

1 ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
Anne J. Schneider, Esq. (Bar No. 72552)
2 2015 H Street
Sacramento, California 95814-3109
3 Telephone: (916) 447-2166
Facsimile: (916) 447-3512

4 SPECIAL REFEREE
5
6
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, RANCHO CUCAMONGA DIVISION

10
11 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER
DISTRICT,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 THE CITY OF CHINO, et al.

15 Defendants.
16

CASE NO. RCV 51010

Judge: Honorable J. Michael Gunn

COMMENTS OF SPECIAL REFEREE
ON WATERMASTER COMPLIANCE
WITH DECEMBER 21, 2007 ORDER
CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 4

17
18 **I. INTRODUCTION**

19 On December 21, 2007, the court issued an Order Concerning Motion for Approval of
20 Peace II Documents ("Peace II Order"). Pursuant to the court's continuing jurisdiction under the
21 Judgment in this case, the court approved amendments to Judgment Exhibit "I", Judgment
22 Paragraph 8, and Judgment Exhibit "G", directed Watermaster to proceed in accordance with the
23 Second Amendment to the Peace Agreement, approved Watermaster's adoption of Resolution
24 07-05 and directed that Watermaster proceed in accordance with the terms of the Resolution and
25 the documents attached to that Resolution, adopted the recommendations made in the Special
26 Referee's Final Report and Recommendations on Motion for Approval of Peace II documents,
27 incorporating the Final Report and Recommendations by reference, and set a hearing for
28 Thursday, May 1, to review compliance with the first four conditions subsequent. The Order

1 was specifically made subject to nine Conditions Subsequent which were set forth in the Order.

2 Watermaster timely prepared and submitted to the court documents in compliance with

3 conditions 1 through 4 of the Peace II Order. Conditions Subsequent one through four are:

- 4 1. By February 1, 2008, Watermaster shall prepare and submit to the Court a brief to
5 explain the amendments to Judgment Paragraph 8 and Exhibit "G".
- 6 2. By February 1, 2008, Watermaster shall prepare and submit to the Court for approval
7 a corrected initial schedule to replace Resolution No. 07-05 Attachment "E", together
8 with an explanation of the corrections made.
- 9 3. By March 1, 2008, Watermaster shall prepare and submit to the Court for approval a
10 new Hydraulic Control technical report that shall address all factors included in the
11 Special Referee's Final Report and Recommendations. The new Hydraulic Control
12 report shall include technical analysis of the projected decline in safe yield, and a
13 definition and analysis of "new equilibrium" issues.
- 14 4. By April 1, 2008, Watermaster shall report to the Court on the status of CEQA
15 documentation, compliance, and requirements, and provide the Court with assurances
16 that Watermaster's approval and participation in any project that is a "project" for
17 CEQA purposes has been or will be subject to all appropriate CEQA review.

18 Watermaster timely filed on January 31, 2008, its "Watermaster Compliance with
19 December 21, 2007 Order Conditions 1 and 2". Watermaster timely filed on March 3, 2008, its
20 "Watermaster Compliance with December 21, 2007 Order Condition 3". Finally, Watermaster
21 timely filed on April 1, 2008, its "Watermaster Compliance with Condition Subsequent Number
22 4". On April 10, 2008, Monte Vista Water District filed its "Response to Watermaster's
23 Compliance with Conditions Subsequent Numbers Three and Four of the Court's 12/21/2007
24 Order; Request for Additional Time to Evaluate Watermaster's Compliance with Condition
25 Subsequent Number Three; and Withdrawal of Monte Vista Water District's Joinder to
26 Watermaster's Motion for Approval of Peace II Documents".

27 Court approval is required for Watermaster's submittals for Conditions Subsequent 2 and
28 3. As of this date, Watermaster has not yet filed its motion for court approval of the documents

1 it submitted in response to Conditions Subsequent 2 and 3.

2 **II. FIRST CONDITION SUBSEQUENT**

3 The Special Referee's Final Report and Recommendations on Motion for Approval of
4 Peace II Documents ("Special Referee Final Report") recommended that Watermaster prepare
5 and submit a post-hearing brief to fully explain the proposed Judgment amendments to
6 Paragraph 8 and Exhibit "G": ". . . If a dispute were to arise as to the meaning of these proposed
7 Judgment amendments, the record does not contain sufficient explanation for the court to resolve
8 questions of interpretation." (Special Referee Final Report, p. 14, Ins. 8-10) Watermaster
9 provides a detailed response to aid the court in interpretation of the amendments in its submittal
10 in response to the first Condition Subsequent. Watermaster explains ". . . the mechanics of how
11 the proposed amendments are to be construed and implemented." (First and Second Conditions
12 Subsequent Response, p. 4, ln. 16)

13 In future actions to implement the Judgment amendments affecting the use of overlying
14 (non-agricultural) pool water, Watermaster's submittal in compliance with Condition Subsequent
15 1 should provide useful background and explanation to the parties. Given the complicated nature
16 of the Judgment amendments and Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Purchase and Sale of
17 Water by Watermaster from the Overlying (Non-Agricultural) Pool, not every conceivable
18 question has been addressed; however, the record is now significantly more complete.

19 **III. SECOND CONDITION SUBSEQUENT**

20 Watermaster submitted a revised "Initial Schedule" in compliance with Condition
21 Subsequent 2. The revised Initial Schedule is a table attached to Watermaster's submittal (Table
22 1, Alternative 1C – Desalter Replenishment with the Most Rapid Depletion of the Re-Operation
23 Account). This table is identical to the revised schedule included as Table 1 in Mr.
24 Wildermuth's December 18, 2007 Report (*Id.*, p. 18, ln. 12). Watermaster states that ". . . the
25 initial schedule was too aggressive in its assumptions regarding the availability of New Yield in
26 the earlier years of Basin Re-Operation." (First and Second Conditions Subsequent Response, p.
27 18, Ins. 1-2) "Mr. Wildermuth testified that model results suggested that the previous estimates
28 of New Yield due to inflow from the Santa Ana River had been underestimated [*sic* – should be

1 overestimated] and that the new estimates require an alteration of the initial schedule.” (*Id.*, p.
2 18, Ins. 5-7) The new table should replace the two tables appended as Attachment “E” to
3 Watermaster Resolution No. 07-05, subject to clarification that the new table is not superseded
4 by what appears to be the equivalent table in the Wildermuth Environmental, Inc. “Response to
5 Condition Subsequent No. 3 from the Order Confirming Motion for Approval of Peace II
6 Documents” (Table 3-5c Alternative 1C Desalter Replenishment with Most Rapid Depletion of
7 the Reoperation Account and New Yield Estimated through Simulation). Table 3-5c shows
8 unreplenished desalter production of 408,726 (175,000 plus 233,726), which is not consistent
9 with the table submitted in response to Condition Subsequent 2.

