

Inyo-Mono **FINAL Meeting Summary**  
Regional Water Management Group Regular Meeting

**Wednesday, October 22, 2014**  
**9:30 am – 12:30 pm**  
Bishop Paiute Tribal Chambers  
50 Tu Su Ln, Bishop, CA

**Call-in option:**  
**866-210-1669**  
**passcode: 6194641#**

Please RSVP for the Inyo-Mono RWMG meeting by emailing Holly Alpert ([holly@inyo-monowater.org](mailto:holly@inyo-monowater.org)) by **Friday, October 17, 2014, 5:00 pm**.

For this meeting only, **all RWMG Members attending the meeting must post this meeting agenda at your call-in location by 9:00 am on Sunday, October 19, 2014. You must also email the address of your call-in location to Holly ([holly@inyo-monowater.org](mailto:holly@inyo-monowater.org)) by 9:00 am on Sunday, October 19, 2014.**

**Call-in locations:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Inyo County Water Department<br>135 South Jackson St.<br>Independence, CA | 2. Bruce Woodworth residence<br>824 Burcham Flat Rd<br>Coeville, CA |
|--|---|

If you require special accommodations to participate in this meeting in person or by phone, please contact Holly Alpert ([holly@inyo-monowater.org](mailto:holly@inyo-monowater.org)) no less than 72 hours prior to the meeting.

**RWMG Meeting Process**

The public will be offered the opportunity to comment on each agenda item prior to any action on the item by the membership. The public will also be offered the opportunity to address the membership on any matter pertaining to IRWMP business. Agenda items indicated as "Action" require that members undertake activities subsequent to the meeting. Agenda items indicated as "Decision" are items where the membership will make a decision on the item at the meeting. This agenda can also be viewed in the Calendar section of [www.inyo-monowater.org](http://www.inyo-monowater.org).

All decisions of the RWMG are made by consensus as defined in Article I of the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group Planning and Implementation Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). After a motion is made by a Member, there is opportunity for discussion, and then RWMG Members are asked to vote. Members may approve a decision (thumbs up), vote that they can live with a decision while not completely approving of it (thumbs sideways), or disapprove of a decision which withholds consensus (thumbs down). A Member may also abstain from voting, which will be interpreted as no opposition to the action. If there are no Members voting thumbs down, the decision is passed by consensus. The decision is then recorded in the meeting notes.

## AGENDA – October 22, 2014

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)
  - Chair Alan Bacock opened the meeting
  - Attending – in person
    - Bruce Woodworth, Mono County RCD
    - Linda Monreal, Birchim CSD
    - Brent Calloway, Mono County
    - Lauma Jurkevics, DWR
    - Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group
    - Oliver Hardwick, Inyo/Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office
    - BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Big Pine CSD
    - Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
    - Bob Harrington, Inyo County
    - Mark Drew, CalTrout/Inyo-Mono IRWMP
    - Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
    - Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
    - Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest
    - Rick Kattelman, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
    - Rich Ciauri, June Lake PUD
    - Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe, Owens Valley Committee
    - Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District
    - Earl Wilson, Independence
    - Dave Grah, City of Bishop
    - Peter Pumphrey, Eastern Sierra Audubon
    - Linda Akyuz, Bishop Paiute Tribe
    - Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony
    - Raymond Charley, Bishop Paiute Tribe Public Works
    - Jesse O'Neill, Mojave Desert Mountain RC&D
    - Mike Powell, Rand Water & Eastern Kern County RCD
    - Rick Pucci, Inyo County Supervisor
  - Attending – on the phone
    - Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
    - Gavin Feiger, Sierra Nevada Alliance
    - Jeremiah Joseph, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation (no call-in)
2. Public Comment (5 minutes)
  - No public comment
3. Quick Decision Items (5 minutes)
  - a. **DECISION ITEM: Approve July 23, 2014, Meeting Summary**
    - Irene comment on page 5: 11<sup>th</sup> bullet needs to be completed on agenda item 4 regarding Mark reaching out to certain entities with respect to approval of the EPA proposal letter of support
    - **Dan Jenkins motions to approve notes subject to the change. Irene seconds.**
    - **All approve.**
    - **Action Item: Holly will correct the notes and re-post on the website.**
4. Program Office Report (20 min)
  - a. List of IRWM Program accomplishments
    - Holly prepared this list after July 2014 meeting with Larry Freilich's help
    - Can be used as outreach tool to new stakeholders, boards

