

1 Jimmy L. Gutierrez (SBN 59448)  
 2 JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ  
 3 A Professional Corporation  
 4 12616 Central Avenue  
 5 Chino, California 91710  
 6 Telephone: (909) 591-6336  
 7 Facsimile: (909) 628-9803

FILED-Rancho Cucamonga District  
 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
 SUPERIOR COURT

JAN 31 2002

By David A. Welford Deputy

5 Attorneys for CITY OF CHINO

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO - RANCHO CUCAMONGA DIVISION**

|                             |   |                                    |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER | ) | CASE NO. RCV 51010                 |
| DISTRICT,                   | ) | [Judge: Honorable J. Michael Gunn] |
|                             | ) |                                    |
| Plaintiff,                  | ) | <b>RESPONSE OF THE CITY OF</b>     |
|                             | ) | <b>CHINO TO THE COURT'S</b>        |
| v.                          | ) | <b>ORDER FOR INFORMATION;</b>      |
|                             | ) | <b>AND MOTION PURSUANT TO</b>      |
| THE CITY OF CHINO,          | ) | <b>PARAGRAPH 15 OF THE</b>         |
|                             | ) | <b>JUDGMENT</b>                    |
| Defendants.                 | ) |                                    |

DATE: February 28, 2002  
 TIME: 2:00 p.m.  
 DEPT: 8

## I.

## INTRODUCTION

## A. The Immediate Problem.

Chino has an immediate problem that cries out for relief. An area of approximately 200 acres within the City of Chino is sinking. This area is located along Central Avenue between Schaefer Avenue on the north and Eucalyptus Avenue on the south. Since 1987, this area has sunk more than 2 feet, including a much smaller area that sunk approximately 2 ½ feet. Hereafter, this area shall be referred to as "the Area of Subsidence." The depth that this area has sunk far exceeds the one to two inches of subsidence experienced in a much wider area of the Chino Basin within which the "Area of Subsidence" is located. This Area of Subsidence has been well documented and is not in dispute.

## B. The Dispute.

What is in dispute is the cause of the subsidence. The City of Chino has believed for some time that the sinking in the Area of Subsidence is caused by Chino Hills production of water from the deep aquifers beneath the Area of Subsidence. However, the City of Chino Hills disputes that its production of water from the deep aquifers beneath the Area of Subsidence is the cause of the subsidence in that Area. Also, Watermaster is not ready to make such a determination. Both believe that more information is necessary.

However, the City of Chino believes that the mountain of available evidence clearly demonstrates the causal connection between the sinking in the Area of Subsidence and Chino Hills production of water from the deep aquifers beneath that Area.

Further, the City of Chino retained GeoPentech to interpret all of available data as to its sufficiency from which to determine the cause of the sinking of the Area of Subsidence and if so to ascertain the cause or causes. The report of GeoPentech concludes that the cause of the sinking in the Area of Subsidence is Chino Hills production of water from the deep aquifers beneath the Area of Subsidence. (See Declaration of Patrick J. Glover, with the attached report by GeoPentech).

///

1           **C. Risk of No Action.**

2           As the studies and discussions about the cause of sinking in the Area of Subsidence  
3 continue, so do the risks of subsidence in that Area. While no one can predict when the  
4 sinking in the Area of Subsidence will cause actual physical damage, it is reasonable to  
5 assume that it will occur if the subsidence continues.

6           The greatest risk is to do nothing. Watermaster may well believe that the cause  
7 should be studied further; but the City of Chino believes that the cause is clear and that the  
8 time is now to focus on a solution.

9           **D. Assumption of Jurisdiction.**

10          The first step is for the Court to assume jurisdiction over the land subsidence in the  
11 Area of Subsidence within the City of Chino. It is observed that the City of Chino Hills  
12 and Watermaster, both, agree that the Court has jurisdiction to resolve the disputes between  
13 the City of Chino and the City of Chino Hills under paragraph 15 of the Judgment herein.  
14 However, it does not appear that the Court has so determined and another party to this  
15 Judgment may contest the Court's jurisdiction.

16          It is no secret that the City of Chino Hills disputes the contention of the City of  
17 Chino that the Area of Subsidence is being caused by Chino Hills production of water from  
18 the deep aquifers beneath that Area. This past year, it was suggested that Watermaster may  
19 have a mandatory or adequate binding process by which to resolve this dispute, although  
20 the City of Chino questioned its availability and adequacy.

21          Nevertheless, the City of Chino submitted a written request to Watermaster about  
22 the availability such a remedy on September 26, 2001. (See Declaration of Jimmy L.  
23 Gutierrez and Exhibits attached thereto). However, on October 31, 2001, John Rossi, the  
24 C.E.O of the Chino Basin Watermaster, wrote a letter to the City of Chino stating that  
25 Watermaster had declined the invitation to determine the availability of Watermaster  
26 remedies. Therein, he also stated as follows: *"Watermaster recommends that Chino or*  
27 *any other party to the Judgment that desires relief related to evaluating the causes,*  
28 *arresting, or mitigating subsidence that they file a Request for Judicial Relief Under*

1 *Paragraph 15 of the Judgment. Please be assured that in the event the City of Chino or*  
2 *any other party to the Judgment makes such a request, Watermaster will file its petition*  
3 *with the Court acknowledging Watermaster's jurisdiction over the subject matter and*  
4 *request the Court for direction on how it should precede."*

5 Most recently, the City of Chino Hills filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate against  
6 the City of Chino on December 7, 2001. In paragraph 7, thereof, the City of Chino Hills  
7 states that venue for the petition was "*before the Honorable J. Michael Gunn, the*  
8 *designated judge to hear all disputes among water producers relating to the Chino Basin,*  
9 *pursuant to Article IV, paragraph 15 of the final Judgment in the case entitled" Chino*  
10 *Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino, et al., San Bernardino Superior Court*  
11 *case number RCV 164325, now designated number RCV 51010."* Further, the City of  
12 Chino Hills alleges in paragraph 27 of the petition that "*the subsidence dispute is, however,*  
13 *within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Honorable J. Michael Gunn, as provided in the*  
14 *Judgment."*

15 While the City of Chino also believes that this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to  
16 paragraph 15 of the Judgment herein to resolve what the City of Chino Hills refers to as the  
17 "*subsidence dispute*" including the causes and remedies of land subsidence in the Area of  
18 Subsidence within the City of Chino, it is not all together clear that such a determination  
19 has been made, and other producers may object to the Court's assumption of jurisdiction  
20 with respect to these issues. The City of Chino acknowledges the Order made by the  
21 Honorable Joseph E. Johnston on December 19, 2001, in City of Chino Hills v. City of  
22 Chino, case number RCV 059670 and the Order made by the Honorable J. Michael Gunn  
23 on the same date in this case. However, it is not clear whether either Order confirms the  
24 Court's jurisdiction regarding this dispute.

25 As an example, the Order by Judge Johnston provides, in pertinent part, as follows:  
26 "*The Court construes the petition by the City of Chino Hills as encompassing two separate*  
27 *matters . . . The second matter is properly described as a motion brought under paragraph*  
28 *15 of the Judgment. [In RCV 51010], which encompasses all claims pertaining to the rights*

1 *and obligations of the parties with respect to the production of water in the Chino Basin,*  
2 *including any issues related to subsidence."* However, such an Order falls short of ruling  
3 that the Court has jurisdiction to resolve those disputes.

4 Likewise, on December 19, 2001, the Honorable J. Michael Gunn issued an Order  
5 in this action and makes two recitals and then orders the parties in this action "*to report on*  
6 *the status of the technical work performed to date by Watermaster and other concerning*  
7 *subsidence and related issues."* The first recital to that Order states that the City of Chino  
8 Hills filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate against the City of Chino "*raising issues related*  
9 *to the rights and obligations of the parties with respect to the production of water in the*  
10 *Chino Basin, including any issue related to subsidence, which are subject to the continuing*  
11 *jurisdiction of this Court under paragraph 15 of the Judgment herein, and therefore, must*  
12 *be brought in this Court as a Motion for Relief Under Paragraph 15 of the Judgment."*

13 Likewise, the second recital states, "*it has been determined that only those issues that are*  
14 *subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the Court under paragraph 15 of the Judgment*  
15 *shall be specially assigned to this Court."* Said order and recitals also fall short of a clear  
16 statement that the Court has assumed or will assume jurisdiction of the dispute between the  
17 City of Chino Hills and the City of Chino regarding water production and land subsidence  
18 disputes.

## 19 II.

### 20 REQUEST FOR RELIEF UNDER PARAGRAPH 15

21 The City of Chino respectfully requests the Court to assume jurisdiction over its  
22 dispute with the City of Chino Hills regarding water production and land subsidence. The  
23 purpose, without limitation, of this request is to resolve the following issues:

24 (a) Whether the City of Chino Hills' production of water from the deep aquifers  
25 within the City of Chino is causing land subsidence in an area approximately 200 acres in  
26 size that is located along Central Avenue from Schaefer Avenue on the north to Eucalyptus  
27 Avenue on the south; and if so, to fashion a remedy to abate the land subsidence.

28

1 (b) Whether Chino Hills proposed purchase of ground water from the Monte  
2 Vista Water District will have the potential to degrade the quantity or quality of water that  
3 Chino now extracts from its northerly wells; and, if so, to fashion a remedy that will avoid  
4 set impacts.

5 As to these two overriding issues, the first is immediate while the second is not, as  
6 production has not yet commenced.

7 In seeking this relief, Chino is willing to submit itself to any reasonable process  
8 suggested by the Court. However, the City of Chino is concerned that any process  
9 involving Watermaster may not be viable, because the appropriators may be required to  
10 finance some portion of the ultimate remedy. Under paragraph 5.4(d) of the Peace  
11 Agreement, a producer such as Chino Hills is entitled to apply "*to Watermaster for*  
12 *reimbursement or credit against future OBMP Assessments for any capital or operations*  
13 *and maintenance expenses incurred in the implementation of any project or program,*  
14 *including the costs of relocating ground water production facilities, that carries out the*  
15 *purposes of the OBMP including but not limited to those facilities relating to the*  
16 *prevention of subsidence in the basin.*"

17 The City of Chino welcomes the Court's resolution of these disputes directly, but  
18 understands that the Court can delegate some aspects of the resolution process to  
19 Watermaster or the special referee. In such an event, Chino will cooperate with any such  
20 process but requests that such a process be reviewed *de novo* by the Court as required by  
21 paragraph 15 of the Judgment.

22  
23 **III.**

24 **HE COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO ORDER A PARTY TO ABATE THE**  
25 **CAUSES OF SUBSIDENCE OR TO IMPLEMENT A PROCESS BY WHICH TO**  
26 **MITIGATE SUCH SUBSIDENCE**

27 The Court has broad jurisdiction to fashion and authorize implementation of a  
28 remedy by which to manage the water resources of the Basin to avoid subsidence, in the

1 exercise of its continuing jurisdiction over administration of its Physical Solution for the  
2 Chino Basin.

3 **A. The Judgment Was Intended to Implement a Physical Solution.**

4  
5 The Judgment sets forth the parameters under which the Court retains jurisdiction in  
6 order to oversee the development and implementation of the Physical Solution. Paragraph  
7 15 of the Judgment reserves to the Court full jurisdiction, power and authority as to all  
8 matters contained in the Judgment unless the matters are expressly exempted.<sup>1</sup>

9 At its core, the Judgment requires that a Physical Solution be developed. (Judgment  
10 Article VI, pp. 39-57.) The purpose of the Physical Solution is to maximize the beneficial  
11 utilization of the Basin pursuant to the mandate of Article X, § 2 of the California  
12 Constitution so that the Basin can be maintained to function as a common pool resource  
13 from which all of the parties can continue to receive benefit. The Court's continuing  
14 jurisdiction is provided for the purpose of enabling the Court to make further Orders as is  
15 necessary or appropriate for the interpretation, enforcement or carrying out of the  
16 Judgment, and to modify, amend or amplify any of the provisions of the Judgment.  
17 (Judgment, 15, pp. 11-12.) In addition, Article VI of the Judgment describes the Physical  
18 Solution and it expressly directs the Watermaster to develop an Optimum Basin  
19 Management Program ("OBMP") to create and implement the management elements that  
20 will lead to a maximization of the Basin resources. (Judgment, pg. 41.)

21  
22 **B. The Plain Meaning of the Judgment the Court to Make Orders that**  
23 **Provides Remedies for the Consequences of Groundwater Production Including**  
24 **Subsidence.**

25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> The retained jurisdiction of the Court is limited only in respect to (1) the redetermination of Safe Yield  
28 during the first 10 years of operation of the Judgment;(2) the allocation of Safe Yield among the Pools; (3) the  
determination of specific rights in the Safe Yield; and (4) the method of allocation and recovery of replenishment  
assessments except under certain circumstances.

1 The same rules of interpretation apply in ascertaining the meaning of a judgment as  
2 in ascertaining the meaning of any other similar writing. Strohm v. Strohm, (1960) 182  
3 Cal.2d 53. A stipulated judgment in particular is regarded as a contract between the parties  
4 and is to be construed as a contract. Hi-Desert County Water District v. Blue Skies  
5 Country Club, (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1723; In re Application of Ferrigno, (1937) 22  
6 Cal.App.2d 472. Intent is the paramount feature of a contract, and the function of all  
7 interpretation is to try to ascertain the true intent of the parties. Scott v. Sun-Maid Raisin  
8 Growers Assn., (1936) 13 Cal.App.2d 353.)

9 In Pasadena v. City of Alhambra, (1949) 33 Cal.2d 908 the term "safe yield" was  
10 defined solely in terms of a balance between extractions and additions to the groundwater  
11 basin. Any lowering of the water table was susceptible to being characterized as an  
12 "undesirable result." Subsequently, the California Supreme Court in City of Los Angeles  
13 v. City San Fernando, (1975) 14 Cal.3d 199, broke free from this rigid definition and  
14 instead looked at a broader context for basin management. The San Fernando opinion was  
15 issued just three years prior to the entry of the Judgment in the instant case. Thus, the  
16 Court may presume that this is the meaning the parties gave to the phrase "undesirable  
17 result" at the time when the Judgment was entered rather than the rigid characterization  
18 used in the Pasadena case.

19 In the twenty-seven years since entry of Judgment in San Fernando, the  
20 understanding that land subsidence may be an "undesirable result" and thus a part of the  
21 concept of Safe Yield, has become a commonplace. In a standard textbook on the subject  
22 first published in 1980, it is stated that:

23 *The [Safe Yield] of a groundwater basin defines the rate at which water can be*  
24 *withdrawn perennially under specified operating conditions without producing an*  
25 *undesired result. An undesired result is an adverse situation such as (1) progressive*  
26 *reduction of the water resource, (2) development of uneconomic pumping*  
27 *conditions, (3) degradation of groundwater quality, (4) interference with prior*  
28 *water rights, or (5) land subsidence caused by lowered groundwater levels.*



1 *Todd, Groundwater Hydrology 363-364 (2nd ed.)*

2  
3 **3. The Peace Agreement and the Implementation Plan.**

4  
5 The fact that "subsidence" was intended to be resolved can be found in the parties  
6 agreement to not oppose the OBMP Implementation Plan that was an Exhibit to the Peace  
7 Agreement. Moreover, Program Element 4 thereto establishes the goal of abating  
8 subsidence, as it was approve by order of this court. It clearly states:

9 *"The occurrence of subsidence and fissuring in Management Zone I is not*  
10 *acceptable and should be reduced to tolerable levels or abated. The OBMP calls*  
11 *for a management plan to reduce or abate the subsidence and fissuring problems to*  
12 *the extent that it may be caused by production in MZI."*

13  
14 **IV.**

15 **THE COURT SHOULD ISSUE AN ORDER INDICATING ITS ASSUMPTION**  
16 **OF JURISDICTION OVER THE ISSUES OF WATER PRODUCTION AND**  
17 **SUBSIDENCE IN DISPUTE BETWEEN THE CITIES OF CHINO AND CHINO**  
18 **HILLS AN PROCEED TO ESTABLISH A PROCESS FOR RESOLVING SAME**

19  
20 No absolute certainty of the causes of subsidence damage ever can be achieved, but  
21 that level of certainty is not necessary for meaningful mitigation of that phenomenon. All  
22 existing data concludes that the logical cause of subsidence in the City of Chino is  
23 production from the deep aquifer wells of the City of Chino Hills located within the City of  
24 Chino; and the most recent study and analysis of Geopentech concludes not only that such  
25 production is the only credible cause of such subsidence, but also that there are no other  
26 credible causes. This subsidence has occurred over a long period of time, and has been the  
27 subject of numerous studies of various types. The City of Chino should not have to suffer

28


1 further risks by waiting on further studies when it is necessary to take action to mitigate  
2 subsidence, at least on an interim basis.

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

Dated: January 31, 2002

JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ  
City Attorney

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jimmy L. Gutierrez  
Attorneys for Defendant  
CITY OF CHINO

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IRVINE, CA 92601


[ X ] by regular mail;

[ X ] I caused such envelope(s) to be deposited in the mail at Chino, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

[ X ] I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing, under which it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day, with postage thereon fully prepaid, at Chino, California. 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 (1) day after deposit of mailing affidavit.

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

Executed on January 31, 2002, at Chino, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Wilkerson



1 Jimmy L. Gutierrez (SBN 59448)  
 2 JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ  
 3 A Professional Corporation  
 4 12616 Central Avenue  
 Chino, California 91710  
 Telephone: (909) 591-6336  
 Facsimile: (909) 628-9803

FILED-Rancho Cucamonga District  
 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
 SUPERIOR COURT

JAN 31 2002

By Dave H. Welford Deputy

5 Attorneys for Defendant THE CITY OF CHINO

6  
 7  
 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
 9 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO - RANCHO CUCAMONGA DIVISION

11 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER )  
 12 DISTRICT, )

CASE NO. RCV 51010  
 [Judge: Honorable J. Michael Gulen]

13 Plaintiff, )

DECLARATION OF PATRICK  
 J. GLOVER

14 v. )

16 THE CITY OF CHINO, )

DATE: February 28, 2002

17 Defendants. )

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

DEPT: 8

RECEIVED  
 JAN 31 2002  
 RANCHO CUCAMONGA DISTRICT

24 I, PATRICK J. GLOVER, state and declare as follows:

25 1. I am Director of Public Works and City Engineer, for the City of Chino and I  
 26 have held this position since 1998.

27 2. The following facts are from my personal knowledge, and if called as a  
 28 witness I could and would so competently testify thereto under oath.

1           3.     I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from California  
2 State Polytechnic University, Pomona, in 1981. The emphasis of my studies was in  
3 structural design and analysis of buildings. I am a licensed Civil Engineer, in the State of  
4 California, licensed number 38164. I am also a Certified Building Official, licensed  
5 number 1157 and a licensed Plans Examiner, licensed number 18338.

6           4.     I have over 20 years of experience in the field of engineering. I worked in  
7 responsible positions in four governmental agencies and a private engineering company at  
8 such I was a principal. That experience consists of the following:

9           (a)    From 1981 until 1992, I worked in the building and safety field. For  
10 the cities of Los Angeles, Burbank, and West Covina. In this capacity, I reviewed building  
11 plans including structural calculation reviews for both vertical and lateral loading on  
12 buildings that ranged in size from single family homes to high-rise structures.

13           (b)    From 1986 until 1988, I was a principal in a civil engineering  
14 company. During that time, I performed structural analysis and prepared calculations for a  
15 variety of buildings from single family homes to three-story steel-framed structures.

16           (c)    From 1992 to the present time, I have been working in the public  
17 works and city engineering for local governments. From 1994 to 1998, I was a Public  
18 Works Director and City Engineer for the City of West Covina. From 1998 to the present,  
19 I have been employed as the Public Works Director and City Engineer for the City of  
20 Chino. In these positions, I have been responsible for all aspects of Public Works and  
21 Civil Engineering of the design, construction and maintenance of the infrastructure of the  
22 cities. Further, I have been responsible for the review of design of all private development  
23 within the cities.

24           5.     In my capacity as Public Works Director and City Engineer for the City of  
25 Chino, I have reviewed and become familiar with the data regarding subsidence within the  
26 southern portion of the City of Chino along Central Avenue between Schaefer Avenue on  
27 the north and Eucalyptus Avenue on the south. In particular, I have carefully reviewed the  
28 studies, surveys and mappings that have been performed for the past 10 years regarding

1 subsidence of land in this area, including all of the following:

2 (a) Final Report Ground Fissure Study for C.I.M., august 1994 by  
3 Geomatrix Consultants.

4 (b) Three Reports from Kleinfelder.

5 1. Geotechnical investigation, regional subsidence and related  
6 ground fissuring, August 1993.

7 2. Chino Basin Subsidence and Fissuring Study, March 1996.

8 3. Update of Subsidence Map, March 1999.

9 (c) Optimum Basin Management Plan for Chino Basin Watermaster,  
10 August 1999.

11 (d) Four sets of survey elevations from Associated Engineers for the City  
12 of Chino, 1995, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

13 (e) Subsidence Monitoring Project for the City of Chino, March 1999 by  
14 G. Peltzer.

15 6. While the foregoing information and data take on many different formats,  
16 they all indicate an area of maximum subsidence generally located along Central Avenue  
17 and between Schaefer Avenue on the north and Eucalyptus Avenue on the south. The  
18 survey work completed by associated engineers shows a maximum subsidence depth in the  
19 order of 2 ½ feet over the past 14 years, with an area of approximately 200 acres showing  
20 subsidence of 2 feet or greater. In contrast, the remote sensing study reveals that a lesser  
21 amount of subsidence, in the order of 1 to 3 inches, has been occurring over a much wider  
22 area of the Chino Basin.

23 7. In evaluating the risks that subsidence presents to property, buildings and  
24 infrastructure, it is important to look at the Area of Subsidence, the uniformity of its  
25 elevation, and the total depth to which it has taken place. This is because each building  
26 and each infrastructure component is designed to perform a function based on the land  
27 elevation remaining constant. Changes in elevation of land caused by subsidence adversely  
28 affect the ability of the infrastructure component and building to perform its original design

1 function. The greater the depth of subsidence and the shorter the distance over which it  
2 occurs, the greater the risk of damage.

3 8. In addition, it is necessary to look at the type of improvements and buildings  
4 constructed on the properties in the Area of Subsidence and the quantity and type of  
5 infrastructure facilities built below the ground surface. These buildings and infrastructure  
6 facilities are significant to the operation of a city because they provide a variety of  
7 functions such as preventing flooding, carrying raw sewage to treatment facilities,  
8 delivering water to residences and businesses, as well as providing structures that house  
9 citizens and businesses vital to the economic health of the community.

10 9. When looking at the two and a half feet of subsidence that has occurred, in  
11 the Area of Subsidence, it is important to note that this depth has occurred over a relatively  
12 short horizontal distance of 3,000 feet along the east/west axis on Eucalyptus Avenue  
13 between Central Avenue and a point just west of Monte Vista Avenue. This change in the  
14 slope of the land has the potential to impact a variety of infrastructure components and  
15 building improvements. While this is the area that has the greatest slope within the Area of  
16 Subsidence, it is not the only location where potential damage may occur.

17 10. Studies have shown that there has been ground fissuring along the eastern  
18 edge of the Area of Subsidence for some time. I have observed some of this fissuring  
19 along 12th Street in the City of Chino. This fissuring ran directly under an older single-  
20 family residence making it unfit for habitation. If fissuring were to continue to occur as a  
21 result of land subsidence, it has the potential to cause sever damage to any building or  
22 infrastructure facility that is built on or through the area of the fissure. This ground  
23 separation can cause buildings to fail structurally, water lines, sewer lines, storm drains and  
24 streets to crack and fail.

25 11. **Threat to Street Drainage.** When a City street is constructed, it is  
26 generally crowned in the center to slope to the curbs and gutters on each side of the street.  
27 These curbs and gutters are then sloped to carry the water to the storm drain catch basin  
28 usually located in the face of the curb. Since the City of Chino has very little natural



1 elevation change from the east the west, it is a challenge to maintain good drainage on  
2 streets that run east and west. Subsidence adversely effects what is already an area of poor  
3 drainage due to low slopes. In fact, subsidence can even change the direction of water  
4 flow away from catch basins that were originally designed to receive the water.

5 12. As an example, the land along Eucalyptus Avenue between Monte Vista on  
6 the west and Central Avenue on the east, experienced a reversal in its natural slope. In  
7 1987, this area sloped ever so slightly from east to west. In other words, the land on the  
8 west at Avenues Monte Vista and Eucalyptus was lower than the land in the east at the  
9 intersection of Eucalyptus and Central Avenues. Now, after the subsidence, the land along  
10 Eucalyptus Avenue slopes 12" in the opposite direction. In other words, the land on the  
11 west at the intersection of Monte Vista and Eucalyptus Avenues is higher by 12" than the  
12 land to the east at the intersection of Eucalyptus and Central Avenues.

13 13. Therefore, one affect of subsidence is that it brings about a change in  
14 drainage patterns on streets, as well as other lands designed with very little slope such as  
15 parking lots and parks. As the drainage pattern on the these streets and lands change due to  
16 subsidence, water will drain less quickly and also pond and puddle, which can be a hazard  
17 to the motoring public.