10 **IV. THIRD CONDITION SUBSEQUENT**

11 In response to the third Condition Subsequent, Watermaster filed a report prepared by
12 Wildermuth Environmental, Inc. (WEI) entitled “Response to Condition Subsequent No. 3 from
13 the Order Confirming Motion for Approval of Peace II Documents” (hereinafter “WEI Final
14 Response Report”). Watermaster requests that the court approve the report, but has not filed a
15 motion to that effect. The WEI Final Response Report notes that it draws heavily from two prior
16 WEI reports: “Final Report, 2007 CBWM Groundwater Model Documentation and Evaluation
17 of the Peace II Project Description, November 2007”, and “Evaluation of Alternative 1C and
18 Declining Safe Yield, December 2007.”

19 The Special Referee Final Report recommended that a new complete report be prepared
20 which would include a full analysis of projected basin yield and hydraulic control in support of
21 the Judgment Exhibit “I” amendment:

22 The new report should essentially be a stand-alone version of Technical Report
23 [WEI 2007 Final Report] Section 7, plus appropriate appendices, to completely
24 document what Watermaster has analyzed as the expected basin response to its
25 proposed reoperation strategy . . .

(Special Referee Final Report, p. 18, Ins. 5-7)

26 Overall, the purpose of the new report would be to add to the record technical
27 documentation in support of the actual proposed Basin Reoperation Strategy
28 (unreplenished desalter production limited to 400,000 acre-feet) at a level of
detail equivalent to Technical Report [WEI 2007 Final Report] Section 7.

1 (*Id.*, p. 18, ln. 25 to p. 19, ln. 3)

2 Technical expert Mr. Scalmanini prepared comments on the WEI Final Response Report,
3 which are attached hereto (“Comments on Final WEI Report Response to Condition Subsequent
4 No. 3 from the Order Confirming Motion for Approval of the Peace II Documents March 3,
5 2008” (hereinafter “Scalmanini Comments”)). Mr. Scalmanini’s comments provide the only
6 review which has been made available of the WEI Final Response Report. In general, Mr.
7 Scalmanini concludes that the WEI Final Response Report “. . . fully satisfies the
8 recommendation that it be a stand-alone documentation of what Watermaster has analyzed as the
9 expected Basin response to its then-proposed reoperation strategy.” (Scalmanini Comments, p.
10 1) Further, “. . . the WEI Final Response Report is a thorough documentation of the technical
11 simulation and interpretation of anticipated Basin response to what Watermaster proposed (now
12 approved) to do in reoperating the Basin.” (*Id.*, p. 3)

13 In addition to addressing the sufficiency of the WEI Final Response Report as responsive
14 to the Special Referee Final Report concerns, Mr. Scalmanini discusses issues raised by the WEI
15 Final Response Report which in large part should and can be addressed in response to the
16 remaining Conditions Subsequent set forth in the Peace II Order. Issues raised by Mr.
17 Scalmanini with respect to reliability of supplemental water and recharge capacity should be
18 addressed in the Condition Subsequent 5 report due July 1, 2008, which is to outline in detail the
19 scope and content of the next update of the Recharge Master Plan. The “robustness” of
20 hydraulic control issue as articulated by Mr. Scalmanini should be addressed also by July 1,
21 2008, in Watermaster’s report on Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and criteria
22 for determining whether hydraulic control is achieved and maintained (Condition Subsequent 6).

23 Condition Subsequent 7 requires Watermaster to submit to the court for approval by
24 December 31, 2008, a revised schedule to replace the corrected initial schedule (submitted to the
25 court in compliance with Condition Subsequent 2). That submittal is to include a reconciliation
26 of new yield and stormwater estimates for 2000 through 2007. Mr. Scalmanini suggests that it
27 would be logical, given the projected decline in safe yield, for Watermaster to include in its
28 response to Condition Subsequent 7 how Watermaster will schedule redetermination of safe

1 yield and how replenishment obligations will be calculated. The WEI Final Response Report
2 suggests: “Due to the projected decline in safe yield, Watermaster should consider evaluating
3 the safe yield at least every two or three years after 2010 until the 400,000 acre-ft of reoperation
4 water is used up.” (WEI Final Response Report, p. 5-6) The report reiterates the fact that the
5 projected decline in safe yield is “a surprising result”. (*Id.*, p. 6-2) The now-projected safe yield
6 decline is not consistent with the premise of the Optimum Basin Management Plan (OBMP)
7 Implementation Plan, which “. . . expected that at least 40,000 acre-ft/yr of groundwater will
8 need to [be] produced in the southern part of the Basin to maintain the safe yield.” (OBMP
9 Implementation Plan, p. 23)

10 Groundwater production for municipal use will be increased in the southern part
11 of the Basin to: meet the emerging demand for municipal supplies in the Chino
Basin, maintain safe yield, and to protect water quality in the Santa Ana River.

12 (*Id.*, p. 24)

13 Finally, Mr. Scalmanini’s comments raise important considerations which are pertinent to
14 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) issues. These are discussed, below, in the
15 context of Watermaster’s response to Condition Subsequent 4.

16 Mr. Scalmanini will be available at the May 1 hearing to answer questions, if the court so
17 requests.

18 **V. FOURTH CONDITION SUBSEQUENT**

19 Watermaster’s submittal in response to Condition Subsequent 4 reports on the status of
20 CEQA documentation to date. Watermaster reports that expansion of desalter capacity is
21 proceeding “in an expedited fashion”, and that “CEQA analysis relative to the expansion of
22 Desalter II consisted of the adoption of a categorical exemption by Western Municipal Water
23 District in January of 2008.” (Fourth Condition Subsequent Response, p. 2, ln. 27 – p. 3, ln. 1)
24 Western Municipal Water District’s Notice of Exemption is attached as Exhibit A to
25 Watermaster’s pleading. Watermaster also reports that Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA)
26 is directing CEQA compliance related to the Chino Creek well field construction, and that
27 Watermaster has included funds in its 2007-2008 budget to construct test wells which comprise
28 the first step in that CEQA review. Further, IEUA intends to use the year 2000 Optimum Basin

1 Management Program Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (2000 OBMP PEIR) and will
2 “process an addendum” to the 2000 OBMP PEIR “for the further evaluation of the impacts
3 associated with the groundwater extraction. . .” (*Id.*, p. 3, lns. 8-9) Watermaster reports that
4 IEUA has “. . . concluded that this addendum will not require recirculation of the PEIR. If the
5 results of the well tests are as predicted, it is anticipated that a mitigated negative declaration will
6 be adopted as a subsequent environmental document.”

