

1 JORGE A. LEÓN (SBN 81177)
(jleon@waterboards.ca.gov)
2 STATE WATER RESOURCES
CONTROL BOARD
3 OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
4 Sacramento, CA 95814
Direct: (916) 341-5180
5 Fax: (916) 341-5284

6 ERIK K. SPIESS (SBN 188924)
(espiess@waterboards.ca.gov)
7 STATE WATER RESOURCES
CONTROL BOARD
8 OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor
9 Sacramento, CA 95814
Direct: (916) 341-5167
10 Fax: (916) 341-5199

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
SANTA ANA REGIONAL WATER
12 QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
ADVOCACY TEAM
13

14 **BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15

16 IN THE MATTER OF:)
17)
18 PERCHLORATE CONTAMINATION)
AT A 160-ACRE SITE IN THE RIALTO)
19 AREA)
20)
21 _____)

SWRCB/OCC File A-1824
SECOND
PRE-HEARING MOTION

22 The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Advocacy Team
23 (“Advocacy Team”) submits the following motions for consideration by the Hearing
24 Officer in this Matter.

25 First, the Advocacy Team requests and hereby moves that the Hearing
26 Officer rule on the Advocacy Team’s Motion for Continuance and for Protective
27 Order (filed separately) by March 7, 2007, or alternatively advise the parties of the
28

1 mechanism and schedule that will be used to rule on those Motions. This request
2 is made necessary because the Parties to this matter are working on completion of
3 work on a submittal to be made in this matter on March 13, 2007. As detailed in
4 our separate Motion, four members of the Advocacy Team (and one nonmember)
5 have been subpoenaed by the dischargers in the CAO action to appear at
6 depositions between now and the March 13, 2007 deadline. The Advocacy Team
7 respectfully submits that it is critical to determining how to expend our limited
8 resources that the Hearing Officer provide guidance to the parties on this matter as
9 soon as possible.

10 Additionally, the Advocacy Team requests and hereby moves that the
11 Hearing Officer order the parties to exchange required documents in electronic
12 format instead of paper copies. This case involves many years of historical
13 corporate records and the use of deposition testimony preserved in transcript form.
14 In all likelihood, *each of the parties* will submit large volumes of exhibits, numbering
15 in excess of 100,000 pages. The total number of pages and associated cost is
16 extremely large. The exchange of electronic copies provide the parties with the
17 opportunity to conserve resources and time. No legitimate purpose is served by
18 requiring or permitting the parties to demand that the other parties provide paper
19 copies. While the Advocacy Team is prepared to provide the Hearing Officer with a
20 paper copy of its filings, we wish to spare the people of the State of California the
21 expense and waste of natural resources attendant to the exchange of paper
22 documents.

23 Finally, the Advocacy Team renews its request of February 27, 2007 and
24 hereby moves that, to the extent the deadlines remain the same as set forth in the
25 Hearing Notice, the Hearing Officer set the deadline for submission of visual
26 displays to some time following the deadline for submission of summary
27 statements of exhibits, or at least amend the deadline to allow for submission of
28 revised visual displays for use in rebuttal.

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

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: March 5, 2007

STATE WATER RESOURCES
CONTROL BOARD

By: 

JORGE A. LEÓN
OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT



ERIK K. SPIESS
OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL

