

# Final Meeting Summary

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

Wednesday, April 11, 2012  
1:00 - 3:00 pm  
Conference call, with in-person options

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

### Summary of Action and Decision Items

- Mark will circulate the revised comments to the Central Sierra-project proponent Implementation Grant contract to the M7 Group per Valerie's comment .
- **Tony moves to recommend the ORMS document as amended to the RWMG for approval. Darla seconds the motion. All approved.**
- Austin will circulate the amended version for dispersal to the RWMG prior to the April 25 meeting.
- **Tony moves to recommend the RFP document as amended to the RWMG with the intent of continuing the discussion of the Group. Darla seconds. All approved.**
- Janet will look into extended hours at the BLM/USFS conference room on April 25 for the Admin. Committee to discuss the budget revisions.
- The Program Office will gather some preliminary information on an MOU amendment and report back to the Group.
- The Program Office will Agendize 501(c)(3) at the April 25, RWMG meeting for further RWMG discussion.

### Agenda

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Public Comment Period**
3. **Goals, Objectives, Resource Management Strategies**
  - a. Review Austin's Final Document
  - b. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
4. **Standardized RFP/Ranking**
  - a. Report from RFP working committee
  - b. Review progress to date from RFP working committee
  - c. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
5. **Round 1 Planning Grant**
  - a. Presentation and discussion of revised budget
6. **MOU Amendment**
7. **501c3 Organizational Structure**
  - a. Progress Report
  - b. Next Steps

## 8. Review of action items from the meeting

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

### Meeting Summary

- 1:03 pm Chair Tony Dublino convenes the meeting

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

##### On the Call

- Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
- Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra RC&DC
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Bruce Woodworth, Mono Co. RCD, Central Sierra RCDC
- Parker Thaler, DWR
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Austin McInerney, Center for Collaborative Policy
- BryAnna Vaughn, Bishop Paiute Tribe

##### Attending in Person

- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- Mark Drew, California Trout
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office

#### 2. Public Comment Period

- Mark Drew welcomes Valerie Klinefelter and briefly discusses Central Sierra's response to the Central Sierra – project proponent Implementation Grant contract drafted by Greg James.
- Valerie summarizes that her comments to the contract were specifically to ensure that DWR, Central Sierra, and all project proponents are on the same page regarding requirements of the Grant Agreement. Valerie notes she is content with the contract as amended on behalf of Central Sierra.
- **Mark will circulate the revised comments to the Central Sierra-project proponent Implementation Grant contract to the M7 Group per Valerie's comment .**
- Parker updates the Admin. Committee of the progress on the Implementation Grant. He reports that the completed draft of the Grant Agreement needs to go through several additional steps of internal review before sending back to Central Sierra for signatures. He maintains that Valerie was communicative and worked well with DWR.
- There is a brief discussion regarding signage and that projects need to have required signage in place prior to beginning implementation of their projects.

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

- a. Review Austin's Final Document
  - b. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
- Program Staff explain that it was agreed to drop the Goals from the GORMS document as Objectives and RMSs are believed to cover all aspects of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program.

Therefore, the document will now be referred to as ORMS (Objectives and Resource Management Strategies).

- Austin gives background on the ORMS document revisions. He comments that he has again added the Climate Change RMS under Objective #5 “Support assessment and mitigation of water-related impacts of renewable and non-renewable energy projects.” per Bob’s request and remains unsure of how the RMS had been dropped.
- Austin asks if those listening are concerned with the addition of the RMS and there is no objection to reincorporating the RMS in question into Objective #5.
- There are several more comments regarding different sections of the ORMS document. The intention of all comments was to provide further clarity to the document.
- Tony provides an update from the Mono County Board of Supervisors and he reports that the Board was accepting of the draft document and the process as a whole.
- **Tony moves to recommend the ORMS document as amended to the RWMG for approval. Darla seconds the motion. All approved.**
- **Austin will circulate the amended version for dispersal to the RWMG prior to the April 25 meeting.**
- Parker Thaler and Valerie Klinefelter depart the call 1:26pm

