		FEE EXEMP
1	JOHN J. SCHATZ, Bar No. 141029 JSchatz13@cox.net	g man was
2	P.O. Box 7775	
3	Laguna Niguel, California 92607 Telephone: (949) 683-0398 Facsimile: (925) 977-1870	
4	Attorney for APPROPRIATIVE POOL	
5		EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES
6		PER CAL. GOV. CODE § 6103
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF SAI	N BERNARDINO
10		
11	CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER	Case No. RCVRS 51010
12	DISTRICT,	[Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable Gilbert G. Ochoa]
13	Petitioner,	
14	V.	APPROPRIATIVE POOL NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR AWARD
15	CITY OF CHINO, et al.,	OF EXPENSES, INCLUDING ATTORNEY FEES PER CONTRACT
16	Defendants.	AND CIVIL CODE SECTION 1717; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
17		[Filed With:
18		Declaration of Mitchell C Tilner; Declaration of Tracy Egoscue;
19		3. Declaration of Edgar Tellez Foster;
20		4. Declaration of John J. Schatz;5. [Proposed] Order]
21		Date: July 29, 2024
22		Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept: R17
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS					
2				Page		
3	TABI	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES				
4	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION					
5	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES					
6	I.	INTI	RODUCTION	6		
7	II.	FAC	CTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY	9		
8	III.	ARC	GUMENT	12		
9		A.	The AP is entitled to recover its costs on appeal, including reasonable attorney fees.	12		
11 12		В.	The AP is entitled to recoup from Ontario et al. the sums other AP members were surcharged to cover Ag Pool's costs on appeal, including its			
13			reasonable attorney fees.	13		
14		C.	Ontario et al. Also Owe Their Share of Approved AP Expenses Unrelated to the Appeal, Including AP Legal Counsel and Consulting Services	14		
15	IV.	CON	NCLUSION	15		
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21 22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28			2			
			~			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES Page(s) Cases Brown Bark III, L.P. v. Haver (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 809......13 Hsu v. Abbara **Statutes** Civil Code § 1717(a)......12 24/ AP's Mot. Expenses Pursuant to Contract 04342.00108\34950183.1

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on July 29, 2024, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as this matter may be heard, in Department R17 – Rancho Cucamonga District of the San Bernardino County Superior Court, located at 8303 Haven Ave., Rancho Cucamonga, California, the Appropriative Pool ("AP") will, and hereby does, move for an order requiring the City of Ontario, the City of Chino, Monte Vista Water District, and Monte Vista Irrigation Company (collectively "Ontario et al."), who are all members of the AP, to pay (1) their shares of duly approved AP special assessments covering the AP's legal and administrative expenses, including AP's costs and fees incurred as the prevailing party on appeal, and (2) costs and fees Ag Pool incurred defending against the same appeal, a sum that the AP surcharged to other AP members and advanced to Ag Pool pursuant to the AP's contractual obligations. Since Ontario et al. alone caused Ag Pool to incur those costs and fees, they alone should bear them.

This Motion is made pursuant to the March 12, 2024 Opinion in Court of Appeal in Case No. E079052, wherein the Court affirmed this court's order that the Terms of Agreement ("TOA") resolved the dispute between the AP and the Agricultural Pool ("Ag Pool") under Section 5.4(a) of the parties' Peace Agreement and bound Ontario et al. with respect to both the TOA and AP expenses approved by majority vote. The Court of Appeal also awarded the AP costs on appeal. As the prevailing party, the AP is entitled per Civil Code Section 1717 and Section 9.2(d) of the Peace Agreement to recover its costs, including reasonable attorney's fees.

The Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities; the Declarations of Mitchell C. Tilner, Tracy Egoscue, Edgar Tellez Foster and John J. Schatz; the March 12, 2024 Opinion; the [Proposed] Order; as well as the files in this action, the arguments of counsel, and any other matters properly before the Court at the hearing on the Motion.

1	Dated: June 26, 2024	JOHN J. SCHATZ
2		By: John J. Schatz JOHN J. SCHATZ
3		JOHN J. SCHATZ
4		Attorney for APPROPRIATIVE POOL
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	٠	
12		
13		
14		
15		
1617		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		5
		\mathcal{J}

AP's Mot. Expenses Pursuant to Contract

04342.00108\34950183.1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

By this Motion, the AP seeks to recover from AP members City of Ontario, City of Chino, Monte Vista Water District, and Monte Vista Irrigation Company (collectively "Ontario et al.")

(1) their shares of duly approved AP special assessments covering the AP's legal and administrative expenses, including AP's costs and fees incurred as the prevailing party on appeal, and (2) costs and fees Ag Pool incurred defending against the same appeal, which were advanced by the AP Pool but should be borne in full by Ontario et al. because they were solely responsible for causing Ag Pool to incur the costs and fees. The AP is entitled to recover these amounts from Ontario et al. pursuant to the September 2012 Restated Judgment ("Judgment") in this action, the June 2000 Peace Agreement between the AP and Ag Pool, the March 2022 Terms of Agreement ("TOA") between the AP and Ag Pool, and the March 12, 2024 Court of Appeal Opinion in appeal number E079052, which validated the TOA and confirmed the AP's authority to bind all its members to pay expenses approved by majority vote.

