1	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665	EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE
2	JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926 STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787	SECTION 6103
3	5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500	
4	IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614 TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600	
	TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972	
5	OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL	
6	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
7	RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR., Bar No. 42230 COUNTY COUNSEL	
,	FREDERICK W. PFAEFFLE, Bar No. 145742	
8	SENIOR DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL	
9	500 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012	
10	TELEPHONE: (213) 974-1901	
10	TELECOPIER: (213) 458-4020	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
12	ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT and LOS ANGELES COUNTY	
10	WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40	
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
14	COUNTY OF LOS AND	GELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT
15	COUNTY OF LOS AND	ieles – Central District
	4	¥
16	ANTELOPE VALLEY	Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408
17	GROUNDWATER CASES	Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
18	Included Actions:	Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar
10	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	
19	No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los	DECLARATION OF STEFANIE D.
20	Angeles, Case No. BC 325201;	HEDLUND RE STATUS OF SERVICE OF PROCESS
21	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	
22	No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case	
	No. S-1500-CV-254-348;	
23	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of	
24	Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of	
25	Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of	
23	California, County of Riverside, Case Nos.	
26	RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	
27		
28		
40		

I, Stefanie D. Hedlund, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney duly admitted to practice before the California courts and I am an associate with Best, Best & Krieger LLP, attorneys for Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 and Rosamond Community Services District. I have personal knowledge of each and all of the facts herein and would testify competently thereto under oath.
- 2. The Public Water Suppliers have initiated numerous rounds of service. The first round of service began on October 28, 2005. The Public Water Suppliers identified approximately 600 landowners that owned 100 acres or more overlying the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin ("Basin"). For the first round of service, the Public Water Suppliers mail served landowners owning 100 or more acres overlying the Basin.
- 3. Of the parties identified and served in the first round of service, 110 parties signed and returned the Notice of Acknowledgment. On December 13, 2006, pursuant to the Court's order, the Public Water Suppliers sent a letter to these parties informing them that they must answer or otherwise appear within 30 days.
- 4. In July of 2007, pursuant to a court order, the Pubic Water Suppliers began attempting personal service on the 453 parties owning 100 acres or more who had not yet signed a Notice of Acknowledgment, answered or otherwise appeared. Of the landowner parties owning 100 acres or more a first attempt was made for each party and service has been completed on 395 parties.
- 5. Pursuant to the Court's direction at the July 20, 2007 Case Management Conference, the Public Water Suppliers halted service of these parties until the Court certified a class of landowners and determined if personal service would be necessary.
- 6. Pursuant to the Court's direction at the March 12, 2007, Case Management Conference, the Public Water Suppliers identified 36 Mutual Water Companies within the Basin. Sufficient information was found to complete service on 25 Mutual Water Companies. The Public Water Suppliers were unable to complete service on the remaining 11 Mutual Water Companies due to either wrong addresses and insufficient information to locate a correct address.

The Public Water Suppliers cannot find correct address information for the	remaining 11 Mutua
Water Companies.	e e

7. California Water Code section 5001 requires that any person in Los Angeles
County who extracts groundwater in excess of 25 acre feet a year must file a Notice of Extraction
with the State Water Resources Control Board. The Public Water Suppliers obtained a
compilation of the Annual Notices of Extraction for Los Angeles County from the State Water
Resources Control Board. Using this information, the Public Water Suppliers identified an
additional 38 parties that were pumping water in the Basin but had not been served. 29 of these
parties were successfully served. Failure to serve those 9 parties was due to wrong addresses.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this $\underline{1}$ day of August 2008, at Irvine, California.

Stefarie D. Hedlund

ORANGE\49328.1

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

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Kerry V. Keefe, declare:

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is Best Best & Krieger LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500, Irvine, California 92614. On August 7, 2008, I served the within document(s):

DECLARATION OF STEFANIE D. HEDLUND RE STATUS OF SERVICE OF **PROCESS**

×	by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.
	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set forth below.
	by causing personal delivery by ASAP Corporate Services of the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by Federal Express following the firm's ordinary business practices.

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

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

Executed on August 7, 2008, at Irvine, California.

Kerry V Keefe

ORANGE\KKEEFE\24201.1