FEE EXEMPT

| 1 | TRACY J. EGOSCUE (SBN 190842) TARREN A. TORRES (SBN 275991) | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | EGOSCUE LAW GROÙP, INC. 3834 Pine Ave. | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Long Beach, CA 90807 Tel/Facsimile: (562) 988-5978 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | tracy@egoscuelaw.com tarren@egoscuelaw.com | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Attorneys for OVERLYING | | | | | | | |
| 6 | (AGRIČULTURAL) POOL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | | | | | | | |
| 9 | FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, | Case No. RCVRS 51010 | | | | | | |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable Stanford E. Reichert | | | | | | |
| 13 | V. | AGRICULTURAL POOL'S REPLY TO | | | | | | |
| 14 | | APPROPRIATIVE POOL'S OPPOSITION TO AGRICULTURAL POOL'S MOTION | | | | | | |
| 15 | CITY OF CHINO et al., | FOR CLARIFICATION OF COURT'S | | | | | | |
| 16 | Defendants. | MARCH 2019 ORDER | | | | | | |
| 17 | | Date: September 25, 2020 Time: 1:30 p.m. | | | | | | |
| 18 | | Dept. S-35 | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | |

REPLY TO APPROPRIATIVE POOL'S OPPOSITION TO AGRICULTURAL POOL MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF COURT'S MARCH 2019 ORDER

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

The arguments made in the Appropriative Pool's opposition to the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification are inapplicable and unresponsive to the Agricultural Pool's motion. This Court's March 15, 2019 order is undeniably an incorporation of a provision of the Peace Agreement into the Judgment by way of the Appropriative Pool's Pooling Plan. The Agricultural Pool's motion is a *request for clarification* from the Court to confirm the Agricultural Pool's understanding at the time of the Court's 2019 order; that the Appropriative Pool's amendment to its Pooling Plan, Exhibit "H" of the Judgment—providing reallocation of unproduced Agricultural Pool water on a yearly basis—is an incorporation of a Peace Agreement provision into the Judgment which is consequently limited to the term of the Peace Agreement and any extension thereof. Contrary to the assertions of the Appropriative Pool in their opposition, the Agricultural Pool's motion is *not* a motion for reconsideration, as the Ag Pool does not seek to change the import or effect of the order, but instead seeks *clarification* for the Watermaster and all Parties that the Judgment amendment at issue does not extend beyond the term of the Peace Agreement.

With the filing of their opposition brief, the Appropriative Pool either ignored or missed a perfect opportunity to clarify the import of their 2019 amendment to the Judgment. The Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification asks the simple question of whether the 2019 amendment to the Judgment is applicable for the term of the Peace Agreement. Instead of responding in a forthright manner, the Appropriative Pool filed an opposition arguing that the Agricultural Pool misunderstands the 2019 Order and should have filed a motion for reconsideration 17 months ago. Not only is the Appropriative Pool filing misleading, but it is also blatantly not responsive to the original motion. One clarifying statement in their papers or in Court by the Appropriative Pool would resolve the Agricultural Pool's Motion. According to the motion filed in 2019 the Appropriative Pool did not seek to "elevate" or "hard-wire" the reallocation of unproduced water on a yearly basis from the Peace Agreement to the Judgment.

However, the final Order does not make this distinction. Instead of providing clarification in response to the Agricultural Pool motion, the Appropriative Pool seeks to continue to allow this confusion and possible mistake in the 2019 Order and the Pool is inexplicably opposing the Agricultural Pool's efforts to gain clarification from the Court.

II. BACKGROUND

On March 15, 2019, this Court approved amendments to the Judgment sought by the Appropriative Pool in a January 15, 2019 motion "to clarify the reallocation of unproduced Overlying Agricultural Pool Safe Yield on a yearly basis rather than every five years and to clarify the calculation of land use conversion claims *under the Peace Agreement now and in the future, if the Peace Agreement is extended.*" (Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit A Appropriative Pool Motion filed January 15, 2019, at p. 13, lines 6-10, italics added; see also Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit B March 15, 2019 Order ("After consideration of the papers filed in connection with the [Appropriative Pool Motion] and arguments of counsel, the Court hereby: [¶] (1) Approves amendments to the Appropriative Pool Pooling Plan…").) Despite the motion language limiting the term of the amendment to that of the Peace Agreement, the actual signed Court Order does not reflect a term.

