

EXHIBIT 2

**Agenda for Regular Meeting
of the Antelope Valley Watermaster Board
Wednesday, August 23, 2017 – 10:00 a.m.**

**Location: Antelope Valley – East Kern Water Agency
6500 West Avenue N, Palmdale, CA 93551
Teleconference: (872) 240-3412 Access Code: 386-099-701**

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Robert Parris, AVEK Water Agency - Chairperson
Dennis Atkinson, Landowners – Vice Chairperson
Adam Ariki, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40
John Calandri, Landowners
Leo Thibault, Public Water Suppliers

Posted August 17, 2017 @ 4:30 pm By: Patricia Rose Patricia Rose, AVEK

Note: To comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, to participate in any Watermaster meeting please contact Patti Rose at 661-943-3201 at least 48 hours prior to a Watermaster meeting to inform us of your needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible.

AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order**
- 2) **Pledge of Allegiance**
- 3) **Roll Call**
- 4) **Adoption of Agenda.**
- 5) **Public comments for non-agenda items.** (This portion of the agenda allows an individual the opportunity to address the Board on any item regarding Watermaster business that is NOT ON THE AGENDA. Without acting or entering a dialogue with the public, Board members may ask clarifying questions about topics posed by the public. Your matter may be referred to the administrator and/or advisory committee.)
- 6) **Consent Agenda**
 - A. Payment of bills through August 18, 2017.
 - B. Approval of minutes of regular meeting held July 26, 2017.
 - C. Finance Report
 - D. Correspondences
- 7) **Advisory Committee Report**
- 8) **Action Items**
 - A. Discussion and possible action on appointment of Watermaster attorney.
(Tom Bunn)
 - B. Discussion and possible action on Resolution No. 17-06 being a Resolution of the Watermaster approving the New or Replacement Well Approval Application and Fee.
 - C. Discussion and possible action on publishing the proposed Meter Requirements for a period of 30 days and schedule the public hearing for September 27, 2017.

9) Engineer's Report – Phyllis Stanin

A. Update on Draft Memorandum's requested by the Board. (Information Only)

- (1) Administrative Assessment Rules and Regulations.
- (2) Framework of Water Storage Agreement.
- (3) Non-Overlyers starting rampdown number methodology.
- (4) Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services District regarding replacement water assessments.

10) Director/Staff Reports

A. Update on Interim Administrative Activities

- (1) Status update on Assessments and Production Reports.
- (2) Advisory Committee and Board Agenda Matrix.
- (3) Status on proposals for Financial Audit.
- (4) Update on Wendy's Water Truck Company issue.

11) Board Members Request for Future Agenda Items

12) Adjournment

AV Watermaster – Regular Meeting
August 23, 2017

Memorandum
Todd Groundwater
Pre-Rampdown Production



August 17, 2017

REVISED DRAFT MEMORANDUM

To: Dennis LaMoreaux, Chair
Antelope Valley Watermaster Advisory Committee

Robert Parris, Chair
Antelope Valley Watermaster Board of Directors

From: Phyllis Stanin, Vice President/Principal Geologist
Kate White, Senior Engineer
Watermaster Engineer

Re: Pre-Rampdown Production for Non-Overlying Producers and Other Producers

The Judgment does not include Pre-Rampdown Production for the Non-Overlying Producers (Exhibit 3 of the Judgment) or for the Federal, State, and City of Lancaster Producers. In addition, it does not define Pre-Rampdown Production for other Producers in the Judgment, such as the Supporting Landowner Parties (Paragraph VII, a through h, Statement of Decision).

A group of Public Water Suppliers¹ has proposed a methodology for developing Pre-Rampdown Production for the Exhibit 3 Producers based on average production for 2011 and 2012, as submitted to the Court during Phase IV of the trial. This methodology is consistent with that used for the quantification of Pre-Rampdown Production assigned to the Overlying Producers in Exhibit 4 of the Judgment.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide information to illustrate the application of this methodology to Exhibit 3 Producers and other parties that do not have a defined Pre-Rampdown Production in the Judgment. The memorandum is not a recommendation for application of the methodology, recognizing that this may require a legal determination. Rather, the information is provided to facilitate discussion by the Advisory Committee and determination by the Watermaster Board regarding potential assignment of Pre-Rampdown Production for these Producers. Relevant portions of the Judgment and production data related to this methodology are summarized below.

¹ Referred to as the Public Water Suppliers Steering Committee.

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE JUDGMENT

Pre-Rampdown Production is defined as *“The reasonable and beneficial use of Groundwater, excluding Imported Water Return Flows, at a time prior to this Judgment, or the Production Right, whichever is greater”* (§3.5.28).

