

**Final Meeting Summary**  
**Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group**  
**Regular Meeting**

**Wednesday, April 25**  
9:30 am - 12:30 pm  
BLM, USFS, SNC Conference Room  
Bishop, CA

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

**Decision Items:**

- 1. Approve revised Inyo-Mono ORMS final document as recommended by the Admin. Committee**  
Darla Heil moves to adopt the ORMS document as amended. Bruce Woodworth seconds the motion. All approved.
- 2. Approve Standardized Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services**  
Irene Yamashita moves to approve the Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services. Ceal Klingler seconds the motion. All approved.
- 3. Approve February 22, 2012 RWMG Meeting Notes**  
Darla Heil moves to approve the February 22 meeting notes. Leroy Corlett seconds the motion. All approved.

**Action Items:**

1. The Program Office will come up with a template for profiling a “Member (Representative) of the Month” to be added to the website in the future.
2. The Program Office will ensure that each entity that received a Needs Assessment can view the report, to the extent that the information is publically available.
3. Program Staff will provide email notification as new chapters of the Plan are released and will indicate their closing dates to RWMG members as a reminder to submit their comments.
4. As necessitated by the current Plan update, Program Office staff is requesting all members with viable projects submit them electronically on or before **May 23<sup>rd</sup>**, for inclusion in the Phase II Plan.
5. Members interested in participating in the Plan review process should create their Google accounts and request access by clicking on a linked chapter and selecting the “Request Access” button when the access error message is presented.
6. Those interested in uploading projects also need to visit the Inyo-Mono website Log-In help page to become familiar with the online project upload form content and operation.  
<http://inyomonowater.org/members/>
7. Janet will provide further instructions in the notes on the new online processes so that they too may be used as an aid to understanding these new website additions.
8. Members who have invested their valuable time to the IRWMP effort are requested to please report your hours to Janet using the March/April MatchEZ form by Friday, May 18<sup>th</sup>.  
<http://inyomonowater.org/documents/downloadable-forms/>
9. After several requests from the RWMG, Mark suggests a website tutorial meeting. Janet will send out an email this week identifying a time and an agenda. The meeting can take place in person at the Cal Trout office and will also be offered as a webinar using GoToMeeting. (details to come via email)
10. Comments and suggestions relevant to the RFP documents presented should be sent to Tony Dublino by May 4<sup>th</sup>.
11. M7 members are asked to comment ASAP (preferably by next week) on the draft Implementation contract, please cc Central Sierra as well as all M7 parties on your response.
12. Program Office will organize an M7 meeting for the near future.
13. Round 1 Implementation Project Proponents need to send their official logo to Valerie, if they

- have not already done so.
- 14. The 501(c)(3) working committee requests feedback on their current progress. Send comments and concerns to Bruce/Rick/Ceal via email. The comment period will remain open until further notice.
  - 15. The Program Staff encourage thoughts regarding amendments to the MOU and would appreciate any comments or ideas from the membership.
  - 16. The Admin. Committee is charged with further investigating MOU amendments and will report back to the RWMG.
  - 17. The South Lahontan Regional Forum is currently scheduled for May 23 in Bishop. All interested parties are STRONGLY encouraged to attend. This meeting will take place immediately following the next RWMG meeting.
  - 18. Program Office will provide link to the Sierra Water Workgroup website on the Links page of the website.

## AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions (10 min)
2. Public Comment period (5min)
3. Round 1 Planning Grant (60 min)
  - a. CRWA Needs Assessment Summary
  - b. Plan Revisions
  - c. Budget Update
  - d. Website login page updates
  - e. Inyo-Mono regional needs
  - f. Match Form March/April
  - g. Objectives & Resource Management Strategies (ORMS) Process Overview

**DECISION ITEM:**

- 1. Approve revised Inyo-Mono ORMS final document as recommended by the Admin. Committee

4. Future Implementation Rounds (30 Min)
  - a. Revised DWR Implementation Schedule
  - b. RFP Working Committee Update & document discussion
  - c. Standardized Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services

**DECISION ITEM:**

- 1. Approve Standardized Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services

5. Round 2 Planning Grant (5min)
6. DAC Grant (10 Min)
7. Implementation Grant Update (15 min)
  - a. M7 Progress Report
  - b. Fiscal Agent Update
8. 501(c)(3) Status Update (10 Min)
9. Discussion of RWMG Governance (10 min)

**10. General Updates (10 Min)**

- a. Water Plan Update 2013 – South Lahontan Regional Forum

**11. Announcements (10 Min)**

**12. Process Check (5 Min)**

**13. Review February 22, 2012, RWMG meeting notes (5 Min)**

**DECISION ITEM:**

**1. Approve February 22, 2012 RWMG Meeting Notes**

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

**15. Next Meeting Dates**

- a. Next RWMG meeting: Meeting Schedule also available at [www.inyomonowater.org](http://www.inyomonowater.org)
  - Wednesday, May 23, 2012

**Meeting Summary**

- 9:34 Irene Yamashita calls the meeting to order.