7 Thus far, therefore, Western Municipal Water District has adopted a categorical
8 exemption for expansion of Desalter II, and IEUA anticipates adopting a mitigated negative
9 declaration for the Chino Creek well field and “impacts associated with groundwater extraction.”
10 Watermaster states that its budget for 2008-2009 will include sufficient funds for the purpose of
11 CEQA compliance for: “Further items relating to Peace II, including Basin Re-Operation and
12 Hydraulic Control.” Watermaster reports that the scope of work is in the process of being
13 developed, but provides no discussion of what these “further items” are.

14 Watermaster’s Response to Condition Subsequent 4 does not provide assurances to the
15 court that Watermaster’s approval and participation in the Peace II project will be subject to all
16 appropriate CEQA review. The court should require Watermaster to report back to the court
17 within a reasonable period of time to further explain actions to be taken in compliance with
18 CEQA for the entire desalter expansion, increased groundwater pumping for the desalters,
19 hydraulic control and basin reoperation activities, and the overall changes that are to proceed
20 under the auspices of the Peace II order.

21 Watermaster and the parties will be mining 400,000 acre-feet from the Chino Basin,
22 installing additional desalter pumping capacity, and expanding the desalters. The proposed
23 project is defined in the WEI Final Response Report:

24 The proposed project has two main features: the expansion of the desalter
25 program, such that groundwater pumping for the desalters will reach about 40,000
26 acre-ft/yr and that pumping will occur in amounts and at locations that contribute
27 to the achievement of hydraulic control; and the strategic reduction in
groundwater storage (reoperation), which, along with the expanded desalter
program, significantly demonstrates achievement of hydraulic control.

28 (WEI Final Response Report, p. 2-4) There is no indication that the full scope of these activities

1 will be subject to CEQA review and the full impacts of these activities considered. Mr.
2 Scalmanini questions whether the overall effect of the increased unreplenished groundwater
3 production for the desalters should be compared solely with fully replenished desalter
4 production, as the WEI Final Response Report suggests in discussing its “baseline alternative”.
5 Watermaster should explain what it intends in light of the WEI Final Response Report’s
6 discussion of its “baseline alternative”. (See, e.g., WEI Final Response Report, pp. 3-7 *et seq.*,
7 pp. 4-3 *et seq.*, pp. 6-2 *et seq.*)

8 Watermaster should return to the court with a full description of what its analysis of
9 “further items relating to Peace II, including Basin Re-Operation and Hydraulic Control” means,
10 including submitting to the court for its review the scope of work now being proposed.

11 Watermaster should also provide to the court a full discussion of what it views as the “project”,
12 and whether and on what basis it concurs with the WEI Final Response Report with respect to
13 definition of the project to be analyzed for CEQA purposes, and the baseline to be used in CEQA
14 analysis.

15 VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

16 At such time as Watermaster files a motion requesting approval of its submittals in
17 response to Conditions Subsequent 2 and 3, the court should approve those submittals as
18 responsive to those Conditions Subsequent, subject to Watermaster clarifying that WEI Final
19 Response Report Table 3-5c has not superseded Watermaster’s Condition Subsequent 2
20 response. Watermaster’s submittal in response to Condition Subsequent 1 is responsive to the
21 court’s condition. Watermaster should be required, however, to provide a further submittal
22 related to CEQA compliance and to address the issues noted above under the Condition
23 Subsequent 4 discussion. A date certain should be set for Watermaster to make that additional
24 submittal. Condition Subsequent 7 should be expanded to include the issue of how Watermaster
25 will schedule redetermination of safe yield and calculate replenishment obligations, given the
26 projected safe yield decline over time.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Finally, given the complexity of the issues, and the fact that Mr. Scalmanini has prepared
2 detailed comments on the WEI Final Response Report, Mr. Scalmanini will be available at the
3 May 1 hearing to answer questions, if the court so requests.

4 Dated: April 16, 2008

5 
6 Anne J. Schneider, Special Referee

**Comments on Final WEI Report
Response to Condition Subsequent No. 3 from the
Order Confirming Motion for Approval of the Peace II Documents
March 3, 2008**

PREPARED FOR: Anne J. Schneider
PREPARED BY: Joseph C. Scalmanini
DATE: April 10, 2008
PROJECT NUMBER: 05-6-111

In response to your request for review of the subject report, following are comments that result from that review. My comments are organized to first address the responses in the subject report to the specific directions included in your Special Referee's Final Report and Recommendations on Motion for Approval of Peace II Documents, December 20, 2007, followed by expanded discussion of some of the responses that did not quite fully "respond", as well as comments on a couple of other topics in the subject report.

Responses to Recommendations in Final Special Referee's Report

The Special Referee's Final Report recommended that the new report, hereafter the WEI Final Response Report, should essentially be a stand-alone version of Chapter 7 of the previous WEI technical report (*Final Report, 2007 CBWM Groundwater Model Documentation and Evaluation of the Peace II Project Description*, November 2007), which provided documentation of the development and calibration of the 2007 Watermaster Model and its application for analysis of two potential basin reoperation scenarios (Alternatives 1A and 1B). The stand-alone report was to completely document what Watermaster has analyzed as the expected Basin response to its proposed reoperation strategy (Alternative 1C), including whether hydraulic control is projected to occur, when it is projected to be achieved, whether hydraulic control will be "robust" (and what that means in quantitative terms), and what the Basin yield resulting from reoperation is projected to be over time. Tables were to be included to summarize projected pumping, replenishment, and changes in storage in a format equivalent to previously submitted tables (Tables 4-4 and 3-3 from WEI reports in April and December 2006, respectively).

