

Meeting Agenda

Regional Water Management Group Regular Meeting

Wednesday, October 25, 2017

9:30 am – 12:30 pm

Mammoth Community Water District Conference Room

1315 Meridian Blvd

Mammoth Lakes, CA

**Call-in option:
712-770-4700
passcode: 221760#**

Please RSVP for the Inyo-Mono RWMG meeting by emailing Lisa Cutting (lisa@monolake.org) by **Friday, October 20, 2017, 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 22, 2017. You must also email the address of your call-in location to Lisa (lisa@monolake.org) by 9:00 am on Sunday, October 22, 2017.**

Call-in locations:

1. Inyo County Water Department
135 South Jackson St.
Independence, CA
2. Indian Wells Valley Water District
500 West Ridgecrest Blvd
Ridgecrest, CA

If you require special accommodations to participate in this meeting in person or by phone, please contact Lisa Cutting (lisa@monolake.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.

**1. Welcome and Introductions (need 19 signatories to constitute quorum)
In attendance (only 15 signatories present/ no quorum)**

In person:

Bob Harrington, Inyo County *

Janice Aton, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation *

Edward Herrmann, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation

Linda Monreal, Birchim CSD *

Jeff Fitzsimmons, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

Melanie Richards, Desert Mountain RC&D *

Kimberly Campbell, Desert Mountain RC&D

Earl Wilson, public

Abel Silva, California Rural Water Association

Malcolm Clark, Range of Light Group, Sierra Club *

Tim Carroll, Inyokern CSD

Donna Thomas, Desert Mountain RC&D

Stan Rattora, Eastern Kern County RCD *

Dan Totheroh, Inyo County Board of Supervisors

Julie Vargo, Amargosa Conservancy *

Ian Bell, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission *

Adam Reigle, Bridgeport Indian Colony *

Michael Draper, Mono County *

David Grah, City of Bishop *

Lisa Cutting, Mono Lake Committee *

Holly Alpert, IRWM Program Office

Jamie Robertson, Town of Mammoth Lakes *

Calling in:

Don Zdeba, Indian Wells Water District, Indian Wells Cooperative Groundwater Management **

- Holly Alpert called the meeting to order at 9:30 am.
- Holly distributed a sign-in sheet for meeting attendance.
- Holly explained that the group did not meet its quorum requirements for today's meeting. Prior to the meeting she emailed the Administrative Committee to seek guidance. The decision was to hold the meeting but defer any decision items until the January 2018 meeting.

2. Public Comment

- Earl Wilson wanted to know if we were bound by the Brown Act. Holly replied that we are not bound by the Brown Act because we are not a public entity. The group does try to abide by the Brown Act as much as possible though.

3. Quick Decision Items

- a. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve January 25, 2017, Meeting Summary Holly asked for changes or comments. There were none. Defer approval until next meeting.

4. ECWA/Program Office funding update

- a. **DECISION ITEM:** Appoint additional check signers. Bruce Woodworth suggested that there be additional check signers. It is not clear if they need to be on the ECWA board or not. Action: Holly will research. Item deferred until next meeting.
- b. Statewide efforts – Roundtable of Regions, Sierra Water Work Group
 - Holly explained that the Roundtable of Regions is a state-wide consortium of IRWM groups, and the Sierra Water Work Group is only the Sierra Nevada IRWM regions.
 - We are running out of money for participating in these groups. The DAC grant will not, for the most part, fund participation in these groups. We need unrestricted funds because we need to participate especially at the State level.
 - Two years ago, this was funded by raising money internal to the RWMG. Currently there isn't a plan to do so but groups should be thinking about that prospect.
- c. **DECISION ITEM:** Approve revised ECWA budget (see below). Item deferred until next meeting.
 - Discussion of unrestricted funding. Holly explained the table below noting that Tasks 1 and 4 are over budget. Task 3 should not be adjusted because most of that funding was contributed by the other Lahontan IRWM regions specifically for the development of the DACI proposal.
 - Jamie raised the issue of groups only contributing when being supported with projects or other services. How can other groups be encouraged to participate? It puts a burden on groups that have financial resources but may not be currently benefiting with project support.
 - David Grah noted that the money has gone much farther than originally planned which makes the case for another fundraising effort.
 - Earl expressed that a cost analysis should be done for meetings and operations. Holly estimated that it costs about \$500 per group meeting and approximately \$1000/month for other meetings and communications.
 - Adam Reigle wanted to know if the RWMG has applied for grants. Holly noted that we are always looking for grants but it's hard to find ones that will fund program operations. Action: Adam will forward any grant opportunities to Holly.
 - Bob Harrington requested that an annual operations budget be drafted. Action: Holly will draft annual operations budget and distribute in advance of next meeting. It was noted that decision item 4.c. may change for next meeting.

