

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
B. Richard Marsh (SBN 23820)
Daniel V. Hyde (SBN: 63365)
221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 250-1800
Facsimile: (213) 250-7900

ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
Anne J. Schneider (SBN: 72552)
Christopher M. Sanders (SBN: 195990)
Peter J. Kiel (SBN: 221548)
2015 H Street
Sacramento, California 95814-3109
Telephone: (916) 447-2166
Facsimile: (916) 447-3512

Attorneys for Defendants County Sanitation Districts Nos. 14 and 20 of Los Angeles County

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Coordination Proceeding
Special Title (Rule 1550(b))

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No.
4408

**ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER
CASES**

ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO:
Judge: Honorable Jack Komar

Included Actions:

**CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
STATEMENT**

Los Angeles County Waterworks District No.
40 v. Diamond Farming Co.
Superior Court of California, County of Los
Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201

General Civil Case
Date: April 28, 2005
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Dept.: 1, Room, 534

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, consolidated actions, Case Nos.
RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436,
RIC 344 668.

1 The County Sanitation Districts Nos. 14 and 20 of Los Angeles County (“Districts”)
2 respectfully provide this Case Management Conference Statement for the April 28, 2006
3 Conference.

4 The Districts thank the Court for providing the parties the opportunity to recommend the
5 issues and trial schedule for this adjudication at the March 24, 2006 Issues Conference. The
6 Issues Conference was productive and we support the Court’s desire to proceed with a Phase I
7 trial on basin boundaries in July. Technical experts for the Districts and other parties have been
8 meeting in order to define the areas of agreement and disagreement regarding the hydrogeology
9 of the basin, and the Districts are hopeful that the parties can stipulate to a boundary within one
10 two months after the technical experts have addressed a few remaining issues. Should the parties
11 be unable to reach a stipulation soon, the Districts expect that a Phase I trial in July could be
12 concluded promptly. While it may not be possible to define the basin boundary with exacting
13 precision given the limited scientific and technical data, the Districts will support a basin
14 boundary that is established by the consensus of the technical experts, provided that boundary is
15 likely to encompass all of the sources of water for the basin and the entire region in which
16 pumping may impact basin supply and quality.

17 The Districts similarly support a prompt Phase II trial to define the “character” of the
18 basin; however, the Districts are unclear what the Court intends to be covered in this phase, and
19 whether the Court’s desire to complete the phase before the end of the year is feasible. The
20 Districts suggest that this phase determine the native and non-native sources of water in the
21 basin, the safe yield of the basin and whether the non-native sources are included in safe yield,
22 and extent to which overdraft has occurred. Providing an estimated starting date for the Phase II
23 trial as soon as possible would allow the parties and their counsel to prepare for the Court’s
24 ambitious schedule.

25 The Districts continue to engage in discussions with the other parties in attempt to better
26 define the issues in this adjudication and to develop common pleadings. Although the Districts
27 are uniquely situated in this adjudication because they are public service providers like the other
28 public agencies in this case, but are overlying property owners and are not appropriators like

1 most of the other public entities, the Districts hope to join the Municipal Water Providers' model
2 complaint to the extent practicable.

3
4 Dated: April 24, 2006

ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.

5
6 By: _____
7 CHRISTOPHER M. SANDERS
8 Attorneys for Defendants
9 County Sanitation Districts
10 2015 H Street
11 Sacramento, California 95814
12 Telephone: (916) 447-2166
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I declare that:

3 I am employed in the County of Sacramento, State of California. I am over the age of
4 eighteen years and am not a party to the within action. My business address is ELLISON,
5 SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, L.L.P.; 2015 H Street; Sacramento, California 95814-3109; telephone
6 (916) 447-2166.

7 On April 24, 2006, I served the County Sanitation Districts' *Case Management*
8 *Conference Statement* by electronic posting to the Santa Clara County Superior Court E-Filing
9 website, <http://www.scefiling.org/cases/casehome.jsp?caseId=19> in compliance with the Court's
10 electronic posting instructions and the Court's Clarification Order dated October 27, 2005.

11 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this
12 declaration was executed on April 24, 2006, at Sacramento, California.

13
14 _____
Peter J. Kiel
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28