



1 RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP  
Jeremy N. Jungreis (State Bar No. 256417)  
2 jjungreis@rutan.com  
Douglas J. Dennington (State Bar No. 173447)  
3 ddennington@rutan.com  
Travis Van Ligten (State Bar No. 301715)  
4 tvanligten@rutan.com  
18575 Jamboree Road, 9th Floor  
5 Irvine, CA 92612  
Telephone: 714-641-5100  
6 Facsimile: 714-546-9035

7 Attorneys for Cross-Defendant  
CASITAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT a California  
8 special district

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
10 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, COMPLEX

11 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, a  
California non-profit corporation,

12 Petitioner,

13 vs.

14 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL  
15 BOARD, a California State Agency;  
CITY OF SAN BUENA VENTURA, a  
16 California municipal corporation, incorrectly  
named as CITY OF BUENA VENTURA,

17 Respondents.

18 CITY OF SAN BUENA VENTURA, a  
19 California municipal corporation,

20 Cross-Complainant,

21 vs.

22 DUNCAN ABBOTT, et al.,

23 Cross-Defendant.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. 19STCP01176

Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger  
Dept: 10

**DECLARATION OF JEREMY N.  
JUNGREIS IN SUPPORT OF CROSS-  
DEFENDANT EAST OJAI GROUP'S EX  
PARTE REQUEST TO CONTINUE TRIAL  
DATE AND ALL RELATED DEADLINES**

Date Action Filed: September 19, 2014  
Phase 1 Trial Date: February 14, 2022

Hearing Date: January 18, 2022  
Time: 1:30 P.M.  
Department: 10



1 *Report*, released December 17, 2021, a true and correct copy of the State’s December 17 Notice is  
2 attached hereto as Exhibit 2.) The inability or unwillingness of the State to provide the requested  
3 technical data and model components sought by Casitas in writing on at least two separate  
4 occasions (*See Exhibits 3<sup>1</sup> and 4<sup>2</sup>*), compounded by the fact that the State’s model appears to have  
5 been superseded by an entirely new version of the model released immediately before the  
6 Christmas Holiday. The non-production of data, exhibits and code underlying the State’s model  
7 has frustrated the ability of Casitas to fully understand the technical basis for the opinions  
8 rendered by the State’s experts on September 24, 2021 and again on January 7, 2022, and made it  
9 difficult for Casitas’ experts to prepare for their own depositions as well as the depositions of the  
10 State’s “hydrologic connection” experts (Preston and Schnaar).

11 4. Casitas also requested to review the technical basis for Dr. Archer’s opinions,  
12 including the model she prepared as part of preparing her expert report, per CCP 843 (b), but  
13 Casitas expert, Mr. Randall Hanson, a thirty eight year veteran of the U.S. Geological Survey  
14 (USGS) was limited in his ability to do so by the fact that Ventura did not produce the model until  
15 December 27, and only then in a manner that only allowed the model to be viewed on one  
16 computer—which presented difficulties for Casitas’ three expert team that would be reviewing and  
17 seeking to run the model in the week between Christmas and New Year’s Day. Meanwhile, not all  
18 required software could be utilized from remote computers by Mr. Hanson during the period  
19 between December 27 and the January 7 deadline for rebuttal reports—further frustrating his  
20 ability to evaluate the Archer Model and how it was used to support the opinions put forth by Dr.  
21 Archer prior to the submission of Mr. Hanson’s expert rebuttal report (*See meet and confer*  
22 *regarding this topic in Exhibit 1*).

23 5. Counsel for Ventura and the State have not been willing to commit to supporting a  
24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of meet and confer correspondence dated December 1 and  
26 December 7, 2021 respectively between Counsel for Casitas and Counsel for the State regarding  
the missing modeling and technical data necessary or Casitas to complete its evaluation of the  
State Model.


27 <sup>2</sup> Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of Casitas’ request to the State Water Board for missing  
28 modeling and technical data necessary or Casitas to complete its evaluation of the State Model,  
and the State’s responses to same between October 13, 2021 and December 17, 2021.

1 delay of the deadline for submission of rebuttal experts, *see* Exhibit 1, though in fairness they  
2 observed, correctly, that only the Court has the authority to extend the pertinent deadline for  
3 submission of rebuttal reports. Thus, Casitas did the best it could in the absence of the missing  
4 information, and timely submitted Rebuttal Expert Reports by Dr. McCord and Mr. Hanson, but  
5 the missing technical information previously requested by Casitas from the State will be essential  
6 to Casitas' ability to depose the State's two hydrogeological experts and to depose the City's  
7 hydrogeological expert. Meanwhile, substantial data, previously requested via the meet and  
8 confer process remains unproduced by the State.

9         6.       There is no compelling reason why the Phase 1 trial must start on February 14  
10 where expert discovery is largely incomplete, and with a current schedule that has discovery  
11 ending after the applicable deadline for discovery related motions. With less than a month before  
12 a February 14 trial start, there are still at least three original disclosures depositions that need to  
13 occur (Preston, Schnaar and Archer), at least six supplemental disclosure depositions (Kear,  
14 McCord, Preston, Schnaar, Archer, Brown), and at least six rebuttal depositions (Kear, McCord,  
15 Hanson, Preston, Schnaar, Archer), and those are just for the major parties. Some of these  
16 depositions can likely be combined, but as of yet, they have not been scheduled. Accomplishing  
17 all of them prior to February 14, and more importantly before the previously referenced January  
18 21, 2022 trial deadlines, would appear to be an impossibility—risking significant prejudice to all  
19 parties. The prejudice can be eliminated by a reasonable trial extension per East Ojai's  
20 Application.

21         I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing  
22 is true and correct. Executed this 18th day of January, 2022, at Irvine, California.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



## EXHIBIT 1

**Jungreis, Jeremy**

---

**From:** Jungreis, Jeremy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 10:51 PM  
**To:** Holly J. Jacobson; Christopher Pisano; Marc Melnick; Patterson, Gregory; Gregg Garrison; Daniel Cooper; Noah GoldenKrasner  
**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman  
**Subject:** Ventura matter and Meet and Confer Over Date of Rebuttal Report Submission  
**Attachments:** Communications Btw Delano and CMWD.pdf; SWRCB Ventura Model Supporting Information Request CMWD 101321.pdf; CMWD Concerns with Omissions of Relevant Data/Files Supporting Expert Reports; RE: CMWD Concerns with Omissions of Relevant Data/Files Supporting Expert Reports

**Tracking:**

**Recipient**

**Read**

Holly J. Jacobson

Christopher Pisano

Marc Melnick

Patterson, Gregory

Gregg Garrison

Daniel Cooper

Noah GoldenKrasner

Jennifer Buckman

Dennington, Doug

Read: 1/6/2022 4:36 AM

{F2816612}.iManageDMS@rutan.imanage.work

Good Evening Folks:

I fully agree with Holly's points below. It is not reasonable to extend all other dates while leaving the deadline for rebuttal experts static. It is particularly troubling where only one "side" has had the benefit of deposing the experts that are the subject of potential rebuttal reports, and the other has not. That's not a level playing field. The following concerns also strongly militate in favor of extending the rebuttal expert report deadline. These issues will potentially need to be the subject of ex parte relief if not promptly addressed.

1. Significant issues accessing and using model provided by Ms. Archer. While I appreciate the effort by City of Ventura to get Ms. Archer's model out between Xmas and New Years (and I'm sincere about my appreciation as Chris clearly busted his hump right before Xmas to make it happen), the limitation to have the model staged on only one computer proved limiting through remote access (for reasons I'm not technically savvy enough to fully articulate) and largely prevented my experts from rerunning the Archer model or otherwise understanding all of its inputs. Also, my understanding is that key documents and data were not disclosed as part of Ms. Archer's link provided on December 27. Deposition would allow a lot of the technical questions CMWD has regarding the assumptions and technical basis for the model to be answered, or at least narrowed.

2. Significant issues with the State Model. It appears that a different version of the State's model was just released for public comment. The newly released model, released on or about December 17, 2021, is apparently a different version of the same model as the State released on September 24. See <https://mailchi.mp/1ba9be9b85c7/p5ux4mr1o4-13462331?e=b5862dc811>. How this new version is different than the September 24 version of the model, which underpins the Preston and Schnaar reports and opinions regarding interconnectivity, is not currently known. What is known is that the State has not provided the data and basis for the opinions for the State's report that was released on September 24

(see attached), despite repeated requests (through the SWRCB program side and through the meet and confer process in the litigation). This failure to disclose, arguably in contravention of CCP 843 (b) (1)-(3), has continued even as the State's model continues to "evolve". Which version of the model will be used at trial in Phase 1 and ultimately Phase 2? The version released on December 17? The version released in the September 24 disclosures? Some future version that will be released after state modelers incorporate the technical comments they solicited on December 17? Or will it be a combination of all three? This moving target, combined with refusal to provide the technical basis for the models and associated assumptions (see attached and below), has made it very difficult for CMWD's experts to understand the basis for the State experts' proffered opinions. The problems identified herein likely cannot be entirely cured via deposition, but deposition would go a long toward at least answering the most significant questions about how the State experts got to the conclusions they did in their September 24 expert report, and whether the September 24 version of the State Model has been superseded by the December 17 version of the State Model.

Note that Mr. Delano, on behalf of the SWRCB, in his attached response to Ms. Dyer of CMWD on December 17, 2021 asserts that key documents and data "will be provided when we respond to the document requests for our consultants' (Al Preston (Geosyntec) and Greg Schnaar (DBS&A)) depositions in January 2022." This position is inconsistent with the requirements of CCP 843 (b) (1)-(3) (as well as the requirements of the CPRA) as Casitas clearly requested all documents/records reflecting the technical basis for the State's model on October 13 (see attached). Nevertheless, ever the optimist, I sought to obtain the withheld information regarding critical elements of the State Model from Mr. Melnick via the meet and confer process. It didn't work. (See attached correspondence of December 7, 2021). Substantial portions of the State's model (whichever version we are currently on), and underlying technical documents, I am told, were not disclosed on September 24 or December 3—substantially frustrating the work of CMWD's experts in developing rebuttal reports, with the scheduled deposition dates now less than a week away, and the rebuttal deadline a few days away. The following information should have been disclosed by the State on September 24. Now, nearly three months later, it still hasn't been disclosed, with no indication if this information will ever be disclosed. CMWD has repeatedly requested, and not received, the following critical information with regard to the State's Model:

- (1) All codes and related source files of codes used to perform the building, running, and analysis of the model components and model results.*
- (2) All GIS shape files, databases, and other supporting input data sets along with scripts used to make the various input files*
- (3) All GIS shape files, databases, and other supporting information and data used in support of building and observations and calibration analysis.*
- (4) Any input and output files as well as all GIS shape files, databases, and other supporting information and data used in support of building and running any parameter estimation software such as PEST or UCODE.*
- (5) Groundwater Vistas (GWV) Map Files (there are six of these) that are shape files that were converted for visualization within GWV that were used to develop the model data sets including the model grid, layering and layer extent, SFR network, and other components of the model input and observations along with the other information specified previously.*

