SHAWN D. HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435

shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com

1

2

66774668 Jul 16 2021 02:08PM EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES P TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION

Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger RESPONDENT AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DISCOVERY

July 19, 2021 3:00 p.m.

Action Filed: Sept. 19, 2014 Feb. 14, 2022

- 1 -

# BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 300 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, 25TH FLOOR T OR ANGELES CALIDDONIA, 00071

#### REPLY BRIEF REGARDING DISCOVERY SCHEDULE

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The City of San Buenaventura ("City") respectfully requests that the Court order a simultaneous expert disclosure for all parties that have retained experts to analyze the Phase 1 trial issues, and that the disclosure occur on September 24, 2021. The City can be prepared to exchange in late August should the Court deem that a more appropriate date for a simultaneous exchange, however, the other parties who have retained experts to analyze the Phase 1 issues are requesting September 24<sup>th</sup>. The City does not object to that date.

The City received responsive briefs on the timing of experts disclosures from the following parties: (i) State Water Resources Control Board and California Department of Fish and Wildlife ("State Agencies"), (ii) City of Ojai, (iii) the collection of Cross-Defendants known as the East Ojai Group, (iv) Jeffrey Bacon, as trustee of the Villa Nero Trust, and (v) Robert Martin (collectively "Responding Parties"). While each Responding Party discusses its/his own unique positions in this action, there are two common themes that form the crux of the issue: (1) they argue that the Court has discretion to force the City to unilaterally disclose its expert witness information under Code of Civil Procedure Section 843, and (2) they argue that the City should be forced to disclose first because the City has been in this case for a long time, and the City, unlike these other parties, can be ready at an earlier date. These arguments fail for two reasons.

First, while the Court has discretion on some aspects of the expert exchange, by statute it does not have discretion to deviate from the requirement of a "simultaneous" exchange. The Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute does not conflict with the Civil Discovery Act's requirement for a simultaneous exchange, and as such the exchange must be simultaneous. (See Code Civ. Proc. § 830, subd. (c) ["[t]he other provisions of the 'code' [i.e. the Code of Civil Procedure] apply to procedures in a comprehensive adjudication to the extent they do not conflict with the provisions of this chapter."].) The Responding Parties are quick to point to Code of Civil Procedure Section 843 subdivision (d), which gives courts the ability to order the "times" and "sequence" of expert disclosures, and they argue that this alone gives the Court discretion to

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

make one side disclose first, even though the Civil Discovery Act requires a simultaneous exchange. (See e.g., East Ojai Group Br., pp. 2-3.) Section 843 subdivision (d) does not conflict with or supersede the requirements of the Civil Discovery Act; it does not allow for anything other than simultaneous exchanges. Section 843, subdivisions (a) and (b) requires parties to disclose not only the identities of their experts, but also to exchange written reports, modeled after Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This requirement for a report expands upon the Civil Discovery Act, which requires only an attorney declaration, and so while Section 843 subdivision (d) may discuss the court's ability to "time" and "sequence" the simultaneous disclosures by the parties, that refers to the court's ability set different dates and sequencing for what is required to be disclosed, i.e. the exchange of expert identities and expert reports. The Legislature could have easily (and unambiguously) stated that courts have discretion to deviate from the well-settled statutory requirement for a simultaneous exchange when it drafted the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute. It did not do so, nor did it expressly exempt the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute from Chapter 18 of the Civil Discovery Act. The only way to harmonize the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute and the Civil Discovery Act is that the different aspects of what is required to be disclosed in a groundwater adjudication can be sequenced, but each party must disclose simultaneously.

Second, even if (which is not the case here) the Court were to have discretion to set something other than a simultaneous exchange, Responding Parties (or any other party seeking a deviation) would have to make a showing of good cause, and they have not done so. The State Agencies and East Ojai Group indicate that they have experts analyzing the Phase 1 issues, but that their experts will not be ready until September 24<sup>th</sup>. The City accepts this date for a simultaneous exchange. That these parties cannot be ready earlier is not a reason to penalize the City. Mr. Martin and Mr. Bacon on the other hand argue that they are relatively small and new to this case, and so they should have access to the City's experts' work before they have to disclose. The City is not necessarily opposed to this proposal; in fact, it already proposed that smaller users who do not yet have experts be given an extra seven weeks to hire experts and submit disclosures.

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

These parties argue that they need even more time than what the City has proposed, but they really do not explain why, and they offer no evidence showing good cause.

On the issue of good cause, the City of Ojai offers nothing; it does not indicate whether or not it has an expert, nor does it offer any legitimate reason as to why the City should be forced to unilaterally disclosure. The City of Ojai (as well as the East Ojai Group) argues that forcing the City to disclose first will "narrow the issues" for trial. But the issues are already narrow; the trial has been bifurcated and Phase 1 is limited to two discrete issues: (1) whether the Ventura River and its tributaries and groundwater basins within the Ventura River Watershed are interconnected, and (2) what are the boundaries of the basins and the Watershed. These are expert-driven issues. The City will offer at the Phase 1 trial credible expert testimony showing that the basins and surface waters of the Ventura River and its tributaries are interconnected, which will be supported by decades' worth of uncontroverted scientific analyses of the interconnectedness of the Watershed. If the City of Ojai (or the East Ojai Group or any other Cross-Defendant) has evidence showing that last 50 years' of scientific analyses of this Watershed are wrong, and that the Ojai groundwater basins are somehow hydrologically disconnected, then it is all the more imperative that there be a simultaneous exchange of expert information, and that all parties see this contradictory evidence as soon as possible, i.e., in a simultaneous exchange. The Responding Parties do not make a showing of good cause, and so even if the Court has discretion to deviate from the statutorily-mandated "simultaneous exchange," which it does not, it should not do so.

