



# **DRAFT Meeting Summary**

## **Regional Water Management Group Regular Meeting**

**Wednesday, January 28, 2015**

**9:30 am – 12:30 pm**

Town of Mammoth Lakes

Town Council Chambers – Suite Z

437 Old Mammoth Rd., Mammoth Lakes, 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, January 23, 2015, 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 25, 2015. 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, January 25, 2015.**

### **Call-in locations:**

1. Inyo County Water Department  
135 South Jackson St.  
Independence, CA
2. Bruce Woodworth Residence  
824 Burcham Flat Rd  
Coleville, CA
3. Linda Akyuz Residence  
303 N. Pacific Coast Highway  
Redondo Beach, CA
4. Big Pine Paiute Tribe  
Environmental Office  
820 Watson St.  
Big Pine, CA
5. Leroy Corlett Residence  
1217 N. Inyo St.  
Ridgecrest, 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 – January 28, 2015

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)
  - Bruce started the meeting at 9:35 am

In attendance (need 17 for quorum):

### In person

Mark Drew – CalTrout, IRWMP Staff  
Holly Alpert – IRWMP Staff  
Janet Hatfield – IRWMP Staff  
Rick Kattelmann – Eastern Sierra Land Trust, Sierra Club (this time), IRWMP Staff  
Bruce Woodworth - Mono County RCD  
Greg James – Amargosa Conservancy  
Irene Yamashita – Mammoth Community Water District  
Haislip Hayes – Town of Mammoth Lakes  
Grady Dutton – Town of Mammoth Lakes  
Al Heinrich – June Lake Advocates  
Jeremiah Joseph – Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation  
Brent Calloway – Mono County  
Bob Harrington – Inyo County (Water Department)  
Carmen Gonzales – Owens Valley Indian Water Commission  
Linda Wimberly – Bridgeport Indian Colony  
Dan Jenkins – Eastern Sierra Unified School District  
Ken Reynolds – Bridgeport PUD  
Dale Johnson – Bishop BLM

### Calling in

Linda Akyuz – Bishop Paiute Tribe  
Sally Manning – Big Pine Paiute Tribe, Owens Valley Committee  
Justin O’Neill – Mojave Desert Mountain RC&D (no call-in location)  
Rich Ciauri – June Lake PUD (no call-in location)  
Valerie Klinefelter – Central Sierra RC&D (no call-in location)  
Leroy Corlett – Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group

- Holly gave a reminder about providing call-in locations per the Brown Act. If you are planning to call in, you must provide your call-in location address to the Program Office at least 72 hours ahead of the meeting. If you think there’s any possibility that you may need to call in but otherwise plan to attend in person, we recommend
2. Public Comment (5 minutes)
    - No comments
  3. Quick Decision Items (5 minutes)
    - a. **DECISION ITEM: Approve October 22, 2014, Meeting Summary**
      - Correction in list of attendees: Rick Pucci (mis-spelling)
      - Correction in 8.c. second bullet; ECWA board – Irene is not on the board; list out the five members of the Admin. Committee that comprise the board
      - **Mark moves to approve the notes with the corrections; Rick seconds; all approved. Holly will make corrections and post to the website.**
  4. Administrative Committee Report (15 minutes)
    - a. Admin. Comm. composition for 2015
      - i. **DECISION ITEM: Bob Harrington/Inyo County Water Department to be selected for**

two-year term beginning January 1, 2015; Malcolm Clark/Sierra Club and Leroy Corlett/Indian Wells Valley Water District to be re-appointed to the Admin. Committee for two-year terms beginning January 2, 2015.

