

1 Robin McGinnis (SBN: 276400)  
2 Office of the Chief Counsel  
3 California Department of Water Resources  
4 P.O. Box 942836  
5 1416 Ninth Street, Room 1104  
6 Sacramento, CA 94236-0001  
7 Telephone: (916) 657-5400  
8 E-mail: robin.mcginis@water.ca.gov

9 Attorney for CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
10 WATER RESOURCES

11 CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

12 **In the matter of the Draft Cease and Desist  
13 Order issued to The West Side Irrigation  
14 District, Enforcement Action ENF01949;**

15 **and**

16 **In the Matter of the Administrative Civil  
17 Liability Complaint issued to  
18 Byron-Bethany Irrigation District,  
19 Enforcement Action ENF01951.**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
20 WATER RESOURCES' MOTION FOR  
21 PROTECTIVE ORDER**

22 California Department of Water Resources ("DWR") requests that the Hearing Officers in  
23 the above-referenced enforcement actions issue protective orders pursuant to Code of Civil  
24 Procedure sections 2019.030 and 2025.420 prohibiting the deposition of Paul Marshall and  
25 accompanying requests for production of documents served by Byron-Bethany Irrigation District  
26 ("BBID") and the Central Delta and South Delta Water Agencies (referred to jointly as  
27 "CDWA"). The deposition and production of documents are unreasonably duplicative and  
28 cumulative, would impose undue burden, and the noticing parties are able to obtain the  
information from a more convenient, less burdensome, and less expensive source during cross  
examination that will occur during the hearing, which commences in three weeks. Indeed, DWR  
already produced some of the documents that BBID and CDWA requested in response to requests  
for production of documents that were included in prior notices for the deposition of Mr.  
Marshall, which were cancelled.

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Even though all written direct and rebuttal testimony and exhibits have been submitted at  
3 this point in the enforcement actions and DWR has already produced documents, BBID and  
4 CDWA are *again*<sup>1</sup> demanding a deposition of Mr. Marshall to occur before March 21, 2016 when  
5 Phase I of the hearings begins. In the recent deposition notices, they also seek from Mr. Marshall  
6 duplicative and additional documents.<sup>2</sup> The rebuttal testimony of Mr. Marshall in most part  
7 responds to misrepresentations or inaccuracies of BBID and WSID that are outside the scope of  
8 the enforcement actions. DWR also objected to extraneous and irrelevant arguments in the legal  
9 briefs submitted by the parties, but nevertheless was compelled to correct the record. Filing  
10 rebuttal to irrelevant direct testimony does not result in the waiver of the original objection or  
11 request that the unresponsive legal briefs be struck from the record. These same parties are  
12 looking to use the discovery process this late in the process to further develop erroneous  
13 arguments and expand the scope.<sup>3</sup> These efforts will not further the efficiency and expediency of  
14 these hearings, but will result in additional confusion of relevant issues. A more efficient and less  
15 burdensome process is for BBID and CDWA to rely on the upcoming hearing process and cross-  
16 examination of witnesses.

17 In an attempt to meet, confer, and compromise regarding the recent Deposition Notices and  
18 Requests for Production of Documents, a conference call between BBID, CDWA, DWR, and  
19 State Water Contractors (“SWC”) occurred on February 25, 2016. (See Declaration of Robin  
20 McGinnis in Support of DWR’s Motion for Protective Order (“McGinnis Decl.”), at ¶ 16). It  
21 became clear from statements made during the call that the noticing parties intend the scope of  
22 the proposed deposition to be unlimited.

---

24 <sup>1</sup> BBID and WSID previously set the Deposition of Mr. Marshall to occur on November 24, 2015, along  
25 with a Request for Production of Documents. After DWR changed its participation as a party to a limited role, the  
parties decided not to depose Mr. Marshall.

26 <sup>2</sup> On December 7, 2015, DWR responded to document requests by the parties that were included in the  
original deposition notices.