The WEI Final Response Report fully satisfies the recommendation that it be a stand-alone documentation of what Watermaster has analyzed as the expected Basin response to its then-proposed reoperation strategy. The WEI Final Response Report specifically describes and illustrates that hydraulic control is projected to occur via a groundwater level depression along the linear alignment of the overall desalter well field; it reports that hydraulic control "is

achieved in 2017” (although there is no illustration or discussion of how that date was determined); it reports that the pumping depression and resultant hydraulic control “appears to be much more robust than the Baseline Alternative” (robustness was not defined in quantitative terms; robustness is further discussed below); and it tabulates the projected yield of the Basin resulting from reoperation over time. Tabular summaries of projected pumping, replenishment, and changes in groundwater storage were not included in a format equivalent to previously submitted tables; however, a summary graph of groundwater storage was included.

The Special Referee’s Final Report also recommended that the new report illustrate how replenishment obligations will be calculated given a declining safe yield, how credit for new yield will be based on model projections, and how Watermaster will be monitoring and interpreting actual Basin response to reoperation, ultimately to describe two key factors: actual change in groundwater storage and actual new yield.

The WEI Final Response Report describes how replenishment obligations for the reported analysis were calculated on the basis of a projected declining safe yield (although there is some ambiguity in the text regarding exactly which declining safe yield was used, i.e. Baseline or Reoperation; the differences between the two, however, are generally small so the exact choice of which declining safe yield would not significantly affect the modeled analysis). Of course, what was simulated is one thing; what will actually be implemented by Watermaster might be another. The WEI Final Response Report recommends that Watermaster consider future redeterminations of safe yield on a short frequency (every two to three years) until the 400,000 af of reoperation water is used up (2030 according to the schedule for Alternative 1C in Table 3-5C); it is unclear why the same recommendation does not extend through the rest of the simulated period, i.e. through 2060, through which safe yield is projected to decline.

Ultimately with regard to the overall issue of declining safe yield, the WEI Final Response Report reports what WEI analyzed and recommends a frequency for redetermination of safe yield to Watermaster. In order to respond to the Special Referee’s Final report, Watermaster will have to separately submit what it intends to do with regard to that as well as how replenishment obligations will be calculated. The most logical place for this to occur is when Watermaster responds to Condition Subsequent No. 7 at the end of this year. It would be logical for Watermaster to include its scheduling of redetermination of safe yield and methodology for calculation of replenishment obligations in that response.

The WEI Final Response Report also describes how future changes in groundwater storage will be computed using a new model that will make use of all lithologic data from boreholes in combination with measured groundwater levels to compute groundwater storage changes at unspecified times. The report notes that the existing groundwater level monitoring programs will be expanded via construction of new monitoring wells for two purposes: assessment of the state of hydraulic control and determination of changes in groundwater storage. Details regarding expansion of the existing groundwater monitoring programs are not presented in the WEI Final Response Report, and will presumably be forthcoming at some future time, potentially in compliance with Condition Subsequent No. 9.

With regard to new yield, the WEI Final Response Report notes that there is no direct way to measure the increase in new yield created by reoperation, and that the only way to assess new yield is through the use of groundwater flow models. The whole concept of “increasing” a component of Basin yield in a setting where the safe yield is currently projected to decline for the next 50+ years is challenging to understand, and is further discussed below. That said, in response to the direction in the Special Referee’s Final Report, the WEI Final Response Report describes a comparative modeling approach whereby Watermaster will first recalibrate its 2007 Model through 2010, and will then use the model to estimate discharge to the Santa Ana River and recharge from the Santa Ana River and tributaries to the Chino Basin under reoperation conditions. A second set of estimates will be generated by simulating an artificial basin operating condition whereby the desalters are fully replenished via a replenishment plan that Watermaster will develop solely for use in that simulation; it is unclear how this scenario will differ from the “Baseline” that is presented in subject WEI Final Response Report. Ultimately, the simulated estimates of Santa Ana River discharge and recharge, under reoperation and under fully replenished conditions, will then be compared to determine the new yield resulting from reoperation. It would be logical for Watermaster to progressively report on updated simulations of new yield, generally in compliance with Condition Subsequent No. 9.

A final recommendation in the Special Referee’s Final Report was that the new report should discuss constraints related to the availability of recharge capacity and water for recharge, and should include discussion of what quantity of recharge capacity and water availability would be needed to overcome the potential imposition of pumping limits (as now described in Section 3.7 of the WEI Final Response Report). The WEI Final Response Report thoroughly discusses and tabulates the interrelationship between reliability of supplemental water and required replenishment capacity in order to achieve the groundwater production plans originally stated in the Appropriators’ 2005 Urban Water Management Plans, i.e. to overcome the imposition of pumping limits included in the analysis in the WEI Final Response Report. Depending on the reliability of supplemental water for replenishment purposes, the required increase in replenishment capacity could range from relatively small (33,000 afy at the currently assumed integrated reliability of 83%) to very large (more than doubling to nearly quadrupling the current recharge capacity if reliability were to be 50% or less). The assumed reliability of supplemental water will be a most critical input to the Recharge Master Planning effort that is to be scoped by July 1, 2008, status reported on January 1 and July 1, 2009, and finally reported by July 1, 2010.

In summary with regard to what was detailed in the Special Referee’s Final Report, the WEI Final Response Report is a thorough documentation of the technical simulation and interpretation of anticipated Basin response to what Watermaster proposed (now approved) to do in reoperating the basin. That said, it should be recognized that the WEI Final Response Report is an after-the-fact simulation of a management program desired by the parties. What is now separately reported in the WEI Final Response Report represents the only scenario ever crafted that would involve 400,000 af of controlled overdraft resulting from under-replenishment of desalter production and achieve hydraulic control. That scenario was not analyzed (with the 2007 Watermaster Model, or with any earlier model) until after Watermaster submitted its Motion for Approval of the Peace II Documents. The after-the-fact simulations thus did not serve as technical input to the selection of the proposed, now approved, reoperation management

program. As a consequence, the results of the analysis documented in the WEI Final Response Report do not represent any kind of optimized or other evaluation to arrive at a technically preferred management plan compared to anything else (except the Baseline). While the reader can understand what is expected to result from the reoperation as described (Alternative 1C), and can understand that hydraulic control is expected to be achieved and to be “robust”, the reader is also left to wonder about the condition of the Basin that will result in order to achieve the reported results. The **total** depletion of groundwater storage projected to occur from the now-approved reoperation of the Basin is about 500,000 af; resultant “new yield” is projected to be all of about 5,600 afy by 2030; the “increase” in Basin safe yield is projected to be about 7,000 afy by about 2040, but that’s an “increase” only in the sense that safe yield ultimately only declines to about 127,000 afy when compared to a decline to about 120,000 afy under “Baseline” conditions. The reader is also left to wonder why nothing else was apparently considered; for example, as discussed below, if the Baseline formed “weak” hydraulic control, and if the goal was to achieve “robust” hydraulic control, why was no consideration given to something like incremental increments of controlled overdraft, e.g. 100,000, 200,000, or 300,000 af, to see whether hydraulic control could be achieved at any of those levels, and how “robust” it might be at those increments.

