

FEE EXEMPT

1 JOHN J. SCHATZ, State Bar No. 141029  
Attorney at Law  
2 P.O. Box 7775  
Laguna Niguel, Ca. 92607-7775  
3 Telephone: (949) 683-0398  
jschatz13@cox.net  
4

5 Attorney for APPROPRIATIVE POOL  
6  
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
10

11 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER  
12 DISTRICT,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 CITY OF CHINO et al,

16 Defendants,  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. RCVRS 51010

Assigned for All Purposes to the  
Honorable Gilbert G. Ochoa

**REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO  
APPROPRIATIVE POOL MOTION FOR  
AWARD OF EXPENSES PER CONTRACT  
AND CIVIL CODE SECTION 1717**

Date: August 29, 2024  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Dept. R17

Motion Filed: June 26, 2024

*[Declaration of Chris Diggs; Declaration of  
Todd M. Corbin; Declaration of John J.  
Schatz; Declaration of Mitchell C. Tilner;  
filed concurrently herewith]*

JOHN SCHATZ  
Attorney at Law  
P.O. Box 7775  
Laguna Niguel, Ca. 92607-7775

1 **I. ATTORNEY FEE-SHIFTING**

2 **A. The Amount of \$393,017 of Appeal Attorney Fees Sought by the Motion is**  
3 **Clear and Has Not Changed Because of the Watermaster Computation**

4 City of Ontario, Monte Vista Water District, and Monte Vista Irrigation Co. (collectively  
5 “Ontario” unless otherwise indicated) claim because the two categories of payments sought by the  
6 Appropriative Pool (AP) motion for expenses and attorney fees (Motion) overlap, and that a  
7 Watermaster computation is required, the amount of appeal attorney fees sought by the Motion is  
8 unclear. Watermaster has now provided that calculation, with which Ontario concurs. [Corbin  
9 Decl.; Jones Decl. ¶¶ 4-5; Scott-Coe Decl. ¶¶ 4-5].

10 The Motion clearly states the amount of attorney fees AP incurred defending against  
11 Ontario’s appeal: \$393,107 [Schatz Decl. ¶ 12, Tellez-Foster Decl. ¶ 3; Motion - Proposed  
12 Order].

13 The Tellez-Foster Declaration included with the Motion states “[i]f the total outstanding  
14 invoices of \$262,761.21 are paid in full by the four appellant parties, all AP parties will have paid  
15 their proportional shares of AP administrative and legal costs to date.” [Tellez-Foster Decl. ¶ 3,  
16 emphasis added]. The Tellez-Foster Declaration then goes on to say what will happen if the court  
17 grants the Motion and awards AP all its fees on appeal as the prevailing party: “if the court awards  
18 any of the legal expenses be paid by the AP parties other than based on their proportional share of  
19 AP administrative and legal expenses, Watermaster will perform the calculation and bill the  
20 appropriate parties for the appropriate charges and issue refunds due to the appropriate parties.”  
21 [*ibid*].

22 As explained in the Corbin Declaration included in this Reply, at the time the Motion was  
23 filed Watermaster had not yet completed the calculation to determine the amount of appeal  
24 attorney fees included in the \$262,761.21 on a proportional shares basis, which would then be  
25 deducted from the \$393,107 to determine the remaining amount of attorney fees if the Court  
26 awards a 100 percent attorney-fee shift. [Corbin Decl. ¶¶ 3-7].

27  
28

1           Consequently, the \$393,107 amount of appeal attorney fees stated in the Motion, has not  
2 changed. The \$196,687.01 of appeal attorney fees cited in the Opposition Declarations, which is  
3 based on the calculation prepared by Watermaster after the Motion was filed and is reflected in the  
4 Corbin Declaration, takes into account the amount of appeal attorney fees included in the AP  
5 Special Assessments and Ag Pool Assessments and deducts that amount from the \$393,107 total.  
6 [Corbin Decl. ¶¶ 3-7].

7           The calculation of the total amount of appeal attorney fees has also been adjusted to  
8 account for the City of Chino paying 100 percent of its share of appeal attorney fees as part of the  
9 recent Chino/AP settlement agreement. [Corbin Decl. ¶¶ 4, 6-7].

10           In summary, the Watermaster calculations show how much of the \$393,107 of appeal  
11 attorney fees are included in the \$262,761.21, which when deducted from the \$393,107 yields the  
12 balance of appeal attorney fees the non-settling appellants will owe if this court awards the AP all  
13 of its appellate fees as the prevailing party on appeal (taking into account that Chino has paid its  
14 share of those fees). Specifically, if Ontario and MVWD/MVIC pay 100 percent of their shares of  
15 appeal attorney fees like Chino did, plus their unpaid invoices, Ontario would pay \$270,962.93  
16 and MVWD/MVIC would pay \$120,783.76, for a total of \$391,746.69. Of this amount,  
17 \$160,365.99 would be 100 percent of their shares of appeal attorney fees taking into consideration  
18 the amount of appeal attorney fees included in the unpaid AP legal invoices. [Corbin Decl. ¶¶ 6-  
19 7].

