

MEETING NOTES
Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group Regular Meeting

Wednesday, April 27, 2011
9:30 am - 12:30 pm
LADWP Bishop Office
300 Mandich St.
Bishop, CA

As requested in the process check at the April 27th meeting a numbered list of decision and action items will be posted at the beginning of the more detailed meeting notes.

Decision Items Summary

1. Mark Drew moved to eliminate emergency meeting clause of the Revised Version #1 of the MOU. Bruce seconded the motion. All approved.
2. Mark motioned to approve the Revised Version #1 of the MOU; all approved.
3. Holly Gallagher moved that the clean copy of the MOU is presented to boards for approval and signature. At the next meeting, we will assess how many signatures have been gathered. At that time, we will go meeting-to-meeting to see how many boards have been able to sign the new version and once everybody is on board, we terminate the old MOU and that becomes the adopted date of the new MOU. Harvey seconded the motion. Motion was amended that at the July 27 meeting, an assessment will be pursued to see where signatures stand. All approved the amended motion.
4. Pete Bernasconi motions to approve the Implementation funding goals/procedures/questionnaire document. Ceal seconded. All approved.
5. Morgan Lindsay moved to provide authority to Program Office to establish Planning Grant sub-contracts. Bruce seconded. All approved.
6. Approved February 23 and March 23, 2011, RWMG meeting notes. Morgan motioned; Holly G. seconded. All approved.

Action Items Summary

1. Program Office will list decision and action items on bulleted list at the top of future meeting notes.
2. Holly Alpert will send out clean Revised Version #1 of the MOU with signature page.
3. Program Office will circulate budget/fiscal sponsor language to project proponents (will make a PDF), along with the final Implementation funding goals/procedures/questionnaire document.
4. If interested in a scholarship to the IRWM Conference May 24-25, express interest to Mark via email by Monday, May 2 or soon thereafter.
5. Staff will send out program office budget spreadsheet with the meeting notes per request from members and participants.
6. Program Office will communicate with signatories that are not participating in Group meetings to see if they intend to become more active and sign the revised MOU.

Call-in locations:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Inyo County Water Department
135 South Jackson St.
Independence, CA 93514 | 3. Bruce Woodworth Residence
824 Burcham Flat Rd.
Walker, CA |
| 2. USFS/BLM/SNC Offices
351 Pacu Ln
Bishop, CA, 93514 | 4. Malcolm Clark Residence
637 John Muir Rd.
Mammoth Lakes, CA |

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - * Introduction of new Program Assistant
2. Public comment period
3. Planning/implementation MOU Revised Version #1
 - * **DECISION ITEM:** Approve Revised Version #1 of Planning/Implementation MOU (attached).
 - * **DECISION ITEM:** MOU Revised Version #1 will take effect May 1, 2011. Current MOU signatories may sign the revised MOU any time before June 30 without losing Member status.
4. Round 1 Implementation Project presentations:
 1. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD (2 projects)
 2. Dan Moore, Round Valley Schools
 3. Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
 4. Nate Reade, Inyo-Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office
 - * **Presentations will be no more than 10 minutes, including questions**
 - * **Please review application materials for each project on the Inyo-Mono website: <http://www.inyomonowater.org/index.php?page=Documents>**
5. Round 1 Implementation funding working committee update
 - * Review process and discussions since last RWMG meeting
 - * **DECISION ITEM:** Approve document containing goals, methods, and questionnaire for Round 1 Implementation funding allocation (attached).
 - * For discussion: Implementation grant administration language to be added to funding allocation document.
6. Planning Grant
 - * Organizational structure
 - * Update from staff on status of grant award
 - * **DECISION ITEM:** Provide Program Office authority to implement the Planning Grant, including establishing contracts for tasks identified and approved by the Group within the Planning Grant application.
7. Updates
 - * Implementation Grant
 - * Prop 1E Grants
 - * DAC funding

- * 2013 California Water Plan Update
- * IRWM Roundtable of Regions survey
- * Feedback to DWR
- * FY 2010-11 Finance Report

8. Announcements

9. Process check

10. Approval of previous RWMG meeting notes

- * February 23, 2011 (attached)
- * March 23, 2011 (attached)
- * Discuss comments, edits, corrections
- * **DECISION ITEM:** Approve February 23 and March 23, 2011, RWMG meeting notes

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

12. Next meeting dates:

- * Wednesday, May 18, 2011
- * Wednesday, June 15, 2011
- * Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

- Bruce Woodworth opened the meeting at 9:33 am
- Mark Drew introduced Janet Hatfield as the new IRWMP Program Assistant. She started mid-April.