On October 31, 2019, the Agricultural Pool filed a motion to amend its Pooling Plan, Exhibit "F" to the Judgment to reflect provisions of the Peace Agreement regarding the payment of Agricultural Pool costs by the Appropriative Pool for the term of the Peace Agreement. These provisions of the Peace Agreement were negotiated in exchange for (among other provisions) the early transfer of unproduced Agricultural Pool water and had been implemented by Watermaster without objection for many years. Curiously, the Appropriative Pool and certain members of the Appropriative Pool opposed the Agricultural Pool's motion based upon arguments that the Peace Agreement cannot be "elevated" or "hard-wired" into the Judgment¹ — even though the Appropriative Pool had done exactly this type of Judgment amendment in 2019. As a result of this opposition, the Agricultural Pool's motion was denied in an order by this Court dated July 31,

¹ Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit B Monte Vista Water District and City of Ontario's Opposition to Agricultural Pool Motion to Amend its Pooling Plan, at p. 6, lines 2-18.

2020 (Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit D July 31, 2020 Order).

Because of the inconsistent litigation outcomes between the two similar motions, and pursuant to this Court's continuing jurisdiction under Paragraph 15 of the Judgment, the Agricultural Pool filed a Motion for Clarification of the Court's March 15, 2019 Order in light of this Court's July 31, 2020 Order.

On September 11, 2020, the Appropriative Pool filed an opposition to the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification.

The Appropriative Pool's opposition fails to demonstrate that the Agricultural Pool's request for clarification by this Court is improper. Instead, the Appropriative Pool's opposition confirms the need for clarification. Notably, the Appropriative Pool does not state in their filing that the modification of the Judgment pursuant to the 2019 Order is for the term of the Peace Agreement. Instead the Appropriative Pool argues that the Agricultural Pool does not understand the Court's 2019 action leaving the Agricultural Pool to conclude that the Appropriative Pool believes their Judgment amendment to be effective for perpetuity. Additionally, the Appropriative Pool's entire opposition rests on an argument that a motion for reconsideration is barred by time, even though the Agricultural Pool has not filed a motion for reconsideration. Consequently, the Appropriative Pool's arguments in opposition to the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification are inapplicable and irrelevant, and the Agricultural Pool reaffirms its request for clarification in light of the inconsistency. This reply is in response to the September 11, 2020 opposition by Appropriative Pool.

III. THIS COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO CONSIDER THE AGRICULTURAL POOL'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 15 OF THE JUDGMENT

The Appropriative Pool's opposition repeatedly asserts that the Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification. Specifically, the Appropriative Pool argues, among other arguments, that "there is no jurisdictional basis to reconsider this Court's orders under Section 1008." (Appropriative Pool Opposition, at p. 4, lines 17-18.)

This argument lacks merit. The Agricultural Pool is not seeking reconsideration under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1008. The Agricultural Pool's motion is seeking clarification that the Appropriative Pool's amendment of the Judgment via their Pooling Plan is for the term of the Peace Agreement. Pursuant to the Court's continuing jurisdiction under Paragraph 15 of the Judgment, the Agricultural Pool is able to file this motion at any time (consistent with the Judgment's requirements for notice). The Appropriative Pool's assertions that the Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification are incorrect.

IV. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 1008 ARE INAPPLICABLE AND IRRELEVANT TO THE AGRICULTURAL POOL'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

The Appropriative Pool's opposition incorrectly asserts that this Court is "compelled to deny" the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Clarification because the Agricultural Pool "failed to satisfy or even address [California Code of Civil Procedure section 1008]," which governs motions for reconsideration. (Appropriative Pool Opposition, at p. 2, lines 18-20.) The Agricultural Pool has not filed a motion for reconsideration and is, therefore, not obligated to "satisfy or even address" Code of Civil Procedure section 1008.

The Appropriative Pool's opposition opines that Section 1008 is the "exclusive avenue" for a party to seek reconsideration by a court of its prior order and that the Agricultural Pool's motion "is untimely since it was filed 17 months later than the 10-day deadline of Section 1008(a)." The Agricultural Pool's motion does not seek reconsideration of the March 15, 2019 Order and is therefore timely. The Agricultural Pool's motion is in response to the Court's July 31, 2020 Order denying the Agricultural Pool's motion to amend the Agricultural Pool's Pooling Plan. The Court's July 31, 2020 Order included a finding that provisions of the Peace Agreement should "not be institutionalized into the judgment." (See Declaration of Gene Tanaka (Tanaka Decl.), Exhibit A, filed concurrently with Appropriative Pool Opposition, July 10, 2020 Court Hearing Transcript, at p. 46, lines 1-4.) This finding by the Court in 2020 is contrary to the Court's March 15, 2019 Order amending the Judgment (via the Appropriative Pool Pooling Plan)

to incorporate provisions of the Peace Agreement, specifically to include the language that clarifies the reallocation of unproduced Agricultural Pool Safe Yield on a yearly basis rather than every five years into the Judgment.

