

**MINUTES**  
**CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER**  
**APPROPRIATIVE POOL MEETING**

June 13, 2013

The Appropriative Pool meeting was held at the offices of Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, CA, on June 13, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.

**APPROPRIATIVE POOL MEMBERS PRESENT**

Marty Zvirbulis, Chair  
John Bosler  
Rosemary Hoerning  
Ron Craig  
Mark Kinsey  
Van Jew  
Seth Zielke  
Tom Harder  
Ben Lewis  
Teri Layton  
J. Arnold Rodriguez  
Todd Corbin

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

**Watermaster Board Members Present**

Bob Craig

Jurupa Community Services District

**Watermaster Staff Present**

Peter Kavounas  
Danielle Maurizio  
Joe Joswiak  
Janine Wilson  
Brenda Corona

General Manager  
Assistant General Manager  
Chief Financial Officer  
Recording Secretary  
Recording Secretary

**Watermaster Consultants Present**

Brad Herrema  
Mark Wildermuth  
Veva Weamer

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

**Others Present**

Jo Lynne Russo-Pereyra  
Nadeem Majaj  
David De Jesus  
Eunice Ulloa  
Dan Chadwick  
Michael Thornton  
Justin Scott-Coe  
Pete Hall  
Josh Swift  
Sheri Rojo  
Curtis Paxton  
Paula Lantz  
Darron Poulsen  
Chuck Hays

Cucamonga Valley Water District  
City of Chino Hills  
Three Valleys Municipal Water District  
CBWCD  
City of Fontana  
TKE  
Monte Vista Water District  
State of California, CIM  
Fontana Water Company  
Fontana Water Company  
Chino Desalter Authority  
City of Pomona  
City of Pomona  
City of Fontana

Chair Zvirbulis called the Appropriative Pool meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**AGENDA - ADDITIONS/REORDER**

Chair Zvirbulis asked Mr. Kavounas if there are any additions or reorders.

Mr. Kavounas stated there is one addition to the agenda and one proposed reorder.

Mr. Kavounas stated in terms of the addition you will find at your place, and also at the back of the room, CBWM has prepared the minutes of the Special Appropriative Pool Meeting that was held on May 16<sup>th</sup>. That meeting was a one item meeting. The item was discussed in closed session; the pool came out of closed session with a motion. The motion was captured in the minutes and Mr. Kavounas stated he realizes this is last minute, so if the pool does not feel comfortable approving them today, it's understandable. However, CBWM feels we have captured the motion well and Mr. Kavounas recommends if it's an acceptable addition, we take that second in the agenda. The first thing we'll do on the agenda is reorder item 3 BI, the Engineering Report, State of the Basin presentation, as the first item of the agenda. The reason is because we have postponed this item once before, it's something that CBWM would like to move forward with and Ms. Weamer with Wildermuth Environmental is in attendance to do the presentation, and we'd like to make her available also to the Non-Agricultural pool to do the same presentation. Moving this item first to the agenda makes sure her presentation will be finished at the Appropriative Pool.

Chair Zvirbulis confirmed Mr. Kavounas wants to take this before the consent calendar and Mr. Kavounas confirmed yes, we'll take that first, take the Special Pool meeting minutes next, and then move on with the remainder of the agenda.

Chair Zvirbulis asked if there were any objections, hearing none, the meeting was reordered.

Ms. Weamer presented her Engineering Report, State of the Basin presentation: Ms. Hoerning stated that there are some water quality constituents that are goals right now, and the EPA is evaluating what should be the MCL, and she thinks if she recalls correctly, some of the background natural occurrences of those constituents are higher than what the EPA may be looking at in terms of establishing the MCL. Ms. Hoerning asked if Watermaster has reached out and contacted or said anything to them expressing a concern over establishing an MCL that's lower than what we can sustain without some sort of treatment or expensive situation. Mr. Kavounas answered that Watermaster has not reached out to advise regulators as to what regulatory limits should be set at. It would be appropriate for Watermaster to express views about how regulatory standards are set in terms of meeting scientific standards, and also opinions as to the impacts that regulatory standards would have. Mr. Kavounas stated this is an effort that generally is undertaken by water districts throughout the state and Watermaster would be happy to add its voice to that effort. Ms. Hoerning stated it would be helpful from her stand point if she got some of that information or guidance from Watermaster as a local jurisdiction to see if we might want to move in that direction given the characterization of the basin. Scott Burton commented that in the past there was a water quality committee and maybe it can be reconvened to discuss that topic. Watermaster has a lot of parties and can potentially send a message for a big group of parties.

No further comments were made.

Mr. Kavounas asked Chair Zvirbulis if he would take the minutes of the Special Appropriative Pool Meeting separate since it was not part of the agenda.

Chair Zvirbulis stated we have the minutes from the Special Appropriative Pool Meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup> that are presented by staff today and asked if we have a motion to approve those minutes.

***Motion to approve the Special Appropriative Pool Meeting Minutes by Craig, second by Burton, and by unanimous vote moved to approve as presented.***

**I. CONSENT CALENDAR****A. MINUTES**

1. Minutes of the Appropriative Pool Meeting held May 9, 2013

Vice Chair Burton would like the word “not” to be inserted into paragraph four, line seven of the May 9, 2013 minutes. The sentence should read: “Vice Chair Burton stated the suggestion about the 10% without doing a salary study is the part, for the City of Ontario, of being something that we could not agree to with a big gulp”.

***Motion to approve by Craig, second by Burton, and by unanimous vote  
Moved to approve the Amended Consent Calendar item A, as presented***

**B. FINANCIAL REPORTS**

1. Cash Disbursements for the month of April 2013
2. Watermaster VISA Check Detail for the month of April 2013
3. Combining Schedule for the Period July 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013
4. Treasurer’s Report of Financial Affairs for the Period April 1, 2013 through April 30, 2013
5. Budget vs. Actual Report for the Period July 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013

***Motion to approve by Ms. Hoerning, second by Burton, and by unanimous vote  
Moved to approve Consent Calendar item B, as presented***

**II. BUSINESS ITEM**

**A. RECHARGE MASTER PLAN UPDATE AMENDMENT**

Mr. Kavounas presented draft number 4 of Section 5 of the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. Draft number 4 is the same version as what was presented to the Steering Committee last Thursday. CBWM accepted the changes that were shown in that draft and made some additions to reflect the comments that were received at that meeting. CBWM believes there is consensus from the Steering Committee on the alternative that is being recommended as how to account for MS4 Recharge, and that is the hybrid alternative 3. The item would require your recommendation to the Advisory Committee to approve in order for the Board to approve.

