

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT

**ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER  
CASES**

Included Actions:  
Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.  
40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of  
California, County of Los Angeles, Case No.  
BC 325201;

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.  
40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of  
California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-  
CV-254-348;

Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of  
Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of  
Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale  
Water Dist., Superior Court of California,  
County of Riverside, Case Nos. RIC 353 840,  
RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668

RICHARD WOOD, on behalf of himself and  
all other similarly situated v. A.V. Materials,  
Inc., et al., Superior Court of California,  
County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC509546

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding  
No. 4408

**CLASS ACTION**

Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053  
Assigned to the Honorable Jack Komar

**STATEMENT OF DECISION**

1           The Court; having considered the evidence and arguments of counsel, orally issued its  
2 tentative decision on November 4, 2015 upon the conclusion of trial. For the reasons described in  
3 further detail below, the Court now issues its Statement of Decision and hereby affirms and  
4 confirms its previous statements of decision from earlier trial phases.

5 **I.     INTRODUCTION**

6           Cross-complainants Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Palmdale Water  
7 District, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District, Palm Ranch Irrigation District, Quartz Hill Water  
8 District, California Water Service Company, Rosamond Community Services District, Desert  
9 Lake Community Services District, North Edwards Water District, City of Palmdale and City of  
10 Lancaster (collectively, the “Public Water Suppliers”) brought an action for, *inter alia*,  
11 declaratory relief, alleging that the Antelope Valley Adjudication Area groundwater aquifer  
12 (“Basin”) was and is in a state of overdraft and requires a judicial intervention to provide for  
13 water resource management within the Basin to prevent depletion of the aquifer and damage to  
14 the Basin. They also seek a comprehensive adjudication of Basin groundwater rights for the  
15 physical solution.

16           West Valley County Water District and Boron Community Services District are also  
17 Public Water Suppliers but not cross-complainants.

18           Cross-defendants include the United States, numerous private landowners (collectively,  
19 “Landowner Parties”), numerous public landowners (“Public Overliers”), Small Pumper Class,  
20 other public water suppliers, and Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District (“Phelan”).  
21 Small Pumper Class and Willis Class filed actions to adjudicate their respective groundwater  
22 rights. All actions were coordinated and consolidated for all purposes.

23           The Court divided trial into phases. The first and second phases concerned the Basin  
24 boundaries and the hydrogeological connectivity of certain areas within the Basin, respectively.  
25 The third phase of trial determined that (1) the Basin was and has been in a state of overdraft  
26 since at least 1951; and (2) that the total safe yield of the Basin is 110,000 acre feet per year  
27 (“AFY”). The Court finds that the Basin’s safe yield consists of 82,300 AFY of native or natural  
28 yield and the remaining yield results from the augmentation of the Basin by parties’ use of

1 imported supplemental water supplies, i.e., State Water Project water for urban, agricultural and  
2 other reasonable and beneficial uses. The fourth phase of trial determined parties' groundwater  
3 pumping for calendar years 2011 and 2012.

4 The fifth and sixth phases of trial included substantial evidence of the federal reserved  
5 right held by the United States, evidence concerning Phelan's claimed groundwater rights, and  
6 concluded with the Court's comprehensive adjudication of all parties' respective groundwater  
7 rights in the Basin with a resulting physical solution to the Basin's chronic overdraft conditions.

8 This Statement of Decision contains the Court's findings as to the comprehensive  
9 adjudication of all groundwater rights in the Basin including the groundwater rights of the United  
10 States, Public Water Suppliers, Landowner Parties, Public Overliers, Small Pumper Class, Willis  
11 Class, Phelan, Tapia Parties, defaulted parties, and parties who did not appear at trial. After  
12 consideration as to all parties' respective groundwater rights and in recognition of those rights,  
13 the Court approves the stipulation and physical solution presented as the [Proposed] Judgment  
14 and Physical Solution (hereafter, "Judgment and Physical Solution" or "Physical Solution") in the  
15 final phase of trial and adopts it as the Court's own physical solution.

16 **II. THESE COORDINATED AND CONSOLIDATED CASES ARE A**  
17 **COMPREHENSIVE ADJUDICATION OF THE BASIN'S GROUNDWATER**  
18 **RIGHTS**

19 The Court finds that these coordinated and consolidated cases are a comprehensive  
20 adjudication of the Basin's groundwater rights under the McCarran Amendment (43 U.S.C. §666)  
21 and California law. In order to effect jurisdiction over the United States under the McCarran  
22 Amendment, a comprehensive or general adjudication must involve all claims to water from a  
23 given source. (*Dugan v. Rank* (1963) 372 U.S. 609, 618-19; *Miller v. Jennings* (5th Cir. 1957)  
24 243 F.2d 157, 159; *In re Snake River Basin Water System* (1988) 764 P.2d 78, 83.)

1 Here, all potential claimants to Basin groundwater have been joined. They have been  
2 provided notice and an opportunity to be heard regarding their respective claims.

3 **III. THE UNITED STATES HAS A FEDERAL RESERVED WATER RIGHT TO**  
4 **BASIN GROUNDWATER**

5 The Judgment and Physical Solution provide the United States with a Federal Reserved  
6 Water Right of 7,600 AFY from the native safe yield for use for military purposes at Edwards Air  
7 Force Base and Air Force Plant 42 (collectively, "Federal Lands.") The Federal Lands consist of  
8 a combination of lands reserved from the public domain and acquired by transfer from public or  
9 private sources. In the fifth phase of trial, the Court heard extensive evidence presented by the  
10 United States as to its claimed rights to the Basin's groundwater. The Court finds such evidence  
11 to be both substantial and credible and determines that the evidence presented is sufficient to  
12 support that part of the Judgment and Physical Solution related to the United States' Federal  
13 Reserved Water Right, including the allocation of 7600 AFY.

14 The federal reserved water rights doctrine provides that when the federal government  
15 dedicates its lands for a particular purpose, it also reserves by implication, sufficient water  
16 necessary to accomplish the purposes for which the land was reserved. (*See, United States v. New*  
17 *Mexico* (1978) 438 U.S. 696; 715; *Cappaert v. United States* (1976) 426 U.S. 128, 138; *Arizona*  
18 *v. California* (1963) 373 U.S. 546, 601; *Winters v. United States* (1908) 207 U.S. 564; *United*  
19 *States v. Anderson* (9th Cir. 1984) 736 F.2d 1358.) The Federal Lands within the Basin are  
20 dedicated to a military purpose, and that purpose by necessity requires water. Relevant to this  
21 adjudication, the federal reserved water rights doctrine may apply to groundwater. (*In re the*  
22 *General Adjudication of all Rights to Use Water in the Gila River Sys. and Source* (1999) 989  
23 P.2d 739, 748.)

24 The evidence at trial established that the water use on the Federal Lands is necessary to  
25 support the military purpose including water used for ancillary and supportive municipal,  
26 industrial and domestic purposes. Further, water reserved for federal enclaves is intended to  
27 satisfy the present and future water needs of the reservation. (*Arizona v California, supra*, 373  
28 U.S. at p. 600.) The future water needs on the Federal Lands was supported by evidence and

1 expert witness testimony presented at trial that persuasively established the unique attributes of  
2 the Federal Lands, their capacity for additional missions, and the trends within the Air Force and  
3 military that make the Federal Lands a likely candidate for potential expansion of the mission.  
4 The evidence presented at the fifth phase of trial was sufficient to establish facts necessary to  
5 support that part of the Judgment and Physical Solution related to the recognition and  
6 quantification of the United States' Federal Reserved Water Right.

7 **IV. CROSS-COMPLAINANT PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS HAVE PRESCRIPTIVE**  
8 **RIGHTS**

9 Cross-complainant Public Water Suppliers sought an award of prescriptive rights against  
10 the Tapia parties, defaulted parties, and parties who did not appear at trial. As explained below,  
11 the Court finds that those Public Water Suppliers have established the requisite elements for their  
12 respective prescriptive rights claims against these parties.

13 **A. Evidence of Adverse Use (Overdraft)**

14 “A prescriptive right in groundwater requires proof of the same elements required to prove  
15 a prescriptive right in any other type of property: a continuous five years of use that is actual,  
16 open and notorious, hostile and adverse to the original owner, and under claim of right. (*City of*  
17 *Santa Maria v. Adam* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 266 (*Santa Maria*) citing *California Water Service*  
18 *Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son* (1964) 224 Cal.App.2d 715, 726 (*California Water Service*)).)

19 Because appropriators are entitled to the portion of the safe yield that is surplus to the  
20 reasonable and beneficial uses of overlying landowners, “[t]he commencement of overdraft  
21 provides the element of adversity which makes the first party's taking an invasion constituting a  
22 basis for injunctive relief to the other party.” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 291  
23 quoting *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando* (1975) 14 Cal.3d 199, 282 (*San Fernando*)).  
24 “The adversity element is satisfied by pumping whenever extractions exceed the safe yield.”  
25 (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 292; see also *San Fernando, supra*, 14 Cal.3d at 278  
26 and 282; *City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra* (1949) 33 Cal.2d 903, 928-929 (*Pasadena*)).  
27 This is because “appropriations of water in excess of surplus then invade senior basin rights,  
28 creating the element of adversity against those rights prerequisite to their owners' becoming

1 entitled to an injunction and thus to the running of any prescriptive period against them.” (*San*  
2 *Fernando, supra*, 14 Cal.3d at p. 278 citing *Pasadena, supra*, 33 Cal.2d at pp. 928-29].)

3 Undisputed evidence was submitted that the Cross-Complainant Public Water Suppliers’  
4 production of water from the Basin has been hostile and adverse to the Tapia parties, defaulted  
5 parties, and parties who did not appear at trial. Each Cross-Complainant Public Water Supplier  
6 has pumped water from the Basin for at least five continuous years while the Basin was in  
7 overdraft.

8 In the third phase of trial, the court took evidence on the physical manifestations of  
9 overdraft and, finding substantial evidence thereof, concluded that there was Basin-wide  
10 overdraft. The Court found that the overdraft conditions commenced by at least 1951 and  
11 continue to the present. During this entire period, there was no groundwater surplus, temporary  
12 or otherwise.<sup>1</sup>

13 The evidence of historical overdraft—years when pumping exceeded the safe yield—is  
14 credible, substantial and sufficient. There was voluminous evidence, both documentary and  
15 testimonial, showing that extractions substantially exceeded the safe yield since at least the  
16 1950’s. By the beginning of this century, the cumulative deficit was in the millions of acre-feet.

17 Here, the adversity element of prescription is satisfied by the various Cross-Complainant  
18 Public Water Suppliers pumping groundwater when extractions exceeded the safe yield beginning  
19 in the 1950’s and continuing to the present time. The Court finds that the evidence of Cross-  
20 Complainant Public Water Supplier groundwater production in the Basin to be credible,  
21 substantial and undisputed.

22 **B. Evidence of Notice**

23 “To perfect a prescriptive right the adverse use must be ‘open and notorious’ and ‘under  
24 claim of right,’ which means that both the prior owner and the claimant must know that the  
25 adverse use is occurring. In the groundwater context that requires evidence from which the court  
26

27 <sup>1</sup> There was no evidence of a temporary surplus condition. Overdraft commences when  
28 groundwater extractions exceed the safe yield plus the volume of a temporary surplus. (*San*  
*Fernando, supra*, 14 Cal.3d at 280.)

1 may fix the time at which the parties ‘should reasonably be deemed to have received notice of the  
2 commencement of overdraft.’” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 293 citing *San*  
3 *Fernando, supra*, 14 Cal.3d at 283.) That can sometimes be difficult to prove. (*Santa Maria,*  
4 *supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 291.) But that was not the case here.

5 The Court finds that the long-term, severe water shortage in the Basin was sufficient to  
6 satisfy the element of notice to the Tapia parties, defaulted parties, and parties who did not appear  
7 at trial. The Court finds that there is credible evidence that the Basin’s chronically depleted water  
8 levels within the Basin, and resulting land subsidence, were themselves well known. (See *Santa*  
9 *Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 293 [“In this case, however, the long-term, severe water  
10 shortage itself was enough to satisfy the element of notice.”]) Undisputed evidence of notice was  
11 presented including the long-standing and widespread chronic overdraft; the decline and  
12 fluctuation in the water levels in the Basin aquifer; the resulting actions of state and local political  
13 leaders; the public notoriety surrounding the need and the construction of the State Water Project;  
14 the subsequent formation of the Antelope Valley East Kern Water Agency (“AVEK”); land  
15 subsidence in portions of the Basin; the loss of irrigated agricultural lands as groundwater  
16 conditions worsened; decades of published governmental reports on the chronic overdraft  
17 conditions including land subsidence; operational problems at Edwards Air Force Base due to  
18 land subsidence; and decades of extensive press accounts of the chronic overdraft conditions.

19 The Court heard credible expert witness testimony from Dr. Douglas Littlefield, a  
20 recognized water rights historian. His opinion was supported by substantial documentary  
21 evidence of the widespread information on overdraft conditions throughout the Basin since at  
22 least 1945. Of particular note, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors enacted an  
23 ordinance declaring the Antelope Valley groundwater basin to be in a state of overdraft in 1945.

24 The Court finds that there was abundant and continual evidence of actual and constructive  
25 notice of the overdraft conditions going back to at least 1945. The numerous governmental  
26 reports and newspaper accounts admitted into evidence are not hearsay because they are not  
27 admissible for the truth of their contents. (Evid. Code, § 1200.) “The truth of the contents of the  
28 documents, i.e., the truth of the assertion that the Basin was in overdraft, is not the point. Other

1 evidence proved that. The documents were offered to prove that the statements contained within  
2 them were made. That is not hearsay but is original evidence.” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211  
3 Cal.App.4th at p. 294 citing *Jazayeri v. Mao* (2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 301, 316.)

4 Here, the documents are evidence that public statements were made and actions taken by  
5 local, state, and federal officials, demonstrating concern about depletion of the Basin's  
6 groundwater supply. The notice evidence is substantial, credible and sufficient that the chronic  
7 overdraft conditions were obvious to the Tapia parties, defaulted parties, and parties who did not  
8 appear at trial. At the local level, AVEK was formed in the 1960's specifically to -bring State  
9 Water Project water into the Basin as a response to persistent groundwater shortage problems.  
10 These facts are sufficient to support the conclusion that the Tapia parties, defaulted parties, and  
11 parties who did not appear at trial were on notice that the Basin was in overdraft.

12 **C. Continuous 5 Years Use**

13 Any continuous five-year adverse use period is sufficient to vest title in the adverse user,  
14 even if the period does not immediately precede the filing of a complaint to establish the right.  
15 (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 266 [rejecting argument that prescription claim based  
16 on actions taken over 30 years ago should be barred by laches]; see *Pasadena, supra*, 33 Cal.2d at  
17 pp. 930-33 [upholding trial court's determination that a prescriptive right vested even though  
18 pumping failed to meet the adversity requirement during two of the three years immediately  
19 preceding the filing of the action]; *Lee v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.* (1936) 7 Cal.2d 114, 120.)

20 As to the prescriptive rights claims by each of the Cross-Complainant Public Water  
21 Suppliers, the Court concludes that they have the burden of proof. The Court finds that the Public  
22 Water Suppliers have met the burden of proof by undisputed evidence as to their following  
23 prescriptive rights against the Tapia parties, defaulted parties, and parties who did not appear at  
24 trial:



Public Water Supplier	Prescriptive Amount (AF)	Prescriptive Period
Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40	17,659.07	1995-1999
Palmdale Water District	8,297.91	2000-2004
Littlerock Creek Irrigation District	1,760	1996-2000
Quartz Hill Water District	1,413	1999-2003
Rosamond Community Services District	1,461.7	2000-2004
Palm Ranch Irrigation District	960	1973-1977
Desert Lake Community Services District	318	1973-1977
California Water Service Company	655	1998- 2002
North Edwards Water District	111.67	2000-2004

The above prescriptive amounts were established by evidence of each Public Water Supplier's respective groundwater production. Specifically, a five-year period with the lowest single year amount was used as the prescriptive right for each respective party's five-year period shown above.

The total prescriptive amount is greater than the amount of native water allocated to the Cross-Complainant Public Water Suppliers in the Judgment and Physical Solution. The Court finds that the amount of water allocated to the Cross-Complainant Public Water Suppliers is appropriate and reasonable, and does not unreasonably burden the groundwater rights of other parties. Additionally, West Valley County Water District and Boron Community Services District also pumped groundwater in quantities greater than their respective allocated amounts in the Judgment and Physical Solution, and their allocations are fair and reasonable in light of their

1 historical and existing reasonable and beneficial uses, and the significant and material reductions  
2 thereto required by the Physical Solution.

3 **V. PHELAN DOES NOT HAVE AN APPROPRIATIVE RIGHT AND**  
4 **VOLUNTARILY DISMISSED ITS PRESCRIPTIVE RIGHT CLAIM**

5 Phelan is also a public water supplier but it waived its prescriptive rights claim. Phelan  
6 seeks a court-adjudicated right to pump groundwater from the Basin for use outside of the  
7 Adjudication Area. For the reasons that follow, Phelan has no appropriative or any other right to  
8 Basin groundwater.

9 Phelan's service area falls entirely within San Bernardino County and outside the  
10 Adjudication Area. Phelan has one well within the Adjudication Area and several wells outside  
11 the Adjudication Area. Phelan uses that well water to provide public water supply to Phelan  
12 customers outside the Adjudication Area and within the adjacent Mojave Adjudication Area. In  
13 this Court's Partial Statement of Decision for Trial Related to Phelan, the Court found that  
14 "Phelan Piñon Hills does not have water rights to pump groundwater and export it from the  
15 Adjudication Area or to an area for use other than on its property where Well 14 is located within  
16 the adjudication area." (*Id.* at 6:19-21.) The Court makes this finding based on the following  
17 facts: Phelan owns land in the Adjudication Area but the water pumped from the well is provided  
18 to customers outside of the Adjudication Area (*Id.* at 7:3-6); the Basin has been in a state of  
19 overdraft with no surplus water available for pumping for the entire duration of Phelan's pumping  
20 (i.e., since at least 2005) (*Id.* at 4:9, 8:3-8); and the entire Basin, including the Butte sub-basin  
21 where Phelan pumps, is hydrologically connected as a single aquifer. (*Id.* at 8:2-3, 16-22).

22 The Court further finds that Phelan's pumping of groundwater from the Basin negatively  
23 impacts the Butte sub-basin. Phelan's expert witness, Mr. Tom Harder, testified that Phelan's  
24 groundwater pumping deprives the Basin of natural recharge that would otherwise flow into the  
25 Basin by taking water from the Adjudication Area for use within the Mojave Adjudication Area.

26 The Court finds that Phelan does not have return flow rights to groundwater in the Basin  
27 because any right to return flow is limited to return flows from imported water and Phelan has  
28 never imported water to the Basin (*Id.* at 9:3-10:6.); any groundwater flows generated from native

1 water pumped by Phelan are intercepted by three groundwater wells operated by Phelan just  
2 outside of the Adjudication Area; and the remaining flows that enter the Basin “merely ‘lessen the  
3 diminution occasioned’ by Phelan’s extraction and do not augment the [Basin’s] groundwater  
4 supply.” (*Id.* at 10:7-11, 15-17, 23-25.)

5 In summary, Phelan claims an appropriative right to pump groundwater from the Basin.  
6 The Court has found that there has been overdraft from the 1950’s to the present time and there is  
7 no surplus available for the acquisition or enlargement of appropriative rights by Phelan. Its  
8 appropriations of Basin groundwater invade other parties’ Basin rights. Phelan voluntarily  
9 dismissed its prescriptive rights claim and thus has no right to pump groundwater from the Basin  
10 except under the terms of the Court-approved Physical Solution herein.

11 **VI. STIPULATING LANDOWNER PARTIES AND PUBLIC OVERLIERS HAVE**  
12 **ESTABLISHED THEIR OVERLYING RIGHTS TO THE BASIN’S NATIVE SAFE**  
13 **YIELD**

14 Each stipulating Landowner Party and Public Overlier claims an overlying right to the  
15 Basin’s groundwater. They have proven their respective land ownership or other appropriate  
16 interest in the Basin and reasonable use and established their overlying right. (*Santa Maria*,  
17 *supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 298 citing *California Water Service, supra*, 224 Cal.App.2d at p.  
18 725; *Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist.* (1935) 3 Cal.2d 489, 524-525  
19 (“*Tulare*”) [a trial court must determine whether overlying owners “considering all the needs of  
20 those in the particular water field, are putting the waters to any reasonable beneficial uses, giving  
21 consideration to all factors involved, including reasonable methods of use and reasonable  
22 methods of diversion”].)

23 As explained below regarding the Physical Solution herein, the Court finds that it is  
24 necessary to allocate the Basin’s native safe yield to protect the Basin for all existing and future  
25 users. The Court received evidence of each stipulating Landowner Party’s, each Public Overlier’s  
26 and the Small Pumper Class’s reasonable and beneficial use of Basin groundwater. “E]vidence of  
27 the quantity of a landowner's reasonable and beneficial use is necessary in many cases. . . . For  
28 example, when it is alleged that the water supply is insufficient to satisfy all users the court must

1 determine the quantity needed by those with overlying rights in order to determine whether there  
2 is any surplus available for appropriation.” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 298 citing  
3 *Tulare, supra*, 3 Cal.2d at p. 525.) “And it stands to reason that when there is a shortage, the  
4 court must determine how much each of the overlying owners is using *in order to fairly allocate*  
5 *the available supply among them.*” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 298 [emphasis  
6 added].)

7 Here, the Court heard evidence from four water engineers in the sixth phase of trial  
8 regarding the stipulating Landowner Parties and Public Overliers’ reasonable and beneficial uses  
9 of water. Based on their credible and undisputed expert witness testimony, and substantial  
10 evidence in the fourth and sixth phases of trial, the Court finds that each stipulating Landowner  
11 Party and each Public Overlier has reasonably and beneficially used amounts of water which  
12 collectively exceeded the total native safe yield; and the amounts allocated to each of these parties  
13 under the Judgment and Physical Solution are reasonable and do not exceed the native safe yield.

14 The Court finds that the Landowner Parties and the Public Overliers will be required to  
15 make severe reductions in their current and historical reasonable and beneficial water use under  
16 the physical solution. The evidence further shows that the Basin’s native safe yield alone is  
17 insufficient to meet the reasonable and beneficial uses of all users, so the Court must allocate  
18 quantities for each party’s present use. The Court therefore finds that there is substantial  
19 evidence that all allocations of groundwater in the Physical Solution herein and as stipulated by  
20 the parties will effectively protect the Basin for existing and future users.

21 The Court further finds that the native safe yield allocations amongst the parties in the  
22 Physical Solution make maximum reasonable and beneficial uses of the native safe yield under  
23 the unique facts of this Basin, as required by the California Constitution, Article X, section 2.  
24 The Court finds based on the credible testimony by water engineers Robert Beeby and Robert  
25 Wagner that the Landowner Parties’ and Public Overliers’ allocated amounts are reasonable and  
26 beneficial uses of water, and are significant reductions from their present and historical uses.

27  
28

1 **VII. SUPPORTING LANDOWNER PARTIES – TRIAL STIPULATIONS**

2 On March 4, 2015, a large number of parties representing a majority of the total  
3 groundwater production in the Basin (the “Stipulating Parties”) stipulated to the Proposed  
4 Judgment and Physical Solution, which was subsequently amended on March 25, 2015. Since  
5 March 25, 2015, a limited number of parties not signatory to, but supportive of, the Proposed  
6 Judgment and Physical Solution (a “Supporting Landowner Party” or collectively, “Supporting  
7 Landowner Parties”) asserted claims to produce groundwater from the Basin and executed  
8 separate Trial Stipulations for Admission of Evidence by Non-Stipulating Parties and Waivers of  
9 Procedural and Legal Obligations to Claims by Stipulating Parties Pursuant to Paragraph 5.1.10  
10 of the Judgment and Physical Solution (“Trial Stipulations”) with the Stipulating Parties.

11 Under the Trial Stipulations, Supporting Landowner Parties agreed to reduce production  
12 of groundwater under Paragraph 5.1.10 of the Judgment and Physical Solution to the following  
13 amounts:

- 14 a. Desert Breeze MHP, LLC – 18.1 acre-feet per year;  
15 b. Milana VII, LLC dba Rosamond Mobile Home Park – 21.7 acre-feet per year;  
16 c. Reesdale Mutual Water Company – 23 acre-feet per year;  
17 d. Juanita Eyherabide, Eyherabide Land Co., LLC and Eyherabide Sheep Company.  
18 – 12 acre-feet per year;  
19 e. Clan Keith Real Estate Investments, LLC. dba Leisure Lake Mobile Estates – 64  
20 acre-feet per year; and  
21 f. White Fence Farms Mutual Water Co. No. 3 - 4 acre-feet per year.

22 *g. LV Ritter Ranch, LLC - 0 acre-feet per year.* *h. Robar Enterprises, Inc., Hi-Grade Materials, Co., and CTR, a General Partnership - 800 acre-feet per year.*  
The Supporting Landowner Parties claim overlying rights to the Basin’s groundwater.

23 Each Supporting Landowner Party has proven its respective land ownership or other appropriate  
24 interest in the Basin, and its reasonable and beneficial use, and established its overlying right.  
25 (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 298 citing *California Water Service, supra*, 224  
26 Cal.App.2d at 725; *Tulare, supra*, 3 Cal.2d at p. 524.)

27 Here, the Court heard evidence from the Supporting Landowner Parties in the sixth phase  
28 of trial. Based on the credible and undisputed evidence presented by the Supporting Landowner

1 Parties, the Court finds that there is substantial and credible evidence that each Supporting  
2 Landowner Party has reasonably and beneficially used amounts of water. The Court finds that  
3 the Supporting Landowner Parties will be required to make severe reductions in their current and  
4 historical reasonable and beneficial water use under the Trial Stipulations and the Physical  
5 Solution. The Court further finds that there is substantial evidence that all allocations of  
6 groundwater in the Trial Stipulations and the Physical Solution will effectively protect the Basin  
7 for existing and future users.

8 Therefore, based on the evidence submitted by the Supporting Landowner Parties, the  
9 Court approves the Trial Stipulations executed by the Stipulating Parties and the Supporting  
10 Landowner Parties and finds that the production rights agreed to therein are for reasonable and  
11 beneficial uses.

12 **VIII. SMALL PUMPER CLASS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IS APPROVED**

13 The Small Pumper Class settlement agreement with the Public Water Suppliers which was  
14 previously approved conditionally by the Court is hereby approved. The Court finds that the  
15 agreement is fair, just, and beneficial to the Small Pumper Class members.

16 The Court finds the testimony by Mr. Thompson, the Court-appointed expert, to be  
17 credible and undisputed regarding Small Pumper Class water use. The Court finds that the  
18 average use of 1.2 AFY per parcel or household is reasonable, and is supported by Mr.  
19 Thompson's report and testimony. Given the variation in Class Member water use for reasonable  
20 and beneficial purposes, the same is true of individual Class Member use of up to 3 AFY. The  
21 Court finds reasonable all other provisions in the proposed Judgment and Physical Solution that  
22 impact or relate to the Small Pumper Class members rights or administration of those rights.

23 **IX. CHARLES TAPIA, AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND AS TRUSTEE OF NELLIE TAPIA**  
24 **FAMILY TRUST**

25 Charles Tapia, as an individual and as trustee of Nellie Tapia Family Trust (collectively,  
26 "Tapia Parties") failed to prove their groundwater use. The Court finds that the evidence and  
27 testimony presented by the Tapia Parties was not credible in any way and that the evidence  
28 presented by Tapia Parties was inherently contradictory. Consequently, the Court cannot make a

1 finding as to what amount of water was used on the Tapia Parties' land for reasonable and  
2 beneficial use. Therefore, the Tapia Parties have failed to establish rights to groundwater  
3 pumping based on the evidence and there is no statutory or equitable basis to give them an  
4 allocation of water under the physical solution. The Tapia Parties will be subject to the  
5 provisions of the Physical Solution.

6 **X. WILLIS CLASS**

7 The Willis Class members are property owners in the Basin who have never exercised  
8 their overlying rights. Because the Willis Class objected to the Physical Solution, it is entitled to  
9 have its rights tried as if there were no stipulated physical solution. (*Pasadena, supra*, 33 Cal.2d  
10 at p. 924 ["Since the stipulation made by the other parties as to the reduction in pumping by each  
11 is not binding upon appellant, it is necessary to determine appellant's rights in relation to the other  
12 producers in the same manner as if there had been no agreement."]; *City of Barstow v. Mojave*  
13 *Water Agency* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1224, 1251-1252, 1256 (*Mojave*.)

14 In certain situations, as the Willis Class argues, unexercised overlying rights can be  
15 exercised at any time, regardless of whether there has been any previous use. The Willis Class  
16 concedes, however, the Court has authority to reasonably limit or burden the exercise of their  
17 overlying rights. .

18 Here, despite the Willis Class' settlement with the Public Water Suppliers limiting the  
19 impact of the prescriptive right, the Court finds multiple grounds to condition the unexercised  
20 overlying rights of the Willis Class. Because the landowners' reasonable and beneficial use  
21 pumping alone exceeded the native safe yield while public water supplier pumping was taking  
22 place, the unexercised overlying rights of the Willis Class are not entitled to an allocation in the  
23 Physical Solution. If that were not required under these circumstances in this Basin, the Court  
24 finds that the pumping here by Landowner Parties, Public Overliers and the Small Pumper Class  
25 would become legally meaningless because all unexercised overlying rights could eliminate long-  
26 established overlying production.

27 Furthermore, the Willis Class settlement and Notice of Proposed Willis Class Action  
28 Settlement and Settlement Hearing specifically state that the court will make a determination of

1 rights in the physical solution that will bind the Willis Class as part of the physical solution.  
2 (Notice of Proposed Settlement at § 9 [“The Court is required to independently determine the  
3 Basin’s safe yield and other pertinent aspects of the Basin after hearing the relevant evidence, and  
4 the Settling Parties will be bound by the Court’s findings in that regard. In addition, the Parties  
5 will be required to comply with the terms of any Physical Solution that may be imposed by the  
6 Court to protect the Basin, and the Court will not be bound by the Settling Parties’ agreements in  
7 that regard.”].)

8 As explained below concerning the Physical Solution herein, the Court finds that the  
9 Basin requires badly needed certainty through quantifying all pumping rights, including overlying  
10 rights. The Court finds that the Willis Class overlying rights cannot be quantified because they  
11 have no present reasonable beneficial use; their future groundwater needs are speculative;  
12 substantial evidence shows that the Basin’s groundwater supply has been insufficient for decades;  
13 and unexercised overlying rights create an unacceptable measure of uncertainty and risk of harm  
14 to the public including Edwards Air Force Base, existing overlying pumpers and public water  
15 supplier appropriators. This uncertainty and risk unreasonably inhibits critically-needed, long-  
16 range planning and investment that is necessary to solve the overdraft conditions in this Basin.

17 The Court has heard evidence on all parties’ water rights. The Court has considered these  
18 water rights in relation to the reasonable use doctrine in Article X, section 2 of the California  
19 Constitution. The Court finds that the unique aspects of this Basin explained below and its  
20 chronic overdraft conditions prevent the Willis Class from having unrestricted overlying rights to  
21 pump Basin groundwater.

22 The Court also finds an alternative basis for conditioning the Willis Class unexercised  
23 overlying rights in Article X, section 2 of the California Constitution. The Court finds that  
24 because of the circumstances existing in the Basin it would be unreasonable under the  
25 Constitution to allow unexercised overlying rights holders to pump without the conditions  
26 imposed by the Physical Solution. The Legislature has now recognized that unexercised overlying  
27 rights holders may have conditions imposed upon them by a physical solution. (Assemb. Bill  
28 1390, 2014-2015 Reg. Sess., ch.672, Code of Civil Procedure section 830, subdivision (b)(7),



1 [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab\\_1351-](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1390_bill_20151009_chaptered.pdf)  
2 [1400/ab\\_1390\\_bill\\_20151009\\_chaptered.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1390_bill_20151009_chaptered.pdf)" [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1390_bill_20151009_chaptered.pdf)  
3 [16/bill/asm/ab\\_1351-1400/ab\\_1390\\_bill\\_20151009\\_chaptered.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1390_bill_20151009_chaptered.pdf).)

4 Here, the Court must impose a physical solution that limits groundwater pumping to the  
5 safe yield, protects the Basin long-term, and is fair and equitable to all parties. The Court's  
6 Physical Solution meets these requirements. It severely reduces groundwater pumping, provides  
7 management structure that will protect the Basin, balances the long-term groundwater supply and  
8 demand, and limits future pumping by management rules that are fair, equitable, necessary and  
9 equally applied to all overlying landowners.

10 The Court also notes that the Willis Class does not presently pump any groundwater and  
11 thus, has no present reasonable and beneficial use of water. The Court finds it would be  
12 unreasonable to require present users to further reduce their already severely reduced water use to  
13 reserve a supply of water for non-users' speculative future use. Here, quantification of overlying  
14 rights is necessary because there is a present need to allocate the native supply. Accordingly, the  
15 Landowner Parties, Public Overliers and Small Pumper Class are entitled to continue their  
16 significantly reduced production of the native or natural safe yield as set forth in the Physical  
17 Solution. (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 300.)

18 The Court finds that without reasonable conditions upon the exercise of an overlying right  
19 in this overdrafted Basin, the Willis Class members' unrestricted right to exercise of the overlying  
20 right during shortage conditions would make it impossible to manage and resolve the overdraft  
21 conditions under the unique facts of this Basin and "[t]he law never requires impossibilities."  
22 (Civ. Code, § 3531.) The Court therefore finds that the Willis Class members have an overlying  
23 right that is to be exercised in accordance with the Physical Solution herein.

24 **XI. PARTIES WHO FAILED TO APPEAR AT TRIAL**

25 Parties who failed to appear at trial failed to meet their burden to produce evidence of  
26 ownership, reasonable and beneficial use, and self-help. The Court finds that the Public Water  
27 Suppliers have established their prescriptive rights claims as against these parties. They are  
28

1 bound by the Physical Solution and their overlying rights are subject to the prescriptive rights of  
2 the Public Water Suppliers.

3 **XII. PHYSICAL SOLUTION**

4 **A. Legal Standard**

5 “‘Physical solution’ is defined as an ‘equitable remedy designed to alleviate overdrafts  
6 and the consequential depletion of water resources in a particular area, consistent with the  
7 constitutional mandate to prevent waste and unreasonable water use and to maximize the  
8 beneficial use of the state's limited resource.’” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at pp. 287-  
9 288 quoting *California American Water v. City of Seaside* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 471, 480.) A  
10 court may use a physical solution to alleviate an overdraft situation. (*Ibid.*)

11 “[I]f a physical solution be ascertainable, the court has the power to make and should  
12 make reasonable regulations for the use of the water by the respective parties, provided they be  
13 adequate to protect the one having the paramount right in the substantial enjoyment thereof and to  
14 prevent its ultimate destruction, and in this connection the court has the power to and should  
15 reserve unto itself the right to change and modify its orders and decree as occasion may demand,  
16 either on its own motion or on motion of any party.” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p.  
17 288 quoting *Peabody v. City of Vallejo* (1935) 2 Cal.2d 351, 383–384 (*Peabody*.) The California  
18 Supreme Court has encouraged the trial courts “to be creative in devising physical solutions to  
19 complex water problems to ensure a fair result consistent with the constitution's reasonable-use  
20 mandate.” (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 288 citing *Tulare, supra*, 3 Cal.2d at 574.)

21 “‘So long as there is an ‘actual controversy,’ the trial court has the power to enter a  
22 judgment declaring the rights of the parties (Code Civ. Proc., § 1060) and to impose a physical  
23 solution where appropriate (*City of Lodi v. East Bay Mun. Dist.* (1936) 7 Cal.2d 316, 341  
24 (*Lodi*)). ‘Each case must turn on its own facts, and the power of the court extends to working  
25 out a fair and just solution, if one can be worked out, of those facts.’ (*Rancho Santa Margarita v.*  
26 *Vail* (1938) 11 Cal.2d 501, 560–561 (*Vail*)). . . . [T]he court not only has the power but the  
27 duty to fashion a solution to insure the reasonable and beneficial use of the state's water resources  
28 as required by article X, section 2. (*Lodi, supra*, at 341.) The only restriction is that, absent the

1 party's consent, a physical solution may not adversely affect that party's existing water rights.  
2 (Cf. *Mojave, supra*, 23 Cal.4th at pp. 1243–1244, 1250–1251.) (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211  
3 Cal.App.4th at p. 288.) Pursuant to this duty a trial court is obliged to consider a physical  
4 solution “when it can be done without substantial damage to the existing rights of others.”  
5 (*Peabody, supra*, 2 Cal.2d at p. 373.)

6 A trial court has broad authority to use its equitable powers to fashion a physical solution.  
7 (*Mojave, supra*, 23 Cal.4th at p. 1249; *Santa Maria, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 288 [“Each case  
8 must turn on its own facts, and the power of the court extends to working out a fair and just  
9 solution”] [quoting *Vail, supra*, 11 Cal.2d at pp 560-61].) The physical solution, however, must  
10 carry out the mandates of Article X, Section 2 of the California Constitution, including the  
11 mandate that the state’s water resources be put to “beneficial use to *the fullest extent of which they*  
12 *are capable.*” (*Lodi, supra*, 7 Cal.2d at p. 340 [emphasis added] quoting Cal.Const., art. XIV, §  
13 3.) In addition, while a physical solution may permit the modification of existing water uses  
14 practices, it may not allow waste. (*Pasadena, supra*, 33 Cal.2d at pp. 948-949 [Physical solution  
15 should “avoid [] waste, ... at the same time not unreasonably and adversely affect the prior  
16 appropriator's vested property right.”] [emphasis added in original]; *Lodi, supra*, 7 Cal.2d at 341  
17 [“Although the prior appropriator may be required to make minor changes in its method of  
18 appropriation in order to render available water for subsequent appropriators, it cannot be  
19 compelled to make major changes or to incur substantial expense.”] citing *Peabody, supra*, 2  
20 Cal.2d at p. 376.)

21 Here, the Court finds that because the Basin is and has been so severely overdrafted and  
22 contains so much undeveloped land that existing pumping must be limited and constraints on new  
23 pumping are required in the Physical Solution to protect the Basin, Edwards AFB and the public  
24 at large. Accordingly, the Court finds that water allocations and reasonable conditions on new  
25 pumping are required in the Physical Solution.

26 Factors that weigh into the reasonableness of water allocations in a physical solution  
27 include actual use (*Tulare, supra*, 3 Cal.2d at 565), whether use has been reasonable and  
28

1 beneficial (*id.* at 526); and the effect of the use on the basin and overall water supply. (*Lodi*,  
2 *supra*, 7 Cal.2d at pp. 344-345.)

3 **B. A Physical Solution Is Required Now**

4 The Court finds that a physical solution with an allocation of water rights is required now.  
5 The Basin has been in a state of overdraft since at least 1951. (Statement of Decision Phase  
6 Three Trial, pp. 5:17-6:28 (“Phase 3 Decision”); Partial Statement of Decision for Trial Related  
7 to Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District (2nd and 6th Causes of Action), p. 4, fn. 1.)  
8 In the phase three trial, the Court determined that the Basin has a safe yield of 110,000 AFY,  
9 consisting of a native safe yield of 82,300 AFY and return flows. (Phase 3 Decision at 9:27-28;  
10 see also Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice, posted on the Court’s website on January 24,  
11 2014 (“Supplemental RJN”), Ex. II, at 30:8-31:4.). The Court finds that groundwater production  
12 has exceeded this native and total safe yield and continues to exceed this safe yield causing harm  
13 to the Basin. (Phase 3 Decision at 6:18-27, 7:24-26.)

14 **C. The Physical Solution Is Unique Because Each Basin Is Unique**

15 The Court finds that there are facts which necessarily make the Physical Solution here  
16 unique and different from any other groundwater basin’s physical solution.

17 The Basin encompasses more than 1,000 square miles of desert land. It is one of the driest  
18 locations in California. The Basin is mostly recharged by nearby mountain front runoff as well as  
19 lesser amounts of recharge from use of State Water Project water. While drought conditions  
20 impact California, they are particularly harmful to the Basin because it has limited surface stream  
21 supplies, and no coastal desalination facilities or other significant natural sources of supply  
22 (except for mountain front recharge).

23 The largest landowner is the United States which operates Edwards Air Force Base  
24 (“Edwards AFB”) and other facilities in the Antelope Valley such as the “Plant 42” site. The  
25 federal facilities including Edwards AFB provide strategic national defense and aerospace  
26 capabilities and are critical to the local economy including the cities of Palmdale and Lancaster.  
27 Testimony by the United States establishes that Edwards AFB is unique amongst the federal  
28

1 military bases because it has and continues to conduct test flights and aerospace operations that  
2 cannot be conducted elsewhere.

3 Due to its location within the Basin, Edwards AFB has been and continues to be  
4 particularly prone to chronic lowering of local groundwater levels and land subsidence which is  
5 caused by groundwater pumping throughout the Basin. The Court received substantial evidence  
6 concerning the land subsidence in and around Edwards AFB.

7 The Court finds that there must be a physical solution which stops the overdraft conditions  
8 in and around Edwards AFB and that protects it from the future exercise of overlying rights that  
9 would exacerbate the existing overdraft or cause it anew. The Court finds that parties cannot  
10 continue to exercise their overlying rights in an unregulated manner because that will continue to  
11 harm the Basin and, in particular, Edwards AFB. The Court finds that the Physical Solution here  
12 allows for the reasonable exercise of overlying rights by all parties in a manner that will protect  
13 the operations at Edwards AFB and the rest of the Basin for all parties.

14 The Court finds that the current cost of supplemental State Water Project water from  
15 AVEK is approximately \$310 per acre foot – even in today’s severe drought conditions. The  
16 Court finds that the cost of supplemental State Water Project water is approximately \$26 a month  
17 (i.e., \$310 to \$312 AFY) that the cost for an acre foot of water is less than what most Californians  
18 would pay for their household water needs. The Court finds that it is fair, reasonable and  
19 beneficial for the Willis Class members to pay for the cost of replacement water from AVEK if a  
20 Class member should decide to exercise its overlying right by installing a groundwater well and  
21 using its water for reasonable and beneficial uses. The Court further finds that the Physical  
22 Solution provides that the Water Master has discretion to allow a Willis Class member to pump  
23 groundwater without having to pay any replacement assessment in certain circumstances.

24 **D. The Court Uses Its Independent Judgment To Adopt The Physical Solution**

25 A large number of parties representing a majority of the total groundwater production in  
26 the Basin (“Stipulating Parties”) have stipulated to the Physical Solution. The Court, however,  
27 uses its own independent judgment and discretion to approve the Physical Solution here; the  
28

1 Court adopts the Physical Solution as its own physical solution for the Basin after it determined  
2 and considered the parties' respective groundwater rights.

3 **E. All Parties Are Bound By The Physical Solution**

4 The Willis Class challenges the Physical Solution's allocation of native safe yield to those  
5 who exercise and have exercised their overlying rights. All present and historical users of the  
6 Basin's overdrafted groundwater supply have a legally protected interest in the native yield after  
7 their sustaining severe restrictions that will be imposed by the Physical Solution to decades-long  
8 water shortage conditions. The Willis Class interest in the long term health of the Basin is the  
9 same as every other overlying user of groundwater; there is no conflict between the Willis Class  
10 and the other parties in the Physical Solution. And the Court's continuing jurisdiction protects the  
11 Willis Class from the possibility that a future exercise of the overlying right by any party could  
12 adversely affect them.

13 The Willis Class asks to not be bound by the Physical Solution. The Willis Class argues  
14 that they cannot be bound by provisions they did not agree to, but the Court finds otherwise. "[I]t  
15 should be kept in mind that the equity court is not bound or limited by the suggestions or offers  
16 made by the parties to this, or any similar, action.' The court 'undoubtedly has the power  
17 regardless of whether the parties have suggested the particular physical solution or not, to make  
18 its injunctive order subject to conditions which it may suggest . . .'" (*Santa Maria, supra*, 211  
19 Cal.App.4th at p. 290 quoting *Tulare, supra*, 3 Cal.2d at 574.) The Court finds that to protect the  
20 Basin it is necessary that all parties participate and be bound by the groundwater management  
21 provisions of the Physical Solution.

