Wednesday, January 11, 2012
9:30 am - 12:00 pm
Conference Call

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

Summary of Action Items

- **Irene will convene a meeting for the M7 Implementation Project Sponsors.**
- **Darla Heil nominates Tony Dublino as Chair and Irene Yamashita as Vice Chair. Leroy Corlett seconds the motion. All approved.**
- **The Program Office requests comments and suggestions regarding the project ranking process by Wednesday, January 18 for summary before the January 25 RWMG meeting. Comments received after that time are welcome but may not make it into the January 25 suggestions and comments summary. The Program Office will then give a brief report to the RWMG of the summarized information, which will then be turned over to the Admin. Committee to incorporate the comments and further revise the project ranking process.**
- **Mark also states that CalTrout as fiscal agent will provide a scope of services for the Round 2 Planning Grant at the January 25 meeting.**
- **Mark moves to recommend that the Group accepts the Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking, and acknowledges that funding will be allocated in accordance with the order of the accepted project ranking, recognizing that the ranking may be subject to DWR mandates.**
- **Austin asks Bruce to provide some wording specific to the notion that DWR may dictate how funds are allocated in the Round 2 Planning Grant for inclusion in the decision for the January 25, 2012 RWMG meeting.**
- **Austin also requests that members share the scoring criteria used to rank projects with their respective boards and provide that feedback either to Holly in an email or to the Group at the January 25 RWMG meeting.**
- **Mark suggests the Program Office puts together a meeting participation matrix for MOU signatories and can present this to the Admin. Committee at the next AC and/or RWMG meeting. After that information is assembled, a RWMG or Program Staff member will be tasked with the outreach to those members to inquire about their interest and intentions to be involved with the RWMG's efforts.**
- **Irene asks for a Round 2 Implementation schedule for the January 25 RWMG Agenda.**

FINAL AGENDA

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

2. **Public Comment period**

3. **Appointment of new Admin. Committee Chair and Vice Chair**

4. **Round 2 Planning Grant Project Ranking and Evaluation Criteria Discussion**
   a. **Aggregate Group project ranking and scores**
   b. **Individualized project ranking methodologies**
   c. **Recommendation of project list to RWMG for January 25, RWMG meeting.**

5. **RWMG quorum requirement MOU amendment discussion.**

6. **Review of Action and Decision Items from today's meeting**

7. **Next RWMG Meeting**
   a. **Wednesday, January 25: Bishop Paiute Tribe Community Center**
   b. **Wednesday, February 22: Mammoth Town Council Chambers, Suite Z.**

Draft Meeting Notes

1. **Welcome and Introductions (Bold denotes participants present @ CalTrout Office)**
   1. Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, IWV Cooperative Groundwater Management Group
   2. Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee
   3. **Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District**
   4. Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
   5. Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
   6. Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee
   7. Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe
   8. Matthew Hayes and Mel Joseph, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation
   9. **Tony Dublino, Mono County**
   10. **Larry Frelich, Inyo County Water Dept.**
   11. Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
   12. Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD, Mono Co. RCD
   13. **Mark Drew, California Trout**
   14. **Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District**
   15. Austin McInerny, Center for Collaborative Policy
   16. **Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono Program Office**
   17. **Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono Program Office**
   18. Bryanna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
   19. Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
   20. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD
   21. Nathan Reade, Inyo County
   22. Jen Wong, DWR
   23. Joy Fatooh, Bishop BLM
   24. Parker Thaler, DWR
   25. Keith Pearce, Inyo County Dept. of Public Works
   26. Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest
   27. **Peter Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes**

- Mark Drew acknowledges this is a large conference call and we are going to need to establish professional courtesy so that we aren't speaking over one another.

- Mark gives an overview of the IRWM Program and emphasizes the need to keep an eye on the bigger picture. He gives a brief history of the Inyo-Mono Program and acknowledges the accomplishments of the Program to date.   He reminds every one of the overall goals of the Group is to build capacity, secure funding and build a voice for our region at the State level. He gives timeline of the current Planning Grant and reminds the RWMG that we also are working on the DAC grant and to a lesser degree the Implementation grant; including management of numerous contracts embedded within these grants. He thanks the RWMG for their hard work and support and acknowledges the support of the fiscal agents, both CalTrout and Central Sierra, throughout the process. He reminds the Group that the Round 2 Planning Grant is now upon us and we have another opportunity to secure further funding. He reminds participants that the RWMG has adopted a consensus decision making process and seeks to remind members of the real meaning of consensus. Mark acknowledges the system is not always perfect but reminds participants that approving a decision does not

always mean that you fully support the decision but rather that you can live with the decision being made, while objecting or vetoing a decision should be reserved for situations that an entity absolutely rejects or simply cannot live with.