**1. Welcome and Introductions (10 min)**

Attending in Person

1. Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&DC, Mono County RCD
2. Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee
3. Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District
4. Dan Moore, Round Valley School
5. Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
6. Doug Thompson, Mojave Desert Mountain RCD
7. Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest Community Services District
8. Heather Crall, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Staff
9. Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Staff
10. Holly Gallagher, Birchim Community Services District
11. Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
12. Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Staff
13. Jeremiah Joseph, Fort Independence Reservation
14. Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group
15. Mark Drew, California Trout, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Staff
16. Matt Hayes, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation
17. Nathan Reade, Inyo/Mono Agriculture Commissioner's Office

On the Phone

1. Austin McInerny, Center for Collaborative Policy
2. Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
3. Dustin Hardwick, California Rural Water Association
4. Gavin Feiger, Sierra Nevada Alliance
5. Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
6. Rich Ciauri, June Lake Public Utilities District

## 2. Public Comment period (5min)

- Mark Drew brings up the idea of adding Member profiles to the website and asks for input from the Group. In general the Group thought it was an interesting idea but clarified that it should feature Member Organization Representatives not Members.
- **The Program Office will come up with a template for profiling a “Member (Representative) of the Month” to be added to the website in the future.**
- Janet Hatfield reminds those in attendance that photographs to be used as new web content are always appreciated.

## 3. Round 1 Planning Grant (60 min)

### a. CRWA Needs Assessment Summary

- Dustin Hardwick reports that last fall the California Rural Water Association conducted a series of Needs Assessments as well as some workshops as part of its contract with CalTrout under the current Planning Grant. He informs the RWMG that anonymous surveys were requested from training participants and that overall the surveys indicated that the trainings were helpful and much was gained by attending. A total of 41 individuals attended the trainings. In addition, CRWA conducted 22 Needs Assessments which focused on evaluation of small water systems and offered technical, managerial and financial analyses of each system. Aging infrastructure and water quality were the major concerns noted from the participants and were observed to be common issues throughout the region. CRWA feels improvements in these systems may be made with technical support and future grant funding. CRWA has extended the invitation for ongoing support to each of the participating entities. A comprehensive and detailed report was provided to the Program Office to help identify and prioritize regional needs. Dustin reminds the RWMG of the importance of raising awareness of water specific regional needs and its value to the CRWA as well as the Inyo-Mono IRWMP.
- A few members asked questions of Dustin regarding the Needs Assessments and where the summary information can be found.
- Dustin responded that a summary report email was circulated to all participating agencies and that the Program Office has been provided with a detailed report.
- It is requested that the information be made available to those interested.
- **The Program Office will ensure that each entity that received a Needs Assessment can view the report, to the extent that the data is publically available.**

### b. Budget Update

- The Staff informs the RWMG of the briefing regarding the revised Planning Grant budget that occurred with the Admin. Committee earlier this morning. Mark summarizes that the Program Office has provided an amended budget to the Admin. Committee and that the Admin. Committee has approved to move forward with the budget amendment. He communicates that all deliverables will still be completed, and that the bottom line has not been changed.
- Mark expresses the need for timeliness on moving forward with the amendment. He states that CalTrout has fronted approximately \$150,000 thus far on the Planning Grant efforts and that it is critical to get the invoicing process underway. He also points out that DWR's fiscal year end is also prompting the invoicing deadline of May 1, 2012.
- Holly Alpert summarizes that the revisions are predominantly shifting funds from tasks where we needed more hours from tasks where we had excess. Major funds pulled were from the contract with the Center for Collaborative Policy contract and some of Rick Kattelmann's hours as well as some travel and printing fees that were not needed. Much of the money was moved into Task 1 to cover meetings and general stakeholder communications.
- There is a discussion of whether or not this is a decision item for the Group and it is agreed that the Admin. Committee who has fiscal oversight of the Program Office has reviewed and approved the amendment and it is not business the RWMG need to address.

