1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	
3	DEPARTMENT NO. S-32 HON. JOHN P. WADE, JUDGE	
4		
5	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER) DISTRICT, et al.,)	
6	Plaintiff,)	
7	vs.) NO. RCVRS 51010	
8	CITY OF CHINO, et al.,	
9	Defendants.	
10		
11		
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL PROCEEDINGS November 13, 2008	
13		
14		
15		
16	APPEARANCES:	
17		
18	(See next page)	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	REPORTED BY: BETTY J. KELLEY, C.S.R. Official Reporter, C-3981	
26		
	ORIGINAL	

1			
2	APPEARANCES:		
3	FOR THE WATERMASTER:	BROWNSTEIN, HYATT, FARBER & SCHRECK BY: SCOTT S. SLATER	
4		BY: MICHAEL FIFE	
5	FOR CITY OF CHINO:	JAMES E. ERICKSON Of Counsel to City Attorney	
6	FOR CITY OF CHINO HILLS:	-	
7	FOR CITY OF CHINO HILLS:	JENKINS & HOGIN BY: JOHN C. COTTI BY: MARK HENSLEY	
8	FOR CITY OF POMONA:	LAGERLOF, SENECAL, GOSNEY & KRUSE BY: THOMAS S. BUNN III	
9			
10	FOR AGRICULTURAL POOL OF		
11	THE CHINO BASIN:	BY: STEVEN G. LEE	
12	FOR MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT:	MC CORMICK, KIDMAN & BEHRENS BY: ARTHUR G. KIDMAN	
13	DISTRICT:	BY: TRAM T. TRAN	
14	FOR CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT:	BEST, BEST, & KRIEGER BY: JILL N. WILLIS	
15		BRUNICK, MC ELHANEY & BECKETT	
16	WATER DISTRCIT:	BY: STEVEN M KENNEDY	
17	FOR CHINO BASIN WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT:	BRUNICK, MC ELHANEY & BECKETT BY: STEVEN K. BECKETT	
18	FOR CITY OF ONTARIO:		
19	7	BY: FREDERIC A. FUDACZ	
20	FOR CITY OF UPLAND AND WEST END CONSOLIDATED	RICHARDS, WATSON, GERSHON BY: STEVEN R. ORR	
21	WATER COMPANY:	DI. DILIVIA II. CIA	
22	FOR INLAND EMPIRE UTILITIES DISTRICT:	CIHIGOYENETCHE, GROSSBERG & CLOUSE	
23		BY: JEAN CIHIGOYENETCHE	
24			
25	REPORTED BY:	BETTY KELLEY, C.S.R. Official Reporter, C-3981	
26		control roper con , o com	

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2008 1 8:30 a.m. 2 HON. JOHN P. WADE, JUDGE 3 DEPARTMENT NO. S-32 4 (Betty J. Kelley, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-3981.) 5 Okay. For the edification of all the 6 THE COURT: rest of you, Chino Basin Municipal Water District versus 7 City of Chino. 8 Okay, gentlemen, ladies, a couple rules. We're going 9 to start over here with the gentleman beside the post. 10 We're going to work our way this way with you giving your 11 appearance. Please give your appearance loudly so the court 12 reporter can take it down. And at any time you address the 13 Court, give your last name and the person -- just your last 14 name again so that the court reporter will know who she's 15 taking down. 16 17 Go ahead, sir. 18 MR. ERICKSON: Jim Erickson representing the City of Chino. 19 MR. SLATER: Scott Slater on behalf of the Chino 20 21 Basin Watermaster. MR. FIFE: Michael Fife, Chino Basin Watermaster. 22 MR. FUDACZ: Fred Fudacz on behalf of the City of 23 Ontario. 24 Steve Kennedy on behalf of Three 25 MR. KENNEDY: Valleys Municipal Water District. 26

1	MR. CIHIGOYENETCHE: Jean Cihigoyenetche on
2	behalf of Inland Empire Utilities Agency.
3	MS. WILLIS: Jill Willis on behalf of Cucamonga
4	Valley Water District.
5	MR. ORR: Steven Orr on behalf of the City of
6	Upland and West End Consolidated Water Company.
7	MR. BUNN: Thomas Bunn for the City of Pomona.
8	MR. HENSLEY: Mark Hensley on behalf of the City
9	of Chino Hills.
10	MR. COTT: John Cotti for the City of Chino
11	Hills.
12	MS. TRAN: Tram Tran on behalf of Monte Vista
13	Water District.
14	MR. KIDMAN: Art Kidman on behalf of Monte Vista
15	Water District.
16	MR. BECKETT: Steven Beckett for Chino Basin
17	Water Conservation District.
18	MR. LEE: Steven Lee of Reid & Hellyer on behalf
19	of the Agricultural Pool of the Chino Basin.
20	THE COURT: We've got a few things to discuss
21	here. Let's take the easy ones first.
22	There's a motion brought by the Watermaster to for
23	a court order in compliance with the mandates of the order
24	made by Judge Gunn on December 21st of '07. Does anyone
25	want to address that?
26	MR. SLATER: Your Honor, if I might on behalf of

Watermaster? If I might, there are 10 items that have been filed with the Court, seven of which are received and filed, three are up for approval under the December 21st order.

