



1 **MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP**

2 2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 200  
3 Westlake Village, California 91361  
4 Telephone (805) 418-3100  
5 Facsimile (805) 418-3101

6 Gregory J. Patterson (State Bar No. 136665)  
7 *g.patterson@musickpeeler.com*

8 Attorneys for The Thacher School; Friend's Ranches, Inc.; Topa Ranch & Nursery, LLC;  
9 Finch Farms, LLC; Red Mountain Land & Farming, LLC; Thacher Creek Citrus, LLC; The Finch  
10 Family Trust; James P. Finch; Robert Calder Davis, Jr.; Robert Calder Davis, Jr., TTEE of Trust  
11 Owned Properties; Sharon H. Booth, Trustee of The Survivor's Trust Created Under Declaration  
12 of Trust of Richard G. Booth and Sharon H. Booth Dated July 10, 1980; David Robert Hamm; Ojai  
13 Oil Company; Ojai Valley School; Reeves Orchard, LLC and Ojai Valley Inn (Collectively, the  
14 East Ojai Group.)

15 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
16 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, COMPLEX CIVIL DIVISION**

17 **SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, a**  
18 **California non-profit organization**

19 **Petitioner,**

20 **vs.**

21 **STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL**  
22 **BOARD, a California State Agency; CITY OF**  
23 **SAN BUENAVENTURA, a California**  
24 **municipal corporation,**

25 **Respondents.**

**CASE No. 19STCP01176**

**Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger**

**EAST OJAI GROUP'S COMMENTS TO  
PROPOSED DRAFT PHYSICAL  
SOLUTION**

**Date July 19, 2021  
Time: 3:00 p.m.  
Dept. SS10**

**Action Filed: September 19, 2014  
Trial Date (Phase One): February 14, 2022**

26 **AND RELATED CROSS-COMPLAINT**

27 The East Ojai Group, collectively provides the following comments and objections to the  
28 City's proposed draft Physical Solution as requested by the Court.

As a general comment, the proposed "Physical Solution" is not really a Physical Solution  
intended to manage the four groundwater basins and the surface water flow of the Ventura River  
to sustain the basins or the river. By the City's own admission, the core goal is to move the  
condition of the Southern California Steelhead in the watershed from Baseline Conditions to Good

1 Condition as both terms are defined. (See Draft Physical Solution at page 43, Section 7.3, lines  
2 15-18.) It is, essentially, an effort by the City to require all water users within the entire basin to  
3 fund the effort to restore the fishery in response to plaintiff, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper's  
4 lawsuit and the City's settlement with Channelkeeper. Fundamental to any participation in the  
5 lawsuit is the determination of whether any groundwater pumping or other water use actually  
6 impairs the flow of the river and fishery habitat. If a party's water use does not impact or affect  
7 flow or habitat necessary to sustain or improve the fishery, then it should not be a party to this  
8 Physical Solution or be required to fund the restoration of the fishery habitat.

9 As a second general comment, the Ventura River watershed is already governed by  
10 multiple federal, state and local agencies, and the City seeks to add yet another layer of public  
11 agency oversight for the sole purpose of complying with its settlement agreement with  
12 Channelkeeper and funding that effort. As shown below, this new agency is duplicative of the  
13 various agencies already involved in the management of the watershed and these agencies already  
14 have, in many cases, overlapping jurisdiction involving the management of both surface water and  
15 groundwater uses within the watershed. Adding yet another agency may complicate an already  
16 complicated regulatory system.

