MAR 15 2006

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

9

10

8

2

5

6

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

LAWFUL ASSESSMENTS; et al.,

SALINAS VALLEY PROPERTY OWNERS FOR

Plaintiffs.

COUNTY OF MONTEREY; BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY; MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY; DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive, and ALL PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE MATTER of the Validity of the Assessments Levied for the Salinas Valley Water Project by the Monterey County Water Resources Agency and Approved by

County of Monterey Ordinance Number 4203,

Defendants.

Case No. M66890

STIPULATED JUDGMENT AFTER BENCH TRIAL AND JUDGMENT THEREON

Plaintiffs in this validation action are: Salinas Valley Property Owners for Lawful Assessments, Ernie Best; Shirley L. Best; John Broome; Butler & Short; Corda Ranch; Cypress

Vineyards, LP; Danini Ranch; De Carli Ranch; Donald De Roza; Double Eagle Vineyards, LP;

Richard H. Gavin; Kristin L. Gavin; Highlands Vineyards, LP; Hooker Ranch; JEG Livingston

Ranches; JJ&H Violini; M&M Dairy, Inc., Tom H. McNamara; Herbert G. Meyer; Kevin

Piearcy; Pisoni Farms; Rincon Farms, Inc.; Santa Lucia, LP; Smith & Hook Vineyards; Richard

E. Stewart; Alison D. Stewart; V&V Farms; Scott Wilkinson; John S. Broome Jr., Trust; Henry

Corda; Daoro Family Trust Dated August 28, 2002; Gregory D. and Susan K. Decarli Trust;

De Dampierre Ranch; Lillian Gularte Trust; Raymond Gularte Trust; Clarice Mahlman; William

	2
	3
•	4
	5
٠	6
	7
	8
	9
	10·
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28

D. Massa Revocable Trust Dated February 7, 1994; Rocci A. Martignoni; William Panziera; Calvin Piearcy; Rancho Hooker, LLC; Tan Oak Canyon Ranch, a California general partnership; T.M.V. Lands, a California general partnership (collectively "Plaintiffs"). Defendants in this action are: County of Monterey, Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, and Monterey County Water Resources Agency ("MCWRA") (collectively "Defendants").

Plaintiffs' validation complaints having been properly noticed, served, filed and answered, this validation action challenging Defendants' assessments levied under Monterey County Ordinance No. 04203 for the Salinas Valley Water Project (hereafter "Zone 2C assessments") came on regularly for trial on August 31, 2005, in Department 15 of the Superior Court, the Honorable Michael S. Fields presiding. Andrew M. Hitchings appeared as attorney for Plaintiffs, and Steven P. Saxton appeared as attorney for Defendants.

The Court has reviewed the parties' points and authorities, reviewed the evidence and underlying administrative record, and considered the arguments of counsel. The matter having been submitted for decision, the Court issued its final statement of decision on 3000.

2006, which is incorporated by this reference in full, and is made a part of this Stipulated Judgment in its entirety.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Plaintiffs and Defendants in the abovecaptioned action, and good cause appearing therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

- Judgment shall be entered in this action in favor of Plaintiffs and against Defendants as follows:
- a. The entire Zone 2C assessment is eliminated for the Plaintiffs' lands identified with the following County Assessors Parcel Nos.:

145072004000, 223042002000,

145131009000, 145072012000, 145072013000, 145181001000, 145181002000,

145181004000, 145181005000, 145072020000, 145072021000, 145011051000,

415111003000, 145072017000, 145072018000, 223041008000, 416481008000,

416491008000, 416501001000, 223041009000, 223042004000, 223042005000,

1	
2	
-3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
. 10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

26

27

28

223042006000, 145072006000, 145072007000, 145072008000, 145072009000, 145072010000, 145072011000.

b. For the Plaintiffs' lands identified with the following County Assessors

Parcel Nos.:

269061020000, 145151004000, 269061008000, 145111004000, 145111005000, 223011058000, 223011032000, 223011022000, 269062003000, 269063002000, 269063003000, 223031005000, 269061011000, 269061018000, 269061019000, 223032010000, 223041028000, 223011017000, 223011018000, 223011019000, 223011021000, 167051005000, 167051006000, 167051007000, 167051008000, 223011003000, 223011036000, 223034010000, 223034011000, 020011002000, 020021003000, 223011057000, 223041025000, 223041037000, 223041038000, 223041039000, 223071003000, 223071006000, 223071007000, 223071008000, 223071012000, 223031004000, 145181003000, 020011001000, 020021027000, 020281073000, 020281077000, 223061015000, 223061005000, 223061006000, 020083003000, 020083004000, 223011012000, 223033003000, 020083004000, 223011012000, 223031004000, 223011012000, 223033003000, 223034008000, 223071001000, 223034009000, 145011050000, 223031015000, 223011015000, 223011016000, 223071001000, 223031006000, 223071001000, 223031006000, 223071006000, 22303300000, 223031006000, 223031006000, 223031006000, 223031006000, 22303300000, 223031006000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 22303300000, 2230330

the Zone 2C assessment is reduced to \$9.20 per acre of irrigated agriculture or other active or developed land use, to \$0.91 per acre of dry farming, grazing and vacant lot acreage, and to \$0.09 per acre of river channels and lands with frequent flooding.