#### THE COURT IS REQUIRED BY STATUTE TO SET A SIMULTANEOUS II. EXPERT EXCHANGE DATE

Chapter 18 of the Civil Discovery Act, entitled "Simultaneous Exchange of Expert Witness Information" applies to the disclosure of expert witnesses in all civil actions, except for eminent domain proceedings. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.010.) The Legislature knew of this law when it wrote the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute in 2015, but it did not amend the City Discovery Act to exclude groundwater adjudications along with eminent domain cases. In fact, it did the opposite; expressly integrating the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication process into the general provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure, including the Civil Discovery

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

Act. (Code Civ. Proc. § 830, subd. (c).) This shows a legislative intent to apply Chapter 18 to groundwater adjudications tried under the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute. (See Mosser Companies v. San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Bd. (2015) 233 Cal.App.4th 505, 514.) The Civil Discovery Act is the starting point, and it provides for a simultaneous exchange. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.260; see Fairfax v. Lords (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 1019, 1027.)

Responding Parties do not refute the Civil Discovery Act's requirement for simultaneous exchanges. Rather they argue that the Civil Discovery Act does not apply to this case because the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute has its own expert exchange procedure, set forth in Code of Civil Procedure Section 843. Responding Parties argue that Section 843 is a more specific and later enacted statute, and there is no simultaneous exchange requirement under Section 843 because a court can exercise discretion and order its own timing and sequencing of the disclosures. (Code Civ. Proc. § 843, subd. (d) ["Unless otherwise stipulated by the parties, a party shall make the disclosures of any expert witness it intends to present at trial ... at the times and in the sequence ordered by the court."].) Responding Parties' reliance on Section 843 to support their novel argument is misplaced for two reasons.

First, the plain language of Section 843 requires a simultaneous exchange and certainly does not say that the disclosure of expert witness information can be unilateral, i.e., not simultaneous, nor does it give the court discretion to decide that one party must disclose its expert information first. Section 843 subdivision (d) gives the court discretion to order different "times" and "sequences" for the expert disclosures, but that does not (and cannot) apply to when parties must disclose vis-à-vis each other. It is important to note here that Section 843 subdivisions (a) and (b) set forth different requirements from the Civil Discovery Act for the substance of what must be disclosed, i.e., the identity of the expert witness, and a written report from the expert, which must contain (i) a complete statement of the opinions, (ii) the facts and data the expert considered, (iii) the expert's exhibits, (iv) his/her qualifications, (v) a list of all cases in which the expert witness previously testified, and (vi) a statement of the expert's compensation. (Code Civ.

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

Proc. § 843, subds. (a)-(b).) The requirement for a written report is not in Chapter 18 of the Civil Discovery Act, which requires only a declaration stating general topics of expert information. (Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.260.) Thus Section 843 requires greater disclosure than does the Civil Discovery Act, but it does not change the requirement that disclosure be simultaneous. This is important for harmonizing the law.

As is noted in the City of Ojai's brief, courts do not construe statutes in isolation, and they must attempt to harmonize the law when possible. (*People v. Pieters* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 894, 899.) (City of Ojai's Br. p. 1:22-23.) The City agrees, and Section 843 must be harmonized with the Civil Discovery Act's requirement for a simultaneous exchange. It makes sense that in using the words "timing" and "sequence" in Section 843 subdivision (d), the Legislature was referring to when the different items of information that are required to be disclosed under Section 843 subdivisions (a) and (b) will be disclosed, for example giving the court discretion to order the parties to disclose the identities of their respective experts first, and then later to disclose their expert reports. This interpretation makes sense because, as Mr. Martin has observed, "there is a finite number of available experts" in this field (Martin Br. p. 2:10), and in some cases parties need to know which experts have retained as early as possible. Of course, in this case the City and other parties proposing the Physical Solution have made their experts available to meet and confer with all parties since last September, so Mr. Martin and the other parties already know the identities of the City's and other proposing parties' experts. Nevertheless, the Civil Discovery Act's requirement for a simultaneous exchange must be harmonized with Section 843 subdivision (d) by interpreting the court's discretion for "timing" and "sequencing" to refer to the different information that must be disclosed, rather than whether some parties must disclose before others. The requirement of simultaneous exchanges in the Civil Discovery Act is consistent with and does not conflict with Section 843, and disclosures must therefore be simultaneous.

Second, as the City explained in its opening brief, there are more causes of action in the City's third amended cross-complaint than just an adjudication under the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute, and Section 843 does not apply to the other causes of action.

The State Agencies were the only parties to address this issue, and they argue that as long as the City seeks an adjudication under Section 830 *et seq.*, Section 843 necessarily applies. (State Agency Br., p. 3.) But the converse is also true; as long as there are causes of action that are not based on the Comprehensive Groundwater Adjudication statute, the Civil Discovery Act necessarily applies, and this statute demands a simultaneous exchange. If the Court is required to set a simultaneous exchange based on the other causes of action, then that is what the Court must do. Even if Section 843 did in fact allow the Court to deviate from the simultaneous exchange requirement (which it does not), the Court could not do so in this case because there are other causes of action at play for which Section 843 has no applicability. It should be noted here that the Court has bifurcated this case by *issues*, and not *causes of action*. A portion of every cause of action will be tried in Phase 1, and as such, the expert exchange must be simultaneous.

