

Minutes
CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
February 21, 2013

The Advisory Committee meeting was held at the offices of the Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga CA, on February 21, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Appropriative Pool

Rosemary Hoerning, Chair
Jo Lynne Russo-Pereyra
Scott Burton
Ron Craig
Dave Crosley
Mark Kinsey
Van Jew
Josh Swift
Seth Zielke
Tom Harder
Ben Lewis
Teri Layton

City of Upland
Cucamonga Valley Water District
City of Ontario
City of Chino Hills
City of Chino
Monte Vista Water District
Monte Vista Irrigation Company
Fontana Union Water Company
Fontana Water Company
Jurupa Community Services District
Golden State Water Company
San Antonio Water Company

Agricultural Pool

Jeff Pierson
Bob Feenstra
Pete Hall

Ag Pool – Crops
Ag Pool – Dairy
Ag Pool – State of California – CIM

Non-Agricultural Pool

Brian Geye, Vice-Chair

Auto Club Speedway

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Kuhn
Bob Craig

Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Jurupa Community Services District

Watermaster Staff Present

Peter Kavounas
Danielle Maurizio
Joe Joswiak
Sherri Molino

General Manager
Assistant General Manager
Chief Financial Officer
Recording Secretary

Watermaster Consultants Present

Brad Herrema
Mark Wildermuth
Andy Malone

Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber & Schreck
Wildermuth Environmental Inc.
Wildermuth Environmental Inc.

Others Present Who Signed In

David De Jesus
Rick Hanson
Marty Zvirbulis
Nadeem Majaj
Sheri Rojo
Todd Corbin
John Bosler
Justin Scott-Coe
Sandra Rose

Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Cucamonga Valley Water District
City of Chino Hills
Fontana Water Company
Jurupa Community Services District
Cucamonga Valley Water District
Monte Vista Water District
Monte Vista Water District

Terry Catlin
 Ryan Shaw
 Eunice Ulloa
 Curtis Paxton
 Jack Safely
 Darron Poulsen
 Rick Reese
 Marsha Westropp

Inland Empire Utilities Agency
 Inland Empire Utilities Agency
 Chino Basin Water Conservation District
 Chino Desalter Authority
 Western Municipal Water District
 City of Pomona
 Amec
 Orange County Water District

Chair Hoerning called the Advisory Committee meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

AGENDA - ADDITIONS/REORDER

There were no additions or reorders made to the agenda.

I. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. MINUTES

1. Minutes of the annual Advisory Committee Meeting held January 17, 2013

B. FINANCIAL REPORTS

1. Cash Disbursements for the month of December 2012
2. Watermaster VISA Check Detail for the month of December 2012
3. Combining Schedule for the Period July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012
4. Treasurer's Report of Financial Affairs for the Period December 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012
5. Budget vs. Actual Report for the Period July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012

Motion by Geye, second by Russo-Pereyra, and by unanimous vote

Moved to approve Consent Calendar Items A through B, as presented

II. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. NINTH AMENDMENT TO THE CHINO BASIN CYCLIC STORAGE AGREEMENT

Chair Hoerning introduced this item and noted this item was moved by the three Pools; although, the Appropriative Pool was a majority vote for the approval. Chair Hoerning asked for a motion on this item.

Mr. Burton stated he had some questions and they are more for Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) rather than Watermaster. Mr. Burton stated in looking at the agreement he is trying to understand the mechanics of how this agreement works which led to questions. Mr. Burton offered some examples of his questions. Mr. Kavounas stated the Cyclic Storage Agreement calls for written permission from IEUA and Watermaster to put water in the basin when it is available. The water would then be available for a later purchase by the parties. The water would be paid for at the time that it is extracted from the basin. The agreement calls for a replenishment rate, which does not exist at this point in time. If this program was to be used in the future, at the time when Metropolitan Water District (MWD) is given written permission to put water in the basin, it would be specified, at that time, with information that would be known best at that time about the losses and the rate that would be used to extract. It will not be the replenishment rate as it has been known in the past; it may be pushed into Tier II at this point in time based on what is known today. If the called-for amount of acre-feet is to be taken out today, that would still be under the Tier I rate because IEUA's Tier I cap has been pushed out by 33,000 acre-feet. What happens in the future is anybody's guess; there has been an uncertainty the entire life of this agreement because of replenishment rate changes.

Mr. Burton stated his next question is regarding number 3 of the amendment and he read that section of the agreement. Mr. Burton offered some examples on how this scenario could play out regarding that section. Mr. Kavounas stated it seems to be a provision of fairness for both parties and in this case it is to protect MWD; MWD is basically placing this water in trust. They

want some assurance that Watermaster is not going to renege on the contract and just keep the water and walk away. Mr. Kavounas stated if we decide to use the Cyclic Storage Agreement it needs to be done with full awareness that the parties are buying the water. A discussion regarding this matter ensued. Mr. Burton stated maybe the agreement could be amended. Mr. Burton inquired if the water is not bought and must be paid for; has that been determined, and will it be a 50/50 split between IEUA's member agencies and the Appropriative Pool. Mr. Burton inquired if it is allowed to have water be put in storage, how's that approval granted. Mr. Kavounas stated the approval process is as with everything else, it would go through the entire Watermaster process. Mr. Kavounas stated with regard to the percentages of who pays, he is not aware of who pays what or if that has ever been determined.

Counsel Herrema stated the way the agreement is set up now it is difficult to project and understand what the end allocation costs may be. Once this is done, the parties will have one more check-in before any water is put into storage. If water is put in storage and it is needed for replenishment, that call can be made. Counsel Herrema offered comment on when the agreement terminates.

Mr. Burton stated he supported this item at the Appropriative Pool meeting; however there were a few agencies there that had a few questions that needed answers, which caused him to look at the Agreement closer. Mr. Burton offered his concerns for the City of Ontario regarding the purchasing of that water.

Mr. Kinsey stated he feels Mr. Burton's comments are relevant. Mr. Kinsey offered comment on reoccurring replenishment obligations, Dry Year Yield (DYY), and this matter. Mr. Kinsey stated if there is an approval process, that approval should be directly granted to the Pool or Pools that it affects.

Ms. Layton inquired when this water becomes available, how much time will the parties have to make a decision on whether the water wants to be taken or not. Mr. Kavounas stated this has not happened over the last few years. Parties/Watermaster could probably see the circumstances for this program being used and developing over a few months time as fall and winter of a particular year come through and it can be seen that the Colorado River has an abundant supply to deliver, and conditions are such that MWD has all its storage topped off; scenarios can start to be imagined. Mr. Kavounas stated there should be a few months worth of warning that this might be coming which would allow a few months for a decision to be made.

Mr. Kinsey stated he believes that MWD thinks this is their last resort for this water and this would probably be the last place they would want to put it. This provides a tremendous benefit for them to park water. Mr. Kinsey noted he has concerns and there are struggles regarding the value of the storage program with benefit to the basin and benefit to MWD, and this is just a tool to bring water into the basin. This is a good management strategy and there are other tools available to accomplish that same goal. Mr. Kinsey stated he sees some real hesitancy and this is not the first time the parties have discussed this situation. Mr. Kinsey spoke on the 2%, losses and storage, and he noted this is a different way to look at this and offered further comment on his concerns.

Ms. Russo-Pereyra stated she thinks Mr. Kinsey brings up some very good issues and she would like to hear from IEUA as it is her understanding they have already signed the Agreement.

Mr. Shaw stated IEUA has signed the Agreement, and IEUA agrees with what Mr. Kavounas has stated at the Pool meetings and at this meeting today. This is a low risk program, especially without a true replenishment program going forward, and IEUA felt it actually increased the value of this type of storage program. Mr. Shaw stated he understands Mr. Kinsey's comments and concerns.

Ms. Russo-Pereyra asked that Mr. Shaw address some of the questions that Mr. Burton had.

Mr. Shaw stated he feels that Mr. Kavounas covered that; however, the water gets put into the storage account for free at the time, Watermaster and IEUA have the authority to decide when to pull it out, and when it is pulled out it is at the applicable price. Mr. Shaw stated he does not think it would count towards the Tier I allotment.

Mr. Burton inquired if IEUA purchases this, or some portion of this, on behalf of its member agencies, how would that bill be paid.

Mr. Shaw stated if MWD ended the contract early, and there is water in the account, that would have to be figured out at that time, and there is nothing in the Agreement that states one way or another. Mr. Burton offered comments on this matter and noted he does not think there is a mechanism to address this matter. Mr. Burton stated he just does not want to see an agency forced into purchasing water that they do not have the money for. Mr. Kavounas stated he understands the parties concerns over this matter. Mr. Kavounas stated staff sees this is a concern and that this must be addressed by the Watermaster group.

Chair Hoerning stated typically this has been exercised to provide for replenishment water needs; however, if the occasion arises where MWD wants to get paid for that water and there is no replenishment need then valid points have been raised in these discussions. Chair Hoerning stated she does not know how to accomplish this so that there are not potential burdens placed on parties not interested in that opportunity.

Counsel Herrema stated that buyout mechanism could be a contingency or it could be something that the overall greater approval is predicated on. At the time of any water potentially being placed into storage, in addition to the other terms that would need to be decided on, the parties could at that time say they won't agree to put water into storage until there is an agreement amongst ourselves of what this buyout would look like. Counsel Herrema stated he agrees with what Mr. Kavounas stated that this is something that is within the Watermaster house, and the involvement from MWD or IEUA at that point, is what the greater approval is contingent upon.

Mr. Kavounas stated in planning forward possibly four years from now, if MWD comes in and says they have 50,000 acre-feet, it comes to the parties for a vote, and if the risk is too great then the parties have the choice to say no or to have contingencies placed upon it.

Mr. Burton offered comment on this coming to this Committee from a majority vote Pool process. Mr. Burton stated what he is looking for is to not be subjected to having to purchase that water. Mr. Burton noted if there was just some way this approval was conditioned upon addressing this issue. Mr. Kavounas asked if Mr. Burton had any suggestions and Mr. Burton stated not today.

Mr. Kavounas stated a thought for today is that this goes forward with the extending of the Cyclic Storage Agreement and the concerns are all later worked out, including all the concerns addressed at today's meeting. Mr. Kavounas stated all those items mentioned are things that can be worked out and there is the time to still work those out.

Mr. Kinsey inquired about the downside of waiting to sign the Agreement since it has already lapsed. Mr. Kinsey inquired about taking a month or two to work out those issues in advance; it appears there are other viable options.

Mr. Kavounas stated there a lot of uncertainties, and the agreement comes at no cost. Mr. Kavounas noted staff does not know what MWD would do if Watermaster told them this is going to be put on hold for more investigation of terms. The recommendation is to approve this renewal because it does not cost anything and Watermaster can always refuse MWD's offer to put water in storage.

Mr. Kinsey stated he would really hate to see a debate between the Watermaster Board who thinks there is value and the Pools who have real concerns who are paying for it. Mr. Kinsey offered history on Watermaster decision making processes.

Ms. Russo-Pereyra stated she understands and appreciates the comments being made today; however, she knows how long it takes to move things through the Watermaster process and cautions all on working on the what if scenarios. Ms. Russo-Pereyra stated her vote would be to just get this going and take note of the issues, and then start to discuss those issues outside of this process.

Mr. Burton stated there have been enough issues raised at the Pool level and today and none of them are in addressed in the staff report. Mr. Burton inquired what if this takes another month to try and craft some of the issues mentioned and then bring this back with more clarity, which would give the City of Ontario more comfort in a motion.

Mr. Craig stated at the recent Appropriative Pool meeting last week discussions took place regarding storage losses, and the desire to make sure there was full and complete acknowledgment and transparency of MWD; this is one of our fundamental factors in placing water in storage under this agreement. Mr. Craig stated in the interest of moving the agreement forward, maybe it is considered that in the transmittal letter that it states the Agreement has been approved by Watermaster; however, it will be subject to clear communication as part of that transmittal letter. Mr. Craig stated this will get the agreement to MWD with some of our fundamental concerns communicated along the way.

Mr. Pierson stated the Agricultural Pool approved this with the understanding that a term sheet would be coming back to the Pools for approval. Mr. Pierson stated he somewhat agrees with the comments made today, and if one more month was spent to identify those issues that could be placed in the term sheet that could satisfy the opposing parties; maybe spend a month on the creation of the term sheet. Mr. Pierson stated everyone has a voice on this matter and it should be heard.

Mr. Kavounas stated he is concerned about bringing this back next month in light of the workload that Watermaster has over the next few weeks, and he does not know if staff could prepare something that captures and expresses everything which realistically could push this extension back another two months as all the parties would have to review the newly created product.

Chair Hoerning inquired about the downside if this Committee asked that this item be brought back in two months, and it may even need to go back through the Pool process.

Mr. Kavounas stated the only risk at this point in time would be giving MWD a signal that Watermaster is struggling with this and we may not be interested in the end. MWD has expressed the desire to extend the agreement. Mr. Kavounas stated this could slightly increase the risk of the Cyclic Storage not being available to Watermaster; not necessarily a fatal flaw but it is a chance because the agreement has lapsed. It has lapsed in the past and did get renewed after its expiration date.

Chair Hoerning stated alternatively Watermaster could do something similar to what Mr. Craig suggested, which is encapsulate these items in a cover letter back to MWD saying these are the elements that need to be addressed before the Watermaster would consider putting any water in storage.

Mr. Kavounas stated with the signed copy being sent back to MWD staff could include a transmittal letter that states that water put in this account today will have losses of 6%, and the rate would be Tier I. Mr. Kavounas stated it would be noted that it is likely to change if at some point in the future MWD comes back and actually has water to put in. Whatever the storage and rate realities are, then those would control.

Chair Hoerning stated for the comfort of the parties here, maybe a draft transmittal letter could be put together and brought back next month. Mr. Kavounas stated that could be done for the Watermaster Board meeting next month.

A discussion regarding Mr. Kavounas' suggested transmittal letter ensued.

Chair Hoerning stated with the discussions there are a couple options before the Committee today; this could move forward with the caveat of providing that cover letter before the Watermaster Board meeting next month or just direct Watermaster staff to prepare that and bring back the following month for action at that time.

Mr. Burton stated he likes the idea about a term sheet and with respect to the City of Ontario's concern he could craft the language that would be agreeable to this Committee for the term sheet to assist in Watermaster staff time. Mr. Burton stated he likes the idea of coming back next month with possibly a term sheet or more clarification in the agenda staff letter, maybe along with a draft letter.

Mr. Kinsey asked if that was a motion, and if it was, he would second that motion.

A lengthy discussion regarding this matter ensued.

Counsel Herrema stated he would like some clarity on the term sheet and the motion.

Mr. Burton stated the term sheet would accompany this staff report, or it could even be in the staff report, that addresses the issues that were brought up today and provide some clarification; it is the term sheet that attempts to address the concerns brought up today.

Counsel Herrema inquired those would be proposals that would be incorporated in to the approval. Mr. Burton stated, yes. Counsel Herrema inquired then that would be proposed to MWD and IEUA as a condition to the approval, or is it separate from that. Mr. Burton stated it is both; the issues that Monte Vista Water District and the City of Chino Hills have brought up potentially can be addressed by the cover letter that would go to MWD. Mr. Burton stated the issue that the City of Ontario brought up is internal within Watermaster and it would just go along with the approval to clarify that these things will be worked out before water is put into storage. This would include IEUA.

Chair Hoerning inquired if that is something that needs to go back through to the Pools and then to the Advisory Committee next month. Counsel Herrema stated he advises that because this seems to be a material change.

A discussion regarding the issues discussed and this matter ensued.

Mr. Crosley inquired if there could be a payment schedule, or is payment due within thirty-days after the Agreement no longer ceases to exist due to termination or expiration or can the parties also discuss how long the parties can take to pay.

Mr. Kavounas stated this can all be discussed; the payment could be according to the take schedule, and he offered comment on how that would look. Mr. Kavounas stated a lot of the discussions are what ifs, and our way might be lost in trying to address all these issues. Mr. Kavounas stated maybe a simple workaround could be if the Appropriative Pool votes to buy the water and some appropriators, because of their own calculus, have voted no on it, then if there is a time when there is forced buyout then they don't buy anything out, and only those who voted yes will buy it. Mr. Kavounas stated the motion as he understands it, is that Watermaster come back next month with a staff report that lays out what those topics are, and it makes it clear

that those concerns would have to be answered before Watermaster says yes to the purchase of any water.

Mr. Burton stated yes that is the motion. A discussion regarding the motion ensued.

Motion by Burton, second by Kinsey, and by unanimous vote

Moved to bring the item back to the Pools for discussion during the March Pool meetings to review all the issues raised at the Advisory Committee meeting, as presented

B. WATERMASTER MID-YEAR REVIEW AND BUDGET TRANSFERS

Mr. Kavounas introduced the Watermaster Mid-Year Review and Budget Transfer item. Mr. Joswiak gave the presentation for the Mid-Year Review Report for the Period July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.

Mr. Kinsey inquired about the cost to do the annotated Judgment. Mr. Kinsey stated he thought the court wanted a revised Judgment but not an annotated Judgment and offered further comment on this matter. Mr. Kinsey asked for where the court specifically asked for an annotated Judgment. Mr. Kinsey inquired about Watermaster staff's workload and noted this will take a lot of time, effort, and money on this project. Mr. Kinsey asked that legal provide documentation where the court asked for an annotated version of the Judgment.

Counsel Herrema stated the Annotated Judgment, as it is included in the budget, is shorthand for three different projects. The first is the Restated Judgment process that was required by the court based on the initial submittal with that conditionality language which was rejected. A process was then followed by Watermaster legal counsel and counsel for the Pools in getting to an agreement as to what could be presented to the court; that was approved through the Watermaster process and by the court. Counsel Herrema stated the second aspect was the Annotated Judgment and the third aspect, which is all included in the paragraph budget memo that was presented to Watermaster at the time of the budget process and was approved, was the updating of the Rules and Regulations. The Rules and Regulations were last formally updated in 2001 and since that time pursuant to the Peace II Agreement, the court specifically directed and the parties agreed, to make certain amendments to the Rules and Regulations. Counsel Herrema stated technically the Rules and Regulations have been approved and they should be followed; however, they have not been incorporated into that larger document. These documents are on Watermaster's website and in all of the guidance documents binders. Counsel Herrema stated with regard to the Annotated Judgment, this specific request pre-dates him as Watermaster's legal counsel; however, Watermaster has been proceeding based on specific direction from the Watermaster's Board.

Motion by Kinsey, second by Pierson, and by unanimous vote

Moved to approve (1) Staff recommendation that the Mid-Year Review Report for the Period July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 be received and filed as presented, and (2) Staff recommendation for approval of the Budget Transfer Form T-13-02-01, as presented

Counsel Herrema stated he would like to move directly into the Legal Counsel Report section of the agenda at this point in time.

III. REPORTS/UPDATES

A. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT

1. Annotated Judgment and Updated Rules and Regulations

Counsel Herrema stated Watermaster is going to bring a strawman which will be a barebones draft of cross-references to anyone that wants to be involved to flush that document out of annotations that all think are important. The goal is that this document is not a Watermaster legal counsel driven document; it is intended to

be a process where a base document is presented and is reviewed through a collaborative process. Counsel Herrema stated the initial document is almost complete and counsel will be meeting with the various Pool counsels to initiate that process shortly. Counsel Herrema stated there is a substantial completed draft Rules and Regulations which will be brought through the entire Watermaster process in the next few months.

Mr. Pierson stated it seems like the dollars allotted for this has already been spent and are the numbers are correct.

Counsel Herrema stated a lot of the work that was done for the Restated Judgment has been done along with the other documents noted. Some of the work on the Rules and Regulations was done prior to this year. We are staying on budget with this item.

Mr. Kinsey inquired if the \$57,000 covers all those items. Counsel Herrema stated yes, that budgeted amount has covered those within this year.

Chair Hoerning inquired about the total anticipated budget to accomplish those three tasks. Counsel Herrema stated that is not known to him because this does pre-date him as being Watermaster's legal counsel and he noted he can look that up.

Mr. Kinsey stated with the discussions today he would move staff recommendations regarding the Mid-Year Review and approval for the Budget Transfer.

C. 2013 AMENDMENT TO THE 2010 RECHARGE MASTER PLAN UPDATE SECTION 6

Chair Hoerning introduced this item and noted this item has gone through the Pool process and had a few modifications which are identified in today's meeting package. Chair Hoerning stated those changes were to remove costs out of table 6-1 and to remove any duplicative projects that may be listed, including the group projects based upon site of the facilities and improvements being recommended.

Motion by Pierson, second by Craig, and by unanimous vote

Moved to approve the 2013 amendment to the 2010 Recharge Master Plan Update Section 6: "Recharge Options to Improve Yield and Assure Sustainability", as presented

D. FUNDING OF THE POMONA CREDIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012/2013

Chair Hoerning introduced this item and noted this item is for the funding of the Pomona credit for fiscal year 2012/2013. Chair Hoerning stated this went through the Pool process and there was a request made by the Appropriative Pool, which is included in the recommendation, which is to defer payment of the Pomona credit and to take that payment out of reserves, and then reconcile that payment with double payments next fiscal year through the assessment package process.

Motion by Layton, second by Craig, and by unanimous vote

Moved to approve to fund payment from existing Watermaster cash reserves in Fiscal Year 2012/2013 with double Appropriative Assessments in Fiscal Year 2013/2014, as presented

III. REPORTS/UPDATES

A. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT

1. Annotated Judgment and Updated Rules and Regulations

This item was taken out of order during the Watermaster Mid-Year Review and Budget Transfers business item.

B. ENGINEERING REPORT1. Demonstration on HydroDaVE

Mr. Kavounas stated most parties have seen this presentation; for those who have not seen it and want to today, the presentation can be given after the Advisory Committee. Mr. Kavounas noted the RMPU Steering Committee meeting was scheduled to start at 10:00 a.m. and for those who are attending that meeting; it will start directly after this meeting.

C. GM REPORT1. Save the Date – Refresh, Recharge, and Reunite

Mr. Kavounas spoke on the Refresh Recharge, and Reunite event. Mr. Kavounas stated Cucamonga Valley Water District has graciously offered to provide breakfast and lunch for this event and he thanked them for assistance.

2. Website Survey

Mr. Joswiak gave the Website Survey presentation.

D. INLAND EMPIRE UTILITIES AGENCY1. MWD Update – Oral

Mr. Shaw offered comment on storage programs with MWD. Mr. Shaw showed a few slides and discussed this item.

2. IEUA 2ND Quarter Water Newsletter

No comment was made.

3. State and Federal Legislative Reports

No comment was made.

4. Community Outreach/Public Relations Report

No comment was made.

E. OTHER METROPOLITAN MEMBER AGENCY REPORTS

Mr. Hansen offered comment on Metropolitan Water District.

IV. INFORMATION1. Cash Disbursements for January 2013

No comment was made.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Kinsey stated local agencies have done an excellent job introducing water into storage and that he believes the DYY participants are close to crafting a proposal to provide to MWD member agencies which achieves the goals of the program.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

No comment was made.

No confidential session was called.

VII. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION - POSSIBLE ACTION

Pursuant to the Advisory Committee Rules & Regulations, a Confidential Session may be held during the Watermaster Pool meeting for the purpose of discussion and possible action.

VIII. FUTURE MEETINGS AT WATERMASTER

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| Thursday, February 21, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. | IEUA DYY Meeting |
| Thursday, February 21, 2013 | 9:00 a.m. | Advisory Committee Meeting |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---|
| Thursday, February 21, 2013 | 10:00 a.m. | CB RMPU Steering Committee Meeting |
| Thursday, February 28, 2013 | 11:00 a.m. | Watermaster Board Meeting |
| Thursday, March 7, 2013 | 10:00 a.m. | CB RMPU Steering Committee Meeting |
| Tuesday, March 12, 2013 | 7:30 a.m. | Refresh, Recharge and Reunite – Frontier Project |
| Thursday, March 14, 2013 | 9:00 a.m. | Appropriative Pool Meeting |
| Thursday, March 14, 2013 | 11:00 a.m. | Non-Agricultural Pool Conference Call Meeting |
| Thursday, March 14, 2013 | 1:30 p.m. | Agricultural Pool Meeting |
| Thursday, March 21, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. | IEUA DYY Meeting |
| Thursday, March 21, 2013 | 9:00 a.m. | Advisory Committee Meeting |
| Thursday, March 21, 2013 | 10:00 a.m. | CB RMPU Steering Committee Meeting |
| Tuesday, March 26, 2013 | 9:00 a.m. | GRCC Meeting |
| Thursday, March 28, 2013 | 11:00 a.m. | Watermaster Board Meeting |
| Tuesday, April 16, 2013 | 9:30 a.m. | Budget Workshop |

Chair Hoerning adjourned the Advisory Committee meeting at 10:42 a.m.

Secretary: _____

Minutes Approved: March 21, 2013