

Final Meeting Summary

Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group

Regular Meeting

Wednesday, February 22, 2012
9:30 am - 12:30 pm
Mammoth Town Council Chambers: Suite Z
Mammoth Lakes, CA

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

DECISION ITEMS:

1. Approve CalTrout Scope of Services

Recommended Motion: The Admin Committee recommends approving the California Trout Scope of Services document as written.

- Dan Moore moves to approve the California Trout Scope of Services as amended; noticing the recommended language change that the Round 2 Planning Grant CalTrout Administrative Budget will not exceed 12%. Rick Kattelman Seconds the motion. All approved.
- ##### **2. Approve January 25, 2012 RWMG meeting notes**
- Rick moves to approve the January 25, 2012 meeting notes. Bruce Woodworth seconded the motion. All approved.

ACTION ITEMS:

- **The Staff clearly articulates that any proposal submissions received after 5:00 p.m. on Feb. 28 will not be included in the Round 2 Planning Grant Final Proposal to DWR.**
- The Program Office will circulate the Sewer Rate Survey for the June Lake PUD via email to assist them in gaining needed rate data for the region.
- Tony will let the Program Office know if the requested comment period extension is granted for the Lahontan RWQCB Agricultural Waiver Program for Bridgeport Valley.
- Comments on the current Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan should be provided to Rick Kattelman by March 1, 2012.
- The Program Office will provide a Word version of the Plan to those individuals interested to facilitate their comments to the current Phase I Plan. Those interested please contact Janet.
- Austin will come up with some suggested wording for the Admin. Committee with regards to the Groundwater objective for the March 21 meeting.
- The Program Office will disseminate the next iteration of the Revised GORMS document to MOU signatories with the Admin. Committee Agenda prior to the next Admin. Committee meeting. Those interested in participating in the final revisions to the document are invited and encouraged to participate in the March Admin. Committee meeting, as this will be the final opportunity to provide feedback before it is sent to the Group for approval.
- Those interested in participating on either of the Working Committees (RFP or Fiscal Agent SoS) who did not verbally volunteer at the meeting, please contact Janet via email janet@inyomonowater.org ASAP to express interest so that you may be included on the emails.
- RFP Working Committee will have a recommended standardized ranking structure and Proposal Development process to recommend to the Admin. Committee by the March 21 meeting with the intention of approval by the RWMG on April 25.
- Fiscal Agent SOS Working Committee will have Standardized Scope of Services prepared prior to the Admin. Committee meeting in March for potential review and recommendation (time permitting) to the RWMG at the April 25 RWMG meeting.
- Holly will provide a Summary of the CA Rural Water Needs Assessments conducted in 2011 at the April 25 RWMG meeting.
- M7 Project Proponents request that they be included on all email correspondence from Valerie relevant to Implementation projects, instead of receiving emails as a third party.
- Bruce will send a description from the Grant Agreement with details relevant to the Civil Engineering requirement to M7 members.
- Program Staff will work with Bob, Tony, Leroy, and Irene to ensure that agendas are being circulated in a timely manner.

- Janet will send out a reminder of the needed match hourly rate justification on official letterhead with the notes.
- Janet will post JAN/FEB Match Forms to the website.

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Introductions (10 min)**
 - a. Report on meeting audio technology findings
- 2. Public Comment period (5min)**
- 3. Round 1 Planning Grant (30 min)**
 - a. General Planning Grant Update
 - b. DWR Invoice #1: April – October, 2011
 - c. Goals Objectives, RMSs Revision Progress
 - d. Project Ranking Process
 - e. 501(c)(3) Update
 - f. Phase II Plan Schedule
- 4. Round 2 Planning Grant (15 min)**
 - a. Update on Proposal Progress
 - b. California Trout Scope of Services
 - DECISION ITEM: Approve CalTrout Scope of Services**
 - Recommended Motion: The Admin Committee recommends approving the California Trout Scope of Services Document as written.**
- 5. DAC Grant (20 Min)**
 - a. Outreach Training: Lessons learned
 - b. DAC data acquisition
 - c. Conversation with DWR regarding DAC Pilot Project
 - d. Next Steps

