

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

Wednesday, January 25, 2012
9:30 am - 12:30 pm
Bishop Paiute Tribe Community Center
Bishop, CA

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

DECISION ITEMS

- **Rick moves to approve the November 16 and January 11 meeting notes. Darla Heil seconds the Motion. All approved pending Irene's revisions.**
- **Recommended Motion: The Group accepts the Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking, and acknowledges that funding will be allocated in accordance with the order of the accepted project ranking, recognizing that the ranking may be subject to DWR mandates. Mark moves to accept the above motion as worded. Leroy seconds the motion. All approved.**

ACTION ITEMS

- **The Program Office will attempt to contact those remaining lapsed signatories that have yet to be contacted to gather information regarding their MOU signatory status and intent for future participation.**
- **Leroy would like the Staff to research alternative conference call technology for future Group meetings.**
- **Austin will work with the Program Staff to revise Goals, Objectives and RMSs to be presented to the Admin. Committee at the February 13 meeting with the goal being a recommendation of revisions to the Group by the February 22 RWMG meeting.**
- **The Program Office will post the final Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking matrix to the website for the Group.**
- **Program Office will revise Scope of Services from CalTrout for the Round 2 Planning Grant in an effort to clarify the language regarding administrative costs, and circulate to the Group for comments and revisions early, week of Jan 30th. Feedback is requested by Friday, February 10. The Scope of Services will then go to the Admin. Committee who provides fiscal oversight and then create a recommendation for approval by the Group at the February 22 RWMG meeting.**
- **The Program Office will create a proposal template to be used as a tool by Round 2 Planning project proponents for the Round 2 Planning Grant in their proposal development.**
- **Rick Kattelman, Bruce Woodworth and Ceal Klingler will form a working committee to research the mechanics of the 501c3 structure and try to answer the fundamental question of the broader goal of the Group. Their findings will be reported back to the Group at a later date.**
- **Dan Jenkins will organize an M7 meeting for next week, to further discuss the Implementation contract issues.**

AGENDA

1. **Welcome and Introductions (5 min)**
2. **Public Comment period (5 min)**
3. **Round 1 Planning Grant (30 min)**
 - a. Report on Planning Grant first reporting and invoicing period
 - b. Planning Grant task status report
 - c. Proposed schedule of final tasks
 - d. RWMG Quorum attendance matrix
 - e. Work plan for revisiting Phase I Goals, Objectives, and Resource Management Strategies
 - i. Survey data report findings
 - ii. Next Steps
4. **Round 2 Planning Grant (25 min)**
 - a. Summary of timeline of events
 - b. Explanation of the evaluation process from Round 2 Project Evaluation Working Committee
 - c. Fiscal Agent status
 - i. California Trout Scope of Services
 - ii. Grant administration expense
 - iii. Standardized fiscal agent SOS
 - d. Next Steps in proposal preparation (deadline March 9)

DECISION ITEM:

1. **Approval of ranked Round 2 Planning Grant project list as recommended for submission into the Round 2 Planning Grant Proposal.**
- **Recommended Motion:** The Group accepts the Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking, and acknowledges that funding will be allocated in accordance with the order of the accepted project ranking, recognizing that the ranking may be subject to DWR mandates.
5. **Re-visitation of project prioritization process in preparation for Round 2 Implementation (30 min)**
 - a. Proposed schedule for Round 2 Implementation
 - b. Lessons Learned: Comments and Suggestions Summary
 - c. Criteria Framework development process proposed schedule
 - d. Next Steps: Admin. Committee

10 MINUTE BREAK

6. **Organizational Structure (20 min)**
 - a. Summary of research findings
 - b. Next steps
7. **DAC Grant (15 min)**
 - a. Initial tasks
 - i. Introducing Heather Crall
 - ii. Data gathering
 - iii. DAC outreach training
 - iv. DAC outreach strategy
 - b. Future schedule
8. **Implementation Grant Update (20 min)**

- a. Letter of Agreement/Contract with the RWMG
- b. Status of subcontract with project proponents
- c. Update from Central Sierra
- d. Update from Program Office

9. General Updates

10. Announcements

11. Process Check

12. Review November 16, 2011, and January 11, 2012, RWMG meeting notes

DECISION ITEM(s):

- 1. Approve November 16, 2011 RWMG meeting notes.
- 2. Approve January 11, 2012, RWMG meeting notes.

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

14. Next Meeting Dates)

- a. Next RWMG meeting: Meeting Schedule also available at www.inyomonowater.org
 - Wednesday, February 22, 2012; Suite Z Mammoth Lakes, CA
 - Wednesday, April 25, 2012
 - Wednesday, May 23, 2012

Final Meeting Notes

- Tony Dublino calls the meeting to order 9:35 am

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person

Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD
 Mark Drew, CalTrout/Inyo-Mono Program Staff
 BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
 Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
 Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group
 Larry Frelich, Inyo County Water Department
 Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District
 Tony Dublino, Mono County
 Joy Fatooh, Bureau of Land Management
 Matt Hayes, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation
 Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe
 Harvey VanDyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
 Lori Dermody, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
 Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee
 Jeremiah Joseph, Fort Independence Tribe
 Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
 Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes
 Heather Crall, Inyo-Mono Program Staff
 Nate Reade, Inyo Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office
 Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono Program Staff
 Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono Program Staff

Attending Via Phone

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD, Mono County RCD
Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
Austin McInerney, Center for Collaborative Policy
Jen Wong, Department of Water Resources
Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony
Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee

2. Public Comment period

- There were no public comments

3. Round 1 Planning Grant

a. Report on Planning Grant first reporting and invoicing period

- The Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office staff, herein referred to as the “The Staff”, gives an update on the Round 1 Planning Grant status, giving a general summary of the process to date. They inform the Group that the first invoice to DWR is on course to be submitted next week and covers the reporting period from April through October, 2011. It is planned, after the first submission, to report on a bimonthly basis. An example DWR invoicing form is projected and discussed by the Group.
- Dan Jenkins inquires if this form is standard invoicing form all DWR grants. Mark Drew responds that other DWR invoices will likely be similar.
- The actual invoice will be presented to the Admin. Committee at the February 13th meeting.

b. Planning Grant task status report

- The Staff delivers a brief summary of where each task in the Planning Grant is to date. The summary includes a bigger picture update on where things stand and that the majority of information gathering for the grant has been completed and now attention will start to turn towards revising the Phase I plan. More detailed updates include changes/upgrades to the website including new timeline software that will soon be incorporated. Staff reports on the status of outreach efforts to Benton Paiute Tribe and updates to the Climate Change and Relevant Documents chapters of the Phase I Plan. Holly Alpert reports that further summary information is expected from CRWA regarding the workshops they held and needs assessments they performed as well as a summary document from the CEQA workshops. Mark reminds the Group that the findings from all efforts of tasks above will assist the Staff in the revision process of the Phase I plan.

c. Proposed schedule of final tasks

- Mark informs the Group that on February 6 a Staff meeting will take place with the goal being to develop a strategy to meet the final deadlines of the Round 1 Planning Grant. He communicates that ideally the draft plan will be completed in March and the final in May, however he affirms the desire to incorporate the Draft PSP for Round 2 Implementation and therefore communicates that the Program Office may consider extending the Planning Grant.
- DWR has scheduled the Draft PSP for Round 2 Implementation to be released in late Spring/Summer of 2012.

d. RWMG Quorum attendance matrix

- The Staff reviews the discussion from the January 11 RWMG meeting and reminds the Group that an action item given to the Staff was to create a RWMG meeting attendance matrix. The matrix shows the meeting participation of MOU signatories from 2011. Low participating signatories were identified, and the Admin. Committee was asked to reach out to participants who attended less than 50% of the time. Several members were called and the summary of those calls was discussed by the Group. It was acknowledged that several members who were contacted are in attendance at today’s meeting.
- **The Program Office will attempt to contact those remaining lapsed signatories that have yet to be contacted to gather information regarding their MOU signatory status and intent for future participation.**
- It was brought to the attention of the Group that the current conference calling equipment is sub-par and in order to facilitate remote meeting participation, an alternative system needs to be acquired. Multiple members support this idea.
- **Leroy would like the Staff to research alternative conference call technology for future Group meetings**

- e. Work plan for revisiting Phase I Goals, Objectives, and Resource Management Strategies
 - i. Survey data report findings
 - Austin gives summary of the Survey findings that are also posted to the website. http://inyomonowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/MOU_SurveySummary_Consolidated-01-23-12.pdf. He communicates that 14 responses were received and that five of the six objectives were given rewording suggestions. He names groundwater management, runoff, ecosystem health, economic feasibility, agricultural runoff, and recreation's relevance to water planning as topics mentioned in the responses as well as the outreach meetings conducted at the end of 2011. He continues that subjects not addressed by the current plan that need further consideration are emergency management, including fire and flood management, water quality improvement and the balance of equity between large and small entities within the group (i.e. how to provide each entity with an equal chance at securing funding)
 - Mark also adds the need to consider the revision of Goal Areas into Goal Statements.
 - ii. Next Steps
 - **Austin will work with the Program Staff to revise Goals, Objectives and RMSs to be presented to the Admin. Committee at the February 13 meeting with the goal being a recommendation of revisions to the Group by the February 22 RWMG meeting.**

