1	OSHA R. MESERVE (SBN 204240)		
2	PATRICK M. SOLURI (SBN 210036) SOLURI MESERVE, A LAW CORPORATION 510 8th Street Sacramento, California 95814		
3			
4	Telephone: (916) 4557300		
5	Facsimile: (916) 2447300 Email: osha@semlawyers.com		
6	patrick@semlawyers.com		
7	Attorneys for Protestants Local Agencies of the Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refug		
8			
9	[ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON NEXT P	AGE]	
10			
11			
12			
13	BEFORE THE		
14			
15			
15 16	HEARING IN THE MATTER OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER	LAND ET AL.'S AND SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S	
16	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR	
16 17	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
16 17 18	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
16 17 18 19	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
16 17 18 19 20	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
16 17 18 19 20 21	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> </ol>	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> </ol>	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF DIVERSION FOR CALIFORNIA WATER FIX	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF	

1	THOMAS H. KEELING (SBN 114979)
2	FREEMAN FIRM
3	1818 Grand Canal Boulevard, Suite 4 Stockton, California 95207
4	Telephone: (209) 474-1818 Facsimile: (209) 474-1245
4 5	Email: tkeeling@freemanfirm.com
	Attorney for Protestants County of San Joaquin, San Joaquin County Flood Control and
6	Water Conservation District, and Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority
7	
8	J. MARK MYLES, County Counsel (SBN 200823) OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL
9	COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN 44 N. San Joaquin Street, Suite 679
10	Stockton, California 95202-2931
11	Telephone: (209) 468-2980 Facsimile: (209) 468-0315
12	Email: jmyles@sjgov.org
13	Attorney for Protestants County of San Joaquin, San Joaquin County Flood Control and
14	Water Conservation District, and Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority
15	JOHN HERRICK (SBN 139125)
16	LAW OFFICE OF JOHN HERRICK 4255 Pacific Avenue, Suite 2
17	Stockton, California 95207
18	Telephone: (209) 956-0150 Facsimile: (209) 956-0154
19	S. DEAN RUIZ (SBN 213515)
20	MOHAN, HARRÌS, RUIZ, WÓRTMANN, PERISHO & RUBINO LP
21	3439 Brookside Road, Suite 208 Stockton, California 95219
22	Telephone: (209) 957-0660 Facsimile: (209) 957-0595
23	
24	Attorneys for South Delta Water Agency, Central Delta Water Agency, Lafayette Ranch, Heritage Lands, Mark Bachetti Farms, and Rudy Mussi Investments L.P.
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2
	LAND et al.'s and San Joaquin County et al.'s Opposition to DWR's Motion for Reconsideration of the Scope of Phase 2

Protestants Local Agencies of the North Delta and Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, Protestants County of San Joaquin, San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority, and Protestants Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency (collectively, "Protestants") hereby join in the "Opposition to DWR's Motion for Reconsideration of the Scope of Phase 2" filed on March 28, 2018 by Natural Resources Defense Council, The Bay Institute, and Defenders of Wildlife ("NRDC et al."). Protestants incorporate by reference NRDC et al.'s Opposition and all documents and evidence filed in support thereof.

DWR's Motion for Reconsideration amounts to an argument that in ruling on what is probably the most significant Petition for Change in California history, and in weighing the momentous consequences of that petition for public trust resources and the public trust, this Board is required to proceed with "blinders" on. Although DWR has repeatedly assured the Board that the project would maintain "existing" levels of "reasonable protection" (see NRDC et al. Opposition, p. 6, lines 3–10), DWR insists that examination of whether "*existing*" regulatory requirements applicable to the Delta really are protective of the public trust and public interest is outside the scope of this Hearing. Nor, says DWR, may the Board consider the proposed project's contribution to the cumulative negative impacts that have brought the Delta to its existing state. Rather, DWR insists that the Board must focus solely on the proposed project's "incremental" effects. And by "incremental" effects, DWR means only its "modeled" incremental effects (comparing the CWF H3+ model against the No Action Alternative scenario), without consideration of what protestants believe are the "real" effects of the twin tunnel scheme and the obvious failures of the existing regulatory regime to protect the public trust, including Delta fisheries. Indeed, application of DWR's myopic "blinders on" approach could render any examination of the failures of the SWP and CVP and the existing regulations to protect public interest and public trust resources irrelevant. No law, practice, precedent, or prior order of this Board requires such an absurd result.

7DWR's position is fraught with ironies that go well beyond the scope of this Joinder. It8should be remembered, though, that the genesis of the "twin tunnels" proposal was the project

3

1	proponents' sounding the alarm about the inadequacy of <i>existing</i> conditions in the Delta, both	
2	with respect to protection of fisheries and with respect to matters they deemed to be in the	
3	"public interest." Now, DWR insists that the existing conditions in the Delta, including what	
4	many argue are regulatory failures that form the background for those existing conditions, are	
5	not to be considered. DWR is also incorrect that protestants must compare the effects of the	
6	Petition against the No Action Alternative as defined by DWR in its environmental documents.	
7	(DWR Motion, p. 4.) No ruling by the Hearing officers dictates what information protestants	
8	may rely upon to illustrate how the Petition fails to carry its various burdens with respect to Part	
9	1 and 2 Hearing issues. As has been explained in the course of the Hearing, existing	
10	conditions are also an important comparison point and should not be ignored. (See, e.g.,	
11	Antioch-200, p. 4; Antioch-202 Errata, p. 20; Antioch 300, pp. 14-15.)	
12	For the reasons set forth above, and in NRDC et. al.'s Opposition, DWR's motion	
13	should be denied.	
14	Respectfully submitted,	
15	Dated: April 4, 2018 SOLURI MESERVE, A LAW CORPORATION	
16		
17	By:	
18	Osha R. Meserve Attorneys for Protestants	
19	Local Agencies of the North Delta, and Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife	
20	Refuge	
21		
22	Dated: April 4, 2018 FREEMAN FIRM,	
23	1120	
24	By: <u>Thomas H. Keeling</u>	
25	Attorneys for Protestants County of San Joaquin, San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water	
26	Conservation District, and Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority	
27	Nokeldinine Kivel Water and Fower Authonity	
28	4	
	LAND et al.'s and San Joaquin County et al.'s Opposition to DWR's Motion for	
	Reconsideration of the Scope of Phase 2	

1 2	Dated: April 4, 2018 MOHAN, HARRIS, RUIZ, WORTMANN, PERISHO & RUBINO LP	
3	s /s/ Dean Ruiz	
4	By: <u>/s/ Dean Ruiz</u> S. Dean Ruiz	
5	Attorneys for Protestants South Delta Water Agency, Central Delta V Agency, Lafayette Ranch, Heritage Lands,	
6 7	Mark Bachetti Farms, and Rudy Mussi	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	5	
	LAND et al.'s and San Joaquin County et al.'s Opposition to DWR's Motion for Reconsideration of the Scope of Phase 2	

1	STATEMENT OF SERVICE	
2	I hereby certify that I have this day, April 4, 2018, submitted to the State Water	
3	Resources Control Board and caused a true and correct copy of the following document:	
4 5	LAND ET AL.'S AND SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY ET AL.'S OPPOSITION TO DWR'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE SCOPE OF PHASE 2	
6	to be served by Electronic Mail (email) upon the parties listed in Table 1 of the Current	
7	Service List for the California WaterFix Petition Hearing, dated March 26, 2018, posted by the State Water Resources Control Board at	
8	https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_water fix/service_list.shtml	
9		
10 11	I certify that the foregoing is true and correct and that this document was executed on April 4, 2018.	
12	Signature:	
13	Name:Mae Ryan Empleo Title: Legal Assistant for Osha R. Meserve	
14	Soluri Meserve, A Law Corporation	
15	Party/Affiliation: Local Agencies of the North Delta, and	
16	Friends of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge	
17		
18	Address: Soluri Meserve, A Law Corporation	
19	510 8th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	6	
	LAND et al.'s and San Joaquin County et al.'s Opposition to DWR's Motion for Reconsideration of the Scope of Phase 2	