

Final Meeting Notes

Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group

Regular Meeting

Wednesday, August 31, 2011
9:30am-12:30pm
Mammoth Community Water District
Mammoth Lakes, CA

Call-in option:
1-866-862-2138
passcode: 1678718

Meeting Summary Information

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approval of increasing Program Office Implementation Administration Budget from 2% to up to 3% as recommended by the Admin. Committee.
 - Bob Harrington moves to approve the increase of Program Office Implementation Administration Budget from 2% to up to 3% as recommended by the Admin. Committee. Harvey seconds the motion. All approved.
2. Approval of Needs Assessment Outline and Summary Information Agreement
3. Approval of CRWA Needs Assessment recipient list
 - Bob moves to approve the CRWA Outline and Summary and Information Agreement and the Needs Assessments Recipient List. Darla seconds the motion. All approved.
4. Approval of 10% allocation of Implementation funds to set aside for Fiscal Agent (as discussed at the July 27th RWMG meeting)
 - Approval of 10% allocation of Implementation funds will be set aside for fiscal agent. Fiscal agent will establish MOU with I-M RWMG containing language that up to 10% of Implementation funds will be used to administer the Grant.
 - Rick moves to approve the motion as amended. Dan Moore seconds. All approve.
5. Approve June 15, 2011, RWMG meeting notes.
6. Approve July 27, 2011, RWMG meeting notes
 - Darla moves to approve the meeting notes from June 15 and July 27 RWMG meetings. Rick seconds. All approved.

ACTION ITEMS:

- The revised version #1 of the MOU becomes effective September 1, 2011.
- Program Office will post Cindy's presentation on the Inyo Mono website, www.inyomonowater.org, along with her contact information to accommodate additional questions about Salt and Nutrient Management Plans from the Group.
- Program Office will provide formal report on Planning Grant schedule, tasks and budget at the September 28 meeting.
- Mark will provide more information regarding future Planning Grant funding rounds, and associated ideas, at the Sept. 28 meeting.
- Match forms will be required for the reporting period of May 1 – August 31; Program Office will send out the revised form and provide a deadline for returning forms.
- Janet will add Implementation category to Match Form and announce to the Group when the revised version becomes available.
- Tony would like to see organizational structure/formation of 501(c)(3) agendized at a future meeting to address additional detailed questions and concerns.
- The Program Office requests specific questions regarding organizational structure/formation of 501(c)(3) to be sent to Holly by **Monday, September 12**, to be forwarded to Matt Griffis (Sierra Nevada Alliance).
- The Program Office will send out the link to the DAC Workshop presentations.
- Mark will present the California Water Plan modeling proposal to the Group at the September 28 meeting.

FINAL AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Public Comment period

3. Discussion of Salt and Nutrient Management Plans

- a. Cindy Rofer-Wise, Lahontan Region

4. Implementation Grant Update

- a. Final Implementation Funding Recommendations from DWR
- b. Update from Program Office on final budget adjustments from Project Proponents
 - i. Revised budget spreadsheet and project realization discussion
- c. Report from Program Office on Fiscal Agent communications
- d. Updated Status Report: Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra RC&D
- e. Specifics of Implementation grant funding

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approval of increasing Program Office Implementation Administration Budget from 2% to up to 3% as recommended by the Admin. Committee.
2. Approval of 10% allocation of Implementation funds to set aside for Fiscal Agent (as discussed at the July 27th RWMG meeting)

5. Planning Grant

- a. Program Office Review of Planning Grant Schedule
- b. California Rural Water Associated Needs Assessments

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approval of Needs Assessment Outline and Summary Information Agreement
2. Approval of CRWA Needs Assessment recipient list

- c. Re-visitation of Strategic Goal Areas, Objectives and Resource Management Strategies for Phase II planning.
 - i. Analysis: Evaluation of relationship between current projects and Phase 1 objectives.
 - ii. Next steps, including plan for outreach meetings
- d. **Planning Grant Updates**
 - i. Planning documents analysis
 - ii. Website
 - iii. Match forms
 - iv. Organizational structure

6. General Updates

- a. DAC funding meeting in Rancho Cucamonga
- b. DAC Grant
- c. Water Plan

7. Announcements

8. Process Check

9. Review June 15 and July 27 RWMG meeting notes

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approve June 15, 2011, RWMG meeting notes.
2. Approve July 27, 2011, RWMG meeting notes

10. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting

11. **Next meeting dates: September 28, 2011**, Fort Independence Tribal Offices, Independence, CA
- November 16 (Mammoth)
 - December 14 (Bishop)

Meeting Notes

- Irene calls meeting to order 9:34 am. She congratulates the Group on receiving the DWR Implementation award and reminds everyone that as of tomorrow, **September 1, 2011, the new MOU will go into effect.**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person

- Nate Reade, Inyo-Mono Agricultural Commission
- Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- Rich Ciauri, June Lake Public Utilities District
- Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
- Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest Community Services District
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D, Mono County RCD
- Mark Drew, California Trout
- Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District
- Mel Joseph, Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone Reservation
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Dan Moore, Round Valley School
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy
- Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra RC&D
- Dustin Hardwick, California Rural Water Association
- Greg Norby, Mammoth Community Water District
- Dan Tothoroh, Round Valley School
- Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony
- Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest

Attending Via Phone

- Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
- Holly Gallagher, Birchim Community Services District
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Cindy Wise, Lahontan RWQCB
- Jennifer Wong, DWR

2. Public Comment period

- Mark commends the Group on the development of the Inyo-Mono program. He explains that with combined Planning, DAC, and Implementation Grants awarded the program brings approximately \$2 million to the region. He continues that we should be proud that we have established an effective regional forum who has also established a clear presence at the State level.

3. Discussion of Salt and Nutrient Management Plans: Cindy Wise, Lahontan Region

- **Program Office will post Cindy's presentation on the Inyo Mono website, www.inyomonowater.org, along with her contact information to accommodate additional questions about Salt and Nutrient Management Plans from the Group.**

- To summarize, the Lahontan Region is looking to coordinate with IRWM Programs on Salt and Nutrient Management Plan efforts. Cindy gives brief history of recycled water policy and future State goals as well as scheduling for Salt and Nutrient Management Plan completion, plan required elements, current regional strategies being developed, and the “pre-adoption” understanding in place with regional board. See presentation at www.inyomonowater.org for specific details.
- Questions that ensued after the presentation:
- Greg Norby asks Cindy to explain emphasis on recycled water portion of the Program. Cindy explains that when certain permits are up for renewal (agricultural leases for example) a management plan should be in place to address Salt and Nutrient related issues relevant to each permit.
- Greg N. asks if the Salt and Nutrient Management Program will dovetail with DWR’s groundwater monitoring program (CASGEM). Cindy replies that you would want to consider CASGEM for the monitoring portion of the Plan, but that the two programs do not directly relate.
- Bob Harrington asks who is responsible for groundwater monitoring on federal land by default in the past the mandate falls to the counties. Cindy notes Bob’s concern and will look into how that requirement will be approached.
- Tony Dublino asks if the adoption of a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan occurs in an area where there is no recycled water program in place, would it curtail agricultural practices. Cindy expects that is not the intention of the program.
- **October 12 Antelope Valley IRWM Meeting to discuss Salt and Nutrient Management Plans, details will follow on the website when made available.**

4. Implementation Grant Update

- a. Final Implementation Funding Recommendations from DWR
 - Mark explains that it looks as if seven projects will be funded as a result of reduced asks from some Project Proponents and that the commitment letter from DWR to fiscal agent should arrive sometime next week. He directs Project Proponents to be ready with revised, budgets and work plans once the letter is in place. Schedules will also need to be revised but until we are closer to actually having a formal agreement completed, project proponents should stand by and be ready to revise their schedules. After that it will likely take several months to construct the official Grant Agreement between DWR & Central Sierra RC&D.
 - Mark explains the various points of contact with DWR for the different Grants; Jen Wong, Planning Grant. Parker Thaler, Implementation. TBD, DAC Grant.
 - Expenses can be incurred as of August 16 with the caveat being that reimbursements will not be available until the grant agreement is officially signed.
- b. Update from Program Office on final budget adjustments from Project Proponents
 - Mark recaps the current budget considering the award and the 10% allocation of Fiscal Agent funds set aside. MCWD reduced ask by 50% (\$200,000 to \$100,000), and the Coleville School Project reduced ask from \$620,000 to \$250,000. Mark explains that with this revised budget, the RWMG is still \$9,000 short of fully funding all seven projects and is looking to volunteer project proponents, such as Inyo County Department of Public Works, to make up the difference.
 - Mark informs Group that additionally the AC is recommending to increase PO staff budget from 2% to up to 3%. Mark communicates the amount of work up to now that has gone into coordination on the Implementation grant and emphasizes that the work is just beginning. He feels that it is likely that 3% is a modest estimate and will likely not cover Program Staff time over the life of the Grant.
 - Irene Yamashita asks if the Program Office has enough information to feel comfortable with a 3% share. Mark replies that, to the extent we can guess at this time, we will need to go with the 3% .
 - There is a conversation about defining roles of the Program Office and Central Sierra RC&D and the duties assigned to each.
 - Holly Alpert re-reads the Program Office role and functions from the Implementation Grant Application and explains that even responding to the initial funding recommendation took an immense amount of time on behalf of the Program Staff to coordinate.