c. Plan Revisions

- **Plan Revisions:** Janet reports that an online plan review process has been set up to facilitate commenting on the Plan as well as streamline the process for incorporating revisions by the Program Staff. This plan review process is hosted on the Google Cloud and is available through the Inyo-Mono website Log-In page. Two steps are required to participate; 1) Set up a Google account (not necessarily a Gmail email address); 2) Request access from the Administrator by clicking on a Linked Chapter within the Plan Review Log-In page (Be prepared for this to take up to 24 hours). Next, simply go to the Plan Review page under the Log-In tab on the website, enter your password (sent to you in an email) and click on the Chapter you want to review. <http://inyomonowater.org/members/plan-review/>. She informs the RWMG that Tech help is posted on the Plan Review page of the website as well as a tutorial video to help reviewers learn how the commenting process works. Janet communicates that the Program Staff will request feedback on how this process worked after the Plan is submitted in an effort to continually refine our processes for the betterment of the Program.
- **Program Staff will provide email notification as new chapters of the plan are released and indicate their closing comment dates to RWMG members as a reminder to submit their comments. Members will be given 4 weeks from the date of release to comment on a Chapter by Chapter basis.**
- **Members interested in participating in the Plan review process should create their Google Accounts and request access by clicking on a linked chapter and selecting the “Request Access” button when the “Access Error” message is presented.**

d. Website login page updates

- Janet updates the RWMG on recent changes and improvement to the website. She summarizes that substantial changes include online Plan Review using Google Documents, an online project upload form which will assist in assembling a Regional Needs list, and interactive web maps.
- **Web Maps:** Janet introduces the new interactive mapping applications now available in the website. She explains the value of intelligent web maps versus static maps and would like direction from the RWMG of other map layers (types of information/data) they would like to see in use for their purposes. She emphasizes the desire to make this map a useful tool for members vs. something pretty to look at and encourages members to explore the maps capabilities and provide feedback. <http://inyomonowater.org/interactive-project-map/>
- Members with ideas on other map layers, or types of information to include in the intelligent web maps, please submit them to Janet by email for consideration.
- **Janet will provide further instructions in the meeting summary from today on the new online processes so that they too may be used as an aid to understanding these new website additions**

e. Inyo-Mono regional needs

- **Inyo-Mono Regional Needs Assessment Project Upload Form:** Janet continues that another major change to the website is the introduction of an online project upload form that will help us create the revised Inyo-Mono Regional Needs Assessment/List. She communicates that a help page specific the project uploading process has been developed and can be accessed by clicking on the Log-In tab on the Homepage main menu <http://inyomonowater.org/members/>. On the help page are listed tips for success as well as downloadable word document versions of the form. She explains that the intention is to use the word documents versions of the form as a study guide for project development, and as an aid to prepare project proponents for use of the online form. Lastly the word documents can be downloaded and distributed to non-internet users who would like to submit projects.
- Janet recommends using the most updated version of your preferred web browser and requests that technical issues experienced while using any of this technology be reported immediately. (After the meeting several issues with Internet Explorer were found while using

the Plan Review Process, Members are encouraged to use Mozilla Firefox, Google Chrome or Safari web browsers)

- As necessitated by the current plan update, Program Office staff is requesting all members with viable project submit them electronically on or before May 23<sup>rd</sup>, for inclusion in the Phase II Plan.
- Those interested in uploading projects also need to begin exploring the Inyo-Mono website Log-In help page to begin familiarizing themselves with the online project upload form content and operation. <http://inyomonowater.org/members/>.

f. Match Form March/April

- March/April Match form has been posted to the website for download. **Members who have invested their valuable time to the IRWMP effort, please report your hours to Janet using the March/April MatchEZ form by Friday, May 16<sup>th</sup>.**  
<http://inyomonowater.org/documents/downloadable-forms/>

g. Objectives & Resource Management Strategies (ORMS) Process Overview

- Austin provides the background process of the ORMS document to date. He summarizes the highlights and presents the RWMG with key changes to the document. He informs the RWMG that a primary change was that Goal statements were removed from the document as it was decided that the eight co-equal regional objectives were comprehensive enough to cover the original goals of the Inyo-Mono region. Austin continues that both Holly Alpert and Irene had made suggested wording changes after the document was posted to the website for member review. He explains the suggested wording changes and encourages conversation among the RWMG. Holly and Irene provide justification for their proposed changes. There was a conversation about using the word "promote" to begin RMS D under objective 4. The conversation concluded that the word "support" would be most appropriate.
- The amended wording discussed and agreed upon is provided below with added or changed wording in red text.
- Objective #2-D: "Protect **public** health and aquatic ecosystem sustainability."
- Objective #4-D will now read: "**Support** water **use** efficiency in power generating facilities."

