

Final Meeting Summary

Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group

Regular Meeting

Wednesday, September 26, 2012
Fort Independence Tribal Offices
141 N. Highway 395
Independence, CA
9:30am-12:30pm

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

Mandatory Project Workshop to follow 1:30-4:30pm

Decision Item Summary

1. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve Program Office endorsement process of Generic Letter of RWMG Support

- *Proposed Process:* When a request for the RWMG letter of support is received by the Program Office, staff will email the pending request to RWMG MOU signatories and provide a comment period of at least three weeks. During the comment period, all IRWMP members may notice their concern of the project. If after the comment period, no members provide notice of concern to the Program Office, the Program Office may submit the support letter on behalf of the RWMG without a formal decision by the IRWMP group. If any concern is voiced by a RWMG member, formal approval of the support letter will be agendaized at the next RWMG meeting. This process is limited to letters of support for water-related grant or loan applications. Membership is not a prerequisite for obtaining letters of support.
- Leroy Corlett moves to approve the Proposed Process for endorsement of the Generic Letter of Support by the Program Office. Holly Gallagher seconds the motion. All approved.
- Mark Drew will contact Inyo County Water Department on an amendment to the process, to explore if the approval process can be accelerated if the issue does not need to be taken to the B.O.S.

2. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve Document: "Proposal Process, Scoring/Ranking Process, & Pre-Proposal Application" as prepared by the RFP Working Committee and recommended by the Admin. Committee

Coupled with this decision is the task of deciding which of the three funding allocation options are preferred by the RWMG, the three options are outlined below as possible funding allocation strategies. The Admin. Committee requested that the three options be provided to the RWMG. In the event that the Group has trouble reaching consensus in a timely manner, the Admin. Committee recommends Option i: High to Low, noting the critical timing of this decision and that additional revisions can take place in subsequent funding rounds.

- High to Low: Implementation projects will be prioritized for funding based on the project's evaluation score, regardless of bins. Projects will be ranked from the highest score to the lowest score, and funding will be allocated accordingly. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
- Irene Yamashita moves to adopt the Proposal Process, Scoring /Ranking Process, & Pre-Proposal Application Process, with Option i: High to Low as the accepted project Prioritization Process. Heather deBethizy seconds the motion. All Approved.

3. **DECISION ITEM(s):** Approve August 22, RWMG Meeting Summary

- Irene moves to approve the Aug. 22 Meeting Notes. Larry Freilich Seconds the Motion. All approved.

Action Item Summary

- The Program Office will provide a letter requesting funding assistance for Round 2 Implementation proposal development to Member organizations and project proponents.
- Member please send your Match forms for both May/June & July/August invoicing periods to Janet by next Wednesday, September 3. Match forms are available for download on the website.
- Those interested in participation of the DAC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) please let the Program Office know so that you can be included in the communications about the upcoming DAC TAC meeting.
- Janet will post Action Items and Decision items to the website in a new easy to access location!

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 Min)
2. Public Comment period (5 Min)
3. RWMG Letters of Support (15 Min)
 - a. Approval Process Generic Inyo-Mono RWMG Letter of Support

DECISION ITEM: Approve Program Office endorsement process of Generic Letter of RWMG Support

- *Proposed Process:* When a request for the RWMG letter of support is received by the Program Office, staff will email the pending request to RWMG MOU signatories and provide a comment period of at least three weeks. During the comment period, all IRWMP members may notice their concern of the project. If after the comment period, no members provide notice of concern to the Program Office, the Program Office may submit the support letter on behalf of the RWMG without a formal decision by the IRWMP group. If any concern is voiced by a RWMG member, formal approval of the support letter will be agendized at the next RWMG meeting. This process is limited to letters of support for water-related grant or loan applications. Membership is not a prerequisite for obtaining letters of support. ***Tentative wording, pending BOS formal approval on Sept. 25, some minor revisions may still occur.**

4. Round 1 Planning Grant (15 Min)
 - a. Phase II Plan Update
 - b. Plan Approval Schedule
5. Round 2 Implementation Rounds (60 Min)
 - a. RFP Project Ranking Process

DECISION ITEM: Approve Document: "Proposal Process, Scoring/Ranking Process, & Pre-Proposal Application" as prepared by the RFP Working Committee and recommended by the Admin. Committee.

- Coupled with this decision is the task of deciding which of the three funding allocation options are preferred by the RWMG, the three options are outlined below as possible funding allocation strategies. The Admin. Committee requested that the three options be provided to the RWMG. In the event that the Group has trouble reaching consensus in a timely manner, the Admin. Committee recommends Option i:

High to Low, noting the critical timing of this decision and that additional revisions can take place in subsequent funding rounds.

- i. **High to Low:** Implementation projects will be prioritized for funding based on the project's evaluation score, regardless of bins. Projects will be ranked from the highest score to the lowest score, and funding will be allocated accordingly. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
 - ii. **Random Bins:** Implementation award will be allocated to the highest ranked projects within each bin. Bins will be randomly prioritized, and the highest ranking project from the first priority bin will receive full funding and then the highest ranked project in the second priority bin will receive funding for their project and so on until the total award is allocated. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
 - iii. **Prioritized Bins:** Implementation award will be allocated to the highest ranked projects within each bin. Bins will be prioritized by the RWMG before project ranking begins, and the highest ranking project from the highest-prioritized bin will receive full funding and then the highest ranked project in the second-highest bin will receive funding for their project and so on until the total award is allocated. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
- b. Update on Fiscal Agent Solicitation (October 12 RFQ Deadline)
 - c. 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. North Lahontan Regional Forum
- b. CA Water Plan

9. Announcements

10. Process Check

11. Review August 22, 2012, RWMG meeting summary

DECISION ITEM(s): Approve August 22, RWMG Meeting Summary

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

13. Next Meeting Dates

- Project Presentations: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 (Suite Z Mammoth Lakes)
- RWMG Meeting: Wednesday, November 14, 2012 (Bishop Area, TBA)

14. Guest Speaker (30 Min)

- a. TBA

Meeting Summary

- Irene Yamashita convenes the meeting at 9:33am

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 Min)

Attending In Person

Heather deBethizy, Mono County, Eastern Sierra Land Trust

Larry Freilich, Inyo County Water Department

Mark Drew, California Trout

Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group

Wesley Hawks, Crystal Crag Water Development Association

Matthew Hays, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation

Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission

Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest

Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff

Sara Pfeifer, IRWMP Staff

Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff

Jeremiah Joseph, Fort Independence Indian Reservation

Holly Gallagher, Birchim Community Services District

On The Phone

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD, Mono County RCD

Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District

Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley

Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD

David Grah, City of Bishop (11:00am)

2. Public Comment period (5 Min)

- There are no public comments.

3. RWMG Letters of Support (15 Min)

a. Approval Process Generic Inyo-Mono RWMG Letter of Support

- Mark reviews past conversations about the generic letter of support and the challenge that Inyo County Board of Supervisors had with the language proposed at the August RWMG meeting.
- Larry Freilich explains that the Board of Supervisors (B.O.S) has worked toward a revised process that they are satisfied with (proposed wording included below).
- Irene asks for clarification as to the differences between the original process and the process proposed below. She wonders whether three weeks is too long to solicit comments or approval from RWMG Members and will cause issues for this letter to be useful in time restricted circumstances.
- Larry explains the need for the three week window to allow the County time to get the issue agendized for their B.O.S. meetings.
- Irene asks if the Inyo County BOS feels like all requests will need to go to through a formal Board approval.
- Larry responds that some issues may not need to seek BOS approval, and that the Inyo Co. Water Department reserves the right to make the decision if Board approval is necessary.

- Members of the Group inquire if there could be some flexibility built into the process to allow for three weeks if Board approval is needed, but to also allow for an expedited process if the Inyo County Water Department does not deem Board approval necessary.
- Mark suggests approving the process below and that he will continue the conversation with the Inyo County Water Department to explore if an expedited option is feasible.
- **Leroy Corlett moves to approve the Proposed Process for endorsement of the Generic Letter of Support by the Program Office. Holly Gallagher seconds the motion. All approved.**
- **Mark Drew will contact Inyo County Water Department regarding an amendment to the process and to explore if the approval process can be accelerated if the requested letter of support does not need to be taken to the Inyo County B.O.S.**
- The Program Staff explains that this week we received a request from the Bridgeport Indian Colony for a letter of support and that we were unable to provide a support letter due to a lack of defined process by the RWMG. The Staff feels this example points to the issue at hand and clarifies the need to agree upon a process that supports the Program Office providing such generic support letters.
- A conversation revolves around the request from the Bridgeport Indian Colony for a letter.
- At the end of the conversation, RWMG Members feel that letters factual in nature vs. supportive in nature (e.g., stating an opinion) should be fine for the Program Staff to issue with the caveat being that the Program Office reports to the Admin. Committee and/or RWMG when such factual letters are issued.
- Program Office Staff seeks clarification if the RWMG feels it's necessary to define a process for the issuing of a factual letter.
- Again the RWMG maintains that as long as the letter is factual and does not in any way advocate support of the requesting agency that the RWMG feels it is appropriate for the Program Office to comply with the requested letter.

