DOWNEYBRAND

David R.E. Aladjem daladjem@downeybrand.com 916.520.5361 Direct 916.520.5761 Fax

Kevin M. O'Brien kobrien@downeybrand.com 916.520.5235 Direct 916.520.5635 Fax Downey Brand LLP 621 Capitol Mall, 18th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814 916.444.1000 Main downeybrand.com

November 15, 2016

VIA EMAIL

State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Rights Attn: California WaterFix Hearing Team P.O. Box 2000 Sacramento, California 95812-2000 CWFhearing@waterboards.ca.gov

Re: Sacramento Valley Water Users' Proposal Regarding Part 1 Rebuttal Evidence and Submission of Closing Briefs

Dear Hearing Chair Doduc, Hearing Officer Marcus, and California WaterFix Hearing Staff:

The Sacramento Valley Water Users¹ ("SVWU") have submitted the testimony and exhibits in support of their cases in chief for Part 1 of the California WaterFix Hearing. Looking ahead to the next phases of this proceeding, the SVWU submits the following proposal regarding procedures for the presentation of rebuttal evidence and submission of closing briefs. We appreciate the Hearing Team's consideration of this proposal.

Part 1 Rebuttal Evidence

The Hearing Notice explains that the presentation of rebuttal evidence will be allowed after all parties have presented their cases-in chief and witnesses have been cross-examined. (Notice of Petition and Notice of Public Hearing for California WaterFix Project ("Notice"), October 30, 2015, at 35.) In the interest of an efficient and orderly proceeding, the SVWU request that the Hearing Team adopt the following procedures to govern the rebuttal phase of Part 1:

1. In light of the ongoing presentation of evidence by parties to the proceeding that will last through the end of this year and possibly into January 2017, presentation of rebuttal evidence should occur no earlier than 30 days after submission of all cases in chief. This will allow the parties time to coordinate preparation of rebuttal evidence and ensure that it is not repetitive.

¹ The SVWU is comprised of the protestants identified in Attachment 1.

- 2. Parties should simultaneously submit rebuttal evidence in writing prior to presentation of such evidence at the hearing. This will allow the parties time to review all rebuttal evidence and prepare cross-examination that is tailored to that evidence. Unlike the staggered approach used for presentation of cases in chief, the SVWU suggests that all parties simultaneously submit rebuttal evidence in the interest of timely and efficient proceedings.
- 3. At times during cross-examination, various parties marked documents for identification purposes only. If a party intends to offer such a document into the record and it was not included in that party's case in chief, then the party should be required to include that document in its submittal of rebuttal evidence. This will clarify the record as to what documents are being offered into the record and it will allow all parties to conduct cross examination regarding such new evidence or prepare and offer appropriate sur-rebuttal.
- 4. The admission of sur-rebuttal evidence that is directly responsive to evidence presented by any party during rebuttal should be considered on a case-by-case basis upon a showing of good cause.

Closing Briefs

The Notice explains that the hearing officers may allow for closing statements or legal briefs at the close of the hearing or at other times, if appropriate. (Notice, at 36.) It has been suggested that closing briefs be submitted at the end of Part 1. However, the SVWU request that closing statements and legal briefs not be filed until the end of Part 2, because the issues of Part 1 and Part 2 have intersected at times during the proceeding and will continue to do so through presentation of evidence during Part 2. For example, as the Notice acknowledges, issues arising out of the California Environmental Quality Act and Endangered Species Act processes that will not be completed prior to the completion of Part 1 may have a material bearing on Part 1 issues and those issues may be revisited in Part 2. (Notice, at 11.) In addition, the Hearing Team has clarified that the administrative record for the Board's decision will include all evidence admitted to evidence in Part 1 and Part 2 of the Hearing. Because the Board will be considering all evidence as it prepares its decision in this matter, the SVWU believe that closing briefs should be based on the entire record and submitted at an appropriate time after completion of Part 2. If discrete issues arise prior to the conclusion of Part 2, the Hearing Officers can direct parties to submit briefs as necessary.

State Water Resources Control Board November 15, 2016 Page 3

SVWU appreciates your consideration of these requests.

Very truly yours,

DOWNEY BRAND LLP

Ul for

David R.E. Aladjem Kevin M. O'Brien

SOMACH, SIMMONS & DUNN, PC

<u>/s/Andrew M. Hitchings</u> Andrew M. Hitchings <u>/s/ Kelley M. Taber</u> Kelley M. Taber <u>/s/Aaron A. Ferguson</u> Aaron A. Ferguson

BARTKIEWICZ, KRONICK & SHANAHAN

<u>/s/ Alan Lilly</u> Alan Lilly <u>/s/ Ryan Bezerra</u> Ryan Bezerra

MINASIAN, MEITH, SOARES, SEXTON & COOPER, LLP

<u>/s/Dustin C. Cooper</u> Dustin C. Cooper

STOEL RIVES LLP

<u>/s/ Wesley A. Miliband</u> Wesley A. Miliband

^{1463427.1} cc: CA WaterFix Service List

Attachment 1-Sacramento Valley Water Users

Northern California Water Association

Clients represented by Downey Brand LLP

Carter Mutual Water Company El Dorado Irrigation District El Dorado Water & Power Authority Howald Farms, Inc. Maxwell Irrigation District Natomas Central Mutual Water Company Meridian Farms Water Company Oji Brothers Farm, Inc. Oji Family Partnership Pelger Mutual Water Company Pleasant-Grove Verona Mutual Water Co. Princeton Codora-Glenn Irrigation District **Provident Irrigation District Reclamation District 108** Sacramento Municipal Utility District Henry D. Richter, et al. River Garden Farms Company South Sutter Water District Sutter Extension Water District Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Irrigation and Drainage Company Windswept Land and Livestock Company

<u>Clients represented by Somach Simmons & Dunn</u> Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Biggs-West Gridley Water District Sacramento County Water Agency Placer County Water Agency Carmichael Water District

Clients represented by Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan

City of Folsom City of Roseville San Juan Water District Sacramento Suburban Water District Yuba County Water Agency Clients represented by Minasian, Meith, Soares, Sexton & Cooper, LLP Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District Butte Water District Nevada Irrigation District Paradise Irrigation District Plumas Mutual Water Company Reclamation District No. 1004 Richvale Irrigation District South Feather Water & Power Agency Western Canal Water District

<u>Clients represented by Stoel Rives</u> City of Sacramento

STATEMENT OF SERVICE

CALIFORNIA WATERFIX PETITION HEARING Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Petitioners)

I hereby certify that I have this day submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board and caused a true and correct copy of the following document(s);

Letter dated 11/15/16 Re SVWU's Proposal Regarding Part 1 Rebuttal Evidence and Submission of Closing Briefs

to be served by Electronic Mail (email) upon the parties listed in Table 1 of the Current Service List for the California WaterFix Petition Hearing, dated November 15, 2016, posted by the State of Water Resources Control Board at

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/service_list.shtml:

Note: In the event that any emails to any parties on the Current Service List are undeliverable, you must attempt to effectuate service using another method of service, if necessary, and submit another statement of service that describes any changes to the date and method of service for those parties.

For Petitioners Only:

I caused a true and correct **hard** copy of the document(s) to be served by the following method of service to Suzanne Womack & Sheldon Moore, Clifton Court, L.P., 3619 Land Park Drive, Sacramento, CA 95818:

Method of Service:

I certify that the foregoing is true and correct and that this document was executed on November 15, 2016.

Signature: Milhanne Sine

Name: Catharine Irvine

Title: Legal Secretary

Party/Affiliation: Downey Brand, LLP

Address: 621 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814