Reliability of Supplemental Water and Recharge Capacity

In Section 3.3, the WEI Final Response Report notes that the average recharge rate of existing recharge facilities was provided by the IEUA (citing to IEUA, 2007 but there is no citation listed in the References) and ultimately reports that the estimated average capacity of existing facilities is about 61,000 afy, and that the estimated average recharge capacity will increase to about 91,000 afy with the addition of new facilities that are expected to be online in 2008. The average capacity is reportedly based on an assumed availability of 75 percent (recharge facilities available nine out of twelve months, and unavailable for maintenance reasons in the other three months). In order to analyze basin operation in a projected condition of declining safe yield, which requires greater replenishment obligations, the analysis in the WEI Final Response Report increased the assumed average recharge capacity to about 104,000 afy (which then became the “actual” capacity, e.g. in Table 5-3) by reducing the annual maintenance period from three to two months. Ultimately, the recharge capacity was combined with currently estimated availability of replenishment water (SWP water from MWD and recycled water from IEUA) to assess the adequacy of replenishment capability and to estimate the need for, and timing of, additional recharge capacity.

The preceding description of recharge capacity raises two comments or questions. First, in his testimony to the Court on November 29, 2007, Ken Manning, Watermaster CEO described the expense to implement the Phase 1 and Phase 2 improvements in Watermaster’s Recharge Master Plan and concluded that, when the latter improvements were completed in 2008, there would be a resultant recharge capacity of about 75,000 to 80,000 afy “depending upon how we operationalize those facilities”. It is unclear what “operationalize” means but the 75,000 to 80,000 afy range of recharge capacity is notably smaller than what is used in the WEI Final Response Report (91,000 afy before the increase to 104,000 afy described above). There needs to be some reconciliation between what Watermaster reported to the Court and what was used in

the technical analysis in the WEI Final Response Report in order to eliminate question about the conclusions reached in the WEI Final Response Report about the adequacy of existing and projected recharge capacity. Secondly, the assumed increase in recharge capacity in the WEI Final Response Report (by reducing the maintenance period from three to two months) raises question about actual operation. Since Watermaster does not own or operate any recharge facilities, is the use of reduced maintenance periods a legitimate assumption and consistent with how the actual operator would maintain the recharge facilities?

Embedded in the overall assessment of Watermaster's recharge capability in the WEI Final Response Report is an assumption that the average reliability of Metropolitan's delivery of SWP water for replenishment in the Chino Basin will be 80 percent. That assumption is described to derive, in part, from DWR's 2002 State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report (cited but not listed in the References). The average reliability derived from that report was 72 percent. However, as is well known, the SWP Delivery Reliability Report has been updated since 2002, most recently in December 2007 (DWR, *The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007*, Draft, December 2007); in that report, projected average reliability of Table A Amounts of SWP water ranges from 63 to 69 percent over the next 20 years. The WEI Final Response Report also notes that the 80 percent reliability of replenishment water from MWD derives from interpretation of results from MWD's Integrated Regional Planning simulations, from which "it appears that Metropolitan believes it will meet the full replenishment demands of Watermaster about 80 percent of the time." Ultimately, there is nothing in the WEI Final Response Report that cites to such a level of reliability having been expressed by MWD.

The assumptions in the WEI Final Response Report are acceptable for the purposes of the analysis reported therein (arguably, a more current version of the SWP Delivery Reliability Report would have been more applicable, even if not the 2007 update). However, in light of today's overall water supply picture, it is difficult to envision that MWD can actually take SWP water, currently projected to have 63 to 69 percent reliability, and make it available to meet the full replenishment demands in the Chino Basin 80 percent of the time. In light of significant replenishment obligations that are projected to increase in the Chino Basin due to a combination of increasing desired pumping and declining safe yield, the assumed reliability of replenishment water will be a most critical input to the upcoming Recharge Master Planning effort. Watermaster should highlight and show support for whatever it assumes for replenishment water reliability in all the reporting to the Court as scheduled in Conditions Subsequent No. 5 and No. 8.

Robustness of Hydraulic Control

It is still a little unclear exactly what commitments are required by the 2004 Basin Plan Amendment, specifically as related to hydraulic control. Commitment No. 8 listed in the WEI Final Response Report says "achievement and maintenance of hydraulic control of the subsurface outflows **from the Chino Basin** to protect Santa Ana River water quality" (emphasis added). WEI interprets the specific language that it quotes from the Basin Plan Amendment (no outflow from the Chino Basin) to be defined as the reduction of groundwater discharge **from the Chino North Management Zone** to the Santa Ana River to de minimus quantities" (emphasis

added). Contour maps of equal groundwater elevation in the WEI Final Response Report still show outflow from the basin to Prado (for both Alternative 1C and Baseline) but they also show “more robust” hydraulic control resulting from Alternative 1C as regards outflow from the Chino North Management Zone. Ultimately, it is up to the Regional Board to interpret what specifically is required by Commitment No. 8, and that will presumably be reported by Watermaster in its response to Condition Subsequent No. 6 by July 1, 2008.

Regardless of what specific commitment is required by the Regional Board regarding hydraulic control, the entire discussion of “robustness” in the WEI Final Response Report misses the direction in the Special Referee’s Final Report. In summary, after noting that the use of “robustness” is relative (in other words, not describing it in quantitative terms), the WEI Final Response Report describes the simulated level of hydraulic control in the Baseline Alternative to be “clearly tenuous, given the uncertainties in the system design and future basin management changes”. No uncertainties are identified; “tenuous” is another relative term; and it is unclear what future basin management changes might be. The WEI Final Response Report goes on to describe the linear pumping depression along the Chino Creek Well Field under reoperation to be at least three times that of the Baseline Alternative and concludes that, as such, it “appears to be much more robust than the Baseline Alternative”. There is no question that, in seeking to form a hydraulic pumping trough, in this case to intercept groundwater discharge from the Chino North Management Zone, more drawdown in the target depression is “more robust” than less drawdown. Technical logic indicates that progressive decreases in replenishment (from full replenishment in the Baseline to lower amounts in reoperation) would progressively increase the level of “robustness”. The real question is not whether Alternative 1C is more robust than the Baseline; rather, the real question is how robust is robust enough. In other words, going back to the amount of controlled overdraft associated with unreplenished desalter production, why 400,000 af and not some other number (whether smaller or bigger)? Watermaster ultimately submitted its proposal for reoperation with the claim that it was guided by the highest level of technical analysis. However, until the after-the-fact analysis now separately documented in the WEI Final Response Report, there had never been a technical analysis, with either the 2007 Watermaster model or its predecessor, of any scenario that **both** reduced groundwater storage by 400,000 af and achieved hydraulic control. There should be some documentation of the technical input and analysis that led Watermaster to land on the level of robustness that it did. The WEI Final Response Report would logically have been that place; however, since it isn’t, it would be appropriate for Watermaster to separately document that input and analysis by including it in its response to Condition Subsequent No. 6.