20           Per the Schatz and Tilner declarations included with this Reply, the AP has incurred an  
21 additional \$44,637 of AP appeal legal expenses in preparing this Reply. [Schatz Reply Decl. ¶ 2].  
22 The total amount of AP legal expenses, including for this Reply, is \$205,002.99. The allocation of  
23 those Reply-related fees as between Ontario and Monte Vista Water District and Monte Vista  
24 Irrigation Company is subject to a Watermaster calculation because Watermaster did not include  
25 the additional \$44,637 when calculating the net amount due from those parties. [Corbin Decl. ¶  
26 7].

27  
28

1           **B.     The Appeal Arose out of Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement, when**  
2           **Appellants Challenged the Terms of Agreement (TOA) and its Approval**

3           Ontario claims that after the TOA was executed the nature of the dispute shifted [Opp. 7:  
4 22-24], or the original dispute transformed into a new dispute between the Ontario and the AP  
5 regarding the legal effect of the TOA [Opp. 8: 26-28, citing Nicholls Dec.]. In their view, the  
6 “transformed” dispute arose out of the Judgment, not out of the Peace Agreement, hence the  
7 latter’s fee-shifting provision does not apply.

8           Ontario’s claim should be rejected. Their appeal sought to invalidate the TOA, which  
9 itself resolved a dispute arising under the Peace Agreement. Ontario’s Opening Brief frankly  
10 recognized that the dispute on appeal arose under the Peace Agreement:

- 11           1.     “The Order from which this appeal is taken arises from a dispute over the meaning  
12                 of the Peace Agreement, in particular Section 5.4(a), which delineates the scope of  
13                 the Appropriative Pool assessments and expenses.” [AOB 17].
- 14           2.     “The TOA provides for the payment of many hundreds of thousands of dollars of  
15                 previously incurred Agricultural Pool legal expenses without ever obtaining  
16                 documentation showing that any portion of this amount is payable under Section  
17                 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement. Such provisions include \$370,000 toward  
18                 Agricultural Pool legal expenses for which the Agricultural Pool sought and failed  
19                 to establish any entitlement, as determined by the Court pursuant to the December  
20                 3 Order.” [AOB 23-24]. It goes on.
- 21           3.     Section II.B: “The TOA Unlawfully Amends the Peace Agreement Without the  
22                 Consent of all Parties.” [AOB 43-44].
- 23           4.     Section II.C: “The TOA Unlawfully Modifies the May 28 and December Orders,”  
24                 which concerned the Pools’ respective rights and obligations under the Peace  
25                 Agreement. [AOB 44-45].

26           By its own admission, Ontario’s appeal arose under the Peace Agreement and was directed  
27 to casting aside the TOA and reverting to the May and December 2021 trial court Orders [AOB  
28

1 44] in defiance of the TOA. In its opening sentence, the TOA states: “[t]hese Terms of Agreement  
2 ... are for the purpose of comprehensively resolving the current dispute and avoiding future  
3 disputes between the Ag Pool and AP ... *with respect to Peace Agreement Section 5.4(a).*”

4 [Schatz Decl. ¶ 9, p. 163, emphasis added]. The TOA was the reason for the appeal.

5 The Court of Appeal Opinion, attached as Exhibit A to the Tilner Declaration submitted  
6 with the Motion, included several conclusions that foreclose Ontario’s attempt to isolate the  
7 Appeal from the Peace Agreement:

8 “[t]he Peace Agreement resolved the parties’ disputes regarding a number of matters  
9 pertaining to the power and authority of the Court and Watermaster under the Judgment....”  
10 [COA Op. 6].

11 “... the Peace Agreement acknowledged and affirmed the AP Pool’s power to resolve  
12 disputes over the Pools obligations via majority. In executing the [Peace] Agreement, appellants  
13 stated their desire ‘to resolve issues by consent under [its] express terms and conditions.’” [COA  
14 Op. 15, underlining added].

15 and: “..., the governance structure embodied within the Judgment, coupled with the Peace  
16 Agreement, enables administration of the Judgment through collective decision making by each  
17 Pool.” [COA Op. 16].

