

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD  
DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS

IN THE MATTER OF:  
WHETHER TO ISSUE A CEASE & DESIST ORDER  
AGAINST WEST SIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT (WSID)  
OLD RIVER TRIBUTARY TO SAN JOAQUIN RIVER  
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

-----/

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2015  
9:00 A.M.

BRYON SHER AUDITORIUM  
JOE SERNA JR.-CALEPA BUILDING  
1001 I STREET, SECOND FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

## APPEARANCES

HEARING OFFICER AND HEARING TEAM

FRANCES SPIVY-WEBER, Hearing Officer  
NICOLE KUENZI, Senior Staff Counsel  
ERNEST MONA, Water Resource Engineer  
JEAN McCUE, Water Resource Engineer  
MICHAEL BUCKMAN, Chief, Hearings Unit

DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS PROSECUTION TEAM

ANDREW TAURIAINEN, Attorney Ill  
JOHN PRAGER  
SWRCB Office of Enforcement  
1001 I Street, 16th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Andrew.Tauriainen@waterboards.ca.gov  
John.Prager@waterboards.ca.gov

WEST SIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

JEANNE M. ZOLEZZI  
JANELLE KRATTIGER  
Herum\Crabtree\Suntag  
5757 Pacific Ave., Suite 222  
Stockton, CA 95207  
jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com  
jkrattiger@herumcrabtree.com

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

ROBIN MCGINNIS  
PO Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001  
robin.mcginis@water.ca.gov

BYRON BETHANY IRRIGATION DISTRICT

DANIEL KELLY  
Somach Simmons & Dunn  
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000,  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
dkelly@somachlaw.com

CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY

JENNIFER SPALETTA  
Spaletta Law PC  
PO Box 2660  
Lodi, CA 95241  
jennifer@spalettalaw.com

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

JOHNATHAN KNAPP  
ROBERT DONLAN  
Office of the City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, Suite 418  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
jonathan.knapp@sfgov.org

SAN JOAQUIN TRIBUTARIES AUTHORITY

VALERI KINCAID  
TIMOTHY WASIEWSKI  
O'Laughlin & Paris LLP  
2617 K Street, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com

SOUTH DELTA WATER AGENCY

DEAN RUIZ  
4255 Pacific Ave., Suite 2  
Stockton, CA 95207  
dean@hprlaw.net

STATE WATER CONTRACTORS

STEPHANIE MORRIS  
1121 L Street, Suite 1050  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
smorris@swc.org

WESTLANDS WATER DISTRICT

PHILIP WILLIAMS  
REBECCA AKROYD  
Kronick Moskovitz Tiedemann & Girard  
400 Capitol Mall, 27th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
pwilliams@westlandswater.org  
rakroyd@kmtg.com

## I N D E X

|                              |    |
|------------------------------|----|
| Roll Call                    | 5  |
| Adjournment                  | 67 |
| Certification of Transcriber | 68 |

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 OCTOBER 19, 2015

9:00 A.M.

3 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay, we're  
4 going to start without Jeane, and I'll introduce her  
5 in absentia.

6 This is the opening pre-hearing conference  
7 for the West Side Irrigation District's Draft Cease  
8 and Desist Order. Good morning and welcome to the  
9 pre-hearing conference regarding the public hearing  
10 to be held to receive evidence relevant to  
11 determining whether to adopt with or without  
12 revision the July 16, 2015 Draft Cease and Desist  
13 Order against the West Side Irrigation District.

14 I'm State Water Resources Control Board  
15 Vice-Chair Frances Spivy-Weber. Also present with me  
16 are Staff Counsel Nicole Kuenzi and Staff Engineer  
17 Ernie Mona. And eventually we will have Jean McCue,  
18 also a staff engineer.

19 Also present is Michael Buckman over here,  
20 Chief of the Hearings Unit. And are you going to  
21 stay with us the whole time? Yes.

22 Here comes Jeane.

23 Please look around and identify the exit  
24 signs, the ones closest to you. In the event of a  
25 fire alarm we must evacuate this room immediately.

1 Please take your valuables with you and walk down  
2 the stairs, no elevators. Our relocation place is  
3 across, catty-corner across the street at Cesar  
4 Chavez Park. If you cannot use the stairs you will  
5 be directed to a protected vestibule inside a  
6 stairwell. I don't know where that is, so someone  
7 needs to help me figure that one out if anyone is so  
8 in need.

9           Please turn off your cell phones, put  
10 things on mute, so we can have as little disturbance  
11 as possible.

12           This pre-hearing conference is being held  
13 in accordance with the Notice of Public Hearing and  
14 Pre-Hearing Conference dated September 1st, 2015,  
15 and my letter to the parties of October 8, 2015.

16           The goal of this pre-hearing conference is  
17 to ensure that hearing proceeds in an orderly and  
18 expeditious -- underline expeditious -- manner. I'm  
19 particularly interested in hearing from you  
20 regarding procedural matters that will further this  
21 goal.

22           The pre-hearing conference is being webcast  
23 on the Internet, and both audio and video are being  
24 recorded.

25           We do not have a court reporter present

1 today but will for the hearing, so there will be no  
2 transcript.

3 We'll begin with a roll call of the  
4 parties. As I identify each party who has filed a  
5 Notice of Intent to Appear, speak into the  
6 microphone and state your name.

7 We'll start with the Division of Water  
8 Rights prosecution team.

9 MR. TAURIAINEN: Andrew Tauriainen, Office  
10 of Enforcement.

11 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Anyone else?

12 MR. TAURIAINEN: With me to my right is  
13 John Prager also of the Office of Enforcement.

14 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: The West Side  
15 Irrigation District.

16 MS. ZOLEZZI: Good morning. Jeanne Zolezzi,  
17 General Counsel for The West Side Irrigation  
18 District. Also with me is my associate, Janelle  
19 Krattiger.

20 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: California  
21 Department of Water Resources.

22 MS. MCGINNIS: Robin McGinnis --

23 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Oh, there you  
24 are.

25 MS. MCGINNIS: -- Chief Counsel.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. South  
2 Delta Water Agency.

3 MR. RUIZ: (inaudible)

4 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Is John  
5 part of your group?

6 MR. RUIZ: (inaudible)

7 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Problems, I  
8 guess. Okay.

9 Central Delta Water Agency.

10 MS. SPALETTA: Jennifer Spaletta on behalf  
11 of Central Delta Water Agency.

12 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Byron-Bethany  
13 Irrigation District.

14 MR. KELLY: Good morning. Daniel Kelly,  
15 General Counsel, Byron-Bethany Irrigation District.

16 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin  
17 Tributaries Authority.

18 MS. KINCAID: Good morning. Valerie Kincaid  
19 and Timothy Wasiewski for San Joaquin Tributaries  
20 Authority.

21 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: The State  
22 Water Contractors.

23 MS. MORRIS: Stefanie Morris, General  
24 Counsel, State Water Contractors.

25 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: The City and

1 County of San Francisco.

2 MR. KNAPP: Good morning. Jonathan Knapp on  
3 behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, and  
4 I'm also here with Robert Donlan, outside counsel  
5 for City and County of San Francisco.

6 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And finally,  
7 Westlands Water District.

8 MS. AKROYD: Good morning. Rebecca Akroyd  
9 and Phil Williams for Westlands Water District.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Have I  
11 covered everyone? Now we can begin.

12 As set forth in the September 1, 2015,  
13 Notice, the hearing in this matter is currently  
14 scheduled for November 12, 2015, and continuing, if  
15 necessary, November 13 and 16.

16 West Side Irrigation District, Central  
17 Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water Agency, and  
18 prosecution team requested that this hearing date be  
19 postponed. In my October 8, 2015 letter I informed  
20 the parties that the prompt consideration of the  
21 proposed Cease and Desist Order is of significant  
22 interest to the Board given the severity of the  
23 current drought and the possibility of recurrence of  
24 the allegedly unauthorized diversions.

25 However, I also informed the parties that I

1 will consider requests for postponement if alternate  
2 timely dates for the hearing are selected. I  
3 directed the parties to identify and submit to me  
4 any conflicts that would prevent their participation  
5 in the hearing during the week of January the 11th  
6 through January 15.

7           The only party who identified a possible  
8 conflict was the Department of Water Resources, who  
9 also indicated that this conflict could be  
10 rescheduled if necessary.

