1	EDGAR B. WASHBURN (BAR NO. 34038) Email: EWashburn@mofo.com		
2	WILLIAM M. SLOAN (BAR NO. 203583) Email: WSloan@mofo.com		
3	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street		
4	San Francisco, California 94105-2482 Telephone: 415.268.7000		
5	Facsimile: 415.268.7522		
6	Attorneys for U.S. BORAX INC.		
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
10			
11	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
12	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER CASES	Assigned to The Honorable	
13	Included Actions:	Jack Komar	
14	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.	U.S. BORAX RESPONSE TO	
15 16	Diamond Farming Co. Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC 325 201	PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIERS' PROPOSAL FOR CLASS DEFINITIONS	
17	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 v.	Date: April 16, 2007	
18	Diamond Farming Co. Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. S-1500-CV-254-348	Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept: 1	
19	Wm. Bolthouse Farms, Inc. v. City of Lancaster	·	
20	Diamond Farming Co. v. City of Lancaster Diamond Farming Co. v. Palmdale Water Dist.		
21	Superior Court of Čalifornia, County of Riverside, Case Nos. RIC 353 840, RIC 344 436, RIC 344 668		
22	(Consolidated Actions)		
23		and D. H. Water County of Constant	
24	U.S. Borax does not oppose the proposal submitted by the Public Water Suppliers for class		
25	definitions, but wishes to raise two concerns. First, the Subclass A proposal states with respect to an		
26	land "that connects to a Public Water Supplier's water service system and does not operate a		
27	groundwater well, then such landownership will no longer be a member of the class and will be		
28	dismissed from the litigation." Proposal at 3:13-15. U.S. Borax presumes that this exclusion is		

28

1	proposed because the Public Water Suppliers will, in some manner, agree to be legally bound to	
2	prevent the construction or utilization of a groundwater well within their service areas in the future.	
3	If that presumption is somehow incorrect, then U.S. Borax requests that the Public Water Suppliers	
4	address how future pumping by excluded landowners that are dismissed from, and not bound by, this	
5	litigation will be controlled. Second, with regard to the exclusion of "all public entities" (Proposal at	
6	3:20), U.S. Borax simply requests some clarification as to the Public Water Suppliers' land	
7	ownership information for the adjudication area to determine the scope of this relatively vague	
8	exclusion. This exclusion does not address the risk that, in the future, publicly owned property not	
9	bound by this litigation may transfer into private hands.	
10	Dated: April 6, 2007	EDGAR B. WASHBURN
11		WILLIAM M. SLOAN MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12		Λ
13		By: Milliam of Albam
14		William M. Sloan Attorneys for U.S. BORAX INC.
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		•
25		
26	·	
27		
28		