

1 JOHN HERRICK, ESQ. – SBN 139125
2 LAW OFFICE OF JOHN HERRICK
3 4255 Pacific Avenue, Suite 2
4 Stockton, California 95207
5 Telephone: (209) 956-0150
6 Facsimile: (209) 956-0154

7 S. DEAN RUIZ, ESQ. – SBN 213515
8 MOHAN, HARRIS, RUIZ,
9 WORTMANN, PERISHO & RUBINO, LLP
10 3439 Brookside Rd. Ste. 208
11 Stockton, California 95219
12 Telephone: (209) 957-0660
13 Facsimile: (209) 957-0595
14 dean@mohanlaw.net

15 On behalf of South Delta Water Agency,
16 Central Delta Water Agency, Lafayette Ranch,
17 Heritage Lands, Mark Bachetti Farms
18 and Rudy Mussi Investments L.P.

19 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

20 **STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**

21 Hearing in the Matter of California
22 Department of Water Resources and
23 United States Department of the Interior,
24 Bureau of Reclamation Request for a
25 Change in Point of Diversion for
26 California Water Fix

27 **PROTESTANTS SOUTH DELTA WATER**
28 **AGENCY, CENTRAL DELTA WATER**
AGENCY, LAFAYETTE RANCH,
HERITAGE LANDS, MARK BACHETTI
FARMS AND RUDY MUSSI
INVESTMENTS L.P.'S JOINDER IN SAVE
THE CALIFORNIA DELTA ALLIANCE,
ET AL.'S MOTION TO CONTINUE THE
COMMENCEMENT OF PART 2 OF THE
HEARING

1 Protestants South Delta Water Agency, Central Delta Water Agency, Lafayette Ranch,
2 Heritage Lands, Mark Bachetti Farms and Rudy Mussi Investments L.P., (“SDWA Parties”)
3 hereby join the motion submitted by Save the California Delta Alliance, et al. seeking a
4 continuance of the commencement of Part 2 of the California WaterFix proceedings. The
5 SDWA Parties hereby incorporate all documents, evidence and materials submitted by the
6 Save the California Delta Alliance, et al. in support of its motions.

7 The Response filed on behalf of the Hearing Team to the motions filed by Save the
8 California Delta Alliance and Sacramento County is dismissive and unsatisfactory. Brazenly
9 improper ex parte communications occurred between DWR and members of the Hearing Team
10 on several occasions. A ninety day continuance of the commencement of the hearings would
11 appear to be the least of Petitioners’ concerns. It would be highly improper and inefficient to
12 proceed with the hearings as scheduled as it will take at least ninety days to determine exactly
13 what effect the currently known ex parte communications had on Part 1 of the hearing.

14
15 Respectfully submitted,

16
17 Date: January 24, 2018

18 **MOHAN, HARRIS, RUIZ,**
19 **WORTMANN, PERISHO & RUBINO, LLP**

20
21 By: 
22 S. DEAN RUIZ, ESQ.