BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP 1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2102

FEE EXEMPT

1	SCOTT S. SLATER (State Bar No. 117317)	
2	sslater@bhfs.com BRADLEY J. HERREMA (State Bar No. 22	28976)
3	bherrema@bhfs.com CHRISTOPHER R. GUILLEN (State Bar N	o. 299132)
4	cguillen@bhfs.com BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHE	RECK, LLP
5	1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2102	
6	Telephone: 805.963.7000 Facsimile: 805.965.4333	
7	Attorneys for CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF SAN BERNARDINO
10		
11	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER	Case No. RCV RS 51010
12	DISTRICT,	[Assigned for All Purposes to the
13	Plaintiff,	Honorable Stanford E. Reichert]
14	v.	CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER'S LIMITED OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF
15	CITY OF CHINO, ET AL.,	APPROPRIATIVE POOL MEMBER AGENCIES RE: AGRICULTURAL POOL
16	Defendants.	LEGAL AND OTHER EXPENSES
17		Date: November 13, 2020
18		Time: 1:30 p.m. Dept: S35
19		[Filed concurrently herewith: Declaration of
20		Joseph S. Joswiak; Declaration of Traci Stewart]
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Chino Basin Watermaster ("Watermaster") hereby files this Limited Opposition to the Motion of Appropriative Pool Member Agencies Re: Agricultural Pool Legal and Other Expenses ("Motion").

I. INTRODUCTION

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

The Motion arises from conflicting interpretations of Peace Agreement Section 5.4(a) asserted by eleven members of the Appropriative Pool ("Eleven Appropriators") on the one hand, and the Overlying (Agricultural) Pool ("Ag Pool") on the other. Watermaster is not a party to the Peace Agreement, however, pursuant to Court order it must act in a manner consistent with the Peace Agreement and implement its provisions. Section 5.4(a) provides that the Appropriative Pool will pay the "assessments and expenses of the Agricultural Pool including those of the Agricultural Pool Committee," but does not describe the manner in which Watermaster must facilitate such payment.

Unlike other provisions of the Peace Agreement from which express Watermaster duties arise, Section 5.4(a) does not include specific direction to Watermaster in this regard, nor does any Watermaster Rule or Regulation. By way of its Reply in Support of Motion of Appropriative Pool Member Agencies Re: Agricultural Pool Legal and Other Expenses ("Reply"), the Eleven Appropriators make clear that pursuant to Paragraph 31 of the Judgment, they seek to challenge Watermaster's actions in implementing Section 5.4(a) through its historical procedure and selected method of invoicing the members of the Appropriative Pool to cause the payment of the "assessments and expenses" of the Ag Pool. They seek a Court determination that Watermaster is "bound" to follow unspecified Judgment procedures.

At the Ex Parte Hearing before the Court on October 22, 2020, Watermaster represented to the parties and to the Court that it takes no position on the interpretation of Section 5.4(a) and that Watermaster, as the Court's administrator of the decree, does not oppose the Court's review of its actions and the performance of its duties. Watermaster's direct responsibility to this Court is to faithfully administer the decree and carry out the Court's orders.

This Limited Opposition explains the reason, origin, and consistent performance of Watermaster's duty to proceed in accordance with the Peace Agreement pertinent to Section

1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2102

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

5.4(a) in the absence of a clear directive. There is no procedure set forth in the Judgment that addresses how Watermaster would arrange for the payment of the Ag Pool's assessments and expenses by the Appropriative Pool. Consequently, Watermaster, with the express and implied consent of the parties to the Judgment, chose to follow a procedure previously agreed to by the two Pools in 1988 for the purpose of conveniently and accurately apportioning the amount of the Ag Pool's assessments and expenses among the members of the Appropriative Pool. This became the selected method to cause the Appropriative Pool's payment of assessments and expenses incurred by the Ag Pool. Each and every Assessment Package approved by the Pool Committees and the Advisory Committee, adopted by the Board, and included in the Annual Reports filed with the Court since the adoption of the Peace Agreement, has included the summary of this procedure.

By way of this Limited Opposition, Watermaster requests either the Court's affirmation that it acted appropriately in implementing Section 5.4(a) as described, or alternative direction as the Court deems appropriate.

