

# Final Meeting Summary

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

Wednesday, March 21, 2012  
9:00 - 11:00 am  
Conference call, with in-person options

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

### Summary of Action Items:

- The Admin.Committee agrees to the following process regarding the GORMS document: Any comments on the current version not discussed in today's meeting go direct via email to Austin by the end of today for assembly of Final Draft Version 2. Austin will then take comments on the revised GORMS document through next Wednesday, March 28, for the final draft version of the document. At that time, he will finalize the document and circulate to the Admin. Committee members on Thursday, March 29, with the final track changes displayed. The goal is to finalize the document from this final draft as a recommendation for approval by the RWMG at the April 25 meeting.
- The RFP Working Committee will review the Inyo-Mono Plan Objectives to ensure they align with the proposed designated bins.
- Program Office will schedule the next AC meeting for April 11 from 1-3pm
- Tony will organize the next RFP Working Committee meeting to continue working on these issues.
- Darla moves to accept the Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services document as revised in the Admin.Committee meeting discussion today, for recommendation to the RWMG at the April 25 meeting. Irene seconded.
- Janet will send Valerie a draft of the Admin. Committee meeting notes to notify Valerie of Project Proponent concerns regarding the wording of the workplan as well as continued communication concerns.
- Bruce will communicate with Valerie regarding the status of the signage issue. He will also request Valerie to provide some information to project proponents about the ability to begin the implementation of a project.
- The Program Office will initiate the next M7 meeting with Central Sierra to discuss next steps in the Implementation process.

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. Public Comment Period**
- 3. Round 2 Planning Grant Submittal**
- 4. Goals, Objectives, Resource Management Strategies**
  - a. Review and discuss Austin's suggested revisions and any additional changes
  - b. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
- 5. Standardized RFP/Ranking**
  - a. Report from RFP working committee
  - b. Review and discuss recommended standardized ranking structure and proposal development process from RFP working committee, and any additional comments
  - c. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
- 6. Fiscal Agent Scope of Services**
  - a. Report from Fiscal Agent SoS working committee
  - b. Review and discuss recommended standardized scope of services
- 7. Update from Central Sierra on Implementation Grant status**
- 8. Draft Generic Letter of Support from IRWMP**
- 9. Review of action items from the meeting**
- 10. Next RWMG Meetings:** April 25 and May 23, 2012

- Tony Dublino calls the meeting to order at 9:02 am

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

#### In Attendance

Mark Drew  
Holly Alpert  
Tony Dublino  
Irene Yamashita  
Janet Hatfield

#### On the Phone

BryAnna Vaughan  
Bruce Woodworth  
Darla Heil  
Harvey vanDyke  
Austin McInerny  
Leroy Corlett

### 2. Public Comment Period

- Mark Drew reports that we have recently learned from DWR that the next Implementation round will be pushed back approximately 6 months. This means that the Round 2 Implementation expected proposal deadline is March, 2013. It will be a one-step process as opposed to the originally proposed two-step process. Funding allocations for Round 2 and 3 of Prop. 84 Implementation are \$131 Million and \$472 Million, respectively. Of that, DWR is mandated to allocate approximately 10% of those funds to DACs. Mark communicates that DWR anticipates Round 3 Implementation to be Fall of 2014.
- \* Later in the meeting there are several questions regarding deliverable deadlines of current efforts underway, such as the Implementation RFP and the fiscal agent scope of services. The Program Office reminds those participating that many of these current efforts are essential components of the IRWM Plan Revision, which will be completed by July, 2012, and thus the change of the Round 2 Implementation deadline does not change the current work deliverable dates.

### 3. Round 2 Planning Grant Submittal

- The Program Office summarizes that the Round 2 Planning Grant was submitted on March 7, 2012, for a total sum of \$685,000. The top 5 projects were submitted, the Inyo County projects were included in "Other Work" section of the Planning Grant. We should hear preliminary funding awards by the end of May.

### 4. Goals, Objectives, Resource Management Strategies

- a. Review and discuss Austin's suggested revisions and any additional changes
- b. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval

- Holly Alpert recaps the GORMS document progress to date and compliments the efforts of all involved, including Austin.
- Austin McInerny summarizes that a number of people have commented on the document and that after the last meeting he was charged with making the final revisions to the document. He explains that the working copy was becoming quite cluttered so this time opted to provide the clean version for review by the Group. He asks for final input from the Admin. Committee regarding the document.
- Janet Hatfield reminds Austin to add "...mitigation in cooperation with all affected parties" to the groundwater objective per the February 22 RWMG meeting notes, as that was a fundamental part of the discussion regarding this objective at the meeting.

- Several Admin. Committee members provide further suggested revisions to the document to Austin.
- Austin inquires if the Goal Statements missing are an issue to the Admin. Committee Members and seeks clarity on Goal Statement and wording.
- The Admin. Committee discusses the benefits/drawback of excluding Goal statements and feels that generally the Objectives cover the goals of the Group. As part of the conversation, it is discussed that the Current RFP Working Committee is developing “Bins” and that each of the Objectives should fall within those “Bins”
- Janet informs the Admin. Committee of recent comments specific to the groundwater objective #8 recently provided to her via email from LADWP.
- There is a lengthy discussion about how to incorporate the input of non-signatories who comment on these types of documents. In the end it is agreed that non-signatories are free to comment, however those comments should be distinguished from MOU signatory comments in the final review of the document. Ultimately the RWMG MOU signatories will have the final vote as to which of the changes are incorporated into the document for adoption.
- **The Admin. Committee agrees to the following process: Any comments on the current version not discussed in today’s meeting go direct via email to Austin by the end of today for assembly of Final Draft version 2. Austin will then take comments on the revised GORMS document through next Wednesday, March 28, for the final draft version of the document. At that time, he will finalize the document and circulate to the Admin. Committee members on Thursday, March 29, with the final track changes displayed. The goal is to finalize the document from this final draft as a recommendation for approval by the RWMG.**

#### 5. Standardized RFP/Ranking

- a. Report from RFP working committee
  - b. Review and discuss recommended standardized ranking structure and proposal development process from RFP working committee, and any additional comments
  - c. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
- Tony summarizes that the RFP Working Committee has had several meetings to date and that several days ago a draft document was circulated for review by the Admin. Committee. He provides basic rationale of the evolution of the ranking and proposal development process and summarizes that the RFP Committee relied heavily on the survey respondents’ input regarding the need to simply revise vs. re-create the ranking processes/criteria. Tony informs the Admin. Committee of the central components of their discussions to date:
    1. Development of Project Bins: Water Supply, Water Quality, Ecosystem Health
    2. Assembly of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for each of the designated bins. The TAC will provide a ranking of the projects given their technical and/or scientific expertise on the bin subject. The TAC ranking will be weighted at 30%.
    3. Project Proponents will be given the opportunity to respond the TAC rankings.
    4. Project Presentations will occur at a series of RWMG meetings.
    5. RWMG Ranking will occur, weighted at 70%
    6. Assessment of entities ability to develop a proposal

- Tony provides a brief background about how the working committee arrived at the weighted ranking arrangement. This included the consideration that the TAC rankings will inevitably influence the RWMG so therefore were weighted lower.
- There is a discussion revolving around basic requirements to serve on a TAC as well as how TAC members will be selected, recognizing the importance of their role in the ranking process as well as influence on the remainder of the RWMG. In addition there is a conversation about the sequencing of project presentations with regards to both TAC and RWMG ranking, which has yet to be firmly decided upon.
- Tony explains that the weight of category-specific questions is draft and will undergo further discussion prior to finalization.
- Tony summarizes that the working committee is currently discussing bin-specific questions as an addition to the document but that currently these are not reflected in the circulated draft.
- Bruce Woodworth clarifies that the basic concept is to use the current Inyo-Mono RMSs to generate four bin-specific questions, each with an appropriate weight.
- Further past discussions of the RFP Working Committee have included how to assess an organization's capacity to submit a proposal. One concept discussed is that of providing a completed successful proposal to project proponents in addition to a template that responds specifically to the draft PSP from DWR and assists project proponents in interpreting the PSP.
- The prior conversation spurs a discussion regarding how to best provide proposal/grant writing assistance to DACs, Tribes and other small entities that lack internal capacity to respond to DWR PSPs. Some ideas presented were using Rick Kattelman, hiring a firm, as well as having the Fiscal Agent for the funding round provide these types of assistance services.
- Irene Yamashita brings to light that identifying the "true cost" of a project is essential and a lesson learned by the Mammoth Community Water District in this first Implementation round.
- **The RFP Working Committee will review objectives to ensure they align with the proposed designated bins.**
- Tony explains that the next RFP will include discussion of weighting the TAC ranking, bin assignments, category specific questions and weight, timing of project presentations as well as funding allocation by bins. The RFP Working Committee aims to have a draft of the document together by the end of March for circulation to the Admin. Committee.
- The need for another Admin. Committee meeting is discussed in an effort to recommend a final version of the RFP to the RWMG.
- **Program Office will schedule the next AC meeting for April 11 from 1-3pm**
- Tony responds to questions on behalf of the RFP Working Committee about the document. He summarizes a discussion that has been taking place amongst working committee members regarding whether or not a project should get preference if it has been on the Inyo-Mono Regional Needs/Project List in past funding rounds. He informs the Admin. Committee that much work is still being done on this topic but provides some of the lines of thinking in response to this question. He explains that one concept under consideration is that previously submitted project status may be used as a tiebreaker in the case of a tied ranking.
- **Tony will organize the next RFP Working Committee meeting to continue working on these issues.**

