TIFFANY N. NORTH, State Bar No. 228068
County Counsel, County of Ventura
JEFFREY E. BARNES, State Bar No. 212154
Chief Assistant County Counsel
FRANCHESCA S. VERDIN, State Bar No. 273464
800 South Victoria Avenue, L/C #1830
Ventura, California 93009
Telephone: (805) 654-2580
Facsimile: (805) 654-2185
Email: jeffrey.barnes@venturacounty.gov
franchesca.verdin@venturacounty.gov

Attorneys for Respondents

**[EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES
[Gov. Code, § 6103]**

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF VENTURA

STEVEN GLENN BOSTOCK, Petitioner, v. COUNTY OF VENTURA, VENTURA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, VENTURA COUNTY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY, VENTURA COUNTY PLANNING DIVISION, and DOES 1-50, inclusive, Respondents.	No. 2026CUWM063387 Judge: Hon. Charmaine H. Buehner **JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT** Date: November 12, 2026 Time: 8:35 a.m. Dept No.: 44 Petition Filed: April 2, 2026

Petitioner STEVEN GLENN BOSTOCK and Respondents COUNTY OF VENTURA, VENTURA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, VENTURA COUNTY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY, and VENTURA COUNTY PLANNING DIVISION hereby submit this Joint Case Management Conference Statement in advance of the November 12, 2026, Case Management Conference and in accordance with the Court's April 6, 2026, Writ Proceedings Case Management Conference Order. The section headings below track the Court's April 6th order.

6.a Parties and Counsel

Petitioner In Pro Per
Steven Glenn Bostock
262 E. Bounds Road
Ventura, CA 93001
Telephone: (805) 651-9898
Email: captseacraft@yahoo.com

Respondents COUNTY OF VENTURA, VENTURA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, VENTURA COUNTY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY, and VENTURA COUNTY PLANNING DIVISION

JEFFREY E. BARNES, State Bar No. 212154
Chief Assistant County Counsel
FRANCHESCA S. VERDIN, State Bar No. 273464
800 South Victoria Avenue, L/C #1830
Ventura, California 93009
Telephone: (805) 654-2580
Facsimile: (805) 654-2185
Email: jeffrey.barnes@venturacounty.gov
franchesca.verdin@venturacounty.gov

6.b Potential Additional Parties

County's Position(s): On October 14, 2026, the Court denied Petitioner's motion for leave to amend his Petition to add Ventura Ranch Partners, LLC, the project applicant that received approval from the County of Ventura to subdivide an existing 82.92-acre parcel located at 4884 North Ventura Avenue and construct a 328-unit, affordable farmworker housing complex. Respondents expect that they or Ventura Ranch Partners, LLC will seek to dismiss the Petition based on the failure to timely name it as a real party in interest.

Petitioner's Position(s): Petitioner presently does not seek to add any party through the Joint Report. Petitioner acknowledges that the Court denied leave to add Ventura Ranch Partners, LLC to the proposed post approval challenge. Petitioner further notes that the October 14, 2026 order expressly states that the ruling addressed only leave to amend and did not adjudicate the ultimate viability of the existing April 2, 2026 Petition.

Petitioner disputes that omission of Ventura Ranch Partners, LLC from the original preapproval Petition automatically requires dismissal of that Petition. Petitioner contends that any argument that Ventura Ranch Partners is necessary or indispensable to the operative Petition should be raised through an appropriate procedural vehicle directed to that Petition and evaluated under Code of Civil Procedure section 389.

Petitioner preserves the distinction between the Court's ruling concerning the rejected post approval challenge seeking direct review and vacatur of final project entitlements and any section 389 question directed to the original preapproval governmental-authority claims.

Petitioner further notes that Ventura Ranch Partners appeared in the related Highway 33 action on July 14, 2026, before the cases were related on August 27, 2026. Petitioner contends that this procedural history may be relevant to notice, practical ability to protect interests, prejudice, coordination, and any later section 389 analysis. Petitioner does not contend that notice alone accomplished joinder, satisfied a limitations requirement, or waived any defense.