18 Ontario’s Opposition admits “[t]he original dispute with the Ag Pool – but not the later  
19 TOA dispute – turned on the meaning of Section 5.4(a) of the Peace Agreement.” [Nicholls Decl.,  
20 ¶ ¶ 2, 10]. As admitted by Ontario in its Opening Brief, the TOA is not a later dispute but an  
21 ongoing dispute about the Peace Agreement.

22 In view of Ontario’s own statements that the appeal arose under the Peace Agreement and  
23 the cited Court of Appeal determinations that the Peace Agreement addresses Judgment matters,  
24 including governance, Ontario’s attempt to label the appeal as merely a dispute about the  
25 Judgment and not a Peace Agreement dispute to avoid paying the AP’s attorney fees is clearly  
26 wrong.

27  
28

1           **C.     Ontario’s Obligation Under the Peace Agreement’s Fee-Shifting Clause is Not**  
2           **Vitiated By the Section 9.1 Notice of Default Provision**

3           Ontario alleges the AP did not give any Notice of Default and opportunity to cure, which  
4 they argue is required to trigger the remedies under Part IX of the Peace Agreement.  
5 Peace Agreement Section 9.1 does not say who shall provide a notice of default or that, absent a  
6 notice of default, the breaching party can avoid the remedies set forth in Section 9.2. [Schatz Decl.  
7 ¶ 4]. In any event, at the March 22, 2022 AP meeting when the vote was taken to approve the  
8 TOA, Ontario declared and provided a notice of its own default. The report on the vote records  
9 Ontario’s position, which it does not dispute: “Vote on settlement and disclose that the City of  
10 Chino, City of Ontario, Monte Vista Water District, and Monte Vista Irrigation Company do not  
11 consent to the terms of settlement, want to be excluded from the Terms, and are not obligated to  
12 *and will not comply with the Terms.*” [Schatz Decl. ¶ 9, p. 161, emphasis added].

13           This record satisfies the purpose of providing a notice of default, which is to afford the  
14 breaching party an opportunity to cure. Ontario announced on the record in the report out of AP  
15 confidential session it would not accept the TOA, which resolved the Pools’ dispute under the  
16 Peace Agreement, and would not comply with its terms. Ontario was true to its word, withholding  
17 for more than two years the payments owed for Ag. Pool invoices until making payment just  
18 before the AP filed the present Motion. [Motion, 14, fn. 7]. Ontario had no intention to cure and  
19 obviously knew it was in default regarding obligations to pay Ag Pool legal expenses pursuant to  
20 the TOA.

21           Further, Peace Agreement Section 9.2(c) provides: “If the non-breaching Party [here, the  
22 AP] fails to exercise or delays in exercising any right or remedy, the non-breaching Party does not  
23 thereby waive that remedy.” Thus, although Ontario stated, in effect, it was in default and  
24 appealed the April 22 Order regarding the TOA arising under the Peace Agreement, if there was  
25 any purpose in this case of providing a Section 9.1 default notice, Section 9.2(c) preserves the  
26 AP’s remedies, including Section 9.2(d) Attorneys’ Fees.

1 Finally, Ontario notes the Ag Pool issued a Section 9.1 Notice of Default “in the original  
2 dispute”. [Opp. 15, fn 6]. To the extent a Notice of Default is required notwithstanding the  
3 foregoing, because the appeal challenging the TOA Order is a continuance of the Peace  
4 Agreement Section 5.4(a) dispute, the Ag Pool’s seminal Notice of Default satisfies Section 9.1.

5 **D. D. The Cost Allocation Clause in Peace Agreement Section 10.5 Applies Only**  
6 **to Fees Incurred in the Original Peace Agreement Negotiation, Not Fees**  
7 **Incurred Later on an Appeal Arising Under the Peace Agreement**

8 Ontario seeks to avoid fee-shifting by relying on Peace Agreement Section 10.5 which  
9 states: “Each Party Bears Own Costs. Each Party is to bear its own costs, expenses, and attorneys’  
10 fees arising out of or in connection with the subject matters of this Agreement and the negotiation,  
11 drafting, and execution of this Agreement. Each of the Parties understands that this Agreement  
12 includes all claims for loss, expense and attorneys’ fees, taxable or otherwise, incurred by it or  
13 arising out of any matters leading up to the execution of this Agreement”.

14 Section 10.5 is part of the Article X, General Provisions, of the Peace Agreement, not part  
15 of Article IX, Dispute Resolution, and by its own terms only applies to the negotiation of the  
16 original Peace Agreement. If applicable to disputes arising after the Peace Agreement was  
17 executed, it would be in conflict with the Dispute Resolution provisions of Article IX, including  
18 Section 9.2(d) providing for attorney’s fees in adversarial proceedings occurring after execution of  
19 the Agreement.

