



1 AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS )  
2

3 Cross-Defendant and Cross-Complainant, Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District  
4 (“PPHCSD”), submits the following trial brief for Phase III of trial.

5 I. INTRODUCTION

6 Phase III of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Adjudication (“Adjudication”) is PPHCSD’s  
7 first opportunity to participate in the trial of this matter. PPHCSD was formed in 2008, after the  
8 Phase I trial. PPHCSD sought to become a party to the Adjudication in November 2008 by  
9 informing the Court of PPHCSD’s intention to intervene in the Adjudication for a determination of  
10 its water rights in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin (“Groundwater Basin”).<sup>1</sup> PPHCSD  
11 seeks a declaration of its water rights and injunctive relief in the form of a physical solution  
12 overseen by a Court-appointed watermaster, with the Court retaining jurisdiction over the case.

13 While PPHCSD’s service area is located in San Bernardino County, just east of the  
14 Adjudication Area, a significant percentage of the groundwater PPHCSD produces is from the  
15 hydrogeologic Groundwater Basin as described in DWR Bulletin 118. That description was relied  
16 on in the Court’s Phase I Order (*see*, footnote 1, *supra*; *see also*, Exhibit 1, Phase I Order, p. 4,  
17

18 <sup>1</sup> “Groundwater basin” is not subject to a single definition. The Court stated as part of its Phase I  
19 Order dated November 3, 2006 (“Phase I Order”), “... that the alluvial basin as described in  
20 California Department of Water Resources [DWR] Bulletin 118-223 should be the basic  
21 jurisdictional boundary for purposes of this litigation.” (*See*, Exhibit 1, Phase I Order, p. 4, lines 6-  
22 8.) DWR Bulletin 118 (2003 update) illustrates (as does Exhibit 2, *infra*) that the hydrogeologic  
23 Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin extends east of the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County line,  
24 into San Bernardino County, extending to within the area adjudicated in the Upper Mojave River  
25 Valley Groundwater Basin Adjudication (“Mojave Valley Adjudication”), in which a final  
26 judgment was reached and a watermaster appointed. (*See, City of Barstow, et al. v. Mojave Water*  
27 *Agency, et al.* (2000) 23 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 1224.)

28 Unless otherwise noted, all references to the “Groundwater Basin” shall mean the hydrogeologic  
Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin as set forth in the Phase I Order and DWR Bulletin 118. All  
references to the “Adjudication Area,” unless otherwise noted, shall refer to that portion of the  
Groundwater Basin established by the Court’s Phase I Order, meaning the Adjudication Area’s  
eastern boundary is the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County line because the Mojave Valley  
Adjudication Area’s western boundary is the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County line. As a result,  
a portion of the hydrogeologic Groundwater Basin in this Adjudication exists within the area  
adjudicated in the Mojave Valley Adjudication Area.

1 lines 6-8). One of PPHCSD's most productive wells – Well 14 – is located in Los Angeles County  
2 and draws water from the Groundwater Basin, thus placing this well within both the Adjudication  
3 Area and the hydrogeologic Groundwater Basin.

4 PPHCSD will offer evidence during Phase III about the condition of the aquifer in the  
5 Southeastern portion of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The evidence will be offered  
6 primarily through its designated expert, Thomas Harder. The nature of the hydrogeologic  
7 Groundwater Basin and its relationship to the Adjudication Area is critical to understanding the  
8 condition of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The evidence PPHCSD will offer focuses on  
9 the condition of the Southeast area of the Groundwater Basin, and will show that as to the portion  
10 of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin studied by PPHCSD, the Groundwater Basin is in  
11 overdraft now, or trending toward overdraft.

12 Ultimately, PPHCSD seeks a finding by the Court that the prevailing condition of the  
13 Groundwater Basin is such that the Court may exercise its equitable powers to move this matter  
14 towards a declaration and final adjudication of water rights, together with this Court's injunctive  
15 relief fashioned to provide a "physical solution" with localized management areas and continuing  
16 jurisdiction.

## 17 II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND OF PHELAN PINON HILLS COMMUNITY 18 SERVICES DISTRICT

19 The evidence to be offered by PPHCSD will show that its service area is located at the  
20 northern base of the San Gabriel Mountains in the westernmost portion of San Bernardino County,  
21 placing PPHCSD within the Southeast area of the Groundwater Basin. (See, Exhibit 2,  
22 *Groundwater Basins*<sup>2</sup>.) Even though PPHCSD's service area is within the Mojave Valley  
23 Adjudication Area, the majority of PPHCSD's pumping occurs within the Groundwater Basin as  
24 identified in DWR Bulletin 118. DWR Bulletin 118 and other documents show that the

---

25 <sup>2</sup> Exhibit 2 is adopted from Figure 5 found in the report entitled, *Analysis of Historical*  
26 *Groundwater Production by the Phelan Pinon Hills Community Services District* (July 13, 2010)  
27 (the "Report"), prepared by PPHCSD's expert, Thomas Harder. The Report was electronically  
28 served and disclosed to all parties July 15, 2010.

1 Groundwater Basin, from which PPHCSD pumps water, extends on either side of, and is  
2 hydrogeologically continuous across, the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County line (*see*, Exhibit  
3 2).

4 PPHCSD is a public agency organized under the Community Services District Law, found  
5 at Government Code §§ 61000 *et seq.* It was formed by Resolution of the San Bernardino County  
6 Local Agency Formation Commission following an election conducted February 5, 2008, in which  
7 the voters approved the formation of PPHCSD as the consolidation of three special districts: San  
8 Bernardino County Zone-L-70 (Water); San Bernardino County CSA09 (Phelan Parks and Street  
9 Lighting); and San Bernardino County CSA 56-F1 (Piñon Hills Parks) (collectively, “San  
10 Bernardino County”). As such, PPHCSD is the successor to San Bernardino County.

11 The evidence PPHCSD will offer shows that as a public water purveyor, PPHCSD provides  
12 municipal and industrial water service to more than 21,000 residents through approximately 6,700  
13 service connections, of which approximately 1,500 are located within the Groundwater Basin.  
14 PPHCSD relies entirely on groundwater pumped from thirteen wells to provide water supply to a  
15 service area of approximately 120 square miles. Historical land use in PPHCSD’s service area  
16 includes cattle ranching, farming and residential uses, with the unincorporated communities of  
17 Phelan and Piñon Hills serving as the population centers for the area.

18 The evidence PPHCSD will offer shows that prior to 2008, water service for the PPHCSD  
19 service area was provided by San Bernardino County, which operated all of PPHCSD’s current  
20 water service facilities, including groundwater production wells. Six of San Bernardino County’s  
21 groundwater production wells are located within the Groundwater Basin. Although San  
22 Bernardino County pumped groundwater from other groundwater basins to the east, a significant  
23 portion of its production occurred from wells in the Groundwater Basin.

24 Until PPHCSD engaged Mr. Harder to undertake a focused study of the condition of the  
25 aquifers from which it produces, both the Southeast area of the Groundwater Basin as well as the  
26 West/Southwest portion of the Mojave Valley Adjudication Area had not been studied in detail.  
27 Neither the Southeast area of the Adjudication Area, nor the West/Southwest portion of the Mojave  
28 Valley Adjudication Area, had previously been studied for the purposes of the Mojave Valley

1 Adjudication. Except for the study undertaken by PPHCSD's expert hydrogeologist, this same area  
2 has not been studied in detail by any of the experts who have previously testified in Phases I and II,  
3 or who have been identified to testify during Phase III of these proceedings.

4 The evidence PPHCSD will offer will show that to meet the various land uses and needs of  
5 its residents, PPHCSD operates thirteen wells, including one well – Well 14 – located on the west  
6 side of the Los Angeles-San Bernardino County line. (*See, Exhibit 2, Groundwater Basins.*) In  
7 addition to Well 14, PPHCSD pumps from five other wells located within the Groundwater Basin.  
8 (*Id.*) The evidence PPHCSD will offer is that PPHCSD's pumping from wells located within the  
9 Groundwater Basin intercepts groundwater that would otherwise flow into the Adjudication Area  
10 and affects the condition of the Adjudication Area. Likewise, much of the water pumped and  
11 delivered by PPHCSD results in "return flow" to the Groundwater Basin, which affects the water  
12 balance of the Adjudication Area.

### 13 **III. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND SINCE THE COURT ISSUED ITS PHASE I AND** 14 **PHASE II ORDERS**

15 PPHCSD was organized after the Court issued its Order following Phase I. PPHCSD was  
16 brought into this groundwater adjudication as a party through cross-complaints filed by several  
17 parties, to which PPHCSD responded by Answer and cross-complaints against various parties for  
18 declaratory and injunctive relief.

19 The Court has held Case Management Conferences ("CMC" or "CMCs") to address various  
20 issues, including the scope of Phase III of the trial.

21 During the CMC on March 8, 2010 ("March 8, 2010 CMC"), the Court indicated its  
22 preference to hear in the "aggregate" but also to hear about the:

23 "... individual areas as to the basin and what's happening in those particular areas  
24 in terms of what the impact is. I know there is conductivity and connectivity, but  
25 I want to know the extent of it with regard to the various portions of it in the  
26 valley now."

(*See, Exhibit 3, Court Reporter's Transcript ("Transcript") from March 8, 2010  
CMC, p. 41, lines 19-24.*)

27 Similarly during the CMC held on March 22, 2010 ("March 22, 2010 CMC"), the Court  
28 stated that its "concern at this point is with whether or not the basin as a whole or parts, thereof, are

1 in overdraft..." (See, Exhibit 4, Transcript from March 22, 2010 CMC, p. 14, line 28 through p.  
2 15, line 2.) Broadly stated, the Court indicated that it wants to "hear the evidence as to the current  
3 status of the basin" (*Id.*, at p. 20, lines 10-11), recognizing that "[i]t may be that somebody wants  
4 to produce evidence that shows that their portion, their land is in an area where pumping has no  
5 affect on anything" (*Id.*, at p. 22, lines 14-16).

