

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

NOV 15 2018

Sherril R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: Roxanne Arraiga, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY,
et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF COMPTON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C506806 [Related to C786656]

(Assigned to the Honorable Kenneth R.
Freeman – Department 14)

**MODIFIED ~~RECEIVED~~ ORDER
GRANTING AMENDMENT TO THE
JUDGMENT**

[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion
and Motion; Memorandum of Points and
Authorities; Declaration of Theodore A.
Johnson; and Request for Judicial Notice]

Date: November 15, 2018
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Dept.: 14

Action Filed: 7/21/1945

RECEIVED
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

OCT 26 2018

S. DREW

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER

2
3 The Motion of Intervenor Water Replenishment District of Southern California ("WRD") to
4 Amend Judgment ("Motion") came on for hearing on November 15, 2018, in Department 14 of the
5 Los Angeles Superior Court, the Honorable Kenneth R. Freeman, Judge presiding. Appearances
6 were made by parties through their respective counsel of record.

7 After considering all the papers filed in connection with the Motion and hearing oral
8 argument, this Court, finding good cause therefore, HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

9 That the Amended Judgment entered on December 5, 2014 in *California Water Service*
10 *Company, et al. v. City of Compton, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. C506806, be
11 amended to add new Paragraph V.15, which shall read as follows:

12 **15. Extraction Exemption**

13 In recognition of existing seawater intrusion into Basin groundwater supplies, extractions of
14 groundwater shall be permitted by certain entities without an Adjudicated Right to produce
15 groundwater within the Basin so long as each of the following criteria are satisfied:

16 1. Only groundwater containing at least 500 milligrams/liter of chloride, as measured at
17 the influent to any facility used to treat such water, may be extracted;

18 2. Extractions must be done by a public agency with statutory authority to clean
19 contaminated groundwater;

20 3. Extractions of such groundwater must provide a Regional Benefit to the Basin as a
21 whole and not just to the extracting party;

22 4. All extractions pursuant to this Paragraph V.15 are subject to payment of the
23 Replenishment Assessment.

24 5. All new projects that seek to extract groundwater pursuant to this Paragraph V. 15
25 shall be reviewed and approved by the following entities: (1) the Water Rights Panel and (2) WRD
26 in its capacity as the Watermaster Administrative Body. Those entities shall review such projects
27 using the procedures generally described in the following subsections of Paragraph V.13.B:
28 subsections (2), (6), (8), and (9); the second and third sentences of subsection (1); the first sentence

1 of subsection (4); and the last sentence of subsection (7). The findings of the Water Rights Panel
2 and WRD in its capacity as the Watermaster Administrative Body shall include a determination that
3 the project is Technically Feasible and will not cause Material Physical Harm. Any new project that
4 would be carried out by WRD pursuant to this Paragraph V.15 would not constitute a conflict of
5 interest within the meaning of Paragraph V.13.B (8) as to WRD's role as Watermaster
6 Administrative Body.

7 Any extractions pursuant to this amendment shall be reported on at least an annual basis to:
8 (1) WRD in its capacity as the Watermaster Administrative Body and (2) the Water Rights Panel.
9 Such report shall include discussion of each of the criteria contained in this Paragraph V.15.

10
11 Dated: NOV 15 2018, 2018

KENNETH R. FREEMAN

Honorable Kenneth R. Freeman
Judge of the Superior Court