Attending in person

Alex Henson, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D and Mono County RCD

Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee

Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District

Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission

Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD

Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff

Holly Gallagher, Birchim CSD

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District

Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff

Lori Dermody, LADWP

Mark Drew, CalTrout/IRWMP Staff

Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee

Nate Reade, Inyo-Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office

Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes

Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD

Tom Mulvihill, Indian Wells Valley Water District

Tony Dublino, Mono County

Attending via phone

Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department

Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club

Matt Griffis, Sierra Nevada Alliance

2. Public comment period

- Lori Dermody announced that LADWP is starting boat inspections for the fishing opener this weekend. Lori has details on dates, times, and locations. A flyer is attached.

3. Planning/implementation MOU Revised Version #1

- Goal today is approval of the Revised Version #1 of the MOU.
- There was some concern about the emergency meeting clause. Specifically the concerns were about (1) what conditions would require an emergency meeting, and (2) reduced quorum needs a quantitative definition.
- Bob Harrington said that the RWMG's notion of emergency and the Brown Act notion of emergency would likely differ and a RWMG meeting with reduced quorum would likely violate the Brown Act. Stacey Simon, Mono County Counsel, did not have a concern with the reduced quorum and the Brown Act on behalf of Mono County. Irene Yamashita expressed that we have not yet had that situation to have an emergency meeting and does not necessarily see the need for it.
- Bruce mentioned some challenges that were realized last December that may have constituted convening an "emergency" meeting.
- Mark Drew suggested that the emergency meeting clause is simply deleted.
- Bruce Woodworth suggested that this concept might have been handled in the bylaws but that it might be examined for appropriate inclusion in the MOU.
- Bruce suggested just calling it an "urgent" meeting.
- Suggestion of calling it "special" meeting instead of emergency meeting – this would only require 24 hour noticing of meeting and agenda.
- Irene: MCWD concerned about who would decide what is an emergency; she argues that it would be wise to have some time to notice a special meeting to deal with an urgent matter.
- Mono County thinks that special meetings should be avoided and not accommodated.
- Bruce suggested that Members could request that they not be counted towards a quorum in certain instances; Morgan Lindsay disagrees. Bob: this would require a revision to the membership concept.
- Irene made the case that in a true urgent matter, staff would be able to get 50% representatives at a special meeting, including the possibility that people can call in.
- Mark: this situation would be used on a very, very limited basis.
- **Mark moved to eliminate emergency meeting clause, Bruce seconded the motion. All approved.**
- Now the MOU can go back to boards for approval
- **Mark motioned to approve the MOU; all approved.**
- Timeline for revised version of MOU taking effect. Bob's concern is that current MOU says that it's in effect until terminated by all Members. The notion of signing the new MOU by a certain date or, that organization's membership is terminated is contrary to the notion of inclusive membership. He suggests to just wait until existing signatories have signed the new MOU before foregoing the old one.
- Dan Jenkins suggests agendizing a vote on termination at some meeting in the future and giving Members some time to get the new version signed.
- **Holly Gallagher moved that the clean copy of the MOU is presented to boards for approval and signature. At the next meeting, we will assess how many signatures have been gathered. At that time, we will go meeting to meeting to see how many boards have been able to sign the new version and once everybody is on board, we terminate the old MOU and that becomes the adopted date of the new MOU. Harvey Van Dyke seconded.**
- **Motion amended that at the July 27 meeting, an assessment will be pursued to see where signatures stand. All approved the amended motion.**
- Morgan and Mark suggest having some kind of deadline to shoot for.

- **Holly will send out clean MOU with signature page.**
- Mark brought up bylaws and suggested that we do not consider bylaws yet but consider it at a future meeting. This is partly because there is work being done on the organizational structure. Bruce would rather not put it off. Mark suggests turning to the MOU/bylaws working committee.
- Harvey and Darla Heil argue that we should see how the first round of Implementation funding goes and learn from it. Bruce suggests keeping the work within the working committee for now.
- On Implementation funding, we expect to hear word on preliminary funding recommendations mid- to late-May.

4. Round 1 Implementation Project presentations:

Mark suggested that project proponents build into project schedules sufficient time to finalize any contractual requirements with the Fiscal Agent. Depending on when final awards are determined, and due to winter conditions, some projects may run into problems that potentially delaying completion of a given project.

1. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD (2 projects)

A: **Wastewater Treatment plant Upgrade: Phase 1**

Treatment facility has been in service 40 years, never has it been offline to inspect influent racetrack. Facility is also in need of other repairs in order to enhance processes and ensure compliance with CA effluent requirements.

Objectives: 1) Improve Operations efficiency and transfers, 2) Improve water quality, 3) Practice Resource Stewardship, 4) Improve wastewater system to ensure safe groundwater.

