1 2	ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP WESLEY A. MILIBAND, Bar No. 241283 MILES P. HOGAN, Bar No. 287345 18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 Telephone: (949) 223-1170	
3		
4	Facsimile: (949) 223-1180 wmiliband@awattorneys.com	
5	mhogan@awattorneys.com	
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainan Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District	
8	SUPERIOR COUR	RT OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT	
10		
11	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	<ul><li>) Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding</li><li>) No. 4408</li></ul>
<ul><li>12</li><li>13</li></ul>	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	) (For Filing Purposes Only:. Santa Clara ) County Case No.: 1-05-CV-049053)
14	Included Actions:	) Assigned for All Purposes To:
15	Los Angeles County Waterworks District	) Judge: Hon. Jack Komar )
16	No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., et al.	) (Filing Fees Exempt, Per Gov't Code § 6103)
17	Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 325 201	<ul><li>) STATEMENT BY PHELAN PIÑON</li><li>) HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES</li><li>) DISTRICT FOR CONFERENCE SET</li></ul>
18	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.	) FOR AUGUST 29, 2014 )
19	Diamond Farming Co., et al. Kern County Superior Court, Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348	
20	5-1300-C v -234-346	) ) DATE: Assessed 20, 2014
21	III D. I.I France I C't f	) DATE: August 29, 2014 ) TIME: 11:00 a.m.
22	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster	) LOCATION: 191 N. 1st Street San Jose, California
23	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water	)
24	Dist. Riverside County Superior Court,	) )
25	Consolidated Action, Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	)
26	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS	)
27		)
28		

TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD HEREIN:

Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District ("Phelan Piñon Hills") hereby submits this Statement for the August 29, 2014 Status Conference.

Phelan Piñon Hills continues to meet-and-confer with the parties to work a stipulation as to which issues and facts will be part of this next trial, as well as the process for disclosures, potential depositions, and briefing in advance of the trial. The Parties have not affirmatively arrived at a consensus on issues or facts yet, but Phelan Piñon Hills believes consensus exists as to some issues and facts. Thus, while Phelan Piñon Hills remains concerned with the trial setting for reasons previously stated on August 11, Phelan Piñon Hills anticipates the Parties will reach substantial consensus on facts.

As to *the* issues for the next trial, Phelan Piñon Hills' sense is that its Second Cause of Action (Appropriative Right) and Sixth Cause of Action (Recapture of Return Flows) are the issues for this trial; however, Phelan Piñon Hills requests clarification from the Court as to whether it seeks to hear evidence about surplus in the local/regional Southeast area of the aquifer.

On August 11, the Court indicated:

So at this point, it seems to me that I will tell you what I want to have bifurcated and adjudicated are questions of your right to pump water as an appropriator of right, number one; and number two, that you brief and present evidence and argument concerning your right --your client's right -- as a public producer apart from whether there was a surplus that would permit you to be an appropriator of right. If you want to add to that a third issue, which is the question of the effect of return flows from your pumping that flow back into the area of your well that you may do too.

As for process and next steps, Phelan Piñon Hills proposes:

- (1) The Court confirm on August 29 the scope of issues being tried in this next trial.
- (2) The Court order the Parties to further meet-and-confer next week as to the facts, and to the extent the Parties do not stipulate by the close of business on Friday, September 5, those Parties are to file and serve before the close of business on Tuesday, September 9 their Notice of Intent to Participate in this trial; Disclosure of Percipient Witnesses with

1	a summary statement of anticipated testimony; and Designate experts pursuant to the
2	Code of Civil Procedure.
3	(3) The Court order a meet-and-confer be done before the close of business on Friday,
4	September 12 for purposes of scheduling depositions and addressing other discovery
5	issues, if any exist.
6	(4) The Court set a telephonic status conference for Monday, September 15.
7	
8	Dated: August 28, 2014 Respectfully submitted,
9	ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
10	
11	By:
12	Wesley A. Miliband Attorneys for Cross-Defendant and
13	Cross-Complainant, Phelan Piñon Hills Community
14	Services District
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 For Filing Purposes Only: Santa Clara County Case No.: 1-05-CV-049053		
2			
3	PROOF OF SERVICE		
4	I, Marie Young,		
5	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 1700, Irvine, CA 92612.		
7	On August 28, 2014, I served the within document(s) described as STATEMENT BY PHELAN PINON HILLS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT FOR CONFERENCE SET FOR AUGUST 29, 2014 as follows:		
9 10 11	(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.scefiling.org.		
12 13 14	(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.		
16 17 18	(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.		
19	Executed on August 28, 2014, at Irvine, California.		
20 21	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.		
	Marie Young Warie Vaus		
22	(Type or print name) (Signature)		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
***************************************	-1-		
	PROOF OF SERVICE		

01133/0012/93114.01