

Minutes
CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER
AGRICULTURAL POOL MEETING
September 13, 2012

The Agricultural Pool Meeting was held at the offices of Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, CA, on September 13, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.

Agricultural Pool Members Present

Bob Feenstra, Chair	Dairy
Nathan deBoom	Dairy
Gene Koopman	Milk Producers Council
Jeff Pierson	Crops
Glen Durrington	Crops
Helen Arens	State of California, Department of Justice
Pete Hall	State of California, CIM

Watermaster Board Members Present

Paul Hofer	Crops
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel	Dairy

Watermaster Staff Present

Peter Kavounas	General Manager
Ken Jeske	Interim CEO
Danielle Maurizio	Assistant General Manager
Joe Joswiak	Chief Financial Officer
Sherri Molino	Recording Secretary

Watermaster Consultants Present

Brad Herrema	Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber & Schreck
--------------	-------------------------------------

Others Present

Tracy Egoscue	Egoscue Law Group
Dave Crosley	City of Chino
Gil Aldaco	City of Chino
Paul Deutsch	Amec
Rick Reese	Amec
Bob Gluck	City of Ontario
Brian Dickenson	Chino Desalter Authority

Chair Feenstra called the Agricultural Pool meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

AGENDA - ADDITIONS/REORDER

Chair Feenstra discussed the Agricultural Pool quorum and noted that the Pool needed to discuss the representatives from the State of California.

Chair Feenstra stated he wanted to take this time to welcome Peter Kavounas to our first official Agricultural Pool meeting. Chair Feenstra stated he and Mr. Pierson had the pleasure of previously meeting Peter at an introduction meeting. Mr. Pierson welcomed Peter and noted it is a tough loss for us with Ken; however, we will try and make it an easy transition. Chair Feenstra introduced each of the Pool members and Ms. Egoscue, the Agricultural Pool legal counsel.

I. CONSENT CALENDAR**A. MINUTES**

1. Minutes of the Agricultural Pool Meeting held July 12, 2012

B. FINANCIAL REPORTS

1. Cash Disbursements for the month of June 2012
2. Watermaster VISA Check Detail for the month of June 2012
3. Combining Schedule for the Period July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
4. Treasurer's Report of Financial Affairs for the Period June 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012
5. Budget vs. Actual Report for the Period July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012
6. Cash Disbursements for the month of July 2012
7. Watermaster VISA Check Detail for the month of July 2012
9. Combining Schedule for the Period July 1, 2011 through July 31, 2012
9. Treasurer's Report of Financial Affairs for the Period July 1, 2012 through July 31, 2012
10. Budget vs. Actual Report for the Period July 1, 2011 through July 31, 2012

C. OBMP SEMI-ANNUAL STATUS REPORT 2012-1

Motion by Durrington, second by Koopman, and by unanimous vote

Moved to approve Consent Calendar items A through C, as presented

II. BUSINESS ITEMS**A. COST SHARING AGREEMENT BETWEEN WATERMASTER AND INLAND EMPIRE UTILITIES AGENCY**

Mr. Kavounas stated this is the approval of a Cost Sharing Agreement, which is the necessary next step for a project which has already approved and is in the budget. Mr. Kavounas stated this Cost Sharing Agreement is in line with the Bright Line agreement between Watermaster and Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA). Mr. Kavounas stated the project is briefly described in the staff letter and it comes out from one of the obligations of the mitigation measures from the EIR that came out of the Peace II Agreement. Mr. Kavounas noted costs will be split 50/50 between Watermaster and IEUA; total costs of \$440,000. Mr. Kavounas stated part of that agreement is that IEUA will be applying for a grant; if the grant is received the total costs will be reduced and the remaining balance will be split 50/50. Mr. Kavounas stated the agreement is shown as a draft Cost Sharing Agreement; however, IEUA has finished their review and that will now be changed and will go as a final to the Advisory Committee and Watermaster Board later this month.

