



Chad W. Herrington

Partner

Orange County

18300 Von Karman Avenue
Suite 650
Irvine, CA 92612-1032

✉ cherrington@bwslaw.com

☎ **D:** +1 949.265.3431

☎ **T:** +1 949.863.3363

Pronouns: he, him, his

PRACTICES

Constitutional Law
Eminent Domain
Environmental Land Use and
Natural Resources
Inverse Condemnation
Litigation
Public Law
Tort Claims and Products
Liability

EDUCATION

J.D., University of California,
Hastings College of the Law,
2009
B.S., Emory University, 2003

ADMISSION

State Bar of California
United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
United States District Court for
the Central District of California
United States District Court for
the Northern District of
California

Chad Herrington provides advisory, transactional, and litigation services on a broad range of [municipal law](#) issues for cities, counties, and other public agencies throughout California. He currently serves as the Assistant City Attorney for the City of Eastvale and the Town of Yucca Valley, and as deputy City Attorney for the City of Rialto, City of Cathedral City, and City of Wildomar. He previously served as the Assistant City Attorney for the City of Piedmont and City of Rohnert Park. His practice includes advising city councils and staff in all areas of municipal law such as the public records act, open meeting laws, conflicts of interest laws, code enforcement, CEQA, public contracting and procurement, solid waste franchises, and land use and zoning. Chad regularly drafts and reviews resolutions, ordinances, and agreements for cities, advises planning departments, reviews environmental documents, and attends planning commission meetings and city council meetings. Chad also provides trainings on the Brown Act, the Public Records Act, and governmental ethics laws.

In addition to his advisory practice, Chad's other area of specialty includes municipal law litigation, with a focus on [eminent domain](#), [inverse condemnation](#), and property disputes. His litigation experience includes the successful representation of public entity clients at all stages of litigation, including trial and appeals.

Chad is passionate about public law and has been working with public entities his entire career. Prior to joining Burke, Williams & Sorensen in 2012, Chad served as a graduate law clerk and attorney in the Alameda County Counsel's Office, and worked for a private firm representing school districts and community college districts in a variety of transactional and litigation matters.

RESULTS

Burke Secures Eminent Domain Jury Verdict for San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

INSIGHTS

Public Law Update – SB 1243 and SB 1181 Create New Rules Regarding Campaign Contributions

Public Law Update – Senate Bill 1111 Expands the Definition of “Remote Interest” in a Contract Under Gov. Code Section 1091

Public Law Update – Permitting Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (AB 2427)

Public Law Update – Expedited Review of Hydrogen-Fueling Station Permits (SB 1418)

Public Law Update – New Conservation Element Requirement to Consider Wildlife and Habitat Connectivity (AB 1889)

Public Law Update – AB 1307: Noise By Residential Occupants On Other People Is Not A Significant Effect For Purposes Of CEQA

PUBLICATIONS

Western City Legal Notes – Six Local Government Transparency Changes City Officials Need to Know

Court of Appeal Rejects City’s Reliance on Setback Standard Under Housing Accountability Act

Public Records Act’s Catchall Exemption Applies to COVID-19 Outbreak Location Information

Protected: Increased Limits on Campaign Contributions and Gifts to CA Officials, Candidates

Appeals Court Rules Governor Newsom’s Use of Emergency Powers Was Constitutional

Bill Summaries: Animal Protections

SB 288 – CEQA Exemption for Alternative Transportation Projects
Changes to Public Generally Exception and New Requirement for Posting of Campaign Disclosure Documents Filed in Paper Format

Bill Summaries | AB 2231 and AB 2311

Housing Roundup: New Housing Bills Signed by Governor Newsom
Recent Legislation Affecting Scooters, Skateboards and Parking Penalties

AB 992 | The Brown Act & Social Media

COVID-19 Updates for Employers

Protecting Our Water and Environmental Resources v. County of Stanislaus

Santa Monica’s At-large Method of Elections Does Not Violate the California Voting Rights Act

Local Public Agencies Must Ensure Emails and Other Documents Are Retained Throughout CEQA Process and Override Automated Deletion Policies

Local Special Taxes Proposed by Voter Initiative Subject to Majority

Voter Approval

FPPC Disclosure Revisions to Close Conflict of Interest Loophole

National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward: No Cost for Redaction of Bodycam Footage in Response to CPRA Request

National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward: No Cost for Redaction of Bodycam Footage in Response to CPRA Request

Navigating the Brown Act During a Period of Local Emergency Due to COVID-19

Zoning Ordinance Did Not Violate the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA)

Are you Compatible? Second Appellate District Considers Incompatible Offices and Finds Offices of Mayor and Board Director are Incompatible

Brown Act: The Importance of Sticking to Your Agenda

Brown Act: Avoiding Violations by Responding to Cease and Desist Letters

Using The "Committee Exception" To Exclude Public Comment At Special Meeting Violates Brown Act

Access to Private Entity Records is Not Enough to Compel Disclosure Obligations Under CPRA

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

- ***San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments v. Shagun, et al.*** (LASC Case No. 1926CV22715). Represented a public agency in eminent domain action with a jury verdict win, in which our client was awarded under 6% above the agency's expert valuation of the project, and less than the agency's settlement offer prior to trial.
- ***San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments v. El Adobe Apts. Inc.*** (Case No. BC 646857). Represented joint powers authority against landowner of a multi-unit apartment building in a part-take condemnation action. Following an 8-day trial, jury awarded only 15% of the \$1.8 million in compensation sought by landowner, which was less than the agency's final offer.
- ***City of Daly City v. California Department of Finance*** (2017, Case Nos. 34-2015-8002205 and 34-2017-80002617-CU-WM-GDS). Obtained a writ from the Sacramento Superior Court directing the Department of Finance to recognize over \$5.2 million in reimbursement agreements as loans eligible for reinstatement under the redevelopment dissolution act.
- ***City of Watsonville v. California Department of Finance*** (2014, Case No. 34-2014-80001910). Obtained a writ from the Sacramento Superior Court directing the Department of Finance to recognize over \$4.4 million in loan agreements as loans eligible for reinstatement under the redevelopment dissolution act.