11           So does anyone have any comments,  
12 additional comments, on their availability during  
13 that week of January 11 through 15, 2016? And you  
14 can reschedule?

15           MS. MCGINNIS: That's right.

16           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Now, a  
17 preliminary issue to be addressed is the prosecution  
18 team's motion for protective orders. The prosecution  
19 team requests that I issue protective orders that  
20 require all parties to coordinate any discovery  
21 requests in order to avoid duplicative or overly  
22 burdensome requests, so they ask that everything be  
23 coordinated in terms of discovery.

24           Prohibit the parties from conducting  
25 depositions on prosecution team witnesses prior to

1 the evidence and witness statement submittal  
2 deadlines. And prohibit the parties from serving  
3 discovery requests seeking witness statements prior  
4 to the evidence and witness statement submittal  
5 deadlines.

6           Although I will not rule today on the  
7 prosecution team's motion at this time, I do want to  
8 hear from everyone about this because it's a  
9 substantial request that would probably entail some  
10 delays, further delays. Well, let's just hear from  
11 folks.

12           First of all, the prosecution team, do you  
13 want to go into more detail?

14           Yes?

15           MS. ZOLEZZI: Madam Hearing Officer, are we  
16 going to spend more time on the possible dates for  
17 the hearing?

18           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Well, he's  
19 suggesting some other dates.

20           MS. ZOLEZZI: Yes, and we'd like to be  
21 heard on the timing. I don't know when you want to  
22 do that.

23           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Well, that's  
24 going to be part of this second piece in terms of  
25 coordination.

1 MS. ZOLEZZI: Okay.

2 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: So, yes. I  
3 mean, the answer is yes and no. We got everyone's  
4 letters in about their availability in January. Now  
5 we've moving on to additional requests from the  
6 prosecution team and that discussion will have an  
7 effect on what we do.

8 Go ahead.

9 MR. TAURIAINEN: The prosecution team's  
10 request for a protective order is related to  
11 Friday's request for aligning the submittal  
12 deadlines with this case and with the Byron-Bethany  
13 Irrigation District case.

14 And what it really boils down to, it's all  
15 the same parties seeking to adjudicate really the  
16 core issue or issues with some variance between the  
17 West Side case and Byron-Bethany's case. This is all  
18 in my briefs, but it creates a burden on the  
19 prosecution to even have to go through multiple  
20 rounds of discovery, and the parties are eager to  
21 have discovery right away.

22 In addition, I suspect it will create  
23 administrative record problems if we don't try and  
24 have some coordination between the two cases, and in  
25 particular the evidentiary submittal deadlines for

1 the two cases.

2 That being said, the West Side matter, the  
3 prosecution team feels it probably should go first.  
4 It's an injunctive order. It's important to have  
5 timely hearings on injunctive orders.

6 It also, with respect to the core issues of  
7 the case, with regard to the water availability at  
8 least, presents probably a cleaner question because  
9 it's a post 1914 right.

10 So to that end, if need be, there can be a  
11 rescheduling to allow this hearing, the West Side  
12 hearing to go before the other, that would probably  
13 be to everyone's benefit and certainly what I would  
14 recommend.

15 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: You really  
16 think that we're going to have availability from  
17 everyone in February? I don't know.

18 Anyway, I am interested in what others have  
19 to say. Let's start with the West Side.

20 MS. ZOLEZZI: Thank you. We have no  
21 objection in general to the request to try to  
22 coordinate discovery and coordinate the deadlines in  
23 the hearings; that does make sense. That's about all  
24 we're in agreement with, however.

25 Two issues. The first is the timing of the

1 hearing. We do agree that it should be postponed, we  
2 do agree with the prosecution team that somewhere  
3 around the BBID hearing would be ideal.

4           And just generally by way of background,  
5 the West Side Irrigation District is not delaying  
6 for sake of delay. We are very eager to get this  
7 heard. We need it answered as much as the State  
8 Board does for what we do next year.

9           However, it is dealing with real property  
10 rights held by the District and in turn its  
11 landowners. These are very important rights and we  
12 have to make sure we get it right. We have to make  
13 sure that we have an opportunity to get to all of  
14 the evidence so that we can protect our rights and  
15 have our due process that we're entitled to.

16           So having said that, even scheduling the  
17 hearing in January simply does not give us enough  
18 time even if we start discovery immediately, which  
19 we're having trouble doing because of the protective  
20 orders.

21           There are at least thirteen witnesses that  
22 the parties have labeled to be giving testimony  
23 here. If we depose one a week starting now, which  
24 we're not being able to, we wouldn't finish in time  
25 for the January hearing, let alone have time to

1 prepare our experts in response to that discovery.

2           In addition, the prosecution team has  
3 turned over to us over three gigabytes of  
4 information just last week for our Public Records  
5 Act request, and that is not all of the information.  
6 We still have information to be provided in response  
7 to that request that we don't know when it's going  
8 to come. There is more information from the  
9 prosecution team and there is information coming  
10 from the Office of Chief Counsel. We have asked when  
11 that might be and we haven't gotten a response. So  
12 we have to get through that information, our experts  
13 have to get through that information.

14           So having said that, we do support the  
15 proposal by the prosecution team to move the hearing  
16 as close as possible to the BBID hearing, whether it  
17 be before or after that hearing in March, I think,  
18 will give us enough time if we move promptly and  
19 quickly, so we do support that.

20           Turning to the protective order. A  
21 protective order to force the parties to coordinate  
22 is really not needed. We have done that. We are  
23 coordinating with all the parties. We have checked  
24 dates with all of the parties to move forward with  
25 these depositions and intend to continue to do that.

1 It doesn't make any sense to have multiple  
2 depositions of the same party. So that is something  
3 that we've already agreed to.

4 We haven't had a chance to respond to the  
5 protective order and we will submit something in  
6 writing, but just to make a point.

7 The protective order asks for discovery not  
8 to be able to take place until the witness  
9 statements are submitted. That raises a serious  
10 Catch 22 item. We have no problem waiting until the  
11 prosecution team submits its witness statements if  
12 that is done promptly and we are given enough time  
13 to do discovery afterwards.

14 The problem is we cannot make our witness  
15 statements until discovery is over, because until we  
16 have a chance to see all of the evidence, we can't  
17 make witness statements. So we definitely have a  
18 Catch 22, chicken-and-egg problem, whatever you want  
19 to see.

20 The only way around that would be to have  
21 preliminary witness statements, then do discovery,  
22 and then have final witness statements. That doesn't  
23 seem to be streamlining the process, as you have  
24 recommended.

25 So discovery simply does need to take place

1 immediately so that we can get it completed and then  
2 present to you concise witness statements. The only  
3 way we are going to be able to streamline this  
4 process is to do discovery and find out who is going  
5 to testify to what, so we would request that we be  
6 allowed to proceed, but we will be submitting  
7 written comments as well. Thank you.

8 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: You had a  
9 comment?

10 MR. TAURIAINEN: Yeah, if I may. It sounds  
11 like the District's counsel is really describing the  
12 process for developing rebuttal testimony, which the  
13 Byron-Bethany process has built in. There's actually  
14 two submittal dates separated by four weeks and the  
15 second submittal date is four weeks ahead of the  
16 hearing, so there's likely ample time to review  
17 witness statements and then prepare rebuttal witness  
18 statements before that.

19 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Thank you.

20 MS. ZOLEZZI: May I just respond? That is  
21 simply not the case, and I think you need to look at  
22 the purpose of discovery and the assumption that the  
23 prosecution team is making that we have seen time  
24 and time again in the letters and the statements  
25 that the prosecution team has made.

1           The prosecution team seems to believe that  
2 when they put out the draft Cease and Desist Order,  
3 that is all the evidence that we are entitled to.  
4 And they say that all the evidence they have used to  
5 put that together and issue the curtailments is on  
6 the website.

7           That's simply not the way this works. That  
8 is their proposed evidence. We are entitled to  
9 investigate that evidence and depose people as to  
10 how they made that decision and why they used that  
11 information that they have disclosed as opposed to  
12 other information.

13           That is not rebuttal. That is putting  
14 together our defense.

15           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Thank you.