II. **BACKGROUND**

Scope of Review

The Reply asserts the Eleven Appropriators' intent to challenge Watermaster action under Paragraph 31 of the Judgment. In relevant part, Paragraph 31 provides: "All actions, decisions, or rules of Watermaster shall be subject to review by the Court on its own motion or on timely motion of any party." In in the instant case, Watermaster's action was to approve the Ag Pool's request to issue invoices to the members of the Appropriative Pool.

The Reply suggests there is a procedure rooted in the Judgment that binds Watermaster and that the issuance of the August 25, 2020 invoices was improper. If these are in fact their contentions, they are incorrect. As set forth below and reflected in the attached supporting declarations, Assessment Packages, and Annual Reports, there is no provision in the Judgment that has been ignored or violated by Watermaster and its issuance of the assessments is consistent with the express and implied agreement of the parties and custom and practice of implementation for the past twenty years. Watermaster's accommodation of the parties' requests in the method

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

selected for processing "payment" is in conformity with this Court's June 2000 Order to proceed in accordance with the Peace Agreement and the parties' consent to such practice. However, Watermaster's implementation of Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement does not constitute a review or approval of any of the parties' actions undertaken pursuant to that Section. All three Pools, including the Ag Pool-not Watermaster-direct the affairs of each respective Pool and the tasks of its lawyers.

В. Administration of Section 5.4 of the Peace Agreement

Watermaster is not a party to the Peace Agreement. However, in its July 13, 2000 Order Concerning Adoption of the OBMP, this Court directed Watermaster to proceed in a manner consistent with the Peace Agreement. Section 5.4 of the Peace Agreement is entitled "Assessments, Credits, and Reimbursements." It states, "After the Effective Date and until the termination of this Agreement, the Parties expressly consent to Watermaster's performance of the following actions, programs or procedures regarding Assessments." (Emphasis added.) Subsection (a) of Section 5.4 further provides:

> During the term of this Agreement, all assessments and expenses of the Agricultural Pool including those of the Agricultural Pool Committee shall be paid by the Appropriative Pool. This includes but is not limited to OBMP Assessments, assessments pursuant to Paragraphs 20, 21, 22, 30, 42, 51, 53, 54 both General Administrative Expenses and Special Project Expenses, 55, and Exhibit F (Overlying Agricultural Pool Pooling Plan) of the Judgment except however in the event the total Agricultural Pool Production exceeds 414,000 acre-feet in any five consecutive year period as defined in the Judgment, the Agricultural Pool shall be responsible for its Replenishment obligation pursuant to Paragraph 45 of the Judgment.

Twelve years before the adoption of the Peace Agreement, the Appropriative Pool commenced paying for the Ag Pool's expenses in consideration for an acceleration of the reallocation of unproduced Ag Pool water. (See Watermaster 42nd Annual Report, Appendix G filed with the Court on January 31, 2020; Declaration of Traci Stewart ("Stewart Decl."), ¶ 4.) By agreement of the Appropriative Pool members, Watermaster apportioned the Ag Pool's budgeted expenses among the Appropriative Pool members on a per acre-foot basis—e.g., each acre-foot of reallocated unproduced Ag Pool water produced by an Appropriative Pool member

was assessed a charge to cover the Ag Pool's annually budgeted administrative and special project costs. (Stewart Decl., ¶¶ 4-6.)

Upon the Court's direction that Watermaster must proceed in accordance with the Peace Agreement, Watermaster conferred with the members of the Appropriative Pool and established a procedure for paying the Ag Pool's assessment and expenses by assessing the members of Appropriative Pool in accordance with past practices. (Stewart Decl., ¶¶ 7-10.) The continuity of this practice is reflected in the Assessment Packages and summarized in the Watermaster Annual Reports immediately prior to and following the adoption of the Peace Agreement in June 2000. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 10-11.) This methodology continues to this day, and is a part of Watermaster's annual budget process. (Declaration of Joseph S. Joswiak ("Joswiak Decl."), ¶ 3.)