Benefits: Project would improve infrastructure of Treatment Plant and improve quality of existing treated wastewater percolation into ground. Thus improving groundwater recharge into the Mono Basin and groundwater's downstream of project.

More economically viable solution to the problems as new racetrack construction was bid out and came back at \$1.5 Million. Project Budget is \$537,395 (with match of \$134,400 by June Lake PUD). Project time June, 2011 to November, 2011. Rich feels like this is a very achievable timeline for the project. There are viable stages/phases to project if funding delays defer project start date or inclimate weather truncates project prematurely.

B: **Water Meter Installation Project:**

In 2002 JLPUD adopted water meter installation program for all residential properties within its jurisdiction. Thus far, 480 meters have been installed resulting in a 32% reduction in water consumption. This is the final phase of the project with 145 meters remaining for installation.

Objectives: 1) Reduce water demand, 2) Improve operations efficiency and transfers, 3) Increase water supply, 4) Practice Resource Stewardship.

Benefits: Water use efficiency and conservation through tiered pricing

Projected budget is \$355,585 with JLPUD match of \$88,965. Project timeline: June, 2011 to December, 2011. June Lake PUD estimates a total water consumption savings of 45% upon completing the project.

2. Dan Moore, Round Valley Schools (was not able to attend meeting)

3. Tom Mulvihill, Indian Wells Valley Water District

Brackish Water Resources Study

Problem Statement: IWV groundwater basin exceeds recharge and has been declining 1-2 feet/year. This project aims to explore potential water supplies in IWV basin. To date only fresh water has been explored, now exploring brackish water resources in the basin. Entire project consists of a 1) Feasibility study, 2) Pilot project 3) Brackish Water Resources Study and 4) Design and Construction of Treatment Plant. Project goal is to optimize current water supply. Work plan and schedule for the study reflect a one year timeframe with quarterly completions of each of the scientific disciplines (Groundwater basin analysis, Groundwater chemistry evaluation, surface geophysics and spatial and temporal analysis). The final report from this study would yield a refined conceptual model along with new maps and figures, feasibility of developing a brackish water supply, and recommendations of location for development and potential impacts of such development. Project budget initial request of \$202,490 has been revisited and a scaled back approach was also presented.

4. Nate Reade, Inyo-Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office

Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Weed Control Project

Invasive plants impact watersheds in a multitude of ways. Negative impacts of invasive plants include reduced yield to working landscapes, increased dust and thus a reduction in air quality, loss of species diversity decreasing quality wildlife habitat and changing fire regime patterns, increased erosion directly affecting water quality, and lastly aesthetic impediments to recreationists.

Past studies have illustrated the importance of early treatment from a financial perspective. Six species will be targeted based on State of California rated species in three different watersheds 1) Owens, 2) West Walker, and 3) East Walker. Project schedule would optimally include two growing seasons for best results. Grant request of \$305,745 could be scaled down by reducing treatment acres. Mapping is currently good and the focus will be predominantly eradication.

- All presenters used Powerpoint presentations. Please contact Holly or Janet if you would like electronic copies of these presentations.

5. Round 1 Implementation funding working committee update

- How to move forward on allocating partial Implementation funding.
- The Implementation funding allocation working committee has been working on this issue.
- The goal is to support as many projects as we can.

- This questionnaire is an information-gathering device.
- Tony Dublino argues that we wait to have project proponents fill out this questionnaire until we get the award. For example, if we get the entire award, we don't need to go through the process. But the process should be in place and project proponents should be contemplating how they might be able to phase or reduce their budgets. Mark thinks we should go through the process based on the preliminary award announcement.
- For now, the questionnaire would be for internal review.
- Tom Mulvihill stated that if IWWWD would have waited until grant was awarded to make a decision if they could use less money, they wouldn't have enough time to evaluate if they could use less. It is smart to start now so you have the time to properly evaluate the possible cost reduction process, otherwise you may not have time to plan and implement within time limits.
- **Pete Bernasconi motions to approve the Implementation funding goals/procedure/questionnaire document. Ceal seconded. All approved.**
- Timeline: encourage project proponents to work with the questionnaire before the May 18 meeting and come to the meeting prepared to discuss thoughts about each budget.
- In addition to the document just approved, it was felt that there should be a reminder to project proponents about grant administration expenses. This will be up to 10% of the total grant award to go to the fiscal sponsor.
- Agreed that this language does not need to become part of the questionnaire document but should be provided to project proponents as informational.
- Mark reminds group to be prepared for quarterly budget reviews. Darla asks if DWR will allow 10% to go to fiscal sponsor. Bruce commented that Central Sierra RC&D may not act as fiscal sponsor if they are not allowed up to 10%, reflecting that it is a lot of work and a difficult process to bid on.
- **Program Office will circulate budget/fiscal sponsor language to project proponents (will make a PDF).**

