## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE

- - -

SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, a California non-profit corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

) Case No. 19STCP01176

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD, ) etc., et al.,

Defendants.

AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2021

IN-PERSON APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

FOR CITY OF SAN BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

BUENAVENTURA: BY: CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO, ESQUIRE

300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90071

CASITAS MUNICIPAL RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP

WATER DISTRICT: BY: DOUGLAS J. DENNINGTON, ESQUIRE

1857 Jamboree Road, 9th Floor

Irvine, California 92612

REPORTED BY: TIMOTHY J. McCOY, CSR NO. 4745

OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE

1	REMOTE LA COURTCONNECT APP	PEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2		
3	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD:	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL BY: MARC N. MELNICK, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
4		
5		OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL BY: NOAH GOLDEN-KRASNER, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
6		DV. ION E DITCC
7	FOR LOA E. BLISS 2006 REVOCABLE TRUST:	BY: LOA E. BLISS, IN PROPRIA PERSONA
8	FOR AERA ENERGY, LLC:	MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS LLP BY: PETER R. DUCHESNEAU, ESQUIRE
9	FOR AGR BREEDING INC.:	ALSTON & BIRD LLP
10	1 011 11011 211222110 21101	BY: GINA ANGIOLILLO, ESQUIRE
11	FOR HEIDI A. WHITMAN:	BY: ANDREW WHITMAN, ESQUIRE
12	FOR BALDWIN RANCH:	BY: BRIAN MOSKAL, ESQUIRE
13	FOR CLAUDE R. BAGGERLY:	BY: CLAUDE R. BAGGERLY
14 15	FOR VENTURA COUNTY WATERSHED PROTECTION DISTRICT:	BY: NATHAN METCALF, ESQUIRE
16	FOR THE THACHER SCHOOL:	BY: GREGORY PATTERSON, ESQUIRE
17	FOR GREGG GARRISON:	BY: GREGG GARRISON, IN PROPRIA PERSONA
18	VENTURA RIVER COUNTY	HEDIIM CDARTDEE SIINTAC
19	WATER DISTRICT:	BY: JEANNE M. ZOLEZZI, ESQUIRE
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

```
1
             I N D E X
 2
     MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2021
 3
 4
 5
         WITNESSES
 6
               (NONE)
 7
 8
          EXHIBITS
 9
               (NONE)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

	1	CASE NUMBER:	19STCP01176
	2	CASE NAME:	SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER
	3		vs. STATE WATER RESOURCES
	4		CONTROL BOARD, et al.
	5	LOS ANGELES, CA	MONDAY, DECEMBER 13 2021
	6	DEPARTMENT 10	HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE
	7	TIME:	4:05 P.M.
	8	REPORTER:	TIMOTHY J. McCOY, CSR NO. 4745
	9	APPEARANCES:	(AS HERETOFORE NOTED)
	10		* * *
	11		
	12		
	13	(The proceedings co	mmenced in open court, with
	14	various parties app	earing remotely, as follows:)
	15		
	16		
	17	THE COURT: Okay. Goo	d afternoon.
	18	Mr. Whitman, you'	re there?
	19	MR. WHITMAN: Yeah, I'	m here.
	20	THE COURT: And Mr. Ga	rrison, you're there?
	21	MR. GARRISON: I'm pre	sent, your Honor.
	22	THE COURT: Mr. Whitma	n, have you and representatives
	23	of City of Ventura, such a	s Mr. Pisano, had any luck
	24	in determining whether you	r relevant fee simples should
	25	or should not be considere	d as within the basin?
	26	MR. WHITMAN: I do und	erstand their position, your
	27	Honor, and, you know, with	out a description I have no way
	28	of knowing one way or the	other, but I'm not objecting
ı			

- 1 until I see that evidence.
- THE COURT: Mr. Pisano, do you consider the Whitman
- 3 property to be within the basin after further examination
- 4 of the details?
- 5 MR. PISANO: Your Honor, the properties that we
- 6 discussed on the meet and confer call, they are either
- 7 within the watershed or --
- 8 THE COURT: The watershed doesn't matter.
- 9 MR. PISANO: For purposes of the Upper Ojai Basin, yes,
- 10 they're within the Upper Ojai Basin.
- 11 THE COURT: That matters.
- 12 MR. PISANO: Correct.
- 13 THE COURT: I don't give a hoot about watershed unless
- 14 they're riparian.
- 15 MR. PISANO: Okay.
- 16 THE COURT: Are they riparian?
- MR. PISANO: Well, some of the addresses or some of
- 18 the properties they gave us are riparians in other portions
- 19 of the watershed.
- 20 But for purposes of the Upper Ojai Basin, the
- 21 properties they gave us --
- 22 THE COURT: Bear with me.
- 23 Are any of the fee simples that are at issue
- 24 owned by Garrison or indirectly owned by Garrison
- 25 named as cross-defendants because they're riparian?
- MR. PISANO: I don't know the answer to that, but
- 27 Mr. Hagerty might. He's on the screen, your Honor.
- 28 MR. HAGERTY: Thank you, your Honor. Shawn Hagerty

- 1 on behalf of the City.
- 2 Mr. Garrison's property itself I don't believe
- 3 is at issue, at least it hasn't been specifically raised --
- 4 THE COURT: I think we're talking about Whitman.
- Weren't we talking about Whitman, Mr. Pisano?
- 6 MR. HAGERTY: Yes, that's correct.
- With Mr. Whitman, we brought up a map, we showed
- 8 Mr. Whitman where his property is located as to that map,
- 9 and it is within the Upper Ojai Basin. We don't think
- 10 there's any dispute about that.
- The issue, you know, was the issue that was
- 12 raised previously about it being outside of the watershed
- 13 but in the basin, and we have confirmed to our satisfaction
- 14 that it is absolutely within the basin, and that's why
- 15 he received notice and that's why he decided to appear
- 16 in the case.
- 17 THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Whitman, is this consistent
- 18 with what they've told you, which is, that your property
- 19 is outside the Ventura River watershed but it is within
- 20 their analysis of the Upper Ojai Valley groundwater basin?
- 21 MR. WHITMAN: I understand that they take that position.
- 22 They showed me a map with the address on the border of
- 23 that, so I'd like to see metes and bounds so I can confirm