- **Rick motions to appoint Bob Harrington to Administrative Committee for a two-year term and to re-appoint Malcolm Clark and Leroy Corlett to new two-year terms; Bruce seconds; all approved.**
  - Admin. Committee will next select Chair and Vice-Chair
  - b. Update on Eastern California Water Association 501(c)(3)
    - ECWA is now a 501(c)(3) with the intention to work with the RWMG in some capacity; there have been a couple of board meetings
    - Bylaws have been approved by the board
    - **Action Item: ECWA board will discuss posting bylaws on the Inyo-Mono IRWM website; until that time, individuals can request bylaws directly from Bruce**
5. Process for IRWMP Letters of Support (10 minutes)
- a. **DECISION ITEM: Approve process for obtaining letters of support from the RWMG (see attached proposed process at end of agenda)**
    - This new proposal seeks to streamline the letter of support request process so that requesters with short timelines can reasonably and quickly seek a letter.
    - Bruce moves to approve the proposed process; Rick seconds.
    - However, there were concerns with the proposed process related to the RWMG not seeing letters before they are provided. Bruce argues there is enough safeguarding in the people who would be involved (i.e., Program Office, Admin. Committee Chair/Vice-Chair) that they would be aware of meeting needs of all RWMG members.
    - **Revised Decision Item: (1) Initial requests for letters of support should be sent to the Program Office; (2) Program Office staff will send the request to the RWMG Membership; (3) Members will have five calendar days to review and send any objections to the Program Office; (4) if Members pose objections, we ask, as a courtesy, that they provide reasons for their objections; (5) objectors can also ask for more time to take letters to governing boards; (6) if there are no objections, Program Office will provide the letter to the requestor; (7) Program Office can also veto the letter outright if it sees problems or incompatibilities upon first request.**
    - **Irene motions to approve this revised process; Mark seconds; all approved.**
6. Budget review & work plan (40 minutes)
- a. 2014 Budget report
    - Holly presented the 2014 budget reports for each Prop. 84 grant; these budget reports are available on the website
    - i. Planning Grant 2 (including match)
    - ii. DAC Grant
    - iii. Program Office portion of Round 1 Implementation Grant
  - b. Overview of 2014 accomplishments
    - i. IRWM Plan adopted by RWMG and approved by DWR
      - This was a primary priority in the second half of 2014 in order to be in compliance with DWR requirements for continuing Round 1 Implementation grant payments
    - ii. DAC workshop & pending recommendations
      - Smaller tasks included: *Living in the Rain Shadow* showings all over the state; region-specific DAC workshop in June with the public and Lahontan RWQCB; grant administration; ongoing RWMG correspondence and upkeep; work with DWR and others in other IRWM regions and the state level
      - Inyo-Mono DAC grant report was submitted September 30, 2014
      - In December, a DAC pilot project workshop was convened in Calistoga, CA. Pilot project representatives attended as well as state water agency

representatives. One of the outcomes is another recommendations report that will be submitted to DWR at the end of January. There will also be a workshop proceedings that is more of a transcript that took place.

- c. 2015 Work Plan & timeline
  - i. DAC grant – ends January 31, 2015
  - ii. Planning Grant 2 – ends June 30, 2015
  - iii. Round 1 Implementation Grant – ends December 31, 2015
  - iv. Introduction to Program Database
    - Janet provided an overview of a new Access database she is in the process of creating
    - **Action Item: Project proponents should submit projects (needed, in process, completed) on Inyo-Mono website. Program Office requests that stakeholders wait for instruction from the Program Office before starting to upload projects.**
  - v. Fourth year of drought
    - Mark doesn't have specific ideas of what we should do, but he feels that we should be doing something about drawing attention to the drought
    - OVIWC is developing some education materials available to everybody about ecological resilience in the face of drought (working with TreePeople)
    - **Action item: Program Office will solicit interest in being part of conversations about drought and exploring if there is anything we could be doing**
    - Irene: MCWD is talking about the drought a lot; took several steps last year and may be recommending to the board the next level of restrictions for water shortage

7. Walking Water: invitation for RWMG to be a part (5 minutes)

- Kate Bunney joined us by phone
- Walking Water project: pilgrimage from Mono Basin to Los Angeles over three year period to raise awareness of local and global water issues
- Relationships between humans and water
- Similar priorities to IRWMP: collaboration, solution-oriented thinking
- September 1-21, 2015: start at Saddlebag Lake, go to Mono Lake, walk close to Owens River down to Owens Lake
- How do we find information on the program? There is a website and a mailing list; a facebook page; and are in the process of creating some PR materials. Website is: [www.walking-water.org](http://www.walking-water.org)
- Kate will be in the region mid-March
- There are some different ideas about activities that could take place along the walk
- [kate@walking-water.org](mailto:kate@walking-water.org)