The March 15, 2019 Order possibly institutionalizes the provisions of the Peace Agreement into the Judgment, something the Court specifically declined to do in 2020, and the Agricultural Pool seeks clarification as a result. The terms in the Appropriative Pool Pooling Plan that allow the reallocation of Agricultural Pool water on a yearly basis tie directly to the language that the Agricultural Pool requested in its Pooling Plan amendment, (i.e. the requirement to have the Appropriative Pool pay all the Agricultural Pool costs for the term of the Peace Agreement). The 2019 Order does not include language that these terms that have been elevated into the Judgment cease to exist when the Peace Agreement ends, and that is the clarification the Agricultural Pool is now requesting.

V. THE REQUESTED CLARIFICATION IS NOT ONLY WARRANTED BUT NECESSARY

The spurious and misleading opposition brief filed by the Appropriative Pool is precisely why clarification by this Court is warranted and necessary. The amendment to the Appropriative Pool's Pooling Plan, as ordered by this Court in the March 15, 2019 Order, includes modification of the Judgment (Paragraph 10 of the Appropriative Pool's Pooling Plan, Exhibit "H" to the Judgment) as follows in redline:

10. <u>Unallocated Safe Yield Water</u>. To the extent that, in any year five years, any portion of the share of Safe Yield allocated to the Overlying (Agricultural) Pool is not produced, such water shall be available for reallocation to members of the Appropriative Pool, as follows:

Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit B Attachment to the March 15, 2019 Order.

According to the pleadings filed by the Appropriative Pool in 2019, the amendment to the

Appropriative Pool's Pooling Plan was made "to clarify the reallocation of unproduced Overlying Agricultural Pool Safe Yield on a yearly basis rather than every five years and to clarify the calculation of land use conversion claims *under the Peace Agreement now and in the future, if the Peace Agreement is extended.*" (Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit A Appropriative Pool Motion filed January 15, 2019, at p. 13, lines 6-10, italics added.) Section 1.1(o) of the Peace Agreement states as follows:

"Early Transfer" means the reallocation of Safe Yield not Produced by the Agricultural Pool to the Appropriative Pool on an annual basis rather than according to the five year increment described in Paragraph 10 of Exhibit "H" of the Judgment;

Section 8.8 of the Peace Agreement states that "[u]pon the termination of this Agreement, the Parties agree that no further Early Transfers of unallocated Safe Yield shall occur."

The 2019 Appropriative Pool Pooling Plan amendment unquestionably contains a provision of the Peace Agreement that was incorporated into the Judgment by the March 15, 2019 Order. The approved amendments plainly sought to align the Judgment and Appropriative Pool Pooling Plan with the terms of the Peace Agreement. However, as the Agricultural Pool notes in its Motion for Clarification, the final order approving the amendment of the March 15, 2019 Order includes no indication that the reallocation under the Peace Agreement is limited to the term of the Peace Agreement or any extension. (Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit B Attachment to March 15, 2019 Order.)

Given the pleadings filed by the Appropriative Pool in 2019 and Section 8.8 of the Peace Agreement, it is the understanding of the Agricultural Pool that the Court's March 15, 2019 Order amending the Appropriative Pool's Pooling Plan is limited to the term of the Peace Agreement – and the Agricultural Pool has filed this instant motion to clarify that understanding. However, instead of concurring with this interpretation by the Agricultural Pool, the Appropriative Pool files an opposition brief asserting that the Agricultural Pool's understanding of the March 15,

The Appropriative Pool's opposition acknowledges that the Agricultural Pool has requested confirmation that "reallocation under the Peace Agreement is limited to the terms of the Peace Agreement or any extension," but argues that "[i]n effect, the [Agricultural Pool] Motion asks the Court to issue an order that modifies and amends its March 15, 2019 Order to support the Agricultural Pool's (erroneous) interpretation." (Appropriative Pool Opposition, at pp. 4, line 26 – 5, line 3.) The Agricultural Pool has not requested an order modifying the intent or effect of the March 15, 2019 Order because it is the understanding of the Agricultural Pool that the 2019 Order was in fact intended to be limited to the term of the Peace Agreement based on the pleadings filed and Section 8.8 of the Peace Agreement. Indeed, the Agricultural Pool declined to file a proposed order with its original motion, seeking instead review and confirmation by the Court that the March 2019 Order is in effect for the term of the Peace Agreement.