- Irene: links to documents cited in the accomplishments
  - **Action item: Any more suggestions, email Holly**
  - **Action item: Holly will revise and post on the website**
  - Lauma suggested presenting the list of accomplishments to the CA Legislature as a tangible benefit of IRWM
- b. Report on future of IRWM funding around the state
- This question came up at the July 2014 RWMG meeting, particularly about post-Prop. 84 funding
  - Posed to DWR staff
  - Referred to IRWM Strategic Plan and the investment strategy being developed as part of the process; lists five important strategies for future state-level funding but does not as of yet provide resources for short- & medium-term funding <http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/stratplan/documents/IRWMFuture.pdf>
  - There has been no survey done of IRWM group-based funding strategies
  - Can suggest to Roundtable of Regions
  - DWR should think about not only funding hard implementation projects but also programmatic activities, which is less appealing from the state's perspective but still important
  - Dan Jenkins: question about how new water bond will affect IRWM groups. Mark: about \$1 billion specific to IRWM; other money specific to small water system & DAC water needs; Mark thinks Lahontan funding region has about \$52 million. What is turnaround if the bond passes? 1<sup>st</sup> they need to spend out Prop. 84 before new water bond can be expended. Will be *at least* after summer 2015. Not sure what is allocated for planning vs. implementation funding. Pete Pumphrey communicated that there have been conversations in Sacramento about how to use IRWM programs to make positive change at the regional level. He suggests at every opportunity to communicate to high level folks the importance of keeping IRWM going. We should be thinking about how to make our perspectives heard at the state level with respect to funding priorities and process. Earl asked who has read supplement for Prop 1. He communicates that IRWM is mentioned in several places, often associated with DACs.
  - Mark emphasizes that there are a lot of other non-IRWM funding opportunities available and that we shouldn't limit ourselves.
  - Leroy asks what the funding outlook is after June 2015 and if CalTrout is willing to continue being the lead agency. Mark responded that we have about eight months of funding remaining and need everybody to work together to obtain future funding. CalTrout is indicating that it is time for other stakeholders to step in and help support the IRWM effort.
  - Bob mentions a pay-to-play mechanism to keep funding going.
  - Alan reminds the RWMG that DAC involvement is a critical part of the Program's success and that pay to play may not be feasible for DACs.
- c. Drought funding round recommended awards
- All \$200 million was awarded
  - None of the Lahontan funding area proposals was awarded funding (Mojave, Tahoe-Sierra, Antelope Valley)
  - Probably a good decision for Inyo-Mono not to apply
  - Lahontan area funding agreement still in effect for Round 3 (see July 2014 meeting notes), which means Inyo-Mono potentially has access to \$1.8 million
  - DWR has acknowledged Lahontan funding agreement but cannot officially "endorse" or "approve" it
  - Round 3 Implementation is likely summer 2015 (current DWR schedule states that applications would be due Fall 2015)

- d. Mark meeting with County Boards of Supervisors
  - Mark presented to Mono County Board regarding approving the updated IRWM Plan; Board unanimously supported approving the Plan
  - Mark has been working with Bob and Larry on Inyo County Board approval
  - Mark would still like to provide more general update to Inyo County; Bob suggested perhaps January
  - Program Office is happy to visit/present to other boards as well
- e. Water-Energy program grant – due December 12, 2014
  - Grant program for water conservation leading to energy conservation and GHG emissions reductions
  - We do not have funding to pursue but may be willing to work on proposal pro bono
  - There is no match requirement, does not need to go through IRWM group
  - The definition of DAC (using CalEnviroScreen) will not benefit our region/communities
  - One idea is a region-wide meter installment/replacement program
  - Need information on which systems are metered/not
  - Applicant workshops late October/early November
  - Application is generally easier than implementation grants
  - **Action item: If you have ideas, let Holly and/or Mark know**
  - Lauma communicates these funds came from the Air Resources Control Board
  - Alan communicates to implement Region-Wide meters may be too complicated to complete within a Grant Period. And that the Big Pine tribe has data on how meters have affected the Big Pine Tribal Water System. Alan suggests case study of Big Pine Tribe's experience of installing water meters and starting to use them and bill by them
  - Lauma suggests that solar panels for water pumping facilities may be viable.
  - Linda Akyuz suggests coming up with a deadline for systems that are interested in participating
  - Mark agrees with Alan of the complexities of a region-wide system and suggests that perhaps the 3 Inyo County systems that put together the meters project for Round 2 Implementation could resurrect the application.
- f. DROPS: Drought Response Outreach Program for Schools – due Jan. 15, 2015
  - Through State Water Resources Control Board
  - This opportunity seems more stormwater-capture oriented
  - Idea would be to include multiple schools throughout the region

