## EXHIBIT "H"

		· 1	
ļ			
1			
1	RICHARD G. ZIMMER - SBN 107263 T. MARK SMITH - SBN 162370	·	
2	CLIFFORD & BROWN		
3	A Professional Corporation Attorneys at Law		
	Bank of America Building		
4	1430 Truxtun Avenue, Suite 900 Bakersfield, CA 93301-5230		
5	(661) 322-6023		
6	Attorneys for Bolthouse Properties, LLC and Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc.		
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
8	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA		
9			
10	* * COORDINATION PROCEEDING	*	
	SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No.	
11	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER	4408	
12	CASES (ANTIBLOTE VALUE)	CASE NO. 1-05-CV-049053	
13	INCLUDED ACTIONS:		
14	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S	
15	WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 v. DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et al.,	AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S PROPOSAL RE CONTENT OF STATEMENT OF DECISION	
16	Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC325201	)	
10	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	[C.C.P. §632]	
17	WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 v.	Phase 3 Trial Date:	
18	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, et al., Kern County Superior Court Case No. S-	January 4, 2011	
19	1500-CV-254348		
20	DIAMOND FARMING COMPANY, and	<b>\</b> .	
21	W.M. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC., v. CITY OF LANCASTER, et al., Riverside Superior Court		
22	Case No. RIC 344436 [c/w case no. RIC		
23	344668 and 353840]   ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES		
24	DISTRICT,	<b>\</b>	
25	CROSS-COMPLAINANT,	)	
26	\\\		
27			
28	  \\\		
20	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM, BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S PROPOSAL RE CONTENT OF STATEMENT OF		
	DEC	SION	
	·		

## TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 632, Bolthouse Properties, LLC and Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. (hereinafter "Bolthouse"), make the following initial proposals as to the content of the Statement of Decision following the issuance of the Court's Tentative Decision Phase 3 Trial dated May 4, 2011, references to which are set forth below.

- 1. That the Statement of Decision be limited to "the safe yield of the Antelope Valley Aquifer" and "whether the Aquifer is in a state of overdraft such that the Court should exercise equitable powers to protect the Aquifer from detriment caused by any such overdraft" as set forth in the Order After Hearing Held on November 18, 2010 setting forth the scope of the Phase 3 Trial.
- 2, The legal definition and basis thereof used by the Court to determine the safe yield of the Antelope Valley Aquifer.
- 3. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine the safe yield as defined by the Court for the purpose of the Phase 3 Trial.
- 4. The legal definition, and the basis thereof, that the Court used to determine "whether the Aquifer is in a state of overdraft such that the Court should exercise equitable powers to protect the Aquifer from detriment caused by any such overdraft."
- 5. All facts relied upon by the Court to support "whether the Aquifer is in a state of overdraft such that the Court should exercise equitable powers to protect the Aquifer from detriment caused by any such overdraft."
- 6. The legal definition, and the basis thereof, that the Court used to determine "whether the Aquifer is in a state of temporary surplus".
- 7. All facts relied upon by the Court to support "whether the Aquifer is in a state of temporary surplus".
- 8. The specific testimony of each testifying expert which the Court relied upon to determine the "safe yield of the Antelope Valley Aquifer."

- 9. The specific testimony of each testifying expert which the Court relied upon to determine "whether the Aquifer is in a state of overdraft such that the Court should exercise equitable powers to protect the Aquifer from detriment caused by any such overdraft."
- 10. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The preponderance of the evidence presented establishes that the basin is in a state of overdraft," as set forth on Page 4, Lines 27 through 28.
- 11. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The preponderance of the evidence presented establishes that the basin is in a state of overdraft," as set forth on Page 4, Lines 27 through 28.
- All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Reliable estimates of long-term extractions from the basin have exceeded reliable estimates of the basin's recharge by significant margins, and empirical evidence of overdraft in the basin corroborates that conclusion," as set forth on Page 4, Line 28 through Page 5, Lines 1 through 2.
- 13. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Reliable estimates of long-term extractions from the basin have exceeded reliable estimates of the basin's recharge by significant margins, and empirical evidence of overdraft in the basin corroborates that conclusion," as set forth on Page 4, Line 28 through Page 5, Lines 1 through 2.
- 14. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The basin has sustained a significant loss of groundwater storage since 1951," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 2 through 3.
- 15. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The basin has sustained a significant loss of groundwater storage since 1951," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 2 through 3.