22 **F. The Physical Solution Protects the Basin by Preventing Future Overdraft**

23 The Physical Solution will protect all water rights in the Basin by preventing future  
24 overdraft, improving the Basin's overall groundwater levels, and preventing the risk of new land  
25 subsidence. (See *Lodi, supra*, 7 Cal.2d at 344-45.) Dr. Williams testified that pumping at  
26 existing levels will continue to degrade and cause undesirable results in the Basin, but that the  
27 Physical Solution will bring the Basin into balance and stop undesirable results including land  
28

1 subsidence. The ramp-down of groundwater production set forth in the Physical Solution will  
2 bring pumping in the Basin within its safe yield.

3 Furthermore, the Physical Solution is likely to lead to additional importation of water into  
4 the Basin and thus additional return flows which will help to restore groundwater levels in the  
5 Basin in two ways. First, if existing groundwater users exceed their respective allocations, they  
6 will pay a replacement assessment that will be used to bring additional imported water into the  
7 Basin. Second, because allocations are capped at the total yield of the Basin, new production,  
8 whether by existing pumpers or new pumpers will result in importation of additional  
9 supplemental water into the Basin. Finally, the Physical Solution allows parties to store water in  
10 the Basin which will improve water levels. The Court further finds that the carryover and transfer  
11 provisions in the Judgment and Physical Solution are reasonable and beneficial, and are essential  
12 in the management of the Basin.

13 Dr. Williams testified as to what will happen to groundwater levels if current pumping  
14 levels continue without a physical solution, compared to scenarios in which parties pump in  
15 accordance with the Physical Solution. His testimony showed that water level decline and  
16 subsidence risk will decrease under the Physical Solution. In the absence of a physical solution,  
17 he testified, subsidence will continue to be a problem. This credible and undisputed testimony  
18 demonstrates that management by the Physical Solution is necessary to sustain groundwater  
19 levels and protect future use of entitlements in the Basin.

20 The Court finds that the Basin's safe yield, together with available supplemental supplies,  
21 are sufficient to meet current water demands. This confirms further that the Physical Solution will  
22 work for this Basin

23 **G. The Physical Solution Reasonably Treats All Overlying Rights**

24 The Court finds that each party is treated reasonably by the Physical Solution; the priority  
25 of rights in the Basin is preserved; no vested rights are eliminated; and allocations are reasonably  
26 tied to reasonable and beneficial use and the health of the Basin. (See *Lodi, supra*, 7 Cal.2d at  
27 341; *Mojave, supra*, 23 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> at p. 1250; *Pasadena, supra*, 33 Cal.2d at pp. 948-949.)

1                   1)     Federal Reserved Rights

2                   The United States has a right to produce 7,600 AFY from the native safe yield as a federal  
3 reserved water right for use for military purposes at Edwards Air Force Base and Air Force Plant  
4 42. (See *United States v. New Mexico, supra*, 438 U.S. at p. 700; *Cappaert v. United States,*  
5 *supra*, 426 U.S. at p. 138.) The Physical Solution preserves the United States' right to produce  
6 7,600 AFY at any time for uses consistent with the federal reserved water right, and shields the  
7 United States' water right from the ramp down and pro-rata reduction due to overdraft. (Physical  
8 Solution, ¶5.1.4.) When the United States does not take its allocation, the Physical Solution  
9 provides for certain parties who have cut back their present water use to use that water consistent  
10 with the Constitutional mandate of Article X, Section 2 to put the water to its fullest use..

11                   2)     Small Pumper Class

12                   Small Pumper Class members are allocated up to and including 3 AFY per existing  
13 household for reasonable and beneficial use on their overlying land, with the known Small  
14 Pumper Class members' aggregate use of native supply limited to 3,806.4 AFY. A Small Pumper  
15 Class member taking more than 3 AFY is subject to a replacement water assessment. (Physical  
16 Solution, ¶5.1.3.) The Court has already admitted evidence regarding the Small Pumper Class'  
17 use of water by the Court-appointed expert, Tim Thompson.

18                   3)     Overlying Landowner Parties and Public Overliers

19                   The Physical Solution allocates approximately 82 percent of the adjusted native safe yield  
20 to the Landowner Parties and Public Overliers. (Physical Solution section 5.1.5, Ex. 4.) The  
21 allocation is fair and reasonable in light of their historical and existing reasonable and beneficial  
22 uses, and the significant and material reductions thereto required by the Physical Solution.

23                   4)     Unknown Existing Pumps

24                   The Physical Solution provides for the allocation of groundwater to unknown *existing*  
25 pumps that prove their respective entitlement to water rights in the future. (Physical Solution,  
26 ¶¶5.1.10, 18.5.13.) Such allocations will not result in continuing overdraft, as the Physical  
27 Solution provides for the Water Master to adjust allocations or take other action necessary to  
28 prevent overdraft. (*Id.* at ¶18.5.13.2.) The Court finds that the Physical Solution approved herein



1 provides sufficient flexibility to the Court and the Water Master so that the Physical Solution is  
2 implemented fairly and reasonably as to any unknown existing users.

3 5) Return Flows From Imported Water

4 Return flow rights exist with respect to foreign water brought into the Basin, the use of  
5 which augments the Basin's groundwater. (*City of Los Angeles v. City of Glendale* (1943) 23  
6 Cal.2d 68, 76-78; *San Fernando, supra*, 14 Cal.3d at pp. 257-259, 262-263; *Santa Maria, supra*,  
7 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 301.) Return flows are calculated by multiplying the quantity of water  
8 imported and used in the Basin by a percentage representing the portion of that water that is  
9 expected to augment the aquifer. (*Ibid.*) Paragraph 18.5.11 provides the Water Master with  
10 flexibility to adjust the return flow percentages in the seventeenth year. The Court finds that the  
11 right to return flows from imported State Water Project water is properly allocated as set forth in  
12 paragraph 5.2 and Exhibit 8 of the Judgment and Physical Solution.

13 6) Phelan

14 The Physical Solution permits Phelan to pump up to 1,200 AFY from the Basin and  
15 deliver the pumped water outside of the Basin for use in the Phelan service area if that amount of  
16 water is available without causing material injury and provided that Phelan pays a replacement  
17 water assessment. (Physical Solution, ¶6.4.1.2.) This allocation and the correlating assessment  
18 are fair and reasonable in light of findings made by the Court.

19 7) Defaulted Parties and Parties That Did Not Appear At Trial

20 Defaulting parties and parties who did not appear at trial failed to meet their burden to  
21 produce evidence of ownership, reasonable and beneficial use, and self-help. They are bound by  
22 the Physical Solution and their overlying rights, if any, are subject to the prescriptive rights of the  
23 Public Water Suppliers.

24 ~~8) Robar Enterprises, Inc., Hi-Grade Materials Co., CJR, a general~~  
25 ~~partnership.~~

26 ~~The Court has severed Robar Enterprises, Inc., Hi-Grade Materials Co., CJR, a general~~  
27 ~~partnership (collectively, "Robar") from the trial and retains jurisdiction over Robar's~~  
28 ~~groundwater rights claim.~~

1           **H.     The Physical Solution Is Consistent With the Willis Class Settlement**  
2                           **Agreement**

3           The Public Water Suppliers entered into a Stipulation of Settlement with the Willis Class  
4 (“Willis Class Stipulation” or “Stipulation”) which was approved by the Court on September 22,  
5 2011. As the Court has already recognized, the Stipulation—which was only between the Willis  
6 Class and the Public Water Suppliers—did not and cannot establish a water rights determination  
7 binding upon all parties in these proceedings. (Order after November 18, 2010 Hearing [“the  
8 court determination of physical solution cannot be limited by the [Stipulation]”; the Stipulation  
9 “may not affect parties who are not parties to the [Stipulation]”].) Rather, water rights must be  
10 determined by the Court as part of a comprehensive physical solution to the Basin’s chronic  
11 overdraft condition. Indeed, the Willis Class acknowledged in the Stipulation that the ultimate  
12 determination of its reasonable correlative right would depend upon the existing and historical  
13 pumping of all other overlying landowners in the Basin. (Stipulation, ¶IV.D.3.) While the  
14 Stipulation recognized that the Willis Class members may receive whatever is later to be  
15 determined by the Court as their reasonable correlative right to the Basin’s native safe yield for  
16 actual reasonable and beneficial uses, it could do nothing more.

