

Exempt From Filing Fees Pursuant to
Cal. Gov't Code § 6103

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

NOV 09 2020

Sherri K. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By Steven Drew, Deputy

1 SHAWN HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435
2 shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com
3 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
4 655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
5 San Diego, California 92101
6 Telephone: (619) 525-1300
7 Facsimile: (619) 233-6118

8 CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO, Bar No. 192831
9 christopher.pisano@bbklaw.com
10 SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY, Bar No. 277223
11 sarah.foley@bbklaw.com
12 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
13 300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
14 Los Angeles, California 90071
15 Telephone: (213) 617-8100
16 Facsimile: (213) 617-7480

17 Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant
18 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA

19 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
20 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

21 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER,
22 a California non-profit corporation,

23 Petitioner,

24 v.

25 STATE WATER RESOURCES
26 CONTROL BOARD, etc., et al.,

27 Respondents.

28 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, etc.,

Cross-Complainant

v.

DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.

Cross-Defendants.

Case No. 19STCP01176

Judge: Honorable William F. Highberger

STATUS CONFERENCE REPORT

Date: November 16, 2020

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Dept: SS10

Action Filed: Sept. 19, 2014

Trial Date: Not Set

- 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

Defendant and Cross-Complainant City of San Buenaventura (“City”) submits this Status Conference Report (“Report”) in advance of the Status Conference scheduled for November 16, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. In accordance with the Court’s order at the August 17, 2020 Status Conference, the City has made a good faith effort to solicit input from interested parties prior to submission of this Report. Specifically, counsel for the City sent a draft of this Report via email to all counsel of record and to all parties for which the City has an email address on November 2, 2020 and again on November 6, 2020. The City has attempted to include all requested edits received and to identify for the Court any areas of dispute identified by the parties.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

On September 15, 2020, the City, Ventura River Water District, Meiners Oaks Water District, the Wood-Claeysens Foundation (Taylor Ranch), and Rancho Matilija Mutual Water Company (Proposing Parties) released a [Proposed] Stipulated Physical Solution and Judgment (Proposed Physical Solution). The City served the Proposed Physical Solution on all parties that had appeared by September 15, 2020 and posted it on the adjudication website and the City's Ventura River website on September 15, 2020. Additionally, on September 18, 2020, the City filed and served a notice of scheduling meet and confer conferences and invited participation from any party and interested landowners.

The City conducted five meet and confer conferences regarding the Physical Solution. Approximately sixty (60) people and fifty-nine (59) different parties and/or overlying landowners who received notice of the adjudication have participated in the meet and confer process. The parties met via Zoom Video Communications on the following dates, and discussed the following topics:

- (1) September 24, 2020 – Overview of the Scientific Analysis;
- (2) October 1, 2020 – Analysis of Non-Flow Measures;

1 (3) October 8, 2020 – Flow Analysis;

2 (4) October 15, 2020 – Monitoring and Adaptive Management;

3 (5) October 29 – Costs.

4 In addition to these regularly scheduled meet and confer sessions, the Proposing Parties
5 have also held multiple meetings with specific parties, including, but not limited to the State
6 Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and the Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW).
7 The Proposing Parties have received significant valuable input on the Physical Solution through
8 these formal and informal meet and confer sessions, and they believe that additional time to
9 continue these meetings is appropriate. The Proposing Parties therefore would like to continue
10 this meet and confer process through at least the end of January 2021, and possibly beyond, and
11 request that the Court set a further CMC in February 2021 to permit this process to continue.

12
13 2. UPDATE RE SERVICE OF THE THIRD AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT
14 AND NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT OF ADJUDICATION
15

16 The City diligently continues to attempt to serve the Third Amended Cross-Complaint on
17 all named Cross-Defendants and to provide the notice of adjudication and form answer to all
18 overlying landowners within the Ventura River Watershed's groundwater basins, while being
19 mindful of Covid-19 public health and safety constraints.

20 A. SERVICE

21 The City mailed 738 service packets, requesting return of an acknowledgement of receipt,
22 to un-served Cross-Defendants in mid-August, 2020. To date, the City has received
23 approximately 165 acknowledgments of receipt. The City will continue to attempt to locate and
24 serve the remaining un-served Cross-Defendants. Additional service attempts may include
25 further research of newly obtained County Assessor records, additional correspondence to Cross-
26 Defendants, another attempt at mail service, outreach to individual Cross-Defendants to schedule
27 service, and additional personal service attempts. The City will ultimately seek to serve any
28 remaining un-served Cross-Defendants that it cannot locate via publication. The City is

1 cognizant of the Court's prior statements regarding service by publication and will make all
2 diligent efforts to perfect service on the named Cross-Defendant prior to seeking approval to
3 serve by publication.

4 B. NOTICE

5 The City mailed 3,072 notice of adjudication packets, return receipt requested, to owners
6 of parcels for which it had not yet received a return receipt in mid-August, 2020. The response to
7 this additional mailing was positive, and there are now only approximately 107 parcels for which
8 the City has not received a return receipt for the notice of adjudication. The City will make
9 additional attempts to provide notices of adjudication and to obtain receipts before ultimately
10 posting the notice of adjudication in a conspicuous place on the real property for any parcels for
11 which the City does not obtain a return receipt pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 836,
12 subdivision (d)(1)(C). The City will take additional steps to complete the required notice process
13 such as additional research from newly obtained County Assessor records, attempting another
14 notice packet mailing, and outreach to individual property owners to schedule delivery of the
15 notice of adjudication.