Rampdown is defined as *“The period of time for Pre-Rampdown Production to be reduced to the Native Safe Yield in the manner described in this Judgment”* (§3.5.37).

The Judgment describes the rampdown period and process in Paragraph 8.3 as follows:

...During Years three through seven of the Rampdown Period, the amount that each Party may Produce from the Native Safe Yield will be progressively reduced, as necessary, in equal annual increments, from its Pre-Rampdown Production to its Production Right... (§8.3).

This definition may indicate that the Rampdown Period applies only to parties that are allocated a portion of the Native Safe Yield, which would include the Producers on Exhibits 3 and 4, as well as State Production Rights. Federal rights are not subject to Rampdown (see below). However, information is also provided herein on other Producers with rights to produce groundwater, including the City of Lancaster and the Supporting Landowner Parties.

Pre-Rampdown Production for each of the Overlying Producers is quantified on Exhibit 4. However, Exhibit 3 does not contain similar information on Pre-Rampdown Production for the Non-Overlying Producers.

The Judgment also does not define the Federal, State, or City of Lancaster Pre-Rampdown Production but does state that *“The Federal Reserved Water Right to Produce 7,600 acre-feet per Year is not subject to Rampdown or any reduction including Pro-Rata Reduction due to Overdraft”* (§5.1.4). The City of Lancaster can produce up to 500 AFY for reasonable and beneficial uses at its National Soccer Complex until recycled water becomes available (§5.1.7).

Finally, the Statement of Decision identifies eight parties with a right to produce groundwater, which were brought into the Judgment after the Physical Solution (Exhibit A) had been finalized (see Paragraph VII, *a* through *h*, Statement of Decision). Pre-Rampdown Production was not provided in the Statement of Decision.

METHODOLOGY FOR ESTABLISHING PRE-RAMPDOWN PRODUCTION FOR THE NON-OVERLYING PRODUCERS

A group of the Public Water Suppliers has recommended that Pre-Rampdown Production for those Parties listed on Exhibit 3 be defined as the average of their Production in the years 2011 and 2012, as submitted to the Court during Phase IV of the trial (filed July 19, 2013²). That document is attached to this memorandum for reference as **Attachment 1**. This methodology is consistent with the methodology used to define the Pre-Rampdown Production amounts for the Overlying Producers in Exhibit 4 of the Judgment.

Table 1 below contains the 2011/2012 average production using production data listed in the July 19, 2013 filing for the Non-Overlying Producers in Exhibit 3. For reference and context, **Table 1** also includes the Production Rights and 2016 Production. As suggested by the method, the 2011/2012 average would be used for the Pre-Rampdown Production Right. During Year 3 of the Rampdown Period (2018), this amount would be reduced in equal annual increments in years 3 through 7 of the Rampdown Period to reach the final Production Right.

² Amended Statement of Partial Decision for Phase IV Trial with Party Name Corrections, Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases, Superior Court of the State of California County of Los Angeles – Central District, July 19, 2013.

Table 1: Non-Overlying Producers 2011/2012 Average Production and Production Rights

Producer (Exhibit 3 of the Judgment)	Average 2011 and 2012 Production (AF)	Production Rights (AF)	2016 Total Groundwater Production (AF)
Boron Community Services District	230.50	50.00	193.74
California Water Service Company	631.50	343.14	358.10
Desert Lake Community Services District	42.75	73.53	0.00
Littlerock Creek Irrigation District	1,420.19	796.58	1,327.10
Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley	18,601.12	6,789.26	16,001.90
North Edwards Water District	102.92	49.02	75.57
Palm Ranch Irrigation District	1,230.50	465.69	1,198.00
Palmdale Water District	7,283.76	2,769.63	8,473.40
Quartz Hill Water District	1,479.35	563.73	1,793.60
Rosamond Community Services District	2,990.78	404.42	2,300.00
West Valley County Water District	Not listed in 7/19/13 filing	40.00	129.38

For Desert Lake CSD, the 2011 and 2012 average production amount (42.75 AF-yellow highlighted value in **Table 1**) is less than its Production Right and would not be applicable as a Pre-Rampdown Production Right; as such, its Production Right (73.53 AF) could be used for both its Pre-Rampdown Production. Average 2011 and 2012 production for West Valley County Water District was not listed in the Phase IV July 19, 2013 Court filing; accordingly, its Production Right (40 AF – see **Table 1**) could be used for its Pre-Rampdown Production, similar to Desert Lake CSD.