The Court's July 31, 2020 Order denying the Agricultural Pool's motion to amend its Pooling Plan further compels clarification of the effect of the March 15, 2019 Order. The Agricultural Pool's motion to amend the Agricultural Pool Pooling Plan was comparable to that of the Appropriative Pool, given that the Agricultural Pool's proposed amendments likewise sought to align the Judgment and the Agricultural Pool Pooling Plan with the terms of the Peace Agreement and sought to include the terms that directly relate to the Early Transfer language from the Peace Agreement. (Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit C October 31, 2019 Agricultural Pool Motion to Amend Pooling Plan, at p. 5, lines 2-13.) Nonetheless, the Court's July 31, 2020 Order denied the Agricultural Pool's motion to amend its Pooling Plan on the basis "set forth in the response that Mr. Schatz filed on behalf of the Appropriative Pool as well as the Court's conclusion that the Court doesn't find a basis on which it should exercise its discretion to amend the judgment... [t]he contractual agreements between the parties...should remain between those parties and not be institutionalized into the judgment." (Tanaka Decl., Exhibit A July 10, 2020 Court Hearing Transcript, at pp. 45, line 22 – 46, line 4.) The response filed by Mr. Schatz on behalf of the Appropriative Pool states, "[a]ny amendments and/or changes to the effect, import

or meaning of the Peace Agreements as a consequence of *elevating* CAMA provisions including Section 5.4(a) of the *Peace Agreement* in the Agricultural Pool Pooling Plan amendment that is *part of the Judgment* would constitute a unilateral amendment to the Peace Agreement."

(Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice, Exhibit A Appropriative Pool Response to Agricultural Pool Motion to Amend Pooling Plan, at p. 3, lines 14-17, italics added.) This adoption of the Appropriative Pool's response within the Court's July 31, 2020 Order demonstrates the necessity of clarification of the March 15, 2019 Order, given that the 2019 Order allowed for a contractual agreement between the parties (the Peace Agreement) to be institutionalized into the Judgment; a direct contradiction of the July 31, 2020 Order. Without clarification from this Court, ongoing and future controversy will surround the Peace Agreement and Judgment. This is especially significant in light of the Appropriative Pool's argument that the Agricultural Pool's understanding of the March 15, 2019 Order's amendment of the Appropriative Pool Pooling Plan as limited to the term of the Peace Agreement is an *erroneous interpretation* and *modification* of the Court's March 15, 2019 Order.

Clarity from the Court regarding the March 15, 2019 Order is warranted and necessary, as such clarification regarding the relationship and effects of the terms of the Peace Agreement and Judgment will give much needed guidance to the Parties and the Watermaster regarding the operation and management of the Basin.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Appropriative Pool's opposition brief demonstrates the need to clarify the implementation of provisions of the Peace Agreement when they are incorporated into the Judgment. Watermaster is required to implement both the Judgment and Peace Agreements and there now exists inconsistency regarding implementation, due to the Court's conflicting March 15, 2019 and July 31, 2020 orders. Consequently, the Agricultural Pool respectfully affirms its request for clarification on the effect of the March 15, 2019 Order on the Judgment, the Peace Agreement, and the contractual relationship between the parties.

| 1 | | |
|----------|---------------------------|--|
| 2 | Dated: September 18, 2020 | EGOSCUE LAW GROUP, INC. |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | By: |
| 5 | | TRACY J. EGOSCUE Attorneys for OVERLYING (AGRICULTURAL) POOL |
| 6 | | OVERLYING (AGRICULTURAL) POOL |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | 10 |
| - 18 | | - - |

CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER

Case No. RCVRS 51010

Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino, et al.

PROOF OF SERVICE

| ı | ~ | ec | 10 | ro | +1 | 1 | 4. |
|---|---|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| ı | u | ec. | ıa | ıe | и | ıa | ١. |

correct.

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, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730; telephone (909) 484-3888.