20 **E. Awarding Attorney Fees Under the Agreement’s Fee-Shifting Provision is**  
21 **Consistent With the Costs Awarded by the Court of Appeal**

22 Ontario suggests the Court of Appeal’s award of “costs” to AP, without mentioning “fees,”  
23 precludes AP’s current Motion for fees. The Rules of Court expressly reject this very suggestion:  
24 "Unless the court orders otherwise, an award of costs neither includes attorney's fees on appeal nor  
25 precludes a party from seeking them under rule 3.1702." Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.278(d)(2); see  
26 *Early v. Becerra* (2021) 60 Cal.App.5th 726, 732, fn. 2 ["a cost award in the Court of Appeal is  
27 irrelevant to a motion for attorney fees in the trial court"].)  
28

1 Here, Section 9.2(d) of the Peace Agreement provides that the “prevailing Party shall be  
2 entitled to recover their costs, including attorneys’ fees.” [Peace Agreement §9.2(d)]. In the  
3 Disposition, the Court of Appeal stated: “[r]espondents are to recover costs on appeal. [COA Op.  
4 24]. The AP was the prevailing party and thus entitled to recover both its costs, which the court  
5 expressly awarded, and its attorneys’ fees, which the cost award did not foreclose.

6 **F. Civil Code Section 1717 Authorizes Parties to the Peace Agreement to Alter**  
7 **the American Rule**

8 Ontario alleges the Motion cites Civil Code section 1717 as a potential basis for attorney  
9 fee-shifting without explaining the statute’s relevance. Section 1717 authorizes contracting parties  
10 to alter the American rule, which requires parties to bear their own attorney fees, by providing in  
11 their contract that the court may award attorney fees to the party who prevails in litigation between  
12 them. (*Drink Tank Ventures LLC v. Real Soda in Real Bottles, Ltd.* (2021) 71 Cal.App.5th 528,  
13 546; see *Essex Ins. Co. v. Five Star Dye House, Inc.* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 1252, 1257 [citing section  
14 1717 as a statutory exception to the American rule]; *Westwood Homes, Inc. v. AGCPII Villa*  
15 *Salerno Member, LLC* (2021) 65 Cal.App.5th 922, 927 [“section 1717 provides an exception [to  
16 the American rule] where the parties enter into an enforceable agreement authorizing an award of  
17 fees”].) That is the case here where the parties to the Peace Agreement, which is a contract, agreed  
18 to prevailing party attorneys’ fee in Section 9.2(d).

19 **G. The AP and Ag. Pool Attorneys Have Established that the Fees Claimed are**  
20 **Reasonable**

21 Ontario faults the Motion and its supporting declarations for stating aggregate fee amounts  
22 and legal high-level summaries of services rendered, without supporting documentation to show  
23 the claimed fees are reasonable. Ontario’s statement that there is no supporting documentation for  
24 payments made to Mr. Schatz as AP legal counsel is part of its argument as addressed in Section  
25 II., below.

26 “[T]here is no legal requirement that an attorney supply billing statements to support a  
27 claim for attorney fees. As this court has held, ‘An attorney’s testimony as to the number of hours  
28



1 worked is sufficient evidence to support an award of attorney fees, even in the absence of detailed  
2 time records.’ (Steiny & Co. v. California Electric Supply Co. (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 285, 293;  
3 see also Martino v. Denevi (1986) 182 Cal.App.3d 553, 559.” (Mardirossian & Associates, Inc. v.  
4 Ersoff (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 257, 269, parallel citations omitted.)

5 “[U]nlike some other jurisdictions, California law does not require detailed billing records  
6 to support a fee award.” (Rancho Mirage Country Club Homeowners Assn. v. Hazelbaker (2016)  
7 2 Cal.App.5th 252, 263–264.)

8 The declarations AP’s attorneys submitted with the Motion explain why the fees sought  
9 were reasonable. Other than arguing the court cannot determine reasonableness absent the  
10 invoices themselves—a position contrary to California law—Ontario does not dispute that the fees  
11 claimed are reasonable.

12 **II. THE MAY 2021 ORDER REGARDING AG POOL INVOICES DOES NOT**  
13 **REQUIRE THE AP TO PROVIDE ATTORNEY INVOICES TO ITS OWN**  
14 **MEMBERS. AP MEMBERS ARE BOUND BY AP MAJORITY VOTE TO PAY**  
15 **THE APPROVED AP SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS**

16 Ontario states it is ready and willing to pay its share of the AP legal expenses into a  
17 Watermaster escrow account with the funds to be released from escrow upon Ontario’s receipt of  
18 the supporting legal invoices. [Opp. 16: 11-13]. Ontario states the May 28, 2021 order is  
19 applicable to AP legal invoices. Not so.