- 24 if there was -- there was no way of correlating that.
- 25 But I'm not objecting to our proceeding on these
- 26 issues until I can see if it's a valid description, which
- 27 I understand that their position is that they don't have
- 28 it and it doesn't exist.

- So, you know, it's their burden of proof to show
- 2 where it is, so we'll see if they do.
- 3 THE COURT: So my understanding of what I've been told
- 4 is that, by law, I am to take and use the basin definition
- 5 created by the Department of Water Resources, however good
- 6 or bad it is, and if people feel that that definition of
- 7 the basin needs to be corrected, either to add precision or
- 8 to move a line, that one has to petition the Department of
- 9 Water Resources to do so, and that that is, by the statute
- 10 I'm applying, supposedly beyond my powers.
- Is that a correct understanding, Mr. Hagerty,
- 12 of your position?
- 13 MR. HAGERTY: That's exactly right, your Honor.
- 14 And if I may just add something. The map we
- showed was actually a tool that is on the DWR website
- 16 where you can look -- they have the boundaries shown,
- 17 and you can use a locator tool. And that's what we
- 18 showed Mr. Whitman. That wasn't something we prepared,
- 19 that was a DWR process.
- 20 MR. GARRISON: Your Honor, if I may speak?
- 21 THE COURT: Not yet. Not yet.
- MR. GARRISON: Okay.
- 23 THE COURT: Mr. Hagerty, if you drill down on that
- 24 map on the internet that the Department of Water Resources
- 25 provides can you essentially go to a given street and start
- looking at this side or that side of the street and have a
- 27 clear answer as to whether the property is mapped as being
- 28 within the groundwater basin, Mr. Hagerty?

- 1 MR. HAGERTY: Yes, your Honor. And we also can do
- 2 that with software that we have. And so -- I mean, there
- 3 is no question that this property is within the basin as
- 4 described in DWR. And, you know, that's why they received
- 5 the notice, and that's why Mr. Whitman apparently elected
- 6 to appear.
- 7 There was a representation made that somehow
- 8 that we were noticing people outside of the basin, and
- 9 we have no evidence of that. We've asked for information
- 10 about that, that's what the meet and confer was about.
- 11 We got a list of six names, and we've confirmed that all
- of those names that Mr. Garrison has provided, they're
- 13 either in the basin or they're named riparians that are
- 14 part of the watershed.
- And so, again, if there's someone that's outside
- of the basin and outside of the watershed, as we said in
- 17 court last Thursday, we don't want them in the case and
- 18 we'll deal with that.
- But Mr. Whitman is definitely part of the Upper
- 20 Ojai Basin.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay.
- Mr. Garrison, you wanted to be heard and I was
- 23 holding you off. You've got the floor.
- MR. GARRISON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 25 Pursuant to the hearing on Thursday, I contacted
- 26 the Department of Water Resources and disclosed to them
- 27 that we have four basins within this adjudication, two
- 28 of which do not have coordinates, and I have asked that

- 1 they provide those coordinates so we can go forward
- with some certainty pursuant to CCP 841(a) through (d).
- I spoke with a senior hydrologist and counsel
- 4 for the Department of Water Resources, which its just
- 5 contacted me and wants to discuss my letter of this morning
- 6 in more detail with what we require for specificity in
- 7 this groundwater adjudication.
- 8 THE COURT: So that was apparently a relatively positive
- 9 interchange, suggesting that they would provide the level
- 10 of detail you're hoping to get?
- MR. GARRISON: Absolutely, your Honor.
- 12 THE COURT: Okay.
- Do you have further questions where you want
- information from Mr. Hagerty or Mr. Pisano that they
- 15 have not yet supplied you, Mr. Garrison?
- 16 MR. GARRISON: I do, your Honor.
- 17 They are correct, we met and conferred with
- 18 Mr. Whitman this morning and we did identify six particular
- 19 parcels. But moreover, on Map 3 of 3 for the answering
- 20 parties, there are 13 parcels that are identified as not
- 21 in the watershed of Ventura and may not be in the basin.
- 22 And on those 13 properties, that's a subset of the
- 23 nonanswering parties or the defaulted parties.
- 24 This map also, that Mr. Hagerty referred to,
- is dated 8/13/2021, four months old. What I would request
- of BBK and the City of Ventura is that they update the
- 27 appearing parties' map so that we can see where the
- answering parties are located that have responded, but

- 1 also include another map of those parcels sued and/or
- 2 defaulted or nonanswering so we can see the full universe
- 3 of all parcels that they have sued that may not be in the
- 4 basin and that may be subject to dismissal based on what
- 5 Mr. Hagerty just said.
- 6 So really, in an instant universe, right now we're
- 7 looking through a knothole in the fence and we need to take
- 8 down that claim and look at -- because there are 13 parties
- 9 here that are not situated in the watershed, I understand
- 10 that. There must be a multiple exponent of 40 parties that
- 11 had been served and/or defaulted, and I'd like to see them
- 12 depicted in this map, as well.
- 13 THE COURT: So bear with me.
- I at least, as a neutral, would contemplate
- 15 proposing that a map generated by the City of Ventura
- of appearing parties be supplemented to include default
- 17 status information only as to named cross-defendants
- 18 who have in fact been defaulted.
- 19 That being noted, the way the Streamlined
- 20 Comprehensive Adjudication statute works for people
- 21 whose interest in the litigation is limited to that
- 22 of the owner of a fee simple over a groundwater basin,
- 23 they aren't named, they instead get alternative kind of
- 24 short-form notice of the suit, they're given an opportunity
- 25 to answer or theoretically demur and move for judgment on