With minor exceptions, Ontario et al. have refused to pay their share of the special assessments since November 2021, taking the position the AP lacked authority to impose the special assessments over their objections. The Court of Appeal has now rejected that position. As members of the AP, Ontario et al. should now be ordered to pay their fair share of the AP's expenses. After the AP took action by majority vote at its June 12, 2024 meeting to authorize AP legal counsel to file this motion for costs on appeal and unpaid AP special assessment invoices, and days before the filing date for this motion, Ontario et al. notified the AP that they would pay invoices for the TOA settlement and Ag. Pool expenses. What remains outstanding are \$262,761.21 in unpaid AP special assessment invoices for administrative costs and attorney fees, including fees the AP incurred on appeal, plus costs and attorney fees Ag. Pool incurred on appeal, which the AP advanced to Ag Pool. (Tellez Foster Decl. pp. 2-3).

This Motion follows a series of motions and an appeal that started with certain members of the AP filing a motion asking this Court to interpret Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement,

 which provides for the AP to pay certain expenses incurred by Ag Pool. That motion argued that in entering the Peace Agreement, the AP members did not give Ag Pool a blank check, allowing it to pass any cost along to the AP unchecked. Ultimately, the court agreed, and interpreted Section 5.4(a) to have certain limitations. Following that decision, the City of Chino filed a motion for reimbursement, asking the Court to order Ag Pool to reimburse the AP for payments made from fiscal year 2020/21 through 2022/23. The City of Ontario and the two Monte Vista entities joined the motion. While this motion was pending, the AP and Ag Pool engaged in settlement discussions that culminated in settlement referred to as the "TOA." Ontario, et al. objected to the TOA and stated they would not comply with it, but a majority of the AP voted to enter the agreement with the Ag Pool. The settling parties then notified the court that the TOA had been signed. The TOA marked the beginning of the dispute between Ontario et al. and the AP.

On April 22, 2022, this court issued an order denying Ontario et al.'s motion for reimbursement, finding that the TOA rendered the motion moot, and that Ontario et al. were bound by the AP majority's vote to approve the TOA. Ontario et al. appealed from that order arguing, among other things, that this Court's order presented "a false characterization of the [AP] as the 'sole obligor' for payment of Agricultural Pool legal expenses under Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement," that the TOA effectively and improperly amended both the Peace Agreement and this Court's April 22 Order interpreting Section 5.4 of the Peace Agreement, and that the AP did not have the authority to enter the TOA. (Ontario/Monte Vista Appellants' Opening Brief, pp. 21-22; pp. 34-35; p. 36¹).

The Court of Appeal affirmed. It held that the AP is a party and the entity obligated in its capacity as a pool to pay Ag Pool expenses under Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement. In its conclusion, the Court of Appeal further explained that "neither the Judgment nor the Peace Agreement requires the Ap Pool to obtain unanimous consent of its members to act. To hold otherwise would disrupt the efficient management of the Basin as provided for in the

¹ For purposes of reducing the size of the exhibit attached to this motion, citation to the document on file with this Court in this proceeding is used.

Judgment." (Decl. of Mitchell C. Tilner, exh. A [Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino (Mar. 12. 2024, E079052) typed opn. p. 24].)

The gist of the Court of Appeal's opinion, in other words, was that the AP is the party obligated to pay the Ag Pool fees pursuant to Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement and that all AP members, including Ontario et al., are bound to pay special assessments and expenses approved by a majority of the Pool's voting power. "[A] decision-making process untethered to the majority rule voting system" would result in "chaos." (*Id.* [typed opn. p. 15].)

The Court of Appeal also awarded costs on appeal to the respondents: the AP, Ag Pool, and Chino Basin Watermaster.

Section 9.2(d) of the Peace Agreement provides, with certain exceptions not relevant here, that the prevailing party "[i]n any adversarial proceedings between the Parties" shall recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs. (Schatz Decl., exh. A, p. 59.) The appeal was an adversarial proceeding under the Peace Agreement. As the prevailing party, the AP is entitled to award of appeal costs, including attorney fees, pursuant to Section 9.2(d) of the Peace Agreement and as provided in Civil Code 1717 for such contracts.²

While the appeal was pending and continuing through today, however, Ontario et al. have refused to pay their proportionate shares of the majority-approved AP special assessments invoices for AP administrative and legal costs shown in the attached invoices. (Tellez Foster Decl. pp. 2-3). This court should now order Ontario et al. to pay the AP's costs and reasonable attorney fees incurred on appeal as well as their share of the unpaid special assessments invoices for AP administrative and legal costs approved by the AP's voting majority. And, for reasons we explain, the court should also order Ontario et al. to pay the costs and attorney fees Ag Pool incurred on appeal defending the TOA.

Ontario has acknowledged the appeal involved a dispute "over the meaning of the Peace Agreement, in particular, Section 5.4(a), which delineates the scope of the Appropriative Pool's obligation to pay certain Agricultural Pool assessments and expenses." (Appellants' Opening Brief of City of Ontario, Monte Vista Water District, and Monte Vista Irrigation Co, p. 17.)

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In June 2000, the AP and the parties to the Judgment, including Ontario et al., signed the Peace Agreement, which resolved certain disputes among them. In Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement, the parties agreed that the AP would pay Ag Pool's legal and other expenses during the term of the Peace Agreement. (Schatz Decl., exh. A, p. 41.)

In 2010, the AP approved a legal services agreement with John J. Schatz to represent the AP as directed. Since then, Schatz has continuously served as AP legal counsel. (Schatz Decl., exh. B.)

Over many years, all AP special assessments, including those approved to pay Ag Pool expenses and Mr. Schatz's fees, were paid by the AP members, including Ontario et al., without protest. (Schatz Decl. p. 2.)

In 2020, a dispute between the two Pools arose under Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement. The dispute spawned litigation and resulted in several court orders. Until November 2021, all AP members continued to pay their shares of all AP special assessments. On November 11, 2021, the AP issued a special assessment for legal services. On November 30, the City of Ontario sent a letter to Watermaster rejecting the November 11, 2021 AP special assessment on the ground that the assessment was not supported by any legal authority. (Schatz Decl., exh. C.) Since then, Ontario has not paid any AP special assessments for any AP administrative and legal expenses, though all such assessments have been approved by a majority of the Pool's voting power. (Schatz Decl., exh. D.).

Monte Vista Water District and Monte Vista Irrigation Company (collectively Monte Vista entities) also did not pay the November 11, 2021 AP special assessment. Except for a small amount of two AP special assessments, the Monte Vista entities have not paid any AP special assessments invoices for AP administrative and legal costs since that time. (Schatz Decl., exh. D, pp. 154-157).

The City of Chino paid the November 11, 2021 AP special assessment. But except for small amounts of two AP special assessments, Chino also has not paid any other AP special

assessments for AP administrative and legal costs since that time. (Schatz Decl., exh. D pp. 158-159).

In January 2022, Ontario et al. filed motions seeking to compel Ag Pool to reimburse the AP for certain legal expenses the AP had previously paid under the Peace Agreement.

Those motions initiated the proceedings that ultimately resulted in the appeal.

On March 22, 2022, the AP resolved its dispute with Ag Pool under Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement when a majority of the AP voting power approved the TOA. (Schatz Decl., exh. E).

Section 6.b. of the TOA detailed the procedures governing the AP's payment of Ag Pool expenses under the Peace Agreement going forward: "The Ag Pool shall submit all invoices to be paid by the AP to Watermaster in a form that enables a determination by the AP that all invoiced expenses are not adverse to the AP and benefits the Ag Pool, and are in accordance with the [court's] Order." (*Id.* [TOA p. 2].) Accordingly, the AP provides Ag Pool invoices for consideration at AP meetings, at which they are voted on. The vote is recorded and included in the report out of confidential session or otherwise. (Schatz Decl., exh. D)

At the March 22, 2022 meeting, Ontario et al. stated on the record that they "do not consent to the terms of settlement, want to be excluded from the Terms, and *are not obligated to and will not comply with the Terms.*" (Schatz Decl., exh. E, (emphasis added).

On April 22, 2022, this court heard the reimbursement motions filed by Ontario et al. This court denied the motions as moot based on the TOA, which comprehensively resolved the Peace Agreement 5.4(a) adversarial proceedings that were litigated starting in 2020. (Schatz Decl., exh. F.). Despite the AP majority having voted to approve special assessments and expenses, and despite this court's April 22 order upholding the AP's authority to incur expenses binding on all members by majority vote, the Monte Vista

³ This process means that after the AP considers and takes action by majority vote to approve expenses, AP parties are bound by such action. Post hoc challenges to invoices or other AP actions would defeat the purpose of majority vote and operate to thwart the TOA, the Stipulated Judgment and Court of Appeal's affirming Opinion.

entities and City of Chino sent letters to the AP withholding payment of AP special assessments unless expressed demands and conditions were met. (Schatz Decl., exh. G.).

To avoid breaching the TOA with respect to payment of both the \$370,000 settlement amount and the monthly ongoing Ag Pool expenses, and to fund the AP's defense of the TOA while also continuing to pay other AP expenses that included its legal counsel and AP consultants, the AP was forced to surcharge those AP members who continued to pay their assessments, in order to cover the shortfall resulting from Ontario et al.'s refusal to pay their share of the assessments. (Tellez Foster Decl., p. 3). To the date of this Motion, Ontario et al. have only paid AP special assessments for their share of the Ag Pool settlement payment and Ag Pool expenses, but not AP special assessment invoices for AP administrative and legal expenses. (*Ibid.*) The surcharge borne by the other AP members due to Ontario et al.'s ongoing refusal totals \$262,761.21. (*Ibid.*) This amount includes part but not all of the AP costs, including attorney fees, on appeal. (*Ibid.*)

Ontario et al. appealed from the court's April 22 order. In its March 12, 2024 Opinion the Court of Appeal affirmed the order, holding that the Pools had the authority under the Judgment to settle their inter-Pool disputes (here through the TOA) and Ontario et al. are bound by the Pools' action. (Tilner Decl., exh. A.).

Over the period of time Ontario et al. have failed to pay their AP assessments, they have continued to participate in AP meetings, which included discussion and majority vote on Ag Pool expenses and AP special assessments, and they continued to receive assessment invoices administered by Watermaster staff following direction by the AP based on AP-approved actions. All AP special assessment invoices were approved by majority vote. (Schatz Decl., exh. D.).

Peace Agreement Section 9.1 states a Party is in default under that Agreement if it fails to perform or observe any term or covenant that it is to perform or observe. Peace Agreement Section 9.2(d) provides the prevailing party in any adversarial proceeding is entitled to recover costs, including attorneys' fees:

In any adversarial proceedings between the Parties other than the dispute resolution procedure set forth below and under the Judgment, the prevailing Party shall be entitled to recover their costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees. If there is no clear prevailing Party, the Court shall determine the prevailing Party and provide for the award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees. In considering the reasonableness of either Party's request for attorneys' fees as a prevailing Party, the Court shall consider the quality, efficiency, and value of the legal services and similar/prevailing rate for comparable legal services in the local community⁴. (Schatz Decl., exh. A, p. 59.)

III. ARGUMENT

A. The AP is entitled to recover its costs on appeal, including reasonable attorney fees.

Attorney fees are an item of costs in any action on a contract within the meaning of Civil Code Section 1717(a), which provides: "In any action on a contract, where the contract specifically provides that attorney's fees and costs, which are incurred to enforce that contract, shall be awarded either to one of the parties or to prevailing party, then the party who is determined to be the party prevailing on the contract, whether he or she is the party specified in the contract or not, shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees in addition to other costs."

Civil Code Section 1717(b)(2) provides in relevant part: "the party prevailing on the contract shall be the party who recovered a greater relief in the action on the contract." When a party completely defeats all contract-based claims against it, it is the prevailing party as a matter of law. (*Hsu v. Abbara* (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 863, 866, 876; *Brown Bark III, L.P. v. Haver* (2013) 219 Cal. App. 4th 809, 825.)

⁴ In its April 1, 2022 Rebuttal to the TOA, Ontario acknowledged the Section 9.2(d) attorney feeshifting provision in the Peace Agreement for adversarial proceedings (Rebuttal Brief and Objections RE: Joint Statement Regarding Settlement Between Appropriative Pool And Agricultural Pool Re: Peace Agreement 5.4(A), Which Does Not Settle The Reimbursement Motion; p. 10, lines 13-14). For purposes of reducing the size of the exhibit attached to this motion, citation to the document on file with this Court in this proceeding is used.

Here, the AP is the prevailing party in an adversarial proceeding regarding the TOA that arose under Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement because the AP was the respondent on appeal and the Court of Appeal affirmed the trial court order in its entirety. In its opening brief on appeal, Ontario acknowledged that the adversarial proceeding at the heart of the appellate decision arose under the parties' contract, i.e., the Peace Agreement: "[T]he Order from which this appeal is taken arises from a dispute over the meaning of the Peace Agreement, in particular, Section 5.4(a), which delineates the scope of the Appropriative Pool's obligation to pay certain Agricultural Pool assessments and expenses." (Appellants' Opening Brief of City of Ontario, Monte Vista Water District, and Monte Vista Irrigation Co, p. 17.)

Accordingly, per Section 9.2(d) of the Peace Agreement, the AP is entitled to recover its costs on appeal, including reasonable attorneys' fees.⁵

B. The AP is entitled to recoup from Ontario et al. the sums other AP members were surcharged to cover Ag Pool's costs on appeal, including its reasonable attorney fees.

Ag Pool legal expenses, including costs and attorney fees on appeal, comprise part of the Ag Pool expenses the AP agreed to pay and has paid pursuant to the Peace Agreement and the TOA. Ontario et al. are bound by both the Peace Agreement, which they signed, and the TOA, which the Court of Appeal validated as binding on them. The Court of Appeal affirmed the trial court's order finding that the AP has the authority to act by majority vote and bind all AP members, including Ontario et al., for all purposes including entering into the TOA.

The TOA was for the purpose of comprehensively resolving an ongoing dispute and avoiding future disputes between the Ag Pool and AP. By affirming the power of the AP to act by binding majority vote pursuant to the Peace Agreement and Judgment, the TOA provided a

⁵ As the Court of Appeal concluded: "[T]he TOA clarified the Peace Agreement— specifically the Ap Pool's obligation to pay for the Ag Pool's legal expenses—by defining the procedures for processing the Ag Pool's requests going forward." (Tilner Decl., exh. A [typed opn. p. 22].) The Court of Appeal further concluded: "[T]he Peace Agreement acknowledged and affirmed the Ap Pool's power to resolve disputes over the Pool's obligations via a majority vote." (*Id.* [typed opn. p. 15].)

process for collective action to avoid "a decision-making process untethered to the majority rule voting system" that would result in "chaos." (Tilner Decl., exh. A [typed opn. p. 15].) For this reason, the Ag Pool like the AP had an equal and intertwined interest in affirming the superior court order upholding the TOA that foundationally provided for collective AP approval in order to avoid an endless series of challenges to Ag Pool invoices brought by one or a few AP members. Consequently, it was appropriate and necessary for Ag to participate in the appeal initiated by Ontario et al. By appealing, Ontario et al. forced both the AP and the Ag Pool to incur costs, including attorney fees, to defend the TOA and the AP's authority to act by majority vote, both of which the Court of Appeal validated. Therefore, all of the Ag Pool's costs on appeal including its reasonable attorney fees, which have been surcharged to other AP members and advanced to Ag Pool pursuant to the Peace Agreement, should be borne by Ontario et al.

C. Ontario et al. Also Owe Their Share of Approved AP Expenses Unrelated to the Appeal, Including AP Legal Counsel and Consulting Services

The legal bases for Ontario's objection to paying AP legal counsel services, which are AP expenses, are described in Ontario's legal counsel's November 30, 2021 letter to Watermaster. The letter stated Ontario intends to (and did) withhold payment of the special assessment for AP legal services and may seek Court intervention. (Schatz Decl. exh. C.) Ontario did just that in its April 1, 2022 TOA Rebuttal Brief and thereafter in the appeal raising the same and related arguments challenging the authority of the AP to take binding actions by majority vote.

⁶ The process for considering and approving Ag Pool invoices includes a determination that Ag's invoiced expenses, including for Ag appeal expenses, are not adverse to the AP and benefits the Ag Pool, and are in accordance with the May 28, 2021 Court Order.

⁷ Starting with the November 18, 2021 invoice that was the subject of the letter, Ontario stopped making payments on <u>all</u> AP special assessment invoices without any explanation. Those invoices were to pay for <u>all</u> AP expenses that include: AP legal counsel and consultants engaged by the AP either directly or through AP legal counsel, the Ag Pool settlement payment, and ongoing Ag Pool expenses. Starting June 21st through June 25th Ontario et al. paid their outstanding invoices for the Ag. Pool settlement payment and Ag. Pool expenses per the TOA, but have continued to withhold payment for AP administrative and legal expenses. (Decl. of Edgar Tellez Foster, p. 3).

Ontario's legal arguments were fully considered and rejected by the Court of Appeal in its March 12, 2024 Opinion construing the parties' respective rights and obligations under the Peace Agreement and stipulated Judgment. The legal authority of the AP to act and to bind all members by majority vote to engage legal counsel for the purposes determined by the AP was cited by the Court of Appeal, among other examples spanning more than 40 years, of the type of activity the AP could undertake in a representative capacity. (Tilner Decl., exh. A [typed opn. p. 11].) Ontario's letter states it previously consented to AP legal representation. The Court of Appeal stated: "[t]he parties' conduct and extensive course of dealing clarify any uncertainty in whether the Pools may act in a representative capacity." (*Id.* [typed opn. p. 16].)

In their April 18, 2022 Moving Parties' Reply To Surrebuttals Filed By the Appropriative Pool And The Agricultural Pool, Ontario et al. said: "[t]o be clear, the Moving Parties do not dispute that all AP members are bound by the Judgment including its voting provisions in the Pooling Plan." (Moving Parties' Reply To Surrebuttals Filed By the Appropriative Pool And The Agricultural Pool; p. 8.). The Court of Appeal confirmed the authority of the AP to act by majority vote in its conclusion stating "the superior court correctly concluded that neither the Judgment nor the Peace Agreement requires the Ap Pool to obtain unanimous consent of its members to act. To hold otherwise would disrupt the efficient management of the Basin as provided in the Judgment." (Tilner Decl., exh. A [typed opn. p. 24].)

In a series of letters issued during the pendency of the appeal, the Monte Vista entities and Chino defied this court's April 2022 Order and TOA by continuing to assert arguments fully addressed in the Order and refusing to pay AP special assessments until their conditions were met. (Schatz Decl., exh. G.) As set forth in this Motion, the Court of Appeal Opinion fully addressed and disposed of the issues raised in the letters by affirming the April 2022 Order.

IV. CONCLUSION

Pursuant to section 9.2(d) of the Peace Agreement and the Court of Appeal's Opinion upholding the AP majority's power and authority to enter contracts and incur expenses binding on all members and authorizing the AP to recover costs on appeal, the AP is entitled to recover from

Ontario et al. the Ap Pool's legal and administrative expenses, including appellate costs and attorney fees, as detailed in the attachment hereto. The AP is also entitled to recover from Ontario et al. sums the AP surcharged other members and advanced to pay Ag Pool's appellate costs and attorney fees, as detailed in the attachment hereto. This court should so order. JOHN J. SCHATZ Dated: June 26, 2024 Attorney for APPROPRIATIVE POOL

CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER Case No. RCVRS 51010 Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. City of Chino, et al.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I declare that:

and correct.