16
17 3. NEWLY APPEARING PARTIES

18
19 As of November 6, 2020, the following additional parties have appeared and/or filed an
20 answer to the Third Amended Cross-Complaint:

- 21 A. Michael Bradbury, Heidi Bradbury, and The Heidi Gramkow Trust, answer
22 filed 8/18/20;
23 B. Joyce Syme, and The Joyce A. Syme Living Trust, answer filed 9/18/20;
24 C. County of Ventura, notice of appearance filed 9/29/20;
25 D. Santa Ana Ranch, Inc., answer filed 9/29/20;
26 E. The Manfred Krankl and Elaine V. Krankl Living Trust, answer filed
27 10/15/20;
28 F. Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust, Loa E. Bliss & David A. Gilbert,

- 1 Trustees, answer filed 10/20/20;
- 2 G. Asquith Family Limited Partnership, Ltd., answer filed 10/26/20;
- 3 H. Michael and Janet Boulton, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 4 I. Burgess Ranch, a California Corporation, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 5 J. Cary Cheldin, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 6 K. Cynthia Daniels, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 7 L. Wayne Francis, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 8 M. David Friend, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 9 N. The Larry & Pat Hartmann Family Trust, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 10 O. The John N. Hartmann Trust, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 11 P. Garry Hirschcron, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 12 Q. Cheryl Jensen, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 13 R. Krotona Institute of Theosophy, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 14 S. Lutheran Church of the Holy Cross of Ojai, California, a California Non-
- 15 Profit Corporation, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 16 T. North Fork Springs Mutual Water Company, a California Corporation,
- 17 answer filed 10/26/20;
- 18 U. Janice Sattler (Mineo), answer filed 10/26/20;
- 19 V. Siete Robles Mutual Water Company, a California Corporation, answer
- 20 filed 10/26/20;
- 21 W. Eitan Sloustcher, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 22 X. Rancho Sueno, LLC, answer filed 10/26/20;
- 23 Y. Ojai Oil Company, answer served 10/30/20;
- 24 Z. Ojai Valley School, answer served 10/30/20;
- 25 AA. Sharon Hamm-Booth and David Robert Hamm, Co-Trustees of The Hamm
- 26 2004 Family Trust Dated April 29, 2004, answer served 10/30/20;
- 27 BB. Emily V. Brown, answer served 10/30/20;
- 28 CC. Rogers-Cooper Memorial Foundation, answer served 11/2/20;

DD. Senior Canyon Mutual Water Company, answer served 11/2/20; and
EE. Reeves Orchard, LLC, answer served 11/2/20.

4. RESPONSE TO THIRD AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT

The current deadline to respond to the City's Third Amended Cross-Complaint is January 29, 2021. The Court previously ordered that Cross-Defendants may elect to file a Stipulation for Disclaimer, in lieu of filing an answer, requiring a \$20 stipulation filing fee rather than a \$435 first appearance fee. The City requests that the Court similarly order that Cross-Defendants and all those who have received notice of the adjudication may elect to file a Stipulation for Entry of Physical Solution and Judgment, a draft of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, in lieu of filing an answer, requiring a \$20 stipulation filing fee rather than a \$435 first appearance fee. Accordingly, the City proposes that by January 29, 2021, all Cross-Defendants and all those who have received notice of the adjudication do one of the following:

1. File a Stipulation for Entry of Physical Solution and Judgment;
2. File a Stipulation for Disclaimer;
3. File an Answer or other responsive pleading the City's Third Amended Cross-Complaint; or
4. Take no action. For those who have received notice of the adjudication, taking no action will mean that the physical solution and judgment entered in this matter will apply to their property. For named Cross-Defendants, taking no action may result in the entry of a default judgment.

5. POSITION OF CROSS-DEFENDANT LOA E. BLISS 2006 REVOCABLE TRUST, LOA E. BLISS & DAVID A. GILBERT, TRUSTEES

Ms. Loa E. Bliss, Trustee of the Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust (the "Trust") sent correspondence to counsel for the City on November 5, 2020. Ms. Bliss requested redline edits to

1 this Report and enclosed a letter regarding certain jurisdictional and other issues, some of which
2 have been previously addressed in the Joint Brief Regarding in Rem and in Personam
3 Jurisdiction, dated November 15, 2019. She requested the letter be filed as an attachment to this
4 Report, and it is attached hereto as Exhibit B. She also inquired about the hydrological status of
5 the Upper Ojai Basin. The City responded to Ms. Bliss on November 6, 2020 regarding her
6 jurisdictional and hydrological questions and proposed adding this section to the Report. Ms.
7 Bliss raised the following additional points of concern and contention in her redline edits and
8 correspondence to the City:

- 9 • The Trust believes the parties and Court should be continue to be aware of how
10 few answers or other responsive pleadings have been filed in response to the Third
11 Amended Cross-Complaint, compared with the number of landowners affected by
12 it and by this case.
- 13 • The Trust does not concede subject matter jurisdiction as to the Upper Ojai basin
14 groundwater and has raised this jurisdictional issue as a burden of the City to
15 prove factually, legally, and before any defaults are issued.
- 16 • The Trust requests the Proposing Parties hold additional meet and confer
17 conferences regarding the Physical Solution.
- 18 • The Trust asserts a Stipulation for Entry of Physical Solution and Judgment will
19 result in a forfeiture of rights in this case. Specifically, the Trust wants to ensure
20 that any implication of rights—relating to water or a party’s right to dispute issues
21 in this case—is made clear to any party before their election to agree to a
22 Stipulation for Entry of Physical Solution and Judgment, and that any such party is
23 given sufficient and reasonable time to consider any such implications. The City
24 disputes this assertion.
- 25 • The Trust wants to ensure proper notice and due process is given surrounding any
26 potential default judgment or implementation of the Proposed Physical Solution.
27 Specifically, the Trust has concerns with the City’s attempts to obtain automatic
28 application of the Proposed Physical Solution resulting from a party’s failure to

1 answer or file an otherwise responsive pleading.

- 2 • The Trust believes that additional time may need to be set for meet and confer
3 efforts regarding the Physical Solution. The parties and Court should consider the
4 need for these additional efforts along with the current deadline to answer or file a
5 responsive pleading.
- 6 • The Trust has raised numerous concerns regarding the Proposed Physical Solution,
7 including that, although it does not presently appear to include specific mention of
8 effects on Upper Ojai, any subsequent application of the Proposed Physical
9 Solution in Upper Ojai would be problematic because (as one example) Upper
10 Ojai is a collection of individuals with no entity representative of their interests
11 (e.g., a water district, city, or town).
- 12 • The Trust believes all reports, findings, and opinions held by the City or Proposing
13 Parties with regard to Upper Ojai or other relevant basin should be made public
14 and made available to all affected overlying landowners without regard to signing
15 confidentiality agreements, as currently required by the City

16
17 6. NEXT STEPS AND REQUEST FOR FURTHER CMC
18

19 The Proposing Parties will continue to solicit input from all affected parties and
20 landowners regarding the Proposed Physical Solution and to meet and confer regarding its
21 contents and potential revisions thereto. The Proposing Parties are willing to discuss
22 modifications to the Proposed Physical Solution The Proposing Parties may propose a revised
23 version of the Proposed Physical Solution based on the input from the meet and confer process.

24 In the event that the parties are unable to agree to a Proposed Physical Solution within a
25 reasonable amount of time or period of time otherwise instructed by the Court, the Proposing
26 Parties will request that the case will proceed to a discovery phase, and then ultimately an
27 evidentiary hearing on whether to enter the Proposed Physical Solution as a judgment binding on
28 all parties. The Proposing Parties may suggest at the next Status Conference that the Court set a

1 schedule for a proposed discovery phase, pretrial proceedings, and evidentiary hearing regarding
2 the Proposed Physical Solution. Other parties (including the State Board and CDFW or Cross-
3 Defendants) may disagree that that is the next step in this process. The Proposing Parties request
4 that the Court set a further Status Conference for February 2021, after responses to the Third
5 Amended Cross-Complaint are currently scheduled to be complete, and accounting for any
6 additional meet and confer conferences that the parties may hold.

7
8 7. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF REQUESTS

9
10 Based on the above Report, the parties request that the Court consider taking the following
11 actions:

- 12 • Set a further Status Conference for February 2021 to provide an update on the
13 parties' efforts to meet and confer about the Proposing Parties' Proposed Physical
14 Solution and potentially to set a schedule and process for the Court's and parties'
15 consideration of the Physical Solution
- 16 • Order that parties may elect to file a Stipulation for Entry of Physical Solution and
17 Judgment, in lieu of an answer, requiring a \$20 stipulation fee rather than a \$435
18 appearance fee.
- 19 • Order that all served parties and all entities and overlying landowners who have
20 received notice of this adjudication take one of the following actions by January
21 29, 2021:
 - 22 1. File a Stipulation for Entry of Physical Solution and Judgment;
 - 23 2. File a Stipulation for Disclaimer;
 - 24 3. File an Answer or other responsive pleading the City's Third Amended
25 Cross-Complaint; or
 - 26 4. Take no action. For those who have received notice of the adjudication,
27 taking no action will mean that the physical solution and judgment entered
28 in this matter will apply to their property. For named Cross-Defendants,

1 taking no action may result in the entry of a default judgment.
2

3 Dated: November 9, 2020

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

4
5 By:



6 SHAV'N HACERTY
7 CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO
8 SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY
9 Attorneys for Respondent and
10 Cross-Complainant
11 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

1 SHAWN HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435
shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com
2 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
3 San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 525-1300
4 Facsimile: (619) 233-6118

Exempt From Filing Fees Pursuant to
Cal. Gov't Code § 6103

5 CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO, Bar No. 192831
christopher.pisano@bbklaw.com
6 SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY, Bar No. 277223
sarah.foley@bbklaw.com
7 Best Best & Krieger LLP
300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
8 Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 617-8100
9 Facsimile: (213) 617-7480

10 Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant
11 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

14
15 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER,
a California non-profit corporation,

16 Petitioner,

17 v.

