



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED

04-16-12
04:59 PM

In the Matter of the Application of Golden Hills Sanitation Company (U438SWR) for Authority to Increase Rates Charged for Sewer Service by \$148,076 or 120% in January 2012, \$148,076 or 54% in January 2013, and \$148,076 or 35% in January 2014.

Application 11-08-019
(Filed August 26, 2011)

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the Operations and Practices of Golden Hills Sanitation Company, and Order to Show Cause why Findings should not be entered by the Commission under Public Utilities Code Section 855.

FILED
PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION
MARCH 8, 2012
SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE
INVESTIGATION 12-03-008

REPLY TO RESPONSE OF EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF CARLIE W. SMITH AND THE EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF LILLIAN W. SMITH TO MOTION DEMANDING CONTINUED SUBSIDY OF GHSC RATEPAYERS

Adrian Maaskant
21605 Belmont Dr.
Tehachapi CA 93561
amaaskant@bak.rr.com

This Reply is filed on behalf of the undersigned and the following persons: Angelina Adkins, Irene G. Torres, Natalie Bullock, Jorge & Zoila Recinos, Ryan & Stacy Estrella, Willow Springs Apartments (Marice Silitonga), and Golden Hills Motel (John Kapadia)

April 16, 2012

Permission to Reply

Pursuant to Rule 11.1(f), written permission was granted by ALJ Wilson for this *Reply To Response Of Executor Of The Estate Of Carlie W. Smith And The Executor Of The Estate Of Lillian W. Smith To Motion Demanding Continued Subsidy Of GHSC Ratepayers* (Reply). This permission was granted in an email dated April 9, 2012 and is offered as Exhibit I. This Reply must be filed and served no later than April 17, 2012.

Reply to Charge that Adrian Maaskant has no Standing

BB&T Wealth Management in its capacity as domiciliary executor of the probate estate of Carlie Smith and Linda Maycock, in her capacity as the surviving Executor of the Estate of Lillian W. Smith (Owners), begin their *Response Of Executor Of The Estate Of Carlie W. Smith And The Executor Of The Estate Of Lillian W. Smith To Motion Demanding Continued Subsidy Of GHSC Ratepayers* (Response) with the claim:

“Mr. Maaskant is not an attorney and he is not a customer of GHSC and does not have standing to bring the Motion.” (page 1 of Response)

Motion Requesting Order for the Continued Subsidy of Operating Expenses for Golden Hills Sanitation Company from the Estates of Carlie Smith and Lillian Smith (Motion) was brought before the California Public Utilities Commission in the matter of the consolidated proceedings of Application 11-08-019 and Investigation 12-03-008. In this venue I was granted the status of Party by ALJ Wilson when she issued and served her Ruling on January 26, 2012 by email (See Exhibit II) in response to my *Motion Requesting Party Status for A. Maaskant (2)* served and filed on January 13, 2012. Rules of Practice and Procedure 11.1(e) provides for parties to respond to motions within 15 days. No response was filed within those 15 days from January 13, 2012.

When I first requested Party Status at the January 5, 2012 Prehearing Conference I fully disclosed the fact that I am not an attorney and not a customer of GHSC. Ms. Sara Steck Myers was present at this hearing representing GHSC and its Owners. Mr. Don Liddell was also present as a member of the public. The parameters that would have to be established for me to become a party were defined at the Prehearing

Conference and can be found on pages 9 and 10 of the transcript of that proceeding. No one objected to those parameters.

For the reasons stated, I refute the Owners' contention that I do not have standing to bring the Motion.

I. Lack of Jurisdiction

¶ 1, page 2: The Owners write:

“The California Public Utilities Commission (the ‘Commission’ or the ‘PUC’) does not have jurisdiction over the probate estates of Carlie W. Smith (the ‘Carlie Estate’) or Lillian W. Smith (the ‘Lillian Estate’), nor over their executors, BB&T and Maycock, respectively. The Carlie Estate and BB&T as its executor are subject to the jurisdiction of the Warren County Probate Court located in Kentucky in Cause No. 10-P-00032; the Lillian Estate and Maycock as its surviving executor are subject to the jurisdiction of the Warren County Probate Court located in Kentucky in Cause No. 09-P-0472. Neither the Carlie Estate nor the Lillian Estate (together, the ‘Estates’), nor either of their executors are public utilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.”

This assertion is not supported by the subsequent argument provided. The Response only looks to California Law for support, though it does so unconvincingly. The Response makes no reference Kentucky Law supporting this claim of lack of jurisdiction, even though the concept of concurrent jurisdiction is not foreign to Kentucky Law (see, for example, KRS 386.690). Noteworthy also is the fact that the State of Kentucky recognizes the authority of the laws of other states when a business enterprise is subject to those laws (see, for example, KRS 386.4420).

¶ 3, page 2: The Owners write:

“... The term sewer system corporation is defined in Public Utilities Code §230.6 as follows: ‘Sewer system corporation’ includes every corporation or person owning, controlling, operating, or managing any sewer system for compensation within this state.

But the reference to ‘persons owning’ is not a reference to ‘persons owning the corporation.’ Rather, the reference in the definition of sewer system corporation to a ‘person owning’ is to a ‘person owning . . . a sewer system . . .’”

This rather tortured bit of reasoning is predicated on the misstatement of California Law, PUC § 205 that the Owners advanced in their filing of April 6, 2012: *Petition of Golden Hills Sanitation Company (U 438-SWR) and the Executors of the Estates of Carlie Smith and Lillian Smith for Modification of Decision 12-03-025*, footnote 5, when the Owners falsely claim that California Law defines “person”:

“The term “Person” is defined in California Public Utilities Code Section 205 as “an individual, a firm, and a copartnership.” The term likewise does not encompass the Estates.”

The definition of “person” is accurately defined by California Law as follows:

Public Utilities Code § 205. "Person" includes an individual, a firm, and a copartnership.

Public Utilities Code § 206. As used in this chapter "person" and "corporation" include the lessees, trustees, receivers or trustees appointed by any court whatsoever, of the person or corporation.

Corporation Code § 29001. "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or association, either domestic or foreign, whether acting in his or her own right or as the officer, agent, servant, employee, correspondent, or representative of another or as trustee.

Business and Professions Code § 302(d) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, association, or other group, however organized.

¶ 5 & ¶ 6, pages 3 & 4: The Owners write:

“In fact, there is affirmative evidence from the California Constitution that the PUC was intentionally *not* granted jurisdiction over mere shareholders of a corporation that owns a public utility and that such shareholders are *not* the guarantors of the debts owed by the utility and *cannot* be compelled to subsidize the operating shortfalls of the utility. Prior to 1930, Article XII § 3 of the California Constitution read:

Each stockholder of a corporation, or joint-stock association, shall be individually and personally liable for such proportion of all its debts and liabilities contracted or incurred ... [the majority of the citation is omitted here]

In 1930, the foregoing provision *was repealed*. Article XII § 3 of the California Constitution *now reads*:

§ 3. Utilities subject to legislative control

Private corporations and persons that own, operate, control, or manage a line, plant, or system for the transportation of people or property, the transmission of telephone and telegraph messages, or the production, generation, transmission, or furnishing of heat, light, water, power, storage, or wharfage directly or indirectly to or for the public, and common carriers, are public utilities subject to control by the Legislature. The Legislature may prescribe that additional classes of private corporations or other persons are public utilities.

Once again it is relevant to note that the reference to a ‘persons that own’ is to the ownership of ‘a line, plant, or system’ and not to the ‘private corporation.’ The repeal of the prior Article XII § 3 is indicative of a rejection that shareholders of utilities serve as the “guarantors” of the debts of the utility.”

There is absolutely **no affirmative evidence** presented in the above passage that supports the Owners’ conclusion. The Owners rely on the existence of a change in the California Constitution in 1930 to **speculate** on the motives of the legislature (or perhaps the electorate) rather than cite any relevant evidence that supports their conjecture. There is no reference to the California Legislative Digest, California Legislative History or any other authoritative reference to bolster this tenuous conclusion.

¶ 8, page 4: The Owners write:

“... there is no legal basis for concluding that the Commission has jurisdiction here and therefore no basis upon which the relief requested in the Motion can be imposed upon the Estates or their executors.”

