

Final Meeting Notes **Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group** **Regular Meeting**

Wednesday, October 19, 2011
9:30 am - 12:30 pm
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
300 Mandich St.
Bishop, CA

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

Summary of Action Items

- Program Office will provide the report and invoice for the first Planning Grant reporting period to the Group.
- Mark Drew will solicit advice on who the key participants will be regarding the next WEAP conversation and reach out accordingly.
- The Group needs to send project Ideas for Round II Planning Grant to Program Office by October 28, 2011. Keep in mind any entity that wants to see a project happen needs the resources to lead the proposal writing and planning effort. Include a schedule and budget along with your ideas. The Program Office will bring ideas back to the Group at the next RWMG meeting.
- Program Office will post new Planning Grant PSP to the Inyo-Mono website for the Group to view.
- Irene Yamashita will send the kick-off email that will begin the Project Proponents Working Group and include initial contact information.
- Irene will convene a Project Proponent Working Group meeting to discuss current Fiscal Agent issues, among other things.

FINAL AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. Public Comment period**
- 3. Round 1 Planning Grant**
 - a. Formal Report on Planning Grant first reporting and invoicing period, including budget and schedule
 - b. Planning Grant task updates
 - i. Needs Assessments and CRWA Workshops
 - ii. CEQA Workshops
 - iii. Outreach
 - iv. Planning documents analysis
 - v. Website
 - vi. Match forms
 - vii. Organizational structure
- 4. Anticipated Schedule for future Grant Funding Rounds**
 - a. Draft DWR Timeline
 - b. Proposal of process for developing Round 2 Planning Grant work plan, budget, and schedule
 - c. WEAP/CA Water Plan modeling

- d. Other planning ideas: groundwater management plans; watershed assessments; watershed mapping
5. **DAC Grant**
 - a. Status Update
 - b. Staffing, including recruitment process for Outreach Specialist
 - c. Overview of work plan and early tasks
 6. **Implementation Grant Update**
 - a. Update from fiscal agent
 - i. Status of project proponent /fiscal agent contracting and RWMG/fiscal agent letter of agreement
 - ii. Status of fiscal agent-DWR grant agreement
 - iii. Timeline for submitting project materials to DWR
 - iv. Timeline for submitting materials to the Group and seeking approval
 7. **General Updates**
 - a. CA Water Plan
 8. **Announcements**
 9. **Process Check**
 10. **Review August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes**
 - DECISION ITEM:**
 - 1. Approve August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes
 11. **Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting**
 12. **Next Meeting Dates**
 - a. Admin. Committee meeting: early November
 - b. Next RWMG meeting, November 16 ,30, December 7

Meeting Notes

- **9:43** Discussion of whether or not a meeting can be convened without a quorum. The meeting is convened and agreed that decision items cannot be addressed without minimum quorum requirements.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&DC, Mono County RCD

Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy

Greg Norby, Mammoth Community Water District

Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District

Jesse Archer, Big Pine Paiute Shoshone Reservation

Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District

Lori Dermody, LADWP

Mark Drew, California Trout

Mel Joseph, Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone Reservation

Nate Reade, Inyo Mono Agriculture Commission

Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes
Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
Tony Dublino, Mono County
Brian Tillemans, LADWP
Eric Tillemans, LADWP

Attending by Phone

David Purkey, Stockholm Environmental Institute
Keith Pearce, Inyo County Public Works
Larry Freilich, Inyo County
Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee
Wesley Hawks, Crystal Crag Water System

2. Public Comment period

- Greg Norby announces ACWA meeting hosted at MCWD on Monday, October 24, 2011. Several head officials of ACWA will be attending. He encourages those interested to attend. Open discussion of water resources 11:00 am to 1:30 will include an opportunity to inform ACWA officials of current water issues in the region. Please RSVP to Greg or Irene so they can have a head count for lunch. Includes Casa Diablo Power Plant tour. Mark & Holly will attend.
- Agenda items 3 & 4 were switched to facilitate the WEAP presentation at 10:00am.