Task:	1: Program Operations	2: Fundraising	3: DAC Involvement Proposal	4: State Policy Efforts	5: Administration	Total
Subtotals	\$ 11,468.32	\$ 1,425.00	\$ 13,457.37	\$ 4,532.82	\$ 702.50	\$31,586.01
Original budget	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$36,000.00
Over/under	\$ (6,468.32)	\$ 2,575.00	\$ 10,542.63	\$ (2,532.82)	\$ 297.50	\$ 4,413.99
Proposed revised budget	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$36,000.00
Updated as of 9/30/17; reflects expenses incurred since June 2016						

5. DAC Involvement Grant

- a. Current status – The first pot of Prop 1 funding is for DACI grants. Within CA there are 12 funding areas with several IRWM regions in each. DWR required that funding areas each submit one proposal. There is \$2.45 million for the Lahontan funding area. There are six regions in our area but one dropped out. Holly is currently working on finalizing the contract/grant agreement with DWR. The CA Rural Water Association will be the grant administrator. It is a three-year grant and our share is

about \$522,000. It will go for things such as technical assistance, needs assessments, leak detection, and basic outreach. A large portion of the money will go toward project development, planning, and environmental documents.

- b. Soliciting planning projects – Holly stated that she hopes the DACI grant work will start within the next month, so we should also begin to solicit project development needs/planning projects. As a group we need to decide how to solicit projects, how to review them, and how to rank.
 - c. Next steps –
 - Bob Harrington suggested that we review our IRWM Plan priorities and objectives list first. Holly noted that there will likely be competition within the region for this planning money. We should get our process going by the January 2018 meeting.
 - Michael Draper: How many DACs in the region? Holly: 32-35.
 - Adam Reigle: Are we responsible for monitoring and data collection? Holly: As a group, no. Adam: Mining is a problem in the Bodie Hills. We may want to look into the impacts.
 - Ian Bell: Is there a list of eligible DACs on the website? Action: Holly will post current eligible DACs on the website. Earl: DWR has maps of the DAC areas.
 - Adam suggested that when Mono County is contracting work that in the contract it should include hiring people from DACs. Earl shared that severely disadvantaged communities have less than 60% of the statewide MHI.
 - Bob Harrington questioned DWR's web tool for DACs. How confident are we with their web tool? Holly: Depends on the data used. They need to include more recent census data.
 - Bob Harrington: SGMA (Sustainable Groundwater Management Act) is looming. Indian Wells, Owens, and Tri-Valley groundwater planning will lead to projects. Planning will be completed in the next couple of years with Indian Wells ahead of Owens.
 - Adam: We should be looking at developing projects with multiple agencies. East Walker and Bodie Hills need watershed monitoring and invasive plant species projects. Holly: We will open up the project solicitation process with an online form in order to get some proposed ideas for the January meeting. Action: Holly will 1) pull planning needs out of our current IRWM plan, 2) open the process of project solicitation, and 3) develop a list of projects for the January meeting.
 - Before stormwater projects can be funded, project proponents must have developed a stormwater resources plan for their service areas/ jurisdictions. The Town of Mammoth Lakes is doing this now.
 - We will be hiring a DAC coordinator for our region for this grant. It will be part-time (30-50%) and the position will help with administration, meetings, and outreach and will assist Holly. Action: Holly will distribute a DAC coordinator position description to the group in the next few weeks. More updates on this project at the January meeting.
 - Donna Thomas: Urged involving the DACs in Groundwater Sustainability planning. Holly said that she has tasked Rick Kattelman to do some work to bring in Tri-Valley as there is specific money for SGMA activities in the DACI grant. Bob supports DAC involvement with SGMA.
- 6. Round 1 Prop. 84 Implementation Grant Update (Central Sierra RC&D)**
- Central Sierra RC&D is the grantee. Holly emailed Valerie and DWR for an update but didn't receive one. Holly believes the grant is very close to being closed out. Action: Bob Harrington will follow-up with Keith Pearce on Inyo County's SCADA grant status.
 - The other groups that received money (including Wheeler Crest CSD, Round Valley School, and ESUSD Coleville) are done. As soon as the grants are closed out Holly will ask them if they still want to be IRWM members. Action: Holly will contact all