***** 10 MINUTE BREAK*****
- 6. Implementation Grant Update (20 min)**
 - a. Update from M7
 - b. Update from Central Sierra
 - c. Next Steps
- 7. Leveraging RWMG Support (15 Min)**
 - a. Recent requests
 - b. Leveraging the RWMG to support member needs
- 8. General Updates (15 Min)**
 - a. Sierra Water Work Group
 - b. CA Water Plan
 - c. WEAP
- 9. Announcements**
- 10. Process Check**
- 11. Review January 25, 2012, RWMG meeting notes**

DECISION ITEM(s):

1. Approve January 25, 2011 RWMG meeting notes.

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

13. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Next RWMG meeting: Meeting Schedule also available at www.inyomonowater.org
 - Wednesday, April 25, 2012
 - Wednesday, May 23, 2012
- b. Next Admin. Committee Meeting: **Wednesday March 21, 2012 (9-11 am)**

Meeting Summary

- **Tony Dublino calls the meeting to order at 9:35 am**

1. Welcome and Introductions (10 min)

Attending in Person

1. Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
2. Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC & DC, Mono County RCD
3. Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District
4. Dan Moore, Round Valley School
5. Danna Stroud, Mojave Desert Mountain RCD
6. Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
7. Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
8. Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff
9. Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
10. Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff
11. Jeremiah Joseph, Fort Independence Indian Reservation
12. Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony
13. Lori Dermody, LADWP
14. Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
15. Mark Drew, CalTrout, IRWMP Staff
16. Matt Hayes, Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone Reservation
17. Nate Reade, Inyo County Ag. Commissioner's Office
18. Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes
19. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD
20. Rick Kattelman, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
21. Tony Dublino, Mono County

Attending on the Phone

22. Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe
23. Austin McInerney, Center for Collaborative Policy
24. BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
25. Jen Wong, Department of Water Resources
26. Joy Fatooh, Bishop BLM
27. Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water Commission, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group.

a. **Report on meeting audio technology findings**

- Janet Hatfield gives brief overview of technology options for improved conference calling quality at RWMG meetings. They include purchasing a brand new high quality PolyCom system which would cost approximately \$1,000, a refurbished system identical to the first for approximately \$700, or we can purchase some refurbished satellite speakers and additional microphones in hope that they work with our current make and model Polycom unit.
- Mark Drew suggests trying the least expensive of the fixes and if they prove satisfactory then great, if not additional options can be explored. All agreed.

2. **Public Comment period (5min)**

- Rich Ciauri explains a sewer rate survey for the Inyo-Mono region and asks members to fill out if willing. **The Program Office will circulate the Sewer Rate Survey for the June Lake PUD via email to assist them in gaining needed rate data for the region.**
- Rick Kattelmann announces that today is the last day for comments on the Lahontan RWQCB Agricultural waiver program which affects land use in the Bridgeport Valley. The Mono Co. Supervisors have requested a 30-day extension to the comment period. The waiver is a renewal of a 2007 waiver but the current document has changed substantially. The Bridgeport Ranchers' Organization would like the renewal of the 2007 waiver without the proposed changes. This waiver has the potential to shut down historic agricultural practices in the Bridgeport Valley.
- **Tony will let the Program Office know if the requested comment period extension is granted for the Lahontan RWQCB Agricultural Waiver Program.**

3. **Round 1 Planning Grant (45 min)**

a. **General Planning Grant Update**

- Mark summarizes that the Program Office is currently accepting revisions to the current Plan and that once those comments are received the writing of the Phase II Plan will begin. Comment period deadlines will be provided on the new timeline, which can be found at www.inyomonowater.org. **Comments on the current Plan should be provided to Rick Kattelmann by March 1, 2012.**
- **The Program Office will provide a Word version of the Plan to those individuals interested to facilitate their comments to the current Phase I Plan. Those interested please contact Janet.**
- Janet gives a brief update on the website and informs the Group of the recent improvements. They include a new Facebook page link as well as a convenient link to the new timeline to assist all members with deliverable dates relevant to all of the different DWR grants.
- Holly Alpert gives summary of continued outreach under the current Planning Grant which has taken place at both Bridgeport PUD and Big Pine CSD. She feels that good progress was made and that the entities contacted were receptive to the IRWMP. Justin verified that increased communications between the Bridgeport PUD and Bridgeport Indian Colony has continued since the Bridgeport PUD meeting and is moving forward in a positive direction.

b. **DWR Invoice #1: April – October, 2011**

- Holly gives background of the first Planning Grant invoice recently submitted to DWR. She mentions that the Admin. Committee has seen the draft invoice and that for the April-October, 2011, reporting period, \$102,000 has been spent. Reimbursement sought in the first round from DWR is approximately \$60,000. For the first invoicing period, we have spent approximately 31% of the budget in 50% of the allocated time. For the November-December, 2011, reporting period we will be looking for ways to adjust the budget and schedule in response to what we have learned from the first two invoicing periods. An adjustment to the current schedule will be proposed to fully maximize potential to incorporate the Round 2 Implementation Draft PSP into the Phase II Plan. The new recommended end date for the Round 1 Planning Grant is July 31, 2012. Holly advises that the learning curve for DWR invoicing is steep and we anticipate easier invoice reports for all future reporting periods and other DWR Grants. The invoice will be made available to all Members once it is accepted by DWR.

- It is agreed that the Program Office reports may serve as templates for future grant reporting for all involved in the DWR invoicing process and that there are efficiencies to be gained from the time invested by the Program Staff in learning the DWR invoicing process.

c. Goals Objectives, RMSs Revision Progress

- Austin McInerney recaps that comments were requested from the RWMG pertaining the revised GORMS document. He has taken input from three individuals who provided comment and consolidated them into a final document. He reminds the Group that the overall goal is that the Admin. Committee will review the consolidated comments and come up with a recommendation motion for the April 25 RWMG meeting. Austin summarizes the feedback into some key points: 1) The need to call out strategic goals areas were questioned by the commenters, in that they felt the objectives could stand alone, 2) The need to clarify that the objectives are not prioritized but co-equal objectives, 3) Flood objectives are continuing to gain support, 4) Bob Harrington articulated a new objective relevant to Groundwater, 5) Economic feasibility should be removed as a component of the current objectives. Austin maintains that the majority of the changes were improvements to the language in an effort to yield the most succinct version possible.
- Bob gives supporting comments to his Groundwater objective and explains that seeing the Stormwater objective gave him the notion to create this objective and recognizes the need for more focused objectives. The new suggested objective would be as follows: **Note *** (RMSs associated with Objective #8 are below. RMSs C,D & E are pre-existing and were taken from Objective #1 and moved here to support the new objective)

Objective #8: Promote sound groundwater monitoring, management, and mitigation

- A. Support and implement state-mandated groundwater monitoring requirements, and other groundwater monitoring efforts
 - B. Promote efforts to monitor, manage, and mitigate effects of large groundwater-using projects
 - C. Develop and support projects that mitigate for the effects of groundwater extraction
 - D. Protect and improve the quality and quantity of stored groundwater supplies and recharge areas
 - E. Identify existing gaps in groundwater and surface water quantity data and undertake appropriate assessments/characterization studies
 - F. Collect data and monitor groundwater and surface water supply variability
- Bob provides background and justification for the need of an objective such as this. He speaks that the objective is aimed at 2009 State mandate of Groundwater Monitoring (CASGEM) which is currently not funded and that the county lacks the infrastructure to comply with this mandate. He explains the concern of groundwater use in the large solar projects in the Southeast portion of Inyo County. He thinks being able to tap into IRWMP funds for supporting groundwater studies within the region would be beneficial. While noting the concerns regarding groundwater, he argues these larger issues are looming and that we need to address them at some level within the IRWMP.
 - Austin invites suggestions as to how to best incorporate groundwater in the GORMS document given the concerns at the last Admin. Committee meeting. He reviews comments from the February 13 Admin. Committee meeting and states that at that meeting it was discussed that by merely having a groundwater objective, it doesn't mean highly controversial projects have to go forward as they will be screened out by the RWMG.
 - There is a conversation about how to balance the inclusion of groundwater specific objectives into the IRWM Plan to help support groundwater type projects while remaining sensitive to the controversial nature of the issue in the region.
 - The Group discusses the revisions to the GORMS document and how such a document works for the Group. One point made is that the document provides a summarization of issues recognized in the Region. There is concern expressed that the document is getting too complex and makes it difficult for the Group to define what they aim to do.