#### 4. Standardized RFP/Ranking

- a. Report from RFP working committee
  - b. Review progress to date from RFP working committee
  - c. Develop recommendation to RWMG for April 25 approval
- Tony leads a discussion about the RFP working committee progress. He reviews the two documents dispersed via email (April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012), one of which provides a summary of the progress to date on the RFP document. Ultimately he maintains that the document presented has changed little, but highlights the three most significant changes as follows:
    - 1) The development of Project Categories or “Bins” had changed from previous versions to include 5 categories as a way to provide a better fit for projects. The five categories include water supply, water quality, ecosystem health, stormwater/flood management, and groundwater.
    - 2) Technical Advisory Committees will be appointed by the Admin. Committee for each bin, and they will provide ranking using their expertise on projects for that bin. Members will be offered the opportunity to merely accept the TAC ranking for projects they feel under-qualified to rank; yet will maintain their membership benefits to rank other projects themselves. Various weighting of the TAC vs. the Group is still under discussion.
    - 3) Tony reads an excerpt of the document provided to the Admin. Committee from the RFP: “Last time, efforts at applying objective criteria were eventually abandoned due to a lack of consensus on weighting. The workgroup agreed that objective criteria were worth pursuing, recognizing the regional benefit as well as recognizing that no evaluation can be totally objective. Following agreement on the role of the TAC and the 5-category approach, the workgroup discussed various weighting approaches. The first step was to agree on how each ‘section’ of questions should be weighted. (10% of total score, 20% of total score, etc.) Following this, the discussion turned to the weight of individual questions within each section, where agreement was harder to come by. Because most discussion resulted in nearly even weight per question, it was decided to recommend an *even weight among all questions within a section*. Should there once again be a failure to achieve

consensus on weighting of individual questions, perhaps it will be possible to retain the % of weight per section. Part of this recommendation includes the intent to communicate to the group that the rankings generated by this process are meant to be final. Once the process is agreed to, the result of the process should be accepted by all.”

- Tony summarizes that the weighting of questions was a challenge that spurred hours of discussion and resulted in agreement that all sections will be weighted evenly as the most equitable way to score projects. He explains the RFP committee feels this was the best way to achieve an objective equitable ranking process. He opens the floor to questions or comments.
- There is a question and subsequent discussion concerning if TAC members need to be MOU signatories. The general feeling is that the answer is no, by doing so we would be limiting our expertise pool. It is also mentioned that those members who have projects in the queue for the current round of projects be last resorts as appointees to respective TACs. The importance and usefulness of the TACs are supported by those on the call. It is noted that while some members may feel very qualified to rank certain types of projects, it is almost certain that there will be projects submitted outside of their area of expertise, and thus the functionality of the TAC is appreciated.
- Weighting of TAC rankings is thoroughly discussed and it is recognized the inevitable weight these rankings will carry among the RWMG. All Admin. Committee members agree that the TAC rankings should **not** carry a percent weighting, but instead remain “Advisory” and therefore removes controversy of RWMG membership status.
- There is a conversation regarding sub-standard proposal quality and the general concern of how that may adversely affect the overall proposal submitted to DWR. It is agreed that Program resources, as available, will be directed to these types of sub-standard proposals in an effort to bring all proposals up to a baseline standard required by the Inyo-Mono program and DWR. It is discussed that project presentations may in fact provide project proponents who have sub-standard written proposals the beneficial opportunity to justify the merits of their project to the RWMG in a format other than writing.
- Tony summarizes the RFP proposed timeline:
  - 1) TAC members appointed by Admin. Committee
  - 2) Project Proponents submit Worksheet A
  - 3) Draft DWR PSP Released (Estimated July, 2012)
  - 4) TAC correspond with Project Proponents to gain additional information needed to rank (if necessary)
  - 5) Project Presentation Workshop (One long meeting encompassing all project presentations)
  - 6) RWMG ranking
  - 7) Final PSP Released (Estimated October, 2012)
  - 8) Rankings assimilated and assigned weighting
  - 9) Funding allocations by Bin are decided by RWMG
  - 10) RWMG Approval/ Vote
  - 11) Assemble and Submit Proposal to DWR
- There is dialogue about the concept of allocation of funding awarded by category or “Bins.” The need for project proponents to commit to a Bin for their project prior to submission to ensure Bin selection is not influenced by funding allocation is identified and generally agreed upon by the members of the conversation.

