

# Meeting Notes

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

Monday, November 7, 2011  
2:30pm-4:30pm  
Conference call, with in-person options

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

### Action Items

- The Program Office will seek volunteers for the next Admin. Committee term (January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2013) at the upcoming November 16, 2011, RWMG meeting. At that time the Group will have the opportunity to approve the new Admin. Committee volunteers.
- The Program Office will ask Tony Dublino if he can approve new Admin. Committee members without bringing it to the Mono County Board before the new term begins.
- Bruce moves to approve Heather Crall as the DAC new outreach specialist. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.
- Bruce Woodworth of Central Sierra will convene the next M7 Working Group meeting after the November 15 DWR deadline.
- The Program Office will agendize suggested revisions to Central Sierra's Letter of Agreement and subsequent document outlining services provided by Central Sierra and responsibilities of Project Sponsors at the November 16 RWMG meeting.
- The Program Office will furnish Admin. Committee meeting notes ASAP to Irene for the creation of the next M7 Agenda.
- Irene moves that the Admin. Committee recommends to the Group the approval of the revised Program Office Implementation Budget, Schedule, and Work Plan. BryAnna seconds the motion. All approved.
- The Program Office will reach out to the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Proponents to see which of the projects are viable and will report to the Group the findings. Meanwhile, the Program Office will send out an email soliciting volunteer involvement in Round 2 Planning Grant Working Group and will continue to solicit volunteers at the Nov. 16 RWMG meeting.

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. Public Comment Period**
- 3. DAC Grant**
  - a. Outreach Specialist Recruitment and recommendation of candidate for approval by Admin. Committee
  - b. Outreach future schedule and work plan
- 4. Round 2 Planning Grant**
  - a. Review of Submitted Planning Projects
  - b. Program Office support funding estimates
  - c. Program Office proposal of project selection process
  - d. Alternative Funding sources for Stormwater/Flood Management Plans
    - \* Possible recommendation to RWMG regarding items b and c
- 5. Implementation**
  - a. Update from Project Proponents Working Group (M7)**
    - i. Report from first M7 meeting
    - ii. Future Plans and issues to address
  - b. Update from Program Office**
    - i. Revised Budget, Schedule and Work Plan
  - c. Update from Fiscal Agent**
    - i. Revised Budget, Schedule and Work Plan
    - ii. Update from Central Sierra regarding DWR grant agreement and project proponent contracts
    - iii. Revised Letter of Agreement to RWMG
- 6. Review of action items from the meeting**

## Meeting Notes

- 2:35 Irene called the meeting to order

### 3. Welcome and Introductions

#### Participants

- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D
- BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
- Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee
- Parker Thaler, Department of Water Resources
- Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest Community Services District
- Keith Pearce, Inyo County Public Works
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWMP Staff

- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWMP Staff
- Holly Alpert reviews the Admin Committee terms of service and reminds the Admin. Committee that the current term for the one-year members expires on December 31, 2011. Leroy Corlett of Indian Wells Valley Water District has volunteered to replace one of the vacancies and Irene Yamashita has agreed to renew her term of service if acceptable to the RWMG.
- Irene reminds the Admin. Committee that the MOU specifies that the Group needs to approve the renewal of an Admin. Committee term.
- There was a brief discussion about other possible Admin. Committee candidates.
- **The Program Office will seek volunteers for the next Admin. Committee term (January 1, 2012- December 31, 2013) at the upcoming November 16, RWMG meeting. At that time the Group will have the opportunity to approve the new Admin. Committee volunteers.**
- Irene recommends discussion and approval on this topic for the Nov. 16 RWMG agenda so that a prompt decision can be made and reminds the Program Office to ask Tony Dublino to see if he can approve new Admin. Committee members without bringing it to the Mono County Board before the new term begins. If not the Program Office will have to consider this issue in the RWMG meeting schedule.
- **The Program Office will ask Tony if he can approve new Admin. Committee members without bringing it to the Mono County Board of Supervisors before the new term begins.**
- Holly recommends rearranging the agenda to discuss Implementation specific items so Parker can answer any questions.

#### 4. Public Comment Period

- Holly informs Admin. Committee of the upcoming Sierra Classic Theater events at Tamarack Lodge and Tom's Place Resort.