18 STATE WATER RESOURCES
19 CONTROL BOARD, etc., et al.,

20 Respondents.

Case No. 19STCP01176

Judge: Honorable William F. Highberger

STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF PHYSICAL
SOLUTION AND JUDGMENT; [PROPOSED]
ORDER

Action Filed: Sept. 19, 2014
Trial Date: Not Set

21
22 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, etc.,

23 Cross-Complainant

24 v.

25 DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.

26 Cross-Defendants.
27
28

1 Cross-Complainant City of San Buenaventura (“City”) and Cross-Defendant [INSERT
2 NAME] (“Cross-Defendant”) (City and Cross-Defendant are collectively referred to herein as the
3 “Parties”), hereby stipulate as follows:

4 I. RECITALS

5 1. On September 19, 2014, Plaintiff Santa Barbara Channelkeeper (“Channelkeeper”)
6 filed a Complaint and Petition for Declaratory Relief and a Writ of Mandate (“Complaint”)
7 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 in the County of San Francisco Superior Court
8 (Case No. CPF-14-513875) against the City and Respondent State Water Resources Control
9 Board. The action is now pending in the Superior Court for Los Angeles County before the
10 Honorable William F. Highberger.

11 2. On January 2, 2020, the City filed its operative Third Amended Cross-Complaint
12 in this action (“Amended Cross-Complaint”) commencing a comprehensive adjudication of the
13 Ventura River Watershed, including its four groundwater basins, the Lower Ventura River Basin,
14 the Upper Ventura River Basin, the Ojai Valley Basin and the Upper Ojai Valley Basin
15 (“Basins”), (the “Ventura River Watershed Adjudication”).

16 3. On or about November 21, 2019, the Court granted the City’s motion to approve a
17 notice of adjudication and form answer pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 836.
18 Pursuant to the Court’s November 21, 2019 order, the City has served a summons on
19 approximately 2,300 cross-defendants owning approximately 1,750 riparian parcels and provided
20 12,766 notices to the owners of approximately 10,000 parcels overlying the Basins. The City
21 provided notice of this action to all property owners who were not otherwise named parties to this
22 action and who own property overlying the Basins in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure
23 section 836.

24 4. On September 15, 2020, the City and Cross-Defendants Ventura River Water
25 District, Meiners Oaks Water District, Rancho Matilija Mutual Water Company, and the Wood-
26 Claeysens Foundation (the “Proposing Parties”) filed a Notice of Dissemination of Proposed
27 Physical Solution and Judgment for the Ventura River Watershed. The Proposed Stipulated
28 Physical Solution and Judgment (the “Physical Solution”) is conditioned on further proceedings

1 that will result in the Physical Solution becoming binding in this action. The Physical Solution is
2 incorporated by reference herein.

3 5. In lieu of filing an answer or other responsive pleading to the Amended Cross-
4 Complaint, Cross-Defendant intends to stipulate to, support, and be bound by the Physical
5 Solution, subject to Court approval of the Physical Solution, or any modified version thereof, and
6 entry of a final judgment. The Parties expect and intend that this Stipulation and attached order
7 shall be incorporated into the final judgment entered in this matter and that the Court will retain
8 jurisdiction in the action.

9 II. TERMS

10 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED that:

11 1. Cross-Defendant is named in the Amended Cross-Complaint. Cross-Defendant
12 acknowledges receipt of process of the City's Amended Cross-Complaint. Cross-Defendant
13 agrees to, and hereby does, submit itself to the jurisdiction of this Court in all matters involving
14 the Ventura River Watershed Adjudication.

15 2. Cross-Defendant owns one or more parcels of real property located in Ventura
16 County with the assessor parcel number(s) of [INSERT APN] (the "Property"). Cross-
17 Defendant's Property is adjoining or abutting the waters of the Ventura River and/or its
18 tributaries, whether flowing on the surface or underground in a known and defined channel,
19 and/or is overlying one or more of the Basins.

20 3. In lieu of filing an answer or other responsive pleading to the Amended Cross-
21 Complaint, Cross-Defendant agrees to be, and is, bound by the Physical Solution, and supports
22 the Physical Solution, subject to Court approval of the Physical Solution, or any modified version
23 thereof, and entry of a final judgment. Judgment may be entered against Cross-Defendant in lieu
24 of Cross-Defendant filing an answer or other responsive pleading.

25 4. Cross-Defendant acknowledges that in signing this Stipulation, Cross-Defendant is
26 responsible for the accuracy of its content. Consequently, Cross-Defendant acknowledges that in
27 lieu of filing an answer or other responsive pleading to the Amended Cross-Complaint, Cross-
28 Defendant shall nevertheless be bound by the results of this litigation, including the entry of a

1 judgment and physical solution and shall be subject to the continuing jurisdiction of this Court to
2 oversee the implementation of the judgment and physical solution entered herein and to resolve
3 subsequent conflicts that may arise.

4 5. This Stipulation and attached order shall be incorporated into the final judgment
5 entered in this matter.

6 6. This Stipulation shall bind and benefit the City and Cross-Defendant and shall be
7 binding upon and benefit all their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, parent,
8 subsidiary entities, and assigns.

