

**DRAFT Notes: Inyo-Mono IRWMP Administrative Committee  
Special Meeting/Conference Call**

**Friday, May 27, 2011  
10:00 am - 12:00 pm**

Call-in number: 866-862-2138  
passcode: 1678718

Feel free to join us in person at the CalTrout Office (3399 Main St., Suite W5, Mammoth Lakes).

Other call-in locations:

1. Mono Lake Committee  
Hwy 395 at 3rd St.  
Lee Vining, CA
2. Mammoth Community Water District  
1315 Meridian Blvd.  
Mammoth Lakes, CA
3. BryAnna Vaughan Residence  
273 Locust St.  
Big Pine, CA
4. Inyo County Water Department  
135 South Jackson St.  
Independence, CA

**All Admin. Committee members must post this meeting agenda at their call-in locations.**

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Preliminary Round 1 Implementation funding recommendations from DWR  
\* Discussion of strategy for responding to recommendation of no funding from DWR
3. Public Comment period
4. Review of recommendations and/or action items from today's meeting
5. Adjourn

\*\*\* Anyone from the RWMG is invited to participate in this meeting/conference call. We would like to especially encourage **project proponents** and **Implementation funding allocation working committee members** to participate in this call.

## Notes

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

#### In attendance

Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission

Mark Drew, CalTrout/IRWMP Staff

Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff

Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department

Keith Pearce, Inyo County DPW

BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe

Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D

Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD

Rick Kattelman, Eastern Sierra Land Trust

Holly Gallagher, Birchim CSD

Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District

Paul Hancock, Inyo County DPW

- BryAnna began the meeting at 10:03 am.

### **2. Preliminary Round 1 Implementation funding recommendations from DWR**

- Mark says that we are not done with the Implementation funding whatsoever. There may be avenues of recourse.
- Mark and Holly were incredibly disappointed and in fact devastated.
- Staff feels like there are points on the evaluation that need to be re-evaluated.
- Mark talked with several DWR staff members at the IRWM conference in Sacramento, and they were understanding of our disappointment and to our situation. They provided guidance on where we should go from here in terms of responding to the preliminary funding recommendations.
- Strategy: DWR has the ability to potentially pull money from Rounds 2 and 3 to provide additional funding to regions in Round 1. Indeed, they have already done this with Antelope Valley with an additional \$1.4 million. If there is not opposition from Mojave and Antelope Valley IRWMPs, there may be a strong case to move forward with this strategy. Mark is working with Antelope Valley and Mojave to obtain their support on our strategy. Tahoe-Sierra also did not receive funding. They are contemplating how to move forward because they got Prop. 50 Implementation funding. They are considering asking about \$1 million. A similar situation happened with Tahoe-Sierra in Prop. 50 Implementation funding whereby it did not receive any initial funding but was later granted 50% of its ask.
- Staff will be drafting public comments and will be making a pitch with a monetary ask of different increments. Minimum we want to consider is \$1 million. Suggestion is to come in around \$2.5 million. That would fund ten projects on our list.
- Holly G. asks about drafting public comments.
- Two ways to go forward: Staff will be drafting general comments about the proposal process and then go through the evaluation comments in detail and respond. Mark says it would be beneficial for project proponents and other Group Members/participants to send in public comments.
- Bob asked about whether we knew ahead of time what the evaluation criteria would be. We consulted closely the PSP which had guidelines on criteria and scoring breakdown.

- Mark encourages participants to share their letters with the Program Office when drafting public comment letters.
- **Deadline is for public comment is Friday, June 10; please provide comment letters to Program Office by Thursday, June 2.**
- Tahoe-Sierra is supportive of our strategy to make a pitch and is willing to draft a letter in support of Inyo-Mono funding.
- There seems to be support at DWR for the types of projects we submitted. The problems seem to be in the proposal development/quality and having it be competitive with other regions. Seems like more affluent regions (urban regions) are able to draft more competitive proposals which pushes out rural and disadvantaged regions.
- Bob emphasizes that the DAC issue is important to put on the table. Mark encourages everyone to make that message clear in their public comments.
- Rick suggests focusing on structural issues with DWR process – real differences between what we thought and what we got back in the evaluation.
- Mark recommends that project proponents go through the evaluation and specifically address places where their project(s) is called out.
- The goal is to get the score up a bit – perhaps into the mid-40s.
- On the flood damage reduction econ analysis: Mark talked to DWR about this because we did not have flood projects and DWR told us that we should not be penalized.
- Good news: the DAC pilot projects are moving forward and were discussed during the IRWM conference. After the Implementation recommendations came out, Mark asked for \$40,000 more to help with project and proposal development. DWR accepted this increased ask.
- Leroy asks whether project proponents should be talking to state senators or assembly members. Mark says it cannot hurt, as long as it's done in a proactive productive fashion.
- Mark emphasizes that now is the time for public agency support, such as from the Counties.
- Mark received a lot of sympathy from the higher levels of DWR who recognize our need.
- Bruce is concerned with unilaterally making a decision on how many projects to go forward with. Holly G. agrees. They think Program Office should make a recommendation and have an emergency Group meeting.
- Bob asks if we can give DWR a few scenarios with a few different figures or simply provide DWR with a list containing our projects with a running budget and then leave it to DWR to decide if and how much money to support. Mark thinks DWR will want a specific ask – one number. Mark will communicate with DWR to see if we can give them a few different scenarios. This is the agreed way forward. The participants felt better having it out of our hands and putting it into DWR hands.
- Mark was encouraged by the IRWM conference itself and provided us with some different ways of thinking about how to move forward in terms of integration.
- BryAnna and Morgan expressed their appreciation at the leadership of the Program Office.
- BryAnna adjourned the meeting at 10:50 am.