

MEETING MINUTES



REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS SEPTEMBER 2, 2026, 5:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

President Doolittle called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM & ATTENDANCE

Board Members Present: President Doolittle, Director Floen, Director Fick, Director Jarlsberg

Staff Present: General Manager Pro Tem Roman, Director of Administration Shook, Accounting Supervisor Rich, Executive Assistant Thompson, HR & Risk Generalist Sheehan, Ray Kolisz

Consultant(s) Present: Legal Counsel, Jeff Hoskinson, Public Outreach Consultant, Kathleen Radich, West Coast Civil Consultant, Kyle McCarty

Citizens Advisory Council Member(s) Present: David Carrillo

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Director Floen moved to approve the agenda and seconded by Director Jarlsberg and approved by the following vote:

1st / 2nd Floen/Jarlsberg
Ayes: Doolittle, Floen, Fick, Jarlsberg
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

4. PUBLIC COMMENT –

See attached addendum for a summary of the public comments during the meeting. To view the recording of the meeting, please click [here](#).

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. DRAFT MINUTES – 08.19.26

Director Floen made a motion to approve the Draft 08.19.26 Minutes, seconded by Director Jarlsberg and approved by the following vote:

1st / 2nd Floen/Jarlsberg
Ayes: Doolittle, Floen, Jarlsberg, Fick
Noes: None
Abstain: None

Absent: None

6. ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR FOR DISCUSSION

B. JULY 2026 MONTHLY CHECK REGISTER

Director Jarlsberg requested that the July 2026 Monthly Check Register be pulled from the Consent Calendar. Director Jarlsberg had several questions about items on the check register and requested that, going forward, the Monthly Check Register be placed under the Discussion/Action Items rather than the Consent Calendar.

Director Jarlsberg made a motion to approve the July 2026 Monthly Check Register, seconded by Director Floen and approved by the following vote:

1 st / 2 nd	Jarlsberg/Floen
Ayes:	Doolittle, Floen, Jarlsberg, Fick
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

7. DISCUSSION/ACTION CALENDAR

A. LOVEMORE RANCH DEVELOPMENT – JBWD WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICE REVIEW PLAN CHECK STATUS

PRESENTED BY: GENERAL MANAGER PRO TEM, ANNE ROMAN

RECOMMENDED ACTION: RECEIVE THIS INFORMATIONAL UPDATE REGARDING THE DISTRICT'S ONGOING REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED LOVEMORE RANCH WATER AND WASTEWATER PLAN CHECK STATUS

General Manager Pro Tem Roman reported that the District's plan check of the Lovemore Ranch development remains ongoing. The revised Water Study is under review by West Coast Civil. Staff has provided comments on the initial Sewer Study, and a revised study has not yet been submitted.

Roman reported that neither study has completed the District's review process or been presented to the Board for consideration. Staff will continue working with the Developer and consultants on the outstanding items.

B. LOVEMORE RANCH DEVELOPMENT – CONSIDERATION OF COMMENT LETTER TO COUNTY

PRESENTED BY: GENERAL MANAGER PRO TEM, ANNE ROMAN

RECOMMENDED ACTION: CONSIDER A DRAFT COMMENT LETTER REGARDING THE RECIRCULATED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE LOVEMORE RANCH DEVELOPMENT AND PROVIDE STAFF DIRECTION REGARDING ITS APPROVAL AND SUBMISSION TO THE COUNTY

General Manager Pro Tem Anne Roman presented the Lovemore Ranch Development – Consideration of Comment Letter to County. The Board reviewed the proposed comment letter regarding the recirculated Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, which addressed the capacity of Lot A to accommodate the detention basin and wastewater treatment facility, stormwater and wastewater effluent interaction, and potential impacts to groundwater recharge.

The Board directed revisions to clarify that the development remains a proposed project, note that Form 200 has not been filed with the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and state that the County's review is premature while the District's water and wastewater studies remain ongoing.

