



1 ANDREW K. WHITMAN (SBN 128358)
 2 821 N. Signal St.
 3 Ojai, Ca 93023
 4 (805) 444-5671
 5 In Pro Per and Attorney for
 6 Heidi A. Whitman, Nancy L.
 7 Whitman and John R. and Nancy
 8 L. Whitman Family Trust

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 10 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

11 SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER,
 12 a California non-profit corporation,
 13
 14 Petitioner,

Case No. 19STCP01176
 Assigned to Judge William F. Highberger
 Dept.: 10

Complaint filed: September 19, 2014

15 v.

**CROSS-DEFENDANTS ANDREW K.
 WHITMAN, HEIDI A. WHITMAN,
 NANCY L. WHITMAN AND JOHN R.
 AND NANCY L. WHITMAN FAMILY
 TRUST’S JOINDER IN MOTION TO
 APPOINT WATER EXPERT TO ASSIST
 THE COURT**

16 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL
 17 BOARD, A CALIFORNIA STATE AGENCY;
 18 CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, a
 19 California municipal corporation, incorrectly
 20 named as CITY OF BUENAVENTURA,

21 Respondents.

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000

21 Cross-Complainant,

22 v.

23 DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.

24 Cross-Defendants.

25
 26 This brief is submitted to clarify that ANDREW K. WHITMAN, HEIDI A. WHITMAN,
 27 NANCY L. WHITMAN AND JOHN R. AND NANCY L. WHITMAN FAMILY TRUST join
 28

1 in the request that the Court appoint a special water expert to assist it with making science-based
2 decisions required by this litigation.

3 Any decision made by this Court in this litigation should begin with the understanding
4 that the CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA created the issues which led to this litigation. The
5 CITY (any reference to CITY hereafter shall refer to CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA) has
6 overused and abused the extraction of water from the Ventura River and that has resulted in a
7 threat to a species of Steelhead Trout. Despite these facts, the CITY has failed to undertake
8 measures to reduce the CITY's use of Ventura River water and has instead persisted in approving
9 development permits that increase the demand against the limited Ventura River water resource.
10 The litigation persists because the CITY wants to impede, restrict or eliminate other persons or
11 entities' use of water in the greater Ventura River and Ojai Valley watershed. At the same time,
12 the CITY persists in granting additional development permits and increasing the demand against
13 Ventura River water. Furthermore, the CITY has unreasonably joined/sued every person or entity
14 with a potential claim to greater Ojai water rights into the litigation without any justification. The
15 vast majority of the cross-defendants have done nothing to contribute to the dire consequences
16 for the Steelhead Trout in the Ventura River.

17 The appointment of a neutral water expert to assist this Court is something completely
18 within this Court's discretion. It is within the trial court's discretion under Evidence Code section
19 730 to determine whether an expert is needed. *Collins v. Superior Ct.* (1977) 74 Cal.App.3d 47,
20 52. In this case, there is ample evidence to support the use of that discretion. The Court is aware
21 of significant disparity between the resources of the CITY in contrast to the resources of what the
22 Court has openly referred to as the "pip squeak" cross-defendants. This is another way of the
23 Court acknowledging the differences in resources between the CITY and the overlying
24 landowners who have been involuntarily brought into the litigation without regard to whether
25 they contribute to the reduction of available water in the Ventura River.

26 The disparity in resources means that the 'pip squeak' cross-defendants likely won't have
27 the resources to retain water experts to review mountains of scientific hydrology and geology data
28 related to the interplay of riparian water and ground water – while this does not mean there will

1 be no opposing experts, it does predict that the cross-defendants' experts are unlikely to respond
2 with the same vigor as the CITY's experts. There is no obligation that the Court appoint an expert
3 to protect the interest of a weaker litigant. However, there is an absolute duty and obligation on
4 the part of the Court to make the correct decisions based on an appropriate understanding of the
5 relevant considerations and scientific data. The appointment of a water expert will make it much
6 more likely that the decisions made by this Court will be made based upon a correct understanding
7 of the water science.

8 This Court has been vocal in informing the litigants that the science involved in the
9 hydrology and geology issues asserted by the CITY is beyond the Court's comprehension.

10 The CITY has already made many assertions that are patently false. For instance, the
11 CITY asserts that it is a "Pueblo" and it enjoys Pueblo water rights. However, any reasonable
12 review of California records will reveal that the CITY was never designated a Pueblo and is not
13 among any government listing of California pueblos. This demonstrates that the CITY plays fast
14 and loose with the truth. This Court should expect that the experts the CITY retains will be
15 instructed that their opinions need not be confined by fact or science. As acknowledged
16 repeatedly by this Court, the hydrology and geology which will be critical to determinations by
17 the Court involves complex science. The Court should exercise its authority to appoint a water
18 expert who is a both neutral and an unbiased adviser to the Court.

19 Disparity of resources is not a prerequisite to the appointment of the expert. The need to
20 be correct on a technical or scientific issue that is beyond the understanding of the Court is the
21 primary factor. An expert's opinion testimony does not achieve the dignity of substantial
22 evidence where the expert bases his or her conclusion on speculative, remote or conjectural factors.
23 *Leslie G. v. Perry & Associates* (1996) 43 Cal.App.4th 472, 487. When the trial court accepts an
24 expert's ultimate conclusion without critically considering his or her reasoning, and it appears the
25 conclusion was based on improper or unwarranted matters, the Court of Appeal must reverse the
26 judgment for lack of substantial evidence. *People ex rel. Brown v. Tri-Union Seafoods, LLC*,
27 (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 1549, 1567-68. The appointed expert can assist this Court in making the
28 threshold assessment of which expert testimony is worthy of consideration (based upon accepted

1 scientific principals) and which expert testimony should be excluded because it is speculative,
2 conjectural and not based upon recognized science. More than a century ago, the California
3 Supreme Court proposed that rather than relying on expert witnesses called by the parties, the
4 trial courts should summon a disinterested body or board of experts to give their opinion and
5 reasons to the court and jury regardless of the consequences to either litigant. *Estate of Dolbeer*
6 (1906) 149 Cal. 227, 243. The Evidence Code now provides for a similar remedy, authorizing
7 courts to appoint experts to investigate and render a report on the matter in question, subject to
8 cross-examination by the parties. (Evid. Code, §§ 730, 732.) Resort to such a procedure can
9 reduce the risk of a decision based on anything but the most valid scientific investigation and
10 assessment. *People ex rel. Brown v. Tri-Union Seafoods, LLC*, supra, 171 Cal.App.4th 1549,
11 1573–74.

12 The interests of justice will be served by the appointment of the expert because this will
13 assure that highly technical and scientific information can be examined, assessed and resolved by
14 the Court with the assistance of a neutral unbiased scientist.

15 Respectfully submitted,

16
17 Dated: July 15, 2021

/s/ Andrew K. Whitman

18 ANDREW K. WHITMAN, in pro per, and
19 attorney for HEIDI A. WHITMAN, NANCY
20 L. WHITMAN and the JOHN R. and
21 NANCY L. WHITMAN FAMILY TRUST