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

Moved to approve the cost sharing agreement between Chino Basin Watermaster and Inland Empire Utilities Agency, as presented

B. DATA REQUEST FOR PRIVATE PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Chair Feenstra stated he had asked Watermaster staff to put this item on the agenda for today. Chair Feenstra stated in the Chino Basin, the City of Ontario and the City of Chino are both very involved in the water transactions - everything that is included in the basin; with properties being offered for sale, and there are some properties that are in escrow, and in order to clear escrow, there are requirements to understand what is in the ground as far as water quality information before escrow can be closed. Chair Feenstra stated he received a call from Peter Herringsma, realtor, about a piece of property that is under consideration right now on Chino Avenue. They need a review and information about water quality of the three wells which are on the property, but they would also like background that we have on file regarding the quality of the water, especially as it relates to any contamination. Chair Feenstra stated the only way he can get this information, in discussing this with Ms. Maurizio, was by filling out a form on behalf of that resident/property owner; however, Mr. Kavounas said some action needs to be taken from this Pool.

Mr. Kavounas stated, from his understanding, it is the custom of Watermaster that a process be gone through by mailing a letter to everyone who may have data that could be useful. Mr. Kavounas stated along with that, a postcard is included which they are instructed to send back to Watermaster if they object to the data being released. Staff then waits for a few weeks and if no postcards are received, staff releases the data that has been requested. Mr. Kavounas stated that is Watermaster's practice and in line of the policy of not releasing data unless authorized to do so. Mr. Kavounas stated what is being recommended by staff today is to follow that practice unless the committee chooses to do otherwise. Mr. Koopman stated he understands what the chair is saying in that it is our policy, and basically that is when a 3rd party has asked for the information. Mr. Koopman stated although this matter, from what he understands, it is an owner that has requested the information. This appears to be the land owner that has requested that information, which is different than the policy that we have for giving information to a 3rd party. Mr. Koopman stated he personally thinks they should know about the land on their own property and be given that information. Chair Feenstra stated he was told by staff that the land owner can certainly take samples on their own for their own property. Ms. Maurizio stated she wanted to make a clarification that the land owner, at any time, can request water quality data for their own properties; it only takes filling out a simple form. Ms. Maurizio stated in this case the land owner wants water quality data for a radius surrounding their property. Mr. Koopman stated that is not how he understood this transaction and staff is correct if they want well data from around the surrounding area; that goes back to our policy. Ms. Maurizio stated in this particular case there are three wells on the property and only one of them has water quality data, and that data is from 2000, so they are not going to gain a whole lot of information from that data. Ms. Maurizio offered the history on the water quality data collection on this property. Mr. deBoom inquired as to why the property owner want this data. Chair Feenstra stated the developer that is buying this property wants to know the quality of the water in that area mainly because that dairy may be continued to be used as a milk producing facility. Chair Feenstra stated they want to know that whatever they do with the property, does it contain drinkable water or what the water condition is. Chair Feenstra stated there are several large green tanks on the property which put up red flags. Mr. deBoom stated that will not affect the development of the property. Chair Feenstra stated it will not affect the development of the property; it affects the buyer paying for that property. A lengthy discussion regarding this matter ensued. Mr. Kavounas stated it is his understanding that the data is being requested by the realtor. Chair Feenstra stated it was presented to him, so he made the call to Watermaster. Chair Feenstra offered further details on the phone call he received from Mr. Harringsma. Ms. Maurizio stated this request came from Chair Feenstra and she also heard from the realtor who wanted to know some general water quality information, and he was referred to the State of the Basin Report because that has some general summaries which are all public information on our website. Chair Feenstra offered comment on property owners wanting to know the water quality on their property and how that quality could affect that property – and if I were a buyer, I would want to know as much as possible about the water quality. Mr. Koopman inquired if we have access to the Aerojet, Boeing, General Electric, and Lockheed (ABGL) collected water sampling data. Ms. Maurizio stated she knows we have the recent samples; however, she does not know if we have the historic ones. Mr. Koopman stated this property has tanks on it and is being served potable water by the City of Ontario – how was it determined that the property needed potable water if the last sampling was done in 2000. Ms. Maurizio stated she will need to look into that. Ms. Maurizio stated Watermaster has the ABGL results and they may have not just made it into the database yet. Ms. Maurizio stated she has not seen the results taken from the past ABGL Group; however, they have shared their more recent results with Watermaster. Mr. Koopman stated the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has done samples on that property for many years now. Ms. Maurizio stated the ABGL Group did tap samples and did not do well samples; it also depends on if there was treatment. Mr. Koopman inquired to the average cost of putting their facility in at that property. Chair Feenstra stated in excess of \$300,000. A discussion regarding the sampling of that property ensued. Chair Feenstra stated he got reports from Lynn Preslo when she represented the ABGL Group and they took well samples in that entire area. Mr. Pierson stated his personal opinion is that we have a policy, and our policy is defined in that that we are not going to divulge information without going through a