## 6. Fiscal Agent Scope of Services

- a. Report from Fiscal Agent SoS working committee
- b. Review and discuss recommended standardized scope of services

- Harvey VanDyke provides a summary of the document that was recently circulated. He explains that the purpose of the document is two-fold: 1) Provide an introductory document for those considering the role of Fiscal Agent 2) Define Fiscal Agent roles and responsibilities. He informs the Admin. Committee that he received written comments from both Bruce and Holly and that he proposes the Admin. Committee accept the black text within the document. His rationale is that the scope of the document needs to maintain its focus and remain general.
- Harvey requests comments and direction from the Admin. Committee.
- There is a general agreement to leave the document as general as possible.
- Corrections suggested are to 1) Remove the red text from the document, 2) Change the title to be more specific, 3) add suggested wording, "The fiscal agent acts as administrator of a grant, and has responsibility for seeing that contractual commitments are met based on requirements from the funding agency", and 4) change language from fiscal "sponsor" to fiscal "agent".
- **Darla Heil moves to accept the Inyo-Mono IRWMP Fiscal Agent Scope of Services document as revised in the Admin. Committee meeting discussion today, for recommendation to the RWMG at the April 25 meeting. Irene seconded.**

## 7. Update from Central Sierra on Implementation Grant status

- Mark summarizes that he is in communication with Greg James regarding the proposed Fiscal Agent/Project Proponent contract. Greg has been tied up with legal matters but will aim to send out the revised contract tomorrow.
- Mark informs the Admin. Committee that Central Sierra is very close to signing the Implementation Grant Agreement with DWR. He explains that there was a slight problem with the match being less than 25% based on total project costs. He notifies the Admin. Committee that the Coleville project was able to reduce the percentage of the work done with DWR funds to a lower number so that their match reached 25%. The project will still be completed in full with additional funding. Revisions of the Coleville workplan were made to reflect these changes. He anticipates Senior Management at DWR is likely to sign the Grant Agreement within the next week.
- Irene requests again that "technical services" be changed to "administrative services" in the workplan and expresses frustration at having to request this on multiple occasions.
- Bruce replies that Central Sierra does not want to make any changes to the workplan that DWR does not initiate. He thinks it boils down to the definition of "technical" and that Central Sierra views this type of work as technical in nature. He explains that he has passed the request on to Valerie and that he thinks it's appropriate to contact her directly regarding this issue.
- There is a conversation about the meaning of "technical" and if there would be opportunity to define it in the contract. Several M7 project proponents participating express concern once again for the lack of customer service from Central Sierra. They feel Central Sierra should not be making anything but administrative changes to submitted documentation.
- Harvey explains his opinion that the Fiscal Agent and Project Proponents should be working as a team, not against one another, and cautions that it will be difficult to stay on

course if communications between Project Proponents and Fiscal Agent are not both fluid and transparent.

- M7 members participating again express the lack of communication from Valerie and feel it's integral that she be more involved in the process.
- **Janet will send Valerie a draft of the Admin. Committee meeting notes to notify Valerie of Project Proponent concerns regarding the wording of the workplan as well as continued communication concerns.**
- An additional question was raised about the status of the signage requirements. Irene responds that she sent an email to Valerie over two months ago and has not received a response.
- **Bruce will communicate with Valerie regarding the status of the signage issue as well as the ability of project proponents to begin project implementation.**
- Some Project Proponents are unclear if spending can safely commence and would like clear direction with regards to this issue. They feel there has been some conflicting information on this subject from Central Sierra.
- Mark suggests another M7 meeting in the near future once the contract is received to continue with progress.
- **The Program Office will initiate the next M7 meeting with Central Sierra to discuss next steps in the Implementation process.**

#### 8. Draft Generic Letter of Support from IRWMP

- No draft has been created or received from Pete Bernasconi. The Program Office will follow up but may have to produce a draft if one is not received fairly soon.
- Irene announces that on April 12 at the new Courthouse is the Hearing Date for the MCWD lawsuit vs. the City of L.A. She would like to encourage local support to keep the case in Mammoth. She is also considering forming an Eastern Sierra Water Issues Group and would like to see how they may be able to work with the Inyo-Mono IRWMP.

#### 9. Review of action items from the meeting

- Janet reviews actions items from today's meeting.

#### 10. Next RWMG Meetings: April 25 and May 23, 2012

Meeting adjourned: 11:01 am