6 E-mail: s One Em San Fran Tel.: (41 Fax: (41) 8 Attorney 9 AERA E 10 11 12 13 SANTA a Califon 14 15 V 16		HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES Case No. 19STCP01176
11 12 13 13 14 15 16 17 SANTA a Califor 14 STATE BOARD	COUNTY OF BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER,	LOS ANGELES
13 SANTA a Califor 14 15 v 16 STATE 17 BOARD		Case No. 10STCD01176
10	Petitioner, WATER RESOURCES CONTROL	CROSS-DEFENDANT AERA ENERGY LLC'S STATUS CONFERENCE REPORT Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger Dept.: 10 Date: Nov. 15, 2021
20 21 22	F SAN BUENAVENTURA, et al., Cross-Complainant,	Time: 1:30 P.M. Dept.: SS10 Action filed: Sept. 19, 2014 Trial Date (Phase 1): Feb. 14, 2022
24 25 26 27 28 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW LOS ANGELES		LLC'S STATUS CONFERENCE REPORT

1 Cross-Defendant Aera Energy LLC ("Aera") respectfully submits this report in advance of 2 the status conference to be held on November 15, 2021. At the October 18, 2021 status conference, the Court set the November 15 conference to address the structure of the Phase 1 3 4 trial, including issues of fact and law to be tried. While Aera believes that it will reach an 5 agreement with the City of San Buenaventura ("City") to avoid the need to participate in Phase 1, 6 if the parties are unable to do so, Aera respectfully submits that Phase 1 should address the depth 7 of the subject watershed and its interconnectivity (i.e., lack thereof) with the much deeper 8 petroleum formations of the Ventura Oil Field from which Aera extracts and reinjects saline 9 water.

10

I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

11 On January 2, 2020, the City filed its operative Third Amended Cross-Complaint in this 12 action commencing a comprehensive adjudication of the Ventura River Watershed, which the 13 City alleges includes four groundwater basins (i.e., the Lower Ventura River Basin, the Upper 14 Ventura River Basin, the Ojai Valley Basin and the Upper Ojai Valley Basin) ("Watershed"). On 15 June 21, 2021, the Court granted the City's Motion to Bifurcate and Partial Lifting of the 16 Discovery Stay ("Motion"). In its Motion, the City sought to bifurcate the case in order to resolve 17 two issues in the Phase 1 trial: 1) determination of the Watershed boundaries and the boundaries 18 of the four groundwater basins; and 2) determination of the interconnection between the surface 19 water and the groundwater in the Watershed, including the interconnection between surface water 20 and the four groundwater basins, and the interconnection between those groundwater basins and 21 the Ventura River and its tributaries. Motion, 5:10-16. The City argued that "an early resolution 22 of these two discrete issues will inform the Court as to the extent, nature, and boundaries of the 23 resources being litigated, and confirm that all parties are properly before the Court." Id., 5:17-19.

24

II. <u>AERA VENTURA OIL FIELD OPERATIONS</u>

Aera is unique among the numerous parties in this action. Aera obtains its water supply from the City and other water purveyors, but Aera operates oil and gas-related wells in the Ventura Oil Field, which covers approximately 3,410 acres on both sides of Highway 33. In addition to petroleum, some of Aera's wells extract saline water from and reinject saline water -2back into very deep geological formations pursuant to authorizations and stringent requirements
of the California Department of Conservation Geologic Energy Management Division ("Cal GEM").¹ A limited part of this oil field on the surface traverses the narrow geographic footprint
of an area of the Lower Ventura River Basin.