inactive members to see if they want to remain members. Reminder that groups need to be IRWM members to receive grant funding.

- 7. 2015 Prop. 84 Implementation Grant Update** (Melanie Richards, Desert Mountain RC&D)
- The overall grant is no longer in breach of contract now that Big Pine Paiute Tribe is back on task. Seven projects all together.
 - Holly is touring the June Lake project today and will take photos. Action: Holly will post photos of the June Lake project on the web site.
 - Julie from Amargosa Conservancy reported on the USGS evapotranspiration studies and hydro monitoring. New monitoring wells will be drilled soon.
 - Holly and Melanie communicating regularly and Melanie is holding quarterly phone calls with all project proponents to discuss upcoming reporting and invoicing. The grant is on track.

Break 10:40 – 10:50 am

8. Prop. 1 Implementation Grant process

- a. Funding timeline – \$24.5 million available for six Lahontan funding area regions for all of Prop. 1, which equates to approximately \$4 million for Inyo-Mono region.
- There will likely be two rounds of funding. The first round will be in 2018 with draft project solicitation process (PSP) in Spring 2018 and final PSP Fall 2018. There is a very good chance that this timeline will be pushed farther out. Round two will be in 2020.
 - The DAC implementation funding will likely be split between the two rounds with more funding in Round 2. General implementation money will be in both rounds. There might be a Round 3.
 - Stan: How does this fit with groundwater grants in Prop 1? Can this money go toward GSPs? Holly: Groundwater projects are part of this but not planning projects. Bob Harrington clarified that DWR told him that GSAs should go to their RWMGs for SGMA project funding. Earl: All planning is excluded? Holly: One exception – DACs can include planning. Adam: How you get validated as a DAC? Holly: There is information on DWR's website and a mapping tool.
 - Any project that we put forward must already be in our IRWM Plan. We need to solicit new projects and develop criteria to evaluate and rank them. We may be asked to submit more projects than available funding allows, knowing that not all of them will be funded. All groups will be trying to stretch their funds as much as possible.
 - In January 2018 we need to start the solicitation process and develop the criteria for ranking. We can use previously established criteria if we want. Adam: Is there a match? Holly: There is a 50% match but for DACs it's partially or fully waived. There are different rules for Prop 1 and a different process (than Prop. 84). Prop 1 is less focused on region priorities and more focused on state priorities.
- b. DWR process of grant solicitation – DWR has some concerns about which implementation projects were funded in the past, including: 1) some projects have limited benefits; 2) some regions have difficulty getting funding because of competition within funding areas; 3) some projects are disconnected from regional goals and objectives; and 4) funding area allocation agreements do not allow for competition.
- Holly explained that some of our projects were unable to demonstrate secondary benefits. So DWR is proposing some changes for projects: 1) must meet Prop. 1 requirements; 2) discussion between DWR and IRWM regions to identify how projects move regional priorities, goals, and objectives forward; 3) give applicants the ability to further justify projects; 4) Give DWR the ability to seek clarification on submitted projects; 5) reduce application costs while maintaining transparency; 6) maintain competition; and 7) help projects developed through DACI have the best

