# 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, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor Sacramento, CA 95814 916.444.1000 Main downeybrand.com

September 22, 2017

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' Proposed Prehearing Conference Topics

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

The Sacramento Valley Water Users<sup>1</sup> ("SVWU") suggest the following agenda topics for the pre-hearing conference to take place on October 19, 2017.

1. Scope of Cases in Chief. The October 30, 2015 Notice of Public Hearing explains that rebuttal evidence is "limited to evidence that is responsive to evidence presented in connection with another party's case-in-chief, and it does not include evidence that should have been presented during the case-in-chief of the party submitting rebuttal evidence." (Notice, at 36 (emphasis added).) As highlighted by recent submittals regarding the request to stagger the submittal of cases-in-chief and to strike the September 8 letter submitted by Petitioners, it will not be clear what operational criteria or modeling assumptions Petitioners will rely on during Part 2 at least until they submit their cases-in-chief. Because Petitioners have been so vague about how California WaterFix actually would operate, it will be necessary for the Hearing Officers to clearly indicate - as soon as possible, even before October 19 - what Part 2 evidence must be presented in cases-in-chief and what may be presented as rebuttal. Accordingly, the prehearing conference should address how the Hearing Officers plan to handle rebuttal based on whatever operating criteria Petitioners apply in their cases-in-chief, so that the rule that rebuttal may not include "evidence that should have been presented during the casein-chief of the party submitting rebuttal evidence" does not generate confusion and excessive evidentiary disputes in Part 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The SVWU is comprised of the protestants identified in Attachment 1.

State Water Resources Control Board September 22, 2017 Page 2

2. Revisiting Part 1 Issues. The October 30, 2015 Notice of Public Hearing also explained that Part 1 issues may be revisited during Part 2 if significant issues arise out of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Endangered Species Act (ESA) and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) processes that have a material bearing on Part 1 issues. (Notice, at 11.) The July 27, 2017 order denying the SVWU's request to hold Part 1 open made several general statements about how water-supply issues arising from the CEQA, ESA and CESA documents might be handled in this hearing. That ruling states that "it would be more efficient to address this issue based on all of the information that is presented in Part 2," that "we have considered whether to revisit Part 1 issues based on evidence presented in Part 2, "that "[f]or the time being, the scope of Part 2 remains unchanged" and that "[a]fter evidence is presented that is relevant to Part 2 issues, we will determine whether to allow additional evidence to be presented that is relevant to Part 1 issues." (July 27, 2017 Ruling, at 2.) These statements make it unclear whether protestants must submit water-supply evidence based on California WaterFix as modified by the CEQA, ESA and CESA documents as Part 2 case-in-chief testimony or can do so later in Part 2 or in a proceeding following Part 2. In order to satisfy due process, protestants must have an adequate opportunity to present water-supply testimony based on what California WaterFix actually is following the issuance of the CEQA, ESA and CESA documents. The pre-hearing conference should address the process by which any additional Part 1 evidence should be submitted during this hearing. At this time, the SVWU propose that the SWRCB confirm that it will consider such evidence following presentation of Part 2 evidence in cases-in-chief and rebuttal so that the SWRCB can efficiently consider Part 2 evidence before revisiting Part 1 issues.

We appreciate the opportunity to suggest these topics and to participate in a pre-hearing conference in advance of Part 2.

Very truly yours,

DOWNEY BRAND LLP

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

State Water Resources Control Board September 22, 2017 Page 3

### SOMACH, SIMMONS & DUNN, PC

/s/Andrew M. Hitchings/s/ Kelley M. TaberAndrew M. HitchingsKelley M. Taber

/s/Aaron A. Ferguson Aaron A. Ferguson

# BARTKIEWICZ, KRONICK & SHANAHAN

/s/ Alan Lilly Alan Lilly

/s/ Ryan Bezerra Ryan Bezerra

# MINASIAN, MEITH, SOARES, SEXTON & COOPER, LLP

/s/ Dustin C. Cooper Dustin C. Cooper

# STOEL RIVES LLP

/s/ Wesley A. Miliband Wesley A. Miliband

cc: CA WaterFix Service List 1495384.1

#### Attachment 1

Sacramento Valley Group 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

Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority Colusa County Water District **Corning Water District** Cortina Water District **Davis Water District** Dunnigan Water District 4M Water District Glide Water District Holthouse Water District Kanawha Water District Kirkwood Water District La Grande Water District **Orland-Artois Water District** Proberta Water District Thomas Creek Water District Westside Water District Glenn Valley Water District Myers-Marsh Mutual Water Company North Delta Water Agency North Delta Water Agency RD 999 RD 2060 RD 2068

Delta Flood Control Group Brannan-Andrus Levee Maintenance District RD 407 RD 317 RD 551 RD 105 RD 563 RD 2067 RD 2098 RD 800 (Byron Tract)

City of Brentwood

## 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:

Letter dated 9/22/2017 Re: Sacramento Valley Water Users' Proposed Prehearing Conference Topics

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 September 12, 2017, 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 September 22, 2017.

Signature:

Name: Catharine Irvine

Title: Legal Secretary

Party/Affiliation: Downey Brand, LLP

Address: 621 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814