8. World Water Day 2015 (5 minutes)

- No specific thoughts, but combined with the drought, is there anything we can do?
- Who might be doing WWD activities, and is there energy to do education, outreach, etc.?
- **Action Item: World Water Day - Please send any interest or input to Program office**

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

9. Looking to the future after June 2015 (40 minutes)

- a. Review funding needs
  - There is no identified source of funding to support programmatic tasks after Prop. 84 money runs out
  - There is IRWM money in the governor's budget that would begin July 1, but those funds might not be available right away
  - Strategic planning process is recommending sustained funding for IRWM regions and IRWM programmatic needs, but those would not be available for some time,

- likely not until fiscal year 16-17.
- There may be some non-competitive money coming out for DACs, but we do not know when those would be available
- Mark reviewed the various scenarios of funding needs; to do the minimal amount of work and convene quarterly meetings, likely need about \$40,000/year
- Also time to move beyond CalTrout as lead organization and depending on them for funding
- b. Programmatic tasks, incl. website, database, meetings, RWMG maintenance
  - Could also include trips and meetings within and outside of the region
- c. Round 3 Implementation Grant – Summer 2015
  - We have an agreement with the other Lahontan funding region IRWM groups to share the last portion of implementation funding. Inyo-Mono has access to \$1.8 million in a non-competitive way, as long as we submit a proposal that meets minimum grant evaluation standards.
  - This application will likely be due late summer 2015.
  - Not sure of areas of emphasis, but drought projects would make sense
  - We need to go through the project solicitation, review, ranking process
  - There is no funding for Program Office to develop proposals; this is the most important need looking to proposal development; Mark estimates we need at least \$10,000
  - We encourage RWMG Members to give thought to project needs and upload projects on the website
  - One suggestion is to have a sub-committee that evaluates and ranks projects and then brings that recommendation back to the group, to streamline the timing
    - Bruce disagrees with this approach as he thinks it seems undemocratic and un-representative
  - i. Project solicitation
  - ii. Project prioritization
- d. Transition committee
  - Mark will start the process of a transition committee
  - Bruce's ideas for proposed funding mechanisms was reviewed
  - There was a round of input from meeting participants
  - Land Trust might be willing to put in \$250/year; Rick likes idea of grant submission fee
  - Irene likes submission fee; would need to get input from GM
  - Federal agency (like BLM) might be able to do submission fee
  - Jeremiah: ok on submission fee; what about asking those who benefit from water resources contribute (say McDonald's) – more development-oriented
  - Ken: sees need for the organization; small water districts benefits from IRWMP; would be willing to take fee request to board
  - Dan: annual fee might not be so palatable; submission fee might not work when there isn't much money to start and org. is depending on the grant
  - Greg: could probably come up with minimal fee; submission fee would be easier if it came out of grant; suggests drafting a letter laying out the situation and asking for specific donations from Members, businesses, others?
  - Grady: looking at it in two phases – the next year and then long-term; could see going to Town Manager; sees regional benefit
  - Brent: Mono County sees the value; find one board member to champion
  - Bob: makes sense that project proponents help to fund the organization; split the fee up based on the phase of proposal development
  - OVIWC: small fee would likely be fine; some concern for tribes in general to be responsible for fees; in-kind work may also be difficult among tribal staff; submission fee seems more fair
  - Linda: would be difficult for BIC to pay; likes idea of in-kind work; thinks the group is important
  - Two pools of money are needed: programmatic and proposal development