27 <sup>3</sup> For example, BBID requested documents concerning or relating to the *current and/or historical* diversions  
28 of water by BBID, which is not relevant to the question of whether it was legally diverting water during June of  
2015, the period subject to curtailment and the enforcement action.

1 In her October 23, 2015 procedural ruling in the WSID matter, Hearing Officer Spivy-  
2 Weber indicated the parties could seek a protective order to prohibit or postpone the deposition of  
3 a particular individual based on undue burden, the unreasonably duplicative or cumulative nature  
4 of the request, or the ability of the noticing party to obtain the information from a more  
5 convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive source. This Board has prevented depositions in  
6 previous proceedings when the information sought had already been or would be provided  
7 pursuant to the Board's hearing procedures and was thus obtainable from a more convenient, less  
8 burdensome, and less expensive source.<sup>4</sup>

9 The undue burden and expense of producing Mr. Marshall for deposition and production of  
10 a potentially large volume of documents, many of which are not relevant, most of which are not  
11 in the possession and control of Mr. Marshall, and some of which have already been produced,  
12 weeks before the commencement of the hearing, far outweighs any purported importance of such  
13 discovery to the noticing parties. Moreover, any information sought from Mr. Marshall at his  
14 deposition would be duplicative of the information the noticing parties have already obtained  
15 through the exchange of rebuttal testimony and exhibits and could obtain through the opportunity  
16 for cross-examination of rebuttal witnesses afforded by the evidentiary hearing process that will  
17 soon commence. Therefore, good cause exists for the issuance of DWR's requested protective  
18 order.

## 19 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

20 On July 16, 2015, the State Water Resources Control Board ("Board") issued a draft Cease  
21 and Desist Order to The West Side Irrigation District ("WSID") pursuant to Water Code Sections  
22 1052 and 1831. In response, WSID requested a formal hearing on August 7, 2015. On July 20,  
23 2015, the Board issued an Administrative Civil Liability Complaint to BBID pursuant to Water  
24 Code Sections 1052 and 1055. In response, BBID requested a formal hearing on August 6, 2015.

---

26 <sup>4</sup>*Water Right Hearing Regarding Proposed Cease and Desist Order Against Millview County Water*  
27 *District, Thomas P. Hill, and Steven L. Gomes*, December 3, 2009, available at:  
28 [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/hearings/millview/docs/hearofficerruling120309.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/hearings/millview/docs/hearofficerruling120309.pdf).

1           The initial hearing notices issued in the enforcement actions did not contemplate  
2 submission of rebuttal evidence prior to the commencement of the evidentiary hearing. (See  
3 Notices of Public Hearing dated August 19, 2015 (BBID) and September 1, 2015 and November  
4 10, 2015 (WSID).) On October 2, 2015, via e-mail, the hearing officer in the BBID matter  
5 continued the hearing date to March 21, 2016 and set a deadline for submission of written  
6 testimony and exhibits for cases-in-chief of January 18, 2016 and a deadline for submission of  
7 written rebuttal testimony and exhibits of February 22, 2016. A revised notice of public hearing  
8 was issued on October 20, 2015 correcting the deadline for submission of cases-in-chief to  
9 January 19, 2016. By ruling on December 16, 2016, the hearing officer in the WSID matter  
10 consolidated the proceeding with the BBID matter adopting the deadlines for submittal of  
11 cases-in-chief and rebuttal testimony. A Notice of Revised Schedule for Public Hearings for both  
12 proceedings was issued on January 8, 2016.

13           On September 2, 2015, DWR submitted a Notice of Intent to Appear in ENF01951  
14 indicating that Mr. Marshall would be an expert witness and testify regarding “Effects of Delta  
15 Diversions.” (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 4.) On October 2, 2015, DWR submitted a Notice of  
16 Intent to Appear in ENF01949 indicating that Mr. Marshall would be an expert witness and  
17 testify regarding “Effects of Delta Diversions.” (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 5.) BBID, CDWA,  
18 and WSID noticed the deposition of Mr. Marshall for November 24, 2015, reset the deposition for  
19 December 30, 2015, and reset it again for February 2, 2016. (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 6–8.) On  
20 December 7, 2015, DWR produced documents in response to requests for production of  
21 documents included in the original notices of deposition. (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 9.) On  
22 January 19, 2016, DWR submitted an Amended Notice of Intent to Appear indicating that it  
23 would participate in the hearing on cross-examination and rebuttal only. (See McGinnis Decl., at  
24 ¶ 10.) On January 28, 2016, BBID, CDWA, and WSID notified DWR that they did not “see a  
25 need to depose Paul [Marshall] at this point.” (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 11.) On February 22,  
26 2016, DWR submitted its rebuttal testimony and exhibits relied on. (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶  
27 12.)  
28

1 On February 23, 2016, CDWA served a “Notice of Taking Deposition of Paul Marshall,”  
2 which included a request for production of documents. (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 13.) In  
3 CDWA’s notice, they request documents including those: describing the “controlling factor” for  
4 State Water Project Delta Operations for each day from January 1, 2015 through December 31,  
5 2015; explaining or computing “Net Channel Depletions to meet Delta Consumptive Use”;  
6 explaining or identifying “authorized in-basin needs”; relating to how “Project operators adjust  
7 the exports scheduled at the SWP and CVP pumping plants to further prevent salinity incursion  
8 into the Delta”; explaining when, during 2014 and 2015, DWR failed to meet the “modified  
9 salinity objectives”; and relating to how “in-Delta users will continue to impact delta water  
10 quality despite the tools available to Project operators.” (*Ibid.*)

11 On February 24, 2016, BBID served an “Amended Notice of Deposition of Paul Marshall  
12 and Request for Production of Documents.” (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 14.) In BBID’s notice, it  
13 requests documents including those: concerning or relating to water right curtailments in 2015<sup>5</sup>;  
14 and concerning or relating to the *current and/or historical* diversions of water by BBID. (*Ibid.*)

15 In both, the deposition is noticed for March 3, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. in the same location.  
16 DWR made a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of the issues raised in  
17 this motion with BBID and CDWA as required by Code of Civil Procedure section 2025.420,  
18 subsection (a). (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 15.) DWR, SWC, BBID, and CDWA had a  
19 teleconference on February 25, 2016, but were unable to resolve the issues raised in this motion.  
20 (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 16.) On February 26, 2016, I notified BBID and CDWA that the  
21 deposition cannot go forward until there is a ruling on this motion. (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 17.)

### 22 **III. ARGUMENT**

23 The Water Code governs the Board’s hearing and discovery procedures, and incorporates  
24 elements of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Civil Discovery Act (Title 4 [commencing  
25 with Section 2016.010] of Part 4 of the Code of Civil Procedure). (See generally Wat. Code, §  
26 1100; Gov. Code, § 11400 et seq.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, §§ 648, 648.4.) The Board or any

---

27 <sup>5</sup> BBID argued in its Jan. 25, 2016 “Notice of Position” that the Board’s authority to curtail pre-1914 water  
28 rights is not at issue in this proceeding.

1 party to proceedings before the Board may take depositions of witnesses in accordance with the  
2 Civil Discovery Act. (Wat.Code, § 1100.)

3 But the right to discovery is not unlimited. The Hearing Officer may issue a protective  
4 order prohibiting or limiting depositions in order to protect a party or deponent from undue  
5 burden and expense. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2025.420, subd. (b).) The Hearing Officer may issue a  
6 protective order if the discovery sought would be “unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is  
7 obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive.”  
8 (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 2025.420, subd. (b), 2019.030, subds. (a), (b).)

