September 20, 2021

1	
2	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
4	DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE
5)
6	Santa Barbara Channelkeeper,)
7) CASE NO.
8) 19STCP01176 Petitioner,)
9	VS.
10))
11	State Water Resources Control) Board, et al.,)
12))
13	Defendants.)
14)
15 16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	REPORTER S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
18	Monday, September 20, 2021
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	There are December (CCD NO. 10202
28	Tracy Dyrness, CSR NO. 12323 OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEM

September 20, 2021

1	
2	APPEARANCES:
3	FOR PLAINTIFF: Best Best & Krieger, LLP
4	BY: Christopher M. Pisano, Esq. 300 South Grand Avenue 25th Floor
5	Los Angeles, California 90071
6	Best Best & Krieger, LLP
7	BY: Shawn Hagerty, Esq. 655 West Broadway 15th Floor
8	San Diego, California 92101
9	
10	VIRTUAL TELECONFERENCE APPEARANCES:
11	FOR DEFENDANT: Rutan & Tucker, LLP
12	(Casitas) BY: Jeremy Jungreis, Esq.
13	FOR DEFENDANT: Holly J. Jacobson, Esq. (Ojai)
14	FOR DEFENDANT: Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP (Wood-Claeyssens) BY: Scott Slater, Esq.
15	FOR DEFENDANT: Daniel Cooper, Esq.
16	(Santa Barbara Channelkeeper)
17 18	FOR DEFENDANT: Claude R. Baggerly (Self)
19	FOR DEFENDANT: Andrew K. Whitman, Esq. (Heidi A. Whitman)
20	FOR DEFENDANT: Mark N. Melnick, Esq.
21	(State Water Resources Control Board)
22	
23	FOR DEFENDANT:
2425	FOR DEFENDANT: Anthony Francois, Esq. (Robin Bernhoft)
26	FOR DEFENDANT: Gregg Garrison, Esq.
27	(Rosanna Garrison)
28	FOR DEFENDANT: Gregory J. Patterson Esq. (William Thatcher)

September 20, 2021

1	
2	Also present on LACourtConnect: Peter Duchesneau, Noah
3	Golden-Krasner, Sophie Wenzlau, David Farkas, Lindley
4	Fraley, Neal Maguire, Nathan Metcalf, Justin Fisch, Jeanne
5	M. Zolezzi, David Greifinger, Dennis Corte, Patrick
6	Rendon, Ryan Blatz, Laura R. Schreiner, Loa E. Bliss,
7	Michael Ray Ozatalar, David A. Ossentjuk and Bradley
8	Herrema
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

September 20, 2021

	CCICILICA COP1	1
1	CASE NUMBER: 19STCP01176	
2	CASE NAME: Santa Barbara Channelkeeper VS.	
3	State Water Resources Control	
4	Board, et al.	
5	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA Monday, September 20, 2021	
6	DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE	
7	APPEARANCES: (AS HERETOFORE NOTED.)	
8	TIME: 9:48 A.M.	
9		
10	THE COURT: We're on the record in 19STCP01176, the	
11	Ventura River water case. Santa Barbara Channel versus	
12	State Board of Resources Control Board. Mr. Hagerty and	
13	Pisano are in court. We've got a number of lawyers and	
14	interested participants via LACourtConnect. Each time you	
15	speak on LACourtConnect, please give your name.	
16	Before we went on the record, I have been talking	
17	with Mr. Hagerty about some ministerial matters having to	
18	do with the status of the Court's order about the legal	
19	consequence of using File & ServeXpress for the service of	
20	papers, in particular Mr. Hagerty's well-advised request	
21	that the Court clearly memorialize what had been asked for	
22	when you-all first came before me in the summer or early	
23	fall of 2019, which is to provide expressly that the use	
24	of File & ServeXpress for service will be equivalent to	
25	personal service for purposes of calculating deadlines.	
26	Correct, Mr. Hagerty?	
27	MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor.	
28	THE COURT: Although a review of the records	
		ı

September 20, 2021

Certified Copy

indicates that in 2019, I made certain orders that did make it clear that the use of File & ServeXpress is mandatory, those orders stopped short of saying it had the legal effect of being the same as personal service. It was a mutual request when the request was made in October -- excuse me, in August of 2019.

Is there anybody who wants to be heard now to object to the Court modifying the otherwise default Rules of Civil Procedure which would allow two extra court days when File & ServeXpress is used and provide instead that there be zero extra court days? Anybody wishes to be heard, please speak up now and state your name and the reasons why you want to protest treating this the same as personal service.

Hearing no response, the Court will provided in today's minute order the use of File & ServeXpress going forward, which will be deemed the legal equivalent of personal service, and the provisions to the contrary in the Code of Civil Procedure are deemed waived for good cause found by the Court with the defending cross-complainant, City of San Buenaventura to give notice and the Court to make sure this is expressed in the minute order.

I separately have before me an ex-parte from the same City of San Buenaventura. I guess technically it's an order to show cause having to do with publication of summons. Is there anybody who wishes to be heard in opposition to the order to show cause regarding the use of

September 20, 2021

Certified Copy

publication notice for certain deceased cross-defendants and certain unserved defendants who are impossible to locate due to their living in gated properties? Hearing no objection, the proposed order is signed. It will be filed, with the City of San Buenaventura to give notice.

So it seems like there's been some notable developments, at least in terms of disclosures, since we were last together. The joint report today is a little bit summary in describing them, and I'm aware of the fact Mr. Baggerly's renewed motion for the appointment of scientific advisors is before the Court.

At the moment, the two things of note in terms of newness are the issuance by the State Water Resources Control Board of a draft sensitivity analysis about the connectivity of groundwater and surface water and the relevant watershed associated with a geological analysis and the final study plan for the development of the aforesaid model and some other incidental papers.

I'm going to invite Mr. Melnick to walk me through them a little bit. I have gotten access to them thanks to Mr. Melnick's approaching this morning through the bulletin board on CaseAnywhere. I'll have more detailed questions, but I would treat that as the first order of business and then invite other counsel, including the City of Ventura, as well as the plaintiff Santa Barbara Channel Keepers as well as the Casitas Water District and others to then speak to their take on this recently issued study. Secondly, at least, to briefly talk at greater length

September 20, 2021

Certified Copy

about what, if anything, can be learned from recent disclosures by the City of Ventura by its own experts. I'm sure I'll find out from Mr. Hagerty why it remains a black box from the Court's point of view. Then I'm going to ask whether any of those developments or other considerations had any impact on negotiating to a more unanimously approved fiscal solution. At the moment, I understand that definitely some people are not persuaded of its utility.

Then I intend to deal with Mr. Baggerly's motion, although the very fact that he, I believe, should have seen the Ventura city disclosures and soon will see another batch of disclosures on Friday of this week unless I'm educated otherwise. But I think, Mr. Hagerty, I should have access to those disclosures, but I don't have them yet. I would, in my mind's eye, probably want the benefit of them before I try to deal afresh with Mr. Baggerly's motion that I go find yet another expert in addition to all those whose thoughts and opinions have now been put on the table or in a few days will be.

Mr. Melnick, are you there?

MR. HAGERTY: Yes, I'm here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you mind giving me a little bit of a tour of the contents? I have the website opened. So while I have opened the three PDF documents, I was trying to open something else, the preliminary zip. It took a lot of time for downloading, but maybe it did download. There's a lot there, I think. At some point, it becomes a

Certified Copy

lot of numbers that exceed my mathematical talents. But I invite you to walk me through it just to sort of orient me to what is there and what a nontechnical layman like me might find utility in reviewing. The question to you, Mr. Melnick, whether there were surprises relative to what had been depicted by others in this case to be the geological and environmental state of affairs of the watershed in question and your sentiments as to whether your client's study seems to be congruent with the draft physical solution that has been offered up until now by the City of Ventura and certain parties aligned with it.

Then I will start inviting comments on the same study starting with the environmental plaintiff, Santa Barbara Channel Keepers, moving to the City of Ventura, moving on to the Casitas Water District, and then moving on to others who want to talk, including the East Ojai group. In part, I'm curious as to whether this will have any impact on trying to negotiate an acceptable physical solution. Mr. Melnick, you have the floor.

MR. MELNICK: Thank you, Your Honor. I guess I'm not quite sure -- I think I'm hearing a lot of feedback. I apologize for that.

THE COURT: On our end, the sound is nice and clean.

MR. MELNICK: Okay, good.

THE COURT: Do you have maybe two microphones on or two speakers like a headset plus a computer speaker at the same time?

MR. MELNICK: No. It seems fine right now. Let's

Certified Copy

go ahead. You raise several questions, Your Honor. I'm not sure -- I can answer any questions you have about what's on the website that has the model on it that is accessible to the public.

THE COURT: I'll start with a question then. Is that okay, Mr. Melnick?

MR. MELNICK: That's perfectly fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thinking about the presumption of what I'll call the East Ojai people, particularly the ones in the upper watershed in physical terms, height terms, does this study tend to show that all of the groundwater basins are functionally interconnected with the surface flows, or does it support a contrary conclusion that one or more of the groundwater basins do not have relevant connectivity or not material connectivity?

MR. MELNICK: Well, Your Honor is asking me to give a preview of what we're going to disclose on Friday, so I'll try to do that. I caution that, you know, I may -- I'm a lawyer, right, not a hired geologist, so I may miss some of the nuance here that expert disclosures will have.

THE COURT: I don't expect this to be binding on you or your client. I appreciate any kind of summary you can provide, recognizing there may be differing opinions.

MR. MELNICK: I think what the model will show and our expert disclosure will explain is that all the groundwater basins are connected to the surface water here. They vary in time and location. So the upper Ojai folks, I would say the eastern edge of the upper Ojai

September 20, 2021

Certified Copy

groundwater basin has probably the smallest amount of connectivity to the surface water in this watershed. And that partly has to do with the fact that it straddles the watershed boundary, but there's other reasons, too.

That's -- you know, the degree to which it's connected to the surface water is pretty small in comparison to other locations. It's also the case that not as much groundwater is pumped in that location. So does that help answer your question?

THE COURT: Yeah, it does. Is there anything else about the study that you think will buck up the physical solution as it is currently drafted or be a tool to question, criticize or otherwise attack the current drafted physical solution?

MR. MELNICK: I think the model will help explain the need for some adjustments to flow requirements in this watershed. And those don't -- we're having a discussion with the City of Ventura and settling conversation about how the physical solution that they proposed needs to be adjusted to account for that.

THE COURT: That's notable in one sense. If my memory is right, the current draft physical solution I have the pleasure of reviewing appeared to accept that the variability of flow currently observed in this watershed due to our wet and dry cycles in the climate in the watershed appear to be an acceptable context in which to try to engage in other mitigation efforts for the betterment of the fishery, particularly having to do with

September 20, 2021

Certified Copy

nonnative shoreline plants and the lack of sufficient deposits of gravel in key places which appear to be the primary way in which the physical solution proposes to improve the fishery through matters beneficial apparently to the fish separate and apart from the quantity of water that flows through the stream in any given month of the year. If I hear you right, your client appears to be concluding that some further efforts to reduce export of the water from the current natural flow may be needed in order to sufficiently protect the fishery.

MR. MELNICK: That's accurate, Your Honor. Just to elaborate, the habitat improvements that are proposed in the physical solution are important. They will help. They will have an impact. The existing flow restrictions at Foster Park are important. Those need to continue. But our view is there needs to be more.

One obvious thing that could happen is that the Matilija Dam could come down. And I think everyone is in agreement that would not be a good thing to happen. There is a fair amount of work that has to happen for that to happen. That will open up a huge stretch of habitat and will have a huge impact. But there are probably other things that need to happen.

THE COURT: One question before I pass it on to Mr. Cooper. As I look at what I find when I open up the public website, is there one or more documents that I should start with in terms of finding a path to reading and comprehending your client's work product? Is there a

Certified Copy

point where it gets too technical or just a bunch of numbers on a spreadsheet that for someone like myself I'm going to get very little by staring at a spreadsheet?

MR. MELNICK: I think, Your Honor, I would ask you to leave the model to the experts and let them translate what it does for the rest of us. I certainly can't work through the model to get you any information. I think our experts are going to produce a report on Friday which explains the model outputs and gives a lot of useful information for the Court and for the parties. I'm sure that Dr. Archer, City of San Buenaventura's expert, will be looking at the model seeing what it does. I'm sure Mr. Patterson's expert will do the same.

I'm sure any other experts will do the same. It is quite technical and, you know, I think with a lot of hard work, a lot of people could get some valuable information out of the model. I'm not sure it's worth the Court's time to do that at this point.

THE COURT: For your purposes, the best way for me to use time in the management of this case would probably be something other than attempting to read any portion of the material on the public website?

MR. MELNICK: I think that's right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. I have no problem with that. I'm going to take a short recess. The only other thing competing this morning is set for 10:00. I hope the lawyers in China are with us. I expect it will take five minutes. We will go off the record.

Certified Copy

1 |

(A recess is taken.)

2.4

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record.

Mr. Cooper, plaintiff's counsel, if memory serves me
right, you have struck what appears to be a full and final
compromise with co-defendant City of San Buenaventura, but
I don't recollect that you reached any similar such state
of equipoise with the lead defendant State Water Resources
Control Board. Is my memory right, Mr. Cooper?

MR. COOPER: Partially, Your Honor. So the settlement that we have with the City of Ventura is interim, the idea being there's some flows for fish at Foster Park, a pumping shutoff at a minimum flow rate in-stream while the physical solution is negotiated as part of this adjudication. We are still part of this litigation in terms of commenting, participating, litigating if necessary the issue of appropriate management of flows in the river to preserve public resources including specifically Steelhead. So when you say we reached equipoise with the City, we have an interim resolution, but not a final resolution.

THE COURT: Fair enough. As to the State, are you more settled with the State, or am I correct you are not settled with the State?

MR. COOPER: We are not settled with the State. The posture has changed a bit. Our claim against the State was primarily to compel them to engage in protecting

Certified Copy

public trust resources and put restrictions on the city's water right. And because this is now adjudication, the State in the form of the state board and California Department of Fish and Wildlife are now engaged to protect public trust resources as part of the adjudication process. So our claim against the State is still alive, but their interests have altered somewhat. We find ourselves, at least generally, aligned with the State in protecting fish going forward.

THE COURT: As to this new study that got released, do you like it? Do you hate it? Do you want to explain it to me? Mr. Melnick felt I didn't need to know much about it.

MR. COOPER: Well, you know, a model is as good as the data put in, so good data in, good results out. I think it's laudable that the State made the model available to the parties so that we can do our own model runs and evaluate the impacts of various withdrawals at various reaches of the river on flows seasonally and compare that to the minimum flows for fish and then provide that kind of testimony, expert review to the Court. So the model is a very useful tool. I'm glad it's finally available.

I laud the State for undertaking the exercise. The State is correct in telling the Court that applying it and using it and interpreting it is an expert-driven exercise. I believe there are plenty of experts who will be running the model and then advising the Court on what those model

Certified Copy

runs mean and what data has gone into it.

THE COURT: Thank you. Unless you want to say something else, I'll move to the City of Ventura.

Mr. Cooper?

MR. COOPER: I would like to comment quickly on the physical solution, if possible.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. COOPER: I just say, again, I think for the Court to engage in a meaningful on a physical solution now is premature. We're talking currently about jurisdiction. I believe the trial was strictly about the scope of the adjudication. I think the model and model runs speak directly to that. The physical solution, we're just not -- nobody is really in a position to talk about that yet. Specifically the proposal put on the table by the City and the other users aligned with them doesn't address water. This is a water adjudication.

The Arendel removal and habitat enhancement measures, while they're interesting and will be helpful, that's the not the focus of this case. The focus is water. Fish need water. Without water, the rest of that stuff is kind of meaningless. And there's no water on the table in the physical solution. They want to leave everything status quo, and the status quo is what has driven the species to the edge of extirpation. I would say the physical solution is, from our perspective, unacceptable. There is no point in engaging on that.

Let's get past the jurisdictional scope, and then we'll

Certified Copy

13

1 deal with the physical solution, and our experts will go 2 on at that phase. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Hagerty, Mr. Pisano? 4 Thank you, Your Honor. As the Court MR. PISANO: 5 observed on August 31, we complied with this Court's order 6 and we served on all parties our expert disclosures. 7 THE COURT: Right now I'm asking about the City's 8 comments about the State Water Resources Control Board. 9 If you're talking about disclosures, I'll get to that 10 I'm going to run through and after you talk about 11 the state model, I'm going to ask Casitas to talk and 12 Ojai. Keep your powder dry on your own disclosures. 13 MR. PISANO: With regards to the State's model, we 14 agree with Mr. Melnick and with Mr. Cooper that it is an 15 expert-driven exercise and it's not really appropriate or 16 ripe, if you will, to discuss it now. 17 THE COURT: Also sounds like it's incomprehensible 18 for those of us who just have a legal education. MR. PISANO: It's difficult to follow on your own. 19 20 You really do need an expert's assistance. 21 THE COURT: In practical terms, at least at this 22 juncture, you're not ready to say whether you think it is 23 supportive of the current physical solution or not; you 24 can't just grab it and say, see, I won my case? 25 MR. PISANO: That's correct, Your Honor. 26 THE COURT: Casitas Water District, who is here

MR. JUNGREIS: Good morning, Your Honor.

