

# Draft Meeting Summary

## Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group

### Regular Meeting

Wednesday, August 22, 2012  
June Lake Community Center  
90 W. Granite Ave  
June Lake, CA  
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm\*Note irregular meeting time!

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

#### Summary of Decision Items

1. Rick Kattelman moves to Restrict Round 2 Implementation projects to the 36 projects that have already been submitted and included in the Phase II IRWM Plan and acknowledges all projects submitted thereafter are valid but may be more appropriate for Round 3 Implementation. Holly Gallagher seconds the motion.

Several Members thumbs down the vote.

2. Mark Drew moves to Keep Round 2 Implementation project solicitation open until September 30, 2012, making clear that all projects not submitted by 11:59 pm on September 30 will not be included in Round 2 Implementation. Holly Gallagher seconds the motion. All approved.
3. Rick Kattelman moves to approve both the April 25 and July 11 RWMG meeting notes. Irene Yamashita seconds the motion. All approved.

#### Summary of Action Items

1. Public comments are due on August 24 for the Preliminary Round 2 Planning Grant recommendations to DWR. The link was provided in an email sent August 14, 2012.
2. Inyo County will provide revised wording for the process of endorsing the RWMG Generic Letter of Support that will be acceptable to the Inyo County Board of Supervisors by September 12 to the Program Office. This is to ensure the item will be included in the Draft Agenda in due time to be decided upon at the September 26 RWMG meeting.
3. Janet reports that it's that time of year again when match forms are due, informing the Group that the May/June Match EZ form is now available for download at <http://inyomonowater.org/documents/downloadable-forms/> . Match forms will be due to Janet by Friday, September 14, 2012. THANK YOU!
4. Program Office Staff will circulate the 501(c)(3) Working Committee Non-Profit Development Proposal to the RWMG Members in an email with the notes.
5. Those with comments or concerns regarding the establishment of a non-profit, please submit them to Janet Hatfield ([janet@inyomonowater.org](mailto:janet@inyomonowater.org)) by Friday, September 7, so that your comments can be collated and forwarded to the 501(c)(3) Working Committee with sufficient time to get the item agendized for the September 26 RWMG meeting.
6. The Program Staff will circulate an email soliciting interest from Member organizations to be Fiscal Agent for the Round 2 Implementation Grant proposal. Those entities who may be interested please send your reply to Mark Drew ([mdrew@caltrout.org](mailto:mdrew@caltrout.org)) by September 1. The Fiscal Agent Scope of Services will be included.
7. Members, who would like to see additional qualifications to the RFQ for the Fiscal Agent, please send any comments or suggestions via email to the Program Office Staff by August 29 for inclusion in the Fiscal Agent RFQ.
8. The proposed RFP and ranking process document is due to Program Staff on the morning of September 12, so it can be circulated to the Members to bring to their respective Boards for approval.

9. Program Office Staff will circulate more detailed information about the North Lahontan Regional Forum once it is received. The meeting is scheduled to take place on Friday, September 28, 2012 in South Lake Tahoe.

## AGENDA

1. **Welcome and Introductions (5 Min)**
2. **Public Comment period ( 5 Min)**
3. **Round 2 Planning Grant (10 Min)**
  - a. Preliminary Recommendations
  - b. Next Steps
4. **RWMG Letters of Support (10 Min)**
  - a. Approval Process Generic Inyo-Mono RWMG Letter of Support

**DECISION ITEM: Approve Program Office Staff 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 MOU signatories and provide a comment period of at least one week. During the comment period, all Members will be given the opportunity to notice their concern of the project. If after the comment period, no Members provide notice of concern to the Program Office Staff, the Staff will then be granted the authority to submit the support letter on behalf of the RWMG without a formal decision by the Group. If any concern is voiced by the membership, formal approval of the support letter will need to be agendized at the next RWMG meeting. Membership is not a prerequisite for said Letter of Support.*

5. **Round 1 Planning Grant (35 Min)**
  - a. Plan Review Process Update
  - b. Plan Approval Schedule
  - c. Member of the Month/Facebook/ Match Forms
  - d. 501(c)(3) update
6. **Round 2 Implementation Rounds (45 Min)**
  - a. Projects for Inclusion in Round 2 Implementation

