

Final Meeting Summary

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program Administrative Committee Meeting

Monday, February 13, 2012
9:00am-11:00am
Conference call, with in-person options

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

Meeting Summary of Action Items:

- The Program Office will send the revised Goals, Objectives and RMS document to the RWMG and request feedback by Friday, February 17. The Program Office will then synthesize comments received for a discussion at the February 22 RWMG meeting. The Admin. Committee will then be tasked with the incorporation of the proposed revisions into a final document to be approved by the RWMG and included in the Phase II Plan.
- The Program Office will send out Central Sierra Implementation Budget to Project Proponents and Admin. Committee members.
- The Program Office will continue conversations with Inyo County, who had the lowest ranked projects, with regards to how best to create a strong Round 2 Planning Grant proposal to DWR, given the current funding available.
- The California Trout Scope of Services will be included as a decision item in the February 22, 2012 RWMG meeting agenda.
- The Program Office will propose Milestone dates for the Project Ranking Process to the IRWMP timeline based on DWR's intended Round 2 Implementation schedule.
- The Program Office will Schedule a debrief appointment with DWR in reference to the Round 1 Implementation round and will communicate the scheduled date and time to the Admin. Committee.

Agenda

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. Public Comments**
- 3. Round 1 Planning Grant**
 - a. DWR Invoice #1: April – October, 2011
 - b. Phase I Plan revision schedule
 - c. Revised Goals/Objectives and RMSs/ Survey Results
- 4. Implementation Grant**
 - a. Update from M7
 - b. Update from Central Sierra
- 5. Round 2 Planning Grant**
 - a. Progress Report/Schedule
 - b. Revised CalTrout Scope of Services/Standardized SOS

- c. Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Long Term Vision

6. Project Ranking Process

- a. Discussion of project ranking process feedback
- b. Standardization of project ranking criteria
- c. Develop recommended roadmap for Round 2 Implementation proposal (schedule, milestones, process, ranking criteria)

Meeting Summary

Tony Dublino calls meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Participating on the Call

- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD, Mono County RCD
- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- BryAnna Vaughn, Bishop Paiute Tribe
- Mark Drew, California Trout
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Parker Thaler, Department of Water Resources
- Austin McInerney, Center for Collaborative Policy
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono Program Office
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono Program Office

2. Public Comments

- There were no public comments.

3. Round 1 Planning Grant

a. DWR Invoice #1: April – October, 2011

- Holly Alpert reports that the Program Office has submitted the first Planning Grant Invoice to DWR. She informs the Admin. Committee that the files sent to them are the same files that were submitted to DWR. She reminds the Admin. Committee that DWR may have suggested revisions and that the Program Office will aim to accommodate those requests. Holly communicates that the first invoice was a learning process and anticipates future invoicing will become much more fluid. Parker Thaler of DWR concurs that the first invoice is always much more difficult than subsequent invoices.
- Holly opens the discussion for questions and concerns regarding the invoice submitted to DWR. She explains the current budget and identifies that it's broken down by task and that some tasks are over budget while others are under.
- There is a conversation about how monies are moved around within the budget and what is acceptable to DWR. It is stated that up to 10% of the budget can be flexible for internal repositioning, but amounts in excess of 10% require a formal amendment from DWR. Parker emphasizes the benefit of building your case for the need to reposition funds into the bimonthly invoices so DWR can anticipate such changes.

- The Staff communicates that the Program Office will be working on the next reporting period, covering November/December, beginning this week. They explain that once the numbers are in for this report we will be better able to forecast budget and schedule changes needed.

b. **Phase I Plan revision schedule**

- The Staff propose an extension of the Round 1 Planning Grant period for 30 to 45 days. They maintain that this slight shift in the schedule may assist the Phase I Plan revision and allow for addressing Round 2 Implementation draft PSP guidance as well as provide for a seamless transition to Round 2 Planning Grant funding.
- The Admin. Committee is in support of the proposed schedule change. There is a specific question about Task 6 funds available and if some of what seems to be excess funds can be used to support Round 2 Implementation project ranking and proposal development. Holly explains that up to 50% of the remaining funds for Task 6 account for in-kind contribution donations and that the current figure does not represent solely a cash amount. She further explains that the challenge will be the timing of the Round 2 Implementation draft PSP but reminds the Admin. Committee that workshops relevant to proposal writing development are accounted for under subtask 6.6.

