1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	COALITION FOR A SUSTAINABLE DELTA,	Case No: 1:08-CV-00397-LJO-MJS
12	BELRIDGE WATER STORAGE DISTRICT, BERRENDA MESA WATER DISTRICT, LOST	(Related Cases: 1:05-cv-01207-LJO-MJS
13	HILLS WATER DISTRICT, WHEELER RIDGE-MARICOPA WATER STORAGE DISTRICT,	1:06-cv-00245-LJO-MJS 1:09-cv-00480-LJO-MJS)
14	AND DEE DILLON,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO DISMISS
15	Plaintiffs,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE
16	vs.	
17	JOHN McCAMMAN, in his official capacity as Director of the California Department of Fish and Game,	Courtroom: 3 Judge: Hon. Lawrence J. O'Neill
18	(Ciame.	8
19	Defendant,	
	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al.	
19	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors,	
19 20	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al.	
19 20 21	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors, CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION	
19 20 21 22	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors, CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE, et al.,	
19 20 21 22 23	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors, CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE, et al., Defendant-Intervenors.	
19 20 21 22 23 24	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors, CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE, et al., Defendant-Intervenors.	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors, CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE, et al., Defendant-Intervenors.	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Defendant, CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY, et al. Defendant-Intervenors, CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE, et al., Defendant-Intervenors.	

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE

WHEREAS, although all the parties were not able to agree upon settlement terms, Plaintiffs and the then Director of the California Department of Fish and Game, John McCamman (the State Defendant), were able to agree upon terms, and executed a settlement agreement;

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2011, the Court entered the settlement agreement as a consent decree (see ECF No. 253);

WHEREAS, under the terms of the settlement agreement, the State Defendant was obligated to, among other things, develop a proposal based upon the best available scientific information to modify the striped bass sport fishing regulation to reduce striped bass predation on the endangered Sacramento River winter-run chinook salmon, the threatened delta smelt, the threatened Central Valley spring-run chinook salmon, and the threatened Central Valley steelhead (the "Listed Species") to be submitted to the California Fish and Game Commission, along with a recommendation that the Commission modify the striped bass sport fishing regulation consistent with the proposal;

WHEREAS, under the terms of the settlement agreement, once the California Fish and Game Commission takes final action on the State Defendant's proposal (by making a final decision to approve, modify and approve, or reject the proposal), Plaintiffs are obligated to take all necessary steps to dismiss their First Amended Complaint with prejudice;

WHEREAS, in the settlement agreement, the Plaintiffs and the State Defendant agreed to each pay their own attorneys' fees and costs and expert witness fees and costs, and also agree that neither shall be entitled to nor shall they seek from the Court any payment for any such fees and/or costs from the other;

WHEREAS, the State Defendant, with the collaboration of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service, developed a joint proposal in accordance with the terms of the settlement agreement;

WHEREAS, the State Defendant has satisfied all requirements of the settlement agreement relating to the development of the regulatory proposal and the submission of that proposal to the California Fish and Game Commission; and

WHEREAS, on February 2, 2012, the California Fish and Game Commission voted to deny the proposal, thereby making a final decision, as that term is defined in the settlement agreement;

	I and the second	
1	NOW THEREFORE, Plaintiffs, the State Defendant, and the Defendant Intervenors, through	
2	their respective counsel, stipulate and agree, subject to the approval of the Court, that the Court,	
3	pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2), dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint with	
4	prejudice, with each party to pay their own attorneys' fees and costs and expert witness fees and costs.	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	Dated: February 27, 2012	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of the State of California
10		CLIFFORD T. LEE Deputy Attorney General
11		DEBORAH A. WORDHAM Deputy Attorney General
12		DANIEL FUCHS Deputy Attorney General
13		
14 15		By: /s/ Clifford T. Lee, Esquire (As authorized on Feb. 22, 2012) CLIFFORD T. LEE
16		Attorneys for Defendant John McCamman, Director of the California Department of Fish and Game
17		Cantornia Department of Fish and Game
18	Dated: February 27, 2012	NOMELLINI, GRILLI &McDANIEL PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
19		
20 21		By: /s/ Daniel A. McDaniel, Esquire (As authorized on Feb. 23, 2012) DANIEL A. McDANIEL
22		Attorneys for Defendants in Intervention Central Delta
23		Water Agency, et al.
24	Dated: February 27, 2012	MICHAEL B. JACKSON
25		
26		By: /s/ Michael B. Jackson, Esquire (As authorized on Feb. 22, 2012)
27		MICHAEL B. JACKSON
28		Attorneys for Defendants in Intervention California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, et al.
I		