

Final Meeting Notes

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program Administrative Committee Meeting

Wednesday, August 17, 2011
11:30pm-1:00pm
Conference Call

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

Call-In Locations

1. California Trout Office
3399 Main Street (Suite W5)
Mammoth Lakes, CA
2. Inyo County Water Department 135
S. Jackson St. Independence, CA
3. Mammoth Community Water District
1315 Meridian Blvd.
Mammoth Lakes, CA
4. Mono County Community
Development Office
Courthouse Annex 1, Room 112
49 Bryant St
Bridgeport, CA

Agenda

- Irene called the meeting to order 11:32 am

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person

- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Greg Norby, Mammoth Community Water District
- Mark Drew, California Trout
- Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff
- Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff

Attending on the Phone

- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD
- Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee

2. Public Comment Period

- There were no public comments

3. Implementation Grant

a. Final award notification

- Mark Drew notifies group that DWR came out with final award notifications and has issued an award to the Inyo-Mono Region for \$1,075,000. There have been reductions in budget from several project proponents potentially enabling several other projects to be funded. DWR will be sending out a commitment letter in the near future with more direction regarding the specifics of the Grant.
- Mark reminds Group it may take some time to actually sign the Grant Agreement, as the Planning Grant agreement still has not been signed. All spending from this point on should be reimbursable. However, until the Grant Agreement is signed there will be no reimbursements made.
- Mark informs Admin. Committee that matches requirements can be back-dated to Sept. 2008.
- Mark reviews the project list and relates how the current award will cover proposed projects. He shares that Dan Jenkins is willing to reduce ask to \$200-\$250,000. So additional projects will very likely be funded. Also the MCWD is willing to reduce ask to \$100,000. So it's looking like we will be able to fund the top 7 projects. Of projects, 4 go to Inyo County, 3 to Mono County with a roughly even monetary split.
- Bob Harrington asks who else we have heard back from regarding budget changes. The Program Office responds that Coleville School and the Water District are the only project proponents to respond to date.
- Mark informs Admin. Committee that the Program Office has been contributing extensive amounts of time on these issues and thus proposes finding additional funds for the Program Office to cover additional time and expenses needed for Implementation Grant Administration. **Program Office requests the Group to consider additional funding from the Implementation Grant in order to assist with administration of the grant.**
- Bruce Woodworth suggests the fiscal agent tentatively may be able to cover some of that funding.
- There was discussion of taking 3% instead of 2% from each of the projects.
- **Tony Dublino moves that the Admin. Committee recommends to the Group that we change Program Office administrative funds for Implementation from 2% to up to 3%. Irene Yamashita seconded. All approved.** (Decision item for Aug. 31 meeting.)
- There is dialogue whether or not members can get this decision to the County Boards in time for the Aug. 31 meeting in order to make a decision.
- Tony and Bob both expect that the County Boards are going to be comfortable with this without much/any opposition.
- **The Program Office will send Admin. Committee members and the funded Project Proponents revised budget spreadsheet.**
- **Program Office will reach out to Project Proponents that we have not heard from to see if additional budget revisions are forecast.**

b. Fiscal Agent Status

- Mark recaps his recent communications with Valerie Klinefelter from Central Sierra RC&D and communicates Program Office concerns regarding past and current communications with proposed fiscal agent.
- Mark asks the AC what they would like to do in regards to this issue.
- Greg Norby describes his grant experiences with DWR. He emphasizes the importance of clear and professional communications with DWR. He also communicates that at best, it is a frustrating and complicated process, and the way the administrative process is handled is not a trivial matter and should be carefully considered. He continues, emphasizing how critical communications are to the success of the program and shares his concerns with his first impression of Central Sierra. Greg suggests we reconsider the fiscal agent we want to work.
- Bob clarifies the discussion is about reopening the role of fiscal agent.
- Greg responds that yes that is the intention.
- There is a thorough discussion regarding communications between the Program Office and Central Sierra RC&D to date.
- Holly Alpert recaps that we are looking for guidance from the Admin. Committee regarding this matter.
- The Admin. Committee discusses the impacts on changing of fiscal agent at this point in time and the associated challenges and negative impacts it may or may not have on the Group.
- Harvey VanDyke asks who will be the point of contact between Central Sierra RC&D. Bruce said they can provide that information next week.
- There is further discussion about how best improve existing relations between Central Sierra RC&D and the Program Office/Group.
- Greg Norby and others emphasize the importance of clear communications between the Fiscal Agent and the Group and that the Group needs to clarify their expectations of the Fiscal Agent, in fairness to them. Greg continues that the expectation from MCWD for instance is total 100% dedication from the Fiscal Agent, but reiterates that **Group expectations need to be defined and communicated.**
- The Admin. Committee converses whether or not there are any alternative fiscal agent candidates, recognizing that the conversation is a moot point if there are no alternatives.
- Tony and Harvey suggest we give Central Sierra RC&D the opportunity to prove themselves now that the funding has arrived.
- It is the general feeling of the Admin. Committee that if in the coming weeks Central Sierra RC&D does not meet the Group's expectations, further investigations into alternate fiscal agent candidates may be re-opened.
- Mark asks Bruce if Central Sierra RC&D would be willing to present a Work Plan to the Group at the next meeting.
- Bruce responds that a staffing plan will certainly be in place but that the budget details may still be contingent upon reporting requirements over the 10-year monitoring period. Central Sierra will gladly report on all available information at the Aug. 31 meeting.

- Bruce reminds everyone that we have not seen the reporting requirements from DWR and until those become available Central Sierra will not be able to give hard numbers in support of this budget. He states that Central Sierra RC&D will provide the budget as soon as the needed requirements become available.
- Bruce asks for direction on how Mark would deal with 10-year monitoring and reporting requirements, and Mark advises that he would rely heavily on project proponents.
- Bruce feels that DWR will need to provide clear guidance as to how this task is achieved.
- Bob asks how Central Sierra has dealt with this in their other State Funded grant programs. Bruce responds that Valerie may be better equipped to answer that question.
- Harvey would like a flow chart from the fiscal agent demonstrating the processes of fiscal agent. Bruce responds that Central Sierra would be able to provide that at the August meeting.
- **Mark and Bruce will together reach out to DWR to inquire about State requirements regarding long term monitoring and the issues that arise from such requirements.**
- Bruce asks if they should get to work or hold off since we may be considering a different fiscal agent.
- Tony feels like hanging back at this point would be an error.
- Bruce confirms that Central Sierra is ready to work.
- **Mark asks Bruce for Central Sierra to provide the maximum available information at the August 31, RWMG meeting.**
- **Holly recommends Mark provides a report to the Group on his conversation with Valerie later today.**
- Mark encourages the group to focus on the positive and move on and anticipates a positive outcome.

c. Content and format of fiscal sponsor reports to Admin. Comm. (monthly) and RWMG (Annually)

- Mark recaps that Program Office reporting under the Planning Grant consists of the following reporting requirements:
 - Written report bi-monthly (consisting of budget to actuals reporting)
 - Oral report every month at the Admin. Committee meeting.
- Bob raised the issue of what the contents of the reporting will be.
- Bruce requests some training regarding interpreting the reports provided to Admin. Committee to ensure proper oversight occurs.
- Mark emphasizes the importance of the Admin. Committee in understanding reports from all the associated programs (Planning Grant, DAC, and Implementation) as these reports contain critical information about each of the programs (Budget, Work Plan, etc...).
- Holly mentions we can use the Planning Grant reporting as a template for future grant reporting (ie. Implementation & DAC). She suggests that once the first report for the Planning Grant is sent to DWR we can schedule an Admin. Committee meeting to discuss the details of the report. At that point

the Admin. Committee can hand select which elements will be relevant to future needed reports.

d. Preliminary discussions of Round 1 Implementation proposal and potential strategies for Round 2

- Mark suggests we focus on getting the top 7 projects underway before attempting to analyze what happened with Round 1 proposal.
- Bruce moves we table this agenda item for another meeting. All agree.

4. Briefing by Program Office on budget

- Discussed generally above. Detailed numbers will be provided at the next Admin. Committee meeting.

5. Review of action items from the meeting

- Bruce brings up to re-open the revised budget request that was once requested now that the money has been awarded.
- **Bruce requests updates from Project Proponents to be forwarded to the fiscal agent.**
- Janet provides a summary of Action and items to the Admin. Committee.
- Irene closed the meeting 1:02pm