Mr. Zielke with Fontana Water Company (FWC) stated that FWC appreciates CBWM’s work and diligence with the Recharge Master Plan and its process, and specifically Mr. Kavounas and Mr. Wildermuth. FWC has read the response letter from CBWM to City of Fontana, and appreciates CBWM’s intention of Section 5. However, FWC sees possibly some missed opportunities with allocation. FWC understands the monitoring, reporting, and accounting of what Section 5 represents; however, FWC is still unclear as to how and where exactly this water will be allocated. FWC’s understanding is if allocation is not being discussed or addressed, once the water is monitored, reported, and accounted for, it will be allocated based on Operating Safe Yield, absent another method of being proposed by the Pools. In effect, no action regarding allocation will create an action; that would be based on Operating Safe Yield, and for those who lack or have limited Operating Safe Yield, doesn’t seem to be the best solution. FWC’s position from the beginning has been, whether discussing stormwater, supplemental water, etc. that the party who pays for it and constructs it, should be the party that is the beneficiary of whatever is created from those projects. This position is not new, it’s been consistent, and dates back to a letter that FWC submitted back in November 2012 to CBWM on this very topic. By continuing not to address the element of allocation in a different draft proposal or section, it seems that Operating Safe Yield would be the mechanism used to eventually allocate this particular water, and FWC was under the impression from the conversations of water allocation, would be occurring in a parallel path. That was discussed sometime ago, and those parallel paths in conversation would be conducted with the intention to avoid any delays in sections, and things of that nature. FWC is directly impacted by the lack of recharge of the Chino Basin, specifically MZ3, and FWC has lost capacity due to this lack of recharge, so we’re in support of a proposal that offers a maximum incentive for parties to recharge; FWC always votes in favor of a proposal that would achieve that. Voting in favor of a proposal that wouldn’t achieve that would be taking a position contrary to the 2012 letter. FWC also supports an inclusive dialog among this pool

regarding the element of allocation, how to be incorporated through this process, and eliminate further delays; thus achieving the overarching goal of maximizing recharge in Chino Basin and protecting Operating Safe Yield.

Mr. Hays, Public Works Director for the City of Fontana read part of the Judgment, under section VI, titled Physical Solution. It reads, "pursuant to the mandate of Section 2, Article 10 of the California Constitution the court hereby adopts and orders the parties to comply with a physical solution. The purpose of these provisions is to establish a legal and practical means for making the maximum, maximum beneficial use of the waters of the Chino Basin by providing the optimum economic, long term, conjunctive utilization of surface waters, ground waters and supplemental water, to meet the requirements of water users having rights in or dependant on the Chino Basin." It is essential that this physical solution provide maximum flexibility and adaptability in order that Watermaster and the court be free to use existing and future technological, social, institutional and economic options, in order to maximize beneficial use of the waters of the Chino Basin. Task 5 in its current form does just the opposite of this, it disincentives all land use agencies to construct MS4 or other recharge related projects above and beyond what is mandated by the Regional Board. This doesn't promote the maximum beneficial use of the water in the basin. As written, Task 5 allocates all New Yield captured by MS4 projects to the appropriators based on OSY; this severely disincentives the land use agencies who are also members of the Appropriative Pool from constructing MS4 upgrades above and beyond the minimum requirements. These land use agencies should have the option to capture as much recharge water as possible for the benefit of their constituents. If an agency makes the investment to construct facilities that maximize recharge then that agency should receive the credit. If we don't seize the opportunity we have now as land use agencies and good stewards of the basin to construct recharge projects, the opportunity will be lost forever as development takes place. The City of Fontana has been told repeatedly that task 5 does not allocate MS4 recharge, but that is exactly what this version of Task 5 does. We were also told that discussions with the AP would take place to discuss equitable allocation of benefits, funding sources and incentives and that the AP supported an implementation plan that maximizes the capture of storm water recharge. The current version of Task 5 doesn't work to maximize the capture of storm water, it works to minimize the capture, and the discussion of equitable allocation of benefits, funding sources and incentives has never taken place.

Mr. Hays stated for those reasons the City of Fontana opposes the current version of Task 5, we also intend to pursue innovative and effective MS4 upgrades and other recharge projects within our jurisdiction. Fontana respectfully requests and expects cooperation from the AP and Watermaster in facilitating these projects. The projects will recharge storm water into the Chino Basin that would otherwise flow beyond the basins boundaries. As such the City requests that in calculating MS4 or other storm water recharge for allocation, Watermaster not include projects located within the City's jurisdiction. Fontana would like to see a version of Task 5 similar to the July 19, 2012 version that contained the original language from the 2010 Recharge Master Plan Update, section 7.1 which stated: Watermaster should allocate new yield that is created by new recharge above that required by MS4 compliance to the owners of those projects that create new recharge. This will require the development of (a) new agreements involving the WM and project owners. Now that would be a step in the right direction in carrying out the true intent of the judgment which is to make maximum beneficial use of the waters of the Chino Basin.

Mr. Kavounas stated he appreciates the participation that everyone has given CBWM in developing the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment, not just on Section 5, but all the sections, including Section 8 which is where we're going to be doing a lot of work in the coming months. As far as Section 5, Mr. Kavounas found it to be one of the most interesting exercises at Watermaster. Mr. Kavounas summarized that the Recharge Master Plan was required by the Peace Agreement every five years. It was done in 2005 and in 2010 lacking agreement, it was agreed at that time that the recharge master plan update would be amended to review projects that were proposed in 2010. It was also suggested, since MS4 requirements became a reality, there should be an evaluation as to what happens with MS4 and CBWM should try to quantify