16           *Nothing in the Decision,  
17 judgment, or Physical Solution, alters the agreed-upon allocations between  
18 the Public Water Suppliers and the Willis Class.*

17           The Court finds that the Physical Solution is consistent with the Willis Class Stipulation  
18 for at least the following reasons:

- 19           1)     The Willis Class Stipulation recognizes that there would be Court-imposed  
20           limits on the Willis Class’ correlative share of overlying rights because the  
21           Basin is and has been in an overdraft condition for decades; *That relation-  
22           ship has no impact on the Court’s duty to impose a*
- 22           2)     No member of the Willis Class has established any present right to produce  
23           groundwater for reasonable and beneficial use based on their unexercised  
24           overlying claim; and *Physical Solution that protects the*
- 25           3)     The Physical Solution recognizes the Willis Class’ share of correlative *Basin.*  
26           overlying rights and does not unreasonably burden its members’ rights  
27           given the significant reductions in groundwater pumping and increased  
28           expense incurred by the Stipulating Parties in the Physical Solution. At

1 this time, more than the entire native safe yield is being applied to  
2 reasonable and beneficial uses.

3 In the Willis Class Stipulation, the Willis Class also agreed that a Court-imposed physical  
4 solution may require the installation of a meter on any groundwater pump by a Willis Class  
5 member (Willis Class Stipulation at ¶V.B. at 11:28-12:7) and that Willis Class member  
6 production from the Basin above its allocated share in a physical solution would require the  
7 member to import replacement water or pay a replacement assessment (*Id.* at ¶IV.D. at 12:19-26).  
8 The requirements set forth in Paragraphs 9.2 and 9.2.1 of the Physical Solution are thus consistent  
9 with the Willis Class Stipulation.

10 **I. The Physical Solution Does Not Unreasonably Affect the Willis Class**

11 As overlying landowners in an overdrafted basin, the members of the Willis Class are  
12 entitled to a fair and just proportion of the water available to overlying landowners, i.e., a  
13 correlative right. (*Katz v. Walkinshaw* (1903) 141 Cal. 116, 136; see also Willis Class  
14 Stipulation, ¶III.D at 5:26-6:2.) The Willis Class members, however, have never exercised their  
15 rights to produce groundwater from the Basin. Recognizing this fact, the Physical Solution does  
16 not provide for an allocation to the Willis Class, but preserves their ability to pump groundwater  
17 in the future. This right cannot be unrestricted, however, due to the unique aspects of this Basin,  
18 its long-standing overdraft conditions, and the significant reductions in groundwater use by  
19 parties who have relied and continue to rely upon the Basin for a sustainable groundwater supply.

20 Here, the Court must fashion a physical solution that limits groundwater pumping to the  
21 safe yield, protects the Basin long-term, and is fair and equitable to all parties. Willis Class  
22 members will have the opportunity to prove a claim of right to the Court (Physical Solution,  
23 ¶5.1.10) or, like all other pumpers in the Basin, apply to the Water Master for new groundwater  
24 production. (¶18.5.13). Thus, the Willis Class' correlative rights are more than fairly protected  
25 by the Physical Solution.

26 As discussed above, to the extent the Court finds that a replacement water assessment is  
27 necessary the Court finds it is reasonable. Significantly, the assessment is consistent with the  
28 Willis Class Stipulation in which the Willis Class agreed to pay a replacement assessment if a

1 member produced “more than its annual share” of the native safe yield less the amount of the  
2 federal reserved right. In addition, the replacement assessment is imposed uniformly on all  
3 existing producers in the Basin that produce more than their available allocation in any given  
4 year. (Physical Solution, ¶9.2.)

5 In today’s unprecedented drought conditions with the cost of water rising, a replacement  
6 assessment for an acre foot of water would be approximately \$310. Assuming an acre foot of  
7 water is sufficient for domestic use in the Antelope Valley as testified by the court-appointed  
8 expert, Tim Thompson, the average monthly cost for a Willis Class member would be a mere \$26  
9 – a monthly amount less than what most Californians are likely paying for that amount of water.  
10 The Court finds that the replacement assessment is not an unreasonable burden upon any Willis  
11 Class member who may someday install a well for domestic use.

12 But even the small amount of replacement assessment cost can be avoided under the  
13 Physical Solution if the Water master determines that the particular Willis Class member’s  
14 domestic use will not harm the Basin or other groundwater users. There is no reasonable basis for  
15 any argument that a replacement assessment somehow unreasonably burdens or significantly  
16 harms a Willis Class member who might have to pay a relatively small amount for a relatively  
17 large amount of water.

18 **J. The Willis Class’ Due Process Rights Are Not Violated**

19 The Court finds that the Physical Solution does not “extinguish” the water rights of the  
20 Willis Class, as the Willis Class claims. Rather, the Physical Solution allows Willis Class  
21 members—who have never put their overlying rights to reasonable and beneficial use - to prove  
22 their entitlement to a Production Right to the Court or apply as a new pumper to the Water  
23 master. (Physical Solution, ¶¶5.1.10 & 18.5.13.) The Willis Class had notice and an opportunity  
24 to present evidence on this and all other issues determined by the Court.

25 The Court finds that the Willis Class received adequate notice that the Court would adopt  
26 a physical solution that could restrict or place conditions on the Willis Class members’ ability to  
27 pump groundwater. Due process protects parties from “arbitrary adjudicative procedures.” (*Ryan*  
28 *v. California Interscholastic Federation-San Diego Section* (2001) 94 Cal.App.4th 1048, 1070.)

1 No such risk exists here because the Court-approved notice to the Willis Class, put them on notice  
2 that they would be subject to a physical solution yet to be approved by the Court. The notice  
3 stated that the Willis Class members “will be bound by the terms of any later findings made by  
4 the Court and any Physical Solution imposed by the Court” and “it is likely that there will be  
5 limits imposed on the amount of pumping in the near future.” (Notice of Proposed Settlement at  
6 §§ 9 & 17.)

7 The Willis Class has actively participated in these proceedings since January 11, 2007,  
8 knows that the other Landowner Parties and Public Overliers claim a correlative share of the  
9 Basin’s native safe yield, and agreed in the Willis Class Stipulation that they would be subject to  
10 the Court’s future jurisdiction and judgment and be bound by a physical solution.

11 **XIII. CONCLUSION**

12 The Court finds that the Physical Solution is required and appropriate under the unique  
13 facts of the Basin. The Physical Solution resolves all groundwater issues in the Basin and  
14 provides for a sustainable groundwater supply for all parties now and in the future. The Physical  
15 Solution addresses all parties’ rights to produce and store groundwater in the Basin while  
16 furthering the mandates of the State Constitution and the water policy of the State of California.  
17 The Court finds that the Physical Solution is reasonable, fair and beneficial as to all parties, and  
18 serves the public interest.

19  
20  
21 Dated: December 23, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

22  
23  
24  
25 26345.00000\23141316.3