

---

## State Water Resources Control Board

### NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF PUBLIC HEARING

The State Water Resources Control Board  
will hold a Public Hearing on the

**Proposed Revocation of License 659 (Application 553)  
of The Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
Millard Canyon in Riverside County**

The Public Hearing listed above,  
originally scheduled to commence on October 14, 2003,  
postponed on September 10, 2003,  
rescheduled to commence on April 30, 2004, and  
postponed on May 13, 2004,  
has been rescheduled to commence

on

**Wednesday, April 25, 2012**  
**at 9:00 a.m.**

and continuing, if necessary, on  
**Thursday, April 26, 2012**

in the Coastal Hearing Room  
Joe Serna, Jr.-Cal/EPA Building  
1001 I Street, Second Floor  
Sacramento, CA

---

### **PURPOSE OF HEARING**

The purpose of this hearing is for the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board or Board) to receive evidence relevant to determining whether water right License 659 (Application 553) of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Morongo Band) should be revoked for failure to apply the authorized water to beneficial use as contemplated in the license in accordance with the State Water Code.

## **BACKGROUND**

Southern Pacific Land Company filed Application 553 on January 3, 1917. The State Department of Public Works, Division of Water Rights, predecessor to the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights (Division) issued License 659 to the company on January 31, 1928. The license authorizes the licensee to directly divert 0.16 cubic foot of water per second (cfs) from springs arising in Millard Canyon<sup>1</sup>, on a year-round basis, for the purpose of irrigation of 13 acres.

The Steele Foundation Arizona Corporation acquired the license in 1958 and then transferred it to Ferydoun Ahadpour and Doris Ahadpour. On July 9, 2001, the Division received notice of assignment of the license to Great Spring Waters of America, Inc. On May 15, 2003, the Division received notice of assignment of the license to the Morongo Band.

## **Procedural History**

Water Code section 1675 provides that the State Water Board may revoke a license if the licensee has ceased to put water to beneficial use as required by the Water Code or if the licensee has not complied with any of the terms and conditions of the license. Under Water Code section 1241, a water right permit or license may be forfeited if water is not beneficially used for a five-year period under the permit or license. Until 1980, section 1241 provided for a statutory forfeiture period of three years. Section 1241 was amended in 1980 to provide for a five-year forfeiture period.

On April 28, 2003, the Division issued a Notice of Proposed Revocation for License 659. The Division proposed to revoke the license on the basis that the licensee had not applied water to beneficial use for at least five consecutive years. The Notice of Proposed Revocation also alleged that the licensee had failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the license. The notice described Reports of Licensee in which the licensee reported using water to irrigate more than the 13 acres authorized under the license and using water for purposes other than irrigation. By letter dated May 9, 2003, the licensee requested a hearing on the proposed revocation.

On August 25, 2003, the State Water Board originally scheduled a hearing to commence on October 14, 2003. The originally scheduled hearing was postponed on September 10, 2003, rescheduled to commence on April 30, 2004, and postponed on May 13, 2004.

---

<sup>1</sup> Millard Creek is tributary to the Whitewater River. The rights of various claimants to use water from the Whitewater River and its tributaries have been adjudicated. The Riverside County Superior Court entered a decree, which determined the rights of the various claimants, on December 9, 1938. (*In the Matter of the Determination of the Relative Rights, Based upon Prior Appropriation, of the Various Claimants to the Waters of the Whitewater River and its Tributaries, in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California* (Super. Ct. Riverside County, 1938, [No. 18035](#))). The decree confirmed Southern Pacific Land Company's appropriative right to divert under License 659, and its adjudicated right to divert 0.12 cfs year-round from the same source with a priority of January 1, 1877.

A copy of the Notice of Proposed Revocation and other related hearing material can be reviewed at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/hearings/morongo\\_mission\\_indians/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/hearings/morongo_mission_indians/)

### **Related Litigation**

On July 22, 2004, the State Water Board adopted water right order [WRO 2004-0034](#). That order denied Morongo Band's request for reconsideration of a hearing officer's ruling which denied Morongo Band's petition to disqualify the State Water Board's enforcement team from participation in the scheduled water right hearing. Morongo Band filed a petition in Superior Court for a writ of mandate alleging that the State Water Board had violated its due process rights by denying its petition to disqualify the enforcement team. The trial court found that the State Water Board's attorney assigned to the enforcement team should be disqualified from serving on the enforcement team and the Court of Appeal affirmed that decision. The State Water Board petitioned the California Supreme Court to review the case.