This is

27

28

today for that entity?

Certified Copy

Jeremy Jungreis from Rutan and Tucker.

THE COURT: You're the guy who took over the case when your partner retired?

MR. JUNGREIS: Something along those lines. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. JUNGREIS: Your Honor, just a couple quick comments. First, Casitas received a model like everyone else around August 31 and we're reviewing the model results. We will have additional comments. We're going through those with our consultant who has a lot of in-depth knowledge of the various aspects of hydrogeology. We're still evaluating, there are extensive comments on the final study plan. We need to understand that.

We're going to need additional model files from the State Water Board to better understand some of the model assumptions and parameters of the model, and our consultant is assisting us right now. For right now, Your Honor, we're dug in. We're looking at the model, and we will have comments in the future. At this point, I don't think we can provide the kind of comments the Court is asking for at this point.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Garrison, if memory serves me right, you're counsel for the cross-defendants who identified themselves as the East Ojai Group?

MR. GARRISON: Your Honor, this is Gregg Garrison. I believe that is Greg Patterson.

THE COURT: Do I have Greg Patterson with me this

Certified Copy

morning?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With Mr. Garrison's helpful comments, it is you who represents the East Ojai Group, am I talking to the right guy?

MR. PATTERSON: You are talking to the right person, Greg Patterson.

THE COURT: Same questions I put to Mr. Pisano and Mr. Jungreis.

MR. PATTERSON: Your Honor, I think what you're going to be seeing is a set of expert reports that are going to be significantly divergent in their opinions. At least with respect to my clients, we're mostly in the upper East Ojai area. It won't come as any surprise that from our perspective and from our analysis of all of the various local reports and the data that is available, our client's groundwater pumping do not contribute to the flow of the river or its tributaries on the San Antonio Creek, and this is really not a physical solution in the true sense of the word.

This is a fish habitat restoration project. The focus should be on whether groundwater pumping from our client's wells, where they're located which is much deeper than the aquifer that may be connected to San Antonio, have any effect on the flow relative to the health of the fishery. That's what this is really all about. So we have a consultant for our clients who will be preparing a report and submitting it on Friday. Other than that, I'm

Certified Copy

not sure what else I can contribute. But there will be, I think, just to alert the Court, significant differences between -- especially between the City's report, somewhat with respect to the State report, but certainly you're going to see some fairly significant analysis that has a different opinion outcome. And it's very technical. I agree with everyone that it's very technical. There's voluminous documents to sort through. I think the reports are probably, if they were in hard copy form, would be three or four feet high least. And so there's just a significant amount of information to plow through for the Court to understand what's actually going on here.

THE COURT: Thank you. In a moment, I will ask City of Ventura to speak about their own disclosures, and in that context I'll try to understand better whether the parties are getting these disclosures even if the Court doesn't, or for some reason the disclosures aren't going to people like Mr. Baggerly in his capacity as a party.

Before I invite the City to talk about its own disclosures, is there anybody else who wants to offer any kind of color commentary at this time on the contents or impact of the State Water Resources Control Board model recently released to the parties and the public? If so, state your name and make your point.

MR. BAGGERLY: Claude Baggerly. I have two comments, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. BAGGERLY: In terms of connectivity, it's only

Certified Copy

possible in the global sense, according to the definition of hydrologic connectivity. All water is connected throughout the globe, but it's not so in relationship to the basins. That's one thing we have to make sure that we understand. The other thing that I'd like everyone to understand is you have to have correct assumptions that are critical to the margin of error of the model. The margin of error of the model is going to be critical to determine what flows are actually necessary to keep the fish in good condition. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Anybody else wish to comment on the State Water Resources Control Board model at this time?

MR. FRANCOIS: Your Honor, this is Tony Francois for Dr. Robin Bernhoft, cross-defendant.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. FRANCOIS: Perhaps it's obvious at this stage, but one point we want to preserve is that in our view in the context of litigation, this lawsuit, the expert work and the model propounded by the state agency, the State Water Resources Control Board is not entitled to any extra credibility because they're a state agency in this particular proceeding. We would preserve that. Also to note that obviously we think the State, in order to advance conclusions from the model, is going to have to prove up all the foundational elements of the model. We anticipate that will be a significant exercise for the State to do. Those are just the two points we want to

Certified Copy

preserve at this point.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Anybody else?

MS. JACOBSON: Holly Jacobson for the City of Ojai.

THE COURT: Go ahead, ma'am.

MS. JACOBSON: Just to make it clear, this is a model that the State Water Resources Control Board has released for public comment. The period of time where they have said, here is what we have put together, here are the assumptions and the data points we have used. If you plug in X, Y and Z, you will get some result. Now, it's subject to public comment right now because those assumptions and how they created the model are subject to criticism. It's not a true report or analysis. It's a model that may be subject to change here or there. So I just wanted to make that point, because that will be crucial for the phase one trial from our perspective.

THE COURT: Thank you. I hope to get on to City of Ventura, but I'll allow one last chance for commentary on the model.

MR. GARRISON: This is Greg Garrison.

THE COURT: Go ahead, sir.

MR. GARRISON: I think the key point is that today this hearing's proposed solution misses the mark. It's really a habitat restoration, and there is no water on the table. As counsel states for the City of Ventura, what the Court really does need is an expert's assistant. And as Mr. Patterson states, the experts will be wildly divergent and there's three to four feet of physical data.

Certified Copy

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

26

27

28

19

At this point, I would underscore these comments indicate the need for an independent, neutral court expert. you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm interested in hearing what, if anything, Ventura city will share with me and in particular to understand if I should anticipate seeing these disclosures, whether the disclosures went to other parties such as Mr. Baggerly, and if they went to him, why it's a better course of wisdom that I not busy myself with them.

MR. PISANO: Thank you, Your Honor. We did on August 31 serve the expert reports on all parties who have appeared.

THE COURT: Mr. Baggerly, by example, got it? MR. PISANO: Mr. Baggerly got it. He's on the service distribution list. The Court was not. We didn't file it. We didn't provide it to the Court because we complied with the statute, Your Honor. CCP is very clear. In both 2034 and in 843, expert reports are served amongst the parties. They are not filed and for good reason. They are hearsay. They are not admissible evidence.

I think it's very important as we proceed, Your Honor, because we have a complicated case with a broad, all-encompassing physical solution that we really keep ourselves grounded in the task at hand. The task at hand is the issue of interconnectivity and the basin boundaries. That's what our expert reports speak to. That's what we assume the expert reports on the other side

Certified Copy

on the 24th we will get will speak to. It's those issues and those issues alone. Once we have all the expert reports and supplemental reports, we'll be able to depose the experts. Then in February, the experts will come in here. They will each present their opinions. They will first go before you wearing your hat as trier of law where you will make the determination about whether they are even permitted to testify.

And then they will go before you, assuming they can testify, in your capacity as the trier of fact where you will weigh their credibility, detail the sufficiency and all that, and you will make a determination as to whether you agree with the opinions of expert X or you agree with the opinions of expert Y. That happens day in and day out in courtrooms all over this state. It's all done pursuant to the CCP and the evidence code, and the legislature in their wisdom, they set forth these rules, and they're good rules. There's a reason we have them. We should follow them, Your Honor. That's why we didn't file the reports. That's why we would object to anybody filing the reports on --

THE COURT: Or serving them with the Court checked as a party served?

MR. PISANO: Right.

THE COURT: And that's possible. I don't think think you've done anything unethical or improper, I was just curious. But you are offering a rather articulate explanation of why the better course of wisdom is wait

Certified Copy

until it all comes at the same time as part of a trial and not dribbled out. If I wasn't the trial judge, it would be different, but I am your trial judge.

MR. PISANO: Correct. At the end of the day, that's what's motivating us in our decisions, to make sure we have a fair and appropriate trial come February.

THE COURT: So I had some follow-up questions.

Perhaps they may shed light on the contents of the expert's reports. I was going to ask Casitas what the reaction was. Part of the answer is come this Friday, you'll be getting competing experts. Perhaps that's the more eloquent response rather than asking an attorney who is not a hydrologist by training to give me informal critique or commentary on your report. You would probably say it's premature for me to ask for comments in today's session on the record of people's reactions to the reports.

MR. PISANO: I would agree with that, Your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: By the same token, Mr. Baggerly and Mr. Garrison, Mr. Patterson, the East Ojai people generally are now able to see what's in the report and they will see what's served on Friday.

MR. PISANO: That's correct.

MR. PATTERSON: This is Greg Patterson. One quick comment. Other than the State Water Board and the City and my group -- and perhaps the City of Ojai, I'm not sure -- but I am completely uncertain at this point as to

Certified Copy

whether you're going to be getting much in the way of other expert witness reports. Most of these folks who have been sued can't afford one. These studies and an expert witness report, from my personal experience, can be in the six figures. And so most of these folks are going to be without the ability to properly respond to the City's efforts. I think that's another sort of something to think about with respect to the City -- that the Court possibly having someone neutral who can advise the Court on some really technical stuff the Court hasn't seen before.

And there's going to be a lot of activity between now and the end of the discovery process that is going to eliminate a lot more of these issues a little bit more clearly. I don't disagree with the idea that maybe some patience on the part of the Court might be appropriate until some of this gets flushed out more thoroughly. The Court should keep on the table the consideration that it may need somebody to assist it in evaluating as a neutral the various reports that may come in.

THE COURT: Your comments, Mr. Patterson, raise two different theoretical issues to my perception. One, as a neutral manager of a complicated case involving hundreds and thousands of parties, some with lawyers, some without lawyers, all of whom have material interests whether they happen to be able to find a lawyer or not, there is a tension between strict neutrality where I'm passive versus some kind of more proactive case management where I try to

Certified Copy

help those who come to court ill equipped to overcome the apparent unevenness of the combat. One does that cautiously, but in the provisions of self-help centers and legal aid and pro bono work by lawyers, judges have for generations been solicitous to find ways in which people who are underrepresented can get access to essential services so that the product of the litigation process is closer to merits and not who has a stronger arm when you arm wrestle.

That's separate from the question of whether or not the Court in a highly complicated field needs to be coached because as a fact finder it's incredibly difficult to go past whether you like the cut of somebody's suit or the sound of their voice or the logic of their presentation or the confidence expressed by how they convey themselves on the witness stand in deciding who is the more persuasive expert. Someone with a rather modest demeanor may be the repository of the better side of truth in a highly complicated field as compared to some showman who comes in or showgirl with great deal of confidence, learned in Hollywood or otherwise, but basically confidence for selling BS.

As to the first point, I have already suggested to people like Mr. Baggerly that they ought to try to coalesce around people who seem to be similarly situated like the City of Ojai and Attorney Jacobson as well as you, Mr. Patterson, and go basically tug at your sleeve and see how they can find assistance from people similarly

Certified Copy

situated. That process still exists. They also theoretically could go try to find interested academics who haven't otherwise been hired but who seem to be involved in this line of work, whether they're doing environmental studies at UC Merced or UC Santa Cruz or California State, University of Channel Islands campus in east side of Oxnard. I'm not sure if those institutions have academic programs that have an interest in this field, but there may be.

That's different than whether I need my own coach. I'm going to see in Mr. Baggerly's motion is essentially a question -- whether I need my own coach is different from whether or not Mr. Baggerly needs to find help somewhere. I say that in passing. I'm going to get to Mr. Baggerly's motion shortly. Insofar as Mr. Baggerly needs help finding advocacy, I have tried to informally, without trying to step out of the role of a neutral, explain to a layman how he could through the City of Ojai or the collective desires of the clients represented by Mr. Patterson find people with what appears to be common cause, even if the Casitas Water District is not closely enough aligned to be of any utility.

Any other comments you wish to offer as to Ventura's disclosures, Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: Not at this time, Your Honor. I think the City has not disclosed its model. It has refused to do so. That would be very helpful to us. That will be dealt with in the process of discovery. We'll

Certified Copy

deal with it then.

THE COURT: The City's experts have the outcome of their model, but the model is a black box at the moment, Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: A lot of it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That will make interesting discovery. But that's not before me today.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper for the plaintiff, do you have any comments or reactions on Ventura's disclosures?

MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor. No.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'm going to ask a different question of Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Pisano. At least it's intended to be a different question. That is, if we step back and ask how the negotiations about the physical solution are going, I guess you're done with all the meetings, if memory serves me right. Is there movement, is something happening? Is the State Water Resources Control Board disclosures a catalyst for any renewed negotiations? Have your disclosures been? Do you think this Fridays' disclosures will be? Should I do anything to chum the water to try to bring you all together to sort of negotiate some more?

MR. HAGERTY: Thank you, Your Honor. Shawn Hagerty. I don't think the Court needs to do anything. I think as Mr. Pisano was saying, at this point in time, sticking to the statutory process is likely the best way to facilitate additional discussion. I do think having the phase one

Certified Copy

trial on calendar is a motivating factor. I do think that without disclosing the substance of the discussions, discussions are continuing and will continue. For those who haven't had a communication with us, if you want to talk, we are ready. We've always been ready and will remain ready. We are in active discussions with various parties, and we'll continue that with the goal of achieving as much consensus as is feasible. We do think we and the parties are capable of moving that process forward, Your Honor.

The most important thing at this time for the court process is to stick to the statute, move forward with the process leading to the phase one. I think that is probably the best thing the Court can do to continue to motivate the parties to discuss things.

MR. GARRISON: Greg Garrison. There was a January letter from the state attorney general to the City of Ventura addressing the premature nature of the proposed physical solution that I included in my papers for -- advocating for a court mutual expert. When I contacted the City of Ventura wanting to discuss that letter, counsel responded, that's confidential and we can't speak to you about that. So getting back to Mr. Hagerty's point, if these conversations of the proposed solution and phase one elements of connectivity and four basins are open, who is the City of Ventura talking to and when and how often, because I've been cut out of those discussions.

MR. HAGERTY: Mr. Garrison, I'm always available to

Certified Copy

2.

talk to you. What you asked for was our response to that letter which is a confidential settlement communication. It had nothing to do with our willingness to talk to you. I've said in court multiple times and I say again now, any party who wishes to have conversations with us, we are open and ready to have those conversations. I think, Your Honor, there's been a lot of representations that are repeatedly made in this context. If we get up and object to each one, we would be here forever.

That's why I think at this point in time, these types of discussions are not necessarily assisting the facilitation of settlement. In some cases, they're polarizing issues. There are representations of comments made here without the need to have actual discussions, to have backup facts and whatnot. So, Mr. Garrison, I will happily give you a call immediately after this status conference and we can talk. I look forward to doing that. I look forward to doing that with any of the parties. This is not the forum to do it, Your Honor.

MS. JACOBSON: This is Greg Garrison. Thank you,
Mr. Hagerty. But to my question, who are you speaking to
and who has the City of Ventura spoken to about the
proposed physical solution so I can do my own recognizance
and talk to the parties that you just represented to the
Court you're in open discussion with?

MR. HAGERTY: Mr. Garrison, I'd be happy to chat with you offline about that. I think that's the appropriate way to do that.

Certified Copy

28

1 THE COURT: I'm not going to squeeze Mr. Hagerty to 2 be more precise in front of the Court on that. MR. OSIAS: Your Honor, this is David Osias. 3 4 THE COURT: Are you East Ojai too in terms of the 5 geographical location? 6 MR. OSIAS: No, I have a single parcel owner who was 7 able to hire counsel. 8 THE COURT: Where is the parcel in geographic terms? 9 MR. OSIAS: It's arguably partially over the Ojai groundwater basin, or perhaps not. Up in Cedar Canyon. 10 11 THE COURT: Go ahead. 12 MR. OSIAS: I just wanted to say, in answer specifically to your question and without revealing any of 13 14 the contents and which way it went, I thought the expert 15 disclosure was -- of the City was helpful to settlement 16 discussions, and we've been engaged in them. 17 THE COURT: Good. Glad to hear that. So our next 18 time together -- I'm going to talk about Mr. Baggerly's 19 motion shortly; I haven't forgotten that -- is October 20 18th followed by November 15 followed by December 20. 21 Those should all remain on calendar, each at 1:30. Remind 22 me, Mr. Hagerty or Pisano, after this Friday's 23 disclosures, is there an additional disclosure deadline 24 for follow-ons, or is this Friday's deadline the last in 25 sequence? 26 MR. HAGERTY: One more, Your Honor. The September 27 24 disclosures are for specific parties, and then there's 28 one further disclosure October 22. Then, of course, there

Certified Copy

will be appropriate supplemental disclosures after depositions and whatnot.

THE COURT: Is there any obligation to do supplemental disclosures as soon as this Friday stuff comes out? Are you under any obligation to respond to it by a statutory deadline, Mr. Hagerty, if somebody comes up with expert information regarding the life of anadromous fish or whatever?