- 26 the pleadings or otherwise, certainly at least to answer,
- 27 but they don't have to, and it cost money to answer, and
- 28 if somebody got that short-form notice and does nothing

- 1 thereafter to respond, they're never going to get defaulted
- 2 so they won't be listed as defaulted parties.
- 3 So if you've got people who own a fee simple in
- 4 that portion of the Upper Ojai groundwater basin which is
- 5 east of or northeast of the limitations of the Ventura River
- 6 watershed, it would be really weird if they have otherwise
- 7 stepped away from the lawsuit to find their default entered.
- 8 Correct, Mr. Pisano?
- 9 MR. PISANO: Correct, your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: So I don't know how we would do much
- 11 more to improve upon that map as to that subset of
- 12 people, Mr. Garrison, who were fee simple owners in the
- 13 non-watershed portion of the Upper Ojai Valley Basin who
- 14 have been noticed up on the suit but otherwise stood aside.
- So help me out with what it is you want Ventura
- 16 City to do as to that unique subset of potential litigants,
- 17 Mr. Garrison?
- 18 MR. GARRISON: Yes, your Honor. To update the now
- 19 four-month old map to include those appearing parties that
- 20 have appeared since August to December, and also, you know,
- 21 through the defaulted parties that do not appear on the map
- 22 currently.
- 23 THE COURT: Well, I don't quarrel with that in concept.
- 24 So if somebody in the Upper Ojai Valley Basin
- 25 who's outside the Ventura watershed did choose to answer,
- 26 it's your request that the map of four months vintage be
- 27 updated to tell us who those people are, Mr. Garrison?
- MR. GARRISON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So Mr. Pisano or Mr. Hagerty, is that a 1 2 reasonable and doable thing by your client, given enough 3 time to implement the data updates? 4 MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, I think we could pursue that. 5 I mean, I think that the problem I'm having here is that we've asked Mr. Garrison and Mr. Whitman to identify 6 7 what they represented to the Court on Thursday, which was, 8 they knew of people who were outside of the basins that got 9 notice. And we haven't received any of that information. 10 And I think what's happening is we're just getting 11 things thrown at us, and I'm not quite sure why this is 12 occurring when, you know, we've noticed everyone, we've 13 demonstrated and submitted to the Court, as required, 14 evidence that we've provided all the notice, we've submitted 15 proofs of service for everyone, there's a whole default 16 process. 17 All this information is there and available, but if the Court wishes us to update a map, we're happy to 18 19 do this. 20 But we would ask that Mr. Garrison or Mr. Whitman, 21 if they have actual evidence of what they asserted to you 22 on Thursday, they need to provide that to us because we 23 haven't seen that at all. 24 And we do also ask the Court to go forward with 25 the order to show cause, because even if there is some 26 subsequent change or we get some information from DWR, 27 it's the Bulletin 118 description that the Court's obligated 28 to use until that's formally amended. And you approved

- 1 the other two -- three, excuse me, and we would ask that
- 2 the Court go forward with that.
- We're happy to continue to work with Mr. Garrison
- 4 and Mr. Whitman, we're happy to update the map as suggested,
- 5 it's just, you know, I'm not sure where this is heading
- 6 in terms of the value to the parties and to the Court.
- 7 MR. GARRISON: Your Honor, I can speak to that.
- 8 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Garrison.
- 9 MR. GARRISON: One concern I had in the map of 8/13,
- 10 I looked for a couple of answering parties and they weren't
- 11 on the map. And I don't know if that's just because it's
- 12 so far back in time. But I was looking particularly for
- 13 the Sisar Water Company.
- 14 Are you familiar with that client?
- 15 THE COURT: Your voice is dropping off, Mr. Garrison.
- 16 You need to be slower, enunciate, and get your mouth closer
- 17 to the microphone.
- 18 MR. GARRISON: The Sisar Mutual Water Company, they're
- 19 not on the map, but they've answered.
- 20 MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor? Again, your Honor, I'm
- 21 happy to work with Mr. Garrison. If he has questions
- 22 about who has answered, who has been defaulted, we're
- 23 happy to work with him and provide that information.
- 24 I don't know why we need to do this at an OSC.
- 25 And the other parties who have questions can
- 26 call us and we'll provide the information, and we're
- 27 happy to continue to do that, including with Mr. Garrison.
- 28 THE COURT: I tend to agree with you on that point.

- But, Mr. Garrison, I do think it's fair to ask 1 2 that a map trying to tell all interested parties who's 3 appeared in the case should be updated, and I think it's 4 good that it be updated to include named parties who have 5 been defaulted. And beyond that, Mr. Whitman, do you wish to 6 7 be heard any further to object to adopting that portion 8 of the order to show cause dealing with adoption of 9 the Department of Water Resources' currently-written, vaque-as-they-may-be boundaries for the Upper Ojai 10 11 Valley water basin, Mr. Whitman? 12 MR. WHITMAN: Yes, your Honor. 13 And just, you know, for the record, Mr. Hagerty's 14 made representations about inquiries that I made. I've been kind of drug into this thing and -- but as long as there's 15 16 no prejudice to our ability to show that we're not in that basin if upon further description it shows we're not in the 17 18 basin quidelines. 19 I understand that if we are, then we're apparently stuck in this, although if you do have to read 118, it 20
- Mr. Garrison, do you wish to be heard further

does say that the water does not serve the valley and --

THE COURT: Well, that's for a merits determination