process step-by-step. Mr. Pierson stated we also have property owners who are overlying agricultural well users that should have direct access to the information if they request it; If that user asks, we should give it to them, and if a 3rd party asks, whether it is a realtor or a developer they need to go through the owner of the wells for that information. Mr. Pierson stated we argued about this for months to try and get to a position where we are not the keeper of this information to give to the outside community – we do not want the liability of providing the information; it's public information, when its public and other than that, we need to follow our policy/process. Mr. Pierson offered further comments on this matter and noted he does not feel we should be a part of this or we can just participate in a facilitator's capacity. Mr. deBoom inquired if we sent out a letter on Watermaster letterhead on why they want the samples and what we would do in this case. Chair Feenstra stated he did not know they were asking for data that was off their actual property. Chair Feenstra offered comment on the difference between information needed for just their property, opposed to other people's property. Mr. Durrington inquired if all three wells in question are on the actual property. Ms. Maurizio stated yes, those three wells are on the property. Mr. Pierson spoke on this matter and on water quality. Mr. Pierson stated when we get too involved in somebody else's property...where do we stop? Mr. Kavounas stated in light of the fact that they are looking for information beyond the private property which includes wells outside the property area; our recommendation would be to follow the practice which is consistent with the policy by sending out the letters which will be signed by the chair of this Pool and Watermaster. Chair Feenstra stated people will not let anyone give out their private water quality data. Ms. Egoscue stated she wants to ask a clarifying question in that was the original request for the representative sample outside the three wells or is that recommendation that was made by Watermaster because of the lack of information on the two wells; how did that distinction come about. Ms. Maurizio stated it was from a telephone conversation with and from Chair Feenstra; the question was presented about radius during that call. Ms. Egoscue stated her suggestion for this matter is a two-step process; to give the onsite data immediately to them and then the process for the radius needs to occur, and then go with what is needed to adhere to the policy for release of data. Chair Feenstra offered more information on this matter and apologized for anything misunderstood during his conversation with Ms. Maurizio and noted they only asked for their well data. Chair Feenstra offered comment on what the ABGL Group sampled. Ms. Maurizio stated Watermaster went out and sampled, we did tap and well and they only took from the tap. Chair Feenstra stated ABGL Group and Wildermuth Environmental (WEI) might have the needed information. Mr. Koopman stated if WEI has it then Watermaster will also have it. Chair Feenstra called for a motion. A discussion regarding this matter and a motion ensued. Counsel Herrema asked for clarification on the motion. The motion was reiterated to staff and counsel as presented in the motion by Mr. Koopman.

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

Moved to approved providing the water quality well information that Watermaster has on this particular property on a letter signed by Agnes Vander Dussen-Koetsier and also to provide her with additional information on who she could contact, and b) Any other information needed outside the parameter of those three wells will need to go through the Watermaster Release of Data Procedure, as presented

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. IEUA Ordinance 70 – Meter Charge/Readiness-to-Serve Update

Mr. Kavounas stated this item is from a follow up from its meeting in July Agricultural Pool meeting for an IEUA ordinance charge. Mr. Jeske stated the summary for this matter is that IEUA is no longer going to charge us for this ordinance charge. The parties thanked IEUA for the prompt response on this matter. Mr. Koopman offered final history and comment on this matter.

III. REPORTS/UPDATES**A. LEGAL REPORT**1. Hearing on CSI Paragraph 15 Motion

Counsel Herrema stated this item is regarding the July 20, 2012 hearing on the California Steel Industries (CSI) Paragraph 15 motion. Counsel Herrema stated at the July 13, 2012 Pool meeting a report was provided on CSI's then pending Paragraph 15 motion. That motion requested that the court confirm that the effect that some of its prior orders was to establish a joint ownership interest among CSI and Aqua Capital Management (ACM) in some disputed water rights. Counsel Herrema stated those water rights have been the subject of a separately pending quiet title action which is pending before a different judge based on the 170.6 preemptory challenge to Judge Reichert hearing that. Counsel Herrema stated at the time we talked two months ago CSI's motion was pending and there had been no other filings. Counsel Herrema stated at that point the Watermaster Board did not direct any participation by Watermaster legal counsel. Counsel Herrema stated after that meeting CSI's follow-up pleading was filed and the Watermaster Board directed legal counsel to file a partial joinder to CSI's motion. Counsel Herrema stated that pleading took no position on the ultimate issue, which was whether or not ACM was a legitimate purchaser of those water rights free and clear without regard to any CSI ownership interest; that was filed on July 19, 2012, and July 20, 2012 was the hearing. Counsel Herrema stated at that hearing Judge Reichert came prepared with a draft order. In that order the Judge indicated that Paragraph 15 did not compel him to make any order granting the relief requested by CSI. Counsel Herrema stated the Judge did not want to make any order that could be seen as interfering with the separately pending quiet title action because he had been preemptively challenged from participating in that particular litigation. Counsel Herrema stated all the pleadings and the order have been posted to Watermaster's FTP site. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel inquired to counsel if there was any update as to the action in Judge Ochoa's court. Counsel Herrema stated he believes there has been no further action.

2. Motion for Adoption of Restated Judgment, Transmittal of Annual Report, and Request for Approval of Intervention

Counsel Herrema stated this item is for the filing of the motion for adoption of the Restated Judgment, transmittal of the Annual Report, and the request for approval on an Intervention which was filed on Monday, September 10, 2012. Counsel Herrema stated the Restated Judgment was approved by the Pools, Advisory Committee, and Watermaster Board and there was no deadline from the court to file that other than at Watermaster's convenience. Counsel Herrema noted the adoption of the Restated Judgment was done when Mr. McKinney was here in the absence of Ms. Egoscue. Counsel Herrema stated the Annual Report was presented to the parties in July and approved by all. Counsel Herrema stated the intervention was approved by all Pools, Advisory Committee, and Watermaster Board back in February. Counsel Herrema offered a brief description of the intervention. Counsel Herrema stated what is typically done for filings are to aggregate any intervention requests and try and file them collectively in groups to assist in saving on costs. Counsel Herrema noted this was pointed out at the Appropriate Pool meeting this morning that there is one other pending intervention request from the City of Chino which has not been processed with recommendations through the Pools, Advisory Committee and Watermaster Board; this is still to come forward when decisions are made and to how to process it.

3. California Steel Industries Settlement Agreement for Paragraph 31 Motion

Counsel Herrema stated the outstanding appeal issue with CSI has been resolved through a settlement and that settlement has been distributed to all the parties. A discussion regarding this matter ensued.

B. GM REPORT**1. Recharge Master Plan Update/Storage Issues Review Process**

Mr. Kavounas stated this is his second week at Watermaster and he has been working diligently on getting up to speed on all the projects being worked on. Mr. Kavounas stated he did sit in on a Recharge Master Plan Update (RMPU) meeting in August to start the education process sooner. Mr. Kavounas stated the RMPU committee is making progress; however, at the rate we are going, it is going to be a challenge to provide items to the court if we do not get a move on. Mr. Kavounas stated this group has held regular meetings and staff, with the assistance of Mr. Jeske and Mr. Wildermuth has come up with a recommendation that will be presented to the group next Thursday to hopefully get us back on track.

Mr. Jeske stated with regard to recharge, he recently attended a San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) function, which was put on by San Bernardino County. Mr. Jeske stated at SANBAG the county made a presentation on a county vision. Mr. Jeske stated the County of San Bernardino has been collaborating with the community on creating a county vision for education, health care and water, and it is not on the radar that is at a level equal to some of those important public services, which is a good thing. Mr. Jeske stated when looking at that plan, the finding is that within the county as a total, there are adequate water resources to sustain the anticipated demand and population growth within the 20-year planning period, and they are not always reflected in each agency's water supply assessments or Urban Water Management Plans, but in the collective. Mr. Jeske stated the primary team that worked on it was Craig Miller from IEUA and his staff, Kirby Brill from Mojave Water Agency, Doug Hedrick from San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, and Celeste Cantu from SAWPA, it was a good project and process. Mr. Jeske stated they highlighted everything from storm water MS4 facilities, land use planning, urban landscape water conservation and interagency approaches. The presentation will be given again today at other meetings in San Bernardino.