MR. HAGERTY: There's a schedule date of December 10 for the exchange of supplemental expert disclosures. I also think in 843, there are additional specific requirements as it relates to deposition and things that happen at deposition. We will comply with those requirements.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to turn to

Mr. Baggerly's renewed motion. As indicated earlier,
although it's probable that in some ways Mr. Baggerly is
hoping I will find him an expert to help in his advocacy,
the motion, as I perceive it, is presented with a request
that the judge find as a neutral to give the Court
completely unbiased opinions that may or may not help
Mr. Baggerly's individual situation. Is that a correct
perception of what you believe you're asking for in your
motion, Mr. Baggerly?

MR. BAGGERLY: Spot on, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Having said that, I trust you've been hearing me today and previously when I indicated that insofar as you're trying to find someone to help advance

Certified Copy

your cause, Mr. Baggerly, that you probably should tug on the sleeve of City of Ventura and Mr. Patterson; I assume you heard that suggestion?

MR. BAGGERLY: I have, and I did reach out. The landscape of parties in support or in opposition remain about the same.

THE COURT: Do you perceive there to be anybody such as Mr. Patterson who is aligned with what you perceive to be your position in this case?

MR. BAGGERLY: I do.

THE COURT: And do you, at least with Mr. Patterson, have someone who seems to be aligned with your position on the case, Mr. Baggerly?

MR. BAGGERLY: I don't know who his expert witness is, but the parties that support my motion understand that the Court really does need some help. That is basically all I can say. The choice is yours, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Fair enough. Interestingly, in some ways, the most persuasive supplemental argument I've heard in favor of Mr. Baggerly's motion is the very fact Mr. Melnick and Mr. Pisano/Mr. Hagerty view the content and methodology of the expert analysis of the relevant questions, including even the threshold question of connectivity of certain groundwater basins and surface flows to be so dense and technical as to not be worthy of independent study by the Court. That suggests I may well need an expert. If I need an expert, I don't want to wait until the final status conference to discover I need an

Certified Copy

expert, because finding such an expert is not going to be a five-minute or five-day exercise. But having said that --

MR. BAGGERLY: I agree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Having said that, we're about to frame the battle better when at least Mr. Patterson's expensive expert, or presumptively expensive expert, puts his or her cards on the table along with anybody else who may be aligned. Mr. Patterson, do you have any perception that City of Ventura or anybody else is coming forward with an expert that is desirous of advancing a position similar to your client's position?

MR. PATTERSON: Your Honor, I think there are several local agencies who have generated reports who will be supportive of our position. They're not actively involved in the case, but they will be deposed. You're going to see some additional material at some point. I don't know at the moment of any other set of parties. I don't even know if Casitas is submitting an expert witness report. I don't know if City of Ojai is doing that. We have the City, the State and us that will be submitting reports by the 24th. Other than that, I just don't know.

THE COURT: Mr. Jungreis, do you know if your client, Casitas Water District, intends to issue a report?

MR. JUNGREIS: Your Honor, we had a lot of robust internal debate about that. The issue for us is timing. As you know, we had some transition on our team. So putting together an expert report by this Friday would

Certified Copy

32

1 likely not be feasible for us. At this point, we were not 2. going to do it. If the Court were inclined to grant 3 additional time -- I wasn't going to ask for that, but 4 since you brought it up, that might be something we would 5 consider. At this point, given the timing involved, we 6 were not going to submit an expert report this Friday. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Jungreis, are you of the view that 8 the December 10 deadline for supplement reports would be applicable and because you're responding to Ventura and 9 10 possibly others that if you submit a supplemental or 11 rebuttal report on December 10, you're able to have an expert at the time of trial? 12 13 MR. JUNGREIS: I would assume so, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Do you have any sentiments on the topic, 15 Mr. Hagerty, Mr. Pisano? 16 MR. PISANO: I do, Your Honor. My understanding of 17 2034 -- and I don't have the research top of head -- is 18 that you need to disclose an expert in order to be able to do a supplemental. That's under 2034. I haven't looked 19 20 at this issue under 843. 21 THE COURT: Did we set a deadline for rebuttal as compared to supplemental, or were we silent on that topic? 22 23 MR. PISANO: Just supplemental. 24 THE COURT: We seem to be silent on the topic of 25 when a rebuttal report would be due? 26 MR. PISANO: Correct. It's not in the schedule.

referring to December 10. What's your theory about

THE COURT: Mr. Jungreis, I appear to be mistaken

27

28

Certified Copy

whether you can still submit a supplemental at some point -- excuse me, a rebuttal in the not-too-distant future as opposed to waiving your client's right to ever having an expert?

MR. JUNGREIS: At this point, we were prepared to not put forth an expert. We realize the timing was such it would be difficult to do so. Given our understanding of the scope of phase one, it was supposed to be relatively limited as to the issues that were to be decided. We felt like that was not necessarily a problem.

To the extent there was an opportunity for additional time to designate experts, it might be helpful to the other parties that may wish to obtain experts. I don't know, I'm new here. If I'm causing problems, I apologize in advance. If there are parties seeking experts, a short expansion of time would be helpful.

MR. PATTERSON: Greg Patterson. I'm looking at my notes. I hope they're accurate. As I understand it, we previously agreed there would be a November 12 date for expert witness disclosures for those who did not previously hire experts. So to the extent that a party has not retained an expert as of today, I suppose, the City graciously agreed to a schedule that would allow those parties to have a November 12 date for expert witness disclosures with a 12/10 date for supplemental expert disclosures. So I think that's the schedule, although Shawn may —

MR. HAGERTY: If I could jump in, Your Honor. There

Certified Copy

was an earlier proposal that had those dates. That's what Mr. Patterson is referring to. The Court will recall that you modified that and you designated -- for September 24 you designated specific parties who needed to make their disclosures. That would include Casitas.

The 22nd was for all other parties, basically with the theory being that at that point in time, everyone would have the City's information, the State's information, Mr. Patterson's information, any other information, and then other parties can make a determination and disclose on October 22. I think Mr. Patterson just remembered an earlier version of the schedule that was discussed.

THE COURT: I'm not trying to modify what was previously made and the record is what it is. I do remember the City originally proposed there would be concurrent, and over the City's objection, I put forward its expert early. But then I did look to what I believe to be the people most likely to have experts intended or lined up. Whether there was any provision that gave them a safe harbor if they had not hired an expert, I'd have to go look and see what the record says. I haven't tried to reconstruct that. Make your own judgment.

Ms. Jacobson for City of Ojai, do you anticipate providing an expert for court this Friday?

MS. JACOBSON: Yes, Your Honor. We are working diligently to make the Friday deadline. As previously discussed, you invited the parties for this September 24

Certified Copy

deadline to file an ex-parte motion if they needed additional time. I am doing everything in my power to not bother you with such a motion, but I may need a few more days.

THE COURT: I'm here every day this week if you need to come in on an ex-parte. Just set it for 10:00 a.m.

MR. SLATER: Scott Slater on behalf of the Wood-Claeyssens trust.

THE COURT: You're aligned with City of Ventura, I believe?

MR. SLATER: We are. Your Honor, I would like -- we did file supplemental papers in support of the City's position. And I would like to point out that if the Casitas Water District, the fact they elected not to file an expert report that takes a different position speaks volumes. They distribute water throughout the watershed. Many of the parties are independently customers of Casitas. Casitas has a history on the watershed which is decades old.

They have expert witnesses that regularly interface with the Department of Fish and Wildlife in California. They are participant in discussions with the federal government in the Department of Fish and Wildlife. They understand the fishery condition. They have the capacity to hire an expert. I would point out they haven't elected to intervene to file a report on this position. Moreover, there are multiple public agencies who sit in this watershed and have the capacity to offer their own expert

Certified Copy

reports. They have chosen not to. We did hear from the City of Ojai. It's great that they choose to come forward and give the Court some confidence. I also want to point out there are four state agencies involved in this process. So the State and its government representatives, half of the Department of Fish and Wildlife on behalf of the State Water Resources Control Board, on behalf of the parks, are represented in this process. The Court has the benefit of all of those agencies who have the opportunity to prepare and file additional points of view.

The largest agriculture user in the watershed is Taylor Ranch. It is supportive of the filing. The traditional triad, if you will, of interest in water policy, you have consummative users, municipalities, you have agriculture, and you have the environmental interests represented privately by the Channel Keepers and by the State of California. The plate is full. Everybody has a fair opportunity. And to the extent somebody has a divergent opinion and wants to offer, Mr. Patterson is there to represent that more discrete interest.

More than 90 percent of the total production is supporting -- sorry. When combined with Casitas, although they have not formally declared, more than 90 percent of the total production is involved in this proceeding. And you have the opportunity to review the expert reports and make a further determination about what else you see and need after you see those reports. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Slater, no criticism of you or Mr.

Certified Copy

Pisano, but Mr. Pisano explained why it was premature for me to look at the reports. And insofar I discover I'm confused when I look at the reports, I want to know when I look at the reports -- and that is apparently some weeks or months into the future. So that, in my way of thinking, makes it premature to hire an expert. I also hesitate to wait until the final status conference to make the decision. You are suggesting I should try to read the City of Ventura reports and what comes in this Friday, Mr. Slater?

MR. SLATER: I think you have -- your authority is largely founded only by the constitution. I think all of us understand that this process is going to be an elongated process. We're going to see you a long time. You're going to have continuing jurisdiction. If ever you're not confident of the information in front of you, you can press a pause button. It's at the risk of the moving parties who are the -- most have prejudice for us not succeeding in an expeditious fishery restoration plan.

We are taking the risk now that you will have sufficient information in front of you to come to the correct decision, and we are pressing to move forward because every day the fishery is at risk is a day that our consummative use is at risk. We accept that if you are not satisfied at any point that you can push the pause button, hire an expert and come to the right conclusion or get whatever help you need to get to that conclusion. So my answer is, it's inherent in our moving forward. We

Certified Copy

think you have enough. We think you'll have a robust file that will answer the questions or frame the issues for you. And if a further pause is required because you can't get there, we will accept that.

THE COURT: What I also hear you say, Mr. Slater, is that it is likely that between the State's expert and the East Ojai experts there's going to be something with a different view as compared to the City of Ventura and the aligning parties. And in that difference of opinion, I hopefully will get a sufficient illumination to get at the truth.

MR. SLATER: I think we're betting on that, Your Honor. Our intention is that the differences will be sharped and that based upon the facts, the expert opinion and the law that you will be able to come to the appropriate conclusion to resolve that and for us to move on.

THE COURT: Okay. Someone else wanted to talk, I believe it was a woman's voice. Who else wanted to talk?

MS. JACOBSON: Holly Jacobson. I apologize for interrupting.

THE COURT: Go ahead. You are Ojai's counsel.

MS. JACOBSON: Yes. I just wanted to object to Mr. Slater's statements in general. It has nothing to do with the question posed by the Court. Essentially, we are arguing the merits of the issue and trying to infer that Casitas's failure to disclose an expert weighed at all on the issues. I found that highly inappropriate and wanted

Certified Copy

to object for the record.

THE COURT: He infers it must be Casitas is aligning itself with the City of Ventura even if it doesn't want to say so publicly. That's what I thought I heard from Mr. Slater.

MS. JACOBSON: That would be highly inappropriate. You don't need an expert to necessarily destroy the other side's case. You can cut holes in an expert without having --

MR. JUNGREIS: Your Honor, this is Mr. Jungreis. I would just say that I don't think we're asserting we're aligning with anybody.

THE COURT: Fair enough. So, Mr. Baggerly, I'm inclined to trail your motion to October 18 to see whether or not in this combat of experts that's going to be more evident this Friday that there is enough out there that it appears that will do the job in classic style. I think I'm also going to reach out to some of the judges who are still alive who have done cases like this to see whether any of them found utility in having an independent expert since the problem from a judge's point of view would appear to be in common with those kinds of cases such as the Antelope Valley Water case.

And so I intend to do that as part of my judicial diligence between now and October 18. Otherwise I'd wait and see what you learn. Interestingly, Mr. Baggerly, this leaves you-all to aruge about whether or not this battle of disclosed expert reports is or is not a sufficient

Certified Copy

basis under which I as a veteran judge neutral can make a fact decision including the threshold question of competence of an expert to testify without my own coach, even when you may be making those arguments without me having direct access to materials on which your arguments are based. Mr. Pisano and others think that's a better course of wisdom, and probably there's some value to it, although I do have my doubts. I'm willing to take it slow.

Mr. Baggerly, you have the floor out of respect of the fact that this is your motion and you would like me to grant it today.

MR. BAGGERLY: Well, Your Honor, I want you to do what's comfortable and right for you to do. If you want to wait until October 18, I'll be glad to do that. I would like to say one thing. I think it's pretty obvious the City of San Buenaventura and their attorneys, the proposing parties and the state agencies, obviously do not approve of the presiding judge in this complex case taking the initiative to receive unbiased, impartial and knowledgeable information upon which you will be called to render a decision that will be upheld in the courts in the future because it's going to be correct if you get some help. Let's wait until October 18, Your Honor.

THE COURT: One thing that the proponents of the motion might do is to figure out in practical terms who by profile this expert is and how I find such an expert.

Because if I am to have --

Certified Copy

MR. BAGGERLY: I can give you his phone number.

THE COURT: I'll wait for October 18 to hear that.

Mr. Pisano?

MR. PISANO: Your Honor, I know we're going to take this up on the 18th. I think it's important to keep in mind because the Court made a comment after I spoke about the need for an expert to understand technical and dense models. Just because you need an expert to walk you through a model does not mean that an expert should be appointed under Evidence Code Section 730. Those are two fundamentally different questions. By the way, another point is, if you were to grant Mr. Baggerly's motion and appoint someone under 730, this person would not be your coach.

This person would be an expert on equal footing with every other expert. This expert would prepare a report, exchange it, be deposed and be subject to direct and cross-examination at trial. It would not be the case that this expert would discuss with you offline in chambers what -- the way things are and the way things ought to be. That's not what an expert under 730 does. The bottom line is, the Court uses 730 when the Court determines there's a hole, there's a gap. That's why they use the word "require."

If you make a determination that the expert presentations before you are insufficient for you to make a determination of interconnectivity or basin boundaries, that's when 730 would come into play. Frankly, I think if

Certified Copy

somebody thinks after September 24, they have the benefit of these expert reports, my goodness, there's no way these expert reports are going to guide the trier of fact or the opinions that will be rendered will guide the trier of fact, it's incumbent on that party to make a showing as to why that is the case and why an expert under 730 is needed. Until that time, it's premature.

THE COURT: Thank you. So, Madam Clerk, on calendar today is the matter described as hearing on motion for order by Claude Baggerly, et cetera. That is trailed to October 18 of 2021 for further argument but no further briefing unless the Court hereafter asks for same. I will be interested in the status report for the next event.

Mr. Baggerly, you can join in that status report if you wish, or you can file a unilateral status report between now and October 18. You can use that status report as your opportunity to comment on the disclosures that are forthcoming this Friday.

The same opportunity exists for everyone else who is interested in the motion brought by Mr. Baggerly insofar as you join into the joint report organized under the auspices of Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Pisano. If for some reason you can't cooperate in a timely fashion, I'll take unilateral reports as long as they're filed with dispatch in advance of October 18.

What, if anything, useful should we talk about today? I notice some of you are working on drone footage.

I'm not driving around the watershed. That will come when

Certified Copy

it comes. Is there anything else that ought to be addressed today, Mr. Hagerty?

MR. HAGERTY: I think that covers everything from the City's point of view.

MR. WHITMAN: This is Andrew Whitman. I would like to go back to the motion and your order that you not receive any further briefing. That causes me a little bit of concern because you've asked for input on how you would go about selecting an expert. And then the City has proposed what that expert is going to be allowed to do. And I've learned from the time I've been involved and everything that what the City says is essentially false or just their version of the truth. I'd like to be able to say what that expert can do for you.

So I would like to have permission to address in a short brief both the issue of how Your Honor might select an expert and what that expert's role would be on your behalf.

THE COURT: What I indicated in my chit-chat with Mr. Baggerly applies equally to you, sir. You can take advantage of the opportunity to file a status report either jointly with the City on October 12 since the 11th is a public holiday, and/or some kind of unilateral statement filed by yourself no later than, say, October 14 styled as a statute report but speaking to the issues in the continued motion of Mr. Whitman and Mr. Baggerly, particularly including what, if any, epiphanies have or have not emerged from the battle of the experts as it gets

Certified Copy

framed this Friday, along with whatever other things you want to say; mindful I won't have seen what the experts are saying, so you are commenting on a data set that is unknown to me. Mr. Pisano has provided the most eloquent explanation he can. I think for his purposes he was sincere and not intended to be obfuscating that it is more prudent to delay diving into these reports until we are flush at the time of trial. It's possible that most are out on the table that even if the depos are underway I may at some point want to get a taste test of what this arcane stuff sounds like.

MR. BAGGERLY: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Claude Baggerly. I would just like to add a little objection to or addition to what Mr. Pisano said about 730. And that's not your only avenue of approach for scientific advice. You have CCP Section 845 as well. There are many, many things open to you to do what you need to do if you need to do it. That's all, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thanks, sir. Okay. So we've accomplished everything you think we needed, Mr. Hagerty. Do you have what you need to give notice?

MR. HAGERTY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anybody who needs something to be taken up by the Court before I adjourn? Hearing nothing, the Court is in recess. City of Ventura, give notice.

MR. HAGERTY: Thank you, Your Honor.

September 20, 2021

Certified Copy

Certified Copy

46 1 2 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 3 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 4 5 DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE 6 Santa Barbara Channelkeeper, CASE NO. 8 19STCP01176 9 Petitioner, Reporter's 10 VS. Certificate 11 State Water Resources Control 12 Board, et al., 13 14 Defendants. 15 16 17 18 I, Tracy Dyrness, Official Reporter Pro Tempore of the 19 Court of the State of California, for the County of Los 2.0 Angeles, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 1 2.1 Through 48, comprise a full, true, and correct transcript 22 of the proceedings held in the above-entitled matter on 23 Monday, September 20, 2021. 24 25 Dated this 29th day of September, 2021. 26 2.7 CSR NO. 12323 TRACY DYRNESS, OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE 28

		AL., 1951CP011		1
& 1:19,24	active 26:6	ember 20, 2021 advising 11:28	aligned 5:11 11:8	andor 43:23
2:2,10,16 (5)	active 20.0	auvising 11.26	12:16 24:22	andor 45.25
2.2,10,10 (3)	actively 31:15	advisors 3:11	30:8,12 31:9 35:9	andrew 43:5
11th 43:22	actively 51.15	44 (15015 5.11	(8)	
	activity 22:12	advocacy 24:16		angeles 1:5
18th 28:20 41:5	·	29:18	aligning 38:9	46:3,20
	actual 27:14		39:2,12	
19stcp01176		advocating 26:20		another 4:13,18
1:1,10 46:19	actually 16:12		alive 11:6 39:19	22:7 41:11 (4)
22nd 34:6	17:9	affairs 5:7	allamaammaaa i ma	answer 6:2 7:9
22Hu 34.0	add 44:13	afford 22:3	allencompassing 19:24	21:10 28:12 37:28
24th 20:1 31:22	auu ++.13	anoru 22.3	17.24	38:2 (6)
2101 20:131:22	addition 4:19	aforesaid 3:18	allow 2:9 18:18	30.2 (0)
29th 46:25	44:14	0.202 0.0020	33:23	antelope 39:23
		afresh 4:17		•
ability 22:6	additional		allowed 43:10	anticipate 17:27
	14:10,15 25:28	after 13:10 27:16		19:6 34:24
able 20:3 21:22	28:23 29:11 31:17	28:22 29:1 36:27	alone 20:2	15.10.24
22:26 28:7	32:3 33:12 35:2 36:10 (10)	41:6 42:1 (7)	along 14.4 21.0	antonio 15:18,24
32:11,18 38:15 43:13 (8)	30:10 (10)	again 12:8 27:4	along 14:4 31:8 44:1	anybody
43.13 (0)	address 12:16	agam 12.0 27.4	77.1	2:7,11,27 16:20
aboveentitled	43:15	against 10:27	already 23:23	17:11 18:2 20:20
46:22		11:6	v	30:7 31:8,10
	addressed 43:2		also 7:7 13:17	39:12 44:24 (12)
academic 24:8		agencies 31:14	17:23 24:1 29:11	
1	addressing 26:18	35:27 36:4,9	36:3 37:6 38:5	anything 4:1
academics 24:2	adjourn 44:25	40:18 (5)	39:18 (9)	7:10 19:5 20:26 25:21,25 42:26
accept 7:23 37:24	aujourn 44.23	agency 17:20,22	altered 11:7	43:1 (8)
38:4	adjudication	agency 17.20,22	uitered 11.7	13.1 (0)
	10:16 11:2,5	agree 13:14 16:7	although 1:28	apart 8:5
acceptable 5:18	12:12,17 (5)	20:13,13 21:18	4:11 29:17 33:27	_
7:26		31:4 (6)	36:22 40:8 (6)	apologize 5:22
2.20 4.15	adjusted 7:20	1 22.10.22	26.5.20	33:15 38:20
access 3:20 4:15 23:6 40:5 (4)	adjustments 7:16	agreed 33:19,23	always 26:5,28	apparent 23:2
23.0 +0.3 (+)	aujustinents 7.10	agreement 8:19	am 1:8 10:24	appartiit 23.2
accessible 6:4	admissible 19:21		15:4 21:3,28	apparently 8:4
		agriculture	35:2,6 40:28 (8)	37:4
accomplished	advance 17:25	36:11,15		
44:21	29:28 33:15 42:25		amongst 19:19	appear 7:26 8:2
according 17.1	(4)	ahead 6:1 14:6 16:27 17:16	amount 7.1 0.20	32:27 39:22 (4)
according 17:1	advancing 31:11	18:4,21 28:11	amount 7:1 8:20	appearances 1:7
account 7:20	auvancing 31.11	38:22 (8)	10.11	appearances 1./
	advantage 43:21	(=)	anadromous	appeared 7:23
accurate 8:11	C	aid 23:4	29:7	19:13
33:18	advice 44:16			_
	1. 22.0	al 1:4 46:12	analysis 3:14,16	appears 8:7 10:6
achieving 26:8	advise 22:9	alout 16.0	15:15 16:5 18:13	24:20 39:17 (4)
		alert 16:2	30:22 (6)	

	•	ember 20, 2021		2
applicable 32:9	around 14:9 23:25 42:28	august 2:6 13:5 14:9 19:12 (4)	basis 40:1	between 16:3,3 22:12,27 38:6
applies 43:20		. ,	batch 4:13	39:25 42:15 (7)
applying 11:25	articulate 20:27 aruge 39:27	auspices 42:22 authority 37:11	battle 31:6 39:27 43:28	binding 6:21
appoint 41:13	aruge 39.27	authority 57.11	45.20	bit 3:9,20 4:23
appointed 41:10	ask 4:5 9:4 13:11 16:13 21:9,15 25:12,15 32:3 (9)	available 11:17,23 15:16 26:28 (4)	because 11:2 17:22 18:11,15 19:17,23 23:12	10:27 22:14 43:7 (6)
appointment 3:10	asked 1:21 27:1	avenue 44:15	26:27 31:1 32:9 37:23 38:3	black 4:4 25:3
appreciate 6:22	43:8	aware 3:9	40:23,28 41:6,8 43:8 (17)	board 1:4,12,12 3:14,22 10:10
approach 44:15	asking 6:16 13:7 14:22 21:12 29:23 (5)	back 10:4 25:15 26:23 43:6 (4)	becomes 4:28	11:3 13:8 14:16 16:22 17:12,21 18:6 21:26 25:19
approaching 3:21	asks 42:12	backup 27:15	before 1:16,22 2:24 3:11 4:17	36:7 46:12 (17)
appropriate	aspects 14:12	baggerly	8:24 16:19 20:6,9 22:11 25:7 41:26	bono 23:4
10:18 13:15 21:6 22:16 27:28 29:1 38:16 (7)	asserting 39:11	16:18,25,25,28 19:8,14,15 21:20 23:24 24:13,15	44:25 (13) behalf 35:7	both 19:19 43:16 bother 35:3
approve 40:19	assist 22:19	29:17,24,25 30:1,4,10,13,14	36:6,7 43:18 (4)	bottom 41:21
approved 4:7	assistance 13:20 23:28	31:4 39:13,26 40:10,13 41:1 42:10,14,20	being 2:4 10:13 34:7	boundaries 19:27 41:27
aquifer 15:24	assistant 18:26	43:20,26 44:12,13 (32)	believe 4:11 11:27 12:11 14:27	boundary 7:4
arcane 44:10	assisting 14:18 27:11	baggerly's 3:10	29:23 34:18 35:10 38:19 (8)	box 4:4 25:3
archer 9:11 area 15:14	associated 3:16	4:10,18 24:11,14 28:18 29:16,22 30:20 41:12 (10)	beneficial 8:4	brief 43:16
aren't 16:17	assume 19:28 30:2 32:13	barbara 1:2,11 3:25 5:14 46:7 (5)	benefit 4:17 36:9 42:1	briefing 42:12 43:7
arendel 12:18	assuming 20:9	based 38:14 40:6	bernhoft 17:15	briefly 3:28
arguably 28:9	assumptions 14:17 17:6	basically	best 9:19 25:27 26:14	bring 25:22
arguing 38:26	18:9,12 (4)	23:21,27 30:16 34:6 (4)	better 14:16	broad 19:23
argument 30:19 42:11	attack 7:13	basin 7:1 19:26	16:15 19:9 20:28 23:18 31:6 40:6	brought 32:4 42:20
arguments	attempting 9:21 attorney 21:12	28:10 41:27 (4) basins 6:11,14,26	(7) betterment 7:28	bs 23:22
,	23:26 26:17	17:4 26:25 30:24		buck 7:11
arm 23:8,9	attorneys 40:17	(6)	betting 38:12	buenaventura
	<u> </u>			

	Sent	ember 20, 2021		3
2:21,25 3:5 10:7 40:17 (5)	20:10 35:24,28 (4)	certificate 46:10	city's 11:1 13:7 16:3 22:7 25:2	color 16:21
buenaventura's	cards 31:8	certify 46:20	34:8,17 35:12 43:4 (9)	combat 23:2 39:15
9:11	case 1:1,2,11 5:6 7:7 9:20 12:20	cetera 42:10	civil 2:9,19	combined 36:22
bulletin 3:22	13:24 14:2 19:23 22:23,28 30:9,13	chambers 41:19	claim 10:27 11:6	come 8:18 15:14
bunch 9:1	31:16 39:8,23 40:19 41:18 42:6	chance 18:18	classic 39:17	20:4 21:6,10 22:20 23:1 35:6
business 3:24	46:7 (21)	change 18:14	claude 16:25	36:2 37:21,26 38:15 41:28 42:28
busy 19:9	caseanywhere 3:22	changed 10:27	42:10 44:13	(14)
button 37:17,26	cases 27:12	channel 1:11 3:25 5:14 24:6	clean 5:23	comes 21:1 23:20 29:5,6 37:9 43:1
calculating 1:25	39:19,22	36:16 (5)	clear 2:2 18:5 19:18	(6)
calendar 26:1 28:21 42:8	casitas 3:26 5:15 13:11,26 14:8 21:9 24:21	channelkeeper 1:2 46:7	clearly 1:21 22:15	comfortable 40:14
california 1:5 11:3 24:6 35:21	31:19,24 34:5 35:14,18,18 36:22	chat 27:26	clerk 42:8	coming 31:10
36:17 46:2,19 (7)	39:2 (15)	checked 20:22	client 6:22 8:7	comment 12:5 17:12 18:7,11
call 6:9 27:16	casitas's 38:27	china 9:27	31:24	21:26 41:6 42:17 (7)
called 40:21	catalyst 25:19	chitchat 43:19	client's 5:9 8:28 15:17,23 31:12	commentary
came 1:22	cause 2:20,26,28 24:21 30:1 (5)	choice 30:17	33:3 (6)	16:21 18:18 21:14
campus 24:6	causes 43:7	choose 36:2	clients 15:13,27 24:19	commenting 10:17 44:3
can 4:1 6:2,22 11:17 14:21 16:1	causing 33:14	chosen 36:1	climate 7:25	comments 5:12
20:9 22:4,9 23:6,28 26:14 27:17,23 30:17	caution 6:18	chum 25:22 city 2:21,25	closely 24:21	13:8 14:8,10,13,20,21 15:3 16:26 19:1
33:1 34:10 37:17,25 39:8	cautiously 23:3	3:5,24 4:2,12 5:11,14 7:18 9:11	closer 23:8	21:15 22:21 24:23 25:10 27:13 (15)
40:1 41:1 42:14,15,16 43:14,20 44:5 (28)	ccp 19:18 20:16 44:16	10:7,12,21 12:3,16 16:13,19 18:3,17,25 19:5	coach 24:10,12 40:3 41:14 (4)	common 24:20 39:22
can't 9:6 13:24	cedar 28:10	21:26,27 22:8 23:26 24:18,26	coached 23:12	communication
22:3 26:22 38:3 42:23 (6)	centers 23:3	26:17,21,26 27:22 28:15 30:2	coalesce 23:25	26:4 27:2
canyon 28:10	certain 2:1 3:1,2 5:11 30:24 (5)	31:10,20,21 33:23 34:16,24 35:9	code 2:19 20:16 41:10	compare 11:20
capable 26:9	certainly 9:6	36:2 37:9 38:8 39:3 40:17	codefendant 10:7	compared 23:19 32:22 38:8
capacity 16:18	16:4	43:9,12,22 44:26 (49)	collective 24:19	comparison 7:6

	· ·	ember 20, 2021		4
compel 10:28	confident 37:16	continued 43:26	20:28 28:28 40:7	20:11
comper 10.20	community 37.10	Continued 43.20	(4)	20.11
competence 40:3	confidential	continuing 26:3	(7)	creek 15:18
competence 10.5	26:22 27:2	37:15	court	15.10
competing 9:26	20.22 27.2		1:10,13,21,28	critical 17:7,8
21:11	confused 37:3	contrary 2:18	2:8,9,11,15,20,22	
		6:13	3:11 4:23 5:23,25	criticism 18:13
completely 21:28	congruent 5:9		6:5,8,21 7:10,21	36:28
29:21	8	contribute 15:17	8:24 9:10,19,24	
	connected 6:26	16:1	10:4,23	criticize 7:13
complex 40:19	7:5 15:24 17:2 (4)		11:10,22,25,28	
_		control 1:3,12	12:2,7,9	critique 21:14
complicated	connectivity 3:15	3:14 10:10 13:8	13:3,4,7,17,21,26	_
19:23 22:23	6:14,15 7:2 16:28	16:22 17:12,21	14:2,6,21,23,28	
23:11,19 (4)	17:2 26:25 30:24	18:6 25:19 36:7	15:3,8	
	(8)	46:11 (12)	16:2,12,13,16,27	
complied 13:5			17:11,16	2:21
19:18	consensus 26:8	conversation	18:2,4,17,21,26	
		7:18	19:2,4,14,16,17	crossdefendant
comply 29:13	consequence		20:22,22,25	17:15
	1:19	conversations	21:7,20	
comprehending		26:24 27:5,6	22:8,9,10,16,18,21	crossdefendants
8:28	consider 32:5	22.16	23:1,11	3:1 14:24
. 46.21	• 1 4•	convey 23:16	25:2,6,9,12,25	
comprise 46:21	consideration	22222 2.25	26:11,14,20	
compromise 10:7	22:18	cooper 8:25 10:5,10,11,26	27:4,25	
compromise 10:7	considerations	11:14 12:4,5,8	28:1,2,4,8,11,17 29:3,15,20,26	41:18
computer 5:26	4:6	13:14 25:9,11 (12)	30:7,11,16,18,26	41.10
computer 5.20	4.0	13.14 23.9,11 (12)	31:5,23	crucial 18:16
concern 43:8	constitution	cooperate 42:23	32:2,7,14,21,24,27	Cruciai 10.10
concern 45.0	37:12	cooperate +2.23	34:2,14,25 35:5,9	cruz 24:5
concluded 45:2	37.12	copy 16:9	36:3,8,28	Cluz 21.3
concided 13.2	consultant	copy 10.5	38:5,18,22,25	csr 46:27
concluding 8:8	14:11,18 15:27	correct 1:26	39:2,13 40:25	652 161 2 7
	, , ·	10:24 11:25 13:25	41:2,6,22,22	curious 5:17
conclusion 6:13	consummative	17:6 21:4,24	42:8,12 43:19	20:27
37:26,27 38:16 (4)	36:14 37:24	29:22 32:26 37:22	44:20,24,25,26	
		40:23 46:21 (12)	46:2,19 (136)	current 7:13,22
conclusions	contacted 26:20			8:9 13:23 (4)
17:25		could 8:17,18	court's 1:18 4:4	
	content 30:21	9:16 24:2,18	9:17 13:5 (4)	currently 7:12,24
concurrent 34:17		33:28 (6)		12:10
	contents 4:24		courtrooms	
condition 17:10	16:21 21:8 28:14	counsel 3:24 10:5	20:15	customers 35:17
35:24	(4)	14:24 18:25 26:22	40.00	4 00 10 06 07
07.17	20mtor-4 7:20	28:7 38:22 (7)	courts 40:22	cut 23:13 26:27
conference 27:17	context 7:26	00unty 46.2 10	00x10xc 12.2	39:8
30:28 37:7	16:15 17:19 27:8	county 46:3,19	covers 43:3	cycles 7:25
confidence	(4)	couple 14:7	created 18:12	Cycles 1.23
23:15,20,22 36:3	continue 8:15	couple 14.7	CICALCU 10.12	dam 8:18
(4)	26:3,7,14 (4)	course 19:9	credibility 17:22	uam 0.10
\''	20.5,7,11(1)	Course 17.7		