## III. EVEN IF THE COURT WERE TO HAVE DISCRETION TO ORDER (WHICH IT DOES NOT) THE CITY TO DISCLOSE BEFORE OTHERS, IT SHOULD NOT DO SO BECAUSE RESPONDING PARTIES MADE NO SHOWING OF GOOD CAUSE

Code of Civil Procedure Section 843 is consistent with the Civil Discovery Act in requiring simultaneous expert exchanges of both initial and supplemental experts at specific times prior to the trial. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 843, subd. (d), 2034.220, 2034.230.) As discussed above, these statutes must be harmonized to require simultaneous exchanges. However, even if Section 843 subdivision (d) did give courts discretion to deviate from the statutorily-mandated simultaneous exchange, it cannot be disputed that the default position under the statute is for a simultaneous exchange. If a party wants a court to deviate from the statute's default position, it must make a showing of good cause. (*See* Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.250, subd. (b) ["The court, for good cause shown, may make any order that justice requires...."].)

None of the Responding Parties has shown good cause to deviate from a simultaneous exchange. The City notes at the outset that not a single Responding Party included a good cause declaration with its/his brief. Without any evidence, these parties have not shown good cause. But regardless of the lack of any evidentiary showing, the arguments alone do not come close to showing good cause. For example, the State Agencies' only reason for requesting that the City

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

unilaterally disclose first is that their experts apparently will not be ready prior to late September. (State Agencies Br., pp. 3-4.) Why should the City be penalized (and prejudiced) simply because its experts will ready to exchange in August and the State Agencies' experts will apparently not be ready by then? The State Agencies' position makes no sense, and certainly does not rise to good cause.

The East Ojai Group and City of Ojai attempt to show good cause by arguing that this is a complex case, and that the parties being able to see the City's expert disclosure in advance will help "narrow the issues." (City of Ojai Br., p. 3; East Ojai Br., pp. 2-3.) This argument is a red herring. The East Ojai Group, either intentionally or mistakenly, misstates what the Phase 1 trial is about. It asserts that the issue to be tried is "Do groundwater pumpers affect surface water flow that is harmful to the fishery and therefore should be subject to the physical solution, and if so, to what degree." (East Ojai Group Br., p. 2:23-25.) That is not the issue that this Court bifurcated for trial in Phase 1. Rather, Phase 1 will address the threshold issues of whether the groundwater basins are interconnected with the Ventura River surface waters, and what are the basin and Watershed boundaries. The specific degree to which the East Ojai Group's individual pumping of groundwater affects the surface flow, and whether it is harmful to the fishery to the point where it should be a part of the Physical Solution, is not at issue in Phase 1, and by law it cannot be the issue. It is now settled that individual water rights holders cannot bar the adoption of proposed physical solutions by asserting their groundwater pumping has a limited impact on the water resource at issue because there is "no authority that a court lacks evidentiary support for a Physical Solution merely because any one party regulated thereunder can argue that exempting its pumping from its terms would only minimally diminish the effectiveness of the Physical Solution." (Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases (2020) 59 Cal.App.5th 241, 266-67.) The Court of Appeal went on to state: "Indeed, we believe this argument (if credited) would eviscerate the ability of a court to adopt any basin-wide physical solution: if any single water rights holder could bar adoption of a proposed physical solution unless it was exempted from it by asserting its specific unconstrained pumping would have limited impact on the effectiveness of its remaining

The East Ojai Group ignores the Court's bifurcation order, and its argument unravels from there. It and the City of Ojai claim that the issues are complex, and that the City disclosing first will help focus its expert and narrow the issues. Yet the issues to be tried in Phase 1, while technical and expert-driven, are not overly complex. The East Ojai Group acknowledges that it has retained an expert, and it admits that it can meet a September 24, 2021 exchange date. (East Ojai Group Br., pp. 3-4.) This is the same date the City is proposing, and so there is no good cause to deviate from a simultaneous exchange. The East Ojai Group all but admits that it wants to see the City's disclosure first so that it can look for potential challenges before it discloses its own expert's report, and while the City of Ojai does not state whether it has an expert in its brief, it suggests a similar motive. This is improper, and it exactly what the Legislature sought to guard against in imposing a simultaneous exchange. (*Fairfax*, *supra*, 138 Cal.App.4th at 1027.)

The bottom line here is that the East Ojai Group's expert (and maybe the City of Ojai's expert) will either say that the groundwater basins are interconnected with the surface waters of the Ventura River Watershed, or that these basins are not interconnected. If it is the latter, then this opinion will contradict 50 years' worth of study on the hydrology of this Watershed, and the City and all parties are entitled to see this opinion as soon as possible, and certainly no later than the City's own disclosure. The City has just as much interest in seeing any contrary expert reports, and the disclosures should be simultaneous.

Finally, Mr. Bacon and Mr. Martin argue that they are prejudiced because they do not currently have experts looking at these issues, and thus they ask that the City be ordered to disclose its experts before they are required to disclose. (Martin Br., p. 2; Bacon Br., p. 2.) As the City has stated many times now, it is not opposed to "small user," later-appearing parties like Mr. Bacon and Mr. Martin having additional time to determine whether they need an expert, and having the benefit of reviewing the other parties' disclosures before making that decision. The

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

City's proposed schedule calls for initial expert disclosures by larger users who currently have experts looking at the Phase 1 issues to disclose on September 24, 2021, and that smaller users who do not presently have experts can then disclose on November 12, 2021, or seven weeks later. Mr. Bacon and Mr. Martin argue that they should be allowed to disclose at least twelve weeks after the City (Martin Br., p. 3; Bacon Br., p. 5.), but neither offers an explanation, let alone any evidence, as to why twelve weeks is sufficient, but seven weeks is not. They have not shown good cause.

