1	COUNSEL IDENTIFICATION AT END	
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFO	ORNIA – FRESNO DIVISION
7	THE DELTA CMELT CACEC	7
8	THE DELTA SMELT CASES	1:09-cv-00407-OWW-GSA
9 10 11	SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY et al. v. SALAZAR et al. (Case No. 1:09-cv-407)	1:09-cv-00422-OWW-GSA 1:09-cv-00631-OWW-GSA 1:09-cv-00892-OWW-GSA PARTIALLY CONSOLIDATED WITH: 1:09-cv-00480-OWW-GSA
12 13	STATE WATER CONTRACTORS v. SALAZAR et al. (Case No. 1:09-cv-422)	STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR
14 15 16	COALITION FOR A SUSTAINABLE DELTA et al. v. UNITED STATES FISH AND WIDLIFE SERVICE et al. (Case No. 1:09-cv-480)	Judge: Honorable Oliver W. Wanger Date: July 26-29, 2011
17 18 19	METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT v. UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE et al. (Case No. 1:09-cv-631)	
20	STEWART & JASPER ORCHARDS et al. v.	
21	UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE et al. (Case No. 1:09-cv-892)	
22	(0.000 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.0	
23		J
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
DIEPENBROCK ELKIN LLP	STIDI II ATION AND ODDED DE EVHIBITS WITNESSES AND OF	DALARCHMENT FOR MOTION FOR INTRODUCE DELECT

STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

The parties, by and through their respective counsel of record, as identified below, hereby have met and conferred and hereby propose the following schedule for the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Injunctive Relief scheduled for July 26-29, 2011:

The parties shall serve and filed their respective exhibit lists on Wednesday, July 20, 2011. The exhibit lists shall identify those exhibits to be used for each party's case-in-chief and need not include exhibits that may be used for demonstrative, cross-examination and/or rebuttal purposes. The exhibit lists shall identify the Administrative Record cite for each exhibit from the Administrative Record. For exhibits not included within the Administrative Record, the parties shall serve on each other copies of the exhibits by email with their exhibit lists or on disks served by overnight delivery for receipt on **Thursday**, **July 21**, **2011**. Service of exhibits on the Federal Defendants shall be by disk by overnight mail only and not by email. The parties agree to label their exhibits numerically using the following number ranges:

Plaintiffs: 0-300

Plaintiff-Intervenor: 301-500

Federal Defendants: 501-1000

Defendant-Intervenors: 1001-1500

The parties have agreed to submit Defendants' Motion to Strike on the papers unless the Court has questions for the parties. The parties respectfully request that the Court rule on the Motion to Strike prior to commencement of argument and evidence on the Motion for Injunctive Relief. The parties propose that time set aside for consideration of the Motion to Strike, inclusive of the time for the Court to share its views on and rule on the motions, and subject to the Court's concurrence, be from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. on July 26, 2011. The time not used by the Court shall be divided evenly between (a) Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenor on the one hand, and (b) Federal Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors on the other hand.

2. Based on the a court day of 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. each day and the Court's routine practice of scheduling one 15 minute break each morning, one 90 minute break at lunch, and one 15 minute break each afternoon, the parties anticipate that there will be 25 court hours, after the Motion to Strike, for evidence and argument. Therefore, each side will be allocated a 8

5

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

DIEPENBROCK ELKIN LLP

total of 12.5 hours to be used by each side in its discretion among opening statements, arguments, and direct, cross and rebuttal examinations, subject to not exceeding the total hours per side per case. Any party may at its sole discretion cede all or a portion of its time to any other party.

