

1 **ROB BONTA** Attorney General of California MYUNG J. PARK 2 Supervising Deputy Attorney General MATTHEW G. BULLOCK (SBN 243377) 3 MARC N. MELNICK (SBN 168187) 4 Deputy Attorneys General 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor 5 P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550 6 Telephone: (510) 879-0750 Fax: (510) 622-2270 7 E-mail: Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Respondent and Intervenor State 8 Water Resources Control Board 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 11 SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE 12 13 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, Case No. 19STCP01176 14 Petitioner, DECLARATION OF MARC N. 15 MELNICK IN RESPONSE TO CASITAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT'S 16 **JOINDER** 17 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL Date: January 20, 2022 Time: 1:30 p.m. BOARD, a California State Agency; CITY 18 OF BUENAVENTURA, a California Dept.: municipal corporation, Judge: Honorable William Highberger 19 Trial Date: February 14, 2022 (Phase Respondents. One) 20 Action Filed: September 19, 2014 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, 21 California municipal corporation, 22 Cross-Complainant, 23 V. 24 DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual; et al., 25 Cross-Defendants. 26 27

28

28

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

Marc Melnick

From:

Marc Melnick

Sent:

Thursday, January 6, 2022 10:30 AM

To:

'Jungreis, Jeremy'

Cc:

Noah GoldenKrasner; Matthew Bullock

Subject:

RE: Ventura matter and Meet and Confer Over Date of Rebuttal Report Submission

Jeremy, I have had time to go through your email. I'm trying to work with you, but I really don't see the issue.

We have produced a mountain of data with our September 24, 2021 and December 3, 2021 expert disclosures. And that is on top of what the SWRCB provided to the general public when it released the preliminary draft model on August 31, 2021 and December 17, 2021. I find it hard to believe that there is anything useful that you don't have. And we certainly have provided everything required by Code of Civil Procedure section 843.

At the last court hearing I was there in person, on December 9, 2021, I told you that the SWRCB would be responding to Casitas's record request. But I also specifically told you if your folks think there is something specific that is missing to let me know and I'll try to get that to you. That offer remains. If there is something specific that you think has not been provided, let me know, and I'll see if it even exists and try to get it to you. I have heard nothing from you about this request since then, not even after the SWRCB sent its response on December 17, 2021, until I saw your email this morning.

Your email raises the issue of updates to the model. That should be nothing surprising. This model is being developed in a public process, not for this litigation. The August 31, 2021 version was a preliminary draft, and we told everyone then that another draft would be coming out in December 2021. My understanding is that the changes are not significant, and have nothing to do with the issues in this phase one trial, but they are detailed in our December 3, 2021 expert report. The expert reports have been very transparent in describing what version of the model is being used. You can certainly ask follow up questions about it in the depositions.

You also raise the issue of the response to Casitas's Public Records Act request. Of the five items requested, two have been provided completely. The bulk of the response to the other three items has already been provided with the expert disclosures on September 24, 2021 and December 3, 2021. Your client has had that literally for weeks. We were going to provide anything remaining yesterday, in connection with the East Ojai Group's deposition notice, but that does not need to be provided until those depositions are rescheduled. If you want, I can talk to the SWRCB about providing that sooner, but it would be much more efficient for both of us if you just take me up on my offer to provide any specific documents you are looking for. Let me know.

None of this has anything to do with the rebuttal deadline tomorrow. All of the SWRCB's experts' opinions are stated in their reports. That is what you should be rebutting, if you think that is appropriate. And you can ask any questions in the depositions, once those are rescheduled.

Marc

From: Jungreis, Jeremy <JJungreis@rutan.com> Sent: Wednesday, January 5, 2022 10:51 PM

To: Holly J. Jacobson <hjj@bkslawfirm.com>; Christopher Pisano <Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com>; Marc Melnick

<Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov>; Patterson, Gregory <G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com>; Gregg Garrison

<gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com>; Daniel Cooper <daniel@sycamore.law>; Noah GoldenKrasner

<Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov>

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name:	Santa Barbara Channelkeeper	No.	19STCP01176	
	v. State Water Board			

I hereby certify that on <u>January 19, 2022</u>, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the File & ServeXpress system:

DECLARATION OF MARC N. MELNICK IN RESPONSE TO CASITAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICTS JOINDER

I certify that **all** participants in the case are registered File & ServeXpress users and that service will be accomplished by the File & ServeXpress system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on <u>January 19, 2022</u>, at Oakland, California.

Kelinda Crenshaw	/s/ Kelinda Crenshaw	
Declarant	Signature	

SF2014902766 91459359.docx