

1 H. Jess Senecal (CSB #026826)  
2 Thomas S. Bunn III (CSB #89502)  
3 LAGERLOF, SENEAL, GOSNEY & KRUSE, LLP  
4 301 N. Lake Avenue, 10th Floor  
Pasadena, CA 91101-4108  
Telephone: (626) 793-9400  
Facsimile: (626) 793-5900

**EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES UNDER  
GOVERNMENT CODE § 6103**

5 Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant,  
6 Palmdale Water District  
7

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT**  
10

11 Coordination Proceeding  
12 Special Title (Rule 1550 (b))

Judicial Council Coordination  
Proceeding No. 4408

13 **ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER**  
14 **CASES**

[Assigned to The Honorable Jack Komar]

Santa Clara Court Case No. 1-05-CV-049053

15 **PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' CASE**  
16 **MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

17 Date: August 30, 2011  
18 Time: 8:00 a.m.  
19 Dept: 316, Central Civil West

20 The Public Water Suppliers have been participating in the settlement discussions before Justice  
21 Robie, and agree that progress is being made toward a comprehensive settlement. As suggested at the  
22 last case management conference, a notice was posted on the court's web site advising all parties of the  
23 settlement discussions and the opportunity to participate. As a result, several new parties have joined the  
24 discussion. Most of the discussion so far has focused on the central issue of water rights. The Public  
25 Water Suppliers believe that if a settlement can be reached on water rights, the remaining issues will  
26 likely be settled as well. However, there are also proposals circulating regarding other issues, including a  
27 proposal for the role of the watermaster in the management of the basin. At this point, it appears that  
28 there is a good possibility that the parties will reach agreement on this issue.

1 One issue hampering settlement has been the lack of participation by the Wood class. In the  
2 reply memorandum for their motion to authorize expert witness work, class counsel stated that they had  
3 stated their position to Justice Robie in numerous briefs addressing the pertinent topics. That may be  
4 true, but those briefs have not been furnished to the other parties, nor has any representative from the  
5 Wood class been present at the settlement negotiations.

6 The court requested proposals about how evidence should be presented with respect to the  
7 watermaster issues, if agreement could not be reached. Given the evolving nature of the settlement  
8 discussions to date, it is difficult to make specific proposals at this time. Ideally, any trial would present  
9 a proposal and evidence to support it, and focus on areas of disagreement. The Public Water Suppliers  
10 suggest another case management conference in 30 days, during which proposals can be further  
11 developed and areas of disagreement identified.

12 In the meantime, the Public Water Suppliers suggest the court consider setting a trial next year  
13 on the key issue of water rights. A trial date could motivate parties to resolve their differences on  
14 the allocation of groundwater in the basin.

15  
16 Dated: August 26, 2011

LAGERLOF, SENEAL, GOSNEY & KRUSE, LLP

17  
18 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Thomas S. Bunn III  
20 Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant  
21 Palmdale Water District  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28