Director Floen made a motion to approve the comment letter, subject to the requested revisions, and authorized General Manager Pro Tem Roman to execute and submit the letter to the County. and seconded by Director Jarlsberg and approved by the following vote:

1st/ 2nd	Floen /Jarlsberg
Ayes:	Doolittle, Floen, Jarlsberg, Fick
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

C. AMENDMENT TO ARDURRA GROUP, INC. AGREEMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES ON E2-1 RESERVOIR REHABILITATION PROJECT

PRESENTED BY: GENERAL MANAGER PRO TEM, ANNE ROMAN & RAY KOLISZ

RECOMMENDED ACTION: 1) AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES UNDER THE EXISTING AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES WITH ARDURRA GROUP, INC. FOR THE E2-1 RESERVOIR REHABILITATION PROJECT, USING ARDURRA'S ATTACHED PROPOSAL IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF \$39,624, INCREASING THE TOTAL AUTHORIZED AMOUNT FROM \$91,689 TO \$131,313;

2) AUTHORIZE THE GENERAL MANAGER TO EXECUTE ANY CONFORMING AMENDMENT OR RELATED DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO INCORPORATE THE ADDITIONAL SCOPE.

General Manager Pro Tem/Director of Finance Anne Roman and Ray Kolisz presented the Amendment to Ardurra Group, LLC Agreement for Construction Management Services for the E2-1 Reservoir Rehabilitation Project. Kolisz reported that the reservoir's interior coating had reached the end of its service life and that construction management services were not included in Ardurra's original agreement. Staff recommended authorizing additional construction management services with Ardurra in a not-to-exceed amount of \$39,624 to provide continued project support during construction.

Director Floen made a motion to authorize additional construction management services under the existing agreement for consulting services with Ardurra Group, LLC for the E2-1 Reservoir Rehabilitation Project using Ardurra's proposal in the not-to-exceed amount of \$39,624, increasing the total authorized amount from \$ 91,689 to \$131,313, and authorize the General Manager to execute any conforming amendment or related documents necessary to incorporate the additional scope, and seconded by Director Jarlsberg, approved by the following vote:

1st/ 2nd	Floen/Jarlsberg
Ayes:	Doolittle, Floen, Jarlsberg, Fick
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

D. TRAILER MOUNTED ARROW BOARD

PRESENTED BY: RAY KOLISZ

RECOMMENDED ACTION: AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE OF A NEW WANCO 55/W SOLAR 25 LED TRAILER MOUNTED ARROW BOARD

Ray Kolisz presented the Trailer Mounted Arrow Board and explained that the District currently does not own one for use during roadway maintenance, construction, and emergency operations. Kolisz noted that the equipment would improve worker and motorist safety by providing advance warning of lane closures and work zones and would be suitable for a variety of District field operations.

Director Jarlberg made a motion to authorize the purchase of a new Wanco 55/W Solar 25 LED Trailer Mounted Arrow Board, seconded by Director Floen and approved by the following vote:

1st/ 2nd	Jarlsberg/Floen
Ayes:	Doolittle, Floen, Jarlsberg, Fick
Noes:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

8. DIRECTOR REPORTS/COMMENTS

President Doolittle

- Doolittle reviewed the District's agenda request process under Article 7 of the Administration Code and noted that Directors and members of the public may request items for consideration on a future agenda.
- Doolittle asked for clarification regarding a public request to place Lovemore Ranch on a future agenda for a 30-day status report and whether the request could be made during a public meeting or needed to follow a different process.

Director Floen

- Floen reported that he was busy with the Farmers' Market last Saturday.
- Floen reported that he will attend the CMM Breakfast this Saturday before heading to the Farmers' Market at 11:00 a.m.

Director Jarlsberg

- Jarlsberg reported attending the CSDA Annual Conference August 24th through 26th in Palm Desert and noted that the conference was well organized and informative. Jarlsberg mentioned that the conference provides an opportunity to learn about and connect with representatives from a variety of special districts, not just water districts
- Jarlsberg requested that a future agenda item be scheduled to reconsider Agenda Items 7A and 7B from the August 5th board meeting regarding the proposed reorganization/removal of the Board President and censure of Board President Stacy Doolittle. Jarlsberg requested that supporting information and attachments be published with the agenda to provide greater transparency and allow for public discussion of the matter.

Director Fick

- Fick provided an update on regional water supplies and noted that Mojave Water Agency is evaluating options for an anticipated surplus of State Water Project water, including storage or sale at approximately \$400 per acre-foot.
- Fick also discussed community concerns regarding the County's septic-to-sewer efforts and their potential connection to the Lovemore Ranch development. Fick expressed concerns regarding the lack of information and transparency surrounding the County's plans and requested that additional information be provided before the District takes a position.