- 3. The parties have met and conferred regarding the order of witnesses. explained in the Defendants' pending motion to strike, Defendants' position is that Plaintiffs' evidence of alleged irreparable harm is the only evidence that may be considered because the merits of Action 4 have been fully adjudicated and a final judgment has been entered. See Docket No. 947-1. Furthermore, because a likelihood of irreparable harm is a threshold showing that must be made before the Court can issue injunctive relief, Defendants' position is that Plaintiffs' testimony regarding alleged irreparable harm (i.e., Mr. Erlewine and Mr. Leahigh) should be presented first, prior to any testimony on the merits (i.e., Drs. Deriso, Burnham, Hanson, and Hutton), because if the Court finds no likelihood of irreparable harm, it need not proceed to the merits witnesses, thereby conserving judicial and party resources. The Court previously noted that such an approach made sense. See Docket No. 790 (summarizing the Court's comments at a status hearing on Plaintiffs' previous injunction motion that "it makes sense" for irreparable harm to be adjudicated prior to deciding whether to having the rest of the evidentiary hearing). Plaintiffs do not agree that Messrs. Erlewine and Leahigh should be presented first. They wish to present Drs. Deriso, Burnham, and Hanson first. Notwithstanding Defendants' objections to presenting merits testimony first, in an effort to conserve judicial and party resources and avoid a scheduling dispute, if the Court is inclined to allow merits testimony to be presented first, Defendants are willing to proceed with Plaintiffs' preferred order of witnesses as set forth below. However, this should not be construed as a waiver of any objections raised by Defendants to date, including this Court's jurisdiction to hold an evidentiary hearing and the objections made in Defendants' pending motion to strike. Defendants believe the Court would be acting well within its discretion to compel Plaintiffs to present testimony from Mr. Erlewine and Mr. Leahigh at the outset of the evidentiary hearing.
 - 4. In response to Defendants' position regarding the order of witnesses, Plaintiffs

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

ELKIN LLP

DIEPENBROCK

submit that they have coordinated many schedules of counsel and witnesses to accommodate the wishes of Defendants leading up to these hearings. Plaintiffs do not agree that Defendants should dictate the order that Plaintiffs put on their witnesses for this motion. Plaintiffs brought this motion for interim relief in light of the Court's decision that the RPAs in the BiOp are arbitrary and capricious, including the Fall X2 Action. It is Defendants' decision to proceed with the Fall X2 Action notwithstanding the Court's ruling that has necessitated this hearing. All of the testimony will go to the issue of harm, showing lack of harm to the species as well as the harm to the state's water supply. Accordingly, Plaintiffs submit that the order of witnesses is appropriate, meets individual scheduling needs, and will be the most efficient presentation to the Court.

5. The following is the order of opening statements, witnesses and closing arguments. This has been set based on the parties' best estimates of time for examinations. If the examination of any witness finishes early, the next witness in order will be called to testify, regardless of the date scheduled below.

Tuesday, July 26, 2011

- **Opening Statements**
- Dr. Richard Deriso
- Dr. Kenneth Burnham
- Dr. Charles Hanson

Wednesday, July 27, 2011

- Dr. Charles Hanson, continued, if necessary
- Dr. Paul Hutton
- Mr. John Leahigh
- Mr. Terry Erlewine

Thursday, July 28, 2011

- Mr. Frederick Feyrer
- Dr. Matthew Nobriga
- Dr. Jennifer Norris

Friday, July 29, 2011 1 Dr. Jennifer Norris, continued 2 Plaintiff rebuttal witnesses 3 **Closing Arguments** 4 6. In addition to the foregoing live testimony, the parties further stipulate that the 5 following witnesses may testify via their previously submitted declarations and that the parties 6 will not raise a hearsay objection against the admissibility of such declarations on the grounds 7 that the declaration is a statement that was made other than while testifying at the trial or 8 hearing: James Snow, David Sunding, Rod Stiefvater, Jeffrey Mettler, Peter Gleick, and Jeffrey 9 Michael. In so stipulating, the parties against whom the declarations have been offered do not 10 stipulate that the facts stated within the declarations are undisputed or waive any other 11 evidentiary objections. 12 7. The parties have agreed that they may submit to the Court and rely upon during 13 the hearing updated evidence regarding project operations, flows, and status and location of the 14 species. 15 16 SO STIPULATED 17 Dated: July 20, 2011 18 KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ, **TIEDEMANN** & GIRARD, LLP DIEPENBROCK ELKIN, LLP 19 A Professional Corporation 20 By: <u>/s/_[Eileen M. Diepenbrock]</u> 21 EILEEN M. DIEPENBROCK Attorneys for Plaintiffs 22 SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY AND WESTLANDS WATER 23 DISTRICT 24 25 26 27 28 - 4 -DIEPENBROCK

STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

ELKIN LLP

1	Dated: July 20, 2011 BROW	NSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK LLP
2		
3		/s/_[Steve O. Sims] (as authorized) ΓΈνε Ο. SIMS
4		IICHELLE C. KALES EOFFREY M. WILLIAMSON
5	A	ttorneys for Plaintiff ESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT
6		
7	Dated: July 20, 2011 BEST I	BEST & KRIEGER LLP
8		
9	By:	/s/ [Gregory K. Wilkinson](as authorized)
10	S	REGORY K. WILKINSON IEVEN M. ANDERSON
11	M	AETER E. GARCIA IELISSA R. CUSHMAN
12	Ai Si	ttorneys for Plaintiff ΓΑΤΕ WATER CONTRACTORS
13	Dated: July 20, 2011 NOSSA	AMAN LLP
14		
15	By:	/s/ [Paul S. Weiland](as authorized) OBERT D. THORNTON
16	PA	AUL S. WEILAND
17	A	UDREY HUANG SHLEY J. REMILLARD
18		ttorneys for Plaintiffs OALITION FOR A SUSTAINABLE DELTA
19		dd KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY
20	Dated: July 20, 2011 MORR	ISON & FOERSTER LLP
21	Dated. July 20, 2011	ISON & POLICIEN LEI
22	Bv: /s/	/_[Christopher J. Carr](as authorized)
23	\overline{A}	RTURO J. GONZALEZ HRISTOPHER J. CARR
24	W	ILLIAM M. SLOAN
25		RAVIS BRANDON ttorneys for Plaintiff
26	T	HE METROPOLITAN WATER ISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
27		ISTRICT OF SOUTHLING CALIFORNIA
28		
Diepenbrock -	- 5 -	
Elkin llp	STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	

1	Dated: July 20, 2011	KAMALA D. HARRIS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2		
3		By: /s/ [Cecilia L. Dennis](as authorized)_
4		CLIFFORD T. LEE CECILIA L. DENNIS
5		WILLIAM JENKINS ALLISON GOLDSMITH
6		Deputies Attorney General Attorneys for Plaintiff-In-Intervention
7		CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
8		
9	Dated: July 20, 2011	IGNACIA S. MORENO, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
10		United States Department of Justice, Environmental & Natural Resources Division
11 12		SETH M. BARSKY, CHIEF
13		
13		By: /s/ [Ethan Carson Eddy] (as authorized) ETHAN CARSON EDDY, Trial Attorney
15		Wildlife & Marine Resources Section Attorneys for FEDERAL DEFENDANTS
16	Dated: July 20, 2011	NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
17	Dated. July 20, 2011	NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
18		By: :_ /s/_[Katherine Poole]_(as authorized)
19		KATHERINE POOLE DOUG OBEGI
20		Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenor NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE
21		COUNCIL
22		
23	Dated: July 20, 2011	THE BAY INSTITUTE
24		By: /s/ [Trent W. Orr] (as authorized)
25		TRENT W. ORR GEORGE M. TORGUN
26		Attorneys For Defendant-Intervenor THE BAY INSTITUTE
27		
28		
Diepenbrock Elkin llp	CTIDLE ATION AND ORDER DE ENVIRONG VIII	- 6 -
	511PULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WIT	INESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1 IT IS SO ORDERED. 2 Dated: July 21, 2011 /s/ Oliver W. Wanger THE HONORABLE OLIVER W. WANGER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 4 5 6 7 8	_
 4 5 6 7 	_
 4 5 6 7 	
567	
6 7	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
DIEPENBROCK ELKIN LLP STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE F	

IDENTIFICATION OF COUNSEL

1	IDENTIFICATION OF COUNSEL	
2	DANIEL J. O'HANLON (SBN 122380)	H. CRAIG MANSON (SBN 102298)
	HANSPETER WALTER (SBN 244847)	General Counsel
3	KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ, TIEDEMANN &	Westlands Water District
4	GIRARD 400 Capitol Mall, 27th Floor	3130 N. Fresno Street
7	Sacramento, CA 95814	Fresno, CA 93703
5	Telephone: (916) 321-4500	Telephone: (559) 224-1523
	Facsimile: (916) 321-4555	Facsimile: (559) 241-6277
6	EILEEN M. DIEPENBROCK (SBN 119254)	COPENSE O COMO ()
7	DAVID A. DIEPENBROCK (SBN 215679)	STEVE O. SIMS (admitted pro hac vice)
	JONATHAN R. MARZ (SBN 221188)	MARTHA F. BAUER (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) MARK J. MATHEWS (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
8	DIEPENBROCK ELKIN, LLP	MICHELLE C. KALES (admitted pro hac vice)
9	400 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	GEOFFREY M. WILLIAMSON (admitted pro
9	Telephone: (916) 492-5000	hac vice)
10	Facsimile: (916) 446-4535	BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
1.4	A C. DI : .:CC	SCHRECK LLP
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER	410 17th Street, Suite 2200
12	AUTHORITY and WESTLANDS WATER	Denver, CO 80202
	DISTRICT	Telephone: (303) 223-1100
13		Facsimile: (303) 223-1111
14		Attorneys for Plaintiff
14		WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT
15		WESTERNOS WITTER DISTRICT
1.6	GREGORY K. WILKINSON (SBN 054809)	NOSSAMAN LLP
16	STEVEN M. ANDERSON (SBN 186700)	ROBERT D. THORNTON (SBN 72934)
17	PAETER E. GARCIA (SBN 199580)	PAUL S. WEILAND (SBN 237058)
	MELISSA R. CUSHMAN (SBN 246398)	AUDREY M. HUANG (SBN 217622)
18	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP	ASHLEY J. REMILLARD (SBN 252374)
19	3750 University Avenue, Suite 400	18101 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1800
1)	P. O. Box 1028	Irvine, CA 92612
20	Riverside, CA 92502	Telephone: (949) 833-7800
21	Telephone: (951) 686-1450	Facsimile: (949) 833-7878
21	Facsimile: (951) 686-3083	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
22	Attorneys for Plaintiff	COALITION FOR A SUSTAINABLE
	STATE WATER CONTRACTORS	DELTA and KERN COUNTY WATER
23		AGENCY
24		,
25		
26		
20		
27		

DIEPENBROCK ELKIN LLP

28

1	KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY	ARTURO J. GONZÁLEZ (SBN 121490)
2	AMELIA T. MINABERRIGARAI (SBN	CHRISTOPHER J. CARR (SBN 184076)
2	192359)	WILLIAM M. SLOAN (SBN 203583)
3	P.O. Box 58	TRAVIS BRANDON (SBN 270717)
٥	Bakersfield, CA 93302-0058	MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
4	Telephone: (661) 634-1400	425 Market Street
_	Facsimile: (661) 634-1428	San Francisco, CA 94105
5		Telephone: (415) 268-7000
6	Attorney for Plaintiff	MARCIA I GCIH IN (GRN 00640)
J	KERN COUNTY WATER AGENCY	MARCIA L. SCULLY (SBN 80648)
7		Interim General Counsel
		LINUS MASOUREDIS (SBN 77322)
8		Senior Deputy General Counsel LMasouredis@mwdh2o.com
9		THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
,		OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
10		1121 L Street, Suite 900
		Sacramento, California 95814-3974
11		Telephone: (916) 650-2600
12		Telephone: (>10) 050 2000
12		Attorneys for Plaintiff
13		THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
		OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
14		
15	KAMALA D. HARRIS (SBN 146672)	IGNACIA S. MORENO,
13	Attorney General of California	Assistant Attorney General
16	CLIFFORD T. LEE (SBN 74687)	United States Department of Justice
	CECILIA L. DENNIS (SBN 201997)	Environmental & Natural Resources Division
17	ALLISON GOLDSMITH (SBN 238263)	SETH M. BARSKY, Chief
18	DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL	S. JAY GOVINDAN, Assistant Chief
10	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000	ETHAN EDDY (Cal. Bar. No. 237214)
19	San Francisco, CA 94102-7004	Trial Attorney
20	Telephone: (415) 703-5511	ROBERT P. WILLIAMS (DC Bar No.
20	Facsimile: (415) 703-5480	474730)
21	A C Di ' .: CC' I	Trial Attorney
21	Attorneys for Plaintiff in Intervention	United States Department of Justice Wildlife and Marine Resources Section
22	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF	
22	WATER RESOURCES	Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7369 Washington, D.C. 20044-7369
23		Telephone: (202) 305-0210
24		Facsimile: (202) 305-0275
27		Attorneys for FEDERAL DEFENDANTS
25		Adomeys for rederal Derempants
2.5		
26		
27		
21		
28		
Diepenbrock		- 9 -
F		

STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

ELKIN LLP

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	KATHERINE POOLE (SBN 195010) DOUG OBEGI (SBN 246127) Natural Resources Defense Council 111 Sutter St., 20 th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 875-6100 Facsimile: (415) 875-6161 Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenor NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL	TRENT W. ORR (SBN 77656) GEORGE M. TORGUN (SBN 222085) Earthjustice 426 17 th Street, 5 th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 550-6725 Facsimile: (510) 550-6749 Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenors NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; THE BAY INSTITUTE
8		
9		
10		
11		
12 13		
13		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		- 10 -
DIEPENBROCK ELKIN LLP	STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: EXHIBITS, WITNESSE	ES AND ORAL ARGUMENT FOR MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF