

**MEETING NOTES**  
**Regular Meeting of the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group**

**Wednesday, March 23, 2011, 9:30 am - 12:30 pm**  
**Mammoth Lakes Community Center**  
**1000 Forest Trail**  
**Mammoth Lakes, CA**

Call-in locations:

1. Inyo County Water Department  
135 South Jackson St.  
Independence, CA 93514
2. Inyo National Forest/BLM/Sierra Nevada Conservancy Office  
351 Pacu Ln  
Bishop, CA 93514
3. Bishop Paiute Tribe  
Environmental Management Office  
50-B Tu Su Ln  
Bishop, CA
4. 236 N. Second Ave.  
Tucson, AZ
5. Leroy Corlett's Residence  
1217 N. Inyo St.  
Ridgecrest, CA
6. Bruce Woodworth's Residence  
824 Burcham Flat Rd.  
Walker, CA
7. Ceal Klingler's Residence  
940 Starlite Dr.  
Bishop, CA

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Public comment period
3. Approval of Inyo-Mono IRWMP organizational chart  
\* **DECISION ITEM:** Approve Inyo-Mono IRWMP organizational chart
4. Approval of letter to DWR regarding Big Pine Paiute Tribe letter of 1-5-11  
\* **DECISION ITEM:** Approve letter to DWR regarding Big Pine Paiute Tribe letter of 1-5-11 and direct staff to send letter.

5. Discuss proposed MOU amendments from MOU working committee
  - \* Reconsider previous RWMG decisions regarding (1) amendments vs. revisions, and (2) approving changes by April, 2011
  - \* Develop recommendation to approve amended/revised MOU at an upcoming RWMG meeting

**BREAK** (if time allows)

6. Round 1 Project Presentations
  1. Holly Gallagher, Birchim Community Services District
  2. Paul Hancock, Inyo County (CSA-2)
  3. Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy
  4. Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
  5. Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes
  - \* **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>**

7. Planning Grant
  - \* Update from staff on status of grant award
  - \* Report from staff on status of Planning Grant implementation
    - \* Recruitment of Program Assistant
  - \* Match reporting requirements

8. Working Committee Updates
  - \* MOU/bylaws (addressed in item #5)
  - \* Hatcheries
  - \* Round 1 Projects
  - \* Organizational structure

9. Updates
  - \* Implementation Grant
  - \* Prop 1E Grants
  - \* DAC funding
  - \* California Water Plan Update
  - \* IRWM Roundtable of Regions survey
  - \* Feedback to DWR
  - \* FY 2010-11 Finance Update

10. Announcements

11. Process check

12. February, 23 2011, RWMG meeting notes
  - \* Discuss comments, edits, corrections
  - \* **DECISION ITEM:** Approve February 23, 2011, RWMG meeting notes

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

14. Next meeting dates:

- \* April 27, 2011: LADWP office, Bishop
- \* Proposed upcoming meeting dates:
  - Wednesday, May 18, 2011
  - Wednesday, June 15, 2011
  - Wednesday, July 27, 2011

Notes

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

- **BryAnna Vaughan, Chair of RWMG, called meeting to order 9:41 am**
- **18 MOU signatories attending**

Attending in person

Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD  
 Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District  
 Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy  
 Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes  
 Forrest Cross, Mammoth Community Water District  
 Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust  
 Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission  
 BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe  
 Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony  
 Greg Norby, Mammoth Community Water District  
 Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff  
 Mark Drew, CalTrout/IRWMP Staff  
 Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD  
 Keith Pearce, Inyo County DPW  
 Holly Gallagher, Birchim CSD  
 Debra Ray, Crowley Lake Mutual Water Company

Leigh Gaasch, member of the public

Attending via phone

Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee  
 Jennifer Wong, DWR Southern Office  
 Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee  
 Parker Thaler, DWR  
 Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District  
 Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department  
 Alex Henson, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe  
 Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe  
 Lori Dermody, LADWP  
 Paul Hancock, Inyo County DPW  
 Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D, Mono RCD  
 Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District

