

Final Meeting Summary

Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group

Regular Meeting

Wednesday, November 14, 2012
USFS/BLM Interagency Conference Room
351 Pacu Lane
Bishop, CA
10:00am-1:00pm *Note later meeting time!

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

Summary of Decision Items

DECISION ITEM: Approve Resolution to Adopt Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Plan (Phase II)

- Rick Kattelmann moves to approve the Resolution to Adopt the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Plan (Phase II). Leroy seconds the motion. All approved

DECISION ITEM: Approve Round 2 Implementation Project Ranking

- Leroy Corlett moves to approve the Round 2 Implementation Project Ranking List. Rick Kattelmann seconds the motion. All approved.

DECISION ITEM: Select and approve Round 2 Implementation Grantee (Fiscal Agent)

- There was no decision made on this topic.

DECISION ITEM: Approve September 26, RWMG Meeting Summary

- No decision was made on this agenda item due to a loss of quorum.

Summary of Action Items

- Valerie will circulate DWR's Invoicing Form and associated invoicing information to M7 Project Proponents, prior to convening an M7 Meeting, by the last week in November or first week in December.
- Bob Harrington will check with Inyo County to get a report on the status of Inyo County Round 1 Implementation project contracts.
- Holly will email Valerie what signs still need to be picked up.
- Valerie will circulate the budget-to-actuals report for Round 1 Implementation before the Thanksgiving Holiday.
- Program Staff will amend the Generic Letter of Support "*proposed process*" to reflect some flexibility on the timeline of board approval for any RWMG Member and will agendize the revised process as a decision at the next RWMG meeting.
- Mark will have a conversation with Pete Bernasconi about today's comments regarding Round 2 Grantee discussion about the Town of Mammoth Lakes being a candidate.
- The Program Staff will send out a correspondence regarding Grantee applicant status when we receive it. At that time we will set up an opinion poll to RWMG Members and ask for a ranking by the Group to develop a decision item at the next meeting. If only one member agency is remaining as a viable fiscal agent, then that agency will be the default Grantee.
- Program Staff will reach out to Round 2 Implementation Project Proponents directly for funding assistance when a final list of projects going forward in Round 2 is developed.
- Program Staff will organize a call with Round 2 Project Proponents to hold a Round 2 Implementation kick-off meeting.
- Program Staff will write an article for the local papers to communicate the lessons learned from the loss of the website domain name to other non-profits and website managers as well as to excuse any odd content witnessed over the past few months.

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 Min)
2. Public Comment period (5 Min)
3. Round 1 Planning Grant (30 Min)
 - a. Recap of Round 1 Accomplishments
 - b. Follow up on RWMG Generic Letter of Support
 - c. Final Steps

DECISION ITEM: Approve Resolution to Adopt Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Plan (Phase II)

4. Round 2 Planning Grant
 - a. Status of preliminary recommendations
 - b. Next steps

5. Round 2 Implementation (60 Min)
 - a. Discuss Round 2 project scoring and ranking
DECISION ITEM: Approve Round 2 Implementation Project Ranking
 - b. Discuss Fiscal Agent Statements of Qualification (please come with a ranking of the three applicants and/or any that you cannot live with)
DECISION ITEM: Select and approve Round 2 Implementation Grantee (Fiscal Agent)
 - c. Proposal Development Funding Assistance
 - d. Next Steps

***** 10 Minute Break*****

6. DAC Grant (10 Min)
 - a. Recent activities
 - b. DAC Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
7. Round 1 Implementation Grant Update (10 Min)
 - a. Progress Report from Central Sierra and Project Proponents
 - b. Next Steps
8. General Updates (10 Min)
 - a. Staff Migrations
 - b. Website Update
 - c. IRWMP Leadership Class

9. Announcements

10. Process Check

11. Review September 26, 2012, RWMG meeting summary

DECISION ITEM: Approve September 26, RWMG Meeting Summary

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

13. Next Meeting Dates

14. Guest Speaker (30 Min)

- a. Inyo National Forest: The Forest Planning Process, Revisions & Updates

Final Meeting Summary

- Irene Yamashita convenes the meeting at 9:34 a.m.

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 Min)

Attending in Person

- Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
- Mark Drew, California Trout, Inyo-Mono IRWMP Staff
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
- Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
- Heather deBethizy, Mono County
- John Drozd, Mono County Department of Environmental Health
- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, IWV Cooperative Groundwater Management Group
- Andrew Skaggs, California Trout SNAP Member
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono Program Staff
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono Program Staff
- Holly Gallagher, Birchim Community Services District
- Matthew Hays, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation

Attending in via Phone

- Wesley Hawks, Crystal Crag and Development Association
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD, Mono County RCD
- Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra RCD
- Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe

2. Public Comment period (5 Min)

- Mark Drew introduces Andrew Skaggs the new AmeriCorps Volunteer for CalTrout.
- Mark suggests moving the Round1 Implementation agenda item forward since Valerie Klinefelter is on the line.

7. Round 1 Implementation Grant Update (10 Min) *(agenda item moved to accommodate Central Sierra's participation)*

a. Progress Report from Central Sierra and Project Proponents

- Valerie Klinefelter reports that the request for the Administrative Adjustment to the budget still remains to be signed by DWR, although they have ensured her that it will be signed.
- Central Sierra has been provided the invoicing form and plans to submit the first invoice for the period of August, 15, 2011 to October, 31, 2012.
- Valerie seeks direction from Project Proponents whether or not Central Sierra should wait to submit the first invoice so that all proponents can submit for reimbursement for this period or if they should proceed with the documentation they currently have from Central Sierra, CalTrout and Eastern Sierra Unified School District.
- Irene asks when Valerie asked for invoices from Project Proponents.

- Valerie has not yet asked for invoices, as she wanted to learn more about the invoicing process before opening it up to all Project Proponents and reports that only recently did Central Sierra receive the documentation they needed from DWR,
- Irene suggests calling a meeting with Project Proponents and communicates that she expected as a Project Proponent to receive a calendar with the proposed invoicing schedule from Central Sierra back in early September.
- Mark agrees and encourages Valerie to convene a meeting with Project Proponents and to address specifics of invoicing at that time and thinks it would be valuable to circulate the invoice form and associated information to Project Proponents prior to the M7 meeting.
- **Valerie will circulate DWR's Invoicing Form and associated invoicing information to M7 Project Proponents, prior to convening an M7 Meeting, by the last week in November or first week in December.**
- Mark asks Valerie for status report on contracts.
- Valerie responds that the only contracts yet to be signed are the ones for Inyo County.
- **Bob Harrington will check with Inyo County to get a report on the status of Inyo County Round 1 Implementation project contracts.**
- Mark gives general progress report for Coleville, Round Valley and Amargosa projects, all of which have made some progress.
- Irene reports that the Mammoth Community Water District needs to wait until spring since the process has been so slow.

b. Next Steps

- Holly Alpert requests a status report on who has picked up their signs.
- Irene reports MCWD has picked up their sign and Valerie responds that Harvey had communicated that he would pick his up for the Hilltop project.
- **Holly will email Valerie what signs still need to be picked up.**
- Irene cites the September Admin. Committee meeting and reminds Valerie that she said she would provide a budget-to-actuals report and asks again for this report as outlined in the action items from the September 7 meeting.
- **Valerie will circulate the budget-to-actuals for Round 1 Implementation before the Thanksgiving Holiday.**

3. Round 1 Planning Grant (30 Min)

a. Recap of Round 1 Accomplishments

- Mark acknowledges this meeting is the culmination of a year-and-a-half of work and that today's meeting is representative of several of the deliverables of the Planning Grant. Mark reports that we collectively have successfully accomplished all of the deliverables stated in the work plan and that at last report; we were within \$1,000-\$2,000 of using the full \$237,000 of the Planning Grant. He thanks all RWMG Members for their participation in this process.
 - Holly Alpert gives a summary of accomplishments of the Round 1 Planning Grant on a task-by-task basis. Her presentation concluded with tasks relevant to the development and completion of the Phase II Plan, the adoption of which will be decided upon today. A link to the presentation can be found on the Inyo-Mono website http://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/I-M_PG1_Milestones_Presentation_111212.pdf

b. Follow up on RWMG Generic Letter of Support

- Mark asks Bob Harrington where Inyo County stands on the Generic Letter of Support flexibility issue.
- Both Inyo and Mono County representatives report they feel they have the ability to make the decision whether or not the request for Generic Letter will need to be taken to their Boards,

and if not, the process could in fact occur more quickly than the three weeks currently included in the process.

- There is a question of how to reword the current proposed process.
- Irene thinks we need to agendaize an amendment as a decision item if we intend to change the process and that for now we need to continue using the process as approved at the last RWMG meeting.
- **Program Staff will amend the Generic Letter of Support “*proposed process*” to reflect some flexibility on the timeline of board approval for any RWMG Member and will agendaize the revised process as a decision item at the next RWMG meeting.**

c. Final Steps

- The Program Staff reports that it is currently incorporating final grammatical edits to the Phase II Plan, and that next week photos and maps will be added as well as a revised cover page. The aim is to submit the Final Phase II Plan to DWR by the end of November.
- Mark reports the new Plan brings the RWMG in much better compliance and that it’s a much improved document.
- Janet Hatfield requests input regarding the Plan review and comment process.
- Members provide suggested changes to document review processes which include more time for reviewing chapters, track changing capabilities for those heavily engaged in the review process, and better clarity of plan chapter status.
- There is a brief conversation regarding the challenge of scaling the review process to appropriately accommodate the number of reviewers.
- Irene suggests the RWMG should review the Phase II Plan together chapter by chapter so that all members have an understanding of its contents and purpose.

DECISION ITEM: Approve Resolution to Adopt Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Plan (Phase II)

- **Rick Kattelman moves to approve the Resolution to Adopt the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Plan (Phase II). Leroy seconds the motion. All approved**

4. Round 2 Planning Grant

a. Status of preliminary recommendations

- Mark reports that he has been in contact with DWR and that the final recommendations are on the desks of DWR senior management. He does not expect the award amount to change from \$480,000 and reminds Planning Project Proponents they can start spending upon the announcement of the final award notification but that reimbursements are not allowed until the Grant Agreement is signed. Mark hopes the final awards will be announced in December and reports that the Program Office is planning to begin work on the Round 2 Planning Grant sometime in January.

b. Next steps

5. Round 2 Implementation (60 Min)

a. Discuss Round 2 project scoring and ranking

- Mark reminds the RWMG that we have agreed upon a process with which to score and rank projects. He reports the total Inyo-Mono regional funding request for Round 2 Implementation (thus far) is approximately the maximum funds available for the Lahontan Region (\$3.93 million). He has sent correspondence to other IRWM groups in the Lahontan Region to inquire about their funding needs to assist the RWMG in deciding which projects to move forward. From his outreach he has learned that Tahoe-Sierra is pursuing \$1.2 million and does not believe the North Lahontan Basin is going to seek funding this round. He is also communicating with Mojave and Antelope Valley IRWMPs and their responses are pending.
- Mark thanks those who served as scoring and ranking Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members for each of the project categories and acknowledges the time investment that was required of them.

- Holly projects the ranked list of projects as they were scored by seven RWMG Members who participated in the scoring and ranking process.
- Mark informs the RWMG that Inyo County Water Department and Amargosa groundwater monitoring projects were combined to reduce redundant efforts in the project area. Further he announces the tie for the number one ranked project between the Big Pine Paiute Tribe hydrant replacement project and the joint Amargosa and Inyo County Water Department groundwater monitoring project. Mark asks for guidance from the RWMG on how to move forward with the prioritized project list given our funding needs versus the funding available in Round 2.
- Bob reminds the RWMG that he has also submitted the Inyo County portion of the groundwater monitoring project under the Local Groundwater Assistance Program and that if funding is received from that program then Inyo County WD would be able to give back \$250,000. He suggests submitting the project list as is, understanding that changes in project status are likely and common in this process.
- Other RWMG members agree that submitting the project list as ranked is the best solution.
- Irene questions why the Inyo County Department of Public Works *Meters Project* superseded the Inyo County Department of Public Works *Needs Assessments Project*. She feels that the Needs Assessment should come first so that Inyo County is addressing the most pressing needs.
- Bob responds that in the CDPH assessments of Inyo County's water infrastructure there were so many issues identified and that criticality of water meters was mentioned as a high need for the County. He does not see an issue with that project coming before the Needs Assessments.
- John Drozd requests input on how Mono County could improve upon project submission to improve their chances for funding of their water quality needs.
- Mark responds that Mono County's issue is a common need in the Inyo-Mono Region and explains the Scoring and Ranking Process documents and how the RWMG has come up with the scores. He maintains the bulk of the document built upon DWR's PSP.
- Several members provide constructive criticism to the Mono County project and mention they would have liked to see a stronger work plan and a prioritization of the projects within the proposal by the Mono County Dept. of Environmental Health so that the BOS would have some guidance on the project needs from the department's perspective. Additionally, evaluators would have liked to know how the Mono County Board of Supervisors feels about each of the projects so that the RWMG would have a better idea of which of these projects were likely to move forward.
- Bob suggests that John put pressure on system operators to be proactive in the IRWM process and take some initiative to learn about the program and the process. He also thinks the Mono County project would be a great project to integrate with Inyo County Public Health Department and develop a region-wide project that addresses the need of these small water systems.
- Wesley Hawks thinks that the size of the water district and its ability to pay for the project should be incorporated into the ranking for the next round.
- Heather deBethizy also expresses she has some comments on the project scoring and ranking process.

