

**Minutes**  
**CHINO BASIN WATERMASTER**  
**WATERMASTER BOARD MEETING**

*October 25, 2012*

The Watermaster Board Meeting was held at the offices of the Chino Basin Watermaster, 9641 San Bernardino Road, Rancho Cucamonga, CA, on October 25, 2012 at 11:00 a.m.

**WATERMASTER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Bob Kuhn, Chair	Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Jim Curatalo	Fontana Union Water Company
Paula Lantz	City of Pomona
Steve Elie	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Bob Bowcock	Vulcan Materials Company (Calmat Division)
Charles Field	Western Municipal Water District
Peter Rogers	City of Chino Hills
Paul Hofer	Agricultural Pool
Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel	Agricultural Pool

**Watermaster Staff Present**

Peter Kavounas	General Manager
Danielle Maurizio	Assistant General Manager
Joseph Joswiak	Chief Financial Officer
Sherri Molino	Recording Secretary

**Watermaster Consultants Present**

Scott Slater	Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber & Schreck
Mark Wildermuth	Wildermuth Environmental Inc.

**Others Present**

Pete Hall	Ag Pool – State of California – CIM
Mark Kinsey	Monte Vista Water District
Art Kidman	Kidman Law LLP
David DeJesus	Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Marty Zvirbulis	Cucamonga Valley Water District
Jo Lynne Russo-Pereyra	Cucamonga Valley Water District
Hank Stoy	Cucamonga Valley Water District
Raul Garibay	City of Pomona
Dave Crosley	City of Chino
Scott Burton	City of Ontario
Ron Craig	City of Chino Hills
Mike Maestas	City of Chino Hills
Nadeem Majaj	City of Chino Hills
Robert Young	Fontana Water Company
Sheri Rojo	Fontana Water Company
Craig Miller	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Terry Catlin	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Curtis Paxton	Chino Desalter Authority
Eunice Ulloa	Chino Basin Water Conservation District
Jack Safely	Western Municipal Water District
Todd Corbin	Jurupa Community Services District

Chair Kuhn called the Watermaster Board meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**AGENDA - ADDITIONS/REORDER**

There were no additions or reorders made to the agenda.

**I. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A. MINUTES**

1. Minutes of the Watermaster Board Meeting held September 27, 2012

**B. FINANCIAL REPORTS**

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

*Motion by Field, second by Rogers, and by unanimous vote*

***Moved to approve Consent Calendar items A through B, as presented***

**II. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. MATERIAL PHYSICAL INJURY ANALYSIS**

Mr. Kavounas stated Watermaster has received an Application for Local Storage Agreement by Vulcan Material Company (VMC), and the Watermaster process calls for the Watermaster's engineer to conduct a Material Physical Injury (MPI) Analysis. Mr. Kavounas stated WEI has performed that analysis and has concluded there is potential for material physical injury. Mr. Kavounas stated the item before the Watermaster Board today is to receive and file the WEI MPI Analysis.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel asked that Mr. Bowcock give an opinion or comments regarding this MPI.

Mr. Bowcock stated, as expressed at the Pool and Advisory Committee meetings, he has a lot of concern for the Watermaster precedence on this matter. Mr. Bowcock stated he is willing to accept the receive and file motion for the MPI analysis; however, he believes it is incumbent upon Watermaster to always be diligent in looking at MPI between parties for all activities through the process, and not a gate keeping or policing activity. Mr. Bowcock stated the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) already governs water quality and degradation of water quality, which is their role and not Watermaster's. Mr. Bowcock offered further comment on his concerns, water quality, and MPI analysis requirements. Mr. Bowcock stated he has also expressed his concerns at each of the Pool meetings and the Advisory Committee meeting, and noted he will abstain from voting; however, he accepts the receive and file, and it his intent to always comply with all Watermaster requests.

Chair Kuhn called for a motion.

*Motion by Curatalo, second by Vanden Heuvel, and by unanimous vote – Abstention by Bowcock*

***Moved to receive and file the Wildermuth Environmental Inc. Material Physical Injury Analysis for Vulcan Material Company, as presented***

**III. REPORTS/UPDATES**

**A. LEGAL REPORT**

1. Order Adopting Restated Judgment, Approved Intervention of Tad Nakase (TDN Land Company) Into Chino Basin Judgment  
Counsel Slater stated the Restated Judgment and the intervention of Tad Nakase was approved by the court. Counsel Slater stated with regard to the Restated Judgment the court made one minor change to the order that had been proposed and agreed upon by

Watermaster legal counsel and counsel for the Pools; it's a minor change to one word, "caveat" to "condition", which does not change the effect of order as we presented it. Counsel Slater stated this was accomplished with no opposition.

2. Watermaster Pool Membership and Party Status

Counsel Slater stated this item has been raised to the Watermaster staff and at various meetings over the last couple of months. Counsel Slater stated this has to do with Pool membership and the status of individuals, and party record keeping. Counsel Slater stated there was an expectation that some housekeeping would occur related to parties that no longer seem to have any association with the Judgment, and yet they continued to receive notices through the Watermaster database. Counsel Slater stated this led to discussion regarding the requirements to be in each of the Pools. Watermaster counsel with input from staff prepared a generic memorandum which articulates the standards to be within the Pools, and of particular interest is the fact that one must, if one is a member of the Agricultural Pool or the Overlying Non-Agricultural Pool, own land within the basin, and they must have a qualifying beneficial use. Counsel Slater stated the balance of the memo addresses how parties can be brought in through the process of an intervention as successors in interest; that has been customary and carried out routinely over the multiple decades that the Judgment has been in place. The memo concludes with an indication that there are lingering issues that confront staff, and ultimately the Board, in terms of administrating the Judgment. Counsel Slater stated these along with other issues related to party status are susceptible of policy direction and there are cost consequences to some of these items. Counsel Slater stated we are not proposing a cost or a timeline associated with addressing them; however, we did want to call them to the Board's attention. Counsel Slater stated our expectation is this memo would serve as a springboard for your discussion and direction, and is not intended to articulate policy, existing or otherwise; it is intended to recite only that which is in the Judgment and the applicable documents. Counsel Slater stated to the extent that Watermaster wants to engage in rule making or policy direction, the custom would be to refer the matter to the Pools for advice and counsel, and then bringing back to the Watermaster Board any proposal that they would have on modification of Rules & Regulations. Counsel Slater stated the issues that have been identified that are pressing are what are we doing with non-participating parties such as the Agricultural Pool parties that have not formally gone through the intervention process, and lastly, an issue that which is the subject of some impending litigation is the form of possessory interest that an individual must have in order to exercise the rights under the Judgment. Counsel Slater offered further comment on the identified issues.

Chair Kuhn inquired if this was an original request made by Mr. Vanden Heuvel. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated it might have come out of some of the questions that I had. Chair Kuhn stated he is going to ask for clarification, what would counsel or staff expect the Board to do with this – it is in the form of a draft and it does not create any precedent at this point other than the recommendation to read it in this draft form. Counsel Slater stated staff and counsel tried to articulate what the issue and concerns are and then note for the Board that the primary duty of Watermaster is to administer the decree; you are an extension of the court. Counsel Slater stated there are issues that should be addressed at some point. There is probably a need for working up a cost component of that, and there is probably a need to develop a sequence or level of urgency on how to handle them, such as all at once or sequentially. Counsel Slater stated staff and counsel would like direction to move this through the Pools to begin seeking advice and consent as to what ought to be done, and customarily this Board would provide the leadership and direction to initiate that process.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated he really appreciates the summary; this really helped to get clarity on this matter. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated that the first and the second issues are about non-participating Agricultural Pool parties that have yet to be formally intervened, this is work that the Watermaster is always doing it seems, as we become aware of agricultural pumps that may have not intervened. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated as to cleaning up our

roles as people leave and so on, those seem like administrative tasks that don't need any kind of direction from the Watermaster Board for staff to do; those two items are different than the third one. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated he appreciates the third item being identified; however, unless there is someone else who wants to take this item on, because from his perspective this is part of some litigation and a lot of these entities are in transition, it seems premature at this point in time. Mr. Vanden Heuvel offered further comment on the third item.

Chair Kuhn stated with regard to Mr. Vanden Heuvel's comments and the nature of this item, this is why he was asking for Board clarification as to how to move this down the road because, as Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated, there are other pressing issues that need to be worked on. Chair Kuhn asked that this item be brought back at another time.

Mr. Elie stated he agrees with the Chair's assessment; however, he wants to get a handle on it if there is something that staff is aware of that is on the horizon that might be coming this way in three to six months, and he would rather know about it now rather than later.

Counsel Slater stated he thinks counsel and staff are aware that there could be issues coming in this Board's direction and they relate to allocation questions within the Pool, they relate to party status, they relate to intervention, and each of these issues will be presented at some point in time. Counsel Slater stated he would rather achieve some input in advance of these issues finding their way one at a time, so that this Board would have the ability to address them; however, counsel and staff does not feel they be viewed as urgent. Counsel stated if it is this Board preference to handle them as they emerge from a process either by consensus and stipulation, and then approving it, or in some sort of a facilitated role – this Board will have that opportunity. Counsel Slater stated it is believed that intervention, allocation, and other facets of party status could find their way to this Board in the next six months.

Mr. Elie stated what he was asking was has something been vetted, and it sounds like counsel's lawyerly response gave us the answer.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated the challenge this Board has here is that we didn't just start this Judgment; we have a history, and in his reading of this memo, is that there has to be some possessory interest in order to hold over the Non-Agricultural rights. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated that has not yet been defined; however, there is a standard – there has to be something, and to go and try to define it will be a process because everything we do here is a big negotiation. Mr. Vanden Heuvel offered further comments on this matter.

Counsel Slater stated there are two pathways here about how this Board wants to approach the problem. Counsel Slater stated a clear memorandum was provided; there are benefits to each, and he thinks the point is this Board would rather have the issue emerge from further discussion, if and when it ever emerges, and it will be dealt with at that time which is perfectly appropriate. Counsel Slater stated there are other things that we need to be working on and there are time allocation issues; although, to be responsive, your staff and counsel has said there are these issues in the queue, so this Board needs to be thoughtful on how they are going to be addressed.

Added item:

Counsel Slater stated there is an update on the Santa Ana Sucker litigation issue. Counsel Slater stated as a reminder, at one point in time Watermaster was urged to intervene into the Santa Ana Sucker litigation. Counsel Slater stated the US Fish and Wildlife Service designated a portion of the Santa Ana River as critical habitat for the Santa Ana Sucker. There was a significant piece of litigation that followed, led by Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) entities and just recently, a motion for summary judgment was handed down which was an opposition to

the contest filed by the water agencies. Counsel Slater stated the basis for designating the critical habitat was invalid. There is now a court ruling which says the designation is appropriate. Counsel Slater stated this means that the designation is of an endangered species or their habitat, and in this instance it is a designation of habitat, which does not mean parties can do things, there is a permitting process that has to be followed to get a take permit, and there is an added layer of regulatory review. Counsel Slater stated in discussing this with Mr. Wildermuth, our expectation is that Watermaster's activities may be distinguished from others – our activities will be largely unaffected; however, it may be more difficult for others to secure the permitting they want to carry out activities along the Santa Ana River. Counsel Slater stated the motion for summary judgment ruling will be appealed, and counsel and staff will continue to watch this matter.

## **B. ENGINEERING REPORT**

### **1. Modeling Update**

Mr. Wildermuth stated there are two items under the Engineering Report section; however, he will take both Item 1 and 2 under the Modeling Update. Mr. Wildermuth gave the Update to the Chino Basin Groundwater Model and Evaluation of Basin Dynamics presentation. Mr. Wildermuth stated he would like to start the planning calibrations next month and get scenario 2 done next month also. However, that will depend on getting assurances from the Appropriative Pool members that the production estimates are right.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated he had an opportunity to review this presentation prior to today, and if one looks at the questions that need to be answered, those questions seem to be driving this presentation. Mr. Vanden Heuvel read the questions presented in the presentation. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated that is why he was surprised and wondering about the planning data, as to what people think is going to happen in the future. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated that might be something that WEI can do when the model is updated; however, he is curious as to why people say what they are going to do in the future, which impacts the answers to the question of what they have done in the past and where we are today. Mr. Wildermuth stated he believes if we go through the scenarios in the presentation that may answer Mr. Vanden Heuvel's questions.

