

Final Meeting Notes
Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group
Regular Meeting

Wednesday, June 15, 2011
9:30am - 12:30pm
Town of Mammoth Lakes
Council Chambers-Suite Z
437 Old Mammoth Rd
Mammoth Lakes, CA

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

June 15, 2011 Meeting Summary

Decision Items

1. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve proposed effective date of September 1, 2011, for the Revised Version #1 of the MOU
 - Bob moves to adopt September 1, 2011, as the effective date for the Revised Version #1 of the MOU, contingent upon current MOU signatories not opposing the effective date and subsequent adoption. Tony seconded. All approved.
2. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve May 18, 2011 RWMG meeting notes
 - Mark moves to approve May 18th meeting notes. Bryanna seconded. All approved.

Action Items

1. Program Office will agenzize the topic of engaging the IRWMP to assist in developing projects for priority watersheds for the Inyo National Forest Watershed Condition Framework initiative at the July 27 meeting.
2. The Program Office will obtain consent, or at minimum get a no contest, from current MOU signatories who have not signed revised MOU version #1, prior to the next meeting.
3. The Program Office will present to the Group at the July 27th meeting a general schedule for outreach efforts.
4. Matt is welcoming input from the group regarding Organizational Structures. If participants would like to see specifics from Matt please send your requests to Janet. The Program Office will send out his Matrix with the notes, or soon thereafter.
5. The Program Office will inquire about CRWAs specific experience with doing water assessments on tribal lands.
6. Program Office will come back to the group with initial criteria for CRWA needs assessments after discussing with the Admin. Committee.
7. Program Office will develop more user friendly tracking forms for members.
8. Program office will send out narrative and task table to Members regarding the DAC grant.
9. The program Office will continue to solicit interest regarding the DAC funding workshop being held in Rancho Cucamonga on June 28, 2011.

AGENDA

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Public comment period**
3. **Planning/implementation MOU Revised Version #1**
 - Status Check on signed MOU's
 - **DECISION ITEM: Approve proposed effective date of September 1, 2011, for the Revised Version #1 of the MOU**
4. **2011 IRWM Conference**
 - ❖ Integration defined
5. **Round 1 Implementation Grant**
 - Review of public comment process
 - Alternative Funding Opportunities
 - Initial process evaluation
 - DWR response letter from Program Office
6. **Planning Grant**
 - Review of planning process and schedule
 - Update Mandatory/Guiding Documents
 - Special Guest: Matt Griffis,(Sierra Nevada Alliance) - Organizational Structure Research
 - Discuss Organizational Structure Work Group
 - Review integration of Climate Change into the Plan
 - Initial criteria for prioritizing CWRA needs assessments
 - Website
 - Match tracking reminders
7. **DAC Grant**
 - ❖ Scope of Work
 - ❖ Status
8. **Updates**
 - ❖ Developing Funding for DAC Infrastructure Projects Workshop- June 28, 2011
9. **Announcements**
10. **Process check**
11. **Approval of previous meeting notes**
 - * Discuss comments, edits, and corrections
 - * **DECISION ITEM: Approve May 18, 2011 RWMG meeting notes**
12. **Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting**
13. **Next meeting dates:**
 - * Wednesday, July 27, 2011, USFS/BLM/SNC Offices, Bishop,CA

NOTES

1. Welcome and Introductions

- BryAnna Vaughan convened meeting at 9:35 am.

Attending in Person

- BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Mark Drew, California Trout and IRWMP Staff
- Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Rich Ciauri, June Lake Public Utilities District
- Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee
- Alex Henson, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D, Mono County RCD
- Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
- Tony Dublino, Mono County

- Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
- Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff
- Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Matt Griffis, Sierra Nevada Alliance
- Terri Chavez, Crowley Lake Mutual Water Company
- Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest
- Peter Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes
- Andy Geisel, The Sheet

Attending via Phone

- Holly Gallagher, Birchim CSD
- Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe
- Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department