Mr. Jeske stated during his interim position the Watermaster Board asked that he work on storage issues and he did have meetings with the Appropriators; they have met with themselves as a Pool and asked that they come up with straw man proposal. Mr. Jeske stated the Appropriative Pool and Non-Agricultural Pool both suggested a small sub-group to meet with Mr. Kavounas to work through the items that are being recommended to come up with a joint recommendation.

Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel noted his concern regarding the amount of storage space that is in the Chino Basin which was identified in the Peace Agreement, which was really reserved for a joint project that would be a benefit to all of us collectively; however, that has not happened. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel stated over the past 9, 10, or 11 years there has been a lot of water transferred to the appropriators, and then think of all the unpumped agriculture water that was transferred. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel asked that the members recognize all of the growth and reclaimed water that agriculture has been using, and then got traded essentially for water rights that went into the Appropriative Pool. What we find today is that there were limits in the Peace Agreement with limits on how much the individual appropriators could accumulate in these storage accounts. Those limits were based on the Judgment clearly stating that you can't store water without a Storage Agreement and collectively we have not paid a lot of attention, and now there is a lot of water that has accumulated; however, they do not have Storage Agreements but they have all this water. The parties need to get their heads together on what is going to be done to rectify this matter. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel noted the Agricultural Pool has not been invited into those meetings and now they have some ideas on what to do, and now they have brought in the Non-Agricultural Pool but they have not invited the Agricultural Pool, and does this not concern the Agricultural Pool. We as an Agricultural Pool view our role as two-fold. One is to clearly watch our interest as agriculture, and the interests of agriculture in the Chino Basin were defined by those who were there when the Judgment

was written. The idea was, agriculture went along with the Judgment, and all we really wanted out of the Judgment was the ability to operate as agriculture until we eventually transitioned out of the Chino Basin; we all knew eventually this would urbanize. We did not take for ourselves any special proprietary individual property owner property rights in the water right which is unique in the Chino Basin Judgment as opposed to other Judgments where water rights are directly tied to the land. So yes, we have a primary interest to make sure that our farming community can continue to operate and have access to the water; that is our primary goal. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel stated he thinks this Agricultural Pool has also felt that it had a responsibility to stand up for and be a watch dog for the total; the integrity of the Judgment including not only the right to pump the water but also the right to store water. I would challenge, just a little bit, the notion that agriculture does not have an interest, and he would say when the appropriators want this with us, that we could have a full briefing and an analysis as to what the broader public policy implications are of whatever they are proposing. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel stated there is a public good that needs to be accomplished here, respected, and promoted.

Chair Feenstra stated he hopes that Mr. Kavounas notices how much passion there is about agriculture and the issues and discussions that take place.

Mr. Jeske stated he believes the parties are working and saying the same things; however, he has not heard the appropriators say to leave agriculture out of the discussions. Mr. Jeske stated what they have said is that they wanted some time because they have such divergent issues amongst the different types of appropriators, that they wanted to talk through and find out what each other's needs were before they sat down and met with others. In the course of doing just that, and coming up with some recommendations, it was immediately apparent to them that those same recommendations affected parties that had stored water in the Non-Agricultural Pool. Mr. Jeske stated that was made very clear through the entire Paragraph 31 meetings, and even in the settlement agreement discussions that revolve around the settlement agreement, on how those two Pools would communicate to each other. Mr. Jeske stated he has never heard them say to exclude agriculture. Mr. Jeske stated start by working with each of the Pools with the General Manager in pulling them together. Mr. Jeske stated the reason for this item being on the agenda under the report section, is to see what the interest is in the Agricultural Pool. Mr. Jeske stated it is now just time to get this started.

Mr. Durrington stated on the twenty-year plan Mr. Jeske did not mention any reclaimed water – does anybody use reclaimed water besides agriculture. Mr. Jeske stated he did not mention reclaimed water because he did not go through the entire 100 pages of information that is on the county website; yes, reclaimed water was a big element in the plan. Mr. Jeske offered further comment on this matter. A lengthy discussion regarding this matter ensued.