and understand how much of that recharge is due to MS4. The direction that the Appropriative Pool, Advisory Committee, and the Board got from the court was the direction they suggested to the court, which was to create a way to account for any MS4 recharge. MS4 recharge is not something that CBWM has imposed, and if it happens, it will benefit the basin. It's yet to be determined if the current MS4 requirements stay as they are or if they morph over time. There is discussion that MS4 requirements will shift from capturing water at individual development locations to more centralized facilities. In order to complete the 2010 Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment, we followed the order as requested: Develop ways to monitor and account for recharge when it comes from MS4 compliance. Mr. Kavounas understands there are parties that don't get any portion of the Operating Safe Yield, and would like to see this as an opportunity to gain for themselves Operating Safe Yield as a result of complying with MS4, and Mr. Kavounas sees the need for incentivizing recharge, but sees this as a conversation that needs to take place in a broader Watermaster context and not the context of amending the 2010 Recharge Master Plan Update. Mr. Kavounas does not agree with the statement of "this Section 5 is a missed opportunity to incentivize maximum recharge in the basin." This Section 5 is saying, "As MS4 recharge is happening, this is how we'll track it". It doesn't de-incentivize recharge. It is for the Watermaster process as a whole to come up with a process to do that. When CBWM gets there, all the parties will have to think who should get any benefit from innovative recharge projects. Whether it should be the jurisdiction allowing recharge to be happening, mandating it on developers to pay, should there be jurisdictions that are using grant monies, which is other people's money, and should get any of that portion of the recharge to themselves, or whether it should go to those that hold water rights in the basin because that's what the judgment said. That discussion can be had at Watermaster along with other issues that were identified. It was helpful for Mr. Kavounas to hear everyone's issues and concerns at the March 12, 2013 Refresh, Recharge and Reunite event. This issue was raised and Mr. Kavounas sees this as his task to help that move along. However, he does not see that fitting in the Section 5 discussion. He feels Section 5 is a small component of what is the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. In Section 8 is where CBWM will identify recharge projects, how to finance them, and how to implement them over time. Mr. Kavounas stated he has heard the concerns expressed by Fontana Water and The City of Fontana; CBWM responded to the City of Fontana by letter and the letter is available at the back table for anyone's review.

Chair Zvirbulis asked for a time frame as to the potential of allocation of these waters. Mr. Kavounas stated the biggest focus right now is completing the Recharge Master Plan Amendment; the other priorities that were identified in the Refresh Recharge and Reunite, need to be sorted out and identified as to what is priority for the Board to look at as well as the Pools to look at. Some of the issues that have come up, for example: the role of Watermaster regarding water quality which was mentioned and discussed at length at the Refresh Recharge and Reunite, and the guiding documents is something that may have higher priority and may be something we need to address sooner. This issue was highlighted by the CDA's request and it's really put a point on it; we don't exactly have a clear direction: how do we deal with a pressing, real time issues related to water quality. Mr. Kavounas stated the recharge of the basin is an important issue; he would rank it one rung lower than dealing with water quality. However, Mr. Kavounas does not see CBWM getting to it in the next six months, but sometime within the next year based on priority.

Mr. Scott-Coe, Monte Vista Water District (MVWD) stated they appreciate the process and apologize for not attending the last committee meeting. One change that occurred at the last committee meeting is the very last sentence of the section where it says "If the preferred alternative 3 does not pan out because people don't provide the right amount of data then we will default to alternative 2". MVWD expressed at a number of committee meetings where we discussed this section: Alternate 2 seems to elide the distinction of stormwater recharge new yield, in the process of resetting safe yield, which we do not think it would be appropriate and may even speak to the interest to the Fontana community. MVWD is wondering in that alternative section, if it could be particularized so in this alternative it's specifically talking about MS4 recharge, not all new storm water recharge. Mr. Scott-Coe also commented that MVWD is

going to be going through this process with alternative 3 in the next resetting of Safe Yield which will be 10 years down the line, and will probably be revisiting the recharge master plan before that time, so Mr. Scott-Coe asked what's the necessity of saying alternative 2 as a fall back if alternative 3 doesn't pan out on a timeframe issue.

Mr. Kavounas replied to Mr. Scott-Coe, that he would entertain any editorial comment that would help highlight MVWD's comment. The language pertains only to MS4, simply because it's in this section, but things can be misread. Mr. Kavounas would be happy to create that and as we said in the Staff Letter, any changes we make to this today, is what the Advisory Committee will receive next week. The comment Mr. Scott Coe is referring to is in response to a comment that was made at the Steering Committee last week.

Ms. Layton commented her concern is if we agreed to this procedure and Fontana said, but they don't get any credit they don't want to put out those figures if they don't get the credit and she was thinking that relying on all the Appropriators to give the information on the MS4 permits and if that doesn't come in, are we now going to pay Wildermuth to do a lot of work to get that information, and Ms. Layton stated where's the benefit in that. She wants to make sure we're not going to incur additional costs in the end.

Ms. Hoerning asked Mr. Wildermuth, her understanding of alternative #2 is that, if you weren't tracking MS4 as all when you do your safe yield recalculation, you're going to use the information and data that you have available to you to make that determination that may be water surface profiles or other; just as you have historically done with Operating Safe Yield calculation, and so that it should be, while you might not realize any kind of benefit for 30 to 40 years because of the time it takes to see that water percolate to the ground water table and become a useful resource in terms of production. It will eventually be iterated in to a safe yield calculation. Maybe you can clarify if my understanding is correct or not.

Mr. Wildermuth added that in the absence of having the information gained by alternative 3, we won't be able to do quite as good a job of estimating recharge in the basin. If we were calibrating all projects and we were seeing ourselves sufficient in recharge, we'd have to use the model; it's probably not ideal to estimate that new recharge. In time, if it were significant, we would see it in the data. It's a less accurate way of proceeding. Wildermuth has put in everything they know about, and they did a back of the envelope calculation several months ago and determined that there really wasn't a significant amount of recharge from the existing inventory of MS4 facility, so they weren't overly concerned about it. They also know that there is the potential for a lot in the future and that's what drove alternative 3. The short answer is we can muddle through without it, but something might show up and they'll have to re-calibrate the model to make it work. That would be moving away from a less accurate recharge model. We can get there, but it's probably going to be a bigger issue 10 to 20 years out.

Mr. Wildermuth went on to explain alternative 3 allows building more accurate recharge models that can drive the ground water model. The concept is to be able to make reasonable estimates and adjust those in calibration.

Mr. Marty Zvirbulis commented that he's seen from past experience, that over-estimating recharge and distributing benefits can lead to challenges in the future, and feels this in one of those areas we want to avoid that because of the functionality of the types of projects that would be considered.

Mr. Burton responded to the discussion regarding the recharge, and he would like to recommend a process where there is a check in once a year on what data is being received; is it sufficient for your needs down the road. He feels the land use agencies can't provide the data that Watermaster needs. Mr. Burton does not want it to be a silent process where we don't act on it because agencies do not provide what CBWM needs. Mr. Burton wants to see some process of a proactive effort where agencies do a check in once per year. Mr. Kavounas stated that was

raised at the Steering Committee and a suggestion was made that CBWM create a repository on the website or the FTP site that would show the projects for which we have received information and what type of information. Mr. Burton suggests if an agency has not provided an update by a specific time frame, CBWM will send the agency a reminder. Mr. Kavounas stated CBWM can add language to that effect in the recommended alternative: That the data will be accumulated and shown on the CBWM database and will be reviewed periodically with the parties. Mr. Burton agreed.

Mr. Burton also commented on Data Requests where there wasn't a real big response from the land use agencies. On page 5-4 of section 5, there is a table that talks about a survey that CBWM did to identify future development anticipated by the different land use agencies; it doesn't look like there was a big response. Mr. Burton is wondering two things: In the next 20 years how much land development do you expect? Some agencies answered it with that frame work on the question, and other agencies just said ultimately we're going to have this much, but we don't know if it will be in the first 20 years. Mr. Burton is wondering what the usefulness of having this table in the report is, and also stated, CBWM only received four responses and there are two columns, one for within the first 20 years (which is speculative) and didn't realize it was going to be formalized in the final report and is wondering what the purpose is there. He also stated the table seems to be incomplete. Mr. Kavounas stated, in hindsight, Section 5 as written reflects the thought process we went through in developing this, but you also have an attached process that was discussed in terms of real time, submission and processing of information; it's safe to say that the way Section 5 is written reflects the process CBWM went through in developing Section 5. Mr. Kavounas agreed with eliminating that table, but would like to hear from the rest of the pool, but sees no harm done in eliminating the table. However, Mr. Kavounas feels there is some value in preserving some of the thought process CBWM went through for those who may read this in the future. Mr. Kavounas suggested keeping the text, but eliminating the references to the table, and the table itself. Mr. Burton stated he would be comfortable with that, and stated another approach that Ontario would want to do is just provide what Chino and Cucamonga water district did, and just give CBWM their ultimate numbers as they don't want to provide speculative numbers. Another approach would be, before this is finalized, request the rest of the land use agencies to provide some input, but Mr. Burton is comfortable with all three of these approaches.

Ms. Hoerning stated she feels as long as the process is outlined is sufficient; the details are not needed. Mr. Harder stated he would support to remove the table as well. Mr. Kavounas took note to remove the table.

Mr. Burton also commented on the section of allocation and how it was scoped out, identifying that the court was not requiring to look at allocation. Mr. Burton doesn't think the court said they couldn't look at allocation, but given that Ontario went in the direction of not addressing allocation for at least the past year since last July, he thinks the section is pragmatic and is comfortable with the approach. It reserves the ability to have discussions about allocation in the future, but Ontario has concerns: Are we doing what optimizes recharge within the Chino Basin from land use, not only new land use, but it's redevelopment, existing land use as there are property owners change, tenant improvements, conditional use permits, there is the opportunity to implement recharge potential. Section 3 identifies the range of 5300 acre feet to 10,500 of MS4 related recharge, and it's for new land use development. There are all kinds of redevelopment that's going to take place, densification. As Mr. Burton mentioned the other ways that land use agencies look at projects and land use and look at implementing things like stormwater capture. Ontario has a project that they submitted it's on the list of projects; it's not a big project, it's called The Ontario Bioswale, it's in a completely developed area, and it's above and beyond minimum MS4 requirements and it captures 8 acre feet of new yield. Not a big number, Ontario is not particularly concerned about not getting credit for that 8 acre feet; however, that's for a very small area within the Chino Basin, so even the numbers listed here for new development is a big number on top of that other ones. Mr. Burton further stated he thinks we're missing an opportunity to identify really what's at stake here, and how do we maximize the beneficial capture

of this water; one of the ideas is to give the land use agency credit to try and do that. Mr. Burton stated he feels troubled by this because this discussion has not taken place. He recognizes the approach that has been taken to carve off that piece; today is the first time he's heard Mr. Kavounas mention it publicly. Mr. Burton would like to task CBWM to set up a committee that is specifically going to focus on this issue. Based on priorities, it may not happen this month or next month, but does feel we need to prioritize all the things we're trying to accomplish and everybody should get to weigh in on what the priorities are. One idea Mr. Burton wants the pool to think about is, to direct Watermaster to let pools know in a month from now when this process can get started. Mr. Burton thinks as we recalculate the Safe Yield of the basin, we factor that in to the list of recharge master plan projects; the question does come up as we start to make adjustments for potential decline in safe yield. Arguments can be made that the best efforts have not been taken to protect and enhance the safe yield of the basin if we haven't had these discussions when we're talking about very big numbers in terms of acre feet. For this committee Mr. Burton would be comfortable with approving this section today and also tasking Watermaster with setting up the process to have the discussions that we're talking about: to maximize storm water capture as a part of land use agencies implementing their objectives.

Ms. Leyton commented that she would like to see all the priorities and requested that Mr. Kavounas prepare it. Mr. Zvirbulis replied that the priorities have already been distributed. He said they all have received copies of the summary of notes that were captured from the Refresh, Recharge, and Reunite event, and Mr. Kavounas is in the process right now of sorting through those and planning the type of discussion Ms. Layton and Mr. Burton are recommending. Mr. Zvirbulis stated this is consistent with the discussions we had previous to the workshop; to identify what the issues were and put them in priority in a collaborative fashion. It may seem like a lot of time has passed since that has occurred, but in Watermaster years, it's moving fast. Mr. Zvirbulis stated that they all discussed and agreed on a process that would help collaboratively identify what those are, and to the extent that Mr. Kavounas can help them do that and build on the comments and topics that were identified from the workshop. Mr. Kavounas stated he plans to do that in concert with the Watermaster Board. Mr. Kavounas stated he's here to support the Pool 100%. CBWM is developing strategies on how to deal with issues; the issues have been prioritized and Mr. Kavounas plans to share them with the Board to get their feedback, and then CBWM will come back to the pools. Mr. Kavounas does not recommend voting to set priorities to avoid confusing issues. The Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment had a specific purpose, which was to make sure there was enough recharge capacity to meet future obligations. So it's focused on that task. Mr. Zvirbulis agreed with Mr. Kavounas and stated it is part of the record, the comments have been made, and they'll be in the minutes; there is no reason to believe it won't occur in a timely fashion. No other questions were asked on this topic. Mr. Zvirbulis stated the work that has been completed as Task 5, is consistent with the court order. There is clear need to continue discussions about other issues raised by Fontana and Fontana Water and those discussions need to be scheduled and need to occur, but the issue before us today is to consider staff requests to approve Section 5 of the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. Mr. Zvirbulis recommends approval to the Advisory Committee.

Mr. Burton requested to understand what the recharge master plan priorities are coming to this process for final approval. Wants to understand what the priorities are with regards to maximizing MS4 recharge will be on the priority list and the pool will have an idea if that discussion is going to occur and when prior to final approval of the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. Mr. Kavounas stated he does not think we'll have that discussion before approving the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. Mr. Burton clarified, not the discussion, but at least Mr. Kavounas would bring back the priorities after discussing with the Board and parties alike: Ontario, City of Fontana, will at least know where that topic falls on the priority list and when it might be discussed. Mr. Kavounas replied yes, that is the intent.

Mr. Zvirbulis stated Staff is recommending based on some of the discussion today, there are a couple of amendments that were agreed upon by the parties as it relates to the table, and associated language. Staff's recommendation is to approve Section 5, titled "Monitoring,



Reporting and Accounting Practices to Estimate Long Term Average Annual Net Use Stormwater Recharge,” and move that to the Advisory Committee for approval.

Mr. Scott-Coe made the motion, and Mr. Harder seconded the motion as amended per discussion. Page 79 5-9, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, “In this alternative, in regard to MS4 projects, the net new recharge from determining safe yield would be automatically incorporated into the safe yield and the direct estimation of net new recharge would not be made.”

Mr. Chuck Hays stated that the City of Fontana is opposed; Mr. Zielke stated that Fontana Water Company is opposed.

Mr. Kavounas stated CBWM will take that comment and it will be reflected in the Advisory Committee Package.

***Motion to approve staff’s recommendation by Mr. Scott Coe second by Harder, and by majority vote***

***Moved to approve Business Item II.A as amended per discussion. Opposed by City of Fontana and Fontana Water Company.***

**B. BUDGET TRANSFER FORM T-13-04-01**

Consider Staff’s Recommendation to Approve Budget Transfer Form T-13-04-01.

CBWM CFO Joe Joswiak, stated as discussed over the last four or five months in the financial reports B5, CBWM created the estimated budget for salary purposes as to allocation within the administrative, OBMP, and the implementation projects. Over the past four or five months we’ve had staff shifting of priorities, so we’re getting a little farther away from our original estimates. Transfer Form T-13-04-01 reallocates some salary funds within the salary categories and absorbs some of those costs, but it does not allocate any funds to any other categories, for example: legal, engineering, and reserve. It will not cause any special assessments, but it will bring our salaries back into budget for the end of the year. No questions or comments were made.

***Motion to approve by Van Jew, second by Burton, and by unanimous vote***

***Moved to approve Business Calendar Item B, as presented***

**C. SUNDING REPORT UPDATE (APPROPRIATIVE POOL ONLY)**

Authorize Proceeding with the Update of the Sunding Report

Mr. Kavounas commented that this item came up as part of the budget. CBWM was asked to add on to the budget the appropriate amount for updating the 2007 Sunding report; CBWM has contacted Mr. Sunding and received an estimate of \$50,000.00 which was included in the budget, and it is CBWM’s understanding that we will not proceed unless or until we receive approval or authorization from the Appropriative Pool Committee to move forward. Part of the staff report is an illustration of the cost that each agency would incur should the Appropriative Pool decide to proceed.

Mr. Zvirbulis commented that there are a number of parties that have expressed concerns about the urgency of this report and why it needs to be done right now, and thinks there is a reason this item went on the agenda now, and requested Mr. Kavounas to expand on as to why on a matter of timing why it’s included as part of this packet.

Mr. Kavounas commented that there were a couple of reasons, and the first one is just being practical with time; Dr. Sunding is an active teaching professor and has the summer off, so from the perspective of being able to confine it and get it done in a short amount of time, now is the best time. The second is, the study looked at the cost benefit for the major right holders within the Appropriative pool, and as we are looking at making additional investments in the basin, getting the data of how the study presented itself in the beginning and how it should be corrected

to allow for realities compared to assumptions that were made back in 2007. It's useful information for people to have as they make their own individual decisions within their own agencies. It seems appropriate to get it done before votes are taken on the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment, which will call for a financial commitment.

Mr. Zvirbulis commented that based on some of the discussions he's had, he does not feel there is an immediate urgency for the pool to take action on this today; however, does believe from his perspective, it is important work to be considered. Suggestions have been made that the pool through the formation of, whether it be a steering committee or an ad hoc committee, work with CBWM to clarify and identify certain specific elements as it relates to the scope to the work. Mr. Craig raised some valid points and issues related to Safe Yield and how it relates to that, and what are needs are for long term recharge and capacity. Perhaps a good first step in moving this item forward would be to have the pool or the parties that are interested, meet with Mr. Kavounas to clarify that the scope address important items.

Mr. Kavounas asked Chair Zvirbulis if he's appointed members of the steering committee or is it open to everyone. Chair Zvirbulis replied that he does not want to exclude anyone. There are 10 agencies in particular that are included as part of that evaluation and should those agencies wish to participate, then Chair Zvirbulis encourages them to participate. Mr. Kavounas stated CBWM will send out invitations to those 10 agencies and will start the process at some point.

Mr. Harding reiterated what Dr. Sunding said, "This will be available on September 1<sup>st</sup>" and we're talking about having the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment go through the pool process in August to meet our October deadline. In terms of a document we would use to evaluate recharge master plan projects, is it going to be available to do that? Mr. Kavounas replied if we take the approach of having the Steering Committee and himself review/revise the scope, he doesn't see how Dr. Sunding could be held to his commitment of September 1<sup>st</sup>. The whole point of this is to serve the Appropriative Pool and its members. Maybe it won't be available for the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment decision, but that's okay.