2. Public comment period

- Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest: Watershed Condition Framework initiative, happening nationwide with U.S. Forest Service. All National Forest watersheds were evaluated against 29 criteria: the Inyo NF evaluated its watersheds and categorized them accordingly. The Inyo National Forest is looking to identify priority watersheds on the Forest (by mid-July) and develop a priority watershed restoration action plan by the end of fiscal year, Sept 30.
- The Inyo will be holding a series of meetings in the near future to identify these priority watersheds. Those interested in participating can contact Todd at tellsworth@fs.fed.us or (760) 873-2457.
- Nationally there are \$80 million budgeted for this initiative.
- **Program Office will agendize the topic of engaging the IRWMP to assist in developing projects for priority watersheds for the Inyo National Forest Watershed Condition Framework initiative at the July 27 meeting.**
- Tony Dublino inquired whether all projects were only for Forest Service Lands. Todd replied there may be an exception for projects that show a clear benefit to the Inyo NF.
- Mark Drew thinks this project can provide the group with further opportunities for project integration that address multiple stakeholder needs and/or priority issues.

5. Round 1 Implementation Grant (agenda item 5 was moved up for discussion here)

- Mark summarizes what has been happening with the Round 1 Implementation grant and informs those who had not heard that the Inyo-Mono received \$0 in the preliminary recommendation.
- At the conference there were many opportunities to speak with DWR about what happened and get direction on how to proceed.
- The goal in responding during the public comment was to bring our score up to those of regions that were recommended for funding.

• Review of public comment process

- The Program Office thanks the following participants for supporting the public response effort to DWR:

- Eastern Sierra Unified School District - Dan Jenkins
- Amargosa Conservancy -Greg James
- Inyo County Water Department - Bob Harrington
- Inyo County - Keith Pearce
- Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe - Mel O. Joseph, Alex Henson
- Owens Valley Indian Water Commission - Teri Red Owl, Darla Heil
- Central Sierra RCD - Valerie Klinefelter, Bruce Woodworth
- June Lake PUD - Rich Ciauri
- Wheeler Crest CSD - Harvey VanDyke
- Birchim CSD- Holly Gallagher
- Mammoth Community Water District - Greg Norby
- California Rural Water Association - Dustin Hardwick
- Inyo County Supervisor- Linda Arcularius
- Eastern Sierra Land Trust- Rick Kattelmann
- Mono County-Tony Dublino
- Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office

- Darla asks about if the Program Office response letter should be sent on to State representatives.
- Central Sierra RC&D has informed their regional representative to the State Senate of the situation, as they have a direct contact.
- Leroy has submitted the Program Office letter to assemblywoman Shannon Grove, who will be forwarding on the letter to Senator Fuller's staff.
- Mark requests if others have upper level contacts at the legislative level, to let the Program Office know.
- Mark explains the mechanics of how funding can be reassigned after preliminary recommendations, and adds further that the precedent has been set to pull monies from subsequent funding rounds. (i.e., DWR has done so for Antelope Valley in this round, and others under Prop 50, etc...)
- Mark is optimistic and proud of the Group effort.
- If no other regions within the Lahontan contest the decision, DWR will have clearance to proceed at its discretion based on justification to do so.
- The program office is working with Tahoe-Sierra, and has their support. Mark has also contacted Antelope Valley and Mojave asking for their support. Antelope Valley has responded and can appreciate our situation. They will look to support our effort upon hearing DWR's recommendation. Program Office has not heard back from Mojave.

- **Alternative Funding Opportunities**
 - Mark reminds the Group that other funding opportunities are available and Prop. 84 monies will eventually dry up so we will continue to pursue alternative funding opportunities to further support our projects.
- **Initial process evaluation**
 - Program Office asked for comments from the Group in February, 2011, after Round 1 projects were submitted. We received a number of comments from the Group. Those comments will be considered in Round 2 proposal development and project ranking.
 - We will further take up this evaluation under Task 5 of the Planning Grant: Evaluation of Goals Objectives and Regional Priorities, with assistance from the Center for Collaborative Policy.
 - Tony recommends the Group evaluates successful applications from other regions as a learning tool. Tony further emphasizes that a proactive approach seems prudent, in an attempt to increase our success rate for the next round.
 - Mark reiterates that there are funds set aside in the planning grant for training and capacity building, to help prepare us for Round 2.
- **DWR response letter from Program Office**
 - Program Office response took a three-tiered approach; beginning with broad scope of what the challenges were for the Inyo-Mono region, followed then by comments addressing process issues/challenges, and finally followed by responses to specific comments pertaining to project evaluations.
 - Program Office will let the group know as soon as DWR responds (expect mid-July).
 - Mark recommends when we hear from DWR, assuming the preliminary recommendation changes in the Group's favor, that we consider convening a special meeting to discuss the next recommendation.

3. **Planning/implementation MOU Revised Version #1**

- **Status Check on signed MOU's**

Signed Copies received by Program Office to date (*Indicates New Signatory)

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Amargosa Conservancy | • Mountain Meadows Mutual Water Company |
| • Big Pine Paiute Tribe | • Owens Valley Indian Water Commission |
| • Birchim CSD | • Bishop Paiute Tribe |
| • Bishop BLM | • Mono County RCD |
| • Bridgeport Indian Colony* | • Mammoth Community Water District |
| • California Trout | • Wheeler Crest CSD |
| • Eastern Sierra Land Trust | • (June Lake PUD) |
| • Eastern Sierra Unified School District | |
| • Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe | |

Pending Signatures Update (*Indicates New Signatory)

- Mono County – approved, waiting for the effective date to sign

- Owens Valley Committee - signed copy, en route
 - Inyo County - approved will send in mail
 - Town of Mammoth Lakes - will be decided upon at Town Council meeting July 3rd
 - Sierra Club – will consider July 9th
 - Mojave Desert Mountain RC&D – approved, en route.
 - Indian Wells Valley Water District - approved, waiting for effective date.
 - Central Sierra RC&D - en route
 - **Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Water Management Group*** - waiting for an effective date to sign.
- **DECISION ITEM: Approve proposed effective date of September 1, 2011, for the Revised Version #1 of the MOU**
 - Leroy Corlett communicates to the Group that his board is uncomfortable signing a document that lacks a date as it leads to ambiguity. A date ensures that everyone is signing the same document.
 - Mark asks the group if there is an objection to pushing the effective date up to August 1.
 - Tony states that the current decision item reads September 1 as the effective date and if changes are made additional permissions will need to be obtained again from his board.
 - Many group members agree and it is decided to remain with a September 1 effective date for the Revised Version #1 of the MOU.
 - Bob Harrington brings up the issue of what happens to those who are previous members once the new MOU is in effect. Do they lose membership? That does not seem to comply with the spirit of the current MOU.
 - Holly Alpert reads Section 2.02 of current MOU: "...in effect until terminated by all existing members."
 - Round Valley, Mono Lake Committee, Audubon Society, and Fort Independence are the four members who have not reported back to Program Office regarding the new MOU.
 - **The Program Office will obtain consent, or at minimum get a no contest, from current MOU signatories who have not signed revised MOU version #1, prior to the next meeting.**
 - **Bob moves to adopt September 1, 2011, as the effective date for the Revised Version #1 of the MOU, contingent upon current MOU signatories not opposing the effective date and subsequent adoption. Tony seconded. All approved.**
 - Darla Heil thinks the language should read that a lack of response can be interpreted as a no contest. This way the Group is not waiting for responses from entities that have become uninterested.

4. 2011 IRWM Conference

- Mark informs group of the value of the conference. Content of presentations was informative and networking opportunities were extremely valuable. Mark encourages more participation from the group at future events.

- Big picture integration was the take-home message for the conference! This means addressing multiple needs and issues on a watershed scale or other larger scale.
- Mark would like to bring Celeste Cantu from the Santa Ana Water Project Authority to speak on integration at one of our meetings.
- Bruce Woodworth argues that integrated projects become massive when you consider whole watersheds and can open up large problematic issues. He also states that the Inyo-Mono region has few issues that are truly region-wide.
- Todd brings up that catastrophic wildfire mitigation is one example of a landscape-scale project that does apply across all boundaries and that the USFS is pushing for an all-lands approach to resource management planning.
- Mark informs the group that there are may be advantages to thinking on a bigger scale.
- Rich Ciauri asks if we can review other regions' project proposals to use as a learning tool. The answer is that the project applications are not readily available online; we would need to contact IRWM regions directly and ask if we can see their proposals.
- To view how other regions are integrating their projects, you can view IRWMP conference presentations online at <http://www.watereducation.org/doc.asp?id=1899>.
- Another way to view project proposals is through the IRWM Implementation page of the DWR website. In each of the region's proposal evaluation, there is a list of the projects that they submitted with their application: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_implementation.cfm.

6. Planning Grant

- Review of [planning process and schedule](#)
 - Mark informs group that DWR has at last received the tax documentation we have been waiting for in order to activate the Planning Grant. Implementation of Planning Grant is on schedule as CalTrout is comfortable fronting the funds at present. Program Office aims to keep on schedule. We are now waiting for the State budget to pass.
 - This applies to Planning Grant as well as DAC Grant.
 - Task 5 (Goals and Objectives) will begin in July, 2011.
 - **The Program Office will present to the Group at the July 27th meeting a general schedule for outreach efforts.**
- [Update Mandatory/Relevant Documents](#)
 - Janet Hatfield summarizes where the Program Office is at in Task 2 (Update relevant planning documents) and proposes a language change from "Mandatory" to "Relevant" documents.
 - Evaluation of Phase I planning documents is complete, and gaps were identified
 - Most recently Janet has been working on filling in those data gaps and compiling the planning documents into the digital library.
 - Janet will continue to seek guidance from knowledgeable members as well as seek out planning documents from underrepresented areas in our region.

- The purpose of completing this table is threefold; 1) Prepares us for completing Phase II of the Plan per DWR requirements, 2) Helps us as members better integrate our projects with a region-wide lens, 3) Provides a tangible example of the complexities of the Inyo-Mono region to DWR as a result of our diverse region and resources.
- Program Office would also like to incorporate this table into a GIS database to make it a valuable tool to the Group.
- As soon as the updates are complete, Janet can begin summarizing the process and needs for the Phase II plan.
- BryAnna said that the Tribe is in the process of putting together a GIS server, and there is a free workstation at the Tribe.
- Ceal Klingler mentioned Brown and Caldwell Water News as a good resource for California.
- Mark includes that DWR also has a daily news feed that may be of interest to some of the Group.
- [Special Guest: Matt Griffis \(Sierra Nevada Alliance\) - Organization Structure Research](#)
 - Holly A. introduces Matt Griffis from the Sierra Nevada Alliance and provides background on what he has been assigned in the Planning Grant tasks.
 - As a start, 14 IRWM regions are the focus of his research, and a list of questions was composed to ask each region. His work will include collecting governance documents, summarizing his discussions from each region contacted, and developing and filling in a summary matrix.
 - 7 regions have been contacted to date. All of the regions he has talked to have been working under MOUs. All the MOUs differ in various ways; Matt presents some of the differences in MOUs.
 - Matt commends integration of the Inyo-Mono region when comparing to some of the other organizations.
 - JPA and 501(c)(3) organizations have not been able to meet with him to date, but he will continue to pursue scheduling those meetings.
 - CABY- provides an interesting template for a region that utilizes all three forms of governance to further their funding opportunities.
 - In some regions, fiscal sponsorship is supported by the largest agencies or by the project proponent asking for the most money. This cuts down on a bit of the grant administration overhead.
 - Most regions say that their processes seem to work fine. The most positive aspects of their organizations were the relationships built by the roundtable type discussions supported through the integrated planning process.
 - Some regions do not comply with the Brown Act, and their meetings remain closed to the public. This has been problematic in some cases.
 - Biggest challenge across regions: Getting DWR to pay invoices.
 - Lack of resources was mentioned from Tahoe-Sierra as a major challenge. However, that same challenge has created stronger collaborative bonds between members and they viewed that as a major benefit.
 - Mark encourages the Group to think about what other information would be useful for Matt to gather from these discussions with other IRWM Groups. Keeping in mind that the Inyo-Mono group will have to make a decision in the future regarding organizational structure.