The Ag Pool is represented by legal counsel and the associated attorneys' fees are and have been (before and after the adoption of the Peace Agreement) included in the assessments and expenses paid by the Appropriative Pool members. (Stewart Decl., ¶¶ 4-10; Joswiak Decl., ¶¶ 4, 7.) In 2009, concerns arose as a result of a budget transfer that allocated special project expenses to the Ag Pool. The concerns were resolved through a Joint Pool committee recommendation, which found that all Ag Pool expenses need to be "budgeted for and presented for Committee review and approval in the same form and fashion as [the] other two Pools." (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 17, Ex. D.)

C. Watermaster's Budget Process

In accordance with the Restated Judgment, the Chino Basin Watermaster Rules and Regulations, and Watermaster's policies, Watermaster has undertaken the same budget process each year for over twenty years. (See Restated Judgment, ¶ 30; Rules and Regulations, § 2.20; Joswiak Decl., ¶¶ 3-8; Stewart Decl., ¶¶ 3-11.)

Each fiscal year's (July to June) budget includes Pool Committee expenses, such as expenses for Pool Committee legal counsel, which are allocated to the members of the respective Pools. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 4.) Every February, Watermaster requests the Pool Committee chairs and vice chairs provide their estimated budgets for the upcoming fiscal year. (*Ibid.*) The Pool Committees develop their estimated budgets on their own accord. (*Ibid.*) Watermaster does not

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

vet or audit the budgets proposed by the Pool Committees, including their budgets for legal services. (Ibid.) Each Pool determines its business; not Watermaster. Watermaster does not provide legal counsel to the Pools. Rather, each of the three Pools retains separate legal counsel that serves at the discretion of the Pool. Watermaster does not review the scope, task, work order, directions, summaries, and confidential briefings of their legal counsel.

In March and April of each year, Watermaster holds workshops with stakeholders to review and receive comments on the proposed budget. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 5.) The draft budget is then presented to the Pool Committees for review and recommendation at their regular meetings in May. After consideration by the Pool Committees, the Advisory Committee reviews and approves the budget in May. The Watermaster Board thereafter adopts the budget in May. (*Ibid.*)

This approved budget is the basis of the Assessment Package which is ordinarily presented and approved in November. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 5.) Upon approval of the Assessment Package, Watermaster invoices the respective Pool members to collect funds necessary to administer payments for their Pool Committee's budget expenses. (*Ibid.*) As discussed above, in the case of Ag Pool expenses, including its budgeted legal fees, Watermaster's assessments issued to the members of the Appropriative Pool are the method to cause the payment of the "assessments and expenses," spread according to the percentage of the unproduced Ag Pool water that each Appropriator is allocated. (*Ibid.*)

To the extent any Pool Committee expense exceeds the amount that has been budgeted and collected, the Pool Committee determines how to pay for the excess amounts. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 6.) In practice, each Pool Committee provides direction to Watermaster regarding payment of the excess amounts. For the Appropriative Pool and Overlying (Non-Agricultural) Pool, Watermaster is generally directed to invoice the Pool's members for the excess amounts. (*Ibid.*) With respect to the Ag Pool, if the excess can be covered through dollars already collected for another budgeted expense (e.g., transferring amounts budgeted to special projects to legal expenses), the Pool Committee will typically direct Watermaster to process a budget transfer. This has happened in regard to Ag Pool legal expenses in every year from 2015 to 2020. However, on the one occasion in which the excess could not be covered in that manner (i.e., this

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

year), the Ag Pool Committee requested Watermaster to increase the budget for the excess amount and directly bill the Appropriative Pool members for the increased budget. (*Ibid.*)

D. Watermaster's Actions as to Pool Committee Legal Expenses and Invoices

Watermaster treats the Pool Committee legal expenses and invoices for each Pool in the same manner. The Pool Committees direct their counsel; not Watermaster. Each of the Pool Committees provides its respective legal budget to be included in the overall fiscal year budget, and that budget proceeds through the Watermaster process. After the budget is approved and funds have been collected, the Pool Committee chairs direct Watermaster to make payment in the amount of the outstanding invoices only after they have been approved by the respective Pool Committee chairs. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 19.) Watermaster does not review any information supporting the amounts due because Watermaster does not direct Pool Committee legal counsel and the information is subject to the attorney-client privilege. It only processes the payment of the invoiced amount in accordance with the direction provided from the Pool Committees honoring the discretion of each Pool to incur expenses as they may determine in the best interest of that Pool. (Ibid.)

