1	SCOTT S. SLATER (State Bar No. 117317) SSlater@bhfs.com				
2	BRADLEY J. HERREMA (State Bar No. 228976) BHerrema@bhfs.com				
3	LAURA K. YRACEBURU (State Bar No. 333085) lyraceburu@bhfs.com				
4	BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP 1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor				
5	Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2102 Telephone: 805.963.7000				
6	Facsimile: 805.965.4333				
7	Attorneys for CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER				
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO				
10					
11	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER	Case No. RCVRS51010			
12	DISTRICT,	[Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable			
13	Plaintiff,	Gilbert Ochoa]			
14	V.	CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER'S OPPOSITION TO ONTARIO'S MOTION			
15	CITY OF CHINO, et al.,	CHALLENGING WATERMASTER'S NOVEMBER 17, 2022 ACTIONS/DECISION TO APPROVE THE			
16	Defendant.				
17		FY 2022/2023 ASSESSMENT PACKAGE			
18		Date: April 5, 2023 Time: 9:00 a.m.			
19		Dept.: S24			
20		[Declaration of Peter Kavounas in Support of Chino Basin Watermaster's Opposition to			
21		Ontario's Motion Challenging Watermaster's November 17, 2022 Actions/Decision to Approve			
22		the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package filed concurrently herewith]			
23	,				
24					
25					
26					
27					
28		,			

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

1			TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2				Page
3	I.	INTR	RODUCTION	4
4	II.	BAC	KGROUND	5
5		A.	Watermaster Assessment of DYYP Deposits and Withdrawals	5
6		В.	Watermaster Approval of the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package	6
7	III.	ARGUMENT		7
8		A.	Imported Water Performance Criteria in Exhibit G Do Not Apply to Voluntary Withdrawals or "Takes" from MWD's DYYP Account	7
10		В.	The Assessment Package Properly Accounts for Withdrawals From MWD's DYYP Storage Account	8
11			1. The Judgment Does Not Include DYYP Withdrawals within the Definition of "Production"	9
12			2. Watermaster's Assessment of Production Has Remained Consister	
13			Throughout the Life of the DYYP	
14		C.	The Time to Challenge the 2019 Letter Agreement and the DYYP Operation Thereunder Expired June 20, 2019.	11
15	IV. C	CON	CLUSION	
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>				
28			2	

# **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES** Page(s) Cases City of Los Angeles v. City of Glendale (1943) 23 Cal.2d 68 ......9 City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando (1975) 14 Cal.3d 199 ......9 Hi-Desert Cnty. Water Dist. v. Blue Skies Country Club, Inc. (1994)

#### 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

On November 23, 2022, this Court determined that Ontario's challenge to Watermaster's Fiscal Year ("FY") 2021/2022 Assessment Package ("Prior Challenge") was effectively a challenge to a 2019 letter agreement regarding the Dry Year Yield Program ("DYYP"), and was time barred. (November 3, 2022 Order denying Ontario's Application for an Order to Extend Time Under Judgment, Paragraph 31(c) to Challenge Watermaster Action/Decision on November 18, 2021 to Approve the FY 2021/2022 Assessment Package ("November 3, 2022 Order").) Ontario now seeks to refresh and restate its prior challenge against the same assessment mechanism for a new year arising from the same transaction and occurrence, through its February 15, 2023 Motion Challenging Watermaster's November 17, 2022 Actions/Decision to Approve the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package ("Motion"). The crux of its challenge remains that Watermaster failed to properly account for and assess the recovery of supplemental water stored under the DYYP as "production" in the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package.

Seeking to avoid the disposition of the November 3, 2022 Order, this time Ontario contends that Watermaster breached a duty arising from the failure to comply with performance criteria in Exhibit "G" to the Dry-Year Yield Agreement<sup>2</sup> ("Exhibit G") – rather than the adoption of the 2019 Letter Agreement itself. It then repeats its previous contentions that the failure to assess the withdrawal of stored water violates the Judgment and Court orders because it is "production" and that Watermaster failed to provide proper notice of the 2019 Letter Agreement to Ontario.

Insofar as the argument that there is an alleged breach of the performance criteria in Exhibit G, the simple answer is that the intent of the parties thereto and the plain meaning of the 2019 Letter Agreement is that the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California ("MWD") - the entity that owns the stored water - was to enable more liberal terms of withdrawal to encourage the groundwater to be extracted – and not be held as a holdover in storage beyond the term of its Dry-Year Yield Agreement. It would be contrary to the objective intent of the parties

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Ontario Request for Judicial Notice ("Ontario RJN"), Exh. 34 ("2019 Letter Agreement"). <sup>2</sup> Agreement No. 49960 Groundwater Storage Program Funding Agreement; see Ontario RJN, Exh. 8.

to the 2019 Letter Agreement to authorize voluntary withdrawals only to maintain the restrictive criteria in Exhibit G that would severely inhibit withdrawals.

#### II. **BACKGROUND**

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 facts giving rise to this dispute are as previously briefed for this Court. On November 3, 2022, this Court denied Ontario's Prior Challenge relating to FY 2021/2022 Assessment Package. (Motion, p. 4.) On February 15, 2023, Ontario filed this Motion challenging the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package on nearly identical grounds as its Prior Challenge. Mindful of the extensive previous briefing and the Court's November 3, 2022 Order, Watermaster respectfully refers the Court to, and hereby incorporates, all filings, briefing, and orders made with respect to the Prior Challenge. Following denial of the Prior Challenge, Ontario filed an appeal of the Court's November 3, 2022 Order. (Motion, p. 4.)

#### A. Watermaster Assessment of DYYP Deposits and Withdrawals

MWD is the owner and holder of the DYYP storage account. (Declaration of Peter Kavounas in Support of Watermaster's Opposition to Ontario's Motion Challenging Watermaster's November 17, 2022 Actions/Decision to Approve the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package ["Kavounas Decl."] ¶ 3.) To fill the account, there must be "deposits" into the DYYP account. (Id.) Deposits are accomplished in two ways: (1) direct recharge of wet water into the Basin and (2) "in-lieu" recharge of the Basin. (Id.) The former is self-explanatory, the latter refers to a means of depositing water by taking surface water and leaving groundwater that a Party might lawfully pump, in the ground. The net effect is the same.

Where the DYYP is concerned, a participating Party takes imported water from MWD directly into its delivery system and foregoes the pumping of the groundwater it would otherwise produce. (Kavounas Decl. ¶ 5.) An "in-lieu" deposit into MWD's DYYP storage account is effectuated. "In-lieu" recharge is accomplished through TVMWD, IEUA, and the participating retailers in the DYYP via the Dry-Year Yield Agreement. (Id.) IEUA is designated by the DYYP Operating Committee as the agency to track and certify DYYP transactions, and provided the amounts of water that should be considered "in-lieu" deposits to Watermaster. (Id. at ¶ 6.) Watermaster uses information certified by IEUA to account for deposits to and withdrawals from

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 DYYP storage account, and ultimately to calculate assessments. (*Id.* at ¶ 9.)

#### В. Watermaster Approval of the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package

Following the close of the 2021/2022 production year, Watermaster staff distributed water activity reports to all Parties for their review of their water activity – groundwater production, withdrawals of water from storage, placement of water into storage – during production year 2021/2022. (Ontario RJN, Exh. 55, p. 2.) Watermaster staff compiled all of this information into its accounting for all such activity during the year. (Id.) Watermaster staff then prepared its draft Assessment Package, spreading the FY 2022/2023 budgeted expenses among the Parties based on the directions in the Pooling Plans, Court orders, and agreements among the Parties. (Kavounas Decl. ¶ 10; see Ontario RJN, Exh. 55, pp. 2–3.)

Watermaster held Assessment Package Workshops on October 18, 2022 and on November 1, 2022 to present the draft FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package to the Parties and provide them the opportunity to raise questions and concerns, and provide feedback. (Ontario RJN, Exh. 55, p. 3.)

Watermaster presented the draft FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package to the Pool Committees for their advice and assistance during their respective November 10, 2022 regular meetings. (Id.) During the Appropriative Pool Committee's November 10, 2022 meeting, representatives from the City of Chino ("Chino"), Monte Vista Water District ("Monte Vista"), and Ontario offered advice that the Board should not adopt the Assessment Package as drafted as it calculated assessments based on the approved FY 2022/23 budget which was the subject of litigation initiated by the same three agencies<sup>3</sup>; in addition, the Ontario's representative expressed the City's continuing opposition to the voluntary withdrawals from MWD's DYYP storage account not being subject to assessments as another reason for opposing the Assessment Package as presented. (Id.) All three parties acknowledged that there were no arithmetic errors in the draft Assessment Package's computations. (Id.) The Overlying (Non-Agricultural) Pool Committee gave the Pool's representatives discretionary authority to vote at Advisory Committee and Board

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This was in reference to these parties' challenge to the Budget's inclusion of expenses related to the CEQA review of the 2020 Optimum Basin Management Plan. On November 18, 2022, this court denied those parties challenge.

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

meetings subject to changes which they deem necessary. (Id.) The Overlying (Agricultural) Pool Committee expressed support for the Assessment Package as then presented. (*Id.*)

Watermaster presented the draft FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package at the Advisory Committee's November 17, 2022 meeting for the Committee's advice and assistance. (Kavounas Decl. ¶ 11.) The Advisory Committee recommended approval of the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package as presented by a vote of 72.141 votes (out of 100) in favor. (Id.) Ontario, Chino, and Monte Vista cast dissenting votes. (Id.) On November 17, 2022, the Board approved the 2022/2023 Assessment Package by a majority vote, with the Board member appointed by Monte Vista Water District voting against. (*Id.* at ¶ 12.) Invoices, generated based on the approved Assessment Package, were then emailed to the Parties. (Id.)

#### III. **ARGUMENT**

Watermaster properly approved the FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package. As before, Ontario's challenge is essentially to the approval and subsequent implementation of the 2019 Letter Agreement signed by Watermaster, IEUA, TVMWD, and MWD.

#### Imported Water Performance Criteria in Exhibit G Do Not Apply to Α. Voluntary Withdrawals or "Takes" from MWD's DYYP Account.

Exhibit G to the Dry-Year Yield Agreement, as amended, includes performance criteria for the benefit of MWD, enabling it to *compel* participating local agencies to pump from the DYYP storage account "in lieu" of receiving imported water deliveries. Exhibit G does not impose any requirements on Watermaster, let alone prescribe how Watermaster must levy production assessments. (See Ontario RJN, Exh. 16, Exh. G.) These conditions are for the benefit of MWD to establish terms under which its water will be recovered.

Ontario argues that the 2019 Letter Agreement amended the Dry-Year Yield Agreement and Exhibit G to allow Parties "to pump over the groundwater baseline as defined in Exhibit G," but "does nothing to amend or modify the imported water criteria contained in Exhibit G." (Motion, p. 11.) This argument, however, assumes that performance criteria in Exhibit G govern

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Exhibit G was deleted and replaced in its entirety by Amendment No. 8 to Groundwater Storage Program Funding Agreement No. 49960, dated January 23, 2015. (See Ontario RJN, Exh. 16, ¶

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

voluntary withdrawals. This is not the case, as Exhibit G explicitly applies only to MWD calls that *compel* Parties to withdraw from the DYYP storage account (a "call") instead of receiving surface deliveries. (Ontario RJN, Exh. 16, Exh. G, p. 1 ["At no time shall a Metropolitan call result in a reduction in imported water deliveries . . . "[[emphasis in original]; id. at pp. 3–6 [examples reference a "call"].) The 2019 Letter Agreement references and incorporates the definition of "groundwater baseline" from Exhibit G, but is not otherwise subject to Exhibit G. Constraining the withdrawal of water by requiring compliance with the imported water baseline in Exhibit G would defeat the entire purpose of establishing a mechanism for voluntary withdrawals.

#### B. The Assessment Package Properly Accounts for Withdrawals From MWD's DYYP Storage Account.

Watermaster has properly accounted for DYYP-related activities, including voluntary withdrawals, during the life of the DYYP. Critical to understanding Watermaster's assessment methodology for the DYYP deposits and withdrawals is understanding Watermaster's role as the accountant for the Chino Basin. This means that Watermaster tracks (and assesses) transfer of water among accounts even when water does not physically leave the Basin. In claiming that all groundwater production must be assessed. Ontario oversimplifies the issue.

From an accounting perspective, there is no difference between a Party pumping for its own use and an "in-lieu" deposit into MWD's DYYP storage account. (Kavounas Decl. ¶ 7.) In both situations, water is leaving a Party's account, thus triggering Watermaster's production assessment. (Id. at  $\P \P 5, 7$ .) In the case of wet water recharge deposits, the wet water recharge is not native to the Chino Basin and no Party has any right to the wet water recharge absent additional action. (Id. at ¶ 7.) The withdrawal from the DYYP storage account does not cause any water to leave the Chino Basin in an accounting sense because the water in the DYYP storage account is not considered assessable Basin groundwater as it was either recharged imported water (that was not brought to the Basin as replenishment water) or was assessed when deposited "inlieu" to the DYYP storage account. (Id.) While water is withdrawn from the DYYP storage account via physical extraction from the Basin, the water is not considered produced from any

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Party's account in the Chino Basin. (*Id.* at  $\P$  8.)

#### 1. The Judgment Does Not Include DYYP Withdrawals within the **Definition of "Production"**

Ontario contends that the recovery of stored water is "production" within the meaning of the Judgment. This is false. Nowhere in the Judgment, the Court's orders, or Watermaster Rules and Regulations does "production" refer to the withdrawal or recovery of supplemental water in a Storage and Recovery Program or the DYYP specifically. "Produce" in the Judgment means "[t]o pump or extract ground water from Chino Basin." (Judgment ¶¶ 4(q), (s) [emphasis added].) When MWD stores water pursuant to the DYYP, that water is not within an appropriator's "right" to "produc[e] . . . from the Chino Basin." (Judgment ¶ 4(c).) The DYYP water belongs to MWD, which as authorized dominion and control, unless and until MWD authorizes its recovery. (See City of Los Angeles v. City of Glendale (1943) 23 Cal.2d 68, 76-77; City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando (1975)14 Cal.3d 199, 260, 261, 264.)

Watermaster has neither ignored nor diminished any Party's rights under the Judgment in assessing production of native water as required and addressing the storing Party's obligation under the DYYP pursuant to the Peace Agreement section 5.2(c)(ix) and the plenary power of Watermasters to regulate storage of supplemental water by agreement. (Judgment, ¶¶ 11, 12 & 14.) Hi-Desert Cnty. Water Dist. v. Blue Skies Country Club, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1723, 1737, cited by Ontario, is inapposite as it directly implicated priorities of water rights to safe yield. In short, the dispute arose as to which parties must pay for the cost of importing water to replenish the basin. (23 Cal.App.4th at 1736.) The Court of Appeal opined that the trial court's determination on bearing the cost of importing replenishment water to off-set production had altered the rights of the parties. (*Id.* at 1737.) In the instant case, Watermaster has not altered the rights of any Party inner-se to pump safe yield or to replenish overproduction. Not assessing the withdrawal of imported water stored by MWD for its benefit does not impact the respective water rights of the members of the Appropriative Pool to the Judgment any more than an entity's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Ontario's argument that Watermaster's decision not to assess withdrawals from the DYYP storage account is inconsistent with the Judgment was raised in Ontario's Prior Challenge. The November 3, 2022 Order addressed this issue by illustrating how the Judgment treats native Basin water and imported or stored water differently.

decision to buy more imported water.

# 2. Watermaster's Assessment of Production Has Remained Consistent Throughout the Life of the DYYP

Ontario claims that "[u]ntil very recently, all water produced in the Basin was assessed consistent with the terms of the Judgment" (Motion, p. 8) and that "Watermaster assessed DYY Program water in production years 2002/03 through 2010/11 during the first cycle of the DYY Program," but argues that Watermaster did not properly impose assessments for the second cycle of the DYYP in production years 2011/2012 to 2022/2023. (Motion, p. 13; Declaration of Courtney Jones in Support of Ontario's Motion ["Jones Decl."] ¶ 50.) This is false. Watermaster's methodology is unchanged from commencement through the current period. (Kayounas Decl. ¶ 13.)

For the entire duration of the DYYP, neither withdrawals from the DYYP storage account nor wet water recharge deposits have ever been assessed, while "in-lieu" deposits have been assessed. (Kavounas Decl. ¶ 13.) This is apparent on the face of assessment packages spanning the life of the DYYP (FY 2003/2004 to FY 2022/2023), which Ontario included with its Motion. (Ontario RJN, Exhs. 37–53, 56.) From the first DYYP cycle – which Ontario concedes properly assessed DYYP deposits and withdrawals – the FY 2003/2004 assessment package illustrates how "in-lieu" deposits are assessed, the FY 2004/2005 assessment package shows how "in-lieu" deposits are assessed while wet water deposits are not, and FY 2008/2009 assessment package compares the assessment of "in-lieu" deposits with the non-assessment of wet water deposits and withdrawals. Watermaster has applied the same assessment methodology during the second DYYP cycle (FY 2017/2018 to FY 2022/2023). As shown in the data provided by Ontario, Watermaster has never assessed withdrawals or wet water recharge. (Jones Decl. ¶ 50.)

The FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package utilizes a method for assessing DYYP water consistent with the last 19 years of assessment packages. In production year 2021/2022 (FY

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The Assessment Package clarifies "[a] DYY in lieu 'put' is shown as a positive number and a DYY 'take' is shown as a negative number" in the "Storage and Recovery Program(s)" column (column 2K), which is then added to actual production (column 2J) to equal assessable production (called "Total Production and Exchanges" in column 2L). (Ontario RJN, Exh. 47, Assessment Package References and Definitions, p. 2.)

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

2022/2023), there were only withdrawals, no deposits, from the DYYP account – thus DYYP withdrawals for use by CVWD and Fontana Water Company ("FWC") should not have been assessed. (Kavounas Decl. ¶ 17.) Watermaster did not "suddenly revers[e] course" in the second DYYP cycle after assessing DYYP deposits and withdrawals "consistently" in the first. (Motion, p. 13.) Rather, changes in MWD's storage patterns drive the change Ontario perceives. DYYP "in-lieu" deposits are assessed at the time the water is transferred into MWD'S DYYP storage account, while wet water recharge deposits are not. (Kavounas Decl. ¶¶ 14, 16–18; Jones Decl. ¶ 50; see Ontario RJN, Exhs. 37–53, 56.) This practice has not changed during the life of the DYYP. (Kayounas Decl. ¶ 13.) In the second cycle of the DYYP, MWD simply changed its storage patterns. During the second cycle, MWD only recharged the DYYP storage account by wet water, not "in-lieu" deposits, causing different assessment patterns between the first and second cycles of the DYYP. (Kayounas Decl. ¶ 17.)8

#### C. The Time to Challenge the 2019 Letter Agreement and the DYYP Operation Thereunder Expired June 20, 2019.

As the Court concluded in its November 3, 2022 Order, and for the reasons set forth therein, the time for Ontario to challenge the validity of the 2019 Letter Agreement and operations thereunder expired on June 20, 2019.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Moreover, in the chart provided in the Jones Declaration, there is no quantity of water shown in the "Water Not Assessed" column for Assessment Year 2022/2023, which is the very year that Ontario challenges for failing to assess. (Jones Decl. ¶ 50.) This is contrary to Ontario's claims and supports Watermaster's position that the takes were not improperly "exempt from assessment."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Voluntary withdrawals provide additional flexibility to the Parties to the Judgment, but do not provide free, unassessed water. When a Party withdraws water from MWD's DYYP storage account, the Parties who use the water pay MWD for the water at MWD's "then applicable fullservice rate . . . as if such Stored Water Deliveries were surface water deliveries through its service connection . . . [less] credits for the Operation and Maintenance Costs and the Electrical Costs associated with the Stored Water Delivery." (Ontario RJN, Exh. 8 [Dry-Year Yield Agreement], § VII.D.) Pursuant to the Dry-Year Yield Agreement, MWD compensates Watermaster for Watermaster's administration of the DYYP. (Ontario RJN, Exh. 8, § VI.D.3.) Payment of MWD's rates will cover MWD's costs, which include costs associated with the Dry-Year Yield Agreement. Therefore, in payment of MWD's rates, CVWD and FWC or any other Party that voluntarily purchases DYYP water will necessarily pay costs to cover Watermaster's expenses for administration of the DYYP. Moreover, pursuant to the Dry-Year Yield Agreement, MWD contributed up to \$27.5 million for the design and construction of facilities that the Parties may use for any purpose, so long as the use does not interfere with the DYYP. (Ontario RJN, Exh. 8, §§ V.A.1; VIII.A.)

#### IV. **CONCLUSION**

Ontario again brings a challenge to the 2019 Letter Agreement masquerading as a motion to attack Watermaster's FY 2022/2023 Assessment Package. For the reasons set forth in this Court's November 3, 2022 ruling, the Motion is wrong in its allegation that Watermaster must impose a production assessment on stored supplemental water in the Dry-Year Yield Agreement and is otherwise untimely.

Dated: March 22, 2023

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP

BY:

BRADLEY J. HERREMA LAURA K. YRACEBURU

Attorneys for CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER

## CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER

Case No. RCVRS 51010

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

### PROOF OF SERVICE

ı	مما	lare	th	te
ı		1016		141

I am employed in the County of San Bernardino, California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the action within. My business address is Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730; telephone (909) 484-3888.

CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER'S OPPOSITION TO ONTARIO'S MOTION

On March 22, 2023, I served the following:

electronic mail device.

	CHALLENGING WATERMASTER'S NOVEMBER 17, 2022 ACTIONS/DECISION TO APPROVE THE FY 2022/2023 ASSESSMENT PACKAGE
/ <u>X</u> /	BY MAIL: in said cause, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed with postage thereon fully prepaid, for delivery by the 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.
//	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

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

Executed on March 22, 2023 in Rancho Cucamonga, California.

See attached service list: Master Email Distribution List

By: Ruby Favela Quintero Chino Basin Watermaster

PAUL HOFER 11248 S TURNER AVE ONTARIO, CA 91761

JEFF PIERSON 2 HEXAM IRVINE, CA 92603

# **Ruby Favela Quintero**

**Contact Group Name:** 

Master Email Distribution List

Categories:

Main Email Lists

#### **Members:**

Adrian Gomez Alan Frost

Alberto Mendoza Alejandro R. Reyes Alexandria Moore Alexis Mascarinas

Alfonso Ruiz Allen Hubsch Alma Heustis Alonso Jurado

Alyssa Coronado Amanda Coker Amer Jakher Amy Bonczewski Andrew Gagen Andy Campbell Andy Malone

Angelica Todd Anna Nelson Anthony Alberti April Robitaille Art Bennett

Arthur Kidman Ashok Dhingra Ben Lewis

Ben Peralta

Benjamin M. Weink

Beth.McHenry Betty Anderson Bill Schwartz Bob Bowcock

Bob DiPrimio Bob Feenstra Bob Kuhn Bob Kuhn Bob Page

Brad Herrema Braden Yu Bradley Jensen Brandi Belmontes

Brandi Goodman-Decoud

Brandon Howard Brenda Fowler Brent Yamasaki Brian Dickinson Brian Geye Brian Lee

Carmen Sierra Carol Boyd

Bryan Smith

Carolina Sanchez

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

arreyes@sgvwater.com amoore@cbwm.org

AMascarinas@ontarioca.gov alfonso.ruiz@cmc.com ahubsch@hubschlaw.com

alma.heustis@californiasteel.com

ajurado@cbwm.org
acoronado@sarwc.com
amandac@cvwdwater.com
AJakher@cityofchino.org
ABonczewski@ontarioca.gov
agagen@kidmanlaw.com
acampbell@ieua.org
amalone@westyost.com
angelica.todd@ge.com
atruongnelson@cbwm.org
aalberti@sgvwater.com

arobitaille@bhfs.com 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 bschwartz@mvwd.org bbowcock@irmwater.com rjdiprimio@sgvwater.com bobfeenstra@gmail.com bkuhn@tvmwd.com bgkuhn@aol.com

