"EXHIBIT M"

91	1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
	2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
	3	DEPARTMENT NO. 1 HON. JACK KOMAR, JUDGE		
	4			
	5	COORDINATION PROCEEDING)		
	6	SPECIAL TITLE (RULE 1550B))) JUDICIAL COUNCIL		
	7	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES) COORDINATION NO. P4408		
	8	PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT AND) SANTA CLARA CASE NO. OUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT.) 1-05-CV-049053		
	9	~		
1	10	CROSS-COMPLAINANTS,)		
1	11			
1	L2	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS,) DISTRICT NO. 40, ET AL,)		
1	13	CROSS-DEFENDANTS.)		
1	L4			
	15			
1	16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
1	17	MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2008		
1	L8	APPEARANCES:		
1	L9	(SEE APPEARANCE PAGES)		
2	20			
2	21			
2	22			
2	23			
2	24	ORIGINAL		
2	25			
2	26	9		
2	27	CHARLOTTE NICHOLAS MOHAMED, CSR #2384		
2	28	OFFICIAL REPORTER		

DILIGENTLY ON THE PROPOSED NOTICE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I THINK THE PRIMARY POINT I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS WITH THE COURT, IF I MAY, THIS MORNING HAS TO DO WITH WHAT MR. ZLOTNICK TALKED A LITTLE BIT ABOUT ALREADY AS PART OF THAT MEET-AND-CONFER PROCESS.

WE HAVE BEEN AWARE THAT MR. ZLOTNICK'S FIRM HAS BEEN SEARCHING FOR ANOTHER PROPERTY OWNER TO BE A CLASS REPRESENTATIVE FOR A GROUP OF HOMEOWNERS -- OR EXCUSE ME --PROPERTY OWNERS WE COMMONLY CALL "SMALL PUMPERS." AND THOSE EFFORTS HAVE BEEN ONGOING, AND THEY CONTINUE. WE HAVE TALKED WITH MR. ZLOTNICK AND OTHER LEGAL COUNSEL AS OF LAST WEEK ON HOW TO CONTINUE THAT PROCESS. BUT WE FIND OURSELVES HERE TODAY STILL WITHOUT A CLASS REPRESENTATIVE TO SERVE IN THE FUNCTION OF ANOTHER CLASS, THIS TIME BEING SMALL PUMPERS.

ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE DONE IS WE HAVE GONE BACK AND WE HAVE LOOKED AT CASE LAW AS IT DEALS WITH CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR LIMITED ISSUES AND IN PARTICULAR WE HAVE GONE BACK AND DONE A VERY THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE CASES AS IT RELATES TO PURPORTED CONFLICTS OR CLAIM CONFLICTS OR APPARENT CONFLICTS WITHIN THE CLASS ACTION CONTEXT. AND THE SHORT VERSION OF THE RESULT OF THAT IS THAT WE ARE CONFIDENT THAT WHAT THE COURT HAD ON ITS OWN SUGGESTED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE LAST HEARING IS AND SHOULD -- IS POSSIBLE AND SHOULD BE AGAIN CONSIDERED BY THE COURT.

WHAT THE COURT HAD PROPOSED OR SUGGESTED WAS THAT FOR LIMITED PURPOSES ONLY, THE CLASS BE MODIFIED SO THAT IT IS MORE INCLUSIVE, INCLUDING REPRESENTATION OF THE SMALL PUMPER GROUP FOR AN ISSUE OR CERTAIN ISSUES THAT ARE COMMON AS TO

12

BOTH PUMPERS AND SMALL PUMPERS. IN OTHER WORDS, ISSUES THAT ARE COMMON TO LANDOWNERS GENERALLY, AND THAT WOULD INCLUDE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BASIN INCLUDING THE BASIN'S YIELD; AND WHETHER YOU ARE A PUMPER OR NONPUMPER, THOSE INTERESTS ARE GENERALLY COMMON. THAT IS A PREDOMINANT COMMON ISSUE AS TO PROPERTY OWNERS, WHETHER THEY PUMP OR NOT.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ALSO WHEN WE LOOK AT MR. ZLOTNICK'S PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION, THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT IS THE OPERATIVE PLEADING ALSO IS A CLASS OF PROPERTY OWNERS WITH A DISPUTE OVER WATER RIGHTS WITH PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS. IN OTHER WORDS, THE ZLOTNICK -- MR. ZLOTNICK'S CLASS ACTION PLEADING DOES NOT RAISE ANY ISSUE WITH ANY OTHER PROPERTY OWNER. IT IS A LAWSUIT THAT IS DIRECTED AT PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS. SO THERE IS NO -- AS FAR AS WE ARE AWARE OF IN THIS CASE THERE IS NO PLEADING AGAINST THE CLASS BY OTHER PROPERTY OWNERS AND THERE IS NO PLEADING BY THIS CLASS OF PROPERTY OWNERS AGAINST OTHER PROVENTS.

AND SO WHEN WE LOOK AT THIS WHOLE AREA IN TERMS OF WHAT THE COURT CAN DO TO SORT OF FACILITATE GETTING THIS CASE FURTHER DOWN THE ROAD TOWARDS A RESOLUTION, THE CASES SEEM VERY CLEAR AND SPEAK VERY LOUDLY AT TIMES THAT THE NECESSITY OF THE CLASS ACTION DEVICE REQUIRES IMPLEMENTATION IN SORT OF CREATIVE WAYS, AND OFTEN THAT MEANS USING THE CLASS ACTION DEVICE INITIALLY FOR LIMITED PURPOSES.

NOW ONE OF THE THINGS WE TALKED ABOUT WITH MR. ZLOTNICK WAS THAT BECAUSE THERE ARE THESE ISSUES THAT ARE COMMON TO LANDOWNERS, PARTICULARLY IN TERMS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BASIN INCLUDING YIELD, WHAT COULD

13

	1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
	2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
	3	DEPARTMENT NO. 1 HON. JACK KOMAR, JUDGE		
	4			
	5	COORDINATION PROCEEDING) SPECIAL TITLE (RULE 1550B))		
	6	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES) COORDINATION NO. P4408		
	7			
	8	PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT AND) SANTA CLARA CASE NO. QUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT,) 1-05-CV-049053		
2	9	CROSS-COMPLAINANTS,)		
	10	VS)		
	11) LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS,)		
	12	DISTRICT NO. 40, ET AL,)		
	13	CROSS-DEFENDANTS.)		
	14			
	15 16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
	16 17	MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2008		
	18	APPEARANCES:		
	19	(SEE APPEARANCE PAGES)		
	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24	ORIGINAL		
	25			
	26			
	27			
	28	CHARLOTTE NICHOLAS MOHAMED, CSR #2384 OFFICIAL REPORTER		
	L			

GOING TO BE AFFECTED BY ALL THIS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: WELL, SOME PEOPLE OWN MORE THAN ONE PARCEL BY DEFINITION.

MR. DOUGHERTY: VERY TRUE.

THE COURT: BUT THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT HAVE TO BE SERVED I'M SURE WOULD BE OVER A HUNDRED AND 50 THOUSAND BASED ON WHAT I UNDERSTAND ABOUT THE CHARACTER OF THE VALLEY.

AND WE ARE INTERESTED IN A PRACTICAL SOLUTION HERE, WE ARE NOT LOOKING FOR SHORTCUTS, MR. DOUGHERTY. THE COURT IS INTERESTED IN A PRACTICAL WAY OF OBTAINING JURISDICTION OVER THE OWNERS OF LAND WITHIN THE VALLEY SO THAT WE CAN GO THROUGH A NORMAL PROGRESSION OF LITIGATION. WE CAN GET A DEFINITION OF THE VALLEY, CHARACTERISTICS. WE CAN DETERMINE WHAT THE YIELD IS. WE CAN PUT THE PARTIES IN A POSITION WHERE THEY CAN EITHER SEEK AN ADJUDICATION OR TRY TO SETTLE THE CASE AMONG THEMSELVES.

