

Minutes
CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER
BOARD MEETING
November 18, 2004

The Watermaster Board Meeting was held at the offices of the Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, California, on November 18, at 11:00 a.m.

WATERMASTER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Robert Neufeld, Chair	Fontana Union Water Company
Paula Lantz	City of Pomona
Terry Catlin	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Bob Bowcock	Vulcan Materials Company (Calmat Division)
Paul Hofer	Agricultural Pool, Crops
Bill Kruger	City of Chino Hills
Don Schroeder	Western Municipal Water District
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel	Agricultural Pool, Dairy

Watermaster Staff Present

Kenneth R. Manning	Chief Executive Officer
Sheri Rojo	Finance Manager
Gordon Treweek	Project Manager
Danielle Maurizio	Senior Engineer
Sheri Lynne Molino	Recording Secretary

Watermaster Consultants Present

Scott Slater	Hatch & Parent
Michael Fife	Hatch & Parent
Mark Wildermuth	Wildermuth Environmental Inc.

Others Present

Jim Taylor	City of Pomona
Ken Jeske	City of Ontario
Dave Crosley	City of Chino
Mark Kinsey	Monte Vista Water District
Rich Atwater	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Tom Love	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Justin Brokaw	Marygold Mutual Water Company
Bob Thompson	Senator Nell Soto Office

The Watermaster Board Meeting was called to order by Chair Neufeld at 11:02 a.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGENDA - ADDITIONS/REORDER

Due to the decision at the joint meeting, a revised Assessment Package which includes the 12,000 acre feet of new yield resulting from the recharge improvement project is being distributed and will be addressed on the agenda as scheduled.

I. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. MINUTES

- 1. Minutes of the Watermaster Board Meeting held on October 28, 2004

B. FINANCIAL REPORTS

- 1. Cash Disbursements for the month of October 2004
- 2. Combining Schedule of Revenue, Expenses and Changes in Working Capital for the Period July 1, 2004 through September 30, 2004
- 3. Treasurer’s Report of Financial Affairs for the Period September 1 through September 30, 2004
- 4. Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual July through September 2004

C. TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT

D. WATER TRANSACTION

Consider Approval for Transaction of Notice of Sale or Transfer from City of Pomona to Monte Vista Water District in the amount of 2,500 acre-feet; Date of Application: September 1, 2004

*Motion by Kruger, second by Bowcock, and by majority vote, with one abstention by Catlin
Moved to approve Consent Calendar Items A through D, as presented*

II. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. ANALYSIS OF MATERIAL PHYSICAL INJURY

Mr. Wildermuth referred to the staff letter on page 53 in the packet which summarizes the issues being presented. Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) made a request to Watermaster to perform a review of material physical injury for their Phase II Recycled Water Recharge Program. By way of history, IEUA made a similar request back in 2002. Watermaster responded to IEUA’s request by stating if IEUA comes back with an approval from DHS and the Regional Board, Watermaster will then review the request. What IEUA is requesting at this time is slightly different in that IEUA is asking Watermaster to perform the technical work on the material physical injury analysis directly; they in turn can use that work elsewhere. This is a substantial amount of work to undertake and IEUA will be reimbursing Watermaster for the work performed and allow Watermaster to operate independently so there will not be an influence in the work. This will allow Wildermuth to perform and to perform an impartial independent analysis. Chair Neufeld inquired if this was an item which needed to have action taken on it. Mr. Manning stated because of the scope of this activity staff is requesting the Board take action so we have record that the Board was made aware of this item and approved Watermaster to move ahead. This will be a pass through as far as costs and it is not a budgeted item.

*Motion by Vanden Heuvel, second by Catlin, and by unanimous vote
Moved to approve analysis of material physical injury, as presented*

B. FY 2004-2005 ASSESSMENT PACKAGE

Mr. Manning stated the assessment package set before you may look similar to the assessment packages received in the past; however, there are some substantial changes to it. This is Sheri Rojo’s first year putting together the assessment package and she has done an outstanding job in compiling and placing items in the assessment package in a logical approach. Mr. Manning noted staff is prepared to give a detailed review of the assessment package, review all changes, and answer any questions at this time. The handout assessment package is different from the one submitted in the agenda package in that the 12,000 acre feet of new yield resulting from the Recharge Improvement Project has been added due to the Pools and Advisory Committee authorization to do so after conclusion that substantial completion had been done to the recharge projects. After reviewing the calculations behind the assessment package it became clear that the administrative assessment and OBMP

assessments should be the same by pool per acre foot if you are going to bill on a percentage of what you have produced from the basin. During a review of the package, we figured out why it was not done that way in the past and came up with a couple items that should have been stripped out and included someplace else in the package; now everyone starts out on a level playing field. Ms. Rojo reviewed several lines of the first page of the assessment package and noted Watermaster is a budget driven organization. As the assessment package was being put together it also became obvious that appropriators, agricultural producers and non agricultural producers send Watermaster their production all throughout the year along with notices of water transactions, and land use conversions. Once data is gathered throughout the year Watermaster contacts each entity and confirms if the numbers sent throughout the year are correct, puts those confirmed numbers into the assessment package and then sends out the package.