3. Anticipated Schedule for future Grant Funding Rounds

- Mark Drew provides the Group with a history of DWR's release of the draft schedule for future grant funding cycles. Draft Planning Grant Proposal Solicitation Package was released yesterday, thus triggering the next Planning Grant cycle. He expects proposals to be due sometime in February, 2012, and explains that each region is eligible to pursue up to \$1 million total between each of the grant funding rounds. Mark explains this means the Inyo-Mono region can pursue another \$764,000 in the next two Planning Grant rounds. Mark sees this as an opportunity to keep the current momentum we have in the Region as well as address some planning specific needs of the Group.
- The Program Office proposes to develop a draft Phase II Planning Grant with CalTrout as the Fiscal Agent.
- Bruce disagrees and thinks that this should be discussed and decided upon at a future RWMG meeting.
- The intent would be to have a draft Planning Grant Application by mid-January, 2012.
- There is currently no funding available for proposal writing. Mark notes that currently there is not funding from any Grant to cover the costs of developing a Round 2 Planning Grant proposal. CalTrout has agreed to help offset expenses but to do so; the Group needs to keep the process of completing the application simple and efficient.
- Examples of topic-specific planning efforts, according to the PSP, might include salt and nutrient plans or stormwater and flood management plans.

a. Draft DWR Timeline

- Proposed Draft Planning Grant application to Group by mid-January, 2012.
Proposal due to DWR by Feb, 2012.

b. Proposal of process for developing Round 2 Planning Grant work plan, budget, and schedule

- See discussion above

c. WEAP/CA Water Plan modeling

- Mark gives history of WEAP program including its relevance to the California Water Plan and the goal of incorporating the WEAP model into the Inyo-Mono region. He explains that WEAP is a scenario based model that looks at

components like population change and more robust components like climate change. Mark sits on the Scenarios Caucus as part of his involvement with the State Water Plan and from his involvement in this Group he became aware and interested in WEAP modeling. An inquiry was made if the WEAP model could be applied to the Inyo-Mono region. This raised interest among several members of the Stockholm Environmental Institute, as well as DWR and has resulted in the following presentation by David Purkey of the Stockholm Environmental Institute.

- David Purkey gives brief history of the Stockholm Environmental Institute (SEI) and what they do in the United States. He explains that WEAP software has been in development over the past 20 years and that originally is devolved as a classic GAP analysis tool. In that time, it has since evolved into a scenarios modeling tool.
- In 2003 SEI began incorporating various scenarios with respect to population growth and water supply considering climate change, thus beginning to explore what the future holds for CA water managers.
- The slideshow can be viewed in the news section at www.inyomonowater.org
- **Questions that ensued from the presentation...**
- Greg James asks what the generating capacity of the Butte Creek hydrologic power plants.
- David answers that the DeSabra facility can generate up to 17 while Centerville hydro plant can generate 6 megawatts(?).
- Leroy asks if the WEAP model can accommodate groundwater scenarios as is the case in the South Lahontan region that lacks surface water modeling. David responds that yes, there is a groundwater object in the software.
- Greg Norby asks if all the operating logic currently in place is being incorporated into the WEAP model. David explains that yes, in part, the current models are being utilized but explains the advantage of the WEAP model is its flexibility. He continues that the 2009 Water Plan has a section discussing calibration of the Central Valley WEAP Model.
- Greg N. also asks if WEAP is purely a deterministic model that does not have optimization routines. David confirms it is not an optimization model but instead a scenario model that provides information based on different inputs. As opposed to being one that can assist in determining what operational strategies could optimize a given need.
- Greg N. asks if WEAP has the ability to interface with MODFLOW code for Groundwater modeling. David responds that in fact WEAP can interface with MODFLOW.
- Greg James asks about funding options for this type of tool. Mark explains the future Planning Grant money can be used in this effort.
- Mark informs the Group that a preliminary budget of \$120,000 to build a WEAP model from the Mono Basin to the Upper Owens watershed was discussed. If we applied the model all the way to the Owens Lake, the preliminary budget changed to approximately \$190,000. These numbers are for SEI services only.
- Mark reminds the Group that \$764,000 is available in the next two rounds of the Planning Grant. He furthers that an additional \$129,000 is available in DAC grant funds and thinks there may a strong argument for this project supporting DACs. In addition DWR may have a small amount to contribute as they are keen on implementing this model in the eastern Sierra.
- Eric Tillamens brings up the complexity of the watershed from Crowley south is much more complex than the Mono Basin to Crowley and that it's likely the figures will rise when the complexities of the system are encountered.
- Mark clarifies the current budget is very preliminary.