This summary statement on the part of the Owners is predicated on specious evidence and suspect reasoning. It is, of course, absurd to think that the Owners are relieved of their responsibilities under California Law for a corporation that exists in California just because they exercise their control over that corporation from beyond the borders of California. That these Owners are active participants in the management and activities of GHSC, rather than simple passive investors, is proven by the *Minutes of*

Emergency Meetin [sic] of Shareholders of Golden Hills Sanitation company, Inc., A California Corporation, dated February 1, 2012 (Exhibit III). Therein is stated at paragraph 2:

“The Estate of Lillian Smith by and through Linda Maycock, co-executrix with a 50% interest in 211 shares of stock in the Corporation and the Estate of Carlie Smith by and through Dennis Longest, Vice President of BB&T Wealth Management, Domiciliary Executor, as the holder of the remaining 50% interest in 211 shares of the stock in the Corporation ...”

This, in conjunction with Corporations Code § 160 (copied below) and Public Utilities Code § 230.6 (copied below) combine to clearly demonstrate that under California Law, the Owners cannot evade jurisdiction by claiming to be domiciled in another state.

Corporations Code § 160. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), "control" means the possession, direct or indirect, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of a corporation.

(b) "Control" in Sections 181, 1001, and 1200 means the ownership directly or indirectly of shares or equity securities possessing more than 50 percent of the voting power of a domestic corporation, a foreign corporation, or an[y] other business entity.

Public Utilities Code § 230.6. "Sewer system corporation" includes every corporation or person owning, **controlling**, operating, or managing any sewer system for compensation within this state. (Bold emphasis added)

Nor can the Owners claim to be passive holders of shares with no influence over the operation and control of GHSC when they voted to shut down this waste water facility and give the customers but one week's notice, as they did at this same shareholders meeting (See Exhibit IV for the letter to customers):

“6. The Board ... was authorized ... to ... (iii) shut down the sewage treatment facility owned by the corporation ...” (Page 2, Exhibit III)

II. Lack of Justification for Granting the Relief Requested in the Motion.

Item 1: My qualifications to represent the owners of 31 connections before the Commission have been established. The Owners' opportunity to question and challenge my status of Party has long since passed.

Item 2: In one form or another, the operational costs of GHSC have been subsidized from its inception in 1980. This was known to all who were involved in ownership of the facility throughout its history (including Carlie and Lillian Smith, who are among the original incorporators of GHSC), but this was not revealed to customers until only a few months ago. Now those customers are faced with sewer rates that threaten their financial security and well being. The Owners argue that they are entitled to a profit from operating the facility, and under equitable circumstances that would surely be the case. Had the customers been timely informed that their rates were subject to a sudden quadrupling when the secret subsidies ceased (a bit more than the quadrupling of rates – from \$58/month to \$266/month – is what GHSC requested in Application 11-08-019), then I would fully agree that the request for continued subsidy would be unjust. But that’s not what happened! The customers were never formally or even informally informed of the financial risk of connecting to GHSC, and only learned of this risk long after they had invested in property dependent on GHSC’s services. Black’s Law Dictionary defines equitable: “Just; conformation to principles of justice and right.” Leaving GHSC’s customers in financial ruin because the Owners now wish to precipitously withdraw their secret subsidy after 30 years is not just and decidedly does not conform to principles of justice and right. A well managed transition over a reasonable period of time to allow an equitable solution for the customers as well as the Owners is what is requested.

The Owners complain that I failed to provide citations. I’m not an expert in business torts and Ponzi schemes, but I would think this would be a fruitful source of possible legal citations for the matter at hand. I would hope that the Owners would agree that a more positive approach to an equitable solution is called for.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Adrian Maaskant
Adrian Maaskant

April 16, 2012
Date

EXHIBIT I

From: [Wilson, Sean](#)

To: [amaaskan](#) ; [Sara Steck Myers](#) ; [Michael Popichak](#) ; [Nixon, Marcus](#) ; [Don Liddell](#) ; [Dave Stegall](#) ; [Clint Hilderbrand](#) ; [Barbara Miller](#) ; rileywalter@W2LG.com ; [water division](#) ; info@goldenhillssanitation.com

Cc: [Lee, Cleveland](#)

Sent: Monday, April 09, 2012 8:49 AM

Subject: RE: Permission Pursuant to Rule 11.1(f) to Reply to Responses (GHSC GRC/Investigation A11-08-019/I12-03-008)

Good morning. Pursuant to Rule 11.1(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Mr. Maaskant may file a reply to the responses to his March 23, 2012 motions by April 17, 2012. No further responses or replies will be granted.

-Judge Wilson

From: amaaskan [mailto:amaaskant@bak.rr.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 08, 2012 9:22 AM

To: Wilson, Sean; Sara Steck Myers; Michael Popichak; Nixon, Marcus; Don Liddell; Dave Stegall; Clint Hilderbrand; Barbara Miller; rileywalter@W2LG.com; water division; info@goldenhillssanitation.com

Cc: Lee, Cleveland

Subject: Permission Pursuant to Rule 11.1(f) to Reply to Responses (GHSC GRC/Investigation A11-08-019/I12-03-008)

Dear Judge Wilson,

I request permission pursuant to Rule 11.1(f) to reply as the moving party to GHSC and its owners in the matter of:

- **RESPONSE OF GOLDEN HILLS SANITATION COMPANY (U 438-SWR) AND THE EXECUTORS OF THE ESTATES OF CARLIE W. SMITH AND LILLIAN W. SMITH IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION SEEKING NULLIFICATION OF DEBT**
- **OBJECTION TO JURISDICTION AND RESPONSE OF EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF CARLIE W. SMITH AND THE EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF LILLIAN W. SMITH TO MOTION DEMANDING CONTINUED SUBSIDY OF GHSC RATEPAYERS**

EXHIBIT I

Calculation of Last date at which Reply Must be Filed and Served:

Rule 11.1(e) and (f)

(e) Responses to written motions must be filed and served within 15 days of the date that the motion was served, except as otherwise provided in these Rules or unless the Administrative Law Judge sets a different date. Responses to oral motions may be made as permitted by the Administrative Law Judge.

(f) With the permission of the Administrative Law Judge, the moving party may reply to responses to the motion. Written replies must be filed and served within 10 days of the last day for filing responses under subsection (e) unless the Administrative Law Judge sets a different date. A written reply must state in the opening paragraph that the Administrative Law Judge has authorized its filing and must state the date and the manner in which the authorization was given (i.e., in writing, by telephone conversation, etc.).

Motion to Nullify Debt was served by email on Friday, March 23, 2012 at 10:06pm.
Motion Requesting Order for Continued Subsidy was served by email on Friday, March 23, 2012 at 10:00pm.

Based on these Rules, it is my understanding that my Replies must be filed and served no later than close of business on April 17, 2012. If this is not correct, please do me the courtesy of correcting my calculation and informing me of this correction.

Sincerely,
Adrian Maaskant

EXHIBIT II

----- Original Message -----

From: [Wilson, Sean](#)
To: [amaaskan](#) ; [Nixon, Marcus](#) ; [Don Liddell](#) ; [Dave Stegall](#) ; [Clint Hilderbrand](#) ; [Barbara Miller](#) ; [Michael Popichak](#) ; [Sara Steck Myers](#)
Cc: [ALJ Process](#) ; [ALJ Docket Office](#)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2012 9:43 AM
Subject: RE: Motion Requesting Party Status for Adrian Maaskant

Good morning. I grant Mr. Maaskant's motion for Party Status. This electronic ruling will be memorialized in hard copy at a later date.

-Judge Wilson

Seaneen McCarthy Wilson
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue - Room 5022
San Francisco, California 94102
☎ (415) 703-1525
✉ sean.wilson@cpuc.ca.gov

From: amaaskan [mailto:amaaskant@bak.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 7:19 PM
To: Nixon, Marcus; Don Liddell; Dave Stegall; Clint Hilderbrand; Barbara Miller; Michael Popichak; Sara Steck Myers; Wilson, Sean
Subject: Motion Requesting Party Status for Adrian Maaskant

Please find attached a new motion for party status for Adrian Maaskant. This motion was filed with the CPUC on January 12, 2012 at 7:15 pm.