c. **Revised Goals/Objectives and RMSs/ Survey Results**

- Austin McInerney gives a summary of the revision process of the Goals, Objectives, and RMSs. He includes that the Admin. Committee received a track changes version to highlight the revisions made to the document. He identifies a common theme being that Goal Areas are too broad and need to be narrowed down further. Austin asks the Admin. Committee for input, specifically if the goal areas need to be further articulated or if the Objectives and RMSs speak for themselves.
- There is a lengthy conversation about the revisions and how relevant they are to the MOU Survey results as the majority of survey respondents indicated they felt the current Goals, Objectives and RMSs were adequate. Austin points out that the revisions also incorporate input gained from Outreach efforts and the Public Survey, in addition to MOU survey results. There is some confusion amongst the Admin. Committee about the source of each revision. It is suggested that Austin can provide some additional information as to the origin of the edits made so that the reviewers can account for differences in the strength of each argument.
- There is a discussion about the revised wording with regards to groundwater in the Objectives and RMSs. Historically groundwater has been and remains highly controversial and some Admin. Committee representatives feel if the wording of this Objective changes significantly they may face challenges gaining support for the revisions. Further there is concern with charging the IRWMP with an Objective that requires some type of Groundwater Management projects.
- A conversation takes place that addresses the need to not eliminate the opportunity to incorporate groundwater projects in the future. It is agreed that the RWMG will have the ultimate say on whether or not a project of this nature is too controversial to move forward and that the RWMG provides a safeguard against politically unpopular projects.
- The Admin. Committee members express the need for additional time to review the document and feel strongly that the entire RWMG be given the opportunity to review the revisions.
- **The Program Office will send the revised Goals, Objectives and RMS document to the RWMG and request feedback by Friday, February 17. The**

Program Office will then synthesize comments received for a discussion at the February, 22 RWMG meeting. The Admin. Committee will then be tasked with the incorporation of the proposed revisions into a final document to be approved by the RWMG and included in the Phase II Plan.

- There is some discussion about the length of time this conversation could take at the RWMG meeting. It is agreed that a finite amount of time be appropriated and remind Members that written comments were requested prior to the meeting.
- It is agreed that the RWMG wants to be careful to not amend Objectives or RMSs that work for the Group and the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program.

4. Implementation Grant

a. Update from M7

- It is summarized that two main points came from the Feb. 3 M7 meeting. The first concern was in regards to the current level of communication. Generally speaking the feeling was that Project Proponents would like increased communications from Fiscal Agent. The second point clearly made was regarding the contract provided from Central Sierra. Project Proponents largely felt that the current contract from Central Sierra was overly lengthy.
- M7 members took the initiative to look to other IRWM regions for examples of simpler fiscal agent contracts. Comments from Project Proponents and the Program Office on the contract will be incorporated into a simpler contract by Greg James and be presented back to Central Sierra. The Program Office has been in contact with Greg and expects the draft contract by February 14.
- It was also recognized that M7 is going to provide feedback regarding Central Sierra's Work Plan.
- The Staff communicates that they have received a budget from Valerie Klinefelter of Central Sierra and have requested permission to share the document with Project Proponents. Bruce doesn't see any issue with this.
- **The Program Office will send out Central Sierra Implementation Budget to Project Proponents and Admin. Committee members.**

b. Update from Central Sierra

- Bruce explains that on February 1, DWR requested additional information from Central Sierra regarding specifics for each project (With the exception of Tecopa). Central Sierra hopes to receive that information and resubmit the edits to DWR by February 22.

5. Round 2 Planning Grant

a. Progress Report/Schedule

- The Staff provides a summary of the proposal development workshop held last week and reminds the Admin. Committee of the current schedule. They inform the Admin. Committee that they are still in the process of trying to compile a final list of projects for inclusion in the proposal that fall within the available funding.
- There is a discussion about whether we can request more funding than is available by providing an alternative project within the proposal. Parker speaks that it may be dependent on how the Planning Projects are presented in the proposal and that DWR may look down upon having an "optional" task/project within the proposal as it may be difficult for DWR to incorporate that into the scoring criteria.