- Tony Dublino asks for a brief update on Implementation.
- Bruce Woodworth responds that the proposed contract has been circulated to project sponsors and that communications with DWR are on track.
- Irene Yamashita asks Bruce if he is going to organize an M7 meeting to discuss the contract.
- Bruce recommends that project sponsors convene an M7 meeting without the Fiscal Agent so they can have a private discussion amongst themselves.
- **Irene will convene a meeting for the M7 Implementation Project Sponsors.**

2. Public Comment period
- There were no public comments.

3. Appointment of new Admin. Committee Chair and Vice Chair
- Mark explains why this order of business is being conducted in this Group meeting versus at an Admin. Committee meeting. He explains the hope of getting this accomplished without having to convene a separate meeting just for this order of business.
- Holly Alpert gives current recap of Admin. Committee members and explains the duties of the respective roles of Chair and Vice Chair. She asks for volunteers for positions of Chair and Vice Chair.
- There is a brief discussion about possible Chair and Vice Chair candidates.
- Tony recognizes that it would be beneficial for a preexisting Admin.Committee member to serve as Chair for consistency reasons.
- **Darla Heil nominates Tony Dublino as Chair and Irene Yamashita as Vice Chair. Leroy Corlett seconds the motion. All approved.**

4. Round 2 Planning Grant Project Ranking and Evaluation Criteria Discussion
- Austin McInerny paints the big picture of the project ranking process and reminds the Group that the final outcome for today's meeting is to make a recommendation for decision at the January 25 meeting regarding the ranked project list. He asks Mark to give a summary of the criteria and matrix development.

a. Aggregate Group project ranking and scores
- Mark walks the Group through the process used to develop the Matrix. He gives the proposed deadlines and that a working committee was formed to establish a set of criteria for project sponsors to respond to in an effort to give RWMG members objective criteria in which to score projects against. He explains the revision process of the ranking criteria and the Program Office made the final recommendation of the ranking criteria. Mark highlights that one element of a scoring matrix such as this provides constructive feedback to the project sponsors in learning how to establish stronger more competitive projects. He explains that two members chose to not use the matrix and that 14 evaluators submitted scores. Mark continues that the Program Office synthesized both ranking types to give respective ranks to the projects and points out that the same conclusion was reached regardless of the ranking method used. He identifies a discrepancy on the matrix but maintains that it does not influence the overall rank once the correction is made. He proposes on behalf of the Program Office, that the current ranked list be the recommended list to go forward as a decision for approval at the next RWMG meeting on January 25, 2012.
- Austin opens the conversation to questions.
- Larry Frelich asks those who did not participate as to why they either chose not to or simply could not respond to the Matrix.