In reviewing this process it became clear that creating the assessment package involves two separate courses of action 1) is the water activity that goes on in the basin, whether it is production, land use conversions, transfers, etc. and 2) is assigning dollar values to those water activities. Watermaster has been in the process of putting together a software program that in the future will calculate the assessment package on a given set of rules and protocols which we have been trying to establish. A couple of the protocols will need some clarification and resolve before this process can be put into place. The idea was to present to the appropriators a list of what we have gathered for their water activities and then let the appropriators review and confirm their water activity for the year, then dollar values will be assigned to form the assessment package. This will eliminate changing the figures over and over when water activity is modified. Ms. Rojo noted her goal for next year is to have the new software up and running, to have a list of protocols on a going forward basis providing a basis, describing where each of the numbers come from and how they are calculated, first on the water activity side and then on assigning a dollar value to said activity. The package includes changes, noting the majority of those changes are on page one of the assessment package. A couple of adjustments did come out of the workshop, one being an issue with one of the appropriators and the land use conversion rolling forward incorrectly for approximately nine years; now there is a policy issue as to how to adjust that figure. There was discussion of a one year look back only and there is a four year legal look back and several other options which need to be taken care of and set as protocol on a going forward basis. Mr. Manning reiterated the two policy issues which will need to be address that came out of the workshop; 1) one year look back issue as Sheri discussed, and 2) assignment issues in coming up with a policy on how we are going to deal with assignments. The question of whether or not the addressing of the Jurupa issue was addressed in this assessment package was presented. Mr. Manning stated there was a correction on the acres on a go forward basis and that Watermaster corrected this year and last years assessments but it did not address the entire magnitude of the problem. Ms. Rojo noted how with the GIS mapping system we can overlay the maps and see exactly what areas are being claimed and double claimed; on a going forward basis the total amount of overage for Jurupa over the last nine years has been corrected but every year for the last nine years Jurupa has received a benefit of that acreage. We adjusted the most recent year. A question regarding page two – land use conversion when the Peace Agreement changed, the amount of acres converted, did that go retroactive to all the land use conversions that had been before was presented. Ms. Rojo stated that did not and referred to page two where it notes conversion prior to and then post Peace Agreement, both at different rates. A question regarding the summary at the top of the page noting it states overproduction of over 9,500 acre feet was presented. Ms. Rojo stated she did not change a lot of the wording that was previously in the assessment package not wanting to make too many changes at once knowing this way of doing the package will be tossed out and we will start fresh with the new system by next year. Ms. Rojo commented the stated over/under production and represents what would have been over/under over allocated if everybody got everything they wanted i.e. the 32,800 early transfer and the land use conversions. The question of what didn't they get was presented. Ms. Rojo referred to page three, fifth column and what the appropriators were given which was the beginning balance of the 32,800 acre feet