5 The claims in this action are ambiguous as to whether and how they purport to pertain to 6 Aera's oil and gas-related wells. The draft proposed Physical Solution, lodged with the Court on 7 July 12, 2021, provides that it does not apply to petroleum production-related wells that extract or 8 inject fluids, including waters from or into formations that are not underground sources of 9 drinking water or are exempted aquifers. See Draft Proposed Physical Solution, ¶¶ 4.3 and 5.2.3. 10 At the status conference held on August 16, 2021, after reviewing the draft proposed Physical 11 Solution, the Court asked whether the parties could reach an agreement to exclude the petroleum-12 related wells from the litigation. To that end, Aera has been conferring with the City and is 13 hopeful that an agreement will be reached.

14 15

III. <u>PHASE 1'S SCOPE SHOULD ADDRESS WHETHER THE DEEPER</u> <u>PETROLEUM FORMATION IS OUTSIDE OF THE SUBJECT GROUNDWATER</u> <u>BASINS</u>

16 While Aera and the City have had constructive discussions, given an agreement had not 17 been reached, Aera had no choice but to timely designate and disclose an expert hydrogeologist, 18 Murray Einarson, on October 22, 2021, in accordance with the Phase 1 schedule. Simply put, the 19 primary issue for Aera's expert concerns the depth of the Lower Ventura River Basin and such 20 basin's lack of interconnectivity with the much deeper geologic formations from which saline 21 water is produced by some of Aera's oil and gas wells and reinjected. Such wells are perforated 22 several hundred to thousands (in most cases) of feet below the depth of, and therefore outside the 23 boundary of, the relatively shallow Lower Ventura River Basin, which has groundwater bearing 24 formations of quaternary alluvial sediments ranging from approximately 60 to no more than 150

25

26

27

¹ Such injection occurs within "exempted aquifers" that are not considered underground sources of drinking water in accordance with the Safe Drinking Water Act, 42 U.S.C. 300(f) *et seq.*, pursuant to the authorization of CalGEM and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 40 C.F.R. section 146.4. *See also* Injection Wells - Frequently Asked Questions, CalGEM

(<u>https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/general_information/Pages/class_injection_wells.aspx</u>)

28

1

feet below the ground surface.

The determination of the boundaries, including the depth, and interconnectivity of the water basins is plainly within the scope of Phase 1. *See* City's Notice of Phase 1 Trial Issues, Nov. 1, 2021, at 2:13-20. In the event that the parties are unable to reach an agreement, Aera submits that it is within the scope of Phase 1 to determine whether the deep geologic formations from which it extracts and reinjects saline water are outside of the boundaries of the Lower Ventura River Basin and not connected to the Watershed.

8

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IV.

CONCLUSION

9 Aera remains optimistic and committed to working with the City to reach an agreement to exclude its wells from the litigation. However, if an agreement is not reached, Aera believes that 10 11 addressing whether the deep geological formations from which it extracts and reinjects saline 12 water are within the boundaries of or connected to the Watershed is within the scope of Phase 1. 13 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP Dated: November 8, 2021 14 15 By: Peter Duchesneau 16 Sigrid R. Waggener Attorneys for Cross-Defendant 17 AERA ENERGY LLC 18 400828428.3 19

MANATT, PHELPS & Phillips, LLP Attorneys At Law Los Angeles

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	I, Mayra Medellin, declare as follows:	
3	I am employed in Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, California. I am over the age	
4	of eighteen years and not a party to this action. My business address is MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP, 2049 Century Park East, Suite 1700, Los Angeles, California 90067. My	
5	electronic notification address is mmedellin@manatt.com	
6	On November 8, 2021, I served on the interested parties in said action the within:	
7	CROSS-DEFENDANT AERA ENERGY LLC'S	
8	STATUS CONFERENCE REPORT	
9	by transmission via E-Service to File & Express as listed on the File & Express service list.	
10	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the	
11	foregoing is true and correct.	
12	Executed on November 8, 2021, at Los Angeles, California.	
13		
14	Marsa Medi	
15	400850388.1	
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
20		
21		
22 23		
23 24		
24 25		
23 26		
20		
28		
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP		
Attorneys At Law Los Angeles	PROOF OF SERVICE	