**DECISION ITEM: Restrict Round 2 Implementation projects to the 36 that have already been submitted to the Phase II IRWM Plan, OR, Keep Round 2 Implementation project solicitation open until September 30, 2012 (with the caveat that any additional projects will not be included in the Phase II analysis but will be included in the Phase II Plan as an addendum).**

- b. Fiscal Agent Solicitation
- c. Implementation Proposal Writer

- d. Project Ranking
  - e. Future Schedule
7. **DAC Grant (10 Min) Next Steps**
    - a. Recent activities
  8. **Round 1 Implementation Grant Update (10 Min)**
    - a. Progress Report from Central Sierra and Project Proponents
    - b. Next Steps
  9. **General Updates (10 Min)**
    - a. SWWG Summit
    - b. North Lahontan Regional Forum
    - c. ESRI UC
  10. **Announcements**
  11. **Process Check**
  12. **Review April 25, 2012, RWMG meeting summary**

**DECISION ITEM(s): Approve April 25, 2012 RWMG Meeting Summary  
Approve July 11, 2012 RWMG Meeting Summary**

13. **Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting**
14. **Next Meeting Dates**
15. **Guest Speaker (60 Min)**
  - a. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD General Manager  
June Lake PUD Operations overview

## Draft Meeting Summary

### 1. Welcome and Introductions (5 Min)

#### **Attending in Person**

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District  
 Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD  
 Holly Gallagher, Birchim Community Services District  
 Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust  
 Heather deBethizy, Mono County  
 Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District  
 Mark Drew, California Trout, IRWMP Program Staff  
 Wesley Hawks, Crystal Crag Water & Development Association  
 Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley  
 Heather Crall, IRWMP Staff  
 Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony  
 Gavin Feiger, Sierra Nevada Alliance  
 Neil Favor, Sierra Nevada Alliance  
 Sara Pfeifer, IRWMP Staff

Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff  
Janet Hatfield, IRWMP Staff  
Harvey Pearce, June Lake PUD

### **Attending Via Phone**

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D, Mono County RCD  
Larry Freilich, Inyo County Water Department  
Joy Fatooh, Bureau of Land Management  
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Big Pine CSD  
Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group  
Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee  
Austin McInerney, Center for Collaborative Policy  
Keith Pearce, Inyo County Public Works  
Jen Wong, Department of Water Resources

## **2. Public Comment period (5 Min)**

- Mark Drew introduces Sara Pfeifer, who has been brought on to assist the Program Office Staff (herein referred to as The Staff) with various administrative duties, and welcomes her.

## **3. Round 2 Planning Grant (10 Min)**

### **a. Preliminary Recommendations**

- Mark announces the Inyo-Mono region has received a preliminary recommendation of \$480,000 for the Round 2 Planning Grant, which is approximately 70% of our grant ask. He informs the Group that the score seemed low and that the Program Office Staff will be looking into the details of the scoring and providing feedback to DWR, as the Staff felt perhaps they did not receive full credit for items such as DAC involvement, etc.
- The Staff is working with Project Proponents to revise budgets to see if we can provide additional funds to projects that initially are not in a position to receive funds given the current recommendation. Currently the final \$62,000 is going to fund the Town of Mammoth Lakes Stormwater Project and will fund at least the first phase of their project.
- **Public comments are due on August 24 for the Preliminary Round 2 Planning Grant recommendations to DWR. The link was provided in an email sent on August 14, 2012.**
- DWR has \$25,000 that it still needs to spend in support of DACs through the Planning Grants. Mark will be talking with Joe Yun of DWR to see if those funds could be used to support Inyo-Mono Program Planning Projects if we can make a viable DAC argument before Friday.
- Jen Wong from DWR comments that final funding recommendations are expected to be released in late September or early October, 2012.

### **b. Next Steps**

- Mark reminds the RWMG that the current Planning Grant has been extended and the Round 2 Planning Grant is likely to be postponed to allow the Staff to make needed progress on the DAC Grant. He adds that this may also allow the Staff the time needed to assist with the Round 2 Implementation proposal as well as make needed progress on the DAC effort.