- Greg Norby asks if DWR has historic guidance on how grant administrative duties have been proportioned in similar Groups state wide.
 - Marks adds that Prop 50.Proposals and/or lessons learned may also prove useful.
 - Cindy Wise recommends asking Tahoe RCD for their example.
 - Mark replies that the Tahoe Prop. 50 Grant Agreement has already been provided to Central Sierra RCD as an example to work from.
- i. Revised budget spreadsheet and project realization discussion
- Holly A. projects revised budget to the Group and Mark explains that we will be able to fund top seven projects on the lists due to reduced asks from several other Project Proponents.

Agenda Items 4.c. and 4.d. were moved to the bottom of the agenda to accommodate Central Sierra RC&D representative's schedule.

- e. Specifics of Implementation grant funding
- Project specifics will be discussed at the Project Proponents meeting, immediately following the RWMG meeting today at the Mammoth Community Water District.
 - As soon as Project Proponents can provide revised budgets, schedules and work plans, the sooner DWR can proceed.

DECISION ITEM (the second decision item was moved to the bottom of the agenda along with Implementation Grant sub headings 4.c & 4.d.)

1. **Approval of increasing Program Office Implementation Administration Budget from 2% to up to 3% as recommended by the Admin. Committee.**
- **Bob Harrington moves to approve the increase of Program Office Implementation Administration Budget from 2% to up to 3% as recommended by the Admin. Committee. Harvey seconds the motion. All approved.**

5. Planning Grant

- a. Program Office Review of Planning Grant Schedule
- Mark gives overview of where the Planning Grant process currently stands. The Program Office has received the draft Grant Agreement from DWR. The agreement is now in review with the finance director of CalTrout. Assuming there are not any discrepancies, the next step is for both parties to sign and then the Program Office will generate reports to DWR for reimbursement.
 - **Program Office will provide formal report on Planning Grant schedule, tasks and budget at September 28 meeting.**
 - Mark reviews the next steps for the Program Office under the Planning Grant which includes not only DWR reporting but outreach, needs assessments and CEQA workshops. He reminds the Group that the goal is to be done with data and information collection by the end of 2011, and then we can turn to Phase II Plan writing and Round 2 project solicitations. Mark explains that Rick Kattelman will be contracted to work with Project Proponents on economic analysis among other things for Round 2 Implementation.
 - Todd Ellsworth is interested in emphasizing ecologically based projects in Round 2 and incorporating that into the focus, and asks for a point person to work with regarding this issue. Mark responds that that conversation is appropriate for the entire Group.
 - Darla brings up that there are still eight projects on the current Implementation list that are still considered highly important to the rest of the Group.
 - It was asked if there was any direction given by DWR of the types of Projects that were favored in the last funding round. Mark responds that water supply and DAC projects were emphasized in Round 1 but that this could change in subsequent Implementation rounds.
 - Greg asks for clarification on Phase II Plan deadline. **The deadline is May 31, 2012.**
 - Mark adds that the second phase in Planning Grant applications is likely to arise in the next several months and the Inyo-Mono region is eligible to apply for the remainder of the Planning Grant balance, which is roughly \$750,000. There is an opportunity for the Group to think of ideas for

additional planning grant projects for Round 2. Mark brings up perhaps pursuing the development of a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan for one of the priority watersheds as identified by the Lahontan region (Owens or Indian Wells Valley) as one idea.