Also, the City notes here that it has no objection to the Court moving up the simultaneous disclosure by four weeks to late August. This would give Mr. Bacon and Mr. Martin almost all the time they have sought. Of course, the State Agencies, the East Ojai Group, and possibly the City of Ojai, would object to that schedule, thus the real dispute is finally exposed. The real dispute here is not between the City and any party, rather it is between the State Agencies, East Ojai Group, and possibly the City of Ojai on the one hand, and Mr. Bacon and Mr. Martin on the other hand. Mr. Bacon and Mr. Martin want about twelve weeks with other parties' experts' reports, but the State Agencies, East Ojai Group and possibly the City of Ojai, cannot be ready that fast. So rather than try to work out mutually agreeable dates, these parties seemingly have "teamed up" on a strategy to try to force the City to disclose before everyone else. While this would probably solve all of their individual problems, it is more gamesmanship than good cause. There is no basis to force the City to unilaterally disclose first, and doing would be completely unfair and prejudicial to the City.

#### IV. **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated, the City requests that the Court set a discovery schedule that provides for a simultaneous exchange of expert witness information, and that it set the initial expert witness disclosure date of September 24, 2021, or an earlier date between late August and September 24<sup>th</sup>, as the Court may deem appropriate.

27

28

1	Dated: July 16, 2021	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
2		Christol Pri
3	I	Dy:
4		SHAWN D. HAGERTY CHRISTOPHER M. PISANO
5		SARAH C. FOLEY PATRICK D. SKAHAN
6		Attorneys for Respondent and Cross- Complainant CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA
7		CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA
8	82470.00018\34206771.2	
9	82470.00018/34200771.2	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	-	11 -
Į.	II	

#### 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 & Krieger LLP, 2001 N. Main Street, Suite 390, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. On July 16, 2021, I served the following document(s):

### RESPONDENT AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DISCOVERY SCHEDULE

- 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
damer c sycamore.raw	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	Eric M. Katz
Deputy Attorney General	Supervising Deputy Attorney General
Attorney General's Office	Noah Golden – Krasner
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor	Deputy Attorney General
P.O. Box 70550	Carol Boyd
Oakland, CA 94612-0550	Deputy Attorney General
Tel: 510-879-0750	300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Marc.melnick@doj.ca.gov	Los Angeles, CA 90013
	Tel. (213) 269-6343
Attorneys for Respondent and Defendant State	Fax (213) 897-2802
Water Resources Control Board	Fric Katz@doi ca gov

Water Resources Control Board Eric.Katz@doj.ca.gov Noah.goldenrasner@doj.ca.gov Carol.boyd@doj.ca.gov

82470.00018\32240721.4

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP	ATTORNEYS AT LAW	655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

1	
2	
3	Edward J. Casey
4	Gina Angiolollo Alston & Bird LLP
5	333 South Hope Street, 16th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: 213.576.1000
6	ed.casey@alston.com
7	gina.angiolillo@alston.com
8	Attorneys for Cross-Defendants AGR Breeding, Inc.; Bentley Family Limited Partnership; and Southern California Edison
9	Company
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor California Department of Fish & Wildlife

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 Troy Becker and Jeri Becker; Janet Boulton; Michael Boulton; Michael Caldwell; Joseph Peter Clark, successor in interest to the Joseph Clark and Linda Epstein Family Trust; Linda Louise Epstein, successor in interest to the Joseph Clark and Linda Epstein Family Trust; Michael I. Cromer and Jody D. Cromer; Michel A. Etchart, Trustee of the Michel A. Etchart Separate Property Trust, and Mark W. Etchart, Trustee of the Mark W. Etchart Sepertate Property Trust; Lawrence Hartmann; Ole Konig; Krotona Institute of Theosophy; Stephen Michtell and Kathleen Reid Mitchell, Trustees of the Stephen Mitchell and Byron Katie Trust; North Fork Springs Mutual Water Company; Stephen Robert Smith, Trustee of the Charles R. Rudd and Lola L. Rudd Trust, dated May 20, 2976; Shlomo Raz; Sylvia Raz; Senior Canyon Mutual Water Company; Siete Robles Mutual Water Company; Soule Park Golf Course, Ltd.; Telos, LLC; Victor C. Timar, Jr. Trustee of the Timar Family Trust; 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 Hirschkron; Cheryl Jensen; Lutheran Church of the Holy Cross of Ojai, California; Janice Sattler (Mineo); Eitan Sloustcher; Rogers-Cooper Memorial Foundation; Robert Norris (not yet appeared); Patricia Norris; Old Creek Road Mutual Water Company (not yet appeared); Margaret Vanderfin; Telos Ojai, LLC (not yet appeared); Jennifer Ware; The Walker Jr. Living Trust; David Altman, Trustee of the 1190 El Toro Trust; Babtiste Foundation; Sean A. Bennett and Leslie Bennett, Trustees of the Bennett Family Trust; Dwayne A. Bower and Marilyn E. Bower Trustees of the Bower Family Trust; Mark Terry Cline and