CMWD has been patient, but we're out of time. The rebuttal deadline needs to be adjusted, or we'll be forced to request relief from the Court. This should be simple--as Ms. Jacobson correctly observes. With an extension of the trial date there will presumably be over a month between the rebuttal deadline and any deposition of CMWD's experts (or those of other parties). The State and Ventura will not suffer any prejudice, as they will still have weeks to prepare for deposition. It is not reasonable to refuse a good faith request to extend the expert rebuttal deadline under these circumstances. I respectfully request that the State reconsider its position and promptly: (1) provide the information and data requested above with regard to the State's Model; (2) agree to extend the rebuttal report deadline until at least ten days after such information is disclosed.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jeremy Jungreis  
Counsel for Casitas Municipal Water District

**Jeremy N. Jungreis**

18575 Jamboree Road, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor | Irvine, CA 92612

O. (714) 641-5100 | D. (714) 338-1882

[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com) | [www.rutan.com](http://www.rutan.com)



---

Privileged And Confidential Communication.

This electronic transmission, and any documents attached hereto, (a) are protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC §§ 2510-2521), (b) may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information, and (c) are for the sole use of the intended recipient named above. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify the sender and delete the electronic message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of the information received in error is strictly prohibited.

---

**From:** Holly J. Jacobson [mailto:[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 6:06 PM

**To:** Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>; Marc Melnick <[Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov)>; Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com)>; Jungreis, Jeremy <[JJungreis@rutan.com](mailto:JJungreis@rutan.com)>; Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Daniel Cooper <[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Noah GoldenKrasner <[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman <[jtb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:jtb@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Ventura matter

Chris,

You and Marc have had the benefit of deposing Jordan and Anthony and therefore are not prejudiced in your ability to provide rebuttal disclosures. If you would like to provide those under the current deadline I won't stop you. However, it is unreasonable to expect the rest of us to meet the current deadline where we haven't had the benefit of deposing your experts, especially Ms. Archer.

As a simple matter of efficiency, why wouldn't we all agree to continue the rebuttal deadline and conduct depositions in a manner that avoids duplication? I would expect this to be a simple issue that we can resolve without raising it with Judge Highberger but please let me know tonight if you and Marc still disagree as I will have to request relief immediately.

---

**From:** Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 5:57 PM

**To:** Holly J. Jacobson <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>; Marc Melnick <[Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov)>; Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com)>; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)) <[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)>; Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Daniel Cooper <[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Noah GoldenKrasner <[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman <[jtb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:jtb@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Ventura matter

Holly and Marc:

We cannot agree to a start date in May. That is far too late. We can agree to March 7<sup>th</sup>, and that should work for everyone because under the current schedule we would be in trial at that time. As for the question of what is getting



continued, I agree with Marc that what should get continued are the expert discovery cut-off dates, not the expert disclosure dates. I see no reason to delay the disclosure dates at this point.

Chris

---

**From:** Holly J. Jacobson <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 5:53 PM

**To:** Marc Melnick <[Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov)>; Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>; Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)) <[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)>; Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Daniel Cooper <[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Noah GoldenKrasner <[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman <[jtb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:jtb@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Ventura matter

CAUTION - EXTERNAL SENDER.

---

All,

I'm in trial for at least five days (maybe more) beginning May 9<sup>th</sup>. Other than that my office will do everything possible to be flexible for trial dates March-May.

As for experts, I disagree. Given the continuance of depositions it simply doesn't make sense to keep the dates relating to rebuttal.

Is there any reason why you think the rebuttal disclosures should not be continued? Is this seriously a point that is not going to be stipulated to?

---

**From:** Marc Melnick <[Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 5:32 PM

**To:** Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>; Holly J. Jacobson <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>; Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)) <[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)>; Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Daniel Cooper <[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Noah GoldenKrasner <[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman <[jtb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:jtb@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Ventura matter

Hi, all. We have a few problems in March. Judge Highberger seemed to be open to doing this in May. What about starting April 25 (or May 2)?

Whatever we do, we should be clear about what dates are moving and what dates are not. My understanding is that the expert disclosure dates are not changing. The expert discovery/deposition cutoff should change, as should the pre-trial conference (and associated deadlines).

Marc

---

**From:** Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 3:26 PM

**To:** 'Holly J. Jacobson' <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>; Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)) <[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)>; Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Marc Melnick



<[Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov)>; Daniel Cooper <[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Noah GoldenKrasner  
<[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman <[jtb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:jtb@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Ventura matter

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This message was sent from outside DOJ. Please do not click links or open attachments that appear suspicious.

Greg, and all: Would March 7<sup>th</sup> work as a start date. That would work on our end. Mid-March is getting problematic.

---

**From:** Holly J. Jacobson <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 3:21 PM

**To:** Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com))  
<[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)>; Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Marc Melnick

<[Marc.melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.melnick@doj.ca.gov)>; Daniel Cooper <[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Christopher Pisano  
<[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>; Noah GoldenKrasner <[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Jennifer Buckman <[jtb@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:jtb@bkslawfirm.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Ventura matter

CAUTION - EXTERNAL SENDER.

---

All,

I am available for a mid-March trial date.

---

**From:** Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 3:02 PM

**To:** Holly J. Jacobson <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)) <[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)>;  
Gregg Garrison <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Marc Melnick <[Marc.melnick@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Marc.melnick@doj.ca.gov)>; Daniel Cooper  
<[daniel@sycamore.law](mailto:daniel@sycamore.law)>; Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>; Noah GoldenKrasner  
<[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** Ventura matter

Folks: It looks like April creates a series of problems with some folks. How does mid March work. I will check with the court.

Regards,

Greg

**Gregory J. Patterson**  
*Partner*

**MusickPeeler**

---

Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP  
2801 Townsgate Road Suite 200  
Westlake Village, California 91361

[g.patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:g.patterson@musicpeeler.com)  
[www.musicpeeler.com](http://www.musicpeeler.com)

T (805) 418-3103  
F (805) 418-3101

---

Los Angeles | Orange County | San Diego | San Francisco | Ventura County

This e-mail is confidential and may contain attorney client or otherwise privileged or private information. Unless you are an intended or authorized recipient, you may not use, copy or disclose this message or any information contained herein. If you have received this message in error, please advise us by reply email to: [administrator@musickpeeler.com](mailto:administrator@musickpeeler.com) and delete the message and any attachments. Thank you.

---

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

This email and any files or attachments transmitted with it may contain privileged or otherwise confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you may have received this communication in error, please advise the sender via reply email and immediately delete the email you received.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

---

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

---

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.



---

## State Water Resources Control Board

### Soliciting Comments on Draft Groundwater-Surface Water Model of the Ventura River Watershed and Model Documentation Report

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Division of Water Rights and Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (collectively, the Water Boards) are publishing the ***Draft Groundwater-Surface Water Model of the Ventura River Watershed***<sup>1</sup> (VRW GW-SW Model) and ***Draft Model Documentation Report for the Groundwater-Surface Water Model of the Ventura River Watershed***<sup>2</sup> (VRW GW-SW Model Documentation Report).

The Draft VRW GW-SW Model is packaged in a zipped electronic folder that includes the model files and simulation results for the calibration and validation (existing conditions) simulation and unimpaired flow scenario, a draft technical user manual, a draft spreadsheet tool for visualizing model outputs, and a GIS shapefile that maps some of the locations referenced in the provided documents and files.

The Draft VRW GW-SW Model Documentation Report is packaged in a separate zipped electronic folder and contains the report and accessory files, such as spreadsheets and appendices.

#### **SOLICITING TECHNICAL COMMENTS**

The Water Boards are soliciting technical comments on the Draft VRW GW-SW Model and Draft VRW GW-SW Model Documentation Report. Parties that are interested in meeting to discuss questions and comments are encouraged to contact Water Boards staff. Contact information is in the *Contact Us* section, below.

**Please email technical comments to: [InstreamFlows@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:InstreamFlows@waterboards.ca.gov) by Friday April 1, 2022.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online at:

[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/instream\\_flows/cwap\\_enhancing/docs/ventura\\_river/vrw\\_gsflow\\_draft.zip](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/instream_flows/cwap_enhancing/docs/ventura_river/vrw_gsflow_draft.zip)

<sup>2</sup> Available online at:

[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/instream\\_flows/cwap\\_enhancing/docs/ventura\\_river/vrw\\_gsflow\\_report\\_draft.zip](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/instream_flows/cwap_enhancing/docs/ventura_river/vrw_gsflow_report_draft.zip)

## TECHNICAL WORKSHOP

The Water Boards are planning a 12-hour technical workshop, spread over two days, on the Draft VRW GW-SW Model. The dates and venue of the workshop are to-be-determined, but expected to occur in February or March 2022.

The first portion of the workshop will consist of a general overview of the VRW GW-SW Model and will be open to all interested persons. The State Water Board will announce this portion of the workshop on its email subscription list, see *Stay Informed* section below for subscription information. The second portion of the workshop is planned as a technical training to teach modeling experts how to use the Draft VRW GW-SW Model. If you, or your organization, would like to have a modeler participate, please contact State Water Board staff.<sup>3</sup> Contact information is in the *Contact Us* section below.

## ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

The Water Boards are also developing a Nitrogen Transport Model (Nitrogen Model) of the Ventura River watershed. The VRW Nitrogen Model is still under development, however, and not yet ready to be released for public comment.

Additional information on the development of the VRW GW-SW Model is available on the Water Board's [Ventura River Watershed webpage](#)<sup>4</sup>

## STAY INFORMED

If you would like to receive emails regarding the Water Boards' development of the VRW GW-SW Model and Nitrogen Model, as well as related California Water Action Plan efforts, please subscribe to the "*California Water Action Plan/Statewide Instream Flows*" list under the "Division of Water Rights" on the State Water Board's [Email Subscription List](#) webpage<sup>5</sup>.

## CONTACT US

If you have questions related to this notice, please contact Kevin DeLano at [kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov).



---

Ann Marie Ore, Program Manager  
Division of Water Rights

12/17/2021

---

Date

---

<sup>3</sup> Each organization and individual who participates in the State Water Board's Technical Advisory Committee will receive an invitation.

<sup>4</sup> Available online at:  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/instream\\_flows/cwap\\_enhancing/ventura\\_river.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/instream_flows/cwap_enhancing/ventura_river.html)

<sup>5</sup> Available online at:  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email\\_subscriptions/swrcb\\_subscribe.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/swrcb_subscribe.html)

## EXHIBIT 3

**Jungreis, Jeremy**

---

**From:** Jungreis, Jeremy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 1, 2021 6:44 PM  
**To:** Marc Melnick; Patterson, Gregory; Christopher Pisano; Shawn Hagerty; 'Gregg S. Garrison'; Holly J. Jacobson  
**Cc:** Noah GoldenKrasner; Matthew Bullock  
**Subject:** CMWD Concerns with Omissions of Relevant Data/Files Supporting Expert Reports  
**Attachments:** SWRCB Ventura Model Supporting Information Request CMWD 101321.docx

Good Evening Mark:

Please see attached. I recently learned that CMWD has on multiple occasions requested the information in the attached, regarding the State's model, since at least October 13. The requests were made directly Kevin Delano at the SWRCB, and to date CMWD has not received a response or the requested data/files. The requests in the attached seek data/files that would presumably have to have been available to the SWRCB prior to releasing its model on September 24. Without this information, which arguably should have been released on September 24 concurrently with the State's expert report per CCP 843 (b)(2), (3), it will be difficult for CMWD to depose the State's experts and/or prepare further rebuttal expert reports (should CMWD determine such reports are appropriate). It would be very helpful to obtain the information referenced and requested in the attached ASAP, and certainly well before the rebuttal expert deadline of January 7 (which may need to be revisited depending on when the requested data/files are provided).

On a related issue, CMWD anticipates filing a supplemental/rebuttal report this Friday regarding concerns CMWD has with the adequacy of the State's model to support the expert opinions proffered in the State's September 24 report. I just wanted to give you a heads up so you and your clients aren't surprised on Friday.

Best,  
Jeremy

**Jeremy N. Jungreis**

18575 Jamboree Road, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor | Irvine, CA 92612  
O. (714) 641-5100 | D. (714) 338-1882  
[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com) | [www.rutan.com](http://www.rutan.com)



---

Privileged And Confidential Communication.

This electronic transmission, and any documents attached hereto, (a) are protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC §§ 2510-2521), (b) may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information, and (c) are for the sole use of the intended recipient named above. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify the sender and delete the electronic message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of the information received in error is strictly prohibited.

---

**From:** Marc Melnick [mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 1, 2021 3:44 PM  
**To:** Patterson, Gregory <G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com>; Christopher Pisano <Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com>; Shawn Hagerty <Shawn.Hagerty@bbklaw.com>; 'Gregg S. Garrison' <gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com>; Holly J.

Jacobson <hjj@bkslawfirm.com>; Jungreis, Jeremy <JJungreis@rutan.com>

**Cc:** Noah GoldenKrasner <Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov>; Matthew Bullock <Matthew.Bullock@doj.ca.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Deposition of Ms. Klug/expert witness disclosure

Greg, you already have the SWRCB's experts' model. It was made available to you and all other parties on August 31, 2021, and then produced again when we made our disclosure on September 24, 2021. If there's something specific that you think you didn't get, please let me know and I can look into that.

Marc

---

**From:** Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 1, 2021 3:27 PM

**To:** Christopher Pisano; Shawn Hagerty; 'Gregg S. Garrison'; Holly J. Jacobson; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)); Marc Melnick

**Subject:** Deposition of Ms. Klug/expert witness disclosure

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This message was sent from outside DOJ. Please do not click links or open attachments that appear suspicious.

Chris:

Thank you for your response to our request that Ms. Archer's model be produced prior to Ms. Klug's deposition. We view it as unfortunate that the City will not produce the model information as requested. To that end, I note that CCP 843(a)(2) requires the expert to provide "The facts or data considered by the witness in forming his or her opinions" at the time of producing the expert report. It is our position that this would include the model (data) upon which Ms. Archer clearly heavily relied upon in forming her opinions. We simply do not know currently how this model was run that forms the basis of Ms. Archer's opinions. To be clear, we are not simply requesting "documents" regarding the model, but the information, as provided in the notice, to allow our expert to independently examine the model.

Ms. Klug's input for the model raises questions regarding her input and how that affected the model and it is difficult to assess that without the model. We understand that it is the City's position that Ms. Klug had nothing to do with the construction of the model, but it does appear she was aware the model was being developed and may have information relevant to the model. Hard to ask questions when we don't know what the model looks like and how it was run.

Given our disagreement over what should be turned over and when, we agree with your proposal that we continue Ms. Klug's deposition until we resolve the modeling disclosure dispute. We will provide notice of the continuance. Please provide some dates in January that work for you and Ms. Klug.

We agree that everyone should play by the same rules with respect to expert witness disclosures. It appears that the City and the State both prepared models, but no other designated experts have done so. Aquilogic did not independently develop a model and we do not intend to do so, but we must have the opportunity and time to review the models upon which the City and the State rely and how those models were run.

In order to provide sufficient time to allow experts to review the model and advise their clients, we propose that the modeling information requested in the notice be mutually produced 10 business days prior to the expert deposition because three business days does not provide sufficient time for our expert to advise us on his opinion of the model, parameters/assumptions/etc. in order to properly prepare for the deposition. All other files can be produced three days before per code. We also reserve the right to provide a rebuttal report after the City and State's depositions, assuming the models are produced at some point.

If we cannot reach agreement, we intend to file a status report or motion on this issue and try to key it up at the pending December 9<sup>th</sup> status conference for the Court to review.

I am copying the parties who I understand intend to participate in person or via zoom in the various depositions. If there are others who anyone thinks should see this, please forward.

Happy to discuss at your convenience.

Greg



## **SWRCB Ventura Model Supporting Information Request**

Submitted by Casitas Municipal Water District (CMWD) on October 13, 2021

CMWD is requesting the following information for the Preliminary Draft version of the Groundwater-Surface Water Model of the Ventura River Watershed that was released by the SWRCB on August 31, 2021:

- (1) All codes and related source files of codes used to perform the building, running, and analysis of the model components and model results.
- (2) All GIS shape files, databases, and other supporting input data sets along with scripts used to make the various input files
- (3) All GIS shape files, databases, and other supporting information and data used in support of building and observations and calibration analysis.
- (4) Any input and output files as well as all GIS shape files, databases, and other supporting information and data used in support of building and running any parameter estimation software such as PEST or UCODE.
- (5) Groundwater Vistas (GWV) Map Files (there are six of these) that are shape files that were converted for visualization within GWV that were used to develop the model data sets including the model grid, layering and layer extent, SFR network, and other components of the model input and observations along with the other information specified previously.