and the full benefit of the land use conversion. What we come up with is a potential acre feet for reallocation, the actual allocation given to the appropriators is an amount prorated not to exceed the 82,000 acre feet allowed to the Agricultural Pool. The question of where the 12,000 acre foot shows up in the assessment package was presented. Ms. Rojo referred to page four, fifth column of the assessment package which adds in the new yield by producer based on their percentage of operating safe yield. Ms. Rojo referred to page five noting the net effect of adding that water per producer, which was added into the net water transaction and in column four it is actually increasing the appropriator's annual production rights. For those who over produced it has the effect offsetting the over production and those who are under produced, the additional right will go into their storage. The question if this change affects the assessment rates was presented. Ms. Rojo noted it does not affect the assessment rates for administrative and OBMP assessments, but rather it will affect the amount required to be paid by over producers to purchase replenishment water. The assessment rates on page one is based on production to the basin with the exception of the Agricultural Pools; the Ag Pool money is actually billed based on the net reallocation to the appropriator. Staff was asked to better describe where the decision of the physical impact of the 12,000 acre feet is either a benefit or a cost. Ms. Rojo referred to page five on the ninth, tenth, and eleventh columns of the assessment package noting after we add in the 12,000 acre feet the production remains the same but their production right changes; the net financial impact would be seen on page ten. The reduction in overproduction thereby reduces the replenishment assessment but not the Watermaster assessment on page one. The question in comparing the revised draft assessment which was handed out today and the one assessment which was in the agenda packets only difference is the 12,000 acre feet or were there other factors that caused changes was presented. Ms. Rojo noted there was one other factor on page nine the next to the last column where the appropriators received a credit for the interest that they have earned in the previous year; this was added instead of subtracted which was corrected in the revised package, the rest being the addition of the 12,000 acre feet. Ms. Rojo stated the 12,000 acre feet reduced the replenishment obligation by 4,000 acre feet times \$250 dollars which equals around a one million dollar reduction. It was noted in actuality 12,000 acre feet equals a three million dollar value. The remaining two million dollars was assigned to under producing, increasing their storage balances. The question was presented staff to identify where the bottom line numbers of the assessments are located. Ms. Rojo referred to page ten in the very last column of the assessment package is the main assessment number along with page nine, the very first two columns by themselves; this page is for the appropriators only. The appropriators will assess themselves for the 6,500 acre feet; they receive the sole benefit of the 6,500 acre foot allocation and the percentage of the benefit of the 6,500 is how it is billed back to them. The next column is the recharge improvement payment – that is our debt service contribution to IEUA. It was noted that a policy decision is being recommended by the Appropriative Pool to declare the recharge project substantially finished which would enable them to take credit for the 12,000 acre feet. With regards to the impact of the 12,000 acre feet staff was asked to provide a report as to justification in stating the recharge project is substantially complete. Chair Neufeld inquired if Ms. Lantz felt her question was sufficiently answered and it was stated there was still some confusion in getting the bottom line figure for Pomona. Ms. Rojo stated with the addition of the 12,000 acre feet, this changed Pomona into an under production category and not being assessed in an over production mode as the package was previously prepared while also noting a credit was given based on water transfers that Pomona had. The question of what process will be used to sort out the Jurupa and other issues was presented. Mr. Manning stated Watermaster is going to put together some thoughts on the assignment issue and the look back on Jurupa issues and then discuss with staff and attorneys in early January and put together a group of Board members and appropriators to try and review this issue and come up with a policy decision. Counsel Slater stated there are a few legal issues relative to the subject of pursuing a party for a back assessment or making some decisions on what you want to do perceptively as well as retroactively with regard to assessments. As a matter of law in redressing issues related to contract there is generally a statute of limitations that affects a party's ability to redress problems that come out of a contract and that statute of limitations is four years. There are