18 14. **Threat to on Storm Drains and Sewer Lines.** The potential adverse  
19 impacts of subsidence on storm drains and sewer lines are similar to those on curbs and  
20 gutters because of the same need to carry water and waste water in areas with low slopes.  
21 Storm drains and sewers are designed according to formulas that calculate the capacity and  
22 performance based on the size and slope of the pipe. The potential for land subsidence to  
23 impact this performance adversely is increased in areas where the natural slope of the land  
24 is low. In addition to altering the storm drain and sewer's ability to carry water, subsidence  
25 can cause the pipeline or storm drain structures themselves to fail. Storm drain structures  
26 are usually built with concrete pipe segments joined together, or continuous concrete box  
27 structures that carry greater flows. Sewer lines are constructed of clay pipe segments  
28 joined together with fittings. As subsidence occurs, the joints in those facilities are subject

1 to movement that will weaken the joint and eventually cause them to fail when enough  
2 subsidence occurs. This can cause the water or sewage carried by these facilities to leak  
3 and erode the ground, causing potential sink holes. In addition, soil debris can enter these  
4 facilities causing blockage and further damage downstream.

5       **15. Threat to Water Lines.** Water lines that carry potable and recycled water  
6 in the Area of Subsidence are pressurized and therefore are not as susceptible to gravity-  
7 flow based performance impacts caused by land subsidence as are storm drains, sewers and  
8 streets. However, these water systems are very carefully designed based on elevations  
9 throughout the service areas and, as such, are impacted adversely by subsidence. These  
10 negative performance impacts, which are mainly a reduction in water pressure, will  
11 increase as subsidence continues to occur. Like with storm drains and sewers, water lines  
12 have joints that will be subject to movement and failure as subsidence increases. Because  
13 these lines are pressurized, breakage can result in a higher potential for erosion and sink  
14 holes.

15       **16. Threat to Utility Services.** Throughout the Area of Subsidence, there  
16 is a variety of general utility service lines. These include gas lines (both general and high  
17 pressure mains), electrical lines, phone lines, cable TV lines, and even an old oil line.  
18 While the ability of each of these utilities to tolerate subsidence varies, it is safe to say that  
19 all will be affected in some fashion. As subsidence continues, the risk of adverse impacts  
20 to these important utility services increases.

21       **17. Threat to Buildings.** There is a wide variety of building types within  
22 the Area of Subsidence. These generally range from one story wood-framed homes to  
23 large 400,000 square-foot concrete tilt-up warehouses. Both the size and type of  
24 construction are important when evaluating the risks for subsidence. With respect to the  
25 size of a typical building, generally the smaller and more flexible the structure, the less  
26 susceptible it will be to damage caused by subsidence. In addition, generally the more  
27 uniform the subsidence, the less the potential for damage. This is because the building will  
28 tilt ever so slightly, which does not cause any significant stress to build up. If, on the other

1 hand, the land under only a portion of a building were to subside, it would introduce  
2 secondary stresses from the differential deflection. These stresses can manifest  
3 themselves in cracked floor slabs, cracked foundations, cracked walls and reduction of a  
4 building's ability to resist earthquake forces.

5 18. With these factors being considered, the adverse impacts of subsidence will  
6 occur in buildings that are generally larger in size, and/or are constructed of more rigid  
7 materials and to those that are located on land that has subsided at different rates. The  
8 types of damage that can occur on buildings as a result of subsidence are:

9 (a) Reduction of roof drainage, such as water ponding, that can lead to  
10 failure of large roofs with minimum slopes;

11 (b) Concrete floor slabs cracking in areas with differential subsidence  
12 depths; and

13 (c) Drywall cracks which occur with small amounts of differential  
14 settlement.

15 As subsidence continues, the potential for these types of physical damage  
16 increases, as does the potential that the subsidence will cause differential settlement under  
17 buildings.

18 19. With the wide variety of infrastructure and building improvements that have  
19 been constructed on lands within the Area of Subsidence, the risks of physical damage to  
20 these facilities are high. Because the value of these improvements is in the hundreds of  
21 millions of dollars, these risks present a large financial exposure if subsidence is not  
22 abated. If subsidence continues to occur in the Area of Subsidence, all of the above-  
23 mentioned infrastructure will experience physical damage of some type..

24 20. Based upon my review of the data about the Area of Subsidence, I have  
25 believed for some time that the cause of subsidence in the Area of Subsidence was a  
26 production of water from the deep aquifers beneath the Area of Subsidence by the City of  
27 Chino Hills. However, my expertise is not in this area. Therefore, I initiated the process of  
28 obtaining such expertise that resulted in the retention of the GeoPentech firm for this

1 purpose.

2 21. As a result, GeoPentech has reviewed all of the available data and has  
3 concluded that the Area of Subsidence is caused by the production of water in the deep  
4 aquifers beneath the Area of Subsidence by the City of Chino Hills. I attached a copy of  
5 the report of GeoPentech dated January 30, 2002, as Exhibit "A" hereto, for the Court's  
6 review and consideration.

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

9 Executed this 31 day of January, 2002, at Chino, California

10   
11  
12 PATRICK J. GLOVER

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

} Case Number RCV 510101

I am employed in the County of San Bernardino, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the above-named action. My business address is: Jimmy L. Gutierrez, A.P.C., 12616 Central Avenue, Chino, California, 91710.

On January 31, 2002, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

**DECLARATION OF PATRICK J. GLOVER**

by placing [ ] the original or [ x ] a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope(s), and addressed as follows:

Scott S. Slater, Esq.  
Hatch and Parent  
21 East Carrillo Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Mark S. Hensley, Esq.  
Burke, William & Sorensen, LLP  
611 West 6th Street, Suite 2500  
Los Angeles, CA 90017


[ x ] by regular mail;

[ x ] I caused such envelope(s) to be deposited in the mail at Chino, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

[ x ] I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing, under which it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day, with postage thereon fully prepaid, at Chino, California. 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 (1) day after deposit of mailing affidavit.

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

Executed on January 31, 2002, at Chino, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Wilkerson

Handwritten text, possibly a list or notes, located in the lower-left quadrant of the page.

Handwritten text, possibly a list or notes, located in the lower-right quadrant of the page.

Handwritten text, possibly a list or notes, located in the lower-right quadrant of the page.

1 Jimmy L. Gutierrez (SBN 59448)  
 JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ  
 2 A Professional Corporation  
 12616 Central Avenue  
 3 Chino, California 91710  
 Telephone: (909) 591-6336  
 4 Facsimile: (909) 628-9803  
 5 Attorneys for Defendant THE CITY OF CHINO

FILED-Rancho Cucamonga District  
 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
 SUPERIOR COURT

JAN 31 2002

By David H. Welford Deputy

6  
 7  
 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
 9 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO - RANCHO CUCAMONGA DIVISION

10  
 11 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER ) CASE NO. RCV 51010  
 12 DISTRICT, ) [Judge: Honorable J. Michael Gunn]  
 )  
 13 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 14 v. ) DECLARATION JIMMY L.  
 ) GUTIERREZ  
 15 )  
 16 THE CITY OF CHINO, )  
 )  
 17 Defendants. ) DATE: February 28, 2002  
 ) TIME: 2:00 p.m.  
 ) DEPT: 8  
 18 )  
 19 )  
 20 )  
 21 )  
 22 )

23  
 24  
 25 I, JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ, state and declare as follows:

26 1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice law in all the Court's in the  
 27 State of California. I also serve as the City Attorney for the City of Chino, a position that I  
 28 have held since January 7, 1975.

1           2.     I have personal knowledge of the matter contained in this declaration; and if  
2 called as a witness I could and would so competently testify thereto under oath.

3           3.     A dispute has arisen between the Officials of the City of Chino and the  
4 Officials of the City of Chino Hills regarding the responsibility of the City of Chino Hills  
5 for land subsidence within the City of Chino due to the production of water from deep  
6 aquifers underneath a portion of the City of Chino along Central Avenue bounded by  
7 Schaefer Avenue on the north and Eucalyptus Avenue on the south.

8           4.     During this dispute, it was suggested that Officials or employees of the City  
9 of Chino Hills that the foregoing dispute was a subject of remedies under Article X entitled  
10 "Applications, Contests and Complaints" of the Chino Basin Watermaster Rules and  
11 Regulations. However, my reading of Article X did not lend itself to such a remedy and  
12 further, such a remedy, if available, appeared to be inadequate to address the concerns of  
13 the City of Chino regarding land subsidence.