9. MANAGER'S REPORT

General Manager Pro Tem Roman prepared and distributed a written manager's report which is included as an attachment to the minutes. In addition to the written report, the Director of Administration, David Shook, reported the following:

- Shook reported that the exterior lighting at the District office was updated to comply with County ordinance requirements.
- Shook acknowledged General Manager Pro Tem Anne Roman for her efforts and leadership in taking on additional responsibilities, including the District's audit, and thanked the staff for their continued support.

10. AGENDA ITEMS REQUESTED BY THE BOARD

- Doolittle – Enable Zoom transcription and related transcription features on YouTube, where available for meeting recordings.
- Floen – None
- Jarlsberg – Agenda Items 7A and 7B from the August 5th board meeting regarding the proposed reorganization/removal of the Board President and censure of President Doolittle.
- Fick – None

11. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Director Floen seconded by Director Jarlsberg, and approved by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



ANNE ROMAN (Sep 18, 2026 13:54:18 PDT)

Anne Roman, General Manager Pro Tem & Board Secretary

TO VIEW THE MEETING RECORDING ON YOUTUBE, CLICK HERE:



PURPOSE:

The Managers Report provides the Board of Directors with a summary of **noteworthy** activities, meetings attended, and updates from the General Manager, Operations, Administration, Finance and other District functions. The report is not intended to be all-inclusive and does not replace separate staff reports or agenda items for matters requiring Board discussion or action. The Managers Report will be provided at least monthly and may be presented more frequently as needed.

GENERAL MANAGER

JEFF'S REPORT ON CHROM 6 APPEAL

The record in the Chromium-6 Appeal has been certified, which now puts the Coalition on a 40-day clock for its Opening Brief. We do not know if an extension will be necessary (and they are easy to receive in 30 and 60 day intervals in appeals), but for now, that provides an idea now of the pace of the case. Absent extensions, it would be 40 days for the Opening Brief, 30 days for the Respondent's Brief, and 20 days for the Coalition's reply brief, after which oral argument will be set if requested. The opinion would come only after oral argument, typically within 90 days.

OPERATIONS

E2-1 TANK

The E2-1 tank rehabilitation project is well underway. Ray is back to help with managing the project now, which is very much appreciated! There will likely be a minor change order to the Paso Robles contract forthcoming as lead in the exterior paint has been affirmed and is being mitigated accordingly by the contractor.

K1 TANK REPLACEMENT UGRADE

District staff is currently working with West Coast Civil (WCC) to develop a conceptual design for the replacement of the existing K1 Booster Station. The existing facility consists of three pumps and a pneumatic pressure tank that work together to provide adequate pressure to the K Pressure Zone. The pneumatic tank relies on compressed air to maintain pressure within the system and push water uphill to the pressure zone.

The proposed replacement booster station would eliminate the existing pneumatic tank configuration and utilize pumps equipped with variable frequency drives (VFDs) to provide the required pressure and flow to the K Pressure Zone. This approach would reduce the District's exposure to the risks associated with the existing pneumatic tank while providing improved operational control and efficiency.

BELMONT PIPELINE PROJECT

West Coast Civil is finalizing the design of the Belmont pipeline replacement project for review. Once the final design is approved, the project will go out for a competitive bidding process. The project consists of replacing sub-standard existing pipelines with approximately 14,000 linear feet of new upgraded pipelines that will improve the water supply and fire protection with increased flows. The area included is north of Golden Street, east of Sunburst Ave, and south of Aberdeen Drive.

D3-1 RESERVOIR ANALYSIS

The District has contracted Ardurra Engineering to perform an evaluation of the D3-1 Reservoir to determine whether rehabilitating and recoating the existing tank is more cost-effective than constructing a new 110,000-gallon reservoir at the current site. The D3-1 Reservoir is similar in design and

condition to the E2-1 Reservoir, which is currently undergoing rehabilitation, and has experienced extensive corrosion.

**C2-B RESERVOIR
RECOATING SPECS
AND STANDARDS**

Ardurra Engineering is currently finalizing the technical specifications and standards for the interior recoating of the C2-B Reservoir. District staff will review the final draft documents. The estimated engineer's estimate for this project is \$4M. Once the specifications and standards are finalized, the project will be shelved until the District makes the determination to fund in the upcoming fiscal year(s).

**G BOOSTER STATION
ELECTRICAL PANEL
UPGRADE**

District staff is working with West Coast Civil (WCC) on a preliminary design to upgrade and replace the existing motor control center for the G Booster Station. The existing electrical panels are in need of replacement due to age and inoperable components. The G Booster comprises two pumps, one (1), 25 horsepower pump and one (1), 20 horsepower pump that boost water into the G tank and pressure zone. This pump station is considered a critical infrastructure of the distribution system as the pumps are the only source of water for the G tank and pressure zone.