- The Group recommends several other IRWMs to contact, including the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, with emphasis being on getting a representative sampling of the different organizational structure types.
 - Darla asked if Matt has explored how other groups have ranked projects and would like Matt to explore that in his continued research.
 - Bruce asked about legally binding MOU, Matt will look into that further. He questions further what criteria were used to select the 14 regions.
 - Some other regions were recommended by the group to add to the research pool.
 - Bruce asked if these organizations have in-house Grant Planner/Administrator/Researcher.
 - Leroy asked if JPAs have input on how expensive it was to get set-up in that type of organizational structure and what the administrative costs were.
 - Mark agrees that information regarding the financials of setting up each of the different types of structures would be very valuable to the Group.
 - **Matt is welcoming input from the group regarding Organizational Structures. If participants would like to see specifics from Matt please send your requests to Janet. The Program office will send out his Matrix with the notes, or soon thereafter.**
 - Mark states that at some point it may be useful to put together a working committee to digest information coming from Matt and develop a recommendation regarding organizational structure for the Group.
- **Review integration of Climate Change into the Plan**
 - Holly A. gives overview of the Climate Change Handbook from Sacramento; she is serving as an advisor to the document's review process.
 - This will be used as a template for planning regions to integrate climate change into their regions, projects, planning processes.
 - Final handbook is not likely to be available until right before Round 2 planning grants.
 - Holly thinks that being part of the review process is a good opportunity to begin incorporating climate change into our plan and gives the Inyo-Mono region an opportunity to become a leader in this arena.
 - Four main steps to incorporating climate change into the plan: 1) Vulnerability Assessment, which includes characterizing the planning region, identifying qualitative impacts, identifying vulnerabilities, and ranking them; 2) Measuring Climate Change Impacts; 3) Evaluate the region's goals, objectives, strategies, and projects in light of climate change ranking criteria; and 4) Implementing under Uncertainty - scenario planning, adaptation strategies, and adaptive management.
 - Holly will be asking for assistance with some phases of incorporating climate change into the Inyo-Mono Plan.
 - Inyo National Forest has a comprehensive climate assessment for the region. Todd will send to Janet to include in the Relevant Docs table.

- **Initial criteria for prioritizing CRWA needs assessments**
 - Mark recaps that in the Planning Grant we have support to conduct needs assessments from California Rural Water Association (CRWA). With DAC grant funds, an additional 20 assessments will be available.
 - Bruce suggested that initial criteria should be discussed first by the Administrative Committee. Mark proposes to hold an Admin. Committee meeting in July. Those interested are welcome to attend and participate.
 - Mark gives the group some preliminary criteria ideas, and asks for input on what other criteria the group thinks need to be considered.
 - Tony asks what exactly the needs assessments entail. Mark explains the general needs assessment process in which CRWA team asks questions, drafts recommendations, and gives cost estimates.
 - Planning Grant funds will be supporting 20 assessments and includes an in-kind match from CRWA.
 - Bruce doesn't think all \$10,000 should go to needs assessment for only small water districts. It seems like other groups should be able to qualify for assistance as well. In the future we are going to need to be thinking about how to provide assistance for environmental interests, etc...
 - Mark said it's already budgeted as a line item in the Planning Grant and would need to explore opportunities of how to do a similar process (assessments) for other types of participants.
 - Ceal agrees that a balance of environmental stewardship projects would be nice to see in the future.
 - Rick Kattelmann notes that the North Coast has been successful at promoting environmental projects so we may be able to learn from that.
 - BryAnna asked if CRWA has specific experience doing needs assessments on Tribal Lands.
 - **The Program Office will inquire about CRWAs specific experience with doing water assessments on tribal lands.**
 - **Program Office will come back to the group with initial criteria for CRWA needs assessments after discussing with the Admin. Committee.**
 - It is requested by the Program Office to get responses for those interested in having a needs assessment done.
 - Irene Yamashita cautions against opening the process to environmental needs assessments at this point.

- **Website**
 - Holly and Janet have received web training so updates are currently ongoing.
 - There is a news tab where current happenings are posted.
 - Events Calendar up to date and current.
 - Agendas are posted on the web now as well as emailed to the Group.
 - Cosmetic overhaul of site to begin in July/early August. Rick was gracious enough to provide us with images for the web. (THANK YOU!) (Display Concept page) Any interested parties with hidden web design talent are welcome to step forward.
 - Members Log-in page is postponed until we define its purpose. Ceal recommends Drop Box.