- **Mark will provide more information regarding future Planning Grant funding rounds, and associated ideas, at the Sept. 28 meeting.**

b. California Rural Water Association Needs Assessments

- CRWA has provided draft contract to Program Office and is waiting for CalTrout approval before signing.
- Mark recaps that the Needs Assessments were discussed at length at the July 27 RWMG meeting. Comments from the Group were taken into consideration and now it is time for the following documents to be decided upon by the Group: the needs assessment recipient list and the needs assessment outline and summary information agreement.
- Dustin reviews the two documents briefly and discusses the process used to generate the list. He explains that he intentionally left one vacancy as there may be entities that will come forward. If there are no additional entities that volunteer, he can easily fill the vacancy from his priority list. The documents are projected for the Group to view.
- Leroy would like to see San Bernardino County included, specifically Trona. Dustin will take this into consideration.
- October, 2011, is the anticipated start date for the needs assessments.

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approval of Needs Assessment Outline and Summary Information Agreement
2. Approval of CRWA Needs Assessment recipient list

- **Bob moves to approve the CRWA Outline and Summary and Information Agreement and the Needs Assessments Recipient List. Darla seconds the motion. All approved.**

c. Re-visitation of Strategic Goal Areas, Objectives and Resource Management Strategies for Phase II planning.

- i. Analysis: Evaluation of relationship between current projects and Phase 1 objectives.
 - Holly A. reviews new maps and explains them to the Group. These maps were created to be used as a tool for upcoming outreach and aim to observe how Goals, Objectives and Resource Management Strategies were addressed by the current Inyo-Mono project list. Holly clarifies that all 101 projects were used in the analysis and that the maps depict where outreach is needed as well as show general project locations and number of projects by area. Holly explains that the maps show how each of the project areas address Phase I Objectives by the aggregation of projects in each area, not on an individual project basis.
 - Holly asks for feedback from the Group on the current maps and analysis and reminds them that this process will additionally be useful in identifying future project needs.
 - The Group discusses the analyses and provides ideas to the Program Office regarding how projects are presented in future funding rounds with respect to Goals and Objectives. Further discussion continues regarding revision needs of project list to accurately reflect viable projects and associated data, and further analysis the Group is interested in seeing.
 - Harvey voices concern of the relevance of the analysis stating that using past projects to target future outreach seems an inappropriate way to address the issue.
 - Holly & Mark respond in tandem that the list used is an actual compilation of projects submitted to the Group through the formal process. Thus the Program Office will use this as a starting point to identify which needs remain and which needs have changed. The list is also a way to validate the Group's goals and objectives in preparation for the Phase II Plan.
 - Holly specifies outreach targets are in the Ridgecrest/Southern Inyo area, Tri-Valley (Benton/Hammil/Chalfant), and Northern Mono County (Bridgeport North). The Program

Office will be relying on local knowledge to help connect with stakeholders in each of these areas. Holly continues that tribal outreach is also a priority for the Group and will likely be more targeted.

- Bruce suggests that without identified Project Proponents outreach may not be successful. He recommends further targeting outreach to Tribes, Chambers of Commerce, etc... to improve our successes through outreach.
 - Mark suggests using Coleville school as meeting place to demonstrate the recent success of the Implementation grant..
- ii. Next steps, including plan for outreach meetings
- Outreach is planned to begin in October, 2011.