To the extent any Pool Committee's legal expenses exceed the budgeted amount, Watermaster follows the procedures described above. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 20.) Over the past several years, Watermaster has processed budget increases for each of the Pool Committee's legal services, (*Ibid.*) The budget increases have been approved in the sole direction of each of the Pool Committees and have not been subject to the other two Pool Committees, Advisory Committee or Watermaster Board review. (*Ibid.*)

Here, the conflict arises because unlike the payments for the expenses of the other two Pools, Section 5.4(a) establishes a requirement for the Appropriative Pool to pay "all assessments and expenses" of the Ag Pool. Watermaster followed the agreed upon process for having the stated assessments and expenses paid. As described above, Watermaster has not validated the legitimacy of the amounts stated; it has only tendered the amount due for payment by the Appropriative Pool. Thus, the Motion raises objections to the invoiced amount on the scope and conditionality of the payment obligation requiring the Court's interpretation of Section 5.4(a).

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

Watermaster simply issued the invoices in accordance with custom and practice and as further described immediately below, preserving to each side to the conflict, every argument and remedy they may have whatever they may be. It acted reasonably, reserving to the Court the role of interpreting Section 5.4(a).

III. WATERMASTER APPROPRIATELY INVOICED THE APPROPRIATIVE POOL MEMBERS FOR THE AG POOL'S LEGAL SERVICES

With respect to Watermaster's issuance of August 25, 2020 invoices to the Appropriative Pool for the Ag Pool's legal expenses, Watermaster acted in accordance with the Restated Judgment, this Court's orders, the Peace Agreement, its Rules and Regulations, and its longstanding practices. As described above, each of the Pool Committees set its 2019-2020 fiscal year legal budget. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 9.) The Advisory Committee approved and the Watermaster Board adopted the Watermaster budget in May 2019, including these amounts. (*Ibid.*)

On a monthly basis, the Ag Pool's legal expenses tracked its budget until April 2020, when the Ag Pool's legal expenses exceeded the monthly budgeted amount. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 10-17, Exs. A-D.) By the end of the fiscal year, June 2020, the Ag Pool legal expenses had exceeded the budgeted amount by \$229,008.75. (Ibid.) To address the exceedance, the Ag Pool took the following action at a June 30, 2020 special meeting:

> Pursuant to the terms of the Peace Agreement (Paragraph 5.4(a)), all assessments and expenses of the Ag Pool shall be paid by the Appropriative Pool.

> The Ag Pool has exceeded the budget for FY (2019/20). Currently the May 2020 Ag Pool legal services invoice has not been paid, and the Watermaster hereby is asked to pay all pending invoices including, and without limitation, the TMDL costs for SAWPA.

> Among other tasks, funds from the Ag Pool Special Projects budget (account 8471) should be moved to the Ag Pool Legal Services Budget (account 8467).

> The Watermaster has refused to promptly pay the pending invoices without justification and should amend the budget as appropriate and necessary to cover all pending invoices.

(Id. at ¶ 11, Ex. A.) In accordance with this action, Watermaster transferred a portion of the Ag Pool's budget for other expenses to cover a portion of the increased expenses for the Ag Pool's

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

legal services. (Id. at ¶ 12.) At a special meeting on August 4, 2020, the Watermaster Board directed staff to offer the proposed assessment of Ag Pool legal expenses on the members of the Appropriative Pool to the Pool Committees and Advisory Committee for advice and assistance at their regular meetings in August. (*Id.* at ¶ 13, Ex. B.)

At their August meetings, the Ag Pool and the Overlying (Non-Agricultural) Pools considered the item, but offered no advice or assistance. (Joswiak Decl., ¶ 14.) The Appropriative Pool Committee provided the following advice:

> Consistent with the purpose of the Pools offering advice and assistance to Watermaster pursuant to the Special Joint Pool committee April 11, 2009 memorandum, because the Agricultural Pool's budget increase remains in dispute and the Appropriative Pool continues to extend invitations to the Ag Pool to meet regarding Ag's expenses, pending a meeting, response to requests for information relating to Ag's expenses or other resolution of the dispute, the Appropriative Pool is opposed to the budget increase and related funds transfer.