## **Jungreis, Jeremy**

---

**From:** Marc Melnick <Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 7, 2021 8:25 AM  
**To:** Jungreis, Jeremy  
**Cc:** Noah GoldenKrasner; Matthew Bullock  
**Subject:** RE: CMWD Concerns with Omissions of Relevant Data/Files Supporting Expert Reports

Jeremy —

I've had time now to look into this. I'm happy to facilitate your client getting most of these documents in a timely way, and my understanding is that some of them have already been made public, but unfortunately there are so many inaccuracies and omissions in your email I need to respond to those, and make some additional observations.

First, Mr. Delano did respond to Ms. Dyer's email of October 13 and did so that very same day, acknowledging receipt of the request and letting her know he needed to do some investigation. That is the only request that I know of, and the only other follow up by Casitas that I know of is Ms. Dyer's email six weeks later, on November 30.

Second, this request was made in the context of the SWRCB ongoing regulatory process, and was treated as such. As I assume you know, the preliminary draft of the model released on August 31 was not put out for public comment. While the SWRCB is happy to receive constructive comments from Casitas earlier, that extensive public comment period will not start until another draft of the model is released later this month. It was that timeline that staff have in mind in responding to this request.

Third, in providing these documents to Casitas in the context of the administrative process, the SWRCB has to keep in mind its timeline for release of the model to the general public. It has limited staff, and limited budget with its consultants, and should prioritize the release of documents to the general public over special requests to one party.

Fourth, neither you nor anyone else has made a request for production of documents to the SWRCB in this case. There is a process for that. You could have done that as early as August 31, but did not. Thus, I have not known about this request until last week, and there has been no connection to the upcoming expert deposition schedule.

Fifth, Mr. Patterson's deposition notices for the SWRCB's experts request some of the same information as this request. We will of course respond to that, and you will receive whatever documents are produced that way in addition to whatever the SWRCB provides to Casitas directly.

Lastly, I really do not understand why any of this information will be relevant to the depositions. But perhaps I'm not understanding Casitas's position in this phase of this case. Feel free to explain that to me.

Mr. DeLano will continue to communicate with Ms. Dyer about her request. My understanding is that they exchanged emails last week about this.

Thank you.

Marc

---

**From:** Marc Melnick

**Sent:** Thursday, December 2, 2021 8:00 AM

**To:** Jungreis, Jeremy <JJungreis@rutan.com>; Patterson, Gregory <G.Patterson@musickpeeler.com>; Christopher Pisano <Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com>; Shawn Hagerty <Shawn.Hagerty@bbklaw.com>; 'Gregg S. Garrison' <gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com>; Holly J. Jacobson <hjj@bkslawfirm.com>

**Cc:** Noah GoldenKrasner <Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov>; Matthew Bullock <Matthew.Bullock@doj.ca.gov>

**Subject:** Re: CMWD Concerns with Omissions of Relevant Data/Files Supporting Expert Reports

Jeremy, I'll need to look into this, but I appreciate the heads up about Friday. Thanks. Marc

---

**From:** Jungreis, Jeremy <[JJungreis@rutan.com](mailto:JJungreis@rutan.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 1, 2021 6:44 PM

**To:** Marc Melnick; Patterson, Gregory; Christopher Pisano; Shawn Hagerty; 'Gregg S. Garrison'; Holly J. Jacobson

**Cc:** Noah GoldenKrasner; Matthew Bullock

**Subject:** CMWD Concerns with Omissions of Relevant Data/Files Supporting Expert Reports

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This message was sent from outside DOJ. Please do not click links or open attachments that appear suspicious.

Good Evening Mark:

Please see attached. I recently learned that CMWD has on multiple occasions requested the information in the attached, regarding the State's model, since at least October 13. The requests were made directly Kevin Delano at the SWRCB, and to date CMWD has not received a response or the requested data/files. The requests in the attached seek data/files that would presumably have to have been available to the SWRCB prior to releasing its model on September 24. Without this information, which arguably should have been released on September 24 concurrently with the State's expert report per CCP 843 (b)(2), (3), it will be difficult for CMWD to depose the State's experts and/or prepare further rebuttal expert reports (should CMWD determine such reports are appropriate). It would be very helpful to obtain the information referenced and requested in the attached ASAP, and certainly well before the rebuttal expert deadline of January 7 (which may need to be revisited depending on when the requested data/files are provided).

On a related issue, CMWD anticipates filing a supplemental/rebuttal report this Friday regarding concerns CMWD has with the adequacy of the State's model to support the expert opinions proffered in the State's September 24 report. I just wanted to give you a heads up so you and your clients aren't surprised on Friday.

Best,

Jeremy

**Jeremy N. Jungreis**

18575 Jamboree Road, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor | Irvine, CA 92612

O. [\(714\) 641-5100](tel:(714)641-5100) | D. [\(714\) 338-1882](tel:(714)338-1882)

[jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com) | [www.rutan.com](http://www.rutan.com)



---

Privileged And Confidential Communication.

This electronic transmission, and any documents attached hereto, (a) are protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC §§ [2510-2521](#)), (b) may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information, and (c) are for the sole use of the intended recipient named above. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify the sender and delete the electronic message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of the information received in error is strictly prohibited.