4. Round 2 Planning Grant

- a. Summary of timeline of events
 - Mark reminds the Group that the deadline for submission of the Round 2 Planning Grant application is **March 9, 2012**. He informs the Group of the need to respond to DWR's criteria in the proposal as this round is expected to be extremely competitive due to the fact that the funding is not allocated on a regional level but instead a statewide level. Mark speaks that February will largely be dedicated to proposal development.
- b. Explanation of the evaluation process from Round 2 Project Evaluation Working Committee
 - Mark gives a brief overview again of the ranking process and asks if any member has questions or concerns about the project rankings as they are presented in the final matrix.

DECISION ITEM:

1. Approval of ranked Round 2 Planning Grant project list as recommended for submission into the Round 2 Planning Grant Proposal.
 - **Recommended Motion: The Group accepts the Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking, and acknowledges that funding will be allocated in accordance with the order of the accepted project ranking, recognizing that the ranking may be subject to DWR mandates.**
 - **Mark moves to accept the above motion as worded. Leroy seconds the motion. All approved.**
 - **The Program Office will post the final Round 2 Planning Grant project ranking matrix to the website for the Group.**
- c. Fiscal Agent status
 - i. California Trout Scope of Services
 - Mark recalls the request from Irene and others and presents a Scope of Services from CalTrout as the fiscal agent for the Round 2 Planning Grant. He clarifies this document includes services CalTrout will provide and in return what will be expected of Project Proponents and the RWMG. He asks for feedback from the Group.
 - There is a discussion about the complexity of Planning Grants in comparison to Implementation Grants. Several members are confused by the current language in the Scope of Services document regarding grant administration costs. The importance of keeping the fiscal agent and Program Office financials separate so as to minimize confusion is expressed.
 - **Program Office will revise Scope of Services from CalTrout in an effort to clarify the language regarding administrative costs, and circulate to the Group for comments and revisions. Feedback is requested by Friday, February 10. The Scope of Services will then go to the Admin. Committee who provides fiscal oversight and then create a recommendation for approval by the Group at the February 22 RWMG meeting.**
 - ii. Grant administration expense

- A discussion about grant administration expenses as proposed in the Scope of Services determines the need for clarification of the document. The conversation in the agenda item above (4.c.i) captures what the Program Office is requested to do by the Group.
- iii. **Standardized fiscal agent SOS**
 - Mark feels like this document can serve as the baseline for the standardization for the Scope of Services that the Group can use this template to begin to create a more standardized Fiscal Agent Scope of Services document.
- d. **Next Steps in proposal preparation (deadline March 9)**
 - Mark recommends that all Project Proponents meet to work on proposals and before that time that they become familiar with the PSP. Currently Tuesday, February 7 is the date for an open house style workshop for Round 2 Planning Grant proponents to work on proposal development. The workshop will be held at the CalTrout office in Mammoth Lakes.
 - **The Program Office will create a proposal template to be used as a tool by project proponents for the Round 2 Planning Grant in their proposal development.** The Staff will send out an announcement about the workshop at a later date.

5. Re-visitation of project prioritization process in preparation for Round 2 Implementation

- a. **Proposed schedule for Round 2 Implementation**
 - Mark informs the Group that we expect the draft PSP for Round 2 Implementation sometime late spring/early summer and expect final proposals will be due in Fall of 2012. He reviews the feedback from both Grant cycles and identifies the following steps as what the Group would like to see: Step 1) Develop standardized project ranking criteria, 2) Draft PSP released, 3) Refine criteria to fit PSP, 4) Submit draft proposals internally, 5) Presentations of Projects @ RWMG meetings, 6) Ranking Process, 7) Final proposal submission to DWR.
- b. **Lessons Learned: Comments and Suggestions Summary**
 - Holly provides a summary of the comments received from both the Round 1 Implementation and Round 2 Planning Grant regarding the proposal development and project ranking process. She identifies several general categories of concern as a way to group the comments. 1) Ranking Process: Break up projects into categories or objectives before ranking, 2) Project presentations prior to ranking projects, 3) More information provided in pre-proposal (cost benefit analysis, no. of people project benefits, average household income in project area), 4) Consider who should perform evaluations, 5) Project Proponent support in preparation of final DWR proposal submission.
- c. **Criteria Framework development process proposed schedule**
 - Mark acknowledges the foundation we have built thus far in the proposal development and ranking process and feels we can build off the knowledge the Group has acquired thus far in the process. He recognizes the need for a definitive schedule and notices the new timeline will be useful in tracking deadlines, and staying on course.
 - Irene expresses the need to agree on ranking criteria and suggests the Group needs to make a decision about developing and using a standardized set of criteria.
- d. **Next Steps: Admin. Committee**
 - Holly proposes, based on the discussion at the Jan. 11 RWMG meeting, turning over the summary findings from the Project Ranking Process to the Admin. Committee meeting to incorporate the comments as they see fit into the future proposal development process.