- Multiple members respond that the short response timeline coupled with the holidays is what prevented them from evaluating the projects.
- Joy Fatooh responds citing the timeline as one factor for not responding but also points out that it is difficult for the BLM, and perhaps other land management agencies, to comment on projects that do not directly affect the lands that they manage, even if there is ample time for them to discuss the projects.
- Austin summarizes that in the future we can work to allow more time for members to review and rank projects. He also identifies that the Admin. Committee may have to revisit the issues Joy brought up regarding the public land management agencies', discomfort being asked to comment on projects that may not be relevant to lands within their jurisdiction.
- Holly informs the Group that we have learned a lot from this process and we aim to continue to improve the process but that we are not always in control of the deadlines imposed upon us by DWR.
- Dan Jenkins conveys that the ESUSD would like to see a standard framework for the ranking process developed for use in future funding rounds. He points out that if standardized criteria were in place at the time the draft PSP was released, the Group would be 3 to 4 weeks ahead of where we presently are and that would in-turn allow for more review time by the RWMG.
- Janet Hatfield reminds the RWMG that there is an opportunity to comment on the ranking process in the MOU survey that is currently available and encourages those who have not yet filled it out, to provide additional comments there.
- Tony asks when the criteria were developed in relation to when projects were submitted. Mark replies that the projects came first, then the criteria were developed and project proponents had approximately a week to respond the criteria.
- Holly reminds all that the draft PSP came out in late October and immediately the Program Office began soliciting projects for the next Planning Grant round.
- Mark acknowledges there was again frustration expressed by those completing the evaluations that DWR imposes their priorities on the Region but reminds everyone that if we don't respond to DWR specific criteria we may hurt ourselves in the proposal application. Mark recognizes the need to address our own priorities as a region but reminds members that we need to do so in tandem with DWRs priorities. He points out the criteria aimed to represent equivalent weights of both Inyo-Mono and DWR priorities.
- Tony asks for names of participants on the working committee that developed the Criteria. Darla Heil, Nate Reade, Dan Jenkins, Pete Bernasconi, Bruce Woodworth, Bob Harrington Mark Drew, Holly Alpert, Janet Hatfield made up the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Criteria development working committee.
- Austin reminds the Group that a year ago the Group had a similar discussion after the Round 1 Implementation projects were submitted. He recommends that perhaps the Program Office writes a brief history of the criteria development process so that Group members can better understand how the criteria were derived.
- Mark communicates that providing project evaluation criteria rationale, is in his opinion, is a critical element of the Round 2 Planning Grant proposal, explaining that DWR may appreciate justification of how the projects in our proposal were selected and ranked.
- Darla agrees with Dan that the Group needs a blueprint for the ranking process so that we don't reinvent the wheel each time a PSP is revealed. She recognizes that each PSP will have differing DWR criteria to be met, but emphasizes the importance of having a process that shortens and simplifies the response process.
- Austin reiterates the desire to develop a blueprint of a standardized scoring process and asks how the Group would like to see this developed; suggesting either the Working Committee or the Admin Committee.
- Dan asks Bruce and Harvey VanDyke why they chose to not use the matrix for ranking the projects. Harvey responds that he has recently had a major surgery and due to him being out in the recent weeks he didn't feel like he could evaluate the projects based solely on the

projects written summary. He would really like to see project presentations prior to asking Group members to rank projects. Bruce elects to not respond to Dan's question and speaks that this conversation will be lengthy and is likely to be more appropriately discussed in the development of the standardized criteria framework previously mentioned.

- Larry asks how Bruce came up with his ranking given that he chose to use not use the developed criteria and specifically asks Bruce to justify ranking the Program Office fourth on the list. Bruce responds that he felt there was not appropriate weight given to those who did not receive funding in past funding rounds. He also said the Program Office budget was difficult to evaluate. Bruce felt the scoring used in the matrix did not in fact reflect how he felt about projects and thought it was important that the Program Office allow he and Harvey to use their own ranking system.
- Larry asks if Bruce proposed this ranking to the boards of the respective groups he represents. Bruce comments that he did approach his Board to ask for their involvement with the ranking process and they declined, stating Bruce had a greater familiarity with the process and projects and therefor was better suited to be the evaluator.
- Irene clarifies that Bruce had permission from each of his boards to rank the projects.
- Bruce explains that he spoke with the head of each organization he represents because there was not time to approach the entire Board and that he was given permission as the representative to evaluate the projects. He feels that each organization, even the large public land management agencies, needs to identify someone as a representative who can make these types of decisions on their behalf when time does not permit an organized board meeting.
- Irene comments that we are not reinventing but improving the wheel. And suggests that either the working committee continue working on the ranking process and if they are not comfortable that the Admin Committee may work to continue the revisions of the criteria development process.
- Austin recognizes the interest in the refinement of the criteria themselves as well as the scoring process encourages those with comments and suggestions to email Holly about the ranking process. This way comments can be reviewed and responded to on an individual basis by the Admin. Committee. He revisits the intent of today's meeting and asks the RWMG if 1)The current project list as ranked is satisfactory to the Group. 2) Are members comfortable with the Process of submitting comments via Holly to the Admin.Committee for review and incorporation into a revised criteria framework by the Admin. Committee.
- Holly reminds the Group that we also have comments from the last Implementation Round that we can address in this larger criteria evaluation process.
- Mark revisits the lessons learned, including more time and project presentations before a ranking is requested.
- Pete Bernasconi emphasizes the importance of project presentations and the opportunity it provides to members to ask Project Proponents specific questions about their proposed projects.
- Holly reminds everyone that re-visitation of the project ranking process is also agendized for the January 25 RWMG meeting and that further discussion will take place at that time.
- Austin suggests a synthesis of the comments received as an outcome of this meeting be presented to the Group at the January 25 meeting.
- **The Program Office requests comments and suggestions regarding the project ranking process by Wednesday, January 18 for summary before the January 25 RWMG meeting. Comments received after that time are welcome but may not make it into the January 25 suggestions and comments summary. The Program Office will then give a brief report to the RWMG of the summarized information, which will then be turned over to the Admin. Committee to incorporate the comments and further revise the project ranking process.**
- Bruce suggests the Admin. Committee takes this on before bringing it up to the Group.
- Darla thinks the entire RWMG needs the opportunity to provide comment.