In *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (2009) 45 Cal.4th 731, the California Supreme Court considered whether the constitutional rights of a water license holder were violated by the agency attorney prosecuting the revocation of the license holder's license before the State Water Board while simultaneously serving as an advisor to that Board in an unrelated matter. The Supreme Court held that internal, case-by-case separations of functions will typically satisfy due process. "In the absence of financial or other personal interest, and when rules mandating an agency's internal separation of functions and prohibiting ex parte communications are observed, the presumption of impartiality can be overcome only by specific evidence demonstrating actual bias or a particular combination of circumstances creating an unacceptable risk of bias." (*Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*, *supra*, 45 Cal.4th at p. 741.)

### **KEY ISSUES**

1. Should License 659 (Application 553) be revoked, in whole or in part, in accordance with Water Code section 1675?
2. Did licensee or its predecessors-in-interest fail to use beneficially and in accordance with the Water Code, in whole or in part, the water authorized to be used under License 659 for the applicable statutory period? If so, what amount of water was unused during what period or periods of time?
3. Did licensee or its predecessors-in-interest fail to comply with any of the terms or conditions of License 659? If so, which terms or conditions did licensee or its predecessors-in-interest violate?

## HEARING OFFICER AND HEARING TEAM

State Water Board Chairman, Charles R. Hoppin, will preside as hearing officer over this proceeding. State Water Board staff hearing team members will include Dana Heinrich, Senior Staff Counsel, Kathleen Groody, Environmental Scientist, and Ernest Mona, Water Resources Control Engineer. The hearing staff will assist the hearing officer and other members of the State Water Board throughout this proceeding.

## SEPARATION OF FUNCTIONS

A staff prosecutorial team will be a party in this hearing. State Water Board prosecutorial team members will include Samantha Olson, Senior Staff Counsel and John O'Hagan, Supervising Water Resource Control Engineer. The prosecution team is separated from the hearing team and is prohibited from having *ex parte* communications with the hearing officer, other members of the State Water Board, and members of the hearing team regarding substantive issues and controversial procedural issues within the scope of this proceeding. This separation of functions also applies to the supervisors of each team.

## HEARING PARTICIPATION

IF YOU WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING, you should carefully read the enclosure entitled "Information Concerning Appearance at Water Right Hearings." As stated in that enclosure, anyone wishing to present evidence at the hearing must submit a **Notice of Intent to Appear**, which must be **received** by the State Water Board no later than the deadline listed below. **If Morongo Band fails to submit a Notice of Intent to Appear by the deadline specified in this notice, the State Water Board will deem its request for a hearing regarding the proposed revocation of License 659 to be withdrawn and License 659 may be revoked without further notice.**

The State Water Board will mail a list of those who have indicated a desire to participate in the hearing and a copy of all Notices of Intent to Appear that were timely received by the State Water Board. The list is provided in order to facilitate exchange of written testimony, exhibits and witness qualifications in advance of the hearing. Only those parties and other participants authorized by the hearing officer will be allowed to present evidence. Copies of witnesses' proposed **testimony, exhibits, lists of exhibits, qualifications, and a statement of service** must be **received** by the State Water Board and served on each of the parties who have indicated their intent to appear, no later than the deadline listed below.

<b>12 Noon, Wednesday, February 15, 2012</b>	Deadline for receipt of Notice of Intent to Appear
<b>12 Noon, Tuesday, March 27, 2012</b>	Deadline for receipt and service of witnesses' proposed testimony, exhibits, lists of exhibits, qualifications, and statement of service

## **SUBMITTALS TO THE WATER BOARD**

Notices of Intent to Appear, written testimony, and other exhibits submitted to the State Water Board should be addressed as follows:

Division of Water Rights  
State Water Resources Control Board

Attention: Kathleen Groody  
P.O. Box 2000, Sacramento, CA 95812-2000 (by mail)  
1001 I Street, 2nd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814 (by hand delivery)  
Phone: (916) 341-5354; Fax: (916) 341-5400

Email: [wrhearing@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:wrhearing@waterboards.ca.gov)  
With Subject of **"MORONGO BAND: REVOCATION HEARING"**

### **IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS**


During the pendency of these proceedings, and commencing no later than the issuance of this notice, there shall be no *ex parte* communications between State Water Board members or State Water Board hearing team staff and any of the other participants, regarding substantive or controversial procedural matters within the scope of the proceeding. (Gov. Code, §§ 11430.10-11430.80.) Questions regarding non-controversial procedural matters (Gov. Code, § 11430.20, subd. (b)) should be directed to Kathleen Groody at (916) 341-5354 (email: [kgroody@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:kgroody@waterboards.ca.gov)).

### **PARKING, ACCESSIBILITY AND SECURITY**

A map to the Joe Serna Jr.-Cal/EPA Building and parking information are available at <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EPABldg/location.htm>. For security purposes, all visitors are required to sign in and receive a badge prior to entering the building. Valid picture identification may be required due to the security level so please allow up to 15 minutes for this process.

The Joe Serna Jr.-Cal/EPA Building is accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals who require special accommodations at the Joe Serna Jr.-Cal/EPA Building are requested to contact Michele Villados, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Officer, at (916) 341-5881.

\_\_\_\_\_  
January 26, 2012  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeanine Townsend  
Clerk to the Board

Enclosures

## INFORMATION CONCERNING APPEARANCE AT WATER RIGHT HEARINGS

The following procedural requirements will apply and will be strictly enforced:

- 1. HEARING PROCEDURES GENERALLY:** The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the procedures for hearings set forth at California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 648-648.8, 649.6 and 760, as they currently exist or may be amended. A copy of the current regulations and the underlying statutes governing adjudicative proceedings before the State Water Board is available upon request or may be viewed at the State Water Board's web site:  
[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws\\_regulations](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws_regulations)

Unless otherwise determined by the hearing officer(s), each party may make an opening statement, call and examine witnesses, introduce exhibits, cross-examine opposing witnesses on any matter relevant to the issues even if that matter was not covered in the direct examination, impeach any witness, rebut adverse evidence, and subpoena, call and examine an adverse party or witness as if under cross-examination. At the discretion of the hearing officer, parties may also be afforded the opportunity to present closing statements or submit briefs. The State Water Board encourages parties with common interests to work together to make the hearing process more efficient. The hearing officer reserves the right to issue further rulings clarifying or limiting the rights of any party where authorized under applicable statutes and regulations.

Parties must file any requests for exceptions to procedural requirements in writing with the State Water Board and must serve such requests on the other parties. To provide time for parties to respond, the hearing officer will rule on procedural requests filed in writing no sooner than fifteen days after receiving the request, unless an earlier ruling is necessary to avoid disrupting the hearing.

- 2. SETTLEMENTS:** In water right enforcement hearings, a State Water Board staff member or team prosecutes an alleged violation. In such enforcement cases, the prosecution and a party who is the subject of the proposed enforcement action may at their discretion engage in private settlement discussions, or may include any other persons in those discussions. Although other persons may be authorized to participate in the hearing as parties, such a designation does not constitute a ruling that those persons must be allowed to engage in any settlement discussions between the prosecution and the party against whom the agency action is directed. The consent of other parties is not required before the State Water Board, or the Executive Director under State Water Board [Resolution No. 2002-0104](#), can approve a proposed settlement agreement between the prosecution and a party subject to a proposed enforcement action. However, all parties will be given the opportunity to comment on any settlement submitted to the State Water Board or the Executive Director for approval.

In non-enforcement hearings involving an unresolved protest between a protestant and a water right applicant or petitioner, those persons will be designated as parties in the hearing. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 648.1, subd. (b).) Other persons who file a Notice of Intent to Appear in the hearing may also be designated as parties. In such cases, the parties whose dispute originates the action may at their discretion meet privately to engage in settlement discussions, or may include other persons. If the original parties resolve the dispute, the hearing officer will determine whether or not to continue the hearing after allowing all remaining parties the opportunity to comment on any proposed settlement. The Executive Director or the State Water Board may approve a settlement in the absence of a hearing, notwithstanding the lack of consent of parties besides the protestant and the applicant or petitioner.

**3. PARTIES:** The current parties to the hearing are **Morongo Band of Mission Indians and the Prosecution Team for the State Water Board.**

Additional parties may be designated in accordance with the procedures for this hearing. Except as may be decided by specific rulings of the hearing officer, any person or entity who timely files a Notice of Intent to Appear indicating the desire to participate beyond presenting a policy statement shall be designated as a party. The hearing officer may impose limitations on a party's participation. (Gov. Code, § 11440.50, subd. (c).) Persons or entities who do not file a timely Notice of Intent to Appear may be designated as parties at the discretion of the hearing officer, for good cause shown, and subject to appropriate conditions as determined by the hearing officer. Except as specifically provided in this notice or by ruling of the hearing officer, only parties will be allowed to present evidence.

**4. INTERESTED PERSONS:** Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 648.1, subdivision (d), the State Water Board will provide an opportunity for presentation of non-evidentiary policy statements or comments by interested persons who are not designated as parties. A person or entity that appears and presents only a policy statement is not a party and will not be allowed to make objections, offer evidence, conduct cross-examination, make legal argument or otherwise participate in the evidentiary hearing. Interested persons will not be added to the service list and will not receive copies of written testimony or exhibits from the parties, but may access hearing documents at the website listed in the Hearing Notice.

Policy statements are subject to the following provisions in addition to the requirements outlined in regulation. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 648.1, subd. (d).)

- a. Policy statements are not subject to the pre-hearing requirements for testimony or exhibits, except that interested persons are requested to file a Notice of Intent to Appear, indicating clearly an intent to make a policy statement only.
- b. The State Water Board requests that policy statements be provided in writing before they are presented. Please see section 7 for details regarding electronic submittal of policy statements.

**5. NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR:** Persons and entities who seek to participate as parties in this hearing must file either an electronic copy or a paper copy of a Notice of Intent to Appear, which must be **received** by the State Water Board no later than **the deadline prescribed in the Hearing Notice**. Failure to submit a Notice of Intent to Appear in a timely manner may be interpreted by the State Water Board as intent not to appear. If the party requesting the hearing fails to file a timely Notice of Intent to Appear, this may be deemed a withdrawal of the request for hearing. Any faxed or emailed Notices of Intent to Appear must be followed by a mailed or delivered hard copy with an original signature.

Interested persons who will not be participating as parties, but instead presenting only non-evidentiary policy statements should also file a Notice of Intent to Appear.

The Notice of Intent to Appear must state the name and address of the participant. Except for interested persons who will not be participating as parties, the Notice of Intent to Appear must also include: (1) the name of each witness who will testify on the party's behalf; (2) a brief description of each witness' proposed testimony; and (3) an estimate of the time (not to exceed 20 minutes) that the witness will need to present a brief oral summary of his or her prior-submitted written testimony. (See section 6, below.) Parties who do not intend to present a case-in-chief but wish to cross-examine witnesses or present rebuttal should so indicate on the Notice of Intent to Appear.<sup>1</sup> Parties who decide not to present a case-in-chief after having submitted a Notice of Intent to Appear should notify the State Water Board and the other parties as soon as possible.

Parties who are not willing to accept electronic service of hearing documents should check the appropriate box on the Notice of Intent to Appear. (See section 7 below.)

The State Water Board will mail a service list of parties to each person who has submitted a Notice of Intent to Appear. The service list will indicate if any party is unwilling to accept electronic service. If there is any change in the hearing schedule, only those parties on the service list, and interested persons that have filed a Notice of Intent to Appear expressing their intent to present a policy statement only, will be informed of the change.

---

<sup>1</sup> A party is not required to present evidence as part of a case-in-chief. Parties not presenting evidence as part of a case-in-chief will be allowed to participate through opening statements, cross-examination, and rebuttal, and may also present closing statements or briefs, if the hearing officer allows these in the hearing.



- 6. WRITTEN TESTIMONY AND OTHER EXHIBITS:** Exhibits include written testimony, statements of qualifications of expert witnesses, and other documents to be used as evidence. Each party proposing to present testimony on factual or other evidentiary matters at the hearing shall submit such testimony in writing.<sup>2</sup> Written testimony shall be designated as an exhibit and must be submitted with the other exhibits. Oral testimony that goes beyond the scope of the written testimony may be excluded. A party who proposes to offer expert testimony must submit an exhibit containing a statement of the expert witness's qualifications.

Each party shall submit to the State Water Board **five (5) paper copies** and **one electronic copy** of each of its exhibits. With its exhibits, each party must submit a completed **Exhibit Identification Index**. Each party shall also serve a copy of each exhibit and the exhibit index on every party on the service list. A statement of service with manner of service indicated shall be filed with each party's exhibits.

The exhibits and indexes for this hearing, and a statement of service, must be **received by the State Water Board and served on the other parties no later than the deadline prescribed in the Hearing Notice**. The State Water Board may interpret failure to timely submit such documents as a waiver of party status.

All hearing documents that are timely received will be posted on the hearings program webpage identified in the Hearing Notice.

The following requirements apply to exhibits:

- a. Exhibits based on technical studies or models shall be accompanied by sufficient information to clearly identify and explain the logic, assumptions, development, and operation of the studies or models.
- b. The hearing officer has discretion to receive into evidence by reference relevant, otherwise admissible, public records of the State Water Board and documents or other evidence that have been prepared and published by a public agency, provided that the original or a copy was in the possession of the State Water Board before the notice of the hearing is issued. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 648.3.) A party offering an exhibit by reference shall advise the other parties and the State Water Board of the titles of the documents, the particular portions, including page and paragraph numbers on which the party relies, the nature of the contents, the purpose for which the exhibit will be used when offered in evidence, and the specific file folder or other exact location in the State Water Board's files where the document may be found.

---

<sup>2</sup> The hearing officer may make an exception to this rule if the witness is adverse to the party presenting the testimony and is willing to testify only in response to a subpoena or alternative arrangement.

- c. A party seeking to enter in evidence as an exhibit a voluminous document or database may so advise the other parties prior to the filing date for exhibits, and may ask them to respond if they wish to have a copy of the exhibit. If a party waives the opportunity to obtain a copy of the exhibit, the party sponsoring the exhibit will not be required to provide a copy to the waiving party. Additionally, with the permission of the hearing officer, such exhibits may be submitted to the State Water Board solely in electronic form, using a file format readable by Microsoft Office 2003 software.
- d. Exhibits that rely on unpublished technical documents will be excluded unless the unpublished technical documents are admitted as exhibits.
- e. Parties submitting large format exhibits such as maps, charts, and other graphics shall provide the original for the hearing record in a form that can be folded to 8 ½ x 11 inches. Alternatively, parties may supply, for the hearing record, a reduced copy of a large format original if it is readable.

**7. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS:** To expedite the exchange of information, reduce paper use, and lower the cost of participating in the hearing, participants are encouraged to submit hearing documents to the State Water Board in electronic form and parties are encouraged to agree to electronic service.

Any documents submitted or served electronically must be in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF), except for Exhibit Identification Indexes, which may be in a format supported by Microsoft Excel or Word. Electronic submittals to the State Water Board of documents less than 11 megabytes in total size (incoming mail server attachment limitation) may be sent via electronic mail to:

[wrhearing@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:wrhearing@waterboards.ca.gov) with a subject of “**MORONGO BAND: REVOCATION HEARING.**” Electronic submittals to the State Water Board of documents greater than 11 megabytes in total size should be submitted on a compact disk (CD). Each electronically submitted exhibit must be saved as a separate PDF file, with the name in lower case lettering.

- 8. PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE:** At the hearing officer’s discretion, a pre-hearing conference may be conducted before the proceeding to discuss the scope of the hearing, the status of any protests, and any other appropriate procedural issues.
- 9. ORDER OF PROCEEDING:** Hearing officer will follow the Order of Proceedings specified in California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 648.5. Participants should take note of the following additional information regarding the major hearing events. The time limits specified below may be changed by the hearing officer, for good cause.
  - a. **Policy Statements within the Evidentiary Hearing:** Policy statements will be heard at the start of the hearing before the presentation of cases-in-chief. Oral summaries of the policy statements will be limited to five minutes or such other time as established by the hearing officer.

- b. **Presentation of Cases-In-Chief:** Each party who so indicates on a Notice of Intent to Appear may present a case-in-chief addressing the key issues identified in the Hearing Notice. The case-in-chief will consist of any opening statement, oral testimony, introduction of exhibits, and cross-examination of the party's witnesses. The hearing officer may allow redirect examination and recross examination. The hearing officer will decide whether to accept the party's exhibits into evidence upon a motion of the party after completion of the case-in-chief.
- i. **Opening Statements:** At the beginning of a case-in-chief, the party or the party's attorney may make an opening statement briefly and concisely stating the objectives of the case-in-chief, the major points that the proposed evidence is intended to establish, and the relationship between the major points and the key issues. Oral opening statements will be limited to 20 minutes per party. A party may submit a written opening statement before the hearing or during the hearing, prior to their case-in-chief. Any policy-oriented statements by a party should be included in the opening statement.
- ii. **Oral Testimony:** All witnesses presenting testimony shall appear at the hearing. Before testifying, witnesses shall swear or affirm that the written and oral testimony they will present is true and correct. Written testimony shall not be read into the record. Written testimony affirmed by the witness is direct testimony. Witnesses will be allowed up to **20 minutes** to summarize or emphasize their written testimony on direct examination. Each party will be allowed up to **one hour total** to present all of its direct testimony.<sup>3</sup>
- iii. **Cross-Examination:** Cross-examination of a witness will be permitted on the party's written submittals, the witness' oral testimony, and other relevant matters not covered in the direct testimony. (Gov. Code, § 11513, subd. (b).) If a party presents multiple witnesses, the hearing officer will decide whether the party's witnesses will be cross-examined as a panel. Cross-examiners initially will be limited to one hour per witness or panel of witnesses. The hearing officer has discretion to allow additional time for cross-examination if there is good cause demonstrated in an offer of proof. Ordinarily, only a party or the party's representative will be permitted to examine a witness, but the hearing officer may allow a party to designate a person technically qualified in the subject being considered to examine a witness.
- iv. **Redirect and Recross Examination:** Redirect examination may be allowed at the discretion of the hearing officer. Any redirect examination and recross examination permitted will be limited to the scope of the cross-examination

---

<sup>3</sup> The hearing officer may, for good cause, approve a party's request for additional time to present direct testimony during the party's case-in-chief. The hearing officer may allow additional time for the oral direct testimony of the witness if the witness is averse to the party presenting the testimony and the hearing officer is satisfied that the party could not produce written direct testimony for the witness.

and the redirect examination, respectively. The hearing officer may establish time limits for any permitted redirect and recross examination.

- v. **Questions by State Water Board and Staff:** State Water Board members and staff may ask questions at any time and may cross-examine any witness.
- c. **Rebuttal:** After all parties have presented their cases-in-chief and their witnesses have been cross-examined, the hearing officer will allow parties to present rebuttal evidence. Rebuttal evidence is new evidence used to rebut evidence presented by another party.

Rebuttal testimony and exhibits need not be submitted prior to the hearing, although the hearing officer may require submittal of rebuttal testimony and exhibits before they are presented in order to improve hearing efficiency. 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. It also does not include repetitive evidence. Cross-examination of rebuttal evidence will be limited to the scope of the rebuttal evidence.

- d. **Closing Statements and Legal Arguments:** At the close of the hearing or at other times, if appropriate, the hearing officer may allow oral closing statements or legal arguments or set a schedule for filing legal briefs or written closing statements. If the hearing officer authorizes the parties to file briefs, five copies of each brief shall be submitted to the State Water Board, and one copy shall be served on each of the other participants on the service list. A party shall not attach a document of an evidentiary nature to a brief unless the document is already in the evidentiary hearing record or is the subject of an offer into evidence made at the hearing.

**10. EX PARTE CONTACTS:** During the pendency of this proceeding, commencing no later than the issuance of the Notice of Hearing, there shall be no *ex parte* communications with State Water Board members or State Water Board hearing team staff and supervisors, regarding substantive or controversial procedural issues within the scope of the proceeding. (Gov. Code, §§ 11430.10-11430.80.) **Any communications regarding potentially substantive or controversial procedural matters, including but not limited to evidence, briefs, and motions, must demonstrate that all parties were served and the manner of service.** Parties may accomplish this by submitting a proof of service or by other verification, such as correct addresses in an electronic-mail carbon copy list, or a list of the parties copied and addresses in the carbon copy portion of a letter. Communications regarding non-controversial procedural matters are permissible and should be directed to staff on the hearing team, not State Water Board members. (Gov. Code, § 11430.20,

subd. (b).) A document regarding *ex parte* communications entitled "Ex Parte Questions and Answers" is available upon request or from our website at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws\\_regulations/docs/exparte.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws_regulations/docs/exparte.pdf).