6. Organizational Structure

- Holly gives the background of revisiting the organizational structure of the Group and reminds everyone that it is time for a decision to be made regarding what to do with the information.
- a. **Summary of research findings**
 - Holly gives a summary of her findings to date regarding costs, and administrative details regarding the establishment of a 501(c)(3) Non-profit organization. She estimates the set-up process with the IRS is likely to take 2-6 months (minimum) to process necessary paperwork and that the costs of filing range between \$400-\$700, not including time spent preparing documents. She continues stating some of the challenges inherent in adopting such a structure including; obtainment of start-up costs, establishing a Board of Directors, payroll taxes, accounting systems, tax preparation,

development of bylaws and the need to acquire three years of tax statements before being able to support grant efforts as a fiscal agent through some funding agencies.

- Mark reminds the Group of the need of the fiscal agent to be in a position to front operating costs ahead of being reimbursed by DWR.
- b. **Next steps**
 - The Staff asks for further direction and reminds the Group of the importance of making a definitive decision on this item as it's been agendized for over 6 months without resolution.
 - There is an extensive discussion regarding whether or not to continue pursuing this alternative organizational structure. Concerns in opposition to the establishment of a 501(c)(3) include how to raise the needed funds, the longevity of the current Prop. 84 funding, additional layers of government slowing the process, and how the 501(c)(3) is managed and funded once established. Arguments in favor of establishing a 501(c)(3) are financial independence from CalTrout and increasing opportunities to accept donations and access other funding sources. It is also stated that up front, it should be determined how creating a 501(c)(3) would further the goals/mission of the group.
 - **Rick Kattelman, Bruce Woodworth and Ceal Klingler will form a working committee to research the mechanics of the 501c3 structure and try to answer the fundamental question of the broader goal of the Group. Their findings will be reported back to the Group at a later date.**
 - Mark speaks that Alan Roesberry, the Financial Director of CalTrout, may be able to provide some financial guidance to the group if requested.

7. DAC Grant

a. Initial tasks

i. Introducing Heather Crall

- Holly introduces Heather and informs the Group that the 2010 Census did not collect Median Household Income (MHI) data and reminds the Group that in the past that is how DWR has defined DACs.

ii. Data gathering

- Darla Heil asks how DWR is going to define DACs without MHI data. Holly responds that DWR has left it up to the current DAC grantees to define DACs within their own regions.
- Heather speaks to redefining DACs in the Inyo-Mono region. She has been researching what metrics are being used in other countries and regions to try to find which metrics will be relevant in the Inyo-Mono region. She gives a summary of what she has found so far, and what data are available. She continues that much of the current data available is only available for more urban populations and that it's challenging finding data for a rural region such as the Inyo-Mono.
- Holly asks the Group for contacts and ideas regarding data acquisition for places within the Region to assist her and Heather on the DAC project. She continues that once data they feel are relevant is acquired, Heather will present their findings in a matrix and bring suggested strategies back to the Group at the next meeting.
- Mark reminds members to keep in mind we may be able to procure the resources necessary to acquire original data in the Region if the Group can help us determine what will be most useful.

iii. DAC outreach training

- Holly notifies the Group that the Staff has invited Maria Elena Kennedy to Mammoth to lead training for DAC outreach. The training is set for February 8 and 9 in Mammoth.
- Mark provides justification for keeping the training small and intimate but states if there are interested parties to please contact Holly.

iv. DAC outreach strategy

- Holly reminds the Group that from many communities, data may not be necessary to determine the DAC status and that outreach will be prioritized accordingly.

b. Future schedule

- Mark and Holly are serving on the design team on the DAC Environmental Justice Caucus and the Inyo-Mono Region is being looked to as a leader in DAC program development.