- chance to receive implementation funding.
- DWR’s proposed grant solicitation process is 1) applicant presents projects to be considered; 2) DWR reviews potential projects and provides comments only; 3) applicant finalizes list of projects and submits application; and 4) DWR evaluates projects and makes a draft funding recommendation. The final grant solicitation process will be described in the PSP and there will be public comment.
- Adam: Do you have the outline for project proposals? Holly: There will be an online project submittal form and a process to review internally. Donna: Made the point that the Inyo – Mono IRWM website contains language that “projects will address critical state-wide needs” which were identified as water quality and quantity and Delta sustainability. Holly: We will have to see what language is in the final PSP. Donna: They also have that “projects should leverage non-state funding.” Holly: DWR wants to see funds from additional sources in order to leverage state funds. That way more projects can be done. Remember, DAC match requirement is waived or reduced.
- Bob: Don’t really like the idea of DWR not honoring funding area grant allocation agreements - the cooperative/collaborative thing. Holly: I brought that up to DWR and they assured me that the Lahontan region will be fine and that intra-area funding agreements will not change. Competition within the Inyo-Mono IRWM stakeholders will be enough to satisfy the competition requirement.
- Adam: Is emergency preparedness supported? Holly: Yes. Action: Holly will distribute the draft PSP to the group to review when it is released.

9. IRWM Plan Update

- Proposed process – Holly is looking for direction on updating the IRWM Plan to meet new Prop. 1 guidelines and Plan standards (see handout).
 - To be eligible for Implementation funding, IRWM plans need to be updated and put through DWR’s Plan Review Process. Our current Plan has been updated twice already. As an example of the updated Plan standards, climate change needs to be in more sections of the Plan. Any Implementation grant award will be contingent on DWR approving our updated IRWMP Plan.
 - Holly has contacted Rick Kattelmann to help her. See handout for proposal and budget. Total cost is \$10,000. We currently do not have the funds or any leads on how to get the funds.
 - Melanie: Is our current plan on the website? Holly: Yes. Earl: Can funding be a match? Holly: Good question, will consult with the state. Bob: Do projects need to be part of the plan? Holly: Yes, in draft form.
 - So the first thing would be to update the project list and do the rest of the updates later. So we need to add \$10,000 plus to the annual operations budget and fundraising subject that we discussed earlier.
- Town of Mammoth Lakes Stormwater Resources Plan (Jamie Robertson) – Before a group can apply for stormwater projects they have to have an approved SRP on file with DWR. The Town of Mammoth Lakes is working on their SRP.
 - Adam: Who is the plan submitted to? Holly: State Water Board – Lahontan and DWR. It also gets integrated into the IRWM Plan. Lisa: How small can the entity be? Lee Vining? Holly: Yes. Stan: Does that project compete with other funds? Holly: Stormwater projects would compete with other Inyo-Mono projects.
 - Donna asked if the RWMG has gotten input from DWP, specifically about how they handled excess snowmelt runoff this year. Holly: DWP stopped attending meetings and we haven’t had any input from them. Bob offered that when he last spoke to a DWP representative about the IRWM they said they had no need to be involved.
 - Earl discussed the recent Lahontan meeting in Bishop. Action: Holly will follow-up with Lahontan and find out the purpose of the meeting. Donna suggested that we invite DWP to give a presentation at the next meeting in January. Action: Holly will invite DWP to give a presentation at the next meeting.

10. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Update

- Donna reported that the Indian Wells Groundwater Authority submitted a letter of intent to DWR that the IWVGA is ready to begin the development of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). Steve Johnson of Stetson Engineers, Inc. was hired as Water Resources Manager.
- The Tech Advisory Committee and the Policy Advisory Committee have met several times. Right now the focus is on the preparation of the application for Proposition 1 funding for SGMA. The draft proposal has been reviewed and 103 comments were received. Many of the comments related to the inaccuracy of the DAC map used in the proposal for the DACs as part of the groundwater sustainability plan grant application. Donna will send the DAC map to Holly to review and comment on.
- The State website is not very helpful in this regard. Stan relayed that they are expecting revisions back from DWR. Inyokern should be added. Trona was added.
- Don (on the phone) added that they are coordinating with the TAC and finalizing revisions. Bob reported that for the Owens Valley Groundwater Basin, four GSAs have formed: Inyo, Mono, Tri Valley and Bishop. Further, a Joint Powers Agreement was signed by 11 local districts and 7 communities.
- The JPA met on October 5 and is meeting tomorrow. DWP is not eligible. Agencies eligible to be GSAs are part of the JPA. There are 11 with equal voting and financial responsibility, but they have the option to choose their level of funding. If a member funds it gets four votes. If you don't fund you only get 2 votes. Any member can assume the unfunded votes, with voting prorated to funding level.
- Beyond the members there is a voting role for associates: tribes, DWP, mutual water companies, federal agencies, and environmental groups.
- Owens Valley is not in critical overdraft, and therefore has two more years than Indian Wells to complete their plan. Holly: How best to stay informed? Bob: Get on the email distribution list – email your request to IPiper@inyocounty.us
- Donna: DWR encourages GSA planning. Groundwater Sustainability plans require a 50% match. The DAC waiver applies here too.

11. Announcements, process check

- Julie announced that NRCS is hosting a free Streambank Soil Bioengineering workshop in Shoshone and Tecopa on November 14-16.
- Dave Grah remarked that holding meetings are good but the fact that we lack a quorum needs to be addressed. Possible options include having members recommit and/or reducing the amount of members and therefore the quorum amount. Holly: Quorum equals 50% plus 1. Bob suggested a possible MOU change that would drop members for non-attendance (they would be able to easily get back on if they wanted). Holly agreed that options should be listed out and discussed. Action: Holly will present several membership options at the January 2018 meeting.
 - a. Tecopa water vending machine – Holly will attend this project kick-off. Action: Holly will take photos at the Tecopa event and post to the website.

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

- **DECISION ITEM:** Approve January 25, 2017, Meeting Summary. Defer approval until next meeting.
- **DECISION ITEM:** Appoint additional check signers. Action: Holly will research. Item deferred until next meeting.
- **DECISION ITEM:** Approve revised ECWA budget (see below). Item deferred until next meeting.
- Action: Adam will forward any grant opportunities to Holly.
- Action: Holly will draft operations budget and distribute in advance of next meeting.
- Action: Holly will post eligible DACs on the website.
- Action: Holly will 1) pull planning needs out of our current plan, 2) open the process of project solicitation, and 3) develop a list of projects for the January meeting.
- Action: Holly will distribute a DAC coordinator position description to the group in the

next few weeks.

- Action: Bob Harrington will follow-up with Keith Pearce on Inyo County's SKADA grant status.
- Action: Holly will contact all inactive members to see if they want to remain members.
- Action: Holly will post photos of the June Lake project on the web site.
- Action: Holly will distribute the draft PSP to the group to review when it is released.
- Action: Holly will follow-up with Lahontan and find out the purpose of the meeting.
- Action: Holly will invite DWP to give a presentation at the next meeting.
- Action: Holly will take photos at the Tecopa event and post to the website.
- Action: Holly will present several membership options at the January 2018 meeting.

13. Next RWMG meeting – January 24, 2018 (MOU-mandated annual meeting)

This meeting will likely be held in Bishop. There will be an Administrative Committee meeting beforehand and it will be a joint ECWA meeting.

14. Adjourn – Holly adjourned the meeting at 12:20 pm.