ADMIN

Staff continue work on the Emergency Response Plan (ERP) and expect no issues with the self-certification deadline of 12/31/26.

District staff continue to gather information on Automated Metering Infrastructure (AMI) and plan to bring a thorough report to the Board in November.

Staff are working with the Emergency Response Network of the Inland Empire (ERNIE) on a mutual aid agreement. Once the agreement is finalized, staff will bring a report and recommendation to the Board for acceptance into the network with the signed agreement. As a result of work on the Risk & Resilience Assessment (RRA), the ERP, and ERNIE, staff understand a need to create Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with various vendors to implement purposeful procurement practices in the event of a disaster or emergency.

Staff are actively working on a report to bring to the Board in October regarding SB 394 – Water Theft and will recommend that the Board adopt an Ordinance to mitigate water theft specifically through fire hydrants.

Staff are coordinating efforts with Mojave Water Agency (MWA) to take part in their district tours on September 16th. JBWD has a 45 window to share our story, projects, and goals.

FINANCE

Finance Staff have been busy finalizing year end and audit entries. The annual Financial Audit field visit will begin on September 8th. The Auditors will be onsite to examine transaction records, review our supporting schedules, and validate our trial balance (final figures at year end). After that, we will begin working with the auditors on the audited financial statements themselves, which should be presented to the Board in November.

Public Comment Summary – Addendum to the Minutes

September 2, 2026 Board Meeting

The following is a summary of public comments received during the September 2, 2026 Board of Directors meeting.

Disclaimer: The public comments were summarized from the meeting transcript using Granola AI and ChatGPT. The summary is intended to provide a concise overview of the comments received and is not a verbatim transcript. In the event of any discrepancy, the official meeting recording and transcript should be relied upon as the source of the speakers' actual statements.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – IN PERSON

Keith Hamm of Joshua Tree Village Neighbors expressed concerns regarding the proposed Lovemore Ranch development, including the environmental review, water supply, and proposed wastewater treatment facility. He requested that the District ask the County for additional time to review the Sewer Study and make the study available to the public for review.

Karl Weimer questioned the Board's recent actions regarding Director Doolittle and former Director Short and expressed concern that those actions may have been related to the Lovemore Ranch development and proposed sewer project.

Thomas Fjallstam requested that meeting videos be expedited and posted within 48 hours.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – VIA ZOOM

Peter Spurr, a Joshua Tree resident, expressed concerns regarding the proposed wastewater treatment facility, including potential impacts to neighboring properties, odors, groundwater, and potential financial obligations to District ratepayers if the District were required to maintain the facility. He also expressed concerns regarding the lack of available information and transparency surrounding the proposed wastewater system.

Agenda Item 7A: Lovemore Ranch Development – JBWD Water & Wastewater Service Review Plan Check Status

PUBLIC COMMENTS – IN PERSON

Keith Hamm expressed concerns regarding the County's environmental review timeline and the proposed development. He requested that the District communicate to the County that additional review is needed before the project proceeds, citing outstanding water, wastewater, and stormwater concerns.

Laird Davis expressed opposition to the Lovemore Ranch development and criticized the County's handling of the project and the Board's prior actions regarding the development.

Atlas, representing Joshua Tree Village Neighbors, requested that the District make all sewer-related documents and studies available to the public. Atlas also requested that the Lovemore Ranch project be placed on a future Board agenda for further review and discussion.

John Osman shared his experience with a package wastewater treatment system at a local business and expressed concerns regarding odors and the proximity of the proposed treatment facility to neighboring properties.

Sarah Taylor, a Joshua Tree Village business and property owner, expressed concerns regarding transparency and the proposed wastewater treatment and stormwater facilities, particularly potential impacts during flooding.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – VIA ZOOM

Bonnie Hawthorne questioned whether the proposed wastewater treatment facility could ultimately lead to the development of a larger sewer system for the community.

Agenda Item 7B: Lovemore Ranch Development – Consideration of Comment Letter to County

PUBLIC COMMENTS – VIA ZOOM

Erin Gatlin, participating via Zoom, commented on the Lovemore Ranch Council's letter and its assertions in comparison with the recirculated environmental review documents. She indicated that she had concerns with the letter but did not wish to read her full comments due to the late hour.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – IN PERSON

Keith Hamm expressed support for the proposed comment letter and recommended explicitly stating that the County's public comment deadline and recirculated Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration are premature given the District's ongoing review and studies related to the project.