None of those items are contested by any party. And the referee who has commented on them had no issues with any of those subjects.

So to list them in order, for the benefit of the Court, they involve the brief related to the completeness of the record related to the transferability of non-ag overlying rights.

Secondly, a corrected initial schedule.

Third, a new technical report to address the basin equilibrium and decline in projected safe yields, CEQA documentation, recharge master planning documentation, a report on criteria for hydraulic control. Those were the conditions subsequent. Again, there's no opposition on any of those items.

As it relates to the two status reports for 2007-1, 2007-2 and the annual reports 29 and 30, there's no opposition.

Item two, related to the corrected initial schedule, item three regarding the new tech report, and item five, recharge master plan, are approval items. So they do require Court approval to complete the record. There, again, was no objection to any item.

Item four, for the Court's benefit, the referee --

this is the item related to CEQA documentation. The referee suggested an outcome with regard to Watermaster supervision of the CEQA process that was different than as presented by Watermaster and the parties. We're happy to respond to any item, but there was no objection to that item.

And without objection, your Honor, we'd ask for acknowledgment of receipt and approval of the items.

THE COURT: Does anyone have anything they want to say about that?

All right. They're approved, sir.

MR. SLATER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I have an aside comment concerning this concern about CEQA. Having been a designated CEQA judge for several years and just recently off that calendar, I'm quite familiar with the processes involved in CEQA. I don't believe this Court -- it's necessary for this Court to be monitoring what's going on with CEQA. So in the future, that's not going to be an issue that's going to arise. There's a regular cottage industry of people out there challenging CEQA decisions, so I don't think the Court has to be involved in that.

MR. SLATER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We already took care of the interventions that were done.

I'm going through my notes here to see if I needed to make any comments concerning these approvals. For the

benefit of all counsel, I'm going to change the procedures that have been going on before Judge Gunn. I'm not going to make any formal orders about that now. I intend to tell you some more about that later.

But to give you some idea, I don't believe this reporting process is doing us much good. I think it takes a lot of time and effort, costs a lot of money, and I don't think we're getting anywhere with it.

My intention is to monitor this -- the progress of the Watermaster by a series of hearings, which I'll conduct in Court before me, so questions can be answered by people, if I have them, about what's going on. I think that's a better way to approach this problem. I don't think the process of having reports prepared, reviewed by the referee and the referee's technical assistant and then responded to and recommendations made and then response come back, it seems to me a huge waste of time and money. So I'm going to do it more directly.

MR. KIDMAN: Your Honor -- Kidman -- just one point of clarification. We received notice yesterday that the special referee was going to be on call.

THE COURT: I don't think she checked in.

THE CLERK: She did not.

MS. SCHNEIDER: This is Anne Schneider on the phone.

THE COURT: So have you been able to hear so far,

Miss Schneider?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes. I couldn't tell when the other appearances were through so I didn't say anything in time.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you, ma'am. I didn't know that you were on call. All right. Thank you.

Concerning Miss Schneider, a couple of things I want to say. I have had no conversations with Miss Schneider since being made this assignment, so I want you to know that.

I did have a conversation with Miss Schurr, who worked -- right now still works for the Court and did work for Miss Schneider for some period of time. And the only matters we discussed at that time were what procedures Judge Gunn used in his contacts with Miss Schneider. Other than that, we didn't discuss anything.

Okay. I'm granting your request to have all the reports designated as filed. That includes the 29th annual report and the 30th annual report.

MR. SLATER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Okay. All right. That leaves us with this request by Cucamonga Valley Water District to discontinue the appointment of the special referee, and that's your client, Miss Willis, is it?

MS. WILLIS: That's correct. Willis.

THE COURT: Miss Willis, anything you want to add to your voluminous filings?

MS. WILLIS: No, your Honor. We're prepared to address any questions you may have. But otherwise, we're prepared to rest on the pleadings.

THE COURT: Miss Schneider, do you want to say anything else?

MS. SNYDER: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. There are several reasons that I'm not going to grant this motion at this time.

First, I am, as you all know, new to the case, although I have spent hours and hours reading in the last -- since my appointment. I'm going to need time and assistance to become familiar with the history of the case. I expect that if I need particular answers, that the most expeditious way for me to get those answers is to have Miss Schneider answer those questions.

Secondly, it appears that the Watermaster's presently not in compliance with certain conditions and deadlines.

For instance, I'll give you this instance. There's a question as to what progress has been made by the Watermaster to form a separate committee to review and make recommendations regarding the Watermaster's governing structure, which it resolved in December of 2005 to have done by January of 2008, nearly a year ago. So I'm going to

have to have a hearing on what's going on in that regard, and I want some testimony in that regard.

Я

Furthermore, this matter is now in a transitional phase with conditions of approval to be monitored and enforced. The Court needs assistance during this transitional period, so I'm not granting the motion to terminate.

But as I said earlier, I'm going to change the way things have been done.

Miss Schneider, it's been my impression that whenever anything was put before the Court, it was your understanding that you were to automatically review and make recommendations to the Court. Am I correct about that?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Not automatically, your Honor.

It depended on if there were issues that needed more information in order to give the Court an idea of what the question was that had been worked on by the parties or the Watermaster, so not in every case.

THE COURT: All right. Well, from this point on, my procedure will be that I will specifically refer questions and assistance in written orders to you before taking any action. Is that understood?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. There's something else I
want -- Mr. -- it's Mr. Slater and Mr. Fife; correct?

MR. SLATER: Yes, your Honor.

MR. FIFE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And you are the attorneys for the Watermaster?

MR. SLATER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, the previous way of doing things, as I understand it, is that the Watermaster would take care of service on all the parties.

MR. SLATER: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I want that to continue because that seems expeditious to me.

What I'm going to do is I'm going to set a hearing for February 2nd, maybe February 3rd. I'll set it for a two-day possible hearing, a date certain. I want the Watermaster to present testimony to me on a couple of issues:

I want to know what is being done to implement and guarantee and assure that the physical solution is going to be accomplished.

And I also want that -- I want testimony as to -- and I don't want some sort of scanning report. I want numbers, and I want you to present me with the plan with all the parties who are going to participate and how we're going to get that water back into that basin.

I also want an explanation by somebody who can put it in language I can understand -- I'm looking for the right words here -- the optimum --

MR. SLATER: Optimum basin management plan, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's it, yes. I want an explanation of that from a historical standpoint and present day. And I want a report on the -- not a report. I want someone to testify what the Watermaster's doing to comply with this resolution concerning the change in governance or the committee to create a better review of governance that I discussed earlier.

Do you understand?

MR. SLATER: Yes, we do, your Honor. I would like your Honor to know that the issue of the special referee was of great concern to the board, and Watermaster counsel was directed to remain neutral in the discussion; that as it relates to the subject of governance, the Watermaster board does believe it has complied with the resolution and will present our position at that hearing.

reason to doubt that that's true. I just want to hear it, okay? And I've read a number of orders made by Judge Gunn, which indicated to me that his way of going about monitoring is different from my own. I prefer a more direct approach. I want people answerable to me. If I have to enforce it, I want to know who is going to suffer. So that's what's going to happen in the future.

The bills to Miss Schneider, which are a concern to

everyone, I think, are going to be reduced, probably, because of the methods that I'm going to employ. That doesn't mean that she won't get work from me in the future, but it does mean there will be a different way of going about it. I think it will save attorneys fees. It will save referee's fees, and I think it will save attorneys fees in the long run. But we'll see that as it moves along. Okay?

1.4

MR. SLATER: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. HENSLEY: Your Honor -- Mr. Hensley -- with respect to the hearing on the OBMP, there may be differences of opinion among the parties as to the compliance. I would assume that we can get the parties to agree to subpoen the witnesses they need to call to put on the evidence they would like the Court to see.

THE COURT: Yes. If you believe -- That's a good thing. If you're going to submit witnesses, please send me a list of witnesses that you intend to submit. I want to hear from everyone, all right? This is an educational experience for me, so this is not going to end up as an adversary situation. I just want to get facts. Okay? No winners or losers in this hearing.

MR. SLATER: Your Honor, to assist the Court and the parties, I think Watermaster would offer to prepare an outline of our proposed testimony in response to the issues that have been identified by the Court so that the parties

may know what, with some definiteness, what we intend to present and thereby prepare as well. THE COURT: That sounds like a good way to go about it, Mr. Slater. All right. Unless further disputes arise, I'll see you back here then. And, Mr. Slater, you're obligated to give notice of what's taken place today. MR. SLATER: Yes, your Honor, thank you. (Proceedings concluded.) - 26

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
3	DEPARTMENT NO. S-32 HON. JOHN P. WADE, JUDGE
4	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER)
5	DISTRICT, et al.,
6	Plaintiff,) vs.) NO. RCVRS 51010
7)
8	CITY OF CHINO, et al.,) REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
9	Defendants)
10	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO)
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
12	
13	I, BETTY J. KELLEY, C.S.R., Official Reporter
14	of the Superior Court of the State of California, for
15	the County of San Bernardino, do hereby certify that the
16	foregoing pages 1 through 12, inclusive, comprise
17	a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings
18	held in the above-entitled matter reported by me on
19	November 13, 2008.
20	
21	
22	DATED this 14th day of November, 2008.
23	Bergi Hoope.
24	BETTY KELLEY, C.S.R. Official Reporter, C-3981
25	Officotal Reporter, C-3981