DECISION ITEM: Approve Program Office endorsement process of Generic Letter of RWMG Support

- *Proposed Process: When a request for the RWMG letter of support is received by the Program Office, staff will email the pending request to RWMG MOU signatories and provide a comment period of at least three weeks. During the comment period, all IRWMP members may notice their concern of the project. If after the comment period, no members provide notice of concern to the Program Office, the Program Office may submit the support letter on behalf of the RWMG without a formal decision by the IRWMP group. If any concern is voiced by a RWMG member, formal approval of the support letter will be agendized at the next RWMG meeting. This process is limited to letters of support for water-related grant or loan applications. Membership is not a prerequisite for obtaining letters of support. ***Tentative wording, pending BOS formal approval on Sept. 25, some minor revisions may still occur.***

5. Round 2 Implementation Rounds (60 Min) (Agenda Item #5 was moved up to accommodate Member schedules)

a. RFP Project Ranking Process

- Program Staff explains the decision that is before the RWMG today. Mark provides a brief outline of the three options provided below.

DECISION ITEM: Approve Document: "Proposal Process, Scoring/Ranking Process, & Pre-Proposal Application" as prepared by the RFP Working Committee and recommended by the Admin. Committee.

- Coupled with this decision is the task of deciding which of the three funding allocation options are preferred by the RWMG, the three options are outlined below as possible funding allocation strategies. The Admin. Committee requested that the three options be provided to the RWMG. In the event that the Group has trouble reaching consensus in a timely manner, the Admin. Committee recommends Option i: High to Low, noting the critical timing of this decision and that additional revisions can take place in subsequent funding rounds.

- ii. High to Low: Implementation projects will be prioritized for funding based on the project's evaluation score, regardless of bins. Projects will be ranked from the highest score to the

lowest score, and funding will be allocated accordingly. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.

- iii. **Random Bins:** Implementation award will be allocated to the highest ranked projects within each bin. Bins will be randomly prioritized, and the highest ranking project from the first priority bin will receive full funding and then the highest ranked project in the second priority bin will receive funding for their project and so on until the total award is allocated. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
 - iv. **Prioritized Bins:** Implementation award will be allocated to the highest ranked projects within each bin. Bins will be prioritized by the RWMG before project ranking begins, and the highest ranking project from the highest-prioritized bin will receive full funding and then the highest ranked project in the second-highest bin will receive funding for their project and so on until the total award is allocated. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
- Darla Heil provides some background on the Admin. Committee's recommendation. She points out that the random bins risk putting forth a weak project because it gets randomly selected as the first priority bin. She reminds the Group that the purpose of ranking is to put forth the strongest projects in the Implementation proposal.
 - Both County representatives speak that the Counties feel that High to Low is the best option for funding allocation.
 - Bruce reminds the Group of the development of the bin concept by the RFP working Committee. He argues that it provides certainty of equitable representation of all five bins and thinks that it would be a mistake to abandon bins at this stage in the process. He reminds that the RWMG has been deficient in putting forth projects in some of the bin categories and cites Ecosystem Health as an example.
 - Holly explains that bins would not be entirely abandoned and that the bins would be used for the assembly of Technical Advisory Committee members and that each TAC will be tasked with evaluating projects within a given bin. Holly adds that thus far no Ecosystem Health or Flood Management projects have been proposed, thus effectively reducing the bins to three.
 - Wesley Hawks inquires if the Department of Water Resources prioritizes bins in any way.
 - Mark expresses appreciation for wanting to round out the types of projects that the Inyo-Mono RWMG includes in its proposal but communicates that ultimately the proposal does not receive additional merit for achievement of project diversity.
 - Bruce disagrees and believes that DWR does give merit for a suite of well-rounded projects within a proposal.
 - Irene thinks that the bins still remain valuable to the RWMG as it helps the Group get a sense of the types of projects that the region needs. She cautions that the Group wants to be careful to not rank a project highly by random selection but instead based on the actual quality of the project.
 - Bruce reminds that bins were created to help with the comparison of evaluating like projects. He reminds that one complaint from Round 1 Implementation was the difficulty of comparing dissimilar projects, and that bins allow for comparing like projects.
 - Bruce proposes the volume of projects in a given bin could be used to prioritize bins with the bin receiving the most projects ranked as the top priority bin.

- Holly Gallagher argues that the number of projects in a bin has no relevance of the importance of these projects to the RWMG. She argues that the number of projects that are at issue (approximately 10-15) is a tangible number to prioritize high to low. She acknowledges if the RWMG had 100 projects that the bins would serve as very valuable tools. She agrees that bins are valuable internally but that high-to-low is going to be the best option to ensure the best projects get prioritized at the top.
- Mark reminds the Group that under the Round 2 Planning Grant, three Ecosystem Health planning projects have received funding, which helps strengthen the work the Group is doing as a whole, even if those are yet to be Implementation projects.
- Irene suggests that language be added to the RFP document ensuring all Members are required to use the process now approved to rank projects. She supports her request by reminding the Group that considerable time has been invested in creating this document and that it ensures an equitable scoring system for all projects. She asks if any language to support this is included in the current document.
- Holly reads from Page. 2 of the RFP document, "... Members wishing to review and rank projects must commit to reviewing and ranking ALL projects. RWMG reviewers may accept the TAC scoring for those specific sections for a particular project, or they may do their own scoring. If you accept the TAC scores, you must also review and score the other sections of the proposal not scored by the TAC." She interprets the document to assume Members will be using only the described scoring and ranking process but points out that it is not explicitly stated that they must use the process and criteria in the document to rank projects.
- Bruce objects to such language being incorporated into the RFP document.
- Heather deBethizy acknowledges the work that was put into defining the process and that the RWMG just agreed upon the document that would be used for the ranking process.
- Bruce recalls in the Round 2 Planning Grant he and another Member used a subjective ranking and it turned out just fine.
- Darla points out that the entire point of defining the process and approving criteria is to eliminate subjective opinions and effectively require all RWMG to use the same criteria to rank projects.
- Mark asks Bruce how he would propose incorporating alternative ranking processes into the final results.
- Bruce said the ranking boils down to a final rank and that the bottom line is that it is irrelevant how the various rankings are achieved.
- Darla argues that if a Member elects to use an alternative ranking process that they provide clear documentation to the RWMG regarding the process they chose to use.
- Bruce disagrees that this is necessary and points out that it is not stated in the RFP document.
- Mark clarifies his interpretation of the wording in the RFP that it is meant to support the ranking as defined in the RFP. He asks how one would incorporate a simple ranking into aggregated scores from the approved ranking process.
- Bruce maintains all scores will be eventually boiled down to a list ranked projects and that it's a simple process to incorporate all final ranks, regardless of how they were achieved into a final ranking.
- Heather argues that she proposed the RFP Scoring & Ranking process to the Mono Count B.O.S. as a process that the RWMG would use to rank projects. She did not present to the Board that all Members can use whatever system they want to rank projects.
- Darla disagrees with Bruce and states her belief that if the RFP Working Committee intended to allow for the use of any non-quantitative ranking process that the language would have clearly stated so. Instead she reads the document and infers that the proposed scoring and ranking process will be used. Darla argues that Bruce was an active part of the development of this document, and feels that if that in fact was the intent of the document, why wasn't explicit language inserted saying any ranking system would suffice.
- There is a long discussion about the intent of the RFP document. The majority of the Group feels similarly that the language supports the use of the ranking process as defined by the criteria and scoring system outlined in the document, and the wording used was only intended to mean that

Members had the option to accept TAC scores/ranks or to score that section of the RFP themselves. The majority of Members at today's meeting felt the intent was not to allow the Membership to use whatever types of scoring they feel like on a given day.

- There is a discussion about the need for anyone ranking projects will need to submit the project scores totaling 115 points consistent with the RFP document.
- Irene objects to allowing any Member to make up an individual ranking process. She maintains that the process as described was developed to support the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan and that as a Member of the RWMG, you should strive to meet the regional objective of the Plan. This document acknowledges those objectives and states that the RWMG will use these criteria to rank projects so that the projects that most closely address both DWR's criteria as well as our own regional criteria receive the best scores.
- Malcolm Clark thinks it is important to get closure now on how an alternative ranking process would be incorporated into the final ranking if we know all Members are not going to comply. He points out that approving the document while knowing that certain Members have no intention of using it simply postpones the decision at hand and puts further burden on the Program Office.
- Janet asks Bruce if he is adamant on using an alternative ranking process, if he would be willing to present the process he elects to use to score/rank projects to the RWMG to vote upon, as a way for the RWMG to ensure all processes used are well thought out and legitimate.
- Bruce replies he is absolutely not willing to comply with such a request.
- Irene questions if the Boards that Bruce represents support his position.
- There is a conversation between Bruce & Irene about how their respective Boards support the decisions their representatives' make.
- Heather goes back to the title of the RFP document. She states that the document is precisely a Scoring/Ranking Process and that only one process is being defined and approved in this document. She points out that Bruce is the only Member at the meeting today who is opposed to using the process.
- The conversation about how to incorporate a subjective ranking into aggregated scores is continued. The issue identified is that scores of projects more closely reflect the relative value that a Member puts on a project but a numeric rank gives no such indication of the amount in which one project exceeds another.
- Bruce agrees that he can put whichever process he uses into a numeric scale that corresponds to the 115 points of the RFP document to facilitate incorporation of his scores into the larger RWMG aggregate scores.
- Keith Pearce reminds the RWMG that DWR is using criteria to rank projects. He feels the closer we can come to emulating their ranking process the better chance we have in putting together a winning proposal.
- Larry thinks that it seems contrived to use your own ranking process when you're a Member of a Group who has an approved process. He feels that it is unfair to the Group and doesn't see why the Group would have to accept a ranking from an individual who refuses to comply with the Group's process.
- Mark asks how the Group would like to address how to reconcile the incorporation of an alternative ranking process into the RWMG-approved process given the time constraints we face as a Group.
- Several members ask if an Admin. Committee meeting could be held to deal with this issue.
- Mark responds to the problems the Program Office faces with regards to other pressing work, time, and budget constraints, and instead emphasizes the need for the RWMG to figure out a way forward and streamline the decision-making processes. He reminds the Group that it needs to begin to learn how to make decisions more efficiently and encourages Members to keep in perspective that they may not get exactly what they want but instead to ask, can I live with this document/decision/process.
- There is a conversation about enforcing the use of this document.
- Leroy asks Irene if she objects to approving the document as it is written.

- Irene thinks if someone doesn't follow this process that their scores and rank should not be counted, once again returning to the point that this is the process that the RWMG has agreed upon.
- Mark suggests adopting the document with one exception, pointing out that ultimately on Nov. 14 that all Members have to approve the ranked list. Further, Mark reminds the Group of the risk of not approving the final ranking on November 14 and that ultimately it will mean that the Round 2 Implementation Proposal will not be submitted.
- Mark asks Bruce for his suggestions on how to incorporate an alternative scoring/ranking process into the overall aggregated RWMG scoring/ranking.
- Bruce replies that he feels incorporating his scores into the aggregate RWMG scores will be easy and that they can continue to have "off-line" conversations about it.
- **Irene moves to adopt the Proposal Process, Scoring /Ranking Process, & Pre-Proposal Application Process, with Option i: High to Low as the accepted project Prioritization Process. Heather seconds the motion. All Approved.**

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

b. [Update on Fiscal Agent Solicitation \(October 12 RFQ Deadline\)](#)

- The Program Office reminds the Group of the need to identify a fiscal agent early in the Round 2 Implementation process. Holly informs the Group that she has placed notifications in both Mammoth papers, the Inyo County Register, as well as on the website.
- Larry notifies that Inyo County will submit an application for Fiscal Agent.
- Mark explains that CalTrout may not continue to pursue Fiscal Agent duties predominantly because the organization is financially extended by about \$200,000 and that he has been enduring some pressure from his Board to get those funds reimbursed. He reminds the Group that match forms are essential as we approach the end of the Planning Grant.
- Program Staff reminds Members that Friday, October 12 is the date application materials for fiscal agent are due to the Program Office. Those materials will then be circulated to the RWMG.
- The decision for Fiscal Agent will be agendized at the November 14 meeting.

c. [Next Steps/ Financial](#)

- Program Staff report that future funding for Implementation proposal development is currently not available from CalTrout. Mark reminds the Group that CalTrout has provided extensive financial support over the years, and given the current financial situation, he is asking for support from other organizations.
- Holly summarizes survey results from the Roundtable of Regions on the cost of developing the Round 1 Implementation proposals for our region compared to other regions. She summarizes that the Inyo-Mono spent a total of \$68,000 of which \$51,000 was in-kind contributions from Project Proponents, \$3,000 went to the Center for Collaborative Policy to assemble the document and the remaining \$14,000 went to support Program Office Staff. Other regions on average spent approximately \$115,000.
- Mark communicates that he is in a tough position to ask CalTrout to provide further funding to support proposal development, prior to receiving reimbursement for the funds already spent.
- Larry asks for a request for funding assistance letter to provide to various organizations for them to take to their Boards. He suggested that the letter include information about how much money CalTrout has already provided and how much funding has been generated to date.
- Mark also thinks that we can provide return on investment data to further bolster support of future IRWMP funding efforts.
- **The Program Office will provide a letter requesting funding assistance for Round 2 Implementation proposal development to RWMG Organizations and Project Proponents.**

4. Round 1 Planning Grant (15 Min)

- Mark gives a background of the current status of the Program Office and the tremendous amount of work that is involved administering six grants. He encourages RWMG Members to step back and think about how to streamline decision making processes and how we can move forward in the most productive manner possible.

a. Phase II Plan Update

- Program Office Staff reports that a PDF version of the Draft Phase II Plan is now available on the website (<http://inyo-monowater.org/inyo-mono-irwm-plan/>). Staff reminds the Group that each of the Plan chapters was open to comment for a minimum for four weeks and the opportunity for comment is now closed.
- The current Draft Phase II Plan is available for Members to seek board approval prior to November 14, when Plan approval will be sought as the final deliverable of the Round 1 Planning Grant.
- Mark explains that grammatical changes are appreciated but substantive changes are not appropriate at this time as they would trigger a delay in the Plan approval process.
- Holly points out the differences between the Draft Phase II Plan and the Phase I Plan. She explains that basically the new Plan builds upon and enhances the original Plan. Newly developed sections are Climate Change, Data Management, Outreach and Engagement, ORMS, Needs Assessments and Capacity Building, and Phase II Project analysis. Holly explains the differences between our region and other region's Plans and reminds the Group that the Plan is primarily for our stakeholders. She explains that this revised Plan will be used for the CA Water Plan Update 2013 and the regional reports.
- Todd Ellsworth mentions the utility of this plan to the USFS Plan Revisions.
- Mark adds that there is a lot of interesting and relevant information with regards to the content of the Plan to this region. He encourages Members to read what they can keeping in mind that the Plan is really a guiding document for the Group and the Program itself.
- Mark reminds that we will have to add an amendment to the Plan which will include Round 2 Implementation Projects that were submitted after June 22, 2012, but before September 30, 2012. He ties this piece of information into the need to adhere to a strict schedule regarding deadlines for Round 2 Implementation.
- There is a conversation about MOU Signatories and the need for MOU signatures/Plan adoption prior to project submission.
- Darla congratulates the Program Office on the completion of the document on the deadline that they proposed.
- Mark speaks to the resolve of the Program Office to meet the Phase II Plan deadline as a first step in setting the new standard for the RWMG to stay on track with deadlines beginning now and continuing into the future.

b. Plan Approval Schedule

- At the Wednesday, November 14, RWMG Meeting, an adoption resolution will be provided and approval will be sought from the RWMG.

c. Match Forms!!

- Mark communicates to the Group the pressing need to finalize the Round 1 Planning Grant. This includes accounting for all match hours
- **Members: please send your Match forms for both May/June & July/August invoicing periods to Janet by next Wednesday, October 3. Match forms are available for download on the website (<http://inyo-monowater.org/documents/downloadable-forms/>).**

6. DAC Grant (10 Min)

a. Recent activities

- Janet gives update on South Sierra IRWMP meeting she and Heather Crall attended on September 13. She reports that they were very interested in how the Inyo-Mono Region has been so successful in its efforts. Janet speaks that their questions were fairly fundamental in nature and really they are looking for guidance and leadership on how to make this process work for them. She reports they also learned of a \$2 Million DAC project conducted in the Central Valley, and she hopes to be able to use the lessons there toward our own DAC project.
- Todd adds that the USFS is going to be working with the Sierra NF and Sequoia NF on the Forest Plan Revisions and that increased engagement is in the queue for the Inyo to collaborate with those forests and ideally the SSIRWMP.
- Program Staff report they have additional DAC meetings scheduled with Upper Pit, CABY, Yosemite-Mariposa and Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM Programs. They are hoping to get some on the ground tours in DACs and Tribes to learn from other Regions.

b. DAC Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

- Program Staff gives update on the origination of the need of the DAC TAC. Staff would like to convene the DAC TAC in October due to the need to ramp up DAC efforts and to come up with a revised workplan so that the goals and objectives of the project can be realized.
- **Those interested in participation of the DAC TAC please let the Program Office know so that you can be included in the communications about the upcoming DAC TAC.**
- The DAC TAC meeting will be scheduled for some time in mid to late October.

7. Round 1 Implementation Grant Update (10 Min)

a. Progress Report from Central Sierra and Project Proponents

- Bruce reports that Central Sierra has used 21% of its allocated budget as of the end of August. Valerie has submitted the grant amendment last month and still awaits a response from DWR. He continues that the first invoice is still scheduled for the end of October.
- Holly asks for clarification on if 1) Project Proponents have been notified that the signs are ready for pick-up, and 2) Valerie can clarify when documentation will be due to Central Sierra for invoicing by providing a proposed schedule to all Project Proponents.
- Bruce believes the invoicing period ends at the end of September and that paperwork will be submitted on October 31, but he will confer with Valerie on both of these details.
- The status of project contracts is discussed briefly.
- Project Proponents are reminded to let the Program Office know when they would like to start their project so that DWR can be notified and a public event can be scheduled.

b. Next Steps

- Continuation of contract processes and implementation of projects.

8. General Updates (10 Min)

a. North Lahontan Regional Forum

- Forum to be held in South Lake Tahoe on Friday, September 28.
- Mark and Holly remind the Group that these Regional Forums are a critical component to the CA Water Plan Update 2013 and that the North Lahontan Forum has been designed to improve upon the lessons learned at the South Lahontan Forum.

b. CA Water Plan

- Mark and Holly attended the CA Water Plan Plenary meeting last week to continue making the Inyo-Mono regional voice heard in Sacramento. There will be an opportunity for public comment in early 2013 on the draft Plan.

9. Announcements

- Mark reports that an **Equity Indicators Workshop** is scheduled in Sacramento on **Tuesday, October 23**, that will be made available via webinar to discuss DACs, Tribes, etc...
- **Central Nevada Regional Water Authority** meeting will be held on **Tuesday, November, 13** in Carson City. This is a meeting to identify pressing Nevada water needs that also cross into California. Greg James is organizing a panel discussion and Mark & Holly will be attending to help contribute lessons learned from the IRWM Program.
- CalTrout will be getting an AmeriCorps Volunteer and part of the volunteer's efforts will be devoted to supporting Program Staff. The Volunteer will be hired for a period of 11 months, arriving in early November..
- Wesley Hawks thanks the RWMG for extending the project solicitation period and that by doing so has allowed him to submit a project.
- The USFS has continued to engage partners and stakeholders for grant opportunities for the Forest. Todd speaks to the value of partnerships in strengthening proposals and help potential partners achieve desired resource management results.

10. Process Check

- There are no comments.

11. Review August 22, 2012, RWMG meeting summary

DECISION ITEM(s): Approve August 22, RWMG Meeting Summary

- Mark asks who has reviewed the meeting notes. A few Members report that they have scanned them.
- Bruce comments that the sooner the notes can be issued back to the RWMG the better.
- Janet acknowledges the time it takes to get the notes through the internal review process and her idea to post action and decision items to the website shortly after the meeting as a way to get those critical items to the Group in a more timely manner.
- **Janet will post Action and Decision Items to the website on a new page and notify the Group of its location ASAP.**
- **Irene moves to approve the Aug. 22 Meeting Notes. Larry Seconds the Motion. All approved.**

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

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

13. Next Meeting Dates

- Project Presentations: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 (Suite Z Mammoth Lakes)
- RWMG Meeting: Wednesday, November 14, 2012 (Bishop Area, TBA)

14. Guest Speaker (30 Min)

a. Jeremiah Joseph, Fort Independence

- Jeremiah gives an introduction to the **Stream Corridor Restoration Workshop** that the Tribe is hosting **October 24-26, 2012**.
- He reports there are a total of 30 spaces for participation and that a few slots remain.
- Please let Jeremiah know if you're interested in attending.
- The DAC grant is one way we may be able to provide support for this workshop.