Mr. Hofer stated within the visioning process he would like to know, because it is intriguing to him that the county has taken this on and there seems to be lot of time, effort, and dollars spent on it, and it would be wise, and he is glad Watermaster is tracking this. Mr. Hofer stated he thinks we, as agriculture, should also be tracking all this. Mr. Hofer offered further comment on this matter. Mr. Hofer stated there is enough water for everybody, because San Bernardino is a big county, and he is very interested to see kind of what the end game is for this visioning process, and what the weight is of this document. He would like to see how much input agriculture has had into this on an overall basis.

Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel stated he attended the workshop of the visioning committee and he did have some opportunity to have some input into it. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel offered final comments on this matter. Mr. Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel stated there is plenty of water, but there is not plenty of cheap water.

Chair Feenstra stated the action this Pool wants is to be included in the conversations with each other and to always have representation from the Agricultural Pool. A lengthy discussion regarding the workshops and this matter ensued.

2. Water Activity Reports (WARs)
No comment was made.

IV. INFORMATION

1. Cash Disbursements for August 2012
No comment was made.

V. POOL MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Koopman stated his comments today have to do with agriculture water usage for other purposes, specifically for dairies that are in the City of Ontario and City of Chino who are using agriculture wells. Mr. Koopman stated if somebody is using agriculture water and is an agriculture user we do an intervention; however, what do we do when it is the other way, and how do we get that done? Mr. Koopman discussed this concern further. Chair Feenstra offered comment on Mr. Koopman's concerns and comments. A discussion regarding what is and is not agriculture ensued. Mr. Jeske stated that would be a huge undertaking for Watermaster to take on and there is a whole series of issues related to this matter. Mr. Koopman stated we do get monitoring reports and he would assume that even dairies that are empty would also get that letter to report their production, and he discussed what the form that is to be filled out looked like. Chair Feenstra stated this will be discussed at another meeting. A discussion regarding Caltrans ensued.

Chair Feenstra stated what he would like to see on a future agenda is the uses of recycled water within the Chino Basin, primarily focusing on recycled water for fire flow, etc.

Chair Feenstra stated he is getting requests from a few property owners, from within the Chino Basin, to start receiving bottled water or they may want us to look into whether they should be hooked up a green tank. Chair Feenstra stated there have been people who have specifically asked us to address this with the Watermaster. Chair Feenstra stated this does not have to be addressed today; however, what do we do when we have a request from those in the farmer/dairy preserve requesting potable water, and what are we going to use as the criteria for them being served. Mr. Koopman stated we do not have the authority to do anything with that regard. Chair Feenstra stated it is our fiduciary responsibility that we assure people within the dairy area safe drinking water. A lengthy discussion regarding this matter ensued.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

No comment was made.

The regular open Agricultural Pool meeting was convened to hold its confidential session at 2:37 p.m.

VII. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION - POSSIBLE ACTION

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

1. Agricultural Pool Legal Counsel Report

The confidential session concluded at 3:10 p.m.

The action from the confidential session is for the Agricultural Pool to hold a Special Confidential meeting on Friday, September 21, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. regarding a status updates.

VIII. FUTURE MEETINGS AT WATERMASTER

* Thursday, September 13, 2012	8:00 a.m.	IEUA DYY Meeting
Thursday, September 13, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Appropriative Pool Meeting
Thursday, September 13, 2012	11:00 a.m.	Non-Agricultural Pool Conference Call Mtg.
Thursday, September 13, 2012	1:30 p.m.	Agricultural Pool Meeting
Thursday, September 20, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 20, 2012	10:00 a.m.	CB RMPU Steering Comm. and Storage Mtg.
Tuesday, September 25, 2012	9:00 a.m.	GRCC Meeting
Thursday, September 27, 2012	11:00 a.m.	Watermaster Board Meeting

* Note: IEUA DYY Meeting changed from September 20th to September 13th for this month

Chair Feenstra adjourned the Agricultural Pool meeting at 3:12 p.m.

Secretary: _____

Minutes Approved: October 11, 2012