**DECISION ITEM:**

1. Approve revised Inyo-Mono ORMS final document as recommended by the Admin. Committee

Darla Heil moves to adopt the ORMS document as amended. Bruce Woodworth seconds. All approved.

\*\*\*\*\*10 Minute Break\*\*\*\*\*

- After the break and several requests from the RWMG, Mark suggests a website tutorial meeting. Janet will send out an email this week identifying a time and an agenda. The meeting can take place in person at the CalTrout office and will also be offered as a webinar using GoToMeeting. (details to come via email)

4. Future Implementation Rounds (30 Min)

a. Revised DWR Implementation Schedule

- The Program Staff inform the Group that the Round 2 Implementation draft PSP is expected in July, 2012, with the final proposal due to DWR in March, 2013, and that the third round of Implementation funding is expected in Fall, 2014. Mark explains the percentage of funds that are required for DAC specific projects within each of the funding rounds. He informs the RWMG that meeting baseline DAC requirements is a challenge for some regions and thinks that this may provide an opportunity for the Inyo-Mono region to secure funding by providing a strong

case that our proposal largely benefits DACs. He reminds the RWMG that approximately \$4.5 million are allocated to the Lahontan Region for Round 2 and a significantly larger amount will be available in the third and final Implementation funding round.

- There are a few questions pertaining to how projects that benefit DACs but are not initiated by DACs might rank. Mark responds that we need to make the strongest case possible in support of projects that benefit DACs no matter who initiates the project.
- Leroy asks how many IRWM Regions will be competing for the available funds. Mark responds that at least four but maybe five Regions will be ready to submit Round 2 Implementation proposals.

b. **RFP Working Committee Update & document discussion**

- Bruce references the handout he provided and reviews that the RFP group has invested approximately 100 hours working on this effort. He reminds the RWMG that he is seeking input regarding the current direction of the RFP document. Bruce reviews some of the major concepts of the document that are new to the ranking processes. He introduces the concept of Technical Advisory Committees (TAC) for each of the project categories, and their advisory-only role. He also specifies that TAC members do not have to be signatories and that there will be an option for members to simply accept the TAC ranking for a given project.
- The RWMG asks a few general questions regarding the TAC but no major objections are brought to the table.
- Next, Bruce requests input regarding the current weighting of projects with respect to the different program preferences and regional priorities, and he explains the suggested weights from his document. Current weights are suggested as follows:

1. State Water Plan	10%
2. DWR Preferences	10%
3. IM RWMG Plan	20%
4. Subjective Evaluation	30%
5. Category Specific	30%

- Harvey feels DWR Preferences need to be a much higher percentage, he reminds the Group that DWR is the “customer” and they need to be weighted accordingly. He continues by stating the problems typical of this type of ranking process and cautions the RFP Working Committee to not get lost in the minutiae of the document thus sacrificing bigger picture issues that need to be addressed. Harvey prompts the Group to think about this process and acknowledges the difficulty of the task at hand.
- Several of the RFP working committee members provide more detailed background on the rationale of the document. They communicate that the document largely responds to DWR’s program preferences as well as regional objectives and resource management strategies. They acknowledge that the document is not perfect but argue that we need a starting point to provide a framework from which members can evaluate and rank projects.
- Several members speak in support of the document and point out that it provides a baseline framework that attempts to remove bias from the ranking process. These members also argue that the Group needs to agree upon a process that can be used as a tool by the membership. Support is shown for the category concept in general, as members feel that this may promote entities to develop projects now that competition is category-specific and gives different types of projects an increased opportunity to secure funding.
- Irene requests the opportunity to discuss the actual categories further. She feels additional categories may be needed to accurately represent all project types. There are also numerous question of how categories will be ranked against one another for funding allocation purposes.
- Bruce responds that the details have yet to be worked out and reminds the Group that he is merely seeking approval of the category concept as a process and acknowledges that many details still need to be worked out.
- Bruce and others point out that there are several ways to allocate funding among categories and

