

REID & HELLYER APC
3880 LEMON STREET, FIFTH FLOOR
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92502-1300
TELEPHONE (951) 682-1771

1 **REID & HELLYER**
A Professional Corporation
2 STEVEN G. LEE, State Bar No. 138168
3880 Lemon Street, Fifth Floor
3 Post Office Box 1300
Riverside, California 92502-1300
4 Telephone: (951) 682-1771
Facsimile: (951) 686-2415

5 Attorneys for Agricultural Pool Committee of the Chino Basin

6
7
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, RANCHO CUCAMONGA**

10
11 CHINO BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CITY OF CHINO, et al.,

15 Defendants.

) CASE NO. RCV 51010

)
) The Hon. J. Michael Gunn
) Dept. R8

)
) **AGRICULTURAL POOL COMMITTEE**
) **OF THE CHINO BASIN'S OPPOSITION**
) **TO CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER**
) **DISTRICT'S MOTION TO DISCONTINUE**
) **THE APPOINTMENT OF THE SPECIAL**
) **REFEREE**

16
17) **DATE: August 21, 2008**

) **TIME: 2:00 p.m.**

18) **DEPT.: R8**

19 The Agricultural Pool Committee of the Chino Basin (hereinafter "Ag Pool") hereby submits
20 the following opposition to Cucamonga Valley Water District's Motion to Discontinue the
21 Appointment of the Special Referee:

22 **I**

23 **INTRODUCTION**

24 On December 21, 2007, after a three year effort by the stakeholders in the Chino Basin, the
25 Court signed an Order approving the suite of documents that have come to be known as the Peace II
26 measures. The Peace II measures constitute a hallmark achievement in basin management and in
27 the ability of parties with varying economic interests to curb those personal interests for the
28 common benefit of the entire Chino Basin.

1 By way of Cucamonga Valley Water District's ("CVWD") motion, it rightly "pats on the
2 back" the various stakeholders for their noble efforts and huge steps which led to the Court signing
3 the December 21, 2007 Order. However, at the same time, in its moving papers, CVWD discounts
4 the large role that the Special Referee and her technical consultant (Joe Scalmanini) also played in
5 directing the course of negotiations and in achieving what ultimately became known as Peace II.
6 Throughout the negotiations, formative concepts and technical data were made known to the Special
7 Referee and her technical assistant. Those formative concepts and technical data were further
8 sharpened and refined through the analysis and peer review of the Special Referee and her technical
9 consultant. Their work and analysis was essential to more fully informing this Court of the wisdom
10 of signing the December 21, 2007 as well as to implementing compliance with Conditions 1 through
11 6 over the next two successive years. These compliance measures were, in large part, solely
12 imposed as a condition of approval of the Peace II measures, due to the strong urging of the Special
13 Referee and her technical consultant. The Court itself specifically acknowledged the efforts of the
14 Special Referee and her technical consultant in the December 21, 2007 Order. That
15 acknowledgment is further seen through the Court's December 21, 2007 Order, which included
16 language further authorizing the Special Referee to act in such a way as to inform and make
17 recommendations to the Court.

18 As asserted in CVWD's motion, it may well be true that the appointment of the Special
19 Referee in 1998, was very limited in scope. However, over the past several years, with the Court's
20 implicit knowledge and tacit, if not actual, direction, the Special Referee's duties have evolved to
21 where they seem to have become much broader in scope. However, the Court has always
22 maintained judicial discretion to seek the advice and input from the Special Referee on matters that
23 are beyond the expertise and knowledge of most jurists. Despite any increase in the scope of the
24 Special Referee's duties, now is not the time to remove her. Instead, if the Court believes it to be
25 appropriate, it may keep her duties as is, or it may further "define" and "clarify" the scope of future
26 duties that are appropriate for the Special Referee and her technical assistant to continue to
27 undertake in the future.