14           5.     Nevertheless, on September 26, 2001, I forwarded a letter to John Rossi,  
15 CEO of Chino Basin Watermaster, requesting an opinion on the subject from the  
16 Watermaster General Council. A true copy of my letter together with my specific requests  
17 is contended hereto as Exhibit "A".

18           6.     Subsequently, I was informed that my request was denied and I submitted a  
19 second letter to Mr. Rossi, dated October 5, 2001, a true copy which is attached hereto as  
20 Exhibit "B".

21           7.     Thereafter, I received a letter addressed to Jim Erickson at my office dated  
22 October 9, 2001, from Scott Slater, who is the general counsel to Watermaster. In essence,  
23 said letter advises that the Watermaster Board declined to act upon my request. A true  
24 copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "C".

25           8.     Lastly, I received a letter from John Rossi dated October 31, 2001, directed  
26 to Jim Erickson at my office. In that letter, Mr. Rossi reports that Watermaster  
27 recommends that the City of Chino file a Request for Judicial Relief Under Paragraph 15  
28 of the Judgment. A true copy of that letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "D"



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

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

Executed this 3 day of January, 2002, at Chino, California

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ

(

)

:

.

..

.

.

.

.

.



# CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER

8632 Archibald Avenue, Suite 109, Rancho Cucamonga, Ca 91730  
Tel: 909.484.3888 Fax: 909.484.3890 www.cbwm.org

**JOHN V. ROSSI**  
Chief Executive Officer

**TRACI STEWART**  
Chief of Watermaster Services

October 31, 2001

Jim Erickson  
Law Offices of Jimmy L. Gutierrez  
12618 Central Avenue  
Chino, CA 91710

**Re: City of Chino Correspondence of September 26, 2001**

Dear Mr. Erickson:

This letter is provided in response to your correspondence referenced above. Watermaster has considered your request for an opinion by Watermaster General Counsel concerning the availability of potential remedies and the construction of the Judgment and Watermaster Rules and Regulations regarding subsidence.

Watermaster has considered your letter, the Judgment, the Rules and Regulations and the concerns of the parties to the Judgment. Many parties have expressed a concern over Watermaster issuing an advisory opinion or the potential subject matter jurisdiction of the Court under the Judgment.

Watermaster recommends that Chino or any other party to the Judgment that desires relief related to evaluating the causes, arresting, or mitigating subsidence that they file a request for judicial relief under paragraph 15 of the Judgment. Please be assured that in the event the City of Chino or any other party to the Judgment makes such a request, Watermaster will file its own petition with the Court acknowledging Watermaster's jurisdiction over the subject matter and requesting the Court for direction on how it should proceed.

If you have any questions, please call me at 909-484-3888.

Sincerely,


  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John V. Rossi, CEO  
Chino Basin Watermaster

EXHIBIT 3

#5928-024

6  
C  
S

6  
C  
S



1910  
C  
S

1910  
C  
S

1910

1910

1910  
C  
S

STANLEY C. HATCH  
 GERALD B. PAREYK  
 S. TIMOTHY BUTHAK  
 SUSAN F. PETROVICH  
 PETER N. BROWN  
 STANLEY M. RODEM  
 SCOTT S. SLATER  
 STEVEN A. AMERIKANER  
 CART M. KVISTAD  
 CHRISTOPHER A. JACOBS  
 JEFFREY A. DINKIN  
 JOFFEY H. SPICOM  
 ROBERT J. SAPERSTON  
 IORI LEWIS PERRY  
 JOSEFO. HOUSKA  
 SARAHJ. KNECHT

STEPHANIE OSLER HASTINGS  
 BRADLEY E. LUNDGREN  
 DEBORAH L. MARTIN  
 MICHELLE L. PICKETT  
 ROBIN L. LEWIS  
 TIMOTHY C. MALE  
 GRHAM M. LYONS  
 MICHAEL T. FIFE  
 MONDY A. WOLFE  
 CAROLYN L. TROKEY  
 RUSSELL M. MCLOTHLIN  
 STEVEN A. JUNG  
 TRAVIS PANANTOES  
 ERIC M. TOKIYAMA  
 KENNETH J. RICHARDSON  
 CHRISTINE E. RAY

**HATCH AND PARENT**  
 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

MAILING ADDRESS:  
 POST OFFICE DRAWER 720  
 SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93102-0720

21 EAST CARRILLO STREET  
 SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93101-2782  
 TELEPHONE: (805) 963-7000  
 FACSIMILE: (805) 965-4333  
 WWW.HATCHPARENT.COM

Of Counsel  
 CHRIS FRAHM  
 KIRK R. WILSON  
 STEVEN L. HOCH  
 GEORGE SHOKT  
 JANA GREEN  
 KEVIN J. NEESE  
 1959-1989

LOS ANGELES  
 11911 SAN VICENTE BLVD.  
 SUITE 950  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90049  
 TELEPHONE: (310) 440-9996

SAN DIEGO  
 110 WEST C STREET, SUITE 2200  
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
 TELEPHONE: (619) 702-6100

SOUTH LAKE TAHOE  
 THE SUMMIT  
 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150  
 TELEPHONE: (530) 542-7800

OUR FILE #  
 DIRECT DIAL #  
 INTERNET:

8350.1  
 (805) 882-1420  
 SSlater  
 @HatchParent.com

October 9, 2001

Jim Erickson, Esq.  
 Law Offices of Jimmy L. Gutierrez  
 12616 Central Avenue  
 Chino CA 91710

Re: City of Chino's Request for Opinion/Correspondence 9/26/2001

Mr. Erickson:

This letter is provided in response to your recent inquiry concerning the action taken by Watermaster Board with regard to the City of Chino's request for a written opinion as set forth in the above-referenced correspondence. This letter will confirm that Watermaster is in receipt of the letter and Watermaster general counsel is presently considering potential responses to the questions raised.


To be sure, the City of Chino's concerns are understood by the Watermaster Board, staff, as well as legal counsel. Although your cover letter expressly references subsidence, the listed questions address processes that *may* be broader in scope and precedential in character. Rather than respond to the City without first having the benefit of a more deliberate consideration of issues, the Watermaster Board directed legal counsel to reach out to prospective stakeholders. It should come as no surprise that the Watermaster Board will be likely to support a consensus-based solution, as it has in virtually every instance of potential conflict that has arisen over the past 18 months. Accordingly, for the time being, the Watermaster Board has directed legal counsel to convene a stakeholder process among the parties to the Judgment to obtain the benefit of a broader understanding of all the underlying issues and the critical path to resolution.

I think our meeting of October 4, 2001 was a good first step. While I clearly appreciate the City of Chino's specific concerns regarding the timing and form of Watermaster's response, we are unable to provide a more specific answer as of the date of this writing.

EXHIBIT C

As always, if you have any questions concerning the contents of this letter or any other matter, please call.

Sincerely yours,



Scott S. Slater  
For HATCH AND PARENT

SSS:psw

cc: Watermaster Board  
John Rossi

*[Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]*

FEB-05-2002 15:55

EUNICE M. ULLOA

Mayor

EARLC. ELROD

Mayor Pro Tem



GLENN DUNCAN  
TOM HAUGHEY  
DENNIS YATES  
Council Members

JIMMY GUTIERREZ  
City Attorney

October 5, 2001

**CITY of CHINO**

Mr. John Rossi, CEO  
Chino Basin Watermaster  
8632 Archibald Avenue, Suite 109  
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Re: Request for Legal Opinion

Dear Mr. Rossi:

I understand that the request of the City of Chino for an administrative construction of the law governing the existing administrative processes of Watermaster by an opinion of its general counsel, conveyed to you by my letter dated and hand delivered on September 26, 2001, was considered by the Watermaster Board in an executive session held during its meeting on September 27, 2001. It is also my understanding that the Board declined to authorize its general counsel to issue that legal opinion.

In the event that my understanding is incorrect, I would appreciate you advising me of the action taking by the Board on my request at your earliest conveyance.