- A conversation is had regarding whether projects should be evaluated on the success of alignment of the budget, schedule, and work plan. Mark expresses this as being an important component of the ranking and Bob agrees. It is agreed that the TAC can provide this as a component of their ranking.
- Next steps for the RFP documents and committee are discussed. Members of the Admin. Committee feel it is time for the documents to go to the RWMG for further vetting; however, prior to that some members seek resolution from the Admin. Committee on several topics. The Admin. Committee responds and reaches consensus on the following topics.
  1. Agreement that TAC rankings will be advisory only and will not carry a percent weight.
  2. No preference will be given to projects previously submitted in past funding rounds.
- **Tony moves to recommend the RFP document as amended to the RWMG with the intent of continuing the discussion of the Group. Darla seconds. All approved.**

## 5. Round 1 Planning Grant

- a. Presentation and discussion of revised budget
  - Program Staff describe the invoicing process and what we've learned thus far as to how much individual tasks are costing the Program. They report that the Program Office proposes to move around approximately \$50,000 from certain tasks within the Grant to support some tasks for which hours were under-allocated.
  - Bruce asks if the money taken from Rick's contract will be a loss to the Group. He would like that information provided to the RWMG when the revised budget is presented at the next meeting.
  - The Program Office staff will provide a detailed report on budget revisions to the Admin. Committee at a special Admin. Committee meeting scheduled just prior to the RWMG meeting on April 25.
  - **Janet will look into extended hours at the BLM/USFS conference room on April 25 for the Admin. Committee to discuss the budget revisions.**
  - Several Admin. Committee members feel the Program Office should report the revision of the budget to the RWMG, with the document being circulated with the Agenda for prior RWMG review.

## 6. MOU Amendment

- Mark introduces the concept of amending the MOU, explaining the growing concern of one entity having the power to halt the entire process. He recollects in the last Implementation round how close the RWMG came to missing the deadline on the Phase I Plan due to last minute conflicts. He feels the progress the Inyo-Mono Program has made has been profound and urges the Admin. Committee to think of the potential risks of the current consensus model.
- (Rick Kattelman joins the call 2:49)
- There is a conversation about loosening the definition of consensus so that potential future risks of binding the process are reduced.
- The amount of work to amend the MOU is brought into question. Members would like to know the legal process of amending the MOU, and if signatures would be required for an amendment.
- **The Program Office will gather some preliminary information on an MOU amendment and report back to the Group.**
- Darla supports investigating additional provisions to the MOU. She understands why 100% consensus could be potentially troublesome.

## 7. **501(c)(3) Organizational Structure**

a. Progress Report

b. Next Step

- Rick reports that the Non-Profit Working Committee has been investigating details of establishing a 501(c)(3) structure as a complement to the current RWMG governance. They feel it is an option that is worth pursuing. He maintains that the set-up process is relatively easy and then the RWMG can begin to utilize the non-profit status when needed. As a first step, Rick reports that preliminary bylaws have been drafted. Those interested in looking at those preliminary bylaws can contact Rick or Janet via email to request a copy.
- Rick continues that next steps are further discussion of the purpose and function of the non-profit and thinks this is an appropriate conversation to have with the RWMG prior to agendizing the decision at a RWMG meeting.
- **The Program Office will Agendize 501(c)(3) at the April 25, RWMG meeting for further RWMG discussion.**

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

9. **Next RWMG Meetings:** April 25 and May 23, 2012

- Tony adjourns the meeting 3:04 pm