8. Implementation Grant Update (20 min)

- a. Letter of Agreement/Contract with the RWMG
- b. Status of subcontract with project proponents

- Bruce provides a general overview of the Implementation process to date. He informs the Group that Central Sierra is waiting on a few answers to technical questions to fill in the necessary data gaps in the proposal, but that otherwise the process seems to be on track. He reminds the Group that a draft contract was sent to Project Proponents on December 28, 2011 and that the M7 group was tasked with getting together to discuss the contract. He continues that Central Sierra took the Grant Agreement from DWR and changed it very little to create the individual project contracts. He feels M7 should meet without Central Sierra to discuss the contract and advises them that Central Sierra is looking for a cohesive response from Project Sponsors regarding the contract.
- Several Project Proponents voice their growing concern over the current contract provided by Central Sierra. They request a Scope of Services and Budget before they can consider the contract further. They communicate that further progress is being inhibited by the lack of information provided by Central Sierra and that the current Letter of Agreement is not sufficient as a Scope of Services. They request a document to define what services will be provided using the 10% Grant Administration funds Central Sierra is scheduled to receive.
- Bruce explains that the work plan and the budget will be attachments to the contract and that Central Sierra will provide what is required by DWR.
- Multiple members ask if Central Sierra has a draft Contract between DWR and Central Sierra that he can provide to the Group. Bruce doesn't feel he can answer that.
- Several other members inquire if at minimum Central Sierra could provide them with the Scope of Services that Central Sierra submitted to DWR. They question if DWR has any objections to the Scope of Services Central Sierra has provided to them. Bruce replies that he is unaware of any problems about the Scope of Services submitted by Central Sierra to DWR.

c. Update from Central Sierra

- Bruce announces that Central Sierra is currently waiting on DWR to provide responses to gaps in the proposals that need to be filled. He is reluctant to make predictions as to when they will have those comments back from DWR.
- Harvey asks if Central Sierra has a deadline from DWR for the contracts to be completed. Bruce replies that there is no formal due date from DWR.

d. Update from Program Office

- Holly suggests the M7 Group convene a meeting to discuss this topic further.
- **Dan Jenkins will organize an M7 meeting for next week, to further discuss the Implementation projects contract issues.** He points out the need for Central Sierra to recognize that the contracts in question are contracts between Central Sierra and each individual project proponent. Dan communicates that the fiscal agent needs to accommodate what each of the Project Proponents want and need in a contract, and that consensus by the Group is irrelevant as this conversation is not about a contract with the Group, but instead with individual entities.
- Mark recognizes the need to bring closure to some of these longstanding issues as the Group has an abundance of other work to do.

9. General Updates

- Mark informs Group of next week's Water Plan Update 2013 Public Advisory Committee meeting.
- Mark asks members with water relevant issues/projects to be sure to inform the Group about what's going on within their individual entities, especially when something may be of interested to other stakeholders within the RWMG.

10. Announcements

- Ceal announces that the Owens Valley Committee is hosting a fundraiser on February 25 at 6:15pm at Mountain Light Gallery (5:30 drinks and hors d'oeuvres). Guest speaker will be John Walton, the author of *Western Times and Water Wars*.
- MCWD Strategic Plan for 2012/2013 is now posted on the website <http://www.mcwd.dst.ca.us/>
- Draft LORP Recreation Use Plan is out and a public review will be held later in February: <http://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/cms/ladwp014936.jsp>

- Scholarships are available for the California Water Policy Conference, to be held March 8 and 9 in Los Angeles: <http://www.cawaterpolicy.org/scholarship.htm>.
- Holly informs Group of the Water Education Foundation tours coming up in the next few months: <http://www.watereducation.org/toursdoc.asp?id=823>.

11. Process Check

- Mark acknowledges again the need to upgrade conference calling equipment.
- Janet requests feedback on the functionality of the Inyo-Mono website.

12. Review November 16, 2011, and January 11, 2012, RWMG meeting notes

- Irene provides a few minor revisions to the Jan. 11 notes. Janet notes the changes.
-

DECISION ITEM(s):

1. Approve November 16, 2011 RWMG meeting notes.
2. Approve January 11, 2012, RWMG meeting notes.
 - **Rick moves to approve the November 16 and January 11 meeting notes. Darla Heil seconds the Motion. All approved pending Irene's revisions.**

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

14. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Next RWMG meeting: [Meeting Schedule also available at www.inyomonowater.org](http://www.inyomonowater.org)
 - Wednesday, February 22, 2012; Suite Z Mammoth Lakes, CA
 - Wednesday, April 25, 2012 (Phone Call?)
 - Wednesday, May 23, 2011
- **Tony adjourns the meeting 12:37 pm**