1 SHAWN HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435 Exempt From Filing Fees Pursuant to shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com Cal. Gov't Code § 6103 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 2 655 West Broadway, 15th Floor 3 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 525-1300 4 Facsimile: (619) 233-6118 5 CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO, Bar No. 192831 christopher.pisano@bbklaw.com 6 SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY, Bar No. 277223 sarah.foley@bbklaw.com 7 PATRICK D. SKAHAN, Bar No. 286140 patrick.skahan@bbklaw.com 8 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor 9 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 617-8100 Facsimile: (213) 617-7480 10 11 Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA 12 13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 15 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER. Case No. 19STCP01176 16 a California non-profit corporation, Judge: Honorable William F. Highberger 17 Petitioner, CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA'S OPPOSITION TO THE GARRISON 18 v. GROUP'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON 19 THE PLEADINGS STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD, etc., et al., 20 January 18, 2022 Date: Respondents. Time: 1:30 p.m. 21 Dept: 10 22 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, etc., Action Filed: Sept. 19, 2014 Trial Date: Feb. 14, 2022 23 Cross-Complainant 24 v. 25 DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al. 26 Cross-Defendants. 27 28 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA'S OPPOSITION TO THE GARRISON GROUP'S MOTION FOR

JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

82470.00018\34628815.2

Defendant and Cross-Complainant the City of San Buenaventura (Ventura) submits this opposition to the motion for judgment on the pleadings (Motion) filed by Gregg Scott Garrison on behalf of himself and approximately16 other parties (Garrison Group).

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Court must deny the Garrison Group's Motion. It is not based on the material allegations in Ventura's Third Amended Cross-Complaint (TACC). Rather, it improperly seeks to introduce unsupported factual allegations that do not appear on the face of the TACC and which are not the subject of a proper and timely request for judicial notice. The Court must therefore disregard, and Ventura objects to, almost all of the Motion because it violates the applicable standards for a motion for judgment on the pleadings.

To the extent the Motion raises any proper issues for the Court's consideration, those issues are contrary to law. At best, the Motion appears to raise two issues, both of which must be rejected based on settled case and statutory law. First, the Garrison Group appears to assert that the Court somehow lacks jurisdiction because neither the Court nor Ventura has conducted environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 et seq.) (CEQA), and that CEQA should have been used instead of the TACC. CEQA does not apply to judicial proceedings and CEQA review is not a prerequisite to the commencement of the TACC. And even if the Garrison Group had a CEQA claim, which they do not, that claim would have been time-barred years ago. Thus, CEQA provides no basis for the Motion.

Second, the Garrison Group appears to assert that the Court somehow lacks jurisdiction because Ventura should have commenced an eminent domain action rather than seeking a physical solution and, if necessary, a determination of existing rights through the TACC. However, Ventura is not seeking to acquire any private property rights for public use. Rather, by its TACC, Ventura seeks the Court's determination of existing rights of all parties, including Ventura, to the water in the Ventura River Watershed (Watershed) or, alternatively and preferably, a physical solution for the Watershed that need not determine water rights. A determination of existing rights of the parties does not transfer property rights—it merely declares what rights parties already possess to use the water in the Watershed under applicable California

water law. Thus, the Garrison Group's mere reference to the power of eminent domain provides no basis for the Motion.

Finally, the Motion purports to incorporate by reference the "additional" motions for judgment on the pleadings filed by "other Cross-Defendants." This vague attempt to incorporate other motions is not appropriate, does not provide appropriate notice or due process, and does not permit Ventura a fair opportunity to respond. The Court should reject this attempt to incorporate arguments not fairly set forth in the Motion. To the extent the Court considers this attempt to incorporate unspecified arguments into the Motion, the Motion must be denied under the law of the case and for the reasons stated in Ventura's oppositions to all other motions.

The Court must not accept the invitation by the Garrison Group to repeat the reversible error that the Court of Appeal had to correct in *Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. City of San Buenaventura* (2018) 19 Cal.App.5th 1176 (*Santa Barbara Channelkeeper*). The Motion should be denied, and the parties should be allowed to proceed with the Phase One Trial. Any contrary ruling would be reversible error.

# II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The rules governing a motion for judgment on the pleadings are the same as a demurrer, which tests the sufficiency of the pleadings. (Code Civ. Proc., § 438; *Southern Calif. Edison Co. v. City of Victorville* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 218, 227.)<sup>2</sup> In reviewing the Motion, the Court is limited to the contents of the TACC and those matters of which it can take judicial notice. (*Saltarelli & Steponovich v. Douglas* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 1, 5.) "As on demurrer, the defendant's motion cannot be aided by reference to the answer or to matters outside the complaint." (*Welshans v. City of Santa Barbara* (1962) 205 Cal.App.2d 304, 305.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> To the extent there are any minor technical defects in the TACC, the Court should permit Ventura to amend the TACC to correct them and to conform the pleadings to the evidence presented in the Phase One Trial.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Whether the Motion is proper under the timelines required by Code of Civil Procedure section 438 or whether it is intended to be a non-statutory motion is unclear. In either case, given that the Phase One Trial is imminent, the Motion should be denied, and the Court should decide any legal questions based on a full factual record, if for no other reason than to avoid the need for multiple additional appeals in a case that has been pending since 2014, that has already resulted in one published decision, but has yet to proceed to even an initial phase of trial.

Because a motion for judgment on the pleadings is the functional equivalent of a general demurrer, it ordinarily does not lie with respect to only part of a cause of action. (Daniels v. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. (2016) 246 Cal. App. 4th 1150, 1167.) Thus, where a claim may be based on alternative grounds, one of which is properly pleaded, the motion will ordinarily be denied. (See Fire Ins. Exch. v. Superior Court (Altman) (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 446, 451.) The Motion violates this rule because it only addresses parts of causes of action, specifically those parts related to the Ojai Basin and the Upper Ojai Basin (See Motion, generally). The Motion can be denied on this basis alone.

