



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 Whitman, and
 7 John R. Whitman and Nancy L. Whitman Family Trust

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 9 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.

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,

**CROSS DEFENDANTS ANDREW K.
 WHITMAN, HEIDI A. WHITMAN,
 NANCY L. WHITMAN AND JOHN R.
 AND NANCY L. WHITMAN FAMILY
 TRUST’S OBJECTION TO PROPOSED
 PHYSICAL SOLUTION**

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

Cross-Complainant,

v.

DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.

Cross-Defendants.

I am personally a cross-defendant and owner of land in Ojai and an owner of groundwater rights. My clients are in the same category except that Nancy Whitman, and the property owned

1 by her Trust, are not within the groundwater basin encompassed by this litigation. At this point
2 there is no mechanism for a maliciously or mistakenly joined party to extract from the litigation.
3 My clients and I first appeared in the action January 28, 2021. It isn't entirely clear at this point
4 abundantly what deprivation of rights a landowner with groundwater rights such as myself or my
5 clients may suffer if the City of Ventura is allowed to push through a physical solution/settlement
6 of claims. Preliminarily, my clients and I do not wish to concede anything to the City of Ventura,
7 wish to have the City of Ventura's use of Ventura River water controlled (reduced) and wish to
8 have our current or future use of our own water rights preserved.

9 **The physical solution is premature** – literally thousands of Ojai Valley landowners have
10 just recently answered the City of Ventura's Cross-Complaint. This Court's prior orders have
11 acknowledged that there are many more Ojai landowners who have yet to appear in this action.
12 Each of the landowner cross-defendants should be allowed ample time to understand the issues
13 and ramifications of the proposed physical solution as well as the original Complaint by SB
14 Channel Keepers and the other causes of action. There is a legion of cross-defendants who are
15 simply landowners, with associated water rights that have never been invoked (the landowners
16 aren't currently using their water rights). This category of cross-defendant needs time to
17 determine if they require legal representation. They need time to potentially identify other
18 landowners with common interests and potentially pool their resources and enter into joint
19 defense and joint representation agreements. Co-ordinated defenses and consolidated
20 representation would save the Court extensive time and judicial efficiency. Furthermore, the
21 impact of the proposed physical solution cannot be understood without expert advice and time is
22 needed to retain experts on behalf of the landowner cross-defendants. The proposed physical
23 solution is a complicated issue and made even more so by the interaction of the original complaint
24 by SB Channelkeeper and the other causes of action. The Court itself has expressed its own
25 concern regarding the interplay of the various causes of action and how due process rights of all
26 participants may be impacted. The City's rush to a "solution" feels like an effort to obtain
27 permanent benefits before the cross-defendants even know what hit them. Substantial time is

1 required – 180 days is suggested but not less than 90 days – before the landowner cross-defendants
2 should be expected or required to respond/comment on the physical solution.

3 **Before Any Physical Solution Can Be Agreeable to Impacted Cross Defendant**
4 **Landowners, The Solution Must Incorporate Control of the Volume of Water**
5 **Used by The City of Ventura.**

6 This litigation arose out of excessive use of Ventura River water by the City of Ventura.
7 A public interest group (SB Channelkeeper) sued the City of Ventura because the City’s excessive
8 use of Ventura River water was damaging the environment, including, but not limited to, steel
9 head trout. The detrimental impacts to the Ventura River should have been addressed in
10 environmental impact reports as the City of Ventura has unleashed unmitigated growth and
11 increased water demands against the entire water system and region over the last decade and more.
12 I am not a land use attorney and perhaps the regional impacts of water use are not encompassed
13 by the issuance of building permits. However, the City of Ventura has filed suit to bring about a
14 regional solution to water usage and that should provide a vehicle to impose regionwide controls
15 on current and future water usage and on applications and permits for development.