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

28

1

Bonnie Burreson Cline, Trustees of the Mark Terry Cline and Connie Burreson Cline Revocable Trust; Robert R. Daddi and Darlene J. Daddi: Lucille A. Elrod, Trustee of the John and Lucille Elrod Family Trust; Friend's Stable & Orchard Inc. Daniel Hultgen, Trustee of the Hultgen Living Trust; Ojai Golf, LLC; Three Oaks, LLC, Erica J. Abrams, Trustee of the Erica J. Abrams Trust; Raul E. Alvarado and Hildegard M. Alvarado, Trustees of the Alvarado Family Trust; William Armstrong and April Nardini; Joseph Lynn Barthelemy and Elvira Lilly Barthelemy, Trustees of the Joseph Lynn Barthelemy and Elvira Lilly Barthelemy 2002 Family Trust; James S. Bennett and Carolyn D. Bennett, Trustees of the Bennett Family Trust; Sumeet Bhatia and Michael McDonald; John Joseph Broesamle and Katharine Sue Broesamle, Trustees of the Broesamle Family Trust; Richard Aaron Carlson, Trustee of the Richard Aaron Carlson Trust and Michelle Larson, Trustee of the Michelle Larson Family Trust; Thomas D. Carver and Cynthia L. Carver; Dana Ceniceros, Trustee of the Dana and Dawn Ceniceros Revocable Living Trust; Deborah Lys Martin Crawford; Frank Clay Creasey Jr.; Debra Joy Reed, Trustee of The Debra Joy Reed Revocable Trust Dated November 3, 1994; Frederic Devault; Diana Syvertson, Trustee of the Diana Syvertson Living Trust; Dive Deep L.L.C.; Douglas Roy Parent and Ann Marie Parent; William Erickson; Gelb Enterprises, L.P.; Jan Stephen Granade and Priscilla K. Granade. Trustees of the Granade Family Revocable Living Trust; Margot J. Griswold; Brian C. Haase and Marie Haase, Trustees of the B&M Haase Trust Dated October 8, 2019; Thomas Lann Harper and Jadona Collier-Harper; Ojai-Jackman L.L.C.; Kevin Rainwater and Marianne Ratcliff; Keith M. Nightingale and Victoria V. Nightingale, Trustees of The Nightingale Family Trust; Heide C. Kurtz, Trustee of The Kurtz Family Trust Dated January 19, 2019; Randall Leavitt, Trustee of The Randall B. Leavitt 2010 Trust; Edward C. Leicht and Jacqueline M. Leicht, Trustees of The Leicht Family 2013 Revocable Trust Dated March 1, 2013; Paul Lepiane and Bengtson Bo; Robert Levin and Lisa Solinas, Trustees of The Levin Family Living Trust; Francis Longstaff and Shauna Longstaff, Trustees of The Longstaff Trust Dated October 11, 2018; Mandy Macaluso, Trustee

82470.00018\32240721.4 - 3 -

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

of The Living Trust of Mandy Macaluso; Marilyn Wallace, Trustee of The Marilyn Wallace Separate Property Trust; Daniel J. McSweeney and Yoko McSweeney; Wendell M. Mortensen and Laura L. Mortensen, Trustees of The Mortensen Family Revocable Trust; Timothy Jerome Murch and Jody Caren Murch, Trustees of The Jodim Family 2007 Trust Dated July 31, 2007; Chris E. Platt and Hanh H. Platt; Robert Erickson, Trustee and Ronald Wilson; Michael D. Robertson and Kimberly A. Robertson, Trustees of The Robertson Family Trust; James P. Robie, Trustee of the Robie Family Trust; Petter Romming and Kimi Romming, Trustees; Marc Saleh, Trustee of The Saleh Family Trust; Konrad Stefan Sonnenfeld, Trustee of The Konrad Stefan Sonnenfeld Living Trust; Mark Sutherland, Trustee of The Sutherland Marital Trust; John H. Thacher and Caroline H. Thacher, Trustees of The Thacher Family Trust Dated January 2004; Gilbert G. Vondriska and Carolyn J. Vondriska, Trustees of The Vondriska Living Trust; William D. Rusin, Sr., Trustee of the William D. Rusin Sr. Revocable Trust: Oscar D. Acosta, Trustee of the Acosta Trust; Chris E. Platt and Hanh H. Plat; Deborah Lys Martin Crawford; Diane Syvertson, Trustee of the Diana Syvertson Living Trust; Erica J. Abrams, Trustee of the Erica J. Abrams Trust; Frank Clay Creasey Jr.; Frederic DeVault; Gilbert G. Vondriska and Carolyn J. Vondriska, Trustees of the Vondriska Living Trust; James P. Robie, Trustee of the Robie Family Trust: John H. Thacher and Caroline H. Thacher, Trustees of the Thacher Family Trust dated January 2004; Mandy Macaluso, Trustee of the Living Trust of Mandy Macaluso; Margot J. Griswold; Mark Sutherland, Trustee of the Sutherland Marital Trust: Randall Leavitt. Trustee of the Randall B. Leavitt 2010 Trust; Raul E. Alvarado and Hildegard M. Alvarado, trustees of the Alvarado Family Trust; Sumeet Bhatia and Michael McDonald; Timothy Jerome Murch and Jody Caren Murch, Trustees of the Jodim Family 2007 Trust dated July 31, 2007; Wendell M. Mortensen and Laura L. Mortensen, Trustees of the Mortensen Family Revocable Trust; Petter Romming and Kimi Romming, Trustees; William Armstrong and April Nardini; William Erickson; Rancho Sueño, LLC