**11.RULES OF EVIDENCE:** Evidence will be admitted in accordance with Government Code section 11513. Hearsay evidence may be used to supplement or explain other evidence, but over timely objection shall not be sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in a civil action.

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAR**

\_\_\_\_\_ plans to participate in the water right hearing regarding  
(name of party or participant)

**Proposed Revocation of License 659 (Application 553) Hearing  
Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
Millard Canyon in Riverside County**

**Wednesday, April 25, 2012  
at 9:00 a.m.**

and continuing, if necessary, on  
**Thursday, April 26, 2012**

**Check all that apply:**

- I/we intend to present a policy statement only.
- I/we intend to participate by cross-examination or rebuttal only.
- I/we decline electronic service.
- I/we plan to call the following witnesses to testify at the hearing.

<b>NAME</b>	<b>SUBJECT OF PROPOSED TESTIMONY</b>	<b>ESTIMATED LENGTH OF DIRECT TESTIMONY</b>	<b>EXPERT WITNESS (YES/NO)</b>

(If more space is required, please add additional pages or use reverse side.)

Name, Address, Phone Number and Fax Number of Attorney or Other Representative

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Name (Print): \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: (    ) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax Number: (    ) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposed Revocation of License 659 (Application 553) Hearing  
Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
Millard Canyon in Riverside County**

**Wednesday, April 25, 2012  
at 9:00 a.m.**

and continuing, if necessary, on  
**Thursday, April 26, 2012**

**Exhibit Identification Index**

Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Exhibit Identification Number</b>	<b>Exhibit Description</b>	<b>Status as Evidence</b>		
		Introduced	Accepted	By Official Notice

**Proposed Revocation of License 659 (Application 553) Hearing  
Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
Millard Canyon in Riverside County**

**HEARING NOTICE MAILING LIST  
(01/05/2012)**

**CERTIFIED MAIL**

THE MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS  
c/o Somach, Simmons & Dunn  
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[dkelly@somachlaw.com](mailto:dkelly@somachlaw.com)  
[ssomach@somachlaw.com](mailto:ssomach@somachlaw.com)

DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS PROSECUTION TEAM  
c/o Samantha Olson  
State Water Resources Control Board  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[solson@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:solson@waterboards.ca.gov)

**CERTIFIED MAIL**

THE MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA 92220  
[info@morongo-nsn.gov](mailto:info@morongo-nsn.gov)

THE MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS  
c/o Krashmer & Associates  
765 Market Street Suite 28F  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
[Barbara@KarshmerIndianLaw.com](mailto:Barbara@KarshmerIndianLaw.com)

Desert Water Agency  
P.O. Box 1710  
Palm Spring, CA 92263  
[dluker@dwa.org](mailto:dluker@dwa.org)  
[sbaca@dwa.org](mailto:sbaca@dwa.org)

Brownstein | Hyatt Farber | Schreck  
21 East Carrillo Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2706  
[wstrickland@bhfs.com](mailto:wstrickland@bhfs.com)  
[rsaperstein@bhfs.com](mailto:rsaperstein@bhfs.com)

Coachella Valley Water District  
P.O. Box 1058  
Coachella, CA 92236  
[srobbins@cvwd.org](mailto:srobbins@cvwd.org)  
[customerservice@cvwd.org](mailto:customerservice@cvwd.org)

Redwine & Sherrill  
1950 Market Street  
Riverside, CA 92501  
[gshoaf@redwineandsherrill.com](mailto:gshoaf@redwineandsherrill.com)  
[ggranito@redwineandsherrill.com](mailto:ggranito@redwineandsherrill.com)

Bold, Polisner, Maddow, Nelson & Judson  
500 Ygnacio Valley Road, Suite 325  
Walnut Creek CA 94596  
[cpanelson@prodigy.net](mailto:cpanelson@prodigy.net)  
[rjmaddow@prodigy.net](mailto:rjmaddow@prodigy.net)