

**Minutes**  
**CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER**  
**ANNUAL AGRICULTURAL POOL MEETING**  
January 17, 2006

The Annual Agricultural Pool Meeting was held at the offices of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, 6075 Kimball Avenue, Chino, CA, on January 17, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

**Agricultural Pool Members Present**

|                      |                         |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Nathan deBoom, Chair | Milk Producers Council  |
| Gene Koopman         | Milk Producers Council  |
| Glen Durrington      | Crops                   |
| Jeff Pierson         | Crops                   |
| John Huitsing        | Dairy                   |
| Pete Hettinga        | Dairy                   |
| Robert Feenstra      | Dairy                   |
| Dan Hostetler        | Cal Poly Pomona         |
| Nate Mackamul        | State of California CIW |
| Robert Nobles        | State of California CIW |

**Watermaster Board Member Present**

|                        |       |
|------------------------|-------|
| Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel | Crops |
| Paul Hofer             | Crops |

**Watermaster Staff Present**

|                     |                         |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Kenneth R. Manning  | Chief Executive Officer |
| Gordon Treweek      | Project Engineer        |
| Danielle Maurizio   | Senior Engineer         |
| Sherri Lynne Molino | Recording Secretary     |

**Watermaster Consultants Present**

|              |                               |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Michael Fife | Hatch & Parent                |
| Andy Malone  | Wildermuth Environmental Inc. |

**Others Present**

|             |                            |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| Steve Lee   | Reid & Hellyer             |
| Sandra Rose | Monte Vista Water District |
| Rick Rees   | Geomatrix for CIM          |

Chair deBoom called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

**I. ANNUAL ELECTIONS - ACTION**

**A. Calendar-Year 2006 Agricultural Pool Members**

The Agricultural Pool membership shall consist of not less than ten representatives selected at large by members of the pool. Pool members will be asked to make any necessary changes to the following list in order to establish pool membership and alternates during calendar year 2006:

**Current Agricultural Pool Members**

Crops: Glen Durrington  
Jeff Pierson  
Dairy: Robert Feenstra  
Gene Koopman  
Peter Hettinga  
Nathan deBoom

**Current Alternates:**

Crops: Dan Hostetler  
Dairy: Syp Vander Dussen

|        |                |        |                |
|--------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| State: | John Huitsing  | State: | Gary Lord      |
|        | Pete Hall      |        |                |
|        | Edward Gonsman |        |                |
|        | Robert Nobles  |        |                |
|        | Nate Mackamul  |        | Aboyomi Sunomi |

**B. Calendar Year 2006 Agricultural Pool Officers**

Nominations will be heard for Pool Chair, followed by nominations for Pool Vice-Chair.

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Chair               | <u>Mr. Nathan deBoom</u>                     |
|                     | <i>Motion by Koopman, second by Hettinga</i> |
| Vice-Chair          | <u>Mr. Glen Durrington</u>                   |
|                     | <i>Motion by Pierson, second by Koopman</i>  |
| Secretary/Treasurer | <u>Watermaster Chief Executive Officer</u>   |

**C. Calendar Year 2006 Advisory Committee Members & Officers**

The pool members will be asked to determine the ten agricultural representatives to serve on the Advisory Committee and, according to the rotation sequence established among the pools, appoint a representative to serve as Chair of the Advisory Committee during calendar year 2006

|                            |                          |                                 |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Chair</b>               | <b>Agricultural Pool</b> | <b><u>Mr. Nathan deBoom</u></b> |
| Vice-Chair                 | Non-Agricultural Pool    | _____                           |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair | Appropriative Pool       | _____                           |

*Motion by Koopman, second by Feenstra*

**D. Calendar-Year 2006 Pool Representation on Watermaster Board**

The Pool members will be asked to consider selecting two representatives to serve on the Watermaster Board during Calendar-Year 2006 and one or two alternate representatives.

Member: Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel Alternate: John Huitsing  
 Member: Paul Hofer Alternate: Jeff Pierson  
*Motion by Feenstra, second by Hettinga*

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A. MINUTES**

- Minutes of the Agricultural Pool Meeting held December 6, 2005

**B. CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER INVESTMENT POLICY**

Resolution 06-01 - Resolution of the Chino Basin Watermaster, San Bernardino County, California, re-authorizing the Watermaster's Investment Policy

**C. LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND**

Resolution 06-02 – Resolution Authorizing Investment of Monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)

**D. ASSESSMENTS**

Resolution 06-03 – Resolution of the Chino Basin Watermaster Levying Replenishment and Administrative Assessments for Fiscal Year 2005-2006

*Motion by Pierson, second by Koopman, and by unanimous vote*  
***Moved to approve Consent Calendar Items A through D, as presented***

Pulled for Discussion:

**E. NOTICE OF INTENT**

Annual Filing of Notice of Intent Regarding the Determination of Operating Safe Yield

It was noted the word operating was left out of the staff letter and it was to be inserted in the correct places.