16           MS. KUENZI: I just have a very quick  
17 question, if I may. I wanted to clarify, I think in  
18 the motion for protective order there was a  
19 description that there may be a request for  
20 discovery before the exhibit submittal deadline and  
21 also after, and then I think I heard you mention  
22 that one deposition of each party makes sense, and  
23 this may be in your response to the motion, but I  
24 wondered if you would clarify whether you would be  
25 looking for depositions both before the submittal

1 deadline and if you were able to obtain that you  
2 would also be looking to depose these same witnesses  
3 after the submittal deadline.

4 MS. ZOLEZZI: I will just give the West  
5 Side's approach. I'm sure the other parties have  
6 comments as well.

7 But our key is just to get to depose all of  
8 these people. The only reason we were proposing  
9 before and after is because we can't finish them all  
10 before, so we have to continue after.

11 It is not our intent, if this is what  
12 you're getting at, to depose everyone before the  
13 witness statements, then the witness statements come  
14 out, and then depose them again. Unless something  
15 comes out in the witness statements that is new or  
16 surprising, I don't believe we would wish to do  
17 that.

18 If, of course, there is something new that  
19 we hadn't seen, we would ask to depose on that very  
20 limited issue.

21 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Let's  
22 hear from the California Department of Water  
23 Resources.

24 MS. MCGINNIS: Thank you, Hearing Officer  
25 Spivy-Weber. DWR agrees that having depositions

1 before and after the written testimony is due is  
2 burdensome, so we agree that depositions should  
3 happen after the written testimony has been  
4 submitted, because otherwise it is, you know, the  
5 different rounds of discovery is analogous to what's  
6 going to happen at the hearing, which is the written  
7 testimony, cross, and rebuttal.

8           And given the limited scope of the hearings  
9 and that this is an administrative action subject to  
10 later review, we agree that, you know, keeping  
11 discovery limited and streamlined is a good idea.

12           And also that document requests as they  
13 come in, we can respond to starting, you know,  
14 before the hearing and written testimony are due.

15           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Central Delta  
16 Water Agency?

17           MS. SPALETTA: Thank you. We would agree  
18 that the depositions should take place before the  
19 witness statements for a couple of reasons.

20           Number one is timing. I actually counted  
21 eighteen separate witnesses that have been  
22 identified by the parties, and so there's the issue  
23 of how much time it takes to do a proper deposition.

24           But in our eyes the fundamental issue is  
25 the ability to streamline the hearing and obtain

1 stipulations. If we are taking depositions after  
2 witness statements and trying to squeeze that in as  
3 well as preparation of rebuttal testimony, I can  
4 almost guarantee there will be no stipulations.

5           If we take the depositions early, all of  
6 the parties will have a chance to understand the  
7 information and the analysis that the State Board  
8 performed, which substantially increases the  
9 likelihood of stipulations on as many issues as  
10 possible, so that when witness statements and  
11 exhibits are submitted, they are as limited as they  
12 need to be to address only those issues that are in  
13 dispute.

14           You often hear people say, "I don't ships  
15 passing in the night," and I don't think that's what  
16 the hearing team wants. You don't want everyone to  
17 submit their exhibits and witness statements and  
18 have ships passing in the night. What would be  
19 preferable is to have ample time for everyone to  
20 understand and see the same information so that the  
21 parties can work on stipulations for what is not in  
22 dispute and focus their submittal of exhibits and  
23 witnesses statements on only those issues that are  
24 in dispute, which also helps narrow the scope of  
25 rebuttal and narrow the time of the hearing.

1           So for practical purposes I think it's very  
2 important that we start the depositions as soon as  
3 possible, because the State Board has completed this  
4 analysis, it's not like their working on something.  
5 They completed the analysis in order to send out the  
6 CDO, so we're not imposing on them additional work;  
7 the work has been done. We're just asking to learn  
8 what the work was and the rationale behind the  
9 analysis earlier so that we can do a better job  
10 collectively preparing the presentation for the  
11 hearing team.

12           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Thank you.

13           Byron-Bethany?

14           MR. KELLY: Yes, Hearing Officer Spivy-  
15 Weber, thank you. A couple things.

16           Number one. You know, I keep hearing people  
17 mention the Byron-Bethany A.C.L. proceeding. It's  
18 important that we not conflate these proceedings.  
19 This hearing was not noticed to include any  
20 discussion of the Byron-Bethany hearing and so I --  
21 you know, the hearing team is the same, but the two  
22 hearings cannot bleed together, certainly not at  
23 this point.

24           And we will be filing oppositions to the  
25 motions for protective order probably in both cases,

1 and so I'm hesitant to start arguing about that now  
2 when we haven't had an opportunity to actually  
3 finish our research and then submit oppositions,  
4 which we will be doing. So what I'm going to say now  
5 is premised on the fact that we're going to still be  
6 submitting oppositions.

7 I agree that in this case people need to be  
8 able to conduct discovery prior to witness  
9 statements and exhibits being submitted. The reality  
10 is, because a lot of what went on, the parties, some  
11 of the water user parties need to be able to  
12 understand what happened at the State Water Board in  
13 order to prepare their case in chief testimony. And  
14 it may be that some of the testimony that we receive  
15 during depositions will be part of the case in chief  
16 testimony that gets submitted whenever it's due.

17 The prosecution team has argued, and we've  
18 heard time and time again how rebuttal testimony  
19 needs to be really limited to true rebuttal  
20 testimony. Well, if we're not entitled to conduct  
21 discovery until after witness statements are due, I  
22 have no idea what the prosecution team is going to  
23 put in their direct testimony. And then how do I  
24 know how to anticipate whether or not I needed to  
25 actually then raise something in my case in chief

1 versus save it for rebuttal when it might not truly  
2 be rebuttal?

3           And so we can't be caught in that kind of  
4 circumstance where the prosecution team puts  
5 together a very narrow package of testimony that  
6 would preclude some relevant information from being  
7 introduced as rebuttal testimony, because it might  
8 not truly be rebuttal to what was offered by the  
9 prosecution team.

10           So in order for the parties to adequately  
11 prepare for the hearing and adequately prepare to be  
12 able to submit written testimony, that discovery has  
13 to happen before written testimony gets submitted.

14           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin  
15 Tributaries Authority.

16           MS. KINCAID: Thank you. Valerie Kincaid  
17 for the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority. The SJTA  
18 agrees that people are coordinating and certainly  
19 these issues need to be coordinated. It doesn't make  
20 any sense to depose and redepose parties.

21           Other than that, however, the SJTA has some  
22 issues with the prosecution team's protective order,  
23 two main issues.

24           One has been spoken about already, but I'll  
25 just tell you the SJTA perspective of presenting

1 evidence and testimony. We are obviously not a  
2 direct party to either of these matters and we have  
3 named witnesses that will talk specifically about  
4 the water availability piece of this puzzle. And  
5 whether we actually call those witnesses or not will  
6 depend on depositions and information coming out of  
7 it.

8           So the Catch 22 that Ms. Zolezzi spoke  
9 about is really very critical for us. We don't  
10 actually know if we're going to call the witnesses,  
11 depending on what happens in the depositions, so we  
12 actually cannot provide a statement at the same time  
13 that the prosecution team's witnesses provide  
14 statements because our statements will literally be  
15 crafted in response to what they are saying, so we  
16 are unable to provide you a witness statement before  
17 we depose and see those first, so we have a real  
18 timing issue.

19           And it kind of goes to the streamlining  
20 issues as well. I would like to call fewer witnesses  
21 than multiple. If we don't have to call all of our  
22 witnesses because we hear testimony that's very  
23 clear on an issue from the prosecution team, then we  
24 would not have to bring everyone in. So for us we  
25 really need to have those depositions happen before

1 we submit our witness statement.

2           The second issue that I'd like to note, and  
3 again, SJTA may also respond in writing to the  
4 protective order, but the issue of non-prosecution  
5 team witnesses should certainly be considered as  
6 well. I know my understanding from my first reading  
7 of the protective order is that that pertains to  
8 prosecution team witnesses.

9           For folks who are not doing a witness  
10 statement because they are not being called by the  
11 hearing team or the prosecution team but we would  
12 like to call them, I have no idea what that means,  
13 when I can depose them. They're not going to do a  
14 witness statement. So if I want to depose someone  
15 like John O'Hagan, who is not named by anyone, I  
16 don't know when I can do that and how I can do it,  
17 and that's certainly something that needs to be  
18 resolved. We will discuss this in probably a written  
19 response to the protective order, but it should be  
20 on the minds of everyone here that this is just a  
21 prosecution team witness issue and there are  
22 observed people who are going to be involved in this  
23 and will be witnesses that are not called by the  
24 prosecution team, so we should think about that as  
25 well. Thank you.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Thank you.  
2 State Water Contractors.

3 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. State Water  
4 Contractors really doesn't take a side on this  
5 issue. We really are here limited to the issue of  
6 protecting stored water. We probably wouldn't  
7 normally be participating in a CDO proceeding like  
8 this except for the fact that the parties have  
9 raised potential defenses regarding water supply  
10 availability that implicate protection of our stored  
11 water. So I have no opinion on this specific  
12 procedural issue.

13 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: City and  
14 County of San Francisco.

15 MR. KNAPP: Jonathan Knapp for the City and  
16 County of San Francisco. San Francisco has no  
17 objection to coordinating discovery and coordinating  
18 the deadlines between the proceedings. And others  
19 have noted, we agree that that's already been  
20 occurring.

21 We also agree that the hearing should be  
22 postponed similar as the Byron-Bethany Irrigation  
23 District enforcement proceeding, as the hearing was  
24 postponed in that proceeding.

25 And with regard to the issue of the

1 protective order, San Francisco agrees with many of  
2 the sentiments that have been expressed, and  
3 specifically agrees with the statements that were  
4 just made by Valerie Kincaid of the SJTA in terms of  
5 being in a difficult position to be able to respond  
6 when we don't have the full picture of what the  
7 State Board is relying upon.

8 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And finally,  
9 Westlands Water District.

10 MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Madam Vice-  
11 Chair. Phil Williams with Westlands [skip] -- City  
12 and County of San Francisco, we're here for limited  
13 purposes, but would emphasize how imperative it is  
14 that all parties are afforded full opportunity  
15 regarding timing and procedural matters to make sure  
16 they're able to put on their full case.

17 In the event that depositions preceding  
18 witness statements somehow mitigate or militate  
19 against their efficacy, Westlands would argue that  
20 it's in everyone's best interest to assure that  
21 timing is right both in terms of when the hearing is  
22 held, so aligning that with BBID, but also in terms  
23 of protective orders, in terms of when parties may  
24 be able to present their full case, that all parties  
25 are afforded ample opportunity.

1           We don't have a specific position there,  
2 but would emphasize that timing is very important  
3 here, and allowing parties a full opportunity to  
4 fully present their case will probably result in a  
5 more durable solution. Thank you.

6           MR. BUCKMAN: I think we skipped South  
7 Delta.

8           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Did I? Oh, I  
9 did. Well, I kept looking at you. I'm so sorry.

10          MR. RUIZ: Good morning. [microphone  
11 malfunction] Sorry about that.

12          MS. KUENZI: A very quick request to the  
13 parties. I understand based on prosecution team  
14 submittals that there may be subpoenas for  
15 depositions floating around there, and it's possible  
16 they have not yet matriculated to my desk, but I  
17 haven't seen them, we haven't seen them. If you can  
18 please just make sure a member of the hearing team  
19 or all of us are copied by email, that would be very  
20 helpful so we know what the status are, especially  
21 when we get motions based on those subpoenas.

22          FEMALE VOICE: Mr. Ruiz, you should  
23 probably repeat yourself summarily just so we have  
24 it for the video recording.

25          MR. RUIZ: I'll be quick. I would just say

1 again, the South Delta Water Agency feels that  
2 depositions need to occur prior to the deadline for  
3 the submittal and the case in chief, and that in  
4 order for the hearing to be as expeditious as  
5 possible, the case in chief needs to be prepared  
6 adequately and it can't be prepared adequately  
7 without the ability to depose these witnesses in  
8 advance. Thank you.

9 MR. KELLY: If I may, Hearing Officer  
10 Spivy-Weber, and I guess for the hearing team.  
11 Typically, in litigation and adjudicative  
12 proceedings the adjudicator is not copied on  
13 anything related to discovery unless there's a  
14 dispute, so deposition notices, subpoenas, written  
15 discovery is not provided to the adjudicator. It's  
16 something that the parties engage in, and if there's  
17 a dispute or if somebody wants to introduce it, then  
18 it's provided to the adjudicator.

19 And so in this proceeding is the hearing  
20 team requested to be copied on all discovery  
21 requests?

22 MS. KUENZI: I believe it's in our hearing  
23 notice; I may stand corrected. But yes, I would  
24 appreciate that. That would just be helpful. Thank  
25 you.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: All in the  
2 spirit of it being expeditious, yes.

3 MS. SPALETTA: Can we clarify this point,  
4 because Page 4 of the October 8th letter discusses  
5 subpoenas, which I read to relate to subpoenaing a  
6 witness to appear at a hearing as opposed to  
7 prehearing discovery, so can we clarify this issue  
8 just so we make sure that the parties do what the  
9 hearing team is requesting.

10 MS. KUENZI: I think, just so that we're  
11 all in the loop and know what's going on it would be  
12 wonderful and I'm asking the parties to copy us on  
13 all subpoenas both for depositions and for testimony  
14 at the hearing itself. And I'm sorry if I didn't  
15 answer the question.

16 MS. SPALETTA: Well, a subpoena is  
17 typically required for a non-party witness, and a  
18 deposition notice is used to take a deposition of a  
19 party witness. So are you asking just to be copied  
20 on subpoenas or are you asking to be copied on all  
21 deposition notice, requests for production of  
22 documents, everything under the Code of Civil  
23 Procedure that's implicated by Water Code Section  
24 1100?

25 MS. KUENZI: All discovery, please.

1 MS. SPALETTA: Okay.

2 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And again,  
3 this is so that we're all on the same page so when  
4 we do start this we can move through and there are  
5 no surprises. I mean, that's what you want, that's  
6 what we want.

7 MS. KINCAID: Hearing Officer Spivy-Weber,  
8 may I just ask one clarifying question about this  
9 issue, and I don't want to belabor the point, but  
10 this is so we make sure we're all on the same page,  
11 it's not because a hearing officer or member will  
12 attend a deposition, right? I want to make that  
13 clear.

14 MS. KUENZI: That's correct. That's  
15 correct. No, it's simply a matter so that when we  
16 get motions the hearing team is at that time aware  
17 of what requests are out there.

18 MS. ZOLEZZI: Hearing Officer, may I make  
19 one comment about the whole discovery issue?

20 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Yes.

21 MS. ZOLEZZI: For the record, I just wanted  
22 to clarify one thing that was stated by the  
23 Department of Water Resources, that somehow  
24 distinguishes the way discovery should be undertaken  
25 here because this is simply an administrative

1 proceeding which is subject to review.

2           And I would point out for the record again  
3 to remind everyone that writ review of a decision  
4 that is made by the State Water Resources Control  
5 Board here is limited to the administrative record,  
6 so this is our only opportunity to make that factual  
7 record, which is why we're taking it very seriously,  
8 because there will be judicial review here and we  
9 want to have a record that can be reviewed. Thank  
10 you.

11           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Now, I  
12 have taken this in, so has our team, and we will be  
13 getting back to you as quickly as possible as to  
14 exactly how to proceed, because it's we definitely  
15 want to make sure there's time, but we also want to  
16 make sure we move expeditiously.

17           MS. ZOLEZZI: Would it be prudent, Hearing  
18 Officer, to make a deadline for when the parties can  
19 respond in writing?

20           MS. KUENZI: I think it would be a good  
21 idea.

22           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: I agree.

23           MS. KUENZI: So that the parties know how  
24 long they have to respond to the motion.

25           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Right. This

1 is Monday the 19th.

2 MS. KUENZI: Two weeks would be standard.

3 MR. KELLY: Two weeks to respond to the  
4 motion for protective order? I guess I say that  
5 because I think that there's actually the first  
6 deposition is scheduled within that two-week period.

7 MS. KUENZI: When is the first deposition  
8 scheduled?

9 MR. KELLY: It is, I think October 26th.

10 MR. TAURIAINEN: Three are within the two-  
11 week period.

12 MS. KUENZI: So that's next Monday. The  
13 26th is a week from today.

14 MS. ZOLEZZI: So perhaps if we could get  
15 our responses in Wednesday?

16 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Let's go for  
17 Wednesday.

