ł		
1	NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP	
2	FRED A. FUDACZ (SBN 050546) HENRY S. WEINSTOCK (SBN 089765)	
3	445 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1602	
4	Telephone: (213) 612-7800	
5	Facsimile: (213) 612-7801	
6	Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant Te	ejon Ranchcorp
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
10	ANTELOPE VALLEY	) Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No.
11	GROUNDWATER CASES Included Actions:	) 4408 )
12	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40	Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053  Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar
13	v. Diamond Farming Co.	)
14	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201	) RESPONSE TO AGWA OBJECTION TO ) JOINT PURVEYOR & LANDOWNER CASE
15	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40	) MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL )
16	v. Diamond Farming Co. Superior Court of California, County of Kern,	Date: February 17, 2006 Time: 9:00 a.m.
17	Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348	Department: 1
18	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster	) )
19	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist.	) )
20	Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, consolidated actions, Case Nos.	) )
21	RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668	)
22		The state of the Total December of the Total
	The landowners who refer to themselves as "AGWA" object to part of the Joint Purveyor	
23	& Landowner Case Management Proposal, i.e., resolution of subarea boundaries, along with outer basin	
24	boundaries, in Phase 1 of the case. There are many reasons why outer boundary and subarea issues	
25	should be decided promptly and together, for example:	
26	1. Both issues involve similar hydro-geological questions (e.g., quantifying	
27	groundwater flows across faults and other proposed boundaries), and the same experts will analyze and	
28	answer these questions.	
	320302_1.DOC  RESPONSE TO ACWA ORIECTION TO JOINT PURVEYOR & LANDOWNER CASE MANAGEMENT	
	4 - RESETTIONE IT ALVA TIMEN THE TRACE IN THE STREET	TIRE VID. TERRO AV E. ALIVERED DV IND. NO. E. ALIND. IVI ALIVAL VID. IVI ALIVA

PROPOSAL

- 2. The USGS has repeatedly studied and reported on both the outer boundaries and the 7 subbasins of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. (See, e.g., the USGS basin/subbasin map attached to the Joint CMC Proposal.) The experts in this case can analyze the USGS data & reports, and either reach an agreement regarding the outer and subarea boundaries, or prepare for trial in relatively short order.
- 3. Chopping the case into numerous small phases each requiring its own extended discovery, pretrial motions, experts, and trial would drag this case out interminably and be very inefficient.
- 4. Prompt resolution of the subarea questions is necessary for the parties to conduct productive settlement negotiations. In the Santa Maria groundwater litigation, postponement of the subarea issues prevented the parties from reaching a settlement for several years. Only when the parties themselves agreed on the 3 subareas were they able to reach a broad settlement. Likewise, in this case, there will be no global settlement without definition of the subareas, either by agreement of the parties or by ruling of the Court. Resolving subarea issues in Phase 1 will expedite, not retard, the progress of the case. Since there cannot be any trial here for at least several months, we should resolve both of these foundational boundary issues in Phase 1.

Dated: February 15, 2006

NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP FREDRIC A. FUDACZ HENRY S. WEINSTOCK

HENRY S. WEINSTOCK

Attorneys for Tejon Ranchcorp

## PROOF OF SERVICE The undersigned declares: I am employed in the County of, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and am not a party to the within action; my business address is c/o Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott, LLP, 445 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1602. On February 15, 2006, I served the foregoing RESPONSE TO AGWA OBJECTION TO JOINT PURVEYOR & LANDOWNER CASE MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL on all interested parties: (By U.S. Mail) On the same date, at my said place of business, said correspondence was sealed 8 (X) and placed for collection and mailing following the usual business practice of my said employer. I am readily familiar with my said employer's business practice for collection and processing of 9 correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and, pursuant to that practice, the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service, with postage 10 thereon fully prepaid, on the same date at Los Angeles, California, addressed to: 11 Honorable Jack Komar Judge of the Superior Court of California 12 County of Santa Clara 13 191 North First Street, Department 17C San Jose, CA 95113 14 (By E-Filing) I posted the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court (X) 15 website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter in compliance with the Court's electronic posting instructions and the Court's Clarification Order dated October 27, 2005. 16 (By Federal Express) I served a true and correct copy by Federal Express or other overnight () 17 delivery service, for delivery on the next business day. Each copy was enclosed in an envelope or package designated by the express service carrier; deposited in a facility regularly maintained 18 by the express service carrier or delivered to a courier or driver authorized to receive documents on its behalf; with delivery fees paid or provided for; addressed as shown on the accompanying 19 service list. 20 Executed on February 15, 2006 at Los Angeles, California. 21 (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the (X)

23

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

(FEDERAL) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America ()that the foregoing is true and correct.

Mitchi Shibata

24

25

26

27

28

320302 1.DOC

foregoing is true and correct.