Jimmy L. Gutierrez (SBN 59448) FEE EXEMPT PER GOV. CODE § 6103 1 JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ LAW CORPORATION 12616 Central Avenue Chino, California 91710 Telephone: (909) 591-6336 3 Attorney for Defendant City of Chino 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO 10 11 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER CASE NUMBER: RCVRS 51010 [Assigned for All Purposes to Honorable Stanford E. Reichert, Dept. S35] DISTRICT, 12 13 Plaintiff, CITY OF CHINO CORRECTED 14 v. MOTION FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF ATTORNEYS FEES AND EXPENSES 15 CITY OF CHINO, et al., PAID TO THE AGRICULTURAL POOL 16 Date: February 4, 2022 Defendants. Time: 1:30 p.m. 17 Dept.: S35 18 (FEE- EXEMPT PER GOVERNMENT CODE § 6103) 19 20 21 Pursuant to this Court's Order dated December 3, 2021, the City of Chino ("Chino") 22 hereby moves the Court to order the Agricultural Pool to reimburse assessments paid by the 23 Appropriative Pool for Agricultural Pool attorney's fees and expenses in the sum of \$483,202.55 for fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21 including Chino's portion thereof and to 24 reimburse Watermaster in the sum of \$102,557 for Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses 25 26 it paid for fiscal year 2020-21 or, alternatively, order Watermaster to refrain from seeking collection of the sum of \$102,557 from Appropriative Pool members including Chino. 27 28 ///

#### 

### 

### 

### **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

I.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Appropriative Pool has paid \$483,202.55 for Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses in fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21 without being shown invoices for such legal services and without a showing that those legal services were of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or not adverse to the Appropriative Pool. Similarly, Watermaster paid \$102,557.12 for Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses for fiscal year 2020-21 from Watermaster Administrative reserve funds for which Watermaster has stated that it seeks reimbursement of that sum from the Appropriative Pool or the Agricultural Pool.

Chino brings this motion to initiate the process for reimbursement of the above sums as ordered by the Court. Chino intends this motion to be the court ordered process for completing resolution of the pending requests of the Appropriative Pool members that elect to join this motion for reimbursement of Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses paid by the Appropriative Pool in the form of Watermaster assessments and those paid by Watermaster because it too seeks reimbursement provided it too elects to join this motion.

The Appropriative Pool's first request for reimbursement was in its "Notice of Motion and Motion of the Appropriative Pool Member Agencies Re: Agricultural Pool Legal Fees and Other Expenses" dated September 17, 2020. The court did not rule on the reimbursement request until the supporting invoices were provided, and, alternatively, the court indicated it would vacate the disputed assessments and reimburse the payment of such assessments to the paying parties.

The Appropriative Pool's second request for reimbursement was in its "Opposition to Agricultural Pool's Motion for Attorney's Fees" dated September 27, 2021. While the Court's order dated December 3, 2021 again does not rule on the reimbursement request of the Appropriative Pool, it does order Chino to file and serve a "motion as to the procedure for reimbursement of any assessments that are not held in the escrow account that may be due the paying party."

Because the Agricultural Pool failed to demonstrate entitlement to the payment of any of its attorney fees and expenses for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 as requested by the Court, the Agricultural Pool has waived its claims to the payment of any of its attorney fees or expenses under Paragraph 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement. Thus, the Court should order:

- Vacation of all Watermaster assessments imposed upon the Appropriative Pool for Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses under Peace Agreement Paragraph 5.4(a) for Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21.
- 2. Reimbursement by the Agricultural Pool of the sum of \$483,202.55 to the members of the Appropriative Pool members in the amounts of their assessments including the amounts paid by Chino.
- 3. Reimbursement by the Agricultural Pool of the sum of \$102,557.12 to Watermaster that it paid for Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses for Fiscal Year 2020-21 or, alternatively, order Watermaster to refrain from seeking collection of the sum of \$102,557 from the members of the Appropriative Pool including Chino.

II.

# APPROPRIATIVE POOL PAYMENTS FOR AGRICULTURAL POOL ATTORNEY FEES AND EXPENSES

The Appropriative Pool members have paid the sum of \$483,202.55 in Watermaster assessments for legal services rendered to the Agricultural Pool in fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21 without (1) being shown invoices for such legal services and (2) a showing that those legal services were (a) of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or (b) not adverse to the Appropriative Pool.

In addition, Watermaster paid the sum of \$102,557.12 for legal services rendered to the Agricultural Pool in fiscal year 2020-21 from Watermaster administrative reserve funds without (1) being shown invoices for such legal services and (2) a showing that those legal services were (a) of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or (b) not adverse to the Appropriative Pool.

21 22

Furthermore, Watermaster has indicated it will seek reimbursement of that sum from the Agricultural Pool or Appropriative Pool. However, the Appropriative Pool has not been shown the invoices for such legal services rendered to the Agricultural Pool and there has been no showing that those legal services were of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or not adverse to the Appropriative Pool. In order to avoid a futile dispute between the Agricultural Pool and the Appropriative Pool on reimbursement of the \$102,557.12 sum, the court should order the Agricultural Pool to reimburse the \$102,557.12 sum to Watermaster. In the alternative, the court should order Watermaster to refrain from collecting the sum of \$102,557.12 from members of the Appropriative Pool including Chino.

### A. Assessments Imposed and Paid by Appropriative Pool Members for Agricultural Pool Attorney Fees and Expenses in Fiscal Year 2019-20

For fiscal year 2019-20, the Agricultural Pool submitted a budget for legal services in the sum of \$300,000. Watermaster included that sum in the general assessment it invoiced to the Appropriative Pool members but it did not specify the amount payable by each Appropriative Pool member in the Watermaster Assessment Fee Summary. [Declaration of Dave Crosley ¶4; Declaration of Jimmy L. Gutierrez ¶9(iii), ¶10(iii), ¶11) and Exhibits 5 & 6; Declaration of John Schatz ¶4]

John Schatz, counsel for the Appropriative Pool, undertook the task of ascertaining the amount each Appropriative Pool member was assessed by Watermaster for the Agricultural Pool legal budget of \$300,000 in Fiscal Year 2019-20. Mr. Schatz did so by referring to the Watermaster Assessment Fee Summary for Fiscal Year 2019-20, performing a weighted calculation using the dollar amounts in columns 8B and 8E in the Assessment Fee Summary and showing the results of his calculations and methodology on Exhibit B of his declaration, and confirming his calculations and methodology with Watermaster General Manager Peter Kavounas. [Declaration of John Schatz, ¶4, ¶5 and Exhibits A, B and C].

Thus, the foregoing methodology reveals the amount of the 2019-20 Watermaster Assessment attributable to the Agricultural Pool Legal Budget of \$300,000 that was assessed

1	to each Appropriative Pool member. The amoun	at assessed to each Appropriative Pool member	
2	is as follows:		
3	Arrowhead Mtn Spring Water Co	\$883	
. 4	2. Chino Hills, City of	\$7,503	
5	3. Chino, City of	\$16,379	
6	4. Cucamonga Valley Water Company	\$32,717	
7	5. Fontana Union Water Company	\$4,003	
8	6. Fontana Water Company	\$31,754	
9	7. Golden State Water Company	\$258	
10	8. Jurupa Community Services District	\$59,667	
11	9. Marygold Mutual Water Company	\$3,350	
12	10. Monte Vista Irrigation District	\$424	
13	11. Monte Vista Water District	\$23,163	
14	12. Niagra Bottling	\$5,210	
15	13. Nicholson Trust	\$3	
16	14. Norco, City of	\$126	
17	15. Ontario, City of	\$61,132	
18	16. Pomona, City of	\$40,576	
19	17. San Antonio Water Co	\$2,108	
20	18. San Bernardino County	\$33	
21	19. Santa Ana River Water Company	\$815	
22	20. Upland, City of	\$8,899	
23	21. Westend Consolidated Water Co.	\$594	
24	22. West Valley Water District	\$403	
25	TOTAL:	\$300,000	
26	On December 13, 2019, Chino paid the sum of \$447,841.58 as its total Watermaster		
27	Assessment for Fiscal Year 2019-20, which included payment of Chino's portion of the		
28	Agricultural Pool legal budget of \$300,000. [D	eclaration of Dave Crosley ¶4] According to	

Mr. Schatz's calculations, Chino paid the sum of \$16,379 as its portion of the 2019-20 Agricultural Pool legal budget of \$300,000. Thus, Chino seeks reimbursement of that sum from the Agricultural Pool.

Later in Fiscal Year 2019-20, the Agricultural Pool increased its 2019-20 legal services expenditures or budget by the sum of \$229,008.75. Watermaster responded to the increase in legal services by transferring the sum of \$63,314 from the Agricultural Pool Special Projects Fund (8471) into the Agricultural Pool Legal Fund (8467) and by invoicing the difference of \$165,694.75 to the Appropriative Pool. [Declaration of Jimmy L. Gutierrez ¶¶ 7, 9(ii), 10(ii) and Exhibit 5; Declaration of Dave Crosley ¶ 5 and Exhibit 3]

The Appropriative Pool members responded to the increased invoice as follows: (a) fifteen Appropriative Pool members deposited their allocated amounts totaling \$161,070.09 into an escrow account held by Watermaster; and (b) four Appropriative Pool members paid their allocated amounts totaling \$4,624.66 directly to Watermaster.\(^1\) At the hearing on November 5, 2021 wherein the Court denied the Agricultural Pool's Motion for Attorneys' fees, Watermaster agreed to return the sum of \$161,070.09 to the appropriators that deposited their allocated amounts in the escrow fund; nothing was said about returning the \$4,624.66 paid by the four appropriators. It remains an issue. [Declaration of Dave Crosley \(^5\) and Exhibit 3; Declaration of Jimmy L. Gutierrez \(^9\)7, 8, 9(i)(ii), 10(i)(ii) and Exhibit 3–Table 1]

Thus, the sums subject to reimbursement for the payment of Agricultural Pool legal services in Fiscal Year 2019-20 by the Appropriative Pool members are:

- (a) \$300,000 paid for the 2019-20 Agricultural Pool legal services budget,
- (b) \$63,314 transferred from the Special Projects Fund (8471) to the Legal Fund,
- (c) \$4,624.66 paid by four appropriators to Watermaster,
- (d) Total: \$367,938.66

The sum of \$300,000 is payable to the Appropriative Pool members in the amount each paid as shown above. The sum of \$63,314 (b) is payable to the Special Projects Fund (8471)

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  Marygold paid \$1,007.38, Norco paid \$310.22, SAWC paid \$2,316.54 and WVWD paid \$990.52.

or to the Appropriative Pool members according to the methodology in the Schatz declaration. The sum of \$4,624.66 is payable to the four appropriators in the amounts shown in **footnote 1**:

# B. <u>Assessments Imposed and Paid by Appropriative Pool Members for</u> <u>Agricultural Pool Attorney Fees and Expenses in Fiscal Year 2020-21</u>

For fiscal year 2020-21, the Agricultural Pool submitted a budget for legal services in the sum of \$500,000. Watermaster allocated the \$500,000 amount to the Appropriative Pool members and invoiced each member. [Declaration of Jimmy L. Gutierrez, Exhibit 3-Table 2, ¶¶7, 8; Declaration of Dave Crosley ¶6, Exhibit 6;]

Watermaster paid the sum of \$102,557.12 for Agricultural Pool legal expenses in fiscal year 2020-21 from Watermaster administrative reserve funds. Watermaster will require the sum refunded to the Administrative Reserve fund. [Declaration of Jimmy L. Gutierrez, Exhibit 1, Table 2,  $\P9(v)$ , 10(v)]

However, the Appropriative Pool is not obligated to refund the \$102,557.12, because (1) the Appropriative Pool has not been shown the invoices for such legal services rendered to the Agricultural Pool and (2) there has been no showing that those legal services were (a) of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or (b) not adverse to the Appropriative Pool.

In order to avoid a futile dispute between the Agricultural Pool and the Appropriative Pool over reimbursement of the \$102,557.12 sum, the court should order the Agricultural Pool to reimburse the \$102,557.12 sum to Watermaster. In the alternative, the court should order Watermaster to refrain from collecting the sum of \$102,557.12 from members of the Appropriative Pool including Chino.

Some Appropriative Pool members declined to pay the Watermaster assessment for the 2020-21 Fiscal Year Agricultural Pool Legal Budget in the sum of \$500,000. However, some of the Appropriative Pool members did pay the assessment. The Appropriative Pool members that paid the assessment and the amounts each paid is shown as follows:

1. Chino Hills, City of

\$19,946.64

4.331172

2. Chino, City of

- \$0
- 3. Cucamonga Valley Water Company \$0

1	4.	Fontana Union Water Company	\$0
2	5.	Fontana Water Company	\$6,845.62
3	6.	Golden State Water Company	\$1,834.16
4	7.	Jurupa Community Services District	\$0
5	8.	Marygold Mutual Water Company	\$2,936.76
6	9.	Monte Vista Irrigation Water Co	\$0
7	10.	Monte Vista Water District	\$0
8	Ì1.	Nicholson Trust	\$17.20
9	12.	Norco, City of	\$904.38
10	13.	Ontario, City of	\$0
11	14.	Pomona, City of	\$50,266.64
12	15.	San Antonio Water Company	\$6,753.34
13	16.	Santa Ana River Water Company	\$5,831.75
14	17.	Upland, City of	\$12,784.15
15	18.	West End Consolidated Water Co	\$4,246.63
16	19.	West Valley Water District	\$2,887.61
17		Total: \$115,263.89.	
18	The	The entire sum of \$115,263.89 paid by the above Appropriative Pool members was used	
19	to pay for l	to pay for legal services rendered to the Agricultural Pool. [Declaration of Jimmy L. Gutierrez	
20	¶¶7, 8, 9(iv	¶¶7, 8, 9(iv), 10(iv) and Exhibit 3–Table 2]	
2i	Hov	However, (1) no invoices for such legal services have been shown and (2) there is no	
22	showing th	showing that those legal services were (a) of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or (b) not	
23	adverse to the Appropriative Pool. Thus, the foregoing assessment payments in the sum of		
24	\$115,263.89 are reimbursable to the Appropriative Pool members that paid them.		
25	The	Agricultural Pool's motion dated Jul	y 25, 2021 seeking payment of its attorney fees
26	and expens	ses for the fiscal years of 2019-20 and	2020-21 sought to justify only its attorney fees
27	and expens	ses that had not been paid. The Ag	gricultural Pool made no attempt to justify its

attorney fees and expenses that already had been paid by the Appropriative Pool - an amount

28

1 Î

of \$483,202.55. John Schatz, counsel of the Appropriative Pool and attorneys of nine other Appropriative Pool members sent a letter on August 27, 2021 to Tracy Egoscue, counsel for the Agricultural Pool, seeking to obtain invoices for legal services that would reveal some legal services rendered to the Agricultural Pool that qualified for payment under Peace Agreement Paragraph 5.4(a) and the Court Order dated May 28, 2021. However, Ms. Egoscue did not provide any invoices in addition to or different from the redacted ones she filed with the Agricultural Pool Motion for Attorney's Fees.

Thus, the Agricultural Pool waived its claim to attorney fees and expenses paid by the Appropriative Pool in the above amounts and the Agricultural Pool should be ordered to reimburse the Appropriative Pool members in the sum of \$483,202.55 and Watermaster in the sum of \$102,557.12.

III.

## THE AGRICULTURAL POOL WAIVED ITS CLAIMS TO ATTORNEY FEES AND EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2019-20 AND 2020-21

The Court has determined that the Agricultural Pool is not entitled to the payment of its attorney fees and expenses for fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21. The reason for its determination is that the Agricultural Pool failed to establish the elements of the Appropriative Pool's obligation for the payment of such expenses under Peace Agreement Paragraph 5.4(a) as set forth by the Court in its May 28, 2021 Order.

The Court's determination applies to all of the Agricultural Pool's attorney fees and expenses in Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 – not only those requested in the Ag Pool Fee Motion. The basis of the Court's ruling is clear. The Agricultural Pool failed to provide unredacted bills that show the purpose of its attorney fees and expenses in Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21; i.e., that those attorney fees and expenses were of benefit to the Agricultural Pool and/or not adverse to the Appropriative Pool. Furthermore, the Agricultural Pool refused an offer to cure its failure by providing minimally redacted bills for FY 2019-20 and 2020-21 and filing them with the court made by John Schatz, as counsel of the Appropriative Pool, and attorneys of nine Appropriative Pool members. [Declaration of John Schatz, ¶6, Exhibit D]

7

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

5.5

Thus, the Agricultural Pool has waived its claim to payment of all of its attorney fees and expenses in Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21.

Therefore, the Agricultural Pool should not retain the payment of its attorney fees and expenses in Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 that have been paid by the Appropriative Pool. It must dislodge those payments. The Agricultural Pool should reimburse the following payments for its attorney fees and expenses to the Appropriative Pool:

- \$300,000 paid by all appropriators for the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Agricultural Pool 1. Legal Budget,
- \$63,314 transferred from the Special Projects Fund (8471) to the Legal Budget to pay for increased legal services in Fiscal Year 2019-20,
- 3. \$4,624.66 paid by four appropriators directly to Watermaster for increased legal services in Fiscal year 2019-20, and
- 4. \$115,263.89 paid by eleven (11) appropriators for the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Agricultural Pool Legal Budget.

Total: \$483,202.55

In addition, the Agricultural Pool should repay Watermaster the sum of \$102,557.12 for the attorney fees and expenses it paid for the Agricultural Pool in Fiscal Year 2020-21. In alternative, the Court should find that said sum is not an obligation of the Appropriative Pool.

### Α. The May 28, 2021 Court Order Defines the Elements of the Appropriative Pool's Obligation for Paying Agricultural Pool Attorney Fees and Expenses

This motion is made in accordance with the Court Order of May 28, 2021 pertaining to the requirements on the Agricultural Pool to obtain payment of its attorney fees and expenses from the Appropriative Pool (hereafter "May 28 Order"). The May 28 Order required the Agricultural Pool to file its motion including all of its bills for attorney fees and expenses, or its claims to payment would be considered waived and the court would vacate the assessments subject to the dispute. [May 28 Order, Paragraph 8.C.II., p. 7, Exhibit 1, Gutierrez Declaration]. The order applies to all payments by the Appropriative Pool for attorney fees and expenses of the Agricultural Pool in fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21.

7 8

.. 

 The genesis of the May 28 Order is the "Notice of Motion and Motion of the Appropriative Pool Member Agencies Re: Agricultural Pool Legal Fees and Other Expenses" dated September 17, 2020 wherein the Appropriative Pool Members sought a determination if its obligation to pay for Agricultural Pool legal expenses and a refund of legal expenses they had paid by requesting the following order:

"an order interpreting the obligation of the AP to pay for legal and other expenses of the Agricultural (Overlying) Pool ("Ag Pool").

"Specifically, the AP Members seek a judicial determination appropriately limiting the expenses that the AP can be required to pay on behalf of the Ag Pool under the Peace Agreement.

"The AP Members seek a further determination, consistent with the above, that the AP and its members are not obligated to pay any Ag Pool legal and expert expenses related to Storage Contests initiated by the Ag Pool. The AP is entitled to a refund of any such expenses already paid" (Emphasis added). [Notice of Motion, page 4, lines 8-12, 19-22; Memorandum of Points and Authorities, page 20, lines 8-15].

The May 28 Order delineated two paths by which the Agricultural Pool may seek payment of its attorneys' fees from the Appropriative Pool. Under the first path, the Agricultural Pool and the Appropriative Pool "can agree to a determination to about payment of 'litigation expense'" adding that the Agricultural Pool must provide its attorney fee bills to the Appropriative Pool and noting that "Otherwise, there will be no way for the Appropriative Pool to determine whether the bills fit within the court's interpretation." [May 28 Order, Paragraph 7 p. 6, Exhibit 1, Gutierrez Declaration]. No such agreement was reached – even after the offer of the Appropriative Pool's counsel. [John Schatz Declaration, Exhibit D]

Under the second path, the Agricultural Pool could seek payment of its attorneys' fees upon a motion for which the court imposed the following requirements: (i) Serve and file a noticed motion; (ii) Notice the motion pursuant to CCP §§1010 and 1020; (iii) Include all supporting documents including the attorney fee bills. As to the third requirement, the court explained that:

....

"It is a denial of due process, as well as fundamentally unfair, for a party to be forced to pay a bill that the party has not seen. In order for a party to contest a bill, the party must be able to see and examine it first. (a) The Court would consider this requirement not only a matter of fundamental fairness, but also for the court and the Appropriative Pool to determine whether the fees for actions benefitting the AgPool (as required by \$\\$54 of the Judgment) and at least not adverse to the Appropriative Pool. (i) The court requires this to be not only a matter of fundamental fairness, but also not to defeat the reasonable expectations of the parties to Peace I. (b) The bills may be redacted, but the court must admonish the parties that the redactions cannot be so extensive as to make the bills meaningless for review by opposing counsel and determination by the court" (Emphasis added). [May 28 Order, Paragraph 8.B.III. page 6, line18 to page 7, line 3, Exhibit 1, Gutierrez Declaration].

The Court also expressed its intent to bring closure to the issue of the obligation for payment of Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses by ordering the Agricultural Pool to serve and file its motion for attorney fees and expenses by July 25,2021. [May 28 Order, Paragraph 8.C.I., p.7, lines 9-12, Exhibit 1, Gutierrez Declaration]. In this context, the Court ruled that the Agricultural Pool will have "waived its current claims for attorney fees and expenses, and any party's payment of assessments subject to the current dispute reimbursed to the paying party." [May 28 Order, Paragraph 8.C.II, page 7, lines 13-18 Exhibit 1, Gutierrez Declaration].

The Agricultural Pool filed such a motion; and it has been denied. Thus, the issue of reimbursement is properly before the court.

# B. The Motion for Attorney's Fees by the Agricultural Pool Waives its Right to Relief under the May 28 Order Due to its Failure to Comply

Pursuant to the May 28 Order, the Agricultural Pool filed the "Notice of Motion and Motion For Attorney's Fees" dated July 26, 2021 ("Ag Pool Fee Motion") for "an order requiring the Appropriative Pool to pay legal expenses in the amount of \$460,723.63 to the Agricultural Pool and \$102,557.12 to the Watermaster Administrative Reserve Account for a

2<u>1</u>
22

total of \$563,280.75." [Ag Pool Fee Motion, page 4, lines 15-18]. The Ag Pool Fee Motion puts at issue all of its budgeted legal expenses for Fiscal Years 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 - asserting that the Appropriative Pool is refusing to pay them.<sup>2</sup>

In response, the Appropriative Pool filed the "Opposition to Agricultural Pool's Motion for Attorney's Fees" dated September 27, 2021 ("AP Opposition"). The thrust of the AP Opposition is the that the Ag Pool Fee Motion fails to comply with the May 28 Order noting that "The Motion completely disregards the Court Order and demands the AP pay all of the legal expenses the Ag Pool has incurred over the last two fiscal years, without limitation." [Emphasis Added] [AP Opposition, page 7, lines 4-6].

The AP Opposition notes the following material failures of the Ag Pool Fee Motion: (i) it does not contain invoices capable of being reviewed meaningfully due to extensive reductions, (ii) it does not show that the legal expenses benefitted the Agricultural Pool or are otherwise unnecessary and unreasonable and (iii) it does not show that the expenses were for legal actions not adverse to the Appropriative Pool.

It also is important to emphasize that the Ag Pool Fee Motion provides invoices only for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses not paid by the Appropriative Pool. The Ag Pool Fee Motion does not provide any evidence that the legal expenses paid by the Appropriative Pool for the enumerated fiscal years were justified under the requirements of the May 28 Order. The "Ag Pool legal expenses are squarely at issue for the entirety of fiscal years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021." [AP Opposition, page 11 lines 20-21].

In addition, the AP Opposition observes that the Agricultural Pool's right to relief under the May 28 Order has been waived due to its failure to comply with that order, and, accordingly, requests reimbursement of all sums paid for Agricultural Pool attorneys' fees and expenses. "Because the Ag Pool has not established any entitlement to attorney's fees and other legal expenses for fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21, . . . the Ag Pool should be responsible to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ag Pool Fee Motion page 5 lines 19-21, page 6 lines 10-12 & 22-24, page 7 lines 1-3 & 7-9, page 9 lines 20-21, page 10 lines 5-8, page 12 lines 12-14 & 21-24, page 13 lines 14-18, page 14 lines 2-5, 7-13 & 19-25.

1213

1415

16

1718

19 20

2122

23

2425

2627

28

reimburse, refund, or otherwise repay all amounts for its expenses for these fiscal years, in the total amount of \$746,830. [AP Opposition, page 17 lines 2-8].

## C. The Court Denies the Ag Pool Fee Motion for Attorney's Fees and Authorizes this Motion for Reimbursement to the Appropriative Pool

On November 5, 2021 at the hearing on the Ag Pool Fee Motion, the Court denied the Ag Pool Fee Motion in its entirety. The Court's written order dated December 3, 2021 states:

"the Motion is DENIED in its entirety, on the basis that all fees sought by the Overlying (Agricultural) Pool are either for activities that were adversarial to the Appropriative Pool or, in the alternative, the Court could not determine whether the claimed fees were fair, reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with the Court's May 28, 2021 Order, due to the level of redaction of the invoices supporting such claimed fees." [Exhibit 2, Gutierrez Declaration]

At the suggestion of Watermaster, the Court also ordered that Watermaster to return all sums currently held in escrow in the same amounts that each Appropriative Pool member paid them into the escrow account. Watermaster did not offer to pay the sum of \$4,624.66 that had been paid by four appropriators directly to Watermaster.

The Court further authorized the City of Chino to bring this motion for reimbursement in order to establish the procedure for reimbursement of any assessments that are not held in the escrow account and that may be due a paying party.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is appropriate for the court to order the Agricultural Pool to reimburse the sum of \$483,202.55 to the Appropriative Pool. It also is appropriate for the court to order the Agricultural Pool to reimburse the sum of \$102,557.12 to Watermaster and/or determine that the Appropriative Pool has no obligation to pay this sum to Watermaster.

However, Chino can only seek and does seek an order that it be reimbursed for all of its assessment payments for Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses in fiscal years 2019-20 and 2020-21 including the sum of \$16,379 Chino paid for fiscal year 2019-20.

Thus, Chino suggests that no order of reimbursement be made in favor of any Appropriative Pool member or Watermaster other than Chino in the absence of any specific request by such a party or by Watermaster. However, Chino does request an order that the Appropriative Pool shall not be obligated to reimburse Watermaster for any portion of the sum of \$102,557.12 that Watermaster paid for Agricultural Pool legal fees in fiscal year 2020-21.

There are three reasons why such orders are just and reasonable. First, the Agricultural Pool failed to demonstrate its entitlement to the payment of its attorney fees and expenses in Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 by the Appropriative Pool under Paragraph 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement and the May 28, 2021 Court Order. Second, most of the assessment payments were paid with public moneys by cities and water districts, which are obligated to account to the public for the expenditure of public funds. Third, public policy is violated by a one-sided attorney fees contract provision that would compel limitless expenditures by one party at the expense of another party.<sup>3</sup>

The only open issue is the method of reimbursement, but the court may adopt any method suggested by any Appropriative Pool member, the Agricultural Pool or Watermaster including whether any such party seeks reimbursement based on this motion. One method is to require the Agricultural Pool to make direct payments to Appropriative Pool members and Watermaster. Another is to permit credits in favor of each Appropriative Pool member against its future obligations to the Agricultural Pool under Paragraph 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement.