*Motion by Koopman, second by Feenstra, and by unanimous vote*

***Moved to approve Consent Calendar Item E, as noted and as presented***

**III. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SUPPORT SERVICES FOR THE CHINO BASIN FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Mr. Manning stated in the past, staff has provided this pool with updates on improvement projects that have been constructed around the basin to help us recharge water. In the past couple of months Watermaster has had some discussions about a couple areas where staff feels there are some shortcomings and staff is asking for the approval of a consultant. Staff does have the authorization to approve contracts up to \$9,999.99 but from \$10,000.00 on we need board approval; this is a \$10,000 dollar contract. This contract is not to exceed \$10,000 for labor and expenses for the analysis of two different areas. The first area is regarding berms and the second area is the issue of emptying basins; the consultant will do an analysis and provide staff with information to present to Flood Control. It was asked if Watermaster had ever used this particular consultant before and Mr. Manning noted that we have used them and their work has been good. Mr. Treweek noted this company had previously done the original basin designs. Staff is seeking an approval of this proposal at this time.

*Motion by Pierson, second by Feenstra, and by unanimous vote*

***Moved to approve the proposal to secure a professional engineering support service (Stantec) for the Chino Basin Facilities Improvement Project, as presented***

**B. BASIN OPERATIONS MANUAL**

Mr. Manning stated in working with the County Flood Control District it was noted that Flood Control desired to have in two items in place before they would feel comfortable in being able to turn over operations to Inland Empire Utilities Agency and the Watermaster. The first item required was the completion of the SCADA system, which is essentially complete for those critical areas that Flood Control was concerned with, and the second item was the approval of a Basin Operations Manual which outlined how those facilities were going to be operated under a variety of conditions. The Basin Operations Manual was constructed by Wildermuth Environmental and has been sent to the County Flood Control which was not only reviewed by them but also by the Conservation District, the City of Upland, Chino Basin Watermaster, and Inland Empire Utilities Agency. There might still be some minor changes made to the manual; the document as it stands meets all the requirements the county has asked for. It was asked if the manual will go to the Board of Supervisors and Mr. Manning stated that was unknown at this time. Staff is looking for approval to take this item to the Watermaster Board as an Operational Manual for the basins.

*Motion by Koopman, second by Pierson, and by unanimous vote*

***Moved to approve the Basin Operations Manual, as presented***

**C. MONTE VISTA WATER DISTRICT APPLICATION TO RECHARGE**

Mr. Manning stated article 10 of Watermaster Rules & Regulations requires that Watermaster prepare a written summary of analysis of potential material and physical injury for applications for recharge within the basin. On November 1, 2005 Monte Vista Water District (MVWD) sent to Watermaster an application for injection recharge up to 3,500 acre-feet in four wells which triggers, by Watermaster, an analysis of material physical injury. This request for material physical injury was forwarded to Wildermuth Environmental to do the material physical injury analysis. In Wildermuth's analysis of this application it was concluded there is no material physical injury caused by this application. Staff's recommendation is based upon Wildermuth's findings. Mr. Manning noted there is a slight modification in the motion which is presented in the meeting package which alleviates the wording regarding the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Mr. Manning read how the new motion would read with the minor change and noted MVWD will enter into an agreement with Chino Basin Watermaster and Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA). The permit required for this recharge application would be covered by the Watermaster/IEUA permit for recharge of imported and recycled water, whereby MVWD will forego going through the RWQCB and working through the Maximum Benefits Permits with IEUA. The permit for this operation will be brought back through the Watermaster process for approval. It was noted that based on Wildermuth's findings and other criteria that there are no subsidence issues or water quality issues and this project does assist in the implementation of the Optimum Basin Management Plan (OBMP) and has some positive features. The conclusion is, there is no material physical injury and this project does support the OBMP. Chair deBoom inquired as to what could happen to not make this project a success or how it will be measured. Mr. Manning stated that within the permitting process there is going to be monitoring involved because of water quality impacts. Mr. Manning stated that staff is pleased that this approach is going to be tested at MVWD well field and the application of injection wells within the basin in the future is a nice alternative that could be utilized elsewhere in the basin. This opportunity to run this test case at MVWD actually is very much a benefit to us learning a lot about how that could be assisting us in the future; this test will be watched very closely. A discussion ensued with regard to the structure of the permit and the timing of the test. A discussion ensued with regard to the water costs for this project and water quality issues.

*Motion by Feenstra, second by Pierson, and by unanimous vote*

***Moved to approve the Monte Vista Water District's application to recharge a maximum of 3,500 acre-feet/yr of treated State Water Project water by injection at its wells 1, 4, 30 and 32 subject to entering into an agreement with the Watermaster and Inland Empire Utilities Agency whereby MVWD's recharge would be covered in the Watermaster/IEUA permit for the recharge of imported and recycled water and to have the permitting process come through the Watermaster process, as presented***

**IV. REPORTS/UPDATES****A. WATERMASTER GENERAL LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT****1. Board Reappointment Motion**

Counsel Fife stated the motion to reappoint the nine member board was filed with the court, a copy of that motion is available on the back table; the hearing for that motion has been set for February 9, 2006 at 2:00 p.m. As originally presented to the pools there was a motion that asked the court to reappoint the nine member board, it recited all the conditions of reappointment that the court set for us in 2000 when it appointed the board for years 2000 through 2005 and then explained how all those conditions were met. There has been controversy over reappointment of the nine member board and discussion concerning what that reappointment should look like. When the motion went to the Appropriate Pool after it was approved at this pool there was some discomfort expressed by some of the Appropriate Pool members to have this motion go through prior to the completion of the Peace II process. The Appropriate Pool's solution to that problem was to have a special

meeting off site and at that meeting a compromise was developed. The compromise was that the members would support the motion going through as written if there was a commitment from Watermaster to convene a committee. In the motion, the committee is called the Watermaster Governance Committee. Counsel Fife stated that it is a very broad request by the Appropriative Pool to the Watermaster Board that a committee be convened of unknown size, composition, etc. that will have the task of studying and making recommendations concerning Watermaster governance. Counsel Fife stated that as a part of the compromise the committee has to commit to providing recommendations by the end of calendar year 2007. The Appropriative Pool asked that the motion be amended to include a recitation of that commitment by the Board. This revised motion went to the Advisory Committee and was unanimously approved and ultimately went to the Watermaster Board and the Board supported the creation of that committee. Counsel Fife stated the purpose of the proposed committee is to study and make recommendations and there was explicit acknowledgement that at the end of two years the committee could say they recommend no changes be made. It was asked who is going to appoint the committee. Counsel Fife and Mr. Manning stated that was not discussed. A lengthy discussion ensued with regard to this new committee and who should be on the committee. Mr. Vanden Heuvel offered comment regarding the suggestion for this committee and noted he was in support of the motion at the Watermaster Board meeting.

2. Peace II Process

Counsel Fife stated workshops have been held, one in November and one in December and out of those workshops work items and questions to be answered were left for staff and counsel. Mr. Wildermuth will be preparing technical answers in a report form for those questions. Based on the feedback we get from the technical report and other answers given on gathered questions, we will decide where we need to go from there. A brief discussion ensued with regard to where we are at and it was noted there was a separate meeting scheduled with Mr. Vanden Heuvel right after this pool meeting that will address several pool member questions.

**B. CEO/STAFF REPORT**

1. Engineers Report

Mr. Manning noted the first item on the CEO/Staff Report section is the Engineers Report section which will become a regular agenda item from now on; however, there is no report formulated for today's meeting.

2. Ontario International Airport Data Request

Mr. Manning offered comment on the history of the Ontario International Airports Potentially Responsible Parties (PRP's) issue. In July, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) sent six PRP's draft clean up and abatement orders on the Ontario International Airport plume. There have been two subsequent meetings held with those PRP's; the first meeting was an introduction meeting where information was shared about the evidence that led those organizations to be at the table and the second meeting was to discuss potential solutions. Staff was very pleased with the PRP's reactions at the meetings, it was thought by discussions at the second meeting that the PRP's had held individual meetings prior to the main meeting. At the last meeting they did make a request to Watermaster to supply them with data that the RWQCB and others were relying on that would show that they were in fact responsible for this pollution. Much of that data was in our agricultural well area which required special notification. Mr. Manning reminded the pool members that authorization was granted from this pool to seek well release information. Staff has not received 100% of the release cards to date; however, enough were received in a wide enough area to move forward. Chair deBoom stated there has been a lot of interest generated from the letter that went out requesting the release of data. Mr. Manning stated the news letter that the Milk Producers Counsel distributes also contained information about this issue and was very helpful. There was also an article in the Daily Bulletin along with one or possibly more radio stations that picked up the