		AL., 1987CP011	. 7 0	5 7
data 11:15,15 12:1 15:16	deemed 2:17,19	ember 20, 2021 desires 24:19	disclose 6:17 32:18 34:11 38:27	35:14 (6)
18:9,28 44:3 (7)	deeper 15:23	desirous 31:11	(4)	divergent 15:12 18:28 36:19
date 29:9 33:19,24,25 (4)	default 2:8	destroy 39:7	disclosed 24:26 39:28	diving 44:7
dated 46:25	defendant 10:9 defendants 3:2	detail 20:11 detailed 3:22	disclosing 26:2	documents 4:25 8:26 16:8
dates 34:1	46:14	determination	disclosure 6:25 28:15,23,28 (4)	does 6:10,13
david 28:3	defending 2:20	20:7,12 34:11 36:26 41:25,27 (6)	disclosures 3:7	7:8,10 9:6,12 18:26 23:2 30:16
day 20:14,14 21:4 35:5	definitely 4:8	determine 17:9	4:2,12,13,15 6:20 13:6,9,12	41:9,21 (11)
37:23,23 46:25 (7) days 2:9,11 4:20	definition 17:1 degree 7:5	determines 41:22	16:14,16,17,20 19:7,7 24:24 25:10,19,20,21	doesn't 12:16 16:17 39:3
35:4 (4)	delay 44:7	development 3:17	28:23,27 29:1,4,10 33:20,25,26 34:5	doing 24:4 27:17,18 31:20
deadline 28:23,24 29:6	demeanor 23:18	developments	42:17 (30)	35:2 (5)
32:8,21 34:27 35:1 (7)	dense 30:25 41:7	3:7 4:5 didn't 11:12	discover 30:28 37:2	done 20:15,26 25:16 39:19 (4)
deadlines 1:25	department 1:6 11:4 35:21,23	19:16,17 20:19 (4)	discovery 22:13 24:28 25:6	doubts 40:8
deal 4:10,17 13:1 23:20 25:1 (5)	36:6 46:5 (6)	difference 38:9	discrete 36:20	down 8:18
dealt 24:28	depicted 5:6 depos 44:9	differences 16:2 38:13	discuss 13:16 26:15,21 41:19 (4)	download 4:27
debate 31:26	depose 20:3	different 16:6 21:3 22:22	discussed	downloading 4:27
decades 35:19	deposed 31:16	24:10,12 25:12,14 35:15 38:8 41:11	34:13,28	dr 9:11 17:15
deceased 3:1	41:17	(10)	discussion 7:17 25:28 27:25	draft 3:14 5:9 7:22
december 28:20 29:9 32:8,11,28 (5)	deposition 29:12,13	differing 6:23 difficult 13:19	discussions 26:2,3,6,27	drafted 7:12,14
decided 33:10	depositions 29:2	23:12 33:7	27:11,14 28:16 35:22 (8)	dribbled 21:2
deciding 23:16	deposits 8:2	diligence 39:25	dispatch 42:24	driving 42:28
decision 37:8,22 40:2,22 (4)	described 42:9 describing 3:9	diligently 34:27 direct 40:5 41:17	distribute 35:16	driving 42:28 drone 42:27
decisions 21:5	designate 33:12	directly 12:13	distribution 19:16	dry 7:25 13:12
declared 36:23	designated 34:3,4	disagree 22:15	district 3:26 5:15 13:26 24:21 31:24	due 3:3 7:25 32:25
	J+.J,+		13.20 24.21 31.24	32.23

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ember 20, 2021		6
dug 14:19	emerged 43:28	evaluate 11:18	expect 6:21 9:27	explanation 20:28 44:5
dyrness 46:18,27	end 5:23 21:4 22:13	evaluating 14:13 22:19	expeditious 37:19	export 8:8
each 1:14 20:5 27:9 28:21 (4)	engage 7:27 10:28 12:9	even 16:16 20:8 24:21 30:23 31:19	expensive 31:6,7	expressed 2:22 23:15
earlier 29:16 34:1,12	engaged 11:4 28:16	39:3 40:4 44:9 (8) event 42:13	experience 22:4 expert 4:18	expressly 1:23
early 1:22 34:18	engaging 12:27	ever 33:3 37:15	6:20,25 9:11,13 11:21 13:6 15:11	extensive 14:13
east 5:16 6:9 14:25 15:4,14 21:21 24:7 28:4	enhancement 12:18	every 35:5 37:23 41:16	17:19 19:2,12,19,27,28 20:2,13,14 22:2,4	extent 33:11,21 36:18
38:7 (9)	enough 10:23	everybody 36:17	23:17 26:20 28:14 29:7,10,18	extirpation 12:25
eastern 6:28	24:22 30:18 38:1 39:13,16 (6)	everyone 8:18 14:8 16:7 17:5	30:14,22,27,27 31: 1,1,7,7,11,19,28	extra 2:9,11 17:21
edge 6:28 12:25 educated 4:14	entitled 17:21	34:7 42:19 (6)	32:6,12,18 33:4,6,20,22,24,26 34:18,21,25	eye 4:16
education 13:18	entity 13:27	everything 12:24 35:2 43:3,12	35:15,20,25,28 36:25 37:6,26	f 1:6 46:5
effect 2:4 15:25	environmental 5:7,13 24:5 36:15	44:21 (5)	38:6,14,27 39:7,8,20,28	facilitate 25:27
efforts 7:27 8:8 22:7	(4) epiphanies 43:27	evidence 19:21 20:16 41:10	40:3,27,27 41:7,8, 9,15,16,16,19,21,2 5 42:2,3,6	facilitation 27:12 fact 3:9 4:11 7:3
either 43:22	equal 41:15	evident 39:16	43:9,10,14,17 (81)	20:10 23:12 30:20 35:14 40:2,11
elaborate 8:12	equally 43:20	example 19:14	expert's 13:20 18:26 21:9 43:17	42:3,5 (11)
elected 35:14,25	equipoise 10:9,21	exceed 5:1	(4)	factor 26:1
elements 17:26 26:25	equipped 23:1	exchange 29:10 41:17	expertdriven 11:26 13:15	facts 27:15 38:14 failure 38:27
eliminate 22:14	equivalent 1:24 2:17	excuse 2:6 33:2	experts 4:2 9:5,8,14 11:27	fair 8:20 10:23
elongated 37:14	error 17:7,8	exercise 11:24,26 13:15 17:27 31:2 (5)	13:1 18:27 20:4,4 21:11 25:2 33:12,13,16,21	21:6 30:18 36:18 39:13 (6)
eloquent 21:12 44:4	especially 16:3	existing 8:14	34:19 38:7 39:15 43:28 44:2 (20)	fairly 16:5
else 4:26 7:10	essential 23:6	exists 24:1 42:19	explain 6:25 7:15	fall 1:23
12:3 14:9 16:1,20 17:11 18:2	essentially 24:11 38:25 43:12	expansion 33:16	11:11 24:17 (4)	false 43:12
31:8,10 36:26 38:18,19 42:19 43:1 (15)	et 1:4 42:10 46:12	exparte 2:24 35:1,6	explained 37:1 explains 9:9	fashion 42:23 favor 30:20
			_	

	Sant	ember 20, 2021		7
feasible 26:8 32:1	fine 5:28 6:7 9:24	footing 41:15	(15)	geological 3:16 5:7
february 20:4 21:6	first 1:22 3:23 14:8 20:6 23:23	foregoing 46:20	friday's 28:22,24	geologist 6:19
federal 35:22	(5)	forever 27:9	fridays' 25:21	get 9:3,7,16
feedback 5:21	fiscal 4:7	forgotten 28:19	front 28:2 37:16,21	12:28 13:9 18:10,17 20:1
feet 16:10 18:28	fish 8:5 10:13 11:4,9,20 12:21	form 11:3 16:9	full 10:6 36:17	23:6 24:14 27:8 37:27,27
felt 11:12 33:10	15:21 17:10 29:8 35:21,23 36:6 (12)	formally 36:23	46:21	38:4,10,10 40:23 44:10 (18)
	, , ,	forth 20:17 33:6	functionally 6:12	, ,
few 4:20 35:3 field 23:11,19	fishery 7:28 8:4,10 15:26 35:24 37:19,23 (7)	forthcoming 42:18	fundamentally 41:11	gets 9:1 22:17 43:28
24:9	five 9:28	forum 27:19	further 8:8 28:28	getting 16:16 21:11 22:1 26:23
figure 40:26	fiveday 31:2	forward 2:17	36:26 38:3 42:11,11 43:7 (7)	(4)
figures 22:5	fiveminute 31:2	11:9 26:10,12 27:17,18 31:10	future 14:20 33:3	give 1:15 2:21 3:5 6:16 21:13 27:16
file 1:19,24 2:2,10,16 19:17	floor 5:19 40:10	34:17 36:2 37:22,28 (11)	37:5 40:23 (4)	29:20 36:3 41:1 44:22,26 (11)
20:19 35:1,12,14,26	flow 7:16,24	foster 8:15 10:14	gap 41:23	given 8:6 32:5
36:10 38:1 42:15 43:21 (15)	8:9,14 10:14 15:17,25 (7)	found 2:20 38:28 39:20	garrison 14:23,26,26 18:20,20,22 21:21	33:7 gives 9:9
filed 3:5 19:20 42:24 43:24 (4)	flows 6:12 8:6 10:13,19 11:19,20	foundational	26:16,16,28 27:15,20,26 (13)	giving 4:23
files 14:15	17:9 30:25 (8)	17:26	garrison's 15:3	glad 11:22 28:17
filing 20:20 36:12	flush 44:8	founded 37:12	gated 3:3	40:15
final 3:17 10:6,22	flushed 22:17	four 16:10 18:28 26:25 36:4 (4)	gave 34:20	global 17:1
14:14 30:28 37:7 (6)	focus 12:20,20 15:22	frame 31:5 38:2	general 26:17	globe 17:3
finally 11:23	folks 6:28 22:2,5	framed 44:1	38:24	go 4:18 6:1 9:28 13:1 14:6 16:27
find 4:3,18 5:4	follow 13:19	francois	generally 11:8 21:22	17:16 18:4,21 20:6,9 23:13,27
8:25 11:7 22:26 23:5,28 24:2,13,20	20:18	17:14,14,17	generated 31:14	24:2 28:11 34:22 38:22 43:6,9 (19)
29:18,20,28 40:27 (15)	followed 28:20,20	frankly 41:28	generations 23:5	goal 26:7
finder 23:12	followons 28:24	friday 4:13 6:17 9:8 15:28 21:10,23 29:4	geographic 28:8	going 2:16 3:19 4:4 6:17 9:3,8,25
finding 8:27 24:16 31:1	followup 21:7	31:28 32:6 34:25,27 37:9	geographical 28:5	11:9 13:10,11 14:10,15 15:11,12
∠ 1 .10 J1.1	footage 42:27	39:16 42:18 44:1	20.3	16:5,12,17 17:8,25

	•	ember 20, 2021		8 1
21:9 22:1,5,12,13	group 5:17 14:25	36:8,17,18 38:24	helpful 12:19	honor 1:27 4:22
24:11,14 25:12,16	15:4 21:27 (4)	43:9 44:4 (23)	15:3 24:27 28:15	5:20 6:1,7,16 8:11
28:1,18 29:15	13.4 21.27 (4)	43.7 44.4 (23)	33:12,16 (6)	9:4,23 10:11
31:1,17 32:2,3,6	guess 2:25 5:20	hasn't 22:10	33.12,10 (0)	13:4,25,28
37:13,14,15 38:7	25:16	11asii t 22.10	her 31:7	14:5,7,19,26
39:15,18 40:23	23.10	hat 20:6	HCI 31.7	15:2,10 16:26
41:4 42:3 43:10	guide 42:3,4	nat 20.0	here 4:22 6:20,27	17:10,14
(46)	guide 42.5,4	hate 11:11	13:26 16:12	19:3,11,18,23
(40)	guy 14:2 15:5	nate 11.11	18:8,8,14 20:5	20:19 21:18 24:25
gone 12:1	guy 14.2 13.3	haven't 24:3 26:4	27:9,14 33:14	25:5,8,11,24 26:10
gone 12.1	habitat 8:12,21	28:19 32:19 34:22	35:5 (13)	27:7,19 28:3,26
good 2:19 5:24	12:18 15:21 18:24	35:25 (6)	33.3 (13)	29:25 30:17
8:19 11:14,15,15	(5)	33.23 (0)	hereafter 42:12	31:4,13,25
13:28 17:10 19:20		having 1:17 2:26	12.12	32:13,16 33:28
20:17 28:17 (11)	hagerty	7:17,28 22:9	hereby 46:20	34:26 35:11 36:27
20:17 20:17 (11)	1:12,17,26,27	25:28 29:26	nereby 10.20	38:13 39:10
goodness 42:2	4:3,14,22 13:3	31:2,5 33:4	heretofore 1:7	40:13,24 41:4
500411000 12.2	25:13,24,24 26:28	39:9,20 40:5 (13)	included in	43:16
got 1:13 11:10	27:21,26	55.5,20 10.5 (15)	hesitate 37:7	44:12,18,23,28
19:14,15 (4)	28:1,22,26 29:6,9	he 4:11 24:18	iiobitute 51.1	(59)
19.11,15 (1)	30:21 32:15 33:28	39:2 44:5,5 (5)	high 16:10	(3))
gotten 3:20	42:22 43:2,3	37.2 11.3,3 (3)	ingi 10.10	hope 9:27 18:17
gotten 5.20	44:21,23,28 (28)	he's 19:15	highberger 1:6	33:18
government	11.21,23,20 (20)	HC 5 17.13	46:5	33.10
35:23 36:5	hagerty's 1:20	head 32:17	10.2	hopefully 38:10
20.20 00.0	26:23	nead 52.17	highly 23:11,19	noperary 20.10
grab 13:24	20.23	headset 5:26	38:28 39:6 (4)	hoping 29:18
gran 13.21	half 36:6	11044500 5.20	20.20 27.0 (1)	noping 27.10
graciously 33:23		health 15:25	him 19:8 29:18	how 7:19 18:12
g-wy	hand 19:25,25			23:15,28 24:18
grant 32:2 40:12		hear 8:7 28:17	hire 28:7 33:21	25:15 26:27 40:27
41:12	happen	36:1 38:5 41:2 (5)	35:25 37:6,26 (5)	43:8,16 (10)
	8:17,19,20,21,23	(0)	(0)	(-0)
gravel 8:2	22:26 29:13 (7)	heard 2:7,12,27	hired 6:19 24:3	huge 8:21,22
8 -w/02 3:=	(,)	30:3,19 39:4 (6)	34:21	
great 23:20 36:2	happening 25:18			hundreds 22:23
9	Impromis 20110	hearing 2:15 3:3	his 16:18 29:18	11011011000 = 2.120
greater 3:28	happens 20:14	5:21 19:4 29:27	30:14 31:7 41:1	hydrogeology
	T. F.	42:9 44:25 (7)	44:5 (6)	14:12
greg 14:27,28	happily 27:16	(-)	` '	
15:7 18:20 21:25		hearing's 18:23	history 35:18	hydrologic 17:2
26:16 27:20 33:17	happy 27:26	0	•	• 6
(8)		hearsay 19:21	hole 41:23	hydrologist
	harbor 34:21	·		21:13
gregg 14:26		height 6:10	holes 39:8	
	hard 9:15 16:9			i'd 17:5 27:26
grounded 19:25		held 46:22	holiday 43:23	34:21 39:25 43:13
	has 5:10 6:3 7:1,3		-	(5)
groundwater	8:20 10:27	help 7:8,15 8:13	holly 18:3 38:20	
3:15 6:11,14,26	12:1,24 14:11	23:1 24:13,15		i'll 3:22 4:3
7:1,8 15:17,22	16:5 18:6 23:8	29:18,21,28 30:16	hollywood 23:21	6:5,9,18 12:3 13:9
28:10 30:24 (10)	24:26,26 27:22	37:27 40:24 (12)		16:15 18:18 40:15
	33:22 35:18		hon 1:6 46:5	41:2 42:23 (12)