18 MS. ZOLEZZI: It may be too much to ask  
19 that you decide this week so maybe we could proceed,  
20 but we could give it a shot.

21 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Right. Okay.  
22 Now, the deadline for submission of written  
23 testimony and other exhibits. In the event that I  
24 reschedule the hearing, I may also reschedule the  
25 deadline for submission of exhibits -- so now we're

1 getting into the possible limits to delay -- to  
2 allow time for the submittal of written rebuttal  
3 testimony in advance of the hearing.

4 I'd like to hear from parties regarding  
5 deadlines for the submission of exhibits and written  
6 rebuttal testimony. Let's start with the prosecution  
7 team.

8 MR. TAURIAINEN: Our request from Friday  
9 the 16th.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Right.

11 MR. TAURIAINEN: The current deadline in  
12 the Byron-Bethany matter is January --

13 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: January 18th.

14 MR. TAURIAINEN: -- January 18th for  
15 initial submittals and then rebuttal on February  
16 22nd.

17 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: 22nd? I had  
18 written down 21st, so okay. So let's move to the  
19 West Side Irrigation District.

20 MS. ZOLEZZI: Yes, that deadline, while  
21 definitely better than what we have now, really  
22 depends on when we can get the discovery scheduled.

23 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: DWR.

24 MS. MCGINNIS: Can you clarify the  
25 question?

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Do you have  
2 specific deadlines to recommend for the submission  
3 of exhibits and written rebuttal testimony?

4 MS. MCGINNIS: I don't have any specific  
5 dates in mind or necessarily that they be  
6 coordinated with deadlines of the Byron-Bethany  
7 matter. Just that if the hearing is postponed that  
8 the deadlines are all moved appropriately.

9 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. South  
10 Delta. I won't forget you this time.

11 MR. RUIZ: Thank you. It's difficult to  
12 make a definitive comment or have an opinion until  
13 we know, frankly, what your rulings are on the  
14 protective orders, but we would agree that the  
15 hearing does need to be delayed and it should be  
16 closer in time to the BBID hearing.

17 MR. BUCKMAN: Vice-Chair, if I can jump in  
18 here. I think in general we're looking for an amount  
19 of time, not necessarily specific dates. So if you  
20 typically think that you need four weeks prior to  
21 the hearing to prepare your exhibits, I think that  
22 would be helpful. If we're going to do written  
23 rebuttal, it would need to be some timeframe in  
24 between the exhibits and the written rebuttal, if  
25 you think that written rebuttal would be helpful.

1           So I think those are the things that we're  
2 looking at, not specific dates, because right now we  
3 don't have a specific hearing date in mind so, of  
4 course, there wouldn't necessarily be a deadline  
5 associated with that, but in general, amounts of  
6 times that you need to prepare and whether you think  
7 written rebuttal is going to be helpful or not and  
8 the associated timeframe in between that, the  
9 hearing, and the exhibit deadline. Thank you.

10           MR. RUIZ: I definitely think that written  
11 rebuttal would be necessary and important. The  
12 deadlines and the typical timeframes in between when  
13 the witness statements are due relative to the  
14 hearing and relative to rebuttal, not generally  
15 opposed to that. But again, I'd have to look at it  
16 further but it's going to have to depend on when  
17 we're able to complete our discovery, frankly.

18           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Does anyone  
19 who's spoken earlier have anything about timeframe?  
20 Okay.

21           MS. MCGINNIS: Yes, I would like to add I  
22 believe written rebuttal would be helpful, and about  
23 a month in between the submittal and the written  
24 testimony and exhibits and the rebuttal would be  
25 sufficient.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay.

2 MR. TAURIAINEN: Prosecution agrees with  
3 that. That was implicit but not expressly stated in  
4 my letter on Friday. But yeah, rebuttal is  
5 definitely important. And of course, I believe  
6 mitigates almost all of the concerns that the  
7 parties have about discovery, and also about four  
8 weeks in between. And then some time ahead of  
9 hearing. It doesn't have to be four weeks, but...

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Central Delta  
11 Water Agency.

12 MS. SPALETTA: I agree with the timeframes  
13 that have been expressed, about a month in between  
14 the case in chief submittals and the rebuttal  
15 submittals, and then at least three weeks between  
16 rebuttal and hearing. I think that will help the  
17 parties prepare for a more streamlined presentation  
18 at hearing. But it does depend on when we can  
19 complete discovery.

20 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Byron-  
21 Bethany.

22 MR. KELLY: Yes, thank you. I think I agree  
23 with Central Delta, this all really depends on what  
24 happens with the protective orders. If protective  
25 orders are issued and folks aren't allowed to

1 conduct discovery until after the submittal of  
2 direct testimony, it's going to require more than  
3 four weeks for rebuttal, because we're going to have  
4 to be able to actually schedule, take the  
5 depositions, and then prepare rebuttal testimony  
6 based on that discovery, and that won't happen  
7 within four weeks.

8           If, on the other hand, the parties are  
9 allowed to move with discovery now, I think that  
10 schedule, the four week schedule between direct  
11 testimony and rebuttal, and about a month between  
12 rebuttal and the hearing are probably appropriate.

13           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Earlier it  
14 was three weeks.

15           MR. KELLY: Roughly, yes, three weeks.  
16 Yeah, those timeframes are more reasonable if we're  
17 able to do discovery prior to direct testimony.

18           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Thank you.  
19 San Joaquin Tributaries Authority.

20           MS. KINCAID: The SJTA agrees with what's  
21 been said previously. The only thing that I would  
22 add is that if the protective order decision  
23 requires that depositions aren't to be taken until  
24 after witness statements we will be making a request  
25 that we stagger witness statements and that we can

1 submit ours later than the prosecution team. Again,  
2 not frankly providing the most expeditious route  
3 there, but we will probably have to do that and  
4 request that we submit them later and after  
5 discovery. For us the three to four week timeframe  
6 once we get that all figured out is fine. Thank you.

7 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: State Water  
8 Contractors.

9 MS. MORRIS: State Water Contractors are  
10 fine submitting written rebuttal. In terms of the  
11 timing of that, in other hearings it's often come  
12 during hearing or after the hearing.

13 It's difficult for us, given the level of  
14 participation we may or may not be doing here, based  
15 on what we see coming in, to make any determination.  
16 So if written rebuttal testimony is going to be  
17 required, there needs to be sufficient time to look  
18 at all the voluminous potential materials coming in  
19 based on what I don't really understand the scope  
20 and the magnitude of what discovery is going to be  
21 occurring in this hearing.

22 And then finally, I'd just like to make a  
23 point of clarification. You know, State Water  
24 Contractors is a party. I have not been contacted,  
25 to my knowledge, about depositions or coordinating

1 on scheduling of depositions. State Water  
2 Contractors will be participating in those  
3 depositions, at least monitoring them, so I'd make a  
4 request that if parties are discussing that, include  
5 all parties.

6 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: The City and  
7 County of San Francisco.

8 MR. KNAPP: San Francisco agrees with the  
9 timeframes that have been discussed, four weeks  
10 between direct and rebuttal testimony seems  
11 adequate, and three weeks between rebuttal testimony  
12 and hearing seems fine.

13 I guess as a point of clarification with  
14 regard if depositions do go forward, San Francisco  
15 doesn't intend to issue any deposition notices at  
16 this point, but we would like to be able to  
17 participate and we wanted to clarify whether it  
18 would be necessary for us to submit deposition  
19 notices in order to do so.

20 MS. KUENZI: I wouldn't think so. I mean,  
21 these deposition notices should be going to all of  
22 the parties unless -- that would seem to be standard  
23 practice, and then coordinate among yourselves.

24 MR. KNAPP: Thank you.

25 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And finally,

1 unless I left someone out, Westlands Water District.

2 MS. AKROYD: Westlands would like to echo  
3 the comments of State Water Contractors, both in  
4 that we would request that written rebuttal  
5 testimony be during or after the hearing so we'll  
6 have seen all the evidence that has been presented.

7 And that also in terms of receiving notices  
8 of depositions, we request that we receive notice  
9 and be able to participate in those depositions.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: So you think  
11 the written rebuttal should be after the hearing.