The City of Chino is hopeful that this motion is the vehicle envisioned by the Court to bring resolution on the amounts of reimbursement for previously paid Agricultural Pool attorney fees and expenses by the parties to the Judgment and by Watermaster.

والمنافعين المنافعين المنافع ا

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: December 31, 2021

JIMMY L. GUTIERREZ LAW CORPORATION

By:

Jimm Gitting

<sup>3</sup> Ecco-Phoenix Electric Corp v. Howard J. White, Inc. (1969) 1 Cal.3d 266, 272; Civil Code §1667.2

101 City of Chino

### **FEE EXEMPT**

APP-002

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY: STATE BAR NO.: 190842	
NAME: Tracy I Egosoup	FOR COURT USE ONLY
NAME: Tracy J. Egoscue	
FIRM NAME: Egoscue Law Group, Inc.	
STREET ADDRESS: 3834 Pine Ave.	
CITY: Long Beach	
E-MAIL ADDRESS: tracy@egoscuelaw.com	
ATTORNEY FOR (name): Overlying (Agricultural) Pool SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	
STREET ADDRESS: 247 West Third Street	
MAILING ADDRESS:	
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Bernardino, CA 92415	
BRANCH NAME: San Bernardino Justice Center	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Chino Basin Municipal Water District	
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: City of Chino, et al.	
× NOTICE OF APPEAL CROSS-APPEAL	CASE NUMBER:
(UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE)	RCVRS51010
(ONLINITED CIVIL CASE)	
Notice: Please read <i>Information on Appeal Procedures for Unlimited Civil Care APP-001</i> ) before completing this form. This form must be filed in the superior A copy of this form must also be served on the other party or parties to this applicable Judicial Council form (such as APP-009 or APP-009E) for the propagate has been completed and a copy served, the original may then be filed with the context of the c	or court, not in the Court of Appeal. appeal. You may use an of of service. When this document
1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that (name): Overlying (Agricultural) Pool appeals from the following judgment or order in this case, which was entered on (date):  Judgment after jury trial  Judgment after court trial  Default judgment  Judgment after an order granting a summary judgment motion  Judgment of dismissal under Code of Civil Procedure, §§ 581d, 583.250, 583.360,  Judgment of dismissal after an order sustaining a demurrer  X An order after judgment under Code of Civil Procedure, § 904.1(a)(2)  An order or judgment under Code of Civil Procedure, § 904.1(a)(3)—(13)	
Other (describe and specify code section that authorizes this appeal):	
2. For cross-appeals only:	
a. Date notice of appeal was filed in original appeal:	
b. Date superior court clerk mailed notice of original appeal:	
c. Court of Appeal case number <i>(if known)</i> :	
Date: January 4, 2022	
	0 -
Tracy J. Egoscue	J. Goscus

### **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 January 4, 2022, I served the following:

- 1. CITY OF CHINO CORRECTED MOTION FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF ATTORNEYS FEES AND EXPENSES PAID TO THE AGRICULTURAL POOL
- 2. OVERLYING (AGRICULTURAL) POOL NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM 11/5/21 ORDER

/ <u>X</u> /	prepaid, for delivery by United States Postal Service mail at Rancho Cucamonga, California, addresses as follows:  See attached service list: Mailing List 1
//	BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the addressee.
/ <u></u> /	BY FACSIMILE: I transmitted said document by fax transmission from (909) 484-3890 to the fax number(s) indicated. The transmission was reported as complete on the transmission report, which was properly issued by the transmitting fax machine.
<u>/ X _</u> /	BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: I transmitted notice of availability of electronic documents by electronic transmission to the email address indicated. The transmission was reported as complete on the transmission report, which was properly issued by the transmitting electronic mail device. <b>See attached service list:</b> Master Email Distribution List

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

Executed on January 4, 2022 in Rancho Cucamonga, California.

By: Gabriela Garcia Chino Basin Watermaster

### **Mailing List 1**

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

### **Gabriela Garcia**

**Contact Group Name:** 

Master Email Distribution List

#### **Members:**

Agnes Cheng Al Lopez

Alan Frost

Alberto Mendoza Alfonso Ruiz

Allen W. Hubsch

Alma Heustis Alonso Jurado Amanda Coker

Amanda Meere

Amer Jakher

Amy Bonczewski

Andrew Gagen

Andy Campbell Andy Malone

Angelica Todd

**Angelo Simoes** 

Anna Nelson

April Robitaille

Armando Martinez

Art Bennett

Arthur Kidman Ashok Dhingra

Ben Lewis

Ben Peralta

Benjamin M. Weink

Beth.McHenry

**Betty Anderson** 

**Betty Folsom** Bill Schwartz

**Bob Bowcock** 

**Bob DiPrimio** 

Bob Feenstra

Bob Kuhn

Bob Kuhn **Bob Page** 

**Brad Herrema** 

Braden Yu

Braden Yu

**Brandon Howard** Brenda Fowler

Brent Yamasaki Brian Dickinson

Brian Geye

Brian Lee

Carmen Sierra

Carol Boyd

Carolina Sanchez

Casev Costa Cassandra Hooks

Catharine Irvine

agnes.cheng@cc.sbcounty.gov

alopez@wmwd.com

Alan.Frost@dpw.sbcounty.gov

Alberto.Mendoza@cmc.com

alfonso.ruiz@cmc.com ahubsch@loeb.com

alma.heustis@californiasteel.com

ajurado@cbwm.org acoker@cityofchino.org

Amanda.Meere@cao.sbcounty.gov

AJakher@cityofchino.org

ABonczewski@ontarioca.gov

agagen@kidmanlaw.com

acampbell@ieua.org

amalone@westyost.com

angelica.todd@ge.com

Angelo.Simoes@linde.com

atruongnelson@cbwm.org

arobitaille@bhfs.com

armartinez@fontana.org

citycouncil@chinohills.org akidman@kidmanlaw.com

ash@akdconsulting.com

benjamin.lewis@gswater.com

bperalta@tvmwd.com

ben.weink@tetratech.com Beth.McHenry@hoferranch.com

banderson@jcsd.us

bfolsom@icsd.us

bschwartz@mvwd.org

bbowcock@irmwater.com

rjdiprimio@sqvwater.com bobfeenstra@gmail.com

bkuhn@tvmwd.com

bgkuhn@aol.com

Bob.Page@rov.sbcounty.gov

bherrema@bhfs.com

bradeny@cvwdwater.com

Byu@ci.upland.ca.us

brahoward@niagarawater.com

balee@fontanawater.com byamasaki@mwdh2o.com

bdickinson65@gmail.com

bgeye@autoclubspeedway.com

blee@sawaterco.com

carmens@cvwdwater.com

Carol.Boyd@doj.ca.gov

csanchez@westyost.com

ccosta@chinodesalter.org

chooks@niagarawater.com

cirvine@DowneyBrand.com

Chad Blais
Chander Letulle
Charles Field
Charles Linder
Charles Moorrees
Chino Hills City Council

Chris Berch
Chris Diggs
Christiana Daisy
Christofer Coppinger
Christopher M. Sanders
Christopher Quach
Christopher R. Guillen

Cindy Cisneros

Cindy Li

Courtney Jones
Craig Miller
Craig Stewart
Cris Fealy
Dan Arrighi
Dan McKinney
Daniel Bobadilla
Danny Kim

Daniel Bobadilla
Danny Kim
Dave Argo
Dave Crosley
David Aladjem
David De Jesus
David Doublet
David Huynh
Dawn Martin
Denise Garzaro
Dennis Mejia
Dennis Williams
Diana Frederick

Ed Means
Edgar Tellez Foster
Eduardo Espinoza
Edward Kolodziej
Elizabeth M. Calciano
Elizabeth Skrzat
Eric Fordham
Eric Garner
Eric Grubb
Eric Papathakis

Evette Ounanian Frank Brommenschenkel

Frank Yoo Fred Fudacz Fred Galante Gabriela Garcia

Eric Tarango

Eunice Ulloa

Erika Clement

cblais@ci.norco.ca.us cletulle@jcsd.us cdfield@att.net

Charles.Linder@nrgenergy.com 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 cindyc@cvwdwater.com Cindy.li@waterboards.ca.gov cjjones@ontarioca.gov CMiller@wmwd.com

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

dmckinney@douglascountylaw.com

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

ddejesus@tvmwd.com

ddoublet@dpw.sbcounty.gov

dhuynh@cbwm.org

Dawn.Martin@cc.sbcounty.gov

dgarzaro@ieua.org dmejia@ontarioca.gov

dwilliams@geoscience-water.com diana.frederick@cdcr.ca.gov 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 frank.brommen@verizon.net

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

ggarcia@cbwm.org

Garrett Rapp Gene Tanaka Geoffrey Kamansky Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel

Gerald Yahr
Gidti Ludesirishoti
Gina Nicholls
Gino L. Filippi
Gracie Torres
Greg Woodside
Gregor Larabee
Henry DeHaan
Irene Islas
James Curatalo
James Jenkins

James Curatalo James Jenkins James McKenzie Jane Anderson Janine Wilson Jasmin A. Hall Jason Marseilles Jason Pivovaroff

Jayne Joy

Jean Cihigoyenetche

Jeff Evers Jeff Mosher Jeffrey L. Pierson Jennifer Hy-Luk

Jeremy N. Jungreis - General Counsel for OCWD

Jessie Ruedas Jim Markman Jim W. Bowman

Jimmy Gutierrez - Law Offices of Jimmy Gutierrez

Jimmy Medrano

jimmy@city-attorney.com

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

John Lopez and Nathan Cole

John Mendoza John Partridge John Schatz John Thornton Jose A Galindo

John Lopez

grapp@westyost.com Gene.Tanaka@bbklaw.com gkamansky@niagarawater.com geoffreyvh60@gmail.com

yahrj@koll.com

GidtiL@cvwdwater.com gnicholls@nossaman.com Ginoffvine@aol.com gtorres@wmwd.com gwoodside@ocwd.com Gregor.Larabee@cdcr.ca.go

Gregor.Larabee@cdcr.ca.gov Hdehaan1950@gmail.com irene.islas@bbklaw.com jamesc@cvwdwater.com

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

janderson@jcsd.us JWilson@cbwm.org jhall@ieua.org jmarseilles@ieua.org JPivovaroff@wmwd.com Jayne.Joy@waterboards.ca.gov Jean@thejclawfirm.com jevers@niagarawater.com

jevers@niagarawater.con jmosher@sawpa.org jpierson@intexcorp.com jhyluk@ieua.org

JJungreis@rutan.com

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

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

Josh Swift Joshua Aguilar Justin Brokaw Justin Nakano

Justin Scott-Coe Ph. D.