20 The May 28, 2021 Order states: “[t]he ruling of the court on the instant motion for attorney  
21 fees is intended to apply only to the specific attorney fee dispute between the AgPool and the  
22 Appropriative Pool. It is not intended to have any general effect on any other party or pool, or to  
23 give the Appropriative Pool any legal basis to object to any other aspect or any other budget item.”  
24 [Opp. RJN ¶ 5]. Thus, the court broadly limited its Order to the Ag Pool legal fees dispute (later  
25 resolved by the TOA) to preclude any party from bootstrapping its provisions to other disputes, as  
26 Ontario currently attempts to do. Moreover, the dispute between the Ag Pool and AP regarding  
27 Ag Pool expenses arising under the Peace Agreement, the subject of the May 28, 2021 order, has  
28

JOHN SCHATZ  
Attorney at Law  
P.O. Box 7775  
Laguna Niguel, Ca. 92607-7775

1 no relevance and is not analogous to the internal administration of the AP or its Pooling Plan, to  
2 which the invoices now at issue relate.

3 AP members vote to approve expense budgets and to assess themselves accordingly. The  
4 majority vote is conclusive with respect to its binding effect on its members and not conditional  
5 upon a member's receipt and review of supporting information, including AP legal invoices.  
6 [Diggs Decl. ¶ 7; and see generally for AP administration including conclusory effect of  
7 Watermaster invoices].

8 **III. CONCLUSION**

9 For the reasons set forth in the Motion and herein, and based on Watermaster's final  
10 calculations, which were not available before AP filed its Motion but are presented with this  
11 Reply, the AP respectfully requests that:

- 12 1. The Court order \$160,365.99 of attorney fees AP incurred on appeal to be paid by  
13 Ontario, Monte Vista Water District and Monte Vista Irrigation Company per the  
14 Watermaster calculation that shows the amount for each provided herein.
- 15 2. The Court order \$231,380.70 of unpaid AP invoices to be paid by Ontario, Monte  
16 Vista Water District and Monte Vista Irrigation Company without imposing any  
17 conditions for the AP to receive payment.
- 18 3. Per the Schatz and Tilner Declarations included with this Reply, the court award  
19 the additional amount of \$44,637 of appeal attorney fees the AP incurred in  
20 preparing this Reply, to be paid by Ontario, Monte Vista Water District and Monte  
21 Vista Irrigation Company per a Watermaster calculation to allocate this amount  
22 between them.
- 23 4. The court order that Ontario, Monte Vista Water District and Monte Vista  
24 Irrigation Company shall be jointly and severally liable for obligations imposed by  
25 Paragraphs 1-3, above.

26 August 15, 2024

By: John J. Schatz  
John J. Schatz,  
Attorney for Chino Basin Watermaster  
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:

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 August 15, 2024 I served the following:

1. REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO APPROPRIATIVE POOL MOTION FOR AWARD OF EXPENSES PER CONTRACT AND CIVIL CODE SECTION 1717

/X/ 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.

