

Koch California Ltd.

662 Eucalyptus Road, P.O. Box 1127 Nipomo, CA 93444
 Phone:
 (805) 929-4153

 Fax:
 (805) 929-5598

 Email:
 kochcal@earthlink.net

June 26, 2000 Nipomo Community Services District 148 Wilson Street P.O. Box 326 Nipomo, CA 93444

(805) 929-1133 Phone (805) 929-1932 Fax

Dear Doug Jones:

I am requesting a complete unedited exact copy of the document provided to Jim Garing by NCSD; "Engineering Considerations of Groundwater Yields and Rights on the Nipomo Mesa Sub-Area, San Luis Obispo County, CA (October 1993) as listed on page 8 of the draft initial study by Jim Garing for new water transmission Main in the May 17th 2000 agenda.

Thank You

John M

John Snyder Vice President

Send Confirmation (Event Succeeded)

Date:	6/26/00	Time:	10:57 PM
Pages:	2	Duration:	0 min 44 sec
Recipient:	Jones, Doug	Company:	Nipomo Community Services District
Fax Number:	9291932	Subject:	
Туре:	Fax	Resolution:	Fine
Retries:	0	Speed:	9600 bps
Status:	Completed	Status Code:	Complete
Remote CSID:	805 929 1932	Pages Sent:	2
Keywords:		ECM:	On
Billing:			



Koch California Ltd.

Tel: (805) 929-4153 Fax: (805) 929-5598 Email kochcal@earthlink.net

FACSIMILE COVER PAGE

To: Doug Jones	From: John Snyder
Fax #: 9291932	Fax #: (805) 929-5598
Company: Nipomo Community Services	Tel #: (805) 929-4153
Subject:	

Sent: 6/26/00 at 10:57:06 PM	Pages: 2 (including cover)

MESSAGE:

Request for Data #2



Koch California Ltd.

662 Eucalyptus Road, P.O. Box 1127 Nipomo, CA 93444
 Phone:
 (805) 929-4153

 Fax:
 (805) 929-5598

 Email:
 kochcal@earthlink.net

June 26, 2000 Nipomo Community Services District 148 Wilson Street P.O. Box 326 Nipomo, CA 93444

(805) 929-1133 Phone (805) 929-1932 Fax

Dear Doug Jones:

I am requesting a complete unedited exact copy of the document provided to Jim Garing by NCSD; "Engineering Considerations of Groundwater Yields and Rights on the Nipomo Mesa Sub-Area, San Luis Obispo County, CA (October 1993) as listed on page 8 of the draft initial study by Jim Garing for new water transmission Main in the May 17th 2000 agenda.

Thank You

John Mar

John Snyder Vice President

File: NCSD Request for exact copy of Reports used in EIR 00 0626 PM

Page 1

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

148 SOUTH WILSON STREET P.O. BOX 326 NIPOMO, CA 93444-0326 (805) 929-1133 FAX (805) 929-1932

July 3, 2000

John Snyder Koch California Ltd. P O Box 1127 Nipomo, CA 93444

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

This is in response to your June 26, 2000 FAX requesting documents from the District. Please refer to the letter sent to you from Mr. Jon Seitz, dated March 23, 2000.

If you have any further questions, please call.

Very truly yours,

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Doug Jones

General Manager

cc: Jon S. Seitz, District Legal Counsel

Document request/Snyder42

SHIPSEY & SEITZ, INC. A LAW CORPORATION 1066 PALM STREET POST OFFICE BOX 953 SAN LUIS OBISPO. CALIFORNIA 93406 (805) 543-7272 PAX (805) 543-7281 JON S. SEITZ District Legal Counsel Niporno Community Services District

101TN L. SEITZ (1924-1986)

GERALD W. SHIPSEY (KETIRED)

JON S. SEITZ MICHAEL W. SEITZ

March 23, 2000

JOHN SNYDER, VICE PRESIDENT KOCH CALIFORNIA LTD. 662 Eucalyptus Road P.O. Box 1127 Nipomo, CA 93444

BARRY H. EPSTEIN, ESQ. FITZGERALD, ABBOTT & BEARDSLEY LLP Attorney for Koch California Ltd./ and John Snyder 1221 Broadway, 21st Floor Oakland, CA 94612

RE: REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

Dear Mr. Snyder:

The District has forwarded your March 18, 2000 request for records, which I presume to be a public records request, on to this firm for a response. Said letter is attached hereto. Accordingly, the District responds as follows:

1. The Request is objected to pursuant to Government Code Section 6255, because on the facts of this particular request the public interest served by not making the records public clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the records.

You are currently represented by Attorneys in the groundwater litigation against the District titled Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District, a public entity, plaintiff, vs. the City of Santa Maria, a municipal corporation, et al. and related cross actions. The records requested potentially relate to said litigation. Using the Public Records Act as well as the formal discovery process under the California Code of Civil Procedure and Evidence Code, unfairly requires the District (as a litigator) to deal with:

• The burden of double disclosure request for the same document; one under the Public Records Act and the other under the formal discovery process. Page 2 Mr. John Snyder Attorney Barry H. Epstein March 23, 2000

- Two disclosure process that could be sequenced by you and your attorneys to the disadvantage of the public
- Two disclosure processes whose procedures may conflict with one another
- Having to make a disclosure determination for the purposes of litigation but within the abbreviated time period allowed by the Public Records Act for public records purposes; rather than within the longer period allowed by the formal discovery process for litigation purposes.

Further, the District cannot fully prepare for litigation challenges if records are being given to an opposing party through the Public Records Act process. Since the Public Records Act is to be administered liberally by the District to facilitate the disclosure of records, it is virtually impossible for the District's special water litigation attorneys to know about, let alone substantially review, requests for records under the Public Records Act. Thus, under the Public Records Act, records relating to a pending claim or litigation can be disclosed to an opposing litigant without being called to the attention of the special litigation attorneys for the District. As a consequence, the District is not able to fully prepare a response to an opponent's potential use of those records.

During the pendency of the current groundwater litigation to which you are a litigant, whatever public interest there is in the disclosure of obtaining records through the Public Records Act is satisfied fully by the formal discovery process which:

- makes available the disclosure of such records, even if the records are not disclosed under the Public Records Act while the matter is pending;
- ensures that the District's litigation attorneys will know about and be involved in deciding what records are being disclosed to an opposing party;
- provides the District's litigation attorneys with the opportunity to raise proper objections to the request for records, within the time frame appropriate for litigation.

It is the District's position that the Public Records Act

Page 3 Mr. John Snyder Attorney Barry H. Epstein March 23, 2000

should not be interpreted to result in a nullification of the existing discovery procedures for obtaining documents for litigation. Therefore, the District objects to the request made in the March 18, 2000 letter and will continue to object on this basis to any and all future Public Records Requests that have any relation or nexus to water issues involved in the current groundwater litigation.

To the extent the records exist, the request is objected to 2. pursuant to Government Code Section 6254(b) because they relate to pending litigation to which the District is a party.

3. To the extent the records exist, the request is objected to pursuant to Government Code Section 6254(k) because disclosure of said records is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code and Code of Civil Procedure relating to Attorney/Client Privilege, Attorney Work Product, and Expert Work Product.

As you are a litigant in the Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District lawsuit and are represented by legal counsel in said litigation, I am jointly addressing this letter to you and your attorney of record.

Very truly yours, SHIPSEY & SEITZ, INC.

JON S District Legal Counse.

JSS/cm Enclosures cc: 🕂 Doug Jones, General Manager Nipomo Community Services District (w/encls) James Markman, Esg., Water Counsel, NCSD (w/encls)