9 Board Hearing Officers have issued protective orders or otherwise limited discovery in  
10 other Board proceedings. In the *Water Right Hearing Regarding Proposed Cease and Desist*  
11 *Order Against Millview County Water District, Thomas P. Hill, and Steven L. Gomes*, the  
12 Hearing Officer denied Millview, et al.’s request for pre-hearing discovery including depositions.  
13 (Hearing Officer’s Ruling dated December 3, 2009.) The Hearing Officer found that a protective  
14 order was warranted because the discovery sought was obtainable from a more convenient, less  
15 burdensome, and less expensive source. (*Id.*, at p. 2.) The Hearing Officer explained that the  
16 information sought by Millview, et al. had already been or would be provided pursuant to the  
17 Board’s hearing procedures. (*Ibid.*) Formal discovery was not warranted because the Prosecution  
18 Team identified its expert witnesses and would have to serve its written testimony and exhibits in  
19 advance of the hearing. (*Ibid.*) Thus, the information sought could be obtained in a less  
20 burdensome manner and formal discovery was unnecessary. (*Id.*, at p. 3.) The Court of Appeal  
21 upheld the Millview Hearing Officer’s ruling. (*Millview County Water Dist. v. State Water*  
22 *Resources Control Bd.* (2014) 229 Cal.App.4th 879, 906, as modified on denial of reh’g (Oct. 14,  
23 2014), review denied (Dec. 17, 2014).) Similarly, here the Board has a strong basis to issue the  
24 requested protective orders, finding that the upcoming hearing process and cross-examination  
25 provides an efficient, less burdensome, and less expensive method to obtain the information.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1           **A. Additional Discovery Following Submission of All Written Testimony and**  
2           **Exhibits Was Not Contemplated by the Parties or Hearing Officers.**

3           No allowances were made for the conduct of discovery after the submittal of rebuttal  
4 testimony just prior to the hearing. Generally, written rebuttal testimony and exhibits are not  
5 required to be submitted prior to the start of the hearing. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, §  
6 648.4(f).) For example, in the enforcement proceeding against WSID, submission of rebuttal  
7 testimony was initially scheduled after the commencement of the evidentiary hearing. (See  
8 Notice of Public Hearing dated November 10, 2015, at p. 2.) As stated by Hearing Officer  
9 Doduc, the purpose of requiring the submittal of written rebuttal testimony and exhibits before  
10 presentation at hearing was to improve hearing efficiency. (September 25, 2015 Pre-Hearing  
11 Conference Transcript, at p. 45:10-16.) To now allow depositions of rebuttal witnesses does not  
12 further efficiency but increases the likelihood of introducing irrelevant evidence and  
13 inappropriately expanding the scope of the hearings.

14           Further, no party proposed to conduct discovery after the submission of all written  
15 testimony and exhibits. In the prehearing conferences, a number of parties argued for time to  
16 conduct extensive discovery prior to the submission of testimony to enable the preparation of  
17 their cases-in-chief, the timing of which was opposed by the Prosecution Team. (See e.g.,  
18 September 25, 2015 Pre-Hearing Conference Transcript, at pp. 18:24–20:3, 38:11–39:4; October  
19 19, 2015 Pre-Hearing Conference Transcript, at pp. 16:7–18:14, 23:7–24:13.) Dan Kelly,  
20 attorney for BBID, stated that he anticipated completing all discovery prior to the submittal of  
21 BBID’s direct written testimony. (October 19, 2015 Pre-Hearing Conference Transcript, at p.  
22 43:8–24.) In fact, continuances of the hearing dates were provided, in part, to specifically allow  
23 the parties discovery prior to the submission of direct written testimony. (See October 2, 2015  
24 hearing officer’s email addressing procedural issues in the BBID enforcement proceeding, at p. 1;  
25 October 23, 2015 procedural ruling in the WSID enforcement proceeding, at p. 2.) Now that all  
26 direct testimony has been submitted, as well as written rebuttal to this testimony, the hearing  
27 should proceed where all parties can ask questions through cross-examination, making further  
28 depositions unnecessary.