	Sent	ember 20, 2021	T	9 1
i'm 3:9,19	inclined 32:2	initiative 40:20	interpreting	32:17 34:2,15,15
'		initiative 40.20	11:26	1 ' ' 1
4:3,4,14,22	39:14		11:20	35:18 36:11,12,17,
5:17,20,21 6:1,19		input 43:8		19,21,24 37:4,11,1
9:2,10,12,14,17,25	include 34:5		interrupting	3,23,23,24,28
11:22 13:7,10,11		insofar 24:15	38:21	38:3,5,6,13
15:28 19:4 21:27	included 26:19	29:28 37:2 42:20		39:2,10,16,28,28
22:27 24:7,11,14	moradou zovis	(4)	intervene 35:26	40:11,26,27
25:12 26:28	including 3:24	(4)	mer vene 33.20	41:12,22
			12 1 27 5	
28:1,18 29:15	5:16 10:20 30:23	instead 2:10	into 12:1 37:5	42:6,6,9,10,19
33:14,14,17 34:14	40:2 43:27 (6)		41:28 42:21 44:7	43:1,5,10,12,23
35:5 37:2		institutions 24:7	(5)	44:3,6,12,24,26
39:13,18 40:8				45:2 (171)
42:28 (43)		instream 10:15	invite 3:19,24 5:2	, ,
12.28 (13)		11150100111 10:15	16:19 (4)	islands 24:6
i've 26:27 27:4	13:17	: 41.26	10.17 (4)	Islanus 24.0
	15.1/	insufficient 41:26		2.12
30:19 43:11,11 (5)			invited 34:28	issuance 3:13
	incredibly 23:12	intend 4:10 39:24		
idea 10:13 22:15			inviting 5:12	issue 10:18 19:26
	incumbent 42:5	intended 25:14		31:24,26 32:20
identified 14:25		34:19 44:6	involved 24:4	38:26 43:16 (7)
11.20	independent 19:2	3 7 11.0	31:16 32:5	
ill 23:1	30:26 39:20	intends 31:24	36:4,24 43:11 (6)	issued 3:27
III 23.1	30.20 39.20	intenus 31.24	30.4,24 43.11 (0)	Issued 5.27
.,,				. 20.12
illumination	independently	intention 38:13	involving 22:23	issues 20:1,2
38:10	35:17			22:14,22 27:13
		interconnected	is 1:23	33:9 38:2,28
immediately	indepth 14:12	6:12	2:2,7,10,22,27	43:25 (9)
27:16	_		3:4,8,11 5:3,23	` ,
	indicate 19:1	interconnectivity	6:3,5,16,25	its 4:2,9 15:18
impact 4:6 5:18	marcate 19.1	19:26 41:27	7:6,8,10,12,22 8:1	16:19 24:26 34:18
	: 3: 4 - 3	19.20 41.27	1 ' ' ' '	
8:14,22 16:22 (5)	indicated		6,17,18,20,26,28	36:5 (7)
	29:16,27 43:19	interest 24:8	9:14,26	
impacts 11:18		36:13,20	10:2,10,12,15	itself 39:3
	indicates 2:1		11:2,6,14,22,25,26	
impartial 40:20		interested 1:14	12:10,14,17,20,22,	jacobson 18:3,3,5
_	individual 29:22	19:4 24:2	24,26,27	23:26 27:20
important		42:13,20 (5)	13:14,22,26,28	34:24,26
8:13,15 19:22	infer 38:26	12.13,20 (3)	14:18,21,26,27 15:	38:20,20,23 39:6
1	111161 30.20	:40mos4! 10.10	1	1 1
26:11 41:5 (5)	. 6 20 2	interesting 12:19	4,11,16,19,21,23,2	(11)
	infers 39:2	25:6	6 16:20 17:2,6,8,1	
impossible 3:2			4,18,21,25	january 26:16
	informal 21:13	interestingly	18:5,8,20,22,24,26	
improper 20:26		30:18 39:26	19:18,26 20:28	jeremy 14:1
• •	informally 24:16		21:10,13,25	
improve 8:4	J - 10	interests 11:7	22:13,26 23:7,16	job 39:17
	information	22:25 36:15	24:11,12,21 25:3,5	JON 27111
improvements	9:7,10,16 16:11	<u> </u>	,14,17,18,18,27	join 42:14,21
improvements		:4		JUIII 42.14,21
8:12	29:7 34:8,9,9,10	interface 35:20	26:1,8,12,13,26	
	37:16,21 40:21		27:2,19,20	joint 3:8 42:21
inappropriate	(12)	interim 10:13,21	28:3,8,19,23,24	
38:28 39:6			29:3,17,19,22	jointly 43:22
	inherent 37:28	internal 31:26	30:8,15,16,17,20 3	
incidental 3:18			1:1,10,11,19,20,26	judge 1:6 21:2,3
3.10			1.1,10,11,10,20,20	Jauge 1.0 21.2,5

	•	AL., 1951CPU11	. 70	10
20.20 40.1 10	_	ember 20, 2021	17.10 22.7	
29:20 40:1,19	know 6:18 7:5	least 3:7,28 11:8	17:19 23:7	41:25,26 42:5 (20)
46:5 (7)	9:15 11:12,14	13:21 15:13 16:10		
	30:14 31:18,19,20,	25:13 30:11 31:6	little 3:8,20 4:23	makes 37:6
judge's 39:21	22,23,27 33:14	(9)	9:3 22:14 43:7	
	37:3 41:4 (15)		44:13 (7)	making 40:4
judges 23:4		leave 9:5 12:23		
39:18	knowledge 14:12		living 3:3	management
		leaves 39:27		9:20 10:19 22:28
judgment 34:23	knowledgeable		local 15:16 31:14	
	40:21	legal 1:18 2:4,17		manager 22:23
judicial 39:24		13:18 23:4 (5)	locate 3:3	
	lack 8:1	, ,		mandatory 2:3
jump 33:28		legislature 20:16	located 15:23	•
Januar	lacourtconnect			many 35:17
juncture 13:22	1:14,15	length 3:28	location 6:27 7:8	44:17,17
Juneture 13.22	1.11,13	rength 3.20	28:5	11.17,17
jungreis 13:28	landscape 30:5	let 9:5	20.3	margin 17:7,8
14:1,4,7 15:9	lanuscape 30.3	1Ct 9.3	locations 7:7	margin 17.7,6
31:23,25	largely 37:12	let's 5:28 12:28	iocations /./	mark 18:23
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	largely 37:12		1 22.14	mark 18:23
32:7,13,27 33:5	1 4 26 11	40:24	logic 23:14	
39:10,10 (13)	largest 36:11	1.44 06 17 01	27.14.40.04	material 6:15
		letter 26:17,21	long 37:14 42:24	9:22 22:25 31:17
jurisdiction	last 3:8 18:18	27:2		(4)
12:10 37:15	28:24		look 8:25	
		life 29:7	27:17,18 34:18,22	materials 40:5
jurisdictional	later 43:24		37:2,3,4 (8)	
12:28		light 21:8		mathematical
	laud 11:24		looked 32:19	5:1
just 5:2 8:11 9:1		like 3:6 5:3,26		
12:8,13 13:18,24	laudable 11:16	9:2 11:11 12:5	looking 9:12	matilija 8:18
14:7 16:2,10		13:17 14:8 16:18	14:19 33:17	
17:28 18:5,15	law 20:6 38:15	17:5 23:13,24,26		matter 42:9
20:27 27:24 28:12		33:10 35:11,13	los 1:5 46:3,19	46:22
31:22 32:23 34:12	lawsuit 17:19	39:19 40:11,16	,	
35:6 38:23 39:11		43:5,13,15	lot 4:27,28 5:1,21	matters 1:17 8:4
41:8 43:13 44:13	lawyer 6:19	44:11,13 (24)	9:9,15,16 14:11	
(25)	22:26	(= 1)	22:12,14 25:5	may 6:18,19,23
(/		likely 25:27 32:1	27:7 31:25 (13)	8:9 15:24 18:14
keep 13:12 17:9	lawyers 1:13	34:19 38:6 (4)		21:8 22:19,20
19:24 22:18 41:5	9:27 22:24,25		ma'am 18:4	23:18 24:9
(5)	23:4 (5)	limited 33:9	III WIII 10.T	29:21,21 30:26
	23.1 (3)	initiou 33.7	madam 42:8	31:8 33:13,27
keepers 3:26	layman 5:3 24:18	line 24:4 41:21	mauaili 72.0	35:3 40:4 44:9
5:14 36:16	1 ayınan 3.3 44.10		made 2:1,5 11:16	
3.14 30.10	lead 10:9	lined 34:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(20)
Iron 0.0 10.00	10.9	1111eu 54:20	27:8,14 34:15	movbs 4.27 5.25
key 8:2 18:22	loodin = 26:12	14.4	41:6 (7)	maybe 4:27 5:25
1:1 6:00 11 01	leading 26:13	lines 14:4	1 2:2.22	22:15
kind 6:22 11:21	1 20.24	1. 4 10 16	make 2:2,22	1 22 2 6 24
12:22 14:21 16:21	learn 39:26	list 19:16	16:24 17:4	me 1:22 2:6,24
22:28 43:23 (7)			18:5,15 20:7,12	3:19 4:23 5:2,2,3
	learned 4:1 23:21	litigating 10:18	21:5 25:6	6:16 9:19 10:5
kinds 39:22	43:11		34:4,10,23,27	11:12 14:23,28
		litigation 10:17	36:26 37:7 40:1	19:5 21:13,15
	i	i	l	

	•	AL., 1951CPU11	. 7 0	11
05.7.17.00.00	_	ember 20, 2021	4 1 2.5 26.20	
25:7,17 28:22	ministerial 1:17	36:20,21,23 39:15	mutual 2:5 26:20	negotiations
29:27 33:2 37:2		44:6 (21)		25:15,20
40:4,11 43:7 44:4	minute 2:16,22		my 4:16 5:1 7:21	
(27)		moreover 35:26	10:10 13:24 15:13	neutral 19:2
	minutes 9:28		21:27 22:4,22	22:9,19,23 24:17
mean 12:1 41:9		morning 3:21	24:10,12 26:19	29:20 40:1 (7)
	miss 6:19	9:26 13:28 15:1	27:21,23 30:15	
meaningful 12:9		(4)	32:16 33:17 35:2	neutrality 22:27
	misses 18:23		37:5,28 39:24	•
meaningless		most 22:2,5	40:3,8 42:2 43:19	new 11:10 33:14
12:22	mistaken 32:27	26:11 30:19 34:19	(25)	
		37:18 44:4,8 (8)		newness 3:13
measures 12:19	mitigation 7:27		myself 9:2 19:9	
111000001100 12119		mostly 15:13	111,5011 5.2 15.5	next 13:10 28:17
meetings 25:17	model 3:18	mostly 13.13	name 1:2,15 2:12	42:13
meetings 23.17	6:3,24 7:15	motion 3:10	16:24 (4)	12.13
melnick 3:19	9:5,7,9,12,17 11:1	4:10,18 24:11,15	10.27 (T)	nice 5:23
4:21	4,16,17,22,28,28	28:19 29:16,19,24	natural 8:9	111CC J.43
5:5,19,20,24,28	12:12,12 13:11,13	30:15,20 35:1,3	11atu1 al 0.7	no 2:15 3:4 5:28
	14:8,9,15,16,17,19		nature 26:18	
6:6,7,16,24 7:15		39:14 40:11,26	nature 20:18	9:24 12:22,27
8:11 9:4,23 11:12	16:22	41:12 42:9,20	9 07 11	18:24 25:11,11
13:14 30:21 (18)	17:7,8,12,20,25,26	43:6,26 (21)	necessarily 27:11	28:6 36:28
1 1 1 1 2 21	18:6,12,14,19		33:10 39:7	42:2,11 43:24
melnick's 3:21	24:26 25:3,3 41:9	motivate 26:15	10.10	46:7,27 (16)
	(40)		necessary 10:18	
memorialize 1:21		motivating 21:5	17:9	nobody 12:14
	models 41:8	26:1		
memory 7:22			need 7:16 8:15,23	nonnative 8:1
10:5,10 14:23	modest 23:17	move 12:3 26:12	11:12 12:21 13:20	
25:17 (5)		37:22 38:16 (4)	14:14,15 18:26	nontechnical 5:3
	modified 34:3		19:2 22:19	
merced 24:5		movement 25:17	24:10,12 27:14	notable 3:6 7:21
	modify 34:14		30:16,27,27,28	
merits 23:8 38:26		moving	32:18 35:3,5	note 3:12 17:24
	modifying 2:8	5:14,15,15 26:9	36:27 37:27 39:7	
methodology		37:18,28 (6)	41:7,8 44:18,18,22	noted 1:7
30:22	moment 3:12 4:7		(29)	
	16:13 25:3 31:18	ms 18:3,5 27:20		notes 33:18
microphones	(5)	34:24,26 38:20,23	needed 8:9 34:4	
5:25		39:6 (8)	35:1 42:7 44:21	nothing 27:3
	monday 1:5		(5)	38:24 44:26
might 5:4 22:16	46:23	much 7:7 11:12		
32:4 33:12 40:26		15:23 22:1 26:8	needs 7:19 8:16	notice 2:21 3:1,5
43:16 (6)	month 8:6	(5)	23:11 24:13,15	42:27 44:22,27 (6)
		\-\ /	25:25 44:24 (7)	: ::-=,= : (0)
mind 4:23 41:6	months 37:5	multiple 27:4	(,)	nottoodistant
11.0		35:27	negotiate 5:18	33:2
mind's 4:16	more 3:22 4:6	55.21	25:23	33.2
AIIIII S 1.10	6:13 8:16,26	municipalities	25.25	november 28:20
mindful 44:2	10:24 21:12	36:14	negotiated 10:15	33:19,24
11111111111 44.4	22:14,14,17,28	JU.1 1	negonateu 10.13	33.17,44
minimum 10:14	23:17 25:23	must 39:2	nogotisting 1:6	now 2:7,12 4:19
11:20		must 37.4	negotiating 4:6	*
11.20	28:2,26 35:3			5:10,28 11:2,4

	Sent	ember 20, 2021		12
12:9 13:7,16	41:19	30:5	19:25	participants 1:14
14:18,18 18:10,11	41.17	30.3	17.23	participants 1.14
19:4 21:22 22:13	often 26:27	order 1:18	out 4:3 9:17	participating
27:4 37:20 39:25	Orten 20.27	2:16,23,26,28	11:15 20:14 21:2	10:17
42:16 (21)	ojai 5:16	3:4,23 8:10 13:5	22:17 24:17 26:27	10.17
12.10 (21)	6:9,27,28 13:12	17:24 32:18 42:10	29:5 30:4	particular 1:20
nuance 6:20	14:25 15:4,14	43:6 (13)	35:13,25 36:4	17:23 19:6
numee 0.20	18:3 21:21,27	13.0 (13)	39:16,18 40:10,26	17.23 17.0
number 1:1,13	23:26 24:18	orders 2:1,3	44:9 (18)	particularly 6:9
41:1	28:4,9 31:20	014615 2.1,5	11.5 (10)	7:28 43:27
	34:24 36:2 38:7	organized 42:21	outcome 16:6	7,120 .0.27
numbers 5:1 9:2	(19)	organizou :=:=1	25:2	parties 5:11 9:10
	(1)	orient 5:2	20.2	11:17 13:6
obfuscating 44:6	ojai's 38:22	0110110 012	outputs 9:9	16:16,23
0.020.000	3,42 5 5 5	originally 34:16	o de partir de la companya de la com	19:8,12,20 22:24
object 2:7 20:20	old 35:19	01- g wy = 11-0	over 14:2 20:15	26:7,9,15 27:18,24
27:8 38:23 39:1	010 00119	osias	28:9 34:17 (4)	28:27 30:5,15
(5)	once 20:2	28:3,3,6,9,12 (5)		31:18 33:13,15,24
		_ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	overcome 23:1	34:4,6,10,28 35:17
objection 3:4	one 6:13 7:21	other 3:18,24 4:5		37:18 38:9 40:18
34:17 44:14	8:17,24,26 17:4,18	7:4,6,27 8:22	own 4:2 11:17	(30)
	18:16,18 21:25	9:14,21,26 12:16	13:12,19 16:14,19	()
obligation 29:3,5	22:3,22 23:2	15:28 17:5	24:10,12 27:23	partly 7:3
	25:28 26:13,25	19:7,28 21:26	34:23 35:28 40:3	
observed 7:24	27:9 28:26,28	22:2 24:23	(12)	partner 14:3
13:5	33:8 40:16,25 (22)	31:18,22 33:13	, ,	•
		34:6,9,10 39:7	owner 28:6	party 16:18
obtain 33:13	ones 6:9	41:16 44:1 (27)		20:23 27:5 33:21
		, ,	oxnard 24:7	42:5 (5)
obvious 8:17	only 9:25 16:28	others 3:26		
17:17 40:16	37:12 44:15 (4)	5:6,16 32:10 40:6	pages 46:20	pass 8:24
		(5)		
obviously 17:24	open 4:26		papers 1:20 3:18	passing 24:14
40:18	8:21,25 26:26	otherwise 2:8	26:19 35:12 (4)	
	27:6,25 44:17 (7)	4:14 7:13 23:21		passive 22:27
october 2:6		24:3 39:25 (6)	parameters	
28:19,28 34:11	opened 4:24,25		14:17	past 12:28 23:13
39:14,25 40:15,24		ought 23:24		
41:2 42:11,16,25	opinion 16:6	41:20 43:1	parcel 28:6,8	path 8:27
43:22,24 (14)	36:19 38:9,14 (4)			
		our 5:23 6:25	park 8:15 10:14	patience 22:16
off 9:28	opinions 4:19	7:25 8:16 9:7		
00 1 2 0 0 1 0 0	6:23 15:12	10:27 11:6,17	parks 36:8	patterson
offer 16:20 24:23	20:5,13,14 29:21	12:26 13:1,6		14:27,28
35:28 36:19 (4)	42:4 (8)	14:11,17	part 5:17	15:2,6,7,10 18:27
.66 1 5 10	•4	15:15,15,16,22,27	10:16,16 11:5	21:21,25,25 22:21
offered 5:10	opportunity	17:18 18:16 19:27	21:1,10 22:16	23:27 24:20,24,25
offering 20:27	33:11 36:9,18,25	21:5 27:1,3 28:17	39:24 (8)	25:4,5,8 30:2,8,11
offering 20:27	42:17,19 43:21 (7)	31:15,27 33:7	noutially 10.11	31:9,13 33:17,17
official 46.10 27	annagad 22.2	37:23,28 38:13	partially 10:11 28:9	34:2,12 36:19 (28)
official 46:18,27	opposed 33:3	(31)	۷٥.۶	nottorgonia 0.12
offline 27:27	opposition 2:28	ourselves 11:8	participant 35:22	patterson's 9:13 31:6 34:9
onnie 21.21	opposition 2.20	ourserves 11.0	parucipant 33.22	J1.U J 1 .7