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

Let me begin with this.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was created for precisely this reason: to identify environmental harms – in this instance to our groundwater -- before it occurs, to require government to make decisions based on evidence rather than assurances, and to give the people of Joshua Tree who will live with those consequences a meaningful voice before those decisions are made.

My primary concern is straightforward: **the County is asking this District and the public to accept environmental conclusions before the technical work necessary to support those conclusions appears to be complete and disclosed. We cannot base our decisions upon assurances!**

The September 1 letter from the the proposed Lovemore Ranch project attorney, which we just received today on the 3rd does not resolve that concern. **In important respects, it reinforces it.**

1. The [Applicant's Letter](#) Highlights the Sequencing Problem

The applicant's letter states that preliminary Water Board approval is part of the County approval and entitlement process. Yet it then states that the RWQCB design and approval process will occur **after the entitlements are approved**, describing that sequencing as "industry standard."

Those statements raise an obvious question:

What Water Board review and approval has actually occurred, what remains to occur after entitlement, and where is the documentation of the preliminary approval the applicant says is required? Where is the transparency?

Final construction engineering can certainly occur later. But that is not the issue.

The issue is whether **environmental analysis necessary to determine the significance of wastewater, stormwater, drainage, and groundwater impacts is also being deferred until later.**

That distinction matters enormously under CEQA.

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

This letter itself acknowledges that additional hydrology, water-quality, or recharge analysis could be required later by the RWQCB or County Environmental Health during subsequent design approval.

That raises the central question:

How can the County conclude today that these environmental impacts have been adequately evaluated if analysis potentially necessary to answer those questions may not occur until after entitlement?

Calling that sequence “industry standard” does not answer the CEQA question. **How is industry standard measured??**

Industry practice is not automatically CEQA compliance. If it were, why would we even need CEQA?

Where Is the Evidence?

The applicant’s letter also makes several specific technical assertions that deserve documentation.

For example, it states that water from a full detention basin would be discharged over approximately **three hours**, that infiltration during that period would be “minimal,” and that groundwater would therefore not be affected.

Where does the three-hour figure come from?

What calculation or technical analysis establishes that infiltration will be minimal?

Where is that information in the environmental record available to this Board and the public? Has JBWD seen this information and not shared it with the Board or the public?

If technical work exists supporting these assertions, **provide it.**

If it does not exist, then these are conclusions rather than evidence.

That is precisely the transparency problem I am concerned about.

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

Lot A Cannot Be Analyzed as Separate Pieces

Lot A would contain 1) the detention infrastructure, 2) the wastewater treatment facility, 3) the wastewater disposal infrastructure and 4) emergency and maintenance access.

The relevant question is not simply whether groundwater is more than 500 feet below the surface or whether these facilities physically fit on the parcel.

The question is whether **the entire system safely and reliably functions together.**

Where is the integrated analysis examining the interaction among:

- the detention basin;
- stormwater flows;
- the wastewater treatment facility;
- wastewater effluent and seepage pits;
- soils and infiltration;
- groundwater;
- emergency and maintenance access; and
- reasonably foreseeable exceedance or failure conditions?

Lovemore's counsel argues there is no scientific basis for concern about the proximity of these facilities. Is this just his opinion?

Where is the scientific analysis establishing that conclusion?

The depth of groundwater, standing alone, does not answer every question about what happens within the unsaturated soils above groundwater or how concentrated stormwater and wastewater disposal systems may interact.

What Happens When the Model Is Wrong?

The detention basin is necessarily designed using modeled storm events, runoff assumptions, infiltration assumptions, and engineering calculations.

Those are not certainties.

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

The appropriate question is therefore not simply whether the basin works under the assumptions used to design it.

What happens when actual conditions exceed those assumptions? That’s really the problem, isn’t? There is no risk analysis here.

What safety factor has been incorporated into the basin?

What happens if runoff volume or peak flow exceeds the modeled amount?

Has interaction with the wastewater treatment and disposal facilities under an exceedance condition been evaluated?

And what are the potential consequences not merely for groundwater, but for wastewater infrastructure, surface flows, and downstream properties? What about your neighbors Lovemore??

Again, where is that analysis?

Future Permitting Is Not a Substitute for CEQA Review Today

We have heard before and seen in this letter today that the owner of Lovemore emphasizes that the proposed wastewater treatment system provides substantially greater treatment than conventional septic systems commonly used in Joshua Tree.

That may be true, but **it does not answer the question before this District.**

We are not being asked whether this system is better than somebody else’s septic tank.

We are being asked to evaluate whether **this particular development, with this particular wastewater system, detention system, drainage configuration, and disposal system, has been adequately analyzed and will adequately protect the groundwater resource JBWD manages.**

Likewise, assurances that the RWQCB and Environmental Health will review additional details later do not resolve today’s CEQA question. **The Judge told the County and the developer to go back and correct an environmental review that was inadequate in part because the required consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board had**

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

not occurred. They cannot “cure” that failure by once again postponing critical review and analysis until after project entitlements are approved.

Future regulatory review should not be used to fill gaps in environmental analysis necessary to determine impacts today.

We Have Already Been Through This Once, People!

This concern is particularly serious because the County's previous environmental review of this project resulted in litigation and a court order setting aside the prior CEQA approval.

The lesson should have been straightforward:

Complete the necessary analysis.

Consult the appropriate agencies.

Disclose the information.

Allow meaningful public review.

Then reach the environmental conclusions.

Instead, we are again being told that some matters can be addressed later.

That is precisely why this District should be asking more questions, not fewer. I'd be curious to know what JBWD has asked in the background that hasn't been visible to the Board. What does West Coast Civil know that the Board doesn't?

The Question Before JBWD

I am not asking the applicant to complete every construction drawing before CEQA approval.

I am asking something much more fundamental:

Has enough technical work actually been completed, disclosed, and subjected to agency and public review for the County—and for this District—to make an informed determination about the environmental consequences of placing this detention

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

system, wastewater treatment facility, and wastewater disposal system together on Lot A?

If the answer depends upon technical analysis that has not yet been performed, regulatory consultation that has not yet occurred, or information that exists but has not been disclosed, **then we do not have a complete environmental record before us. This needs to be made clear in the letter.**

CEQA exists so environmental consequences are understood **before** decisions are made—not so the public is told afterward that unresolved matters were handled during final engineering. This letter basically says “trust us!”

JBWD should therefore identify the information that remains missing or unclear and expressly reserve its ability to comment when that information becomes available.

The County is not JBWD’s “superior government agency.” JBWD is an independent special district with its own statutory responsibilities and its own obligation to protect the groundwater resource entrusted to it.

We do not answer to the developer, and we do not simply defer to the County’s conclusions. We answer to the people and ratepayers of this District, and we have an independent responsibility to determine whether the evidence before us is sufficient to protect their groundwater.

I again remind my fellow Board members that JBWD is an independent public agency. Whatever pressure or representations we may hear from outside this District, the responsibility for the decisions we make here belongs to us. We cannot delegate that responsibility to the County, the developer, or anyone else.

This District should not lend its name or credibility to a conclusion that Joshua Tree’s groundwater has been adequately protected unless this Board has actually been given the technical evidence necessary to reach that conclusion independently.

Our responsibility is not to accept assurances that these issues will be handled later.

Our responsibility is to protect the groundwater resource entrusted to this District and to insist upon the evidence necessary to know that it is protected.

President Stacy Doolittle, Director Comments

Agenda Item 7.B

Proposed Lovemore Ranch Development – Status Update and Proposed Comment Letter| September 2, 2026

Stacy Doolittle

Board President

Joshua Basin Water District

2. JBWD MINUTES MEETING - AMENDED BY BOARD 09.02.26

Final Audit Report

2026-09-18

Created:	2026-09-17
By:	LISA THOMPSON (lthompson@jbwd.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA1OyYf8vcKMuxn6ZGZGFIHRmNKKSU707W

"2. JBWD MINUTES MEETING - AMENDED BY BOARD 09.02.26" History

-  Document created by LISA THOMPSON (lthompson@jbwd.com)
2026-09-17 - 9:01:17 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to ANNE ROMAN (aroman@jbwd.com) for signature
2026-09-17 - 9:01:57 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by ANNE ROMAN (aroman@jbwd.com)
2026-09-17 - 10:48:43 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by ANNE ROMAN (aroman@jbwd.com)
Signature Date: 2026-09-18 - 8:54:18 PM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: DRAW
-  Agreement completed.
2026-09-18 - 8:54:18 PM GMT