- that those conversations will take place later.
- Darla asks how this document will change if in the PSP DWR is very specific about what type of projects they want. Bruce responds that DWR has given verbal direction that there will be less emphasis placed on project types within the PSP. He emphasizes the need to move forward based off what we currently know in order to achieve the progress needed on this effort.
  - Mark supports that the current document is subject to change after the PSP is released and that the bottom line is we need to respond to the PSP.
  - Dan Jenkins points out that within the current RFP document the categories/bins provide built-in flexibility to the ranking process. He explains after the PSP is released we may be able to re-assign category weight in response to direction given in the PSP.
  - Bruce encourages Harvey to work with the RFP working committee to work out some of his issues with the current document. Due to time constraints, he requests that Group members with input on the RFP provide their comments to Tony via email.
  - **Comments and suggestions relevant to the RFP documents presented should be sent to Tony Dublino by May 4<sup>th</sup>.**
  - Mark encourages those with comments to please provide suggested solutions to the issues they have with the current document.
  - The RFP working committee is acknowledged and thanked for the immense amount of time they have invested into the development of the ranking process.
- c. **Standardized Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services**
- Mark gives background on the development of the document. He explains the document provides a template for future fiscal agents and outlines a list of services they will provide as fiscal agent. He acknowledges Harvey for his work on the document.
  - Bruce speaks from his experience and suggests looking forward and soliciting a fiscal agent for Round 2 Implementation sooner than later.

**DECISION ITEM:**

**2. Approve Standardized Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services**

Irene Yamashita moves to approve the Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services. Ceal Klingler seconds the motion. All approved.

**5. Round 2 Planning Grant (5min)**

- Mark reminds the RWMG that the Round 2 Planning Grant was submitted on March 7, 2012 and recaps the projects submitted. He informs the Group that preliminary recommendations are expected this May. Mark summarizes that a total of \$9 million is available, and \$13 million was requested statewide, so he feels optimistic but maintains that funding will be competitive. He reminds the Group of the funding award process, summarizing that a 30-day comment period is typically provided after the preliminary recommendations are issued, and then final recommendations will be announced.

**6. DAC Grant (10 Min)**

- Mark reports that additional funding (\$129,000) was sought as an amendment to the DAC pilot project to facilitate the new DAC definition metrics. He explains that within the amended funding request, funds were set aside to produce a video documentary that emphasizes the criticality of water in the Inyo-Mono region. Mark thinks the decision on the amendment will be made in the next several weeks.
- Heather Crall gives a summary of the work resulting from the DAC training in February. She explains she has been collecting data on 10 test communities, and that the next step will be to ground-truth the data gathered. She explains that this will enable us to determine if the DAC defining characteristics we have identified do in fact tell the story of the varying characteristics of these communities. She explains the biggest challenge has been lack of data at the Tribal level

- and informs the Group that she has been working with her Tribal contacts to remedy the situation.
- Holly reports that the Sierra Nevada Alliance is helping us identify liaisons with other mountain/headwaters regions and that they will help us schedule a meetings with these regions to discuss DAC engagement in other IRWM efforts.

## **7. Implementation Grant Update (15 min)**

- M7 Progress Report
- Fiscal Agent Update
  - Mark gives background to the draft contract between Central Sierra and project proponents and asks if there is any feedback on the contract.
  - Some entities remind the RWMG that they must wait to seek legal counsel on the revised draft contract and that it is agendized for the next board meeting, but until then they cannot comment.
  - Bruce reminds those involved that once Central Sierra has a contract with DWR that they can individually sign contracts with project proponents as their schedules allow and that no entity need wait for another to sign.
  - M7 members are asked to comment ASAP (preferably by next week) on the draft Implementation contract, please cc Central Sierra as well as all M7 members' parties on your response.**
  - Program Office will organize an M7 meeting for the near future.**
  - It is requested that the M7 meeting be scheduled to correspond with the website tutorial meeting next week.
  - Round 1 Implementation Project Proponents need to send their official logo to Valerie, if they have not already done so.**