- Rick Kattelman expresses the usefulness in applying the model to the largest possible extent, ideally all the way to Southern California.
- Mark agrees that this would be ideal but considering the complexities of collaborating on this type of work outside of the region, thinks it wise to focus on the region for the short-term.
- Rick suggests keeping the larger goal of modeling in the entire South Lahontan but that for the shorter term, applying the model to the Inyo-Mono region can be Objective #1.
- Bruce Woodworth brings up the importance of the Walker River and suggests including it with the project.
- Mark thinks we could potentially model the Walker River Watershed, as there is a strong argument because of the DAC component.
- Greg N. brings up the fact that current IRWMP projects are local and small scale, but the need for this IRWMP Group will eventually lead to some type of modeling tool similar to WEAP. He encourages the Group to think about what it is they foresee needing and to strongly consider this opportunity. He believes a model of this type for under \$250,000 seems like a bargain, if in fact the tool works like we think it can.
- The Group agrees a finer scale budget needs to be addressed.
- Greg N. suggests a modest amount of money being allocated to do a survey of existing modeling resources within the Group, before we begin the process. He thinks \$10,000 could cover those cost. He thinks this would give everyone a better handle on the true scope of the project.
- Brian Tillemans from LADWP, expresses concern because the expense incurred to LADWP may be significant as they need to furnish the bulk of the information.
- Eric Tillemans speaks that they currently have modeling tools in place but that they are not combined into a single modeling tool like WEAP.
- Mark confirms that they do not want to pursue a redundant effort if LADWP already has models that work in place.
- Lori Dermody emphasizes the need to discuss the WEAP further with LADWP Upper Management.
- Leroy asks what the chances of DWR funding the entire project independent of the Inyo-Mono region. Mark believes that they could potentially find further funding if DWR could see the Region making proactive efforts.
- Leroy asks what the limitations of the DAC grant moneys are. Mark responds that DAC funds need to support the engagement and capacity building of DACs with respect to water resources.
- Brian Tillemans asks how DWR would use this model as an end product. Would they use it as an accurate predictor of what is being exported out of the area? Mark responds that he believes they would use the output in a similar fashion to what they are currently doing in the Central Valley with respect to the CA Water Plan. He thinks it is simply a tool to provide better understanding to dynamics in water resources.
- Bruce cautions using DAC funds toward WEAP, he thinks Planning Grant money may be more appropriate.
- There is a discussion about the appropriate use of additional DAC funds.
- Mark asks the Group for next steps.
- Greg returns to his prior suggestion and thinks the next step is the assimilation of current modeling tools in place in the Region.
- Marks asks LADWP if they would be willing to participate in this type of effort.
- LADWP thinks they could provide some information generally speaking.
- Rick reiterates the larger picture and thinks it imperative to not replicate existing efforts.

- Mark suggests pursuing funds to realize this project in the region.
- Leroy suggests Mark include the Mojave Water Agency on the outreach call regarding the WEAP project.
- **Mark will solicit advice on who the key participants will be regarding the next WEAP conversation and reach out accordingly.**
- d. [Other planning ideas: groundwater management plans; watershed assessments; watershed mapping](#)
- Mark asks if there are objections moving forward for the next Planning Grant. He communicates that CalTrout is willing to help offset expense for the next Planning Grant proposal submission.
- Mark asks for other project ideas.
- Nate Reade suggests watershed-level mapping of invasive plant populations, the current information is 10 years old and needs reassessments. Weed Management Area Group could lead the project. Simple costs include data collection and labor and could be relatively inexpensive.
- Mark invites other project ideas from the Group, he explains that the Program Office cannot take on proposal development for all these projects.
- **Group needs to send project Ideas to Program Office by October 28, 2011. Keep in mind any entity that wants to see a project happen needs the resources to lead the proposal writing and planning effort. Include a schedule and budget along with your ideas. The Program Office will bring ideas back to the Group at the next RWMG meeting.**
- Mark reminds Group there is a 25% Match Requirement (all of which may be in-kind) and that certain projects may be weighted more heavily by DWR: Storm Water and Flood Management, DAC involvement and Salt and Nutrient Management Plans. These types of plans will help us achieve a higher potential score and thus insure we can secure funding for the region.
- Mark suggests that CalTrout be the Fiscal Agent to maintain continuity for the Planning Grant.
- Bruce would like to consider the Group becoming a 501(c)(3) and could serve as fiscal agent.
- Mark communicates that he cannot see how we could convert the current RWMG structure to a 501(c)(3) that is ready to administer a grant before February, 2012. He emphasizes that if we are not proactive, the region could miss a significant opportunity.
- Bruce acknowledges creating a new entity would not realistically be possible given the timeframe set by DWR.
- Mark speaks that we need to tell DWR how we intend to use the money, and this is done by submitting a specific budget, schedule, work plan.
- **Program Office will post new Planning Grant PSP to the Website for the Group to view.**
- Greg advises to focus on what we can objectively do in the time allotted and be responsive to what DWR is looking for. He reiterates storm water management, Salt & Nutrient Management Plans are what DWR would like to see but that we should consider including capacity building which may include the inventory of tools (models) and existing data sets (GIS) available.
- Leroy suggests seeing what projects are submitted to the Program Office by next week and try to fund the maximum number of viable planning efforts.
- Mark asks the Group for future direction.
- Greg James suggests including preliminary steps in WEAP funding as Greg N. suggested (data and information collection) and inquires if the development of a Wild and Scenic River Management Plan fit would fit into the scope of this effort.
- Tony asks on some specifics on Salt and Nutrient Management plans.

- Mark replies that the Program Office can look to Antelope Valley for guidance regarding Salt and Nutrient Management Plans.
- Mark emphasizes keeping the scope narrow as to not miss the opportunity.

4. Round 1 Planning Grant

- Mark recaps where we are in the Planning Grant; he explains the Program Office is getting close to submitting first report to DWR. He reports that thus far we have spent 18% of the entire sum and are time wise 35% into the grant. Mark outlines where the program currently is on a task-by-tasks basis.
- **Program Office will provide the report and invoice for the first Planning Grant reporting period to the Group.**
 - a. **Formal Report on Planning Grant first reporting and invoicing period, including budget and schedule**
 - b. **Planning Grant task updates**
 - i. **Needs Assessments and CRWA Workshops**
 - Considering locations currently for CRWA workshops
 - Once dates and locations are confirmed for the workshops we will solicit interest from the Group, after that the invitation will go public.
 - ii. **CEQA Workshops**
 - Mark gives a summary of the three workshops designed specifically for Project Proponents regarding CEQA compliance. He explains that a fourth workshop will be open to all interested parties and may be of interest to those wanting to learn more about how to be involved in the CEQA process from a general public perspective. The law firm of Carstens and Chatten-Brown will be providing the training as an in-kind contribution to the Planning Grant. The workshops are scheduled to take place at the end of November or beginning of December. The Planning Conservation League handbook will likely be used for the fourth workshop whereas different materials will likely be used for the other three workshops. .
 - iii. **Outreach**
 - Holly recaps the outreach efforts. She explains that the outreach efforts are divided between public and tribal groups. She has recently met with Bridgeport Indian Colony and that the Benton Paiute Tribe as well as the Timbisha-Shoshone tribe remain on the outreach list. A total of three public outreach meetings are underway this week. The Ridgecrest meeting took place Monday, and went well. Once all of the meetings are completed we will synthesize the information and report back to the Group. The Benton and Coleville meetings will take place tonight and tomorrow night respectively.
 - iv. **Planning documents analysis**
 - Janet Hatfield reports that the current planning documents analysis write up is in internal review. She explains that a list of the documents gathered in this effort can be viewed on the library page of the new website. She welcomes further input from experts in the respective fields for additional pertinent documents.
 - v. **Website**
 - Janet informs the Group that the new website look has been completed. The aim of the new site was to make it more usable and break down the information into more manageable sections. She reviews the Upcoming Meeting Documents page and a few other features of the new site. Janet would appreciate any issues while using the site to be reported to her so that remedies can be sought.

vi. Match forms

- Janet reports that the new September/October reporting period is nearing close and that the Match Form specific to this time period will be posted to the web next week. She asks if anyone had issues with the match form from the past reporting period. She explains that the form may change slightly again as the Implementation hours tracking is now the responsibility of the Fiscal Agent and didn't work perfectly in the last reporting period.
- Harvey suggests the same form be used for both Planning as well as Implementation, and that project proponents can just fill one out for each.

vii. Organizational structure

- Holly informs the Group that Matt Griffis from the Sierra Nevada Alliance has left his position and no further research has been done regarding Organizational Structure. She will take over his research where he left off, especially regarding 501(c)(3)s and JPAs.
- Holly acknowledges that the Program Office will still formalize the Organizational Structure to the Agenda perhaps in December or January.
- Mark informs the Group that a contract is underway with Rick Kattelmann to assist in Phase II Plan efforts as well as providing assistance to DACs under the new DAC grant.

5. DAC Grant

a. Status Update

- Mark informs the Group that the DAC Grant agreement is signed and the effective date was October 1, 2011.

b. Staffing, including recruitment process for Outreach Specialist

- Mark proposes similar process as the hiring process as the Program Assistant. Ten applications were received; the pool has been narrowed to five. Interviews will take place next week. He further acknowledges the importance of finding the right personality for this position.

c. Overview of work plan and early tasks

- The current DAC Work Plan is available on the website www.inyomonowater.org under the "Our Work" tab. Holly encourages anyone interested in becoming involved with certain aspects of the DAC that interest them to contact her.
- The Program Office will be happy to answer any specific questions regarding the DAC work plan at any time.

6. Implementation Grant Update

a. Update from fiscal agent

- Bruce reports Central Sierra has received most of the revised Budget, Schedule and Work Plans from Project Proponents. He explains that Central Sierra will have the reviews completed by October 27 and that then they plan on conducting individualized phone meetings with each of the Project Proponents. Those meetings are scheduled to take place from October 28 to November 4, 2011.

i. Status of project proponent /fiscal agent contracting and RWMG/fiscal agent letter of agreement

- Bruce communicates that contracts are still being written and that once Central Sierra has the project contracts completed they will be released for review by Project Proponents.
- Irene suggests a project proponent working group as an alternative way to tackle project specific issues. She states that currently implementation specific discussions are taking a large amount of time from the Admin. Committee and the larger RWMG and feels it's not always appropriate.
- There is a discussion about the usefulness of this type of group among project proponents.
- Mark suggests this may help with communications between Central Sierra and the various project proponents.
- Mark also suggests that the project proponent work group be established with the goal of helping one another as well as reconciling any outstanding issues with fiscal agent. Based on the need, the project proponent workgroup can then come back to the Admin. Committee and/or the RWMG for guidance.
- **Irene will send the kick-off email that will begin the Project Proponents Working Group and include initial contact information.**
- Mark speaks to the larger IRWM Plan, in which we have specifically committed to creating an Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Group. He explains it is part of the check and balance system to ensure all processes are progressing appropriately and that this Project Proponents working group may be a key player in the delivery of this commitment to DWR. Mark speaks that we still need to identify how we are going to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the IRWM Plan itself.
- Leroy speaks that DWR will assist in the monitoring of the Fiscal Agent very closely.
- Mark reminds the Group that it is not only reporting on specific projects but that we need to keep in mind monitoring and reporting on the larger IRWM program as a whole.
- Greg N. concludes that the proposed Project Proponent Working Group will then serve two purposes; to streamline communications with Fiscal Agent as well as provide status updates of Implementation to the larger Group for reporting purposes.
- Mark reiterates to the Group to review the plan periodically to remind us of our obligations and keep us tracking in the right direction.
- Janet informs the Group that the current plan has been broken down by chapter for ease of use on the new website. <http://inyomonowater.org/inyo-mono-irwm-plan/>
- Harvey asks about Fiscal Agent contracts and when he needs to update his project schedule, he states that he is still unsure of when to begin the updated schedule as there has been little clarity about these details from the Fiscal Agent thus far.
- Bruce answers that contracts are still a month away and that project proponents can use September 15, 2011, as a start date.
- Harvey argues that there still isn't a contract in place between project proponents and the fiscal agent and that he is reluctant to revise a schedule until the contract is ready.
- Bruce responds that the letter of commitment from DWR should suffice.
- There is an agreement that this needs to be one of the first issues resolved by the new Project Proponents Working Group.

- ii. Status of fiscal agent-DWR grant agreement
- iii. Timeline for submitting project materials to DWR
 - Bruce reminds the Group that the DWR deadline for submission of all completed paperwork is November 15, 2011.
- iv. Timeline for submitting materials to the Group and seeking approval
 - Bruce begins the discussion that Central Sierra believes they have a contract with the Group indicating that up to 10% of the award may be used for administration of the grant. He gives the background that the Program Office has suggested that the documents (Budget, Schedule and Work Plan) that will be submitted to DWR should also be submitted to the Group for approval. Bruce states that Central Sierra believes this is unnecessary. He states that the current contract in place with the Group does not mention such requirements and that it's cumbersome and not meaningful. He argues that the DWR will have the final say as to the contents of these documents no matter what the Group desires. Bruce continues that if the Group wants to approve all of the documents submitted to DWR that presumably means that all revisions from DWR also need to go through the Group approval process. Central Sierra feels this is micro-managing and is an unnecessary process and reiterates that DWR will scrutinize these documents heavily and call out any gross inadequacies or misappropriations. **Bruce further explains that a more detailed work plan including specific subtasks will be provided for Admin. Committee review but that Central Sierra is resistant to seeking formal approval by the RWMG.**
 - Irene asks for clarification as she is unfamiliar with the contract Bruce is referencing between Central Sierra and the Group.
 - It is discussed that the Letter of Agreement provided by Central Sierra has not yet been discussed or approved by the Group.
 - Bruce confirms that the Letter of Agreement, also serving as the contract between Central Sierra and the Group still needs to be approved by the Group.
 - Mark recalls Valerie Klinefelter's agreement to seek approval of these documents as recorded in the August 31 RWMG meeting notes.
 - Bruce acknowledges that Valerie committed to allowing the Group to approve the Budget but that Central Sierra has retracted that commitment and they no longer feel it is necessary.
 - Bruce asks if the allocation of 10% of the Implementation funds for Fiscal Agent was decided upon at the August 31 meeting.
 - Holly responds that yes it was approved to set aside 10% of the Implementation funding but that the use of those funds were contingent upon receiving the Letter of Agreement from the Fiscal Agent specifying that up to 10% may be used by Central Sierra.
 - Bruce argues that if the Group felt that the approval of the Budget, Schedule and Work Plan were necessary, that language should have been reflected in the Letter of Agreement.
 - Irene thinks the services Central Sierra is providing should be included in the contract.
 - Mark returns to the larger Group process and how we have been operating to date and the responsibility we have to report back to the Group regarding the implementation of the IRWM Plan of which Project Implementation is a significant component. He agrees with Irene that purpose of the Letter of Agreement is to define the relationship between the Fiscal Agent and the RWMG. He reiterates that how implementation occurs has a direct impact on the larger RWMG.

- Leroy suggests instead of trying to approve each of the documents prior to the Fiscal Agent submitting them to DWR that a monitoring approach would be more appropriate. He proposes that whatever documents are submitted to DWR should also to be submitted to the Group and at that time can be challenged if the Group finds any components of the documents to be questionable. He cautions the Group of getting too involved in the minute details of the DWR-Fiscal Agent contract.
- Rick confirms this is wise counsel.
- Mark explains the intention of the conversation is to clarify roles of CS relative to project proponents and the Group-not to approving all documents being submitted to DWR is required. He also asked what the Group wants to do in regards to the Fiscal Agent contract with the RWMG. He would like clarification if the Group feels they need to approve the scope of services.
- Bruce confirms that the Group will receive everything that Central Sierra submits to DWR.
- Irene proposes that we persist on getting a comprehensive contract/ agreement with the Fiscal Agent in this first implementation round so that everyone is clear on what services will be provided to the Group. Once we have been through the first funding round this contract/agreement can then be adjusted for future implementation funding rounds based on how it worked in this first round.
- Harvey points out that he views this as simple contract administration. The contract should outline Fiscal Agent responsibilities as well as project or Group responsibilities.
- Irene asks if Harvey if he is clear on what Central Sierra is going to do for him as a project proponent.
- Larry Freilich agrees with Irene as they would like to see services to be provided by Central Sierra in the Contract and thinks it will be helpful for all parties to identify the roles and responsibilities up front.
- Irene emphasizes that by defining the scope of services it may halt the current misunderstandings between project proponents and Fiscal Agent as to what each of their specific roles entail.
- Bruce refers to the DWR template and the information it supplies, he speaks that Central Sierra will pass along all information from DWR regarding specifics of the template but that Central Sierra does not have the expertise to advise project proponents on each of the specific issues. He states that it is the responsibility of all project proponents to be intimately familiar with the template and seek their own counsel on its interpretation.
- Harvey disagrees and thinks it is Central Sierra's responsibility to provide an interpretation of the template to all project proponents as their main role is to serve as the liaison between DWR and each of the project proponents. He argues that if all seven project proponents interpret the template differently it will become more difficult to submit uniform project documents to DWR.
- **Marks suggest that the new Project Proponents Working Group come up with expectations to provide to Central Sierra as to what they expect and need, to include roles and responsibilities of each contract participant. He emphasizes that this conversation is critical to the success of the project and that he feels it should be clearly established in the contract/agreement between the Fiscal Agent and the RWMG. Mark mentions the importance of accomplishing this quickly.**
- Bruce comes back to formal approval of budget, schedule, work plan by the Group and confirms the conversation did not reach a conclusion.

- Tony asks if the Program Office has received any of the revised documents from the Fiscal Agent as requested in the Admin. Committee meeting last week.
- The Program Office replies that they have yet to receive the revised documents as requested by the Admin. Committee from Central Sierra. The Program Office communicates that currently they are revising Implementation documents as requested by the Admin. Committee.
- Tony states the importance of getting the requested revisions so that the Admin. Committee can effectively do their job in monitoring the processes. He continues that when the Admin. Committee requests revisions of documents that we would expect that the request be granted in a timely manner.
- Bruce disagrees that there is any time constraint on the delivery of the documents.
- Tony argues that out of respect for the participating members, he would have expected that the request was granted and the revisions were submitted to be discussed in today's meeting. He also identifies that a reoccurring issue with Central Sierra is their lack of acknowledgement of pressing needs of the project proponents and the Group.
- Mark asks Central Sierra be sensitive to the concerns being voiced by the Project Proponents and the Group. He feels it is imperative that Central Sierra listens to what is being requested of them.
- **Bruce in response asks that when a matter is urgent, that it is communicated to the fiscal agent along with rationale of why the request is urgent. Instead of being given the request as a mandate.**
- Irene expresses that the Mammoth Community Water District has a growing concern that a draft contract is not in place and would appreciate greater communication from the Fiscal Agent regarding the scheduled release of contracts as well as other expected documents.
- **Irene will convene a Project Proponent Working Group meeting to discuss current Fiscal Agent issues.**

7. General Updates

a. CA Water Plan

- Mark announces next Wednesday there is a Water Plan Plenary Meeting in Sacramento that Holly and Mark will be attending.

8. Announcements

- Irene informs that the MCWD draft Urban Water Management Plan will be posted to the MCWD website for public review next Tuesday, October 25.

9. Process Check

10. Review August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes

- Decision not discussed due to lack of quorum.

DECISION ITEM:

1. Approve August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes

11. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting

- Janet and Holly review action items from the meeting.

12. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Admin. Committee meeting suggested in early November (Monday, November 7).
- b. Next RWMG meeting, tentative date November 16, 2011.

- **Meeting adjourned 12:33pm**