Baseline Basin Operation

The majority of “evaluation” of Alternative 1C, basin reoperation, in the WEI Final Response Report is conducted via comparison to a “Baseline” that, as far as desalters are concerned, would involve the same amount of desalter pumping but with full replenishment of all desalter pumping. This operational program was chosen to serve as the Baseline in the WEI Final Response Report because “it is currently authorized and will occur without the adoption of the Peace II Instruments.” Ultimately, the Baseline affords the opportunity to claim that reoperational results are not the net change in basin conditions that are projected to occur in the

future; rather, some of the results of reoperation are discounted by assigning them to the Baseline because those results would occur without reoperation. For example, total changes in groundwater levels are discounted by as much as 60 to 70 feet because they are attributable to Baseline operations; total change in storage is discounted by about 100,000 af attributable to Baseline operations. In the extreme, as noted above, reoperated safe yield is actually claimed to be “increased” despite the fact that it is projected to decrease from 140,000 afy to about 127,000 afy (because Baseline yield would be even lower, about 120,000 afy). In summary, Baseline is projected to cause a number of adverse effects (lower groundwater levels throughout much of the basin, decreased groundwater storage, and substantial decrease in safe yield); but that is summarily dismissed as already “authorized”. As a result, reoperational results can be described as relatively smaller adverse effects, or even an “improvement” in the case of safe yield.

When the Peace Agreement and the OBMP Implementation Plan were approved, “authorizing” the installation of the desalters as “required” in the OBMP, the desalters were specifically to replace the estimated then-remaining agricultural pumping as it further declined in the southern part of the Basin, specifically to avoid rising groundwater levels, to avoid associated increases in outflow from the Basin, and to avoid a resultant loss of safe yield. The focus at that time was to avoid rising groundwater levels; there was no mention of the widespread declines in groundwater levels and storage now attributed to that “authorized” operation. The focus at that time was also to preserve safe yield; there was no hint that safe yield could significantly decline, by about 20,000 afy.

Overall, in the context of what is now presented, the Baseline is set up to take a large part of the total impacts resulting from planned operation of the Basin when none of the Baseline-related impacts have ever been previously identified or quantified. It’s as if tens of feet of groundwater level decline, and 100,000 af of decreased groundwater storage, and a loss of 20,000 afy of safe yield have all been previously “authorized”, so the results of reoperation can be incrementally described as relatively small or, in the extreme, “better”. At a minimum, such a presentation is misleading. It would seem that a more thorough and complete explanation of all the impacts that will derive from now-approved Basin management should be addressed in the CEQA documentation that responds to Condition Subsequent No. 4.

Material Physical Injury

Evaluation of the Planning Alternative, i.e. the then-proposed, now approved Basin reoperation program in Section 4 begins with the Peace Agreement definition of Material Physical Injury. One of the illustrative definitions of Material Physical Injury is “increases in pump lift”. The quoted definition concludes by noting that “once fully mitigated, physical injury shall no longer be considered material.” In its discussion of projected groundwater levels in the Chino Basin in Section 4.3, the WEI Final Response Report discusses and illustrates the magnitude of changes associated with both the Baseline Alternative and Alternative 1C. The former are ultimately described as significant throughout the basin, while the latter are simply noted to occur throughout the basin. In summary, the WEI Final Response Report acknowledges that “some water agencies will experience greater lift and related energy expenses from reoperation” and that, “at face value, this would appear to be a material physical injury”. However, the report

goes on to dismiss such apparent material physical injury by noting that “the parties to the Judgment have indicated that they are willing to accept an increase in energy expenses with the expectation of other financial gains and certainties made possible by implementing the Peace II project description and other Peace II related agreements”, then concluding that “therefore, no material physical injury is projected to occur from the decline in groundwater levels”. There is no identified mitigation of the **physical** conditions, widespread lowering of groundwater levels and associated “increases in pump lift”, that are described and illustrated in detail in Section 4 of the WEI Final Response Report. Thus, in that technical report, the conclusion that “no material physical injury is projected to occur” does not have any evident support. There is nothing in the definition that eliminates the physical occurrence of something like increases in pump lifts simply because the parties are willing to accept them. Given the widespread support for the Peace II measures by the parties, they obviously believe that the results of reoperation override the impacts, but that does not make the impacts go away. The WEI Final Response Report dismisses a technical finding without support in this case, i.e. without any identified mitigation.

Minor Comments

Since the WEI Final Response Report has been submitted as a final report, it is probably academic to make minor comments of a mostly editorial nature. However, in the interest of a complete record, there are a few places where some editorial correction is needed: some housekeeping of numbers is needed in Section 3.4 to make it consistent with the referenced table regarding desalter capacity; reference to Alternative 1A in Section 3.6 would appear to be Alternative 1C instead; there is reference to a non-existent Section 7 in Section 5.1. In Section 2.1, there is reference to three WEI reports prepared in 2006; two are cited (as WEI 2006a and b, actually 2006a and c), but the third cannot be identified. Finally, in the tabular schedule that summarizes the now-approved reoperation management program, Alternative 1C in Table 3-5c, the total of unreplenished desalter production is nearly 409,000 af; it is unclear why that total exceeds the emphasized maximum of 400,000 af.

CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER

Case No. RCV 51010

Chino Basin Municipal Water District v. The City of Chino

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 within action. My business address is Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730; telephone (909) 484-3888.

On April 17, 2008 I served the following:

1) COMMENTS OF SPECIAL REFEREE ON WATERMASTER COMPLIANCE WITH DECEMBER 21, 2007 ORDER CONDITIONS 1 THROUGH 4

BY MAIL: in said cause, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed with postage thereon fully prepaid, for delivery by 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.