	· ·	AL., 19STCP011	70	1.2
27.17.25	_	ember 20, 2021	15.07	13
pause 37:17,25	physical 5:10,18	31:17 32:1,5	preparing 15:27	problems 33:14
38:3	6:10 7:11,14,19,22	33:2,5 34:7		
	8:3,13 10:15	35:13,25 36:3	present 20:5	procedure 2:9,19
pdf 4:25	12:6,9,13,23,26	37:25 39:21 41:12		
	13:1,23 15:19	43:4 44:10 (32)	presentation	proceed 19:22
people 4:8 6:9	18:28 19:24 25:15		23:15	
9:16 16:18 21:21	26:19 27:23 (23)	points 17:28 18:9		proceeding 17:23
23:5,24,25,28		36:10	presentations	36:24
24:20 34:19 (11)	pisano 1:13		41:26	
	13:3,4,13,19,25	polarizing 27:13		proceedings 45:2
people's 21:16	15:8 19:11,15		presented 29:19	46:22
	20:24 21:4,18,24	policy 36:14	_	
perceive 29:19	25:13,26 28:22		preserve 10:19	process 11:6
30:7,8	32:15,16,23,26	portion 9:21	17:18,23 18:1 (4)	22:13 23:7
,	37:1,1 40:6 41:3,4	•	, , ,	24:1,28 25:27
percent 36:21,23	42:22 44:4,14 (28)	posed 38:25	presiding 40:19	26:9,12,13 36:5,8
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	•	• •	37:13,14 (13)
perception 22:22	pisanomr 30:21	position 12:14	press 37:17	()
29:23 31:9	P -2-4-10-1112	30:9,12	P2 000 T (T	produce 9:8
	places 8:2	31:11,12,15	pressing 37:22	Product
perfectly 6:7	places o.2	35:13,15,26 (9)	pressing ever	product 8:28
perfectly 6.7	plaintiff 3:25	33.13,13,20 ())	presumption 6:8	23:7
perhaps 17:17	5:13 25:9	possible 12:6	presumption old	23.7
21:8,11,27 28:10	3.13 23.7	17:1 20:25 44:8	presumptively	production
(5)	plaintiff's 10:5	(4)	31:7	36:21,24
	planting 10.5	(1)	31.7	30.21,21
period 18:7	plan 3:17 14:14	possibly 22:9	pretty 7:6 40:16	profile 40:27
period 10.7	37:19	32:10	precty 7.0 10.10	prome 10.27
permission 43:15	37.17	32.10	preview 6:17	programs 24:8
permission 18118	plants 8:1	posture 10:27	preview our	programs 2
permitted 20:8	parts o.1	postare 10.27	previously 29:27	project 15:21
permitted 20.0	plate 36:17	powder 13:12	33:19,21 34:15,27	project 15.21
person 15:6	plate 30.17	powder 13.12	(5)	properly 22:6
41:13,15	play 41:28	power 35:2	(3)	property 22.0
71.13,13	play +1.20	power 33.2	primarily 10:28	properties 3:3
personal 1:25	please 1:15 2:12	practical 13:21	primarny 10.26	properties 3.3
2:4,14,18 22:4 (5)	picase 1.13 2.12	40:26	primary 8:3	proponents
2.4,14,10 22.4 (3)	pleasure 7:23	40.20	primary 6.3	40:25
perspective	picasure 7.23	precise 28:2	privately 36:16	40.23
12:26 15:15 18:16	plenty 11:27	precise 20.2	privately 30.10	proposal 12:15
12.20 13.13 10.10	pienty 11.27	prejudice 37:18	pro 23:4 46:18,27	34:1
persuaded 4:8	plow 16:11	prejudice 37.16	pro 23.4 40.10,27	J 1 .1
persuaueu 4.0	piow 10.11	preliminary 4:26	proactive 22:28	proposed 3:4
persuasive 23:17	plug 18:10	premimary 4.20	proactive 22.20	7:19 8:12 18:23
30:19	prug 10.10	premature 12:10	probable 29:17	26:18,24 27:23
30.17	plus 5:26	21:15 26:18	probable 47.17	34:16 43:10 (9)
petitioner 46:9	pius J.20	37:1,6 42:7 (6)	probably 4:16	J + .10 4 J.10 (7)
pennoner 40.7	point 4:4,28	31.1,0 42.1 (0)	7:1 8:22 9:20 16:9	proposes 8:3
phase 13:2 18:16	9:1,18 12:27	prepare 36:10	21:14 26:14 30:1	hrohoses ora
25:28 26:13,25	14:20,22 16:24	41:16	40:7 (9)	proposing 40:18
33:8 (6)	17:18 18:1,15,22	41.10	+∪./ (<i>⊅)</i>	hrohosing 40.19
33.0 (0)	19:1 21:28 23:23	prepared 33:5	problem 9:24	propounded
phone 41:1	25:26 26:24 27:10	prepareu 33.3	33:10 39:21	17:20
phone 71.1	23.20 20.2 1 27.10		33.10 37.41	17.20

	Sent	ember 20, 2021		14
protect 8:10 11:4	putting 31:28	really 12:14 13:15,20 15:19,26	regarding 2:28	reporter 46:18,27
protecting 10:28	quantity 8:5	18:24,26 19:24 22:10 30:16 (10)	regards 13:13	reporter's 46:9
11.7	question 5:4,8	22.10 30.10 (10)	regards 13.13	reporter's 40.9
protest 2:13	6:5 7:9,13 8:24 23:10 24:12	reason 16:17 19:20 20:18 42:23	regularly 35:20	reports 15:11,16 16:8
prove 17:26	25:13,14 27:21 28:13 30:23 38:25	(4)	relates 29:12	19:12,19,27,28 20:3,3,19,20
provide 1:23 2:10 6:23 11:21	40:2 (15)	reasons 2:13 7:4	relationship 17:3	21:9,17 22:2,20 31:14,22 32:8
14:21 19:17 (6)	questions 3:23 6:1,2 15:8 21:7	rebuttal 32:11,21,25 33:2	relative 5:5 15:25	36:1,25,27 37:2,3,4,9 39:28
provided 2:15 44:4	30:23 38:2 41:11 (8)	(4)	relatively 33:9	42:2,3,24 44:7 (30)
		recall 34:2	released 11:10	
providing 34:25	quick 14:7 21:25	receive 40:20	16:23 18:7	repository 23:18
provision 34:20	quickly 12:5	43:7	relevant 3:16 6:14 30:22	represent 36:20
provisions 2:18	quite 5:21 9:15	received 14:8		representations
23:3	quo 12:24,24	recent 4:1	remain 26:6 28:21 30:5	27:7,13
prudent 44:7	•			representatives
public 6:4 8:26	raise 6:1 22:21	recently 3:27 16:23	remains 4:3	36:5
9:22 10:19 11:1,5	ranch 36:12		remember 34:16	represented
16:23 18:7,11 35:27 43:23 (11)	rate 10:14	recess 9:25 10:2 44:26	remembered 34:12	24:19 27:24 36:8,16 (4)
publication 2:26	rather 20:27	recognizance		represents 15:4
3:1	21:12 23:17	27:23	remind 28:21	
publicly 39:4	reach 30:4 39:18	recognizing 6:23	removal 12:18	request 1:20 2:5,5 29:19 (4)
pumped 7:8	reached 10:8,21	recollect 10:8	render 40:22	require 41:24
pumping 10:14 15:17,22	reaches 11:19	reconstruct 34:23	rendered 42:4	required 38:3
,	reaction 21:10		renewed 3:10	requirements
purposes 1:25 9:19 44:5	reactions 21:16	record 1:10,16 9:28 10:4 21:16	25:19 29:16	7:16 29:12,14
	25:10	34:15,22 39:1 (8)	repeatedly 27:8	research 32:17
pursuant 20:15	read 9:21 37:8	records 1:28	report 3:8 9:8	resolution
push 37:25		reduce 8:8	15:28 16:3,4 18:13 21:14,22	10:22,22
put 4:20 11:1,15	reading 8:27		22:4 31:20,24,28	resolve 38:16
12:15 15:8 18:8 33:6 34:17 (8)	ready 13:22 26:5,5,6 27:6 (5)	referring 32:28 34:2	32:6,11,25 35:15,26 41:16	resources 1:3,12
, ,			42:13,14,15,16,21	3:13 10:9,20
puts 31:7	realize 33:6	refused 24:27	43:21,25 (25)	11:1,5 13:8 16:22 17:12,21 18:6

		ember 20, 2021	. 7 0	15
25:18 36:7 46:11 (15)	37:17,20,23,24 (4)	says 34:22 43:12	sensitivity 3:14	share 19:5
respect 15:13	river 1:11 10:19 11:19 15:18 (4)	schedule 29:9 32:26 33:23,26	sentiments 5:8 32:14	sharped 38:14
16:4 22:8 40:10 (4)	robin 17:15	34:13 (5)	separate 8:5	shawn 25:24 33:27
respond 22:6	robust 31:25	scientific 3:11 44:16	23:10	shed 21:8
29:5	38:1	scope 12:11,28	separately 2:24	shoreline 8:1
responded 26:22	role 24:17 43:17	33:8	september 1:5 28:26 34:3,28	short 2:3 9:25
responding 32:9	rules 2:8 20:17,18	scott 35:7	42:1 46:23,25 (7)	33:16 43:16 (4)
response 2:15 21:12 27:1	run 13:10	seasonally 11:19	sequence 28:25	shortly 24:15 28:19
rest 9:6 12:21	running 11:27	secondly 3:28	serve 19:12	should 4:11,15
restoration 15:21 18:24 37:19	runs 11:18 12:1,12	section 41:10 44:16	served 13:6 19:19 20:23 21:23 (4)	8:27 15:22 19:6 20:18 22:18 25:21 28:21 30:1 37:8
restrictions 8:14	rutan 14:1	see 4:12 13:24 16:5 21:22,23 23:28 24:11 31:17	serves 10:5 14:23 25:17	41:9 42:26 (13) show 2:26,28
result 18:10	safe 34:21	34:22 36:26,27 37:14 39:14,19,26	servexpress	6:11,24 (4)
results 11:15	said 18:8 27:4 29:26 31:2,5	(15)	1:19,24 2:2,10,16 (5)	showgirl 23:20
14:10	44:14 (6)	seeing 9:12 15:11 19:6	service	showing 42:5
retained 33:22	same 2:4,13,25 5:12,27 9:13,14	seeking 33:15	1:19,24,25 2:4,14,18 19:16	showman 23:19
retired 14:3	15:8 21:1,20 30:6 42:12,19 (13)	seem 23:25 24:3	(7)	shutoff 10:14
revealing 28:13	san 2:21,25 3:5	32:24	services 23:7	side 19:28 23:18 24:7
review 1:28 11:21 36:25	9:11 10:7 15:18,24 40:17 (8)	seems 3:6 5:9,28 30:12 (4)	serving 20:22	side's 39:8
reviewing 5:4 7:23 14:9	santa 1:2,11 3:25	seen 4:12 22:10 44:2	session 21:16 set 9:26 15:11	signature 46:26
right 5:28 6:19	5:13 24:5 46:7 (6) satisfied 37:25	select 43:16	20:17 31:18 32:21 35:6 44:3 (7)	signed 3:4
7:22 8:7 9:23 10:6,10 11:2 13:7	say 6:28 10:21	select 43.10	settled	significant 16:2,5,11 17:27
10.0,10 11.2 13.7 14:18,18,24 15:5,6 18:11 20:24 25:17	12:2,8,26 13:22,24 21:15 24:14 27:4	selfhelp 23:3	10:24,25,26	(4)
33:3 37:26 40:14 (20)	28:12 30:17 38:5 39:4,11 40:16	selling 23:22	settlement 10:12 27:2,12 28:15 (4)	significantly 15:12
ripe 13:16	43:14,24 44:2 (19)	sense 7:21 15:20	settling 7:18	silent 32:22,24
risk	saying 2:3 25:26 44:3	17:1	several 6:1 31:14	similar 10:8
		1	l .	1

	•	ember 20, 2021		16
31:11	_	43:25	states 19,25.27	_
31:11	14:16 16:5,17	43:25	states 18:25,27	styled 43:25
	18:10 21:7 22:10,			
similarly	15,17,24,24,28	speaks 35:15	status 1:18	subject
23:25,28	23:19 25:23 27:12		12:24,24 27:16	18:11,12,14 41:17
	29:17 30:16,18	species 12:25	30:28 37:7	(4)
since 3:7 32:4	31:17,17,27 33:1		42:13,14,15,16	
39:21 43:22 (4)	36:3 37:4 39:18	specific 28:27	43:21 (11)	submit 32:6,10
	40:7,23 42:22,27	29:11 34:4		33:1
sincere 44:6	43:23 44:10 (40)		statute 19:18	
		specifically 10:20	26:12 43:25	submitting 15:28
single 28:6	somebody 22:19	12:15 28:13		31:19,21
	29:6 36:18 42:1		statutory 25:27	
sir 17:11 18:2,21	(4)	spoke 41:6	29:6	substance 26:2
43:20 44:20 (5)		•		
	somebody's	spoken 27:22	steelhead 10:20	succeeding 37:19
sit 35:27	23:13	.		
		spot 29:25	step 24:17 25:14	such 10:8 19:8
situated 23:25	someone 9:2 22:9			30:7 31:1 33:6
24:1	23:17 29:28 30:12	spreadsheet	stick 26:12	35:3 39:22 40:27
2 4, 1	38:18 41:13 (7)	9:2,3	SUCK 20.12	(8)
situation 29:22	30.10 +1.13 (7)	7.2,3	sticking 25:26	
Situation 29.22	something 4:26	squeeze 28:1	sucking 25.20	sued 22:3
six 22:5	9:21 12:3 14:4	squeeze 20.1	still 10:16 11:6	Sueu 22.3
SIX 22.3	22:7 25:18 32:4	atomo 17,17	14:13 24:1 33:1	andrian and 20,11
-l-4 25.7.7.11		stage 17:17		sufficiency 20:11
slater 35:7,7,11	38:7 44:24 (9)	-4 J 02.16	39:19 (6)	CC 0.1
36:28 37:10,11		stand 23:16	102	sufficient 8:1
38:5,12 39:5 (9)	somewhat 11:7		stopped 2:3	37:21 38:10 39:28
1 20 24	16:3	staring 9:3		(4)
slater's 38:24			straddles 7:3	001 1 1 0 10
	somewhere 24:13	start 5:12 6:5		sufficiently 8:10
sleeve 23:27 30:2		8:27	stream 8:6	
	soon 4:12 29:4			suggested 23:23
slow 40:9		starting 5:13	stretch 8:21	
	sorry 36:22			suggesting 37:8
small 7:6		state 1:3,12 2:12	strict 22:27	
	sort 5:2 16:8 22:7	3:13 5:7 10:8,9,23		suggestion 30:3
smallest 7:1	25:22 (4)	,24,25,26,27 11:3,	strictly 12:11	
		3,6,8,16,24,25		suggests 30:26
solicitous 23:5	sound 5:23 23:14	13:8,11 14:16	stronger 23:8	
		16:4,22,24 17:12,2		suit 23:13
solution 4:7	sounds 13:17	0,20,22,24,28 18:6	struck 10:6	
5:10,19	44:11	20:15 21:26 24:6		summary 3:9
7:12,14,19,22		25:18 26:17 31:21	studies 22:3 24:5	6:22
8:3,13 10:15	speak 1:15 2:12	36:4,5,7,17 40:18		
12:6,9,13,23,26	3:27 12:12 16:14	46:2,11,19 (46)	study 3:17,27	summer 1:22
13:1,23 15:19	19:27 20:1 26:22	, , - (/	5:9,13 6:11 7:11	
18:23 19:24 25:16	(8)	state's 13:13 34:8	11:10 14:14 30:26	summons 2:27
26:19,24 27:23		38:6	(9)	
(24)	speaker 5:26		\ \frac{1}{2}	superior 46:2
(= -/		statement 43:24	stuff 12:22 22:10	
some 1:17 3:6,18	speakers 5:26	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	29:4 44:11 (4)	supplement 32:8
4:8,28 6:20 7:16	Special State Stat	statements 38:24		Sapplement 32.0
8:8 9:16 10:13	speaking 27:21	Section 50.27	style 39:17	supplemental
	PROMINING -111	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	DUJIN DOIL	approment
0.0 7.10 10.15				