- **The Program Office will continue conversations with Inyo County, who had the lowest ranked projects, with regards to how best to create a strong proposal to DWR, given the current funding available.**

b. [Revised CalTrout Scope of Services/Standardized SOS](#)

- The Staff opens the discussion about the Scope of Services provided by CalTrout and informs the Admin. Committee that no negative responses to the document have been received. It is decided to drop the expectations of Project Proponents section from the document as those items will be covered in individual contracts.
- **The California Trout Scope of Services will be included as a decision item in the February 22, 2012 RWMG meeting agenda.**

c. [Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Long Term Vision](#)

- Tony leads a discussion regarding future funding of the Inyo-Mono IRWMP. He summarizes how a 501(c)(3) can function in that role, and thinks it worthwhile to identify continued Grant funding and meeting schedule for overall purpose of the Group.
- The conversation addresses the current Round 2 Planning Grant Proposal from the Program Office and that one of the tasks identified is to develop a long term funding strategy for the region with the goal being to diversify and enhance future funding needs. It is proposed that perhaps an annual stipend from Members could be used to support Program Office operations given a lack of grant funding support and recognized that this would likely need to be based on available resources of each member as opposed to a flat rate.
- There is a discussion about future State Water Bonds and the realization that it's up to California voters to approve future funding. The current proposed Bond allocates \$11.1 billion under the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012 and would appropriate approximately \$1.4 billion to IRWMP efforts. The Staff adds that currently there is also a finance caucus as a part of the State Water Plan that recognizes the importance of funding water resources management in California.

6. [Project Ranking Process](#)

a. [Discussion of project ranking process feedback](#)

b. [Standardization of project ranking criteria](#)

- The Staff begin the discussion and remind the Admin. Committee that a summary of the Project Ranking process feedback has been circulated to the Admin. Comm. It is discussed that the MOU Survey question pertaining to the need to adjust the Project Ranking Process again reflects overall acceptability of the ranking process used for Round 1 Implementation. An argument is made against the sample size of the survey and the need to balance survey results with written feedback from the RWMG. The Staff reiterates that 11 pages were needed to summarize comments received after Round 1 Implementation, a clear indicator that several RWMG participants had input with regards to the ranking process used.
- A conversation at a recent RWMG meeting is recalled where Members expressed the need for a standardized "blueprint" to rank projects for future funding rounds that can be in place prior to the PSPs from DWR being released. It is acknowledged that without criteria in place ahead of the Draft PSP release, it will not be possible to respond to the PSP as the RWMG has requested (i.e. Holding presentations at RWMG meeting prior to a ranking by the RWMG).

- Tony recommends a Working Committee be tasked with taking the Round 1 Implementation feedback and the Round 2 Planning Grant Matrix Criteria and developing standardized set of criteria for review by the RWMG.
- c. [Develop recommended roadmap for Round 2 Implementation proposal \(schedule, milestones, process, ranking criteria\)](#)
- Mark recaps that the schedule for future funding rounds would be to: 1) Develop criteria blueprint to be used by the RWMG, 2) Draft DWR PSP released, 3) Call for pre-proposals, 4) Project Presentations, 5) Project Ranking, 6) Proposal Submittal to DWR.
- It is brought to the Admin. Committee's attention that the process of soliciting a Fiscal Agent for Round 2 Implementation also needs to be considered in the overall schedule. It is suggested that viable fiscal agent options should be researched to expand on fiscal agent possibilities within the IRWMP.
- **The Program Office will propose Milestone dates for the Project Ranking Process to the IRWMP timeline based on DWRs intended schedule.** The Program Office will then work with the Working Committee to refine the deliverable dates once additional information obtained.
- It is suggested that the Program Office takes advantage of DWR's counsel in acquiring lessons learned from Round 1 Implementation through a DWR debriefing.
- **The Program Office will Schedule a debrief appointment with DWR per the Round 1 Implementation round and will communicate the scheduled date and time to the Admin. Committee.**

Meeting Adjourned. 10:59