

From: Louis Sarmiento

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 4:58 PM

To: elizabeth [endreslaw.com](mailto:elizabeth@endreslaw.com) <elizabeth@endreslaw.com>;
todd [endreslaw.com](mailto:todd@endreslaw.com) <todd@endreslaw.com>

Subject: RE: Woodridge Mutual Water and Property Owners Corporation

Thank you for your responses, Mr. Endres and Ms. Elizondo.

It is not for the members to provide support for using Sonar. Instead, members are asking the Board to justify a prospective, further departure from a long history of using Sonar. Also, one reason Mr. Montler is exercising his records inspection rights is so that members may have insight into any facts with which the Board has made its decisions and are currently making its decisions.

Our position is based on the following:

The pellets need to be in by early March, hence the urgency conveyed in my communications. The Board has over a decade of experience and familiarity with pricing and timing related to Sonar, including permits and application to the lake. I understand that last year was the first year that the Board decided to mow based on a suspectedly unsupported representation to the membership that there are environmental issues with Sonar. The Board seemingly only developed a plan after Mr. Montler met with them, in the weeks after the meeting in which members voted. It appears that the Board did not have a plan in place when they sought approval to deviate from past practice of using Sonar.

The mowing performed in 2020 appears to have been ineffective. I understand that the company mowed 1/8th of the lake to a level of 6 feet deep at a cost known to the membership. The 1/8th of the lake that was mowed grew back in days. I also understand that many members documented the failure extensively.

We know that one method – mowing – has failed. In contrast, Sonar was successful in remediating the growth of weeds in and around the lake.

Once the bid comes in, the parties would have another factor to consider in the mechanical vs. chemical maintenance decision.

When we have the information the Board has, members would be in a better position to provide support for its advocacy for Sonar. Also, I believe a growing number of members would be willing to calculate the comparative costs and efficacy of mowing vs. Sonar after the requested association records are produced if the Board decides to not apply Sonar despite decades of past practice and an apparent lack of subjective facts to the contrary.

In the interest of transparency, if there were reports, plans, or other supporting materials, we expect the Association to provide these requested association records

along with the other items requested in my letter dated as of February 19, 2021 **by the end of Friday, March 5th, in compliance with the Davis-Stirling Act.**

As a reminder, the Association is required to provide the requested association records in a timely manner. The Association members have a right to that information. They also have a statutory right to enforce their right of access to Association records. As the prevailing party in an enforcement action, a member would be awarded reasonable costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

Louis

Louis J. Sarmiento, Jr., Esq.
Scherer Smith & Kenny LLP
140 Geary Street, Seventh Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Ph: (415) 433-1099
Fax: (415) 433-9434
E-Mail: louis@sfcounsel.com
www.sfcounsel.com