On September 18, 2020 I served the following:

| | 1. | AGRICULTURAL POOL'S REPLY TO APPROPRIATIVE POOL'S OPPOSITION TO AGRICULTURAL POOL'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF COURT'S MARCH 2019 ORDER |
|--------------|----------|--|
| <u>X</u> / | pr ac | Y MAIL: in said cause, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed with postage thereon fully epaid, for delivery by United States Postal Service mail at Rancho Cucamonga, California, ddresses as follows: ee attached service list: Mailing List 1 |
| / | B' | Y PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the addressee. |
| / | nι | Y FACSIMILE: I transmitted said document by fax transmission from (909) 484-3890 to the fax imber(s) indicated. The transmission was reported as complete on the transmission report, nich was properly issued by the transmitting fax machine. |
| <u>' X</u> / | tra | Y ELECTRONIC MAIL: I transmitted notice of availability of electronic documents by electronic ansmission to the email address indicated. The transmission was reported as complete on the ansmission report, which was properly issued by the transmitting electronic mail device. |
| decla | are u | inder penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and |

Executed on September 18, 2020 in Rancho Cucamonga, California.

By: Vanessa Aldaz Chino Basin Watermaster BRIAN GEYE CA SPEEDWAY CORPORATION 9300 CHERRY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335

STEVE ELIE IEUA 17017 ESTORIL STREET CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

DON GALLEANO WMWD 4220 WINEVILLE ROAD MIRA LOMA, CA 91752 BOB KUHN THREE VALLEYS MWD 669 HUNTERS TRAIL GLENDORA, CA 91740

JEFF PIERSON 2 HEXAM IRVINE, CA 92603

ALLEN HUBSCH LOEB & LOEB LLP 10100 SANTA MONICA BLVD. SUITE 2200 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067 ROBERT BOWCOCK INTEGRATED RESOURCES MGMNT 405 N. INDIAN HILL BLVD CLAREMONT, CA 91711

PAUL HOFER CBWM BOARD MEMBER 11248 S TURNER AVE ONTARIO, CA 91761

BOB FEENSTRA 2720 SPRINGFIELD ST, ORANGE, CA 92867

Members:

Adrianna.Ortiz@airports.sbcountAdrianna.Ortiz@airports.sbcounty.gov

Agnes Cheng agnes.cheng@cc.sbcounty.gov

Al Lopez alopez@wmwd.com

Alan Frost Alan.Frost@dpw.sbcounty.gov Alberto Mendoza Alberto.Mendoza@cmc.com alfonso.ruiz@cmc.com Alfonso Ruiz Allen W. Hubsch ahubsch@loeb.com ajurado@cbwm.org Alonso Jurado acoker@cityofchino.org Amanda Coker AJakher@cityofchino.org Amer Jakher ABonczewski@ontarioca.gov Amy Bonczewski

Andrea Olivas aolivas@jcsd.us

Andrew Gagen agagen@kidmanlaw.com Andy Campbell acampbell@ieua.org amalone@weiwater.com Andy Malone angelica.todd@ge.com Angelica Todd Anna Nelson atruongnelson@cbwm.org April Robitaille arobitaille@bhfs.com jarodriguez@sarwc.com Arnold Rodriguez citycouncil@chinohills.org Art Bennett akidman@kidmanlaw.com Arthur Kidman Ashok Dhingra ash@akdconsulting.com benjamin.lewis@gswater.com Ben Lewis

Ben Peralta bperalta@tvmwd.com ben.weink@tetratech.com Benjamin M. Weink banderson@jcsd.us Betty Anderson **Bob Bowcock** bbowcock@irmwater.com Bob DiPrimio rjdiprimio@sqvwater.com bobfeenstra@gmail.com Bob Feenstra Bob Kuhn bakuhn@aol.com bkuhn@tvmwd.com Bob Kuhn

Bob Page Bob.Page@rov.sbcounty.gov

Brad Herrema bherrema@bhfs.com
Braden Yu bradeny@cvwdwater.com
Brandon Howard brahoward@niagarawater.com
Brenda Fowler balee@fontanawater.com
Brent Yamasaki byamasaki@mwdh2o.com
Brian Dickinson bdickinson65@gmail.com
Brian Geye bgeye@autoclubspeedway.com

Brian Lee blee@sawaterco.com

Cameron Andreasen memphisbelle38@outlook.com Carmen Sierra carmens@cvwdwater.com Carol Boyd Carol.Boyd@doj.ca.gov csanchez@weiwater.com Carolina Sanchez ccosta@chinodesalter.org Casey Costa Cassandra Hooks chooks@niagarawater.com Catharine Irvine cirvine@DowneyBrand.com cblais@ci.norco.ca.us Chad Blais

Chad Bials collais@ci.norco.ca.us
Charles Field cdfield@att.net

Charles Linder Charles Linder@nrgenergy.com
Charles Moorrees cmoorrees@sawaterco.com

Chino Hills City Council

Chris Berch

Chris Diggs

Christiana Daisy

Christofer Coppinger

Christopher M. Sanders Christopher Quach Christopher R. Guillen

Chuck Hays Cindy Cisneros Cindy Li

Cinthia Heredia Clarence Mansell Courtney Jones

Craig Miller Craig Stewart Cris Fealy

Dan Arrighi Dan McKinnev

Daniel Bobadilla

Dave Argo Dave Crosley David Aladjem

David De Jesus

David Doublet

David Huynh
David LeValley
David Penrice
Dennis Dooley

Dennis Dooley Dennis Mejia Dennis Williams

Diana Frederick
Don Galleano
Ed Means
Edgar Tellez Foster
Eduardo Espinoza

Edward Kolodziej Elizabeth M. Calciano

Elizabeth Skrzat

Eric Fordham
Eric Garner
Eric Grubb
Eric Papathakis
Eric Tarango

Erika Clement
Eunice Ulloa
Evette Ounanian
Felix Hamilton

Frank Brommenschenkel

Frank Yoo Fred Fudacz Fred Galante Gabby Garcia citycouncil@chinohills.org

cberch@jcsd.us

Chris_Diggs@ci.pomona.ca.us

cdaisy@ieua.org

ccoppinger@geoscience-water.com

cms@eslawfirm.com cquach@ontarioca.gov cguillen@bhfs.com chays@fontana.org cindyc@cvwdwater.com Cindy.li@waterboards.ca.gov Cinthia.Heredia@cmc.com cmansell@wvwd.org cjjones@ontarioca.gov CMiller@wmwd.com

craig.stewart@woodplc.com cifealy@fontanawater.com darrighi@sgvwater.com

dmckinney@douglascountylaw.com

dbobadilla@chinohills.org daveargo46@icloud.com DCrosley@cityofchino.org daladjem@downeybrand.com

ddejesus@tvmwd.com

ddoublet@dpw.sbcounty.gov

dhuynh@cbwm.org
David.LeValley@linde.com
dpenrice@acmwater.com
ddooley@angelica.com
dmejia@ontarioca.gov

dwilliams@geoscience-water.com diana.frederick@cdcr.ca.gov dongalleano@icloud.com edmeans@roadrunner.com etellezfoster@cbwm.org EduardoE@cvwdwater.com edward.kolodziej@ge.com ecalciano@hensleylawgroup.com

ESkrzat@cbwcd.org

eric_fordham@geopentech.com eric.garner@bbklaw.com ericg@cvwdwater.com Eric.Papathakis@cdcr.ca.gov edtarango@fontanawater.com

Erika.clement@sce.com eulloa@cityofchino.org EvetteO@cvwdwater.com felixhamilton.chino@yahoo.com frank.brommen@verizon.net

FrankY@cbwm.org ffudacz@nossaman.com fgalante@awattorneys.com

ggarcia@mvwd.org

Garrett Rapp grapp@weiwater.com
Gene Tanaka Gene.Tanaka@bbklaw.com
Geoffrey Kamansky gkamansky@niagarawater.com
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel geoffreyvh60@gmail.com

Gerald Yahr yahrj@koll.com

Gina Nicholls gnicholls@nossaman.com
Gino L. Filippi Ginoffvine@aol.com
Greg Woodside gwoodside@ocwd.com
Henry DeHaan Hdehaan1950@gmail.com
Hope Smythe hsmythe@waterboards.ca.gov
Irene Islas irene.islas@bbklaw.com
James Curatalo jamesc@cvwdwater.com

James Jenkins cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.gov James McKenzie jmckenzie@dpw.sbcounty.gov

Jane Anderson janderson@jcsd.us

Janelle Granger jgranger@niagarawater.com

Janine Wilson JWilson@cbwm.org Jasmin A. Hall jhall@ieua.org Jason Marseilles imarseilles@ieua.org Jason Pivovaroff JPivovaroff@wmwd.com Jean Cihigoyenetche Jean@thejclawfirm.com Jean Perry JPerry@wmwd.com Jeff Evers jevers@niagarawater.com Jeffrey L. Pierson jpierson@intexcorp.com

Jennifer Hy-Luk jhyluk@ieua.org

Jessie Ruedas Jessie@thejclawfirm.com
Jim Markman jmarkman@rwglaw.com
Jim W. Bowman jbowman@ontarioca.gov