**///** 

- 16. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "While pumping in recent years has reduced and moderated the margin between pumping and recharge as cultural conditions have changed and precipitation has increased with the appearance of wetter parts of the historical cycle, pumping in some areas of the aquifer is continuing to cause harm to the basin," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 3 through 6.
- 17. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "While pumping in recent years has reduced and moderated the margin between pumping and recharge as cultural conditions have changed and precipitation has increased with the appearance of wetter parts of the historical cycle, pumping in some areas of the aquifer is continuing to cause harm to the basin," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 3 through 6.
- 18. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The evidence is persuasive that current extractions continue to exceed recharge and therefore that the basin continues to be in a state of overdraft, although by a much reduced amount," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 6 through 8.
- 19. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The evidence is persuasive that current extractions continue to exceed recharge and therefore that the basin continues to be in a state of overdraft, although by a much reduced amount," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 6 through 8.
- 20. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Since 1951, there is evidence of substantial pumping (principally agricultural in the early years of the period) coinciding with periods of drought, with continuous lowering of water levels and subsidence extending to the present time, with intervals of only slight rises in water levels in some areas," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 8 through 12.

- 21. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Since 1951, there is evidence of substantial pumping (principally agricultural in the early years of the period) coinciding with periods of drought, with continuous lowering of water levels and subsidence extending to the present time, with intervals of only slight rises in water levels in some areas," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 8 through 12.
- 22. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "In the areas of increased pumping, in particular in the Palmdale and Lancaster areas, there is a continual lowering of water levels such that it may have a serious effect on water rights in other areas, causing cones of depression, altering natural water flow gradients, causing the lowering of water levels in adjacent areas, and causing subsidence and loss of aquifer storage capacity," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 13 through 17.
- 23. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "In the areas of increased pumping, in particular in the Palmdale and Lancaster areas, there is a continual lowering of water levels such that it may have a serious effect on water rights in other areas, causing cones of depression, altering natural water flow gradients, causing the lowering of water levels in adjacent areas, and causing subsidence and loss of aquifer storage capacity," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 13 through 17.
- 24. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Given population growth, and agricultural and industrial changes, the valley is at risk of being in an even more serious continuing overdraft in the future," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 17 through 18.
- 25. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Given population growth, and agricultural and industrial changes, the valley is at risk of being in an even more serious continuing overdraft in the future," as set forth

- 26. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "While the lowering of current water levels has slowed, and some levels in wells in some areas have risen in recent years, significant areas within the aquifer continue to show declining levels, some slightly so, but many with material lowering of water levels," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 19 through 21.
- 27. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "While the lowering of current water levels has slowed, and some levels in wells in some areas have risen in recent years, significant areas within the aquifer continue to show declining levels, some slightly so, but many with material lowering of water levels," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 19 through 21.
- All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Thus, the Antelope Valley adjudication area has been in a state of overdraft for more than 50 years and based on estimates of extraction and recharge, corroborated by physical evidence of conditions in the basin as a whole, and while the annual amount of overdraft has lessened in recent years with increased precipitation and recharge, the effects of overdraft remain and are in danger of being exacerbated with increased pumping and the prospective cyclical precipitation fluctuations shown by the historical record," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 22 through 26 through Page 6, Line 1.
- 29. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Thus, the Antelope Valley adjudication area has been in a state of overdraft for more than 50 years and based on estimates of extraction and recharge, corroborated by physical evidence of conditions in the basin as a whole, and while the annual amount of overdraft has lessened in recent years with increased precipitation and recharge, the effects of overdraft remain and are in danger of being exacerbated with increased pumping and the prospective cyclical precipitation fluctuations shown by the historical record," as set forth on Page 5, Lines 22 through 26

- 30. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The physical evidence establishes that there was significant subsidence occurring throughout the valley ranging from two to six feet or more in certain areas of the valley caused by such pumping and that measurable water levels fell in a substantial part of the valley," as set forth on Page 6, Line 1 through 4.
- 31. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The physical evidence establishes that there was significant subsidence occurring throughout the valley ranging from two to six feet or more in certain areas of the valley caused by such pumping and that measurable water levels fell in a substantial part of the valley," as set forth on Page 6, Line 1 through 4.
- 32. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "While some of the ongoing subsidence may be attributable to residual subsidence (from earlier periods of shortfall) that would not seem to be an explanation for the extent of continued subsidence," as set forth on Page 6, Lines 4 through 6.
- 33. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "While some of the ongoing subsidence may be attributable to residual subsidence (from earlier periods of shortfall) that would not seem to be an explanation for the extent of continued subsidence," as set forth on Page 6, Lines 4 through 6.
- 34. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "One expert selected two shorter base periods (the total time span of which was considerably less than the 50 year period the court believes is more credible), each having a different estimated average natural recharge based upon different precipitation averages from each base period," as set forth on Page 6, Lines 20 through 23.
- 35. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "One expert selected two shorter base periods (the total time span of which was considerably less than the 50 year period the court believes is more credible), each having a different estimated average natural recharge based upon different precipitation