1                   **B.     The Information Sought by Noticing Parties through the Deposition of Paul**  
2                   **Marshall is Duplicative of Information Already Available in a More**  
3                   **Convenient, Less Burdensome, and Less Expensive Manner.**

4                   As required by hearing procedures, Mr. Marshall will be made available to all parties for  
5                   cross-examination on his rebuttal testimony at the evidentiary hearing, providing parties with the  
6                   opportunity to question him concerning the bases for his testimony. Thus, the hearing procedures  
7                   adopted for the enforcement proceedings fully provide the noticing parties with the ability to gain  
8                   the information sought regarding Mr. Marshall’s rebuttal testimony in a more convenient, less  
9                   burdensome, and less expensive manner than noticing a continuing deposition of Mr. Marshall  
10                  with an extensive request for the production of documents. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.030, subd.  
11                  (a)(1); McGinnis Decl., at ¶¶ 13–14.) As of the date of service of the deposition notices, BBID  
12                  and CDWA were already in possession of Mr. Marshall’s submitted written rebuttal testimony,  
13                  documents relied on therein, and documents produced by DWR on December 7, 2015 in response  
14                  to the original notices of deposition.

15                  For these reasons, the information sought by the noticing parties is duplicative of  
16                  information already available to the parties in a manner more convenient, less burdensome, and  
17                  less expensive, namely the submission of written rebuttal testimony prior to the evidentiary  
18                  hearing, the opportunity to cross-examine all rebuttal witnesses during the hearing, and the  
19                  previous document production. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.030, subd. (a)(1).) As Hearing Officer  
20                  Doduc noted in her November 25, 2016 procedural ruling (p. 5), because the Board’s hearing  
21                  procedures require disclosure of evidence in advance, allow cross-examination of witnesses not  
22                  limited to the scope of their direct testimony, and do not strictly follow the rules of evidence  
23                  applicable to civil actions, the burden and cost of pre-hearing discovery and the likelihood that  
24                  the same information could be obtained through other, less expensive means, typically outweigh  
25                  the expected benefit to the discovering party.

26                   **C.     The Noticed Deposition Constitutes an Undue Burden and Expense on DWR**  
27                   **that Will Not Lead to the Discovery of Admissible Evidence.**

28                  DWR will and hereby does object to the requests for production of documents to the extent  
                  they seek documents in the possession of DWR and any “representative” of DWR not in the

1 possession or control of the deponent. The deposition of Mr. Marshall and the request for  
2 production of documents constitute an undue burden and expense that far outweigh the likelihood  
3 that any of the information sought will lead to the discovery of any further admissible evidence.  
4 (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 2017.020(a); 2025.420(b).) At this point in the proceedings, all of the direct  
5 and rebuttal written testimony and exhibits have been submitted in the consolidated proceedings  
6 per the adopted procedural rulings. Nothing in the documents or the deposition testimony sought  
7 to be produced will contribute to the admission of additional evidence, in particular for the cases-  
8 in-chief. (See Notices of Public Hearing dated August 19, 2015 (BBID) and September 1, 2015  
9 (WSID); October 2, 2015 hearing officer's email addressing procedural issues in the BBID  
10 enforcement proceeding, at p. 4.)

11 If the noticing parties simply seek information regarding Mr. Marshall's rebuttal testimony,  
12 the hearing procedures provide each party with the opportunity to cross-examine rebuttal  
13 witnesses. By noticing Mr. Marshall's deposition, however, the noticing parties seek the ability  
14 to question Mr. Marshall, for hours or days, in advance of the evidentiary hearings on topics that  
15 are beyond the scope of his rebuttal testimony. For example, BBID seeks to question Mr.  
16 Marshall not only on his actual rebuttal testimony but on any and all facts, opinions, or  
17 documents that more broadly refer to or relate to his testimony. (See McGinnis Decl., at ¶ 14.)

18 In addition, the noticing parties seek the production of documents in addition to those  
19 documents submitted as exhibits by DWR and cited by Mr. Marshall in his testimony. The  
20 deposition notices request the production of not only documents concerning or relating to Mr.  
21 Marshall's rebuttal testimony but documents well beyond the scope of Mr. Marshall's rebuttal  
22 testimony, some of which are also beyond the scope of these enforcement actions. They also,  
23 inappropriately, seek documents not within the possession or control of Mr. Marshall, including  
24 documents in the possession or control of anyone at DWR. (*Ibid.*)

25 In these proceedings, the noticing parties have been afforded the opportunity to review  
26 documents previously produced and written rebuttal testimony and exhibits in advance of the  
27 hearing, as well as the opportunity to cross-examine rebuttal witnesses at the evidentiary hearing.  
28 DWR should not be forced to bear the burden and considerable expense of producing its rebuttal

1 witness for a continuing deposition, just weeks prior to the evidentiary hearings, or the burden  
2 and expense of producing extensive documents, after the deadline for submission of evidence in  
3 these consolidated proceedings has passed and having already produced documents. The undue  
4 burden and expense to DWR far outweighs any benefit to noticing parties merely to prepare for  
5 the cross-examination of Mr. Marshall on the limited topics of his rebuttal testimony.

6 Here, the noticing parties seek to exploit the discovery process to not only prepare for the  
7 cross-examination of Mr. Marshall regarding his limited rebuttal testimony but also to engage in a  
8 fishing expedition for information and documents beyond the scope of Mr. Marshall's rebuttal  
9 testimony, all at the undue burden and expense of DWR. For these reasons, good cause exists for  
10 the issuance of a protective order prohibiting the deposition and production of documents.

11 **IV. CONCLUSION**

12 The deposition and production of documents are unreasonably duplicative and  
13 cumulative, would impose undue burden, and the noticing parties are able to obtain the  
14 information from a more convenient, less burdensome, and less expensive source. For these  
15 reasons, DWR requests that the Hearing Officers issue a protective order prohibiting the  
16 deposition of Mr. Marshall and the accompanying requests for production of documents. If the  
17 Hearing Officers are not inclined to prohibit the deposition, DWR respectfully requests that they  
18 impose restrictions on the deposition and document requests.

19 Dated: February 29, 2016

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER  
RESOURCES



Robin McGinnis  
Office of the Chief Counsel

1 **SERVICE LISTS (VIA E-MAIL)**

2 **PARTIES**  
3 **THE WEST SIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT**  
4 **CEASE AND DESIST ORDER HEARING**

5 <b>Division of Water Rights</b> 6 Prosecution Team 7 Andrew Tauriainen, Attorney III 8 SWRCB Office of Enforcement 9 1001 I Street, 10 16th Floor 11 Sacramento, CA 95814 12 Andrew.Tauriainen@waterboards.ca.gov	<b>The West Side Irrigation District</b> Jeanne M. Zolezzi Karna Harrigfeld Janelle Krattiger Herum\Crabtree\Suntag 5757 Pacific Ave., Suite 222 Stockton, CA 95207 jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com kharrigfeld@herumcrabtree.com jkrattiger@herumcrabtree.com
13 <b>Westlands Water District</b> 14 Daniel O'Hanlon 15 Rebecca Akroyd 16 Kronick Moskovitz Tiedemann & Girard 17 400 Capitol Mall, 27th Floor 18 Sacramento, CA 95814 19 dohanlon@kmtg.com 20 rakroyd@kmtg.com 21 Philip Williams of Westlands Water District 22 pwilliams@westlandswater.org	<b>South Delta Water Agency</b> John Herrick, Esq. Dean Ruiz 4255 Pacific Ave., Suite 2 Stockton, CA 95207 jherrlaw@aol.com dean@hprlaw.net
23 <b>Central Delta Water Agency</b> 24 Jennifer Spaletta 25 Spaletta Law PC 26 PO Box 2660 27 Lodi, CA 95241 28 jennifer@spalettalaw.com Dante Nomellini and Dante Nomellini, Jr. Nomellini, Grilli & McDaniel ngmplcs@pacbell.net dantejr@pacbell.net	<b>City and County of San Francisco</b> Jonathan Knapp Office of the City Attorney 1390 Market Street, Suite 418 San Francisco, CA 94102 jonathan.knapp@sfgov.org
<b>San Joaquin Tributaries Authority</b> Valerie Kincaid O'Laughlin & Paris LLP 2617 K Street, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95814 vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com towater@olagghlinparis.com	<b>State Water Contractors</b> Stephanie Morris 1121 L Street, Suite 1050 Sacramento, CA 95814 smorris@swc.org