AND IT SEEMS TO ME THERE ARE LARGE COMMON INTERESTS AMONG THE NONPUMPERS AS WELL AS THE SMALL PUMPERS, AND THE LARGE PUMPERS AS OPPOSED TO THOSE WHO ARE SUPPLYING, OR "PURVEYING," AS YOU PUT IT, WATER. WHETHER THEY ARE A MUNICIPALITY OR A PRIVATE WATER COMPANY OR WHATEVER.

MR. DOUGHERTY: YOUR HONOR, I GUESS I REALLY SHOULD APOLOGIZE FOR USING THE WORD "SHORTCUT." I DIDN'T MEAN IT IN THE SENSE THAT IT SOUNDS. WHAT I WAS TRYING TO GET ACROSS IS IT WOULD BE A SHAME TO GO THROUGH WHATEVER WE GO THROUGH AND THEN FIND OUT LATER ON THAT WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE WAY OF OBTAINING JURISDICTION OVER EVERYONE THAT WE THOUGHT WE MIGHT BE DOING. AND THAT IS THE REASON I SAY

	1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
	2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
	3	DEPARTMENT NO. 1 HON. JACK KOMAR, JUDGE				
	4					
	5	COORDINATION PROCEEDING)				
	6	SPECIAL TITLE (RULE 1550B))) JUDICIAL COUNCIL				
	7	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES) COORDINATION NO. P4408				
	8	PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT AND) SANTA CLARA CASE NO.				
	9	QUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT,) 1-05-CV-049053				
	10	CROSS-COMPLAINANTS,)				
	11					
	12	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS,) DISTRICT NO. 40, ET AL,)				
	13	CROSS-DEFENDANTS.				
	14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	15					
	16	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
	17	MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2008				
	18	APPEARANCES:				
	19	(SEE APPEARANCE PAGES)				
	20	*				
	21					
	22					
	23					
	24	ORIGINAL				
	25					
	26					
3	27	CHARLOTTE NICHOLAS MOHAMED, CSR #2384				
7	28	OFFICIAL REPORTER				
	ļ					

•

ANYTHING THAT INTERFERES WITH SETTLEMENT IS INTERFERING WITH THIS CASE MOVING FORWARD.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

24

25

26

27

28

MR. ZLOTNICK, IF HE REPRESENTS BOTH PUMPERS AND NONPUMPERS, IS GOING TO HAVE AN IMPOSSIBLE TIME PARTICIPATING IN THE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS BECAUSE A CENTRAL ISSUE IN THOSE NEGOTIATIONS IS HOW TO RECONCILE THE RIGHTS OF THE PUMPERS VERSUS THE NONPUMPERS.

I REPRESENT PUMPERS. OUR BIGGEST CONCERN IS NOT THE WATER PURVEYORS, IT'S THE NONPUMPERS. AND MOST OF OUR PARTICIPATION IN THE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS -- WHICH ARE UNDERWAY RIGHT NOW, THIS ISN'T SOMETHING IN THE FUTURE -- OUR PRINCIPAL CONCERN IS TO GET A SETTLEMENT THAT PROTECTS US FROM THE NONPUMPERS. IF WE CAN GET A SETTLEMENT, THEN THESE PHASES OF TRIAL SUCH AS BASIN CHARACTERISTICS, PRESCRIPTION, ET CETERA, MAY BECOME MOOT. MAYBE WE CAN AVOID THEM ALTOGETHER. IF WE HAVE A PROPER SETTLEMENT IN THE WORKS, PERHAPS WE CAN HAVE STIPULATIONS ABOUT THOSE THINGS; WE CAN REACH CONSENSUS. BECAUSE IF PEOPLE KNOW WHERE THE RESOLUTION IS GOING, THEN THEY CAN BE LESS CONCERNED ABOUT WHETHER WE HAVE SUBBASINS OR NON-SUBBASINS.

THE COURT: HOW DO YOU HAVE STIPULATIONS WITH PARTIES WHO ARE NOT PARTIES TO WHICH THE COURT HAS NOT OBTAINED JURISDICTION?