16 Despite the SB Channelkeeper lawsuit, the City of Ventura has not taken measures to
17 control its water use. The City continuously and aggressively issues new development permits
18 within the City of Ventura. This inevitably results in increased demand on water in the Ventura
19 River and on the entire region. The water supply is not unlimited and current usage apparently
20 outstrips the supply (look at the level of Lake Casitas - the principal water storage facility in the
21 region). Yet development permits continue to be issued by the City of Ventura and the demands
22 on the regional water supply are increased thereby. If the current causes of action before this
23 Court do not incorporate the legal ability for a solution to control or enjoin the City of Ventura
24 use of Ventura River water (and regional water) then a new cause of action and/or cross-complaint
25 needs to be included within the present proceedings so that the issue can be litigated. This is
26 another reason that additional time is necessary. No physical solution can be considered without
27 a mechanism to control if and when the City of Ventura places additional demands on the Ventura
28 River and regional water resources.

1 At this early stage of my involvement in this litigation (a little more than 30 days), I cannot
2 say what legal doctrine allows implementation of controls/limitations on City of Ventura
3 development. However, it seems likely that equitable law demands that a solution includes such
4 controls. Perhaps the unclean hands doctrine is the correct legal vehicle, since any physical
5 solution would necessarily require use of this Court’s equitable powers. If unclean hands is not
6 the correct vehicle, then there must be another appropriate legal doctrine that applies. In general,
7 in equity every wrong must have a remedy. As part of any regional inspection of the Ventura
8 River and regional basin by this Court, this Court should survey the City of Ventura and the
9 extensive development that has been recently completed or is still in process. The Court should
10 also mandate reports from the City concerning current and future development and how it will
11 impact water supply and demand in the entire basin. Without knowing the demands the City of
12 Ventura is currently placing on regional water the Court cannot consider the propriety of a
13 solution.

14 In contrast to Ventura water usage, the entire Ojai Valley basin has been in a virtual
15 moratorium prohibiting development. This is primarily because of air quality and traffic
16 congestion issues. Ask any cross-defendant and they will tell you that their ability to subdivide
17 their land has been precluded by County of Ventura or City of Ojai planning departments.
18 Ironically, the City of Ventura is suing its neighbors to control their water usage when it is the
19 City’s own greedy use of water and poor planning that led to the necessity of a solution. The
20 alleged need for a “solution” to Ventura River water and the associated Ojai groundwater basin
21 is primarily caused by the lack of responsible management of development and future water use
22 by the City of Ventura. This would seem to provide the Court with equitable authority to deny
23 the City any equitable relief (in the form of the proposed solution).

24 When Greta Thunberg addressed the UN in 2019 her comments were directed at Nations,
25 but her comments were just as applicable, if not more, to local governments who behave like the
26 City of Ventura.

27 “You have stolen my dreams and my childhood with your empty words and yet I’m one
28 of the lucky ones,” Thunberg told the United Nations Climate Action Summit.

1
2 “People are suffering. People are dying. Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are in the
3 beginning of a mass extinction and all you can talk about is money and fairytales of eternal
4 economic growth. How dare you.”

5 The City of Ventura obviously views the fairytale of continuous development as the
6 engine for economic security for its citizens. However, as Ms. Thunberg stated so precisely,
7 economic prosperity is not sustainable and there is a severe cost. The cost is to our future and
8 everyone and everything that shares the planet. With respect to subject matter of this litigation,
9 the excessive draft that the City of Ventura takes against the Ventura River and the water basin
10 in general is a toll that must be accounted for, curbed, and controlled. It implicates both economic
11 justice and environmental justice. While the City of Ventura and its citizens profit from the use
12 of Ventura River water and regional water resources, the outliers (everybody not in the City
13 limits) are constrained in the opportunity for profitable use. The City of Ventura is a parasite on
14 the region and its plans for the Ventura River and the water basin appear to include subservience
15 by the Ojai landowners. Any such solution is unjust and cannot be allowed.

16 **All City Of Ventura Landowners Should Be Joined As Defendants In Any**
17 **Solution/Adjudication.**

18 Ojai landowners with groundwater rights were dragged into this litigation kicking and
19 screaming (and at great expense). It is only fair and equitable that every City of Ventura
20 landowner with water rights should also be part of any solution/settlement. As framed by the
21 City, they expect only the Ojai basin landowners to submit to the solution. However, because the
22 reason for this litigation is to secure water usage and water rights for the City of Ventura, every
23 landowner within the City’s jurisdiction should also be a party and a part of the solution. Their
24 rights to groundwater and riparian water should be incorporated into a regional solution under the
25 same rational the mandated the participation of Ojai landowners. Furthermore, Ventura residents
26 benefit financially and disproportionately under the City’s unbridled and unabashed use of
27 regional water. Any equitable solution would require that any additional development in the City
28 of Ventura would come from the water currently allocated to use by Ventura users. It is more

1 equitable that Ventura residents be asked to ration their water use than it is to adjudicate the rights
2 of Ojai landowners who are not enjoying profit from development. Alternatively, an appropriate
3 solution to Ventura's future water use may include acquisition of water through desalination or
4 purchase of water from sources outside the region. The cost of such acquisition should be borne
5 by Ventura landowners and citizens.