## **8. 501(c)(3) Status Update (10 Min)**

- Bruce gives a summary of the work from the current 501(c)(3) working committee. He seeks additional input from the RWMG regarding whether or not the Group agrees with the direction of the working committee thus far and references the handout. He communicates that costs are minimal to file paperwork to form a 501(c)(3) and the establishment of such an organization could provide security to the RWMG in the case that CalTrout does not maintain its supportive role in the future.
- There is a conversation concerning what the requirements are after paperwork is submitted. In general the working committee has found that it is possible to file and not activate the 501(c)(3) and that the only requirements are one board meeting per year and minutes from that meeting.
- Concerns expressed are that of distracting the RWMG from its current work and how exactly funding such an organization will work. It is discussed whether or not the Admin. Committee could serve as the Board and the current MOU as the current governance.
- There is a discussion about the work required to form bylaws for this type of organization. The working committee suggests using out-of-the-box bylaws until the RWMG decides to activate 501(c)(3), at which time bylaws can be discussed. They inform the RWMG that Rick has already drafted some preliminary bylaws.
- The RWMG suggests looking to other IRWMPs with this same organizational structure and borrowing their bylaws to the degree they apply to the Inyo-Mono region.
- Some members express confusion as to why we are looking to add this organization to our current organizational structure. The working committee and other members respond that the formation of a 501(c)(3) would provide the Group with an emergency backup provided that CalTrout rescinded their current financial support.
- There is not opposition expressed about continuing efforts toward the formation of the Inyo-Mono 501(c)(3). Bruce requests members use the handout provided to provide comments and suggested names, scope, and mission statement for the organization.
- The 501(c)(3) working committee requests feedback on their current progress. Send comments and concerns to Bruce/Rick/Ceal via email. The comment period will remain**

**open until further notice.**

#### **9. Discussion of RWMG Governance (10 min)**

- Mark gives background of the rationale for this agenda item and informs the RWMG that the concept was discussed at the last Admin. Committee meeting and that the Admin. Committee has requested the Program Office look into further detail regarding an amendment to the MOU. He explains that this would be simplest if presented as an amendment to the MOU as opposed to revising the current MOU. Mark believes that if there is consensus on making an amendment that the Group may stipulate that no signatures are needed.
- It is clarified that the suggestion is to redefine “consensus” as currently defined at 100% under the current MOU.
- The RWMG discusses how to redefine consensus and some suggest a consensus less one or two votes. Other ideas include only applying the new consensus definition to large IRWMP items like Plan Approval, etc...
- There is a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of the consensus model and how it's worked thus far for the RWMG. The contentious nature of water is noted and some consider the RWMG lucky in our success using the consensus model thus far.
- Some members feel strongly that any change to the current MOU will require signatures.
- Other members suggest that if we open the MOU we should consider also redefining current quorum requirements.
- Program Staff make it clear they are not advocating for a change to the current consensus model one way or another but recognize the potential the current model has in paralyzing the current processes and acknowledge what is at stake.
- **The Program Staff encourage thoughts regarding the amendment to the MOU and would appreciate any comments or ideas from the membership.**
- **The Admin. Committee is charged with further investigating the MOU amendment and will report back to the RWMG with further discussion points.**

#### **10. General Updates (10 Min)**

##### **a. Water Plan Update 2013**

- **The South Lahontan Regional Forum is currently scheduled for May 23 in Bishop.** The idea is to host the meeting in tandem with the May RWMG meeting to reduce members travel to only one day for both meetings. Stay tuned for details.
- **RWMG participants and other individuals interested in water issues are STRONGLY encouraged to attend the regional forum.**

#### **11. Announcements (10 Min)**

- Sierra Water Workgroup ([www.sierrawaterworkgroup.org](http://www.sierrawaterworkgroup.org)) is hosting a Summit scheduled for July 17&18 in Kings Beach, NV. The agenda is a work in progress and the meeting is open to participation from the Group. There will likely be a DAC panel discussion at the Summit on which the Inyo-Mono Program Staff will participate.
- **Program Office will provide link to the Sierra Water Workgroup website on the Links page of the website.**

#### **12. Process Check (5 Min)**

- Holly announces the completion of the East Walker Watershed assessment by the Eastern Sierra Land Trust. The document is housed on our website in the Digital Library <http://inyomonowater.org/library/>.

#### **13. Review February 22, 2012, RWMG meeting notes (5 Min)**

##### **DECISION ITEM:**

##### **3. Approve February 22, 2012 RWMG Meeting Notes**

**Darla Heil moves to approve the Feb 22 meeting notes. Leroy Corlett seconds the motion.  
All approved.**

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

**15. Next Meeting Dates**

- a. Next RWMG meeting: Meeting Schedule also available at [www.inyomonowater.org](http://www.inyomonowater.org)
  - Wednesday, May 23, 2012
- Meeting Adjourned 12:35 pm.