1 2 3 4	PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY Daniel Kelly (SBN 215051) 144 Ferguson Road P.O. Box 6570 Auburn, CA 95604 Telephone: (530) 823-4850 dkelly@pcwa.net
5 6 7 8 9 10	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN A Professional Corporation Kelley M. Taber (SBN 184348) 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 446-7979 Facsimile: (916) 446-8199 ktaber@somachlaw.com  Attorneys for PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY
12	BEFORE THE
13	CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
14	
15	HEARING ON THE MATTER OF . THE PLACER COUNTY WATER
16	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND UNITED STATES LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER ALITHOPHY AND WEST AND
17	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REQUEST AUTHORITY AND WESTLANDS FOR A CHANGE IN POINT OF DIVERSION FOR CAI IFORNIA WATER FIX.  AUTHORITY AND WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT'S OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS SUBMITTED FOR
18	FOR CALIFORNIA WATER FIX.  TO EXHIBITS SUBMITTED FOR ADMISSION INTO EVIDENCE BY GROUPS 7 AND 9 AT THE CLOSE
19	OF THEIR PART 1B CASE IN CHIEF
20	
21	I. INTRODUCTION
22	The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) respectfully requests that the State
23	Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) overrule San Luis & Delta-Mendota
24	Water Authority (SLDMWA) and Westlands Water District's (Westlands) objections to the
25	admission of Exhibit PCWA-071. (Objections to Exhibit). This exhibit constitutes a
26	summary of written testimony submitted by PCWA witness, Einar Maisch. SLDMWA
27	and Westlands fail to identify the statements in this summary upon which their
28	Objections to Exhibit are based.

# 1 2

#### A.

# 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

#### 11. DISCUSSION

#### Standard of Review

This hearing is governed by chapter 4.5 of the Administrative Procedure Act. (Gov. Code, § 11400 et seq.); regulations adopted by the State Water Board (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, § 648-648.8); sections 801 to 805 of the Evidence Code; and section 11513 of the Government Code. (Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 23, § 648(b).) The State Water Board is not required to conduct adjudicative hearings according to the technical rules of evidence applicable to a court. (Gov. Code, § 11513(c).) Instead, "[a]ny relevant evidence shall be admitted if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule which might make improper the admission of evidence over objection in civil actions." (*Ibid.*)

Specifically, "[h]earsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence but over timely objection shall not be sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objections in civil actions." (Gov. Code, § 11513(d); see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 648.5.1 ["Hearsay evidence is admissible subject to the provisions of Government Code section 11513."].) The State Water Board follows these relaxed standards because the Hearing Officers' expertise in the subject matter justifies the State Water Board's ability to make both legal and factual determinations.

#### B. PCWA's Summary of Witness Testimony Should Be Admitted

SLDMWA and Westlands' objections to the admission of PCWA's summary of witness testimony are vague, without merit, and should be overruled.

First, SLDMWA and Westlands fail to identify any statements in the document to which they object. (See Objections to Exhibits at p. 3:4-7.) SLDMWA and Westlands object to this exhibit on the grounds that it includes "statements that were made other than by witnesses while testifying during the California WaterFix change petition hearing . . . . " (Objections to Exhibits at p. 4:4-5.) An objection, however, must identify 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the nature of the evidence and the basis for requesting exclusion. (People v. Hayes (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1211, 1261.) A general evidentiary objection like the one offered by SLDMWA and Westlands is not sufficient to exclude evidence "without specific identification of the evidence to which the party objects and the reason for that objection." (State Water Board Order WR 2012-0012 at p. 11, fn. 28.) SLDMWA and Westlands have simply objected to the exhibit because it includes "statements" without identifying the statements to which they object. In this respect, the Objections to Exhibit are vague, and for this reason alone, should be overruled.

Second, the objections should be overruled because the exhibit is relevant. Again, any relevant evidence should be admitted if it is the sort of evidence relied upon in the conduct of serious affairs, despite any rule which might otherwise make the evidence inadmissible in civil actions. (Gov. Code, § 11513(c).) PCWA's witness -Einar Maisch - prepared a PowerPoint presentation summarizing his written direct testimony, as required by the State Water Board in its January 15, 2016 letter and February 11, 2016 Pre-Hearing Conference Ruling. This summary is relevant to the proceeding because it was prepared in response to the Hearing Officers' request in order to provide for the efficient presentation of evidence. Further, PowerPoint presentations are commonly used at State Water Board hearings to summarize lengthy written testimony. Thus, this exhibit is relevant and the Objections to Exhibit should be overruled on this ground alone.

Even if this summary of testimony could be considered hearsay, it is otherwise admissible because it explains other evidence – i.e., Mr. Maisch's written testimony.

23 /// 24 ///

25 /// 26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

# SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN A Professional Corporation

#### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, PCWA respectfully requests that the State Water Board overrule SLDMWA and Westlands' objections to Exhibits PCWA-071, and admit this document into evidence.

SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN A Professional Corporation

DATED: January 6, 2017

Kelley M. Taber

Attorneys for Placer County Water

Agency

#### 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):

### THE PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY'S RESPONSE TO SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY AND WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT'S OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS SUBMITTED FOR ADMISSION INTO EVIDENCE BY GROUPS 7 AND 9 AT THE CLOSE OF THEIR PART 1B CASE IN CHIEF

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 Water Resources Control Board at

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water issues/programs/bay delta/california waterfix/service 1 ist.shtml:

I certify that the foregoing is true and correct and that this document was executed on January 6, 2017.

Breces

Signature:

Name:

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

Legal Secretary Title:

Party/Affiliation: Placer County Water Agency

500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000 Address: Sacramento, CA 95814

Michelle Brach