#### 3. DAC Grant

- Outreach Specialist Recruitment and recommendation of candidate for approval by Admin. Committee**
  - Holly recaps the recruitment process. She explains that four candidates were interviewed by the Program Office. Unanimously the Program Office has selected Heather Crall, new to the Mammoth Lakes area. She is an Attorney by training but interested in becoming involved in public service work. She has DAC experience nationally as well as internationally. Holly continues that Heather's personality and skill set are an excellent complement to the Program Office Team. The Program Office believes that she is an excellent selection for the position.
  - **Bruce moves to approve Heather Crall as the DAC new outreach specialist. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.**
  - Holly maintains that we will continue on with the contract process to get Heather officially on-board.
- Outreach future schedule and work plan**

- Holly speaks to the future schedule of the DAC grant and some of the overall DAC goals and objectives. Specifically she explains that the Program Office will be examining other metrics of determining a DAC other than median household income.
- Irene asks if the DAC Grant will also support more California Rural Water Association needs assessments. Holly answers yes there will be another 20 needs assessments provided under this Grant that will specifically target DACs.

## 5. Implementation (Moved to accommodate DWR representative availability)

### a. Update from Project Proponents Working Group (M7)

#### i. Report from first M7 meeting

- Irene recaps the rationale for the creation of the M7 Group. She explains that she coordinated a complete contact list of all project sponsors and would like to hand it over to Central Sierra to maintain from this day forward. All contacts listed should be included on all Central Sierra correspondence to Project Sponsors/Proponents. M7 also discussed the Letter of Agreement (LOA) from Central Sierra. Valerie made clear that the Sept. 21 letter that was addresses to Holly Alpert is the contract between Central Sierra and the Group. Holly clarifies that the LOA has not been approved by the Group. Bruce responds that the approval by the Group of Central Sierra as the fiscal agent constitutes a contract between the fiscal agent and the Group.
- Irene asks for clarification from Bruce that Central Sierra will not be forthcoming with a revised, more detailed Letter of Agreement for the Group.
- Bruce replies that Central Sierra will provide what is required by DWR.
- Harvey thinks the question is whether or not the current Letter of Agreement needs to be expanded upon and thinks this needs to be discussed at the Group Level and expresses his opinion that the current LOA lacks necessary detailed information. He continues that perhaps a separate document needs to be drafted outlining the working relationship between Central Sierra and the Project Sponsors/Group. He reminds everyone that the Implementation process is going to be long and tedious and the more clearly the communications between Central Sierra and the Project Sponsors are defined the smoother the process will likely be.
- A request was made by M7 that Central Sierra provides a checklist consisting of the documents required for submission by Central Sierra to DWR by November 15. This request also included a checklist of requirements and deadlines for project sponsors. Valerie did provide a basic checklist to project sponsors.
- An additional request was made by M7 that Central Sierra develops an additional checklist that identifies all project sponsor requirements contained in the DWR grant agreement/template with accompanying deadlines. M7 feels that this would help ensure that all project sponsors are clear of what is required of them and when each deliverable is due.
- Bruce reiterates that the DWR template defines the requirements and that Central Sierra does not carry the expertise to interpret the template for Project Proponents and stresses the importance of the Project Proponents being self-sufficient in their own interpretation of the DWR template.
- Harvey recommends M7 meets again to discuss the template interpretation issue.

- **Bruce Woodworth of Central Sierra will convene the next M7 meeting after the Nov 15 DWR deadline.**
- Irene voices the concern of the Mammoth Community Water District that no draft contract has been presented to each of the Project Proponents and would like an estimate for that deliverable from Central Sierra.
- Bruce maintains that hopefully Central Sierra will have contracts drafted by the end of November but stresses the importance of the internal vetting process and that Central Sierra wants to issue the most finalized version of the contract possible and will likely take the time it needs in doing so.
- Also discussed at the M7 meeting was the reporting schedule proposed by the M7 Group to the Admin. Committee and RWMG. Irene reminds Central Sierra of the MOU reporting requirements and stresses the importance of complying with the Inyo-Mono RWMG MOU.
- Bruce confirms that Central Sierra will follow Inyo-Mono MOU guidance. Similar to the Planning Grant, written reports and invoicing will occur bi-monthly followed up by more interim oral reports on a monthly basis to the Admin. Committee and Group.
- Irene states that also discussed at the M7 meeting were the inconsistencies in the internal communication between Central Sierra and Project Proponents. She explains that M7 has provided an updated contact list and hopes this will clear up communication issues between Central Sierra and the Project Proponents/Sponsors.
- Also discussed was the fact that the Group will not see revised Budget/Schedule/Work Plan from Central Sierra until after November 15, 2011.
- Holly maintains that Valerie did furnish updated Work Plan per the comments/request from Tony and Irene at the last Admin. Committee meeting, but this was not discussed during the meeting.
- Bruce states that after November 15, if the Group has recommended revisions to the Work Plan that Central Sierra will be happy to consider those recommendations.
- Signage was also discussed at the M7 meeting. Irene has provided Valerie with local sign shop contact information.

ii. **Future Plans and issues to address**

- Irene asks for guidance on whether the lack of a contract between Central Sierra and the RWMG is an issue for the Group or M7 to discuss.
- Harvey distinguishes between the Letter of Agreement and what the project sponsors are requesting. He maintains that project sponsors seek a document defining the services provided by Central Sierra and what in return will be required of project sponsors. Ideally this will define the flow of information and the internal workings of the relationship between all entities. He continues that this discussion needs to be brought to the attention of the Group and suggests it is agendaized for the November 16 RWMG meeting. Based on feedback by the Group the M7 Working Group can incorporate revisions and Group ideas and work with Central Sierra on finalizing a sufficient document.
- Irene requests a commitment from Central Sierra that they will be compliant with drafting a document providing more details defining their working relationship

with the Project Sponsors. Bruce is open to working with M7 to establish expectations of the working relationship between the project proponents and the fiscal agent.

- It is discussed that Central Sierra will use previous input from the Project Sponsors to create the document defining their relationship with Project Sponsors.
- Holly recaps that the basics are covered; she thinks perhaps by presenting it to the Group for one final discussion is worthwhile.
- **The Program Office will agendize suggested revisions to Central Sierra's Letter of Agreement and subsequent document outlining services of Central Sierra and responsibilities of Project Sponsors at the November 16 RWMG meeting.**
- Irene asks for suggestions for agenda items for future M7 meeting
- **The Program Office will furnish meeting notes ASAP to Irene for the creation of the next M7 Agenda.**

#### b. Update from Program Office

##### i. Revised Budget, Schedule and Work Plan

- Holly reviews the update to the Work Plan per Tony and Valerie's suggestions from the last Admin. Committee meeting. She explains that Task 3 has been revised, including adding subtask 3.3 which states that the Program Office will establish and facilitate a Plan Implementation Evaluation work group. She also reviews the changes to the budget and explains that the schedule did not undergo significant change.
- Irene expresses appreciation for the responsiveness from the Program Office in regards to the input received from the Admin. Committee.
- Holly asks if we should recommend these documents to the Group for Approval.
- **Irene moves that the Admin. Committee recommends to the Group the approval of the revised Program Office Budget, Schedule, and Work Plan. BryAnna seconds the motion.**
- Bruce abstains and feels that Group approval is unnecessary.

#### c. Update from Fiscal Agent

##### i. Revised Budget, Schedule and Work Plan

- Holly asks for clarification on if these documents will be presented to the Group.
- Bruce maintains that the final budget, schedule and work plan will be submitted to DWR and after that will be provided to the Group.

##### iv. Update from Central Sierra regarding DWR grant agreement and project proponent contracts

- Bruce reports that Central Sierra is getting very close to finalizing the necessary documents for submission to DWR.
- Irene asks for specific detail regarding the number of projects still needing revision as compared with the number of projects completed and ready for submission to DWR on November 15, 2011.
- Bruce does not give specific numbers but replies that all the projects are nearing completion and will be ready for submission this coming week.(Nov.7-11)

- Holly opens the floor to questions from Project Sponsors to Parker Thaler.
- Parker asks if the CEQA documentation is slowing the submittal process.
- Bruce responds that Central Sierra will submit CEQA status of each project but that this is not expected to slow the process.
- Parker clarifies that that CEQA is not required until construction begins.
- Keith asks when Parker when he should expect an answer to some of his questions.
- **Holly will forward Keith Pearce's original email questions to Parker to remind him to respond to Keith's question.**

v. **Revised Letter of Agreement to RWMG**

- Bruce believes that the Group needs to discuss whether or not there is a contract between Central Sierra and the Group.
- Holly reads the Letter of Agreement (LOA) addressed to herself from Central Sierra and suggests the letter is readdressed to the Inyo-Mono RWMG.
- Bruce thinks the current LOA is a summary of the Contract already agreed upon by the Group over a year ago that approved Central Sierra as the Fiscal Agent. He maintains Central Sierra is going to provide what is required by the State.
- Holly suggests the issue regarding the approval of the Letter of Agreement gets agendized in the RWMG November 16 meeting and then gets revised by M7 considering input received. The final documents can be provided to the Group at a later date.

4. **Round 2 Planning Grant**

a. **Review of Submitted Planning Projects**

- Holly recaps there were 10 projects submitted but that no Salt & Nutrient Management Plans were submitted.
- Bruce argues that the East Walker project he submitted addresses nutrient planning.
- Bruce asks if the proposed administration structure will differ significantly from how the Planning Grant was administered in the current planning grant. Holly responds that the Round 2 Planning Grant administration will remain the same but that there will likely be project proponent contracts similar to the Implementation Grant, for each of the specific projects.
- Bruce suggests agendizing clearly a discussion about ranking projects vs. a narrative process for this round of the Planning Grant and speaks to the difficulties of confirming match requirements at this phase of the process.

b. **Program Office support funding estimates**

- Holly gives brief overview of the rough funding estimates for the Program Office. Each of the Program Office staff is budgeted for 50% time. The Program Office sought to use lessons learned in this Planning Grant to come up with realistic figures. The Program Office can provide further detail on the proposed work plan at the Nov. 16 RWMG meeting.
- Bruce asks if economic analysis will be required for this proposal scoring process. He also inquires whether we could utilize some of Rick Kattelmann's time to prepare the Round 2 PSP, out of the current funds in the Round 1 Planning Grant. Holly thinks that it is a good suggestion and will explore the option.

c. [Program Office proposal of project selection process](#)

- Holly emphasizes the need to decipher whether or not some of the projects are Planning or are trying to incorporate some Implementation projects. She continues that the Program Office will need to verify that match requirements can be met, proposals can be developed independently and that we submit the strongest projects possible to increase our potential score. She reminds the Admin. Committee that specifically called out in the Round 2 Planning Grant PSP are projects addressing DACs, Flood and Stormwater Management and Salt & Nutrient Management. She also expresses that the Program Office suggests as a possibility that prior funding award status play into project selection process.

d. [Alternative Funding sources for Stormwater/Flood Management Plans](#)

- Holly informs the Admin. Committee that there is a Prop. 84 Stormwater Grant Program through the SWRCB specifically addressing Stormwater Management. The Program Office may assist project proponents in accessing this funding source for projects that meet the criteria. If the Group can successfully find alternative funding sources, securing funding for other planning projects could be possible.
- BryAnna asks if it is possible to submit proposals for the stormwater plans to both funding sources to increase the likelihood that the project gets funded and advises the Program Office to do so.
- Holly responds that if we submit projects that ask for more funding than is available, we will need a way to prioritize projects.
- Bruce recalls the first Implementation Grant Round and thinks these projects deserve the same prioritization process.
- Holly asks for suggestions on how to achieve the prioritization process requested by the Admin. Committee given the proposal deadline is imminent.
- Irene suggests a Project Selection Working Group forms to develop project ranking criteria.
- Bruce suggests rather than ranking the projects that the working Group would write narratives summarizing each of the projects.
- Irene reminds that the projects still will need to be ranked if we apply for more funding than is available.
- **The Program Office will reach out to the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Proponents to see which of the projects are viable and will report to the Group the findings. Meanwhile, the Program Office will send out an email soliciting volunteer involvement in Round 2 Planning Grant Working Group.**

\* [Possible recommendation to RWMG regarding items b and c](#)

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

- 4:21 Irene concludes the meeting.