Karen Williams Kathleen Brundage Keith Kramer

Keith Person Ken Waring Kevin O'Toole Kevin Sage

Kimberly E. Leefatt Kristina Robb Kurt Berchtold **Kyle Brochard** Kyle Snay Larry Cain Laura Mantilla Laura Yraceburu Lauren Harold Linda Jadeski Lisa Lemoine

Marcella Correa Marco Tule Maria Avala Maria Mendoza Maribel Sosa Marilyn Levin Mark D. Hensley Mark Wildermuth Mark Wiley

Liz Hurst

Martin Cihigoyenetche

Martin Rauch Martin Zvirbulis Mathew C. Ballantyne Matthew H. Litchfield

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

Michael P. Thornton

Michelle Licea Michelle Staples Mike Gardner Mike Maestas Moore, Toby **MWDProgram** Nadia Aguirre Natalie Costaglio Nathan deBoom

jmswift@fontanawater.com

jaguilar@ieua.org

jbrokaw@marygoldmutualwater.com

JNakano@cbwm.org jscottcoe@mvwd.org kwilliams@sawpa.org

kathleen.brundage@californiasteel.com

kkramer@fontana.org

keith.person@waterboards.ca.gov

kwaring@jcsd.us kotoole@ocwd.com Ksage@IRMwater.com kleefatt@bhfs.com KRobb@cc.sbcounty.gov kberchtold@gmail.com KBrochard@rwglaw.com kylesnay@gswater.com larry.cain@cdcr.ca.gov Imantilla@ieua.org lyraceburu@bhfs.com lharold@linklogistics.com ljadeski@wvwd.org LLemoine@wmwd.com

ehurst@ieua.org MCorrea@rwglaw.com mtule@ieua.org mayala@jcsd.us

mmendoza@westyost.com msosa@ci.pomona.ca.us marilyn.levin@doj.ca.gov

mhensley@hensleylawgroup.com mwildermuth@westyost.com

mwiley@chinohills.org marty@thejclawfirm.com martin@rauchcc.com mezvirbulis@sqvwater.com mballantyne@cityofchino.org mlitchfield@tvmwd.com matencio@fontana.org mwalker@dpw.sbcounty.gov

mgarcia@ieua.org mblazevic@westyost.com michael.adler@mcmcnet.net mthornton@tkeengineering.com

mlicea@mvwd.org

mstaples@jacksontidus.law mgardner@wmwd.com mikem@cvwdwater.com TobyMoore@gswater.com MWDProgram@sdcwa.org naguirre@tvmwd.com

natalie.costaglio@mcmcnet.net

n8deboom@gmail.com

Neetu Gupta
Nichole Horton
Nick Jacobs
Nicole deMoet
Nicole Escalante
Noah Golden-Krasner

Parker Simon Paul Deutsch Paul Hofer Paul Hofer Paul S. Leon

Penny Alexander-Kelley

Pete Hall
Pete Hall
Pete Vicario
Peter Hettinga
Peter Kavounas
Peter Rogers
Rachel Avila
Rachel Ortiz
Randy Visser
Richard Anderson
Rick Darnell
Rick Rees

Rickey S. Manbahal

Rita Pro

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

Ron LaBrucherie, Jr. Ronald C. Pietersma

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

Stephanie Gutierrez Stephanie Reimer Stephen Deitsch

Skylar Stephens

Sonya Barber

Sonya Zite

ngupta@ieua.org

Nichole\_Horton@ci.pomona.ca.us

njacobs@somachlaw.com ndemoet@ci.upland.ca.us NEscalante@ontarioca.gov Noah.goldenkrasner@doj.ca.gov

psimon@bhfs.com

paul.deutsch@woodplc.com farmerhofer@aol.com farmwatchtoo@aol.com pleon@ontarioca.gov

Palexander-kelley@cc.sbcounty.gov

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

RVisser@sheppardmullin.com

horsfly1@yahoo.com

Richard.Darnell@nrgenergy.com richard.rees@woodplc.com smanbahal@wvwd.org 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
rllamas71@yahoo.com
rfavela@cbwm.org
RShaw@wmwd.com
shlee@ieua.org

snelson@ci.norco.ca.us srubenstein@wpcarey.com directorrose@mvwd.org Sarah.Foley@bbklaw.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

Stephanie.Gutierrez@cc.sbcounty.gov

SReimer@mvwd.org

stephen.deitsch@bbklaw.com

Steve Kennedy Steve M. Anderson

Steve Nix Steve Riboli Steve Smith

Steve W. Ledbetter, PE Steven Andrews Engineering

Steven Flower Steven J. Elie Steven J. Elie Steven Popelar Steven Raughley Susan Palmer Sylvie Lee 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 McPeters Tom O'Neill Toni Medell Tony Long Toyasha Sebbag Tracy J. Egoscue

Van Jew Vanny Khu Veronica Tristan Veva Weamer Victor Preciado Vivian Castro

WestWater Research, LLC

William J Brunick

Wade Fultz

wurena@emeraldus.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

sflower@rwglaw.com selie@ieua.org s.elie@mpglaw.com spopelar@jcsd.us

Steven.Raughley@cao.sbcounty.gov

spalmer@kidmanlaw.com

slee@ieua.org
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

THMcP@aol.com

toneill@chinodesalter.org mmedel@mbakerintl.com tlong@angelica.com tsebbag@cbwcd.org tracy@egoscuelaw.com vjew@wvwd.org VKhu@ontarioca.gov

VKhu@ontarioca.gov vtristan@jcsd.us

vweamer@westyost.com

Victor\_Preciado@ci.pomona.ca.us

vcastro@cityofchino.org Wade.Fultz@cmc.com

research@waterexchange.com bbrunick@bmblawoffice.com wurena@emeraldus.com