- Austin suggests that Holly will merely collate the comments she receives between now and the next meeting for a short presentation to the RWMG. At that time, additional suggestions can be contributed and a brief discussion can take place. The results from that discussion will then be given to the Admin. Committee to work from in building a standardized criteria and ranking process.
- Tony recommends a timeline for the criteria development process. He maintains the importance of project applicants having the criteria in advance of the PSP release and points out that developing criteria after projects have been submitted is a backward process. This gives projects sponsors the advantage of being able to develop projects that meet standard criteria.
- Todd Ellsworth thinks given the time constraints, the Program Office and working committee did a good job developing the criteria and is supportive of the current ranked list.
- Austin asks for concerns or hesitancy of the ranked project list as presented.
- Tony asks if the Group is going to allocate funding based on past strategies, given the top project received full funding and the last project receives partial funding if funds are not ample to support the last project on the list.
- Holly responds that the Group needs to make that decision.
- Tony reminds the Group that after the last grant was awarded there was discussion of revisiting the ranking process and he thinks it is important to establish how we plan to allocate resources before funding is determined and maintain that course once funding is received.
- Harvey speaks of lessons learned in the Implementation process and recognizes the time invested developing a ranking and thinks we need to adhere to that ranking.
- Dan reminds the Group that first we need a monetary figure to work from. He reminds the Group that projects change while waiting and when funds are awarded we can revisit the conversation.
- Bruce reminds the Group that during Implementation we used the ranking to determine who gets the funding keeping in mind that DWR may specify how the money is allocated.
- Parker Thaler asks for clarification on tribal participation requirements under the Implementation Grant.
- Mark reminds Parker of a previous discussion regarding funding of certain percentages of DAC projects and that an argument needed to be made in the case of Implementation that the projects submitted in fact benefitted DACs.
- Parker acknowledges the conversation and reminds those involved that DWR worked with the Program Office to remedy that particular situation.
- Mark maintains that the bottom line is that the Group needs to maintain a bit of flexibility with respect to the project ranking given additional stipulations from DWR need to be met.
- Darla brings up that a percentage for grant administration and management was only included in very few of the projects and that with those additional costs added, the project budgets are likely to change.
- Pete thinks we need to give some thought to the Grant Administration percentage at the January 25, 2012 meeting.
- Mark notes that the PO did include a budget for grant administration for the PO office but did not include such a budget for the overall management of the PG2 should more than the PO funding need be awarded.
- **Mark states that CalTrout will provide a scope of services as fiscal agent at the January 25 meeting.**

b. **Individualized project ranking methodologies**
- See discussion in **a. Aggregate Group project ranking and scores** above.

c. **Recommendation of project list to RWMG for January 25, RWMG meeting.**
- **Rick Kattelmann moves to adopt the ranked project list as proposed to be approved at the January 25, 2012 RWMG meeting.** Keeping in mind that DWR may

provide further guidance to how the funds are allocated, and that otherwise funds will be allocated according to the current ranking.

- Mark reminds the Group that Board approval still needs to be sought to officially approve the current list and the intent is to not repeat this conversation at the January 25 meeting. He feels that the motion needs to be amended.
- **Mark moves to recommend that the Group accepts the Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking, and acknowledges that funding will be allocated in accordance with the order of the accepted project ranking, recognizing that the ranking may be subject to DWR mandates. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.**
- **Austin asks Bruce to provide some wording specific to the notion that DWR may dictate how funds are allocated in the Round 2 Planning Grant for inclusion in the decision for the January 25, 2012 RWMG meeting.**
- **Austin also requests that members share the scoring criteria used to rank projects with their respective boards and provide that feedback either to Holly in an email or to the Group at the January 25 RWMG meeting.**
- Austin wants it to be clear that the Admin. Committee will take the comments and suggestions on the ranking process discussed at the January 25 RWMG Group meeting into consideration while working to revise the criteria and develop a more refined ranking tool to present back to the Group for approval.

5. RWMG quorum requirement MOU amendment discussion.

- Holly gives background of the difficultly the Group has had in achieving 50% quorum requirements in recent months. She asks the Group to consider if 50% is a reasonable request and asks how we can get people to want to participate.
- Larry asks if specific organizations never participate. Holly answers yes.
- Larry asks that the Group suggest that non-participating Members leave the Group or pass on their voting representation to a more active member.
- Mark intervenes that Bruce gave some ideas regarding quorum requirements.
- Bruce maintains we don't want to amend an MOU if possible. However, he thinks we can accomplish changing the definition of a quorum through a by-law.
- Harvey thinks Bruce's idea of revising the quorum definition, i.e., keeping track of active Members, is quite a stretch to the wording of the current MOU.
- Austin hears the concern of revising the MOU and returns to Holly's question and asks for suggestions from the Members how to encourage participation, realizing that if we can achieve quorum that amending the MOU may not be necessary.
- Harvey asks if we can send decision item questions via email to the group. Holly responds that the MOU specifies that MOU votes cannot be cast electronically.
- Irene suggests an initial outreach attempt to learn what issues are preventing participation. She also compliments the working committee process and identifies that it streamlines decision making processes and makes Group meeting more productive and thinks we should continue to foster that type of process.
- Joy responds that in RWMG meetings it is often difficult to hear when there are 20+ people in a large room and that it discourages her from calling in to participate.
- Mark acknowledges that perhaps an upgrade in technology or more intimate meeting venues may assist in the call-in participation.
- Multiple other members agree with Joy and speak to the difficulties of hearing the conversation in some of the larger venues.
- Mel Joseph also speaks to the burden of travel time in making the monthly meetings and suggests scheduling some Group meetings just as conference calls.
- Austin summarizes that he is hearing that call-in meetings may work better for many Group Members with more occasional in person meetings. This coupled with a reduction of meetings and some strategic outreach may be enough to solve the quorum issue.

- Harvey suggests that those who don't participate give their vote to another member or delegate another representative.
- Darla reminds the Group that we have the system set up that requires an entity to be an MOU signatory in order to submit a project and that some entities only have one issue or project need, and once the issue is solved they cease participating.
- Dan Jenkins asks if we can consider active vs. inactive status on a quarterly basis and use active members as the basis of the quorum.
- Austin speaks that a mechanism similar to this is not currently addressed in the MOU but may be worth pursuing.
- Darla thinks this would require an amendment to the MOU.
- Harvey cautions amending the MOU and reminds the Group what that entails.
- Bruce reads Section 2.07 of MOU and thinks that we may be able to amend a bylaw by redefining definition of member.
- Irene corrects Bruce and reads from the definitions section of the MOU where it clearly defines what a member of the Group is and specifically calls out that MOU signatories are members.
- Austin recognizes the complications amending the MOU and instead recommends the Group try the easier paths by restructuring the meetings, reducing frequency of meetings, and conducting focused outreach to uninvolved Members to inquire about their lack of participation.
- Larry agrees that outreach is a smart first step but inquires if there is a way to open the MOU to address only quorum requirements and that the Group agrees not to touch any other aspects of the MOU.
- Tony asks how amendments are discussed in the current MOU.
- Harvey wants to know how many Members never participate and agrees with Austin that we should target these people and either get them to participate or to drop out.
- Many participants agree that initial outreach is the first step and then this topic will be followed up upon before we consider re-opening the MOU.
- Pete reminds the Group of the increasing number of grant programs and thinks it will be difficult to reduce the number of meetings.
- Austin asks what the current meeting schedule is for the next Planning Grant.
- Janet responds that under the current Round 2 Planning Grant budget is 10 Group meetings and 18 AC meetings in an 18 month grant cycle.
- Morgan informs that she has been conversing with smaller water-related entities, and reminds the Group that many of these small groups operate purely on volunteer time and discourages asking people to step out. Her main argument is that she recognizes the burden for these volunteer groups to commit the time to adopting the MOU initially and if we want them to be poised to respond to a PSP in a brief timeframe that it is extremely difficult to ask them to start over when a PSP is released that may in fact benefit them.
- Dan clarifies his intention that active members would be purely defined as those who were currently active and he is not necessarily asking them to give up their signatory status.
- Irene doesn't think it's a good idea to open the MOU and thinks we need to do everything possible, including encouraging alternate representative, to avoid revisiting the MOU. Tony agrees.
- Tony suggests inviting people to present interesting water issues at RWMG meetings to solicit interest keeping in mind we still conduct business. He also thinks assigning a specific member to facilitate agenda items may help expedite meeting conversation topics.
- Larry argues that the meetings take a tremendous amount of time and he doesn't think that adding agenda items would necessarily entice Inyo Co. to participate.
- Austin requests suggestions of how to approach outreach.
- Irene asks if the Program Office can take the time to do the outreach or can they delegate it to a member.

