 1290.3 straight 1323:20	successful 1172:14	synonymous 1348:1 synonyms 1347:15
1246:7,11 1262:25,25	starts 1184:2 1186:1	straight 1323.20 strategic 1199:16	sue 1196:7 1249:9	system 1165:16
1309:13,13,15 1312:5	1242:8	strategy 1162:10	1306:18 1324:25	1189:13 1208:21
space-available	state 1157:1 1160:17	Street 1157:24 1158:6	sued 1202:11	1230:11 1270:5
Space available	See 115/.1 1100.1/	Server 1137.27 1130.0	5404 1202,11	1230.11 12/0.3
	I	I	I	I

1272:7 1281:12	1233:7 1249:23,25	1254:9 1258:25	1262:17 1296:12	time-out 1201:20
1283:10 1292:14	1253:7 1249:25,25	1311:17 1320:21	1329:5,22 1330:3,5	time-out 1201.20
1294:19,20 1309:24	1292:18,21 1293:21	1321:7 1320:21	1330:11 1331:8	1198:6 1201:14
1310:24 1311:2,14	1292.18,21 1293.21	1324:9 1330:9 1339:8	1334:14,17,20	1306:6 1308:9
1315:6,8,12,14,16	1300:15,22	Texas 1161:23	1337:21 1340:4	1323:13,15,18 1324:1
1335:3	teammates 1286:21	Thank 1160:9,16	1343:2 1344:8,15	times 1165:25
system-wide 1193:13	technicality 1309:2	1183:24 1203:10	1345:2,9	titled 1340:22
system-wide 1175.15	tell 1169:18 1178:18,20	1205:12 1208:5	thought 1179:11	today 1189:10 1217:24
T	1184:11 1185:12	1215:11 1232:24	1182:20 1196:21	1295:17 1307:23
T-H-O-M-A-S 1262:18	1191:6 1200:19	1243:17 1254:7	1200:21 1228:19	1317:3
table 1218:6 1219:16	1201:5,12 1225:6,21	1257:2 1258:19,20	1231:17,21,25	told 1210:22 1211:6,10
1220:1 1245:1	1241:21 1268:4	1265:6 1268:23	1231:17,21,23	1230:6 1231:20,24
1346:10	1241.21 1208.4	1205:0 1208:23	1247:22 1283.8	1230:0 1231:20,24
	1293:1 1304:20		1303:5 1330:8	
tackle 1288:2,6 take 1168:11,14		1307:7,9,11 1316:20		1242:16,17 1304:4
	1341:22	1316:21 1321:12	thousands 1205:5,18	1339:18
1170:19 1176:14	telling 1212:6,10	1331:7	three 1173:16,18	tolerable 1181:18
1190:10 1192:15	1225:15 1232:25	theories 1231:2	1219:6 1249:24	tolling 1254:22
1203:9 1214:23,25	1240:11 1241:10,16	theory 1170:16	1270:9 1284:1	tomorrow 1350:25
1215:8 1223:16	1256:15	1199:13	1294:21 1327:18	top 1184:3 1185:24
1227:7 1230:3 1232:3	ten 1234:1,9 1302:13	thereof 1182:24	1328:24 1345:16,23	1198:18 1320:9
1233:20 1240:15	1350:25	thing 1202:16,18	time 1163:6,13 1164:3	1325:25
1246:12 1248:16,23	ten-minute 1307:5	things 1178:1 1202:7	1166:8 1168:17	topic 1308:17 1311:18
1252:11 1254:6	tend 1311:24	1238:5 1253:9,10	1171:11 1172:5	topics 1207:15
1255:9,14 1257:10	tender 1179:3	1254:4 1303:11	1180:24 1181:10	tops 1272:21
1259:8,17,23 1261:18	tens 1205:5,18	1314:1 1321:17,20	1185:5 1187:10	total 1219:14,15 1220:9
1261:24 1267:24	term 1164:13 1165:1	think 1172:21 1174:21	1188:11 1189:4,5,21	1278:5
1274:20 1283:24	1165:11 1166:5	1181:4,17 1188:17	1190:20 1192:8	touchstone 1179:9
1284:8,8 1285:2	1175:12,15 1176:1	1193:3 1194:2	1199:16,19 1203:25	tough 1301:10
1288:22 1292:18	1177:6,20,23 1179:2	1197:13 1198:15	1204:14 1206:14,23	traded 1162:2
1293:16 1298:15	1180:7,18 1181:9	1203:21 1213:12	1207:3,8 1210:17	Traditional 1162:9
1299:15 1301:13	1183:10,12,16 1195:9	1215:9 1216:16	1211:21 1213:20	transaction 1197:14
1307:5 1310:25	1198:12 1199:21	1217:19 1221:4	1217:4,5 1218:3,15	1221:17,24 1222:7,10
1311:17 1313:8	1202:25 1237:10	1228:5 1232:8,17	1218:20 1220:15	1222:18,20 1238:6
1314:13,19	1288:2 1317:11	1233:24 1238:18,18	1226:25 1227:20	1245:20
taken 1256:3 1297:3	1319:9,12,13,18	1239:11 1240:3	1228:12,16 1238:16	transactions 1283:7
1352:9	1320:22 1326:1	1242:22 1243:1,2	1239:10 1241:20	transcript 1157:15
takes 1310:23	1327:22 1338:21	1246:4 1248:17	1243:15,16 1246:14	1249:3 1257:22,23
talk 1213:11 1275:18	1340:23 1341:9,18	1250:24 1252:23	1247:13 1248:1	1258:5 1262:10,14,21
1281:5 1311:18	terms 1164:5 1187:3	1259:13 1268:9	1265:24 1266:4	1266:3 1336:20
1312:5 1324:16	1188:13,15,18	1285:7 1288:8	1272:20 1273:20	transcription 1352:12
1347:25	1193:22 1206:8	1304:15 1315:4	1274:12 1277:4,11,20	transcripts 1262:4,5
talked 1214:16 1253:8	1211:18 1212:7	1321:10 1322:25	1280:4 1282:12	1263:3 1330:15,24
1276:16 1299:11	1216:5 1221:19,21	1324:3,6 1327:18	1283:17 1284:13	transfer 1164:11
talking 1167:4 1177:14	1238:8 1300:9 1304:9	1328:24 1329:1	1286:23,25 1288:13	1165:19,22 1166:6
1221:18 1244:24	1341:4,11 1346:4	1330:13,23 1336:9,22	1289:12 1290:5,21	1169:1 1197:15
1246:5 1254:17	test 1252:21 1255:15	1339:8 1343:11	1294:2,5 1295:25	1221:6 1270:22
1282:7 1304:19	testified 1160:13	1344:22 1346:6,20	1296:4 1297:14,15,16	1271:1,10,14 1272:2
1307:12 1343:19	1227:9 1244:7	thinking 1343:14	1299:23 1302:13,15	1272:4,9,23 1276:19
talks 1322:10 1324:14	1257:17 1268:20	third 1182:18 1218:11	1302:16 1305:21,21	1277:5,9 1279:10
1324:15	1329:1 1339:14	1218:12 1282:3,6	1308:4 1315:14	1288:4 1291:21
tap 1205:14	testify 1206:4 1207:14	1310:22 1328:3,5	1316:3,7 1319:25	1309:16,17 1311:4,15
TARA 1157:20 1352:6	1207:23 1329:24	1341:18,19 1349:13	1320:25 1324:18	1341:11 1342:11
1352:23	testifying 1302:10	<b>Thirty</b> 1209:4,5	1330:16 1331:14	transferred 1223:1
task 1196:18	1317:24	Thirty-five 1216:19	1332:1 1336:22	1272:18 1298:16
taught 1161:19,21	testimony 1212:2	Thirty-seven 1269:22	1337:2 1340:16	transferring 1194:6
<b>Taylor</b> 1163:5 1249:25	1213:6 1232:15	<b>Thomas</b> 1163:11	1343:15 1346:23	1272:20
team 1176:23 1188:4	1233:5 1239:14	1177:3 1191:17	1349:11,15 1350:22	transfers 1194:9,11,11
1191:10 1192:7	1240:4 1246:22	1192:14,15 1233:17	1350:23 1352:10	transmitted 1339:2
		, and the second		
	1	1	1	1

transmitting 1344:12 1239:17,17,19 1245:7 understood 1169:24 1312:22 1322:3 transport 1205:18 1253:9 1265:1 1177:15 1178:1,10,14 utilities 1162:4 1266:13,25 1281:15 1187:3 1188:3 1216:12 V transportation 1173:4 1284:1 1291:6 1227:19 1229:23 V-A-N 1262:23,25 1184:15 1258:9 1295:15.18 1299:18 1230:6.15 1238:9 Vague 1177:13 1181:1 1259:11,12 1260:17 1314:12 1348:18 1243:2,3 1305:19 valid 1192:20 1194:14 1267:17 1336:15 two-and-a-half 1349:6 1306:10,15 1320:3 1337:6,17,20,25 two-volume 1161:16 1322:6 1330:8 1200:22 1201:8 validating 1190:18 1339:5 type 1162:7 1211:23 undertake 1226:25 validation 1190:13 1226:25 1227:15 transported 1175:10 undertook 1227:8 1191:1 1193:9 treated 1281:13 1247:1 1272:15 **Underwood** 1163:11 treatise 1161:16 validity 1157:10 1190:4 1321:21 1177:2 1233:18 treatment 1252:15 types 1161:24 1285:10 1286:24 1287:1 Valley 1273:24 1255:15 1285:19 1320:19,20 1345:8 valuable 1300:17,19 tremendous 1282:4 typewriting 1352:11 1348:15 valuation 1219:20 trial 1263:16 typically 1311:9 undisputed 1311:25 1270:8 tried 1179:23 1193:10 value 1170:2,5 1219:13 uniformly 1252:4 U 1247:25 1210:13 1255:13 true 1204:2 1206:14,18 U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-H unique 1250:18 Van 1158:3 1261:17 1206:19 1209:7,8,12 1262:20 1255:12 1262:22 **U.S** 1221:7 United 1197:16 1274:3 VANDERHORST 1209:13,22,23 **ultimate** 1305:14 1211:25 1218:25 1274:8,9 1279:23 1158:16 1225:9,22,23 1226:3 ultimately 1287:10 1280:17 variable 1175:18 1226:4,24 1233:15 1294:3 1308:21 universe 1179:11 1185:20 1199:16 1241:23,24 1246:14 umbrella 1253:18 various 1169:7 1206:4 universities 1161:22 1247:3,11,12 1259:3 unbelievable 1196:12 unlawful 1193:13 1207:15,23 1208:6,17 1259:8 1264:24 1196:17.17 1229:21 1231:22 1210:20 1219:16 **unbounded** 1180:15 1269:9 1271:19 1232:1,12,21 1233:4 1227:22 1235:14 **unbundle** 1227:21 1275:23 1321:17 1272:13 1288:14 1233:19 1247:2,11 1282:14 1283:8,24 1318:13,15,17,20,22 1338:23 1289:8 1291:5 1341:10 1284:14 1285:19 1318:24 1319:2,7,14 **veering** 1304:9 trusted 1174:18,19 **unbundled** 1286:12 unpack 1227:21 version 1345:25 1329:13 unbundling 1283:20 unprecedented vice 1286:24 1196:10 **VIDEOGRAPHY** try 1193:25 1235:17 1284:23 1285:3,5,8 1285:13 1286:10 unquote 1339:10 1157:23 1288:18 1333:12 1303:7 1337:8,14 view 1179:8 1194:9 trying 1184:13 1188:5 unsettled 1194:1 1193:8 1194:10 uncertain 1227:10 untreated 1281:14 1289:10 1303:12 1238:4,19 1243:11 uncertainty 1194:13 unused 1277:18,20 1328:5 1342:18 1273:19 1312:3 undercut 1238:6 1278:4 viewed 1179:8 1337:12 1319:1 1341:3 underground 1205:15 **unwilling** 1274:20 views 1285:24 1286:8,8 turn 1167:6 1175:5 understand 1188:6 **Upadhyah** 1262:20 **VIII** 1157:10 virtue 1199:19 1310:22 1196:22 1198:15 1189:7 1202:21 **update** 1297:25 1207:25 1210:9,11,14 **updated** 1161:18 **volume** 1157:10 1236:22 1275:21 1212:12,14 1221:24 1287:25 1292:4 1223:22 1226:7 1278:18 1222:14 1239:4 1227:25 1233:22 turn-of-the-century **updates** 1287:13 1262:15 1283:12 urban 1221:6 1312:24 1238:23 1240:20,25 1275:8 1287:1 1297:4 1241:1,2,25 1272:17 turned 1287:17 **UROUHART** 1158:11 **Turning** 1291:3 1306:13 1307:19 use 1201:25 1205:25 voluntarily 1286:2 turns 1314:24 1308:24 1318:18 vote 1270:5 1284:6 1221:6 1224:13 1324:4 1326:20 1286:11 1293:9 Twenty 1209:3 1237:4 1247:6 Twenty-four 1321:12 understanding 1169:8 1271:13,21 1277:8,17 voted 1247:5,7 twice 1243:7 1172:25 1188:11,14 1277:23 1283:9 votes 1270:3,14 two 1172:4 1178:1 1202:6 1228:11 1289:16 1348:8 vs 1157:8 1191:17 1193:7 1229:17 1238:13 user 1277:7 W 1245:25 1248:18 1196:14,14 1198:20 users 1277:3,8 1278:12 1252:10 1254:2 wagons 1197:5,11 1198:22 1202:7 1278:22 wait 1232:23 1293:17 1305:6 1214:2 1216:3.5 uses 1210:12 1313:12 waited 1332:8 1331:14 1332:1 1218:7,19 1219:11 usually 1162:5 1282:11

waive 1199:1,19 waiver 1200:4,8,10,11 1200:12 waiving 1200:7 1304:7 1339:3.6 walk 1202:23 1305:5 want 1176:14 1185:3 1202:21 1203:2 1205:18 1209:16,24 1211:9 1215:16 1234:2 1238:2 1242:11 1257:8 1259:7 1268:4 1271:17,18 1281:4 1290:17 1294:22 1301:7 1305:4 1309:6 1310:17 1314:13 1327:2 1330:21 1332:11 wanted 1180:16 1187:2 1199:18 1218:4 1240:9 1248:14 1254:3 1255:8,10,17 1259:9 1263:20 1268:6 1273:8 1289:20 1294:12 1304:21 1310:15 1315:11 1341:24 wants 1234:18 1341:21 **WARREN** 1158:5 wasn't 1193:12 1213:6 1217:12 1267:14 1287:22 1290:18 1306:24 1336:8 1339:1 wasting 1271:17,24 watched 1194:2 water 1157:6,9,11 1158:10 1160:7 1161:13,14,15,17,19 1161:21,21,24 1162:9 1162:12,14,17,22,25 1163:15 1164:2,4,11 1164:21,21 1165:5,8 1165:12,14,15,18,21 1166:2,4,9,15,16,23 1166:25,25 1168:25 1169:23,25 1170:2,3 1170:6,10 1171:6,9 1171:19 1172:6,19,23 1173:1,4,8,13,13 1174:11 1175:3,11,12 1176:12 1179:5,12 1180:9,17 1182:15 1183:9,12 1184:5,19 1185:8 1186:10 1189:6,12,14,19

1190:1,2,7,10,21,24

1191:5,10,13 1194:6
1101.0,10,10 1104.0
1194:8,10 1196:11
1201.5 7 18 1204.15
1194:8,10 1196:11 1201:5,7,18 1204:15 1204:21,24 1205:15
1204:21,24 1205:15
1205:19 1208:22 1211:13 1212:18,18
1203.17 1200.22
1211:13 1212:18,18
1213:18 1214:16,24
1213.16 1214.10,24
1214:24 1216:10,13
1216:23 1217:13
1218:1 1219:22
1220:25 1221:6,23
1220.23 1221.0,23
1223:1 1225:11 1226:2,15 1228:14
1226.2 15 1228.14
1220.2,13 1226.14
1230:11 1231:7
1237:19 1245:21
1246:1,7,8,19 1248:5
1256:1 1258:8,9,16
1259:25 1260:15,16
1261.10 1266.10 10
1201.18 1200:18,19
1270:21.22.22 1271:1
1271.2 4 5 9 0 12 12
1261:18 1266:18,19 1270:21,22,22 1271:1 1271:3,4,5,8,9,12,13
1271:18,18,22,24
1272.4 7 12 14 10 10
1272:4,7,12,14,18,18
1272:21,24 1273:2,2
1272.4 14 16 20 22
1273:4,14,16,20,23
1274:4 1275:2,4,6,10
1075.01.01.04.1076.0
1275:21,21,24 1276:2
1276:6,17,17,18,19 1277:3,6,10,17,19,23
1077.2 ( 10 17 10 22
12//:3,6,10,17,19,23
1278:4,19,21,21
1279:3,10 1280:19
1281:10,14,14 1282:1
1282:2,11,23 1283:1
1284:24 1287:4
1288:21 1289:9 1290:3,6,16,22
1290:3 6 16 22
1201.5 11 16 21
1291:5,11,16,21
1292:8,10,15 1293:21
1294:6,16,18,20
1295:11,14,24 1296:5
1206.14.10.22.1225.5
1296:14,19,23 1297:5
1297:11,16,25
1298:14,16,22 1299:3
1299:4 1300:17
1299:4 1300:17 1301:1,13 1302:6,8
1301:1,13 1302:6,8
1302:18,20,23 1303:1
1204.2 20 21 1207.2
1304:2,20,21 1305:9
1305:22 1306:1
1308:10,13 1309:7,15
1309:20 1310:2,10,23
1010.05 1011 1 10 11
1310:25 1311:1,10,11
1312:6,8,8,9,10,10,11
1212.14.14.15.16.21
1312:14,14,15,16,21
1312:24 1313:3 4 10
1312:14,14,15,16,21 1312:24 1313:3,4,10 1313:20 1314:8
1313:20 1314:8
1315:22,22 1317:19
1318:7 1326:10
1331:17,22 1332:6
·-·, ·

```
1333:21 1334:24
  1335:2,7,15,17
  1336:5,13,14 1337:4
  1337:5,10,11,12,15
  1337:22,24 1338:11
  1338:15 1339:2,3,4
  1339:20 1347:4
  1348:21
way 1189:16 1190:4,22
  1191:7 1243:11
  1251:24 1255:13
  1260:1 1274:15
  1280:24 1282:23
  1283:5,12 1303:13
  1305:12 1306:9
  1312:4 1341:23
ways 1275:24
wbraunig@kvn.com
  1158:9
we'll 1180:12 1214:23
  1214:23,25 1275:17
  1294:24 1314:4
  1350:23
we're 1268:13 1286:2
  1314:3 1339:3
we've 1216:16 1221:18
  1231:12,20 1312:25
Wednesday 1157:17
  1160:2
week 1219:7 1262:4.9
  1268:1,1 1349:13,14
weeks 1219:6 1294:9
  1297:18 1299:18
  1345:16 1349:6
weighted 1270:5
well-regarded 1174:15
  1174:16,17,18
went 1187:2 1189:16
  1219:2 1224:23
  1242:22 1271:16
  1274:10 1280:16
  1290:17 1296:25
  1297:4,5
weren't 1277:3 1289:19
West 1254:9
whatsoever 1323:12,24
wheel 1172:6 1245:21
wheeler 1309:13
  1310:1,17,20 1311:8
  1311:10
wheeler's 1309:15
wheelers 1273:9
  1283:21 1305:13
wheeling 1159:17
  1171:8 1172:16
```

1173:2,12,13,19,24

1174:2,7,22,23

1175:2 1182:5

```
1184:15 1185:10,13
  1186:9,23 1188:23
  1189:8,21 1190:2,5
  1190:13,18,22 1191:8
  1193:6,8,20,25
  1194:14 1200:21
  1201:8 1203:21
  1204:1.5 1205:22
  1213:19 1215:3
  1216:11,25 1217:4
  1218:13 1219:15
  1221:2,13 1226:2
  1227:17 1229:7
  1230:7,10 1231:25
  1233:1,14 1245:4,17
  1246:9 1256:7
  1272:25 1273:5
  1283:16,18,21
  1294:14,24 1308:21
  1308:25 1309:3,8
  1311:12 1314:7,8
  1315:1,4 1342:8,14
  1342:18 1344:17,24
  1347:3,9,15,18,20,23
  1348:1 1350:1
wheeling-type 1283:4
whiteboard 1192:9
wholesale 1267:20
willing 1196:7 1228:23
Wilson 1340:14
window 1322:10
wished 1218:3
withdraw 1298:21
witness 1159:8 1160:6
  1160:8,12,15,18,22
  1164:16 1182:1
  1191:24 1192:5
  1193:5 1201:22,24
  1202:1,6 1203:1
  1205:11 1207:12
  1210:13 1212:4
  1224:22 1227:7
  1232:16 1236:19,21
  1242:2 1247:24
  1260:24 1261:9
  1262:11 1268:19,22
  1269:1 1275:13
  1285:18 1293:5
  1295:22 1303:21
  1318:21 1320:2
  1323:22 1326:24
  1330:14,22,23 1337:1
  1338:5,7,9,11 1342:1
  1352:15
witnesses 1159:2
  1262:2 1267:7
word 1198:22 1201:25
  1202:5 1210:12
```

```
1225:10 1232:11
  1346:22 1348:8
words 1185:21 1285:13
  1301:8 1306:2,4
  1328:23 1339:21
  1346:19 1347:11,12
wordsmith 1243:11
work 1161:13.15
  1162:7,13,25 1260:2
  1274:14 1286:7
  1292:25 1297:23
  1327:21
worked 1284:5 1286:9
  1303:18 1340:15
working 1187:10
  1243:10 1273:22
  1278:24 1284:2,3
  1296:14 1320:12
workshop 1284:19
workshops 1284:4
world 1259:25 1283:2
WORLDWIDE
  1157:23
worth 1247:17,23
wouldn't 1170:5
  1195:21 1209:19
  1284:9,11 1322:2
  1335:23
write 1344:16
writes 1342:5 1344:15
writing 1200:7,12
  1201:17 1338:19
  1344:8
written 1203:25 1247:1
  1247:8
wrong 1334:15
wrote 1161:16 1247:1
          X
X 1159:1
Yeah 1254:25 1335:19
  1349:13
year 1161:18 1164:21
  1165:6,12,24 1214:25
  1216:22 1225:3
  1272:10,20 1275:12
  1275:13 1276:14,21
  1279:16 1282:9,9,12
  1288:4,4 1309:18
  1312:25 1317:16
years 1162:11 1164:14
  1164:15,18 1165:2,19
  1165:22,24,25
  1175:17,19,22
  1184:25 1185:16,18
  1194:22 1195:5,18
```

```
1196:2,8 1198:10
  1209:2,3,5 1213:14
  1213:16,17,24
  1216:23 1217:13
  1221:11 1234:21
  1235:7 1246:23
  1248:5 1249:10
  1254:4.23 1255:2.9
  1255:18 1258:15
  1260:16 1266:21
  1271:16 1274:14
  1276:6 1278:8 1284:1
  1284:2 1288:3,4,7
  1301:4,11,12 1302:5
  1302:20 1305:23
  1306:16,17,25 1308:6
  1308:7,14 1309:18
  1316:9 1320:24
  1321:5 1322:1,7,13
  1322:19 1325:8,16
  1327:12 1328:3
  1331:16 1332:8
  1333:1,25 1334:5,11
  1335:18,25 1336:15
  1337:7,22 1340:24
  1350:14
yesterday 1257:9,21
  1258:25
          \mathbf{Z}
zero 1245:13 1246:6
          0
03 1176:25 1177:1,8,8
  1181.20
050 1291:14
          1
1 1157:12,12,17 1160:2
  1167:25 1198:3
  1218:6,12 1223:22
  1244:2 1245:1
  1267:11,14 1284:11
  1286:15
1-10 1157:13
1-12th 1313:2
1.2 1278:1
1.7 1282:8
1/12th 1313:10
1:30 1243:17 1244:3
```

<b>102</b> 1242:9 <b>104</b> 1241:25 1242:3	<b>1812.5</b> 1173:6	1192:7,8,11,19	1264:24 1265:5,7	<b>450</b> 1282:12
	<b>19</b> 1226:7 1238:23,25	1194:12 1200:17,20	<b>25</b> 1162:10 1209:3	<b>481</b> 1159:17 1170:22
1248:20	1245:2 1340:3 1343:2	1201:6,13 1206:15	1331:9	1170:25 1171:1,2,4
<b>105,000</b> 1272:10	<b>1941</b> 1281:10	1207:18 1208:9	<b>250A</b> 1263:20	1171:13,17 1244:23
10th 1158:13	<b>1984</b> 1161:9,10,13	1215:18 1219:3	<b>253</b> 1176:8 1212:23	11/1.15,1/ 1244.25
<b>11</b> 1198:3	1271:22	1226:11,12 1231:18	1294:14,16,21,24	5
<b>11.1</b> 1321:9 1332:12	<b>1988</b> 1272:3 1273:22	1231:21,23,24 1232:6	1295:1,3 1296:1,20	<b>5</b> 1172:20 1173:11
1333:8,20	1990s 1282:17 1283:17	1231:21,23,24 1232:0	253-dollar 1219:9	1227:24 1244:24
<b>110</b> 1216:23 1217:13	<b>1994</b> 1161:18,18	1237:2 1245:25	<b>26</b> 1256:6,8 1270:2	1280:18
1248:5 1302:5,20	<b>1995</b> 1269:18	1246:17 1247:13	<b>27</b> 1186:4,14,17	<b>5.2</b> 1175:6,7,8 1176:7
<b>1149</b> 1230:3 1244:12	<b>1996</b> 1274:12	1256:1,4,23 1270:17	1198:15,19 1321:10	1194:16 1198:9
<b>1157</b> 1157:13	<b>1997</b> 1204:25	1273:15 1279:17	1345:11	1236:24 1278:8
<b>116</b> 1233:25 1234:9	<b>1998</b> 1163:20,21	1280:17,21 1281:3,5	<b>28</b> 1183:10	1317:10 1322:13
<b>1161</b> 1159:3	1164:5,9,20,23	1284:11 1286:15,16	20 1103.10	1324:3 1332:5,25
<b>117</b> 1233:21	1166:11,13 1167:1,3	1286:16 1287:11,14	3	<b>50</b> 1215:9 1299:14
<b>1171</b> 1159:17,17	1167:18 1169:1	1287:15 1290:5	<b>3</b> 1166:2 1345:25	<b>500</b> 1220:16 1278:9
<b>1181</b> 1159:20,20	1170:2,21 1172:20	1292:5 1294:10	1349:16	<b>51</b> 1236:23
<b>12</b> 1233:21	1174:8 1191:25	1297:22 1299:14	<b>30</b> 1164:17,17,21	<b>513</b> 1159:18 1262:13
<b>12.5</b> 1198:17,21	1197:24 1202:12	1300:10 1301:12	1165:2,6,12 1184:25	1263:11,13
<b>12.3</b> 1150.17,21 <b>1203</b> 1159:3	1203:20 1204:8	1307:13,14,16,20	1185:16 1193:15	<b>514</b> 1262:16 1263:11
<b>122</b> 1331:9	1213:11,23 1214:1,12	1308:8 1309:8	1196:1 1213:14	<b>515</b> 1262:18 1263:11
<b>124</b> 1331:9	1244:24 1246:10	1317:12 1329:4	1288:3	<b>516</b> 1263:11
<b>1257</b> 1159:4	1276:22 1282:25	1334:23 1336:18,21	<b>30-some</b> 1279:21	<b>517</b> 1159:18 1263:11
<b>1258</b> 1159:4	1287:12,20 1288:2,5	1336:22 1337:4	1299:22 1300:1	1263:13
<b>1260</b> 1159:4	1291:9,12,24 1292:3	1340:3 1341:3 1343:2	<b>30-year</b> 1166:10	<b>518</b> 1262:21
<b>1263</b> 1159:19,19	1292:3 1308:21	1343:8 1345:11,14	1185:15 1301:5	<b>522-7096</b> 1157:25
<b>1265</b> 1159:6,14,14,15	<b>1999</b> 1276:5	1349:3	1307:1	<b>550,000</b> 1277:24
1159:15		<b>2006</b> 1269:16	<b>304</b> 1157:4 1160:4	<b>56</b> 1159:13 1340:1
<b>1269</b> 1159:9	2	<b>2007</b> 1234:11 1236:19	1244:4	1343:24 1344:7,12
<b>13</b> 1264:21,22,23	<b>2</b> 1167:25 1188:20,22	<b>2010</b> 1264:12,17	<b>31</b> 1166:18 1185:18	<b>57</b> 1185:22
<b>13.12</b> 1324:19	1193:17 1194:3	1329:9,10	1280:9,15 1288:4	
<b>13.9</b> 1200:2,3	1220:2 1237:9	<b>2011</b> 1329:9	1340:24	6
<b>1316</b> 1159:9	1349:25	<b>2012</b> 1157:12 1264:12	<b>3374</b> 1157:20 1352:6	<b>60</b> 1193:15
<b>1343</b> 1159:16,16	<b>2/19/03</b> 1159:13,16	1264:16	1352:23	<b>600,000</b> 1280:18
<b>1344</b> 1159:13,13	<b>20</b> 1162:10 1223:18,23	<b>2013</b> 1157:12	<b>381A</b> 1263:20	<b>633</b> 1158:6
<b>135</b> 1257:23 1334:20	1227:25 1235:7	<b>2014</b> 1157:12	<b>398</b> 1159:16 1342:25	<b>64</b> 1226:6
<b>1352</b> 1157:13	1254:15 1258:15	<b>2015</b> 1157:17 1160:2	1343:5,21,23	<b>65</b> 1175:1,2 1183:16
<b>136</b> 1334:21	1260:16	1244:2 1352:16	<b>3rd</b> 1157:24	1194:18,19 1198:16
<b>13th</b> 1352:15	<b>20-year</b> 1220:6	<b>21</b> 1241:25 1242:6,9		1237:1,3,4 1317:7
<b>14</b> 1238:23	<b>200</b> 1223:18,23	1248:22	4	<b>68</b> 1227:24
<b>15</b> 1165:19,22,24,25	1290:12	<b>213.217.6000</b> 1158:17	4 1186:6,7 1241:5	ļ —
1213:16,17,23	<b>200,000</b> 1165:23,25	<b>213.443.3000</b> 1158:14	1347:2 1350:12	7
1248:20 1257:24	1272:21	<b>218</b> 1256:5,8	<b>4.4</b> 1172:15 1196:19	7 1248:22 1264:20,21
1258:2,2,7,8,11	<b>2000</b> 1277:22 1278:4,6	<b>23</b> 1167:6	1277:17,25 1278:10	1264:23
1288:7 1342:8	1281:11 1283:17	<b>235</b> 1215:1 1216:20,21	1278:13,23 1280:13	<b>7/8/03</b> 1159:20
<b>16</b> 1175:5,6 1188:8	<b>2001</b> 1284:9 1286:13	1221:23 1290:23	1289:1	<b>70</b> 1275:5,9
1215:18 1219:3	1307:18	1298:25 1346:6	<b>415</b> 1157:25	<b>700</b> 1158:16
1236:24 1317:10	<b>2002</b> 1280:9,16	<b>235A</b> 1263:19	<b>415.391.5400</b> 1158:7	<b>701</b> 1157:24
1324:3 1334:21	1284:10 1299:13	<b>237A</b> 1263:19	<b>423</b> 1219:23	<b>75</b> 1276:13 1308:6
1349:3	<b>2003</b> 1162:18 1163:1,9	<b>24</b> 1198:2 1226:7	<b>4405</b> 1230:4	1320:24 1321:5
<b>17</b> 1175:5 1184:4	1163:13 1164:3,10	1321:11 1332:15	<b>45</b> 1164:13 1185:18	1322:1,7
1194:17 1236:24	1166:5,8 1168:10,18	<b>24/7</b> 1275:21	1195:18 1288:4,5	<b>77,000</b> 1216:22
1237:8 1254:8,15	1169:5 1175:2,8,15	<b>245A</b> 1263:19	1301:4 1306:25	8
1324:3,17 1334:21	1175:20 1183:10	<b>246A</b> 1263:19	1308:6 1320:23	<b>8.1</b> 1167:11
<b>179</b> 1240:17	1184:8 1186:4,14,17	<b>246B</b> 1159:14 1264:14	1340:24 45 year 1165:14	<b>80</b> 1289:11
<b>18</b> 1223:18,23	1188:8 1189:4,5,11 1189:15,22 1190:20	1264:16,19 1265:5,7	<b>45-year</b> 1165:14 1185:15 1302:6	<b>80,000</b> 1214:24 1275:5
<b>180</b> 1240:23,25 1241:3	1189:15,22 1190:20	<b>247A</b> 1263:19 <b>247B</b> 1159:15 1264:16	1303:13 1306:19	1275:9 1276:14
<b>1810</b> 1173:1				

		1	1	ı İ
<b>800</b> 1157:25				
<b>800,000</b> 1278:9				
<b>811</b> 1159:20 1181:21				
1181:25 1182:2				
1183:18,20,21,23,25				
<b>82</b> 1346:2,13				
041 1107.4 ( 1100.24				
<b>841</b> 1187:4,6 1188:24				
1189:2,3 1348:9				
<b>865</b> 1158:13				
<b>884</b> 1230:21,22,23,25				
1231:15				
<b>89</b> 1238:23,24				
,				
9				
<b>900</b> 1220:16				
<b>90012</b> 1158:17				
<b>90017-2543</b> 1158:13				
907 1219:23				
<b>90s</b> 1278:24				
<b>94111</b> 1157:24				
<b>97</b> 1229:6 1292:5				
<b>98</b> 1167:1 1169:20				
1192:6 1222:11				
1229:6 1257:22				
1288:9 1308:20				
<b>981-3498</b> 1157:25				
<b>99</b> 1254:6,15				
>> 120o,10				
Ī	=			<u>-</u>

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                                         INDEX
                COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                         2
                                                                              DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW
                                                                              KIGHTLINGER, Jeff
                                                                                                       1358 1382
                 DEPARTMENT 304
                                                                              (resumed)
      SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                              UPADHYAH, Devendra
                                                                                                     1397 1411 1440
         Petitioner and Plaintiff, ) Case No.
                        ) CPF-10-510830
                         ) CPF-12-512466
                                                                              STAPLETON, Maureen
                                                                                                     1443 1517 --
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL
      PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE
      VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY ) Volume IX
                                                                        10
      THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT )
      OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL )
                                                                        11
                                                                                        EXHIBITS
      10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY)
                                                                        12
                                                                              NUMBER
                                                                                                        FOR ID EVIDENCE
      1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and )
                                                                        13
                                                                                   8/17/04 fax
                                                                                                       1377
                                                                                                             1377
      DOES 1-10,
                         Pages 1353 - 1534
                                                                        14
                                                                                   5/3/10 letter
                                                                                                        1362
                                                                                                              1362
        Respondents and Defendants. )
                                                                        15
                                                                              120
                                                                                   8/2/05 letter
                                                                                                       1424
                                                                                                              1420
                                                                        16
                                                                              175
                                                                                   6/30/10 letter
                                                                                                        1363
                                                                                                              1363
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                                                        17
                                                                                   2/24/11 letter
                                                                                                        1366
                                                                                                              1366
               San Francisco Superior
                                                                        18
                                                                              207
                                                                                   8/26/11 letter
                                                                                                        1364
                                                                                                              1364
               San Francisco, California
                                                                        19
               Thursday, April 2, 2015
                                                                              221
                                                                                   9/25/03 presentation
                                                                                                          1486 1486
                                                                        20
                                                                              225
                                                                                   5/4/12 letter
                                                                                                       1364
                                                                                                              1365
      Reported By:
                                                                        21
                                                                              229
                                                                                   10/2 letter from McCrae
                                                                                                            1367
      TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR #3374
                                                                                                                  1367
                                                                        22
                                                                              230
                                                                                   10/15 letter from Breaux
                                                                                                            1367
                                                                                                                 1367
               JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                        23
                                                                                   2/5/13 letter
                                                                                                       1367
                                                                                                              1367
          WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                        24
       701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                              234
                                                                                   2/15/13 letter
                                                                                                        1367
                                                                                                              1367
            (415) 981-3498 or (800) 522-7096
                                                                        25
                                                                              243
                                                                                   6/18/13 letter
                                                                                                        1367
                                                                                                              1367
                                                            1353
                                                                                                                                    1355
         APPEARANCES
                                                                                302
                                                                                       7/3/06 email (EC54-547)
                                                                                                                       1367
                                                                                                                               1367
     For Petitioner and Plaintiff:
                                                                         2
                                                                                            EXHIBITS (continued)
     KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                         3
     BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ.
BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                                358
                                                                                      7/7/10 letter
                                                                                                                1436
                                                                                                                        1436
                                                                         4
                                                                                475
                                                                                      12/28/01 Draft Report Rates
                                                                                                                        1447
                                                                                                                                1447
     BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                         5
                                                                                      2/10/11 letter
                                                                                624
                                                                                                                 1369
                                                                                                                         1369
     BY: WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ.
                                                                         6
                                                                                      10/11/01 MWD Rate Structure
     BY: NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG, ESQ.
                                                                                767
                                                                                                                          1445
                                                                                                                                   1445
     633 Battery Street
                                                                         7
                                                                                      2/28/02 Minutes
                                                                                772
                                                                                                                   1449
                                                                                                                           1449
     San Francisco, California
                                                                         8
                                                                                829
                                                                                      9/9/03 email
                                                                                                                 1464
                                                                                                                         1464
     415.391.5400
     Email: ahadlock@kvn.com
                                                                         9
                                                                                830
                                                                                      9/10/03 email
                                                                                                                  1470
                                                                                                                          1470
     Email: dpurcell@kvn.com
                                                                        10
                                                                                      9/16/03 email
                                                                                837
                                                                                                                  1473
                                                                                                                          1473
     Email: jkeker@kvn.com
                                                                        11
                                                                                      9/24/03 document re Water Policy
                                                                                856
     Email: wbraunig@kvn.com
     Email: ngoldberg@kvn.com
                                                                                    Committee
                                                                                                                1479
                                                                                                                        1479
10
                                                                        12
11
     For Respondent and Defendant Metropolitan Water District
     of Southern California:
                                                                                909 7/30/04 letter
                                                                                                                 1374
                                                                                                                        1374
12
                                                                        13
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
                                                                                979 2/2011 SB-60 Report
                                                                                                                             1439
13
     BY: JOHN B. QUINN, ESQ.
                                                                                                                      1411
     BY: ERIC J. EMANUEL, ESQ
                                                                        14
     865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
                                                                                1114 Water Authority's MWD Work Plan 1514
                                                                                                                                      1514
     Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
                                                                        15
     213.443.3000
     Email: johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com
                                                                        16
16
          and
                                                                        17
     OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
17
     BY: JOSEPH VANDERHORST, ESQ.
                                                                        18
     700 North Alameda Street
                                                                        19
18
     Los Angeles, California 90012
                                                                        20
     213.217.6000
19
                                                                        21
20
                                                                        2.2
21
                                                                        2.3
22
23
                                                                        24
24
                                                                        25
25
                                                            1354
                                                                                                                                    1356
```

```
1
                San Francisco, California
                                                                           Q. I think you testified that San Diego during
 2
                                                                   2
                                                                         that five years didn't try to persuade Metropolitan to
                Thursday, April 2, 2015
                                                                   3
 3
                    10:00 a.m.
                                                                         change the cost allocations that went into its rate
                                                                   4
 4
       Department 304
                             Hon. Curtis E. A. Karnow, Judge
                                                                         structure; correct?
                                                                   5
 5
                                                                           A. Yes.
 6
                                                                   6
            THE COURT: Good morning.
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: All right. I'd like to read from
                                                                   7
            I had a chance to look at Metropolitan's motion
                                                                         Brian Thomas's deposition again, the person most
                                                                   8
 8
       brought at the conclusion of the Plaintiff's case. And
                                                                         knowledgeable for Metropolitan, pages 144, line 18, to
 9
                                                                   9
       I am going to defer this until the end of trial. I
                                                                         145, line 21.
10
                                                                  10
       think I understand the differences in approaches here.
                                                                              THE COURT: Is that something that I have?
                                                                  11
11
            We've got two views as to how it is proper to
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: We can get it up on the screen.
12
                                                                  12
       establish a breach and how it is proper to measure
                                                                              THE COURT: Let's follow along on the screen.
13
                                                                  13
       damages. I think the wisest course is to defer ruling
                                                                              You don't have that?
                                                                  14
14
       until the end of this trial.
                                                                              THE WITNESS: I am not aware if I have it.
1.5
                                                                  1.5
                                                                              THE COURT: Let's follow along on the screen.
            So let's proceed with our witnesses.
16
                                                                  16
                                                                              You don't have that?
17
                                                                  17
                  JEFF KIGHTLINGER,
                                                                              THE WITNESS: I am not aware I have it. Maybe
18
                                                                  18
       resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
                                                                         it is in one of these binders.
                                                                  19
19
                                                                              MR. KEKER: 144, yes.
20
                                                                  20
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: This is in evidence as PTX 516.
            THE COURT: You recall you are still under
                                                                  21
21
       oath?
                                                                              May I proceed, your Honor?
                                                                  2.2
2.2
            THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
                                                                              THE COURT: Please.
23
                                                                  23
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: (Reading:)
24
      //
                                                                  24
                                                                              Starting at page 144, line 18 and going to page
2.5
                                                                  2.5
       ///
                                                                         145 at line 21.
                                                      1357
                                                                                                                         1359
 1
                                                                   1
                CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)
                                                                                 "Q Okay. The Water Authority
 2
                                                                   2
       BY MR. PURCELL:
                                                                                 waited until beyond that
 3
                                                                   3
         Q. Good morning, Mr. Kightlinger.
                                                                                 five-year period before it
 4
         A. Good morning, sir.
                                                                   4
                                                                                 filed this lawsuit; correct?
 5
                                                                   5
         Q. I would just like to clear one thing up to
                                                                                 "A Yes.
 6
                                                                    6
       start with. There's a lot of testimony yesterday about
                                                                                 "Q During the -- during the
 7
                                                                   7
       the Metropolitan rate structure; correct?
                                                                                 time between the filing of the
 8
                                                                   8
         A. Yes.
                                                                                 exchange agreement or, rather,
 9
         Q. Now, the rate structure is the buckets that Met
                                                                   9
                                                                                 the signing of the exchange
1.0
                                                                  10
       arranges for the rates; right? There is a supply
                                                                                 agreement and the filing of
11
                                                                  11
       bucket; there's a power bucket, and there is a system
                                                                                 this lawsuit, the Water
12
                                                                  12
       access bucket?
                                                                                 Authority participated in
13
         A. Yes.
                                                                  13
                                                                                 various Metropolitan processes
14
                                                                  14
         Q. San Diego's objections aren't to the buckets,
                                                                                 related to the setting of Met's
15
       really; they are to the allocation of costs that go into
                                                                  15
                                                                                 rates; right?
16
                                                                  16
                                                                                 "A Yes.
       the buckets; correct?
17
                                                                  17
         A. That is how I understand their objections, yes.
                                                                                 "Q The Water Authority
18
                                                                  18
         Q. Okay, good.
                                                                                 continued to advocate for
19
                                                                  19
            So I am going to talk about in terms of cost
                                                                                 changes to Met's rates in the
20
                                                                  20
       allocations, really, rather than the rate structure, and
                                                                                 boardroom and in committee
21
                                                                  2.1
       if there is any confusion, please let me know.
                                                                                 meetings; right?
22
                                                                  22
            You testified yesterday about the five-year
                                                                                 "A Yes.
23
       period following the execution of the exchange
                                                                  23
                                                                                 "O That was part of the rate
2.4
       agreement: correct?
                                                                  2.4
                                                                                 -- for example, the rate
25
                                                                  25
         A. Yes.
                                                                                 refinement process?
                                                       1358
                                                                                                                         1360
```

		1	
. 1	"A Yes. Staff, as well. In	1	MR. PURCELL: Can I get PTX 175 up on the
2	staff meetings, as well.	2	screen?
3	"Q And in staff meetings, as	3	Q. Mr. Kightlinger, is this a subsequent letter to
4	well.	4	the Water Authority sent to Karen Tachiki, your
5	"And likewise, there was a cost	5	successor as Metropolitan general counsel, involving the
6	of service review process that	6	resolution dispute process in paragraph 11.1?
7		7	
8	the Water Authority		A. Yes, it looks like it.
	participated in during that	8	Q. Did you get a copy of this letter when it was
9	process?	9	sent to Ms. Tachiki?
10	"A Yes.	10	A. Probably.
11	"Q And as part of the cost of	11	MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, I would like to move
12	service review process, the	12	PTX 175 into evidence.
1.3	Water Authority again advocated	13	MR. EMANUEL: I have an objection. This was
14	in the boardroom, and in	14	not part of Plaintiff's exhibit list in advance of
15	committee meetings and in staff	15	trial. I will not object to it being admitted, but I do
16	meetings for changes to	16	want it noted that it is not really playing by the
17	Metropolitan's rates?	17	rules.
18	"A Yes."	18	MR. PURCELL: It is on our list, your Honor.
19	Q. Mr. Kightlinger, was Mr. Thomas wrong?	19	We are happy to provide a copy of the list.
20	A. No.	20	THE COURT: We can take care of that at one of
21	Q. We talked yesterday a little bit about the	21	
22		22	the convenient breaks today. In the meantime, PTX 175
23	dispute resolution process in Section 11.1 of the		is admitted.
24	exchange agreement.	23	(Exhibit 175 was received into evidence.)
	Do you remember that discussion?	24	MR. PURCELL: Can I have PTX 207 up on the
25	A. Yes.	25	screen?
	1261		1262
	1361	-	1363
1	Q. Prior to the Water Authority filing this	1	Q. Mr. Kightlinger, is this a letter that the
2	lawsuit, the Water Authority invoked that dispute	2	Water Authority sent to Metropolitan, to you
3	resolution process; correct?	3	specifically, stating that all payments made to the
4	A. Yes, they sent us a letter at some point,	4	water stewardship rate after June 23, 2011, are made
5	around 2010, I believe.	5	under protest?
6		6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And Metropolitan responded with a letter of its	7	
8	own?	8	MR. PURCELL: I would like to move PTX 207 into
	A. I believe so. I don't think you showed it to	9	evidence.
9	me yesterday. I think we did respond.		MR. EMANUEL: No objection, your Honor.
10	Q. I would just like to do that now and hopefully	10	THE COURT: I am looking at the record. It
11	we can do it quickly. Can I get PTX 169 up on the	11	clearly reflects your position.
12	screen?	12	PTX 207 is admitted.
13	Mr. Kightlinger, is this the letter the Water	13	(PTX 207 was received into evidence.)
14	Authority sent to you invoking paragraph 11.1?	14	MR. PURCELL: Can I have PTX 225 up on the
15	A. Yes.	15	screen?
16	MR. PURCELL: I would like to move PTX 169 into	16	Q. Mr. Kightlinger, is this a letter you sent in
17	evidence, your Honor.	17	response to the Water Authority's request for a
18	MR. EMANUEL: I really don't understand the	18	negotiation under paragraph 11.1 of the exchange
19	point of this.	19	agreement?
20	THE COURT: What's your objection?	20	A. I can't see the bottom. I don't know if I
21	MR. EMANUEL: The objection is relevance, your	21	signed it or Karen signed it, but this is certainly a
22	Honor.	22	letter in response from Metropolitan, yes.
23	THE COURT: Overruled.	23	Q. I think PTX 225 is in the new binder I gave you
24	PTX 169 is admitted.	24	
25		25	this morning, if you want to confirm that fact. It is
23	(Exhibit PTX 169 was received into evidence.)	23	in fact.
	1362		1364
I	1302	1	1304

```
1
            Actually, Mr. Kightlinger, you can see on the
                                                                         asking they lay a foundation and let's go through it.
2
                                                                   2
      screen, I pulled up the signature block.
                                                                               THE COURT: All right. Let's go.
                                                                   3
 3
         A. That is my signature, ves.
                                                                               MR. PURCELL: Let's just do it.
                                                                   4
 4
            MR. PURCELL: I would like to move 225 into
                                                                               PTX 229, next, please. I would like to move
                                                                   5
 5
                                                                         PTX 229 in evidence, your Honor.
      evidence
                                                                   6
 6
           MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
                                                                               THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                                   7
                                                                               MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
           THE COURT: PTX 225 is admitted.
                                                                   8
 8
                                                                               THE COURT: PTX 229 is admitted.
           (Exhibit PTX 225 was received in evidence.)
                                                                   9
                                                                               (Exhibit 229 was received in evidence.)
 9
         Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Mr. Kightlinger, Metropolitan
10
                                                                  10
                                                                               MR. PURCELL: PTX 230 is the next exhibit. I
      has never contended that the Water Authority failed to
                                                                  11
                                                                         would like to move PTX 230 into evidence.
11
      satisfy the dispute resolution obligation in paragraph
                                                                  12
      11.1 of the exchange agreement; correct?
                                                                               MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
12
                                                                  13
13
                                                                               THE COURT: PTX 230 is admitted.
         A. That's correct.
                                                                  14
14
                                                                               (Exhibit 230 was received in evidence.)
         Q. Similarly, there's a procedure under the
                                                                  1.5
                                                                               MR. PURCELL: PTX 232. I would like to move
15
      exchange agreement for Metropolitan to set aside
                                                                  16
                                                                         PTX 232 into evidence.
16
      disputed amounts of payments under the exchange
                                                                  17
17
                                                                               MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
      agreement when there's a price dispute; correct?
                                                                  18
                                                                               THE COURT: PTX 232 is admitted.
18
         A. Yes.
                                                                  19
                                                                               MR. PURCELL: PTX 234. I would like to move
19
         Q. And the Water Authority sent some
                                                                  20
                                                                         PTX 234 into evidence.
20
      correspondence to Metropolitan invoking that set-aside
                                                                  21
                                                                               MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
21
      procedure?
                                                                  2.2
                                                                               THE COURT: PTX 234 is admitted.
22
         A. Yes.
                                                                  23
                                                                               MR. PURCELL: PTX 243. I would like to move
23
         Q. And Metropolitan responded to the Water
                                                                  24
                                                                         PTX 243 into evidence.
24
      Authority's letters?
                                                                  25
                                                                               THE COURT: I would like to ask whether these
25
         A. Yes, they did.
                                                      1365
                                                                                                                        1367
1
                                                                   1
         Q. In fact, money was set aside?
                                                                         are coming in to try to prove any disputed fact?
2
                                                                   2
         A. Yes, it was.
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, these are trying --
 3
                                                                   3
                                                                         these are being submitted for the purpose of proving the
            MR. PURCELL: I would like to show you a few
                                                                   4
 4
      letters on that. PTX 189, please.
                                                                         amounts that were set aside -- under the set-aside
 5
                                                                   5
                                                                         provision of the contract. We don't think there's a
         Q. Mr. Kightlinger, is this a letter that the
                                                                   6
 6
      Metropolitan general counsel sent to Dan Hentschke, San
                                                                         dispute about it.
 7
                                                                   7
      Diego general counsel, regarding payments under protest
                                                                              THE COURT: Is it part of your case that X
 8
                                                                   8
      under the exchange agreement?
                                                                         dollars were set aside or that money was set aside?
                                                                   9
 9
         A. Yes, it is.
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: It relates to the availability of
                                                                  10
10
            MR. PURCELL: I would like to move PTX 189 into
                                                                         interest under the damages calculation.
                                                                  11
11
      evidence.
                                                                              THE COURT: Okay.
                                                                  12
12
           MR. EMANUEL: No objection, your Honor,
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, if I may, these don't
                                                                  13
13
      although the copy that is on the screen doesn't have a
                                                                         go to the amount that has been set aside.
14
                                                                  14
      number on it. Is it there someplace else?
                                                                              THE COURT: How many of these are there?
                                                                  15
15
           MR. PURCELL: It is at the top.
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: One more.
16
                                                                  16
            MR. EMANUEL: That's all I needed.
                                                                              THE WITNESS: This letter is about a bond.
17
                                                                  17
                                                                              THE COURT: We will wait for a question. Is
            THE COURT: PTX 189 is admitted.
18
                                                                  18
            (Exhibit 189 is received in evidence.)
                                                                         there an objection to PTX 243?
19
                                                                  19
            MR. PURCELL: I am happy to do this one by one.
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: No.
20
                                                                  20
      We invited Metropolitan to stipulate to admission of
                                                                              THE COURT: PTX 243 is admitted.
                                                                  21
21
      these letters between the parties. I don't think there
                                                                              MR. PURCELL: The last one is DTX 624.
22
      is any objection to the authenticity of any of them.
                                                                  22
                                                                              THE COURT: This last one only is a D; correct?
2.3
                                                                  23
           MR. EMANUEL: I am a little put off that they
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: No objection, your Honor.
24
                                                                  24
                                                                              THE COURT: DTX 624 is admitted.
      asked for a stipulation. That is not really appropriate
25
                                                                  25
      to argue in front of the Court. Right now I am just
                                                      1366
                                                                                                                        1368
```

2.5

(Exhibits 232, 234, 243 and 624 were received in evidence.)

1.0

2.4

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Mr. Kightlinger, getting back to the substance of the case here for a second, one of the issues that San Diego objected to, I think you testified yesterday, was the inclusion of State Water Project costs in Metropolitan's transportation rates; correct?

# A. Yes. Going back to the late '90s, they protested that when we were doing the unbundling process.

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, the State Water Project is not the start of the Metropolitan's facilities and infrastructure; correct?

### A. It is owned by the State of California.

Q. I would like to put up PTX 302. Is this an e-mail that you sent to your board of directors in July of 2006 about the LADWP AVEK turnout agreement?

### A. It appears to be. I don't recall the issue.

MR. PURCELL: I move Exhibit 302 into evidence.
MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
THE COURT: PTX 302 is admitted.
(Exhibit 302 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: Going to the last paragraph on page one, the second sentence says, "Distilled to its

provisions of the Metropolitan Water District Act, Administrative Code or adopted board policies."

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. One of the reasons that this agreement was within the authority of Mr. Gastelum to execute without submitting to the Metropolitan board of directors was because LADWP moving non State Water Project water through the State Water Project did not require the use of any Metropolitan facilities or infrastructure; correct?

#### A. That's right.

Q. Mr. Kightlinger, you are familiar with the rate structure integrity program; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. That was a program where Metropolitan included certain language within local resource program contracts; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And that language that Metropolitan included in contracts permitted Metropolitan to terminate the contract if the recipient member agency mounted a challenge to Metropolitan's current rate structure; correct?

A. Yes.

essence, this agreement permits AVEK to transport non State Water Project, SWP water, through the California aqueduct, and to deliver such water to LADWP at a turnout to be constructed within AVEK's service area."

### A. Yes.

Q. This refers to the agreement that permits LADWP to obtain non State Water Project water through the State Water Project facilities without needing to move through Metropolitan's facilities; correct?

# A. Yes.

Q. I would like to highlight the first paragraph under Authority for the turnout agreement, page three.

This paragraph reads, "Another question that has been raised is whether the former CEO had the authority to execute the turnout agreement without obtaining prior approval from the board of directors.

"As I explained at the meeting, Mr. Gastelum posed this question to me, as then general counsel, and it was my conclusion it was within his authority to execute the turnout agreement because it is, "one, was consistent with enforcement of Metropolitan's rights under the State water contract; two, did not require the use of Metropolitan's facilities or infrastructure; three, did not require any expenditure of Metropolitan's funds; and, four, did not conflict with any applicable

Q. It did not permit Metropolitan to terminate the contract if Metropolitan were to change its rate structure and then the agency were to mount a challenge to the new rate structure; correct?

# A. I don't recall that twist on it. That sounds right. I would have to take a look at it.

Q. We can show you the documents and hopefully refresh you.

Can we have PTX 80 to put on the screen. This is in evidence.

This is a little bit of background. This is a memo, June 18, 2004, from Ron Gastelum, who was then the CEO and general manager of Metropolitan; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Your predecessor. Not your immediate predecessor, but one of them in that role?

#### A. Exactly.

Q. It's the job you have today?

#### A. Yes.

Q. The first paragraph says, "For years we have been discussing the continuing financial risk to Metropolitan and the member agencies from the threat of legal or legislative actions undermining our rate structure. As in the past, some entities for their own gain may challenge the rate structure in order to convey

1 water at a lesser cost than as required to properly clarifying at our July member agency managers' meeting 2 2 maintain the system's integrity and reliability. This that the San Diego County Water Authority has no plans 3 3 challenge is not presented by deficiencies in the rate to challenge Metropolitan's rate structure. At the same 4 4 structure but by continuing economic attraction of lower time, you suggested a meeting with me would be useful to 5 cost based agricultural transfer water, if it can be 5 address the reservation by the authority in the 6 6 conveyed into our service area at marginal cost." quantification settlement agreement, QSA, to challenge 7 Do you see that? Metropolitan's rate structure after five years." 8 8 A. I do. Do you see that? 9 9 Q. That accurately summarizes why Metropolitan A. I do. 10 10 wanted to put the rate structure integrity into place; Q. Mr. Gastelum is summarizing a meeting he had 11 11 correct? with Miss Stapleton; correct? 12 12 A. Yes. A. Yes, I think so. A phone call, meeting, 13 13 Q. And then in the second paragraph Mr. Gastelum something. 14 writes: "One indication that such concern is still 14 Q. Mr. Gastelum is stating what his impression is 15 valid was the San Diego Water Authority's position in 15 of what Miss Stapleton told him; correct? 16 the QSA agreement reserving their right to challenge 16 A. That's my understanding of this. 17 Metropolitan's uniform wheeling rates after five years 17 Q. Mr. Gastelum, when he talks about the 18 from the date of execution of the QSA." 18 reservation by the authority to challenge Metropolitan's 19 Do you see that? 19 rate structure after five years, he doesn't say anything 20 A. Yes. 20 about a new rate structure, does he? 21 Q. Mr. Gastelum is specifically referring to San 21 A. Not in this sentence, no. 2.2 Diego as a member agency that might litigate in the 22 Q. He doesn't limit his understanding of San 23 future; correct? 23 Diego's right to challenge Metropolitan's rate structure 24 A. Yes. 24 as to some material change in the cost allocation? 2.5 Q. That reference to five years, that's a 25 A. He doesn't go into that detail, no. 1373 1375 1 reference to the five-year provision in paragraph 5.2 of 1 Q. I would like to show you PTX 95. 2 2 Is this an August 17, 2004, fax from you to the exchange agreement? 3 3 A. Yes. your then counterpart at the Water Authority, Dan 4 4 Q. Mr. Gastelum doesn't say anything there about Hentschke, the general counsel? 5 5 San Diego reserving its right only to challenge new cost A. It looks like it, yes. 6 6 MR. PURCELL: I would like to move PTX 95 into allocations to Met's rate structure, does he? 7 7 A. No. He certainly knew what the intent was, but evidence. 8 8 he also had his suspicions. MR. EMANUEL: Can we see all the pages? 9 9 Q. There is nothing in this language that limits THE COURT: Of course. This is a one-page 10 10 the concern about San Diego litigating -- to litigation document? 11 11 over new rate structures; correct? MR. PURCELL: I'm sorry. No, your Honor. It 12 12 A. Not in this sentence, no. is a three-page letter attached to the cover page. 13 13 Q. And let's take a look at DTX 909. This is a MR. EMANUEL: Now they have handed me -- wait a 14 14 minute. Part of the problem, it wasn't on the exhibit month-and-a-half later, July 30th, 2004. This is a 15 15 letter from Mr. Gastelum to Miss Stapleton, his list. I am looking at it for the first time now. 16 16 counterpart at the Water Authority. Can I have a minute? 17 17 THE COURT: Of course. Do you see that? 18 18 MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, because it wasn't on A. Yes. 19 19 MR. PURCELL: I would like to move DTX 909 into the exhibit list and I haven't had a chance to prepare, 20 20 evidence? I am going to object to its use and admission. 21 21 MR. EMANUEL: No objection. THE COURT: Do you know if it was on the list 22 22 THE COURT: 909 is admitted. or not? 2.3 2.3 (Exhibit 909 was received in evidence.) MR. PURCELL: I believe it was inadvertently 24 24 O. BY MR. PURCELL: In the first paragraph omitted. It was on our Phase 1 exhibit list. 25 25 MR. EMANUEL: It wasn't omitted in the Phase 1; Mr. Gastelum writes Miss Stapleton, "Thank you for

1376

is that correct?

THE COURT: PTX 95 is admitted. (Exhibit 95 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. PURCELL: If we could turn to page two of the letter itself, which is the third page of the document, the paragraph starting "likewise."

This paragraph reads: "Likewise, member agencies are not being asked to forfeit any fundamental First Amendment rights in exchange for such funding. They are merely being asked to forego commencing a legal or legislative action challenging the district's existing rate structure. See Section 7, rate structure integrity language.

"Paragraph 2: "Member agencies who accept such finding remain free to challenge Metropolitan's existing rate structure via the normal board process and challenge any material changes to the existing rate structure via whatever means are available. Such member agencies also remain free to commence a legal action against Metropolitan, quote, should Metropolitan in setting rates under existing rate structure fail to comply with public notice, open meeting or other legal requirements associated with the process of setting water rates and related taxes, fees and charges."

MR. EMANUEL: I will object. The question was confusing. Could I ask it be rephrased?

THE COURT: Could you start that again?

- Q. BY MR. PURCELL: You testified yesterday under the exchange agreement the intention of that, the bargain between the parties, was San Diego gave up the right to challenge the existing cost allocations in Metropolitan's rate structure; correct?
  - A. Within the term of the exchange agreement.
  - Q. Within the 45 years of the exchange agreement?
  - A. (Nods head affirmatively.)
- Q. For 45 years they were agreeing not to challenge the existing cost allocations in the rate structure; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. And the rate structure integrity program only applies to the existing rate structure and not any future rate structures; correct?

### A. That's right.

- Q. You read Mr. Gastelum's e-mail or memo from June, which said that one of the reasons the rate structure integrity program was being adopted was because San Diego might sue later on?
- A. I think he said that San Diego had expressly reserved a right to bring actions, as one of his reasons

- A. Yes.
  - Q. This is your letter; correct?

Do you see that, Mr. Kightlinger?

- A. Yes.
- Q. You wrote this to Mr. Hentschke at the Water Authority?
- A. And to Jerry Shoal at -- counsel, I believe at this time, to Eastern MWD, as well.
- Q. This was in response to a letter they had written to you objecting to the rate structure integrity language as unconstitutional and objectionable in various other ways?
- A. I don't remember exactly all their objections, but I do know they were upset with it.
- Q. This accurately reflected your understanding of what the language covered; correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you say pretty clearly there that "member agencies remain free to challenge any material change to the existing rate structure under the RSI language."

  Correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So if the RSA language limited only changes to the existing rate structure, your testimony yesterday was under the exchange agreement San Diego gave up the right to challenge the existing rate structure; correct?

that we should be concerned about this.

- Q. But if San Diego had already given up its right to challenge the existing rate structure under the exchange agreement, there would be no need to impose the RSI language on San Diego, would there?
- A. As a need -- we have 26 member agencies. This letter came from two agencies. A number of agencies had concerns. When we adopted the rate structure. It was actually not 25 member agencies for it and San Diego against it. It was a fairly split vote.

And a number of agencies had concerns. The whole point of the RSI language was that we were signing long-term program agreements. Some of these agreements would be we would provide subsidies to projects that would be 20 to 30 to 40 years. And the idea was to make sure there was some commitment to be able to collect those funds before we would sign those contracts. And that is what this was intended to address.

- Q. Mr. Kightlinger, do you know the only agency being called out by name in Gastelum's memos in San Diego; correct?
- A. He calls out entities. He calls out one of the basins that were attempted to sue -- if you go through the memo, he really talks about it is really a broad policy issue. There are a number of people that are

#### 1 1 two organizations? seeking low-cost water he does call out by name, but he 2 2 does talk about other entities and organizations. A. Yes. 3 3 Q. He doesn't call out any other Met member agency Q. Which side of the equation would you say 4 4 by name other than San Diego? Mr. Gastelum was on, trusting, not trusting, or trust 5 5 and verifying; how would you describe him? A. Not in that memo, no. 6 6 Q. As regarding San Diego, if San Diego had really A. I would say I'm in the trust-but-verify mode as 7 7 given up its right to sue under the exchange agreement the counsel. Mr. Gastelum was -- he came out of the 8 8 over the existing rate structure, there would be no need landfill industry, and he was a very not trusting person 9 9 for the rate structure integrity provision as against in general. 10 10 San Diego, would there? Q. You had involvement in creating this RSI 11 11 A. That was the intent, yes. clause; correct? 12 12 MR. PURCELL: Nothing further. A. Yes. I went through and worked through with 13 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Gastelum on the actual language of it, but the 14 14 Redirect, sir? policy proposal was his to the board. 15 15 MR. EMANUEL: Thank you. Q. Was it your understanding this RSI clause would 16 16 THE COURT: If you need a break because of this be a disincentive to file suit; right? 17 17 new document, let me know. A. Yes. 18 18 MR. EMANUEL: I appreciate that. I have my MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Leading. 19 19 team looking at it. THE COURT: I won't sustain the objection on 20 20 that one because it is so obvious. If we could avoid THE COURT: In a situation like that, if there 21 21 is something I can do to ameliorate the situation, let leading questions. 22 22 me know. MR. EMANUEL: Thank you. I will, your Honor. 23 23 MR. EMANUEL: I apologize. It got the better THE COURT: That one is overruled. 24 24 of me. It is such a long document, single space, it was Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Would it apply to all 25 a lot. 25 lawsuits? 1381 1383 1 THE COURT: I understand. 1 A. No. Simply challenges to the existing rate 2 2 3 3 REDIRECT EXAMINATION Q. Would it apply to ill-conceived or 4 BY MR. EMANUEL: 4 non-meritorious lawsuits? 5 5 Q. Let's go back. Let's start with that last A. I assume they were challenging the existing 6 6 point about there is an agreement under the exchange rate structure, it would apply to that. 7 7 that the -- limiting what San Diego could sue on. Q. I want to go back to some exhibits that were 8 8 Sir, isn't it true, or in your experience, San shown you yesterday. 9 9 Diego has found any number of reasons to sue Could you put up PTX 56, please. Zoom this on 10 10 Metropolitan, isn't that true? the date. 11 11 A. In the last 15 years we've had probably four or Mr. Kightlinger, do you see the date on this? 12 12 five different lawsuits over various issues with the A. Yes. 13 13 Water Authority. Q. You see how it is "for your information, San 14 14 Q. Would it be accurate to say that your Diego's latest proposal," do you see that? 15 15 understanding of the exchange agreement isn't a A. Yes. 16 16 Q. Based on the date, would this proposal have guarantee that suit still couldn't be filed? 17 17 A. No. It only dealt with the existing rate been the one we talked about yesterday, Option-1 and 18 18 structure. Their rate structure integrity language is Option-2? 19 19 A. No. This predated that by some months. intended to sweep in all our member agencies as well, 20 20 but we've had lawsuits over the applicability of the Q. Can you give me an estimate of when Option-1 21 21 Brown Act. We've had lawsuits over preferential rights. and Option-2 was proposed? 22 22 We've had lawsuits over point-to-point versus postage A. The late July, early August time frame of 2003. 23 23 stamp rates. So we had other challenges. No. This preceded that by some months. 24 24 O. How can I put this question? It seems fair to Q. Can you give me an estimate of when Option-1 25 25 say that there is a certain lack of trust between these and Option-2 was proposed?

1384

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Vol. IX - April 2, 2015 1 A. The late July, early August time frame of 2003. 1 that project. 2 2 Q. Close enough. Give me PTX 57. Q. Please explain why you consider it to be a part 3 3 owner of that system? Do you see the date? 4 4 A. Yes. A. We have certain rights to use that facility. 5 5 Q. Do you see the subject line? We have transportation rights. We have to pay for it 6 6 A. "Getting to yes." every year, so a significant sum. But with that, even 7 Q. This originated with an email from Mr. Slater; if we don't -- aren't getting water just from the State 8 8 correct? of California, if we wish to move water within it, we 9 9 A. Yes. have capacity rights that enable us to move water, 10 10 Q. Was this part of that process after Option-1, Metropolitan transfer water, in our ownership capacity 11 11 Option-2, to work out the points and reach an agreement? rights. And in fact we can do so on behalf of our 12 12 A. That's correct. member agencies, and we have done so, including San 13 1.3 Q. I take it as of this point, just by the phrase 14 14 "getting to yes," what was your understanding as to They have purchased transfers in the past and 15 15 whether you had in fact reached yes? they have moved that water within Metropolitan's 16 16 A. No. We had a number of deal points that still capacity rights in the State Water Project system. 17 17 had not yet been worked out. Q. When San Diego moved non-State Water Project, 18 18 Q. Can we go down to the bottom of this exhibit, non-Metropolitan water through the conveyance system, 19 19 item number five. Do you see that? did San Diego have to pay a wheeling rate to 20 20 A. I do. Metropolitan? 21 21 Q. Was that literally true? A. Only when it reached our system and then they 2.2 22 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Vague. had the ability to use the State system through our 23 23 THE COURT: I am not sure what that question ownership capacity. 24 24 means. The record will be a little bit easier if you Q. Did they have to pay a wheeling rate through 25 25 the State or could they use Metropolitan's? just read that line into the record. 1385 1 1 THE WITNESS: Certainly. "Item five, San Diego 2 2 will draft an 'I love you MWD' reso." Reso meaning 3 3 resolution. 4 4 O. BY MR. EMANUEL: How did you understand that? 5 5 A. We had talked about the intent was if we got to the State water contract? 6 6 yes and our agencies agreed on this, that this was 7 7 intended to start a new page and peace and harmony, et THE COURT: Do you understand that question? 8 8 cetera, between our two agencies and put aside the lawsuits and the rancor. So they were going to draft a 9 9 believe I understand the question. 10 10 resolution to that effect. 11 11 Q. You were asked about the State Water Project? 12 12 A. Yes. and answer it. 13 13 Q. Does Metropolitan consider it part of its 14 14 conveyance system? Do you remember that question? 15 1.5 A. Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

system?

Q. I think your answer didn't answer the question.

The question was, sir, as asked by Mr. Purcell,

A. We do not consider it part of our conveyance

ownership interest in the State Water Project based on

California and the way in which we make our payments on

system, but we do consider our agency as having an

the contract we entered into with the State of

does Metropolitan consider it part of its conveyance

You said, "The state owns it."

- A. The latter. They used Metropolitan's capacity. Q. Are you aware of any litigation involving
- whether the payments to the State for the State Water Project are payment of costs of the State or costs of

MR. PURCELL: Objection. Vague.

THE WITNESS: I understood the question. I

THE COURT: We are going with this witness' understanding. This may be a legal issue, but go ahead

THE WITNESS: There were early validation actions to establish the rights under the -- and payments of the State Water Project. And so in that validation action it was determined these were obligations of the contractors for the State of

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And Metropolitan is a State water contractor; correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it makes payments to the State that the State -- for the conveyance system and for the supply water; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

1388

1387

1386

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Q. What I'm asking you, have you ever heard or 1 Metropolitan water and not as local water." 2 2 have an understanding that the payments to the State is Do you see that? 3 3 the State's mere conduit? A. I do. 4 4 MR. PURCELL: Objection. Vague. Q. What is your understanding of that? 5 THE COURT: Has he ever heard it? That's not 5 A. Notwithstanding for the purposes of drought 6 6 management and the readiness-to-serve charges, at the -vague. 7 7 Have you ever heard that? the way the exchange worked is that when the water hits 8 8 THE WITNESS: I've not heard it actually our intake, it's Metropolitan's water. And then we take 9 9 expressed that way. it and then what we exchange with San Diego is 10 10 MR. EMANUEL: Can you pull up the 2003 exchange Metropolitan water. 11 11 agreement. Would you go to the paragraph just before Q. And when does it hit your intake? 12 12 5.2? A. In theory, when it's made available by IID to 13 13 THE COURT: For the record, the exhibit number us, we order from the Bureau of Reclamation, and it 14 14 is -comes to Lake Havasu, and that is where our intake is 15 MR. KEKER: 65 PTX and DTX 51, but they have 51 15 and that is where we pump the water. 16 16 up, I think. Q. You are still on the Colorado River? 17 17 THE COURT: PTX 65 we will call it. A. Yes. 18 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Do you see paragraph 5.1 and 18 Q. The location is the Colorado River? 19 19 that deals with pricing? Do you see that, sir? A. Yes, it is a location on the Colorado River, 20 20 A. I do. yes. 21 21 Q. Would you go to the paragraph above that? You MR. EMANUEL: Your Honor, if I could have a 22 22 see paragraph 4.2? minute? 23 23 A. I do. THE COURT: Of course 24 24 Q. Let's back up. So 4.1 deals with MR. QUINN: Would it be possible for us to have 25 characterization of exchange water. Do you see that? 25 five minutes? 1389 1391 1 1 THE COURT: See everybody in five minutes. A. Yes. 2 2 Q. And for some purpose it is characterized as (Recess.) 3 3 local water; is that right? THE COURT: Sir. 4 A. Yes. 4 MR. PURCELL: Your Honor, before we get 5 5 Q. That has certain financial implications? started, we have a motion to strike. 6 6 A. Yes. This is something San Diego wanted. It THE COURT: All right. 7 7 doesn't fit within the typical meaning of the word MR. PURCELL: We move to strike 8 8 "local." It is coming from several hundred miles away. Mr. Kightlinger's testimony about Metropolitan having an 9 9 ownership interest in the State Water Project as being In our parlance, in our structure within Metropolitan, 10 1.0 local water has certain benefits, how we do our drought directly contrary to Metropolitan's response to Request 11 11 for Admission 44, which is in evidence as PTX 237A. management planning. 12 12 Local water is not considered regional water to THE COURT: How does that read? 13 13 be shared. It is their own water, so it doesn't fit MR. PURCELL: It reads, Request for Admission 14 14 Number 44, "Admit that Metropolitan does not own the into something that we would then pull back in a 15 15 drought, as part of drought management. So it is State Water Project." 16 16 important to them that it becomes an independent local Response to Request for Admission Number 17 17 44, "Admit." supply. It is also how we calculate a 18 18 readiness-to-serve charge. If it's a local supply, it THE COURT: I will tell you that I actually 19 19 made a note and he used the phrase "ownership interest" doesn't go into that calculation. So those were 20 20 but I don't think -- I didn't interpret the answer benefits, how they wanted this water, the IID transfer 21 21 water to be treated. actually to be that he says he has interest to certain 22 22 Q. Let's look at 4.2., the entire paragraph, rights. My sense is that Metropolitan is not contending 23 23 please. they actually have any literal ownership interest in the 24 24 Notwithstanding provisions of 4.1, "The water State Water Project. Right? 25 25 delivered to SDCWA shall be characterized as MR. EMANUEL: Right. And the witness said

1392

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 that 2 THE COURT: I think it was a shorthand for --3 it's like having rights to a license more than anything 4 else or rights to use, and that's how I interpreted it. 5 I will deny the motion to strike with that 6 understanding, that he really did not mean ownership in 7 the literal sense. RFA 44 actually governs here, and 8 let's proceed. 9 MR. EMANUEL: Would the Court permit I get that 10 on the record from the witness? 11 THE COURT: You don't have to. RFA 44 is 12 preclusive. 13 MR. EMANUEL: Not that. I meant what he was 14 referring to as those interests. 15 THE COURT: If you think it matters. I think I 16 understand that Metropolitan has certain rights to use 17 the State Water Project. I understand that. We went 18 through some of that in the first trial. 19 MR. EMANUEL: Very well. 20 THE COURT: And I recall that. 21 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: In that case, then, I'll go 22 back to Exhibit DTX 51. 23 Mr. Kightlinger, we were discussing this 24 exception and --25 THE COURT: Again, this has also been named PTX 1393 1 56. 2 MR. KEKER: Sixty-five. 3 THE COURT: Sixty-five. 4 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Unfortunately, it has two 5 numbers. 6 "The exchange water delivered to SDCWA shall be 7 characterized as Metropolitan and not as local water 8 only for the limited purposes of paragraph 5.2." 9 Do you see that? 10 A. I do. 11 Q. Let's -- let's look at 5.2 so we know what

Q. Was there an advantage to the Water Authority for the water to be considered Metropolitan water?

A. Yes. One of the complications in their transfer with IID is the water from IID is Colorado River water. The only parties that can receive Colorado River water are parties that have what's called a Section 5 contract with the Bureau of Reclamation under the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

The Water Authority, not being a Colorado River contractor, technically, unless it got such a contract with the United States, could not receive Colorado River water. So Metropolitan, by receiving that water as Metropolitan and then exchanging it, solved the issue of how to get delivery from the United States Bureau of Reclamation.

Q. But explain, how did that solve that problem?

A. It was deemed Metropolitan's water. And so we have a contract for delivery of Colorado River water with the United States and, therefore, the Water Authority wasn't deemed -- they were not getting a delivery of Colorado River water. Metropolitan was.

Q. Thank you very much.

Let's turn back to this rate structure integrity clause. I believe you testified this was a subject that was discussed at the board level of

1395

1 Metropolitan; is that correct? 2 A. Yes. 3

Q. And were there agencies in favor of it, agencies against it?

A. Yes.

No. It was a controversial proposal, and my recollection there were a number of amendments proposed by various board members on behalf of their agencies to be made to the policy before it was adopted.

Q. Was the Water Authority for or against it?

A. They were flat-out opposed to it from the get-go.

Q. Do you have a recollection whether or not the Water Authority made an amendment that the rate structuring integrity clause should only be triggered if someone sued and lost?

A. I don't recall the Water Authority proposing any suggested amendments to it. They felt it shouldn't be adopted at all. The amendments I recall being proposed were from agencies such as Orange County agencies and the Riverside County agencies having a number of concerns and proffering a number of amendments.

MR. EMANUEL: Nothing more, your Honor. MR. PURCELL: No recross.

1394

1396

we're talking about here.

5.2 is the price that the Water Authority would pay; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Q. Would you please explain, then, how 4.2 relates to 5.2?

A. Yes. The Water Authority wanted this water to be considered local water, the water they were getting from IID, for purposes of how it would be dealt with in terms of drought and calculation of our readiness-to-serve charges.

But for the purpose of the pricing, it was going to be treated as Metropolitan water and governed by 5.2, the pricing terms.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Can you tell me what's under those programs? 2 2 You are excused. A. Sure. Demand management programs consist 3 3 really of two different programs that Metropolitan runs. THE WITNESS: Thank you. 4 One of them is a conservation program. That program 5 DEVENDRA UPADHYAH, 5 provides incentives through throughout Southern 6 6 called as a witness by the Defendant, was sworn and California for consumers to purchase water-efficient 7 7 testified as follows: devices, things like, for example would be, 8 8 high-efficiency clothes washers or high-efficiency 9 9 THE COURT: You are calling? toilets that reduce demands for water. We provide 10 10 MR. EMANUEL: Mr. Upadhyah. incentives that buy down the costs of those things for 11 11 THE WITNESS: I do. consumers. That's the conservation program. 12 12 THE CLERK: Go ahead and be seated. Would you Another program is the local resources program. 13 1.3 please state and spell your full name for the record. That program provides financial incentives for our local 14 14 THE WITNESS: Devendra Upadhyah, and it's agencies to develop projects that fall into three major 15 15 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A, U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-H. categories: Wastewater recycling, groundwater recovery 16 16 and seawater desalination at some point in the future. 17 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION These would be projects that would produce supplies that 18 18 BY MR. EMANUEL: those local agencies are able to use to meet their 19 19 Q. By whom are you employed? customers' needs. 20 20 Q. You referred to incentives. Did you mean A. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern 21 21 California. financial incentives? Are there other kinds of 2.2 22 incentives? Q. What is your position? 23 23 A. Financial incentives. A. My position is the group manager for the water 24 24 resources management group. Q. How long have you been the manager of the water 25 25 Q. What programs fall within the water resources resources management group? 1397 1399 1 1 management group? A. Since the beginning of 2010. 2 2 A. Water resource management group manages demand Q. How long have you been an employee of 3 3 management programs, conservation programs that provide Metropolitan? 4 incentives to consumers in Southern California, local A. I started with Met back in 1995, and there was 5 resources program aimed at helping to develop supplies a period for about three years there where I was working 6 among the customer member agencies. for another agency. 7 We have a group that looks at forecasting for Q. Going back to the local resources program, who 8 8 the needs of Southern California out in the future. We receives the dollars that are part of these financial 9 incentives? also manage our contracts with the State Water Project, 10 10 A. The local agencies, the member agencies and the Department of Water Resources and with the U.S. 11 11 Bureau of Reclamation for supplies that we receive on their subagencies that actually develop the projects. 12 12 Q. What are the benefits to local agencies for the Colorado River along with many other partners we 13 13 these local resource programs? have. We manage the contracts for those supplies. 14 14 MR. EMANUEL: In advance, and according to the A. They are receiving a financial incentive from 15 15 Metropolitan. But ultimately the benefit of those Court's deadline, we prepared a declaration for 16 16 projects is that those projects produce supplies that Mr. Upadhyah that had been submitted to the other side 17 17 they are able to use to meet the needs of their and filed with the Court. 18 18 customers and they are able to sell those supplies to Does the Court want a copy? I am not going to 19 19 their customers. direct him on those questions. 20 Q. You used the word "they." 20 THE COURT: I would appreciate it if you have a 21 A. They receive supplies. 21 22 22 Q. What are the benefits to local agencies for MR. EMANUEL: I will leave one for the witness 23 these local resource programs? 2.3 in case it comes up on cross. 24 A. They are receiving a financial incentive from 24 Q. Sir, a topic not covered in your declaration 25 25 Metropolitan. But ultimately the benefit of those has to do with the demand management programs.

1400

projects is that those projects produce supplies that they are able to use to meet the needs of their customers and they are able to sell those supplies to their customers.

Q. You used the word "they." They receive supplies. Who is "they" referring to?

2.2

2.5

- A. The member agencies or the local agency that develop the project.
- Q. Is that also true for other demand management programs that these supply? Who owns the supplies that were produced through those other demand management programs?
- A. That's correct. There are supplies that are produced by the local agencies. They are their supplies. They are able to use those to meet their customers' demands.
- Q. What I am asking, there are conservation programs and there are other kinds of programs, all of which produce water, I take it?
- A. Either produce water or reduce demand for water, right.
  - Q. And my point is, whose supply is it?
  - A. It's those local agencies.
- Q. When this water is produced through these demand management programs, who has the title to that

that requires that Metropolitan increase or focus on conservation, water recycling and groundwater recovery recharge.

- Q. Are you familiar with the phrases "upstream" and "downstream"?
  - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Would you explain what "upstream" means and "downstream" means in the context of what we've been talking, conservation?
  - A. Sure. Metropolitan has service connections that demark the point of delivery between Metropolitan's distribution system into our member agencies' distribution systems. And so we refer to anything that is downstream of those service connections, that are then within our member agencies and their local agencies, as downstream.

Anything that is above those service connections in Met's system and beyond is considered to be upstream.

- Q. The demand management programs that you referred to, are they upstream or downstream?
  - A. They are downstream.
- Q. What rate at Metropolitan generates the income that pays for demand management programs?
  - A. The cost of the demand management programs is

water? I'm just speaking loosely. I don't know what the word is in water law. Who owns the water?

MR. BRAUNIG: I am going to object to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: We will get his understanding. Do you know?

THE WITNESS: To the extent it is water supplied that they are able to use through that project, it's theirs to sell to their customers.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: From Metropolitan's point of view, does Metropolitan consider whether or not this is part of Metropolitan's supply?
- A. It is not part of Metropolitan's supply. These aren't supplies that we have access to. It doesn't come into our system. We don't sell them to our member agencies. At no point is it a supply that Metropolitan has to provide to our customers. Rather, it is at the local level.
- Q. Why does Metropolitan have these demand management programs?
- A. These demand management programs provide a benefit to Metropolitan in that it reduces the demand for water to move through our system.

But there's also a piece of legislation that was passed in 1999, we refer to it as Senate Bill 60,

1 recovered through our water stewardship rate.

Q. Are you aware of whether any part of that water stewardship rate -- let me back up.

Does the entirety of the water stewardship rate go upstream, downstream or split between the two streams?

MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Vague.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Can you please restate the question?

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Let me take it one at a time.

So the costs that are paid through the water stewardship rate, are they paid to downstream users or upstream users or some combination?

- A. It is all downstream.
- Q. Has that been true -- how long has that been true?
- A. To my knowledge, it's been true since the beginning of the water stewardship rate.
- Q. Does Metropolitan have -- strike that. What benefits -- what benefits, if any, do wheelers enjoy because of demand management programs?
- A. Demand management programs that we run reduce the need for water to move through Metropolitan's system. And as a result of that it is creating capacity

within Metropolitan's system to move supplies, to the extent that a wheeler is acquiring a supply from another entity and moving that water through Metropolitan's system. Part of the reason the capacity is available to do that is because of the demand management programs.

- Q. Mr. Upadhyah, are you aware of whether or not Metropolitan purchases back the supplies generated -- purchases back from the local agencies the supplies generated by the demand management program?
- A. I'm not aware of a situation where that happens, no.
- Q. I would like to show you what has been marked for identification as DTX 979.

Can you tell the Court what this is?

- A. Yes. This is the February 2011 version of what we refer to as our SB-60 report. I had mentioned earlier Senate Bill 60 that placed some requirements on Metropolitan, and one of those requirements was filing a report to the State legislature each year that showed some of the actions that we had taken in the areas of conservation, recycling, groundwater recovery and recharge.
- Q. Is the production of this report one of your duties and responsibilities, at least, to oversee?
  - A. Yes, it is.

it?

A. The line below it is showing that we've actually been doing this program for a number of years, and that devices that were installed in previous years are also still saving water.

The first line is showing just the new things that were installed that year and their savings. But the next — the second line, 147,000 acre-feet, depicts the savings associated with things that had been installed before that are still saving water in that year.

- Q. Now, if we look at the third line, what does that represent?
- A. The third line is showing that since the program's inception in the early 1990s, the cumulative water savings across all of those things that have been installed is estimated to be about 1.4 million acre-feet.
- Q. Let's move down the chart to under "recycled water." Look at the first line there.

Please explain what that represents.

A. The first line under "recycled water" is similarly showing for 2009-'10 the acre-feet that was produced in that year by wastewater recycling facilities that were funded, in part, by this program.

- Q. If you would turn to page 7 of this report, tell us what this achievement scorecard represents.
- A. This -- what you see on the screen is the scorecard that we include in the report that shows both the acre-feet associated with the demand management programs and the dollars associated with the demand management programs.

This is a part of what we're reporting to the legislature that we've been able to do in combination with the member and local agencies.

- Q. If we look at the very first line under conservation, would you explain what that 15,500 acre-feet are?
- A. Okay. So as part of the demand management programs, I mentioned one of the programs we run is a conservation program where we're providing incentives for consumers, businesses, residents in our service area to purchase devices that save water, are more efficient.

That line is showing that in fiscal year 2009-'10, which was the period that we were reporting on for this year in this report, those new conservation devices that were installed and funded by that program saved 15,500 acre-feet. That is the new savings from those actions.

Q. How is that line different from the line below

- Q. Could you give us an example of a wastewater recycling program or type of program?
- A. Sure. The an example there, and there are many different facilities that are funded that are producing as part of this, but an example would be an agency would take wastewater that is coming from the wastewater plant and treat that wastewater to a higher grade of treated supply, and then would pipe that to, as an example, outdoor irrigation on a park or on a golf course, so that they are able to use that treated wastewater to meet the needs of that irrigated territory.
- Q. If we look two lines below that, see where it says, "cumulative production." Please explain what that represents.
- A. The cumulative production line is showing that since this program's inception, the projects that were partially funded by these incentives for Metropolitan are producing or have produced about 1.3 million acre-feet.
- Q. Move down to "groundwater recovery," and looking at the first line. What is an example of a groundwater recovery program?
- A. Groundwater recovery refers to a situation where there is groundwater that is contaminated in some

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

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

2.4

way or may have salt content that is high enough that in order to be able to use that water, you have to put some measure of treatment to be able to get rid of that contaminant.

So groundwater recovery are programs where we're providing incentives similar to the wastewater recycling to be able to help an agency develop a project, to help them pay for that project, so they can clean up that groundwater and be able to use it to meet their customers' demands.

Q. Does the 50,000 acre-feet represent the amount of water produced through this program for that particular fiscal year?

# A. Right. For 2009-'10 the production for those facilities was 50.000 acre-feet.

Q. And two lines below that, "the cumulative production," is that the same as what you explained before, the life of these programs, this is your estimate?

# A. That's correct. Over the life of the program, it's produced 515,000 acre-feet.

- Q. Let me ask you to turn in this document to page
- 8. Do you see that sentence?
  - A. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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. To whom is conserved water a source of supply?

THE COURT: Exhibit 979.

MR. EMANUEL: DTX 979, your Honor, we move it into evidence.

THE COURT: Are there more pages than the ones we talked about that I'll be reading?

MR. EMANUEL: There are certainly more pages. I don't know that you need to read them. Maybe we should do a redacted.

THE COURT: Yes. Then remind me later on to admit it as redacted.

(Exhibit 979 was marked for identification.)

THE COURT: Cross-examination.

### **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

#### BY MR. BRAUNIG:

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Upadhyah.
- A. Good morning.
  - Q. I am Warren Braunig and we met at your deposition.

You testified that the primary benefit of the -- of the water stewardship rate in the demand management programs is the creation of local supply for use by -- by the local member agencies; correct?

A. The primary benefit to the local agencies is the supply.

1409 | 1411

A. This statement is showing that it is a source of supply for Southern California. Specifically, it's a source of supply for the local agencies that produce it and they are able to take that supply and meet their customers' demands.

- Q. Would it be accurate to say not only -- when you say use it, do they give it away or do they sell it to their users?
- A. To my knowledge, it's always sold to their users. I'm not aware of a situation where it is simply given away.
- Q. Can you tell the Court whether or not conserved water downstream is a source of supply for Metropolitan?
- A. So, this these programs, they're not a source of supply for Metropolitan. At no point are they producing water that Metropolitan is able to take into our system. We are not able to sell that water to our customers. Rather, they are supplies that our member agencies and local agencies are able to use to meet their customer demands.

MR. EMANUEL: Thank you, your Honor. No more questions.

THE COURT: Cross-examination. It looks like maybe one more question.

MR. EMANUEL: I will move it into evidence.

Q. It is also a benefit to Metropolitan, that Metropolitan, by investing in these demand management programs, doesn't have to import or buy supplies of its

4 own; correct?

# A. The benefit to Metropolitan is the reduced demand on our system.

- Q. And that's a supply benefit?
- A. I would not argue that's a supply benefit.
- Q. Met's investments in local water grow the supply of water for Metropolitan in the region; correct?

#### A. That's not correct.

Q. You have Tab 1 of your deposition, Tab 1 of the binder one, Volume I is your deposition, and I would ask you to turn to page 109, line 16.

MR. EMANUEL: It's Tab 2, Volume I.

THE COURT: The page is 109?

MR. BRAUNIG: Yes.

(Reading:)

19 "Q And my question is does

Metropolitan invest in local resources in order to grow the

pie of supply?

"A That's -- yes, that's one of the benefits we're investing

for, yes."

1412

MR. EMANUEL: Where were we? invested in in 2011? 2 2 THE COURT: Sixteen through 20. MR. EMANUEL: I am going to object. It is 3 3 O. BY MR. BRAUNIG: That's correct, that's true ambiguous. We need to know what regional benefit. 4 4 testimony that you gave? THE COURT: Aside from the calculation of 5 5 conserved acre-feet, there is some other regional A. That's correct. 6 6 benefit that you have calculated? Q. The demand management programs also create a 7 7 benefit for Metropolitan by not having to spend money on THE WITNESS: On an annual basis we are not 8 8 calculating a separate benefit from what's being imported water supplies; correct? 9 9 A. The demand management programs reduce the need reported in SB-60. Although the development of the 10 10 programs initially was based on a calculation of for the movement of water through the Metropolitan 11 benefits to the region overall, and we continue those 11 system. It may not be Metropolitan's imported supplies. 12 12 programs as a result of that. MR. BRAUNIG: Your deposition, page 109, line 13 13 Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: To be clear, just so the 21 through page 110, line one. 14 14 record is clear, for the programs that Met invested in THE COURT: Go ahead. 15 15 through the water stewardship rate in 2011, Met has not MR. BRAUNIG: (Reading:) 16 gone in and said, here's what the -- in dollar terms --16 "Q Okay. Is metropolitan's 17 here's what the regional benefits are to the region? 17 -- is one of the benefits that 18 A. No. I don't believe we've done it in dollar 18 you articulated of these 19 19 terms. programs, that it creates a 20 Q. You didn't do that in 2012, '13 or '14 either? 20 benefit of not having to spend 21 A. Not to my knowledge. 21 money on other imported 2.2 Q. Met doesn't do any regular calculation of the 22 supplies? 23 benefits to Metropolitan in terms of avoided capital or 23 "A Yeah. That's part of the 24 transportation costs associated with these programs, 24 basis for the incentive." 2.5 does it? 25 Q. That's true testimony? 1413 1415 1 1 A. We did that initially when the program was set A. Correct. 2 2 O. Would you agree -- you testified in addition to up, but we're not doing that on an annual basis, no. 3 3 Q. And you didn't do that for the money that was creating local supplies, the demand management programs 4 4 have regional benefits for Metropolitan; correct? invested in 2011? 5 5 A. Correct. A. Not to my knowledge. 6 6 Q. Or 2012 through '14? Q. Met has never calculated the regional benefit 7 7 of the aggregate group of water supply projects and A. Again, not to my knowledge. 8 8 desalination projects and conservation programs funded Q. On an ongoing basis the only thing that Met 9 9 keeps track of is how many acre-feet of water are we in a given calendar year, has it? 10 10 A. Metropolitan calculates the benefit of the creating for these programs? 11 11 A. The acre-feet that are produced by the local water that's produced, and we report that each year in 12 12 agencies and used by the local agencies. the SB-60 report. 13 13 Q. You calculate the number of acre-feet created? Q. You don't know what percentage of the benefits 14 14 to Metropolitan associated with these demand management A. Right. 15 15 Q. Met does not calculate the regional benefit programs are associated with avoiding supply costs 16 16 versus what percentage are attributable to avoiding any beyond the calculation of acre-feet; it does not 17 17 other costs, do you? calculate the regional benefit of the group of programs 18 18 that were funded in 2011, does it? A. We know that these programs are reducing the 19 19 demand for water moving through our system, so we know A. The SB-60 report we are producing is showing 20 20 that there is a benefit associated with that reduced the supplies that are benefiting the local agencies as a 21 21 result of those programs. It is a characterization of flow in our system. 22 22 MR. BRAUNIG: I am going to use the deposition what's produced through those programs. 23 2.3 Q. I am asking you a specific question. I am again. Page 126, lines four through ten. 24 24 asking you about the regional benefit. Met has not THE COURT: I really should do this the right 25 25 way, which is to ask if there is any objection. calculated the regional benefit of the programs Met

1416

MR. EMANUEL: I am reading it right now. duties. 2 2 Thank you, your Honor. Q. Met then, after it takes the money, after it 3 3 No objection. collects the money, then distributes -- then distributes 4 THE COURT: Go ahead. the demand management subsidies to its member agencies; 5 MR. BRAUNIG: (Reading:) 5 right? 6 6 "Q Of the investment that A. The conservation programs largely do not go 7 Metropolitan is making in LRP directly to the member agencies. They are benefit to 8 8 programs, what percentage of the consumers throughout Southern California. The local 9 9 the benefits are attributable resources program financial incentives are provided to 10 10 to avoiding water supply costs local agencies that enter into a contract with 11 11 and what percentage are Metropolitan and produce supplies for their customers 12 12 attributable to avoiding some through those projects. 13 13 of these other costs that you Q. Met makes the decision, though, about how those 14 14 described? subsidies are going to be distributed out to the member 15 15 "A I don't know." agents; right? 16 16 Q. That's true testimony? A. To the extent member agencies are applying for 17 17 A. Yes. or consumers are applying for those rebates, then they 18 18 Q. When Met is deciding whether to invest in are ultimately going to be getting those benefits. 19 19 specific demand management programs, Met doesn't There isn't a pre-decision distribution of funds. 20 20 consider whether those specific programs will help Met Q. The decision about how these funds are going to 21 avoid some future transportation or facility costs, does 21 be distributed out is a decision made by Met in response 22 22 to applications made by the member agencies? 23 23 A. That's correct. A. The basis for the program is the avoidance of 24 24 those costs and the reduced demand on our system and the Q. That's created situations where some large 25 25 member agencies receive a lot more in demand management specific programs we're trying to implement in order to 1417 1419 1 1 subsidies than they pay into the water stewardship rate; meet that overall objective. 2 2 Q. On a project-by-project basis Met doesn't 3 3 evaluate whether a specific project it invests in will A. I'm not sure. 4 4 have a transportation or facility benefit, does it? O. You are not sure because Met hasn't done that 5 5 A. No. analysis? 6 6 Rather, we have overarching goals for the A. Because I know the projects that are pursued, 7 7 programs. They are articulated in our integrated but I can't say as to whether that compares with the 8 8 resource plan in terms of goals. We are trying to put amounts that agencies are paying in. 9 9 programs together that meet those goals. Q. So Met has the data to determine how much each 10 10 Q. Water stewardship is not a service that is agency contributes to the water stewardship rate; right? 11 11 inherent to the delivery of water, is it? A. Probably, yes. 12 12 A. A service that is inherent to the delivery of Q. As far as you know, they would? 13 13 water? A. As far as I know. 14 14 Q. And Met also possesses data about how much it Q. Met could supply and deliver water to its 15 15 member agencies without charging for water stewardship; pays out in subsidies to each member agency; correct? 16 16 A. Correct. 17 17 A. If by that you mean we could exist without Q. Met has never compiled that data in order to 18 18 determine whether there's a proportional relationship running these programs, I think that's true. 19 19 between the amount of water stewardship rate monies that Q. Met has made a policy decision that it wants to 20 20 are contributed and the amount of subsidies that are fund these demand management programs? 21 21 going out to those member agencies? A. That's correct. 22 22 Q. And Met collects money from the water A. Not to my knowledge, and, frankly, that's not 23 2.3 the way our programs are measured. Our programs are stewardship rate to fund the programs; correct? 24 24 A. That's correct. And one thing we're also doing measured against overall regional goals. 25 25 Q. But Met has never done that; Met has never is complying with SB-60. We are carrying out these 1418 1420

- tried to see if there is a proportional relationship between the funds that are created -- funds that are received through these charges and the benefits to the member agencies from the distribution of those funds as subsidies?
  - A. Not to my knowledge. And the reason for that is, frankly, these are programs meant to provide regional benefits. It's not designed to provide a specific amount of benefit to any specific agency.
  - Q. But they do provide a local benefit, don't they?
    - A. They do provide local benefit.
  - Q. That local benefit is cash in the form of subsidies; correct?
  - A. There is a financial incentive Metropolitan is providing.
  - Q. There is also the water created that is a benefit to the local member agency that is generated through these subsidies; right?
    - A. That is correct.

2.2

2.3

- Q. You don't measure what the benefits are that are specific to those agencies compared to how much they are contributing through the water stewardship rate?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.
  - Q. You're familiar with the rate structuring

Q. And the actions that have been triggered are because San Diego filed this lawsuit, they are not allowed to participate in new local resource program projects?

- A. That is a follow-on action that has occurred as a result of San Diego's litigation.
- Q. That means no matter how good a program San Diego might have to generate supply of water, no matter how cost effective it is, no matter how shovel-ready it is, Met is not going to fund it because San Diego filed this lawsuit; correct?

MR. EMANUEL: I am going to object. The question is argumentative and the Court may recall this was the subject of a motion in limine, as well.

THE COURT: It is a little argumentative. I will allow it.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: What was the question?

- Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: The question is no matter how good the project is that San Diego might have, Met is not going to fund it because of rate structure integrity?
- A. To the extent that San Diego has a project, and I can't speak to how good a project is or isn't, a project that would be part of the LRP program, that

integrity provision?

- A. I am familiar with it, yes.
- Q. Because of the rate structure integrity provision, San Diego isn't allowed to receive any new contracts for local resource projects or conservation; correct?
- A. Can you rephrase it? I didn't catch the last part.
- Q. Since 2011, when rate structure integrity was invoked, San Diego has not been allowed to participate in new local resource projects or conservation programs; correct?
  - A. That's not correct.
- Q. Met has not entered into new contracts with San Diego for local resource projects since 2011, has it?
- A. For local resources projects, I believe you're correct. The conservation program continues to provide incentives for consumers throughout Met's service area, including the water authorities.
- Q. San Diego is no longer allowed to participate in the local resource programs since 2011? Or into new contracts?
- A. Since 2011 the County Water Authority has taken actions that triggered the RSI provisions in the agreements we've had.

contract would contain rate structure integrity language that would be triggered by the action San Diego has taken with this litigation.

- Q. And therefore, Met wouldn't fund it?
- A. Ultimately, our board would have to consider that but, yes, it would likely trigger that clause and until that's settled, we wouldn't be funding it.
- Q. There have been some questions that have been asked about whether San Diego at any point tried to get Met to change the RSI provisions. In fact, San Diego did try to change the provisions at one point in time and Met said no. Correct?
  - A. I actually don't recall that.
  - Q. Can we go to Tab 17, please, PTX 120.

Do you recognize Tab 17, PTX 120, as a letter from Metropolitan to San Diego County Water Authority about the rate structure integrity on August 2, 2005?

A. Yes, I recognize this as that letter.

MR. BRAUNIG: We would move PTX 120 into evidence.

MR. EMANUEL: No objection.

THE COURT: PTX 120 has the proposal as an attachment and you are moving that in, as well?

MR. BRAUNIG: Yes.

THE COURT: PTX 120 is admitted.

```
1
            (Exhibit 120 was received in evidence.)
                                                                                  agreement that has standard
2
                                                                      2
         Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: I want to draw your attention,
                                                                                 provisions."
 3
                                                                      3
       please, to the second line of that first paragraph.
                                                                                 MR. EMANUEL: To be fair, you should read the
                                                                      4
 4
       "Metropolitan is unable to execute your agreement
                                                                            question and answer above that.
 5
                                                                      5
                                                                                 THE COURT: The question and answer above that,
       because your modified version departs from the uniform
 6
                                                                      6
       rate structure integrity provision required by
                                                                            starting at line 13?
                                                                      7
       Metropolitan's board of directors for all new incentive
                                                                                 MR. EMANUEL: Starting at line seven.
                                                                      8
 8
       program agreements with the member agencies."
                                                                                 THE COURT: Starting at line seven?
 9
                                                                      9
                                                                                 MR. BRAUNIG: I think it is a different
            Does this refresh your recollection that when
10
                                                                     10
       attempted to modify the rate structure language, Met
                                                                            question. If he wants to read it in and spend his time
11
                                                                     11
       told you it can't enter into a program that doesn't have
                                                                            doing it, he can do that.
12
                                                                     12
       that specific language?
                                                                                  THE COURT: I don't think it changes the
13
                                                                     13
            MR. EMANUEL: I don't think there was a
                                                                            meaning. Let's go ahead at this time and read that in,
14
                                                                     14
       failure --
                                                                            line seven and ending at line 12.
15
                                                                     15
            THE COURT: Sustained.
                                                                                 MR. EMANUEL: Yes.
                                                                     16
16
         Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: For member agencies the rate
                                                                                 THE COURT: We can do that now.
17
                                                                     17
                                                                                 MR. BRAUNIG: (Reading:)
       structure integrity language is nonnegotiable; right?
18
         A. The process that we would consider or our board
                                                                     18
                                                                                 "Q What if an agency -- what
19
                                                                     19
       would consider would be their own board process to take
                                                                                 if a member agency refuses to
20
                                                                     20
       a look at whether changes to the rate structure
                                                                                 sign an agreement with that
                                                                     21
21
       integrity provision are things they would want to
                                                                                 language?
22
                                                                     22
       undertake.
                                                                                 "A To the extent that it's
                                                                     23
23
                                                                                 part of the standard language
         Q. The RSI language is nonnegotiable; correct?
24
                                                                     24
         A. Once the board has adopted the language, they
                                                                                 that the board has instructed
                                                                     25
25
       then gave us direction to include that in all of our
                                                                                 to have in all of these
                                                         1425
                                                                                                                              1427
 1
                                                                      1
                                                                                 contracts, then the agency
       contracts.
 2
                                                                      2
             THE COURT: Does that mean it's nonnegotiable?
                                                                                 would be agreeing to not
 3
                                                                      3
             THE WITNESS: The negotiation that could occur
                                                                                 participate in those programs."
                                                                      4
 4
       would be at a board level.
                                                                              Q. You testified earlier when this program was
 5
                                                                      5
             MR. BRAUNIG: I am going to use his deposition,
                                                                           initiated, the demand management programs were initiated
                                                                      6
 6
       please, your Honor.
                                                                           back in the mid-1990s or so, Metropolitan evaluated the
 7
                                                                      7
             Page 34, line 21, through 35, line four.
                                                                           regional benefits or the benefits associated with doing
 8
                                                                      8
             MR. EMANUEL: Give me a second, your Honor.
                                                                           these programs; correct?
                                                                      9
 9
             THE WITNESS: This was Tab 2.
                                                                              A. That's correct.
                                                                     10
1.0
             MR. BRAUNIG: Tab 2. It will come up on the
                                                                              Q. Metropolitan has never done a backward-looking
                                                                     11
11
                                                                           analysis to determine if demand management programs are
       board for you.
                                                                     12
12
             THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                                           actually avoiding particular costs, has it?
                                                                     13
13
             MR. EMANUEL: No objection.
                                                                              A. Not to my knowledge.
14
                                                                     14
                                                                              Q. Since the mid-1990s Metropolitan has never done
             MR. BRAUNIG: (Reading:)
                                                                     15
15
             "Q Is it negotiable?
                                                                           another forward look to see if additional demand
16
                                                                     16
             "A No.
                                                                           management spending would avoid transportation facility
17
                                                                     17
                                                                           costs, has it?
             "Q So as a member agency your
                                                                     18
1.8
             choice is to sign an agreement
                                                                              A. Additional demand management spending itself
                                                                     19
19
             that includes the rate
                                                                           may not be analyzed, but I do believe we looked at the
20
                                                                     20
                                                                           projected capital investment program at Metropolitan in
             structure integrity language or
                                                                     21
21
             you're not eligible to obtain
                                                                           the, maybe, mid-2000s to see if reductions in demand
                                                                     22
22
             certain incentive benefits for
                                                                           would help reduce the expenditures to our capital
                                                                     23
23
             local resources or conservation
                                                                           program in the future. But I don't think it was
                                                                     24
2.4
             or desalination?
                                                                           directly related to the incentive program itself.
                                                                     25
25
             "A You need to sign an
                                                                              Q. Changing gears a little bit, when a member
```

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

agency chooses to wheel water, that fact, the wheeling, doesn't cause Met to need to spend more money on demand management programs, does it?

- A. Does the wheeling itself cause Metropolitan to spend more money on demand management?
  - Q. That's right.

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

- A. I don't think so.
- Q. Likewise, the entry into the exchange agreement by San Diego and Metropolitan, that didn't cause Metropolitan to need to spend more money on local resource projects and conservation, did it?
- A. That individual agreement may not, but when Metropolitan is looking at our programs, as I said before, you're looking back, say, the 1990s, we were considering in the future the needs for the system to be determined to be able to move water to meet customer demands.

And that includes both supplies that Metropolitan is providing but supplies that would be wheeled by other parties through the system.

- Q. You're not able to identify any specific wheeling transactions that are attributable to spending on demand management programs, are you?
- A. What do you mean by attributable to spending? I'm not sure I understand.

State Water Project costs off of transportation, has it?

- A. Over the course of the years since the rate structure was adopted, we have discussed many different potential things with the board, but we've never made a recommendation for a wholesale rate structure change, if that's what you're getting at.
- Q. There has never been presented to the board an option that would move State Water Project costs off of transportation?
- A. In a -- as an option that the board would take action on, I'm not sure.
- O. You're not sure, or no?
- A. Well, we've had many discussions over the years about different things that could be done. We've had board workshops related to what we called our long-range finance plans and things like that.

So there were concepts that were discussed, but I don't know that there was ever a specific action to make significant changes to the rate structure that the board would have acted on.

- Q. The same goes for the demand management programs, there's never been an option presented to the board that would take those demand management programs off of transportation and put them somewhere else?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.

1429 1431

- Q. Your testimony is that spending this money frees up space that then makes wheeling possible; is that right?
  - A. It reduces demand for deliveries in our system.
  - Q. But you're not able to identify any specific wheeling transaction that's attributable to the spending that's been made on demand management programs, are you?
  - A. Again, I'm not sure what you mean by "attributable."
    - Q. It had been caused by or as a result of.
  - A. I don't know why a wheeling transaction would be caused by demand management programs.
  - Q. You have been a Met staffer for more than a decade; correct?
    - A. That's true.
  - Q. And you have been involved in a number of different rate refinement or rate-related initiatives; correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Since 2003, when Met unbundled its rates, Met has not presented any rate structures to its board other than the one it's using today, has it?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.
- 24 Q. Met has not presented to its board any 25
  - different cost allocations that would move all of the

Q. Over the years that you've been working on these rate initiatives. San Diego has frequently complained about the fact that State Water Project costs are on transportation, haven't they?

- A. San Diego has voiced that opinion in many meetings.
  - Q. Over the course of many years?
- A. That's correct.
  - Q. Since 2003?
  - A. I can't say the exact years, but yes.
  - Q. Likewise, with the demand management programs, they've been complaining for a decade or more that those programs shouldn't be on Metropolitan's transportation rates; correct?
  - A. I can't say a decade or more, but I do know that they have voiced that desire.
- Q. You can't say that they have voiced that desire?
  - A. I can say that they have.
- Q. Okay, thank you. And they've voiced that desire repeatedly?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Over the course of many years?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. In your declaration that was submitted into --

1 as part of your testimony, you note that Metropolitan Q. Met still doesn't operate the State Water 2 2 and its member agencies have the right to wheel Project, does it? 3 3 third-party water on the State Water Project; do you A. We don't operate the State Water Project, to my 4 4 recall that? 5 A. Yes. 5 Q. And the State Water Project still is not part 6 6 Q. Met has never attempted to put a financial of Met's conveyance system, is it? 7 7 value on the right of Metropolitan or its member A. It is included in our conveyance rates. 8 8 agencies to wheel water on the State Water Project, has Q. With respect to this idea of State Water 9 9 Project wheeling, there are many years where Met doesn't 10 10 A. A financial value on our right to wheel water? wheel any third-party water on the State Water Project; 11 11 O. Uh-huh. correct? 12 12 A. Metropolitan's right to wheel water? A. That's correct. 13 13 Q. That's right. Q. And there are many years where Metropolitan 14 14 A. Not to my knowledge. It is one of the benefits member agencies don't wheel any water on the State Water 15 15 we get as State water contractor and part of the fees we Project; correct? 16 16 pay under our State water contract allow us part of that A. Correct. 17 17 right. Q. In fact, isn't it true that of the water that's 18 18 Q. But you've never attempted to put a financial been moved on the State Water Project over the last 19 19 value on that right, Metropolitan hasn't? decade, less than five percent of that is wheeling by 20 20 A. I don't believe that we put a financial value Metropolitan or its member agencies? 21 on it other than the fact that the bill we pay for the 21 A. I think that's probably right. I don't know 22 22 the exact statistic, but I would imagine that is a very State Water Project is broken up into 23 23 conservation/supply and transportation from the small amount. 24 24 Department of Water Resources. We are getting that O. Met makes decisions about whether a member 25 25 agency like San Diego can stand in Met's shoes and wheel value for the transportation. 1433 1 1 water on the State Water Project, doesn't it? Q. Is it your opinion that the disaggregation of 2 2 the DWR bill into conservation and conveyance that has A. Can stand in Metropolitan's shoes and wheel 3 3 -- that has legal meaning, that that -- that that, water? If -- in a scenario where San Diego wants to 4 therefore, means that's the value to Metropolitan? 4 execute a transfer that's purchasing supply from another 5 5 entity? MR. EMANUEL: I will object to the question. 6 6 THE COURT: It is two different questions. I Q. Right. 7 7 think you mean the latter. A. Then they could enter into an arrangement with 8 8 MR. BRAUNIG: I'll re-ask the question. Metropolitan to wheel the water, yes. 9 9 Q. And Metropolitan would have the discretion to Q. Your -- you were present during the first phase 10 10 of this trial; correct? decide whether or not San Diego is allowed to do that; 11 11 correct? A. Correct. 12 12 Q. Have you read the Court's statement of decision A. Well, there are wheeling provisions that would 13 13 on the issue of whether or not DWR -- the fact that DWR apply in terms of the ability to move the water. 14 14 disaggregates its bill means those are Met's Q. Can we bring up PTX 358, please. 15 15 transportation costs? This is Tab 24 in your binder. It's in the 16 16 binder that's in the binder one. A. I have. 17 17 This is PTX 358. This is a letter from Q. You have, okay. 18 18 Since 2013, since December of 2013, has the Metropolitan to San Diego concerning a proposed wheeling 19 19 structure of DWR's billing to Met changed? transaction? 20 20 A. Okav. A. Not to my knowledge. 21 21 Q. DWR still breaks up its bill in the same way? Q. The answer is yes, that's what this is? 22 22 A. Correct. A. Yes, it appears that way, yes. 23 23 Q. Met still doesn't own the State Water Project, MR. BRAUNIG: We would move PTX 358 into 24 24 evidence. 25 25 MR. EMANUEL: No objection. A. Correct.

Pages 1433 to 1436

1436

1435

1 THE COURT: PTX 358 is admitted. THE COURT: Is there something else that when 2 2 (Exhibit 358 was received in evidence.) you write the post-trial briefs you will be pointing me 3 3 Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: In PTX 357 San Diego had to some of the other pages? 4 4 requested wheeling service on the State Water Project MR. BRAUNIG: Possibly. We would like to have 5 5 for water it was getting from the San Juan Water the opportunity to do that. 6 6 District? That's what is in the first paragraph. THE COURT: One of the requests -- I'll make it 7 7 A. That appears to be, ves. now -- when we finish the exhibits, you are going to be 8 8 providing to me the courtesy copies, you are going to Q. If you look on the third paragraph, 9 9 take everything out of this room and you are going to be Metropolitan was refusing to consent to wheel this water 10 10 providing me only the pages you will be relying on and or to allow the State Water Project to wheel this water 11 you think I need to read afterwards. 11 on San Diego's behalf; correct? 12 If you want the entire 979 in, I will admit the 12 A. It -- yes, it appears we are not consenting to 13 13 entire 979. It is hereby admitted. And I apologize to it. 14 14 counsel for having gone to the trouble of doing what I Q. That is a decision that Metropolitan can make? 15 15 asked you to do. A. Right. There would be many considerations 16 MR. EMANUEL: No apologies necessary. 16 behind that, but ves. 17 17 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, also there is some MR. BRAUNIG: We are five minutes from noon and 18 discrepancy as to whether or not I moved PTX 358 in. 18 it is a good time. 19 THE COURT: I have an indication that you did. 19 THE COURT: Do you have more questions after 20 MR. BRAUNIG: It's admitted. 20 lunch? 21 THE COURT: That's my indication. The clerk 21 MR. BRAUNIG: I might have a little more. 22 22 confirms. THE COURT: Why don't we get together again at 23 THE CLERK: I do not. I do confirm now that 23 1:30. Thank you very much. 24 you saw it. 24 (Noon recess.) 2.5 THE COURT: Now he does. 25 1437 1439 1 1 MR. BRAUNIG: With that, your Honor, I have San Francisco, California 2 2 Thursday, April 2, 2015 nothing further. 3 3 1:30 p.m. THE COURT: Any further questions of this 4 4 Department No. 304 Hon. Curtis E.A. Karnow, Judge witness, redirect? 5 6 6 DEVENDRA UPADHYAH, REDIRECT EXAMINATION 7 7 resumed the stand and testified further as follows: BY MR. EMANUEL: 8 8 Q. We are going to look again at PTX 358. 9 9 THE COURT: Shall we continue. Do we have a Mr. Upadhyah, do you have that in front of you? 10 10 witness? THE COURT: The July 7, 2010, letter under Tab 11 11 Sir, if you'll join us. 24. 12 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 13 13 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, counsel for Met had Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Let's look into the third 14 14 paragraph, and specifically, I think, to the third sought to move in DTX 979, which is the SB-60 report, a 15 15 30-page document, and you had asked them to prepare an sentence of the third paragraph. 16 16 excerpted version. We think for purposes of For the record, "If SDCWA possesses a change in 17 17 place of use from the State Water Resources Control completeness the entire 979 should come in, and we don't 18 18 object to it. Since he sought to move it in, we don't Board for CVP supplies from SJWD, then Metropolitan will 19 19 object, if the Court would allow it. provide transportation for this water as non-SWP 20 20 supplies." MR. EMANUEL: I am withdrawing 979. I would 21 21 ask to enter evidence 979A which is only the two pages Sir, would you explain to us what that means? 22 22 we used. I think that would be more efficient. A. Sure. When San Diego was proposing this 23 2.3 MR. BRAUNIG: Your Honor, I think, that putting transfer at the time, it was with a party that has 24 24 in two pages of a 30-page document, it's not an enormous rights on the Central Valley project, which in this 25 25 document. paragraph is referred to as CVP. And there is a certain 1438 1440

```
1
                                                                               MR. EMANUEL: Yes, I gave that at the break.
      place of use defined for the Central Valley Project and
 2
                                                                   2
                                                                               MR. BRAUNIG: No objection.
      contractors that are on the Central Valley Project, that
 3
                                                                   3
                                                                               (Exhibit 1149A was received into evidence.)
      is separate from the place of use for the State Water
                                                                   4
 4
      Project and contractors on the State Water Project.
                                                                               THE COURT: 1149A is admitted.
                                                                   5
 5
         Q. Let's stop you right there. Would you explain
                                                                               MR. QUINN: Metropolitan calls Maureen
                                                                   6
 6
      the importance of place of use?
                                                                          Stapleton.
                                                                   7
         A. Sure. It's defined that permanent operations
                                                                   8
 8
                                                                                     MAUREEN STAPLETON,
      of the CVP is for the benefit of contractors on the CVP
                                                                   9
 9
                                                                          called as a witness by the Defendant, was sworn and
      and its use of water in the CVP area, that place of use,
10
                                                                  10
                                                                          testified as follows:
      which is completely different than the State Water
                                                                  11
11
      Project and the place of use within the State Water
                                                                  12
                                                                               THE WITNESS: I do.
12
      Project area.
                                                                  13
13
                                                                               THE CLERK: Please be seated. Maureen
           So what we were saying there is there is a
                                                                  14
14
                                                                          Stapleton. M-A-U-R-E-E-N. S-T-A-P-L-E-T-O-N.
      process that is used to go to the State board and
                                                                  15
15
      request a change in place of use. There was risk from
                                                                  16
                                                                                     DIRECT EXAMINATION
16
      Metropolitan if we were to agree to a wheeling
                                                                  17
                                                                          BY MR. QUINN:
17
      arrangement for a transfer that does not have that
                                                                  18
                                                                            Q. Good afternoon, Miss Stapleton.
18
      approval, so we were saying if you are able to process
                                                                  19
19
                                                                            A. Good afternoon.
      that change in place of use through the State board then
                                                                  20
                                                                            Q. My name is John Quinn. You are the general
20
      we'll move the water as nonproject water.
                                                                  21
                                                                          manager of the Water Authority in San Diego?
21
            THE COURT: Do you need the permission of the
                                                                  22
22
                                                                            A. Correct.
      State board to do any wheeling deal?
                                                                  23
23
                                                                            Q. How long have you been the general manager?
            THE WITNESS: If it's in this situation where
                                                                  24
                                                                            A. Nineteen-and-a-half years.
24
      there's the risk of not -- the State board not
                                                                  25
                                                                            Q. Did you work for the Water Authority before you
25
      acknowledging the change of place of use, then there is
                                                       1441
 1
                                                                   1
       a risk that, for example, if we had done that without
                                                                         became general manager?
 2
                                                                   2
       that change in place of use, the State Board could look,
                                                                            A. No. I did not.
                                                                   3
 3
       after the fact, could look and say, you took delivery of
                                                                   4
 4
```

your State Water Project allocation, we are not acknowledging that it was a transfer.

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: We were talking about the conservation and the demand management program.

Do you have an estimate of how much water was produced through these demand management programs?

A. The number changes as we go through time, as the benefits increase. It is more than three million acre-feet over the life of the programs.

MR. EMANUEL: Thank you. Nothing more, your Honor.

MR. BRAUNIG: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you. You are excused. MR. KEKER: Let me get Miss Stapleton who is

next, your Honor.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. EMANUEL: Can we do administrative housekeeping? Do you remember there was the Administrative Code, the Court asked that only some portion of it, so we have -- what was the number --

1149A, Metropolitan moves into evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does San Diego have a copy of that?

Q. What are the scope of your responsibilities as general manager of the San Diego Water Authority?

# A. I am responsible for the overall management of the Water Authority and its 260 employees.

Q. Do you recall back in 2001 that Metropolitan went through a process of unbundling its rates?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Do you recall those unbundled rates went into effect January 1, 2003?

A. Yes.

Q. As early as 2001, when Metropolitan was considered unbundling its rates, you folks at the San Diego Water Authority understood that the system access rate was a component of the conveyance charges that Met was implementing for these unbundled rates; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And certainly you knew that power was another component?

A. Yes.

Q. You knew the water stewardship rate was another component of this unbundled conveyance rate?

A. Yes.

MR. QUINN: If we could look at Defense Exhibit

1444

1442

Pages 1441 to 1444

1 767. There has been no objection to this, your Honor, MR. QUINN: If you could look, please, at DTX 2 2 and I would offer it into evidence. 475. This has not been admitted, at least as marked, 3 3 MR. KEKER: No objection. your Honor. It was previously part of the administrative 4 4 MR. QUINN: You should have a binder up there record. There is no objection to it, as I understand 5 that will have copies of all the exhibits I will refer 5 it, and we will offer Defense Exhibit 475. 6 6 MR. KEKER: No objection. 7 THE COURT: Exhibit 767, I take it that's a THE COURT: DTX 475 is admitted. 8 DTX? 8 (Exhibit 475 was received into evidence.) 9 MR. QUINN: DTX 767. 9 THE COURT: If we could put that up on the 10 10 THE COURT: It is admitted. screen. 11 (Exhibit 767 was received in evidence.) 11 MR. KEKER: Again, this is a 200-page document. 12 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Could you please identify this 12 THE COURT: I think we're just going to have a 13 13 document for us? general conversation about this at the end Of the trial. 14 A. It appears to be a PowerPoint presentation by 14 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do you recognize this document, 15 15 the Water Authority, or it's referenced as the Water Miss Stapleton? 16 Authority. 16 A. I do not. 17 O. And it bears a date that we see on the first 17 Q. But you did -- you did get information -- you 18 page of October 11, 2001? 18 do recall receiving information from time to time about 19 A. Yes. 19 specifically -- prior to January 1, 2003, when these 20 Q. And do you recall participating in a San Diego 20 unbundled rates went into effect, you had very specific 21 Water Authority workshop concerning Met's unbundling 21 information about what the particular charges would be 22 proposal back in October of 2001? 22 and what is contained in those charges. 23 A. Yes. I don't remember this specific meeting 23 Is that fair to say? 24 per se, but I attended all of these workshops. 24 A. Yes. 2.5 Q. This exhibit appears to be a PowerPoint 25 Q. And in March of 2002, the specific rates for 1447 1445 1 1 presentation that was used in connection with one of the unbundled rate structure, including the conveyance 2 2 those workshops in San Diego where you were considering rate, were considered and approved by the Met.But you 3 3 did -- you did get information -- you do recall this unbundled rate proposal? 4 4 A. It does. receiving information from time to time about 5 5 specifically -- prior to January 1, 2003, when these Q. If you could turn to, I think it is, slide 6 6 number five. It is page 28 of the document. It is the unbundled rates went into effect, you had very specific 7 7 page entitled "Wheeling." We've got it up on the information about what the particular charges would be 8 8 screen. If it is easier for you to look at the screen and what was contained in those charges. 9 9 there, there is a screen -- you can also see it right in Is that fair to say? 10 1.0 front of you on the left-hand side. A. Yes. 11 11 A. Oh, yes. Thank you. Q. And in March of 2002 the specific rates for the 12 12 Q. This slide, of course, shows that under this unbundled rate structure, including the conveyance rate, 13 13 unbundled proposal for wheeling there be a system access were considered and approved by the Met board. 14 14 rate and a water stewardship rate, an incremental power Do you recall that? 15 15 cost, and there is a question mark there. You see that? A. Yes. 16 16 Q. If we can look at Defense Exhibit 129, which I 17 17 understand is in evidence. This document is entitled Q. San Diego knew that these components were going 18 18 to be on this unbundled conveyance rate and also got "Delegate Votes at a Glance." 19 19 information about what the charges would be? Do you see that? 20 20 A. Yes, I do. A. Yes. 21 21 Q. In fact, San Diego received cost of service Q. This is a document you can see in the lower 22 22 reports that specified, for example, the amount of the right-hand corner, depending -- if you hold it this way, 2.3 23 State Water Project costs that would go into, for the long way, it's in the lower right-hand corner, you 24 24 can see a Bates number SDCWA, et cetera, which indicates example, the system access rate; do you recall that? 25 25 A. Yes. this is a document that came from San Diego's files. 1446 1448

1 You understand that? 1 between San Diego and who? 2 2 A. Yes. A. And Metropolitan Water District. 3 3 Q. Can you tell us what this document is? Q. About this preferential rights issues? 4 4 A. This is an at-a-glance voting record of our MWD 5 5 delegates from the Water Authority. Q. After a discussion at San Diego about the 6 6 Q. So is it true, then, that in this document we unbundled rate structure and the components of it, the 7 7 can see how the delegates from the San Diego Water San Diego board, after looking at this, directed the San 8 8 Authority, who sit on the Metropolitan board, how they Diego delegates on the Met board to vote for the rates 9 9 vote on various issues? that went into effect January 1, 2003; is that correct? 10 10 A. Yes. A. Yes. To support the rate structure, correct. 11 11 MR. QUINN: That's what this reflects. And Q. And to vote, you understand that? 12 12 then if we could turn, please, to Defense Exhibit 772, A. Yes, to vote affirmative. 13 13 DTX 772, not yet admitted, your Honor. As I understand Q. The only reservation related to this other 14 14 there is no objection to it. I am going to offer this, issue, which was the subject of a pending lawsuit 15 15 as well. regarding preferential rights, at least as reflected in 16 16 (Exhibit 772 was received into evidence.) the minutes? 17 17 A. Yes. MR. KEKER: No objection. 18 THE COURT: DTX 772 is admitted. 18 Q. There was no reservation, at least as reflected 19 19 O. BY MR. OUINN: You see this exhibit, 772, these in the minutes, in terms of the vote on these unbundled 20 20 are minutes of a San Diego Water Authority board meeting rates with respect to either State Water Project costs 21 21 on February 28, 2002? or the water stewardship rate; correct? 22 22 A. Yes. A. Correct. 23 23 Q. And if you turn, please, to page 11, that's Q. In fact, San Diego delegates, if we go back and 24 24 page 11 on the lower right-hand side. You can also see look at Defense Exhibit 129, San Diego's members on the 25 25 that on the screen. You see there in the first Met board did, in fact, vote in favor of those unbundled 1449 1451 1 1 paragraph, but I would like to read that to you. The rates; correct? 2 2 first paragraph under 1B it says, "Director of imported A. They voted in favor of the rate structure, 3 3 water has provided reasons why CWA staff -- " correct. 4 What is CWA? 4 Q. And those rates and that rate structure and the 5 5 A. County Water Authority. That's our agency. components of it, that's the same structure which San 6 6 Q. -- "had recommended that the board take a Diego maintains in this case is a breach of the 2003 7 7 position on MWD's proposed rates and charges. He exchange agreement? 8 8 reviewed the proposed rate structure and described rate A. Yes. 9 structure components. He showed potential impact to CWA 9 Q. You are aware Mr. Slater has been -- Mr. Scott 1.0 10 member agencies. Mr. Hess compared existing and Slater was designated by San Diego as the person most 11 11 proposed MWD rates and charges, and said the IID knowledgeable to testify on various issues relating to 12 12 transfer would provide a benefit to the proposed MWD damages, breach and mistake. You are aware of that? 13 13 rate structure." A. Yes, I am. I would like to read to you from You see that? 14 14 Mr. Slater's deposition as the person most 15 15 A. Yes, I do. knowledgeable, from page 216 to 217, 12. 16 16 Q. The second paragraph says, "After a lengthy MR. KEKER: No objection. 17 17 discussion, the staff recommendation was revised to Q. BY MR. QUINN: I will read to you Mr. Slater's 18 read: "The board direct the Met delegates to support 18 testimony as the person most knowledgeable. 19 19 the proposed Met rates and charges for 2003, with the "Q. You knew that at the time 20 20 statement and understanding that the action is without the October 2003 agreement was 21 21 prejudice to the continuation of the preferential rights signed, that that \$235 charge 22 lawsuit." 22 included charges, costs 2.3 You see that? 23 relating to the State Water 24 2.4 A. Yes, I do. Project that were included in

1452

the system access rate, that

1450

Q. Apparently there was some lawsuit then going on

1 Q. My point is you believed it was unlawful under were rolled up into the 2 2 wheeling rate. You knew that? the law, as it existed in 2003, the existing law at that 3 3 "A Yes, I did. time? 4 4 "Q And you thought it was A. Yes. 5 5 inappropriate to include those Q. Now, on occasion over the years, you haven't 6 6 charges; correct? been bashful about writing to Metropolitan to express 7 "A Correct. concerns that the San Diego Water Authority had about 8 "Q And you believe that was actually not 8 various issues. Would that be fair to say? 9 9 lawful to do that; correct? A. Yes. That is fair to say. I am not a bashful 10 10 "A Agreed. 11 11 "Q And, similarly, if I ask Q. And if an issue is important enough, you would 12 12 you the same questions about put those concerns in writing? 13 13 the costs associated with power A. It depends on what forum we would be at and it 14 14 and the State Water Project, depends on what we're trying to achieve. So I wouldn't 15 15 you knew those were included, say wholesale I would put something like that in 16 16 too, and you thought it was 17 illegal to include those in 17 Q. What I'm saying is, without regard to the 18 that rate; correct? 18 forum, you wouldn't wait -- if you had a particular 19 "A That's correct. 19 concern you thought it was important enough -- you 2.0 "Q And -- but you knew they were 20 wouldn't necessarily wait until the next board meeting. 21 in that 235-dollar rate? 21 You might send off a letter or an email and document 22 "A That's correct." 22 your strongly held views? 23 Now, back in 2003, you heard Mr. Slater 23 A. Or make a phone call to let my views be known; 24 emphatically express that opinion at the time the 24 correct. 25 exchange agreement was being negotiated; correct? 25 Q. And if an issue was important enough that you 1453 1455 1 1 A. Yes. We believed that they were not lawfully thought it ought to be documented, you wouldn't hesitate 2 2 to put San Diego's views in writing; is that fair to to be included. 3 3 Q. And you heard him express that opinion and you say? 4 4 believed that also, even before the exchange agreement A. I guess I am hesitating on documented. I am 5 5 was signed up; correct? not sure I understand the question. 6 6 A. Correct. Q. Let me withdraw it again. 7 Q. When, Miss Stapleton, did you first reach the I am saying if you thought it was important 8 8 conclusion that the inclusion of State Water Project enough, if you thought an issue was important enough, I 9 9 costs in the unbundled conveyance rate was unlawful? mean, you've been a general manager for, you told me, 19 10 10 When did you first reach that conclusion? years? 11 11 A. When Metropolitan started talking about A. Correct. 12 12 unbundling of the rates and of the cost allocation of Q. And you understand the value sometimes of 13 13 the State Water Project. That's when we believed that negotiating things, of documenting things when it 14 14 relates to issues that are important; correct? was a misinterpretation of what was allowed by law. 15 15 Q. You had that belief when you first heard that A. Correct. 16 16 Metropolitan had proposed to include those costs in the Q. Including issues about illegal conduct? 17 17 unbundled conveyance rate? A. Yes. 18 18 A. Correct. Q. So if an issue is important enough --19 19 Q. That could have been in 2001, 2002, but A. Uh-huh. 20 20 certainly by 2003; correct? Q. -- to you, you wouldn't hesitate to put San 21 21 A. Correct. Diego's concerns in writing; correct? 22 22 Q. You believed that it was unlawful, based upon A. Yes. I would put them in writing from time to 23 2.3 the law as it existed then in 2003; correct? time, if it was appropriate. Again, depending upon what 24 24 A. Yes. We believed that the interpretation by venue I'm using to try to make a change. 25 25 Metropolitan was not correct. Q. So in particular, in 2003, after Metropolitan 1454 1456

1 unbundled its rates, and after the new rates went into existing rates, in this case, system access and water 2 2 effect, you wrote Mr. Gastelum -stewardship. And that would provide rate stability to 3 3 A. Yes. the member agency, right. 4 4 Q. -- your counterpart at Metropolitan at the Q. So you say, "Thus providing overall rate 5 time, about those rates and documented your concerns. 5 stability to agencies." 6 6 Do you recall that? Just reading that I got the impression you 7 A. Yes, I do. thought that was a useful thing to do? 8 O. Let's take a look at DTX 794. This is in 8 A. Yes. 9 9 evidence. Q. Further, further down the page, you actually 10 10 discuss the system power rate. Do you see that? You And you say in the first line of your letter 11 that you have identified some issues in the setting and 11 have a numbered paragraph. 12 the adoption of Metropolitan's proposed rates. 12 A. I do. 13 13 Do you see that? Q. What you say there about the system power rate, 14 A. I do see that. 14 the only thing you say about it there is it is kind of 15 Q. And then it goes on -- and I am not going to 15 positive. Would you agree? 16 take the time to go through your three-page 16 A. Yes. It was the first time that we were able 17 single-spaced letter -- but continuing in the second 17 to distinguish with specificity the system power rate in 18 paragraph there, and on to the second paragraph, you 18 its detail, so we thought that was -- we wanted to give 19 list certain of these issues; correct? 19 kudos where we could for doing that. 20 20 Q. The answer to my question was, yes, it was a 21 Q. And these include something called 21 positive thing? 2.2 "pay-as-you-go funding." I'm not even going to ask you 22 A. Yes, it was. 23 what that is. 23 Q. You say, "it is an excellent example of rate 24 A. Yes. 24 component transparency." Is what you wrote? 2.5 Q. "Excess revenue collection. The use of 25 A. Yes. 1457 1459 1 reserved funds." 1 Q. You don't -- you didn't actually hear, say, by 2 2 Do you see all that? the way, we think it is unlawful; you don't see that in 3 3 A. I do see that. that paragraph? 4 Q. And then on page two there is a -- you reach --4 A. Not in that paragraph. 5 5 in the first full paragraph on page two, in the last Q. Or anywhere in that letter. You don't say that 6 6 sentence, you refer to "rate stability." Do you see use of power, inclusion of power in the rate is 7 7 unlawful? 8 8 THE COURT: Can you say that one more time, A. Yes, that's true. We kind of reference State 9 9 Mr. Quinn? Water Project in the next section. 1.0 10 MR. QUINN: Yes. Q. Sure. We will come to that. 11 11 Q. On page two, last sentence of the first full You did not request or even suggest that the 12 12 paragraph on page two, if you look at the second-to-last State Water Project costs come out of the power rate? 13 13 maybe you can highlight that, "rate stability." A. Not in this paragraph, no. 14 This is in the second-to-last line of the 14 Q. In the next paragraph you write about water 15 15 paragraph. delivery costs. Do you see that? 16 16 A. Yes, I see it now. A. Yes, I do. 17 17 Q. And that was an issue. You thought that rate Q. There you do say that, "San Diego objects to 18 18 stability was something that was important to the inclusion of significant water supply costs, e.g., 19 19 Metropolitan's members, including San Diego. Fair to State Water Project costs, as a component in 20 say? 20 Metropolitan's system access rate." 21 21 Do you see that? A. Yes, it was the use of reserves. 22 22 Q. Okay. But the rate stability was something A. Yes, I do. 23 23 that you thought was important; correct? Q. That is part of what we're talking about, what 24 24 A. Yes. That the use of the planned increase of this lawsuit is about; right? 25

1460

1458

A. Correct.

reserves could be more properly applied to maintaining

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. You go on to explain why San Diego objects. You say, and I quote, "The inclusion of supply costs in the system access rate creates subsidies for Metropolitan's supplies and increased costs for water delivery. This result sends inappropriate economic signals on both the costs of alternative supplies and appropriate delivery costs."

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

2

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

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Q. At that time you thought that those costs, actually, that it was unlawful, it was illegal?

#### A. Yes, we believed it was unlawful.

Q. But you decided not to put that in the letter?

### A. Not in this letter.

Q. Well, let me ask you: Before this lawsuit was filed, are you aware of any written communication that you wrote to anyone at Metropolitan saying that any of these challenged rates were illegal or unlawful?

# A. I cannot recall offhand a written letter that says, hello, these rates are unlawful.

Q. Are you aware of any written communication, prior to the filing of this lawsuit, at any time, where anybody at San Diego tells anybody at Metropolitan that the inclusion of these State Water Project costs and the water stewardship rate in the unbundled conveyance rate and development programs," and it goes on. You can read ahead and read it to yourself.

There is nothing there where you say the water stewardship rate should not be included in the water delivery costs or the costs of conveyance, is there?

A. Well, it references that the Water Authority believes that these goals could be met without unnecessarily increasing the system access charge in the water stewardship rate this year.

# So that was our reference to they should not be in the transportation rates.

Q. There is nothing there where you indicate or even suggest that you thought that the inclusion of the water stewardship rate charges was actually unlawful or illegal?

#### A. Correct.

Q. Did you have any role in the negotiation and approval of the exchange agreement that ended up being signed in October of 2003?

#### A. Yes, I did.

Q. And what was your role?

### A. I was the team leader of the negotiating team.

Q. And do you recall that, just kind of jumping into the middle of that, that around August of 2003, San Diego proposed to Metropolitan two different ways of

1461

1463

is illegal?

# A. In writing?

Q. Yes.

### A. No.

Q. That would be a pretty important thing, wouldn't it? I mean, these contracts involve millions and millions of -- the conveyance of water in these charges involve tens of millions of dollars, don't they?

### A. Yes, sir, they do.

Q. If somebody thought it was illegal, they are illegally being charged tens of millions of dollars, or that a proposal was on the table that would contemplate illegally charging tens of millions of dollars, that would be something significant, wouldn't you agree?

### A. It is something significant, yes.

Q. And there is nothing in this letter where you say that --

Let me turn now to the water stewardship rate and what you write there. The last paragraph on that page, "The Water Authority" -- it says, "The Water Authority supports the goal of increasing the production of recycled water and increasing support for economic water conservation programs, requiring an increase in the water stewardship rate. The Water Authority would like to continue to support local resource management

entering into this conveyance arrangement for the water that San Diego had contracted to get; do you recall?

#### A. I do.

Q. And if we could take a look at DTX 8- -- just a second. DTX 829.

MR. QUINN: This is not in evidence but there isn't an objection to it and I would offer this, your Honor.

> MR. KEKER: No objection. THE COURT: DTX 829 is admitted. (exhibit 829 was received into evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: You are in the e-mail string down at the bottom, between you and Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Campbell refers it up to Lee Miller, I guess.

#### A. Yes.

THE COURT: Willer, W-I-L-L-E-R. MR. QUINN: Thank you, your Honor.

Q. Who is Lee Willer?

# A. She was an employee of the Water Authority who was a subordinate of Campbell.

Q. This is dated in -- your email is dated September 8. This is, I guess, kind of early on, not too long after the idea of these two different options have been put on the table; is that right?

A. Correct.

1464

Q. In your email you ask Mr. Campbell to develop some written material for San Diego's board concerning the potential deal points for this exchange agreement?

#### A. Yes.

2.2

2.5

2.3

Q. Mr. Campbell then writes to Mr. Willer asking also, "How are you doing on the last canal lining analysis? We talked about comparing the exchange agreement versus wheeling rate differential and spreading the difference over canal lining water for 75 years. I would like to do some escalation sensitivities on the MWD wheeling rate, two percent, three percent, four percent, to see the per AF" --

I have come to learn that's acre-foot.

#### A. Yes, it is.

Q. -- "on the canal lining water."
Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. What was requested here was an analysis of the assumption that the MWD conveyance or wheeling rate would escalate over a 75-year period; correct?

#### A. Right. We were doing a range of escalations.

Q. Among the ranges you did, do you ever recall being a range of escalations done where you only looked at a five-year period, and assume those rates would only be in effect for five years?

lawful wheeling rate, that they knew what their exposure would be.

- Q. You didn't think the board would be interested in knowing what the future scenarios might look like if the rate structure was only in place for five years?
- A. No. They want to know what the worst case is. You hope for the best but you plan for the worst.

So we did the worst-case scenario in a two to five percent, I believe it was, escalation, so we knew what our maximum exposure would be.

- Q. So that's your experience in the business world when you're looking at a particular potential deal. You don't look at -- you only look at a worst case. You don't run the numbers for what the case is, for what you hope to achieve, it's not the worst case; you don't run those numbers?
- A. We did not. We were under a very short time period. We were talking about a huge risk that we were taking on, and I would rather tell my board what I believed was the worst-case scenario so they wouldn't come back and say, why didn't you tell me what that maximum exposure was.
- Q. I understand, ma'am, why you -- the board would want to know worst case, and I understand why you would want to tell them worst case. My question is a little

# A. No. We actually did it on a worst-case scenario.

Q. If you look at your e-mail, the second at the bottom, in the second sentence in the first paragraph, where it says, "The handout needs to articulate the deal points and identify the canal lining projects and its water as an alternative path that is at the sole discretion of the authority."

Do you see that?

### A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall that Metropolitan, when these two options were put on the table by San Diego, Metropolitan came back to San Diego and said, "They look roughly the same to us from an economic standpoint. San Diego, you can choose which one. You choose, Option-1 or Option-2." Do you recall that?

# A. I do recall that Metropolitan said that they were okay with either Option-1 or Option-2.

Q. Right. I was interested in an answer you gave a moment ago. Are you telling us the reason you didn't run the numbers, the projections for five years, is you're only interested in a worst-case analysis?

A. Yes, a worst-case scenario to present to my board, so that they knew if, in fact, we were unsuccessful in negotiating what we thought was the

different.

Isn't it your experience in the business world, that decision makers also want to see a projection based on what you realistically think you can achieve, something that is not the worst case?

MR. KEKER: Objection. Argumentative. No foundation. And I move to strike the speech at the beginning.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: We had been on a monthly or twice or three times a month been talking to our board about the various options. The All-American Canal option was a new option, and that was the focus of what my board needed to look at, was whether to take Option-1, which was already out there, or Option-2, which was new. And, therefore, I directed staff to take the number that Metropolitan had, escalate it out, and assuming that it would not change over that 45 years, what was our exposure based on the escalation of two to five percent. That is what I wanted the board to know, what the maximum exposure would be so they could make the most informed decision.

The worst thing for a manager is to have a board member come back and say why didn't you tell me

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

that was possible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. You know with respect, I don't think that answered my question, which was directed to, in the real world, if you want to give them, I think you just said, you want to give them the best information, don't you also want to give them a projection, based not just on the worst case but by what you hoped to achieve in negotiating the agreement? Don't you want them also to have that information?
- A. No. Because the exposure would be less than that maximum that you provided to the board. It would be nothing but better than what you gave to the board as the worst-case scenario. That would be a positive. They would be happy. So, no.
- Q. So the way it works at San Diego is the board only wants to hear worst-case scenarios. They are not interested in hearing what you think is actually realistic or what you can achieve? Is that your experience at San Diego?

#### A. In this case it is.

Q. Is it your testimony that you had some discussion with some board members where they said to you, "No, don't present us with any scenarios reflecting what you really intend to achieve in this agreement or what you can think you can realistically do. We are not

I'm sorry.

Does this appear to be -- maybe you can tell me what that presentation, these PowerPoints seem to reflect?

- A. Right. Based upon the cover memo of Gil Ivey, who is an employee of Metropolitan was, sending to my staff member the presentation that was made at the MWD water planning quality and resources committee meeting on the QSA.
- Q. This is a document generated by Metropolitan, to your understanding?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any understanding why it was sent to the folks at San Diego?
- A. I don't have any specific knowledge. We were trying to keep each agency informed of what the other one was doing.
- Q. If you thumb through, I think, four or five pages, you will see one slide that is entitled at the top "peace treaties." You see that?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. It says, "Wheeling laws, no legislative change by San Diego and MWD."
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Do you see that?

1469 1471

```
1
      interested in that. All we want to see is the absolute
2
      worst case?" Did you have a conversation like that with
3
      anybody on the San Diego board?
```

### A. No, I did not.

MR. QUINN: Let's take a look at DTX 830. I understand this is not in evidence and I understand there is no objection.

THE COURT: The PowerPoint slides.

MR. KEKER: No objection, your Honor.

MR. QUINN: We have offered this.

THE COURT: DTX 830 is admitted.

(Exhibit 830 was received into evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Just so you know where I'm going, ma'am, I want to walk through the written records that exist leading up to the execution of the exchange agreement in October.

What we're looking at here, the cover note is an e-mail from Amy Chen to some people, including yourself, and it is dated September 10, 2003; correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. Who is Amy Chen?
- A. She is one of my staff members who is assigned the MWD program and she's located in Los Angeles in the MWD building.
  - Q. She lives in enemy territory. It's a joke.

A. I do.

O. And then if you skip forward a couple of pages there is a heading that says, "Alternate SDCWA Pathways." Two bullets. "Two options available. SDCWA to choose by October 1."

A. Yes.

Q. That is probably referring to that San Diego can choose which option?

### A. Correct.

Q. The next slide at the top, it says, "SDCWA Option-1."

And the second bullet there is "SDCWA pays discount wheeling rate for 35 years or 5.1 MAF."

### A. Million acre-feet.

Q. So Option-1, that was -- this is we are going to continue just to go -- we will continue under that exchange agreement that we negotiated a few years ago; right?

# A. Correct.

- Q. Which had a discounted wheeling rate in it?
- A. We would argue it's not discounted.
- 22 Q. If you look at the next slide on the top, SDCWA 23 Option-2, the second option, what Met is saying is here, 24 "SDCWA pays full wheeling rate for IID, SDCWA transfer 25

water and canal lining conserved water."

1472

Do you see that? 8.5 million acre-feet of water." That's a lot of water? 2 2 A. It's a lot of water. A. I do. 3 3 Q. And you understood that was Met's position O. Worth a lot? 4 about what the proposal was? A. Worth a lot. 5 A. Yes. It doesn't reference a year on this one. 5 Q. Worth billions, with a B, of dollars; correct? 6 6 So I can't tell how long they thought that would be. A. I don't know. But it is worth a lot of -- it 7 Q. It just says full wheeling rate? has high value. 8 A. Yes. 8 Q. It is certainly worth -- 77,700 acre-feet 9 9 Q. You understood that was their understanding and annually for 110 years is certainly worth more than 10 10 expectation? \$100 million? 11 11 A. No, I did not know that full wheeling rate --A. Absolutely. 12 it's not the same language we used, but I presume it 12 Q. Absolutely. Certainly worth more than 13 13 referenced the \$253 rate. \$500 million? 14 Q. And that's what ultimately ended up going into 14 A. I don't know. 15 the agreement? 15 O. You don't know? 16 A. It did. 16 A. I'd have to do a calculation of what it would 17 MR. OUINN: And then if we could look at DTX 17 be worth compared to other transfers. 18 837, which has not been admitted. I understand there is 18 Q. Would you dispute that that quantity of water 19 no objection to it. We would offer it, your Honor. 19 is worth -- I understand you don't know whether it's 20 MR. KEKER: No objection. 20 worth billions. Are you in a position to dispute that? 21 THE COURT: DTX 837 is admitted. 21 Would you dispute -- if somebody said that was worth \$2 2.2 (Exhibit 837 was received into evidence.) 22 billion, with a B, would you dispute that? 23 MR. KEKER: It is also 846. You're right. No 23 A. I would not, no. 24 objection. 24 Q. You just don't know? 2.5 Q. BY MR. QUINN: The top document is an email 25 A. I wouldn't know what, you know, what the costs 1473 1475 1 1 from you dated September 16, 2003? would be over 110 years and how to present value the 2 2 A. Yes. cost of that water. 3 3 Q. And you sent this to all board members --Q. How about just the current cost? Let's talk in 4 4 terms of today. If you could get that much water 5 5 today -- let's not worry about for now the Q. -- is that right? Concerning QSA update and 6 6 attached fact sheet and Campbell memorandum, you discounting -- that would be worth billions of dollars? 7 7 attached those two documents; right? A. Yes, it would be worth a lot of money. 8 8 Q. Billions? A. I did. 9 9 Q. The first attachment, if we could look at that, A. Sir, I don't want to say what it's worth unless 10 10 the first page, it says, "Fact Sheet, September 16, I had the ability to spend some time to calculate its 11 11 2003." And this is a fact sheet that was prepared at value. 12 12 San Diego outlining the two options; right? Q. Certainly anyone who said it might only be 13 13 A. Yes. worth \$100,000, that would be flat-out wrong? 14 14 Q. And the second attachment is the memorandum A. I would say it's worth much more than that. 15 15 from Bob Campbell outlining the financial analysis of Q. Let's go to the second attachment, the 16 16 memorandum from Mr. Campbell. And I assume you would the two options; correct? 17 17 read this memo before you sent it -- before you attached A. Yes. 18 18 Q. So if we could just look first at the fact it to your email to your board of directors? 19 19 A. Yes, I would have read it. sheet. 20 20 Q. And insofar as you know, everything that's in And if we could go to the second page, which 21 21 says, "Option-2" at the top. If we would just enlarge, this memo is accurate? 22 22 A. Yes. say, the top third. The second bullet, in describing 23 23 the Option-2, it says "MWD assigns its canal lining Q. And the description of Option-2, in this memo, 24 24 rights to SDCWA. Canal lining water rights to SDCWA. there in that first paragraph, it says, "The assignment 25 25 Project yields 77,700 acre-feet annually for 110 years. of Met's canal lining project water rights to SDCWA, in 1474 1476

2.2

2.5

consideration for SDCWA's paying Met's wheeling rate, in lieu of the exchange agreement to transport the IID/SDCWA transfer water and canal lining water. Currently the Met wheeling rate is set at \$253 per acre-foot, including the system access and water stewardship rates and power cost." Do you see that? A. I do. 

Q. And then it says, where it says, "In consideration," what you understood that to mean was that Met would get what's stated there, Met's wheeling rate, instead of the rate under the 1998 exchange agreement, which is what the existing exchange agreement provided for; right?

# A. Yes. That we would pay the \$253 instead of that 90-dollar rate.

Q. So you were going to pay a lot more?

#### A. Yes.

1.0

2.4

Q. You understood that \$253, probably beating the dead horse here, but it included that system access rate, the power rate with the State Water Project costs built into both of them, and the water stewardship rate; correct?

# A. Yes. That would be included in that \$253 that we would pay for a minimum of the five years.

and in looking at the potential costs of the second option, the staff is looking at these two different ways, but they are assuming it is going to start at 253 and escalate up over time; right?

# A. Right. In this calculation or analysis, that is exactly what we're doing.

Q. Again, there is no numbers here run on just a five-year scenario. This only --

#### A. No.

Q. -- the 253 and escalator is only for five years?

# A. No. Because the canal lining was for 110 years.

Q. A week after that you helped prepare and approved a memorandum to the water policy committee?

### A. Yes.

MR. QUINN: And let's take a look at DTX 856. Not admitted yet. No objection, as I understand it.

We'd offer this, your Honor.

MR. KEKER: No objection.

THE COURT: DTX 856 is admitted. (Exhibit 856 was received into evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: What is the water policy committee?

A. It is a committee made up of approximately 14

Q. In the next full paragraph Mr. Campbell writes about how the staff used two different approaches to evaluate the costs of the two options.

### A. Yes.

Q. And in both approaches he assumed that under Option-2 Met's wheeling rate would escalate over the term of the contract; correct?

### A. Correct.

Q. In the last paragraph on page one, third sentence he writes, "The Met wheeling rate is established annually by the Met board of directors and is assumed to escalate over time." Correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. In this memorandum that you sent, you said we are anticipating that the wheeling rate, at least for purposes of trying to value this option, we assume the wheeling rate will include these components, will be starting at \$253, and there will be a factor for inflation over time; correct?

A. That -- I'm not sure about the way we would value this option. But that -- what the potential costs could be for this option.

Q. Right.

A. It would be done in this manner.

Q. Thank you. You are trying to compare the two,

1 members of my board of directors.

Q. If you go to the last page, you will see an indication there, I think it's the last lines on the page, this is a memorandum that was -- that you prepared and approved?

### A. Yes.

Q. Also prepared by Mr. Campbell and Mr. Hentschke, the general counsel?

### A. Correct.

Q. If you turn to page two in this memo that you wrote, you describe Option-1 and Option-2?

### A. Yes.

Q. In particular to Option-2, if we can enlarge that paragraph, you wrote, "In consideration for Met's assignment of All-American and Coachella canal lining water rights to the authority, the authority would pay Met's lawful wheeling rate in lieu of the exchange agreement. The Met's current published wheeling rate is \$253 per acre-foot and is comprised of the system access charge, water stewardship charge and power cost."

Do you see that?

### A. I do.

Q. In this memo, at any point, do you tell the water policy committee when you're laying this out that you think those charges are unlawful?

- A. In the public sessions we did not.
- Q. Go back to my question. In this memo.
  - A. In the memo, no, we did not.
- Q. Did you ever write a memo to your board, did you, considering these various proposals and leading up to the execution of the agreement, did you personally write a memo to your board at any point which indicates that any of these charges are unlawful?
- A. We never provided any written documentation to our board related to this. It was never in writing.
  - O. Related to this --

1.0

2.1

2.4

- A. Related to our belief that Met's wheeling rate at that time was not lawful. We did not provide anything in writing to the board on that.
- Q. It wasn't important enough to include in any of the documents?
- A. Oh, not in the documents. It was absolutely important for the board to know that what our concerns were about Met's rates not being lawful and those -- and those discussions, and there were many of those discussions were held with our board.
- Q. You don't have anything in writing that you can share with us?
- A. We do not provide any written documentation to the board for closed session items.

the \$253 rate will escalate over time, using inflation factors ranging from two to five percent?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And, again, if we look in here, there's nothing in here about proposed -- any other proposed alternative scenario, like a five-year period, in terms of length of the wheeling deal?
  - A. There is not.
- Q. At the bottom of page six there is a beginning of a summary in which you present various factors to assist the board in assessing the risks and benefits of Option-2. Do you see that?
  - A. I do.
- Q. On the next page, page 7, you discuss supply reliability, saying "There is no other readily available water supply with the priority level, cost amount and duration of water supply resulting from the canal lining." Do you see that?
  - A. I do.
- Q. How did you know that, that there wasn't other similar available water supply?
- A. Because we had been negotiating for so long and were very familiar with the Colorado River and the availability of various supplies on the river.
  - Q. On page 7 you indicate how the marginal cost of

- Q. So this is something that -- this view about the illegality is something you wanted to keep in closed session?
  - A. Absolutely.
- Q. You regarded that as something that was confidential?
  - A. Absolutely.
- Q. You didn't want that to be publicly known, that you thought these rates were --
- A. The discussions, it was not appropriate to have those discussions in open session.

THE COURT: Ma'am, you have to just let him finish his question. Just give it a beat and then answer.

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: I am not asking about the discussions. I am focusing on your view that these rates were illegal. You didn't want that to be publicly known.
  - A. No, that is not true.
- Q. If you look at pages five and six, there is a discussion of the staff, two approaches to the analysis of the cost of Option-1 and -2.
  - Do you see that?
- A. Yes, I do.
  - Q. And, again, each of those approaches assumes

- the canal lining water compares favorably to other water transfers that range in supply costs alone --
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. -- between \$250 and \$300; do you see that?
  - A. I do see that.

Q. On page 8 under "Supply risks are significantly lower," you write, and I quote, "While choosing Option-2 exposes the authority to higher wheeling costs, comprised of Met rate components and system access charge, stewardship and fluctuations of power costs, it protects the authority from even greater exposure associated with securing an alternative imported supply, whether or not that supply" -- I'm sorry -- "securing an alternative imported supply, whether or not that supply comes from Met or another seller."

Did you believe that to be true at the time?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And you recommended that Option-2 be approved; right?
- A. I did.
- Q. Notwithstanding your view that these rates are illegal; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And you concluded that this was a good deal for San Diego, to start with the wheeling rate -- it was a

2.2

good deal even if, worst-case scenario, if you had to pay this illegal wheeling rate of \$253, with an inflation factor of up to five percent over the life of the contract, even at that scenario you were recommending that this was a good deal for San Diego?

#### A. Yes.

2.2

2.5

2.3

MR. QUINN: If we could turn now to DTX 221, which is not yet admitted, and to which the Plaintiff has objected on the grounds of relevance.

THE COURT: Are you offering it now?

MR. QUINN: I am offering it, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am trying to figure out if you are going to ask the witness some questions to lay a foundation. Why don't you tell me what the relevance is and then they can tell me why it's not.

MR. QUINN: This raises -- this addresses the same issues, your Honor, about the risk, the wheeling rate, the proposed exchange deal. It talks also about the other related agreements, the allocation, the quantification settlement agreement and identifies the various risks of Option-2.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, I think our objection -- I know our objection as to relevance is based on that portion that talks about everything but what this trial about, which is the terms of the

You recall this PowerPoint presentation here, DTX 221, was presented to the board at San Diego?

# A. Yes. This is our public PowerPoint presentation.

- Q. You thought this was accurate?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You wouldn't have submitted it otherwise?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. If you turn, please, to slide 2.

Fair to say that this shows that San Diego -this pie here shows that San Diego was fairly dependent on Metropolitan for their water supply?

- A. In 1991 we were 95 percent dependent.
- Q. Do you know what that was in 2003?

# A. In 2003 we had reduced it to maybe -- I am going to say maybe 75 percent or so, 80 percent.

Q. Would it be true to say that San Diego had, for a long time, sought to secure its own independent supply of water?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And if you turn, please, to slide 21, the heading at the top is "Option-2, Financial Risk/Benefit."

Here you identify the risk under Option-2, risk: "Exposure to MWD wheeling rate."

exchange agreement. And this going back to the motive, the other benefits and so on is a complete red herring to the issue of what the parties agreed to in 2003 and 5.2 of the agreement. We said before, we are all over the place with parole evidence; we get it. But our argument is going to be read the contract and follow it, and none of this atmosphere and the earth cooled and then land was formed and canals were dug and so on is useful to making that decision.

So that's our objection, and I'll sit down.

THE COURT: I understand. I do understand your position, you should look at the other contracts. And part of the defense is that we should, and so it is admissible on that basis. DTX 221 is admitted.

(Exhibit 221 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do you recall this -- we are now up to September 25, 2003, just a few days, a couple of weeks before the exchange agreement is actually signed?

# A. Yes, a few days before the deadline, where we had to make a decision.

Q. It actually was signed -- somebody help me -- do you remember the date of the exchange agreement?

### A. I want to say October 10.

Q. I am hearing a chorus of October 10, so I think you're right.

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes

Q. Under that exchange agreement that had already been in place, which would have been Option-1, for at least 30 years you knew what the wheeling charges were going to be; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. Because there was -- that starts out at a certain number, \$80 and \$90, and then an index to increases; right?

#### A. Yes.

Q. But you didn't have that under the proposal under Option-2?

### A. Correct.

Q. The risk was, it says here, "Exposure to the MWD wheeling rate." You mean for the term of the contract; right?

# A. Certainly for the first five years we were exposed to it -- to Met's wheeling rate. And then after five years, depending on what the Water Authority chose to do, we were exposed to the lawful wheeling rate.

Q. I mean, even under San Diego's interpretation, if we look at that exchange agreement, we won't see anything in there specifying what the price would be for any year, you know, years two to five or after five?

2.4

- A. We have -- yes, there's nothing in the agreement that talks about what a specific dollar amount would be after year five.
  - Q. Or what the increases would be?
  - A. Correct.

Q. There was no index, in other words, like there was under the previous exchange agreement?

#### A. Correct.

THE COURT: Whenever you get to a good point in the next five minutes or so, just pick a time and take a break.

MR. QUINN: Why don't I finish this exhibit. It won't take long.

THE COURT: Sure.

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: And then you say, you describe here the cost for benefit received from canal lining. You describe that as, "The present value difference between the 1998 exchange agreement cost and the MWD wheeling rate cost for 35 years." Do you see that?
  - A. I do.
- Q. And it refers there, below that, to "Inflation sensitivity for the wheeling rate." Do you see that?
  - A. I do.
  - Q. That is something that needs to be considered?
  - A. Yes.

were presenting to the board in making this decision; correct?

- A. Absolutely.
- Q. It says, "The present value of differential is the cost of getting the canal lining water benefit." Right?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. So the board understood that the canal lining water was a trade-off for the payment of the existing Met wheeling rate plus an inflation factor?
    - A. I don't think that's exactly correct.

I think that they felt that the canal lining project was a trade for giving up the 1998 exchange agreement for the exchange agreement that was proposed in -- that now is the 2003. It is not correct that we traded absolutely the canal lining project for the Met determined wheeling rate for 45 years.

Q. In terms of the analysis that was presented to the board --

#### A. Yes. In terms of the analysis, yes.

Q. -- it was presented to the board, and what you were asking the board to make its decision based on, you were presenting them this present value analysis and comparing the cost.

In terms of the analysis that was presented to

1489 1491

Q. So it is still anticipated that San Diego would pay the MWD wheeling rate for 35 years and that rate would increase over time; correct?

- A. Yes. As I explained earlier, we had a range of escalations that we used to determine what we felt was the maximum wheeling rate that we would be exposed to.
- Q. So if we look at the present value analysis that's done here, and you are kind of summarizing here, that present value analysis, again, was based on an assumption that the Met wheeling rate would escalate over the existing rate of the life term of the contract?

#### A. Correct.

Q. If we turn to slide 22, "Option-2, financial risk analysis," that identifies what we have been talking about, the price under the 1998 agreement as \$97 an acre-foot for 2003. Do you see that?

#### A. Yes.

Q. It goes on to say, "Risk is in difference between Met wheeling rate cost and wheeling rate cost under the exchange agreement." And using the numbers in the slide the risk was the difference between \$253 and \$97 per acre-foot or \$156 per acre-foot with an inflation factor for each?

- A. Yes.
- Q. That was the important information that you

<sup>1</sup> the board --

#### A. Yes. In terms of the analysis, ves.

Q. It was presented to the board, and what you were asking the board to make its decision based on, you were presenting them this present value analysis and comparing the cost; correct?

# A. Right. We were comparing the costs and the maximum exposure of costs.

Q. And we looked earlier at Mr. -- is it Campbell's memorandum? -- where he talked in terms about the consideration for the canal lining water paying the wheeling rate; do you recall that?

#### A. Yes.

Q. You understand that -- I mean, you don't have any disagreement with that? That was part of the consideration, forgetting this huge volume of water for 110 years was agreeing to pay this much increased wheeling rate; correct?

#### A. Yes, yes. For that five years.

Q. And that was -- those were key points in the deal; fair?

#### A. Yes.

Q. They are reflected in the -- that deal, those key points of this deal are reflected in different documents, the exchange agreement and the allocation

1 quite a bit of time trying to figure this out, coming up agreement; correct? 2 2 A. Yes. with some rules of thumb about how to deal with the 3 3 Q. You can't just read one of those documents to amount of time people need on direct and cross. I don't 4 4 have an understanding of what the deal was; correct? think anything's changed. So I'm not going to grant the 5 A. The total deal? 5 motion. I am just going to live with the time we set. 6 6 Q. Yes. MR. KEKER: The second request, your Honor, is 7 A. It would be -- you would have to look at all that in the back of the courtroom Jessica Fromm, who is 8 8 30-some documents in the QSA to actually understand the an 8th grade teacher from Denver, is here and she wanted 9 9 total deal, not just one or two. to take a picture of the courtroom to show her students, 10 10 Q. So, again, after considering all this and the and we wondered if you had any objection to her doing 11 11 risk and benefits described in the information you gave 12 12 the board, the San Diego board approved Option-2; THE COURT: Of course not. 13 13 correct? MR. QUINN: I object. Mr. Keker is going to be 14 14 A. Yes. in the photo. 15 15 MR. QUINN: This would be a good time, your THE COURT: That I understand. I appreciate it 16 16 if you don't take pictures of someone who is on the 17 17 witness stand. We will arrange the room. Because the THE COURT: I will see everybody in 15 minutes. 18 18 Thank you very much. witness might object to that. You can always take a 19 19 (Recess.) picture of everybody after the witness has stepped down, 20 20 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, could I raise a point if you want. If anybody else has any objection to being 21 21 that I was going to raise at the end of the day but I am in a picture, please just make that known and move when 22 22 afraid if I wait it will be in a rush for 4:00 and we the picture is being taken. 23 23 should do it now. And that is the question of time. Let's proceed. 24 24 When we -- we have used about four hours to Q. BY MR. QUINN: Miss Stapleton, I would like to 25 25 read to you again some testimony from Mr. Slater, San present our direct case, as promised. Your order says 1493 1 1 we get nine hours and they get 12 hours, and just Diego's person most knowledgeable. And this will be 2 2 basically we don't think that's fair. We had three from page 64 of his deposition, lines 14 to 25. 3 3 witnesses. They've got seven witnesses. I'm not sure "Q I want to jump back to the 4 our clocks and your chess clock are a little bit 4 2003 agreement for a second. 5 different. The clerk let us look at your chess clock. I'm jumping back here like 6 6 We basically used, we think, us about 4:45 and Marty McFly. I'm jumping 7 7 them about 5:14. What I am suggesting is you give us between time frames here. 8 8 equal time and we use three days in the week that you "A I'm not Marty McFly. 9 set aside four days, and we get in 12 hours of testimony 9 "Q Okay. Get that on the 1.0 1.0 split evenly with the rest of the witnesses, rather than record. 2003, the negotiations 11 11 have us at a three-hour disadvantage, for what we don't for the 2003 agreement, was it 12 12 think there is any good reason. ever discussed excluding -- did 13 13 THE COURT: Would you like to be heard? any party ever propose 14 14 MR. QUINN: If the Court is going to consider excluding State Water Project 15 15 that, yes. Otherwise we -- we want some more time, too. costs from the price -- from 16 16 Remember, they were telling us this could all be done the price, the contract price 17 17 this week. We cut witnesses. Told them to send Amy to be charged under that 18 18 Chen home, for example. We scrambled and cut agreement? 19 19 examinations and tried to squeeze in the time we had. "A I do not recall that, no."

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

They just had a damages case to put on. They say

everything else has been decided. We have affirmative

THE COURT: I have actually already -- I spent

defenses. I think the Court had good reasons for not

giving both sides, at this point, the same amount of

Was Mr. Slater wrong about that?

A. He was not. We did not propose a lower price.

Q. And you also -- at no point did San Diego in negotiations for that agreement, Mr. Slater, the person most knowledgeable testified, never proposed taking out the State Water Project costs from the wheeling rate, in

1496

1495

1494

20

21

22

23

24

1 connection with the negotiation of that agreement; projections that you presented to the board? 2 2 correct? A. It escalated. I can't tell you if it escalated 3 3 between the two and five percent. I do not recall. A. For the price that started, that we started 4 4 within the exchange agreement? Q. But it did escalate every year? 5 5 Q. At no point, did any party ever propose A. Yes, it did. 6 6 excluding State Water Project costs from the price, the Q. In 2005, it's true to say that San Diego did 7 contract price to be charged under that agreement; is not write to Metropolitan saying that the rates were 8 8 that true? unlawful? 9 9 A. That is true. A. Correct. 10 10 Q. So is it your testimony, just reading between Q. And in 2005, San Diego did not make any claim 11 11 the lines, Miss Stapleton, are you saying that you with Met that charging a price based on these unlawful 12 12 rates was a breach of contract? brought up with Met excluding State Water Project costs 13 1.3 in year two? A. Correct. 14 14 A. No. Q. And San Diego, in 2005, did not object in 15 15 O. Year three? writing to the price or to any invoice; true? 16 16 A. No. A. Correct. 17 17 Q. Four? Q. And that would be true if I asked you those 18 A. No. 18 same questions for 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, your answers 19 19 Q. For any year? would be the same? Do you want me to go through them? 20 20 A. Yes. A. I believe we started some dialogue and there 21 21 Q. What year did you propose backing out the State may be in writing some references to us beginning --2.2 22 Water Project costs on, you personally? wanting to talk about the negotiations for the wheeling 23 23 A. Yes. In year six or beyond, that we had to 24 24 come to some agreement in that we believed the State Q. Is there any writing that you can point us to 25 25 in any of those years where San Diego wrote to Met, water projects were not lawfully included in the rates. 1497 1499 1 1 Q. And who did you propose that to on the Met prior to 2010, stating that the rates being charged were 2 2 side? 3 3 A. Dennis Underwood. A. I cannot go to any specific document. I cannot 4 Q. Anyone else? 4 recall any right now. 5 5 A. I believe it was referenced among the group, Q. You cannot recall, can't identify for us any 6 6 which would be the Met team and the Water Authority document in any of those years where San Diego made a 7 7 claim with Met that it was charging a price that was in 8 8 Q. I am trying to find out who, other than breach of contract? 9 9 Mr. Underwood, you say you proposed taking State Water A. No. 10 1.0 Project costs out after the five years you identified --Q. Or even objecting in writing to the price being 11 11 A. I personally? charged or to any invoice before 2010? 12 12 O. Yes. A. I don't recall any. 13 13 A. I personally? Q. If you'd look at -- if we could turn to the 14 14 exchange agreement itself, DTX 55, PTX 65, and turn to Q. Yes. 15 15 A. No. It would be just Mr. Underwood. page 26, there is a Section 12.4(c), if you would take a 16 16 Q. And sadly he's deceased? look at that. 17 17 A. Yes, unfortunately. And you recall this provision here that says, 18 18 Q. By 2005 the 2003 exchange agreement had been in "In the event of a dispute over the price, SDCWA shall 19 19 effect for over a year? pay, whenever due, the full amount claimed by 20 20 Metropolitan, provided, however, during the pendency of A. Correct. 21 21 Q. Met initially billed San Diego for conveyance the dispute, Metropolitan shall deposit . . ." 22 charges at that initial price of \$253? 22 You know the provision I'm referring to? 23 2.3 A. Yes. 24 24 O. And over the next five years that price Q. Unless you want me to, I won't read the whole 25 25 escalated, just as San Diego had anticipated in those paragraph. 1498 1500

#### A. I do know that provision.

Q. You understood since -- at any time after 2003, if San Diego disputed a price, it could deposit money with Met and Met would have to keep that money in an account until the dispute was resolved?

#### A. Yes.

1.5

Q. The first time that San Diego did that was in February of 2011; right?

#### A. Yes.

MR. QUINN: Let's look at DTX 624, not yet admitted. I understand there is no objection, and I would offer it, February 10, 2010, letter from Mr. Hentschke to Mr. Kightlinger.

MR. KEKER: No objection. THE COURT: DTX 624 is admitted.

(Exhibit 624 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: You recognize this as a letter from San Diego's general counsel to Mr. Kightlinger?

#### A. Yes.

Q. This is the first time San Diego asked Met to set aside money under that Section 12.4 (c); correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. There is nothing in that five-year provision, sometimes referred to as a standstill or year of good feelings, whatever -- there is nothing in that that

time frame, 2005 through 2009, Met every single year, Metropolitan's conveyance rates were submitted for approval by the Met board every year; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. You recall, if we can look at DTX 129, I think we looked at this already, in 2005 San Diego's members of the Met board voted for the wheeling rate which included the State Water Project costs and the water stewardship rate; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. As we discussed earlier, San Diego's delegates to the Met board received direction from the San Diego board as to how to vote on certain matters; right?

# A. Only -- the only one I see is the one you referenced earlier. That's the only one that I have seen.

Q. Let me ask, is it generally a custom and practice on the issue of rates that San Diego's delegates will be instructed how to vote?

## A. No. It's actually opposite of that. They are not instructed by our board of directors on how to vote.

Q. In any event, we can see here, this is a record of how in fact they did vote; right?

#### A. Yes.

Q. And as part of that, you know that when these

prevented San Diego during that time from invoking this deposit procedure under 12.4 (c), was there?

### A. I believe we could not challenge the rate for the first five years. So unless they were charging more than the Met established rate, we could not -- we couldn't dispute it.

Q. Let's take a look at that section and see what it provides that you couldn't do in the first five years, Section 5.2, pages 16 and 17.

I think you will see in the second line there, it says, "For the term of this agreement neither San Diego nor Met shall seek or support in any legislative, administrative or judicial forum any change in the form, substance or interpretation of any applicable law or regulation."

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. It refers to not taking actions in legislative, administrative or judicial forums; correct?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Does that refresh your recollection there was nothing that prevented San Diego from invoking this 12.4(c) procedure even during the first five years?

#### A. I see that.

Q. You are aware that from 2000 -- during this

rates and rate structures come up for vote, there's a whole package that goes to the whole members of the board to support the requested action; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. And that includes a cost of service breakdown which specifically identifies the components of the rates that the delegates are being asked to vote on; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. So it would not be true to say, would it, that when these things come up for vote at the Met board, the only thing the board members can vote on is whether the rates should be increased?

## A. That is the primary issue. But in addition, it is they are aware of how the costs are allocated.

Q. Ma'am, it would not be true to say, that when these packages come up for review, that the only thing the board members have an opportunity to approve is an increase in the rates; that they have no ability to address the rate structures?

# A. I do not know what that specific package is. I don't know what the resolution is. So I don't believe I can answer that accurately.

Q. As far as you know --

A. I do not know.

Pages 1501 to 1504

THE COURT: She's still talking, Mr. Quinn. A. Yes. 2 2 MR. QUINN: Sorry. Q. For example, if we could look at DTX 75 -- this 3 3 THE WITNESS: I just don't know. I haven't is in evidence -- December 1, 2008, letter to 4 4 viewed it. Mr. Kightlinger from you, this is an example of a -- one 5 5 Q. BY MR. QUINN: You attend some of the instance where San Diego was requesting that water be 6 6 Metropolitan board meetings? wheeled through Met -- through State Water Project 7 facilities under Met's contract with the State; is that A. Rarely. 8 8 Q. You know that those -- there are recordings correct? 9 9 made of those meetings? A. That is correct. 10 10 A. Yes. Q. And San Diego requested that Met -- San Diego 11 11 Q. As there are recordings made of the San Diego knew that Met had this ability, this right to use the 12 12 meetings; right? State Water Project facilities for that purpose; right? 13 13 A. Correct. 14 14 Q. So far as you are aware, did any of the San Q. And San Diego knew that Met pays for those 15 15 facilities through its contract with the State; correct? Diego delegates to the Met board ever disclose to the 16 Met board that San Diego believed any of these rates 16 17 17 that were being voted on were unlawful? Q. And San Diego, when it did that, when it 18 18 A. During what period of time? wheeled water through the State Water Project 19 19 facilities, it would pay the full Met wheeling rate for Q. Prior to the filing of this lawsuit. 20 20 A. I believe that they did indicate that they did those services without objection; correct? 21 21 not support, did not believe that the costs were A. I don't know. 2.2 Q. You don't know whether or not the wheeling rate 22 allocated correctly. 23 23 Q. At any time -- my question -- I'm not sure -that San Diego was charged for wheeling through the 24 I might have misspoken and maybe you misheard 24 State Water Project facilities included the system 25 25 access rate, power rate and including the State water my question. 1505 1507 1 1 My question is, when these votes -- when these costs, you just don't know? 2 2 rates came up annually, at any time did any -- so far as A. I am aware that they included that. I am not 3 3 you know, did any of the San Diego delegates inform the aware if it included other costs. 4 4 Met board that the rates on the table submitted for Q. Okay. You are aware when you request wheeling, 5 5 voting were illegal or unlawful? transportation of water, you are going to be paying 6 6 A. No. system access rate, power rate, including the State 7 7 Q. Is it your understanding the board members have Water Project costs; correct? 8 8 fiduciary duties to other board members? A. Correct. 9 9 A. To other board members? Q. And San Diego pays those charges without 10 10 Q. To the board. To the board as a whole. objections? 11 11 A. To the agency, yes. A. Correct. 12 12 Q. As members of the board they are fiduciaries? Q. No objection to paying those costs when you are 13 13 A. Yes. wheeling water through the State Water Project? 14 14 Q. It is true, isn't it, that San Diego's A. We did not object when we moved this water in, 15 15 delegates to the Met board also voted to approve these it looks like, probably 2009 when we moved this water. 16 16 conveyance rates in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009? Q. Similarly, if the State Water Project was being 17 17 A. Yes. used to perform under the exchange agreement, San Diego 18 18 Q. During the period we've been talking about, would have no objection to paying those costs related to 19 19 prior to 2010, San Diego requested, on occasion, that use of the State Water Project? 20 20 Met wheel water, wheel water on San Diego's behalf, A. Could you explain what "objection" is? 21 21 isn't that correct? Q. San Diego would have no issue with being 22 22 charged for use of State Water Project facilities if A. Yes. 23 23 Q. And San Diego wanted water wheeled through the they had to be used to perform the exchange agreement; 24 24 State Water Project facilities under Met's contract with correct? 25 25 the State; correct? A. I don't know.

1508

1 Q. Well, the use of -- it's true, isn't it, that Q. Is it more than 50 percent of the water that's 2 2 the use of the State Water Project facilities was been exchanged? 3 3 essential to Met's performance under the exchange A. I don't believe so. 4 4 agreement; it had to be done? Correct? O. Is it more than a third of the water that's 5 5 been exchanged? A. Not necessarily. 6 6 Q. Is it your understanding that Met could perform A. I don't know. 7 7 the exchange agreement simply by using the Colorado Q. Can you give us an order of magnitude? 8 8 A. I cannot. Sorry. River Aqueduct exclusively? 9 9 A. Yes. MR. QUINN: I would like to read you another 10 10 passage of Mr. Slater's deposition, Volume II, page 243, Q. Well, you knew, in fact, that the State Water 11 11 Project facilities would be used to deliver water under line 20, to 244, eight. 12 MR. KEKER: No objection, your Honor. 12 the exchange agreement; you knew that at the time the 13 13 THE COURT: Go ahead, please. exchange agreement was negotiated and signed; correct? 14 14 MR. QUINN: (Reading:) A. No. I knew it could be used, but I did not 1.5 15 "Q So would it be true to say know it would be used. 16 that, as of 2007, San Diego 16 Q. In fact, San Diego understood, at the time that 17 17 would sue if Met did not change the agreement was negotiated and signed, that even a 18 the way it calculated its 18 temporary inability to use the State Water Project 19 19 wheeling rate upon -- it would facilities could cause a change in the delivery of water 20 sue upon the exp- -- sometime 20 to San Diego under the exchange agreement? 21 between the expiration of the 21 A. Yes, it could. 2.2 five-year period and ten years 22 Q. So if we look at DTX 51, Section -- this is the after that? 23 exchange agreement -- Section 3.3, pages 13 to 14. You 24 "A Correct. 24 see where it says, "SDCWA understands that any number of 2.5 "Q And that was San Diego's 25 factors, including emergencies, inspection, maintenance 1509 1511 1 1 state of mind as of 2007? or repair of Metropolitan facilities or the State Water 2 2 Project facilities may result in a temporary and "A Yes. 3 3 incidental modification of the delivery schedule "Q And that if I ask you that 4 contemplated in paragraph 3.2." Correct? 4 same question about 2006, 2005, A. Correct. 2004, your answer would be the 6 6 same" Q. The parties clearly contemplated that the use 7 of the State Water Project facilities were an essential "A Yes. 8 "Q And 2008? aspect under the exchange agreement? 9 9 A. I don't see that. "They may result." It "A Yes." 10 10 doesn't say "they shall result." Q. That is flatly not true, isn't it? Correct? 11 11 Q. You understood if there were a shutdown of the A. No. We had every intention to negotiate an 12 12 State Water Project facilities, that might have certain acceptable rate with Met and knew if we were unable to 13 13 consequences for the schedule of the deliveries? do so that our only alternative was lawsuit. 14 14 Q. Mr. Slater says as of 2007 they intend -- there A. Yes, it might. 15 Q. So you understood from that that Met might well 1.5 would be an intention to sue. 16 16 be using the State Water Project facilities to perform That is simply not true as of 2007? 17 17 under the exchange agreement? A. An intention to sue, no. We did not in 2007 18 18 A. Yes, they might. intend to sue. 19 19 Q. And as a historical fact, you know that a large Q. When he says that San Diego's state of mind as 20 20 portion of the water that has been delivered under the of 2007 that it intended to sue upon expiration of the

Pages 1509 to 1512

1512

1510

21

22

2.3

24

25

five-year period, that's simply wrong?

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor.

O. BY MR. OUINN: Let's take a look at DTX 555,

which is admitted. This is an April 18, 2007, memo to

exchange agreement has come through the State Water

Project; you know that?

Q. Do you know how much?

A. Yes.

A. I do not.

2.1

22

23

2.4

1 Q. Since 2003 San Diego has received the benefits the imported water committee. 2 2 A. Yes. it expected to get under the exchange agreement? 3 3 Q. On the second page, this is a memorandum A. Yes. 4 4 prepared by Daniel Hentschke? Q. It has received that assignment of the water 5 5 and the water -- you have no criticisms of Met's A. Yes. 6 6 Q. Approved by you? performance other than these charges which are the 7 A. Yes. subject of this case; is that true? 8 Q. The last sentence reads, "The Water Authority 8 A. That's true. 9 9 does not intend to litigate Met's current rate structure Q. And San Diego has received and accepted the 10 10 but it cannot know what future actions the Met board may benefits and Met has performed; correct? 11 11 take since the Met rates are established annually and A. Correct. 12 12 are subject to change by Met's board of directors." Q. Option-2 had that initial price of \$253 which 13 was assumed to escalate from there? 1.3 Do you see that? 14 14 A. Yes. A. I do. 15 15 Q. That is language you approved? Q. And the price that San Diego contends it should 16 16 pay for 2011, for example, according to your expert, 17 17 Mr. Denham is \$136 per square foot? Q. In 2007 there was no intention to sue; correct? 18 A. Correct. We did not intend to litigate. 18 A. Per acre-foot. 19 19 O. And this was --O. Per acre-foot. 20 20 A. Yes. Q. It was 2008 that five-year period expired? 21 21 A. Yes. Q. So is it your understanding of the exchange 2.2 22 MR. QUINN: And then if we can look at DTX agreement San Diego is entitled to the benefits of 23 23 1114. This is not yet admitted and I understand there Option-2, the canal lining water, for 110 years and the 24 24 is no objection. I would offer it. \$235 million, and the other thing it gets but should pay 25 25 MR. KEKER: No objection. about half of what San Diego assumed it would pay under 1513 1515 1 THE COURT: DTX 1114 is admitted. 1 option two when it was running those analyses? 2 2 (Exhibit 1114 was received into evidence.) A. No. We assumed we would pay a lawful wheeling 3 3 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Can you identify this document? rate, and we would get the benefit of the exchange 4 4 A. This is a PowerPoint related to the MWD's work agreement by a lawful wheeling rate. 5 plan. Q. If I understand correctly what you're telling 6 6 Q. If you turn to page 11, there is a reference to us is you believe that Mr. Denham is right, that for 7 7 "Transportation Issues re SDCWA Transfers." 2011, for example, you can get all those same benefits 8 8 A. Yes. and only pay the \$136; correct? 9 9 Q. And it says, "Approval of canal lining option A. The benefits derived were not directly related 10 10 brought additional reliable water supplies for 110 to the exchange agreement number. The benefits, the 11 11 years." totality of benefits of the QSA related to the exchange 12 12 Do you see that? agreement, the \$253. 13 13 Q. I mean, again, not to gild the lily, I hope, 14 14 Q. After that it says, "No expectation of we've seen these memos that say the consideration for 15 15 litigation." the canal lining water was the wheeling rate, which 16 16 starts out \$238; right? I'm sorry. \$253? Do you see that? 17 17 A. I do. A. Correct. 18 18 Q. If you turn to page 12, "2007 Objectives," do Q. And so San Diego's position now is it should be 19 19 you see, "work in partnership with MWD" and below that able to get all those benefits anticipated under the 20 20 "peace treaty' expired - no litigation"? exchange agreement but actually it should only have to 21 21 Do you see that? pay much, much less than what that initial year's price 22 22 A. Yes. was? 23 2.3 Q. Again, as of 2007, the state of mind at San A. We should only have to pay the lawful wheeling 24 24 Diego is there is no intention to sue? 25 25 A. Correct. Q. Your testimony, Miss Stapleton, was -- I was

1516