9 7. This Stipulation constitutes the entire, complete and integrated agreement among
10 the Parties, and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous undertakings of the Parties in connection
11 herewith. This Stipulation may not be modified or amended except in writing executed by the
12 Parties and approved by the Court. It shall be construed and interpreted to effectuate the intent of
13 the Parties which is to provide, through this Stipulation, for a complete resolution of the relevant
14 claims between the Parties on the terms provided in this Stipulation. Notwithstanding the
15 foregoing, the Parties intend and agree that this Stipulation will later be incorporated into a
16 Physical Solution, which is consistent with the terms of this Stipulation.

17 8. This Stipulation may be executed in counterpart originals, by facsimile, or by
18 electronic signature, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which shall
19 constitute one and the same document.

20 9. No fees and/or costs shall be awarded against Cross-Defendant in this action, and
21 Cross-Defendant shall not seek an award of fees or costs from the City.

22 IT IS SO STIPULATED.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: , 2020

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

2
3 By: _____
4 SHAWN HAGERTY
5 CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO
6 SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY
7 Attorneys for Respondent and
8 Cross-Complainant
9 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA

10 Dated: , 2020

11
12 By: _____
13 Cross-Defendant [INSERT NAME]

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER

2 Having read and considered the pleadings and the preceding Stipulation for entry of
3 Physical Solution and Judgment (the “Stipulation”), by and between Cross-Complainant City of
4 San Buenaventura (“City”) and Cross-Defendant [INSERT NAME] (“Cross-Defendant”), and
5 good cause appearing,

6 IT IS ORDERED:

7 1. Cross-Defendant is named in the Third Amended Cross-Complaint (“Amended
8 Cross-Complaint”), filed by the City on January 2, 2020. Cross-Defendant has acknowledged
9 receipt of the process of the City’s Amended Cross-Complaint. Cross-Defendant is subject to the
10 jurisdiction of this Court in all matters involving the Ventura River Watershed Adjudication.

11 2. Cross-Defendant owns one or more parcels of real property located in Ventura
12 County with the assessor parcel number(s) of [INSERT APN] (the “Property”). Cross-
13 Defendant’s Property is adjoining or abutting the waters of the Ventura River and/or its
14 tributaries, whether flowing on the surface or underground in a known and defined channel,
15 and/or is overlying one or more of the Basins.

16 3. On September 15, 2020, the City and Cross-Defendants Ventura River Water
17 District, Meiners Oaks Water District, Rancho Matilija Mutual Water Company, and the Wood-
18 Claeysens Foundation filed a Notice of Dissemination of Proposed Physical Solution and
19 Judgment for the Ventura River watershed. The Proposed Stipulated Physical Solution and
20 Judgment (the “Physical Solution”) is conditioned on further proceedings that will result in the
21 Physical Solution becoming binding in this action.

22 4. In lieu of filing an answer or other responsive pleading to the Amended Cross-
23 Complaint, Cross-Defendant agrees to be, and is, bound by the Physical Solution, and supports
24 the Physical Solution, subject to Court approval of the Physical Solution, or any modified version
25 thereof, and entry of a final judgment. Judgment may be entered against Cross-Defendant in lieu
26 of Cross-Defendant filing an answer or other responsive pleading.

27 5. This order and preceding Stipulation shall be incorporated into the final entered
28 judgment in this matter.

1 6. The City and Cross-Defendant are bound and benefitted by the preceding
2 Stipulation, which shall also bind and benefit all their respective heirs, executors, administrators,
3 successors, parent, subsidiary entities, and assigns.

4 7. The Court shall retain jurisdiction over the City and Cross-Defendant to enforce
5 the preceding Stipulation until there is full performance thereof.

6 8. No fees and/or costs shall be awarded against Cross-Defendant in this action, and
7 Cross-Defendant shall not recover fees or costs from the City.

8
9
10 Dated: _____

By: _____
The Honorable William F. Highberger
Judge of the Superior Court
County of Los Angeles

EXHIBIT B

Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust
Loa E. Bliss and David A. Gilbert, Trustees
9030 Ojai Santa Paula Rd.
Ojai, CA 93023
Tel: (617) 750-8500
loabliss@hotmail.com
waban15@hotmail.com

November 5, 2020

VIA EMAIL

Shawn Hagerty
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 525-1300
Fax: (619) 233-6118
shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com

Christopher M. Pisano
Sarah Christopher Foley
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: (213) 617-8100
Fax: (213) 617-7480

Re: *Santa Barbara Channelkeeper v. State Water Resources Control Board and City of San Buenaventura; City of San Buenaventura v. Duncan Abbott, et al.*,
Case No. 19STCP01176

Counsel:

I am writing on behalf of the Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust, as Trustee, in response to your email dated November 2, 2020 regarding a Draft Status Conference Report (the "Draft Report"). In your email, you attached the Draft Report in connection with the Status Conference currently set with the Court on November 16, 2020. This letter serves to raise several concerns regarding the Draft Report and case more generally.

First, there is a threshold issue of whether the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over claims asserted in the Third Amended Cross-Complaint, filed by Cross-Complainant City of San Buenaventura (the "City") on January 2, 2020. It is unclear from records available to me (and therefore potentially to other parties) whether it has been sufficiently demonstrated that the Upper Ojai basin feeds into any of the basins or tributaries at issue in the above-captioned case, or whether the Upper Ojai basin is an isolated, standalone, basin.

The Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust does not concede subject matter jurisdiction as to the Upper Ojai basin groundwater based on mere supposition, bare assertion, or overreach. Other parties may hold the same view. Subject matter jurisdiction must be proved by the City at the outset, and before any order by the Court that would approve, allow, or otherwise permit any physical solution to move forward, or other order that would otherwise subject overlying landowners to any such physical solution or resolution of the case. Of course, factual determinations underlying subject matter jurisdiction must be made before any default—regarding judgment or otherwise—is issued that would subject overlying landowners to a physical solution, including the Proposed Physical Solution.¹ Depending on the facts, consideration should be given to dismissal of the Third Amended Cross-Complaint with respect to the Upper Ojai Basin. No defaults should be entered regarding any claim in the City’s Third Amended Cross-Complaint before subject matter jurisdiction is definitively proven. At that point, if proven, additional opportunity to answer should be provided.

Second, although the Proposed Physical Solution does not currently appear to include specific mention of effects on Upper Ojai, if the Proposed Physical Solution subsequently affects Upper Ojai, such a result would be incredibly problematic.

The management structure outlined in the Proposed Physical Solution provides no representation for Upper Ojai, which is a collection of individuals with no entity of any sort that is representative of their interests, such as a water district, city, or town. To this end, the City should identify for the record owners in Upper Ojai, as well as parcels by location over the basin, affected by this lawsuit so that persons with common interests can communicate. For example, the ability to contest any finding in the suit, or any action by the management board, if it is established, is burdensome. Findings and rulings on the Upper Ojai basins should be put on hold, with no defaults issued, or dismissed, particularly in reference to the basin, unless and until the impact on overlying owners is specifically known. Furthermore, there should be requirement relating to the reporting of water use until the character of the Upper Ojai basin is established. The bare assertion of unreasonable use should not stand, even by default.

Third, all reports, findings, opinions held by the City or Proposing Parties with regard to the Upper Ojai basin should be public, and made available to all affected overlying landowners without regard to signing privacy or confidentiality statements or agreements.

Please contact me with any issues or questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Loa E. Bliss

¹ The term “Proposed Physical Solution” has the same meaning as in the Draft Report.

SHAWN HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435
shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
655 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 525-1300
Facsimile: (619) 233-6118

**CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED**
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

NOV 09 2020

CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO, Bar No. 192831
christopher.pisano@bbklaw.com
SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY, Bar No. 277223
sarah.foley@bbklaw.com
Best Best & Krieger LLP
300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 617-8100
Facsimile: (213) 617-7480

Sherri K. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court
By Steven Drew, Deputy

Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA

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

SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER,
a California non-profit corporation,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE WATER RESOURCES
CONTROL BOARD, a California State
Agency;
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, a
California municipal corporation, etc.,

Respondents.

Case No. 19STCP01176

Exempt From Filing Fees Pursuant to Cal.
Gov't Code § 6103

PROOF OF SERVICE

Status Conf.: November 16, 2020
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Dept.: SS10

Action Filed: September 19, 2014
Trial Date: Not Set

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

CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, a
California municipal corporation,

Cross-Complainant

v.

DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.

Cross-Defendants.

FAC Filed: September 7, 2018

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 Best & Krieger LLP, 2001 N. Main St. Suite 390, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. On November 9, 2020, I served the following document(s):

STATUS CONFERENCE REPORT

- ☐ 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
Sycamore Law
1004 O'Reilly Ave.
San Francisco CA 94129
Tel: (415) 360-2962
daniel@sycamore.law

Matthew Bullock
Deputy Attorney General
California Department of Justice
Natural Resources Law Section
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Tel: (415) 510-3376
matthew.bullock@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Petitioner and Plaintiff
Santa Barbara Channelkeeper

Attorneys for Respondent and Defendant State
Water Resources Control Board

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

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 Respondent and Defendant
State Water Resources Control Board

Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor California
Department of Fish & Wildlife

Edward J. Casey
Clynton Namuo
Alston & Bird LLP
333 South Hope Street, 16th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: 213.576.1000
ed.casey@alston.com
clynton.namuo@alston.com

Paul Blatz
Ryan Blatz
Blatz Law Firm
206 N. Signal St. Suite G
Ojai, CA 93023
Tel: (805) 646-3110
blatzlawfirm@gmail.com
ryan@ryanblatzlaw.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Bentley
Family Limited Partnership and AGR
Breeding, Inc.

Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Troy Becker;
Janet Boulten; Michael Boulten; Michael
Caldwell; Joe Clark; Michael Cromer; Linda
Epstein; Etchart Ranch; Lawrence Hartmann;
Ole Konig; Krotona 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; Trudie Town;
Asquith Family Limited Partnership, Ltd.;
Burgess Ranch; Cary Cheldin; Cynthia Daniels;
Wayne Francis; David Friend; The Larry & Pat
Hartmann Family Trust; The John N. Hartmann
Trust; Gary Hirschcron; Cheryl Jensen;
Lutheran Church of the Holy Cross of Ojai,
California; Janice Sattler (Mineo); Eitan
Sloustcher; Rogers-Cooper Memorial
Foundation; Robert and Patricia Norris (not yet
appeared); Old Creek Road Mutaual Water
Company (not yet appeared); Margaret
Vanderifin (not yet appeared); and Telos Ojai,
LLC (not yet appeared).