(Id. at ¶ 15, Ex. C.) The Advisory Committee offered no advice or assistance on the matter. (Id. at ¶16.) At its August 25, 2020 meeting, the Watermaster Board voted to direct staff to issue invoices to the Appropriative Pool parties for the Ag Pool's increased legal expenses. (Id. at ¶ 17-18, Ex. D-E.)

IV. CONCLUSION

In the end, the public interest in the sustainable management of the Chino Basin deserves the open and transparent administration of the decree and when necessary, the evaluation of Watermaster functions. Watermaster offers this Limited Opposition to fairly state the procedure it selected to implement Section 5.4(a) and thereafter faithfully followed, and why it believes it was and continues to be prudent and reasonable under the circumstances. Further, it is aware of no provision of the Judgment, the Peace Agreement, Watermaster Rules and Regulations that binds, compels, or suggests a better method of proceeding. The selected methodology preserves to the Parties the right to object to the invoices as the Motion now puts at issue. Accordingly, Watermaster has reserved to the parties to the Judgment and the Peace Agreement their respective rights to seek appropriate relief that will better inform future administration of the decree in implementing Section 5.4(a) rather than interject itself into the interpretation. Subject to the

1	Court's review and rulings of the Motion and Limited Opposition, Watermaster requests the
2	Court's acknowledgment that is has proceeded properly or, in the alternative, the Court's
3	direction to Watermaster as to how it may better address the situation in the future.
4	
5	
6	
7	Dated: October 27, 2020 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
8	SCHRECK, LLP
9	By: Moving Make SCOTT S. SLATER
10	BRADLEY J. HERREMA CHRISTOPHER R. GUILLEN
11	ATTORNEYS FOR CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER
12	
13	
14	21773798
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER Case No. RCVRS 51010

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

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

On October 27, 2020 I served the following:

	1.	CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER'S LIMITED OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF APPROPRIATIVE POOL MEMBER AGENCIES RE: AGRICULTURAL POOL LEGAL AND OTHER EXPENSES
/ <u>X</u> /	pr ac	Y MAIL: in said cause, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed with postage thereon fully repaid, for delivery by United States Postal Service mail at Rancho Cucamonga, California, ddresses as follows: ee attached service list: Mailing List 1
//	В	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 umber(s) indicated. The transmission was reported as complete on the transmission report, hich 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.
i decla		under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and

Executed on October 27, 2020 in Rancho Cucamonga, California.

By: Janine Wilson

Chino Basin Watermaster

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

JEFF PIERSON 2 HEXAM IRVINE, CA 92603

ALLEN HUBSCH LOEB & LOEB LLP 10100 SANTA MONICA BLVD. SUITE 2200 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

BRIAN GEYE CA SPEEDWAY CORPORATION 9300 CHERRY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335

Members:

Adrianna.Ortiz Agnes Cheng Al Lopez

Alan Frost

Alberto Mendoza Alfonso Ruiz

Allen W. Hubsch Alonso Jurado Amanda Coker Amer Jakher

Amy Bonczewski Andrea Olivas

Andrew Gagen Andy Campbell Andy Malone

Angelica Todd Angelo Simoes Anna Nelson

April Robitaille Arnold Rodriguez

Art Bennett Arthur Kidman Ashok Dhingra Ben Lewis

Ben Peralta Benjamin M. Weink

Betty Anderson

Bob Bowcock Bob DiPrimio Bob Feenstra

Bob Kuhn Bob Kuhn

Bob Page Brad Herrema

Braden Yu

Brandon Howard Brenda Fowler Brent Yamasaki

Brian Dickinson Brian Geye Brian Lee

Cameron Andreasen

Carmen Sierra
Carol Boyd
Carolina Sanchez
Casey Costa
Cassandra Hooks

Catharine Irvine Chad Blais

Charles Field
Charles Linder

Adrianna. Ortiz@airports.sbcounty.gov

agnes.cheng@cc.sbcounty.gov

alopez@wmwd.com

Alan.Frost@dpw.sbcounty.gov Alberto.Mendoza@cmc.com

alfonso.ruiz@cmc.com ahubsch@loeb.com ajurado@cbwm.org acoker@cityofchino.org AJakher@cityofchino.org ABonczewski@ontarioca.gov