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

Executed on August 15, 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	agomez@emeraldus.com
Alan Frost	Alan.Frost@dpw.sbcounty.gov
Alberto Mendoza	Alberto.Mendoza@cmc.com
Alejandro R. Reyes	arreyes@sgvwater.com
Alex Padilla	Alex.Padilla@wsp.com
Alexis Mascarinas	AMascarinas@ontarioca.gov
Alfonso Ruiz	alfonso.ruiz@cmc.com
Allen Hubsch	ahubsch@hubschlaw.com
Alma Heustis	alma.heustis@nucor.com
Alonso Jurado	ajurado@cbwm.org
Alyssa Coronado	acoronado@sarwc.com
Amanda Coker	amandac@cvwdwater.com
Amy Bonczewski	ABonczewski@ontarioca.gov
Andrew Gagen	agagen@kidmanlaw.com
Andy Campbell	acampbell@ieua.org
Andy Malone	amalone@westyost.com
Angelica Todd	angelica.todd@ge.com
Anna Nelson	atruongnelson@cbwm.org
Anthony Alberti	aalberti@sgvwater.com
April Robitaille	arobitaille@bhfs.com
Art Bennett	citycouncil@chinohills.org
Arthur Kidman	akidman@kidmanlaw.com
Ashley Zapp	ashley.zapp@cmc.com
Ashok Dhingra	ash@akdconsulting.com
Ben Lewis	benjamin.lewis@gswater.com
Ben Markham	bmarkham@bhfs.com
Ben Roden	BenR@cvwdwater.com
Benjamin M. Weink	ben.weink@tetrattech.com
Beth.McHenry	Beth.McHenry@hoferranch.com
Bill Schwartz	bschwartz@mvwd.org
Bill Velto	bvelto@uplandca.gov
Board Support Team IEUA	BoardSupportTeam@ieua.org
Bob Bowcock	bbowcock@irmwater.com
Bob DiPrimio	rjdiprimio@sgvwater.com
Bob Feenstra	bobfeenstra@gmail.com
Bob Kuhn	bgkuhn@aol.com
Bob Kuhn	bkuhn@tvmwd.com
Bob Page	Bob.Page@rov.sbcounty.gov
Brad Herrema	bherrema@bhfs.com
Bradley Jensen	bradley.jensen@cao.sbcounty.gov
Brandi Belmontes	BBelmontes@ontarioca.gov
Brandi Goodman-Decoud	bgdecoud@mvwd.org
Brandon Howard	brahoward@niagarawater.com
Brenda Fowler	balee@fontanawater.com
Brent Yamasaki	byamasaki@mw20.com
Brett Godown	Brett.Godown@Airports.SBCounty.Gov
Brian Dickinson	bdickinson65@gmail.com
Brian Geye	bgeye@autoclubspeedway.com
Brian Lee	blee@sawaterco.com
Bryan Smith	bsmith@jcsd.us
Carmen Sierra	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	Chris_Diggs@ci.pomona.ca.us
Christen Miller	Christen.Miller@cao.sbcounty.gov
Christensen, Rebecca A	rebecca_christensen@fws.gov
Christiana Daisy	cdaisy@ieua.org
Christopher M. Sanders	cms@eslawfirm.com
Christopher R. Guillen	cguillen@bhfs.com
Cindy Cisneros	cindyc@cvwdwater.com
Cindy Li	Cindy.li@waterboards.ca.gov
City of Chino, Administration Department	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
Dan McKinney	dmckinney@douglascountylaw.com
Daniel Bobadilla	dbobadilla@chinohills.org
Daniela Uriarte	dUriarte@cbwm.org
Danny Kim	dkim@linklogistics.com
Dave Argo	daveargo46@icloud.com
Dave Crosley	DCrosley@cityofchino.org
Dave Schroeder	DSchroeder@cbwcd.org
David Barnes	DBarnes@geoscience-water.com
David De Jesus	ddejesus@tvmwd.com
David Schroeder (dschroeder@cbwcd.org)	dschroeder@cbwcd.org
Dawn Varacchi-Ives (dawn.varacchi@ge.com)	dawn.varacchi@ge.com
Denise Garzaro	dgarzaro@ieua.org
Dennis Mejia	dmejia@ontarioca.gov
Dennis Williams	dwilliams@geoscience-water.com
Derek Hoffman	dhoffman@fennemorelaw.com
Diana Frederick	diana.frederick@cdcr.ca.gov
Ed Diggs	ediggs@uplandca.gov
Ed Means	edmeans@icloud.com
Eddie Lin (elin@ieua.org)	elin@ieua.org
Edgar Tellez Foster	etellezfoster@cbwm.org
Eduardo Espinoza	EduardoE@cvwdwater.com
Elizabeth M. Calciano	ecalciano@hensleylawgroup.com
Elizabeth P. Ewens	elizabeth.ewens@stoel.com