- Austin notes that although two new objectives were added relevant to Stormwater and Groundwater, the revisions to the current document have in fact made it more succinct and focused and therefore more understandable. He gets support from other Group members recognizing that in fact the document has been focused and consolidated and will serve as an improved tool in the future project ranking process. All agree that the aim is to balance brevity and clarity with the need to adequately represent issues in the Region.
- The Program Office will take the issue of the complexity/brevity of the document into consideration in the Phase I Plan revision process.
- Lori Dermody speaks to the groundwater issue and expresses her neutrality to including Groundwater into the Objectives specifically in relation to CASGEM. However she expresses her concerns relative to including mitigation and reminds the RWMG of the agreement to stay clear of contentious issues. She continues that if the intent is to seek solutions to groundwater issues that could benefit all parties then it seems like a good idea. However if the intent is to support projects that could be used in conflict resolution against the City of L.A. then she questions its place in the IRWMP. Lori reminds the long term members that at the inception of the IRWMP that all involved were in agreement to check contentious issues at the door and thinks this might be an appropriate place to do that.
- Bob reminds the Group that the County has mitigation requirements outside of those with the City of L.A. and that it would be detrimental to not be able to seek financial support for these other mitigation needs.
- Irene supports Bob's proposed objective and argues that revisions like this are exactly what we are looking for in our Plan. She thinks that the uniqueness of our region and the issues that we face can only help strengthen our case for continued funding from the State.
- There is a lengthy discussion regarding groundwater and the high tension brought on at the community level when mentioning a project involving groundwater. This conversation recognized the need for mindful wording with regards to this objective and may include wording such as "Mitigation in cooperation with all affected parties." It is also recognized that this type of wording may be appropriate to other objectives as well.
- **Austin will come up with some suggested wording for the Admin. Committee with regards to the Groundwater objective for the March 21 meeting.**
- **The Program Office will disseminate the next iteration of the Revised GORMS document to MOU signatories with the Admin. Committee Agenda prior to the next Admin. Committee meeting. Those interested in participating in the final revisions to the document are invited and encouraged to participate in the March Admin. Committee meeting.**
- One primary goal of the March Admin. Committee is to provide a recommended motion to the RWMG at the April 25 meeting for adoption of the Revised GORMS document so that it can be included in the Phase II Plan.

d. Project Ranking Process

- Mark gives the overall scope of the Program and includes Planning Grant as well as Implementation schedules. He informs the Group of the process outlined at the Feb. 13 Admin. Committee meeting in preparation to be in a position to respond to future funding rounds. The needed steps for the next Implementation funding round are: 1) Define preliminary ranking Criteria, 2) Draft PSP received, finalize ranking criteria, 3) Pre-proposals solicitation, 4) Project Presentations, 5) Project ranking, 6) Final Proposal Submission to DWR. He proposes the establishment of a Working Committee to be tasked with developing standardized framework for both the Fiscal Agent Scope of Services and Project Ranking Criteria Blueprints for project proponents. He solicits interest as well as gives the proposed long term timeline for Round 2 Implementation.
- The Group generally feels like the two processes should be independent of one another and recommends two separate working Committees for each task (RFP and SoS). The importance for progress on each of these committees is acknowledged and agreed that priority should be given to these endeavors in order to maintain the current proposed timeline.
- **RFP Working Committee Volunteers:** Tony Dublino, Bob Harrington, Bruce Woodworth, Dan Jenkins, Jeremiah Joseph, Mark Drew

- **Fiscal Agent SoS Working Committee**: Bruce Woodworth, Pete Bernasconi, Harvey VanDyke, Holly Alpert, Dan Jenkins.
- **Others interested in participating on either of the Working Committees please contact Janet via email ASAP to express interest.**
- **RFP Working Committee will have a recommended standardized ranking structure and Proposal Development process to recommend to the Admin.Committee by the March 21 Admin. Committee meeting with the intention of approval by the RWMG on April 25.**
- **Fiscal Agent SOS Working Committee will have Standardized Scope of Services prepared prior to the Admin.Committee meeting in March for potential review and recommendation (time permitting) to the RWMG at the April 25 RWMG meeting.**

e. 501(c)(3) Update

- No update was given on this agenda item.

f. Phase II Plan Schedule

- The Staff informs the Group that a proposed Phase II Plan review schedule has been posted to the new TIMELINE which can now be found on the Inyo-Mono website and that frequent referral is encouraged. It is estimated that some preliminary chapters will be available for Group review by the end of March.