DECISION ITEM: Approve Round 2 Implementation Project Ranking

- **Leroy Corlett moves to approve the Round 2 Implementation Project Ranking List. Rick Kattelmann seconds the motion. All approved.**
- b. Discuss Fiscal Agent Statements of Qualification (please come with a ranking of the three applicants and/or any that you cannot live with)
- Mark gives background on the three applicants to submit applications for Round 2 Implementation Grantee. At this time CalTrout, Town of Mammoth Lakes and Inyo County all have submitted applications. Mark seeks comments from the Group and asks if any Member is opposed to any of the three Grantee applicants.
 - No Members communicate that they would thumbs down any of the applicants.

- Bob reports if RWMG thinks that Inyo County should be the fiscal agent that he will proceed with the necessary steps. He communicates that Inyo County will review the application and do the analysis to see if the job is feasible. He mentions that the County wants to ensure it is comfortable with assuming the performance guarantees as outlined in DWR's Grantee contracts. He also maintains that Inyo County would support another fiscal agent if the RWMG feels there is a better organization for the job.
- Mark reports that CalTrout senior management has not confirmed its commitment but that if the RWMG feels it is the best candidate that they likely would be willing to be the Grantee.
- Mark reports that he spoke with Pete Bernasconi with the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML) and that Pete has sent the various documents up the appropriate channels to see about the Town's ability/interest in performing the task.
- There is a lengthy conversation about selection of a Grantee for future implementation rounds. Several members express the benefits of continuity of a Grantee throughout funding rounds as the learning curve has proven to be steep and there are economies of scale to be gained by securing a consistent entity to serve in this capacity. It is acknowledged that both CalTrout and Inyo County have the experience desired to administer the Grant and that there are pros and cons to each organization taking on the job.
- It is suggested that each of the three applicants proceed with investigating the feasibility of serving as the Grantee so that the RWMG can make a decision.
- Each Member at the table voices his/her organization's preference of potential Grantees. The summary of inputs for first pick of Grantee produced 7 votes for CalTrout, 2 votes for Inyo County, and no votes for TOML. Several Members elected not to assign any priority, and others voiced their concern over the TOML's current fiscal situation and the fact that the Town's staff is currently severely overcommitted.
- There is a discussion regarding the costs of the three applicants to administer the Grant, and Bob is asked to interpret the "Cost + 10%" as stated in Inyo County's application.
- Bob responds that cost refers to the staff hourly rate as outlined in the interest letter and then an additional 10%. Bob expects that is less than 10% of the grant award.
- **Mark will have a conversation with Pete Bernasconi about today's comments regarding Round 2 Grantee discussion about the Town of Mammoth Lakes being a candidate.**
- Bob suggests having a RWMG phone call if a vote to select a Round 2 Implementation Grantee needs to be conducted. If the situation arises that only one fiscal agent is moving forward, then the selection decision is made by default.
- **The Program Staff will send out a correspondence regarding Grantee applicant status when we receive it. At that time we will set up an opinion poll to RWMG Members and ask for a ranking by the Group to develop a decision item at the next meeting. If only one organization is remaining as a viable fiscal agent, then that agency will be the default Grantee.**
- Leroy asks how the 10% figure was decided upon.
- Mark responds that 5% is DWR's minimum administration fee recommendation while 15% is the uppermost threshold thought to be acceptable, thus the RWMG has decided to aim for 10% as an appropriate and justifiable amount to DWR.
- **DECISION ITEM: Select and approve Round 2 Implementation Grantee (Fiscal Agent)**
- **There was no decision made on this topic.**

c. Proposal Development Funding Assistance

- Mark recaps the fundraising letter that was circulated per Inyo County's request and the issue at hand to raise funds to support Program Staff in Round 2 Implementation Proposal Development.
- Bob is working with the County to provide funding assistance to the Inyo-Mono Program Staff.
- Mark asks if any other entity is seeking funding from their governing boards. No other Members indicate they are seeking financial support from their organization.
- Leroy asks how much is needed to support the effort.

- Mark replies that \$10,000 is a good base figure. He continues that although this amount will not cover the cost of proposal development, it at minimum sends a signal to CalTrout that the RWMG is equally committed to the process and that message is integral in keeping CalTrout as a continued supporter of the IRWM effort.
- There is a conversation about if other grant funding can be used toward proposal development.
- Holly responds that DWR funding is not available to prepare DWR grant proposals, but that DAC money can be used to assist DACs in proposal development capacity building. She reminds the RWMG that under the DAC grant we are planning to hold proposal development workshops that all entities would be welcome to participate but that priority will be given to DACs and Tribes.

d. **Next Steps**

- **Program Staff will reach out to Project Proponents directly for funding assistance when a final list of projects going forward in Round 2 is finalized.**
- **Program Staff will organize a call with Round 2 Project Proponents to hold a Round 2 Implementation kick-off meeting.**

6. **DAC Grant (10 Min)**

a. **Recent activities**

- Holly gives an update on the inter-regional outreach to the Upper Pit, Yosemite-Mariposa, Madera, Merced, and Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM regions.

b. **DAC Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**

- Holly reports that outreach within the Region has plateaued and that the focus from now on will be opportunistic outreach. She communicates that the immediate focus is going to be targeted training from CA Rural Water Association and other training topics as identified in the recent survey. Holly continues that the DAC Technical Advisory Committee meeting is going to be assembled perhaps tomorrow and a Doodle poll was sent to the initial participants from the training in February, but others interested should email her today so you can be included in future correspondence (holly@inyo-monowater.org).
- Holly reminds the RWMG that the Program Staff still has not received final notification of the DAC grant amendment for \$125,000 and that once that notification is received, work for the documentary film is the next major task.
- In January, a Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG)/ Inyo-Mono meeting will take place to begin brainstorming on a specific day for DAC/Tribes as an add-on to the SWWG conference scheduled for June 2013.

7. **General Updates (10 Min)**

a. **Staff Migrations**

- Mark reports that Heather Crall is transitioning from her outreach position to more of a research-related position under the DAC grant with a particular focus on reviewing current and possibly pending legislation relating to DAC water issues. In addition Andrew Skaggs is joining us as an AmeriCorps/SNAP Volunteer. Mark also reports that Sara Pfiefer has moved on and that we will be looking for another Program Administrator position that can help Staff with grant and meeting administration as well as other programmatic administrative duties.

b. **Website Update**

- Janet explains the domain name loss that happened roughly two weeks ago. The old domain name had expired and was purchased by someone in the United Arab Emirates who wanted to sell the domain name back to us for several thousand dollars. Since this was not viewed as an option Program Staff elected to change the domain name to a new hyphenated name: www.inyo-monowater.org. This means the website as well as Staff emails have changed to www.inyo-monowater.org and name@inyo-monowater.org. Janet mentions that additionally, the domain purchaser also stole the content of the Inyo-Mono website and so there was a copyright infringement issue at hand. Holly Gallagher helped her file the copyright infringement case with

Google to take the old site down from the Google Search engine. She reports that to date approximately 30 individual URLs have been accepted by Google for removal from their search engine but that a claim to a private DMCA takedown service has also been filed in attempt to remove content from other search engines such as Bing.

- Janet asks members to remain wary and notify her of any broken links on the new domain website, pages that appear under the old domain name, or questionable content on either site.
- Janet continues that under Holly Gallagher's advice the **Program Staff will write an article for the local papers to communicate the lessons learned from this event to other non-profits and website managers as well as excuse any odd content witnessed over the past few months.**

c. IRWMP Leadership Class

- Holly reports she attended the Riverside workshop and that it was a valuable class and a good networking opportunity with other IRWM Groups.

13. Guest Speaker (30 Min)

- a. Inyo National Forest: The Forest Planning Process, Revisions & Updates by Susan Joyce

7. Announcements

- Global Water World Day in March that CalTrout would like to participate in, as well as the IRWMP.
 - Rick mentions an interesting recent LA Times article about water resources.
<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-egypt-troubled-nile-20121111,0,1270505.story>

8. Process Check

- No comments

9. Review September 26, 2012, RWMG meeting summary

DECISION ITEM: Approve September 26, RWMG Meeting Summary

- No decision was made on this agenda item due to a loss of quorum.

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

- Janet reviews action and decision items from today's meeting.

11. Next Meeting Dates

- Wednesday, January 23
- **The meeting is adjourned at 12:59**