## **4. RWMG Letters of Support (10 Min)**

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

### **DECISION ITEM: Approve Program Office Staff 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 MOU signatories and provide a comment period of*

*at least one week. During the comment period, all Members will be given the opportunity to notice their concern of the project. If after the comment period, no Members provide notice of concern to the Staff, the Program Office Staff will then be granted the authority to submit the support letter on behalf of the RWMG without a formal decision by the Group. If any concern is voiced by the membership, formal approval of the support letter will need to be agendized at the next RWMG meeting. Membership is not a prerequisite for said Letter of Support.*

- Mark provides some background on the genesis of the RWMG Generic Letter of Support. He communicates he has spoken with representatives of Inyo County who have recently voiced concern over the current proposed process. He gives the floor to Larry Freilich to expand on the County's concerns.
- Larry explains that Bob Harrington presented the proposed Process to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) at the August 14 Inyo County BOS meeting. He reports that the Board generally felt there was a lack of detail regarding both scope and purpose for the letter, and they also questioned the intent of the letter. He elaborates by saying the Board was unsure if the Letter was to be used only for fundraising (grant, loan or other financial applications) or to be used to support legislative measures or other initiatives. He adds that the BOS also felt that the one-week timeframe as outlined in the proposed process is inadequate to allow responses from all entities. Larry mentions that the Board may also have issues with additional language added at the August 15 Admin. Committee meeting (*"Membership is not a prerequisite for said Letter of Support."*).
- Larry believes the Board could be swayed into supporting a process if the RWMG would be willing to address some of the above stated concerns.
- There is a discussion of Inyo County's past request for this exact type of letter, and Members recall the time constraint that Inyo County was under at the time of the request. It is brought up that the very nature of these types of requests are often under tight time restrictions.
- Larry acknowledges the utility of the letter and the importance of having an avenue to provide support to Members. He makes some suggested options of alternative ways to accomplish this task as a short term solution, such as having The Staff circulate the generic letter for Members to sign, and that individual entities could each sign the generic letter of behalf of their Organization and submit several letters from independent organizations, stating that the sheer volume could be an asset to Organizations seeking funding.
- There is discussion regarding the relative weight of a letter from the RWMG vs. several letters from members, citing that a letter endorsed by the RWMG carries increased clout.
- It is requested that Inyo County provide revisions to the proposed process that are acceptable to the BOS and submit their suggested revisions back to the RWMG.
- Mark reminds the Group that the generic letter has been approved but it is the process that is in question and up for decision today. He suggests requesting further guidance from the Inyo Co. Board to create a process the Board is comfortable with.
- Larry concedes that if the Board has the approved Letter that they should be able to work on wording to create a process they are more comfortable with. He asks for some ideas from the Group about how they see these letters being used.
- There is a conversation about the intent of use of the letter, and it is broadly thought that the letter would be used solely for fundraising purposes and support of Organizations in their pursuit of funding and project related needs. Further it is discussed that the current letter is so generic that it in essence encapsulates the scope and that the letter is not designed to support legislation.
- **Inyo County will provide revised wording for the process of endorsing the RWMG Generic Letter of Support that will be acceptable to the Inyo County Board of Supervisors by September 12 to the Program Office. This is to ensure the item will be included in the Draft Agenda in due time to be decided upon at the September 26 RWMG meeting.**
- There is a conversation about creating an acceptable timeline to assign to the process, and an argument made in support of including non-Members as candidates to receive the Letter of Support. It was generally agreed that a two-week comment period for proposed letters is

acceptable. Furthermore, some argued that small non-Member agencies who may not even have the ability to participate in the RWMG would greatly benefit by RWMG support.

## 5. Round 1 Planning Grant (35 Min)

### a. Plan Review Process Update

- Holly A. announces that all draft Chapters for the Phase II Plan are now up on the website. The Program Staff is dedicated to keeping on track with the revised Plan Review Process timeline. She reports that chapters that have been closed for review are going to be revised, formatted and put forth as a complete draft Plan for the September 26 RWMG meeting.
- Holly reminds the Group of the intention of the review period, and that the issues Members have with the Plan need to be brought up during the comment process, not during the approval process.
- Rick encourages all Members to start reviewing Plan chapters immediately and to give notice to the authors if there is language they cannot live with, emphasizing strongly that the time to make comments is now.
- The Staff reports that of the final chapters posted, most are much briefer than the lengthy chapters completed this Spring & Summer, thus reviewing may go a bit more quickly.
- The Staff provides some explanation of the three types of Chapters they will find on the Plan Review Webpage; 1) Open for review and comment are in Black, 2) Closed for review and comment, in editing phase, Yellow, 3) Editing phase completed, completed chapter in PDF for viewing only in Green.