- 25 to contest adopting the Department of Water Resources
- 26 Bulletin 118 definition, vague as it may be at the

21

22

23

later.

- 27 moment, of the boundaries of the Upper Ojai Valley basin?
- MR. GARRISON: Your Honor, I would respectfully ask

- 1 that we defer a decision on this until our standard
- 2 December 20th status conference, by which time I'll
- 3 have had a chance and an opportunity to meet and confer
- 4 with counsel for the Department of Water Resources, as
- 5 they've already responded to my letter of today's date
- 6 identifying the defects in the boundary descriptions,
- 7 and them positively willing to work with us pursuant
- 8 to 841 of the CCP.
- 9 THE COURT: I don't believe we've got anything on
- 10 calendar December 20.
- What date do you think we're next together,
- 12 Mr. Garrison?
- 13 MR. GARRISON: Our next status conference in this
- 14 matter.
- MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, I think that that December
- 16 20th date did get moved to the one we had last week. And
- 17 so we don't have any December status conference. And I
- 18 think the next scheduled date is in January for the hearings
- 19 on the 18th.
- 20 THE COURT: Indeed.
- MR. HAGERTY: And, I mean, for what it's worth, we don't
- 22 disagree with what Mr. Whitman said in terms of -- I mean,
- 23 if the boundaries change or if there's an issue, if he can
- 24 demonstrate he's actually outside the boundaries, that's
- 25 a different story.
- And, you know, with Mr. Garrison, if his work
- 27 proves fruitful and there are changes, that can be added
- 28 to the Court's decision.

But again, we renew our request that the Court 1 2 move forward now with fixing the boundaries of the basin 3 subject to subsequent change to the DWR process. 4 MR. GARRISON: And your Honor, a final word from myself? 5 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Garrison. 6 MR. GARRISON: The statute specifically delineates, 7 as was pointed out by Mr. Melnick on Thursday, a CCP 8 section by which you, as the judicial representative or 9 a litigant in a water adjudication can request that the 10 Department of Water Resources Control Board to provide more specificity. That has been done, and I would ask 11 12 that you defer any final -- defer anything on the boundaries 13 until we let the DWR respond pursuant to the statute. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 I am going to adopt the currently-defined 16 boundaries for the Upper Ojai Valley basin over your 17 objection, Mr. Garrison, but have Mr. Hagerty and Mr. Pisano 18 include the statement that this is without prejudice to 19 updating these boundaries if and when the Department of Water Resources provides a more detailed description and/or 20 21 a revised location of the boundaries. 22 I want that expressed in the order, Mr. Hagerty. 23 MR. HAGERTY: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay. But you can finalize that order. 25 and I think for efficiency sake it would be just 26 as well that you now submit a single order that is the 27 boundaries of the watershed and the two subbasins for 28 Upper and Lower Ventura River groundwater and then the

- 1 Ojai Valley groundwater and Upper Ojai groundwater,
- 2 Mr. Hagerty.
- MR. HAGERTY: Will do. And we'll include all the
- 4 language that we discussed last Thursday.
- 5 Thank you, your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: But including today's new language about
- 7 recognizing the provisions of --
- 8 MR. HAGERTY: Yes. Yes, your Honor.
- 9 THE COURT: And frankly, we know that Mr. Garrison
- 10 has quite usefully -- and I thank you for this,
- 11 Mr. Garrison -- asked the Department of Water Resources to
- 12 provide the missing clarity of the exact metes and bounds
- of what at the moment may be in software precise but in
- 14 terms of English is not yet precise, so that those of us
- 15 who rely on English words can have a better understanding
- of the metes and bounds and not just be dependent on going
- into somebody's interactive software.
- 18 So thank you for your efforts in this regard,
- 19 Mr. Garrison.
- MR. GARRISON: Thank you, your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay.
- Mr. Hagerty, is there anything else, or Mr. Pisano,
- 23 you think we need to usefully address this afternoon?
- Oh, the Archer thing. Are you making any progress
- 25 on Archer, or not?
- MR. PISANO: Well, I've submitted a draft stipulation
- 27 and protective order to counsel for the City of Ojai,
- 28 the East Ojai Group and Casitas, who have all retained

- 1 hydrogeological experts and who have requested the model
- 2 for their experts. That draft is out for --
- 3 THE COURT: So basically it's just three different
- 4 people who want the model.
- 5 MR. PISANO: Three different people want the model.
- 6 And assuming we can work out this stip and
- 7 protective order, we would prepare hard drives and FedEx
- 8 them to those three people, and they can do, you know,
- 9 their verifying of the model.
- 10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, if you have further discovery
- 11 problems, I'm here Friday. Tomorrow's too soon. I'm out
- 12 Wednesday for a medical procedure and recovery is Thursday.
- 13 Hopefully that's all I need. Next week I'm out Monday
- 14 through Wednesday, but I am here -- Monday and Tuesday
- 15 rather. I'm here the 22nd and the 23rd. I don't wish
- 16 to be here between Christmas and New Years, but if you
- 17 have something urgent, post a message on the bulletin
- 18 board and I'll make myself available because I'm in town.
- 19 Otherwise I'm back on January 3 and I'm here all days
- 20 that week.
- 21 MR. PISANO: Very good, your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: Anybody else wish to be heard this
- 23 afternoon?
- MR. HAGERTY: Your Honor, Shawn Hagerty.
- Just to clarify, we did respond to your post on
- 26 the message board over the weekend explaining the situation
- 27 with regard to any summary judgments. We're not sure what
- 28 that is, but it's not --

```
THE COURT: Well, it's just a rough calendar. I mean,
 1
 2
     I had planned ahead in part because, since I was going to
    be out of town, if there was going to be a serious event I
 3
 4
     wanted to give it a new date. Now it sounds like it's not
 5
     going to be any event at all.
 6
         MR. HAGERTY:
                       That's right, your Honor. It can't be
 7
    under the current schedule.
         THE COURT: Okay. That solved that. So, so much the
 8
 9
    better.
10
              Okay. Court's in recess. City of Ventura to
11
     give notice.
12
         MR. PISANO: Thank you, your Honor.
13
         MR. DENNINGTON: Thank you, your Honor.
14
15
            (At 4:35 p.m., the proceedings were adjourned)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

	5000mb01 10, 2021
1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3	DEPARTMENT 10 HON. WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE
4	
5	
6	
7	SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, a )
8	California non-profit corporation, )
9	Plaintiff, ) )
10	vs. ) Case No. 19STCP01176
11	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD, ) etc., et al.,
12	Defendants. )
13	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.
14	)
15	I, TIMOTHY J. McCOY, CSR No. 4745, Official
16	Reporter Pro Tempore of the Superior Court of the State of
17	California, for the County of Los Angeles, do hereby certify
18	that the foregoing pages, 1 through 16, inclusive, comprise
19	a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings held
20	in the above-entitled matter on Monday, December 13, 2021.
21	
22	DATED THIS 20TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2021.
23	
24	- 1111 Por
25	TIMOTHY J. McCOY, CSR NO. 4745
26	OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
27	
28	

	3	add 7:7,14	apparently 8:5 9:8 14:19	20 6:9,13,14, 20 7:4,7,28
				8:3,8,13,16,
(d)	3	<b>added</b> 15:27	APPEARANC ES	20 9:21 10:4,
9:2	9:19 18:19		4:9	22 11:4,13,24
		address		14:11,17,18,
1	4	6:22 17:23	appeared	27 16:2,16
		addresses	11:20 14:3	basins
1	40	5:17	appearing	8:27 12:8
20:18	10:10	adjourned	4:14 9:27	BBK
10	4745	19:15	10:16 11:19	9:26
4:6 20:3	4:8 20:15,25		applying	
		adjudication	7:10	bear
118	4:05	8:27 9:7		5:22 10:13
12:27 14:20, 26	4:7	10:20 16:9	approved 12:28	behalf
	4:35	adopt	12.28	6:1
13	19:15	16:15	Archer	board
4:5 9:20,22		adopting	17:24,25	4:4 16:10
10:8 20:20	8	14:7,25	asserted	18:18,26
16		,	12:21	20:10
20:18	8/13	adoption 14:8	assuming	
18th	13:9		18:6	border
15:19	8/13/2021	afternoon		6:22
	9:25	4:17 17:23	August	boundaries
19STCP01176	0.44	18:23	11:20	7:16 14:10,27
4:1 20:9	8 <b>41</b> 15:8	agree		15:23,24
		13:28	В	16:2,12,16,
2	841(a)	ahead		19,21,27
	9:2	13:8 19:2	back	boundary
20			13:12 18:19	15:6
15:10	Α	amended	bad	bounds
2021		12:28	7:6	6:23 17:12,16
4:5 20:20,22	ability	analysis	BARBARA	·
20th	14:16	6:20	4:2 20:7	brought
15:2,16 20:22	above-	and/or		6:7
•	entitled	10:1,11 16:20	based	bulletin
<b>22nd</b> 18:15	20:20	Angeles	10:4	12:27 14:26
	absolutely	4:5 20:2,17,	basically	18:17
23rd	6:14 9:11	26	18:3	burden
18:15			basin	7:1
	actual 12:21	answering	4:25 5:3,9,10,	
	40.04	9:19,28 13:10		I .