MR. FIFE: RIGHT. SO THE QUESTION IS HOW TO GET THOSE PEOPLE IN. AND THE POSITION THAT THE COURT HAS GOTTEN TO AT THE END OF EVERY SINGLE ONE OF OUR PAST HALF DOZEN HEARINGS IS THAT THERE SHOULD BE THE ZLOTNICK CLASS FOR THE NONPUMPERS ---AND THERE ARE ABOUT 3 HUNDRED THOUSAND PEOPLE IN THE ANTELOPE

30

	1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
	2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
:	3 DEPARTMENT NO. 1 HON. JACK KOMAR, JUDG				
	4				
	5	COORDINATION PROCEEDING) SPECIAL TITLE (RULE 1550B))			
	6	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES)	JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION NO. P4408		
	7				
1	8	PALMDALE WATER DISTRICT AND) QUARTZ HILL WATER DISTRICT,)	SANTA CLARA CASE NO. 1-05-CV-049053		
	9	CROSS-COMPLAINANTS,			
10	0	VS)			
1	1) LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS,)			
1:	2	DISTRICT NO. 40, ET AL,			
1:	3	CROSS-DEFENDANTS.)))		
1	4		1.		
1	15 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
16 MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2008		¥ 14, 2008			
1'	7				
18	8	APPEARANCES:			
19	9	(SEE APPEARANCE PAGES)			
20	0	D			
23					
22			40 40		
23	3				
24	4	ORIGINAL			
2	5				
20	6				
27 CHARLOTTE NICHOLAS MOHAMED, CSR #2384 OFFICIAL REPORTER					
		OFFICIAL REPORTER			

ANYTHING THAT INTERFERES WITH SETTLEMENT IS INTERFERING WITH THIS CASE MOVING FORWARD.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. ZLOTNICK, IF HE REPRESENTS BOTH PUMPERS AND NONPUMPERS, IS GOING TO HAVE AN IMPOSSIBLE TIME PARTICIPATING IN THE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS BECAUSE A CENTRAL ISSUE IN THOSE NEGOTIATIONS IS HOW TO RECONCILE THE RIGHTS OF THE PUMPERS VERSUS THE NONPUMPERS.

I REPRESENT PUMPERS. OUR BIGGEST CONCERN IS NOT THE WATER PURVEYORS, IT'S THE NONPUMPERS. AND MOST OF OUR PARTICIPATION IN THE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS -- WHICH ARE UNDERWAY RIGHT NOW, THIS ISN'T SOMETHING IN THE FUTURE -- OUR PRINCIPAL CONCERN IS TO GET A SETTLEMENT THAT PROTECTS US FROM THE NONPUMPERS. IF WE CAN GET A SETTLEMENT, THEN THESE PHASES OF TRIAL SUCH AS BASIN CHARACTERISTICS, PRESCRIPTION, ET CETERA, MAY BECOME MOOT. MAYBE WE CAN AVOID THEM ALTOGETHER. IF WE HAVE A PROPER SETTLEMENT IN THE WORKS, PERHAPS WE CAN HAVE STIPULATIONS ABOUT THOSE THINGS; WE CAN REACH CONSENSUS. BECAUSE IF PEOPLE KNOW WHERE THE RESOLUTION IS GOING, THEN THEY CAN BE LESS CONCERNED ABOUT WHETHER WE HAVE SUBBASINS OR NON-SUBBASINS.

THE COURT: HOW DO YOU HAVE STIPULATIONS WITH PARTIES WHO ARE NOT PARTIES TO WHICH THE COURT HAS NOT OBTAINED JURISDICTION?

MR. FIFE: RIGHT. SO THE QUESTION IS HOW TO GET THOSE PEOPLE IN. AND THE POSITION THAT THE COURT HAS GOTTEN TO AT THE END OF EVERY SINGLE ONE OF OUR PAST HALF DOZEN HEARINGS IS THAT THERE SHOULD BE THE ZLOTNICK CLASS FOR THE NONPUMPERS --AND THERE ARE ABOUT 3 HUNDRED THOUSAND PEOPLE IN THE ANTELOPE