1 William G. Short, Esq.
2 Law Offices of William G. Short
3 Post Office Box 1313
4 Ojai, California 93024-1313
5 Tel: (805) 490-6399
6 Fax: (805) 640-1940
7 billshortesq@me.com

8 Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin
9 Bernhoft
10 Robert N. Kwong
11 Dennis O. La Rochelle
12 Arnold Larochelle Mathews Vanconas &
13 Zirbel, LLP
14 300 Esplanade Dr Ste 2100
15 Oxnard, CA 93036
16 Tel: (805) 988-9886
17 rk Wong@atozlaw.com

18 Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas
19 Municipal Water District

20 Gregory J. Patterson
21 Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP
22 2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 200
23 Westlake Village, CA 91361
24 Tel: (805) 418-3103
25 Fax: (805) 418-3101
26 g.patterson@musickpeeler.com

27 Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Robert C.
28 Davis, Jr.; James Finch; Friend's Ranches,
Inc.; Topa Topa Ranch Company, LLC; The
Thacher School; Thacher Creek Citrus, LLC;
Ojai Oil Company; Ojai Valley School;
Sharon Hamm-Booth and David Robert
Hamm, Co-Trustees of The Hamm 2004
Family Trust Dated April 29, 2004; and
Reeves Orchard, LLC

Anthony Lee Francois
Jeremy Talcott
David Deerson
Pacific Legal Foundation
930 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-1802
Tel: (916) 419-7111
Fax: (916) 419-7111
alf@pacificlegal.org
TFrancois@pacificlegal.org
jtalcott@pacificlegal.org
ddeerson@pacificlegal.org

Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin Bernhoft

Patrick Loughman
Cristian Arrieta
Lowthorp, Richards, McMillan, Miller &
Templeman
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 850
Oxnard, CA 93036
Tel: 805.804.3848
Ploughman@lrmmt.com
Carrieta@lrmmt.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Ernest Ford
and Tico Mutual Water Company

Lindsay F. Nielson
Law Office of Lindsay F. Nielson
845 E Santa Clara Street
Ventura, CA 93001
Tel: 805-658-0977
nielsonlaw@aol.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Meiners Oaks
Water District and Ventura River Water
District

Jeanne Zolezzi
Herum Crabtree Suntag
5757 Pacific Avenue, Suite 222
Stockton, CA 95207
Tel: (209) 472-7700
Fax: (209) 472.7986
jzolezzi@herumcrabtree.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Meiners
Oaks Water District and Ventura River
Water District

Thomas S. Bunn III
Elsa Sham
Lagerlof Senecal Gosney & Kruse LLP
301 N. Lake Avenue, 10th Floor
Pasadena, CA 91101-5123
Tel.: (626) 793-9400
Fax: (626) 793-5900
tombunn@lagerlof.com
esham@lagerlof.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant St. Joseph's
Associates of Ojai, California, Inc.

Alberto Boada
Karen V. Marble
Ventura County Counsel's Office
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009-1830
Tel.: (805) 654-2590
Fax: (805) 654-2185
alberto.boada@ventura.org
karen.marble@ventura.org

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Ventura
County Watershed Protection District and
County of Ventura

Neal P. Maguire
Ferguson Case Orr Patterson LLP
1050 South Kimball Road
Ventura, CA 93004
Tel: (805) 659-6800
nmaguire@fcoplaw.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Rancho
Matilija Mutual Water Company; Bettina
Chandler, Trustee of the Bettina Chandler Trust

Michael J. Van Zandt
Nathan A. Metcalf
Sean G. Herman
Hanson Bridgett LLP
425 Market Street, 26 Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-777-3200
Fax: 415-541-9366
mvanzandt@hansonbridgett.com
nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com
sherman@hansonbridgett.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Ventura County
Watershed Protection District and County of
Ventura

Scott Slater
Bradley Herrema
Christopher Guillen
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck LLP
1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Tel: (805) 963-7000
Fax: (805) 965-4333
sslater@bhfs.com
bherrema@bhfs.com
cgullen@bhfs.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Wood-
Claeyssens Foundation

Joseph C. Chrisman
Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers,
Chrisman & Gutierrez
5450 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003
(805) 644-7111
jchrisman@hathawaylawfirm.com

David B. Cosgrove
Jeffrey M. Oderman
Douglas J. Dennington
Jeremy N. Jungreis
Rutan & Tucker, LLP
611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1931
Tel: 714-641-5100
Fax: 714-546-9035
dcosgrove@rutan.com
joderman@rutan.com
ddennington@rutan.com
jjungreis@rutan.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Wood-
Claeyssens Foundation

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas
Municipal Water District

Thomas E. Jeffry
Debra J. Albin-Riley
Stefan Bogdanovich
Arent Fox LLP
555 West Fifth Avenue, 48th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90013-1065
(213) 629-7400
(213) 629-7401
Thomas.jeffry@arentfox.com
Stefan.bogdanovich@arentfox.com

Andrew Brady
DLA Piper LLP (US)
550 South Hope Street, Suite 2400
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2618
Tel. (213) 330-7700
Fax: (213) 330-7701
andrew.brady@us.dlapiper.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Community
Memorial Health System

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Integritas Ojai,
LLC

Jennifer T. Buckman
Andrew J. Ramos
Holly Jacobson
Bartkiewicz Kronick & Shanahan, PC
1011 Twenty-Second Street
Sacramento, CA 95816-4907
Tel. (916) 446-4254
Fax (916) 446-4018
jtb@bkslawfirm.com
hjj@bkslawfirm.com