In ruling on a motion for judgment on the pleadings, the Court "must assume that all the facts alleged in the complaint are true" and must interpret all allegations liberally. (Sheehan v. San Francisco 49ers, LTD. (2009) 45 Cal.4th 992, 998, citing Evans v. City of Berkeley (2006) 38 Cal.4th 1, 6.) "The trial court is obligated to look past the form of a pleading to its substance. Erroneous or confusing labels attached . . . are to be ignored if a complaint pleads facts which would entitle the plaintiff to relief." (Saunders v. Cariss (1990) 224 Cal.App.3d 905, 908.) The motion must be denied if there are material factual issues that require evidentiary resolution. (Schabarum v. California Legislature (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1205, 1216.) Where the motion for judgment on the pleadings is granted, leave to amend must also be granted unless the defect cannot be cured by amendment. (Baughman v. State of California (1995) 38 Cal.App.4th 182, 187.) Under these standards, each of the causes of action in the TACC states a valid cause of action, and Ventura is entitled to proceed to the Phase One Trial to prove certain of its allegations, specifically the interconnectedness of the Watershed.

22

28

# III. FAILURE OF THE MOTION TO COMPLY WITH THE STANDARD OF **REVIEW AND VENTURA'S OBJECTIONS**

The Garrison Group's Motion fails entirely to comply with the applicable standard of review and fails to provide appropriate grounds for a motion for judgment on the pleadings. The Motion does not fairly cite even a paragraph of the TACC. The Motion does not contain a proper and timely request for judicial notice as is required by Code of Civil Procedure section 438,

| 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 |  |

subdivision (d). Rather, the Motion seeks to introduce unsupported factual allegations that do not appear on the face of the TACC and which are not the subject of a proper and timely request for judicial notice. This is improper. The Court cannot consider any allegations that are not apparent on the face of the TACC. For the purposes of the Motion, Ventura objects to the Court's consideration of all such allegations, including, but not limited to: (1) all of Motion Section I of the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, pp. 7-13; (2) all assertions in Motion Section III of the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, pp. 13-21, which are not supported by proper cites to the TACC; and (3) all other assertions in the moving papers that are not supported by proper cites to the TACC.

### IV. MATERIAL ALLEGATIONS THAT MUST BE ACCEPTED AS TRUE

The Court is well aware of the procedural history of this case and the general factual background of the dispute. For purposes of this Motion, the Court must assume that the following factual allegations from the TACC are true.

The Ventura River Watershed is located in western Ventura County, with a small section located in eastern Santa Barbara County, is fan-shaped, and covers 226 square miles. (TACC, ¶ 98.) The Ventura River runs through the center of the Watershed along a 33.5-mile stretch from its headwaters in the Transverse Ranges to the Pacific Ocean. (TACC, ¶ 99.) The Ventura River is fed by several major tributaries, including Matilija Creek, North Fork Matilija Creek, San Antonio Creek, Canada Larga Creek, and Coyote Creek. (TACC, ¶ 100.) There are four significant groundwater basins in the Watershed—the Lower Ventura Groundwater Basin, the Upper Ventura River Groundwater Basin, the Ojai Valley Groundwater Basin, and the Upper Ojai Valley Groundwater Basin. (TACC, ¶ 103.) The Ventura River and its tributaries and the four groundwater basins in the Watershed are hydrologically interconnected. (TACC, ¶ 103.)

Ventura holds pueblo, prescriptive, and/or appropriative rights to the waters in the Watershed. (TACC, ¶ 107.) Ventura is a successor to the Mission San Buenaventura pueblo water right, which gives it a priority right to use sufficient water from the Ventura River Watershed, which by definition includes the Ojai Basin, to meet its needs. (TACC, ¶¶ 107, 124-

28

126.) Ventura also holds pre-1914 appropriative water rights. (TACC, ¶¶ 107, 135.) Ventura's use of water in the Watershed has also resulted in Ventura obtaining prescriptive water rights. (TACC, ¶ 107, 130.) Ventura's water rights in the Watershed are senior to and have priority over the rights of all Cross-Defendants. (TACC, ¶¶ 126, 131, 135-136, 143, 149-150.)

Cross-Defendants' claims to the Watershed threaten Ventura's superior rights, and the pumping and/or diversion activities of Cross-Defendants reduce Watershed groundwater tables and surface flows and contribute to the deficiency of the Watershed water supply as a whole. (TACC, ¶ 108.) Cross-Defendants' use of water, or claims of rights to the use of water, reduces the surface and/or subsurface water flow of the Ventura River and impairs Ventura's water rights. (TACC, ¶¶ 105, 108-110.) This continued and increasing extraction and/or diversion of Watershed waters has and will deprive Ventura of its rights to provide water for the public health, welfare, and benefit. (TACC, ¶ 110.) Ventura's use of Watershed water is reasonable and consistent with the public trust as compared to the use of Watershed water by the Cross-Defendants. (TACC, ¶ 115, 120-121, 154.)

## V. LEGAL ARGUMENT

Because the Motion is based entirely on matters outside the TACC, and which are not subject to a proper and timely request for judicial notice, the bulk of the Motion must be rejected outright. To the extent the Motion attempts to raise any cognizable legal issues, they appear to be that the Court lacks jurisdiction over the TACC because neither the Court nor Ventura conducted CEQA review and because Ventura did not file an eminent domain action. Neither argument has any legal support.

# A. CEQA Does Not Apply to the Court or to the TACC, and Any CEQA Claim is Time-Barred

CEQA requires a public agency that is considering the approval of a discretionary project that is not otherwise exempt from CEQA review to conduct a review of the effects of the decision on the environment. (Pub. Res. Code §§ 21991.1, 21063, 21080(a).) By definition, "public

agency" does not "include the courts of the state." (14 Cal. Code Reg. § 15379.) Therefore, by definition, CEQA does not apply to the Court's jurisdiction to hear the TACC and does not limit the Court's ability to determine the matters asserted in the TACC.

This result is the only valid one because the Court's jurisdiction to hear the TACC is fundamentally rooted in Article X, section 2 of the California Constitution, which cannot be superseded by legislation such as CEQA. This specific point is confirmed in *Hillside Memorial Park & Mortuary v. Golden State Water Company* (2012) 205 Cal.App.4th 534 (*Hillside Memorial Park*). In *Hillside Memorial Park*, the Court of Appeal rejected a trial court's decision that a party was required to prepare an Environmental Impact Report under CEQA before filing a motion to amend a judgment and physical solution in an adjudication. (*Id.* at 550.) The Court of Appeal reasoned that CEQA did not apply to the adjudication. It held that "[t]o the extent there is a conflict between the statutory provision of CEQA and article X, section 2 of the California Constitution establishing a public policy of fostering the reasonable and beneficial use of water, the constitutional provision must prevail and the court must hold an evidentiary hearing to resolve the issues presented by the motion to amend the judgment." (*Ibid.*)

The Court of Appeal reached a similar result in *California American Water v. City of Seaside* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 471, 481-482 (*Seaside*). In *Seaside*, the court held that parties to a judgment and physical solution in an adjudication cannot use or require CEQA review in ways that conflict with the court's judgment and continuing jurisdiction. (*Ibid.*) The same holding was reached in *Central Basin Municipal Water District v. Water Replenishment District of Southern California* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 943, 948-951 (*Central Basin*). In *Central Basin*, the Court of Appeal addressed whether the Water Replenishment District of Southern California was required to conduct CEQA review before declaring a water emergency that would modify the schedule during which over-extracted water could be replaced within an adjudicated basin. (*Id.* at 945-946.) The Court of Appeal rejected this argument, holding that requiring CEQA review would frustrate the judgment and physical solution in the adjudicated basin and would in fact be improper. (*Id.* at 951.) In sum, CEQA simply has no application here.