6 The Court subsequently issued an Order dated March 22, 2010, in which the Court stated  
7 that it:

8 "...will not hear any evidence concerning prescription claims nor does it expect to  
9 hear evidence of individual pumping of water by any party within the basin; rather,  
10 it expects to hear evidence concerning total pumping and total recharge from all  
11 sources, with a further breakdown showing the amount of imported water on an  
12 annual basis."

13 (*See*, Exhibit 5, Order dated March 22, 2010, p. 3, lines 5-8.)

14 PPHCSD will offer evidence during Phase III consistent with the Court's position as stated  
15 during the CMCs and reflected in the Court's Orders.

#### 16 **IV. THE CONDITION OF THE SOUTHEAST AREA OF THE** 17 **GROUNDWATER BASIN**

18 The evidence PPHCSD will offer is that the entire hydrogeologic Groundwater Basin,  
19 including that portion which is east of the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County line, must be  
20 evaluated and taken into account in order to fully understand the condition of the Southeastern  
21 portion of the Adjudication Area. PPHCSD's expert hydrogeologist agrees with the identification  
22 of the Groundwater Basin, as reflected in DWR Bulletin 118, and PPHCSD will offer evidence that  
23 the groundwater basin is hydrogeologically continuous across the Los Angeles/San Bernardino  
24 County line.

25 PPHCSD will offer evidence that pumping from PPHCSD's six wells located within the  
26 Groundwater Basin intercepts groundwater that would otherwise flow to the northwest and into a  
27 portion of the Adjudication Area where irrigation pumping by others is occurring. The evidence  
28 indicates, among other things, that the combination of PPHCSD pumping and downgradient  
pumping by others has resulted in declining groundwater levels in the Southeast portion of the  
Adjudication Area, particularly over the past ten years. Groundwater level trends indicate that

1 overdraft exists in the Southeast area of the Adjudication Area, or will exist in the near future, if  
2 groundwater pumping in this area continues at current rates or increases.

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 Consistent with the Court's earlier Orders from Phase I of trial and more recent Case  
5 Management Conference hearings, PPHCSD will offer evidence during Phase III that focuses on  
6 the condition of the Groundwater Basin in the Southeast area. The entire hydrogeologic  
7 Groundwater Basin must be evaluated in order to achieve a complete understanding of the  
8 Groundwater Basin's condition, including east of the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County line.  
9 Evidence about the condition of the Groundwater Basin in the Southeast area has not yet been  
10 made available for the Court's consideration. This comprehensive examination of the Groundwater  
11 Basin allows for a sound methodological study of the Southeast area, which yields results  
12 demonstrating that the Groundwater Basin – or at least the Southeast area thereof – is in overdraft  
13 or trending toward overdraft.

14 PPHCSD will ask the Court to exercise its equitable powers to work toward formulation of  
15 a "physical solution" to protect the Groundwater Basin allowing management. This will allow the  
16 parties to maximize the beneficial use of all water resources for the benefit of the residents and  
17 customers who rely on the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin.

18  
19 Dated: December 10, 2010

SMITH TRAGER, LLP  
SUSAN M. TRAGER

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP  
WESLEY A. MILIBAND

20  
21  
22  
23 By: 

Susan M. Trager  
Attorneys for Cross-Defendant and  
Cross-Complainant,  
Phelan Piñon Hills Community  
Services District

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Linda M. Yarvis,

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 400, Irvine, CA 92612.

On December 10, 2010, I served the within document(s) described as **PHASE III TRIAL BRIEF OF PHELAN PINON HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT (Including Exhibits 1 through 5)**, as follows:

☒ (ELECTRONIC SERVICE) By posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to Antelope Valley Groundwater matter pursuant to the Court's Clarification Order. Electronic service and electronic posting completed through [www.sceffiling.org](http://www.sceffiling.org).

☐ (BY MAIL) By placing a true copy of the foregoing document(s) in a sealed envelope addressed as set forth above. I placed each such envelope for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this Firm's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on that same day, with postage thereon fully prepaid at Irvine, California, 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.

☐ (BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) I deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by Overnight Express, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the foregoing document(s) in a sealed envelope or package designated by the express service carrier, addressed as set forth above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.

☐ (BY FAX) By transmitting a true copy of the foregoing document(s) via facsimile transmission from this Firm's sending facsimile machine, whose telephone number is (949) 223-1180, to each interested party at the facsimile machine telephone number(s) set forth above. Said transmission(s) were completed on the aforesaid date at the time stated on the transmission record issued by this Firm's sending facsimile machine. Each such transmission was reported as complete and without error and a transmission report was properly issued by this Firm's sending facsimile machine for each interested party served. A true copy of each transmission report is attached to the office copy of this proof of service and will be provided upon request.

Executed on December 10, 2010, at Irvine, California.

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

Linda Yarvis  
(Type or print name)

(Signature)