The parties dispute the effect of nonjoinder upon the operative Petition. Petitioner does not request that this issue be resolved through the Joint Report.

Petitioner reserves all rights to oppose any dismissal, demurrer, or other motion directed to nonjoinder or real-party-in-interest issues on all grounds available under applicable law.

6.c Erroneously Named Parties

County Position(s): Respondents reserve all rights regarding the Verified Petition's naming of the County Resource Management Agency and its Planning Division, which are inferior entities within the County and not the final decision-makers regarding approval of the project.

Petitioner's Position(s): Petitioner disputes that any named party should presently be characterized as erroneously named and reserves all positions concerning party status. Petitioner will meet and confer regarding any proposed noncontroversial correction.

Petitioner notes that the operative Petition attributes challenged processing, review, completeness, recommendation, and implementation conduct to the Resource Management Agency and Planning Division at multiple stages before final Board action. Respondents dispute whether

those entities are proper parties. Petitioner does not request resolution of that disputed party-status question through the Joint Report.

If Respondents intend to challenge a named entity, Petitioner requests identification of the entity challenged, the basis for the challenge, the entity Respondents contend is proper, the procedural vehicle to be used, and whether the challenge seeks dismissal of that entity only or is asserted to affect any claim or requested relief.

The parties have not agreed that any named Respondent is erroneous, and the Joint Report should not characterize that issue as resolved.

6.d Case Summary; Identification of Potential Motions and Issues

County's Summary: Ventura Ranch Partners, LLC, applied and received approval from the County for its farmworker housing project. The project includes 328 residential units along with a community center, community garden, and recreation areas (basketball court, playgrounds). Mr. Bostock, the Petitioner, lives in an existing residential neighborhood adjacent to the proposed project.

The Verified Petition challenges the County's consideration and approval of the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project. At its heart, the Verified Petition contends the County failed to make threshold determinations regarding the project's consistency with the County General Plan, County of Ventura Measure Save Open-Space and Agricultural Resources (SOAR) Initiative, and the North Ventura Avenue Area Plan. The Verified Petition seeks to compel the County to make such consistency determinations and to unwind the subsequent approval of the Ventura Ranch project.

The County answered the Verified Petition. Among other defenses, the County contends that Petitioner prematurely filed the Verified Petition, that Petitioner failed to exhaust his administrative remedies, that the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project is consistent with the General Plan, SOAR Initiative and the North Ventura Avenue Area Plan, and that the administrative record thoroughly supports the County's consistency determinations.

At its August 27, 2026, case management conference, the Court related this case to a second lawsuit challenging the same project (HWY 33 PRESERVATION SOCIETY v. COUNTY

OF VENTURA, et al., Ventura County Sup. Ct. Case No. 2026CUWM068541, filed June 22, 2026). That case has also been assigned to this Court. It is also set for a November 12, 2026, initial case management conference.

Respondents propose the Court consider partially consolidating the two cases for the limited purposes of having a single certified administrative record and a joint briefing and hearing schedule for both matters, which would otherwise remain separate cases. Petitioner objects to coordination or consolidation of the two cases.

Petitioner's Summary: Ventura Ranch Partners, LLC applied for and received County approval for Ventura Ranch Project No. PL23-0051, involving an approximately 82.92-acre property at 4884 North Ventura Avenue and a proposed 328-unit farmworker housing complex, together with associated subdivision, permit, parking, infrastructure, and project components. Petitioner owns neighboring residential property at 262 E. Bounds Road.

Petitioner contends that the April 2, 2026 Petition remains the operative pleading. The Petition was filed after the February 19, 2026 Planning Commission approval and before the May 19, 2026 Board decision. It asserts two claims under Code of Civil Procedure section 1085: failure to perform a ministerial duty and action in excess of jurisdiction. The October 14 order denied leave to add a later post approval section 1094.5 challenge but expressly did not adjudicate the ultimate viability of the April 2 Petition.