Sincerely,

JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ  
City Attorney

By:

Cc: Mayor and City Council Members  
Glen Rojas, City Manager  
Patrick Glover, Director of Public Works



FEB-05-2002 15:55

**REQUEST FOR WATERMASTER LEGAL COUNSEL OPINION RE  
AVAILABLE WATERMASTER DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS**

1. Is any Watermaster process available, either (a) the Article X Complaint process or other process defined in its existing Rules & Regulations, or (b) some other process authorized by the generic jurisdiction of the Judgment although not defined in such Rules & Regulations, by which to secure:
  - a. Any order of Watermaster necessary or desirable to avoid or minimize property damage and direct and indirect "economic" and other damage to a party to the Judgment or a third party caused by the groundwater pumping of another party to the Judgment, even though not caused by any Watermaster action, decision or rule regarding its approval of an application or any other function of Watermaster, including but not limited to an order to cease or reduce pumping from wells which are a substantial factor in causing land subsidence; and,
  - b. Indemnification or compensation of a party to the Judgment and other third parties for any such damage.
2. Is the provision of Section 9.3 of the Peace Agreement that disputes between the Parties shall be resolved by non-binding mediation a mandatory alternative process in lieu of any such Watermaster process?
3. Would there be any presumption that no cognizable damage had been created by the other party actions complained of in such process.
4. Would the pursuit of such a Watermaster process stay the ability of the complaining party to pursue otherwise available legal remedies until such process is exhausted and a final decision rendered by Watermaster?
5. In the event Watermaster orders a party to cease or reduce pumping from wells causing land subsidence that were in existence on the Date of Execution of the Peace Agreement (June 29, 2000), would Watermaster be obligated to compensate such party for the reasonable cost of replacement groundwater Production facilities.
6. In the event Watermaster is obligated to pay for such costs, against which Producers would it be assessed?
7. In the event Watermaster is obligated to pay for the cost of such replacement facilities if it orders a party to cease or reduce pumping, would the conflict of that economic self interest be a legal impediment to a valid decision by Watermaster whether or not to issue such an order?
8. Is judicial review of the decision of Watermaster in such a process available on a "de novo" basis, not just limited to a determination of whether there was "substantial evidence" to support that decision?
9. Is the scope of judicial review of this decision limited only to situations where the alleged injury arises from the Recharge, Transfer or Qualifying Storage or Recapture of water?

Doc. # 11837 v1

#5928-025

RECEIVED FROM:



Mayor  
EARL C. ELROD  
Mayor Pro Tem



GLENN DUNCAN  
TOM HAUGHEY  
DENNIS YATES  
Council Members

JIMMY GUTIERREZ  
City Attorney

# CITY of CHINO

September 26, 2001

Mr. John Rossi, CEO  
Chino Basin Watermaster  
8632 Archibald Avenue, Suite 109  
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Re: Request for Legal Opinion

Dear Mr. Rossi:


It has been asserted by the City of Chino Hills that an adequate remedy is available through existing authorized Watermaster procedures by which to redress the potential land subsidence and other damages to the City of Chino, its property owners, inhabitants and others caused by the production of Chino Hills from the wells from which it has and will derive its supply of water.

However, we have several specific questions about the availability and adequacy of any such remedy, which need to be resolved by the responsive written opinion of Watermaster general counsel providing an authorized administrative construction by Watermaster of applicable law. We understand, however, that in order to secure this opinion we need to submit a formal written request for such an opinion for approval by yourself or your Board. Accordingly, we enclose our written request for an opinion on each of the specifically identified legal issues regarding the availability and adequacy of such a remedy, answers to which we need before we would be able to consider relying on the use of such a remedy.

Time is important, and we urge you to secure whatever approval is necessary to authorize issuance of such an opinion as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ  
City Attorney

By:   
Jimmy L. Gutierrez

JLG:js  
Enclosure



12616 Central Avenue, Chino, California 91710  
(909) 591-6336 • (909) 628-9803 Fax

Doc. # 11834 v1

EXHIBIT A  
#5928-02<sup>9</sup>



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS  
5308 S. DICKINSON DRIVE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

PHYSICS 435  
LECTURE 10

1998

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

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ) Case Number RCV 510101

I am employed in the County of San Bernardino, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the above-named action. My business address is: Jimmy L. Gutierrez, A.P.C., 12616 Central Avenue, Chino, California, 91710.

On January 31, 2002, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

**DECLARATION OF JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ**

by placing [ ] the original or [ x ] a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope(s), and addressed as follows:

Scott Slater, Esq.  
Hatch and Parent  
21 East Carrillo Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 83101-2782

Mark S. Hensley, Esq.  
Burke, William & Sorensen, LLP  
611 West 6th Street, Suite 2500  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

[ x ] by regular mail;

[ x ] I caused such envelope(s) to be deposited in the mail at Chino, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

[ x ] I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing, under which it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day, with postage thereon fully prepaid, at Chino, California. 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 (1) day after deposit of mailing affidavit.

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

Executed on January 31, 2002, at Chino, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Wilkerson



**CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER**

Case No. RCV 51010

Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. The City of Chino

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I declare that:

I am employed in the County of San Bernardino, California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Chino Basin Watermaster, 8632 Archibald Avenue, Suite 109, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730; telephone (909) 484-3888.

On February 6, 2002 I served the attached:

**DATE OF HEARING: FEBRUARY 28, 2002 AT 2:00 P.M.**

- ***RESPONSE <sup>OF</sup> TO THE CITY OF CHINO TO THE COURT'S ORDER FOR INFORMATION; AND MOTION PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 15 OF THE JUDGMENT***
- ***DECLARATION OF PATRICK J. GLOVER (Note: Exhibit A – GeoPentech Report is not included. It can be obtained by contacting the City of Chino)***
- ***DECLARATION OF JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ***

in said cause, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed with postage thereon fully prepaid, for overnight delivery by United States Postal Service mail at Rancho Cucamonga, California, addresses as follows:

***See attached service list:***

Attorney Service List  
Mailing List 1

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed at Rancho Cucamonga, California, on February 06, 2002.

  
Michelle Lauter



RICHARD ADAMS II  
DEPUTY COUNSEL - POMONA  
ALVAREZ-GLASMAN & CLOVEN  
505 S GAREY AVE  
POMONA CA 91766

DAVID B. ANDERSON  
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES  
1416 NINTH ST  
P.O. BOX 94236  
SACRAMENTO CA 94236-0001

WILLIAM J. BRUNICK ESQ.  
BRUNICK ALVAREZ & BATTERSBY  
P O BOX 6425  
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92412

THOMAS S. BUNN III  
LAGERLOF SENEAL BRADLEY  
GOSNEY & KRUSE  
301 N LAKE AVE 10<sup>TH</sup> FL  
PASADENA CA 91101-4108

CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER  
8632 ARCHIBALD AVE STE 109  
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730

JEAN CIHIGOYENETCHE  
GENERAL COUNSEL-IEUA  
CIHIGOYENETCHE GROSSBERG &  
CLOUSE  
3602 INLAND EMPIRE BLVD STE C315  
ONTARIO CA 91764

ROBERT DOUGHERTY  
GENERAL COUNSEL-ONTARIO  
COVINGTON & CROWE  
P O BOX 1515  
ONTARIO CA 91762

JIM ERICKSON  
LAW OFFICES OF JIMMY GUTIERREZ  
EL CENTRAL REAL PLAZA  
12616 CENTRAL AVE  
CHINO CA 91710

FREDERIC FUDACZ  
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT LLP  
445 S FIGUEROA ST 31<sup>ST</sup> FL  
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-1672

ERIC GARNER  
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP  
P O BOX 1028  
RIVERSIDE CA 92502-1028

JIMMY GUTIERREZ  
ATTORNEY-CITY OF CHINO  
EL CENTRAL REAL PLAZA  
12616 CENTRAL AVE  
CHINO CA 91710

SHARON JOYCE  
LEGAL COUNSEL - STATE OF CA - CDC  
1515 S STREET ROOM 125  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

STEVEN KENNEDY  
GENERAL COUNSEL-TVMWD  
BRUNICK ALVAREZ & BATTERSBY  
P O BOX 6425  
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92412

ARTHUR KIDMAN  
ATTORNEY-MVWD  
MC CORMICK KIDMAN & BEHRENS  
695 TOWN CENTER DR STE 400  
COSTA MESA CA 92626

MARILYN LEVIN  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
300 S SPRING ST 11<sup>TH</sup> FL N TOWER  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1232

JAMES L MARKMAN  
RICHARDS WATSON & GERSHON  
P O BOX 1059  
BREA CA 92622-1059

DAN MC KINNEY  
SPECIAL COUNSEL-AG POOL  
REID & HELLYER  
P O BOX 1300  
RIVERSIDE CA 92502-1300

THOMAS H MC PETERS  
MC PETERS MC ALEARNEY SHIMFF &  
HATT  
P O BOX 2084  
REDLANDS CA 92373

JAMES P MORRIS  
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP  
P O BOX 1028  
RIVERSIDE CA 92502-1028

JARLATH OLAY  
DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL MWD  
700 N ALAMEDA ST  
LOS ANGELES CA 90012

TIMOTHY J RYAN  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY WATER  
COMPANY  
P O BOX 6010  
EL MONTE CA 91734

