BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665
JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926
STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787
5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614
TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600
TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972
Attorneys for Cross-Complainant
LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS
DISTRICT NO. 40

OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
ANDREA ORDIN, Bar No. 38235
COUNTY COUNSEL
WARREN WELLEN, Bar No. 139152
PRINCIPAL DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
TELEPHONE: (213) 974-8407
TELECOPIER: (213) 687-7337
Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES
COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6103

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT

ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES

Included Actions:
Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325201;

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

Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408

CLASS ACTION

Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053
Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar

LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40'S CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

DATE: November 18, 2010
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 1

CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

This Case Management Statement is provided pursuant to the Court's request and is an update on the status of the Phase 3 trial and settlement efforts.

Twelve expert depositions have been taken. About seven expert depositions remain, including some now being scheduled. Some depositions have been continued because the experts had not completed their work. Furthermore, some parties have indicated they may de-designate experts based on the Court's upcoming case management order. The case should go to trial as scheduled.

Justice Robie ordered four lawyers representing the "Waldo Group" to meet and confer with the Public Water Suppliers. The parties met once telephonically. The lawyers appointed to represent the Waldo Group agreed to provide a proposal to the Public Water Suppliers. No proposal has been provided. The Waldo Group, which may include fewer parties than previously represented to the court, seems to be working against Justice Robie's directive.

Dated: November 15, 2010

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

By _____
ERIC L. GARNER
JEFFREY V. DUNN
STEFANIE D. HEDLUND
Attorneys for Cross-Complainant
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

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

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Stefanie D. Hedlund, 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, 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1650, Sacramento, California 95814. On November 15, 2010, I served the within document(s):

LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40'S CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

☒ 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 November 15, 2010, at Truckee, California.

Stefanie D. Hedlund