Petitioner further notes that the preapproval posture of the Petition was known to Respondents at the time of filing. Before the May 19, 2026 Board hearing, County Counsel acknowledged Petitioner's agreement not to seek court action on the Petition before the Board considered the project, proposed that Respondents' responsive pleading be deferred until after the Board hearing, and thereafter entered into a stipulation extending Respondents' responsive-pleading deadline until after the scheduled hearing. Petitioner cites this procedural history solely as evidence of how the pending Petition was handled while the Board process continued and does not contend that the procedural history waived any defense, resolved any disputed issue, or determined the ultimate viability of the Petition.

Petitioner contends that the operative Petition principally challenges alleged governmental authority, duties, and processing actions associated with the County's decision to deem complete, process, and proceed toward approval of PL23-0051. Petitioner asks Respondents to identify:

1. the adopted authority relied upon;
2. the project-specific determination applying that authority where required; or
3. the adopted provision establishing why a disputed step was unnecessary.

Petitioner contends that the disputes include the asserted relationship among the NVAA Agriculture/Open Space framework, ECU-Agricultural or Existing Community treatment, the parcel-specific map and adoption chain, the non-bonus base-density source, the County's farmworker-housing classifications including the relationship between Farmworker Dwelling Units and Farmworker Housing Complexes, SOAR, applicable General Plan and Agricultural Land Preservation provisions, and the distinction between municipal-service authority and County land-use authority

The parties dispute whether the May 19, 2026 Board action rendered the operative Petition moot or eliminated all forms of effective relief. Petitioner contends that the October 14, 2026 order expressly left the viability of the April 2, 2026 Petition unresolved.

Petitioner further contends that the operative Petition was filed after Planning Commission approval but before the May 19, 2026 Board decision and principally challenges alleged governmental authority, duties, and processing actions associated with the County's decision to deem complete, process, and proceed toward approval of PL23-0051. Petitioner therefore contends that the subsequent Board action does not necessarily eliminate all forms of effective relief.

Petitioner further contends that, if the Court determines that Respondents failed to perform a pleaded duty, failed to proceed as required by law, or proceeded without identifying or lawfully applying the governing adopted authority alleged in the Petition, effective County-directed relief may remain available notwithstanding the subsequent May 19, 2026 Board action, including identification of the governing authority, performance of any duty found to exist, remand, reconsideration, or other County-directed relief authorized by law. Petitioner does not contend that any particular land-use outcome is required and instead contends that the nature and scope of any

remedy should be determined only after the Court identifies the governing adopted authority, any required applying determinations, and the legal consequences flowing from that authority framework.

Petitioner contends that the operative Petition seeks identification of the adopted authority supporting the challenged approval pathway, any project-specific determination applying that authority where required, and any adopted provision establishing why a disputed authority step was unnecessary

Petitioner does not ask the Joint Report to determine the ultimate relief, direct a particular land-use result, adjudicate the rights of any nonparty, determine that a SOAR vote is presently required, or prejudge any issue arising under Code of Civil Procedure section 389. Petitioner requests only that mootness, effective relief, remand, and reconsideration be identified as disputed issues reserved for later proceedings

Petitioner further reserves the right to seek temporary, preliminary, emergency, or other provisional relief authorized by law if material site alteration, grading, orchard removal, construction activity, displacement of existing occupants, or other substantial changes to the property commence or appear imminent before the operative Petition is adjudicated. Nothing in this Joint Report constitutes a present request for such relief, and Petitioner reserves all rights concerning the timing, scope, and legal basis of any future application.