Mr. Wildermuth continued with the presentation.

Mr. Elie inquired how a transfer affects water levels. Mr. Wildermuth gave some examples how the transfers would affect water levels.

Mr. Wildermuth continued with the presentation. Mr. Wildermuth stated he would like to schedule a workshop in November on calibration. Mr. Wildermuth stated sometime in the New Year we will schedule some workshops on the planning scenarios. It was noted a notice on the workshops will be sent out by Watermaster staff.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel inquired in the Peace Agreement, or wherever one might find them, do they have a requirement that the safe yield be recalibrated on any kind of a regular basis on going forward. Mr. Kavounas stated, yes. Mr. Vanden Heuvel inquired how often. Mr. Kavounas stated Watermaster was asked to perform a safe yield recalculation in the year 2011 and every 5 years after. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated then the anticipation is that safe yield is recalculated every five years. Mr. Kavounas agreed. Mr. Vanden Heuvel inquired to Mr. Wildermuth about planning scenario 3. Mr. Wildermuth stated he is very confident in answering Mr. Vanden Heuvel's question and noted WEI has not done runs to go back and recalculate it, and he explained what was done during the Peace II Agreement process. Mr. Vanden Heuvel asked what the relationship is between the emergence of new yield and hydraulic control. Mr. Wildermuth stated you have to have both. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated can we assume that we have also moved up the achievement of hydraulic control by a year. Mr. Wildermuth stated, no. A discussion regarding this matter ensued. Mr. Vanden Heuvel inquired why we don't get to take the storage loss from 2%

down to zero until we reach hydraulic control. Mr. Wildermuth stated that is his understanding in the Peace Agreement. Mr. Vanden Heuvel offered comment on the 2%.

Mr. Bowcock inquired if it is exclusive to the Chino Creek Wellfield. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated that is the only leak we have left. Mr. Wildermuth stated, yes. Mr. Bowcock asked the dollar value. Mr. Kinsey stated \$3M per year. A discussion regarding the 2% and the \$3M per year ensued.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel inquired since Watermaster has to recalculate the safe yield every 5 years is there is an embedded process to give us a safe yield that would have twenty years worth of shelf life by taking into account the planning plans of all of our appropriators. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated maybe that is a good thing; however, we know things can change – in fact change is the only constant. Mr. Vanden Heuvel offered comment on the economy, the future, and safe yield. A discussion regarding Mr. Vanden Heuvel's comments ensued.

Chair Kuhn stated he does not think the Board can fully understand this going through it once and asked for more education on this matter.

Mr. Bowcock stated if we don't get this, then everything else that is currently being worked on is going to be wrong. Mr. Bowcock stated for those of you who don't know, a tour which was attended by most of our Board members and Pool chairs was provided by Watermaster of the basins and that tour gave us a real education. Mr. Bowcock stated what he found most interesting was to touch, feel, and talk to staff at the desalters and as we spoke to the operator; the operator was expressing concerns which Mr. Bowcock felt is contrary to what we are seeing in the model. Mr. Wildermuth stated that is not true. Mr. Bowcock stated that is what he envisioned and he needs to be educated better on this matter. Mr. Bowcock offered further comment on this matter.

Counsel Slater stated it sounds like this Board has chosen to couple the question of safe yield recalculation, hydraulic control, and losses, and that is not necessary to do that. There is a mandate that you take the losses to zero once hydraulic control is achieved; that is a requirement which is a mix of policy negotiation and court ordered package to ensure the projects were complete and the objective was achieved. It is not required though, that you maintain 2% until hydraulic control is achieved. What is needed is a demonstrated, factual presentation which provides credible substantial evidence to suggest that the loss figure is different from 2%; that is a different thing. Counsel Slater stated what you are hearing is that through the Chino Creek Wellfield you are still experiencing some leakage, whether it's 2% or not, it might be south of 2% and north a half percent – we just don't know. The second item is there is some level of urgency in trying to move forward with the study evaluation of safe yield and if the suggestion is that we ought have some sort of more dynamic determination of safe yield on an annual basis, then that can be complimentary to what is already being recommended by staff without losing 30 or 60 days while it is being hashed out.

Mr. Kavounas stated what he would add to the comments heard already is that in terms of planning scenarios he does not think Mr. Wildermuth is envisioning that whatever being planned today would necessarily hold out forever; when WEI redoes the safe yield recalculation 5 years from now, there will also be a new set of planning scenarios at that time based on what is known at that time.

Mr. Bowcock offered final comment on this matter.

A discussion on calculations ensued.

Mr. Kavounas stated WEI is going to do a workshop in November and Mr. Wildermuth is envisioning coming back each month for an update.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated what Mr. Bowcock is discussing is well documented and known about, which was predicted by the model. Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated he has a lot of confidence in Mr. Wildermuth's work, and he is challenging him to continue to use these planning numbers and embed them in things that need to be absolute. Mr. Wildermuth stated that is a demonstration that needs to be made.

Ms. Lantz stated she has a question about the 2% and the explanation that Counsel Slater made that it is not mandatory to wait until we have hydraulic control before we look at that. Ms. Lantz stated what came out of this for her was the fact that it means a lot to so many agencies. Ms. Lantz stated she thinks that needs to be a presentation and evaluation, or whatever it needs to be for this Board, so that we can reexamine that. Ms. Lantz stated she thinks the second component of that is an explanation from engineering about what it would take to accelerate the control. Ms. Lantz inquired is it concentrating in this area, is it doing that so that we can make a policy decision about whether or not we want to focus energies on that to improve or lessen the losses even further.

Mr. Elie inquired to the genesis of the 2% and where did it come from; there is a lot of 'in this basin this is the way we have always done it'. Mr. Elie noted he did not understand that concept.

Mr. Vanden Heuvel stated this is not the first time we have asked Mr. Wildermuth these questions and so far, in his opinion, we have not gotten the right answer back. Mr. Vanden Heuvel offered further comment on this matter and noted there is a lot of money at stake with this 2%.

A discussion regarding all the discussions comments ensued.

2. Planning Scenarios  
This item was discussed under the Modeling Update item.

### **C. GM REPORT**

1. Recharge Master Plan Update Timing

Mr. Kavounas stated the Recharge Master Plan Update (RMPU) is heavily engaged in by all the parties, and for him personally, it was important to take a step back and understand what each item, document, filing, project, etc. is and when it's due. Mr. Kavounas stated he put his thoughts together, compiled them, and noted he can make that available to any party who wishes to see it. Mr. Kavounas stated he has shared this spreadsheet with John Schatz, who is working with the Appropriative Pool on some RMPU amendment issues. Mr. Kavounas stated his conclusion from reviewing Watermaster's history on the RMP is that the court expects a refinement of the stormwater recharge facilities projects, along with the funding and implementation plan, by October 2013, and completion of projects by 2018. The court asked for a committee to be established for monitoring reporting and accounting practices for local stormwater recharge and new yield, but did not set a due date for when that work had to be done. The committee that the court ordered is the Steering Committee, and the work itself is Task 5. Mr. Kavounas stated the analysis, funding, and implementation plans for projects that were ordered by the court to commence, but again there is no explicit date when the court said that they have to be done, although the implicit date is October 2013. In December 2011 the Watermaster Board adopted a motion to complete the RMPU amendment work including stormwater recharge matters, funding, and implementation plans by December 2012. In December 2011 the Watermaster Board adopted a motion which was also adopted by the Advisory Committee, to complete the RMPU amendment work by December 2012. Mr. Kavounas stated the Board filed a progress report with the court in June 2012 as was required, and the report expressed the Board's direction that all the work would be completed by December 2012, and stated that progress would be made consistent with the Board's action. Mr. Kavounas stated with

regard to status, as of today, last month Watermaster prepared a strawman for Task 5 for discussion purposes only. The Appropriative Pool has been meeting and discussing this actively, with John Schatz as the facilitator, and we have received comments from four entities which have been circulated. Mr. Kavounas stated the next step would be to work with the Pools and come up with a process going forward.

2. Safe Yield Calculation

Mr. Kavounas stated this item was discussed in Mr. Wildermuth's presentation; however, it is due in 2011 and is due every 5 years after.

Ms. Lantz stated she was not clear whether the safe yield calculation was done in 2011 or not. Mr. Kavounas stated it was not done and it is overdue, and that is why Mr. Wildermuth is doing it now and intends to have it complete in June 2013.

3. Notice of Availability

Mr. Kavounas stated this item will be discussed under the confidential session.

4. Other Activities

Mr. Kavounas stated this Board approved in the consent calendar the reports, including the report B5 and there is something that he would like to draw attention to; this is not an item this Board will take action on, it is for information only regarding something the auditors pointed out to Watermaster. Mr. Kavounas stated to be in compliance with GASB 27, Watermaster needs to start showing an item that has always been an expense item; however, it has not been shown on the balance sheet. The item is funding the pension liability. The auditors are now recommending that we show it, and staff will comply with that request. Mr. Kavounas offered history on this item.

Chair Kuhn inquired if staff has any calculation on what is really due, and what we are paying interest on. Mr. Kavounas stated approximately \$125,000. Chair Kuhn stated if Watermaster pays that off then that will make the interest go away. Mr. Kavounas stated that is correct.

Mr. Kavounas stated it was his pleasure to attend the City of Chino Hills October 9<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting in which he presented Mr. Bill Kruger a certificate for his retirement, which was Board approved in September.

Mr. Kavounas stated he attended the October 12<sup>th</sup> Bioenergy Facility dedication at IEUA, which it is the largest Bioenergy facility in the whole world and was very impressive.

Mr. Kavounas stated Watermaster hosted a Basin Tour two days ago, which was constructive and he appreciated all the people who took time out of their busy schedules to go on this tour. Mr. Kavounas stated Watermaster was asked to host another tour next May. Mr. Kavounas stated there are a few folders which were used during the tour left over if anyone wants to take a look at what was visited and discussed.

Mr. Kavounas stated he is attending the Southern California Water Committee's dinner tonight.

Mr. Kavounas stated he wanted to remind the parties that the ACWA conference is being held in December in San Diego, and he is planning on attending that conference. Mr. Kavounas offered comment on some of the speakers that will be attending that conference.

#### IV. INFORMATION

1. Cash Disbursements for August 2012

No comment was made.



**V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Several of the Board members concurred it was a very good basin tour.

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

No comment was made.

The regular open Watermaster Board meeting was convened to hold its confidential session at 12:08 p.m.

**VII. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION - POSSIBLE ACTION**

Pursuant to Article 2.6 of the Watermaster Rules & Regulations, a Confidential Session may be held during the Watermaster committee meeting for the purpose of discussion and possible action.

1. Paragraph 31 Appeal

The confidential session concluded at 12:16 p.m.

Counsel Slater stated the motion from the confidential session was to authorize the Board Chair to execute a further implementation of the Paragraph 31 Settlement which will designate a substitute rate for Metropolitan Water District replenishment rates.

**VIII. FUTURE MEETINGS AT WATERMASTER**

Thursday, October 25, 2012	11:00 a.m.	Watermaster Board Meeting
Tuesday, October 30, 2012	2:00 p.m.	Assessment Package Workshop
** Wednesday, October 31, 2012	10:00 a.m.	Land Subsidence Committee Meeting
-----		
Thursday, November 1, 2012	10:00 a.m.	RMPU Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, November 8, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Appropriative Pool Meeting
Thursday, November 8, 2012	11:00 a.m.	Non-Agricultural Pool Conference Call Mtg.
Thursday, November 8, 2012	1:30 p.m.	Agricultural Pool Meeting
Thursday, November 15, 2012	8:00 a.m.	IEUA DYY Meeting
Thursday, November 15, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, November 15, 2012	10:00 a.m.	RMPU Steering Committee Meeting
* Thursday, November 15, 2012	11:00 a.m.	Watermaster Board Meeting
Tuesday, November 20, 2012	9:00 a.m.	GRCC Meeting

\* **NOTE:** Watermaster Board Meeting changed from November 22<sup>nd</sup> to **November 15<sup>th</sup>** due to the Thanksgiving Holiday

\*\* **NOTE:** Recently added

Chair Kuhn adjourned the Watermaster Board meeting at 12:19 p.m.

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

Minutes Approved: November 15, 2012