```
1
       asking about whether you brought up taking out the State
                                                                                we believed the State Water
 2
                                                                     2
       Water Project costs, you personally brought it up with
                                                                                Project costs were not lawfully
 3
                                                                     3
       anyone on the Met side. And you said that you did that
                                                                                included in the rates.
 4
       in -- I have 2009.
                                                                                "Q Who did you propose that
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                                to on the Met side?
         A. About the State Water Project costs?
                                                                     6
 6
         O. Yes.
                                                                                "A Dennis Underwood."
         A. We raised that issue way before 2009.
                                                                                Was that your testimony?
 8
                                                                     8
         Q. I'm talking about the conversation with
                                                                             A. I'm sorry. I misunderstood then.
                                                                     9
 9
       Mr. Underwood.
                                                                                Basically my conversations with Dennis were
10
                                                                    10
         A. I raised that conversation with Dennis all the
                                                                           during the negotiations to 2003 and beyond, and I
                                                                    11
11
                                                                           continued those conversations with Dennis until he
       way back to -- I mean, we were having conversations in
                                                                    12
12
       1999 or 2000, 2001, 2002, all the way up to the
                                                                           passed in 2005.
                                                                    13
13
       execution of the exchange agreement.
                                                                                The issue about 2009 was when we had formal
14
                                                                    14
         Q. I asked you what year did you propose backing
                                                                           conversations about -- in 2009 we were raising the issue
                                                                    15
15
       out the State Water Project costs on, you personally,
                                                                           in a much more public way.
                                                                    16
16
       and you said, yes, in year six or beyond --
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Can I have just a moment, your
17
                                                                    17
         A. Right.
                                                                           Honor?
18
         Q. Right?
                                                                    18
                                                                                THE COURT: Of course.
19
                                                                    19
         A. After the execution of the exchange agreement.
                                                                                MR. OUINN: Nothing further.
20
                                                                    20
         Q. You did that with Mr. Underwood?
                                                                    21
21
         A. No, no. Mr. Underwood had passed since then.
                                                                                      CROSS-EXAMINATION
2.2
                                                                    22
         Q. That is what I was going to ask. He passed in
                                                                           BY MR. KEKER:
                                                                    23
23
       2005?
                                                                             Q. With speed, Miss Stapleton, because of time.
24
                                                                    24
         A. Yes. I'm sorry. I misunderstood.
                                                                                When did San Diego raise with Met the problem
25
                                                                    25
                                                                           with cost allocation of the State Water Project costs?
            I had ongoing discussions with Dennis Underwood
                                                         1517
                                                                                                                            1519
 1
                                                                     1
       in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003. The 2009 is when the Water
                                                                             A. Our first concerns regarding wheeling were in
 2
                                                                     2
       Authority or I actually issued formal objections to the
                                                                           1996 and they were -- we continued those dialogues for a
                                                                     3
 3
       State Water Project costs being included in the Met
                                                                           number of years.
                                                                     4
 4
                                                                             Q. Did -- did people that you talked to at Met
 5
                                                                     5
          Q. Wasn't it your testimony that you said that you
                                                                           understand that you believed it was improper to allocate
                                                                     6
 6
       did not bring -- you were asked, just reading between
                                                                           State Water Project costs to the transportation rate?
 7
                                                                     7
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Objection. Speculation.
 8
                                                                     8
             "Q Miss Stapleton, are you
                                                                           Foundation.
                                                                     9
 9
                                                                                THE COURT: Sustained.
            saying you brought up with Met
                                                                    10
10
            excluding State Water Project
                                                                             Q. BY MR. KEKER: Did you talk to somebody at Met
                                                                    11
11
            costs in year two?
                                                                           about your objection to including State Water Project
12
                                                                    12
            "A No.
                                                                           costs in the transportation rates?
                                                                    13
13
             "Q Year three?
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Objection. Vague. Time, as to
                                                                    14
14
            "A No.
                                                                           time
                                                                    15
15
            "Q Year four?
                                                                                THE COURT: Overruled.
16
             "A. No.
                                                                    16
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
17
                                                                    17
                                                                             Q. BY MR. KEKER: When?
            "Q For any year?
18
                                                                    18
            "A Yes.
                                                                             A. I had continuing conversations about this issue
                                                                    19
19
             "Q What year did you propose
                                                                           with Dennis Underwood beginning in about 2000 and
20
                                                                    20
            backing out the State Water
                                                                           continuing on.
                                                                    21
21
            Project costs on you
                                                                             Q. To your knowledge, did San Diego staff have
                                                                    22
22
            personally?
                                                                           similar conversations with people on Met staff objecting
                                                                    23
2.3
            "A Yes. In year six or
                                                                           to the inclusion of State Water Project costs in the
24
                                                                    24
            beyond. We had come to know --
                                                                           transportation rates?
                                                                    25
25
                                                                             A. Yes.
            come to some agreement and that
```

1 MR. QUINN: Objection. Foundation. subject of a great deal of discussion and objection and 2 2 Q. BY MR. KEKER: When -contention between San Diego and Met since the rates 3 3 THE COURT: Overruled. Give me a shot to rule were unbundled? 4 4 on it. A. Yes. We had many, many conversations with Met 5 5 MR. KEKER: Sorry. staff and during this period of time trying to come to 6 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, they did. resolution. 7 7 Q. BY MR. KEKER: When? Starting when? Q. Could anybody in these agencies or involved in 8 MR. QUINN: Objection. Foundation. 8 this process not understand that there was a dispute 9 9 THE COURT: Overruled. about where to allocate these State Water Project costs? 10 10 THE WITNESS: In approximately 1997, '98, and MR. QUINN: Objection. Foundation. 11 11 it continued through the execution of the exchange THE COURT: Sustained. It is argumentative. 12 12 agreement. Q. BY MR. KEKER: You mentioned something about 13 13 Q. BY MR. KEKER: To your knowledge did anybody at closed sessions and so on. Was San Diego's position 14 14 the Water Authority ever stop saying that they believed prior to 2003 about the proper allocation of State Water 15 15 the State Water Project costs should not be in the Project costs, was it public or private? Was it 16 16 transportation rates? publicly known, publicly discussed? 17 17 A. No. A. Yes. It was known by MWD and the member 18 18 Q. What language did you use when you talked to agencies at Metropolitan that we disputed the inclusion 19 19 Vice President Underwood at Met in these many of the State Water Project in the wheeling rate. 20 20 conversations that you had about what was wrong with Q. When you talked about closed sessions during 21 21 including State Water Project costs in the Mr. Quinn's examination, what was your point about the 22 22 transportation rates? closed sessions? 23 23 A. I indicated to Dennis that I didn't believe A. Was that we had repeated and frequent closed 24 24 they were lawful, that it was improper to put the State sessions with our board of directors during the 25 Water Project costs on transportation in lieu of supply; 25 negotiations of the QSA, and a huge amount of the 1521 1523 1 1 information and the analysis were done in closed session that I thought it was inconsistent with the wheeling 2 2 with the board as we continued to try to reach 3 3 Q. What wheeling statute are you referring to? agreement. 4 4 A. The Katz wheeling statute. Q. What about the water stewardship rate? When 5 5 Q. Do you know if that has a Water Code had you directly begun communicating your concern about 6 6 designation? the placement of the water stewardship rate costs on 7 7 A. Yes. 1810. transportation to anybody at Met? 8 8 O. Who is Mr. Katz? A. In about the year 2000. 9 9 Q. And to whom did you communicate that concern A. Mr. Katz was in the legislature and he was the 10 10 and what did you say about it? author of the wheeling statute. 11 11 Q. Was Mr. Katz the author of the wheeling statute A. For me, it was to Dennis Underwood who was my 12 12 involved in the negotiations -- in 2003, what was his counterpart on the negotiating team of Met. And, again, 13 13 role in 2003? I indicated the water stewardship charge was directly 14 14 A. In 2003 Richard Katz actually was a -- was on related to supply development and it didn't belong on 15 15 the Governor's staff and he and another individual on the transportation charge. I didn't believe it was 16 16 behalf of Governor Davis participated and facilitated consistent, again, with the wheeling law. 17 17 the negotiations in 2003. Q. And did you say -- did you tell him it was 18 18 Q. Did Mr. Katz, for example, understand there was improper, invalid or anything like that? 19 19 a dispute between San Diego and Met about how to A. Yes. The language I would use is it's improper 20 20 or that it's not consistent with the law or that it -calculate the wheeling rate? 21 21 that is not a valid charge to the transportation or A. Yes, he was aware. 22 22 MR. QUINN: Objection. Foundation. system access rate. 23 2.3 THE COURT: I'll sustain. We are probably Q. To your knowledge did Met staff -- excuse me. 24 24 going off a little bit. San Diego Water Authority staff communicate similar 25 25 Q. BY MR. KEKER: Just generally, had this been a concerns to their contemporaries at Met?

1524

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

1525

1 MR. QUINN: Objection; foundation. 2 THE COURT: Did you overhear these 3 communications? 4 THE WITNESS: I did in some cases. 5 THE COURT: Tell us about what you heard. 6 THE WITNESS: I heard both Scott Slater, my 7 special counsel, and Bob Campbell, one of my staff 8 members, having discussions with either Brian Thomas, 9 who was an employee of Metropolitan, or Jeff 10 Kightlinger, the general counsel, about the wheeling 11 rate and our objections to the inclusion of certain 12 charges in that wheeling rate. 13 Q. BY MR. KEKER: By the way, was Mr. Gastelum, 14 who was the general manager in 2003, is he still around 15 and available to Met as a witness? 16 A. Yes, he is around. 17 Q. Miss Stapleton why did the Water Authority 18 agree -- let me back up. You said the \$253 wheeling 19 rate made up of the current system access rate, water 20 stewardship rate and system power rate, adding to \$253. 21 You said you believed at the time of the exchange 2.2 agreement that rate was not -- was illegal, was not 23 properly calculated. Do you remember that? 24 A. Correct. 25 Q. Why did San Diego agree in the exchange

please?

#### A. I don't think I have 65.

Q. Sorry, Miss Stapleton, I am rushing. Let's put up 5.2 on the screen.

This is an agreement for exchange water, and in 5.2 it says the price on the date of execution is \$253; right?

#### A. Correct.

Q. At the time was there a dispute between Met and San Diego about whether or not that was a lawful wheeling rate?

#### A. Yes, that was.

O. Did Mr. Underwood understand there was a dispute?

#### A. Absolutely.

Q. Did you understand there was a dispute?

Q. Did anybody at Met not understand that there was a dispute?

#### A. No.

MR. QUINN: I object. Move to strike. THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: And it says, "Thereafter, the price shall be equal to the charge or charges set by the Met board of directors pursuant to applicable law and

1527

agreement to pay that rate for the initial year?

A. For a couple reasons. We needed to make modifications in the exchange agreement from 1998. We had to solve some problems, which is the exchange agreement term was shorter than our water transfer term and we had 15 years of exposure.

The second issue was there was some conditions precedent that we had been told by Ron Gastelum that would invalidate the 1998 agreement.

So we decided if we could put boundaries on our exposure to Met's wheeling rate and had the opportunity to either negotiate something we both could live with and that it was lawful, that that was worth -- that was worth the risk.

Q. You said you agreed as part of the exchange agreement to pay Met's wheeling rate, whatever they said, for five years?

#### A. Correct.

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 thereafter, what wheeling rate did you agree to pay?

#### A. The lawful wheeling rate.

Q. Did you make sure that the agreement reflected that agreement?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Could we look at Plaintiff's 65 and put up 5.2,

regulation."

What did that mean to you?

#### A. That meant thereafter Met -- that the price would be a lawful wheeling rate that was set by MWD.

Q. And had there been some discussion about how long San Diego would sit still if Met didn't change its ways about cost allocation?

A. Yes.

O. And what did the discussion lead to?

### A. It led to that we could not challenge the MWD established rate for the first five years.

Q. And what was the purpose for you, for San Diego, to agree to a wheeling rate that you thought was higher than the law permitted and to agree to it, to pay it for five years?

A. Because it provided an exchange agreement that matched our water transfer agreement in the length of time. And it got rid of the conditions precedent. So we knew we would have a firm capacity within the aqueduct in this exchange agreement, and we were willing to take the risk.

Q. During the negotiations, as Mr. Kightlinger told us, did Met say we want you to agree to whatever we say the wheeling rate is for the next 45 and maybe 75 years?

1528

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

- A. That was their initial offer to us.
- Q. And did San Diego agree to eat whatever they wanted to call the wheel rate, whatever number they wanted to put on it, for 45 to 75 years?
  - A. Absolutely not.

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

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. What did the negotiation yield in that regard?
- A. We finally got down to a five-year time period where we agreed to pay the MWD established rate, and after five years we had the opportunity to seek either administrative or judicial remedy.
- Q. Let's look at the next term. It says, still in 5.2, "For the term of this agreement neither San Diego nor Met shall seek or support in any legislative, administrative or judicial forum."

Does administrative include Met?

Q. So you are promising you are not going to go to Met, you are not going to go to the legislature and you are not going to go to court for the life of this agreement --

#### A. Yes.

Q. -- pertaining to the charge or charges set by the board of directors. That's what that says; right?

#### A. Correct.

Q. And then it comes down and it says, "Provided

thought that there may be additional court decisions that might have an influence on -- an influence to help clarify what a lawful wheeling rate might be.

Q. In San Diego's mind did the term "lawful wheeling rate" have meaning?

#### A. It had essential meaning.

Q. Was there any part of California or constitutional law that was excluded from the term "lawful"?

#### A. No.

Q. And in your discussions with Mr. Underwood, did he seem to understand that, as well?

#### A. He did.

Q. Would you look at 11.1, please. 11.1 says you have to negotiate if you have a problem, but it also says, "San Diego shall not dispute whether the price determined pursuant to paragraph 5.2 for the first five years of this agreement was determined in accordance with applicable law or regulation ('a price dispute')."

What price did you think they were talking about that you couldn't dispute for five years?

#### A. Met's wheeling rate as selected or as set by the board of directors.

Q. Where the parentheses are around "price dispute," look over at 12.4, please, and 12.4(c), which

1529

1531

further that, A, after the conclusion of the first five vears" --3

What are the next two words?

#### A. "Nothing herein."

Q. -- "shall preclude San Diego from contesting in an administrative or judicial forum," blah, blah, blah.

What did you understand that to mean about this five-year period?

- A. After five years, if we were unsuccessful reaching an agreement on what would be considered the lawful rate, the Water Authority had the ability to contest the wheeling rate that Met had established in either an administrative or judicial manner.
- Q. After the five years with respect to what the subject matter of your lawsuit could be, did you understand that there was any condition about only procedural or only something that didn't exist when we started or anything, any limitation on that?

#### A. Absolutely not.

Q. Did you expect there was a possible -- did you anticipate there was a possibility the law might change or develop and make the wheeling situation work more plain over the next five years?

A. Yes. That there were some court cases regarding wheeling during this period of time, and we says, "In the event of a dispute over the price, San Diego shall pay when due. . ."

And then it goes and talks about the escrow accounts?

#### A. Right.

Q. Was there anything in this agreement that limited San Diego's ability to complain about any aspect whatsoever of the price it was being charged by Met after five years were over?

#### A. No.

Q. Was that something that was negotiated for hard?

#### A. Very hard.

Q. And was that contrary to the position that Met wanted, which is you can never challenge our prices?

#### A. Yes.

Q. That was the compromise?

#### A. This was the compromise.

Q. For five years you couldn't challenge --

THE COURT: I have to interrupt. I have another case coming in at 4:00. I have a ferocious amount of work to do.

Can we pick this up on our next trial date?

MR. KEKER: Yes. sir.

THE COURT: I do have some other cases. Thank

1532

Pages 1529 to 1532

```
1
         you. I will see you next time we get together.
 2
               (Evening recess was taken.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                        1533
1
               REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
3
      STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
      COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA.
 6
        I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Shorthand
      Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of
 9
      California, hereby certify:
10
        That the court proceedings were taken down by me in
11
      stenotype at the time and place herein named and
12
      thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided
13
      transcription under my direction.
14
        I further certify that I am not interested in the
15
      event of the action.
16
        WITNESS my hand this 13th day of April,
17
      2015, at Santa Barbara, California.
18
20
21
                     Jan Sandfor
2.2
                 TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR No. 3374
24
                 Certified Shorthand Reporter
25
                 State of California
                                                        1534
```

	- -	1	•	1
· <b>A</b>	achieve 1455:14	1445:10 1447:2,7	1528:13,14,23 1529:2	All-American 1468:13
<b>\$100</b> 1475:10	1467:15 1468:4	1449:13,18 1464:10	<b>agreed</b> 1386:6 1453:10	1480:15
<b>\$100,000</b> 1476:13	1469:7,18,24	1470:11 1473:18,21	1486:3 1526:15	<b>allocate</b> 1520:5 1523:9
<b>\$136</b> 1515:17 1516:8	achievement 1406:2	1479:18,21 1485:8	1529:8	allocated 1504:15
<b>\$156</b> 1490:22	acknowledging	1486:14 1501:11,15	agreeing 1379:12	1505:22
<b>\$2</b> 1475:21	1441:25 1442:5	1512:25 1513:23	1428:2 1492:17	allocation 1358:15
<b>S235</b> 1452:21 1515:24	acquiring 1405:2	1514:1	agreement 1358:24	1375:24 1442:4
<b>\$238</b> 1516:16	acre-feet 1406:5,13,23	adopted 1353:10	1360:8,10 1361:23	1454:12 1485:19
<b>6250</b> 1484:4	1407:8,18,23 1408:20	1371:2 1379:22	1364:19 1365:12,15	1492:25 1519:25
<b>8253</b> 1473:13 1477:4	1409:11,15,21	1380:8 1396:9,19	1365:17 1366:8	1523:14 1528:7
1477:15,19,24	1414:13,16 1415:5	1425:24 1431:3	1369:18 1370:1,6,12	allocations 1358:20
1478:18 1480:19	1416:9,11 1442:12	adoption 1457:12	1370:15,20 1371:5	1359:3 1374:6 1379:7
1483:1 1485:2	1472:14 1474:25	advance 1363:14	1373:16 1374:2	1379:13 1430:25
1490:21 1498:22	1475:1,8	1398:14	1375:6 1378:24	<b>allow</b> 1423:16 1433:16
1515:12 1516:12,16	acre-foot 1465:13	advantage 1395:1	1379:5,9,10 1380:4	1437:10 1438:19
1525:18,20 1527:6	1477:5 1480:19	advocate 1360:18	1381:7 1382:6,15	allowed 1422:4,10,20
300 1484:4	1490:16,22,22	advocated 1361:13	1385:11 1389:11	1423:3 1436:10
<b>6500</b> 1475:13	1515:18,19	<b>AF</b> 1465:12	1425:4 1426:18	1454:14
<b>680</b> 1488:9	Act 1371:1 1382:21	affirmative 1451:12	1427:1,20 1429:8,12	Alternate 1472:3
<b>890</b> 1488:9	1395:8	1494:21	1452:7,20 1453:25	alternative 1461:6
<b>897</b> 1490:15,22	acted 1431:20	affirmatively 1379:11	1454:4 1463:18	1466:7 1483:5
a.m 1357:3	action 1377:11,19	afraid 1493:22	1465:3,8 1469:8,24	1484:12,14 1512:13
ability 1387:22 1436:13	1388:16 1423:5	afternoon 1443:18,19	1470:16 1472:17	ambiguous 1415:3
1476:10 1504:19	1424:2 1431:11,18	agencies 1372:22	1473:15 1477:2,13,13	ameliorate 1381:21
1507:11 1530:11	1450:20 1504:3	1377:8,14,19 1378:18	1480:18 1481:6	amendment 1377:9
1532:7	1534:15	1380:6,7,7,9,11	1485:20 1486:1,4,18	1396:14
able 1380:16 1399:18	actions 1372:23	1382:19 1386:6,8	1486:22 1488:3,23	amendments 1396:7,18
1400:17,18 1401:2,3	1379:25 1388:14	1387:12 1396:3,4,8	1489:2,7,18 1490:15	1396:19,23
1401:15 1402:8	1405:20 1406:24	1396:20,21,21 1398:6	1490:20 1491:14,14	amount 1368:13
1406:9 1408:10	1422:24 1423:1	1399:14,18 1400:10	1492:25 1493:1	1409:11 1420:19,20
1409:2,3,7,9 1410:4	1502:18 1513:10	1400:10,12,22 1401:7	1496:4,11,18,23	1421:9 1435:23
1410:16,17,19	actual 1383:13	1401:14,23 1402:16	1497:1,4,7,24	1446:22 1483:16
1429:16,21 1430:5	adding 1525:20	1403:12,15,16 1405:8	1498:18 1500:14	1489:2 1494:23
1441:18 1459:16	addition 1414:2	1406:10 1410:3,19,19	1502:11 1508:17,23	1495:3 1500:19
1516:19	1504:14	1411:23,24 1414:20	1509:4,7,12,13,17,20	1523:25 1532:22
absolute 1470:1	additional 1428:15,18	1416:12,12 1418:15	1509:23 1510:8,17,21	amounts 1365:16
absolutely 1475:11,12	1514:10 1531:1	1419:4,7,10,16,22,25	1515:2,22 1516:4,10	1368:4 1420:8
1481:17 1482:4,7	address 1375:5	1420:8,21 1421:4,22	1516:12,20 1517:13	<b>Amy</b> 1470:18,21
1491:3,16 1527:15	1380:18 1504:20	1425:8,16 1433:2,8	1517:19 1518:25	1494:17
1529:5 1530:19	addresses 1485:16	1435:14,20 1450:10	1521:12 1524:3	analyses 1516:1
accept 1377:14	administrative 1371:2	1459:5 1523:7,18	1525:22 1526:1,3,5,9	analysis 1420:5
acceptable 1512:12	1442:20,22 1447:3	agency 1371:22 1372:3	1526:16,22,23 1527:5	1428:11 1465:7,18
accepted 1515:9	1502:13,19 1529:10	1373:22 1375:1	1528:16,17,20	1466:22 1474:15
access 1358:12 1402:14	1529:14,15 1530:6,13	1380:19 1381:3	1529:12,20 1530:10	1479:5 1482:21
1444:15 1446:13,24	admissible 1486:14	1386:22 1400:6	1531:18 1532:6	1490:7,9,14 1491:18
1452:25 1459:1	admission 1366:20	1401:7 1408:6 1409:7	agreements 1380:13,13	1491:20,23,25 1492:2
1460:20 1461:3	1376:20 1392:11,13	1420:10,15 1421:9,18	1422:25 1425:8	1492:5 1524:1
1463:8 1477:5,20	1392:16	1426:17 1427:18,19	1485:19	analyzed 1428:19
1480:19 1484:9	admit 1392:14,17	1428:1 1429:1	agricultural 1373:5	<b>Angeles</b> 1354:14,18
1507:25 1508:6	1411:10 1439:12	1435:25 1450:5	ahadlock@kvn.com	1470:23
1524:22 1525:19	admitted 1362:24	1459:3 1471:16	1354:7	ANN 1534:7
account 1501:5	1363:15,22 1364:12	1506:11	ahead 1388:11 1397:12	annual 1415:7 1416:2
accounts 1532:4	1365:7 1366:17	agents 1419:15	1413:14 1417:4	annually 1474:25
accurate 1382:14	1367:8,13,18,22	aggregate 1414:7	1423:17 1427:13	1475:9 1478:11
1410:6 1476:21	1368:20,24 1369:22	<b>ago</b> 1466:20 1472:17	1463:2 1468:10	1506:2 1513:11
1487:5	1374:22 1377:2	agree 1414:2 1441:16	1511:13	answer 1386:16,16
accurately 1373:9	1424:25 1437:1	1459:15 1462:14	aimed 1398:5	1388:12 1392:20
1378:14 1504:23	1439:13,20 1443:4	1525:18,25 1526:20	<b>Alameda</b> 1354:17	1427:4,5 1436:21
- · · · · - · · · - ·				

1450.20 1466.10	1406.17 1422.19	1474.6 7 1476.17	arriana 1250:14 17	haliaf 1454.15 1401.12
1459:20 1466:19	1406:17 1422:18	1474:6,7 1476:17	aware 1359:14,17	belief 1454:15 1481:12
1482:14 1504:23	1441:9,12	attachment 1424:23	1388:2 1404:2 1405:6	believe 1362:5,8
1512:5	areas 1405:20	1474:9,14 1476:15	1405:10 1410:10	1376:23 1378:6
answered 1469:3	argue 1366:25 1412:8	attempted 1380:23	1452:9,12 1461:16,21	1388:9 1395:24
answers 1499:18	1472:21	1425:10 1433:6,18	1502:25 1504:15	1415:18 1422:16
anticipate 1530:21	argument 1486:6	attend 1505:5	1505:14 1508:2,3,4	1428:19 1433:20
anticipated 1490:1	argumentative 1423:13	attended 1445:24	1522:21	1453:8 1467:9
1498:25 1516:19	1423:15 1468:6	attention 1425:2		1484:16 1498:5
anticipating 1478:15	1523:11	attraction 1373:4	B	1499:20 1502:3
anybody 1461:23,23	arrange 1495:17	attributable 1416:16	<b>B</b> 1354:13 1475:5,22	1504:22 1505:20,21
1470:3 1495:20	arrangement 1436:7	1417:9,12 1429:22,24	back 1369:3,9 1382:5	1511:3 1516:6
1521:13 1523:7	1441:17 1464:1	1430:6,9	1384:7 1389:24	1521:23 1524:15
1524:7 1527:18	arranges 1358:10	<b>AUDREY</b> 1354:4	1390:14 1393:22	believed 1454:1,4,13,22
anything's 1495:4	articulate 1466:5	August 1376:2 1384:22	1395:23 1400:4,7	1454:24 1455:1
apologies 1439:16	articulated 1413:18	1385:1 1424:17	1404:3 1405:7,8	1461:12 1467:20
apologize 1381:23	1418:7	1463:24	1428:6 1429:14	1497:24 1505:16
1439:13	aside 1365:15 1366:1	authenticity 1366:22	1444:7 1445:22	1519:1 1520:5
Apparently 1450:25	1368:4,8,8,13 1386:8	author 1522:10,11	1451:23 1453:23	1521:14 1525:21
appear 1471:2	1415:4 1494:9	authorities 1422:19	1466:13 1467:21	believes 1463:7
APPEARANCES	1501:21	authority 1353:6	1468:25 1481:2	<b>belong</b> 1524:14
1354:1	asked 1366:24 1377:8	1360:1,12,17 1361:7	1486:1 1495:7 1496:3	<b>benefit</b> 1400:15,25
<b>appears</b> 1369:19	1377:10 1386:11,18	1361:13 1362:1,2,14	1496:5 1517:11	1402:22 1411:20,24
1436:22 1437:7,12	1424:9 1438:15	1363:4 1364:2	1525:18	1412:1,5,7,8 1413:7
1445:14,25	1439:15 1442:22	1365:10,19 1370:12	background 1372:11	1413:20 1414:6,10,15
applicability 1382:20	1499:17 1501:20	1370:15,19 1371:6	<b>backing</b> 1497:21	1414:17,24,25 1415:3
applicable 1370:25	1504:7 1517:14	1374:16 1375:2,5,18	1517:14 1518:20	1415:6,8 1416:20
1502:14 1527:25	1518:6	1376:3 1378:5	backward-looking	1418:4 1419:7 1421:9
1531:19	asking 1367:1 1389:1	1382:13 1394:13,18	1428:10	1421:10,12,13,18
applications 1419:22	1401:17 1414:23,24	1395:1,9,20 1396:10	<b>Barbara</b> 1534:4,8,17	1441:8 1450:12
applied 1458:25	1465:5 1482:15	1396:14,17 1422:23	bargain 1379:6	1489:16 1491:5
<b>applies</b> 1379:17	1491:22 1492:4	1424:16 1443:21,25	<b>based</b> 1373:5 1384:16	1516:3
<b>apply</b> 1383:24 1384:3,6	1517:1	1444:4,6,15 1445:15	1386:23 1415:10	benefiting 1414:20
1436:13	aspect 1510:8 1532:7	1445:16,21 1449:5,8	1454:22 1468:3,20	benefits 1390:10,20
applying 1419:16,17	assessing 1483:11	1449:20 1450:5	1469:6 1471:5	1400:12,22 1404:21
appreciate 1381:18	assigned 1470:22	1455:7 1462:20,21,24	1485:24 1490:9	1404:21 1412:24
1398:20 1495:15	assignment 1476:24	1463:6 1464:19	1491:22 1492:4	1413:17 1414:4
approaches 1357:10	1480:15 1515:4	1466:8 1480:16,16	1499:11	1415:11,17,23
1478:2,5 1482:21,25	assigns 1474:23	1484:8,11 1488:20	<b>bashful</b> 1455:6,9	1416:13 1417:9
appropriate 1366:24	assist 1483:11	1498:6 1513:8 1518:2	basically 1494:2,6	1419:18 1421:3,8,21
1456:23 1461:7	associated 1377:23	1521:14 1524:24	1519:9	1426:22 1428:7,7
1482:10	1406:5,6 1407:9	1525:17 1530:11	basins 1380:23	1433:14 1442:11
approval 1370:16	1415:24 1416:14,15	Authority's 1356:14	basis 1413:24 1415:7	1483:11 1486:2
1441:18 1463:18	1416:20 1428:7	1364:17 1365:24	1416:2,8 1417:23	1493:11 1515:1,10,22
1503:3 1514:9	1453:13 1484:12	1373:15	1418:2 1486:14	1516:7,9,10,11,19
approve 1504:18	ASSOCIATES	availability 1368:9	Bates 1448:24	best 1467:7 1469:5
1506:15	1353:22	1483:24	<b>Battery</b> 1353:24	better 1381:23 1469:12
approved 1448:2,13	assume 1384:5 1465:24	available 1377:18	1354:6	<b>beyond</b> 1360:2 1403:18
1479:15 1480:5	1476:16 1478:16	1391:12 1405:4	bears 1445:17	1414:16 1497:23
1484:18 1493:12	assumed 1478:5,12	1472:4 1483:15,21	beat 1482:13	1517:16 1518:24
1513:6,15	1515:13,25 1516:2	1525:15	beating 1477:19	1519:10
approximately 1479:25	assumes 1482:25	AVEK 1369:18 1370:1	beginning 1400:1	bill 1402:25 1405:17
1521:10	assuming 1468:18	AVEK's 1370:4	1404:19 1468:8	1433:21 1434:2,14,21
<b>April</b> 1353:11,18	1479:3	avoid 1383:20 1417:21	1483:9 1499:21	billed 1498:21
1357:2 1438:2	assumption 1465:19	1428:16	1520:19	billing 1434:19
1512:25 1534:16	1490:10	avoidance 1417:23	begun 1524:5	billion 1475:22
aqueduct 1370:3	at-a-glance 1449:4	avoided 1415:23	behalf 1387:11 1396:8	billions 1475:5,20
1509:8 1528:20	atmosphere 1486:7	avoiding 1416:15,16	1437:11 1506:20	1476:6,8
area 1370:4 1373:6	attached 1376:12	1417:10,12 1428:12	1522:16	<b>binder</b> 1364:23
	1	1	I	1

1412:13 1436:15,16	1426:5,10,14 1427:9	1369:15 1370:2	Central 1440:24	1524:13,15,21
1436:16 1445:4	1427:17 1434:8	1386:25 1387:8	1441:1,2	1527:24 1529:22
binders 1359:18	1436:23 1437:3,17,21	1388:18 1397:21	CEO 1370:14 1372:13	charged 1462:11
bit 1361:21 1372:11			certain 1371:17	1496:17 1497:7
	1438:13,23 1439:4,17	1398:4,8 1399:6		
1385:24 1428:25	1439:20 1440:1	1410:2 1419:8 1438:1	1382:25 1387:4	1500:1,11 1507:23
1494:4 1495:1	1442:15 1443:2	1531:7 1534:3,9,17	1390:5,10 1392:21	1508:22 1532:8
1522:24	breach 1357:12 1452:6	1534:25	1393:16 1426:22	<b>charges</b> 1377:24
<b>blah</b> 1530:6,6,6	1452:12 1499:12	call 1375:12 1381:1,3	1440:25 1457:19	1391:6 1394:22
block 1365:2	1500:8	1389:17 1455:23	1488:9 1503:13	1421:3 1444:16
<b>board</b> 1369:17 1370:16	<b>break</b> 1381:16 1443:1	1529:3	1510:12 1525:11	1446:19 1447:21,22
1371:2,7 1377:16	1489:11	called 1380:20 1395:6	certainly 1364:21	1448:7,8 1450:7,11
1383:14 1395:25	breakdown 1504:5	1397:6 1431:15	1374:7 1386:1 1411:6	1450:19 1452:22
1396:8 1424:5 1425:7	breaks 1363:21	1443:9 1457:21	1444:19 1454:20	1453:6 1462:8
1425:18,19,24 1426:4	1434:21	calling 1397:9	1475:8,9,12 1476:12	1463:14 1480:25
1426:11 1427:24	Breaux 1355:22	calls 1380:22,22 1402:4	1488:18	1481:8 1488:5
1430:21,24 1431:4,7	<b>Brian</b> 1359:7 1525:8	1443:5	CERTIFICATE	1498:22 1508:9
1431:10,15,20,23	briefs 1439:2	Campbell 1464:13,14	1534:1	1515:6 1525:12
1440:18 1441:14,19	bring 1379:25 1436:14	1464:20 1465:1,5	<b>Certified</b> 1534:7,24	1527:24 1529:22
1441:22,24 1442:2	1518:6	1474:6,15 1476:16	certify 1534:9,14	charging 1418:15
1448:13 1449:8,20	broad 1380:24	1478:1 1480:7 1525:7	cetera 1386:8 1448:24	1462:13 1499:11
*	broken 1433:22			1500:7 1502:4
1450:6,18 1451:7,8		Campbell's 1492:10	challenge 1371:23	
1451:25 1455:20	brought 1357:8	canal 1465:6,9,15	1372:3,25 1373:3,16	<b>chart</b> 1407:19
1465:2 1466:24	1497:12 1514:10	1466:6 1468:13	1374:5 1375:3,6,18	Chen 1470:18,21
1467:3,19,23 1468:12	1517:1,2 1518:9	1472:25 1474:23,24	1375:23 1377:15,17	1494:18
1468:14,21,25	Brown 1353:22	1476:25 1477:3	1378:18,25 1379:7,13	chess 1494:4,5
1469:11,12,15,22	1382:21	1479:12 1480:15	1380:3 1502:3	<b>choice</b> 1426:18
1470:3 1474:3	bucket 1358:11,11,12	1483:17 1484:1	1528:10 1532:15,19	<b>choose</b> 1466:15,15
1476:18 1478:11	buckets 1358:9,14,16	1489:16 1491:5,8,12	challenged 1461:18	1472:5,8
1480:1 1481:4,7,10	building 1470:24	1491:16 1492:11	challenges 1382:23	chooses 1429:1
1481:14,18,21,25	<b>built</b> 1477:22	1514:9 1515:23	1384:1	choosing 1484:7
1483:11 1487:2	<b>bullet</b> 1472:12 1474:22	1516:15	challenging 1377:11	chorus 1486:24
1491:1,8,19,21,22	bullets 1472:4	<b>canals</b> 1486:8	1384:5	chose 1488:20
1492:1,3,4 1493:12	<b>Bureau</b> 1391:13 1395:7	<b>Canyon</b> 1395:8	<b>chance</b> 1357:7 1376:19	<b>claim</b> 1499:10 1500:7
1493:12 1499:1	1395:14 1398:11	capacity 1387:9,10,16	<b>change</b> 1359:3 1372:2	<b>claimed</b> 1500:19
1503:3,7,12,13,21	business 1467:11	1387:23 1388:1	1375:24 1378:18	clarify 1531:3
1504:3,11,12,18	1468:2	1404:25 1405:4	1424:10,11 1431:5	clarifying 1375:1
1505:6,15,16 1506:4	businesses 1406:17	1528:19	1440:16 1441:15,19	clause 1383:11,15
1506:7,8,9,10,10,12	buy 1399:10 1412:3	capital 1415:23	1441:25 1442:2	1395:24 1396:15
1506:15 1513:10,12		1428:20,22	1456:24 1468:19	1424:6
1523:24 1524:2	C	care 1363:20	1471:22 1502:13	clean 1409:9
1527:25 1529:23	c 1501:21 1502:2,23	carrying 1418:25	1509:19 1511:17	clear 1358:5 1415:13
1531:23	CA 1353:24	case 1353:7 1357:8	1513:12 1528:6	1415:14
boardroom 1360:20	calculate 1390:17	1368:7 1369:4	1530:21	clearly 1364:11
1361:14	1414:13,15,17	1393:21 1398:23	changed 1434:19	1378:17 1510:6
<b>Bob</b> 1474:15 1525:7	1476:10 1522:20	1452:6 1459:1 1467:6		clerk 1397:12 1439:21
bond 1368:16	calculated 1414:6,25	1467:13,14,15,24,25	changes 1360:19	1439:23 1443:13
	1415:6 1511:18			
<b>bottom</b> 1364:20		1468:5 1469:7,20	1361:16 1377:17	1494:5
1385:18 1464:13	1525:23	1470:2 1493:25	1378:22 1425:20	clock 1494:4,5
1466:4 1483:9	calculates 1414:10	1494:20 1515:7	1427:12 1431:19	clocks 1494:4
<b>Boulder</b> 1395:8	calculating 1415:8	1532:21	1442:10	Close 1385:2
boundaries 1526:10	calculation 1368:10	cases 1525:4 1530:24	Changing 1428:25	closed 1481:25 1482:2
D 1 10545	1200 10 120 121	1532:25	characterization	1523:13,20,22,23
<b>Braunig</b> 1354:5	1390:19 1394:21			
1383:18 1402:3	1414:16 1415:4,10,22	cash 1421:13	1389:25 1414:21	1524:1
1383:18 1402:3 1404:7 1411:15,18	1414:16 1415:4,10,22 1475:16 1479:5	cash 1421:13 catch 1422:7	1389:25 1414:21 characterized 1390:2	<b>clothes</b> 1399:8
1383:18 1402:3	1414:16 1415:4,10,22 1475:16 1479:5 calendar 1414:9	cash 1421:13 catch 1422:7 categories 1399:15	1389:25 1414:21 characterized 1390:2 1390:25 1394:7	clothes 1399:8 Coachella 1480:15
1383:18 1402:3 1404:7 1411:15,18 1412:17 1413:3,12,15 1415:13 1416:22	1414:16 1415:4,10,22 1475:16 1479:5 calendar 1414:9 California 1353:1,9,11	cash 1421:13 catch 1422:7 categories 1399:15 cause 1429:2,4,9	1389:25 1414:21 characterized 1390:2 1390:25 1394:7 charge 1390:18	clothes 1399:8 Coachella 1480:15 Code 1371:2 1442:22
1383:18 1402:3 1404:7 1411:15,18 1412:17 1413:3,12,15 1415:13 1416:22 1417:5 1423:19	1414:16 1415:4,10,22 1475:16 1479:5 calendar 1414:9	cash 1421:13 catch 1422:7 categories 1399:15 cause 1429:2,4,9 1509:19	1389:25 1414:21 characterized 1390:2 1390:25 1394:7	clothes 1399:8 Coachella 1480:15 Code 1371:2 1442:22 1522:5
1383:18 1402:3 1404:7 1411:15,18 1412:17 1413:3,12,15 1415:13 1416:22	1414:16 1415:4,10,22 1475:16 1479:5 calendar 1414:9 California 1353:1,9,11	cash 1421:13 catch 1422:7 categories 1399:15 cause 1429:2,4,9	1389:25 1414:21 characterized 1390:2 1390:25 1394:7 charge 1390:18	clothes 1399:8 Coachella 1480:15 Code 1371:2 1442:22
1383:18 1402:3 1404:7 1411:15,18 1412:17 1413:3,12,15 1415:13 1416:22 1417:5 1423:19	1414:16 1415:4,10,22 1475:16 1479:5 calendar 1414:9 California 1353:1,9,11 1353:17 1354:6,11,14	cash 1421:13 catch 1422:7 categories 1399:15 cause 1429:2,4,9 1509:19	1389:25 1414:21 <b>characterized</b> 1390:2 1390:25 1394:7 <b>charge</b> 1390:18 1452:21 1463:8	clothes 1399:8 Coachella 1480:15 Code 1371:2 1442:22 1522:5

			1	1
collection 1457:25	comprised 1480:19	1424:5 1425:18,19	1488:17 1490:11	1396:1 1401:13
collects 1418:22 1419:3	1484:9	1494:14	1496:16 1497:7	1409:20 1411:23
Colorado 1391:16,18	compromise 1532:17	consideration 1477:1	1499:12 1500:8	1412:4,10,11 1413:3
1391:19 1395:4,5,9	1532:18	1477:10 1480:14	1506:24 1507:7,15	1413:5,8 1414:1,4,5
1395:11,18,21	computer-aided	1492:11,16 1516:14	contracted 1464:2	1418:16,21,23,24
1398:12 1483:23	1534:12	considerations 1437:15	contractor 1388:20	1419:23 1420:15,16
1509:7	concepts 1431:17	considered 1390:12	1395:10 1433:15	1421:14,20 1422:6,12
combination 1404:14	concern 1373:14	1394:19 1395:2	contractors 1388:17	1422:13,17 1423:11
1406:9	1374:10 1455:19	1403:18 1444:14	1441:2,4,8	1424:12 1425:23
come 1402:14 1426:10	1524:5,9	1448:2,13 1489:24	contracts 1371:18,21	1428:8,9 1430:14,18
1438:17 1460:10,12	concerned 1380:1	1530:10	1380:17 1398:9,13	1432:8,14 1434:10,11
1465:13 1467:21	concerning 1436:18	considering 1429:15	1422:5,14,22 1426:1	1434:22,25 1435:11
1468:25 1497:24	1445:21 1465:2	1446:2 1481:5	1428:1 1462:6	1435:12,15,16
1504:1,11,17 1510:21	1474:5	1493:10	1486:12	1436:11 1437:11
1518:24,25 1523:5	concerns 1380:8,11	consist 1399:2	contrary 1392:10	1443:22 1444:17
comes 1391:14 1398:23	1396:22 1455:7,12	consistent 1370:21	1532:14	1451:9,10,21,22
1484:15 1529:25	1456:21 1457:5	1524:16,20	contributed 1420:20	1452:1,3 1453:6,7,9
coming 1368:1 1390:8	1481:18 1520:1	constitutional 1531:8	contributes 1420:10	1453:18,19,22,25
1408:6 1495:1	1524:25	constructed 1370:4	contributing 1421:23	1454:5,6,18,20,21,23
1532:21	concluded 1484:24	consumers 1398:4	Control 1440:17	1454:25 1455:24
commence 1377:19	conclusion 1357:8	1399:6,11 1406:17	controversial 1396:6	1456:11,14,15,21
commencing 1377:10	1370:19 1402:4	1419:8,17 1422:18	convenient 1363:21	1457:19 1458:23
commitment 1380:16	1454:8,10 1530:1	contain 1424:1	conversation 1447:13	1460:25 1463:16
committee 1356:11	condition 1530:16	contain 1424.1	1470:2 1517:8,10	1464:25 1465:20
1360:20 1361:15	conditions 1526:7	1448:8	conversations 1517:11	1470:19,20 1472:9,19
1471:8 1479:15,24,25	1528:18	contaminant 1409:4	1519:9,11,14 1520:18	1474:16 1475:5
1480:24 1513:1	conduct 1456:16	contaminated 1408:25	1520:22 1521:20	1477:23 1478:7,8,12
communicate 1524:9	conduit 1389:3	contemplate 1462:12	1520:22 1321:20	1478:13,19 1480:9
1524:24	confidential 1482:6	contemplated 1510:4,6	convey 1372:25	1484:22,23 1488:6,7
communicating 1524:5	confirm 1364:24	contemporaries	conveyance 1386:14,19	1488:14 1489:5,8
communicating 1324.3	1439:23	1524:25	1386:21 1387:18	1490:3,12 1491:2,11
1461:16,21	confirms 1439:22	contended 1365:10	1388:23 1434:2	1491:15 1492:6,18
communications	conflict 1370:25	contending 1392:22	1435:6,7 1444:16,23	1493:1,4,13 1497:2
1525:3	confusing 1379:2	contends 1515:15	1446:18 1448:1,12	1498:20 1499:9,13,16
compare 1478:25	confusing 1379.2	content 1409:1	1454:9,17 1461:25	1501:21,22 1502:19
compared 1421:22	connection 1446:1	contention 1523:2	1462:7 1463:5 1464:1	1503:3,9,10 1504:3,4
1450:10 1475:17	1497:1	contest 1530:12	1465:19 1498:21	1504:8,9 1505:13
compares 1420:7	connections 1403:10,14	contesting 1530:5	1503:2 1506:16	1506:21,25 1507:8,9
1484:1	1403:18	context 1403:8	conveyed 1373:6	1507:15,20 1508:7,8
comparing 1465:7	consent 1437:9	continuation 1450:21	cooled 1486:7	1508:11,24 1509:4,13
1491:24 1492:6,7	consenting 1437:12	continue 1415:11	copies 1439:8 1445:5	1510:4,5 1511:24
compiled 1420:17	consequences 1510:13	1438:9 1462:25	copy 1363:8,19	1510:4,3 1311:24
complain 1532:7	conservation 1398:3	1472:16,16	1366:13 1398:18,21	1514:25 1515:10,11
complained 1432:3	1399:4,11 1401:17	continued 1356:2	1442:25	1514:23 1515:10,11
complaining 1432:12	1403:2,9 1405:21	1360:18 1519:11	corner 1448:22,23	1516.8,17 1323.24
complete 1486:2	1406:12,16,21 1414:8	1520:2 1521:11	correct 1358:7,16,24	1529:24
completely 1441:10	1419:6 1422:5,11,17	1520.2 1321.11	1359:4 1360:4 1362:3	correctly 1505:22
completeness 1438:17	1426:23 1429:11	continues 1422:17	1365:12,13,17	1516:5
complications 1395:3	1434:2 1442:7	continues 1422.17	1368:22 1369:8,14	correspondence
comply 1377:22	1462:23	1373:4 1457:17	1370:9 1371:11,14,18	1365:20
complying 1418:25	conservation/supply	1520:18,20	1371:24 1372:4,13	cost 1358:19 1359:3
component 1444:16,20	1433:23	contract 1368:5	1371:24 1372:4,13	1361:5,11 1373:1,5,6
1444:23 1459:24	conserved 1409:25	1370:22 1371:22	1375:11,15 1377:1	1374:5 1375:24
1460:19	1410:12 1415:5	1370.22 1371.22	1378:2,15,20,25	1374.3 1373.24
components 1446:17	1472:25	1388:5 1395:7,10,18	1379:8,14,15,18	1423:9 1430:25
1450:9 1451:6 1452:5	consider 1386:13,19,21	1419:10 1424:1	1380:21 1383:11	1446:15,21 1454:12
1478:17 1484:9	1386:22 1387:2	1433:16 1478:7	1385:8,12 1388:20,24	1476:2,3 1477:6
1504:6	1402:11 1417:20	1485:4 1486:6	1388:25 1394:14,15	1480:20 1482:22
1307.0	1704.11 171/.40	U.U0F1 T.CUT	1300.23 1374.14,13	1700.20 1702.22
	I	I	I	I

	1	l	l	l
1483:16,25 1489:16	1374:22 1376:9,17,21	1416:10	1484:24 1485:1,5,18	1405:5,9 1406:5,6,14
1489:18,19 1490:19	1377:2 1379:3	creation 1411:22	1492:21,23,24 1493:4	1411:21 1412:2,6
1490:19 1491:5,24	1381:13,16,20 1382:1	criticisms 1515:5	1493:5,9 1495:2	1413:6,9 1414:3
1492:6 1504:5	1383:19,23 1385:23	cross 1355:2 1398:23	1523:1	1416:14,19 1417:19
1519:25 1528:7	1388:7,10 1389:5,13	1495:3	deals 1389:19,24	1417:24 1418:20
			· ·	
costs 1358:15 1369:7	1389:17 1391:23	Cross-examination	dealt 1382:17 1394:20	1419:4,25 1428:5,11
1388:4,4 1399:10	1392:1,3,6,12,18	1358:1 1410:23	decade 1430:14	1428:15,18,21 1429:2
1404:12 1415:24	1393:2,9,11,15,20,25	1411:12,14 1519:21	1432:12,15 1435:19	1429:5,23 1430:4,7
1416:15,17 1417:10	1394:3 1397:1,9	<b>CSR</b> 1353:20 1534:7	deceased 1498:16	1430:12 1431:21,23
1417:13,21,24	1398:17,18,20 1402:5	1534:23	<b>December</b> 1434:18	1432:11 1442:7,9
1428:12,17 1431:1,8	1404:8 1405:14	cumulative 1407:15	1507:3	demands 1399:9
1432:3 1434:15	1410:12,23 1411:1,4	1408:14,16 1409:16	decide 1436:10	1401:16 1409:10
1446:23 1451:20	1411:9,12 1412:16	<b>current</b> 1371:23 1476:3	decided 1461:13	1410:5,20 1429:17
1452:22 1453:13	1413:2,14 1415:4	1480:18 1513:9	1494:21 1526:10	demark 1403:11
1454:9,16 1460:12,15	*	1525:19	deciding 1417:18	<b>Denham</b> 1515:17
1460:18,19 1461:2,4	1423:13,15 1424:22	Currently 1477:4	decision 1418:19	1516:6
	The state of the s	Curtis 1353:3 1357:4		<b>Dennis</b> 1498:3 1517:10
1461:6,7,10,24	1424:25 1425:15		1419:13,20,21	
1463:5,5 1475:25	1426:2,12 1427:5,8	1438:4	1434:12 1437:14	1517:25 1519:6,9,11
1477:21 1478:3,21	1427:12,16 1434:6	<b>custom</b> 1503:17	1468:3,23 1486:9,20	1520:19 1521:23
1479:1 1484:2,8,10	1437:1,19,22 1438:9	customer 1398:6	1491:1,22 1492:4	1524:11
1492:7,8 1496:15,25	1438:19 1439:1,6,19	1410:20 1429:16	decisions 1435:24	<b>Denver</b> 1495:8
1497:6,12,22 1498:10	1439:21,25 1440:3,10	customers 1399:19	1531:1	deny 1393:5
1503:8 1504:15	1441:21 1442:16,19	1400:18,19 1401:3,4	declaration 1398:15,24	Department 1353:4
1505:21 1508:1,3,7	1442:22,25 1443:4	1401:16 1402:9,17	1432:25	1357:4 1398:10
1508:12,18 1517:2,5	1445:7,10 1447:7,9	1409:10 1410:5,18	deemed 1395:17,20	1433:24 1438:4
1517:15 1518:3,11,21	1447:12 1449:18	1419:11	<b>Defendant</b> 1354:11	departs 1425:5
1519:2,25 1520:6,12	1458:8 1464:10,16	cut 1494:17,18	1397:6 1443:9	dependent 1487:11,13
1520:23 1521:15,21	_	CVP 1440:18,25		depending 1448:22
	1468:9 1470:8,11		DEFENDANT'S	
1521:25 1523:9,15	1473:21 1479:21	1441:8,8,9	1355:2	1456:23 1488:20
1524:6	1482:12 1485:10,12	CWA 1450:3,4,9	Defendants 1353:14	depends 1455:13,14
		0,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
counsel 1354:16 1363:5	1486:11 1489:9,14		defense 1444:25 1447:5	depicts 1407:8
<b>counsel</b> 1354:16 1363:5 1366:6,7 1370:18	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14	D		
	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14	<b>D D 1355:1</b> 1368:22	defense 1444:25 1447:5	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2
1366:6,7 1370:18	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14	D	<b>defense</b> 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12	<b>D D 1355:1</b> 1368:22	<b>defense</b> 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22 1362:20,23 1363:20	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8 create 1413:6	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9 dead 1477:20	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5 1509:19 1510:3	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21 detail 1375:25 1459:18
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22 1362:20,23 1363:20 1364:10 1365:7	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8 created 1413:6 created 1414:13	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9 dead 1477:20 deadline 1398:15	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5 1509:19 1510:3 demand 1398:2,25	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21 detail 1375:25 1459:18 determine 1420:9,18
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22 1362:20,23 1363:20 1364:10 1365:7 1366:17,25 1367:2,6	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8 create 1413:6 created 1414:13 1419:24 1421:2,17	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9 dead 1477:20 deadline 1398:15 1486:19	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5 1509:19 1510:3 demand 1398:2,25 1399:2 1401:9,11,20	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21 detail 1375:25 1459:18 determine 1420:9,18 1428:11 1490:5
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22 1362:20,23 1363:20 1364:10 1365:7 1366:17,25 1367:2,6 1367:8,13,18,22,25	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8 create 1413:6 created 1414:13 1419:24 1421:2,17 creates 1413:19 1461:3	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9 dead 1477:20 deadline 1398:15 1486:19 deal 1385:16 1441:22	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5 1509:19 1510:3 demand 1398:2,25 1399:2 1401:9,11,20 1401:25 1402:19,21	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21 detail 1375:25 1459:18 determine 1420:9,18 1428:11 1490:5 determined 1388:16
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22 1362:20,23 1363:20 1364:10 1365:7 1366:17,25 1367:2,6 1367:8,13,18,22,25 1368:7,11,14,17,20	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8 create 1413:6 created 1414:13 1419:24 1421:2,17 creates 1413:19 1461:3 creating 1383:10	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9 dead 1477:20 deadline 1398:15 1486:19 deal 1385:16 1441:22 1465:3 1466:5	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5 1509:19 1510:3 demand 1398:2,25 1399:2 1401:9,11,20 1401:25 1402:19,21 1402:22 1403:20,24	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21 detail 1375:25 1459:18 determine 1420:9,18 1428:11 1490:5 determined 1388:16 1429:16 1491:17
1366:6,7 1370:18 1376:4 1378:6 1383:7 1438:13 1439:14 1480:8 1501:18 1525:7,10 counterpart 1374:16 1376:3 1457:4 1524:12 County 1353:2 1375:2 1396:20,21 1422:23 1424:16 1450:5 1534:4,8 couple 1472:2 1486:17 1526:2 course 1357:13 1376:9 1376:17 1391:23 1408:10 1431:2 1432:7,23 1446:12 1495:12 1519:18 court 1353:1 1357:6,20 1359:10,12,15,22 1362:20,23 1363:20 1364:10 1365:7 1366:17,25 1367:2,6 1367:8,13,18,22,25	1486:11 1489:9,14 1493:17 1494:13,14 1494:22,25 1495:12 1495:15 1501:15 1505:1 1511:13 1512:23 1514:1 1519:18 1520:9,15 1521:3,9 1522:23 1523:11 1525:2,5 1527:22 1529:19 1530:24 1531:1 1532:20,25 1534:10 Court's 1398:15 1434:12 courtesy 1439:8 courtroom 1495:7,9 cover 1376:12 1470:17 1471:5 covered 1378:15 1398:24 CPF-10-510830 1353:7 CPF-12-512466 1353:8 create 1413:6 created 1414:13 1419:24 1421:2,17 creates 1413:19 1461:3	D D 1355:1 1368:22 D-E-V-E-N-D-R-A 1397:15 damages 1357:13 1368:10 1452:12 1494:20 Dan 1354:4 1366:6 1376:3 Daniel 1513:4 data 1420:9,14,17 date 1373:18 1384:10 1384:11,16 1385:3 1445:17 1486:22 1527:6 1532:23 dated 1464:21,21 1470:19 1474:1 Davis 1522:16 day 1493:21 1534:16 days 1486:17,19 1494:8 1494:9 dead 1477:20 deadline 1398:15 1486:19 deal 1385:16 1441:22	defense 1444:25 1447:5 1448:16 1449:12 1451:24 1486:13 defenses 1494:22 defer 1357:9,13 deficiencies 1373:3 defined 1441:1,7 Delegate 1448:18 delegates 1449:5,7 1450:18 1451:8,23 1503:11,19 1504:7 1505:15 1506:3,15 deliver 1370:3 1418:14 1509:11 delivered 1390:25 1394:6 1510:20 deliveries 1430:4 1510:13 delivery 1395:14,18,21 1403:11 1418:11,12 1442:3 1460:15 1461:5,7 1463:5 1509:19 1510:3 demand 1398:2,25 1399:2 1401:9,11,20 1401:25 1402:19,21	depicts 1407:8 deposit 1500:21 1501:3 1502:2 deposition 1353:23 1359:7 1411:19 1412:12,13 1413:12 1416:22 1426:5 1452:14 1496:2 1511:10 derived 1516:9 desalination 1399:16 1414:8 1426:24 describe 1383:5 1480:11 1489:15,17 described 1417:14 1450:8 1493:11 describing 1474:22 description 1476:23 designated 1452:10 designation 1522:6 designed 1421:8 desire 1432:16,18,21 detail 1375:25 1459:18 determine 1420:9,18 1428:11 1490:5 determined 1388:16

develop 1398:5	1532:2	1431:3,17 1496:12	1439:14 1459:19	1461:5 1462:22
1399:14 1400:11	<b>Diego's</b> 1358:14	1503:11 1523:16	1465:6,21 1471:17	1466:14
1401:8 1409:7 1465:1	1375:23 1384:14	discussing 1372:21	1479:6 1495:10	<b>effect</b> 1386:10 1444:11
1530:22	1423:6 1437:11	1393:23	dollar 1415:16,18	1447:20 1448:6
development 1415:9	1448:25 1451:24	discussion 1361:24	1489:2	1451:9 1457:2
1463:1 1524:14	1456:2,21 1465:2	1450:17 1451:5	dollars 1368:8 1400:8	1465:25 1498:19
Devendra 1355:5	1488:22 1496:1	1469:22 1482:21	1406:6 1462:8,11,13	effective 1353:12
1397:5,14 1438:6	1501:18 1503:6,11,18	1523:1 1528:5,9	1475:5 1476:6	1423:9
devices 1399:7 1406:18	1506:14,20 1511:25	discussions 1431:13	downstream 1403:5,8	efficient 1406:18
1406:22 1407:4	1512:19 1516:18	1481:20,21 1482:10	1403:14,16,21,22	1438:22
dialogue 1499:20	1523:13 1531:4	1482:11,16 1517:25	1404:5,13,15 1410:13	eight 1511:11
dialogues 1520:2	1532:7	1525:8 1531:11	dpurcell@kvn.com	either 1401:20 1415:20
<b>Diego</b> 1353:6 1359:1	difference 1465:9	disincentive 1383:16	1354:8	1451:20 1466:18
1366:7 1369:5	1489:17 1490:18,21	dispute 1361:22 1362:2	draft 1356:4 1386:2,9	1525:8 1526:12
1373:15,22 1374:5,10	differences 1357:10	1363:6 1365:11,17	draw 1425:2	1529:9 1530:13
1375:2 1378:24	different 1382:12	1368:6 1475:18,20,21	drought 1390:10,15,15	eligible 1426:21
1379:6,23,24 1380:2	1399:3 1406:25	1475:22 1500:18,21	1391:5 1394:21	email 1354:7,8,8,9,9,15
1380:5,9,21 1381:4,6	1408:4 1427:9	1501:5 1502:6	DTX 1368:21,24	1356:1,8,9,10 1385:7
1381:6,10 1382:7,9	1430:17,25 1431:3,14	1522:19 1523:8	1374:13,19 1389:15	1455:21 1464:21
1386:1 1387:13,17,19	1434:6 1441:10	1527:9,14,16,19	1393:22 1405:13	1465:1 1473:25
1390:6 1391:9 1422:4	1463:25 1464:23	1531:16,19,21,25	1411:2 1438:14	1476:18
1422:10,15,20 1423:2	1468:1 1478:2 1479:2	1532:1	1445:8,9 1447:1,7	EMANUEL 1354:12
1423:8,10,20,23	1492:24 1494:5	disputed 1365:16	1449:13,18 1457:8	1354:13 1362:18,21
1424:2,9,10,16	differential 1465:8	1368:1 1501:3	1464:4,5,10 1470:5	1363:13 1364:9
1429:9 1432:2,5	1491:4	1523:18	1470:11 1473:17,21	1365:6 1366:12,16,23
1435:25 1436:3,10,18	direct 1355:2 1397:17	<b>Distilled</b> 1369:25	1479:17,21 1485:7	1367:7,12,17,21
1437:3 1440:22	1398:19 1443:16	distinguish 1459:17	1486:14 1487:2	1368:12,19,23
1442:25 1443:21	1450:18 1493:25	distributed 1419:14,21	1500:14 1501:10,15	1369:21 1374:21
1444:4,15 1445:20	1495:3	distributes 1419:3,3	1503:5 1507:2	1376:8,13,18,25
1446:2,17,21 1449:7	directed 1451:7	distribution 1403:12	1509:22 1512:24	1379:1 1381:15,18,23
1449:20 1451:1,5,7,8	1468:17 1469:3	1403:13 1419:19	1513:22 1514:1	1382:4 1383:22,24
1451:23 1452:6,10	direction 1425:25	1421:4	due 1500:19 1532:2	1386:4 1388:19
1455:7 1458:19	1503:12 1534:13	District 1353:9,11	due 1300:17 1332:2 dug 1486:8	1389:10,18 1391:21
1460:17 1461:1,23	directly 1392:10	1354:11 1371:1	duration 1483:17	1392:25 1393:9,13,19
1463:25 1464:2	1419:7 1428:24	1397:20 1437:6	duties 1405:24 1419:1	1393:21 1394:4
1466:12,13,14	1516:9 1524:5,13	1451:2	1506:8	1396:24 1397:10,18
1469:15,19 1470:3	Director 1450:2	district's 1377:11	DWR 1434:2,13,13,21	1398:14,22 1402:10
1471:14,23 1472:7	directors 1369:17	document 1356:11	DWR's 1434:2,13,13,21 DWR's 1434:19	1404:11 1410:21,25
1474:12 1484:25	1370:16 1371:7	1376:10 1377:6	DWK \$ 1434.19	1411:2,6 1412:15
1485:5 1487:2,10,11	1425:7 1476:18	1381:17,24 1409:22		1413:1 1415:2 1417:1
1487:17 1490:1	1478:11 1480:1	1438:15,24,25	E 1353:3 1355:1 1357:4	1423:12 1424:21
1493:12 1496:22	1503:21 1513:12	1438.13,24,23	e-mail 1369:17 1379:20	1425:12 1424:21
	1523:24 1527:25		1464:12 1466:3	1427:3,7,15 1434:5
1498:21,25 1499:6,10	1529:23 1531:23	1447:11,14 1448:17	1470:18	1436:25 1438:20
1499:14,25 1500:6		1448:21,25 1449:3,6		
1501:3,7,20 1502:1	disadvantage 1494:11	1455:21 1471:10	E.A 1438:4	1439:16 1440:7,13
1502:12,22 1503:12	disaggregates 1434:14	1473:25 1500:3,6	<b>e.g</b> 1460:18 <b>earlier</b> 1405:17 1428:4	1442:6,13,20 1443:1
1505:11,15,16 1506:3	disaggregation 1434:1	1514:3		emergencies 1509:25
1506:19,23 1507:5,10	disagreement 1492:15	documentation 1481:9	1490:4 1492:9	emphatically 1453:24
1507:10,14,17,23	disclose 1505:15	1481:24	1503:11,15	employed 1397:19
1508:9,17,21 1509:16	discount 1472:13	documented 1456:1,4	early 1384:22 1385:1	employee 1400:2
1509:20 1511:16	discounted 1472:20,21	1457:5	1388:13 1407:15	1464:19 1471:6
1514:24 1515:1,9,15	discounting 1476:6	documenting 1456:13	1444:13 1464:22	1525:9
1515:22,25 1519:24	discrepancy 1439:18	documents 1372:7	earth 1486:7	employees 1444:6
1520:21 1522:19	discretion 1436:9	1474:7 1481:16,17	easier 1385:24 1446:8	enable 1387:9
1523:2 1524:24	1466:8	1492:25 1493:3,8	Eastern 1378:7	ended 1463:18 1473:14
1525:25 1527:10	discuss 1459:10	doing 1369:10 1407:3	eat 1529:2	enemy 1470:25
1528:6,13 1529:2,12	1483:14	1416:2 1418:24	EC54-547 1356:1	enforcement 1370:21
1530:5 1531:16	discussed 1395:25	1427:11 1428:7	economic 1373:4	enjoy 1404:22
1000.0 1001.10	4.50 tt 550 tt 1 575.25	1127.11 1720.7	13/3.т	onjoy 1707.22

1363:12,23 1364,8,13   1515:23 1516:23 1,011   1480:13		l	<u> </u>	1	1
1469:19	enlarge 1474:21	1363:12,23 1364:8,13	1510:8,17,21 1515:2	experience 1382:8	<b>failed</b> 1365:10
1807-24   1369-2 20.23   1521-11   1325-21   2.5   2					
H367-1438.21			-		
1528:16.20				-	
certaing 1464:1					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
entring 1464:1 entire 1309:22 1438:17 l439:12,13 entirety 1404:4 entities 1372:24 entities 1372:24 l148:21 1447:8 l148:21 1448:3 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 1449:8 l148:21 l1497:6,12 l518:10 exclusively 1509:8 entry 1409:8 entities 1372:24 equation 1383:3 entry 1429:8 equal 1494:8 l527:24 equation 1383:3 exclate 1465:20 l148:11 l1497:6 l148:11 l1499:4 l149:11 examination 1382:3 l1399:10 l148:11 examination 1382:3 l1399:10 l148:11 examination 1382:3 l1399:10 l148:11 examination 1382:3 l1399:10 l148:11 examination 1382:3 l1399:10 l148:12 l1490:12 l1499:4 l149:11 examination 1382:3 l1399:14 l149:14 l1497:6,12 l518:10 exclate 1465:20 l1499:12 l1499:12 examination 1382:3 l1399:14 l149:14 l1497:6,12 l518:10 exclate 1498:25 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:26 exclated 1498:27 exclated 1498:27 exclated 1498:27 exclated 1498:27 exclated 1498:28 exclated 1498:29 exclated 149					
entire 1390:22 148:17   1435:21   1436:24   1437:2 1438:21   1447:24 1443:21   1447:24 1443:21   1447:24 1445:2.11   1447:28   1448:2.11   1447:28   1448:2.11   1447:28   1448:2.11   1447:28   1448:2.11   1447:28   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.11   1447:29   1448:2.12   1448:2.12   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1448:2.13   1449:2.13				-	
1439-12 1438-21   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1443-3   1447-24 1448-17 1449-16   1448-17 1449-18   1448-17 1449-18   1448-17 1449-18   1448-17 1449-18   1448-17 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1449-18 1449-18   1					
entirety 1404-4 entitied 1446-7 1448-17 1452-11 1447-8 1452-11 1447-8 14452-11 1447-8 14452-11 1447-8 14452-11 1447-8 14452-11 1447-8 14452-11 1445-8 14452-11 1445-8 14452-11 1445-8 14452-11 1445-8 14452-11 1445-8 14452-11 1445-8 14452-11 1457-9 1464-6,11 1471-9 1515-22 entity 1429-8 equal 1494-8 1527-24 tquation 1383-3 ERIC 1354-13 ERIC 1499-11 examination 1382-3 ERIC 1354-13 ER					
exclusively 1509:8   1408:14 1440:21   142:22 1488:23   1449:21 1488:17 1449:16   14579-1464:6,11   1477:19 1515:22   1470:6,12 1473:22   142:16   142:16   1508:20   1508:20   1508:20   1488:17 1499:8   1488:17 1499:8   1488:17 1499:8   1488:17 1499:8   1488:17 1499:8   1488:18 1499:10 1499:4   1515:13   1499:12   1488:16 1517:13   1499:10   1499:4   1515:13   1499:22   1468:20   14579-1408:13   1499:10   1499:4   1499:10   1499:4   1499:10   1499:4   1499:10   1499:4   1515:13   1499:22   1468:20   1498:25   1494:18 1507:24   1498:18 1499:23   1494:18 1507:24   1498:18 1499:23   1494:18 1507:24   1449:18 1508:28   1399:17 1490:8   1449:24 1593:3   1354:17   1522:18   1358:18 1399:13   1354:17   1522:18   1358:18 1399:13   1358:18   1359:18   1359:18   1359:18   1359:18   1359:18   1359:18   1	*				
1380:22   1381:2					
1471:19 1515:22		· ·			
1471:19 1515:22					The state of the s
entity   1405:3   1436:5   1479:22   1486:5,15   1501:16   1507:3   1507:16   1507:3   1507:3   1507:16   1507:3   1507:16   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:3   1507:					
entry   1429.8   1501.16   1507.3   1371.6   1425.4   1436.4   execution   1358.23   1373.18   1470.15   1378.12   1479.6   1378.12   1479.6   1491.11   1492.13   1362.25   1499.12   1499.2   examination   1382.3   1366.18   1367.9   1,014   1482.15   1499.2   examination   1465.10   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1494.19   1499.2   examination   1399.2   1499.2   examination   1499.19   1499.2   examination   1499.19   1499.2   examination   1499.19   1499.2   examination   1499.19   1499.2					
equal   1494:8   1527;24   1514:2   exact   1432:10   1435:22   1373:18   1470:15   1479:10   1483:1   1490:5   1468:18   150:2;   1846:18   1354:13   1354:13   1490:10   1499:4   1397:17   1440:6   1354:3   1490:10   1499:4   1397:17   1440:6   1366:18   1366:18   1366:18   1366:18   1369:20; 23   1374:23   1376:2   1488:16   1517:3,   1499:2   1399:7   1408:1, 3.5, 9   1399:7   1408:1, 3.5, 9   1399:7   1408:1, 3.5, 9   1499:2, 2   escalation   1465:10   1467:9   1468:20   1449:18   1507:2, 4   1449:25   1449:21   1369:20; 23   1376:18   1449:21   1369:20; 23   1376:18   1499:2   1499:23   1499:24   1499:25   1499:25   1499:25   1388:14   1366:18   1366:					
Equation   1383:3   exact   1432:10   1435:22     1373:18   1470:15     1481:6   1517:13,19     1468:20,22   1469:10   1499:2,2					•
ERIC   1354:13 escalate   1465:20   1378:12   1479:6   1378:12   1479:6   1468:18   1478:6,12   1499:14   1491:11   examination   1382:3   1490:10   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:4   1499:2   2 escalation   1465:10   1467:9   1468:20   22 escalation   1465:10   1467:9   1468:20   22 escalation   1465:10   1467:9   1468:20   22 escalation   1465:21,23   1490:5   1490:5   1446:22   1448:11   1457:24   1449:24   1369:20,23   1374:23   1490:5   1499:22   2448:18   1507:2,4   1449:22   1449:23   1449:24   1	-				
cscalate   445:20   1378:12   1479:6   1491:11   exhibit   1362:25   1488:15   1492:8   1497:14   1483:1   1490:10   1499:4   1515:13   escalated   1498:25   1499:2   examinations   1494:19   examile   1360:24   1397:17   1406:6   1366:18   1367:9,10,14   1396:18   1385:18   1389:13   1396:24   1496:10   1468:20   1498:22   1442:1   1496:12	_				
1468:18 1478:6,12					
1479:4 1483:1   1490:10 1499:4   1397:17 1440:6   1366:18 1367:9,10,14   155:6:6,11   1526:6,11   1491:12   1499:2,2   examinations 1494:19   examinations 1494:19   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:2,2   1499:3,2   1499:3,3   1490:5   1499:2,2   1499:3,3   1490:5   1499:3,5					
1490:10 1499:4   1397:17 1440:6   1366:18 1367:9,10,14   1526:6,11   1491:12   examinations 1494:19   example 1360:24   1385:18 1389:13   1385:18 1389:13   1385:18 1389:13   1385:14 147:2; 1447:2   1		examination 1382:3			
1515:13					
1499:2,2   escalation 1465:10   1399:7 1408:1,3,5,9   1408:22 1442:1   1425:1 1437:2 1443:3   2445:23 145:23   1490:5   1446:22,24 1459:23   1444:25 1445:7,11,25   1447:5,8 1448:16   1515:16 1516:7   1522:18   1451:24 1464:11   Figure 1485:12 1495:1   1491:16 1423:23   1461:16 1363:16   1522:18   1470:12 1473:22   1471:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1481:16   1497:12 1473:22   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1473:22   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1473:22   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1473:22   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1473:22   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1473:22   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1481:15   1497:12 1481:15   1497:14   1497:15   1497:15   1497:14   1497:15   1497:15   1497:14   1497:15   1497:15   1497:14   1497:15   14					ferocious 1532:21
escalation 1465:10 1467:9 1468:20         1399:7 1408:1,3,5,9 1408:22 142:1         1399:7 1408:1,3,5,9 1408:22 142:1         1399:7 1408:1,3,5,9 142:1 1437:2 1443:3         expressly 1379:24 extent 1402:4,7 1405:2 1419:16 1423:23         Figuero 1354:14 figure 1485:12 1459:1           1490:5 escalator 1479:10 escrow 1532:3 ESQ 1354:3,4,4,5,5,13 1354:17 essence 1370:1 essence 1388:14         149:16 1423:23 1470:12 1473:22 1449:12,16,19         filed 1360:4 1382:16 1398:17 1423:2,10           essential 1509:3 1510:7 1338:8 14         Excess 1457:25 exchange 1358:23 exchange 1368:23 1366:18 1365:12,15 1366:18 1365:12,15 1368:19 1384:4         1360:8,9 1361:23 1366:18 1365:12,15 1370:21 1379:9,10         1350:13 1384:5 1530:17 1370:13 1480:17 1490:19 1442:8 estimated 1407:17 et 1386:7 1448:24 evaluate 1418:3 1478:3 1449:12 1349:12         1378:24 1379:5,9,10 1380:3 1381:8 estimated 1407:17 et 1386:7 1448:24 evaluate 1418:3 1478:3 1449:12 1349:13 1490:21 1491:13,14 evaluated 1428:6 Evening 1533:2 event 1500:18 1503:22 1488:3.23 1489:7,18 1499:20 1491:13,14 evelocidence 1355:12         1388:17 1382:16 1449:12 1479:22 1489:12 1470:12 1493:17 1449:19 1490:19 1490:20 1491:13,14 expected 1515:2 expect 1530:20 expect 1500:14 expected 1515:2 expenditure 1370:24         1419:16 1423:23 1447:12 1431:3 1449:12 152:33 1448:15 1449:12 1432:3 11407:12 1432:3 11407:12 1432:3 11407:12 1432:3 11407:12 1479:2 1448:15 1448:15 1449:15 1449:15 1449:15 1506:24 1508:17 1449:19 1449:15 1506:24 1508:22 1509:2,11,19 1510:1,2,7,12,16 1510:1,2,	escalated 1498:25	examinations 1494:19	1376:14,19,24 1377:3	1455:6	fiduciaries 1506:12
1467:9 1468:20   1408:22 1442:1   1425:1 1437:2 1443:3   extent 1402:4,7 1405:2   figure 1485:12 1495:1   1490:5   1446:22,24 1459:23   1444:25 1445:7,11,25   1419:16 1423:23   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1416:16   1423:23   1410:19   1410:15	1499:2,2	<b>example</b> 1360:24	1385:18 1389:13	expressed 1389:9	fiduciary 1506:8
cscalations 1465:21,23	escalation 1465:10	1399:7 1408:1,3,5,9	1393:22 1411:1,11	expressly 1379:24	Figueroa 1354:14
1490:5   1494:18 1507:2,4   1447:5,8 1448:16   1427:22   1515:16 1516:7   1449:12,16,19   1449:12,16,19   1451:24 1464:11   150:18 1439:17   1449:12   1479:22   1486:15   1479:22   1486:15   1479:22   1486:15   1479:22   1486:15   1479:22   1486:15   1370:8,9,23   1371:10   1360:7,10 1362:1   1479:22   1489:12   1501:16   1370:8,9,23   1371:10   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1409:15 1506:24   1508:22 1509:2,11,19   1528:11 1529:8   1378:24 1379:5,9,10   1360:13 1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   1379:2,11378:19,23   1368:1 1385:15   1380:12   1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   1379:2,11378:19,23   1368:1 1385:15   1470:12,13 1480:17   1429:8 1450:7   1370:8,13 1381:8   1429:1 1432:3   1409:19 1442:8   1409:19 1442:8   1409:19 1442:8   1409:19 1442:8   1409:19 1442:8   1409:19 1442:8   1409:19 1442:6   1463:18 1465:3,7   1453:25 1454:4   1463:18 1465:3,7   1450:10 1455:2   1470:12,13 1480:17   1429:1 1470:12   1470:12 1378:19   1460:14 1434:13   1489:12   1490:19 149:10   1485:18 1486:1,18,22   1490:19 149:10   1485:18 1486:1,18,22   1490:19 149:10   1489:13 1490:19 149:10   1498:18 1500:14	1467:9 1468:20	1408:22 1442:1	1425:1 1437:2 1443:3	<b>extent</b> 1402:4,7 1405:2	<b>figure</b> 1485:12 1495:1
escalator 1479:10   1515:16 1516:7   1449:12,16,19   1522:18   1522:18   1449:12,16,19   1449:13,115   1449:12,16,19   1449:10   1485:18 1486:1,18,22   everybody 1392:1   1499:19   1449:19   1498:18 1500:14   everybody 1392:1   1498:19   1498:19   1498:18 1500:14   everplative for interest of the color of the colo	escalations 1465:21,23	1446:22,24 1459:23	1444:25 1445:7,11,25	1419:16 1423:23	file 1383:16
ESCROW 1532:3   ESQ 1354:3,4,4,5,5,13   ESQ 1354:3,4,4,5,5,13   Excellent 1459:23   exception 1393:24   exception 1393:25   exception 1393:24   exception 1358:23   exception 1358:23   exception 1358:23   exception 1358:23   exception 1393:24   exception 1393:24   exception 1393:24   exception 1393:24   exception 1393:17   exception 1409:11   exception 1409:12   exception 1409:11   exception 1409:11   exception 1409:10   exception 1409:10   exception 1409:10   exception 1409:10	1490:5	1494:18 1507:2,4	1447:5,8 1448:16	1427:22	filed 1360:4 1382:16
ESQ 1354:3,4,4,5,5,13 1354:17 essence 1370:1 essential 1509:3 1510:7 1531:6 establish 1357:12 1360:8,9 1361:23 1356:2 1369:13 150:7 1532:1 1 established 1478:11 1365:16 1366:8 1378:24 1379:5,9,10 1530:12 estimate 1384:20,24 1382:15 1389:10,25 1409:19 1442:8 estimated 1407:17 et 1386:7 1448:24 estimated 1407:17 et 1386:7 1448:24 estimated 1407:17 et 1386:7 1448:24 evaluate 1418:3 1478:3 evaluated 1428:6 Evening 1533:2 evaluated 1428:6 Evening 1533:2 evenit 1500:18 1503:22 1488:3,23 1489:7,18 expected 1515:2 everybody 1392:1 1498:18 1500:14 everybody 1392:1 1498:18 1500:14 everybody 1392:1 1498:19 1498:18 1500:14 everyediduced 1355:12  1470:12 1473:22 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1489:12 1501:16 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:15 1489:12 1501:16 1479:22 1486:15 1479:22 1486:13 1370:8, 2,23 1371:10 1405:18 1486:2 1500:22 1509:23 171:10 1405:18 1488:25 fining 1370:2,10;10 1405:18 1488:25 fining 1370:2,10;10 1409:15 1506:24 1500:22 1509:2,1119 1400:18,120 1400:18,120 1400:18,120 1400:18,120 1400:18,120 1400:18,1	escalator 1479:10	1515:16 1516:7	1449:12,16,19		1398:17 1423:2,10
1354:17	escrow 1532:3	1522:18	1451:24 1464:11		1461:16
essence 1370:1         excerpted 1438:16         1489:12 1501:16         1370:8,9,23 1371:10         1405:18 1461:22         1405:18 1461:22         1505:19           essential 1509:3 1510:7         eschange 1358:23         exhibits 1355:11         1360:8,9 1361:23         exhibits 1355:11         1407:24 1408:4         1409:15 1506:24         finally 1529:7           established 1478:11         1366:16 1366:8         1356:2 1369:1 1384:7         1508:22 1509:2,11,19         finance 1431:16         finance 1431:16 <td><b>ESQ</b> 1354:3,4,4,5,5,13</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	<b>ESQ</b> 1354:3,4,4,5,5,13				
essential         1509:3         1510:7         Excess         1457:25         1514:2         1407:24         1408:4         1505:19         finally         1505:19           1531:6         establish         1357:12         1360:8,9         1361:23         1356:2         1369:1         1384:7         1507:7,12,15,19,24         finance         1431:16           1388:14         1364:18         1365:12,15         1365:16         1366:8         1365:16         1366:8         1374:2         1377:9         1374:2         1377:9         1378:24         1379:5,9,10         1378:24         1379:5,9,10         existed         1454:23         1455:2         existed         1458:14         128:16         1360:8,9 136:23         1380:4         1381:7         1382:6         1380:7         1445:5         1439:7         1445:5         1508:22         1509:2,11,19         finance         1439:5         1508:22         1509:2,11,19         finance         1390:5         1399:3,21,23         1360:18         1375:21         1375:21         1388:3         1459:2         1488:4         1428:1         1429:1         1439:2         1445:2         1488:1,145:2         1488:1,145:2         1488:1,145:2         1488:1,145:2         1488:1,145:2         1489:1         1489:1         1489:1					
1531:6   exchange 1358:23   1360:8,9 1361:23   1360:8,9 1361:23   1360:8,9 1361:23   1366:18 1365:12,15   1360:8,9 1361:23   1364:18 1365:12,15   1365:16 1366:8   exist 1418:17 1470:15   1510:1,2,7,12,16   finance 1431:16   fi					
establish 1357:12 1360:8,9 1361:23 1364:18 1365:12,15 1364:18 1365:12,15 1365:16 1366:8 1374:2 1377:9 1528:11 1529:8 1530:12 estimate 1384:20,24 1409:19 1442:8 estimated 1407:17 et 1386:7 1448:24 evaluate 1418:3 1478:3 evaluated 1428:6 Evaluated 1428:6 evaluated 1428:6 evaluated 1428:6 evaluated 1428:6 evaluated 1498:10 eventy 1494:10 eventy 1500:18 1503:22 eventy 1500:18 1503:22 eventy 1500:18 1503:22 evertybody 1392:1 1498:18 1500:14 evidence 1355:12  1360:8,9 1361:23 1366:2 1369:1 1384:7 1439:7 1445:5 exist 1418:17 1470:15 1530:17 exist 4148:17 1470:15 1530:17 existed 1454:23 1455:2 existing 1377:12,15,17 existed 1454:23 1455:2 1380:3 1381:8 1377:21 1378:19,23 1368:1 1387:4 1417:21 1418:4 1428:16 fact 1364:24,25 1366:1 1418:4 1428:16 fact 1364:24,25 1366:1 1421:15 1433:20 1474:15 1380:3 1381:8 1429:1 1432:3 1387:11 1424:10 1380:3 1381:8 1429:1 1432:3 1446:21 1451:23,25 1446:21 1451:23,25 1466:24 1474:6,10,11 expect 1530:20 expect 1530					
1388:14					
established         1478:11         1365:16 1366:8         exist 1418:17 1470:15         1510:1,2,7,12,16         1390:5 1399:13,21,23           1502:5 1513:11         1374:2 1377:9         1378:24 1379:5,9,10         existed 1454:23 1455:2         1418:4 1428:16         1400:8,14,24 1419:9           1530:12         1380:4 1381:7 1382:6         existing 1377:12,15,17         fact 1364:24,25 1366:1         1433:20 1474:15           estimate 1384:20,24         1391:7,9 1394:6         1377:21 1378:19,23         1368:1 1385:15         1487:22 1490:13           estimated 1407:17         1429:8 1452:7         1380:3 1381:8         1429:1 1432:3         find 1498:8           evaluate 1418:3 1478:3         1453:25 1454:4         1382:17 1384:1,5         1433:21 1434:13         1433:21 1434:13         1489:12           evaluate 1428:6         1477:2,12,13 1480:17         1485:18 1466:1,18,22         1477:13         1446:21 1451:23,25         firm 1528:19           eventy 1500:18 1503:22         1488:3,23 1489:7,18         1490:21 1491:10         1474:18 1503:23         1374:24 1376:15           everybody 1392:1         1493:17 1495:19         1493:17 1495:19         1493:17 1495:19         1493:17 1495:19         1493:17 1495:19         1498:18 1500:14         expected 1515:2         1509:25         1445:17 1449:25					
1502:5 1513:11					
1528:11 1529:8   1378:24 1379:5,9,10   1380:4 1381:7 1382:6   existed 1454:23 1455:2   fact 1364:24,25 1366:1   1433:20 1474:15   existed 1409:19 1442:8   1391:7,9 1394:6   1380:3 1381:8   1391:7,9 1394:6   1380:3 1381:8   1429:1 1432:3   finding 1377:15   eximated 1407:17   et 1386:7 1448:24   1453:25 1454:4   1382:17 1384:1,5   1433:21 1434:13   finding 1377:15   evaluated 1418:3 1478:3   evaluated 1428:6   1470:15 1472:17   1485:18 1486:1,18,22   evenly 1494:10   event 1500:18 1503:22   1488:3,23 1489:7,18   1490:20 1491:13,14   everybody 1392:1   1493:17 1495:19   evidence 1355:12   1508:17,23 1509:3,7   expenditure 1370:24   1509:25   1445:17 1449:25   1445:17 1449:25   expenditure 1370:24   1509:25   1445:17 1449:18   1445:17 1449:18   1445:17 1449:1					
1530:12					
estimate         1384:20,24         1382:15         1389:10,25         1377:21         1378:19,23         1368:1         1385:15         1487:22         1490:13           estimated         1407:17         1429:8         1452:7         1380:3         1381:8         1429:1         1432:3         find 1498:8           estimated         1407:17         1429:8         1452:7         1380:3         1381:8         1429:1         1432:3         finding         1377:15           et         1386:7         1448:24         1453:25         1454:4         1382:17         1384:1,5         1433:21         1434:13         finish         1439:71         1489:12           evaluated         1428:6         1470:15         1472:17         1459:1         1477:13         1446:21         1451:23,25         firm         1528:19           Evening         1533:2         1477:2,12,13         1480:17         exp         1490:11         1491:9         1446:21         1451:23,25         firm         1528:19           event         1500:18         1503:22         1488:3,23         1489:7,18         expect         1530:20         1509:10,16         1510:19         1377:9         1393:18           everybody         1392:1         1498:18					
1409:19 1442:8       1391:7,9 1394:6       1378:25 1379:7,13,17       1387:11 1424:10       find 1498:8         estimated 1407:17       1429:8 1452:7       1380:3 1381:8       1429:1 1432:3       finding 1377:15         et 1386:7 1448:24       1453:25 1454:4       1382:17 1384:1,5       1433:21 1434:13       finish 1439:7 1482:13         evaluate 1418:3 1478:3       1463:18 1465:3,7       1450:10 1455:2       1435:17 1442:3       1489:12         evaluated 1428:6       1470:15 1472:17       1459:1 1477:13       1446:21 1451:23,25       firm 1528:19         Evening 1533:2       1477:2,12,13 1480:17       1490:11 1491:9       1466:24 1474:6,10,11       first 1370:11 1372:20         event 1500:18 1503:22       1488:3,23 1489:7,18       expect 1530:20       1509:10,16 1510:19       1377:9 1393:18         everybody 1392:1       1490:20 1491:13,14       expect 1530:20       1514:14       1490:23 1491:10       1408:22 1425:3         1493:17 1495:19       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 1437:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25				-	
estimated         1407:17         1429:8         1452:7         1380:3         1381:8         1429:1         1432:3         finding         1377:15           et         1386:7         1448:24         1453:25         1454:4         1382:17         1384:1,5         1433:21         1434:13         finish         1439:7         1482:13           evaluate         1418:3         1478:3         1465:3,7         1450:10         1455:2         1435:17         1442:3         1489:12           evaluated         1428:6         1470:15         1472:17         1459:1         1477:13         1446:21         1451:23,25         firm         1528:19           Evening         1533:2         1477:2,12,13         1480:17         1490:11         1491:9         1466:24         1474:6,10,11         first         1370:11         1372:20           event         1500:18         1503:22         1488:3,23         1489:7,18         expect         1530:20         1509:10,16         1510:19         1377:9         1393:18           everybody         1392:1         1492:25         1497:4         1514:14         1490:23         1491:10         1408:22         1429:23           evidence         135:19         1498:18         1500:14		*			
et 1386:7 1448:24       1453:25 1454:4       1382:17 1384:1,5       1433:21 1434:13       finish 1439:7 1482:13         evaluate 1418:3 1478:3       1463:18 1465:3,7       1450:10 1455:2       1435:17 1442:3       1489:12         evaluated 1428:6       1470:15 1472:17       1459:1 1477:13       1446:21 1451:23,25       firm 1528:19         Evening 1533:2       1477:2,12,13 1480:17       1490:11 1491:9       1466:24 1474:6,10,11       first 1370:11 1372:20         eventy 1500:18 1503:22       1488:3,23 1489:7,18       expect 1530:20       1509:10,16 1510:19       1377:9 1393:18         1532:1 1534:15       1490:20 1491:13,14       expectation 1473:10       factor 1478:18 1485:3       1406:11 1407:6,20,22         everybody 1392:1       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 143:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 143:7:6		•			
evaluate 1418:3 1478:3         1463:18 1465:3,7         1450:10 1455:2         1435:17 1442:3         1489:12           evaluated 1428:6         1470:15 1472:17         1459:1 1477:13         1446:21 1451:23,25         firm 1528:19           Evening 1533:2         1477:2,12,13 1480:17         1490:11 1491:9         1466:24 1474:6,10,11         first 1370:11 1372:20           evenly 1494:10         1485:18 1486:1,18,22         exp 1511:20         expect 1530:20         1509:10,16 1510:19         1377:9 1393:18           1532:1 1534:15         1490:20 1491:13,14         expect ation 1473:10         factor 1478:18 1485:3         1406:11 1407:6,20,22           everybody 1392:1         1498:18 1500:14         expected 1515:2         factors 1483:2,10         1434:9 1437:6           evidence 1355:12         1508:17,23 1509:3,7         expected 1515:2         factors 1483:2,10         1434:9 1437:6					<u> </u>
evaluated 1428:6         1470:15 1472:17         1459:1 1477:13         1446:21 1451:23,25         firm 1528:19           Evening 1533:2         1477:2,12,13 1480:17         1490:11 1491:9         1466:24 1474:6,10,11         first 1370:11 1372:20           evenly 1494:10         1485:18 1486:1,18,22         exp 1511:20         exp 1511:20         1474:18 1503:23         1374:24 1376:15           event 1500:18 1503:22         1488:3,23 1489:7,18         expect 1530:20         1509:10,16 1510:19         1377:9 1393:18           everybody 1392:1         1492:25 1497:4         1514:14         factor 1478:18 1485:3         1406:11 1407:6,20,22           evidence 1355:12         1508:17,23 1509:3,7         expected 1515:2         factors 1483:2,10         1434:9 1437:6           expected 1570:24         1509:25         1445:17 1449:25					
Evening 1533:2       1477:2,12,13 1480:17       1490:11 1491:9       1466:24 1474:6,10,11       first 1370:11 1372:20         evenly 1494:10       1485:18 1486:1,18,22       exp 1511:20       1474:18 1503:23       1374:24 1376:15         event 1500:18 1503:22       1488:3,23 1489:7,18       expect 1530:20       1509:10,16 1510:19       1377:9 1393:18         1532:1 1534:15       1490:20 1491:13,14       expectation 1473:10       factor 1478:18 1485:3       1406:11 1407:6,20,22         everybody 1392:1       1493:17 1495:19       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 1437:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25					
evenly 1494:10       1485:18 1486:1,18,22       exp 1511:20       1474:18 1503:23       1374:24 1376:15         event 1500:18 1503:22       1488:3,23 1489:7,18       expect 1530:20       1509:10,16 1510:19       1377:9 1393:18         1532:1 1534:15       1490:20 1491:13,14       expectation 1473:10       factor 1478:18 1485:3       1406:11 1407:6,20,22         everybody 1392:1       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       1490:23 1491:10       1408:22 1425:3         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25					
event 1500:18 1503:22       1488:3,23 1489:7,18       expect 1530:20       1509:10,16 1510:19       1377:9 1393:18         1532:1 1534:15       1490:20 1491:13,14       expectation 1473:10       factor 1478:18 1485:3       1406:11 1407:6,20,22         everybody 1392:1       1492:25 1497:4       1514:14       1490:23 1491:10       1408:22 1425:3         1493:17 1495:19       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 1437:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25					
1532:1 1534:15       1490:20 1491:13,14       expectation 1473:10       factor 1478:18 1485:3       1406:11 1407:6,20,22         everybody 1392:1       1492:25 1497:4       1514:14       1490:23 1491:10       1408:22 1425:3         1493:17 1495:19       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 1437:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25					
everybody 1392:1       1492:25 1497:4       1514:14       1490:23 1491:10       1408:22 1425:3         1493:17 1495:19       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 1437:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25				-	
1493:17 1495:19       1498:18 1500:14       expected 1515:2       factors 1483:2,10       1434:9 1437:6         evidence 1355:12       1508:17,23 1509:3,7       expenditure 1370:24       1509:25       1445:17 1449:25			_		
evidence         1355:12         1508:17,23 1509:3,7         expenditure         1370:24         1509:25         1445:17 1449:25					
				-	
ı ı ı ı ı	1000.20 1002.17,20				1.00.2 110 1.7,10,10
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I	l

1457.10 1450.5 11	former 1455,12 10		1490.2 1491.2	
1457:10 1458:5,11	forum 1455:13,18	G	1480:2 1481:2	guess 1456:4 1464:14
1459:16 1466:4	1502:13 1529:14	gain 1372:25	1499:19 1500:3	1464:22
1474:9,10,18 1476:24	1530:6	Gastelum 1370:17	1511:13 1529:17,18	
1488:18 1501:7,20	forums 1502:19	1371:6 1372:12	1529:19	H
1502:4,8,23 1520:1	forward 1428:15	1373:13,21 1374:4,15	goal 1462:21	HADLOCK 1354:4
1528:11 1530:1	1472:2	1374:25 1375:10,14	goals 1418:6,8,9	half 1515:25
1531:17	<b>found</b> 1382:9	1375:17 1383:4,7,13	1420:24 1463:7	hand 1534:16
<b>fiscal</b> 1406:19 1409:13	foundation 1367:1	1457:2 1525:13	goes 1431:21 1457:15	handed 1376:13
<b>fit</b> 1390:7,13	1468:7 1485:14	1526:8	1463:1 1490:18	handout 1466:5
<b>five</b> 1359:2 1373:17,25	1520:8 1521:1,8	Gastelum's 1379:20	1504:2 1532:3	happens 1405:11
1375:7,19 1382:12	1522:22 1523:10	1380:20	going 1357:9 1358:19	happy 1363:19 1366:19
1385:19 1386:1	1525:1	gears 1428:25	1359:24 1369:9,24	1469:14
1391:25 1392:1	four 1370:25 1382:11	general 1354:16 1363:5	1376:20 1386:9	hard 1532:12,13
1435:19 1437:17	1416:23 1426:7	1366:6,7 1370:18	1388:10 1394:24	harmony 1386:7
1446:6 1465:25	1465:12 1471:18	1372:13 1376:4	1398:18 1400:7	Havasu 1391:14
1466:21 1467:5,9	1493:24 1494:9	1383:9 1443:20,23	1402:3 1415:2	head 1379:11
1468:20 1471:18	1497:17 1518:15	1444:1,4 1447:13	1416:22 1419:14,18	heading 1472:3
1477:25 1479:10	frame 1384:22 1385:1	1456:9 1480:8	1419:20 1420:21	1487:22
1482:20 1483:2	1503:1	1501:18 1525:10,14	1423:10,12,21 1426:5	hear 1460:1 1469:16
1485:3 1488:18,20,25	frames 1496:7	generally 1503:17	1439:7,8,9 1440:8	heard 1389:1,5,7,8
1488:25 1489:3,10	Francisco 1353:2,16,17	1522:25	1446:17 1447:12	1453:23 1454:3,15
1492:19 1498:10,24	1353:24 1354:6	generate 1423:8	1449:14 1450:25	1494:13 1525:5,6
1499:3 1502:4,8,23	1357:1 1438:1	generated 1405:7,9	1457:15,22 1470:14	hearing 1469:17
1526:17 1528:11,15	frankly 1420:22 1421:7	1421:18 1471:10	1472:15 1473:14	1486:24
1529:9 1530:1,9,14	free 1377:15,19	generates 1403:23	1477:17 1479:3	held 1455:22 1481:21
1530:23 1531:17,21	1378:18	<b>get-go</b> 1396:12	1485:13 1486:1,6	hello 1461:20
1532:9,19	frees 1430:2	getting 1369:3 1385:6	1487:16 1488:6	help 1409:7,8 1417:20
five-year 1358:22	frequent 1523:23	1385:14 1387:7	1493:21 1494:14	1428:22 1486:21
1360:3 1374:1	frequently 1432:2	1394:19 1395:20	1495:4,5,13 1508:5	1531:2
1465:24 1479:8	Fromm 1495:7	1419:18 1431:6	1517:22 1522:24	helped 1479:14
1483:6 1501:23	front 1366:25 1440:9	1433:24 1437:5	1529:17,18,19	helping 1398:5
1511:22 1512:21	1446:10	1491:5	GOLDBERG 1354:5	Hentschke 1366:6
1513:20 1529:7	full 1397:13 1458:5,11	<b>Gil</b> 1471:5	golf 1408:9	1376:4 1378:4 1480:8
1530:8	1472:24 1473:7,11	<b>gild</b> 1516:13	good 1357:6 1358:3,4	1501:13 1513:4
flat-out 1396:11	1478:1 1500:19	<b>give</b> 1384:20,24 1385:2	1358:18 1411:16,17	herring 1486:2
1476:13	1507:19	1408:1 1410:7 1426:8	1423:7,20,24 1437:18	hesitate 1456:1,20
flatly 1512:10	fund 1418:20,23	1459:18 1469:4,5,6	1443:18,19 1484:24	hesitating 1456:4
Floor 1353:24 1354:14	1423:10,21 1424:4	1482:13 1494:7	1485:1,5 1489:9	Hess 1450:10
flow 1416:21	fundamental 1377:8	1511:7 1521:3	1493:15 1494:12,22	high 1409:1 1475:7
fluctuations 1484:10	funded 1406:22	given 1380:2 1381:7	1501:24	high-efficiency 1399:8
focus 1403:1 1468:14	1407:25 1408:4,18	1410:11 1414:9	governed 1394:24	1399:8
focusing 1482:16	1414:8,18	<b>giving</b> 1491:13 1494:23	Governor 1522:16	higher 1408:7 1484:8
folks 1444:14 1471:14	<b>funding</b> 1377:9 1424:7	<b>Glance</b> 1448:18	Governor's 1522:15	1528:14
follow 1359:12,15	1457:22	<b>go</b> 1358:15 1367:1,2	governs 1393:7	highlight 1370:11
1486:6	funds 1370:25 1380:17	1368:13 1375:25	grade 1408:8 1495:8	1458:13
follow-on 1423:5	1419:19,20 1421:2,2	1380:23 1382:5	grant 1495:4	historical 1510:19
following 1358:23	1421:4 1458:1	1384:7 1385:18	great 1523:1	hit 1391:11
follows 1357:18 1397:7	further 1357:18	1388:11 1389:11,21	greater 1484:11	hits 1391:7
1438:7 1443:10	1381:12 1438:7	1390:19 1393:21	grounds 1485:9	hold 1448:22
foot 1515:17	1440:2,3 1442:15	1397:12 1404:5	groundwater 1399:15	home 1494:18
forecasting 1398:7	1459:9,9 1519:19	1413:14 1417:4	1403:2 1405:21	Hon 1357:4 1438:4
forego 1377:10	1530:1 1534:14	1419:6 1423:17	1408:21,23,24,25	Honor 1359:21
forfeit 1377:8	<b>future</b> 1373:23 1379:18	1424:14 1427:13	1409:5,9	1362:17,22 1363:11
forgetting 1492:16	1398:8 1399:16	1441:14 1442:10	group 1397:23,24	1363:18 1364:9
form 1421:13 1502:13	1417:21 1428:23	1446:23 1451:23	1398:1,2,7 1399:25	1366:12 1367:5
formal 1518:2 1519:13	1429:15 1467:4	1457:16 1461:1	1414:7,17 1498:5	1368:2,12,23 1376:11
formed 1486:8	1513:10	1468:10 1472:16	grow 1412:9,21	1376:18 1383:22
former 1370:14		1474:20 1476:15	guarantee 1382:16	1391:21 1392:4
	l		l	I

1396:24 1410:21	implications 1390:5	income 1403:23	intake 1391
1411:2 1417:2 1426:6	<b>import</b> 1412:3	inconsistent 1522:1	integrated 1
1426:8 1438:13,23	importance 1441:6	increase 1403:1	integrity 13
1439:17 1440:1	important 1390:16	1442:11 1458:24	1373:2,10
1442:14,18,24 1445:1	1455:11,19,25 1456:7	1462:23 1490:3	1378:9 13
1447:3 1449:13	1456:8,14,18 1458:18	1504:19	1381:9 13
1464:8,17 1470:9	1458:23 1462:5	increased 1461:4	1395:24 1
1473:19 1479:19	1481:15,18 1490:25	1492:17 1504:13	1422:1,3,
1485:11,17,22	<b>imported</b> 1413:8,11,21	increases 1488:10	1424:1,17
1493:16,20 1495:6	1450:2 1484:12,14	1489:4	1425:21 1
1511:12 1512:22	1513:1	increasing 1462:21,22	intend 1469
1519:17	impose 1380:4	1463:8	1512:18 1
<b>HONORABLE</b> 1353:3	impression 1375:14	incremental 1446:14	intended 13
hope 1467:7,15	1459:6	independent 1390:16	1382:19 1
1516:13	improper 1520:5	1487:18	1512:20
hoped 1469:7	1521:24 1524:18,19	index 1488:9 1489:6	intent 1374:
hopefully 1362:10	inability 1509:18	indicate 1463:12	1386:5
1372:7	inadvertently 1376:23	1483:25 1505:20	intention 13
horse 1477:20	inappropriate 1453:5	indicated 1521:23	1512:11,1
hours 1493:24 1494:1,1	1461:5	1524:13	1513:17 1
1494:9	incentive 1400:14,24	indicates 1448:24	interest 136
housekeeping 1442:21	1413:24 1421:15	1481:7	1386:23 1
huge 1467:18 1492:16	1425:7 1426:22	indication 1373:14	1392:23
1523:25	1428:24	1439:19,21 1480:3	interested 1
hundred 1390:8	incentives 1398:4	individual 1429:12	1466:19,2
1370.0	1399:5,10,13,20,21	1522:15	1469:17 1
	1399:22,23 1400:9	industry 1383:8	1534:14
ID 1355:12	1406:16 1408:18	inflation 1478:19	interests 13
idea 1380:15 1435:8	1409:6 1419:9	1483:1 1485:3	interpret 13
1464:23	1422:18	1489:21 1490:23	interpretati
identification 1405:13	inception 1407:15	1491:10	1488:22 1
1411:11	1408:17	influence 1531:2,2	interpreted
identified 1457:11	incidental 1510:3	inform 1506:3	interpreted
1498:10	include 1406:4 1425:25	information 1384:13	invalid 1524
identifies 1485:20	1453:5,17 1454:16	1446:19 1447:17,18	invalidate 1
1490:14 1504:6	1457:21 1478:17	1447:21 1448:3,4,7	invest 1412:
identify 1429:21	1481:15 1529:15	1469:5,9 1490:25	invested 14
1430:5 1445:12	included 1371:16,20	1493:11 1524:1	1416:4
1466:6 1487:24	1435:7 1452:22,24	informed 1468:23	investing 14
1500:5 1514:3	1453:15 1454:2	1471:16	investing
II 1511:10	1463:4 1477:20,24	infrastructure 1369:14	1428:20
IID 1390:20 1391:12	1497:25 1503:8	1370:23 1371:10	investments
1394:20 1395:4,4	1507:24 1508:2,3	inherent 1418:11,12	investments
1450:11 1472:24	1507.24 1508.2,5	initial 1498:22 1515:12	invited 1366
IID/SDCWA 1477:3	includes 1426:19	1516:21 1526:1	invoice 1499
ill-conceived 1384:3			
	1429:18 1504:5	1529:1	1500:11
illegal 1453:17 1456:16	including 1387:12	initially 1415:10	invoked 136
1461:11,18 1462:1,10	1422:19 1448:1,12	1416:1 1498:21	1422:10
1463:15 1482:17	1456:16 1458:19	initiated 1428:5,5	invoking 13
1484:22 1485:2	1470:18 1477:5	initiatives 1430:17	1365:20 1

1507:25 1508:6

1509:25 1520:11

1454:8 1460:6,18

1520:23 1523:18

1461:2,24 1463:13

1521:21

1525:11

inclusion 1369:6

1506:5 1525:22

illegally 1462:11,13

**immediate** 1372:15

**implement** 1417:25

implementing 1444:17

illegality 1482:2

imagine 1435:22

**impact** 1450:9

intake 1391:8,11,14
1114KC 1371.0,11,14
integrated 1418:7
integrity 1371:14
1272.2 10 1277 12
1373:2,10 1377:13
1378:9 1379:16,22
1381:9 1382:18
1395:24 1396:15
1422-1 3 9 1423-22
1422:1,3,9 1423:22
1424:1,17 1425:6,17 1425:21 1426:20
1425:21 1426:20
intend 1469:24 1512:14
1512:18 1513:9,18
<b>intended</b> 1380:18
1382:19 1386:7
1512:20
intent 1374:7 1381:11
1386:5
intention 1379:5
1510.11 15 17
1512:11,15,17
1513:17 1514:24
interest 1368:10
1386:23 1392:9,19,21
1392:23
interested 1353:10
1466:19,22 1467:3
interested 1353:10 1466:19,22 1467:3 1469:17 1470:1
1409.1/ 14/0.1
1534:14
interests 1393:14
interpret 1392:20
interpretation 1454:24
1488:22 1502:14
interpreted 1393:4
interpreted 1393:4
interrupt 1532:20
<b>interrupt</b> 1532:20 <b>invalid</b> 1524:18
interrupt 1532:20
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invests 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7 involvement 1383:10
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7 involvement 1383:10 involving 1363:5
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7 involvement 1383:10 involving 1363:5 1388:2
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7 involvement 1383:10 involving 1363:5 1388:2 irrigated 1408:11
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7 involvement 1383:10 involving 1363:5 1388:2
interrupt 1532:20 invalid 1524:18 invalidate 1526:9 invest 1412:20 1417:18 invested 1415:1,14 1416:4 investing 1412:2,24 investment 1417:6 1428:20 investments 1412:9 invest 1418:3 invited 1366:20 invoice 1499:15 1500:11 invoked 1362:2 1422:10 invoking 1362:14 1365:20 1502:1,22 involve 1462:6,8 involved 1430:16 1522:12 1523:7 involvement 1383:10 involving 1363:5 1388:2 irrigated 1408:11

issue 1369:19 1380:25 1388:11 1395:13 1434:13 1451:14 1455:11,25 1456:8,18 1458:17 1486:3 1503:18 1504:14 1508:21 1517:7 1519:13.14 1520:18 1526:7 **issued** 1518:2 issues 1369:5 1382:12 1449:9 1451:3 1452:11 1455:8 1456:14,16 1457:11 1457:19 1485:17 1514:7 item 1385:19 1386:1 items 1481:25 Ivev 1471:5 IX 1353:10 J

**J** 1354:13

**JAN** 1353:22 **January** 1353:12,12 1444:11 1447:19 1448:5 1451:9 **Jeff** 1355:3 1357:17 1525:9 Jerry 1378:6 Jessica 1495:7 jkeker@kvn.com 1354:8 **iob** 1372:18 **John** 1354:3,13 1443:20 johnquinn@quinne... 1354:15 join 1438:11 joke 1470:25 **JOSEPH** 1354:17 **Juan** 1437:5 **Judge** 1357:4 1438:4 judicial 1502:13,19 1529:10,14 1530:6,13 **July** 1369:17 1374:14 1375:1 1384:22 1385:1 1440:10 jump 1496:3 jumping 1463:23 1496:5,6 **June** 1364:4 1372:12 1379:21

K

Karen 1363:4 1364:21 Karnow 1353:3 1357:4 1438:4

inspection 1509:25

1407:4,7,10,17

instructed 1427:24

**installed** 1406:22

instance 1507:5

1503:19,21

insofar 1476:20

1432:2

	1	1	1	1
Katz 1522:4,8,9,11,14	1487:14 1488:25	1530:11 1531:3,4,9	1424:15,18 1436:17	litigation 1374:10
1522:18	1500:22 1501:1	lawfully 1454:1	1440:10 1455:21	1388:2 1423:6 1424:3
keep 1471:16 1482:2	1503:25 1504:21,22	1497:25 1519:2	1457:10,17 1460:5	1514:15,20
1501:4	1504:24,25 1505:3,8	laws 1471:22	1461:13,14,19	little 1361:21 1366:23
keeps 1416:9	1506:3 1507:21,22	lawsuit 1360:4,11	1462:16 1501:12,17	1372:11 1385:24
Keker 1354:3,3	1508:1,25 1509:15	1362:2 1423:2,11	1507:3	1423:15 1428:25
1359:19 1389:15	1510:19,22,24 1511:6	1450:22,25 1451:14	letters 1365:24 1366:4	1437:21 1467:25
1394:2 1442:17	1513:10 1518:24	1460:24 1461:15,22	1366:21	1494:4 1522:24
1445:3 1447:6,11	1522:5	1505:19 1512:13	level 1395:25 1402:18	live 1495:5 1526:12
1449:17 1452:16	knowing 1467:4	1530:15	1426:4 1483:16	lives 1470:25
1464:9 1468:6 1470:9	knowledge 1404:18	lawsuits 1382:12,20,21	license 1393:3	local 1371:17 1390:3,8
1473:20,23 1479:20	1410:9 1415:21	1382:22 1383:25	lieu 1477:2 1480:17	1390:10,12,16,18
1485:22 1493:20	1416:5,7 1420:22	1384:4 1386:9	1521:25	1391:1 1394:7,19
1495:6,13 1501:14	1421:6,24 1428:13	lay 1367:1 1485:13	life 1409:18,20 1442:12	1398:4 1399:12,13,18
1511:12 1512:22	1430:23 1431:25	laying 1480:24	1485:3 1490:11	1400:7,10,12,13,22
1511:12 1512:22	1433:14 1434:20	lead 1528:9	1529:19	1400:7,10,12,13,22
1513.23 1319.22	1435:14 1434.20	leader 1463:22	likewise 1361:5 1377:6	1400.23 1401.7,14,23
1521:7,13 1522:25	1520:21 1521:13	leading 1383:18,21	1377:7 1429:8	1405:8 1406:10
1523:12 1525:13 1527:23 1532:24	1524:23	1470:15 1481:5 learn 1465:13	1432:11	1410:3,19 1411:22,23
	knowledgeable 1359:8		lily 1516:13	1411:24 1412:9,20
key 1492:20,24 Kightlinger 1355:3	1452:11,15,18 1496:1	leave 1398:22	limine 1423:14	1414:3,20 1416:11,12 1419:8,10 1421:10,12
8	1496:24	led 1528:10	limit 1375:22	
1357:17 1358:3	known 1455:23 1482:8	Lee 1464:14,18	limitation 1530:18	1421:13,18 1422:5,11
1361:19 1362:13	1482:18 1495:21	left-hand 1446:10	limited 1378:22 1394:8	1422:15,16,21 1423:3
1363:3 1364:1,16	1523:16,17	legal 1372:23 1377:10	1532:7	1426:23 1429:10
1365:1,9 1366:5	<b>kudos</b> 1459:19	1377:19,22 1388:11	limiting 1382:7	1462:25
1369:3,12 1371:13		1402:4 1434:3	limits 1374:9	located 1470:23
1377:25 1380:19		legislation 1402:24	line 1359:8,9,24,25	location 1391:18,19
1384:11 1393:23	lack 1382:25	legislative 1372:23	1385:5,25 1406:11,19	long 1381:24 1399:24
1501:13,18 1507:4	LADWP 1369:18	1377:11 1471:22	1406:25,25 1407:2,6	1400:2 1404:16
1525:10 1528:22	1370:3,6 1371:8	1502:12,18 1529:13	1407:8,12,14,20,22	1443:23 1448:23
Kightlinger's 1392:8	Lake 1391:14	legislature 1405:19	1408:16,22 1412:14	1464:23 1473:6
kind 1459:14 1460:8	land 1486:8	1406:9 1522:9	1413:12,13 1425:3	1483:22 1487:18
1463:23 1464:22	landfill 1383:8	1529:18	1426:7,7 1427:6,7,8	1489:13 1528:6
1490:8	language 1371:17,20	length 1483:6 1528:17	1427:14,14 1457:10	long-range 1431:15
kinds 1399:21 1401:18	1374:9 1377:13	lengthy 1450:16	1458:14 1502:10	long-term 1380:13
knew 1374:7 1444:19	1378:10,15,19,22	lesser 1373:1	1511:11	longer 1422:20
1444:22 1446:17	1380:5,12 1382:18	let's 1357:15 1359:12	lines 1408:13 1409:16	look 1357:7 1372:6
1452:19 1453:2,15,20		1359:15 1367:1,2,3	1416:23 1480:3	1374:13 1390:22
1466:24 1467:1,9	1425:10,12,17,23,24	1374:13 1382:5,5	1496:2 1497:11	1394:11 1406:11
1488:5 1507:11,14	1426:20 1427:21,23	1389:24 1390:22	1518:7	1407:12,20 1408:13
1509:10,12,14	1473:12 1513:15	1393:8 1394:11,11	lining 1465:6,9,15	1425:20 1428:15
1512:12 1528:19	1521:18 1524:19	1395:23 1407:19	1466:6 1472:25	1437:8 1440:8,13
know 1358:21 1364:20	large 1419:24 1510:19	1427:13 1440:13	1474:23,24 1476:25	1442:2,3 1444:25
1376:21 1378:13	largely 1419:6	1441:5 1457:8 1470:5	1477:3 1479:12	1446:8 1447:1
1380:19 1381:17,22	late 1369:9 1384:22	1476:3,5,15 1479:17	1480:15 1483:18	1448:16 1451:24
1394:11 1402:1,6	1385:1	1495:23 1501:10	1484:1 1489:16	1457:8 1458:12
1411:7 1415:3	latest 1384:14	1502:7 1512:24	1491:5,8,12,16	1464:4 1466:3,13
1416:13,18,19	law 1402:2 1454:14,23	1527:3 1529:11	1492:11 1514:9	1467:4,13,13 1468:15
1417:15 1420:6,12,13	1455:2,2 1502:14	letter 1355:14,15,16,17	1515:23 1516:15	1470:5 1472:22
1430:11 1431:18	1524:16,20 1527:25	1355:18,20,21,22,23	list 1363:14,18,19	1473:17 1474:9,18
1432:15 1435:21	1528:14 1530:21	1355:24,25 1356:3,5	1376:15,19,21,24	1479:17 1482:20
1467:6,24 1468:21	1531:8,19	1356:12 1362:4,6,13	1457:19	1483:4 1486:12
1469:2 1470:13	lawful 1453:9 1467:1	1363:3,8 1364:1,16	literal 1392:23 1393:7	1488:23 1490:7
1473:11 1475:6,14,15	1480:17 1481:13,19	1364:22 1366:5	literally 1385:21	1493:7 1494:5
1475:19,24,25,25	1488:21 1516:2,4,23	1368:16 1374:15	litigate 1373:22 1513:9	1500:13,16 1501:10
1476:20 1481:18	1521:24 1526:13,21	1376:12 1377:5	1513:18	1502:7 1503:5 1507:2
1483:20 1485:23	1527:10 1528:4	1378:2,8 1380:7	litigating 1374:10	1509:22 1512:24
L				

1513:22 1526:25
1529:11 1531:14,25
looked 1428:19
1465:23 1492:9
1503:6
looking 1364:10
1376:15 1381:19
1408:22 1429:13,14
1451:7 1467:12
1470:17 1479:1,2
looks 1363:7 1376:5
1398:7 1410:23
1508:15
loosely 1402:1
Los 1354:14,18
1470:23
lost 1396:16
lot 1358:6 1381:25
1419:25 1475:1,2,3,4
1475:6 1476:7
1477:17
love 1386:2
low-cost 1381:1
lower 1373:4 1448:21
1448:23 1449:24
1484:7 1496:21
LRP 1417:7 1423:25
lunch 1437:20

### M M-A-U-R-E-E-N 1443:14 ma'am 1467:23 1470:14 1482:12 1504:16 **MAF** 1472:13 magnitude 1511:7 maintain 1373:2 maintaining 1458:25 maintains 1452:6 maintenance 1509:25 major 1399:14 makers 1468:3 making 1417:7 1486:9 1491:1 manage 1398:9,13 management 1390:11 1390:15 1391:6 1397:24 1398:1,2,3 1398:25 1399:2,25 1401:9,11,25 1402:20 1402:21 1403:20,24 1403:25 1404:22,23 1405:5,9 1406:5,7,14 1411:22 1412:2 1413:6,9 1414:3 1416:14 1417:19 1418:20 1419:4,25

```
1443:21.23 1444:1.4
  1456:9 1468:24
  1525:14
managers 1375:1
manages 1398:2
manner 1478:24
  1530:13
March 1447:25
  1448:11
marginal 1373:6
  1483:25
mark 1446:15
marked 1405:12
  1411:11 1447:2
Marty 1496:6,8
matched 1528:17
material 1375:24
  1377:17 1378:18
  1465:2
matter 1423:7,8,9,19
  1530:15
matters 1393:15
  1503:13
Maureen 1355:6
  1443:5,8,13
maximum 1467:10,22
  1468:22 1469:11
  1490:6 1492:8
McCrae 1355:21
McFly 1496:6,8
mean 1393:6 1399:20
  1418:17 1426:2
  1429:24 1430:8
  1434:7 1456:9 1462:6
  1477:10 1488:16,22
  1492:14 1516:13
  1517:11 1528:2
  1530:7
meaning 1386:2 1390:7
  1427:13 1434:3
  1531:5,6
means 1377:18 1385:24
  1403:7,8 1423:7
  1434:4,14 1440:21
meant 1393:13 1421:7
  1528:3
measure 1357:12
  1409:3 1421:21
measured 1420:23,24
meet 1399:18 1400:17
  1401:2,15 1408:11
```

1428:5,11,16,18 1429:3,5,23 1430:7

1430:12 1431:21,23

1432:11 1442:7,9

1444:5 1462:25

manager 1372:13 1397:23 1399:24

```
1409:9 1410:4,19
  1418:1,9 1429:16
meeting 1370:17
  1375:1,4,10,12
  1377:22 1445:23
  1449:20 1455:20
  1471:8
meetings 1360:21
  1361:2,3,15,16
  1432:6 1505:6,9,12
member 1371:22
  1372:22 1373:22
  1375:1 1377:7,14,18
  1378:17 1380:6,9
  1381:3 1382:19
  1387:12 1398:6
  1400:10 1401:7
  1402:15 1403:12,15
  1406:10 1410:18
  1411:23 1418:15
  1419:4,7,14,16,22,25
  1420:15,21 1421:4,18
  1425:8,16 1426:17
  1427:19 1428:25
  1433:2,7 1435:14,20
  1435:24 1450:10
  1459:3 1468:25
  1471:7 1523:17
members 1396:8
  1451:24 1458:19
  1469:22 1470:22
  1474:3 1480:1 1503:6
  1504:2,12,18 1506:7
  1506:8,9,12 1525:8
memo 1372:12 1379:20
  1380:24 1381:5
  1471:5 1476:17,21,23
  1480:10,23 1481:2,3
  1481:4,7 1512:25
memorandum 1474:6
  1474:14 1476:16
  1478:14 1479:15
  1480:4 1492:10
  1513:3
memos 1380:20
  1516:14
mentioned 1405:16
  1406:15 1523:12
mere 1389:3
merely 1377:10
met 1358:9 1381:3
  1400:4 1411:18
  1414:6,15,24,25
  1415:14,15,22 1416:8
  1417:18,19,20 1418:2
  1418:14,19,22 1419:2
  1419:13,21 1420:4,9
```

```
1422:14 1423:10,20
  1424:4,10,12 1425:10
  1429:2 1430:13,20,20
  1430:24 1433:6
  1434:19,23 1435:1,9
  1435:24 1438:13
  1444:16 1448:13
  1450:18.19 1451:8.25
  1463:7 1472:23
  1477:4,11 1478:10,11
  1484:9,15 1490:10,19
  1491:10,16 1497:12
  1498:1,6,21 1499:11
  1499:25 1500:7
  1501:4,4,20 1502:5
  1502:12 1503:1,3,7
  1503:12 1504:11
  1505:15,16 1506:4,15
  1506:20 1507:6,10,11
  1507:14,19 1509:6
  1510:15 1511:17
  1512:12 1513:10,11
  1515:10 1517:3
  1518:3,9 1519:5,24
  1520:4,10,22 1521:19
  1522:19 1523:2,4
  1524:7,12,23,25
  1525:15 1527:9,18,25
  1528:3,6,23 1529:13
  1529:15,18 1530:12
  1532:8,14
Met's 1360:14,19
  1374:6 1403:18
  1412:9 1422:18
  1434:14 1435:6,25
  1445:21 1473:3
  1476:25 1477:1,11
  1478:6 1480:14,17,18
  1481:12,19 1488:19
  1506:24 1507:7
  1509:3 1513:9,12
  1515:5 1526:11,16
  1531:22
Met.But 1448:2
Metropolitan 1353:9
  1353:11 1354:11
  1358:7 1359:2,8
  1360:13 1362:6
  1363:5 1364:2,22
  1365:9,15,20,23
  1366:6,20 1371:1,7
  1371:10,16,20,21
  1372:1,2,13,22
  1373:9 1377:20,20
  1382:10 1386:13,19
  1387:10,20 1388:19
  1390:9 1391:1,10
  1392:8,14,22 1393:16
```

1394:7,24 1395:2,12 1395:13,21 1396:1 1397:20 1399:3 1400:3,15,25 1402:11 1402:16,19,22 1403:1 1403:10,23 1404:20 1405:7,18 1408:18 1410:13.15.16 1412:1 1412:2,5,10,20 1413:7,10 1414:4,10 1415:23 1416:14 1417:7 1419:11 1421:15 1424:16 1425:4 1428:6,10,14 1428:20 1429:4,9,10 1429:13,19 1433:1,7 1433:19 1434:4 1435:13,20 1436:8,9 1436:18 1437:9,14 1440:18 1441:16 1442:24 1443:5 1444:7,13 1449:8 1451:2 1454:11,16,25 1455:6 1456:25 1457:4 1461:17,23 1463:25 1466:11,12 1466:17 1468:18 1471:6,10 1487:12 1499:7 1500:20,21 1505:6 1510:1 1523:18 1525:9 metropolitan's 1357:7 1361:17 1369:7,13 1370:9,21,23,24 1371:23 1373:17 1375:3,7,18,23 1377:15 1379:8 1387:15,25 1388:1 1391:8 1392:10 1395:17 1402:10,12 1402:13 1403:11 1404:24 1405:1,3 1413:11,16 1425:7 1432:13 1433:12 1436:2 1457:12 1458:19 1460:20 1461:4 1503:2 mid-1990s 1428:6,14 mid-2000s 1428:21 middle 1463:24 miles 1390:8 Miller 1464:14 million 1407:17 1408:19 1442:11 1472:14 1475:1,10,13 1515:24 millions 1462:6,7,8,11

1462:13

1420:14,17,25,25

mind 1512:1 10	1469.7 1405.21	1523:25 1528:22	1479:7 1490:20	offor 1445:2 1447:5
mind 1512:1,19	1468:7 1495:21		14/9:/ 1490:20	offer 1445:2 1447:5
1514:23 1531:4	1527:21	neither 1502:11	0	1449:14 1464:7
minimum 1477:25	moved 1387:15,17	1529:12		1473:19 1479:19
minute 1376:14,16	1435:18 1439:18	NEST 1354:3	oath 1357:21	1501:12 1513:24
1391:22	1508:14,15	never 1365:10 1414:6	<b>object</b> 1363:15 1376:20	1529:1
<b>minutes</b> 1356:7	movement 1413:10	1420:17,25,25	1379:1 1402:3 1415:2	offered 1470:10
1391:25 1392:1	moves 1442:24	1428:10,14 1431:4,7	1423:12 1434:5	offering 1485:10,11
1437:17 1449:20	moving 1371:8 1405:3	1431:22 1433:6,18	1438:18,19 1495:13	offhand 1461:19
1451:16,19 1489:10	1416:19 1424:23	1481:9,10 1496:24	1495:18 1499:14	<b>OFFICE</b> 1354:16
1493:17	<b>MWD</b> 1356:6,14	1532:15	1508:14 1527:21	<b>Oh</b> 1446:11 1481:17
misheard 1505:24	1378:7 1386:2 1449:4	new 1364:23 1372:4	<b>objected</b> 1369:5 1485:9	okay 1358:18 1360:1
misinterpretation	1450:11,12 1465:11	1374:5,11 1375:20	objecting 1378:9	1368:11 1406:14
1454:14	1465:19 1470:23,24	1381:17 1386:7	1500:10 1520:22	1413:16 1432:20
misspoken 1505:24	1471:7,23 1474:23	1406:21,23 1407:6	<b>objection</b> 1362:20,21	1434:17 1436:20
mistake 1452:12	1487:25 1488:16	1422:4,11,14,21	1363:13 1364:9	1458:22 1466:18
misunderstood	1489:18 1490:2	1423:3 1425:7 1457:1	1365:6 1366:12,22	1496:9 1508:4
1517:24 1519:8	1514:19 1523:17	1468:14,16	1367:6,7,12,17,21	omitted 1376:24,25
mode 1383:6	1528:4,10 1529:8	ngoldberg@kvn.com	1368:18,23 1369:21	Once 1425:24
modification 1510:3	MWD's 1450:7 1514:4	1354:9	1374:21 1383:18,19	one-page 1376:9
modifications 1526:3		NICHOLAS 1354:5	1385:22 1388:6	ones 1411:4
modified 1425:5	N	nine 1494:1	1389:4 1404:7	ongoing 1416:8
modify 1425:10	N 1355:1	Nineteen-and-a-half	1416:25 1417:3	1517:25
moment 1466:20	name 1380:20 1381:1,4	1443:24	1424:21 1426:12,13	open 1377:22 1482:11
1519:16	1397:13 1443:20	Nods 1379:11	1436:25 1443:2	operate 1435:1,3
money 1366:1 1368:8	named 1393:25	non 1370:1,7 1371:8	1445:1,3 1447:4,6	operations 1441:7
1413:7,21 1416:3	1534:11	non-meritorious	1449:14,17 1452:16	opinion 1432:5 1434:1
1418:22 1419:2,3	necessarily 1455:20	1384:4	1464:7,9 1468:6	1453:24 1454:3
1429:2,5,10 1430:1	1509:5	non-Metropolitan	1470:7,9 1473:19,20	opportunity 1439:5
1476:7 1501:3,4,21	necessary 1439:16	1387:18	1473:24 1479:18,20	1504:18 1526:11
monies 1420:19	need 1380:4,6 1381:8	non-State 1387:17	1485:23,23 1486:10	1529:9
month 1468:12	1381:16 1404:24	non-SWP 1440:19	1495:10,20 1501:11	opposed 1396:11
month-and-a-half	1411:7 1413:9 1415:3	nonnegotiable 1425:17	1501:14 1507:20	opposite 1503:20
1374:14	1426:25 1429:2,10	1425:23 1426:2	1508:12,18,20	option 1431:8,10,22
monthly 1468:11	1439:11 1441:21	nonproject 1441:20	1511:12 1512:22	1468:13,14 1472:8,23
months 1384:19,23	1495:3	noon 1437:17,24	1513:24,25 1520:7,11	1478:16,21,22 1479:2
morning 1357:6 1358:3	needed 1366:16	normal 1377:16	1520:13 1521:1,8	1514:9 1516:1
1358:4 1364:24	1468:15 1526:2	North 1354:17	1522:22 1523:1,10	Option-1 1384:17,20
1411:16,17	needing 1370:8	note 1392:19 1433:1	1525:1	1384:24 1385:10
motion 1357:7 1392:5	needs 1398:8 1399:19	1470:17	objectionable 1378:10	1466:15,18 1468:15
1393:5 1423:14	1400:17 1401:2	noted 1363:16	objections 1358:14,17	1472:11,15 1480:11
1495:5	1408:11 1429:15	notice 1377:22	1378:12 1508:10	1482:22 1488:4
motive 1486:1	1466:5 1489:24	Notwithstanding	1518:2 1525:11	Option-2 1384:18,21
mount 1372:3		e e	objective 1418:1	1384:25 1385:11
mount 13/2:3 mounted 1371:22	negotiable 1426:15 negotiate 1512:11	1390:24 1391:5 1484:21	Objectives 1514:18	
				1466:16,18 1468:16
move 1362:16 1363:11	1526:12 1531:15 negotiated 1453:25	number 1355:12	objects 1460:17 1461:1	1472:23 1474:21,23
1364:7 1365:4	- C	1366:14 1380:7,11,25	obligation 1365:11	1476:23 1478:6
1366:10 1367:4,11,15	1472:17 1509:13,17	1382:9 1385:16,19	obligations 1388:17	1480:11,13 1483:12
1367:19,23 1369:20	1532:11	1389:13 1392:14,16	<b>obtain</b> 1370:7 1426:21	1484:7,18 1485:21
1370:8 1374:19	negotiating 1456:13	1396:7,22,22 1407:3	obtaining 1370:16	1487:22,24 1488:13
1376:6 1387:8,9	1463:22 1466:25	1414:13 1430:16	<b>obvious</b> 1383:20	1490:13 1493:12
1392:7 1402:23	1469:8 1483:22	1442:10,23 1446:6	occasion 1455:5	1515:12,23
1404:24 1405:1	1524:12	1448:24 1468:17	1506:19	options 1464:23
1407:19 1408:21	negotiation 1364:18	1488:9 1509:24	occur 1426:3	1466:12 1468:13
1410:25 1411:2	1426:3 1463:17	1516:10 1520:3	occurred 1423:5	1472:4 1474:12,16
1424:19 1429:16	1497:1 1529:6	1529:3	October 1445:18,22	1478:3
	negotiations 1496:10	numbered 1459:11	1452:20 1463:19	<b>Orange</b> 1396:20
1430:25 1431:8	_		1 450 1 6 1 155 5	
1436:13,23 1438:14	1496:23 1499:22	numbers 1394:5	1470:16 1472:5	order 1372:25 1391:13
	_	<b>numbers</b> 1394:5 1466:21 1467:14,16	1470:16 1472:5 1486:23,24	<b>order</b> 1372:25 1391:13 1409:2 1412:21

1417:25 1420:17 1493:25 1511:7 organizations 1381:2 1383:1 originated 1385:7 ought 1456:1 **outdoor** 1408:9 outlining 1474:12.15 overall 1415:11 1418:1 1420:24 1444:5 1459:4 overarching 1418:6 overhear 1525:2 overruled 1362:23 1383:23 1404:8 1468:9 1520:15 1521:3,9 oversee 1405:24 owned 1369:15 owner 1387:3 ownership 1386:23 1387:10,23 1392:9,19 1392:23 1393:6 owns 1386:17 1401:10 1402:2

#### P

**p.m** 1438:3 package 1504:2,21 packages 1504:17 page 1359:24,24 1369:25 1370:12 1376:12 1377:4,5 1386:7 1406:1 1409:22 1412:14,16 1413:12,13 1416:23 1426:7 1445:18 1446:6,7 1449:23,24 1452:15 1458:4,5,11 1458:12 1459:9 1462:20 1474:10,20 1478:9 1480:2,4,10 1483:9,14,14,25 1484:6 1496:2 1500:15 1511:10 1513:3 1514:6.18 pages 1353:13 1359:8 1376:8 1411:4,6 1438:21,24 1439:3,10 1471:19 1472:2 1482:20 1502:9 1509:23 paid 1404:12,13 paragraph 1362:14 1363:6 1364:18 1365:11 1369:24

1370:11,13 1372:20

1373:13 1374:1,24

1425:3 1437:6,8 1440:14,15,25 1450:1 1450:2,16 1457:18,18 1458:5,12,15 1459:11 1460:3.4.13.14 1462:19 1466:4 1476:24 1478:1,9 1480:14 1500:25 1510:4 1531:17 parentheses 1531:24 park 1408:9 parlance 1390:9 **parole** 1486:5 part 1360:23 1361:11 1363:14 1368:7 1376:14 1385:10 1386:13,19,21 1387:2 1390:15 1400:8 1402:12,13 1404:2 1405:4 1406:8,14 1407:25 1408:5 1413:23 1422:8 1423:25 1427:23 1433:1,15,16 1435:5 1447:3 1460:23 1486:13 1492:15 1503:25 1526:15 1531:7 partially 1408:18 participate 1422:10,20 1423:3 1428:3 participated 1360:12 1361:8 1522:16 participating 1445:20 particular 1409:13 1428:12 1447:21 1448:7 1455:18 1456:25 1467:12 1480:13 parties 1366:21 1379:6 1395:5,6 1429:20 1486:3 1510:6 **partners** 1398:12 partnership 1514:19 party 1440:23 1496:13 1497:5 passage 1511:10 passed 1402:25 1517:21,22 1519:12 path 1466:7 Pathways 1472:4 pay 1387:5,19,24 1394:14 1409:8 1420:1 1433:16,21 1477:15,17,25

1377:6,7,14 1389:11

1389:18,21,22

1390:22 1394:8

1480:16 1485:2 1490:2 1492:17 1500:19 1507:19 1515:16,24,25 1516:2 1516:8.21.23 1526:1 1526:16,20 1528:14 1529:8 1532:2 pay-as-you-go 1457:22 paying 1420:8 1477:1 1492:12 1508:5,12,18 payment 1388:4 1491:9 payments 1364:3 1365:16 1366:7 1386:25 1388:3,15,22 1389:2 pays 1403:24 1420:15 1472:12,24 1507:14 1508:9 peace 1386:7 1471:20 1514:20 **pendency** 1500:20 **pending** 1451:14 people 1380:25 1470:18 1495:3 1520:4,22 percent 1435:19 1465:11,11,12 1467:9 1468:20 1483:2 1485:3 1487:13,16,16 1499:3 1511:1 percentage 1416:13,16 1417:8,11 **perform** 1508:17,23 1509:6 1510:16 performance 1509:3 1515:6 performed 1515:10 period 1358:23 1360:3 1400:5 1406:20 1465:20,24 1467:18 1483:6 1505:18 1506:18 1511:22 1512:21 1513:20 1523:5 1529:7 1530:8 1530:25 permanent 1441:7 permission 1441:21 **permit** 1372:1 1393:9 permits 1370:1,6 permitted 1371:21 1528:14 person 1359:7 1383:8 1452:10,14,18 1496:1 1496:23 personally 1481:6

persuade 1359:2 pertaining 1529:22 Petitioner 1353:7 1354:2 phase 1376:24,25 1434:9 **phone** 1375:12 1455:23 **photo** 1495:14 phrase 1385:13 1392:19 **phrases** 1403:4 pick 1489:10 1532:23 picture 1495:9,19,21 1495:22 **pictures** 1495:16 pie 1412:22 1487:11 piece 1402:24 pipe 1408:8 place 1373:10 1440:17 1441:1,3,6,9,11,15,19 1441:25 1442:2 1467:5 1486:5 1488:4 1534:11 placed 1405:17 placement 1524:6 plain 1530:23 Plaintiff 1353:7 1354:2 1485:8 Plaintiff's 1357:8 1363:14 1526:25 plan 1356:14 1418:8 1467:7 1514:5 planned 1458:24 **planning** 1390:11 1471:8 plans 1375:2 1431:16 **plant** 1408:7 **playing** 1363:16 please 1358:21 1359:22 1366:4 1367:4 1384:9 1387:2 1390:23 1394:16 1397:13 1404:9 1407:21 1408:14 1424:14 1425:3 1426:6 1436:14 1443:13 1445:12 1447:1 1449:12,23 1487:9,21 1495:21 1511:13 1527:1 1531:14,25 **plus** 1491:10 point 1362:4,19 1380:12 1382:6 1385:13 1399:16 1401:22 1402:10,16 1403:11 1410:15 1424:9,11 1455:1 1480:23 1481:7

1489:9 1493:20 1494:23 1496:22 1497:5 1499:24 1523:21 point-to-point 1382:22 **pointing** 1439:2 points 1385:11,16 1465:3 1466:6 1492:20.24 policies 1371:2 policy 1356:11 1380:25 1383:14 1396:9 1418:19 1479:15,23 1480:24 portion 1442:23 1485:24 1510:20 **posed** 1370:18 **position** 1364:11 1373:15 1397:22,23 1450:7 1473:3 1475:20 1486:12 1516:18 1523:13 1532:14 positive 1459:15,21 1469:13 **possesses** 1420:14 1440:16 possibility 1530:21 **possible** 1391:24 1430:2 1469:1 1530:20 Possibly 1439:4 post-trial 1439:2 postage 1382:22 potential 1431:4 1450:9 1465:3 1467:12 1478:21 1479:1 power 1358:11 1444:19 1446:14 1453:13 1459:10,13,17 1460:6 1460:6,12 1477:6,21 1480:20 1484:10 1507:25 1508:6 1525:20 **PowerPoint** 1445:14,25 1470:8 1487:1,3 1514:4 PowerPoints 1471:3 **practice** 1503:18 pre-decision 1419:19 **preceded** 1384:23 precedent 1526:8 1528:18 preclude 1530:5 preclusive 1393:12 **predated** 1384:19

predecessor 1372:15

1497:22 1498:11,13

1517:2,15 1518:22

**PERSONS** 1353:10

1372:16	1531:15	1414:17,21,22,25	1466:6 1497:25	1436:12
preferential 1382:21	problems 1526:4	1415:10,12,14,24	promised 1493:25	PTX 1359:20 1362:11
1450:21 1451:3,15	procedural 1530:17	1416:10,15,18 1417:8	promising 1529:17	1362:16,24,25 1363:1
prejudice 1450:21	<b>procedure</b> 1365:14,21	1417:19,20,25 1418:7	proper 1357:11,12	1363:12,21,24 1364:7
prepare 1376:19	1502:2,23	1418:9,18,20,23	1523:14	1364:12,13,14,23
1438:15 1479:14	<b>proceed</b> 1357:15	1419:6 1420:23,23	properly 1373:1	1365:7,8 1366:4,10
prepared 1398:15	1359:21 1393:8	1421:7 1422:11,21	1458:25 1525:23	1366:17 1367:4,5,8
1474:11 1480:4,7	1495:23	1428:3,5,8,11 1429:3	proportional 1420:18	1367:10,11,13,15,16
1513:4	proceedings 1353:15	1429:13,23 1430:7,12	1421:1	1367:18,19,20,22,23
present 1434:9 1466:23	1534:10	1431:22,23 1432:11	proposal 1383:14	1367:24 1368:18,20
1469:23 1476:1	process 1360:25 1361:6	1432:13 1442:9,12	1384:14,16 1396:6	1369:16,22 1372:9
1483:10 1489:17	1361:9,12,22 1362:3	1462:23 1463:1	1424:22 1445:22	1376:1,6 1377:2
1490:7,9 1491:4,23	1363:6 1369:11	project 1369:7,12	1446:3,13 1462:12	1384:9 1385:2
1492:5 1493:25	1377:16,23 1385:10	1370:2,7,8 1371:8,9	1473:4 1488:12	1389:15,17 1392:11
presentation 1355:19	1425:18,19 1441:14	1386:11,23 1387:1,16	proposals 1481:5	1393:25 1424:14,15
1445:14 1446:1	1441:18 1444:8	1387:17 1388:4,15	propose 1496:13,21	1424:19,22,25
1471:3,7 1487:1,4	1523:8	1392:9,15,24 1393:17	1497:5,21 1498:1	1436:14,17,23 1437:1
presented 1373:3	processes 1360:13	1395:8 1398:9 1401:8	1517:14 1518:19	1437:3 1439:18
1430:21,24 1431:7,22	<b>produce</b> 1399:17	1402:8 1409:8,8	1519:4	1440:8 1500:14
1487:2 1491:18,21,25	1400:16 1401:1,19,20	1418:3 1423:20,23,24	proposed 1384:21,25	public 1377:22 1481:1
1492:3 1499:1	1410:3 1419:11	1423:25 1431:1,8	1396:7,20 1436:18	1487:3 1519:15
presenting 1491:1,23	produced 1401:11,14	1432:3 1433:3,8,22	1450:7,8,11,12,19	1523:15
1492:5	1401:24 1407:24	1434:23 1435:2,3,5,9	1454:16 1457:12	publicly 1482:8,17
President 1521:19	1408:19 1409:12,21	1435:10,15,18 1436:1	1463:25 1483:5,5	1523:16,16
presume 1473:12	1414:11,22 1416:11	1437:4,10 1440:24	1485:18 1491:14	published 1480:18
pretty 1378:17 1462:5	1442:9	1441:1,2,4,4,11,12	1496:24 1498:9	pull 1389:10 1390:14
prevented 1502:1,22	producing 1408:5,19	1442:4 1446:23	proposing 1396:17	pulled 1365:2
previous 1407:4 1489:7	1410:16 1414:19	1451:20 1452:24	1440:22	pump 1391:15
previously 1447:3	production 1405:23	1453:14 1454:8,13	protects 1484:11	Purcell 1354:4 1358:2
price 1365:17 1394:13	1408:14,16 1409:14	1460:9,12,19 1461:24	protest 1364:5 1366:7	1359:6,11,20,23
1488:24 1490:15	1409:17 1462:21	1474:25 1476:25	protested 1369:10	1362:16 1363:1,11,18
1496:15,16,16,21	proffering 1396:22	1477:21 1491:13,16	prove 1368:1	1363:24 1364:7,14
1497:3,6,7 1498:22	program 1371:14,16,17	1496:14,25 1497:6,12 1497:22 1498:10	provide 1363:19	1365:4,9 1366:3,10 1366:15,19 1367:3,10
1498:24 1499:11,15 1500:7,10,18 1501:3	1379:16,22 1380:13 1398:5 1399:4,4,11	1503:8 1506:24	1380:14 1398:3 1399:9 1402:17,21	1367:15,19,23 1368:2
			*	1368:9,15,21 1369:3
1515:12,15 1516:21 1527:6,24 1528:3	1399:12,12,13 1400:7 1405:9 1406:16,22	1507:6,12,18,24 1508:7,13,16,19,22	1421:7,8,10,12 1422:17 1440:19	1369:20,24 1374:19
1531:16,19,20,24	1407:3,25 1408:2,2	1508.7,15,10,19,22	1450:12 1459:2	1374:24 1376:6,11,23
1531:10,19,20,24	1407.3,23 1408.2,2 1408:23 1409:12,20	1510:7,12,16,22	1481:13,24	1377:4 1379:4
prices 1532:15	1416:1 1417:23	1517:2,5,15 1518:3	provided 1419:9	1381:12 1385:22
prices 1332.13 pricing 1389:19	1419:9 1422:17	1517.2,5,15 1518.5	1450:3 1469:11	1386:18 1388:6
1394:23,25	1423:3,7,25 1425:8	1520:6,11,23 1521:15	1477:14 1481:9	1389:4 1392:4,7,13
primary 1411:20,24	1425:3,7,25 1425:0	1520:0,11,25 1321:15	1500:20 1528:16	1396:25
1504:14	1428:24 1442:7	1523:19	1529:25	purchase 1399:6
prior 1362:1 1370:16	1470:23	project-by-project	provides 1399:5,13	1406:18
1447:19 1448:5	program's 1407:15	1418:2	1502:8	purchased 1387:14
1461:22 1500:1	1408:17	projected 1428:20	providing 1406:16	purchases 1405:7,8
1505:19 1506:19	programs 1397:25	projection 1468:3	1409:6 1421:16	purchasing 1436:4
1523:14	1398:3,3,25 1399:1,2	1469:6	1429:19 1439:8,10	purpose 1368:3 1390:2
priority 1483:16	1399:3 1400:13,23	projections 1466:21	1459:4	1394:23 1507:12
private 1523:15	1401:10,12,18,18,25	1499:1	proving 1368:3	1528:12
probably 1363:10	1402:20,21 1403:20	projects 1380:14	provision 1368:5	purposes 1391:5
1382:11 1420:11	1403:24,25 1404:22	1399:14,17 1400:11	1374:1 1381:9 1422:1	1394:8,20 1438:16
1435:21 1472:7	1404:23 1405:5	1400:16,16 1401:1,1	1422:4 1425:6,21	1478:16
1477:19 1508:15	1406:6,7,15,15	1408:17 1414:7,8	1500:17,22 1501:1,23	pursuant 1527:25
1522:23	1409:5,18 1410:14	1419:12 1420:6	provisions 1371:1	1531:17
problem 1376:14	1411:22 1412:3	1422:5,11,15,16	1390:24 1422:24	pursued 1420:6
1395:16 1519:24	1413:6,9,19 1414:3,8	1423:4 1429:11	1424:10,11 1427:2	put 1366:23 1369:16

	I	I	I	I
1372:9 1373:10	1521:1,8 1522:22	1467:5 1472:13,20,24	read 1359:6 1379:20	1367:9,14 1369:2,23
1382:24 1384:9	1523:10 1525:1	1473:7,11,13 1477:1	1385:25 1392:12	1374:23 1377:3
1386:8 1409:2 1418:8	1527:21	1477:4,12,12,16,21	1411:7 1427:3,10,13	1421:3 1425:1 1437:2
1431:24 1433:6,18,20	Quinn's 1523:21	1477:21,22 1478:6,10	1434:12 1439:11	1443:3 1445:11
	_			
1447:9 1455:12,15	<b>QUINN,ESQ</b> 1354:13	1478:15,17 1480:17	1450:1,18 1452:13,17	1446:21 1447:8
1456:2,20,22 1461:13	quite 1495:1	1480:18 1481:12	1463:1,2 1476:17,19	1449:16 1464:11
1464:24 1466:12	quote 1377:20 1461:2	1483:1 1484:9,25	1486:6 1493:3	1470:12 1473:22
1494:20 1521:24	1484:7	1485:2,18 1487:25	1495:25 1500:24	1479:22 1486:15
1526:10,25 1527:3		1488:16,19,21	1511:9	1489:16 1501:16
1529:4	R	1489:19,22 1490:2,2	readily 1483:15	1503:12 1514:2
	raise 1493:20,21		readiness-to-serve	1515:1,4,9
<b>putting</b> 1438:23		1490:6,10,11,19,19		, , ,
	1519:24	1491:10,17 1492:12	1390:18 1391:6	receives 1400:8
Q	raised 1370:14 1517:7	1492:18 1496:25	1394:22	receiving 1395:12
<b>QSA</b> 1373:16,18	1517:10	1499:23 1502:3,5	reading 1359:23	1400:14,24 1447:18
1375:6 1471:9 1474:5	raises 1485:16	1503:7,9 1504:1,20	1411:5 1412:18	1448:4
1493:8 1516:11	raising 1519:14	1507:19,22,25,25	1413:15 1417:1,5	recess 1392:2 1437:24
1523:25	rancor 1386:9	1508:6,6 1511:19	1426:14 1427:17	1493:19 1533:2
quality 1471:8	range 1465:21,23	1512:12 1513:9	1459:6 1497:10	recharge 1403:3
quantification 1375:6	1484:2 1490:4	1516:3,4,15,24	1511:14 1518:6	1405:22
1485:20	ranges 1465:22	1518:4 1520:6	reads 1370:13 1377:7	recipient 1371:22
quantity 1475:18	ranging 1483:2	1522:20 1523:19	1392:13 1513:8	Reclamation 1391:13
<b>question</b> 1368:17	<b>Rarely</b> 1505:7	1524:4,6,22 1525:11	real 1469:3	1395:7,15 1398:11
1370:13,18 1379:1	rate 1356:6 1358:7,9	1525:12,19,19,20,20	realistic 1469:18	recognize 1424:15,18
1382:24 1385:23	1358:20 1359:3	1525:12,15,15,26,26	realistically 1468:4	1447:14 1501:17
			•	
1386:14,16,18 1388:7	1360:23,24 1364:4	1526:19,21 1527:11	1469:25	recollection 1396:7,13
1388:8,9 1404:10	1371:13,23 1372:2,4	1528:4,11,13,24	really 1358:15,20	1425:9 1502:21
1410:24 1412:19	1372:23,25 1373:3,10	1529:3,8 1530:11,12	1362:18 1363:16	recommendation
1414:23 1423:13,18	1374:6,11 1375:3,7	1531:3,5,22	1366:24 1380:24,24	1431:5 1450:17
1423:19 1427:4,5,10	1375:19,20,23	rate-related 1430:17	1381:6 1393:6 1399:3	recommended 1450:6
1434:5,8 1446:15	1377:12,12,16,17,21	rates 1353:10 1356:4	1416:24 1469:24	1484:18
			1110.211107.21	1 10 1.10
1456:5 1459:20				
1456:5 1459:20 1467:25 1469:3	1378:9,19,23,25	1358:10 1360:15,19	reason 1405:4 1421:6	recommending 1485:5
1467:25 1469:3	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 <b>questions</b> 1383:21	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 <b>questions</b> 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 <b>questions</b> 1383:21	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 <b>questions</b> 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 <b>questions</b> 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 <b>questions</b> 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10     1385:24,25 1389:13     1393:10 1397:13     1415:14 1440:16     1447:4 1449:4     1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15     1403:2 1405:21     1408:21,23,24 1409:5
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10     1385:24,25 1389:13     1393:10 1397:13     1415:14 1440:16     1447:4 1449:4     1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15     1403:2 1405:21     1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15 1493:15 1494:14	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13 1458:17,22 1459:2,4	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8 reach 1385:11 1454:7	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11 1398:11 1400:21	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10 redirect 1355:2
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15 1493:15 1494:14 1495:13,24 1501:10	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13 1458:17,22 1459:2,4 1459:10,13,17,23	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10     1385:24,25 1389:13     1393:10 1397:13     1415:14 1440:16     1447:4 1449:4     1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15     1403:2 1405:21     1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22     1462:22 recycling 1399:15     1403:2 1405:21     1407:24 1408:2     1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10 redirect 1355:2     1381:14 1382:3
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15 1493:15 1494:14	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13 1458:17,22 1459:2,4	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8 reach 1385:11 1454:7	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11 1398:11 1400:21	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10 redirect 1355:2
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15 1493:15 1494:14 1495:13,24 1501:10	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13 1458:17,22 1459:2,4 1459:10,13,17,23	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8 reach 1385:11 1454:7 1454:10 1458:4	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11 1398:11 1400:21 1401:5 1419:25	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10 redirect 1355:2 1381:14 1382:3
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15 1493:15 1494:14 1495:13,24 1501:10 1501:17 1505:1,2,5 1511:9,14 1512:24	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13 1458:17,22 1459:2,4 1459:10,13,17,23 1460:6,12,20 1461:3 1461:25,25 1462:18	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8 reach 1385:11 1454:7 1454:10 1458:4 1524:2 reached 1385:15	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11 1398:11 1400:21 1401:5 1419:25 1422:4 received 1362:25	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10 redirect 1355:2 1381:14 1382:3 1440:4,6 reduce 1399:9 1401:20
1467:25 1469:3 1481:2 1482:13 1493:23 1505:23,25 1506:1 1512:4 questions 1383:21 1398:19 1410:22 1424:8 1434:6 1437:19 1440:3 1453:12 1485:13 1499:18 quickly 1362:11 Quinn 1354:12 1391:24 1443:5,17,20 1444:25 1445:4,9,12 1447:1 1447:14 1449:11,19 1452:17 1458:9,10 1464:6,12,17 1470:5 1470:10,13 1473:17 1473:25 1479:17,23 1482:15 1485:7,11,16 1486:16 1489:12,15 1493:15 1494:14 1495:13,24 1501:10 1501:17 1505:1,2,5	1378:9,19,23,25 1379:8,13,16,17,18 1379:21 1380:3,8 1381:8,9 1382:17,18 1384:1,6 1387:19,24 1395:23 1396:14 1403:23 1404:1,3,4 1404:13,19 1411:21 1415:15 1418:23 1420:1,10,19 1421:23 1421:25 1422:3,9 1423:21 1424:1,17 1425:6,10,16,20 1426:19 1430:17,21 1431:2,5,19 1432:2 1444:16,22,23 1446:3 1446:14,14,18,24 1448:1,2,12,12 1450:8,8,13 1451:6 1451:10,21 1452:2,4 1452:25 1453:2,18,21 1454:9,17 1458:6,13 1458:17,22 1459:2,4 1459:10,13,17,23 1460:6,12,20 1461:3	1358:10 1360:15,19 1361:17 1369:7 1373:17 1377:21,24 1382:23 1430:20 1432:14 1435:7 1444:8,10,14,17 1447:20,25 1448:6,11 1450:7,11,19 1451:8 1451:20 1452:1,4 1454:12 1457:1,1,5 1457:12 1459:1 1461:18,20 1463:11 1465:24 1477:6 1481:19 1482:9,17 1484:21 1497:25 1499:7,12 1500:1 1503:2,18 1504:1,7 1504:13,19 1505:16 1506:2,4,16 1513:11 1519:3 1520:12,24 1521:16,22 1523:2 re-ask 1434:8 reach 1385:11 1454:7 1454:10 1458:4 1524:2	reason 1405:4 1421:6 1466:20 1494:12 reasons 1371:5 1379:21 1379:25 1382:9 1450:3 1494:22 1526:2 rebates 1419:17 recall 1357:20 1369:19 1372:5 1393:20 1396:17,19 1423:13 1424:13 1433:4 1444:7,10 1445:20 1446:24 1447:18 1448:3,14 1457:6 1461:19 1463:23 1464:2 1465:22 1466:11,16,17 1486:16 1487:1 1492:12 1496:19 1499:3 1500:4,5,12 1500:17 1503:5 receive 1395:5,11 1398:11 1400:21 1401:5 1419:25 1422:4	recommending 1485:5 record 1364:10 1385:24,25 1389:13 1393:10 1397:13 1415:14 1440:16 1447:4 1449:4 1496:10 1503:22 recordings 1505:8,11 records 1470:14 recovered 1404:1 recovery 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1408:21,23,24 1409:5 recross 1355:2 1396:25 recycled 1407:19,22 1462:22 recycling 1399:15 1403:2 1405:21 1407:24 1408:2 1409:7 red 1486:2 redacted 1411:8,10 redirect 1355:2 1381:14 1382:3 1440:4,6

reduced 1412:5	1431:15 1451:13	1405.17 19		mallad 1452:1
		1405:17,18	rid 1409:3 1528:18 right 1358:10 1359:6	rolled 1453:1
1416:20 1417:24	1481:10,11,12	requires 1403:1	8	Ron 1372:12 1526:8
1487:15 1534:12	1485:19 1508:18	requiring 1462:23	1360:15,21 1366:25	room 1439:9 1495:17
reduces 1402:22	1514:4 1516:9,11	reservation 1375:5,18	1367:2 1371:12	roughly 1466:13
1430:4	1524:14	1451:13,18	1372:6 1373:16	RPR 1353:20 1534:23
reducing 1416:18	relates 1368:9 1394:16	reserved 1379:25	1374:5 1375:23	RSA 1378:22
reductions 1428:21	1456:14	1458:1	1378:25 1379:7,19,25	<b>RSI</b> 1378:19 1380:5,12
refer 1402:25 1403:13	relating 1452:11,23	reserves 1458:21,25	1380:2 1381:7	1383:10,15 1422:24
1405:16 1445:5	relationship 1420:18	reserving 1373:16	1383:16 1390:3	1424:10 1425:23
1458:6	1421:1	1374:5	1392:6,24,25 1401:21	rule 1521:3
reference 1373:25	relevance 1362:21	residents 1406:17	1409:14 1414:14	rules 1363:17 1495:2
1374:1 1460:8	1485:9,14,23	reso 1386:2,2	1416:24 1417:1	ruling 1357:13
1463:10 1473:5	reliability 1373:2	resolution 1361:22	1419:5,15 1420:2,10	run 1404:23 1406:15
1514:6	1483:15	1362:3 1363:6	1421:19 1425:17	1466:21 1467:14,15
referenced 1445:15	reliable 1514:10	1365:11 1386:3,10	1429:6 1430:3 1433:2	1479:7
1473:13 1498:5	relying 1439:10	1504:22 1523:6	1433:7,10,12,13,17	running 1418:18
1503:15	remain 1377:15,19	resolved 1501:5	1433:19 1435:21	1516:1
references 1463:6	1378:18	resource 1371:17	1436:6 1437:15	runs 1399:3
1499:21	remedy 1529:10	1398:2 1400:13,23	1441:5 1446:9 1459:3	rush 1493:22
referred 1399:20	remember 1361:24	1418:8 1422:5,11,15	1460:24 1464:24	rushing 1527:3
1403:21 1440:25	1378:12 1386:14	1422:21 1423:3	1465:21 1466:19	
1501:24	1442:21 1445:23	1429:11 1462:25	1471:5 1472:18	S
referring 1373:21	1486:22 1494:16	resources 1397:24,25	1473:23 1474:5,7,12	<b>S</b> 1354:5
1393:14 1401:6	1525:23	1398:5,10 1399:12,25	1477:14 1478:23	S-T-A-P-L-E-T-O-N
1472:7 1500:22	remind 1411:9	1400:7 1412:21	1479:4,5 1484:19	1443:14
1522:3	repair 1510:1	1419:9 1422:16	1486:25 1488:10,17	<b>sadly</b> 1498:16
refers 1370:6 1408:24	repeated 1523:23	1426:23 1433:24	1491:6,7 1492:7	salt 1409:1
1464:14 1489:21	repeatedly 1432:21	1440:17 1471:8	1500:4 1501:8	San 1353:2,6,16,17,24
1502:18	rephrase 1422:7	respect 1435:8 1451:20	1503:13,23 1505:12	1354:6 1357:1
refinement 1360:25	rephrased 1379:2	1469:2 1530:14	1507:11,12 1516:6,16	1358:14 1359:1
1430:17	report 1356:4,13	respond 1362:9	1517:17,18 1527:7	1366:6 1369:5
reflect 1471:4	1405:16,19,23 1406:1	responded 1362:6	1529:23 1532:5	1373:15,21 1374:5,10
reflected 1378:14	1406:4,21 1414:11,12	1365:23	right-hand 1448:22,23	1375:2,22 1378:24
1451:15,18 1492:23	1414:19 1438:14	Respondent 1354:11	1449:24	1379:6,23,24 1380:2
1492:24 1526:22	reported 1353:19	Respondents 1353:14	<b>rights</b> 1370:21 1377:9	1380:5,9,20 1381:4,6
reflecting 1469:23	1415:9	response 1364:17,22	1382:21 1387:4,5,9	1381:6,10 1382:7,8
reflects 1364:11	<b>Reporter</b> 1534:8,24	1378:8 1392:10,16	1387:11,16 1388:14	1384:13 1386:1
1449:11	REPORTER'S	1419:21	1392:22 1393:3,4,16	1387:12,17,19 1390:6
refresh 1372:8 1425:9	1353:15 1534:1	responsibilities	1440:24 1450:21	1391:9 1422:4,10,14
1502:21	reporting 1406:8,20	1405:24 1444:3	1451:3,15 1474:24,24	1422:20 1423:2,6,7
refuses 1427:19	reports 1446:22	responsible 1444:5	1476:25 1480:16	1423:10,20,23 1424:2
refusing 1437:9	represent 1407:13	rest 1494:10	risk 1372:21 1441:15	1424:9,10,16 1429:9
regard 1455:17 1529:6	1409:11	restate 1404:9	1441:24 1442:1	1432:2,5 1435:25
regarded 1482:5	represents 1406:2	result 1404:25 1414:21	1467:18 1485:17	1436:3,10,18 1437:3
regarding 1366:7	1407:21 1408:15	1415:12 1423:6	1487:24,25 1488:15	1437:5,11 1438:1
1381:6 1451:15	request 1364:17	1430:10 1461:5	1490:14,18,21	1440:22 1442:25
1520:1 1530:25	1392:10,13,16	1510:2,9,10	1493:11 1526:14	1443:21 1444:4,14
region 1412:10 1415:11	1441:15 1460:11	resulting 1483:17	1528:21	1445:20 1446:2,17,21
1415:17	1495:6 1508:4	resumed 1355:4	Risk/Benefit 1487:23	1448:25 1449:7,20
regional 1390:12	requested 1437:4	1357:18 1358:1	risks 1483:11 1484:6	1451:1,5,7,7,23,24
1414:4,6,15,17,24,25	1465:18 1504:3	1438:7	1485:21	1452:5,10 1455:7
1415:3,5,17 1420:24	1506:19 1507:10	revenue 1457:25	river 1391:16,18,19	1456:2,20 1458:19
1421:8 1428:7	requesting 1507:5	review 1361:6,12	1395:5,6,9,11,18,21	1460:17 1461:1,23
regular 1415:22	requests 1439:6	1504:17	1398:12 1483:23,24	1463:24 1464:2
regulation 1502:15	require 1370:22,24	reviewed 1450:8	1509:8	1465:2 1466:12,13,14
1528:1 1531:19	1371:9	revised 1450:17	Riverside 1396:21	1469:15,19 1470:3
related 1360:14	required 1373:1 1425:6	<b>RFA</b> 1393:7,11	role 1372:16 1463:17	1471:14,23 1472:7
1377:24 1428:24	requirements 1377:23	<b>Richard</b> 1522:14	1463:21 1522:13	1474:12 1484:25
•				

1485:5 1487:2,10,11	1469:13 1479:8	1449:19,24,25	set 1365:15 1366:1	similarly 1365:14
1487:17 1488:22	1483:6 1485:1,4	1450:14,23 1457:13	1368:4,8,8,13 1416:1	1407:23 1453:11
1490:1 1493:12	*	1457:14 1458:2,3,6	1477:4 1494:9 1495:5	1508:16
	scenarios 1467:4			
1495:25 1496:22	1469:16,23	1458:16 1459:10	1501:21 1527:24	simply 1384:1 1410:10
1498:21,25 1499:6,10	schedule 1510:3,13	1460:2,15,21 1461:8	1528:4 1529:22	1509:7 1512:16,21
1499:14,25 1500:6	scope 1444:3	1465:12,16 1466:9	1531:22	single 1381:24 1503:1
1501:3,7,18,20	scorecard 1406:2,4	1468:3 1470:1	set-aside 1365:20	single-spaced 1457:17
1502:1,11,22 1503:6	Scott 1452:9 1525:6	1471:19,20,25 1473:1	1368:4	sir 1357:22 1358:4
1503:11,12,18	scrambled 1494:18	1477:7 1480:2,21	<b>setting</b> 1360:14	1381:14 1382:8
1505:11,14,16 1506:3	screen 1359:11,12,15	1482:23 1483:12,18	1377:21,23 1457:11	1386:18 1388:21
1506:14,19,20,23	1362:12 1363:2,25	1484:4,5 1488:1,23	settled 1424:7	1389:19 1392:3
1507:5,10,10,14,17	1364:15 1365:2	1489:19,22 1490:16	settlement 1375:6	1397:1 1398:24
1507:23 1508:9,17,21	1366:13 1372:9	1493:17 1502:7,10,16	1485:20	1430:19 1438:11
1509:16,20 1511:16	1406:3 1446:8,8,9	1502:24 1503:14,22	seven 1427:7,8,14	1440:21 1462:9
1511:25 1512:19	1447:10 1449:25	1509:24 1510:9	1494:3	1476:9 1532:24
1514:23 1515:1,9,15	1527:4	1513:13 1514:12,16	share 1481:23	sit 1449:8 1486:10
1515:22,25 1516:18	SDCWA 1390:25	1514:19,21 1533:1	shared 1390:13	1528:6
1519:24 1520:21	1394:6 1440:16	seek 1502:12 1529:9,13	sheet 1474:6,10,11,19	situation 1381:20,21
1522:19 1523:2,13	1448:24 1472:3,4,10	seeking 1381:1	Shoal 1378:6	1405:10 1408:24
1524:24 1525:25	1472:12,22,24,24	seen 1503:16 1516:14	shoes 1435:25 1436:2	1410:10 1441:23
1527:10 1528:6,12	1474:24,24 1476:25	selected 1531:22	short 1467:17	1530:22
1529:2,12 1530:5	1500:18 1509:24	sell 1400:18 1401:3	shorter 1526:5	situations 1419:24
1531:4,16 1532:1,7	1514:7	1402:9,15 1410:7,17	shorthand 1393:2	six 1482:20 1483:9
<b>SANDFORD</b> 1353:20	SDCWA's 1477:1	seller 1484:15	1534:7,24	1497:23 1517:16
1534:7,23	se 1445:24	Senate 1402:25	shot 1521:3	1518:23
Santa 1534:4,8,17	seated 1397:12 1443:13	1405:17	shovel-ready 1423:9	Sixteen 1413:2
satisfy 1365:11	seawater 1399:16	send 1455:21 1494:17	show 1366:3 1372:7	<b>Sixty-five</b> 1394:2,3
save 1406:18	second 1369:4,25	sending 1471:6	1376:1 1405:12	<b>SJWD</b> 1440:18
saved 1406:23	1373:13 1407:8	sends 1461:5	1495:9	skip 1472:2
saving 1407:5,10	1425:3 1426:8	sense 1392:22 1393:7	<b>showed</b> 1362:8 1405:19	<b>Slater</b> 1385:7 1452:9
savings 1406:23 1407:7	1450:16 1457:17,18	sensitivities 1465:10	1450:9	1452:10 1453:23
1407:9,16	1464:5 1466:3,4	sensitivity 1489:22	<b>showing</b> 1406:19	1495:25 1496:20,23
saw 1439:24	1472:12,23 1474:14	sent 1362:4,14 1363:4,9	1407:2,6,14,23	1512:14 1525:6
saying 1441:13,18	1474:20,22 1476:15	1364:2,16 1365:19	1408:16 1410:1	<b>Slater's</b> 1452:14,17
1455:17 1456:7	1479:1 1495:6 1496:4	1366:6 1369:17	1414:19	1511:10
1461:17 1472:23	1502:10 1513:3	1471:13 1474:3	shown 1384:8	slide 1446:5,12 1471:19
1483:15 1497:11	1526:7	1476:17 1478:14	shows 1406:4 1446:12	1472:10,22 1487:9,21
1499:7 1518:9	second-to-last 1458:12	sentence 1369:25	1487:10,11	1490:13,21
1521:14	1458:14	1374:12 1375:21	shutdown 1510:11	slides 1470:8
says 1369:25 1372:20	section 1361:22	1409:23 1440:15	side 1383:3 1398:16	small 1435:23
1392:21 1408:14	1377:12 1395:7	1458:6,11 1466:4	1446:10 1449:24	sold 1410:9
1450:2,16 1461:20	1460:9 1500:15	1478:10 1513:8	1498:2 1517:3 1519:5	sole 1466:7
1462:20 1466:5	1501:21 1502:7,9	separate 1415:8 1441:3	sides 1494:23	solve 1395:16 1526:4
1471:22 1472:3,10	1501.21 1502.7,9	September 1464:22	sign 1380:17 1426:18	solved 1395:13
			0	
1473:7 1474:10,21,23	secure 1487:18	1470:19 1474:1,10	1426:25 1427:20	somebody 1462:10
1476:24 1477:9,9	securing 1484:12,13	1486:17	signals 1461:6	1475:21 1486:21
1488:15 1491:4	see 1364:20 1365:1	service 1361:6,12	signature 1365:2,3	1520:10
1493:25 1500:17	1371:3 1373:7,19	1370:4 1373:6	signed 1364:21,21	someplace 1366:14
1502:11 1509:24	1374:17 1375:8	1403:10,14,17	1452:21 1454:5	sorry 1376:11 1471:1
1512:14,19 1514:9,14	1376:8 1377:12,25	1406:17 1418:10,12	1463:19 1486:18,21	1484:13 1505:2
1527:6,23 1529:11,23	1384:11,13,14 1385:3	1422:18 1437:4	1509:13,17	1511:8 1516:16
1529:25 1531:14,16	1385:5,19 1389:18,19	1446:21 1504:5	significant 1387:6	1517:24 1519:8
1532:1	1389:22,25 1391:2	services 1353:23	1431:19 1460:18	1521:5 1527:3
<b>SB-60</b> 1356:13 1405:16	1392:1 1394:9 1406:3	1507:20	1462:14,15	sought 1438:14,18
1414:12,19 1415:9	1408:13 1409:23	session 1481:25 1482:3	significantly 1484:6	1487:18
1418:25 1438:14	1421:1 1428:15,21	1482:11 1524:1	signing 1360:9 1380:12	sounds 1372:5
scenario 1436:3 1466:2	1445:17 1446:9,15	sessions 1481:1	similar 1409:6 1483:21	source 1409:25 1410:1
1466:23 1467:8,20	1448:19,21,24 1449:7	1523:13,20,22,24	1520:22 1524:24	1410:3,13,15
	•	•	•	•

<b>South</b> 1354:14	Stapleton 1355:6	stating 1364:3 1375:14	1423:14 1451:14	1461:2 1483:14,16,17
Southern 1353:9,11	1374:15,25 1375:11	1500:1	1513:12 1515:7	1483:21 1484:2,6,12
1354:11 1397:20	1375:15 1442:17	statistic 1435:22	1523:1 1530:15	1484:13,14,14
1398:4,8 1399:5	1443:6,8,14,18	statute 1522:2,3,4,10	submitted 1368:3	1487:12,18 1521:25
1410:2 1419:8	1447:15 1454:7	1522:11	1398:16 1432:25	1524:14
space 1381:24 1430:2	1495:24 1497:11	stenotype 1534:11	1487:7 1503:2 1506:4	support 1450:18
spare 1398:21	1516:25 1518:8	stepped 1495:19	submitting 1371:7	1451:10 1462:22,25
speak 1423:24	1519:23 1525:17	stewardship 1364:4	subordinate 1464:20	1502:12 1504:3
speaking 1402:1	1527:3	1404:1,3,4,13,19	subsequent 1363:3	1505:21 1529:13
special 1525:7	start 1358:6 1369:13	1411:21 1415:15	subsidies 1380:14	supports 1462:21
specific 1414:23	1379:3 1382:5 1386:7	1418:10,15,23 1420:1	1419:4,14 1420:1,15	sure 1380:16 1385:23
1417:19,20,25 1418:3	1479:3 1484:25	1420:10,19 1421:23	1420:20 1421:5,14,19	1399:2 1403:10
1421:9,9,22 1425:12	started 1392:5 1400:4	1444:22 1446:14	1461:3	1408:3 1420:3,4
1429:21 1430:5	1454:11 1497:3,3	1451:21 1459:2	substance 1369:4	1429:25 1430:8
1431:18 1445:23	1499:20 1530:18	1461:25 1462:18,24	1502:14	1431:11,12 1440:22
1447:20,25 1448:6,11	starting 1359:24	1463:4,9,14 1477:6	successor 1363:5	1441:7 1456:5
1471:15 1489:2	1377:6 1427:6,7,8	1477:22 1480:20	sue 1379:23 1380:23	1460:10 1478:20
1500:3 1504:21	1478:18 1521:7	1484:10 1503:9	1381:7 1382:7,9	1489:14 1494:3
specifically 1364:3	starts 1488:8 1516:16	1524:4,6,13 1525:20	1511:17,20 1512:15	1505:23 1526:22
1373:21 1410:2	state 1353:1 1369:6,12	stipulate 1366:20	1512:17,18,20	suspicions 1374:8
1440:14 1447:19	1369:15 1370:2,7,8	stipulation 1366:24	1513:17 1514:24	sustain 1383:19
1448:5 1504:6	1370:22 1371:8,9	stop 1441:5 1521:14	sued 1396:16	1522:23
specificity 1459:17	1386:11,17,23,24	streams 1404:6	suggest 1460:11	Sustained 1425:15
specified 1446:22	1387:7,16,22,25	Street 1353:24 1354:6	1463:13	1512:23 1520:9
specifying 1488:24	1388:3,3,4,5,15,17,19	1354:14,17	suggested 1375:4	1523:11 1527:22
Speculation 1520:7	1388:22,23 1389:2	strike 1392:5,7 1393:5	1396:18	sweep 1382:19
<b>speech</b> 1468:7	1392:9,15,24 1393:17	1404:20 1468:7	suggesting 1494:7	sworn 1397:6 1443:9
speed 1519:23	1397:13 1398:9	1527:21	suit 1382:16 1383:16	SWP 1370:2
spell 1397:13	1405:19 1431:1,8	string 1464:12	<b>SULLIVAN</b> 1354:12	system 1358:11
spend 1413:7,20	1432:3 1433:3,8,15	strongly 1455:22	sum 1387:6	1386:14,20,22 1387:3
1427:10 1429:2,5,10	1433:16,22 1434:23	structure 1356:6	summarizes 1373:9	1387:16,18,21,22
1476:10	1435:1,3,5,8,10,14,18	1358:7,9,20 1359:4	summarizing 1375:10	1388:23 1402:15,23
<b>spending</b> 1428:16,18	1436:1 1437:4,10	1371:14,23 1372:3,4	1490:8	1403:12,18 1404:25
1429:22,24 1430:1,6	1440:17 1441:3,4,10	1372:24,25 1373:4,10	summary 1483:10	1405:1,4 1410:17
spent 1494:25	1441:11,14,19,22,24	1374:6 1375:3,7,19	<b>Superior</b> 1353:1,16	1412:6 1413:11
<b>split</b> 1380:10 1404:5	1442:2,4 1446:23	1375:20,23 1377:12	supplied 1402:8	1416:19,21 1417:24
1494:10	1451:20 1452:23	1377:12,16,18,21	<b>supplies</b> 1398:5,11,13	1429:15,20 1430:4
spreading 1465:9	1453:14 1454:8,13	1378:9,19,23,25	1399:17 1400:16,18	1435:6 1444:15
<b>square</b> 1515:17	1460:8,12,19 1461:24	1379:8,14,16,17,22	1400:21 1401:1,3,6	1446:13,24 1452:25
<b>squeeze</b> 1494:19	1477:21 1496:14,25	1380:3,8 1381:8,9	1401:10,13,15	1459:1,10,13,17
ss 1534:4	1497:6,12,21,24	1382:18,18 1384:2,6	1402:14 1405:1,7,8	1460:20 1461:3
<b>stability</b> 1458:6,13,18	1498:9 1503:8	1390:9 1395:23	1410:18 1412:3	1463:8 1477:5,20
1458:22 1459:2,5	1506:24,25 1507:6,7	1422:3,9 1423:21	1413:8,11,22 1414:3	1480:19 1484:9
staff 1361:1,2,3,15	1507:12,15,18,24,25	1424:1,17 1425:6,10	1414:20 1419:11	1507:24 1508:6
1450:3,17 1468:17	1508:6,13,16,19,22	1425:17,20 1426:20	1429:18,19 1440:18	1524:22 1525:19,20
1470:22 1471:7	1509:2,10,18 1510:1	1431:3,5,19 1434:19	1440:20 1461:4,6	system's 1373:2
1478:2 1479:2	1510:7,12,16,21	1448:1,12 1450:8,9	1483:24 1514:10	systems 1403:13
1482:21 1520:21,22	1512:1,19 1514:23	1450:13 1451:6,10	supply 1358:10	
1522:15 1523:5	1517:1,5,15 1518:3	1452:2,4,5 1467:5	1388:23 1390:17,18	
1524:23,24 1525:7	1518:10,20 1519:1,25	1513:9	1401:10,22 1402:12	<b>Tab</b> 1412:12,12,15
staffer 1430:13	1520:6,11,23 1521:15	structures 1374:11	1402:13,16 1405:2	1424:14,15 1426:9,10
stamp 1382:23	1521:21,24 1523:9,14	1379:18 1430:21	1408:8 1409:25	1436:15 1440:10
stand 1357:18 1435:25	1523:19 1534:3,8,25	1504:1,20	1410:2,3,4,13,15	table 1462:12 1464:24
1436:2 1438:7	State's 1389:3	structuring 1396:15	1411:22,25 1412:7,8	1466:12 1506:4
1495:17	stated 1477:11	1421:25	1412:10,22 1414:7	Tachiki 1363:4,9
standard 1427:1,23	statement 1410:1	students 1495:9	1416:15 1417:10	take 1363:20 1372:6
standpoint 1466:14	1434:12 1450:20 States 1305:11 14 10	subagencies 1400:11	1418:14 1423:8	1374:13 1385:13
standstill 1501:24	<b>States</b> 1395:11,14,19	subject 1385:5 1395:25	1436:4 1460:18	1391:8 1401:19
1	I		l	I

1404:11 1408:6	1372:1	1447:12 1460:2	1501:7,20 1502:1	treaties 1471:20
1410:4,16 1425:19	terms 1358:19 1394:21	1467:3 1468:4 1469:2	1503:1 1505:18,23	treatment 1409:3
1431:10,23 1439:9	1394:25 1415:16,19	1469:4,17,25 1471:18	1506:2 1509:12,16	treaty 1514:20
1445:7 1450:6 1457:8	1415:23 1418:8	1480:3,25 1485:22	1519:23 1520:13,14	trial 1357:9,14 1363:15
1457:16 1464:4	1436:13 1451:19	1486:24 1491:11,12	1523:5 1525:21	1393:18 1434:10
1468:15,17 1470:5	1476:4 1483:6	1494:2,6,12,22	1527:9 1528:18	1447:13 1485:25
1479:17 1489:10,13	1485:25 1491:18,20	1495:4 1502:10	1529:7 1530:25	1532:23
1495:9,16,18 1500:15	1491:25 1492:2,10	1503:5 1527:2	1533:1 1534:11	tried 1421:1 1424:9
1502:7 1512:24	territory 1408:12	1531:20	times 1468:12	1494:19
1513:11 1528:21	1470:25	third 1377:5 1407:12	title 1401:25	trigger 1424:6
taken 1405:20 1422:23	testified 1357:18	1407:14 1437:8	today 1363:21 1372:18	triggered 1396:15
1424:3 1495:22	1358:22 1359:1	1440:13,14,15	1430:22 1476:4,5	1422:24 1423:1
1533:2 1534:10	1369:6 1379:4	1474:22 1478:9	toilets 1399:9	1424:2
takes 1419:2	1395:24 1397:7	1511:4	told 1375:15 1425:11	trouble 1439:14
talk 1358:19 1381:2	1411:20 1414:2	third-party 1433:3	1456:9 1494:17	true 1382:8,10 1385:21
1476:3 1499:22	1428:4 1438:7	1435:10	1526:8 1528:23	1401:9 1404:16,17,18
1520:10	1443:10 1496:24	<b>Thomas</b> 1361:19	top 1366:15 1471:20	1413:3,25 1417:16
talked 1361:21 1384:17	testify 1452:11	1525:8	1472:10,22 1473:25	1418:18 1430:15
1386:5 1411:5 1465:7	testimony 1358:6	<b>Thomas's</b> 1359:7	1474:21,22 1487:22	1435:17 1449:6
1492:10 1520:4	1378:23 1392:8	thought 1453:4,16	topic 1398:24	1460:8 1482:19
1521:18 1523:20	1413:4,25 1417:16	1455:19 1456:1,7,8	total 1493:5,9	1484:16 1487:17
talking 1394:12 1403:9	1430:1 1433:1	1458:17,23 1459:7,18	totality 1516:11	1497:8,9 1499:6,15
1442:6 1454:11	1452:18 1469:21	1461:10 1462:10	track 1416:9	1499:17 1504:10,16
1460:23 1467:18	1494:9 1495:25	1463:13 1466:25	trade 1491:13	1506:14 1509:1
1468:12 1490:15	1497:10 1516:25	1473:6 1482:9 1487:5	trade-off 1491:9	1511:15 1512:10,16
1505:1 1506:18	1518:5 1519:7	1522:1 1528:13	<b>traded</b> 1491:16	1515:7,8
1517:8 1531:20	thank 1374:25 1381:13	1531:1	transaction 1430:6,11	trust 1382:25 1383:4
talks 1375:17 1380:24	1381:15 1383:22	threat 1372:22	1436:19	trust-but-verify 1383:6
1485:18,24 1489:2	1395:22 1397:1,3	three 1370:12,24	transactions 1429:22	trusting 1383:4,4,8
1532:3	1410:21 1417:2	1399:14 1400:5	TRANSCRIPT	try 1359:2 1368:1
TARA 1353:20 1534:7	1432:20 1437:23	1442:11 1465:11	1353:15	1424:11 1456:24
1534:23	1442:13,16,19	1468:12 1494:2,8	transcription 1534:13	1524:2
taxes 1377:24	1446:11 1464:17	1497:15 1518:13	transfer 1373:5	trying 1368:2 1417:25
teacher 1495:8	1478:25 1493:18	three-hour 1494:11	1387:10 1390:20	1418:8 1455:14
team 1381:19 1463:22	1532:25	three-page 1376:12 1457:16	1395:4 1436:4	1471:16 1478:16,25
1463:22 1498:6,7 1524:12	theirs 1402:9 theory 1391:12	thumb 1471:18 1495:2	1440:23 1441:17 1442:5 1450:12	1485:12 1495:1 1498:8 1523:5
technically 1395:10	thing 1358:5 1416:8	Thursday 1353:18	1472:24 1477:3	turn 1377:4 1395:23
tell 1392:18 1399:1	1418:24 1459:7,14,21	1357:2 1438:2	1526:5 1528:17	1406:1 1409:22
1405:14 1406:2	1462:5 1468:24	time 1360:7 1375:4	transfers 1387:14	1412:14 1446:5
1410:12 1449:3	1504:12,17 1515:24	1376:15 1378:7	1475:17 1484:2	1449:12,23 1462:18
1467:19,21,25	things 1399:7,10	1384:22 1385:1	1514:7	1480:10 1485:7
1468:25 1471:2	1407:6,9,16 1425:21	1404:11 1424:11	transparency 1459:24	1487:9,21 1490:13
1473:6 1480:23	1431:4,14,16 1456:13	1427:10,13 1437:18	transport 1370:1	1500:13,14 1514:6,18
1485:14,15 1499:2	1456:13 1504:11	1440:23 1442:10	1477:2	turnout 1369:18
1524:17 1525:5	think 1357:10,13	1447:18,18 1448:4,4	transportation 1369:7	1370:4,12,15,20
telling 1466:20 1494:16	1359:1 1362:8,9	1452:19 1453:24	1387:5 1415:24	twice 1468:11
1516:5	1364:23 1366:21	1455:3 1456:22,23	1417:21 1418:4	twist 1372:5
tells 1461:23	1368:5 1369:5	1457:5,16 1458:8	1428:16 1431:1,9,24	two 1357:11 1370:22
temporary 1509:18	1375:12 1379:24	1459:16 1461:10,22	1432:4,13 1433:23,25	1377:4 1380:7 1383:1
1510:2	1386:16 1389:16	1467:17 1476:10	1434:15 1440:19	1386:8 1394:4 1399:3
ten 1416:23 1511:22	1392:20 1393:2,15,15	1478:12,19 1479:4	1463:11 1508:5	1404:5 1408:13
tens 1462:8,11,13	1418:18 1425:13	1481:13 1483:1	1514:7 1520:6,12,24	1409:16 1434:6
term 1379:9 1478:7	1427:9,12 1428:23	1484:16 1487:18	1521:16,22,25 1524:7	1438:21,24 1458:4,5
1488:16 1490:11	1429:7 1434:7	1489:10 1490:3	1524:15,21	1458:11,12 1463:25
1502:11 1526:5,5	1435:21 1438:16,22	1493:15,23 1494:8,15	treat 1408:7	1464:23 1465:11
1529:11,12 1531:4,8	1438:23 1439:11	1494:19,24 1495:1,3	treated 1390:21	1466:11 1467:8
terminate 1371:21	1440:14 1446:5	1495:5 1496:7 1501:2	1394:24 1408:8,10	1468:20 1472:4,4

1474:7,12,16 1478:2 1515:21 1478:3,25 1479:2 understands 1509:24 1480:10 1482:21 understood 1388:8 1483:2 1488:25 1444:15 1473:3,9 1493:9 1497:13 1477:10,19 1491:8 1499:3 1516:1 1501:2 1509:16 1518:11 1530:3 1510:11,15 type 1408:2 undertake 1425:22 typewriting 1534:12 **Underwood** 1498:3,9 1498:15 1517:9,20,21 **typical** 1390:7 1517:25 1519:6 U 1520:19 1521:19 U-P-A-D-H-Y-A-H 1524:11 1527:13 1397:15 1531:11 U.S 1398:10 unfortunately 1394:4 Uh-huh 1433:11 1498:17 **uniform** 1373:17 1456:19 ultimately 1400:15,25 1425:5 1419:18 1424:5 **United** 1395:11,14,19 1473:14 unlawful 1454:9,22 unable 1425:4 1512:12 1455:1 1460:2,7 **unbundled** 1430:20 1461:11,12,18,20 1444:10,17,23 1446:3 1463:14 1480:25 1446:13,18 1447:20 1481:8 1499:8,11 1448:1,6,12 1451:6 1500:2 1505:17 1451:19,25 1454:9,17 1506:5 1457:1 1461:25 unnecessarily 1463:8 unsuccessful 1466:25 1523:3 unbundling 1369:10 1530:9 1444:8,14 1445:21 Upadhyah 1355:5 1454:12 1397:5,10,14 1398:16 unconstitutional 1405:6 1411:16 1378:10 1438:6 1440:9 undermining 1372:23 **update** 1474:5 understand 1357:10 **upset** 1378:13 1358:17 1362:18 **upstream** 1403:4,7,19 1382:1 1386:4 1388:7 1403:21 1404:5,14 1388:9 1393:16,17 **URQUHART** 1354:12 1429:25 1447:4 use 1370:23 1371:9 1448:17 1449:1,13 1376:20 1387:4,22,25 1451:11 1456:5,12 1393:4,16 1399:18 1467:23,24 1470:6,7 1400:17 1401:2,15 1473:18 1475:19 1402:8 1408:10 1479:18 1486:11,11 1409:2,9 1410:7,19 1492:14 1493:8 1411:23 1416:22 1495:15 1501:11 1426:5 1440:17 1513:23 1516:5 1441:1,3,6,9,9,11,15 1520:5 1522:18 1441:19,25 1442:2 1523:8 1527:13,16,18 1457:25 1458:21,24 1530:7,16 1531:12 1460:6 1494:8 understanding 1375:16 1507:11 1508:19,22 1375:22 1378:14 1509:1,2,18 1510:6 1382:15 1383:15 1521:18 1524:19 1385:14 1388:11 useful 1375:4 1459:7 1389:2 1391:4 1393:6 1486:9 1402:5 1450:20 users 1404:13,14

1471:11,13 1473:9

1493:4 1506:7 1509:6

1410:8,10

vague 1385:22 1388:6 1389:4,6 1404:7 1520:13 valid 1373:15 1524:21 validation 1388:13,16 **VALIDITY** 1353:10 Valley 1440:24 1441:1 1441:2 value 1433:7,10,19,20 1433:25 1434:4 1456:12 1475:7 1476:1,11 1478:16,21 1489:17 1490:7.9 1491:4,23 1492:5 VAN 1354:3 VANDERHORST 1354:17 various 1360:13 1378:11 1382:12 1396:8 1449:9 1452:11 1455:8 1468:13 1481:5 1483:10,24 1485:21 venue 1456:24 verifying 1383:5 version 1405:15 1425:5 1438:16 versus 1382:22 1416:16 1465:8 Vice 1521:19 **VIDEOGRAPHY** 1353:23 view 1402:11 1482:1.16 1484:21 viewed 1505:4 views 1357:11 1455:22 1455:23 1456:2 voiced 1432:5,16,17,21 **volume** 1353:10 1412:13,15 1492:16 1511:10 **vote** 1380:10 1449:9 1451:8,11,12,19,25 1503:13,19,21,23 1504:1,7,11,12 **voted** 1452:2 1503:7 1505:17 1506:15 votes 1448:18 1506:1 **voting** 1449:4 1506:5 vs 1353:8 W W-I-L-L-E-R 1464:16

want 1363:16 1364:24 1384:7 1398:18 1425:2,21 1439:12 1467:6,24,25 1468:3 1469:4,5,6,8 1470:1 1470:14 1476:9 1482:8,17 1486:23 1494:15 1495:20 1496:3 1499:19 1500:24 1528:23 wanted 1373:10 1390:6 1390:20 1394:18 1459:18 1468:21 1482:2 1495:8 1506:23 1529:3,4 1532:15 wanting 1499:22 wants 1418:19 1427:10 1436:3 1469:16 **Warren** 1354:5 1411:18 washers 1399:8 wasn't 1376:14,18,25 1395:20 1481:15 1483:20 1518:5 wastewater 1399:15 1407:24 1408:1,6,7,7 1408:11 1409:6 water 1353:6,9,11 1354:11 1356:11.14 1360:1,11,17 1361:7 1361:13 1362:1,2,13 1363:4 1364:2,4,17 1365:10,19,23 1369:6 1369:12 1370:2,2,3,7 1370:7,8,22 1371:1,8 1371:8,9 1373:1,5,15 1374:16 1375:2 1376:3 1377:24 1378:4 1381:1 1382:13 1386:11,23 1387:7,8,9,10,15,16 1387:17,18 1388:3,5 1388:15,20,24 1389:25 1390:3,10,12 1390:12,13,20,21,24 1391:1,1,7,8,10,15 1392:9,15,24 1393:17 1394:6,7,13,18,18,19 1394:19,24 1395:1,2 1395:2,4,5,6,9,12,12 1395:17,18,19,21 1396:10,14,17 1397:20,23,25 1398:2 1398:9,10 1399:9,24 1401:19,20,21,24 1402:1,2,2,7,23 1403:2 1404:1,2,4,12

1404:19,24 1405:3 1406:18 1407:5,10,16 1407:20,22 1409:2,12 1409:25 1410:13,16 1410:17 1411:21 1412:9,10 1413:8,10 1414:7,11 1415:15 1416:9.19 1417:10 1418:10,11,13,14,15 1418:22 1420:1,10,19 1421:17,23 1422:19 1422:23 1423:8 1424:16 1429:1,16 1431:1,8 1432:3 1433:3,3,8,8,10,12,15 1433:16,22,24 1434:23 1435:1,3,5,8 1435:10,10,14,14,17 1435:18 1436:1,1,3,8 1436:13 1437:4,5,5,9 1437:10,10 1440:17 1440:19 1441:3,4,9 1441:10,11,20,20 1442:4,8 1443:21,25 1444:4,6,15,22 1445:15,15,21 1446:14,23 1449:5,7 1449:20 1450:3,5 1451:2,20,21 1452:23 1453:14 1454:8.13 1455:7 1459:1 1460:9 1460:12,14,18,19 1461:4,24,25 1462:7 1462:18,20,20,22,23 1462:24,24 1463:3,4 1463:6,9,14 1464:1 1464:19 1465:9,15 1466:7 1471:8 1472:25,25 1474:24 1475:1,1,2,18 1476:2 1476:4,25 1477:3,3,5 1477:21,22 1479:15 1479:23 1480:16,20 1480:24 1483:16,17 1483:21 1484:1,1 1487:12,19 1488:20 1491:5,9 1492:11,16 1496:14,25 1497:6,12 1497:22,25 1498:6,9 1503:8,8 1506:20,20 1506:23,24 1507:5,6 1507:12,18,18,24,25 1508:5,7,13,13,14,15 1508:16,19,22 1509:2 1509:10,11,18,19 1510:1,7,12,16,20,21 1511:1,4 1513:1,8 1514:10 1515:4,5,23

wait 1368:17 1376:13

waited 1360:2

walk 1470:14

1455:18,20 1493:22

<u> </u>				
1516.15 1517.0 5 15	1427.4 1441.16 22	work 1356:14 1385:11	1414:9,11 1463:9	1470:10 1496:22 24
1516:15 1517:2,5,15	1437:4 1441:16,22			1470:19 1486:23,24
1518:1,3,10,20	1446:7,13 1453:2	1443:25 1514:4,19	1473:5 1488:25	1501:12
1519:1,25 1520:6,11	1465:8,11,19 1467:1	1530:22 1532:22	1489:3 1497:13,15,19	10/11/01 1356:6
1520:23 1521:14,15	1471:22 1472:13,20	worked 1383:12	1497:21,23 1498:19	10/15 1355:22
1521:21,25 1522:5	1472:24 1473:7,11	1385:17 1391:7	1499:4 1501:24	10/2 1355:21
1523:9,14,19 1524:4	1477:1,4,11 1478:6	working 1400:5 1432:1	1503:1,3 1517:14,16	10:00 1357:3
1524:6,13,24 1525:17	1478:10,15,17	works 1469:15	1518:11,13,15,17,19	<b>109</b> 1412:14,16
1525:19 1526:5	1480:17,18 1481:12	workshop 1445:21	1518:23 1524:8	1413:12
1527:5 1528:17	1483:7 1484:8,25	workshops 1431:15	1526:1	10th 1354:14
1530:11	1485:2,17 1487:25	1445:24 1446:2	year's 1516:21	11 1445:18 1449:23,24
water-efficient 1399:6	1488:5,16,19,21	world 1467:11 1468:2	years 1359:2 1372:20	1514:6
way 1386:25 1389:9	1489:19,22 1490:2,6	1469:4	1373:17,25 1375:7,19	11.1 1361:22 1362:14
1391:7 1409:1	1490:10,19,19	WORLDWIDE	1379:10,12 1380:15	1363:6 1364:18
1416:25 1420:23	1491:10,17 1492:12	1353:23	1382:11 1400:5	1365:12 1531:14,14
1434:21 1436:22	1492:18 1496:25	worry 1476:5	1407:3,4 1431:2,13	110 1413:13 1474:25
1448:22,23 1460:2	1499:22 1503:7	worst 1467:6,7,13,15	1432:1,7,10,23	1475:9 1476:1
1469:15 1478:20	1507:19,22,23 1508:4	1467:24,25 1468:5,24	1435:9,13 1443:24	1479:12 1492:17
1511:18 1517:7,11,12	1508:13 1511:19	1469:7 1470:2	1455:5 1456:10	1514:10 1515:23
1519:15 1525:13	1516:2,4,15,23	worst-case 1466:1,22	1465:10,25 1466:21	<b>1114</b> 1356:14 1513:23
ways 1378:11 1463:25	1520:1 1522:1,3,4,10	1466:23 1467:8,20	1467:5 1468:19	1514:1,2 <b>1149A</b> 1442:24 1443:3
1479:3 1528:7	1522:11,20 1523:19	1469:13,16 1485:1	1472:13,17 1474:25	
wbraunig@kvn.com	1524:16 1525:10,12	worth 1475:3,4,5,6,8,9	1475:9 1476:1	1443:4
1354:9	1525:18 1526:11,16	1475:12,17,19,20,21	1477:25 1479:11,13	<b>12</b> 1427:14 1452:15
we'll 1441:20 we're 1394:12 1406:8	1526:19,21 1527:11 1528:4,13,24 1530:12	1476:6,7,9,13,14 1526:13,14	1488:5,18,20,25 1489:19 1490:2	1494:1,9 1514:18 <b>12.4</b> 1501:21 1502:2,22
1406:16 1409:6	1530:22,25 1531:3,5	wouldn't 1424:4,7	1491:17 1490:2	1531:25
1412:24 1416:2	1530.22,23 1331.3,3	1455:14,18,20 1456:1	1491:17 1492:17,19	1331.23 12.4(c) 1500:15
1417:25 1418:24	wholesale 1431:5	1456:20 1462:6,14	1500:6 1502:4,9,23	1531:25
1447:12 1455:14	1455:15	1467:20 1475:25	1511:22 1514:11	<b>12/28/01</b> 1356:4
1460:23 1470:17	Willer 1464:16,18	1487:7	1515:23 1520:3	<b>120</b> 1355:15 1424:14
1479:6	1465:5	write 1439:2 1460:14	1526:6,17 1528:11,15	1424:15,19,22,25
we've 1357:11 1382:11	willing 1528:20	1462:19 1481:4,7	1528:25 1529:4,9	1425:1
1382:20,21,22 1403:8	wisest 1357:13	1484:7 1499:7	1530:2,9,14,23	<b>126</b> 1416:23
1406:9 1407:2	wish 1387:8	writes 1373:14 1374:25	1531:18,21 1532:9,19	<b>129</b> 1448:16 1451:24
1415:18 1422:25	withdraw 1456:6	1465:5 1478:1,10	yesterday 1358:6,22	1503:5
1431:4,13,14 1446:7	withdrawing 1438:20	writing 1455:6,12,16	1361:21 1362:9	<b>13</b> 1415:20 1427:6
1506:18 1516:14	witness 1357:22	1456:2,21,22 1462:2	1369:6 1378:23	1509:23
week 1479:14 1494:8	1359:14,17 1368:16	1481:10,14,22	1379:4 1384:8,17	<b>1353</b> 1353:13
1494:17	1386:1 1388:8,10,13	1499:15,21,24	yield 1529:6	<b>1358</b> 1355:3
weeks 1486:18	1389:8 1392:25	1500:10	yields 1474:25	<b>1362</b> 1355:14,14
went 1359:3 1383:12	1393:10 1397:3,6,11	written 1378:9 1461:16		<b>1363</b> 1355:16,16
1393:17 1444:8,10	1397:14 1398:22	1461:19,21 1465:2	Z	<b>1364</b> 1355:18,18,20
1447:20 1448:6	1402:7 1404:9 1415:7	1470:14 1481:9,24	<b>Zoom</b> 1384:9	<b>1365</b> 1355:20
1451:9 1457:1	1423:18 1426:3,9	wrong 1361:19		<b>1366</b> 1355:17,17
whatsoever 1532:8	1438:10 1440:4,12	1476:13 1496:20	0	<b>1367</b> 1355:21,21,22,22
wheel 1429:1 1433:2,8	1441:23 1443:9,12	1512:21 1521:20		1355:23,23,24,24,25
1433:10,12 1435:10	1468:11 1485:13	wrote 1378:4 1457:2	1	1355:25 1356:1,1
1435:14,25 1436:2,8	1495:17,18,19 1505:3	1459:24 1461:17	<b>1</b> 1353:12,12 1376:24	<b>1369</b> 1356:5,5
1437:9,10 1506:20,20	1520:16 1521:6,10	1480:11,14 1499:25	1376:25 1412:12,12	<b>1374</b> 1356:12,12
1529:3	1525:4,6,15 1534:16		1444:11 1447:19	<b>1377</b> 1355:13,13
wheeled 1429:20	witnesses 1355:2	X	1448:5 1451:9 1472:5	<b>1382</b> 1355:3
1506:23 1507:6,18	1357:15 1494:3,3,10	<b>X</b> 1355:1 1368:7	1507:3	<b>1397</b> 1355:5
wheeler 1405:2	1494:17		1-10 1353:13	<b>13th</b> 1534:16
wheelers 1404:22	woman 1455:10	<u>Y</u>	<b>1.3</b> 1408:19	<b>14</b> 1415:20 1416:6
wheeling 1373:17	wondered 1495:10	Yeah 1413:23	<b>1.4</b> 1407:17	1479:25 1496:2
1387:19,24 1429:1,4	word 1390:7 1400:20	year 1387:6 1405:19	<b>1:30</b> 1437:23 1438:3	1509:23
1429:22 1430:2,6,11	1401:5 1402:2	1406:19,21 1407:7,11 1407:24 1409:13	<b>10</b> 1353:12 1406:20 1407:23 1409:14	<b>1411</b> 1355:5 1356:13
1435:9,19 1436:12,18	words 1489:6 1530:3	1407.24 1407.13	1407.43 1407.14	<b>1420</b> 1355:15
1	l		l	I

<b>1424</b> 1355:15	<b>2/5/13</b> 1355:23	1416:6	<b>357</b> 1437:3	7 1377:12 1406:1
<b>1436</b> 1356:3,3	<b>20</b> 1380:15 1413:2	<b>2013</b> 1353:12 1434:18	<b>358</b> 1356:3 1436:14,17	1440:10 1483:14,25
<b>1439</b> 1356:13	1511:11	1434:18	1436:23 1437:1,2	<b>7/3/06</b> 1356:1
<b>144</b> 1359:8,19,24	<b>200-page</b> 1447:11	<b>2014</b> 1353:12	1439:18 1440:8	<b>7/30/04</b> 1356:12
<b>1440</b> 1355:5	<b>2000</b> 1502:25 1517:12	<b>2015</b> 1353:12 <b>2015</b> 1353:18 1357:2	3rd 1353:24	7/7/ <b>10</b> 1356:3
<b>1443</b> 1355:6	1518:1 1520:19	1438:2 1534:17	31 <b>u</b> 1333.24	<b>700</b> 1354:17
<b>1445</b> 1356:6,6	1524:8	<b>207</b> 1355:18 1363:24	4	<b>701</b> 1353:24
<b>1447</b> 1356:4,4	<b>2001</b> 1444:7,13	1364:7,12,13	<b>4.1</b> 1389:24 1390:24	<b>75</b> 1465:9 1487:16
<b>1447</b> 1356.4,4 <b>1449</b> 1356:7,7	1445:18,22 1454:19	<b>21</b> 1359:9,25 1413:13	<b>4.2</b> 1389:22 1390:22	1507:2 1528:24
<b>145</b> 1359:9,25	1517:12 1518:1	1426:7 1487:21	1394:16	1507.2 1528.24
<b>1464</b> 1356:8,8	<b>2002</b> 1447:25 1448:11	<b>213.217.6000</b> 1354:18	<b>4:00</b> 1493:22 1532:21	75-year 1465:20
<b>147,000</b> 1407:8	1449:21 1454:19	<b>213.443.3000</b> 1354:15	<b>4:45</b> 1494:6	<b>767</b> 1356:6 1445:1,7,9
<b>147,000</b> 1407.8 <b>1470</b> 1356:9,9	1517:12 1518:1	<b>216</b> 1452:15	<b>40</b> 1380:15	1445:11
<b>1470</b> 1336.9,9 <b>1473</b> 1356:10,10	<b>2003</b> 1384:22 1385:1	<b>217</b> 1452:15	<b>415</b> 1353:25	<b>77,700</b> 1474:25 1475:8
<b>1479</b> 1356:11,11	1389:10 1430:20	<b>21</b> 7 1432.13 <b>22</b> 1490:13	<b>415.391.5400</b> 1354:7	<b>772</b> 1356:7 1449:12,13
<b>1479</b> 1350.11,11 <b>1486</b> 1355:19,19	1432:9 1444:11	<b>221</b> 1355:19 1485:7	<b>44</b> 1392:11,14,17	1449:16,18,19
<b>15</b> 1382:11 1493:17	1447:19 1448:5	1486:14,15 1487:2	1393:7,11	<b>794</b> 1457:8
1526:6		<b>225</b> 1355:20 1364:14	<b>45</b> 1379:10,12 1468:19	774 1437.8
15,500 1406:12,23	1450:19 1451:9 1452:6,20 1453:23	1364:23 1365:4,7,8	1491:17 1528:24	8
	1452:0,20 1453:23 1454:20,23 1455:2		1529:4	<b>8</b> 1409:23 1464:4,22
<b>1514</b> 1356:14,14 <b>1517</b> 1355:6	1454:20,25 1455:2	<b>229</b> 1355:21 1367:4,5,8 1367:9	<b>475</b> 1356:4 1447:2,5,7	1484:6
<b>1534</b> 1353:13	1470:19 1474:1,11	<b>23</b> 1364:4	1447:8	<b>8.5</b> 1475:1
<b>16</b> 1412:14 1474:1,10	1486:3,17 1487:14,15	<b>23</b> 1304.4 <b>230</b> 1355:22 1367:10	1447.8	<b>8/17/04</b> 1355:13
1502:9	1490:16 1491:15	1367:11,13,14	5	<b>8/2/05</b> 1355:15
<b>169</b> 1355:14 1362:11	1496:4,10,11 1498:18	<b>232</b> 1355:23 1367:15	<b>5</b> 1395:7	<b>8/26/11</b> 1355:18
1362:16,24,25	1501:2 1515:1 1518:1	1367:16,18 1369:1	<b>5.1</b> 1389:18 1472:13	<b>80</b> 1372:9 1487:16
<b>17</b> 1376:2 1424:14,15	1519:10 1522:12,13	<b>234</b> 1355:24 1367:19	<b>5.2</b> 1374:1 1389:12	800 1353:25
1502:9	1522:14,17 1523:14	1367:20,22 1369:1	1394:8,11,13,17,25	<b>829</b> 1356:8 1464:5,10
<b>175</b> 1355:16 1363:1,12	1525:14	<b>235-dollar</b> 1453:21	1486:4 1502:9	1464:11
1363:21,23	<b>2004</b> 1372:12 1374:14	<b>237A</b> 1392:11	1526:25 1527:4,6	<b>830</b> 1356:9 1470:5,11
<b>18</b> 1359:8,24 1372:12	1376:2 1512:5	<b>24</b> 1436:15 1440:11	1529:12 1531:17	1470:12
1512:25	<b>2005</b> 1424:17 1498:18	<b>243</b> 1355:25 1367:23	<b>5/3/10</b> 1355:14	<b>837</b> 1356:10 1473:18
<b>1810</b> 1522:7	1499:6,10,14 1503:1	1367:24 1368:18,20	<b>5/4/12</b> 1355:20	1473:21,22
<b>189</b> 1355:17 1366:4,10	1503:6 1512:4	1369:1 1511:10	<b>5:14</b> 1494:7	<b>846</b> 1473:23
1366:17,18	1517:23 1519:12	<b>244</b> 1511:11	<b>50</b> 1511:1	<b>856</b> 1356:11 1479:17
<b>19</b> 1456:9	<b>2006</b> 1369:18 1499:18	<b>25</b> 1380:9 1486:17	<b>50,000</b> 1409:11,15	1479:21,22
<b>1990s</b> 1407:15 1429:14	1506:16 1512:4	1496:2	<b>51</b> 1389:15,15 1393:22	<b>865</b> 1354:14
<b>1991</b> 1487:13	<b>2007</b> 1499:18 1506:16	<b>253</b> 1479:3,10	1509:22	8th 1495:8
<b>1995</b> 1400:4	1511:16 1512:1,14,16		<b>515,000</b> 1409:21	
<b>1996</b> 1520:2	1512:17,20,25	<b>260</b> 1444:6	<b>516</b> 1359:20	9
<b>1997</b> 1521:10	1513:17 1514:18,23	<b>28</b> 1446:6 1449:21	<b>522-7096</b> 1353:25	<b>9/10/03</b> 1356:9
<b>1998</b> 1477:12 1489:18	<b>2008</b> 1499:18 1506:16		<b>55</b> 1500:14	<b>9/16/03</b> 1356:10
1490:15 1491:13	1507:3 1512:8	3	<b>555</b> 1512:24	<b>9/24/03</b> 1356:11
1526:3,9	1513:20	<b>3.2</b> 1510:4	<b>56</b> 1384:9 1394:1	<b>9/25/03</b> 1355:19
<b>1999</b> 1402:25 1517:12	<b>2009</b> 1406:20 1407:23	<b>3.3</b> 1509:23	<b>57</b> 1385:2	<b>9/9/03</b> 1356:8
<b>1B</b> 1450:2	1409:14 1499:18	<b>30</b> 1380:15 1488:5		<b>90-dollar</b> 1477:16
	1503:1 1506:16	<b>30-page</b> 1438:15,24	6	<b>90012</b> 1354:18
2	1508:15 1517:4,7	<b>30-some</b> 1493:8	<b>6/18/13</b> 1355:25	<b>90017-2543</b> 1354:14
<b>2</b> 1353:18 1357:2	1518:1 1519:13,14	<b>302</b> 1356:1 1369:16,20	<b>6/30/10</b> 1355:16	<b>909</b> 1356:12 1374:13
1377:14 1412:15	<b>2010</b> 1362:5 1400:1	1369:22,23	<b>60</b> 1402:25 1405:17	1374:19,22,23
1424:17 1426:9,10	1440:10 1500:1,11	<b>304</b> 1353:4 1357:4	<b>624</b> 1356:5 1368:21,24	<b>90s</b> 1369:9
1438:2 1482:22	1501:12 1506:19	1438:4	1369:1 1501:10,15,16	<b>94111</b> 1353:24
1487:9	<b>2011</b> 1364:4 1405:15	<b>30th</b> 1374:14	<b>633</b> 1354:6	<b>95</b> 1355:13 1376:1,6
<b>2/10/11</b> 1356:5	1414:18 1415:1,15	<b>3374</b> 1353:20 1534:7	<b>64</b> 1496:2	1377:2,3 1487:13
<b>2/15/13</b> 1355:24	1416:4 1422:9,15,21	1534:23	<b>65</b> 1389:15,17 1500:14	<b>979</b> 1356:13 1405:13
<b>2/2011</b> 1356:13	1422:23 1501:8	<b>34</b> 1426:7	1526:25 1527:2	1411:1,2,11 1438:14
<b>2/24/11</b> 1355:17	1515:16 1516:7	<b>35</b> 1426:7 1472:13		1438:17,20 1439:12
<b>2/28/02</b> 1356:7	<b>2012</b> 1353:12 1415:20	1489:19 1490:2	7	1439:13

<b>979A</b> 1438:21 <b>98</b> 1521:10 <b>981-3498</b> 1353:25		
701 6 170 1333.23		

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                                        INDEX
               COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                       2
                                                                             DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW
                                                                             STAPLETON, Maureen
                                                                                                  -- 1554 1572 1645
                 DEPARTMENT 304
                                                                             (E.C. 776)
      SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY,
                                                                             YAMASAKI, Brent
                                                                                                 1661 1687 1701 1706
        Petitioner and Plaintiff, ) Case No.
                       ) No. CPF-10-510830
                                                                             LAMBECK, Jon
                                                                                                1709
                        ) No. CPF-12-512466
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
                                                                                        EXHIBITS
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL
      PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE
                                                                                             FOR ID IN EVIDENCE
                                                                            NUMBER
      VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY ) VOLUME X
                                                                             DTX 859
                                                                                            1566
                                                                                                    1567
      THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT )
                                                                             DTX 1096
                                                                                             1725
      OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL )
                                                                      1.0
      10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY)
                                                                             DTX 1143
                                                                                             1580
      1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and )
                                                                      11
                                                                             DTX 1103
                                                                                             1720
      DOES 1-10,
                                                                      12
                                                                             DTX 1105
                                                                                             1672
                                                                                                     1673
                         Pages 1535 - 1727
                                                                      13
                                                                             DTX 1121
                                                                                             1710
                                                                                                     1710
        Respondents and Defendants. )
                                                                      14
                                                                             DTX 1122
                                                                                             1673
                                                                                                     1674
                                                                      15
                                                                             DTX 1123
                                                                                             1715
                                                                                                     1718
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                                                      16
                                                                            DTX 1124
                                                                                             1673
                                                                                                     1674
               San Francisco Superior
                                                                      17
                                                                                             1716
                                                                             DTX 1125
                                                                                                     1718
               San Francisco, California
                                                                      18
                                                                             DTX 1126
                                                                                             1673
                                                                                                     1674
                Monday, April 27, 2015
                                                                      19
                                                                                             1719
                                                                             DTX 1127
                                                                                                     1720
      Reported By:
                                                                      20
                                                                             DTX 1128
                                                                                             1673
                                                                                                     1674
      TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR #3374
                                                                      21
                                                                             DTX 1151
                                                                                             1710
                                                                                                     1710
                                                                      22
                                                                             DTX 1154
                                                                                             1674
                                                                                                     1678
               JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                      23
                                                                             DTX 1155
                                                                                             1683
                                                                                                     1684
          WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                      24
       701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                             DTX 1156
                                                                                             1683
                                                                                                     1685
            (415) 981-3498 or (800) 522-7096
                                                                             DTX 1157
                                                                                             1685
                                                                                                     1686
                                                           1535
                                                                                                                                  1537
                                                                        1
         APPEARANCES
                                                                                        San Francisco, California
      For Petitioner and Plaintiff:
                                                                        2
                                                                                        Monday, April 27, 2015
      KEKER & VAN NEST
     BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ
                                                                        3
                                                                                             10:00 a.m.
     BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                        4
                                                                               Department 304
                                                                                                     Hon. Curtis E. A. Karnow, Judge
      BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ
      BY: WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ
                                                                        5
      BY: NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG, ESQ.
                                                                        6
                                                                                    THE COURT: Good morning.
      633 Battery Street
      San Francisco, California
                                                                        7
                                                                                    Did you want to talk first about the motion to
      415.391.5400
                                                                        8
                                                                              exclude?
      Email: ahadlock@kvn.com
      Email: dpurcell@kvn.com
                                                                        9
                                                                                    MR. KEKER: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, if I
      Email: jkeker@kvn.com
                                                                       10
                                                                              could pass up a document that we received, several
      Email: wbraunig@kvn.com
      Email: ngoldberg@kvn.com
                                                                       11
                                                                              documents that we received late morning yesterday, which
10
11
                                                                       12
      For Respondent and Defendant Metropolitan Water District
                                                                              I won't summarize too much of it.
12
     of Southern California:
                                                                       13
                                                                                    If you could, put up the sixth slide. This
13
      QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
                                                                       14
                                                                              purports to be their damage analysis. This is after
14
     BY: JOHN B. QUINN, ESQ.
                                                                       15
                                                                              trial briefs. This is after opening statements. This
     BY: GARY GANS, ESQ
15
      BY: KARA BORDEN, ESQ.
                                                                       16
                                                                               is after a lot of trial.
      865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
                                                                       17
16
                                                                                    We have four hours left, and for the first time
     Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
      213.443.3000
                                                                       18
                                                                              we are receiving this, what purports to be a damage
17
     Email: johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com
                                                                       19
                                                                               analysis. We don't know who is going to testify to it,
          and
18
      OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
                                                                       20
                                                                              but I suspect it is Mr. Woodcock. There is not a word
      BY: JOSEPH VANDERHORST, ESQ.
                                                                       21
19
      700 North Alameda Street
                                                                              of this in his expert report, contrary to what they have
      Los Angeles, California 90012
                                                                       22
                                                                              said in a motion that we just saw this morning, or in an
20
     213.217.6000
21
                                                                       23
                                                                              opposition.
22
                                                                       24
                                                                                    THE COURT: I haven't seen it.
23
24
                                                                       25
                                                                                    MR. KEKER: They filed something this morning
25
                                                           1536
                                                                                                                                  1538
```

that said this is not expert testimony, and I would ask you -- and, therefore, what are you worried about. And Mr. Woodcock has this in his report, which is -- Mr. Woodcock said I can't possibly calculate damages. The supply charge -- the State Water Project charges are very properly put in transportation. The water stewardship rate is reasonably and properly put in transportation -- that's all he said -- and I can't calculate damages. And now they come up with this.

2.2

2.5

So we have so many objections to this that it is going to take me a moment, but I would like to go through and put them on the record.

First of all, it is undisclosed expert testimony. And as we said in our motion, they made an effort to reopen expert discovery. We would have been a lot better off if they had reopened it and we had three months to deal with this, rather than have it dumped on us when we have four hours left at the last minute.

The opinions that are expressed there, you can tell by looking, directly conflict with the Phase 1 ruling. They put State -- what they have done is they're blending and they've gone and estimated what State Water Project water they used for blending, and then they say for that water we should be able to charge access fees on the State Water Project, directly

contract requires. To all member agencies, it is a one-off, let's-get-San-Diego kind of analysis.

No fact witness has or can testify in support of these numbers. It contradicts PTX 235, which are interrogatories, Response Number 20 -- this is in evidence -- MWD does not break out its cost of delivering exchange water from its cost of delivering other MWD water. This damage analysis does. 235 goes on to say -- Interrogatory Number 8 -- MWD does not break out its cost of transporting MWD water from its costs of transporting non-MWD water on behalf of member agencies.

Same exhibit, PTX 235A, interrogatories, MWD's cost of transporting water are the same whether the member agency is transporting MWD water or not MWD water.

We asked if there are any cost of service reports associated with delivering San Diego's third-party water; they say no such documents exist.

We asked for all data, analysis, calculations, studies and other information that detail or evidence Met's specific costs of delivery to San Diego, San Diego's conserved water from IID or canal lining water supplies; no such documents exist.

As you know, in the Skillman declaration, which

contrary to your ruling. They have included it in the water stewardship rate. I have no idea what Woodcock is going to come up with as a rationale for that, given your ruling. These are, as I said, directly contrary to the Phase 1 ruling. We have objected, and they said that no attempt to speculate about alternative rates is properly before you.

This is an attempt -- we think it's an illegal, irrelevant attempt because it conflicts with the Phase 1 ruling. But even if it weren't, it's an effort to speculate about some other set of rates that could have been charged.

They come up, by the way, with we owe them two-and-a-half million dollars, which is not surprising here. The contract damages here is that we underpaid. That is whoever's opinion.

You've already decided that a speculative rate -- this speculative rate can't be a lawful rate because of the cost of service principles, because they are loading water stewardship rate and supply costs in there. It's based on no record. It's based on no net action. It violates the wheeling law because it is a further effort to discourage wheeling by loading lots of stuff on a wheeling so it doesn't happen. It is not applicable as to what the wheeling statute and the

we will move into evidence -- that's the April 5, 2013, Skillman deposition -- declaration, she says they don't retrospectively analyze the expenditures funded for each of the rate components. She says they don't conduct a retrospective cost of service analysis that would reconcile MWD's cost of revenue of each component of MWD's rates. She says not -- such a reconciliation would require MWD to assign actual amounts to cost of service categories, a time-consuming and imprecise task, because the Oracle financial accounting system records reports revenues and expenditures, according to MWD's chart of accounts, not by cost of service category.

So, in short, somebody has done what we asked for in discovery, and they said that they couldn't do, didn't want to do. We moved to compel. You said the whole game here is to make sure you're not surprised at trial. If you are going to use something, tell them now. We find out, for example, they've got state water resources power charges in there that they never had produced in discovery. They put them on their exhibit list. We object to them, of course. And we object to a lot of what the basis is for these numbers, and then we take a breath.

Most tellingly, we don't know, and can't tell, where these numbers come from. Take, for example, the

actual State Water Project power costs, which they say they break out. They produced, over our objection, and put on the exhibit list, after not producing them in discovery, DTX1096 through 1099. These are the sort of things they insisted they didn't have, couldn't produce. They add to that administrative and general costs. We have no idea where they got that. And the basic premise, as I said before, is irrelevant because State Water Project -- they are treating State Water Project charges as transportation charges to Met. That's the --and that violates the Phase 1 ruling. 

2.0

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.4

We tried to go to their cost of service study and see what they had done and the numbers don't match. Their cost of service study for the first two years is Exhibit 90, DTX 90. For the last two years, '12 and -- no. '13 and '14, it's 110. And we try to do the math, and we come up with lower numbers than they come up with. There is this hole, where did you get these numbers. It's not clear from that.

Our brief at page 4 lays out that hearing. We attached the transcript of the hearing where we talked about this, where you said the issue here is surprise; we don't want anybody surprised and so on. I can --

Just basically there's five things: They put in actual State Water Project power costs. You've ruled

witness testimony, and it ought to be completely barred. Not -- the least reason is that no expert has begun to say anything about this, and the first we heard about it is yesterday morning and we have four hours left.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Quinn, does anybody on your side want to address this?

MR. QUINN: Yes, your Honor. We can.

We have filed a response this morning to the motion. I don't know -- I'm sure the Court has not had a chance to see that.

THE COURT: True. When are you expecting to get into this? Is it now?

MR. QUINN: It would come today with June Skillman. She is a percipient witness. I can address some of these points now. The most efficient way to deal with this might be, if I can suggest, that the Court file our opposition, and then we have a chance to talk about it. But I am fully prepared to try to respond to Mr. Keker's comments now.

THE COURT: What is your plan this morning? That is up to you.

MR. QUINN: We have Ms. Stapleton on the stand, and she is on their direct exam. We will have some re-cross. And then we have Mr. Yamasaki, and we have

those are improper in the transportation rates.

They put in actual Colorado River power costs they claim, but what they've used are spot market charges, which they have never used, never will use and don't use, and didn't use in these years. They just made it up.

They put in State Water Project access charges for the blended water that came to San Diego, they claim, which they estimate. And, again, that's a supply cost based on your ruling.

They have put in the water stewardship rate and we just can't fathom how they can do that.

There was never a -- again, in your opinion, you said to the extent that there's blending, that's gratuitous. San Diego never bargained for and there is nothing in this contract that requires them to do anything except we make available to them the Colorado River water, and they make it available to us. If they want to put in State water, if they want to blend, if they want to do something different, that's their problem. San Diego doesn't care, and there's nothing in the contract that says otherwise.

So bottom line is, this is a total sandbag. It's wrong. It's irrelevant because of the reasons I've just said. It's expert testimony, not percipient Mr. Lambeck, and I'm pretty sure that is going to get us to noon. I think at some point this afternoon June

Skillman, who is a percipient witness, and she is the one who we would use this demonstrative -- and I will say, by the way, your Honor, the agreement is and the

practice has been that demonstratives were exchanged the
 day before, and that is what both sides have done. This
 is all -- I'm sorry, your Honor.

There is no expert testimony here. And calculations, doing calculations from records and just running numbers, that is not the subject of expert testimony in my understanding. They use Mr. Denham for that. But in my own understanding, and in my own view of Mr. Denham's testimony, none of that was expert testimony.

THE COURT: The exhibit that we're looking at up here on the screen, which is this demonstrative, is it based on DTX 1096 through 1099 and 1103?

MR. KEKER: That is only the first -- that's the State Water Project part. Each part, if you look at these footnotes, presents a different problem. I can go through them one by one.

MR. QUINN: It is based on that and other documents that have been produced.

THE COURT: Were DTX 1096 through -99 produced

in discovery to the other side? You might want to think about that between now and lunch. I haven't read your opposition, and it sounds like we can get through this morning, so I can read your opposition over lunch and have a further discussion of it.

I will tell you what some of my tentative thoughts are on the issues, which might be helpful.

With respect to the sorts of objections Mr. Keker was making, in my own mind, I divide them into two kinds of categories. There is one category, which is the admissibility category, which is the only category I really care about right now.

There are other issues that Mr. Keker raised, which may not really go to admissibility. For example, if evidence is contradicted by other evidence and things like that, that is for me to look at with my trier of fact hat on and not my admissibility hat. So the fact that something is or isn't supported by the evidence is something I can handle, I think, as we hear the testimony coming in.

The question I have is really whether things are admissible or not. When it comes to expert testimony, let me just give you some preliminary thoughts, subject to my thinking about them again, as I read the opposition filed by Met.

But he did state that it was impossible to express an opinion on this. He did not express an opinion on it, so ordinarily that information would be -- or that testimony would be excluded.

With respect to the Skillman and Lambeck, at this particular -- from this vantage right now it doesn't look like they are being presented as experts. It doesn't look like it. I think, generally speaking, we could probably handle their issues as they come up at trial. So if they are asked a question or they start expressing what seems to be an expert opinion, I can handle it on the spot.

But the concern I have with Skillman and Lambeck is whether or not they are going to be testifying based on documents that were not provided to San Diego during discovery, but ought to be disclosed to San Diego during discovery. We've got some spreadsheets that calculate State Water Project power rates from a 2011 to 2014. We have a Skillman spreadsheet calculating costs of supplemental power -- the cost of supplemental power to transport exchange water. I don't know if those are expert calculations or they're just numbers put into an Excel spreadsheet, where somebody in effect pressed a button and generated some sort of answer.

1547 | 1549

With respect to Woodcock, there are -- his testimony is circumscribed by his report. And Met might be able to find some of these things for me, but there are at least three areas that don't appear to be in his report, and, therefore, would not be admissible.

The first is, "The fair and reasonable alternatives available to MWD to recover proper costs for exchange water, including fixed infrastructure costs, power costs and costs associated with conservation." He does not opine on that.

Next, quote, "Reasonable and fair rates MWD could have charged SDCWA under the 2003 amended and restated exchange agreement. Woodcock actually said it was impossible to express an opinion on those subjects, and he didn't offer an opinion on what are reasonable and fair rates that Met could have charged." So ordinarily I would exclude that testimony.

And, finally, "Mr. Woodcock's testimony will establish what MWD could properly have charged SDCWA in light of the rulings in Phase 1." I'm not exactly sure what that means. The use of the word "properly" is highly charged. It is a little unclear as to what "properly" means. Does it mean lawfully? Does it mean in conformity with certain facts on the ground as to what something costs? I don't know.

It is expert discovery to the extent there are -- that there are algorithms or formulas buried in the spreadsheet that generate a number, as there might be. For example, averaging something is probably not something you need an expert for. We can all, I think, as laypeople, understand what an average is in other sorts of contexts. But if there are other calculations that are buried inside the spreadsheet, the validity would require expert testimony, then the spreadsheet itself is expert testimony and is subject to analysis, for example, of whether or not those opinions were disclosed in a report.

But I don't know the answer to those questions about those documents right now. And that would be something we would have to discuss. So the first question is whether the documents were disclosed in discovery, and the second question is whether they, in effect, contain expert analysis of how numbers should be related to each other.

Do you know the answer to those two questions? MR. QUINN: I believe all the documents, and we addressed this in the opposition --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. QUINN: -- in the moving papers, there was nothing specifically identified as to you want to use

this, but you didn't give us this. So we are sort of responding on a background.

THE COURT: Yeah.

2.2

2.5

MR. QUINN: We believe all the data on which this analysis was done is information they have or is available to them. We provided or it is publicly available information. So in terms of -- I don't think there is going to be any instance where they can say here is a discovery request; we asked for this; you didn't give it to us, and now your analysis is based on that. I don't believe there will be any such instance.

I also do not believe there is going to be any algorithms. It's all in the nature of pretty simple arithmetic.

THE COURT: Maybe this is something we take up as it comes. I will read the opposition at lunchtime, and it sounds like the issue is not quite before us until after lunch.

MR. KEKER: Before you read the opposition, and while you're reading the opposition, can I state in rebuttal --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. KEKER: -- our brief specifically mentioned 1096 through 1099 and said this was never provided in discovery. They don't address it.

THE COURT: Let's proceed. Who is the current witness?

MR. KEKER: The current witness is Ms. Stapleton who is outside, your Honor, and we are ready to proceed.

Could you tell us what you -- we all have our own views and the only one that matters is yours, how much time we have?

THE COURT: This is always available for anybody to look at. There is no secret. And it is showing that you have used about five hours and 13 minutes. The other side, Met, has used about six hours and 17 minutes. That is what it shows.

MR. KEKER: We are under four hours at this point to go because we only have nine.

THE COURT: Whatever the math is, yeah.

## MAUREEN STAPLETON,

having been previously sworn, testified further as follows:

THE COURT: You are still under oath. The witness has been previously sworn?

MR. KEKER: She was sworn. And she testified at the end of the day. I can't understand why I can't

Our brief also said 1103 -- I believe this is right -- 1103 is Ms. Skillman's chart of what she calls on-peak power rates, and she's taking them from something call Platts reports.

All of that was never produced in discovery. We objected to it as hearsay. Platts reports is somebody out there who purports to say what the average on-peak cost is for each month and so on. And she did calculations in 1103 based on that, none of which was done in discovery, none of which have we been able to depose her on, and all of which is completely irrelevant because they won't buy on-peak power. So this is a monkey chasing its tail, as far as we're concerned.

If we are going to go forward, one of the requests would be they should not be able to use something like this without us -- and have us be limited to a short time of cross-examining. It is going to take a while to unpack this. We would like, if necessary, a recess for Skillman. Leave her right there on the stand, you go off and do other things in chambers, and we will take her deposition and find out what goes into this, if she is the one who is going to testify about it. We can't figure it out. It doesn't make any sense, and we believe it is completely wrong on a million levels.

remember what happened three-and-a-half weeks ago. She was testifying then on redirect -- on direct examination.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)

BY MR. KEKER:

Q. Ms. Stapleton, Mr. Kightlinger testified in this courtroom at transcript page 1304, as follows -- I am going to read it to you, and ask you if you agree with it.

He said:

"Q I asked Mr. Slater and Ms. Stapleton, point blank, are you going to be challenging our rate structure in which case we can't have an agreement?"

Did that happen, ma'am?

A. No.

Q. He said at 1305, one through five --THE COURT: Let's just take a second. (Discussion held off the record.)

Q. BY MR. KEKER: At 1305 of the transcript of this case, Mr. Kightlinger said, in connection with this same conversation, they stated:

"We have no objection to the

rate structure. We agree to pay that. What we are concerned about are changes Metropolitan might make in the future and we want to reserve the right to challenge those." Is that an accurate description of conversations you had with Mr. Kightlinger during negotiation of the exchange agreement? A. The first part of that is not accurate. We 

- A. The first part of that is not accurate. We always had concerns and we had raised them repeatedly about the rate itself. We did express our concern about future MWD activities, which may be harmful to the Water Authority, as well.
- Q. After the exchange agreement was signed, did you see a document from Met that recognized your view of the five-year cooling off period was the same as theirs?
- A. I saw documents that expressed the concern about us suing and the five-year period, yes.
- Q. Look at 342, please, which is in your binder. That's a -- I believe this is in evidence. That is a memorandum from Mr. Gastelum, who is the chief executive officer of Met at the time, in 2004. You said, I think, the last time we were here, that Mr. Gastelum is still around and would have been available to testify if

to challenge the wheeling charges in the future.

Q. That's the last sentence, "The reservation of rights in the QSA negotiations by San Diego to contest the District's wheeling charges is also a factor that should be considered."

When you got that, did you think that Mr. Gastelum thought there was some limitation other than the five-year limitation on your right to challenge those wheeling charges?

- A. No. I believe that Mr. Gastelum knew that we had the right to challenge the wheeling charge after the five-year period.
- Q. And this was in connection with rate structure integrity. If you look at Number 4, Mr. Gastelum is talking about, in the last sentence in the response, "Member agencies benefit from the rate structure integrity proposal because it's intended to discourage cost shifting by legislative or legal actions initiated by individual member agencies."

What was he talking about as far as you were concerned?

A. He was talking about the Water Authority's potential to challenge the wheeling rates, which may cost the other member agencies, if those costs are shifted elsewhere.

1555 | 1557

anybody wanted to call him.

#### A. Yes.

2.3

Q. And in the third paragraph he talks about a response to the white paper and talks about the intent of such a challenge would be to reduce QSA costs agreed to by San Diego in the negotiations. These costs would necessarily be paid by other member agencies. And then attached to it is a memorandum from him to member agency managers.

Were you a member agency manager?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Did you get this along with all the other member agency managers?

#### A. Yes.

- Q. In November of 2004, in that memorandum, if you look at Number 2, in the response, he is talking about the risk. He is talking about the risk of serious attempts by San Diego to legislate changes in the District's wheeling charges as well as litigation by IID and SDCWA against Met to shift wheeling costs. Was such litigation going on in 2004?
- A. Litigation on the wheeling costs, those were done. It was sent back to the lower court. But we did not have a litigation on the wheeling charges in 2004. What this talked about is the reservation of our right

Q. As of 2004, was there any question in your mind that Met understood that if this cost allocation problem didn't get resolved, after five years, San Diego had a right to challenge and to say that the rate was not lawful?

#### A. There is no question in my mind whatsoever.

Q. Look at Exhibit 81, which is in evidence. THE COURT: Do you mean PTX, Plaintiff's Exhibit 81?

Q. BY MR. KEKER: This is a memorandum from Kevin Hunt to the board of directors at the Orange County Water District; right?

MR. QUINN: We object. It's hearsay. THE COURT: It's in evidence.

MR. QUINN: I'm sorry. I withdraw my objection.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: And the date of this is 2004, around the same time as Mr. Gastelum's memorandum?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Do you see where he says -- Mr. Hunt asks you, "Ms. Stapleton, I asked whether San Diego would be pursuing legal or legislative remedies at the end of the five years' QSA delay, and she said absent any negotiated changes, yes."

Is that an accurate description of what you

would have said to Mr. Hunt at that time? well as the water stewardship charge. Those are 2 2 A. Yes. It is accurate. examples of what we were advocating that there be 3 3 O. Did you work during this five-year period with modifications in their cost allocation. 4 4 Met to try to come up with a cost allocation that San Q. Was San Diego successful in this rate 5 Diego could live with? 5 refinement process in getting Met to change? 6 6 A. Yes, we did. A. No, we were not. As a matter of fact, in one 7 Q. Who did you work with? instance, their staff had recommended a slight 8 A. Initially, after the execution of the QSA, I modification, but it was not approved by the board of 9 9 worked with Dennis Underwood, and we had many directors. 10 10 conversations regarding the potential to solve this Q. At some point did you have a conversation with 11 11 problem within the five-year time period. Mr. Kightlinger? 12 12 Q. Were you optimistic that you and Mr. Underwood A. Yes. We had done a variety of presentations to 13 13 could solve this problem? their board. 14 14 A. Yes. I found him to be a problem solver. He THE COURT: Which board? 15 had a lot of experience under his belt. He was 15 THE WITNESS: To the board of MWD. We had 16 16 commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation prior to actually submitted an alternative cost of service study 17 coming to MWD, and we had spent hours and hours together 17 to them. We paid for some consultants to provide 18 18 in the negotiations. I felt like I could trust that his material to them to try to show them why we believed our 19 19 intent was true, and I did believe that we would find interpretation was correct in properly allocating the 20 20 that sweet spot of being able to come to an agreement. costs, and it was without success. Year after year, we 21 21 Q. He was the deputy general manager during the had tried different approaches. 22 22 negotiations? And so in 2010, I had -- I called Jeff 23 23 A. Yes, he was. Kightlinger after they had adopted their 2011 and 2012 24 24 Q. Was he later promoted to general manager of rates. This was after we had provided a variety of 25 25 Met? material to them and had testified. I said to Jeff 1559 1 1 A. Yes. He was promoted in, I believe, 2005. basically is there anything else you believe we could do 2 2 O. 2005 or '4? When did he die? that would changes MWD's mind about this improper 3 3 A. He died in November of 2005. allocation. 4 Q. So he was promoted sometime during the year in 4 Jeff's comment to me was, "Maureen, you are 5 5 which he, then, unfortunately died? asking our individual board members at Met to vote 6 6 A. Yes. He was at Met the entire time until his against their own self-interest of their agency." 7 7 death. I said, "Is there anything you can think of 8 8 Q. Who became general manager after that? that would help?" 9 9 A. Jeff Kightlinger. And he said, "No." 10 10 Q. After Mr. Underwood died, did you continue to And I said, "Well, you know what that means 11 11 hope or try to work out this cost allocation problem then, Jeff. That means our only alternative is court." 12 12 with Met? THE COURT: Were there any other member 13 13 A. Yes. There were a series of processes that Met agencies who were on your side in this at this point in 14 14 had set up regarding long-range financing plan and rate this dispute? 15 15 refinement and so forth. My staff actively participated THE WITNESS: No, sir. We're the only agency 16 16 in it and raised issues regarding it and tried to that wheels independent water through the Met system. 17 17 advocate for changes in the allocation of costs. And we As a result, when I said --18 18 were hopeful then. Q. BY MR. KEKER: Stop right there. Were the 19 19 Q. Among the cost allocations you were talking member agencies, around this time, calculating how much 20 20 about, were the State Water Project -it would cost them if this cost shifting you were 21 21 MR. QUINN: Objection. Leading. advocating occurred? 22 Q. BY MR. KEKER: What were a couple of the 22 A. Yes. 23 23 allocation issues? MR. QUINN: Objection. Leading. 24 24 A. They were regarding the allocation of the State THE COURT: I will overrule in this case. 25

Pages 1559 to 1562

1562

THE WITNESS: Yes. They had done the

1561

1560

Water Project costs to the transportation charge, as

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 calculations of what we thought was the lawful wheeling 2 rate and what it would mean to moving those costs to the 3 supply rate. 4

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I move to strike. Lacks foundation.

THE COURT: I will sustain that.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, there is, in the record, a member agency chart that shows --

THE COURT: In which case, I will look at that.

- Q. BY MR. KEKER: Let me go back to the negotiations which you were asked about on the original direct examination. Would you look at Defense Exhibit 837 in your binder.
  - A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- O. You see Number 837? This is a memorandum from you to your board members; right?
  - A. Correct.
- 18 Q. And attached to it is something entitled 19 "Quantification Settlement Agreement Option for San 20 Diego County Water Authority Fact Sheet, September 16,
  - A. Yes.

2003."

23 Q. Attached to that is a two-page letter from Bob 24 Campbell or memorandum from Robert Campbell to the board 25 of directors?

wheeling costs over the initial term. Is that

- information you provided to your board about how this would work?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And then is -- Mr. Campbell's analysis that followed, you testified about that, and said it was a worst-case analysis?
  - A. Yes.
- O. Let's look at 859, which occurred about a week later. That is a memorandum from you to your executive staff dated September 24, 2003. And to refresh the Court's recollection, the exchange agreement was signed October 10, Exhibit 65.

The second page of that is a memorandum. Who got that memorandum?

- A. That was sent on to our board of directors. It was also sent to our member agency general managers, as well as it is posted as a public document as our board agenda.
- Q. This was a public document for anybody to read at the time, just before the exchange agreement was
- A. Yes. It is widely distributed and posted on our website.
  - Q. The second page of the September 24 memoranda,

1563

1565

#### A. Yes.

MR. KEKER: For the record, the two-page memorandum from Campbell is Defense Exhibit 50, which was shown to Mr. Slater, your Honor.

- Q. But that was part of a larger package; right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. On the second page of the fact sheet, would you look under Option-2, sixth bullet down. Can we blow up that bullet?

It reads, "In consideration" -- and this --Just to set a stage, this is you presenting facts to your board about this deal that you are negotiating with Met; right?

- A. Yes. This is a quick fact sheet a week before our board is going to consider it in a formal board
- Q. It says, "In consideration for MWD's assignment of canal lining water rights to San Diego, San Diego pays Met's lawful wheeling rate in lieu of the exchange agreement rates. Neither MWD nor San Diego may lobby for a change in law that affects the MWD wheeling rates. San Diego may not contest the wheeling rate in a judicial setting during the first five years."

And then down at the bottom it talks about Option-2 provides exposure to potentially higher MWD

- 1 under "SDCWA Canal Lining Options," let's blow up 2
  - Option-2. In Option 2 it says, in the second -- third
- sentence, "In consideration for MWD's assignment of All 4
- American and Coachella canal lining water rights to the
- 5 Authority, the Authority would pay MWD's lawful wheeling
- 6 rate in lieu of the exchange agreement. The current
- 7 published wheeling rate is \$253 per acre-foot and is
- 8 comprised of the system access charge, water stewardship 9
  - charge and power cost."

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes.

Q. If you skip back to page 9 of 9 in this public document, there is a paragraph that says, "Risks are bounded."

Do you see that?

#### A. Yes, I do.

Q. That says, "It is important when considering Option-2 to recognize that the cost risks are bounded in the agreements and/or in law. The financial analysis provided in this memo includes worst-case cost projections."

And the last sentence says, "In short, there's far greater definition over costs associated with Option-2 than those that would be encountered in an effort to secure as yet unidentified supplies to meet

1566

future demands."

And then finally, if you go back a number of pages to A-7, and look at number 3.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. I am reminded that 859 is not in evidence. I would move it into evidence.

MR. QUINN: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: DTX 859 is admitted.

(DTX 859 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. KEKER: Go to A-7. Number 3 says, "San Diego shall pay rate established by MWD for all exchange water. MWD and SDCWA agree not to seek changes to law regulation regarding transportation-related charges for water wheeled by MWD. However, after first five years, SDCWA can contest lawfulness of MWD rate in an administrative or judicial forum."

Does this memorandum exactly show what you understood the agreement consisted of?

#### A. Yes, it does.

- Q. There's been testimony about the fact that San Diego receives equal monthly deliveries of its Colorado River water. Who requested that term in the agreement?
- A. MWD requested they be equal allocations for the 12 months.
  - Q. Was it explained to you why Met wanted it that

deliver water, if we have not provided it.

- Q. If you don't give them the Colorado River water, they don't have any obligation under the exchange agreement?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. Look at 3.2(e).
- A. Yes.
  - Q. Explain what that means.
  - A. That -- that is an example of how Met wanted the flexibility to operate their system, their physical system, any way they saw fit. So they wanted the ability to use whatever facility or whatever pipe they wanted to deliver the exchange water in. It says basically they have that right, and if they deliver it in a certain manner in one year, it doesn't set a precedent to have it delivered that same way in future years.
  - Q. If they deliver 100 percent Colorado River water to meet their obligations under this agreement, did San Diego have any concern about that?

## A. No, none at all.

Q. If they chose, because of their own convenience or something else, to mix -- to deliver a mix of Colorado River and some other water that they bought somewhere else, did Metropolitan care about that?

way?

- A. It was for operational purposes. It was something they could count on, they knew exactly how much water they had to deliver each month to San Diego.
- Q. In the contract, did it give a right to blend water?
- A. Yes. At Met's sole discretion they could blend water with other water sources that they had.
- Q. Look at that in a second. Who asked for that right to blend water?
- A. That was MWD, as well. They were very adamant in our agreement that they have sole discretion to operate their system, their total system, as they saw fit and we had no objection to it.
- Q. Did you care whether or not they gave you 100 percent Colorado River water or something different?
- A. No. We were prepared to take 100 percent Colorado River water. Met wanted that ability to take it from whatever source they deemed appropriate.
- Q. In the contract, is there a provision -- let's look at 3.2 of PTX 65. 3.2(a). It is in your book. And 3.2(a), what does 3.2(a) provide, just generally? The Court can read it.
- A. It basically says if we provide the water, then they need to deliver it. They are not required to

Excuse me. Did San Diego care about that?

- A. No. We did not.
- Q. Let's look at 3.6, that's the water quality provision. Explain that to the Court, please.
- A. Right. This is, again, an example of Metropolitan wanting their discretion to deliver whatever type of water blend. And it's a quality -- it's pretty much the same thing as before. It's a quality issue. They could either blend it or they could give us 100 percent Colorado River water. It was at their discretion to make that decision. And then finally, that whatever they did, if they did blend it, it set no precedence for future years.
- Q. Was there ever a time up until now when there was not enough Colorado River water available to Met to make the monthly deliveries that it was committed to make to San Diego?
- A. No. The Bureau of Reclamation actually has the water available at the beginning of each water year, and that water sits in Lake Mead and then is moved down to Lake Havasu where the pumps are. So even if Imperial Irrigation District conserved the water, technically, in the latter part of the year, Met still has all the water they need to move the exchange water in monthly increments starting at the beginning of the year.

2.3

The accounting is done at the end of the year, so it isn't as if each month someone is checking to see if IID conserved how much water and then only that water is given to Met. Actually, the Bureau of Reclamation allows Met to take that water uniformly, and then at the end of the year, they do the accounting and true it up.

Q. Through the years, up to now, has there ever been a time when the Colorado River Aqueduct was volume constrained where it couldn't move the water that Met needed to move?

A. The only time I can think of is when they bring down a pump or they bring down the aqueduct for an inspection or maintenance, and then they bring it back.

A. The only time I can think of is when they bring down a pump or they bring down the aqueduct for an inspection or maintenance, and then they bring it back up and the water is delivered -- there's provisions within the contract that says you don't have to deliver the water in that month, if you are doing maintenance or an inspection or there's an emergency.

Q. My final question, Ms. Stapleton, is by far the most interesting fact I learned in this case. How many gallons of water does it take to produce one cheeseburger?

## A. 698 gallons.

MR. KEKER: Thanks. No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, any questions?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And on the Met side, the participants included, I think you told us, Mr. Kightlinger?

A. Ves

Q. Was there a gentleman by the name of Brian Thomas?

# A. Brian Thomas was included in the negotiation team, as well.

Q. Was there an individual -- was Paul Cunningham also involved?

A. Yes.

Q. Was Carl Kaseman involved, as well?

A. He -- I do not recall him often at the table. He did a variety of the writing of the documents, and I believe is a peer of Paul Cunningham.

Q. Whether he was involved a lot or not, he had some involvement?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. As well as Mr. Gastelum?

A. Yes.

Q. He was involved, as well?

A. On occasion, yes.

THE COURT: Ma'am, if I could ask you to let him completely finish the question, it will be easier.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

1571 1573

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. QUINN:

Q. Do you recall the last time you testified, when we were here, Mr. Keker asked you some questions about San Diego's objections to including State Water Project costs in the conveyance rates? Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. At that time you testified that you had conversations with Dennis Underwood, the man who passed away about that --

A. Yes.

Q. -- do you recall?

Now, there were a number of people who participated in the negotiation of the 2003 exchange agreement besides yourself and Mr. Underwood; isn't that true?

A. Yes.

Q. And that would include, for example,

Mr. Cushman?

A. He didn't participate much in the negotiations itself.

Q. But I mean he was involved in structuring the deal?

A. He was -- yes, he was aware of it.

Q. And Mr. Slater, as well?

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Now, in response to Mr. Keker's questions, you said that you told Mr. Underwood that including the State Water Project costs in transportation was unlawful because it violated the Katz wheeling statute.

Do you recall saying that in response to one of Mr. Keker's questions last time?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall that you testified at a public hearing before the State Water Resources Control Board in April of 2002? This is going back in time, I know. Do you have a recollection of that?

A. Yes.

Q. The subject of that hearing concerned a joint petition by San Diego and the IID for approval of a long-term transfer of conserved water pursuant to the agreement between San Diego and the IID; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. That hearing was around the time you told us you had those conversations with Mr. Underwood; correct?

A. I had them throughout the entire process.

Q. Including that time?

A. Yes.

Q. At that hearing -- actually, Mr. Slater was asking you questions. He was your lawyer then and he

Pages 1571 to 1574

1 was asking you questions like Mr. Keker has been asking 1 agreement which San Diego then had with Met; correct? 2 2 you questions in this trial? A. Yes. 3 3 Q. So, at the time, at the time of this hearing, A. That's true. 4 4 Q. Do you recall in response to Mr. Slater's the 2003 agreement wasn't yet in effect. What you were 5 5 questions you testified concerning your understanding of referring to was the 1998 agreement which was then in 6 6 that Katz wheeling law; do you recall that? effect? A. I do not recall that specific. A. Correct. 8 8 MR. QUINN: If we could take a look at PTX 224. Q. But each of those exchange agreements, whether 9 9 it's the 1998 one or 2003 exchange agreement, they are That is a transcript of that hearing. The Court 10 10 requested if we are only going to use a few pages we try radically different than a wheeling agreement; correct? 11 11 to put the few pages in. We will put the few pages we A. It was the difference between firm and space 12 12 use as Exhibit 44A. If we could look at, from this available. 13 13 transcript, page 437, line 15; 438, line six. O. So at --14 14 Mr. Slater asked you: A. That's the radical difference. 1.5 1.5 "Q Are you aware of the Katz Q. We will get to that. But your testimony is it 16 wheeling law? 16 is radically different than a wheeling agreement; 17 17 And you said, "Yes." correct? 18 18 If it is easier, you can look at the screen, A. Yes. 19 19 ma'am. Q. You testified that the exchange agreement is 20 20 radically different from a Katz wheeling transfer in at Mr. Slater asked you: 21 21 "Q Are you aware of whether least two respects. One, that it is a trade of one 22 2.2 the Katz wheeling law provides supply of water for another and, second, it is firm 23 23 for firm capacity transfers or capacity as opposed to space available; correct? That 24 space available?" 24 was your testimony? 2.5 2.5 And your answer was: A. Yes. 1575 1577 1 1 "A Yes, I'm aware that it is Q. You understand that the Katz wheeling statute 2 2 space available." did not apply to the exchange agreement? 3 3 Q. Do you see that? A. That portion did not apply. 4 4 Q. Because it didn't meet those requirements; A. I do. 5 5 Q. And you testified that the Katz wheeling law correct? 6 6 A. Yes. applied to space available transfers? 7 7 A. Yes. Q. The rates under the exchange agreement, the --8 8 since they are radically different, the rates under the O. You also testified that: 9 9 exchange agreement could not violate the Katz wheeling "A Sometimes, including at the 10 1.0 time of that hearing, that the law because it didn't apply to the exchange agreement; 11 11 isn't that true? Colorado River Aqueduct is 12 12 full." A. No. that's not true. 13 13 Do you recall that? Q. You told us there was a radical difference 14 14 between a wheeling agreement and an exchange agreement; A. I do. 15 15 O. You said: true? 16 "If there was not space 16 17 17 Q. And the two things that you've indicated are available in the Colorado 18 18 radically different is, first, it's a trade of one aqueduct at a given time, San 19 19 Diego could not move water supply of water for another; right? 20 20 purchased from the IID." A. Correct. 21 21 Correct? Q. And second, it's firm capacity as opposed to 22 22 space available; correct? A. Yes. 23 2.3 Q. You understand and you testified at that A. Correct. 2.4 24 hearing that there is a radical difference, your words, Q. In fact, San Diego has acknowledged in other 25 25 litigation that the exchange agreement is not a wheeling between the wheeling agreement and the exchange 1576 1578

2.3

agreement and falls outside the scope of the wheeling law?

2.3

# A. That the exchange agreement falls outside the wheeling law.

- Q. The exchange agreement is not a wheeling agreement and falls outside the scope of the wheeling law?
  - A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
  - Q. Is there a particular word I'm using?
- A. You said the wheeling law. The exchange agreement includes components that rely on the wheeling rate. So I'm uncertain as to how to answer that question.
- Q. Isn't it true that it's been San Diego's position in other litigation that the exchange agreements do not trigger the application of wheeling statutes; isn't that true?

## A. Doesn't trigger. I would be happy --

THE COURT: It is a question about whether you know what position San Diego has taken in other litigation. You may or may not but that is what the question is.

THE WITNESS: Right. I believe portions of the Katz law apply to the exchange agreement, so I don't know how to answer that. I'm sorry, your Honor.

of the wheeling statutes. Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. And then if you look also at Defense DTX 78, this is in evidence, joint motion of Met and San Diego for summary adjudication in litigation entitled, "In re QSA cases dated April 2, 2009, filed in Sacramento County Superior Court."

You are familiar with that litigation, aren't you?

#### A. Yes.

Q. If you turn to page 20 at line five, do you see if it says -- do you see where it says, "Even if it were subject to validation, the MWD-SDCWA exchange agreement falls outside the scope of the wheeling law"?

Do you see that?

#### A. I do.

Q. Not only is the exchange agreement not a wheeling agreement but the price under the exchange agreement was never Met wheeling rate. Isn't that true?

#### A. No, that's absolutely false.

Q. Let's take a look at 1149A. This is in evidence. The Met Administrative Code Section 4405, sub (b), and if you look at 1149 at page six, sub (b), "The rates for wheeling service shall include the system access rate, the water stewardship rate and for treated

THE COURT: The question is, do you know what positions San Diego has taken in other litigation?

THE WITNESS: Not specific legal components, no, sir.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Let's take a look at Defense Exhibit 1143. This is not yet in evidence.

MR. KEKER: Can I look at it? Is it in here? It is Appellant San Diego County Water Authority, Coachella Valley Water District, and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Joint Combined Appellants' Reply and Cross-Defendants' and Respondents' brief in QSA Coordinated Civil Cases. We objected to this pretrial as hearsay.

THE COURT: Let's see what uses can be made out of it. Let's reserve that ruling. Let's see what Mr. Quinn wants to do with this.

MR. QUINN: This is a pleading filed on behalf of San Diego. If we could turn to page 154, seven lines from the top.

Q. What is written here in this brief filed by San

Diego is that Metropolitan and San Diego maintain that the exchange agreement and the transfer agreements are clear on their faces and they do not pertain to the forced use of unused capacity in the water conveyance system of an agency and thus do not trigger application water the treatment surcharge as set forth in Section 4401."

### A. Yes.

Q. "In addition, wheeling parties must pay for their own costs for power if such power can be scheduled by the district or pay the district for the actual cost, not system average, of power service used for delivery of the wheeled water."

Do you see that?

### A. I do.

Q. And as you can see, Met's wheeling rate from this you can see is based on the actual cost of power and the system power rate?

### A. Yes. I see that.

Q. Metropolitan's wheeling rate is based on the actual cost of power and not the system power rate; correct?

#### A. Yes, I see that.

Q. But as you have previously testified, both the initial price under the exchange agreement of \$253 and the prices charged since then under the exchange agreement were based on the system power rate; correct?

## A. Yes.

Q. So the price under the exchange agreement was not Met's wheeling rate as specified in the

1.5

Administrative Code; correct?

A. It's not in the -- it's not related to the Administrative Code. It's what is the lawful wheeling rate. So it is a determination of what is lawful to charge, not per se what their Admin Code may or may not say.

- Q. I understand your position on that, ma'am. My question is a little bit different. Met's code sets forth what its wheeling rate is; correct?
  - A. That is their published rate, correct.
- Q. That is what they say their wheeling rate is; correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And that's not, at least as it relates to power, not the rate that was charged under the exchange agreement; correct?
- A. Correct. Met decided the power rate they charged.
- Q. Right. In connection with the water stewardship rate, you testified that you communicated your belief that it was unlawful to include that water stewardship rate in the conveyance charges again to Mr. Underwood; correct?
- A. Mr. Underwood as one. We also conveyed it to others.

Q. Let me read to you from Mr. -- you are aware Mr. Slater was designated by the San Diego Water Authority as a person most knowledgeable to testify on various subjects including the negotiation of the exchange agreement. You know that, don't you?

#### A. I do.

- Q. Let me read to you from Mr. Slater's deposition as San Diego's person most knowledgeable. This is Volume II, page 231, line 7 to 15.
  - "Q Let me focus now on the water stewardship rate. Do you recall Maureen Stapleton telling Dennis Underwood that in her view the inclusion of water stewardship rate was unlawful?
  - "A I don't believe she used that phrase. I believe she spoke, as we did at the time, about a systemwide charge. And her focus, I believe, was the inclusion of the state project. I don't recall her talking about the stewardship rate."

    Is that consistent with your recollection?

1583 1585

Q. Well, when you were asked about this by Mr. Keker, you identified Mr. Underwood as the one you spoke to about that. Do you recall that?

## A. Yes, I do.

Q. And again, the reason you told us, again, why you thought it was improper in response to Mr. Keker's questions was, again, it wasn't consistent with the wheeling law. Do you recall giving that answer?

#### A. I do.

Q. And we have talked about that now, what the wheeling law provides and what San Diego's positions are on that.

Let me ask you this question about this conversation that you recall with Mr. Underwood relating to the water stewardship rtae. Was Mr. Cushman present during any of your conversations with Mr. Underwood about the water stewardship rate?

- A. No. My recollection is that it was -- Dennis Underwood and I talked one-on-one and I do not recall an incident where Mr. Cushman was present. He could have been but I don't recall a specific incident.
- Q. Was Mr. Slater present during any of your conversations about the water stewardship rate with Mr. Underwood?
  - A. I do not recall.

A. No. No, it isn't. I believe that Mr. Slater's reference about, "She did not use that phrase" is the reference to saying it's unlawful. We talked about that before, that we don't say it's illegal. We say it's not consistent with law. We say, you know, whatever.

But I did talk to Dennis and, as I said, Dennis and I had numerous -- dozens of private conversations because he was my peer on the negotiation team.

- Q. Would it be true to say that the only conversation you had with anyone from Met that you can recall about the lawfulness of the water stewardship rate was Mr. Underwood who is deceased and nobody from either side, including your attorney Mr. Slater, nothing about that conversation?
- A. I also spoke to Ron Gastelum about it, the RSI -- we are talking about the RSI now, sir?
- Q. We are talking about this conversation you had with Mr. Underwood. I am asking you is there anyone else. Is it true to say there is nobody on your side or your lawyer who knows about this conversation who you spoke to about this other than the deceased individual?
- A. Mr. Slater, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Taylor, they all know that Dennis and I had frequent conversations and they were aware I had expressed my concern about the inclusion of certain costs in the wheeling rate. We

1 were meeting on a regular basis and I mean sometimes Q. And some of those communications concerned the 2 2 daily. Many, many conversations were taking place and legality of including the State Water Project costs? 3 3 we would come back as a team and talk about what folks A. Yes. 4 4 had said. Q. And those communications also concerned the 5 Q. In terms of people who were actually present 5 legality of including the State Water Project costs in 6 6 when you had this conversation, it would be you and Met's power charges? 7 Mr. Underwood; is that true? A. I don't recall that specific one. 8 8 A. We did talk as teams about our disagreement Q. Well, let me read to you from Mr. Slater's 9 9 with the wheeling rate and we had continued to talk deposition and see if this jogs your recollection. This 10 10 about that right up until the negotiations for Option-2 is from Volume II, page 212, line 22, to 213, line 11 11 three? 12 12 Q. Ma'am, the only persons present when you talked "O How about in the weeks and 13 13 to Mr. Underwood about -months leading up to the 14 14 A. No. execution of the October 2003 15 15 Q. -- the water stewardship rate was you and exchange agreement, did you 16 16 Mr. Underwood? have the conversations with 17 A. Water stewardship? No. I believe that we had 17 people at San Diego about the 18 conversations as a team as well with the MWD team about 18 legality of including power 19 19 what was included in the wheeling rate. charges associated with the 20 20 Q. You recall in response to Mr. Keker's State Water Project in Met's 21 21 questions, when he asked you, and this is from the last wheeling rate? 22 22 session of the trial, page 1524, four to 16: "A Yes." 23 23 "Q And to whom did you Mr. Slater's testimony, does that jog your 24 24 communicate that concern and memory at all? 25 25 what did you say about it? A. I knew that he and Mr. Campbell were having 1587 1589 1 1 A. For me, it was Dennis conversations about the power rate. 2 2 Underwood who was my Q. And those communications that Mr. Slater had 3 3 counterpart on the negotiating also concerned the legality of including the water 4 4 team of Met. And again, I stewardship rate in what is sometimes referred to as the 5 5 indicated the water stewardship wheeling rate; correct? 6 A. Yes. charge was directly related to 7 supply development and it O. Now, isn't it true that Mr. Slater did not see 8 8 didn't belong on the any violation of pertinent laws in 2003 in the inclusion 9 9 of these rates at the time the exchange agreement was transportation charge. I 10 1.0 signed? didn't believe it was 11 11 consistent, again, with the A. I don't believe that statement is accurate. I 12 12 believe that Mr. Slater felt our interpretation of the wheeling law." 13 13 Do you recall giving that testimony? wheeling law was different than Met's. 14 14 A. Absolutely. That is correct. Q. Let me read from Mr. Slater's deposition, 15 15 Q. And let me change gears now and ask you about Volume I, page 72, line 25, to 73, line seven" 16 16 conversations regarding the legality of the rates "O And I don't want to put 17 17 leading up to the approval of the 2003 exchange any words in your mouth at all. 18 18 I don't want to do that at all agreement. In the months leading up to that, would it 19 19 be true to say that Mr. Slater had many communications today. So at this point in 20 20 with the San Diego Water Authority about the legality of time, in 2003, you had not 21 21 Met's rates? identified that Met's then 22 22 A. Yes. existing rate structure might 23 Q. Probably had more than 50 such communications 23 be in violation of --2.4 2.4 in writing or orally? you had not identified any 25 25 A. Yes. particular law or reg, law or

1590

1 regulation that Met's then "Q To your understanding, was 2 2 existing rate structure might that a legal rate? 3 3 be in violation of? "A Yeah. Look, I think the 4 "A We did -- we knew that rate was properly adopted by 5 5 there were laws that could be their Administrative Code and I 6 6 pertinent but we did not see a think we agreed to pay it." violation." Did you agree with Mr. Slater back at the time 8 8 the exchange agreement was signed? Do you agree, as of the time of the exchange 9 9 agreement, San Diego did not see any violation of law in A. I believe that his statement that the rate was 10 10 the inclusion of these charges in the transportation properly adopted by the Admin Code and that we agreed to 11 11 rate? pay it for that period of time is correct. 12 12 Q. How about the "yeah," which begins the answer A. There was a variety of court cases going on 13 13 with "Yeah"? that were inconclusive and, as a result, we thought 14 14 there was inconsistency with the law but we could not "Q To your understanding, was 15 15 say it is absolutely, it's illegal. And I don't know that a legal rate?" 16 16 The answer is, "Yeah." Scott's reference to violation. But we couldn't be 17 17 Do you agree with that? absolute. 18 A. No. And I don't know what the "yeah" reference 18 Q. Would you agree that you didn't see any 19 19 violation in the inclusion of the power rate, the State is. 20 20 Q. Do you have any -- on the one hand -- can you Water Project costs, the water stewardship rate in the 21 21 transportation rate as of the time the exchange help me out on this? 22 22 agreement was signed? A. Sure. 23 23 Q. On the one hand, Mr. Slater says we didn't see A. I'm not sure I would -- I'm not sure I would 24 24 agree with the words that we didn't see a violation. We a violation and here he says, "Yeah, we understand that 25 did not -- we weren't certain there was a violation of. 25 was a -- was it a legal rate?" 1591 1593 1 1 Q. You don't have -- I take it you don't have a "Yeah." 2 2 law degree: ma'am? But you also tell us there was a dispute about 3 3 A. No. You can tell. whether it was legal or not. All those things are true? 4 4 Q. You would rely on Mr. Slater for determination A. No. I think that this answer by Mr. Slater 5 5 of whether there was a violation or not? says we believed it was administratively adopted 6 6 correctly and we agreed to pay for it for a period of A. Him and our general counsel, yes. 7 7 Q. You told Mr. Keker in response to one of his time. It doesn't mean we didn't believe and didn't 8 8 questions that the time the exchange agreement was express that we felt our interpretation was different 9 9 signed up, there was then a dispute between Metropolitan than MWD's. That was the whole basis for the five-year 10 10 and San Diego about whether that initial price that was timeout. If we agreed to pay for it, we wouldn't have 11 11 in the agreement of \$253 was a lawful rate; do you had a five-year timeout. 12 12 recall telling Mr. Keker that? Q. We will get to the five-year provision but we 13 13 A. Yes. looked at the testimony before when Mr. Slater said we 14 14 didn't see a violation. Do you recall that? Q. Let me read to you a portion again of 15 15 Mr. Slater's deposition as San Diego's person most A. Uh-huh. 16 16 knowledgeable, Volume I, page 36, line 25 to 37, line Q. You understand that referred to the same period 17 17 11" of time when the exchange agreement is signed up? 18 18 "Q The 2003 agreement, there A. Right. 19 19 was a price provision for Q. There's been discussion, I think we talked 20 20 roughly \$253 in addition. Do about this last time, about Option-1 and Option-2 that 21 21 vou recall that? were presented in connection with the negotiation of the 22 22 "A Yeah. exchange agreement and it was actually Mr. Slater's 23 2.3 "Q To your understanding was idea. Do you recall that? 24 24 that a legal rate at the time? A. Yes. 25 25 "A Do I understand that was a legal rate? Q. Do you recall that San Diego proposed to pay 1592 1594

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

6

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 Met's full wheeling rate as the initial price term under 2 Option-2? 3
  - A. Yes.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. Which at the time was the \$253 initial price in the 2003 exchange agreement?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. That's what San Diego proposed?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So San Diego proposed a price term which actually are you telling us you thought was illegal at the time?
- A. I'm saying at that time we thought our interpretation was different than theirs and the 253 would -- was not the proper wheeling rate.
- Q. You thought it was illegal; is that what you've told us, it was unlawful?
  - A. It was unlawful.
- Q. So San Diego proposed that price term which you thought was unlawful for five years; correct?
- A. We weren't sure but our interpretation was that it wasn't lawful.
- Q. So even though you believe the price term was unlawful, you recommended that to the San Diego board; is that true?
  - A. Yes.

1595

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That a public agency such as San Diego can enter into a contract believing the performance of that contract is unlawful?

MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. QUINN: Her understanding.

THE COURT: Overruled. I won't take it as that.

THE WITNESS: Pardon?

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: Is it your understanding that a public agency, like the San Diego Water Authority, can enter into a contract believing that the performance of that contract is illegal?
- A. I believe that we can enter into a contract where there is a disagreement of an interpretation of a law, yes.
- Q. We looked at various of the pro formas that you had your staff work up. You asked or they worked up to compare Option-1, Option-2 and what the costs and savings would be for an additional volume of water versus the different wheeling rates. Do you recall that we looked at some of those?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. We looked at in evidence DTX 829, that email

1597

- Q. And the board did approve it before you told the board orally in closed session that was an illegal 3 price; is that true?
  - A. We told them we thought our interpretation was different than Met's and that we had the right to challenge after five years.
  - Q. Did you tell your board -- you recommended this \$253 price, which you told us you thought was illegal. Did you tell your board that what you had proposed was actually an illegal price?
  - A. Again, sir, I don't use the word "illegal." What I said was our interpretation was different that -that our interpretation of the law was that that price was not consistent with the law. So I didn't say this is illegal, we are agreeing to something illegal. That wouldn't be something I would say. I'm not a lawyer.
  - Q. Whether or not you said unlawful or illegal or not consistent with the law, did you tell your board when you submitted this for recommendation that you had proposed a price that was either illegal, unlawful or not consistent with the law? Yes or no, did you tell them that?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. Is it your understanding -- I am focusing just on your understanding now.

- chain between you and Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Campbell to Mr. Willer, where he asked that he work up a pro forma
- comparing that analysis over 75 years of what the cost would be.
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. We looked at that? You recall that?
  - A. I do.
- 8 Q. And you also had an analysis done about what 9 the relative cost would be under the wheeling charges 10 and what the value of the water you would get over 45 11 years, as well; do you recall that? 12
  - A. I do.
  - Q. You also had your staff prepare an analysis as to what the cost would be, including the wheeling charges over 35 years; correct?
  - Q. That DTX 221, which is in evidence, slide 21, in this slide you describe the cost for benefit received from canal lining as the present value difference between the 1998 exchange agreement cost and the MWD wheeling rate cost for 35 years. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes, I do.
  - Q. If we turn to slide 26, you also had a forecast and analysis done over 20 years comparison of Option-1 and Option-2; do you see that?

1598

A. I do.

- Q. In considering Option-1 and Option-2 and what the cost would be under the relative wheeling rates and
- other financial factors, San Diego did a 75-year
- <sup>5</sup> forecast, a 45-year forecast and a 35-year forecast and
- a 20-year forecast but it never did a five-year
- <sup>7</sup> forecast, isn't that true?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Let me ask you, which of these four forecasts that you did do were the worst case? You said you wanted to see the worst-case scenario. Which one of these was the worst case?
  - A. I believe all of the numbers used were assuming that we were unable to change the MWD wheeling rate. So they were all worst-case scenarios based on different terms.
  - Q. You say that -- I mean, you were insistent that the price in the exchange agreement should be based on lawful rates; correct?
    - A. Yes. Yes.
  - Q. But San Diego based all its analyses, every single one of them, all four of these based on escalations of what you are telling us you consider to be unlawful rates; correct?
    - A. That is correct.

Q. Do you recall those questions?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. You said San Diego agreed to pay Met's wheeling rate, whatever they said, for five years; do you recall that?
- A. I do.
- Q. In 2003, you told us several times, that you thought the then existing wheeling rate and its components were unlawful; right?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. But you agreed to pay those rates you thought were unlawful for at least five years?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And when you testified that San Diego agreed to pay Met's wheeling rate, whatever they set for five years, did you mean that literally?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So did you understand there were any limitations at all on the price that Met could charge in the first five years?
- A. No. That we expected Met to continue to do the cost of service analysis and charge what rate they decided they wanted to charge. And we were willing to take that risk.
  - Q. You said you were prepared to pay Met's

- Q. And we won't find anywhere a piece of paper where you did an analysis of the first five years and then some projection about what would be after that, based on some other wheeling rate?
- A. No. Because you had Option-1, which was the wheeling rate of the \$90. That is what we thought was a fair and equitable wheeling rate, approximately, at the time.
  - Q. My question was a little bit different.
  - A. Sorry.
- Q. In assessing the Option-2 and doing the various forecasts under the Option-2 scenario, we won't find anywhere any document where there was a forecast done of what the cost would be for the wheeling rate for just five years and then some other rate after those five years?
  - A. That is correct. Yes.
- Q. So let's now talk about -- I forget what term you referred to it, either the standstill or the timeout. Let's talk about that a little bit.
  - A. (Nods head affirmatively.)
- Q. Mr. Keker asked you some questions about this, about how long San Diego agreed to pay that rate which you thought was unlawful.
  - A. Yes.

wheeling rate for five years, whatever they set?

- A Ves
- Q. Quote, unquote, for five years?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. Was there any limitations at all?
- A. Not in the agreement.
- Q. Met could have set the price at \$10,000 per acre-foot and San Diego would have paid that for five years?
  - A. We would have had to have paid it because we were precluded from challenging in court.
    - Q. No matter what the amount was?
  - A. There was no -- there's no provision in the new exchange agreement which had governors on the amount they could charge.
  - Q. Let's -- Let's take a look at that provision and see if that's -- if you actually agree with that after looking at the language.

If you take a look at the exchange agreement, DTX 51, PTX 65, starting at page 16, I think you told us that in your understanding San Diego could not challenge the Met established rate for the first five years; that was your testimony?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Keker showed you the second proviso, kind

1 of a complicated passage there. He showed you the 2 2 second proviso to the standstill agreement which says, rates as unlawful; correct? 3 3 "Provided further that, A, after the conclusion of the 4 first five years, nothing herein shall preclude San what the contract states. 5 Diego from contesting in an administrative or judicial 5 6 6 forum whether such charge or charges have been set in grounds, "did not have to." 7 accordance with applicable law and regulations." 8 8 Do you see that? 9 9 A. I do. 10 10 Q. That's the second proviso. If you would, 11 11 please, back up and look at the main part of section THE COURT: Overruled. 12 12 5.2, beginning on page 17, on the second line where it Legitimate cross. 13 13 says, "For the term of this agreement, neither SDCWA nor 14 14 Metropolitan shall seek or support in any legislative, A. Correct. 15 15 administrative or judicial forum any change in the form, 16 16 substance or interpretation of any applicable law or 17 17 regulation (including the Administrative Code) in effect 18 18 on the date of this agreement and pertaining to the A. Correct. 19 19 charge or charges set by Metropolitan's board of 20 20 directors and generally applicable to the conveyance of 21 21 water." 2.2 22 Do you see that? 23 23 A. I do. 24 24 Q. You understood from reading this provision that interpretation of the law? 25 25 San Diego was only restricted from seeking a change in 1603 1 1 the form, substance and interpretation of the then conclusion. 2 2 existing law; correct? 3 3 A. Laws or regulation. Yeah. 4 4 Q. That was in effect on the date of this conclusion. 5 5 agreement; correct? 6 6 A. Yes. 7 7 Q. And you understood that the change in form, 8 8 substance or interpretation of existing law, that 9 9 referred to -- that that refers to what was in effect in 10 1.0 2003? of this language. 11 11 12 12 Q. But San Diego's understanding in 2003, that does it? 13 13 Met's rates were illegal in 2003 --14 14 Are you with me so far? 15 15 A. I am. 16 16 Q. -- was based on the then existing law in 2003, 17 17 necessarily; correct? 18 18 A. Yes. 19 19 Q. So you understood that San Diego did not have 20 20 to seek a change in the law in effect in 2003 to 21 21 challenge that Met's rates were unlawful in the first 22

22

23

2.4

25

five years? Correct?

A. Could you repeat that question?

Q. You understood that San Diego did not have to

seek a change in the law in effect in 2003, which is

what you were prohibited from doing, to challenge Met's

MR. KEKER: Objection. Misstates what the --

THE COURT: I will sustain on vagueness

Q. BY MR. QUINN: San Diego could challenge Met's rates -- it was San Diego's view that the rates were unlawful under the then existing law of 2003?

MR. KEKER: Asked and answered.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Correct?

Q. And you're only prohibited from seeking to change the form, substance or interpretation of the then existing law; that's what the proviso governs; correct?

Q. So it would be true to say if you thought the rates were illegal under the then existing law, it would not be a violation of that proviso to challenge the rates as being unlawful because you wouldn't have to be seeking a change in the form, substance or

MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for a legal

THE COURT: This will go to her understanding of the agreement. I won't take it as a legal

THE WITNESS: No. No, that's not correct because it's the interpretation of the law and, as you said, that it says right there, interpretation of any applicable law. We believed that we could not challenge the rates for five years, period. That was the intent

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Okay. But it doesn't say that,

A. No. It says we won't -- neither San Diego nor Met shall seek or support any blah, blah, blah, including judicial forum, any change in the form, substance or interpretation of the law.

Q. I will try this once more and then I'll move

If you thought it was illegal under the existing law, which you told me you about --

Q. -- then you wouldn't have to seek a change in order to challenge it as being unlawful, isn't that

MR. KEKER: Objection. Argumentative.

1606

1605

1604

23

24

THE COURT: Sustained. 1 understanding, your Honor. 2 2 Let me ask one question. I don't know if this THE COURT: Overruled. 3 3 is part of what's -- I don't know if this is helpful or THE WITNESS: Could you --4 4 not, so I'm only going to ask one question. THE COURT: Do you want the question? 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. 5 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question? 6 6 THE COURT: At this point, which is if you look Q. BY MR. QUINN: Sure. This third proviso, you 7 7 at this phrase on the second line of page 17, "for the understood this third proviso said that after five years 8 term of this agreement" --8 San Diego could contest whether the charges set under 9 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. the first proviso, the amendments to the Administrative 10 10 THE COURT: -- what time period does that Code were set in accordance with applicable law. That 11 11 cover, in your personal view? was your understanding? 12 THE WITNESS: Right. For the term of the 12 A. No. My understanding, it was that we could --13 agreement, we were not -- we are not able to do --13 we could challenge or contest the charges that have been 14 THE COURT: I don't -- I'm not asking what --14 set in accordance with the applicable law. It did not 1.5 15 THE WITNESS: Sorry. refer to the first proviso. So I am not sure how to 16 THE COURT: Let me start again. 16 interpret your question. 17 THE WITNESS: Sorry, sir. 17 Q. Let's take a look at DTX 355 in evidence. 18 THE COURT: I am not asking for what you have 18 This is the April 18, 2007, memo to the 19 to do or not have to do during that time period. 19 imported water committee. This is a memo that --20 I am just asking what time period is that. 20 A. What number is that again? 21 THE WITNESS: It's the term of the agreement. 21 Q. 355. This is a memorandum, we looked at this 2.2 THE COURT: Not just the five years? 22 before, and you said you approved and sent to San 23 THE WITNESS: Correct. 23 Diego's imported water committee. 24 MR. QUINN: May I proceed, your Honor? 24 A. Yes. 2.5 THE COURT: Please. 25 Q. And the last sentence of the memorandum on page 1607 1609 1 1 Q. BY MR. QUINN: The first proviso in Section 5.2 two reads, "The Water Authority does not intend to 2 2 on page 17 says, "Provided, however, that Metropolitan litigate Met's current rate structure but it cannot know 3 3 may at any time amend the Administrative Code in what future actions the Met board may take since the Met 4 4 accordance with Paragraph 13.12 and the Administrative rates are established annually and are subject to change 5 5 Code as thereby amended shall be included within the by Met's board of directors." 6 6 Do you see that? foregoing restriction." 7 Do you see that? A. I do. 8 8 A. Yes. Q. This statement here that you approved reflects 9 9 the understanding that San Diego was not going to Q. And you know Met changes its conveyance charges 10 10 by amending its Administrative Code; correct? litigate Met's existing rate structure but reserve the 11 11 A. Correct. right to litigate changes in the rates as set forth in 12 12 Q. And this provision would allow Met to do that; the Administrative Code; correct? 13 13 correct? A. No. What it says is at that time we don't 14 14 A. Yes. intend to litigate; in April of '07, we did not have the 15 15 Q. Then we have the third proviso, the one that intent to litigate. But we certainly stated that any 16 16 Mr. Keker called your attention to. You understood this further action by Met we may, you know, reconsider. 17 17 third proviso said that after five years San Diego Q. You would agree this statement would be 18 18 could -- you understood, you told us that this third consistent with an interpretation of that third proviso, 19 19 proviso said after five years San Diego could contest that what you were reserving was the right to challenge 20 20 whether the charges set forth in the first proviso, the amendments, future changes in the transportation rates? 21 21 amendments to the Administrative Code were set in A. No. Our reservation of rights was always to 22 22 accordance with applicable law; correct? challenge the rate itself. 23 2.3 MR. KEKER: Objection. Misstates the statement Q. In response to a question by Mr. Keker, you 24 24 and is argumentative. testified that there was nothing in the exchange 25 25 MR. QUINN: I am asking if that's her agreement that limited San Diego's ability to complain

1610

1 about any aspects of the price during the first five in writing about the lawfulness of the rates -- at 2 2 years. You could complain and I think your testimony is least --3 3 you complained a fair amount about the price; correct? They hadn't complained in writing yet about the 4 4 A. Correct. unlawfulness of the rates, isn't that true? 5 Q. You said that was something that San Diego had 5 A. No -- that is correct. 6 6 negotiated for, your words, very hard; correct? Q. In fact, you hadn't done it once? Since the 7 unbundling of the rate to the end of 2008, there is no A. Correct. 8 Q. Now this five-year period, under the exchange 8 writing San Diego is complaining about the unlawfulness 9 9 agreement, that ended on December 31, 2007; correct? of the rates; correct? 10 10 A. Yes. A. There is nothing in writing. 11 Q. So whatever you understood that five-year 11 Q. In 2008 San Diego did not claim in writing that 12 restriction to be, it ended as of December 31, 2007? 12 Met was charging a price that was in breach of contract? 13 13 A. Yes. A. That is correct. There was nothing in writing. 14 Q. And in response to questions by Mr. Keker, you 14 Q. And nothing in writing in 2008 reflecting an 15 15 referred to a five-year period in Section 11.1 of the objection to the price being charged? 16 exchange agreement, also; do you recall this DTX 51, 16 A. That is correct. 17 page 24? 17 Q. You had not complained about the lawfulness of 18 A. Yes. Yes. 18 the rates orally for at least three years because you 19 Q. And that five-year period also ended on 19 only complained to Mr. Underwood, and he passed away in 20 December 31, 2007? 20 2005; correct? 21 A. Yes. 21 A. That is not correct. 2.2 Q. So let's -- let's look at what happened after 22 Q. Do you recall in response to a question from 23 December 31, 2007. Let's look at the year 2008. 23 Mr. Keker asking you about who you complained to about 24 In 2008 you said that at that time you believed 24 this, and you identified Mr. Underwood? Do you recall 2.5 that including the State Water Project costs and the 25 that testimony? 1611 1613 1 water stewardship rate and the conveyance charges was A. I do. 2 2 illegal; right? O. So far as you know, Mr. Cushman never 3 3 A. Yes. complained orally about the legality of the rates, isn't 4 4 Q. Had you -- actually, matters settled down, so that true? 5 5 you actually formed a conclusion as of 2008, by golly, A. That is not true. 6 6 it really is illegal? Q. Let me read to you from Mr. Cushman's trial 7 7 testimony Volume VI of the trial testimony -- Volume A. Yes. That it is not consistent with the law. 8 8 Q. You believe that San Diego was being VII. Volume VII, page 1041, 14 to 22: 9 9 overcharged by Met by tens of millions of dollars "Q Do you recall it ever 1.0 1.0 annually; correct? being communicated orally prior 11 11 to filing of the lawsuit where A. Correct. 12 12 Q. And you had negotiated very hard for this San Diego says these rates are 13 13 provision that would enable you to challenge rates? illegal after unbundling and 14 14 A. Yes. before the filing of this 1.5 15 Q. After five years; right? lawsuit? 16 16 "A That's just not the way we 17 17 Q. And you believed San Diego was free to object communicated our concerns. 18 18 to the price being charged as of January 1, 2008? That is less businesslike than 19 19 the Water Authority 20 20 Q. And you believe that San Diego was free to file communicates its concerns. I 21 2.1 a lawsuit to challenge Met's rates as of January 1, think we said they were 22 2008; correct? 22 improper, orally. I was not a 23 23 A. Yes. lead negotiator. I am not in a 2.4 2.4 Q. By the end of 2008, by the end of 2008, position to say that was 25 focusing on that year, San Diego had not yet complained

1614

communicated by our

1 negotiators." Q. When -- in 2008, when San Diego's 2 2 MR. KEKER: "What was communicated," not representatives voted in favor of the rates --3 3 A. Correct. 4 4 Q. BY MR. QUINN: (Reading:) Q. -- were they voting only on the rates or were 5 5 they voting on the entire rate structure in voting their "I am not in a position to say 6 6 what was communicated by our approval of the rate structure? 7 negotiators." A. They were voting on the rate increases, just 8 8 Are you saying that you do recall now that the rate increases. 9 9 Mr. Cushman said that the rate -- said orally the rates Q. How about in 2002, they voted to support the 10 10 were illegal or unlawful? rate structure in 2002, not just the --11 11 A. I believe they voted "no" on the rate structure A. If you are asking if those exact words were 12 12 used, as I have testified earlier, we do not say those in -- in 2002. I believe they voted "no." 13 13 words "illegal, unlawful." Q. Let's take your trial testimony, page 1451, 14 14 line five to 1452, line eight -- at lines 28 to three. We expressed our concerns. 15 15 We were trying to work it out with Met. If you This is talking about 2002. 16 16 walk in and say they're illegal and that's all we're "Q In fact, San Diego 17 17 going to say, that is not productive in these processes delegates, if we go back and 18 18 we have been involved in. look at Defense Exhibit 129, 19 19 So I believe his answer is correct, we never San Diego's members on the 20 20 said, hey, they are illegal. board did in fact vote in favor 21 21 of those unbundled rates? Q. And you have been -- I think you told us you 22 2.2 had been having these discussions for several years, "A They voted in favor of the 23 23 complaining about the rates; is that right? rate structure." 24 24 A. That is true. Do you see that? 2.5 2.5 Q. So focusing then back on 2008, in 2008, isn't A. Where is it? 1615 1617 1 1 it true that San Diego never asked Met to deposit any Q. Line 23 and it carries over. 2 2 disputed amount under that Section 12.4(c) of the A. Thank you. Yes. 3 3 exchange agreement? Q. Do you recall back in 2002 when it was 4 4 A. That is correct. unbundled, San Diego's delegates actually voted in favor 5 5 Q. Obviously, we know a lawsuit was filed in 2008; of the rate structure? 6 6 A. I thought they voted "no" for the -- when they right? 7 7 A. That is correct. unbundled the rates and then voted in favor of the new 8 8 Q. In fact, San Diego, at least as of that time, unbundled rates. 9 9 had no expectation of litigation in 2008? So, I apologize. 10 1.0 A. We did not intend to sue at that point. Q. Not a problem. 11 11 Q. This is in evidence, DTX 1114, the Water But we can agree in 2002 they voted in favor of 12 12 Authority's MWD Work Plan. the rate structure? 13 13 If you look at page 11, do you see where it MR. KEKER: Objection. It's the opposite of 14 14 says, "No expectation of litigation"? what you said. 15 15 A. That's right. THE WITNESS: Right. Yeah, I thought --16 16 Q. Page 12, "Peace treaty expired - no THE COURT: Do you know what they voted in 2002 17 17 litigation"? on? 18 18 THE WITNESS: I thought when they unbundled the A. Correct. 19 19 rates that our delegates initially voted "no" on the Q. Let me ask you about the votes that San Diego's 20 20 representatives on the board were making about these rate structure. And then subsequently they did vote 21 2.1 affirmative for the, I believe it was, the 2003 rates. rates. 22 22 THE COURT: Okay. You testified San Diego's board directed its 23 23 members on the Met board to vote in favor of the rate Q. BY MR. QUINN: So at least when they 2.4 24 structure, not just the rates; isn't that true? actually -- the rates that were adopted in 2002, they 25 25 voted in favor of that structure that was implemented in A. I'm sorry? 1616 1618

2.5

2003; correct?

2.4

THE COURT: That's not how I heard her answer.

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: Correct me if I'm wrong. You are telling me they voted against the initial unbundling?
- A. I believe they voted against the new unbundled rate structure, and then I believe they voted "yes" on the rates themselves.
- Q. So when you were saying here they voted in favor of the rate structure --
- A. It should have been they voted in favor of the rates. That's my error.
- Q. Well, the San Diego delegates on more than one occasion actually did vote in favor not just of the rates but the rate structure?
  - A. It was --
  - Q. Isn't that true?
- A. They voted in favor of the annual rate increases that were -- that occurred over a period of time. And I believe they voted affirmative in a number of those years where a rate increase was proposed.
  - Q. My question is a little bit different.

Several times the San Diego representatives voted not just in favor of the rates but in favor of the rate structure itself, isn't that true?

#### A. Yes, I do.

Q. On the next page, section two, it says, and I quote, "The Board finds and determines that the rates and charges contained in the chief executive officer's recommendations are supported by the cost of service process and that such rates and charges reasonably and fairly allocate the costs of providing service of Metropolitan's water system to its member agencies and third-party transporters of water, if any."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Remind us what the cost of service process is.
- A. It is how MWD allocates their various costs to categories.
- Q. And then in section three it says, and I quote, "The board finds and determines that the cost of service process reasonably and fairly, (i), allocates costs to the service functions that Metropolitan provides to its member agencies; (ii) classifies service function costs based upon use of Metropolitan's system and (iii) allocates costs to rates and charges based on customary water industry standards. Accordingly, the board finds that the cost of service process supports the chief executive officer's rates and charges recommendation by creating a logical nexus between the

# A. I would have to go back and look. But I believe most, if not all, were related to the rates.

- Q. Let's take a look at Defense Exhibit 41, which is a Met board action letter concerning the March 12, 2002, board meeting, including the resolution. And if we could turn to Attachment 3 of DTX 41. And you will see a resolution of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California fixing and adopting rates and charges for fiscal year
- 2002/03. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And you understand that this is the resolution the Met board passed in March of 2002; correct?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. And if you turn to page three of the resolution, it is Attachment 3, page three. Do you see where it says, "Now, therefore, the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California does hereby resolve and determine and order as follows." Do you see that?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. And then section one below that, it says, "The board fixes and adopts the rates and charges contained in the chief executive officer's recommendation."

Do you see that?

revenues required and the rates and charges necessary to defray the costs of providing service of Metropolitan's water system."

Do you see that?

A. I do.

Q. Whoever votes in favor of this is actually approving those cost allocations?

- A. Yes, if they approve this resolution, they are approving all of these provisions.
- Q. At the direction of the San Diego board, San Diego's delegates to the Met board voted to approve this very resolution that we are looking at?
- A. Our board did not approve the very resolution. As I recall, that resolution was not before our board for consideration. It would be before our MWD delegates for consideration.
- Q. At the direction of the San Diego board, San Diego's delegates to the Met board voted to approve this resolution; correct?
- A. They voted to support -- I believe the language was voted to support the rates.
- Q. Rate structure; correct?
  - A. I would have to look at the board memo to see what the language was.
    - Q. They voted to approve all this information?

		1
. 1	A. The delegates voted.	Q. San Diego actually recommended, not directed
2	Q. Including the San Diego delegates?	but recommended, its delegates to vote to approve Met's
3	A. Yes. Including San Diego delegates.	rates and rate structure and the cost of service
4	Q. If I could read to you from your trial	analysis in later years, as well, isn't that true?
5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	testimony, 1451, five to 12:	THE COCKT. Whenever you get to a good stoppin
6	"Q After a discussion at San	6 point, Mr. Quinn.
7	Diego about the unbundled rate	<sup>7</sup> Let's have this answer. Do you recall that?
8	structure and the components of	8 THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
9	it, the San Diego board, after	9 MR. QUINN: This is good, your Honor.
10	looking at this, directed the	THE COURT: Okay. I'll see everybody at 1:30.
11	San Diego delegates to the Met	Thank you.
12	board to vote for the rates	Thank you.
13		12 (Noon recess was taken.)
14	that went into effect	
	January 1, 2003; is that	14
15	correct?	15
16	"A Yes. To support the rate	16
17	structure; correct.	17
18	"Q And to vote, you understand that?	18
19	"A Yes, to vote affirmative"?	19
20	A. Right.	20
21	Q. Is that correct?	21
22		
	A. Your question was did we vote for the rates	22
23	that went into effect. The answer is yes.	23
24	And I said to support the rate structure. I	24
25	meant, again, the rates.	25
	1623	1625
1	O Decad on what we just looked at we know that	San Francisco, California
	Q. Based on what we just looked at, we know that	
2	the San Diego delegates were directed and did vote to	Wioliday, 14pm 27, 2013
3	approve findings and determinations that the rates and	3 1:35 p.m.
4	charges were supported by the cost of service process;	4
5	correct?	5 MAUREEN STAPLETON,
6	A. Correct.	6 resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
7	Q. They reasonably and fairly allocate the Met's	7
8	services to member agencies?	8 THE COURT: Good afternoon. I suggest we
9	A. Yes.	9 conclude with this witness and then we can have a chat
10		conclude with this withess and then we can have a char
	Q. Including the conveyance charges?	about the evidentiary issues we tarked about this
11	A. Yes.	11 morning.
12	Q. To allocate the cost to rates and charges based	12
13	on customary water industry standards?	13 CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)
14	A. Yes.	14 BY MR. QUINN:
15	Q. And they create a logical nexus between the	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Stapleton.
16	revenues required and the rates and charges necessary to	A. Good afternoon.
17	defray Met's costs?	Q. In terms of the language that you would use to
18	· ·	
	A. Yes. All of that is in the resolution.	describe your objections of characterization of the
19	Q. You told us before, in this instance, the San	rates, we talked about that a little bit this morning.
20	Diego board directed its delegates how to vote. That is	Did you tell Mr. Underwood that you thought the
21	not usually how you do things, I think you told us?	rates were unlawful?
22	A. Correct.	A. I think what I said was, you know, we have a
23	Q. That vote in 2002 was the only time you had	difference of opinion regarding the interpretation of
24	seen San Diego instruct its delegates how to vote?	the law. We don't believe that some of the costs you
25	A. Correct.	put in the transportation the transportation category
		par in the transportation category
	1624	1626

#### 1 are appropriate or consistent with our interpretation of nexus between the revenues required and the rates and 2 2 charges necessary to defray Met's costs? where they should be located. 3 3 Q. My question is, did you tell Mr. Underwood that A. Yes. 4 4 you thought the rates were unlawful, using that phrase? Q. And it is that type of boilerplate, you are 5 A. "Not according to the law" would be the phrase 5 telling us, in the years after 2002 the San Diego 6 6 delegates voted in favor of? I would use. 7 Q. So you did tell him you thought they were not A. No. I do not know that for a fact. I said 8 8 according to the law? that I would assume that boilerplate is added to any of A. Yes. Yeah, that's what I -- according to our 9 9 the rate resolutions that Met generated. I do not know 10 10 interpretation. if the delegates actually read that material or that if 11 11 Q. Before we broke we were talking about the vote they were sitting here today that they would say, yes, I 12 12 in 2002. And you had told us that this was the only read that in support of that. 13 13 time you can recall when the San Diego board had Q. My question isn't whether they read it. 14 14 actually instructed its delegates on how to vote. Are you in a position to say whether or not San 15 15 A. Yes. Diego delegates voted for similar resolutions in the 16 16 Q. It is true, isn't it, in the years following years after 2002? 17 2002, San Diego recommended that its delegates vote to 17 A. I have not seen any other resolutions than the 18 approve Met's rates, including the cost of service 18 one you showed me. 19 19 reports and the rate structure? Isn't that true? Q. So you are saying you don't know one way or the 20 20 A. No. That there have been recommendations other? 21 regarding the percentage of increase of the rates. That 21 A. I do not know. 22 has been discussed. But the board has not -- my board, 22 Q. You would certainly expect that what you refer 23 23 not the Met board, but my board has not discussed cost to as the boilerplate, that would be the kind of 24 24 of service reports or anything like that. language that would be included in any such resolution; 25 25 Q. Well, we looked at a resolution -correct?

1629

A. Uh-huh.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

O. -- that was adopted back in 2002 that San Diego's delegates voted in favor of. Isn't it true that San Diego's delegates voted in favor of similar resolutions with similar language in the years after 2000?

## A. I do not know that for a fact, but I presume all of that boilerplate went into the rate resolutions on a regular basis.

Q. By "boilerplate," you are referring to the determination that the rates and charges are supported by the cost of service process?

A. Yes.

Q. And that they are reasonable -- they are reasonably fair and allocate the cost of Met services to member agencies? That is another item of that boilerplate the delegates supported?

A. Yes.

Q. And that they allocate costs to rates and charges based on customary water industry standards, that is another piece of the boilerplate you are referring to?

## A. Yes. That be would part of the boilerplate.

Q. Another piece of the boilerplate would be that the proposed rates and charges would create a logical 1 A. 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

Q. You do know that San Diego delegates did vote in favor of such resolutions in the years after 2002?

Q. If we take a look at DTX 129, San Diego -- it's in evidence -- San Diego delegates' vote record At-a-Glance.

If you look at page ten, please, the middle entry for March of 2008, the second column says, "Adopted calendar year 2009 rates and charges with COS." Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. That is cost of service; right?

A. Correct.

Q. The third column says, "Per delegates' notes, delegates to vote 'yes' on staff's recommendation."

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. That's the recommendation of the San Diego staff?

Q. It says, "Actual MWD board vote by delegates Bond and Parker voted "yes" to the motion, Barrett and Pocklington were absent"; correct?

A. Correct.

1630

1628

1627

Pages 1627 to 1630

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

2.4

25

Q. So the San Diego staff recommended that the delegates vote "yes" in 2008 to adopt the rates to be effective in 2009; correct?

#### A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

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

Q. At that time, were the San Diego delegates to Met's board informed of San Diego's belief that the rates at issue were unlawful?

## A. Again, I don't think we had absolute confidence that our interpretation of the law was correct.

Q. I thought you told me before lunch, and maybe I got it wrong, I thought you told me you absolutely had gotten clarification on that issue, that there was a violation?

## A. We believed that -- our interpretation was we believed they were unlawful. Our interpretation.

Q. So my question is, before these delegates voted "yes" in 2008, were the delegates to Met's board informed that the rates at issue that they were being voted on were thought by San Diego to be unlawful?

## A. Yes. They knew what we thought.

Q. Who told them that before they voted that these rates were unlawful?

## A. It would be staff would indicate our disagreement with Met's rate allocation or cost allocation.

voted, were the San Diego delegates to the Met board ever advised to communicate to the full Met board that any of the rates at issue might be unlawful or illegal?

## A. The -- yes. The delegates had conversations about our concerns regarding the cost allocations with various board members and with staff.

Q. Were they ever told that they should, you know, in the plenary session when they are voting before the whole Met board, were they ever told that they should tell the board that these rates which were being -- they were voting on were illegal?

## A. No. They were not told -- they were not directed or told to do that.

Q. But in any case, we know they voted for the cost of service, rate structure, and the rates in 2008, as they had in prior years; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. Now, did San Diego believe that Met breached the exchange agreement by adopting those rates in 2009?

## A. I don't know if our legal counsel would say that or not. I am not sure.

Q. Let me read to you from the deposition of Mr. Cushman, who, as I think you know, is the person most knowledgeable designated by San Diego on various issues. You are aware of that?

1631 1633

Q. I am focusing really on the "unlawful." You told me they were told it was unlawful in 2008?

## A. Did I use that -- sorry.

Q. I understood your testimony to be that before these delegates voted in 2008, they were informed of San Diego's view that these rates were unlawful; is that true?

## A. Yes.

Q. And who told them that?

## A. Staff, I believe. I probably mentioned it to them in our various meetings.

Q. Can you identity anyone else who told them the rates they were about to vote on were unlawful besides yourself?

#### A. In this circumstance, sir?

Q. Yes. In that vote, before they voted on that, I am asking who told them that these rates they were going to vote on were illegal.

## A. I would say that I cannot remember specifically on this vote. But our general counsel, Mr. Cushman, would have been one who would say something like that to the delegates.

Q. You just don't recall?

#### A. I do not recall specifically.

Q. At any time before March of 2008, when they

A. Yes. 2

Q. This is from Mr. Cushman's deposition, Volume III, page 339, line one to 340, line nine.

MR. KEKER: May I have a moment, your Honor? THE WITNESS: Am I supposed to have this on? THE COURT: Yes. You are able to follow along. THE WITNESS: It is just a black screen.

THE CLERK: Before you do that, I'm not sure if they set each one of them up individually. Was that one set up, as well?

THE COURT: Let's go off the record.

MR. QUINN: Stop the clock.

THE COURT: Stop the clock. Thank you for reminding me.

(Discussion held off the record.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

17 MR. QUINN: Thank you. 18

"Q So let me ask you, getting back to the subject matter that you are testifying about today, the breach --

21 this is another one of your broad questions

but I'll drill down on it some more --23 how did MWD breach the 2003 exchange

agreement, to your understanding?

"A MWD first breached the

1634

Pages 1631 to 1634

. 1	2003 exchange agreement when it	<sup>1</sup> A. Yes.
2	adopted in the spring of 2008	Q. So the San Diego staff what happened here is
3	water rates for 2009, when they	the San Diego staff recommended that San Diego's
4	implemented those rates and	delegates to the Met board vote in favor of a breach of
5	started collecting those rates	5 the exchange agreement; true?
6	in 2009, when they adopted	6 A. They voted to increase the rates. They did
7	rates in 2010, in the spring of	7 not again, I don't believe they voted specifically on
8	2010, and began collecting	8 the allocation. So even though it was in the
9	those rates in excuse me	resolution, that wasn't in our discussions. So, yeah.
10		Q. That may be the answer to another question.
11	in the spring of 2009 when they	Q. That may be the answer to another question.
12	adopted rates for 2010, again	A. Kight. Surry.
13	when they began collecting	Q. Tou assume that what you refer to as
14	those rates, revenues beginning	bonerpiate was in there, right:
	in 2010, and each of the	A. I presume so.
15	rate-setting cycles in 2010 and	Q. And you have told us that you know that staff
16	again in 2012 when they adopted	recommended that the San Diego delegates in 2008 vote
17	rates for their successive two	for those 2009 rates; right?
18	years. So in the case of 2010,	A. Vote for one of the options that was offered,
19	they adopted rates for both	19 correct.
20	calendar years '11 and '12. So	Q. You have no disagreement with Mr. Cushman's
21	when they adopted those rates	testimony that the adoption of those rates was a breach
22	and began collecting those	of contract?
23	rates, beginning in 2011, in	A. That they did not abide correct, that they
24	the case of 2011 rates, and in	did not abide by the conditions.
25	2012 in relation to the 2012	Q. So what happened here is the San Diego staff
	1635	1637
1	rates, and then again when they	<sup>1</sup> recommended that San Diego's delegates to the Met board
2	adopted rates in the spring of	vote in favor of the act, which Mr. Cushman, the person
3	2012 for calendar year '13,	most knowledgeable, says was a breach of contract;
4	they breached it then and they	4 correct?
5	breached it when they began	5 A. Yes, it was staff who made that recommendation.
6	collecting revenues earlier	Q. When did you personally, when did you believe
7	this year in 2013 under the	7 that Met first breached the exchange agreement?
8	rates they adopted.	8 A. I believe that I believed that Met did not
9	"Q So let's talk about how MW	9 charge the lawful wheeling rate our interpretation:
10	breached the exchange agreement	That from, you know, the beginning of the exchange
11	when it adopted in the spring	agreement, but we could not do anything about it until
12	of 2008 water rates. What did	the five years had passed. So
13	you mean by that?	Q. I'm sorry. I interrupted you.
14	"A They did not abide by the	14 A. Yeah.
15	condition or the provision in	7. I Can.
16	the exchange agreement that	So our interpretation was that they were not charging the lawful rate.
17	~ ~	
18	required that Metropolitan set its rates in conformance with	Q. So when do you believe that wet hist breached
19		the exemple agreement.
	applicable law."	At in at the chu of the five-year agreement.
20	Q. Mr. Cushman was designated as the person most	Q. So that would be, what, January 1, 2008?
21	knowledgeable on the subject of breach?	A. Yes. Yes.
22	A. Correct.	Q. So you agree with Mr. Cushman that when they
23	Q. Do you disagree with Mr. Cushman, that Met	first adopted, that was the first breach?
24	breached the contract, breached the exchange agreement	A. Correct.
25	in 2008 when it adopted rates for 2009?	Q. Let me ask you about the next year, 2009.
•		
	1636	1638

1 In 2009, San Diego still did not complain about lawsuit, and even until today, San Diego has accepted 2 2 the unlawfulness of any rates in writing. Isn't that the benefits that it received under the exchange 3 3 agreement; isn't that true? 4 4 A. That is correct. A. Correct. 5 Q. And San Diego, in 2009, still did not claim in 5 Q. Those benefits under the exchange agreement and 6 6 writing that Met was charging a price that was in breach the related agreement include hundreds of millions of 7 7 of contract? dollars from the State of California? 8 8 A. Not in writing, correct. A. Yes. 9 9 Q. It did not, in writing, say anything -- any Q. And they also include hundreds of thousands of 10 10 acre-feet of water from the canal lining with another objection to the price, at least in writing? 11 11 A. In writing we did not. 100 years to go; correct? 12 12 THE COURT: I am going to ask each of you not A. Yes. 13 13 to talk over each other. I understand what's going on, Q. It also includes the exchange of IID and canal 14 14 lining water on a fixed guaranteed schedule per month? but we are going to want to read this in a couple of 15 15 A. Yes. years. 16 16 Q. BY MR. QUINN: And then, in 2009, San Diego did Q. So from the time San Diego first approved the 17 17 rate structure and the findings in support of the rate not request that Met make any deposit under that Section 18 18 12.4(c)? structure that we looked at in 2002, until 2010, San 19 19 Diego had agreed to and voted for the rate structure. A. Correct. 20 20 had performed under the exchange agreement without O. And there was no lawsuit filed in 2009? 21 21 A. Correct. objection, and had accepted the benefits of the 22 22 Q. Once again, in 2009, the San Diego delegates transaction; correct? 23 23 voted to approve those rates and the cost of service A. I would disagree with that because we did have 24 24 report once again; isn't that true? objections. And during that period of time both with 25 25 A. Correct. the MWD staff, as well as in testimony to the board, we 1639 1641 1 Q. We know that from DTX 129, page one? 1 had indicated our objections. 2 2 Q. So you are referring to oral objections? 3 3 Q. If you could take a look, please, at JTX 2:936; A. Yes. 4 this is in evidence. JTX 2:936. This is a letter from 4 Q. So if we set that aside, the oral objections, 5 5 four of San Diego's delegates to the Met board dated my statement is correct? That from the time San Diego 6 6 March 21, 2012; correct? first approved the rate structure and the findings in 7 7 A. Correct. support of the rate structure in 2002, until 2010, San 8 8 Q. The subject of the letter is, "Recommendation Diego agreed to and voted for the rate structure, 9 9 to Cap MWD Rate Increases at Three Percent for 2013 and performed under the exchange agreement without 10 1.0 2014." objection, other than these oral objections you've 11 11 Do you see that? referred us to, and accepted the benefits of the 12 12 A. I do. transaction: true? 13 13 Q. Did you see this letter at any time before it A. Yes. 14 14 was sent in 2012? Q. By the way, as to the benefits from the canal 15 15 A. I don't believe I did. lining water, San Diego had received about 80,000 16 16 Q. Do you see anywhere in this letter where it acre-feet last year? 17 17 says that including State Water Project costs or water A. Correct. 18 18 stewardship rate and conveyance charges is unlawful or a Q. If you multiply that out for 100 years, just to 19 19 breach of contract? keep it simple, that would be about eight million 20 20 A. I have not reviewed this. I would have to read acre-feet? 21 21 A. Correct. 22 22 Q. I won't take the time right now. If we could Q. Are you aware Met's current charge for supply

1642

1640

23

24

25

step back for a second.

During the seven years from the execution of

the exchange agreement, until San Diego filed this

23

2.4

25

is \$158 per acre-foot?

MR. QUINN: Do we have a calculator?

A. Yes.

1 May I approach the witness, your Honor? IID and the canal lining water? 2 2 THE COURT: I have a calculator, too, but we A. Yes. 3 3 will use yours. Q. You would consider that a pretty good deal for 4 4 MR. QUINN: You can check the math, your Honor. San Diego, wouldn't you? 5 THE COURT: I was just so proud of having 5 A. Yes. I think this -- it's why our board voted 6 6 brought one. for it and I recommended it. That -- I thought this, 7 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Without getting into inflation even with the exposure we had, I thought this was the 8 8 factors for the cost of water or any kind of present right thing to do. 9 9 value calculation, just to get an order of magnitude as Q. You actually -- you think the right thing to do 10 10 to the benefit that San Diego receives under this is that San Diego should get approximately another 11 11 transaction and the related agreements, what is eight \$180 million just for 2011 to 2014 at the expense of the 12 12 other communities that are members of Met; isn't that million acre-feet times \$158 per acre-foot? 13 1.3 A. Right. If I did my math correctly, it is 14 14 1.2 billion. A. Yes, because we've been overcharged. 15 15 O. 1.264 billion? MR. QUINN: Nothing further. 16 16 A. Correct. THE COURT: Thank you very much. 17 17 Q. Would you agree with me that is a pretty good 18 deal for San Diego, even if it had to pay the \$253 18 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 19 19 initial price it agreed to pay, with the annual BY MR. KEKER: 20 20 increases that it voted for? Q. Is San Diego a public agency? 21 21 A. Up to now? A. Yes. 2.2 22 O. Yes. Q. Did it agree to pay a lawful rate for as long 23 23 A. Yes. as this water keeps flowing? 24 24 Q. In fact, Mr. Campbell estimated that the cost A. Yes. 25 25 to San Diego of conveying the IID water under Option-2 Q. Did San Diego hire experts, spend a lot of 1643 1645 1 1 would exceed the cost under Option-1 by an amount in the money on them, to try to persuade Met to do the right 2 2 range of 423 million to 907 million. 3 3 Do you recall that? A. Yes, over a number of years. A. I do. 4 O. Was that successful? 5 Q. That is in DTX 50, which is in evidence. A. No. 6 6 Setting aside inflation factors for cost of water and Q. Did San Diego have any option after 2010 when 7 7 present value calculations, even if San Diego paid what you talked to Mr. Kightlinger except to bring a lawsuit? 8 8 Mr. Campbell forecast, what you would call the A. No. 9 9 worst-case scenario, San Diego would still get the Q. What portions of the Katz wheeling law apply to 10 10 benefit of 1.264 billion less an amount between -the exchange agreement in your view? You were asked 11 11 Mr. Campbell calculated 423 to 907 million; right? questions about whether or not the exchange agreement is 12 12 A. And then less the amount of contribution we a wheeling transaction. I take it you don't think it is 13 13 made for the construction and the cost of that. a wheeling agreement? 14 14 A. That's correct. Q. Well, looking just at Mr. Campbell's 15 15 calculations --Q. What does the Katz wheeling law have to do with 16 16 A. Right. the exchange agreement? 17 17 Q. -- San Diego's benefit after paying the full A. Because in the exchange agreement there is a 18 18 wheeling rate would be, if you deduct the numbers that reference to the lawful wheeling rate, and that's the 19 19 Mr. Campbell computed based upon the full -- the full component that I believe is applicable. 20 20 wheeling rate, San Diego's benefit would be up to Also, it relates to what you can charge, which 21 21 \$840 million just from the supply of canal lining water; is the State Water Project, because it is neither owned 22 correct? 22 nor operated by Metropolitan, should not be charged 23 2.3 A. Yes. within the transportation or the wheeling rate that 24 24 Q. That does not include any benefit you might Metropolitan establishes. 25 25 ascribe to having fixed and guaranteed delivery of the Q. What is the language in the exchange agreement 1644 1646

"generally applicable," with respect to the price terms, generally applicable to the conveyance of water by member agencies? What's the function of that language in the agreement?

- A. Right. That was important language for us because we wanted to make sure that they did not charge us something that was different than other member agencies. So it had to be applicable both to the law and what they were charging to others.
- Q. What they charged to other member agencies for the conveyance of water, is that the wheeling rate?
  - A. Yes, it is.

- Q. Whose idea was it to charge system power rate instead of actual power charges?
- A. It was Metropolitan's. They're the ones that determined to charge the melded rate.
- Q. Between 2005, when Mr. Underwood died, and filing this lawsuit, did San Diego consistently make its views about improper cost allocation known to Met?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Who did it?
- A. Staff did it, as well as board members in one-on-one conversations. It was well known both throughout Met and the other member agencies that we objected to the cost allocation as it relates to

Can we have a brief discussion on this exclusion issue? I read the opposition. I am not sure there is a lot to add to what we said this morning, although if you people want to address it, that's fine.

The central problem is that, for example, if I look at the proposed exhibit that was sent to San Diego, I suppose, over the weekend, it mentions, for example, sometimes the source of the data that is reflected in the spreadsheets; sometimes it does not. So I don't have any more idea than Mr. Keker does as to where the information came from.

But for example, if you take the fifth page, which is titled "Department of Water Resources Charges for State Water Project Power, East Branch Deliveries," it gives you some sources. I don't know if those documents DTX 90, 110 and so on were turned over to San Diego or not. And if they were not turned over, I don't know, I can't tell right now whether or not they were demanded or the subject of court order or the extent of time the court order issued or Metropolitan said they would provide them. Nevertheless, Metropolitan failed to provide them. It is a little difficult to tell right now

So, I do know, for example, Interrogatory Number 20, this is under Tab I in the binder provided by

1647 1649

\_\_\_\_\_

#### transportation.

Q. Do you recall from Phase I Brian Thomas' deposition testimony that everybody at Met knew about these objections?

- A. Yes.
- Q. He was the CFO of Met?
- A. Yes.

Q. You have been asked a lot of questions about votes. Did any Met -- excuse me. San Diego delegate vote for the rates at issue in this contract case, namely the rates that have been charged for 2011 through 2014?

## A. They did not.

Q. Are you seeking damages for any period before 2011 to '14?

## A. No. We are seeking damages only for '11 to '14.

Q. With respect to your view that you were overcharged from 2003 on, you're not seeking damages, I take it, until 2011 through 2014?

#### A. That is correct.

MR. KEKER: Nothing further. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. QUINN: Nothing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. You are excused.

San Diego, these are responses by Met to

third-party water."

interrogatories. Number 20, for example, asks for, "All documents, data analysis, calculations, studies or other information that detail or evidence Metropolitan's specific costs of delivering to San Diego, San Diego's water from IID. . . including, but not limited to any cost of service reports associated with delivering the

And the response at the end is that no such documents exist. The tenor of the hearing we had was that Met certainly didn't have to create any documents to comply with the discovery demand, but if they had anything, they should have turned them over.

So I don't know if the documents that we have here fit into the category of things that existed at the time or were responsive to Interrogatory Number 20 and Met failed to deliver them.

My guess is the most efficient way to proceed is for us to -- subject to further discussion from the attorneys, and, specifically Met, who has not had an opportunity to address my tentative ruling, to proceed with the witnesses as we have them, which includes limiting Woodcock to his report, for example. During cross-examination or during direct it may come out as to what the foundational documents are, and it would be all

subject to a motion to strike by San Diego and conceivably a motion to augment the record if San Diego was able to demonstrate that they had been caught by surprise. In other words, sometimes you can get alternative relief.

2.2

2.5

2.3

If it turns out, and we've had a little bit more time to think it through, and not while anybody's clock is ticking, that somebody has testified on the basis of documents that really should not be admissible, there are almost always at least two solutions. One is to strike it, which is probably the best way to go, but sometimes the other alternative is a motion to augment so San Diego has an opportunity to, for example, recall somebody. Because this is a bench trial and not a jury trial, we have a little more flexibility than we might have had.

That's one proposal, and we will move to discussion.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, I don't think that proposal is fair or adequate.

If you were going to let this go forward, we think that the best way to do it, given the limited time that's remaining, and we've got three days to do it, Ms. Skillman is outside. Let you go away and work on something else. We'll take Ms. Skillman's deposition

the cost of transportation. And now she is doing that, at least with respect to the power rate. She's just made up something that we happen to think, on cross-examination, which will take an hour to show, is just a bunch of baloney in the first place. She shouldn't be able to testify about it when this is total sandbagging. We didn't get it over the weekend. We got it yesterday morning. I think -- we've got problems all the way through.

Actual CRA power, we asked them how much does it cost you to run through the Colorado River Aqueduct. They said we don't do it that way. We don't know. We don't have documents about that.

They put in there a system -- a State Water
Project access cost that somehow they are going to try
to tie in violation, we think, of your ruling. They are
going to tie a State Water Project access cost to the
amount of water that they choose to use from the State
Water Project to blend to fulfill their commitments
under this exchange agreement. We have no idea how they
made their estimates. We have some idea how they made
their estimate, but it is an estimate and so on. I
don't see how --

THE COURT: I want to focus on the admissibility issues and not whether this conflicts with

and ask her where all this came from.

THE COURT: Can't we do that now here?

MR. KEKER: Sure. But it shouldn't be -- they get to put all this into the record. This should be stricken. For example, the system that the -- we already know that Ms. Skillman's 1103, and that on which it is based, was not produced in discovery. We know what interrogatory -- the interrogatories say, and we also know the request for production that say all documents discuss the allocation of MWD costs -- I can cite these things to you. And they didn't -- we know they weren't produced. We know that we saw them on the witness list for the first time. For her to be able to give direct testimony and then on cross-examination have to get up and say, wait a minute, where did all this come from is going to take much more time than we have.

THE COURT: Is the problem 1103?

MR. KEKER: 1103 and -- the problem is almost all of it. The problem is 1096 through 1099, which is actual State Water Project power, which they said we don't do that, we don't break it out that way. And they never produced it until they put them on their witness list.

1103, again, they said that Met water is Met water. We don't break out what's CRA -- we don't change

something else, not whether we just don't understand today how they can find their way through these numbers.

MR. KEKER: Let me stick with admissibility. These numbers are things that they say, "No such documents exist. We didn't produce them."

We had a hearing on this in which you said we are not going to let people be blindsided. It made good sense. You said go for it. They made a decision not to produce this. For them to produce these documents late, and then the testimony on what we couldn't figure out what they were going to do with it, but now we see, and to do that yesterday morning, this is basically an expert report that is delivered to us based on documents that are inadmissible and shouldn't come in.

THE COURT: The issue is, as I understand it, the admissibility issue is testimony is going to be based on 1096 through 1099, as well as 1103 --

MR. KEKER: And then exhibits attached to 1103 that show these hearsay documents about what Platts says on-peak rate is. There is a lot of those.

THE COURT: I don't have 1103. When I say 1103, I guess I mean whatever is incorporated in that document. Your position is that those things ought to have been given to you, for example, pursuant to Interrogatory Number 20. They were not, and, therefore,

they are not -- it is not admissible and the testimony based on it is not admissible.

2.2

MR. KEKER: Correct. And, similarly, they are going to talk about the market cost of power at the CRA and they have told us that no documents exist and so on.

THE COURT: It has to be a little more specific. I don't know which interrogatory you mean, for example, when it comes to CRA. It may be when people testify this can be sorted out a little bit longer.

I can probably pause here and ask Mr. Quinn whether DTX 1096 through -99 and 1103 existed at the time Interrogatory Number 20 was answered and that set was answered and whether they were turned over or not so we see what the record is.

MR. QUINN: The data we rely on comes from documents created in the ordinary course of business at Met. And we would anticipate on direct examination asking witnesses where does this come from, laying that foundation.

None of that data is found in documents that are responsive to document requests served by San Diego. Let's take, for example, Interrogatory Number 20: Documents, data analysis, calculation studies or other information that detail evidence of Met's specific costs

never seen before. The testimony is going to be from Ms. Skillman.

We can tell, from looking at this chart, that -- you see this on-peak SP15? That is on-peak South of Path 15. Apparently, that's the on-peak day-before energy price, according to the hearsay documents that follow that we've never seen before.

What she is going to do is say we would have sold Colorado River water, we would have paid for power for Colorado River water at these on-peak rates. I have figured out what all of that is. And for the month of January it's \$87. And basically averaging out over the year it is going to be about \$88. Mr. Denham says it's less than that, the system power rate and so on.

She is going to say this is the actual cost to them of delivering that water. I mean --

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. KEKER: -- this has never been produced.

The documents on which it's based are, as I said, hearsay. Somebody's average, some Platts, we don't know who that is. We never deposed them about how accurate or how they do it. We won't get into the admissibility, but the on-peak SP15 has nothing to do with anything. That is what her testimony will be based on. She shouldn't be able to do it given that this document fits

of delivering to -- that is something very specific -- SDWCA's conserved water from IID and canal lining water supplies.

None of these documents are based upon that, that San Diego's -- the cost of Met delivering San Diego's conserved water. That is a very narrow term, and it refers to the IID and the canal lining water. We will see on direct examination that none of this data relates to that. And believe me, we looked -- since we received their motion last Friday, we looked at this pretty carefully, and I am comfortable representing to the Court that none of this data comes from any document that we are going to rely on, that these charts are based on, comes from any document that they requested in discovery.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. QUINN: They are speculating about what these things say and what the witnesses are going to testify to.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. KEKER: First of all, we delivered our brief on Wednesday, not Friday. Can we put up 1103 and put to lie to what he just said.

THE COURT: If you wish.

MR. KEKER: This is 1103, a document we have

squarely within requests to say tell us how you computed your rates or however you allocate the rates.

All documents created on or before April 13, 2010, that discuss MWD's allocation into rate categories, supplies, system access rates, system power rate of charges or costs associated with MWD's purchase of State Water Project water, and all documents created after April 13, 2010, that discuss this subject with respect to MWD's 2011, 2012.

Notice we said documents before, and if you have documents afterwards that relate to these rates, tell us. They didn't tell us. I picked the wrong one, but we have a bunch of these that cover exactly this.

THE COURT: I think we will have a much better record if instead of trying to project what the witness is going to say or do or what the bases are or where the information surely must have come from, the best thing is just to have the record. We have this great benefit where we can do this and we have this stuff coming in subject to a motion to strike. If it turns out you have wasted time in doing so, then as part of your motion to strike and you want to augment the record and have some more time, you are free to ask for that. I think, really, the fastest way, the most efficient way to do it is find out where the witness got this stuff.

It's not true that, for example, simply being surprised at trial is a basis for excluding evidence. It is a little bit more tight than that. There has to be a specific discovery demand. There has to be a specific response for a court order saying it is going to be produced. And the document itself, it has to be clear that it existed at the time.

My only guess is this particular document here was probably created thereafter. This looks like a series of numbers that somebody went out and found in some other documents that may or may not have been within the possession of Metropolitan at the time or may or may not have fit the description in the document requests.

MR. KEKER: We have asked -- we asked for documents that existed. And then documents that were produced that were done after that. So again, Ms. Skillman, who was not designated as an expert --

THE COURT: Right.

1.0

MR. KEKER: -- she is going to come in and try to testify about something that is subject to expert testimony.

THE COURT: We'll see.

MR. KEKER: She has gone out to gather information about this, and she's going to claim to be

#### BRENT YAMASAKI,

called as a witness by the Defendants, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

If you would adjust the microphone and then state and spell your first and last name.

THE WITNESS: My name is Brent Yamasaki. B-R-E-N-T, Y-A-M-A-S-A-K-I.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. QUINN:

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Yamasaki. By whom are you employed?
  - A. The Metropolitan Water District.
- Q. How long have you worked for the Metropolitan Water District?
  - A. Twenty-four years.
- Q. What is your position at the Metropolitan Water District?
  - A. I'm section manager of operations and planning.
- Q. As the section manager for operations and planning, can you tell the Court generally what your job duties are?
  - A. Yes. I'm responsible for the district --

an expert in what the on-peak rate is. This is not something that is part of her job.

THE COURT: It is not a question of whether it is part of her job. It is a question whether she is a percipient or expert witness. If she starts giving opinions, I think you should object and I will sustain them. I think that is the most efficient way to handle it

MR. KEKER: We have less than four hours.

THE COURT: I understand your time concern.

MR. KEKER: And it is not fair not knowing what Woodcock is going to try to do and needing to save time for Woodcock to say that us exploring Ms. Skillman and doing a thorough job with her is going to just shut us off. I ask now for more time, at least even time with the other side, given this embroglio.

THE COURT: I don't think this is necessarily justification for it, but I will take it under advisement.

Let's call the next witness.

MR. QUINN: Metropolitan calls Brent Yamasaki to the stand.

23 / 24 //

25 ///

movement and distribution of water in the Metropolitan system. I am responsible for storage activities, system operations, operations planning, emergency management.

Q. Are you familiar with the exchange agreement between Metropolitan and the San Diego Water Authority?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Does Metropolitan have an obligation under that agreement to deliver a certain volume of water to San Diego every month under that agreement?

A. Yes.

Q. What is that amount?

A. 1/12th of the annual total.

Q. Do you know how much it is this year?

A. It is roughly 15,000 acre-feet per month.

- Q. Could you tell the Court, please, how the amount that Metropolitan is obligated to deliver under the exchange agreement, how that amount is determined?
- A. There's a schedule that represents the amounts that are conserved by Imperial Irrigation District and that schedule is provided to us.
- Q. Between 2011 and 2014, on average, how much water was Metropolitan obligated to deliver to San Diego each month?
  - A. It averaged about 15,000 acre-feet per month.
  - Q. Do you know whether Metropolitan's obligations

Pages 1659 to 1662

- to deliver under that contract, in terms of the volume of water that it's obligated to deliver, whether that will change over time under the terms -- under the life of the exchange agreement?
  - A. Yes. It's expected to increase.
  - Q. Do you know how much -- when it reaches its peak amount, do you know how much that obligation will increase to?
  - A. Yeah. It's on the order of 280,000 acre-feet per year.
    - Q. So about 23,000, roughly, per month?
  - A. Per month, yes.
    - Q. Will be the max it will grow to?
    - A. Correct.

2.3

- Q. Is it possible for -- as the person who's operations manager and knowledgeable about the Met systems, can you tell the Court whether it's possible for Metropolitan to satisfy its monthly delivery obligations under the exchange agreement to San Diego by using exclusively Colorado River water?
  - A. No, it's not.
  - Q. Why isn't it possible?
- A. Well, there's a number of reasons. Probably
  the first and foremost, we have to shut down the
  aqueduct for maintenance. We have been doing so for

- Q. Are there any other reasons why Metropolitan cannot satisfy its monthly delivery obligations under the exchange agreement using solely Colorado River water?
  - A. Yes, there are.
  - Q. What other reasons are there?
- A. One is for operational reasons, like water quality. There are times where we have algae blooms in the aqueduct or the need to scrape algae off the aqueduct and that limits the amount of water we can deliver on the Colorado River Aqueduct.
- Q. When there are algae blooms, what consequence does that have in terms of your ability to deliver Colorado River water as opposed to State Water Project water?
- A. Well, there's a lake in the area that collects all the water that gets delivered to the San Diego area. It's called Lake Skinner. To avoid running into problems with algae in that lake, we will send water to Lake Matthew. Colorado River water would travel away from the area that delivers water to San Diego, and we would replace that with another supply like State Water Project.
- Q. Does the actual system, does the infrastructure that Metropolitan has, actually permit Metropolitan to

- roughly about a month a year in recent years. So without the aqueduct in service, we don't have the ability to deliver Colorado River water during that time.
  - Q. Is that something that happens every year?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And so how is water provided to San Diego when there's maintenance or shutdown on the Colorado River aqueduct?
  - A. It is delivered by State Water Project or reservoirs that hold State Water Project water.
  - Q. Based on your knowledge of the Colorado River Aqueduct, can you tell us whether or not it is anticipated in the future there will be more or less renovation and taking out of service for the aqueduct in the future?
  - A. I would expect there would be more. The aqueduct is 75 years old and so the maintenance needs and the needs to upgrade in the future would probably be more.
  - Q. What is the term of the exchange agreement, do you know, what it runs to?
    - A. I believe it is 35 years.
  - Q. Does it run to 2048? Does that sound right?
  - A. That sounds right.

- deliver exclusively Colorado River water to San Diego?
  - A. No. It's a blended system.
  - Q. Can you explain what you mean by that?
  - A. Water deliveries to the Skinner area or --
  - Q. Let me stop you right there. What is the Skinner area?
  - A. The Skinner area consists of Lake Skinner, the Skinner filtration plant and the associated plumbing in that area.
  - Q. The water that San Diego gets under the exchange agreement, does that come from a particular location in the Met system?
    - A. I'm sorry?
  - Q. Does that come from a particular facility or area in the Met system?

MR. BRAUNIG: Vague and ambiguous. THE COURT: Let's have it rephrased.

- Q. BY MR. KEKER: I'm focusing on where Met gets the water that under the exchange agreement is provided to San Diego.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Does that come from a particular location in the Met system?
- A. It comes from the Colorado River Aqueduct and the State Water Project.

1 O. You referred to this Skinner area? obligations under the exchange agreement by providing 2 2 A. Yes. solely Colorado River water? 3 3 Q. Can you tell us whether or not all the water A. Yes. There's a supply reason. 4 4 that ultimately goes to San Diego comes from the Skinner Q. What are you referring to there? 5 5 area? A. There are times where we have very high levels 6 6 A. Yes, all of it goes through the Skinner area. of State Water Project supplies --7 Q. The Skinner area, you said that consists of a Q. Not in the recent past, I take it? 8 lake or reservoir? 8 A. Not in the past couple of years, but just prior 9 9 A. Yes. to that. 10 10 Q. As well as something else you mentioned? Q. How does the fact that there are high levels of 11 11 State Water Project supplies affect Met's ability to A. Yes, a Skinner treatment plant. 12 12 Q. And the water that goes into the Skinner area, provide exclusively Colorado River water to San Diego? 13 13 where does that water come from? A. Well, during those times State Water Project is 14 14 A. It comes from the Colorado River Aqueduct, as available, we have to be able to deliver the water to 15 15 well as the State Water Project. meet demands. We also have to store the water or we 16 16 Q. You said that all the water that San Diego gets lose the opportunity to capture or utilize our water 17 17 under the exchange agreement comes from the Skinner supply. 18 18 area? Q. What do you mean by that, when you say when 19 19 A. Yes. there's State Water Project water available, what do you 20 20 Q. At the Skinner area, is the State Water Project mean when you say that you have to use that opportunity? 21 21 water and the Colorado River water, are they kept Could you explain that, please? 2.2 22 separate? A. As you know, when there's wet weather, supplies 23 23 A. No. They are mixed together. on the State Water Project are high. We have limited 24 24 Q. Is it possible? Is there any way they can be capacity to deliver and store that water. So we have to 25 25 kept separate? take every opportunity that we have to be able to do 1667 1669 1 1 A. No, there isn't. that when the supplies are available. The water is made 2 2 Q. So, I mean, is it possible to shut off some available, say, in a wet year and by the end of the year 3 3 valves and change -- do something in the Skinner area so we have to have figured out how to deliver or store all 4 4 that only Colorado River water flows or is provided to of that water. Or the consequence is that we could 5 5 San Diego under the exchange agreement? potentially lose that water. 6 6 Q. When you say lose that water, what do you mean A. No, there's not. 7 7 O. So how does the existence -- how does the --8 8 can you explain to the Court why the Skinner area, the A. It stays in the State Water Project or it goes 9 9 fact that that is where San Diego gets all its water out to the ocean. 10 10 that's provided under the exchange agreement, why that Q. Can you tell us whether or not under the 11 11 means that Met cannot provide simply Colorado River exchange agreement Met has for these reasons always 12 12 water? provided a blend of State Water Project water and 13 13 A. Well, San Diego is not the only agency that Colorado River water to San Diego? 14 14 A. We have mostly delivered a blend of State Water receives this water. We have other member agencies, and 15 15 we have various needs to deliver the water. And it's Project and Colorado River water. There have been times 16 16 blended prior to going into the Skinner area. So where the State Water Project supplies were not 17 17 there's no way to separate the waters apart. adequate, for example last year, where we were not able 18 18 Q. Is there any way for Met to, you know, shift to blend the water for short periods of time. 19 19 valves or do something so that the water would not be Q. And that's -- can you give the Court some idea 20 20 blended so that the State Water Project water and the of how many times that has been true or how many months? 21 21 Colorado River water would be kept separate and not A. Probably a few months. 22 22 intermingled? Q. Where does Met take delivery of the State Water 23 2.3 A. No, there isn't. Project water that ends up being in the blend that Met

1667 . 1670

1670

1668

24

25

provides to Diego?

A. We get that delivered to us on the east branch

24

25

Q. Are there any other reasons why Met cannot

supply solely Colorado River water -- fulfill its

#### 1 MR. QUINN: We'd offer Exhibit 1105. of the State Water Project. 2 2 Q. Does Met have the ability to determine the MR. BRAUNIG: No objection. 3 3 actual blend of State Water Project water and Colorado (DTX Exhibit 1105 was received in evidence.) 4 4 River water that is delivered to San Diego pursuant to THE COURT: 1105 is admitted. 5 5 Q. BY MR. QUINN: In fact, I would like to address the exchange agreement? 6 6 four documents. We can do them as a group DTX 1122, DTX A. Yes, we do. 7 7 Q. And is that something that Met determines in a 1124, DTX 1126 and DTX 1128. If we could start with DTX 8 8 1122, can you tell us what this document is? regular course of business? 9 9 A. Yes. A. Yes. 10 10 O. And how often does Met do that? Q. What is it? 11 11 A. We measure that daily. A. This is our weekly water quality system status. 12 12 Q. The other exhibits 1124, 1126 and 1128, are Q. I'm sorry? 13 13 A. We measure that daily. those other influences of this particular document? 14 14 Q. Are there records kept of what that blend is? A. Yes. This first document shows the information 15 15 A. Yes. weekly for 2011 and the other documents show each year 16 16 O. What are the names of those records? all the way to 2014. 17 17 Q. So, would you please tell the Court what these A. We have a water quality database. It's called 18 18 Lab Sheet where we capture salinity and other water weekly water quality systems status documents say? 19 19 quality parameters that tell us about the water and its What's the information that's in them? 20 20 quality that's delivered. A. This is a report of the water quality 21 Q. From that information, can you determine what 21 parameters that we measure. 22 22 the blend is? There is a variety of them on there, including 23 23 A. Yes, we can. the TDS, total dissolved solids, that we measure at each 24 24 Q. How much came from the State and how much came of the treatment plants and at various locations in our 25 25 from the Colorado River? system. 1671 1673 1 1 Q. Does this also permit you to determine what the A. Correct. 2 2 Q. If we can look at Defense Exhibit 1105, and blend is of State Water Project water and Colorado River 3 3 that is not yet admitted, and I will ask you if you can water that's provided to San Diego? 4 4 identify Exhibit 1105. A. Correct. A. Yes. 5 Q. Are these documents created in the ordinary 6 6 course of business? Q. What is Exhibit 1105? 7 7 A. That shows daily readings from the lab sheet A. Yes. 8 8 database program of the blends that are taken at the Q. And by you and people acting under your 9 9 direction? Skinner plant. It is raw water and it shows the 10 1.0 percentage of State Water Project water in the A. Correct. 11 11 deliveries that are made each day. O. And these are made at the time that the 12 12 Q. Is this one of the documents that you were measurements are made? 13 13 referring to earlier that is created in the course of A. Yes. They are published weekly. 14 14 business? MR. QUINN: We would offer these three 15 15 A. Yes. exhibits, your Honor, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1128. 16 16 THE COURT: Four exhibits. Q. Are they created at or near the time that you 17 17 are actually measuring the blend and you create this at MR. QUINN: Yes. I'm sorry. Four exhibits. 18 18 that time? MR. BRAUNIG: No objection. 19 19 A. Yes. THE COURT: DTX 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1128 are 20 20 Q. And is this something that is created by you or admitted. 21 2.1 people acting under your direction? (DTX 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1128 were received 22 22 A. Yes. into evidence.) 23 23 Q. And is the source of information that this Q. BY MR. QUINN: We can look at DTX 1154, not yet 2.4 24 comes from, is this trustworthy information? admitted. Could you identify this document for us? 25 25 A. This is a status update sheet that we received A. Yes, it is.

1674

## weekly from the San Diego Water Authority.

- Q. Who creates this document?
- A. Somebody at the Authority does.
- Q. At the San Diego Water Authority?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you say this is something they provide to you?
  - A. Yes.