**2. Public comment period**

- No comments (Leigh Gaasch arrived later in the meeting and was provided time to comment at the end of the meeting)

**3. Approval of Inyo-Mono IRWMP organizational chart**

- There have been several iterations of the organizational chart.
- There were some additional comments to the most recent draft of the org. chart.
- Harvey Van Dyke made some suggestions about cleaning up the lines between the boxes on the first page.
- There was a suggestion to not have a list of responsibilities for the RWMG. Greg Norby thinks that it is helpful to have an idea of the responsibilities of the RWMG. Agreed to keep list of RWMG responsibilities.
- Reviewed four additional comments suggested by Harvey on the RWMG responsibility list.

- Greg Norby suggested that several of the suggested additions fall within the mission and vision statements. The suggested changes were deleted and a new sentence was added at the end of the column.
- Harvey made another suggestion about handling non-grant funding. Distinction is that any grant funds flowing through DWR are administered through fiscal agent. Any other funds can be channeled through something else, such as a 501(c)(3).
- Mark Drew motioned to adopt org. chart; Greg N. seconded.
- No thumbs down. So approved.
- BryAnna asked for titles on each page. Irene asked for a date. **Holly A. will make the agreed-upon changes and put final version on website.**

4. Approval of letter to DWR regarding Big Pine Paiute Tribe letter of 1-5-11 (final recommended letter will be attached)

- Mark reviewed the process of discussing the BPPT letter and writing the letter to DWR.
- Bob Harrington feels it is unfortunate that the letter does not point out that we followed our MOU process in submitting the Plan earlier this year.
- Rick Kattelman moved to approve the letter. Irene Yamashita seconded.
- ICWD is thumbs sideways. No thumbs down. So approved.
- **Mark will sign the letter and submit to DWR.**

5. Discuss proposed MOU amendments from MOU working committee (final recommended version attached)

- MOU working committee has largely been driven by Harvey and Bruce – thank you!!
- Mark reviewed the process of discussing revisions to date.
- **MCWD on Section 2.16: “A Member shall have no financial obligation to the Group or the Plan unless otherwise agreed to by the Member in writing.” This would become the first sentence of Section 2.16.**
- Bruce Woodworth’s concern with this language in Section 2.16 regards liability. Leaving other people, such as future RWMG stakeholders, with a liability problem. Holly G. suggests that our MOU language will not matter if the Group were to get sued.
- MCWD likes the statement that 2.16 makes with the additional statement.
- Bob is concerned that 2.16 and 2.17 conflict with respect to making financial contributions to the RWMG.
- Greg N. wants to make sure that DWR will allow money to be used through grants to support the administrative work of the RWMG.
- Such language would prevent required annual payment. With respect to funding the Group, we either continue on a voluntary/informal basis, or we make a formal revision to the MOU.
- Greg N. made a case for the language to remain in Section 2.16 on behalf of MCWD. Bruce would like to see wording “Notwithstanding the above, no limitations are placed on Section 2.17 Revenue Sources, as described below.”
- Lori thinks that the second statement in 2.17 is very open-ended at this point.
- Point of 2.17 is to identify one source of funding for the RWMG. Right now, the language is general, and details would be spelled out in the bylaws.
- Harvey suggests adding a sentence about non-grant monies in 2.17. Harvey recommends removing sentence about refunding money to grant recipients. He thinks it is inherent in the meaning. MCWD also had a concern about that sentence.
- MCWD added a suggested statement about following the terms and conditions of each grant. But this would be obsolete if Harvey’s suggested removal was approved.