5. Phase II IRWM Plan (10 min)

- a. Review of process to update Plan to IRWM Plan Standards & RWMG review process
  - Found out in early August that IRWM Plan needed to be updated to 2012 Plan Standards in order to continue receiving Round 1 Implementation funding reimbursements
  - Program Office shifted gears to accommodate this additional work while completing the DAC white paper
  - Revised Plan chapters were made available via an Inyo-Mono webpage for RWMG review
  - Only received one person's comments on two different chapters
  - Full formatted Plan now available on website
  - Need to meet 75% of the Plan Standards by DWR's review to "pass" the Plan Review Process
  - Brent Calloway expressed that it would be good to see Plan changes documented (such as using track changes) so that they are more easily traceable. Mono County Supervisors may have issues in the future if changes are not documented in this way. Janet suggested we could start with a clean copy next time and show all revisions.

- b. Review of major changes to Plan
    - Change summaries were produced for each chapter
    - The big changes were related to the following Plan Standards: technical analysis, climate change, data management, integration, objectives, RMS, impacts/benefits, Plan performance
    - Bob indicated that the change summaries were valuable.
  - c. **DECISION ITEM: Approve & adopt updated Phase II IRWM Plan**
    - **Bob made motion. Leroy seconded. Approved & adopted!**
  - d. Next steps
    - Full Plan will be submitted to DWR ASAP for review, which will take about a month, and then it will go out for public comment for 30 days
    - Expect to have approved Plan by the end of the year
    - We do not think this hinders Implementation reimbursements in any way, from what we know about current Implementation invoices
    - There will be an opportunity for further updating and revising over the next eight months through the Planning Grant
    - **Action item: If people have ideas about future updates and revisions, please let Program Office know**
    - **Action item: Program Office to formally submit adopted Plan to DWR this week**
6. Governance & Organizational Structure (40 min)
- a. Review of county counsel concern with change in quorum requirement
    - At July meeting, the Group chose to modify the MOU quorum requirement to 35% to make it easier to achieve quorum for meetings
    - Inyo County counsel showed concern with a less-than 50% quorum requirement being contrary to the Brown Act
    - Mono County concurred with concern
    - Bob clarified that the Brown Act language does not define quorum but instead suggests a “majority” of members need to be present to conduct business.
    - Admin. Committee agreed that we should continue abiding by the Brown Act and maintain an open, transparent process
    - Decision today is to go back to 50%, but the issue of difficulty with achieving quorum still exists, which is what Decision Items B & C aim to address
  - b. **DECISION ITEM A: Reinstate MOU quorum requirement to 50% in Section 2.07 of the Planning/Implementation MOU**
    - **Bob motions to reinstate the 50% quorum requirement, which will revert back to the Version #1 MOU. Irene seconded. All approved.**
    - **Holly will change MOU back to 50% quorum and make sure the correct version is on the website.**
  - c. Discuss MOU re-signing process
    - Leroy asks what happens to Members who have already signed the version of the MOU with the 35% quorum requirement.
    - Bruce thinks it’s irrelevant, as the MOU states the RWMG can change the MOU so it does not matter if boards have approved it.
    - Mark reminds the Group that one thought was to re-sign as a renewed commitment to the IRWM RWMG effort.
    - Alan speaks that the current MOU doesn’t define re-signing as a process, and therefore he supports Option 2.
    - Bruce mentions that “proxy” is not defined in the MOU and so it just needs to be a “representative” of the organization.
    - Alan tells the Group that a template has been created to help non-participatory Members resign participation and/or to designate an alternative representative.
    - Dan Jenkins doesn’t want to have to go to the Board again because of an “oops” on the MOU language.

- i. Update on re-signing process based on 7/23/14 meeting, and signatories
  - Reminder: at the last meeting, the Group asked all Members to “re-commit” by re-signing the MOU since it changed
  - To-date: 5-6 groups have re-signed
  - Suggestion: no re-signing but send withdrawal letter to all Signatories with information on how to designate someone to represent your organization at meetings; this becomes Action Item below
  - If it is not a direct representative of your agency and you’re going to have a representative of another agency represent your group, an email needs to be sent to the Program Office
  - Holly read Section 2.03 of the MOU about Member Representatives
  - Discussion of needing to be a signatory to submit a project to the Plan
  - Talk of more outreach to Members to discuss the importance of the Group (which has already happened by the Admin. Committee)
- ii. **DECISION ITEM B (either/or):**
- iii. **Option 1:** Continue with re-signing process while AC encourages some groups not to re-sign and/or designate a proxy
- iv. **Option 2:** Forego re-signing process but AC asks certain groups to un-sign the MOU and forego Member status and/or designate a proxy
  - **Mark moves to approve Option 2: Forego re-signing process of MOU. The Admin. Committee will ask certain groups to give consideration to withdrawing from the RWMG and forego Member status and/or designate an alternate representative. Rick seconds the motion. All approved.**
- v. **DECISION ITEM C:** Proposed MOU amendment: Insert a clause into the MOU defining “inactive Member status” as not having attended two of the last four RWMG meetings. Reinstatement of active Membership occurs at the beginning of the second meeting attended of the last four. This is true for new Members as well.
  - Pete Pumphrey asks why members may have marginal attendance. He explains what the Eastern Sierra Audubon’s role has been in the past and in the future. He communicates it is nice to have input and to be part of conversations, but that perhaps Members should revisit their responsibility as MOU signatories. He thinks clear communications to these organizations about why their lack of participation makes RWMG governance cumbersome would be a valuable conversation to have.
  - BryAnna brings up the Big Pine CSD situation and the fact that they are a likely project candidate but RWMG participation is not likely
  - Bob suggests “associate” level membership where you don’t have a vote but you can put in projects.
  - Jeremiah speaks to the burden of agency participation and speaks in favor of Option 2.
  - Pete thinks that Program Office should pitch why participation in the RWMG is valuable.
  - This is a consideration of another tier of Membership to help with the quorum requirement
  - Bruce volunteered to keep track of which Members are active and which are not
  - Irene suggests more thought before deciding and thinks we would need to describe in the MOU what an inactive Member is
  - Concern was stated about it being a confusing requirement
  - Mark suggests moving forward without this decision item and see if the quorum requirement is easier to achieve with the above efforts taking place
  - **Bruce moves to table the Decision Item C. Bob seconds the motion. All approved.**

- **Action item: Alan asked if Counties could bring the question to their counsel about having different types/tiers of Membership. Bob said he can do this.**

\*\*\*\*\* BREAK (10 min) \*\*\*\*\*

7. DAC grant wrap-up & final tasks (10 min)
  - a. Meeting with DWR & film showings in September
    - Program Office presented DAC grant findings to DWR in early September and had a very productive discussion about recommendations which helped to shape the final recommendations
    - Also showed the film twice that day, to a DWR-centered audience (with more than 100 people on a webcast version) and a State Board audience
  - b. DAC white paper
    - A significant effort went into completing the DAC report/white paper. It was completed on time (September 30, 2014) and submitted to DWR
    - Have not gotten any feedback yet from DWR
    - Paper is available on the Inyo-Mono website: <http://inyo-monowater.org/inyo-mono-irwm-plan-2/dac/findings/>
    - PO encourages everyone to look at the report, especially the recommendations
    - PO is interested in discussing about how we can continue on our DAC work and would encourage RWMG to look at the white paper and be part of the discussion
  - c. Continuing work through the fall: capacity building, film showings, DAC retreat (now called “workshop”)
    - A few last tasks of the grant will continue through the end of the year
    - We are looking into having one more showing of the film in the region
    - There will be a DAC “workshop” in Calistoga in early December to work with the other six DAC pilot projects to develop joint recommendations to DWR and tangible work items to pursue next
    - We are in the process of doing a mail blast of the documentary DVD, including Group Members, state legislators, state agency representatives
    - California Rural Water Association will do several emergency response and drought management plans for DACs to continue the capacity-building work
  
8. Administrative Committee Report (15 min)
  - a. Process for requesting and approving letters of support
    - This discussion is being re-opened after a letter was requested over the summer that did not abide by the agreed-upon process
    - The process seems too slow as it is right now. How can we streamline the process?
    - Bruce re-drafted the process: letters of support requests go to PO, goes to Chair and Vice-Chair for initial approval within three days, move forward to RWMG via email to approve or not approve within four additional days. This is not a decision item today. Think about how the process needs to be modified now that we’re moving towards quarterly meetings.
    - Mark communicates that he has not been able to contact Stacy Simon to get advice on this process.
    - Concerns were voiced that seven days are not enough time for all Members to consider and decide upon a letter.
    - It is desirable to make a letter of support easier to obtain but that we need to follow a process that all Members can live with. It will be brought up again at the January meeting.
  - b. Discuss Admin. Comm. composition for 2015
    - Solicit interest among RWMG Members

- Member terms expiring: Bruce (Mono County RCD), Leroy (IWWWD), Malcolm (Sierra Club)
  - All three expressed interest in staying on, but we wanted to open the solicitation to the entire Group first
  - Bruce really encourages groups that have not yet served on the AC to consider serving a term
  - **Action Item: If you are interested in serving on the Admin. Committee (2-year commitment), please email the Program Office**
- c. Update on Eastern California Water Association 501(c)(3)
- ECWA will meet after this RWMG meeting; public is welcome
  - The board is comprised of five members of the current Admin. Committee (Bruce Woodworth, Leroy Corlett, Justin Nalder, Alan Bacock, and Malcolm Clark) + Mark
9. Round 1 Implementation Grant (10 min)
- a. Grant administration update
- Before this morning, we had not gotten an update from Central Sierra RC&D since the summer (did not receive a reply prior to the Admin. Committee meeting)
  - Third-quarter invoice & reporting material is due this week
  - Received an update from Valerie this morning
  - January – March 2014 invoice has not been signed off as final by DWR, so the later invoices have not yet been processed
  - Valerie is going to extend the overall grant schedule with DWR to accommodate the Inyo County projects
  - Dan Jenkins asks if Holly had talked to Valerie about the close out reports and the status thereof and if the retention needs to be invoiced separately. Holly has not heard anything about close-out reports but agrees with Mark that retention automatically is triggered with the final report.
  - We do not expect that the Plan review process will hold up any actual reimbursements
- b. Project updates
- MCWD well profiling was completed in September; they are now waiting on the report
  - Do not have an update on Inyo County project implementation
10. Guest talk: New groundwater legislation (Bob Harrington) (15 min)
- **Action Item: put presentation on website**
11. Guest talk: Lauma Jurkevics, DWR Climate Change Staff (20 min)
- **Action Item: put presentation on website**
12. Announcements, process check, meeting dates (5 minutes)
- Todd – Forest Planning:
  - BryAnna – Bishop Paiute Tribe is involved in...
  - November 6: DWR sponsoring one-day workshop on capacity building
  - Bob brought an additional summary of the new Groundwater Legislation; he will send it to the Program Office to make available online.
  - Jeremiah thanks the speakers for their presentations today.
13. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting (5 min)
- Janet reviewed
14. Next RWMG meeting (proposed)
- **Annual Meeting: Wednesday, January 28, 2015**



**15. Adjourn**

- Alan adjourned at 1:32 pm