28

1 At the present time, despite the near unanimity among the various stakeholders and the
2 efficient operation by the Watermaster Staff, the time has not come, nor likely ever will come,
3 where the services of a Special Referee (at least in some role) will not be necessary. CVWD asserts
4 that the Watermaster should be the sole liaison with the Court as it relates to basin management and
5 oversight of the various stakeholders in the Chino Basin. The Ag Pool lauds the excellent manner
6 in which Watermaster staff has overseen and continues to oversee the basin and how it has always
7 acted in accordance with the fiduciary obligations imposed by this Court and by prior court orders
8 issued by this Court. However, despite Watermaster staff's effort to stay objective, the "lens"
9 through which Watermaster acts will always be subject to outside influence. The simple fact is that
10 Watermaster's CEO is appointed by the Watermaster Board, which is comprised of stakeholders
11 that have and will continue to assert a strong influence on the office of the Watermaster. Unlike a
12 court, where a neutral disinterested body makes decisions, here it is the stakeholders, each with their
13 own constituents, who drive Watermaster's decision-making. So long as there are parties and
14 stakeholders with varying personal financial and vested interests, there will always be a need for
15 oversight and review by an independent and objective court-appointed Special Referee.

16 As shall be shown below, strong rationale exists for the continued role of the Special
17 Referee in the oversight of the Chino Basin. First, the Special Referee is independent and objective.
18 She does not "have a horse in this race." Second, the issues presented by the 1978 Judgement and
19 from Peace I and Peace II measures call for a keen knowledge and understanding of water law and
20 the unique circumstances of the Chino Basin. The appointment of a Special Referee has been, and
21 will continue to be, a necessary tool for the Court to assist and ensure that the terms of the 1978
22 Judgment and the Peace II measures are fairly implemented. It will also act to ensure that water
23 resources continue to be safely and adequately managed for future generations. Second, removal of
24 the Special Referee will likely increase, not decrease, future costs to the parties. Third, the Special
25 Referee's continued future service ensures that any future appointment of a new judge to oversee
26 this case, will be as painless as possible and will continue to add the necessary component of
27 continuity to all stakeholders in the Chino Basin.
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

II
ARGUMENT

A. **The Special Referee Is Necessary And Provides An Independent and Objective View That Has and Will Continue to Assist The Court**

While the role of the Special Referee has evolved since 1998, the Court has continued to acknowledge the usefulness of the Special Referee throughout this evolution. The parties should not discount the role filled by the Special Referee. Despite the obvious talents of Judge Gunn over these past several years as it relates to complex water law issues, due to time constraints, a heavy civil calendar and other pressing matters, the expertise provided by the Special Referee has been invaluable and certainly appreciated by the Court.

The Court has not only expressed its appreciation for the Special Referee, at prior hearings over the past three years, but it specifically stated as follows in the December 21, 2007 Order:

“The role of the Special Referee is to (1) provide the court with as full and complete explanations as possible of what the Watermaster requests or of issues that have been brought to the court; and (2) to make recommendations to the court as appropriate.”

The Court further reiterated the desire, in the December 21, 2007 Order, for the continued assistance of the Special Referee:

“The Court has said on many occasions that the assistance provided by the Special Referee is invaluable. It is the desire of the Court that the Special Referee continue to monitor the contents, implementation, effectiveness and shortcomings (if any) of the OBMP.”

These statements follow a prior acknowledgment in the Order Re-Appointing the Nine Member Board for a Further Five Year Term (Feb. 9, 2006) as follows:

“The Special Referee also is to be commended for providing independent assessments of Watermaster’s effectiveness in implementing the OBMP and in managing the basin. . . . The Special Referee’s report is largely an effort to assist Watermaster in this regard.”

Ignoring the Court’s own statements as to the necessity of the Special Referee in assisting both the Court and Watermaster, CVWD aims to deprive both of this expertise and objectivity.