	17:27 19:10	considered	4:13,17,20,22	12:3
С	claim	4:25	5:2,8,11,13,	date
	10:8	consistent	16,22 6:4,17	15:5,11,16,18
CA	alarify.	6:17	7:3,21,23	19:4
4:5	clarify 18:25	contacted	8:17,21 9:8,	dated
calendar	10.23	contacted 8:25 9:5	12 10:13	9:25 20:22
15:10 19:1	clarity		11:10,23	
California	17:12	contemplate	12:1,7,13,18,	DAY
20:1,7,17	clear	10:14	24 13:2,6,8,	20:22
	7:27	contest	15,28 14:22	days
call		14:25	15:9,20 16:1,	18:19
5:6 13:26	client		5,14,24 17:6,	dool
case	12:2 13:14	continue	9,21 18:3,10,	deal
4:1,2 6:16	closer	13:3,27	22 19:1,8	8:18
8:17 14:3	13:16	Control	20:1,16,26	dealing
20:9	commenced	4:4 16:10	Court's	14:8
Casitas	4:13	20:10	12:27 15:28	December
17:28		coordinates	19:10	4:5 11:20
	Company	8:28 9:1	created	15:2,10,15,17
CCP	13:13,18		7:5	20:20,22
9:2 15:8 16:7	Comprehensi	corporation		·
certainty	ve	20:7	CROSS-	decided
9:2	10:20	correct	ACTION	6:15
		5:12 6:6 7:11	20:13	decision
certify	comprise	9:17 11:8,9	cross-	15:1,28
20:17	20:18	20:19	defendants	,
chance	concept		5:25 10:17	default
15:3	11:23	corrected		10:16 11:7
		7:7	CSR 4.0.00.45.05	12:15
change	concern 13:9	correlating	4:8 20:15,25	defaulted
12:26 15:23	13.9	6:24	current	9:23 10:2,11,
16:3	confer	acct	19:7	18 11:1,2,21
CHANNELKE	5:6 8:10 15:3	cost	currently-	13:22 14:5
EPER	conference	10:27	defined	dofocto
4:2 20:7	15:2,13,17	counsel	16:15	defects
choose		9:3 15:4		15:6
11:25	conferred	17:27	currently-	Defendants
	9:17	County	written	20:12
Christmas	confirm	20:2,17	14:9	defer
18:16	6:23	,		15:1 16:12
	confirmed	couple	D	
Citv		13:10	_	definition
<b>City</b> 4:23 6:1 9:26	6:13 8:11	13.10		7:4,6 14:26

delineates	disagree	17:18		frankly
16:6	15:22	elected	F	17:9
demonstrate	disclosed	8:5	fact	Friday
15:24	8:26	English	10:18	18:11
demonstrated	discovery	17:14,15		fruitful
12:13	18:10	,	fair	15:27
demur	discuss	entered 11:7	14:1	full
10:25	9:5		familiar	10:2 20:19
		enunciate	13:14	10.2 20.19
DENNINGTO	discussed	13:16	Fedex	
10.12	5:6 17:4	essentially	18:7	G
19:13	dismissal	7:25	fee	Garrison
Department	10:4	et al	4:24 5:23	4:20,21 5:24
4:6 7:5,8,24	dispute	4:4 20:11	10:22 11:3,12	7:20,22 8:12,
8:26 9:4 14:9,	6:10	event	feel	22,24 9:11,
25 15:4	doable	19:3,5	7:6	15,16 11:12,
16:10,19 17:11 20:3	12:2	·		17,18,27,28
		evidence	fence	12:6,20 13:3
dependent	draft	5:1 8:9 12:14,	10:7	7,8,9,15,18,
17:16	17:26 18:2	21	final	21,27 14:1,
depicted	drill	exact	16:4,12	24,28 15:12,
10:12	7:23	17:12	finalize	13,26 16:4,5
description	drives	examination	16:24	6,17 17:9,11, 19,20
4:27 6:26	18:7	5:3	find	
12:27 14:17	dropping	excuse	11:7	Garrison's
16:20	13:15	13:1		6:2
descriptions		exist	fixing	gave
15:6	drug 14:15	6:28	16:2	5:18,21
detail			floor	generated
9:6,10	DWR	experts	8:23	10:15
•	7:15,19 8:4	18:1,2	foregoing	get alternativ
detailed	12:26 16:3,13	explaining	20:18	e
16:20		18:26	formally	10:23
details	E	exponent	12:28	
5:4	east	10:10	forward	<b>give</b> 5:13 19:4,11
determination	11:5 17:28	expressed	9:1 12:24	,
14:22		16:22	13:2 16:2	good
determining	efficiency			4:17 7:5 14:4
4:24	16:25		four-month	18:21
	efforts		11:19	groundwater

