

Draft Meeting Summary

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program Administrative Committee Meeting

Wednesday, August 15, 2012
10:00 am - 12:00 pm
Conference call, with in-person options

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

1. Public comments are due on August 24 for the Preliminary Round 2 Planning Grant recommendations to DWR. The link was provided in an email sent yesterday, August 14, 2012.
2. Program Office Staff will report on outcome of the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Proponent Meeting at next week's RWMG meeting.
3. Bruce Woodworth moves to recommend the proposed wording to the RWMG Letter of Support at next week's meeting. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.
4. Irene will follow up with Valerie on the current status of the Implementation Grant Agreement
5. On behalf of the Admin. Committee, Mark requests a budget report from Central Sierra at the next Admin. Committee meeting and asks Bruce to help facilitate the assembly of that information.
6. It is requested that Valerie provide a schedule or calendar of invoicing dates and associated Implementation deadlines.
7. The Program Office will provide a budget report on the current Round 1 Implementation Grant at the next Admin. Committee meeting.
8. Mark will send an email to Leroy requesting needed resolution regarding the various relationships between the RWMG and the Non-Profit.
9. Janet will distill a version of the Non-Profit conversation today to be presented to the RWMG at next week's meeting. Comments or suggestions will be emailed back to Janet for assimilation and dispersal back to the Non-Profit Working Committee.
10. A copy of CABY Organizational Structure documents will be sent to all Admin. Committee members.

Draft Meeting Summary

- 10:03 Irene Yamashita convenes the Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 min.)

In Person

- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D, Mono County RCD
- Mark Drew, California Trout/IRWMP Staff
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff
- Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff
- Sara Pfeifer, IRWMP Staff
- Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
- Heather deBethizy, Mono County

On the Call

- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony (10:45-11:30)

2. Public Comment Period (5 min.)

- Program Office Staff thanks Members for their patience while they took a much needed break.

3. Update from Program Office (25 min.)

a. Round 2 Planning Grant Initial Funding Recommendations

- Mark proudly announces the Inyo-Mono region has received a preliminary recommendation of \$480,000 for the Round 2 Planning Grant, which is approximately 70% of our grant ask. He informs the Admin. Committee that the score seemed low and that the Program Office Staff will be looking into the details of the scoring and providing feedback to DWR, as the Staff felt perhaps they did not receive full credit for items such as DAC involvement, etc.
- Holly informs that the current evaluations are online at DWR's website, and she can help those who are interested find the evaluations. She recommends taking a look at the evaluation and reports that paper copies of the submitted Planning Grant proposal are available in the office.
- **Public comments are due on August 24 for the Preliminary Round 2 Planning Grant recommendations to DWR. The link was provided in an email sent yesterday, August 14, 2012.**
- The recommended funding would cover up through a portion of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Stormwater project. A meeting will be held later today with Planning Grant Project Proponents to see where projects may be able to trim budgets in order to share the wealth with the Invasive Species project, which is currently excluded from the funding pool.
- **Program Office Staff will report on outcome of the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Proponent Meeting at next week's RWMG meeting.**
- Staff reminds the Admin. Committee that the current Planning Grant has been extended through September, 2012, and that the Round 2 Planning grant will begin sometime after the end of the current Planning Grant. Exact dates are TBD and will be dependent on Round 2 Implementation as well as DAC Grant schedules.

b. Round 1 Planning Grant Budget Reporting

c. DAC Grant Budget Reporting

- Holly summarizes the budget status for both Planning Grant and DAC Grants and is pleased to report that CalTrout has been reimbursed for the first Planning Grant invoice which covered expenses from April through October of 2011, totaling approximately \$60,000. The second and third Planning Grant invoices are currently under review with DWR and are for \$38,000 and \$24,000, respectively. The first DAC Invoice for \$13,000 is also under review with DWR. Holly believes subsequent invoices should move more quickly as we have learned a considerable amount about the process of working on these invoices with DWR. One lesson learned is that quarterly invoicing is desired for future grants to reduce staff time needed to administer the grants.
- The Program Staff will report back at the next Admin. Committee meeting as to exactly where expenses stand with respect to the budget as we near the completion of the Planning grant.
- Mark reminds that the DAC Grant goes through September, 2013, and that a considerable amount of funding remains. He points this out to inform the Admin. Committee that the

Program Staff will be making a concerted effort to make progress on the DAC grant in the coming months.

- Future DAC budget reports will be provided at upcoming Admin.Committee meetings.

d. Proposed process wording and membership requirement for Generic Letter of Support

- There is a discussion about the proposed wording for the process of issuing a generic Letter of Support on behalf of the RWMG. This conversation included some suggested wording added to the process making it clear that membership is not a prerequisite to request this generic letter from the RWMG.
- *Proposed Process: When a request for the RWMG Letter of Support is received by the Program Office, Staff will email the pending request to MOU signatories and provide a comment period of at least one week. During the comment period, all Members will be given the opportunity to notice their concern of the project. If after the comment period, no Members provide notice of concern to the Program Office, the Program Office will then be granted the authority to submit the support letter on behalf of the RWMG without a formal decision by the Group. If any concern is voiced by the membership, formal approval of the support letter will need to be agendized at the next RWMG meeting. **Membership is not a prerequisite for said Letter of Support.** (Bold indicates added wording between draft and final agenda.)*
- Irene suggests the Admin. Committee makes a recommendation to the Group to accept the wordings as revised in the agenda (it italics above)
- **Bruce Woodworth moves to recommend the proposed wording to the RWMG Letter of Support at next week's meeting. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.**

e. Next Steps

- Program Office staff reports that final Plan chapter writing is currently underway and that the final deadline for draft chapters to go out to the RWMG for review is this Friday, August 17 at 5:00 p.m. Chapters will be posted online for review for those Members interested in providing comments and will be available for four weeks to review.
- The goal is to have Plan review completed by September 14, so that the Program Office Staff has a week or so to incorporate comments and collate the entire document to provide to the RWMG for final approval.
- Plan approval will be sought at the November 14 RWMG meeting.
- Mark reports that some other regions are being audited for Prop. 50 grants and it is likely we are audited sometime in the future by DWR. Thus the time we are spending on reporting and invoicing is a worthwhile investment, so that all the paperwork is well organized in the event of an audit.
- Irene asks about the status of comments from the South Lahontan Regional Forum to DWR.
- Mark responds that Jen Wong will be working on that section of the Water Plan now that Parker has moved on and that they have been in touch. He summarizes that the MCWD, Sierra Club, and Program Office Staff provided comments on the issue statements. Those comments will be sent on to Judie Talbot of the Center for Collaborative Policy who will coordinate with DWR staff to synthesize the comments on behalf of the South Lahontan Region.
- Mark and Holly both are optimistic that the feedback gathered on the South Lahontan forum will improve the North Lahontan meeting.
- North Lahontan is currently scheduled for Friday, September 28, in South Lake Tahoe. More information will be provided as it comes available.

4. Round 1 Implementation/Update from Central Sierra (15 min.)

a. Financial reporting

- There is a discussion of the role of the Admin. Committee and the importance of fiscal oversight of the various Fiscal Agents. Some members speak of the importance in knowing where Central Sierra (and all fiscal agents) is at financially. They would like to see consistency in reporting and would like to see Valerie provide verbal and written reports at the Admin. Committee meetings per the MOU.
- **Mark requests a budget report from Central Sierra at the next Admin. Committee meeting and asks Bruce to help facilitate the assembly of that information.** He reminds Admin. Committee that monthly reports are outlined in the MOU and speaks of the value of the monthly budget checks for the Program Office.
- Program Office staff has heard from Central Sierra that October 31 is the date of the first invoice, but is unclear whether this is the end of the invoicing period or the date of the invoice submittal.
- **It is requested that Valerie provide a schedule or calendar of invoicing dates and associated implementation deadlines.**
- Program Staff remind those in attendance that reporting is required in unison with invoicing and that a schedule would be extremely valuable for Project Proponents.
- Bruce reports that once DWR is receiving invoices and reports, the Admin. Committee and RWMG will also receive them.
- **The Program Office will provide a budget report on the current Round 1 Implementation Grant at the next Admin. Committee meeting.**

b. Status of project proponent contracts

- Bruce reports that he spoke with Valerie on Monday, summarizing that further revisions are being done to some of the Project budget numbers. He reports that it is unfortunate that the errors were not caught until they reached Upper Level DWR staff.
- Mark adds some detail and provides that the Hilltop Project and Inyo County CSA-2 Project are the two in question. He believes there will be no bottom line funding change, but rather a reallocation of contingency funds that were not assigned to particular tasks. These funds will need to be embedded into a specific task as contingency funding is not acceptable to DWR. Mark understands the changes needed will be considered an Administrative Amendment to the Grant Agreement and should be rather simple to execute.
- Irene asks if the Grant Agreement has been signed. Bruce is unsure of the current status and is uncertain how the Administrative Amendment will affect the Grant Agreement status.
- Irene will follow up with Valerie on the current status of the Implementation Grant Agreement.
- There is a discussion about the current status of project proponent contracts.