Table 2 lists the 2011/2012 average production for the Federal, State, and City of Lancaster Producers as contained in the July 19, 2013 filing. The table also provides each Production Right and 2016 Production, when available, for reference. The Federal water right is included in **Table 2** for completeness, but is not subject to Rampdown (§5.1.4 in the Judgment).

Table 2: Federal³, State, and City of Lancaster Production Rights and 2016 Production

Federal, State and City of Lancaster Rights	Average 2011 and 2012 Production (AF)	Production Rights or Rights to Produce Groundwater	2016 Total Groundwater Production (AF)
Federal Reserved Water Right	Not subject to Rampdown	7,600.00	1,094.01
State of California (207 AF total) from:			
Department of Water Resources	54.05	104.00	Not Reported
Department of Parks and Recreation	1.44	9.00	Not Reported
Department of Transportation	15.56	47.00	Not Reported
State Lands Commission	0.00	3.00	Not Reported
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	0.00	3.00	Not Reported
50th District Agricultural Association	0.00	32.00	Not Reported
Department of Veteran Affairs	0.00	3.00	Not Reported
Highway Patrol	0.00	3.00	Not Reported
Department of Military	0.00	3.00	Not Reported
City of Lancaster	506.63	500.00	558.00

The average 2011/2012 production totals for the various State Departments (yellow highlighted values in **Table 2**) are less than the corresponding Production Rights. Therefore, the respective Department Production Right could be designated as the Pre-Rampdown Production. For the City of Lancaster, the 2011/2012 average production could be used as its Pre-Rampdown Production, consistent with the methodology for parties in **Table 1**, if Rampdown applies to the City of Lancaster production.

³ 2016 production based on final data received 8-10-2017.

In summary, Pre-Rampdown Production could be established for Producers in the Judgment, if applicable to Rampdown reductions, using the following criteria:

1. **Average 2011/2012 Production is greater than the Production Right.** The average would be used as the Pre-Rampdown Production amount. From 2018 through 2022, the Pre-Rampdown Production would be reduced in equal increments each year to reach the Production Right.
2. **Average 2011/2012 is less than or equal to the Production Right.** Pre-Rampdown Production is defined as the Production Right and held constant during the rampdown period (2016-2022).

SUPPORTING LANDOWNER PARTIES

Additional rights to produce groundwater are assigned to the Supporting Landowner Parties as identified in the Statement of Decision (§VII, *a* through *h*). These parties are listed in **Table 3** below, along with each respective right.

Table 3: Supporting Landowner Parties and Rights to Produce Groundwater

Supporting Landowner Parties in Statement of Decision	Rights to Produce Groundwater (AFY)
Desert Breeze MHP, LLC	18.1
Milana VII, LLC dba Rosamond Mobile Home Park	21.7
Reesdale Mutual Water Company	23
Juanita Eyherabide, Eyherabide Land Co., LLC and Eyherabide Sheep Company	12
Clan Keith Real Estate Investments, LLC dba Leisure Lake Mobile Estates	64
White Fence Farms Mutual Water Company No. 3	4
LV Ritter Ranch, LLC	0
Robar Enterprises, Inc., HI-Grade Materials, Co., and CJR, a General Partnership	200

These Parties were not included in Phase IV of the trial (filed July 19, 2013) and, as such, average production for 2011 and 2012 is not available in that document (**Attachment 1**). In addition, 2016 production for these parties was not reported. Pre-Rampdown for the Supporting Landowners could be based on either the rights to produce groundwater from the Judgment or average 2011/2012 production if available (or some other average historical production). We are working with Administrative Staff to obtain 2016 production amounts and other input from the Supporting Landowner Parties.

ATTACHMENT 1: Amended Statement of Partial Decision for Phase IV Trial with Party Name Corrections, July 19, 2013.

LAW OFFICES OF
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612

1 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665
2 JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926
STEFANIE MORRIS, Bar No. 239787
3 18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612
4 TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600
TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972
5 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant
LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS
6 DISTRICT NO. 40

EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES
UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION
6103

CONFORMED COPY
OF ORIGINAL FILED
Los Angeles Superior Court

JUL 19 2013

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
By Amber Hayes, Deputy

7 OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
8 JOHN F. KRATTLI, Bar No. 82149
COUNTY COUNSEL
9 WARREN WELLEN, Bar No. 139152
PRINCIPAL DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL
10 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
11 TELEPHONE: (213) 974-8407
TELECOPIER: (213) 687-7337

12 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES
13 COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT

17 ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER
18 CASES
19 Included Actions:
Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.
20 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of
California, County of Los Angeles, Case No.
BC 325201;
21 Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.
22 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of
California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-
23 CV-254-348;
24 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of
Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of
25 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale
Water Dist., Superior Court of California,
26 County of Riverside, Case Nos. RIC 353 840,
RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668
27

Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408

CLASS ACTION

Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar

**AMENDED [PROPOSED]
STATEMENT OF PARTIAL DECISION
FOR PHASE IV TRIAL WITH PARTY
NAME CORRECTIONS**

28 AMENDED [PROPOSED] STATEMENT OF PARTIAL DECISION FOR PHASE IV TRIAL WITH PARTY NAME
CORRECTIONS

LAW OFFICES OF
 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
 18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612

1 The Phase IV trial began on May 28, 2013, in Department 322 of this Court. Over the
 2 course of three days, the parties who participated in the Phase IV trial, with the exception of the
 3 Wood Class, presented evidence of their respective groundwater pumping during 2011 and 2012.
 4 The matter having been submitted, the court now renders its finding of facts in this Phase IV
 5 statement of decision.

6 **FINDING OF FACTS**

7 Based on the evidence submitted by the parties who participated in Phase IV, the court
 8 finds that the following amounts of groundwater were pumped from the Antelope Valley
 9 Groundwater Adjudication Area during 2011 and 2012 by the following parties:

CLAIMANT	2011 Pumping (acre-feet)	2012 Pumping (acre-feet)
Adams Bennett Investments, LLC	0	0
Antelope Park Mutual Water Company	244.7	172.8
Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District	65.94	71.74
Antelope Valley Water Storage LLC	1198	2281
Aqua J Mutual Water Company	42.5	47.3
AV Solar Ranch I, LLC	129	147
AVEK	11463	2792
Averydale Mutual Water Company	247.9	268
Baxter Mutual Water Company	44.9	44.6
Big Rock Mutual Water Company	0	0
Billie and Randall Dickey	0	0
Bleich Flat Mutual Water Company	21.9	24.8
Blum Trust	0	0
Bolthouse Properties LLC/Farms	16720.22	16891.55
Boron Community Service District	228	233
Burrows/300 A40 H LLC	100	100
California Water Service Co.	623	640
City of Lancaster	489.68	523
City of Los Angeles, Department of Airports	5156	4531
Colorado Mutual Water Company	24.1	27.7
Copa De Oro Land Company	0	0
County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles #14 and 20	575	551

LAW OFFICES OF
 BEST, BEST & KRIEGER LLP
 18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Craig Van Dam	55	57
Crystal Organic LLC	1591.769	1986.096
Del Sur Ranch LLC	0	0
Desert Lake Community Services District	58	27.49
Diamond Farming Co, LLC	1641.285	1491.989
Donna and Lee Wilson	10	10
Efren Chavez	25.7	25.7
Eldorado Mutual Water Company	272	280.1
eSolar Inc.; Red Dawn Suntower LLC	0	0
eSolar Inc.; Tumbleweed Suntower LLC	0	0
eSolar, Inc.; Sierra Sun Tower, LLC	5.76	5.76
Evergreen Mutual Water Company	66.4	72.6
Frank and Yvonne Lane 1993 Family Trust, Little Rock Sand and Gravel, Inc., George and Charlene Lane Family Trust [Does not include water pumped on land leased to Granite Construction]	1356	948
Gailen and Julie Kyle, R & M Ranch	9108	9442
Gary Van Dam, Gertrude Van Dam, Delmar Van Dam	9840	10023
Gene Bahlman	5.25	5.25
Gorrindo Resourceful LLC	624	0
Granite Construction Company (Little Rock Sand and Gravel, Inc.)	400	400
Grimmway Enterprises, Inc.	0	0
H & N Development Co. West Inc.	1695.25	1904.25
Jane Healy and Healy Enterprises Inc.	0	0
Jeffrey and Nancee Siebert	200	200
John and Adrienne Reca	519.5	483.4
John Calandri, B.J. Calandri, Sunrise Farms	4091	3515
Jose Maritorena, Marie Maritorena, Jean Maritorena, Maritorena Farms, the Jose Maritorena Living Trust	3624.8	3976.3
Juniper Hills Water Group	18	18
Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40	16583.24	20618.99
Land Projects Mutual Water Company	621	624
Landale Mutual Water Company	139.7	175.8
Landinv Inc	1212	862.14
Lapis Land Co., LLC	0	0
Laura Griffin	1170	1170
Lawrence J. Schilling and the L&M Schilling 1992 Family Trust	3.4	3.8