d. Planning Grant Updates

- i. Planning documents analysis
- Janet reports to Group that Task 2 is nearing completion and that it will be sent to Mark and Holly for review shortly. Upon review by Group it is expected that new documents will arise. Janet will be adding relevant documents to digital library throughout the year and plans on having it available on the Web as soon as the website remodel is completed in the newly organized format.
- ii. Website
- Janet reports that web progress has taken a bit longer than we hoped due to scheduling conflicts with the web developers. Recent progress has been made and the Program Office is hopeful that the upgrade is completed in September, providing us the opportunity to work on upgrading functionality for the remaining portion of the year.
 - Mark includes with the new Implementation award that the website will provide us an opportunity to feature funded projects in the region.
- iii. Match forms
- Janet reports that the Program Office has created a new, more user-friendly match form that is available online in the documents section as well as in the news posts. We are asking all involved to please use this form in an effort to simplify tracking requirements to DWR.
 - **Match forms will be required for the reporting period of May 1 – August 31. Program Office will send out the revised form and will provide a deadline for returning forms to the Program Office.**
 - Holly explains to the Group the amount of money CalTrout has already fronted in the Planning Grant effort and maintains that without being able to show required match the Program Office will not be able to get reimbursement from DWR. Bottom line is that it is very important we get your match forms in a timely manner.
 - Mark reminds Group that time recorded needs to specify whether time spent was for planning or implementation grants, as the two grants match requirements differ.
 - There is discussion of how to split out planning and implementation hours by the Group.
 - The Group asks if we can't just track all match on the same form as the easier it is for members the better compliance the Program Office will get.
 - **Janet will add an Implementation category to Match Form and announce to the Group when the revised version becomes available.**
 - Members are asked to wait to fill in Match Tracking form until the new version is re-posted to the web and the Program Office gives clear direction regarding instructions and the deadline.
- iv. Organizational structure
- Holly A. gives update from Matt Griffis from Sierra Nevada Alliance. The findings are that IRWM groups are overwhelmingly MOU governed. Some have created 501(c)(3)s or JPAs to further make themselves eligible for different types of funding. Holly has

asked Matt to look further into 501(c)(3) funding structures. She asks Group for further direction on this subject.

- The Group converses about the pros and cons of a 501(c)(3) and concurs that it is interested in learning more about 501(c)(3) organization details.
- **Tony would like to see organizational structure/formation of a 501(c)(3) agendized at a future meeting to address additional detailed questions and concerns.**
- Holly will communicate with CABY staff on further details and ask Matt to continue his research on organizational structure.
- **The Program Office requests specific questions regarding organizational structure/501(c)(3)s to be sent to Holly by September 12, to be forwarded to Matt.**

6. General Updates

- a. DAC funding meeting in Rancho Cucamonga
 - Holly recaps the DAC meeting. General feeling was that the emphasis was on urban DACs which have very different issues than rural DACs, but that it was helpful to hear about some specific funding opportunities and it was a good chance to network.
 - **The Program Office will send out the link to the DAC Workshop presentations**
- b. DAC Grant
 - Mark summarizes where the DAC Grant Agreement is currently. Estimates are that it's 6-8 weeks out.
- c. Water Plan
 - Mark describes that a water evaluation and planning (WEAP) modeling tool is being utilized to run three levels of scenarios based on projected water demand, population changes, and climatic changes in the Central Valley.
 - DWR is interested in applying the model to the Eastern Sierra.
 - Mark asks the Group to think about the relevance of this type of modeling on the Eastside and if we want to pursue funding in order to make it a reality.
 - Mark thinks it is a great opportunity to get the Inyo-Mono region involved in the State Water Plan and adds that it offers an opportunity to bridge what goes on in L.A., with respect to water demand, to what's going on in the Inyo-Mono Region regarding water supply.
 - The regional forums are likely to launch in the next few months and both Mark and Holly will be a part of that process. There is still opportunity to engage in the process for others who may be interested.
 - **Mark will present the California Water Plan modeling proposal to the Group at the September 28 meeting.**

7. Announcements

- Greg Norby is on Region 3 board of Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA), which represents several hundred water management agencies throughout the State. Currently ACWA is trying to launch an initiative for a more formal policy on the specific role of Mountain Watersheds/Mountain Counties Group. The Group acknowledges the current policy gaps and is now outlining a new policy relevant to the Mountain Counties to be presented to ACWA for consideration and eventual adoption. Greg maintains that ACWA policy, once established, is extremely influential. The Mountain Counties are looking to establish common water resource framework, which comprises the Sierra Nevada Mountain Counties. Greg encourages the Inyo-Mono Group to consider involvement in this effective group as mutually beneficial for both entities.
- Mark asks if a letter of support from the Inyo-Mono IRWMP regarding the new policy would be beneficial. Greg confirms that it would be greatly appreciated and that he will keep the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program informed on the policy progress.
- Holly announces that there is a Groundwater Conference October 5 & 6 in Sacramento titled "California's Water Future Goes Underground." More information can be found at this website: <http://www.grac.org/am2011.asp>

Continued 4. Implementation Grant Agenda Items moved to the end of the meeting to accommodate scheduling of Central Sierra RC&D

