

# Final Meeting Summary

## Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program Administrative Committee Meeting

Friday, September 7, 2012  
9:00 am - 11:00 pm  
Conference call, with in-person options

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

### Summary of Action Items:

- Valerie Klinefelter will email Project Proponents once the remainder of the deposit has been submitted to Alpine Signs and will include in her email that if any Proponent needs assistance with the installation of their signs to please let Central Sierra know.
- Valerie will notify project proponents by email as soon as Central Sierra knows the invoicing schedule. This will give Project Proponents ample time to gather their necessary documentation.
- Central Sierra will provide written budget to actuals summary at the next Admin. Committee meeting.
- Admin. Committee members and others on the call are requested to provide recommendations for potential TAC members back to the Program Office Staff by September 19, 2012.
- The Admin. Committee will provide the RWMG with several options to select from regarding a funding allocation strategy to be decided upon at the September 26 RWMG meeting.
- The Program Office will circulate the Round 2 Fiscal Agent RFQ publicly and will impose a firm deadline of Oct. 12 for RFQ submissions.
- **If Admin. Committee members have other ideas on equipment needed for purchase for the Planning Grant; please send them to the Program Office immediately.**

### Draft Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Public Comment Period
3. Round 2 Implementation Grant
  - a. RFP/Project ranking document for Round 2 Implementation
  - b. Fiscal Agent update
  - c. Next Steps
4. Round 1 Implementation Grant
  - a. Financial reporting on Implementation Grant 1 from Central Sierra
  - b. Financial reporting on Implementation Grant 1 from Program Office
5. Round 1 Planning Grant
  - a. Financial reporting on Planning Grant 1 from Program Office
6. DAC Grant

**a. Financial reporting on DAC Grant 1 from Program Office**

**7. General updates**

**8. Review of action items from the meeting**

**9. Next RWMG Meeting**

- Wednesday, September 26, Fort Independence Tribal Offices, Independence, CA

**Draft Meeting Summary**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

In Attendance

- Mark Drew, California Trout
- Holly Alpert, IRWMP Program Staff
- Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Program Staff
- Rick Kattelman, Eastern Sierra Land Trust

On the Phone

- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra Resource Conservation & Development
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department 9:30
- Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District

**2. Public Comment Period**

- There were no public comments.

**4. Round 1 Implementation Grant** (*Agenda item #4 moved up to accommodate schedule of Central Sierra representative*)

**a. Financial reporting on Implementation Grant 1 from Central Sierra**

- Valerie Klinefelter reports she sent a budget out on Thursday (which was only a budget and not budget-to-actuals). She reports that Central Sierra has spent just over \$20,000 or 21% of the Grant Administration monies thus far. She explains this is a rough estimate and that official Staff timecards have not yet been submitted.
- Mark Drew asks for a breakdown of the \$20,000 spent to date.
- Valerie responds that it includes 232.75 of her hours, an invoice for Bruce's time (which includes a GPS/Camera) for \$3,900, a portion of rent and utilities equaling \$300, and approximately \$1,800 in Central Sierra Administrative Staff support time.
- There is a discussion about equipment purchased using grant funds and who that equipment belongs to once the Grant has concluded. Valerie responds that any equipment purchased belongs to DWR and that it is up to DWR to determine what is done with equipment at the conclusion of the grant.
- Mark reports that the signs are ready and awaiting final payment before Project Proponents can pick them up. The Admin. Committee discusses the cleanest way to distribute signs to Project Proponents. Mark requests that the Program Office not get involved in the distribution and installation of signs.
- Valerie requests that if Projects Proponents needs assistance in installing the signage, to please let Central Sierra know in advance.

- **Valerie will email Project Proponents once the remainder of the deposit has been submitted to Alpine Signs and will include in her email that if any Proponent needs assistance with the installation of their signs to please let Central Sierra know.**
- Irene and Valerie discuss some final needed changes to the MCWD Work Plan and how best to obtain timely progress on the final details of the workplan so that the contract can be finalized.
- Mark asks about Central Sierra's invoicing schedule to provide some clarity for Project Proponents and Program Staff.
- Valerie responds that Central Sierra is awaiting a response from DWR but that she expects the invoicing period to end at the end of September.
- **Valerie will notify project proponents by email as soon as Central Sierra knows the invoicing schedule. This will give Project Proponents ample time to gather their necessary documentation.**
- Valerie reminds that even in-kind contributions would be worthwhile to report on for the first invoicing period.
- Valerie reports there was a tremendous amount of upfront work and she also expects the hours to taper off as the Projects get underway.
- Mark asks what Bob Dean's role is in the Implementation Grant.
- Valerie responds that Bob was originally identified to serve on the Central Sierra Grant Administration team. She explains this selection was due to Bob's experience and involvement on several boards (ACWA, MAC, Central Sierra, etc.) but explains that to-date Bob has not yet been explicitly tasked with any duties. Valerie believes it may be time for Bob to become more actively involved in the Implementation Grant. She states he is level-headed and has been a great board member to Central Sierra and that he likely could be a great asset to the Implementation Grant team.
- Irene suggests that maybe Bob could be another point of contact, as it is difficult to contact Valerie.
- Valerie apologizes for her limited availability and reports that a large project she has been working on is currently winding down; she apologizes for her limited email correspondence to date and aims to be a better communicator in the future.
- The Admin. Committee thanks Valerie and looks forward to seeing a spreadsheet of Central Sierra's budget/actuals at the next AC Meeting.
- **Central Sierra will provide written budget to actuals summary at the next Admin. Committee meeting.**

#### **b. Financial reporting on Implementation Grant 1 from Program Office**

- Holly Alpert reports she sent an Excel workbook yesterday to all in attendance at this meeting. The implementation hours currently sit at 35% of total budget of \$29,025. She indicates that the cost invested to date has been purely the upfront time getting the grant started and expects Staff time to decrease from here forward.
- Irene Yamashita asks if Program Office Staff is concerned about the Communications with Central Sierra line item (Task 4) being at 80%.
- Holly responds that she does think that this line item is going to overflow and that at a future date the Program Staff can consider moving funds around within their budget to cover some additional hours.
- Irene points out how nice the Program Office budget spreadsheet is and how it makes it nice for the Admin. Committee to provide fiscal oversight to the numerous grants the Program Office is working on. She requests Valerie use this as a template for future Central Sierra budget reporting.
- Valerie comments that she feels comfortable with the current budget percentages and reminds the Admin. Committee of the tremendous amount of upfront work that has gone into the grant thus far and that the workload will even out over the final months of the grant. She also informs those in attendance that there is likely to be some additional funding available

under the Grant Administration line item where Central Sierra can move funding to cover additional Program Office time if necessary.

### 3. Round 2 Implementation Grant

#### a. RFP/Project ranking document for Round 2 Implementation

- Mark gives summary of the status of the Round 2 RFP working committee thus far and the need to come up with a recommendation to the RWMG during today's meeting.

#### TAC Responsibilities

- Irene voices concern about the time commitment involved in TAC participation, citing that if the task is time consuming it may affect the quality of TAC member participation.
- There is a conversation about proposed TAC members and what will be asked of those who volunteer to participate.
- Holly informs the Admin. Committee that now we have a schedule in place, the TAC will be tasked with ranking projects within their assigned bin October 17-24. This gives TAC members a full week after project presentations to evaluate and rank projects.
- Mark adds that since TAC members will only be evaluating projects in a given bin, the reality is that they may be evaluating 1-5 projects in this funding round, which should further ease the time burden.
- There is a conversation regarding desired expertise of TAC members, recognizing that technical expertise, as well as knowledge of project management and proposal development, is desired. The Admin. Committee expects the TAC rankings to be considered heavily by the RWMG and will likely serve as rankings for Members with a lack of knowledge or expertise in a given bins. For this reason, the importance of selecting qualified TAC members is acknowledged.
- **Admin. Committee members and others on the call are requested to provide recommendations for potential TAC members back to the Program Office Staff by September 19, 2012.**
- It is discussed that TACs will consist of a minimum of 3 individuals, and that Membership in the RWMG is not a prerequisite.
- Several members identify a current problem with the Water Quality bin, and explain that both potable water supply to communities and water quality issues in natural water bodies could fall within the same bin but are technically very different.
- Holly reminds those attending that currently Project Proponents are being asked to self-select their projects bins.
- It is discussed that the TAC ideally could provide guidance as to whether certain projects were a good fit for the existing bin or if they should be moved to a more relevant bin.
- Program Office Staff reminds the Admin. Committee of the proposed schedule: 1) TACs assembled by September 26, 2) Project review and ranking period will take place October 17-24, 3) Project Presentation Meeting, October, 17, 4) TAC ranking due October 24, accompanied by a brief report summarizing the justification for their ranking.
- There is a discussion aimed at clarifying what the precise deliverables are for the TAC so that those asked to participate have a clear understanding of what is being requested of them.
- It is also made clear that the Program Office Staff should make the effort to provide some type of video conferencing option for the Oct. 17 Project Presentations, if TAC participation is going to be required.
- Program Office responds that Page 2 of the RFP Working Committee document speaks to some of the responsibilities as a TAC member.
- TAC duties were outlined as:
  - 1) Attend (via GoToMeeting Webinar\*, conference call or in person) Project Presentations on October 17.

- 2) Use scoring matrix provided to individually rank projects and as a TAC decide upon a combined project ranking.
- 3) Provide brief narrative justifying your ranking to the RWMG.  
*\* Internet will be required for GoToMeeting Participation.*

### TAC Ranking Point Spread

- Bob Harrington expresses his opinion on the weakness of the Round 1 project ranking, and the feeling of his own lack of expertise in the Round 1 ranking process. He also reminds us that those who provided ranking did so with very little time invested, as all Members who ranked were asked to rank all or none of the projects. He states that for these reasons, he supports a heavier weighting of the TAC rankings – up to 80 points.
- Rick Kattelman explains his recommended point spread from 25-75 points would help reduce the probability of project scores tying.
- There is a conversation about the 80 points versus 45 points for TAC rankings.
- Members of the Admin. Committee agrees that 80 points for TACs is most appropriate because of TAC members' expertise in their respective fields.
- The Admin. Committee is comfortable with this point allocation given that a TAC's ranking is advisory and any RWMG Member can accept or reject suggested ranking.

### Award Funding Allocation

- Mark initiates a conversation about how funding allocation will be handled if the funding recommended is not commensurate with an exact number of projects. He summarizes that in the past the Program Staff has simply worked with Project Proponents to revise budgets as appropriate in an attempt to fund the greatest number of projects. He seeks clarification if the Admin. Committee would like to see a more formal role for themselves in this process.
- Those on the phone feel like the methods the Program Office has employed to date are sufficient and that if issues arise the AC is willing to help work through those issues with all parties involved.

### Bin Prioritization

- Bob brings up the question of if there may be a better way to treat allocation of funding among bins. His concern is that the current system, in which bins are prioritized randomly, removes power from the RWMG to decide that a particular bin is more important to the Group in a given funding round. Bob fully realizes this means the RWMG will have to decide on how to prioritize these bins and reach a consensus in doing so.
- There is a lengthy discussion around this topic. The discussion points out the rationale for random bins in the original RFP document and identifies the option to provide alternative options to the RWMG to decide upon at the September 26 RWMG.
- Irene disagrees with funding allocation as proposed in the RFP document, and she highlights problems she sees with this process. Ultimately she thinks this could weaken the overall proposal by forcing the RWMG to accept sub-par projects because they were the only project in their bin. She is also disappointed that a Climate Change Mitigation bin did not make it into the document.
- Bob gives Irene the background of the RFP document evolution. He reminds her that it was extensively discussed to allow the RWMG to decide bin priority, but that the committee saw flaws with that system. He admits that the RFP process has been a struggle. Bob agrees that the document is far from perfect and that random bin priority is problematic, but recognizes the progress made thus far.
- It is agreed that the RWMG will be given the option to vote on the prioritization of bins at the next meeting. As a backup there will be two other options presented to adopt if in fact the RWMG cannot reach consensus on bin priority. The options will be presented as; A) High to Low, B) Random Bins, C) RWMG prioritized bins.

- The criticality of the timing of the funding allocation process decision is recognized, and options are discussed to give the RWMG every opportunity to vote on bin priority. It is proposed to allow the RWMG a reasonable amount of time to come up with its decision but if consensus cannot be reached, it is suggested that one of the options become the default selection.
- Irene expresses her concern and feels that the RWMG needs to maintain its ability to be able to approve a final ranked list of projects.
- Bob agrees that ultimately the RWMG should have final say in which projects move forward.
- There is a conversation about prioritizing bins before projects are submitted, as a conceptual way for the RWMG to establish which bins are most important to the region for this funding round. It is acknowledged that doing so may influence which bin Project Proponents try to “fit” their project in, based on priority funding.
- Mark encourages the Admin. Committee and others to focus on the progress made thus far and recognize that although the document may not be perfect, it’s far improved from where we began as a Group years ago. He encourages participants to consider if they can live with the document versus trying to perfect it.
- Mark and Rick support the establishment of adopting a process to alleviate potential headaches at the final hour. They both speak to the benefits of having a process in place as a way to reduce the risk of a thumbs- down vote that could sabotage all progress made to date.
- **The Admin. Committee will provide the RWMG with several options to select from regarding a funding allocation strategy to be decided upon at the September 26 RWMG meeting, but will advise the High to Low option may be the most suitable funding allocation strategy for approval by the RWMG.**
- It is discussed that if the RWMG feels like they additional time to decide upon an overall project ranking after the November 14 RWMG meeting, that a date in early December can be reserved for a contingency conference-call to make that decision.