### b. Plan Approval Schedule

- The Staff makes clear the intent is to approve the Revised Plan at the November 14, 2012, RWMG Meeting.

### c. Member of the Month/Website Updates

- Janet Hatfield informs the Group of a few new features on the website. She updates the Group that Sara has been working to bring up-to-date the online timeline (accessible from the Inyo-Mono homepage) and emphasizes that the tool is created and maintained to assist both Members and Project Proponents with the strict timeline the Group has imposed upon them. By adhering to the timeline, we can ensure that we are able to accomplish all the deliverables as requested by the RWMG, including project presentations, project ranking, and proposal development and finalization. Observance of the timeline will also ensure maximum success in the development of a strong Implementation Proposal.
- Another addition to the website is the new Member of the Month button on the homepage. As discussed at the April RWMG meeting, each month a Member will be selected and featured on this page in hopes of getting to know one another better both professionally and personally. The goal is to promote integration and communication among Members and their respective activities.
- Sara reports she is working on updating the RWMG facebook page and will aim to maintain a fun yet informative Inyo-Mono facebook presence. If you're a facebook member please like us, you won't be disappointed.
- Janet reports that it's that time of year again when match forms are due, informing the Group that the May/June Match EZ form is now available for download at <http://inyomonowater.org/documents/downloadable-forms/>. Match forms will be due to Janet by Friday, September 14, 2012. THANK YOU!

### d. 501(c)(3) update

- Janet provides a brief background and then reads the 501(c)(3) discussion from last week's Admin. Committee meeting (*In italics*).

- “The 501(c)(3) Working Committee (herein referred to as the Committee) summarized the current Non-Profit discussions within the RWMG to date.

The Committee reminds those in attendance that the intent of establishment of the Non-Profit is to supplement the current RWMG management structure. Benefits could include but are not limited to; increased funding opportunities, enhanced legal clout, project sponsorship abilities, as well as some RWMG financial security should the Group lose CalTrout’s support.

The Committee communicates that this type of back-up governance support is currently being used by other IRWMP regions. **The CABY example is discussed but not necessarily endorsed as a working model**, with emphasis on how their multiple organizational structures work together.

The Working Committee explains the time needed for the paperwork to be processed through the state of CA is substantial, and that the initial idea would be to create the organization with fairly generic bylaws and a small board of directors that would be sufficient for establishment purposes only. Details and specific requirements can be improved upon at a later dates as the need for the Non-Profit presents itself.

- Some Admin. Committee Members question the need of another organization, and there are multiple questions about how exactly the relationship between the RWMG Group and the Non-Profit would be defined. The critical piece missing seemed to be the mechanics of how the two organizations could work together to benefit one another instead of simply adding complexity to an already slow decision making process.

- *Two major models discussed were:*

- i. *To establish the Non-Profit autonomous of the RWMG. As an option the Non-Profit could become a voting Member of the RWMG which would allow project sponsorship as well as the other mentioned utilities that benefit the RWMG. It is suggested that at least four of initially proposed Directors would be associated with the RWMG.*
- ii. *The CABY model where two organizations co-exist, allowing the current MOU to govern both entities, and allowing the RWMG to designate Board of Directors requirements etc...This includes whether or not the Board members serve as individuals or as representatives of their Organization and if they need to be Members of the RWMG.*

- Questions remained if/how public agencies can be involved.
- The Committee communicates that its proposal for the initiation of this non-profit is vague by design, in hopes for allowing maximum flexibility as the Non-Profit organization is developed and need is determined.
- The Committee suggests going through with the formation of the Non-Profit and then letting the organization sit idle until there is a proven need. They communicate that because the paperwork may take up to one year, it would be wise to form the Non-Profit so that opportunities are not missed and potential problems averted in the future.
- Rick reminds the Group that at the January 25, 2012, meeting, the RWMG quasi-decided that the Non-Profit was generally thought a good direction to be heading. He shows concern that the Admin.Committee now seems to be revisiting this decision. He continues that the Working Committee was not organized to condone the Non-Profit but instead to research and implement the mechanics of such an organization.
- He adds that in addition to the 6-12 month processing time, he’s recently learned that three years of financial papers may also be required in order for DWR to acknowledge the



Organization as a viable fiscal agent. He argues there is likely a four year timeline before the Organization is functional at all.