Elizabeth Willis	ewillis@cbwcd.org
Eric Fordham	eric_fordham@geopentech.com
Eric Garner	eric.garner@bbklaw.com
Eric Grubb	ericg@cvwdwater.com
Eric Lindberg PG,CHG	eric.lindberg@waterboards.ca.gov
Eric N. Robinson	erobinson@kmtg.com
Eric Papathakis	Eric.Papathakis@cdcr.ca.gov
Eric Tarango	edtarango@fontanawater.com
Erik Vides	evides@cbwm.org
Erika Clement	Erika.clement@sce.com
Eunice Ulloa	eulloa@cityofchino.org
Eunice Ulloa - City of Chino (eulloa@cityofchino.org)	eulloa@cityofchino.org
Evette Ounanian	EvetteO@cvwdwater.com
Frank Yoo	FrankY@cbwm.org
Fred Fudacz	ffudacz@nossaman.com
Fred Galante	fgalante@awattorneys.com
G. Michael Milhiser	directormilhiser@mvwd.org
G. Michael Milhiser	Milhiser@hotmail.com
Garrett Rapp	grapp@westyost.com
Geoffrey Kamansky	gkamansky@niagarawater.com
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel	geoffreyvh60@gmail.com
Gerald Yahr	yahrj@koll.com
Gina Gomez	ggomez@ontarioca.gov
Gina Nicholls	gnicholls@nossaman.com
Gino L. Filippi	Ginoffvine@aol.com
Gracie Torres	gtorres@wmwd.com
Grant Mann	GMann@dpw.sbcounty.gov
Greg Zarco	Greg.Zarco@airports.sbcounty.gov
Gregor Larabee	Gregor.Larabee@cdcr.ca.gov
Ha T. Nguyen	ha.nguyen@stoel.com
Henry DeHaan	Hdehaan1950@gmail.com
Hvianca Hakim	HHakim@linklogistics.com
Hye Jin Lee	HJLee@cityofchino.org
Imelda Cadigal	Imelda.Cadigal@cdcr.ca.gov
Insixiengmay, Maria	Maria.Insxiengmay@cc.sbcounty.gov
Irene Islas	irene.islas@bbklaw.com
Ivy Capili	ICapili@bhfs.com
James Curatalo	jamesc@cvwdwater.com
Janelle S.H. Krattiger, Esq	janelle.krattiger@stoel.com
Jasmin A. Hall	jhall@ieua.org
Jason Marseilles	jmarseilles@ieua.org
Jayne Joy	Jayne.Joy@waterboards.ca.gov
Jean Cihigoyenetché	Jean@thejclawfirm.com
Jeff Evers	jevers@niagarawater.com
Jeff Mosher	jmosher@sawpa.org
Jeffrey L. Pierson	jpierson@intexcorp.com
Jenifer Ryan	jryan@kmtg.com
Jennifer Hy-Luk	jhyluk@ieua.org
Jeremy N. Jungries	jjungreis@rutan.com
Jesse Pompa	jpompa@jcsd.us
Jessie Ruedas	Jessie@thejclawfirm.com
Jill Keehnen	jill.keehnen@stoel.com



Jim Markman	jmarkman@rwglaw.com
Jim Van de Water	jimvdw@thomashardercompany.com
Jim W. Bowman	jbowman@ontarioca.gov
jimmiem@cvwdwater.com	jimmiem@cvwdwater.com
Jimmy Gutierrez - Law Offices of Jimmy Gutierrez	
	jimmylaredo@gmail.com
Jimmy L. Gutierrez	Jimmy@City-Attorney.com
Jimmy Medrano	Jaime.medrano2@cdcr.ca.gov
Jiwon Seung	JiwonS@cvwdwater.com
Joanne Chan	jchan@wvwd.org
Joao Feitoza	joao.feitoza@cmc.com
Jody Roberto	jroberto@tvmwd.com
Joe Graziano	jgraz4077@aol.com
Joel Ignacio	jignacio@ieua.org
John Bosler	johnb@cvwdwater.com
John Harper	jrharper@harperburns.com
John Hughes - Monte Vista Water District (jhughes@mvwd.org)	
	jhughes@mvwd.org
John Huitsing	johnhuitsing@gmail.com
John Lopez	jlopez@sarwc.com
John Lopez and Nathan Cole	customerservice@sarwc.com
John Mendoza	jmendoza@tvmwd.com
John Partridge	jpartridge@angelica.com
John Russ	jruss@ieua.org
John Schatz	jschatz13@cox.net
Jordan Garcia	jgarcia@cbwm.org
Jose A Galindo	Jose.A.Galindo@linde.com
Jose Ventura	jose.ventura@linde.com
Josh Swift	jmswift@fontanawater.com
Joshua Aguilar	jaguilar1@wmwd.com
Justin Brokaw	jbrokaw@marygoldmutualwater.com
Justin Nakano	JNakano@cbwm.org
Justin Scott-Coe Ph. D.	jscottcoe@mvwd.org
Kaitlyn Dodson-Hamilton	kaitlyn@tdaenv.com
Karen Williams	kwilliams@sawpa.org
Kathleen Brundage	kathleen.brundage@californiasteel.com
Keith Person	keith.person@waterboards.ca.gov
Kelly Ridenour	KRIDENOUR@fennemorelaw.com
Ken Waring	kwaring@jcsd.us
Kevin O'Toole	kotoole@ocwd.com
Kevin Sage	Ksage@IRMwater.com
kparker@katithewaterlady.com	kparker@katithewaterlady.com
Krista Paterson	Kpaterson@kmtg.com
Kurt Berchtold	kberchtold@gmail.com
Kyle Brochard	KBrochard@rwglaw.com
Kyle Snay	kylesnay@gswater.com
Laura Roughton	lroughton@wmwd.com
Laura Yraceburu	lyraceburu@bhfs.com
Lauren V. Neuhaus, Esq.	lauren.neuhaus@stoel.com
Lee McElhaney	lmcElhaney@bmklawplc.com
Lewis Callahan	Lewis.Callahan@cdcr.ca.gov
Linda Jadeski	ljadeski@wvwd.org
Liz Hurst	ehurst@ieua.org