Ventura's decision to file a cross-complaint in response to the underlying complaint is also not subject to CEQA. CEQA only applies to discretionary projects undertaken by a public agency that may have a significant and adverse physical effect on the environment. (*Hillside Memorial Park, supra,* 205 Cal.App.4th at 550.) Where, as here, the Court holds the power to act, CEQA does not apply. (*Ibid.*) Agency action that merely establishes the agency's ability to take a later action that may affect the environment, but does not commit the agency to a definite course of action that is under its control, is not an "approval" under CEQA. (*Kaufman & Broad-South Bay, Inc. v. Morgan Hill Unified School Dist.* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 464, 474-476.)

Ventura's decision to file the TACC and subject itself to the Court's jurisdiction on the issues in the TACC does not constitute the discretionary approval of a project that is subject to CEQA review. (*See, e.g., Central Basin, supra,* 211 Cal.App.4th at 949.)

The Motion cites no case or CEQA provision that CEQA review is required before initiation of litigation, and no such case or provision exists to Ventura's knowledge. This is true because initiation of litigation is not a discretionary project, particularly the initiation of a cross-complaint. It would also be entirely infeasible to apply CEQA to the initiation of litigation, especially the initiation of a cross-complaint, given the short time limits to file litigation and the significant time requirements for CEQA compliance. Such a requirement would also be nonsensical because only a court has the final power to make the decision in litigation and CEQA does not apply to the courts. (14 Cal. Code Reg. § 15379.)

Finally, and fatally, even if the Garrison Group did have some claim under CEQA (which they do not), such a claim would be time-barred. The Supreme Court has held that CEQA challenges are time barred if not brought within the applicable Public Resources Code section 21167 statute of limitations. (Committee for Green Foothills v. Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors (2011) 48 Cal.4th 32, 47-48.) Courts must strictly enforce the CEQA limitations periods. (Stockton Citizens for Sensible Planning v. City of Stockton (2010) 48 Cal.4th 481, 500.)

Here, the longest applicable statute of limitation for a CEQA challenge would be the 180-day limitation under Public Resources Code section 21167, subdivision (a). Since the original cross-complaint was filed in 2015, and the TACC was filed in January of 2020, any CEQA claim

by the Garrison Group has been time-barred for several years, and the Court must reject it.

It is true that an adjudication and physical solution will not preclude compliance with CEQA as to *future projects* to the extent such projects do not conflict with the physical solution. (*Seaside, supra*, 183 Cal.App.4th at 482.) However, there is no legal authority to support the proposition that CEQA compliance is required before the Court considers the TACC, and even if such a claim existed, which is does not, it would be time-barred. The Motion must therefore be denied.

# B. The TACC is Not an Eminent Domain Action, Such an Action is Not Required for the Court to have Jurisdiction and Ventura Cannot be Forced to Bring Such an Action

An adjudication of groundwater and surface water rights, whether brought as an action for declaratory relief, quiet title, injunction, or through a statutory process, is simply a request for a court or administrative agency to determine existing rights to the use of water, and, as necessary to protect those rights from injury. (*City of Santa Maria v. Adam* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 266, 298 (*Santa Maria*); *Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist.* (1935) 3 Cal.2d 489; *Pasadena v. Alhambra* (1949) 33 Cal.2d 908.) In such an adjudication, existing rights must be fixed in light of paramount concepts of reasonable use and public trust because there is "no property right in an unreasonable use" of water. (*United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd.* (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 82, 101.) Existing rights may include prescriptive water rights, which are acquired by operation of law when essential elements for adverse use have been established. (*Santa Maria, supra,* 211 Cal.App.4th at 294.) In all of these circumstances, however, the Court is merely determining existing rights of the parties—no one is taking rights or acquiring rights they do not otherwise possess.

Therefore, eminent domain does not apply to this case, and nothing in the TACC alleges that Ventura is seeking to acquire the private property (water rights) of any Cross-Defendant for public use. In fact, the opposite is true—Ventura is seeking a physical solution to protect existing water rights held by all parties. (TACC, ¶¶ 1,139 ["The physical solution doctrine imposes a duty on this Court to resolve competing claims to water by cooperatively satisfying the reasonable and

beneficial needs of each user while protecting the substantial enjoyment of their prior rights."].) In *Central Basin Municipal Water Dist. v. Fossette* (1965) 235 Cal.App.2d 689, 698, the Court of Appeal rejected the contention that such a physical solution in an adjudication violated rights without the proper exercise of the power of eminent domain. To the contrary, the Court of Appeal held that the stipulation and proposed judgment at issue in that case "do not purport to deprive any individual of a property right, but on the contrary, disclose a careful and concerted effort on the part of the litigants to conserve and protect the individual rights to the use of water within the watershed, where the need for such water is growing and the supply is limited." (*Ibid.*)

Even where governmental action limits water rights, courts have held that there is no "taking" within the meaning of the federal and California constitutions. (*Allegretti & Co. v. County of Imperial* (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 1261.) When water use is reallocated under the reasonable use doctrine, the public trust doctrine, or other statutory or common law bases, courts have found no interference with a property right at all because water rights are held subject to these doctrines and a vested water right cannot be obtained in a use that conflicts with them. (*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419, 443-445.) Where, as here, a party is merely seeking a physical solution or, as needed, a declaration of existing rights under California water law, there is no credible basis for an argument that eminent domain concepts apply.