- Austin emphasizes this outreach needs to be systematic.
- **Mark suggests the Program Office puts together a meeting participation matrix and can present this to the Admin. Committee at the next AC and/or RWMG meeting. After that information is assembled, an RWMG or Program Staff member will be tasked with the outreach to those members.**
- Austin clarifies that the suggestion to amend the MOU is on hold.
- BryAnna brings up that in Chapter 5 of the Plan is where it requires project applicants to be MOU signatories and suggests the Group discusses this further as a better way to address the quorum issue. She thinks that by making this a requirement that we may be in fact contributing to the problem as it is likely that the smaller entities may have the greatest need for funding and the most limited resources for consistent attendance.
- Harvey thinks this is a good angle to explore.
- Janet requests that the outreach is assigned to one individual so that information is consistently distributed and information assimilation is quick and easy in order to reduce staff time.
- Mark suggests three issues be addressed in the initial outreach contact: 1) quorum requirement needed to conduct business, 2) issue of equity and the sense that a given entity that has been committed to the RWMG process and may feel gipped if an entity that has not been involved all of a sudden jumps in and receives priority ranking etc. 3) an inconsistent MOU signatory being able drop in unexpectedly and disrupt a process in motion.
- Austin clarifies that the Program Staff will develop a meeting attendance matrix and formulate some initial outreach ideas, prior to the January 25, meeting. From there an internal discussion on Member outreach targets and content of the message will begin and next steps will be identified.

6. **Review of Action and Decision Items from today's meeting**
   - Janet recaps today's meeting topics.
   - **Irene asks for a Round 2 Implementation schedule for the January 25 RWMG Agenda.**
   - Mark responds that the Program Office can put together a overview of the general schedule
   - Mark reminds the Group to go to the inyomonowater.org website for updated information.

7. **Next RWMG Meetings**
   a. **Wednesday, January 25: Bishop Paiute Tribe Community Center**
   b. **Wednesday, February 22: Mammoth Town Council Chambers, Suite Z.**

   Holly makes a few announcements.
   - PCL Environmental Symposium Saturday, January 28, 2012
   - CA Water Policy Conference March 8, 9 in LA (Scholarships may be available; Darla went last year and said it was great)
   - Mono Lake Committee will be hosting a Wild and Scenic Film Festival in Hollywood on March 8.
   - CFCC 2012 Funding Fairs have been announced. (Mark thinks we could arrange transportation if multiple people were interested) http://inyomonowater.org/2012/01/2012-cfcc-funding-fairs-save-the-date/
   - The Final Round 2 Planning Grant PSP is out and posted to the website http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_planning.cfm
   - Three applicant workshops are taking place relative to the Round 2 Planning Grant January 26, Auburn, CA, January 31, Riverside, CA, February 1, Kingsburg, CA
   - Mark suggests that after the January 25 RWMG meeting, Round 2 Planning Grant project proponents get together to strategize on proposal development.
   - Irene asks if a CA Water Plan Update meeting will be held in the local area. Mark clarifies that these meetings are called regional forums and it is scheduled to take place in the next

several months. Currently they are proposing to hold meetings in a number of other satellite locations in the region.

- Jen Wong announces Climate Change and Extreme Flooding Events, On January 31, 2012 to be held in Alhambra, CA
- DWR has recently completed a statewide Flood Management Plan.
- LORP draft Recreation Plan Public Meeting Feb 24th
- Mark announces that Holly has been recently accepted to the Water Education Foundation Water Leaders class of 2012 and will be participating in the program over the next year.

11:53 Tony adjourns the meeting.