



Meeting Notes

Regional Water Management Group Regular Meeting

Wednesday, January 27, 2016

9:30 am – 12:30 pm

960 Poleta Road

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) by **Friday, January 22, 2016, 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, January 24, 2016. You must also email the address of your call-in location to Holly (holly@inyo-monowater.org) by 9:00 am on Sunday, January 24, 2016.**

Call-in locations:

1. Inyo County Water Department
135 South Jackson St.
Independence, CA

2. Amargosa Conservancy
Highway 127
Shoshone, CA

3. Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone
Environmental Office
1101 E-Sha Lane
Lone Pine, CA

4. Malcolm Clark Residence
637 John Muir Road
Mammoth Lakes, CA

If you require special accommodations to participate in this meeting in person or by phone, please contact Holly Alpert (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.

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 – January 27, 2016

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)

Joint meeting with Eastern California Water Association board of directors

RSVPs (18 signatories [*in italics*] needed)

Yes -In person

Mark Drew, California Trout, IRWM Program Office

Holly Alpert, IRWM Program Office

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

Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust, IRWM Program Office

Deston Dishion, City of Bishop

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District

Brent Calloway, Mono County

Pete Pumphrey, Eastern Sierra Audubon

Linda Monreal, Birchim CSD

Bruce Woodworth, WRAMP Foundation, Mono County RCD

Donna Thomas, Desert Mountain RC&D

Kari Hunter, Desert Mountain RC&D

Sam Merck, Eastern Kern County RCD

Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department

Melanie Richards, Desert Mountain RC&D

Lisa Cutting, Mono Lake Committee

Ken Lloyd, Eastern Sierra CSD

Walt Pachucki, Eastern Sierra CSD

Jennifer Krafcheck, Eastern Sierra CSD

Linda Wimberly, Bridgeport Indian Colony

Sue, Bridgeport Indian Colony

Todd Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest

Chester the dog

Yes – via phone

Patrick Donnelly, Amargosa Conservancy

Mel Joseph and Jeremiah Joseph, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe

Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club

Cindy Wise, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony

2. Public Comment/Announcements (5 minutes)

- No comments

3. Quick Decision Items (5 minutes)

- a. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve October 28, 2015, Meeting Summary
 - Rick motions to approve the notes. Bruce seconds. All approved.

4. Administrative Committee composition for 2016 (10 minutes)

- a. Nominations for three new Administrative Committee members
 - Alan Bacock (Big Pine Paiute Tribe), Justin Nalder (Bridgeport Indian Colony), Irene Yamashita (Mammoth Community Water District) two-year terms are expired. Three terms are available. City of Bishop has expressed interest in serving a term. Bridgeport Indian Colony is also interested in serving another term (Linda Wimberly). Lisa Cutting (Mono Lake Committee) expresses interest.
- b. **DECISION ITEM:** Elect new Administrative Committee members
 - Bob motions for Bridgeport Indian Colony, Mono Lake Committee, and City of

Bishop to serve two-year terms on the Admin. Committee. Rick seconds. No discussion. All approved.

- Next: Admin. Committee will choose Chair and Vice-Chair
- Acknowledgement to Irene, Justin, and Alan who have served for the past two years.

5. 2015 Program Finance Review (15 minutes)

a. Round 2 Planning Grant

b. Round 1 Implementation Grant

- Holly reviewed the numbers for the Round 2 Planning Grant and the Program Office portion of the Round 1 Implementation Grant. She also explained where we are with each task in detail. The tables are below that report the numbers.
- Mark reminded us that these are restricted grants, meaning the work we can do with them is restricted to specific tasks
- That's why we also need unrestricted funds

Proposition 84 Planning Grant 2				
Task	Budget	Expenses through 12/31/15	Difference	*Grant Term ends 5/31/16
Task 1: Maintain and build upon Inyo-Mono IRWM Program operations	\$ 123,546.75	\$ 107,047.83	\$ 16,498.92	
Task 2: Planning studies	\$ 154,285.00	\$ 152,330.53	\$ 1,954.47	
Task 3: Enhance integration of climate change information into the Inyo-Mono IRWM planning process	\$ 19,507.00	\$ 12,907.50	\$ 6,599.50	
Task 4: Data and information management	\$ 19,182.50	\$ 13,528.00	\$ 5,654.50	
Task 5: Sustainable finance plan	\$ 42,260.75	\$ 15,352.35	\$ 26,908.40	
Task 6: Integration and Updating the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan to Meet Plan Standards	\$ 31,772.00	\$ 24,377.30	\$ 7,394.70	
Task 7: Preparing for long-term regional and local groundwater management planning	\$ 7,595.00	\$ 2,380.00	\$ 5,215.00	
Other	\$ 30,663.50	\$ 24,423.33	\$ 6,240.17	
12% CallTrout O&A	\$ 51,457.50	\$ 40,882.50	\$ 10,575.00	*this estimate does not
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 480,270.00	\$ 393,229.34	\$ 87,040.66	
Match (Grantee cost share)	\$ 164,516.00	\$ 135,761.92	\$ 28,754.08	

Prop. 84 Round 1 Implementation Grant			
Task	Budgeted Amount	Expenses through 12/31/15	Difference
Task 1: Serve as liaison between Implementation project proponents and RWMG/Task 4: Regular communications between Program Office and grantee/fiscal agent	\$ 17,658.50	\$ 13,544.50	\$ 4,114.00
Task 2: Provide public relations on behalf of project proponents and the Inyo-Mono RWMG	\$ 5,360.00	\$ 4,900.00	\$ 460.00
Task 3: Per requirements of the Phase I Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan, evaluate project progress and outcomes	\$ 2,912.50	\$ 2,350.50	\$ 562.00
Supplies	\$ 944.00	\$ -	\$ 944.00
Administration (8%)	\$ 2,150.00	\$ 1,562.25	\$ 587.75
			\$ -
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 29,025.00	\$ 22,357.25	\$ 6,667.75

6. Round 2 Planning Grant Update (30 minutes)

- a. Administration/amendment
 - Grant has been extended through May 31, 2016, and no further
 - Had some extra money from Oak Creek planning study that could go to Program Office
 - Amendment has been approved and almost executed
- b. Oak Creek planning study presentation
 - Todd Ellsworth gave a presentation about the Oak Creek study
 - **Action Item: Holly will post the presentation to the website**
 - The Oak Creek report is complete and will also **be posted to the website**
- c. Finance plan
 - Mark admits he's delinquent – will try to get it done in a few weeks
 - Invites others to get involved
 - How much do we need in funding, what are opportunities, what is long-term plan
 - We have some money in there for a finance plan consultant
- d. Outreach
 - Holly has held 18 formal 1-on-1 meetings so far, with a few more informal conversations and phone calls
 - Another 14 planned in the next 8 days
 - A few more to wrap up in March
 - Holly provided some thoughts about the benefits of the meetings and about what she has learned; she will provide a more thorough report at the next RWMG meeting, once all of the outreach is completed
 - Holly thanks those who have already met with her and those who have agreed to meet with her in the upcoming week
 - Last week, Rick met with the Tri-Valley and was reminded that there are individuals who are philosophically opposed to what the IRWMP does
- e. Groundwater information assessment/SGMA
 - Rick reminded the Group why we are looking at SGMA and the IRWMP's role
 - Rick is going to look at other examples of how IRWMPs are involved in the

7. Round 1 Implementation Grant (10 minutes)

- a. Grant administration update
 - Holly did not receive an update from Valerie prior to the meeting
 - Holly provided an update based on what she knows as of the end of 2015
 - It is unknown where invoicing stands and what invoice is in with DWR
- b. Project updates
 - SCADA is the only project still in progress; the last Holly heard from Keith, he is likely to need an extension through June 2016, which would also presumably extend the grant administration and Program Office tasks
 - All other projects are either complete or in final reporting stage
 - **Action items: Per the outcome of the Admin. Committee meeting, Bob is going to look into Keith's availability for working on the SCADA project, and Program Office will convene a call with Valerie to determine current status and see how we can help move things forward**

***** 10 MINUTE BREAK *****

8. 2015 Prop. 84 Implementation Grant (15 minutes)

- a. Award announcement
 - Final award announcement was made about two weeks ago
 - Our award is \$1.816 million to fund six projects
 - DWR will move forward with Desert Mtn RC&D, the grantee, to secure a grant agreement in the coming months
 - Date of reimbursement is final award date: January 13, 2016
 - DWR is sending a package of instructions to RC&D on how to work with project proponents
- b. Introduction of Desert Mtn. RC&D personnel
 - Kari Hunter, Donna Thomas, and Melanie Richards from RC&D attended
- c. Next steps

9. Proposition 1 (25 minutes)

- a. Funding overview
 - Statewide total of \$510 million for IRWM, divided into funding areas
 - Lahontan funding area allocation is \$24.5 million
 - Four pools of money: 10% for DAC involvement, 10% for DAC project implementation, planning (statewide pool), implementation
 - Planning grant and DAC involvement funding draft PSPs and RFPs, Guidelines have been released
 - DAC round is non-competitive
 - For DAC involvement money, DWR wants to execute a contract with one representative of a funding area, and that IRWM region would coordinate and contract with the other IRWM regions to disburse funds
 - Is Inyo-Mono region interested in being the lead? If so, who would be the lead agency?
- b. Lahontan funding area coordination
 - Mark looks for support for entering into a similar agreement as with Prop. 84
 - Numbers have changed somewhat from table below based on re-calculations including Fremont Valley and various formulas including land area
 - Mark suggests at a minimum pursuing the same formula but pushing at including an element of land area
 - **DECISION ITEM: Continue with Lahontan funding area allocation using same formula as that used with Proposition 84 (see table below)**
 - **Bruce motions to allow the Program office to start with the status quo (Proposition 84 allocation) and use that as the minimum for negotiations. Irene**

seconds. All approved.

- c. Guidelines, DAC involvement PSP, and planning PSP
- d. DAC involvement and engagement proposal ideas and plans
 - Potential grantee for IRWM region and Lahontan funding region
 - **DECISION ITEM?**
 - ◇ Discussion about Inyo-Mono serving as lead entity for the funding region
 - ◇ What would be the resources necessary for Inyo-Mono to do it?
 - ◇ Bruce motions to explore. Rick seconds.
 - ◇ Bruce inquires about the current Program Office's desire to lead up either a funding area-wide or a region-wide DAC project. Mark expresses concerns about the resources necessary to take on such a project. Holly expresses willingness to lead a project but voices a desire to take on more staff to help with program and project administration.
 - ◇ **Action item: RWMG directed Holly to put together proposal for Inyo-Mono to lead DAC proposal, including pros and cons for IRWMP (e.g., administration vs. actual work) to present to RWMG**
 - ◇ **Action item: Mark and Holly will take this discussion to Lahontan partners and express interest to lead regional proposal**
 - ◇ In terms of an agency to back such a proposal, Bruce suggests the Program Office solicit interest and come back to the Group with some proposal
 - ◇ **Action Item: Program Office will look into possible agencies to be grantee for funding area-wide or region-wide proposal**
 - ◇ **Action item: Program Office welcomes ideas about the types of activities and work to be done with the funding; review the RFP and contact Program Office**
- e. DAC implementation
 - DWR trying to figure out whether DAC implementation round will be part of the regular implementation money or whether it will be a separate round. Either way, it is not likely to be available until 2017.

	Mojave	Mono Inyo	Antelope Valley	Tahoe Sierra	Lahontan Basins	Fremont Valley
Prop 1 Planning Grant	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$750,000
Scenarios						
Equal Split	\$3,770,000	\$3,770,000	\$3,770,000	\$3,770,000	\$3,770,000	\$0
Population Split	\$8,300,708	\$1,290,595	\$7,387,061	\$1,234,113	\$637,522	\$0
Area Split	\$2,967,944	\$10,089,603	\$1,828,931	\$955,693	\$3,007,830	\$0
2-Way Pop/Equal Split (used for Prop 84)	\$6,035,354	\$2,530,298	\$5,578,531	\$2,502,056	\$2,203,761	\$0
2-Way Pop/Area Split	\$5,634,326	\$5,690,099	\$4,607,996	\$1,094,903	\$1,822,676	\$0
2-Way Area/Equal Split	\$3,368,972	\$6,929,802	\$2,799,466	\$2,362,846	\$3,388,915	\$0
3-Way Pop/Area/Equal Split	\$5,012,884	\$5,050,066	\$4,328,664	\$1,986,602	\$2,471,784	\$0