Lorena Heredia	lheredia@ieua.org
Mallory Gandara	MGandara@wmwd.com
Manny Martinez - Monte Vista Water District Director	DirectorMartinez@mvwd.org
Marcella Correa	MCorrea@rwglaw.com
Marco Tule	mtule@ieua.org
Maria Ayala	mayala@jcsd.us
Maria Mendoza	mmendoza@westyost.com
Maribel Sosa	msosa@ci.pomona.ca.us
Marilynhlevin@gmail.com	Marilynhlevin@gmail.com
Marissa Turner	mtturner@tvmwd.com
Mark D. Hensley	mhensley@hensleylawgroup.com
Mark Wiley	mwiley@chinohills.org
Marlene B. Wiman	mwiman@nossaman.com
Martin Cihigoyenetché	marty@thejclawfirm.com
Martin Rauch	martin@rauchcc.com
Martin Zvirbulis	mezvirbulis@sgvwater.com
Matthew H. Litchfield	mlitchfield@tvmwd.com
Maureen Snelgrove	Maureen.snelgrove@airports.sbcounty.gov
Melanie Trevino	Mtrevino@jcsd.us
Michael Adler	michael.adler@mcmcnet.net
Michael B. Brown, Esq.	michael.brown@stoel.com
Michael Blay	mblay@uplandca.gov
Michael Fam	mfam@dpw.sbcounty.gov
Michael Hurley	mhurley@ieua.org
Michael Mayer	Michael.Mayer@dpw.sbcounty.gov
Michael P. Thornton	mthornton@tkeengineering.com
Michelle Licea	mlicea@mvwd.org
Mikayla Coleman	mikayla@cvstrat.com
Mike Gardner	mgardner@wmwd.com
Mike Maestas	mikem@cvwdwater.com
Miriam Garcia	mgarcia@ieua.org
Monica Nelson	mnelson@ieua.org
Moore, Toby	TobyMoore@gswater.com
MWDProgram	MWDProgram@sdca.org
Nadia Aguirre	naguirre@tvmwd.com
Natalie Avila	navila@cityofchino.org
Natalie Costaglio	natalie.costaglio@mcmcnet.net
Nathan deBoom	n8deboom@gmail.com
Neetu Gupta	ngupta@ieua.org
Nichole Horton	Nichole.Horton@pomona.ca.gov
Nick Jacobs	njacobs@somachlaw.com
Nicole deMoet	ndemoet@uplandca.gov
Nicole Escalante	NEscalante@ontarioca.gov
Noah Golden-Krasner	Noah.goldenkrasner@doj.ca.gov
Norberto Ferreira	nferreira@uplandca.gov
Oscar Ramos	omramos@sgvwater.com
Paul Hofer	farmwatchtoo@aol.com
Paul Hofer	farmerhofer@aol.com
Paul S. Leon	pleon@ontarioca.gov
Pete Vicario	PVicario@cityofchino.org
Peter Hettinga	peterhettinga@yahoo.com
Peter Rogers	progers@chinohills.org

Rebekah Walker  
Richard Anderson  
Richard Rees  
Rickey S. Manbahal  
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

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

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  
Tim Barr  
Tim Moore

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  
tcatlin@wfajpa.org  
Twatkins@geoscience-water.com  
tombunn@lagerlof.com  
tbarr@wmwd.com  
tmoore@westyost.com

Timothy Ryan	tjryan@sgvwater.com
Toby Moore	toby.moore@gswater.com
Todd M. Corbin (tcorbin@cbwm.org)	tcorbin@cbwm.org
Tom Barnes	tbarnes@esassoc.com
Tom Bunn	TomBunn@Lagerlof.com
Tom Cruikshank	tcruikshank@linklogistics.com
Tom Dodson (tda@tdaenv.com)	tda@tdaenv.com
Tom Harder	tharder@thomashardercompany.com
Tom O'Neill	toneill@chinodesalter.org
Toni Medell	mmedel@mbakerintl.com
Tony Long	tlong@angelica.com
Toyasha Sebbag	tsebbag@cbwcd.org
Tracy J. Egoscue	tracy@egoscuelaw.com
Trevor Leja	Trevor.Leja@cao.sbcounty.gov
Veva Weamer	vweamer@westyost.com
Victor Preciado	Victor_Preciado@ci.pomona.ca.us
Vivian Castro	vcastro@cityofchino.org
Wade Fultz	Wade.Fultz@cmc.com
WestWater Research, LLC	research@waterexchange.com
William Brunick	bbrunick@bmklawplc.com
William McDonnell	wmcdonnell@ieua.org
William Urena	wurena@emeraldus.com