1.5

2.2

2.5

2.3

Q. And what does this document show?

MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: He can -- the foundation to this question? In other words, you don't think he has a basis to know what this shows or are you objecting to the admissibility of the document?

MR. BRAUNIG: Both, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will overrule the current objection. It hasn't been moved into evidence.

MR. QUINN: I will offer it.

MR. BRAUNIG: Objection. Lack of foundation for him to testify about this document that he didn't create that isn't a Met document.

THE COURT: What is the foundation?

MR. QUINN: As I understood the witness' testimony, this is a document created by San Diego that is provided to Met.

### A. Periodically it is, yes.

Q. And is this a document that people at Met rely on in terms of providing that coordination between the two agencies?

## A. Yes.

Q. And do people at San Diego tell you this is a document that they create and they rely on?

MR. BRAUNIG: Hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

MR. QUINN: I would offer 1154, your Honor.

MR. BRAUNIG: It still has a foundation objection. For him to testify as to what the meaning of these specific statistics are that he didn't himself create is improper. I will also note these are, if you look at the bottom, they have page three of eight, page three of eight. They are individual incomplete pages from a random assorted variety of dates and they are incomplete as they are. But more importantly, it is this foundation objection.

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, he testified that he actually works with this document, relies on it in coordination with the folks at San Diego, that the people at San Diego confirm that to him, that they also use it and rely on it.

THE COURT: But how does he know what the foundation is, the method of preparation, reliability, at or about the time, all the standard?

MR. QUINN: I would submit it is a party admission. This is a document that is created by San Diego that they sent to us. So it's --

THE COURT: That is not the test. That is not the test. I will sustain the objection.

MR. BRAUNIG: Take it down, please.

THE COURT: He can leave it up. There is no jury. I know what not to look at. It's okay.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do you have an understanding -- I am going to try to lay some foundation and what you know about this document.

Whatever it is you know about this document, how do you know it?

A. Just through our ordinary operational coordination with San Diego, it's something that we do in the normal course of business. It helps us -- makes us aware of some of their planning parameters and, likewise, we share documents like the status map with San Diego so they can plan their operations.

Q. Is this a document that -- that San Diego provides to you and then is the subject of discussion with people at San Diego, between Met and San Diego?

MR. BRAUNIG: That's not what he testified.

THE COURT: There is actually an Evidence Code on this. I am trying to find it. 1414(b), the writing has been acted upon as authentic by the party against whom it is offered. The question is whether this witness has suggested that San Diego has acted as if the document is authentic. That is probably the test. I think that is where Mr. Quinn was going. All I know is that San Diego, I guess, sends this to Met. What else do we know?

MR. QUINN: He didn't say he sends it to him. He says that it's the subject and used in connection with coordination between the two agencies, that he uses it and the people at San Diego tell him they use it, as well.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. The document is admitted under 1414(b). I have my doubts as to how much weight to give to any testimony that he gives as to what this means. The objection is overruled.

(DTX 1154 was received into evidence.)

Q. BY MR. QUINN: In your discussions with the folks at San Diego and doing the coordination you referred to, do the people at San Diego, have they told you what this document reflects?

1 MR. BRAUNIG: Hearsay. 2 2 THE COURT: Sustained. THE WITNESS: With me directly, no. With my 3 3 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Who is it that you talk to at staff, ves. 4 4 San Diego concerning this document? MR. BRAUNIG: Double hearsay. 5 5 THE COURT: I'll accept the first part of his A. We spoke to various operations managers at San 6 6 answer. I won't strike the second because it is Diego. 7 7 Q. Would those persons be your counterparts at San illuminating but it is hearsay. 8 8 Diego? Q. BY MR. QUINN: Have you personally ever had a 9 9 conversation with any operations manager at San Diego A. Yes, at times, yes. 10 10 Q. And do those operations managers at San Diego where the San Diego operations manager has told you that 11 11 tell you what this document reflects? Have they done San Diego is itself able to determine the relative blend 12 12 that? of Colorado River water and State Water Project water 13 13 MR. BRAUNIG: It is calling for hearsay. that it's receiving from Met pursuant to the exchange 14 14 THE COURT: At a general level I will allow it agreement? 15 in to give a general overview as to what the document is 15 A. I have not. 16 16 and how it's used. O. Ouickly take a look at Demonstrative 2. Were 17 17 You can go and answer that question. you able to use the monthly -- that information -- those 18 18 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question? exhibits that we looked at, the daily records and the 19 19 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do the operations managers in weekly records, in terms of the blends, were you able to 20 San Diego, when you have had discussions with them about 20 use those to calculate the volumes of State Water 21 21 this document that they send you, did they tell you what Project and Colorado River water that San Diego received 22 22 in its monthly exchange deliveries? the document reflects? 23 23 A. Yes. A. Yes, I have. 24 24 Q. What do they tell you that the document Q. And did you personally do that calculation? 25 25 reflects? A. Yes. 1679 1681 1 1 MR. BRAUNIG: Hearsay. Q. Do you know whether or not that raw data about 2 2 THE COURT: Overruled. monthly deliveries to San Diego can also be found in 3 3 THE WITNESS: It reflects the flows. There's Met's invoices to San Diego? 4 4 also reservoir information on this. They also -- we A. I'm sorry? 5 5 talk about the blends, at this place the blends they Q. Do you know whether or not the raw data about 6 6 expect to receive from the Skinner area. the monthly deliveries to San Diego can actually be 7 7 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do they tell you whether or not found in Met's invoices to San Diego? 8 8 this document, this report that they provide to you, A. Yes, it can. 9 9 reflects their own determination of what blends they are MR. QUINN: If we could look at PTX 469-A, that 10 10 receiving? is, as I understand, admitted, your Honor. 11 11 MR. BRAUNIG: Hearsay. PTX 469 is admitted. 12 12 THE COURT: Overruled. Q. Can you identify this document? 13 13 THE WITNESS: I haven't had that conversation A. Yes, this is the monthly invoice to San Diego 14 14 directly, but I would say --**County Water Authority.** 15 15 THE COURT: That answers the question. Thank Q. Does this exhibit include the invoices to San 16 16 Diego for 2011 to 2014? you. 17 17 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do they tell you whether or not A. Yes. 18 18 it's -- has any -- the operations managers at San Diego, Q. Using your monthly calculations, did you 19 19 have they told you whether or not they can determine calculate the annual volumes of State Water Project and 20 20 what the blend is of Colorado River water versus State Colorado River water that San Diego received in its 21 21 Water Project water that they received pursuant to the exchange agreements for each year 2011 through 2014? 22 22 exchange agreement? A. Yes, I did. 23 23 MR. BRAUNIG: Objection, your Honor. It is O. If we could take a look at Exhibit 1156. Is 24 24 this the first one? 25 25 THE COURT: Overruled. That is probably a yes A. Sorry?

1682

```
1
         Q. 1155, please.
                                                                            State Project water that was delivered as part of the
2
                                                                      2
            We are looking at Exhibit 1155.
                                                                            exchange deliveries and it also shows the corresponding
                                                                      3
 3
            MR. KEKER: 1105?
                                                                            Colorado River water amounts in the exchange deliveries.
                                                                      4
            THE COURT: This is a DTX?
                                                                                 MR. QUINN: We offer Exhibit 1156.
 5
            MR. QUINN: DTX, yes. 1155, I'm told.
                                                                      5
                                                                                 MR. BRAUNIG: No objection.
 6
                                                                      6
            THE COURT: Got it.
                                                                                 THE COURT: 1156, DTX, is admitted.
                                                                      7
         Q. BY MR. QUINN: The numbers we see here, is this
                                                                                 (DTX 1156 was received in evidence.)
8
                                                                      8
                                                                              Q. BY MR. QUINN: DTX 1157. What does this
       numbers you personally prepared?
 9
                                                                      9
         A. Yes, they are.
                                                                            document show?
10
                                                                     10
         Q. Can you explain to the Court what Exhibit 1155
                                                                              A. This shows the monthly total untreated water
11
                                                                     11
       shows?
                                                                            deliveries to the San Diego Water Authority as well as
                                                                     12
12
         A. This shows the monthly average blend and it is
                                                                            the total exchanged volumes each month. And it shows
13
                                                                     13
       directly from data that was taken from the Lab Sheet
                                                                            how much Colorado River water was delivered as part of
                                                                     14
14
       program, the daily data that we saw earlier.
                                                                            the total volume to San Diego County Water Authority per
                                                                     15
15
            So a monthly blend of State Water Project, the
                                                                            month.
                                                                     16
16
       amount was calculated for each month from 2011 to 2014.
                                                                              Q. When you say total volume, what are you
17
                                                                     17
                                                                            including in that?
         Q. For example, January of 2011 we see a 33. What
                                                                     18
18
       does that reflect?
                                                                              A. When we look at all of the untreated deliveries
19
                                                                     19
         A. That reflects that in the deliveries that were
                                                                            by month to San Diego County Water Authority and
20
                                                                     20
       made to San Diego, 33 percent of that delivery was State
                                                                            applying those percentages from the blend -- the blend
                                                                     21
21
       Water Project water.
                                                                            table from two exhibits ago, we arrive at the amount of
22
                                                                     22
            MR. QUINN: We would offer this exhibit, your
                                                                            Colorado River water that was made in their total
                                                                     23
23
                                                                            deliveries. That would be their full service firm
       Honor.
                                                                     24
24
            MR. BRAUNIG: No objection.
                                                                            deliveries as well as the exchange deliveries.
                                                                     25
25
            THE COURT: 1155 DTX is admitted.
                                                                              Q. So San Diego purchases full service water but
                                                         1683
                                                                                                                              1685
1
                                                                      1
            (DTX 1155 was received into evidence.)
                                                                            also gets exchange deliveries; is that correct?
2
                                                                      2
         Q. BY MR. QUINN: If we could look at 1156, can
                                                                              A. That's correct.
 3
                                                                      3
      you identify this document for us, please?
                                                                              Q. You have done some calculations here relating
                                                                      4
 4
         A. Yes. This is a document that shows the total
                                                                            to the combination of the two?
 5
       volume of the exchange from the period of 2011 to 2014.
                                                                              A. That's correct.
 6
                                                                      6
       And using the blend information from the prior exhibit,
                                                                              Q. You show combining the two what the various
 7
                                                                      7
       the amount of State Water Project delivery and Colorado
                                                                            percentages are and what the deliveries are of State
                                                                      8
8
       River water deliveries were calculated for each month.
                                                                            Water Project water versus Colorado River water; is that
                                                                      9
 9
         Q. When you say the total volume, what do you mean
                                                                            correct?
                                                                     10
10
       by the total volume?
                                                                              A. Yes. This one shows Colorado River water and,
                                                                     11
11
                                                                            by subtraction, you can calculate how much State Water
         A. The total amount of acre-feet delivered from
                                                                     12
12
       each of the two sources.
                                                                            Project is in the deliveries.
13
                                                                     13
         Q. Did you just apply the percentages that we
                                                                              Q. I see you have highlighted certain months here.
                                                                     14
14
       looked at in the preceding Exhibit 1155 to the volumes
                                                                            Why are those highlighted?
                                                                     15
15
       that were delivered to come up with these numbers?
                                                                              A. Those are highlighted because those are months
                                                                     16
16
         A. Yes, that's correct.
                                                                            where the amount of Colorado River water that was
                                                                     17
17
         Q. Does this show us for each month in 2011
                                                                            delivered in total to San Diego Water Authority for
18
                                                                     18
       through 2014 and for the year as a whole what the total
                                                                            those months was less than the exchange volume.
                                                                     19
19
       water deliveries were to San Diego?
                                                                              Q. How many months of the 48 at issue in this case
20
                                                                     20
         A. Yes, from each water source.
                                                                            did that occur?
                                                                     21
21
         Q. From each water source?
                                                                              A. Nineteen.
                                                                     22
22
         A. Yes.
                                                                              Q. That is nearly roughly half or a little less
                                                                     23
2.3
         O. Where do we see those two different water
                                                                            than half the months in question?
24
                                                                     24
       sources?
                                                                              A. Yes.
25
                                                                     25
                                                                                 MR. QUINN: We offer DTX 1156.
         A. Right there up in the corner, you see first the
                                                         1684
                                                                                                                              1686
```

```
1
             THE COURT: 1157.
                                                                            Q. When we talk about the water that San Diego
 2
                                                                   2
             MR. OUINN: 1157.
                                                                          provides at Lake Havasu, we are talking about water
                                                                   3
 3
            THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                                          that's conserved by IID and through the lining of two
                                                                   4
 4
            MR. BRAUNIG: No objection.
                                                                          canals in the Imperial Valley?
 5
            THE COURT: DTX 1157 is admitted.
                                                                   5
                                                                            A. Yes.
 6
                                                                   6
             (DTX 1157 was received into evidence.)
                                                                            Q. Lake Havasu is the sort of far out end point of
                                                                   7
            THE COURT: Take a 15-minute recess. I will
                                                                          the Colorado River Aqueduct; right? That's the entry
                                                                   8
 8
       see you at 3:00.
                                                                          point to the Colorado River Aqueduct?
 9
                                                                   9
             (Recess.)
                                                                            A. Yes, it is.
10
                                                                  10
            THE COURT: Let's continue, please.
                                                                            Q. That IID and canal lining water that San Diego
                                                                  11
                                                                          has acquired, that passes through the Colorado River
11
            MR. QUINN: Thank you, your Honor.
12
                                                                  12
         Q. Mr. Yamasaki, is it possible to get the
                                                                          Aqueduct?
13
                                                                  13
       exchange water that Met is obligated to provide to San
                                                                            A. Yes.
                                                                  14
14
       Diego without going through the Skinner reservoir and
                                                                            Q. It doesn't ever touch the State Water Project,
15
                                                                  15
       the related Skinner facility known as the Skinner area,
                                                                          does it?
16
       is it possible to do that?
                                                                  16
                                                                            A. No. it doesn't.
17
                                                                  17
         A. No, it is not.
                                                                            Q. In fact, it would be physically impossible for
                                                                  18
18
             MR. QUINN: Nothing further.
                                                                          that water to go through the State Water Project from
19
                                                                  19
            THE COURT: Cross-examination.
                                                                          Lake Havasu to the Met service area?
                                                                  20
20
                                                                            A. It wouldn't be impossible, no.
21
                   CROSS-EXAMINATION
                                                                  21
                                                                            Q. The Colorado River Aqueduct flows from Lake
                                                                  22
22
       BY MR. BRAUNIG:
                                                                          Havasu to Met service area; correct?
23
         Q. We will have binders coming to you in just a
                                                                  23
                                                                            A. Yes.
24
                                                                  24
       second but in the interest of time I will get started.
                                                                            Q. And that's where the IID and canal lining water
25
                                                                  25
             Mr. Yamasaki, I'm Warren Braunig from the San
                                                                          that San Diego acquires, that's where it travels is
                                                       1687
                                                                                                                         1689
 1
                                                                   1
       Diego County Water Authority counsel.
                                                                         through the Colorado River Aqueduct?
 2
                                                                   2
            You are familiar with Section 136 of the Met
                                                                   3
 3
       act, are you not?
                                                                            Q. The exchange agreement also gives Met sole
 4
         A. I am, yes.
                                                                   4
                                                                         discretion to decide which facilities and delivery path
 5
                                                                   5
                                                                         it wants to use in delivering exchange water; correct?
         Q. Section 136 requires Met, when it sells Met
                                                                   6
 6
       water, to provide a 50 percent blend of State Water
                                                                            A. Could you repeat that?
 7
                                                                   7
       Project water to the extent practicable; right?
                                                                            Q. The exchange agreement gives Met sole
                                                                   8
 8
         A. I believe that's what it says.
                                                                         discretion to decide how it is going to deliver exchange
                                                                   9
 9
                                                                         water to San Diego; right?
         Q. That obligation doesn't apply to water conveyed
                                                                  10
10
       as part of the exchange agreement, does it?
                                                                            A. I believe it does.
                                                                  11
11
         A. I've never applied it in that way so I don't --
                                                                            Q. And Met, therefore, is able to decide in
                                                                  12
12
       I've never thought of it in that way.
                                                                         delivering exchange water what the blend of State Water
13
                                                                  13
         Q. You testified that you're familiar with the
                                                                         Project versus Colorado River Aqueduct water San Diego
                                                                  14
14
       exchange agreement; right?
                                                                         will get?
                                                                  15
15
         A. Yes.
                                                                           A. Yes.
16
                                                                  16
         Q. You have read the exchange agreement?
                                                                            Q. San Diego has no control over that, over what
17
                                                                  17
         A. Yes.
                                                                         that blend is going to be?
                                                                  18
18
         Q. And you're aware that Met has no obligation
                                                                            A. San Diego through its demands, depending on if
19
                                                                  19
       under the exchange agreement to blend the IID and canal
                                                                         they increase their demands, could.
20
                                                                  20
       lining water with State Water Project water; right?
                                                                            Q. You testified in Phase I, did you not, Phase I
21
                                                                  21
         A. I don't believe there's a commitment, no.
                                                                         of this trial, that San Diego doesn't have any ability
22
                                                                  22
         Q. The exchange agreement only requires Met to
                                                                         to dictate what blend of water it receives in terms of
                                                                  23
23
       deliver a water of equal quality to the water that San
                                                                         its IID and canal lining water; that was your testimony;
24
                                                                  24
       Diego provides at Lake Havasu; right?
                                                                  25
25
                                                                           A. I believe it was.
         A. I believe so, yes.
                                                       1688
                                                                                                                         1690
```

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

- 1 Q. That is true, that testimony was truthful? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. And that's -- that gives Met operational
  - flexibility, right, the fact -- the ability to blend these different sources of water gives Met operational flexibility; right?
    - A. Yes.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

2.5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And you testified a little bit ago as to what some of those operational flexibilities are?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And that's a benefit to Met, to be able to blend these different waters to satisfy Met's operational needs; right?

#### A. I would say it's a benefit to Metropolitan and the member agencies we serve.

- Q. You testified about the use of the State Water Project -- using State Water Project water when there are shutdowns on the Colorado River Aqueduct; right?
  - A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Metropolitan could always deliver more Colorado 21 River water in the month before a shutdown and more 22 Colorado River Aqueduct water after a month of a 23 shutdown, couldn't it?
  - A. We could, yes.
  - Q. And that's something the exchange agreement

fact Metropolitan -- the blend of water at Skinner is 2 entirely Colorado River water; right? 3

### A. During periods where there's a lack of State Water Project water, ves.

- Q. Right. In other words, you are able to deliver purely Colorado River water to San Diego?
- A. Periodically, ves.
- Q. As a matter of course, you do do it periodically; right?
  - A. Yes, we have.
  - Q. You could do it more frequently, couldn't you?
- 12 A. It depends on a lot of factors.
  - Q. Operational factors?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. But physically, you could deliver 100 percent Colorado River water, as you have done, to San Diego; correct?

#### A. In periods where there's no need to move other supplies, perhaps.

- Q. Physically? I am asking physically.
- A. Physically.
  - Q. The physical capabilities, Met can deliver to San Diego 100 percent Colorado River water; correct?
    - A. Correct.
    - Q. Let's look at DTX 1157, which is one of your

1691

1693

- 1 would allow; right? If Metropolitan wanted to deliver 2
  - the IID and canal lining water to San Diego and wanted
- 3 to do that, and there was a shutdown on the Colorado
- 4 River Aqueduct, you could deliver more water the month
- 5 before or deliver more water the month after and that
- 6 would still be consistent, you would still satisfy Met's 7
  - obligations under the exchange agreement, wouldn't you?
    - A. I don't think we've done it that way.
    - Q. But you could?
    - A. Physically?
    - Q. Yes, physically.
      - A. I suppose we could.
  - Q. In fact, as a matter of fact, the amount of water that Met delivers through the Colorado River Aqueduct or conveys through the Colorado River Aqueduct fluctuates pretty significantly from one month to the next; right?
  - A. It can, yes.
    - Q. Let's look at DTX 1105 which you reviewed with your counsel. Can we put that up, please?

It was your testimony that Metropolitan has to blend State Water Project water with Colorado River water in its system, correct, at the Skinner plant?

- A. In the vicinity of the Skinner plant.
- Q. But there have been periods of time where in

- charts. You gave some testimony about this. Do you recall that?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. You testified there were months in which the CRA -- the volume of CRA untreated deliveries, as you calculated them, is less than the total exchange volume; right?
  - Q. You identified and highlighted in yellow these 19 months?
    - A. Correct.
- 12 Q. Let's look at January 2011. Can we blow that 13 up, please. 14

Let's back up just a step. The capacity of the Colorado River Aqueduct is about 100,000 acre-feet a month; correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. As a matter of course, Met regularly delivers through the Colorado River Aqueduct to Met -- I should say conveys through the Colorado River Aqueduct about 60,000 to 90,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water; right?
  - A. I think it varies more widely than that.
  - Q. In most months it's above 50,000 acre-feet?
  - A. Yes, in most months.

1694

2.5

- Q. And the Bureau of Reclamation tracks, does it not, the amount of water that's conveyed through the -- that's basically diverted into the Colorado River Aqueduct for Met on a monthly basis? That's something that the Bureau of Reclamation keeps track of?
  - A. Yes.

2.5

1.0

2.1

2.4

Q. And you should have in the binder that's in front of you, it's PTX 322 which is in evidence. I would ask you to turn to page 13, please. And it will also be on your screen, Mr. Yamasaki.

Do you recognize PTX as a report generated by the Bureau of Reclamation on an annual basis?

#### A. Yes, I do.

- Q. Could we please blow up on page 13 the Metropolitan Water District just through June. These figures on Exhibit 322, this is the amount of water actually diverted into the Colorado River aqueduct for Met's use in January of 2011; right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. That amount is 51,748, do you see that?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Quite a bit more than the total volume of exchange water, correct, that Met was required to provide to San Diego in that month?
  - A. Yes.

water at Skinner and decrease it somewhere else?

- A. Yes.
- Q. That is something Met can do; right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. In fact, Metropolitan has a way to deliver untreated Colorado River water directly to San Diego without going through the Skinner plant, doesn't it?
  - A. We do, yes.
    - Q. That's the Skinner bypass?
  - A. Correct.
    - Q. And through the Skinner bypass you could take 13,142 acre-feet of Colorado River water, untreated, and deliver it straight into the San Diego pipeline going to the San Diego Water Authority; correct?
    - A. Not if we're delivering State Water Project water also to that area, to San Diego and other customers.
    - Q. Physically, you can do that? Physically, you can deliver pure -- you could deliver, physically, 13,142 acre-feet of water per month to San Diego via the Skinner bypass?
      - A. Yes.
    - Q. And the reason that you don't is for Metropolitan's operational considerations?
      - A. And many other considerations.

- Q. And likewise, if you look at February, 22,000 -- the total amount of water that was diverted into the Colorado River Aqueduct was 22,444; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And that's more than the amount of exchange water Met was obligated to provide?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. The same is true in March and April and May; correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. So now let's bring back up DTX 1157.

In those months you highlighted January through of May, in each of those months Met actually conveyed through the Colorado River Aqueduct a volume that is greater than the total exchange volume?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And it's Met that decides which of its facilities are going to receive Colorado River Aqueduct water; correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Met can deliver more Colorado River water to San Diego and less to other parts of its system if it so chooses?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. It could increase the blend of Colorado River

Q. We looked at PTX 322, which is the Bureau of Reclamation chart or the schedule for 2011. If we were to look at 2012 and 2013 and 2014, we would see the same information? In other words, we would see that the amount of water that Metropolitan conveys through the Colorado River Aqueduct is greater than the amount of total exchange volume that is listed in your DTX 1157, wouldn't we?

# A. I'd have to take a look at the information myself.

- Q. Let's look at PTX 323. That should be in front of you. That's the 2012 -- that's the 2012 Bureau of Reclamation schedule. Do you recognize this?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. This is in evidence.

Can we go, please, to page 13, again.

Looking at PTX 323, the amount of water that Metropolitan is conveying through the Colorado River Aqueduct is quite a bit greater than the total exchange water; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And the only reason that Metropolitan doesn't deliver the exchange volume of 100 percent untreated Colorado River water directly to San Diego through the Skinner bypass is because of the operational

1 considerations that Met has? fluctuate depending on what 2 2 A. Once again, I would say operational and other blend of water it's delivering 3 3 considerations. to member agencies?" 4 4 O. Those are Met's considerations? And there's an objection that is overruled. 5 A. Yes. 5 "A I don't know of any. 6 6 Q. Met makes that decision? "Q You are not aware of any A. Correct. hard data on that issue? 8 Q. Physically, Metropolitan could deliver all of 8 "A Not that I know of." 9 9 that water untreated, 100 percent Colorado River water That was truthful and accurate testimony? 10 10 to San Diego? 11 11 A. Yes. Q. Is the same true today, that as you sit here 12 Q. In the volume specified in the exchange 12 today, you are not aware of any effort by Metropolitan 13 13 agreement? to determine how its costs fluctuate, how Metropolitan's 14 A. Under the circumstances shown, yes. 14 costs change depending on what blend of water it 15 Q. When you say in DTX 1157 that the State Water 15 provides to its member agencies? 16 Project is necessary to deliver exchange water in those 16 A. I am not aware of any. 17 19 months, that's only because Metropolitan has chosen 17 MR. BRAUNIG: Nothing further. 18 to do it that way for operational reasons; right? 18 THE COURT: Any redirect? 19 A. For operational reasons, water supply and 19 20 consideration of our other member agencies, yes. 20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 21 Q. One other thing about this chart. This is not 21 BY MR. QUINN: 2.2 all of the Colorado River Aqueduct water that San Diego 22 Q. You were asked some questions about whether it 23 gets each month; this is just the untreated deliveries? 23 would be physically possible to deliver pure Colorado 24 A. That's correct. 24 River water through something called the Skinner bypass. 2.5 Q. In fact, as a point of fact, San Diego also 25 Do you recall those questions? 1699 1701 1 1 receives treated Colorado River Aqueduct water? 2 2 Q. And you said it would be physically possible? 3 3 A. That's correct. Q. If you were to include in this chart both 4 treated and untreated deliveries to San Diego, the top 4 Q. And then you were asked, does Met choose not to 5 5 do that purely for operational reasons, and you said two rows in each year would increase sometimes by 5- to 6 6 operational and other reasons? 10,000 acre-feet, wouldn't they? 7 7 A. I can't confirm whether they would increase by A. Correct. 8 8 that much but they would increase. Q. Can you please explain to the Court what the 9 9 Q. During the Phase I of the trial you testified reasons are why Colorado River water is delivered 10 10 Met has never attempted to determine how its costs through something called the Skinner bypass? 11 11 fluctuate depending on what blend of water it delivers A. Primarily for water supply reasons. As I 12 12 to its member agencies. Do you recall that? mentioned before, we move Colorado River water as well 13 13 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? as State Water Project supplies, and also it is 14 14 theoretically possible, maybe with the exception of 2013 Q. Yeah. During the first phase of the trial, 15 15 isn't it correct you testified that Met has never and 2014, which were some of the driest and hottest 16 16 attempted to determine how its costs fluctuate depending years of record where State Water Project supplies were 17 17 on what blend of water it delivers to its member very short, we always have a need to move both supplies. 18 18 agencies? So we would then have to blend the water upstream of the 19 19 A. I don't recall that. Skinner facility and we are compelled to do that because 20 20 Q. You don't recall that. Let's look at your in certain years to not do that we would not be able to 21 21 trial testimony which is Tab 1 in the binder. Page 542, maximize the use or movement or storage of the water 22 22 line 18 through 543, five. supplies that are available when they are available. 23 2.3 Do you see the question? Q. When you say that last part of your answer, we 24 24 "O Has Met ever done any wouldn't be able to maximize the water supplies when 25 25 they are available, are you referring to the study as to how its costs

1702

- availability of State Water Project water that you told
   us in direct exam?
   A. That's correct. Yes.
  - Q. If that is not used --
  - A. We have the potential to lose that water supply.
  - Q. Is it simply a matter of Met's discretion as to whether or not to blend State Water Project water and Colorado River water?
    - A. I suppose theoretically it is.
    - Q. Real world?

2.3

- A. The real world, yes. The State has standards that talk about salinity standards for water deliveries by water utilities.
- Q. The Skinner facility, the blending takes place at what point?
- A. Upstream of the Skinner facility. We have a canal that leads to the Skinner facility. It's called the San Diego Canal. At the beginning of that canal is the intersection of the State Water Project with the Colorado River Aqueduct water. The blending takes place far ahead of Lake Skinner and the Skinner facilities. Think of it as a bucket. The two supplies go into that
- bucket and get mixed together and there's not a way to
  - unmix them. The only way and time they aren't mixed is

- Q. What are those limitations on your flexibility to determine the blend?
- A. The first is system capacity during periods where flows are high. Certain pipelines or canals can only carry so much water from either supply. The other is water supply related.

At times where, like I said, we have State Water Project supplies to deliver, we are compelled to deliver them to all of our member agencies where we can.

And in a very wet year we have -- I would say we have to do so or else we risk losing a water supply that's available for a calendar year that's wet.

- Q. Other than the times when there hasn't been State Water Project water available, have there ever been times when San Diego has received only Colorado River water in the exchange agreement?
  - A. None that I can think of specifically.
- Q. Have there ever been any complaints that you're aware of from San Diego that we're not receiving pure Colorado River water; what we're receiving is a blend?
  - A. No.
- Q. As a practical matter, when there is State Water Project water available, is it practically -- the questions were asked about in theory, physically is it possible. In the real world, is it practical, when

- if there's something extraordinary like a lack of State Water Project water supplies.
  - Q. And that's what you talked about earlier?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Has there ever been a time when water, pure Colorado River water, has been routed to San Diego through the Skinner bypass and that was the only water that San Diego received as part of the exchange agreement?
- A. You know, we do have a Skinner bypass. We use it periodically. That is not the primary method of making deliveries to San Diego. We use it a few times a year but not frequently. The majority of the water is delivered through Lake Skinner.
- Q. Is there a reason why you only use that a few times a year?
- A. Mainly water quality purposes and it is not part of our normal operations. We usually like to route the water through the Lake Skinner facility.
- Q. You said you had some operational flexibility to determine the blend. Do you recall that question?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Are there limitations on the operational flexibility that you have to determine the blend?
  - A. Yes, there are.

there is State Water Project water available, to deliver unblended Colorado River water to San Diego?

A. No, it's not.

MR. QUINN: Thank you.

MR. BRAUNIG: Hold on one second.

#### RECROSS-EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. BRAUNIG:

Q. If you delivered -- if you delivered 13,000 acre-feet of exchange water directly to San Diego through the Skinner bypass, you could still blend Colorado River water and State Water Project water when delivering Met water through the Skinner facilities, couldn't you?

A. No.

MR. QUINN: Objection. I didn't understand the question.

THE COURT: I do. I think the witness does. Did you understand the question?

THE WITNESS: I think I did.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll go with that.

Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: And the -- you could -- you could theoretically do both; right? You could theoretically send some water untreated through the Skinner bypass and blend water elsewhere in the system

1 in Lake Skinner, for example; right? THE WITNESS: Jon Lambeck. J-O-N, 2 2 L-A-M-B-E-C-K. A. No. 3 3 Q. Lake Skinner is a blend, isn't it? 4 4 A. Yes. DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 Q. And the San Diego Canal can take water, as you 5 BY MS. BORDEN: 6 6 testified, can take water in the Colorado River and Q. Who do you work for? 7 7 deliver that straight to San Diego; right? A. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern 8 8 A. Theoretically you could. But --California. 9 9 THE COURT: Could you do both at the same time Q. What is your position at Metropolitan? 10 10 in effect, the same over the period of a couple of days, A. I'm the manager of power operations and 11 11 do some bypass and send some into the Lake Skinner area? 12 12 Q. How long have you worked at Met? THE WITNESS: No, it's not possible. The San 13 13 Diego Canal conveyance I spoke of where we mix the two A. A little over 16 years. 14 14 waters together, you can't unmix them. And the Skinner Q. What are your job responsibilities? 15 15 bypass is simply a bypass that takes water from the San A. I'm responsible for acquiring and managing the 16 16 Diego Canal, that is already mixed together, and goes power requirements for the Colorado River Aqueduct. I 17 17 around Lake Skinner. So if Lake Skinner is a blend, you also work with the Department of Water Resources, with 18 18 would have to make this whole San Diego Canal Colorado the energy requirements on the State Water Project. 19 19 River water only and bypass that around. Q. What is your educational background? 20 20 Q. BY MR. BRAUNIG: You could do that? You could A. I have a bachelor's of science in electrical 21 21 do that, couldn't you? If you wanted to, if the engineering from Michigan State University and a master 22 22 directive from the Met gods on high, your bosses, was of science in electrical engineering from the University 23 23 that you had to do that, you could do that, couldn't of Southern California. 24 you? 24 Q. Do you have any professional license? 25 25 A. I am a registered professional engineer in the A. I would have to say that it would be -- there 1707 1709 1 1 are physical limitations in the San Diego Canal that state of California for electrical engineering. 2 2 impair our ability to change the flows that frequently. Q. Have you submitted a declaration in this case? 3 3 A. Yes, I have. Q. But you could. You could do it for some period 4 4 during the year and provide that bypass; right? Q. Please turn to DTX 1151 in the binder. Is this 5 5 A. I suppose to the detriment of possibly damaging the declaration you referred to? 6 6 facilities or not being able to move other water A. Yes, it is. 7 7 supplies. Q. Have you recently reviewed the declaration? 8 8 Q. You haven't documented what the damages to Q. Does it remain accurate? 9 other facilities or other water supplies would take 9 10 1.0 place if you did -- if you provided the IID and canal A. Yes. 11 11 lining water straight to San Diego; right? MS. BORDEN: Met offers DTX 1151. 12 12 A. I haven't been asked. I haven't documented but THE COURT: 1151 is admitted. 13 13 I haven't been asked. (Exhibit DTX 1151 was received into evidence.) 14 14 Q. BY MS. BORDEN: As part of your job, are you MR. BRAUNIG: Nothing further. 15 15 MR. QUINN: Nothing further. responsible for purchasing power? 16 16 THE COURT: Thank you very much. You are A. Yes, I am. 17 17 excused. Q. Have you ever sold excess Met power? 18 18 A. Yes, I have. 19 19 JON LAMBECK, Q. What rate did Met sell the power at? 20 20 called as a witness by the Defendants, was sworn and A. At the market power rate. 21 21 Q. Please turn to DTX 1121 in the binder in front testified as follows: 22 22 of you. 23 2.3 THE WITNESS: I do. MR. GOLDBERG: We object to this exhibit on 24 2.4 THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state and relevance grounds. 25 25 spell your full name for the record. THE COURT: Let's have a question first and see

1710

```
1
                                                                     1
                                                                           coming in to be a series of accurate statements as to
      how it comes out.
2
                                                                     2
      Q: BY MS. BORDEN: Do you recognize DTX 1121?
                                                                           what the price was for the market generally?
                                                                     3
 3
                                                                                MS. BORDEN: It's coming in for the SB15 path
         A. Yes.
                                                                     4
 4
         O. What is it?
                                                                           rate on monthly average.
 5
         A. A page out of a publication called Energy
                                                                     5
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, we have no basis and
                                                                     6
 6
                                                                           I don't believe the witness even has a basis to know
       Trader from Platts.
                                                                     7
 7
         Q. What are Platts energy trader reports?
                                                                           whether this is true and accurate information that
 8
                                                                     8
                                                                           reflects the actual market price at any given point in
         A. It is a report that describes the energy
                                                                     9
 9
                                                                           time or that Met even used it.
      industry and different activities coming on as well as
10
                                                                    10
                                                                                THE COURT: This we can find out. Your
       different pricing at points within the country.
                                                                    11
11
         Q. Does DTX 1121 contain the entire daily report?
                                                                           position is that this -- let me ask the witness some
                                                                    12
12
                                                                           questions. This will help.
         A. No, it does not.
13
                                                                    13
         Q. Why not? What does it contain?
                                                                                What do you use this document for?
                                                                    14
14
                                                                                THE WITNESS: This document provides a basis
         A. It's a copy of one page that contains the
15
                                                                    15
       market prices for different locations in the western
                                                                           for the acquisition or the sale for Met's power
                                                                    16
16
       United States.
                                                                           transactions. It gives us an idea of where the market
17
                                                                    17
            MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. That's
                                                                    18
18
                                                                                THE COURT: Do you use it to set your prices?
      hearsay.
19
                                                                    19
            THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                                THE WITNESS: We use it as a basis when we're
20
                                                                    20
                                                                           negotiating with -- with the buyers if we're selling, as
         Q. BY MS. BORDEN: How does Met obtain the Platts
21
      market reports?
                                                                    21
                                                                           to what would be a reasonable number to sell the power
22
                                                                    22
         A. We subscribe to it.
                                                                           as a basis for --
                                                                    23
23
         Q. Do you look at these reports in the course of
                                                                                THE COURT: Is it fair to say it is one of the
24
                                                                    24
      your normal responsibilities?
                                                                           different -- one of a variety of inputs you use to
25
                                                                    25
         A. Yes.
                                                                           negotiate a price?
                                                         1711
                                                                                                                             1713
 1
                                                                     1
                                                                                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
         Q. For what purpose do you use these reports?
 2
                                                                     2
         A. To track the market price of energy.
                                                                                 MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, he is talking about
                                                                     3
 3
         Q. Do you use the reports regularly in the course
                                                                           selling power, not buying power. It is a fundamental
                                                                     4
 4
       of business?
                                                                           difference.
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                                 THE WITNESS: It is used for both.
         A. Yes.
                                                                     6
 6
                                                                                 THE COURT: It is used for both?
         Q. Do you rely on the reports as accurate?
                                                                     7
         A. Yes.
                                                                                 THE WITNESS: Yes. We're buying, as well.
                                                                     8
 8
            MS. BORDEN: Met offers DTX 1121.
                                                                                 THE COURT: I will admit it for the purposes of
                                                                     9
 9
            MR. GOLDBERG: We object on hearsay grounds.
                                                                           showing what Met, as one of the inputs that Met uses in
                                                                    10
10
       It is not a Met business record and, if not, the witness
                                                                           deciding what to buy or sell power for. That's what it
                                                                    11
11
       has any percipient fact knowledge of the data on spot
                                                                           is. I will admit it for that limited purpose. The
12
                                                                    12
       market rates for power based on an energy trade
                                                                           objection is overruled to that extent. 1121 is
13
                                                                    13
       publication which Met does not publish.
                                                                           admitted.
14
                                                                    14
            THE COURT: Why should this be admitted?
                                                                                 (Exhibit DTX 1121 was admitted into evidence.)
15
                                                                    15
            MS. BORDEN: Evidence Code section 1340 for
                                                                              Q. BY MS. BORDEN: In your declaration you refer
16
                                                                    16
                                                                           to the regional index applicable to energy sold for use
       commercial publications.
17
                                                                    17
            THE COURT: Does San Diego counsel have a copy
                                                                           in the Colorado River Aqueduct. Is that reflected in
18
                                                                    18
                                                                           DTX 1121?
       of that?
19
                                                                    19
                                                                              A. Yes, it is.
            MR. GOLDBERG: I have a summary of it.
20
                                                                    20
            THE COURT: Not made inadmissible by the
                                                                              O. Where is that reflected?
21
                                                                    21
       hearsay rule if the compilation is generally used and
                                                                              A. It's in the line for SP15.
22
                                                                    22
       relied upon as accurate in the course of a business as
                                                                              Q. Which rate would apply here?
                                                                    23
2.3
       defined in 1270.
                                                                                 MR. GOLDBERG: Vague, your Honor.
24
                                                                    24
            Is this coming in for more than just the
                                                                                 THE COURT: Are we talking about the first page
25
                                                                           of DTX 1121?
       evidence of what Met priced its power at or is this
                                                         1712
                                                                                                                             1714
```

1 MS. BORDEN: Correct. 1 stated before as hearsay. And now the witness testified 2 2 THE COURT: There are many pages. Are you that the on-peek price is irrelevant for buying power. 3 3 It is not what they use, so we don't see how this is referring me to the table on the right-hand side where 4 4 it says SP15, index 38, change four? relevant. 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 THE COURT: This is coming in to show solely by 6 6 THE COURT: The vague objection is overruled. virtue of looking at the SP15 line in each case what Met 7 Q. BY MS. BORDEN: Which rate would apply here? sells excess power at and it uses on-peak time as 8 8 A. The SP15 on-peak price. reflected here and shows what Met buys power at and it 9 9 uses the off-peak number reflected here? Is that what Q. If you were selling excess Met power in 10 10 Southern California, what rate would apply? these are coming in for? 11 11 A. The SP15. MS. BORDEN: Mr. Lambeck had previously 12 12 Q. Which rate, on-peak or off-peak? testified that the on-peak rate was also used in 13 1.3 A. The on-peak. purchasing power. I can elicit further testimony. 14 14 Q. If Met needed to purchase power for a third MR. GOLDBERG: That's not what he testified to. 15 15 party to move non-Met water, what price would be THE COURT: Can you state that again? 16 16 applicable? MS. BORDEN: He testified previously in his 17 17 examination that Met sometimes purchases power at the A. For purchasing power we would look for the 18 off-peak. 18 on-peak rate. 19 19 Q. What time period is offered by the on-peak MR. GOLDBERG: He didn't. He testified they 20 20 rate? buy the off-peak --21 21 A. On-peak prices are from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. THE COURT: Does Met sometimes buy power at the 2.2 22 Monday through Saturday. That's a standard on-peak on-peak rate? 23 23 THE WITNESS: Sometimes. Very infrequently. 24 24 Q. How much was the monthly on-peak price as of THE COURT: I will ask the question. Are these 25 January 31st, 2011? 25 numbers here where it says SP15 by and large for each of 1715 1717 1 1 A. Price was \$37.13. these years, is it your testimony that if we look at the 2 2 Q. Please turn to DTX 1123. on-peak rate, that will tell us what Met sold its excess 3 3 MR. GOLDBERG: Can we have a standing objection power at; yes? 4 4 to these on the same grounds? THE WITNESS: Those -- yes -- well, we use this 5 5 THE COURT: I can't do standing objections but information to help us determine what would be a market 6 6 you can be brief and I'll be brief. price for the power when we go out to sell. 7 7 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection on the grounds of THE COURT: If the number here is 38, that may 8 8 hearsay for the reasons stated previously. or may not be actually what the final negotiations were 9 9 THE COURT: We haven't done anything yet other when you engaged in negotiations to sell power at in 10 10 than to turn to the document. It is overruled. 1123. January of 2011? 11 11 Q. BY MS. BORDEN: Do you recognize DTX 1123? THE WITNESS: That's correct. Because we're 12 12 A. Yes, I do. not selling every day. 13 13 O. What is it? THE COURT: Right. 14 14 THE WITNESS: It's only when we have the excess A. These are the same type of pricing information 15 15 sheets from the Platt's energy trader publication with power that we would be. 16 16 THE COURT: This again is one of the inputs information for each month of the year. This is 17 17 calendar year 2012. into these negotiations? 18 18 Q. Please turn to DTX 1125. Do you recognize DTX THE WITNESS: Yes. 19 19 1125? THE COURT: I'll admit these documents for that 20 20 A. Yes, I do. limited purpose. I am not sure how useful they are and 21 21 Q. What is it? I don't know what you will do with them. This is one of 22 22 A. It's the same pricing information on a monthly the inputs that's used to generate the ultimate 23 23 basis for calendar year 2013. negotiated rates when Met buys or sells power to the 24 24 MS. BORDEN: Met offers DTX 1123 and DTX 1125. extent the objection is overruled. 25 25 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection on the same grounds MR. GOLDBERG: We just have to object because 1716 1718

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

he says they very infrequently use the on-peak when they 2 buy. 3 THE COURT: Yes. I have that in mind. MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you. 5 THE COURT: I have that in mind. Thank you. 6 Let's continue. (DTX 1123 and 1125 were received in evidence.) 8 Q. BY MS. BORDEN: Please turn to DTX 1127. Do 9 you recognize DTX 1127? 1.0 A. Yes, I do. 11 O. What is it? 12 A. DTX 1127 is the same information as discussed 13 previously for the months January through November of 14 the year 2014. And then it includes information that's 15 taken from the California Independent System Operator or 16 the CALISO to provide information for the month of 17 December and this was done because the Platts energy 18 trader stops publishing the SP15 information in December 19 of 2014. 20 Q. What is the California Independent System 21 Operator? 22 A. It is an entity that controls and operates most 23 of the electric system in the state of California. 24 O. How does Met obtain this information? 25

A. It's from the website. Publicly available on

A. Yes, I do.

Q. What is it?

A. It is a compilation of the monthly average energy prices for SP15 on-peak for the four years from 2011 through 2014. It includes a scheduling fee that would -- is based upon an estimate of Metropolitan's costs for scheduling power and that includes -- and then it's the addition of those two amounts and then the final column is multiplication of that sum against the value 2.349 to come up with a dollar amount per acre-foot.

Q. What is the source of the on-peak monthly average?

- A. It's from the Platts reports.
- Q. How is the scheduling fee calculated?

A. Metropolitan looked at the types of tasks that we do in scheduling power, the amount of time that is spent to do those various tasks. We looked at the buying of a standard block amount of energy. And we looked at the labor rate with additional burden costs and the administrative and general costs for Metropolitan employees, and on a per-megawatt basis, we came up with the values that you see here.

Q. What is the source of the administrative and general costs that go into this fee?

1719 1721

their website.

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. Do you look at this data in the course of your normal responsibilities?

A. Yes.

Q. For what purpose do you use this data?

A. It's another source of information as to the market price for energy.

Q. Do you use this information regularly in the course of business?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you rely on the data as accurate?

A. Yes.

MS. BORDEN: Met offers DTX 1127.

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. It's hearsay and totally irrelevant. It has absolutely nothing to do with the actual cost they use for buying or selling power. That's now quite clear. I think it has no evidentiary value at all.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled on the same basis. It represents one of the many inputs into the calculation of the price. I will use it for that purpose. I agree it may not end up being very useful.

(DTX 1127 was received into evidence.)

O. BY MS. BORDEN: Please turn to DTX 1103. Do you recognize DTX 1103?

A. These are fees that are determined with Metropolitan annually in setting its rates and determining the costs. With Metropolitan these are costs that don't necessarily apply directly to particular functions. So those costs are collected and then assigned to specific functions including the power costs for Metropolitan. And a portion of those costs are allocated to the system power rate, which is then allocated into the costs for scheduling power.

Q. What is the basis for the 2.349 number in the upper right column?

A. That is made up of three components. The first component is the amount of power that is consumed at the pumps on the Colorado River Aqueduct. It is two megawatt hours per acre-foot. That's how much energy the pump requires to move the water through the aqueduct.

The second component is based upon the impact of moving additional water in our aqueduct. We have a contract with Southern California Edison in which they provide a certain amount of power to Metropolitan on an annual basis. The amount of power we receive is determined by the usage of the aqueduct. The more we use the aqueduct, the less power we get from Edison.

And on a continuing basis of additional use of

1722

```
1
                                                                     1
                                                                           these other numbers mean made absolutely no sense to me.
       the aqueduct there is a reduction in energy from Edison
2
                                                                     2
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Maybe we need to do a better job of
       of .317.
                                                                     3
 3
            THE COURT: Edison?
                                                                           explaining those numbers.
                                                                     4
 4
            THE WITNESS: Southern California Edison, like
                                                                                THE COURT: That's my ruling for now. Let's
 5
                                                                     5
       a utility.
                                                                           continue with the questions.
                                                                     6
 6
            THE COURT: Got it.
                                                                                Do you have any other questions of this
 7
                                                                     7
            THE WITNESS: .317 megawatt hours per
                                                                           witness?
 8
                                                                     8
       acre-foot.
                                                                                MS. BORDEN: I do.
                                                                     9
 9
            The third component making up the total of
                                                                                THE COURT: Let's go with those.
10
                                                                    10
       2.349 is the loss of energy by diverting water around or
                                                                             Q. BY MS. BORDEN: Your declaration describes
                                                                    11
11
       away from the Parker Dam Power Plant. Parker Dam is a
                                                                           power required to deliver State Water Project water.
12
                                                                    12
       dam on the Colorado River, and the water that flows
                                                                           Has Met calculated power charges necessary to pump water
                                                                    13
13
       through that dam generates power. And Metropolitan, per
                                                                           through the California Aqueduct to Met's service
14
                                                                    14
       contractual rights, receives half of the power that is
                                                                           area?
                                                                    15
15
       produced from that power plant. And the power
                                                                             A. Yes.
                                                                    16
16
       production is .064 megawatt hours per acre-foot, total.
                                                                             O. Please turn to DTX 1096.
17
                                                                    17
                                                                                THE COURT: Excuse me. Off the record.
       We get half of that, so it is .032 megawatt hours per
                                                                    18
18
       acre-foot that Metropolitan doesn't receive if water
                                                                                (Discussion held off the record.)
19
                                                                    19
       that normally would have gone through the dam, through
                                                                                THE COURT: Back on the record.
                                                                    20
20
       the power plant, is diverted before it gets there and
                                                                                 We are looking at 1096, DTX.
                                                                    21
21
       pumped through our aqueduct.
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Before we start a new area, this
22
                                                                    22
            So there are three components that make up that
                                                                           would be a good time.
23
                                                                    23
       total of 2.349.
                                                                                 THE COURT: Fine with me. We will pick up
24
                                                                    24
            MS. BORDEN: Met offers DTX 1103.
                                                                           again tomorrow at ten o'clock.
25
                                                                    25
            MR. GOLDBERG: We have so many objections to
                                                                                 Thanks very much.
                                                         1723
                                                                                                                             1725
 1
       this document.
                                                                                   (Evening recess taken until April 28, 2015,
 2
                                                                      2
             THE COURT: You should choose.
                                                                                    at 10:00 a.m.)
 3
                                                                      3
             MR. GOLDBERG: Number one, we've never seen
 4
       this document before.
                                                                      4
 5
             THE COURT: That doesn't count.
 6
             MR. GOLDBERG: They said they don't perform
 7
       these kinds of calculations when we ask for them. They
 8
                                                                      8
       said they don't break out the cost of delivering.
 9
             THE COURT: I am not going to belabor this. I
                                                                      9
1.0
                                                                    1.0
       will sustain your objection.
11
                                                                    11
             The reason I am sustaining it, in particular,
12
                                                                    12
       the description of what went into this is completely
13
       incoherent. The bases that were described that generate
                                                                    1.3
14
                                                                    14
       all these numbers, it is completely incoherent. I
15
       couldn't even understand what goes into 2.349 or why it
                                                                    15
16
                                                                    16
       is this witness has this information or what the bases
17
                                                                     17
       are
18
                                                                    1.8
             I think it is irrelevant. This is not a
19
                                                                    19
       helpful document and the explanation of what it is is
20
                                                                     20
       not coherent. The objection is sustained.
21
                                                                    21
             MS. BORDEN: The basis for the 2.349 number is
22
                                                                    22
       a portion of his declaration that San Diego had no
23
       objection to.
                                                                    23
2.4
                                                                    24
             THE COURT: Before he got to the 2.349, all of
25
                                                                    2.5
       the suggestions he made as to how to calculate or what
                                                         1724
                                                                                                                             1726
```

. 1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )	
5	) ss COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA. )	
6	COUNTI OF SANTA BARBARA.	
7		
8	I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Shorthand	
9	Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of	
10	California, hereby certify:	
11	That the court proceedings were taken down by me in	
12	stenotype at the time and place herein named and	
13 14	thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided	
15	transcription under my direction.  I further certify that I am not interested in the	
16	event of the action.	
17	WITNESS my hand this 28th day of April,	
18	2015, at Santa Barbara, California.	
19	•	
20		
21		
22	TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR No. 3374	
23		
24 25	Certified Shorthand Reporter	
23	State of California	
	1727	

<u>A</u>	acquiring 1709:15	1655:2	1593:10 1594:6,10	1551:13
<b>\$10,000</b> 1602:7	acquisition 1713:15	admission 1676:5	1600:23 1601:3,11,14	<b>allocate</b> 1621:7 1624:7
<b>\$158</b> 1642:23 1643:12	acre-feet 1641:10	<b>admit</b> 1714:8,11	1641:19 1642:8	1624:12 1628:15,19
<b>\$180</b> 1645:11	1642:16,20 1643:12	1718:19	1643:19	1658:2
<b>\$253</b> 1566:7 1582:20	1662:14,24 1663:9	admitted 1567:8	agreeing 1596:15	allocated 1722:8,9
1592:11,20 1595:4	1684:11 1694:15,21	1672:3 1673:4	agreement 1546:5	allocates 1621:13,17,21
1596:8 1643:18	1694:24 1697:12,20	1674:20,24 1678:17	1548:13 1554:16	allocating 1561:19
<b>\$37.13</b> 1716:1	1700:6 1706:10	1682:10,11 1683:25	1555:9,15 1559:20	allocation 1558:2
<b>\$840</b> 1644:21	acre-foot 1566:7	1685:6 1687:5	1563:19 1564:20	1559:4 1560:11,17,23
<b>\$87</b> 1657:12	1602:8 1642:23	1710:12 1712:14	1565:12,21 1566:6	1560:24 1561:3
<b>\$88</b> 1657:13	1643:12 1721:11	1714:13,14	1567:18,22 1568:12	1562:3 1631:24,25
<b>\$90</b> 1600:6	1722:15 1723:8,16,18	adopt 1631:2	1569:4,19 1572:15	1637:8 1647:19,25
<b>A-7</b> 1567:3,10	act 1638:2 1688:3	adopted 1535:10	1574:17 1576:25	1652:10 1658:4
a.m 1538:3 1715:21	acted 1678:4,6	1561:23 1593:4,10	1577:1,4,5,9,10,16,19	allocations 1560:19
1726:2	acting 1672:21 1674:8	1594:5 1618:24	1578:2,7,9,10,14,14	1567:23 1622:7
abide 1636:14 1637:23	action 1540:22 1610:16	1628:2 1630:10	1578:25 1579:1,3,5,6	1633:5
1637:24	1620:4 1727:16	1635:2,6,11,16,19,21	1579:11,24 1580:22	<b>allow</b> 1608:12 1679:14
ability 1568:18 1569:12	actions 1557:18 1610:3	1636:2,8,11,25	1581:13,17,18,19	1692:1
1610:25 1664:3	actively 1560:15	1638:23	1582:20,22,24	allows 1571:5
1665:13 1669:11	activities 1555:13	adopting 1620:9	1583:16 1585:5	alternative 1540:6
1671:2 1690:21	1662:2 1711:9	1633:19	1588:18 1589:15	1561:16 1562:11
1691:4 1708:2	actual 1542:8 1543:1	adoption 1637:21	1590:9 1591:9,22	1651:5,12
able 1539:24 1548:3	1543:25 1544:2	adopts 1620:23	1592:8,11,18 1593:8	alternatives 1548:7
1552:10,15 1559:20	1582:6,12,16 1630:22	advised 1633:2	1594:17,22 1595:5	ambiguous 1666:16
1607:13 1634:6	1647:14 1652:20	advisement 1660:19	1598:20 1599:18	amend 1608:3
1651:3 1652:13	1653:10 1657:15	advocate 1560:17	1602:6,14,19 1603:2	amended 1548:12
1653:6 1657:25	1665:24 1671:3	advocating 1561:2	1603:13,18 1604:5	1608:5
1669:14,25 1670:17	1713:8 1720:16	1562:21	1606:3 1607:8,13,21	amending 1608:10
1681:11,17,19	adamant 1568:11	<b>affect</b> 1669:11	1610:25 1611:9,16	amendments 1608:21
1690:11 1691:11	add 1543:6 1649:3	affirmative 1618:21	1616:3 1633:19	1609:9 1610:20
1693:5 1702:20,24	added 1629:8	1619:20 1623:19	1634:24 1635:1	American 1566:4
1708:6	addition 1582:4	affirmatively 1600:21	1636:10,16,24 1637:5	amount 1602:12,14
absent 1558:23	1592:20 1721:8	afternoon 1546:2	1638:7,11,18,19	1611:3 1616:2 1644:1
1630:24	additional 1597:21	1626:8,15,16 1661:13	1640:25 1641:3,5,6	1644:10,12 1653:18
absolute 1591:17	1721:20 1722:19,25	agencies 1541:1,12	1641:20 1642:9	1662:11,16,17 1663:7
1631:8	address 1545:7,15	1556:7 1557:16,19,24	1646:10,11,13,16,17	1665:10 1683:16
absolutely 1581:20	1551:25 1649:4	1562:13,19 1621:8,19	1646:25 1647:4	1684:7,11 1685:21
1588:14 1591:15	1650:21 1673:5	1624:8 1628:16	1653:20 1662:4,8,9	1686:16 1692:13
1631:11 1720:15	addressed 1550:22	1647:3,8,10,24	1662:17 1663:4,19	1695:2,16,20 1696:2
1725:1	adequate 1651:20	1668:14 1677:4	1664:21 1665:3	1696:5 1698:5,6,17
accept 1681:5	1670:17	1678:13 1691:15	1666:11,19 1667:17	1721:10,17,19
accepted 1641:1,21	adjudication 1581:5	1699:20 1700:12,18	1668:5,10 1669:1	1722:13,21,22
1642:11	adjust 1661:6	1701:3,15 1705:9	1670:11 1671:5	amounts 1542:8
access 1539:25 1544:7	<b>Admin</b> 1583:5 1593:10	agency 1541:15 1556:8	1680:22 1681:14	1662:18 1685:3
1566:8 1581:25	administrative 1543:6	1556:10,13 1562:6,15	1688:10,14,16,19,22	1721:8
1653:15,17 1658:5	1567:16 1581:22	1563:8 1565:17	1690:3,7 1691:25	analyses 1599:21
accounting 1542:10	1583:1,3 1593:5	1580:25 1597:2,12	1692:7 1699:13	analysis 1538:14,19
1571:1,6	1603:5,15,17 1608:3	1645:20 1668:13	1704:9 1705:16	1541:2,8,20 1542:5
accounts 1542:12	1608:4,10,21 1609:9	agenda 1565:19	agreements 1566:19	1550:10,18 1551:5,10
accurate 1555:7,10	1610:12 1721:21,24	ago 1554:1 1685:21	1577:8 1579:16	1565:5,7 1566:19
1558:25 1559:2	administratively	1691:8	1580:22 1643:11	1598:3,8,13,24
1590:11 1657:21	1594:5	agree 1554:9 1555:1	1682:21	1600:2 1601:22
1701:9 1710:9 1712:6	admissibility 1547:11	1567:12 1591:8,18,24	ahadlock@kvn.com	1625:4 1650:3
	1547:14,17 1653:25	1593:7,17 1602:17	1536:7	1655:24
1712:22 1713:1,7 1720:11	1654:3,16 1657:22	1610:17 1618:11	ahead 1703:22	analyze 1542:3
	1675:14	1638:22 1643:17	<b>Alameda</b> 1536:19	and/or 1566:19
acknowledged 1578:24	admissible 1547:22	1645:22 1720:22	algae 1665:8 9 12 19	<b>Angeles</b> 1536:16-19
acquired 1689:11 acquires 1689:25	<b>admissible</b> 1547:22 1548:5 1651:9 1655:1	1645:22 1720:22 agreed 1556:5 1593:6	algae 1665:8,9,12,19 algorithms 1550:2	<b>Angeles</b> 1536:16,19 <b>ANN</b> 1727:8

annual 1610:19	1641.16 1642.6	1615.11 1622.17	1660-01 1600-10	1712-14 10 22
annual 1619:18	1641:16 1642:6	1615:11 1632:17	1662:21 1683:12	1713:14,19,22
1643:19 1662:12 1682:19 1695:12	approving 1622:7,9 approximately 1600:7	1655:19 1693:20 asks 1558:20 1650:2	1713:4 1721:3,13 averaged 1662:24	1716:23 1720:20
1722:22	1645:10	aspects 1611:1	averaged 1002.24 averaging 1550:4	1721:22 1722:10,22 1722:25 1724:21
annually 1610:4	April 1535:11,18	assessing 1600:11	1657:12	Battery 1535:24
1612:10 1722:2	1538:2 1542:1	assign 1542:8	avoid 1665:18	1536:6
answer 1549:25	1574:11 1581:6	assigned 1722:6	aware 1572:24 1575:15	began 1587:11 1635:8
1550:13,20 1575:25	1609:18 1610:14	assignment 1564:17	1575:21 1576:1	1635:12,22 1636:5
1579:12,25 1584:8	1626:2 1658:3,8	1566:3	1585:1 1586:24	beginning 1570:19,25
1593:12,16 1594:4	1696:8 1726:1	associated 1541:18	1633:25 1642:22	1603:12 1635:13,23
1615:19 1619:2	1727:17	1548:9 1566:23	1676:20 1688:18	1638:10 1703:19
1623:23 1625:7	aqueduct 1571:8,12	1589:19 1650:7	1701:6,12,16 1705:19	begins 1593:12
1637:10 1679:17	1576:11,18 1653:11	1658:6 1666:8		begun 1545:2
1681:6 1702:23	1663:25 1664:2,9,13	ASSOCIATES	B	<b>behalf</b> 1541:11 1580:17
answered 1605:10	1664:15,18 1665:9,10	1535:22	<b>b</b> 1536:14 1581:23,23	belabor 1724:9
1655:13,14	1665:11 1666:24	assorted 1677:18	<b>B-R-E-N-T</b> 1661:9	<b>belief</b> 1583:21 1631:6
answers 1680:15	1667:14 1689:7,8,12	assume 1629:8 1637:12	bachelor's 1709:20	believe 1550:21 1551:4
anticipate 1655:18	1689:21 1690:1,13	assuming 1599:13	back 1556:23 1563:10	1551:11,12 1552:1,24
anticipated 1664:14	1691:18,22 1692:4,15	At-a-Glance 1630:7	1566:12 1567:2	1555:21 1557:10
anybody 1543:23	1692:15 1694:15,19	attached 1543:21	1571:13 1574:11	1559:19 1560:1
1545:6 1553:10	1694:20 1695:4,17	1556:8 1563:18,23	1587:3 1593:7	1562:1 1573:15
1556:1 1565:20	1696:3,14,18 1698:6	1654:18	1603:11 1615:25	1579:23 1585:17,18
anybody's 1651:7	1698:19 1699:22	Attachment 1620:6,16	1617:17 1618:3	1585:21 1586:1
apart 1668:17	1700:1 1703:21	attempt 1540:6,8,9	1620:1 1628:2	1587:17 1588:10
apologize 1618:9	1709:16 1714:17	attempted 1700:10,16	1634:16,18 1640:23	1590:11,12 1593:9
Apparently 1657:5	1722:14,17,19,23,24	attempts 1556:18	1694:14 1696:11	1594:7 1595:22
appear 1548:4	1723:1,21 1725:13	attention 1608:16	1725:19	1597:15 1599:13
APPEARANCES	area 1665:16,17,21	attorney 1586:13	background 1551:2	1612:8,20 1615:19
1536:1	1666:4,6,7,9,15	attorneys 1650:20	1709:19	1617:11,12 1618:21
Appellant 1580:8	1667:1,5,6,7,12,18,20	AUDREY 1536:4	<b>baloney</b> 1653:5	1619:6,7,20 1620:2
Appellants 1580:11 applicable 1540:25	1668:3,8,16 1680:6 1687:15 1689:19,22	augment 1651:2,12 1658:22	<b>Barbara</b> 1727:5,9,18 <b>bargained</b> 1544:15	1622:20 1626:24 1632:10 1633:18
1603:7,16,20 1606:8	1697:16 1707:11	authentic 1678:4,7	barred 1545:1	1637:7 1638:6,8,17
1608:22 1609:10,14	1725:14,21	Authority 1535:6	Barrett 1630:23	1640:15 1646:19
1636:19 1646:19	areas 1548:4	1555:14 1563:20	based 1540:21,21	1656:9 1664:23
1647:1,2,8 1714:16	argumentative 1606:25	1566:5,5 1580:8	1544:10 1546:18,23	1688:8,21,25 1690:10
1715:16	1608:24	1585:3 1588:20	1549:15 1551:10	1690:25 1713:6
application 1579:16	arithmetic 1551:14	1597:12 1610:1	1552:9 1582:12,15,22	believed 1561:18
1580:25	arrive 1685:21	1614:19 1662:5	1599:15,18,21,22	1594:5 1606:8
<b>applied</b> 1576:6 1688:11	ascribe 1644:25	1675:1,3,4 1682:14	1600:4 1604:16	1611:24 1612:17
apply 1578:2,3,10	aside 1642:4 1644:6	1685:11,14,19	1621:20,21 1624:1,12	1631:14,15 1638:8
1579:24 1646:9	asked 1541:17,20	1686:17 1688:1	1628:20 1644:19	<b>believing</b> 1597:3,13
1684:13 1688:9	1542:13 1549:10	1697:14	1652:7 1654:13,17	<b>belong</b> 1588:8
1714:22 1715:7,10	1551:9 1554:12	Authority's 1557:22	1655:2 1656:4,14	belt 1559:15
1722:4	1558:21 1563:11	1616:12	1657:19,24 1664:12	bench 1651:14
applying 1685:20	1568:9 1572:4	availability 1703:1	1712:12 1721:6	<b>benefit</b> 1557:16
approach 1643:1	1575:14,20 1584:1	available 1544:17,18	1722:18	1598:18 1643:10
approaches 1561:21	1587:21 1597:19	1548:7 1551:6,7	bases 1658:16 1724:13	1644:10,17,20,24
appropriate 1568:19	1598:2 1600:22	1553:9 1555:25	1724:16	1658:18 1691:11,14
1627:1	1605:10 1616:1	1570:15,19 1575:24	basic 1543:7	benefits 1641:2,5,21
approval 1574:15	1646:10 1648:8	1576:2,6,17 1577:12	basically 1543:24	1642:11,14
1588:17 1617:6	1653:10 1659:15,15	1577:23 1578:22	1562:1 1568:24	best 1651:11,22
approve 1596:1 1622:8	1701:22 1702:4	1669:14,19 1670:1,2	1569:14 1654:12	1658:17
1622:11,13,18,25 1624:3 1625:2	1705:24 1708:12,13	1702:22,22,25	1657:12 1695:3 <b>basis</b> 1542:22 1587:1	better 1539:16 1658:14 1725:2
1627:18 1639:23	asking 1562:5 1574:25 1575:1,1 1586:18	1705:12,14,23 1706:1 1719:25	1594:9 1628:9 1651:9	<b>billion</b> 1643:14,15
approved 1561:8	1607:14,18,20	average 1550:6 1552:7	1659:2 1675:13	1644:10
1609:22 1610:8	1607:14,18,20	1582:7 1657:20	1695:4,12 1713:5,6	binder 1555:20
1007.22 1010.0	1000.20 1013.23	1502.7 1057.20	10,0.1,12 1,10.0,0	211401 1333.20
	1		•	

1562.12 1640.25	1647.22	huonght 1642.6	1500.10 1620.0 10	1547.10 1731.14
1563:13 1649:25	1647:22	brought 1643:6	1580:10 1620:8,19	1547:10 1621:14
1695:7 1700:21	<b>Bob</b> 1563:23	BROWN 1535:22	1626:1 1641:7 1709:8	1658:5
1710:4,21	boilerplate 1628:8,10	bucket 1703:23,24	1709:23 1710:1	category 1542:12
<b>binders</b> 1687:23	1628:17,21,23,24	<b>bullet</b> 1564:8,9	1715:10 1719:15,20	1547:10,11,12
<b>bit</b> 1583:8 1600:9,20	1629:4,8,23 1637:13	<b>bunch</b> 1653:5 1658:13	1719:23 1722:20	1626:25 1650:15
1619:22 1626:19	<b>Bond</b> 1630:23	<b>burden</b> 1721:20	1723:4 1725:13	<b>caught</b> 1651:3
1651:6 1655:9 1659:3	book 1568:21	<b>Bureau</b> 1559:16	1727:3,10,18,25	central 1649:5
1691:8 1695:22	<b>BORDEN</b> 1709:5	1570:18 1571:4	<b>CALISO</b> 1719:16	certain 1548:24
1698:19	1710:11,14 1711:2,20	1695:1,5,12 1698:1	call 1552:4 1556:1	1569:15 1586:25
black 1634:7	1712:8,15 1713:3	1698:12	1644:8 1660:20	1591:25 1662:8
<b>blah</b> 1606:14,14,14	1714:15 1715:1,7	<b>buried</b> 1550:2,8	called 1561:22 1608:16	1686:13 1702:20
<b>blank</b> 1554:13	1716:11,24 1717:11	<b>business</b> 1655:17	1661:2 1665:18	1705:4 1722:21
<b>blend</b> 1544:19 1568:5,7	1717:16 1719:8	1671:8 1672:14	1671:17 1701:24	certainly 1610:15
1568:10 1570:7,9,12	1720:13,24 1723:24	1674:6 1676:19	1702:10 1703:18	1629:22 1650:11
1653:19 1670:12,14	1724:21 1725:8,10	1712:4,10,22 1720:9	1708:20 1711:5	CERTIFICATE
1670:18,23 1671:3,14	BORDEN,ESQ	businesslike 1614:18	<b>calling</b> 1679:13	1727:1
1671:22 1672:17	1536:15	<b>button</b> 1549:24	calls 1552:2 1597:5	Certified 1727:8,24
1674:2 1680:20	bosses 1707:22	<b>buy</b> 1552:12 1714:10	1605:25 1660:21	certify 1727:10,15
1681:11 1683:12,15	<b>bottom</b> 1544:23	1717:20,21 1719:2	Campbell 1563:24,24	<b>CFO</b> 1648:6
1684:6 1685:20,20	1564:24 1677:16	buyers 1713:20	1564:3 1586:22	<b>chain</b> 1598:1
1688:6,19 1690:12,17	<b>bought</b> 1569:24	<b>buying</b> 1714:3,7 1717:2	1589:25 1598:1,1	challenge 1555:6
1690:22 1691:4,12	<b>bounded</b> 1566:14,18	1720:16 1721:19	1643:24 1644:8,11,19	1556:5 1557:1,8,11
1692:22 1693:1	<b>branch</b> 1649:14	<b>buys</b> 1717:8 1718:23	Campbell's 1565:5	1557:23 1558:4
1696:25 1700:11,17	1670:25	<b>bypass</b> 1697:9,11,21	1644:14	1596:6 1602:21
1701:2,14 1702:18	Braunig 1536:5	1698:25 1701:24	canal 1541:23 1564:18	1604:21 1605:1,7,21
1703:8 1704:21,24	1666:16 1673:2	1702:10 1704:7,10	1566:1,4 1598:19	1606:8,23 1609:13
1705:2,20 1706:11,25	1674:18 1675:10,15	1706:11,25 1707:11	1641:10,13 1642:14	1610:19,22 1612:13
1707:3,17	1675:19 1676:9	1707:15,15,19 1708:4	1644:21 1645:1	1612:21
<b>blended</b> 1544:8 1666:2	1677:8,12 1678:1		1656:2,7 1688:19	challenging 1554:14
1668:16,20	1679:1,13 1680:1,11	C	1689:10,24 1690:23	1602:11
blending 1539:22,23	1680:23 1681:4	CA 1535:24	1692:2 1703:18,19,19	chambers 1552:20
1544:14 1703:15,21	1683:24 1685:5	calculate 1539:4,9	1707:5,13,16,18	chance 1545:11,18
blends 1672:8 1680:5,5	1687:4,22,25 1701:17	1549:18 1681:20	1708:1,10	<b>change</b> 1561:5 1564:21
1680:9 1681:19	1706:5,8,22 1707:20	1682:19 1686:11	canals 1689:4 1705:4	1588:15 1599:14
blindsided 1654:7	1708:14	1724:25	Cap 1640:9	1603:15,25 1604:7,20
block 1721:19	breach 1613:12	calculated 1644:11	capabilities 1693:22	1604:25 1605:16,23
blooms 1665:8,12	1634:20,23 1636:21	1683:16 1684:8	capacity 1575:23	1606:15,22 1610:4
blow 1564:8 1566:1	1637:4,21 1638:3,23	1694:6 1721:15	1577:23 1578:21	1652:25 1663:3
1694:12 1695:14	1639:6 1640:19	1725:12	1580:24 1669:24	1668:3 1701:14
<b>board</b> 1558:11 1561:8	breached 1633:18	calculating 1549:20	1694:14 1705:3	1708:2 1715:4
1561:13,14,15 1562:5	1634:25 1636:4,5,10	1562:19	<b>capture</b> 1669:16	changes 1555:3
1563:16,24 1564:12	1636:24,24 1638:7,17	calculation 1643:9	1671:18	1556:18 1558:24
1564:15,15 1565:2,16	break 1541:6,10	1655:24 1681:24	care 1544:21 1547:12	1560:17 1562:2
1565:18 1574:10	1543:2 1652:21,25	1720:21	1568:15 1569:25	1567:12 1608:9
1595:23 1596:1,2,7,9	1724:8	calculations 1541:20	1570:1	1610:11,20
1596:18 1603:19	breath 1542:23	1546:10,10 1549:22	carefully 1656:11	characterization
1610:3,5 1616:20,22	Brent 1537:4 1660:21	1550:7 1552:9 1563:1	Carl 1573:12	1626:18
1616:23 1617:20	1661:1,8	1644:7,15 1650:3	carries 1618:1	charge 1539:5,24
1620:4,5,7,13,17,23	<b>Brian</b> 1573:5,7 1648:2	1682:18 1686:3	carry 1705:5	1557:11 1560:25
1621:3,16,23 1622:10	brief 1543:20 1551:23	1724:7	case 1535:7 1554:15,23	1561:1 1566:8,9
1622:11,13,14,17,18	1552:1 1580:12,20	calculator 1642:25	1562:24 1563:9	1583:5 1585:20
1622:23 1623:9,12	1649:1 1656:22	1643:2	1571:19 1599:10,12	1588:6,9 1601:19,22
1624:20 1627:13,22	1716:6,6	calendar 1630:10	1633:14 1635:18,24	1601:23 1602:15
1627:22,23,23	briefs 1538:15	1635:20 1636:3	1648:10 1686:19	1603:6,19 1638:9
1630:22 1631:6,17	bring 1571:11,12,13	1705:12 1716:17,23	1710:2 1717:6	1642:22 1646:20
1633:1,2,6,9,10	1646:7 1696:11	California 1535:1,9,11	cases 1580:12 1581:6	1647:6,13,16
1637:4 1638:1 1640:5	broad 1634:21	1535:17 1536:6,12,16	1591:12	charged 1540:12
1641:25 1645:5	broke 1627:11	1536:19 1538:1	categories 1542:9	1548:12,16,19,22
1011.23 1073.3	NI UNC 102/.11	1000.17 1000.1	categories 1572.)	10.12,10,17,22
	I	<u>l</u>	I	I

1582:21 1583:15,18	1603:17 1608:3,5,10	1672:24 1711:1	conceivably 1651:2	construction 1644:13
1612:18 1613:15	1608:21 1609:10	comfortable 1656:11	<b>concern</b> 1549:13	consultants 1561:17
1646:22 1647:10	1610:12 1678:2	coming 1547:20	1555:12,18 1569:20	consumed 1722:13
1648:11	1712:15	1559:17 1658:19	1586:24 1587:24	<b>contain</b> 1550:18
charges 1539:5	coherent 1724:20	1687:23 1711:9	1660:10	1711:11,13
1542:19 1543:10,10	collected 1722:5	1712:24 1713:1,3	concerned 1552:13	contained 1620:23
1544:4,7 1556:19,24	<b>collecting</b> 1635:5,8,12	1717:5,10	1555:3 1557:21	1621:4
1557:1,4,9 1567:13	1635:22 1636:6	comment 1562:4	1574:14 1589:1,4	<b>contains</b> 1711:14
1583:22 1589:6,19	<b>collects</b> 1665:16	comments 1545:20	1590:3	contest 1557:3 1564:22
1591:10 1598:9,15	Colorado 1544:2,17	commercial 1712:16	concerning 1575:5	1567:15 1608:19
1603:6,19 1608:9,20	1567:21 1568:16,18	commissioner 1559:16	1620:4 1679:4	1609:8,13
1609:8,13 1612:1	1569:2,18,24 1570:10	commitment 1688:21	concerns 1555:11	contesting 1603:5
1620:9,23 1621:4,6	1570:15 1571:8	commitments 1653:19	1614:17,20 1615:14	contexts 1550:7
1621:21,24 1622:1	1576:11,17 1653:11	committed 1570:16	1633:5	continue 1560:10
1624:4,10,12,16	1657:9,10 1663:20	committee 1609:19,23	conclude 1626:9	1601:21 1687:10
1628:11,20,25 1629:2	1664:3,8,12 1665:3	communicate 1587:24	conclusion 1597:6	1719:6 1725:5
1630:10 1640:18	1665:11,14,20 1666:1	1633:2	1603:3 1606:1,4	continued 1587:9
1647:14 1649:13	1666:24 1667:14,21	communicated 1583:20	1612:5	continuing 1722:25
1658:6 1725:12	1668:4,11,21,25	1614:10,17,25 1615:2	condition 1636:15	contract 1540:15
charging 1613:12	1669:2,12 1670:13,15	1615:6	conditions 1637:24	1541:1 1544:16,22
1638:16 1639:6	1671:3,25 1674:2	communicates 1614:20	conduct 1542:4	1568:5,20 1571:15
1647:9	1680:20 1681:12,21	communications	confidence 1631:8	1597:3,4,13,14,15
chart 1542:12 1552:2	1682:20 1684:7	1588:19,23 1589:1,4	confirm 1677:24	1605:4 1613:12
1563:8 1657:3 1698:2	1685:3,13,22 1686:8	1590:2	1700:7	1636:24 1637:22
1699:21 1700:3	1686:10,16 1689:7,8	communities 1645:12	conflict 1539:20	1638:3 1639:7
charts 1656:13 1694:1	1689:11,21 1690:1,13	compare 1597:20	conflicts 1540:9	1640:19 1648:10
chasing 1552:13	1691:18,20,22 1692:3	comparing 1598:3	1653:25	1663:1 1722:20
chat 1626:9	1692:14,15,22 1693:2	comparison 1598:24	conformance 1636:18	contractual 1723:14
check 1643:4	1693:6,16,23 1694:15	compel 1542:15	conformity 1548:24	contradicted 1547:15
checking 1571:2	1694:19,20,21 1695:3	compelled 1702:19	connection 1554:23	contradicts 1541:4
cheeseburger 1571:21	1695:17 1696:3,14,18	1705:8	1557:13 1583:19	contrary 1538:21
chief 1555:22 1620:24	1696:21,25 1697:6,12	compilation 1712:21	1594:21 1678:12	1540:1,4
1621:4,24	1698:6,18,24 1699:9	1721:3	consequence 1665:12	contribution 1644:12
choose 1653:18 1702:4	1699:22 1700:1	complain 1610:25	1670:4	control 1574:10
1724:2	1701:23 1702:9,12	1611:2 1639:1	conservation 1548:10	1690:16
chooses 1696:23	1703:9,21 1704:6	complained 1611:3	conserved 1541:23	controls 1719:22
chose 1569:22	1705:15,20 1706:2,12	1612:25 1613:3,17,19	1570:22 1571:3	convenience 1569:22
chosen 1699:17	1707:6,18 1709:16	1613:23 1614:3	1574:16 1656:2,6	conversation 1554:24
circumscribed 1548:2	1714:17 1722:14	complaining 1613:8	1662:19 1689:3	1561:10 1584:14
circumstance 1632:15	1723:12	1615:23	consider 1564:15	1586:10,14,17,20
circumstances 1699:14	column 1630:9,15	complaints 1705:18	1599:23 1645:3	1587:6 1680:13
cite 1652:11	1721:9 1722:11	completely 1545:1	consideration 1564:10	1681:9
Civil 1580:12	<b>combination</b> 1686:4	1552:11,24 1573:24	1564:17 1566:3	conversations 1555:8
claim 1544:3,9 1613:11	Combined 1580:10	1724:12,14	1622:15,16 1699:20	1559:10 1572:9
1639:5 1659:25		complicated 1603:1	considerations 1697:24	1574:20 1584:16,23
	combining 1686:6			
clarification 1631:12	come 1539:9 1540:3,13	comply 1650:12	1697:25 1699:1,3,4 <b>considered</b> 1557:5	1586:7,23 1587:2,18
classifies 1621:19	1542:25 1543:17,17	component 1542:6		1588:16 1589:16
clear 1543:19 1580:23	1545:14 1549:9	1646:19 1722:13,18	considering 1566:17	1590:1 1633:4
1659:7 1720:17	1559:4,20 1587:3	1723:9	1599:2	1647:23
CLERK 1634:8 1661:5	1650:24 1652:16	components 1542:4	consisted 1567:18	conveyance 1572:6
1708:24	1654:14 1655:19	1579:11 1580:3	consistent 1584:7	1580:24 1583:22
clock 1634:12,13	1658:17 1659:20	1601:9 1623:8	1585:25 1586:5	1603:20 1608:9
1651:8	1666:11,14,22	1722:12 1723:22	1588:11 1596:14,18	1612:1 1624:10
	1 166 / 14 168/1·15	comprised 1566:8	1596:21 1610:18	1640:18 1647:2,11
<b>closed</b> 1596:2	1667:13 1684:15	, = 1 < 4 < 1 <		
closed 1596:2 Coachella 1566:4	1721:10	<b>computed</b> 1644:19	1612:7 1627:1 1692:6	1707:13
closed 1596:2 Coachella 1566:4 1580:9	1721:10 <b>comes</b> 1547:22 1551:16	1658:1	consistently 1647:18	conveyed 1583:24
<b>closed</b> 1596:2 <b>Coachella</b> 1566:4	1721:10			

conveying 1643:25	<b>COS</b> 1630:10	1685:14,19 1688:1	1718:7,13,16,19	damage 1538:14,18
1698:18	cost 1540:19 1541:6,7	1727:5,9	1719:3,5 1720:19	1541:8
conveys 1692:15	1541:10,14,17 1542:5	couple 1560:22	1723:3,6 1724:2,5,9	damages 1539:4,9
1694:20 1698:5	1542:6,8,12 1543:12	1639:14 1669:8	1724:24 1725:4,9,17	1540:15 1648:14,16
<b>cooling</b> 1555:17	1543:14 1544:10	1707:10	1725:19,23 1727:11	1648:19 1708:8
Coordinated 1580:12	1549:20 1552:8	course 1542:21	Court's 1565:12	damaging 1708:5
coordination 1676:18	1557:18,24 1558:2	1655:17 1671:8	courtroom 1554:8	DAN 1536:4
1677:3,23 1678:13,23	1559:4 1560:11,19	1672:13 1674:6	cover 1607:11 1658:13	data 1541:20 1551:4
copy 1711:14 1712:17	1561:3,16 1562:20,20	1676:19 1693:8	<b>CPF-10-510830</b> 1535:7	1649:8 1650:3
corner 1684:25	1566:9,18,20 1582:6	1694:18 1711:23	CPF-12-512466 1535:8	1655:16,21,24 1656:8
correct 1561:19	1582:12,16 1598:3,9	1712:3,22 1720:2,9	CRA 1652:25 1653:10	1656:12 1682:1,5
1563:17 1569:5	1598:14,18,20,21	court 1535:1 1538:6,24	1655:4,8 1694:5,5	1683:13,14 1701:7
1574:17,20 1576:21	1599:3 1600:14	1545:5,10,12,18,21	create 1624:15 1628:25	1712:11 1720:2,5,11
1577:1,7,10,17,23	1601:22 1621:5,12,16	1546:16,25 1550:23	1650:11 1672:17	database 1671:17
1578:5,20,22,23	1621:23 1622:7	1551:3,15,22 1553:1	1675:21 1677:7,15	1672:8
1582:17,22 1583:1,9	1624:4,12 1625:3	1553:9,16,22 1554:20	<b>created</b> 1655:17 1658:3	date 1558:17 1603:18
1583:10,12,16,17,23	1627:18,23 1628:12	1556:23 1558:8,14	1658:7 1659:9	1604:4
1588:14 1590:5	1628:15 1630:13	1561:14 1562:11,12	1672:13,16,20 1674:5	dated 1565:11 1581:6
1593:11 1595:6,19	1631:24 1633:5,15	1562:24 1563:6,9	1675:24 1676:5	1640:5
1598:15 1599:8,19,24	1639:23 1643:8,24	1567:8 1568:23	creates 1675:2	dates 1677:18
1599:25 1600:17	1644:1,6,13 1647:19	1570:4 1571:25	creating 1621:25	day 1546:7 1553:25
1601:10 1604:2,5,17	1647:25 1650:7	1573:23 1575:9	cross 1537:2 1605:12	1672:11 1718:12
1604:22 1605:2,13,14	1653:1,11,15,17	1579:19 1580:1,14	Cross-Defendants	1727:17
1605:17,18 1606:5	1655:4 1656:5	1581:7 1591:12	1580:11	day-before 1657:6
1607:23 1608:10,11	1657:15 1720:16	1597:8 1602:11	cross-examination	days 1651:23 1707:10
1608:13,22 1610:12	1724:8	1605:5,11 1606:2	1554:5 1626:13	<b>deal</b> 1539:17 1545:17
1611:3,4,6,7,9	costs 1540:20 1541:11	1607:1,6,10,14,16,18	1650:24 1652:14	1564:12 1572:23
1612:10,11,22 1613:5	1541:22 1543:1,6,25	1607:22,25 1609:2,4	1653:4 1687:19,21	1643:18 1645:3
1613:9,13,16,20,21	1544:2 1548:7,9,9,9	1618:16,22 1619:2	cross-examining	death 1560:7
1615:19 1616:4,7,18	1548:25 1549:20	1625:5,10 1626:8	1552:17	deceased 1586:12,21
1617:3 1619:1,3	1556:5,6,20,22	1634:6,11,13,16	CSR 1535:20 1727:8	<b>December</b> 1611:9,12
1620:13 1622:19,22	1557:24 1560:17,25	1639:12 1643:2,5	1727:23	1611:20,23 1719:17
1623:15,17,21 1624:5	1561:20 1563:2	1645:16 1648:25	Cunningham 1573:9	1719:18
1624:6,22,25 1629:25	1565:1 1566:23	1649:19,20 1652:2,17	1573:15	decide 1690:4,8,11
1630:1,14,24,25	1572:6 1574:3 1582:5	1653:24 1654:15,21	current 1553:1,3	decided 1540:17
1631:3,4,9 1633:16	1586:25 1589:2,5	1655:6 1656:12,16,20	1566:6 1610:2	1583:17 1601:23
1633:17 1636:22	1591:20 1597:20	1656:24 1657:17	1642:22 1675:16	decides 1696:17
1637:19,23 1638:4,24	1611:25 1621:7,13,18	1658:14 1659:5,19,23	Curtis 1535:3 1538:4	deciding 1714:10
1639:4,8,19,21,25	1621:20,21 1622:2	1660:3,10,17 1661:23		decision 1570:11
1640:2,6,7 1641:4,11	1624:17 1626:24	1662:15 1663:17	1584:15,20 1614:2	1654:8 1699:6
1641:22 1642:5,17,21	1628:19 1629:2	1666:17 1668:8	1615:9 1632:20	declaration 1541:25
1643:16 1644:22 1646:14 1648:21	1640:17 1650:5	1670:19 1673:4,17	1633:23 1636:20,23	1542:2 1710:2,5,7 1714:15 1724:22
1655:3 1663:14	1652:10 1655:25	1674:16,19 1675:11	1638:2,22 <b>Cushman's</b> 1614:6	
1672:1 1674:4,10	1658:6 1700:10,16,25 1701:13,14 1721:7,20	1675:16,22 1676:1,7 1676:10 1677:9	1634:2 1637:20	1725:10 decrease 1697:1
1675:5 1684:16	1701.13,14 1721.7,20 1721:21,25 1722:3,4	1678:2,16 1679:2,14	customary 1621:22	deduct 1644:18
1686:1,2,5,9 1689:22	1721.21,23 1722.3,4	1680:2,12,15,25	1624:13 1628:20	deemed 1568:19
1690:5 1692:23	counsel 1536:18 1592:6	1681:5 1683:4,6,10	customers 1697:17	Defendant 1536:11
1693:17,23,24	1632:20 1633:20	1683:25 1685:6	cycles 1635:15	DEFENDANT'S
1694:11,16 1695:23	1688:1 1692:20	1687:1,3,5,7,10,19	cycles 1033.13	1537:2
1696:3,4,9,10,19	1712:17	1701:18 1702:8	D	<b>Defendants</b> 1535:14
1697:10,14 1699:7,24	count 1568:3 1724:5	1706:18,21 1707:9	<b>D</b> 1537:1	1661:2 1708:20
1700:15 1702:3,7	counterpart 1588:3	1708:16 1710:12,25	daily 1587:2 1671:11	<b>Defense</b> 1563:12
1703:3 1704:4 1715:1	counterparts 1679:7	1711:19 1712:14,17	1671:13 1672:7	1564:3 1580:5 1581:3
1718:11	country 1711:10	1712:20 1713:10,18	1681:18 1683:14	1617:18 1620:3
correctly 1594:6	County 1535:2 1558:11	1713:23 1714:6,8,24	1711:11	1672:2
1643:13	1563:20 1580:8	1715:2,6 1716:5,9	dam 1723:11,11,12,13	defined 1712:23
corresponding 1685:2	1581:7 1682:14	1717:5,15,21,24	1723:19	definition 1566:23
1 9		, , ,		
			•	

		•	-	ī
defray 1622:2 1624:17	1700:11,17	1704:21,24 1705:2	1666:20 1667:4,16	1661:11 1703:2
1629:2	delivery 1541:22	1718:5	1668:5,9,13 1669:12	1709:4
degree 1592:2	1582:7 1644:25	determined 1647:16	1670:13,24 1671:4	directed 1616:22
delay 1558:23	1663:18 1665:2	1662:17 1722:1,23	1674:3 1675:1,4,24	1623:10 1624:2,20
delegate 1648:9	1670:22 1683:20	determines 1621:3,16	1676:6,18,22,23,25	1625:10 1621:2,20
delegates 1617:17	1684:7 1690:4	1671:7	1676:25 1677:6,23,24	direction 1622:10,17
1618:4,19 1619:13	demand 1650:12	determining 1722:3	1678:6,9,14,23,24	1672:21 1674:9
1622:11,15,18 1623:1	1659:4	detriment 1708:5	1679:4,6,8,10,20	1727:14
1623:2,3,11 1624:2	demanded 1649:19	development 1588:7	1680:18 1681:9,10,11	directive 1707:22
1624:20,24 1625:2	demands 1567:1	dictate 1690:22	1681:21 1682:2,3,6,7	directly 1539:20,25
1627:14,17 1628:3,4	1669:15 1690:18,19	die 1560:2	1682:13,16,20	1540:4 1588:6
1628:17 1629:6,10,15	demonstrate 1651:3	died 1560:3,5,10	1683:20 1684:19	1680:14 1681:2
1630:2,6,15,16,22	demonstrative 1546:4	1647:17	1685:11,14,19,25	1683:13 1697:6
1631:2,5,16,17	1546:17 1681:16	Diego 1535:6 1541:22	1686:17 1687:14	1698:24 1706:10
1632:5,22 1633:1,4	demonstratives 1546:6	1544:8,15,21 1549:16	1688:1,24 1689:1,10	1722:4
1637:4,16 1638:1	<b>Denham</b> 1546:12	1549:17 1556:6,18	1689:25 1690:9,13,16	directors 1558:11
1639:22 1640:5	1657:13	1557:3 1558:3,21	1690:18,21 1692:2	1561:9 1563:25
deliver 1568:4,25	<b>Denham's</b> 1546:14	1559:5 1561:4	1693:6,16,23 1695:24	1565:16 1603:20
1569:1,13,14,18,23	<b>Dennis</b> 1559:9 1572:9	1563:20 1564:18,18	1696:22 1697:6,13,14	1610:5 1620:7,17
1570:6 1571:15	1584:18 1585:13	1564:20,22 1567:11	1697:16,20 1698:24	disagree 1636:23
1650:17 1662:8,16,22	1586:6,6,23 1588:1	1567:21 1568:4	1699:10,22,25 1700:4	1641:23
1663:1,2 1664:3	Department 1535:4	1569:20 1570:1,17	1703:19 1704:6,8,12	disagreement 1587:8
1665:11,13 1666:1	1538:4 1649:13	1574:15,17 1576:19	1705:15,19 1706:2,10	1597:16 1631:24
1668:15 1669:14,24	1709:17	1577:1 1578:24	1707:5,7,13,16,18	1637:20
1670:3 1688:23	depending 1690:18	1579:20 1580:2,8,18	1708:1,11 1712:17	disclosed 1549:16
1690:8 1691:20	1700:11,16 1701:1,14	1580:21,21 1581:4	1724:22	1550:12,16
1692:1,4,5 1693:5,15	depends 1693:12	1585:2 1588:20	Diego's 1541:18,23	discourage 1540:23
1693:22 1696:21	depose 1552:11	1589:17 1591:9	1572:5 1579:14	1557:18
1697:5,13,19,19	deposed 1657:21	1592:10 1594:25	1584:11 1585:8	discovery 1539:15
1698:23 1699:8,16	deposit 1616:1 1639:17	1595:7,9,18,23	1592:15 1604:12	1542:14,20 1543:4
1701:23 1705:8,9	deposition 1535:23	1597:2,12 1599:4,21	1605:8 1609:23	1547:1 1549:16,17
1706:1 1707:7	1542:2 1552:21	1600:23 1601:3,14	1610:25 1616:19,22	1550:1,17 1551:9,25
1725:11	1585:7 1589:9	1602:8,21 1603:5,25	1617:1,19 1618:4	1552:5,10 1650:12
delivered 1569:16	1590:14 1592:15	1604:19,24 1605:7	1622:11,18 1628:3,4	1652:7 1656:15
1571:14 1654:13	1633:22 1634:2	1606:13 1608:17,19	1631:6 1632:6 1637:3	1659:4
1656:21 1664:10	1648:3 1651:25	1609:8 1610:9 1611:5	1638:1 1640:5	discretion 1568:7,12
1665:17 1670:14,25	deputy 1559:21	1612:8,17,20,25	1644:17,20 1650:5	1570:6,11 1690:4,8
1671:4,20 1684:11,15	describe 1598:18	1613:8,11 1614:12	1656:5,6	1703:7
1685:1,13 1686:17	1626:18	1616:1,8 1617:16	difference 1576:24	discuss 1550:15
1702:9 1704:14	described 1724:13	1619:13,23 1622:10	1577:11,14 1578:13	1652:10 1658:4,8
1706:9,9	describes 1711:8	1622:17 1623:2,3,7,9	1598:19 1626:23	discussed 1627:22,23
deliveries 1567:21	1725:10	1623:11 1624:2,20,24	1714:4	1719:12
1570:16 1649:14	description 1555:7	1625:1 1627:13,17	different 1544:20	discussion 1547:5
1666:4 1672:11	1558:25 1659:13	1629:5,15 1630:2,5,6	1546:21 1561:21	1554:21 1594:19
1681:22 1682:2,6	1724:12	1630:19 1631:1,5,19	1568:16 1577:10,16	1623:6 1634:15
1683:19 1684:8,19	designated 1585:2	1633:1,18,24 1637:2	1577:20 1578:8,18	1649:1 1650:19
1685:2,3,11,18,23,24	1633:24 1636:20	1637:3,16,25 1639:1	1583:8 1590:13	1651:18 1676:24
1685:24 1686:1,7,12	1659:18	1639:5,16,22 1640:25	1594:8 1595:13	1725:18
1694:5 1699:23	detail 1541:21 1650:4	1641:1,16,19 1642:5	1596:5,12 1597:22	discussions 1615:22
1700:4 1703:13	1655:25	1642:8,15 1643:10,18	1599:15 1600:9	1637:9 1678:22
1704:12	<b>determination</b> 1583:4	1643:25 1644:7,9	1619:22 1647:7	1679:20
delivering 1541:7,7,18	1592:4 1628:11	1645:4,10,20,25	1684:23 1691:5,12	dispute 1562:14 1592:9
1650:5,7 1656:1,5	1680:9 <b>determinations</b> 1624:3	1646:6 1647:18	1711:9,10,15 1713:24	1594:2
1657:16 1690:5,12		1648:9 1649:6,17	difficult 1649:22	disputed 1616:2
1697:15 1701:2	<b>determine</b> 1620:19	1650:1,5 1651:1,2,13	direct 1537:2 1545:24	dissolved 1673:23
1706:13 1724:8 delivers 1665:21	1671:2,21 1674:1 1680:19 1681:11	1655:22 1662:5,9,22 1663:19 1664:7	1554:2 1563:12 1650:24 1652:14	distributed 1565:23 distribution 1662:1
1692:14 1694:18	1700:10,16 1701:13	1665:17,21 1666:1,10	1655:18 1656:8	district 1535:9,11
1072.14 1074.10	1700.10,10 1701.13	1005.17,41 1000.1,10	1055.10 1050.0	uisti ict 1333.7,11
	1	1	l	I

1506 11 1550 15	1 70 1 62 4 22	1705.5	1555 01 1550 = 11	1500 10 1605 1115
1536:11 1558:12	drill 1634:22	1705:5	1555:21 1558:7,14	1599:18 1602:14,19
1570:22 1580:9,10	<b>DTX</b> 1537:8,9,10,11,12	electric 1719:23	1567:5,6,9 1580:6	1610:24 1611:8,16
1582:6,6 1620:8,18	1537:13,14,15,16,17	electrical 1709:20,22	1581:4,22 1597:25	1616:3 1633:19
1661:15,17,20,25	1537:18,19,20,21,22	1710:1	1598:17 1609:17	1634:23 1635:1
1662:19 1695:15	1537:23,24,25	elicit 1717:13	1616:11 1630:6	1636:10,16,24 1637:5
1709:7	1543:15 1546:18,25	<b>email</b> 1536:7,8,8,9,9,17	1640:4 1644:5 1650:4	1638:7,10,18 1640:25
<b>District's</b> 1556:19	1567:8,9 1581:3	1597:25	1655:25 1659:2	1641:2,5,13,20
1557:4	1597:25 1598:17	<b>EMANUEL</b> 1536:13	1673:3 1674:22	1642:9 1646:10,11,16
diverted 1695:3,17	1602:20 1609:17	embroglio 1660:16	1675:17 1678:2,21	1646:17,25 1653:20
1696:2 1723:20	1611:16 1616:11	emergency 1571:17	1684:1 1685:7 1687:6	1662:4,17 1663:4,19
diverting 1723:10	1620:6 1630:5 1640:1	1662:3	1695:8 1698:15	1664:21 1665:3
<b>divide</b> 1547:9	1644:5 1649:16	employed 1661:14	1710:13 1712:15,25	1666:11,19 1667:17
document 1538:10	1655:12 1673:3,6,6,7	employees 1721:22	1714:14 1719:7	1668:5,10 1669:1
1555:16 1565:18,20	1673:7,7 1674:19,21	<b>enable</b> 1612:13	1720:23	1670:11 1671:5
1566:13 1600:13	1674:23 1678:21	encountered 1566:24	evidentiary 1626:10	1680:22 1681:13,22
1654:23 1655:22	1683:4,5,25 1684:1	ended 1611:9,12,19	1720:18	1682:21 1684:5
1656:12,14,25	1685:6,7,8 1686:25	ends 1670:23	exact 1615:11	1685:2,3,24 1686:1
1657:25 1659:6,8,13	1687:5,6 1692:19	energy 1657:6 1709:18	exactly 1548:20	1686:18 1687:13
1673:8,13,14 1674:24	1693:25 1696:11	1711:5,7,8 1712:2,12	1567:17 1568:3	1688:10,14,16,19,22
1675:2,9,14,20,21,24	1698:7 1699:15	1711:3,7,8 1712:2,12	1658:13	1690:3,5,7,8,12
1676:5,14,15,23	1710:4,11,13,21	1719:17 1720:7	exam 1545:24 1703:2	1691:25 1692:7
1677:2,7,22 1678:7	1710.4,11,13,21	1721:4,19 1722:15	<b>exam</b> 1343.24 1703.2 <b>examination</b> 1554:3	1694:6 1695:23
1678:17,25 1679:4,11	1711.2,11 1712.8	1721.4,19 1722.13	1563:12 1572:1	1696:5,15 1698:7,19
			1655:18 1656:8	1698:23 1699:12,16
1679:15,21,22,24	1716:11,18,18,24,24	engaged 1718:9		,
1680:8 1682:12	1719:7,8,9,12	engineer 1709:25	1661:11 1701:20	1704:8 1705:16 1706:10
1684:3,4 1685:9	1720:13,23,24,25	engineering 1709:21,22 1710:1	1709:4 1717:17	
1713:13,14 1716:10	1723:24 1725:16,20 <b>DTX1096</b> 1543:4		<b>example</b> 1542:18,25 1547:14 1550:4,11	<b>exchanged</b> 1546:6 1685:12
1724:1,4,19		enter 1597:3,13,15 entered 1565:22	1569:9 1570:5	exclude 1538:8 1548:17
documented 1708:8,12	dumped 1539:17	entereu 1303.22	1309.9 13/0.3	<b>exclude</b> 1336.6 1346.17
January 1520,11	J-4: no 1661.24	and: 1560.6 1574.01	1570.10 1640.5 7 10	a-ral-ral and 1540.4
documents 1538:11	<b>duties</b> 1661:24	entire 1560:6 1574:21	1572:18 1649:5,7,12	excluded 1549:4
1541:19,24 1546:24		1617:5 1711:11	1649:24 1650:2,23	excluding 1659:2
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16	E	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9 1641:7	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17 1581:18 1582:20,21	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2 1672:4,6 1673:1,3
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9	E E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9 1641:7	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7 effort 1539:15 1540:10	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21 Evening 1726:1	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17 1581:18 1582:20,21	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2 1672:4,6 1673:1,3
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9 1641:7 Double 1681:4	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7 effort 1539:15 1540:10 1540:23 1566:25	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21 Evening 1726:1 event 1727:16	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17 1581:18 1582:20,21 1582:24 1583:15	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2 1672:4,6 1673:1,3 1682:15,23 1683:2,10
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9 1641:7 Double 1681:4 doubts 1678:17	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7 effort 1539:15 1540:10 1540:23 1566:25 1701:12 eight 1617:14 1642:19 1643:11 1677:16,17	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21 Evening 1726:1 event 1727:16 everybody 1625:10	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17 1581:18 1582:20,21 1582:24 1583:15 1585:5 1588:17	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2 1672:4,6 1673:1,3 1682:15,23 1683:2,10 1683:22 1684:6,14
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9 1641:7 Double 1681:4 doubts 1678:17 dozens 1586:7	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7 effort 1539:15 1540:10 1540:23 1566:25 1701:12 eight 1617:14 1642:19	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21 Evening 1726:1 event 1727:16 everybody 1625:10 1648:3	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17 1581:18 1582:20,21 1582:24 1583:15 1585:5 1588:17 1589:15 1590:9	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 excution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2 1672:4,6 1673:1,3 1682:15,23 1683:2,10 1683:22 1684:6,14 1685:4 1695:16
1541:19,24 1546:24 1549:15 1550:14,16 1550:21 1555:18 1573:14 1649:16 1650:3,10,11,14,25 1651:9 1652:10 1653:13 1654:5,9,13 1654:19 1655:5,17,21 1655:24 1656:4 1657:7,19 1658:3,7 1658:10,11 1659:11 1659:16,16 1672:12 1673:6,15,18 1674:5 1676:21 1718:19 doing 1546:10 1571:16 1600:11 1605:1 1653:1 1658:21 1660:14 1663:25 1678:23 dollar 1721:10 dollars 1540:14 1612:9 1641:7 Double 1681:4 doubts 1678:17 dozens 1586:7 dpurcell@kvn.com	E 1535:3 1537:1 1538:4 E.C 1537:3 earlier 1615:12 1636:6 1672:13 1683:14 1704:3 easier 1573:24 1575:18 east 1649:14 1670:25 Edison 1722:20,24 1723:1,3,4 educational 1709:19 effect 1549:24 1550:18 1577:4,6 1603:17 1604:4,9,20,25 1623:13,23 1707:10 effective 1535:12 1631:3 efficient 1545:16 1650:18 1658:24 1660:7 effort 1539:15 1540:10 1540:23 1566:25 1701:12 eight 1617:14 1642:19 1643:11 1677:16,17	1617:5 1711:11 entirely 1693:2 entitled 1563:18 1581:5 entity 1719:22 entry 1630:9 1689:7 equal 1567:21,23 1688:23 equitable 1600:7 error 1619:12 escalations 1599:23 ESQ 1536:3,4,4,5,5,14 1536:18 establish 1548:19 established 1567:11 1602:22 1610:4 establishes 1646:24 estimate 1544:9 1653:22,22 1721:6 estimated 1539:22 1643:24 estimates 1653:21 Evening 1726:1 event 1727:16 everybody 1625:10 1648:3 evidence 1537:7 1541:6	1649:24 1650:2,23 1651:13 1652:5 1654:24 1655:8,23 1659:1 1670:17 1683:17 1707:1 examples 1561:2 exceed 1644:1 Excel 1549:23 exception 1702:14 excess 1710:17 1715:9 1717:7 1718:2,14 exchange 1541:7 1548:8,13 1549:21 1555:9,15 1564:19 1565:12,21 1566:6 1567:11 1569:3,13 1570:24 1572:14 1576:25 1577:8,9,19 1578:2,7,9,10,14,25 1579:3,5,10,15,24 1580:22 1581:13,17 1581:18 1582:20,21 1582:24 1583:15 1585:5 1588:17 1589:15 1590:9 1591:8,21 1592:8	excluding 1659:2 exclusion 1649:2 exclusively 1663:20 1666:1 1669:12 excuse 1567:4 1570:1 1635:9 1648:9 1725:17 excused 1648:25 1708:17 execution 1559:8 1589:14 1640:24 executive 1555:22 1565:10 1620:24 1621:4,24 exhibit 1541:13 1542:20 1543:3,15 1546:16 1558:7,9 1563:12 1564:3 1565:13 1575:12 1580:6 1617:18 1620:3 1649:6 1672:2 1672:4,6 1673:1,3 1682:15,23 1683:2,10 1683:22 1684:6,14 1685:4 1695:16 1710:13,23 1714:14

1674:15,16,17	facility 1569:12	1639:20 1640:25	1612:15 1617:14	1603:15 1606:15
1681:18 1685:21	1666:14 1687:15	filing 1614:11,14	1623:5 1638:12	forward 1552:14
exist 1541:19,24	1702:19 1703:15,17	1647:18	1700:22	1651:21
1650:10 1654:5	1703:18 1704:19	filtration 1666:8	five-year 1555:17,19	<b>found</b> 1559:14 1655:21
1655:5	<b>fact</b> 1541:3 1547:17,17	<b>final</b> 1571:18 1718:8	1557:8,12 1559:3,11	1659:10 1682:2,7
<b>existed</b> 1650:15	1561:6 1563:20	1721:9	1594:9,11,12 1599:6	foundation 1563:5
1655:12 1659:7,16	1564:7,14 1567:20	<b>finally</b> 1548:18 1567:2	1611:8,11,15,19	1655:20 1675:10,11
existence 1668:7	1571:19 1578:24	1570:12	1638:19	1675:19,22 1676:2,13
existing 1590:22	1613:6 1616:8	financial 1542:10	<b>fixed</b> 1548:8 1641:14	1677:12,20
1591:2 1601:8 1604:2	1617:16,20 1628:7	1566:19 1599:4	1644:25	foundational 1650:25
1604:8,16 1605:9,17	1629:7 1643:24	financing 1560:14	fixes 1620:23	four 1538:17 1539:18
1605:20 1606:20	1668:9 1669:10	<b>find</b> 1542:18 1548:3	<b>fixing</b> 1620:9	1545:4 1553:14
1610:10	1673:5 1689:17	1552:21 1559:19	flexibilities 1691:9	1587:22 1599:9,22
expect 1629:22 1664:17	1691:4 1692:13,13	1600:1,12 1654:2	flexibility 1569:10	1640:5 1660:9 1673:6
1680:6	1693:1 1697:5	1658:25 1678:3	1651:15 1691:4,6	1674:16,17 1715:4
expectation 1616:9,14	1699:25,25 1712:11	1713:10	1704:20,24 1705:1	1721:4
expected 1601:21	factor 1557:4	findings 1624:3	Floor 1535:24 1536:15	Francisco 1535:2,16,17
1663:5	factors 1599:4 1643:8	1641:17 1642:6	<b>flowing</b> 1645:23	1535:24 1536:6
expecting 1545:12	1644:6 1693:12,13	finds 1621:3,16,23	flows 1668:4 1680:3	1538:1 1626:1
expenditures 1542:3,11	facts 1548:24 1564:12	fine 1649:4 1725:23	1689:21 1705:4	free 1612:17,20
<b>expense</b> 1645:11	failed 1649:21 1650:17	finish 1573:24	1708:2 1723:12	1658:23
experience 1559:15	fair 1548:6,11,16	<b>firm</b> 1575:23 1577:11	fluctuate 1700:11,16	frequent 1586:23
expert 1538:21 1539:1	1600:7 1611:3	1577:22 1578:21	1701:1,13	frequently 1693:11
1539:13,15 1544:25	1628:15 1651:20	1685:23	fluctuates 1692:16	1704:13 1708:2
1545:2 1546:9,11,14	1660:11 1713:23	first 1538:7,17 1539:13	focus 1585:10,21	Friday 1656:10,22
1547:22 1549:11,22	fairly 1621:7,17 1624:7	1543:14 1545:3	1653:24	front 1695:8 1698:11
1550:1,5,9,10,18	falls 1579:1,3,6	1546:19 1548:6	focusing 1596:24	1710:21
1654:13 1659:18,21	1581:14	1550:15 1555:10	1612:25 1615:25	<b>fulfill</b> 1653:19 1668:25
1660:1,5	false 1581:20	1564:23 1567:14	1632:1 1666:18	full 1576:12 1595:1
experts 1549:7 1645:25	familiar 1581:8 1662:4	1578:18 1600:2	folks 1587:3 1677:23	1633:2 1644:17,19,19
expired 1616:16	1688:2,13	1601:20 1602:22	1678:23	1685:23,25 1708:25
explain 1569:8 1570:4	far 1552:13 1557:20	1603:4 1604:21	follow 1634:6 1657:7	fully 1545:19
1666:3 1668:8	1566:23 1571:18	1608:1,20 1609:9,15	followed 1565:6	function 1621:20
1669:21 1683:10	1604:14 1614:2	1611:1 1634:25	following 1627:16	1647:3
1702:8	1689:6 1703:22	1638:7,17,23,23	follows 1553:20 1554:8	functions 1621:18
explained 1567:25	fastest 1658:24	1640:21 1641:16	1620:20 1626:6	1722:5,6
explaining 1725:3	<b>fathom</b> 1544:12	1642:6 1652:13	1661:3 1708:21	fundamental 1714:3
explanation 1724:19	favor 1616:23 1617:2	1653:5 1656:21	footnotes 1546:21	funded 1542:3
<b>exploring</b> 1660:13	1617:20,22 1618:4,7	1661:7 1663:24	forced 1580:24	further 1540:23 1547:5
<b>exposure</b> 1564:25 1645:7	1618:11,25 1619:10	1673:14 1681:5 1682:24 1684:25	forecast 1598:23 1599:5,5,5,6,7	1553:19 1571:23
	1619:11,14,18,24,24 1622:6 1628:3,4	1700:14 1705:3	1600:13 1644:8	1603:3 1610:16 1626:6 1645:15
<b>express</b> 1548:14 1549:2 1549:2 1555:12	1629:6 1630:3 1637:4	1700.14 1703.3	forecasts 1599:9	1648:22 1650:19
1594:8	1638:2	1710.23 1714.24 1722:12	1600:12	1687:18 1701:17
	February 1696:1	fiscal 1620:9	foregoing 1608:6	1708:14,15 1717:13
<b>expressed</b> 1539:19 1555:18 1586:24	fee 1721:5,15,25	fit 1568:14 1569:11	foremost 1663:24	1708.14,13 1717.13
1615:14	fees 1539:25 1722:1	1650:15 1659:13	forget 1600:18	future 1555:5,13
expressing 1549:11	felt 1559:18 1590:12	fits 1657:25	form 1603:15 1604:1,7	1557:1 1567:1
extent 1544:14 1550:1	1594:8	five 1543:24 1553:11	1605:16,23 1606:15	1569:16 1570:13
1649:19 1688:7	<b>fifth</b> 1649:12	1554:19 1558:3,23	forma 1598:2	1610:3,20 1664:14,16
1714:12 1718:24	Figueroa 1536:15	1564:23 1567:14	formal 1564:15	1664:19
extraordinary 1704:1	figure 1552:23 1654:10	1581:11 1595:19	formas 1597:18	1004.17
CALIAUI UIIIAI y 1/07.1	figured 1657:11 1670:3	1596:6 1600:2,15,15	formed 1612:5	G
	figures 1695:16	1601:4,12,15,20	formulas 1550:2	gallons 1571:20,22
faces 1580:23	file 1545:18 1612:20	1602:1,3,8,22 1603:4	forth 1560:15 1582:1	game 1542:16
1400.43	filed 1538:25 1545:9	1604:22 1606:9	1583:9 1608:20	GANS 1536:14
facilities 1690·4		・ ・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・	1303.7 1000.40	1 3/11/10 1220.17
facilities 1690:4				
facilities 1690:4 1696:18 1703:22 1706:13 1708:6,9	1547:25 1580:17,20 1581:6 1616:5	1607:22 1608:17,19 1609:7 1611:1	1610:11 <b>forum</b> 1567:16 1603:6	<b>GARY</b> 1536:14 <b>Gastelum</b> 1555:22,24

	Ì	Ì		
1557:7,10,14 1573:19	1574:11 1575:10	happens 1664:5	hope 1560:11	imprecise 1542:9
1586:15	1591:12 1607:4	<b>happy</b> 1579:18	hopeful 1560:18	improper 1544:1
Gastelum's 1558:18	1610:9 1615:17	hard 1611:6 1612:12	hottest 1702:15	1562:2 1584:6
gather 1659:24	1632:18 1639:12,13	1701:7	hour 1653:4	1614:22 1647:19
<b>gears</b> 1588:15	1639:14 1651:21	harmful 1555:13	hours 1538:17 1539:18	1677:15
general 1536:18 1543:6	1652:16 1653:15,17	hat 1547:17,17	1545:4 1553:11,12,14	inadmissible 1654:14
1559:21,24 1560:8	1654:7,11,16 1655:4	Havasu 1570:21	1559:17,17 1660:9	1712:20
1565:17 1592:6	1656:13,18 1657:1,8	1688:24 1689:2,6,19	1722:15 1723:7,16,17	incident 1584:20,21
1632:20 1679:14,15	1657:13,15 1658:16	1689:22	<b>hundreds</b> 1641:6,9	<b>include</b> 1572:18
1721:21,25	1659:5,20,25 1660:12	head 1600:21	Hunt 1558:11,20	1581:24 1583:21
generally 1549:8	1660:14 1668:16	hear 1547:19	1559:1	1641:6,9 1644:24
1568:22 1603:20	1676:13 1678:8	heard 1545:3 1619:2		1682:15 1700:3
1647:1,2 1661:23	1687:14 1690:8,17	hearing 1543:20,21	I	included 1540:1 1573:2
1712:21 1713:2	1696:18 1697:7,13	1574:10,14,19,24	ID 1537:7	1573:7 1587:19
generate 1550:3	1724:9	1575:9 1576:10,24	idea 1540:2 1543:7	1608:5 1629:24
1718:22 1724:13	GOLDBERG 1536:5	1577:3 1650:10	1594:23 1647:13	includes 1566:20
generated 1549:24	1710:23 1711:17	1654:6	1649:10 1653:20,21	1579:11 1641:13
1629:9 1695:11	1712:9,19 1713:5	hearsay 1552:6	1670:19 1713:16	1650:22 1719:14
generates 1723:13	1714:2,23 1716:3,7	1558:13 1580:13	identified 1550:25	1721:5,7
gentleman 1573:5	1716:25 1717:14,19	1654:19 1657:6,20	1584:2 1590:21,24	including 1548:8
getting 1561:5 1634:18 1643:7	1718:25 1719:4 1720:14 1723:25	1677:8 1679:1,13	1613:24 1694:9 identify 1672:4	1572:5 1574:3,22 1576:9 1585:4
give 1547:23 1551:1,10	1720.14 1723.23	1680:1,11,24 1681:4 1681:7 1711:18	1674:24 1682:12	1576.9 1585.4 1586:13 1589:2,5,18
1568:5 1569:2	golly 1612:5	1712:9,21 1716:8	1684:3	1590:3 1598:14
1570:10 1652:14	good 1538:6 1625:5,9	1717:1 1720:14	identity 1632:12	1603:17 1606:15
1670:19 1678:18	1626:8,15,16 1643:17	held 1554:21 1634:15	ii 1585:9 1589:10	1611:25 1620:5
1679:15	1645:3 1654:7	1725:18	1621:19	1623:2,3 1624:10
given 1540:3 1571:4	1661:13 1725:22	help 1562:8 1593:21	IID 1541:23 1556:19	1627:18 1640:17
1576:18 1651:22	gotten 1631:12	1713:12 1718:5	1571:3 1574:15,17	1650:6 1673:22
1654:24 1657:25	governors 1602:14	helpful 1547:7 1607:3	1576:20 1641:13	1685:17 1722:6
1660:16 1713:8	governs 1605:17	1724:19	1643:25 1645:1	inclusion 1585:14,22
gives 1649:15 1678:19	gratuitous 1544:15	helps 1676:19	1650:6 1656:2,7	1586:25 1590:8
1690:3,7 1691:3,5	great 1658:18	hey 1615:20	1688:19 1689:3,10,24	1591:10,19
1713:16	greater 1566:23	high 1669:5,10,23	1690:23 1692:2	incoherent 1724:13,14
giving 1584:8 1588:13	1696:15 1698:6,19	1705:4 1707:22	1708:10	incomplete 1677:17,19
1660:5	ground 1548:24	higher 1564:25	iii 1621:21 1634:3	inconclusive 1591:13
<b>go</b> 1539:11 1543:12	grounds 1605:6	highlighted 1686:13,14	illegal 1540:8 1586:4	inconsistency 1591:14
1546:21 1547:14	1710:24 1712:9	1686:15 1694:9	1591:15 1595:10,15	incorporated 1654:22
1552:14,20 1553:15	1716:4,7,25	1696:12	1596:2,8,10,11,15,15	increase 1619:21
1563:10 1567:2,10	<b>group</b> 1673:6	highly 1548:22	1596:17,20 1597:14	1627:21 1637:6
1606:2 1617:17	grow 1663:13	hire 1645:25	1604:13 1605:20	1663:5,8 1690:19
1620:1 1634:11	guaranteed 1641:14	hold 1664:11 1706:5	1606:19 1612:2,6	1696:25 1700:5,7,8
1641:11 1651:11,21	1644:25	hole 1543:18	1614:13 1615:10,13	increases 1617:7,8
1651:24 1654:8	guess 1650:18 1654:22	Hon 1538:4	1615:16,20 1632:18	1619:19 1640:9
1679:17 1689:18	1659:8 1678:9	<b>Honor</b> 1538:9,9 1545:8	1633:3,11	1643:20
1698:16 1703:23	Н	1546:5,8 1553:4	illuminating 1681:7	increments 1570:25
1706:21 1718:6		1563:4,7 1564:4	impact 1722:18	independent 1562:16
1721:25 1725:9	HADLOCK 1536:4	1567:4,7 1571:24	impair 1708:2	1719:15,20
gods 1707:22 goes 1541:8 1552:21	half 1686:22,23 1723:14,17	1579:25 1607:24 1609:1 1625:9 1634:4	Imperial 1570:21 1662:19 1689:4	index 1714:16 1715:4 indicate 1631:23
1667:4,6,12 1670:8	hand 1593:20,23	1643:1,4 1648:23,24	implemented 1618:25	indicated 1578:17
1707:16 1724:15	1727:17	1651:19 1674:15	1635:4	1588:5 1642:1
going 1538:19 1539:11	handle 1547:19 1549:9	1675:15 1677:11,21	important 1566:17	individual 1557:19
1540:3 1542:17	1549:12 1660:7	1680:23 1682:10	1647:5	1562:5 1573:9
1546:1 1549:14	happen 1540:24	1683:23 1687:11	importantly 1677:19	1586:21 1677:17
1551:8,12 1552:14,17	1554:17 1653:3	1711:17 1713:5	imported 1609:19,23	individually 1634:9
1552:22 1554:9,14	happened 1554:1	1714:2,23	impossible 1548:14	industry 1621:22
1556:21 1564:15	1611:22 1637:2,25	HONORABLE 1535:3	1549:1 1689:17,20	1624:13 1628:20
	ĺ		ĺ	
	1	1	1	1

	1		1	1
1711:9	1631:9,14,15 1638:9	1581:4	1629:23 1643:8	1707:11,17,17
<b>inflation</b> 1643:7 1644:6	1638:15	Jon 1537:5 1708:19	kinds 1547:10 1724:7	Lambeck 1537:5
influences 1673:13	interrogatories 1541:5	1709:1	knew 1557:10 1568:3	1546:1 1549:5,14
information 1541:21	1541:13 1650:2	JOSEPH 1536:18	1589:25 1591:4	1708:19 1709:1
1549:3 1551:5,7	1652:8	JTX 1640:3,4	1631:20 1648:3	1717:11
1565:2 1622:25	interrogatory 1541:9	Judge 1538:4	know 1538:19 1541:25	language 1602:18
1649:11 1650:4	1649:24 1650:16	judicial 1564:23	1542:24 1545:10	1606:10 1622:20,24
1655:25 1658:17	1652:8 1654:25	1567:16 1603:5,15	1548:25 1549:22	1626:17 1628:5
1659:25 1671:21	1655:7,13,23	1606:15	1550:13,20 1562:10	1629:24 1646:25
1672:23,24 1673:14	interrupted 1638:13	June 1545:14 1546:2	1574:11 1579:20,25	1647:3,5
1673:19 1680:4	interrupted 1038.13	1695:15	1580:1 1585:5 1586:5	large 1717:25
1681:17 1684:6	invoice 1682:13	jury 1651:14 1676:11	1586:23 1591:15	larger 1564:5
1698:4,9 1713:7	invoices 1682:3,7,15	justification 1660:18	1593:18 1607:2,3	late 1538:11 1654:9
1716:14,16,22 1718:5	involved 1572:22	justification 1000.10	1608:9 1610:2,16	law 1540:22 1564:21
1710:14,16,22 1710:3	1573:10,12,16,21	K	1614:2 1616:5	1566:19 1567:12
1720:6,8 1724:16	1615:18	KARA 1536:15	1618:16 1624:1	1575:6,16,22 1576:5
informed 1631:6,18	involvement 1573:17	Karnow 1535:3 1538:4	1626:22 1628:7	1578:10 1579:2,4,7
1632:5	irrelevant 1540:9	Kaseman 1573:12	1629:7,9,19,21	1579:10,24 1581:14
infrastructure 1548:8	1543:8 1544:24	Katz 1574:4 1575:6,15	1630:2 1633:7,14,20	1584:8,11 1586:5
1665:24	1552:11 1717:2	1575:22 1576:5	1633:23 1637:15	1588:12 1590:13,25
infrequently 1717:23	1720:15 1724:18	1577:20 1578:1,9	1638:10 1640:1	1590:25 1591:9,14
1719:1	Irrigation 1570:22	1577:24 1646:9,15	1649:15,18,24	1590.23 1591.9,14
initial 1565:1 1582:20	1662:19	keep 1642:19	1650:14 1652:6,7,9	1596:21 1597:17
1592:10 1595:1,4	issue 1543:22 1551:17	keeps 1645:23 1695:5	1652:11,12 1653:12	1603:7,16 1604:2,8
1619:4 1643:19	1570:9 1631:7,12,18	Keker 1536:3,3 1538:9	1655:7 1657:20	1604:16,20,25 1605:9
initially 1559:8	1633:3 1648:10	1538:25 1546:19	1662:13,25 1663:6,7	1605:17,20,24 1606:6
1618:19	1649:2 1654:15,16	1547:9,13 1551:19,23	1664:22 1668:18	1606:8,16,20 1608:22
initiated 1557:19	1686:19 1701:7	1553:3,14,24 1554:6	1669:22 1675:13	1609:10,14 1612:7
inputs 1713:24 1714:9	issued 1649:20	1554:22 1558:10,17	1676:1,11,14,15,16	1626:24 1627:5,8
1718:16,22 1720:20	issues 1547:7,13 1549:9	1560:22 1562:18	1678:8,10 1682:1,5	1631:9 1636:19
inside 1550:8	1560:16,23 1626:10	1563:7,10 1564:2	1701:5,8 1704:10	1646:9,15 1647:8
insisted 1543:5	1633:25 1653:25	1567:4,10 1571:23	1713:6 1718:21	lawful 1540:18 1558:5
insistent 1599:17	item 1628:16	1572:4 1575:1 1580:7	knowing 1660:11	1563:1 1564:19
<b>inspection</b> 1571:13,17		1584:2 1592:7,12	knowledge 1664:12	1566:5 1583:3,4
instance 1551:8,11	J	1597:5 1600:22	1712:11	1592:11 1595:21
1561:7 1624:19	<b>J-O-N</b> 1709:1	1602:25 1605:3,10,25	knowledgeable 1585:3	1599:19 1638:9,16
instruct 1624:24	JAN 1535:22	1606:25 1608:16,23	1585:8 1592:16	1645:22 1646:18
instructed 1627:14	<b>January</b> 1535:12,12	1610:23 1611:14	1633:24 1636:21	lawfully 1548:23
integrity 1557:14,17	1612:18,21 1623:14	1613:23 1615:2	1638:3 1663:16	lawfulness 1567:15
intend 1610:1,14	1638:20 1657:12	1618:13 1634:4	known 1647:19,23	1586:11 1613:1,17
1616:10	1683:17 1694:12	1645:19 1648:22	1687:15	laws 1590:8 1591:5
intended 1557:17	1695:18 1696:12	1649:10 1651:19	knows 1586:20	1604:3
intent 1556:4 1559:19	1715:25 1718:10	1652:3,18 1654:3,18		lawsuit 1612:21
1606:9 1610:15	1719:13	1655:3 1656:21,25	L	1614:11,15 1616:5
interest 1687:24	<b>Jeff</b> 1560:9 1561:22,25	1657:18 1659:15,20	L-A-M-B-E-C-K	1639:20 1641:1
interested 1535:10	1562:11	1659:24 1660:9,11	1709:2	1646:7 1647:18
1727:15	<b>Jeff's</b> 1562:4	1666:18 1683:3	lab 1671:18 1672:7	lawyer 1574:25
interesting 1571:19	jkeker@kvn.com	<b>Keker's</b> 1545:20	1683:13	1586:20 1596:16
intermingled 1668:22	1536:8	1574:1,7 1584:6	labor 1721:20	<b>lay</b> 1676:13
interpret 1609:16	<b>job</b> 1660:2,4,14	1587:20	lack 1675:19 1693:3	laying 1655:19
interpretation 1561:19	1661:23 1709:14	kept 1667:21,25	1704:1	laypeople 1550:6
1590:12 1594:8	1710:14 1725:2	1668:21 1671:14	Lacks 1563:5	lays 1543:20
1595:13,20 1596:4,12	jog 1589:23	Kevin 1558:10	lake 1570:20,21	lead 1614:23
1596:13 1597:16	jogs 1589:9	<b>Kightlinger</b> 1554:7,23	1665:16,18,19,20	leading 1560:21
1603:16 1604:1,8	<b>JOHN</b> 1536:3,14	1555:8 1560:9	1666:7 1667:8	1562:23 1588:17,18
1605:16,24 1606:6,7	johnquinn@quinne	1561:11,23 1573:3	1688:24 1689:2,6,19	1589:13
1606:16 1610:18	1536:17	1646:7	1689:21 1703:22	leads 1703:18
1626:23 1627:1,10	joint 1574:14 1580:10	kind 1541:2 1602:25	1704:14,19 1707:1,3	learned 1571:19

leave 1552:19 1676:10	1590:15,15 1592:16	1617:18 1620:1,3	manager 1556:10	meetings 1632:11
left 1538:17 1539:18	1592:16 1603:12	1622:23 1630:5,8	1559:21,24 1560:8	megawatt 1722:15
1545:4	1607:7 1617:14,14	1640:3 1649:6 1672:2	1661:21,22 1663:16	1723:7,16,17
legal 1557:18 1558:22	1618:1 1634:3,3	1674:23 1676:11	1681:9,10 1709:10	melded 1647:16
1580:3 1592:24,25	1700:22 1714:21	1677:16 1681:16	managers 1556:9,13	member 1541:1,11,15
1593:2,15,25 1594:3	1717:6	1682:9,23 1684:2	1565:17 1679:5,10,19	1556:7,8,10,13
1597:5 1605:25	lines 1580:18 1617:14	1685:18 1692:19	1680:18	1557:16,19,24
1606:3 1633:20	lining 1541:23 1564:18	1693:25 1694:12	managing 1709:15	1562:12,19 1563:8
legality 1588:16,20	1566:1,4 1598:19	1696:1 1698:3,9,11	manner 1569:15	1565:17 1621:8,19
1589:2,5,18 1590:3	1641:10,14 1642:15	1700:20 1711:23	map 1676:21	1624:8 1628:16
1614:3	1644:21 1645:1	1715:17 1718:1	March 1620:4,13	1647:3,7,10,24
legislate 1556:18	1656:2,7 1688:20	1720:2	1630:9 1632:25	1668:14 1691:15
legislative 1557:18	1689:3,10,24 1690:23	looked 1594:13	1640:6 1696:8	1699:20 1700:12,17
1558:22 1603:14	1692:2 1708:11	1597:18,23,25 1598:6	market 1544:3 1655:4	1701:3,15 1705:9
Legitimate 1605:12	list 1542:21 1543:3	1609:21 1624:1	1710:20 1711:15,21	members 1562:5
let's 1553:1 1554:20	1652:13,23	1627:25 1641:18	1712:2,12 1713:2,8	1563:16 1616:23
1565:9 1566:1	listed 1698:7	1656:9,10 1681:18	1713:16 1718:5	1617:19 1633:6
1568:20 1570:3	literally 1601:16	1684:14 1698:1	1720:7	1645:12 1647:22
1580:5,14,15,15	litigate 1610:2,10,11,14	1721:16,18,20	master 1709:21	memo 1566:20 1609:18
1581:21 1600:18,20	1610:15	looking 1539:20	match 1543:13	1609:19 1622:23
1602:16,16 1609:17	litigation 1556:19,21	1546:16 1602:18	material 1561:18,25	memoranda 1565:25
1611:22,22,23	1556:22,24 1578:25	1622:12 1623:10	1629:10	memorandum 1555:22
1617:13 1620:3	1579:15,21 1580:2	1644:14 1657:3	math 1543:16 1553:16	1556:8,15 1558:10,18
1625:7 1634:11	1581:5,8 1616:9,14	1683:2 1698:17	1643:4,13	1563:15,24 1564:3
1636:9 1655:23	1616:17	1717:6 1725:20	matter 1561:6 1602:12	1565:10,14,15
1660:20 1666:17	little 1548:22 1583:8	looks 1659:9	1634:19 1692:13	1567:17 1609:21,25
1687:10 1692:19	1600:9,20 1619:22	Los 1536:16,19	1693:8 1694:18	memory 1589:24
1693:25 1694:12,14	1626:19 1649:22	lose 1669:16 1670:5,6	1703:7 1705:22	mentioned 1551:23
1696:11 1698:11	1651:6,15 1655:6,9	1703:5	matters 1553:7 1612:4	1632:10 1667:10
1700:20 1710:25	1659:3 1686:22	losing 1705:11	<b>Matthew</b> 1665:20	1702:12
1719:6 1725:4,9	1691:8 1709:13	loss 1723:10	Maureen 1537:3	mentions 1649:7
let's-get-San-Diego	live 1559:5	lot 1538:16 1539:16	1553:18 1562:4	Met 1543:10 1547:25
1541:2	loading 1540:20,23	1542:22 1559:15	1585:12 1626:5	1548:2,16 1553:12
letter 1563:23 1620:4	<b>lobby</b> 1564:20	1573:16 1645:25	max 1663:13	1555:16,23 1556:20
1640:4,8,13,16	located 1627:2	1648:8 1649:3	maximize 1702:21,24	1558:2 1559:4,25
level 1679:14	location 1666:12,22	1654:20 1693:12	Mead 1570:20	1560:6,12,13 1561:5
levels 1552:25 1669:5	locations 1673:24	lots 1540:23	mean 1548:23,23	1562:5,16 1564:13
1669:10	1711:15	lower 1543:17 1556:23	1558:8 1563:2	1567:25 1568:18
license 1709:24	logical 1621:25	lunch 1547:2,4 1551:18	1572:22 1587:1	1569:9 1570:15,23
lie 1656:23	1624:15 1628:25	1631:10	1594:7 1599:17	1571:4,5,9 1573:2
lieu 1564:19 1566:6	long 1600:23 1645:22	lunchtime 1551:16	1601:16 1636:13	1577:1 1581:4,19,22
life 1663:3	1661:16 1709:12		1654:22 1655:7	1583:17 1586:10
light 1548:20	long-range 1560:14	M	1657:16 1666:3	1588:4 1601:19,21
likewise 1676:21	long-term 1574:16	ma'am 1554:17	1668:2 1669:18,20	1602:7,22 1606:14
				-
1696:1	longer 1655:10	1573:23 1575:19	1670:6 1684:9 1725:1	1008.9,12 1010.5,5
1696:1 <b>limitation</b> 1557:7,8		1573:23 1575:19 1583:7 1587:12		1608:9,12 1610:3,3 1610:16 1612:9
	longer 1655:10		1670:6 1684:9 1725:1 meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23	
<b>limitation</b> 1557:7,8	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16	1583:7 1587:12	meaning 1677:13	1610:16 1612:9
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6 1651:22 1669:23	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9 1568:21 1569:6 1570:3 1575:8,12,18 1580:5,7 1581:3,21	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13 1571:16 1663:25	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13 1673:21,23	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18 1636:23 1637:4
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6 1651:22 1669:23 1714:11 1718:20	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9 1568:21 1569:6 1570:3 1575:8,12,18	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13 1571:16 1663:25 1664:8,18	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13 1673:21,23 measurements 1674:12	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18 1636:23 1637:4 1638:1,7,8,17 1639:6
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6 1651:22 1669:23 1714:11 1718:20 limiting 1650:23	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9 1568:21 1569:6 1570:3 1575:8,12,18 1580:5,7 1581:3,21	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13 1571:16 1663:25 1664:8,18 majority 1704:13	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13 1673:21,23 measurements 1674:12 measuring 1672:17	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18 1636:23 1637:4 1638:1,7,8,17 1639:6 1639:17 1640:5
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6 1651:22 1669:23 1714:11 1718:20 limiting 1650:23 limits 1665:10	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9 1568:21 1569:6 1570:3 1575:8,12,18 1580:5,7 1581:3,21 1581:23 1593:3	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13 1571:16 1663:25 1664:8,18 majority 1704:13 making 1547:9 1616:20 1704:12 1723:9 man 1572:9	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13 1673:21,23 measurements 1674:12 measuring 1672:17 meet 1566:25 1569:19 1578:4 1669:15 meeting 1564:16	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18 1636:23 1637:4 1638:1,7,8,17 1639:6 1639:17 1640:5 1645:12 1646:1 1647:19,24 1648:3,6 1648:9 1650:1,11,17
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6 1651:22 1669:23 1714:11 1718:20 limiting 1650:23 limits 1665:10 line 1544:23 1575:13	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9 1568:21 1569:6 1570:3 1575:8,12,18 1580:5,7 1581:3,21 1581:23 1593:3 1602:16,19 1603:11	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13 1571:16 1663:25 1664:8,18 majority 1704:13 making 1547:9 1616:20 1704:12 1723:9	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13 1673:21,23 measurements 1674:12 measuring 1672:17 meet 1566:25 1569:19 1578:4 1669:15	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18 1636:23 1637:4 1638:1,7,8,17 1639:6 1639:17 1640:5 1645:12 1646:1 1647:19,24 1648:3,6
limitation 1557:7,8 limitations 1601:19 1602:5 1704:23 1705:1 1708:1 limited 1552:16 1610:25 1650:6 1651:22 1669:23 1714:11 1718:20 limits 1665:10 line 1544:23 1575:13 1575:13 1581:11	longer 1655:10 look 1546:20 1547:16 1549:7,8 1553:10 1555:20 1556:16 1557:14 1558:7 1563:9,12 1564:8 1565:9 1567:3 1568:9 1568:21 1569:6 1570:3 1575:8,12,18 1580:5,7 1581:3,21 1581:23 1593:3 1602:16,19 1603:11 1607:6 1609:17	1583:7 1587:12 1592:2 magnitude 1643:9 main 1603:11 maintain 1580:21 maintenance 1571:13 1571:16 1663:25 1664:8,18 majority 1704:13 making 1547:9 1616:20 1704:12 1723:9 man 1572:9	meaning 1677:13 means 1548:21,23 1562:10,11 1569:8 1668:11 1678:19 meant 1623:25 measure 1671:11,13 1673:21,23 measurements 1674:12 measuring 1672:17 meet 1566:25 1569:19 1578:4 1669:15 meeting 1564:16	1610:16 1612:9 1613:12 1615:15 1616:1,23 1620:4,13 1622:11,18 1623:11 1627:23 1628:15 1629:9 1633:1,2,9,18 1636:23 1637:4 1638:1,7,8,17 1639:6 1639:17 1640:5 1645:12 1646:1 1647:19,24 1648:3,6 1648:9 1650:1,11,17

	<u> </u>	·		
1655:18 1656:5	1693:1 1695:15	1721:3,12	named 1727:12	NICHOLAS 1536:5
1663:16 1666:12,15	1697:5 1698:5,18,22	months 1539:17	names 1671:16	nine 1553:15 1634:3
1666:18,23 1668:11	1699:8,17 1701:12	1567:24 1588:18	narrow 1656:6	Nineteen 1686:21
1668:18,24 1670:11	1709:7,9 1721:16,22	1589:13 1670:20,21	nature 1551:13	Nods 1600:21
1670:22,23 1671:2,7	1722:2,3,7,21	1686:13,15,18,19,23	near 1672:16	non-Met 1715:15
1671:10 1675:21,25	1723:13,18	1694:4,10,24,25	nearly 1686:22	non-MWD 1541:11
1676:25 1677:2	Metropolitan's	1696:12,13 1699:17	necessarily 1556:7	noon 1546:2 1625:12
1678:9 1681:13	1582:15 1603:19	1719:13	1604:17 1660:17	normal 1676:19
1687:13 1688:2,5,5	1621:8,20 1622:2	morning 1538:6,11,22	1722:4	1704:18 1711:24
1688:18,22 1689:19	1647:15 1650:4	1538:25 1545:4,9,21	necessary 1552:18	1720:3
1689:22 1690:3,7,11	1662:25 1697:24	1547:4 1626:11,19	1622:1 1624:16	normally 1723:19
1691:3,5,11 1692:14	1701:13 1721:6	1649:3 1653:8	1629:2 1699:16	North 1536:19
1693:22 1694:18,19	Michigan 1709:21	1654:12	1725:12	note 1677:15
1695:4,23 1696:6,13	microphone 1661:6	motion 1538:7,22	need 1550:5 1568:25	notes 1630:15
1696:17,21 1697:3	middle 1630:8	1539:14 1545:10	1570:24 1665:9	<b>Notice</b> 1658:10
1699:1,6 1700:10,15	million 1540:14	1581:4 1630:23	1693:18 1702:17	November 1556:15
1700:24 1702:4	1552:24 1642:19	1651:1,2,12 1656:10	1725:2	1560:3 1719:13
1706:13 1707:22	1643:12 1644:2,2,11	1658:20,21	needed 1571:10	<b>number</b> 1537:7 1541:5
1709:12 1710:11,17	1644:21 1645:11	mouth 1590:17	1715:14	1541:9 1550:3
1710:19 1711:20	millions 1612:9 1641:6	move 1542:1 1563:4	needing 1660:12	1556:16 1557:14
1712:8,10,13,25	mind 1547:9 1558:1,6	1567:5 1570:24	needs 1664:18,19	1563:15 1567:2,3,10
1713:9 1714:9,9	1562:2 1719:3,5	1571:9,10 1576:19	1668:15 1691:13	1572:13 1609:20
1715:9,14 1716:24	minute 1539:18	1606:17 1651:17	negotiate 1713:25	1619:20 1646:3
1717:6,8,17,21	1652:15	1693:18 1702:12,17	negotiated 1558:24	1649:25 1650:2,16
1718:2,23 1719:24	minutes 1553:12,13	1708:6 1715:15	1611:6 1612:12	1654:25 1655:13,23
1720:13 1723:24	Misstates 1605:3	1722:16	1718:23	1663:23 1713:21
1725:12	1608:23	moved 1542:15	negotiating 1564:13	1717:9 1718:7
<b>Met's</b> 1541:22 1564:19	mix 1569:23,23	1570:20 1675:17	1588:3 1713:20	1722:10 1724:3,21
1568:7 1582:11,25	1707:13	movement 1662:1	negotiation 1555:9	numbers 1541:4
1583:8 1588:21	mixed 1667:23 1703:24	1702:21	1572:14 1573:7	1542:22,25 1543:13
1589:6,20 1590:13,21	1703:25 1707:16	moving 1550:24 1563:2	1585:4 1586:8	1543:17,19 1546:11
1591:1 1595:1 1596:5	modification 1561:8	1722:19	1594:21	1549:23 1550:18
1601:3,15,25 1604:13	modifications 1561:3	multiplication 1721:9	negotiations 1556:6	1599:13 1644:18
1604:21 1605:1,7	moment 1539:11	multiply 1642:18	1557:3 1559:18,22	1654:2,4 1659:10
1610:2,5,10 1612:21	1634:4	<b>MW</b> 1636:9	1563:11 1572:20	1683:7,8 1684:15
1624:7,17 1625:2	<b>Monday</b> 1535:18	<b>MWD</b> 1541:6,8,9,10,15	1587:10 1718:8,9,17	1717:25 1724:14
1627:18 1629:2	1538:2 1626:2	1541:15 1542:8	negotiator 1614:23	1725:1,3
1631:6,17,24 1642:22	1715:22	1548:7,11,19 1555:13	negotiators 1615:1,7	numerous 1586:7
1655:25 1669:11	money 1646:1	1559:17 1561:15	neither 1564:20	
1682:3,7 1691:12	monkey 1552:13	1564:20,21,25	1603:13 1606:13	0
1692:6 1695:18	month 1552:8 1568:4	1567:11,12,14,15,23	1646:21	o'clock 1725:24
1699:4 1703:7	1571:2,16 1641:14	1568:11 1587:18	NEST 1536:3	oath 1553:22
1713:15 1725:13	1657:11 1662:9,14,23	1598:20 1599:14	net 1540:21	object 1542:21,21
method 1676:2 1704:11	1662:24 1663:11,12	1616:12 1621:13	never 1542:19 1544:4,4	1558:13 1612:17
Metropolitan 1535:9	1664:1 1683:16	1622:15 1630:22	1544:13,15 1551:24	1660:6 1710:23
1535:11 1536:11	1684:8,17 1685:12,15	1634:23,25 1640:9	1552:5 1581:19	1712:9 1718:25
1555:4 1569:25	1685:19 1691:21,22	1641:25 1652:10	1599:6 1614:2	<b>objected</b> 1540:5 1552:6
1570:6 1580:9,21	1692:4,5,16 1694:16	MWD's 1541:13	1615:19 1616:1	1580:12 1647:25
1592:9 1603:14	1695:24 1697:20	1542:6,7,11 1562:2	1652:22 1657:1,7,18	objecting 1675:13
1608:2 1620:8,18	1699:23 1716:16	1564:17 1566:3,5	1657:21 1688:11,12	objection 1543:2
1621:18 1636:17	1719:16	1594:9 1658:4,6,9	1700:10,15 1724:3	1554:25 1558:16
1646:22,24 1649:20	monthly 1567:21	MWD-SDCWA	Nevertheless 1649:21	1560:21 1562:23
1649:21 1659:12	1570:16,24 1663:18	1581:13	new 1602:13 1618:7	1567:7 1568:14
1660:21 1661:15,16	1665:2 1681:17,22		1619:6 1725:21	1597:5 1605:3,25
1661:19 1662:1,5,7	1682:2,6,13,18	N 1527 1	nexus 1621:25 1624:15	1606:25 1608:23
1662:16,22 1663:18	1683:12,15 1685:10	N 1537:1	1629:1	1613:15 1618:13
1665:1,25,25 1691:14	1695:4 1713:4	name 1573:5 1661:7,8	ngoldberg@kvn.com	1639:10 1641:21
1691:20 1692:1,21	1715:24 1716:22	1708:25	1536:9	1642:10 1673:2
				<u> </u>

-1674:18 1675:10,17   1657:10,23 1660:1   1715:8,12,13,19,21   1715:8,12,13,19,21   1715:8,12,13,19,21   1715:8,12,13,19,21   1715:8,12,13,19,21   1715:8,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1719:1 1721:4,12   0n-peck 1717:2   0n-peck 1717:2   0n-peck 1717:2   0n-peck 1717:2   0n-on-on 1584:19   1647:23   1447:23   1447:23   1447:23   1447:23   14
1675:19 1676:8   1715:8,12,13,19,21   1715:18,12,1718:2   1715:18,12,1718:2   1715:18,12,1718:2   1715:18,12,1718:2   1715:18,12,1718:2   1715:18,12,1718:2   1715:18,12,1718:2   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1716:37,25   1639:22,24   1699:2   1643:9   1649:19,20   16
1677:13,20 1678:16   1715:22,24 1717:7,12   1677:19,12 1718;2 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:18,22 1718:2   1717:11:17   1706:16 1711:17   0nce 1606:17 1613:6   1636:2,2 2,4 1699:2   1639:9   1639:2,2 4 1699:2   1639:9   1643:9 1649:19   20   1659:5 1663:9   0rdinarily 1548:17   1549:3   0ne-on-one 1584:19   1647:23   1647:23   1647:23   0nes 1647:15   0
1678:19 1680:23
1683:24 1685:5   1719:1 1721:4,12   0nce folo:17 1613:6   1706:16 1711:17   1714:12 1715:6   1714:12 1715:6   1712:20,23   0nce folo:17 1613:6   0nce folo:17 1613:6   1639:22,24 1699:2   1643:9 1649:19,20   1643:9 1649:19,20   1647:23   1569:18 1647:23   1569:18 1647:23   1569:18 1647:23   1569:18 1647:23   1569:18 1647:23   1569:19   1643:9 1649:19,20   1647:23   1569:19   1647:23   1569:19   1647:23   1569:19   1647:23   1569:19   1647:23   1569:19   1665:2 1669:19   1665:2 1669:19   1665:2 1669:19   1665:2 1669:19   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:19   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:3 1565:9 1693:9   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:3 1569:1   1698:2 1698:2 1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1698:2 1698:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:2   1669:1 1692:3   1688:6 1693:15   1669:1 1584:10   1689:2 1669:1 1692:3   1689:5 1669:9   1669:1 1692:1   1669:1 1692:1   1698:2 1698:2 1699:2   1669:1 1692:1   1698:2 1699:2   1669:1 1692:1   1698:2 1699:2   1669:1 1692:1   1698:2 1699:2   1669:1 1692:1   1698:2 1699:2   1698:2 1699:2   1699
1687:3,4 1701:4   1706:16 1711:17   onc 1606:17 1613:6   1639:22,24 1699:2   1639:22,24 1699:2   1639:22,24 1699:2   1639:22,24 1699:2   1672:10   1673:21 1676:20   1672:10
1706:16 1711:17
1714:12 1715:6
1716:3,7,25 1718:24   1720:14,19 1724:10   one-on-one 1584:19   1647:23   one-on-one 1584:19   1647:23   opening 1538:15   opening 1538:15   opening 1538:15   operate 1568:13   operate 1568:2   o
1720:14,19 1724:10   1724:20,23   1647:23   1549:3   1723:11,11   part 1546:20,20   1545:15 1546:3   1547:8 1572:5   opening 1538:15   operate 1568:13   operate 1568:13   operate 1568:13   1569:10   operate 1563:2   1663:2 1687:13   1662:7 1673:2   1663:2 1687:13   1662:7 1673:1   1662:7 1673:1   1691:3,5,9,13   1662:7 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:2 1663:1   1662:3 1663:1   1662:3 1663:1   1662:3 1663:1   1693:1 3 1697:24   1663:2 1669:1 1692:7   0btain 1711:20 1719:24   Obviously 1616:5   0ccasion 1573:22   1603:1   1691:4   Operator 1719:15,21   0pinion 1540:16   opinion 1540:16   openator 1670:9   1549:2,3,11 1626:23   Opinions 1539:19   October 1565:13   Ones 163:2 19   October 1565:13   Ones 1640:12   Opinion 1539:19   October 1565:13   Ones 1640:12   Opinion 1539:19   October 1565:13   Ones 1640:21   Opinion 1539:19   October 1565:13   Ones 1640:12   Opinion 1539:19   October 1565:13   Ones 1640:21   Opinion 1539:19   October 1565:13   Ones 1640:12   Opinion 15
1724:20,23
objections 1539:10         ones 1647:15         ordinary 1655:17         part 1546:20,20         1545:15 1546:3         1660:5 1712:11           1547:8 1572:5         opening 1538:15         operate 1568:13         original 1563:11         1570:23 1603:11         perform 1724:6           1716:5 1723:25         operated 1646:22         operated 1646:22         operated 1646:22         operated 1646:22         operated 1646:23         outside 1553:4 1579:1         1681:5 1685:1,13         1660:2,4         performance 1597:3         performance 1597:3         perform 1724:6         performance 1597:3         performance 1597:3 <td< td=""></td<>
1547:8 1572:5   1626:18 1641:24   1642:1,2,4,10 1648:4   1716:5 1723:25   0 perate 1646:22   0 operate 1719:22   0 operate 1719:23   1658:2   1668:5   1669:5   1712:11   perform 1724:6   0 performance 1597:3   1658:2   1669:2,4   1654:23   1658:2   1660:2,4   1688:10   1702:23   1688:1,13   1688:10   1702:23   1704:8,18   1710:14   1557:12   1559:3,11   1594:6,16   1662:5   1669:1   1691:3,5,9,13   1693:13   1697:24   1698:25   1699:2,18,19   1698:25   1699:2,18,19   1662:25   1669:1   1692:7   1662:25   1669:1   1692:7   1662:23   1662:23   1662:21   1662:23   1662:21   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1704:18   1799:10   1706:18   1799:15   1669:22   1669:3,3   1669:22   1669:23   1669:23   1669:22   1704:18   1704:18   1706:3   1706:3   1708:3   170
1626:18 1641:24   1642:1,2,4,10 1648:4   1569:10   operated 1646:22   operates 1719:22   operates 1719:24   operates 1719:24   operates 1719:24   operates 1719:24   operates 1719:24   operates 1719:24   operates 1719:25
1642:1,2,4,10 1648:4   1569:10   ought 1545:1 1549:16   1607:3 1628:23   performance 1597:3   performance 1597:3   1656:21 1662:16,22   operated 1646:22   operational 1568:2   operational 1568:2   operational 1568:2   operational 1568:2   1654:23   outside 1553:4 1579:1   1681:5 1685:1,13   1688:10 1702:23   1704:8,18 1710:14   participants 1573:2   period 1555:17,19   1557:12 1559:3,11   1593:11 1594:6,16   overcharged 1612:9   participants 1573:2   participants 1573:2   participants 1573:2   participants 1573:2   participants 1560:15   1572:14   1662:25 1663:19   1606:2,3,3 1663:16   operations 1661:2,1,22   operations 1661:2,1,2   oper
1716:5 1723:25
obligated 1662:16,22 1663:2 1687:13         operates 1719:22 operational 1568:2 1696:6         outside 1553:4 1579:1 1579:3,6 1581:14         1681:5 1685:1,13 1688:10 1702:23 1704:8,18 1710:14 1557:12 1559:3,11 1691:3,5,9,13 1691:3,5,9,13 1691:3,5,9,13 1692:4 1698:25 1699:2,18,19 1698:25 1699:2,18,19 1698:25 1699:2,18,19 1662:25 1663:19 1662:25 1663:19 1665:2 1669:1 1692:7 0btain 1711:20 1719:24 Obviously 1616:5 1665:2 1699:2,18,19 0ccasion 1573:22 1619:14 0ccasion 1573:22 1619:14 0ccur 1686:20 opinion 1548:10 opinions 1548:10 opinions 1539:19         outside 1553:4 1579:1 1688:5 1685:1,13 1688:10 1702:23 1688:10 1702:23 1704:8,18 1710:14 1557:12 1559:3,11 1594:6,16 1704:8,18 1710:14 1704:8,18 1710:1
1663:2 1687:13         operational 1568:2         1579:3,6 1581:14         1688:10 1702:23         period 1555:17,19           1696:6         1665:7 1676:17         1651:24         1704:8,18 1710:14         1557:12 1559:3,11           obligation 1569:3         1691:3,5,9,13         1692:7 1663:7 1688:9         1693:13 1697:24         1698:25 1699:2,18,19         1645:14 1648:19         participate 1572:20         1606:9 1607:10,19           obligations 1569:19         1692:25 1663:19         1702:5,6 1704:20,23         1675:16         participate 1572:20         1606:9 1607:10,19           1665:2 1669:1 1692:7         1662:3,3 1663:16         1662:3,3 1663:16         1605:11 1609:2         1677:9 1678:16,20         1579:9 1590:25         1708:3 1715:19,23           obtain 1711:20 1719:24         0bviously 1616:5         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:18 1609:2         1680:21,2,25 1701:4         1673:13 1722:5         1693:7,9 1704:11           occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periodically 167:18           occurred 1562:21         opinion 1540:16         1544:13 1548:14,15         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           ocean 1670:9         0ctober 1565:13         0pinions 1539:19         0pinions 1539:19         0pinions 1539:19         1542:13         0passage 1603:1
1696:6   1696:6   1691:3,5,9,13   1697:24   1698:25 1699:2,18,19   1698:25 1699:2,18,19   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1702:24   1698:18   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1692:7   1665:2 1669:1 1702:24   1676:22 1679:5,10,19   1680:18 1681:9,10   1698:18 1691:14   1698:25 1699:2,18,19   1698:18 1698:18   1698:18 1681:9,10   1698:18 1681:9,10   1698:18 1691:14   1699:14   1699:15   1704:18 1709:10   1711:19 1714:12   1619:14   1619:14   1619:14   1619:14   1619:14   1619:14   1619:14   1619:14   1619:15   1619:15   1619:19   1619:19   1616:5   1619:19   161
obligation 1569:3         1691:3,5,9,13         overcharged 1612:9         participants 1573:2         1593:11 1594:6,16           1688:18         1698:25 1699:2,18,19         1698:25 1699:2,18,19         overrule 1562:24         participate 1572:20         1606:9 1607:10,19           obligations 1569:19         1702:5,6 1704:20,23         1675:16         participated 1560:15         1611:8,15,19 1619           1665:2 1669:1 1692:7         0perations 1661:21,22         1662:3,3 1663:16         1605:11 1609:2         1579:9 1590:25         1708:3 1715:19,23           0bviously 1616:5         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:2,12,25 1701:4         1673:13 1722:5         1693:7,9 1704:11           0ccasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periods 1670:18           169:14         0perator 1719:15,21         0pinion 1540:16         1718:24 1720:19         parts 1696:22         1705:3           0ccurred 1562:21         0pinion 1540:16         1544:13 1548:14,15         0wee 1540:13         1715:15         person 1585:3,8           0ccober 1565:13         0pinions 1539:19         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         0wned 1646:21         pass ge 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
1662:7 1663:7 1668:9       1693:13 1697:24       1645:14 1648:19       participate 1572:20       1606:9 1607:10,19         1688:18       1698:25 1699:2,18,19       1698:25 1699:2,18,19       overrule 1562:24       participate 1572:20       1606:9 1607:10,19         obligations 1569:19       1702:5,6 1704:20,23       1652:16       1652:16       1572:14       1641:24 1648:14         1662:25 1669:1 1692:7       1662:3,3 1663:16       operations 1661:21,22       overruled 1597:8       particular 1549:6       1684:5 1707:10         1652:1 1701:24       1662:23,3 1663:16       1605:11 1609:2       1579:9 1590:25       1708:3 1715:19,23         obtain 1711:20 1719:24       1680:18 1681:9,10       1680:18 1681:9,10       1680:2,12,25 1701:4       1673:13 1722:5       1693:7,9 1704:11         occasion 1573:22       1704:18 1709:10       1711:19 1714:12       1724:11       participate 1572:20       periodically 1677:1         169:14       Operator 1719:15,21       1704:18 1709:10       1718:24 1720:19       parts 1696:22       1693:3,18         occur 1686:20       opinion 1540:16       1544:13 1548:14,15       owe 1540:13       party 1676:4 1678:4       1692:25 1693:3,18         1565:9 1619:19       1549:2,3,11 1626:23       opinions 1539:19       passage 1603:1       1592:15 1633:23         October 1565:13 <t< td=""></t<>
1688:18         1698:25 1699:2,18,19         overrule 1562:24         participated 1560:15         1611:8,15,19 1619           obligations 1569:19         1702:5,6 1704:20,23         1675:16         participated 1560:15         1611:8,15,19 1619           1662:25 1663:19         operations 1661:21,22         operations 1661:21,22         overruled 1597:8         participated 1560:15         1641:24 1648:14           obtain 1711:20 1719:24         1662:3,3 1663:16         1605:11 1609:2         1579:9 1590:25         1708:3 1715:19,23           Obviously 1616:5         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:2,12,25 1701:4         1673:13 1722:5         1693:7,9 1704:11         periodically 1677:1           occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         parties 1582:4         1692:25 1693:3,18           occur 1686:20         opine 1548:10         opine 1548:10         overview 1679:15         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         opinions 1539:19         owned 1646:21         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
obligations         1569:19         1702:5,6 1704:20,23         1675:16         1572:14         1641:24 1648:14         1648:5 1707:10           1662:25 1663:19         1665:2 1669:1 1692:7         1662:3,3 1663:16         1605:11 1609:2         1579:9 1590:25         1708:3 1715:19,23           obtain 1711:20 1719:24         1676:22 1679:5,10,19         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:2,12,25 1701:4         1659:8 1666:11,14,22         periodically 1677:1           occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periods 1670:18           1665:9 1619:19         1548:10         opine 1548:10         opine 1548:14,15         overview 1679:15         parts 1696:22         permit 1665:25 1674           0ccour 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         person 1585:3,8           0ctober 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         1675:16         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
1662:25 1663:19         operations 1661:21,22         overruled 1597:8         particular 1549:6         1684:5 1707:10           1665:2 1669:1 1692:7         1662:3,3 1663:16         1605:11 1609:2         1579:9 1590:25         1708:3 1715:19,23           obtain 1711:20 1719:24         1676:22 1679:5,10,19         1677:9 1678:16,20         1659:8 1666:11,14,22         periodically 1677:1           Obviously 1616:5         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:2,12,25 1701:4         1673:13 1722:5         1693:7,9 1704:11           occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periodically 1670:18           169:14         Operator 1719:15,21         opine 1548:10         1718:24 1720:19         parts 1696:22         1705:3           occur 1686:20         opinion 1540:16         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           1565:9 1619:19         1544:13 1548:14,15         owe 1540:13         pass 1538:10         person 1585:3,8           occur 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
1665:2 1669:1 1692:7       1662:3,3 1663:16       1605:11 1609:2       1579:9 1590:25       1708:3 1715:19,23         obtain 1711:20 1719:24       1676:22 1679:5,10,19       1677:9 1678:16,20       1659:8 1666:11,14,22       periodically 1677:1         Obviously 1616:5       1680:18 1681:9,10       1680:2,12,25 1701:4       1673:13 1722:5       1693:7,9 1704:11         occasion 1573:22       1704:18 1709:10       1711:19 1714:12       1724:11       periods 1670:18         1619:14       Operator 1719:15,21       1715:6 1716:10       parties 1582:4       1692:25 1693:3,18         occur 1686:20       opine 1548:10       opinion 1540:16       parts 1696:22       1705:3         occurred 1562:21       opinion 1540:16       owe 1540:13       party 1676:4 1678:4       permit 1665:25 1674         1565:9 1619:19       1544:13 1548:14,15       owe 1540:13       pass 1538:10       person 1585:3,8         occor 1565:13       opinions 1539:19       passage 1603:1       1636:20 1638:2
obtain 1711:20 1719:24         1676:22 1679:5,10,19         1677:9 1678:16,20         1659:8 1666:11,14,22         periodically 1677:1           Obviously 1616:5         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:2,12,25 1701:4         1673:13 1722:5         1693:7,9 1704:11           occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periodically 1677:1           1619:14         Operator 1719:15,21         1715:6 1716:10         parties 1582:4         1692:25 1693:3,18           occur 1686:20         opine 1548:10         opinion 1540:16         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           1565:9 1619:19         1544:13 1548:14,15         owe 1540:13         pass 1538:10         person 1585:3,8           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         owned 1646:21         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
Obviously 1616:5         1680:18 1681:9,10         1680:2,12,25 1701:4         1673:13 1722:5         1693:7,9 1704:11           occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periods 1670:18           1619:14         Operator 1719:15,21         1715:6 1716:10         parties 1582:4         1692:25 1693:3,18           occur 1686:20         opine 1548:10         opinion 1540:16         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           1565:9 1619:19         1544:13 1548:14,15         owe 1540:13         pass 1538:10         person 1585:3,8           ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         1592:15 1633:23           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
occasion 1573:22         1704:18 1709:10         1711:19 1714:12         1724:11         periods 1670:18           1619:14         Operator 1719:15,21         1715:6 1716:10         parties 1582:4         1692:25 1693:3,18           occur 1686:20         opine 1548:10         1718:24 1720:19         parts 1696:22         1705:3           occurred 1562:21         opinion 1540:16         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           1565:9 1619:19         1544:13 1548:14,15         owe 1540:13         1715:15         person 1585:3,8           ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         1592:15 1633:23           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
1619:14         Operator 1719:15,21         1715:6 1716:10         parties 1582:4         1692:25 1693:3,18           occur 1686:20         opine 1548:10         1718:24 1720:19         parts 1696:22         1705:3           occurred 1562:21         opinion 1540:16         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           1565:9 1619:19         1544:13 1548:14,15         owe 1540:13         1715:15         person 1585:3,8           ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         1592:15 1633:23           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
occur 1686:20         opine 1548:10         1718:24 1720:19         parts 1696:22         1705:3           occurred 1562:21         opinion 1540:16         overview 1679:15         party 1676:4 1678:4         permit 1665:25 1674           1565:9 1619:19         1544:13 1548:14,15         owe 1540:13         1715:15         person 1585:3,8           ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         1592:15 1633:23           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
occurred         1565:9         1619:19         opinion         1540:16         owe 1540:13         party         1676:4         1678:4         permit         1665:25         1674           ocean         1670:9         1549:2,3,11         1626:23         owned         1646:21         pass         1538:10         1592:15         1633:23           October         1565:13         opinions         1539:19         passage         1603:1         1636:20         1638:2
1565:9 1619:19       1544:13 1548:14,15       owe 1540:13       1715:15       person 1585:3,8         ocean 1670:9       1549:2,3,11 1626:23       owned 1646:21       pass 1538:10       1592:15 1633:23         October 1565:13       opinions 1539:19       passage 1603:1       1636:20 1638:2
ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         1592:15 1633:23           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
ocean 1670:9         1549:2,3,11 1626:23         owned 1646:21         pass 1538:10         1592:15 1633:23           October 1565:13         opinions 1539:19         passage 1603:1         1636:20 1638:2
October 1565:13 opinions 1539:19 passage 1603:1 1636:20 1638:2
1589:14   1550:11 1660:6   P   passed 1572:9 1613:19   1663:15
off-peak 1715:12,18   opportunity 1650:21   p.m 1626:3 1715:21   1620:13 1638:12   personal 1607:11
1717:9,20 1651:13 1669:16,20 package 1564:5 passes 1689:11 personally 1638:6
offer 1548:15 1673:1 1669:25 page 1543:20 1554:8 path 1657:5 1690:4 1681:8,24 1683:8
1674:14 1675:18 opposed 1577:23 1564:7 1565:14,25 1713:3 persons 1535:10
1677:11 1683:22
1685:4 1686:25 opposite 1618:13 1580:18 1581:11,23 pause 1655:11 persuade 1646:1
offered 1637:18 1678:5   opposition 1538:23   1585:9 1587:22   pay 1555:2 1566:5   pertain 1580:23
1715:19   1545:18 1547:3,4,25   1589:10 1590:15   1567:11 1582:4,6   pertaining 1603:18
offers 1710:11 1712:8 1550:22 1551:16,19 1592:16 1602:20 1593:6,11 1594:6,10 pertinent 1590:8
1716:24 1720:13 1551:20 1649:2 1603:12 1607:7 1594:0,10 per tillent 1550:8
1776.24 1720.13   1331.20 1049.2   1003.12 1007.7   1394.23 1000.23   1391.0   1723:24   optimistic 1559:12   1608:2 1609:25   1601:3,11,15,25   petition 1574:15
Oh 1573:1 1599:2 1600:5 1644:1 1649:12 1677:16,16 peak 1663:7 1648:2 1690:20,20
okay 1550:23 1606:11
1607:5 1618:22
1625:10 1656:16
1676:11 1706:21
old 1664:18
on-peak 1552:3,8,12 1643:25 1677:17 1715:2 1676:25 1677:2,6,24 physically 1689:17
1654:20 1657:4,4,5   <b>options</b> 1566:1 1637:18   <b>paid</b> 1556:7 1561:17   1678:14,24   1692:10,11 1693:1

	ı	İ	ı	i
1693:20,20,21	1583:7 1614:24	1587:5,12 1598:19	1665:19	1560:1,4
1697:18,18,19 1699:8	1615:5 1629:14	1643:8 1644:7	proceed 1553:1,5	<b>proper</b> 1548:7 1595:14
1701:23 1702:2	1654:23 1661:19	presentations 1561:12	1607:24 1650:18,21	properly 1539:6,7
1705:24	1709:9 1713:11	presented 1549:7	proceedings 1535:15	1540:7 1548:19,21,23
pick 1725:23	positions 1580:2	1594:21	1727:11	1561:19 1593:4,10
picked 1658:12	1584:11	presenting 1564:11	process 1561:5 1574:21	proposal 1557:17
piece 1600:1 1628:21	possession 1659:12	presents 1546:21	1621:6,12,17,23	1651:17,20
1628:24	possible 1663:15,17,22	pressed 1549:24	1624:4 1628:12	proposed 1594:25
pipe 1569:12	1667:24 1668:2	presume 1628:7	processes 1560:13	1595:7,9,18 1596:9
pipeline 1697:13	1687:12,16 1701:23	1637:14	1615:17	1596:20 1619:21
pipelines 1705:4	1702:2,14 1705:25	pretrial 1580:13	produce 1543:5	1628:25 1649:6
place 1587:2 1653:5	1707:12	pretty 1546:1 1551:13	1571:20 1654:5,9,9	proud 1643:5
1680:5 1703:15,21	<b>possibly</b> 1539:4 1708:5	1570:8 1643:17	produced 1542:20	<b>provide</b> 1561:17
1708:10 1727:12	posted 1565:18,23	1645:3 1656:11	1543:2 1546:24,25	1568:22,24 1649:21
<b>Plaintiff</b> 1535:7 1536:2	potential 1557:23	1692:16	1552:5 1652:7,12,22	1649:22 1668:11
Plaintiff's 1558:8	1559:10 1703:5	previously 1553:19,23	1657:18 1659:6,17	1669:12 1675:6
<b>plan</b> 1545:21 1560:14	potentially 1564:25	1582:19 1716:8	1723:15	1680:8 1687:13
1616:12 1676:22	1670:5	1717:11,16 1719:13	producing 1543:3	1688:6 1695:24
planning 1661:21,23	power 1542:19 1543:1	price 1581:18 1582:20	production 1652:9	1696:6 1708:4
1662:3 1676:20	1543:25 1544:2	1582:24 1592:10,19	1723:16	1719:16 1722:21
1709:11	1548:9 1549:18,20,21	1595:1,4,9,18,22	productive 1615:17	provided 1549:15
<b>plant</b> 1666:8 1667:11	1552:3,12 1566:9	1596:3,8,10,13,20	professional 1709:24	1551:6,24 1561:24
1672:9 1692:23,24	1582:5,5,7,12,13,16	1599:18 1601:19	1709:25	1565:2 1566:20
1697:7 1723:11,15,20	1582:16,22 1583:15	1602:7 1611:1,3	program 1672:8	1569:1 1603:3 1608:2
plants 1673:24	1583:17 1589:6,18	1612:18 1613:12,15	1683:14	1649:25 1662:20
<b>Platt's</b> 1716:15	1590:1 1591:19	1639:6,10 1643:19	prohibited 1605:1,15	1664:7 1666:19
<b>Platts</b> 1552:4,6 1654:19	1647:13,14 1649:14	1647:1 1657:6 1712:2	project 1539:5,23,25	1668:4,10 1670:12
1657:20 1711:6,7,20	1652:20 1653:2,10	1713:2,8,25 1715:8	1543:1,9,9,25 1544:7	1674:3 1675:25
1719:17 1721:14	1655:4 1657:9,14	1715:15,24 1716:1	1546:20 1549:18	1708:10
pleading 1580:17	1658:5 1709:10,16	1717:2 1718:6 1720:7	1560:20,25 1572:5	provides 1564:25
please 1555:20 1570:4	1710:15,17,19,20	1720:21	1574:3 1585:22	1575:22 1584:11
1603:11 1607:25	1712:12,25 1713:15	priced 1712:25	1589:2,5,20 1591:20	1621:19 1670:24
1630:8 1640:3 1661:5	1713:21 1714:3,3,10	prices 1582:21 1711:15	1611:25 1640:17	1676:24 1688:24
1662:15 1669:21	1715:9,14,17 1717:2	1713:18 1715:21	1646:21 1649:14	1689:2 1701:15
1673:17 1676:9	1717:7,8,13,17,21	1721:4	1652:20 1653:15,17	1713:14
1683:1 1684:3	1718:3,6,9,15,23	pricing 1711:10	1653:19 1658:7,15	providing 1621:7
1687:10 1692:20	1720:17 1721:7,17	1716:14,22	1664:10,11 1665:14	1622:2 1669:1 1677:3
1694:13 1695:9,14	1722:6,8,9,13,21,22	Primarily 1702:11	1665:23 1666:25	provision 1568:20
1698:16 1702:8	1722:24 1723:11,13	primary 1704:11	1667:15,20 1668:20	1570:4 1592:19
1708:24,24 1710:4,21	1723:14,15,15,20	principles 1540:19	1669:6,11,13,19,23	1594:12 1602:13,16
1716:2,18 1719:8	1725:11,12	<b>prior</b> 1559:16 1614:10	1670:8,12,15,16,23	1603:24 1608:12
1720:24 1725:16	practicable 1688:7	1633:16 1668:16	1671:1,3 1672:10	1612:13 1636:15
plenary 1633:8	practical 1705:22,25	1669:8 1684:6	1674:2 1680:21	provisions 1571:14
plumbing 1666:8	practically 1705:23	private 1586:7	1681:12,21 1682:19	1622:9
Pocklington 1630:24	practice 1546:6	pro 1597:18 1598:2	1683:15,21 1684:7	proviso 1602:25 1603:2
point 1546:2 1553:15	precedence 1570:13	probably 1549:9	1685:1 1686:8,12	1603:10 1605:17,21
1554:13 1561:10	precedent 1569:16	1550:4 1588:23	1688:7,20 1689:14,18	1608:1,15,17,19,20
1562:13 1590:19	preceding 1684:14	1632:10 1651:11	1690:13 1691:17,17	1609:6,7,9,15
1607:6 1616:10	preclude 1603:4	1655:11 1659:9	1692:22 1693:4	1610:18
1625:6 1689:6,8	precluded 1602:11	1663:23 1664:19	1697:15 1699:16	PTX 1541:4,13 1558:8
1699:25 1703:16	preliminary 1547:23	1670:21 1678:7	1702:13,16 1703:1,8	1568:21 1575:8
1713:8	premise 1543:8	1680:25	1703:20 1704:2	1602:20 1682:9,11
points 1545:16 1711:10	preparation 1676:2	problem 1544:21	1705:8,14,23 1706:1	1695:8,11 1698:1,11
portion 1578:3 1592:14	prepare 1598:13	1546:21 1558:2	1706:12 1709:18	1698:17
1722:7 1724:22	prepared 1545:19	1559:11,13,14	1725:11	public 1565:18,20
portions 1579:23	1568:17 1601:25	1560:11 1618:10	projection 1600:3	1566:12 1574:9
1646:9	1683:8	1649:5 1652:17,18,19	projections 1566:21	1597:2,12 1645:20
<b>position</b> 1579:15,20	present 1584:15,20,22	problems 1653:8	promoted 1559:24	publication 1711:5
		l		l