- 4 -82470.00018\32240721.4

1 2	William G. Short, Esq. Law Offices of William G. Short Post Office Box 1313	Anthony Lee François Jeremy Talcott David Deerson
3	Ojai, California 93024-1313 Tel: (805) 490-6399	Pacific Legal Foundation 930 G Street
4	Fax: (805) 640-1940 billshortesq@me.com	Sacramento, CA 95814-1802 Tel: (916) 419-7111 Fax: (916) 419-7111
5	Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin Bernhoft	alf@pacificlegal.org TFrancois@pacificlegal.org
6		jtalcott@pacificlegal.org ddeerson@pacificlegal.org
7		Attorney for Cross-Defendant Robin Bernhoft
8	Robert N. Kwong Dennis O. La Rochelle	Patrick Loughman Cristian Arrieta
9	Arnold Larochelle Mathews Vanconas & Zirbel, LLP	Lowthorp, Richards, McMillan, Miller &
10	300 Esplanade Dr Ste 2100 Oxnard, CA 93036	Templeman 300 Esplande Drive, Suite 850
11	Tel: (805) 988-9886	Oxnard, CA 93036 Tel: 805.804.3848
12	rkwong@atozlaw.com	Ploughman@lrmmt.com Carrieta@lrmmt.com
13	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas Municipal Water District	Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Ernest Ford,
14		Tico Mutual Water Company, and Betty Withers and Betty Bow Withers Trust
15		
16	Gregory J. Patterson Musick, Peeler & Garrett LLP	Lindsay F. Nielson Law Office of Lindsay F. Nielson
17	2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 200 Westlake Village, CA 91361	845 E Santa Clara Street Ventura, CA 93001
18	Tel: (805) 418-3103 Fax: (805) 418-3101	Tel: 805-658-0977 nielsonlaw@aol.com
19	g.patterson@musickpeeler.com	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Meiners Oaks
20	Attorneys for Cross-Defendants Robert C. Davis, Jr.; James Finch; Topa Topa Ranch	Water District, Ventura River Water District, and Jean Marie Webster, Trustee of The
21	Company, LLC; The Thacher School; Thacher Creek Citrus, LLC; Ojai Oil	Roger E. and Jean Marie Webster Trust
22	Company; Ojai Valley School; Sharon Hamm-Booth and David Robert Hamm, Co-	
23	Trustees of The Hamm 2004 Family Trust Dated April 29, 2004; Reeves Orchard, LLC;	
24	and Ojai Valley Inn	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	I .	

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR
SANDIEGO CALIDDRAIA 97101

1	Joseph C. Chrisman	David B. Cosgrove
2	Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers, Chrisman & Gutierrez	Jeffrey M. Oderman Douglas J. Dennington
3	5450 Telegraph Road Ventura, CA 93003	Jeremy N. Jungreis Rutan & Tucker, LLP
4	(805) 644-7111 jchrisman@hathawaylawfirm.com	611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1931
		Tel: 714-641-5100
5	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Wood- Claeyssens Foundation	Fax: 714-546-9035 dcosgrove@rutan.com
6		joderman@rutan.com ddennington@rutan.com
7		jjungreis@rutan.com
8		Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Casitas Municipal Water District
9	Thomas E. Jeffry	Andrew Brady
10	Debra J. Albin-Riley Arent Fox LLP	DLA Piper LLP (US) 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2400
11	555 West Fifth Avenue, 48th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90013-1065	Los Angeles, CA 90071-2618 Tel. (213) 330-7700
12	(213) 629-7400 (213) 629-7401	Fax: (213) 330-7701 andrew.brady@us.dlapiper.com
13	Thomas.jeffry@arentfox.com	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Integritas Ojai,
14	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Community Memorial Health System	LLC
15	Jennifer T. Buckman	David R. Krause-Leemon
16	Andrew J. Ramos Holly Jacobson	BEAUDOIN & KRAUSE-LEEMON LLP
17	Bartkiewicz Kronick & Shanahan, PC	15165 Ventura Blvd., Suite 400 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
18	1011 Twenty-Second Street Sacramento, CA 95816-4907	Tel. (818) 205-2809 Fax (818) 788-8104
19	Tel. (916) 446-4254 Fax (916) 446-4018	david@bk-llaw.com
20	jtb@bkslawfirm.com hjj@bkslawfirm.com	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant RDK Land, LLC
21	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant City of Ojai	
22	Eric J. Schindler	Brian A. Osborne
23	Michelle J. Berner Kroesche Schindler LLP	Osborne Law Firm 674 County Square Drive, Suite 308
24	2603 Main Street, Suite 200 Irvine, CA 92614	Ventura, CA 93003 Tel. (805) 642-9283
25	Tel. (949) 387-0495 Fax (888) 588-0034 Fax	Fax (805) 642-7054 osbornelawyer@gmail.com
26	eschindler@kslaw.legal mberner@kslaw.legal	Attorney for Cross-Defendants Brian A.
		Osborne; Ronald W. Rood and Susan B.
27	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Oak Haven, LLC	Rood, Trustees of the Rood Family Trust
28		