- Holly G.: unsure about the use of terms Group and Members in the first sentence. Take Members out of the first sentence and streamline the whole sentence: "...shall pay to the RWMG an assessment set by and at a time agreed to by the Group."
- Lori asked about details of 2.17. This will be variable and will be determined on a case-by-case basis. This involves a budgeting process and is only one stream of funding. Bruce argued for not making it more specific right now because of many variables.
- Since all decisions are by consensus, no assessments can be levied that a Member objects to. This can be discussed at the time of Implementation proposal or based on need.
- Add in "Grant recipients, through written agreement, receiving payments..."
- Lori still wants language that this is based on something, such as a budget. Harvey argues that since it is an assessment set by the Group, it will be decided by the Group based on needs at that time.
- Bob is thumbs down to Section 2.17 until he has a better understanding of what it is trying to do. Suggests taking it out for this first round and see how the first round of Implementation works.
- This section ties the revenue source to the projects rather than any individual Members.
- Holly G. argues the downside of specificity and the upside of generality. She suggests getting through this first round of funding to see how it works.
- Harvey moved to eliminate 2.17. Darla seconded. Bruce thumbs down. He wants to see something saying that we're looking to grant recipients, those who benefit from the IRWMP, to provide support to the RWMG.
- **Irene: Section 2.13. Last sentence is redundant with second sentence and will be removed.**
- **Lori. Section 2.09: designee, not designate.**
- **Lori – Section 2.10. Thinks the language is too general. Mark suggests "necessary to support the Inyo-Mono RWMG."**
- **The Group came back to the question of Section 2.17. Bruce offered to rescind his opposition to removing it from the MOU. It was agreed by the Group that the concept of revenue sources will be taken up in the bylaws.**
- The rest of the language in the revised MOU was accepted.
- Question is whether these changes can just be incorporated vs. having all changes as amendments.
- **Recommendation: adopt discussed revisions, including changes discussed today, and revisions will be incorporated instead of amendments. There will be a decision item to adopt the revised MOU at the April, 2011, RWMG meeting.**
- **Title should say Amendment #1, with date**

## 6. Round 1 Project Presentations

### Holly Gallagher, Birchim CSD:

- Birchim CSD formed in 1964 by Mono County. Encompasses majority of old Birchim Tract.
- In 1989, put in a tank to provide fire protection water. At the time, built a bolted steel tank and bolts were not coated.
- Sunny Slopes has ~75 homes served by the tank.
- Options: do nothing, re-do plumbing and tank bolts (hard on pumps), treating water with chemical

- Preferred option is to build a 45,000-gallon secondary water tank that sits next to the original tank. Would provide additional water for area fire crews. Also provides drought preparedness.
- Total project cost: \$100,000; Birchim CSD will provide \$25K of it; has land available; fits under negative declaration under CEQA. Take about 5 months to put out bid and put up the tank.
- Grant includes repairing bolts in existing tank. Existing tank is 200K gallons.
- Seismically engineered.
- Concrete foundation: \$3600; tank: \$40,000; the rest is plumbing, bolt repair, legal, etc.
- USFS has indicated that approval will be forthcoming fairly quickly.

#### Paul Hancock, Inyo County DPW

- Aspendell system constructed in early 1960s. System has problem to do with sub-standard construction.
- Provided a presentation
- County operates system on behalf of the residents.
- Permitting will be a challenge, also includes USFS
- Darla: this seems like a good project to be phased because of CEQA/NEPA and the time necessary there. This project was not proposed in a phased version but might be possible.
- Permitting budget is large
- CSA-2 advisory committee will supply 25% grant match. Nothing from any other partners.
- Have submitted proposal for second round grant to the USFS.

#### Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy

- AG is nonprofit in SE Inyo County
- Funding is grant funding and membership
- Looking to do a feasibility study for providing potable water and fire storage for the Tecopa area.
- Tecopa MHI is \$12,000/year; disadvantaged.
- Much of population is seasonal.
- Water supply does not meet State water standards for fluoride and arsenic.
- Current water supply is sub-standard well water or go to Tecopa Elementary School tank which is also sub-standard. Or go to Pahrump and get water.
- 28 miles of Amargosa River designated as Wild and Scenic.
- Purpose of this study is to hire consultant to look at whether there is a viable source of water that can be treated. Plan to put two potable water dispensing stations, probably reverse osmosis. One in Tecopa, one in Tecopa Hot Springs.
- Southern Inyo Fire Protection District has one small tank for water storage.
- Second part of the study is to try to locate fire storage tanks.
- Total cost of study is \$67,435. Conservancy will provide \$1,000. Work can start immediately. Seeking waiver on match.
- Hoped result of study will be conceptual design to seek further funding to put in water treatment facilities and build storage tanks. Treatment facilities likely not subject to CEQA; tank may be.
- There are several existing wells, but none meet state standards.
- Water storage capacity is yet undetermined and will be asked of consultant.
- Rights would be appropriate and would be determined where the wells should be located.

### Forrest Cross, MCWD

- Well rehabilitation project
- Surface water is limited in the amount of use.
- Need to keep wells reliable.
- Vertical well profiling on two of the wells.
- Arsenic levels are a problem. In Well 17, current treatment methods are not effective
- Want to figure out where arsenic is coming from in well column.
- Well 25 – water quality was okay; now manganese and iron are present, as well as color and odor. Want to find source of those contaminants and isolate those areas.
- Idea is to block off certain portions of the wells to reduce contaminants coming in and reduce treatment necessary, which then reduces future costs.
- There are several different methods to do well profiling. They are looking at the BESST method (in handout). This is done with the existing equipment in place to look at contaminants under actual pumping conditions.
- Not much environmental doc. required b/c it's an existing facility.
- 6-week window for testing late summer/early fall.
- Budget is in handout. \$100,000 per well profile. District will provide match funds for the other costs.
- Method could be used in the future by other entities in the region. Might be more affordable.
- This method has been used with arsenic.
- Holly G. asked that the well profiling company come to give a presentation to RWMG participants. MCWD indicated that they could help set this up.

### Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes

- Pete had a presentation handout.
- Currently the town is not required to have a permit (Peter – what kind of permit?) but may at some point.
- Much erosion is coming from developments that were approved prior to town incorporation.
- Irene asked if the Town was considering Prop 1E (flood mitigation) funding. Peter noted that the Town did not have the required 50% match and therefore they were not pursuing Prop 1E funds.
- Question: could this be used as match for other grants? Not California grants, but others.

### 7. Planning Grant

- Mark is talking with DWR about Planning Grant commitment letters and should be drafted before March 31, 2011. This will trigger a contract process between DWR and CalTrout. Jen Wong will likely be our contact for DWR. That means we are several weeks out from the contract process. Mark has gotten approval from CalTrout to start expending funds to a certain extent.
- Program Assistant recruitment process has begun; had a call with Austin McInerney (CCP) to start process; call with Sierra Nevada Alliance
- Program Assistant recruitment: received 8 applications; we are now scheduling interviews for next week. Mark and Holly will make recommendation to Admin. Committee after the interviews.
- **Match reporting. Staff will be sending out new forms soon with instructions.**

\*\*\*\*\*

(The following highlighted agenda items were not taken up at the 3-23-11 meeting due to lack of time but will be addressed at a future meeting.)

8. Working Committee Updates

9. Updates

10. Announcements

11. Process check

12. February, 23 2011, RWMG meeting notes

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

- Organizational chart: BryAnna asked for titles on each page. Irene asked for a date. **Holly A. will make the agreed-upon changes and put final version on website.**
- **BPPT letter to DWR: Mark will sign the letter and submit to DWR.**
- **MOU: Holly will develop both marked-up and clean drafts of the revised MOU and distribution to RWMG.**
- **MOU Recommendation: adopt discussed revisions, including changes discussed today, and revisions will be incorporated instead of amendments.**
- **Planning Grant match reporting: Staff will be sending out new forms soon with instructions.**

14. Next meeting dates:

\* April 27, 2011: LADWP office, Bishop

\* Proposed upcoming meeting dates:

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

Public comment

- Lee Gaasch, member of the public: Comment on drainage in Sierra Valley Sites in Mammoth Lakes. Has visited TOML Planning Commission about concerns with flooding in Sierra Valley sites. There are infrastructure needs there. Pipes are too small. Has had trouble getting grant money. Flooding is a problem. Please consider Mammoth Lakes for the grant. Public sector of Mammoth is not rich. Human health and safety issues.
- The RWMG answered that this issue is addressed in TOML stormwater master plan proposal – just the planning at this point, not implementation. But it's the first step.