12 MS. AKROYD: Either during or after. If  
13 there's something that comes off during cross-  
14 examination or during direct testimony in the  
15 proceeding, we'd like an opportunity to respond in  
16 writing. Thank you.

17 MR. MONA: I would just like to reiterate  
18 my understanding of the steps that we're talking  
19 about here.

20 So we're talking about first the responses  
21 to the prosecution team's motion, followed by  
22 depositions, followed by discovery, followed by  
23 stipulations if any, followed by submittal of  
24 exhibits, and followed by rebuttal testimony; is  
25 that the general understanding of the order of

1 things to come?

2 MR. TAURIAINEN: I think if I can  
3 characterize all the water agencies [skip]  
4 Depositions could come at any time, so after  
5 submittal, before submittal. [skip] restricted to  
6 prior to the parties' submittals of the case in  
7 chief.

8 MR. KELLY: That's not correct, and I'm not  
9 sure I know which water agencies are aligned, so  
10 I'll just say on behalf of Byron-Bethany that that's  
11 not correct, that's not our position.

12 I want to take the depositions prior to the  
13 submittal of direct written testimony in this case.  
14 I don't intend on asking to depose anybody post  
15 submittal of written testimony, with the caveat that  
16 if there's something substantially different that we  
17 learn during depositions that gets submitted during  
18 direct testimony, we may reserve the right to come  
19 before you and to request further discovery if for  
20 some reason it's entirely inconsistent, but I don't  
21 anticipate that happening.

22 So I anticipate that discovery for my  
23 client would happen before written submittal, and  
24 then we would be done.

25 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Does anyone

1 need to read through that list that he just  
2 outlined? Okay. We have many things to talk about.

3           Next, stipulations, to facilitate the  
4 efficient conduct at the hearing, I ask the  
5 prosecution team and the West Side Irrigation  
6 District to meet and confer regarding stipulations  
7 of the material facts not in dispute, and that was  
8 mentioned earlier as well.

9           Does anyone have comments on this matter,  
10 the idea of stipulations?

11           MS. ZOLEZZI: Yes, Hearing Officer. We  
12 believe that the West Side Irrigation District  
13 hearing has a lot of opportunity for stipulations. I  
14 have, in fact, drafted a proposal to the prosecution  
15 team that we're internally reviewing that he should  
16 receive shortly. We believe that we can  
17 significantly restrict the hearing issues, the key  
18 issues, and reduce them.

19           In fact, as Ms. Spaletta mentioned earlier,  
20 after discovery we can probably further reduce  
21 those, so we think there's a real opportunity here  
22 and we'll be conferring this week probably.

23           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Any comment?

24           MR. TAURIAINEN: We look forward to  
25 conferring.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: I'll run  
2 through the list, and if anyone has anything in  
3 addition to speak to this. DWR? On the  
4 stipulations.

5 MS. MCGINNIS: No, thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Central  
7 Delta?

8 MS. SPALETTA: Nothing further.

9 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Byron-  
10 Bethany?

11 MR. KELLY: No, thank you.

12 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin  
13 Tributaries Authority.

14 MS. KINCAID: No, although I would be  
15 interested to know if the stipulation would be just  
16 between West Side and the prosecution team or if it  
17 would be among a larger group of parties, and we  
18 should think about how that will work if it's going  
19 to be among everyone.

20 I would hate to get into a situation where  
21 the prosecution team and West Side stipulate to  
22 things and the other members don't and that doesn't  
23 get us very far, so we should think about that.

24 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Good point.  
25 That's an excellent point, thank you.

1 State Water Contractors.

2 MS. MORRIS: No, thank you.

3 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: City and  
4 County of San Francisco.

5 MR. KNAPP: We have nothing to add, thank  
6 you.

7 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And  
8 Westlands.

9 MS. AKROYD: Nothing further.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Thank you.

11 Okay. In terms of time limits, as stated in  
12 my October 8th letter, I intend to impose specific  
13 time limits for opening and policy statements,  
14 direct testimony and cross-examination. I'm also  
15 considering time limits on rebuttal testimony.

16 Again, this is all to make sure we're not  
17 saying more than we need to say, but we want to make  
18 sure we say what is needed.

19 The parties may choose to combine their  
20 allowed time with that of other parties, but will be  
21 required to indicate their intent in advance of the  
22 hearing.

23 I may alter the time limits at a future  
24 date if necessary to ensure that hearing proceeds  
25 efficiently.

1           Does anyone have comments on this? I'll  
2 start with the prosecution team. Time limits.

3           MR. TAURIAINEN: I think we'll likely need  
4 to address specific time limits at the hearing  
5 either at the commencement of the hearing or maybe  
6 in a second prehearing conference.

7           One issue would be that the prosecution  
8 team would request that the hearing officer do  
9 direct parties to coordinate and group their  
10 presentations or cross-examination and rebuttal.

11           As Mr. Kelly with Byron-Bethany questioned,  
12 there really are alignments of the parties here, and  
13 in Byron-Bethany the hearing officer has instructed  
14 the parties to group accordingly, and I would ask  
15 that you do the same.

16           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. West  
17 Side.

18           MS. ZOLEZZI: Yes, we do have some  
19 comments.

20           First, to reply to the prosecution team. I  
21 don't know how you can identify that parties are in  
22 alignment before we've made any position statements,  
23 but I guess we'll find out.

24           Regarding the specific time limits proposed  
25 upon the parties, the twenty minute per witness

1 that's been thrown out is acceptable for all  
2 witnesses to the West Side Irrigation District  
3 except the parties' experts. We believe the experts  
4 will need more time to summarize their statements.  
5 We would suggest that the time limit be one hour for  
6 experts and twenty minutes for the other parties.

7           And we think the total time limit as well  
8 is not sufficient and we would respectfully request  
9 three hours instead of the one hour.

10           Now, this does not mean that the hearing  
11 officer can't step in and say this is being  
12 duplicative, and that is entirely appropriate, but  
13 we would request the opportunity to use that full  
14 time period if it's not duplicative and if it is  
15 providing new evidence.

16           So I think it may also, as the prosecution  
17 team mentioned, be easier to set those time limits  
18 after discovery, so perhaps we would want to have a  
19 post discovery hearing conference to hone in on  
20 that. Thank you.

21           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: South Delta  
22 Water Agency.

23           MR. RUIZ: South Delta Water Agency agrees  
24 with the comments Ms. Zolezzi just made in terms of  
25 the specific time limit, but just emphasizes that I

1 don't think we can fully know that until we get done  
2 with the discovery in terms of how that's going to  
3 shake out or if it's just going to be additional  
4 disputes as we go along. Thank you.

5 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Do you think  
6 there will need to be a prehearing conference post -  
7 -

8 MR. RUIZ: I think after, Yes, I think an  
9 additional prehearing conference after the discovery  
10 is completed or at least substantially completed is  
11 going to help things significantly.

12 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And is that  
13 also the time when parties would indicate that they  
14 are combining their times if we held this prehearing  
15 conference?

16 MR. RUIZ: I would think that would be the  
17 time parties would be able to understand that after  
18 the discovery is completed.

19 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay.  
20 California Department of Water Resources.

21 MS. MCGINNIS: Thank you, Hearing Officer.  
22 Given that the evidence that parties are submitting  
23 is going to be in a written testimony, DWR agrees  
24 with the time limits that are proposed in the -- I  
25 can't remember the name of the document, but the

1 document attached to the hearing notice.

2 And then also agree that we can coordinate  
3 cross and rebuttal.

4 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: South Delta  
5 Water Agency?

6 MR. RUIZ: I just responded. I think you  
7 meant Central Delta.

8 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: I'm sorry.  
9 Yes, Central Delta. I keep bouncing around you.

10 MS. SPALETTA: Thank you, Hearing Officer.  
11 Jennifer Spaletta for Central Delta Water Agency. I  
12 would actually suggest that the second prehearing  
13 conference occur after the submittal of the written  
14 rebuttal testimony. I think that is the point in  
15 time in which we will know the scope, particularly  
16 of expert testimony.

17 I will tell you that I have personally  
18 reviewed some of the spreadsheets that the State  
19 Board has produced and some of them have more than  
20 twenty tabs, so if I were to ask one question per  
21 tab of the spreadsheet I would exceed my ten minutes  
22 on cross.

23 So I am concerned about seeing what we have  
24 as far as written submittals, particularly from  
25 experts, before we talk about time limits, and I

1 think it would be most appropriate after all of the  
2 written testimony has been presented.

3 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: But you are  
4 interested in the combination of the testimonies.

5 MS. SPALETTA: Absolutely. I do not want to  
6 be here any longer than necessary, along with  
7 everyone else, so we will definitely want to combine  
8 but we can't make that decision until we've seen the  
9 testimony.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Thank  
11 you. Byron-Bethany.

12 MR. KELLY: Yes, thank you. We agree with  
13 Central Delta that the second prehearing conference  
14 happen after the submittal of written testimony. I  
15 think that makes the most sense.

16 As for the time limits at the hearing, I  
17 think it all depends on how many parties are  
18 aligned. If there are two or three parties aligned  
19 in cross-examination, it might make sense to limit  
20 it to twenty minutes. But if there are eight parties  
21 aligned, it wouldn't make sense to give them only  
22 twenty minutes; maybe an hour for cross. And so  
23 that's the kind of stuff I think we're not going to  
24 know maybe until the second prehearing conference.

25 I will say, though, that I think conducting

1 discovery will go a long way to providing parties  
2 with a good opportunity to limit cross-examination,  
3 because that's when we'll really get to be able to  
4 get at the real questions we have, figure out where  
5 the real controversies are, and then kind of present  
6 those to you in a streamlined cross-examination at  
7 the hearing.

8           And so, again, I just think that the  
9 ability to do discovery is going to go a long way to  
10 making the hearing a little more streamlined and  
11 move a little more quickly, but as for the actual  
12 times, I think it's best left until the second  
13 prehearing conference to figure out what those  
14 should be.

15           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin  
16 Tributaries Authority.

17           MS. KINCAID: We also agree that a second  
18 prehearing conference is probably a good idea, and  
19 it's probably best to review times at that point.

20           The expert testimony time does seem  
21 limited. If I had to make a request right now, we  
22 would ask for an hour for our experts. But again, I  
23 think that's better left to closer to the hearing.  
24 Thanks.

25           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Now, remind

1 me when are the stipulations, where do they fall?

2 MR. MONA: I think I heard the parties say  
3 that the stipulations could be submitted at any  
4 time, but according to my list here, stipulations  
5 should come after discovery and before the exhibits  
6 and before written testimony.

7 And with regards to the prehearing  
8 conference, any suggestions as to when you'd like to  
9 have the prehearing conference; two weeks after  
10 rebuttal testimony is submitted, or two weeks before  
11 the hearing, or any suggestions?

12 MS. KINCAID: Two weeks before the hearing  
13 is probably the best idea. At that point hopefully  
14 we'll have all stipulations, all discovery,  
15 everything will be wrapped up and we can all speak  
16 much more intelligently on what we think is going to  
17 happen at the hearing. So that sounds appropriate to  
18 the San Joaquin Tributaries Authority.

19 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And those who  
20 have spoken up earlier, if you disagree with this,  
21 raise your hand; otherwise, we'll assume that you  
22 agree.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Ma'am, this is Phil Williams  
24 with Westland. I would echo that the trigger for a  
25 second prehearing conference is most appropriately

1 the hearing itself and not the submission of any  
2 discovery or statements.

3 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: State Water  
4 Contractors.

5 MS. MORRIS: One point of clarification. In  
6 terms of the opening or policy statements, the  
7 parties who are only participating by rebuttal and  
8 cross-examination are limited to five minutes, and  
9 I'd like to clarify that we can also submit  
10 statements in writing, because it's not exactly  
11 clear.

12 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Yes, that was  
13 my understanding as well.

14 MS. MORRIS: Fantastic. And then in terms  
15 of rebuttal, I believe a second prehearing  
16 conference after we've seen the evidence and the  
17 parties' statements, then I will be able to assess  
18 in a much better fashion how much time I would need  
19 for rebuttal.

20 And I would only point out that if the time  
21 limits are expanded for cross-examination, that  
22 means there's more material to be covered and they  
23 should be correspondingly expanded for cross-  
24 examination as well.

25 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Finally, City

1 and County of San Francisco.

2 MR. KNAPP: We agree that a second  
3 prehearing conference sounds like the best way to go  
4 forward, and that --

5 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: What do you  
6 think about making it part of the hearing itself, is  
7 the recommendation from Westlands.

8 MR. KNAPP: I understood the recommendation  
9 from Westland was just that the time trigger for  
10 when we would have the second prehearing conference  
11 should be set in relation to the hearing, so it  
12 should be two weeks back from the start of the  
13 hearing.

14 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Is that what  
15 you said? I'm sorry, I misunderstood.

16 MR. WILLIAMS: That may not have been what  
17 I said but that is what I meant, yes.

18 MR. KNAPP: And we agree with that.

19 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Good thing it  
20 got clarified. Thank you.

21 Okay, the order of presentation, are there  
22 any comments on the tentative order of presentation  
23 or cross specified in my October 8 letter? Yes.

24 MR. TAURIAINEN: Prosecution team. No  
25 specific comments other than the one I made earlier

1 about needing to group the parties according to  
2 alignment.

3 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Right. Okay.  
4 Absolutely, parties will be encouraged through time  
5 limits to do this, because it will give you more  
6 time, but we will look at the expert witness time  
7 request.

8 Let's see. The West Side?

9 MS. ZOLEZZI: No comments.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Department of  
11 Water Resources?

12 MS. MCGINNIS: No comments.

13 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: South Delta.

14 MR. RUIZ: No comments.

15 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Central  
16 Delta.

17 MS. SPALETTA: No comments.

18 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Byron-  
19 Bethany.

20 MR. KELLY: No comments, thank you.

21 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin  
22 Tributaries Authority.

23 MS. KINCAID: Also no comments, thank you.

24 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: State Water  
25 Contractors.

1 MS. MORRIS: A quick clarification. If  
2 parties decide to group and combine their times, in  
3 particular on cross-examination, I want to make sure  
4 that we're able to have two attorneys potentially  
5 questioning, because we'd like to be able to  
6 coordinate with other parties who may have similar  
7 interests but there may be a need for one attorney  
8 to ask, you know, some follow-up questions so long  
9 as it's within the time limits.

10 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: So you're  
11 requesting that there be at least two or a maximum  
12 of two.

13 MS. MORRIS: My request is, if parties  
14 group, that attorneys from different parties are  
15 able, within the timeframe of the grouping, to ask  
16 questions.

17 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. That  
18 should be okay.

19 MS. KUENZI: That would be, I think, what  
20 we were thinking in terms of combining time, was  
21 that the parties, once combined, you could allocate  
22 the time among yourselves as you saw fit.

23 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: City and  
24 County of San Francisco.

25 MR. KNAPP: No comments.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And  
2 Westlands.

3 MS. AKROYD: Nothing regarding the order of  
4 presentation or cross, but I'd note that it states  
5 on here Westlands Water Company and It's Westlands  
6 Water District. The October 8th document.

7 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Oops. I  
8 didn't catch that, I'm sorry. I do know that.

9 Okay, redirect and recross examination. At  
10 my discretion during the hearing I may allow  
11 redirect examination upon an offer of proof as to  
12 the substance, purpose, and relevancy of the  
13 expected testimony. So this is, I hope there will be  
14 very little of this, but it certainly is possible.  
15 So does anyone have any questions or comments  
16 regarding redirect and recross? Let's start with the  
17 prosecution team.

18 MR. TAURIAINEN: No.

19 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: West Side.

20 MS. ZOLEZZI: We don't necessarily disagree  
21 with the statement, we just want to make sure that  
22 where it is needed it's allowed.

23 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: California  
24 Department of Water Resources.

25 MS. MCGINNIS: DWR agrees that it may be

1 necessary to have redirect and recross.

2 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: South Delta.

3 MR. RUIZ: No comments other than it's

4 likely it will be necessary.

5 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Central

6 Delta.

7 MS. SPALETTA: No further comments.

8 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Byron-

9 Bethany.

10 MR. KELLY: The only comment is if you're

11 going to allow redirect then we need to have

12 recross, but that's it.

13 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin

14 Tributaries Authority.

15 MS. KINCAID: No comments, thank you.

16 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: State Water

17 Contractors.

18 MS. MORRIS: No comments.

19 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Francisco

20 City and County.

21 MR. KNAPP: No comments, thank you.

22 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Westlands.