1712:13 1716:15 publications 1712:16 publicly 1551:6 1719:25 **publish** 1712:13 published 1566:7 1583:10 1674:13 publishing 1719:18 **pump** 1571:12 1722:16 1725:12 pumped 1723:21 pumps 1570:21 1722:14 **PURCELL** 1536:4 purchase 1658:6 1715:14 purchased 1576:20 purchases 1685:25 1717:17 purchasing 1710:15 1715:17 1717:13 **pure** 1697:19 1701:23 1704:5 1705:19 purely 1693:6 1702:5 purports 1538:14,18 1552:7 **purpose** 1712:1 1714:11 1718:20 1720:5,22 **purposes** 1568:2 1704:17 1714:8 **pursuant** 1574:16 1654:24 1671:4 1680:21 1681:13 **pursuing** 1558:22 put 1538:13 1539:6,7 1539:12,21 1542:20 1543:3,24 1544:2,7 1544:11,19 1549:23 1575:11,11 1590:16 1626:25 1652:4,22 1653:14 1656:22,23 1692:20

#### Q

**OSA** 1556:5 1557:3 1558:23 1559:8 1580:12 1581:6 quality 1570:3,7,9 1665:8 1671:17,19,20 1673:11,18,20 1688:23 1704:17 Quantification 1563:19 **question** 1547:21 1549:10 1550:16,17 1558:1,6 1571:18 1573:24 1579:8,13,19 1579:22 1580:1

1583:8 1584:13 1600:9 1604:23 1607:2,4 1609:4,5,16 1610:23 1613:22 1619:22 1623:22 1627:3 1629:13 1631:16 1637:10 1660:3.4 1675:12 1678:5 1679:17,18 1680:15 1686:23 1700:23 1704:21 1706:17,19 1710:25 1717:24 questions 1550:13,20 1571:23,25 1572:4 1574:2,7,25 1575:1,2 1575:5 1584:7 1587:21 1592:8 1600:22 1601:1 1611:14 1634:21 1646:11 1648:8 1701:22,25 1705:24 1713:12 1725:5,6 quick 1564:14 **Quickly** 1681:16 **Quinn** 1536:13 1545:6 1545:8,14,23 1546:23 1550:21,24 1551:4 1558:13,15 1560:21 1562:23 1563:4 1567:7 1572:2 1574:1 1575:8 1580:5,16,17 1597:7,11 1605:7,13 1606:11 1607:24 1608:1,25 1609:6 1615:4 1618:23 1619:3 1625:6,9 1626:14 1634:12,17 1639:16 1642:25 1643:4,7 1645:15 1648:24 1655:11,16 1656:17 1660:21 1661:12 1673:1.5 1674:14,17,23 1675:18,23 1676:4,12 1677:11,21 1678:8,11 1678:22 1679:3,19 1680:7,17 1681:8 1682:9 1683:5,7,22 1684:2 1685:4,8 1686:25 1687:2,11,18 1701:21 1706:4,16 1708:15 1725:2,21 **QUINN, ESQ** 1536:14 quite 1551:17 1695:22 1698:19 1720:17 quote 1548:11 1602:3

1621:3,16

## R radical 1576:24 1577:14 1578:13 radically 1577:10,16 1577:20 1578:8,18 raised 1547:13 1555:11 1560:16 random 1677:18 range 1644:2

rate 1539:7 1540:2,18 1540:18,18,20 1542:4 1544:11 1554:15 1555:1,12 1557:13,16 1558:4 1560:14 1561:4 1563:2,3 1564:19,22 1566:6,7 1567:11,15 1579:12 1581:19,25,25 1582:11,13,15,16,22 1582:25 1583:4,9,10 1583:11,15,17,20,22 1584:17,23 1585:11 1585:15,24 1586:12 1586:25 1587:9,15,19 1589:21 1590:1,4,5 1590:22 1591:2,11,19 1591:20,21 1592:11 1592:24,25 1593:2,4 1593:9,15,25 1595:1 1595:14 1598:21 1599:14 1600:4,6,7 1600:14,15,23 1601:4 1601:8,15,22 1602:1 1602:22 1610:2,10,22 1612:1 1613:7 1615:9 1616:23 1617:5,6,7,8 1617:10,11,23 1618:5 1618:12,20 1619:7,10

1619:15,18,21,25

1625:3 1627:19

1628:8 1629:9

1631:24 1633:15

1638:9,16 1640:9,18

1641:17,17,19 1642:6

1642:7,8 1644:18,20

1645:22 1646:18,23

1654:20 1657:14

1658:4,6 1660:1

1717:22 1718:2

1721:20 1722:8

rate-setting 1635:15

rates 1535:10 1540:6

1540:11 1542:7

1710:19,20 1713:4

1714:22 1715:7,10,12

1715:20 1717:12,18

1647:11,13,16 1653:2

1622:22 1623:7,16,24

1613:9,18 1614:3,12 1615:9,23 1616:21,24 1617:2,4,21 1618:7,8 1618:19,21,24 1619:8 1619:12,15,24 1620:2 1620:9,23 1621:3,6 1621:21,24 1622:1,21 1623:12,22,25 1624:3 1624:12,16 1625:3 1626:19,21 1627:4,18 1627:21 1628:11,19 1628:25 1629:1 1630:10 1631:2,7,18 1631:22 1632:6,13,17 1633:3,10,15,19 1635:3,4,5,7,9,11,13 1635:17,19,21,23,24 1636:1,2,8,12,18,25 1637:6,17,21 1639:2 1639:23 1648:10,11 1657:10 1658:2,2,5 1658:11 1712:12 1718:23 1722:2 rationale 1540:3 raw 1672:9 1682:1,5 re-cross 1545:25 **reaches** 1663:6 read 1547:2,4,25 1551:16,19 1554:9 1565:20 1568:23 1585:1,7 1589:8 1590:14 1592:14 1614:6 1623:4 1629:10,12,13 1633:22 1639:14 1640:20 1649:2 1688:16 **reading** 1551:20 1603:24 1615:4 readings 1672:7 reads 1564:10 1610:1 ready 1553:5 real 1703:11,12 1705:25 really 1547:12,14,21 1612:6 1632:1 1651:9 1658:24

1544:1 1548:11,16 reason 1545:2 1584:5 1549:18 1552:3 1669:3 1697:23 1698:22 1704:15 1557:23 1561:24 1564:20,21 1572:6 1724:11 1578:7.8 1581:24 reasonable 1548:6.11 1588:16,21 1590:9 1548:15 1628:14 1597:22 1599:3,19,24 1713:21 1601:11 1604:13.21 reasonably 1539:7 1605:2,8,8,20,22 1621:6,17 1624:7 1628:15 1606:9 1610:4,11,20 1612:13,21 1613:1,4 reasons 1544:24 1663:23 1665:1,6,7 1668:24 1670:11 1699:18,19 1702:5,6 1702:9,11 1716:8 rebuttal 1551:21 recall 1572:3,6,12 1573:13 1574:6,9 1575:4,6,7 1576:13 1584:3,8,14,19,21,25 1585:12,23 1586:11 1587:20 1588:13 1589:7 1592:12,21 1594:14,23,25 1597:22 1598:6,11 1601:1,4 1611:16 1613:22,24 1614:9 1615:8 1618:3 1622:14 1625:7,8 1627:13 1632:23,24 1644:3 1648:2 1651:13 1694:2 1700:12,19,20 1701:25 1704:21 receive 1680:6 1696:18 1722:22 1723:18 received 1538:10,11 1567:9 1598:18 1641:2 1642:15 1656:10 1673:3 1674:21,25 1678:21 1680:21 1681:21 1682:20 1684:1 1685:7 1687:6 1704:8 1705:15 1710:13 1719:7 1720:23 receives 1567:21

1643:10 1668:14

1690:22 1700:1

receiving 1538:18

1705:19,20

1680:10 1681:13

1687:7,9 1726:1

1570:18 1571:4

Reclamation 1559:16

1695:1,5,12 1698:2

recess 1552:19 1625:12

1723:14

1698:13	refers 1604:9 1656:7	reminding 1634:14	1620:16 1622:8,12,13	1564:5,13 1568:5,10
recognize 1566:18	refinement 1560:15	renovation 1664:15	1622:14,19 1624:18	1569:14 1570:5
			1627:25 1629:24	
1695:11 1698:13	1561:5	reopen 1539:15		1578:19 1579:23
1711:2 1716:11,18	reflect 1683:18	reopened 1539:16	1637:9	1583:19 1587:10
1719:9 1720:25	reflected 1649:8	repeat 1604:23 1609:5	resolutions 1628:5,8	1594:18 1596:5
recognized 1555:16	1714:17,20 1717:8,9	1679:18 1690:6	1629:9,15,17 1630:3	1601:9 1606:7,24
recollection 1565:12	reflecting 1613:14	1700:13	resolve 1620:19	1607:12 1610:11,19
1574:12 1584:18	reflects 1610:8 1678:25	repeatedly 1555:11	resolved 1558:3	1612:2,15 1615:23
1585:25 1589:9	1679:11,22,25 1680:3	rephrased 1666:17	resources 1542:19	1616:6,15 1618:15
recommendation	1680:9 1683:19	replace 1665:22	1574:10 1649:13	1623:20 1630:13
1596:19 1620:24	1713:8	<b>Reply</b> 1580:11	1709:17	1637:11,13,17
1621:25 1630:16,19	refresh 1565:11	report 1538:21 1539:3	respect 1547:8 1548:1	1640:22 1643:13
1638:5 1640:8	reg 1590:25	1548:2,5 1550:12	1549:5 1647:1	1644:11,16 1645:8,9
recommendations	regarding 1559:10	1639:24 1650:23	1648:18 1653:2	1646:1 1647:5
1621:5 1627:20	1560:14,16,24	1654:13 1673:20	1658:9	1649:18,22 1659:19
recommended 1561:7	1567:13 1588:16	1680:8 1695:11	respects 1577:21	1664:24,25 1666:5
1595:23 1596:7	1626:23 1627:21	1711:8,11	respond 1545:20	1684:25 1688:7,14,20
1625:1,2 1627:17	1633:5	Reported 1535:19	Respondent 1536:11	1688:24 1689:7
1631:1 1637:3,16	regional 1714:16	<b>Reporter</b> 1727:9,24	Respondents 1535:14	1690:9,24 1691:4,6
1638:1 1645:6	registered 1709:25	REPORTER'S	1580:11	1691:13,18 1692:1,17
reconcile 1542:6	regular 1587:1 1628:9	1535:15 1727:1	responding 1551:2	1693:2,5,9 1694:7,22
reconciliation 1542:7	1671:8	reports 1541:18	response 1541:5 1545:9	1695:18 1697:3
reconsider 1610:16	regularly 1694:18	1542:11 1552:4,6	1556:4,16 1557:16	1698:20 1699:18
record 1539:12	1712:3 1720:8	1627:19,24 1650:7	1574:1,6 1575:4	1706:23 1707:1,7
1540:21 1554:21	regulation 1567:13	1711:7,21,23 1712:1	1584:6 1587:20	1708:4,11 1718:13
1563:8 1564:2 1630:6	1591:1 1603:17	1712:3,6 1721:14	1592:7 1610:23	1722:11
1634:11,15,16 1651:2	1604:3	representatives	1611:14 1613:22	right-hand 1715:3
1652:4 1655:15	regulations 1603:7	1616:20 1617:2	1650:9 1659:5	<b>rights</b> 1557:3 1564:18
1658:15,18,22	relate 1658:11	1619:23	responses 1650:1	1566:4 1610:21
1702:16 1708:25	related 1550:19 1583:2	representing 1656:11	responsibilities	1723:14
1712:10 1725:17,18	1588:6 1620:2 1641:6	represents 1662:18	1709:14 1711:24	risk 1556:17,17
1725:19	1643:11 1687:15	1720:20	1720:3	1601:24 1705:11
records 1542:10	1705:6	request 1551:9 1639:17	responsible 1661:25	risks 1566:13,18
1546:10 1671:14,16	relates 1583:14	1652:9	1662:2 1709:15	River 1544:2,18
1681:18,19	1646:20 1647:25	requested 1567:22,23	1710:15	1567:22 1568:16,18
recover 1548:7	1656:9	1575:10 1656:14	responsive 1650:16	1569:2,18,24 1570:10
<b>RECROSS</b> 1537:2	relating 1584:14	requests 1552:15	1655:22	1570:15 1571:8
RECROSS-EXAMI	1686:3	1655:22 1658:1	restated 1548:13	1576:11 1653:11
1645:18 1706:7	relation 1635:25	1659:14	restricted 1603:25	1657:9,10 1663:20
redirect 1537:2 1554:2	relative 1598:9 1599:3	require 1542:8 1550:9	restriction 1608:6	1664:3,8,12 1665:3
1572:1 1701:18,20	1681:11	required 1568:25	1611:12	1665:11,14,20 1666:1
reduce 1556:5	relevance 1710:24	1622:1 1624:16	result 1562:17 1591:13	1666:24 1667:14,21
reduced 1727:13	relevant 1717:4	1629:1 1636:17	resumed 1554:5 1626:6	1668:4,11,21,25
reduction 1723:1	reliability 1676:2	1695:23 1725:11	1626:13	1669:2,12 1670:13,15
refer 1609:15 1629:22	relied 1712:22	requirements 1578:4	retrospective 1542:5	1671:4,25 1674:2
1637:12 1714:15	relief 1651:5	1709:16,18	retrospectively 1542:3	1680:20 1681:12,21
reference 1586:2,3	relies 1677:22	requires 1541:1	revenue 1542:6	1682:20 1684:8
1591:16 1593:18	rely 1579:11 1592:4	1544:16 1688:5,22	revenues 1542:11	1685:3,13,22 1686:8
1646:18	1655:16 1656:13	1722:16	1622:1 1624:16	1686:10,16 1689:7,8
referred 1590:4	1677:2,7,25 1712:6	reservation 1556:25	1629:1 1635:13	1689:11,21 1690:1,13
1594:16 1600:19	1720:11	1557:2 1610:21	1636:6	1691:18,21,22 1692:4
1604:9 1611:15	remain 1710:9	reserve 1555:5 1580:15	reviewed 1640:20	1692:14,15,22 1693:2
1642:11 1667:1	remaining 1651:23	1610:10	1692:19 1710:7	1693:6,16,23 1694:15
1678:24 1710:5	remedies 1558:22	reserving 1610:19	right 1547:12 1549:6	1694:19,20,21 1695:3
referring 1577:5	remember 1554:1	reservoir 1667:8	1550:14 1552:2,19	1695:17 1696:3,14,18
1628:10,22 1642:2	1632:19	1680:4 1687:14	1555:6 1556:25	1696:21,25 1697:6,12
1669:4 1672:13	<b>Remind</b> 1621:12	reservoirs 1664:11	1557:8,11 1558:4,12	1698:6,18,24 1699:9
1702:25 1715:3	reminded 1567:5	resolution 1620:5,7,12	1562:18 1563:16	1699:22 1700:1
	•	1	•	•

1701:24 1702:9,12 1703:9,21 1704:6 1705:16,20 1706:2,12 1707:6,19 1709:16 1714:17 1722:14 1723:12 Robert 1563:24 Ron 1586:15 roughly 1592:20 1662:14 1663:11 1664:1 1686:22 route 1704:18 routed 1704:6 rows 1700:5 RPR 1535:20 1727:23 **RSI** 1586:16,16 rtae 1584:15 rule 1712:21 ruled 1543:25 ruling 1539:21 1540:1 1540:4,5,10 1543:11 1544:10 1580:15 1650:21 1653:16 1725:4 rulings 1548:20 run 1653:11 1664:24 running 1546:11 1665:18 runs 1664:22

**S** 1536:5 Sacramento 1581:6 sale 1713:15 salinity 1671:18 1703:13 San 1535:2,6,16,17,24 1536:6 1538:1 1541:18,22,22 1544:8 1544:15,21 1549:16 1549:17 1556:6,18 1557:3 1558:3,21 1559:4 1561:4 1563:19 1564:18,18 1564:20,22 1567:10 1567:20 1568:4 1569:20 1570:1,17 1572:5 1574:15,17 1576:18 1577:1 1578:24 1579:14,20 1580:2,8,18,20,21 1581:4 1584:11 1585:2,8 1588:20 1589:17 1591:9 1592:10,15 1594:25 1595:7,9,18,23 1597:2,12 1599:4,21 1600:23 1601:3,14

1604:12,19,24 1605:7 1605:8 1606:13 1608:17,19 1609:8,22 1610:9,25 1611:5 1612:8,17,20,25 1613:8,11 1614:12 1616:1.8.19.22 1617:1,16,19 1618:4 1619:13,23 1622:10 1622:10,17,17 1623:2 1623:3,6,9,11 1624:2 1624:19,24 1625:1 1626:1 1627:13,17 1628:2,4 1629:5,14 1630:2,5,6,19 1631:1 1631:5,6,19 1632:5 1633:1,18,24 1637:2 1637:3,3,16,25 1638:1 1639:1,5,16 1639:22 1640:5,25 1641:1,16,18 1642:5 1642:7,15 1643:10,18 1643:25 1644:7,9,17 1644:20 1645:4,10,20 1645:25 1646:6 1647:18 1648:9 1649:6,16 1650:1,5,5 1651:1,2,13 1655:22 1656:5,5 1662:5,8,22 1663:19 1664:7 1665:17,21 1666:1,10 1666:20 1667:4,16 1668:5,9,13 1669:12 1670:13 1671:4 1674:3 1675:1,4,24 1676:5,18,22,23,25 1676:25 1677:6,23,24 1678:6,9,14,23,24 1679:4,5,7,10,20 1680:18 1681:9,10,11 1681:21 1682:2,3,6,7 1682:13,15,20 1683:20 1684:19 1685:11,14,19,25 1686:17 1687:13,25 1688:23 1689:1,10,25 1690:9,13,16,18,21 1692:2 1693:6,16,23 1695:24 1696:22 1697:6,13,14,16,20 1698:24 1699:10,22 1699:25 1700:4 1703:19 1704:6,8,12 1705:15,19 1706:2,10 1707:5,7,12,15,18 1708:1,11 1712:17 1724:22

1602:8,21 1603:4,25

sandbag 1544:23 sandbagging 1653:7 **SANDFORD** 1535:20 1727:8,23 Santa 1727:5,9,18 satisfy 1663:18 1665:2 1691:12 1692:6 **Saturday** 1715:22 save 1660:12 savings 1597:21 saw 1538:22 1555:18 1568:13 1569:11 1652:12 1683:14 saving 1574:6 1586:3 1595:12 1615:8 1619:9 1629:19 1659:5 says 1542:2,4,7 1544:22 1558:20 1564:17 1566:2,13,17 1566:22 1567:10 1568:24 1569:13 1571:15 1581:12,12 1593:23,24 1594:5 1603:2,13 1606:7,13 1608:2 1610:13 1614:12 1616:14 1620:17,22 1621:2,15 1630:9,15,22 1638:3 1640:17 1654:19 1657:13 1678:12 1688:8 1715:4 1717:25 1719:1 SB15 1713:3 scenario 1599:11 1600:12 1644:9 scenarios 1599:15 **schedule** 1641:14 1662:18,20 1698:2,13 scheduled 1582:5 scheduling 1721:5,7,15 1721:17 1722:9 science 1709:20,22 scope 1579:1,6 1581:14 Scott's 1591:16 **scrape** 1665:9 screen 1546:17 1575:18 1634:7 1695:10 **SDCWA** 1548:12,19 1556:20 1566:1 1567:12,15 1603:13 **SDWCA's** 1656:2 se 1583:5 seated 1661:5 1708:24 second 1550:17 1554:20 1564:7 1565:14,25 1566:2 1568:9 1577:22

1578:21 1602:25 1603:2,10,12 1607:7 1630:9 1640:23 1681:6 1687:24 1706:5 1722:18 secret 1553:10 section 1581:22 1582:1 1603:11 1608:1 1611:15 1616:2 1620:22 1621:2,15 1639:17 1661:21,22 1688:2,5 1712:15 secure 1566:25 see 1543:13 1545:11 1555:16 1558:20 1563:15 1566:10,15 1571:2 1576:3 1580:14,15 1581:1,11 1581:12,15 1582:9,11 1582:12,14,18 1589:9 1590:7 1591:6,9,18 1591:24 1593:23 1594:14 1598:21,25 1599:11 1602:17 1603:8,22 1608:7 1610:6 1616:13 1617:24 1620:7,10,16 1620:20,25 1621:10 1622:4,23 1625:10 1630:11.17 1640:11 1640:13,16 1653:23 1654:11 1655:15 1656:8 1657:4 1659:23 1683:7,17 1684:23,25 1686:13 1687:8 1695:20 1698:3,4 1700:23 1710:25 1717:3 1721:23 seek 1567:12 1603:14 1604:20,25 1606:14 1606:22 **seeking** 1603:25 1605:15,23 1648:14 1648:16,19 seen 1538:24 1624:24 1629:17 1657:1,7 1724:3 self-interest 1562:6 sell 1710:19 1713:21 1714:10 1718:6,9 selling 1713:20 1714:3 1715:9 1718:12 1720:16 sells 1688:5 1717:7 1718:23 send 1665:19 1679:21 1706:24 1707:11

sends 1678:9,11 sense 1552:23 1654:8 1725:1 sent 1556:23 1565:16 1565:17 1609:22 1640:14 1649:6 1676:6 sentence 1557:2.15 1566:3,22 1609:25 separate 1667:22,25 1668:17,21 **September** 1563:20 1565:11,25 series 1560:13 1659:10 1713:1 serious 1556:17 serve 1691:15 served 1655:22 service 1540:19 1541:17 1542:5,9,12 1543:12,14 1561:16 1581:24 1582:7 1601:22 1621:5,7,12 1621:17,18,19,23 1622:2 1624:4 1625:3 1627:18,24 1628:12 1630:13 1633:15 1639:23 1650:7 1664:2,15 1685:23,25 1689:19.22 1725:13 **services** 1535:23 1624:8 1628:15 session 1587:22 1596:2 1633:8 set 1540:11 1560:14 1564:11 1569:15 1570:13 1582:1 1601:15 1602:1,7 1603:6,19 1608:20,21 1609:8,10,14 1610:11 1634:9,10 1636:17 1642:4 1655:13 1713:18 sets 1583:8 setting 1564:23 1644:6 1722:2 **settled** 1612:4 Settlement 1563:19 seven 1580:18 1590:15 1640:24 share 1676:21 sheet 1563:20 1564:7 1564:14 1671:18 1672:7 1674:25 1683:13 sheets 1716:15 shift 1556:20 1668:18 **shifted** 1557:25

<b>shifting</b> 1557:18	1657:2 1659:18	sorts 1547:8 1550:7	1633:6 1637:2,3,15	1717:15 1719:23
1562:20	1660:13	sound 1664:24	1637:25 1638:5	1725:11 1727:3,9,25
short 1542:13 1552:17	Skillman's 1552:2	sounds 1547:3 1551:17	1641:25 1647:22	stated 1554:24 1610:15
1566:22 1670:18	1651:25 1652:6	1664:25	1681:3	1716:8 1717:1
1702:17	Skinner 1665:18	source 1568:19 1649:8	staff's 1630:16	statement 1590:11
<b>Shorthand</b> 1727:8,24	1666:4,6,7,7,8 1667:1	1672:23 1684:20,21	stage 1564:11	1593:9 1608:23
show 1561:18 1567:17	1667:4,6,7,11,12,17	1720:6 1721:12,24	stand 1545:23 1552:20	1610:8,17 1642:5
1653:4 1654:19	1667:20 1668:3,8,16	sources 1568:8 1649:15	1626:6 1660:22	statements 1538:15
1673:15 1675:9	1672:9 1680:6	1684:12,24 1691:5	standard 1676:3	1713:1
1684:17 1685:9	1687:14,15,15	South 1536:15 1657:5	1715:22 1721:19	states 1605:4 1711:16
1686:6 1717:5	1692:23,24 1693:1	<b>South</b> 1535:15 1637:5	standards 1621:22	statistics 1677:14
showed 1602:25 1603:1	1697:1,7,9,11,21	1536:12 1580:10	1624:13 1628:20	status 1673:11,18
1629:18	1698:25 1701:24	1620:8,18 1709:7,23	1703:12,13	1674:25 1676:21
showing 1553:11	1702:10,19 1703:15	1715:10 1722:20	standing 1716:3,5	statute 1540:25 1574:5
1714:9	1702:10,15 1703:15	1723:4	standing 1710.3,5 standstill 1600:19	1578:1
shown 1564:4 1699:14	1704:7,10,14,19	SP15 1657:4,23	1603:2	statutes 1579:17
shows 1553:13 1563:8	1704:7,10,14,19	1714:21 1715:4,8,11	Stapleton 1537:3	1581:1
1672:7,9 1673:14	1700:11,13,23 1707:1	1717:6,25 1719:18	1545:23 1553:4,18	stays 1670:8
1675:13 1683:11,12	skip 1566:12	1721:4	1545.25 1555.4,18	stenotype 1727:12
1684:4 1685:2,10,12	Slater 1554:12 1564:4	space 1575:24 1576:2,6	1571:18 1585:12	stenotype 1727.12 step 1640:23 1694:14
1686:10 1717:8	1572:25 1574:24	1576:16 1577:11,23	1626:5,15	step 1040.23 1094.14 stewardship 1539:7
shut 1660:14 1663:24	1575:14,20 1584:22	1578:22	start 1549:10 1607:16	1540:2,20 1544:11
1668:2	1575.14,20 1384.22	speaking 1549:8	1673:7 1725:21	1540.2,20 1544.11
shutdown 1664:8	1588:19 1590:2,7,12	specific 1541:22 1575:7	started 1635:5 1687:24	1581:25 1583:20,22
1691:21,23 1692:3	1592:4 1593:7,23	1580:3 1584:21	started 1033.3 1007.24	1584:15,17,23
shutdowns 1691:18	1594:4,13	1589:7 1650:5 1655:7	1602:20	1585:11,15,24
side 1545:6 1547:1	Slater's 1575:4 1585:7	1655:25 1656:1	starts 1660:5	1586:11 1587:15,17
1553:12 1562:13	1586:1 1589:8,23	1659:4,5 1677:14	state 1535:1 1539:5,21	1588:5 1590:4
1573:2 1586:13,19	1590:14 1592:15	1722:6	1539:23,25 1542:18	1591:20 1612:1
1660:16 1715:3	1594:22	specifically 1550:25	1543:1,8,9,25 1544:7	1640:18
sides 1546:7	slide 1538:13 1598:17	1551:23 1632:19,24	1544:19 1546:20	stick 1654:3
signed 1555:15 1565:12	1598:18,23	1637:7 1650:20	1549:1,18 1551:20	stop 1562:18 1634:12
1590:10 1591:22	slight 1561:7	1705:17	1560:20,24 1572:5	1634:13 1666:5
1592:9 1593:8	sold 1657:9 1710:17	specified 1582:25	1574:3,10 1585:22	stopping 1625:5
1594:17	1714:16 1718:2	1699:12	1589:2,5,20 1591:19	stops 1719:18
significantly 1692:16	sole 1568:7,12 1690:3,7	speculate 1540:6,11	1611:25 1640:17	storage 1662:2 1702:21
similar 1628:4,5	solely 1665:3 1668:25	speculating 1656:17	1641:7 1646:21	store 1669:15,24
1629:15	1669:2 1717:5	speculative 1540:17,18	1649:14 1652:20	1670:3
similarly 1655:3	solids 1673:23	spell 1661:7 1708:25	1653:14,17,18 1658:7	
simple 1551:13	solutions 1651:10	spend 1645:25	1661:7 1664:10,11	1707:7 1708:11
1642:19	solve 1559:10,13	spent 1559:17 1721:18	1665:14,22 1666:25	Street 1535:24 1536:6
simply 1659:1 1668:11	solver 1559:14	spoke 1584:3 1585:19	1667:15,20 1668:20	1536:15,19
1703:7 1707:15	somebody 1542:13	1586:15,21 1679:5	1669:6,11,13,19,23	stricken 1652:5
single 1599:22	1549:23 1552:7	1707:13	1670:8,12,14,16,22	strike 1563:4 1651:1,11
sir 1562:15 1571:25	1651:8,14 1659:10	spot 1544:3 1549:12	1671:1,3,24 1672:10	1658:20,22 1681:6
1580:4 1586:16	1675:3	1559:20 1712:11	1674:2 1680:20	structure 1554:15
1596:11 1597:1	Somebody's 1657:20	spreadsheet 1549:19	1681:12,20 1682:19	1555:1 1557:13,17
1607:17 1632:15	sorry 1546:8 1558:15	1549:23 1550:3,8,9	1683:15,20 1684:7	1590:22 1591:2
sit 1701:11	1573:25 1579:25	spreadsheets 1549:17	1685:1 1686:7,11	1610:2,10 1616:24
sits 1570:20	1600:10 1607:15,17	1649:9	1688:6,20 1689:14,18	1617:5,6,10,11,23
sitting 1629:11	1616:25 1632:3	spring 1635:2,7,10	1690:12 1691:16,17	1618:5,12,20,25
six 1553:12 1575:13	1637:11 1638:13	1636:2,11	1692:22 1693:3	1619:7,10,15,25
1581:23	1666:13 1671:12	squarely 1658:1	1697:15 1699:15	1622:22 1623:8,17,24
sixth 1538:13 1564:8	1674:17 1682:4,25	ss 1727:4	1702:13,16 1703:1,8	1625:3 1627:19
<b>Skillman</b> 1541:25	1700:13	staff 1560:15 1561:7	1703:12,20 1704:1	1633:15 1641:17,18
1542:2 1545:15	sort 1543:4 1549:24	1565:11 1597:19	1705:12,20 1704:1	1641:19 1642:6,7,8
1546:3 1549:5,13,19	1551:1 1689:6	1598:13 1630:20	1706:12 1708:24	structuring 1572:22
1552:19 1651:24	sorted 1655:9	1631:1,23 1632:10	1700:12 1700:24	studies 1541:21 1650:3
1002.17 1001.21		1051.1,25 1052.10	1,05.10,211,10.1	
	1	l	I	I
				Page 18

1655:24	1703:6 1705:5,6,11	<b>Tab</b> 1649:25 1700:21	tell 1539:20 1542:17,24	1546:9,12,14,15
study 1543:12,14	support 1541:3	table 1573:13 1685:21	1547:6 1553:6 1592:3	1547:20,23 1548:2,17
1561:16 1700:25	1603:14 1606:14	1715:3	1594:2 1596:7,9,18	1548:18 1549:4
stuff 1540:24 1658:19	1617:9 1622:20,21	tail 1552:13	1596:21 1626:20	1550:9,10 1567:20
1658:25	1623:16,24 1629:12	take 1539:11 1542:23	1627:3,7 1633:10	1577:15,24 1588:13
sub 1581:22,23	1641:17 1642:7	1542:25 1551:15	1649:18,22 1657:3	1589:23 1594:13
subject 1546:11	<b>supported</b> 1547:18	1552:17,21 1554:20	1658:1,12,12 1661:23	1602:23 1611:2
1547:24 1550:10	1621:5 1624:4	1568:17,18 1571:5,20	1662:15 1663:17	1613:25 1614:7,7
1574:14 1581:13	1628:11,17	1575:8 1580:5	1664:13 1667:3	1617:13 1623:5
1610:4 1634:19	supports 1621:23	1581:21 1592:1	1670:10 1671:19	1632:4 1637:21
1636:21 1640:8	suppose 1649:7	1597:8 1601:24	1673:8,17 1677:6	1641:25 1648:3
1649:19 1650:19	1692:12 1703:10	1602:16,19 1606:3	1678:14 1679:11,21	1652:14 1654:10,16
1651:1 1658:8,20	1708:5	1609:17 1610:3	1679:24 1680:7,17	1655:1 1657:1,24
1659:21 1676:24	supposed 1634:5	1617:13 1620:3	1718:2	1659:22 1675:24
1678:12	surcharge 1582:1	1630:5 1640:3,22	telling 1585:13 1592:12	1678:18 1690:23
subjects 1548:14	sure 1542:16 1545:10	1646:12 1648:20	1595:10 1599:23	1691:1 1692:21
1585:4	1546:1 1548:20	1649:12 1651:25	1619:4 1629:5	1694:1 1700:21
submit 1676:4	1579:8 1591:23,23	1652:16 1653:4	tellingly 1542:24	1701:9 1717:13
submitted 1561:16	1593:22 1595:20	1655:23 1660:18	ten 1630:8 1725:24	1718:1
1596:19 1710:2	1609:6,15 1633:21	1669:7,25 1670:22	tenor 1650:10	Thank 1545:5 1618:2
subscribe 1711:22	1634:8 1647:6 1649:2	1676:9 1681:16	tens 1612:9	1625:11 1634:13,17
subsequently 1618:20	1652:3 1718:20	1682:23 1687:7	tentative 1547:6	1645:16 1648:22,25
substance 1603:16	surely 1658:17	1697:11 1698:9	1650:21	1661:5 1680:15
1604:1,8 1605:16,23	surprise 1543:22	1707:5,6 1708:9	term 1565:1 1567:22	1687:11 1706:4
1606:16	1651:4	taken 1579:20 1580:2	1595:1,9,18,22	1708:16 1719:4,5
subtraction 1686:11	surprised 1542:16	1625:12 1672:8	1600:18 1603:13	<b>Thanks</b> 1571:23
success 1561:20	1543:23 1659:2	1683:13 1719:15	1607:8,12,21 1656:6	1725:25
successful 1561:4	surprising 1540:14	1726:1 1727:11	1664:21	theirs 1555:17 1595:13
1646:4	suspect 1538:20	takes 1703:15,21	terms 1551:7 1587:5	theoretically 1702:14
successive 1635:17	sustain 1563:6 1605:5	1707:15	1599:16 1626:17	1703:10 1706:23,24
sue 1616:10	1660:6 1676:8	talk 1538:7 1545:19	1647:1 1663:1,3	1707:8
suggest 1545:17 1626:8	1724:10	1586:6 1587:3,8,9	1665:13 1677:3	theory 1705:24
suggested 1678:6	sustained 1607:1	1600:18,20 1636:9	1681:19 1690:22	thing 1570:8 1645:8,9
suggestions 1724:25	1679:2 1724:20	1639:13 1655:4	test 1676:7,8 1678:7	1646:2 1658:17
suing 1555:19	sustaining 1724:11	1679:3 1680:5 1689:1	testified 1553:19,24	1699:21
SULLIVAN 1536:13	sweet 1559:20	1703:13	1554:7 1561:25	things 1543:5,24
sum 1721:9	sworn 1553:19,23,24	talked 1543:21 1556:25	1565:6 1572:3,8	1547:15,21 1548:3
summarize 1538:12	1661:2 1708:20	1584:10,19 1586:3	1574:9 1575:5 1576:5	1552:20 1578:17
summary 1581:5	system 1542:10	1587:12 1594:19	1576:8,23 1577:19	1594:3 1624:21
1712:19	1562:16 1566:8	1626:10,19 1646:7	1582:19 1583:20	1650:15 1652:11
<b>Superior</b> 1535:1,16	1568:13,13 1569:10	1704:3	1601:14 1610:24	1654:4,23 1656:18
1581:7	1569:11 1580:25	talking 1556:16,17	1615:12 1616:22	think 1540:8 1546:2
supplemental 1549:20	1581:24 1582:7,13,16	1557:15,20,22	1626:6 1651:8 1661:3	1547:1,19 1549:8
1549:21	1582:22 1621:8,20	1560:19 1585:23	1677:21 1678:1	1550:5 1551:7
supplies 1541:24	1622:3 1647:13 1652:5 1653:14	1586:16,17 1617:15	1688:13 1690:20	1555:23 1557:6 1562:7 1571:11
1566:25 1656:3		1627:11 1689:2 1714:2,24	1691:8,16 1694:4 1700:9,15 1707:6	
1658:5 1669:6,11,22 1670:1,16 1693:19	1657:14 1658:5,5 1662:2,2 1665:24	talks 1556:3,4 1564:24	1700:9,15 1707:6	1573:3 1593:3,6 1594:4 19 1602:20
1702:13,16,17,22,24	1666:2,12,15,23	TARA 1535:20 1727:8	1708:21 1717:1,12,14	1594:4,19 1602:20
1702.13,16,17,22,24	1673:11,25 1692:23	1727:23	testify 1538:19 1541:3	1611:2 1614:21 1615:21 1624:21
1705:8 1708:7,9	1696:22 1705:3	task 1542:9	1552:22 1555:25	1626:22 1631:8
supply 1539:5 1540:20	1706:25 1719:15,20	tasks 1721:16,18	1585:3 1653:6 1655:9	1633:23 1645:5,9
1544:9 1563:3	1719:23 1722:8	Taylor 1586:22	1656:19 1659:21	1646:12 1651:7,19,22
1577:22 1578:19	systems 1663:17	TDS 1673:23	1675:20 1677:13	1653:3,8,16 1658:14
1588:7 1642:22	1673:18	team 1573:8 1586:8	testifying 1549:15	1658:23 1660:6,7,17
1644:21 1665:22	systemwide 1585:20	1587:3,18,18 1588:4	1554:2 1634:20	1675:12 1678:8
1668:25 1669:3,17	systemmiae 1505.20	teams 1587:8	testimony 1539:1,14	1692:8 1694:23
1699:19 1702:11	T	technically 1570:22	1544:25 1545:1	1703:23 1705:17
1077.17 1/02.11		1010.22	1011.20 1010.1	1,03.23 1,03.17
Ī	I		I	Ī

1706:18,20 1720:17	1659:7,12 1660:10,12	1646:12	1642:12 1645:13	underpaid 1540:15
1724:18	1660:15,15 1663:3	transactions 1713:16	1659:1 1670:20	understand 1550:6
thinking 1547:24	1664:4 1670:18	transcript 1535:15	1691:1 1696:8	1553:25 1576:23
third 1556:3 1566:2	1672:16,18 1674:11	1543:21 1554:8,22	1701:11 1713:7	1578:1 1579:8 1583:7
1608:15,17,18 1609:6	1676:3 1687:24	1575:9,13	trust 1559:18	1592:25 1593:24
1609:7 1610:18	1692:25 1703:25	transcription 1727:14		1592.23 1593.24
	1704:5 1707:9 1713:9	transfer 1574:16	trustworthy 1672:24	
1630:15 1715:14			truthful 1691:1 1701:9	1620:12 1623:18
1723:9	1715:19 1717:7	1577:20 1580:22	try 1543:16 1545:19	1639:13 1654:1,15
third-party 1541:19	1721:17 1725:22	transfers 1575:23	1559:4 1560:11	1656:20 1657:17
1621:9 1650:8	1727:12	1576:6	1561:18 1575:10	1660:10 1682:10
Thomas 1573:6,7	time-consuming 1542:9	transport 1549:21	1606:17 1646:1	1706:16,19 1724:15
1648:2	timeout 1594:10,11	transportation 1539:6	1653:15 1659:20	understanding 1546:12
thorough 1660:14	1600:20	1539:8 1543:10	1660:12 1676:13	1546:13 1575:5
thought 1557:7 1563:1	times 1601:7 1619:23	1544:1 1560:25	trying 1615:15 1658:15	1592:23 1593:1,14
1584:6 1591:13	1643:12 1665:8	1574:4 1588:9	1678:3	1596:24,25 1597:7,11
1595:10,12,15,19	1669:5,13 1670:15,20	1591:10,21 1610:20	turn 1580:18 1581:11	1602:21 1604:12
1596:4,8 1600:6,24	1679:9 1704:12,16	1626:25,25 1646:23	1598:23 1620:6,15	1606:2 1609:1,11,12
1601:8,11 1605:19	1705:7,13,15	1648:1 1653:1	1695:9 1710:4,21	1610:9 1634:24
1606:19 1618:6,15,18	titled 1649:13	transportation-related	1716:2,10,18 1719:8	1676:12
1626:20 1627:4,7	today 1545:14 1590:19	1567:13	1720:24 1725:16	understood 1558:2
1631:10,11,19,20	1629:11 1634:20	transporters 1621:9	turned 1649:16,17	1567:18 1603:24
1645:6,7 1688:12	1641:1 1654:2	transporting 1541:10	1650:13 1655:14	1604:7,19,24 1608:16
thoughts 1547:7,24	1701:11,12	1541:11,14,15	turns 1651:6 1658:20	1608:18 1609:7
thousands 1641:9	told 1573:3 1574:2,19	travel 1665:20	Twenty-four 1661:18	1611:11 1632:4
three 1539:16 1548:4	1578:13 1584:5	travels 1689:25	two 1543:14,15	1675:23
1589:11 1613:18	1592:7 1595:16	treated 1581:25 1700:1	1547:10 1550:20	<b>Underwood</b> 1559:9,12
1617:14 1620:15,16	1596:1,4,8 1601:7	1700:4	1577:21 1578:17	1560:10 1572:9,15
1621:15 1640:9	1602:20 1606:20	treating 1543:9	1610:1 1621:2	1574:2,20 1583:23,24
1651:23 1674:14	1608:18 1615:21	treatment 1582:1	1635:17 1651:10	1584:2,14,16,19,24
1677:16,17 1722:12	1624:19,21 1627:12	1667:11 1673:24	1677:4 1678:13	1585:13 1586:12,18
1723:22	1631:10,11,21 1632:2	treaty 1616:16	1684:12,23 1685:21	1587:7,13,16 1588:2
three-and-a-half	1632:2,9,12,17	trial 1538:15,16	1686:4,6 1689:3	1613:19,24 1626:20
1554:1	1633:7,9,12,13	1542:17 1549:10	1700:5 1703:23	1627:3 1647:17
ticking 1651:8	1637:15 1655:5	1575:2 1587:22	1707:13 1721:8	undisclosed 1539:13
tie 1653:16,17	1678:24 1680:19	1614:6,7 1617:13	1722:14	unfortunately 1560:5
tight 1659:3	1681:10 1683:5	1623:4 1651:14,15	two-and-a-half	unidentified 1566:25
time 1538:17 1552:17	1703:1	1659:2 1690:21	1540:14	uniformly 1571:5
1553:8 1555:23,24	tomorrow 1725:24	1700:9,14,21	two-page 1563:23	<b>United</b> 1711:16
1558:18 1559:1,11	top 1580:19 1700:4	tried 1543:12 1560:16	1564:2	University 1709:21,22
1560:6 1562:19	total 1544:23 1568:13	1561:21	type 1570:7 1629:4	unlawful 1574:4
1565:21 1570:14	1653:6 1662:12	trier 1547:16	1716:14	1583:21 1585:16
1571:8,11 1572:3,8	1673:23 1684:4,9,10	trigger 1579:16,18	types 1721:16	1586:3 1595:16,17,19
1574:7,11,19,22	1684:11,18 1685:10	1580:25	typewriting 1727:13	1595:23 1596:17,20
1576:10,18 1577:3,3	1685:12,14,16,22	true 1545:12 1559:19		1597:4 1599:24
1585:19 1590:9,20	1686:17 1694:6	1571:6 1572:16	U	1600:24 1601:9,12
1591:8,21 1592:8,24	1695:22 1696:2,15	1575:3 1578:11,12,15	<b>Uh-huh</b> 1594:15	1604:21 1605:2,9,22
1593:7,11 1594:7,17	1698:7,19 1723:9,16	1578:16 1579:14,17	1628:1	1606:23 1615:10,13
1594:20 1595:4,11,12	1723:23	1581:19 1586:9,19	ultimate 1718:22	1626:21 1627:4
1600:8 1607:10,19,20	totally 1720:15	1587:7 1588:19	ultimately 1667:4	1631:7,15,19,22
1608:3 1610:13	touch 1689:14	1590:7 1594:3	unable 1599:14	1632:1,2,6,13 1633:3
1611:24 1616:8	track 1695:5 1712:2	1595:24 1596:3	unblended 1706:2	1640:18
1619:20 1624:23	tracks 1695:1	1599:7 1605:19	unbundled 1617:21	unlawfulness 1613:4,8
1627:13 1631:5	trade 1577:21 1578:18	1613:4 1614:4,5	1618:4,7,8,18 1619:6	1639:2
1632:25 1640:13,22	1712:12	1615:24 1616:1,24	1623:7	unmix 1703:25 1707:14
1641:16,24 1642:5	trader 1711:6,7	1619:17,25 1625:4	unbundling 1613:7	unpack 1552:18
1649:20 1650:16	1716:15 1719:18	1627:16,19 1628:3	1614:13 1619:5	unquote 1602:3
1651:7,22 1652:13,16	transaction 1641:22	1632:7 1637:5 1639:3	uncertain 1579:12	untreated 1685:10,18
1655:13 1658:21,23	1642:12 1643:11	1639:24 1641:3	unclear 1548:22	1694:5 1697:6,12
1000.10 1000.21,20	10.2.12 1015.11	1007.211011.5		1055 1057.0,12
	Ī	I	Ī	1

1698:23 1699:9,23 1700:4 1706:24 unused 1580:24 **update** 1674:25 **upgrade** 1664:19 upper 1722:11 **upstream** 1702:18 1703:17 **URQUHART** 1536:13 usage 1722:23 use 1542:17 1544:4,5,5 1546:4.12 1548:21 1550:25 1552:15 1569:12 1575:10,12 1580:24 1586:2 1596:11 1621:20 1626:17 1627:6 1632:3 1643:3 1653:18 1669:20 1677:25 1678:14 1681:17,20 1690:5 1691:16 1695:18 1702:21 1704:10,12 1704:15 1712:1,3 1713:13,18,19,24 1714:16 1717:3 1718:4 1719:1 1720:5 1720:8,16,21 1722:24 1722:25 useful 1718:20 1720:22 uses 1580:14 1678:13 1714:9 1717:7,9 usually 1624:21 1704:18 utilities 1703:14 utility 1723:5 utilize 1669:16 V

vague 1666:16 1714:23 1715:6 vagueness 1605:5 validation 1581:13 validity 1535:10 1550:8 Valley 1580:9 1689:4 value 1598:10.19 1643:9 1644:7 1720:18 1721:10 values 1721:23 valves 1668:3,19 VAN 1536:3 VANDERHORST 1536:18 vantage 1549:6 varies 1694:23 variety 1561:12,24 1573:14 1591:12

1673:22 1677:18

1713:24 various 1585:4 1597:18 1600:11 1621:13 1632:11 1633:6,24 1668:15 1673:24 1679:5 1686:6 1721:18 versus 1597:22 1680:20 1686:8 1690:13 VI 1614:7 vicinity 1692:24 VIDEOGRAPHY 1535:23 view 1546:13 1555:16 1585:14 1605:8 1607:11 1632:6 1646:10 1648:18 views 1553:7 1647:19 VII 1614:8,8 violate 1578:9 violated 1574:4 violates 1540:22 1543:11 violation 1590:8,23 1591:3,7,9,16,19,24 1591:25 1592:5 1593:24 1594:14 1605:21 1631:13 1653:16 virtue 1717:6 **volume** 1535:10 1571:8 1585:9 1589:10 1590:15 1592:16 1597:21 1614:7,7,8 1634:2 1662:8 1663:1 1684:5,9,10 1685:14 1685:16 1686:18 1694:5,6 1695:22 1696:14,15 1698:7,23 1699:12 volumes 1681:20 1682:19 1684:14 1685:12 vote 1562:5 1616:23 1617:20 1618:20 1619:14 1623:12,18 1623:19,22 1624:2,20 1624:23,24 1625:2 1627:11,14,17 1630:2 1630:6,16,22 1631:2

1632:13,16,18,20

voted 1617:2,9,11,12

1617:22 1618:4,6,7

1619:4,6,7,9,11,18,20

1619:24 1622:11,18

1618:11,16,19,25

1648:10

1637:4,16,18 1638:2

1622:20,21,25 1623:1 1628:3,4 1629:6,15 1630:23 1631:16,19 1631:21 1632:5,16 1633:1,14 1637:6,7 1639:23 1641:19 1642:8 1643:20 1645:5 votes 1616:19 1622:6 1648:9 voting 1617:4,5,5,7 1633:8,11 vs 1535:8

 $\mathbf{W}$ wait 1652:15 walk 1615:16 want 1538:7 1542:15 1543:23 1544:19,19 1544:20 1545:6 1547:1 1550:25 1555:5 1590:16,18 1609:4 1639:14 1649:4 1653:24 1658:22 wanted 1556:1 1567:25 1568:18 1569:9,11,13 1599:11 1601:23 1647:6 1692:1,2 1707:21 **wanting** 1570:6 wants 1580:16 1690:5 Warren 1536:5 1687:25 wasn't 1577:4 1584:7 1595:21 1637:9 wasted 1658:21 water 1535:6,9,11 1536:11 1539:5,6,23 1539:23,24,25 1540:2 1540:20 1541:7,8,10 1541:11,14,15,16,19 1541:23,23 1542:18 1543:1,9,9,25 1544:7 1544:8,11,18,19 1546:20 1548:8 1549:18,21 1555:13 1557:22 1558:12 1560:20.25 1561:1 1562:16 1563:20 1564:18 1566:4,8 1567:12,14,22 1568:4 1568:6,8,8,10,16,18 1568:24 1569:1,3,13 1569:19,24 1570:3,7 1570:10,15,19,19,20 1570:22,23,24 1571:3 1572:5 1574:3,10,16 1576:19 1577:22 1578:19 1580:8,9,10 1580:24 1581:25 1582:1.8 1583:19.21 1584:15,17,23 1585:2 1585:11,15 1586:11 1587:15,17 1588:5,20 1589:2,5,20 1590:3 1591:20,20 1597:12 1597:21 1598:10 1603:21 1609:19,23 1610:1 1611:25 1612:1 1614:19 1616:11 1620:8,18 1621:8,9,22 1622:3 1624:13 1628:20 1635:3 1636:12 1640:17,17 1641:10 1641:14 1642:15 1643:8,25 1644:6,21 1645:1,23 1646:21 1647:2,11 1649:13,14 1650:6,8 1652:20,24 1652:25 1653:14,17 1653:18,19 1656:2,2 1656:6,7 1657:9,10 1657:16 1658:7,7 1661:15,17,19 1662:1 1662:5,8,22 1663:2 1663:20 1664:3,7,10 1664:11,11 1665:4,7 1665:10,14,14,15,17 1665:19,20,21,22 1666:1,4,10,19,25 1667:3,12,13,15,16 1667:20,21,21 1668:4 1668:9,12,14,15,19 1668:20,20,21,25 1669:2,6,11,12,13,14 1669:15,16,19,19,23 1669:24 1670:1,4,5,6 1670:8,12,12,13,14 1670:15,16,18,22,23 1671:1,3,3,4,17,18,19 1672:9,10,10 1673:11 1673:18,20 1674:2,2 1674:3 1675:1,4 1680:20,21,21 1681:12,12,12,20,21 1682:14,19,20 1683:15,21,21 1684:7 1684:8,19,20,21,23 1685:1,3,10,11,13,14 1685:19,22,25 1686:8 1686:8,8,10,11,16,17 1687:13 1688:1,6,6,7

1688:9,20,20,20,23

1688:23 1689:1,2,10 1689:14,18,18,24 1690:5,9,12,12,13,22 1690:23 1691:5,16,17 1691:17,21,22 1692:2 1692:4,5,14,22,22,23 1693:1,2,4,4,6,16,23 1694:21 1695:2.15.16 1695:23 1696:2,6,19 1696:21 1697:1,6,12 1697:14,15,16,20 1698:5,17,20,24 1699:9,9,15,16,19,22 1700:1,11,17 1701:2 1701:14,24 1702:9,11 1702:12,13,16,18,21 1702:24 1703:1,1,5,8 1703:8,9,13,14,20,21 1704:2,2,5,6,7,13,17 1704:19 1705:5,6,8 1705:11,14,14,16,20 1705:23,23 1706:1,1 1706:2,10,12,12,12 1706:13,24,25 1707:5 1707:6,15,19 1708:6 1708:9,11 1709:7,17 1709:18 1715:15 1722:16,19 1723:10 1723:12,18 1725:11 1725:11.12 waters 1668:17 1691:12 1707:14

waters 1668:17
1691:12 1707:14
way 1540:13 1545:16
1546:5 1568:1
1569:11,16 1614:16
1629:19 1642:14
1650:18 1651:11,22
1652:21 1653:9,12
1654:2 1658:24,24
1660:7 1667:24
1668:17,18 1673:16
1688:11,12 1692:8
1697:5 1699:18
1703:24,25
wbraunig@kyn.com

wbraunig@kvn.com 1536:9

**We'll** 1651:25 1659:23 1706:21 **we're** 1546:16 1552:13 1562:15 1615:16

1697:15 1705:19,20 1713:19,20 1714:7 1718:11

**we've** 1549:17 1645:14 1651:6,23 1653:8 1657:7 1692:8 1724:3

weather 1669:22 website 1565:24

1571:3,5,9,14,16,20

1719:25 1720:1	1562:15,25 1573:25	1702:24
Wednesday 1656:22	1579:23 1580:3	writing 1573:14
week 1564:14 1565:9	15/9.23 1380.3	1588:24 1613:1,3,8
weekend 1649:7 1653:7		1613:10,11,13,14
	1607:5,9,12,15,17,21 1607:23 1609:3,5	
weekly 1673:11,15,18 1674:13 1675:1		1639:2,6,8,9,10,11 1678:3
1681:19	1618:15,18 1625:8	written 1580:20
weeks 1554:1 1589:12	1626:9 1634:5,7 1643:1 1652:13,22	
	1658:15,25 1660:5,20	wrong 1544:24 1552:24 1619:3
weight 1678:18	7	
went 1623:13,23	1661:2,4,8 1675:23	1631:11 1658:12
1628:8 1659:10 1724:12	1677:10 1678:6	X
weren't 1540:10	1679:18 1680:3,13	X 1535:10 1537:1
1591:25 1595:20	1681:2 1706:18,20 1707:12 1708:20,23	A 1333.10 1337.1
1652:12	· ·	Y
western 1711:15	1709:1 1712:10 1713:6,11,14,19	Y-A-M-A-S-A-K-I
western 1711.13 wes 1669:22 1670:2	1713:0,11,14,19	1661:9
1705:10,12	1717:1,23 1718:4,11	Yamasaki 1537:4
whatsoever 1558:6	1717.1,23 1718.4,11 1718:14,18 1723:4,7	1545:25 1660:21
wheeled 1567:14		1661:1,8,13 1687:12
1582:8	1724:16 1725:7 1727:17	1687:25 1695:10
		yeah 1551:3,22
wheeling 1540:22,23 1540:24,25 1556:19	witnesses 1537:2 1650:22 1655:19	1553:16 1592:22
1556:20,22,24 1557:1	1656:18	1593:3,12,13,16,18
1557:4,9,11,23	Woodcock 1538:20	1593:24 1594:1
1563:1 1564:19,21,22	1539:3,4 1540:2	1604:3 1618:15
1565:1 1566:5,7	1548:1,13 1650:23	1627:9 1637:9
1574:5 1575:6,16,22	1660:12,13	1638:14 1663:9
1576:5,25 1577:10,16	Woodcock's 1548:18	1700:14
1577:20 1578:1,9,14	word 1538:20 1548:21	year 1560:4 1561:20,2
1578:25 1579:1,4,5,6	1579:9 1596:11	1569:15 1570:19,23
1579:10,11,16 1581:1	words 1576:24 1590:17	1570:25 1571:1,6
1581:14,18,19,24	1591:24 1611:6	1611:23 1612:25
1582:4,11,15,25	1615:11,13 1651:4	1620:9 1630:10
1583:3,9,11 1584:8	1675:12 1693:5	1636:3,7 1638:25
1584:11 1586:25	1698:4	1642:16 1657:13
1587:9,19 1588:12	work 1559:3,7 1560:11	1662:13 1663:10
1589:21 1590:5,13	1565:3 1597:19	1664:1,5 1670:2,2,1
1595:1,14 1597:22	1598:2 1615:15	1673:15 1682:21
1598:9,14,21 1599:3	1616:12 1651:24	1684:18 1700:5
1599:14 1600:4,6,7	1709:6,17	1704:13,16 1705:10
1600:14 1601:3,8,15	worked 1559:9 1597:19	1705:12 1708:4
1602:1 1638:9	1661:16 1709:12	1716:16,17,23
1644:18,20 1646:9,12	works 1677:22	1719:14
1646:13,15,18,23	world 1703:11,12	years 1543:14,15
1647:11	1705:25	1544:5 1558:3,23
wheels 1562:16	WORLDWIDE	1564:23 1567:14
white 1556:4	1535:23	1569:17 1570:13
whoever's 1540:16	worried 1539:2	1571:7 1595:19
widely 1565:23	worst 1599:10,12	1596:6 1598:3,11,15
1694:23	worst-case 1565:7	1598:21,24 1600:2,1
Willer 1598:2	1566:20 1599:11,15	1600:16 1601:4,12,1
willing 1601:23	1644:9	1601:20 1602:1,3,9
wish 1656:24	wouldn't 1594:10	1602:22 1603:4
withdraw 1558:15	1596:16 1605:22	1604:22 1606:9
witness 1541:3 1545:1	1606:22 1645:4	1607:22 1608:17,19
1545:15 1546:3	1689:20 1692:7	1609:7 1611:2
1553:2,3,23 1561:15	1698:8 1700:6	1612:15 1613:18

```
10,11,13,14
2,6,8,9,10,11
3
1580:20
1544:24
24 1619:3
11 1658:12
   X
:10 1537:1
   Y
-A-S-A-K-I
aki 1537:4
25 1660:21
1,8,13 1687:12
25 1695:10
51:3,22
16 1592:22
3,12,13,16,18
24 1594:1
3 1618:15
9 1637:9
14 1663:9
14
60:4 1561:20,20
15 1570:19,23
25 1571:1,6
23 1612:25
9 1630:10
3,7 1638:25
16 1657:13
13 1663:10
1,5 1670:2,2,17
15 1682:21
18 1700:5
13,16 1705:10
12 1708:4
16,17,23
14
543:14,15
5 1558:3.23
23 1567:14
17 1570:13
7 1595:19
6 1598:3,11,15
21,24 1600:2,15
16 1601:4,12,16
20 1602:1,3,9
22 1603:4
22 1606:9
22 1608:17,19
7 1611:2
```

```
1615:22 1619:21
  1625:4 1627:16
  1628:5 1629:5,16
  1630:3 1633:16
  1635:18,20 1638:12
  1639:15 1640:24
  1641:11 1642:18
  1646:3 1661:18
  1664:1,18,23 1669:8
  1702:16,20 1709:13
  1718:1 1721:4
yellow 1694:9
yesterday 1538:11
  1545:4 1653:8
  1654:12
          Z
          0
032 1723:17
064 1723:16
07 1610:14
1 1535:12,12 1539:20
  1540:5,9 1543:11
  1548:20 1612:18,21
  1623:14 1638:20
  1700:21
1-10 1535:13
1.2 1643:14
1.264 1643:15 1644:10
1/12th 1662:12
1:30 1625:10
1:35 1626:3
10 1535:12 1565:13
10,000 1700:6
10:00 1538:3 1715:21
  1726:2
100 1568:16,17
  1569:18 1570:10
  1641:11 1642:18
  1693:15,23 1698:23
  1699:9
100,000 1694:15
1041 1614:8
1096 1537:9 1546:18
  1546:25 1551:24
  1652:19 1654:17
  1655:12 1725:16,20
1099 1543:4 1546:18
  1551:24 1652:19
  1654:17
10th 1536:15
11 1592:17 1616:13
  1635:20 1648:16
11.1 1611:15
110 1543:16 1649:16
```

```
1103 1537:11 1546:18
  1552:1,2,9 1652:6,17
  1652:18,24 1654:17
  1654:18,21,22
  1655:12 1656:22.25
  1720:24,25 1723:24
1105 1537:12 1672:2,4
  1672:6 1673:1.3.4
  1683:3 1692:19
1114 1616:11
1121 1537:13 1710:21
  1711:2,11 1712:8
  1714:12,14,18,25
1122 1537:14 1673:6,8
  1674:15,19,21
1123 1537:15 1716:2
  1716:10,11,24 1719:7
1124 1537:16 1673:7
  1673:12 1674:15,19
  1674:21
1125 1537:17 1716:18
  1716:19,24 1719:7
1126 1537:18 1673:7
  1673:12 1674:15,19
  1674:21
1127 1537:19 1719:8,9
  1719:12 1720:13,23
1128 1537:20 1673:7
  1673:12 1674:15,19
  1674:21
1143 1537:10 1580:6
1149 1581:23
1149A 1581:21
1151 1537:21 1710:4
  1710:11,12,13
1154 1537:22 1674:23
  1677:11 1678:21
1155 1537:23 1683:1,2
  1683:5,10,25 1684:1
  1684:14
1156 1537:24 1682:23
  1684:2 1685:4,6,7
  1686:25
1157 1537:25 1685:8
  1687:1,2,5,6 1693:25
  1696:11 1698:7
  1699:15
12 1543:15 1567:24
  1616:16 1620:4
  1623:5 1635:20
12.4(c) 1616:2 1639:18
1270 1712:23
129 1617:18 1630:5
  1640:1
13 1543:16 1553:11
  1636:3 1658:3,8
  1695:9,14 1698:16
13,000 1706:9
```

	I	1	I	I
<b>13,142</b> 1697:12,20	<b>2.349</b> 1721:10 1722:10	1694:12 1695:18	<b>323</b> 1698:11,17	<b>73</b> 1590:15
<b>13.12</b> 1608:4	1723:10,23 1724:15	1698:2 1715:25	<b>33</b> 1683:17,20	<b>75</b> 1598:3 1664:18
<b>1304</b> 1554:8	1724:21,24	1718:10 1721:5	<b>3374</b> 1535:20 1727:8	<b>75-year</b> 1599:4
<b>1305</b> 1554:19,22	<b>2:936</b> 1640:3,4	<b>2012</b> 1535:12 1561:23	1727:23	<b>776</b> 1537:3
<b>1340</b> 1712:15	<b>20</b> 1541:5 1581:11	1635:16,25,25 1636:3	<b>339</b> 1634:3	<b>78</b> 1581:3
<b>136</b> 1688:2,5	1598:24 1649:25	1640:6,14 1658:9	<b>340</b> 1634:3	
<b>14</b> 1543:16 1614:8	1650:2,16 1654:25	1698:3,12,12 1716:17	<b>342</b> 1555:20	8
1648:15,17	1655:13,23	<b>2013</b> 1535:12 1542:1	<b>35</b> 1598:15,21 1664:23	<b>8</b> 1541:9
<b>1414(b)</b> 1678:3,17	<b>20-year</b> 1599:6	1636:7 1640:9 1698:3	<b>35-year</b> 1599:5	<b>80,000</b> 1642:15
<b>1451</b> 1617:13 1623:5	<b>2000</b> 1628:6	1702:14 1716:23	<b>355</b> 1609:17,21	<b>800</b> 1535:25
<b>1452</b> 1617:14	<b>2002</b> 1574:11 1617:9	<b>2014</b> 1535:12 1549:19	<b>36</b> 1592:16	<b>81</b> 1558:7,9
<b>15</b> 1575:13 1585:9	1617:10,12,15 1618:3	1640:10 1645:11	<b>37</b> 1592:16	<b>829</b> 1597:25
1657:5	1618:11,16,24 1620:5	1648:12,20 1662:21	<b>38</b> 1715:4 1718:7	<b>837</b> 1563:13,15
<b>15-minute</b> 1687:7	1620:13 1624:23	1673:16 1682:16,21	<b>3rd</b> 1535:24	<b>859</b> 1537:8 1565:9
<b>15,000</b> 1662:14,24	1627:12,17 1628:2	1683:16 1684:5,18		1567:5,8,9
<b>1524</b> 1587:22	1629:5,16 1630:3	1698:3 1702:15	4	<b>865</b> 1536:15
<b>1535</b> 1535:13	1641:18 1642:7	1719:14,19 1721:5	<b>4</b> 1543:20 1557:14	
<b>154</b> 1580:18	<b>2002/03</b> 1620:10	<b>2015</b> 1535:18 1538:2	1560:2	9
<b>1554</b> 1537:3	<b>2003</b> 1548:12 1563:21	1626:2 1726:1	<b>41</b> 1620:3,6	<b>9</b> 1566:12,12
<b>1566</b> 1537:8	1565:11 1572:14	1727:18	<b>415</b> 1535:25	<b>90</b> 1543:15,15 1649:16
<b>1567</b> 1537:8	1577:4,9 1588:17	<b>2048</b> 1664:24	<b>415.391.5400</b> 1536:7	<b>90,000</b> 1694:21
<b>1572</b> 1537:3	1589:14 1590:8,20	<b>21</b> 1598:17 1640:6	<b>423</b> 1644:2,11	<b>90012</b> 1536:19
<b>1580</b> 1537:10	1592:18 1595:5	<b>212</b> 1589:10	<b>437</b> 1575:13	<b>90017-2543</b> 1536:16
<b>16</b> 1563:20 1587:22	1601:7 1604:10,12,13	<b>213</b> 1589:10	<b>438</b> 1575:13	<b>907</b> 1644:2,11
1602:20 1709:13	1604:16,20,25 1605:9	<b>213.217.6000</b> 1536:20	<b>4401</b> 1582:2	<b>94111</b> 1535:24
<b>1645</b> 1537:3	1618:21 1619:1	<b>213.443.3000</b> 1536:16	<b>4405</b> 1581:22	<b>981-3498</b> 1535:25
<b>1661</b> 1537:4	1623:14 1634:23	<b>22</b> 1589:10 1614:8	<b>44A</b> 1575:12	<b>99</b> 1546:25 1655:12
<b>1672</b> 1537:12	1635:1 1648:19	<b>22,000</b> 1696:2	<b>45</b> 1598:10	
<b>1673</b> 1537:12,14,16,18	<b>2004</b> 1555:23 1556:15	<b>22,444</b> 1696:3	<b>45-year</b> 1599:5	
1537:20	1556:21,24 1558:1,17	<b>221</b> 1598:17	<b>469</b> 1682:11	
<b>1674</b> 1537:14,16,18,20	<b>2005</b> 1560:1,2,3	<b>224</b> 1575:8	<b>469-A</b> 1682:9	
1537:22	1613:20 1647:17	<b>23</b> 1618:1	<b>48</b> 1686:19	
<b>1678</b> 1537:22	<b>2007</b> 1609:18 1611:9	<b>23,000</b> 1663:11	5	
<b>1683</b> 1537:23,24	1611:12,20,23	<b>231</b> 1585:9		
<b>1684</b> 1537:23	<b>2008</b> 1611:23,24	<b>235</b> 1541:4,8	<b>5</b> 1542:1 1700:5	
<b>1685</b> 1537:24,25	1612:5,18,22,24,24	<b>235A</b> 1541:13	<b>5.2</b> 1603:12 1608:1	
<b>1686</b> 1537:25	1613:7,11,14 1615:25	<b>24</b> 1565:11,25 1611:17	<b>50</b> 1564:3 1588:23	
<b>1687</b> 1537:4	1615:25 1616:5,9	<b>25</b> 1590:15 1592:16	1644:5 1688:6	
<b>17</b> 1553:13 1603:12	1617:1 1630:9 1631:2	<b>253</b> 1595:13	<b>50,000</b> 1694:24	
1607:7 1608:2	1631:17 1632:2,5,25	<b>26</b> 1598:23	<b>51</b> 1602:20 1611:16	
<b>1701</b> 1537:4 <b>1706</b> 1537:4	1633:15 1635:2	<b>27</b> 1535:18 1538:2 1626:2	<b>51,748</b> 1695:20 <b>522-7096</b> 1535:25	
1706 1537:4 1709 1537:5	1636:12,25 1637:16 1638:20	<b>28</b> 1617:14 1726:1	<b>542</b> 1700:21	
<b>1709</b> 1537:5 <b>1710</b> 1537:13,13,21,21	<b>2009</b> 1581:6 1630:10		<b>543</b> 1700:22	
<b>1710</b> 1537:13,13,21,21 <b>1715</b> 1537:15	1631:3 1633:19	<b>280,000</b> 1663:9 <b>28th</b> 1727:17	J-13 1/00.22	
<b>1716</b> 1537:17	1631.3 1633.19	20th 1/2/.1/	6	
<b>1718</b> 1537:17 <b>1718</b> 1537:15,17	1637:17 1638:25	3	<b>6:00</b> 1715:21	
<b>1716</b> 1337.13,17 <b>1719</b> 1537:19	1639:1,5,16,20,22	<b>3</b> 1567:3,10 1620:6,16	<b>60,000</b> 1694:21	
<b>1719</b> 1337.19 <b>1720</b> 1537:11,19	<b>2010</b> 1561:22 1635:7,8	<b>3.2</b> 1568:21	<b>633</b> 1536:6	
<b>1725</b> 1537:11,19	1635:11,14,15,18	3.2(a) 1568:21,22,22	<b>65</b> 1565:13 1568:21	
<b>1723</b> 1537.5 <b>1727</b> 1535:13	1641:18 1642:7	3.2(e) 1569:6	1602:20	
<b>18</b> 1609:18 1700:22	1646:6 1658:4,8	<b>3.6</b> 1570:3	<b>698</b> 1571:22	
<b>19</b> 1694:10 1699:17	<b>2011</b> 1549:19 1561:23	<b>3:00</b> 1687:8		
<b>1998</b> 1577:5,9 1598:20	1635:23,24 1645:11	<b>304</b> 1535:4 1538:4	7	
	1648:11,15,20 1658:9	<b>31</b> 1611:9,12,20,23	7 1585:9	
2	1662:21 1673:15	<b>317</b> 1723:2,7	<b>700</b> 1536:19	
<b>2</b> 1556:16 1566:2	1682:16,21 1683:16	<b>31st</b> 1715:25	<b>701</b> 1535:24	
1581:6 1681:16	1683:17 1684:5,17	<b>322</b> 1695:8,16 1698:1	<b>72</b> 1590:15	
	,			
	•	-	•	•

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                                       INDEX
                COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                            DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW
                 DEPARTMENT 304
                                                                            LAMBECK, Jon
      SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                                           1734 1760 1790
                                                                            (resumed)
        Petitioner and Plaintiff, ) Case No.
                                                                            SKILLMAN, June
                                                                                                1796 ---
                       ) No. CPF-10-510830
                        ) No. CPF-12-512466
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL
      PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE
      VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY) VOLUME XI
                                                                      11
      THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT)
                                                                      12
      OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL )
                                                                      13
      10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY)
      1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and)
                                                                      14
      DOES 1-10,
                                                                      15
                        ) Pages 1728 - 1840
        Respondents and Defendants.)
                                                                      17
                                                                      18
           REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
               San Francisco Superior
                                                                      19
              San Francisco, California
                                                                      20
              Tuesday, April 28, 2015
      Reported By:
                                                                      21
      TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR #3374
                                                                      22
                JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
                                                                      23
          WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                      24
       701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                      25
            (800) 522-7096 or (415) 981-3498
                                                           1728
                                                                                                                                 1730
        APPEARANCES
                                                                                             EXHIBITS
     For Petitioner and Plaintiff:
                                                                        2
                                                                              NUMBER DESCRIPTION
                                                                                                                      ID
                                                                                                                           EVIDENCE
     KEKER & VAN NEST
     BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ.
BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                        3
                                                                              DTX 159 Market Cost of Power 2011-14 1753
     BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                        4
                                                                              DTX 1074 10/21/13 letter from SDCWA 1769
     BY: WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ
                                                                        5
                                                                              DTX 1160 Chart of Rates and Damages
     BY: NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG, ESQ.
     633 Battery Street
                                                                        6
     San Francisco, California
                                                                        7
                                                                              PTX 497 MWD Board Actions 3/8/11
                                                                                                                        1774
                                                                                                                                 1774
     415.391.5400
     Email: ahadlock@kvn.com
                                                                        8
                                                                              PTX 479 1/14/10 email form Lambeck 1790
                                                                                                                                1790
     Email: dpurcell@kvn.com
     Email: jkeker@kvn.com
                                                                        9
                                                                              DTX 953 MWD Fiscal Year 2011/12 Cost 1813
                                                                                                                                   1814
     Email: wbraunig@kvn.com
                                                                       1.0
                                                                                   of Service
     Email: ngoldberg@kvn.com
                                                                       11
11
     For Respondent and Defendant Metropolitan Water District
                                                                      12
     of Southern California:
12
                                                                      13
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
13
     BY: JOHN B. QUINN, ESQ.
                                                                       14
     BY: GARY GANS, ESQ.
                                                                      15
     BY: ERIC EMANUEL, ESQ.
     BY: DALE OLIVER, ESQ.
                                                                      16
     865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
15
                                                                       17
     Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
16
     213.443.3000
                                                                      18
     Email: johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com
17
                                                                       19
     OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
     BY: JOSEPH VANDERHORST, ESQ.
                                                                       20
     700 North Alameda Street
                                                                       21
19
     Los Angeles, California 90012
                                                                       22
     213.217.6000
20
                                                                       2.3
21
22
                                                                       24
23
                                                                       25
25
                                                           1729
                                                                                                                                 1731
```

```
1
               San Francisco, California
                                                                                   DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed)
 2
                                                                     2
                Tuesday, April 28, 2015
                                                                           BY MR. EMANUEL:
 3
                                                                     3
                    10:00 a.m.
                                                                             Q. Mr. Lambeck, you are still under oath.
 4
                                                                     4
       Department 304
                             Hon. Curtis E. A. Karnow, Judge
                                                                           Yesterday there was some confusion about the use of
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                           electric power to pump water. I want to go back just
                                                                     6
 6
            THE COURT: Good morning.
                                                                           for a moment.
                                                                     7
            MR. KEKER: Good morning, your Honor. Before
                                                                                Does Metropolitan generate the power it uses to
 8
                                                                     8
                                                                           pump water along the California River Aqueduct?
       we start, could I raise an issue about time?
                                                                     9
 9
            THE COURT: Sure.
                                                                             A. No.
10
                                                                    10
                                                                             Q. Where does it get its power?
            MR. KEKER: Your clock -- we thought that
                                                                    11
11
       yesterday we spent 49 minutes and they spent two hours
                                                                             A. It has several sources. From the Federal
                                                                    12
12
       and 32 minutes. Your clock indicates that we spent an
                                                                           Government. For installations along the Colorado River,
13
                                                                    13
       hour and 15 minutes and they spent only two hours and
                                                                           as well as a contract with Southern California Edison
14
                                                                    14
       three minutes. So there is a half an hour and I
                                                                           Utility Company.
                                                                    15
15
       wonder -- I wonder if the clock didn't get pushed down
                                                                             Q. Maybe it would speed things up if we put up PTX
                                                                    16
16
       or something, but we have the times and would like to
                                                                           490. Sir, look at your monitor. This is the pie chart.
17
                                                                    17
                                                                           Would you explain to the Court what this pie chart
       get the time back.
                                                                    18
18
            THE COURT: How much time do you think you
                                                                           shows?
19
                                                                    19
       should get back?
                                                                             A. This shows the energy sources for pumping on
20
                                                                    20
            MR. KEKER: We believe that you have a half an
                                                                           the Colorado River Aqueduct.
                                                                    21
21
       hour -- 25 minutes too short for us and a half an hour
                                                                             Q. And tell the Court what the "Hoover" is and
22
                                                                    22
       too long for -- they should get a half an hour less and
                                                                           "Parker," and then I'll ask about the next slices.
                                                                    23
23
       we should get a half an hour more is the way we count.
                                                                             A. Metropolitan has contracts with the Federal
24
                                                                    24
            THE COURT: Maybe to compromise I will give you
                                                                           Government for cost-based power from the Hoover
25
       a half an hour back. How's that?
                                                                    25
                                                                           Powerplant and the Parker Powerplant, both located on
                                                         1732
                                                                                                                             1734
 1
                                                                     1
            MR. KEKER: Okay.
                                                                           the Colorado River.
 2
                                                                     2
            THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                                             O. As we go clockwise around the pie, what is the
                                                                     3
 3
            MR. QUINN: No objection.
                                                                           "Edison Benefit"?
                                                                     4
            THE COURT: Shall we continue with our witness.
                                                                             A. Benefit refers to energy that we receive from
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                           Edison under a contract with them at no cost.
                                                                     6
 6
                                                                             Q. And the narrower slice is "Edison Exchange,"
                     JON LAMBECK,
 7
                                                                     7
       called as a witness by the Defendants, resumed the stand
                                                                           would you explain what that is?
                                                                     8
 8
       and testified as follows:
                                                                             A. Under the contract with Edison we have the
                                                                     9
 9
                                                                           ability to exchange or to bank energy with Edison.
                                                                    10
10
            MR. EMANUEL: With the Court's permission, may
                                                                             Q. And the final slice is "Energy Purchases."
                                                                    11
11
       I resume the examination?
                                                                             A. These are the purchases that we make when the
                                                                    12
12
            MR. GOLDBERG: We understood it is one lawyer,
                                                                           supply of energy from our contractual resources are not
                                                                    13
13
       one witness, but it is up to you.
                                                                           sufficient for the pumping required on the aqueduct.
14
                                                                    14
            THE COURT: I assume there is some reason for
                                                                             Q. When the aqueduct is running full, are the
15
                                                                    15
       that. You have some insight into the new topic?
                                                                           other sources, Hoover, Parker, Edison, Edison Exchange,
16
                                                                    16
            MR. EMANUEL: I steeped myself into power more
                                                                           sufficient to move the water through the aqueduct?
17
                                                                    17
       than any human being except for the witness.
                                                                             A. No.
                                                                    18
18
            THE COURT: I will ask the People to avoid
                                                                             Q. However, are there some years in which so
                                                                    19
19
       this. This is frankly irritating to opposing counsel
                                                                           little water is moving through the aqueduct you have
20
                                                                    20
                                                                           excess power?
       when this happens, but it is not going to be fatal.
21
                                                                    21
            MR. EMANUEL: This won't be a practice, your
                                                                             A. Yes.
                                                                    22
22
       Honor.
                                                                             Q. What do you do in the years there is excess
                                                                    23
2.3
            THE COURT: Okay.
                                                                           power?
24
                                                                    24
                                                                             A. We will either sell the power or bank it with
25
                                                                    25
       //
                                                                           Edison.
                                                         1733
                                                                                                                             1735
```

- Q. And how does -- how do you or how does Metropolitan decide which sources of power to use to move water through the aqueduct?
- A. We optimize the resources that we have on both the power cost, as well as the flexibility of use standpoint to achieve a lowest overall cost to our member agencies.
- Q. If you look at the pie chart there, would you say which ones are the lowest cost and which ones are the most expensive?
- A. The Edison Benefit is zero cost. Hoover and Parker are cost-based. And the Edison Exchange, the exchange is valued at market prices when it's made, either deposits or withdrawals, so there can be a cost, but often at the end of the year there is no cost for Edison Exchange power.
  - Q. And the most expensive?

2.3

- A. And then the most expensive would be the market-priced power we purchase, the purchased power.
- Q. Do you have a purchasing strategy in which you try to keep energy purchases to be the least expensive?
- A. We utilize our resources to avoid having to purchase power at a higher cost time periods.
- Q. Is that yesterday what was referred to as on-peak and off-peak?

on that: What happens, then, if a third party or a member agency wants to move Metropolitan water through the aqueduct? Where does that power come from?

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. It lacks foundation and, again, it is expert testimony.

THE COURT: I don't think it calls for expert testimony. I think this is just to be a question of fact and the foundation has been laid as to his duties. I will just take this as a question of fact. Do you have the question in mind?

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: To move non-Metropolitan water, where does the power come from?
  - A. Metropolitan would purchase the power.
- Q. Would Metropolitan use its own power to move non-Metropolitan water?
  - A. No.
- Q. When you are going into the market to buy power -- let me lay a foundation.

Sir, it is your duties and responsibilities to go into the market and buy power; correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. At the present time the aqueduct is running full, so I take it you have had to buy power lately?

1736 1738

A. Yes. We move our resources so that we are not minimize -- maximize the amount of energy we purchase off-peak, which is the cheapest time period to purchase the power.

- Q. Because you had said minimize, maximize --
- A. I'm sorry.
- Q. -- let's take the situation, you don't have enough energy to move the water down the aqueduct. You have to go out into the market. What are you buying off-peak or on-peak to move Metropolitan's water?
- A. To move Metropolitan's water we are buying off-peak power.
- Q. If it's a year in which you have excess power to sell, are you selling on-peak or off-peak power?
- A. We would strive to sell on-peak to achieve the highest value for that energy.
- Q. If Metropolitan is selling its excess power, does it have power left over to move non-Metropolitan water?

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Do you know?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

No.

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Just to make sure we are clear

- A. Yes, we are buying power every day, every workday.
  - Q. Does the price of power fluctuate day to day?
  - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. And to buy and sell power, do you need to know what the market price of the power is?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. I take it from the testimony yesterday there's some negotiation goes on in setting the price of the power; correct?
  - A. Correct. And in determining what our negotiating strategy is, what we offer for the power we wish to purchase, we base that on what the market prices have been. If they are going up, we know that there may be tougher negotiation. If they are going down, we can strive to push them down even more.
  - Q. Yesterday we were talking about the DTX 1121. Can we put that back up again, please?

If you would highlight the right-hand corner graph, please.

Sir, prior to going into a negotiation for the purchase of power, is this the information you look to to determine what the market -- fair market price would be for the power?

A. Yes.

2.3

Q. I take it, sir, from your testimony, this isn't the price of the -- this is the price from the preceding day?

#### A. That's correct.

2.2

2.3

- Q. How is it helpful to know what the price is on preceding days going into a negotiation where market price fluctuates day to day?
- A. It can give you the trends of where the market prices are going, if they are remaining relatively stable or moving up or down. It influences our negotiating strategy for buying power for the next day.
- Q. And to make sure I've laid the foundation for this, this DTX 1121, this is a market report for which part of the United States?

#### A. It's the Western United States.

Q. On the graph here, which numbers apply to the power that you would buy for the Colorado River Aqueduct?

### A. To move Metropolitan water?

O. Yes.

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. He testified yesterday this is not the price they use to either buy or sell power.

THE COURT: I take the word "used" as used in the overall calculation. Overruled.

A. I am not sure how long we have had the subscription to Platts. It's been a while.

Q. Was it proven to be a reliable source of market price information for you?

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. It's foundation. It's hearsay. I have no idea how he is going to testify to this as a fact witness.

THE COURT: As to whether it is reliable or not?

MR. GOLDBERG: On a day-to-day basis when he already said they don't track what they buy or sell power at, how is he going to tell us whether this is reliable or accurate?

THE COURT: I will allow the question. You can examine on that.

Go ahead.

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: I will do it a little different way, your Honor. With this information in hand, and you go out to negotiate, has it been your experience that the negotiation seems to begin or end within the range you would expect, based on the market information you had in hand going into the negotiation?

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Based on the experience you've had, with the results you've attained in your

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: For buying power we would be on the off-peak, SP15.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Because counsel makes a good point about what do you mean by use, could you explain the use that you would put yesterday's market price to in trying to negotiate the current day's market price?
- A. We would look at the index price, the second column from the left, as to what the market price was for yesterday. It also provides the change from the prior day to that day, so we can see that the cost of power moved up pretty substantially. And we also get an indication, depending upon what prior days were, if this escalation was something that was kind of a trend or if this was a one-day anomaly. All of those types of pieces of information we would extract from this. And prior days' values would go into our strategy for purchasing power.
- Q. I think you anticipated my next question. Extracting this information, you use it in the negotiation with whomever you are buying power from; is that correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. How many years had you used this Platts market information?

negotiation, does that confirm that this is a reliable source of market information?

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Why do you think it's reliable?
- A. Because the negotiations that we have with parties who are sellers of energy we find that it's consistent with the information that we extracted and our expectations for the market.
- Q. I think we talked before there is on-peak and off-peak information here; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Can you point to the number that -- so -- if we want the on-peak number, that would be the number in the middle of the page?
  - A. It would be the --
- O. Or SP15?
  - A. SP15 on-peak?
- Q. Yes.
  - A. Yes, it would be the value there in the middle of the page that's now highlighted.
  - Q. DTX 1121 is showing the average cost for megawatt hour of power for the month; is that correct?

MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Leading.

1 THE COURT: Sustained. clarification. Go ahead. 2 2 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Would you explain if there is THE WITNESS: \$26.27. 3 3 a number there that shows the cost for megawatt hour of Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: If you need power, what is it 4 4 power for January 2011? you can do so that you can take advantage of off-peak 5 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Vague as to "cost." 5 prices? 6 6 THE COURT: Cost to who? Somebody? These MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Vague. Calls for 7 7 people? Something else? expert testimony. Lack of foundation. 8 8 THE COURT: Overruled. Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: This document shows -- has 9 9 dollar numbers. Would you explain what those dollar THE WITNESS: We utilize the resources 10 10 amounts are? available to us from the contracts, and we utilize that 11 11 energy in the most expensive time periods. So we create A. They're the cost of power in the marketplace on 12 12 a megawatt-hour basis. the need only in the off-peak period, and we would 13 13 Q. Would you tell us what is the cost of megawatt purchase the power in the off-peak as the cheapest of 14 14 hour basis on-peak for average for the month of the supplemental energy we would have to acquire. 15 15 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Now I want to add a different January 2011? 16 16 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Calls for expert qualification to the question. Let's take the situation 17 17 of buying power for a third party, conveying non-Met testimony. Lack of foundation. 18 18 THE COURT: I think all he is going to do is water through the Colorado River Aqueduct. What power 19 19 read some numbers into the record. I don't think it is are you buying in that situation? 20 20 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Lack of foundation. expert opinion. 21 21 Overruled. Calls for expert testimony. 22 22 THE WITNESS: The average cost per megawatt THE COURT: Overruled. 23 23 THE WITNESS: We would utilize our resources to hour for the month of January was \$37.13. 24 24 THE COURT: Do you know what that is an average satisfy the needs first for the Metropolitan water that 25 25 of or what the market is defined as? was being conveyed. And we would go out and purchase 1744 1746 1 THE WITNESS: Market is defined as the 1 on-peak power to move the non-Met water. 2 2 THE COURT: You buy on-peak power to move information Platts has extracted from participants in 3 3 the market as to what was sold at that price. non-Met water regardless of when the movement is 4 4 THE COURT: Do you know who those participants occurring? 5 5 THE WITNESS: The movement would be occurring are? 6 6 THE WITNESS: It's a process that Platts goes during the on-peak hours. 7 7 through to obtain the data. THE COURT: You wouldn't be moving it during 8 8 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: So we were talking about the the off-peak hours? 9 9 on-peak amount. That's not the amount you seek to buy? THE WITNESS: No. We would utilize our 10 10 resources to move our water in the off-peak hours. A. No. 11 11 Q. For Metropolitan water, you seek to buy the Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Mr. Lambeck, I want to 12 12 off-peak amount; correct? clarify. I think you misspoke yesterday. There was 13 13 A. Correct. some reference to using off-peak prices for 14 14 non-Metropolitan water. That was a mistake? Q. And what is that number? 15 15 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. Is he A. That was a misstatement, that's correct. 16 16 talking only about --Q. We have been talking about the first page of 17 17 THE COURT: Sustained. DTX 1121. There are several more pages to it. Are you 18 18 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: What is the average cost of familiar with this document, sir? 19 19 power off-peak? A. Yes, I am. 20 20 THE COURT: You are just asking him to read Q. Do the remaining pages in the exhibit show the 21 21 end-of-month averages for the other months in 2011? from this document? 22 22 MR. EMANUEL: Yes. A. Yes, they do. 23 2.3 MR. GOLDBERG: As long as he is talking about MR. GOLDBERG: Objection as to if he's 24 24 testifying about what the actual average was versus the document. 25 25 what's in the document. THE COURT: That is why I inserted the 1745 1747

```
1
            THE COURT: I take it the question is merely do
                                                                     1
                                                                           take the comment --
 2
                                                                     2
       the other documents in effect show the same information
                                                                             Q. Did you look at the employees' salaries that
 3
                                                                     3
       as this document?
                                                                           are being devoted to scheduling power?
                                                                     4
 4
            MR. EMANUEL: Correct.
                                                                             A. Yes.
 5
            THE COURT: With that understanding, go ahead.
                                                                     5
                                                                             Q. And did you divide that cost by the amount of
 6
                                                                     6
         Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: To speed things up just a
                                                                           power they were scheduling?
 7
                                                                     7
       little bit, I will have you look at DTX 1123.
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, objection. It is
 8
            Can I have that up?
                                                                     8
                                                                           undisclosed expert testimony. We have never seen the
 9
                                                                     9
            And that, too, is a document with information
                                                                           calculation. I object to it coming in.
10
                                                                    10
       on it about power costs for 2012; correct?
                                                                                THE COURT: Overruled.
11
                                                                    11
         A. Correct.
                                                                                Go ahead.
12
                                                                    12
         Q. So it would be accurate to say that the same
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: We have the component, you
13
       questions I asked you about 2011 would also be true for
                                                                    13
                                                                           know, the cost of the salaries of your staff. You
14
       2012? There are 12 pages with end-of-the-month reports
                                                                    14
                                                                           divide that -- I'm sorry.
15
                                                                    15
       reflecting monthly average prices on the report?
                                                                                Let's make sure we've got this right.
16
         A. Correct.
                                                                    16
                                                                                The cost of the salary of the staff devoted to
17
         O. And DTX 1125 -- need to see this, too -- this
                                                                    17
                                                                           scheduling --
18
       is another collection of pages. Do they show power for
                                                                    18
                                                                             A. Yes.
19
       monthly averages for 2013?
                                                                    19
                                                                             Q. -- and you divide that by the power that they
2.0
         A. Yes.
                                                                    20
                                                                           schedule; correct?
21
         Q. DTX 1127, do they show power costs for
                                                                    21
                                                                             A. That's --
2.2
       monthly -- monthly average power costs for 2014?
                                                                    22
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Vague as to "power
23
                                                                    23
                                                                           they schedule."
24
            THE COURT: Not that they show average monthly
                                                                    24
                                                                                THE COURT: Sustained.
25
       power costs for anyone in particular, but the same
                                                                    25
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: When you buy power, you have
                                                         1748
                                                                                                                             1750
 1
                                                                     1
       information we went over with respect to DTX 1121?
                                                                           to schedule it; is that right?
 2
                                                                     2
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Objection as to whose power.
            MR. EMANUEL: Yes.
                                                                     3
 3
            THE COURT: That is my understanding.
                                                                           Vague.
 4
            MR. EMANUEL: I appreciate the clarification.
                                                                     4
                                                                                THE COURT: Overruled.
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Yes.
         Q. I am going to change subjects for a second.
 6
                                                                     6
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Would you explain to the Court
            I take it there is a cost, internally a cost of
 7
                                                                     7
       scheduling power; is that correct?
                                                                           what "scheduling" means?
                                                                     8
 8
         A. That's correct.
                                                                             A. Scheduling is the negotiation and acquisition
                                                                     9
 9
         Q. Do you have staff devoted to doing that?
                                                                           of power from the marketplace, and as well as the
                                                                    10
10
                                                                           accounting and settlement process that occurs with the
         A. Yes, I do.
                                                                    11
11
         Q. Have you had an occasion to calculate the
                                                                           parties at the end of the month.
                                                                    12
12
       internal cost of scheduling power?
                                                                             Q. And you have made a calculation of the time it
13
                                                                    13
             MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Undisclosed expert
                                                                           takes to do that?
                                                                    14
14
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. Expert
       testimony.
15
                                                                    15
            THE COURT: I believe it is. Feel free to lay
                                                                           testimony.
16
                                                                    16
                                                                                THE COURT: Not quite yet. Not with that
       a foundation. This is just percipient testimony. I
17
                                                                    17
       don't know if this is something that can be done without
                                                                           question.
18
                                                                    18
                                                                                Overruled.
       some expertise in analyzing internal costs. Generally
                                                                    19
19
       speaking, that is a matter of expert testimony.
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Yes.
20
                                                                    20
            MR. EMANUEL: I think it is more pertinent than
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And you made a calculation of
21
                                                                    21
                                                                           the dollars per hour paid to the people who make this
       that.
                                                                    22
22
                                                                           calculation?
            THE COURT: I think it is. Here is a fact what
                                                                    23
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. That is
23
       this costs and what that costs and maybe you will leave
24
                                                                    24
                                                                           calling for a dollar per hour that we've never seen.
       it to argument to decide what that shows.
                                                                    25
25
                                                                                THE COURT: It calls for a yes or no.
            MR. EMANUEL: I understand, your Honor, but I
```

1 A. Yes. Overruled. 2 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. Q. This bill refers to variable power? 3 3 THE COURT: It is not a bill. Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And when, at the end of the 4 4 day, you calculate the amount of time, the cost of that Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: This document -- this document 5 time and the amount of power that they have scheduled, 5 refers to variable power and off-aqueduct power. Do you 6 6 are you able to do a mathematical calculation of the see that? 7 7 cost per megawatt hour? A. Yes, I do. 8 8 MR. GOLDBERG: Same objection. Q. Would you explain what those are? 9 9 THE COURT: Overruled. A. There's two components in the cost of power on 10 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. the State Water Project. 11 11 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: What is that number? The first is variable. And these are costs 12 12 MR. GOLDBERG: Same objection. that vary with the amount of water that is conveyed 13 1.3 THE COURT: Sustained. through the State Water Project. The off-aqueduct 14 14 MR. EMANUEL: Let's put up DTX 1096. charge is to recover costs associated with facilities 15 15 Q. Do you recognize this document? that are not located on the State Water Project but are 16 16 A. Yes, I do. off the project or off-aqueduct that are used to -- as 17 17 Q. What is it? providing power and supporting the pumping on the 18 18 A. This is a statement that's created annually for aqueduct, and there's two different methodologies to 19 19 billing purposes to non-member agency. those values. 20 20 Q. Is this created and maintained in the regular Q. Do you see on the bottom there, East Branch, 21 21 course of business? West Branch? Would you explain what the East Branch and 2.2 22 West Branches are? A. Yes. 23 23 O. What is it used for? A. Those are the two delivery points at which 24 24 A. It's used to -- as part of the billing process Metropolitan receives water from the State Water 25 for water delivery to a non-member agency. 25 Project, and it is a locational indication. One comes 1752 1754 1 1 Q. Is another way to put it this is a bill you in on the east side of our system and one comes in on 2 2 send and expect to be paid? the west side of our system. 3 3 MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. I think that's Q. If State Water Project water is delivered to 4 4 San Diego, which branch would it go down? vague. 5 5 THE COURT: Overruled. A. It would go down the East Branch. 6 6 THE WITNESS: This is used in the preparation Q. And that number going across there next to East 7 7 of a bill that would be sent. Branch, does that reflect the cost per acre-foot for 8 8 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Who creates this document? water flowing down the East Branch during this -- for 9 9 A. This is created by Metropolitan staff. this document, January 2012? 10 10 Q. Is it their duty and responsibility to create MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. Lacks 11 11 these documents? foundation. Calls for expert testimony. 12 12 A. Yes. This document was specifically called for by 13 13 Q. And what -- what is the source of the numerous document requests. We object to him testifying 14 14 information of the power costs used in this document? as to the numbers. We have no basis to believe --15 15 A. They come from the Department of Water THE COURT: What is the foundation? Can you 16 16 **Resources for State Water Project costs.** lay some foundation as to why he knows the answer to all 17 17 Q. Is the information -- does Metropolitan these questions about this document? 18 18 consider the information provided by the Department of Let me ask one basic question. Is this a 19 19 Water Resources reliable? document you interact with in your work? 20 20 A. Yes. THE WITNESS: No. 21 21 Q. In fact, isn't it true, sir, that the Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: But you are familiar with the 22 22 Department of Water Resources sends bills to document? 2.3 23 Metropolitan, as well? A. Yes, I am familiar with the document. 24 24 A. Yes. THE COURT: Are you familiar with the document 25 25 Q. And Metropolitan pays them? because of your work in this litigation or because of

1755

```
your job?
                                                                            Q. Do the amounts in each cell under January,
2
                                                                   2
           THE WITNESS: Because of the work with the
                                                                         February through December for 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014
3
                                                                   3
                                                                         reflect the calculation you just described?
      litigation.
                                                                   4
 4
           THE COURT: Objection sustained. He doesn't
                                                                              MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Leading. Same
5
                                                                   5
                                                                         objections as to undisclosed testimony. Foundation.
      have a foundation to talk to me about this.
 6
                                                                   6
           MR. GOLDBERG: Move to strike, your Honor, all
                                                                              THE COURT: Overruled.
 7
                                                                   7
      the testimony that relates to this document.
                                                                              THE WITNESS: Yes.
 8
           THE COURT: Motion is granted.
                                                                   8
                                                                            Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And if we look in the
                                                                   9
 9
           THE CLERK: This is DTX 1096?
                                                                         next-to-last column, we have four numbers, 87.80, 83.30,
1.0
                                                                   10
           THE COURT: It is 1096.
                                                                         115.15, 122.32. Is that the weighted average that you
11
                                                                   11
           MR. EMANUEL: Can I have a minute, your Honor?
                                                                         calculated based on exchange water going through the
                                                                   12
12
           THE COURT: Of course.
                                                                         Colorado River?
                                                                   13
13
        Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Mr. Lambeck, if we can go back
                                                                               MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. It is
                                                                   14
14
      to DTX 1121.
                                                                         undisclosed expert testimony. Now he is telling him to
                                                                   15
15
           THE COURT: 1101?
                                                                         calculate the amount based on the reports that he says
                                                                   16
16
                                                                         don't accurately reflect the actual costs they buy or
           MR. EMANUEL: 1121.
                                                                   17
17
        Q. And if we can zoom in on the on-peak costs and
                                                                         sell power at.
                                                                   18
18
      the $37.13. Do you see that?
                                                                               THE COURT: I understand. I think this
19
                                                                   19
        A. Yes, I do.
                                                                         document is simply to be a reflection of some
                                                                   20
20
        Q. Have you had -- have you been asked to
                                                                         mathematics.
                                                                   21
21
      calculate the average cost based on these reports for
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: That is all it is.
22
                                                                   22
      the years 2011 and -- through 2014?
                                                                              THE COURT: So far that's all it is. The
23
                                                                   23
           MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Expert testimony,
                                                                         objection is overruled.
24
                                                                   24
      undisclosed. Foundation.
                                                                               You may want an answer to the question.
25
                                                                   25
           THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                            Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: I'm sorry.
                                                       1756
                                                                                                                          1758
1
                                                                   1
            THE WITNESS: Yes.
                                                                           A. Yes.
 2
                                                                   2
         O. BY MR. EMANUEL: In doing that calculation, did
                                                                           O. The last column adds a total with A&G. Where
 3
                                                                   3
       you multiply the costs per megawatt hour times the
                                                                         did the A&G come from?
                                                                   4
 4
      number of megawatt hours it takes to move an acre-foot
                                                                              MR. GOLDBERG: Asked and answered.
 5
                                                                   5
       of water?
                                                                              THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                   6
 6
                                                                              THE WITNESS: June Skillman.
            MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Leading, and the
 7
                                                                   7
      same objections.
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: I will ask her about that.
                                                                   8
 8
                                                                              MR. GOLDBERG: Lack of foundation.
            THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                   9
 9
            THE WITNESS: Yes.
                                                                              THE COURT: The foundation, he doesn't know it
                                                                   10
1.0
         Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Did you do that for every
                                                                         came from June Skillman?
                                                                   11
11
       month of 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014?
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: Foundation as to where the number
12
                                                                   12
            MR. GOLDBERG: Same objections.
                                                                         came from.
                                                                  13
13
            THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                              THE COURT: It came from June Skillman.
                                                                   14
14
            THE WITNESS: Yes.
                                                                              Overruled.
                                                                   15
15
         Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And when you derived that
                                                                              MR. EMANUEL: Nothing more, your Honor.
16
                                                                   16
       average, did you then create those numbers? Did you
                                                                               Thank you.
17
                                                                   17
                                                                              THE COURT: Cross-examination.
       then create a weighted average based on the volume of
18
                                                                   18
      Colorado River water delivered as exchange water each
                                                                               MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, your Honor.
19
                                                                   19
      month?
                                                                               Before I begin, we will be moving to strike
20
                                                                   20
            MR. GOLDBERG: Same objections and lack of
                                                                         Mr. Lambeck's testimony in its entirety, all the
                                                                   21
21
       foundation.
                                                                         documents we looked at in his direct. And pursuant to
22
                                                                   22
            THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                         your guidance yesterday in connection with the motion to
                                                                   23
2.3
            THE WITNESS: Yes.
                                                                         exclude, I am happy to cross-examine Mr. Lambeck now
24
                                                                   24
            MR. EMANUEL: I am just going to mark this for
                                                                         without waiving that motion to strike or I can make the
25
                                                                   25
       identification, your Honor, as DTX 1159.
                                                                         motion now.
                                                       1757
                                                                                                                          1759
```

1 THE COURT: I think you should go ahead and Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: Both when your lawyer asked 2 2 cross now. What I had in mind was -- part of your you the question and when the judge asked you the 3 3 motion has to do with an analysis of prior discovery auestion? 4 4 demands, prior rulings and analyzing and matching up A. Those are two different questions. 5 with what's come in. I think it is better to do after 5 Q. Let's take them one at time. 6 6 When Ms. Borden asked you yesterday if the 7 MR. GOLDBERG: Understood, your Honor. purchase price for moving non-Met water was what 8 8 purchase price you would use, and you said off-peak, you 9 9 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** misunderstood that question? That's your testimony 10 10 today? BY MR. GOLDBERG: 11 A. Yes. 11 Q. I am Nick Goldberg from the Water Authority, 12 12 Q. When the Court asked you separately, "Does Met and we will hand you a binder. 13 13 sometimes buy power at the on-peak rate," and you Yesterday you testified on direct examination 14 14 answered "very infrequently," did you misunderstand that that if Met needed to purchase power for a third party 15 15 to move non-Metropolitan water, the purchase price would question, as well? 16 16 be based on the off-peak price; isn't that correct? A. No. 17 17 Q. Is it your testimony when Met buys its own A. Yes. I misspoke. 18 18 Q. That was your answer yesterday? power, it is on-peak, it is very infrequent; that's what 19 19 A. Yes. you are saying? 20 20 Q. I will read it to you: A. That's correct. 21 21 "If Met needed to purchase Q. Let me ask you to look at your declaration and 22 22 power for a third party to move specifically at the top of page five. 23 23 non-Met water, what price would The on-peak price index published in Platts 24 24 be applicable? Market Report is indicative of the price that would be 25 "A For purchasing power we 25 paid to non-MWD water. That is contrary to what you 1760 1762 1 1 would look for the off-peak." testified to yesterday? 2 2 That's what you testified to yesterday? A. That is correct. 3 3 A. Yes. Q. You didn't write this declaration yourself, did 4 Q. If you could put up 717, lines 21 through 23. 4 you? 5 5 And then the Court asked you: A. No. I -- I worked on it. I wrote part of it. 6 6 "Does Met sometimes buy power It was a collaborative process. 7 at beyond peak rate? Q. It was a collaborative process with Met's 8 8 "A Sometimes. Very infrequently." lawyers; isn't that true? 9 9 Was that your testimony, sir? A. Correct. 10 10 Q. You didn't write every word in here? In fact, A. Yes. 11 11 Q. You met with your counsel after we broke some of that was written by Met's counsel in this 12 12 yesterday; isn't that true? litigation; true? 13 13 A. Yes. A. The outside counsel? 14 14 Q. And now less than a day later you testified to Q. Or in-house counsel. 15 1.5 something completely different today; isn't that true? A. It was a collaborative process with the 16 16 A. That's correct. Yesterday I misspoke. in-house counsel. 17 17 Q. We just looked at two different questions, one Q. When you say collaborative process, you are 18 18 that your own lawyer, Ms. Borden in the back, asked you, talking about the fact they would draft the declaration 19 19 and another that the Court asked you. And it wasn't and supply it to you for you to review; correct? 20 20 A. We would draft it together. just misspeaking, was it, sir? 21 21 MR. EMANUEL: Objection, your Honor. Q. You are not testifying today you drafted every 22 22 word of this declaration? Argumentative. 23 2.3 THE COURT: Overruled. A. Not every word. 24 2.4 THE WITNESS: I misunderstood the question that Q. So the record is clear, Met's lawyers that are 25 25 was asked on the purchasing for the power. involved in this litigation, whether in-house or outside

1763

1 counsel, also participated in drafting this declaration? own water for purposes of moving it through the CRA, the 2 2 A. I do not know if the outside counsel Colorado River Aqueduct? 3 3 participated in drafting this. A. Not that I'm aware of. 4 4 Q. You don't know one way or the other? Q. That water moves through the aqueduct all at 5 A. No. 5 the same time? It is not like you are separately 6 6 Q. They could have? disaggregating the Water Authority's IID and canal 7 A. Yeah. lining water from Metropolitan's own supplies? 8 Q. And the in-house counsel, we know they sure did 8 A. Not at this time that I'm aware of, no. 9 9 participate in drafting the declaration you submitted to Q. Is it true Met has moved its own supplies 10 10 the Court today? during off-peak times; you testified to that on direct 11 11 A. We worked together on it, yes. just a moment ago? 12 Q. You testified yesterday the off-peak hours are 12 A. Yes, we move our water. 13 from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday? 13 Q. So if you're not disaggregating the Water 14 A. That is the market definition. 14 Authority's IID and canal lining water, isn't it true, 15 15 Q. Is it your testimony that Met has never pumped sir, that Met has also necessarily moved the Water 16 the Water Authority' IID and canal lining water during 16 Authority's canal lining and IID water during off-peak 17 off-peak hours? 17 hours? That's just true? 18 A. Could you repeat that question? 18 A. I don't have anything to refute that. 19 Q. I'm asking you whether -- whether you're saying 19 O. So it's true? 20 that Met has never pumped the Water Authority's IID and 20 A. I don't know anything that would refute it. 21 canal lining water during off-peak hours? 21 Q. I am asking you a specific question. The 2.2 A. I do not know. 22 statement I said is true, is it not? I am not asking 23 Q. You don't know one way or the other? 23 whether you have anything to refute it. I am asking you 24 A. I do not know one way or the other. 24 whether it's true. 2.5 Q. You're testifying that Met ought to charge San 25 A. I do not know of any distinction in the water 1764 1766 1 1 Diego the on-peak price because it is third-party water that today is being moved through the aqueduct. 2 2 but you don't know if that water moves at off-peak Q. That is not my question, sir. 3 3 A. I'm sorry. times? 4 MR. EMANUEL: Objection, your Honor. 4 Q. I am asking you whether it is true that the 5 5 THE COURT: It is argumentative. Water Authority's IID and canal lining water gets moved 6 6 Sustained through the Colorado River Aqueduct at off-peak times. 7 7 O. BY MR. GOLDBERG: You don't know if Met has A. I believe the water that you're referring to is 8 8 ever moved the Water Authority's water after 10:00 p.m. treated as a Met supply, and it is moved as all the 9 9 at night? other water is moved, that is, Met's supply of our 10 10 MR. EMANUEL: Asked and answered, your Honor. member agencies. 11 11 THE COURT: Sustained. Q. Which moves at times during off-peak hours, 12 12 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: It is true, sir, Met has correct? 13 13 moved the Water Authority's IID and canal lining water A. Presumably. 14 14 on Sunday, for example? Q. Yes or no? Presumably, it does. You testified 15 15 MR. EMANUEL: Objection, your Honor. to that on direct. You testified on --16 16 THE COURT: Let's wait to see if there is an THE COURT: Overruled. 17 17 THE WITNESS: I do not know when the specific answer. Let's take a pause. 18 18 water was moved for IID or --Do you have the question in mind? 19 19 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: I didn't mean to interrupt THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 20 20 you. Please finish. If it's aggregated, then all the water is moved 21 21 A. For Metropolitan I do not know of the 22 22 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: You testified on direct distinction in the water that has been moved through the 23 23 aqueduct. examination, did you not, that Met's own supplies moved 24 24 O. Met does not draw a distinction between the during off-peak hours? 25 25 Water Authority's IID and canal lining water and Met's A. Yes.

1767

1 Q. And if it's not disaggregated and it includes A. Yes. 2 2 Q. We talked a little bit -- I think your counsel the Water Authority's IID and canal lining water, the 3 3 Water Authority's IID and canal lining water also moves asked you some questions about what "day-ahead" meant. 4 4 during off-peak hours; correct? And that is where you go to buy power the day 5 5 before you need it; right? A. Correct. 6 6 Q. Today and yesterday, in fact, we looked at some A. Correct. 7 7 exhibits from Platts Market Index; do you remember that? Q. And under the exchange agreement Met has 8 8 advance notice of the amount of water it delivers 9 9 through the Colorado River Aqueduct to San Diego; Q. This is one of the Platts reports you testified 10 10 about today and yesterday; correct? correct? 11 11 A. I'm sorry. Which agreement? A. Correct. 12 12 Q. Under the exchange agreement that is at issue Q. And you testified yesterday that these prices 13 13 on the Platts reports are just one of a variety of 14 14 inputs that Met looks at when it's negotiating with A. I'm not familiar with the exchange agreement. 15 15 Q. You're not familiar with the exchange buyers to sell Met's power. That's what you testified 16 16 to vesterday; right? agreement, sir? 17 17 A. No. A. Yes. 18 Q. Specifically we were looking at the on-peak and 18 Q. And you testified earlier about a price that 19 19 ought to be charged under the exchange agreement? off-peak price for SP15, isn't that right? 20 20 MR. EMANUEL: Objection, your Honor. A. Yes. 21 Q. And you testified there was some confusion but 21 THE COURT: Sustained. Argumentative. 2.2 22 you testified these numbers in the far right corner, Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: How about this: Do you know, 23 23 37.13 and 26.27, they reflect something. We don't know sir, one way or the other -- this is a yes or no 24 24 exactly what, but it is some price that Platts question -- whether Met gets advanced notice of the 25 25 calculated? amount of water that San Diego delivers to it at 1768 1770 1 1 MR. EMANUEL: I am going to object. Metropolitan's intake at Lake Havasu? 2 2 THE COURT: Sustained. Let's just have a A. I do not know. 3 3 question. Q. Put up DTX 1074. This is a letter from the 4 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: Let me start again. That 4 Water Authority dated October 21, 2013. And the subject 5 is "Annual notice of quantity of water to be transferred price in the bottom right-hand corner is something that 6 6 Platts calculated; correct? in calendar year 2014." 7 7 A. Correct. Do you see that? 8 8 Q. In fact, you can't tell us whether that price A. Yes, I do. 9 9 for on-peak SP15 is the same price at which Met bought Q. It is going to Mr. Jan Matusak? 1.0 10 or sold power in January 2011? A. Matusak. 11 11 A. That's correct. Q. Do you know who that individual is? 12 12 Q. And the same is true for the off-peak number; A. Yes. 13 13 right? Q. That is someone who works at Met; right? 14 14 A. That's correct. 15 15 Q. If we were to look at all of these pages from Q. Do you see, "In accordance with the exchange 16 16 2011 to 2014 and I asked you the same question, you'd agreement this water is required to be delivered in 17 17 give me the same answer; right? equal monthly installments during 2014 or 14,808.33 18 18 A. Yes, I would. acre-feet per month." 19 19 Q. So, in fact, that price that Platts reports, And then the sentence before that, it says, 20 20 you are not in a position to tell me one way or the "Thus, the total amount of water expected to be 21 21 other whether that reflects Met's cost of either buying transferred in calendar year 2014 is 177,700 acre feet." 22 22 Do you see that? or selling power; true? 23 23 A. Yes. I do. A. True. It's a market price. 2.4 24 Q. At the top of the table in DTX 1121, do you see O. Met knows in advance the total amount of water

1771

expected to be transferred in any calendar year; true?

1769

25

25

where it says "day-ahead markets"?

A. Met does.

1

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

23

24

25

- 2 Q. It also knows that water is to be delivered by
- 3 Metropolitan in equal monthly increments; correct?
  - A. It's to be transferred?
  - Q. It says "delivered"; right?
  - A. To be delivered by Met, yes. Yes, I see it.
  - Q. So Met knows in advance how much water is going to be transferred in any calendar year, and it knows the schedule of delivery; correct?
    - A. Correct.
    - Q. So Met doesn't need to wait until the day before it's going to pump San Diego's water to purchase power on the spot market; correct?
    - A. We don't have to, but in our determination of scheduling energy, we find that to be the best way to achieve the overall lowest costs for our member agencies.
      - Q. But you don't have to do that; right?
    - A. We don't have to -- no, no, we don't have to do that.
  - Q. You know well in advance that the expected number of acre-feet and the schedule of deliveries before the year; right?
    - A. Correct.
    - Q. You could buy that power in advance if you

- 1 its supplemental power on only the day-ahead market;
- 2 right?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1772

- A. Historically, it has not.
  - Q. It typically buys that power in advance; right?
- A. The non day of?
  - Q. I am talking about supplemental power now.
- A. Supplemental power?
  - Q. Met typically buys that power in advance and not on the day-ahead market; true?
- A. No. That's not specifically true. We do buy supplemental power, what's called forwards, on occasion if we believe there's risk in the marketplace, but today we are only buying day-ahead.
  - Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: You mentioned forward.
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You are familiar with Met's forward energy program?
- A. Oh, yes.

MR. GOLDBERG: Could you put up PTX 497? This isn't in evidence. It is a Met board memo. I will move

THE COURT: PTX 497, any objection?

23 MR. EMANUEL: No objection.

THE COURT: PTX 497 is admitted.

(PTX 497 was received in evidence.)

1774

wanted to, couldn't you?

# A. Yes. But that wouldn't achieve the most effective price.

- Q. But you could buy it in advance? Yes or no?

MR. GOLDBERG: DTX 1074 isn't in evidence, and I will move it in.

THE COURT: Do you have any objection to 1074? The suggestion is it is not yet in evidence.

MR. GOLDBERG: I don't believe it is.

MR. EMANUEL: It can't come in through this witness. He doesn't have a foundation for it.

THE COURT: I'm sure that's true. Do you have a position? Or is that your position?

MR. EMANUEL: It is hearsay and lacks foundation.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained at this time

MR. GOLDBERG: It is also on their exhibit list, as I am reminded by Mr. Purcell.

THE COURT: It is not quite enough.

MR. GOLDBERG: I thought I would take a shot at it, right.

O. Isn't it true, sir, when Met does buy supplemental power in the market, it doesn't purchase 1 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: You see this is a memo to the 2

board of directors, the finance and insurance committee,

3 "An increase in the total authorized payment obligation 4

for Colorado River Aqueduct forward energy commitments."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. In fact, you have delivered presentations to
- Met's board about this program, have you not?

  - Q. And you delivered this presentation; correct?
- A. I don't recall specifically if I did this presentation or not.
  - Q. But presentations like this?
  - A. Yes. I've talked to the board about this program.
    - Q. And if you can blow up -- you have it there. The sentence that says, the second sentence,

"In order to reduce price and supply volatility and risk, Metropolitan has utilized forward purchase contracts to lock in prices and quantities for up to 24 months in advance of need."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
  - Q. That is true?
- A. Yes, we do.

1775

1 Q. Met buys -- purchases power in the market for 1 Q. That's true; right? 2 2 up to 24 months before it needs it; correct? A. That was true, yes. 3 3 Q. In fact, it is not just some of the time; A. We have. 4 Q. Scroll down to page two. And do you see where right? It's 70 percent of the time? 5 it says, "Day-ahead purchases meet the pumping needs of 5 A. No. It's not 70 percent of the time. 6 6 the CRA for the next day after accounting for the Q. I take it back. It is 70 percent of the 7 7 resources from the federal hydro projects, SCE and the supplemental energy that you buy? 8 8 forward energy purchases." A. Some 2010. 9 9 Right? Q. For the next two years; right? 10 10 A. Yes. A. Looking out two years, that's correct. 11 11 Q. The next sentence, "At times, energy suppliers Q. Which would take you through 2012; true? 12 12 will raise their prices if they believe a buyer must A. True. 13 13 have the energy." Q. That's a true statement; correct? 14 14 Right? A. Yes. 15 15 A. Yes. Q. In your declaration you submitted in this case 16 Q. "Forward energy purchases afford Metropolitan 16 you talked about Met's various sources of energy for 17 17 the flexibility to defer day-ahead energy purchases, moving water on the Colorado River Aqueduct? 18 18 which helps bring a supplier's prices down." A. Yes. 19 19 Do you see that? Q. You talked about the power from the federal 2.0 20 A. Yes. I do. hydro plant at Hoover? 21 21 Q. That's true; right? A. Yes. 22 2.2 Q. You talked about the power from the federal A. It is one of our strategies, yes. 23 23 Q. Met buys power in advance which defers its need hydro plant at Parker; right? 24 24 to buy power on the day-ahead market? A. Yes. 25 2.5 Q. You talked about the Edison energy; correct? A. We buy power in advance if we believe the 1776 1778 1 1 market is acting in such a way it is going to provide A. Yes. 2 2 the risk/benefit in a forward purchase. That is not the Q. When it came to supplemental purchases for the 3 3 market, what you talked about was the day-ahead, on-peak way the market is always responding. That was the way 4 4 things were happening back in 2011, which is why we went price; correct? 5 to the board to increase this program. A. Yes. 6 6 Q. In 2011 is one of the years that you looked at, Q. You didn't mention anything about this forward 7 7 right, in the Platts day-ahead reports? That was the energy program, did you? 8 8 first report, in fact, we looked at; right? A. No. 9 9 A. Yes. Q. You didn't mention it during your direct 10 10 Q. So this is the same exact time frame, correct, examination either, correct? 11 11 2011? A. Correct. 12 12 A. This is happening during that time, yes. MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, maybe now is a good 13 13 Q. So when you're buying power and forward energy time for a break. 14 14 in 2011, that's different than buying it at the THE COURT: Why don't we get together again in 1.5 15 day-ahead market; correct? ten minutes. Thank you. 16 16 A. Yes. (Recess.) 17 17 Q. You testified just a moment ago that sometimes THE COURT: Let's continue. 18 18 you do, sometimes you don't; it depends on the MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 19 19 conditions. Why don't you look at the bottom part of Q. Put up on screen DTX 1121 which is Platts 20 20 this same page. Energy Trader Report, and blow up the first column 21 21 It says in early 2010 Metropolitan had acquired there. That's fine. 22 22 a little over 70 percent of the supplemental energy Mr. Lambeck again, this DTX 1121, one of the 23 23 needed for the next two years through forward energy Platts reports; right?

1779

1777

24

25

A. Yes.

Q. And if you look in the SP15 row, you see

24

25

purchases. Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

columns there for de	eals; right?	1	Q. Should
2 <b>A. Yes.</b>	, 5	2	A. For one day.
<sup>3</sup> Q. And deals is	presuming the number of deals that	3	Q. Should be or is it? I am asking whether you
are done at that rate		4	actually know.
5 A. I would pres	sume so.	5	A. That is what we take it to be.
6 Q. And it says N		6	Q. That is what you interpret this to be?
<sup>7</sup> <b>A. Yes.</b>	, 0	7	A. Yes.
8 Q. Not applicab	le?	8	Q. You don't know what Platts did when they came
9 A. Maybe avail		9	up with change; right?
Q. Not available		10	A. I do not know the process that they go through
A. I don't know	what "NA" specifically stands for.	11	to come up with all of the these numbers.
12 They didn't have t	= -	12	Q. In fact, you don't really know the product of
Q. There is certa	ninly no data here?	13	any of these numbers on this chart; right?
14 A. Right.	•	14	A. The product?
Q. That is true for	or the off-peak, as well?	15	Q. You don't know what Platts is doing at Platts
16 <b>A. Yes.</b>	•	16	headquarters to come up with these numbers?
Q. What about v	volume; do you see volume?	17	A. I do not know specifically what they are doing
18 <b>A. Yes, I do.</b>		18	to come up with these numbers. They are making a
Q. And volume	is the volume of purchases or sales?	19	determination as to the market price at these different
20 <b>A. Yes.</b>	-	20	points. Specifically how they do that, I do not know.
Q. Do you know	one way or the other what that	21	Q. You know they've made some determination but
means?	•	22	you don't know how they made that determination?
A. What the vo	lume means?	23	A. That's correct.
<sup>24</sup> Q. Yes.		24	Q. And that's true for every single number on this
A. No. I presui	ne that it's the volume of megawatt	25	chart; correct?
_	1700		1700
	1780		1782
hours that are tran	sacted.	1	A. That's correct.
	ow one way or the other?	2	Q. That would be true for every single number on
3 <b>A. No.</b>		3	every single one of these charts, on DTX 1121, 1123,
	rue for deals; right?	4	1125 and 1127?
5 A. Correct.	, <b>.</b>	5	A. Yes.
6 Q. And range, w	hat's that?	6	Q. Okay. And instead of calculating some
_	be the range for the specific	7	day-ahead, on-peak spot market rate, another way you
8 transactions that to		8	could do it would be to calculate a melded power rate;
	ge, is that what you're telling	9	right?
<sup>10</sup> me?	<i>y y</i>	10	A. For what purpose?
11 <b>A. Yes.</b>		11	Q. For the purpose of calculating a melded cost of
	ge for SP15 is 38 to 38 and the	12	power of moving water on the Colorado River Aqueduct;
<sup>13</sup> average is 37.13. T	-	13	correct?
	average for the month.	14	A. For moving Metropolitan's water, yes.
Q. But the range	C	15	Q. You could also calculate that for non-Met
A. That's for th		16	water; right?
	? You don't know what "range"	17	A. But that's not what we would do.
means, do you?		18	Q. You could calculate that; right?
, ,	's the range of the deals.	19	A. I can do the math.
Q. But you don't	_	20	Q. In fact, you testified earlier that Met, for
21 <b>A. No.</b>		21	your purposes, doesn't disaggregate Met water versus
	e is true for change; you presume	22	non-Met water that moves through the CRA?
-	of something? You don't really know	23	A. What we are moving through the CRA is all Met
what that means, do		24	water.
	the change of the index price.	25	Q. Are you telling me that San Diego's IID and
	1781		1783

canal lining water does not move through the Colorado A. Yes. 2 2 River Aqueduct? Q. Do you see the subject of this email, San Diego 3 3 A. It does, but it is treated as a member agency Union Tribune was looking for info re power costs for 4 4 for Metropolitan's purposes. the State Water Project and the Colorado River. You 5 5 Q. What you are testifying to is you are treating understood? 6 6 it all as Met's own water? A. Uh-huh. 7 A. Yes. Q. San Diego Union Tribune was looking for 8 8 information regarding the power costs for the State Q. If you are treating it all as Met's own water, 9 9 you could calculate a melded average cost of power for Water Project and the Colorado River? 10 10 A. Yes. that water? 11 11 Q. Start with the bottom email in the chain. A. That's what we've done with achieving --12 This is from Mike Gardner. This is part of the 12 working to achieve the lowest power costs to move water 13 13 same email; right? on the aqueduct from Met's water to our member agencies. 14 A. Yes. 14 Q. You would agree that rather than charging the 15 Q. This is an email from Mr. Gardner to R. Muir of 15 day-ahead market price, Met should instead calculate and 16 the MWD. Who is R. Muir? 16 come up with some cost for the melded cost of power for 17 A. Bob Muir. 17 that water; right? 18 Q. An employee at Met? 18 MR. EMANUEL: I'm sorry. Which water? 19 19 A. Yes. THE COURT: Sustained. 20 Q. Mr. Gardner is asking how much does Met spend 20 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: You testified earlier, 21 on power costs for the SWP and Colorado River; do you 21 literally just a few seconds ago, that you consider the 22 see that? 22 IID and canal lining water that the Water Authority 23 A. Yes. 23 delivers to Metropolitan at its intake at Lake Havasu 24 Q. Mr. Gardner is a reporter at the San Diego 24 Met's own water; right? 2.5 Union Tribune, is he not? 25 A. That's how we're treating it today, yes. 1784 1786 1 1 Q. You testified just a moment ago for that A. That's what it appears, yes. I don't know him 2 2 purpose you can calculate a melded cost of power; right? 3 3 A. We do. Yes. Q. "It looks like I have a graph that talks about 4 Q. My question is, isn't it true, then, that the 4 power generation that I want to also not the costs of 5 5 wheeling." melded cost of the power, since that's what you are 6 6 already calculating, is not the same thing as this I think he means know the costs of wheeling; 7 7 day-ahead cost of power of the on-peak spot market rate? right? 8 8 MR. EMANUEL: Objection, your Honor. I didn't MR. EMANUEL: Calls for speculation, your 9 9 understand the question. Honor. 10 10 THE COURT: As I understand it, he is asking THE COURT: I will take this as his 11 11 whether the melded power rate would be the same as the understanding. 12 12 on-peak rate in, for example, DTX 1121. Overruled. 13 13 THE WITNESS: The melded rate would be lower. THE WITNESS: I would assume so, yes. 14 14 Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: A lot lower? Q. BY MR. GOLDBERG: Go to the next email in the 15 15 A. It would be lower. chain here. This is an email from Mr. Acuna, and he is 16 16 sending this to other folks at Met. And he is saying, O. In fact, that's what you calculate for 17 17 Metropolitan's own water? That includes the Water "Reporter Mike Gardner writes." 18 18 Authority's canal lining and IID water; right? This jogs your recollection that Mr. Gardner 19 19 was a reporter for the then San Diego Union Tribune? 20 20 Q. Why don't we look at PTX 479, please. A. Yes. 21 21 This is an email, Mr. Lambeck, that you wrote Q. He is working on a story re how San Diego gets 22 22 its water; right? That's what it says? to Armando Acuna at Metropolitan? 2.3 23 A. Yes. A. Yes. 24 24 Q. Mr. Acuna is an employee in the media services Q. This all ultimately gets forwarded to you and 25 25 department; right? you respond in the top email in the chain --

1787

1 Why don't you read to the Court what you say in 1 power rate. If you could blow that up. 2 2 the second paragraph about "on the CRA"? And the column that is at the top, this is 3 3 telling you in 2010 the system power rate was \$119 per A. "On the CRA the total estimated power cost, 4 4 both contractual power and market purchases, to move acre-foot; right? 5 5 A. Yes. 1.2 million acre-feet in calendar year 2010 is 6 6 59.9 million or approximately \$50 per acre-foot." Q. So in 2010, the system power rate that Met 7 7 Q. And the Water Authority moved San Diego's IID charged the Water Authority under the exchange agreement 8 8 and canal lining water through the CRA in 2010; right? was more than double the actual cost of power for moving 9 9 the Water Authority's IID and canal lining water through A. I believe so. 10 10 Q. And you're calculating here a melded cost of the CRA; right? 11 11 A. It was twice as much as the melded cost on the power, aren't you? 12 12 A. I am because we treat that as all Met water for CRA. 13 13 the CRA conveyance purposes. MR. GOLDBERG: I will move PTX 479 into 14 14 evidence, which is Mr. Lambeck's email. Q. Right. You are looking at both the contractual 15 15 power and the market purchases; right? MR. EMANUEL: No objection. 16 16 THE COURT: 479 is admitted. 17 17 (PTX 479 was received in evidence.) Q. You are not just looking at the market 18 purchases at the day-ahead spot market on-peak rate; 18 MR. GOLDBERG: Nothing further. 19 19 correct? THE COURT: Redirect. 20 20 A. Correct. MR. EMANUEL: Yes, your Honor. 21 21 Q. And we talked about -- this is 1.2 million 22 22 acre-feet in calendar year 2010; right? REDIRECT EXAMINATION 23 23 BY MR. EMANUEL: A. Correct. 24 24 Q. At capacity the CRA can only really move 1.2 Q. Sir, you were never asked if that forward power 25 million acre-feet; right? 25 buying program ended up being cheaper, more expensive or 1788 1790 1 1 A. We can move a little bit more. Our capacity is neutral? 2 2 1.25 with the shutdown. A. It was more expensive. 3 3 O. So near full conditions? Q. Why was it more expensive? 4 A. Yes. 4 A. Well, the forward power purchase is like an 5 5 Q. You are calculating at near full conditions a insurance policy. You are insuring yourself against 6 6 \$50 per acre-foot melded cost of power? rate spikes, increasing power costs, and it reduces the 7 7 A. Yes. risk to you of seeing those and having to buy in that 8 8 O. For the CRA? type of a market. So you lock in the price of power 9 9 A. Right. going out forward into the marketplace. 10 10 Q. Including the Water Authority's IID and canal THE COURT: Is it basically like buying futures 11 11 lining water; right? in energy? 12 12 A. All the water, yes. THE WITNESS: It is not so much -- you are 13 13 Q. That is a lot more than a day-ahead spot market agreeing with the supplier that they will provide you 14 14 on-peak rate would be -- excuse me. Let me strike that. the power for that price and you're obligated to take it 15 15 That is a lot less than the day-ahead on-peak at that price at some point in the future. So it's an 16 16 spot market would be? insurance policy. 17 17 A. During this time period, that's correct. And we did not have spikes. We did not have 18 18 Q. In fact, in 2010, Met charged the Water dramatic increasing and as anybody selling insurance, 19 19 Authority the system power rate; right? they add to the price to cover their risk. 20 20 Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: In hindsight, would A. Yes. 21 21 Q. And the system power rate in 2010 was \$119 per Metropolitan had been better off if they had purchased 22 22 acre-foot, was it not? water in the day-ahead --23 2.3 A. I do not know. MR. GOLDBERG: Objection. Calls for 24 Q. Why don't you put up PTX 357. This is in 24 speculation and lack of foundation. 25 25 evidence. About midway through you will see the system THE COURT: It is a question of comparing the 1789 1791

```
1
      two prices. I think he has the foundation for it.
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Vague.
2
                                                                    2
            MR. EMANUEL: I misspoke. Can I rephrase my
                                                                                THE COURT: Overruled.
 3
                                                                    3
      question?
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Yes. It's -- it's the movement
 4
                                                                    4
           THE COURT: Yes.
                                                                          of the Met water and the cost that it takes.
 5
         Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Looking back historically,
                                                                    5
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: In the event a third party
 6
                                                                    6
      would Metropolitan have been better off buying power in
                                                                          came along and said they wanted to wheel water down the
 7
                                                                    7
      the day-ahead spot market?
                                                                          Colorado River Aqueduct, would they be entitled to the
 8
            MR. GOLDBERG: Lacks foundation.
                                                                    8
                                                                          melded rate?
 9
                                                                    9
            THE COURT: For which period of time?
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor.
10
                                                                   10
            MR. EMANUEL: For the period of the forward
                                                                                THE COURT: Sustained. Legal conclusion.
11
                                                                   11
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Thank you.
      purchase program.
12
            MR. GOLDBERG: Lacks foundation. There is no
                                                                   12
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: If a wheeler came along and
13
                                                                   13
      foundation for how he would know that.
                                                                           said they wanted to convey water down the Colorado River
14
                                                                   14
            THE COURT: I assume he is able to compute in
                                                                           Aqueduct, would you have to go into the market to buy
                                                                   15
15
      his mind what he actually --
                                                                          power?
                                                                   16
16
           Do you know what you actually paid and what the
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Same objection.
17
                                                                   17
      actual prices were in the forward market? Do you have
                                                                                THE COURT: Sustained. Wouldn't it all
                                                                   18
18
      all those numbers in your head?
                                                                          depend -- it seems to depend on legal issues that this
19
                                                                   19
            THE WITNESS: No, I do not have them in my
                                                                          witness hasn't been presented for.
                                                                   20
20
      head.
                                                                                MR. EMANUEL: Let me put it a different way,
                                                                   21
21
            THE COURT: Sustained.
                                                                          your Honor.
22
                                                                   22
         Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: Without -- without knowing the
                                                                             Q. In reality, what actually happens when a
                                                                   23
23
      exact number, do you have in your head whether it was
                                                                          wheeler asks to send water down the Colorado River
24
                                                                   24
      more or less going into using the forward purchase
                                                                          Aqueduct?
                                                                   25
25
      program or the spot market?
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Objection, your Honor. I think
                                                        1792
                                                                                                                           1794
1
            MR. GOLDBERG: Same objection. He just said he
                                                                    1
                                                                           this was covered, and he testified that they look at it
2
                                                                    2
      didn't know.
                                                                          all the same.
 3
                                                                    3
                                                                                THE COURT: We'll find out.
            THE COURT: Overruled. If you know the answer.
                                                                    4
 4
            THE WITNESS: We would not, looking back,
                                                                                Overruled. This was a question about
5
                                                                    5
      Monday-morning quarterbacking, we would not have made
                                                                          historical practice.
                                                                    6
 6
      those purchases had we known what the day-ahead market
                                                                                MR. EMANUEL: Yes. Thank you.
 7
                                                                    7
      was going to do.
                                                                                THE COURT: Go ahead.
                                                                    8
 8
         Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: You were asked some questions
                                                                                THE WITNESS: A third party coming in to wheel
                                                                    9
 9
      about melded rates. Is melded rate another word for the
                                                                          water down the Colorado would not be charged the melded
                                                                   10
10
      system power rate?
                                                                           rate. They would be charged the cost for us to go out
                                                                   11
11
         A. No. The melded rate for the CRA includes all
                                                                          and acquire the power.
                                                                   12
12
      of the resources and the costs of those resources, the
                                                                             Q. BY MR. EMANUEL: And the power you acquired,
13
                                                                   13
      low-cost hydro that we receive from Hoover and Parker,
                                                                          would that be on-peak or off-peak?
14
                                                                   14
      incorporating the zero-cost energy that we get from
                                                                             A. We would be --
                                                                   15
15
      Edison as benefit energy, as well as the supplemental
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Same objections we had earlier.
16
                                                                   16
                                                                                THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead.
      purchase. It is all of that gets melded together, the
17
                                                                   17
      total cost versus total megawatt hours needed.
                                                                                THE WITNESS: We would be acquiring on-peak
18
                                                                   18
         Q. Recalling that pie chart, there are some slices
                                                                          power.
                                                                   19
19
      of virtually free power in there?
                                                                                MR. EMANUEL: Thank you. Nothing more.
20
                                                                   20
         A. Yes, the benefit, as well as the exchange
                                                                                MR. GOLDBERG: Nothing from us, your Honor.
                                                                   21
21
      typically turns out to be no cost.
                                                                                THE COURT: Thank you so much. You are
22
                                                                   22
         Q. Would you be able to compare for me -- when
                                                                          excused.
                                                                   2.3
                                                                                Call your next witness. Just for the record
23
      you're talking about melded costs, those are only
24
                                                                   24
                                                                          who are we calling?
      charged to Met -- that is only charged to Metropolitan
25
                                                                   25
      water, isn't that correct?
                                                                          /
                                                        1793
                                                                                                                           1795
```

JUNE SKILLMAN, place, now in place at Metropolitan, in determining what 2 2 called as a witness by the Defendants, was sworn and the possible cost impacts would be in relationship to 3 3 testified as follows: the exchange agreement? 4 4 A. Yes. 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 Q. Did you, in essence, then, in your analysis 6 6 THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. shift the SWP costs, that is to say, the State Water 7 7 MR. OLIVER: Your Honor, my name is Dale Project water costs to other cost objectives? 8 Oliver 8 MR. KEKER: Cost objectives? I didn't hear. 9 9 THE CLERK: And state and spell your first and Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Cost objectives other than the 10 10 last name for the record. exchange water. 11 THE WITNESS: My name is June Skillman. 11 A. Yes. 12 S-K-I-L-L-M-A-N. J-U-N-E. 12 MR. KEKER: Objection. Vague and 13 THE COURT: Sir. 13 incomprehensible. I don't understand the question. 14 MR. OLIVER: My name is Dale Oliver, and I am 14 THE COURT: I don't either, but I am going to 15 with Quinn Emanuel. I will be conducting the direct 15 overrule the objection and see if the rest of the 16 examination of Ms. Skillman. 16 context makes it clear. 17 17 Q. BY MR. OLIVER: If one removes the State Water 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 Project costs from the cost pool, do those costs, under 19 BY MR. OLIVER: 19 your existing structure, then have to be assigned some 20 Q. Are you employed at Metropolitan? 20 other cost objective? 21 A. Yes. 21 A. Yes. 2.2 Q. What is your job description? 22 Q. Is this an expression or a need that is framed 23 A. I am the manager of the budget and financial 23 by the requirements that there be income for revenue 24 planning section. 24 neutrality? 2.5 Q. With that job title what are your general 25 A. Yes. 1796 1798 1 1 responsibilities? Q. What do you understand is revenue neutrality? 2 2 A. I am responsible for the development of A. In undertaking the analysis we need to insure 3 3 Metropolitan's biennial budget and the rates and charges that the -- that anything that changes that we're 4 4 that support the revenue to support the budget. collecting the same amount of revenue under any revised 5 5 Q. Do you have employees that work for you in that analysis that we do as we did under the existing rate 6 6 connection? structure. And that way we can make sure that the 7 7 A. Yes. analysis has integrity in terms of accounting for all 8 8 Q. Were you asked to conduct and supervise an changes. 9 9 analysis of costs associated with the Phase I ruling in Q. Costs that are incurred by Metropolitan have to 10 10 this case and its impact on the rate structure that was be absorbed by some cost objective? Is that correct? 11 11 then in place at Metropolitan as pertaining to exchange A. Yes. 12 12 water? MR. OLIVER: Next I would like to have 13 13 A. Yes. displayed a document that has been marked for 14 14 Q. In that analysis that you undertook, did you identification as DTX 1160. 15 15 give effect to the impact of removing State Water MR. KEKER: Excuse me. Before this is put up 16 16 Project costs from the system access rate that had been even, your Honor, I have objections to what Ms. Skillman 17 17 used by Metropolitan? is about to try to do. This -- and the objections are 18 18 A. Yes. she has not been --19 19 Q. Did you give effect to the impact costwise in Can we take this down, Mr. Oliver, please? 20 20 removing the State Water Project costs from the system THE COURT: Yes. 21 21 power rate then being utilized by Metropolitan? MR. KEKER: She has not been designated as an 22 22 A. Yes. expert. If Mr. Woodcock can't testify, you said 23 23 Q. But for the removal of the State Water Project yesterday, about fair and reasonable alternatives 24 24 water costs from the various system rates, did you available to MWD, I don't know why Ms. Skillman, who is 25 25 otherwise utilize the existing rate structure then in not designated as an expert, can.

1799

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

If Mr. Woodcock can't testify to fair and reasonable rates that Met could have charged in some different world, then I don't think that Ms. Skillman can either.

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

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

If Mr. Woodcock can't testify as to what Met could have properly charged in the light of the rulings in Phase I, Ms. Skillman can't either. She's never been designated. They've never -- the opinion is based on documents that weren't produced in discovery. We talked about that before.

They contradict sworn interrogatory answers that she has signed as the verifier that such documents don't exist. They were requested and never produced.

The notion they can pop this new analysis about what fair and reasonable rates are and how this all could have been worked out and how we could have reached net neutrality if we move this to this to this, if they could pop this on us on Sunday morning on a trial that started in December of 2012, when we didn't hear about it then, and then we waited and started again on March 30th. We didn't hear it in their witness designations or their briefs. We heard nothing about this. And they put it on us when we have three hours left on a Sunday morning. It is not just a question of unfair. It is

suggested the other day, math? She is going to say if you take \$100 and delete \$30 here and I put \$30 in these two columns, this is how this adds up? That is what she is going to be doing?

MR. OLIVER: That is correct. As you will see, and we will specifically describe, the only exercise will be addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled at this time, subject to motion to strike.

Let's continue.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Ms. Skillman, do you recognize this document which has been marked for purposes of identification as DTX 1160?

#### A. Yes.

Q. Did you and the people that were working under your supervision prepare this document?

#### A. Yes.

Q. I would direct your attention to the first third of this page. Would you describe what is set forth in that block of information?

A. This information sets forth Metropolitan's existing rate structure for the four calendar years in question. It shows, for example, on lines one through four, summarized in line five, Metropolitan's full

1800

beyond ridiculous. This is expert testimony. She shouldn't be able to give it.

THE COURT: Mr. Oliver.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

What seems to me, Mr. Keker is a tad before the cart or perhaps before the horse. I am introducing this. I have laid no foundation yet. I have not asked the witness to describe it. His characterization with regard to this document truly are unsubstantiated since we haven't heard anything from the witness about it.

This is going to be used as a demonstrative for purposes of facilitating and assisting this witness' testimony. It remains to be seen at the end of the day whether there's sufficient reliability and usefulness in terms of marking it as an exhibit for purposes of this trial.

But in advance, without any description as to what this document is, we cannot make a determination as to whether it calls for expert testimony because there is no basis or foundation for that ruling.

THE COURT: Your present intention is not to present her as an expert; right?

MR. OLIVER: That is correct.

THE COURT: What you are going to be doing, I take it, she is in effect going to be doing as Mr. Quinn

service rates for the respective calendar years shown in columns A, B, C and D.

Lines six and seven are the rates that are associated with two discounted water programs Metropolitan had that were in effect in calendar years 2000 and 2012.

Lines eight through ten, and summarized in line 11, is the price that was charged for the exchange water to the Water Authority for the four calendar years.

The next block, which is highlighted in blue, shows the actual volumes of water purchased by the Water Authority for full service on line 12. The discounted programs on line 13, and the exchange water on line 14 for the four calendar years in question.

And finally, line 16, 17 and 18, and summarized on line 19, show the actual volumetric revenue that was received by Metropolitan for the sales that are shown in the lines above.

Q. I would note before we proceed that each column has a letter designation; correct?

#### A. Correct.

Q. And each line has a number designation?

#### A. Correct.

Q. I would ask that to the extent you are focusing or directing your testimony later on to the specific

1803

1802

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 line or item, that you use those designations for 2 assistance in terms of later reference. 3 Now back to this first third of the page, 4 indeed, is this the information and rates that were 5 challenged in the first phase of this litigation? 6 A. Yes. Q. Do you know whether it was these rates that 8 Mr. Denham proceeded from in deciding his calculation as 9 to how much damage was associated with the exchange 10 agreement? 11 MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. Calls for 12 expert testimony. She's criticizing the work of another 13 expert. She is analyzing what Mr. Denham did. That's 14 expert testimony. We object. 15 THE COURT: Overruled on that particular 16 question. 17 Go ahead. 18 Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Do you remember the question? 19 A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? 20 Q. Did Mr. Denham use this specific set of 21 information? Let me ask that question again. 22 Is this the rate information that Mr. Denham 23 used in undertaking his calculation? 24 MR. KEKER: Objection. No foundation. 25 THE COURT: Overruled. 1804 1 THE WITNESS: Yes. 2 O. BY MR. OLIVER: Does this first third represent 3 the baseline against which we then measure the possible 4 impacts of rate adjustments and unit cost adjustments 5 for purposes of associated costs with the exchange 6 agreement? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. The middle part of this document, which has 9 been marked as Exhibit DTX 1160, is entitled "Denham's 10 Damage Calculation." 11 Do you see that? 12 A. Yes, I do. 13 Q. What does this aggregation of information 14 represent? 15 MR. KEKER: Objection. This calls for expert 16 testimony. 17 THE COURT: Overruled. 18 THE WITNESS: This just presents the summary of 19 the information that was provided by the Water Authority 20 in their damages calculation. 21 Q. BY MR. OLIVER: By Water Authority you are

22

23

24

25

referring to San Diego; correct?

Q. I note that at line one, you have a designation

of system power rate and the word "system" is in

A. Correct.

quotations. Why did you use quotations with regard to that designation?

A. The analysis removed State Water Project costs from the system power rate, so it no longer represents a systemwide cost.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me. Move to strike and object. She is --

THE COURT: Sustained.

Let me tell you, and it may be helpful, me telling you my reason for overruling Mr. Keker's objections with respect to this Denham's damages calculation.

It doesn't necessarily take an expert to read an expert report. We ask juries, for example, to do it all the time and we ask judges, who are clearly not experts, to do it all the time. Reading an expert report doesn't require expertise.

Criticizing and analyzing it might. But the reason the muddle column is in here and is admissible and why she can talk about it because it might be contradicted by Denham's own declaration but it doesn't take an expert to read an expert report and understand it as a jury may, for example.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you, your Honor. I understand.

1806

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. Did the analysis that you undertook, and you had others under your supervision engaged in, involve utilization of information and facts and records that you utilize on a daily basis in performance of your other duties at Metropolitan?

# A. Yes.

Q. Is the analysis undertaken and reflected on DTX 1160 similar to the types of exercises that you undertake in performance of your duties?

MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. She is not an expert, and I am going to object to leading questions of Ms. Skillman.

THE COURT: That particular question I'll allow, and I take it you are talking about the last table on this page, or are you talking about the first two tables?

MR. OLIVER: Well, I was --

THE COURT: The first and the third, perhaps?

MR. OLIVER: I think what we've established is that the first and the second really are simply setting forth something that existed, so I will direct myself to the third which does involve rate applications.

THE COURT: All right. The objection is overruled as to the third column, on that question.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: I would, specifically, then

1807

1805

Pages 1804 to 1807

1 1 turn your attention to the last third of this page, (Noon recess.) 2 which has been designated as DTX 1160. 3 3 Were you responsible for the preparation of the 4 4 information set forth in this block of information? 5 5 A. Yes. 6 6 Q. In undertaking the exercise to drive this 7 information, were you utilizing the type of financial 8 records that you normally utilized in performing your 9 9 duties otherwise at Metropolitan? 10 10 A. Yes. 11 11 Q. Does this collection of information involve 12 consideration of costs, inclusion in pools and 12 13 13 associated -- and association with cost objectives in 14 14 order to establish unit costs? 15 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Do you do similar type activities when you 16 17 17 prepare cost of service reports, for example? 18 18 19 19 Q. And indeed, are you primarily responsible for 20 2.0 the establishment of costs of service reports at 21 2.1 Metropolitan? 22 22 A. Yes. 23 23 Q. What are cost of service reports? 24 2.4 A. Cost of service analyses lay out the costs 25 25 of -- in Metropolitan and through a process, an 1808 1810 1 1 San Francisco, California analytical process, assign them to services that we 2 2 recover through rates and charges. Tuesday, April 28, 2015 3 3 Q. Are cost of service reports utilized by the Department No. 304 Hon. Curtis E.A. Karnow, Judge 4 4 board in terms of deciding appropriate rates? 5 5 A. They are provided to the board for their review JUNE SKILLMAN, 6 6 resumed the stand and testified further as follows: and analysis when they set rates, ves. 7 7 Q. In front of you there, I believe, will be a 8 8 booklet. And I would like to direct your attention to a THE COURT: Good afternoon. 9 9 document which is labeled DTX 90-A. MR. KEKER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Before 10 1.0 Are you familiar with this document? Mr. Oliver starts --11 11 A. Yes. (Interruption in proceedings.) 12 12 O. What is the document? THE COURT: Yes, sir. 13 13 A. This is the cost of service report that was MR. KEKER: Your Honor, with your permission, 14 14 attached to the April 2010 board letter that went to the before Mr. Oliver proceeds, and in keeping with your 15 15 board in April of 2010 for their budget rate setting statement yesterday about motions to strike, we have 16 16 a -- would like to make a motion to strike parts of the approval. 17 17 declaration of Jon Lambeck, which was admitted into Q. Were you responsible for the preparation of 18 18 this document? evidence as DTX 1151. 19 19 A. I was partially responsible for it at the time I have as 1150-A a marked-up copy showing what 20 20 it was presented in April of 2010. we object on the grounds of expert testimony and no 21 21 THE COURT: Whenever you get to a good breaking foundation based on his testimony. I propose to give 22 22 the other side and you a copy of this, if that's all spot, just let me know. 23 2.3 MR. OLIVER: This would be fine, your Honor. right with you. 24 24 THE COURT: I will see everybody at 1:30. The things we are moving to exclude are the 25 25 third sentence of paragraph 11, all of paragraph 12, all Thank you so much. 1809 1811

1 of paragraph 14 and 15 and the last sentence of this document has not been admitted, and it's the only 2 2 paragraph 17. We are prepared to submit it. one of the four cost of service documents that 3 3 THE COURT: I will take it under advisement. heretofore has not been admitted. I would move its 4 4 MR. QUINN: As part of the pretrial scheduling admission and note there is no objection indicated. 5 5 MR. KEKER: There is an objection as to order, this was filed on a specified date several weeks 6 6 relevance in this phase of the trial, but that's the before trial. Objections were due a certain period 7 7 after that. And it was offered yesterday and there was only one. 8 8 a statement made with no objection. If the Court is THE COURT: I'll admit it at this time, DTX 9 9 going to consider this, we would like to have a chance 953. 10 10 to respond. (DTX 953 was received into evidence.) 11 11 THE COURT: Of course. Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Next document I would ask you 12 12 MR. GOLDBERG: May I approach with the to turn to, Ms. Skillman, is DTX 110-A. 13 13 highlighted exhibit? Do you recognize this document? 14 14 THE COURT: All right. Anticipation is by the A. Yes, I do. 15 15 time we are finished, there might be a couple of motions O. What is the document? 16 16 from both sides -- I don't know -- to strike. I am A. It's the cost of service report that was 17 17 happy to entertain them at that time. prepared for fiscal year 2012-13 and provided to the 18 18 May we continue with the questions in the board in March of 2012. 19 19 meantime? Q. Did you utilize the costs and financial 20 20 information set forth in this cost of service in 21 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed) connection with your examination of the unit costs for 22 22 BY MR. OLIVER: 2013? 23 23 Q. At the lunch break we were discussing the A. Yes. 24 24 document which has been designated as DTX 90-A. Do you MR. OLIVER: This document has been admitted 25 have DTX 90-A in front of you? 25 previously. 1812 1814 1 1 Q. I would like next to have you turn to DTX A. Yes. 2 2 Q. Does this cost of service study set forth 110-B. 3 3 financial and cost information that you utilized in Do you recognize this document? 4 4 connection with your examination of the unit costs for A. Yes, I do. 5 Q. What is the document? the exchange water? 6 6 A. Yes. A. This is the fiscal year 2013-14 cost of service 7 7 MR. OLIVER: I know, your Honor, this document that was approved by the board in April of 2012, 8 8 has been admitted previously. presented to them first in March of 2012. 9 9 Q. The next document I would like you to turn to, Q. Were you responsible in whole or in part for 10 1.0 Ms. Skillman, is DTX 953. the preparation of this document? 11 11 Do you recognize this document? A. Yes. 12 12 A. Yes, I do. Q. Does the document, which has been marked as DTX 13 13 Q. What is the document? 110-B, set forth financial and cost information that you 14 14 referenced for purposes of your examination of unit A. At the April 2010 board meeting, the board 15 15 adopted rates and charges for two years. At that costs pertaining to the exchange water? 16 16 meeting, the board letter actually only had one -- the 17 17 cost of service for fiscal year 2010-11 attached to it. MR. OLIVER: I would like to have displayed a 18 18 demonstrative that has been marked for purposes of Q. Is this a cost of service report? 19 19 identification as DTX 1161. 20 20 Q. And is this the cost of service report that you Q. Do you recognize this demonstrative, 21 21 utilized in connection with financial and cost Ms. Skillman? 22 22 information pertaining to your examination of unit costs A. Yes, I do. 23 23 for 2012? Q. Does this document that has been marked for 24 2.4 A. Yes. purposes of identification constitute an exact extract 25 25 MR. OLIVER: Here, your Honor, for some reason from the document we previously had been discussing,

1815

which was marked for identification as 1160? 2 2 A. Yes, it is. 3 3 Q. So that this document is simply a subset of the 4 4 earlier chart? 5 5 A. Yes, the information for 2011. 6 6 Q. What does this subset pertain to? 7 A. This subset pertains to a calculation of unit 8 8 costs that would be applicable to the exchange water, 9 9 taking into consideration the Phase I ruling by the 10 10 Court. 11 11 MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor, and move to 12 12 strike. This would be expert testimony. 13 13 THE COURT: I will strike it because this 14 14 notion of taking it into consideration seems like some 15 15 sort of judgment is being exercised. It may be that 16 this witness means -- and I am going back two answers --16 17 17 is that if you look at these numbers on the right-hand 18 18 column here, 203, 94, 204, all the way down, that those 19 19 are numbers that are just extracted from 1160, in which 20 20 case there is nothing wrong with this. 21 21 If there is something else going on with this 2.2 22 document, I am concerned. This notion that it, quote, 23 23 takes into consideration, suggests to us a judgment that 24 24 this witness is not being presented for. 2.5 25 MR. OLIVER: This document does nothing more 1816 1 1 than simply reflect the 1160 document. 2 2 THE COURT: Make that clear, and that will be 3 3 fine. 4 4 That would overrule Mr. Keker's objection. 5 5 MR. KEKER: Except, your Honor, now that we're 6 6 getting to this, this does not reflect numbers that are 7 7 just plugged out of something. These are calculations, 8 8 computations. This is expert testimony. 9 9 THE COURT: I need to hear from the witness. 10 1.0 The witness may confirm that. The witness may not 11 11 confirm that. I don't know. 12 12 I will turn it over to Mr. Oliver. 13 13 Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Are the numbers set forth in 14 14 this document, 1161, exactly the same numbers that are 15 15 set forth in 1160? 16 16 A. Yes, they are. 17 17 Q. My prior question was, what specifically is 18 18 being calculated in terms of this collection of 19 19 information under exchange costs? 20 20 MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. It calls 21 21 for --22 22 THE COURT: Sustained. 23 23 Q. BY MR. OLIVER: I have to ask a different 24 2.4 auestion. 203 -- 1160 is the expert report. This is just a 25 25 breakout of a piece of it. The 203 has no foundation Did you undertake to consider what the cost

1

impact would be of removing the State Water Project costs from the system access rate that had been challenged in the Phase I trial? MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for expert testimony. THE COURT: Overruled, so far. THE WITNESS: Yes. Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Previously you stated that one of your responsibilities was consideration and preparation of financial costs relating to the rate structure; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Mathematically, did you seek to extract the numbers that had been identified by Mr. Denham and challenged by San Diego from the system access rate --MR. KEKER: Objection -- I'm sorry. THE COURT: Let's have a full question. Mr. Oliver. Q. BY MR. OLIVER: -- as those costs pertain to the State Water Project? MR. KEKER: Objection. Leading. THE COURT: Overruled. THE WITNESS: Yes. Q. BY MR. OLIVER: In the chart, there is, at lines one and two, two separate power unit cost 1818 designations. Why do you employ two designations there? MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for --THE COURT: Sustained. If it calls for the exercise of judgment, or something like that, that only somebody with her background and experience can provide to me, then it's expert opinion, probably. It may or may not be in this specific case, but it probably is. I am just saying that to maybe be helpful. If you want to walk her through she took column X and deducted column Y and what we are looking at is the net of that, that's fine. That is walking me through the math, and I don't mind that at all. MR. OLIVER: Thank you, your Honor. Q. What are the numbers set forth here? A. Line one represents the actual State Water Project power costs for 2011. MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for expert opinion and move to strike. THE COURT: Overruled. I take it from this answer that she is simply extracting the 203 from, for example, 1160; is that right? Is that what you did? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KEKER: I'm sorry. We are confused. The

1819

```
1
                                                                             A. Yes.
       anywhere except she's going to come up with an expert
 2
                                                                    2
       opinion. The basis of this 203 was supposed to be 1103.
                                                                             Q. And in 2011, how much water was sourced from
                                                                    3
 3
                                                                          the State Water Project?
       That's -- not that one. That was going to be 1096
                                                                    4
 4
       through 1099. Those aren't in evidence.
                                                                             A. 76,581.1 acre-feet came from the State Water
 5
            For her to testify about numbers that don't
                                                                    5
                                                                          Project.
                                                                    6
 6
       come from anything that's in evidence as a percipient or
                                                                             Q. Does this document, and the totals, report the
                                                                    7
 7
       expert witness is improper. This -- there is no
                                                                          amount of water in the exchange that was sourced from
 8
                                                                    8
                                                                          the Colorado River?
       foundation for this.
                                                                    9
 9
            THE COURT: Where did the 203 come from, for
                                                                             A. Yes.
10
                                                                   10
       example? Where is 203 from? Where did you extract
                                                                             Q. How much is that amount?
                                                                   11
11
       that?
                                                                                MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. No
                                                                   12
12
            THE WITNESS: The number for 203 comes from a
                                                                          foundation. The evidence established that a lot more
                                                                   13
13
       schedule that's developed by our water research
                                                                          than 66,000 acre-feet came from the Colorado River.
                                                                   14
14
       management group.
                                                                          This is them interpreting and doing their own internal
15
                                                                   15
            THE COURT: Is it from some document we just
                                                                          numbers. She doesn't know about this. There was
                                                                   16
16
       talked about in the last 15 to 20 minutes?
                                                                          probably a million acre-feet that came from the Colorado
                                                                   17
17
            THE WITNESS: It could be.
                                                                          River and Met chose to call some of it exchange water
18
            THE COURT: It could be?
                                                                   18
                                                                          and then some of it State Water Project water.
                                                                   19
19
            THE WITNESS: Yes.
                                                                                She has no basis to know anything about this.
20
                                                                   20
            THE COURT: I don't know what that means. I
                                                                                THE COURT: Have you seen this document before
                                                                   21
21
       will turn it over to Mr. Oliver.
                                                                          that we are looking at now?
2.2
                                                                   22
                                                                                MR. KEKER: Other than with lawyers, your
            MR. OLIVER: Let me come to this in a different
                                                                   23
23
                                                                          Honor. I'm sure they have shown it.
       wav.
24
                                                                   24
            THE COURT: Sure.
                                                                                THE COURT: Outside of discussing it with
                                                                   25
25
         Q. BY MR. OLIVER: I would like displayed an
                                                                          attorneys, is this a document you have worked with
                                                        1820
                                                                                                                           1822
1
                                                                    1
      exhibit which has been admitted, which is 1156.
                                                                          before?
2
                                                                    2
            MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. This
                                                                               THE WITNESS: No.
 3
                                                                    3
      exhibit -- it's been admitted?
                                                                                THE COURT: Why do you think 66,000 is the
                                                                    4
 4
            MR. OLIVER: Yes, it has.
                                                                          answer to the question that was just posed? Are you
 5
                                                                    5
         Q. Are you familiar with this document that has
                                                                          just reading the number off the document?
                                                                    6
 6
      been marked as DTX 1156?
                                                                                THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, it was prepared
 7
                                                                    7
         A. Yes.
                                                                          by our water system operations people. And they had a
                                                                    8
 8
         Q. What does this document inform you of?
                                                                          methodology for determining, based on the water quality,
                                                                    9
 9
         A. It --
                                                                          how much water was State Water Project and how much
                                                                   10
1.0
            MR. KEKER: Objection. No foundation. Calls
                                                                          water was Colorado River on a monthly basis.
                                                                   11
11
       for expert opinion.
                                                                               THE COURT: I will sustain the objection. We
12
                                                                   12
            THE COURT: Is 1156 in evidence?
                                                                          are way, way afield of what this witness is here
                                                                   13
13
            MR. OLIVER: Yes, sir, it is. It was in
                                                                          prepared to do in terms of her own knowledge.
14
                                                                   14
      through Mr. Yamasaki yesterday. And it was admitted.
                                                                             Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Do you understand -- and I
                                                                   15
15
            THE COURT: I will let her discuss it.
                                                                          recall that we had testimony yesterday as to measurable
16
                                                                   16
                                                                          blend of the exchange water actually transmitted to San
            Go ahead.
17
                                                                   17
            THE WITNESS: This document summarizes the
                                                                          Diego in various proportions over the years.
                                                                   18
18
      exchange deliveries by month for the four calendar
                                                                               I will ask this witness, do you understand that
                                                                   19
19
      years, and breaks out the exchange deliveries by State
                                                                          a portion of the exchange water is sourced from the
20
                                                                   20
      Water Project and Colorado River Aqueduct source for the
                                                                          State Water Project?
21
                                                                   21
      exchange water.
                                                                               MR. KEKER: Objection. Leading.
22
                                                                   22
                                                                                THE COURT: Let me see if I can cut through
         Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Looking for the total set forth
                                                                   23
23
      at the far right-hand of the page, can you ascertain how
                                                                          this so we can actually get in the admissible evidence.
24
                                                                   24
      much exchange water in a given year was sourced from the
                                                                          If you want her to make certain assumptions -- forget
25
                                                                   25
      State Water Project?
                                                                          that. That's not the way to approach it.
```

If you want her to say, look, I took this number from this document and I took that number from that document and mechanically this is what I did, here you are, I think that's fine. And later on people can argue whether that is a meaningful gesture or not, whether she had -- whether those numbers that she used are linked to anything that is useful in this case. We can have that discussion later on.

But if you want to walk her through mechanically, I took the third number of the fourth column and I put it over here in this other document, I netted these items and I walked through it, I think that's fine. We can have that in the record. And that is something she can testify she did.

Her understanding of what all these numbers are probably will just get us into trouble and probably will just delay proceedings is my guess, unless you think personally her understanding as to what these numbers are is relevant and it's not expert opinion. But if you just want to walk her through mechanically what she did, that is probably the fastest way to do it.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: In your analysis, did you utilize the total for 2011 of SWP exchange water of 76,581?

MR. KEKER: Object to her analysis. That's

```
financial impact as to the unit cost under the existing rate structure that you prepared and were familiar with, what did you do?
```

MR. KEKER: Same objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Did you arrive at a unit cost for the system power?

MR. KEKER: Objection. Vague and unintelligible and probably expert opinion.

THE COURT: I am not sure yet.

Overruled.

THE WITNESS: For the system power, I developed three rates.

THE COURT: Three what?

THE WITNESS: Three separate rates to accommodate -- to accommodate the fact there is State Water Project in the exchange -- State Water Project or Colorado River Aqueduct water in the exchange, and we still have a full service rate we needed to charge.

MR. KEKER: Objection and move to strike. That's expert testimony. She's accommodating and getting to a goal and so on.

THE COURT: I understand. I will allow that answer to remain, but I think we are probably right at the edge of expert testimony.

expert opinion.

2.2

2.5

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did, on DTX 1160. It is not shown on K-17.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Did you utilize the 2011 number total of 66,661.8 for the calculation of the CRA exchange water?

# A. I used the CRA number of 66,661.8 acre-feet and it is shown in -- on DTX 1160 in K-18.

Q. In terms of the assignment of costs in connection with the system power costs as to which -- as a result of the Phase I ruling -- there was a removal of the State Water Projects, how in your analysis would those costs be assigned?

MR. KEKER: Objection. Leading. THE COURT: Sustained. I sustained an objection.

We will wait for another question.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: What did you do to accommodate the removal of the State Water Project costs from the system access rate?

MR. KEKER: Objection. It calls for expert testimony.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: In your calculation of the

The objection is overruled.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: I am going to ask you to refer back to the chart, which has been marked for identification as 1160.

What did you do to calculate the amounts in K-1?

A. The calculation I performed is shown in Footnote 4. In order to determine the number, I took the Department of Water Resources charges for State Water Project deliveries to the East Branch and added Metropolitan administrative and general costs to that.

MR. KEKER: I object to that. There is no foundation. None of that is in evidence. There is no -- there is no DWR charges for SWP deliveries, and there's no MWD administrative and general charges to be added together. You can't do math if you don't have integers or decimals.

THE COURT: I understand. That objection is overruled. She's told us what she did.

- Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Where did you derive the information to be able to calculate that number?
- A. I used information provided to me by our water resource management group with regard to the Department of Water Resources charges for State Water Project deliveries.

And for the administrative and general costs I relied on the cost of service study.

- Q. Are these documents regularly maintained in the course of business at Metropolitan?
- A. The DWR charges for State Water Project deliveries to the East Branch are performed in the normal course of business.
- Q. The cost of service is, in fact, a report to the board including San Diego; correct?
  - A. Yes.

2.3

- Q. What did you do to calculate the number in K-2?
- A. The calculation is shown in Footnote 5. The calculation, it uses the market cost of power for Colorado River Aqueduct, plus a cost of scheduling fee and Metropolitan administrative general costs as described in Footnote 4.
- Q. How did you calculate the number set forth at K-3?
- A. For the access costs, I calculated three access costs. I calculated State Water Project access costs. I calculated a Colorado River Aqueduct access cost, and I calculated an access rate for the full service.
- Q. In the cost of service reports utilized by Metropolitan, what is included within the access system costs?

need to associate costs with cost objectives?

MR. KEKER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained. The clue that that's expert testimony is when you preface it, as you have to, by "in your experience do you." That's the red flag that you are asking for an expert opinion.

Unless it is something I could figure out or someone off the street who sat in the jury box could figure out, the chances are it probably asks for expert opinion and testimony.

The reason she is able to give these answers and come up with formulas appears to be a function of her long-time expertise, which I admire, but she is not here as an expert witness.

- Q. BY MR. OLIVER: What does the denominator at the first portion of Footnote 7 represent?
- A. That represents the portion of Metropolitan sales that were from the Colorado River Aqueduct.
- Q. Adding to that grouping you have distribution costs minus hydroelectric revenues. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What are hydroelectric revenues?

A. Metropolitan's distribution system has 16 small hydroelectric generators. They are basically generating electricity as water flows through the pipeline.

- A. The system access rate that's put forward in the cost of service includes costs for the State Water Project conveyance system, costs for the Colorado River Aqueduct conveyance system, and costs associated with Metropolitan's distribution system.
  - Q. What did you do to calculate the number at K-4?
- A. The number at K-4 is the Colorado River access costs, and Footnote 7 explains that it is the Colorado River Aqueduct cost and the system access rate, which comes from Schedule 7 in the cost of service analysis, divided by the Colorado River Aqueduct sales in that fiscal year, plus the distribution system costs minus hydroelectric revenues, which also comes from the same Schedule 7, divided by total sales.

I developed two separate unit costs, and then added them together, and that derived the number at K-4 of \$119 an acre-foot.

Q. Why did you -- and I'm now referring to the piece of information you were just discussing, Footnote 7 -- did you divide the CRA cost by CRA sales?

MR. KEKER: Objection. Calls for expert testimony.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. OLIVER: In your experience as financial manager and one who works and collects costs, is there a

- Q. What are the revenues associated with those?
- A. The revenues are associated with the use of the distribution system, the water flowing through the distribution system that generates those revenues.
  - Q. Why are you subtracting those amounts here?MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor.THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. BY MR. OLIVER: What is left over when you subtract hydroelectric revenue from distribution system costs?

MR. KEKER: Same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: The net distribution system costs, which we used in this particular case to calculate the distribution system unit costs.

MR. KEKER: Objection. Move to strike. THE COURT: Sustained. Motion to strike is granted.

- Q. BY MR. OLIVER: What are distribution costs?
- A. Those are costs that are associated with the Metropolitan's in base and distribution system. Basically, it's where the Colorado River Aqueduct and the State Water Project delivery points terminate.
- Q. What are the total sales used as a denominator in that last part of the equation?

```
1
                                                                    1
                                                                               THE COURT: Sustained.
         A. All of the water that is sold by Metropolitan
 2
                                                                    2
                                                                               MR. QUINN: Your Honor, may we have a brief
       is delivered through our distribution system.
                                                                    3
 3
         Q. So what amount utilizes SW -- I'm sorry -- uses
                                                                          break?
                                                                    4
 4
       CRA sales as a denominator, and the second portion of
                                                                               THE COURT: Of course. I will see anybody in
                                                                    5
 5
       that additive amount uses total sales; correct?
                                                                          whatever you like. Shall we say ten minutes?
 6
                                                                    6
            MR. KEKER: Objection. Leading and -- leading.
                                                                               MR. QUINN: Sounds good, your Honor. Thank
                                                                    7
            THE COURT: Sorry. Leading? Overruled.
                                                                          you.
                                                                    8
 8
            Did you understand the question?
                                                                               THE COURT: While we are on the record, off the
                                                                    9
 9
            THE WITNESS: I didn't understand the question.
                                                                          clock, in case it is helpful, the other concern I have,
10
            THE COURT: That's my clue.
                                                                   10
                                                                          in addition to the ones you can see me struggling with,
                                                                   11
11
            Why don't we have another one?
                                                                          are that some of the numbers that we're talking about
                                                                   12
12
         Q. BY MR. OLIVER: The two denominators you
                                                                          here appear to be based or to be summaries of documents
13
                                                                   13
       utilized are different?
                                                                          which, A, are not yet in evidence. Maybe they will be
                                                                   14
14
         A. Yes.
                                                                          some day, I don't know. But, B, don't seem to be
                                                                   15
15
                                                                          available to the other side to inspect.
         Q. Why are they different?
                                                                   16
16
            MR. KEKER: Objection.
                                                                               That is to say, sometimes you can have
17
                                                                   17
            THE COURT: Sustained.
                                                                          summaries. And I think summaries are great. You can
                                                                   18
18
         Q. BY MR. OLIVER: What are they?
                                                                          have a summary of voluminous documents and have that
                                                                   19
19
            MR. KEKER: Asked and answered. She said they
                                                                          introduced, but the prerequisite is usually the
20
                                                                   20
                                                                          production of the documents to the other side so they
                                                                   21
21
            THE COURT: Overruled.
                                                                          can double-check that these are, in fact, accurate
                                                                   22
2.2
            Go ahead.
                                                                          summaries.
                                                                   23
23
            THE WITNESS: So the total sales are all the
                                                                               I haven't yet seen the basis to think that all
                                                                   24
24
       sales that Metropolitan was expected to or projected to
                                                                          the numbers we talked about that are in, for example
2.5
                                                                   25
       sell in that fiscal year and all the sales that used the
                                                                          1160, are extracted from documents that have previously
                                                       1832
                                                                                                                          1834
 1
                                                                    1
       distribution system. Those sales are made up of State
                                                                          been made available to San Diego. I may be wrong about
 2
                                                                    2
                                                                          that, and I am willing to be corrected. It is a concern
       Water Project sales and Colorado River Aqueduct sales as
 3
                                                                    3
       those are the only two sources of water Metropolitan
                                                                          I have. I will see everybody when you are ready.
                                                                    4
 4
       has.
                                                                               Thank you.
 5
                                                                    5
         Q. BY MR. OLIVER: We have been discussing 2011.
                                                                                        (Recess.)
                                                                    6
 6
       Did you undertake the same type of calculation with
                                                                               MR. QUINN: Your Honor, obviously, this is at
 7
                                                                    7
       regard to 2012 through 2014?
                                                                          the heart of our alternative damages case and obviously
 8
                                                                    8
                                                                          we have some issues here. I would request permission to
         A. Yes.
                                                                    9
 9
         Q. As to the identity of the numbers, the analysis
                                                                          stop this examination now and move on to our final
                                                                   10
10
       is the same as to those years?
                                                                          witness.
                                                                   11
11
         A. Yes.
                                                                               THE COURT: Okav.
                                                                   12
12
                                                                               MR. QUINN: And call Miss Skillman back
         O. What is described at line five?
                                                                   13
13
         A. Line five is the water stewardship rate.
                                                                          tomorrow morning.
                                                                   14
14
                                                                               THE COURT: She will be available for
         Q. Did Metropolitan undertake an examination with
15
                                                                   15
       regard to its water stewardship costs in light of the
                                                                          cross-examination thereafter?
16
                                                                   16
       Phase I decision?
                                                                               MR. QUINN: Yes.
17
                                                                   17
         A. Yes.
                                                                               THE COURT: Any objection?
18
                                                                   18
         Q. What was the conclusion of that analysis?
                                                                               MR. KEKER: Yes. The witness order was pretty
19
                                                                   19
            MR. KEKER: Objection.
                                                                          clear. The final witness is Woodcock. Mr. Woodcock
20
                                                                   20
            THE COURT: Sustained.
                                                                          shouldn't be able, based on his report, to give any
21
                                                                   21
         Q. BY MR. OLIVER: Do any of the water -- do any
                                                                          information about anything that is useful to the
                                                                   22
22
       of the costs that are in the water stewardship rate
                                                                          decision you have to make. And that's going to be our
                                                                   23
2.3
       presently relate to the creation of supply that
                                                                          position.
24
                                                                   24
       Metropolitan purchases?
                                                                               To the extent that he wants to say something --
25
                                                                   25
                                                                          we anticipated they would try to use Ms. Skillman and
            MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor.
```

```
1
       maybe Mr. Lambeck to prop him up and then he would try
                                                                           can either have him now or we can have him tomorrow.
 2
                                                                     2
       to say something about what they said. But I think the
                                                                           Either way.
                                                                     3
 3
                                                                                Mr. Keker, do you have a preference?
       order is prejudicial.
                                                                     4
 4
            Let's find out what Ms. Skillman is -- has to
                                                                                MR. KEKER: Tomorrow, your Honor.
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                                THE COURT: Tomorrow?
       say that's nonexpert, percipient witness testimony. We
                                                                     6
 6
       ought to go on. If they are going to -- I think keep
                                                                                MR. KEKER: Yes.
 7
       the order. So if they want to -- if they want to spend
                                                                                THE COURT: At nine o'clock.
 8
                                                                     8
       a day, a night with her, so be it, but let's keep the
                                                                                MR. QUINN: That's fine, your Honor.
                                                                     9
 9
                                                                                THE COURT: We will stop for today. The clocks
       order.
10
                                                                    10
            MR. QUINN: The objection I'm hearing --
                                                                           have stopped ticking, and I will see you tomorrow at
                                                                    11
11
            THE COURT: Are you suggesting we just stop for
                                                                           nine o'clock. Yes. 9:00.
                                                                    12
12
       today?
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Was our clock ticking then while we
                                                                    13
1.3
            MR. KEKER: I guess. If they've got a final
                                                                           were talking?
                                                                    14
14
       witness who is Mr. Woodcock and I can't imagine -- you
                                                                                THE COURT: It was ticking for at least --
                                                                    15
15
       have read the report. We have read the report. There's
                                                                          actually, it wasn't your clock. You shouldn't have said
                                                                    16
16
                                                                    17
17
            THE COURT: I don't want to have that argument
                                                                                MR. KEKER: Our clock keeps ticking.
                                                                    18
18
       right now. It is an order of witnesses. I don't know
                                                                                THE COURT: We will give Mr. Keker another four
                                                                    19
19
       if you are suggesting if Woodcock testifies now, you
                                                                           minutes. That was on my clock. I think tomorrow we can
20
                                                                    20
       would be prejudiced because you are not prepared to
                                                                           start at nine o'clock. Nine o'clock tomorrow.
                                                                    21
21
       cross him. If you are suggesting in fairness it is
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Got it, your Honor.
2.2
                                                                    22
       better to stop today and start with this witness
                                                                                THE COURT: I will see you then. Thank you
                                                                    23
23
                                                                           very much. I assume we are starting with Woodcock, is
       tomorrow morning.
24
                                                                    24
            MR. KEKER: I think we would like to know what
                                                                           that right, tomorrow morning?
                                                                    25
25
       the evidentiary record is from percipient witnesses
                                                                                MR. QUINN: We can start with Skillman or
                                                        1836
                                                                                                                            1838
 1
                                                                     1
                                                                           Woodcock.
       before their expert testifies as they promised. So the
 2
                                                                     2
                                                                                THE COURT: If it is okay, in that event, I
                                                                     3
 3
            THE COURT: I think I can ask Mr. Quinn. I
                                                                           would suggest we finish this witness.
 4
       take it you don't need Ms. Skillman to lay whatever the
                                                                     4
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Yes.
 5
                                                                     5
                                                                                THE COURT: Tomorrow at 9:00 and we will move
       foundation is for Woodcock's testimony, no more than
                                                                     6
 6
       what you have?
                                                                           on.
                                                                     7
            MR. OUINN: That's correct.
                                                                                MR. QUINN: Yes, your Honor.
 8
                                                                     8
            THE COURT: He can decide that. That's what he
                                                                                THE COURT: Thank you very much.
                                                                     9
 9
                                                                                (Court is recessed at 2:30 p.m. until 9:00 a.m.
       thinks.
10
                                                                    10
            MR. QUINN: I am happy to do whatever the Court
                                                                                 April 28, 2015.)
                                                                    11
11
       prefers, whether we break today or go on with Woodcock
                                                                    12
12
       today.
13
                                                                    13
            THE COURT: I am happy to do it either way, as
                                                                    14
14
       well. I don't have anything invested in this one way or
15
                                                                    15
       the other.
16
                                                                    16
            If there is something that will disrupt our
17
                                                                    17
       ability to cross-examine Woodcock, we could postpone
18
                                                                    18
       Woodcock's cross or altogether.
19
                                                                    19
            MR. KEKER: If we could postpone Woodcock's
20
                                                                    20
       cross until Ms. Skillman finishes, that's good.
21
                                                                    21
            MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I realize I'm asking
22
                                                                    22
       for a favor, your Honor. I understand that. But that
2.3
       seems a little unfair. What I represented to the Court
                                                                    2.3
24
                                                                    24
       is Mr. Woodcock does not rely on Miss Stillman at all.
25
            THE COURT: Okay. We can have Woodcock. We
                                                        1837
                                                                                                                            1839
```

. 1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )	
4	) ss	
5	COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA. )	
6		
7		
8	I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Shorthand	
9	Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of	
10	California, hereby certify:	
11	That the court proceedings were taken down by me in	
12	stenotype at the time and place herein named and	
13 14	thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided	
15	transcription under my direction.	
16	I further certify that I am not interested in the	
17	event of the action.	
18	WITNESS my hand this 28th day of April, 2015, at Santa Barbara, California.	
19	2013, at Santa Barbara, Cambinia.	
20		
21		
22	Jain Sanafi	
23	TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR No. 3374	
24	Certified Shorthand Reporter	
25	State of California	
	1840	

- A	add 1746:15 1791:19	1826:23	approved 1815:7	1787:13 1792:14
<b>\$100</b> 1802:2	added 1827:10,16	alternative 1835:7	approximately 1788:6	1838:23
	1829:16	alternatives 1799:23	April 1728:11,19	assumptions 1823:24
<b>\$119</b> 1789:21 1790:3	Adding 1830:19	altogether 1837:18	1732:2 1809:14,15,20	attached 1809:14
1829:17	addition 1802:7	amount 1737:2 1745:9	1811:2 1813:14	1813:17
<b>\$26.27</b> 1746:2	1834:10	1745:9,12 1750:5	1815:7 1839:10	attained 1742:25
<b>\$30</b> 1802:2,2	additive 1832:5	1752:4,5 1754:12	1840:17	attention 1802:19
<b>\$37.13</b> 1744:23	adds 1759:2 1802:3	1758:15 1770:8,25	aqueduct 1734:8,20	1808:1 1809:8
1756:18	adjustments 1805:4,4	1771:20,24 1799:4	1735:13,14,16,19	attorneys 1822:25
<b>\$50</b> 1788:6 1789:6	administrative 1827:11	1822:7,10 1832:3,5	1736:3 1737:8 1738:3	<b>AUDREY</b> 1729:4
<b>A&amp;G</b> 1759:2,3	1827:15 1828:1,15	amounts 1744:10	1738:24 1740:18	Authority 1728:6
<b>a.m</b> 1732:3 1764:13	admire 1830:13	1758:1 1827:5 1831:5	1746:18 1754:18	1760:11 1764:16
1839:9	admissible 1806:19	analyses 1808:24	1765:23 1766:2,4	1771:4 1784:22
ability 1735:9 1837:17		analysis 1760:3 1797:9		1788:7 1789:19
able 1752:6 1792:14	1823:23	•	1767:1,6 1770:9	
1793:22 1801:2	admission 1814:4	1797:14 1798:5	1775:4 1778:17	1790:7 1803:9,12
1827:21 1830:11	admit 1814:8	1799:2,5,7 1800:14	1783:12 1784:2,13	1805:19,21
1835:20	admitted 1774:24	1806:3 1807:1,7	1794:7,14,24 1821:20	Authority's 1764:20
absorbed 1799:10	1790:16 1811:17	1809:6 1824:22,25	1826:18 1828:14,21	1765:8,13,25 1766:6
access 1797:16 1818:2	1813:8 1814:1,3,24	1825:13 1829:10	1829:4,9,11 1830:18	1766:14,16 1767:5
1818:15 1825:21	1821:1,3,14	1833:9,18	1831:22 1833:2	1768:2,3 1785:18
1828:19,19,20,21,22	adopted 1728:10	analytical 1809:1	<b>argue</b> 1824:5	1789:10 1790:9
1828:24 1829:1,7,9	1813:15	analyzing 1749:18	argument 1749:24	authorized 1775:3
accommodate 1825:19	advance 1770:8	1760:4 1804:13	1836:17	available 1746:10
1826:16,16	1771:24 1772:7,21,25	1806:18	argumentative 1761:22	1780:9,10 1799:24
accommodating	1773:4 1774:4,8	<b>Angeles</b> 1729:15,19	1765:5 1770:21	1834:15 1835:1,14
1826:21	1775:21 1776:23,25	ANN 1840:8	<b>Armando</b> 1785:22	average 1743:23
accounting 1751:10	1801:17	<b>Annual</b> 1771:5	arrive 1826:6	1744:14,22,24
1776:6 1799:7	advanced 1770:24	annually 1752:18	ascertain 1821:23	1745:18 1747:24
accurate 1742:13	advantage 1746:4	anomaly 1741:15	asked 1748:13 1756:20	1748:15,22,24
1748:12 1834:21	advisement 1812:3	answer 1755:16	1759:4 1761:5,18,19	1756:21 1757:16,17
accurately 1758:16	<b>afford</b> 1776:16	1758:24 1760:18	1761:25 1762:1,2,6	1758:10 1781:13,14
achieve 1736:6 1737:15	afield 1823:12	1767:17 1769:17	1762:12 1765:10	1784:9
1772:16 1773:2	afternoon 1811:8,9	1793:3 1819:20	1769:16 1770:3	averages 1747:21
1784:12	agencies 1736:7	1823:4 1826:24	1790:24 1793:8	1748:19
achieving 1784:11	1767:10 1772:17	answered 1759:4	1797:8 1801:7	avoid 1733:18 1736:22
acquire 1746:14	1784:13	1762:14 1765:10	1832:19	aware 1766:3,8
1795:11	agency 1738:2 1752:19	1832:19	asking 1745:20	
acquired 1777:21	1752:25 1784:3	answers 1800:11	1764:19 1766:21,22	B
1795:12	aggregated 1767:20	1816:16 1830:11	1766:23 1767:4	<b>B</b> 1729:13 1803:2
acquiring 1795:17	aggregation 1805:13	anticipated 1741:19	1782:3 1785:10	1834:14
acquiring 1793.17 acquisition 1751:8	ago 1766:11 1777:17	1835:25	1786:20 1830:6	back 1732:17,19,25
acquisition 1/31.8 acre 1771:21	1784:21 1785:1	Anticipation 1812:14	1837:21	1734:5 1739:18
	agree 1784:14	anybody 1791:18	asks 1794:23 1830:9	1756:13 1761:18
acre-feet 1771:18	agreeing 1791:13	1834:4	assign 1809:1	1777:4 1778:6 1792:5
1772:22 1788:5,22,25	agreement 1770:7,11	appear 1834:12	assigned 1798:19	1793:4 1804:3
1822:4,13,16 1825:8	1770:12,14,16,19	APPEARANCES	1825:14	1816:16 1827:3
acre-foot 1755:7	1771:16 1790:7	1729:1	assignment 1825:10	1835:12
1757:4 1788:6 1789:6	1798:3 1804:10	appears 1787:1	assistance 1804:2	background 1819:5
1789:22 1790:4	1805:6	1830:12	assisting 1801:12	bank 1735:9,24
1829:17	ahadlock@kvn.com	applicable 1760:24	associate 1830:1	<b>Barbara</b> 1840:5,9,18
acting 1777:1	1729:7	1780:8 1816:8	associated 1754:14	base 1739:13 1831:21
action 1840:16	ahead 1741:1 1742:16	applications 1807:22	1797:9 1803:4 1804:9	based 1742:21,24
Actions 1731:7	1746:1 1748:5	applications 1807.22 apply 1740:16	1805:5 1808:13	1756:21 1757:17
activities 1808:16		110		
a a 4 a 1 1747.24 1750.16	1750:11 1760:1 1795:7,16 1804:17	appreciate 1749:4	1829:4 1831:1,2,20	1758:11,15 1760:16
actual 1747:24 1758:16	1 /9 1 / ID 1XUA'I /	approach 1812:12	ASSOCIATES	1800:8 1811:21
1790:8 1792:17		1000.05	1720.22	1072.0 1074.17
1790:8 1792:17 1803:11,16 1819:15	1821:16 1832:22	1823:25	1728:22	1823:8 1834:12
1790:8 1792:17		1823:25 appropriate 1809:4 approval 1809:16	1728:22 association 1808:13 assume 1733:14	1823:8 1834:12 1835:20 baseline 1805:3

basic 1755:18	briefs 1800:22	1728:18 1729:6,11,15	1827:24 1828:5	1784:16 1820:1,6,9
basically 1791:10	bring 1776:18	1729:19 1732:1	charging 1784:14	1820:22 1830:12
1830:24 1831:22	broke 1761:11	1734:8,13 1811:1	chart 1731:5 1734:16	comes 1754:25 1755:1
basis 1742:10 1744:12	BROWN 1728:22		1734:17 1736:8	1820:12 1829:10,13
		1840:3,10,18,25		
1744:14 1755:14	<b>budget</b> 1796:23 1797:3 1797:4 1809:15	call 1795:23 1822:17 1835:12	1782:13,25 1793:18	coming 1750:9 1795:8
1801:20 1807:4			1816:4 1818:24	comment 1750:1
1820:2 1822:19	business 1752:21	called 1733:7 1755:12	1827:3	commitments 1775:4
1823:10 1834:23	1828:4,7	1774:11 1796:2	charts 1783:3	committee 1775:2
Battery 1728:24	buy 1738:19,22,25	calling 1751:24	cheaper 1790:25	Company 1734:14
1729:6	1739:5 1740:17,23	1795:24	cheapest 1737:3	compare 1793:22
believe 1732:20	1742:11 1745:9,11	calls 1738:6 1744:16	1746:13	comparing 1791:25
1749:15 1755:14	1747:2 1750:25	1746:6,21 1751:25	chose 1822:17	completely 1761:15
1767:7 1773:10	1758:16 1761:6	1755:11 1787:8	clarification 1746:1	component 1750:12
1774:12 1776:12,25	1762:13 1770:4	1791:23 1801:19	1749:4	components 1754:9
1788:9 1809:7	1772:25 1773:4,24	1804:11 1805:15	clarify 1747:12	compromise 1732:24
benefit 1735:3,4	1774:10 1776:24,25	1817:20 1818:4	clear 1737:25 1763:24	computations 1817:8
1736:11 1793:15,20	1778:7 1791:7	1819:2,3,17 1821:10	1798:16 1817:2	compute 1792:14
best 1772:15	1794:14	1825:22 1829:21	1835:19	computer-aided
better 1760:5 1791:21	buyer 1776:12	canal 1764:16,21	clearly 1806:15	1840:13
1792:6 1836:22	buyers 1768:15	1765:13,25 1766:6,14	CLERK 1756:9 1796:6	concern 1834:9 1835:2
beyond 1761:7 1801:1	buying 1737:9,11	1766:16 1767:5	1796:9	concerned 1816:22
biennial 1797:3	1739:1 1740:11	1768:2,3 1784:1,22	clock 1732:10,12,15	<b>conclusion</b> 1794:10
<b>bill</b> 1753:1,7 1754:2,3	1741:2,21 1746:17,19	1785:18 1788:8	1834:9 1838:12,15,17	1833:18
billing 1752:19,24	1769:21 1774:13	1789:10 1790:9	1838:19	conditions 1777:19
bills 1753:22	1777:13,14 1790:25 1791:10 1792:6	capacity 1788:24 1789:1	clocks 1838:9	1789:3,5
<b>binder</b> 1760:12 <b>bit</b> 1748:7 1770:2	buys 1762:17 1774:4,8	cart 1801:6	clockwise 1735:2 clue 1830:3 1832:10	conduct 1797:8
1789:1	1776:1,23	case 1728:7 1770:13	collaborative 1763:6,7	conducting 1796:15 confirm 1743:1
blend 1823:16	1770.1,23	1778:15 1797:10	1763:15,17	1817:10,11
block 1802:21 1803:10		1816:20 1819:7	collecting 1799:4	confused 1819:23
1808:4	C 1803:2	1824:7 1831:14	collection 1748:18	confusion 1734:4
blow 1775:16 1779:20	CA 1728:24	1834:9 1835:7	1808:11 1817:18	1768:21
1790:1	calculate 1749:11	cell 1758:1	collects 1829:25	connection 1759:22
blue 1803:10	1752:4 1756:21	certain 1812:6 1823:24	<b>Colorado</b> 1734:12,20	1797:6 1813:4,21
board 1731:7 1774:20	1758:15 1783:8,15,18	certainly 1780:13	1735:1 1740:17	1814:21 1825:11
1775:2,8,14 1777:5	1784:9,15 1785:2,16	CERTIFICATE	1746:18 1757:18	consider 1753:18
1809:4,5,14,15	1827:5,21 1828:11,17	1840:1	1758:12 1766:2	1784:21 1812:9
1813:14,14,16	1829:6 1831:15	<b>Certified</b> 1840:8,24	1767:6 1770:9 1775:4	1817:25
1814:18 1815:7	calculated 1758:11	certify 1840:10,15		consideration 1808:12
1828:9	1768:25 1769:6	<b>chain</b> 1786:11 1787:15	1784:1 1786:4,9,21	1816:9,14,23 1818:9
<b>Bob</b> 1786:17	1817:18 1828:19,20	1787:25	1794:7,13,23 1795:9	consistent 1743:9
booklet 1809:8	1828:21,22	challenged 1804:5	1821:20 1822:8,13,16	constitute 1815:24
Borden 1761:18 1762:6	calculating 1783:6,11	1818:3,15	1823:10 1826:18	context 1798:16
<b>bottom</b> 1754:20 1769:5	1785:6 1788:10	<b>chance</b> 1812:9	1828:14,21 1829:3,7	continue 1733:4
1777:19 1786:11	1789:5	chances 1830:9	1829:8,11 1830:18	1779:17 1802:11
<b>bought</b> 1769:9	calculation 1740:25	<b>change</b> 1741:10 1749:5	1831:22 1833:2	1812:18
box 1830:8	1750:9 1751:12,20,22	1781:22,23,25 1782:9	column 1741:9 1758:9	<b>contract</b> 1734:13
<b>branch</b> 1754:20,21,21	1752:6 1757:2 1758:3	<b>changes</b> 1799:3,8	1759:2 1779:20	1735:5,8
1755:4,5,7,8 1827:10	1804:8,23 1805:10,20	characterization	1790:2 1803:19	contracts 1734:23
1828:6	1806:12 1816:7	1801:8	1806:19 1807:24	1746:10 1775:20
Branches 1754:22	1825:6,25 1827:7	<b>charge</b> 1754:14	1816:18 1819:9,10	contractual 1735:12
BRAUNIG 1729:5	1828:12,13 1833:6	1764:25 1826:19	1824:11	1788:4,14
break 1779:13 1812:23	calculations 1817:7	<b>charged</b> 1770:19	columns 1780:1 1802:3	contradict 1800:11
1834:3 1837:11	calendar 1771:6,21,25	1789:18 1790:7	1803:2	contradicted 1806:21
breaking 1809:21	1772:8 1788:5,22	1793:24,24 1795:9,10	come 1738:3,14	contrary 1762:25
breakout 1819:25	1802:23 1803:1,5,9	1800:2,6 1803:8	1753:15 1759:3	convey 1794:13
breaks 1821:19	1803:14 1821:18	charges 1797:3 1809:2	1760:5 1773:11	conveyance 1788:13
<b>brief</b> 1834:2	<b>California</b> 1728:1,9,11	1813:15 1827:9,14,15	1782:11,16,18	1829:3,4
	Ī			Ī

conveyed 1746:25	1736:12	1767:16 1769:2	1837:17	1730:2
1754:12	costs 1748:10,21,22,25	1770:21 1773:8,13,17	CSR 1728:20 1840:8	<b>Defendants</b> 1728:14
			1840:23	1733:7 1796:2
conveying 1746:17	1749:18,23,23	1773:21 1774:22,24	current 1741:7	
copy 1811:19,22	1753:14,16 1754:11	1779:14,17 1784:19		defer 1776:17
corner 1739:19	1754:14 1756:17	1785:10 1787:10	Curtis 1728:3 1732:4	defers 1776:23
1768:22 1769:5	1757:3 1758:16	1788:1 1790:16,19	1811:3	defined 1744:25 1745:1
correct 1738:22,23	1772:16 1784:12	1791:10,25 1792:4,9	cut 1823:22	definition 1764:14
1739:10,11 1740:4	1786:3,8,21 1787:4,6	1792:14,21 1793:3	D	delay 1824:17
1741:22,23 1743:12	1791:6 1793:12,23	1794:2,10,17 1795:3		delete 1802:2
1743:13,24 1745:12	1797:9,16,20,24	1795:7,16,21 1796:13	<b>D</b> 1730:1 1803:2	delivered 1755:3
1745:13 1747:15	1798:6,7,18,18	1798:14 1799:20	daily 1807:4	1757:18 1771:16
1748:4,10,11,16	1799:9 1805:5 1806:3	1801:3,21,24 1802:9	Dale 1729:14 1796:7,14	1772:2,5,6 1775:7,10
1749:7,8 1750:20	1808:12,14,20,24	1804:15,25 1805:17	damage 1804:9	1832:2
1760:16 1761:16	1813:4,22 1814:19,21	1806:8 1807:13,18,23	1805:10	deliveries 1772:22
1762:20 1763:2,9,19	1815:15 1816:8	1809:21,24 1811:8,12	damages 1731:5	1821:18,19 1827:10
1767:12 1768:4,5,10	1817:19 1818:2,10,19	1812:3,8,11,14	1805:20 1806:11	1827:14,25 1828:6
1768:11 1769:6,7,11	1819:16 1825:10,11	1814:8 1816:10,13	1835:7	delivers 1770:8,25
1769:14 1770:6,10	1825:14,20 1827:11	1817:2,9,22 1818:6	DAN 1729:4	1784:23
1772:3,9,10,13,24	1828:1,15,19,20,20	1818:17,22 1819:3,19	data 1745:7 1780:12,13	delivery 1752:25
1775:10 1776:2	1828:25 1829:2,3,4,8	1820:9,15,18,20,24	date 1812:5	1754:23 1772:9
1777:10,15 1778:10	1829:12,15,25 1830:1	1821:12,15 1822:20	dated 1771:4	1831:23
1778:13,25 1779:4,10	1830:20 1831:10,14	1822:24 1823:3,11,22	day 1739:1,3,3 1740:3	demands 1760:4
1779:11 1781:5	1831:15,19,20	1825:2,16,24 1826:5	1740:7,7,11 1741:11	demonstrative 1801:11
1782:23,25 1783:1,13	1833:15,22	1826:10,14,23	1741:11 1752:4	1815:18,20
1788:19,20,23	costwise 1797:19	1827:18 1829:23	1761:14 1770:4	<b>Denham</b> 1804:8,13,20
1789:17 1793:25	counsel 1729:17	1830:3 1831:7,12,17	1772:11 1774:5	1804:22 1818:14
1799:10 1801:23	1733:19 1741:4	1832:7,10,17,21	1776:6 1781:16	<b>Denham's</b> 1805:9
1802:5 1803:20,21,23	1761:11 1763:11,13	1833:20 1834:1,4,8	1782:2 1801:13	1806:11,21
1805:22,23 1818:11	1763:14,16 1764:1,2	1835:11,14,17	1802:1 1834:14	denominator 1830:15
1818:12 1828:9	1764:8 1770:2	1836:11,17 1837:3,8	1836:8 1840:17	1831:24 1832:4
1832:5 1837:7	count 1732:23	1837:10,13,23,25	day's 1741:7	denominators 1832:12
corrected 1835:2	County 1728:2 1840:5	1838:5,7,9,14,18,22	day-ahead 1769:25	department 1728:4
cost 1731:3,9 1735:5	1840:9	1839:2,5,8,9 1840:11	1770:3 1774:1,9,13	1732:4 1753:15,18,22
1736:5,6,9,11,14,15	couple 1812:15	Court's 1733:10	1776:5,17,24 1777:7	1785:25 1811:3
1736:23 1741:11	course 1752:21	cover 1791:19	1777:15 1779:3	1827:9,23
1743:23 1744:3,5,6	1756:12 1812:11	covered 1795:1	1783:7 1784:15	depend 1794:18,18
1744:11,13,22	1828:4,7 1834:4	CPF-10-510830 1728:7	1785:7 1788:18	depending 1741:13
1745:18 1749:6,6,12	court 1728:1 1732:6,9	CPF-12-512466 1728:8	1789:13,15 1791:22	depends 1777:18
1750:5,13,16 1752:4	1732:18,24 1733:2,4	CRA 1766:1 1776:6	1792:7 1793:6	DEPOSITION 1728:23
1752:7 1754:9 1755:7	1733:14,18,23	1783:22,23 1788:2,3	day-to-day 1742:10	deposits 1736:14
1756:21 1769:21	1734:17,21 1737:21	1788:8,13,24 1789:8	days 1740:6 1741:13,17	derive 1827:20
1783:11 1784:9,16,16	1738:6 1740:24	1790:10,12 1793:11	deals 1780:1,3,3 1781:4	derived 1757:15
1785:2,5,7 1788:3,10	1742:8,14,23 1743:4	1825:6,8 1829:20,20	1781:19	1829:16
1789:6 1790:8,11	1744:1,6,18,24	1832:4	<b>December</b> 1758:2	describe 1801:8 1802:6
1793:17,21 1794:4	1745:4,17,20,25	create 1746:11 1753:10	1800:19	1802:20
1795:10 1798:2,7,8,9	1746:8,22 1747:2,7	1757:16,17	decide 1736:2 1749:24	described 1758:3
1798:18,20 1799:10	1748:1,5,24 1749:3	created 1752:18,20	1837:8	1828:16 1833:12
1805:4 1806:5	1749:15,22 1750:10	1753:9	deciding 1804:8 1809:4	description 1731:2
1808:13,17,23,24	1750:24 1751:4,6,16	creates 1753:8	decimals 1827:17	1796:22 1801:17
1809:3,13 1813:2,3	1751:25 1752:9,13	creation 1833:23	decision 1833:16	designated 1799:21,25
1813:17,18,20,21	1753:5 1754:3	criticizing 1804:12	1835:22	1800:8 1808:2
1814:2,16,20 1815:6	1755:15,24 1756:4,8	1806:18	declaration 1762:21	1812:24
1815:13 1817:25	1756:10,12,15,25	cross 1730:2 1760:2	1763:3,18,22 1764:1	designation 1803:20,22
1818:25 1826:1,6	1757:8,13,22 1758:6	1836:21 1837:18,20	1764:9 1778:15	1805:24 1806:2
1828:2,8,13,14,21,23	1758:18,22 1759:5,9	cross-examination	1806:21 1811:17	designations 1800:22
1829:2,9,10,20	1759:13,17 1760:1	1759:17 1760:9	deducted 1819:10	1804:1 1819:1,1
1830:1	1761:5,19,23 1762:12	1835:15	Defendant 1729:11	determination 1772:14
cost-based 1734:24	1764:10 1765:5,11,16	cross-examine 1759:23	DEFENDANT'S	1782:19,21,22
	l		l	

1827:8 <b>determining</b> 1739:11	1829:20 <b>divided</b> 1829:11,14	1825:3,9 <b>due</b> 1812:6	1774:23 1784:18 1785:8 1787:8	exactly 1768:24
1827:8 <b>determining</b> 1739:11			1 / 85 8 1 / 8 / 8	1817:14
determining 1739:11	division 1802:8	duties 1738:8,21	1790:15,20,23	examination 1733:11
	document 1744:8	1807:5,9 1808:9	1790:13,20,23	1734:1 1760:13
1700.1 1022.0	1745:21,24 1747:18	duty 1753:10	1791:20 1792:2,3,10	1767:23 1779:10
1798:1 1823:8 developed 1820:13	1747:25 1748:3,9	DWR 1827:14 1828:5	1792.22 1793.8	1790:22 1796:16,18
1826:12 1829:15	1752:15 1753:8,14	DWK 1827.14 1828.3	1794.3,12,20 1793.0	1812:21 1813:4,22
development 1797:2	1754:4,4 1755:9,12	E	EMANUEL,ESQ	1814:21 1815:14
devoted 1749:9 1750:3		E 1728:3 1730:1 1732:4	1729:14	1833:14 1835:9
1750:16	1755:13,17,19,22,23 1755:24 1756:7	E.A 1811:3	employ 1819:1	examine 1742:15
Diego 1728:6 1755:4	1758:19 1799:13	earlier 1770:18	employ 1819.1 employed 1796:20	example 1742.13
1765:1 1770:9,25	1801:9,18 1802:13,17	1783:20 1784:20	employee 1785:24	1785:12 1802:24
1786:2,7,24 1787:19	1805:8 1809:9,10,12	1795:15 1816:4	1786:18	1806:14,23 1808:17
1787:21 1805:22	1809:18 1812:24	early 1777:21	employees 1750:2	1819:21 1820:10
1818:15 1823:17	1813:7,9,11,13	east 1754:20,21 1755:1	1797:5	1834:24
1828:9 1835:1	1814:1,11,13,15,24		end-of-month 1747:21	excess 1735:20,22
		1755:5,6,8 1827:10 1828:6	end-of-the-month	1737:13,17
<b>Diego's</b> 1772:12 1783:25 1788:7	1815:3,5,10,12,23,25 1816:3,22,25 1817:1	edge 1826:25	1748:14	exchange 1735:6,9,15
different 1742:18	1817:14 1820:15	Edison 1734:13 1735:3	ended 1790:25	
				1736:12,13,16 1757:18 1758:11
1746:15 1754:18	1821:5,8,17 1822:6	1735:5,6,8,9,15,15,25	energy 1734:19 1735:4	
1761:15,17 1762:4	1822:20,25 1823:5	1736:11,12,16 1778:25 1793:15	1735:9,10,12 1736:21	1770:7,12,14,15,19
1777:14 1782:19	1824:2,3,11	effect 1748:2 1797:15	1737:2,8,16 1743:8	1771:15 1790:7
	documents 1748:2		1746:11,14 1772:15	1793:20 1797:11
1817:23 1820:22	1753:11 1759:21	1797:19 1801:25 1803:5	1774:16 1775:4	1798:3,10 1803:8,13
1832:13,15	1800:9,12 1814:2		1776:8,11,13,16,17	1804:9 1805:5 1813:5
direct 1730:2 1734:1	1828:3 1834:12,18,20 1834:25	effective 1728:12 1773:3	1777:13,22,23 1778:7	1815:15 1816:8
1759:21 1760:13			1778:16,25 1779:7,20	1817:19 1821:18,19
	doing 1749:9 1757:2	eight 1803:7	1791:11 1793:14,15	1821:21,24 1822:7,17
1779:9 1796:15,18	1782:15,17 1801:24	either 1735:24 1736:14	engaged 1807:2	1823:16,19 1824:23
1802:19 1807:21	1801:25 1802:4	1740:23 1769:21	entertain 1812:17	1825:7 1826:17,18
1809:8 1812:21	1822:14	1779:10 1798:14	entirety 1759:20	exclude 1759:23
S	dollar 1744:9,9	1800:4,7 1837:13	entitled 1794:7 1805:9	1811:24
direction 1840:14	1751:24	1838:1,2 electric 1734:5	equal 1771:17 1772:3	excuse 1789:14
	dollars 1751:21	electricity 1830:25	equation 1831:25	1799:15 1806:6
	double 1790:8	•	ERIC 1729:14	1821:2
88 8	double-check 1834:21	email 1729:7,8,8,9,9,16 1731:8 1785:21	escalation 1741:14	excused 1795:22
, 00, 0	dpurcell@kvn.com	1786:2,11,13,15	ESQ 1729:3,4,4,5,5,13	exercise 1802:6 1808:6
1766:13	1729:8		1729:14,18 essence 1798:5	1819:4 exercised 1816:15
	draft 1763:18,20	1787:14,15,25 1790:14		
	drafted 1763:21	Emanuel 1729:12	establish 1808:14 established 1807:19	exercises 1807:8
	drafting 1764:1,3,9 dramatic 1791:18	1733:10,16,21 1734:2	1822:12	<b>exhibit</b> 1747:20 1773:19 1801:15
	draw 1765:24	1737:25 1738:13	establishment 1808:20	1805:9 1812:13
0	drive 1808:6	1741:4 1742:17,24	estimated 1788:3	1821:1,3
	DTX 1731:3,4,5,9	1743:5 1744:2,8	event 1794:5 1839:2	exhibits 1731:1 1768:7
discussion 1824:8	* * *	1745:8,18,22 1746:3		
	1739:17 1740:13 1743:23 1747:17	1745.8,18,22 1740.5	1840:16	exist 1800:13
displayed 1799:13			everybody 1809:24 1835:3	existed 1807:21
1815:17 1820:25	1748:7,17,21 1749:1	1748:4,6 1749:2,4,20 1749:25 1750:12,25	evidence 1731:2 1773:6	existing 1797:25
disrupt 1837:16	1752:14 1756:9,14 1757:25 1769:24		1773:9 1774:20,25	1798:19 1799:5
distinction 1765:22,24		1751:6,20 1752:3,11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1802:23 1826:1
1766:25 <b>distribution</b> 1829:5,12	1771:3 1773:6	1752:14 1753:8 1754:4 1755:21	1789:25 1790:14,17 1811:18 1814:10	expect 1742:21 1753:2
	1779:19,22 1783:3 1785:12 1799:14			<b>expectations</b> 1743:10 <b>expected</b> 1771:20,25
1830:19,23 1831:3,4	1802:14 1805:9	1756:11,13,16 1757:2	1820:4,6 1821:12 1822:12 1823:23	1772:21 1832:24
1831:9,13,15,19,21 1832:2 1833:1	1807:7 1808:2 1809:9	1757:10,15,24 1758:8	1827:13 1834:13	
		1758:21,25 1759:7,11 1759:15 1761:21		expensive 1736:10,17
<b>District</b> 1728:9,11	1811:18 1812:24,25		evidentiary 1836:25	1736:18,21 1746:11
1729:11	1813:10 1814:8,10,12	1765:4,10,15 1769:1 1770:20 1773:11,15	exact 1777:10 1792:23	1790:25 1791:2,3
divide 1750:5,14,19	1815:1,12,19 1821:6	1//0.20 1//3.11,13	1815:24	<b>experience</b> 1742:20,24

1010 - 1000 - 1
1819:5 1829:24
1830:5
<b>expert</b> 1738:5,6
1744:16,20 1746:7,21
1749:13,19 1750:8
1751:14 1755:11
1751:14 1755:11 1756:23 1758:14
1799:22,25 1801:1,19
1801:22 1804:12,13
1804:14 1805:15
1804:14 1805:15 1806:13,14,16,22,22
1807:11 1811:20
1816:12 1817:8
1818:4 1819:6,17,24 1820:1,7 1821:11
1824:19 1825:1,22
1826:9,21,25 1829:21
1830:4,6,9,14 1837:1
expertise 1749:18
1806:17 1830:13
experts 1806:16
<b>explain</b> 1734:17 1735:7
1741:5 1744:2,9
1741.5 1744.2,9
explains 1829:8
expression 1798:22
extent 1803:24 1835:24
extract 1741:16
1815:24 1818:13
1820:10
extracted 1743:9
1745:2 1816:19
1834:25
extracting 1741:20
1819:20
<u>F</u>
facilitating 1801:12
facilities 1754:14
fact 1738:8,9 1742:7
1749:22 1753:21
1760:6 1763:10 18

# 1760:6 1763:10,18 1768:6 1769:8,19 1775:7 1777:8 1778:3 1782:12 1783:20 1785:16 1789:18 1826:16 1828:8 1834:21 facts 1807:3 fair 1739:23 1799:23 1800:1,15 fairness 1836:21 **familiar** 1747:18 1755:21,23,24 1770:14,15 1774:16 1809:10 1821:5 1826:2 far 1758:22 1768:22

```
fastest 1824:21
fatal 1733:20
favor 1837:22
February 1758:2
federal 1734:11,23
  1776:7 1778:19,22
fee 1828:14
Feel 1749:15
feet 1771:21
Figueroa 1729:15
figure 1830:7,9
filed 1812:5
final 1735:10 1835:9,19
  1836:13
finally 1803:15
finance 1775:2
financial 1796:23
  1808:7 1813:3,21
  1814:19 1815:13
  1818:10 1826:1
  1829:24
find 1743:8 1772:15
  1795:3 1836:4
fine 1779:21 1809:23
  1817:3 1819:11
  1824:4,13 1838:8
finish 1765:20 1839:3
finished 1812:15
finishes 1837:20
first 1746:24 1747:16
  1754:11 1777:8
  1779:20 1796:9
  1802:19 1804:3,5
  1805:2 1807:15,18,20
  1815:8 1830:16
fiscal 1731:9 1813:17
  1814:17 1815:6
  1829:12 1832:25
five 1762:22 1802:25
  1833:12,13
flag 1830:5
flexibility 1736:5
  1776:17
Floor 1728:24 1729:15
flowing 1755:8 1831:3
flows 1830:25
fluctuate 1739:3
fluctuates 1740:7
focusing 1803:24
folks 1787:16
follows 1733:8 1796:3
  1811:6
Footnote 1827:8
  1828:12,16 1829:8,19
  1830:16
forget 1823:24
form 1731:8
```

1818:6 1821:23

```
formulas 1830:12
forth 1802:21,22
  1807:21 1808:4
  1813:2 1814:20
  1815:13 1817:13.15
  1819:14 1821:22
  1828:17
forward 1774:14.16
  1775:4,19 1776:8,16
  1777:2,13,23 1779:6
  1790:24 1791:4,9
  1792:10,17,24 1829:1
forwarded 1787:24
forwards 1774:11
foundation 1738:5,8,20
  1740:12 1742:6
  1744:17 1746:7,20
  1749:16 1755:11,15
  1755:16 1756:5,24
  1757:21 1758:5
  1759:8,9,11 1773:12
  1773:16 1791:24
  1792:1,8,12,13
  1801:7,20 1804:24
  1811:21 1819:25
  1820:8 1821:10
  1822:12 1827:13
  1837:5
four 1758:9 1802:23,25
  1803:9.14 1814:2
  1821:18 1838:18
fourth 1824:10
frame 1777:10
framed 1798:22
Francisco 1728:2,17,18
  1728:24 1729:6
  1732:1 1811:1
frankly 1733:19
free 1749:15 1793:19
front 1809:7 1812:25
full 1735:14 1738:25
  1789:3,5 1802:25
  1803:12 1818:17
  1826:19 1828:22
function 1830:12
further 1790:18 1811:6
  1840:15
future 1791:15
futures 1791:10
          G
  1786:24 1787:17,18
```

```
GANS 1729:13
Gardner 1786:12,15,20
GARY 1729:13
general 1729:17
  1796:25 1827:11,15
  1828:1,15
```

```
Generally 1749:18
generate 1734:7
generates 1831:4
generating 1830:24
generation 1787:4
generators 1830:24
gesture 1824:5
getting 1817:6 1826:22
give 1732:24 1740:8
  1769:17 1797:15,19
  1801:2 1811:21
  1830:11 1835:20
  1838:18
given 1821:24
go 1734:5 1735:2
  1737:9 1738:22
  1741:1,17 1742:16,19
  1746:1,25 1748:5
  1750:11 1755:4,5
  1756:13 1760:1
  1770:4 1782:10
  1787:14 1794:14
  1795:7,10,16 1804:17
  1821:16 1832:22
  1836:6 1837:11
goal 1826:22
goes 1739:9 1745:6
going 1733:20 1738:19
  1739:14,15,21 1740:6
  1740:9 1742:7.12.22
  1744:18 1749:5
  1755:6 1757:24
  1758:11 1769:1
  1771:9 1772:7,12
  1777:1 1791:9
  1792:24 1793:7
  1798:14 1801:11,24
  1801:25 1802:1,4
  1807:11 1812:9
  1816:16,21 1820:1,3
  1827:2 1835:22
  1836:6
Goldberg 1729:5
  1733:12 1737:20
  1738:4 1740:21
  1742:5,10 1743:3,25
  1744:5,16 1745:15,23
  1746:6,20 1747:23
  1749:13 1750:7,22
  1751:2,14,23 1752:8
  1752:12 1753:3
  1755:10 1756:6,23
  1757:6,12,20 1758:4
  1758:13 1759:4,8,18
  1760:7,10,11 1762:1
  1765:7,12,19 1767:22
  1769:4 1770:22
  1773:6,10,19,22
```

1//4.14,17 1//3.1
1779:12,18 1784:20
1785:14 1787:14
1790:13,18 1791:23
1792:8,12 1793:1
1794:1,9,11,16,25
1795:15,20 1812:12
good 1732:6,7 1741:4
1779:12 1809:21
1811:8,9 1834:6
1837:20
Government 1734:12
1734:24
granted 1756:8
1831:18
graph 1739:20 1740:16
1787:3
great 1834:17
grounds 1811:20
group 1820:14 1827:23
grouping 1830:19
guess 1824:17 1836:13
guidance 1759:22
Suldunee 1737.22
H
HADLOCK 1729:4
1 161722 14 20 21 22

1774:14,19 1775:1

# half 1732:14,20,21,22 1732:23,25 hand 1742:19,22 1760:12 1840:17 **happening** 1777:4,12 happens 1733:20 1738:1 1794:22 happy 1759:23 1812:17 1837:10,13 Havasu 1771:1 1784:23 head 1792:18,20,23 headquarters 1782:16 hear 1798:8 1800:19,21 1817:9 heard 1800:22 1801:10 hearing 1836:10 hearsay 1742:6 1773:15 heart 1835:7 helpful 1740:5 1806:9 1819:8 1834:9 helps 1776:18 heretofore 1814:3 higher 1736:23 highest 1737:16 highlight 1739:19 highlighted 1743:22 1803:10 1812:13 **hindsight** 1791:20

historical 1795:5

1792:5

historically 1774:3

Hon 1732:4 1811:3 Honor 1732:7 1733:22
1737:20 1738:4
1740:21 1742:5,18
1745:15 1749:25
1750:7 1751:14,23
1755:10 1756:6,11 1757:25 1758:13 1759:15,18 1760:7
1/5/:25 1/58:13
1761:21 1765:4,10,15
1770:20 1779:12,18
1770.20 1779.12,18
1790:20 1794:9,21,25
1795:20 1794:9,21,23
1799:16 1801:4
1804:11 1806:24
1804:11 1806:24 1807:10 1809:23
1811:9,13 1813:7,25
1816:11 1817:5,20
1819:13 1821:2
1822:11,23 1831:6
1833:25 1834:2,6
1835:6 1837:21,22
1838:4,8,21 1839:7 HONORABLE 1728:3
HONORABLE 1728:3
Hoover 1734:21,24
1735:15 1736:11
1778:20 1793:13
horse 1801:6
<b>hour</b> 1732:13,14,21,21 1732:22,23,25
1732.22,23,23
1743:24 1744:3,14,23 1751:21,24 1752:7
1757:3
hours 1732:11,13
1747:6,8,10 1757:4
1764:12,17,21
1766:17 1767:11,24
1768:4 1781:1
1793:17 1800:23
How's 1732:25
human 1733:17
<b>hydro</b> 1776:7 1778:20
1778:23 1793:13
hydroelectric 1829:13
1830:20,22,24 1831:9
ID 1731:2
idea 1742:6
identification 1757:25
1799:14 1802:14
1///.17 1004.17

ID 1731:2 idea 1742:6 identification 1757:25 1799:14 1802:14 1815:19,24 1816:1 1827:4 identified 1818:14 identity 1833:9 IID 1764:16,20 1765:13,18,25 1766:6

1766:14,16 1767:5 1768:2,3 1783:25 1784:22 1785:18 1788:7 1789:10 1790:9 **imagine** 1836:14 **impact** 1797:10,15,19 1818:1 1826:1 **impacts** 1798:2 1805:4 **improper** 1820:7 in-house 1763:14,16,25 1764:8 included 1828:24 **includes** 1768:1 1785:17 1793:11 1829:2 **including** 1789:10 1828:9 inclusion 1808:12 income 1798:23 incomprehensible 1798:13 incorporating 1793:14 increase 1775:3 1777:5 **increasing** 1791:6,18 increments 1772:3 incurred 1799:9 index 1741:8 1762:23 1768:7 1781:25 indicated 1814:4 **indicates** 1732:12 indication 1741:13 1754:25 indicative 1762:24 individual 1771:11 influences 1740:10 info 1786:3 inform 1821:8 information 1739:22 1741:16,20,25 1742:4 1742:18,22 1743:2,9 1743:12 1745:2 1748:2,9 1749:1 1753:14,17,18 1786:8 1802:21,22 1804:4,21 1804:22 1805:13,19 1807:3 1808:4,4,7,11 1813:3,22 1814:20 1815:13 1816:5 1817:19 1827:21,22 1829:19 1835:21 infrequent 1762:18 infrequently 1761:8 1762:14

inputs 1768:14

inserted 1745:25

**insight** 1733:15

**inspect** 1834:15

installations 1734:12 installments 1771:17 insurance 1775:2 1791:5,16,18 insure 1799:2 insuring 1791:5 intake 1771:1 1784:23 **integers** 1827:17 integrity 1799:7 **intention** 1801:21 **interact** 1755:19 interested 1728:10 1840:15 internal 1749:12,18 1822:14 internally 1749:6 interpret 1782:6 interpreting 1822:14 interrogatory 1800:11 **interrupt** 1765:19 **Interruption** 1811:11 introduced 1834:19 introducing 1801:6 **invested** 1837:14 involve 1807:2,22 1808:11 **involved** 1763:25 irritating 1733:19 issue 1732:8 1770:12 issues 1794:18 1835:8 item 1804·1 items 1824:12

J **J-U-N-E** 1796:12 Jan 1728:22 1771:9 **January** 1728:12,12 1744:4,15,23 1755:9 1758:1 1769:10 jkeker@kvn.com 1729:8 **job** 1756:1 1796:22,25 jogs 1787:18 **JOHN** 1729:3,13 johnquinn@quinne... 1729:16 Jon 1730:4 1733:6 1811:17 **JOSEPH** 1729:18 judge 1732:4 1762:2 1811:3 iudges 1806:15 judgment 1816:15,23 1819:4 June 1730:6 1759:6,10 1759:13 1796:1,11

jury 1806:23 1830:8 K **K-1** 1827:6 K-17 1825:4 **K-18** 1825:9 K-2 1828:11 **K-3** 1828:18 **K-4** 1829:6,7,16 Karnow 1728:3 1732:4 1811:3 keep 1736:21 1836:6,8 keeping 1811:14 keeps 1838:17 Keker 1729:3,3 1732:7 1732:10,20 1733:1 1798:8,12 1799:15,21 1801:5 1804:11,24 1805:15 1806:6 1807:10 1811:9,13 1814:5 1816:11 1817:5,20 1818:4,16 1818:21 1819:2,17,23 1821:2,10 1822:11,22 1823:21 1824:25 1825:15,22 1826:4,8 1826:20 1827:12 1829:21 1830:2 1831:6,11,16 1832:6 1832:16,19 1833:19 1833:25 1835:18 1836:13,24 1837:19 1838:3,4,6,17,18 Keker's 1806:10 1817:4 kind 1741:14 know 1737:22 1739:5 1739:14 1740:5 1744:24 1745:4 1749:17 1750:13 1759:9 1764:2,4,8,22 1764:23,24 1765:2,7 1765:17,21 1766:20 1766:25 1768:23 1770:22 1771:2,11 1772:21 1780:11.21 1781:2,17,17,20,23 1782:4,8,10,12,15,17 1782:20,21,22 1787:1 1787:6 1789:23 1792:13,16 1793:2,3 1799:24 1804:7 1809:22 1812:16 1813:7 1817:11 1820:20 1822:15,19

1834:14 1836:18,24

knowledge 1823:6,13

knowing 1792:22

knows 1755:16 1771:24 1772:2,7,8 labeled 1809:9 lack 1744:17 1746:7,20 1757:20 1759:8 1791:24 lacks 1738:4 1755:10 1773:15 1792:8,12 laid 1738:8 1740:12 1801:7 Lake 1771:1 1784:23 Lambeck 1730:4 1731:8 1733:6 1734:3 1747:11 1756:13 1759:23 1779:22 1785:21 1811:17 1836:1 Lambeck's 1759:20 1790:14 lately 1738:25 lawyer 1733:12 1761:18 1762:1 lawvers 1763:8,24 1822:22 lay 1738:20 1749:15 1755:16 1808:24 1837:4 leading 1743:25 1757:6 1758:4 1807:11 1818:21 1823:21 1825:15 1832:6,6,7 leave 1749:23 left 1737:18 1741:9 1800:24 1831:8 legal 1794:10,18 let's 1737:7 1746:16 1750:15 1752:14 1762:5 1767:16,17 1769:2 1779:17 1802:11 1818:17 1836:4,8 **letter** 1731:4 1771:3 1803:20 1809:14 1813:16 **light** 1800:6 1833:15 line 1802:25 1803:7,12 1803:13,13,15,16,22 1804:1 1805:24 1819:15 1833:12,13 lines 1761:4 1802:24 1803:3,7,18 1818:25 lining 1764:16,21 1765:13,25 1766:7,14 1766:16 1767:5

known 1793:6

1768:2,3 1784:1,22

1811:5

juries 1806:14

1785:18 1788:8 1789:11 1790:9 linked 1824:7 list 1773:20 literally 1784:21 litigation 1755:25 1756:3 1763:12.25 1804.5 little 1735:19 1742:17 1748:7 1770:2 1777:22 1789:1 1837:23 located 1734:25 1754:15 locational 1754:25 lock 1775:20 1791:8 long 1732:22 1742:1 1745:23 long-time 1830:13 longer 1806:4 look 1734:16 1736:8 1739:22 1741:8 1748:7 1750:2 1758:8 1761:1 1762:21 1769:15 1777:19 1779:25 1785:20 1795:1 1816:17 1824:1 looked 1759:21 1761:17 1768:6 1777:6.8 looking 1768:18 1778:10 1786:3,7 1788:14,17 1792:5 1793:4 1819:10 1821:22 1822:21 looks 1768:14 1787:3 Los 1729:15.19 **lot** 1785:14 1789:13,15 1822:12 low-cost 1793:13 lower 1785:13,14,15 lowest 1736:6.9 1772:16 1784:12 lunch 1812:23 M maintained 1752:20 1828:3

maintained 1752:20 1828:3 making 1782:18 management 1820:14 1827:23 manager 1796:23 1829:25 March 1800:21 1814:18 1815:8 mark 1757:24 marked 1799:13

1802:13 1805:9 1815:12,18,23 1816:1 1821:6 1827:3 marked-up 1811:19 market 1731:3 1736:13 1737:9 1738:19,22 1739:6.13.23.23 1740:6.8.13 1741:6.7 1741:9,24 1742:3,21 1743:2,10 1744:25 1745:1,3 1762:24 1764:14 1768:7 1769:23 1772:13 1773:25 1774:1,9 1776:1,24 1777:1,3 1777:15 1779:3 1782:19 1783:7 1784:15 1785:7 1788:4,15,17,18 1789:13,16 1791:8 1792:7,17,25 1793:6 1794:14 1828:13 market-priced 1736:19 marketplace 1744:11 1751:9 1774:12 1791:9 markets 1769:25 marking 1801:15 matching 1760:4 math 1783:19 1802:1 1819:12 1827:16 mathematical 1752:6 Mathematically 1818:13 mathematics 1758:20 matter 1749:19 Matusak 1771:9,10 **maximize** 1737:2.5 mean 1741:5 1765:19 meaningful 1824:5 means 1751:7 1780:22 1780:23 1781:18,23 1781:24 1787:6 1816:16 1820:20 meant 1770:3 measurable 1823:15 measure 1805:3 mechanically 1824:3 1824:10,20 media 1785:24 meet 1776:5 meeting 1813:14,16 megawatt 1743:24 1744:3,13,22 1752:7 1757:3,4 1780:25

1793:17

1744:12

megawatt-hour

melded 1783:8,11 1784:9,16 1785:2,5 1785:11,13 1788:10 1789:6 1790:11 1793:9,9,11,16,23 1794:8 1795:9 member 1736:7 1738:2 1767:10 1772:16 1784.3 13 memo 1774:20 1775:1 mention 1779:6.9 mentioned 1774:14 merely 1748:1 met 1760:14,21 1761:6 1761:11 1762:12,17 1764:15,20,25 1765:7 1765:12,24 1766:9,15 1767:8 1768:14 1769:9 1770:7,24 1771:13,24 1772:1,6 1772:7,11 1773:24 1774:8,20 1776:1,23 1783:20,21,23 1784:15 1786:18,20 1787:16 1788:12 1789:18 1790:6 1793:24 1794:4 1800:2,5 1822:17 Met's 1763:7,11,24 1765:25 1767:9.23 1768:15 1769:21 1774:16 1775:8 1778:16 1784:6,8,13 1784:24 methodologies 1754:18 methodology 1823:8 Metropolitan 1728:9 1728:11 1729:11 1734:7,23 1736:2 1737:17 1738:2,15,16 1740:19 1745:11 1746:24 1753:9,17,23 1753:25 1754:24 1765:21 1772:3 1775:19 1776:16 1777:21 1784:23 1785:22 1791:21 1792:6 1793:24 1796:20 1797:11,17 1797:21 1798:1 1799:9 1803:5,17 1807:5 1808:9,21,25 1827:11 1828:4,15,24 1830:17 1832:1,24 1833:3,14,24 Metropolitan's 1737:10,11 1766:7 1771:1 1783:14

1784:4 1785:17 1797:3 1802:22,25 1829:5 1830:23 1831:21 middle 1743:16,21 1805:8 midway 1789:25 Mike 1786:12 1787:17 million 1788:5,6,21,25 1822:16 mind 1738:10 1760:2 1767:18 1792:15 1819:12 minimize 1737:2,5 minus 1829:12 1830:20 minute 1756:11 minutes 1732:11,12,13 1732:14,21 1779:15 1820:16 1834:5 1838:19 misspeaking 1761:20 misspoke 1747:12 1760:17 1761:16 1792:2 misstatement 1747:15 mistake 1747:14 misunderstand 1762:14 misunderstood 1761:24 1762:9 moment 1734:6 1766:11 1777:17 1785:1 Monday 1764:13 **Monday-morning** 1793:5 monitor 1734:16 month 1743:24 1744:14,23 1751:11 1757:11,19 1771:18 1781:14 1821:18 monthly 1748:15,19,22 1748:22,24 1771:17 1772:3 1823:10 months 1747:21 1775:21 1776:2 morning 1732:6,7 1800:18,24 1835:13 1836:23 1838:24 motion 1756:8 1759:22 1759:24,25 1760:3 1802:10 1811:16 1831:17 motions 1811:15 1812:15 move 1735:16 1736:3 1737:1,8,10,11,18 1738:2,13,16 1740:19

1747:1,2,10 1756:6 1757:4 1760:15,22 1766:12 1773:7 1774:20 1784:1,12 1788:4.24 1789:1 1790:13 1800:17 1806:6 1814:3 1816:11 1819:18 1826:20 1831:16 1835:9 1839:5 moved 1741:12 1765:8 1765:13,18,22 1766:9 1766:15 1767:1,5,8,9 1767:20,23 1788:7 **movement** 1747:3,5 1794:3 moves 1765:2 1766:4 1767:11 1768:3 1783:22 moving 1735:19 1740:10 1747:7 1759:19 1762:7 1766:1 1778:17 1783:12,14,23 1790:8 1811:24 muddle 1806:19 Muir 1786:15,16,17 multiplication 1802:7 multiply 1757:3 MWD 1731:7.9 1786:16 1799:24 1827:15 N 1730:1

name 1796:7,10,11,14 named 1840:12 narrower 1735:6 near 1789:3,5 necessarily 1766:15 1806:13 need 1739:5 1746:3,12 1748:17 1770:5 1772:11 1775:21 1776:23 1798:22 1799:2 1817:9 1830:1 1837:4 needed 1760:14,21 1777:23 1793:17

1826:19 needs 1746:24 1776:2,5 negotiate 1741:7 1742:19

negotiating 1739:12 1740:11 1768:14 negotiation 1739:9,15 1739:21 1740:6 1741:21 1742:20,22

1743:1 1751:8 negotiations 1743:7 **NEST** 1729:3 net 1800:17 1819:11 1831:13 netted 1824:12 **neutral** 1791:1 neutrality 1798:24 1799:1 1800:17 never 1750:8 1751:24 1764:15,20 1790:24 1800:7,8,13 new 1733:15 1800:14 next-to-last 1758:9 ngoldberg@kvn.com 1729:9 NICHOLAS 1729:5 Nick 1760:11 night 1765:9 1836:8 nine 1838:7,11,20,20 non 1774:5 non-member 1752:19 1752:25 non-Met 1746:17 1747:1,3 1760:23 1762:7 1783:15,22 non-Metropolitan 1737:18 1738:13,17 1747:14 1760:15 non-MWD 1762:25 nonexpert 1836:5 Noon 1810:1 normal 1828:7 normally 1808:8 North 1729:18 note 1803:19 1805:24 1814:4 notice 1770:8,24 1771:5 notion 1800:14 1816:14 1816:22 number 1731:2 1743:14,15,15 1744:3 1745:14 1752:11 1755:6 1757:4 1759:11 1769:12 1772:22 1780:3 1782:24 1783:2 1792:23 1803:22 1820:12 1823:5 1824:2,2,10 1825:5,8 1827:8,21 1828:11,17 1829:6,7,16 numbers 1740:16 1744:9,19 1755:14 1757:16 1758:9 1768:22 1782:11,13 1782:16,18 1792:18

1816:17,19 1817:6,13 1817:14 1818:14 1819:14 1820:5 1822:15 1824:6,15,18 1833:9 1834:11,24 numerous 1755:13

 $\mathbf{0}$ o'clock 1838:7,11,20,20 oath 1734:3 **object** 1750:9 1755:13 1769:1 1804:14 1806:7 1807:11 1811:20 1824:25 1827:12 **objection** 1733:2,3 1737:20 1738:4 1740:21 1742:5 1743:3,25 1744:5,16 1745:15 1746:6,20 1747:23 1749:13 1750:7,22 1751:2,14 1751:23 1752:8,12 1753:3 1755:10 1756:4,23 1757:6 1758:4,13,23 1761:21 1765:4,15 1770:20 1773:8,17 1774:22,23 1785:8 1790:15 1791:23 1793:1 1794:9,16,25 1798:12 1798:15 1802:9 1804:11,24 1805:15 1807:10,23 1812:8 1814:4,5 1816:11 1817:4,20 1818:4,16 1818:21 1819:2,17 1821:10 1822:11 1823:11,21 1825:15 1825:17,22 1826:4,8 1826:20 1827:1,18 1829:21 1830:2 1831:6,11,16 1832:6 1832:16 1833:19,25 1835:17 1836:10 **objections** 1757:7,12 1757:20 1758:5 1795:15 1799:16,17 1806:11 1812:6 objective 1798:20 1799:10 **objectives** 1798:7.8.9 1808:13 1830:1 obligated 1791:14 obligation 1775:3 obtain 1745:7 obviously 1835:6,7

occasion 1749:11

1774:11 occurring 1747:4,5 occurs 1751:10 **October** 1771:4 **off-aqueduct** 1754:5.13 1754:16 off-peak 1736:25 1737:3.10.12.14 1741:3 1743:12 1745:12,19 1746:4,12 1746:13 1747:8,10,13 1760:16 1761:1 1762:8 1764:12,17,21 1765:2 1766:10,16 1767:6,11,24 1768:4 1768:19 1769:12 1780:15 1795:13 offer 1739:12 offered 1812:7 **OFFICE** 1729:17 **Oh** 1774:18 okay 1733:1,23 1783:6 1835:11 1837:25 1839:2 Oliver 1729:14 1796:7 1796:8,14,14,19 1798:9,17 1799:12,19 1801:3,4,23 1802:5 1802:12 1804:18 1805:2.21 1806:24 1807:17,19,25 1809:23 1811:10,14 1812:22 1813:7,25 1814:11,24 1815:17 1816:25 1817:12,13 1817:23 1818:8,18,19 1818:24 1819:13 1820:21,22,25 1821:4 1821:13,22 1823:14 1824:22 1825:5,19,25 1826:6 1827:2,20 1829:24 1830:15 1831:8,19 1832:12,18 1833:5,21 on-peak 1736:25 1737:10,14,15 1743:11,15,19 1744:14 1745:9 1747:1,2,6 1756:17 1762:13,18,23 1765:1 1768:18 1769:9 1779:3 1783:7 1785:7 1785:12 1788:18 1789:14,15 1795:13 1795:17 one-day 1741:15 ones 1736:9,9 1834:10

opinion 1744:20 1800:8 1819:6,18 1820:2 1821:11 1824:19 1825:1 1826:9 1830:6 1830:10 **opposing** 1733:19 **optimize** 1736:4 order 1775:18 1808:14 1812:5 1827:8 1835:18 1836:3,7,9 1836:18 ought 1764:25 1770:19 1836:6 outside 1763:13,25 1764:2 1822:24 overall 1736:6 1740:25 1772:16 overrule 1798:15 1817:4 overruled 1737:21 1740:25 1744:21 1746:8,22 1750:10 1751:4,18 1752:1,9 1753:5 1756:25 1757:8,13,22 1758:6 1758:23 1759:5,14 1761:23 1765:16 1787:12 1793:3 1794:2 1795:4,16 1802:9 1804:15.25 1805:17 1807:24 1818:6,22 1819:19 1825:2 1826:11 1827:1,19 1831:12 1832:7,21 overruling 1806:10 P p.m 1764:13 1765:8 1839:9 page 1743:16,22 1747:16 1762:22 1776:4 1777:20 1802:20 1804:3 1807:15 1808:1 1821:23 pages 1728:13 1747:17 1747:20 1748:14,18 1769:15 paid 1751:21 1753:2 1762:25 1792:16 paragraph 1788:2 1811:25,25 1812:1,2 Parker 1734:22,25 1735:15 1736:12 1778:23 1793:13 part 1740:14 1752:24 1760:2 1763:5

1777:19 1786:12 1805:8 1812:4 1815:9 1831:25 partially 1809:19 participants 1745:2,4 participate 1764:9 participated 1764:1,3 particular 1748:25 1804:15 1807:13 1831:14 parties 1743:8 1751:11 parts 1811:16 party 1738:1 1746:17 1760:14,22 1794:5 1795:8 pause 1767:17 payment 1775:3 pays 1753:25 peak 1761:7 people 1733:18 1744:7 1751:21 1802:16 1823:7 1824:4 percent 1777:22 1778:4 1778:5,6 percipient 1749:16 1820:6 1836:5,25 performance 1807:4,9 performed 1827:7 1828:6 performing 1808:8 **period** 1737:3 1746:12 1789:17 1792:9,10 1812:6 periods 1736:23 1746:11 permission 1733:10 1811:13 1835:8 personally 1787:2 1824:18 **PERSONS** 1728:10 pertain 1816:6 1818:19 pertaining 1797:11 1813:22 1815:15 pertains 1816:7 **pertinent** 1749:20 Petitioner 1728:7 1729:2 phase 1797:9 1800:7 1804:5 1814:6 1816:9 1818:3 1825:12 1833:16 **pie** 1734:16,17 1735:2 1736:8 1793:18 piece 1819:25 1829:19 pieces 1741:16 pipeline 1830:25

place 1781:8 1797:11

1798:1,1 1840:12

operations 1823:7

<b>Plaintiff</b> 1728:7 1729:2
planning 1796:24
plant 1778:20,23
Platte 17/10.20,23
Platts 1741:24 1742:2
1745:2,6 1762:23
1768:7,9,13,24
1769:6,19 1777:7
1779:19,23 1782:8,15
1782:15
please 1738:12 1739:18
1739-20 1765-20
1739:20 1765:20 1785:20 1796:6
1799:19
plugged 1817:7
plus 1828:14 1829:12
point 1741:5 1743:14
1791:15
points 1754:23 1782:20
1831:23
policy 1791:5,16
<b>pool</b> 1798:18
pools 1808:12
pop 1800:14,18
portion 1823:19
-
1830:16,17 1832:4
posed 1823:4
<b>position</b> 1769:20
1772 14 14 1025 22
1773:14,14 1835:23
possible 1798:2 1805:3
postpone 1837:17,19
power 1731:3 1733:16
1734:5,7,10,24
1735:20,23,24 1736:2
1736:5,16,19,19,23
1737:4,12,13,14,17
1737.4,12,13,14,17
1737:18 1738:3,14,15 1738:16,20,22,25
1738:16,20,22,25
1739:1,3,5,6,10,12,22
1739:24 1740:11,17
1/37.24 1/40.11,1/
1740:23 1741:2,12,18
1741:21 1742:12
1743:24 1744:4,11
1745:19 1746:3,13,17
1746.19 1747.13
1746:18 1747:1,2 1748:10,18,21,22,25
1748:10,18,21,22,25
1749:7,12 1750:3,6
1750:19,22,25 1751:2
1/30.19,44,43 1/31.4
1771 0 1770 7
1751:9 1752:5
1751:9 1752:5 1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22 1770:4 1772:13,25
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22 1770:4 1772:13,25 1773:25 1774:1,4,6,7
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22 1770:4 1772:13,25 1773:25 1774:1,4,6,7 1774:8,11 1776:1,23
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22 1770:4 1772:13,25 1773:25 1774:1,4,6,7 1774:8,11 1776:1,23 1776:24,25 1777:13
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22 1770:4 1772:13,25 1773:25 1774:1,4,6,7 1774:8,11 1776:1,23 1776:24,25 1777:13
1753:14 1754:2,5,5,9 1754:17 1758:17 1760:14,22,25 1761:6 1761:25 1762:13,18 1768:15 1769:10,22 1770:4 1772:13,25 1773:25 1774:1,4,6,7 1774:8,11 1776:1,23

```
1784:9,12,16 1785:2
  1785:5,7,11 1786:3,8
  1786:21 1787:4
  1788:3,4,11,15
  1789:6,19,21 1790:1
  1790:3,6,8,24 1791:4
  1791:6,8,14 1792:6
  1793:10.19 1794:15
  1795:11,12,18
  1797:21 1805:25
  1806:4 1818:25
  1819:16 1825:11
  1826:7,12 1828:13
Powerplant 1734:25,25
practice 1733:21
  1795:5
preceding 1740:2,6
preface 1830:4
preference 1838:3
prefers 1837:11
prejudiced 1836:20
prejudicial 1836:3
preparation 1753:6
  1808:3 1809:17
  1815:10 1818:10
prepare 1802:17
  1808:17
prepared 1812:2
  1814:17 1823:6,13
  1826:2 1836:20
prerequisite 1834:19
present 1738:24
  1801:21,22
presentation 1775:10
  1775:12
presentations 1775:7
  1775:13
presented 1794:19
  1809:20 1815:8
  1816:24
presently 1833:23
presents 1805:18
Presumably 1767:13
  1767:14
presume 1780:5,25
  1781:19,22
presuming 1780:3
pretrial 1812:4
pretty 1741:12 1835:18
previously 1813:8
  1814:25 1815:25
  1818:8 1834:25
price 1739:3,6,9,23
  1740:2,2,5,7,22
  1741:6,7,8,9 1742:4
  1745:3 1760:15,16,23
  1762:7,8,23,24
```

1765:1 1768:19,24

```
1769:5,8,9,19,23
  1770:18 1773:3
  1775:18 1779:4
  1781:9,12,25 1782:19
  1784:15 1791:8,14,15
  1791:19 1803:8
prices 1736:13 1739:13
  1740:9 1746:5
  1747:13 1748:15
  1768:12 1775:20
  1776:12,18 1792:1,17
primarily 1808:19
prior 1739:21 1741:11
  1741:13,17 1760:3,4
  1817:17
probably 1819:6,7
  1822:16 1824:16,16
  1824:21 1826:9,24
  1830:9
proceed 1803:19
proceeded 1804:8
proceedings 1728:16
  1811:11 1824:17
  1840:11
proceeds 1811:14
process 1745:6 1751:10
  1752:24 1763:6,7,15
  1763:17 1782:10
  1808:25 1809:1
produced 1800:9.13
product 1782:12,14
production 1834:20
program 1774:17
  1775:8,15 1777:5
  1779:7 1790:25
  1792:11,25
programs 1803:4,13
project 1753:16
  1754:10,13,15,16,25
  1755:3 1786:4,9
  1797:16,20,23 1798:7
  1798:18 1806:3
  1818:1,20 1819:16
  1821:20,25 1822:3,5
  1822:18 1823:9,20
  1825:20 1826:17,17
  1827:10,24 1828:5,20
  1829:3 1831:23
  1833:2
projected 1832:24
projects 1776:7
  1825:13
promised 1837:1
prop 1836:1
properly 1800:6
proportions 1823:17
propose 1811:21
proven 1742:3
```

```
provide 1777:1
  1791:13 1819:5
provided 1753:18
  1805:19 1809:5
  1814:17 1827:22
provides 1741:10
providing 1754:17
PTX 1731:7.8 1734:15
  1774:19,22,24,25
  1785:20 1789:24
  1790:13,17
published 1762:23
pump 1734:5,8 1772:12
pumped 1764:15,20
pumping 1734:19
  1735:13 1754:17
  1776:5
Purcell 1729:4 1773:20
purchase 1736:19,23
  1737:2,3 1738:15
  1739:13,22 1746:13
  1746:25 1760:14,15
  1760:21 1762:7,8
  1772:12 1773:25
  1775:19 1777:2
  1791:4 1792:11,24
  1793:16
purchased 1736:19
  1791:21 1803:11
purchases 1735:10,11
  1736:21 1776:1,5,8
  1776:16,17 1777:24
  1779:2 1780:19
  1788:4,15,18 1793:6
  1833:24
purchasing 1736:20
  1741:18 1760:25
  1761:25
purpose 1783:10,11
  1785:2
purposes 1752:19
  1766:1 1783:21
  1784:4 1788:13
  1801:12,15 1802:13
  1805:5 1815:14,18,24
pursuant 1759:21
push 1739:16
pushed 1732:15
put 1734:15 1739:18
  1741:6 1752:14
  1753:1 1761:4 1771:3
  1774:19 1779:19
  1789:24 1794:20
  1799:15 1800:23
  1802:2 1824:11
  1829:1
          Q
```

qualification 1746:16 **quality** 1823:8 quantities 1775:20 quantity 1771:5 quarterbacking 1793:5 question 1738:7,9,10 1738:11 1741:19 1742:14 1746:16 1748:1 1751:17 1755:18 1758:24 1761:24 1762:2,3,9 1762:15 1764:18 1766:21 1767:2,18 1769:3,16 1770:24 1785:4,9 1791:25 1792:3 1795:4 1798:13 1800:25 1802:24 1803:14 1804:16,18,19,21 1807:13,24 1817:17 1817:24 1818:17 1823:4 1825:18 1832:8,9 questions 1748:13 1755:17 1761:17 1762:4 1770:3 1793:8 1807:11 1812:18 Quinn 1729:12 1733:3 1796:15 1801:25 1812:4 1834:2.6 1835:6,12,16 1836:10 1837:3,7,10,21 1838:8,12,21,25 1839:4,7 **QUINN,ESQ** 1729:13

QUINN,ESQ 1729:13 quite 1751:16 1773:21 quotations 1806:1,1 quote 1816:22

# R

R 1786:15,16 raise 1732:8 1776:12 range 1742:21 1781:6,7 1781:9,12,15,17,19 rate 1761:7 1762:13 1780:4 1783:7,8 1785:7,11,12,13 1788:18 1789:14,19 1789:21 1790:1.3.6 1791:6 1793:9,10,11 1794:8 1795:10 1797:10,16,21,25 1799:5 1802:23 1804:22 1805:4,25 1806:4 1807:22 1809:15 1818:2,10,15 1825:21 1826:2,19 1828:22 1829:1,9

1922.12.22
1833:13,22
rates 1728:10 1731:5
1793:9 1797:3,24 1800:2,15 1803:1,3
1800:2,15 1803:1,3
1804:4,7 1809:2,4,6
1813:15 1826:13,15
reached 1800:16
read 1744:19 1745:20
1760:20 1788:1
1806:13,22 1836:15 1836:15
reading 1806:16 1823:5
ready 1835:3
reality 1794:22
realize 1837:21
really 1781:23 1782:12
1788:24 1807:20
reason 1733:14
1806:10,19 1813:25
1830:11
reasonable 1799:23
1800:2,15
recall 1775:11 1823:15
<b>Recalling</b> 1793:18
receive 1735:4 1793:13
received 1774:25
1790:17 1803:17
1814:10
receives 1754:24
recess 1779:16 1810:1
1835:5
recessed 1839:9
recognize 1752:15
1802:12 1813:11
1814:13 1815:3,20
recollection 1787:18
record 1744:19
1763:24 1795:23
1796:10 1824:13
1834:8 1836:25
records 1807:3 1808:8
recover 1754:14 1809:2
RECROSS 1730:2
red 1830:5
Redirect 1730:2
1790:19,22
reduce 1775:18
reduced 1840:13
reduces 1791:6
refer 1827:2
reference 1747:13
1804:2
referenced 1815:14
referenced 1815:14 referred 1736:24
referring 1767:7
1805:22 1829:18

refers 1735:4 1754:2,5

```
reflect 1755:7 1758:3
  1758:16 1768:23
  1817:1,6
reflected 1807:7
reflecting 1748:15
reflection 1758:19
reflects 1769:21
refute 1766:18.20.23
regard 1801:9 1806:1
  1827:23 1833:7,15
regarding 1786:8
regardless 1747:3
regular 1752:20
regularly 1828:3
relate 1833:23
relates 1756:7
relating 1818:10
relationship 1798:2
relatively 1740:9
relevance 1814:6
relevant 1824:19
reliability 1801:14
reliable 1742:3,8,13
  1743:1,6 1753:19
relied 1828:2
rely 1837:24
remain 1826:24
remaining 1740:9
  1747:20
remains 1801:13
remember 1768:7
  1804:18
reminded 1773:20
removal 1797:23
  1825:12,20
removed 1806:3
removes 1798:17
removing 1797:15,20
  1818:1
repeat 1738:11 1764:18
  1804:19
rephrase 1792:2
report 1740:13 1748:15
  1762:24 1777:8
  1779:20 1806:14,17
  1806:22 1809:13
  1813:18,20 1814:16
  1819:24 1822:6
  1828:8 1835:20
  1836:15,15
Reported 1728:20
reporter 1786:24
  1787:17,19 1840:9,24
REPORTER'S
  1728:16 1840:1
reports 1748:14
  1756:21 1758:15
```

1768:9,13 1769:19

```
1777:7 1779:23
  1808:17,20,23 1809:3
  1828:23
represent 1805:2,14
  1830:16
represented 1837:23
represents 1806:4
  1819:15 1830:17
request 1835:8 1837:2
requested 1800:13
requests 1755:13
require 1806:17
required 1735:13
  1771:16
requirements 1798:23
research 1820:13
resource 1827:23
resources 1735:12
  1736:4,22 1737:1
  1746:9,23 1747:10
  1753:16,19,22 1776:7
  1793:12,12 1827:9,24
respect 1749:1 1806:11
respective 1803:1
respond 1787:25
  1812:10
Respondent 1729:11
Respondents 1728:14
responding 1777:3
responsibilities
  1738:21 1797:1
  1818:9
responsibility 1753:10
responsible 1797:2
  1808:3,19 1809:17,19
  1815:9
rest 1798:15
result 1825:12
results 1742:25
resume 1733:11
resumed 1730:5 1733:7
  1734:1 1811:6
  1812:21
revenue 1797:4
  1798:23 1799:1,4
  1803:16 1831:9
revenues 1829:13
  1830:20,22 1831:1,2
  1831:4
review 1763:19 1809:5
revised 1799:4
```

```
1777:8 1778:1,4,9,23
  1779:23 1780:1,6,14
  1781:4,13 1782:9,13
  1783:9,16,18 1784:17
  1784:24 1785:2.18.25
  1786:13 1787:7,22
  1788:8,14,15,22,25
  1789:9.11.19 1790:4
  1790:10 1801:22
  1807:23 1811:23
  1812:14 1819:21
  1826:24 1836:18
  1838:24
right-hand 1739:19
  1769:5 1816:17
  1821:23
risk 1774:12 1775:19
  1791:7,19
risk/benefit 1777:2
River 1734:8,12,20
  1735:1 1740:17
  1746:18 1757:18
  1758:12 1766:2
  1767:6 1770:9 1775:4
  1778:17 1783:12
  1784:2 1786:4,9,21
  1794:7,13,23 1821:20
  1822:8,13,17 1823:10
  1826:18 1828:14,21
  1829:3,7,9,11
  1830:18 1831:22
  1833:2
row 1779:25
RPR 1728:20 1840:23
ruling 1797:9 1801:20
  1816:9 1825:12
  1738:24
          S
  1796:12
```

rulings 1760:4 1800:6 running 1735:14 S 1729:5 S-K-I-L-M-A-N salaries 1750:2,13 salary 1750:16 sales 1780:19 1803:17 1829:11,14,20 1830:18 1831:24 1832:4,5,23,24,25 1833:1,2,2 San 1728:2,6,17,18,24 1729:6 1732:1 1755:4 1764:25 1770:9,25 1772:12 1783:25 1786:2,7,24 1787:19 1787:21 1788:7 1805:22 1811:1

1818:15 1823:16 1828:9 1835:1 **SANDFORD** 1728:20 1840:8,23 Santa 1840:5.9.18 sat 1830:8 satisfy 1746:24 **Saturday** 1764:13 saving 1762:19 1764:19 1787:16 1819:8 says 1758:15 1769:25 1771:19 1772:5 1775:17 1776:5 1777:21 1780:6 1787:22 **SCE** 1776:7 schedule 1750:20,23 1751:1 1772:9,22 1820:13 1829:10,14 scheduled 1752:5 **scheduling** 1749:7,12 1750:3,6,17 1751:7,8 1772:15 1812:4 1828:14 screen 1779:19 **Scroll** 1776:4 **SDCWA** 1731:4 seated 1796:6 second 1741:8 1749:5 1775:17 1788:2 1807:20 1832:4 seconds 1784:21 section 1796:24 see 1741:11 1748:17 1754:6,20 1756:18 1767:16 1769:24 1771:7,15,22 1772:6 1775:1,5,22 1776:4 1776:19 1777:24 1779:25 1780:17 1786:2,22 1789:25 1798:15 1802:5 1805:11 1809:24 1823:22 1830:20 1834:4,10 1835:3 1838:10,22 seeing 1791:7 seek 1745:9,11 1818:13 seen 1750:8 1751:24 1801:13 1822:20 1834:23 sell 1735:24 1737:14,15 1739:5 1740:23 1742:11 1758:17 1768:15 1832:25

sellers 1743:8

selling 1737:14,17

1769:22 1791:18

ridiculous 1801:1

**right** 1750:15 1751:1

1769:13,17 1770:5

1773:23 1774:2,4

1776:9,14,21 1777:7

1771:13 1772:5,18,23

1768:16,19,22

send 1753:2 1794:23
sending 1787:16
sends 1753:22
sent 1753:7
sentence 1771:19
1775:17,17 1776:11
1811:25 1812:1
separate 1818:25
1826:15 1829:15
separately 1762:12
1766:5
service 1731:10 1803:1
1803:12 1808:17,20
1808:23,24 1809:3,13
1813:2,17,18,20
1814:2,16,20 1815:6
1826:19 1828:2,8,22
1828:23 1829:2,10
services 1728:23
1785:24 1809:1
set 1802:20 1804:20
1808:4 1809:6 1813:2
1814:20 1815:13 1817:13,15 1819:14 1821:22 1828:17
1817:13,15 1819:14
1821:22 1828:17
sets 1802:22
setting 1739:9 1807:20
1809:15
settlement 1751:10
garram 1902.2
seven 1803.3
seven 1803:3 shift 1798:6
shift 1798:6
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19 1807:20 1816:3
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19 1807:20 1816:3 1817:1 1819:20
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19 1807:20 1816:3 1817:1 1819:20 single 1782:24 1783:2,3
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19 1807:20 1816:3 1817:1 1819:20 single 1782:24 1783:2,3 sir 1734:16 1738:21
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19 1807:20 1816:3 1817:1 1819:20 single 1782:24 1783:2,3 sir 1734:16 1738:21
shift 1798:6 short 1732:21 Shorthand 1840:8,24 shot 1773:22 show 1747:20 1748:2 1748:18,21,24 1803:16 showing 1743:23 1811:19 shown 1803:1,17 1822:23 1825:4,9 1827:7 1828:12 shows 1734:18,19 1744:3,8 1749:24 1802:24 1803:11 shutdown 1789:2 side 1755:1,2 1811:22 1834:15,20 sides 1812:16 signed 1800:12 similar 1807:8 1808:16 simply 1758:19 1807:20 1816:3 1817:1 1819:20 single 1782:24 1783:2,3 sir 1734:16 1738:21

1761:9,20 1765:12
1766:15 1767:2
1770:16,23 1773:24
1774:15 1790:24
1796:13 1811:12
1821:13
situation 1737:7
1746:16,19
six 1803:3
Skillman 1730:6
1759:6,10,13 1796:1
1796:11,16 1799:16
1799:24 1800:3,7 1802:12 1807:12
1802:12 1807:12
1811:5 1813:10
1814:12 1815:21
1835:12,25 1836:4
1837:4,20 1838:25
slice 1735:6,10
slices 1734:22 1793:18
small 1830:23
sold 1745:3 1769:10
1832:1
somebody 1744:6
1819:5
sorry 1737:6 1750:14
1758:25 1767:3
1770:11 1784:18
1804:19 1818:16
1819:23 1832:3,7
sort 1816:15
<b>Sounds</b> 1834:6
source 1742:3 1743:2
1753:13 1821:20
sourced 1821:24
1822:2,7 1823:19
sources 1734:11,19
1735:15 1736:2
1778:16 1833:3
South 1729:15
Southern 1728:9,11
1729:11 1734:13
<b>SP15</b> 1741:3 1743:18
1743:19 1768:19
1769:9 1779:25
1781:12
speaking 1749:19 specific 1765:17
1766:21 1781:7
1803:25 1804:20
1819:7
specifically 1755:12
1762:22 1768:18
1774:10 1775:11
1780:11 1782:17,20
1802:6 1807:25
1817:17
101/.1/

specified 1812:5

```
speculation 1787:8
  1791:24
speed 1734:15 1748:6
spell 1796:9
spend 1786:20 1836:7
spent 1732:11,11,12,13
spikes 1791:6,17
spot 1772:13 1783:7
  1785:7 1788:18
  1789:13,16 1792:7,25
  1809:22
ss 1840:4
stable 1740:10
staff 1749:9 1750:13,16
  1753:9
stand 1733:7 1811:6
standpoint 1736:6
stands 1780:11
start 1732:8 1769:4
  1786:11 1836:22
  1838:20,25
started 1800:19,20
starting 1838:23
starts 1811:10
state 1728:1 1753:16
  1754:10,13,15,24
  1755:3 1786:4,8
  1796:9 1797:15,20,23
  1798:6,17 1806:3
  1818:1.20 1819:15
  1821:19,25 1822:3,4
  1822:18 1823:9,20
  1825:13,20 1826:16
  1826:17 1827:9,24
  1828:5,20 1829:2
  1831:23 1833:1
  1840:3,9,25
stated 1818:8
statement 1752:18
  1766:22 1778:13
  1811:15 1812:8
States 1740:14,15
steeped 1733:16
stenotype 1840:12
stewardship 1833:13
  1833:15,22
Stillman 1837:24
stop 1835:9 1836:11,22
  1838:9
stopped 1838:10
story 1787:21
strategies 1776:22
strategy 1736:20
  1739:12 1740:11
  1741:17
street 1728:24 1729:6
  1729:15,18 1830:8
strike 1756:6 1759:19
```

1759:24 1789:14
1802:10 1806:6
1811:15,16 1812:16
1816:12,13 1819:18
1826:20 1831:16,17 <b>strive</b> 1737:15 1739:16
structure 1797:10,25
1798:19 1799:6
1802:23 1818:11
1826:2
struggling 1834:10
<b>study</b> 1813:2 1828:2 <b>subject</b> 1771:4 1786:2
1802:10
subjects 1749:5
submit 1812:2
submitted 1764:9
1778:15
<b>subscription</b> 1742:2 <b>subset</b> 1816:3,6,7
substantially 1741:12
subtract 1831:9
subtracting 1831:5 subtraction 1802:7
subtraction 1802:7
<b>sufficient</b> 1735:13,16 1801:14
suggest 1839:3
suggested 1802:1
suggesting 1836:11,19
1836:21
suggestion 1773:9
<b>suggests</b> 1816:23 <b>SULLIVAN</b> 1729:12
summaries 1834:12,17
1834:17,22
summarized 1802:25
1803:7,15
summarizes 1821:17
<b>summary</b> 1805:18 1834:18
Sunday 1765:14
1800:18,24
<b>Superior</b> 1728:1,17
supervise 1797:8
<b>supervision</b> 1802:17 1807:2
supplemental 1746:14
1773:25 1774:1,6,7
1773:25 1774:1,6,7 1774:11 1777:22
1778:7 1779:2
1793:15
<b>supplier</b> 1791:13 <b>supplier's</b> 1776:18
suppliers 1776:11
supplies 1766:7,9
1767:23
supply 1735:12
1763:19 1767:8,9

```
1775:18 1833:23
support 1797:4,4
supporting 1754:17
supposed 1820:2
sure 1732:9 1737:25
  1740:12 1742:1
  1750:15 1764:8
  1773:13 1799:6
  1820:24 1822:23
  1826:10
sustain 1823:11
sustained 1742:23
  1743:4 1744:1
  1745:17 1750:24
  1752:13 1756:4
  1765:6,11 1769:2
  1770:21 1773:17
  1784:19 1792:21
  1794:10,17 1806:8
  1817:22 1819:3
  1825:16,16,24 1826:5
  1829:23 1830:3
  1831:7,17 1832:17
  1833:20 1834:1
SW 1832:3
sworn 1796:2 1800:11
SWP 1786:21 1798:6
  1824:23 1827:14
system 1755:1,2
  1789:19,21,25 1790:3
  1790:6 1793:10
  1797:16,20,24
  1805:25,25 1806:4
  1818:2,15 1823:7
  1825:11,21 1826:7,12
  1828:24 1829:1,3,4,5
  1829:9,12 1830:23
  1831:3,4,9,13,15,21
  1832:2 1833:1
systemwide 1806:5
          Т
```

### table 1769:24 1807:15 tables 1807:16 tad 1801:5 take 1737:7 1738:9,25 1739:8 1740:1,24 1746:4,16 1748:1 1749:6 1750:1 1762:5 1767:17 1773:22 1778:6,11 1782:5 1787:10 1791:14 1799:19 1801:25 1802:2 1806:13,22 1807:14 1812:3 1819:19 1837:4 taken 1840:11 takes 1751:13 1757:4

1704.4 1016.22	1026.21 25 1020.22	1774.12 1704.25	1017-12 1020-21	1720.16 1740.22
1794:4 1816:23	1826:21,25 1829:22	1774:12 1784:25	1817:12 1820:21	1738:16 1740:22
talk 1756:5 1806:20	1830:4,10 1836:5	1836:12,22 1837:11	turns 1793:21	1741:5,6,20 1762:8
talked 1743:11 1770:2	1837:5	1837:12 1838:9	twice 1790:11	1804:1,20 1806:1
1775:14 1778:16,19	thank 1759:16 1779:15	told 1827:19	two 1732:11,13 1754:9	1831:2 1835:25
1778:22,25 1779:3	1779:18 1794:11	tomorrow 1835:13	1754:18,23 1761:17	useful 1824:7 1835:21
1788:21 1800:9	1795:6,19,21 1796:6	1836:23 1838:1,4,5	1762:4 1776:4	usefulness 1801:14
1820:16 1834:24	1801:4 1806:24	1838:10,19,20,24	1777:23 1778:9,10	uses 1734:7 1828:13
talking 1739:17 1745:8	1809:25 1819:13	1839:5	1792:1 1802:3 1803:4	1832:3,5
1745:16,23 1747:16	1834:6 1835:4	top 1762:22 1769:24	1807:16 1813:15	usually 1834:19
1763:18 1774:6	1838:22 1839:8	1787:25 1790:2	1816:16 1818:25,25	<b>Utility</b> 1734:14
1793:23 1807:14,15	thing 1785:6	topic 1733:15	1819:1 1829:15	utilization 1807:3
1834:11 1838:13	things 1734:15 1748:6	total 1759:2 1771:20,24	1832:12 1833:3	utilize 1736:22 1746:9
talks 1787:3	1777:4 1811:24	1775:3 1788:3	type 1791:8 1808:7,16	1746:10,23 1747:9
TARA 1728:20 1840:8	think 1732:18 1738:6,7	1793:17,17 1821:22	1833:6	1797:25 1807:4
1840:23	1741:19 1743:5,11	1824:23 1825:6	types 1741:15 1807:8	1814:19 1824:23
tell 1734:21 1742:12	1744:18,19 1747:12	1829:14 1831:24	typewriting 1840:13	1825:5
	1744.18,19 1747.12	1832:5,23		utilized 1775:19
1744:13 1769:8,20		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	typically 1774:4,8	
1806:9	1758:18 1760:1,5	totals 1822:6	1793:21	1797:21 1808:8
telling 1758:14 1781:9	1770:2 1787:6 1792:1	tougher 1739:15	U	1809:3 1813:3,21
1783:25 1790:3	1794:25 1800:3	track 1742:11		1828:23 1832:13
1806:10	1807:19 1823:3	<b>Trader</b> 1779:20	Uh-huh 1786:6	utilizes 1832:3
ten 1779:15 1803:7	1824:4,12,17 1826:24	transacted 1781:1	ultimately 1787:24	utilizing 1808:7
1834:5	1834:17,23 1836:2,6	transactions 1781:8	understand 1749:25	
terminate 1831:23	1836:24 1837:3	TRANSCRIPT	1758:18 1785:9,10	V
terms 1799:7 1801:15	1838:19	1728:16	1798:13 1799:1	vague 1744:5 1746:6
1804:2 1809:4	thinks 1837:9	transcription 1840:14	1806:22,25 1823:14	1750:22 1751:3
1817:18 1823:13	third 1738:1 1746:17	transferred 1771:5,21	1823:18 1826:23	1753:4 1794:1
1825:10	1760:14,22 1794:5	1771:25 1772:4,8	1827:18 1832:8,9	1798:12 1826:8
testified 1733:8	1795:8 1802:20	transmitted 1823:16	1837:22	VALIDITY 1728:10
1740:22 1760:13	1804:3 1805:2	treat 1788:12	understanding 1748:5	value 1737:16 1743:21
1761:2,14 1763:1	1807:18,22,24 1808:1	treated 1767:8 1784:3	1749:3 1787:11	valued 1736:13
1764:12 1766:10	1811:25 1824:10	treating 1784:5,8,25	1824:15,18	values 1741:17 1754:19
1767:14,15,22 1768:9	third-party 1765:1	trend 1741:14	understood 1733:12	VAN 1729:3
		trends 1741.14 trends 1740:8	1760:7 1786:5	VANDERHORST
1768:12,15,21,22	thought 1732:10			
1770:18 1777:17	1773:22	trial 1800:18 1801:16	undertake 1807:9	1729:18
1783:20 1784:20	three 1732:14 1800:23	1812:6 1814:6 1818:3	1817:25 1833:6,14	variable 1754:2,5,11
1785:1 1795:1 1796:3	1826:13,14,15	<b>Tribune</b> 1786:3,7,25	undertaken 1807:7	variety 1768:13
1811:6	1828:19	1787:19	undertaking 1799:2	various 1778:16
testifies 1836:19 1837:1	ticking 1838:10,12,14	trouble 1824:16	1804:23 1808:6	1797:24 1823:17
testify 1742:7 1799:22	1838:17	true 1748:13 1753:21	undertook 1797:14	vary 1754:12
1800:1,5 1820:5	time 1732:8,17,18	1761:12,15 1763:8,12	1807:1	verifier 1800:12
1824:14	1736:23 1737:3	1765:12 1766:9,14,17	undisclosed 1749:13	versus 1747:24 1783:21
testifying 1747:24	1738:24 1746:11	1766:19,22,24 1767:4	1750:8 1756:24	1793:17
1755:13 1763:21	1751:12 1752:4,5	1769:12,22,23	1758:5,14	VIDEOGRAPHY
1764:25 1784:5	1762:5 1766:5,8	1771:25 1773:13,24	unfair 1800:25 1837:23	1728:23
testimony 1738:5,7	1773:18 1777:10,12	1774:9,10 1775:24	unintelligible 1826:9	virtually 1793:19
1739:8 1740:1	1778:3,4,5 1779:13	1776:21 1778:1,2,11	Union 1786:3,7,25	volatility 1775:18
1744:17 1746:7,21	1789:17 1792:9	1778:12,13 1780:15	1787:19	volume 1728:10
1749:14,16,19 1750:8	1802:10 1806:15,16	1781:4,22 1782:24	unit 1805:4 1808:14	1757:17 1780:17,17
1749:14,10,19 1730:8	1809:19 1812:15,17	1783:2 1785:4	1813:4,22 1814:21	1780:19,19,23,25
1751:15 1755:11	1814:8 1840:12	truly 1801:9	1815:14 1816:7	volumes 1803:11
1759:20 1761:9	times 1732:16 1757:3	try 1736:21 1799:17	1818:25 1826:1,6	volumetric 1803:16
1762:9,17 1764:15	1765:3 1766:10	1835:25 1836:1	1829:15 1831:15	voluminous 1834:18
1801:1,13,19 1803:25	1767:6,11 1776:11	trying 1741:7	United 1740:14,15	vs 1728:8
1804:12,14 1805:16	title 1796:25	<b>Tuesday</b> 1728:19	unsubstantiated	****
1811:20,21 1816:12	today 1761:15 1762:10	1732:2 1811:2	1801:9	W
1817:8 1818:5	1763:21 1764:10	turn 1808:1 1813:9	URQUHART 1729:12	wait 1767:16 1772:11
1823:15 1825:23	1767:1 1768:6,10	1814:12 1815:1	use 1734:4 1736:2,5	1825:18
L				
				Page 12

waited 1800:20
waiving 1759:24
walk 1819:9 1824:9,20
walked 1824:12
<b>walking</b> 1819:11
want 1734:5 1743:15
1746:15 1747:11
1758:24 1787:4
1819:9 1823:24
1824:1,9,20 1836:7,7
1836:17
wanted 1773:1 1794:6
1794:13
wants 1738:2 1835:24
<b>WARREN</b> 1729:5
wasn't 1761:19
1838:15
water 1728:6,9,11
1729:11 1734:5,8
1735:16,19 1736:3
1737:8,10,11,19 1738:2,14,17 1740:19
1720.0 14 17 1740 10
1/38:2,14,1/1/40:19
1745:11 1746:18,24
1747.1 2 10 14
1747:1,3,10,14
1752:25 1753:15,16
1753:19,22 1754:10
1/33.19,22 1/34.10
1754:12,13,15,24,24
1755:3,3,8 1757:5,18
1755.5,5,6 1757.5,16
1/5/:18 1/58:11
1760:11 15 23 1762:7
1757:18 1758:11 1760:11,15,23 1762:7 1762:25 1764:16,16 1764:20,21 1765:1,2
1/62:25 1/64:16,16
1764:20.21 1765:1.2
1765.0 0 12 12 10 22
1765:8,8,13,13,18,22
1765:25,25 1766:1,4
1766:6,7,12,13,14,15
1766:16,25 1767:5,5
1767:7,9,20 1768:2,2 1768:3,3 1770:8,25
1760.2.2.1770.0.25
1/68:3,3 1//0:8,25
1771:4.5.16.20.24
1771:4,5,16,20,24 1772:2,7,12 1778:17
1//4.4,/,14 1//0.1/
1783:12,14,16,21,22
1783:24 1784:1,6,8
1784:10,12,13,17,18
1784:22,22,24
1785:17,17,18 1786:4
1786:9 1787:22
1788:7,8,12 1789:10
1/00./,0,14 1/09.10
1789:11,12,18 1790:7
1790:9,9 1791:22
1702.25 1704 4 6 12
1793:25 1794:4,6,13
1794:23 1795:9
1797:12,15,20,23,24
1798:6,7,10,17
1803:4,8,9,11,11,13
1005.4,0,7,11,11,13
1805:19,21 1806:3
1813-5 1815-15
1813:5 1815:15 1816:8 1818:1,20
1816.8 1818:1,20
1819:15 1820:13

```
1821:20,21,24,25
  1822:2,3,4,7,17,18,18
  1823:7,8,9,9,10,16,19
  1823:20 1824:23
  1825:7,13,20 1826:17
  1826:17,18 1827:9,10
  1827:22,24,24 1828:5
  1828:20 1829:2
  1830:25 1831:3,23
  1832:1 1833:2,3,13
  1833:15,21,22
way 1732:23 1742:18
  1753:1 1764:4,23,24
  1769:20 1770:23
  1772:15 1777:1,3,3
  1780:21 1781:2
  1783:7 1794:20
  1799:6 1816:18
  1820:23 1823:12,12
  1823:25 1824:21
  1837:13,14 1838:2
wbraunig@kvn.com
  1729:9
We'll 1795:3
we're 1784:25 1799:3
  1817:5 1834:11
we've 1750:15 1751:24
  1784:11 1807:19
weeks 1812:5
weighted 1757:17
  1758:10
went 1749:1 1777:4
  1809:14
weren't 1800:9
west 1754:21,22 1755:2
Western 1740:15
wheel 1794:6 1795:8
wheeler 1794:12,23
wheeling 1787:5,6
willing 1835:2
wish 1739:13
withdrawals 1736:14
witness 1733:4,7,13,17
  1737:23 1738:11
  1741:2 1742:7
  1744:22 1745:1,6
  1746:2,9,23 1747:5,9
  1751:5,19 1752:2,10
  1753:6 1755:20
  1756:2 1757:1,9,14
  1757:23 1758:7
  1759:6 1761:24
  1765:17 1767:19
  1773:12 1785:13
  1787:13 1791:12
  1792:19 1793:4
  1794:3,19 1795:8,17
```

1795:23 1796:2,5,11

```
1800:21 1801:8,10,12
  1805:1,18 1816:16,24
  1817:9,10,10 1818:7
  1818:23 1819:22
  1820:7.12.17.19
  1821:17 1823:2,6,12
  1823:18 1825:3
  1826:12.15 1830:14
  1831:13 1832:9,23
  1835:10,18,19 1836:5
  1836:14,22 1839:3
  1840:17
witnesses 1730:2
  1836:18,25
wonder 1732:15,15
Woodcock 1799:22
  1800:1,5 1835:19,19
  1836:14,19 1837:11
  1837:17,24,25
  1838:23 1839:1
Woodcock's 1837:5,18
  1837:19
word 1740:24 1763:10
  1763:22,23 1793:9
  1805:25
work 1755:19,25
  1756:2 1797:5
  1804:12
workday 1739:2
worked 1763:5 1764:11
  1800:16 1822:25
working 1784:12
  1787:21 1802:16
works 1771:13 1829:25
world 1800:3
WORLDWIDE
  1728:23
wouldn't 1747:7
  1773:2 1794:17
write 1763:3,10
writes 1787:17
written 1763:11
wrong 1816:20 1835:1
wrote 1763:5 1785:21
          X
```

### X 1730:1 1819:10 XI 1728:10 Y Y 1819:10 Yamasaki 1821:14 Yeah 1764:7 year 1731:9 1736:15 1737:13 1771:6,21,25 1772:8,23 1788:5,22 1813:17 1814:17 1815:6 1821:24

```
1829:12 1832:25
years 1735:18,22
  1741:24 1756:22
  1777:6,23 1778:9,10
  1802:23 1803:1.5.9
  1803:14 1813:15
  1821:19 1823:17
  1833:10
yesterday 1732:11
  1734:4 1736:24
  1739:8,17 1740:22
  1741:10 1747:12
  1759:22 1760:13,18
  1761:2,12,16 1762:6
  1763:1 1764:12
  1768:6,10,12,16
  1799:23 1811:15
  1812:7 1821:14
  1823:15
yesterday's 1741:6
          Z
zero 1736:11
zero-cost 1793:14
zoom 1756:17
          0
1 1728:12,12
1-10 1728:13
1.2 1788:5,21,24
1.25 1789:2
1/14/10 1731:8
1:30 1809:24
10 1728:12
10/21/13 1731:4
10:00 1732:3 1764:13
  1765:8
1074 1731:4 1771:3
  1773:6,8
1096 1752:14 1756:9
  1756:10 1820:3
1099 1820:4
10th 1729:15
11 1803:8 1811:25
110-A 1814:12
110-B 1815:2,13
1101 1756:15
1103 1820:2
1121 1739:17 1740:13
  1743:23 1747:17
  1749:1 1756:14,16
```

1769:24 1779:19,22

1783:3 1785:12

**1123** 1748:7 1783:3

**1125** 1748:17 1783:4

**1127** 1748:21 1783:4

```
115.15 1758:10
1150-A 1811:19
1151 1811:18
1156 1821:1,6,12
1159 1757:25
1160 1731:5 1799:14
  1802:14 1805:9
  1807:8 1808:2 1816:1
  1816:19 1817:1,15
  1819:21,24 1825:3,9
  1827:4 1834:25
1161 1815:19 1817:14
12 1748:14 1803:12
  1811:25
122.32 1758:10
13 1803:13
14 1803:13 1812:1
14,808.33 1771:17
15 1732:13 1812:1
  1820:16
159 1731:3
16 1803:15 1830:23
17 1803:15 1812:2
1728 1728:13
1734 1730:5
1753 1731:3
1760 1730:5
1769 1731:4
177,700 1771:21
1774 1731:7,7
1790 1730:5 1731:8,8
1796 1730:6
18 1803:15
1802 1731:5
1813 1731:9
1814 1731:9
1840 1728:13
19 1803:16
          2
2:30 1839:9
20 1820:16
2000 1803:6
2010 1777:21 1778:8
  1788:5,8,22 1789:18
  1789:21 1790:3,6
  1809:14,15,20
  1813:14
2010-11 1813:17
2011 1744:4,15
  1747:21 1748:13
  1756:22 1757:11
  1758:2 1769:10,16
  1777:4,6,11,14
  1816:5 1819:16
  1822:2 1824:23
  1825:5 1833:5
```

**2011-14** 1731:3

2014/12 1501 0	1	]	
<b>2011/12</b> 1731:9	1774:24,25		
<b>2012</b> 1728:12 1748:10			
1748:14 1755:9	5		
1757:11 1758:2	<b>5</b> 1828:12		
1778:11 1800:19	<b>522-7096</b> 1728:25		
1803:6 1813:23	<b>59.9</b> 1788:6		
1814:18 1815:7,8			
1833:7	6		
<b>2012-13</b> 1814:17	<b>6:00</b> 1764:13		
<b>2013</b> 1728:12 1748:19	<b>633</b> 1729:6		
1757:11 1758:2	<b>66,000</b> 1822:13 1823:3		
1771:4 1814:22	<b>66,661.8</b> 1825:6,8		
<b>2013-14</b> 1815:6			
<b>2014</b> 1728:12 1748:22	7		
1756:22 1757:11	7 1829:8,10,14,20		
1758:2 1769:16	1830:16		
1771:6,17,21 1833:7	<b>70</b> 1777:22 1778:4,5,6		
<b>2015</b> 1728:19 1732:2	<b>700</b> 1729:18		
1811:2 1839:10	<b>701</b> 1728:24		
1840:18	<b>717</b> 1761:4		
<b>203</b> 1816:18 1819:20	<b>76,581</b> 1824:24		
1819:24,25 1820:2,9	<b>76,581.1</b> 1822:4		
1820:10,12			
<b>204</b> 1816:18	8		
<b>21</b> 1761:4 1771:4	<b>800</b> 1728:25		
<b>213.217.6000</b> 1729:19	<b>83.30</b> 1758:9		
<b>213.443.3000</b> 1729:16	<b>865</b> 1729:15		
<b>23</b> 1761:4	<b>87.80</b> 1758:9		
<b>24</b> 1775:20 1776:2			
<b>25</b> 1732:21	9		
<b>26.27</b> 1768:23	<b>9:00</b> 1838:11 1839:5,9		
<b>28</b> 1728:19 1732:2	<b>90-A</b> 1809:9 1812:24		
1811:2 1839:10	1812:25		
<b>28th</b> 1840:17	<b>90012</b> 1729:19		
20th 1010.17	<b>90017-2543</b> 1729:15		
3	<b>94</b> 1816:18		
<b>3/8/11</b> 1731:7	<b>94111</b> 1728:24		
<b>304</b> 1728:4 1732:4	<b>953</b> 1731:9 1813:10		
1811:3	1814:9,10		
<b>30th</b> 1800:21	<b>981-3498</b> 1728:25		
<b>32</b> 1732:12	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
	1		
<b>3374</b> 1728:20 1840:8	1		
1840:23			
<b>357</b> 1789:24			
<b>37.13</b> 1768:23 1781:13	1		
1781:14	1		
<b>38</b> 1781:12,12,15,15	1		
3rd 1728:24	1		
4	1		
4 1827:8 1828:16	1		
<b>415</b> 1728:25			
	1		
<b>415.391.5400</b> 1729:7	1		
<b>479</b> 1731:8 1785:20	1		
1790:13,16,17			
<b>49</b> 1732:11	1		
<b>490</b> 1734:16	1		
	1		
<b>497</b> 1731:7 1774:19,22			
	1		

```
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                                                                        INDEX
               COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                                                        2
                                                                             DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW
                                                                                                 1845 1848 --
                                                                             SKILLMAN, June
                 DEPARTMENT 304
                                                                             WOODCOCK, Christopher 1859 1904 1941
                                                                                                                       1948
      SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY, )
                                                                                                1954
                                                                        5
         Petitioner and Plaintiff, ) Case No.
                       ) CPF-10-510830
                                                                        6
                                                                             Defendant Rests: 1970
                         ) CPF-12-512466
                                                                             Plaintiff Rests: 1970
      METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF )
      SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL
      PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE
                                                                       10
      VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY ) Volume XII
      THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT )
                                                                       11
      OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL )
                                                                       12
      10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY)
                                                                       13
      1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and )
      DOES 1-10,
                                                                       14
                        ) Pages 1841 - 1971
                                                                       15
        Respondents and Defendants. )
                                                                       16
                                                                       17
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                                                       18
                San Francisco Superior
                San Francisco, California
                                                                       19
                Wednesday, April 29, 2015
                                                                       20
      Reported By:
                                                                       21
      TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR #3374
                                                                       22
                                                                       23
                JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES
           WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES
                                                                       24
       701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111
                                                                       25
             (800) 522-7096 or (415) 981-3498
                                                           1841
                                                                                                                                  1843
        APPEARANCES
                                                                        1
                                                                                            EXHIBITS
     For Petitioner and Plaintiff:
                                                                        2
                                                                              NUMBER DESCRIPTION
                                                                                                                     ID EVIDENCE
     KEKER & VAN NEST
                                                                        3
     BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ.
BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ.
                                                                              PTX 487 6/12/09 email from Skillman 1849 1849
                                                                        4
                                                                              PTX 487A Excepts from MWD Annual
     BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ.
                                                                                    Reports
                                                                                                          1849
                                                                                                                 1849
     BY: WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ
                                                                        5
     BY: NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG, ESQ.
                                                                              PTX 488A
     633 Battery Street
     San Francisco, California
     415.391.5400
                                                                              PTX 489A
     Email: ahadlock@kvn.com
                                                                        7
     Email: dpurcell@kvn.com
     Email: jkeker@kvn.com
                                                                              PTX 490A
     Email: wbraunig@kvn.com
                                                                        8
     Email: ngoldberg@kvn.com
                                                                              PTX 519 5/7/10 email from Kostopoulos 1855
                                                                                                                               1856
                                                                        9
11
     For Respondent and Defendant Metropolitan Water District
                                                                              PTX 520 7/19/10 email from Kostopoulos 1856
                                                                                                                               1856
     of Southern California:
12
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
                                                                              PTX 521 7/7/10 email from Skillman 1857 1858
13
     BY: JOHN B. QUINN, ESQ.
                                                                       11
     BY: ERIC EMANUEL, ESQ.
                                                                       12
     BY: DALE OLIVER, ESQ.
                                                                              DTX 123 Woodcock Expert Disclosure
                                                                                                                       1865 1866
     BY: GARY GANS, ESQ.
                                                                       13
                                                                              DTX 884
                                                                                                            -- 1957
15
     865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
                                                                       14
                                                                              DTX 1143 Brief by San Diego Water
                                                                                                                            1956
     Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
                                                                       15
                                                                              DTX 1152 Declaration of Upadhyay
                                                                                                                      1957
16
                                                                                                                             1957
     213.443.3000
                                                                       16
                                                                              DTX 1165 9/3/99 letter from Hess
     Email: johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com
                                                                                                                    1957
17
                                                                       17
                                                                              DTX 1166 12/20/01 letter from Stapleton 1957
     OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
                                                                       18
                                                                              DTX 1167 3/5/98 letter from Stapleton 1957
     BY: JOSEPH VANDERHORST, ESQ.
                                                                       19
     700 North Alameda Street
19
                                                                       20
     Los Angeles, California 90012
     213.217.6000
                                                                       21
20
                                                                       2.2
21
                                                                       23
22
23
                                                                       24
                                                                       25
25
                                                           1842
                                                                                                                                  1844
```

1 San Francisco, California Q. What is your involvement in terms of 2 2 Wednesday, April 29, 2015 preferential rights at Met? 3 3 A. My staff annually calculates preferential 9:00 a.m. 4 4 Department No. 304 Hon. Curtis E.A. Karnow, Judge 5 5 Q. What is included in terms of credits for 6 6 THE COURT: Good morning. purposes of determining the preferences under the 7 Are we ready to continue with the witness? preferential right calculation? 8 8 MR. OLIVER: Yes, your Honor. A. The act states that it's the payments for taxes 9 9 THE COURT: Good morning, ma'am. and others. Currently Metropolitan includes property 10 10 THE WITNESS: Good morning. tax payments, any other revenues that we might receive 11 11 THE COURT: Let's continue. that are related to connections, construction of 12 12 connections and two fixed charges that we have, the 13 1.3 JUNE SKILLMAN, readiness-to-serve charge and the capacity charge. And 14 14 resumed the stand and testified further as follows: those are the four elements that go into the 15 15 calculation. 16 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed) Q. Are there payments received from your member 17 17 agencies for the supply of water that are not included BY MR. OLIVER: 18 18 in the calculation of preferential rights? Q. Good morning, Ms. Skillman. Is it possible 19 19 from the financial records at Met to determine the unit A. The purchase of water isn't included in 20 20 cost for SWP water that's included in the exchange water preferential rights. 21 21 for years 2011 through '14? Q. Have your calculations of preferential rights 2.2 22 MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. Calls for credits included consideration of San Diego? 23 23 A. To the degree the Water Authority pays property expert testimony. 24 24 THE COURT: Overruled on that question. taxes or constructs the service connection or pays the 25 25 readiness-to-serve charge and the capacity charge, those Go ahead, please. 1845 1847 1 1 THE WITNESS: Yes. revenues have been included in the calculation. 2 2 O. BY MR. OLIVER: As a result of your employment O. Is that the same type of credit that other 3 3 at Met, are you familiar with the term "preferential member agencies receive credit for in the calculation of 4 4 rights"? preferential rights? 5 5 A. Yes. A. Yes. 6 6 Q. What are preferential rights? Q. In your experience, has the calculation of 7 A. Preferential rights are a statutory calculation preferential rights remained the same? 8 8 of Metropolitan's Act. A. Metropolitan's Act was amended in 1931 to --9 9 Q. I heard a portion of that. Could you repeat for the current calculation and my understanding is that 10 10 it, please? it's been done the same way since then. 11 11 A. Preferential rights are a statutory calculation Q. However, in your personal experience, has the 12 12 calculation remained the same? in Metropolitan's act. 13 13 Q. Of your understanding, why is a calculation A. Yes. 14 14 undertaken? Q. And has it remained the same with regard to San 15 15 A. It is undertaken annually and it allocates Diego? 16 16 Metropolitan's water to member agencies based on their 17 17 proportion of accumulated payments for property taxes MR. OLIVER: Thank you, your Honor. That 18 18 completes my direct examination. and others and excluding the purchase of water. 19 19 THE COURT: Thank you. Q. What are preferential rights? 20 20 Cross-examination. A. A calculation. 21 21 O. What -- preference for what? 22 22 A. Water. **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 23 2.3 Q. And water in what circumstance? BY MR. KEKER: 24 24 A. The act doesn't say. It just says each member O. Just a little, Ms. Skillman. 25 25 MR. KEKER: Your Honor, it is my understanding agency has a preferential right to water. 1846 1848

2.4

```
1
       that Met has filed this morning an offer of proof with
2
       respect to Ms. Skillman. And I haven't really had a
3
       chance to analyze it yet so I just want to ask a couple
4
       of questions.
5
            THE COURT: I haven't seen it.
6
            MR. KEKER: So let me -- can she have a
       notebook? First of all, Exhibits 487-A through 490-A,
8
       this is Plaintiff's PTX 487-A, 488-A, 489-A and 490-A,
9
       are excerpts from the Met annual report and we would
10
       move those exhibits into evidence in this phase.
```

2.2

1.0

2.3

MR. OLIVER: I believe, your Honor, they already are in evidence as part of the administrative record previously already entered into that case.

MR. KEKER: If they are -- we're not sure, but if they are not, we would like them to be part of the record.

THE COURT: I will admit 487-A, 488-A, 489-A and 490-A.

MR. KEKER: One other, an email, 478 is an email, I think, to Ms. Skillman. Ms. Skillman, look in there -- 478 is at Tab 15 in your binder.

THE COURT: This is PTX 478.

MR. KEKER: PTX 478 is at Tab 15, and that is an email from June Skillman dated Friday, June 12. And attached to it are answers to some questions. I would

Q. And San Diego sued in June of 2010; correct?

A. Correct.

Q. DTX 90-A is a cost-of-service study that has on it the date of April 2010. But that's for an option that was not adopted by the board; right?

- A. That's correct. The costs are the same. The only difference was that the board adopted lower rates. So the cost-of-service, in terms of cost, was still valid. It's just the revenues that would have been generated were different.
- Q. This is a proposal. This cost-of-service study is supporting a recommendation of 12.4 percent increase in rates across the board; right?
- A. It was a 12 percent increase in rates -- 12.4 percent increase in rates.
  - Q. And the board refused to do that; right?
  - A. The board adopted seven-and-a-half percent.
- Q. So this cost-of-service study is not the cost-of-service study that the board relied on to approve rates different than the ones that are listed in this cost-of-service study; right?
- A. The board adopted the costs that are in this cost-of-service study. They simply adopted lower rates that generated less revenue, and, therefore, we used reserves to cover the difference.

like to move that into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. OLIVER: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: PTX 478 is admitted.

(PTX 478 was received in evidence.)

MR. KEKER: And then, finally, a few questions -- not finally. What I would like to do is ask these questions and then ask for a break and consult with my team for just a couple of minutes, but I think this may be all I have.

Q. Yesterday you testified about some cost of service studies -- excuse me, your Honor.

THE COURT: These were, for example, DTX 11---

MR. KEKER: 1190 and 110.

THE COURT: let's go off the record.

(Short recess.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

MR. KEKER: Back on the record, your Honor.

- Q. You testified about DTX 90-A. Do you have that in front of you? That's the fiscal year 2010-11 cost-of-service, April 2010.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, the board adopted the 2011 and 2012 rates in April of 2010, isn't that right?
  - A. Correct.

Q. Could we put up -- in DTX 90 -- the entire DTX 90 I think is in the record. Could we put up page 7 of that? This is the board letter. Blow up that sentence that's about right in the middle of the page, a two-line sentence.

This is the letter that went to the board in connection with -- it's actually the letter that goes with DTX 90-A and says, "Depending on the rate option adopted by the board, the detailed cost-of-service study will be updated to reflect that option, consistent with the current methodology."

MR. OLIVER: Objection. Is this --

THE COURT: Let me just pause here. Are we reading from DTX 90?

MR. KEKER: Ninety, your Honor.

THE COURT: The version that's in the Skillman's binder?

MR. KEKER: That is 90-A. Following your instructions, I think, Met put in less. If you take all of 90, which I think is in evidence -- it is in evidence. There is a board letter -- and what 90-A is is Attachment 2 to the board letter we are looking at.

THE COURT: I want to pause to make sure the other side has access to this so they can follow along.

MR. OLIVER: If they have a copy, I would like

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

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 to offer it now but with the representation -- we have 2 no objection to admission if the document is not in 3 evidence. 4 THE COURT: The discussion is it is in 5 evidence. It's a question of all of us being able to 6 follow along. You are being handed a copy right now of the entirety of 90 and I will rely on what is being 8 posted on the display board. 9 MR. KEKER: It is in evidence and part of the 10 record and now Mr. Oliver has a copy. 11 Q. Page 7 of this board letter that precedes the 12 attachment to the cost-of-service study that is 90-A has 13 this sentence: "Depending on the rate option adopted by 14 the board, the detailed cost-of-service study will be 15 updated to reflect that option, consistent with the

Do you see that?

current methodology."

### A. Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Q. As a matter of fact, the staff continued to work on a cost-of-service study to support the rates that were actually adopted. You continued to work on that well after the rates had been adopted; right?

Q. You didn't finalize that until well after San Diego had sued; right?

Q. You remember that? You remember that?

### A. Yes.

Q. You are sure about that as you are about everything else in your testimony?

### A. Yes.

MR. KEKER: Can we have marked as the next in order PTX 518. MWD 2010-00373724.

THE CLERK: I show there is already a PTX 518.

MR. KEKER: That was the next in order. We will come back to that one. Let's look at another one which we may have.

Could we have marked as next in order -- so we don't confuse the record, can we make this PTX 519. Can we give one to the witness. I have given one to the other side.

(PTX 519 was marked for identification.)

Q. BY MR. KEKER: Ms. Skillman, do you recognize 519 as a memorandum you received from Stathis Kostupoulos on or about May 27, 2010?

### A. Okay. Yes.

Q. Does that reference --

MR. KEKER: May we move it in, your Honor?

THE COURT: Any objection? MR. OLIVER: No objection.

THE COURT: It looks like it appears to be an

1853

1855

- A. We actually finalized it in May.
- O. Finalized it in May?

### A. Uh-huh.

Q. Let's look at 953, DTX 953.

Is that the cost-of-service study that was finalized in May of 2010?

### A. For fiscal year '11-'12.

Q. Was there another cost-of-service study that was finalized in 2010 for some other years?

### A. Not in my book.

Q. You said it says 2011-2012. This is the -let's back up.

The 2011 and 2012 rates were adopted by the board in April of 2010?

### A. Correct.

- Q. You are telling us that the cost-of-service study to support the rates that were adopted was finalized in May of 2010?
- A. The information that was needed for the board to act on the '11-'12 rates was provided to them in the presentation at the time they adopted this. We just didn't have the report prepared.
- Q. Did you have the report finalized by May of 2010?
  - A. Yes. It is dated May of 2010.

email. With that caveat, PTX 519 is admitted.

(PTX 519 was received in evidence.)

Q. BY MR. KEKER: Does this indicate that study to support the April 2011 resolutions? What cost-of-service study is he working on?

### A. In 2010 he would have been working on the May 2010 --

Q. The one you said was adopted in May of 2010?

### A. Right.

MR. KEKER: Let's look at PTX 519, Bates MWD 2010-00207563.

Q. Is that an email you received a copy on, on or about July 19, 2010?

### A. I did.

MR. KEKER: We would move it in.

THE COURT: Any objection?

17 MR. OLIVER: No objection.

18 THE COURT: PTX 520 is admitted. 19 (PTX 520 was received in evidence.)

> Q. BY MR. KEKER: Mr. Kostupoulos is the same person we saw in the previous email?

### A. Yes.

Q. Ms. Bennion is a lawyer at Met you have identified in your testimony in Phase I?

A. Correct.

```
1
         Q. And then your copy, along with Mr. Vandenberg.
                                                                         reviewed?
 2
                                                                   2
       What Mr. Kostupoulos is sending on to Sid Bennion is the
                                                                            A. For a report to the board.
                                                                   3
 3
       final cost-of-service based on the adopted 7.5
                                                                               MR. KEKER: That is all I have with one
                                                                   4
 4
       increases. Is that the first time that you had
                                                                         request. We gave a list of exhibits that were annual
                                                                   5
 5
                                                                         reports. When you said what was in evidence, I am not
       finalized the cost-of-service study based on these
                                                                   6
 6
       adopted increases that happened back in April?
                                                                         sure you said 489-A. We moved for 487-A, PTX 488-A,
                                                                   7
                                                                         489-A, and 490-A.
         A. Perhaps that was when the letters were final --
                                                                   8
 8
                                                                               THE COURT: I believe I did. This will confirm
       it has the letter.
                                                                   9
 9
                                                                         it.
         Q. When the board passed the resolution about
10
                                                                  10
       rates in 2011 and '12, it did not have a final
                                                                               MR. KEKER: Thank you.
                                                                  11
                                                                               THE COURT: Any redirect?
11
       cost-of-service study to support what it did, did it?
                                                                  12
                                                                               MR. OLIVER: No, your Honor.
12
         A. The information was provided to the board in
                                                                  13
                                                                               MR. QUINN: Met calls Christopher Woodcock.
13
       the presentation in April for them to act on that
                                                                  14
                                                                               THE COURT: Thank you.
14
       supported the seven-and-a-half percent.
                                                                  15
15
            MR. KEKER: Your Honor, could I ask for a
                                                                  16
                                                                                    CHRISTOPHER WOODCOCK,
16
       five-minute break to see if I have any more questions?
                                                                  17
                                                                         called as a witness by the Defendant, was sworn and
17
       I may not.
                                                                  18
                                                                         testified as follows:
18
            THE COURT: Of course.
                                                                  19
19
            (Recess.)
                                                                  2.0
                                                                               THE WITNESS: I do.
20
            THE COURT: Sir.
                                                                  21
                                                                               THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
21
            MR. KEKER: One more exhibit, your Honor, on
                                                                  2.2
                                                                               State and spell your first and last name.
2.2
       the same subject. PTX 521 is an email string from and
                                                                  23
                                                                               THE WITNESS: Christopher,
23
       to June Skillman dated July 7, 2010. We would move it
                                                                  24
                                                                         C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R. Last name Woodcock,
24
       in.
                                                                  2.5
                                                                         W-O-O-D-C-O-C-K.
25
            THE COURT: Any objection?
                                                       1857
                                                                                                                         1859
 1
                                                                   1
            MR. OLIVER: No objection.
                                                                               MR. QUINN: May I proceed, your Honor?
 2
                                                                   2
            THE COURT: PTX 521 admitted.
                                                                               THE COURT: Please.
                                                                   3
 3
            (PTX 521 was received in evidence.)
 4
         Q. BY MR. KEKER: Ms. Skillman, the bottom email
                                                                   4
                                                                                     DIRECT EXAMINATION
 5
                                                                   5
       says -- from you to Joanne Gonzales says, "Did Brian/Sid
                                                                         BY MR. QUINN:
                                                                   6
 6
       ever review the COS report?"
                                                                            Q. Good morning, Mr. Woodcock.
 7
                                                                   7
            Does this refer to this COS report you told us
                                                                            A. Good morning.
                                                                   8
 8
       was adopted and finalized in May of 2010?
                                                                            Q. What is your area of expertise?
                                                                   9
 9
         A. Probably.
                                                                            A. Water and sewer rates, primarily, including
                                                                  10
10
         Q. Is Brian, Brian Thomas?
                                                                         financing, setting of rates, cost-of-service studies,
                                                                  11
11
         A. Yes.
                                                                         some management issues associated with it, financing
                                                                  12
12
         Q. Is Brian Thomas your boss?
                                                                         bonds, that type of thing.
                                                                  13
13
         A. At the time.
                                                                            Q. What is water ratemaking?
                                                                  14
14
         Q. And Sid is Sid Bennion the lawyer?
                                                                            A. Water ratemaking is a process that one goes
                                                                  15
15
         A. Yes.
                                                                         through with different utilities to determine what the
16
                                                                  16
         Q. You couldn't finalize the cost-of-service
                                                                         costs of providing service are, what the requirements
17
                                                                  17
       report yourself, could you, before they reviewed it?
                                                                         are for revenues, how to fairly allocate or assign those
                                                                  18
18
         A. That's correct.
                                                                         costs, and then come up with rates that recover those
19
                                                                  19
         Q. If you are asking whether or not they reviewed
                                                                         costs in proportion to the expenses incurred.
20
                                                                  20
       this cost-of-service report, it was not finalized as of
                                                                            Q. Is there a publication that is recognized in
21
                                                                  21
       the date of your email, July 7?
                                                                         the water ratemaking field as being authoritative in
22
                                                                  22
                                                                         terms of establishing the basic recognized principles of
         A. That would be correct.
                                                                  23
2.3
         Q. That's after the lawsuit from San Diego?
                                                                         water ratemaking?
24
                                                                  24
         A. That would be after.
                                                                            A. Yes.
                                                                  25
25
         Q. Still working on it. Still getting it
                                                                            Q. What is the name of that publication?
                                                       1858
                                                                                                                         1860
```

1.8

- A. That publication is called the "M-1 Manual of Practice" published by the American Water Works Association. The title is "Principles of Water Rates, Fees and Charges."
  - Q. You said you are an expert in water ratemaking?
  - A. Yes.

1.0

2.4

- Q. What do you base your claim that you are an expert in this area on?
- A. I have spent in excess of four decades helping municipalities, water authorities, water districts, some private water companies in determining water and sewer rates. I have stopped counting some time ago, but it is in excess of 500 of such studies over my career.
- Q. Have you been retained previously to provide expert testimony in connection with trials or regulatory bodies on water ratemaking issues?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Have you previously been involved in disputes as to the appropriate amount of corrected charges; that is to say, undercharges or overcharges, with respect to water rates?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Have any of your engagements resulted in your testifying in court or before regulatory bodies as an expert on the subject of water ratemaking?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What does that organization do?
- A. The American Water Works Association is a professional trade association made up of water utilities, consultants, manufacturers. It's nominally throughout North America, United States, Canada and Mexico. But its influence and reach certainly goes around the world.
- Q. Is that the organization that published that manual you referred to?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- O. The M1 manual?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Have you ever served as an officer -- we will refer to it as the AWA.
  - A. Yes, I have.
  - Q. What positions have you held?
- A. I was the president of the New England section of the American Water Works which makes me a trustee, if you will, of the association. I have been chairman of the financial management committee for American Water Works.

I was chairman of the rates and charges committee and subcommittee of the American Water Works Association. I have been treasurer of the New England

A. Yes, they have.

Q. Can you please tell the Court approximately how many times you have actually testified in court or before some type of regulatory body on the subject of water ratemaking?

### A. Seventy-five, 85, somewhere in that order of magnitude.

- Q. Are there instances where you have actually -you were engaged as an expert to give testimony but the matter resolved itself one way or the other before you actually were called upon to testify in a proceeding?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell the Court approximately how many times that has happened?
  - A. Another two dozen, 20 times, maybe.
- Q. When you have testified on these occasions were you qualified as an expert?
  - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. Has there ever been an occasion where you were not qualified as an expert; that is to say that the Court or regulatory body rejected the proffer of your testimony as expert testimony?
  - A. No, that's never happened.
- Q. You referred to previously an organization called the American Water Works Association?

Section, board of directors, various committees.

- Q. Have you also contributed to the M1 manual you referred to?
  - A. Yes, many editions.
- Q. Can you describe for the Court just in general terms what that contribution has consisted of?
- A. The M1 manual is prepared by the rates and charges committee of the American Water Works Association. They prepare a number of manuals on water rates and charges and associated fees. My involvement as a member of the committee has been going from a contributor to that manual to the -- being on the editorial board, which is a group of maybe four or five people of the committee that take disparate views on subjects and decide what is going to be in the manual.

I was chairman of the committee for the -- I remember it was the fourth or fifth edition. On the editorial board of the most recent sixth edition. I am leading the effort on the most current update, the seventh edition, which is winding its way through preparation right now.

Q. In addition to the M1 manual, have you, yourself, written and published materials pertaining to water ratemaking and the appropriate assessment of costs pertaining to the distribution of water?

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. Yes, I have.

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

- Q. Can you tell the Court how many such publications you have authored?
  - A. I know there is a listing. It was attached to my report. More than 50. If it's 100 different occasions, I would believe. But it is somewhere between 50 and 100, I believe, maybe more.
  - Q. That is attached, I believe, to your report, which is DTX 123 and the appendices to that report, I believe?
    - A. Yes.
- Q. Have you actually ever been retained and done some work, expert work for the San Diego County Water Authority?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. If we can take a look at your report and put that up on the screen.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. The report is not in evidence. We would object to it. We don't object to him testifying.

MR. QUINN: We would -- I would first like to identify the report, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's take a pause and wait for someone to move to admit it.

MR. QUINN: What we have on the screen is DTX

Q. And you are aware that your report and your opinion were not before the Court in the Phase I portion of this proceeding?

### A. That is my understanding, yes.

- Q. Are you aware that the Court in its opinion resulting from the Phase I of this trial reached some conclusions which are at odds with some of the opinions expressed in your expert report? You are aware of that?
  - A. I am aware of that, yes.
  - Q. So have you taken into account this Court's ruling in Phase I in connection with the opinions that you are going to give here today?
    - A. I have, yes.
- Q. And how so? How have you taken the Court's opinion into account?
- A. The Court's opinion stands as the opinion. It's a given, if you will, in this case on what the Court has ruled.

### I accept the Court's ruling, certainly.

- Q. Let's first talk about principles of cost recovery. And let me ask you, do the costs incurred by Met have to be recovered through Met's rate structure?
  - A. Yes, they do.
  - Q. Why is that?
  - A. The Metropolitan Water District is a

1865

123.

- Q. Is this a copy of your report?
- A. Yes, it appears to be.
- Q. And does it have annexed to it that information we referred to earlier, your C.V. and the publication?
- A. The copy I have in front of me that is marked DTX 123 does have that, yes. It is Appendix B.

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, we would offer this. Mr. Denham's report came into evidence. We think it would be useful to the Court to have this report, as well. We would offer it.

MR. KEKER: We don't have any objection to the resume coming in with the list but the report itself is hearsay and shouldn't be in evidence. He should testify.

THE COURT: The report dated October 28, 2013?

MR. QUINN: Yes.

MR. KEKER: Yes.

THE COURT: I am going to admit it. DTX 123 is admitted.

(DTX 123 was received into evidence.)

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: Mr. Woodcock, have you seen this Court's opinion that was issued after and as a result of the Phase I of this trial?
  - A. Yes, I have.

governmental or quasi-governmental agency. Its only source of revenue that covers its expenses is its rates and charges. In essence, it can't operate at a loss. It must recover its expenses and so, therefore, it has to fully recover them.

- Q. We heard about cost-of-service reports. Can you tell us what a cost-of-service report is?
- A. A cost-of-service report is, in general terms, a report that's prepared for a utility, a water utility in this case, that looks at what the total revenue needs are of the utility, how those costs should be functionalized and allocated, what they are, what services are provided with the different expenditures, and once those costs have been allocated, how those should be distributed to different classes of customers or types of use which then is instructive in determining rates and the determination of rates that would recover those allocated costs in proportion to the causes of the costs, if you will.
- Q. When you refer to "allocation of costs," what do you mean by that?
- A. Essentially what you do is you look at the different expenses of the utility, determine what they are and who caused them or what classes or groups caused those costs to then determine how to most equitably or

1868

1867

### fairly recover them based on principles. I'll call them cost causation.

- Q. When you refer to cost causation, what do you mean by that?
- A. It's a principle that those that cause costs, those that benefit from services should be paying for them.

If I can give you a quick example. Meter reading on a retail water utility is a service that's provided by the utility. If everybody has their meter read, everybody should share equally in those costs.

- Q. Have you reviewed the cost-of-service reports of Metropolitan for the four years in question in this case?
  - A. Yes, I have.

2.5

2.3

- Q. Putting aside the issues addressed by this Court's opinion in Phase I, do you have an opinion as to whether or not Met's cost-of-service reports fairly and adequately reflect the appropriate allocation of costs?
- A. I believe they do. Again, putting aside the Court's opinion.
- Q. You have read the report that was prepared by
  Mr. Denham, the expert retained by the San Diego Water
  Authority?
  - A. Yes, I have.

they are not enough to satisfy the needs of those 26 agencies so they must find an additional source of water. The Metropolitan water district is the agency that provides that supplemental water to fulfill the needs they have to serve their customers.

- Q. Just in general terms, who are these 26 member agencies you referred to? I am not asking you to list all the names but tell the Court roughly who these agencies are.
- A. They are municipalities, some cities, Los Angeles, Beverly Hills. They are water districts that serve different areas. It's 26 different agencies, some of them wholesale, that re-wholesale the water like the San Diego County Water Authority. Some of them retail like Beverly Hills, City of Los Angeles.
- Q. Would it be fair to say, based on your experience as you described it, you have had dealings with and familiarity with hundreds, if not thousands, of different types of water districts or water agencies in the United States and around the world?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is Met similar to other water agencies in the United States?
  - A. No, it's not.
  - Q. How so?

1869 | 1871

- Q. Did Mr. Denham have any disagreement with the idea that Met was required to cover its costs projected in the cost-of-service reports?
  - A. He did not, no.
- Q. Did Mr. Denham make any separate finding that Met's costs that are addressed in its cost-of-service reports were not allowable or what they were spent on was somehow inappropriate?
- A. No. I think he accepted that all of the costs, expenses of Metropolitan were accept -- frankly, I don't know if he opined one way or the other. He certainly didn't suggest any of them were disallowable.
- Q. Let's turn now to the Metropolitan system big picture: Can you tell the Court your understanding about what is the service that Met provides?
- A. Metropolitan obtains water from two different sources, transmits it through its system of pipes and pumps and reservoirs to 26 member agencies.
- Q. Is it -- we've heard reference to the idea of supplemental water supply. Does Met have part of its mission to provide a supplemental water supply?
  - A. Yes, it does.
  - Q. Can you explain that, please?
- A. The 26 member agencies in general have their own sources of water, sources of supply of water. But

A. Metropolitan in some ways is similar but in many ways is very unique.

MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. I will object on the grounds of relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: In many ways it's very unique.

I think first it's huge. It is much bigger than any other agency in the United States in terms of the number of acre-feet of water it provides, the number of customers, nearly 20 million it's budgeted. It is a very big agency which in itself results in some complications, some issues.

It's not a retailer. Most water supply, water companies, water agencies in the United States and North America provide retail service. That is not to say they all do. There are other wholesale entities but the vast majority provide retail service to an end user, a house, a business, a factory, that type of thing.

And thirdly, and perhaps the most unique factor, especially considering its size, is that Metropolitan does not own or control the water that it supplies, the supplemental water supplies. It's dependent on other agencies to get them water. Most other agencies, not all, but most -- a vast majority own

their own supplies and control their own supplies.

Q. Where does Met get its water?

- A. Metropolitan gets water from two different sources. The main source, at least in terms of rights to water, is from the Department of Water Resources of the State of California through the State Water Project where it gets water generally north of here, Lake Oroville. And the next source is the Colorado River from the, I believe it's from the Department of Interior at Lake Havasu off Parker Dam.
- Q. Does Met get a consistent amount of water from those two sources every year?
  - A. No, it does not.
  - Q. Can you explain that?
- A. They have a right to a certain volume of water to the extent it's available. From the Colorado River water, it's fairly consistent from year to year. Sometimes they are able to take more than they are allowed, if others don't take their full amount.

The biggest variation, however, comes from the State Water Project where they have the rights to water and every year the State determines an allocation, what percentage of the rights they will get from year to year. Sometimes it changes throughout the year but the State makes a determination as to how much they will

reservoirs to store it, take it out when they need it.

They have been doing that recently with the cutback in the State water. It is like a big black box where you have water coming from two sources and going out to 26 different agencies. And within that black box they have to have this somewhat complicated series of pipes, pumps, reservoirs -- there is also treatment which isn't at issue here -- to distribute that water to the agencies.

Q. Have you had an opportunity to review any of the contractual or legal documents relating to Met's financial responsibilities regarding the State Water Project?

### A. I have, yes.

Q. Is the relationship between Met and the California Department of Water Resources the same as that -- as that between the typical water supplier on the one hand and wholesaler or retailer on the other hand?

### A. No, it's not.

Q. How is the relationship between Met and the California Department of Water Resources different?

MR. KEKER: I am going to object. We are in a contract trial where the issue is contract and damages and this sounds like testimony that could have been put

- get. Recently they have been getting a very small percentage of that right to water from the State Water Project.
- Q. Can the allocations from the State Water Project vary -- can they vary a lot from year to year?
- A. They can vary extraordinarily. Like I said, recently it has been fairly low. At one point they were given a zero allocation and it was later bumped up to, I believe, five percent. I think this year it is in the order of 15 percent, their allocation.
- Q. You have described to us some ways in which Metropolitan is a unique water agency in your experience. Do these unique features of Metropolitan's system have any impact on its physical infrastructure?
  - A. Yes, it does.
  - Q. Can you explain that for us, please?
- A. It ends up being a the Metropolitan system is one where they take the water they get and whatever they can, again depending on the allocations we just discussed, they take that water and they bring it into their system. They, through a series of integrated types of reservoirs and pumps, are able to take that water, move it around and distribute it as needed to the 26 member agencies. And those demands can vary from year to year, month to month. And if needed, move it to

in in Phase I but it's not relevant to this case, to this part of the trial.

THE COURT: It may or may not be. This is in part why we have time limits, so the attorneys can decide how they like to best spend their time. I don't think this will injure anybody. I will let it continue.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Do you have the question in mind, sir?

## A. I do. Let -- actually, if I can have it back again? I'm sorry.

Q. How is the relationship between Met and the Department of Water Resources different between that of a typical supplier of water and a water wholesaler or retailer?

### A. Sure.

The -- the typical relationship is one where the supplier of water provides water on demand to the end user. In the case of a wholesaler, in this case to the 26 member agencies as they need it.

It's generally priced on a per gallon, per acre-foot basis whereas you take the commodity, water in this case, you pay for it. You pay for what you use.

That's not the relationship at all between the Metropolitan and the State of California, Department of Water Resources and the State Water Project. That is a

2.5

very different arrangement.

Metropolitan's agreement with them is essentially a take-or-pay situation where Metropolitan must make payments to the State of California for those capacity rights, whether they are used or not.

In fact, if no water is made available, Metropolitan still is on the hook, must pay for those full costs of capacity rights even if no product is delivered.

MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. And move to strike. This is not in his report. He is talking about relations between Met and DWR, other places. It's not in the report. We move to strike it.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. BY MR. QUINN: In terms of its contractual relationship with the California Department of Water, is Met guaranteed any particular volume of water?
- A. They are not guaranteed any particular water volume.
- Q. What is it exactly Met is paying for when it pays the California Department of Water and Power?
- A. The only thing they're guaranteed is a capacity in the transportation network, if you will. They are guaranteed there will be a certain volume of capacity in that piping system, if it's available. If it is not

Q. When you refer to contractors, the State Water Project, Met -- is Met one of those contractors?

### A. Met is one of those contractors.

Q. Is it true that Met and the other contractors are paying for the bonds which were used to raise the money to create that State Water Project infrastructure?

#### A. That's correct.

Q. From a rate-making perspective, does it make any difference whether or not Met actually owns the State Water Project?

MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. This calls for an opinion that it may be relevant to Phase I.

THE COURT: We are going over a lot of Phase I material which is in great part why I'm allowing it in. I think it is sort of no harm-no foul. We went through a lot of this in Phase I. Mr. Quinn wants to emphasize it now. I don't see the harm, do you?

MR. KEKER: I do. THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEKER: In the first phase they made a motion that experts can't opine on what is proper ratemaking, that is a legal conclusion. We concurred in the motion. You said, level playing field for everybody.

The idea their experts are now coming in and

available, they can put somebody else's water in if they want.

- Q. Whether or not there is water available, did I understand you to say that Met still has certain payment obligations to the State?
- A. Yes. Met has to make payments whether they use water or not.
  - Q. Whether there is water available or not?
- A. Whether there is water available or not, they still, for the most part, have to make payments to them. There are some other payments based on power costs and things like that that are variable. But the vast majority of the payments are take or pay. They pay whether they get water or not.
- Q. Do you know what those payments are for, what they are used for at the State of California?
- A. They are used by the State to make the payments on the bonds that were used to finance the State Water Project. When the State of California built the State Water Project they issued bonds to pay for the construction. Those bonds are guaranteed by the payments from the different contractors of the State Water Project.

So those are payments that are used to pay off the State's bonds.

giving opinions, for example, that ownership makes no difference, that it is improper to call State Water Project water supply, the water stewardship rate is honky dory, that is not something that you said before experts were going to be able to do. So we object to it

THE COURT: I understand. I am going to allow it. It may not be useful. We are not going to use this phase to revisit the first phase.

MR. QUINN: Understood, your Honor.

MR. KEKER: But we're concerned that they are setting themselves up for appeal. They are going to use this phase to try to revisit Phase I. A decision was made in Phase I. Mr. Woodcock was designated as an expert and they didn't call him. And they are now trying to, I guess, impeach your Phase I decision by calling an expert in this phase that has nothing to do with this phase. That's our objection.

THE COURT: Understood.

Mr. Quinn, do you want to walk me through a little bit of what you think we are going to end up with now?

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, we ultimately will be submitting an alternative damages case.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. QUINN: We think it's in the record here. We think the issue -- this is an issue that is relevant to that in terms of whether in his expert opinion -- this is not a legal opinion -- whether in his expert opinion as a rate maker ownership of the facility makes any difference at arriving at rates.

At the end of the day we are going to be briefing an alternative damage scenario and we think this is important for that.

THE COURT: You think it will be consistent with the Phase I rulings?

MR. QUINN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. KEKER: That is simply impossible. The Phase I ruling said that ownership was -- was very relevant to the decision that was made. This witness has said in his report it's irrelevant, it's just -- the only proper way to deal with the State Water Project costs is transportation, not supply. That's what he said in his report.

They could have called him in Phase I to talk about that. You made a decision about that. This is peppering the record with something that they didn't put in that new lawyers have now decided they wished they put in Phase I. It has nothing to do with the contract damages.

recovered is irrelevant of the ownership. They would be exactly the same if Metropolitan owned it or the State of California owned it or the United States Government owned it.

- Q. Under generally accepted ratemaking principles, does Met need to recover the costs that it incurs for having that capacity with the State Water Project?
  - A. Yes, it does.
  - Q. Why is that?
- A. It is an expense, as I said, that Metropolitan has. They have to make those payments to the State of California and they have to recover -- they have no -- they can't operate at a loss. They have to recover those expenses.
- Q. From a rate-making perspective, are there accepted principles that govern how Met should be recovering those costs?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What are those principles?
- A. Well, the principles, again, are the costs should be recovered from those that cause the costs, from those that benefit from the expenditures.
- Q. You are aware that the exchange water that we're concerned about in this case is it's available as a result of an agreement between the IID and San Diego

THE COURT: We'll see. Overruled.

Go ahead.

2.5

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

MR. QUINN: I understand. Let me re-ask the question.

Q. From a ratemaking perspective, does it make any difference whether or not Met actually owned the State Water Project?

MR. KEKER: Objection. Improper expert opinion.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: No, it does not.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Why is that?

A. The process of ratemaking we discussed a few minutes ago involves the determination of expenses and then the allocation of those expenses to come up with rates. The expenses in this case are payments that are made by Metropolitan that go to the State that go to pay off the bonds.

It doesn't really matter for ratemaking whether those bonds are in the name of the State of California or in the name of the Metropolitan Water District. The payments are still payments that go to pay off those bonds. And then the treatment of those payments, how those should be allocated, how they should be fairly

and certain related agreements; you're aware of that?

- A. I am, yes.
- Q. Do you know where that water is brought into the Metropolitan system?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Where is it brought into the Metropolitan system?
- A. It's brought into the Metropolitan system through the intake of the Colorado River Aqueduct at Lake Havasu.
- Q. Let me turn now to the water stewardship rate. Do you understand that Metropolitan utilizes a water stewardship rate?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. What is your understanding of the cost that that rate seeks to recover from Met clients?
- A. The costs are investment that the Metropolitan Water District makes, investment in the 26 member agencies or they are all eligible for it I don't know if they have all gotten money from it but investments that are made by the member agencies for groundwater augmentation, desalination, conservation programs, things that would augment the supply of water or supply of water at the agency level, not at the Metropolitan level but by the 26 member agencies.

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

- Q. Why would Met seek to recover those costs?
- A. It would seek to recover those costs because it has to -- if it is going to make that expenditure, again, it has to recover all of its costs.
  - Q. Why would Met make that expenditure?
- A. It would make that expenditure solely for the purpose of making that black box I talked about function better, to make capacity available in its transmission system, to make capacity in its reservoirs available, offset it by -- reducing the amount of supplemental water that it might have to take and offsetting the costs of moving that water, storing that water, reducing their former -- the future -- their future capital expenditures by not having to make more capacity available.
- Q. If as a result of this water stewardship program Met is selling less water to particular agencies that participate in it, doesn't Met also save some costs on Met's supply for water?
  - A. No.

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

- Q. Why not?
- A. It -- it is not saving Met anything at all on supply. Metropolitan Water District buys all the water it can. It needs all the water it has rights to. It buys all it can and uses it to distribute to the 26

procedure. If he has comments on the facts that Mr. Denham relied on, that's appropriate.

I have cases if you want to --

THE COURT: I am generally familiar with the area. I think the question at the bottom is the extent to which he was disclosed and an opportunity for deposition was available for his opinion on the Denham report.

MR. KEKER: He was deposed two days after Mr. Denham was deposed. His report and Mr. Denham's report came in the same day, a month before their depositions. He had plenty of opportunity. And, as I say, the proper way to do it is if there's a rebuttal report, from this witness or anybody else, another expert, you have 20 days to do it under the Code of Civil Procedure.

In any event, all he can do -- and I would like to cite that one -- the best case, the clearest case. It is Collins versus Navistar at 214 Cal.App.4th 1486. It's a 2013 case in the Third District. And it talks about this rebuttal to experts and how you can't do opinions. And that's what the Code says.

THE COURT: Mr. Quinn.

MR. QUINN: I have to admit, I am not familiar -- I don't have this off the top of my head.

1885

agencies or, if they are not demanding it in a particular year, to put it in storage for emergencies, for droughts, situations like we have right now. It doesn't impact how much water Met needs to purchase or purchases in any way or form.

- Q. Does Met ever take less water than the supply of water that is made available to it?
- A. I don't think Met has ever taken less water than it can take. And particularly given the current circumstance, I can't imagine a situation where they ever would.
- Q. In the course of your engagement, have you had occasion to read the report prepared by Mr. Denham?
  - A. Yes, I have.
  - Q. That was proffered by San Diego?
  - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Do you have any general conclusions as to the adequacy of Mr. Denham's report?

MR. KEKER: Excuse me, your Honor. This is improper pursuant to CCP 2034.310. An expert cannot opine -- first of all, he had an opportunity to file a rebuttal report. He did not. The 20 days went by, according to the Code.

An expert cannot comment on another expert's opinions without doing that, going through that rebuttal THE COURT: I understand.

MR. QUINN: There is case law, particularly I can cite the Court to Easterby versus Clark, 171 Cal.App.4th 772, 780, 2009, where the Court summarizes the law about experts' reports and issues that come outside the report.

He did not -- Mr. Keker is correct, he did not critique Mr. Denham in his report. He was not asked about Mr. Denham's report, I don't think, in his deposition, and he certainly did not file a supplemental report.

The Easterby case, if I can read the Court a passage, "The overarching principle in Kennemur, Jones and Bonds" -- those being cases that this Court is summarizing -- "is clear. A party's expert may not offer testimony at trial that exceeds the scope of his deposition testimony if the opposing party has no notice or expectation that the expert will offer the new testimony, or if the notice of the new testimony comes at a time when deposing the expert is unreasonably difficult."

In our CMC statement that was filed -- I can't recall when, some number of weeks, if not months, before the trial -- we clearly said he will critique Mr. Denham's report.

1888

2.5

They certainly could have said we want to hear what that critique is going to be and take his deposition, and we would have certainly made him available. The Court will remember we wanted to reopen expert testimony. We wanted to have some more expert discovery. They were the ones that really didn't want to do that. So I don't think it is unfair for -- I think it would be useful for the Court to hear his response to what Mr. Denham said.

2.3

THE COURT: The issue is not whether it is fair or unfair. The issue is whether fair notice was given to the other side that the expert was going to be providing a new opinion. And typically what happens, even under Easterby, is then this witness is provided or offered to the other side for a further deposition. The idea -- your notion is that if you mention it in a CMC statement that's enough notice?

MR. QUINN: Well, it's February 2. I am reading from it now. February 2, 2015, we said, and I quote, "Mr. Woodcock has been designated as MWD's expert on contract damages. Mr. Woodcock will critique the opinions of SDCWA's expert."

I could not have been any clearer. If Mr. Keker is saying we can be faulted for not sending him an email and saying he's available for deposition, That's what we are objecting to. If he has something to say that Denham got a number wrong, calculated something wrong, we accept that. That's fair game, and that's what we thought they were talking about.

If he is going to do opinions in contradiction of his twice asked-and-answered questions in his deposition, I have no more opinions," after Denham's report was a month old, after the time for filing rebuttal testimony was over, and after Denham had been deposed, we think that's wrong.

THE COURT: I am going to take a ten-minute recess. But before I do that -- I am going to read a couple of cases during that recess. Before I do that is there anything else you want me to look at, Mr. Quinn?

MR. QUINN: I don't have anything else.

MR. KEKER: Your Honor, can I cite a couple of other cases, if you are interested. The Fish versus Guevara, 1993, Sixth District, 12 Cal.App.4th 142 at 145 and 146; Mizel v. City of Santa Monica, 93 Cal.App.4th 1059, a 2002 case, from the Second District at 1068.

THE COURT: Probably enough.

MR. KEKER: Okay. And I gave you the Collins one.

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I would just point out

that seems kind of a small thing on which to make a decision like this. They could equally have said, surprise, surprise, we understand your expert is going to critique our expert; we would like to hear what he has to say. Is that what this really comes down to?

MR. KEKER: No. What this comes down to is we asked him twice in his deposition, "Do you have any other opinions?"

And he said, "No. I have no other opinions." Twice we asked him.

And we are aware of CCP 2034.310, that the expert called as a witness to impeach the testimony of an expert witness offered by any other party at trial, the impeachment may include testimony to the falsity or nonexistence of any fact used as the foundation for any opinion. He can get up and say he got the number wrong; I looked at the same document, but may not include testimony that contradicts the opinion.

And there's a series of cases, Collins is one. Let me -- "The trial court properly excluded Friedman's proposed rebuttal under this CCP Section. Friedman did not propose to testify to the falsity or nonexistence of any fact in the databases Dr. Ray used. Instead, he testified in his opinion the databases were not reliable and so on." He gave opinion testimony. that San Diego did the exact same thing in their joint CMC statement. They said on page 3, lines three to four, "In addition, Mr. Denham may offer testimony and/or opinions in response to the specific testimony of Met's experts or percipient witnesses and to rebut any defenses Met may offer at trial."

They served the same placeholder that we did.
MR. KEKER: We have a lot of objections, as you know, to what they said Mr. Woodcock would talk about.
When someone puts in that kind of statement, it doesn't mean you waived all your objections. We have identified some and here is another.

THE COURT: I will see everybody in ten minutes. Thank you so much.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: I thank you for indulging me. I wanted to have a look at some of these cases.

The issue that is presented is whether or not the CMC statement is a sufficient disclosure that the expert would provide the opinion that is now being sought at trial. This is not an issue which is addressed in Cottini, C-O-T-T-I-N-I, 226 Cal.App.4th, 401. It is also not addressed by the principle that is espoused in -- discussed in Mizel, M-I-Z-E-L, 93 Cal.App.4th 1059 at 1067 through -68. Those cases don't

address this issue.

2.2

2.5

The issue is, I think, addressed in the Easterby case. And there the issue, again, is notice. So given indeed an expert's disclaimer that he or she will not testify on a certain subject, that gets overcome at such time; in other words, such time in the Easterby case where it is quoting another case, as the Appellant, in that case, disclosed that the expert had conducted a further investigation and had reached additional opinions. When the opposing side is on notice that an additional opinion is indeed going to be forthcoming, the first piece of the test is satisfied.

The second piece of the test is whether there's enough time, in fairness, to allow for a deposition to address that opinion.

Those are the two branches of the test as discussed in Easterby. As in Easterby, we have a situation here where the other side was put on notice. In Easterby, it was a letter that went from one side to the other. Here was a CMC statement which I've reviewed

The February 2015 CMC statement tells San Diego that Woodcock will testify as to analysis of San Diego's expert testimony that was in 2015. I think that was probably in enough time to have a deposition taken if

opinion, not an attack on the underlying fact. And in fairness, you were given enough notice of that. So you could have taken the deposition if you had wanted to.

The matter is submitted and we will proceed with the questions.

Mr. Quinn.

MR. KEKER: Can I raise one other issue? It was objected to. Mr. Denham's report had come into evidence. It turns out they misspoke. It has not come into evidence. We renew our objection.

The report itself is hearsay and part of the mischief is it violates the motion in limine by opining on what proper rates are under the law, and you said that's your job and not the expert's job. And we at least move to exclude that part of the report from the record and strike any testimony about it in which an expert opines on what a legal rate is and not a legal rate.

THE COURT: Why don't you make that the subject of a motion so I can see what pieces you are talking about. My impression -- why don't you do that. Tell me what pages you believe violated the in limine order and I am happy to rule on that.

Q. BY MR. QUINN: Did you have any general conclusions regarding the adequacy of Mr. Denham's

San Diego had wanted it. I will allow the questioning to continue

MR. KEKER: Can I be heard for a second on that? I don't think you've dealt with 2034.310. Yes, they can ask him questions about facts. But what that talks about is the distinction which the cases say should be strictly construed by the trial court between facts and opinions.

THE COURT: That is why I talked about the Mizel opinion. You are talking about the Mizel principle, and you are absolutely right. You don't have to give them or they don't have to give you notice probably at all if you want to call an expert, for example, to undermine the foundation for expert opinion.

So, for example, if this gentleman is relying on facts about how he thinks the Met system works and the configuration that he thinks water comes from the Colorado River, but you want to bring somebody in to testify that the water does not come from the Colorado River, you can do it. That is what Mizel talks about. That is the distinction between underlying facts and actually rebutting an opinion. That is not what is going on here.

What is going on here is, under Easterby, you were put on notice that they were going to extract this

report?

A. Yes.Q. What are those?

A. I thought the report only went part way. It didn't address the full issue.

Q. And could you explain what you're referring to?

A. The calculations that Mr. Denham did essentially took the Court's ruling in Phase I, removed a large number of costs from transportation, calculated a new transportation rate or charge and came up with damages that way. What happened to those costs that were removed, that were to be put to supply were really left hanging. How they impacted the calculations, there was no calculation by Mr. Denham as to what the impact of that would be.

Q. Let me call your attention to a sentence in your report, DTX 123, at 24, where you wrote, "If one or more of the rates and charges is changed, it will be necessary to adjust one or more of the other rates or charges to still collect the same total revenue."

Do you recall that passage in your report?

A. I do.

Q. And then at page 25, "Rate setting is a zero sum proposition. If one or more rates are reduced, something else needs to increase to keep MWD whole."

sing olde needs to mercuse to need it. W. Where.

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

1897

Do you recall that?

### A. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.5

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Does that have some -- do those points have some application to the critique you just made of Mr. Denham's report?
- A. That's exactly the points I was making in the critique.
- Q. Did Mr. Denham's report take into account elasticity of demand as it relates to how demand would be affected by changes in supply prices?

### A. No, it did not.

Q. I want to call your attention to a passage at page 24 in your report, where you wrote, "For example, a revision to the supply rates would impact total water sales and therefore the revenues that are available to pay MWD's costs. This in turn may cause changes to other rates and charges such as the water stewardship rate."

Do you recall that passage?

Q. And then the passage on page 25, "Many member agencies renewed their purchase orders in 2012 based on the existing rates. It is unknown if they would agree to a renewal of supply rates that may be structured differently (higher) because the only commitment they

result of the Court's ruling, I suspect that the member agencies might have a different view as to how much they would have committed to under tier one or tier two.

I know as a board member, as I was -- I would certainly be upset that the rules of the game changed to some degree like that by changing the rates so significantly.

- Q. Do you have any other comments regarding the adequacy of Mr. Denham's report?
- A. The other area that I thought was a problem was in -- the denominator that Mr. Denham used in his calculations. He essentially looked at what Colorado River Aqueduct costs were and then divided those by total amounts of water supplied.

And that violates, frankly, what is known as a matching principle in rate setting where one needs to match costs with gallons or acre-feet, basically.

In this case he was taking some of the costs and dividing them by all of the sales. He should have taken some of those costs, Colorado River costs and divided by Colorado River sales. And the impact of that with the much smaller denominator, Colorado River sales would have been a much lower -- a much higher rate and a larger delta.

Q. By including all water sales in the

1899

1 make under the purchase order is under the supply rate." 2 Could you please explain to the Court what you meant by that?

3

A. In 12 -- let me step back. Metropolitan has two different supply rates, a tier one and tier two rate. The tier two rate is a higher rate that is charged to the member agencies, and it kicks in or applies when member agencies exceed certain volumes that they take within a year in order to try to plan better. Metropolitan went through an effort in the beginning of this decade looking for the member agencies to enter into supply agreements, if you will, where they said how much they would commit to taking and pay for under the supply rates.

They made those commitments. Most of them, not all of them, as I understand, but most of the member agencies signed those new commitments to take a certain amount of water that would apply at the tier one rate with the understanding of what the rates were at that time, how much the supply rates were vis-a-vis the transportation or power or any other rate.

When they made those rates, they did it with the presumption as to how much was in the supply rates. If Metropolitan then goes and has to change that supply rate, and significantly change the supply rate, as a

denominator, does that result in having a smaller fraction, a smaller number?

### A. Yes, it does.

Q. And what was the consequences of that for the purpose of determining the damages number that he arrived at?

### A. I believe it inflated the number.

Q. Establishing the unit costs for Colorado River water and Colorado River costs and unique Colorado River costs, should he have divided those costs by the CRA sales, that is to say the Colorado River Aqueduct sales, instead of all sales which include both CRA and SWD?

### A. Yes, I believe that is what he should have done.

Q. Let me back up for a second.

Have you been informed that roughly 40 percent of the exchange water that San Diego has received over the four years at issue in this case actually came from the State Water Project?

### A. That's correct.

MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. No foundation.

THE COURT: I think we're just putting this in as an assumption. I understand. This is not coming in for the truth of that statement.

1900

1 MR. QUINN: Correct. Overruled. 2 2 THE COURT: With that understanding, the Let's proceed. 3 3 objection is overruled. MR. QUINN: Let me frame the question again. 4 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's my understanding. Q. Again, from a rate-making perspective, does the 5 Q. BY MR. QUINN: Would the fact that a 5 fact that a substantial part of the exchange water that 6 6 substantial part of the exchange water is actually from San Diego received is actually from the State Water 7 the State Water Project in any way bear from a Project in any way bear on whether State water costs are 8 8 rate-making perspective on whether State Water Project appropriately charged to San Diego? 9 9 costs are appropriately charged to San Diego in part, at MR. KEKER: Objection; form of the question. 10 least those as related to that State water that is 10 He stated as a fact something he told me he had to 11 11 included in the exchange? assume. 12 MR. KEKER: Objection, your Honor. Motion in 12 THE COURT: I understand it is not coming in as 13 13 limine. a fact. It is coming in as part of a hypothetical 14 He is opining on what is an appropriate cost to 14 question, in effect. I do have my doubts as to whether 15 15 include in the rate, in a legal rate. He is giving a it relates to the damages in this case. But go ahead. 16 legal conclusion. 16 THE WITNESS: The answer is yes. 17 MR. QUINN: I don't think so, your Honor. He 17 Q. BY MR. QUINN: How so? 18 is saying from a rate-making perspective, in terms of --18 A. That 40 percent that I understand is coming 19 the principles he's employed, cost causation, burden and 19 from the State Water Project, there is a cost to provide 20 benefit for the appropriate costs and benefits, would it 20 that 40 percent of the exchange water that is caused by 21 be -- is it appropriate to include the costs for that 21 that water coming through the State Water Project into 2.2 portion of the State Water Project water that's included 22 the black box we talked about, and it's caused by coming 23 in the exchange water. He is being asked from -- this 23 through the State Water Project and it would therefore 24 is his expertise, from the rate-making standpoint. 24 be appropriate to include those to reflect that cost 2.5 MR. KEKER: His expertise from a rate-making 25 causation of that 40 percent of water. 1903 1901 1 1 standpoint is not the point in a case where what we're Q. And then just -- I am asking a general question 2 2 looking for is the lawful, legal rate and where you now. I am not asking you now to get into any specifics 3 3 ruled in motions in limine from both sides that experts that the question might implicate. 4 4 shouldn't opine on what a legal rate is. And this is a Is the rate structure that Met adopted in 2003 5 5 way to simply get around that motion in limine. the only one that Met could have selected to fairly and 6 6 THE COURT: Are you going to be answering this reasonably apportion its costs to its customers, 7 7 question from the perspective what is or what is not including San Diego? 8 8 cost causation? MR. KEKER: Same objection, your Honor. 9 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: I will allow that question. 10 1.0 THE COURT: I will allow that within those THE WITNESS: No, it's not. 11 11 confines. Q. BY MR. QUINN: Can you tell us whether or not 12 12 there are multiple different rate structures that MR. KEKER: It is also not in the report, your 13 13 Honor. Metropolitan could have adopted in 2003 which would have 14 14 THE COURT: Mr. Quinn. fairly and reasonably apportioned its costs to its 15 15 MR. QUINN: I would refer to DTX 128 -customers, including San Diego? 16 THE COURT: This is the report? 16 A. Yes, there are. 17 17 MR. QUINN: Nothing further. MR. QUINN: Yeah. 18 18 -- where he makes the general -- he makes the THE COURT: Cross-examination. 19 19 statement that MWD's rates and charges result in a 20 20 reasonable allocation of costs to member agencies that CROSS-EXAMINATION 21 21 are served and result in an appropriate assignment of BY MR. KEKER: 22 22 Q. Good morning, Mr. Woodcock. costs. 23 23 THE COURT: I think this is under that heading. A. Good morning. 2.4 24 We talked about cost causation, and he has been allowed O. I am John Keker, representing San Diego. 25 25 to testify on these issues and he can talk about it. You are not a lawyer, are you, sir?

1904

A. No, I'm not.

2.5

2.3

- Q. Are you an expert in the application of the constitutional amendment to the California Constitution that is generally called Proposition 26?
- A. From -- let me try answering it this way. From a legal perspective I am not a lawyer, so I can't -- as to how it impacts ratemaking, I'm generally familiar with it.
- Q. Your report concluded that the State Water Project costs were all properly charged to conveyance; is that right? The transportation?
- A. I am not quite sure all of them but the majority of them, certainly.
- Q. The system access rate and system power rate were properly charged to conveyance?
  - A. The portions that were included in that, yes.
- Q. In your report or your deposition, I guess, you said it would have been unreasonable to call these charges supply; that was your opinion?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And your report says that the -- you believe that the ownership of the State Water Project is simply irrelevant to any analysis of the law?
  - A. I don't believe I --

MR. QUINN: Vague as to "law," your Honor.

would have been that State water costs were supply costs; right?

### A. That is part of what I stated about that, yes.

- Q. With respect to the water stewardship rate, you were a little softer in your report, weren't you?
- MR. QUINN: Vague.

THE WITNESS: I --

THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead. I don't know what you mean by that.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: You said, "I understand the point that with respect to the water stewardship rate, I understand the point that San Diego has asserted and it may have validity in other -- in another situation."

### A. Right.

- Q. That being the water stewardship rate has an effect on supply; it is a supply rate or supply charge?
- A. What I was saying is in another situation, if the investments that were made from the revenues from the water stewardship rate had impacted the supply costs of the Metropolitan Water District, if that were the case, I could understand that.

That wasn't the case. It didn't impact the supply costs of Met at all.

Q. In your deposition, didn't you say it was not unreasonable? It would not have been unreasonable to

THE COURT: Cross-examination. The witness can explain if he meant something else or if he said something else.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe I said "of the law." I think I said it was irrelevant in the determination of rates.

- Q. BY MR. KEKER: But were you referring to what you thought were legal rates?
- A. I was talking more generally in that deposition as to the appropriateness of including those costs, that those were an appropriate cost to include in the rates. At the time they were legal, but I am mindful of the Court's decision in Phase I. As I said earlier, I certainly accept the Court's ruling.
- Q. Your ultimate conclusion was the transportation costs in the State Water Project were -- were properly classified and allocated correctly; that was your conclusion; right?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. That was notwithstanding the fact -- what is NARUC?
- A. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners.
- Q. You opine that if the classification had been done according to NARUC standards, the classification

treat the water stewardship rate as the supply cost?

- A. I think what you just said, in another situation, if it had impacted the supply costs of Met, that would not be unreasonable. But it impacted the supply costs of the 26 member agencies, not of Met, and that's why I don't think it's reasonable to call it a supply cost in this situation.
- Q. Were you asked in your deposition at page 224, lines 19 through 23 --

THE COURT: Do you want him to actually -- You have it up on the screen.

MR. KEKER: (Reading:)

"Q Would it also be

reasonable for them to recover

the" -- referring to the water stewardship rate -- "to recover

the costs of supply?

"A Can I say it wouldn't be

9 unreasonable in certain

circumstances to do that."

THE WITNESS: That's who

THE WITNESS: That's what I said and, again, it's the certain circumstances we were just talking about that I was referring to, and that is why I said certain circumstances in that response.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: I think you agreed in your

deposition, at least, with Mr. Raftelis that it would be appropriate and prudent to analyze on a project-by-project basis whether or not a water conservation project affected supply or transportation or both or neither, I suppose?

2.5

# A. That's what I have been saying, yes. Again, it's the Metropolitan's supply or transportation or both.

Q. Let me ask you about your comments on the Denham report.

As I understand it, you agree with Mr. Denham under the Court's Phase I opinion, San Diego has been overcharged during the years 2011 to 2014 for transportation costs; in short, the system access rate and the system power rate were inflated?

## A. I certainly accept the Court's ruling regarding the transportation costs.

### As I said at the beginning, as it applies to Colorado River water, I accept that, as well, too.

Q. And you accept the Court's ruling that the water stewardship rate was not a legal rate during these four years that are at issue for the damages?

MR. QUINN: Actually, I think that misstates the Court's ruling.

THE COURT: It is a little confusing because he

they didn't think compelling evidence had been provided to say one way or another. They particularly — I recall the Court particularly critiqued a portion of Mr. Raftelis' report that said maybe it should be 50-50, that there was no basis for that.

Again, my reading -- and if I'm wrong, I'm wrong -- but my reading of the Court's decision on the water stewardship rate is it was still up in the air and it needed to be demonstrated one way or another as to where and how that should be recovered.

Q. Let's stick, for just a moment, with the water stewardship costs. Do you disagree with Mr. Denham when he looked at the water stewardship -- excuse me -- the State Water Project costs that were included in the system access rate and the system power rate and removed those in his damage calculation?

MR. QUINN: Vague. Disagree as to the calculation or disagree with something else?

MR. KEKER: Disagree with the calculation.

THE WITNESS: I don't disagree with what he did and how he calculated it.

I disagree with the denominator he used to come up with the result of that.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: Was San Diego --Let me ask you this: If you accept the Court's

may personally disagree with me, which he is entitled to do. I don't know what "accept" means.

MR. QUINN: Actually, my point was I think it actually misstated the Court's ruling on that issue. I am happy to --

THE COURT: I don't think we need to belabor it

Ask Mr. Keker to rephrase.

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Denham took the charges that Met had given to San Diego for system access rate, system power rate and water stewardship rate and removed from them certain items that he said were consistent with the Court's Phase I ruling. Is that the way you understood what he did?

### A. That is what Mr. Denham did, that is my understanding.

- Q. You don't disagree with that portion of his opinion?
- A. I don't disagree that he did it. As far as the removal of the water stewardship rates -- again, I'm not a lawyer and I may have misunderstood what the Court said. My lay reading of that opinion was not as certain as you're portraying it, I think, Mr. Keker.

I read the Court more to say they weren't --

premise that the State Water Project costs should not have been included during the four damage years of 2011 to 2014, do you believe that San Diego overpaid those damages during those fours years?

### A. Those portions of the charges for Colorado River water, yes.

- Q. They overpaid those for exchange water, they overpaid those charges?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. With respect to the water stewardship rate, do you agree, if you accept the Court's premise in Phase I, that they overpaid for water stewardship rate costs?
- A. Again, I am going to get back to my understanding. As I said, it may be wrong, but my understanding of the Court's opinion I don't think was quite as firm as yours, Mr. Keker. You are suggesting to me in the question that the Court said 100 percent of the water stewardship costs should be removed --
  - Q. I am asking the opposite.

MR. QUINN: Can he finish his answer?

THE COURT: Let's finish the answer.

THE WITNESS: What I'm understanding you to be asking me is the Court said that 100 percent of those costs should be removed from the transportation costs.

My reading of the opinion was somewhat less

definitive than yours, I think.

2.3

Q. BY MR. KEKER: Did you understand the Court's opinion as saying that 100 percent of the water stewardship rate costs should not have been charged to transportation and, therefore, the rate as charged was illegal?

### A. I didn't understand it as firm as you do.

Q. So do you believe, based on reading the Court's opinion, San Diego was damaged in any way in paying the water stewardship rate that it did during those four years?

### A. Can you repeat that again?

Q. Do you understand whether or not San Diego was damaged in any way during those four damage years by paying the full water stewardship rate?

MR. QUINN: Objection. Legal conclusion.

THE COURT: We will take it as his understanding.

Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: Did Mr. Denham correctly, from a mathematical point of view, in your opinion, remove State Water Project costs from what San Diego paid for system access rates and state power rates during the four years, system power rates during the four years?

back and recalculating rates for the four years, 2011 to 2014, can't it?

### A. Are we talking about Metropolitan's rates or the damage calculation rates?

Q. I am talking about the damage --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. We are talking over each other. I would like you to finish first and Mr. Keker will have his next question.

THE WITNESS: I am getting a little confused, Mr. Keker, whether you are talking about Metropolitan's rates in general or if you're talking about calculation of damages.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: I am talking about calculation of damages.

Do you understand there is was a contract between Met and San Diego, that San Diego at least claims, has been breached and that this trial is and your testimony is about the appropriate damage that that breach of contract might have caused; right?

#### A. Correct.

Q. You understand Mr. Denham came in and said what I did was read Phase I, saw that the State Water Project charges should not properly have been in the conveyance rate, took them out and recalculated what should have been paid for system access rates and system power rates

A. His math -- taking it out 100 percent was -- he took out 100 percent. The math was not incorrect.

Q. Your position is that had a different set of rates been in effect, then there might have been an offset against that, the rate would have -- the money would have shown up somewhere else?

A. Certainly, the money must have shown up somewhere else. It is a zero sum game. Metropolitan must recover its costs somewhere. If they don't through the water stewardship rate portion of the transportation rate, it needs to show up somewhere else.

Q. Have you looked at the exchange agreement, 2003 exchange agreement?

### A. Yes, I have.

Q. Are you aware of the provision that talks about an escrow if there is a dispute about rates?

### A. I am.

Q. Are you aware the money in the escrow could be used to pay damages in this case without anybody changing any rates for those four years?

### A. Yes.

MR. QUINN: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: And plus they have -- Met can pay whatever the damages are in this case without going

during those four years. And then he also looked at the part about the water stewardship rate where it said it was illegal, said taking that out and adding all that up, those are the damages. Do you understand that's what he did?

### A. I understand that is what he did.

Q. You don't have any quarrel with his math at all, do you?

### A. I don't have any quarrel with the math.

Q. Your position is that maybe there would have been some other set of rates that would have caused San Diego to pay something more than they actually paid in some other area and that that should be, I guess, I offset against those damages?

A. What I'm saying is in terms of damages calculations, Mr. Denham only went part way. He did what you just described in taking out a number of expenses from the transportation charges that you described. The math was proper in what he did with that.

But what I'm saying is to calculate those damages under there, you must do something with that money to fully calculate what the damages are and that he did not do that. He left that money hanging.

Q. Okay. So what would you do to fully calculate

1 Q. Did he calculate how much -- you understand the damages? 2 2 A. Well, there's a number of things I would do to that from reading his report? 3 3 fully calculate the damages. A. Yes, sir. 4 4 First, I would put that money back into a Q. Are you aware when Mr. Denham testified and we 5 5 tried to ask him what happened, if they had been moved supply rate. 6 6 to supply, that the Met lawyer objected and the Court Q. Just one second. Did the Met board say that 7 7 any money we have to pay in damages for those four years didn't let that evidence in? It is not in his report. 8 8 is going to be charged to the supply rate? A. Yes, I did read the transcript of his 9 9 deposition. And my understanding is that the A. I'm sorry. I am trying to answer your question 10 10 about what you asked I would do if I -questioning had to do with dollars, not rates. 11 11 Q. Let me ask another question. My understanding of Mr. Denham's report is he 12 12 A. If I did that and not what the Met board would actually did calculate a supply rate in his report. 13 13 He never did calculate what the dollar impact 14 14 THE COURT: Do you want him to answer that of that within the damages are. That is what I'm 15 15 question? saying, Mr. Keker. 16 16 MR. KEKER: No, I don't, your Honor. I want to Q. What I'm saying is you have opined, and what 17 17 ask him --I'm asking you, you have opined, haven't you, sir, that 18 18 THE COURT: A different question. you can't assume that whatever damages are paid in this 19 19 O. BY MR. KEKER: I want to ask him whether or not case would be made up in the supply rate? 20 20 you said that if, in your report, if 12 people looked at A. At the time I wrote my report I said exactly 21 21 this situation, 12 experts looked at the situation and what you said, yes. 22 22 decided what a good rate structure would be, they would MR. KEKER: You were asked in your deposition 23 23 come up with 12 different answers; right? at 259, at line 17: 24 24 A. Again, in that situation, in my report, I was "Q We're moving 100 percent 25 25 of the State Water Project cost talking about rates in general and not the damages, but 1917 1919 1 1 I did say that, yes. to supply rate as San Diego 2 2 Q. When you were asked in your deposition if you contends should be done in this 3 3 could calculate what effect on the supply rate it would case. Wouldn't it be 4 have if these costs came out of the State Water Project 4 relatively simple to calculate 5 5 and were no longer transportation costs for the water the effect of each -- of that 6 6 stewardship rate, you said that you wouldn't assume they on each member agency? 7 7 would go -- that somebody would decide to charge these "A I don't think so." 8 8 costs to the supply rate, didn't you? And then referring to lines 16 to 19 --9 A. That's what I said in my deposition regarding 9 MR. QUINN: I think you should read the whole 10 10 that. But what Mr. Denham did, he actually moved them answer. 11 11 to supply rates and then left them hanging there. MR. KEKER: He goes on --12 12 Q. He didn't move them anyplace. All he did was MR. QUINN: I know, but --13 13 calculate the overcharge; right? MR. KEKER: (Reading:) 14 14 MR. QUINN: This is argument now, your Honor. "I don't think so. As I said 1.5 15 Q. BY MR. KEKER: Are you saying you found in his in here, the suite of rates the 16 16 report -board had adopted were 17 17 THE COURT: Mr. Keker, if when he objects, you developed over a long period of 18 18 need to give me at least a second. time. Long in comparison to 19 19 The objection is overruled. what most agencies look at when 20 20 Please continue. they make changes." 21 21 Q. BY MR. KEKER: Are you saying Mr. Denham said THE WITNESS: I'm losing on the screen what 22 22 in his report that these charges are going to the supply you're reading. 23 23 rate? MR. KEKER: (Reading:) 24 24 A. That is my understanding is what he did, he "It's usually a year or two 25 25 removed them from transportation to supply. that they look. In the case of 1918 1920

. 1	Metropolitan, they've really	1	is, isn't the change relatively
2	been looking at this going back	2	easy to do as a matter of math?
3		3	Don't you just move a certain
4	to, you know, the 1990s. So	4	sum from one column to another?
5	it's within at least a decade	5	
6	that they have been doing it	6	"A I understand what you're
	and it has been a very	7	saying, that the math is
7	deliberate process with a lot		simple. But the implication in
8	of input from the various	8	what would happen is not that
9	member agencies. They have	9	simple because I don't think
10	arrived at a point today, a	10	the board would just say, oh,
11	year ago, two years ago, where	11	okay, move 300 million from
12	I think the board had come to	12	here to there."
13	some degrees of not I can't	13	I will skip the next two paragraphs unless
14	not unanimous agreement, but	14	counsel insists
15	not even consensus but	15	MR. QUINN: I think he should read it. He
16	certainly majority, feeling	16	shouldn't read part of the answer.
17	that this is the proper	17	THE COURT: Why don't we read the whole thing,
18	mixture. If you were to move	18	if that's what it is going to be.
19	the State Water Project rates	19	The other way to do it is ask him I will not
20	all to supply, it would it	20	tell Mr. Keker how to ask this witness questions. You
21	would upset the mixture that's	21	can just read it in.
22	taken this decade for the board	22	Q. BY MR. KEKER: Did you say, sir:
23	to come in. I would be really	23	"They were all interrelated.
24	surprised if the board didn't	24	The math is really simple but
25	say, 'Whoa, wait a minute.' If	25	math isn't what changes.
	say, whoa, wait a infinite. If		main isin t what changes.
	1921		1923
1	that's what you're going to do,	1	Everything changes if you make
2	I've got to step back and look	2	that kind of huge change in the
3	at everything and see how	3	revenue allocation"?
4	everything mixes together now	4	A. Yes, I did say that.
5	and how that impacts the the	5	Q. So what Mr. Denham calculated, what he said,
6	capacity charge, the	6	were the costs of the system, in the system access rate
7	readiness-to-serve charge,	7	and system power rate, attributable to the State Water
8	the do I have one, two,	8	Project, and he calculated the water stewardship rate.
9	maybe three or four different	9	And what he didn't calculate was some offsetting charge
10	supply rates?"	10	to San Diego that might show up somewhere in some rate
11	I'll stop reading.	11	structure sometime if the Met board ever got around to
12	MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I think he should read	12	doing it; is that correct?
13	the whole answer. He chose	13	A. I'm sorry. My confusion here is there's two
14	THE COURT: How much longer does this go on?	14	different things that seem to be going on here.
15	MR. QUINN: It	15	You are talking about the transcript of my
16	MR. KEKER: It goes on for quite a while.	16	deposition where there's a supposition that we took some
17		17	
18	MR. QUINN: It goes on for a page-and-a-half.	18	costs out of transportation and then moved them to
19	THE COURT: You can have it introduced, if	19	supply. And under the supposition that was going on in
20	necessary, separately.	20	the transcript, we were talking in very generic terms
	Let's go on to the next question.	21	before any decisions clearly by the Court here.
21	Q. BY MR. KEKER: Were you asked at page 262, line		What I was saying is talking about the
22	five:	22	interrelationship that I discussed in my report and the
23	"Q. I understand the board	23	supposition it just be moved to supply was an incorrect
24	might take action in response	24	one, I thought when we were talking about in my
25	to the change. But my question	25	deposition.
1	1922		1004
			1924

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

Then you started asking me about what Mr. Denham did. What Mr. Denham did is he said, no, this is a simple thing. I am just going to take it out of the transportation and move it to supply.

In my deposition I was saying I don't think it's clearcut and simple to just plain move it. That's what Mr. Denham did.

The second part of that, then, is once he did that, once we start talking about damages now, put aside what the board might or might not do going forward with those costs, the Court -- given the Court's ruling, what Mr. Denham did, though, looking at damages, separate from what the board might do with the rates, is he only calculated part of the damages because he took some money out, put it into supply and never calculated what the impact of that movement would be.

- Q. But are you testifying that the -- that during the period 2011 to 2014 the supply rate was somehow different than the one that it was?
  - A. No, I'm not.

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

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. So the Met board had a supply rate during that period?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. San Diego paid it?
  - A. Yes, it did.

wasn't --

Q. Mr. Woodcock, what happened to that money is it went into an escrow account, pursuant to 12.4(c), right, and is sitting there in San Diego's escrow account in its reserves; right?

### A. That's correct.

Q. So that's what happened to the money. What are you saying? Are you saying that if the world had been different, if Met had listened to San Diego back in 2010 and if they had done the rate structure that the Court suggests to them in the Phase I was the legal rate structure, it would have been a different rate structure and we would have different amounts of money sitting in escrow?

### A. I am not saying that.

- Q. What you are saying, you are assuming -- you are making up where San Diego -- where the Met board, if something had happened, would have made up this money to get zero -- to get this neutral position where all their costs were covered going forward; right?
- A. I'm saying on the one hand, putting the damages aside, if we had been given the Court's ruling back in 2010, and the Met board had done something, we don't really know where they would have put the money. But we're not at 2010. We are at 2015.

1925 1927

- Q. What are you saying, that somehow the supply rate should have been different if the Met board did something?
  - A. No. I'm sorry. You seem to be mixing up, at least in my mind, what the board might do as a result of the Court's decision with rates, mixing that with what are the implications in terms of damages here, which aren't necessarily the same as what the board might do with rates.
  - Q. Fair enough. Let's stick with that. Let's stick with what are the implications for damages. Mr. Denham said I read the Court's opinion. I found out which rates were illegal and I found out how much that added to.

What are you saying? Are you saying there should be something that reduces that?

A. Yes. I am saying Mr. Denham only went part way when he took the money out of the transportation rate, the three components he talked about. When he took those monies out, in order to completely or fairly calculate what the damages were, he needed to figure out what happened to that money he took out from those three components. Put it back in and figure out what the total damages were to San Diego, not just what half the damages were. I am using half as an example. It

We have the Court's ruling in this case. The Court said you should not be charging the Colorado River water for certain costs, State Water Project water costs. And Mr. Denham then went and said given that ruling, I am going to take those out and that the damages are approximately 188 million, I gather. What he didn't say was I took those out to fully calculate what the impact of the damages -- forget 2010 and what might or might not have happened then. But sticking to the calculation of the damages, he only went part way and he never figured out that money that he took out, how that would -- how that impacts the damage calculation.

Q. Why -- Mr. Denham knew that there's an escrow account set aside with the money in it. He figured out what the money was. You are saying he should have figured out something about a supply charge?

MR. QUINN: You know, that's --THE COURT: Sustained. It's vague.

We are getting a little far.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: You have termed the ability to predict what the Metropolitan board would do with the rate structure if San Diego prevailed in this lawsuit, you have termed that knowledge as impossible; right? You just can't know what the Met board would do if the

1928

judge's ruling was as it is?

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.1

2.4

### A. That's correct.

Q. And it's impossible to know, if they decide to accept the judge's ruling and change their cost allocations in the future or their rate structure or way of collecting money, for example, property taxes, they have a lot of options, and 12 experts would come up with 12 different ways to do it?

### A. That's correct.

Q. It is simply impossible to know what that might be? Not what it might be but what it's going to be?

### A. It is impossible to know what the board might do with their rates given the Court's ruling.

Q. Let me ask you a couple of questions about the denominator.

As I understand your criticism of Mr. Denham is that he took out the rates that the Court said were improperly put on transportation from the State Water Project and he added the water stewardship rate, 100 percent of the water stewardship rate, according to his reading of the opinion, and created a new system access rate and system power rate?

### A. That's correct.

Q. And the system access rate and the system power rate by definition are systemwide rates; right?

water stewardship rates out of the transportation rates and create a new systemwide, system access rate and system power rate; right?

### A. That's what he did.

Q. And divided them by all the sales in the system?

#### A. That's what he did, yes.

Q. What is wrong with that?

A. The problem with that is it calculates a charge for water that comes from the Colorado River Aqueduct by taking all of those out of those rates. However, under the exchange agreement, the amount of water that comes from Colorado River or comes from the State Water Project is left up to Metropolitan and the system to decide how that gets split out. By necessity, some 40 percent of it comes from the State Water Project.

That 40 percent of the water that comes from the State Water Project has certain costs associated with it, including the State Water Project costs, including the system power costs in there, including all of the transportation portion of the State Water Project costs. Those are State Water Project costs that need to match with that State Water Project water.

The exchange agreement does not provide that it's only Colorado River water. It provides it can be

### A. Under Metropolitan's rates, yes, they are.

Q. And the system we're talking about is all sales?

### A. Correct.

Q. There's no division between Colorado River sales and State Water Project sales; the system is all sales?

### A. That's correct.

Q. When Mr. Denham took out costs that according to his reading of Judge Karnow's opinion, Phase I opinion, when he took out those costs, his unit cost was divided by all sales; right?

### A. That's what he did, yes.

Q. You say that somehow he should have created a new rate structure limited to Colorado River sales; right?

### A. That's correct.

Q. And he should have come up with a new system access rate and system power rate just for Colorado River sales; is that your testimony?

### A. That's in effect what he did and I believe he did it incorrectly, yes.

Q. What he did was take out State Water Project costs from the transportation rates and State Water Project power costs from the transportation rates and

any mix that happens to be needed or necessary. Over the four years we're looking at 40 percent of it, roughly, is State Water Project costs and those need to be reflected to fairly charge San Diego County Water Authority for that 40 percent that comes from the State Water Project. If you don't, you are leaving everybody else to pay for those.

Q. Let me see if I can understand something about cost causation. This fixed cost that's the State Water Project cost, that existed before 2003, didn't it?

### A. Yes, it did.

Q. Those bonds had to be paid before 2003; they had to be paid annually?

### A. Yes, they did.

Q. 2003 came along and the bonds still had to be paid; right?

### A. Correct.

Q. In 2004 and the bonds still have to be paid?

### A. Yes

Q. In 2003 San Diego made an exchange agreement to provide Colorado River water to Met, and Met said we're going to use it anyway we want to but we will give you your share. You'll get it, you'll get our stuff.

When the exchange agreement -- MR. QUINN: Is that a question?

n l

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

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

1933

THE COURT: It is leading up to one.

- Q. BY MR. KEKER: When the exchange agreement came into effect, did that cause the payments, the fixed costs of the State Water Project to go up?
- A. It didn't impact the costs of the State Water Project.
- Q. Okay. So a deal to get Colorado River water to Met had no effect whatsoever on State Water Project fixed costs which existed before and after; right?
  - A. It didn't impact the costs to Metropolitan, no.
- Q. Your testimony is that exchange agreement for Colorado River water caused costs in the State Water Project, that's your testimony?
  - A. No, it's not.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. I thought that's what you said.
- A. If I said that, I was incorrect.

The exchange agreement did not change or cause any costs for State Water Project.

What I'm saying is the implementation of the State Water Project -- sorry. The implementation of the exchange agreement -- under the terms of that agreement has State Water Project costs going to San Diego Water Authority. That is some of the exchange water. And there are costs associated with that State Water Project water that is delivered under the terms of that

### discretion of the Metropolitan Water District.

- Q. The only thing that the exchange agreement says about this is in order for the exchange agreement to put any burden at all on Met, San Diego has to make sure that Met gets Colorado River water at the intake at Lake Havasu; right?
  - A. The agreement says that Met has to get water from the Colorado River.
  - Q. Colorado River, not State Water Project water, Colorado River?
    - A. Met has to get that water, yes.
- Q. And the agreement makes clear that once that water gets into Met's system, it is up to Met how they deal with it and what they gave -- the equivalent amount they give; right?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. You are saying that causes State Water Project
  - A. I'm saying the agreement leaves it up to the discretion of the Metropolitan Water District as to what that mix of water provided to San Diego in exchange is.
  - Q. Has the Colorado River Aqueduct ever been capacity constrained to your knowledge?
    - A. It shut down.
    - Q. Other than being repaired, has it been capacity

1935

agreement that must be reflected in the charges to the 2 San Diego Water Authority, if we're going to associate 3 cause with effect, cost causation rates.

- Q. Sir, you are aware that every year of the exchange agreement to date is and probably going on until it's over the amount of water moved by the Colorado River Aqueduct is far, far in excess of the requirements under the exchange agreement; right?
- Q. You are aware that whatever blending occurs is something that is entirely for the convenience at the sole discretion of Met?
  - A. That is incorrect.
  - Q. Have you read the exchange agreement?
  - A. I read the exchange agreement.
- Q. Is there anything in the exchange agreement that says that San Diego has the right under the exchange agreement to one drop of the State Water Project water?

drops or where those come from. It is up to the

A. There's wording in the exchange agreement that says the amount of water that Metropolitan provides to San Diego County Water Authority under the agreement is up to the discretion of the Metropolitan Water Authority. It doesn't say one way or another whose

1 constrained?

- A. That is a constraint. Other than it being constrained (sic), it hasn't been constrained.
- Q. It runs about 100,000 acre-feet of water a month? 1.2 a year?
- A. I don't remember the numbers. I'll accept that.
  - Q. It doesn't run full, does it?
  - A. I'm not sure when it runs full or not.
- Q. There is plenty of Colorado River water to fulfill this exchange agreement?
- A. Some months there are, but not in all months. MR. KEKER: Can I have a moment to check with folks?

THE COURT: Just a moment or five or ten minutes?

MR. KEKER: How about -- I'd like five minutes. THE COURT: Okay. I'll see everybody in five minutes.

(Recess.)

21 MR. KEKER: A couple of other questions about 22 this.

> Q. Your assumption is that somehow 40 percent blending means something in terms of calculating damages.

1934

Any rates that were set based on percentage of blending would have to change every day, every week and every hour, wouldn't they?

- A. Yeah, you might be able to make that a monthly calculation. I don't know you'd need to do it every hour. You could, but you could get the monthly blend and do it on a monthly basis. I think that would be reasonable.
- Q. Let's look at 1126. Can we put it up? This is a big map.

MR. KEKER: DTX 1126.

2.2

Q. This is really hard to read. What this shows -- this is a weekly status system for January 2013. You look down at the Skinner Plant and this month there is a 80 percent State Water Project blend over here. The Jensen Plant has 100 percent State water blend. This Weymouth Plant has got a 39 percent State Water Project blend.

Let's go to the last page of this. That was January 2, 2013. Stop right here.

March 20, 2013. Now the Skinner Plant, the blend is 63. Let's go back up to the other. Weymouth Plant is down to 37.

These blends change all the time, don't they?

A. Yes, they do.

sorry if I have confused the discussion on this.

But you're talking now about setting rates for 26 member agencies based on blends. I've never suggested that they set rates for the 26 member agencies based on blends. I'm talking about damages for the San Diego Water Authority for the four years in question only for exchange water.

I am not talking about the normal supply of San Diego County. I am talking about the exchange water and what the damage implications are.

Q. What you are saying, because Met chose in some years --

By the way, in 2014 Met didn't get much State Water Project water, did it?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. So almost all of the water that San Diego got in 2014 was Colorado River water?
- A. The number is the number. If you want to characterize it as almost all, okay.
- Q. In other years that changed according to Met's operational whims; right?
  - A. I wouldn't call them operational whims, no.
- Q. What you are saying is that the exchange agreement which calls for San Diego to give Colorado River water to Met, at that point Met can do whatever it

Q. And each different agency gets water from the different plants and has a different blend as Met mixes Colorado River and State Water Project water together; right?

A. Yes. These are water treatment plant blends you are talking about; right?

- Q. Yes.
- A. Okay.
- Q. So a rate, a rate that was set up trying to figure out what a blend was going to be would be impossible to be uniform among member agencies, wouldn't it?
- A. I don't know that's necessarily true. I don't think that's necessarily true.
- Q. If they -- if a rate was set up, for example, for San Diego, we are going to assume that the blend is 60-40 Colorado River State Water Project and another member agency has 100 percent State water and another member agency has ten percent State Water Project and 90 percent Colorado River, and another member agency has still a different blend, and the rate is going to be set according to the blend; there can't be a rate that's uniform for the conveyance of water by member agencies, can there?
  - A. No. I think the problem again here -- and I'm

wants with its other water supplies and Colorado River and eventually just deliver exchange water to San Diego. You are saying somehow that Met's operational considerations should be charged to San Diego for buying that Colorado River water from IID?

- A. Boy, I am sorry. I really didn't follow that. I sort of lost you with the whims. It's not a whims thing. There is real practical constraints there. And I am not sure what you are really asking me with that.
- Q. You can't have a situation under the exchange agreement where every -- the exchange agreement requires a rate that's generally applicable to member agencies when they conveyed water; are you aware of that?
- A. Exchange agreement requires the rates to be charged the same as to all the member agencies, yes.
  - Q. For the conveyance of water?
- A. I don't recall that section of the agreement saying conveyance of water. If it is there, I will accept that. I don't recall it is saying that.
- Q. Your understanding is the lawful rate that is to be set to be used in the exchange agreement to set the price for this Colorado River water is a price that is both lawful and generally applicable to the conveyance of something by member agencies?
  - A. The agreement says that the rate charged for

Pages 1937 to 1940

2.5

the exchange water shall be the same rate charged to all other agencies for that service. There's not a treatment charge, for example, charged in the exchange rate. Even though that's charged to some agencies, that's not charged.

But the same rate for the same services is charged to the other 26 agencies, including San Diego's normal supply is the same rate that will be charged for the exchange water is what it says.

- Q. Fair enough. It would be completely impractical and, indeed, impossible to set a rate based on blending that met that criteria, that was the same for everybody?
- A. I don't know that it would be impossible. It would certainly would be difficult.
- Q. There's no indication that Met has ever tried to do it?
  - A. Not that I'm aware of, no, sir.

MR. KEKER: No further questions. Thank you, Mr. Woodcock.

THE COURT: Redirect.

### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. QUINN:

Q. Mr. Woodcock, if you were to seek to recover

based on the percentage if somebody told you what the percentage of the blend was?

### A. Correct, yes, you could.

Q. And that wouldn't require that you re-do those numbers for the State Water Project costs every time you went through that exercise?

### A. No, it would not.

Q. That is something you could just do as a matter of a formula if you had an input as to what the percentage was of the State Water Project water in a particular blend?

#### A. Correct.

Q. Mr. Keker asked you some questions about before 2003 weren't those bonds outstanding; after 2003 weren't the bonds still outstanding. Do you recall those questions?

### A. I do.

Q. As a matter of cost causation and standard rate-mixing principles, do fixed costs also have to be covered under the same cost causation principles?

### A. Yes, they do.

Q. In response to one of Mr. Keker's questions, he used the term "operational whims" with respect to blending. Do you remember him asking you about that?

A. I do.

- the costs associated with State Water Project water which is in a particular blend, would it be necessary to have different rates for different blends?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Is it possible to determine what the costs are for State Water Project water and allocate that based on the percentage of water that's in the blend?
    - A. Yes, it is.
    - Q. Could you explain that?
  - A. We could take the costs of the State Water Project, divide it by the cost of the State Water Project deliveries to come up with the rate. I am simplifying this a little bit. We could come up with the Colorado River Aqueduct cost and divide that by the Colorado River Aqueduct sales, come up with a rate for Colorado River Aqueduct. And then based on what the blend is, weight those two to come up with a rate for the blended water.
  - Q. And that's a rate that you could come up with that you could just apply at any given time, depending upon what the blend was; is that true?
    - A. To the exchange water, yes.
  - Q. And that could be done with any mixture of water? If you knew what the State Water Project costs were, you could do that division and that allocation

- Q. And you said you didn't think it was operational whims?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. In terms of what Met's blend was?
  - A. That's what I said, yes.
  - Q. In response to one question you said the blend was within the discretion of Met. Do you recall that?
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. What did you mean when you said that?
  - A. Under the exchange agreement there is very specific wording that the mixture of water that's delivered to San Diego, the water provided in exchange for the IID and the canal lining water that is up to the discretion of the Metropolitan Water District and what that mixture will be.
  - Q. So were you responding in terms of what the contract provided?
    - A. The contractual requirements, yes.
  - Q. Let me ask a different question now. As a practical matter, are there constraints on Metropolitan's ability to use exclusively Colorado River water or exclusively State Water Project water or to implement whatever blend it wants?
    - A. To San Diego, yes.
    - Q. What are those constraints?

- A. They are operational and structural. The system, the way it's laid out, the black box, if you will -- where the -- I don't know if we need to bring the map up again. But where the water comes in from the Colorado River Aqueduct, it meets with a pipe that comes in from State Water Project. Those two pipes meet and blend the water there. There is not getting away from that blending. That then comes down, goes down to Skinner and ultimately goes to San Diego, as well as several other agencies. The configuration of the system, the hardware as such, there is no way of escaping that blending.
  - Q. Could you imagine circumstances -- is it physically possible or could you imagine circumstances where there would be no blending; there would only be Colorado River water?
  - A. The only way that could happen is if there was no Colorado River water coming down that other pipe.
    - Q. You said no Colorado River water?
    - A. I'm sorry.

No State Water Project water coming down from the State Water Project. There is no allocation, no water from the State Water Project. The only water coming from the Metropolitan system is from the Colorado River water. So where those pipes meet, you would only maintenance and no Colorado River water can get in other than what may be blended in the reservoirs that come in below there. There is a period where it is shut down and it is, in effect, only State Water Project water because of that shutdown.

- Q. Any other constraints that limit Met's ability to adjust the blend?
- A. Under the exchange agreement Metropolitan gives an equal annual volume of exchange water every 12 months. The IID water is really conserved in the summer but Metropolitan still has to give it equal amount every 12 months. So theoretically, the IID water comes in the summer and the other months, when there's no conservation savings, Metropolitan still has to deliver 1-12th of the annual amount to San Diego.
- Q. IID water is Colorado River water?
- A. IID water is Colorado River water, yes.
- Q. How about the availability of State Water Project water, does that limit Met's ability to control the blend?
- A. Well, if -- yes. I mean, Metropolitan takes whatever State Water Project it can get, all of it.
- Q. Why?
  - A. It needs it to supply Southern California. It needs as much State Water Project as it can to either

have one water coming down.

You would have to bypass Diamond Valley to not get any of the mixed water that was in Diamond Valley. You would have to bypass the Skinner Reservoir to make sure you didn't get any of the mix there.

I think, theoretically, that could happen, you could bypass those two reservoirs. If there were no State Water Project water and you bypassed the two reservoirs, theoretically you could get just Colorado River water. As a practical matter, I am not sure Metropolitan could operate without having State Water Project water for too long a period of time.

- Q. You refer to this location where these two types from the Colorado River and the State Water Project join, is that -- did you say that's above this Skinner Reservoir?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And it's above the Skinner bypass?
- A. Yes
  - Q. Are there any other constraints in the system or any other constraints, as a practical matter, that limit Metropolitan's ability to control the blend of Colorado River water and State Water Project water?
  - A. There's a couple. There's a period of time when the Colorado River Aqueduct is shut down for

supply the agencies directly or, if they're not taking it right away today, to put it in a reservoir when they need it tomorrow.

- Q. What happens if Metropolitan did not take State Water Project water that was available?
- A. I don't mean to be facetious but there would be an awful lot of thirsty people in Southern California. They need State Water Project water to meet their obligations to supply the 26 member agencies.
  - Q. They have to take it when it is available?
- A. They have to take all that they can when it's available, yes.
- Q. Does that mean necessarily that is going to affect the blend with the Colorado River water that goes into the exchange water?
- A. Yes, whatever the State decides is the allocation for that period of time is certainly going to impact the blend.

MR. QUINN: Nothing further.

MR. KEKER: A few questions, Mr. Woodcock.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEKER:

Q. This IID water, it is some water sitting in Lake Mead that IID has a right to take out and it has

cad that H2 has a right to take out and it has

1.5

2.2

sold that right to San Diego?

### A. That's correct.

2.3

Q. It is sitting at Lake Mead and IID, when they don't use it, they don't use it in the summer, maybe but it's not the -- the water is there available to be taken to Lake Havasu and be taken out at any month that San Diego chooses to get it; right?

#### A. That's correct.

Q. That is what Met does, and it takes it out on a regular basis every month. So it doesn't matter --

MR. QUINN: Objection -- THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KEKER: It doesn't matter --

THE COURT: Is that a question about taking it out every month? Why don't we pause and, Mr. Keker, just ask a question.

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir.

Q. The IID water sitting in Lake Mead can be taken out each month in equal amounts as Met chooses; right?

A. It can be taken out each month. There's this constraint of them shutting down the pipeline. So that period when it is shut down, they can't.

There is also the reality of the fact that the way Metropolitan maximizes the amount of water it can take is it takes more than 1-12th of its Colorado River

You understand it gets to Lake Skinner, Met can choose to say this Colorado River water that's coming in, we are going to call the first 13,000 acre-feet, exchange water, and then assign the rest of the water to somebody else; right? How they -- for Met to say 8000 acre-feet, 9000 acre-feet, 10,000 acre-feet when they are getting 50,000 or 80,000 acre-feet each month, to say this lesser amount is the exchange water is just kind of Met's accounting system. Lake Skinner doesn't know?

MR. QUINN: Compound, I think, and argumentative.

THE COURT: It is a little compound. Do you understand the question?

THE WITNESS: I do. I think I understand, your Honor.

What you're talking about, Mr. Keker, is probably true in a very theoretical sense. On paper I can say I blocked off the reservoir and I kept these molecules aside and I will only deliver them to San Diego.

In reality, it doesn't work that way. And it would be -- you mentioned earlier the water at Lake Havasu that is there for IID, theoretically that water is there for June. If you are going to go through the

allocation in the early months of the year. The exhibits that Mr. Denham had of the annual reports from the Colorado River Aqueduct showed monthly withdrawals from the Colorado River Aqueduct by the Metropolitan Water District. If you look at those, you will see at the end of the year, October, November, December, those withdrawals pretty much universally tend to be very low.

That is because what Metropolitan does is they take all they can, not in equal monthly installments, but they tend to take it up front. In case somebody doesn't use all of their allocation, Met then says I'll take it, I'll take it, I need it, and then takes it. Often there isn't any available, there isn't water available.

What you will see is October, November,
December months the amount withdrawn by Metropolitan is
much lower. That's because of this operational
consideration that they do to try to maximize the amount
they can do.

- Q. The amount that they take out each of those months at the beginning of the year going on through the year is always far greater than the exchange water allotment that is committed to San Diego; right?
  - A. I don't know that, no. I don't know that.
  - Q. It's in the record.

theoretical changes of molecules, I think you really need to go back to the IID water is really summer water and not 1-12th every month, as in reality it is.

Once you get back to reality, you can't do what you said. In theory, maybe. On paper, maybe.

But the real world, that's not true. It doesn't happen that way.

Q. BY MR. KEKER: I didn't mean on paper or theory.

If I'm getting through the pipe, through Colorado River Aqueduct, I'm getting 50,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water, and it's about to dump into the Skinner Lake where it is going to be mixed with State Water Project water, I have a choice, if I'm Met, of categorizing which water is which? I can say the 15,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River water, I'm going to check, okay, that's my obligation under the exchange agreement to San Diego and now I know it's all going to be mixed and I will eventually give them 15,000 acre-feet of mixed water.

But I could say I'm going to account for the exchange agreement water from only Colorado River water, even though I know it's going to be mixed eventually; right?

A. You could say that. You could account for it