6. Planning Grant

- We received the Planning Grant commitment letter that asked us to provide some additional materials before further pursuing the contract.
- Program Office will submit those materials to DWR on Friday, April 29. That will then allow CalTrout to pursue the contract with DWR. The work plan will include bimonthly reports and invoicing to DWR.
- Program Staff has put effort into looking at the budget and schedule and adding detail and making revisions as needed.
- There were some questions about being able to sole-source subcontracts for planning grant work. Program Office learned that we CAN sole-source these contracts.
- Program Office has started to communicate with sub-contractors. Mark is working with them to confirm budgets and scheduling. Sub-contractors include Center for Collaborative Policy, CA Rural Water Association, Rick Kattlemann, and Chatten, Brown and Carstens law firm.
- Sierra Nevada Alliance is making support available through Matt Griffis' staff time. He is taking a lead on identifying organizational structures of other IRWM groups and is getting us started on that task (Task 3). He will also be helping Holly A. with climate change issues.
- There is money to support a grant writer and Plan writer, and staff is proposing to contract Rick Kattlemann. He would spend half the time in helping to develop the Plan and half the time helping provide support for drafting project proposals.

- **Morgan moved to provide authority to Program Office to establish Planning Grant sub-contracts. Bruce seconded. All approved.**
- In the future, Bruce would like to see more specific information regarding budgets and contracts farther ahead of the meetings.
- Scheduling: originally 12-month duration. Using April 11 as the start date. Built in an extra 6 weeks to end of May, 2012 for delivery of Phase II Plan.
- The goal is to wrap up items that will be providing material for the Plan by the end of 2011. This will allow for time to send out pieces of the Plan in an iterative manner for approval.

7. Updates

* IRWM Conference

- May 24-25 in Sacramento. Staff encourages Inyo-Mono representatives to attend and participate. Mark will be presenting. Link to site, including registration and agenda: <http://www.watereducation.org/doc.asp?id=1899&parentID=849>. There are scholarships available for registration, particularly for DACs and Tribes. Mark is considering renting a van if enough people decide to attend. **If interested in a scholarship, express interest to Mark via email by Monday, May 2 or soon thereafter.**

* Prop 1E Grants

- Passed around a list of groups that applied for Prop. 1E grants in April, 2011.

* DAC funding

- No news.

* 2013 California Water Plan Update

- Mark and Holly are involved; there is a meeting (including webinar) May 5 which is a discussion on the scenarios that DWR will be using for the Water Plan Update. Website: <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm?subject=may5b11>.
- DWR will be launching regional description forum meetings soon, likely in the summer. We will be involved in both South and North Lahontan teams. This is the most important opportunity for people in our region to get involved.
- Holly will be participating in the climate change forum and will be helping to review the climate change handbook for the IRWM Plan Guidelines.

* IRWM Roundtable of Regions survey

- There was a survey sent around to IRWM groups. Program staff will make available the results as soon as they are available.

* Feedback to DWR

- Holly has drafted a letter about Implementation proposal feedback. Mark will review and they will send it to DWR.

* FY 2010-11 Finance Report

- Mark drafted three budgets: past expenditures and two future budgets. **Staff will send out to interested parties upon request.** The second budget is money in addition to the Planning Grant to administer the Implementation grant. Third budget is a year post-Planning Grant. Overall, we're looking at about \$80,000/year to run the program.

8. Announcements

- Irene: MCWD water demand triples in the summer. Offering rebates for weather-sensitive irrigation controls. Irrigation workshop on June 17 at MCWD with hands-on training. 9:00 am – 3:00 pm, will be providing lunch. Irene is working on getting the information up on the MCWD website.

9. Process check
 - Harvey suggests splitting out action items and decision items, and Holly A. suggests putting those items at the front of the meeting notes document.
 - **Program Office will list decision and action items on numbered list at the top of future meeting notes.**
10. Approval of previous RWMG meeting notes
 - There were a few comments and corrections on the March 23 meeting notes.
 - **DECISION ITEM: Approve February 23 and March 23, 2011, RWMG meeting notes. Morgan motioned; Holly G. seconded. All approved.**
11. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting
12. Next meeting dates:
 - Holly G. suggests having a special RWMG meeting as soon as preliminary Implementation award is announced.
 - ◆ Wednesday, May 18, 2011 – Ridgecrest; may also coordinate a meeting with neighboring IRWMP efforts, 12 -3 pm.
 - ◆ Wednesday, June 15, 2011 – Suite Z in Mammoth Lakes
 - ◆ Wednesday, July 27, 2011 – Forest Service Supervisor's Office in Bishop

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm