EXHIBIT G

- 1	f .		
1	Michael D. McLachlan (State Bar No. 181705)		
2	LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN, APC 523 West Sixth Street, Suite 215		
3	Los Angeles, California 90014 Telephone: (213) 630-2884		
4	Facsimile: (213) 630-2886 mike@mclachlanlaw.com		
5	Daniel M. O'Leary (State Bar No. 175128) LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY 523 West Sixth Street, Suite 215 Los Angeles, California 90014		
6			
7	Telephone: (213) 630-2880 Facsimile: (213) 630-2886		
8	dan@danolearylaw.com		
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10			
11	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
12	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
13	Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b))	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4408	
14	ANTELOPE VALLEY GROUNDWATER	(Santa Clara Case No. 1-05-CV-049053,	
15	CASES	Honorable Jack Komar)	
16	RICHARD A. WOOD, an individual, on	Case No.: BC 391869	
17	behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,	RICHARD WOOD'S RESPONSE TO	
18		AGWA'S MOTION TO DECERTIFY CLASS	
19	Plaintiff,		
20	v.	Date: May 6, 2009 Time: 9:00 a.m.	
21	LOS ANGELES COUNTY WATERWORKS DISTRICT NO. 40; et al.	Dept.: 17C	
22			
23	Defendants.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	RICHARD WOOD'S RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DECERTIFY CLASS		

AGWA moves to decertify or amend the class definition of the Small Pumper Class. The Small Pumper class counsel agree that, as currently defined, the class may include parties with potentially adverse interests. The problem is that nobody knows (1) how much groundwater the average domestic pumper uses or (2) how many domestic pumpers reside in the area of adjudication. Based on an informal survey, Mr. Wood and his counsel believe that the average use is significantly higher than the 1 acre-foot/year value cited in AGWA's motion. Wood and his counsel also believe that the number of potential class members is far less than the 15,000 people currently set to receive class notice.¹

The more imminent and possibly intractable problem is that the Small Pumper class will not be able to get solid answers to these questions because it has been starved of resources. Indeed, the Court's ruling on Mr. Wood's motion for appointment of an expert will effectively prevent a meaningful investigation of class size and the volume of classwide pumping until after the Phase III trial.² In the mind of class counsel, this fact weighs in favor of decertifying the class.

The problem faced by class counsel is that without an expert to participate in the overdraft determination, the pumping rights of class members will be permanently impaired. At the risk of some oversimplification, the determination of overdraft will require that parties to produce evidence of total pumping in excess of the area of adjudication's safe yield. The total pumping is the sum of pumping for municipal, industrial, agricultural, and domestic use, along with whatever miscellaneous pumping is occurring. The members of the Small Pumper class contribute to the total amount of domestic (and, if AGWA is to be believed, agricultural) pumping. Whatever this

1 Two days ago, Los Angeles Waterworks District No. 40 informed class counsel that it has ballooned the number of potential class members from approximately 8,000 (where it had been estimated for a year or more) to 15,000. This compounds core problems with the class. Richard Wood will address these matters further in his *ex parte* application to be heard on May 6, 2009.

contribution is, the amount would establish the amount of self-help available to the class, i.e., the amount of pumping safe from the prescription claims of the public water purveyors.

Whatever that amount might be, the Small Pumper class clearly cannot rely on the experts retained by other landowners. As evidenced by this motion and other recent filings, the other landowners do not want the Small Pumper class present in this proceeding at all and have become increasingly hostile to its continued existence. Their experts will be incentivized to attribute pumping to uses other than small domestic use, because they are interested in protecting the pumping rights of other landowners against prescription claims. In the Phase III trial, if the evidence supports a finding of overdraft, the agricultural pumpers will advocate that they have been pumping a greater volume of water for reasonable and beneficial uses than other overlying owners, and vice versa. No landowner would seek to minimize their pumping volume in an overdrawn basin because any physical solution will ultimately force users to scale down from some baseline pumping volume.

So without an expert in the Phase III trial, the Small Pumper class will get whipsawed by competing experts, all of whom will interpret whatever data exists to minimize pumping by the small domestic pumpers. Thus, when the Court eventually lifts its stay order on the appointment of an expert, there may already exist a factual finding concerning the ceiling amount of water available to the class's self-help defense.

Under this scenario, the small pumpers cannot be adequately represented as a class, regardless of class definition. Thus, if the class is to participate in the Phase III trial without an expert, it should be decertified.

 2 The Court granted Wood's motion for appointment of an expert, but stayed the order until after the Phase III trial on safe yield and overdraft. For reasons explained below, this ruling subjects that Wood class to the possibility of prejudice in the Phase III trial.

1	DATED: May 1, 2009 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. McLACHLAN	
2	LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL M. O'LEARY	
3		
4	By:	
5	Daniel M. O'Leary Attorneys for Plaintiff	
6	Audineys for Francis	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	3 This hostility will increase when the other landowners learn that the Wood class may end up	
28	having twice as many members as anticipated.	
	RICHARD WOOD'S RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DECERTIFY CLASS	