Mr. Burton stated he is still not clear on what the need is to factor this information into the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment, and asked Mr. Kavounas to explain. Mr. Kavounas explained his perspective that the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment comes as a result of the Peace Agreement; the Sunding Report evaluated the cost and benefit associated with the Peace Agreement. The parties are about to re-commit a few million dollars above and beyond what's already been committed in implementing the Peace Agreement. To Mr. Kavounas, it seems it would be helpful to understand the cost benefit calculation, updated with reality compared to assumptions that were made in 2006 and 2007. Mr. Burton stated that when we looked at the formula last time for implementing the Recharge Master Plan it was basically Operating Safe Yield percentage, so maybe we won't use that same methodology. It seems dollars contributed have to equate to a pro rata share of any new yield from the stormwater capture, if it's not based on Operating Safe Yield, it would be some other way of coming up with dollars contributed that equate to benefit moving forward. Mr. Burton also stated he is concerned if we're trying to identify other aspects of the Peace II Agreement, which has already been approved and look backwards and try to recalculate who got what benefit and somehow factor that in to who pays for Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment moving forward. Mr. Burton went on to say that he's concerned about that being a divisive approach that actually could prevent us from meeting schedules that we're working so hard to meet on the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. Maybe that discussion is for a separate committee.

Mr. Zvirbulis stated to Mr. Burton that he may be reading too far into this, than what it really is. Mr. Zvirbulis said this is really just a tool to use for planning and making decisions in the future. It's consistent with the approach that CBWM has used on a lot of the issues over time.

Mr. Burton stated there was a discussion about priorities, not being able to do certain things that parties wanted to do because CBWM can't do everything at once. From Ontario's perspective, if

we spend our resources on that, we are not spending those same resources on something else. Maybe this study needs to be put into that list of priorities Mr. Kavounas talked about. Rather than assume this is a top priority; maybe it should be included with the list of the whole host of things and the stake holders can decide what they want to spend our time on. It's not just CBWM's time; it's all of their time too. Mr. Burton feels this got thrown in very late, quickly, and has jumped above other priorities. Mr. Zvirbulis stated it depends on whose priority it is. From his perspective, it is important from a timing perspective for all to sit down and talk about whether or not it is important. As we saw an issue come before the pool today, and a couple parties weren't supportive of it. Mr. Zvirbulis stated he respects his position from Mr. Burton's agency, but everybody else has a perspective and thinks it's important to share that, and decide whether or not it needs to be done. We have a window of opportunity of Dr. Sunding to do the work now and he feels it's something they need to consider and talk about. Mr. Harder stated that JCSD there is interested in the steering committee. What's lacking is a very clear objective of what the study is and feels the objective is missing here. Mr. Harder echoed Mr. Burton's concern with schedule. He sees as having the potential of slowing down an already slow moving year. He would like to see the value of spending \$50,000.00 on this. Mr. Zvirbulis commented that these are legitimate questions and that is why he is suggesting that they meet and confer to have a discussion apart from the regular pool meeting to review that.

Mr. Burton asked Mr. Kavounas, based on the budget as a special assessment, would Watermaster then hold off on the special assessment until we can have a committee that talks about finding a benefit for this work. Mr. Kavounas answered, "Yes." Mr. Scott-Coe echoed that they also support doing this, they believe it won't slow the process down, that it is part of the transparency of making public policy decisions and making sure these decisions on a go forward basis meet the needs of all of our constituents and believes that it does not change past negotiated deals, but just clarifies what they mean in terms of cost benefit and understanding if different results occur and how we can make better decisions in the future, so Monte Vista Water District believes this is vital in making well informed decisions going forward. Mr. Poulsen, City of Pomona is concerned, being one of the more larger share holders in the basin, agrees with Mr. Zvirbulis' recommendation today to move this topic to a steering committee. He feels this will give us appreciation as to what's trying to be accomplished here. Mr. Zielke stated that Fontana Water Company is in favor of studies and documents that provide the most current relevant information that helps us make the best decisions for the basin, so they're in favor of those studies, but as he was reading through the staff letter, the \$50,000.00 is an Appropriative Pool Assessment distributed throughout the pool and while there are 10 agencies being considered in the report, not including Fontana Water Company. Mr. Zielke requests to be included in the second one, and stated he agrees with Cucamonga in support of a committee and would like to be considered as well, and requested if the verbiage can be changed to 11 agencies instead of 10.

Mr. Kavounas stated his position that this item was not expedited any differently than any other request that was made of Watermaster during the budget process. There were three requests that were made, and they were each handled with the same speed. Mr. Kavounas asked the Pool members when they would like the steering committee to come together, and Mr. Zvirbulis stated next month.

### **III. REPORTS/UPDATES**

#### **A. LEGAL COUNSEL REPORT**

1. Annotated Judgment

Mr. Herrema commented that he will be taking this item to the Watermaster Board this month.

2. CDA Request re Remediation of Chino Airport Groundwater Plume

This pool met in a special session immediately prior to the Advisory Committee meeting last month. The Advisory Committee with the exception of the representative of the Ag Pool approved the same action that this pool requested, which was to have Watermaster's

hydrological consultant work with the Regional Board to determine the status of hydraulic control in regards to the Chino Creek Well Field as its now better understood. That process is ongoing and should be completed by the end of July. Watermaster Board at its meeting last month did not take any action on this item. It's content to allow this process with Mr. Wildermuth and the Regional Board to continue.

3. Court Filings- 2 court filings

The first filing is a motion by Watermaster for a court approval of the Cyclic Storage Agreement and specifically the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> amendments to the Cyclic Storage Agreement. The 9<sup>th</sup> amendment was approved a few months ago and Watermaster always sought court approval of those amendments in the past with the exception of the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment, since the original agreement was approved by the court back in 1978. The 8<sup>th</sup> amendment never went to the court for approval; it looks that was an oversight during the Peace 2 negotiations, so we've asked the court to approve both the 8<sup>th</sup> and the 9<sup>th</sup> amendments. As part of that pleading, we've also asked the court to receive and file the most resent OBMP status report.

The second filing was made on behalf of the Ag Pool. It's the Ag Pool motion to amend the Court's 1998 Order that established the nine member Watermaster Board. Last month the representatives from the Ag Pool were present as part of an information item on that pleading. What they've asked the court to do is effectively bless their course of practice over the last 10 years to allow the Ag Pool chair and the Ag Pool Advisory Committee representatives to be the alternates to their board member appointees. According to the 1998 Order, having those folks serve as board alternates could be read as being contrary to the Court Order. The Ag Pool has done this over the last 10 years and there hasn't been any objection.

Consistent with the Paragraph 15 requirements the hearing has been scheduled for July 12 at 1:30 p.m. on both those motions. Ms. Leyton asked if the Appropriative Pool is the only one that can't do what they're asking now, why wouldn't we just change it for everybody? Mr. Herrema stated that the Appropriative Pool can ask for a similar change if they wished. It is Watermaster's practice to do the filing for any party who has a filing with the court, so they were made in conjunction and a hearing was scheduled on each of the same time for efficiency purposes and preserve recourses.