aolivas@jcsd.us

agagen@kidmanlaw.com acampbell@ieua.org amalone@weiwater.com angelica.todd@ge.com Angelo.Simoes@linde.com atruongnelson@cbwm.org arobitaille@bhfs.com jarodriguez@sarwc.com citycouncil@chinohills.org akidman@kidmanlaw.com ash@akdconsulting.com

benjamin.lewis@gswater.com bperalta@tvmwd.com ben.weink@tetratech.com

banderson@jcsd.us

bbowcock@irmwater.com rjdiprimio@sgvwater.com bobfeenstra@gmail.com

bgkuhn@aol.com bkuhn@tvmwd.com

Bob.Page@rov.sbcounty.gov

bherrema@bhfs.com bradeny@cvwdwater.com brahoward@niagarawater.com balee@fontanawater.com byamasaki@mwdh2o.com bdickinson65@gmail.com

bgeye@autoclubspeedway.com

blee@sawaterco.com

memphisbelle38@outlook.com carmens@cvwdwater.com Carol.Boyd@doj.ca.gov csanchez@weiwater.com ccosta@chinodesalter.org chooks@niagarawater.com cirvine@DowneyBrand.com

cblais@ci.norco.ca.us

cdfield@att.net

Charles.Linder@nrgenergy.com

Charles Moorrees

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 McKinney

Daniel Bobadilla

Dave Argo Dave Crosley David Aladjem David De Jesus

David Doublet
David Huynh
David Penrice

Dawn Martin Denise Garzaro

Dennis Dooley Dennis Mejia

Dennis Williams Diana Frederick Don Galleano

Ed Means

Edgar Tellez Foster
Eduardo Espinoza
Edward Kolodziej
Elizabeth M. Calciano

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 cmoorrees@sawaterco.com 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 dpenrice@acmwater.com Dawn.Martin@cc.sbcounty.gov

dgarzaro@ieua.org 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

Fred Galante
Gabby Garcia
Garrett Rapp
Gene Tanaka
Geoffrey Kamansky
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel

Gerald Yahr Gina Nicholls Gino L. Filippi Greg Woodside Henry DeHaan Hope Smythe Irene Islas James Curatalo James Jenkins James McKenzie Jane Anderson Janelle Granger Janine Wilson Jasmin A. Hall Jason Marseilles Jason Pivovaroff Jean Cihigoyenetche

Jeff Evers

Jeffrey L. Pierson Jennifer Hy-Luk Jessie Ruedas Jim Markman Jim W. Bowman

Jimmy Gutierrez - Law Offices of Jimmy Gutierrez

Jimmy Medrano

jimmy@city-attorney.com

Joanne Chan
Joao Feitoza
Joe Graziano
Joe Joswiak
Joel Ignacio
John Abusham
John Bosler
John Harper
John Huitsing
John Lopez

John Lopez and Nathan Cole

John Mendoza John Partridge John Schatz John Thornton Jose A Galindo Josh Swift Joshua Aguilar Julie Saba Justin Brokaw fgalante@awattorneys.com ggarcia@mvwd.org grapp@weiwater.com Gene.Tanaka@bbklaw.com gkamansky@niagarawater.com

geoffreyvh60@gmail.com

yahrj@koll.com

gnicholls@nossaman.com Ginoffvine@aol.com gwoodside@ocwd.com Hdehaan1950@gmail.com hsmythe@waterboards.ca.gov irene.islas@bbklaw.com jamesc@cvwdwater.com

cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.gov jmckenzie@dpw.sbcounty.gov

janderson@jcsd.us

jgranger@niagarawater.com

JWilson@cbwm.org jhall@ieua.org jmarseilles@ieua.org JPivovaroff@wmwd.com Jean@thejclawfirm.com jevers@niagarawater.com jpierson@intexcorp.com

jhyluk@ieua.org

Jessie@thejclawfirm.com jmarkman@rwglaw.com jbowman@ontarioca.gov

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

jchan@wvwd.org
joao.feitoza@cmc.com
jgraz4077@aol.com
JJoswiak@cbwm.org
jignacio@ieua.org
john.abusham@nrg.com
johnb@cvwdwater.com
jrharper@harperburns.com
johnhuitsing@gmail.com
jlopez@sarwc.com

customerservice@sarwc.com jmendoza@tvmwd.com jpartridge@angelica.com

jschatz13@cox.net

JThorntonPE@H2OExpert.net Jose.A.Galindo@linde.com jmswift@fontanawater.com

jaguilar@ieua.org jsaba@jcsd.us

jbrokaw@marygoldmutualwater.com

Justin Nakano

Justin Scott-Coe Ph. D.

Kathleen Brundage

Keith Kramer Keith Person Kelly Berry Ken Waring

Kevin O'Toole Kevin Sage

Kimberly E. Leefatt

Kristina Robb
Kurt Berchtold
Kyle Brochard
Kyle Snay
Larry Cain

Laura Mantilla Lauren Harold Linda Jadeski

Lisa Lemoine Liz Hurst

Marco Tule

Maria Mendoza-Tellez

Maribel Sosa Marilyn Levin Mark D. Hensley Mark Wildermuth

Mark Wiley

Martin Cihigoyenetche

Martin Rauch Martin Zvirbulis

Mathew C. Ballantyne Matthew H. Litchfield

May Atencio Melissa L. Walker mgarcia@ieua.org Michael Adler

Michael Camacho Michael Camacho Michael P. Thornton

Michelle Licea Michelle Staples Mike Blazevic Mike Maestas Moore, Toby MWDProgram

Nadia Aguirre Natalie Costaglio Nathan deBoom Neetu Gupta

Nick Jacobs Nicole Escalante

Noah Golden-Krasner

Pam Wilson

JNakano@cbwm.org jscottcoe@mvwd.org

kathleen.brundage@californiasteel.com

kkramer@fontana.org

keith.person@waterboards.ca.gov

KBerry@sawpa.org kwaring@jcsd.us kotoole@ocwd.com Ksage@IRMwater.com kleefatt@bhfs.com KRobb@cc.sbcounty.gov kberchtold@gmail.com

kberchtold@gmail.com KBrochard@rwglaw.com kylesnay@gswater.com larry.cain@cdcr.ca.gov lmantilla@ieua.org

Iharold@linklogistics.com ljadeski@wvwd.org

LLemoine@wmwd.com ehurst@ieua.org marco.tule@nrg.com

MMendoza@weiwater.com msosa@ci.pomona.ca.us marilyn.levin@doj.ca.gov

mhensley@hensleylawgroup.com mwildermuth@weiwater.com

mwiley@chinohills.org marty@thejclawfirm.com martin@rauchcc.com mezvirbulis@sgvwater.com mballantyne@cityofchino.org

mlitchfield@tvmwd.com matencio@fontana.org

mwalker@dpw.sbcounty.gov

mgarcia@ieua.org

michael.adler@mcmcnet.net

mcamacho@ieua.org

MCamacho@pacificaservices.com mthornton@tkeengineering.com

mlicea@mvwd.org

mstaples@jacksontidus.law mblazevic@weiwater.com mikem@cvwdwater.com TobyMoore@gswater.com MWDProgram@sdcwa.org naguirre@tvmwd.com

natalie.costaglio@mcmcnet.net

n8deboom@gmail.com

ngupta@ieua.org

njacobs@somachlaw.com NEscalante@ontarioca.gov Noah.goldenkrasner@doj.ca.gov

pwilson@bhfs.com

Paul Deutsch Paul Hofer Paul Hofer Paul S. Leon

Penny Alexander-Kelley

Pete Hall
Pete Hall
Pete Vicario
Peter Hettinga
Peter Kavounas
Peter Rogers
Praseetha Krishnan

Rachel Avila Rachel Ortiz Ramsey Haddad Randy Visser Ray Wilkings Rick Darnell

Rick Rees

Rita Pro

Robert C. Hawkins Robert DeLoach Robert E. Donlan Robert Neufeld Robert Wagner Ron Craig