---

**From:** Marc Melnick [<mailto:Marc.Melnick@doj.ca.gov>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 1, 2021 3:44 PM

**To:** Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>; Christopher Pisano <[Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com](mailto:Christopher.Pisano@bbklaw.com)>; Shawn Hagerty <[Shawn.Hagerty@bbklaw.com](mailto:Shawn.Hagerty@bbklaw.com)>; 'Gregg S. Garrison' <[gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com](mailto:gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com)>; Holly J. Jacobson <[hjj@bkslawfirm.com](mailto:hjj@bkslawfirm.com)>; Jungreis, Jeremy <[JJungreis@rutan.com](mailto:JJungreis@rutan.com)>

**Cc:** Noah GoldenKrasner <[Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov)>; Matthew Bullock <[Matthew.Bullock@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Matthew.Bullock@doj.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Deposition of Ms. Klug/expert witness disclosure

Greg, you already have the SWRCB's experts' model. It was made available to you and all other parties on August 31, 2021, and then produced again when we made our disclosure on September 24, 2021. If there's something specific that you think you didn't get, please let me know and I can look into that.

Marc

---

**From:** Patterson, Gregory <[G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com](mailto:G.Patterson@musicpeeler.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 1, 2021 3:27 PM

**To:** Christopher Pisano; Shawn Hagerty; 'Gregg S. Garrison'; Holly J. Jacobson; Jeremy N. Jungreis Esq. ([jjungreis@rutan.com](mailto:jjungreis@rutan.com)); Marc Melnick

**Subject:** Deposition of Ms. Klug/expert witness disclosure

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This message was sent from outside DOJ. Please do not click links or open attachments that appear suspicious.

## EXHIBIT 4

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **DeLano, Kevin@Waterboards** <[Kevin.DeLano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.DeLano@waterboards.ca.gov)>

Date: Fri, Dec 17, 2021 at 11:35 AM

Subject: Re: Information Request for Preliminary Draft Model of the Ventura River Watershed

To: Kelley Dyer <[kdyer@casitaswater.com](mailto:kdyer@casitaswater.com)>

Cc: Worth, Daniel@Waterboards <[Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov)>, Ore, AnnMarie@Waterboards <[AnnMarie.Ore@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:AnnMarie.Ore@waterboards.ca.gov)>, Michael Flood <[mflood@casitaswater.com](mailto:mflood@casitaswater.com)>, Jungreis, Jeremy <[JJungreis@rutan.com](mailto:JJungreis@rutan.com)>, Coupe, David@Waterboards <[David.Coupe@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:David.Coupe@waterboards.ca.gov)>

Good Morning Kelley,

1. The items on this request were released to the public for the Preliminary Draft VRW GSFLOW Model in August 2021 and were released for the Draft VRW GSFLOW Model today.
2. For both the Preliminary Draft VRW GSFLOW and Draft VRW GSFLOW models, this has been provided with our expert disclosures in the court case that were provided on September 24, 2021, or December 3, 2021, or will be provided when we respond to the document requests for our consultants' (Al Preston (Geosyntec) and Greg Schnaar (DBS&A)) depositions in January 2022.
3. Same as 2
4. Same as 2
5. Please see attached.

Sincerely,

Kevin

-----

Kevin DeLano, MS, GIT

Geologist, [Instream Flow Unit](#)

Division of Water Rights, State Water Board

[kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov)

Telework (Google Voice): 916-359-9827

Office: 916-319-0631

---

**From:** Kelley Dyer <[kdyer@casitaswater.com](mailto:kdyer@casitaswater.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2021 10:54 AM

**To:** DeLano, Kevin@Waterboards <[Kevin.DeLano@Waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.DeLano@Waterboards.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Worth, Daniel@Waterboards <[Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov)>; Ore, AnnMarie@Waterboards <[AnnMarie.Ore@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:AnnMarie.Ore@waterboards.ca.gov)>; Michael Flood <[mflood@casitaswater.com](mailto:mflood@casitaswater.com)>; Jungreis, Jeremy <[JJungreis@rutan.com](mailto:JJungreis@rutan.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Information Request for Preliminary Draft Model of the Ventura River Watershed

EXTERNAL:

Good morning, Kevin,

Since the model is being used as evidence in the adjudication lawsuit, we would like the files used to support the expert opinions in Phase 1 of the trial. However, we will be making this request through our attorneys given that is now the appropriate route.

We will also be looking for similar information with the future release of the model.

Best regards,

Kelley Dyer

805-649-2251 ext. 150

Cell 805-794-1060

On Fri, Dec 3, 2021 at 4:01 PM DeLano, Kevin@Waterboards <[Kevin.DeLano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.DeLano@waterboards.ca.gov)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Kelley,

Thank you for your email. Given the impending publication of the draft model and model report, scheduled for mid-December 2021, would you prefer to have any responsive and non-privileged records associated with your information request on the forthcoming draft model instead of the preliminary draft model? The draft model records would likely be much more helpful and germane as those records would inform any comments you may want to submit on the draft model and model report. The deadline to submit comments on the draft model would not be until sometime in March 2022.

We did not release the preliminary draft model to solicit comments. However, we would have considered comments from interested parties. Given that we are two weeks from publishing the draft model and model report, I'm sure you can appreciate that comments on the forthcoming draft model and model report would be more helpful. Please let me know.

If you are still interested in any remaining responsive and non-privileged records associated with the preliminary draft model, please confirm. If that is the case, we are planning to meet with our consultants next week to discuss their estimated timeline for providing the requested information. At that time, we can provide a timeline to you to provide any remaining responsive and non-privileged records.

Thanks again for your continued patience and understanding. I hope you are well too.

Sincerely,  
Kevin

-----

Kevin DeLano, MS, GIT

Geologist, [Instream Flow Unit](#)

Division of Water Rights, State Water Board

[kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov)

Telework (Google Voice): 916-359-9827

Office: 916-319-0631

---

**From:** Kelley Dyer <[kdyer@casitaswater.com](mailto:kdyer@casitaswater.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 6:22 AM

**To:** DeLano, Kevin@Waterboards <[Kevin.DeLano@Waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.DeLano@Waterboards.ca.gov)>

**Cc:** Worth, Daniel@Waterboards <[Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Information Request for Preliminary Draft Model of the Ventura River Watershed

EXTERNAL:

Good morning, Kevin,



Hope you are well.

