1 **BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE** ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665 2 JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926 SECTION 6103 STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787 3 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614 TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600 4 TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972 Attorneys for Cross-Complainants 5 ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES 6 DISTRICT and LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 7 OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 8 JOHN F. KRATTLI, Bar No. 82149 9 SENIOR ASSISTANT COUNTY COUNSEL WARREN WELLEN, Bar No. 139152 10 PRINCIPAL DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET 11 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 TELEPHONE: (213) 974-8407 12 TELECOPIER: (213) 687-7337 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 13 [See Next Page For Additional Counsel] 14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 15 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT 16 17 Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408 ANTELOPE VALLEY 18 GROUNDWATER CASES **CLASS ACTION** 19 Included Actions: Los Angeles County Waterworks District Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 20 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar Court of California, County of Los 21 Angeles, Case No. BC 325201; 22 Los Angeles County Waterworks District CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior 23 Court of California, County of Kern, Case March 8, 2010 Date: No. S-1500-CV-254-348; Time: 10:00 a.m. 24 Dept.: 1 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of 25 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. 26 Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, Case Nos. 27 RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668 28

LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614 

## TRIAL

The Public Water Suppliers propose the next phase of trial be a determination of Basin characteristics including its safe yield and overdraft (past or present). The proposal has been discussed with other attorneys, and the trial should start between July 6 and August 1, 2010. The trial is expected to last about 10 to 15 court days.

The Public Water Suppliers and other attorneys agree the next phase of trial take place as soon as possible to minimize further delay, avoid potentially unnecessary litigation expense, and to facilitate the earliest possible negotiated resolution of case issues. Once the Court makes a safe yield determination and decides whether a prescriptive period has resulted from overproduction, the parties will be able assess the strength of their claims of priority to Basin water while understanding the total amount available for all producers. In any event, the Court cannot make a determination of whether a party acquired prescriptive rights until the Court first determines the nature and extent of the Basin's safe yield, and whether groundwater withdrawals have exceeded safe yield.

As the Court is aware, the parties' experts participated in an informal Technical Committee that spent over a year collecting and analyzing data concerning groundwater recharge including precipitation and return flows from imported water. They are ready to testify on Basin characteristics. Accordingly, the following dates are proposed for the first trial phase:

- 1. April 30, 2010 is the deadline for a party to designate its expert witness(es), if any, and to provide an expert witness report.
- 2. May 20, 2020 is the deadline for a party to designate supplemental expert witnesses but only as allowed by Code of Civil Procedure section 2034.280 and applicable case law.
  - 3. May 30, 2010 is the deadline for completing non-expert discovery limited to the next

1	phase of trial.
2	
3	4. June 15, 2010 is the deadline for completing expert witness depositions.
4	
5	5 June 15, 2010 is the deadline for each party's witness list, exhibit list and trial
6	brief to be posted on the court's website.
7	
8	Each party's expert witness designation shall comply with Code of Civil Procedure
9	Section 2034.260 and shall include a written report containing all opinions and the entire factual
10	basis for each opinion. Each expert must provide his or her opinion, if any, on the natural yield of
11	the Basin (past and present), yield from imported water deliveries, and whether groundwater
12	extractions exceeded either or both yields for any time period. No party will be allowed to
13	provide an expert witness opinion at trial unless the opinion was fully and timely disclosed and
14	explained in writing with the party's expert witness designation.
15	
16	Dated: February 26, 2010 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
17	BEST BEST RENEGER LEF
18	By W
19	ERIC L GARNER JEFFREY V. DUNN
20	STE ANIE D. HEDLUND Attorneys for Cross-Complainants
21	ROSAMOND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT and LOS ANGELES
22	COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40
23	
24	
2-	
25	
26	
	ORANGE\65647.1

## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

## **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Kerry V. Keefe, declare:

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is Best Best & Krieger LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500, Irvine, California 92614. On March 2, 2010, I served the within document(s):

## CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

X

×	by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Court website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.
	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set forth below.
	by causing personal delivery by ASAP Corporate Services of the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.
	I caused such envelope to be delivered via overnight delivery addressed as indicated on the attached service list. Such envelope was deposited for delivery by Federal Express following the firm's ordinary business practices.

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid 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.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on March 2, 2010, at Irvine, California.

Kerry V. Keefe

ORANGE\KKEEFE\24201.1

- 1 -