6.e Writs of Mandate / Prohibition

i. Broadly speaking, the County believes the Verified Petition challenges the County's consideration and approval of the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project. Petitioner filed this action prior to the County's final approval of that project, and so the challenged actions appear to challenge acts or omissions by the County prior to final approval of the project. Petitioner contends that the operative section 1085 Petition challenges alleged governmental acts and omissions in deeming complete, processing, and proceeding toward approval of PL23-0051 without identifying what Petitioner contends were required adopted SOAR, NVAA, General Plan, and related authority and determinations. Petitioner also contends that the filing date was consistent with the Petition's focus on alleged preapproval governmental authority and processing. Respondents

contend that the Petition was premature. The legal effect of the filing date remains disputed.

ii. The County believes that the County of Ventura, through its Board of Supervisors, approved the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project. The Verified Petition also appears to challenge actions taken or not taken by the County's Resource Management Agency and its Planning Division. Petitioner contends the challenged governmental conduct is attributed to the County of Ventura, the Ventura County Board of Supervisors, the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, and the Ventura County Planning Division.

iii. The County understands that the Verified Petition appears to primarily raise legal claims under California's Planning and Zoning laws (Gov. Code, § 65000 et seq.), including claims that the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project is inconsistent with the County's General Plan, SOAR Initiative, and the North Ventura Avenue Area Plan. The Verified Petition also raises claims under Code of Civil Procedure sections 1085 and 1094.5. The Verified Petition expressly does not attack the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). Petitioner additionally identifies Code of Civil Procedure section 1085, County SOAR, the Ventura County General Plan, the NVAA, and the enacted or adopted provisions governing the alleged duties and authority pleaded in the Petition.

Petitioner disputes the characterization that the operative Petition principally seeks review of the merits of the project approval itself or primarily asserts a post-approval administrative-mandamus claim under Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5, and instead contends that the Petition primarily concerns whether Respondents identified and lawfully relied upon the adopted authority, determinations, and governmental prerequisites necessary to proceed with processing and approval of PL23-0051.

6.f Administrative Writs

i. The County Board of Supervisors approved the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project at a public hearing on May 19, 2026. Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance section 8111-7 required the hearing, which was an appeal from an earlier approval by the Planning Commission. Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance sections 8105-4, 8111-1.2.1, 8111-2.11, and 8111-3.2, required the underlying Planning Commission hearing (for the Planned

Development Permit and Discretionary Tree Permit approvals), as well as sections 8205-6 and 8215-2.6 of the Ventura County Subdivision Ordinance (for approval of the Tentative Parcel Map). Petitioner initiated this action, which includes claims under Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5, on April 2, 2026, prior to that May 19, 2026, final approval. The Verified Petition appears to challenge acts or omissions by the County prior to final approval of the project

Petitioner contends that the operative Petition preceded the May 19 decision and principally alleges section 1085 claims concerning preapproval authority, duties, and processing. Petitioner disputes Respondents' characterization that the operative Petition asserts a post-approval claim under Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5 and further disputes any characterization that the denied post-approval section 1094.5 claim became part of the operative pleading merely because the Petition's jurisdictional paragraph referenced section 1094.5.

ii. The County Board of Supervisors approved the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project after appeals from the County Planning Commission's approval of the project. Petitioner further identifies the County departments and officials alleged to have participated in the challenged processing and completeness actions, subject to the parties' dispute regarding proper party status and ultimate responsibility.

iii. California's Planning and Zoning Law (Gov. Code, § 65000 et seq.), the Subdivision Map Act (Gov. Code, § 66410 et seq.), and the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) apply to the procedural and substantive consideration and approval of the Ventura Ranch farmworker housing project. Additionally, because of the affordable housing nature of the project, the Housing Accountability Act (Gov. Code, § 65589.5 et seq.) and the State Density Bonus Law (Gov. Code, § 65915 et seq.) apply to the project, among other State law. The County's Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance also apply, among other County law. Petitioner identifies section 1085 and the adopted SOAR, General Plan, NVAA, and related enactments alleged to govern the authority and duties pleaded. The parties dispute the applicability and legal effect of the respective authorities.