Bob.Page@rov.sbcounty.gov

bherrema@bhfs.com Byu@ci.upland.ca.us

bradley.jensen@cao.sbcounty.gov BBelmontes@ontarioca.gov

bgdecoud@mvwd.org

brahoward@niagarawater.com balee@fontanawater.com byamasaki@mwdh2o.com bdickinson65@gmail.com

bgeye@autoclubspeedway.com

blee@sawaterco.com bsmith@icsd.us

carmens@cvwdwater.com Carol.Boyd@doj.ca.gov csanchez@westyost.com Casey Costa ccosta@chinodesalter.org
Cassandra Hooks chooks@niagarawater.com

Cathleen Pieroni - Inland Empire Utilities Agency (cpieroni@ieua.org)

cpieroni@ieua.org
Chad Blais cblais@ci.norco.ca.us
Chander Letulle cletulle@jcsd.us
Charles Field cdfield@att.net

Charles Moorrees cmoorrees@sawaterco.com
Chino Hills City Council citycouncil@chinohills.org

Chris Berch 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

City of Chino, Administration Department

administration@cityofchino.org

cjjones@ontarioca.gov CMiller@wmwd.com craig.stewart@wsp.com cifealy@fontanawater.com CBurton@cityofchino.org darrighi@sgvwater.com

dmckinney@douglascountylaw.com

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

ddejesus@tvmwd.com dhuynh@cbwm.org dawn.forgeur@stoel.com dgarzaro@ieua.org dmejia@ontarioca.gov

dwilliams@geoscience-water.com dhoffman@fennemorelaw.com diana.frederick@cdcr.ca.gov edmeans@roadrunner.com

elin@ieua.org

etellezfoster@cbwm.org EduardoE@cvwdwater.com edward.kolodziej@ge.com ecalciano@hensleylawgroup.com

elizabeth.ewens@stoel.com

ESkrzat@cbwcd.org

eric\_fordham@geopentech.com

eric.garner@bbklaw.com ericg@cvwdwater.com erobinson@kmtg.com Eric.Papathakis@cdcr.ca.gov

Courtney Jones

**Cindy Cisneros** 

Cindy Li

Chris Diggs

Christiana Daisy

Christofer Coppinger

Christopher Quach

Christopher R. Guillen

Christopher M. Sanders

Craig Miller
Craig Stewart
Cris Fealy
Curtis Burton
Dan Arrighi
Dan McKinney
Daniel Bobadilla

Danny Kim
Dave Argo
Dave Crosley
David Aladjem

David De Jesus David Huynh Dawn Forgeur Denise Garzaro Dennis Mejia Dennis Williams Derek Hoffman

Diana Frederick Ed Means

Eddie Lin (elin@ieua.org) Edgar Tellez Foster

Eduardo Espinoza Edward Kolodziej Elizabeth M. Calciano Elizabeth P. Ewens Elizabeth Skrzat Eric Fordham

Eric Garner Eric Grubb Eric N. Robinson

Eric Papathakis

Eric Tarango Erika Clement Eunice Ulloa

Eunice Ulloa - City of Chino (eulloa@cityofchino.org)

Evette Ounanian
Frank Yoo
Fred Fudacz
Fred Galante
G. Michael Milhiser
G. Michael Milhiser
Garrett Rapp
Gene Tanaka
Geoffrey Kamansky

Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel

Gerald Yahr
Gina Gomez
Gina Nicholls
Gino L. Filippi
Gracie Torres
Grant Mann
Greg Woodside
Gregor Larabee
Ha T. Nguyen
Henry DeHaan
Irene Islas
James Curatalo
James Jenkins

Janelle S.H. Krattiger, Esq

Janine Wilson
Jasmin A. Hall
Jason Marseilles
Jason Pivovaroff
Jayne Joy

Jean Cihigoyenetche

Jeff Evers
Jeff Mosher
Jeffrey L. Pierson
Jenifer Ryan
Jennifer Hy-Luk
Jeremy N. Jungries
Jesse Pompa
Jessie Ruedas
Jim Markman

Jimmy Gutierrez - Law Offices of Jimmy Gutierrez

Jimmy L. Gutierrez Jimmy Medrano Jiwon Seung Joanne Chan Joao Feitoza Jody Roberto

Jim W. Bowman

edtarango@fontanawater.com

Erika.clement@sce.com eulloa@cityofchino.org

eulloa@cityofchino.org
EvetteO@cvwdwater.com
FrankY@cbwm.org
ffudacz@nossaman.com
fgalante@awattorneys.com
Milhiser@hotmail.com
directormilhiser@mvwd.org
grapp@westyost.com
Gene.Tanaka@bbklaw.com
gkamansky@niagarawater.com
geoffreyvh60@gmail.com

yahrj@koll.com

ggomez@ontarioca.gov gnicholls@nossaman.com Ginoffvine@aol.com gtorres@wmwd.com GMann@dpw.sbcounty.gov gwoodside@ocwd.com Gregor.Larabee@cdcr.ca.gov ha.nguyen@stoel.com Hdehaan1950@gmail.com irene.islas@bbklaw.com jamesc@cvwdwater.com cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.go

cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.gov janelle.krattiger@stoel.com