Water rights can of course be acquired through the power of eminent domain, when such an action is properly initiated, as Article X, section 5 of the California Constitution specifically contemplates. However, neither the Court nor the parties can force Ventura to pursue such an eminent domain action in lieu of seeking a physical solution or, if necessary, an adjudication of existing rights, whatever they may be. And the Court's jurisdiction to hear these issues under the Constitution, common law, and statutes is entirely unrelated to the presence or absence of an action in eminent domain. The Motion must therefore be denied.

| 1 2 | C. Any Other Cognizable Argument in the Motion or Through Incorporation is Barred by the Law of the Case and Arguments in Ventura's Other Oppositions |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 3   | To the extent the Motion raises or incorporates any other valid arguments, which Ventura  |  |
| 4   | asserts it does not, those arguments are either barred by the law of the case or fail because of the  |  |
| 5   | authority provided in Ventura's other oppositions. The doctrine of the "law of the case"  |  |
| 6   | addresses the effect of a first appellate decision on the subsequent retrial or appeal of that case.  |  |
| 7   | The law of the case doctrine provides that "a decision of an appellate court, stating a rule of law   |  |
| 8   | necessary to the decision of the case, conclusively establishes that rule and makes it determinative  |  |
| 9   | of the rights of the same parties in any subsequent retrial or appeal in the same case." (Morohoshi   |  |
| 10  | v. Pacific Homes (2004) 34 Cal.4th 482, 491.) Here, the Court of Appeal has already determined  |  |
| 11  | that Ventura is <i>entitled</i> to have its cross-complaint heard on the merits, and that the Court <i>must</i>                                       |  |
| 12  | consider the water uses of others in the Watershed. (Santa Barbara Channelkeeper, supra, 19   |  |
| 13  | Cal.App.5th at 1181.) The Motion must be denied in light of the law of the case, and because of   |  |
| 14  | the authority provided in Ventura's other oppositions.  |  |
| 15  |   |  |
| 16  | VI. CONCLUSION  |  |
| 17  | For all the reasons set forth above, the Motion must be denied.   |  |
| 18  | D. 1.1. A 2022 DECEMBER & VINEGER LLD   |  |
| 19  | Dated: January 4, 2022 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP  |  |
| 20  | By: Chiefs Pri  |  |
| 21  | SHAWN HAGERTY   |  |
| 22  | CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO<br>SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY  |  |
| 23  | PATRICK D. SKAHAN Attorneys for Respondent and  |  |
| 24  | Cross-Complainant CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA  |  |
| 25  |   |  |
| 26  |   |  |
| 27  |   |  |
| 28  |   |  |

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

# PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the action herein; my business address is Best & Krieger LLP, 2001 N. Main Street, Suite 390, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. On January 4, 2022, I served the following document(s):

# CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA'S OPPOSITION TO THE GARRISON GROUP'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

- by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Walnut Creek, California addressed as set forth below. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business.
  - I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by United Parcel Service following the firm's ordinary business practices.
- by transmission via **E-Service to File & ServeXpress** to the person(s) set forth below. × Local Rules of Court 2.10 (P).
- **By e-mail or electronic transmission.** I caused the documents to be sent to the persons × at the e-mail addresses listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

Daniel Cooper Matthew Bullock Sycamore Law Deputy Attorney General 1004 O'Reilly Ave. California Department of Justice San Francisco CA 94129 Natural Resources Law Section Tel: (415) 360-2962 455 Golden Gate Ave.. Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 daniel@sycamore.law Tel: (415) 510-3376 matthew.bullock@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Petitioner and Plaintiff Attorneys for Respondent and Defendant State Water Resources Control Board Santa Barbara Channelkeeper

| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9 | Marc N. Melnick Deputy Attorney General Attorney General's Office 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550 Tel: 510-879-0750 Marc.melnick@doj.ca.gov  Attorneys for Respondent and Defendant State Water Resources Control Board  Edward J. Casey Gina Angiolollo Alston & Bird LLP | Eric M. Katz Supervising Deputy Attorney General Noah Golden – Krasner Deputy Attorney General Carol Boyd Deputy Attorney General 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Tel. (213) 269-6343 Fax (213) 897-2802 Eric.Katz@doj.ca.gov Noah.goldenrasner@doj.ca.gov Carol.boyd@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor California Department of Fish & Wildlife  Ryan Blatz Blatz Law Firm 206 N. Signal St. Suite G |
|---|---|--|
| 11  | 333 South Hope Street, 16th Floor<br>Los Angeles, CA 90071  | Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel: (805) 646-3110  |
| 12  | Tel: 213.576.1000<br>ed.casey@alston.com  | ryan@ryanblatzlaw.com  |
| 13  | gina.angiolillo@alston.com  | Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Troy Becker and Jeri Becker; Janet Boulton; Michael   |
| 14  | Attorneys for Cross-Defendants AGR  | Boulton; Michael Caldwell; Joseph Peter  |
| 15  | Breeding, Inc.; Bentley Family Limited Partnership; and Southern California Edison  | Clark, successor in interest to the Joseph<br>Clark and Linda Epstein Family Trust; Linda<br>Louise Epstein, successor in interest to the  |
| 16  | Company   | Joseph Clark and Linda Epstein Family Trust;<br>Michael I. Cromer and Jody D. Cromer;  |
| 17  |   | Michel A. Etchart, Trustee of the Michel A.  |
| 18  |   | Etchart Separate Property Trust, and Mark W. Etchart, Trustee of the Mark W. Etchart   |
| 19  |   | Sepertate Property Trust; Lawrence Hartmann; Ole Konig; Krotona Institute of Theosophy: Stephen Michtell and Kathleen  |
| 20  |   | Theosophy; Stephen Michtell and Kathleen Reid Mitchell, Trustees of the Stephen Mitchell and Byron Ketia Trust: North Fork   |
| 21  |   | Mitchell and Byron Katie Trust; North Fork Springs Mutual Water Company; Stephen Pahert Smith, Trustee of the Charles P. Budd  |
| 22  |   | Robert Smith, Trustee of the Charles R. Rudd and Lola L. Rudd Trust, dated May 20, 2976;   |
| 23  |   | Shlomo Raz; Sylvia Raz; Senior Canyon Mutual Water Company; Siete Robles Mutual Water Company; Soula Park Golf Course  |
| 24  |   | Water Company; Soule Park Golf Course,<br>Ltd.; Telos, LLC; Victor C. Timar, Jr. Trustee<br>of the Timer Femily Trust; John Toyan; Trudio  |
| 25  |   | of the Timar Family Trust; John Town; Trudie Town; Asquith Family Limited Partnership,   |
| 26  |   | Ltd.; Burgess Ranch; Cary Cheldin; Cynthia Daniels; Wayne Francis; David Friend; The Larry & Pot Hortmann Family Trust: The John   |
| 27  |   | Larry & Pat Hartmann Family Trust; The John N. Hartmann Trust; Gary Hirschkron; Cheryl Lancon, Lutheren Church of the Hely Cross of  |
| 28  |   | Jensen; Lutheran Church of the Holy Cross of Ojai, California; Janice Sattler (Mineo); Eitan   |

Ojai, California; Janice Sattler (Mineo); Eitan

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

28

1

Sloustcher; Rogers-Cooper Memorial Foundation; Robert Norris (not yet appeared); Patricia Norris; Old Creek Road Mutual Water Company (not yet appeared); Margaret Vanderfin; Telos Ojai, LLC (not yet appeared); Jennifer Ware; The Walker Jr. Living Trust; David Altman, Trustee of the 1190 El Toro Trust; Babtiste Foundation; Sean A. Bennett and Leslie Bennett, Trustees of the Bennett Family Trust; Dwayne A. Bower and Marilyn E. Bower Trustees of the Bower Family Trust; Mark Terry Cline and Bonnie Burreson Cline, Trustees of the Mark Terry Cline and Connie Burreson Cline Revocable Trust; Robert R. Daddi and Darlene J. Daddi; Lucille A. Elrod, Trustee of the John and Lucille Elrod Family Trust; Friend's Stable & Orchard Inc. Daniel Hultgen, Trustee of the Hultgen Living Trust; Ojai Golf, LLC; Three Oaks, LLC, Erica J. Abrams, Trustee of the Erica J. Abrams Trust; Raul E. Alvarado and Hildegard M. Alvarado, Trustees of the Alvarado Family Trust; William Armstrong and April Nardini; Joseph Lynn Barthelemy and Elvira Lilly Barthelemy, Trustees of the Joseph Lynn Barthelemy and Elvira Lilly Barthelemy 2002 Family Trust; James S. Bennett and Carolyn D. Bennett, Trustees of the Bennett Family Trust; Sumeet Bhatia and Michael McDonald; John Joseph Broesamle and Katharine Sue Broesamle, Trustees of the Broesamle Family Trust; Richard Aaron Carlson, Trustee of the Richard Aaron Carlson Trust and Michelle Larson. Trustee of the Michelle Larson Family Trust; Thomas D. Carver and Cynthia L. Carver; Dana Ceniceros, Trustee of the Dana and Dawn Ceniceros Revocable Living Trust; Deborah Lys Martin Crawford; Frank Clay Creasey Jr.; Debra Joy Reed, Trustee of The Debra Joy Reed Revocable Trust Dated November 3, 1994; Frederic Devault; Diana Syvertson, Trustee of the Diana Syvertson Living Trust; Dive Deep L.L.C.; Douglas Roy Parent and Ann Marie Parent; William Erickson; Gelb Enterprises, L.P.; Jan Stephen Granade and Priscilla K. Granade, Trustees of the Granade Family Revocable Living Trust; Margot J. Griswold; Brian C. Haase and Marie Haase, Trustees of the B&M Haase Trust Dated October 8, 2019; Thomas Lann Harper and Jadona Collier-Harper; Ojai-Jackman L.L.C.; Kevin Rainwater and Marianne Ratcliff; Keith M. Nightingale and Victoria V. Nightingale, Trustees of The

82470.00018\32240721.4 - 3 -

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

28

1

2

Nightingale Family Trust; Heide C. Kurtz, Trustee of The Kurtz Family Trust Dated January 19, 2019; Randall Leavitt, Trustee of The Randall B. Leavitt 2010 Trust; Edward C. Leicht and Jacqueline M. Leicht, Trustees of The Leicht Family 2013 Revocable Trust Dated March 1, 2013; Paul Lepiane and Bengtson Bo; Robert Levin and Lisa Solinas, Trustees of The Levin Family Living Trust; Francis Longstaff and Shauna Longstaff, Trustees of The Longstaff Trust Dated October 11, 2018; Mandy Macaluso, Trustee of The Living Trust of Mandy Macaluso: Marilyn Wallace, Trustee of The Marilyn Wallace Separate Property Trust; Daniel J. McSweeney and Yoko McSweeney; Wendell M. Mortensen and Laura L. Mortensen, Trustees of The Mortensen Family Revocable Trust; Timothy Jerome Murch and Jody Caren Murch, Trustees of The Jodim Family 2007 Trust Dated July 31, 2007; Chris E. Platt and Hanh H. Platt; Robert Erickson, Trustee and Ronald Wilson; Michael D. Robertson and Kimberly A. Robertson, Trustees of The Robertson Family Trust; James P. Robie, Trustee of the Robie Family Trust; Petter Romming and Kimi Romming, Trustees; Marc Saleh, Trustee of The Saleh Family Trust; Konrad Stefan Sonnenfeld, Trustee of The Konrad Stefan Sonnenfeld Living Trust; Mark Sutherland, Trustee of The Sutherland Marital Trust; John H. Thacher and Caroline H. Thacher, Trustees of The Thacher Family Trust Dated January 2004; Gilbert G. Vondriska and Carolyn J. Vondriska, Trustees of The Vondriska Living Trust; William D. Rusin, Sr., Trustee of the William D. Rusin Sr. Revocable Trust; Oscar D. Acosta, Trustee of the Acosta Trust; Chris E. Platt and Hanh H. Plat; Deborah Lys Martin Crawford; Diane Syvertson, Trustee of the Diana Syvertson Living Trust; Erica J. Abrams, Trustee of the Erica J. Abrams Trust; Frank Clay Creasey Jr.; Frederic DeVault; Gilbert G. Vondriska and Carolyn J. Vondriska, Trustees of the Vondriska Living Trust; James P. Robie, Trustee of the Robie Family Trust; John H. Thacher and Caroline H. Thacher, Trustees of the Thacher Family Trust dated January 2004; Mandy Macaluso, Trustee of the Living Trust of Mandy Macaluso; Margot J. Griswold; Mark Sutherland, Trustee of the Sutherland Marital Trust; Randall Leavitt, Trustee of the Randall B. Leavitt 2010 Trust; Raul E. Alvarado and Hildegard M. Alvarado, trustees

82470.00018\32240721.4 - 4 -

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

Wendell M. Mortensen and Laura L. Mortensen, Trustees of the Mortensen Family Revocable Trust; Petter Romming and Kimi Romming, Trustees; William Armstrong and April Nardini; William Erickson; Rancho Briscoe Ivester & Bazel LLP 235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935 Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin Bernhoft Lowthorp, Richards, McMillan, Miller & 300 Esplande Drive, Suite 850 Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Ernest Ford, Tico Mutual Water Company, and Betty Withers and Betty Bow Withers Trust - 5 -

| 1 2 | Gregory J. Patterson<br>William W. Carter<br>Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP  | Lindsay F. Nielson<br>Law Office of Lindsay F. Nielson<br>845 E Santa Clara Street  |
|-----|--|---|
|     | 2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 200   | Ventura, CA 93001   |
| 3   | Westlake Village, CA 91361<br>Tel: (805) 418-3103  | Tel: 805-658-0977<br>nielsonlaw@aol.com   |
| 4   | Fax: (805) 418-3101  | meisoniaw @ aoi.com   |
| 5   | g.patterson@musickpeeler.com<br>w.carter@musickpeeler.com  | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Meiners Oaks<br>Water District, Ventura River Water District,<br>and Jean Marie Webster, Trustee of The |
| 6   | Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Robert C.   | Roger E. and Jean Marie Webster Trust   |
| 7   | Davis, Jr.; James Finch; Topa Topa Ranch & Nursery, LLC; The Thacher School; Thacher Creek Citrus, LLC; Ojai Oil Company; Ojai |   |
| 8   | Valley School; Sharon Hamm-Booth and   |   |
| 9   | David Robert Hamm, Co-Trustees of The<br>Hamm 2004 Family Trust Dated April 29,<br>2004; Reeves Orchard, LLC; and Ojai Valley  |   |
| 10  | Inn, Edward J. Conner, Edward J. Conner,   |   |
| 11  | Trustee of the Edward J. Conner Trust, Roe 56; Friend's Ranches, Inc.; Finch Farms,  |   |
| 12  | LLC; Red Mountain Land & Farming, LLC; James Finch, Trustee of the Finch Family Trust  |   |
| 13  |  | V 15 16   |
| 14  | Jeanne Zolezzi Herum Crabtree Suntag 5757 Pacific Avenue, Suite 222  | Neal P. Maguire<br>Ferguson Case Orr Patterson LLP<br>1050 South Kimball Road   |
| 15  | Stockton, CA 95207   | Ventura, CA 93004   |
| 16  | Tel: (209) 472-7700<br>Fax: (209) 472.7986   | Tel: (805) 659-6800<br>nmaguire@fcoplaw.com   |
| 17  | jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com   | Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Rancho   |
| 18  | Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Meiners Oaks Water District and Ventura River Water   | Matilija Mutual Water Company; Bettina Chandler, Trustee of the Bettina Chandler  |
| 19  | District   | Trust; Martin Gramckow and Linda<br>Gramckow individually; Martin Gramckow,<br>Trustee of the Monika G. Huss Irrevocable              |
| 20  |  | Trust, Trustee of the Karin W. Gramckow Irrevocable Trust, and Trustee of the Kurt J.   |
| 21  |  | Gramckow Irrevocable Trust  |
| 22  |  |   |
| 23  |  |   |
| 24  |  |   |
| 25  |  |   |
| 26  |  |   |
| 27  |  |   |
| 28  |  |   |

| 1  | Thomas S. Bunn III  | Michael J. Van Zandt  |
|----|---|---|
| 2  | Elsa Sham Lagerlof Senecal Gosney & Kruse LLP   | Nathan A. Metcalf<br>Sean G. Herman   |
| 3  | 301 N. Lake Avenue, 10th Floor<br>Pasadena, CA 91101-5123   | Hanson Bridgett LLP<br>425 Market Street, 26 Floor                                |
| 4  | Tel.: (626) 793-9400<br>Fax: (626) 793-5900   | San Francisco, CA 94105<br>Tel: 415-777-3200                                      |
| 5  | tombunn@lagerlof.com<br>esham@lagerlof.com  | Fax: 415-541-9366<br>mvanzandt@hansonbridgett.com                                 |
| 6  | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant St. Joseph's  | nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com<br>sherman@hansonbridgett.com                         |
| 7  | Associates of Ojai, California, Inc. and St.<br>Joseph's Health and Retirement Center, Janis<br>Long Nicholas, John Jay Nicholas, Jess Earl | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Ventura<br>County Watershed Protection District and |
| 8  | Long (aka Jess E. Long), Johana Rae Long, and Mary Margaret Long, Janis Long  | County of Ventura   |
| 9  | Nicholas and Jess E. Long as Trustees of the Long Family Trust  |   |
| 10 | Long Family Trust   |   |
| 11 | Jeffrey E. Barnes<br>Chief Assistant County Counsel   | Scott Slater<br>Bradley Herrema   |
| 12 | Jason Canger Assistant County Counsel   | Christopher Guillen Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP                           |
| 13 | Office of Ventura County Counsel<br>800 South Victoria Avenue, L/C #1830  | 1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor<br>Santa Barbara, CA 93101                         |
| 14 | Ventura, CA 93009<br>Tel.: (805) 654-2879   | Tel: (805) 963-7000<br>Fax: (805) 965-4333  |
| 15 | Fax: (805) 654-2185<br>jason.canger@ventura.org   | sslater@bhfs.com<br>bherrema@bhfs.com   |
| 16 | Attorneys for Cross-Defendants  | cguillen@bhfs.com   |
| 17 | Ventura County Watershed Protection District and County of Ventura  | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant The Wood-<br>Claeyssens Foundation                  |
| 18 |   |   |
| 19 | Joseph C. Chrisman<br>Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers,   | Jeffrey M. Oderman<br>Douglas J. Dennington                                       |
| 20 | Chrisman & Gutierrez<br>5450 Telegraph Road   | Jeremy N. Jungreis<br>Rutan & Tucker, LLP   |
| 21 | Ventura, ČA 93003<br>(805) 644-7111   | 611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400<br>Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1931                      |
| 22 | jchrisman@hathawaylawfirm.com   | Tel: 714-641-5100<br>Fax: 714-546-9035  |
| 23 | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Wood-<br>Claeyssens Foundation  | joderman@rutan.com<br>ddennington@rutan.com                                       |
| 24 |   | jjungreis@rutan.com   |
| 25 |   | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas<br>Municipal Water District                 |
| 26 |   | -   |
| 27 |   |   |
| 28 |   |   |

| 1 2      | Thomas E. Jeffry Debra J. Albin-Riley Arent Fox LLP             | Andrew Brady<br>DLA Piper LLP (US)<br>550 South Hope Street, Suite 2400     |
|----------|---|---|
| 3        | 555 West Fifth Avenue, 48th Floor<br>Los Angeles, CA 90013-1065 | Los Angeles, CA 90071-2618<br>Tel. (213) 330-7700                           |
| 4        | (213) 629-7400<br>(213) 629-7401<br>Thomas.jeffry@arentfox.com  | Fax: (213) 330-7701 andrew.brady@us.dlapiper.com                            |
| 5        | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Community                         | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Integritas Ojai, LLC                          |
| 6        | Memorial Health System  |   |
| 7        | Jennifer T. Buckman<br>Andrew J. Ramos                          | David R. Krause-Leemon<br>BEAUDOIN & KRAUSE-LEEMON LLP                      |
| 8        | Holly Jacobson Bartkiewicz Kronick & Shanahan, PC               | 15165 Ventura Blvd., Suite 400<br>Sherman Oaks, CA 91403                    |
| 9        | 1011 Twenty-Second Street<br>Sacramento, CA 95816-4907          | Tel. (818) 205-2809<br>Fax (818) 788-8104                                   |
| 10       | Tel. (916) 446-4254<br>Fax (916) 446-4018                       | david@bk-llaw.com   |
| 11       | jtb@bkslawfirm.com<br>hjj@bkslawfirm.com                        | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant RDK Land, LLC                                 |
| 12       | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant City of Ojai                      |   |
| 13       | Eric J. Schindler   | Brian A. Osborne  |
| 14       | Michelle J. Berner<br>Kroesche Schindler LLP                    | Osborne Law Firm<br>674 County Square Drive, Suite 308                      |
| 15       | 2603 Main Street, Suite 200<br>Irvine, CA 92614                 | Ventura, CA 93003<br>Tel. (805) 642-9283                                    |
| 16<br>17 | Tel. (949) 387-0495<br>Fax (888) 588-0034 Fax                   | Fax (805) 642-7054<br>osbornelawyer@gmail.com                               |
| 18       | eschindler@kslaw.legal<br>mberner@kslaw.legal                   | Attorney for Cross-Defendants Brian A. Osborne; Ronald W. Rood and Susan B. |
| 19       | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Oak Haven, LLC                    | Rood, Trustees of the Rood Family Trust                                     |
| 20       | Adam D. Wieder  | Peter A. Goldenring   |
| 21       | Barry C. Groveman<br>Ryan Hiete                                 | Mark R. Pachowicz Pachowicz   Goldenring A Professional Law                 |
| 22       | Groveman Hiete LLP<br>35 East Union Street, Suite B             | Corporation 6050 Seahawk Street   |
| 23       | Pasadena, CA 91103<br>Tel (626) 747-9383                        | Ventura, CA 93003-6622<br>Tel. (805) 642-6702                               |
| 24       | Fax (626) 747-9370<br>awieder@grovemanhiete.com                 | Fax (805) 642-3145<br>attorneys@gopro-law.com                               |
| 25       | bgroveman@grovemanhiete.com<br>rhiete@grovemanhiete.com         | peter@gopro-law.com<br>mark@pglaw.law                                       |
| 26       | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Michael                           | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant The Manfred                                   |
| 27       | Bradbury; Heidi Bradbury; and The Heidi<br>Gramkow Trust        | Krankl and Elaine V. Krankl Living Trust                                    |
| 28       |   |   |
|          |   |   |

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR

| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4           | Anthonie M. Voogd<br>918 Palomar Road<br>Ojai, CA93023<br>Tel. (805) 646-1512<br>avoogd@stanfordalumni.org   | Lawrence S. Mihalas Trustees of the Mihalas Family Trust 419 21 <sup>st</sup> Place Santa Monica, CA 90402 Tel. (310) 739-0700 lmihalas@gmail.com lmihalas@ucla.edu |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8           | Heather Blair<br>556 So. Fair Oaks Ave., Ste 101<br>Box 356<br>Pasadena, CA 91105<br>Tel. (626) 755-6566<br>Hblair1946@gmail.com   | Martin Hartmann<br>Whitney Hartmann<br>430 S. Carrillo Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel. (805) 798-2253<br>earthbuilding@gmail.com                                     |
| 9<br>10<br>11              | Robert K. Cartin<br>Cartin Family LLC<br>505 Estremoz Ct.<br>Oceanside, CA 92057<br>Tel. (760) 429-4738<br>bob.cartin@dvm.com  | Loa E. Bliss<br>Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust<br>9030 Ojai Santa Paula Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel: (617) 750-8500<br>loabliss@hotmail.com                    |
| 12<br>13<br>14<br>15       | Del Cielo LLC<br>Attn. Tim Carey, Managing Member<br>22410 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 5<br>Torrance, CA 90505<br>Tel. (310) 787-6569<br>tim@calvoterguide.com                              | Joyce Syme, and<br>The Joyce A. Syme Living Trust<br>1760 Ocean Avenue<br>Santa Monica, CA 90401<br>Tel. (310) 403-1760<br>seaviewmotel@hotmail.com                 |
| 16<br>17<br>18             | Janice and Jesse Hillestad<br>9611 N. Ventura Ave.<br>Ventura, CA 93001<br>Tel. (310) 614-8438<br>janicehillestad@icloud.com<br>jessehillestad@gmail.com                                   | Dale and Patricia Givner<br>12617 Koenigstein Rd.<br>Santa Paula, CA 93060<br>Tel. (805) 525-9524<br>dalegivner@gmail.com   |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | Carlos A Mejia Sophie A Wenzlau Department of Justice 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Tel. (916) 210-6379 Fax: (916) 327-2319 sophie.wenzlau@doj.ca.gov | Dennis and Nadine Corte<br>12812 MacDonald Drive<br>Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel. (805) 701-1950<br>dwcorte@outlook.com  |
| 24<br>25<br>26<br>27       | carlos.mejia@doj.ca.gov  Attorneys for California Department of Parks and Recreation   |   |
| 28                         |  |   |

82470.00018\32240721.4

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS ATLAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH PLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

| 1 2         | Harry D. Sims and Raymond P. Sims<br>P.O. Box 1870<br>Ojai, CA 93024  | Tiernan Dolan<br>995 Riverside St.<br>Ventura, CA 93001   |
|-------------|---|---|
| 3           | Tel. (805) 646-0167<br>1978simsfamilytrust@gmail.com  | tdolan@hacityventura.org  |
| 4<br>5<br>6 |   | Attorney for Cross-Defendants Housing<br>Authority of the City of San Buenaventura,<br>Triad Properties, Inc., Encanto Del Mar<br>Apartments, L.P., Villages at Westview I LP,<br>Vista Del Mar Commons, LP, and Soho<br>Associates, L.P. |
|             |   |   |
| 7 8         | Andrew K. Whitman<br>821 N. Signal Street<br>Ojai, CA 93023   | Christopher Danch<br>16200 Maricopa Highway<br>Ojai, CA 93023   |
| 9           | Tel. (805) 444-5671<br>sfreberg@scr-legaliner.com   | Tel. (805) 640-8534<br>chrisdanch@gmail.com   |
| 10          | In pro per and Atty for Cross-Defendants  | Attorney for Cross-Defendants Angie Marie   |
| 11          | Andrew K. Whitman and Heidi A. Whitman;<br>Nancy L. Whitman; John R. Whitman and<br>Nancy L. Whitman Family Trust | Genasci and Christopher Paul Danch, Trustees of the Genasci-Danch Family Trust; and Donald and Wendy Givens   |
| 12          |   | ·   |
| 13          | Paul R. Huff The Huff Law Firm APC 21 S. California Street, Suite 205   | Alessandro (Alex) Lobba<br>Alessandro Lobba and Mary E. Jackson,<br>individually as Trustees of the Lobba-Jackson   |
| 14          | Ventura, CA 93001<br>Tel. (805) 667-8940  | Family Trust<br>947 Casitas Vista Road  |
| 15<br>16    | Fax (805) 850-7399<br>phuff@hufffirm.com  | Ventura, CA 93001<br>Tel. (805) 895)-7056<br>alobba@gmail.com   |
|             | Attorneys for Barnard Properties, LLC   |   |
| 17          | Christine Steiner   | William Slaughter   |
| 18<br>19    | 2560 Ladera Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel. (31) 600-3220  | Slaughter, Reagan & Cole, LLP<br>625 East Santa Clara Street, Suite 101<br>Ventura, CA 93001  |
| 20          | csteiner@csteinerlaw.com  | Tel. (805) 658-7800<br>Fax (805) 644-2131   |
| 21          |   | slaughter@srllplaw.com  |
| 22          |   | Attorneys for The Boyd S. Dron and Karin<br>Dron Joint Living Trust, and Sisar Mutual<br>Water Company  |
| 23          |   | 1 2   |
| 24          | Julia Taft-Whitman, President CEO Taft Corporation' 111 West Topa Topa Street                                     | Jaide Whitman, President Julia Whitman, Director Conservation Endowment Fund  |
| 25          | Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel. (805) 794-2837   | P.O. Box 6 Oak View, CA 93022   |
| 26          | juliawhitman@gmail.com  | Tel. (805) 649-2333<br>Tel. (805) 804-7005  |
| 27          |   | jaide.whitman@gmail.com   |
| 28          |   | TaftGardensOffice@gmail.com   |
|             |   |   |

82470.00018\32240721.4

| 1  | Catherine Ferro & Catherine Eileen Ferro Inter Vivos Trust  | Susan C. White<br>Steven J. White  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | 312 Montana Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023                          | 2 Shorewood Drive<br>Bellingham, WA 98225  |
| 3  | Tel. (805) 326-1686<br>cepharoah@gmail.com                  | Tel. (425) 891-9249<br>curranwhite1@hotmail.com  |
| 4  |   |  |
| 5  | Susan Capper<br>12870 Tree Ranch Road                       | Lindy & Karen C. Goetz 12338 Linda Flora   |
| 6  | Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel. (805) 794-6421<br>chelsue@aol.com    | Ojai, CA 93023-9721<br>Tel. (805) 649-2526; (805) 794-2312   |
| 7  |   | lindygoetz@roadrunner.com  |
| 8  | Joyce L. Heath Joyce Heath, Trustee of the Heath Family     | Thomas M. German 301 N. Drown Avenue   |
| 9  | Living Trust,<br>P.O. Box 1323                              | Ojai, CA 93023<br>Tel. (805) 646-2130  |
| 10 | Ojai, CA 93024<br>Tel. (805) 290-6231                       | kittycatgirl214@gmail.com  |
| 11 | mamaheath55@gmail.com                                       |  |
| 12 | Ronald W. Bowman Trustee of the Bowman Trust dated April 8, | Andrew P. Byrne, Esq. 1140 Highland Avenue, Ste. 250   |
| 13 | 2011<br>672 W. Villanova Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023             | Manhattan Beach, CA 90266<br>Tel. (310) 505.7170<br>Andy@ByrneLaw-LA.com                                 |
| 14 | Tel. (805) 732-4014<br>ron@l-binc.com                       | Attorney for Cross-Defendant Roman   |
| 15 | Tone i-onic.com   | Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles, a sole corporation  |
| 16 | Amy Hueppe  | Glenn Bator  |
| 17 | 1025 Moreno Drive<br>Ojai, CA 93023                         | 338 Montana Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023   |
| 18 | Tel. (310) 699-4619<br>amychueppe@gmail.com                 | Tel. (805) 798-1802<br>denibator@aol.com   |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 | Harry Anthony Williams<br>915 Daly Road<br>Ojai, CA 93023   | Bryan M. Sullivan, Esq.<br>EARLY SULLIVAN WRIGHT GIZER &<br>McRAE LLP                                    |
| 21 | Tel. (661) 609-1253   | 6420 Wilshire Boulevard, 17 <sup>th</sup> Floor  |
| 22 | Tel. (805) 794-6922<br>awilliam@me.com                      | Los Angeles, CA 90048<br>Tel. (323) 301-4660<br>bsullivan@earlysullivan.com                              |
| 23 |   | ·  |
| 24 |   | Attorneys for Cross-Defendant<br>Jeff Bacon as Trustee of the Villa Nero Trust<br>Dated January 25, 2000 |
| 25 |   | 2 vandar j 20, 2000  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 |   |  |
|    |   |  |

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR
SAN DIFFG CALIDDRIA 97101

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLF

Kristi Schoeld

82470.00018\32240721.4

1

Robert Turnage

82470.00018\32240721.4

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH PLOOR
SAN DIFGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

I declare 1 under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on January 4, 2022at Walnut Creek, California

Irene Islas

82470.00018\32240721.4