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

1

Adam D. Wieder

Peter A. Goldenring

1	Julie A. Baker 2193 Maricopa Hwy	The Joseph Fedele 1995 Living Trust, Oriana Marie Fedele, Trustee
2	Ojai, CA 93023 (805) 646-8700	Attn. Oriana Fedele P.O. Box 298
3	Jandjbaker2@gmail.com	Lahaina, HI 96767
4		Tel. (818) 601-3161 orianafedele@gmail.com
5		
6	T&D Nevada Trust Dennis and Antoinette Mitchell	Michaela Boehm 12293 topa Lane
7	Mitchell Homes Inc. P.O. Box 360	Santa Paula, CA 93060 Tel. (323) 493-3737
8	Ojai, CA 93024 (805) 340-2890	micboehm@me.com
9	amitc74383@aol.com	
10	Anthonie M. Voogd 918 Palomar Road	Lawrence S. Mihalas Trustees of the Mihalas Family Trust
11	Ojai, CA93023 Tel. (805) 646-1512	419 21 <sup>st</sup> Place Santa Monica, CA 90402
12	avoogd@stanfordalumni.org	Tel. (310) 739-0700 lmihalas@gmail.com
		lmihalas@gman.com lmihalas@ucla.edu
13	Heather Blair	Martin Hartmann
14	556 So. Fair Oaks Ave., Ste 101	Whitney Hartmann
15	Box 356 Pasadena, CA 91105	430 S. Carrillo Road Ojai, CA 93023
16	Tel. (626) 755-6566	Tel. (805) 798-2253
16	Hblair1946@gmail.com	earthbuilding@gmail.com
17	Robert K. Cartin	Loa E. Bliss
18	Cartin Family LLC 505 Estremoz Ct.	Loa E. Bliss 2006 Revocable Trust 9030 Ojai Santa Paula Road
19	Oceanside, CA 92057 Tel. (760) 429-4738	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel: (617) 750-8500
	bob.cartin@dvm.com	loabliss@hotmail.com
20	Del Cielo LLC	Joyce Syme, and
21	Attn. Tim Carey, Managing Member	The Joyce A. Syme Living Trust
22	22410 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 5 Torrance, CA 90505	1760 Ocean Avenue Santa Monica, CA 90401
23	Tel. (310) 787-6569 tim@calvoterguide.com	Tel. (310) 403-1760 seaviewmotel@hotmail.com
24	Janice and Jesse Hillestad	Dale and Patricia Givner
25	9611 N. Ventura Ave. Ventura, CA 93001	12617 Koenigstein Rd. Santa Paula, CA 93060
26	Tel. (310) 614-8438 janicehillestad@icloud.com	Tel. (805) 525-9524 dalegivner@gmail.com
27	jessehillestad@gmail.com	
28		
20		

- 10 -

PROOF OF SERVICE

82470.00018\32240721.4

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

- 11 -

PROOF OF SERVICE

82470.00018\32240721.4

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

1 2 3 4	Christine Steiner 2560 Ladera Road Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (31) 600-3220 csteiner@csteinerlaw.com	William Slaughter Slaughter, Reagan & Cole, LLP 625 East Santa Clara Street, Suite 101 Ventura, CA 93001 Tel. (805) 658-7800 Fax (805) 644-2131 slaughter@srllplaw.com
5 6		Attorneys for The Boyd S. Dron and Karin Dron Joint Living Trust, and Sisar Mutual Water Company
7	Julia Taft-Whitman, President CEO	Jaide Whitman, President
8	Taft Corporation' 111 West Topa Topa Street Ojai, CA 93023	Julia Whitman, Director Conservation Endowment Fund P.O. Box 6
9	Tel. (805) 794-2837 juliawhitman@gmail.com	Oak View, CA 93022 Tel. (805) 649-2333 Tel. (805) 804-7005
11		jaide.whitman@gmail.com TaftGardensOffice@gmail.com
12	Kelley M. Rasmussen, Trustee	Angela Small Booth, Attorney
13	2420 Park Road Lake Oswego, OR 97034 Tel. (805) 798-7125	2175 Valley Meadow Drive Oak View, CA 93022 Tel. (805) 765-5413
14	kelleyras@gmail.com	angie@angiesmall.org
15	William E. Colborn, Jr. 13183 Ojai Road	Rebecca Tickell 350 Verano Drive
16	Santa Paula, CA 93060 Tel. (805) 795-1909	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (323) 559-5700
17	jake@colbornandassociates.com	rebecca@bigpictureranch.com
18	Joshua Beckman 913 Oso Road	Gregg S. Garrison and Rosanna Garrison Garrison Law Corporation
19	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (323) 404-0465	12986 MacDonald Drive Ojai, CA 93023
20	joshbfbp@gmail.com	Tel. (650) 726-1111 / Fax: (805) 669-3168 gsgarrison@garrisonlawcorp.com
21	Robert L. Smith	Susan M. Glennon
22	12777 Tree Ranch Road Ojai, CA 93023	292 Cruzero Street Ojai, CA 93023
23	Tel. (805) 558-6322 treeranch@ymail.com	Tel. (805) 646-4816 theglennonnest@aol.com
24	•	
25	Robin Schwartzburd 411 Franklin Drive Ojai, CA 93023	Melinda Hass 11947 Koenigstein Road Santa Paula, CA 93060
26	Tel. (805) 272-5877 robin.schwartzburd@gmail.com	Tel. (213) 713-4360 mlynnbooking@gmail.com
27	100m.sonwartzourd@gman.com	mymioooking e gilaii.com
28		

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP Attorneys at Law 655 West Broadway, 15th Floor San Diego, Californa 92101

