

Meeting Notes
Inyo-Mono IRWMP Administrative Committee and
Implementation funding allocation working committee

Monday, April 4, 2011
10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Conference call only
866-862-2138

Administrative Committee members and working committee participants will be calling in from the following locations. Other participants may call in from their own locations or go to one of the following locations:

1. California Trout Office
3399 Main St., Suite W5
Mammoth Lakes, CA
2. Inyo County Water Department
135 S. Jackson St.
Independence, CA
3. Bishop Paiute Tribe Environmental Management Office
50-B Tu Su Ln
Bishop, CA
4. Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
46 Tu Su Ln
Bishop, CA
5. Mammoth Community Water District
1315 Meridian Blvd.
Mammoth Lakes, CA
6. Central Sierra RC&D Office
824 Burcham Flat Rd.
Walker, CA

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Recommendation from Program Office on Program Assistant position
4. Progress report from Implementation funding allocation working committee

Notes

In attendance

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D
Tony Dublino, Mono County
Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Dept.
Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water Department
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Keith Pearce, Inyo County DPW

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - Bruce convened meeting at 10:03 am.
2. Public Comment
 - No comments
3. Recommendation from Program Office on Program Assistant position
 - Mark recapped process of recruiting Program Assistant.
 - Mark and Holly drafted position announcement and run in Mammoth Times and Inyo Register.
 - Received several inquiries and eight full applications.
 - Chose six candidates to interview; ultimately interviewed five.
 - Chose Janet Hatfield as the desired candidate.
 - Janet has a background in National Park Service; CEQA and reporting, grantwriting experience.
 - The second choice had some scheduling and availability challenges.
 - Bob motioned to accept Janet Hatfield as Program Assistant; Irene seconded; all accepted.
 - Next steps: Mark will begin contracting process with Janet; hope to complete within this week so that Janet could start next week.
 - Mark and Holly ensured the Admin. Committee that neither of them knew Janet ahead of time nor had heard anything about her work prior to her submitting her application.
4. Progress report from Implementation funding allocation working committee
 - In the principles and questionnaire document, there is a goals statement laying the foundation for the questionnaire.
 - The first item for discussion is Question 5, which asked whether a project proponent would be willing to have its project reviewed by another RWMG participant to realize cost savings. The working committee did not want project proponents to do this because it felt the question was too intrusive. This could be voluntary but would not be mandated. It was agreed to eliminate Question 5 but that the concept would be communicated to the Group.
 - One issue with this is that it may take so much time for another stakeholder to review another's project that it may not actually realize cost savings.
 - Another issue on the table was that this could be achieved through another RWMG participant essentially donating his/her time for a specific purpose.

- Mark suggested that the working committee verbalize to the Group the opportunity to have project budgets reviewed.
- Tony suggested that it might be better to do more critical reviews of budgets during the initial proposal development process rather than after the application has been submitted. Bob seconded this thought and added that not everybody has the expertise to review all projects and may not be able to provide very helpful feedback.
- We will ask project proponents to review budgets, and if proponents would like help reviewing budgets, we can try to find someone within the Group who is capable and willing to provide that help.
- Recommendation is to not include Question 5 but to verbalize the concept to project proponents. Accepted.
- Keith made some comments on the Methods section and wanted to include the idea that project proponents would not be penalized if they did not reduce their budgets. A change was made to Section B to address Keith's concerns.
- It was unclear whether this document needs to be approved by the RWMG, and thus the Admin. Committee is asked to make a recommendation or help the Program Office decide whether this needs to be taken to the Group.
- Working committee signed off on questions on questionnaire.
- Asked Admin. Committee for feedback or concerns.
- Question of including Mark's suggested comment about providing part of the grant award to the fiscal agent (up to 10%) to support the grant administration, and 2% to support the Program Office.
- Bruce does not think that this needs to be included in the document but rather should be provided as a reminder to project proponents at a Group meeting. Darla thinks that it is worth reminding project proponents in the document. It should be put in as an extra note and not part of the methods.
- 7.5% was built into the overall application budget for grant administration.
- Will include reminder statement for providing funding for grant administration.
- Mark suggested that DWR will want to see a budget for the fiscal agent, presumably based on the full grant amount. It would then presumably be reduced by some method if the full amount was not funded.
- Darla suggested that it would be useful to see a few different scenarios of budget from fiscal agent.
- Bruce asserted that it was because of the sliding nature of the funding available to Central Sierra that it agreed to be fiscal sponsor. He believes it is a matter of negotiation between the fiscal sponsor and the DWR and makes budgeting on the part of the fiscal agent impossible.
- Bruce thinks that it will not be possible to provide an up-front budget but will be reporting to DWR on actual expenses.
- Leroy suggests writing a separate memo to present to the whole Group and not include it in this document. Others agree with this.
- Mark asked Bruce for more detail on the fiscal agent work plan.
- Bruce will take a first cut at a short memo detailing the fiscal sponsor costs and will work with the Program Office to refine it. The goal is to present this to the Group at the April 27 RWMG meeting. This will be attached in some form to the existing goals/questionnaire document.
- Pending the discussed changes, all agree to the document.

- Question of whether this document needs to be approved by the Group. Bruce feels that this is a policy document and thus should be approved by the Group. Others concur. The final draft of the document needs to be circulated among this meeting group and approved for recommendation to the Group.
- There are two separate documents for now. Today the Admin. Committee and working committee are recommending the goals/methods/questionnaire. The fiscal agent language will only be recommended by working committee. This will all be sent out (at least to the Counties) by next Monday, April 11, and then put forth as a decision item on April 27.