1 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP **EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES** ERIC L. GARNER, Bar No. 130665 UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE 2 JEFFREY V. DUNN, Bar No. 131926 **SECTION 6103** STEFANIE D. HEDLUND, Bar No. 239787 3 5 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1500 **IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614** 4 TELEPHONE: (949) 263-2600 TELECOPIER: (949) 260-0972 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant 5 LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS 6 DISTRICT NO. 40 7 OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 8 ANDREA ORDIN, Bar No. 38235 COUNTY COUNSEL 9 WARREN WELLEN, Bar No. 139152 PRINCIPAL DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL 10 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 11 TELEPHONE: (213) 974-8407 TELECOPIER: (213) 687-7337 12 Attorneys for Cross-Complainant LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 13 14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 15 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT 16 17 ANTELOPE VALLEY Judicial Council Coordination No. 4408 **GROUNDWATER CASES** 18 CLASS ACTION Included Actions: 19 Los Angeles County Waterworks District Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar 20 Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325201; 21 LOS ANGELES COUNTY Los Angeles County Waterworks District WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 22 No. 40 v. Diamond Farming Co., Superior NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION Court of California, County of Kern, Case FOR LEGAL FINDINGS ON WATER 23 No. S-1500-CV-254-348: CODE REQUIREMENTS TO REPORT EXTRACTIONS OF GROUNDWATER IN 24 Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of LOS ANGELES COUNTY; Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. City of **DECLARATION OF JEFFREY V. DUNN;** 25 Lancaster, Diamond Farming Co. v. **EXHIBIT** Palmdale Water Dist., Superior Court of 26 California, County of Riverside, Case Nos. February 14, 2012 Date: RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668 Time: 9:00 a.m. 27 1515 Room: 28

MOTION TO DETERMINE WATER CODE REQUIREMENT TO REPORT PUMPING

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 14, 2012, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter be heard, in Room 1515 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court at 600 South West Commonwealth Avenue, Los Angeles, California, Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 will move and hereby does move for a court determination of the following legal issues:

- 1. Does Water Code section 4,999 *et seq* require a party extracting more than 25 afy in Los Angeles County to file an annual notice with the State Water Resource Control Board?
- 2. If the answer to Question Number 1 is yes, is a party's failure to file the notice deemed a party's non use of water for a reasonable and beneficial purpose under Water Code sections 5003 and 5004?
- 3. For each party who files a notice, is the stated amount of ground water extraction deemed to be the use of groundwater by that party for that reporting year?

The motion is made pursuant to the Court's Order during the December 13, 2011 Case Management Conference, statutory and equitable authority of the Court to determine legal issues in complex Judicial Council coordination proceedings including Code of Civil Procedure sections 187 and 591, Rule 3541 of the California Rules of Court, and the inherent powers granted to the Court to manage complex coordination proceedings. (Asbestos Claims Facility v. Berry & Berry (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 9, 19 ["In the context of complex civil litigation, the court's 'inherent managerial powers' have been invoked to ensure court's 'assume an aggressive role at the earliest possible time to efficiently move the case to settlement or trial.""])

Dated: January 17, 2012

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

Ву

JEFFREY V. DUNN

STEFANIE D. HEDLUND

Attorneys for Cross-Complainant

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40

ii

#### **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

For the last 8 months, the parties have participated in mediation with Justice Robie in Sacramento. The parties have focused their efforts on the key settlement issue: allocation of the safe yield. Despite numerous trips to Sacramento and many additional meetings and teleconferences, the parties are at an impasse on the safe yield allocation. And they have been at an impasse for months.

The largest and most divisive allocation dispute is a legal issue: Whether Water Code section 4999 *et seq* applies in these coordination proceedings. It is for this reason, Los Angeles County Waterworks District brought this important issue to the Court's attention at the last Case Management Conference and the Court scheduled a hearing on February 14, 2012 to consider the issue.

The issue needs to be decided as soon as possible. Without an early resolution of this legal issue, the parties are unlikely to reach to a settlement of allocation and without an allocation settlement there will not be an overall settlement of the case or physical solution to the increasing overdraft of the Antelope Valley's groundwater supply. The key Water Code sections at issue are explained below.

### II. THE WATER CODE PROVISIONS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY GROUND WATER USERS

Although the Court's overdraft decision was year, the Legislature has long recognized overdraft risks to groundwater supplies in four Southern California counties: "The Legislature finds and declares that by reasons of the combination of light rainfall, concentrated population, the transition of considerable areas of land from agricultural use to urban use, and a similar dependence upon ground water supplies which prevails in the Counties of Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Ventura, together with the fact that most such underground water

supplies are overdrawn, it is necessary that the provisions of this part [Part 5 of the Water Code] apply to said counties." (Water Code § 4999 [Added in 1955 and amended in 1959].) But the Legislature did more than recognize its concern and enacted statutes to protect ground water supplies.

As explained below, Part 5 of the Water Code contains statutes that (1) require a party using more than 25 acre fee a year ("afy") in Los Angeles County to file an annual notice with the State Water Resources Control Board; (2) impose a finding of a non use of water for a failure to file the notice; and (3) establish a party's use of ground water to be the amount stated in the notice. (Water Code §§ 4999 et seq.) Given the increasing need to properly allocate the limited ground water supply in these coordinated proceedings and the long-standing inability to informally resolve the allocation disputes in judicial mediation and numerous settlement discussions, court legal findings on the Water Code provisions is needed now to resolve an allocation impasse by settlement and/or for subsequent court factual determinations and findings.

## A. The Water code Ground Water Reporting Requirements Apply To A Person Or Entity Who Uses More Than 25 Acre Feet Annually In Los Angeles County

Water Code section 5001 requires each "person" who extracts more than 25 afy of ground water in Los Angeles County to file a "Notice of Extraction and Diversion of Water" ("Notice") with the California State Water Resources Control Board.<sup>2</sup>

Pursuant to Water Code section 5002, each person will file the Notice on the form provided by the State Water Resources Control Board. As an example, Phase 3 Trial Exhibit No. A-12 is a Notice filed by a landowner party in Los Angeles County. A true and correct copy of the Notice that Exhibit A-12 in the Phase 3 trial is attached Exhibit "A" to the accompanying declaration of Jeffrey V. Dunn. The Notice requires detailed information including the user

Water Code section 5000 provides definitions for the statutes in Part 5. For example, ground water is defined as "water beneath the surface of the ground whether or not flowing through known and definite channels." "Person" is defined as "all persons whether natural or artificial, including the United States of America, the State of California, and all political subdivisions, districts, municipalities and public agencies."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> There are listed reporting exceptions in Water Code section 5001 which do not appear applicable these coordinated proceedings.

name, use location and the amount of ground water used. (See Water Code § 5002 [description of notice form and information requirements].) The Notice is to be filed for each calendar year for which the extraction exceeds 25 acre feet. (Water Code § 5001.)

### B. The State Water Resources Control Board's Required form Supports The Motion

The form that each party is required to fill in and return to the State Water Resources

Control Board states:

The dependence on groundwater in the Counties of Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Ventura has resulted in diminishing water suppliers. As water becomes more scarce, determination of your water rights by the courts may become necessary. Your Annual Notice of Groundwater Extraction and Diversion is required to establish a record of water use which can assist the court in determining your rights.

The California Water Code requires you to record your annual surface and groundwater use if your total groundwater extractions from all wells exceed 25 acre-feet. Extractions of less than 10 acre feet from a single well need not be reported. Although there is no penalty for failure to file the annual notice, failure to file is considered nonuse of water. Therefore, persons who do not file notices may have difficulty supporting a claim of water use during a lawsuit to establish ownership of groundwater rights. (Notice of Groundwater Extraction and Diversion Form, attached hereto as Exhibit "A." to the Dunn Declaration. [Emphasis added].)

The form supports the statutory intent and further advises that failure to file the Notice will result in a finding of nonuse. The form unequivocally states the Notice, or failure to file the Notice, may be used in a court proceeding, "a lawsuit to establish ownership of groundwater rights."

## C. The Failure To File A Notice Is A Deemed Non Use Of Groundwater, No Groundwater Was Used For A Reasonable And Beneficial Purpose, And There is A Loss Of Right For The Year In Which The Notice Was Not Filed

Water Code section 5003 provides that a party's failure to file the Notice is deemed to be a finding "that no claim of right to the extraction of ground water from any source in the four counties has been made by the person, and that water extracted by the person from the groundwater source during that period has not been devoted to or used for any beneficial use." (Emphasis added.)

Additionally, Water Code section 5004 provides that, after the year 1959, the failure to file the Notice for any calendar year "shall be deemed equivalent **for all purposes** to nonuse for such year of any ground water within the four counties by each person failing to so file a notice within said period; provided, that this section and Section 5003 shall not apply to any person whose aggregate extractions of ground water in any year does not exceed 25 acre-feet nor to any extractions of ground water with respect to which no notice is required under this part."

(Emphasis added.) Finally, Section 5005 indicates there is a loss of ground water rights unless there has been performance or excuse from performance as provided by Part 5.

Stated simply, Sections 5003, 5004 and 5005 state the failure to file the Notice is deemed the non use of ground water for the reporting year, the amount of ground water extracted is deemed not be used for a reasonable and beneficial purpose, and that no claim of right has been made for that year.

#### D. The Statutes' Plain Meaning Supports The Motion

In interpreting a statute, the California Supreme Court has held that courts should adopt a literal or plain meaning interpretation. (*Lungren v. Deukmejian* (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 727, 735 ["Words used in a statute or constitutional provision should be given the meaning they bear in ordinary use. . . . If the language is clear and unambiguous there is no need for construction, nor is it necessary to resort to indicia of the intent of the Legislature."] Here, the statutory language is not ambiguous and the consequence for failing to file the Notice required by Water Code section 5001 is clear and unequivocal: Water Code section 5004 provides that failure to file the required Notice "shall be deemed equivalent *for all purposes to nonuse*." (Water. Code § 5004 [emphasis added].)

## III. THE FAILURE TO FILE THE NOTICE IS THE EQUIVALENT OF THE NONUSE OF GROUND WATER AND THE NONUSE OF WATER FOR REASONABLE AND BENEFICIAL USE FOR THE REPORTING YEAR

A plain reading of Water Code sections 4999 through 5005, inclusive, requires the

following legal findings in these coordinated proceedings:

1. All parties who used more than 25 afy in Los Angeles County are subject to Water Code section 4999 *et seq*, unless exempted by Water Code Section 5001.

- 2. A party's failure to file the Notice as required by Water Code section 5001, is deemed to be a non use of groundwater, a non use of ground water for reasonable and beneficial use, and a loss of ground water right for each year in which the Notice was required.
- 3. A party's filing of the Notice as required by Water Code Section 5001, is deemed to be the party's use of groundwater in the amount stated in the Notice.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The Court should find, as a matter of law, the failure of any party in Los Angeles County to comply with Water Code sections 4999 through 5005, inclusive, is deemed the non use of ground water for any year in which a notice was required to be filed with the State Water Resources Control Board. For those parties who properly filed Notices, the amount of ground

///

24 ///

26 ///

28 ///

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

water stated in the Notice is deemed to be the an	nount of groundwater used by the party.
Settlement is unlikely without the Court's decisi	on on these legal issues and the Court will have
	ctual findings in subsequent phases of trial, if any
to determine the issues before making further far	ettai inidings in suosequent phases of that, if any
Dated: January 17, 2012	BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
	ERIC LOARNER 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

#### **DECLARATION OF JEFFREY V. DUNN**

I, Jeffrey V. Dunn, declare:

- 1. I have personal knowledge of the facts below, and if called upon to do so, I could testify competently thereto in a court of law. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of California. I am a partner of Best, Best & Krieger LLP, attorneys of record for Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40.
- 2. This Declaration is filed in support of Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40's Notice of Motion and Motion For Legal Findings on Water Code Requirements to Report Extractions of Groundwater in Los Angeles County.
- 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is a true and correct copy of Phase 3 trial exhibit A-12.

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

Executed this 17th day of January, 2012, at Irvine, California.

Jeffrey V. DUNN

26345.00009\7215201.1

# EXHIBIT "A"

PLEASE COMPLETE, SUBBIT THE ORIGINAL AND MAKE A COPY FOR YOUR RECORDS of State of California, State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights.
P.D. BOX 2000, EACRAMENTO, CA 95812-2000

hate: \$16) 341-5300, FAX: \$16) 341-5400, Web, http://www.waterrights.co.gov ANNUAL NOTICE OF EXTRACTION AND DIVERSION OF WATER (SHOUNDWATER RECOFFIGATION PROGRAM)

If the owner information below in sering or missing, presse correct, pressarry owners of record — EST OF E A MEBEKER

G191050 2009

PRIMARY CONTACT ON ASSESS FOR BAS, A REPORTING:

EST OF E ANEBEGR 400 N ROOGNGHAM AVE LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

Cerear's Designation of WAR

THIS SPACE FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

State Well Number

Percel Mumber

AMT:

DATION NO: G191050 CT PHONE NO: (310)449-8882

08N/13W-11M S

DEADCINE: Notices must be received no later than June 30, 2010 in order to be recorded.

REQUIRED FEES: A Sting tee of \$50,00 is required for each Annual Notice of Groundwater Extraction and Diversion. Check or money order should indicate your accompanion number(s) and be made payable to: State Water Resources Control Board. Do not send cash.

PLEASE READ THE GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE REVERSE SIDE BEFORE COMPLETING THIS NOTICE If the above information is insertiable, please line it out in red and provide current information. Notify this office if ownership or address

	he above information is inacturate, please line it out in red and provide current information	ia. Notify this office if owners a	b or surveys				
	enges occur during the coming year.  TYPE OF DIVERSION & Groundwater extraction or [] Surface diversion	۵					
2	OWNERSHIP, Person listed below is:						
	8 Owner of land on which well or point of diversion is located, and is extracting/diversing water.						
	Lessee of land on which well or point of diversion is located, and is extracting/diverting water.	namen and the state of the stat	S acre-test				
	C Quinter of lands, but leased is extracting thereing water.	-0-	Dokata D				
	AMOUNT OF GROUNDWATER EXTRACTED DURING CALENDAR YEAR	(Must be a specific number)	C galars				
	AMOUNT OF SURFACE WATER DIVERTED DURING CALENDAR YEAR						
5.			Cacrolect				
	TYPE OF WATER USE & Agricultural   Domestic or Municipal   Other		Capic-lea				
	ACTION REQUESTED (Check one):	Annual quantity					
	☐ Recogn file. (Fee required)	Season of diversion	277 Bosely or				
	Cose this file. (No fee required)	Begin	udgaggartinon-tumplyation				
	2 Record my water use. (Fee required)	Erd					
	Do not record thy leaser use that clean thy name on mailing list. (No fee required)	Maximum rate of diversion					
Tr	ansfer this file to:						
	(M. NAME)	(LAST NAME)					
	Company Name:	A	and the second s				
	Address						
	(MAILING ADDRESS)	, m	(ZIP CODE)				
	Telephone ( ) Effective Date:	on the photographic transfer of the photographic distribution of t	Mangaran er er en announce ann carton de la				
٤.	<ol> <li>SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION. Please list any changes in your project since last year (new pump, new land imgetion, new method of largation, etc.) or any other continents.</li> </ol>						
	CERTIFICATION AND SIGNATURE: I couldy that the foregoing statements are true and co	DateDate					
1,74		Said	S referred to the contract of				
P	righted Name Eugene E. Nebekey		and the second s				
	(M. NAME)	(LAST NAME)					
¢	ompany Name: Nebesser Factor, Tho.						

#### GENERAL INFORMATION

13104408865

The dependence on groundwater in the Counties of Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Ventura has resulted in diminishing water supplies. As water becomes more scarce, determination of your water rights by the courts may become necessary. Your Annual Notice of Groundwater Extraction and Diversion is required to establish a record of water use which can assist the court in determining your rights.

The California Water Code requires you to record your annual surface and groundwater use if your total groundwater extractions from all wells exceed 25 acre-feet. Extractions of less than 10 acre-feet from a single well need not be reported. Although there is no penalty for failure to file the annual notice, failure to file is considered nonuse of water. Therefore, persons who do not file notices may have difficulty in supporting a claim of water use during a lawsult to establish ownership of groundwater rights.

Exceptions: (1) If you are currently reporting your pumpage to a watermaster, your water use is already on record, and you are exempt from the requirement of filing a notice, or (2) if annual water uso is loss than the required amounts, filing is optional because these minimal amounts would probably not be affected by a water right dispute. All optional notices that are accompanied by appropriate fees will be

Should you require additional information about the Water Code requirements or assistance in completing this form, please write to the address on the top of this form, or telephone (916) 341-5300.

#### TABLE 1: AGRICULTURAL WATER USE WORKSHEET (Optional)

To estimate your use of water, indicate below the crop type and number of acres. Then find the average irrigation requirement for each crop using Table II. Multiply acres (column 1) to applied water depth (column 2) to determine the amount pumped (column 3). Then total all amounts in column 3 to determine total irrigation use.

	COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3  AMOUNT PUMPED (acrefeet) (column 1 X column 2)		
CROP	ACRES	AVERAGE APPLIED WATER DEPTH (acre-feet per acre)			
##					
	10000	•			
CONVERSION FACTORS  One acre-toot (at) = 43,560 cu  One miners inch is approxima  An acre-toot covers one acre	tely 9 gallons p	er minute.	•		

TABLE II. AVERAGE DEPTH OF WATER APPLIED TO IRRIGATE EACH CROP (acro-foct por acro)

LOCALITY'	ALFALFA	AVOCADOS	BEANS	DATES	LEMONS	LETTUCE	PERMANENT PASTURE	TOMATOES
1. Los Angeles County							Land Comment	
a. Coastal Basin		2.0 - 2.5			20-25	20-25		
b. Antelopo Valloy	7.6						7.4	
Eastern Riverside County     Coachella & Blythe Area	9.0 - 10 0			7.9 - 9.0	5.5-6.0	36-42	90-100	4.3-6.4
3. Western Riverside County	4.0 - 4.5	2.5 - 3.0			2.5-30	2.0 - 2.5	4.5 - 5.0	
4. San Bernardine County								
a, Chino Area	4.0 - 4.5	2.5 - 3.0			2.5 - 3.0	2.0 - 2.5	4,5 - 5.0	2.3 - 2.5
b. San Bornardino Aroa	4.0 - 4.5	2.5 - 0.0			2.5 + 3.0	20-25	4.0 - 5.0	2.3 - 2.5
c. Barslow-Apple Valley	6.0 - 6.5					**************************************	6.0 ~ 6.5	
d. Ontario	4.0 - 4.5	2.5 - 3.0			2.5 - 3.0		4.0 - 5.0	2.3 - 2.5
e. Highlands-Rodlands	4.0 - 4.5	2.5 - 3.0			2.5 - 3.0	-	4,0 - 5.0	2.3 - 2.5
5. Ventura County	4.0 - 4.5	2.3 - 2.5	1.3 - 1.5		2.3 - 2.5	20-25	4.0 - 4.5	2.0 - 2.5

Based on information provided by Agricultural Extension Service of the University of California.

Upgated: Department of Water Resources, Southern District // Backup date for the California Water Plan, Bulletin 160-98. Date August 21, 2000 <sup>2</sup> Unit use values for group grown in each region.

## LAW OFFICES OF BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP S PARK PLAZA, SUTE 1500 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92614

#### **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 & Krieger LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1500, Irvine, California, 92614. On January 17, 2012, I served the within document(s):

LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40 NOTICE OF IN LIMINE MOTION NUMBER 1 AND MOTION IN LIMINE NUMBER 1 FOR LEGAL FINDINGS ON WATER CODE REQUIREMENTS TO REPORT EXTRACTIONS OF GROUNDWATER IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY; DECLARATION OF JEFFREY V. DUNN; EXHIBIT

×	by posting the document(s) listed above to the Santa Clara County Superior Cour website in regard to the Antelope Valley Groundwater matter.
	by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereofully prepaid, in the United States mail at Irvine, California addressed as set fortlebelow.
	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 January 17, 2012, at Irvine, California.

Kerry V. Keefe

26345.00000\6052781.1