IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
CASE NO. S212800

ORANGE CITIZENS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION, et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
THE SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY,
Respondent;
MILAN REI IV LLC et al.,
Real Parties in Interest.

ORANGE CITIZENS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION, et al.,
Plaintiffs and Appellants,
vs.
MILAN REI IV LLC et al.,
Defendants and Respondents.

After a Decision by the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Three
Case No. G047013 (Consolidated with Case No. G047219)

Appeal from the Superior Court of the State of California
for the County of Orange, Superior Court Case #30-2011-00494437
Honorable Robert J. Moss, Judge Presiding

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

---

*DAVID A. DEBERRY
State Bar No.l40441
WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART
555 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1200
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7670
Telephone: (714) 558-7000
Facsimile: (714) 835-7787
E-Mail: ddeberry@wss-law.com

WAYNE W. WINTHERS
State Bar No. 134659
City Attorney, City of Orange
300 East Chapman Avenue
Orange, California 92866-1508
Telephone: (714) 744-5580
Facsimile: (714) 538-7157

Attorneys for Defendants and Respondents City Clerk of the City of Orange, City Council of the City of Orange and City of Orange

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

STATE CASES

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

OTHER

1. INTRODUCTION

This answer is filed by the City Council of the City of Orange ("City Council") and the City of Orange ("City") in response to the Petition for Review filed by Orange Citizens for Parks and Recreation ("Petitioners"). This case is about Petitioners' quarrel with the City Council's interpretation of its General Plan and in particular, the relationship between two General Plan documents, the City-wide General Plan and the Orange Park Acres Plan, a General Plan for a community within the City known as Orange Park Acres. Based on that interpretation the City Council concluded that a Project proposing 39 single family homes was consistent with the General Plan. Petitioners, who oppose the Project, disagree with this interpretation. The City Council is the legislative body charged with interpreting its General Plan and under a long line of cases its interpretation is to be upheld as long as it is reasonable. Both the Superior Court and Appellate Court concluded it was.

The Appellate Court applied the particular facts of this case to statutory and case law precedent concerning the interpretation of the contents of a General Plan and in particular the interplay between a city-wide General Plan and a more focused community General Plan. The Orange Park Acres Plan was adopted by way of City Council Resolution 3915 in 1973 as the General Plan for a sub-community in the City known as Orange Park Acres, in which the Project is located. Administrative Record

("AR")[1], 11:4899-4900. At the time of adoption, the City Council also adopted a General Plan land use designation on the Project property as Other Open Space/Low Density (1 acre). Sixteen years later in 1989, the City Council by way of Resolution 7348 found, "the Orange Park Acres Plan, which is part of the General Plan, provides a more specific direction for the Plan area." AR, 9:3903. Twenty-two years later, in 2011, the City Council, in approving the Project, concluded, as had the City Councils before it, that the Orange Park Acres Plan was the guiding General Plan document for the Orange Park Acres community and that the controlling land use designation for the property remained as originally adopted, as Other Open Space /Low Density (1 acre)[2]. Due to this it found, rather unremarkably, that the Project, which proposed 39 one-acre estates, riding trails and a ride in arena, was consistent with the General Plan.

The case involves the 2011 City Council coming to the same conclusions about the relationship between the City-wide General Plan and the Orange Park Acres Plan as did the City Council in 1973, when the Orange Park Acres Plan was first adopted, and as did the City Councils in 1977, 1989, 1990, 1998, 2000, and 2003. Petitioners advocate that the

---

[1] Citations to the Administrative Record are by volume:page number.
[2] Petitioners incorrectly represent that this dual designation was a modification to the designation on the property. At the same time the Orange Park Acres Plan was adopted in 1973, the City Council placed this dual designation on the property and it remains to this day the only duly adopted designation on the property under the Orange Park Acres Plan.

Orange Park Acres Plan has been completely removed as a General Plan document, an interpretation that is entirely inconsistent with the Orange Park Acres Plan's status as a vibrant General Plan document by which all development within Orange Park Acres has been measured against for the past 40 years and as stated by the Appellate Court, "ignores the City Council's repeated findings in multiple resolutions and the challenged ordinances that the Orange Park Acres Plan was part of the City's general plan..." Appellate Court Opinion, 31, Exhibit "A", to Petition for Review.

Petitioners' contentions are based in part on positions that directly contradict State law, including the contention that the City's General Plan can only be in one document. This position is contrary to Government Code section 65301, which permits a General Plan to be "adopted as a single document or as a group of documents" and numerous cases interpreting section 65301[3] that a City's General Plan can consist of a City-wide General Plan and a more tailored General Plan for a segment of the community. It is also completely inconsistent with the legislative acts of the City Council, which adopted the Orange Park Acres Plan as part of the General Plan. In particular Petitioners' position is inconsistent with the holding in Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, Inc. v. County of Los

[3] Vineyard Area Citizens v. Rancho Cardova (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 412, 421; Gonzales v. County of Tulare (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 777, 781; Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300; No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 223.

Angeles (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300, in which the central question was the same as the herein case, i.e., whether a land use designation on a city-wide General Plan map (county-wide in the case of Las Virgenes) or the land use designation contained within a duly adopted General Plan for a segment of the community controlled. The Board of Supervisors in Las Virgenes found, as did the City Council in the herein case, that the community specific General Plan land use designation controlled and in both cases the appellate courts found this interpretation to be reasonable.

Although Petitioners and Amicus Curiae profess otherwise, this case is not about whether the City's General Plan is at the top of the hierarchy of local government law regulating land use and the constitution for development in the City. The Appellate Court opinion on pages 5-7 clearly states that this is the case and there has never been any dispute between the parties to this action about the importance of the General Plan over and above all other planning documents. Petitioners simply disagree with the City Council's interpretation that (1) the Orange Park Acres Plan remained, as originally adopted in 1973 and as interpreted by the City Council in multiple resolutions since that time, as the General Plan land use element for Orange Park Acres; (2) it was the more specific General Plan document for development in Orange Park Acres; and (3) the land use designation of the property under the Orange Park Acres Plan was Other Open Space/Low Density (1 acre).

Following a long line of cases providing that a City Council's interpretation of its own General Plan and findings of consistency is entitled to substantial deference and will not be disturbed unless arbitrary and capricious and one which no reasonable person would make, first the Superior Court and then the Appellate Court, upheld the City Council's interpretation and findings of consistency. It was Petitioners' burden to show that the interpretation and findings were arbitrary, capricious and ones which no reasonable person could make. It was a burden Petitioners did not carry.

2. PETITIONERS PRESENTATION OF THE ISSUES AND FACTS IS ARGUMENTATIVE AND BIASED IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT

Petitioners' presentation of the issues is on its face argumentative and leading and does not comply with California Rules of Court, Rule 8.504(b), requiring that the petition "begin with a concise, non-argumentative statement of the issues presented for review..." Moreover, Petitioners', as well as Amicus Curiae's, presentation of the issues contradicts both the Superior Court's and the Appellate Court's rather straightforward presentation: The "central issue in this case is whether the Ridgeline Project is in conformance with the City's general plan." Order of Judge Robert J. Moss, Appellant's Appendix, 54. "The primary issue presented for our review is the question of whether the Project is consistent with the City's pre-General Plan Amendment general plan." Appellate

Court Opinion, 28.

While Petitioners were successful in their efforts to defeat by way referendum, a General Plan Amendment which confirmed the existing land use designation and made minor textual changes in the General Plan, the General Plan Amendment, as found by the City Council and as affirmed by the Superior and Appellate courts, was not necessary for the Project to be consistent with the General Plan. Petitioners were unsuccessful, however, in their referendum efforts on the Project's zone change and development agreement, both of which were undisputedly necessary for the Project to be consistent with the General Plan. Thus, the issue, as succinctly stated by both the Superior and Appellate courts, was whether the Project, which consisted of the zone change and development agreement, were consistent with the City's General Plan in the absence of the General Plan Amendment.

Petitioners also fail to present the facts in a complete and unbiased manner. California Rules of Court, Rule 8.204(a)(2)(C); In re Marriage of Davenport (2011) 194 Cal. App. 4th 1507, 1531. Fortunately Petitioners did comply with the requirement that the Appellate Court opinion be attached, which opinion does contain an unbiased presentation of the facts. Petitioners selectively attach 10 pages of a 5,000 page Administrative Record from the City-wide General Plan, but none from the controlling Orange Park Acres Plan. In any event even those selective pages, in the

opinion of the City, tend to undercut Petitioners argument that the Orange Park Acres Plan is a nullity.

The City will not attempt to respond to all of the misleading "facts" within the Petition for Review, but does want to address at least three. First, the Orange Park Acres Plan has never been buried in some "file drawer" and forgotten for decades as represented by Petitioners. It has been a vibrant much-debated constitution for development within Orange Park Acres for 40 years since it was first adopted in 1973 and has been amended seven times since. The land use designation in the Orange Park Acres Plan of Other Open Space/Low Density Residential (1 acre) was placed there in 1973 during a very public process which met and exceeded all State law requirements. To the extent this designation was forgotten, it was because no development other than a golf course had been proposed for the property since 1973 and due to the failure of City staff to ministerially revise the map and tables in a never adopted Orange Park Acres Plan to reflect the final action of the City Council. When the Project did come along, a review of the publicly available resolutions that had been on file with the City Clerk evidenced the dual designation, which designation was known to everyone a full year and half before the Project was approved by the City Council and fully vetted in the EIR and in public hearings.

Second, at page 3 of its Brief, Petitioners misrepresent that the 1973 Resolution "proposed" to amend the Orange Park Acres Specific Plan and

incorporate that document into the City's previous and long since superseded general plan at that time. While the Orange Park Acres Plan was proposed as a specific plan in 1973, it was never adopted as such and there is no language in the 1973 Resolution incorporating it into a City-wide General Plan. The 1973 Resolution did not propose anything, it was the final action in adopting the Orange Park Acres Plan as the General Plan land use element for Orange Park Acres.

Third, Petitioners' representation that the General Plan Amendment changed the existing land use designation on the property and that the City Council found that it was necessary for the Project and then "changed its tune" during this litigation is completely contrary to the Administrative Record, the findings of the City Council contained therein and the Appellate Court's opinion, "Taken at face value, the City *did not amend* the land use designation of the Property by means of the General Plan Amendment." (Emphasis not added.) Appellate Court Opinion, 31. In quoting from the title of the City Council's resolution adopting the General Plan Amendment, the City Council "AFFIRMS THE SITE'S EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION OF 'OTHER OPEN SPACE AND LOW DENSITY (1 ACRE)." Appellate Court Opinion, 20. In addition the Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"), adopted by the City Council prior to approving the Project, contains 56 pages of findings that the Project was consistent with the General Plan. Not a single finding in the EIR relied

upon the General Plan Amendment. AR, 7:2666-2721. At pages 20-23, the Appellate Court thoroughly discusses the fact that the City Council adopted extensive findings that the Project was consistent with the General Plan and that the findings were not reliant on the General Plan Amendment. Petitioners did not challenge the EIR and as noted by the Appellate Court the Petitioners did "not identify any of the other features of the General Plan Amendment as necessary for the Project to be found consistent with the general plan." Appellate Court Opinion, 31.

3. BACKGROUND

As is set forth in more detail in the Appellate Court opinion, in 1973 a committee was established to create and identify goals, objectives, policies and recommended land uses in Orange Park Acres and to resolve issues of controversy between stakeholders in the community. The members of the committee represented the City, County of Orange, residents of Orange Park Acres, major land owners and developers of Orange Park Acres. They developed a document entitled, "Orange Park Acres Specific Plan", which was presented jointly to the City and County's Planning Commissions, as it covered area both within the incorporated City and unincorporated County. Appellate Court Opinion, 10-11; AR, 11:4915.

Although presented as a specific plan to the City's Planning Commission, the City's Planning Commission made two recommendations of note to the City Council: (1) "that said Plan be adopted as representing a

portion of the land use element of the General Plan" and to "Designate the Golf Course as Other Open Space and Low Density (1 acre)." Appellate Court Opinion, 11-12; AR, 11:4901-4902. It is undisputed that the "Golf Course" is the Project property.

The Planning Commission's recommendations were subsequently considered by the City Council and by Resolution 3915, the City Council resolved that the Orange Park Acres Plan "dated September 1973 and as amended by the Planning Commission on November 19, 1973, be adopted and approved as part of the land use element of the City of Orange" and found that it "meets General Plan criteria set forth in section 65302(a) of the California Government Code..." Appellate Court Opinion, 12-13; AR, 11:4899-4900. It is not disputed that the only land use designation ever adopted by the City Council on the Project property under the Orange Park Acres Plan was Other Open Space/Low Density (1 acre).

Over the years the Orange Park Acres Plan was amended on several occasions by City Council resolution, in 1977, 1989, 1990, 1998, 2000, 2003, and lastly in 2011. Although mistakenly labeled as a specific plan on some occasions, in each case the Orange Park Acres Plan was amended by way of a General Plan Amendment. In adopting these resolutions the City Council often reiterated that the Orange Park Acres Plan was the guiding General Plan document for Orange Park Acres, "due to its contents, and the manner in which it was adopted, the Orange Park Acres Plan has the

authority of a General Plan...That the Orange Park Acres Plan, which is part of the General Plan, provides a more specific direction for the Plan area." Appellate Court Opinion, 15; City Council Resolution 7348 (1989) AR, 9:3903.

Milan REI IV, LLC, ("Milan") brought the Project forward to the City Council requesting that the City Council approve a change in the General Plan land use designation to a low density residential only designation. The request was rejected because the City Council found that the existing designation of Other Open Space/Low Density Residential (1 acre). The City Council also rejected Milan's request to change the zoning to solely residential, instead adopting a dual Open Space/Residential on the property. Appellate Court Opinion, 19-20; AR 1:23; 4:1950.

Superior Court Judge Robert Moss upheld the City's position that the Project was consistent with the City's General Plan with or without the General Plan Amendment in that the General Plan Amendment "did not attempt to change the land use designation of the OPA [Orange Park Acres] Plan. Instead its chief purpose was to correct errors that occurred over the years in describing the land use designation for the...Project." Appellate Court Opinion, 25.

While the matter was pending before the Appellate Court, the referendum vote took place at the November 2012 general election and the General Plan Amendment was defeated. With defeat of the General Plan

Amendment, the issue before the Appellate Court was straightforward—was the City Council's determination that the Project was consistent with the General Plan in the absence of the General Plan Amendment reasonable? The Appellate Court found it was.

Petitioners argue that the Orange Park Acres Plan and its land use designation of Other Open Space/Low Density (1 acre) had been removed from the City's General Plan when the City Council adopted the 1989 General Plan and/or the 2010 General Plan Update. The problems with this theory are many and chronicled by the Appellate Court, but in sum, it is quite obvious that the 1989 General Plan did not since on four different occasions after adoption of the 1989 General Plan the Orange Park Acres Plan was amended by the City Council by way of a General Plan Amendment. In particular, just eight months later in 1990 the same City Council that approved the 1989 General Plan adopted Resolution 7557, "General Plan Amendment 3-89, an amendment to the Orange Park Acres Plan, which is part of the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan..." AR, 9:3970. Petitioners are about 21 years late in challenging the City Council's determination in 1990 that the Orange Park Acres Plan remained as the land use element of the General Plan for Orange Park Acres, as the statute of limitations for challenges to general plan determinations is 90 days pursuant to Government Code section 65009. They seek to have the Court conclude, 20 years after the fact, that the 1989 General Plan removed

the Orange Park Acres Plan from the General Plan and to retroactively place four general plan amendments in legal limbo and to do a complete judicial re-write of the legislative history of the City Council as it pertains to the status of the Orange Park Acres Plan.

Petitioners also seek to re-write the legislative history of the 2010 General Plan Update and insist that it did something, removed the Orange Park Acres Plan from the General Plan, which the 2010 General Plan Update specifically informed the community it would not do. Initially, the 2010 General Plan states that the Orange Park Acres Plan is "currently in effect", undermining Petitioners' contention it has been completely removed as a viable planning document. Appellate Court Opinion, 18. Second, the 2010 General Plan specifically apprised the public and the Orange Park Acres community that within "portions of the City that do not lie within one of the identified focus areas, no significant land use changes are anticipated." AR, 10:4079. It is not disputed that none of the eight focus areas are within a mile of Orange Park Acres. Despite the representations by the City and the General Plan document itself to the contrary, Petitioners contend that the 2010 General Plan Update made the most significant land use change ever to Orange Park Acres! In addition, the same City Council that adopted the 2010 General Plan Update, just one year later in approving the Project found that the Orange Park Acres Plan remained as the controlling General Plan document for Orange Park Acres. If the five

council members on the 2010 City Council removed the Orange Park Acres Plan from the General Plan, they did so without their knowledge.

In approving the Project the City Council concluded that the Orange Park Acres Plan remained as it had for the past 40 years, as the controlling General Plan land use document for Orange Park Acres. Petitioners' view that the Orange Park Acres Plan had lost its status as a General Plan document by way of the adoption of the 1989 or 2010 General Plans was not shared by the same City Councils which adopted those plans. Based on this the Appellate Court concluded that "we are unwilling to conclude that the City Council acted unreasonably by finding the 1989 and/or 2010 general plans were not intended to supersede the Orange Park Acres Plan, and that the low density residential designation therefore survived the adoption of the 1989 and 2010 general plans." Appellate Court Opinion, 39.

4. THE CRITERIA FOR SUPREME COURT REVIEW IS NOT MET IN THAT THE FACTS OF THIS CASE ARE UNIQUE, THE PROJECT HAS NO STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE, THERE IS NO CONFLICT AMONG COURTS AND THE APPELLATE COURT RELIED HEAVILY ON EXISTING LAW

The case does not, as represented by the Petitioners, turn "California planning law upside-down", but rather keeps it right side up. The Appellate Court relied upon

Government Code section 65301 and numerous cases interpreting section 65301[4] that a City's General Plan can be contained in more than one document. While the facts are somewhat different, the primary issue in this case is analogous to the issue in Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300, wherein that court determined that a residential project which was consistent with the land use designation in a community specific General Plan, although somewhat inconsistent with the county-wide General Plan land use policy map, was legally consistent with the General Plan and could proceed. As the Appellate Court found, Petitioners contention that the City Council could not go beyond the land use map accompanying the City-wide General Plan to determine the Project's consistency contradicts the holding in Las Virgenes:

"The General Plan Land Use Policy Map identifies general and dominant uses and intensities. The role of the local plan is to identify more specific land uses...Because it is necessary to judge proposals in relation to stated policies of the General Plan in addition to the policy map itself, a proposal may be consistent even if not literally supported by the map. The mere examination of land use and other policy maps is insufficient to

[4] Vineyard Area Citizens v. Rancho Cardova (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 412, 421; Gonzales v. County of Tulare (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 777, 781; Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300; No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 223.

determine consistency." (Emphasis added.) Las Virgenes, supra, at 310.

While trumpeting the General Plan as the "constitution" for development, Petitioners' position is reliant upon the contention that its contents are determined by the ministerial omissions and scrivener errors of City staff, rather than by the official actions of the legislative body. And further that these errors and omissions trump the legislative acts of the City Council taken after meeting all requirements for public notice, public comment, public hearing and formal adoption as required by Government Code sections 65350 et seq. Petitioners position that the Orange Park Acres Plan was removed as a General Plan document by the 1989 or 2010 adoption of City-wide General Plans is based on the contention that this "constitution" can be dramatically amended without any public notice, public comment or public hearing and indeed, without anyone's knowledge. In weighing the evidence in the administrative record, the Appellate Court followed the holding in No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 223, 246, that pronouncements made by the City Council in interpreting its General Plan are entitled to substantial weight, while pronouncements of City staff, property owners or developers, evidence upon which Petitioners rely, are not, because the latter are not charged with interpreting a General Plan.

The Appellate Court did not voice any disagreement with or refuse to follow any existing statutory or case law, whether cited by the City,

Milan or the Petitioners. The Appellate Court simply disagreed with the Petitioners that the authority they cited was controlling due to the particular facts of this case and in a reasoned way distinguished the authority cited by Petitioners. The standard of review of the City Council's decision applied by the Appellate Court followed a long line of cases, including No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 223; A Local & Regional Monitor v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 630; and California Native Plant Society v. City of Rancho Cordova (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 603, finding that a "city's findings that the project is consistent with its general plan can be reversed only if it is based on evidence from which no reasonable person could have reached the same conclusion." Local & Regional Monitor, supra, at 647.

The Project itself is of no State-wide consequence. It consists of 39 one-acre equestrian estates, riding trails and a ride-in horse arena on 52 acres. The Project is located in the middle of Orange Park Acres, a community which is known for its one-acre equestrian estates and riding trails. It is an infill development which will be constructed over a nine-hole golf course, swimming and tennis facility all of which have been long abandoned and removed. There are no significant environmental impacts or issues and indeed the Final EIR for the Project was not challenged.

5. CONCLUSION

In interpreting its General Plan the City Council concluded, as had numerous City Councils before it, that the Orange Park Acres Plan was the controlling General Plan document for development of the Project. It further concluded that the Project was consistent with the Orange Park Acres Plan dual open space and residential designation. While Petitioners are free to disagree with this interpretation, to overturn it, they were required to show that the City Council's interpretation was arbitrary and capricious and one which no reasonable person could have reached. Petitioners fell well short of making this showing.

DATED: September 6, 2013

WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART

By: _____
DAVID A. DEBERRY
Attorneys for Defendants and Respondents CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF ORANGE; CITY OF ORANGE; CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ORANGE

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

The text of the Answer to Petition for Review, exclusive of this Certificate, Table of Contents and Table of Authorities, consists of 4,333 words as counted by the Microsoft Word 2007 word processing program used to generate this Answer to Petition for Review.