6:20 7:28 9:7	HERETOFOR	implement	6:26	limitations
10:22 11:4	E	12:3		11:5
16:28 17:1	4:9	improve	J	limited
Group	HIGHBERGE	11:11	_	10:21
17:28	R	include	January	list
guidelines	4:6 20:3	10:1,16 11:19	15:18 18:19	8:11
14:18	holding	14:4 16:18	JUDGE	listed
	8:23	17:3	4:6 20:3	11:2
Н	HON	including	judgment	litigant
	4:6 20:3	13:27 17:6	10:25	16:9
Hagerty	Honor	inclusive	judgments	
5:27,28 6:6	4:21,27 5:5,	20:18	18:27	litigants 11:16
7:11,13,23,28 8:1 9:14,24	27,28 7:13,20	indirectly	judicial	
10:5 12:1,4	8:1,24 9:11,	5:24	16:8	litigation
13:20 15:15,	16 11:9,18,28			10:21
21 16:17,22,	12:4 13:7,20	information 8:9 9:14	K	located
23 17:2,3,8,	14:12,28 15:15 16:4,23	10:17 12:9,		6:8 9:28
22 18:24 19:6	17:5,8,20	17,26 13:23,	kind	location
Hagerty's	18:21,24	26	10:23 14:15	16:21
14:13	19:6,12,13	inquiries	knew	locator
happening	hoot	14:14	12:8	7:17
12:10	5:13		knothole	long
		instant 10:6	10:7	14:15
<b>happy</b> 12:18 13:3,4,	hoping 9:10			
21,23,27		interactive	knowing 4:28	<b>looked</b> 13:10
, ,	hydrogeologi	17:17	4.20	
<b>hard</b> 18:7	<b>cal</b> 18:1	interchange		Los
		9:9		4:5 20:2,17, 26
heading	hydrologist	interest	language	
13:5	9:3	10:21	17:4,6	Lower
heard		interested	law	16:28
8:22 14:7,24	I	14:2	7:4	luck
18:22	identified	internet	lawsuit	4:23
hearing	9:20	7:24	11:7	
8:25		issue		M
hearings	identify 9:18 12:6	5:23 6:3,11	letter	mada
15:18		15:23	9:5 15:5	<b>made</b> 8:7 14:14
held	identifying	issues	level	
20:19	15:6	เออนซอ	9:9	make

40-40	47-40			- 0.07
18:18	17:12	non-	13,24 14:10,	9:27
making	model	watershed	27 16:16	people
17:24	18:1,4,5,9	11:13	17:1,27,28	7:6 8:8 10:20
map	moment	nonanswerin	open	11:3,12,27
6:7,8,22 7:14,	14:27 17:13	g	4:13	12:8 18:4,5,8
24 9:19,24,27		9:23 10:2	opportunity	petition
10:1,12,15	Monday	northeast	10:24 15:3	7:8
11:11,19,21,	4:5 18:13,14	11:5		Discus
26 12:18	20:20	noted	order 12:25 14:8	Pisano
13:4,9,11,19	money	noted 4:9 10:19	16:22,24,26	4:23 5:2,5,9, 12,15,17,26
14:2	10:27		17:27 18:7	6:5 9:14 11:8,
mapped	months	notice		9 12:1 16:17
7:27	9:25 11:26	6:15 8:5	OSC	17:22,26
		10:24,28	13:24	18:5,21 19:12
matter	morning	12:9,14 19:11	owned	
5:8 15:14	9:5,18	noticed	5:24	Plaintiff
20:20	mouth	11:14 12:12	owner	20:8
matters	13:16	noticing	10:22	planned
5:11	move	8:8	10.22	19:2
Mccoy	7:8 10:25		owners	pleadings
4:8 20:15,25	16:2	NUMBER	11:12	10:26
	moved	4:1		
medical	15:16		P	point
18:12		0		13:28
meet	multiple		p.m.	pointed
5:6 8:10 15:3	10:10	object	4:7 19:15	16:7
Melnick	Mutual	14:7	pages	portion
16:7	13:18	objecting	20:18	11:4,13 14:7
merits		4:28 6:25	parcels	
14:22	N	objection	9:19,20 10:1,	portions 5:18
14.22		16:17	3	
message	named			position
18:17,26	5:25 8:13	obligated	part	4:26 6:21,27
met	10:17,23 14:4	12:27	8:14,19 19:2	7:12
9:17	names	occurring	parties	positive
metes	8:11,12	12:12	4:14 9:20,23,	9:8
6:23 17:12,16	·	Official	28 10:8,10,16	positively
,	neutral 10:14	20:15,26	11:2,19,21	15:7
microphone		,	13:6,10,25	
13:17	non-profit	<b>Ojai</b> 5:9,10,20 6:9,	14:2,4	post
missing	20:7	20 8:20 11:4,	parties'	18:17,25
		20 0.20 11.4,		