4. Santa Ana sucker appeal

The Santa Ana sucker decision is being challenged by 12 or 13 water agencies. The court decision designated critical habitat for the Santa Ana sucker, including a portion of the Sana Ana River that runs along the eastern boundary of the Chino Basin. Watermaster doesn't have facilities directly located in the river; however, Watermaster does have recharge facilities in tributaries to the Santa Ana River. Some of the members of that group of plaintiffs that have challenged the critical habitat designation are also Watermaster's stakeholders, specifically Western Municipal Water District. Watermaster filed two letters in support of that group in the critical habitat designation process. In October 2012 CBWM was advised that the District Court ruled against the plaintiffs in their case, motion for summary judgment and ruled in favor of Fish and Wildlife service. At that time the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal will set a briefing schedule. There were articles in the papers last week regarding the Santa Ana sucker case, and they may have implied that the appeal was filed last week. The appeal was filed back in the fall; the Ninth Circuit set its briefing schedule then. What was filed last week was the opening brief by the group of plaintiffs. Based on the briefing scheduled as it exists now, which is always subject to extension, the Fish and Wildlife Service responsive brief is due on July 3<sup>rd</sup> and any appellant brief would be due July 17<sup>th</sup>. If argument is set and giving time for the court to make a ruling, legal counsel anticipates this fall or this winter would probably be the earliest we would see any decision in the case.

**B. ENGINEERING REPORT**1. State of the Basin Part II Presentation

Engineering Report Item B. was taken out of order as the first item on the agenda.

Mr. Craig would like a timing status update relative to working with the Regional Board on CDA Well 18, and also the analysis of the decline of safe yield, and losses.

Mr. Wildermuth answered that WEI is confident to have everything resolved with the Regional Board by the end of July. WEI is going to produce a draft report on the modeling effort by late June or early July and will present the first glimpse of the model's most recent suggestions are about Safe Yield. Mr. Craig asked if that would include perspective on losses as well. Mr. Kavounas replied yes. Mr. Craig commented that it seems to him on what's happening with Operational Safe Yield and with losses has or can have a substantial influence on the prioritization of financial viability of expanded recharge capability. He feels those are fundamental understandings we should have before we even embark on a review of Dr. Sunding's report. Mr. Kavounas stated that the Appropriative Pool will also get an assessment on Desalter replenishment obligations, as part of the Safe Yield recalculation.

**C. GM REPORT**1. Prado Basin Habitat Sustainability Program update

Ms. Maurizio, Assistant GM gave a brief presentation on the Prado Basin Habitat Sustainability Program. She stated this program is required by Peace II EIR mitigation measure 4.4-3; the EIR was adopted by IEUA's Board on October 2010. The purpose of this is to ensure the Prado Basin Riparian Habitat will not incur adverse effects due to the implementation of Peace II. As stated in the mitigation measure the IEUA, Watermaster, Orange County Water District, and individual stakeholders that choose to participate, will jointly fund and develop the adaptive management program. The program parts that are included within the mitigation measure are to convene a committee, create an adaptive management plan, install monitoring wells, perform vegetation, aerial surveys, and perform photo station monitoring. In terms of the financial aspects of the program, there was a cost sharing agreement that was approved between IEUA and Watermaster in September 2012. The current total capital budget is approximately \$546,000.00 to be split 50/50 between Watermaster and IEUA. Included within that cost sharing agreement is to hire a consultant to develop the adaptive management plan; WEI to perform project management tasks related to monitoring installation for the wells; and to hire a contractor to construct and install 16 monitoring wells at nine separate sites. CBWM was originally looking at 17 monitoring wells, but found a suitable monitoring well at RP2 that we were able to use, and USVR to perform vegetation surveys and monitoring every three years. IEUA applied for three grants towards this program, but we did not receive any of them. To date, there has been approximately \$124,000.00 of expenses through consultants: \$62,000.00 each for Watermaster and IEUA, and for cost of Watermaster staff time has been about \$7,000.00 to date. Once the wells are installed there will be additional water level and water quality costs, already included in the budget. The first year we're looking at approximately \$100,000.00 for these monitoring costs, and hope to significantly reduce that in future years. The first year we have to monitor for a lot of water quality constituents. If we don't find those in there, we should be able to reduce that in the future and probably reduce the frequency. As a reminder, any kind of hydraulic control monitoring associated costs is 100% Watermaster costs. The capital is shared 50/50, but the monitoring expenses are borne 100% by Watermaster per the bright-line agreement. As for the current status of activities, there have been two of the large committee meetings primarily to discuss the adaptive management plan. The first one was in November 2012 and Ms. Maurizio reported on that last time, but has since met in May 2013. IEUA hired RBF in April to develop the adaptive management plan and that's why there was a second large committee meeting. Now that RBF is on board, we expect to have plan completed in September. IEUA is currently finalizing the site acquisition for all the well sites. Ms. Maurizio presented a map reflecting the well sites, and stated that four sites are already permitted,

there are five sites that are on core property and that's taking a lot longer to get through the process and feel it will take a couple more months until those are finalized. IEUA is going out to bid later this month for the installation of the monitoring wells and for cone penetrometer testing and they expect to award that contract in August. We expect to complete the wells by the end of the calendar year and hoping to do it in two phases. Half are already permitted, so we're hoping to expedite those and get them done as soon as possible. As for the permitting, IEUA has to wait to get the permitting done on the core property and we've run into a bird nesting problem. Only the core properties have that, so we have to wait until after September 15<sup>th</sup> anyway to install those monitoring wells, but at the same time Orange County Water District is anxious to start seeing some data out of it. We're looking at installing them in two phases.

Mr. Kavounas asked Ms. Maurizio if Orange County participated in this effort so far, and Ms. Maurizio answered no they have not, with the exception of any in house contributions. Mr. Kavounas also asked about the limit of the cost sharing agreement; Ms. Maurizio answered the limit was \$220K each, for a total of \$440K. We will most likely have to amend the cost sharing agreement. We don't know until IEUA receives a bid on the well installation costs, but we went out to bid on one and received one bid back, which our budget was significantly lower than what it came in at. Likely we will have to amend that.