c. For the Plaintiffs' lands identified with the following County Assessors

Parcel Nos.:

145151001000, 145151005000, 269031005000, 167052010000, 167042021000, 145011009000, 223061016000, 145011010000, 167042005000, 167042006000, if the lands are situated outside the 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River, the Zone 2C assessment is reduced to \$11.04 per acre of irrigated agriculture or other active or developed land use, to \$1.10 per acre of dry farming, grazing and vacant lot acreage, and to \$0.11 per acre of

river channels and lands with frequent flooding; if the lands are situated within the 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River, the Zone 2C assessment is reduced to \$13.04 per acre of irrigated agriculture, to \$1.30 per acre of dry farming, grazing and vacant lot acreage, and to \$0.13 per acre of river channels and lands with frequent flooding. Whether the lands are outside of or within the 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River will be calculated based on the location of the individual acre, not of the APN-designated parcel as a whole.

d. For the Plaintiffs' lands identified with the following County Assessors

Parcel Nos.:

269031006000, 269031007000, 269031008000, 269031009000, 167032011000, 167033001000, 137151003000, 137151004000, 167011015000, 137151006000, 137151007000, 137151008000, 137151009000, 167011013000, 167081006000, 167042004000, 167091001000, 167032010000, 167032010000, 167091002000, if the lands are situated outside the 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River, the Zone 2C assessment is reduced to \$12.35 per acre of irrigated agriculture or other active or developed land use, to \$1.23 per acre of dry farming, grazing and vacant lot acreage, and to \$0.12 per acre of river channels and lands with frequent flooding; if the lands are situated outside the 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River, the Zone 2C assessment is reduced to \$14.35 per acre of irrigated agriculture, to \$1.43 per acre of dry farming, grazing and vacant lot acreage, and to \$0.14 per acre of river channels and lands with frequent flooding. Whether the lands are outside of or within the 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River will be calculated based on the location of the individual acre, not of the APN-designated parcel as a whole.

- e. Defendants will reimburse or otherwise credit each Plaintiff for the amount of Zone 2C assessment that each Plaintiff has already paid in excess of the modified assessment amounts identified in the preceding subparagraphs a through d.
- f. To the extent any of the lands within the County Assessors Parcel Nos. listed above are designated or otherwise assigned with a new or different Assessors Parcel No., then the modified assessment amounts identified in the preceding subparagraphs a through d will continue to apply to such lands. If any of the designated County Assessors Parcels are split or merged with

other Parcels, or the shape of the Parcels otherwise changes, the modified assessment amounts will apply only to those acres designated under the County Assessors Parcel Nos. listed above as of the date of the execution of this Stipulated Judgment, or as listed and detailed as part of the procedure described in Paragraph 3 below.

- 2. With the exception of the preceding reductions in Zone 2C assessments for Plaintiffs' parcels, Monterey County Ordinance No. 04203 is validated in all other respects, including the imposition of assessments thereunder on all other lands within Zone 2C.
- 3. Plaintiffs and Defendants shall develop a mutually agreeable procedure that will be used to list and detail: (1) the total amount of acreage subject to the Zone 2C assessment within each of the Plaintiffs' above-referenced parcels; (2) the land use type(s) within each parcel and the specific acreage amounts for each land use type; and (3) the corresponding Zone 2C assessment rates and amounts charged based upon each land use type. This procedure will require Defendants to provide said information to Plaintiffs each year prior to the issuance of the County of Monterey's Property Tax Bills. This procedure will also provide for a dispute resolution process to address any disputes between Plaintiffs and Defendants regarding the acreage amounts or land use classifications for each of Plaintiffs' subject parcels.
- 4. Within 30 days of entry of this judgment, Defendants shall deposit into escrow Plaintiffs' costs of suit, attorneys' fees and expert consultant fees (collectively "Litigation Costs") in the total amount of \$265,785.93, such amount having been billed to Plaintiffs through January 31, 2006. The Litigation Costs shall be held in escrow pursuant to a separate escrow agreement to be executed by and between Plaintiffs and Defendants which shall provide for the disbursement of the Litigation Costs to Plaintiffs following the expiration of a 60-day period following entry of this Stipulated Judgment; provided, however, that in the event of the commencement by any non-party of a challenge to this Stipulated Judgment or Ordinance 04203 within such 60-day period, then the Litigation Costs shall remain in escrow until final disposition of such challenge. In the event that such challenge results in a return to the status quo ante pursuant to paragraph 5 of this Stipulated Judgment, the Litigation Costs shall be returned to Defendants. Defendants shall also pay Plaintiffs' additional reasonable attorneys' fees and legal

. 

costs incurred in this litigation after December 31, 2005, and until all of Defendants' obligations under this Stipulated Judgment are fully performed. Such additional Litigation Costs shall be placed in escrow under the same terms and conditions as set forth in this paragraph 3 above.

- 5. This Stipulated Judgment shall become final for all purposes upon its entry by the Court, and Plaintiffs and Defendants waive any right to appeal or seek review of this Stipulated Judgment by a higher court; provided, however, that if this Stipulated Judgment or Ordinance 04203 is challenged by any non-party, and any such challenge causes this Stipulated Judgment or the assessment determinations in Ordinance 04203 to be vacated or modified by the trial court, then (1) the status of this matter shall return to the status quo ante as of the point when the Court's Intended Decision had issued but no final Decision had been rendered and no Judgment entered, and (2) Plaintiffs and Defendants shall retain all rights and remedies inuring to them as of that time, including without limitation the rights to submit alternative proposed decisions and to appeal from any final judgment ultimately entered.
- 6. Plaintiffs and Defendants will cooperate in and actively support all efforts to defend against any challenges to this Stipulated Judgment by non-parties; provided, however, that Defendants, their board members, directors, officers, agents, servants, employees, successors and assigns, hereby agree to protect, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless each and all of the Plaintiffs, their heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, lessees, licensees, agents, and employees, from and against any and all costs (including without limitation sums paid for attorneys' fees, consultant fees, expert fees and any other professional fees), losses, claims, liens, demands and causes of action of every kind and character that result from any actions taken by non-parties to this Stipulated Judgment, and which arise from or relate in any way to, the validity of Ordinance 04203 or the assessment determinations imposed pursuant to this Stipulated Judgment.
- 7. All provisions contained in this Stipulated Judgment are applicable to and binding upon and inure to the benefit of not only the parties to this action, but also to their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, assigns, lessees, licensees and to the agents, employees and attorneys in fact of any such Persons.

2	make such further or supplemental orders or directions as may be necessary or appropriate for					
3	interpretation, enforcement, or implementation of this Stipulated Judgment. Should a contest arise					
4	concerning the interpretation of one or more provisions of this Stipulated Judgment, the Court					
5	shall endeavor to interpret said provision(s) consistent with the parties' original intent in agreeing					
6	to this Stipulated Judgment.					
7	9. This Stipulated Judgment may be signed by the parties in facsimile counterparts.					
8	10. The clerk shall enter this Stipulated Judgment.					
9	MAR 1 5 2006 MICHAEL S. FIELDS					
10	Dated:, 2006					
11	Hon. Michael S. Fields JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT					
12						
13						
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned hereby execute this Stipulated Judgment on					
15	the dates set forth opposite their signatures.					
16	Board of Supervisors of Monterey County					
17	Dated: March 3, 2006 By Smy					
18	Jerry Smrtin, Chairman					
19	Monterey County Water Resources Agency  Dated: March 3, 2006  By State March 3, 2006					
20	Richard Morgantini					
21	Chairman, Board of Directors					
22	Approved as to Form and Content.					
23	DOWNEY BRAND LLP					
24	March 7					
25	Dated: 2006 By Steven P. Saxton, Attorneys for Defendants					
26	County of Monterey; Board of Supervisors of Monterey County; Monterey County Water					
27	Resources Agency					
28						

Full jurisdiction, power and authority are retained by and reserved to the Court to

1			
2	Dated:	2006	
3	Dateu.		Ernie Best
		•	
4	Dated:	.2006	•
5	·	•	Shirley L. Best
6	· .	, 2006	
	Dated:		
7			John Broome
8			
· 9	Dated:	, 2006	Butler & Short
. 9			Duder & Onort
10		2006	
. 11	Dated:	, 2006	Corda Ranch
12	Dated:	2006	
13	Daiva.		Cypress Vineyards, LP
14			. •
	Dated:	, 2006	
15			Danini Ranch
16		٠.	
	Dated:	, 2006	De Carli Ranch
17			De Carn Ranch
18			
. 19	Dated:	, 2006	Donald De Roza
20	Dated:	, 2006	
21	Dateu.	, 2000	Double Eagle Vineyards, LP
	_	•	
22	Dated:		
<b>23</b> .			Richard H. Gavin
24	· .		
1	Dated:	, 2006	
25			Kristin L. Gavin
26			•
	Dated:	_, 2006	
27			Highlands Vineyards, LP
		•	

1	Dated: , 2006
2	Dated:, 2006 Rancho Hooker, LLC
·3 ·	
4	Dated:, 2006 Tan Oak Canyon Ranch,
5	a California general partnership
6	Dated: 2/17/06, 2006 1/14 Franscion
	T.M.V. Lands, a California general partnership
7	
8	Approved as to Form and Content.
9	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN
10	Dated: March 6 2006 By Bol Miles
11	Andrew M. Hitchings, Attorneys for Plaintiffs Salinas Valley Property Owners for Lawful
12	Assessments, et al.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	