- c. Report from Program Office on Fiscal Agent communications
- Mark specifies that Holly and he had a very positive meeting last week with Valerie of Central Sierra RC&D. Mark introduces Valerie Klinefelter from Central Sierra RC&D.
- d. Updated Status Report: Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra RC&D
- Valerie communicates to group that until Central Sierra RC&D and DWR meet, it's difficult to provide specific budget numbers, reporting requirements and timeframes.
 - She specifies the role of Central Sierra is generally to ensure that compliance requirements with DWR are met and that reimbursements of project funds run smoothly. Central Sierra will also facilitate communications and streamline reporting to DWR.
 - Central Sierra will provide standardized reporting requirements for Project Proponents so all reports will appear similarly formatted, making the administrative tasks of Central Sierra simpler.
 - A basic flowchart will be made available for the Project Proponents at the special meeting following later today; a more detailed flowchart will be available at a later date.
 - Staffing for Implementations are an anticipated five member team: Valerie, Central Sierra RC&D President; Bob Dean, ACWA Board Member & Calaveras County Water District board member; Bruce Woodworth, representing the Eastern Sierra; and two administrative staff already employed at Central Sierra.
 - Mark adds that the commitment letter is likely to be sent next week per his communications with DWR. This will formally let fiscal agent know the requirements that will be later outlined as part of the Grant Agreement. The DWR contact for Implementation is committed to pushing the Inyo-Mono award through as quickly as possible as he understands the impact of winter months on our projects. This means Project Proponents need to provide updated budgets, and work plans ASAP so that DWR is not waiting on us. Revised schedules will be needed at a slightly later date when the formal grant agreement is close to being completed.
 - Irene asks for more detail regarding where the 10% is going to be allocated for Implementation of the Grant.
 - Valerie responds that money will be used to pay staff for work performed (embedding travel and per diem into their hourly rates) as well support for Central Sierra's operation as a non-profit. Additionally Central Sierra will seek legal counsel to review contractual agreements and other grant related documents before submitting to DWR. She explains that once the projects are underway Central Sierra will have a better idea of whether or not there will be remainder funds available to reallocate to projects.
 - Valerie's main goal is to have all paperwork that is submitted to DWR accepted immediately and therefore it will go through several levels of scrutiny before submittal to DWR.
 - Mark informs the Group that as part of the Grant Agreement, Central Sierra will be required to provide DWR with specifics as to their administration plans pertinent to the Implementation Grant.
 - There is concern among the Group of approving the decision item without seeing details from Central Sierra.
 - Valerie suggests approving the allocation of 10% to fiscal agent so that further allocation of project funds can be decided. Then in the MOU agreement between Central Sierra and the Group we can specify that up to 10% may be used by the fiscal agent.
 - Rick clarifies that the Group will be able to approve the fiscal agent budget once it becomes available.
 - Valerie confirms that yes the budget will need approval from the Group.

DECISION ITEM:

- 1. Approval of 10% allocation of Implementation funds to set aside for Fiscal Agent (as discussed at the July 27th RWMG meeting)**

- **Bob would like to amend the motion to reflect the contract between the RWMG and Central Sierra RC&D to read that up to 10%**
- **The amended motion reads as follows: “Approval of 10% allocation of Implementation funds will be set aside for fiscal agent. Fiscal agent will establish MOU with I-M RWMG containing language that up to 10% of Implementation funds will be used to administer the Grant.”**
- **Rick moves to approve the motion as amended. Dan Moore seconds. All approve.**

8. Process Check

- Mark asks Group if the Planning Grant updates are helpful and receives back that yes, the Group finds them beneficial and they want to continue with Planning Grant updates.

9. Review June 15 and July 27 RWMG meeting notes

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approve June 15, 2011, RWMG meeting notes.
2. Approve July 27, 2011, RWMG meeting notes
 - **Darla moves to approve the meeting notes from June 15 and July 27 RWMG meetings. Rick seconds. All approved.**

10. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting

- Holly A. reads action and decision items back to the Group.

11. Next meeting dates: September 28, 2011, Fort Independence Tribal Offices Independence, CA

- Tentative: November 16, 2011 (Mammoth)
- Tentative: December 14, 2011 (Bishop)
- Meeting is adjourned at 12:46 pm