LAW OFFICES OF
 BEST BEST & KRUEGER LLP
 18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612

1	Littlerock Creek Irrigation District	1367	1473.37
2	Littlerock Aggregate Co., Inc., Holliday Rock Co., Inc.	145	166
3	Llano Del Rio Water Company	598.2	547.1
4	Llano Mutual Water Company	0	0
5	Mabel Selak	0	0
6	Miracle Improvement Corp. (Golden Sands Mobile Home Park)	46.7	44.1
7	Nebeker Ranch	63	111
8	North Edwards Water District	104.52	101.32
9	Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation	1.5	1
10	NRG Solar Alpine, LLC	1.49	126.92
11	Palm Ranch Irrigation District	916	1545
12	Palmdale Water District	7024.67	7542.85
13	Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services District	1053.14	1035.26
14	Quartz Hill Water District	1433.8	1524.9
15	Richard Miner	930.8	1248
16	Richard Nelson, Willow Springs Co.	168.2	193.1
17	Rosamond Community Services District	2994	2987.56
18	Rosamond Ranch LLP	1	1
19	Sahara Nursery	25.37	18.98
20	Sal and Connie Cardile	0.712	0.712
21	Service Rock Products, L.P.	561	445
22	SGS Antelope Valley Development, LLC	0	0
23	Shadow Acres Mutual Water Company	55.7	49.5
24	Sheep Creek Water Co.	0	0
25	Southern California Edison Company	30.49	5
26	St. Andrews Abbey	149	201
27	State of California – Department of Military California Highway Patrol 50th District Agricultural Association Department of Veteran Affairs Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation State Lands Commission	0	0
28	State of California Department of Transportation	15.47	15.64
	State of California Department of Water Resources	54.05	54.05
	State of California Department of Parks and Recreation	1.58	1.3
	Steve Godde and Forrest G. Godde 1998 Trust	1299	1624

1	Sundale Mutual Water Company	430.7	457.8
2	Sunnyside Mutual Water Company	73.5	77.3
3	Tejon Ranchcorp and Tejon Ranch Company	1603	2770
4	Terry Munz	5	5
5	Thomas Bookman	236.6	308.4
6	Tierra Bonita Mutual Water Company	43	38.5
7	Tierra Bonita Ranch	607	403
8	Triple M Property Co.	1	1
9	U.S. Borax	924	1146
10	United States: Edwards AFB and Plant 42	1246.09	1450.59
11	Vulcan Materials Co., Vulcan Lands Inc., Consolidated Rock Products Co., Calmat Land Co., and Allied Concrete & Materials	634.91	403.29
12	WAGAS Land Company LLC	951.5	1016.8
13	WDS California II, LLC	2244	2550
14	West Side Park Mutual Water Company	294	267.5
15	White Fence Farms Mutual Water Company	782.8	783.3
16	Totals	121,429.39	120,415.30

17 All parties who participated in the Phase IV trial, with the exception of the Wood Class,
 18 have also stipulated to the above amounts of groundwater pumped. A copy of the stipulation is
 19 attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Notwithstanding the stipulation, the court finds that the evidence
 20 presented during the Phase IV trial supports each party's 2011 and 2012 groundwater production
 21 amount as stated herein.

22 **GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**

23 During the Phase IV trial, the Public Water Suppliers indicated that they dispute the
 24 amount of groundwater pumped by Granite Construction Company ("Granite") at its Littlerock
 25 Quarry. In response, Granite agreed to install a meter for each of its wells at its Littlerock Quarry
 26 within 30 days after the Phase IV trial to measure groundwater pumping for a period of one year.
 27 At the conclusion of the one year period Granite and the Public Water Suppliers will compare the
 28 meter readings against Granite's 2011 and 2012 product volumes to estimate Granite's
 groundwater use in 2011 and 2012, and report the findings to the court if such findings differ
 materially from 400 acre-feet per year. For that reason, the court reserves jurisdiction to amend
 this decision based on the meter readings as to the amount of groundwater pumped by Granite in

LAW OFFICES OF
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92612

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2011 and 2012. In the meantime, the agreement of the parties and the finding of the court is that Granite Construction is deemed to have pumped 400 acre feet of groundwater in 2011 and 2012, respectively.

THE WOOD CLASS

During the Phase IV trial, the Court-appointed expert had not completed its analysis of groundwater pumping by the Wood Class. It did not present any evidence in the Phase IV trial. Consequently, the Court defers the determination of the Wood Class groundwater pumping in 2011 and 2012 to a later time to be determined.

Dated: 6-29-13



JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT