



XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California  
ERIC M. KATZ  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
NOAH GOLDEN-KRASNER  
Deputy Attorney General  
State Bar No. 217556  
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Telephone: (213) 269-6343  
Fax: (213) 897-2802  
E-mail: Noah.GoldenKrasner@doj.ca.gov  
Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor  
California Department of Fish & Wildlife

*EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES  
PER GOV. CODE, § 6103*

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT  
SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

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

Petitioner,

v.

**STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL  
BOARD, a California State Agency, CITY  
OF BUENAVENTURA, a California  
municipal corporation,**

Respondents.

Case No. 19STCP01176

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION  
TO INTERVENE BY CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND  
WILDLIFE**

Date: December 6, 2019

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept: 10

Judge: William F. Highberger

Trial Date: None Set

Action Filed: September 19, 2014

**CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, a  
California municipal corporation,**

Cross-Complainant,

v.

**DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual; et al.,**

Cross-Defendants.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION .....	4
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....	5
INTRODUCTION .....	5
PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND .....	5
ARGUMENT .....	7
I.    The Department is Entitled to Intervene as a Matter of Right .....	7
A.    Intervention Is Timely .....	7
B.    The Streamlined Groundwater Adjudication Statute Confers on the Department an Unconditional Right to Intervene .....	8
C.    The Department Has a Right to Intervene to Protect Its Interests.....	8
1.    The Department Has an Interest in the Adjudication and the Flow Regime Ultimately Set for the Ventura River.....	8
2.    This Case's Disposition May Affect the Department's Interests. ....	10
3.    The Department's Interests Are Not Adequately Represented By Existing Parties .....	10
II.    In The Alternative, The Court Should Permit Intervention In Its Discretion .....	11
A.    Proper Procedures Were Followed in Filing this Motion .....	11
B.    The Department Has a Direct and Immediate Interest in This Action.....	11
C.    The Department's Intervention Will Not Enlarge the Issues in the Litigation .....	12
D.    The Reasons for the Department's Intervention Outweigh any Opposition by the Parties .....	12
III.   The Department Requests that it Be Excused From Filing and Complaint or Answer in Intervention.....	13
CONCLUSION .....	13

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Reliance Ins. Co. v. Superior Court</i> (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 383 .....	7
<i>Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. City of San Buenaventura</i> (2018) 19 Cal.App.5th 1176 .....	5
<i>Truck Ins. Exchange v. Super. Ct.</i> (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th 341 .....	8
<b>STATUTES</b>	
Code Civ. Proc., § 387, subd. (d)(1) .....	8
Code of Civil Procedure	
§ 387.....	7
§ 387 (b).....	7
Code of Civil Procedure § 387(d)(1) .....	8
§ 387(d)(1)(A).....	7, 8, 11
§§ 830-52 .....	6
§ 835.....	9
§ 835(a)(6).....	7, 8
§ 836(d).....	6
§ 837.5.....	7, 8
§ 1085.....	5
Fish & Game Code	
§ 711.7.....	9
§ 1600.....	9
§ 1802.....	9
§ 2080.....	9
§ 2081.....	9
Public Resources Code	
§ 10002.....	9
Water Code	
§ 275.....	5
§§ 10720-37.8 .....	6
<b>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS</b>	
California Constitution, Article X, § 2.....	5, 6

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

TO THE COURT AND THE PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that respondent California Department of Fish and Wildlife hereby moves to intervene on the cross-complaint in this action and that that motion has been set for hearing on December 6, 2019 at 10 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Department 10 of the above-entitled court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California. This motion is based on this notice, the accompanying memorandum of points and authorities, and any other matter submitted on reply or at the hearing on matter.

Dated: November 4, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California  
ERIC M. KATZ  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General



NOAH GOLDEN-KRASNER  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor  
California Department of Fish & Wildlife*

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3 The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) seeks to intervene in the City  
4 of Buenaventura's (City) second amended cross-complaint, which has initiated a comprehensive  
5 adjudication of water rights in the Ventura River basin. The Department's interest in this case is  
6 to ensure that any interim or final adjudication of water rights is consistent with the instream flow  
7 needs for fish and other surface flow dependent plants and wildlife, as well as that groundwater  
8 levels be maintained to sufficiently protect groundwater dependent ecosystems. The Department  
9 has met and conferred informally with attorneys for all parties who have appeared in this case,  
10 and no one has voiced an objection to the granting of this motion.

11 **PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

12 In September 2014, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper (Channelkeeper) filed a Complaint and  
13 Petition for Declaratory Relief and a Writ of Mandate pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section  
14 1085 against the City and the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board). The Petition  
15 asked the Court to declare the City's use of Reach 4 of the Ventura River from April through  
16 October is unreasonable, in violation of article X, section 2 of the California Constitution, and to  
17 direct the State Board to perform alleged mandatory duties under article X, section 2, Water Code  
18 section 275, and the public trust doctrine to prevent that unreasonable use.

19 In response, the City filed a Cross-Complaint, and later a First Amended Cross-  
20 Complaint, against other surface water and groundwater users who it alleged affect the flow of  
21 water in the Ventura River. Pursuant to Channelkeeper's motion, the Court struck City's First  
22 Amended Cross-Complaint. The City appealed the decision to strike its First Amended Cross-  
23 Complaint, and the Court of Appeal reversed the decision in a published decision. (*Santa Barbara*  
24 *Channelkeeper v. City of San Buenaventura* (2018) 19 Cal.App.5th 1176.) Following the appeal,  
25 Channelkeeper filed a First Amended Complaint and Petition ("1st Am. Complaint"). The State  
26 Board's Answer to the original Complaint and Petition was deemed its answer to the 1st Am.  
27 Complaint. The City filed an Answer and a Second Amended Cross-Complaint ("2nd Am.  
28 Cross-Complaint").

1 In its 2nd Am. Cross-Complaint, City named approximately one hundred Cross-  
2 Defendants who divert water from the Ventura River or pump groundwater from the Upper  
3 Ventura River, Ojai Valley, Lower Ventura River, and Upper Ojai Valley Groundwater Basins  
4 (collectively "Ventura Groundwater Basins"), which it contends affect the flow of water in the  
5 Ventura River. The City's 2nd Am. Cross-Complaint alleges the following claims: (1) violation  
6 of reasonable use under Article X, section 2 by Cross-Defendants; (2) violation of public trust by  
7 Cross-Defendants; (3) declaratory relief regarding pueblo and/or treaty water rights;  
8 (4) declaratory relief regarding prescriptive water rights; (5) declaratory relief regarding  
9 appropriative water rights; (6) comprehensive adjudication and physical solution; (7) declaratory  
10 relief regarding municipal priority; (8) declaratory relief regarding human right to water; and  
11 (9) declaratory relief. As an adjudication action that includes adjudication of the Ventura  
12 Groundwater Basins, the 2nd Am. Cross-Complaint involves, among other things, the  
13 Streamlined Groundwater Adjudication Statutes (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 830-852) and the  
14 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) (Wat. Code, §§ 10720-10737.8).

15 Most Cross-Defendants have not filed responsive pleadings pursuant to an extension of  
16 time granted by the San Francisco Superior Court allowing them to respond to the 2nd Am.  
17 Cross-Complaint within 60 days after receipt of a Court-approved Form Answer.

18 Although originally venued in San Francisco County Superior Court, the case has been  
19 transferred to Los Angeles County Superior Court. The case has been deemed complex and was  
20 assigned to this department on May 15, 2019. This court ordered a partial stay of the action on  
21 August 23, 2019 and no trial date has been set. The City's motion for approval of its notice is to  
22 come for hearing on November 1, 2019. At that point, the City will have a period of time to serve  
23 the potential cross-defendants. (Code Civ. Proc., § 836, subd. (d).) The City has not yet provided  
24 the statutory notice to all potential parties, and no due date for responsive pleadings has been  
25 scheduled. The City has recently indicated an intent to obtain the court's approval to file a Third  
26 Amended Cross-Complaint.

## ARGUMENT

Code of Civil Procedure section 387(d)(1) provides that a nonparty may intervene as a matter of right upon timely application when a provision of law confers an unconditional right to intervene. The Department arguably has a statutory right to intervene as a state agency. (See Code Civ. Proc., §§ 835, subd. (a)(6), 837.5.) A nonparty may also intervene as a matter of right upon timely application when (1) the proposed intervenor has an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action; (2) the disposition of this case may as a practical matter impair or impede the proposed intervenor's ability to protect that interest; and (3) the proposed intervenor's interests are not adequately represented by the existing parties. (Code Civ. Proc., § 387, subd. (d)(1); see also, *Reliance Ins. Co. v. Superior Court* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 383, 386.) The Department meets each of these elements, and therefore is entitled to intervene as a matter of right on this basis as well.

In the alternative, the Court may permit intervention under section 387(d)(2) when "(1) the proper procedures have been followed; (2) the nonparty has a direct and immediate interest in the action; (3) the intervention will not enlarge the issues in the litigation; and (4) the reasons for the intervention outweigh any opposition by the parties presently in the action." (*Reliance Ins. Co.*, *supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th at 386, citing *Truck Ins. Exchange v. Superior Court* (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th 342, 346.) Should the court find that the Department is not entitled to intervene as a matter of right, it should exercise its discretion to allow the Department to intervene by permission.

### **I. THE DEPARTMENT IS ENTITLED TO INTERVENE AS A MATTER OF RIGHT**

#### **A. Intervention Is Timely**

This case is still in its infancy stages of litigation. The vast majority of water producers and potential defendants in this case have not been served and the case is not yet at issue. In fact, this case was reassigned to this court on May 15, 2019. Although there have been Case Management Conferences and other hearings in the case, no trial date has been set and formal discovery has not commenced. Indeed, the City has expressed its interest in filing a Third Amended Complaint. Moreover, any delay, if there were one, is outweighed "when a direct interest is demonstrated"

1 and there is no prejudice to the parties. (*Truck Ins. Exchange v. Super. Ct.* (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th  
2 341, 352.) As such, intervention is timely.

3 **B. The Streamlined Groundwater Adjudication Statute Confers on the**  
4 **Department an Unconditional Right to Intervene**

5 The Streamlined Groundwater Adjudication Statutes provide that the plaintiff (here, the  
6 City) is required to give notice of this comprehensive adjudication to the Department, as well as  
7 the Attorney General, the Department of Water Resources, and the State Water Board. (Code  
8 Civ. Proc., § 835, subd. (a)(6).) The statutes also provide that “the state” may intervene in a  
9 comprehensive adjudication. (*Id.*, § 837.5.) The Code of Civil Procedure provides that a  
10 nonparty must be allowed to intervene when a statute confers an unconditional right to intervene.  
11 (Code Civ. Proc., § 387, subd. (d)(1)(A).) Given that the Streamlined Groundwater Adjudication  
12 statutes require the plaintiff to give notice to the Department as a state agency, and that “the state”  
13 is entitled to intervene as a matter of right, it is a fair reading of these statutes together to mean  
14 that the Legislature intended that the state agencies who are given notice of a comprehensive  
15 groundwater adjudication be allowed to intervene in such action as a matter of right. As such, the  
16 Department should be allowed to intervene as a matter of right pursuant to Code of Civil  
17 Procedure, section 387, subdivision (d)(1)(A).

18 **C. The Department Has a Right to Intervene to Protect Its Interests**

19 The Department may intervene as a matter of right under Code of Civil Procedure section  
20 387(d)(1) as it meets the each the three elements: (1) the Department has an interest relating to the  
21 property or transaction that is the subject of the action; (2) the disposition of this case may as a  
22 practical matter impair or impede the Department’s ability to protect that interest; and (3) the  
23 Department’s interests are not adequately represented by the existing parties. (Code Civ. Proc.,  
24 § 387, subd. (d)(1).)

25 **1. The Department Has an Interest in the Adjudication and the Flow**  
26 **Regime Ultimately Set for the Ventura River**

27 Although the Department is not a water producer and is not diverting any flows from the  
28 Ventura River, the Department has a significant regulatory interest in the Ventura River and the



1 ultimate flow regime set for the river and its watershed. The Department also has been studying  
2 the Ventura River watershed for several years in developing a recommended flow regime for the  
3 Ventura River. Through these studies the Department has gained significant knowledge and  
4 expertise relating to the flow regime that could be set for the Ventura River and the effects that  
5 regime may have on the watershed's wildlife resources. Department staff also regularly deals  
6 with questions of flow and its connections to resources and has the expertise and statutory  
7 responsibility to protect those resources.

8 The Department has statutory responsibilities with regard to fish and wildlife resources,  
9 including their habitats, in the State of California. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, 1802.) Further, the  
10 Department has the authority to review projects for their potential impacts to threatened,  
11 candidate, and endangered species and their habitats and may authorize the incidental taking of  
12 these species through incidental take permits. (*Id.*, §§ 2080, 2081.) The Department also  
13 regulates and permits activities that may substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or  
14 substantially change or use the material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or  
15 lake, or deposit debris, waste, or other materials where it could pass into any river, stream, or lake  
16 through a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement. (*Id.*, § 1600 et seq.)

17 In addition, the Department has the responsibility to develop and transmit flow criteria to  
18 the State Board for consideration as part of the State Board's instream flow program pursuant to  
19 Public Resources Code section 10002. Finally, in 2014, Governor Brown signed the California  
20 Water Action Plan which directs the Department and State Water Board to implement a suite of  
21 actions designed to enhance instream flows in five priority watersheds, including the Ventura  
22 River watershed.

23 Since the Department has regulatory and statutory responsibilities related to the Ventura  
24 River and its fish and wildlife resources, and has the expertise and knowledge for how to protect  
25 those resources, the Department has a clear interest related to this adjudication. This is further  
26 supported by the requirement in the adjudication statute, California Code of Civil Procedure  
27 section 835, to serve notice of the commencement of any adjudication upon the Department. The  
28 Legislature found that the Department has an interest in every adjudication and required notice

1 upon the Department. This interest is even stronger in a case such as this, where the question at  
2 issue is at the heart of the regulatory authority of the Department related to fish and wildlife  
3 resources in the Ventura River watershed. In fact, the Department is tasked by the Legislature  
4 and Governor to provide knowledge, expertise and advice regarding the watershed and take  
5 action if necessary to protect the wildlife in the watershed.

6 **2. This Case's Disposition May Affect the Department's Interests.**

7 Intervention should also be granted as a matter of right because the disposition of this case  
8 may, as a practical matter, impair or impede the interests of the Department. As the entity  
9 responsible for protecting the fish and wildlife resources of the Ventura River and its watershed,  
10 any final judgment related to the rights of the parties to pump or divert flow or groundwater in  
11 this watershed will have a practical and possibly even a legal effect on how the Department  
12 protects the resources at issue in this case. The flow regime agreed upon and the amount of  
13 pumping permitted may exacerbate or alleviate the current impairment to the fish and wildlife  
14 resources in the watershed. Setting sustainable flows and pumping coincides directly with the  
15 Department's responsibilities under the Fish and Game and Public Resources Codes. Therefore,  
16 it is hard to imagine a scenario where the final disposition of this case and the rights of the parties  
17 to the action do not affect the Department's direct interests as overseer of the watershed's fish and  
18 wildlife resources.

19 **3. The Department's Interests Are Not Adequately Represented By**  
20 **Existing Parties**

21 The primary reason for this water rights adjudication case is to set all water rights for  
22 existing and future pumpers from the Ventura River watershed. Therefore, existing and future  
23 pumpers' first and foremost concern is their own individual water rights and access to water for  
24 their own needs. The Department, however, has a very different interest at stake. As stated  
25 above, the Department's interest is as the public's trustee to protect the fish and wildlife resources  
26 of the Ventura River and its watershed. Although some of the parties to the case may have  
27 concern for the fish and wildlife resources in mind, they cannot adequately represent the  
28 Department and will necessarily have a conflict of interest involved in any plan to protect the

1 watershed and river's resources. The Department has been tasked by the State of California to  
2 protect these resources and no existing party can adequately stand in its shoes and protect its  
3 interests.

4 Based on the foregoing factors, the Department should be granted the right to intervene in  
5 this action. The case is in its infancy, the Department has an interest in the adjudication which  
6 may be affected by the disposition of the adjudication and there are currently no existing parties  
7 that can adequately represent the Department.

8 **II. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE COURT SHOULD PERMIT INTERVENTION IN ITS**  
9 **DISCRETION**

10 While the Department's right to intervene under section 387(d)(1) make analysis under  
11 permissive intervention under section 387(d)(2) unnecessary, the Department nonetheless meets  
12 the requirements for permissive intervention as well. The Department meets each of the four  
13 necessary elements, discussed below.

14 **A. Proper Procedures Were Followed in Filing this Motion**

15 The Department has also followed all of the necessary procedural requirements for this  
16 motion.

17 **B. The Department Has a Direct and Immediate Interest in This Action**

18 As discussed above, the Department has a clear interest in this litigation. The Department  
19 has a significant regulatory interest in the Ventura River and the ultimate flow regime set for the  
20 river and its watershed. The Department also has significant knowledge and expertise relating to  
21 the flow regime that could be set for the Ventura River and the effects that regime may have on  
22 the watershed's fish and wildlife resources. Department staff regularly deals with questions of  
23 flow and its connections to resources and has the expertise and statutory responsibility to protect  
24 those resources.

25 Further, the adjudication must as a practical matter engage in the issues surrounding the  
26 flow regime of the Ventura River and the needs of the resources in the watershed. Any ultimate  
27 adjudication of the rights to pump and divert water in the watershed must contend with these  
28

1 competing needs and the Department is ideally placed to help resolve the competing needs and  
2 avoid as much regulatory interference as possible in the future.

3 **C. The Department's Intervention Will Not Enlarge the Issues in the**  
4 **Litigation**

5 The needs of fish and wildlife will need to be addressed in this litigation with or without the  
6 Department, and so the Department's intervention to address them will not enlarge the issues in  
7 this case. For example, a comprehensive adjudication is required to be "consistent with the  
8 achievement of groundwater sustainability" under SGMA. (Code Civ. Proc., § 830, subd. (a)(4).)  
9 Among other things, SGMA requires that groundwater be managed to avoid depletions of  
10 interconnected surface water that have significant and unreasonable impacts on beneficial uses of  
11 the surface water, such as providing necessary flow for fish. (Wat. Code, §§ 10720.1, subd. (a);  
12 10721, subds. (v) & (x)(6).) Furthermore, groundwater management requires that the  
13 "environmental users of groundwater" be considered. (*Id.*, § 10723.2, subd. (e).) Additionally,  
14 surface water rights are conditioned on the effect appropriations have on fish and wildlife,  
15 considering measures proposed to be taken to protect fish and wildlife. (E.g., *Id.*, § 1260, subd.  
16 (j).) Finally, the public trust doctrine requires that all water right permits are subject to reopening  
17 to consider the impacts that surface water diversions have on public trust resources, such as fish  
18 and wildlife. (*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419.) For all these  
19 reasons, the parties and the court will necessarily need to consider the needs of fish and wildlife  
20 before resolving this case, and the Department's intervention in this case to address those issues  
21 will therefore not enlarge the issues.

22 **D. The Reasons for the Department's Intervention Outweigh any Opposition**  
23 **by the Parties**

24 The Department's reason for intervening are addressed extensively above. The Department  
25 inquired of all the parties active in this case whether they oppose the Department's intervention,  
26 and no party has voiced any opposition to the Department intervening in this action.  
27  
28

1 **III. THE DEPARTMENT REQUESTS THAT IT BE EXCUSED FROM FILING AND COMPLAINT**  
2 **OR ANSWER IN INTERVENTION**

3 In a typical civil case, a motion to intervene must be accompanied by a complaint in  
4 intervention or an answer in intervention. (Code Civ. Proc. § 387, subd. (c).) This is not a typical  
5 civil case. The Legislature has employed highly unique procedural requirements for the naming  
6 of parties and for how entities can participate in comprehensive groundwater adjudications like  
7 this by filing court-approved form answers. (E.g., Code Civ. Proc., § 835.) Given the unique  
8 procedural posture of this case and the Department's unique role in it, a complaint or answer is  
9 intervention would not be meaningful or appropriate. The Department therefore requests that it  
10 be relieved of the otherwise applicable requirement to file a complaint or answer in intervention.

11 **CONCLUSION**

12 The Department respectfully requests that its motion to intervene as a matter of right be  
13 granted. In the alternative, it requests that it be allowed to intervene by permission.

14 Dated: November 4, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

15  
16 XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California  
17 ERIC M. KATZ  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

18  
19 

20 NOAH GOLDEN-KRASNER  
Deputy Attorney General  
21 *Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor*  
22 *California Department of Fish & Wildlife*

23 LA2019600071  
53871967.docx

**DECLARATION OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE AND SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL**

Case Name: **City of San Buenaventura v. Abbott, et al.**  
No.: **19STCP1176**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collecting and processing electronic and physical correspondence. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service with postage thereon fully prepaid that same day in the ordinary course of business. Correspondence that is submitted electronically is transmitted using the File&ServeXpress electronic filing system. Participants who are registered with File&ServeXpress will be served electronically. Participants in this case who are not registered with File&ServeXpress will receive hard copies of said correspondence through the mail via the United States Postal Service or a commercial carrier.

On November 4, 2019, I electronically served the attached **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE BY CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE** by transmitting a true copy via this Court's File&ServeXpress system. Because one or more of the participants in this case have not registered with the Court's File&ServeXpress system or are unable to receive electronic correspondence, on November 4, 2019, I placed a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702, Los Angeles, CA 90013, addressed as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LISTS

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on November 4, 2019, at Los Angeles, California.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol Chow  
Declarant

\_\_\_\_\_  
  
Signature

**SERVICE LIST BY E-MAIL**

Case Name: **City of San Buenaventura v. Abbott, et al.**  
No.: **19STCP1176**

Daniel Cooper  
[daniel@lawyersforcleanwater.com](mailto:daniel@lawyersforcleanwater.com)  
Cooper & Lewand-Martin Inc.  
1004-A O'Reilly Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94129  
*Attorney for Petitioner and Plaintiff Santa Barbara Channelkeeper*

Stephen C. Lewis  
[slewis@bargcoffin.com](mailto:slewis@bargcoffin.com)  
Barg Coffin Lewis & Trapp LLP  
600 Montgomery Street, Suite 525  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
*Attorney specially appearing for Cross-Defendant Rudd Ranch, LLC*

Gene Tanaka  
[gene.tanaka@bbklaw.com](mailto:gene.tanaka@bbklaw.com)  
Sarah Christopher Foley  
[sarah.foley@bbklaw.com](mailto:sarah.foley@bbklaw.com)  
Dakotah Benjamin  
[dakotah.benjamin@bbklaw.com](mailto:dakotah.benjamin@bbklaw.com)  
Best Best & Krieger LLP  
2001 N. Main Street, Suite 390  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
*Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant City of San Buenaventura*

Shawn Hagerty  
[shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com](mailto:shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com)  
Best Best & Krieger LLP  
655 West Broadway, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
*Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant City of San Buenaventura*

Robert N. Kwong  
[rk Wong@atozlaw.com](mailto:rk Wong@atozlaw.com)  
Dennis O. La Rochelle  
A to Z Law Firm, LLP  
300 Esplanade Dr. Ste 2100  
Oxnard, CA 93036  
*Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas Municipal Water District*

Paul Blatz  
[blatzlawfirm@gmail.com](mailto:blatzlawfirm@gmail.com)  
Ryan Blatz  
[ryan@ryanblatzlaw.com](mailto:ryan@ryanblatzlaw.com)  
Blatz Law Firm  
206 N. Signal St. Suite G  
Ojai, CA 93023  
*Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Troy Becker; Janet Boulten; Michael Boulten; Michael Caldwell; Joe Clark; Michael Cromer; Linda Epstein; Lawrence Hartmann; Ole Konig; Krotana Institute of Theosophy; Stephen Mitchell; North Fork Springs Mutual Water Company; Rudd Ranch, LLC; Shlomo Raz; Sylvia Raz, Senior Canyon Mutual Water Company; Siete Robles Mutual Water Company; Soule Park Golf Course, Ltd.; Telos LLC; Victor Timar; John Town and Trudie Town*

Lindsay F. Nielson  
[nielsonlaw@aol.com](mailto:nielsonlaw@aol.com)  
Law Office of Lidsay F. Nielson  
845 E Santa Clara Street  
Ventura, CA 93001  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendants Meiners Oaks Water District and Ventura River Water District*

William G. Short, Esq.  
[billshortesq@me.com](mailto:billshortesq@me.com)  
Law Offices of William G. Short  
Post Office Box 1313  
Ojai, CA 93024-1313  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin Bernhoft*

Antony Lee Francois  
[alf@pacificlegal.org](mailto:alf@pacificlegal.org)  
[TFrancois@pacificlegal.org](mailto:TFrancois@pacificlegal.org)  
Jeremy Talcott  
[jtalcott@pacificlegal.org](mailto:jtalcott@pacificlegal.org)  
David Deerson  
[ddeerson@pacificlegal.org](mailto:ddeerson@pacificlegal.org)  
Pacific Legal Foundation  
930 G Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814-1802  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin Bernhoft*

Michael J. VanZandt  
[mvanzandt@hansonbridgett.com](mailto:mvanzandt@hansonbridgett.com)  
Nathan A. Metcalf  
[nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com](mailto:nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com)  
Sean G. Herman  
[sherman@hansonbridgett.com](mailto:sherman@hansonbridgett.com)  
Hanson Bridgett LLP  
425 Market Street, 26 Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendant Ventura County  
Watershed Protection District*

Joseph C. Chrisman  
[jchrisman@hathawaylawfirm.com](mailto:jchrisman@hathawaylawfirm.com)  
Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers,  
Chrisman & Gutierrez  
5450 Telegraph Road  
Ventura, CA 93003  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendant Wood-  
Claeyssens Foundation*

Jeanne Zolezzi  
[jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com](mailto:jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com)  
Herum Crabtree Suntag  
5757 Pacific Avenue, Suite 222  
Stockton, CA 95207  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendants Meiners Oaks  
Water District and Ventura River Water  
District*

Neal P. Maguire  
[nmaguire@fcoplaw.com](mailto:nmaguire@fcoplaw.com)  
Ferguson Case Orr Patterson LLP  
1050 South Kimball Road  
Ventura, CA 93004  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendant Rancho  
Matilija Mutual Water Company*

Clynton Namuo, Esq  
[clynton.namuo@alston.com](mailto:clynton.namuo@alston.com)  
Edward J. Casey, Esq  
[ed.casey@alston.com](mailto:ed.casey@alston.com)  
Alston & Bird LLP  
333 South Hope Street, 16<sup>th</sup> floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
*Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Bentley  
Family Ltd. Partnership and specially  
appearing for Cross-Defendant AGR  
Breeding, Inc.*

Scott Slater  
[sslater@bhfs.com](mailto:sslater@bhfs.com)  
Bradley Herrema  
[bherrema@bhfs.com](mailto:bherrema@bhfs.com)  
Christopher Guillen  
[cguillen@bhfs.com](mailto:cguillen@bhfs.com)  
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP  
1021 Anacapa Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
*Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Wood-  
Claeyssens Foundation*



Patrick Loughman  
[ploughman@lrnmt.com](mailto:ploughman@lrnmt.com)  
Cristian Arrieta  
[Carrieta@lrnmt.com](mailto:Carrieta@lrnmt.com)  
Lowthorp, Richards, McMillan, Miller &  
Templeman  
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 850  
Oxnard, CA 93036  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendants Ernest Ford  
and Tico Mutual Water Company*

Thomas S. Bunn III  
[tombunn@lagerlof.com](mailto:tombunn@lagerlof.com)  
Elsa Sham  
[esham@lagerlof.com](mailto:esham@lagerlof.com)  
Lagerlof Senecal Gosney & Kruse LLP  
301 N. Lake Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Pasadena, CA 91101-5123  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendant St. Joseph's  
Associates for Ojai, California, Inc.*

Gregory J. Patterson  
[g.patterson@musickpeeler.com](mailto:g.patterson@musickpeeler.com)  
Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP  
2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 200  
Westlake Village, CA 91361  
*Attorney for Cross-Defendants Friend's  
Ranches, Inc., Krotona Institute of  
Theosophy, Topa Topa Ranch Company, LLC  
and The Thatcher School*

David B. Cosgrove  
[dcosgrove@rutan.com](mailto:dcosgrove@rutan.com)  
Jeffrey M. Oderman  
[joderman@rutan.com](mailto:joderman@rutan.com)  
Douglas J. Dennington  
[ddennington@rutan.com](mailto:ddennington@rutan.com)  
Jeremy N. Jungreis  
[jjungrei@rutan.com](mailto:jjungrei@rutan.com)  
Rutan & Tucker, LLP  
611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1931  
*Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas  
Municipal Water District*

**SERVICE LIST BY U.S. MAIL**

Case Name: **City of San Buenaventura v. Abbott, et al.**

No.: **19STCP1176**

Duncan Abbott  
P.O. Box 1322  
Carpinteria, CA 93014

Asquith Family Ltd.  
910 Mercer Avenue  
Ojai, CA 93023

DeWayne Boccali  
3277 Ojai Avenue  
Ojai, CA 93023

Casitas Mutual Water Company  
c/o Margaret Aldrich, Agent for Service of Process  
8239 Edison Drive  
Ventura, CA 93001

Dwayne Bower  
970 Boardman Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Calvin Zara  
1312 Rugby Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

James Burgess  
356 Carne Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Kevin Clark & Lisa Clark  
715 El Toro Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Rebecca Collins & Thomas Collins  
241 Longhorn Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Michael Cromer  
3310 Maricopa Highway  
Ojai, CA 93023

Robert C. Davis, Jr.  
1380 Gridley Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Essick Farm Management Company, LLC  
2955 Hermitage Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Etchart Ranch  
3310 Maricopa Highway  
Ojai, CA 93023

James Finch  
900 Orange Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Flying H. Ranch, Inc  
c/o Joseph Yung, Agent for Service of Process  
10221 Slater Avenue, Suite 101  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Wayne Francis  
160 Oak Glen Avenue  
Ojai, CA 93023

J & G Trust  
1060 Shokat Drive  
Ojai, CA 93023

John Galaska  
909 Drown Avenue  
Ojai, CA 93023

Jurgen Gramckow  
12401 Ranch Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Gridley Road Water Group  
487 Gridley Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Stephanie Gustafson  
811 Saddle Lane  
Ojai, CA 93023

Hermitage Mutual Water Company  
2955 Hermitage Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Dorothy Homes  
16350 Maricopa Highway  
Ojai, CA 93023

Stephen Huyler  
10 Sea Street  
Camden, ME 04843

Cheryl Jensen  
901 Shaddle Lane  
Ojai, CA 93023

Brett Kantrowitz & Denise Kantrowitz  
2133 McNell Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Jerry Kenton  
1113 Serenidad Place  
Oakview, CA 93022

Tim Krout  
230 Saddle Lane  
Ojai, CA 93023

Betina La Plante  
1203 Daly Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Lutheran Church of the Holy Cross of Ojai  
c/o Wayne Francis, Agent for Service of Process  
160 Oak Glen Avenue  
Ojai, CA 93023

Scott Luttenberg  
1138 Mariano Drive  
Ojai, CA 93023

Jeffrey Luttrull  
283 Carne Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Frederick Menninger & Margaret Menninger  
1710 Ladera Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Stephen Mitchell  
140 Longhorn Lane  
Ojai, CA 93023

Bill Moses  
1352 Foothill Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Ojai Water Conservation District  
417 Bryant Circle, Suite 112  
Ojai, CA 93023

Old Creek Road Mutual Water Company  
9940 Old Creek Road  
Ventura, CA 93001

Rancho de Cielo Mutual Water Company  
763 Haverford Avenue  
Pacific Palisade, CA 90272  
Rincon Water and Road Works  
6500 Casitas Pass Road  
Ventura, CA 93001

William Rusin  
229 McNell Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Sisar Mutual Water Company  
c/o Rodney Edward Thompson, Agent for  
Service  
12264 Topa Lane  
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Lou Tomesetta  
2865 Ladera Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Victor Timar  
13877 Polk Street  
Sylmar, CA 91342

Ernesto Vega  
400 Gorham Road  
Ojai, CA 93023

Mark Salch  
10586 W. Pico Boulevard #111  
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Andrew Stasse  
4510 Grand Avenue  
Ojai, CA 93023