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.

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

Executed on April 17, 2008 in Rancho Cucamonga, California.



ALEX PEREZ
Chino Basin Watermaster

RICHARD ANDERSON
1365 W. FOOTHILL BLVD
SUITE 1
UPLAND, CA 91786

RODNEY BAKER
COUNSEL FOR EGGWEST &
JOHNSON
PO BOX 438
COULTERVILLE, CA 95311-0438

WILLIAM P. CURLEY
PO BOX 1059
BREA, CA 92882-1059

CRAIG STEWART
GEOMATRIX CONSULTANTS INC
510 SUPERIOR AVE, SUITE 200
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92663

LEAGUE OF CA HOMEOWNERS
ATTN: KEN WILLIS
99 "C" STREET, SUITE 209
UPLAND, CA 91786

CHARLES FIELD
4415 FIFTH STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

CARL HAUGE
SWRCB
PO BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001

DAVID SCRIVEN
KRIEGER & STEWART
ENGINEERING
3602 UNIVERSITY AVE
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

DAN FRALEY
HERMAN G. STARK YOUTH
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
15180 S EUCLID
CHINO, CA 91710

DAVID B. COSGROVE
RUTAN & TUCKER
611 ANTON BLVD
SUITE 1400
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

PAUL HOFER
11248 S TURNER AVE
ONTARIO, CA 91761

JOE DELGADO
BOYS REPUBLIC
3493 GRAND AVENUE
CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

GLEN DURRINGTON
5512 FRANCIS ST
CHINO, CA 91710

DICK DYKSTRA
10129 SCHAEFER
ONTARIO, CA 91761-7973

RALPH FRANK
25345 AVENUE STANFORD, STE 208
VALENCIA, CA 91355

CARL FREEMAN
L.D. KING
2151 CONVENTION CENTRE WAY
ONTARIO, CA 91764

BOB BEST
NAT'L RESOURCE CONS SVCS
25864 BUSINESS CENTER DR K
REDLANDS, CA 92374

JIM GALLAGHER
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER CO
2143 CONVENTION CENTER WAY
SUITE 110
ONTARIO, CA 91764

DON GALLEANO
4220 WINEVILLE RD
MIRA LOMA, CA 91752-1412

PETER HETTINGA
14244 ANON CT
CHINO, CA 91710

PETE HALL
PO BOX 519
TWIN PEAKS, CA 92391

MANUEL CARRILLO
CONSULTANT TO SENATOR SOTO
822 N EUCLID AVE, SUITE A
ONTARIO, CA 91762

KRONICK ET AL
KRONICK MOSKOVITZ TIEDEMANN
& GIRARD
400 CAPITOL MALL, 27TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4417

RONALD LA BRUCHERIE
12953 S BAKER AVE
ONTARIO, CA 91761-7903

JOEL KUPERBERG
OCWD GENERAL COUNSEL
RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP
611 ANTON BLVD., 14TH FLOOR
COSTA MESA, CA 92626-1931

ANNESLEY IGNATIUS
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO FCD
825 E 3RD ST
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0835

W. C. "BILL" KRUGER
CITY OF CHINO HILLS
2001 GRAND AVE
CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

STEVE ARBELBIDE
417 PONDEROSA TR
CALIMESA, CA 92320

ROBERT BOWCOCK
INTEGRATED RESOURCES MGMNT
405 N. INDIAN HILL BLVD
CLAREMONT, CA 91711-4724

JOHN ANDERSON
12475 CEDAR AVENUE
CHINO, CA 91710

SWRCB
PO BOX 2000
SACRAMENTO, CA 95809-2000

SENATOR NELL SOTO
STATE CAPITOL
ROOM NO 4066
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

JOHN THORNTON
PSOMAS AND ASSOCIATES
3187 RED HILL AVE, SUITE 250
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

ALAN MARKS
COUNSEL – COUNTY OF SAN
BERNARDINO
157 W 5TH STREET
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415

JIM BOWMAN
CITY OF ONTARIO
303 EAST "B" STREET
ONTARIO, CA 91764

BOB KUHN
669 HUNTERS TRAIL
GLENORA, CA 91740

GEOFFREY VANDEN HEUVEL
CBWM BOARD MEMBER
8315 MERRILL AVENUE
CHINO, CA 91710

BRIAN GEYE
DIRECTOR OF TRACK ADMIN
CALIFORNIA SPEEDWAY
PO BOX 9300
FONTANA, CA 92334-9300

MICHAEL THIES
SPACE CENTER MIRA LOMA INC
3401 S ETIWANDA AVE, BLDG 503
MIRA LOMA, CA 91752-1126

JAMES CURATOLO
CVWD
PO BOX 638
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA
91729-0638

Members:

Alfred E. Smith
Amy Steinfeld
Andy Malone
Anne Schneider
April Woodruff
Arnold Rodriguez
Art Kidman
Ashnok Dhingra
Barbara Swanson
Bill Kruger
Bill Rice
Bill Thompson
Bob Feenstra
Bob Kuhn
Bonnie Tazza
Brenda Fowler
Brian Hess
Butch Araiza
Carol
Charles Field
Charles Moorrees
Chris Swanberg
Cindy LaCamera
Craig Stewart
Curtis Aaron
Dan Arrighi
Dan Hostetler
Dan McKinney
Dave Argo
Dave Crosley
David B. Anderson
David D DeJesus
David D DeJesus
David Ringel
Dennis Dooley
Diane Sanchez
Don Galleano
Duffy Blau
Eldon Horst
Eric Garner
Eunice Ulloa
Frank Brommenschenkel
Fred Fudacz
Gene Koopman
Gerard Thibeault
Gerry Foote
Gordon P. Treweek
Grace Cabrera
Greg Woodside
Henry Pepper
James Curatalo
James Jenkins
James P. Morris
Janine Wilson
Jarlath Oley
Jean Cihigoyenetché
jeeinc@aol.com
Jeff Pierson
Jennifer Novak
Jerry King
Jess Senecal
Jill Willis
Jim Hill
Jim Markman
Jim Taylor
Jim@city-attorney.com
jimmy@city-attorney.com
Joe Graziano
Joe P LeClaire
Joe Scalmanini
John Anderson