23 MS. AKROYD: No comments, thank you.

24 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Now, we have

25 two more, closing briefs and prehearing briefs. I

1 plan to allow the submission of closing briefs. I  
2 will set the deadline and page limits for closing  
3 briefs at the end of the hearing. I'd like to hear  
4 from parties as to whether you think submittal of  
5 prehearing briefs would be helpful, and the timing  
6 of those briefs. So let's start with prosecution  
7 team.

8 MR. TAURIAINEN: I assume just as an  
9 initial matter that prehearing briefs would be  
10 limited to the parties who are submitting cases in  
11 chief rather than cross or rebuttal parties.

12 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Right. That's  
13 my understanding.

14 MS. KUENZI: I think actually it depends on  
15 what kind of prehearing briefs we would allow. If  
16 those are legal briefs on legal issues, I don't  
17 think it would be necessarily limited.

18 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Oh, okay.

19 MS. KUENZI: Because there may be relevant  
20 comments on that as well. So really I think we're  
21 looking for comments on what kind of briefing that  
22 you think would be helpful to us.

23 MR. TAURIAINEN: Then I think some  
24 prehearing briefing will be necessary and will  
25 likely be very closely aligned with the prehearing

1 briefs that are about to be requested in the Byron-  
2 Bethany matter. In that case the parties later this  
3 week will be submitting their specific legal issues  
4 to be briefed in that case, so the prehearing briefs  
5 in that case.

6 As far as closing briefs, I think setting  
7 time and page limits at the end of the hearing  
8 [skip].

9 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: West Side.

10 MS. ZOLEZZI: I'm sorry, Hearing Officer, I  
11 was taken off guard by the statement about what's  
12 happening in the BBID matter since we weren't  
13 notified about that.

14 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: But we're not  
15 talking about that here, right?

16 MS. ZOLEZZI: No, we're not talking about  
17 that here.

18 We do believe it would be helpful to have  
19 prehearing briefs. I do believe those would have to  
20 be very narrow and very direct. I simply think it  
21 would be helpful for each party to have an  
22 opportunity to put forward its legal theories. I  
23 think that would help the hearing officer in  
24 understanding what we're trying to say through  
25 putting on our case in chief and our rebuttal

1 evidence, but I don't think they need to be very  
2 lengthy.

3           And I don't have anything to add as far as  
4 timing. It's going to be very difficult to put those  
5 together after discovery has been completed, after  
6 the parties have submitted their exhibit lists and  
7 witnesses and still have enough time to put those  
8 together before the hearing, so I think a prehearing  
9 conference will help put all that together.

10           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: DWR.

11           MS. MCGINNIS: DWR agrees that closing  
12 briefs should be allowed and that prehearing legal  
13 briefs to help the hearing team understand the  
14 parties' legal theories would be helpful. And that  
15 since it's for your benefit, the deadline, I think,  
16 is up to you.

17           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Thank  
18 you. South Delta.

19           MR. RUIZ: South Delta agrees that  
20 prehearing briefs based on legal issues is  
21 necessary. And timing, again, I think it going to be  
22 very close in time to the hearing just because the  
23 reality of how crunched this will be. And also  
24 agrees that post hearing briefs are necessary.

25           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Central

1 Delta.

2 MS. SPALETTA: I have nothing to add to  
3 that.

4 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Byron-  
5 Bethany.

6 MR. KELLY: I think prehearing briefs may  
7 be useful for legal issues. I think arguing fact  
8 issues in prehearing briefs isn't going to be very  
9 useful because you don't know what you're going to  
10 accept and not accept into evidence, and so I think  
11 that's probably best saved for the hearing and for  
12 posthearing briefing.

13 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: San Joaquin  
14 Tributaries Authority.

15 MS. KINCAID: The SJTA endorses prehearing  
16 briefs. My suggestion would be that they be due  
17 about a week before the hearing so folks can read  
18 them, depending on the length. I mean, you may need  
19 more than a week of you're going to allow fifty  
20 pages, but if they're twenty or thirty pages a week  
21 before the hearing seems like a prudent approach.  
22 Thank you.

23 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And do you  
24 think it could be done during the prehearing  
25 conference?

1           MS. KINCAID: You know, I think it's  
2 probably smart to have them due just after that. I  
3 think certain issues may be teed up if people are  
4 not particularly happy with the time limit that  
5 they're given and they want to put that in a  
6 prehearing brief, you can do that.

7           I also think sometimes it's just difficult  
8 to provide prehearing briefs at the prehearing  
9 conference. My suggestion would be to have the  
10 conference two weeks out and then the brief due  
11 maybe a week later. That would give us a chance to  
12 read it. Thanks.

13           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: State Water  
14 Contractors.

15           MS. MORRIS: State Water Contractors  
16 support prebriefing on legal issues that's narrow in  
17 scope, preferably with page limitations.

18           And in terms of closing briefs, I think  
19 closing briefs are a great idea. It seems to me  
20 something that the hearing officer might handle at  
21 the end of the hearing and may give the parties  
22 direction on how it would be helpful for those to be  
23 drafted and what questions potentially you would  
24 like to have answered.

25           HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: City and

1 County of San Francisco.

2 MR. KNAPP: San Francisco supports discreet  
3 prehearing legal briefing and agrees with the  
4 timeline suggested by the SJTA of a week before the  
5 hearing commences. And also supports the closing  
6 briefs. Thank you.

7 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: And  
8 Westlands.

9 MS. AKROYD: Westlands would support  
10 prehearing legal briefs and closing briefs for all  
11 parties.

12 MR. KELLY: Hearing Officer Spivy-Weber,  
13 can I just clarify perhaps. When I said that I think  
14 it's appropriate to do prehearing legal briefing and  
15 save the factual issues for what's kind of argued  
16 about at the hearing and in closing briefing, I  
17 don't want that to preclude any party from being  
18 able to submit a brief ahead of the hearing, a  
19 motion to dismiss or some other kind of motion that  
20 would be based on judicially noticeable facts or  
21 facts not in dispute. There may be some procedural  
22 motions that folks want to file that may involve  
23 facts that are not disputed or judicially  
24 noticeable. I just don't want to preclude anybody  
25 from doing that.

1 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Okay. Thank  
2 you. That's a good clarification, thank you very  
3 much.

4 MR. KELLY: Thank you.

5 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Finally, I  
6 want to remind the parties with regard to ex parte  
7 communications. There will be no ex parte  
8 communications with State Board members or State  
9 Board hearing team staff and supervisors regarding  
10 substantive or controversial procedural issues  
11 within the scope of the proceeding.

12 Any communications regarding potentially  
13 substantive or controversial procedural matters,  
14 including but not limited to evidence, briefs, and  
15 motions, must demonstrate that all parties were  
16 served and the manner of service.

17 As we contemplate dates, there are a lot of  
18 you, and it's very, very hard to find dates. So in  
19 February will you look at your calendars, and when  
20 you submit your letters by Wednesday, could you also  
21 indicate what your availability is for dates in  
22 February and March. And I would say a good three  
23 days or four. Probably three, I hope three, but you  
24 know, I'm optimistic. We've set aside five  
25 initially.

1 Yes.

2 MR. TAURIAINEN: Could you clarify what  
3 letters on Wednesday. Do you mean oppositions to the  
4 motions for protective orders?

5 HEARING OFFICER SPIVY-WEBER: Yeah, yeah.  
6 So let's just take care of both tasks at one time.

7 Does anyone wish to provide comment or any  
8 other procedural matters not previously discussed  
9 today? Seeing no one, I will provide a letter  
10 regarding the procedural issues that we discussed  
11 today after we have -- as soon as possible. I can't  
12 guarantee exactly when that will be, but it will be  
13 very -- I am very interested in making sure that  
14 this moves along as promptly as possible, and so I  
15 will get a letter out as soon as I can after  
16 Wednesday.

17 Thank you all for participating in this  
18 prehearing conference. Your participation will  
19 assist us in our efforts to ensure that the hearing  
20 proceeds smoothly. This has been very, very helpful.  
21 Thank you.

22 (Adjourned)

23 --o0o--

24

25

**TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE**

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of November, 2015.



---

Terri Harper  
Certified Transcriber  
AAERT No. CET\*\*D-709