potential	proof	questions	representatio	retained
11:16	7:1	9:13 13:21,25	n	17:28
powers	proofs		8:7	revised
7:10	12:15	R	representatio	16:21
precise	properties		ns	riparian
17:13,14	5:5,18,21	raised	14:14	5:14,16,25
precision	9:22	6:3,12	representativ	riparians
7:7	property	read	е	5:18 8:13
	5:3 6:2,8,18	14:20	16:8	
prejudice	7:27 8:3	reasonable	representativ	River
14:16 16:18		12:2	es	6:19 11:5 16:28
prepare	proposing 10:15	received	4:22	10.20
18:7		6:15 8:4 12:9	represented	rough
prepared	protective		12:7	19:1
7:18	17:27 18:7	recess	1 -11	
present	proves	19:10	request 9:25 11:26	S
4:21	15:27	recognizing	16:1,9	
	provide	17:7	·	sake
previously 6:12	9:1,9 12:22	record	requested	16:25
0.12	13:23,26	14:13	18:1	SANTA
Pro	16:10 17:12	recovery	require	4:2 20:7
20:16,26	provided	18:12	9:6	satisfaction
problem	8:12 12:14	referred	required	6:13
12:5		referred 9:24	12:13	schedule
problems	provisions 17:7		Resources	19:7
18:11		regard	4:3 7:5,9,24	
procedure	purposes	17:18 18:27	8:26 9:4	scheduled
18:12	5:9,20	RELATED	14:25 15:4	15:18
	pursuant	20:13	16:10,20	screen
proceeding	8:25 9:2 15:7	relevant	17:11 20:10	5:27
6:25	16:13	4:24	Resources'	section
proceedings	pursue	rely	14:9	16:8
4:13 19:15	12:4	17:15		senior
20:19			respectfully 14:28	9:3
process	Q	remotely		
7:19 12:16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4:14	respond	<b>serve</b> 14:21
16:3	quarrel	renew	11:1 16:13	
progress	11:23	16:1	18:25	served
17:24	question	Reporter	responded	10:11
<del>-</del> -	8:3	4:8 20:16,26	9:28 15:5	service

12:15	sounds	street		town
Shawn	19:4	7:25,26	ТТ	18:18 19:3
5:28 18:24	speak	stuck	tallsing.	transcript
short-form	7:20 13:7	14:20	talking 6:4,5	20:19
10:24,28	specifically	subbasins	Tempore	true
show	6:3 16:6	16:27	20:16,26	20:19
7:1 12:25	specificity	subject	tend	Tuesday
14:8,16	9:6 16:11	10:4 16:3	13:28	18:14
showed	spoke	submit	terms	
6:7,22 7:15,	9:3	16:26	13:6 15:22	U
18	standard	submitted	17:14	
shown	15:1	12:13,14	theoretically	understand
7:16	start	17:26	theoretically 10:25	4:26 6:21,27 10:9 14:19
shows	7:25	subsequent		
14:17		12:26 16:3	thing	understandin
	State		12:2 14:15	9
side	4:3 20:1,10, 16	subset	17:24	7:3,11 17:15
7:26	10	9:22 11:11,16	things	unique
simple	statement	sued	12:11	11:16
10:22 11:3,12	16:18	10:1,3	thrown	universe
simples	status	suggested	12:11	10:2,6
4:24 5:23	10:17 15:2,	13:4	Thursday	update
single	13,17	suggesting	8:17,25 12:7,	9:26 11:18
16:26	statute	9:9	22 16:7 17:4	12:18 13:4
	7:9 10:20		18:12	
Sisar	16:6,13	suit		updated
13:13,18	·	10:24 11:14	time	11:27 14:3,4
situated	stepped 11:7	summary	4:7 12:3	updates
10:9		18:27	13:12 15:2	12:3
situation	stip	Superior	TIMOTHY	updating
18:26	18:6	20:1,16,26	4:8 20:15,25	16:19
slower	stipulation	supplemente	today's	Upper
13:16	17:26	d	15:5 17:6	5:9,10,20 6:9,
	stood	10:16	told	20 8:19 11:4,
software	11:14		6:18 7:3	13,24 14:10,
8:2 17:13,17		supplied 9:15		27 16:16,28
solved	<b>story</b> 15:25		Tomorrow's 18:11	17:1
19:8		supposedly		urgent
	Streamlined	7:10	tool	ui y <del>e</del> iit
somebody's	10:19	7.10	7:15,17	18:17

			December 1	3, ZUZ I
usefully	watershed	15:21		
17:10,23	5:7,8,13,19		_	
	6:12,19 8:14,	Y		
V	16 9:21 10:9 11:6,25 16:27	Years	_	
vague	website	18:16		
14:26	7:15			
vague-as-	Wednesday			
they-may-be	18:12,14			
14:10	week			
valid	15:16 18:13,			
6:26	20			
valley	weekend			
6:20 11:13,24	18:26			
14:11,21,27 16:16 17:1	weird			
	11:6			
Ventura	Whitman			
4:23 6:19 0:21 26 10:15	4:18,19,22,26			
9:21,26 10:15 11:5,15,25	5:2 6:4,5,7,8,			
16:28 19:10	17,21 7:18			
	8:5,19 9:18			
<b>verifying</b> 18:9	12:6,20 13:4 14:6,11,12			
	15:22			
vintage 11:26	WILLIAM			
	4:6 20:3			
voice				
13:15	<b>wishes</b> 12:18			
W	word			
wanted	16:4			
8:22 19:4	words			
water	17:15			
4:3 7:5,9,24	work			
8:26 9:4	13:3,21,23			
13:13,18	15:7,26 18:6			
14:9,11,21,25	works			
15:4 16:9,10,	10:20			
20 17:11	worth			
20:10				
			<u> </u>	