Ron LaBrucherie, Jr. Ronald C. Pietersma Rosemary Hoerning

Ryan Shaw
Sally H. Lee
Sam Nelson
Sam Rubenstein
Sandra S. Rose
Sarah Foley
Sarah Schneider
Scott Burton
Scott Slater
Seth J. Zielke
Shawnda M. Grady
Shivaji Deshmukh

Skylar Stephens Sonya Barber Sonya Zite Steve Kennedy Steve M. Anderson

Steve Nix Steve Riboli Steve Smith

Steve W. Ledbetter, PE Steven Andrews Engineering

Steven J. Elie Steven J. Elie Paul.deutsch@tetratech.com farmwatchtoo@aol.com farmerhofer@aol.com pleon@ontarioca.gov

Palexander-kelley@cc.sbcounty.gov

pete.hall@cdcr.ca.gov rpetehall@gmail.com PVicario@cityofchino.org peterhettinga@yahoo.com PKavounas@cbwm.org progers@chinohills.org praseethak@cvwdwater.com R.Avila@MPGLAW.com rortiz@nossaman.com

ramsey.haddad@californiasteel.com RVisser@sheppardmullin.com rwilkings@autoclubspeedway.com Richard.Darnell@nrgenergy.com richard.rees@woodplc.com rpro@cityofchino.org RHawkins@earthlink.net robertadeloach1@gmail.com

red@eslawfirm.com robneu1@yahoo.com rwagner@wbecorp.com Rcraig21@icloud.com ronLaBrucherie@gmail.com rcpietersma@aol.com rhoerning@ci.upland.ca.us RShaw@wmwd.com shlee@ieua.org

snelson@ci.norco.ca.us srubenstein@wpcarey.com directorrose@mvwd.org Sarah.Foley@bbklaw.com sarah.schneider@amec.com sburton@ontarioca.gov sslater@bhfs.com

sjzielke@fontanawater.com sgrady@eslawfirm.com sdeshmukh@ieua.org SStephens@sdcwa.org sbarber@ci.upland.ca.us

szite@wmwd.com

skennedy@bmklawplc.com steve.anderson@bbklaw.com

snix@ci.upland.ca.us

steve.riboli@sanantoniowinery.com

ssmith@ieua.org

sledbetter@tkeengineering.com sandrews@sandrewsengineering.com

s.elie@mpglaw.com selie@ieua.org Steven Popelar

Steven.Raughley@cao.sbcounty.gov

Susan Palmer Sylvie Lee Tamer Ahmed Tammi Ford Taya Victorino Teri Layton

Terry Bettencourt

Terry Catlin
Tim Barr
Tim Kellett
Timothy Ryan
Toby Moore
Todd Minten
Tom Barnes
Tom Bunn

Tom Cruikshank Tom Harder Tom Haughey Tom McPeters

Tom O'Neill Toni Medell Tony Long

Toyasha Sebbag Tracy J. Egoscue Trish Geren

Van Jew Vanessa Aldaz

Vanessa Campos Veva Weamer Victor Preciado Vivian Castro

WestWater Research, LLC

William J Brunick William Urena spopelar@jcsd.us

Steven.Raughley@cao.sbcounty.gov

spalmer@kidmanlaw.com

slee@ieua.org

tamer.ahmed@cdcr.ca.gov

tford@wmwd.com tayav@cvwdwater.com tlayton@sawaterco.com

miles.bettencourt@cdcr.ca.gov

tlcatlin@wfajpa.org tbarr@wmwd.com tkellett@tvmwd.com tjryan@sgvwater.com TobyMoore@gswater.com tminten@sbcglobal.net tbarnes@esassoc.com TomBunn@Lagerlof.com tcruikshank@linklogistics.com

tharder@thomashardercompany.com

Thaughey@cityofchino.org

THMcP@aol.com

toneill@chinodesalter.org mmedel@mbakerintl.com tlong@angelica.com tsebbag@cbwcd.org

tracy@egoscuelaw.com tgeren@sheppardmullin.com

vjew@mvwd.org valdaz@cbwm.org

VCampos@ontarioca.gov vweamer@weiwater.com

Victor_Preciado@ci.pomona.ca.us

vcastro@cityofchino.org

research@waterexchange.com bbrunick@bmblawoffice.com

wurena@angelica.com