10. Post-Planning Grant funding (25 minutes)

- a. Year-end fundraising campaign
 - A fundraising letter was sent to RWMG Members and other stakeholders at the end of 2015
 - Targeted \$20,000; minimum \$250; purpose is to raise unrestricted funding
 - Raised \$1,000 from three stakeholders so far
 - *Thank you to the groups that have contributed!!!!*

- MCWD: Irene took it to her board; they will contribute \$1000 directly and \$3000 as match until April 1 (will start from January 21)
- Mark expresses disappointment that we are going to run out of money and CalTrout cannot keep floating the boat; there is not money to put together the DAC involvement proposal
- b. Base funding proposal
- c. ECWA's proposed role
 - **DECISION ITEM:** (1) Authorize ECWA to act as book keeper for RWMG on an hourly (\$50/hr.) basis to accept & payout funds. (2) Authorize ECWA to undertake administration services for RWMG per Proposal to RWMG dated 12-09-2015 (see attached). Note even after authorization and commitment confirmation by ECWA, proposal dated 12-09-2015 would only become active when deemed necessary by the Group. No ECWA director is being paid under either Item 1 or 2.
 - Mark motions to approve ECWA as bookkeeper and overseer of monies from fundraising campaign; has authority to write checks based on scope of work to be presented to Group at next meeting; Group approved expenditures from ECWA for Prop. 1 DAC proposal coordination and development; grant Holly Alpert authority to authorize expenditures by ECWA on behalf of the Group; Admin. Committee to review expenditures as having fiscal oversight. Rick seconds. All approved.
 - Postponing other part of decision item related to....
 - **Action item: Holly will work with ECWA to develop scope of work for monies raised through fundraising campaign**
 - 3% contribution of grant amounts by grant recipients to support the I-M IRWM Program when grants are received through I-M RWMG.
 - This will be dependent on the grant and whether it allows for this kind of expense
 - Bruce intends that this is a tax on the people who get the grant and would not come out of the grant itself
 - Postpone this discussion for later

11. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) (15 minutes)

- a. Update
 - Two medium-priority basins in our region: Owens Valley and Indian Wells Valley
 - Indian Wells Valley is also in critical overdraft
 - Mutual water companies, which represent agricultural interests in the IWW, want to be part of the joint powers authority (but non-voting members) which will become the GSA; also should groundwater pumpers be on the board of the entity regulating groundwater pumping?
 - GSAs have to be formed by June 2017
 - Plans have to be formed by summer 2020 (for critical overdraft basins)
 - If not completed, the State will come in and come up with a plan
 - In Owens, Inyo County is working with Mono County and Tri-Valley to separate the basin into two sub-basins; they are making an application to DWR in the next few months
 - Mono County focused on the sub-division of Tri-Valley but not looking to be GSA; providing minimal staffing to help Tri-Valley
 - Question of what status of Tri-Valley basin would be if they separate out
 - \$4 million available to go to Counties to support groundwater plan development; Kern County got \$500,000, some for IWW

12. Announcements, process check, meeting dates (5 minutes)

- Cindy: Prop. 1 Stormwater grant solicitation is now open: \$20 million projects for green infrastructure, capture, resource plans

13. **Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting** (5 minutes)
14. **Next RWMG meeting (proposed): March or April 2016**
15. **Adjourn**
 - Leroy adjourned at 12:44 pm

Proposal for RWMG services approved by ECWA 12-09-2015

This document is a proposal from the Eastern California Water Association (ECWA) to the Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) to provide services for one year from the date of acceptance and implementation. Under the proposal ECWA would become the RWMG's **Contract Agent**, assuming a portion of the former tasks of the Program Office.

CalTrout created and has overseen the maturing of the RWMG, and is now wanting to cultivate another organization to serve as the RWMG's institutional support. This proposal describes a minimalist means by which the RWMG can continue to fulfill its purpose. It allows for expandability if there are supporting means.

The Proposal

Not-to-exceed budget proposal of **\$15,000** plus costs incurred by ECWA and approved by Admin Committee. Proposal is to provide services as described for one year.

Scope of services:

- Facilitate up to four Group meetings as well as up to two Group special meetings. Includes preparing agenda at Admin Committee direction, and summary minutes and recordation of decision items.¹
- Provide financial operations.
- Normal office infrastructure and equipment.
- Distribute and redistribute potential grant opportunity information.

Only those items mentioned above are included in this proposal contract. ECWA will depend on receiving appropriate RWMG files, records and hardware assets (if any).

Optional Services/costs specifically not covered by the proposal:

Below are desirable, but unfunded tasks. It is hoped that by volunteer, in-kind donations, they may be sustained and improved, or funding can be found for ECWA to undertake them on behalf of the RWMG.

- Web page services. The current web page is well designed and lends stature to the RWMG, but its cost and technical maintenance is beyond the means of the proposal.
- Cost and preparation of non-electronic communications (i.e. mailing and printing), as well as travel for RWMG purposes.
- Attendance/participation at/in Admin Committee meetings.

¹ With the exception of the annual meeting, it is anticipated that all meetings will be conference calls and that verbatim recordings will be made and retained. There is a loss of personal contact in phone meetings, but the cost and travel time savings is considerable.

- MOU or Bylaw revision or creation.
- Capacity building for members.
- Workshops and presentations such as grant writing and GIS capabilities.
- Outreach to member communities.

Terms of the Proposal:

1. In the absence of other resources, ECWA will fund the RWMG services above, as necessary, for the one year period of the contract on the basis of a \$50/hr. charge plus all legitimate out-of-pocket expenses as approved by the Admin Committee. (Examples of these expenses would be cost of conference calls and dedicated phone costs.)

However, the \$50/hr. charge to the RWMG will be under a not-to-exceed amount of: **\$15,000**. ECWA will provide the services described without cost if the charges surpass the not-to-exceed amount.

Hourly Budget:

Meetings associated time.	\$1,500
Accounting time.	\$1,000
General administration/communications to update Group.	<u>\$12,500</u>
Total	<u>\$15,000</u>

Out-of-Pocket Expenses:

Unknown, but require prior, or after-the-fact approval of the Admin Committee for compensation.

ECWA will underwrite the funding of the RWMG for the specified services during the period of this proposal contract in the form of a **Loan** to be repaid to ECWA when discretionary funds accrue to the RWMG. The loan is unsecured, but in accepting this proposal, the RWMG acknowledges that ethical practice requires priority repayment to ECWA before funding other activities, except as arranged with ECWA.

2. Proposal contract is for a term of one year, but implementation is contingent on action by the **RWMG to establish a funding mechanism** for itself prior to the implementation of the contract. Funding mechanisms considered by RWMG in the past include a 1% and 3% financial contribution by project proponents to compensate for expenses. Therefore, one possible funding mechanism would be to require grant recipients to pay ECWA a designated percentage of the grant received sufficient to cover the RWMG program office costs in order to repay the amount of the loan (up to \$15,000) advanced by ECWA under terms of this contract. This or some other funding mechanism approved by the RWMG is a prerequisite to implementation of this proposed contract.

3. With approval of the ECWA Board and the RWMG, **independent contractors** may be employed by ECWA to facilitate RWMG purposes. As anticipated, if grants became available, ECWA would become the applicant for these grants and pay the contractors from the grant. ECWA would retain a legitimate administrative cost. In high certainty, these independent contractors would be Holly Alpert and Mark Drew given both organizations' regard for their work.

Nothing in the above precludes other organizations (such as CalTrout and Whitebark Institute) from pursuing grants which fulfill these purposes, rather than these contractors working for ECWA.

4. As did CalTrout in previous Proposition 84 rounds, ECWA foresees contracting with Holly Alpert (as an independent contractor for ECWA), if available, for services supporting the RWMG.

5. **Fiscal Agents** shall be solicited by the RWMG for Group grants. It will be considered proper and not a conflict of interest for ECWA to apply as a fiscal agent candidate.

6. Possible **Non-Group Grants**. Some grants that become available may be of limited application to the

RWVG as a group. In such cases, it will be considered proper and not a conflict of interest with the contract proposal with the RWVG that ECWA or associated independent contractors contact those who might be benefit and to explore individual grant applications in those cases. The contract proposal with the RWVG does not affect ECWA's interests in providing grant administration, application or its ability to provide fiscal agent services.