Petitioner further disputes any characterization that the operative Petition is primarily a challenge to discretionary approval findings or project-consistency determinations and instead

contends that the principal dispute concerns the adopted authority, applying determinations, and governmental prerequisites required to process and approve PL23-0051.

iv. **Administrative Record ("AR")**: Petitioner has not requested the preparation of the administrative record in this proceeding. In connection with the related lawsuit, HWY 33 PRESERVATION SOCIETY v. COUNTY OF VENTURA, et al., Ventura County Sup. Ct. Case No. 2026CUWM068541, filed June 22, 2026, the County certified an AR on October 9, 2026, and lodged an electronic copy of the AR with the Court in that matter on October 13th. The AR comprises 68 volumes, 19,665 pages and two videos.

Petitioner acknowledges the certification and lodging reported by Respondents but reserves all positions concerning whether that record is complete, properly scoped, and applicable to the section 1085 claims in this case. Petitioner has not agreed that certification and lodging in the related action constitutes certification or lodging for this action. Petitioner specifically reserves the right to challenge omissions, the accuracy of any index or certification, the characterization of what the record shows, privilege assertions, and the exclusion of materials relevant to the operative claims; to seek supplementation or augmentation; to request judicial notice where appropriate; and to raise evidentiary and record-related objections permitted by law.

6.g Case Deadlines & Dates

The County proposed the following briefing schedule to Petitioner:

i. Petitioner shall file and serve his opening brief by January 18, 2027.

ii. Respondents shall file and serve their opposition brief(s) by March 19, 2027.

iii. Petitioner shall file and serve his reply brief by April 18, 2027.

These dates track those offered in the related case.

Petitioner has not agreed to these dates unless the parties separately and expressly confirm an agreement. Petitioner further believes that any merits briefing or writ-trial schedule should take into account ongoing public-record efforts, continued collection of objective documents and objective record evidence, anticipated follow-up investigation concerning project processing and record-completeness issues, Petitioner's pro per status, caregiving responsibilities, previously scheduled travel, and the upcoming holiday season. Petitioner therefore believes that a later 2027

schedule would be more practical and would reduce the likelihood of repeated requests to modify deadlines while record-related issues continue to develop.

6.h. Writ Trials

The parties understand that the Court hears writ trials on Tuesdays at 1:30 p.m. Petitioner wishes to note that he has not yet agreed upon a writ-trial date or time estimate. Petitioner contends that those matters should be addressed after clarification of the operative claims, anticipated threshold motions, applicable record, and briefing sequence. Petitioner contends the parties should provide a proposed writ-trial date and time estimate only after completing the required meet and confer. Until then, Petitioner's position is that no trial date or time estimate has been agreed.

Date: October 28, 2026

STEVEN GLENN BOSTOCK

By: _____
Petitioner, In Pro Per

Date: October 29, 2026

COUNTY COUNSEL, COUNTY OF VENTURA

By: _____
JEFFREY E. BARNES
FRANCHESCA S. VERDIN
Attorneys for Respondents

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA

I am a resident of or employed in the County of Ventura, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. I am employed by the County of Ventura (County) and my business address is County Counsel's Office, 800 South Victoria Avenue, L/C #1830, Ventura, California 93009.

On October 29, 2026, I served the within JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT on:

Steven Glenn Bostock
262 E. Bounds Road
Ventura, California 93001
captseacraft@yahoo.com

[X] **by standard County mail practice.** I enclosed a true copy of each of said documents in a sealed envelope addressed to the above-named person(s) as indicated above, and placed the envelope for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service with postage fully paid.

[ ] **by overnight delivery.** I enclosed a true copy of each of said documents in a sealed envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier addressed to the above-named person(s) as indicated above, with delivery fees paid or provided for. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly maintained drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

[X] **by electronic service.** Based on a court order, a court rule or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I electronically served said documents from to the above-named person(s) at the electronic address(es) as indicated above.

[X] (**STATE**) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 29, 2026, at Ventura, California.

Jennifer Talmadge
JENNIFER TALMADGE