Sincerely,
Adrian Maaskant

EXHIBIT III

DWA 2

MINUTES OF EMERGENCY MEETING OF SHAREHOLDERS
OF
GOLDEN HILLS SANITATION COMPANY, INC.
A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION

An emergency meeting of the shareholders of Golden Hills Sanitation Company, Inc., a California corporation (the "Corporation"), was held on February 1, 2012 at the offices of BB&T Wealth Management located at 1820 Scottsville Road, Bowling Green, KY 42104 at 4:30 p.m. local time (the "Emergency Meeting").

The following shareholders were present: the Estate of Lillian Smith by and through Linda Maycock, co-executrix with a 50% interest in 211 shares of the stock in the Corporation and the Estate of Carlie Smith by and through Dennis Longest, Vice President of BB&T Wealth Management, Domiciliary Executor, as the holder of the remaining 50% interest in 211 shares of the stock in the Corporation (together, the "Smith Estate Shareholders"). There were also present A. Franklin Berry, probate counsel for BB&T, Maria K. Pum (by telephone), special California counsel for BB&T and William Maycock, husband of Linda Maycock.

The holder of the remaining 27 outstanding shares of the Corporation, Golden Hills Land Company, Inc. was not present at the Emergency Meeting because neither the Corporation nor either of the Smith Shareholders has any current contact information for that shareholder.

The Emergency Meeting was convened without having given 10 days' notice of a Special Meeting to all shareholders as required by Article 1, Section 4 of the Corporation's bylaws because (1) at the time Carlie Smith died, the remaining officer of the corporation was Clint Hilderbrand, as secretary and the two surviving Directors were Jerry Smith and Clint Hilderbrand; (2) in January 10, 2010, a Certificate of Action was issued on behalf of the Directors naming Cody Tellis as the President and Chief Financial Officer of the Corporation and Clint Hilderbrand as Secretary, but the Smith Estate Shareholders could not locate an original or copy signed by both surviving Directors and the only original or copy that was found was signed by Jerry Smith; (3) Jerry Smith could not be located; (4) Clint Hilderbrand reports that he resigned as Secretary of the Corporation in October 2011 thereby leaving the Corporation without an officer to act on behalf of the Corporation unless Cody Tellis was the properly appointed as President and Chief Financial Officer of the Corporation, (5) the Corporation has insufficient funds or income to operate and a plant closure, plant transfer or bankruptcy was likely to be required in the immediate future, and (6) Clint Hilderbrand advised representatives of the Estate of Carlie Smith that he would no longer act as the licensed operator of the Corporation's sewage treatment plant effective February 1, 2012 unless he was assured that the Carlie Smith Estate would transfer him 9.5 acres of real property in consideration for past services and the Corporation signed a new 6-month contract with Aqua Operations, Inc., a company with which Clint Hilderbrand is affiliated and by which he is employed. As of February 1, 2012 it was imperative that the Corporation have a new board and confirmation that Cody Tellis could act and was acting as President, and that it engage a new officer residing in the vicinity of the plant to act as an interim officer until a Chief Restructuring Officer might be engaged. The Smith Estate Shareholders waived notice of the Emergency Meeting.

EXHIBIT III

At the Emergency Meeting, a quorum of shareholders was present. At the Emergency Meeting it was determined by the Smith Estate Shareholders (which together hold 211 out of the 238 outstanding shares of the Corporation), that the following actions were unanimously approved:

1. All individuals claiming to be a member of the Corporation's Board of Directors were removed, effective February 1, 2012;
2. The following two (2) Directors were elected: Cody Tellis and Kathy Omachi;
3. The By-Laws of the Corporation were amended to authorize a President, Secretary or Vice President of the Corporation to: (a) engage a Chief Restructuring Officer for the Corporation, and (b) engage such other officers for the Corporation as said President, Secretary, Vice President or Chief Restructuring Officer deems necessary;
4. Mr. Cody Tellis was confirmed as having previously been duly appointed by the Corporation as President and his prior engagement of professionals or officers or employees to undertake the business of the Corporation was ratified and affirmed as having been completed with apparent, if not actual, authority;
5. The Board as reconstituted was authorized, should it so choose, to engage Ms. Kathy Omachi as an officer of the Corporation;
6. The Board as reconstituted was authorized, should it so choose, to either directly or by authorization given to the President, Ms. Omachi or a newly engaged Chief Restructuring Officer or other officer of the Corporation should he or she determine it to be appropriate, to engage the law firm of Walter & Wilhelm Law Group, a Professional Corporation and such other professionals as the officers of the Corporation, deem necessary or appropriate to (i) prepare for, commence and prosecute a case under title 11 of the United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code"), (ii) negotiate or facilitate the transfer of the assets or stock of the Corporation to a third party, be that a commercial owner or a governmental authority, provided that a majority of the shareholders consent to the same, and/or (iii) shut down the sewage treatment facility owned by the Corporation, subject to the consent of a majority of the shareholders;
7. The Corporation through one or more of its officers was authorized to borrow money from third parties and/or the Smith Estate Shareholders on such terms and conditions as the officers may determine to be prudent or appropriate.