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

On June 26, 2024 I served the following:

1.	EXPENSES, INCLUDING ATTORNEY FEES PER CONTRACT AND CIVIL CODE SECTION 1717; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
/ <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.
<i>II</i>	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. See attached service list: Master Email Distribution List
I decla	re under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true

Executed on June 26, 2024 in Rancho Cucamonga, California.

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

Categories:

Main Email Lists

Members:

Adrian Gomez Alan Frost Alberto Mendoza Alejandro R. Reyes

Alex Padilla Alexandria Moore

Alexis Mascarinas Alfonso Ruiz Allen Hubsch Alma Heustis Alonso Jurado Alyssa Coronado Amanda Coker Amy Bonczewski

Andrew Gagen Andy Campbell Andy Malone Angelica Todd Anna Nelson Anthony Alberti April Robitaille

Art Bennett Arthur Kidman Ashley Zapp Ashok Dhingra Ben Lewis Ben Markham

Ben Roden Benjamin M. Weink Beth.McHenry Bill Schwartz

Bill Velto

Board Support Team IEUA

Bob Bowcock Bob DiPrimio Bob Feenstra Bob Kuhn Bob Kuhn Bob Page

Brad Herrema Bradley Jensen Brandi Belmontes

Brandi Goodman-Decoud

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

Bryan Smith Carmen Sierra agomez@emeraldus.com Alan.Frost@dpw.sbcounty.gov Alberto.Mendoza@cmc.com arreyes@sgvwater.com

arreyes@sgvwater.com Alex.Padilla@wsp.com amoore@cbwm.org

AMascarinas@ontarioca.gov alfonso.ruiz@cmc.com ahubsch@hubschlaw.com alma.heustis@nucor.com ajurado@cbwm.org acoronado@sarwc.com

amandac@cvwdwater.com
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
citvcouncil@chinohills.org

ashley.zapp@cmc.com ash@akdconsulting.com benjamin.lewis@gswater.com bmarkham@bhfs.com

BenR@cvwdwater.com ben.weink@tetratech.com

akidman@kidmanlaw.com

Beth.McHenry@hoferranch.com

bschwartz@mvwd.org bvelto@uplandca.gov

BoardSupportTeam@ieua.org bbowcock@irmwater.com rjdiprimio@sgvwater.com bobfeenstra@gmail.com bgkuhn@aol.com bkuhn@tvmwd.com

Bob.Page@rov.sbcounty.gov

bherrema@bhfs.com

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@jcsd.us

carmens@cvwdwater.com

Carol Boyd Carol.Boyd@doj.ca.gov Carolina Sanchez 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 Chad Nishida CNishida@ontarioca.gov 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 Chris Diggs Christen Miller Christen.Miller@cao.sbcounty.gov Christensen, Rebecca A rebecca christensen@fws.gov

cdaisy@ieua.org Christiana Daisy Christopher M. Sanders cms@eslawfirm.com Christopher R. Guillen cquillen@bhfs.com **Cindy Cisneros** cindyc@cvwdwater.com Cindy.li@waterboards.ca.gov Cindy Li

City of Chino, Administration Department

Daniel Bobadilla

Daniela Uriarte

Dave Schroeder

David De Jesus

David Barnes

Danny Kim

Dave Argo **Dave Crosley**

administration@cityofchino.org Courtney Jones cjjones@ontarioca.gov

Craig Miller CMiller@wmwd.com Craig Stewart craig.stewart@wsp.com Cris Fealy cifealy@fontanawater.com **Curtis Burton** CBurton@cityofchino.org

dmckinney@douglascountylaw.com Dan McKinney

> dbobadilla@chinohills.org dUriarte@cbwm.org dkim@linklogistics.com daveargo46@icloud.com DCrosley@cityofchino.org DSchroeder@cbwcd.org

> > DBarnes@geoscience-water.com

ddejesus@tvmwd.com

David Schroeder (dschroeder@cbwcd.org)

dschroeder@cbwcd.org

Dawn Varacchi-Ives (dawn.varacchi@ge.com)

dawn.varacchi@ge.com dgarzaro@ieua.org Denise Garzaro Dennis Mejia dmejia@ontarioca.gov Dennis Williams dwilliams@geoscience-water.com Derek Hoffman dhoffman@fennemorelaw.com diana.frederick@cdcr.ca.gov Diana Frederick ediggs@uplandca.gov Ed Diggs

edmeans@icloud.com Ed Means

Eddie Lin (elin@ieua.org) Edgar Tellez Foster etellezfoster@cbwm.org EduardoE@cvwdwater.com Eduardo Espinoza ecalciano@hensleylawgroup.com Elizabeth M. Calciano elizabeth.ewens@stoel.com Elizabeth P. Ewens

elin@ieua.org

Elizabeth Willis Eric Fordham

Eric Garner Eric Grubb

Eric Lindberg PG,CHG

Eric N. Robinson Eric Papathakis Eric Tarango Erik Vides

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

Geoffrey Kamansky Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel

Gerald Yahr
Gina Gomez
Gina Nicholls
Gino L. Filippi
Gracie Torres
Grant Mann
Gregor Larabee
Ha T. Nguyen
Henry DeHaan
Hvianca Hakim
Hye Jin Lee

lmelda Cadigal Insixiengmay, Maria

Irene Islas Ivy Capili James Curatalo James Jenkins

Janelle S.H. Krattiger, Esq

Jasmin A. Hall Jason Marseilles Jayne Joy

Jean Cihigoyenetche

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

Jill Keehnen

ewillis@cbwcd.org

eric_fordham@geopentech.com

eric.garner@bbklaw.com ericg@cvwdwater.com

eric.lindberg@waterboards.ca.gov

erobinson@kmtg.com Eric.Papathakis@cdcr.ca.gov edtarango@fontanawater.com

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

eulloa@cityofchino.org
EvetteO@cvwdwater.com
FrankY@cbwm.org
ffudacz@nossaman.com
fgalante@awattorneys.com
directormilhiser@mvwd.org
Milhiser@hotmail.com

gkamansky@niagarawater.com geoffreyvh60@gmail.com

yahrj@koll.com

grapp@westyost.com

ggomez@ontarioca.gov gnicholls@nossaman.com Ginoffvine@aol.com gtorres@wmwd.com GMann@dpw.sbcounty.gov Gregor.Larabee@cdcr.ca.gov ha.nguyen@stoel.com Hdehaan1950@gmail.com

HHakim@linklogistics.com HJLee@cityofchino.org Imelda.Cadigal@cdcr.ca.gov

Maria.Insixiengmay@cc.sbcounty.gov

irene.islas@bbklaw.com ICapili@bhfs.com

jamesc@cvwdwater.com cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.gov

janelle.krattiger@stoel.com

jhall@ieua.org jmarseilles@ieua.org

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 jill.keehnen@stoel.com Jim Markman Jim W. Bowman

jimmiem@cvwdwater.com

Jimmy Gutierrez - Law Offices of Jimmy Gutierrez

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

Joe Graziano Joel Ignacio John Bosler John Harper

John Hughes - Monte Vista Water District (jhughes@mvwd.org)

John Huitsing John Lopez

John Lopez and Nathan Cole John Mendoza John Partridge John Russ John Schatz Jordan Garcia

Jose A Galindo Jose Ventura Josh Swift Joshua Aquilar Justin Brokaw Justin Nakano

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

Karen Williams Kathleen Brundage Keith Person

Kelly Ridenour Ken Waring Kevin O'Toole Kevin Sage

kparker@katithewaterlady.com

Krista Paterson Kurt Berchtold Kyle Benoit Kyle Brochard

Kyle Snay Laura Roughton Laura Yraceburu

Lauren V. Neuhaus, Esq. Lee McElhaney Lewis Callahan

Linda Jadeski Liz Hurst

jmarkman@rwglaw.com jbowman@ontarioca.gov jimmiem@cvwdwater.com

jimmylaredo@gmail.com Jimmy@City-Attorney.com Jaime.medrano2@cdcr.ca.gov JiwonS@cvwdwater.com jchan@wvwd.org ioao.feitoza@cmc.com jroberto@tvmwd.com jgraz4077@aol.com jignacio@ieua.org

johnb@cvwdwater.com jrharper@harperburns.com

jhughes@mvwd.org

johnhuitsing@gmail.com ilopez@sarwc.com

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

jruss@ieua.org ischatz13@cox.net jgarcia@cbwm.org

Jose.A.Galindo@linde.com iose.ventura@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 KRIDENOUR@fennemorelaw.com

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

kparker@katithewaterlady.com

Kpaterson@kmtg.com kberchtold@gmail.com

kyle.benoit@airports.sbcounty.gov

KBrochard@rwglaw.com kylesnay@gswater.com Iroughton@wmwd.com lyraceburu@bhfs.com lauren.neuhaus@stoel.com Imcelhaney@bmklawplc.com

Lewis.Callahan@cdcr.ca.gov ljadeski@wvwd.org ehurst@ieua.org

Lorena Heredia Mallory Gandara

Manny Martinez - Monte Vista Water District

lheredia@ieua.org MGandara@wmwd.com

mmarti47@yahoo.com

Manny Martinez - Monte Vista Water District Director

DirectorMartinez@mvwd.org

MCorrea@rwglaw.com

mtule@ieua.org mayala@jcsd.us

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

mhensley@hensleylawgroup.com

mwiley@chinohills.org mwiman@nossaman.com marty@thejclawfirm.com martin@rauchcc.com mezvirbulis@sgvwater.com mlitchfield@tvmwd.com

Maureen.snelgrove@airports.sbcounty.gov

Mtrevino@jcsd.us

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

mhurley@ieua.org

Michael.Mayer@dpw.sbcounty.gov mthornton@tkeengineering.com

mlicea@mvwd.org
mikayla@cvstrat.com
mgardner@wmwd.com
mikem@cvwdwater.com
mgarcia@ieua.org
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@uplandca.gov NEscalante@ontarioca.gov Noah.goldenkrasner@doj.ca.gov

nferreira@uplandca.gov omramos@sgvwater.com farmerhofer@aol.com farmwatchtoo@aol.com pleon@ontarioca.gov PVicario@cityofchino.org

Marcella Correa

Marco Tule Maria Ayala Maria Mendoza

Maria Mendoza Maribel Sosa Marilyn Levin Marissa Turner Mark D. Hensley Mark Wiley

Marlene B. Wiman Martin Cihigoyenetche

Martin Rauch Martin Zvirbulis Matthew H. Litchfield Maureen Snelgrove Melanie Trevino Michael Adler

Michael B. Brown, Esq.

Michael Blay Michael Fam Michael Hurley Michael Mayer Michael P. Thornton

Michelle Licea Mikayla Coleman Mike Gardner Mike Maestas Miriam Garcia Monica Nelson Moore, Toby MWDProgram Nadia Aguirre Natalie Avila

Natalie Costaglio

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

Norberto Ferreira Oscar Ramos Paul Hofer Paul Hofer Paul S. Leon Pete Vicario Peter Hettinga Peter Rogers Rebekah Walker Richard Anderson Richard Rees Rickey S. Manbahal

Rickey S. Manbaha Robert DeLoach Robert E. Donlan Robert Neufeld

Robert S. (RobertS@cbwcd.org)

Robert Wagner Ron Craig

Ron LaBrucherie, Jr. Ronald C. Pietersma

Ruben Llamas Ruby Favela Rudy Nunez Ryan Shaw Sam Nelson Sam Rubenstein Sandra S. Rose Scott Burton Scott Slater

Seth J. Zielke Shawnda M. Grady Shivaji Deshmukh Sonya Barber Sonya Zite

SRamirez@kmtg.com Stephanie Reimer Stephen Deitsch

Stephen Parker - sparker@uplandca.gov

Steve Kennedy Steve M. Anderson

Steve Nix 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
Taya Victorino
Teri Layton
Terri Whitman
Terry Catlin

Terry Watkins

Thomas S. Bunn

peterhettinga@yahoo.com progers@chinohills.org

rwalker@jcsd.us horsfly1@yahoo.com richard.rees@wsp.com smanbahal@wvwd.org robertadeloach1@gmail.com

red@eslawfirm.com robneu1@yahoo.com RobertS@cbwcd.org rwagner@wbecorp.com Rcraig21@icloud.com ronLaBrucherie@gmail.com rcpietersma@aol.com rllamas71@yahoo.com rfavela@cbwm.org rnunez@cbwm.org RShaw@wmwd.com snelson@ci.norco.ca.us srubenstein@wpcarey.com directorrose@mvwd.org sburton@ontarioca.gov sslater@bhfs.com

sjzielke@fontanawater.com sgrady@eslawfirm.com sdeshmukh@ieua.org sbarber@ci.upland.ca.us szite@wmwd.com SRamirez@kmtg.com SReimer@mvwd.org

stephen.deitsch@bbklaw.com

sparker@uplandca.gov skennedy@bmklawplc.com steve.anderson@bbklaw.com

snix@ci.upland.ca.us ssmith@ieua.org

sandrews@sandrewsengineering.com

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

Steven.Raughley@isd.sbcounty.gov

spalmer@kidmanlaw.com

slee@tvmwd.com tford@wmwd.com Tariq.Awan@cdcr.ca.gov tayav@cvwdwater.com tlayton@sawaterco.com TWhitman@kmtg.com tlcatlin@wfajpa.org

Twatkins@geoscience-water.com

tombunn@lagerlof.com

Tim Barr
Tim Moore
Timothy Ryan
Toby Moore
Tom Barnes
Tom Bunn

Tom Cruikshank

Tom Dodson (tda@tdaenv.com)

Tom Harder Tom O'Neill Toni Medell Tony Long

Toyasha Sebbag Tracy J. Egoscue Trevor Leja Veva Weamer

Victor Preciado Vivian Castro Wade Fultz

WestWater Research, LLC

William Brunick
William McDonnell
William Urena

tbarr@wmwd.com tmoore@westyost.com tjryan@sgvwater.com toby.moore@gswater.com tbarnes@esassoc.com TomBunn@Lagerlof.com tcruikshank@linklogistics.com

tda@tdaenv.com

tharder@thomashardercompany.com

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

Trevor.Leja@cao.sbcounty.gov vweamer@westyost.com

Victor_Preciado@ci.pomona.ca.us

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

research@waterexchange.com bbrunick@bmklawplc.com wmcdonnell@ieua.org wurena@emeraldus.com