- Mark will recruit Members to develop a development/fundraising strategy to reach out to the community to solicit funding; work more formally with larger entities to get seed money
  - Leroy: follow Bruce's financial plan step-by-step
  - **Action Item: Development committee (Jeremiah, Bruce, Bob, Mark, and others from counties, and whoever is interested) will start to work on a development strategy; this will also be the start of the transition committee**
  - **Action item: Circulate Bruce's funding ideas; provide feedback to Program Office by Feb. 15**
10. Round 1 Implementation Grant (10 minutes)
- a. Grant administration update
  - b. Project updates
    - Four projects are complete (Tecopa, Coleville, Hilltop, Round Valley)
    - CSA#2 field work is complete, but no final site visit yet, nor has there been a final invoice
    - New SCADA schedule is through 6/30/15
    - Overall grant schedule has been extended through 12/31/15
    - Program Office schedule has been extended through 12/31/15
    - The last 6 months of the grant is for finishing out administration
    - There has not been an updated report from MCWD
    - Project completion reports for Coleville and Hilltop are complete
    - Unclear whether MCWD will come under budget
    - Two projects were over budget, so any leftover funds could be used to support those projects
    - CSA#2 will likely be under budget because County kicked in some funding
    - SCADA may be over budget
    - Bob will talk to Keith about the budgets for the Inyo County projects
    - Irene asked Valerie for an updated financial report from Central Sierra
    - **Action Item: Program Office will let Valerie know when the next Administrative Committee meeting is scheduled, and she will prepare a financial report for the meeting**
  - c. MCWD press release
    - Holly and Irene prepared a press release announcing the completion of fieldwork for the well profiling project. The press release was distributed to all local media outlets, and at least two of them published it. The press release is also available on the Inyo-Mono website.
11. Guest talk(s): Round 1 Implementation Projects (15 minutes)
- a. Mammoth Community Water District (Irene Yamashita/Forrest Cross) – Well Profiling Project (15 minutes)
    - Forrest was ill so could not present; Irene gave brief update
    - Did the well profiling in September; have received a draft report; not sure when the final will be available
12. Announcements, process check, meeting dates (5 minutes)
- Tecopa water station: grant has been delivered to County; want to use to construct water dispensing station owned by fire district; well was tested and results came back under arsenic and over fluoride; bottled water is being delivered
  - Inyo Water Commission: Feb. 4, 6 pm
  - Standing Committee: Feb. 9, 1 pm
  - Technical Group Meeting for LORP: Feb. 12, 8 am
13. Review of action items, decision items, and recommendations from today's meeting

(5 min)

14. **Next RWMG meeting (proposed) (5 minutes)**
  - **Unsure at this time when next meeting will be held**
15. **Adjourn**
  - **Leroy adjourned at 12:31 pm**

## **Draft Protocol for RWMG Endorsement Letters**

**07-24-2014**

For the RWMG to be able to effectively respond to Requests for endorsement of projects in a timely way, the following protocol wording is suggested:

1. When a Request of Endorsement of a project is received by RWMG it is to be promptly directed to the senior person available in the Program Office.

Program Office reviews the Request for a) obvious incompatibilities with RWMG Plan, b) likely potential objections from Group Signatories.

If in the opinion of the Program Office, the Request does not suggest problems with either “a” or “b”, then the Request for Endorsement is forwarded on to both the Chair and Vice Chair of the Admin Committee<sup>1</sup>, who have three business days within which to review the Request.

If in the judgment of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Program Office is correct that there appears to be no salient problem with the Request, they should inform the Program Office to write the Letter of Endorsement.

If there is no communication from either the Chair or Vice Chair after three business days, the Program Office should provide the Letter of Endorsement.

If either Chair or Vice Chair sees a potential problem in endorsing the project, they shall inform<sup>2</sup> the Program Office of this and direct the Program Office to email the Request for endorsement for review by all signatory members, who will have four business days in which to respond.

2. If a signatory member disapproves<sup>3</sup> of the Endorsement Letter and emails the Program Office within four business days, the Program Office will inform the applicant that the Letter is denied according to RWMG protocol, without indicating to the applicant the members(s) who have objected.

3. If the Program Office receives no email objection from a signatory member after four business days of sending out the Endorsement Request to the signatory members, the Program Office shall provide the Letter of Endorsement for the applicant.

---

<sup>1</sup> Both email and voice message.

<sup>2</sup> Both email and voice message.

<sup>3</sup> A signatory who decides that he/she must get their Board's approval, should provisionally object until the Letter of Endorsement can be presented to their Board.