JWilson@cbwm.org

jhall@ieua.org jmarseilles@ieua.org JPivovaroff@wmwd.com Jayne.Joy@waterboards.ca.gov Jean@thejclawfirm.com jevers@niagarawater.com jmosher@sawpa.org jpierson@intexcorp.com

jryan@kmtg.com jhyluk@ieua.org jjungreis@rutan.com jpompa@jcsd.us

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

jimmylaredo@gmail.com Jimmy@City-Attorney.com Jaime.medrano2@cdcr.ca.gov JiwonS@cvwdwater.com

jchan@wvwd.org joao.feitoza@cmc.com jroberto@tvmwd.com Joe Graziano
Joe Joswiak
Joel Ignacio
John Bosler
John Harper
John Huitsing
John Lopez

John Lopez and Nathan Cole

John Mendoza John Partridge John Russ John Schatz John Thornton

John Thornton Jose A Galindo Josh Swift Joshua Aguilar Justin Brokaw Justin Nakano

Justin Scott-Coe Ph. D. Kaitlyn Dodson-Hamilton

Karen Williams Kathleen Brundage Keith Person

Kelli Hills (khills@cbwm.org)

Kelly Ridenour Ken Waring Kevin O'Toole Kevin Sage

kparker@katithewaterlady.com

Krista Paterson Kristina Robb Kurt Berchtold Kyle Brochard Kyle Snay Laura Mantilla Laura Roughton Laura Yraceburu

Lauren V. Neuhaus, Esq.

Lee McElhaney

Leon (Kaz) Kazandjian

Linda Jadeski Liz Hurst Lorena Heredia Mallory Gandara Manny Martinez Marcella Correa Marco Tule Maria Ayala

Maria Insixiengmay Maria Mendoza Maribel Sosa Marilyn Levin

Mark D. Hensley

jgraz4077@aol.com JJoswiak@cbwm.org jignacio@ieua.org johnb@cvwdwater.com jrharper@harperburns.com johnhuitsing@gmail.com ilopez@sarwc.com

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

jruss@ieua.org jschatz13@cox.net

JThorntonPE@H2OExpert.net Jose.A.Galindo@linde.com jmswift@fontanawater.com jaguilar1@wmwd.com

jbrokaw@marygoldmutualwater.com

JNakano@cbwm.org jscottcoe@mvwd.org kaitlyn@tdaenv.com kwilliams@sawpa.org

kathleen.brundage@californiasteel.com keith.person@waterboards.ca.gov

khills@cbwm.org

KRIDENOUR@fennemorelaw.com

kwaring@jcsd.us kotoole@ocwd.com Ksage@IRMwater.com

kparker@katithewaterlady.com

Kpaterson@kmtg.com
KRobb@cc.sbcounty.gov
kberchtold@gmail.com
KBrochard@rwglaw.com
kylesnay@gswater.com
lmantilla@ieua.org
lroughton@wmwd.com
lyraceburu@bhfs.com
lauren.neuhaus@stoel.com
lmcelhaney@bmklawplc.com
Leon.Kazandjian@cdcr.ca.gov

ljadeski@wvwd.org ehurst@ieua.org lheredia@ieua.org MGandara@wmwd.com directormartinez@mvwd.org MCorrea@rwglaw.com

mtule@ieua.org mayala@jcsd.us

Maria.Insixiengmay@cc.sbcounty.gov

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

mhensley@hensleylawgroup.com

Mark Wiley Marlene B. Wiman Martin Cihigoyenetche

Martin Rauch Martin Zvirbulis Matthew H. Litchfield

May Atencio Melanie Trevino Michael Adler

Michael B. Brown, Esq.

Michael Fam Michael Hurley Michael Mayer Michael P. Thornton

Michelle Licea Mike Gardner Mike Maestas Miriam Garcia

mmarti47@yahoo.com

Monica Nelson (mnelson@ieua.org)

Moore, Toby MWDProgram Nadia Aguirre Natalie Avila Natalie Costaglio Nathan deBoom

Neetu Gupta Nichole Horton Nick Jacobs Nicole deMoet

Nicole Escalante
Noah Golden-Krasner

Paul Deutsch
Paul Hofer
Paul Hofer
Paul S. Leon
Pete Hall
Pete Vicario
Peter Hettinga

Peter Kavounas Peter Rogers Randy Visser Rebekah Walker Richard Anderson Richard Rees

Rickey S. Manbahal

Rita Pro

Robert C. Hawkins Robert DeLoach Robert E. Donlan Robert Neufeld Robert Wagner mwiley@chinohills.org mwiman@nossaman.com marty@thejclawfirm.com martin@rauchcc.com mezvirbulis@sgvwater.com mlitchfield@tvmwd.com

matencio@fontana.org

michael.adler@mcmcnet.net michael.brown@stoel.com mfam@dpw.sbcounty.gov

mhurley@ieua.org

Mtrevino@jcsd.us

 $\label{lem:mayer} Michael. Mayer@dpw.sbcounty.gov\\ mthornton@tkeengineering.com$ 

mlicea@mvwd.org mgardner@wmwd.com mikem@cvwdwater.com mgarcia@ieua.org mmarti47@yahoo.com mnelson@ieua.org

TobyMoore@gswater.com MWDProgram@sdcwa.org naguirre@tvmwd.com navila@cityofchino.org

natalie.costaglio@mcmcnet.net

n8deboom@gmail.com ngupta@ieua.org

Nichole.Horton@pomonaca.gov njacobs@somachlaw.com ndemoet@ci.upland.ca.us NEscalante@ontarioca.gov Noah.goldenkrasner@doj.ca.gov paul.deutsch@woodplc.com

farmerhofer@aol.com farmwatchtoo@aol.com pleon@ontarioca.gov pete.hall@cdcr.ca.gov rpetehall@gmail.com PVicario@cityofchino.org peterhettinga@yahoo.com PKavounas@cbwm.org progers@chinohills.org

RVisser@sheppardmullin.com rwalker@jcsd.us horsfly1@yahoo.com

richard.rees@wsp.com smanbahal@wvwd.org rpro@cityofchino.org RHawkins@earthlink.net robertadeloach1@gmail.com

red@eslawfirm.com robneu1@yahoo.com rwagner@wbecorp.com Ron Craig

Ron LaBrucherie, Jr.

Ronald C. Pietersma

Ruben Llamas Ruby Favela

Ryan Shaw Sam Nelson

Sam Rubenstein Sandra S. Rose Sarah Foley

Scott Burton

Scott Slater Seth J. Zielke

Shawnda M. Grady Sheila D. Brown Shivaii Deshmukh

Sonya Barber

Sonya Zite

SRamirez@kmtg.com Stephanie Reimer

Stephen Deitsch Steve Kennedy

Steve M. Anderson

Steve Nix Steve Riboli

Steve Smith

Steven Andrews Engineering

Steven Flower Steven J. Elie

Steven J. Elie

Steven Popelar Steven Raughley

Susan Palmer Sylvie Lee

Tammi Ford Tariq Awan

Tarren Torres Taya Victorino

Teri Layton Terri Whitman

Terry Catlin Tim Barr

Tim Kellett Tim Moore Timothy Ryan

Toby Moore
Tom Barnes

Tom Bunn

Tom Cruikshank

Tom Dodson (tda@tdaenv.com)

Tom Harder

Tom McPeters
Tom O'Neill

Rcraig21@icloud.com

ronLaBrucherie@gmail.com

rcpietersma@aol.com rllamas71@yahoo.com

rfavela@cbwm.org RShaw@wmwd.com 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 sheila.brown@stoel.com

sdeshmukh@ieua.org sbarber@ci.upland.ca.us

SRamirez@kmtg.com SReimer@mvwd.org

szite@wmwd.com

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

snix@ci.upland.ca.us

steve.riboli@sanantoniowinery.com

ssmith@ieua.org

sandrews@sandrewsengineering.com

sflower@rwglaw.com

selie@ieua.org s.elie@mpglaw.com spopelar@icsd.us

Steven.Raughley@isd.sbcounty.gov

spalmer@kidmanlaw.com

slee@tvmwd.com tford@wmwd.com

Tariq.Awan@cdcr.ca.gov tarren@egoscuelaw.com tayav@cvwdwater.com tlayton@sawaterco.com TWhitman@kmtg.com

tlcatlin@wfajpa.org tbarr@wmwd.com tkellett@tvmwd.com tmoore@westyost.com

tjryan@sgvwater.com TobyMoore@gswater.com tbarnes@esassoc.com

TomBunn@Lagerlof.com tcruikshank@linklogistics.com

tda@tdaenv.com

tharder@thomashardercompany.com

THMcP@aol.com

toneill@chinodesalter.org

Toni Medell
Tony Long
Toyasha Sebbag
Tracy J. Egoscue
Van Jew
Veva Weamer
Victor Preciado
Vivian Castro
Wade Fultz
WestWater Research, LLC
William J Brunick
William McDonnell
William Urena

mmedel@mbakerintl.com
tlong@angelica.com
tsebbag@cbwcd.org
tracy@egoscuelaw.com
vjew@wvwd.org
vweamer@westyost.com
Victor\_Preciado@ci.pomona.ca.us
vcastro@cityofchino.org
Wade.Fultz@cmc.com
research@waterexchange.com
bbrunick@bmblawoffice.com
wmcdonnell@ieua.org
wurena@emeraldus.com