	•	ember 20, 2021	T	17
20:3 29:1,4,10	38:18,19 42:26	44:12,19,28 (19)	things 3:12 8:23	through 3:19,21
30:19	(15)	17.12,17,20 (17)	26:15 29:12	5:2 8:4,6 9:7
•	(13)	thanks 2.20		′
32:10,19,22,23	tollring 1.16	thanks 3:20	41:20,20 44:1,17	13:10 14:11
33:1,25 35:12 (12)	talking 1:16	44:20	(8)	16:8,11 24:18
4 6.12	12:10 13:9 15:4,6	Al: 2:2 07 11 7	41.1.1. 4.14.00	41:9 46:21 (13)
support 6:13	26:26 (6)	their 3:3,27 11:7	think 4:14,28	
30:5,15 35:12 (4)		15:12 16:14	5:21 6:24 7:11,15	throughout 17:3
	task 19:25,25	20:5,11,17	8:18 9:4,7,15,23	35:16
supporting 36:22		23:14,14 25:3	11:16 12:8,12	
	taste 44:10	34:4 35:28 40:17	13:22 14:21 15:10	time 1:8,14 4:27
supportive 13:23		43:13 (15)	16:2,8 17:24	5:27 6:27 9:18,20
31:15 36:12	taylor 36:12		18:22 19:22	16:21 17:13 18:7
		them 3:9,20,20	20:25,26 22:7,8	21:1 24:25 25:26
suppose 33:22	team 31:27	4:16,17 9:5 10:28	24:26	26:11 27:10 28:18
		12:16 19:10	25:20,25,25,28	32:3,12 33:12,16
supposed 33:8	technical 9:1,15	20:18,19,22 28:16	26:1,8,13	34:7 35:2 37:14
	16:6,7 22:10	34:20 39:20 (15)	27:6,10,27 29:11	42:7 43:11 44:8
sure 2:22 4:3	30:25 41:7 (7)		31:13 33:26 34:11	(26)
5:21 6:2		themselves 14:25	37:11,12 38:1,1,12	
9:10,12,14,17 12:7	technically 2:25	23:16	39:11,17 40:6,16	timely 42:23
16:1 17:4 21:5,28	2.20		41:5,28 43:3	
24:7 (14)	telling 11:25	theoretical 22:22	44:5,21 (55)	times 27:4
27.7 (17)	11.23	dicorcucar 22.22	17.5,21 (55)	diffes 21.T
surface 3:15	tempore	theoretically	thinking 6:8 37:6	timing 31:26
6:12,26 7:2,6	46:18,27	24:2	_	32:5 33:6
30:24 (6)			thinks 42:1	
20.2.(0)	tend 6:11	theory 32:28	1211	today 3:8 13:27
surprise 15:14	0.11	34:7	thoroughly 22:17	18:22 25:7 29:27
surprise 13.11	tension 22:27	31.7	thoroughly 22.17	33:22 40:12
surprises 5:5	CHRICH LL.L	there's 3:6 4:28	those 2:3	42:9,27 43:2 (10)
Sui pilises 3.3	terms 3:7,12	7:4 10:13 12:22	4:5,15,19 7:17	12.7,21 73.2 (10)
table 4:20	6:10,10 8:27	16:7,10 18:28	8:15 11:28 13:18	today's 2:16
12:15,23 18:25	10:17 13:21 16:28	20:18 22:12 27:7	14:4,11 17:28	21:15
22:18 31:8 44:9	28:4,8 40:26 (11)	28:27 29:9 38:7	18:11 20:1,2 23:1	21.13
	20.7,0 40.20 (11)	40:7 41:22,23	24:7 26:3,27 27:6	together 3:8 18:8
(7)	test 44:10	l '	28:21 29:13	25:22 28:18 31:28
tolso 2:27 0:25 29	1681 44.10	42:2 (18)		
take 3:27 9:25,28	40g4:fr. 20.0 10	th ogo 16:16	33:20,24 34:1	(5)
40:8 41:4 42:23	testify 20:8,10	these 16:16	36:9,27 39:22	tokon 21.20
43:20 (7)	40:3	19:1,7 20:17	40:4 41:10 (29)	token 21:20
40 hom 10:2 44 27	4004im 11 01	22:2,3,5,14 26:24	4h an al-4 20 14	4000 17:14
taken 10:2 44:25	testimony 11:21	27:10 42:2,2 44:7	thought 28:14	tony 17:14
4.1 25 15	41 0.21	(13)	39:4	7.40.1.20.4
takes 35:15	than 9:21	40.10		too 7:4 9:1 28:4
	15:24,28 21:12,26	they're 12:19	thoughts 4:19	, , , , , , , , ,
taking 37:20	24:10 31:22	15:23 17:22 20:17		took 4:26 14:2
40:19	36:21,23 43:24	24:4 27:12 31:15	thousands 22:24	
	(10)	33:18 42:24 (9)		tool 7:12 11:22
talents 5:1			three 4:25 16:10	
	thank 5:20 12:2	thing 8:17,19	18:28	top 32:17
talk 3:28 5:16	13:3,4 16:13	9:26 17:4,5		
12:14 13:10,11	17:10,11 18:2,17	26:11,14 40:16,25	threshold 30:23	topic 32:14,22,24
16:19 26:5	19:2,11 25:12,24	(9)	40:2	_
27:1,3,17,24 28:18	27:20 36:27 42:8			total 36:21,24
				·

	Sept	ember 20, 2021		18
tour 4:24	tucker 14:1	unilateral	using 1:19 11:26	volumes 35:16
tracy 46:18,27	tug 23:27 30:1	42:15,24 43:23	utility 4:9 5:4	voluminous 16:8
traditional 36:13	turn 29:15	university 24:6	24:22 39:20 (4)	vs 1:2 46:10
		unknown 44:4	valley 39:23	
trail 39:14	two 2:9 3:12 5:25,26 16:25	unless 4:13 12:2	valuable 9:16	wait 20:28 30:27 37:7 39:25
trailed 42:10	17:28 22:21 41:10	42:12		40:15,24 41:2 (7)
training 21:13	(8)	unserved 3:2	value 40:7	waived 2:19
6	types 27:11		variability 7:24	
transcript 46:21	24.5.5	until 5:10 21:1	•	waiving 33:3
transition 31:27	uc 24:5,5	22:17 30:28 37:7 40:15,24 42:7	various 11:18,19 14:12 15:16 22:20	walk 3:19 5:2
	unacceptable	44:7 (9)	26:6 (6)	41:8
translate 9:5	12:27	2.12 5.10 7.11	6.27	
treat 3:23	unanimously 4:7	up 2:12 5:10 7:11 8:21,25 17:26	vary 6:27	want 2:13 4:16 5:16 11:11
		27:8 28:10 29:6	ventura 1:11	12:2,23 17:18,28
treating 2:13	unbiased 29:21	32:4 34:20 41:5	3:25 4:2,12	26:4 30:27 36:3
triad 36:13	40:20	44:25 (13)	5:11,14 7:18 10:12 12:3 16:14	37:3 39:3 40:13,14 44:2,10
11au 50.15	uncertain 21:28	upheld 40:22	18:18,25 19:5	(17)
trial 12:11 18:16			26:18,21,26 27:22	
21:1,2,3,6 26:1	under 29:5	upon 38:14 40:21	30:2 31:10 32:9	wanted 18:15
32:12 41:18 44:8 (10)	32:19,20 40:1 41:10,13,21	upper 6:10,27,28	35:9 37:9 38:8 39:3 44:26 (25)	28:12 38:18,19,23,28 (6)
(10)	42:6,21 (9)	15:14 (4)	39.3 44.20 (23)	36.16,19,23,26 (0)
tributaries 15:18		0 6 27 12 10	ventura's 24:23	wanting 26:21
tried 24:16 34:22	underrepresente d 23:6	us 9:6,27 13:18 14:18 21:5 24:27	25:10	wants 2:7 16:20
tileu 24.10 34.22	u 23.0	26:4 27:5	version 34:12	36:19
trier 20:6,10	underscore 19:1	31:21,26 32:1	43:13	
42:3,4 (4)		37:13,18 38:16	1 11 22 27	wasn't 21:2 32:3
true 15:19 18:13	understand 4:8 14:14,16 16:12,15	(14)	versus 1:11 22:27	water 1:3,11
46:21	17:5,6 19:6 30:15	use 1:23	very 4:11 9:3	3:13,15,26 5:15
	33:18 35:24 37:13	2:2,16,28 9:20	11:22 16:6,7	6:26 7:2,6 8:5,9
trust 11:1,5	41:7 (13)	37:24 41:23 42:16	19:18,22 24:27	10:9 11:2 12:17,1
29:26 35:8 (4)	understanding	(8)	30:20 (9)	7,21,21,21,22 13:8,26 14:16
truth 23:18 38:11	32:16 33:7	used 2:10 18:9	veteran 40:1	16:22 17:2,12,21
43:13				18:6,24 21:26
4 4.17 6.10	undertaking	useful 9:9 11:22	via 1:14	24:21 25:18,22
try 4:17 6:18 7:27 16:15 22:28	11:24	42:26	view 4:4 8:16	31:24 35:14,16 36:7,13 39:23
23:24 24:2 25:22	underway 44:9	user 36:11	17:18 30:21 32:7	46:11 (39)
37:8 (9)	·		36:10 38:8 39:21	
twing 1.25 5.10	unethical 20:26	users 12:16 36:14	43:4 (9)	watershed 3:16 5:8 6:10
trying 4:25 5:18 24:17 29:28 34:14	unevenness 23:2	uses 41:22	voice 23:14 38:19	7:2,4,17,24,26
38:26 (6)	3.10.0111003 20.2			35:16,18,28 36:11

	Sept	ember 20, 2021		19
42:28 (13)	15:10,26 16:1	whitman	william 1:6 46:5	9:4,20 12:5,25
42.20 (13)	17:9 18:8,25	43:5,5,26	William 1.0 40.3	16:9 17:23 19:1
****** 9.2 0.10 22.1	′	45.5,5,20	willing 10.0	
way 8:3 9:19 22:1	19:5,27,28 21:9	1. 0.7.07.2.2	willing 40:8	20:20 21:2,14,18
25:27 27:28 28:14	24:20 27:1 29:23	who 2:7,27 3:2		24:27 27:9 31:28
37:5 41:11,20,20	30:8	5:16 11:27	willingness 27:3	32:4,8,13,25
42:2 (11)	34:1,14,15,18,22	13:18,26		33:7,16,19,23
	36:26 37:9 38:5	14:2,11,24 15:4,27	wisdom 19:9	34:5,8,16
ways 23:5 29:17	39:4,26 41:20,21	16:20 19:12 21:12	20:17,28 40:7 (4)	35:11,13,25
30:19	42:26 43:10,12,14,	22:2,9		39:6,11,21
	17,19,27	23:1,6,8,16,20,25	wish 17:11 24:23	40:11,16 41:13,15,
we'll 12:28 20:3	44:2,10,14,17,22	24:3,3 26:4,26	33:13 42:15 (4)	16,18,19,28
24:28 26:7 (4)	(53)	27:5,21,22 28:6		43:5,8,15,17 44:13
, ,		30:8,12,14	wishes 2:11,27	(49)
we're 1:10 6:17	what's 6:3 16:12	31:8,14,14 33:20	27:5	
7:17 10:4	21:5,22,23 32:28	34:4 35:27 36:9		wrestle 23:9
12:10,13 14:9,10,1	40:14 (7)	37:18 38:19	withdrawals	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
3,15,19,19 15:13	(/)	39:18,19 40:26	11:18	x 18:10 20:13
31:5 37:14 38:12	whatever 29:8	42:19 44:24 (48)	11.10	A 10.10 20.13
39:11,11 41:4 (19)	37:27 44:1	72.17 44.24 (40)	without 12:21	v 18:10 20:14
37.11,11 41.4 (19)	31.41 44 .1	whom 22:25	22:6,24 24:16	y 10.10 20.14
1.12.26.5		wnom 22:23	'	l - 7.10
we've 1:13 26:5	whatnot 27:15	1 4 10	26:2 27:14 28:13	yeah 7:10
28:16 44:20 (4)	29:2	whose 4:19	39:8 40:3,4 (10)	
				year 8:7
wearing 20:6	when 1:22 2:5,10	why 2:13 4:3	witness 22:2,4	
	8:25 10:20 14:3	19:8 20:19,20,28	23:16 30:14 31:19	yes 1:27 4:22
website 4:24 6:3	23:8 26:20,26	27:10 37:1 41:23	33:20,25 (7)	14:4 15:2 21:19
8:26 9:22 (4)	29:27 31:6 32:25	42:6,6 (11)		25:8 34:26 38:23
	36:22 37:3,3 40:4		witnesses 35:20	44:23 (9)
week 4:13 35:5	41:22,28 42:28	wildlife 11:4		
	(19)	35:21,23 36:6 (4)	woman's 38:19	yet 4:16,18 12:15
weeks 37:4				
	where 9:1 15:23	wildly 18:27	won 13:24	you'll 21:11 38:1
weigh 20:11	18:7 20:6,10	, .		
,, v.g	22:27,28 28:8 (8)	will 1:24 2:15,17	won't 15:14 44:2	you're 13:9,22
weighed 38:27	22.27,20 20.0 (0)	3:4 4:12,20	WOII € 15.11 · · · · · 2	14:2,24 15:10
Weighted 50.27	whether 4:5	5:12,17 6:20,24,25	woodclaeyssens	16:4 22:1 25:16
well 3:25,26 6:16	5:5,8,17 13:22	7:11,15	35:8	27:25 29:23,28
11:14 23:26 30:26	15:22 16:15 19:7	8:13,14,21,22	55.0	31:16 32:9,11
			word 15:20 41:23	· /
40:13 44:16 (8)	20:7,12 22:1,25	9:11,13,14,27,28	WOLU 12:70 41:73	35:9 37:15,16 (17)
	23:10,13	11:27 12:19	I- 0.00.00	
welladvised 1:20	24:4,10,12,13 33:1	13:1,16 14:10,20	work 8:20,28	you've 20:26
	34:20 39:14,19,27	15:27 16:1,13	9:6,16 17:19 23:4	29:26 43:8
wells 15:23	(23)	17:27 18:10,15,27	24:4 (7)	
		19:5 20:1,1,4,5,5,7		youall 1:22 39:27
went 1:16 19:7,8	which 1:23	,9,11,12 21:23	working 34:26	
28:14 (4)	2:9,17 7:5,26	24:28 25:6,21	42:27	your 1:15,27 2:12
	8:2,3 9:8 15:23	26:3,5 27:15		4:22 5:8,9,20
wet 7:25	23:5 27:2 28:14	29:1,13,18	worth 9:17	6:1,7,16,22 7:9
	35:18 40:1,5,21	31:14,16,21 34:2		8:7,11,28
what 1:21 4:1	(16)	36:13 37:20	worthy 30:25	9:4,19,23 10:11 13
5:3,3,5 6:8,17,24	()	38:2,4,10,13,15	J	:4,12,12,19,25,28
8:25 9:6,12 10:6	while 4:25 10:15	39:17 40:21,22	would 2:9 3:23	14:3,5,7,18,26
11:28 12:1,24	12:19	42:4,4,12,28 (73)	4:16 6:28 8:19	15:2,10
11.20 12.1,27	12.17	r2.7,7,12,20 (13)	r.10 0.20 0.17	13.2,10

	•	ember 20, 2021	 20
16,24,24,26	-	EMDEL 20, 2021	20
16:24,24,26	32:17,19		
17:10,14			
19:3,11,18,22	12323 46:27		
20:6,10,19			
21:3,14,18 22:21			
23:27 24:25			
1			
25:5,8,11,20,24			
26:10 27:6,19			
28:3,13,26			
29:23,25			
30:1,9,12,17			
31:4,12,13,23,25			
32:13,16,28			
33:3,28 34:23,26			
35:11 36:27 37:11			
1			
38:12 39:10,14			
40:5,11,13,24			
41:4,13 42:17			
43:6,16,17			
44:12,15,18,23,28			
(100)			
(100)			
20.17			
yours 30:17			
10.40.04			
yourself 43:24			
z 18:10			
zero 2:11			
2010 2.11			
zip 4:26			
Zip 4.20			
7 20			
730			
41:10,13,21,22,28			
42:6 44:15 (7)			
843 19:19 29:11			
32:20			
32.20			
045 44.16			
845 44:16			
948 1:8			
1000 9:26 35:6			
1210 33:25			
1210 33.23			
2010 1.22 2.1 6			
2019 1:23 2:1,6			
2021 1:5 42:11			
46:23,25 (4)			
2034 19:19			
			ĺ