JOHN SCHATZ  
COUNSEL-JCSD  
P O BOX 7775  
LAGUNA NIGUEL CA 92607-7775

ANNE J SCHNEIDER  
ELLISON & SCHNEIDER  
2015 H ST  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-3109

JESS SENEAL  
LAGERLOF SENEAL BRADLEY  
GOSNEY & KRUSE  
301 N LAKE AVE 10<sup>TH</sup> FL  
PASADENA CA 91101-4108

GERALYN SKAPIK ATTORNEY  
CITY OF CHINO HILLS  
BURKE WILLIAMS & SORENSON  
611 W 6<sup>TH</sup> ST STE 2500  
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-1469

SCOTT SLATER  
HATCH & PARENT  
21 E CARRILLO ST  
SANTA BARBARA CA 93101-2782

MICHELE A STAPLES  
JACKSON DEMARCO & PECKENPAUGH  
4 PARK PLAZA 16<sup>TH</sup> FL  
IRVINE CA 92614

GENE TANAKA  
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP  
P O BOX 1028  
RIVERSIDE CA 92502-1028

ANNE T THOMAS  
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP  
P O BOX 1028  
RIVERSIDE CA 92502-1028

SUSAN TRAGER  
LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN M TRAGER  
19712 MacArthur Blvd Ste 120  
Irvine, CA 92612

1. 1901  
2. 1902  
3. 1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908  
1909

1910  
1911  
1912  
1913

1914  
1915  
1916  
1917

1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922

1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927

1928  
1929  
1930

1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935

1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940

1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945

1946

1947

1948

1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953

1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958

1959



BURTON J. GINDLER  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
555 W 5<sup>TH</sup> ST  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1024



AAA AA  
MAILING LIST 1  
UPDATED 10/16/01

CURTIS AARON  
CITY OF FONTANA  
8353 SIERRA AVE  
FONTANA CA 92335-3598

RICHARD ANDERSON  
1365 W FOOTHILL BLVD STE 1  
UPLAND CA 91786

A W ARAIZA  
WEST SAN BERN CWD  
P.O. BOX 920  
RIALTO CA 92376-0920

STEVE ARBELBIDE  
CBWM BOARD  
417 PONDEROSA TR  
CALIMESA CA 92320

DAVE ARGO  
BLACK & VEATCH  
6 VENTURE STE 315  
IRVINE CA 92618-3317

DAN ARRIGHI  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY WATER CO  
P.O. BOX 6010  
EL MONTE CA 91734-2010

RICH ATWATER  
IEUA  
P.O. BOX 697  
RCHO CUCA CA 91729-0697

RODNEY BAKER  
COUNSEL FOR EGGSWEST & JOHNSO  
BROS  
P.O. BOX 438  
COULTERVILLE CA 95311-0438

VIC BARRION  
RELIANT ENERGY ETIWANDA  
8996 ETIWANDA AVE  
ETIWANDA CA 91739

KEITH BELAND  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA CDC  
P.O. BOX 942883  
SACRAMENTO CA 94283-0001

BOB BEST  
NAT'L RESOURCES CONS SVS  
25864 BUSINESS CENTER DR K  
REDLANDS CA 92374

GERALD BLACK  
FONTANA UNION WATER CO  
P.O. BOX 309  
FONTANA CA 92334

MICHAEL BOCCADORO  
THE DOLPHIN GROUP  
925 L ST STE 800  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

ROBERT BOWCOCK  
VULCAN MATERIALS  
2417 N BONNIE BRAE  
CLAREMONT CA 91711-1913

FRANK BROMMENSCHENKEL  
134 DAVIS ST  
SANTA PAULA CA 93060

JIM BRYSON  
FONTANA WATER COMPANY  
P.O. BOX 987  
FONTANA CA 92334-0987

BRUCE CASH  
UNITED WATER MGMT CO INC  
1905 BUSINESS CENTER DR STE 100  
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92408

TERRY CATLIN  
CBWM BOARD  
2344 IVY CT  
UPLAND CA 91784

NEIL CLIFTON  
IEUA  
P.O. BOX 697  
RCHO CUCA CA 91729-0697

DAVID COOPER  
SUNKIST GROWERS INC  
760 E SUNKIST ST  
ONTARIO CA 91761

STEVE CORTNER  
VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY  
P.O. BOX 39756  
LOS ANGELES CA 90039

DAVID B COSGROVE  
RUTAN & TUCKER  
611 ANTON BLVD STE 1400  
COSTA MESA CA 92626

RON CRAIG  
RBF & ASSOC  
14725 ALTON PKWY  
IRVINE CA 92718

DAVE CROSLEY  
CITY OF CHINO  
5050 SCHAEFER AVE  
CHINO CA 91710-5549

DAVID DE JESUS  
CBWM BOARD (TVMWD)  
146 E COLLEGE ST  
COVINA CA 91723

ROBERT DEBERARD  
CHAIRMAN-AG POOL  
1886 UKIAH WAY  
UPLAND CA 91784

ROBERT DELOACH  
CUCAMONGA CTY WD  
P.O. BOX 638  
RANCHO CUCA CA 91729-0638

BILL DENDY  
BILL DENDY & ASSOCIATES  
429 F ST STE 2  
DAVIS CA 95616-4111

GREG DEVEREAUX  
CITY OF ONTARIO  
303 E "B" ST  
ONTARIO CA 91764



DOUG DRURY  
IUEA  
P.O. BOX 697  
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730

GERALD A. DUBOIS  
CBWM BOARD  
303 E B ST  
ONTARIO CA 91764

GLENN DUNCAN  
CBWM BOARD/ALTERNATE  
P.O. BOX 667  
CHINO CA 91708-0667

GLEN DURRINGTON  
5512 FRANCIS ST  
CHINO CA 91710

DICK DYKSTRA  
10129 SCHAEFER  
ONTARIO CA 91761-7973

MOHAMED EL AMAMY  
CITY OF ONTARIO  
1425 S BON VIEW  
ONTARIO CA 91761-4406

BOB FEENSTRA  
MILK PRODUCERS COUNCIL  
13545 S EUCLID AVE  
ONTARIO CA 91762-6656

RALPH FRANK  
755 LAKEFIELD RD #E  
WESTLAKE VILLAGE CA 91361

COLE FRATES  
WESTERN DEVELOPMENT & STORAGE  
5657 WILSHIRE BLVD STE 330  
LOS ANGELES CA 90036

CARL FREEMAN  
L. D. KING  
2151 CONVENTION CENTRE WAY  
ONTARIO CA 91764

SAM FULLER  
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY MWD  
P.O. BOX 5906  
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92412-5906

MARK GAGE P E  
GEOMATRIX CONSULTANTS INC  
2101 WEBSTER ST #1200  
OAKLAND CA 94612

JIM GALLAGHER  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER CO  
2143 CONVENTION CTR WAY STE 110  
ONTARIO CA 91764

JOE GRINDSTAFF  
SAWPA  
11615 STERLING AVE  
RIVERSIDE CA 92503

JACK HAGERMAN  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA CIM  
4158 CENTER ST  
NORCO CA 91760

LISA HAMILTON  
GE/MGR ENV REMEDIATION PRGM  
640 FREEDOM BUSINESS CTR  
KING OF PRUSSIA PA 19406

PATSY HAMILTON  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CIW  
P.O. BOX 6000  
CORONA CA 91718

RICK HANSEN  
THREE VALLEYS M W D  
1021 E MIRAMAR AVE  
CLAREMONT CA 91711-2052

DONALD HARRIGER  
CBWM BOARD/ALTERNATE  
P.O. BOX 5286  
RIVERSIDE CA 92517-5286

CARL HAUGE  
DPLA DIV. PLANNING & LOCAL  
ASSISTANCE  
901 P ST  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-6418

PAUL HOFER  
CBWM BOARD  
11248 S TURNER AVE  
ONTARIO CA 91761

CLARK IDE  
OCWD GENERAL COUNSEL  
P.O. BOX 8300  
FOUNTAIN VALLEY CA 92728-8300

ANNESLEY IGNATIUS  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO FCD  
825 E 3RD ST  
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92415-0835

JOHN WILLIAM INGRAHAM  
CNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
7000 MERRILL AVE BOX 1  
CHINO CA 91710-9027

KEN JESKE  
CITY OF ONTARIO  
1425 S BON VIEW AVE  
ONTARIO CA 91761-4406

BARRETT KEHL  
CBWCD  
P.O. BOX 2400  
MONTCLAIR CA 91763-0900

ROB KETTLE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CIW  
P.O. BOX 6000  
CORONA CA 91718

