1 2	SHAWN D. HAGERTY, Bar No. 182435 shawn.hagerty@bbklaw.com BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP	EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103
	655 West Broadway, 15th Floor	
3	San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 525-1300	
4	Facsimile: (619) 233-6118	
5	CHRISTOPHER MARK PISANO, Bar No. 1928 christopher.pisano@bbklaw.com	331
6	SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY, Bar No. 2772 sarah.foley@bbklaw.com	223
7	PATRICK D. SKAHAN, Bar No. 286140 patrick.skahan@bbklaw.com	
8	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor	
9	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 617-8100	
10	Facsimile: (619) 617-7480	
11	Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainan CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA	t
12	CITT OF SAN BOENAVENTORA	
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
14	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
15	SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER, a	Case No. 19STCP01176
16	California non-profit corporation,	
17	Petitioner,	Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger
18	v.	RESPONDENT AND CROSS- COMPLAINANT CITY OF SAN
19	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL	BUENAVENTURA'S SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR COURT-
20	BOARD, etc., et al.,	APPOINTED SCIENTIFIC EXPERT
21	Respondents.	Date: July 19, 2021 Time: 3:00 p.m.
22		Dept: SS10
23	CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, etc.,	Action Filed: Sept. 19, 2014 Trial Date: Feb. 14, 2022
24	Cross-Complainant,	,
25	V.	
26	DUNCAN ABBOTT, an individual, et al.,	
27	Cross-Defendants.	
28		
	82470.00018\34184573.2	
	-1-	

SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR COURT-APPOINTED SCIENTIFIC EXPERT

At the July 6, 2021 further status conference, the Court granted Respondent and Cross-Complainant the City of San Buenaventura ("City") leave to file this supplemental opposition to respond to arguments raised by Cross-Defendants Rosanna Garrison and Gregg Garrison in their July 6, 2021 filing supporting a Court-appointed scientific advisor.

On June 1, 2021, the City filed its opposition to Cross-Defendant Claude R. Baggerly's motion requesting the Court to appoint a scientific advisor for hydrogeology (the "Opposition"). As explained further in its previously filed Opposition, while the Court has discretion to appoint a scientific advisor under certain factual circumstances, there is no need to appoint one at this time. A court-appointed expert would be duplicative, unnecessary, and contrary to judicial economy because the Court will be provided with the comprehensive technical opinions it needs to fully understand the issues without appointing an independent advisor. The City anticipates that multiple parties, including the State, other public agencies, and private parties, will present significant professional expert testimony on hydrogeology. The Court will also receive as evidence neutral reports and studies that were prepared outside of the context of this litigation. There is no need to appoint an additional expert witness, particularly here as current experts have studied the Ventura River Watershed for decades.

The City emphasizes that, consistent with the authorities cited in the Opposition, the Court may only appoint a scientific advisor when it determines there is a gap in the expert testimony that needs to be filled. (Opp., at p. 3:10-25.) Further, the appointed expert must be neutral because "experts appointed under [Evidence Code] section 730 are necessary only when the court sees the need for an assessment by a disinterested and impartial expert who is not advocating on behalf of a party to the action." (*In re Eric A.* (1999) 73 Cal.App.4th 1390, 1394, fn. 4, citing *Mercury Casualty Co. v. Superior Court* (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1032-33; see also *People v. Stuckey* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 898, 917.)

In contrast here, Cross-Defendants Garrisons and Baggerly are seeking the appointment of an advisor to "represent" them or at least to "counter" the perceived bias from the City. What 82470.00018/34184573.2

Cross-Defendants Garrisons and Baggerly want is not a neutral expert but someone who will argue against the City's position. This is not a legal basis for the Court to appoint an expert, particularly because the Court does not yet know the range of opinions that will be expressed by the different experts representing a range of parties.

Notwithstanding Cross-Defendants Garrisons' objections, and the inappropriate, accusatory language in Cross-Defendant Baggerly's originally filed reply regarding the City's expert, Cross-Defendants cannot make a showing at this stage that the Court requires an independent expert rather than the use of expert witnesses called by the parties in order to make findings. The Court should deny the motion for a court-appointed scientific expert because Cross-Defendants have made an improper and unsupported request for the appointment of an expert to represent their own interests – at the expense of the other parties to the litigation – but have failed to demonstrate any need at this time for the Court to appoint a neutral expert witness.

Dated: July 8, 2021 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

By:

SHAWN D. HAGERTY CHRISTOPHER MARK PISANO SARAH CHRISTOPHER FOLEY PATRICK D. SKAHAN

Attorneys for Respondent and Cross-Complainant

CITÝ OF SAN BUENAVENTURA

82470.00018\34184573.2