- **Program Office Staff will circulate the 501(c)(3) Working Committee Non-Profit Development Proposal to the RWMG Members in an email with the notes.**
- Mark clarifies that Project Proponents are required to have three years of financials but that the Fiscal Agent may not necessarily need to have it in place, and asks Jen Wong for clarification on those details from DWR.
- Regardless of how DWR responds, Rick speaks from experience that the Non-Profit groups he has worked have opted to not apply for funding until financially established with a fiscal track record, in order to improve their odds of receiving funding. He feels there are no downfalls to submitting the paperwork now.
- **Those with comments or concerns regarding the establishment of a non-profit, please submit them to Janet Hatfield ([janet@inyomonowater.org](mailto:janet@inyomonowater.org)) by Friday, September 7, so that your comments can be collated and forwarded to the 501(c)(3) Working Committee with sufficient time to get the item agendaized for the September 26 RWMG meeting.**

## 6. Round 2 Implementation (45 Min)

### a. Projects for Inclusion in Round 2 Implementation

- Mark asks the Group how they feel about leaving the project acceptance process open until September 30 or if we should only include those projects which were submitted prior to the deadline imposed for inclusion in the Phase II Plan.
- Holly justifies that an amendment to the Plan would be needed at this point if additional projects are going to be accepted, and that the time needed to complete an amendment is going to be highly dependent on the number of additional projects added from now until September 30, 2012.
- There is a question proposed to see if anyone attending might have projects that could be submitted for Round 2 Implementation that have not already been uploaded.
- Wesley Hawks from Crystal Crag speaks that he has a small project that they desire but that the bid is around \$2,000.
- Group members speak from experience and advise Wes that the DWR grant administration process may be prohibitive to such a small project and likely the Group could assist in finding other ways to fund such a small project. He is encouraged to submit his project to be included in the Plan so even the small needs of the region are reflected.
- It is asked how the DAC outreach has been used to add projects to the list.
- The Staff respond that those needs gathered from DAC outreach have been generalized and included in the Plan, but that specific project submission is left up to the entity or their sponsoring agency.
- A few other Members suggest potential projects and a conversation revolves around the reality of when Round 2 Implementation funds would actually arrive and some of the complexities around the status of projects that have funding from other sources in addition to seeking it from DWR, and the critical timing around those projects.
- Project submittal requirements are discussed. It has not been formally addressed, but the feeling is that anyone can submit a project, but in order for that project to move forward for funding, the submitting entity or their sponsor would need to sign the MOU and that it would be best that it was done prior to the Project ranking process so that Members are not investing time ranking projects that are not going to have the option to receive funding because the submitting agency is not a Member or lacks a sponsor who is a Member.
- **Rick moves to Restrict Round 2 Implementation projects to the 36 that have already been submitted to the Phase II IRWM Plan and acknowledges all projects are valid but**



may be more appropriate for Round 3 Implementation. Holly Gallagher seconds the motion.

- Several Members thumbs down the vote.
- Mark moves to **Keep Round 2 Implementation project solicitation open until September 30, 2012** clearly stating that all project not submitted by Midnight on September 30, will not be included in Round 2 Implementation. Holly Gallagher seconds the motion. All approved.

**DECISION ITEM:** Restrict Round 2 Implementation projects to the 36 that have already been submitted to the Phase II IRWM Plan, OR, Keep Round 2 Implementation project solicitation open until September 30, 2012 (with the caveat that any additional projects will not be included in the Phase II analysis but will be included in the Phase II Plan as an addendum).