JERRY A. KING  
PSOMAS  
3187 RED HILL AVE, SUITE 250  
COSTA MESA CA 92626

PATRICK KING  
CONSULTANT TO SENATOR NELL SOTO  
822 N EUCLID AVE  
ONTARIO CA 91762

MARK KINSEY  
MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT  
P.O. BOX 71  
MONTCLAIR CA 91763-0071

100  
100  
100



100  
100



100  
100  
100

100  
100

100  
100

100  
100

100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100

100  
100  
100

100  
100  
100

MARK KINSEY  
MONTE VISTA IRRIGATION CO  
10575 CENTRAL AVE  
MONTCLAIR CA 91763

GENE KOOPMAN  
13898 ARCHIBALD AVE  
ONTARIO CA 91761-7979

KRONICK ET AL  
KRONICK MOSKOVITZ TIEDEMANN &  
GIRARD  
400 CAPITOL MALL 27TH FL  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-4417

KENNETH KULES  
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT  
P.O. BOX 54153  
LOS ANGELES CA 90054-0153

RITA KURTH  
CUCAMONGA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT  
P.O. BOX 638  
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91729-0638

RONALD LA BRUCHERIE  
12953 S BAKER AVE  
ONTARIO CA 91761-7903

FRED LANTZ  
CBWM BD/ALTERNATE (TVMWD)  
P.O. BOX 2701  
POMONA CA 91769

PAUL LEON  
CBWM BOARD/ALTERNATE  
303 E B ST  
ONTARIO CA 91764

CARLOS LOZANO  
STATE OF CA YTS  
15180 S. EUCLID  
CHINO CA 91710

MIKE MAESTAS  
CITY OF CHINO HILLS  
2001 GRAND AVE  
CHINO HILLS CA 91709-4869

ALAN MARKS  
CTY OF SAN BERN CTY CNSL  
157 W 5TH ST  
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92415

MIKE MCGRAW  
CBWM BOARD  
P.O. BOX 987  
FONTANA CA 92334-0987

CAROLE MCGREEVY  
JURUPA COMM SVCS DIST  
8621 JURUPA RD  
RIVERSIDE CA 92509-3229

BILL MILLS  
ORANGE COUNTY WATER DIST  
P.O. BOX 8300  
FTN VALLEY CA 92728-8300

ERIC MILLS  
CITY OF POMONA  
148 N HUNTINGTON ST  
POMONA CA 91768

JIM MOODY  
CITY OF UPLAND  
P.O. BOX 460  
UPLAND CA 91785-0460

CHRIS NAGLER  
DEPT OF WATER RESOURCES  
770 FAIRMONT AVE SUITE 102  
GLENDALE CA 91203-1035

ROBERT NICHOLSON  
CBWM BOARD/ALTERNATE  
P.O. BOX 6010  
EL MONTE CA 91734-2010

DANA OLDENKAMP  
MILK PRODUCERS COUNCIL  
3214 CENTURION PL  
ONTARIO CA 91761

SANDY OLSON  
WALNUT VALLEY WATER DISTRICT  
271 S BREA CANYON RD  
WALNUT CA 91789

MARY PARENTE  
8559 EDISON AVE  
CHINO CA 91710-9242

HENRY PEPPER  
CITY OF POMONA  
505 S GAREY AVE  
POMONA CA 91766

JEFF PIERSON  
2 HEXAM ST  
IRVINE CA 92612

ROBB QUINCEY  
CITY OF HESPERIA  
15776 MAIN ST  
HESPERIA CA 92345

BILL RICE  
RWQCB - SANTA ANA REGION  
3737 MAIN ST STE 500  
RIVERSIDE CA 92501-3339

LES RICHTER  
CALIFORNIA SPEEDWAY  
P.O. BOX 9300  
FONTANA CA 92334-9300

DAVID RINGEL  
MONTGOMERY WATSON  
P.O. BOX 7009  
PASADENA CA 91109-7009

ARNOLD RODRIGUEZ  
SANTA ANA RIVER WATER CO  
10530 54TH ST  
MIRA LOMA CA 91752-2331

PATRICK SAMPSON  
P.O. BOX 660  
POMONA CA 91769

DIANE SANCHEZ  
DWR  
770 FAIRMONT AVE  
GLENDALE CA 91203-1035

1957

1958

1959

1

2

3

4

5



JOSEPH C SCALMANINI  
500 FIRST ST  
WOODLAND CA 95695

JOE SCHENK  
CITY OF NORCO  
P.O. BOX 428  
NORCO CA 91760-0428

DONALD SCHROEDER  
CBWM BOARD  
3700 MINTERN  
RIVERSIDE CA 92509

JUDY SCHURR  
76433 SHOSHONE DR  
INDIAN WELLS CA 92210

DAVID SCRIVEN  
KRIEGER & STEWART ENGINEERING  
3602 UNIVERSITY AVE  
RIVERSIDE CA 92501

MICHAEL SMITH  
NICHOLS STEAD BOILEAU & KOSTOFF  
223 W FOOTHILL BLVD #200  
CLAREMONT CA 91711-2708

ROD SMITH  
STRATECON INC.  
2335 W FOOTHILL BLVD STE 11  
UPLAND CA 91786

KYLE SNAY  
SOUTHERN CA WATER CO  
401 S SAN DIMAS CANYON RD  
SANDIMAS CA 91773

NELL SOTO  
STATE CAPITOL  
ROOM NO 4066  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

BILL STAFFORD  
MARYGOLD MUTUAL WATER CO  
9725 ALDER ST  
BLOOMINGTON CA 92316-1637

DAVID STARNES  
MOBILE COMMUNITY MGMT CO  
1801 E EDINGER AVE STE 230  
SANTA ANA CA 92705

L HAIT  
STERN & GOLDBERG  
9150 WILSHIRE BLVD STE 100  
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90210

TOM STETSON  
STETSON ENGINEERS INC  
3104 E GARVEY AVE  
WEST COVINA CA 91791

CRAIG STEWART  
GEOMATRIX CONSULTANTS INC.  
330 W BAY ST STE 140  
COSTA MESA CA 92629

TRACI STEWART

SWRCB  
SWRCB - DIV OF WATER RIGHTS  
P.O. BOX 2000  
SACRAMENTO CA 95809-2000

JIM TAYLOR  
POMONA UTILITY SVS DEPT.  
148 N HUNTINGTON BLVD  
POMONA CA 91768

JERRY THIBEAULT  
RWQCB - SANTA ANA REGION  
3737 MAIN ST STE 500  
RIVERSIDE CA 92501-3339

MICHAEL THIES  
SPACE CENTER MIRA LOMA INC  
3401 S ETIWANDA AVE BLDG 503  
MIRA LOMA CA 91752-1126

JOHN THORNTON  
PSOMAS AND ASSOCIATES  
3187 RED HILL AVE, SUITE 250  
COSTA MESA CA 92626

R.E. THRASH III  
PRAXAIR  
5705 AIRPORT DR  
ONTARIO CA 91761

PETER VAN HAAM  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
300 S SPRING ST 11TH FL N TOWER  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1232

GEOFFREY VANDEN HEUVEL  
CBWM BOARD  
7551 KIMBALL AVE  
CHINO CA 91710

ERICK VAUGHN  
ANGELICA RENTAL SERVICE  
1575 N CASE ST  
ORANGE CA 92867-3635


MARK WARD  
AMERON INTERNATIONAL  
13032 SLOVER AVE  
FONTANA CA 92335-6990

RAY WELLINGTON  
SAN ANTONIO WATER COMPANY  
139 N EUCLID AVE  
UPLAND CA 91786-6036

MICHAEL WHITEHEAD  
SAN GABRIEL VALLEY WC  
P.O. BOX 6010  
EL MONTE CA 91734

MARK WILDERMUTH  
WILDERMUTH ENVIRONMENTAL INC  
415 N EL CAMINO REAL STE A  
SAN CLEMENTE CA 92672

DENNIS YATES  
CBWM BOARD  
P.O. BOX 667  
CHINO CA 91708-0667



Faint text or a stamp at the top right of the page.

Faint text in the lower left quadrant.

Faint text in the lower center of the page.

Faint text in the lower right quadrant.

Faint text in the lower left quadrant, below the first block.

Faint text in the lower center of the page, below the second block.

Faint text in the lower right quadrant, below the third block.

Faint text in the lower left quadrant, below the fourth block.

Faint text in the bottom right corner of the page.