- Other ideas from attending members were to include an Archives section, include a “Search Box” in the website itself, include an RSS news feed option, have an upcoming meeting documents folder for members to easily locate needed meeting documents, and lastly to have a “orientation” page for first time visitors to enable them to grasp the IRWM concept and what we do in a simple page or two.
- **Match tracking reminders**
 - Program Office will be sending the first Planning Grant report to DWR late June/early July. In order to meet our match requirement for the Planning Grant, we need to be able to account for the valuable hours worked by our members.
 - For those who have submitted match tracking forms, THANK YOU!
 - Forms not received from the following active members...
 - Bob Harrington
 - Sally Manning
 - Greg James
 - Keith Pearce
 - Sierra Nevada Alliance
 - Holly Gallagher
 - Harvey VanDyke
 - Morgan Lindsay
 - Pete Bernasconi
 - Darla would like to have a form to keep up to date with these reporting requirements - i.e., where the meetings were held, mileage, time spent, phone calls, etc...
 - **Program Office will develop more user friendly tracking forms for members.**

7. DAC Grant

Status:

- Mark said DWR may have received appropriate tax paperwork for drafting grant agreement as well, just like the planning grant. Mark went over the proposal submitted to DWR and discussed the six tasks included in the proposal. Five groups were selected to participate statewide. \$371,000 is the grant award amount to the Inyo-Mono region. The budget timeline was extended to two years. Funding is likely to arrive at the end of the summer. Mark has inquired to DWR when we can start spending the funds, and has requested it in writing.
- Darla asks how this grant will be integrated into the current process and group.
- Mark responds that it is to build capacity specifically for DACs. Gives us an opportunity to be a part of a pilot projects to be used as a learning tool for the rest of the state.
- Now a grant vs. a contract of services.

Scope of Work

- Task 1 - Project planning
- Task 2 – Outreach implementation
- Task 3 - Needs assessments
- Task 4 - Capacity building
- Task 5 - Report compilation
- Task 6 - Findings dissemination
- **Program office will send out narrative and task table to Members regarding the DAC grant.**
- Bruce requests to see the entire package, and suggests it is sent to members only. In subject line include language “For members only, do not forward”.

8. Updates

- Developing Funding for DAC Infrastructure Projects Workshop June 28, 2011: <http://www.cvent.com/events/developing-funding-for-disadvantaged-community-infrastructure-projects/event-summary-535b076b602f482fa395d64612808f4e.aspx>
- A survey was taken for interested parties.
- **The program Office will continue to solicit interest regarding the DAC funding workshop being held in Rancho Cucamonga on June 28, 2011.**
- Mark informs group that the Program Office would be willing to make some funds available to those interested in attending.

9. Announcements

- CA Rural Water Drought Management Preparedness Workshop in Bishop. Help will be provided to small water districts with a focus on developing water shortage contingency plans. Content hours will be provided to operators. July 19, 2011. **See attachment for details.**
- CalTrout will be starting a non-point source pollution study in the Mammoth Lakes Basin, in the fall; Mark and Janet are looking for interested parties to serve on the technical advisory committee (TAC) for this project. Partners on the project include Inyo National Forest and American Rivers. TAC will assist in developing management recommendations in an effort to avoid having to implement TMDLs for the Lakes Basin. Contact Mark or Janet if interested.

10. Process check

- No comments

11. Approval of previous meeting notes

* **DECISION ITEM:** Approve May 18, 2011 RWMG meeting notes

- **Mark moves to approve May 18th meeting notes. Bryanna seconded. All approved.**

12. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting

- Janet and Holly reviewed the action and decision items from the meeting.

13. Next meeting dates:

- Wednesday, July 27, 2011, USFS/BLM/SNC Offices,
 - Bishop, CA (9:30am-12:30pm)
 - Wednesday, August 31, 2011 (Location TBA)
 - Wednesday, September,28, 2011 (Location TBA)
- BryAnna adjourns the meeting 12:37 pm.