Just checking in to see if you have a timeline for providing the supporting information requested (attached for reference).

Thank you,

Kelley Dyer

805-649-2251 ext. 150

Cell 805-794-1060

On Thu, Oct 14, 2021 at 1:57 PM Kelley Dyer <[kdyer@casitaswater.com](mailto:kdyer@casitaswater.com)> wrote:

Hi Kevin,

Thank you for your response and information on the updated schedule. We are requesting the files as soon as possible, so we may provide constructive comments sooner than later on the model.

We will keep an eye out for the upcoming announcement.

All the best,

Kelley Dyer

805-649-2251 ext. 150

Cell 805-794-1060

On Wed, Oct 13, 2021 at 5:43 PM DeLano, Kevin@Waterboards <[Kevin.DeLano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.DeLano@waterboards.ca.gov)> wrote:

Hi Kelley,

We have received your request. I will talk to the project team to determine how long it will take to pull the requested files together. When do you need the files by? The team is working hard this month on the upcoming Scenarios Webinar (look for an announcement tomorrow) and Draft GW-SW Model and Model Report.

FYI, in December 2021, we will release the Draft GW-SW Model with a Model Report (the next version of the model) for a 60+ day TAC and public comment period. We have not scheduled the model trainings yet. We will schedule 12-hours of training for local modelers during the 60+ day comment period. I anticipate the trainings will be after the GSAs' January 31, 2022 deadline. I'm eyeing February 2022. The comment period will be long enough to give modelers time to use the model after the training and write comments.

Hope you're doing well,  
Kevin

-----  
Kevin DeLano, MS, GIT  
Geologist, [Instream Flow Unit](#)  
Division of Water Rights, State Water Board

[kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:kevin.delano@waterboards.ca.gov)  
Telework (Google Voice): 916-359-9827  
Office: 916-319-0631

**From:** Kelley Dyer <[kdyer@casitaswater.com](mailto:kdyer@casitaswater.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 13, 2021 4:27 PM  
**To:** DeLano, Kevin@Waterboards <[Kevin.DeLano@Waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Kevin.DeLano@Waterboards.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Information Request for Preliminary Draft Model of the Ventura River Watershed

EXTERNAL:

Dear Kevin,

I hope this finds you well.

We are requesting additional information to complete our review of the preliminary draft model. Please see attached.

Also, could you please provide an update if any model training sessions will be scheduled?

Thank you, and best regards,

**Kelley A. Dyer, P.E.**  
Assistant General Manager  
Casitas Municipal Water District  
1055 Ventura Avenue  
Oak View, CA 93022  
805-649-2251 ext. 150  
Cell 805-794-1060

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <[lyris@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:lyris@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov)>

Date: Tue, Aug 31, 2021 at 4:55 PM

Subject: Release of Preliminary Draft Groundwater-Surface Water Model of the Ventura River Watershed

To: California Water Action Plan/Statewide Instream Flows

<[waterrights\\_ca\\_water\\_action\\_plan@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:waterrights_ca_water_action_plan@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov)>



**This is a message from the State Water Resources Control Board.**

Today, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) and Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (collectively, the Water Boards) released a Preliminary Draft version of the Groundwater-Surface Water Model of the Ventura River Watershed (VRW GW-SW Model). The Water Boards are making these files available to give interested persons the opportunity to learn more about the VRW GW-SW Model and review preliminary draft model results. Please see the [Notice](#) for additional information and access instructions.

If you received this notice in a forwarded message and would like to receive future emails related to this and similar efforts, please subscribe to the “*California Water Action Plan/Statewide Instream Flows*” list under “*Water Rights*” on the State Water Board’s [Email Subscription List](#) webpage

at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email\\_subscriptions/swrcb\\_subscribe.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/resources/email_subscriptions/swrcb_subscribe.html)

---

You are currently subscribed to waterrights\_ca\_water\_action\_plan as: [kdyer@casitaswater.com](mailto:kdyer@casitaswater.com).

To unsubscribe click here: [leave-8061182-6376350.104d60bf0651a26f6e2fca25e0867f02@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:leave-8061182-6376350.104d60bf0651a26f6e2fca25e0867f02@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov)

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 ***Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.***  
3 ***and related cross-action***

4 **Los Angeles County Superior Court**  
5 **Case No. 19STCP01176**

6 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE**

7 I am employed by the law office of Rutan & Tucker, LLP in the County of Orange, State  
8 of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is  
9 18575 Jamboree Road, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Irvine, California 92612. My electronic notification address is  
10 mmartinez@rutan.com.

11 On January 18, 2022, I served on the interested parties in said action the within:

12 **DECLARATION OF JEREMY N. JUNGREIS IN SUPPORT OF CROSS-**  
13 **DEFENDANT EAST OJAI GROUP'S EX PARTE REQUEST TO CONTINUE TRIAL**  
14 **DATE AND ALL RELATED DEADLINES**

15 as stated below:

16 ☒ (Via E-Service to **File & ServeXpress**) I affected electronic service by submitting an  
17 electronic version of the document(s) to **File & ServeXpress, LLC**, through the user interface at  
18 <https://secure.fileandservexpress.com>, which caused the document(s) to be sent by electronic  
19 transmission to the person(s) at the electronic service address(es) listed.

20 Executed on January 18, 2022, at Irvine, California.

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
22 foregoing is true and correct.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Marisol Martinez  
(Type or print name)

/s/ Marisol Martinez  
(Signature)