17 The multiple agencies already involved in management of the watershed include: 1.) the  
18 National Marine Fisheries Service charged with stewardship of national marine resources,  
19 conservation and management of marine resources, the promotion of sustainability, and lost  
20 economic potential associate with overfishing, declining species and impaired habitats, including  
21 the steelhead population at issue here; 2) the State Water Resources Control Board, a defendant in  
22 the Channelkeeper litigation and a party in this lawsuit, whose mission is to preserve, restore and  
23 enhance the quality of California's water resources and drinking water for the protection of the  
24 environment, public health and beneficial uses, and to ensure proper water resources allocation  
25 and efficient use for the benefit of present and future generations; 3) The State Department of Fish  
26 and Wildlife, a party to this lawsuit, whose mission is to manage California's diverse fish, wildlife  
27 and plant resources, the habitats upon which they depend, and for their ecological values, for their  
28 use and enjoyment by the public; 3) The Ojai Basin Groundwater Management Agency, charged

1 with developing a groundwater management plan for its basin to provide sustainability within that  
2 basin; 4) the Upper Ventura River Groundwater Management Agency, also a groundwater  
3 management agency charged with developing a groundwater management plan for the upper  
4 basin; and 5) the Ventura County Watershed Protection District; whose mission is to protect life,  
5 property, water courses, watersheds, and public infrastructure. These various agencies have some  
6 overlapping jurisdictions and sometimes contradictory regulatory objectives. The addition of yet  
7 another public agency created at an unknown cost with unknown future requirements is of great  
8 concern. While the protection of the environment and fishery within the watershed are laudable  
9 goals, and the Physical Solution states that the parties involved in implementing a physical  
10 solution will work with the various agencies, one wonders whether an additional public agency is  
11 required and if so, who should fund it.

12 A few specific comments regarding the draft Physical Solution.

13 In Section 7.7.2 of the draft Physical Solution, the City proposes an Annual Assessment  
14 based on the a pro rata amount equal to each Producer's percentage share of the total Watershed  
15 production in five-year increments. This proposed assessment assumes that each producing party  
16 equally impacts the flow and fishery habitat, and fails to weigh the actual impact to the fishery.  
17 Any assessment must weight the impact to the fishery and assess accordingly. For example, the  
18 City takes surface water from the River creating an immediate impact on flow. An agricultural  
19 user pumping water from a well deep within one of the basins may have a very minimal impact of  
20 surface flow and fish habitat, if any at all. Assuming the Court finds that all or most groundwater  
21 pumpers must be part of this solution, then the assessment should reflect this minimal impact as  
22 opposed to those, like the City, who have a direct and immediate impact on flow and habitat.

23 Section 7.6 "Uncontrollable Conditions" lists water for human consumption, but does not  
24 directly address agricultural interests. This section must include conditions that affect agricultural  
25 interests (drought, access to water and priority over flow, etc.). Landowners and agricultural  
26 interests are concerned that they will not be able to access water during drought conditions and  
27 available water would be diverted to municipal water use using this section.


28 Section 7.7 "Management Committee," 7.7.3.4 "Voting Requirements"

1 The East Ojai Group has concerns regarding the governance as expensive and overlapping  
2 with other agencies. It is entirely possible that members of the management committee could be  
3 on multiple agencies creating conflict of interests and multiple voting rights because a member  
4 may represent more than one committee member. This section needs to be clarified to avoid  
5 conflicts and protect each parties interests.

6  
7 DATED: July 15, 2021

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP

8  
9 By:

  
10 Gregory J. Patterson  
11 Attorneys for The Thacher School; Friend's  
12 Ranches, Inc.; Topa Ranch & Nursery, LLC;  
13 Finch Farms, LLC; Red Mountain Land &  
14 Farming, LLC; Thacher Creek Citrus, LLC; The  
15 Finch Family Trust; James P. Finch; Robert Calder  
16 Davis, Jr.; Robert Calder Davis, Jr., TTEE of Trust  
17 Owned Properties; Sharon H. Booth, Trustee of  
18 The Survivor's Trust Created Under Declaration  
19 of Trust of Richard G. Booth and Sharon H. Booth  
20 Dated July 10, 1980; David Robert Hamm; Ojai  
21 Oil Company; Ojai Valley School; Reeves  
22 Orchard, LLC and Ojai Valley Inn (Collectively,  
23 the East Ojai Group.)  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28