#### b. Fiscal Agent Solicitation

- Mark reminds the Group of the need to solicit a Round 2 Implementation Fiscal Agent in a timely manner and references the proposed timeline necessary for Round 2 Implementation.
- Several Members request, for a variety of reasons that Program Staff recruit internally among the RWMG before issuing a formal RFP as they feel that the experience of the Group may yield a viable candidate and save the The Staff valuable time.
- A question is brought to the floor of CalTrout's interest in serving as Fiscal Agent for the Round 2 Implementation Grant. Mark reports he is unsure of CalTrout's willingness to serve as the Fiscal Agent. He informs the Group that he has not had conversations with upper level management, but that it would likely trigger the hiring of additional staff members to administer the Grant as the current staff is at capacity.
- **The Program Staff will circulate an email soliciting interest from Organizations to be Fiscal Agent (to include the RWMG approved Fiscal Agent Scope of Services), and allow until September 1 to express their interest. Those entities who may be interested please send your reply to Mark Drew.**
- There is a lengthy conversation about expanding the fiscal agent Scope of Services to include various other qualifications that the Group has found lacking in past Fiscal Agents. Several Members agree that the Fiscal Agent Scope of Services has already been decided upon by the Group and that it's not appropriate to change that document. An alternative approach is suggested and would include adding a list of other desired qualifications along with the approved Scope of Services to send out in the RFP.
- Bruce Woodworth expresses concern on how the Staff would select suggestions from Members to be added to the additional desired qualifications list.
- A technicality is brought up between an RFP and an RFQ. It is discussed that the desired output of either document is to get a list of qualified applicants. Technically speaking an RFP proposal includes a bid for services while a RFQ is intended to get a feel for the applicants' qualifications.
- It is considered acceptable to change the RFP to an RFQ, with the understanding that the intent is to gather a pool of qualified applicants from which the RWMG can make a selection.
- 
- **Members who would like to see additional qualifications to the RFQ for the Fiscal Agent, please send any comments or suggestions via email to the Program Office Staff by August 29 for inclusion in the Fiscal Agent RFQ.**
- Holly reads from the approved Fiscal Agent S.O.S. and describes the clause that already contains language allowing for other services to be added as appropriate.
- Multiple Members agree that anyone interested in performing as Fiscal Agent can and should be encouraged to read DWR's PSP.  
[http://www.dwr.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio\\_implementation.cfm](http://www.dwr.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_implementation.cfm)

#### c. Implementation Proposal Writer

- Mark gives the justification to the delay of the next Planning Grant as a way to free up Staff time to enable us to work on the Implementation Proposal as well as the DAC grant. He communicates that we have learned a better way to prepare proposals and it will be a much improved process.
- He communicates that we may have the option to bring in a Grantwriter to assist with the writing but is unsure of how the associated finances would work, as it is not allowable to pay someone to prepare a proposal with other DWR grant funding.
- Bruce supports the Fiscal Agent working on proposal development and supports his view by stating the amount of rewriting that took place on the Round 1 Implementation proposal.
- There is a question of how the Staff envisions the proposal development for this round.
- Mark replies it will be much more of a team effort to develop proposals, including sitting down individually with Project Proponents to get a better idea of the larger scope of their projects and then beginning to develop the components of the proposal together as a team.

#### d. Project Ranking

- Mark informs the Group that comments are due to DWR on the Round 2 Implementation Draft PSP, as well as the Draft 2012 Plan Guidelines, by Friday, August 24, 5:00 pm.
- He informs the Group that in response to the Draft PSP, the RFP Working Committee is scheduled to meet several more times to finalize the RFP document and process so that it may be included as a decision item at the September 26 RWMG meeting.
- **The proposed RFP and ranking process document is due to Program Staff on the morning of September 12, so it can be circulated to the Members to bring to their respective Boards for approval.**

#### e. Future Schedule

- Draft Round 2 Implementation proposal is likely due the end of February, 2013, and finalized shortly thereafter in anticipation of an early March due date.

### 7. DAC Grant (10 Min) Next Steps

#### a. Recent activities

- Heather Crall reports she has been attending community meetings this summer season trying to gain interest and support for the IRWMP efforts. Members of the Program Staff will be attending the Southern Sierra IRWMP meeting on September 13. Heather has been working with the Sierra Nevada Alliance to organize DAC specific meetings with CABY, Upper Pit, and Yosemite-Mariposa.
- Holly reports that soon she and Janet will be working with DACs on climate change and data management to assess needs, help build capacity, and get DACs the resources they need.
- The Program Staff reports it is currently working on the Grant Agreement for the additional \$129,000 of DAC funding with DWR.

### 8. Round 1 Implementation Grant Update (10 Min)

#### a. Progress Report from Central Sierra and Project Proponents

- Round Valley School is planning to begin drilling its well in September.
- Coleville School Contract is executed.
- CalTrout contract is executed
- MCWD still has comments to return to Central Sierra.
- Central Sierra is working with the Hilltop Project as well as Inyo County on final details of their contracts.

#### b. Next Steps

- Program Staff reminds Project Proponents to please let them know when you are planning to break ground on your project. This is largely due to the fact that DWR requires two weeks' notice of all media events.
- Admin. Committee has requested that Central Sierra begin their budget reporting as defined in the MOU at the next Admin. Committee meeting.

## 9. General Updates (10 Min)

### a. SWWG Summit

- Holly reports that the Inyo-Mono made a strong showing at the SWWG; in fact the Inyo-Mono had more representatives than any other IRWM region. She reports that Mark, Janet and she all participated as panelists in their respective areas of expertise. Holly reports that strong attendance was made possible by the offering of DAC travel stipends.
- Alan Bacock thanks the Staff for the financial support and comments that the Tribes and DACs would not have been able to attend without that support. He commends the Inyo-Mono for the work they have been doing with the Tribes and explains that many other regions are not experiencing similar success with Tribal participation and involvement. Alan also noted that engaging with tribes from the very beginning of the Inyo-Mono planning process was appreciated and valued.

### b. North Lahontan Regional Forum

- Mark reports that on **September 28, 2012, the North Lahontan Regional Forum is going to be held in South Lake Tahoe**. He reports that the North Lahontan meeting aims to improve upon the South Lahontan forum by incorporating constructive feedback received by DWR after the South Lahontan forum. There should be a call-in option for participation in that meeting. The RWMG group is notified that Conway Summit is the boundary separating the North and South sections of the Lahontan Region.
- **Program Office Staff will circulate more detailed information about the North Lahontan Regional Forum once it is received. The meeting is scheduled to take place on Friday, September 28, 2012 in South Lake Tahoe.**

### c. ESRI UC

- Janet reports she was privileged to be able to attend the ESRI UC this year along with between 15,000- 20,000 international participants. She reports the venue is used to introduce brand new technologies, learn of future software development plans and gain technical as well as applied knowledge of GIS. She reports she has returned with numerous ideas and under the next planning grant will be working to apply that knowledge toward beneficial improvements to the IRWM Program.
- Additionally Janet informs the RWMG that the Online Round 1 Implementation Project Map as of mid-July had seen approximately 1,000 visits. Prior to today's meeting, the map had almost 5,000 visits. She interprets this to mean we are reaching a much broader audience and that the presentation given at the SWWG Summit has lead other IRWM regions to look to the Inyo-Mono for direction and inspiration. <http://inyomonowater.org/interactive-project-map/>

## 10. Announcements

- The Sierra Nevada Alliance 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference is scheduled for September 21-23 (Friday-Sunday) Scholarships are available, check out on the website for more details. [www.sierranevadaalliance.org](http://www.sierranevadaalliance.org)
- The MCWD Board approved a Level 1 water restriction for Mammoth Lakes, which includes a number of corrective measures to conserve water. <http://www.mcwd.dst.ca.us/pressrelease/Level%20Restrictions%20Sheet.pdf>
- MCWD Lawn Efficient Care Workshop takes place tomorrow, September 23 from 11AM-1PM at Cerro Coso Community College in Mammoth.

- Holly G. reports she has received a phone call back from the USFS in regards to the Birchim Community Services District tank replacement project, but that no other progress has been made. She requests the Program Office Staff call again on their behalf.

#### 11. Process Check

- No process related comments were received.

#### 12. Review April 25, 2012, RWMG meeting summary

**DECISION ITEM(s): Approve April 25, 2012 RWMG Meeting Summary  
Approve July 11, 2012 RWMG Meeting Summary**

- Rick moves to approve both months of meeting notes. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.

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

- Janet reviews action & decision items from the meeting.

#### 14. Next Meeting Dates

- Wednesday, September 26, 2012: RWMG Meeting and mandatory Project Proponent Workshop
- Wednesday, October 17, 2012: Project Presentations
- Wednesday, September 10: Admin. Committee meeting
- November 14: RWMG Meeting

#### 15. Guest Speaker (60 Min)

- a. Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD General Manager  
June Lake PUD Operations overview
  - Rich presented an overview of the June Lakes PUD structure and operations. This was followed by a brief field trip to one of the June Lakes PUD treatment facility.