asmith@nossaman.com
asteinfeld@bhfs.com
amalone@wildermuthenvironmental.com
ajs@eslawfirm.com
awoodruff@ieua.org
jarodriguez@sarwc.com
akidman@mkblawyers.com
ashok.dhingra@m-e.aecom.com
Barbara_Swanson@yahoo.com
citycouncil@chinohills.org
WRice@waterboards.ca.gov
bthompson@ci.norco.ca.us
feenstra@agconceptsinc.com
bgkuhn@aol.com
bonniet@cvwdwater.com
balee@fontanawater.com
bhess@niagarawater.com
butcharaiza@mindspring.com
marie@tragerlaw.com
cdfield@att.net
cmoorrees@sawaterco.com
chris.swanberg@corr.ca.gov
clacamera@mwdh2o.com
cstewart@geomatrix.com
caaron@fontana.org
darrighi@sgvwater.com
dghostetler@csupomona.edu
dmckinney@rhlaw.com
argodg@bv.com
DCrosley@cityofchino.org
danders@water.ca.gov
ddejesus@mwdh2o.com
davidcicgm@aol.com
david.j.ringel@us.mwhglobal.com
ddooley@angelica.com
dianes@water.ca.gov
donald@galleanowinery.com
Duffy954@aol.com
ehorst@jcsd.us
elgarner@bbklaw.com
eulloa@cbwcd.org
frank.brommen@verizon.net
ffudacz@nossaman.com
GTKoopman@aol.com
gthibeault@rb8.swrcb.ca.gov
gfoote@cbwcd.org
GTreweek@CBWM.ORG
grace_cabrera@ci.pomona.ca.us
gwoodside@ocwd.com
henry_pepper@ci.pomona.ca.us
jamesc@cvwdwater.com
cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.gov
jpmorris@bbklaw.com
Janine@CBWM.ORG
joley@mwdh2o.com
Jean_CGC@hotmail.com
jeeinc@aol.com
jpierson@unitexc corp.com
jennifer.novak@doj.ca.gov
jking@psomas.com
JessSenecal@lagerlof.com
jnwillis@bbklaw.com
jhill@cityofchino.org
jmarkman@rwglaw.com
jim_taylor@ci.pomona.ca.us
Jim@city-attorney.com
jimmy@city-attorney.com
jgraz4077@aol.com
jleclaire@wildermuthenvironmental.com
jsca@lsce.com
janderson@ieua.org

John Ayers
John Huitsing
John Schatz
John V. Rossi
John Vega
Jose Galindo
Joseph S. Aklufi
Judy Schurr
Justin Brokaw
Kathy Kunysz
Kathy Tieg
Ken Jeske
Ken Kules
Kenneth Willis
Kevin Sage
Kyle Snay
Lisa Hamilton
Mark Hensley
Martin Zvirbulis
Robert Bowcock

jayers@sunkistgrowers.com
johnhuitsing@gmail.com
jschatz13@cox.net
jrossi@wmwd.com
johnv@cvwdwater.com
jose_a_galindo@praxair.com
AandWLaw@aol.com
jschurr@courts.sbcounty.gov
jbrokaw@hughes.net
kkunysz@mwdh2o.com
ktiegs@ieua.org
kjeske@ci.ontario.ca.us
kkules@mwdh2o.com
kwillis@homeowners.org
Ksage@IRMwater.com
kylesnay@gswater.com
Lisa.Hamilton@corporate.ge.com
mhensley@localgovlaw.com
martinz@cvwdwater.com
bbowcock@irmwater.com

Members:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Manuel Carrillo | Manuel.Carrillo@SEN.CA.GOV |
| Mark Kinsey | mkinsey@mvwd.org |
| Mark Ward | mark_ward@ameron-intl.com |
| Mark Wildermuth | mwildermuth@wildermuthenvironmental.com |
| Martha Davis | mdavis@ieua.org |
| Martin Rauch | martin@rauchcc.com |
| Martin Zvirbulis | martinz@cvwdwater.com |
| Maynard Lenhart | directorlenhart@mvwd.org |
| Michael B. Malpezzi | MMalpezzi@reliant.com |
| Michael T Fife | MFife@bhfs.com |
| Mike Del Santo | mdelsant@prologis.com |
| Mike Maestas | mmaestas@chinohills.org |
| Mike McGraw | mjmcmgraw@FontanaWater.com |
| Mike Thies | mthies@spacecenterinc.com |
| Mohamed El-Amamy | melamamy@ci.ontario.ca.us. |
| Nathan deBoom | n8deboom@gmail.com |
| Pam Wilson | pwilson@bhfs.com |
| Paul Deutsch | pdeutsch@geomatrix.com |
| Paul Hofer | farmwatchtoo@aol.com |
| Pete Hall | r.pete.hall@cdcr.ca.gov |
| Peter Hettinga | peterhettinga@yahoo.com |
| Phil Krause | pkrause@parks.sbcounty.gov |
| Phil Rosentrater | prosentrater@wmwd.com |
| Rachel R Robledo | rrobledo@bhfs.com |
| Raul Garibay | raul_garibay@ci.pomona.ca.us |
| Richard Atwater | Atwater@ieua.org |
| Rick Hansen | rhansen@tvmwd.com |
| Rick Rees | rrees@geomatrix.com |
| Rita Kurth | ritak@cvwdwater.com |
| Robert Bowcock | bbowcock@irmwater.com |
| Robert Cayce | rcayce@airports.sbcounty.gov |
| Robert DeLoach | robertd@cvwdwater.com |
| Robert Rauch | robert.rauchcc@verizon.net |
| Robert Tock | rtock@jcsd.us |
| Robert W. Nicholson | rwnicholson@sgvwater.com |
| Robert Young | rkyoung@fontanawater.com |
| Roger Florio | roger.florio@ge.com |
| Ron Craig | RonC@rbf.com |
| Rosemary Hoerning | rhoerning@ci.upland.ca.us |
| Sam Fuller | samf@sbvmwd.com |
| Sandra S. Rose | ybarose@verizon.net |
| Sandy Lopez | slopez@ci.ontario.ca.us |
| Scott Burton | sburton@ci.ontario.ca.us |
| Steve Arbelbide | sarbelbide@californiasteel.com |
| Tej Pahwa | tpahwa@dtsc.ca.gov |
| Terry Catlin | tlcatlin@verizon.net |
| Timothy Ryan | tjryan@sgvwater.com |
| Tom Love | TLove@ieua.org |
| Tony Banegas | tbanegas@sunkistgrowers.com |
| Tracy Tracy | ttracy@mvwd.org |
| Tram Tran | ttran@mkblawyers.com |
| Vanessa Hampton | vhampton@jcsd.us |
| WM Admin Staff | |