2. Watermaster policy on well data gathering and reporting

Mr. Kavounas advised the committee that there is an item on the Ag Pool agenda today that does not appear on the Appropriative Pool Committee agenda, but it will in the future; the item relates to the policy on private well data gathering and reporting by Watermaster. This is an issue that was debated in the past, and CBWM came up with the current policy. Mr. Kavounas believes the policy in its current form can present some problems. To address these CBWM thought we would start a review with the Ag Pool since it primarily affects the Ag wells and explain what the problems are and recommend a different way to move forward. Depending where this discussion goes, if the Ag Pool is willing to entertain some modifications to the existing guidelines, we'll bring them back through all pools in the future, so all pools have opportunity to participate as well. The staff letter is there for review and reflects what the item is about.

3. Consider cancelling July Meeting

CBWM is recommending cancelling the pool meetings: Advisory, Agricultural, and Appropriative, primarily because there is not a hot-pressing item that we will bring in July, and also CBWM views July as the month to focus on Section 8 of the Recharge Master Plan Update Amendment. Section 8 is turning the corner right now; we're pulling together the information we need, and CBWM believes it can be done in July for formal considerations of the pools in August and September. To do that it would help to not have the pool meetings. Chair Zvirbulis suggested scheduling Appropriative Pool steering committee meeting to discuss the Sunding Report Update in lieu of the Appropriative Pool meeting.

Mr. Kavounas also commented on RMPU amendment. He stated he understands that this is a difficult process, and understands that every party has their own interests and their own perspective, so from his point of view, he'd like to congratulate everyone for getting section 5, 6, and 7 approved. Mr. Kavounas thanked everyone for all their cooperation and feedback on Section 8; specifically on Section 8, CBWM had some feedback last week at the Steering Committee and Mr. Kavounas wanted to bring the pool up to speed and not wait until next week. When CBWM came back with Section 8 last week, the table that showed the projects did not include any in lieu projects. The suggestion was to include projects and CBWM will do that. The pools will see will see discussion of in lieu projects at the next Steering Committee. Mr. Kavounas concerns with the in lieu projects are that Watermaster cannot drive those projects, and we cannot give you a good cost assessment on those because those are projects that relate more to distribution system improvements; to the extent that

this is understood, Watermaster will incorporate that in the description. We will have in lieu projects included in that, including the GRA, which was described as an in lieu project in table 6-1, which is what we agreed to address in Section 8.

Mr. Kavounas mentioned that part of the Refresh Recharge and Reunite meeting brought out one of the earlier comments made, which is apparent by inspection of the Watermaster process, and that is that there is some lack of clarity on the roles of the Pools, Advisory, and the Board. Mr. Kavounas stated he's heard that comment from a number of people and was not surprised when it came up at the Refresh, Recharge and Reunite event, so CBWM went back and reviewed some of the material of the Watermaster landscape, and created a brief summary. There are copies at the back table for those who want one. The summary identifies the four different categories of actions that Watermaster can take and the role that the Advisory and the Pools can play in each one. To conform to this, Watermaster has changed the look and feel of staff reports to help make it more obvious and more compliant with this as to what future actions are going to be, by which body as they come up. Mr. Kavounas invited everyone to take a copy, look at it, and provide any feedback that can help make the process better.

Mr. Kavounas gave a brief heads-up that there is likely going to be a change in the budget for the Wildermuth environmental contract; there were some assumptions that were made early in the fiscal year; we have changed some of those assumptions, we are still looking at all the work being done, there may be some cost savings to offset some of the projected overrun, but we do expect that there might be an overrun. In summary, some of the things that have changed are [1] the list of the projects that we assumed Wildermuth would be evaluating grew dramatically; [2] the criteria that were developed in task 7 created a larger need for Wildermuth to do more work per project than originally envisioned; [3] originally, Mr. Kavounas' assessment of Section 5 was going to be something that he could accomplish in house and started down that path, then it became obvious that we needed more involvement and analysis for Wildermuth, so that was added on work; [4] finally, the effort to review each project was greater than what was thought last November when we put that list together, so we've leaned a lot more heavily on Wildermuth. There have been some activities that they've not been able to undertake, so we'll see some reduction in those categories, but we do expect to exceed the budget. In addition to the budget transfer that you saw today, you'll probably see one more adjustment by the end of the year.

Teri Layton asked Mr. Kavounas if he knows about how much we're going to be exceeding the budget, and Mr. Kavounas stated probably close to \$100K pertaining to the Recharge Master Plan. Mr. Kavounas replied that this is all the WEI work, not just the Recharge Master Plan.

Mr. Kavounas stated that the Safe Yield recalculation workshop is scheduled for July 30<sup>th</sup>, moved from June 18<sup>th</sup> as to have a well documented discussion on that. As of right now, we're looking to meet that date.

Mr. Kavounas announced that he'll be on vacation from June 19<sup>th</sup> returning back to the office July 8<sup>th</sup>. All questions and inquiries can be addressed to Ms. Danni Maurizio.

#### **IV. INFORMATION**

1. Cash Disbursements for May 2013  
No comment was made.

#### **V. POOL MEMBER COMMENTS**

Teri Layton asked if the ethics and sexual harassment training is that for the board. Mr. Kavounas stated that the training is open to everyone as many public agencies have the

need to have some kind of training. CBWM does feel the need for our board to have the opportunity to do that. CBWM staff is taking the training and it's open to all agencies that want to attend. Mr. Herrema stated that the training meet the requirements AB1234.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

No comment was made.

**VII. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION - POSSIBLE ACTION**

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

There was no confidential session.

**VIII. FUTURE MEETINGS AT WATERMASTER**

Thursday, June 13, 2013	9:00 a.m.	Appropriative Pool Meeting
Thursday, June 13, 2013	11:00 a.m.	Non-Agricultural Pool Conference Call Meeting
Thursday, June 13, 2013	1:30 p.m.	Agricultural Pool Meeting
Tuesday, June 18, 2013	1:00 p.m.	Ethics & Sexual Harassment Prevention Training
Thursday, June 20, 2013	8:00 a.m.	IEUA DYY Meeting
Thursday, June 20, 2013	9:00 a.m.	Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, June 20, 2013	10:00 a.m.	RMPU Amendment Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, June 25, 2013	9:00 a.m.	GRCC Meeting
Thursday, June 27, 2013	11:00 a.m.	Watermaster Board Meeting

Chair Burton adjourned the Appropriative Pool meeting at 10:56 a.m.

Secretary: \_\_\_\_\_

Minutes Approved: August 8, 2013