information; that entire media has helped the people/parties see the need to cooperate in this important endeavor. It was noted the newspaper article is in the meeting package on page 131 and Mr. Koopman offered comment on that particular article and its misconceptions and nonsensical notions. A detailed discussion ensued with regard to the quality of water in the wells and the communication that has taken place to the well owners regarding water quality. Mr. Manning noted that the potential responsible parties were made aware at the last meeting that a representative from the Agricultural Pool will be attending all future meetings; Chair deBoom will be that representative.

3. Water Activity Update

Mr. Manning stated we have experienced one storm this season and along with that storm Watermaster is doing some recharge of State Water Project water off the Metropolitan delivery system. Mr. Treweek noted that in prior years from 2000 to 2004 Watermaster recharged approximately 13,000 acre-feet annually. Last year was the first year that we had most CBFIP facilities in place which recharged 18,000 acre-feet of storm water and 12,000 acre-feet of imported water for a total of 30,000 acre-feet. This year Watermaster set a goal of approximately 50,000 acre-feet consisting of 20,000 acre-feet of storm water, 28,000 acre-feet of imported water, and 3,000 acre-feet of recycled water; this is an ambitious goal. As for the six month report approximately 1,000 acre-feet of recycled water, 3,000 acre-feet of storm water, and 16,000 acre-feet of imported water for a total of 20,000 acre-feet recharged within the first six months of this year. We are looking to capture over the remaining six months about 30,000 acre-feet which, a good portion of that amount will be imported water unless the storms pick up. Mr. Manning stated during the next several months staff will keep the parties apprised of all water activities. A question regarding banking of water was presented. Mr. Treweek noted that historically we are able to achieve 6,000 acre-feet, and then we went through the Facilities Improvement Project thinking we could get an additional 12,000 acre-feet; we did accomplish that the first year because of all the rain. The goal is to continue to achieve at least 18,000 acre-feet of storm water and then the 12,000 acre-feet of new. Mr. Manning stated that at the end of the five year period there will be a look back on the accomplishments of being able to meet that 18,000 acre-feet. The 12,000 acre-feet that was noted by Mr. Treweek is considered new water and is considered into the calculations – at the end of that five year period if we do not meet that requirement then the number will be adjusted from 12,000 in order to make up for the lower numbers which will then make this a rolling five year average that represents the actual rather than the anticipated. A discussion ensued with regard to the future costs of imported water and basin recharge limitations.

V. INFORMATION

1. Newspaper Articles

No comment was made regarding this item.

2. NWRA Election Results

No comment was made regarding this item.

3. AGWA Hydrologic, Environmental and Legislative Challenges to Southern California's Present and Future Managed Aquifer Recharge Programs Monday, February 6, 2006

No comment was made regarding this item.

VI. POOL MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Feenstra pointed out an article on the cover of the Orange County Register regarding Orange County having more water than they know what to do with. It was noted in this article that all their basins are full and the water is actually seeping out of the ground. Mr. Feenstra inquired as to what that means sort term-long term to us. Mr. Manning stated he will pull that article up once he returns to the office and provide comment at a later time.

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

No comment was made regarding this item.

**VIII. FUTURE MEETINGS**

|                  |            |   |
|------------------|------------|---|
| January 12, 2006 | 9:00 a.m.  | Annual Appropriative Pool Meeting       |
| January 12, 2006 | 11:00 a.m. | Annual Non-Agricultural Pool Meeting    |
| January 12, 2006 | 1:00 p.m.  | MZ1 Technical Committee Meeting         |
| January 16, 2006 | 1:00 p.m.  | Water Quality Committee Meeting         |
| January 17, 2006 | 9:00 a.m.  | Annual Agricultural Pool Meeting @ IEUA |
| January 26, 2006 | 9:00 a.m.  | Annual Advisory Committee Meeting       |
| January 26, 2006 | 11:00 a.m. | Annual Watermaster Board Meeting        |

The Annual Agricultural Pool Meeting Adjourned at 10:28 a.m.

Secretary: \_\_\_\_\_

Minutes Approved: February 21, 2006