Jimmy Gutierrez - Law Offices of Jimmy Gutierrez

jimmylaredo@gmail.com
Jimmy Medrano Jaime.medrano2@cdcr.ca.gov
jimmy@city-attorney.com jimmy@city-attorney.com

Joanne Chan jchan@wvwd.org Joao Feitoza joao.feitoza@cmc.com Joe Graziano jgraz4077@aol.com Joe Joswiak JJoswiak@cbwm.org Joel Ignacio jignacio@ieua.org John Abusham john.abusham@nrg.com John Bosler johnb@cvwdwater.com jrharper@harperburns.com John Harper John Huitsing johnhuitsing@gmail.com John Lopez ilopez@sarwc.com

John Lopez and Nathan Cole customerservice@sarwc.com
John Mendoza jmendoza@tvmwd.com
John Partridge jpartridge@angelica.com
John Schatz jschatz13@cox.net

John ThorntonJThorntonPE@H2OExpert.netJose A GalindoJose.A.Galindo@linde.comJosh Swiftjmswift@fontanawater.com

Joshua Aguilar jaguilar@ieua.org Julie Saba jsaba@jcsd.us

Justin Brokaw jbrokaw@marygoldmutualwater.com

Justin Nakano JNakano@cbwm.org

Justin Scott-Coe Ph. D. jscottcoe@mvwd.org Karen Johnson kejwater@aol.com

Kathleen Brundage kathleen.brundage@californiasteel.com

Keith Kramer kkramer@fontana.org

Keith Person keith.person@waterboards.ca.gov

Kelly Berry KBerry@sawpa.org kwaring@jcsd.us Ken Waring Kevin O'Toole kotoole@ocwd.com Ksage@IRMwater.com Kevin Sage Kimberly E. Leefatt kleefatt@bhfs.com Kristina Robb KRobb@cc.sbcounty.gov Kurt Berchtold kberchtold@gmail.com kylesnay@gswater.com Kyle Snay Larry Cain larry.cain@cdcr.ca.gov Larry Rothman lawrence.rothman@cmc.com

Laura Mantilla Imantilla@ieua.org
Lauren Harold Iharold@linklogistics.com
Linda Jadeski Ijadeski@wvwd.org
Lisa Lemoine LLemoine@wmwd.com
Liz Hurst ehurst@ieua.org
Marco Tule marco.tule@nrg.com

Maria Mendoza-Tellez MMendoza@weiwater.com
Maribel Sosa msosa@ci.pomona.ca.us
Marilyn Levin marilyn.levin@doj.ca.gov

Mark D. Hensley mhensley@hensleylawgroup.com Mark Wildermuth mwildermuth@weiwater.com Mark Wiley mwiley@chinohills.org Martin Cihigoyenetche marty@theiclawfirm.com Martin Rauch martin@rauchcc.com mezvirbulis@sgvwater.com Martin Zvirbulis Mathew C. Ballantyne mballantyne@cityofchino.org Matthew H. Litchfield mlitchfield@tvmwd.com May Atencio matencio@fontana.org Melissa L. Walker mwalker@dpw.sbcounty.gov

mgarcia@ieua.org mgarcia@ieua.org

Michael Adler michael.adler@mcmcnet.net

Michael Camacho mcamacho@ieua.org

Michael Camacho MCamacho@pacificaservices.com
Michael P. Thornton mthornton@tkeengineering.com

Michelle Licea mlicea@mvwd.org

Michelle Staples mstaples@jacksontidus.law
Mike Blazevic mblazevic@weiwater.com
Mike Maestas mikem@cvwdwater.com
Moore, Toby TobyMoore@gswater.com
MWDProgram MWDProgram@sdcwa.org
Nadia Aguirre naguirre@tvmwd.com
Nadia Loukeh nloukeh@wvwd.org

Natalie Costaglio natalie.costaglio@mcmcnet.net

Noah.goldenkrasner@doj.ca.gov

Nathan deBoom n8deboom@gmail.com
Neetu Gupta ngupta@ieua.org
Nick Jacobs njacobs@somachlaw.com
Nicole Escalante NEscalante@ontarioca.gov

Noah Golden-Krasner

Pam Wilson pwilson@bhfs.com

Paul DeutschPaul.deutsch@tetratech.comPaul Hoferfarmwatchtoo@aol.comPaul Hoferfarmerhofer@aol.comPaul S. Leonpleon@ontarioca.gov