initially two limitations issues, 1) there is the responsibility of the party who receives the assessment to respond and object within 30 days if they believe it is incorrect and 2) there is a contractual bounding about four years if our Judgment is a contract as it typically is construed by others. There is however a discretionary part that Watermaster gets to play in this and this would arise where there may have been a mistake or an error in the preparation of the assessment package. Specifically Watermaster Rules and Regulations that were recently approved by the court included an assessment procedure in a basis where each party assumes a burden to properly report each of their issues and that would include production and other essential information that was required by Watermaster to complete the assessment package. If a party incorrectly submitted information, whether that was on purpose or through omission there is a failure under our Rules and Regulations, there is also 4.4 which provides you discretion on how you want to address errors. There is an expressed discretion that is reserved to the Watermaster and the Watermaster process in how to deal with errors and thus far from what we have heard, the issue with Jurupa was a mistake or an error, it was an error in the filing, an error on the part of parties in reviewing the packages, it was in error on Watermaster by relying on incorrect data which was resulted in the assessments. There is the retroactive piece, the prospective piece – do you correct the error on a go forward basis, and our reading of the Rules and Regulations is that Watermaster has discretion on how to address that. Any parties who do not agree with Watermasters decision can object/test that decision through the court process. The question of whether we need to create mechanisms to verify and go forward was presented. Counsel Slater stated from a legal perspective Watermaster would be wise to have clear rules and procedures that can be followed in the future. On a go forward basis Counsel Slater urged Watermaster to consider rules that are fair and capable of consistent application and that Watermaster should not be clouded in judgment by a single occurrence. Mr. Manning stated we are fairly certain with our new GIS capabilities that we will not have the same type of situation in the future. Mr. Manning acknowledged that Watermaster is an organization based on trust and we work with our producers to make sure the information we get is coming in on a consistent basis and is accurate as best as we can tell. The question that we now face is how much of a policing authority the Watermaster would really have to become and how much would it cost to police each agency and organizations to ensure we are receiving 100% accurate information. The way the Pools, Advisory Committee and Watermaster Board have been set up is in a way to allow policing of one self. What we need is a policy to address issues as they come up, and issues will still come up, however we must have a way of correcting them. Watermaster is anticipating being able to bring those new policies to the Pool, Advisory Committee, and Board in April/May 2005 for consideration so that it does not affect the timing of the water activity report and assessment package for next year. Chair Neufeld directed staff to return to Mr. Vanden Heuvel's point regarding the decision to adopt the 12,000 acre feet due to substantial completion of the recharge basins. Mr. Manning stated he was not present during the discussions regarding the 12,000 acre feet, although in reading the past minutes and actions taken during those discussions about the new yield it was not clear to me or others whether or not what the actual threshold was to substantiate actual completion. For that reason Watermaster asked that in order to put the 12,000 into the mix that some determination be made by involved parties to that regard. During the last meeting a discussion took place as to the discussions that took place in 2003 as to the new yield. Two charts were presented to the Pools and Advisory Committee which was put together by Gordon Treweek, first regarding the Improvement Project – Construction Status which is an analysis of the entire project included within the program as of June 30th and November 15th so that we could have some discussion as to where we were on June 30th, 2004. The second document was based upon the first storm event which occurred in October and an analysis of the performance of the recharge facilities based on our limited ability to operate them because of our manual operation and no operational plans that are yet approved by the county. During the first storm event we were able to capture almost 1,500 acre feet of water and the 2nd storm, which you do not have a copy of that report; we estimate we captured almost the same amount of water. Over those two storm events we are estimating almost 3,000 acre feet of captured water, which indicates to us that the performance of the basins what we thought they would be and we were very pleased with these initial numbers. This still leaves that fact that as of

June 30, 2004 we were unsure as to whether or not we had crossed the threshold into substantial completion so we asked the Pools and Advisory Committee to make that determination based on the discussions they had and the numbers presented. Mr. Jeske noted there is a third document that should have been added to today's viewing while the Board considers this recommendation which is on page 57 of the package; there is table which discusses potential recharge capabilities for all the basins. This page is pointed out because there was an extensive discussion on this issue. Mr. Jeske reviewed the five year average review process and noted this was done so we did not spike every year based on whether it rained or not in a given year. We did not plan on the 21,000 originally forecasted but reduced it to the 12,000 acre feet to allow us a conservative approach, we then looked at what each basin would produce when completed, looked at the tables which are before you on status of completion, and found that it was well in excess of 12,000 acre feet – based on that, all three Pools and the Advisory Committee unanimously recommended the finding of substantial completion and compliance with the facilities. Mr. Manning made note that the action we are taking today is not a question whether the 12,000 is an accurate number, that decision was made in 2003, the decision we are making today is whether or not the 12,000 would be included in this assessment package or held off until next years assessment package; 12,000 acre feet is the number that will be used based on the agreements that were reached. It was noted by Mr. Vanden Heuvel that the 12,000 acre feet is not a conservative number and is in fact is an aggressive number; however, that is the number that was decided upon and is not what is in question. Whether or not we find the work to be substantially completed is the question at hand. It was stated that as great as the two recent storms were, we realized that the SCADA system will be extremely beneficial because storms come 24 hours a day and not just during business hours. It was noted that until the SCADA system is in full operation the notion of gaining 12,000 acre feet is not probable. Mr. Vanden Heuvel strongly noted his opposition to believing the SCADA system would be fully operational and 12,000 acre feet of water would be captured this year and inquired that the minutes would reflect his views. Mr. Manning stated the minutes will state clearly what was discussed and offered a chart would be coming out after each storm event to notify committee members in terms of the performance of the basins. Chair Nuefeld commented that he was present at the prior meeting and at that meeting it was noted there were measuring devices in place to measure the amount of water captured. It was noted that being able to measure captured water was important; however, the most critical issue with the SCADA system will be the ability to open and close gates. Mr. Jeske stated he wanted to represent the City of Ontario regarding this issue and noted Ontario's position regarding the credit of the 12,000 is not entirely dependant on one years events. That 12,000 is to be re-evaluated on a five year period and readjusted based on actual findings from year to year if they differ from that amount; it may be adjusted up or it may be adjusted down. The question if there ever was a definition of what would involve substantial completion was presented. Mr. Manning stated there was no such definition recorded. The discussions in 2003 primarily focused on rubber dams and drop inlets specifically; and those are substantially complete. Mr. Vanden Heuvel gave a brief history on recharge and allocation and noted what was proposed in those 2003 discussions was to take the modeling studies done by Wildermuth and project what this series of improvements would yield in a model and then choose an annualized number based on the model and then begin to take credit for that right away. There were many heated discussions whether to take the credit then, even prior to excavations being started, or wait until substantial completion was found; the decided method was the later option. As of June 30, 2004 the core elements were complete and in early January 2005 the SCADA system will be operational. Mr. Hofer noted he shares Mr. Vanden Heuvel's concerns regarding substantial completion and the need to have the SCADA system up and running. Chair Neufeld stated the decision coming from the Advisory Committee that they felt there was substantial completion carries a significant amount of weight as it comes to this Board. Chair Neufeld acknowledged Mr. Vanden Heuvel and Mr. Hofer's objections and stated the Board now has before it the decision to approve or not to approve the presented 2004/2005 Assessment Package. The question regarding the 50 year history of what has happened in the basin was presented to Mr. Wildermuth. Mr. Wildermuth stated the 12,000 acre foot estimate came from looking at what the project would look like completed, looking at

current land use, and estimating the daily inflow into these basins on a 50 year historical rainfall. We did not include the entire facilities improvement project in this because we were unclear of a few of the features. Based on those reviews we came up with the 12,000 acre feet per year average; the concept in the proposal which was developed was that we would use the 12,000 figure, watch the basins and understand their performance characteristics, and note changes and/or departures from the assumed operations of those basins. With the modeling work being updated on a continual basis we can then project a new 50 year average number every 5 years. There are no costs or risks associated with this method if we self correct; the integrity of the Judgment is still preserved.

Motion by Catlin, second by Kruger, and by majority vote, with one no vote by Vanden Heuvel and one no vote by Hofer

Moved to approve the revised Assessment Package which included the 12,000 acre feet, as presented

C. 2004-2005 ANNUAL MONITORING PLAN AND BUDGET

Mr. Manning stated that in June 2004 Watermaster and IEUA approved the Cooperative Agreement that provided for the long term cooperation in the groundwater monitoring and surface monitoring process. Before us today is an amendment to that agreement based upon the use of reclaimed water. Mr. Wildermuth stated with the approval of the 2004 Cooperative Agreement is the Annual Monitoring Plan, which is prepared every year; we are asking the Board to review and approve a modification to that Monitoring Plan. In the original Annual Monitoring Plan we intentionally left a spot in there to be resolved later down the line, once the Department of Health Services produced its final findings of fact regarding the Phase I Recycled Water Recharge Project. What this amendment does is allows IEUA to get to Watermaster and Wildermuth staff to perform the design and engineering for the wells and some of the lysimeters (at no cost to Watermaster – this will be a pass through cost because IEUA will reimburse our expenses). Mr. Manning stated this is an action item due to it being an amendment to the original Annual Monitoring Agreement and it also came through the Pools and Advisory Committee for recommendation of approval.

Motion by Vanden Heuvel, second by Catlin, and by unanimous vote, as presented

Moved to approve the amended 2004-2005 Annual Monitoring Plan and budget Agreement

III. REPORTS/UPDATES

A. WATERMASTER GENERAL LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT

1. Santa Ana River

Counsel Slater stated the Peace Agreement II discussions are still held in abeyance while we try to pull together the necessary technical information to reengage in the deal making; projections of completion of information will take place in mid to late December and have action started in January 2005.

Counsel Slater noted this item could become more active regarding Santa Ana River matters. Counsel Slater stated there is a great amount of work that Wildermuth has prepared in connection with the Basin Plan Amendment; there will be added pressure for environmental studies. In hearing discussions and in reviewing overall information, consensus is, it is time for a coordinated program/effort to form conjunctionally.

B. STAFF REPORT

1. Cyclic Account Update

Mr. Manning noted it was mentioned last month we do have a carryover replenishment obligation from the prior year that is in excess of 11,000 acre feet currently. Nothing has changed that will effect that amount and Watermaster is planning on taking at lease that out of the cyclic storage by the end of the year. Watermaster is monitoring the amount of water we are currently recharging as it relates to our replenishment obligation this year.

The question will be whether to increase the 11,000 acre feet purchased out of our cyclic account based on the fact that the replenishment rate maybe going up \$5.00 dollars an acre foot and our replenishment obligation in the current year exceeds 30,000 acre feet.