DATED: September 6, 2013

WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART

By: _____
DAVID A. DEBERRY
Attorneys for Defendants and Respondents CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF ORANGE; CITY OF ORANGE; CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ORANGE

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; I am employed by WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART in the County of Orange at 555 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1200, Costa Mesa, CA 92626-7670.

On September 6, 2013, I served the foregoing document(s) described as **ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW**

☒ by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list;

☒ **(BY MAIL)** I placed said envelope(s) for collection and mailing, following ordinary business practices, at the business offices of WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART, and addressed as shown on the attached service list, for deposit in the United States Postal Service. I am readily familiar with the practice of WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART for collection and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and said envelope(s) will be deposited with the United States Postal Service on said date in the ordinary course of business.

☐ **(BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE)** by causing the foregoing document(s) to be electronically filed using the Court's Electronic Filing System which constitutes service of the filed document(s) on the individual(s) listed on the attached mailing list.

☒ **(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY)** I placed said documents in envelope(s) for collection following ordinary business practices, at the business offices of WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART, and addressed as shown on the attached service list, for collection and delivery to a courier authorized by NORCO DELIVERY SERVICES to receive said documents, with delivery fees provided for. I am readily familiar with the practices of WOODRUFF, SPRADLIN & SMART for collection and processing of documents for overnight delivery, and said envelope(s) will be deposited for receipt by NORCO DELIVERY SERVICES on said date in the ordinary course of business.

☒ (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on September 6, 2013 at Costa Mesa, California.

Connie Jo Smith

Connie Jo Smith

SERVICE LIST

Orange Citizens for Parks and Recreation vs.
Orange County Superior Court
Milan REI LLC et al.

California Supreme Court Civil No. S212800

After Decision by
California Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Three
Case No. G047219 and G047013 (Consolidated)
Orange County Superior Court No. 30-2011-00494437

Rachel B. Hooper Robert S. Perlmutter Susannah T. French Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94102 Tel: 415.552.7272 Fax: 415.552.5816 Email: hooper@smwlaw.com perlmutter@smwlaw.com french@smwal.com Attorneys for *Petitioners Orange Citizens for Parks and Recreation and Orange Parks Association*	Daniel P. Selmi 919 Albany Street Los Angeles, CA 90015 Tel: 213.736.1098 Fax: 949.675.9861 Email: dselmi@aol.com Attorneys for *Petitioners Orange Citizens for Parks and Recreation and Orange Parks Association*
Steve Baric Baric & Tran 2603 Main Street, Suite 1050 Irvine, CA 92614 Tel: 949.468.1047 Fax: 949.251.1886 Email:sbaric@barictran.com sbaric@bamlawyers.com Attorneys for *Real Party in Interest Milan Rei IV, LLC*	Colin L. Pearce Duane Morris LLP One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, No. 2200 San Francisco, CA 94105-1127 Tel: 415.957.3015 Fax: 415.704.3098 Email:clpearce@duanemorris.com Attorneys for *Real Party in Interest Milan Rei IV, LLC*

David E. Watson Heather U. Guerena Duane Morris LLP 750 B Street, Suite 2900 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: 619.744.2200 Fax: 619.744.2201 Email: dewatson@duanemorris.com huguerena@duanemorris.com Attorneys for *Real Party in Interest Milan Rei IV, LLC*	Wayne W. Winthers City Attorney City of Orange 300 E. Chapman Avenue Orange, CA 92866 Tel: 714.744.5580 Fax: 714.538.7157 Email: wwinthers@cityoforange.org Attorneys for Respondents *City Clerk of the City of Orange; City of Orange; City Council of the City of Orange*
Leon Page Senior Deputy County Counsel Rebecca S. Leeds Deputy County Counsel Office of Orange County Counsel 333 W. Santa Ana Blvd., Suite 407 Santa Ana, CA 92702 Tel: 714.834.6298 Fax: 714.834.2359 Email: leon.page@coco.ocgov.com Attorneys for *Real Party in Interest Neal Kelley, Registrar of Voters for the County of Orange*	Clerk of the Court Orange County Superior Court Central Justice Center 700 Civic Center Drive West Santa Ana, CA 92701
VIA OVERNTE EXPRESS Original and 13 Copies to: California Supreme Court 350 McAllister Street Second Floor San Francisco, CA 94102-4783	Clerk of the Court California Court of Appeal Fourth District, Division Three 601 West Santa Ana Boulevard Santa Ana, CA 92701