- 36. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "A period of precipitation fluctuations from 1951 to 2004 satisfies that standard. Shorter periods do not," as set forth on Page 6, Lines 28 through Page 7, Line 1 through 2.
- 37. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "A period of precipitation fluctuations from 1951 to 2004 satisfies that standard. Shorter periods do not," as set forth on Page 6, Lines 28 through Page 7, Line 1 through 2.
- 38. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The total amount of extractions of water by pumping is not seriously in dispute by any of the experts who testified. All seem to agree that pumping currently is estimated to range from 130,000 to 150,000 acre feet a year," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 3 through 5.
- 39. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The total amount of extractions of water by pumping is not seriously in dispute by any of the experts who testified. All seem to agree that pumping currently is estimated to range from 130,000 to 150,000 acre feet a year," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 3 through 5.
- 40. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Other sources of recharge to the basin, including artificial recharge-water pumped into the aquifer from external sources are not in dispute," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 8 through 10.
- 41. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Other sources of recharge to the basin, including artificial recharge-water pumped into the aquifer from external sources are not in dispute," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 8 through 10.
- 42. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The nature of the agricultural duties has changed as well," as set forth on Page 7, Line 15.
- 43. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The nature of the agricultural duties has changed as well," as set forth on Page 7, Line 15.

  BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S PROPOSAL RE CONTENT OF STATEMENT OF DECISION

- 44. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The type of irrigation used by farmers has become more efficient and less water is needed per acre (depending on the crops grown) with more efficient uses of water," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 15 through 17.
- 45. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The type of irrigation used by farmers has become more efficient and less water is needed per acre (depending on the crops grown) with more efficient uses of water," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 15 through 17.
- 46. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "But there has also been an increase as well as a change in the nature of the type of agriculture in the valley in material quantities in recent years," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 17 through 19.
- 47. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "But there has also been an increase as well as a change in the nature of the type of agriculture in the valley in material quantities in recent years," as set forth on Page 7, Lines 17 through 19.
- 48. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Observable conditions in the valley are inconsistent with those conclusions" as set forth on Page 8, Lines 15 through 16.
- 49. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Observable conditions in the valley are inconsistent with those conclusions" as set forth on Page 8, Lines 15 through 16.
- 50. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "If there were a surplus, even in the shortened base periods used by the same experts, there should not be subsidence of land, nor the need to drill for water at deeper and deeper levels in those parts of the aquifer most affected by the overdraft" as set forth on Page 8, Lines 16 through 19.

- 51. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "If there were a surplus, even in the shortened base periods used by the same experts, there should not be subsidence of land, nor the need to drill for water at deeper and deeper levels in those parts of the aquifer most affected by the overdraft" as set forth on Page 8, Lines 16 through 19.
- 52. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "The physical condition of the valley is inconsistent with those estimates that there is and has been a surplus of water in the aquifer" as set forth on Page 8, Lines 19 through 20.
- 53. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "The physical condition of the valley is inconsistent with those estimates that there is and has been a surplus of water in the aquifer" as set forth on Page 8, Lines 19 through 20.
- 54. All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "Weighing the various opinions, however, the Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that setting a safe yield at a conservative 110,000 acre feet a year will permit management of the valley in such a way as to preserve the rights of all parties in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the State of California" as set forth on Page 9, Lines 7 through 10.
- 55. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "Weighing the various opinions, however, the Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that setting a safe yield at a conservative 110,000 acre feet a year will permit management of the valley in such a way as to preserve the rights of all parties in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the State of California" as set forth on Page 9, Lines 7 through 10.

- All facts relied upon by the Court to determine that "It should not be assumed that the safe yield management number may not change as climate circumstances and pumping may change, or as the empirical evidence based on experience in managing the basin suggests it is either too high or too low" as set forth on Page 9, Lines 15 through 17.
- 57. Specific expert testimony relied upon by the Court to determine that "It should not be assumed that the safe yield management number may not change as climate circumstances and pumping may change, or as the empirical evidence based on experience in managing the basin suggests it is either too high or too low" as set forth on Page 9, Lines 15 through 17.

DATED: May 24, 2011

Respectfully submitted.

CLIFFORD & BROWN

R<sub>v</sub>,

RICHARD G. ZIMMER, ESQ.

T. MARK \$MITH, ESQ.

Attorneys for

BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC and

WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.

1	PROOF OF SERVICE (C.C.P. §1013a, 2015.5)	
2	Antelope Valley Groundwater Cases  Judicial Counsel Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
3	Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 1-05-CV-049053	
4	I am employed in the County of Kern, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a	
5	party to the within action; my business address is 1430 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301.	
6	On May 24, 2011, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:	
7	BOLTHOUSE PROPERTIES, LLC'S AND WM. BOLTHOUSE FARMS, INC.'S PROPOSAL RE CONTENT OF STATEMENT OF DECISION	
8	by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list.	
9		
10	by placing _ the original, _ a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed enveloped addressed as follows:	
11		
12	X BY SANTA CLARA SUPERIOR COURT E-FILING IN COMPLEX LITIGATION PURSUANT TO CLARIFICATION ORDER DATED OCTOBER	
13	27, 2005.	
14	Executed on May 24, 2011, at Bakersfield, California.	
15 16	X (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.	
17	(Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.	
18	11 4	
19	Sancte Maxeu	
20	NANETTE MAXEY  2455-2	
21	2100-2	
22		
23	·	
24		
25		
26		