*** 10 MINUTE BREAK***

4. Round 2 Planning Grant (15 min)

a. Update on Proposal Progress

- Holly gives brief overview on Round 2 Planning Grant proposal development progress. Drafts have been received from each project proponent, and the Program Office has provided comment in an effort to standardize all of the proposals received. Those comments will be returned to Project Proponents today and are requested back in final form by Tuesday, February 28 at 5:00 p.m. **The Staff clearly articulates that any proposal submissions received after 5:00 p.m on Feb. 28 will not be included in the Final Proposal to DWR!**

b. California Trout Scope of Services

DECISION ITEM: Approve CalTrout Scope of Services

Recommended Motion: The Admin Committee recommends approving the California Trout Scope of Services document as written.

- Mark gives evolution of the CalTrout Scope of Services document to date.
- Bruce suggests changing the wording from the CalTrout Administrative Budget to “not to exceed 12%.”
- **Dan Moore moves to approve the California Trout Scope of Services as amended; noticing the recommended language change that the Round 2 Planning Grant CalTrout Administrative Budget will not exceed 12%. Rick Kattelmann seconds the motion. All approved.**

5. DAC Grant (20 Min)

a. Outreach Training: Lessons learned

- Holly gives a summary of the recent DAC outreach training. She highlights the major points of the training: 1) Spend time in the community, get to know them, get to know their issues, 2) Don't begin by talking about the IRWMP (It's a difficult concept to start with).
- Regional problems identified were: 1) Figuring out what a DAC is or what a Community is in the Inyo-Mono region, 2) Dealing with the geographic expanse of the region.

b. DAC data acquisition

- A large part of the training was devoted to figuring out the most representative way to define a DAC. The Staff reminds the Group that with 2010 Census data lacking the DAC definition is no longer viable and therefore DWR is looking to these pilot programs to provide alternative definitions for DACs across the State. Those attending came up with the concept of selecting criteria to be used

and then ground-truthing the criteria's relevance/applicability in 10 test communities across the region. It was identified that photo documenting resultant communities will be a powerful way to communicate our findings. This study may also include a short video of the Inyo-Mono region as an additional communication tool to try and present the unique issues we face. The summer months are scheduled to the field testing of these criteria with the intent being to submit a white paper to DWR in January 2013.

c. **Conversation with DWR regarding DAC Pilot Project**

- The Program Office will seek remaining funds from the DAC pilot project from DWR to help fund these additional aspects of the project.

d. **Next Steps**

- Mark speaks that the Inyo-Mono region is in a position to help the State define what a DAC is and possibly the opportunity to influence an \$11 billion water bond at the legislative level.
- Dan Moore speaks that the school districts have income data as well as other metrics at the school district level that can be provided to the Staff.
- Irene asks if the CA Rural Water summary findings will be made available for the Group. The Program Office has received this summary.
- **Holly will provide a Summary of the CA Rural Water Needs Assessments conducted in 2011 at the April 25, RWMG meeting.**

6. **Implementation Grant Update (20 min)**

- Mark mentions that he and Bruce are meeting on Monday, Feb. 27 with DWR to get the lessons learned from Round 1 Implementation and encourages anyone else interested in participating to contact him via email mdrew@caltrout.org . He can set up a conference calling option if needed.

a. **Update from M7**

- M7 members have looked to other IRWM regions for fiscal agent-project proponent contracts. Comments back regarding the contract drafted by Greg James are due by today. Greg will incorporate comments and return a clean draft to submit to Central Sierra by the end of the week.

b. **Update from Central Sierra**

- Bruce summarizes that Central Sierra plans to submit the revised Budget, Schedule, and Workplan to DWR tomorrow. He mentions that DWR will be requiring a Civil Engineer on site for each project with a construction element.
- There is a discussion about the definition of "technical" in the Central Sierra workplan and M7 members have asked repeatedly for this wording to be changed to "Provides administrative support." Bruce concurred with this point.
- Again, direct communication is emphasized with M7 Project Proponents on the part of Central Sierra so that information is not filtered or lost in translation.
- **M7 Project Proponents request that they be included on all email correspondence from Valerie relevant to Implementation projects, instead of receiving emails as a third party.**

c. **Next Steps**

- DWR will provide a draft grant agreement to Central Sierra.
- **Bruce will send a description from the Grant Agreement with details relevant to the Civil Engineering requirement to M7 members.**

7. **Leveraging RWMG Support (15 Min)**

- a. Recent requests
 - b. Leveraging the RWMG to support member needs
- Mark gives the background for this agenda item and informs the Group that recently the Program Office has been requested to provide letters of support for various projects or efforts. He expresses the need to identify an efficient process that the Group is comfortable with in providing requested support.