2. Stormwater Recharge Update

Mr. Manning commented that Watermaster staff will continue to report on stormwater events. This will allow committee members to see at what level each recharge basin is performing and where we might be having problems. Mr. Manning noted Mr. Treweek is here and available to answer any questions regarding the two handouts which he prepared. In reviewing the data Watermaster staff feels the recharge basins performed well for the two recent storm events. There are still a few issues which need to be worked out with the County Flood Control District in terms of their confidence level of us being able to maintain and manage those basins. Our operation plans are in process and initial discussions have taken place with the County. Mr. Manning stated he felt very positive about working with the Flood Control District, Inland Empire Utilities Agency, and others to make sure we capture as much stormwater as projected in our exhibits presented here today. Chair Neufeld presented a question regarding the basins capabilities to perform at maximum levels due to the debris and silt from the recent fires. Chair Neufeld noted a formal plan has not been submitted regarding this issue and that such report would be extremely beneficial to be included to the new report regarding stormwater events/operating levels of basins. Mr. Manning noted Watermaster has engaged the services of a subcontractor to make repairs when Flood Control is not available or can't do the work which is necessary to keep the maintenance of these basins intact. This company works with several other agencies in doing those types of jobs and is currently working out at Etiwanda repairing the damage which occurred in storm event number two in taking out the debris which could potentially clog those basins. Mr. Manning stated he feels we have a good handle on those types of operations and Watermaster also has a meeting scheduled with IUEA next week to discuss the 24 hour staffing need including time, financing, and various other issues to tackle this matter. The question if whether or not the costs for debris removal are in our current budget. Mr. Manning stated Watermaster does have such monies in the budget and this item will be re-evaluated for the budget next year based upon this increased need. Watermaster is still unclear as to how much cost Flood Control will absorb and/or how much Watermaster will have to take on ourselves.

3. College Heights Monitoring Update

Mr. Manning commented that the Watermaster Board approved going ahead with the two monitoring wells that were directly to the west and southwest of the Upland Basin. Those are moving forward; staff concurred with the Board's decision that the monitoring well to the northwest of the project directly west of College Heights was not needed. Watermaster has had discussions with the City of Upland and have encouraged them to speak with their developers to possibly paying for that monitoring well themselves because they would have more benefit from that than we would at this point in time.

4. Discuss holiday meeting schedules

Mr. Manning noted there were no meetings scheduled for the month of December and stated that the Watermaster staff is available and will accommodate the desires of any member if the need arises to schedule a meeting. There is an MZ1 meeting scheduled for December 8, 2004. Lunch will be served today and Mr. Manning encourages all to stay if their schedules allow.

IV. INFORMATION

- 1. Reminder That the Reorganization of Board, Advisory Committee, and Pools Take Place in January

Chair Neufeld thanked Paula Lantz who is representing the City of Pomona and for her participation along with thanking the City of Pomona who will be going off rotation this next January. Chair Neufeld stated we look forward to welcoming Jurupa Community Services who will be joining the Board this January.

- 2. Newspaper Articles

It was stated to Board Member Hofer, the picture in the distributed newspaper articles was a good looking picture.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Schroeder commented this would be his last meeting after about twenty years of service. Mr. Schroeder noted that Don Galleono will take his place on the Water District's board and did not know who will be taking his place on the Watermaster board. Chair Neufeld stated Watermaster looks forward to working with whoever is sent to represent Western and that it has been a pleasure working with him for so many years on so many projects.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

No comment was made regarding this item.

VII. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION - POSSIBLE ACTION

Pursuant to Article 2.6 of the Watermaster Rules & Regulations, a Confidential Session may be held during the Watermaster Board meeting for the purpose of discussion and possible action regarding Personnel Matters and/or Potential Litigation.

No confidential session was called to order for the November 18, 2004 Board meeting.

VII. FUTURE MEETINGS

January 13, 2005	9:00 a.m.	Annual Appropriative Pool Meeting
January 13, 2005	11:00 a.m.	Annual Non-Agricultural Pool Meeting
January 18, 2005	9:00 a.m.	Annual Agricultural Pool Meeting @ IEUA
January 27, 2005	9:00 a.m.	Annual Advisory Committee Meeting
January 27, 2005	11:00 a.m.	Annual Watermaster Board Meeting

No meetings are currently planned for the month of December 2004

The Watermaster Board Meeting Adjourned at 12:23 p.m.

Secretary: _____

Minutes Approved: January 27, 2005