6 **A Solution Must Exclude the City of Ventura as a Decision Maker or Monitor**

7 Although it is not entirely clear at this early stage of my involvement, it seems that the
8 City of Ventura wants to place itself at the head of the table in terms of water management
9 decisions for the region moving forward. This places the proverbial fox in the position of
10 guarding the henhouse. The City is the primary bad actor with respect to the water debacle that
11 led to the SB Channelkeeper lawsuit. The bad actor, the actor with unclean hands, should not
12 have a seat at the table. The City's cross-complaint puts in issue the fact that water usage is a
13 regional concern. Any body governing future regional use and the allocation of water usage in
14 this region should be composed of persons/entities with regional interests at heart. The City of
15 Ventura has a conflict of interest when it comes to managing regional water resources. The
16 various water districts also should not be at the table of regional decision making (except in a
17 minor advisory role). The water district that supplies my water has made it abundantly clear that
18 my interests as a landowner with water rights are not of their concern. The local water districts
19 also have a conflict of interest, do not represent the interests of landowner/rights holders and
20 should be disqualified from participation and decision making concerning regional water
21 management.

22 **An Independent Water Expert Should Be Involved in Any Solution.**

23 This Court should have the benefit of an expert concerning regional riparian and
24 groundwater supply and demand. The Court should not rely upon any expert tendered by the City
25 (fox guarding the hen house) or any other litigant. The Court should devise a method for selecting
26 a water expert to assist the Court with understanding complicated science based issues. The
27 selection of the expert should be based upon scientific qualifications, knowledge and experience
28 concerning water resources and water use in the region (including historical resources and usage).

1 The selected expert should have a reputation for fairness and broad concern for all competing
2 interests in the region. The expense of the expert should be paid entirely by the City (the City's
3 cross-complaint has created the need for the Court to have the benefit of independent technical
4 and scientific advice).

5 Of course, the City and any other litigant or interested party can present the testimony of
6 a retained expert whenever the need arises. The circumstances are akin to medical malpractice
7 litigation where the standard of care is not something a judge or jury is expected to know. The
8 Court is being asked to assess and formulate equitable rulings concerning a complex regional
9 water basin, and fair and impartial expert assistance to the Court is warranted by what the City
10 has placed in issue. The situation is different than the typical adversarial litigated case with the
11 experts being supplied by the litigants. The Court must take into consideration broader regional
12 interests not just the interests of the parties to the litigation.

13 **The Court Should Develop A Special Procedure For Extracting Landowners**
14 **Erroneously Joined As Cross Defendants.**

15 One of my clients owns property that is not within the Ojai/Ventura River water basin.
16 The client has riparian and groundwater rights, but it is undisputable that the riparian and hence
17 the ground water eventually flows, through Santa Paula and to the Santa Clara River. There
18 should be a mechanism to summarily extract my client from the litigation. Perhaps a
19 questionnaire? Perhaps the Court's independent expert (prior paragraph) can assess landowners
20 who contest that they have any association with the Ventura River or greater Ojai Groundwater
21 basin.

22 **Every Landowner Cross-Defendant Must be Afforded The Right to Discovery**
23 **and a Right to Trial before the Court Endorses a Solution.**

24 The proposed solution purposefully places the cart before the horse. It seeks adjudication
25 of matters that will or may have long term impacts for the region and the landowner cross-
26 defendants.

27 ///

28 ///

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

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Andrew K. Whitman

ANDREW K. WHITMAN, in pro per, and
attorney for HEIDI A. WHITMAN, NANCY L.
WHITMAN, JOHN R. AND NANCY L.
WHITMAN TRUST