- There is a detailed discussion about how to best go about providing support letters on behalf of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. Several differing levels of approval were discussed. Alas, it was concluded that a generic letter may be drafted and used in very general circumstances, with the caveat that the Program Office will report to the RWMG when said letters have been issued. Detailed letters of support will need to be agendaized and decided upon by the RWMG.
- **Pete Bernasconi will draft a template letter for general Inyo-Mono IRWMP support and provide it to the Program Office for circulation. Comments pertaining to the draft letter can be directed to Pete by March 16th. Approval of a final version of the support letter will be agendaized at the April 25 RWMG.**

8. General Updates (15 Min)

a. Sierra Water Work Group

- The Program Staff provide updates to the numerous other endeavors they participate in at the State level. These include the Sierra Water Work Group, which aims to leverage Sierra IRWMP regions to make voices heard in Sacramento at a Sierra Wide level. The Program Office will manage their time conservatively regarding this endeavor.

b. CA Water Plan

- Mark and Holly are currently serving on the Design Team for the DAC Caucus.
- Finance Caucus tasked with financial needs of the State. The Inyo-Mono region has been invited to participate in a beta information sharing program.
- Holly will be sitting on the DWR Climate Change Technical Advisory Group
- Sustainable Metrics Plan. Resources Legacy Fund. Pilot Projects for sustainable water resource plans.
- The South Lahontan Regional Forum is finally about to start. Design teams are being put together, and Program Staff will be serving on the design teams for North and South Lahontan and will help to disseminate information and announcements about the regional forums.

c. WEAP

- Mark Communicates there is a WEAP meeting scheduled next week with DWR and that interest currently lies at applying this model at a Mammoth Basin/Mono Basin scale. He will be meeting next week in Sacramento with DWR and Lester Snow of the Resource Legacy Fund.

9. Announcements

- The Department of Fish and Game has revised its proposed regulations governing suction dredge mining in California under the Fish and Game Code. The revised version is now available for review at www.dfg.ca.gov/suctiondredge, and DFG will be accepting public comment on the new draft through 5 p.m. on **Monday, March 5, 2012**.
- Justification of match hourly rate is required by DWR prior to invoicing reimbursement.
- **Janet will send out a reminder of the needed match hourly rate justification on official letterhead with the notes.**
- **Janet will post JAN/FEB Match Forms to Web.**
- Draft LORP rec use plan venue has been changed; please see the Inyo-Mono website for updated information.

10. Process Check

- Bob requests information earlier for bringing it to his BOS meetings. **Program Staff will work with Bob, Tony, Leroy, and Irene to ensure that agendas are being circulated in a timely manner.**
- There is a discussion about the previous project "wish list" and where to go with the list for the future. Some members feel the Group should start over with the creation of a new master needs list. There is disagreement as to the usefulness of the current list to the program or the plan. Several suggestions are made in reference to applying sunset dates to this type of list. Others suggested only generally referencing this type of list in the Plan but instead housing the list on the website so that it maintains needed flexibility. There is conversation about how if the list was more relevant, that it could aid in pre-proposal planning as well as assist in facilitating larger integrated projects where the burden could be

lifted off the smaller entities by only submitting one proposal to cover a multitude of smaller integrated projects.

11. Review January 25, 2012, RWMG meeting notes

- The new notes summary format is acceptable to the RWMG.

DECISION ITEM(s):

1. Approve January 25, 2012 RWMG meeting notes.

- Rick moves to approve the January 25, 2012 meeting notes. Bruce seconded the motion. All approved.

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

- Janet reviews the action and decision items.

13. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Next RWMG meeting: Meeting Schedule also available at www.inyomonowater.org
 - Wednesday, April 25, 2012 (Goal: RFP Working Committee Approval of Standardized Framework of both Ranking Criteria and Fiscal Agent Scope of Services)
 - No Meeting in May.
 - Wednesday, June 27 (Conference Call : Approve Phase II Plan)
 - Wednesday, July 25 (Goal: Adopt Phase II Plan, R2Implementation Project Presentations)
 - Wednesday, August 22 (Report on Project Ranking R2Implementation)
- b. Next Admin. Committee Meeting: **March 21, 2012, 9-11 am**
 - **Tony adjourns the Meeting at 12:29**