After motion made and seconded, the forgoing actions were unanimously approved.

A motion was made and seconded to hold a fully-noticed special meeting of the shareholders of the Corporation to ratify the above actions on February 14, 2012.

EXHIBIT III

After motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned.

Dated: 2/1/2012

BB&T WEALTH MANAGEMENT

By: *Dennis Longest*
Dennis Longest
Domiciliary Executor of the Estate of Carlie Smith

Linda Maycock
LINDA MAYCOCK
Co-Executor of the Estate of Lillian Smith

EXHIBIT IV

GOLDEN HILLS SANITATION CO., INC.
PO Box 3015
Pinedale, CA 93650

February 21, 2012

NOTICE TO CUSTOMERS OF CLOSURE AND CESSATION OF SEWER SERVICE
EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 29, 2012

It is with great regret that Golden Hills Sanitation Co., Inc. ("GHS") notifies you that on February 29, 2012, it must cease operation of its waste water plant and close its Tehachapi office. As a consequence, customers will no longer receive sewer service from GHS after 5:00 p.m. on February 29, 2012.

The reason for this closure and cessation of service is that GHS lacks revenue required based on currently authorized rates to continue its public utility operations beyond February 29, 2012. GHS has taken steps to seek funding sufficient to continue operations or to transfer its wastewater facility to another public or private entity. However, its currently pending application to the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") (Application (A.) 11-08-019) to increase its rates commensurate with its required revenue, of which customers have been previously notified, has not been resolved in time to raise rates to the level required to continue or sustain the service, and no decision is expected in that application before October 2012 at the earliest. Further, despite GHS's ongoing, best efforts to transfer its plant to another public or private entity so that service could continue, no transferee has been found to step in and take over the facility and service.

In these circumstances, GHS has had no choice but to cease operations and close its office. GHS greatly regrets this unavoidable outcome.

As to questions you may have regarding alternatives to the sewer service that has been provided by GHS, GHS recommends that your questions be directed to: Golden Hills Community Service District, at (661) 822-3064; Kern County, Department of Public Health, at (661) 321-3000; the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region 5

EXHIBIT IV

Fresno Office, at (559) 445-5116; and the California Public Utilities Commission, Consumer Affairs Branch, at (800) 649-7570.

Regretfully,

GOLDEN HILLS SANITATION CO., INC.



Kathy Omachi, Director and Officer

cc: Honorable Zack Scrivner, Supervisor, County of Kern
Honorable Jean Fuller, California State Senate
Honorable Shannon Grove, California State Assembly
Teresa Goldner, Esq., County Counsel, County of Kern
Kirk Perkins, Esq., Chief Deputy County Counsel, County of Kern
Bruce DeBerry, California Public Utilities Commission
Rami Kahlon, California Public Utilities Commission
Mr. Cody Tellis
Ms. Kathy Omachi
Mr. Clifford Bressler
Ms. Sara Steck Myers, Esq.
Mr. Lonnie Wass, California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Mr. Clint Hilderbrand
Golden Hills Community Services District
Bakersfield Californian
Tehachapi News
Kkey TV
Kero-TV 23 ABC
Three Angels Broadcasting Network
Kbak –TV 29
KZKC
Fox 58
Jab Broadcasting
KBBV
The Eyewitness News Station
KUVI
KABE
KGET TV 17
Latin Eyes