1	<p><b>Byron Bethany Irrigation District</b>  Daniel Kelly  Somach Simmons &amp; Dunn  500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000  Sacramento, CA 95814  dkelly@somachlaw.com</p>	
---	--	--

<p><b>PARTIES</b>  <b>BYRON-BETHANY IRRIGATION DISTRICT</b>  <b>ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY HEARING</b></p>
--

8	<p><b>Division of Water Rights</b>  Prosecution Team  Andrew Tauriainen, Attorney III  SWRCB Office of Enforcement  1001 I Street  16<sup>th</sup> Floor  Sacramento, CA 95814  andrew.tauriainen@waterboards.ca.gov</p>	<p><b>Byron Bethany Irrigation District</b>  Daniel Kelly  Somach Simmons &amp; Dunn  500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000,  Sacramento, CA 95814  dkelly@somachlaw.com</p>
---	--	---

13	<p><b>Patterson Irrigation District</b>  <b>Banta-Carbona Irrigation District</b>  <b>The West Side Irrigation District</b>  Jeanne M. Zolezzi  Herum\Crabtree\Suntag  5757 Pacific Ave., Suite 222  Stockton, CA 95207  jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com</p>	<p><b>City and County of San Francisco</b>  Jonathan Knapp  Office of the City Attorney  1390 Market Street, Suite 418  San Francisco, CA 94102  jonathan.knapp@sfgov.org</p> <p>Robert E. Donlan  Ellison, Schneider &amp; Harris L.L.P.  2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite 400  Sacramento, CA 95816  (916) 447-2166  red@eslawfirm.com</p>
----	---	--

21	<p><b>Central Delta Water Agency</b>  Jennifer Spaletta  Spaletta Law PC  PO Box 2660  Lodi, CA 95241  jennifer@spalettalaw.com</p> <p>Dante Nomellini and Dante Nomellini, Jr.  Nomellini, Grilli &amp; McDaniel  ngmplcs@pacbell.net  dantejr@pacbell.net</p>	<p><b>State Water Contractors</b>  Stephanie Morris  1121 L Street, Suite 1050  Sacramento, CA 95814  smorris@swc.org</p>
----	---	---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

<p><b>Richard Morat</b> 2821 Berkshire Way Sacramento, CA 95864 rjmorat@gmail.com</p>	<p><b>San Joaquin Tributaries Authority</b> Valerie Kincaid O'Laughlin &amp; Paris LLP 2617 K Street, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95814 vkincaid@olaughlinparis.com towater@olaughlinparis.com lwood@olaughlinparis.com</p>
<p><b>South Delta Water Agency</b> John Herrick, Esq. 4255 Pacific Ave., Suite 2 Stockton, CA 95207 jherrlaw@aol.com</p> <p>Dean Ruiz, Esq. Harris, Perisho &amp; Ruiz, Attorneys at Law 3439 Brookside Road, Suite 210 Stockton, CA 95219 dean@hprlaw.net</p>	