#### b. Fiscal Agent update

- Mark reports the Program Staff has solicited internal interest for the Round 2 Implementation Fiscal Agent and that Central Sierra and CalTrout have expressed interest.
- Mark seeks direction from the Admin. Committee as to whether or not we need to circulate the RFQ more broadly to gain additional interested parties.
- There is a discussion of the pros and cons of soliciting further interest, with full recognition of the time commitment involved in circulation and response time.
- Bob Harrington communicates that he believed that further Fiscal Agent solicitation was going to be circulated. He reports that he has the topic agendized to discuss it with the Inyo County BOS at its next meeting.
- Mark reminds Bob that Oct. 12 is the scheduled deadline for Fiscal Agent, RFQ, and asks if Inyo County can make the deadline. Bob responds he is aware of the deadline and he believes the County will be able to respond in a timely manner if interested.
- **The Program Office will circulate the Round 2 Fiscal Agent RFQ more broadly, and impose a firm deadline of Oct. 12 for RFQ submissions.**

#### c. Next Steps

### 5. Round 1 Planning Grant

#### a. Financial reporting on Planning Grant 1 from Program Office

- Holly refers to worksheet in the Budget workbook relevant to the Planning Grant. She reminds the Admin. Committee that the Planning Grant ends this month. These numbers are preliminary, as some of Mark’s hours and Center for Collaborative Policy invoices are delinquent. She reports that the majority of the hours is staff time and generally describes

the line items by Task. Holly reports that the numbers you see here are from the amended budget.

- Mark thinks we may only spend \$220,000 and would be surprised if we spent the entire sum.
- Darla Heil asks if there are opportunities to purchase something for the Program Office.
- Mark explains he will be speaking w/ Joe Yun on Monday, and that we can ask him about purchasing needed items at that time.
- Darla suggests purchasing better conference calling equipment and suggests that video conferencing may be even better.
- Others agree and are in support of obtaining improved conference calling equipment.
- **If Admin. Committee members have other ideas on equipment needed for purchase for the Planning Grant; please send them to the Program Office immediately.**

## 6. DAC Grant

### a. Financial reporting on DAC Grant 1 from Program Office

- Holly reports we have spent very little on the DAC grant thus far. She reports the Program Staff fully realizes that an immense amount of work is needed on this Grant before it ends in September, 2013. The current numbers do not reflect the additional \$129,000 still incoming on the DAC effort.
- The Program Office is planning to ramp up DAC efforts significantly in the next several months, and that the numbers should increase substantially.
- Darla expresses her concern about the need to spend these funds; she asks if we can use the monies to hire a Grant Writer to prepare the Implementation Grant for DAC project proponents.
- The Program Office Staff is planning to convene the DAC Technical Advisory Committee to discuss how to best allocate the remaining funds over the next year. Mark is not sure that DWR will support an Implementation Proposal Grant Writer-type of position using these funds.
- Darla suggests hiring a Grant Writing consultant to basically write grants for DACs because in reality some of these DACs and Tribes and may never have the capacity to prepare any types of grant proposals.
- Irene suggests using some of the funding to sponsor DAC/Tribal travel to go to Sacramento to communicate some of the real challenges in involving DACs/Tribes.
- **The Program Office will convene a DAC/TAC meeting in early October, and will agendize this topic on the September 26 RWMG meeting.**
- Mark says yes, the Program Staff will ask DWR about some of the options to spend the funds, and responds that there is a fine line between grantwriting assistance and grantwriting.
- Concern is expressed by Admin. Committee members that not enough time remains to spend the remaining funds on the Grant.

## 7. General updates

- There was no time for general updates during this meeting.

## 8. Review of action items from the meeting

- Janet Hatfield reviews action items from today's meeting.

## 9. Next RWMG Meeting

- Wednesday, September 26, Fort Independence Tribal Offices, Independence, CA