Exhibit B



Respond to Orange County Wesley A. Miliband wmiliband@awattorneys.com Direct (949) 250-5416

Orange County 18881 Von Karman Ave., Suite 1700 Irvine, CA 92612 P 949.223.1170 • F 949.223.1180

Los Angeles 2361 Rosecrans Ave., Suite 475 El Segundo, CA 90245 P 310.527.6660 • F 310.532.7395

Inland Empire 3880 Lemon Street, Suite 520 Riverside, CA 92501 P 951, 241.7338 • F 951.300.0985

Central Valley 2125 Kern Street, Suite 307 Fresno, CA 93721 P 559.445.1580 • F 888.519.9160

awattorneys.com

July 17, 2014

Via Electronic Service - PRIVATE DISCOVERY POSTING

To The Liaison Committee
Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases
(Judicial Council Coordination No. JCCP 4408)

Re: Meet and Confer Pursuant to the Court's July 11, 2014 Minute Order

Dear Liaison Committee:

This letter serves to initiate the meet-and-confer process ordered by the Court through the Minute Order dated July 11, 2014 ("Minute Order").

Phelan Piñon Hills Community Services District ("Phelan Piñon Hills") understands the goal of this meet-and-confer process is for the Committee, and in turn the parties, to identify a process, and ultimately a "plan," for resolving all outstanding causes of action, claims, and issues of non-settling parties ("Claims"), which includes Phelan Piñon Hills. In turn, we must attempt to identify and agree upon a plan for resolving all outstanding Claims by those parties that sued and have not settled with Phelan Piñon Hills. The scope of Claims that we must address is set by the universe of complaints and cross-complaints between Phelan Piñon Hills and those parties that sued but have not settled with Phelan Piñon Hills.

In an effort to move forward in an orderly fashion that seeks efficiency without jeopardizing rights to proper discovery or a fair trial, I propose we discuss the following:

- (1) Determine the scope of disputed Claims: The vast universe of complaints and cross-complaints between the Phelan Piñon Hills and other parties leaves much to be resolved. As I requested in my June 24, 2014 letter from all parties, I propose that all parties sued by or suing Phelan Piñon Hills (other than the two classes) *immediately* identify whether they seek to challenge Phelan Piñon Hills, and if so, on which Claims; for simplicity, we can call these parties the "Contesting Parties." Adopting this approach would avoid undue delay and unfair surprise, and would be consistent to the approach done in prior trial phases. To date, only Palmdale Water District and Bolthouse have explicitly stated in writing they plan to challenge Phelan Piñon Hills on all Claims; Phelan Piñon Hills intends to challenge each of these parties and their Claims.
- (2) Determine to what extent we can stipulate to facts relating to one another's Claims: To date, very few counsel have expressed a willingness to stipulate to facts. Mr.

01133/0012/172928.01

To Liaison Committee July 17, 2014 Page 2

Zimmer has previously indicated his willingness to stipulate to facts. While I have every intention of trying to stipulate to as many facts as we can, historical trends of some counsel and parties in this case, as well as the complex and controversial nature of some facts, lead me to think we may not be able to stipulate to all necessary facts. Also, beyond trying to stipulate to all necessary facts is the challenge of *all* Contesting Parties agreeing to those facts. A stipulation of facts that falls short of all Contesting Parties bears little to no value because Phelan Piñon Hills would still need to present evidence regarding each such fact lacking a stipulation from all Contesting Parties. Nonetheless, I invite the dialogue to see how far we can go.

(3) Written discovery and depositions, for non-expert and expert facts and issues: To the extent a global stipulation as described above cannot be reached, discovery is necessary and should proceed in the form and process set forth by the Code of Civil Procedure, unless otherwise agreed to by the Contesting Parties and approved by the Court.

Substantively, I anticipate a scope of issues that bears upon water use, hydrogeologic conditions, among other (for additional information, see my June 24 letter that identified various documents previously posted by Phelan Piñon Hills).

I look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP

Wesley A, Miliband

1 2	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408 For Filing Purposes Only: Santa Clara County Case No.: 1-05-CV-049053
3	PROOF OF SERVICE
4	I, Marie W. 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 8	On July 17, 2014, I served the within document(s) described as PHELAN PIÑON HILLS LETTER TO LIAISON COMMITTEE TO MEET AND CONFER PURSUANT TO THE COURT'S JULY 11, 2014 MINUTE ORDER as follows:
9 10 11 12 13 14	(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. (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 July 17, 2014, at Irvine, California.
20	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
22	Marie W. Young (Type or print name) (Signature)
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	-1-
	PROOF OF SERVICE 01133/0012/93114.01