Penny Alexander-Kelley Palexander-kelley@cc.sbcounty.gov

Pete Hall pete.hall@cdcr.ca.gov rpetehall@gmail.com Pete Hall Pete Vicario PVicario@cityofchino.org peterhettinga@yahoo.com Peter Hettinga PKavounas@cbwm.org Peter Kavounas Peter Rogers progers@chinohills.org Praseetha Krishnan praseethak@cvwdwater.com Rachel Avila R.Avila@MPGLAW.com Rachel Ortiz rortiz@nossaman.com

Ramsey Haddad ramsey.haddad@californiasteel.com
Randy Visser RVisser@sheppardmullin.com
Ray Wilkings rwilkings@autoclubspeedway.com
Rick Darnell Richard.Darnell@nrgenergy.com
Rick Rees richard.rees@woodplc.com
Rita Pro rpro@cityofchino.org
Robert C. Hawkins RHawkins@earthlink.net

robertadeloach1@gmail.com Robert DeLoach Robert E. Donlan red@eslawfirm.com robneu1@yahoo.com Robert Neufeld Robert Wagner rwagner@wbecorp.com Rcraig21@icloud.com Ron Craig Ron LaBrucherie, Jr. ronLaBrucherie@gmail.com Ronald C. Pietersma rcpietersma@aol.com Rosemary Hoerning rhoerning@ci.upland.ca.us Ryan Shaw RShaw@wmwd.com shlee@ieua.org Sally H. Lee

Sally H. Lee shlee@ieua.org
Sam Nelson snelson@ci.norco.ca.us
Sam Rubenstein srubenstein@wpcarey.com
Sandra S. Rose directorrose@mvwd.org
Sarah Foley Sarah.Foley@bbklaw.com
Sarah Schneider sarah.schneider@amec.com
Scott Burton sburton@ontarioca.gov
Scott Slater sslater@bhfs.com

Seth J. Zielke sjzielke@fontanawater.com
Shawnda M. Grady sgrady@eslawfirm.com
Shivaji Deshmukh sdeshmukh@ieua.org
Skylar Stephens SStephens@sdcwa.org
Sonya Barber sbarber@ci.upland.ca.us
Sonya Zite szite@wmwd.com

Steve Kennedyskennedy@bmklawplc.comSteve M. Andersonsteve.anderson@bbklaw.comSteve Ribolisteve.riboli@sanantoniowinery.com

Steve Smith ssmith@ieua.org

Steve W. Ledbetter, PE sledbetter@tkeengineering.com
Steven Andrews Engineering sandrews@sandrewsengineering.com

Steven J. Elie s.elie@mpglaw.com Steven J. Elie selie@ieua.org Steven Popelar spopelar@jcsd.us

Susan Palmer spalmer@kidmanlaw.com

Sylvie Lee slee@ieua.org

Tamer Ahmed tamer.ahmed@cdcr.ca.gov

Tammi Ford tford@wmwd.com
Taya Victorino tayav@cvwdwater.com
Teri Layton tlayton@sawaterco.com

Terry Bettencourt miles.bettencourt@cdcr.ca.gov

Terry Catlin tlcatlin@wfajpa.org
Tim Barr tbarr@wmwd.com
Tim Kellett tkellett@tvmwd.com
Timothy Ryan tjryan@sgvwater.com
Toby Moore TobyMoore@gswater.com
Todd Minten tminten@sbcglobal.net

Tom Barnes - ESA Water (tbarnes@esassoc.com)

tbarnes@esassoc.com

Tom Bunn TomBunn@Lagerlof.com

Tom Cruikshank - Link Industrial Properties (tcruikshank@linklogistics.com)

tcruikshank@linklogistics.com

Tom Harder tharder@thomashardercompany.com

Tom Haughey Thaughey@cityofchino.org

Tom McPeters THMcP@aol.com

Tom O'Neill toneill@chinodesalter.org
Toni Medell mmedel@mbakerintl.com
Tony Long tlong@angelica.com
Tracy J. Egoscue tracy@egoscuelaw.com

Trish Geren tgeren@sheppardmullin.com

Van Jew vjew@mvwd.org Vanessa Aldaz valdaz@cbwm.org

Vanessa Campos VCampos@ontarioca.gov Veva Weamer vweamer@weiwater.com

Victor Preciado Victor_Preciado@ci.pomona.ca.us

 Vivian Castro
 vcastro@cityofchino.org

 WestWater Research, LLC
 research@waterexchange.com

 William J Brunick
 bbrunick@bmblawoffice.com

William Urena wurena@angelica.com