1 Instead it asserts that Watermaster should be the exclusive liaison to the Court as Watermaster is
2 objective and is best equipped to provide oversight of the Peace II measures. As stated above,
3 although Watermaster has, and continues to perform an admirable job, the fact remains that it
4 receives pressure from its stakeholders, whether individually or by pools. In theory, the
5 Watermaster can be a “neutral arm of the court.” However, as long as one pool or group of
6 stakeholders bears the brunt of expenses and basin costs, the risk always exists that Watermaster
7 staff or its CEO may be “ beholden ” to the largest and most powerful pool or group of stakeholders.
8 These influences will always pose risk to the role of the Watermaster and its CEO, whose very job is
9 based upon a periodic review by the very parties that he oversees. Consequently, the continued
10 existence of a Special Referee is needed to ensure objectivity and independence.

11 Removal of the Special Referee at this time would ask the Court to make future decisions
12 based solely on what the parties before the court have agreed to do or stipulated to. Rarely does a
13 judicial officer make decisions based solely upon what the parties before it have agreed to (even if
14 the parties were unanimous in their approval). Instead, the court ensures compliance with the law
15 and the appropriateness of the action through its own consideration; part of this analysis may well
16 require the expertise of a Special Referee to assist in the decision-making process and provide a
17 check on the parties’ actions.

18
19 **B. Removal of the Special Referee May Result in Increased Future Costs**

20 One of CVWD’s primary arguments is that the Special Referee, her staff and technical
21 consultant have incurred substantial costs that are being borne by the Appropriate Pool, and
22 ultimately its rate-payers. The argument is that in many cases, these charges are duplicative in
23 nature and constitute work that doesn’t need to be done. The Ag Pool does not object to closer
24 oversight on the work to be undertaken by the Special Referee and her technical consultant in the
25 future. However, the larger issue that appears to be lost in CVWD’s motion is while this Court
26 relies heavily upon the Special Referee, any successor judge will have an even greater need for the
27 Special Referee. The current Special Referee, possesses vast knowledge of the Chino Basin, its
28 water issues, and the long history of the parties and the Court dating back to the 1979 judgment. To

1 appoint a new Special Referee to bring a new judge “up to speed” and then to hire a new technical
2 consultant to help the judge more fully understand these issues could result in significantly higher
3 costs than to keep the current Special Referee and technical consultant. One can only imagine how
4 long it would take a new Special Referee and judge to attain even a working knowledge of the
5 Chino Basin. A new Special Referee would end up costing more, both financially and in risks to the
6 wisdom of decisions regarding the Chino Basin.

7
8 **C. A Further Order Defining the Scope of Duties to be Performed by the Special**
9 **Referee May Be Needed, But Not Removal of the Special Referee**

10 In 1998, an Order of Reference was issued by this Court which provided specific duties to be
11 undertaken by the Special Referee. Over time, the Special Referee’s role has expanded, in large part
12 with written direction and/or tacit approval from this Court. The Court’s direction to the Special
13 Referee has been made in order to ensure that the Peace II measures were adequately supported by
14 law, in accordance with the 1979 Judgment, and that the measures were supported by solid technical
15 data and science. The court specifically envisioned continued oversight of Peace II. (See December
16 21, 2007 Order and quote at page 4 above.) Regular periodic reporting by the Special Referee was
17 also included in the Peace II measures to ensure optimal basin management, safe yield and overall
18 implementation of the OBMP.

19 The Special Referee will continue to play an important role to the Court for many years to
20 come. Although Watermaster has proven it can, and has, successfully carried out its obligations
21 under the Judgment and can serve as a reliable arm of the Court, a Special Referee will play a key
22 role to this Court and to the future of the Chino Basin. The Court can make the best determination
23 of how it defines the Special Referee’s role. To the extent that the Special Referee’s role requires
24 re-definition or clarification, the Ag Pool does not object.¹ However, complete removal of the
25

26 ¹The Court may consider (if it is helpful to the Court) the preparation of a new Order of
27 Reference, that more clearly articulates and defines the scope of the Special Referee’s (as well as her
28 staff and technical consultant) current duties and specifically defines the scope and nature of any
future work. Should the Court so choose, it could also invite further briefing by interested parties
on the nature and extent of the Special Referee’s duties that should be included in any future Order
of Reference.