c. Other progress reports

- It is reported that the signs should be nearing completion but no one has heard from Valerie on this issue since the art was submitted several weeks ago. The initial check reportedly arrived at Alpine Signs “a couple of weeks ago.”

d. Next Steps

- Holly recaps about media events to kick off projects and believes Round Valley School and the MCWD projects will be the first to hold ribbon cutting ceremonies.
- Irene requests Holly coordinates with Forest Cross on the MCWD media events.

5. 501(c)(3) Organizational Structure (45 min.) *(move from Item #6 to #5 to accommodate schedule of certain participants)*

a. Discussion of future direction & scope

- Rick Kattelmann summarizes the discussions concerning organizational structure that have occurred with the RWMG to date. He reminds those in attendance that the intent of

establishing a non-profit is to supplement the current RWMG structure and provide increased funding opportunities, perhaps some legal benefits, as well as some RWMG financial security should the Group lose CalTrout's support. This type of back-up support is currently being used by other IRWMP regions and he provides an example from CABY of how their multiple organizational structures work together. Rick explains that the timing needed for the paperwork to be processed through the state of CA is substantial and that the initial idea would be fairly generic bylaws and a small board of directors, which is sufficient for establishment purposes. Details can be improved upon at a later date as the need for the non-profit presents itself.

- Some Members question the need of another organization dedicated to IRWM.
- The Non-Profit Working Committee responds again stating that financial security, increasing the funding options, additional legal clout, project sponsorship, and the ability to serve as Fiscal Agent to assist with grant administration are among the numerous benefits a non-profit could bring.
- There are multiple questions about how exactly the relationship between the RWMG and the Non-Profit would be defined. The critical piece missing seemed to be the mechanics of how the two organizations could work to benefit one another instead of simply adding complexity to an already slow decision-making process.
- Two major models proposed were: (1) To mimic the CABY model and have the two organizations co-exist, allowing the current MOU to govern both entities, and allowing the RWMG to designate Board of Directors. In this model, there is a question as to whether Board members would serve as individuals or as representatives of their Organization and if they need to be Members of the RWMG; (2) To establish the Non-Profit autonomously of the RWMG and have the non-profit organization simply become a voting Member of the RWMG which would allow project sponsorship as well as other utility that could still benefit the RWMG but not require time on the part of RWMG Members.
- Questions remained if/how public agencies can be involved.
- There was a general feeling among the Admin. Comm. that Members need some time to digest the information and really think about the potential benefits and pitfalls of establishing a Non-Profit before making a recommendation to the Group.
- The Working Committee has put together a proposal to be distributed at the next RWMG meeting. The proposal is intentionally vague to allow for maximum flexibility as the need for the Non-Profit is determined and the organization is developed.
- Irene questions the relevance of establishing the Non-Profit and reminds attendees of past conversations regarding Inyo and Mono Counties serving in an increased capacity and encourages the Admin. Committee to think about Inyo or Mono Counties becoming more involved project sponsors. She would like to see concrete examples of how the Non-Profit could work and benefit the RWMG and a more clear definition of the relationship between the RWMG and the Non-Profit to ensure the amount of overlap with the RWMG is legally acceptable.
- Rick suggests going through with the formation of the Non-Profit and then letting the organization sit idle until there is a proven need. He communicates that because the paperwork may take up to one year it would be wise to form the Non-Profit so that opportunities are not missed.
- There is a discussion about how in-depth to allow this conversation at next week's RWMG meeting. In general, the Admin. Committee thinks that RWMG input may be valuable given the disagreement within the Admin. Committee but realizes the time sink a topic like this could be.

b. Next steps

- Rick suggests Janet Hatfield distills today's conversation into a succinct summary that can be presented to the RWMG at the meeting. The Program Office staff will then allow a brief conversation followed by encouragement to send written comments via email to Janet by

September 7. Janet will forward the comments to the Non-Profit Working Committee after all comments are received.

- **Mark will send an email to Leroy requesting needed resolution regarding the various relationships between the RWMG and the Non-Profit.**
- **Janet will distill a version of the Non-Profit conversation today to be presented to the RWMG at next week's meeting. Comments or suggestions will be emailed back to Janet for assimilation and dispersal back to the Non-Profit Working Committee.**
- **A copy of CABY Organizational Structure documents will be sent to all Admin. Committee members.**

6. Round 2 Implementation (25 min)

a. Fiscal Agent recruitment

- Program Office staff asks for clarification if the Group needs to formally agendaize and decide on the Program Office disseminating an RFP for Fiscal Agent.
- The Admin. Committee doesn't think a formal Group decision is needed since we are using the already approved Fiscal Agent SOS.

b. Desired future schedule

c. Update from RFP Working Committee on project evaluation/ranking process

- Mark summarizes there are three main tasks needed to complete a Round 2 Implementation proposal; 1) Solicit and hire the Fiscal Agent, 2) Solidify and complete project ranking process, 3) Proposal development and submission to DWR.
- The Program Office staff discusses the schedule necessary to complete all of the aforementioned deliverables in a timely manner in order to submit a competitive proposal.

1. Use approved Fiscal Agent Scope of Services as the RFP to solicit Fiscal Agent. Circulate RFP by **September 1** and allow 6 weeks for responses (applications due **October 12**). Applicants will be screened and brought back to the RWMG for a decision at the **November 14** RWMG meeting.
 2. Redefine RFP ranking process. Completion required by **September 12** in order to agendaize for **September 26** RWMG meeting for approval. There is a discussion about the RFP process and schedule and the criticality of RWMG approval at the September meeting. The RFP Working Committee may want to work closely with County Boards and other key players to facilitate any major concerns prior to a formal decision. This also gives Project Proponents clarity on how they will be evaluated.
 3. **Mandatory** Project Proponent workshop following **September 26** RWMG meeting.
 4. **October 17**: Project Presentations to the RWMG. Pre-proposals due to Program Office.
 5. **November 14**: Fiscal Agent selection decision @ RWMG Meeting; Project ranking approved
 6. **November 15**: Begin proposal development, Grantwriter interviews Project Proponents
 7. **January 15**, 2013: Draft project materials due to Grantwriter.
 8. **February 7**, 2013: Draft project materials returned to Project Proponents for approval
 9. **March 1**, 2013: Final Proposal due to DWR (this date is an estimate)
- There is a conversation focused on the importance of the Cost-Benefit Analysis in the project ranking and proposal development process because of its weight in the draft PSP.
 - Bruce would like to find a way to have these analyses performed for projects before they are ranked so that their ranking reflects the most competitive projects from a Cost-Benefit perspective. He suggests perhaps expanding the Fiscal Agent Scope of Services to include

such services and proposes we also consider adding labor compliance and CEQA assistance as well.

- Mark responds that the scope of the projects will determine the extent of Cost-Benefit Analyses needed and that there will be a sliding scale depending on project complexity. He also brings up the problem with having someone do cost-benefit analysis pro-bono as no reimbursements are allowed from DWR for proposal development costs. He communicates his appreciation for the idea and support of developing a strong proposal but is unsure of how to accomplish such a task from a fiscal and logistical perspective.

d. Grantwriter Discussion

- Holly reports she has been reviewing the Round 1 Implementation proposal recently and points out the deficiencies of that proposal. She explains that a fundamental problem was that the proposal was written from 15 different voices and emphasizes the need for consistency in the Round 2 Proposal.
- There is a discussion about hiring a consultant or perhaps having the Fiscal Agent develop the proposal, but the conversation is truncated due to time constraints. The discussion will continue at next week's RWMG meeting.

7. MOU Amendments (10 min.)

- The AC feels this item can be removed from future agendas.

8. General updates (5 min.)

a. Sierra Water Workgroup Summit: July 17 – 18, Kings Beach, CA

b. ESRI-UC

- This agenda item was not covered due to time constraints.

9. Review of action items from the meeting (5 min.)

- Janet recaps today's meeting action items.

10. Next RWMG Meeting

- Wednesday, August 22, 1:00 pm - 4:00pm/BBQ to follow @ June Lake