













































“connection charge” is “a fee for connecting a user to a utility’s facilities” and the District has no authority to impose connection charges for additional residential water fixtures. The broad statutory language of the District Law empowers the District to fix and collect charges for any of its services, not just for supplying water. Even though the charge is denominated a “connection charge” by the District, it is not a charge for initially connecting to a water distribution system. The District’s authority under the District Law to collect charges for services is not narrowly restricted to charges for furnishing water or connecting to a water distribution system. Broadly speaking, the District’s services include “planning for, acquiring, reserving, and maintaining capacity in the water distribution facilities existing or to be constructed within the District.”

- 7) The Thums assert, that the District’s water permit inspections violate the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and article I, section 13 of the California Constitution. The trial court did not resolve those constitutional issues. It did find, however, that the Thums “agreed to the District’s inspection” and their “rights under Article I, section 1, of the California Constitution were not violated.” Respondents contend that “the trial court’s determination regarding the Thums’ consent to the inspection effectively moots the Thums’ argument.”
- 8) The record does not demonstrate that the Thums’ consent to inspection was coerced and, therefore, involuntary. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to resolve the Thums’ statutory and constitutional claims that the District has no right to conduct residential inspections to confirm permit compliance or to obtain a warrant upon refusal of consent.