```
on paper or electronically. In reality you can't. I hear what you are saying, and I think I understand what you are saying. You would like to be able to say I can block it off and say it is Colorado River water, but in reality it is not -- in reality, there is no way of doing it.
```

I am not sure even in reality, when the Colorado River Aqueduct is shut down for maintenance, if there is enough water left in that month to meet the obligation of 1-12th of the water and to be able to meet all the other obligations of Metropolitan to its other agencies. The reality is one thing; the theory is another.

Q. Last try. Why isn't it reality? If I am getting 50,000 acre feet of water and it's about to get mixed, why can't I categorize the 50,000 acre-feet any way I want to? I am going to say 15,000 of it is exchange water. I am going to say something else about the other 35,000 acre-feet. What is wrong with doing that?

A. I mean, it is basically the same answer. You can do that. But the reality is you can't. And I am pretty sure when the parties reached the exchange agreement, put in the wording to the exchange agreement that it is not Colorado River water that is being

```
Q. And Mr. Keker asked you a question where he says, we take the Colorado River water, it's about -- it is about to be dumped into Skinner and there it is going to get mixed. Is it your testimony the mixture actually happens at a juncture that is above Skinner?
```

A. Yes. The mixtures doesn't happen at Skinner. The mixture happens when two pipes come together above Diamond Lake or Diamond Valley. It is even farther above Skinner.

```
    MR. QUINN: Nothing further.
    MR. KEKER: Nothing further.
    THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. You are excused.
```

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, can we break for lunch?
THE COURT: We are off the record.
(Noon recess was taken.)

16 (Noon recess was taken.)

delivered to San Diego under this agreement, we are taking Colorado River water and in exchange we are giving you other water because the reality is we can't do what you would theoretically like to do.

MR. KEKER: No further questions, your Honor.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. QUINN:

Q. Do you know if the deliveries to San Diego also go through the same pipe as Eastern and Western?

- A. Yes, they do.
- Q. Could you explain to the Court what that means?
- A. The water that is provided to San Diego County Water Authority -- there is not a separate pipe that goes to the San Diego County Water Authority. That pipe also serves Eastern and Western Water Districts, and there is no way of breaking them up.

I suppose on paper we could but in reality they get the same water.

- Q. They get the same mix?
- A. They get the same mix.
- Q. The Eastern and Western Districts, where are they?
- A. They are in that southeast portion of the district where the -- down by Lake Skinner.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, April 29, 2015 1:30 p.m.

THE COURT: Sir.

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I do think we are prepared to rest and we won't be calling any other witnesses. There are a few documents we would like to move into evidence. There is no controversy to this first batch. And then we are going to ask you to look at three documents we would like to offer which Mr. Keker has some positions on.

And the first document I would like to move into evidence is DTX 1153, which are Met's deposition designations.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. KEKER: We filed -- we filed objections and move in our objections to the deposition designations.

THE COURT: Subject to those objections?

MR. KEKER: Yes.

THE COURT: DTX 1153 admitted, subject to objections.

(DTX 1153 was received in evidence.)

MR. QUINN: And then, your Honor, DTX 1143, which is a brief filed by San Diego County Water

Pages 1953 to 1956

Authority and others that I questioned Ms. Stapleton about, I failed to move it into evidence at the time. MR. KEKER: No objection. THE COURT: DTX 1143 is admitted. (DTX 1143 was received in evidence.) MR. QUINN: And then DTX 884, which is the allocation agreement between the United States of America and a whole bunch of different public entities, I would like to move that into evidence. MR. KEKER: Without conceding relevance, your Honor, no objection. THE COURT: DTX 884 admitted. 1.3 (DTX 884 was received in evidence.) MR. QUINN: We have a declaration of Devendra Upadhyah, DTX 1152, move that into evidence. MR. KEKER: No objection. THE COURT: Peaks 1152 is admitted. (DTX 1152 was received in evidence.) MR. OUINN: We have three documents we need to talk about, your Honor. I believe we have given the Court copies of these. We marked them for exhibits as 2.2 DTX 1165 through 1167. And as to these, there's no dispute, as I understand it, about authenticity. These documents come from San Diego's Public Record Act production. We offer these documents as 

which are dated -- 1167 is a 1998 document. 1166 is 2001, and 1165 is 1999. All before negotiation of the 2003 exchange agreement, which was what Ms. Stapleton was talking about.

This is at a time when Ms. Stapleton, to the extent she was concerned about it or anybody was concerned about anything, they were looking at the water that they were getting from the State Water Project, as I understand it, which under the Met Act has to meet certain salinity. This was not the subject of any negotiation or concern about the exchange agreement.

They were talking about whether or not the water they got from Met met the Met Act requirements.

THE COURT: Before 2003 there was another agreement, as I understand it, independent of the ordinary sort of agreement that San Diego and other agencies had to get from Met.

Was Met, during the time period of 1998 through 2001, getting Colorado River water, do we know?

MR. KEKER: In 1998 there was an agreement to provide Colorado River water. Ms. Stapleton talked about that.

Let me just look at these one at a time. This is a letter from Ms. Stapleton who was saying the purpose of Section 136 -- this is on page two -- service

being, among other things, we think they are substantively relevant but they are also impeaching Ms. Stapleton's testimony at page 1568 of the trial transcript.

1.0

2.4

THE COURT: I don't have that. You can summarize what she was talking about.

MR. QUINN: Basically -- I can give it to you. Basically she says she didn't care whether or not Met provided pure Colorado River water. It was a matter of indifference to them, prepared to take 100 percent Colorado River water.

These documents show that San Diego was very focused on salinity issues and wanted reassurances from Met that water provided would meet certain salinity requirements of threshold levels and also recognized constraints on the blends that Metropolitan was providing.

And they show concern on the part of San Diego that they get the blend that gives them the minimum salinity they are looking for but also recognizing that Metropolitan doesn't have complete discretion as to what it delivers.

We believe it is relevant both substantively and as impeachment.

MR. KEKER: We object to these three documents

of State water blending was to insure that member agencies who contribute funds to the State Water Project would receive its benefits. Met's long-term blending policy must be consistent with the intent of Section 136 of the Met Act.

She talks about Metropolitan's long-term policy must insure that agencies receive benefits commensurate with payments made for SWP water or at a minimum provide differential water rates depending on the source of water to compensate for this inequity.

She is talking about water delivered under Metropolitan's 1998 interim salinity blending plan. This does not have anything to do with her statement we are perfectly happy to take 100 percent Colorado River water pursuant to the exchange agreement. That is what she was testifying about.

The second one is 1999, Mr. Hess says, "As you know, it would be unacceptable for the Authority's service area to receive water from Metropolitan that does not meet its board's, Met's boards adopted salinity water quality service objective."

They are saying you are supposed to be delivering water of a certain quality and they are complaining about that. That has nothing to do with whether or not they were perfectly happy and negotiated

1.0

2.4

to get 100 percent Colorado River water.

The third one, 2001, again talks about Metropolitan's 1999 salinity management study and goes on and talks about an increase in salinity from historic levels. These are Metropolitan's policies that its members are supposed to benefit from. That is what they're talking about. There is nothing in here to impeach or even comment on her testimony that we negotiated an exchange agreement, and it would have been perfectly happy to take all Colorado River water.

We think these are irrelevant. They weren't identified on the witness list. Ms. Stapleton wasn't asked about them. And we object to their admission.

THE COURT: Mr. Quinn, is there anything other than the following in these documents, an expression by the author or Ms. Stapleton that with respect to water secured from Met outside of an exchange agreement she cares about and expects Met to comply with certain salinity standards that Met either has or ought to have? That is to say, to make that slightly different, what she is really talking about here is as a member agency, not necessarily as a water exchange recipient but as a member agency, I want you, Met, under 136 to adhere to certain standards, for example, 500 milligrams per litre?

MR. QUINN: What this does battle with is the testimony of Ms. Stapleton that we were happy to get pure Colorado River water; whereas, those documents express a concern that the long-term blending policy must in fact make sure that it reaches -- the water we get reaches certain levels with respect to salinity. If that's true, it does do battle with the idea, Ms. Stapleton said, it is a matter of indifference to us whether we get pure Colorado River water.

I think it is some evidence that bears on that dispute. I think it is relevant to it that back in 1998, when, by the way, there is an exchange agreement then in place, which the 2003 agreement amends and restates, that we have a consistent recognition in 1998, 1999, 2001 that we, San Diego, have certain expectations in that regard, recognizing that too much of a salinity content can be damaging, and we are concerned about that. I think it would be fair for a trier of fact to take that into account in assessing the credibility of Ms. Stapleton's testimony that we really didn't care whether there was any blending at all, when here she's saying we really need to get blending because we don't want to incur this kind of damage.

THE COURT: The only kind of statement this tends to impeach is a statement along the following

Isn't that what is going on in these letters? She cares about that and she wants Met to play ball according to the rules as she thought were in place with respect to member agency, generally speaking.

MR. QUINN: Well, that is part of it.

THE COURT: Is there anything else in here that suggests her position with respect to this sort of independent status that San Diego may have as a recipient of exchange water?

MR. QUINN: There is a recognition that water above a certain saline --

Looking at Defense Exhibit 1166 --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. QUINN: -- on the bottom paragraph of that first page that there is a recognition this can be damaging, may cause damage to the system. I think the Court knows it's in the record that if the Colorado River water is more saline --

THE COURT: We actually went through this in Phase I. There was evidence to suggest, and everybody in the room would probably agree, you would rather have less saline water than not, and that saline water does damage in a way that non-saline water doesn't.

That is understood here. It doesn't seem these letters -- add much more to the record than that.

lines: We at San Diego don't care. When we get water from whatever sources, we don't care whether it has a high or low level of salinity. That doesn't concern us.

That is a different kind of statement from when we were negotiating the exchange agreement we did or didn't care about the level of salinity that we got. I don't think Miss Stapleton said anything like the former statement. She was talking about the intent that went into the formation of the exchange agreement.

These letters don't say anything other than what you have in the letter that any reasonable person that deals with water on behalf of an agency -- I can almost assume that person would, as a general matter, prefer to have less saline water than more saline water.

The real question in this case, at least as we've been trying over the last week or two, has been what was the intent with respect to the salinity of the water under the exchange agreement. These don't go to that. They don't impeach her statement under it.

The objection is sustained.

MR. QUINN: Can I read the testimony?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. QUINN: 1568, lines five to 19:

"Q In the contract did it give a right to blend water?

```
"A Yes.
                                                                           those together.
 2
                                                                    2
             "O In Met's sole discretion
                                                                                MR. QUINN: There are a couple of motions that
                                                                    3
 3
             they could blend water with
                                                                           San Diego made which are hanging fire, a motion to
                                                                    4
 4
             other water sources?"
                                                                           exclude, a motion to strike.
                                                                    5
 5
             It's in the record. I won't bother reading it.
                                                                                THE COURT: Let's put all those together and
 6
                                                                    6
       The Court can see it.
                                                                           make sure I have courtesy copies of everything. And I
                                                                    7
                                                                           will review all of those in advance of the hearing. In
             I think we are putting blinders on, frankly,
                                                                    8
 8
       your Honor, if we're saying all she is saying is we were
                                                                           advance of the arguments, I will give you some tentative
 9
                                                                    9
       indifferent to Colorado -- whether we got 100 percent
                                                                           thoughts on those before we get together to talk after I
10
                                                                   10
       Colorado River water, but she's not saying we are
                                                                           have read your briefs.
                                                                   11
11
       indifferent to salinity levels.
                                                                                MR. QUINN: We won't have the rulings on those
12
                                                                   12
             If she is saying I am indifferent to salinity
                                                                           at the time we file our briefs?
13
                                                                   13
       levels, this could come in as impeachment but because
                                                                                THE COURT: Right.
                                                                   14
14
       she only said, "I am indifferent to whether it is pure
                                                                                How does June 5 look on your calendar?
1.5
                                                                   15
       Colorado river," and it is not impeaching, I think we
                                                                                MR. KEKER: I have an incredibly hard to
16
       are all putting blinders on.
                                                                   16
                                                                           make --
17
                                                                   17
             We all know what the facts are about the
                                                                                THE COURT: That is fine.
                                                                   18
18
       salinity of the Colorado River.
                                                                                MR. KEKER: -- at 8:30. So if it didn't start
                                                                   19
19
             THE COURT: I don't think they get to add
                                                                           until ten o'clock or after.
20
                                                                   20
       anything to the argument. You still get to make the
                                                                                THE COURT: We could do it at 10:30, if you
21
                                                                   21
       argument. I don't think it adds anything.
                                                                           would like.
                                                                   2.2
22
             The objection is sustained as to 1165, 1166 and
                                                                                MR. KEKER: Fine. That would work.
23
                                                                   23
       1167.
                                                                                MR. EMANUEL: A later afternoon hearing.
24
                                                                   24
                                                                                THE COURT: I can do it from 2:00 to 4:00.
             MR. QUINN: With that we do indeed rest.
                                                                   2.5
25
             THE COURT: Any rebuttal from San Diego?
                                                                                MR. KEKER: 2:00 p.m. on June 5.
                                                        1965
                                                                                                                           1967
 1
                                                                    1
                                                                                THE COURT: 2:00 p.m. June 5 for the hearing.
            MR. KEKER: No. We rest, as well.
 2
                                                                    2
            THE COURT: Let's talk about what you would
                                                                          Briefs May 22. And I'll make every effort to get out
                                                                    3
 3
       like to do next. I don't know if you have had a chance
                                                                          any obvious questions and tentatives on what's hanging
                                                                    4
 4
       to talk to each other.
 5
                                                                    5
            MR. KEKER: We sent a schedule --
                                                                               MR. KEKER: We owe a few things. We owe a
                                                                    6
 6
            Sorry. I interrupted you.
                                                                          motion dealing with Mr. Lambeck's declaration, which you
                                                                    7
            We sent a schedule proposing the following and
                                                                          invited us to make or said we could make after the
                                                                    8
 8
       we haven't heard back.
                                                                          trial. And we owe some Denham demonstratives.
                                                                    9
 9
            Opening briefs May 22. Argument, if it meets
                                                                               MR. PURCELL: These are exhibits that have been
                                                                   10
10
       the Court's -- doing like we did last time. Opening
                                                                          marked and admitted. We haven't delivered the marked
                                                                   11
11
       briefs, giving the Court the opportunity to read the
                                                                          copies to the clerk. We will try to do that as soon as
                                                                   12
12
       briefs. And if you wanted to send us questions ahead of
                                                                          possible.
13
                                                                   13
       time to be sure to address, like you did last time, that
                                                                                THE COURT: Maybe we can set a date by sometime
14
                                                                   14
       was extremely helpful.
                                                                          around -- let me try out the 7th of May as a date by
                                                                   15
15
            If you don't, we show up on June 4 and either
                                                                          which any pending motions that haven't been reduced to
16
                                                                   16
       answer your questions or simply argue our case and then
                                                                          writing can be made so that everybody knows what the end
17
                                                                   17
       you take it under submission. That's our proposal.
                                                                          is.
                                                                   18
18
            THE COURT: I may not be able to do those exact
                                                                               May 7, would that work for everybody? Motions
                                                                   19
19
       dates, but let me hear from Met as to your preferred
                                                                          to strike, for example.
20
                                                                   20
                                                                               MR. QUINN: That's fine, your Honor.
       course.
21
                                                                   21
                                                                               MR. KEKER: That's fine, your Honor. When I
            MR. QUINN: What Mr. Keker proposes seems fine
                                                                   22
22
       with us, your Honor. I am reminded that we did file a
                                                                          said Lambeck, I should have also said Woodcock.
                                                                   23
2.3
       motion for non-suit which the Court said it would
                                                                               THE COURT: Right.
24
                                                                   24
       consider at the close.
                                                                               MR. QUINN: And a date, oppositions a week
25
                                                                   25
            THE COURT: I will. I think I will consider
                                                                          later.
```

```
1
 1
            THE COURT: Do you want to fold it into your
                                                                                  REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
 2
                                                                    2
       brief in chief? Do you want it May 22?
 3
                                                                    3
            MR. QUINN: It might be easier, frankly, to
                                                                         STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 4
                                                                    4
       keep those separate.
                                                                                          ) ss
 5
            THE COURT: Okay. If we went about two weeks
                                                                    5
                                                                         COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA.
 6
                                                                    6
       after that, it would be roughly the 21st of May. A
       slightly different date for oppositions to motions.
 8
            MR. KEKER: Your Honor, could we ask for page
                                                                    8
                                                                           I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Shorthand
 9
                                                                    9
       limits? They don't need to be too tight but just in
                                                                         Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of
10
                                                                   10
       deference to you and in deference to all of us, if
                                                                         California, hereby certify:
11
       somebody files --
                                                                   11
                                                                            That the court proceedings were taken down by me in
12
            THE COURT: In deference to me.
                                                                   12
                                                                         stenotype at the time and place herein named and
13
            MR. KEKER: Twenty-five pages?
                                                                   13
                                                                         thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided
14
            MR. QUINN: How long were the -- I don't know.
                                                                   14
                                                                         transcription under my direction.
15
                                                                   15
            THE COURT: Met's briefs were very long in the
                                                                            I further certify that I am not interested in the
16
       first phase. They were too long. I will tell you, they
                                                                   16
                                                                         event of the action.
17
       were too long. They were really too long, and it didn't
                                                                   17
                                                                            WITNESS my hand this 30th day of April,
18
       help.
                                                                   18
                                                                         2015, at Santa Barbara, California.
19
            I have a vague recollection -- I pray I'm
                                                                   19
20
       wrong -- but they were closer to 70 or 80 pages or
                                                                   20
21
       something like that.
                                                                   21
2.2
            MR. KEKER: Some were 100.
                                                                                           Jain Sandfor
                                                                   22
23
            THE COURT: Some were 100 pages.
                                                                   23
                                                                                    TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR No. 3374
24
            Thirty-five pages. The issues are a little
                                                                   24
                                                                                    Certified Shorthand Reporter
2.5
       simpler. I'm flexible. Chief Justice Roberts said, he
                                                                   25
                                                                                    State of California
                                                        1969
                                                                                                                           1971
 1
       said, "I have never picked up a brief and put it down
 2
       and said to myself I wish it had been longer."
 3
             MR. QUINN: How about 40, your Honor?
 4
             THE COURT: Forty it is.
 5
             MR. KEKER: How about 37-and-a-half?
             THE COURT: Forty pages on May 22, but not
 7
       necessarily. They may even be shorter.
 8
             Thank you very much. I appreciate everyone's
 9
       help.
10
             (Trial concluded.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
18
19
20
2.1
22
2.3
2.4
25
                                                        1970
```

		•	-	-
<b>A</b>	adequately 1869:19	1934:20,22 1935:2,3	1950:16,18,20 1951:8	1862:13 1928:6
<b>a.m</b> 1845:3	adhere 1961:23	1935:7,12,19 1936:11	amounts 1899:14	<b>April</b> 1841:11,18
ability 1928:21 1944:21	adjust 1896:19 1947:7	1939:24 1940:11,11	1927:13 1949:19	1845:2 1850:21,24
1946:22 1947:6,19	administrative 1849:12	1940:14,17,21,25	analysis 1893:23	1851:4 1854:14
able 1853:5 1873:18	admission 1853:2	1944:10 1947:8	1905:23	1856:4 1857:6,13
	1961:13	1952:18,22 1953:24	analyze 1849:3 1909:2	1956:2 1971:17
1874:22 1880:5	admit 1849:17 1865:24	1953:24 1954:1	and/or 1892:4	Aqueduct 1884:9
1937:4 1953:3,10 1966:18	1866:19 1887:24	1957:7 1959:3,11,15	Angeles 1842:15,19	1899:13 1900:11
	admitted 1850:4	1959:16,20 1960:15	1871:11,15	1931:10 1934:7
absolutely 1894:11	1856:1,18 1858:2	1961:9,17 1963:12,13	ANN 1971:8	1935:22 1942:14,15
1964:22	1866:20 1956:21	1964:5,9,18	annexed 1866:4	1942:16 1945:5
accept 1867:19 1870:10	1957:4,12,17 1968:10	agreements 1884:1	annual 1844:4 1849:9	1946:25 1950:3,4
1891:3 1906:14	adopted 1841:10	1898:12	1859:4 1947:9,15	1952:11 1953:8
1909:16,19,20 1910:2	1850:23 1851:5,7,17	ahadlock@kvn.com	1950:2	area 1860:8 1861:8
1911:25 1912:11	1851:22,23 1852:9	1842:7	annually 1846:15	1887:5 1899:10
1929:4 1936:6	1853:13,21,22	ahead 1845:25 1872:6	1847:3 1932:13	1916:13 1960:19
1940:19	1854:13,17,21 1856:8	1882:2 1903:15	answer 1903:16	areas 1871:12
accepted 1870:9 1883:5		1907:8 1966:12	1912:20,21 1917:9,14	
1883:16	1857:3,6 1858:8			argue 1966:16
access 1852:24 1905:14	1904:4,13 1920:16	air 1911:8	1920:10 1922:13	argument 1918:14
1909:14 1910:11	1960:20	Alameda 1842:18	1923:16 1953:21	1965:20,21 1966:9
1911:15 1913:24	advance 1967:7,8	allocate 1860:17	1966:16	argumentative 1951:12
1915:25 1924:6	affect 1948:14	1942:6	answering 1902:6	arguments 1967:8
1929:22,24 1930:19	afternoon 1967:23	allocated 1868:12,14	1905:5	arrangement 1877:1
1931:2	agencies 1846:16	1868:18 1882:25	answers 1849:25	arrived 1900:6 1921:10
account 1867:10,15	1847:17 1848:3	1906:17	1917:23	arriving 1881:6
1897:8 1927:3,4	1870:18,24 1871:2,7	allocates 1846:15	anybody 1876:6	aside 1869:16,20
1928:15 1952:21,25	1871:9,12,19,22	allocation 1868:20	1887:14 1914:19	1925:9 1927:22
1963:19	1872:15,24,25	1869:19 1873:22	1959:6	1928:15 1951:20
accounting 1951:9	1874:24 1875:5,9	1874:8,10 1882:16	anyplace 1918:12	asked 1888:8 1890:7,10
accumulated 1846:17	1876:19 1884:19,21	1902:20 1924:3	anyway 1932:22	1901:23 1908:8
acre 1953:15	1884:25 1885:17	1942:25 1945:22	appeal 1880:12	1917:10 1918:2
acre-feet 1872:10	1886:1 1897:22	1948:17 1950:1,11	APPEARANCES	1919:22 1922:21
1899:17 1936:4	1898:7,8,11,17	1957:7	1842:1	1943:13 1955:1
1951:3,6,6,6,7	1899:2 1902:20	allocations 1874:4,19	appears 1855:25	1961:13
1952:11,16,20	1908:5 1920:19	1929:5	1866:3	asked-and-answered
1953:16,19	1921:9 1938:11,23	allotment 1950:23	Appellant 1893:8	1891:7
acre-foot 1876:21	1939:3,4 1940:12,15	<b>allow</b> 1880:7 1893:14	appendices 1865:9	asking 1858:19 1871:7
act 1846:8,12,24	1940:24 1941:2,4,7	1894:1 1902:10	Appendix 1866:7	1904:1,2 1912:19,23
1847:8 1848:8	1945:10 1948:1,9	1904:9	applicable 1940:12,23	1919:17 1925:1
1854:20 1857:13	1953:12 1959:17	allowable 1870:7	application 1897:4	1940:9 1943:24
1957:25 1959:9,13	1960:2,7	<b>allowed</b> 1873:19	1905:2	asserted 1907:12
1960:5	agency 1846:25 1868:1	1902:24	<b>applies</b> 1898:8 1909:18	assessing 1963:19
action 1922:24 1971:16	1871:3 1872:9,12	allowing 1879:14	apply 1898:18 1942:20	assessment 1864:24
add 1962:25 1965:19	1874:12 1884:24	alternative 1880:24	apportion 1904:6	assign 1860:17 1951:4
added 1926:14 1929:19	1920:6 1938:1,18,19	1881:8	apportioned 1904:14	assignment 1902:21
adding 1916:3	1938:20 1961:21,23	amended 1848:8	appreciate 1970:8	associate 1934:2
addition 1864:22	1962:4 1964:12	amendment 1905:3	appropriate 1861:19	associated 1860:11
1892:3	ago 1861:12 1882:15	amends 1963:13	1864:24 1869:19	1864:10 1931:18
additional 1871:2	1921:11,11	America 1863:6	1887:2 1901:14,20,21	1933:24 1942:1
1893:10,11	agree 1897:23 1909:11	1872:16 1957:8	1902:21 1903:24	ASSOCIATES
address 1893:1,15	1912:11 1962:21	American 1861:2	1906:11 1909:2	1841:22
1896:5 1966:13	agreed 1908:25	1862:25 1863:3,19,21	1915:18	association 1861:3
addressed 1869:16	agreement 1877:2	1863:24 1864:8	appropriately 1901:9	1862:25 1863:3,4,20
	1883:25 1914:12,13	amount 1861:19	1903:8	1863:25 1864:9
1870:6 1892:22,23 1893:2	1921:14 1931:12,24	1873:11,19 1885:10	appropriateness	1906:22
adds 1965:21	1932:20,24 1933:2,11	1898:18 1931:12	1906:10	assume 1903:11 1918:6
	1933:17,21,21 1934:1	1934:6,21 1935:14	approve 1851:20	1919:18 1938:16
adequacy 1886:18	1934:5,8,14,15,16,18	1947:11,15 1949:24	approximately 1862:2	1964:13
1895:25 1899:9	,.,.,.,.,.,.			., ., ., .
	Ī		i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	

assuming 1927:16 assumption 1900:24 1936:23 attached 1849:25 1865:4.8 attachment 1852:22 1853:12 attack 1895:1 **attention** 1896:16 1897:12 attorneys 1876:4 attributable 1924:7 **AUDREY** 1842:4 augment 1884:23 augmentation 1884:22 authenticity 1957:23 author 1961:16 authored 1865:3 authoritative 1860:21 authorities 1861:10 Authority 1841:6 1847:23 1865:14 1869:24 1871:14 1932:5 1933:23 1934:2,22,24 1939:6 1954:14,15 1957:1 Authority's 1960:18 availability 1947:18 available 1873:16 1877:6.25 1878:1.3.8 1878:9 1883:24 1885:8,9,15 1886:7 1887:7 1889:4,25 1897:15 1948:5,10,12 1949:5 1950:13,14 **AWA** 1863:15 aware 1867:1,5,8,9 1883:23 1884:1 1890:11 1914:15,18 1919:4 1934:4,10 1940:13 1941:18 awful 1948:7 В

## B 1842:13 1866:7 back 1850:17,18 1854:12 1855:10 1857:6 1876:9 1898:4 1900:15 1912:13 1915:1 1917:4 1921:2 1922:2 1926:23 1927:9,22 1937:22 1952:2,4 1963:11 1966:8

**ball** 1962:2 **Barbara** 1971:5,9,18 **base** 1861:7 **based** 1846:16 1857:3,5

1869:1 1871:16 1878:11 1897:22 1913:8 1937:1 1939:3 1939:5 1941:11 1942:6.16 1943:1 basic 1860:22 basically 1899:17 1953:21 1958:7.8 basis 1876:21 1909:3 1911:5 1937:7 1949:10 **batch** 1956:10 Bates 1856:10 **Battery** 1841:24 1842:6 **battle** 1963:1,7 bear 1901:7 1903:7 bears 1963:10 **beginning** 1898:10 1909:18 1950:21 behalf 1964:12 **belabor** 1910:6 believe 1849:11 1859:8 1865:6,7,8,10 1869:20 1873:9 1874:9 1895:22 1900:7,13 1905:21,24 1906:4 1912:3 1913:8 1930:21 1957:20 1958:23 benefit 1869:6 1883:22 1901:20 1961:6 **benefits** 1901:20 1960:3.7 **Bennion** 1856:23 1857:2 1858:14 **best** 1876:5 1887:18 better 1885:8 1898:9 **Beverly** 1871:11,15 big 1870:13 1872:12 1875:3 1937:10 bigger 1872:8 biggest 1873:20 **binder** 1849:21 1852:17 **bit** 1880:21 1942:13 black 1875:3,5 1885:7 1903:22 1945:2 blend 1937:6.16.17.18 1937:22 1938:2,10,16 1938:21,22 1942:2,7 1942:17,21 1943:2,11 1944:4,6,23 1945:7 1946:22 1947:7,20 1948:14,18 1958:19

1964:25 1965:3

**blended** 1942:18

1947:2

**blending** 1934:10 1936:24 1937:2 1941:12 1943:24 1945:8,12,15 1960:1 1960:3.12 1963:4.21 1963:22 blends 1937:24 1938:5 1939:3.5 1942:3 1958.16 blinders 1965:7,16 block 1953:4 **blocked** 1951:19 Blow 1852:3 board 1850:23 1851:5 1851:7,13,16,17,19 1851:22 1852:3,6,9 1852:21,22 1853:8,11 1853:14 1854:14,19 1857:9,12 1859:2 1864:1,13,18 1899:4 1917:6,12 1920:16 1921:12,22,24 1922:23 1923:10 1924:11 1925:10,13 1925:21 1926:2,5,8 1927:17,23 1928:22 1928:25 1929:12 board's 1960:20 **boards** 1960:20 **bodies** 1861:16.24 body 1862:4,21 bonds 1860:12 1878:18 1878:20,21,25 1879:5 1882:19,21,24 1888:14 1932:12,15 1932:18 1943:14,15 book 1854:10 boss 1858:12 **bother** 1965:5 **bottom** 1858:4 1887:5 1962:14 box 1875:3,5 1885:7 1903:22 1945:2 Boy 1940:6 **branches** 1893:16 **BRAUNIG** 1842:5 breach 1915:19 **breached** 1915:17 break 1850:8 1857:16 1955:14 **breaking** 1954:17 **Brian** 1858:10,10,12 **Brian/Sid** 1858:5 brief 1844:14 1956:25 1969:2 1970:1 briefing 1881:8 briefs 1966:9,11,12

1969:15 bring 1874:20 1894:18 1945:3 brought 1884:3,6,8 **BROWN** 1841:22 **budgeted** 1872:11 **built** 1878:19 **bumped** 1874:8 **bunch** 1957:8 burden 1901:19 1935:4 **business** 1872:19 **buving** 1940:4 buys 1885:23,25 bypass 1946:2,4,7,18 **bypassed** 1946:8  $\mathbf{C}$ C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-... 1859:24 C-O-T-T-I-N-I 1892:22 **C.V** 1866:5 CA 1841:24 Cal.App.4th 1887:19 1888:4 1891:19,20 1892:22,25 calculate 1916:21,23 1916:25 1917:3 1918:3,13 1919:1,12 1919:13 1920:4 1924:9 1926:21 1928:7 calculated 1891:3 1896:9 1911:21 1924:5,8 1925:14,15 calculates 1847:3 1931:9 calculating 1936:24 **calculation** 1846:7,11

1846:13,20 1847:7,15 1847:18 1848:1,3,6,9 1848:12 1896:14 1911:16,18,19 1915:4 1915:11,13 1928:10 1928:13 1937:5 calculations 1847:21 1896:7.13 1899:12 1916:16 calendar 1967:14 **California** 1841:1,9,11 1841:17 1842:6,11,15 1842:19 1845:1 1873:6 1875:16,22 1876:24 1877:4,16,21 1878:16,19 1882:21 1883:3,12 1905:3 1947:24 1948:7 1956:1 1971:3,10,18

1971:25 call 1869:1 1880:2,15 1894:13 1896:16 1897:12 1905:18 1908:6 1939:22 1951:3 called 1859:17 1861:1 1862:11.25 1881:20 1890:12 1905:4 calling 1880:17 1956:7 calls 1845:22 1859:13 1879:11 1939:24 Canada 1863:6 canal 1944:13 capacity 1847:13,25 1877:5,8,22,24 1883:7 1885:8,9,14 1922:6 1935:23,25 capital 1885:13 care 1958:8 1963:20 1964:1,2,6 career 1861:13 cares 1961:18 1962:2 case 1841:7 1849:13 1867:17 1868:10 1869:14 1876:1,18,18 1876:22 1880:24 1882:17 1883:24 1887:18,18,20 1888:2 1888:12 1891:21 1893:3,7,7,8 1899:18 1900:18 1902:1 1903:15 1907:21,22 1914:19,25 1919:19 1920:3,25 1928:1 1950:10 1964:15 1966:16 cases 1887:3 1888:14 1890:19 1891:14,18 1892:17,25 1894:6 categorize 1953:16 categorizing 1952:15 **causation** 1869:2,3 1901:19 1902:8,24 1903:25 1932:9 1934:3 1943:18,20 cause 1869:5 1883:21 1897:16 1933:3,17 1934:3 1962:16 caused 1868:24,24 1903:20,22 1915:19 1916:11 1933:12 causes 1868:18 1935:17 caveat 1856:1 CCP 1886:20 1890:11 1890:21 certain 1873:15 1877:24 1878:4

1967:10,12 1968:2

1004.1 1002.5 1000 0	ahaasa 1051.2	1040-25 1050-2 4	20mmon ==-4= 1027:10	1059.16
1884:1 1893:5 1898:8 1898:17 1908:19,22	<b>choose</b> 1951:2 <b>chooses</b> 1949:7,19	1949:25 1950:3,4 1951:2 1952:11,12,16	components 1926:19 1926:23	1958:16 construction 1847:11
1908:24 1910:12,23	chose 1922:13 1939:11	1951:2 1952:11,12,10	compound 1951:11,13	1878:21
1923:3 1928:3	Christopher 1843:4	1954:2 1955:2 1958:9	computer-aided	constructs 1847:24
1931:18 1958:14	1859:13,16,23	1958:11 1959:19,21	1971:13	construed 1894:7
1959:10 1960:23	circumstance 1846:23	1960:14 1961:1,10	conceding 1957:10	consult 1850:8
1961:18,24 1962:11	1886:10	1960:14 1961:1,10	concern 1958:18	consultants 1863:5
1963:6,15	circumstances 1908:20	1965:9,10,15,18	1959:11 1963:4	contends 1920:2
certainly 1863:7	1908:22,24 1945:13	column 1923:4	1964:3	content 1963:17
1867:19 1870:11	1945:14	come 1855:10 1860:18	concerned 1880:11	continue 1845:7,11
1888:10 1889:1,3	cite 1887:18 1888:3	1882:16 1888:5	1883:24 1959:6,7	1876:6 1894:2
1899:5 1905:13	1891:17	1894:19 1895:8,9	1963:17	1918:20
1906:14 1909:16	cities 1871:10	1911:22 1917:23	concluded 1905:9	continued 1853:19,21
1914:7 1921:16	City 1871:15 1891:20	1921:12,23 1929:7	1970:10	contract 1875:24,24
1941:15 1948:17	Civil 1887:16	1930:18 1934:25	conclusion 1879:22	1881:24 1889:21
CERTIFICATE	<b>claim</b> 1861:7	1942:12,13,15,17,19	1901:16 1906:15,18	1915:15,19 1944:17
1971:1	<b>claims</b> 1915:17	1947:2 1955:7	1913:16	1964:24
Certified 1971:8,24	Clark 1888:3	1957:24 1965:13	conclusions 1867:7	contractors 1878:22
certify 1971:10,15	classes 1868:15,24	comes 1873:20 1888:19	1886:17 1895:25	1879:1,2,3,4
chairman 1863:20,23	classification 1906:24	1890:5,6 1894:17	concurred 1879:22	contractual 1875:11
1864:16	1906:25	1931:10,12,13,16,17	conducted 1893:9	1877:15 1944:18
<b>chance</b> 1849:3 1966:3	classified 1906:17	1932:5 1945:4,5,8	configuration 1894:17	contradiction 1891:6
change 1898:24,25	clear 1888:15 1935:12	1947:12	1945:10	contradicts 1890:18
1922:25 1923:1	clearcut 1925:6	coming 1866:13 1875:4	<b>confines</b> 1902:11	contribute 1960:2
1924:2 1929:4	<b>clearer</b> 1889:23	1879:25 1900:24	confirm 1859:8	contributed 1864:2
1933:17 1937:2,24	clearest 1887:18	1903:12,13,18,21,22	<b>confuse</b> 1855:13	contribution 1864:6
<b>changed</b> 1896:18	<b>clearly</b> 1888:24	1945:18,21,24 1946:1	confused 1915:9	contributor 1864:12
1899:5 1939:20	1924:20	1951:2	1939:1	control 1872:22 1873:1
<b>changes</b> 1873:24	clerk 1855:8 1859:21	commensurate 1960:7	confusing 1909:25	1946:22 1947:19
1897:10,16 1920:20	1968:11	<b>comment</b> 1886:24	confusion 1924:13	controversy 1956:9
1923:25 1924:1	<b>clients</b> 1884:16	1961:8	connection 1847:24	convenience 1934:11
1952:1	close 1966:24	comments 1887:1	1852:7 1861:15	<b>conveyance</b> 1905:10,15
changing 1899:6	<b>closer</b> 1969:20	1899:8 1909:9	1867:11	1915:23 1938:23
1914:20	CMC 1888:22 1889:16	Commissioners	<b>connections</b> 1847:11,12	1940:16,18,24
characterize 1939:19	1892:2,19 1893:20,22	1906:23	consensus 1921:15	conveyed 1940:13
<b>charge</b> 1847:13,13,25	Code 1886:23 1887:15	<b>commit</b> 1898:13	consequences 1900:4	copies 1957:21 1967:6
1847:25 1896:10	1887:22	commitment 1897:25	conservation 1884:22	1968:11
1907:16 1918:7	collect 1896:20	commitments 1898:15	1909:4 1947:14	<b>copy</b> 1852:25 1853:6
1922:6,7 1924:9	collecting 1929:6	1898:17	conserved 1947:10	1853:10 1856:12
1928:17 1931:9	<b>Collins</b> 1887:19	committed 1899:3	consider 1966:24,25	1857:1 1866:2,6
1932:4 1941:3	1890:19 1891:23	1950:23	consideration 1847:22	correct 1850:25 1851:1
<b>charged</b> 1898:7 1901:9	<b>Colorado</b> 1873:8,16	committee 1863:21,24	1950:18	1851:2,6 1854:15
1903:8 1905:10,15	1884:9 1894:18,19	1864:8,11,14,16	considerations 1940:4	1856:25 1858:18,22
1913:4,5 1917:8	1899:12,20,21,22	committees 1864:1	considering 1872:21	1879:7 1888:7
1940:4,15,25 1941:1	1900:8,9,9,11	commodity 1876:21	consisted 1864:6	1900:20 1901:1
1941:3,4,5,7,8	1909:19 1912:5	companies 1861:11	consistent 1852:10	1905:20 1906:19
charges 1847:12	1928:2 1930:5,15,19	1872:15	1853:15 1873:11,17	1915:20 1924:12
1861:4,19 1863:23	1931:10,13,25	comparison 1920:18	1881:10 1910:13	1925:23 1927:6
1864:8,10 1868:3	1932:21 1933:7,12	compelling 1911:1	1960:4 1963:14	1929:2,9,23 1930:4,8
1896:18,20 1897:17	1934:7 1935:5,8,9,10	compensate 1960:10	Constitution 1905:3	1930:17 1932:17
1902:19 1905:19	1935:22 1936:10	complaining 1960:24	constitutional 1905:3	1935:16 1939:15
1910:10 1912:5,8	1938:3,17,20 1939:17	complete 1958:21	constrained 1935:23	1943:3,12 1944:3
1915:23 1916:18	1939:24 1940:1,5,22	completely 1926:20	1936:1,3,3	1949:2,8
1010 00 1004 1	1942:14,15,16	1941:10	constraint 1936:2	corrected 1861:19
1918:22 1934:1		1 4 1040 10		L 00 mm 0 of ly: 1006 · 17
charging 1928:2	1944:21 1945:5,16,18	completes 1848:18	1949:21	correctly 1906:17
<b>charging</b> 1928:2 <b>check</b> 1936:13 1952:17	1944:21 1945:5,16,18 1945:19,24 1946:9,14	complicated 1875:6	constraints 1940:8	1913:21
charging 1928:2	1944:21 1945:5,16,18			

	1	1	i	i
1851:8 1867:20	couple 1849:3 1850:9	1867:10,14,16,19	1900:5 1903:15	degree 1847:23 1899:6
1869:2,3 1884:15	1891:14,17 1929:14	1869:17,21 1896:8	1909:22 1912:4	degrees 1921:13
1901:14,19 1902:8,24	1936:21 1946:24	1899:1 1906:13,14	1914:19,25 1915:12	deliberate 1921:7
1903:19,24 1906:11	1967:2	1909:12,16,20,24	1915:14 1916:4,14,15	deliver 1940:2 1947:14
1908:1,7 1919:25	course 1857:18	1910:4,13 1911:7,25	1916:22,23 1917:1,3	1951:20
1929:4 1930:11	1886:12 1966:20	1912:11,15 1913:2,8	1917:7,25 1919:14,18	delivered 1877:9
1932:9,9,10 1934:3	court 1841:1 1845:6,9	1925:11 1926:6,12	1925:9,12,14 1926:7	1933:25 1944:12
1942:11,14 1943:18	1845:11,24 1848:19	1927:22 1928:1	1926:11,21,24,25	1954:1 1960:11
1943:20	1849:5,17,22 1850:2	1929:13 1966:10	1927:21 1928:6,8,10	1968:10
cost-of-service 1850:21	1850:4,13,15,17	courtesy 1967:6	1936:25 1939:5	deliveries 1942:12
1851:3,8,11,18,19,21	1852:13,16,23 1853:4	cover 1851:25 1870:2	damaging 1962:16	1954:9
1851:23 1852:9	1855:23,25 1856:16	covered 1927:20	1963:17	delivering 1960:23
1853:12,14,20 1854:5	1856:18 1857:18,20	1943:20	DAN 1842:4	delivers 1958:22
1854:8,16 1856:5	1857:25 1858:2	covers 1868:2	databases 1890:23,24	delta 1899:24
1857:3,5,11 1858:16	1859:8,11,14 1860:2	CPF-10-510830 1841:7	date 1851:4 1858:21	demand 1876:17
1858:20 1860:10	1861:24 1862:2,3,13	CPF-12-512466 1841:8	1934:5 1968:13,14,24	1897:9,9
1868:6,7,8 1869:12	1862:21 1864:5	CRA 1900:10,12	1969:7	demanding 1886:1
1869:18 1870:3,6	1865:2,23 1866:10,16	create 1879:6 1931:2	dated 1849:24 1854:25	demands 1874:24
costs 1851:6,22	1866:19 1867:2,5,18	created 1929:21	1857:23 1866:16	demands 1674.24 demonstrated 1911:9
1860:16,18,19	1870:14 1871:8	1930:14	1959:1	demonstratives 1968:8
1864:24 1867:21	1872:5 1876:3	credibility 1963:19	dates 1966:19	<b>Denham</b> 1869:23
1868:11,14,18,19,20	1877:14 1879:13,19	credit 1848:2,3	day 1881:7 1887:11	1870:1,5 1886:13
1868:25 1869:5,11,19	1880:7,19,25 1881:10	credits 1847:5,22	1937:2 1971:17	1887:2,7,10 1888:8
		criteria 1941:12	days 1886:22 1887:9,15	1889:9 1891:2,10
1870:2,6,9 1877:8 1878:11 1881:18	1882:1,11 1887:4,23 1888:1,3,4,12,14	criticism 1929:16	deal 1881:17 1933:7	1892:3 1896:7,14
1883:6,17,20,21	1889:4,8,10 1890:20	critique 1888:8,24	1935:14	1899:11 1909:10,11
1884:17 1885:1,2,4	1891:12,22 1892:13	1889:2,21 1890:4	dealing 1968:6	1910:10,16 1911:12
1885:12,18 1896:9,11	1892:16 1894:7,9	1897:4,7	dealings 1871:17	1910:10,10 1911:12
1897:16 1899:13,17	1895:19 1898:2	critiqued 1911:3	deals 1964:12	1915.21 1915.21 1916:16 1918:10,21
1899:18,20,20 1900:8	1900:23 1901:2	CROSS 1843:2	dealt 1894:4	1910:10 1918:10,21
1900:9,10,10 1901:9		Cross-examination	decade 1898:11 1921:4	
1900.9,10,10 1901.9	1902:6,10,14,16,23 1903:12 1904:9,18		1921:22	1925:2,7,12 1926:12 1926:17 1928:4,14
1901.20,21 1902.20	1905.12 1904.9,18	1848:20,22 1904:18 1904:20 1906:1	decades 1861:9	1920:17 1928:4,14
	1908:10 1909:25	CSR 1841:20 1971:8	December 1950:6,16	1950:2 1968:8
1904:6,14 1905:10 1906:10,16 1907:1,2		1971:23	decide 1864:15 1876:5	Denham's 1866:9
1907:19,23 1908:3,5	1910:6,22,25 1911:3 1912:17,21,23	current 1848:9 1852:11	1918:7 1929:3	1886:18 1887:10
1907:19,23 1908:3,3	1912:17,21,23	1853:16 1864:19	1931:15	1888:9,25 1891:8
1911:12,14 1912:1,12	1915:6 1917:14,18	1886:9	decided 1881:23	1895:8,25 1897:5,8
1912:18,24,24 1913:4	1918:17 1919:6	<b>Currently</b> 1847:9	1917:22	1899:9 1919:11
1913:23 1914:9	1922:14,18 1923:17	Curtis 1841:3 1845:4	decides 1948:16	denominator 1899:11
1918:4,5,8 1924:6,17	1924:20 1925:11	customers 1868:15	decision 1880:13,16	1899:22 1900:1
1925:11 1927:20	1924.20 1923.11	1871:5 1872:11	1881:15,21 1890:2	1911:22 1929:15
1928:3,4 1930:9,11	1929:17 1933:1	1904:6,15	1906:13 1911:7	<b>Department</b> 1841:4
1930:24,25 1931:18	1936:15,18 1941:21	cutback 1875:3	1926:6	1845:4 1873:5,9
1930:24,23 1931:18	1949:12,14 1951:13	CULDACK 10/J.J	decisions 1924:20	1875:16,22 1876:12
1931:19,20,22,22	1949.12,14 1931.13	D	declaration 1844:15	1876:24 1877:16,21
1932.3 1933.4,3,9,10	1954.12 1955.12,15	<b>D</b> 1843:1	1957:14 1968:6	dependent 1872:24
1935:12,18,22,24	1950:3,16,19,21	DALE 1842:14	Defendant 1842:11	depending 1852:8
1942:24 1943:5,19	1958:5 1959:14	Dam 1873:10	1843:6 1859:17	1853:13 1874:19
Cottini 1892:22	1938.3 1939.14	damage 1881:8	DEFENDANT'S	1942:20 1960:9
counsel 1842:17	1962:19 1963:24	1911:16 1912:2	1843:2	deposed 1887:9,10
1923:14	1964:22 1965:6,19,25	1911:10 1912:2	<b>Defendants</b> 1841:14	1891:11
counting 1861:12	1966:2,11,18,23,25	1928:12 1939:10	Defense 1962:12	deposing 1888:20
County 1841:2 1865:13	1967:5,13,17,20,24	1962:16,23 1963:23	defenses 1892:6	deposition 1841:23
1871:14 1932:4	1968:1,13,23 1969:1	damaged 1913:9,14	deference 1969:10,10	1887:7 1888:10,17
1934:22 1939:9	1968.1,13,23 1969.1	damages 1875:24	1969:12	1889:3,15,25 1890:7
1954:13,15 1956:25	1970:4,6 1971:11	1880:24 1881:25	definition 1929:25	1891:8 1893:14,25
1934.13,13 1930.23	Court's 1866:23	1889:21 1896:11	definitive 1913:1	1895:3 1905:17
19/1.5,9	Court \$ 1000.23	1007.21 1070.11	ucimitive 1713.1	1095.5 1905.17
	I	I	I	I

1906:9 1907:24	1956:25 1958:12,18	distinction 1894:6,21		escaping 1945:12
1908:8 1909:1 1918:2	1959:16 1962:8	distribute 1874:23	E 1841:3 1843:1	escrow 1914:16,18
1918:9 1919:9,22	1963:15 1964:1	1875:8 1885:25		1927:3,4,14 1928:14
1924:16,25 1925:5	1965:25 1967:3	distributed 1868:15	E.A 1845:4	especially 1872:21
1956:14,18	Diego's 1893:23 1927:4	distribution 1864:25	earlier 1866:5 1906:13	espoused 1892:24
depositions 1887:12	1941:7 1957:24	district 1841:9,11	1951:23	ESQ 1842:3,4,4,5,5,13
desalination 1884:22	difference 1851:7,25	1842:11 1867:25	early 1950:1	1842:14,14,18
describe 1864:5	1879:9 1880:2 1881:6	1871:3 1882:22	easier 1969:3	essence 1868:3
described 1871:17	1882:7	1884:18 1885:23	Easterby 1888:3,12	essentially 1868:22
1874:11 1916:17,19	different 1851:10,20	1887:20 1891:19,21	1889:14 1893:3,7,17	1877:3 1896:8
DESCRIPTION	1860:15 1865:5	1907:20 1935:1,20	1893:17,19 1894:24	1899:12
1844:2	1868:13,15,23	1944:14 1950:5	Eastern 1954:10,16,22	establishing 1860:22
designated 1880:14	1870:16 1871:12,12	1954:25	easy 1923:2	1900:8
1889:20	1871:19 1873:3	districts 1861:10	edition 1864:17,18,20	event 1887:17 1971:16
designations 1956:15	1875:5,22 1876:12	1871:11,19 1954:16	editions 1864:4	eventually 1940:2
1956:18	1877:1 1878:22	1954:22	editorial 1864:13,18	1952:19,23
<b>detailed</b> 1852:9	1898:5 1899:2	divide 1942:11,14	effect 1903:14 1907:16	everybody 1869:10,11
1853:14	1904:12 1914:3	divided 1899:13,21	1914:4 1918:3 1920:5	1879:24 1892:13
determination 1868:17	1917:18,23 1922:9	1900:10 1930:12	1930:21 1933:3,8	1932:6 1936:18
1873:25 1882:15	1924:14 1925:19	1931:5	1934:3 1947:4	1941:13 1962:20
1906:6	1926:2 1927:9,12,13	dividing 1899:19	<b>EFFECTIVE</b> 1841:12	1968:16,18
<b>determine</b> 1845:19	1920:2 1927:9,12,13	division 1930:5	effort 1864:19 1898:10	everyone's 1970:8
1860:15 1868:23,25	1942:3,3 1944:19	1942:25	1968:2	evidence 1844:2
1942:5	1957:8 1961:20	document 1853:2	either 1947:25 1961:19	1849:10,12 1850:1,5
determines 1873:22	1964:4 1969:7	1890:17 1956:13	1966:15	1852:20,21 1853:3,5
determining 1847:6	differential 1960:9	1959:1	elasticity 1897:9	1853:9 1856:2,19
1861:11 1868:16	differently 1897:25	documents 1875:11	electronically 1953:1	1858:3 1859:5
1900:5	difficult 1888:21	1956:8,11 1957:19,24	elements 1847:14	1865:19 1866:9,14,21
developed 1920:17	1941:15	1957:25 1958:12,25	<b>eligible</b> 1884:19	1895:9,10 1911:1
Devendra 1957:14	direct 1843:2 1845:16	1961:15 1963:3	else's 1878:1	1919:7 1956:9,14,23
<b>Diamond</b> 1946:2,3	1848:18 1860:4	doing 1875:2 1886:25	email 1842:7,8,8,9,9,16	1957:2,5,9,13,15,18
1955:8,8	direction 1971:14	1921:5 1924:12	1844:3,8,9,10	1962:20 1963:10
<b>Diego</b> 1841:6 1844:14	directly 1948:1	1953:6,19 1966:10	1849:19,20,24 1856:1	exact 1892:1 1966:18
1847:22 1848:15	directors 1864:1	dollar 1919:13	1856:12,21 1857:22	exactly 1877:20 1883:2
1851:1 1853:25	disagree 1910:1,18,20	dollars 1919:10	1858:4,21 1889:25	1897:6 1919:20
1858:23 1865:13	1911:12,17,18,19,20	dory 1880:4	EMANUEL 1842:12	examination 1845:16
1869:23 1871:14	1911:22	doubts 1903:14	1842:13 1967:23	1848:18 1860:4
1883:25 1886:15	disagreement 1870:1	dozen 1862:15	emergencies 1886:2	1941:23 1954:7
1892:1 1893:22	disallowable 1870:12	dpurcell@kvn.com	emphasize 1879:16	example 1850:13
1894:1 1900:17	disclaimer 1893:4	1842:8	employed 1901:19	1869:8 1880:1
1901:9 1903:6,8	disclosed 1887:6	Dr 1890:23	employment 1846:2	1894:14,15 1897:13
1904:7,15,24 1907:12	1893:8	drop 1934:18	ends 1874:17	1926:25 1929:6
1909:12 1910:11	disclosure 1844:12	drops 1934:25	engaged 1862:9	1938:15 1941:3
1911:24 1912:3	1892:19	droughts 1886:3	engagement 1886:12	1961:24 1968:19
1913:9,13,23 1915:16	discovery 1889:6	<b>DTX</b> 1844:12,13,14,15	<b>engagements</b> 1861:23 <b>England</b> 1863:18,25	exceed 1898:8
1915:16 1916:12	discretion 1934:12,23	1844:16,17,18	enter 1898:11	exceeds 1888:16
1920:1 1924:10	1935:1,20 1944:7,14	1850:13,19 1851:3		Excepts 1844:4
1925:24 1926:24	1958:21 1965:2	1852:1,1,8,14 1854:4	entered 1849:13 entire 1852:1	excerpts 1849:9
1927:9,17 1928:23	discussed 1874:20	1865:9,25 1866:7,19		excess 1861:9,13
1932:4,20 1933:22	1882:14 1892:24	1866:21 1896:17	entirely 1934:11	1934:7
1934:2,17,22 1935:4	1893:17 1924:22	1902:15 1937:11	entirety 1853:7	exchange 1845:20
1935:21 1938:16	discussion 1853:4	1956:14,21,23,24	entities 1872:17 1957:8 entitled 1910:1	1883:23 1900:17
1939:6,9,16,24	1939:1	1957:4,5,6,12,13,15		1901:6,11,23 1903:5
1940:2,4 1944:12,24	disparate 1864:14	1957:18,22	equal 1947:9,11	1903:20 1912:7
1945:9 1947:15	display 1853:8	dump 1952:12	1949:19 1950:9	1914:12,13 1931:12
1949:1,7 1950:23	dispute 1914:16	dumped 1955:3	equally 1869:11 1890:2	1931:24 1932:20,24
1951:21 1952:18	1957:23 1963:11	DWR 1877:12	equitably 1868:25	1933:2,11,17,21,23
1954:1,9,13,15	disputes 1861:18		equivalent 1935:14 ERIC 1842:13	1934:5,8,14,15,16,18
			ENIC 1042.13	
	Ī	ı	1	1

1934:20 1935:2,3,21
1936:11 1939:7,9,23
1940:2,10,11,14,21 1941:1,3,9 1942:22
1941:1,3,9 1942:22
1944:10,12 1947:8,9
1948:15 1950:22
1951:4,8 1952:17,22
1953:18,23,24 1954:2
1959:3,11 1960:15
1961:9,17,22 1962:9
1963:12 1964:5,9,18
exclude 1895:15 1967:4
excluded 1890:20
excluding 1846:18
<b>exclusively</b> 1944:21,22
excuse 1850:12
1865:18 1872:3
1886:19 1911:13
excused 1955:13
exercise 1943:6
exhibit 1857:21
1962:12
exhibits 1844:1 1849:7
1849:10 1859:4
1950:2 1957:21
1968:9
<b>existed</b> 1932:10 1933:9
existing 1897:23
expectation 1888:18
expectations 1963:15
expects 1961:18
<b>expenditure</b> 1885:3,5,6
expenditures 1868:13
1883:22 1885:14
1883:22 1885:14 expense 1883:10
<b>expense</b> 1883:10
<b>expense</b> 1883:10 <b>expenses</b> 1860:19
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24 1894:13,14 1895:17
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24 1894:13,14 1895:17 1905:2
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24 1894:13,14 1895:17 1905:2 expert's 1886:24
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24 1894:13,14 1895:17 1905:2 expert's 1886:24 1893:4 1895:14
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24 1894:13,14 1895:17 1905:2 expert's 1886:24 1893:4 1895:14 expertise 1860:8
expense 1883:10 expenses 1860:19 1868:2,4,23 1870:10 1882:15,16,17 1883:14 1916:18 experience 1848:6,11 1871:17 1874:13 expert 1844:12 1845:23 1861:5,8,15,25 1862:9,17,20,22 1865:13 1867:8 1869:23 1880:15,17 1881:3,4 1882:9 1886:20,24 1887:15 1888:15,18,20 1889:5 1889:5,12,20,22 1890:3,4,12,13 1892:20 1893:8,24 1894:13,14 1895:17 1905:2 expert's 1886:24 1893:4 1895:14

experts 1879:21,25 1880:5 1887:21 1888:5 1892:5 1902:3 1917:21 1929:7 explain 1870:23 1873:14 1874:16 1896:6 1898:2 1906:2 1942:9 1954:12 **express** 1963:4 expressed 1867:8 expression 1961:15 extent 1873:16 1887:5 1959.6 extract 1894:25 extraordinarily 1874:6 extremely 1966:14

F facetious 1948:6 facility 1881:5 fact 1853:19 1877:6 1890:15,23 1895:1 1901:5 1903:5,10,13 1906:20 1949:23 1963:5,18 factor 1872:21 factory 1872:19 facts 1887:1 1894:5,8 1894:16,21 1965:17 failed 1957:2 **fair** 1871:16 1889:10 1889:11 1891:3 1926:10 1941:10 1963:18 fairly 1860:17 1869:1 1869:18 1873:17 1874:7 1882:25 1904:5,14 1926:20 1932:4 **fairness** 1893:14 1895:2 falsity 1890:14,22 familiar 1846:3 1887:4 1887:25 1905:7 familiarity 1871:18 far 1910:20 1928:20 1934:7,7 1950:22 **farther** 1955:8 faulted 1889:24 **features** 1874:13 **February** 1889:18,19 1893:22 **feeling** 1921:16 fees 1861:4 1864:10 feet 1953:15 field 1860:21 1879:23 fifth 1864:17 Figueroa 1842:15

figure 1926:21,23 1938:10 figured 1928:11,15,17 **file** 1886:21 1888:10 1966:22 1967:12 filed 1849:1 1888:22 1956:17,17,25 files 1969:11 filing 1891:9 **final** 1857:3,7,10 **finalize** 1853:24 1858:16 **finalized** 1854:1,2,6,9 1854:18,23 1857:5 1858:8,20 finally 1850:6,7 **finance** 1878:18 **financial** 1845:19 1863:21 1875:12 **financing** 1860:10,11 find 1871:2 **finding** 1870:5 fine 1966:21 1967:17 1967:22 1968:20,21 finish 1912:20,21 1915:7 fire 1967:3 1968:4 **firm** 1912:16 1913:7 first 1849:7 1857:4 1859:22 1865:21 1867:20 1872:8 1879:20 1880:9 1886:21 1893:12 1915:7 1917:4 1951:3 1956:10,13 1962:15 1969:16 fiscal 1850:20 1854:7 Fish 1891:18 **five** 1864:13 1874:9 1922:22 1936:15,17 1936:18 1964:23 **five-minute** 1857:16 fixed 1847:12 1932:9 1933:3,9 1943:19 flexible 1969:25 Floor 1841:24 1842:15 **focused** 1958:13 fold 1969:1 folks 1936:14 follow 1852:24 1853:6 1940:6 **following** 1852:18 1961:15 1963:25 1966:7 follows 1845:14 1859:18 forget 1928:8

formation 1964:9 former 1885:13 1964:7 **formula** 1943:9 forthcoming 1893:12 Forty 1970:4,6 forward 1925:10 1927:20 foul 1879:15 **found** 1918:15 1926:12 1926:13 foundation 1890:15 1894:14 1900:22 **four** 1847:14 1861:9 1864:13 1869:13 1892:3 1900:18 1909:22 1912:2 1913:10,14,25,25 1914:20 1915:1 1916:1 1917:7 1922:9 1932:2 1939:6 fours 1912:4 fourth 1864:17 fraction 1900:2 frame 1903:3 Francisco 1841:2,16,17 1841:24 1842:6 1845:1 1956:1 frankly 1870:10 1899:15 1965:7 1969:3 Friday 1849:24 Friedman 1890:21 Friedman's 1890:20 front 1850:20 1866:6 1950:10 fulfill 1871:4 1936:11 full 1873:19 1877:8 1896:5 1913:15 1936:8,9 fully 1868:5 1916:23,25 1917:3 1928:7 **function** 1885:7 functionalized 1868:12 funds 1960:2 **further** 1845:14 1889:15 1893:9 1904:17 1941:19 1948:19 1954:5,7 1955:10,11 1971:15 future 1885:13,13 1929:5 G gallon 1876:20 gallons 1899:17

game 1891:4 1899:5

1914:8

**GANS** 1842:14

**GARY** 1842:14 gather 1928:6 general 1842:17 1864:5 1868:8 1870:24 1871:6 1886:17 1895:24 1902:18 1904:1 1915:11 1917:25 1964:13 generally 1873:7 1876:20 1883:5 1887:4 1905:4,7 1906:9 1940:12,23 1962:4 generated 1851:10,24 generic 1924:19 gentleman 1894:15 getting 1858:25 1874:1 1915:9 1928:20 1945:7 1951:7 1952:10,11 1953:15 1959:8,19 give 1855:14 1862:9 1867:12 1869:8 1894:12,12 1918:18 1932:22 1935:15 1939:24 1947:11 1952:19 1958:7 1964:25 1967:8 given 1855:14 1867:17 1874:8 1886:9 1889:11 1893:4 1895:2 1910:10 1925:11 1927:22 1928:4 1929:13 1942:20 1957:20 gives 1947:8 1958:19 giving 1880:1 1901:15 1954:3 1966:11 **go** 1845:25 1847:14 1850:15 1872:6 1882:2,18,18,23 1903:15 1907:8 1918:7 1922:14,20 1933:4 1937:19,22 1951:25 1952:2 1954:10 1964:18 goes 1852:7 1860:14 1863:7 1898:24 1920:11 1922:16,17 1945:8,9 1948:14 1954:15 1961:3 going 1864:11,15 1866:19 1867:12 1875:4,23 1879:13 1880:5,7,8,12,21 1881:7 1885:3 1886:25 1889:2,12

1890:3 1891:6,12,13

form 1886:5 1903:9

1893:11 1894:23,24 1894:25 1902:6 1912:13 1914:25 1917:8 1918:22 1921:2 1922:1 1923:18 1924:14,18 1925:3.10 1927:20 1928:5 1929:11 1932.22 1933.22 1934:2,5 1938:10,16 1938:21 1948:13,17 1950:21 1951:3.25 1952:13,16,18,21,23 1953:17,18 1955:3 1956:10 1962:1 **GOLDBERG** 1842:5 Gonzales 1858:5 **good** 1845:6,9,10,18 1860:6,7 1904:22,23 1917:22 gotten 1884:20 govern 1883:16 Government 1883:3 governmental 1868:1 great 1879:14 greater 1950:22 grounds 1872:4 groundwater 1884:21 **group** 1864:13 groups 1868:24 **guaranteed** 1877:17,18 1877:22,24 1878:21 guess 1880:16 1905:17 1916:13 Guevara 1891:19

## Н

**HADLOCK** 1842:4 half 1926:24,25 hand 1875:18,19 1927:21 1971:17 **handed** 1853:6 hanging 1896:13 1916:24 1918:11 1967:3 1968:3 happen 1923:8 1945:17 1946:6 1952:7 1955:6 happened 1857:6 1862:14,23 1896:11 1919:5 1926:22 1927:2,7,18 1928:9 happens 1889:13 1932:1 1948:4 1955:5 1955:7 happy 1895:23 1910:5 1960:14,25 1961:10 1963:2

hard 1937:12 1967:15

hardware 1945:11 harm 1879:17 harm-no 1879:15 Havasu 1873:10 1884:10 1935:6 1949:6 1951:24 head 1887:25 heading 1902:23 hear 1889:1,8 1890:4 1953:2 1966:19 heard 1846:9 1868:6 1870:19 1894:3 1966:8 hearing 1967:7,23 1968:1 hearsay 1866:14 1895:11 held 1863:17 help 1969:18 1970:9 helpful 1966:14 **helping** 1861:9 Hess 1844:16 1960:17 high 1964:3 higher 1897:25 1898:6 1899:23 Hills 1871:11,15 historic 1961:4 Hon 1845:4 honky 1880:4 Honor 1845:8.22 1848:17,25 1849:11 1850:3,12,18 1852:15 1855:22 1857:15,21 1859:12 1860:1 1865:18,22 1866:8 1872:3 1877:10 1879:11 1880:10,23 1881:12 1886:19 1891:17,25 1900:21 1901:12,17 1902:13 1904:8 1905:25 1917:16 1918:14 1922:12 1951:16 1954:5 1955:14 1956:6,24 1957:11,20 1965:8 1966:22 1968:20,21 1969:8 1970:3 **HONORABLE** 1841:3 hook 1877:7 hour 1937:3,6 house 1872:18 huge 1872:8 1924:2 **hundreds** 1871:18 hypothetical 1903:13 **ID** 1844:2

idea 1870:2,19 1879:25 including 1860:9 1889:16 1963:7 identification 1855:16 identified 1856:24 1892:11 1961:12 identify 1865:22 **IID** 1883:25 1940:5 1944:13 1947:10.12 1947:16.17 1948:24 1948:25 1949:3,18 1951:24 1952:2 illegal 1913:6 1916:3 1926:13 **imagine** 1886:10 1945:13,14 impact 1874:14 1886:4 1896:14 1897:14 1899:21 1907:22 1919:13 1925:16 1928:8 1933:5,10 1948:18 **impacted** 1896:13 1907:19 1908:3,4 impacts 1905:7 1922:5 1928:12 **impeach** 1880:16 1890:12 1961:8 1963:25 1964:19 impeaching 1958:2 1965:15 impeachment 1890:14 1958:24 1965:13 **implement** 1944:23 implementation 1933:19,20 implicate 1904:3 implication 1923:7 **implications** 1926:7,11 1939:10 important 1881:9 impossible 1881:13 1928:24 1929:3,10,12 1938:11 1941:11,14 impractical 1941:11 impression 1895:21 improper 1880:2 1882:9 1886:20 improperly 1929:18 inappropriate 1870:8 include 1890:14,17 1900:12 1901:15,21 1903:24 1906:11 included 1845:20 1847:5,17,19,22 1848:1 1901:11,22 1905:16 1911:14

1899:25 1904:7,15 1906:10 1931:19,20 1931:20 1941:7 incorrect 1914:2 1924:23 1933:16 1934:13 incorrectly 1930:22 increase 1851:12,14,15 1896:25 1961:4 **increases** 1857:4.6 incredibly 1967:15 incur 1963:23 incurred 1860:19 1867:21 incurs 1883:6 independent 1959:15 1962:8 indicate 1856:3 indication 1941:16 indifference 1958:10 1963:8 **indifferent** 1965:9,11 1965:12,14 **indulging** 1892:16 **inequity** 1960:10 **inflated** 1900:7 1909:15 influence 1863:7 information 1854:19 1857:12 1866:4 **informed** 1900:16 infrastructure 1874:14 1879:6 injure 1876:6 input 1921:8 1943:9 insists 1923:14 installments 1950:9 instances 1862:8 instructions 1852:19 instructive 1868:16 insure 1960:1,7 intake 1884:9 1935:5 integrated 1874:21 intent 1960:4 1964:8 1964:17 interested 1841:10 1891:18 1971:15 interim 1960:12 **Interior** 1873:9 interrelated 1923:23 interrelationship 1924:22 interrupted 1966:6 introduced 1922:18 investigation 1893:9 investment 1884:17,18 investments 1884:20

1907:18 **invited** 1968:7 **involved** 1861:18 involvement 1847:1 1864:10 **involves** 1882:15 irrelevant 1881:16 1883:1 1905:23 1906:5 1961:11 issue 1875:8,24 1881:2 1881:2 1889:10,11 1892:18,21 1893:1,2 1893:3 1895:7 1896:5 1900:18 1909:22 1910:4 issued 1866:23 1878:20 issues 1860:11 1861:16 1869:16 1872:13 1888:5 1902:25 1958:13 1969:24 items 1910:13

## J

JAN 1841:22 January 1841:12,12 1937:14,20 Jensen 1937:16 ikeker@kvn.com 1842:8 Joanne 1858:5 iob 1895:14,14 John 1842:3,13 1904:24 johnquinn@quinne... 1842:16 join 1946:15 joint 1892:1 Jones 1888:13 **JOSEPH** 1842:18 **Judge** 1845:4 1930:10 judge's 1929:1,4 July 1856:13 1857:23 1858:21 juncture 1955:5 **June** 1843:3 1845:13 1849:24.24 1851:1 1857:23 1951:25 1966:15 1967:14,25 1968:1 **Justice** 1969:25

## K

Karnow 1841:3 1845:4 Karnow's 1930:10 keep 1896:25 1969:4 Keker 1842:3,3 1845:22 1848:23.25 1849:6,14,19,23

1912:2

**includes** 1847:9

	1		1	İ
1850:6,14,18 1852:15	1954:9 1959:19	1853:11 1857:8	loss 1868:3 1883:13	mean 1868:21 1869:4
1852:18 1853:9	1960:18 1965:17	1893:19 1959:24	lost 1940:7	1892:11 1907:9
1855:6,9,17,22	1966:3 1969:14	1964:11	<b>lot</b> 1874:5 1879:13,16	1944:9 1947:21
1856:3,10,15,20	knowledge 1928:24	<b>letters</b> 1857:7 1962:1	1892:8 1921:7 1929:7	1948:6,13 1952:8
1857:15,21 1858:4	1935:23	1962:25 1964:10	1948:7	1953:21
1859:3,10 1865:18	known 1899:15	level 1879:23 1884:24	low 1874:7 1950:7	means 1910:2 1936:24
1866:12,18 1872:3	knows 1962:17 1968:16	1884:25 1964:3,6	1964:3	1954:12
1875:23 1877:10	Kostopoulos 1844:8,9	levels 1958:15 1961:5	lower 1851:7,23	meant 1898:2 1906:2
1879:11,18,20	Kostupoulos 1855:19	1963:6 1965:11,13	1899:23 1950:17	meet 1945:6,25 1948:8
1880:11 1881:13	1856:20 1857:2	limine 1895:12,22	lunch 1955:14	1953:9,10 1958:14
1882:9 1886:19		1901:13 1902:3,5		1959:9 1960:20
1887:9 1888:7	L	limit 1946:22 1947:6,19	M	meets 1945:5 1966:9
1889:24 1890:6	laid 1945:2	limited 1930:15	<b>M-1</b> 1861:1	member 1846:16,24
1891:17,23 1892:8	Lake 1873:7,10	limits 1876:4 1969:9	<b>M-I-Z-E-L</b> 1892:24	1847:16 1848:3
1894:3 1895:7	1884:10 1935:5	line 1919:23 1922:21	M1 1863:12 1864:2,7	1864:11 1870:18,24
1900:21 1901:12,25	1948:25 1949:3,6,18	lines 1892:2 1908:9	1864:22	1871:6 1874:24
1902:12 1903:9	1951:1,9,23 1952:13	1920:8 1964:1,23	ma'am 1845:9	1876:19 1884:18,21
1904:8,21,24 1906:7	1954:25 1955:8	lining 1944:13	magnitude 1862:7	1884:25 1897:21
1907:10 1908:12,25	Lambeck 1968:22	list 1859:4 1866:13	main 1873:4	1898:7,8,11,16
1910:8,9,24 1911:19	Lambeck 1908.22 Lambeck's 1968:6	1871:7 1961:12	maintenance 1947:1	1899:1,4 1902:20
1910.8,9,24 1911.19	large 1896:9	listed 1851:20	1953:8	1908:5 1920:6 1921:9
1911:24 1912:10	larger 1899:24	listened 1927:9	majority 1872:18,25	1938:11,18,19,20,23
,	law 1888:2,5 1895:13		1878:13 1905:13	
1915:8,10,13 1917:16	*	listing 1865:4	1921:16	1939:3,4 1940:12,15
1917:19 1918:15,17	1905:23,25 1906:5 lawful 1902:2 1940:20	litre 1961:25		1940:24 1948:9
1918:21 1919:15,22		little 1848:24 1880:21	maker 1881:5	1960:1 1961:21,23
1920:11,13,23	1940:23	1907:5 1909:25	making 1885:7 1897:6	1962:4
1922:16,21 1923:20	lawsuit 1858:23	1915:9 1928:20	1927:17	members 1961:6
1923:22 1928:21	1928:23	1942:13 1951:13	management 1860:11	memorandum 1855:18
1933:2 1936:13,17,21	lawyer 1856:23	1969:24	1863:21 1961:3	mention 1889:16
1937:11 1941:19	1858:14 1904:25	location 1946:13	manual 1861:1 1863:10	mentioned 1951:23
1943:13 1948:20,23	1905:6 1910:22	long 1920:17,18	1863:12 1864:2,7,12	met 1845:19 1846:3
1949:13,15,17	1919:6	1946:12 1969:14,15	1864:15,22	1847:2 1849:1,9
1951:17 1952:8	lawyers 1881:23	1969:16,17,17	manuals 1864:9	1852:19 1856:23
1954:5 1955:1,11	lay 1910:23	long-term 1960:3,6	manufacturers 1863:5	1859:13 1867:22
1956:12,17,20 1957:3	leading 1864:19 1933:1	1963:4	map 1937:10 1945:4	1870:2,15,20 1871:22
1957:10,16 1958:25	leaves 1935:19	longer 1918:5 1922:14	March 1937:21	1873:2,11 1875:15,21
1959:20 1966:1,5,21	leaving 1932:6	1970:2	marked 1855:6,12,16	1876:11 1877:12,17
1967:15,18,22,25	left 1896:13 1916:24	look 1849:20 1854:4	1866:6 1957:21	1877:20 1878:4,6
1968:5,21 1969:8,13	1918:11 1931:14	1855:10 1856:10	1968:10,10	1879:2,2,3,4,9 1882:7
1969:22 1970:5	1953:9	1865:16 1868:22	match 1899:17 1931:23	1883:6,16 1884:16
Keker's 1943:22	legal 1875:11 1879:22	1891:15 1892:17	matching 1899:16	1885:1,5,17,18,22
Kennemur 1888:13	1881:4 1895:17,17	1920:19,25 1922:2	material 1879:14	1886:4,6,8 1892:6
kept 1951:19	1901:15,16 1902:2,4	1937:9,14 1950:5	materials 1864:23	1894:16 1904:4,5
kicks 1898:7	1905:6 1906:8,12	1956:10 1959:23	math 1914:1,2 1916:7,9	1907:23 1908:3,5
kind 1890:1 1892:10	1909:21 1913:16	1967:14	1916:19 1923:2,6,24	1910:10 1914:24
1924:2 1951:9	1927:11	looked 1890:17	1923:25	1915:16 1917:6,12
1963:23,24 1964:4	lesser 1951:8	1899:12 1911:13	mathematical 1913:22	1919:6 1924:11
knew 1928:14 1942:24	let's 1845:11 1850:15	1914:12 1916:1	matter 1853:19	1925:21 1926:2
know 1865:4 1870:11	1854:4,12 1855:10	1917:20,21	1862:10 1882:20	1927:9,17,23 1928:25
1878:15 1884:3,19	1856:10 1865:23	looking 1852:22	1895:4 1923:2 1943:8	1932:21,21 1933:8
1892:9 1899:4 1907:8	1867:20 1870:13	1898:11 1902:2	1943:18 1944:20	1934:12 1935:4,5,7
1910:2 1913:20	1903:2 1911:11	1921:2 1925:12	1946:10,21 1949:10	1935:11,13 1938:2
1920:12 1921:3	1912:21 1922:20	1932:2 1958:20	1949:13 1958:9	1939:11,13,25,25
1927:24 1928:18,25	1926:10,10 1937:9,19	1959:7 1962:12	1963:8 1964:13	1941:12,16 1944:7
1929:3,10,12 1937:5	1937:22 1966:2	looks 1855:25 1868:10	maximize 1950:18	1949:9,19 1950:11
1938:13 1941:14	1967:5	Los 1842:15,19	maximizes 1949:24	1951:1,5 1952:14
1945:3 1950:24,24	letter 1844:16,17,18	1871:10,15	Mead 1948:25 1949:3	1958:8,14 1959:9,13
1951:10 1952:18,23	1852:3,6,7,21,22	losing 1920:21	1949:18	1959:13,13,17,18
ĺ				
	1	1	1	1

1960:5 1961:17,18,19 misstated 1910:4 moved 1859:6 1918:10 1889:13 1896:10 objects 1918:17 1919:5 1924:17,23 obligation 1952:17 1961:23 1962:2 misstates 1909:23 1898:17 1929:21 1930:15,18 1931:2 1966:19 misunderstood 1934:6 1953:10 Met's 1867:22 1869:18 movement 1925:16 obligations 1878:5 1910:22 ngoldberg@kvn.com 1870:6 1875:11 mix 1932:1 1935:21 moving 1885:12 1948:9 1953:11 1842:9 1885:19 1892:5 1919:24 **NICHOLAS** 1842:5 obtains 1870:16 1946:5 1954:20.21 1935:13 1939:20 mixed 1946:3 1952:13 **multiple** 1904:12 Ninety 1852:15 **obvious** 1968:3 1940:3 1944:4 1947:6 1952:19.20.23 municipalities 1861:10 nominally 1863:5 occasion 1862:19 non-saline 1962:23 1947:19 1951:9 1953:16 1955:4 1871.10 1886.13 **MWD** 1844:4 1855:7 1956:14 1960:3,20 mixes 1922:4 1938:2 non-suit 1966:23 occasions 1862:16 1965:2 1969:15 mixing 1926:4,6 1856:10 1896:25 nonexistence 1890:15 1865:6 meter 1869:8,10 mixture 1921:18,21 MWD's 1889:20 1890:22 occurs 1934:10 methodology 1852:11 1942:23 1944:11,15 1897:16 1902:19 Noon 1955:16 **October** 1866:16 1853:16 1955:4.7 normal 1939:8 1941:8 1950:6,15 N **Metropolitan** 1841:9 mixtures 1955:6 north 1842:18 1863:6 odds 1867:7 1841:11 1842:11 Mizel 1891:20 1892:24 N 1843:1 1872:15 1873:7 offer 1849:1 1853:1 1847:9 1867:25 1894:10,10,20 name 1859:22,24 notebook 1849:7 1866:8,11 1888:16,18 1860:25 1882:21,22 1892:3,6 1956:11 1869:13 1870:10,13 molecules 1951:20 notice 1888:17,19 1870:16 1871:3 1952:1 named 1971:12 1889:11,17 1893:3,11 1957:25 moment 1911:11 1872:1,22 1873:3 names 1871:8 1893:18 1894:12,25 offered 1889:15 NARUC 1906:21,25 1874:12,17 1876:24 1936:13,15 1895:2 1890:13 money 1879:6 1884:20 **National** 1906:22 notion 1889:16 **OFFICE** 1842:17 1877:3,7 1882:18,22 1883:2,10 1884:4,6,8 1914:5,7,18 1916:23 **Navistar** 1887:19 notwithstanding officer 1863:14 1916:24 1917:4,7 1884:12,17,24 nearly 1872:11 1906:20 offset 1885:10 1914:5 1885:23 1898:4,10,24 1925:15 1926:18,22 necessarily 1926:8 **November** 1950:6,15 1916:14 1904:13 1907:20 1927:2,7,13,18,24 1938:13,14 1948:13 number 1844:2 1864:9 offsetting 1885:11 1914:8 1921:1 1928:11,15,16 1929:6 1961:22 1970:7 1872:10.10 1888:23 1924:9 1928:22 1931:14 Monica 1891:20 necessary 1896:19 oh 1923:10 1890:16 1891:2 1922:19 1932:1 monies 1926:20 1933:10 1934:21,23 1896:9 1900:2,5,7 okay 1855:20 1879:19 1935:1.20 1944:14 month 1874:25.25 1942:2 1916:17 1917:2 1891:23 1916:25 necessity 1931:15 1945:24 1946:11 1887:11 1891:9 1939:18.18 1923:11 1933:7 1936:18 1938:8 need 1875:1 1876:19 1947:8,11,14,21 1936:5 1937:15 numbers 1936:6 1943:5 1883:6 1910:6 1948:4 1949:24 1949:6,10,15,19,20 1939:19 1952:17 0 1951:7 1952:3 1953:9 1950:4,8,16 1953:11 1918:18 1931:22 1969:5 1958:16,21 1960:19 monthly 1937:4,6,7 1932:3 1937:5 1945:3 o'clock 1967:19 old 1891:9 1948:3,8 1950:12 object 1865:19,20 Metropolitan's 1846:8 1950:3,9 Oliver 1842:14 1845:8 1952:2 1957:19 1872:4 1875:23 1846:12,16 1848:8 months 1888:23 1845:17 1846:2 1874:13 1877:2 1936:12.12 1947:10 1963:22 1969:9 1880:5 1958:25 1848:17 1849:11 1909:7 1915:3,10 1947:12,13 1950:1,16 needed 1854:19 1961:13 1850:3 1852:12,25 1930:1 1944:21 1950:21 1874:23,25 1911:9 **objected** 1895:8 1919:6 1853:10 1855:24 morning 1845:6,9,10 1946:22 1960:6,12 1926:21 1932:1 objecting 1891:1 1856:17 1858:1 1845:18 1849:1 needs 1868:10 1871:1,5 **objection** 1845:22 1859:12 1961:3,5 **Mexico** 1863:7 1885:24 1886:4 1850:2,3 1852:12 1860:6,7 1904:22,23 once 1868:14 1925:8,9 middle 1852:4 motion 1879:21,23 1896:25 1899:16 1853:2 1855:23,24 1935:12 1952:4 milligrams 1961:24 1895:12,20 1901:12 1914:11 1947:24,25 1856:16,17 1857:25 ones 1851:20 1889:6 million 1872:11 1902:5 1966:23 negotiated 1960:25 1858:1 1866:12 **Opening** 1966:9,10 1961:9 1923:11 1928:6 1877:10 1879:11 1967:3,4 1968:6 **operate** 1868:3 1883:13 mind 1876:8 1926:5 negotiating 1964:5 motions 1902:3 1967:2 1880:18 1882:9 1946:11 mindful 1906:12 1968:15.18 1969:7 negotiation 1959:2.11 1895:10 1900:21 operational 1939:21,22 minimum 1958:19 move 1849:10 1850:1 neither 1909:5 1901:3,12 1903:9 1940:3 1943:23 1960:8 **NEST** 1842:3 1855:22 1856:15 1904:8 1913:16 1944:2 1945:1 minute 1921:25 1857:23 1865:24 network 1877:23 1914:22 1918:19 1950:17 opine 1879:21 1886:21 minutes 1850:9 1874:23,25 1877:10 neutral 1927:19 1949:11 1956:16 1882:15 1892:14 1877:13 1895:15 never 1862:23 1919:13 1957:3,11,16 1964:20 1902:4 1906:24 1936:16,17,19 1925:15 1928:11 1965:22 opined 1870:11 1918:12 1921:18 mischief 1895:12 1923:3,11 1925:4,6 1939:3 1970:1 **objections** 1892:8,11 1919:16.17 1956:17,18,19,22 mission 1870:21 1956:9,13,18 1957:2 new 1863:18,25 opines 1895:17 **objective** 1960:21 1957:9,15 1881:23 1888:18,19 opining 1895:12 misspoke 1895:9

1901:14	owned 1882:7 1883:2,3	1898:13 1914:19,25	1879:12,13,16,20	1962:7
opinion 1866:23 1867:2	1883:4	1916:12 1917:7	1880:9,9,13,13,14,16	positions 1863:17
1867:5,15,16,16	ownership 1880:1	1932:7	1880:17,18 1881:11	1956:12
1869:17,17,21	1881:5,14 1883:1	paying 1869:6 1877:20	1881:14,20,24 1896:8	possible 1845:18
1879:12 1881:3,4,5	1905:22	1879:5 1913:9,15	1906:13 1909:12	1942:5 1945:14
1882:10 1887:7	owns 1879:9	payment 1878:4	1900.13 1909.12	1968:12
1889:13 1890:16,18	OWIIS 1879.9	payments 1846:17	1915:22 1927:11	posted 1853:8
1890:24,25 1892:20	P	1847:8,10,16 1877:4	1930:10 1962:20	power 1877:21 1878:11
1893:11,15 1894:10	<b>p.m</b> 1956:3 1967:25	1878:6,10,11,13,15	1969:16	1898:21 1905:14
1894:14,22 1895:1	1968:1	1878:17,22,24	physical 1874:14	1909:15 1910:11
1905:19 1909:12	page 1852:2,4 1853:11	1882:17,23,23,24	physically 1945:14	1911:15 1913:24,25
1910:19,23 1912:15	1892:2 1896:23	1883:11 1933:3	picked 1970:1	1915:25 1924:7
1912:25 1913:3,9,22	1897:13,21 1908:8	1960:8	picture 1870:14	1929:22,24 1930:19
1926:12 1929:21	1922:21 1937:19	pays 1847:23,24	piece 1893:12,13	1930:25 1931:3,20
1930:10,11	1958:3 1959:25	1877:21	pieces 1895:20	practical 1940:8
opinions 1867:7,11	1962:15 1969:8	Peaks 1957:17	pipe 1945:5,18 1952:10	1944:20 1946:10,21
1880:1 1886:25	page-and-a-half	pending 1968:15	1954:10,14,15	Practice 1861:2
1887:22 1889:22	1922:17	people 1864:14	pipeline 1949:21	pray 1969:19
1890:8,9 1891:6,8	pages 1841:13 1895:22	1917:20 1948:7	pipes 1870:17 1875:7	precedes 1853:11
1892:4 1893:10	1969:13,20,23,24	peppering 1881:22	1945:6,25 1955:7	predict 1928:22
1894:8	1970:6	percent 1851:12,14,15	piping 1877:25	prefer 1964:14
opportunity 1875:10	paid 1913:23 1915:25	1851:17 1857:14	place 1962:3 1963:13	preference 1846:21
1886:21 1887:6,12	1916:12 1919:18	1874:9,10 1900:16	1971:12	preferences 1847:6
1966:11	1925:24 1932:12,13	1903:18,20,25	placeholder 1892:7	preferential 1846:3,6,7
<b>opposing</b> 1888:17	1932:16,18	1912:17,23 1913:3	places 1877:12	1846:11,19,25 1847:2
1893:10	paper 1951:18 1952:5	1914:1,2 1919:24	plain 1925:6	1847:3,7,18,20,21
opposite 1912:19	1952:8 1953:1	1929:20 1931:16,17	<b>Plaintiff</b> 1841:7 1842:2	1848:4,7
oppositions 1968:24	1954:18	1932:2,5 1936:23	1843:7	preferred 1966:19
1969:7	paragraph 1962:14	1937:15,16,17	Plaintiff's 1849:8	premise 1912:1,11
option 1851:4 1852:8	paragraphs 1923:13	1938:18,19,20	plan 1898:9 1960:12	preparation 1864:21
1852:10 1853:13,15	Parker 1873:10	1958:10 1960:14	<b>plant</b> 1937:14,16,17,21	prepare 1864:9
<b>options</b> 1929:7	part 1849:12,15 1853:9	1961:1 1965:9	1937:23 1938:5	prepared 1854:22
order 1855:7,9,12	1870:20 1876:2,4	percentage 1873:23	<b>plants</b> 1938:2	1864:7 1868:9
1862:6 1874:10	1878:10 1879:14	1874:2 1937:1 1942:7	play 1962:2	1869:22 1886:13
1895:22 1898:1,9	1895:11,15 1896:4	1943:1,2,10	<b>playing</b> 1879:23	1956:7 1958:10
1926:20 1935:3	1901:6,9 1903:5,13	percipient 1892:5	please 1845:25 1846:10	presentation 1854:21
orders 1897:22	1907:3 1916:2,16	perfectly 1960:14,25	1859:21 1860:2	1857:13
ordinary 1959:16	1923:16 1925:8,14	1961:10	1862:2 1870:23	presented 1892:18
organization 1862:24	1926:17 1928:10	period 1920:17	1874:16 1898:2	president 1863:18
1863:2,9	1958:18 1962:5	1925:18,22 1946:12	1918:20	presumption 1898:23
<b>Oroville</b> 1873:8	participate 1885:18	1946:24 1947:3	plenty 1887:12 1936:10	pretty 1950:7 1953:23
ought 1961:19	particular 1877:17,18	1948:17 1949:22	plus 1914:24	prevailed 1928:23
outside 1888:6 1961:17	1885:17 1886:2	1959:18	point 1874:7 1891:25	previous 1856:21
outstanding 1943:14	1942:2 1943:11	person 1856:21	1902:1 1907:11,12	previously 1849:13
1943:15	particularly 1886:9	1964:11,13	1910:3 1913:22	1861:14,18 1862:24
overarching 1888:13	1888:2 1911:2,3 parties 1953:23	personal 1848:11	1921:10 1939:25	price 1940:22,22 priced 1876:20
overcharge 1918:13	party 1888:17 1890:13	personally 1910:1 PERSONS 1841:10	points 1897:3,6 policies 1961:5	prices 1897:10
overcharged 1909:13 overcharges 1861:20	party 1888:15	perspective 1879:8	policy 1960:4,6 1963:4	primarily 1860:9
overcome 1893:6	party \$ 1888:13	1882:6 1883:15	portion 1846:9 1867:2	principle 1869:5
overpaid 1912:3,7,8,12	1896:21 1897:12,19	1901:8,18 1902:7	1901:22 1910:18	1888:13 1892:23
overruled 1845:24	1897:21	1903:4 1905:6	1911:3 1914:10	1894:11 1899:16
1872:5 1877:14	passed 1857:9	pertaining 1864:23,25	1931:21 1954:24	principles 1860:22
1882:1,11 1901:3	pause 1852:13,23	Petitioner 1841:7	portions 1905:16	1861:3 1867:20
1903:1 1907:8	1865:23 1949:15	1842:2	1912:5	1869:1 1883:5,16,19
1913:19 1914:23	pay 1876:22,22 1877:7	phase 1849:10 1856:24	portraying 1910:24	1883:20 1901:19
1918:19	1878:13,13,20,24	1866:24 1867:2,6,11	position 1914:3	1943:19,20
owe 1968:5,5,8	1882:18,23 1897:16	1869:17 1876:1	1916:10 1927:19	private 1861:11
, ,				•
	ı	ı	ı	ı

probably 1858:9	1921:17	1959:25	1901:1,5,17 1902:14	1942:15,17,19
1891:22 1893:25	properly 1890:20	purposes 1847:6	1901:1,3,17 1902:14	rate-making 1879:8
			1902:13,17 1903:3,17	
1894:13 1934:5	1905:10,15 1906:16	pursuant 1886:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1883:15 1901:8,18,24
1951:18 1962:21	1915:23	1927:3 1960:15	1907:6 1909:23	1901:25 1903:4
problem 1899:10	property 1846:17	put 1852:1,2,19	1910:3 1911:17	rate-mixing 1943:19
1931:9 1938:25	1847:9,23 1929:6	1865:16 1875:25	1912:20 1913:16	ratemaking 1860:13,14
procedure 1887:1,16	<b>proportion</b> 1846:17	1878:1 1881:22,24	1914:22 1918:14	1860:21,23 1861:5,16
proceed 1860:1 1895:4	1860:19 1868:18	1886:2 1893:18	1920:9,12 1922:12,15	1861:25 1862:5
1903:2	proposal 1851:11	1894:25 1896:12	1922:17 1923:15	1864:24 1879:22
proceeding 1862:11	1966:17	1917:4 1925:9,15	1928:18 1932:25	1882:6,14,20 1883:5
1867:3	propose 1890:22	1926:23 1927:24	1941:24 1948:19	1905:7
proceedings 1841:15	proposed 1890:21	1929:18 1935:3	1949:11 1951:11	rates 1841:10 1850:23
1971:11	proposes 1966:21	1937:9 1948:2	1954:8 1955:10,14	1851:7,13,14,15,20
process 1860:14	proposing 1966:7	1953:24 1967:5	1956:6,24 1957:6,14	1851:23 1853:20,22
1882:14 1921:7	proposition 1896:24	1970:1	1957:19 1958:7	1854:13,17,20
product 1877:8	1905:4	puts 1892:10	1961:14 1962:5,10,14	1857:10 1860:9,10,18
production 1957:25	<b>provide</b> 1861:14	<b>putting</b> 1869:16,20	1963:1 1964:21,23	1861:3,12,21 1863:23
professional 1863:4	1870:21 1872:16,18	1900:23 1927:21	1965:24 1966:21	1864:7,10 1868:2,17
<b>proffer</b> 1862:21	1892:20 1903:19	1965:7,16	1967:2,11 1968:20,24	1868:17 1881:6
proffered 1886:15	1931:24 1932:21		1969:3,14 1970:3	1882:17 1895:13
program 1885:17	1959:21 1960:8	Q	<b>QUINN,ESQ</b> 1842:13	1896:18,19,24
programs 1884:22	provided 1854:20	<b>qualified</b> 1862:17,20	quite 1905:12 1912:16	1897:14,17,23,24
project 1873:6,21	1857:12 1868:13	quality 1960:21,23	1922:16	1898:5,14,19,20,22
1874:3,5 1875:13	1869:10 1889:14	quarrel 1916:7,9	<b>quote</b> 1889:20	1898:23 1899:6
1876:25 1878:19,20	1911:1 1935:21	quasi-governmental	quoting 1893:7	1902:19 1906:6,8,11
1878:23 1879:2,6,10	1944:12,17 1954:13	1868:1		1910:21 1913:24,24
1880:3 1881:17	1958:9,14	question 1845:24	R	1913:25 1914:4,16,20
1882:8 1883:7	provides 1870:15	1853:5 1869:13	<b>Raftelis</b> 1909:1 1911:4	1915:1,3,4,11,25,25
1900:19 1901:7,8,22	1871:4 1872:10	1876:7 1882:5 1887:5	raise 1879:5 1895:7	1916:11 1917:25
1903:7,19,21,23	1876:17 1931:25	1902:7 1903:3,9,14	rate 1852:8 1853:13	1918:11 1919:10
1905:10,22 1906:16	1934:21	1904:1,3,9 1912:17	1867:22 1880:3	1920:15 1921:19
1909:4 1911:14	providing 1860:16	1915:8 1917:9,11,15	1881:5 1884:11,13,16	1922:10 1925:13
1912:1 1913:23	1889:13 1958:17	1917:18 1922:20,25	1895:17,18 1896:10	1926:6,9,13 1929:13
1915:22 1918:4	provision 1914:15	1932:25 1939:6	1896:23 1897:18	1929:17,25 1930:1,24
1919:25 1921:19	prudent 1909:2	1944:6,19 1949:14,16	1898:1,6,6,6,18,21,25	1930:25 1931:1,1,11
1924:8 1928:3	<b>PTX</b> 1844:3,4,5,6,7,8,9	1951:14 1955:1	1898:25 1899:16,23	1934:3 1937:1 1939:2
1929:19 1930:6,23,25	1844:10 1849:8,22,23	1964:15	1901:15,15 1902:2,4	1939:4 1940:14
1931:14,16,18,19,21	1850:4,5 1855:7,8,13	questioned 1957:1	1904:4,12 1905:14,14	1942:3 1960:9
1931:22,23 1932:3,6	1855:16 1856:1,2,10	questioning 1894:1	1907:4,11,15,16,19	Ray 1890:23
1932:10 1933:4,6,8	1856:18,19 1857:22	1919:10	1908:1,16 1909:14,15	re-ask 1882:4
1933:13,18,20,22,24	1858:2,3 1859:6	<b>questions</b> 1849:4,25	1909:21,21 1910:11	re-do 1943:4
1934:19 1935:9,17	public 1957:8,24	1850:7,8 1857:16	1910:11,12 1911:8,15	re-wholesale 1871:13
1937:15,18 1938:3,17	publication 1860:20,25	1891:7 1894:5 1895:5	1911:15 1912:10,12	reach 1863:7
1938:19 1939:14	1861:1 1866:5	1923:20 1929:14	1913:4,5,10,15	reached 1867:6 1893:9
1942:1,6,11,12,24	publications 1865:3	1936:21 1941:19	1914:5,10,11 1915:24	1953:23
1943:5,10 1944:22	published 1861:2	1943:13,16,22	1916:2 1917:5,8,22	reaches 1963:5,6
1945:6,21,22,23	1863:9 1864:23	1948:20 1954:5	1918:3,6,8,23	read 1869:11,22
1946:8,12,15,23	pumps 1870:18	1966:12,16 1968:3	1919:12,19 1920:1	1886:13 1888:12
1947:4,19,22,25	1874:22 1875:7	quick 1869:8	1924:6,7,8,10	1891:13 1910:25
1948:5,8 1952:14	<b>PURCELL</b> 1842:4	Quinn 1842:12 1859:13	1925:18,21 1926:2,18	1915:22 1919:8
1959:8 1960:2	1968:9	1860:1,5 1865:21,25	1927:10,11,12	1920:9 1922:12
project-by-project	purchase 1846:18	1866:8,17,22 1876:7	1928:23 1929:5,19,20	1923:15,16,17,21
1909:3	1847:19 1886:4	1877:15 1879:16	1929:22,22,24,25	1926:12 1934:14,15
projected 1870:2	1897:22 1898:1	1880:10,20,23 1881:1	1930:15,19,19 1931:2	1937:12 1964:21
<b>proof</b> 1849:1	purchases 1886:5	1881:12 1882:4,13	1931:3 1938:9,9,15	1966:11 1967:10
proper 1879:21	pure 1958:9 1963:3,9	1887:23,24 1888:2	1938:21,22 1940:12	readiness-to-serve
1881:17 1887:13	1965:14	1889:18 1891:15,16	1940:20,25 1941:1,4	1847:13,25 1922:7
1895:13 1916:19	purpose 1885:7 1900:5	1891:25 1895:6,24	1941:6,8,11 1942:12	reading 1852:14
ĺ	•	•	•	•

	 	1		l
1869:9 1889:19	recollection 1969:19	relates 1897:9 1903:15	reports 1844:4 1859:5	retained 1861:14
1908:12 1910:23	recommendation	relating 1875:11	1868:6 1869:12,18	1865:12 1869:23
1911:6,7 1912:25	1851:12	relations 1877:12	1870:3,7 1888:5	revenue 1851:24
1913:8 1919:2	record 1849:13,16	relationship 1875:15	1950:2	1868:2,10 1896:20
1920:13,22,23	1850:15,17,18 1852:2	1875:21 1876:11,16	representation 1853:1	1924:3
1922:11 1929:21	1853:10 1855:13	1876:23 1877:16	representing 1904:24	revenues 1847:10
1930:10 1965:5	1881:1,22 1895:16	relatively 1920:4	request 1859:4	1848:1 1851:9
ready 1845:7	1950:25 1955:15	1923:1	require 1943:4	1860:17 1897:15
real 1940:8 1952:6	1957:25 1962:17,25	relevance 1872:4	required 1870:2	1907:18
1964:15	1965:5	1914:22 1957:10	requirements 1860:16	review 1858:6 1875:10
reality 1949:23	records 1845:19	relevant 1876:1	1934:8 1944:18	1967:7
1951:22 1952:3,4	recover 1860:18 1868:4	1879:12 1881:2,15	1958:15 1959:13	reviewed 1858:17,19
1953:1,5,5,7,12,14,22	1868:5,17 1869:1	1958:2,23 1963:11	requires 1940:11,14	1859:1 1869:12
1954:3,18	1883:6,12,13 1884:16	reliable 1890:24	reserves 1851:25	1893:21
really 1849:2 1882:20	1885:1,2,4 1908:14	relied 1851:19 1887:2	1927:5	revision 1897:14
1889:6 1890:5	1908:16 1914:9	rely 1853:7	reservoir 1946:4,16	revisit 1880:9,13
1896:12 1921:1,23	1941:25	<b>relying</b> 1894:15	1948:2 1951:19	right 1846:25 1847:7
1923:24 1927:24	recovered 1867:22	remained 1848:7,12,14	reservoirs 1870:18	1850:24 1851:5,13,16
1937:12 1940:6,9	1883:1,21 1911:10	remember 1855:1,1	1874:22 1875:1,7	1851:21 1852:4
1947:10 1952:1,2	recovering 1883:17	1864:17 1889:4	1885:9 1946:7,9	1853:6,22,25 1856:9
1961:21 1963:20,22	recovery 1867:21	1936:6 1943:24	1947:2	1864:21 1873:15
1969:17	<b>RECROSS</b> 1843:2	reminded 1966:22	resolution 1857:9	1874:2 1886:3
reasonable 1902:20	RECROSS-EXAMI	removal 1910:21	resolutions 1856:4	1894:11 1905:11
1908:6,14 1937:8	1948:22	remove 1913:22	resolved 1862:10	1906:18 1907:2,14
1964:11	redirect 1843:2	removed 1896:8,12	Resources 1873:5	1915:19 1917:23
reasonably 1904:6,14	1859:11 1941:21,23	1910:12 1911:15	1875:16,22 1876:12	1918:13 1927:3,5,20
reassurances 1958:13	1954:7	1912:18,24 1918:25	1876:25	1928:24 1929:25
rebut 1892:5	reduced 1896:24	renew 1895:10	respect 1849:2 1861:20	1930:12,16 1931:3
rebuttal 1886:22,25	1968:15 1971:13	renewal 1897:24	1907:4,11 1912:10	1932:16 1933:9
1887:13,21 1890:21	reduces 1926:16	renewed 1897:22	1943:23 1961:16	1934:8,17 1935:6,15
1891:10 1965:25	reducing 1885:10,12	reopen 1889:4	1962:4,7 1963:6	1937:20 1938:4,6
rebutting 1894:22	refer 1858:7 1863:15	repaired 1935:25	1964:17	1939:21 1948:2,25
recalculated 1915:24	1868:20 1869:3	repeat 1846:9 1913:12	Respondent 1842:11	1949:1,7,19 1950:23
recalculating 1915:1	1879:1 1902:15	rephrase 1910:8	Respondents 1841:14	1951:5 1952:24
recall 1888:23 1896:21	1946:13	report 1849:9 1854:22	responding 1944:16	1964:25 1967:13
1897:1,19 1911:3	reference 1855:21	1854:23 1858:6,7,17	response 1889:9 1892:4	1968:23
1940:17,19 1943:15	1870:19	1858:20 1859:2	1908:24 1922:24	<b>rights</b> 1846:4,6,7,11,19
1944:7	referred 1862:24	1865:5,8,9,16,18,22	1943:22 1944:6	1847:2,4,18,20,21
receive 1847:10 1848:3	1863:10 1864:3	1866:2,9,10,13,16	responsibilities	1848:4,7 1873:4,21
1960:3,7,19	1866:5 1871:7	1867:1,8 1868:7,8,9	1875:12	1873:23 1877:5,8
received 1847:16	referring 1896:6	1869:22 1877:11,13	rest 1951:4 1956:7	1885:24
1850:5 1855:18	1906:7 1908:15,23	1881:16,19 1886:13	1965:24 1966:1	river 1873:8,16 1884:9
1856:2,12,19 1858:3	1920:8	1886:18,22 1887:8,10	restates 1963:14	1894:18,20 1899:13
1866:21 1900:17	reflect 1852:10 1853:15	1887:11,14 1888:6,8	<b>Rests</b> 1843:6,7	1899:20,21,22 1900:8
1903:6 1956:23	1869:19 1903:24	1888:9,11,25 1891:9	result 1846:2 1866:23	1900:9,9,11 1909:19
1957:5,13,18	reflected 1932:4 1934:1	1895:8,11,15 1896:1	1883:25 1885:16	1912:6 1928:2 1930:5
recess 1850:16 1857:19	refused 1851:16	1896:4,17,21 1897:5	1899:1 1900:1	1930:15,20 1931:10
1891:13,14 1892:15	regard 1848:14	1897:8,13 1899:9	1902:19,21 1911:23	1931:13,25 1932:21
1936:20 1955:16	1963:16	1902:12,16 1905:9,17	1926:5	1933:7,12 1934:7
recipient 1961:22	regarding 1875:12	1905:21 1907:5	resulted 1861:23	1935:5,8,9,10,22
1962:9	1895:25 1899:8	1909:10 1911:4	resulting 1867:6	1936:10 1938:3,17,20
<b>recognition</b> 1962:10,15	1909:16 1918:9	1917:20,24 1918:16	results 1872:12	1939:17,25 1940:1,5
1963:14	regular 1949:10	1918:22 1919:2,7,11	resume 1866:13	1940:22 1942:14,15
recognize 1855:17	regulatory 1861:15,24	1919:12,20 1924:22	resumed 1845:14,16	1942:16 1944:21
recognized 1860:20,22	1862:4,21 1906:22	Reported 1841:19	retail 1869:9 1871:14	1945:5,16,18,19,25
1958:15	rejected 1862:21	<b>Reporter</b> 1971:9,24	1872:16,18	1946:10,14,23,25
recognizing 1958:20	related 1847:11 1884:1	REPORTER'S	retailer 1872:14	1947:1,16,17 1948:14
1963:16	1901:10	1841:15 1971:1	1875:18 1876:14	1949:25 1950:3,4
	=	=	=	-

1951:2 1952:11,12,16
1952:22 1953:4,8,25
1954:2 1955:2 1958:9
1958:11 1959:19,21
1960:14 1961:1,10
1962:18 1963:3,9
1965:10,15,18
<b>Roberts</b> 1969:25
room 1962:21
roughly 1871:8
1900:16 1932:3
1969:6
<b>RPR</b> 1841:20 1971:23
rule 1895:23
ruled 1867:18 1902:3
rules 1899:5 1962:3
ruling 1867:11,19
1881:14 1896:8
1899:1 1906:14
1909:16,20,24 1910:4
1910:14 1925:11
1927:22 1928:1,5
1929:1,4,13
rulings 1881:11
1967:11
run 1936:8
runs 1936:4,9

S 1842:5 sales 1897:15 1899:19 1899:21,22,25 1900:11,11,12 1930:3 1930:6,6,7,12,15,20 1931:5 1942:15 saline 1962:11,18,22,22 1964:14,14 salinity 1958:13,14,20 1959:10 1960:12,20 1961:3,4,19 1963:6 1963:16 1964:3,6,17 1965:11,12,18 San 1841:2,6,16,17,24 1842:6 1844:14 1845:1 1847:22 1848:14 1851:1 1853:24 1858:23 1865:13 1869:23 1871:14 1883:25 1886:15 1892:1 1893:22,23 1894:1 1900:17 1901:9 1903:6,8 1904:7,15 1904:24 1907:12 1909:12 1910:11 1911:24 1912:3 1913:9,13,23 1915:16 1915:16 1916:11

1932:4,20 1933:22 1934:2.17.22 1935:4 1935:21 1938:16 1939:5,8,16,24 1940:2.4 1941:7 1944:12,24 1945:9 1947:15 1949:1,6 1950:23 1951:20 1952:18 1954:1.9.13 1954:15 1956:1,25 1957:24 1958:12,18 1959:16 1962:8 1963:15 1964:1 1965:25 1967:3 **SANDFORD** 1841:20 1971:8,23 Santa 1891:20 1971:5,9 1971:18 satisfied 1893:12 satisfy 1871:1 save 1885:18 saving 1885:22 savings 1947:14 saw 1856:21 1915:22 saying 1889:24,25 1901:18 1907:17 1909:6 1913:3 1916:15,21 1918:15 1918:21 1919:15,16 1923:6 1924:21 1925:5 1926:1,15,15 1926:17 1927:8,8,15 1927:16,21 1928:16 1933:19 1935:17,19 1939:11,23 1940:3,18 1940:19 1953:2,3 1959:24 1960:22 1963:22 1965:8,8,10 1965:12 savs 1846:24 1852:8 1854:11 1858:5,5 1887:22 1905:21 1934:17,21 1935:2,7 1940:25 1941:9 1950:11 1955:2 1958:8 1960:17 scenario 1881:8 schedule 1966:5,7 scope 1888:16 screen 1865:17,25 1908:11 1920:21 SDCWA's 1889:22 seated 1859:21 second 1891:21

1893:13 1894:3

1920:1 1924:10

1925:24 1926:24

1927:4,9,17 1928:23

1900:15 1917:6 1918:18 1925:8 1960:17 section 1863:18 1864:1 1890:21 1940:17 1959:25 1960:4 secured 1961:17 see 1853:17 1857:16 1879:17 1882:1 1892:13 1895:20 1922:3 1932:8 1936:18 1950:5,15 1965:6 seek 1885:1,2 1941:25 seeks 1884:16 seen 1849:5 1866:22 selected 1904:5 selling 1885:17 send 1966:12 **sending** 1857:2 1889:24 sense 1951:18 sent 1966:5,7 **sentence** 1852:3.5 1853:13 1896:16 separate 1870:5 1925:12 1954:14 1969:4 separately 1922:19 series 1874:21 1875:6 1890:19 serve 1871:5,12 served 1863:14 1892:7 1902:21 serves 1954:16 service 1847:24 1850:12 1860:16 1869:9 1870:15 1872:16,18 1941:2 1959:25 1960:19,21 services 1841:23 1868:13 1869:6 1941:6 set 1914:3 1916:11 1928:15 1937:1 1938:9,15,21 1939:4 1940:21,21 1941:11 1968:13 setting 1860:10 1880:12 1896:23 1899:16 1939:2 seven-and-a-half 1851:17 1857:14 seventh 1864:20 Seventy-five 1862:6 sewer 1860:9 1861:11 share 1869:11 1932:23

**shorter** 1970:7 **Shorthand** 1971:8,24 show 1855:8 1914:11 1924:10 1958:12,18 1966:15 **showed** 1950:3 shown 1914:6,7 shows 1937:13 shut 1935:24 1946:25 1947:3 1949:22 1953:8 **shutdown** 1947:5 **shutting** 1949:21 sic 1936:3 **Sid** 1857:2 1858:14,14 side 1852:24 1855:15 1889:12,15 1893:10 1893:18,19 sides 1902:3 signed 1898:17 significantly 1898:25 1899:7 similar 1871:22 1872:1 simple 1920:4 1923:7,9 1923:24 1925:3,6 simpler 1969:25 simplifying 1942:13 simply 1851:23 1881:13 1902:5 1905:22 1929:10 1966:16 sir 1857:20 1876:8 1904:25 1910:9 1919:3,17 1923:22 1934:4 1941:18 1949:17 1955:12 1956:5 sitting 1927:4,13 1948:24 1949:3,18 situation 1877:3 1886:10 1893:18 1907:13,17 1908:3,7 1917:21,21,24 1940:10 situations 1886:3 sixth 1864:18 1891:19 size 1872:21 **Skillman** 1843:3 1844:3,10 1845:13,18 1848:24 1849:2,20,20 1849:24 1855:17 1857:23 1858:4 Skillman's 1852:17 Skinner 1937:14,21 1945:9 1946:4,16,18 1951:1,9 1952:13 1954:25 1955:3,5,6,9 **skip** 1923:13

slightly 1961:20 1969:7 small 1874:1 1890:1 smaller 1899:22 1900:1 1900:2 softer 1907:5 sold 1949:1 sole 1934:12 1965:2 solely 1885:6 somebody 1878:1 1894:18 1918:7 1943:1 1950:10 1951:5 1969:11 somewhat 1875:6 1912:25 soon 1968:11 sorry 1876:10 1882:3 1915:6 1917:9 1924:13 1926:4 1933:20 1939:1 1940:6 1945:20 1966:6 **sort** 1879:15 1940:7 1959:16 1962:7 sought 1892:21 sounds 1875:25 source 1868:2 1871:2 1873:4,8 1960:9 sources 1870:17,25,25 1873:4,12 1875:4 1964:2 1965:4 **South** 1842:15 southeast 1954:24 **Southern** 1841:9,11 1842:11 1947:24 1948:7 speaking 1962:4 **specific** 1892:4 1944:11 specifics 1904:2 spell 1859:22 **spend** 1876:5 **spent** 1861:9 1870:7 **split** 1931:15 ss 1971:4 staff 1847:3 1853:19 stand 1845:14 **standard** 1943:18 **standards** 1906:25 1961:19,24 standpoint 1901:24 1902:1 stands 1867:16 **Stapleton** 1844:17,18 1957:1 1959:3,5,21 1959:24 1961:12,16 1963:2,8 1964:7 Stapleton's 1958:3 1963:20 start 1925:9 1967:18

**short** 1850:16 1909:14

	Ī	Ī	Ī	I
started 1925:1	1916:2 1918:6 1924:8	summarize 1958:6	1949:12 1964:20	talking 1877:11 1891:4
state 1841:1 1859:22	1929:19,20 1931:1	summarizes 1888:4	1965:22	1894:10 1895:20
1873:6,6,21,22,25	stick 1911:11 1926:10	summarizing 1888:15	<b>SWD</b> 1900:12	1906:9 1908:22
1874:2,4 1875:3,12	1926:11	summer 1947:10,13	sworn 1859:17	1915:3,5,6,10,11,13
1876:24,25 1877:4	sticking 1928:9	1949:4 1952:2	<b>SWP</b> 1845:20 1960:8	1917:25 1924:15,19
1878:5,16,17,18,19	stop 1922:11 1937:20	<b>Superior</b> 1841:1,16	system 1870:13,17	1924:21,24 1925:9
1878:19,22 1879:1,6	stopped 1861:12	supplemental 1870:20	1874:14,17,21	1930:2 1938:6 1939:2
1879:10 1880:2	storage 1886:2	1870:21 1871:4	1877:25 1884:4,7,8	1939:5,8,9 1951:17
1881:17 1882:7,18,21	store 1875:1	1872:23 1885:10	1885:9 1894:16	1958:6 1959:4,12
1883:2,7,11 1900:19	storing 1885:12	1888:10	1905:14,14 1909:14	1960:11 1961:7,21
1901:7,8,10,22	Street 1841:24 1842:6	supplied 1899:14	1909:15 1910:11,11	1964:8
1903:6,7,19,21,23	1842:15,18	supplier 1875:17	1911:15,15 1913:24	talks 1887:20 1894:6
1905:9,22 1906:16	strictly 1894:7	1876:13,17	1913:25 1915:25,25	1894:20 1914:15
1907:1 1911:14	strike 1877:11,13	supplies 1872:23,23	1924:6,6,7 1929:21	1960:6 1961:2,4
1912:1 1913:23,24	1895:16 1967:4	1873:1,1 1940:1	1929:22,24,24 1930:2	<b>TARA</b> 1841:20 1971:8
1915:22 1918:4	1968:19	supply 1847:17	1930:6,18,19 1931:2	1971:23
1919:25 1921:19	string 1857:22	1870:20,21,25	1931:3,6,14,20	tax 1847:10
1924:7 1928:3	structural 1945:1	1872:14 1880:3	1935:13 1937:13	taxes 1846:17 1847:8
1929:18 1930:6,23,24	structure 1867:22	1881:18 1884:23,23	1945:2,11,24 1946:20	1847:24 1929:6
1931:13,16,18,19,21	1904:4 1917:22	1885:19,23 1886:6	1951:9 1962:16	team 1850:9
1931:22,23 1932:3,5	1924:11 1927:10,12	1896:12 1897:10,14	systemwide 1929:25	tell 1862:2,13 1865:2
1932:9 1933:4,5,8,12	1927:12 1928:23	1897:24 1898:1,5,12	1931:2	1868:7 1870:14
1933:18,20,22,24	1929:5 1930:15	1898:14,20,23,24,25		1871:8 1895:21
1934:18 1935:9,17	structured 1897:24	1905:19 1907:1,16,16	T	1904:11 1923:20
1937:15,16,18 1938:3	structures 1904:12	1907:16,19,23 1908:1	<b>Tab</b> 1849:21,23	1969:16
1938:17,18,19	studies 1850:12	1908:3,5,7,17 1909:4	take 1852:19 1864:14	telling 1854:16
1939:13 1942:1,6,10	1860:10 1861:13	1909:7 1917:5,8	1865:16,23 1873:18	tells 1893:22
1942:11,24 1943:5,10	study 1851:3,11,18,19	1918:3,8,11,22,25	1873:19 1874:18,20	ten 1892:13 1936:15
1944:22 1945:6,21,22	1851:21,23 1852:9	1919:6,12,19 1920:1	1874:22 1875:1	1938:19 1967:19
1945:23 1946:8,11,14	1853:12,14,20 1854:5	1921:20 1922:10	1876:21 1878:13	ten-minute 1891:12
1946:23 1947:4,18,22	1854:8,17 1856:3,5	1924:18,23 1925:4,15	1885:11 1886:6,9	tend 1950:7,10
1947:25 1948:4,8,16	1857:5,11 1961:3	1925:18,21 1926:1	1889:2 1891:12	tends 1963:25
1952:13 1959:8	stuff 1932:23	1928:17 1939:8	1897:8 1898:9,17	tentative 1967:8
1960:1,2 1971:3,9,25	subcommittee 1863:24	1941:8 1947:24	1913:17 1922:24	tentatives 1968:3
State's 1878:25	subject 1857:22	1948:1,9	1925:3 1928:5	term 1846:3 1943:23
stated 1903:10 1907:3	1861:25 1862:4	support 1853:20	1930:23 1942:10	termed 1928:21,24
statement 1888:22	1893:5 1895:19	1854:17 1856:4	1948:4,10,11,25	terms 1847:1,5 1851:8
1889:17 1892:2,10,19	1956:19,21 1959:10	1857:11	1949:25 1950:9,10,12	1860:22 1864:6
1893:20,22 1900:25	subjects 1864:15	supported 1857:14	1950:12,20 1955:2	1868:8 1871:6 1872:9
1902:19 1960:13	submission 1966:17	supporting 1851:12	1958:10 1960:14	1873:4 1877:15
1963:24,25 1964:4,8	submitted 1895:4	suppose 1909:5	1961:10 1963:19	1881:3 1901:18
1964:19	submitting 1880:24	1954:18	1966:17	1916:15 1924:19
states 1847:8 1863:6	substantial 1901:6	supposed 1960:22	take-or-pay 1877:3	1926:7 1933:21,25
1871:20,23 1872:9,15	1903:5	1961:6	taken 1867:10,14	1936:24 1944:4,16
1883:3 1957:7	substantively 1958:2	<b>supposition</b> 1924:16,18	1886:8 1893:25	test 1893:12,13,16
Stathis 1855:18	1958:23	1924:23	1895:3 1899:20	testified 1845:14
status 1937:13 1962:8	sued 1851:1 1853:25	sure 1849:14 1852:23	1921:22 1949:5,6,18	1850:11,19 1859:18
statutory 1846:7,11	sufficient 1892:19	1855:3 1859:6	1949:20 1955:16	1862:3,16 1890:24
stenotype 1971:12	suggest 1870:12	1876:15 1880:25	1971:11	1919:4
stenotype 1971.12 step 1898:4 1922:2	1962:20	1905:12 1935:4	takes 1947:21 1949:9	testify 1862:11 1866:15
stewardship 1880:3	suggested 1939:4	1936:9 1940:9 1946:5	1949:25 1950:12	1890:22 1893:5,23
1884:11,13 1885:16	suggesting 1912:16	1946:10 1953:7,23	talk 1867:20 1881:20	1894:19 1902:25
1897:17 1907:4,11,15	suggesting 1912.10	1963:5 1966:13	1892:9 1902:25	testifying 1861:24
1907:19 1908:1,16	1962:7	1967:6	1957:20 1966:2,4	1865:20 1925:17
1907:19 1908:1,10	suite 1920:15	surprise 1890:3,3	1967:9	1960:16
1909.21 1910.12,21 1911:8,12,13 1912:10	SULLIVAN 1842:12	surprised 1921:24	talked 1885:7 1894:9	testimony 1845:23
1911:8,12,13 1912:10	sum 1896:24 1914:8	suspect 1899:1	1902:24 1903:22	1855:4 1856:24
1913:15 1914:10	1923:4	sustained 1928:19	1926:19 1959:21	1861:15 1862:9,22,22
1713.13 1717.10	1 <i>723</i> . F	Submitted 1/20.1/	1,20.1, 1,0,1,21	1001.13 1002.7,22,22
				<u> </u>
·				Page 1/

1975.25 1999.16 17	Thomas 1050.10 12	1941:3	doughour d 1070.4	l ————
1875:25 1888:16,17	Thomas 1858:10,12		understand 1878:4	V
1888:19,19 1889:5	thought 1891:4 1896:4	trial 1866:24 1867:6	1880:7 1882:4	v 1891:20
1890:12,14,18,25	1899:10 1906:8	1875:24 1876:2	1884:12 1888:1	vague 1905:25 1907:6
1891:10 1892:3,4	1924:24 1933:15	1888:16,24 1890:13	1890:3 1898:16	1911:17 1928:19
1893:24 1895:16	1962:3	1890:20 1892:6,21	1900:24 1903:12,18	1969:19
1915:18 1930:20	thoughts 1967:9	1894:7 1915:17	1907:10,12,21	<b>valid</b> 1851:9
1933:11,13 1955:4	thousands 1871:18	1958:3 1968:8	1909:11 1913:2,7,13	validity 1841:10
1958:3 1961:8 1963:2	three 1892:2 1922:9	1970:10	1915:15,21 1916:4,6	1907:13
1963:20 1964:21	1926:19,22 1956:11	trials 1861:15	1919:1 1922:23	Valley 1946:2,3 1955:8
thank 1848:17,19	1957:19 1958:25	tried 1919:5 1941:16	1923:5 1929:16	VAN 1842:3
1859:10,14,21	threshold 1958:15	trier 1963:18	1932:8 1951:1,14,15	Vandenberg 1857:1
1892:14,16 1941:19	tier 1898:5,5,6,18	true 1879:4 1938:13,14	1953:2 1957:23	VANDERHORST
1955:12 1970:8	1899:3,3	1942:21 1951:18	1959:9,15	1842:18
theoretical 1951:18	<b>tight</b> 1969:9	1952:6 1963:7	understanding 1846:13	variable 1878:12
1952:1	time 1854:21 1857:4	trustee 1863:19	1848:9,25 1867:4	variation 1873:20
theoretically 1946:6,9	1858:13 1861:12	truth 1900:25	1870:14 1884:15	various 1864:1 1921:8
1947:12 1951:24	1876:4,5 1888:20	try 1880:13 1898:9	1898:19 1901:2,4	vary 1874:5,5,6,24
1954:4	1891:9 1893:6,6,14	1905:5 1950:18	1910:17 1912:14,15	vary 1674.5,5,6,24 vast 1872:17,25
theory 1952:5,9	1893:25 1898:20	1953:14 1968:11,14	1912:22 1913:18	1878:12
1953:12	1906:12 1919:20	trying 1880:16 1917:9	1918:24 1919:9,11	version 1852:16
thing 1860:12 1872:19	1920:18 1937:24	1938:9 1964:16	1940:20	versus 1887:19 1888:3
1877:22 1890:1	1942:20 1943:5	turn 1870:13 1884:11	understood 1880:10,19	1891:18
1892:1 1923:17	1946:12,24 1948:17	1897:16	1910:14 1962:24	
1925:3 1935:2 1940:8	1957:2 1959:5,18,23	turns 1895:9	undertaken 1846:14,15	VIDEOGRAPHY
1953:12	1966:10,13,13	<b>Twenty-five</b> 1969:13	unfair 1889:7,11	1841:23
things 1878:12 1884:23	1967:12 1971:12	twice 1890:7,10 1891:7	uniform 1938:11,23	view 1899:2 1913:22
1917:2 1924:14	times 1862:3,14,15	two 1847:12 1862:15	unique 1872:2,7,20	views 1864:14
1958:1 1968:5	title 1861:3	1870:16 1873:3,12	1874:12,13 1900:9	violated 1895:22
think 1849:20 1850:9	today 1867:12 1921:10	1875:4 1887:9	unit 1845:19 1900:8	violates 1895:12
1852:2,19,20 1866:9	1948:2	1893:16 1898:5,5,6	1930:11	1899:15
	told 1858:7 1903:10		United 1863:6 1871:20	vis-a-vis 1898:20
1870:9 1872:8 1874:9		1899:3 1920:24		<b>volume</b> 1841:10
1876:6 1879:15	1943:1	1921:11 1922:8	1871:23 1872:9,15	1873:15 1877:17,19
1880:21 1881:1,2,8	tomorrow 1948:3	1923:13 1924:13	1883:3 1957:7	1877:24 1947:9
1881:10 1886:8	top 1887:25	1942:17 1945:6	universally 1950:7	volumes 1898:8
1887:5 1888:9 1889:7	total 1868:10 1896:20	1946:7,8,13 1955:7	unknown 1897:23	vs 1841:8
1889:8 1891:11	1897:14 1899:14	1959:25 1964:16	unreasonable 1905:18	
1893:2,24 1894:4	1926:24	1969:5	1907:25,25 1908:4,19	W
1900:23 1901:17	trade 1863:4	two-line 1852:4	unreasonably 1888:20	W-O-O-D-C-O-C-K
1902:23 1906:5	transcript 1841:15	type 1848:2 1860:12	Upadhyah 1957:15	1859:25
1908:2,6,25 1909:23	1919:8 1924:15,19	1862:4 1872:19	Upadhyay 1844:15	wait 1865:23 1921:25
1910:3,6,24 1911:1	1958:4	<b>types</b> 1868:16 1871:19	<b>update</b> 1864:19	waived 1892:11
1912:15 1913:1	transcription 1971:14	1874:22 1946:14	<b>updated</b> 1852:10	walk 1880:20
1920:7,9,14 1921:12	transmission 1885:8	typewriting 1971:13	1853:15	want 1849:3 1852:23
1922:12 1923:9,15	transmits 1870:17	typical 1875:17	<b>upset</b> 1899:5 1921:21	1878:2 1880:20
1925:5 1937:7	transportation 1877:23	1876:13,16	URQUHART 1842:12	1887:3 1889:1,6
1938:14,25 1944:1	1881:18 1896:9,10	typically 1889:13	use 1868:16 1876:22	1891:15 1894:13,18
1946:6 1951:11,15	1898:21 1905:11		1878:6 1880:8,12	1897:12 1908:10
1952:1 1953:2 1956:6	1906:15 1909:4,7,14	U	1932:22 1944:21	1917:14,16,19
1958:1 1961:11	1909:17 1912:24	<b>Uh-huh</b> 1854:3	1949:4,4 1950:11	1932:22 1939:18
1962:16 1963:10,11	1913:5 1914:10	ultimate 1906:15	useful 1866:10 1880:8	1952:22 1959:18
1963:18 1964:7	1916:18 1918:5,25	ultimately 1880:23	1889:8	1963:23 1969:1,2
1965:7,15,19,21	1924:17 1925:4	1945:9	user 1872:18 1876:18	wanted 1889:4,5
1966:25	1926:18 1929:18	unacceptable 1960:18	uses 1885:25	1892:17 1894:1
thinks 1894:16,17	1930:24,25 1931:1,21	unanimous 1921:14	usually 1920:24	
third 1887:20 1961:2	treasurer 1863:25	undercharges 1861:20	utilities 1860:15 1863:5	1895:3 1958:13
thirdly 1872:20	treat 1908:1	underlying 1894:21	utility 1868:9,9,11,23	1966:12
thirsty 1948:7	treatment 1875:7	1895:1	1869:9,10 1906:22	wants 1879:16 1940:1
Thirty-five 1969:24	1882:24 1938:5	undermine 1894:14	utilizes 1884:12	1944:23 1962:2
1 mm ty-mvc 1909.24	1002.24 1930.3	unuci mine 1074.14	utilizes 1007.12	<b>WARREN</b> 1842:5
	I	I	I	I

wasn't 1907:22 1927:1
1961:12
water 1841:6,9,11
1842:11 1844:14
1845:20,20 1846:16
1846:18,22,23,25
1847:17,19,23 1860:9 1860:13,14,21,23
1860:13,14,21,23
1861:2,3,5,10,10,11
1861:11,16,21,25
1862:5,25 1863:3,4
1863:19,21,24 1864:8
1864:9,24,25 1865:13
1867:25 1868:9
1869:9,23 1870:16,20
1870:21,25,25 1871:3
1871:3,4,11,13,14,19
1871:19,22 1872:10
1872:14,14,15,22,23
1872:24 1873:2,3,5,5
1873:6,7,11,15,17,21
1873:21 1874:2,2,4
1874:12,18,20,23
1875:3,4,8,12,16,17
1875:22 1876:12,13
1876:13,17,17,21,25
1876:25 1877:6,16,17
1877:18,21 1878:1,3
1878:7,8,9,14,18,20
1878:23 1879:1,6,10
1880:2,3,3 1881:17
1882:8,22 1883:7,23
1882:8,22 1883:7,23 1884:3,11,12,18,23
1884:24 1885:11,12
1885:12,16,17,19,23
1885:23,24 1886:4,6
1886:7,8 1894:17,19
1897:14,17 1898:18
1899:14,25 1900:9,17
1900:19 1901:6,7,8 1901:10,22,22,23
1903:5,6,7,19,20,21
1903:21,23,25 1905:9
1905:22 1906:16
1907:1,4,11,15,19,20
1908:1,15 1909:3,19
1909:21 1910:12,21
1911:8,11,13,14
1912:1,6,7,10,12,18
1913:3,10,15,23
1914:10 1915:22
1916:2 1918:4,5
1919:25 1921:19
1924:7,8 1928:3,3,3
1929:18,19,20 1930:6
1930.23 24 1931.1
1930:23,24 1931:1,10 1931:12,13,16,17,18
1931:19,21,22,23,23
1,7,7,1,1,,42,43,43

```
1931:25 1932:3,4,6,9
 1932:21 1933:4,5,7,8
 1933:12,12,18,20,22
 1933:22,23,24,25
 1934:2,6,18,19,21,22
 1934:23 1935:1,5,7,9
 1935:9,11,13,17,20
 1935:21 1936:4.10
 1937:15,17,18 1938:1
 1938:3,3,5,17,18,19
 1938:23 1939:6,7,9
 1939:14,14,16,17,25
 1940:1,2,5,13,16,18
 1940:22 1941:1,9
 1942:1,1,6,6,7,10,11
 1942:18,22,24,24
 1943:5,10,10 1944:11
 1944:12,13,14,22,22
 1944:22 1945:4,6,7
 1945:16,18,19,21,21
 1945:22,23,23,23,25
 1946:1,3,8,8,10,11,12
 1946:14,23,23,23
 1947:1,4,4,9,10,12,16
 1947:16,17,17,18,19
 1947:22,25 1948:5,5
 1948:8,8,14,15,24,24
 1949:5,18,24 1950:5
 1950:13,22 1951:2,4
 1951:4,8,23,24
 1952:2,2,12,14,14,15
 1952:16,20,22,22
 1953:4,9,10,15,18,25
 1954:2,3,13,14,15,16
 1954:19 1955:2
 1956:25 1958:9,11,14
 1959:7,8,13,19,21
 1960:1,2,8,9,10,11,15
 1960:19,21,23 1961:1
 1961:10,16,22 1962:9
 1962:10,18,22,22,23
 1963:3,5,9 1964:1,12
 1964:14,14,18,25
 1965:3,4,10
wav 1848:10 1862:10
 1864:20 1870:11
 1881:17 1886:5
 1887:13 1896:4,11
 1901:7 1902:5 1903:7
 1905:5 1910:14
 1911:2,9 1913:9,14
 1916:16 1923:19
 1926:17 1928:10
 1929:5 1934:24
 1939:13 1945:2,11,17
 1949:24 1951:22
 1952:7 1953:5,17
 1954:17 1962:23
```

```
1963:12
ways 1872:1,2,7
  1874:11 1929:8
wbraunig@kvn.com
  1842:9
We'll 1882:1
we're 1849:14 1880:11
  1883:24 1900:23
  1902:1 1919:24
  1927:25 1930:2
  1932:2,21 1934:2
  1965:8
we've 1870:19 1964:16
Wednesday 1841:18
  1845:2 1956:2
week 1937:2 1964:16
  1968:24
weekly 1937:13
weeks 1888:23 1969:5
weight 1942:17
went 1852:6 1879:15
  1886:22 1893:19
  1896:4 1898:10
  1916:16 1926:17
  1927:3 1928:4,10
  1943:6 1962:19
  1964:8 1969:5
weren't 1907:5 1910:25
  1943:14,14 1961:11
Western 1954:10,16,22
Weymouth 1937:17,22
whatsoever 1933:8
whims 1939:21,22
  1940:7,7 1943:23
  1944:2
Whoa 1921:25
wholesale 1871:13
  1872:17
wholesaler 1875:18
  1876:13,18
winding 1864:20
wish 1970:2
wished 1881:23
withdrawals 1950:3,7
withdrawn 1950:16
witness 1845:7,10
  1846:1 1855:14
  1859:17,20,23 1872:7
  1881:15 1882:3,12
  1887:14 1889:14
  1890:12,13 1901:4
  1902:9 1903:16
  1904:10 1906:1,4
  1907:7 1908:21
  1911:20 1912:22
  1913:20 1915:9
  1920:21 1923:20
  1951:15 1961:12
```

```
1971:17
witnesses 1843:2
  1892:5 1956:8
Woodcock 1843:4
  1844:12 1859:13,16
  1859:24 1860:6
  1866:22 1880:14
  1889:20.21 1892:9
  1893:23 1904:22
  1927:2 1941:20,25
  1948:20 1968:22
wording 1934:20
  1944:11 1953:24
words 1893:6
work 1853:20,21
  1865:13,13 1951:22
  1967:22 1968:18
working 1856:5,6
  1858:25
works 1861:2 1862:25
  1863:3,19,22,24
  1864:8 1894:16
world 1863:8 1871:20
  1927:8 1952:6
WORLDWIDE
  1841:23
wouldn't 1908:18
  1918:6 1920:3 1937:3
  1938:11 1939:22
  1943:4
writing 1968:16
written 1864:23
wrong 1890:16 1891:2
  1891:3,11 1911:6,7
  1912:14 1931:8
  1953:19 1969:20
wrote 1896:17 1897:13
  1919:20
          X
X 1843:1
XII 1841:10
Yeah 1902:17 1937:4
year 1850:20 1854:7
  1873:12,17,17,22,23
  1873:24,24 1874:5,5
  1874:9,25,25 1886:2
  1898:9 1920:24
  1921:11 1934:4
  1936:5 1950:1,6,21
```

1950:22

years 1845:21 1854:9

1869:13 1900:18

1913:11,14,25,25

1914:20 1915:1

1909:13,22 1912:2,4

```
1939:6,12,20
Yesterday 1850:11
zero 1874:8 1896:23
  1914:8 1927:19
          0
          1
1 1841:12.12
1-10 1841:13
1-12th 1947:15
  1949:25 1952:3
  1953:10
1.2 1936:5
1:30 1956:3
10 1841:12
10,000 1951:6
10:30 1967:20
100 1865:5,7 1912:17
  1912:23 1913:3
  1914:1,2 1919:24
  1929:20 1937:16
  1938:18 1958:10
  1960:14 1961:1
  1965:9 1969:22,23
100.000 1936:4
1059 1891:21 1892:25
1067 1892:25
1068 1891:21
10th 1842:15
11 1850:13 1854:7,20
110 1850:14
1126 1937:9,11
1143 1844:14 1956:24
  1957:4.5
1152 1844:15 1957:15
  1957:17,18
1153 1956:14,21,23
1165 1844:16 1957:22
  1959:2 1965:22
1166 1844:17 1959:1
  1962:12 1965:22
1167 1844:18 1957:22
  1959:1 1965:23
1190 1850:14
12 1849:24 1851:14
  1854:7,20 1857:10
  1891:19 1898:4
  1917:20,21,23 1929:7
  1929:8 1947:9,12
12.4 1851:12,15
12.4(c) 1927:3
12/20/01 1844:17
123 1844:12 1865:9
```

1916:1 1917:7

1921:11 1932:2

	ī.		1
1866:1,7,19,21	<b>2002</b> 1891:21	<b>27</b> 1855:19	1858:2,3
1896:17	<b>2003</b> 1904:4,13	<b>28</b> 1866:16	<b>522-7096</b> 1841:25
<b>128</b> 1902:15	1914:12 1932:10,12	<b>29</b> 1841:18 1845:2	
<b>13,000</b> 1951:3	1932:15,20 1943:14	1956:2	6
<b>136</b> 1959:25 1960:4	1943:14 1959:3,14		<b>6/12/09</b> 1844:3
1961:23	1963:13	3	<b>60-40</b> 1938:17
<b>14</b> 1845:21	<b>2004</b> 1932:18	<b>3</b> 1892:2	<b>63</b> 1937:22
<b>142</b> 1891:19	<b>2009</b> 1888:4	<b>3/5/98</b> 1844:18	<b>633</b> 1842:6
<b>145</b> 1891:19	<b>2010</b> 1850:21,24	<b>300</b> 1923:11	<b>68</b> 1892:25
<b>146</b> 1891:20	1851:1,4 1854:6,9,14	<b>304</b> 1841:4 1845:4	
<b>1486</b> 1887:19	1854:18,24,25	<b>30th</b> 1971:17	7
<b>15</b> 1849:21,23 1874:10	1855:19 1856:6,7,8	<b>3374</b> 1841:20 1971:8	7 1852:2 1853:11
<b>15,000</b> 1952:15,19	1856:13 1857:23	1971:23	1857:23 1858:21
1953:17	1858:8 1927:9,23,25	<b>35,000</b> 1953:19	1968:18
<b>1568</b> 1958:3 1964:23	1928:8	<b>37</b> 1937:23	<b>7.5</b> 1857:3
<b>16</b> 1920:8	2010-00207563	<b>37-and-a-half</b> 1970:5	<b>7/19/10</b> 1844:9
<b>17</b> 1919:23	1856:11	<b>39</b> 1937:17	<b>7/7/10</b> 1844:10
<b>171</b> 1888:3	<b>2010-00373724</b> 1855:7	<b>3rd</b> 1841:24	<b>70</b> 1969:20
<b>1841</b> 1841:13	<b>2010-11</b> 1850:20		<b>700</b> 1842:18
<b>1845</b> 1843:3	<b>2011</b> 1845:21 1850:23	4	<b>701</b> 1841:24
<b>1848</b> 1843:3	1854:13 1856:4	4 1966:15	772 1888:4
<b>1849</b> 1844:3,3,4,4	1857:10 1909:13	<b>4:00</b> 1967:24	<b>780</b> 1888:4
<b>1855</b> 1844:8	1912:2 1915:1	<b>40</b> 1900:16 1903:18,20	<b>7th</b> 1968:14
<b>1856</b> 1844:8,9,9	1925:18	1903:25 1931:16,17	8
<b>1857</b> 1844:10	<b>2011-2012</b> 1854:11	1932:2,5 1936:23	
<b>1858</b> 1844:10	<b>2012</b> 1841:12 1850:23	1970:3	<b>8:30</b> 1967:18
<b>1859</b> 1843:4	1854:13 1897:22	<b>401</b> 1892:23	<b>80</b> 1937:15 1969:20
<b>1865</b> 1844:12	<b>2013</b> 1841:12 1866:16	<b>415</b> 1841:25	<b>80,000</b> 1951:7
<b>1866</b> 1844:12	1887:20 1937:14,20	<b>415.391.5400</b> 1842:7	800 1841:25
<b>188</b> 1928:6	1937:21	<b>478</b> 1849:19,21,22,23	<b>8000</b> 1951:5 <b>85</b> 1862:6
<b>19</b> 1856:13 1908:9	<b>2014</b> 1841:12 1909:13	1850:4,5 <b>487</b> 1844:3	<b>865</b> 1842:15
1920:8 1964:23	1912:3 1915:2	<b>487-A</b> 1849:7,8,17	<b>884</b> 1844:13 1957:6,12
<b>1904</b> 1843:4	1925:18 1939:13,17 <b>2015</b> 1841:18 1845:2	1859:6	1957:13
<b>1931</b> 1848:8 <b>1941</b> 1843:4	1889:19 1893:22,24	<b>487A</b> 1844:4	1937.13
	1927:25 1956:2	<b>488-A</b> 1849:8,17	9
<b>1948</b> 1843:4 <b>1954</b> 1843:4	1927.23 1936.2	1859:6	<b>9/3/99</b> 1844:16
<b>1956</b> 1844:14	<b>2034.310</b> 1886:20	<b>488A</b> 1844:5	<b>9:00</b> 1845:3
<b>1950</b> 1844.14 <b>1957</b> 1844:13,15,15,16	1890:11 1894:4	<b>489-A</b> 1849:8,17	<b>90</b> 1852:1,2,14,20
1844:17,18	<b>213.217.6000</b> 1842:19	1859:6,7	1853:7 1938:20
<b>1970</b> 1843:6,7	<b>213.443.3000</b> 1842:16	<b>489A</b> 1844:6	<b>90-A</b> 1850:19 1851:3
<b>1970</b> 1843:0,7	<b>213.443.3000</b> 1842.10 <b>214</b> 1887:19	<b>490-A</b> 1849:7,8,18	1852:8,18,21 1853:12
1990s 1921:3	21st 1969:6	1859:7	9000 1951:6
<b>1993</b> 1891:19	<b>22</b> 1966:9 1968:2	<b>490A</b> 1844:7	<b>90012</b> 1842:19
<b>1998</b> 1959:1,18,20	1969:2 1970:6		<b>90017-2543</b> 1842:15
1960:12 1963:12,14	<b>224</b> 1908:8	5	<b>93</b> 1891:20 1892:24
<b>1999</b> 1959:2 1960:17	<b>226</b> 1892:22	<b>5</b> 1967:14,25 1968:1	<b>94111</b> 1841:24
1961:3 1963:15	<b>23</b> 1908:9	<b>5/7/10</b> 1844:8	<b>953</b> 1854:4,4
	<b>24</b> 1896:17 1897:13	<b>50</b> 1865:5,7	<b>981-3498</b> 1841:25
2	<b>25</b> 1896:23 1897:21	<b>50-50</b> 1911:4	
<b>2</b> 1852:22 1889:18,19	<b>259</b> 1919:23	<b>50,000</b> 1951:7 1952:11	
1937:20	<b>26</b> 1870:18,24 1871:1,6	1953:15,16	
<b>2:00</b> 1967:24,25 1968:1	1871:12 1874:24	<b>500</b> 1861:13 1961:24	
<b>20</b> 1862:15 1872:11	1875:5 1876:19	<b>518</b> 1855:7,8	
1886:22 1887:15	1884:18,25 1885:25	<b>519</b> 1844:8 1855:13,16	
1937:21	1905:4 1908:5 1939:3	1855:18 1856:1,2,10	
<b>2001</b> 1959:2,19 1961:2	1939:4 1941:7 1948:9	<b>520</b> 1844:9 1856:18,19	
1963:15	<b>262</b> 1922:21	<b>521</b> 1844:10 1857:22	
	1		1

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEFORE THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. A. KARNOW DEPARTMENT 304  SAN DIEGO WATER AUTHORITY, ) Petitioner and Plaintiff, )  vs. ) No. CPF-10-510830 ) No. CPF-12-512466 METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF ) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA; ALL ) PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE ) VALIDITY OF THE RATES ADOPTED BY ) VOLUME XIII THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT ) OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON APRIL ) 10, 2012 TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY ) 1, 2013 AND JANUARY 1, 2014, and ) DOES 1-10, ) Pages 1972 - 2058 Respondents and Defendants. )  REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS San Francisco Superior	1 INDEX 2 Friday, June 5, 2015 (Dept. 304, Judge Karnow) 3 Volume XIII (Pages 1972 through 2058) 4 CLOSING ARGUMENTS: PAGE 5 BY MR. KEKER 1976 6 BY MR. QUINN 2010 7 BY MR. KEKER 2049 8 BY MR. QUINN 2055 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
(800) 522-7096 or (415) 981-3498 1972	1974
For Petitioner and Plaintiff:  KEKER & VAN NEST BY: JOHN KEKER, ESQ. BY: DAN PURCELL, ESQ. BY: AUDREY HADLOCK, ESQ. BY: NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG, ESQ. G33 Battery Street San Francisco, California 415.391.5400 ahadlock@kvn.com dpurcell@kvn.com jkeker@kvn.com wbraunig@kvn.com mgoldberg@kvn.com  QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN BY: JOHN B. QUINN,ESQ. BY: GARY GANS, ESQ. BY: GARY GANS, ESQ. CS South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 213.443.3000 johnquinn@quinnemanuel.com and OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL BY: HEATHER BEATTY, ESQ. TOO North Alameda Street Los Angeles, California 90012 212 223 244 255	San Francisco, California Friday, June 5, 2015 2:05 p.m.  THE COURT: Good afternoon. Just one or two words before we get started. I have an electronic version of San Diego County Water Authority's brief and I also would like one from Metropolitan, if you would. Any kind of electronic.  MR. QUINN: Will do. THE COURT: Something that is editable so I can shamelessly steal from whatever brief I think will be useful.  With respect to Met's motion for partial judgment, that is subsumed in the talk we are going to have today and the general merits of the case. It is my current plan, unless you think I should do something otherwise, to fold my discussion of that into the proposed statement of decision that will come out of today's hearing.  With respect to timing, I will try to get out a proposed statement within two weeks, but I may not make it. If I don't I am leaving on a trip it won't be until mid-July until the proposed statement and tentative decision come out.
1973	1975

When it does come out, we will have time for written objections, and that will be followed by a final statement of decision.

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.4

Why don't I turn it first over to San Diego and we can turn it over to Met.

MR. KEKER: You have asked several questions of San Diego, and I intend to answer them, and believe my answers will also be comments on questions to them.

So I am going to start there and not go to any of your tentative rulings. If that comes up later, we'll do it. We have a lot to say about your questions.

The first question was, as far as we know, might there be a lawful rate that generates zero damages? And our answer to that is an unqualified no, that you cannot.

You found in Phase I that you cannot put 100 percent of State Water Project costs and water stewardship rate costs in a lawful wheeling rate to charge. There simply is no evidence and no imaginable evidence before you -- it is pure speculation -- about a rate structure that would be based on lawful cost causation that could include some substantial or all of the State Water Project costs or the water stewardship costs.

It's a -- I think I understand where the

would be there is a tiny fraction of them that were inappropriately put on.

MR. KEKER: You look in the record to see if there's any evidence of nonspeculative damage proof that has been presented. I will get to that in a second.

Our position is that is Mr. Denham's analysis. Mr. Denham took your Phase I position, and you said certain rates were illegal, and he figured out if those rates were illegal and hadn't been charged, what the damages would be.

I will get to that in a second. But then you reminded -- and we said -- we said over and over again, we say what the damages are and if somebody thinks that there is some offset or there's some amount of money that should cause those damages to be reduced because of some other payment, that that burden is on the -- is on Met. We have said that. They have never responded to it.

You have reminded them in your CMC order which was November of 2014. Ben, can we put that up?

Before the trial, citing the Meister case, you said even if damages are difficult to determine, a trial court, nevertheless, should attempt to do it if there is liability. See Meister versus Mensinger. We have cited and talked to you in the brief about Meister. I will

1976 | 1978

question is coming from, and it may have come from questioning of Mr. Cushman which was cited in their brief.

I want to put up what Mr. Cushman actually said when it was cleared up. Before we do that, you will recall, I'm sure, that everybody agreed that figuring out what a rate structure would be, a lawful rate structure, other than the one that you were adjudicating in Phase I, was an effort of pure speculation.

Mr. Woodcock said 12 people would come up with 12 answers. Met in their brief said you can't do it; you don't have the authority to do it; none of us had done it. And there is no evidence of what it might be.

THE COURT: The question, then, is whose problem is that? Met's position is that's really your problem. Your position is that that's Met's problem.

Let's say the issue is, is there a lawful rate that generates 25 cents in damages. Maybe not zero. You're right, because there is something about the rates that were previously set that have to be reduced. But how do I know where the rate should be from your -- on the spectrum of your position, what the damages should be with respect to your position, which was 100 percent of all of those items that were put into the rate structure, versus, perhaps, some other position, which

remind you, somewhere around 396 or 397. For the fact the damages is certain, the amount of damages need not be calculated with absolutely certainty. The law requires only some reasonable computation of damages be used. The damages may be computed even if the result reached is an approximation. This is especially true where it is the wrongful acts of the Defendant that have caused the damages. We believe that is precisely the situation here. There is a dispute about what the contract amount was. You decided that the contract amount included the charges were too rich.

We have shown in a nonspeculative way -remember, Mr. Woodcock said Denham's math is right. So a nonspeculative way. If you took State water costs out and water stewardship rates costs out, what it would be.

Then you have to turn to Met for them to say, no, that's too much because the number should be something else. They put a big emphasis on the fact that you said -- you didn't say zero. You said not 100 percent. We say the only thing that is in this record is what 100 percent of the charges for system access rate, system power rate attributable to the State Water Project costs are. And the only other thing that's in the record is what the water stewardship rate costs actually are.

I will get to that in a minute because you have another question that is related to this.

2.2

2.5

Basically, this burden argument we think is done. They never responded to it. The only thing they cited from Meister is the proposition in business cases damages are based on net profits, not gross revenues. This isn't a business case. Even if it were, it detracts from the Court's fundamental point that once a plaintiff has offered reasonable proof that there were damages, which is what your finding is, we believe the burden of proving those damages -- of reducing those damages should be resting on the Defendant.

They said, quote, where it is clear a defendant has been at fault and has caused some part of the plaintiff's damages, the burden of proof should rest on him to show the extent of his contribution and if he cannot sustain it, he should be liable for the entire loss.

Mr. Denham brought you what the numbers would be. And I emphasize, I will go back -- before I get to the numbers, so Meister is the case that we rely on. When you get to the unjust enrichment part of Meister, it's just -- it's just added to. "In measuring the amount" --

"In measuring the amount of Defendant's unjust

MR. KEKER: That's not a reasonable -- our position is that's not a reasonable way of approaching it. In fact, it is absurd, given 12.4(c) of the agreement. 12.4(c) of the agreement said if there's a dispute, we are going to set aside money and put it in an escrow account. And at the end of the day -- I know we made a motion and you said that's not the measure of damages. But it's a pot of money that is sitting there. When the fight is over, who -- and damages are determined, you go to the escrow account and say give me, give me the money. You don't wait until they decide rates.

Actually, the absurdity of that position, the unlawfulness of that position, were you to decide a rate and say, for example, well, this could have -- these charges could have been put on the supply rate. Supply rate would have gone up. And I will explain that later about Mr. Cushman. That's the 15 percent reduction. If they had all been on the supply rate, then everybody would have paid more for the supply rate, and San Diego would have paid a higher supply rate. And according to Mr. Denham's calculations that Mr. Cushman testified about would be -- that 188 million would be reduced by about 15 percent.

The problem with that is they can't set rates

enrichment, the Plaintiff may present evidence of total or gross amount of the benefit or the reasonable approximation thereof, and the Defendant may present evidence of cost, expenses and other deductions to show the actual or net benefit the Defendant received. The party seeking disgorgement has the burden of producing evidence, at least a reasonable approximation of the amount. Wrongful gain and the residual risk of the uncertainty in calculating net profit is assigned to the wrongdoer."

We cited cases dealing with overcharge rates. The MCI case is the most important. I am not going to read it to you. But at 1414 and 1415 of the MCI case, this point is made in spades about once you have established that the rate is unlawful, if somebody wants to reduce the full amount of that as the measure of damages, the burden is on them to do it. And I don't need to remind the Court, despite many opportunities and despite what we anticipated they would do, they never presented any evidence of what a reasonable reduction would have been.

THE COURT: Well, they presented a way of approaching it, which is to wait until they do so, until they come up with a lawful rate, and then come back and figure it out at that point.

that aren't applicable to everybody. Nobody else is going to pay a 15 percent greater supply rate.

What they're asking you to do is decide that San Diego, and only San Diego, should pay some rate for something that nobody else is paying. That is unlawful under the exchange agreement. It is unlawful, we believe, under the Met act. Just plain unlawful.

That's why the contract was shaped the way it was.

We have a contract. We have a price. We recognize it may be a dispute about whether or not the price meets applicable law. There is a way of dealing with it. We set aside the money while we fight about it. The judge decides. The Court of Appeals decides, whatever. And that escrow account takes care of it. That way nobody gets charged different rates. That's it. This is just part of Met's operating expenses. They have an escrow account which pays damages.

So this idea that you wait -- it makes no sense. What are they going to do? They are in the future going to say, now that we've lost to San Diego, we would have charged in 2011 through 2015 some rate that nobody -- we are not going to charge anybody else that rate but that is what we would have done, approve it, stamp it, and now we are going to mitigate our

2.5

2.3

damages that way. Wrong. We don't think they can do it, and it makes no sense.

2.5

1.0

2.4

THE COURT: You think they can't do it not only with respect to San Diego but all the other members of Met, you don't think they can go back and redo all these numbers for everybody going backwards in time? Just reset the rates?

MR. KEKER: I don't think -- that doesn't -- No, I don't think they can. Their obligation, as they've told you many times, is to meet their costs.

So when they are setting rates for 2016, if they have some obligation from the past, they have some unexpected costs they have to pay, then build that into the rates. That is part of what you do when you set rates for the future.

Here it doesn't work like that, thanks to 12.4(c). People anticipated it and set this up and the money is already set aside. It's in the system. And they pay what they pay and 2016 takes care of itself.

So that's our answer to zero.

The second question is do we agree that some portion of the system access rate, system power rate or water stewardship rate are attributable to transportation or otherwise a proper basis to charge San Diego for exchange water. And then your subset, does a

what he did, he took that out, not in their entirety but only the State Water Project costs.

And our answer to that, of course, is yes. I remind you that Mr. Woodcock says there is no question about the math involved. And our answer to your question, does this come from a fair reading of your prior opinion, and we believe it does.

Their entire theory seems to be that because exchange water is blended, then we get to charge the State Water Project costs in some measure. You have dealt with that. You dealt with that the first time around, the Phase I decision.

Can we see statement of decision, page 53? Walk through it, the top.

You found Met's contract with the State makes clear that they don't own or operate, and your conclusion was no reasonable basis appears in the record as to why this has changed. What has changed is they used to charge this to supply and now they are charging it to transportation.

The only thing I would quibble with is there's no reasonable basis, but the basis in the record is pretty clear. San Diego wanting to wheel water. That is why they changed it.

And this was confirmed, and then it goes on to

fair reading of my opinion make that clear or not?

Again, our answer is no. Assuming what the Court is talking about when you talk about the system access rate and the system power rate is only the State Water Project costs. If we could put up PTX 512. You will remember Mr. Denham's chart. It shows how he got to the 188 million.

What San Diego is not seeking damages for is that \$100 million down at the bottom. There is a system access rate. Take the State Water Project charges out of the system access rate, the same with the system power rate. What remains is a properly paid -- we could, I suppose, if we wanted to go wild, say we should be able to get all of the system access rate or all the system power rate because they haven't proved anything different.

We didn't do that. The reasonable position was why did you say it was illegal, and we took out the parts of it that were the reason you said it was illegal and aren't challenging that \$100 million.

So the question here is whether or not it was proper for Denham to remove the State Water Project costs from the system access rate. I am talking about State Water Project now. I will get to water stewardship. Whether the SAR and the SPR, and that's

say you found that the SWP costs are the State's transportation costs, not Met's. And you noted that the record doesn't establish that State Water Project is necessary for wheeling at all. It is not necessary for

wheeling at all nor does it matter whether Met delivers a blend of water to wheelers. The blend might be useful

but as to wheelers, the benefit is gratuitous and not required by wheeling agreements.

There was a footnote about salinity. Their argument was much broader than that. You heard from the stand here and you heard in the first phase the evidence that supports your opinion. This business about blending is purely Met's convenience.

And it was confirmed by Mr. Woodcock, who testified that the foundation of proper ratemaking is cost causation, but that the exchange agreement does not cause Met to incur any additional State Water Project costs. And that's at page 1933, one through ten.

And then you've got your dispositive finding in Phase I which Met completely ignores in their brief. Nor does it matter that Met delivers a blend of water to wheelers and so on.

We put it up, so I won't do it again.

Their damages theory on blending and some alternative as something that matters is almost -- they

Pages 1984 to 1987

just completely ignored the statement of decision. And we believe the statement of decision was right and shouldn't be changed. They are not even arguing it should be changed. They just ignore it.

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.4

The only aspect of the Phase I decision they seem to recognize in their brief is this 100 percent business, that the Court didn't find -- you said 100 percent can't be charged, but you didn't say some other percent couldn't be charged. But they can't avoid mentioning in that very sentence in their brief, which is on page 12, that the percentage they could lawfully charge is certainly not 100 percent and all of their arguments are that, that just forget everything that you found because -- and treat it as though 100 percent was properly charged. And their burden is to show that some different number was proper.

So unless there are questions about the State Water Project resources -- State Water Project part of that second question, I am going to turn to the water stewardship rate.

Again, they don't make any effort to establish that it could charge any amount other than 100 percent, but they do admit they can't charge 100 percent, which is what they did.

They argue that the causal and beneficial

any money on demand management.

Let's put Mr. Upadhyah's testimony on the screen. You will remember him from both Phase I and Phase II. Page 1428, line 25, to 1429, line seven, Mr. Upadhyah was asked:

"Q When a member agency chooses to wheel water, that fact, the wheeling, doesn't cause Met to need to spend more money on demand management programs, does it?

He clarify the question:

"A Does the wheeling itself cause Metropolitan to spend

cause Metropolitan to spend more money on demand management?

"Q That's right.
"A I don't think so."

And back to the statement of decision at the bottom of page 60, top of 61. "It is worth noting here that the wheelers secure their benefits only when there is unused capacity in the extant transportation system."

THE COURT: That's not the case under the exchange agreement; right?

MR. KEKER: Except our position is the exchange

effect of reducing demand from the downstream member agency is in the infrastructure. That is at their brief, 12 and 13. But you've already rejected that argument.

We see the statement of decision at 61. "The cost of wheeling, while properly a function of system-wide costs associated with transportation as such, should not be a function of system-wide avoided costs of transporting purchased water."

There is a lot of discussion in Phase I about that, and that is the decision you reached. The entire section of 58 to 61 of the statement of the decision contradicts the argument that Met is making.

I would like to focus on this last sentence which says, "The cost of wheeling should not be a function of system-wide avoided costs." In other words, Metropolitan water.

Met ignores this crucial point and continues to argue that if it didn't invest in local supplies, quote, it would have to enlarge the transportation system, closed quote.

But they never attempted any causal nexus between the water stewardship rate and the cost of wheeling non-Met water. And now Met's own witnesses have admitted that wheeling does not cause Met to spend agreement, when it talks about a lawful rate for the conveyance of water applicable to all members and the testimony, is that's the wheeling rate. They are trying to figure out what the wheeling rate is.

THE COURT: I am just suggesting, there is a jump between moving from that particular sentence to suggesting that that logic applies to the exchange agreement. Because, for example, under the exchange agreement, whether there's unused capacity or not may not matter. They still are their obligation to deliver you the exchange water.

MR. KEKER: We agree. And our position has always been, and I think the evidence has uniformly been, when they were negotiating the price term, the reference to prices applicable under State law and applicable to the conveyance of water and equivalent for all member agencies, that was understood by everybody to be a wheeling rate. So the exchange agreement, whether it is a wheeling agreement or not, set as its price a reference outside of it, which is the lawful wheeling rate. And that's the way we are supposed to measure it.

I understand the jump, but we think the jump is pretty easy, and the evidence supports that connection.

So we think that Mr. Upadhyah's admission really should be the end of this water stewardship rate

discussion. He's admitted that there's no cost causation basis for charging any part of the water stewardship in the exchange agreement price. I will remind the Court you also mentioned in the statement of decision that Mr. Raftelis, in a throw-away line someplace in the history of this, had mentioned maybe you could divide it 50-50 between supply and transportation. But you mentioned in the statement of decision, and it was absolutely right, he was just talking. It was speculation. There was no basis.

1.0

2.4

And we know from the evidence at no point did Met do the work that would be required to make some kind of reasoned connection. You look at a project or you look at projects in gross, and you would say this much goes this way and this much goes that way. It is just completely not in the record.

So we believe that given this admission by Upadhyah and the evidence, that was completely proper for Mr. Denham to remove all of it.

Again, we go back to whose burden it is. We look at the decision. The water stewardship rate is illegal as charged. We say how much it is and take it out of the rates. And if they have -- if they want to make something and say we could have done something different or something else makes sense or something

MR. KEKER: And our position is that we read your decision. We learned what rates we had been charged were unlawful. There is the fact of damages we believe the decision has established.

The Meister case says it's not capable of exact measurement. Approximation is okay. The best approximation we can do is take out the parts of the rates that are illegal under your decision, and we took out those rates and came up with \$188 million. And that is a nonspeculative number. It is a number that can be explained. We say they are damages.

If they say they are too gross damages and they should be mitigated, reduced, offset, that's their burden. This is something we have been talking about from the beginning briefs all the way through. And they never respond to it except maybe -- and for them --

Again, go back to that case management. For them to stand up now and say it's our burden to prove what the lawful rate is when they have been arguing from the beginning that it is impossible for anybody in this courtroom to know what a lawful rate is and it would be beyond your jurisdiction to set one or to make a decision based on one is wrong.

I just repeat, our briefs have been a broken record on this point and they won't deal with it.

1992 1994

else is not speculative or whatever, something else should be set, that was their burden and they didn't meet it.

THE COURT: It all depends on how you phrase it. I think Met's position is you are the Plaintiff and you have to prove what a lawful rate was. And if you don't, then you haven't established your damages.

MR. KEKER: Okay. If that's their position, then I think they are really, really, really wrong because they said it is absolutely impossible -- we go back to Meister. It is impossible to prove what a lawful rate was because, A, it's speculation; B, according to their expert, ten different people would come up with a different lawful rate and, C, it is something the Court has no jurisdiction in deciding or doing. So their position is that it cannot be done --

THE COURT: That may be true, and I will be asking them when they get up to talk. Their position seems to be, at least in the brief, that until and unless you've established what the lawful rate is, something which previously as you and I know they had talked about doing themselves, perhaps, at the last hearing, their position today, as I understand it, is unless and until you have done that, you haven't established damages.

THE COURT: The section, just so the record is clear, I was talking about the bottom of Met's brief on page three. And they chastise you for not showing and never trying to prove you paid more than the amount of a lawful charge. That's at least one place that issue comes up.

MR. KEKER: I am going to get to -- there is proof in the record about why this is a lawful rate. Maybe I should just get to it now. Under your decision, you could find easily that Denham's rate is a lawful rate.

If they had charged -- given your rationale, if they said we are looking at wheeling and we are not going to put State Water Project costs in the wheeling rate, we are not going to put water stewardship costs into the wheeling rate, I don't think there's any question that what Denham -- by taking those things out, you would get a lawful wheeling rate.

I will show you in a minute that that's exactly what happened when they were fighting about the wheeling rate back in 1997. Maybe I will show you now. Put up that Kennedy summary slide.

In 1997 these parties were fighting about what a lawful wheeling rate should be. And they were in court. And at some point the legislature grew

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

frustrated and they passed AB 1082, which directed the head of the water resources, Kennedy -- this is in our brief -- to go out and figure it out. He said no cost shifting. We want to figure out what the burdens and benefits without cost shifting of a wheeling rate would

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

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Kennedy went out and he studied the situation. He was supposed to account for costs but also for the benefits up to net of San Diego bringing in water that they didn't have to supply.

He came up and concluded that it was an 80-dollar an acre-foot was a lawful wheeling rate. That became the basis. That became the basis for the 1998 exchange agreement, which you will recall started at 90.

There was a price term in it. There was a price term in it. That is Exhibit 31 in the record, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 31. We will start at 80, and here it is going to ratchet up over the years as a lawful wheeling rate in the original exchange agreement.

The evidence you have before you is when Kennedy was ordered by the legislature to figure out a fair and proper wheeling rate, he came up with \$80.

The 1998 exchange agreement in Exhibit 31, which took that \$80 and played it out, has for the years in question in this case a rate of 109 to 115 as a

unused capacity, so that's the legal rate, maybe. But if there's -- if you are running water through when there's not unused capacity, then they could charge you the full rate but you have to give San Diego a credit for the regional benefit. The regional benefit he calculated was somewhere up around \$250 an acre-foot. So Met could charge their big rate, but then they had to give a 250 acre-foot credit, which worked out to sort of the same thing.

In short, people who have gone through this -the only evidence that this is not a way to think about the wheeling rate is when June Skillman, which you heard in the first trial, when June Skillman sent back the report that Raftelis was doing, that was supposed to be a cost-of-service study, and told him to put in the State Water Project. That's the only evidence of any other rate.

But there's more. The water stewardship rate is, our position is, nothing but an unlawful tax, and you ought to think about it that way. And not just by virtue of the Court's ruling that it violates Prop 26. It is a tax under any analysis.

Mr. Upadhyah testified that the water stewardship rate collections go into Met's general reserves. They are used as Met sees fit. And he

1996 1998

lawful wheeling rate. Mr. Denham's corrected exchange price, the work that he did, is higher than that, 136 to 164. And the last line is what their actual rate is charged.

So you do have evidence before you of what a lawful wheeling rate would be. It is Denham's rate. It is Kennedy's rate projected out. If you remember the RMI report, in the RMI report option three came in at \$100, if you just put the costs of actually doing the transaction.

There is a lot of evidence in the record, your Honor, of what a lawful wheeling rate would be.

And we didn't pay it. And so what we're saying is our damages are the difference between what we were charged and a lawful wheeling rate. Denham has been conservative according to some of the evidence we could put in about lawful wheeling rates.

THE COURT: You are suggesting the Kennedy number acts as a cross-check on your expert's view of what the damages ought to be?

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir. Yes. Absolutely, we're saying that. He was assigned by the legislature to do the job. No cost shifting. If you get into the details of it, he was asked to try and figure out -- one of the things he did was when -- if for some reason, there's

admitted in both Phase I and Phase II that they don't make any effort to establish a reasonable relationship between the manner in which the water stewardship is allocated and the benefit its agencies receive.

So we say it's a tax. And the other part of it is that there's absolute failure on Met's part because they intentionally deny San Diego anything like a proportional benefit with the water stewardship rate. That's in retaliation. That's the effect of the RSI clause.

Can we see Plaintiffs' Exhibit 506? You saw this before. Blow up the 54 million number on the lower right.

This is the total. The testimony about this was this was what San Diego is losing, its water stewardship deficit, by not getting money because of the RSI clause. It was \$54 million.

Compare that to what we're asking for in our damage calculation, which is only \$28 million. 28- is the amount of money that the water stewardship rate --28 million is the amount of money that the water stewardship rate contributes to the damages of 188 million.

If we look at PTX 471, down at the bottom. that's where the 28- is. Our deficit of 54 million,

1997

instead of seeking that as a damage number, we are seeking the far more conservative amount we paid, that San Diego paid as a result of water stewardship rate charges.

It's extremely conservative.

2.2

If you look at the refund cases that we cited in our pre- and post-trial briefs, they all stand for the proposition that an entity that imposes an illegal tax can't shift the burden to the plaintiff to prove that some part of the illegal tax could have been legal or was legal after all or to prove a negative. If defendant cannot prove that its tax was unlawful, the plaintiff certainly isn't required to -- excuse me. If the defendant can't prove that its tax was lawful, the plaintiff isn't required to show what the lawful tax would be and then measure the difference.

You just get the money back that you paid for the illegal tax. That's the General Motors versus San Francisco case; Modesto versus National Medical, which are cited in our brief.

Another argument they make, which we think is completely wrong -- and I addressed it a little bit -- is that the amounts that Denham calculated, other member agencies would make up the shortfall. And as I said before, you rejected that argument in Phase I. Met

how rates are going to be set in the future to take into account your opinion is a completely different matter.

Your opinion is about a little limited -- not your opinion. Your -- this damage calculation is about a little limited four-year period. What the future is going to be, as we've agreed, is all speculative. It is going to be something. They will have to do something, and so far they haven't paid much attention to your opinion in setting rates for the future years.

If the Court of Appeals agrees, then I suppose they will have to adjust their rates not to pay for the past but just because that's what the law is, so that people are charged a lawful rate, that doesn't undercut our right to get damages for breach of contract is our view.

So your question was, are the damages claimed by San Diego overstated. And you can probably guess, we say no.

And we think it's reinforced completely by a comparison of the Kennedy analysis back then and the RMI analysis and what the 1998 exchange agreement projected were being charged during this period as a lawful wheeling rate. We think, no, it's not overstated.

The next question was how should I use Cushman's testimony that the State Water Project costs

2000 2002

argued its full service customers would end up subsidizing the cost of wheeling transaction but you held in Phase I Met must, nevertheless, permit such wheelings -- I can't remember that case now. It is down in Carmel -- and can only charge costs by the charge of wheeling. That is your decision, 55 through 58.

I have already mentioned that they don't have to go to other member agencies. They have got 12.4 escrow to draw down. They have been planning for this.

THE COURT: The money comes from someplace.

I mean, if they win the case, it comes out of escrow. I take it, it goes back. The fact that the money has been put in escrow doesn't seem to me to be a reason to think -- that alone doesn't tell me the money isn't going to come out of the hide of all the other member agencies in some way and the rates in some fashion are going to have to be adjusted to accommodate.

MR. KEKER: Two questions: One is certainly any expense that Met incurs is going to be paid for by the member agencies as long as it is going to be recovered in a legal rate structure. We get it. If they lose a lawsuit and somebody slips and falls in the front door, yes. If they lose a lawsuit, the member agencies are going to pay.

How it is going to be adjusted in the future or

are moved off of -- if they were moved off of conveyance and onto supply. It would reduce the damages by about 15 percent. Where does that 15 percent come from?

I think I addressed that. The testimony came up on cross at 1063 of the transcript. It was in Mr. Cushman's deposition. I don't know if it was designated or not. What he said was that Mr. Denham calculated what the supply rate would have been if these costs, State Water Project and WSR costs that were imposed on the exchange water had been not done that way but, instead, had been included in the supply rate. The supply rate would have gone up. Everybody would have paid more, including San Diego. And if you take the amount that San Diego would have paid as a result of that analysis for supply, the increase, then the result would be a number equal to 15 percent of what we're asking for for damages. That's just a straight calculation.

THE COURT: The supply costs would have been incurred by San Diego and everybody else under or pursuant to agreements that are not the exchange agreement; right?

MR. KEKER: Correct.

THE COURT: It's a function of other contracts that are out there.

MR. KEKER: I don't know. It's a function of what the -- remember, Met charges people. When you get water from Met, you get a supply rate, a system access.

THE COURT: Right.

2.3

MR. KEKER: So the supply rate would have been a little higher. System access rate would be whatever. The other rates would be whatever.

But San Diego, according to Mr. Denham's calculations, would have paid a higher supply rate with everybody else.

THE COURT: I understand that. I am just trying to make sure I am correct in my assumption that the obligation to pay the supply rate in the way that Mr. Cushman was talking about is a function not of any obligation under the exchange agreement. It is a function under obligation that comes from being a member of Met, so on and so forth, preexisting, separate, distinguishable, extraneous agreements.

MR. KEKER: Yes, sir. All true. Remember the context. We have been anticipating all along Mr. Denham, when asking him to do various calculations, because San Diego's position before Met had been you shouldn't be charging these costs to transportation. They should be on supply.

And Met had always said, forget it, we're not

be uniform for like classes of service throughout the district.

So San Diego can't have its damages calculated on a supply rate or reduced based on a supply rate that nobody else paid.

And that's another reference to the MCI case, the 59 F.3d at 1419. They talked about that, too. You can't be charged for offsetting category of service at a rate above or different from what others paid for that service. It is inconsistent with statutory and regulatory goals of preventing discrimination.

Because there's no proof of such a rate, because they insisted that nobody could prove that, nobody knows if that would have happened, there were so many other ways to make up this difference and nobody knows what they would do in the future, we think you should disregard the 15 percent. You can take the 188-and reduce it by 27-, if you found evidence in the record that made that less speculative than what we say is nonspeculative, which is the 188-. We just don't know how that would be reduced, if it would be.

Now, the last two questions to both of us about preferential rights, unless you have more about that.

THE COURT: Go ahead, please.

MR. KEKER: The first one, do the parties agree

doing that.

Mr. Denham said what if they had? What if they agreed back when, then their supply rate would have been different. How much different? It wasn't very hard to calculate. What was it? Add these things in and divide it by the amount of water they sold, and you get a different supply rate which would be higher and San Diego would have paid their share of it. The number, the result -- it is 18 plus nine so -- 27 million, something like that. They would have paid more, and that would have reduced the damages by 27 million.

We don't think you ought to do that because of all these arguments about speculation. And we don't know how they would have adjusted the rates. There were many things they could do. And the burden is on them to show something about this and they never did.

We argued in our pre- and post-trial briefs to award an offset based on increased supply rates couldn't be done if no other member agency paid those rates. This is pure speculation. To reduce our damages because under some system that never happened and maybe never would happen and so on, we might have paid more for supply we think is wrong. And it violates -- not just wrong but it violates Water Code Sections 109 through 134 which talks about a statutory requirement that rates

that in a pure wheeling transaction Met should give the purchasing party preferential rights credit?

The first point is this notion of a pure wheeling transaction is made for litigation. There is no such thing, according to them, because every time they use their system, there's an exchange of water. So "pure" makes no sense.

But the answer is yes. We certainly agree Met should give wheeling parties preferential rights credits. They are paying for conveyance of water and not purchase of water.

And the fact that they don't do that, even for what they call pure wheeling transactions, shows the logic -- the illogic of their position on preferential rights.

And then your final question to us, and this one to both parties, whether or not the preferential rights dispute comes down to whether the exchange agreement is for the water purchase or for conveyance. And we think that is basically correct, although we are asking for a broader ruling than that.

We are asking that for other conveyance payments for what Met concedes is wheeling, they should count for preferential rights, too.

But the big ticket item here definitely is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

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

2008

exchange agreement water. It is not -- it is a purchase according to 5.2. What the price is for is for the conveyance of water and not for the purchase of water.

1

2

3

4

5

6

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

THE COURT: Why is it that the agreement called this Met Water? Met has five reasons why the preferential rights don't kick in.

I think the first reason is the parties seem to have gone out of their way in this agreement to call the water San Diego is receiving Metropolitan water. They call it that. One inference from that is, regardless of whatever is happening in the real world with water molecules and the fact whether it is wheeling or anything else, there is always in effect an exchange of water. The parties appear to have agreed in the contract that it was going to be called Metropolitan Water so that, perhaps, it would be a purchase of water, treated as a purchase of water for these purposes.

MR. KEKER: The reason it was called -- the reason that 5.2 was set up as it is was because San Diego wanted to make sure that Met treated this water running through the Colorado River Aqueduct as Metropolitan Water so it couldn't make the kind of arguments it is making now, which is the water in the bottom is our water and we use cheap power to push it through, and the water on the top is your water and any

```
Metropolitan water are distinguished in the exchange
agreement in these two ways.
```

We think Met must treat the Met exchange water as local water under this provision. And that covers preferential rights. And the price term where it is treated as Metropolitan water, 5.2, says what we've just talked about. Needless to say, we agree with your tentative conclusions about affirmative defenses.

I will talk about them if you want me to or later.

THE COURT: We should probably take a short break and allow Met to talk and, perhaps, you would like to save that for the rebuttal.

14 MR. KEKER: Great. Yes, sir.

15 THE COURT: Take a five-minute recess. 16

(Recess.)

17 THE COURT: Mr. Quinn.

> MR. QUINN: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

MR. QUINN: I welcome interruptions, by the wav.

THE COURT: I'll try to control myself. As you

can see, I'm not very good at it. MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I proposed also to go

2010

expensive power you have to pay. So once it gets into the aqueduct, it's Metropolitan Water for purposes of pricing. That's the reason that they said it there.

There is a very important section they haven't talked about. This came up just in their brief this time. And that is 4.1.

Can we put up 4.1?

It is only Metropolitan Water for purposes of 4.2 and 5.2, the price mechanism. 4.1 makes plain that the exchange water shall be characterized for the purposes of all of Metropolitan's ordinances, plans, programs, like preferential rights, rules and regulations, like preferential rights, including any then effective drought management plan and for calculation of any readiness-to-serve charge share in the same manner as the local water of other Metropolitan member agencies, except as provided in the places where it is treated as Metropolitan Water, 4.2 and 5.2.

So when it comes to -- that's really our point. When it comes to preferential rights, which is Met's ordinances, plans, programs, rules, regulations, all that stuff, it is local water. Just like Los Angeles or Orange County, when they get a good rainfall, when they get a nice year of groundwater, they don't want to be charged for moving that around. So local water and

through the Court's questions.

THE COURT: However you would like to proceed is fine.

MR. QUINN: I may wander a little bit beyond

Did my last opinion establish at least the fact of damages?

We submit, no, your Honor, that the Court -- we weren't involved in Phase I, our firm. We read the record, and it was pretty clear from that that the focus -- and both sides agreed on this and it was brought up many times -- that that was not about the exchange agreement per se. Many times both sides and the Court said we're not talking about the exchange agreement. We are going to get into that in Phase II. That was a proceeding that focused on the legality of certain rates.

And the Court's opinion is phrased in terms of exchange rates and overcharging wheelers and it being unlawful as far as those rates would overcharge

At no point does the Court go to the extent of talking about the rates under the exchange agreement as applied here.

THE COURT: What does the contract say the

2011

2.2

rates are going to be after the first year?

MR. QUINN: After the first year?

THE COURT: Yes. After the year which everybody is in agreement.

MR. QUINN: There is a dollar number.

1.5

2.3

THE COURT: After that, the contract says the rates are going to be what?

MR. QUINN: It talks in terms of conveyance rates. It talks in terms of conveyance rates.

I'm told we can look at Met's rate schedule and look for the term "conveyance rates" and, interestingly, one doesn't find it. It is not something that -- a lot of issues have been explored in this case, but the issue of conveyance rate, as such, what that is, is not something that's gotten a lot of attention.

I think there's been a lot of discussion -- the terms "exchange rate" or "wheeling rate" has been used to mean a couple of different things at different times, at least. It has been used kind of loosely. I don't think we should jump to the conclusion that that is a wheeling rate as such. And I think that becomes significant when we talk, and as I will in a little bit, about the significance of the blending. But it is not a -- we all know it is not a wheeling transaction.

Miss Stapleton told you it is radically

lowest, the lowest delta. And I submit -- their argument on the burden of proof, the notion they are pitching to the Court is we have established the fact of damages, you did in Phase I.

Okay. Given that that's true, the fact that it is then hard to figure out what harm the wrongdoer has done. Under these cases the burden shifts, and it's now Met's obligation. That falls apart if you don't accept the first proposition, that they've established the damages. The thing sort of eats itself.

We submit we are comfortable with the standard statutory measure of damages here, the difference between what was charged and what could have been charged.

THE COURT: Walk me through, again, that first part.

How is it that -- or what more ought San Diego to have shown, let's say in this phase, having completed the work it did in Phase I and established whatever it established in Phase I, given that, what is it that San Diego failed to do to establish the fact of damages?

MR. QUINN: Fantastic question. Fantastic question, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, thank you.

MR. QUINN: They could have called an expert, a

different than a wheeling transaction. But the fact that the rates the Court found were unlawful in Phase I, the fact that those were unlawful does not necessarily follow that San Diego agreed -- that San Diego, in fact, paid more than what would be a lawful rate.

The Court found the rates were unlawful, but the Court didn't find in Phase I that San Diego paid more than what would be a lawful rate.

The Court would have to find that to establish the fact of damages. If it had been determined in Phase I that not only were the rates unlawful but that they were more than Met could lawfully charge, they would have a pretty good argument that the fact of damage has been established. But it wasn't established in Phase I.

So we then get to the question, and this is characterized by San Diego as a burden of proof issue, and the 60,000-dollar question in this context, given the state of the record, the evidence, whose burden was it to establish what a lawful rate would be? Or as we put it, and the authority we've cited we think supports the notion, what is the maximum amount we could lawfully charge.

Under those cases it says when there are different alternatives, the Court should use the measure that would yield the lowest number of damages, the

rate-making expert.

THE COURT: You would have objected -- MR. QUINN: Why would we have done that?

THE COURT: -- to a ratemaking expert.

MR. QUINN: I am saying this is what they could have done. And I am not clear as to why I would have objected to this because of some earlier ruling, perhaps. I would think if I would, then I would like to lay down a marker through expert testimony, a couple of different models, this is what could have been done here, and that there was some delta between what we were charged and what could have been done under different scenarios.

THE COURT: Phase I would have been of no utility to San Diego in this context. They would have been essentially starting from scratch in this endeavor.

MR. QUINN: No. I don't think so, because what you have established there is the rates they were charged were the wrong rates. They were more than problematical. They were wrong.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. QUINN: They paid that amount of money.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. QUINN: But the question is, and it wasn't established, should they have paid less? And it

estacioned, silvara titely have para less. Tina

wouldn't be possible in this day and age, I suspect, to find an expert witness who could address that. Instead, what did we get? What did we get, your Honor?

2.3

The sum total of their effort was to call Mr. Denham, who I submit was not an expert and gave zero expert testimony. The sum total of their effort was to call a man with a calculator and computer and to give him certain assumptions and tell him to back all this out and, presto, that difference, those are our damages. That was it.

That wasn't expert testimony. I trust the Court understands why I say that.

THE COURT: I do understand why you say that.
MR. QUINN: So, there was no effort made here
at all to address the issue about what the Delta was,
what could we have been charged. They just asked
Mr. Denham to make the assumption, and they asked this
Court to make the assumption, that's it, not taking into
account any other factors.

I can address and will address some of the other factors that could and should have been taken into account.

But I submit, since they didn't prove the fact of damage, it still was -- we're still in the world where the Plaintiff has the burden of proof to show MR. QUINN: Your Honor, with all respect, that has been our consistent view.

3 THE COURT: That has been --

MR. QUINN: True.

THE COURT: I think that's right, it has been.

MR. QUINN: It has been our view. We got past

THE COURT: Okay.

that. We needed to.

MR. QUINN: So given that, that the Court does -- given that the law of this case is the Court has that jurisdiction, they could have proved -- they could have proved up a case there. It wasn't because -- we were never saying you can't get into the minds of the people on the Met board and decide what they would have come up with. That was never our position, that it is speculative in that sense.

THE COURT: Suppose I disagree with you on the first issue, and I will give it more thought, on the first issue that the fact of damages has not been established.

What are your thoughts as to what kind of a situation you are in if the fact of damages has been established? What should I do now?

MR. QUINN: We have a lot of issues -THE COURT: Just in terms of the speculation.

2016 2018

where they should have been. If they had gotten there and there was any uncertainty, they would put an expert up there and he painted a different picture, a different scenario, then they would have an argument: The burden shifts, you wrongdoer, you created this problem; the burden is yours now.

We didn't get that. We got a man who had a calculator and was given certain assumptions, period, full stop. That was their whole damages case. That was it.

So I think they haven't proved the fact of damages. We never said, as I recall, it couldn't be done; it was speculative; it was impossible. They cited Mr. Woodcock's report where he said you could call 10 people or 12 people and they would do different things. If you look at the context in which he said that, I don't think he was talking about this particular issue, about how to design rates.

I think that is their -- no, the Court hasn't decided the fact of damage. It was still their burden and they didn't prove they were overcharged, that there were damages.

THE COURT: Your view has not been in this case that the Court was without jurisdiction to engage in some equivalent of a rate-making procedure?

We seem to have a situation where each side is saying that the responsibility for firming up that number, which could be, according to your brief, anywhere from zero to 100 percent of the items that had been removed

by San Diego from the rates, as far as San Diego is
 concerned pursuant to the Phase I opinion. Your view is

that it could be zero. Their view is it is 100 percent.

And you are each pointing to the other as responsible

And you are each pointing to the other as responsible to bear the burden of any ambiguity or speculation that would be involved in trying to put it somewhere within that range.

MR. QUINN: Let's assume they have proved the fact of damage. I don't think that relieves them from the obligation of putting forward a, for want of a better word, a decent damages case, one that isn't subject to some pretty obvious problems.

I mean, these include the failure to take into account the increase in supply costs which, by the way, we don't think is an offset problem but is something which to be an offset, as we understand the law, it has to be the sort of thing that has to be the subject of a separate cause of action, in this case, a counterclaim.

Completely ignoring that they now kind of, sort of would like the Court to pay attention to Mr. Cushman's testimony about the 15 percent, what he

was told by Mr. Denham, they don't really embrace that.

2.2

2.5

What does the Court know about that? Is that the sort of -- Mr. Cushman testified that's what he was told. We don't know how they arrived at that number. It is certainly not the type of evidence that the Court would accept if Mr. Denham was on the stand, if he just -- without giving some explanation about what he did

THE COURT: I have some question about why I should pay any attention to it at all. If San Diego conceivably, and maybe speculatively, get a hit on supply costs, that would be under -- it strikes me, as I was suggesting when Mr. Keker was talking -- under a completely different set of contractual agreements. Under the exchange agreement, maybe this is what the damages are and maybe, as a consequence, under these other agreements, as rates get modified, the supply costs go up to some extent.

Why is it that I would consider the effects on supply costs as I am trying to figure out what the damages are under the exchange agreements?

MR. QUINN: I don't understand, frankly, your Honor, why that would make any difference at all. It is not a question of an issue about whether that's a result of some other contract or agreement or transaction. It

agreement with a nonmember agency -- their supply costs would go up. The fact that they -- if they are not a member agency, that doesn't change the result. Their supply cost goes up.

They sort of realize that's an issue for them and that's why they are telling you, you know, you don't really have to take into account but you do have the testimony out of Mr. Denham's mouth as to what he was told -- testimony from Mr. Cushman as to what Mr. Denham told him.

THE COURT: Do you think the numbers should be something other than 15 percent and, if you do, what is the basis and evidence for that suggestion?

MR. QUINN: Not my problem.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. QUINN: That's my answer to that.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

MR. QUINN: But another issue with that, not only do you not know what Mr. Denham did to come up with that, one thing you do know is he closed his eyes to the potential effects on supply and pricing from the elasticity of demand. That if prices go up, how that will affect purchases, what the consequence of that is, he acknowledged he didn't do that.

Is that important? The Court only has the

2020 2022

is a necessary consequence, a necessary inevitable, acknowledged consequence of doing what they asked the Court to do.

You know perfectly well, you take it out of conveyance and move it to supply, supply costs go up. It's night and day. You don't have to go look at the terms of some other agreement and say is this a breach of that or what's the consequences of that. It's by definition it happens. That is nature. You have to look at net damages. It's a consequence of it.

THE COURT: San Diego, perhaps San Diego -let's say San Diego had never been a member of the Met
board and never been a member of the Met assemblage at
all. They just had this exchange agreement, that's it.
We have the situation we have today. Arguably, you
breached it and, arguably, there is the damages. And
you are supposed to figure out what the damages are.

In a situation like that, I would confine myself to what the problem is under the exchange agreement. I wouldn't look at some other potential series of arrangements that San Diego did or didn't have with Met, would I?

MR. QUINN: I don't think the Court, I hope, would close its ears to the testimony of Mr. Denham, that a consequence of that -- albeit, a separate

testimony of Mr. Woodcock, who told you that's important. That is something -- he criticized Mr. Denham for that. He said that's important; that is something you would have to take into account.

We think that's a real -- that's a real problem with this model. Again, addressing the Court's issue, assume there is a fact of damages, then what? That doesn't mean that you can accept any theory that's trotted out. That's one problem.

The other problem, the denominator issue. That cuts across every calculation, every single calculation that Mr. Denham made, whether for power, backing out the system access, all the rest of it. He purported to calculate what the costs were on a per-acre basis for Colorado River water but he didn't use that denominator. He used all water.

Of course, San Diego gets State Water Project water more than they get exchange water.

And the result of that is the denominator gets big, the total number of the fraction smaller, the delta bigger, and it yields another damages number. This is a problem, your Honor. It shouldn't be the Court's problem. It's a problem of proof for the Plaintiff.

Now I'm going to go a little bit more generally, your Honor, and I am going to sort of trench

2.2

2.5

on candidly addressing some of the issues which I'll say are dicta in the Phase I ruling because, as I understand it, that was focused on ratemaking. Because, as I said, the record reflects -- I wasn't here -- but the record reflects that all parties in the court understood that the Phase I was not about the exchange agreement per se.

2.2

2.5

2.3

So a lot of things I think the Court said in that opinion were dicta and don't necessarily bind the Court here.

I take it, it's undisputed that this is not a wheeling agreement. It is an exchange agreement, something radically different. And that the Court said in the Phase I opinion -- again, I think this was dicta -- the Court had limited evidence before it, the Court was limited, except for one cause of action, to the administrative record. Different now. The Court said, and San Diego relies on this -- I can't remember the exact word -- but gratuitously provided a blend.

That was our own decision that we did that. It may have been of benefit to San Diego, but that was something that we did and it was our decision.

I submit, the evidence is absolutely clear now that we had to provide a blend. It was expected we would provide a blend. We had no choice but to provide a blend. You shut down the State Water Project -- first

Ms. Stapleton, bless her heart, says, it is a matter of indifference to her. Of course, the contract says, by the way, if the State Water Project is down or there's interruptions there, it may affect our ability to deliver water. Clearly, the parties knew State Water Project water was coming through.

In our brief -- I can't remember them all of them off the top of my head -- but in our brief we gave six reasons why we had to deliver a blend.

THE COURT: I completely agree with that. It is clear as day that there's no way that any of this can be done without a blend being delivered.

MR. QUINN: Right.

THE COURT: I'm less clear as to what I'm supposed to do with that.

MR. QUINN: If the Court is open to suggestions on what to do with that.

THE COURT: I am.

MR. QUINN: What I'm sensing the Court may be grappling with is, "Listen, Met, you signed this contract, and it doesn't say that you're going to deliver a blend. It doesn't say you are not going to deliver a blend. It's your problem."

I think the only thing you can deduce from the words of that contract is that people knew it was going

2024 2026

empty the reservoirs, empty the aqueducts and shut down the State Water Project so none of that water was coming south, so you could only bring in through Colorado River water. That is what it would take to deliver a non blend. The system is set up in a way where it had to be a blend.

THE COURT: Your system is set up that way. MR. QUINN: It is.

THE COURT: It is for your convenience. That makes it easy for you to fulfill these contractual obligations. It might have been you had a system set up so that water comes in from Alaska, too.

MR. QUINN: The system has been set up for decades.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. QUINN: It is not a surprise to our board to know how our system is set up. Everybody knows how our system is set up and where the Colorado River water comes in.

There is nothing in that contract anywhere that contemplates that we're going to build a new aqueduct or bypass or something like that. There's a physical structure out there that was not a secret to anybody, which the undisputed evidence is. You could not deliver pure Colorado River water, notwithstanding what

to be a blend.

It says we can deliver either kind. When the one is down, you know, it may cause problems for our ability to perform under this. Everybody knows the structure of our system. It's not like we entered into a contract which we, by definition, could not perform.

That would be the alternative view of this, that they expected unblended water; you could have given them unblended water but, too bad, so sad, Met. It just happens you have a system you couldn't do that.

No, that's not the situation here. Everybody knew what the scenario was. There really isn't any dispute about that. You didn't hear anybody from San Diego give you some theory about how physically unblended water could have been provided.

Am I making progress on that, your Honor? THE COURT: Not yet. I am still convinced that you're right, that everybody knew it had to be -- it was going to be blended water.

I'm convinced your brief is correct, that when you track out the course of water, no matter what anybody from San Diego said, it was going to be blended water, and there is no way around that. Everybody knew it. I don't know where to go with that.

MR. QUINN: I will show you. I will tell you,

the first thing is the Court had some dicta in the first opinion about how that was just our -- whatever it was the Court said.

2.2

2.5

1.0

2.4

THE COURT: It was just -- right, it still seems right to me that the fact it is blended water, that's the way it is. It seems to be a matter of indifference to San Diego, and nobody at San Diego cares.

MR. QUINN: The Court, if I recall what the language was, the Court said something like -- this is dicta and the Court didn't have all the records it has now -- something like it was our choice or it was a gratuitous benefit or something like that. I don't think it matters much.

THE COURT: Probably not.

MR. QUINN: My point is, and I think we may be together on this, it wasn't a matter of our choice. What does the Court do with that?

We have an exchange agreement which necessarily requires a blend and it includes some amount of State Water Project water. It has to be there. It has to be there.

The question is, is it fair under this exchange agreement for Met to charge for some of those State Water Project costs which are attributable to the State

debt that had been assumed at the appropriate level. And the Court says the entire cost of the project, the

<sup>3</sup> State Water Project, was to be met by the proceeds of

4 these contracts, the contracts between the various

members, the agencies and the State. The State's

general fund was clearly nothing more than a conduit.

Yeah we're going to issue bonds: we are going to issue

Yeah, we're going to issue bonds; we are going to issue bonds but we're a conduit. You are going to pay off

these bonds. We are doing nothing. We are a conduit.

And by the way, we are not guaranteeing you a car. If

we produce a car, you have a claim on a car. We are not

guaranteeing you a car.

The Court goes on to say, "We conclude when the
State's voters approved the fact that they approved an
indebtedness in the amount necessary for building,
operating, maintaining and replacing the project and

that they intended that the costs were to be met by payments from the local agencies with these water

19 contracts."

In a very real sense, those are our costs. I am not arguing at this point for the strong case that we should get 100 percent. What I'm saying here is there should be daylight for the Court to look at the blend, recognizing we had to deliver a blend, and they get it for free or almost free if they don't pay any State

Water Project water which is necessarily included in that blend? I think that is one of the issues the Court has to grapple with.

If -- what's at stake here? If those costs cannot -- if no State Water Project -- no costs attributed to that portion of the blend can be charged to San Diego, that means they get free State Water Project water or highly subsidized State Water Project water, subsidized by all the other member agencies.

They get that water, which is higher quality and which is more expensive to get there than the Colorado River water. They get it for essentially nothing if we can't charge them for some of that.

That is what I think the Court has to grapple with. Now I realize I am running right up against the Court's -- the views, the ruling in the Phase I, that none of the State Water Project costs are Met's costs. And on that I would say, your Honor, a couple of things.

Again, the record is more fully developed than it was before. We built the Ford factory. We were required -- our costs. There is a case, it's the Goodman versus County of Riverside case, which is 140 Cal.App.3d 900, where the Court went through this issue about whose costs, whose obligations are these and there was a challenge by taxpayers about whether this is

Water Project costs.

And an alternative theory, which they could have presented, would tie those costs on some per-unit basis based on the blend. That wouldn't be that hard to do. You just decide what it was, and you could review what the blend was periodically and there would be a billing for that. In other words, it's a rate for State Water Project water.

The evidence is in the record as to what the that would be, what it would come out to for each of those elements. It's all in the record. They didn't do that. That is one scenario that could have been presented, and I submit would be a defensible way of looking at this. There are other ways.

We have this postage stamp parade.

THE COURT: The other way is one of the ways you suggested, which is don't award damages now and wait. Do you want to walk me through how long that would take? Wait for this case to go to the Court of Appeal, get that resolved, figure out what the Court of Appeal thinks ought to happen and maybe remand it to me, get a final decision, have San Diego -- have Met come up with a new rate, at that point the lawful rates, which, by the way, would probably be challenged.

MR. QUINN: Right.

2.2

THE COURT: Right. We are talking about ten years down the road or something before we know what the damages are in this case.

MR. QUINN: I think the fastest way and the most expeditious way to deal with this is to rule that -- to dismiss their contract claim for failure of proof. And that then the rest of it, the rate issue goes up.

1.0

2.4

THE COURT: Right. Gets resolved.

 $MR.\ QUINN:\ And\ then\ we'll\ get\ some\ answers.$ 

THE COURT: You are endorsing this. You are saying let's dismiss this now because we can't figure it out until we know what the lawful rate is. Once the Court of Appeals figures out the Phase I issue, and I may have to try the case again and maybe not, then have San Diego refile its claim and then we'll figure out what the damages are.

My question is, aside from the obvious question which is really, how long will that take, in part I'm also looking at this trying to figure out what the parties may have had in mind when the parties signed the contract.

Do you think this is what the parties thought would happen when the parties say it has to be a lawful rate in Sections 5.1 or 5.2 holding Met to some sort of

and arrive at different rates. There is such evidence.

Mr. Keker told you that in his -- I can't remember if it is his opening statement or closing argument. I could point the Court to the passage.

Mr. Cushman also said he thought that's what is going to happen. I can't tell you that he thought that at the time of contract was entered into or his prediction about what would happen.

I don't think -- trying to divine what the intent of the parties are in a contract case is always a useful thing, but I think we are kind of beyond that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. QUINN: In terms of the State Water Project, what else could they have done in the State Water Project water? I'm not putting all my eggs in the basket of this is a blend, they get it for free or substantially free if you back out all these costs. Because there is this issue, which I know has come up time and again in the Phase I, about Met does, under its contract with the State, does have the ability to wheel water in State facilities. There was testimony in the Phase I about some occasions when that's happened.

Why does that matter? It's, in effect, a paid-up license, a property interest that Met has in the State Water Project system. I know there was attention

2 2034

a standard? I understand there is a disagreement as to what that standard is but holding Met to some sort of standard.

Assuming Met violated that standard, that they violated the standard, so the rate was not lawful, do you think that is what the parties had in mind, that it would be sort of a period of 10 to 15 years, or whatever it is, before they got their damages?

MR. QUINN: I doubt if they thought about it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. QUINN: But I want to address that but -- I want to Respond to the preliminary comment your Honor made.

We're saying that it's not -- we are saying the contract claim should be dismissed for failure of proof on a basic element. That's our position. I'm not here saying we are waiving statute of limitations about refiling or anything like that.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. QUINN: I am saying they had a burden and they didn't meet it.

There is evidence in the record that the parties did contemplate that if the Court invalidated the rates, it would then go back to Met to look at that

to the fact it only happened once or twice or three times or how often it happened. I submit the issue is not how often it happened, but the fact we have a paid-up right to do that whenever there is space available, what is that worth?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. QUINN: There is a paid-up license, a property interest in the State system where, subject to certain conditions, if it is available, we can always use that.

THE COURT: We kind of went through this in Phase I.

MR. OUINN: I know.

THE COURT: The whole idea of a property interest is one of those marvelous concepts. Anything can be a property interest, a license. I don't know how much time you want to spend. Your position is Phase I is dicta as far as the issues that have to be decided today.

MR. QUINN: Not all of it. What I'm saying, your Honor, is one could have said that paid-up license, the right to use the State system at any time -- set aside how often we've done it -- the right to do it at any time, what's that worth? And done some sort of proration about State Water Project costs based upon

on about State Water Froject costs based apon

that acknowledged property right.

2.2

2.5

1.0

THE COURT: San Diego has always had the position that isn't something we should be doing.

MR. QUINN: Of course, they've had that position. I understand that.

THE COURT: Yes. I seem to have agreed with them at least to that extent in Phase I.

MR. QUINN: I think I began by signaling that there are some issues that I think on this fuller record the Court now has --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. QUINN: -- that the Court has the ability -- the Court could do it on a new trial motion. Clearly, that lays in the future. Maybe there are some things we can address now. We have this right. It's worth something. That is another way you could have valued this and prorated State Water Project costs. You say maybe that's worth the ability to use the State Water Project system at any time, pick a number out of the air. An expert could testify and say that's worth ten percent of those costs. Ten percent of those costs we could then allocate. Again, not our burden of proof. It was their burden of proof.

Another infirmity in Mr. Denham's analysis,

which is all you have, which is all they gave you, is

MR. QUINN: We do not.

Under the Met law, member agencies, only Met agencies, have preferential rights. Met cannot give, lawfully give preferential rights to a third party that wheels.

And you have to ask yourself, would it make any sense to give an increased right to buy Metropolitan water to a third party that can't buy Metropolitan water in the first place?

As to member agencies, of course, San Diego is a member agency. Would it make any sense to give an agency the right to purchase more Metropolitan water for using the Met system to move non-Met water? That doesn't make sense either. So in a pure wheeling transaction, addressing the Court's question about a pure wheeling transaction, that would not give them preferential rights credit.

Does the parties' dispute come down to whether the exchange agreement is for water purchase or conveyance? Respectfully, no. San Diego is not entitled to preferential rights; however, the agreement is characterized. Either way, San Diego is paying a volumetric water rate, and the Court of Appeal has excluded those payments. That's the case, San Diego versus Metropolitan, where the Court upheld the

2036 2038

the power, the power to move water.

A lot of the facts here are undisputed. We have a variety of different rates. We have a unitary systemwide rate. And Mr. Denham simply assumed let's just back out the State power costs, which are the more expensive ones, and we'll just use that all our water, no matter what the volume is, will be moved at the essentially free or very low cost Colorado River rates.

Where did that come from? There was no expert analysis on it. None. It was just an assumption they were given. The Court knows that wheelers, to the extent they are wheelers and to the extent an analogy to the wheeling relationships is relevant, under our code wheelers must supply their own power, market rate.

If we have subsidized or essentially free or low-cost power, why would you assume that we would give that to them rather than us. There was no analysis. We are going to assume the lower cost rate. I think the Court has the point on that.

On preferential rights, the Court raised the question: Do the parties agree that in pure wheeling transaction Met should give the purchasing party preferential rights credit? And we don't agree with that.

THE COURT: You do not?

exclusion of all payments for water, even though those payments included charges for conveyance. You couldn't say this is for conveyance.

THE COURT: You can't break it apart.

MR. QUINN: You can't break it apart. If that were true, if you could -- if they could get preferential rights credit for this, they would be the only agency getting credit for paying conveyance charges, even though every single agency does pay conveyance charges. San Diego would be the only one getting credit for it, if they were right.

THE COURT: What's the overall policy? What's the overall reason that preferential rights are granted? What I'm getting at is this: In your brief you've gone and I think argued there's this big difference between exchange water and wheeled water. See if I'm getting this correct. And there are five reasons why in the brief you suggest that preferential rights don't attach.

I'm trying to get a sense of what is it that preferential rights are supposed to do. My understanding is that basically they are there so that people -- that people who are using and contributing to the ongoing expenses and to the capital costs of maintaining the structure that Met has are to that extent entitled to their preferential rights.

And so the question comes, and I'm saying this so you will contradict me if I'm wrong, the issue comes down to the extent to which the exchange water is water that the payments for it are in any way payments that go to the ongoing costs or capital expenditures of maintaining the Met system.

Is it your position that, A, that's true; and, B, this is all payment for water, so that's why there are no preferential rights, that what San Diego is paying under the exchange agreement is simply for water and it doesn't go to capital costs and the ongoing costs?

Or is your position that, yes, maybe it does go to ongoing costs and capital costs but, just as in the San Diego case you just cited, you can't split them apart, so the default is it is going to be treated just as a water purchase?

MR. QUINN: This goes back to it's a function of a State law.

THE COURT: Right.

2.0

2.5

1.0

1.5

2.4

MR. QUINN: Legislation act back in 1931, which Met has interpreted as preferential rights for certain classes of things, not anything that is volumetric. Anything that is volumetric does not get you preferential rights. It is based on volumes of water.

I think that's all I have except with respect to the affirmative defenses.

THE COURT: Do you want to say anything about that now? It is already a quarter to 4:00.

MR. QUINN: I can, sure.

By the way, your Honor, I don't want to waste anybody's time.

THE COURT: You're not.

MR. QUINN: I would say I'm not going to go through the affirmative defenses and the evidence. The Court heard it and a lot of it was repetitive.

The Court's tentative did not address mistake of law, which we went to the trouble of amending our Answer to include here. And indisputably, everybody agrees there was a mistake of law here because the testimony from San Diego was that, in fact, Met did believe they thought that Met believed the rates were lawful. Court has held they are unlawful. So there's a mistake here, no question. We're over that hurdle.

THE COURT: Suppose you're right on illegality and mistake of law. Typically that, I think, results in rescission. What happens? You have to give San Diego the water back?

MR. QUINN: That's a really good question. THE COURT: We go to sort of a trial on quantum

So real estate taxes, property taxes, fixed charges, capital -- I'm getting some help -- readiness-to-serve and anything that is volumetric, based on quantities of water delivered does not get you preferential rights.

And that is the way Met has always applied this and their interpretation of the State law. I think the agency's interpretation of the law -- they administer it. They have the history and the expertise -- is entitled to some deference.

In terms of the Court's question about Metropolitan water, that the contract goes out of the way to say it's Metropolitan water, and Mr. Keker read you that passage that said it's local water except in 4.2 and 5.2, wow. That's what it is all about, 4.2 and 5.2. That's the section that describes the payments. That's the basis for our contention this is Metropolitan water. They were paying volumetric rates for Metropolitan water and they can't get credit for preferential rights for that. The passage he read to you is really the whole point.

I think this is an area where the Court at least ought to think about this is how this agency has -- who administers this law, has interpreted it for a long time, isn't that entitled to some deference?

meruit.

MR. QUINN: Can I think about this? THE COURT: We may not have an answer in the next four or five minutes, but that is one of my concerns about some of these defenses.

MR. QUINN: Right. The answer may be different. If it was illegal, the contract may have been void. If there was a mistake of law, it may be rescission. That is what my gut is telling me.

But if there was a mistake of law as to any one of these rates, the Court invalidated four rates, then each one -- any one of them is immaterial. They involve tens of millions of dollars. So if there was a mistake of law, for example, as to water stewardship charges, whether a mutual or universal, I think the evidence on that was there was a mistake of law on that one. There's no evidence in the record that San Diego understood that the inclusion of the water stewardship rate and conveyance charges was unlawful at the time of the contract.

In fact, Mr. Slater, their person most knowledgeable designated, testified that San Diego saw no violation of the pertinent laws in 2003. We have a slide, slide 49, where he testified at the time he saw no violation.

Ms. Stapleton's letter to the MWD in February of 2008, DTX 794, further proves the point. She actually supported the water stewardship rate. That's slide 30.

2.2

2.5

2.3

So we don't think there's any evidence as to this rate, they thought it was unlawful at the time the contract was entered into.

If they did think that the inclusion of the water stewardship rate was illegal, then we get to the question, is this an issue of unilateral mistake? Did they tell anybody at Met? They know it's illegal. They don't tell anybody at Met. That is unilateral mistake. They kind of in their brief kind of ridiculed the idea, magic word, when did you say it was illegal. Unilateral mistake of law, that magic word is magic. It doesn't -- you are not putting somebody else on notice that it's illegal if you just say we really oppose that and we think that's completely wrong. That doesn't discharge your obligation. If you think it's illegal and you want to get out of unilateral mistake of law, you know the other guy thinks it's legal, you have to tell him, "It's illegal." You do, indeed, have to use the magic word.

Cushman confirmed that there was no written or oral statement that the water stewardship was unlawful before 2010. And that's slide 31.

There is an ambiguity when we say whether something is legal or illegal. Sometimes things are very clear. People can sit around and tell each other we know murder is illegal. In this area of water law there is evidence at the time there were developing cases, lawsuits going on, and there seemed to be a lot of uncertainty as to where the law would end up. It may well be that when people -- people didn't know if it was going to be illegal or not and maybe we still don't know today. Right?

MR. QUINN: We are learning in realtime, your Honor.

THE COURT: We don't know. The Court of Appeal will rule in this case, and we'll find some things out at that point. Maybe the Supreme Court will take the case and we'll find things out. Given all of that and given the apparent mental state of the people who entered into this agreement, that some people are hoping it's legal, some people are hoping it is not legal and some people are hoping a Court will ultimately shift the rates around, why would an illegality be a basis to void this or to do something that -- or to agree that the affirmative defense works, just to put it in neutral terms?

MR. QUINN: I think we have to talk about the

Ms. Stapleton's testimony was she did discuss the legality of the water stewardship rate with Mr. Underwood, who passed away. For reasons we indicated in our brief, we have some issues with the credibility of his testimony -- of her testimony. In any event, she said that was based on the Katz wheeling law which San Diego admitted did not apply to the exchange agreement.

That testimony by Ms. Stapleton, if she discussed it with Underwood, was contradicted by Mr. Slater -- slide 32 -- where he says, and this is specifically about Underwood and he said, "I don't believe she used that phrase."

THE COURT: The evidence seems to be consistent with the following sort of a picture, that at the time the agreement was signed that San Diego may have had some very deep reservations about the legality of these rates and, in fact, hoped, fervently hoped, that some day a Court would declare them to be illegal.

Some of the people, perhaps, Mr. Slater and perhaps others on their own had their own personal view, not as judges but perhaps not as lawyers but their own personal view, that the rates were illegal and that they hoped some day this would all get resolved in their favor.

two separately: The mistake of law versus illegality.

I take it that the law is that in the state of affairs the Court describes, if it is uncertainty whether a contract term is illegal, and then you have a Court that decides, wow, that was illegal, that contract is void. It is not -- the law isn't that it's only the next contract after that decision where the Court says it's illegal that that one is void.

No. I think the law is pretty clear, and we can cite the Court Metropolitan Water District of Southern California versus Superior Court, 23 Cal.Rptr. 491, basically, uncertainty in the law at the time does not get you out from a contract being void if a Court later decides that was illegal.

I think the analysis on mistake of the law is different. We have testimony from Mr. Slater. I didn't see any legal issues under the pertinent laws at the time. We certainly acknowledged we thought it was legal. I think that supports a mutual mistake defense, at least as to the large stewardship rate.

I think you have to look at the evidence of each of them separately. These are each multimillion-dollar components of these rates, any one of them. You have to deal with whether the contract is void ab initio.

2

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

Then we have the testimony of other people at San Diego that said I absolutely thought it was illegal from the very beginning; except for the man who passed away, I never told anybody at Met that.

So I think there is a tension in San Diego's position in that they are trying to have it both ways: No, we weren't mistaken, or we were mistaken but you weren't, or we were mistaken and we told you, or we weren't mistaken and we told you. I think there is a tension there.

As to the water stewardship rate, I don't think there is evidence that San Diego understood the inclusion of the water stewardship rate in the conveyance charges to be unlawful at the time of the contract. We certainly didn't think it was illegal.

THE COURT: Right.

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

MR. QUINN: I could talk about other issues here. If the Court has any questions about any of the other affirmative defenses, the Court raised some other issues in the questions, and I am happy to address those

THE COURT: I am satisfied. I appreciate your help. Let's just take a pause off the record.

Let's continue.

MR. KEKER: Brief response, your Honor.

other people -- we have shown that.

And what they are complaining about is we haven't shown the highest possible rate that we could somehow think of. You know from the history of this case that they could charge -- they had a lot of ways to deal with the State Water Project. They could charge membership fees. They could charge property taxes. They don't have to charge volumetric rates.

The whole premise of Phase I is that if you are going to charge volumetric rates, they have to be based on cost causation and so on. So the idea that somehow there is some burden on somebody to figure out the highest possible thing you can charge is just plain wrong.

It's also wrong that, having shown that you were charged an improper rate, you send the fox back to the henhouse to eat some more chickens. That's the Shapell case which we cited in our earlier briefs, 1 Cal.App.4th 218 at page 244, California Court of Appeals. That's the teaching of the MCI case which we cited again and again on tax rebates, illegal taxes. That's the point of the Oneida case, which we have cited in our briefs. That it's an illegal rate, and it is a violation of the contract.

The other thing, if I could find it, that we

2048

2050

THE COURT: Please, I appreciate it. MR. KEKER: I am going to concentrate on the damages portion. First of all, the fact of damages, that we don't know what the conveyance rate means, I won't put up 5.2.

They don't talk about the conveyance rate. They talk about the lawful rate applicable to the conveyance of water.

Met's brief, in their trial brief in this case, they say on page 11, "First, San Diego board was clearly informed of the differences in price and the price term in Option-2" -- remember that is where we ended up --"Was the conveyance rate, and the conveyance rate consisted of System Power Rate, Water Stewardship Water Rate and System Access Rate."

This idea that we don't know what conveyance -that there is some ambiguity about it is wrong. The difference, what they say the proof should be -- We have shown what we were charged. We have shown what we were charged illegally. We have shown what would happen if you took the illegal portion of the rates out of those charges. They say that it is our burden to show what we could have been charged. We have shown a lawful rate which is what Denham has put in, and we have shown that is consistent with other lawful rates that Kennedy and

cited in our post-trial brief in Phase II, we have pointed out all the cases that talk about unlawful fees are a breach of contract. This is on page 23 of our brief. The Marella Boxer case versus Superior Court, which is cited at 23 and 24, you have a right not to be subjected to unlawful billing practices.

So, the fact of damages is established. And we were subject to unlawful billing practices, and now we go on to the next stage.

These arguments about all the things that we ignored, we did not ignore an increase in the supply cost. What we did was accept testimony that was uniform that nobody knows whether or if or what any increase in the supply costs might have been. They say you've got to shift the money from -- if you are not going to charge it here, you have to shift it to the supply costs. You don't have to do it. You can collect it many different ways. Ten different experts, ten solutions. That's what the evidence is.

Elasticity is a quibble. If they've got something that they wanted to prove about elasticity, they could. But it certainly does not undermine. Since we don't know if supply rates are going to go up, we don't know what the elasticity might change.

This denominator issue, just flat out wrong.

2051

What they're saying -- they mischaracterize what Mr. Denham is doing. Mr. Denham is looking -- he does not -- they say he is trying to present evidence on the cost per acre-foot of conveying Colorado River water. That's not what he did.

2.0

2.5

1.0

2.4

He said that he was calculating costs. He wasn't calculating them specific to the Colorado River. He was correcting wheeling rates by, what I said, removing State Water Project and water stewardship rates, and then spreading those costs over the remaining non State Water Project transportation costs, the ones that San Diego doesn't challenge, that part of the system access rate and system power rate, across all the water in the Met system. Because that's the way it is done.

That's what the denominator should be, all Metropolitan water, not -- otherwise, it wouldn't be a systemwide rate. It wouldn't be a rate that is generally applicable to everybody.

So further, what you can see is that it is simply a stalking horse. This denominator argument is a stalking horse for what became very clear during Met's argument, which is you got Phase I wrong; you missed it; you didn't understand; you shouldn't have said that the State owns the State Water Project; you shouldn't have

State Water Project water. Everybody got it then. This is when Kennedy was working. This is when the legislature had told Kennedy to come up with a rate. No cost shifting. That's what it meant back in 1998. Exclude State Water Project costs.

It completely refutes -- everybody understood that until the rates were unbundled and until Ms. Skillman got involved and until the 2003 rate structure was in place, the State Water Project was considered supply. And it wasn't until San Diego wanted to start moving water through the system they began to break it up. This notion of blending is not even a stalking horse. It is an explicit attack on your Phase I decision where you got it right.

Very brief -- excuse me. Very briefly on this mistake of law business, we dealt with that on page 22 of our brief in the footnote. And Footnote 8 says, the exchange agreement were illegal, which it is not, San Diego would be entitled to a full refund of all consideration; whereas, Met would be barred as a matter of law from seeking any offset. And we cited two cases there. I won't repeat them for the record. They are in Footnote 8. Their argument is both nonsensical and self-defeating. It would be bad for Met.

When they cited the Met versus Superior Court

said that for them to treat the State Water Project as their project and their transportation and their power costs, that they shouldn't have done that and it's wrong.

They have said they couldn't have been more clear. And that's what this whole denominator issue, this blending issue is about.

And by the way, they have proved absolutely nothing in terms of quantification about the blending issue. There's no data for you to do anything with. They are just making this argument that because of blending, you should ignore what you said in the Phase I decision. You should go back on what you said and you should recognize that the State Water Project really is Met's State Water Project. And you were right in Phase I. I am not going to argue it again but that's clearly what their whole case is based on.

I would point out that PTX 31 is the 1998 exchange agreement. Can we put Section 5.4 up for a minute?

Let me set the stage. In 1998 the rates have not been unbundled yet. So they talk about what is going to happen in the 20th contract year. In the 20th contract year, Met is going to be able to adjust because of its costs, but the one thing it can't do is include

case to you just now, that's from the dissent. Their arguments on the contract give pettifoggery a bad name. I'll just leave it there.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KEKER: Thanks for your patience.

THE COURT: Mr. Quinn, you have your glasses on in a very determined way.

MR. QUINN: Two things I forgot to say.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. QUINN: One, in the Court's questions we got yesterday, with respect to the illegality, the Court wrote it appears the parties simply agreed to legal rates.

And that is true except for the first year.

The Court will remember it was a dollar amount.

THE COURT: It was a dollar number.

MR. QUINN: It was a dollar number.

THE COURT: Right. I do recall that. You are not contending the dollar number was illegal.

MR. QUINN: I am contending it had the very same component in it which everybody knew which the Court said it was illegal. Everybody knew where that came from, from San Diego.

THE COURT: I will tell you, I am not persuaded by that argument.

```
1
1
            MR. QUINN: All right.
                                                                                       REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2
                                                                        2
            THE COURT: They came up with that number.
 3
                                                                        3
       They could have a thousand reasons to come up with that
                                                                              STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 4
                                                                        4
       number. They could have dreamed it in their heads, but
                                                                                                ) ss
 5
                                                                        5
                                                                              COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA.
       we are not going to attack it on the basis it was a
                                                                        6
 6
       function of a dream. We look at the number. And people
 7
                                                                        7
       come up with funny ways for numbers. They came up with
 8
                                                                        8
                                                                                I, TARA ANN SANDFORD, CSR #3374, Certified Shorthand
       this way and good enough for the first year.
                                                                        9
 9
                                                                              Reporter, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of
            Is your contention that first number is an
10
                                                                       10
                                                                              California, hereby certify:
       agreement to an illegal rate?
                                                                       11
11
            MR. QUINN: That's San Diego's contention.
                                                                                That the court proceedings were taken down by me in
                                                                       12
12
                                                                              stenotype at the time and place herein named and
            THE COURT: The first --
13
                                                                       13
                                                                              thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided
            MR. QUINN: I think it's absolutely clear in
                                                                       14
14
                                                                              transcription under my direction.
       the evidence that they knew --
                                                                       15
15
                                                                                I further certify that I am not interested in the
            THE COURT: I don't think they are challenging
                                                                       16
16
       that first year.
                                                                              event of the action.
17
                                                                       17
                                                                                WITNESS my hand this 6th day of June,
            MR. QUINN: That $253, you built that from the
                                                                       18
18
       system access rate, the system power rate, their own
                                                                              2015, at Santa Barbara, California.
19
                                                                       19
       document. Their own internal documents and
                                                                       20
20
       presentations say that's what that was.
                                                                       21
21
            THE COURT: I think you're probably right.
                                                                                          Jain Sandfor
22
                                                                       22
            MR. QUINN: At least the first year. It wasn't
                                                                       23
                                                                                          TARA SANDFORD, RPR, CSR No. 3374
23
       a question of agreeing to an illegal rate.
                                                                       24
24
            If that's illegal, that goes to the core of the
                                                                                          Certified Shorthand Reporter
25
                                                                       25
       contract, and that is part of our affirmative defense.
                                                                                          State of California
                                                           2056
                                                                                                                                   2058
 1
             The second thing, and last thing I'll say, is
 2
       Mr. Keker said we have given the Court in Mr. Denham a
 3
       lawful rate schedule or lawful way to do this. Well,
 4
       with all respect, the Court has no way of knowing
 5
       whether that would be lawful. It would be equally
 6
       unlawful to overcharge other member agencies and have
 7
       them subsidize San Diego's exchange activity. That
 8
       would be illegal, too. And the Court just has no
 9
       evidence on that issue.
10
             They assert, just back out those costs and we
11
       have given you a lawful rate, your Honor.
12
             I don't think they've shown that. I think that
13
       results in real issues about the legality of the
14
       consequences and the treatment of other member agencies
15
       if you do what they suggest.
16
             Thanks, your Honor.
17
             THE COURT: I appreciate everybody so much.
18
       Thank you so much.
19
             MR. KEKER: Thank you, your Honor.
20
             MR. QUINN: Thank you, your Honor.
21
             MR. KEKER: Thanks for your patience.
22
             (Arguments concluded at 4:10 p.m.)
2.3
24
25
                                                           2057
```

<u>A</u>
<b>ab</b> 1996:1 2047:25
ability 2026:4 2027:4
2034:20 2036:13,18
able 1985:14 2053:24
absolute 1999:6
<b>absolutely</b> 1979:3 1992:9 1993:10
1992.9 1993.10
2048:2 2053:8
2046.2 2033.8
absurd 1982:3
absurdity 1982:13
accept 2014:8 2020:6
2023:8 2051:12
access 1979:22 1984:22
1985:4,10,11,14,23
2004:3,6 2023:13
2049:15 2052:13
2056:18
accommodate 2001:17
account 1982:6,10
1983:15,18 1996:8
2002:2 2016:19,22
2019:18 2022:7
2023:4
acknowledged 2021:2
2022:24 2036:1 2047:18
acre-foot 1996:12
1998:6,8 2052:4
act 1983:7 2040:21
action 2019:22 2024:15
2058:16
activity 2057:7
<b>acts</b> 1979:7 1997:19 <b>actual</b> 1981:5 1997:3
Add 2005:5
added 1980:23
additional 1987:17
address 2016:2,15,20
2016:20 2033:12
2036:15 2042:12
2048:20
addressed 2000:22
2003:4
addressing 2023:6
2024:1 2038:15
adjudicating 1977:8 adjust 2002:11 2053:24
adjusted 2001:17,25
2005:14
administer 2041:8
administers 2041:24
administrative 2024:16
admission 1991:24
1992:17
admit 1988:23
I

```
admitted 1989:25
  1992:1 1999:1 2045:7
ADOPTED 1972:10
affairs 2047:3
affect 2022:23 2026:4
affirmative 2010:8
  2042:2,10 2046:23
  2048:19 2056:25
afternoon 1975:5
  2010:19,20
age 2016:1
agencies 1991:17
  1999:4 2000:24
  2001:8,16,20,24
  2009:17 2029:9
  2030:5,18 2038:2,3
  2038:10 2057:6,14
agency 1989:2 1990:6
  2005:19 2022:1,3
  2038:11,12 2039:8,9
  2041:23
agency's 2041:8
agree 1984:21 1991:12
  2006:25 2007:8
  2010:7 2026:10
  2037:21,23 2046:22
agreed 1977:6 2002:6
  2005:3 2008:14
  2011:11 2013:4
  2036:6 2055:12
agreeing 2056:23
agreement 1982:4,4
  1983:6 1987:16
  1990:24 1991:1,8,9
  1991:18,19 1992:3
  1996:14,19,23
  2002:21 2003:22
  2004:15 2007:19
  2008:1,4,8 2010:2
  2011:13,15,23 2012:4
  2020:15,25 2021:7,14
  2021:20 2022:1
  2024:6,11,11 2028:19
  2028:24 2038:19,21
  2040:10 2045:8,16
  2046:18 2053:19
  2054:18 2056:10
agreements 1987:8
  2003:21 2004:18
  2020:14,17,21
agrees 2002:10 2042:15
ahadlock@kvn.com
  1973:7
ahead 2006:24 2035:6
air 2036:20
Alameda 1973:18
```

Alaska 2025:12

albeit 2021:25

```
allocate 2036:22
allocated 1999:4
allow 2010:12
alternative 1987:25
  2027:7 2031:2
alternatives 2013:24
ambiguity 2019:9
  2046:1 2049:17
amending 2042:13
amount 1978:14
  1979:2,10,11 1980:24
  1980:25 1981:2,8,16
  1988:22 1995:4
  1999:20,21 2000:2
  2003:14 2005:6
  2013:21 2015:22
  2028:20 2030:15
  2055:15
amounts 2000:23
analogy 2037:12
analysis 1978:6
  1998:22 2002:20,21
  2003:15 2036:24
  2037:10,17 2047:15
Angeles 1973:15,19
  2009:22
ANN 2058:8
answer 1976:7,14
  1984:20 1985:2
  1986:3.5 2007:8
  2022:16 2042:14
  2043:3,6
answers 1976:8
  1977:11 2032:10
anticipated 1981:19
  1984:17
anticipating 2004:20
anybody 1983:23
  1994:20 2025:23
  2027:13,22 2044:11
  2044:12 2048:4
anybody's 2042:7
apart 2014:8 2039:4,5
  2040:16
apparent 2046:17
Appeal 2031:20,21
  2038:23 2046:13
Appeals 1983:14
  2002:10 2032:14
  2050:20
appear 2008:14
APPEARANCES
  1973:1
appears 1986:17
  2055:12
```

```
apply 2045:7
appreciate 2048:22
  2049:1 2057:17
approaching 1981:23
  1982:2
appropriate 2030:1
approve 1983:24
approved 2030:14,14
approximation 1979:6
  1981:3,7 1994:6,7
APRIL 1972:11
aqueduct 2008:21
  2009:2 2025:21
aqueducts 2025:1
area 2041:22 2046:4
arguably 2021:15,16
argue 1988:25 1989:19
  2053:16
argued 2001:1 2005:17
  2039:15
arguing 1988:3
  1994:19 2030:21
argument 1980:3
  1987:10 1989:4,13
  2000:21,25 2013:13
  2014:2 2017:4 2034:4
  2052:21,23 2053:11
  2054:23 2055:25
arguments 1974:4
  1988:13 2005:13
  2008:23 2051:10
  2055:2 2057:22
arrangements 2021:21
arrive 2034:1
arrived 2020:4
aside 1982:5 1983:13
  1984:18 2032:18
  2035:23
asked 1976:6 1990:5
  1997:24 2016:16,17
  2021:2
asking 1983:3 1993:18
  1999:18 2003:17
  2004:21 2007:21,22
aspect 1988:5
assemblage 2021:13
assert 2057:10
assigned 1981:9
  1997:22
associated 1989:7
ASSOCIATES
  1972:22
assume 2019:12 2023:7
  2037:16.18
assumed 2030:1 2037:4
Assuming 1985:2
```

applied 2011:24 2041:6

**applies** 1991:7

2033:4 assumption 2004:12 2016:17,18 2037:10 assumptions 2016:8 2017:8 attach 2039:18 attack 2054:13 2056:5 attempt 1978:23 attempted 1989:22 attention 2002:8 2012:15 2019:24 2020:10 2034:25 attributable 1979:22 1984:23 2028:25 attributed 2029:6 **AUDREY** 1973:4 authority 1972:6 1977:12 2013:20 Authority's 1975:7 **available** 2035:5,9 avoid 1988:9 avoided 1989:8,16 award 2005:18 2031:17 В **B** 1973:13 1993:12 2040:8 back 1980:20 1981:24 1984:5 1990:19 1992:20 1993:11 1994:17 1995:21 1998:13 2000:17 2001:12 2002:20 2005:3 2016:8 2033:25 2034:17 2037:5 2040:18,21 2042:23 2050:16 2053:13 2054:4

2057:10 **backing** 2023:12 backwards 1984:6 **bad** 2027:9 2054:24 2055:2 **Barbara** 2058:5,9,18 barred 2054:20 based 1976:21 1980:6 1994:23 2005:18 2006:4 2031:4 2035:25 2040:25 2041:4 2045:6 2050:10 2053:17 basic 2033:17 basically 1980:3 2007:20 2039:21 2047:12 basis 1984:24 1986:17 1986:22,22 1992:2,10

**applicable** 1983:1,12

2052:19

1991:2,15,16 2049:7

**BRAUNIG** 1973:5 1996:13,13 2022:13 1998:6 2000:23 2023:14 2031:4 breach 2002:14 2021:7 2003:8 2006:3 2041:17 2046:21 calculating 1981:9 2051:3 2056:5 breached 2021:16 2052:6,7 calculation 1999:19 basket 2034:16 break 2010:12 2039:4 2002:4 2003:18 Battery 1972:24 2039:5 2054:11 1973:6 2009:15 2023:11.11 brief 1975:7,12 1977:3 bear 2019:9 1977:11 1978:25 calculations 1982:22 **BEATTY** 1973:17 1987:20 1988:6,10 2004:9.21 calculator 2016:7 began 2036:8 2054:11 1989:3 1993:19 1995:2 1996:3 2017:8 **beginning** 1994:15,20 2048:3 2000:20 2009:5 California 1972:1,9,11 believe 1976:7 1979:8 2019:3 2026:7,8 1972:17 1973:6,11,15 1980:10 1983:7 2027:20 2039:14,18 1973:19 1975:1 1986:7 1988:2 2044:13 2045:4 2047:11 2050:19 1992:17 1994:4 2048:25 2049:9.9 2058:3,10,18,25 2042:17 2045:13 2051:1,4 2054:15,17 call 2007:13 2008:8,10 **believed** 2042:17 briefly 2054:15 2016:4,7 2017:14 Ben 1978:20 briefs 1994:15,24 called 2008:4,15,18 beneficial 1988:25 2000:7 2005:17 2014:25 benefit 1981:2,5 1987:7 2050:18,23 candidly 2024:1 1998:5,5 1999:4,8 **capable** 1994:5 **bring** 2025:3 2024:20 2028:13 bringing 1996:9 capacity 1990:22 benefits 1990:21 broader 1987:10 1991:9 1998:1,3 1996:5,9 2007:21 capital 2039:23 2040:5 broken 1994:24 best 1994:6 2040:11,14 2041:2 brought 1980:19 car 2030:10,11,11,12 better 2019:15 2011:12 beyond 1994:22 2011:4 care 1983:15 1984:19 BROWN 1972:22 cares 2028:8 2034:11 big 1979:18 1998:7 **build** 1984:13 2025:21 Carmel 2001:5 2007:25 2023:20 **building** 2030:15 case 1975:16 1978:21 2039:15 built 2029:20 2056:17 1980:7,21 1981:12,13 bigger 2023:21 burden 1978:16 1980:3 1990:23 1994:5,17 billing 2031:7 2051:6,8 1980:11,15 1981:6,17 1996:25 2000:19 **bind** 2024:8 1988:15 1992:20 2001:4,11 2006:6 bit 2000:22 2011:4 1993:2 1994:14,18 2012:13 2017:9,23 2012:22 2023:24 2000:9 2005:15 2018:10,12 2019:15 2019:22 2029:21,22 **blend** 1987:6.6.21 2013:16,18 2014:2,7 2024:18,23,24,25 2016:25 2017:4,6,20 2030:21 2031:19 2032:3,15 2034:10 2025:5,6 2026:9,12 2019:9 2033:21 2026:22,23 2027:1 2036:22,23 2049:22 2038:24 2040:15 2028:20 2029:2,6 2050:12 2046:14,16 2049:9 2030:23,24 2031:4,6 **burdens** 1996:4 2050:5,18,20,22 2034:16 business 1980:5,7 2051:4 2053:17 blended 1986:9 1987:12 1988:7 2055:1 2027:19,22 2028:5 2054:16 cases 1980:5 1981:11 buv 2038:7,8 blending 1987:13,24 2000:6 2013:23 2012:23 2053:7,9,12 2014:7 2046:6 2051:2 bypass 2025:22 2054:12 2054:21 C bless 2026:1 category 2006:8 Blow 1999:12 C 1993:14 causal 1988:25 1989:22 **board** 2018:14 2021:13 CA 1972:24 causation 1976:22 1987:16 1992:2 2025:16 2049:10 Cal.App.3d 2029:23 bonds 2030:7,8,9 Cal.App.4th 2050:19 2050:11 **bottom** 1985:9 1990:20 Cal.Rptr 2047:11 cause 1978:15 1987:17 1995:2 1999:24 calculate 2005:5 1989:25 1990:9.14 2008:24 2023:14 2019:22 2024:15 calculated 1979:3 2027:3 **choice** 2024:24 2028:12 Boxer 2051:4

caused 1979:8 1980:14 cents 1977:18 certain 1978:8 1979:2 2011:17 2016:8 2017:8 2035:9 2040:22 certainly 1988:12 2000:13 2001:18 2007:8 2020:5 2047:18 2048:15 2051:22 certainty 1979:3 **CERTIFICATE** 2058:1 **Certified** 2058:8,24 certify 2058:10,15 challenge 2029:25 2052:12 challenged 2031:24 challenging 1985:20 2056:15 change 2022:3 2051:24 changed 1986:18,18,24 1988:3,4 characterized 2009:10 2013:16 2038:22 charge 1976:19 1983:23 1984:24 1986:9,19 1988:12,22 1988:23 1995:5 1998:3,7 2001:5,5 2009:15 2013:12,22 2028:24 2029:13 2050:5,6,7,8,10,13 2051:16 **charged** 1978:9 1983:16,22 1988:8,9 1988:15 1992:22 1994:3 1995:12 1997:4,15 2002:13,22 2006:8 2009:25 2014:13,14 2015:12 2015:19 2016:16 2029:6 2049:19,20,23 2050:16 charges 1979:11,21 1982:16 1985:10 2000:4 2004:2 2039:2 2039:9,10 2041:2 2043:14,19 2048:14 2049:22 **charging** 1986:19 1992:2 2004:23 chart 1985:6 chastise 1995:3 cheap 2008:24 **chickens** 2050:17

2028:17 **chooses** 1990:7 cite 2047:10 cited 1977:2 1978:24 1980:5 1981:11 2000:6,20 2013:20 2017:13 2040:15 2050:18.21.22 2051:1 2051:5 2054:21,25 citing 1978:21 claim 2030:11 2032:6 2032:16 2033:16 **claimed** 2002:16 clarify 1990:12 classes 2006:1 2040:23 clause 1999:10.17 clear 1980:13 1985:1 1986:16,23 1995:2 2011:10 2015:6 2024:22 2026:11,14 2046:3 2047:9 2052:22 2053:6 2056:13 **cleared** 1977:5 clearly 2026:5 2030:6 2036:14 2049:10 2053:16 close 2021:24 closed 1989:21 2022:20 **closing** 1974:4 2034:3 CMC 1978:19 code 2005:24 2037:13 collect 2051:17 collections 1998:24 Colorado 2008:21 2023:15 2025:3,18,25 2029:12 2037:8 2052:4.7 come 1975:19,25 1976:1 1977:1,10 1981:24,24 1986:6 1993:14 2001:15 2003:3 2018:15 2022:19 2031:10,22 2034:18 2037:9 2038:18 2054:3 2056:3.7 comes 1976:10 1995:6 2001:10,11 2004:16 2007:18 2009:19,20 2025:12,19 2040:1,2 comfortable 2014:11 coming 1977:1 2025:2 2026:6 **comment** 2033:13 **comments** 1976:8 **Compare** 1999:18 comparison 2002:20

	I
complaining 2050:2	
completed 2014:18	
completely 1987:20	
1988:1 1992:16,18	
2000:22 2002:2,19	
2019:23 2020:14	
2026:10 2044:18	
2054:6	
component 2055:21	
components 2047:23	
computation 1979:4	
computed 1979:5	
computer 2016:7	c
computer-aided	
2058:13	_
	C
concedes 2007:23	
conceivably 2020:11	C
concentrate 2049:2	C
concepts 2035:15	C
concerned 2019:6	C
concerns 2043:5	c
<b>conclude</b> 2030:13	c
concluded 1996:11	c
2057:22	
conclusion 1986:17	C
2012:20	C
conclusions 2010:8	
conditions 2035:9	
<b>conduit</b> 2030:6,8,9	
confine 2021:18	
confirmed 1986:25	
1987:14 2044:23	
connection 1991:23	
1992:13	c
consequence 2020:16	C
2021:1,2,10,25	C
2022:23	C
consequences 2021:8	
2057:14	
conservative 1997:16	C
2000:2,5	c
consider 2020:19	c
consideration 2054:20	
considered 2054:9	
consisted 2049:14	
consistent 2018:2	
2045:14 2049:25	
contemplate 2033:24	
contemplates 2025:21	
<b>contending</b> 2055:19,20	C
contention 2041:17	c
2056:9,11	
context 2004:20	
2013:17 2015:15	
2017:16	
continue 2048:24	
continues 1989:18	
contract 1979:10,10	
-	

```
1983:8,10 1986:15
 2002:14 2008:15
 2011:25 2012:6
 2020:25 2025:20
 2026:2,21,25 2027:6
 2032:6,22 2033:16
 2034:7,10,20 2041:12
 2043:7.20 2044:7
 2047:4,5,7,13,24
 2048:15 2050:24
 2051:3 2053:23,24
 2055:2 2056:25
contracts 2003:24
2030:4,4,19
contractual 2020:14
2025:10
contradict 2040:2
contradicted 2045:10
contradicts 1989:13
contributes 1999:22
contributing 2039:22
contribution 1980:16
control 2010:23
convenience 1987:13
2025:9
onvevance 1991:2,16
 2003:1 2007:10,19,22
 2008:3 2012:8,9,11
 2012:14 2021:5
 2038:20 2039:2.3.8
 2039:10 2043:19
 2048:14 2049:4,6,8
 2049:13,13,16
conveying 2052:4
convinced 2027:17,20
ore 2056:24
correct 2003:23
2004:12 2007:20
2027:20 2039:17
corrected 1997:1
correcting 2052:8
cost 1976:21 1981:4
 1987:16 1989:6,15,23
 1992:1 1996:3,5
 1997:23 2001:2
 2022:4 2030:2 2037:8
 2037:18 2050:11
 2051:12 2052:4
 2054:4
cost-of-service 1998:15
costs 1976:17,18,23,24
 1979:14,15,23,25
 1984:10,13 1985:5,23
 1986:2,10 1987:1,2
 1987:18 1989:7,9,16
 1995:14,15 1996:8
 1997:9 2001:5
```

2002:25 2003:9,9,19

```
2004:23 2019:18
  2020:12,18,20 2021:5
  2022:1 2023:14
  2028:25 2029:4,5,17
  2029:17,21,24
  2030:17,20 2031:1,3
  2034:17 2035:25
  2036:17.21.21 2037:5
  2039:23 2040:5,11,12
  2040:14,14 2051:14
  2051:17 2052:6,10,11
  2053:3,25 2054:5
  2057:10
COUNSEL 1973:17
count 2007:24
counterclaim 2019:22
County 1972:2 1975:7
  2009:23 2029:22
  2058:5,9
couple 2012:18 2015:9
  2029:18
course 1986:3 2023:17
  2026:2 2027:21
  2036:4 2038:10
court 1972:1 1975:5,11
  1977:14 1978:23
  1981:18,22 1983:14
  1984:3 1985:3 1988:7
  1990:23 1991:5
  1992:4 1993:4.15.17
  1995:1,25 1997:18
  2001:10 2002:10
  2003:19,24 2004:4,11
  2006:24 2008:4
  2010:11,15,17,20,23
  2011:2,8,14,22,25
  2012:3,6 2013:2,6,7,9
  2013:24 2014:3,15,24
  2015:2,4,14,21,23
  2016:12,13,18
  2017:19,23,24 2018:3
  2018:5,8,9,10,17,25
  2019:24 2020:2,5,9
  2021:3,11,23 2022:11
  2022:15,17,25 2024:5
  2024:7,9,12,14,15,16
  2025:7,9,15 2026:10
  2026:14,16,18,19
  2027:17 2028:1,3,4,9
  2028:10,11,15,18
  2029:2,14,23 2030:2
  2030:13,23 2031:16
  2031:19,20 2032:1,9
  2032:11,14 2033:11
  2033:20,24 2034:4,12
  2035:6,11,14 2036:2
  2036:6,10,11,12,13
  2037:11,19,20,25
```

```
2038:23,25 2039:4,12
  2040:20 2041:22
  2042:3,8,11,18,20,25
  2043:3,11 2045:14,19
  2046:13,13,15,20
  2047:3,5,7,10,11,13
  2048:16,18,19,22
  2049:1 2050:19
  2051:4 2054:25
  2055:4,6,9,11,15,16
  2055:18,22,24 2056:2
  2056:12,15,21 2057:2
  2057:4,8,17 2058:11
Court's 1980:8 1998:21
  2011:1,18 2023:6,22
  2029:16 2038:15
  2041:11 2042:12
  2055:10
courtroom 1994:21
covers 2010:4
CPF-10-510830 1972:8
CPF-12-512466 1972:8
created 2017:5
credibility 2045:5
credit 1998:4,8 2007:2
  2037:23 2038:17
  2039:7,8,11 2041:19
credits 2007:10
criticized 2023:2
cross 2003:5
cross-check 1997:19
crucial 1989:18
CSR 1972:20 2058:8
  2058:23
current 1975:17
CURTIS 1972:3
Cushman 1977:2,4
  1982:18.22 2004:14
  2020:3 2022:9 2034:5
  2044:23
Cushman's 2002:25
  2003:6 2019:25
customers 2001:1
cuts 2023:11
          D
damage 1978:4
  1999:19 2000:1
  2002:4 2013:13
  2016:24 2017:20
  2019:13
damages 1976:14
  1977:18,22 1978:10
  1978:13,15,22 1979:2
  1979:2,4,5,8 1980:6
  1980:10,11,12,15
  1981:17 1982:8,9
```

1983:18 1984:1

1985:8 1987:24 1993:7,25 1994:3,11 1994:12 1997:14,20 1999:22 2002:14,16 2003:2,17 2005:11,20 2006:3 2011:7 2013:10,25 2014:4,10 2014:12.21 2016:9 2017:9.12.22 2018:19 2018:22 2019:15 2020:16,21 2021:10 2021:16,17 2023:7,21 2031:17 2032:3,17 2033:8 2049:3,3 2051:7 **DAN** 1973:4 data 2053:10 day 1982:6 2016:1 2021:6 2026:11 2045:19,24 2058:17 daylight 2030:23 deal 1994:25 2032:5 2047:24 2050:6 **dealing** 1981:11 1983:12 dealt 1986:11,11 2054:16 debt 2030:1 decades 2025:14 decent 2019:15 decide 1982:11,14 1983:3 2018:14 2031:5 decided 1979:10 2017:20 2035:18 decides 1983:14,14 2047:5,14 **deciding** 1993:15 decision 1975:19,25 1976:3 1986:12,13 1988:1,2,5 1989:5,11 1989:12 1990:19 1992:5,9,21 1994:2,4 1994:8,23 1995:9 2001:6 2024:19,21 2031:22 2047:7 2053:13 2054:14 declare 2045:19 deduce 2026:24 deductions 1981:4 deep 2045:17 default 2040:16 defendant 1973:11 1979:7 1980:12,13 1981:3,5 2000:12,14 **Defendant's** 1980:25 **Defendants** 1972:14 **defense** 2046:23

2047:19 2056:25	developing 2046:5	disgorgement 1981:6	electronic 1975:6,9	2054:1,6 2055:21,22
defenses 2010:8 2042:2	dicta 2024:2,8,14	dismiss 2032:6,12	<b>element</b> 2033:17	2057:17
2042:10 2043:5	2028:1,11 2035:18	dismissed 2033:16	elements 2031:11	evidence 1976:19,20
2048:19	<b>Diego</b> 1972:6 1975:7	dispositive 1987:19	EMANUEL 1973:12	1977:13 1978:4
defensible 2031:13	1976:4,7 1982:20	dispute 1979:9 1982:5	EMANUEL,ESQ	1981:1,4,7,20
<b>deference</b> 2041:10,25	1983:4,4,21 1984:4	1983:11 2007:18	1973:13	1987:11 1991:13,23
deficit 1999:16,25	1984:25 1985:8	2027:13 2038:18	<b>embrace</b> 2020:1	1992:11,18 1996:20
definitely 2007:25	1986:23 1996:9	disregard 2006:17	emphasis 1979:18	1997:5,11,16 1998:11
definition 2021:9	1998:4 1999:7,15	dissent 2055:1	emphasize 1980:20	1998:16 2006:18
2027:6	2000:3 2002:17	distinguishable	<b>empty</b> 2025:1,1	2013:18 2020:5
deliver 1991:10 2025:4	2003:13,14,20 2004:8	2004:18	endeavor 2015:16	2022:13 2024:14,22
2025:24 2026:5,9,22	2005:8 2006:3 2008:9	distinguished 2010:1	ended 2049:12	2025:24 2031:9
2026:23 2027:2	2008:20 2013:4,4,7	district 1972:9,11	endorsing 2032:11	2033:23 2034:1
2030:24	2013:16 2014:17,21	1973:11 2006:2	engage 2017:24	2042:10 2043:15,17
delivered 2026:12	2015:15 2019:5,5	2047:10	enlarge 1989:20	2044:5 2045:14
2041:4	2020:10 2021:11,11	divide 1992:7 2005:5	enrichment 1980:22	2046:5 2047:21
delivers 1987:5,21	2021:12,21 2023:17	divine 2034:9	1981:1	2048:12 2051:19
delta 2014:1 2015:11	2024:17,20 2027:14	<b>document</b> 2056:19	entered 2027:5 2034:7	2052:3 2056:14
2016:15 2023:20	2027:22 2028:7,7	documents 2056:19	2044:7 2046:18	2057:9
demand 1989:1 1990:1	2029:7 2031:22	doing 1993:16,22	entire 1980:17 1986:8	exact 1994:5 2024:18
1990:10,15 2022:22	2032:16 2036:2	1997:9 1998:14	1989:11 2030:2	exactly 1995:19
<b>Denham</b> 1978:7	2038:10,20,22,24	2005:1 2021:2 2030:9	entirety 1986:1	<b>example</b> 1982:15
1980:19 1985:22	2039:10 2040:9,15	2036:3 2052:2	entitled 2038:21	1991:8 2043:14
1992:19 1995:17	2042:16,22 2043:17	dollar 2012:5 2055:15	2039:25 2041:10,25	exchange 1983:6
1997:15 2000:23	2043:22 2045:7,16	2055:16,17,19	2054:19	1984:25 1986:9
2003:7 2004:21	2048:2,12 2049:10	dollars 2043:13	entity 2000:8	1987:16 1990:24,25
2005:2 2016:5,17	2052:12 2054:10,19	door 2001:23	equal 2003:16	1991:7,8,11,18
2020:1,6 2021:24	2055:23	doubt 2033:9	equally 2057:5	1992:3 1996:14,19,23
2022:9,19 2023:3,12	<b>Diego's</b> 2004:22 2048:5	downstream 1989:1	equivalent 1991:16	1997:1 2002:21
2037:4 2049:24	2056:11 2057:7	dpurcell@kvn.com	2017:25	2003:10,21 2004:15
2052:2,2 2057:2	difference 1997:14	1973:8	ERIC 1973:13	2007:6,18 2008:1,13
Denham's 1978:6	2000:16 2006:15	draw 2001:9	escrow 1982:6,10	2009:10 2010:1,3
1979:13 1982:22	2014:12 2016:9	dream 2056:6	1983:15,18 2001:9,12	2011:13,14,19,23
1985:6 1995:10	2020:23 2039:15	dreamed 2056:4	2001:13	2012:17 2020:15,21
1997:1,6 2004:8	2049:18	drought 2009:14	especially 1979:6	2021:14,19 2023:18
2022:8 2036:24	differences 2049:11	DTX 2044:2	<b>ESQ</b> 1973:3,4,4,5,5,14	2024:6,11 2028:19,23
denominator 2023:10	different 1983:16	D1X 2044.2	1973:17,18	2038:19 2039:16
2023:15,19 2051:25	1985:16 1988:16	E	essentially 2015:16	2040:3,10 2045:8
2052:16,21 2053:6	1992:25 1993:13,14	E 1972:3	2029:12 2037:8,15	2053:19 2054:18
deny 1999:7	2002:2 2005:4,4,7	earlier 2015:7 2050:18	establish 1987:3	2055:19 2054:18
DEPARTMENT	2006:9 2012:18,18	ears 2021:24	1988:21 1999:2	Exclude 2054:5
1972:4	2013:1,24 2015:10,12	easily 1995:10	2011:6 2013:9,19	excluded 2038:24
depends 1993:4		easy 1991:23 2025:10	2011:0 2013.9,19	
-	2017:3,3,15 2020:14	· ·		exclusion 2039:1
<b>deposition</b> 1972:23	2024:12,16 2034:1	eat 2050:17	established 1981:15	excuse 2000:13
2003:6 D	2037:3 2043:7	eats 2014:10	1993:7,20,25 1994:4	2054:15
<b>Dept</b> 1974:2	2047:16 2051:18,18	editable 1975:11	2013:14,14 2014:3,9	Exhibit 1996:16,17,23
describes 2041:16	difficult 1978:22	effect 1989:1 1999:9	2014:19,20 2015:18	1999:11
2047:3	directed 1996:1	2008:13 2034:23	2015:25 2018:20,23	expected 2024:23
design 2017:18	direction 2058:14	effective 1972:12	2051:7	2027:8
designated 2003:7	disagree 2018:17	2009:14	estate 2041:1	expeditious 2032:5
2043:22	disagreement 2033:1	effects 2020:19 2022:21	event 2045:6 2058:16	expenditures 2040:5
despite 1981:18,19	discharge 2044:18	effort 1977:9 1988:21	everybody 1977:6	expense 2001:19
details 1997:23	discrimination 2006:11	1999:2 2016:4,6,14	1982:19 1983:1	expenses 1981:4
determine 1978:22	discuss 2045:1	eggs 2034:15	1984:6 1991:17	1983:17 2039:23
determined 1982:10	discussed 2045:10	either 2027:2 2038:14	2003:12,20 2004:10	expensive 2009:1
2013:10 2055:7	discussion 1975:18	2038:22	2012:4 2025:17	2029:11 2037:6
detracts 1980:8	1989:10 1992:1	elasticity 2022:22	2027:4,11,18,23	<b>expert</b> 1993:13 2014:25
developed 2029:19	2012:16	2051:20,21,24	2042:14 2052:19	2015:1,4,9 2016:2,5,6

2016:11 2017:2 2036:20 2037:9 expert's 1997:19 expertise 2041:9 experts 2051:18 **explain** 1982:17 explained 1994:11 explanation 2020:7 **explicit** 2054:13 **explored** 2012:13 extant 1990:22 extent 1980:16 2011:22 2020:18 2036:7 2037:12,12 2039:25 2040:3 extraneous 2004:18 extremely 2000:5

eyes 2022:20

**F.3d** 2006:7 facilities 2034:21 fact 1979:1,18 1982:3 1990:8 1994:3 2001:12 2007:12 2008:12 2011:6 2013:1,3,4,10,13 2014:3,5,21 2016:23 2017:11,20 2018:19 2018:22 2019:13 2022:2 2023:7 2028:5 2030:14 2035:1,3 2042:16 2043:21 2045:18 2049:3 2051:7 factors 2016:19,21 factory 2029:20 facts 2037:2 failed 2014:21 failure 1999:6 2019:17 2032:6 2033:16 fair 1985:1 1986:6 1996:22 2022:17 2028:23 falls 2001:22 2014:8 Fantastic 2014:22.22 far 1976:12 2000:2 2002:8 2011:20 2019:5 2035:18 **fashion** 2001:17 fastest 2032:4 fault 1980:14 favor 2045:25 February 2044:1 fees 2050:7 2051:2 fervently 2045:18

**fight** 1982:9 1983:13

**fighting** 1995:20,23

**Figueroa** 1973:14 figure 1981:25 1991:4 1996:3,4,21 1997:24 2014:6 2020:20 2021:17 2031:20 2032:12,16,20 2050:12 **figured** 1978:8 figures 2032:14 figuring 1977:6 final 1976:2 2007:16 2031:22 **find** 1988:7 1995:10 2012:12 2013:7,9 2016:2 2046:14,16 2050:25 **finding** 1980:10 1987:19 fine 2011:3 firm 2011:9 firming 2019:2 first 1976:4,12 1986:11 1987:11 1998:13 2006:25 2007:3 2008:7 2012:1,2 2014:9,15 2018:18,19 2024:25 2028:1,1 2038:9 2049:3,10 2055:14 2056:8,9,12 2056:16.22 fit 1998:25 **five** 2008:5 2039:17 2043:4 five-minute 2010:15 fixed 2041:1 flat 2051:25 Floor 1972:24 1973:14 focus 1989:14 2011:11 focused 2011:16 2024:3 fold 1975:18 follow 2013:4 **followed** 1976:2 **following** 2045:15 footnote 1987:9 2054:17,17,23 Ford 2029:20 forget 1988:13 2004:25 **forgot** 2055:8 forth 2004:17 forward 2019:14 **found** 1976:16 1986:15 1987:1 1988:14 2006:18 2013:2,6 foundation 1987:15 four 2043:4,11

four-year 2002:5

fraction 1978:1

fox 2050:16

2023:20 Francisco 1972:2,17,17 1972:24 1973:6 1975:1 2000:19 frankly 2020:22 free 2029:7 2030:25,25 2034:16,17 2037:8,15 Friday 1972:18 1974:2 1975.2 front 2001:23 frustrated 1996:1 **fulfill** 2025:10 full 1981:16 1998:4 2001:1 2017:9 2054:19 fuller 2036:9 fully 2029:19 **function** 1989:6,8,16 2003:24 2004:1,14,16 2040:18 2056:6 **fund** 2030:6 fundamental 1980:8 funny 2056:7 further 2044:2 2052:20 2058:15 future 1983:21 1984:15 2001:25 2002:1,5,9 2006:16 2036:14  $\mathbf{G}$ gain 1981:8

GANS 1973:14 **GARY** 1973:14 general 1973:17 1975:16 1998:24 2000:18 2030:6 generally 2023:25 2052:19 generates 1976:13 1977:18 getting 1999:16 2039:8 2039:11,14,16 2041:2 give 1982:10,11 1998:4 1998:8 2007:1,9 2016:7 2018:18 2027:14 2037:16,22 2038:3,4,7,11,16 2042:22 2055:2 given 1982:3 1992:17 1995:12 2013:17 2014:5,20 2017:8 2018:9,10 2027:8 2037:11 2046:16,17 2057:2,11 giving 2020:7 glasses 2055:6 go 1976:9 1980:20 1982:10 1984:5

1985:13 1992:20 1993:10 1994:17 1996:3 1998:24 2001:8 2006:24 2010:25 2011:22 2020:18 2021:5,6 2022:2,22 2023:24 2027:24 2031:19 2033:25 2035:6 2040:4,11,13 2042:9 2042:25 2051:9,23 2053:13 goals 2006:11 goes 1986:25 1992:15 1992:15 2001:12 2022:4 2030:13 2032:8 2040:18 2041:12 2056:24 going 1975:15 1976:9 1981:12 1982:5 1983:2,20,21,23,25 1984:6 1988:19 1995:7,14,15 1996:18 2001:15,17,19,20,24 2001:25 2002:1,6,7 2008:15 2011:15 2012:1,7 2023:24,25 2025:21 2026:21,22 2026:25 2027:19,22 2030:7.7.8 2034:6 2037:18 2040:16 2042:9 2046:6,9 2049:2 2050:10 2051:15,23 2053:16 2053:23,24 2056:5 **GOLDBERG** 1973:5 **good** 1975:5 2009:23 2010:18,20,24 2013:13 2042:24 2056:8 Goodman 2029:22 gotten 2012:15 2017:1 granted 2039:13 grapple 2029:3,14 **grappling** 2026:20 gratuitous 1987:7 2028:13 gratuitously 2024:18 Great 2010:14 greater 1983:2 grew 1995:25 gross 1980:6 1981:2 1992:14 1994:12 groundwater 2009:24 guaranteeing 2030:10 2030:12 guess 2002:17 hurdle 2042:19

guy 2044:21

## Н

**HADLOCK** 1973:4 hand 2058:17 happen 2005:22 2031:21 2032:24 2034:6,8 2049:20 2053:23 happened 1995:20 2005:21 2006:14 2034:22 2035:1,2,3 happening 2008:11 **happens** 2021:9 2027:10 2042:22 happy 2048:20 hard 2005:4 2014:6 2031:4 harm 2014:6 head 1996:2 2026:8 heads 2056:4 hear 2027:13 heard 1987:10,11 1998:12 2042:11 hearing 1975:20 1993:23 heart 2026:1 **HEATHER** 1973:17 held 2001:3 2042:18 help 2041:2 2048:23 henhouse 2050:17 hide 2001:15 higher 1982:21 1997:2 2004:6,9 2005:7 2029:10 highest 2050:3,13 highly 2029:8 **history** 1992:6 2041:9 2050:4 hit 2020:11 **holding** 2032:25 2033:2 Honor 1997:12 2010:18,25 2011:8 2014:23 2016:3 2018:1 2020:23 2023:22,25 2027:16 2029:18 2033:10,13 2035:21 2042:6 2046:12 2048:25 2057:11.16.19.20 **HONORABLE** 1972:3 hope 2021:23 hoped 2045:18,18,24 hoping 2046:18,19,20 horse 2052:21,22

2054:13

gut 2043:9

idea 1983:19 2035:14 2044:13 2049:16 2050:11 ignore 1988:4 2051:11 2053:12 **ignored** 1988:1 2051:11 ignores 1987:20 1989:18 **ignoring** 2019:23 II 1990:4 1999:1 2011:15 2051:1 illegal 1978:8,9 1985:18,19 1992:22 1994:8 2000:8,10,18 2043:7 2044:9,11,14 2044:17,19,22 2045:19,23 2046:2,4 2046:9 2047:4,5,8,14 2048:2,15 2049:21 2050:21,23 2054:18 2055:19,22 2056:10 2056:23,24 2057:8 illegality 2042:20 2046:21 2047:1 2055:11 illegally 2049:20 illogic 2007:14 imaginable 1976:19 immaterial 2043:12 **important** 1981:12 2009:4 2022:25 2023:2.3 **imposed** 2003:10 **imposes** 2000:8 **impossible** 1993:10,11 1994:20 2017:13 **improper** 2050:16 inappropriately 1978:2 include 1976:22 2019:17 2042:14 2053:25 included 1979:11 2003:11 2029:1 2039:2 **includes** 2028:20 **including** 2003:13 2009:13 **inclusion** 2043:18 2044:8 2048:13 inconsistent 2006:10 **increase** 2003:15 2019:18 2051:11,13 increased 2005:18 2038.7 incur 1987:17

**incurred** 2003:20

incurs 2001:19 indebtedness 2030:15 **INDEX** 1974:1 indicated 2045:4 indifference 2026:2 2028:7 indisputably 2042:14 inevitable 2021:1 inference 2008:10 **infirmity** 2036:24 **informed** 2049:11 infrastructure 1989:2 initio 2047:25 **insisted** 2006:13 intend 1976:7 **intended** 2030:17 intent 2034:10 intentionally 1999:7 interest 2034:24 2035:8 2035:15,16 interested 1972:10 2058:15 interestingly 2012:11 **internal** 2056:19 interpretation 2041:7.8 interpreted 2040:22 2041:24 interruptions 2010:21 2026:4 invalidated 2033:24 2043.11 invest 1989:19 involve 2043:12 involved 1986:5 2011:9 2019:10 2054:8 issue 1977:17 1995:5 2012:13 2013:16 2016:15 2017:17 2018:18,19 2020:24 2022:5,18 2023:6,10 2029:24 2030:7,7 2032:7,14 2034:18 2035:2 2040:2 2044:10 2051:25 2053:6,7,10 2057:9 issues 2012:13 2018:24 2024:1 2029:2 2035:18 2036:9 2045:4 2047:17 2048:17,20 2057:13 item 2007:25

J JAN 1972:22 JANUARY 1972:12,12 jkeker@kvn.com 1973:8

items 1977:24 2019:4

job 1997:23 JOHN 1973:3,13 johnquinn@quinne... 1973:16 judge 1974:2 1983:14 judges 2045:22 judgment 1975:15 jump 1991:6,22,22 2012:20 June 1972:18 1974:2 1975:2 1998:12,13 2058:17 jurisdiction 1993:15 1994:22 2017:24 2018:11

K
Karnow 1972:3 1974:2
Katz 2045:6
Keker 1973:3,3 1974:5
1974:7 1976:6 1978:3
1982:1 1984:8
1990:25 1991:12
1993:8 1994:1 1995:7
1997:21 2001:18
2003:23 2004:1,5,19
2006:25 2008:18

2010:14 2020:13 2034:2 2041:13 2048:25 2049:2 2055:5 2057:2,19,21 Kennedy 1995:22

Kennedy 1995:22 1996:2,7,21 1997:18 2002:20 2049:25 2054:2,3 Kennedy's 1997:7

kick 2008:6 kind 1975:9 1992:12 2008:22 2012:19 2018:21 2019:23 2027:2 2034:11 2035:11 2044:13,13 knew 2026:5,25

2027:12,18,23 2055:21,22 2056:14 **know** 1976:12 1977:21 1982:6 1992:11 1993:21 1994:21 2003:6 2004:1

2005:14 2006:21

2012:24 2020:2,4 2021:4 2022:6,19,20 2025:17 2027:3,24 2032:2,13 2034:18,25 2035:13,16 2044:11

2044:20 2046:4,8,9 2046:13 2049:4,16 2050:4 2051:23,24 knowing 2057:4 knowledgeable 2043:22 knows 2006:14,16 2025:17 2027:4 2037:11 2051:13

L language 2028:10 large 2047:20 law 1979:3 1983:12 1991:15 2002:12 2018:10 2019:20 2038:2 2040:19 2041:7,8,24 2042:13 2042:15,21 2043:8,10 2043:14,16 2044:15 2044:20 2045:7 2046:4,7 2047:1,2,6,9 2047:12,15 2054:16 2054:21 lawful 1976:13 18 21

2054:21

lawful 1976:13,18,21
1977:7,17 1981:24
1991:1,20 1993:6,12
1993:14,20 1994:19
1994:21 1995:5,8,10
1995:18,24 1996:12
1996:18 1997:1,6,12
1997:15,17 2000:14
2000:15 2002:13,22
2013:5,8,19 2031:23
2032:13,24 2033:5
2042:18 2049:7,23,25
2057:3,3,5,11

2042:18 2049:7,23,2 2057:3,3,5,11 lawfully 1988:11 2013:12,21 2038:4 laws 2043:23 2047:17 lawsuit 2001:22,23 lawsuits 2046:6 lawyers 2045:22 lay 2015:9 lays 2036:14 learned 1994:2 learning 2046:11 leave 2055:3 leaving 1975:23 legal 1998:1 2000:10

2000:11 2001:21 2004:21 2046:2,19,19 2047:17,19 2055:12 legality 2011:16 2045:2 2045:17 2057:13 Legislation 2040:21 legislature 1995:25 1996:21 1997:22

2054:3 **let's** 1977:17 1990:2 2014:18 2019:12 2021:12 2032:12 2037:4 2048:23,24 letter 2044:1 level 2030:1 liability 1978:24 liable 1980:17 license 2034:24 2035:7 2035:16,21

limitations 2033:18 limited 2002:3,5 2024:14,15 line 1990:4,4 1992:5 1997:3

1997:3 Listen 2026:20 litigation 2007:4

little 2000:22 2002:3,5 2004:6 2011:4 2012:22 2023:24 local 1989:19 2009:16

local 1989:19 2009:16 2009:22,25 2010:4 2030:18 2041:14 logic 1991:7 2007:14 long 2001:20 2031:18

2032:19 2041:25 look 1978:3 1992:13,14 1992:21 1999:24 2000:6 2012:10,11

2017:16 2021:6,10,20 2030:23 2033:25 2047:21 2056:6

looking 1995:13 2031:14 2032:20 2052:2

loosely 2012:19 Los 1973:15,19 2009:22 lose 2001:22,23

losing 1999:15 loss 1980:18

lost 1983:21 lot 1976:11 1989:10

1997:11 2012:12,15 2012:16 2018:24 2024:7 2037:2 2042:11 2046:6

low 2037:8 low-cost 2037:16 lower 1999:13 2037:18 lowest 2013:25 2014:1

2050:5

2014:1

M

magic 2044:14,15,15 2044:22 maintaining 2030:16 2039:24 2040:6 making 1989:13

2008:23 2027:16 merits 1975:16 mistake 2042:12,15,19 1994:16 1995:4 **OFFICE** 1973:17 2053:11 meruit 2043:1 2042:21 2043:8,10,13 2005:16,21,21 offset 1978:14 1994:13 met 1976:5 1977:11 man 2016:7 2017:7 2043:16 2044:10,12 2017:12 2018:13,15 2005:18 2019:19,20 2044:15,20 2047:1,15 2021:12,13 2048:4 2048:3 1978:17 1979:16 2054:21 management 1990:1.10 1983:7 1984:5 1987:5 2047:19 2054:16 offsetting 2006:8 nevertheless 1978:23 1990:16 1994:17 mistaken 2048:7,7,8,9 2001:3 okay 1993:8 1994:6 1987:17,20,21 2009:14 1989:13.18.25 1990:9 **mitigate** 1983:25 new 2025:21 2031:23 2014:5 2018:8 manner 1999:3 1992:12 1998:7.25 mitigated 1994:13 2036:13 2022:15 2034:12 model 2023:6 2009.16 2000:25 2001:3.19 nexus 1989:22 2036:11 2055:4 **MARCIA** 1973:18 2004:2,3,17,22,25 models 2015:10 ngoldberg@kvn.com once 1980:8 1981:14 2007:1,8,23 2008:5,5 1973:9 Marella 2051:4 **Modesto** 2000:19 2009:1 2032:13 marker 2015:9 2008:20 2010:3.3.12 **modified** 2020:17 nice 2009:24 2035:1 market 2037:14 2013:12 2018:14 **molecules** 2008:12 **NICHOLAS** 1973:5 Oneida 2050:22 marvelous 2035:15 2021:12,13,22 money 1978:14 1982:5 **night** 2021:6 ones 2037:6 2052:11 math 1979:13 1986:5 2026:20 2027:9 1982:8,11 1983:13 nine 2005:9 ongoing 2039:23 matter 1987:5.21 2028:24 2030:3.17 1984:18 1990:1,10,15 non 2025:4 2052:11 2040:5,11,14 1991:10 2002:2 2031:22 2032:25 1999:16,20,21 non-Met 1989:24 open 2026:16 2000:17 2001:10,13 2026:1 2027:21 2033:2,4,25 2034:19 2038:13 **opening** 2034:3 2028:6,17 2034:23 2034:24 2037:22 2001:14 2015:22 nonmember 2022:1 operate 1986:16 2037:7 2054:20 2038:2,2,3,13 2051:15 nonsensical 2054:23 **operating** 1983:17 2030:16 matters 1987:25 2039:24 2040:6,22 motion 1975:14 1982:7 nonspeculative 1978:4 2028:14 2036:13 1979:12,14 1994:10 opinion 1985:1 1986:7 2041:6 2042:16,17 maximum 2013:21 2044:11,12 2048:4 Motors 2000:18 2006:20 1987:12 2002:2,3,4,9 MCI 1981:12,13 2052:14 2053:24 mouth 2022:8 North 1973:18 2011:6,18 2019:6 **noted** 1987:2 2006:6 2050:20 2054:20,24,25 move 2021:5 2037:1 2024:8,13 2028:2 Met's 1975:14 1977:15 mean 2001:11 2012:18 2038:13 notice 2044:16 opportunities 1981:18 2019:17 2023:8 1977:16 1983:17 moved 2003:1,1 2037:7 noting 1990:20 oppose 2044:17 moving 1991:6 2009:25 means 2029:7 2049:4 1986:15 1987:2,13 notion 2007:3 2013:21 **option** 1997:8 2014:2 2054:12 2054:11 meant 2054:4 1989:24 1993:5 **Option-2** 2049:12 measure 1981:16 1995:2 1998:24 multimillion-dollar notwithstanding oral 2044:24 1982:7 1986:10 1999:6 2009:20 2047:23 2025:25 Orange 2009:23 1991:21 2000:16 2012:10 2014:8 murder 2046:4 **November** 1978:20 order 1978:19 2013:24 2014:12 2029:17 2049:9 mutual 2043:15 number 1979:17 ordered 1996:21 measurement 1994:6 2052:22 2053:15 2047:19 1988:16 1994:10.10 ordinances 2009:11.21 measuring 1980:23,25 Metropolitan 1972:9 MWD 2044:1 1997:19 1999:13 original 1996:19 mechanism 2009:9 1972:11 1973:11 ought 1997:20 1998:20 2000:1 2003:16  $\mathbf{N}$ **Medical** 2000:19 1975:8 1989:17 2005:8 2012:5 2005:12 2014:17 meet 1984:10 1993:3 1990:14 2008:9,15,22 name 2055:2 2013:25 2019:2 2031:21 2041:23 2033:22 2009:2,8,16,18 named 2058:12 2020:4 2023:20,21 outside 1991:20 meets 1983:12 2010:1,6 2038:7,8,12 **National** 2000:19 2036:19 2055:16,17 overall 2039:12,13 2055:19 2056:2,4,6,9 Meister 1978:21,24,25 2038:25 2041:12,13 nature 2021:9 overcharge 1981:11 1980:5,21,22 1993:11 2041:17,19 2047:10 necessarily 2013:3 numbers 1980:19,21 2011:20 2057:6 2024:8 2028:19 1984:6 2022:11 1994:5 2052:17 overcharged 2017:21 member 1989:1 1990:6 Metropolitan's 2029:1 2056:7 overcharging 2011:19 1991:17 2000:23 2009:11 necessary 1987:4,4 overstated 2002:17,23 0 2001:8,16,20,23 mid-July 1975:24 2021:1.1 2030:15 owns 2052:25 need 1979:2 1981:18 **objected** 2015:2,7 2004:16 2005:19 million 1982:23 1985:7 P 1990:9 objections 1976:2 2009:17 2021:12,13 1985:9,20 1994:9 1999:12,17,19,21,23 2022:3 2029:9 2038:2 needed 2018:7 **obligation** 1984:9.12 **p.m** 1975:3 2057:22 1991:10 2004:13,15 2038:10,11 2057:6,14 1999:25 2005:9,11 Needless 2010:7 page 1974:4 1986:13 members 1984:4 2004:16 2014:8 1987:18 1988:11 millions 2043:13 **negative** 2000:11 2019:14 2044:19 1991:2 2030:5 mind 2032:21 2033:6 negotiating 1991:14 1990:4,20 1995:3 membership 2050:7 minds 2018:13 **NEST** 1973:3 obligations 2025:11 2049:10 2050:19 net 1980:6 1981:5,9 Mensinger 1978:24 minute 1980:1 1995:19 2029:24 2051:3 2054:16 mental 2046:17 1996:9 2021:10 obvious 2019:16 Pages 1972:13 1974:3 2053:20 mentioned 1992:4,6,8 minutes 2043:4 neutral 2046:23 2032:18 paid 1982:20,21 occasions 2034:22 2001:7 mischaracterize 2052:1 never 1978:17 1980:4 1985:12 1995:4 1981:19 1989:22 offered 1980:9 mentioning 1988:10 missed 2052:23 2000:2,3,17 2001:19

2002.9 2002.12 14	2046,20 2040:1	2022.22	2020.2 4 17 21	2024.25 2025.2
2002:8 2003:13,14	2046:20 2048:1	2023:23	2038:3,4,17,21	2024:25 2025:2
2004:9 2005:8,10,19	2050:1 2056:6	plaintiff's 1980:15	2039:7,13,18,20,25	2026:3,6 2028:21,25
2005:22 2006:5,9	per-acre 2023:14	Plaintiffs' 1996:17	2040:9,22,25 2041:5	2029:1,5,8,8,17
2013:5,7 2015:22,25	per-unit 2031:3	1999:11	2041:20	2030:2,3,16 2031:1,8
paid-up 2034:24	percent 1976:17	plan 1975:17 2009:14	preliminary 2033:13	2034:14,15,25
2035:4,7,21	1977:23 1979:20,21	planning 2001:9	premise 2050:9	2035:25 2036:17,19
painted 2017:3	1982:18,24 1983:2	plans 2009:11,21	present 1981:1,3	2050:6 2052:9,11,25
parade 2031:15	1988:6,8,9,12,14,22	played 1996:24	2052:3	2053:1,2,14,15
part 1980:14,22	1988:23 2003:3,3,16	please 2006:24 2049:1	presentations 2056:20	2054:1,5,9
1983:17 1984:14	2006:17 2019:4,7,25	plus 2005:9	presented 1978:5	projected 1997:7
1988:18 1992:2	2022:12 2030:22	point 1980:8 1981:14	1981:20,22 2031:3,13	2002:21
1999:5,6 2000:10	2036:21,21	1981:25 1989:18	presto 2016:9	projects 1992:14
2014:16 2032:19	percentage 1988:11	1992:11 1994:25	pretty 1986:23 1991:23	<b>proof</b> 1978:4 1980:9,15
2052:12 2056:25	perfectly 2021:4	1995:25 2007:3	2011:10 2013:13	1995:8 2006:12
partial 1975:14	perform 2027:4,6	2009:19 2011:22	2019:16 2047:9	2013:16 2014:2
particular 1991:6	period 2002:5,22	2028:16 2030:21	preventing 2006:11	2016:25 2023:23
2017:17	2017:8 2033:7	2031:23 2034:4	previously 1977:20	2032:7 2033:16
parties 1995:23	periodically 2031:6	2037:19 2041:21	1993:21	2036:22,23 2049:18
2006:25 2007:9,17	permit 2001:3	2044:2 2046:15	price 1983:10,12	<b>Prop</b> 1998:21
2008:7,14 2024:5	person 2043:21	2050:22 2053:18	1991:14,19 1992:3	proper 1984:24
2026:5 2032:21,21,23	personal 2045:21,23	pointed 2051:2	1996:15,16 1997:2	1985:22 1987:15
2032:24 2033:6,24	PERSONS 1972:10	pointing 2019:8	2008:2 2009:9 2010:5	1988:16 1992:18
2034:10 2037:21	persuaded 2055:24	policy 2039:12	2049:11,11	1996:22
2055:12	pertinent 2043:23	portion 1984:22 2029:6	prices 1991:15 2022:22	properly 1985:12
parties' 2038:18	2047:17	2049:3,21	pricing 2009:3 2022:21	1988:15 1989:6
parts 1985:19 1994:7	Petitioner 1972:7	position 1977:15,16,22	prior 1986:7	property 2034:24
party 1981:6 2007:2	1973:2	1977:23,25 1978:6,7	probably 2002:17	2035:8,14,16 2036:1
2037:22 2038:4,8	pettifoggery 2055:2	1982:2,13,14 1985:17	2010:11 2028:15	2041:1 2050:7
passage 2034:4	phase 1976:16 1977:9	1990:25 1991:12	2031:24 2056:21	proportional 1999:8
2041:14,20	1978:7 1986:12	1993:5,8,16,18,23	<b>problem</b> 1977:15,16,16	proposed 1975:19,22
passed 1996:1 2045:3	1987:11,20 1988:5	1994:1 1998:19	1982:25 2017:5	1975:24 2010:25
2048:3	1989:10 1990:3,4	2004:22 2007:14	2019:19 2021:19	proposition 1980:5
patience 2055:5	1999:1,1 2000:25	2018:15 2033:17	2022:14 2023:5,9,10	2000:8 2014:9
2057:21	2001:3 2011:9,15	2035:17 2036:3,5	2023:22,23,23	prorated 2036:17
pause 2048:23	2013:2,7,10,14	2040:7,13 2048:6	2026:23	proration 2035:25
pay 1983:2,4 1984:13	2014:4,18,19,20	possible 2016:1 2050:3	problematical 2015:20	prove 1993:6,11
1984:19,19 1997:13	2015:14 2019:6	2050:13	problems 2019:16	1994:18 1995:4
2001:24 2002:11	2024:2,6,13 2029:16	post-trial 2000:7	2027:3	2000:9,11,12,14
2004:13 2009:1	2032:14 2034:19,22	2005:17 2051:1	procedure 2017:25	2006:13 2016:23
2019:24 2020:10	2035:12,17 2036:7	postage 2031:15	proceed 2011:2	2017:21 2051:21
2030:8,25 2039:9	2050:9 2051:1	pot 1982:8	proceeding 2011:16	proved 1985:15
paying 1983:5 2007:10	2052:23 2053:12,15	potential 2021:20	proceedings 1972:16	2017:11 2018:11,12
2038:22 2039:8	2054:13	2022:21	2058:11	2019:12 2053:8
2040:10 2041:18	phrase 1993:4 2045:13	power 1979:22 1984:22	proceeds 2030:3	proves 2044:2
payment 1978:16	phrased 2011:18	1985:4,12,15 2008:24	produce 2030:11	provide 2024:23,24,24
2040:8	physical 2025:22	2009:1 2023:12	producing 1981:6	provided 2009:17
payments 2007:23	physically 2027:14	2037:1,1,5,14,16	profit 1981:9	2024:18 2027:15
2030:18 2038:24	pick 2036:19	2049:14 2052:13	profits 1980:6	proving 1980:11
2039:1,2 2040:4,4	picture 2017:3 2045:15	2053:2 2056:18	programs 1990:11	provision 2010:4
2041:16	pitching 2014:3	practices 2051:6,8	2009:12,21	PTX 1985:5 1999:24
pays 1983:18	place 1995:5 2038:9	pre- 2000:7 2005:17	progress 2027:16	2053:18
people 1977:10	2054:9 2058:12	precisely 1979:8	project 1976:17,23	PURCELL 1973:4
1984:17 1993:13	places 2009:17	prediction 2034:8	1979:23 1985:5,10,22	purchase 2007:11,19
1998:10 2002:13	plain 1983:7 2009:9	preexisting 2004:17	1985:24 1986:2,10	2008:1,3,16,17
2004:2 2017:15,15	2050:13	preferential 2006:23	1987:3,17 1988:18,18	2038:12,19 2040:17
2018:14 2026:25	plaintiff 1972:7 1973:2	2007:2,9,14,17,24	1992:13 1995:14	purchased 1989:9
2039:22,22 2045:20	1980:9 1981:1 1993:5	2008:6 2009:12,13,20	1998:16 2002:25	purchases 2022:23
2046:3,8,8,17,18,19	2000:9,13,15 2016:25	2010:5 2037:20,23	2003:9 2023:17	purchasing 2007:2
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

2044:3,6,9 2045:2

2037:22 pure 1976:20 1977:9 2005:20 2007:1,3,7 2007:13 2025:25 2037:21 2038:14.16 purely 1987:13 purported 2023:13 **purposes** 2008:17 2009:2,8,11 **pursuant** 2003:21 2019:6 push 2008:24 put 1976:16 1977:4,24 1978:2,20 1979:18 1982:5,16 1985:5 1987:23 1990:2 1995:14,15,21 1997:9 1997:17 1998:15 2001:13 2009:7 2013:20 2017:2 2019:10 2046:23 2049:5,24 2053:19 **putting** 2019:14 2034:15 2044:16

## Q

quality 2029:10 quantification 2053:9 quantities 2041:4 quantum 2042:25 **quarter** 2042:4 **question** 1976:12 1977:1,14 1980:2 1984:21 1985:21 1986:4,6 1988:19 1990:12 1995:17 1996:25 2002:16,24 2007:16 2013:15,17 2014:22,23 2015:24 2020:9,24 2028:23 2032:18,18 2037:21 2038:15 2040:1 2041:11 2042:19,24 2044:10 2056:23 questioning 1977:2 questions 1976:6,8,11 1988:17 2001:18 2006:22 2011:1 2048:18,20 2055:10 quibble 1986:21 2051:20 **Quinn** 1973:12 1974:6 1974:8 1975:10 2010:17,18,21,25 2011:4 2012:2,5,8 2014:22,25 2015:3,5

2015:17,22,24

2016:14 2018:1,4,6,9

2018:24 2019:12 2020:22 2021:23 2022:14,16,18 2025:8 2025:13,16 2026:13 2026:16.19 2027:25 2028:9,16 2031:25 2032:4,10 2033:9,12 2033:21 2034:13 2035:7,13,20 2036:4 2036:8,12 2038:1 2039:5 2040:18,21 2042:5,9,24 2043:2,6 2046:11,25 2048:17 2055:6,8,10,17,20 2056:1,11,13,17,22 2057:20 **QUINN,ESQ** 1973:13

## R

quote 1980:13 1989:19

1989:21

radically 2012:25 2024:12 Raftelis 1992:5 1998:14 rainfall 2009:23 raised 2037:20 2048:19 range 2019:11 ratchet 1996:18 rate 1976:13,18,18,21 1977:7,7,17,21,24 1979:22,22,24 1981:15,24 1982:14 1982:16,17,19,20,21 1983:2,4,22,24 1984:22,22,23 1985:4 1985:4,10,11,12,14 1985:15,23 1988:20 1989:23 1991:1,3,4 1991:18,21,25 1992:21 1993:6,12,14 1993:20 1994:19,21 1995:8,10,11,15,16 1995:18,21,24 1996:5 1996:12,19,22,25 1997:1,3,6,6,7,12,15 1998:1,4,7,12,17,18 1998:24 1999:8,20,22 2000:3 2001:21 2002:13,23 2003:8,11 2003:12 2004:3,5,6,9 2004:13 2005:3,7 2006:4,4,9,12 2012:10,14,17,17,21 2013:5,8,19 2031:7 2031:23 2032:7,13,25 2033:5 2037:4,14,18 2038:23 2043:19

2047:20 2048:11,13 2049:4,6,7,13,13,14 2049:15,15,23 2050:3 2050:16,23 2052:13 2052:13,18,18 2054:3 2054:8 2056:10,18,18 2056:23 2057:3.11 rate-making 2015:1 2017:25 ratemaking 1987:15 2015:4 2024:3 rates 1972:10 1977:19 1978:8,9 1979:15 1981:11 1982:12,25 1983:16 1984:7.11.14 1984:15 1992:23 1994:2,8,9 1997:17 2001:16 2002:1,9,11 2004:7 2005:14,18,19 2005:25 2011:17,19 2011:20,23 2012:1,7 2012:9,9,11 2013:2,6 2013:11 2015:18,19 2017:18 2019:5 2020:17 2031:23 2033:25 2034:1 2037:3,8 2041:18 2042:17 2043:11,11 2045:18.23 2046:21 2047:23 2049:21,25 2050:8,10 2051:23 2052:8,10 2053:21 2054:7 2055:13 rationale 1995:12 reached 1979:6 1989:11 read 1981:13 1994:1 2011:9 2041:13,20 readiness-to-serve 2009:15 2041:3 reading 1985:1 1986:6 real 2008:11 2023:5,5 2030:20 2041:1 2057:13 realize 2022:5 2029:15 really 1977:15 1991:25 1993:9,9,9 2009:19 2020:1 2022:7 2027:12 2032:19 2041:21 2042:24 2044:17 2053:14 **realtime** 2046:11 reason 1985:19 1997:25 2001:14 2008:7,18,19 2009:3 2039:13 reasonable 1979:4

1980:9 1981:2,7,20 1982:1,2 1985:17 1986:17,22 1999:2 **reasoned** 1992:13 reasons 2008:5 2026:9 2039:17 2045:3 2056:3 rebates 2050:21 rebuttal 2010:13 recall 1977:6 1996:14 2017:12 2028:9 2055:18 receive 1999:4 received 1981:5 receiving 2008:9 recess 2010:15,16 recognize 1983:11 1988:6 2053:14 recognizing 2030:24 record 1978:3 1979:21 1979:24 1986:17,22 1987:3 1992:16 1994:25 1995:1,8 1996:16 1997:11 2006:19 2011:10 2013:18 2024:4,4,16 2029:19 2031:9.11 2033:23 2036:9 2043:17 2048:23 2054:22 records 2028:11 recovered 2001:21 redo 1984:5 reduce 1981:16 2003:2 2005:20 2006:18 reduced 1977:20 1978:15 1982:23 1994:13 2005:11 2006:4,21 2058:13 reducing 1980:11 1989:1 reduction 1981:20 1982:18 reference 1991:15,20 2006:6 refile 2032:16 **refiling** 2033:19 reflects 2024:4,5 refund 2000:6 2054:19 **refutes** 2054:6 regardless 2008:10 **regional** 1998:5,5 **regulations** 2009:13,21 regulatory 2006:11 reinforced 2002:19 rejected 1989:3 2000:25 related 1980:2 Respondent 1973:11

relationship 1999:2 relationships 2037:13 **relevant** 2037:13 relies 2024:17 **relieves** 2019:13 relv 1980:21 remaining 2052:10 remains 1985:12 remand 2031:21 **remember** 1979:13 1985:6 1990:3 1997:7 2001:4 2004:2.19 2024:17 2026:7 2034:3 2049:12 2055:15 remind 1979:1 1981:18 1986:4 1992:4 reminded 1978:12,19 remove 1985:22 1992:19 removed 2019:4 removing 2052:9 repeat 1994:24 2054:22 repetitive 2042:11 replacing 2030:16 report 1997:8,8 1998:14 2017:14 **Reported** 1972:19 **Reporter** 2058:9,24 REPORTER'S 1972:16 2058:1 required 1987:8 1992:12 2000:13,15 2029:21 requirement 2005:25 requires 1979:4 2028:20 rescission 2042:22 2043.9 reservations 2045:17 reserves 1998:25 reservoirs 2025:1 reset 1984:7 residual 1981:8 resolved 2031:20 2032:9 2045:24 resources 1988:18 1996:2 respect 1975:14,21 1977:23 1984:4 2018:1 2042:1 2055:11 2057:4 Respectfully 2038:20 respond 1994:16 2033:13 **responded** 1978:17

1980:4

Respondents 1972:14
response 2048:25
responsibility 2019:2
responsible 2019:8
rest 1980:15 2023:13
2032:7
resting 1980:12
result 1979:5 2000:3
2003:14,15 2005:9
2020:24 2022:3
2020:24 2022:3
results 2042:21
2057:13
retaliation 1999:9
revenues 1980:6
review 2031:5
rich 1979:11
ridiculed 2044:13
right 1977:19 1979:13
1988:2 1990:17,24
1992:9 1999:13
2002:14 2003:22
2004:4 2015:21,23 2018:5 2026:13
2018:5 2026:13
2027:18 2028:4,5
2029:15 2031:25
2032:1,9 2033:20
2035:4,22,23 2036:1
2036:15 2038:7,12
2039:11 2040:20
2042:20 2043:6
2046:10 2048:16
2051:5 2053:15
2054:14 2055:18
2056:1,21
rights 2006:23 2007:2
2007:9,15,18,24
2008:6 2009:12,13,20
2010:5 2037:20,23
2010.3 2037.20,23
2038:3,4,17,21
2039:7,13,18,20,25
2040:9,22,25 2041:5
2041:20
risk 1981:8
River 2008:21 2023:15
2025:3,18,25 2029:12
2037:8 2052:4,7
<b>Riverside</b> 2029:22
RMI 1997:8,8 2002:20
road 2032:2
RPR 1972:20 2058:23
<b>RSI</b> 1999:9,17
rule 2032:5 2046:14
rules 2009:12,21
ruling 1998:21 2007:21
2015:7 2024:2
2029:16
rulings 1976:10

running 1998:2 2008:21 2029:15 S S 1973:5 sad 2027:9 salinity 1987:9 San 1972:2,6,17,17,24 1973:6 1975:1,7 1976:4,7 1982:20 1983:4,4,21 1984:4 1984:24 1985:8 1986:23 1996:9 1998:4 1999:7,15 2000:3,18 2002:17 2003:13,14,20 2004:8 2004:22 2005:7 2006:3 2008:9,19 2013:4,4,7,16 2014:17,20 2015:15 2019:5,5 2020:10 2021:11,11,12,21 2023:17 2024:17,20 2027:13,22 2028:7,7 2029:7 2031:22 2032:16 2036:2 2038:10,20,22,24 2039:10 2040:9,15 2042:16,22 2043:17 2043:22 2045:7,16 2048:2,5,12 2049:10 2052:12 2054:10,18 2055:23 2056:11 2057:7 **SANDFORD** 1972:20 2058:8,23 Santa 2058:5,9,18 SAR 1985:25 satisfied 2048:22 save 2010:13 saw 1999:12 2043:22 2043:24 saving 1997:13,22 2015:5 2018:13 2019:1 2030:22 2032:12 2033:15,15 2033:18,21 2035:20 2040:1 2052:1 savs 1986:4 1989:15 1994:5 2010:6 2012:6 2013:23 2026:1,2 2027:2 2030:2 2045:11 2047:7 2054:17 scenario 2017:4 2027:12 2031:12 scenarios 2015:13

schedule 2012:10

2057:3 scratch 2015:16 screen 1990:3 **SCULLY** 1973:18 se 2011:13 2024:6 second 1978:5,11 1984:21 1988:19 2057:1 secret 2025:23 section 1989:12 1995:1 2009:4 2041:16 2053:19 **Sections** 2005:24 2032:25 secure 1990:21 see 1978:3,24 1986:13 1989:5 1999:11 2010:24 2039:16 2047:17 2052:20 seeking 1981:6 1985:8 2000:1,2 2054:21 sees 1998:25 self-defeating 2054:24 send 2050:16 sense 1983:20 1984:2 1992:25 2007:7 2018:16 2030:20 2038:7,11,14 2039:19 sensing 2026:19 sent 1998:13 **sentence** 1988:10 1989:14 1991:6 separate 2004:17 2019:22 2021:25 **separately** 2047:1,22 series 2021:21 service 2001:1 2006:1,8 2006:10 **SERVICES** 1972:23 set 1977:20 1982:5,25 1983:13 1984:14,17 1984:18 1991:19 1993:2 1994:22 2002:1 2008:19 2020:14 2025:5,7,11 2025:13,17,18 2035:22 2053:21 setting 1984:11 2002:9 seven 1990:4 shamelessly 1975:12 **shaped** 1983:8 **Shapell** 2050:18 share 2005:8 2009:15 shift 2000:9 2046:20 2051:15,16 **shifting** 1996:4,5 1997:23 2054:4 shifts 2014:7 2017:5

short 1998:10 2010:11 shortfall 2000:24 **Shorthand** 2058:8,24 **show** 1980:16 1981:4 1988:15 1995:19.21 2000:15 2005:16 2016:25 2027:25 2049:22 **showing** 1995:3 shown 1979:12 2014:18 2049:19,19,20,23,24 2050:1,3,15 2057:12 shows 1985:6 2007:13 shut 2024:25 2025:1 side 2019:1 sides 2011:11,13 signaling 2036:8 signed 2026:20 2032:21 2045:16 significance 2012:23 significant 2012:22 simply 1976:19 2037:4 2040:10 2052:21 2055:12 single 2023:11 2039:9 sir 1997:21 2004:19 2010:14,20 sit 2046:3 **sitting** 1982:8 situation 1979:9 1996:7 2018:22 2019:1 2021:15,18 2027:11 six 2026:9 **Skillman** 1998:12,13 2054:8 **Slater** 2043:21 2045:11 2045:20 2047:16 slide 1995:22 2043:24 2043:24 2044:4,25 2045:11 slips 2001:22 smaller 2023:20 sold 2005:6 **solutions** 2051:19 somebody 1978:13 1981:15 2001:22 2044:16 2050:12 someplace 1992:6 2001:10 sort 1998:8 2014:10 2019:21,23 2020:3 2022:5 2023:25 2032:25 2033:2,7 2035:24 2042:25 2045:15 south 1973:14 2025:3 **Southern** 1972:9,11 1973:11 2047:11

space 2035:4 spades 1981:14 specific 2052:7 specifically 2045:12 **spectrum** 1977:22 speculation 1976:20 1977:9 1992:10 1993:12 2005:13.20 2018:25 2019:9 speculative 1993:1 2002:6 2006:19 2017:13 2018:16 speculatively 2020:11 spend 1989:25 1990:9 1990:14 2035:17 **split** 2040:15 SPR 1985:25 spreading 2052:10 ss 2058:4 stage 2051:9 2053:21 stake 2029:4 stalking 2052:21,22 2054:12 **stamp** 1983:25 2031:15 stand 1987:11 1994:18 2000:7 2020:6 **standard** 2014:11 2033:1,2,3,4,5 Stapleton 2012:25 2026:1 2045:9 Stapleton's 2044:1 2045:1 start 1976:9 1996:17 2054:10 started 1975:6 1996:14 **starting** 2015:16 state 1972:1 1976:17 1976:23 1979:14,22 1985:4,10,22,24 1986:2,10,15 1987:3 1987:17 1988:17,18 1991:15 1995:14 1998:16 2002:25 2003:9 2013:18 2023:17 2024:25 2025:2 2026:3,5 2028:20,24,25 2029:5 2029:7,8,17 2030:3,5 2030:25 2031:7 2034:13,14,20,21,25 2035:8,22,25 2036:17 2036:18 2037:5 2040:19 2041:7 2046:17 2047:2 2050:6 2052:9,11,25 2052:25 2053:1,14,15 2054:1,5,9 2058:3,9 2058:25

G 1005 1 2020 5
I Stata's IUX/·I 2030·5
State's 1987:1 2030:5
2030:14
statement 1975:19,22
1975:24 1976:3
1986:13 1988:1,2
1000.13 1000.1,2
1989:5,12 1990:19
1992:4,8 2034:3
2044:24
statute 2033:18
statutory 2005:25
2006:10 2014:12
steal 1975:12
stenotype 2058:12
stewardship 1976:18
1976:23 1979:15,24 1984:23 1985:25 1988:20 1989:23
1004.22 1005.25
1984.23 1983.23
1988:20 1989:23
1991:25 1992:3,21
1995:15 1998:18,24
1999:3,8,16,20,22
2000:3 2043:14,18
2044:3,9,24 2045:2
2047:20 2048:11,13
2049:14 2052:9
stop 2017:9
straight 2003:17
<b>Street</b> 1972:24 1973:6
1973:14,18
strikes 2020:12
strong 2030:21
structure 1976:21
1977:7,8,25 2001:21
1977:7,8,25 2001:21
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 <b>studied</b> 1996:7 <b>study</b> 1998:15
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 <b>studied</b> 1996:7 <b>study</b> 1998:15 <b>stuff</b> 2009:22
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 <b>studied</b> 1996:7 <b>study</b> 1998:15 <b>stuff</b> 2009:22
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidize 2057:7
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidize 2057:7 subsidized 2029:8,9
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17 subsumed 1975:15 suggest 2039:18
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17 subsumed 1975:15 suggest 2039:18 2057:15
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17 subsumed 1975:15 suggest 2039:18 2057:15 suggested 2031:17
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17 subsumed 1975:15 suggest 2039:18 2057:15 suggested 2031:17
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17 subsumed 1975:15 suggest 2039:18 2057:15 suggested 2031:17 suggesting 1991:5,7 1997:18 2020:13
1977:7,8,25 2001:21 2025:23 2027:5 2039:24 2054:8 studied 1996:7 study 1998:15 stuff 2009:22 subject 2019:16,21 2035:8 2051:8 subjected 2051:6 submit 2011:8 2014:1 2014:11 2016:5,23 2024:22 2031:13 2035:2 subset 1984:25 subsidized 2029:8,9 2037:15 subsidizing 2001:2 substantial 1976:22 substantially 2034:17 subsumed 1975:15 suggest 2039:18 2057:15 suggested 2031:17

```
suggestions 2026:16
SULLIVAN 1973:12
sum 2016:4,6
summary 1995:22
Superior 1972:1,17
  2047:11 2051:4
  2054:25
supplies 1989:19
supply 1982:16,16,19
  1982:20,21 1983:2
  1986:19 1992:7
  1996:10 2003:2,8,11
  2003:12,15,19 2004:3
  2004:5,9,13,24
  2005:3,7,18,23
  2006:4,4 2019:18
  2020:12,17,20 2021:5
  2021:5 2022:1,4,21
  2037:14 2051:11,14
  2051:16,23 2054:10
supported 2044:3
supports 1987:12
  1991:23 2013:20
  2047:19
suppose 1985:13
  2002:10 2018:17
  2042:20
supposed 1991:21
  1996:8 1998:14
  2021:17 2026:15
  2039:20
Supreme 2046:15
sure 1977:6 2004:12
  2008:20 2025:15
  2042:5 2055:9
surprise 2025:16
suspect 2016:1
sustain 1980:17
SWP 1987:1
system 1979:21,22
  1984:18,22,22 1985:3
  1985:4,9,11,11,14,15
  1985:23 1989:20
  1990:22 2004:3,6
  2005:21 2007:6
  2023:13 2025:5,7,11
  2025:13,17,18 2027:5
  2027:10 2034:25
  2035:8,22 2036:19
  2038:13 2040:6
  2049:14,15 2052:13
  2052:13,14 2054:11
  2056:18,18
system-wide 1989:7,8
  1989:16
systemwide 2037:4
```

2052:18

	t
take 1985:10 1992:22	
1994:7 2001:12	
2002:1 2003:13	t
2006:17 2010:11,15	t
2019:17 2021:4	
2022:7 2023:4	
2024:10 2025:4	
2031:19 2032:19	
2046:15 2047:2	
2048:23	
taken 2016:21 2058:11	
takes 1983:15 1984:19	4
talk 1975:15 1985:3	t
1993:18 2010:9,12 2012:22 2046:25	4
2012:22 2046:25	t
2048:17 2049:6,7	t
2051:2 2053:22	ι
talked 1978:25 1993:22	
2006:7 2009:5 2010:7	t
talking 1985:3,23	t
1992:10 1994:14	
1995:2 2004:14 2011:14,23 2017:17	
2020:13 2032:1	
talks 1991:1 2005:25	
2012:8,9	
TARA 1972:20 2058:8	
2058:23	
tax 1998:19,22 1999:5	t
2000:9,10,12,14,15	
2000:18 2050:21	
taxes 2041:1,1 2050:7	
2050:21	
taxpayers 2029:25	
teaching 2050:20	t
tell 2001:14 2016:8	
2027:25 2034:6	
2044:11,12,21 2046:3	
2055:24	
telling 2022:6 2043:9	
ten 1987:18 1993:13	
2032:1 2036:21,21	
2051:18,18 tens 2043:13	
tension 2048:5,10	
tentative 1975:25	
1976:10 2010:8	
2042:12	
term 1991:14 1996:15	
1996:16 2010:5	
2012:11 2047:4	
2049:11	
terms 2011:18 2012:8,9	
2012:17 2018:25	
2021:7 2034:13	
2041:11 2046:24	

```
testified 1982:22
 1987:15 1998:23
 2020:3 2043:22,24
estify 2036:20
estimony 1990:2
 1991:3 1999:14
 2002:25 2003:4
 2015:9 2016:6.11
 2019:25 2021:24
 2022:8,9 2023:1
 2034:21 2042:16
 2045:1,5,5,9 2047:16
 2048:1 2051:12
thank 2010:18 2014:24
 2057:18,19,20
thanks 1984:16 2055:5
 2057:16,21
theory 1986:8 1987:24
 2023:8 2027:14
 2031:2
thereof 1981:3
hing 1979:20,23
 1980:4 1986:21
 1998:9 2007:5
 2014:10 2019:21
 2022:20 2026:24
 2028:1 2034:11
 2050:13,25 2053:25
 2057:1,1
hings 1995:17 1997:25
 2005:5,15 2012:18
 2017:15 2024:7
 2029:18 2036:15
 2040:23 2046:2,14,16
 2051:10 2055:8
think 1975:12,17
 1976:25 1980:3
 1984:1,3,5,8,9
 1990:18 1991:13,22
 1991:24 1993:5,9
 1995:16 1998:11,20
 2000:21 2001:14
 2002:19,23 2003:4
 2005:12,23 2006:16
 2007:20 2008:7
 2010:3 2012:16,20,21
 2013:20 2015:8,17
 2017:11,17,19 2018:5
 2019:13,19 2021:23
 2022:11 2023:5
 2024:7,13 2026:24
 2028:14,16 2029:2,14
 2032:4,23 2033:6
 2034:9,11 2036:8,9
 2037:18 2039:15
 2041:7,22,23 2042:1
 2042:21 2043:2,15
 2044:5,8,18,19
```

```
2046:25 2047:9,15,19
  2047:21 2048:5,9,11
  2048:15 2050:4
  2056:13,15,21
  2057:12.12
thinks 1978:13 2031:21
  2044:21
third 2038:4.8
thought 2018:18
  2032:23 2033:9
  2034:5,6 2042:17
  2044:6 2047:18
  2048:2
thoughts 2018:21
thousand 2056:3
three 1995:3 1997:8
 2035.1
throw-away 1992:5
ticket 2007:25
tie 2031:3
time 1976:1 1984:6
  1986:11 2007:5
  2009:6 2034:7,19
  2035:17,22,24
  2036:19 2041:25
  2042:7 2043:19,24
  2044:6 2045:15
  2046:5 2047:12,18
  2048:14 2058:12
times 1984:10 2011:12
  2011:13 2012:18
  2035:2
timing 1975:21
tiny 1978:1
today 1975:16 1993:23
  2021:15 2035:19
  2046:10
today's 1975:20
told 1984:10 1998:15
  2012:10,25 2020:1,4
  2022:9,10 2023:1
  2034:2 2048:4,8,9
  2054:3
top 1986:14 1990:20
  2008:25 2026:8
total 1981:1 1999:14
  2016:4,6 2023:20
track 2027:21
transaction 1997:10
  2001:2 2007:1,4
  2012:24 2013:1
  2020:25 2037:22
  2038:15,16
transactions 2007:13
transcript 1972:16
  2003:5
transcription 2058:14
transportation 1984:24
```

2053:9

1986:20 1987:2 1989:7,20 1990:22 1992:8 2004:23 2052:11 2053:2 transporting 1989:9 treat 1988:14 2010:3 2053:1 treated 2008:17.20 2009:18 2010:6 2040:16 treatment 2057:14 trench 2023:25 trial 1978:21,22 1998:13 2036:13 2042:25 2049:9 trip 1975:23 **trotted** 2023:9 trouble 2042:13 true 1979:6 1993:17 2004:19 2014:5 2018:4 2039:6 2040:7 2055:14 trust 2016:11 try 1975:21 1997:24 2010:23 2032:15 trying 1991:3 1995:4 2004:12 2019:10 2020:20 2032:20 2034:9 2039:19 2048:6 2052:3 **turn** 1976:4,5 1979:16 1988:19 twice 2035:1 two 1975:5,22 2001:18 2006:22 2010:2 2047:1 2054:21 2055:8 type 2020:5 typewriting 2058:13 **Typically 2042:21** 

U ultimately 2046:20 **unblended** 2027:8,9,15 **unbundled** 2053:22 2054:7 uncertainty 1981:9 2017:2 2046:7 2047:3 2047:12 undercut 2002:13 undermine 2051:22 understand 1976:25 1991:22 1993:23 2004:11 2016:13 2019:20 2020:22 2024:2 2033:1 2036:5 2052:24 understanding 2039:21

understands 2016:12 understood 1991:17 2024:5 2043:18 2048:12 2054:6 **Underwood** 2045:3.10 2045:12 undisputed 2024:10 2025:24 2037:2 unexpected 1984:13 **uniform** 2006:1 2051:12 uniformly 1991:13 unilateral 2044:10,12 2044:14,20 **unitary** 2037:3 universal 2043:15 unjust 1980:22,25 **unlawful** 1981:15 1983:5,6,7 1994:3 1998:19 2000:12 2011:20 2013:2,3,6 2013:11 2042:18 2043:19 2044:6,24 2048:14 2051:2,6,8 2057:6 unlawfulness 1982:14 unqualified 1976:14 unused 1990:22 1991:9 1998:1,3 Upadhvah 1990:5 1992:18 1998:23 Upadhyah's 1990:2 1991:24 upheld 2038:25 **URQUHART** 1973:12 use 2002:24 2007:6 2008:24 2013:24 2023:15 2035:10,22 2036:18 2037:6 2044:22 useful 1975:13 1987:6

## V

2034:11

utility 2015:15

VALIDITY 1972:10 valued 2036:17 VAN 1973:3 variety 2037:3 various 2004:21 2030:4 version 1975:7 versus 1977:25 1978:24 2000:18,19 2029:22 2038:25 2047:1,11 2051:4 2054:25 VIDEOGRAPHY 1972:23

view 1997:19 2002:15

2017:23 2018:2,6 2019:6,7 2027:7 2045:21,23 views 2029:16 violated 2033:4.5 **violates** 1998:21 2005:23.24 violation 2043:23.25 2050:24 virtue 1998:21 **void** 2043:8 2046:21 2047:6,8,13,25 volume 1972:10 1974:3 2037:7 volumes 2040:25 volumetric 2038:23 2040:23,24 2041:3,18 2050:8,10 voters 2030:14 vs 1972:8

W

1983:19 2031:18,19

wait 1981:23 1982:11

waiving 2033:18 walk 1986:14 2014:15 2031:18 wander 2011:4 want 1977:4 1992:23 1996:4 2009:24 2010:9 2019:14 2031:18 2033:12,13 2035:17 2042:3,6 2044:19 wanted 1985:13 2008:20 2051:21 2054:10 wanting 1986:23 wants 1981:15 **WARREN** 1973:5 wasn't 2005:4 2013:14 2015:24 2016:11 2018:12 2024:4 2028:17 2052:7 2054:10 2056:22 waste 2042:6 water 1972:6,9,11 1973:11 1975:7 1976:17,17,23,23 1979:14,15,23,24 1984:23,25 1985:5,10 1985:22,24,24 1986:2 1986:9,10,23 1987:3 1987:6,17,21 1988:18 1988:18,19 1989:9,17 1989:23,24 1990:7 1991:2,11,16,25 1992:2,21 1995:14,15

1996:2,9 1998:2,16 1998:18,23 1999:3,8 1999:15,20,21 2000:3 2002:25 2003:9,10 2004:3 2005:6.24 2007:6,10,11,19 2008:1,3,3,5,9,9,11 2008:14.16.16.17.20 2008:22,23,24,25,25 2009:2,8,10,16,18,22 2009:25 2010:1,3,4,6 2023:15,16,17,18,18 2024:25 2025:2,2,4 2025:12,18,25 2026:3 2026:5,5,6 2027:8,9 2027:15,19,21,23 2028:5,21,21,25 2029:1,1,5,7,8,8,9,10 2029:12,17 2030:3,18 2031:1,8,8 2034:13 2034:15,15,21,25 2035:25 2036:17,19 2037:1,6 2038:8,8,12 2038:13,19,23 2039:1 2039:16,16 2040:3,3 2040:8,10,17,25 2041:4,12,13,14,18 2041:19 2042:23 2043:14,18 2044:3,9 2044:24 2045:2 2046:4 2047:10 2048:11,13 2049:8,14 2049:14 2050:6 2052:4,9,9,11,14,17 2052:25 2053:1,14,15 2054:1,1,5,9,11 way 1979:12,14 1981:22 1982:2 1983:8,12,16 1984:1 1991:21 1992:15,15 1994:15 1998:11,20 2001:16 2003:10 2004:13 2008:8 2010:22 2019:18 2025:5,7 2026:3,11 2027:23 2028:6 2030:10 2031:13,16 2031:24 2032:4,5 2036:16 2038:22 2040:4 2041:6,13 2042:6 2052:14 2053:8 2055:7 2056:8 2057:3,4 ways 2006:15 2010:2 2031:14,16 2048:6 2050:5 2051:18

1973:9 we'll 1976:11 2032:10 2032:16 2037:6 2046:14,16 we're 1997:13.21 1999:18 2003:16 2004:25 2011:14 2016:24 2025:21 2030:7,8 2033:15 2042:19 we've 1983:21 2002:6 2010:6 2013:20 2035:23 weeks 1975:22 welcome 2010:21 went 1996:7 2029:23 2035:11 2042:13 weren't 2011:9 2048:7 2048:8,9 wheel 1986:23 1990:7 2034:20 wheeled 2039:16 wheelers 1987:6,7,22 1990:21 2011:19,21 2037:11,12,14 **wheeling** 1976:18 1987:4,5,8 1989:6,15 1989:24,25 1990:8,13 1991:3,4,18,19,20 1995:13,14,16,18,20 1995:24 1996:5,12,19 1996:22 1997:1,6,12 1997:15,17 1998:12 2001:2,6 2002:23 2007:1,4,9,13,23 2008:12 2012:17,21 2012:24 2013:1 2024:11 2037:13,21 2038:14,16 2045:6 2052:8 wheelings 2001:4 wheels 2038:5 wild 1985:13 win 2001:11 witness 2016:2 2058:17 witnesses 1989:24 **Woodcock** 1977:10 1979:13 1986:4 1987:14 2023:1 Woodcock's 2017:14 word 2019:15 2024:18 2044:14,15,22 words 1975:6 1989:16 2026:25 2031:7 work 1984:16 1992:12 1997:2 2014:19 worked 1998:8

**working** 2054:2

2056:7

wbraunig@kvn.com

	1	1	l	I
works 2046:23	<b>1082</b> 1996:1	<b>23</b> 2047:11 2051:3,5	<b>61</b> 1989:5,12 1990:20	
world 2008:11 2016:24	<b>109</b> 1996:25 2005:24	<b>24</b> 2051:5	<b>633</b> 1973:6	
WORLDWIDE	<b>10th</b> 1973:14	<b>244</b> 2050:19	6th 2058:17	
1972:23	<b>11</b> 2049:10	<b>25</b> 1977:18 1990:4		
worth 1990:20 2035:5	<b>115</b> 1996:25	<b>250</b> 1998:6,8	7	
2035:24 2036:16,18	<b>12</b> 1977:10,10 1988:11	<b>253</b> 2056:17	<b>700</b> 1973:18	
2036:20	1989:3 2017:15	<b>26</b> 1998:21	<b>701</b> 1972:24	
wouldn't 2016:1	<b>12.4</b> 2001:8	<b>27</b> 2005:9,11	<b>794</b> 2044:2	
2021:20 2031:4	<b>12.4(c)</b> 1982:3,4	<b>27-</b> 2006:18		
2052:17,18	1984:17	<b>28</b> 1999:19,21	8	
<b>wow</b> 2041:15 2047:5	<b>13</b> 1989:3	<b>28</b> - 1999:19,25	<b>8</b> 2054:17,23	
written 1976:2 2044:23	<b>134</b> 2005:25		<b>80</b> 1996:17,22,24	
wrong 1984:1 1993:9	<b>136</b> 1997:2		<b>80-dollar</b> 1996:12	
1994:23 2000:22	<b>140</b> 2029:23	<b>30</b> 2044:4	<b>800</b> 1972:25	
2005:23,24 2015:19	<b>1414</b> 1981:13	<b>304</b> 1972:4 1974:2	<b>865</b> 1973:14	
2015:20 2040:2	<b>1415</b> 1981:13	<b>31</b> 1996:16,17,23		
2044:18 2049:17	<b>1419</b> 2006:7	2044:25 2053:18	9	
2050:14,15 2051:25	<b>1428</b> 1990:4	<b>32</b> 2045:11	<b>90</b> 1996:14	
2052:23 2053:4	<b>1429</b> 1990:4	<b>3374</b> 1972:20 2058:8	<b>900</b> 2029:23	
wrongdoer 1981:10	<b>15</b> 1982:18,24 1983:2	2058:23	<b>90012</b> 1973:19	
2014:6 2017:5	2003:3,3,16 2006:17	<b>396</b> 1979:1	<b>90017-2543</b> 1973:15	
wrongful 1979:7	2019:25 2022:12	<b>397</b> 1979:1	<b>94111</b> 1972:24	
1981:8	2033:7	<b>3rd</b> 1972:24	<b>981-3498</b> 1972:25	
wrote 2055:12	<b>164</b> 1997:3			
WSR 2003:9	<b>18</b> 2005:9	4		
	<b>188</b> 1982:23 1985:7	<b>4.1</b> 2009:6,7,9		
X	1994:9 1999:23	<b>4.2</b> 2009:9,18 2041:15		
XIII 1972:10 1974:3	<b>188-</b> 2006:17,20	2041:15		
	<b>1931</b> 2040:21	<b>4:00</b> 2042:4		
Y	<b>1933</b> 1987:18	<b>4:10</b> 2057:22		
<b>Yeah</b> 2030:7 2033:11	<b>1972</b> 1972:13 1974:3	<b>415</b> 1972:25		
year 2009:24 2012:1,2	<b>1976</b> 1974:5	<b>415.391.5400</b> 1973:7		
2012:3 2053:23,24	<b>1997</b> 1995:21,23	<b>471</b> 1999:24		
2055:14 2056:8,16,22	<b>1998</b> 1996:13,23	<b>49</b> 2043:24		
years 1996:18,24	2002:21 2053:18,21	<b>491</b> 2047:12		
2002:9 2032:2 2033:7	2054:4			
yesterday 2055:11		5		
yield 2013:25		<b>5</b> 1972:18 1974:2		
yields 2023:21	<b>2:05</b> 1975:3	1975:2		
	<b>2003</b> 2043:23 2054:8	<b>5.1</b> 2032:25		
Z	<b>2008</b> 2044:2	<b>5.2</b> 2008:2,19 2009:9		
zero 1976:13 1977:18	<b>2010</b> 1974:6 2044:25	2009:18 2010:6		
1979:19 1984:20	<b>2011</b> 1983:22	2032:25 2041:15,16		
2016:5 2019:4,7	<b>2012</b> 1972:12	2049:5		
	<b>2013</b> 1972:12	<b>5.4</b> 2053:19		
	<b>2014</b> 1972:12 1978:20	<b>50-50</b> 1992:7		
	<b>2015</b> 1972:18 1974:2	<b>506</b> 1999:11		
1	1975:2 1983:22	<b>512</b> 1985:5		
<b>1</b> 1972:12,12 2050:19	2058:18	<b>522-7096</b> 1972:25		
<b>1-10</b> 1972:13	<b>2016</b> 1984:11,19	<b>53</b> 1986:13		
<b>10</b> 1972:12 2017:14	<b>2049</b> 1974:7	<b>54</b> 1999:12,17,25		
2033:7	<b>2055</b> 1974:8	<b>55</b> 2001:6		
100 1976:17 1977:23	<b>2058</b> 1972:13 1974:3	<b>58</b> 1989:12 2001:6		
1979:20,21 1985:9,20	<b>20th</b> 2053:23,23	<b>59</b> 2006:7		
1988:6,8,12,14,22,23	<b>213.217.6000</b> 1973:19			
1997:9 2019:4,7	<b>213.443.3000</b> 1973:15	6		
2030:22	<b>218</b> 2050:19	60 1990:20		
<b>1063</b> 2003:5	<b>22</b> 2054:16	<b>60,000-dollar</b> 2013:17		