REID & HELLYER APC
3880 LEMON STREET, FIFTH FLOOR
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92502-1300
TELEPHONE (951) 682-1771

1 Special Referee is not the answer. To take such action would not be in the best long-term interest
2 of the parties.

3 III


4 CONCLUSION

5 The Ag Pool respectively submits to this Court that CVWD's motion should be denied. The
6 Ag Pool acknowledges the key role that each party, Watermaster and Watermaster legal counsel
7 played in obtaining the approval of the Peace II measures. It further acknowledges the approval of
8 the management strategy known as Basin Re-Operation, which is a real milestone for the current
9 and future residents of the Chino Basin. The Ag Pool further submits that the Special Referee and
10 her technical assistant also played a vital role in advising and providing peer review to ensure that
11 the implementation of the Peace II measures was in compliance with the 1979 Judgment. The Ag
12 Pool further submits that the continued oversight by this Court (through the Special Referee) is
13 essential to maintaining an independent and objective view of the implementation of the Peace II
14 measures.

15 To the extent that there is confusion or disagreement regarding the Special Referee's scope
16 of duties, the Ag Pool would not object to a further definition of those duties to ensure that the best
17 interests of the Chino Basin are protected for future generations.

18
19 DATED: August 8, 2008

REID & HELLYER
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

21 By: 

22 Steven G. Lee
23 Attorneys for Agricultural Pool Committee
24 of the Chino Basin
25
26
27
28

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 August 7, 2008 I served the following:

1) AGRICULTURAL POOL COMMITTEE OF THE CHINO BASIN'S OPPOSITION TO CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT'S MOTION TO DISCONTINUE THE APPOINTMENT OF THE SPECIAL REFEREE

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 August 7, 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
GLEN DORA, CA 91740

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

BRIAN GEYER
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:

Al Lopez	lopezsixto@netzero.net
Alfred E. Smith	asmith@nossaman.com
Amy Steinfeld	asteinfeld@bhfs.com
Andy Malone	amalone@wildermuthenvironmental.com
Anne Schneider	ajs@eslawfirm.com
Anthony La	ala@ci.upland.ca.us
April Woodruff	awoodruff@ieua.org
Arnold Rodriguez	jarodriguez@sarwc.com
Art Kidman	akidman@mkblawyers.com
Ashok K. Dhingra	ashok.dhingra@m-e.aecom.com
Barbara Swanson	Barbara_Swanson@yahoo.com
Bill Dendy	bdendy@aol.com
Bill Kruger	citycouncil@chinohills.org
Bill Rice	WRice@waterboards.ca.gov
Bill Thompson	bthompson@ci.norco.ca.us
Bob Feenstra	feenstra@agconceptsinc.com
Bob Kuhn	bgkuhn@aol.com
Bonnie Tazza	bonniet@cvwdwater.com
Brenda Fowler	balee@fontanawater.com
Brian Hess	bhess@niagarawater.com
Butch Araiza	butcharaiza@mindspring.com
Carol	marie@tragerlaw.com
Carol Davis	cdavis@lagerlof.com
Charles Field	cdfield@att.net
Charles Moorrees	cmoorrees@sawaterco.com
Chris Swanberg	chris.swanberg@corr.ca.gov
Cindy LaCamera	clacamera@mwdh2o.com
Craig Stewart	cstewart@geomatrix.com
Curtis Aaron	caaron@fontana.org
Cyndi Windell	cynthia.windell@sce.com
Dan Arrighi	darrighi@sgwwater.com
Dan Hostetler	dghostetler@csupomona.edu
Dan McKinney	dmckinney@rhlaw.com
Dave Argo	argodg@bv.com
Dave Crosley	DCrosley@cityofchino.org
David B. Anderson	danders@water.ca.gov
David D DeJesus	ddejesus@mwdh2o.com
David D DeJesus	davidcicgm@aol.com
David Ringel	david.j.ringel@us.mwhglobal.com
Dennis Dooley	ddooley@angelica.com
Diane Sanchez	dianes@water.ca.gov
Don Galleano	donald@galleanowinery.com
Duffy Blau	Duffy954@aol.com
Eldon Horst	ehorst@jcsd.us
Eric Garner	elgarner@bbklaw.com
Eunice Ulloa	eulloa@cbwcd.org
Frank Brommenschenkel	frank.brommen@verizon.net
Fred Fudacz	ffudacz@nossaman.com
Fred Lantz	flantz@ci.burbank.ca.us
Gene Koopman	GTKoopman@aol.com
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel	GeoffreyVH@juno.com
Gerard Thibeault	gthibeault@rb8.swrcb.ca.gov
Gerry Foote	gfoote@cbwcd.org
Grace Cabrera	grace_cabrera@ci.pomona.ca.us
Greg Woodside	gwoodside@ocwd.com
Henry Pepper	henry_pepper@ci.pomona.ca.us
James Curatalo	jamesc@cvwdwater.com
James Jenkins	cnomgr@airports.sbcounty.gov
James P. Morris	jpmorris@bbklaw.com
Janine Wilson	Janine@CBWM.ORG
Jarlath Oley	joley@mwdh2o.com
Jean Cihigoyenetche	Jean_CGC@hotmail.com

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 P LeClaire
Joe Scalmanini
John Anderson
John Ayers
John Cotti
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

jeeinc@aol.com
jpierson@unitexcorp.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
jleclaire@wildermuthenvironmental.com
jscal@lsce.com
janderson@ieua.org
jayers@sunkistgrowers.com
jcotti@localgovlaw.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@mw20.com
ktieg@ieua.org
kjeske@ci.ontario.ca.us
kkules@mw20.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 Lenhert	directorlenhert@mvwd.org
Michael T Fife	MFife@bhfs.com
Michelle Staples	mstaples@jdplaw.com
Mike Del Santo	mdelsanto@prologis.com
Mike Maestas	mmaestas@chinohills.org
Mike McGraw	mjmcgraw@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
Paul Lacroix	placroix@reliant.com
Pete Hall	r.pete.hall@cdcr.ca.gov
Peter Hettinga	peterhettinga@yahoo.com
Phil Krause	pkrause@parks.sbcounty.gov
Phil Rosenberg	prosenberg@hargis.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	rbowcock@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@sbsvwd.com
Sandra S. Rose	directorrose@mvwd.org
Sandy Lopez	slopez@ci.ontario.ca.us
Scott Burton	sburton@ci.ontario.ca.us
smt@tragerlaw.com	smt@tragerlaw.com
sorr@rwglaw.com	sorr@rwglaw.com
Steve Arbelbide	sarbelbide@californiasteel.com
Steve Kennedy	skennedy@bbmblaw.com
Steven K. Beckett	skbeckett@bbmblaw.com
Steven Lee	slee@rhlaw.com
Tej Pahwa	tpahwa@dtsc.ca.gov
Terry Catlin	tcatlin@verizon.net
Timothy Ryan	tjryan@sgvwater.com
Tom Bunn	TomBunn@Lagerlof.com
Tom Love	TLove@ieua.org
Tom McPeters	THMcP@aol.com
Tony Banages	tbanegas@sunkistgrowers.com
Tracy Tracy	ttracy@mvwd.org
Tram Tran	ttran@mkblawyers.com
Vanessa Hampton	vhampton@jcsd.us
WM Admin Staff	