1	Malinda K. Vaughn	Rebecca D. Schwermer
2	Mitchell B. Vaughn 12283 Ojai Santa Paula Road	P. O. Box 174 Santa Paula, CA 93061
3	Ojai, CA 93023-9323 Tel. (805) 890-6616	Tel. (805) 551-3494 octoberbabies2@verizon.net
4	vaughnmb@aol.com	
5	Jennifer Jordan Day and Joel Fox 909 North Rice Road Ojai, CA 93023	Brigitte Lovell, Trustee of Lovell Living Trust 295 Encino Drive Oak View, CA 93022
6	Tel. (213) 321-5253	Tel. (915) 227-9412
7	jenniferjordanday@gmail.com	loveb9@gmail.com
8	Catherine Ferro & Catherine Eileen Ferro Inter Vivos Trust 312 Montana Road	Susan C. White Steven J. White 2 Shorewood Drive
9	Ojai, CA 93023	Bellingham, WA 98225
10	Tel. (805) 326-1686 cepharoah@gmail.com	Tel. (425) 891-9249 curranwhite1@hotmail.com
11	Susan Capper 12870 Tree Ranch Road	Lindy & Karen C. Goetz 12338 Linda Flora
12	Ojai, CA 93023	Ojai, CA 93023-9721
13	Tel. (805) 794-6421 chelsue@aol.com	Tel. (805) 649-2526; (805) 794-2312 lindygoetz@roadrunner.com
14	Joyce L. Heath Joyce Heath, Trustee of the Heath Family	Thomas M. German 301 N. Drown Avenue
15	Living Trust, P.O. Box 1323	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (805) 646-2130
16	Ojai, CA 93024	kittycatgirl214@gmail.com
17	Tel. (805) 290-6231 mamaheath55@gmail.com	
18	Ronald W. Bowman	Andrew P. Byrne, Esq.
19	Trustee of the Bowman Trust dated April 8, 2011 672 W. Villanova Road	1140 Highland Avenue, Ste. 250 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 Tel. (310) 505.7170
20	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (805) 732-4014	Andy@ByrneLaw-LA.com
21	ron@l-binc.com	Attorney for Cross-Defendant Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles, a sole
22		corporation 2 de la 2007 migeres, a sore
23	Amy Hueppe 1025 Moreno Drive	Glenn Bator 338 Montana Road
24	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (310) 699-4619	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (805) 798-1802
25	amychueppe@gmail.com	denibator@aol.com
26		
27		
28		

82470.00018\32240721.4

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR

1 2 3	Salvatore Scarpato 106 Calhoun Lane Georgetown, TX 78633 Tel. (805) 797-8767 salscarpato@att.net	Robert Kyle The Robert Kyle Living Trust 715 Sunset Place Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (626) 260-5509 robertkyle61@gmail.com
4	William R. Thatcher	David Bishop
5 6	12195 Linda Flora Drive Ojai, CA 93023-9723 thelostplanetairmen@yahoo.com	Sophie Loire Tel. (805) 403-5370 frenchiephotos@yahoo.com
7	Chet Hilgers	Stephanie Gustafson
8	Mellanie Hilgers mellaniehilgers@gmail.com	Tel. (805) 646-1423 sgustafson@ovs.org
9	Kristi Schoeld	Robert Turnage
10	Neil Jorgensen Tel. (805)272-8360	9902 Sulphur Mountain Road Ojai, CA 93023
11	neilkristi@googlemail.com	Tel. (916) 837-3907 Robert.turnage@sbcglobal.net
12		Authorized Representative for Cross- Defendant Meher Mount Corporation
13	Linda J.G. MacDougall, Trustee of The Linda	Gerrold Grigsby
14	J.G. MacdDugall Living Trust  Marsha Kee Strong-Chandler	Karen Grigsby 9799 Ojai Santa Paula Road
15	Richard Holt Robinson	Ojai, CA 93023 Tel. (805) 649-1624
16	119 E. Channel Islands Blvd. Port Hueneme, CA 93041 (805) 202-6379	grigsbyranch@gmail.com
17	speakerholistic@gmail.com	
18	James A. Vickman	Nancy J. Johnson
19	Vickman & Associates 424 South Beverly Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Tel. (310) 553-8533	Berliner Cohen LLP 10 Almaden Blvd., 11 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Jose, CA 95113 Tel. (408) 286-5800
20		
21	Fax (310) 553-0557 jv@vickmanassociates.com	Fax (408) 998-5388 Nancy.Johnson@berliner.com
22	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant New	Attorneys for Cross-Defendant Union Pacific
23	Civilization, a California corporation	Railroad Company, a Delaware corporation – Roe 411
24	Claire S. Brian and Brad D. Brian, Trustees of	Via First Class Mail
25	the Brad & Claire Brian Living Trust, Roes 30 and 31	Warren W. Greene
26	1150 So Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	Bonnie M. Greene 958 E. Main Street
27	cbrian8587@gmail.com brad.brian@mto.com	Ventura, CA 93001 Tel. (805) 652-1080 Fax (805) 652-0400
28		1 us (000) 002 0700
- 1	1	

	1	Via First Class Mail
	2	Michael W. Price, Trustee of the Michael W.
	3	Price Trust, Roe 197 Leslie L. Clark, Trustee of the Leslie L. Clark
	4	Trust, Roe 51 10886 Creek Rd
	5	Ojai, CA 93023
	6	I declare 1 under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
	7	above is true and correct.
	8	Executed on July 16, 2021 at Walnut Creek, California
	9	Irene Islas
	10	
	11	
ER LLP	12	
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 655 WEST BROADWAY, 15TH FLOOR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101	13	
ST BEST ATTOR WEST BRO AN DIEGO, (	14	
BE 655	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
		82470.00018\32240721.4 - 16 -