David R. Krause-Leemon
BEAUDOIN & KRAUSE-LEEMON LLP
15165 Ventura Blvd., Suite 400
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
Tel. (818) 205-2809
Fax (818) 788-8104
david@bk-llaw.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant City of Ojai

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant RDK Land,
LLC

Eric J. Schindler
Michelle J. Berner
Kroesche Schindler LLP
2603 Main Street, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel. (949) 387-0495
Fax (888) 588-0034 Fax
eschindler@kslaw.legal
mberner@kslaw.legal

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Oak Haven,
LLC

Adam D. Wieder
Barry C. Groveman
Groveman Hiete LLP
35 East Union Street, Suite B
Pasadena, CA 91103
Tel (626) 747-9383
Fax (626) 747-9370
awieder@grovemanhiete.com
bgroveman@grovemanhiete.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Michael
Bradbury; Heidi Bradbury; and The Heidi
Gramkow Trust

Ernest J. Guadiana
Elkins Kalt Weintraub Reuben Gartside LLP
10345 W. Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90064
Tel. (310) 746-4425
eguadiana@elkinskalt.com

Specially appearing for Michael Lombardo
and Charles L. Ward III, as Co-Trustees of
the Ward-Lombardo Living Trust

Patrick L. Rendon
Lamb and Kawakami LLP
333 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel. (213) 630-5500
Fax: (213) 630-5555
prendon@lcfirm.com

Attorneys for Real Party in Interest Emily V.
Brown

Brian A. Osborne
Osborne Law Firm
674 County Square Drive, Suite 308
Ventura, CA 93003
Tel. (805) 642-9283
Fax (805) 642-7054
osbornelawyer@gmail.com

Attorney for Cross-Defendants Brian A.
Osborne; Ronald W. Rood and Susan B. Rood,
Trustees of the Rood Family Trust

Peter A. Goldenring
Mark R. Pachowicz
Pachowicz | Goldenring A Professional Law
Corporation
6050 Seahawk Street
Ventura, CA 93003-6622
Tel. (805) 642-6702
Fax (805) 642-3145
attorneys@gopro-law.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant The Manfred
Krankl and Elaine V. Krankl Living Trust

Justin M. Alvarez
Lamdien T. Le
The Alvarez Firm, A Law Corporation
24005 Ventura Boulevard
Calabasas, CA 91302
Tel. (818) 224-7077
Fax (818) 224-1380
jalvarez@alvarezfirm.com
dle@alvarezfirm.com

Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Rancho Sueño,
LLC

Hermitage Mutual Water Company, and Santa
Ana Ranch, Inc.

Attn: J. Roger Essick
2955 Hermitage Road
Ojai, CA 93023
Tel. (805) 320-1406
rogeressick@gmail.com

Julie A. Baker
2193 Maricopa Hwy
Ojai, CA 93023
(805) 646-8700
Jandjbaker2@gmail.com

The Joseph Fedele 1995 Living Trust,
Oriana Marie Fedele, Trustee
Attn. Oriana Fedele
P.O. Box 298
Lahaina, HI 96767
Tel. (818) 601-3161
orianafedele@gmail.com

T&D Nevada Trust
Dennis and Antoinette Mitchell
Mitchell Homes Inc.
P.O. Box 360
Ojai, CA 93024
(805) 340-2890
amitc74383@aol.com

Michaela Boehm
12293 topa Lane
Santa Paula, CA 93060
Tel. (323) 493-3737
micboehm@me.com

Anthonie M. Voogd
918 Palomar Road
Ojai, CA 93023
Tel. (805) 646-1512
avoogd@stanfordalumni.org

Lawrence S. Mihalas
Trustees of the Mihalas Family Trust
419 21st Place
Santa Monica, CA 90402
Tel. (310) 739-0700
lmihalas@gmail.com
lmihalas@ucla.edu

Heather Blair
556 So. Fair Oaks Ave., Ste 101
Box 356
Pasadena, CA 91105
Tel. (626) 755-6566
Hblair1946@gmail.com

Martin Hartmann
Whitney Hartmann
430 S. Carrillo Road
Ojai, CA 93023
Tel. (805) 798-2253
earthbuilding@gmail.com

Robert K. Cartin
Cartin Family LLC
505 Estremoz Ct.
Oceanside, CA 92057
Tel. (760) 429-4738
bob.cartin@dvm.com

Joyce Syme, and
The Joyce A. Syme Living Trust
1760 Ocean Avenue
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Tel. (310) 403-1760
seaviewhotel@hotmail.com

Loa E. Bliss
Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust
9030 Ojai Santa Paula Road
Ojai, CA 93023
Tel: (617) 750-8500
loabliss@hotmail.com

Via First Class Mail

Del Cielo LLC
Attn. Tim Carey, Managing Member
22410 Hawthorne # 5
Torrance, CA 90505
Tel. (310) 787-6569

Via First Class Mail

Salvatore Scarpato
106 Calhoun Lane
Georgetown, TX 78633
(805) 797-8767

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

3 Executed on November 9, 2020 at Walnut Creek, California.

4 

5 _____
6 Irene Islas
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28