

Meeting Summary

Inyo – Mono IRWM Administrative Committee Meeting

Date: Wednesday, October 14, 2015

10:00 am – 12:00 pm

In-person option at California Trout in Mammoth Lakes

3399 Main St.

Mammoth Lakes, CA

Call-in option:

866-210-1669

passcode: 6194641

Conference call option at right

Admin. Committee Members must send call-in location

to Holly by Sunday, October 11, 2015 and post agenda at location

Call-in locations

1. Leroy Corlett residence
1217 N. Inyo St
Ridgecrest, CA

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
Chair: Leroy
Vice-Chair: Bob

In attendance:

Mark Drew, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office

Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office

Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District

Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club

Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe

Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District

Justin Nalder, Bridgeport Indian Colony (called in for last hour)

Leroy called the meeting to order at 10:01

2. Public Comment Period
 - Mark reminded the group that three Admin. Committee members' terms will expire at the end of 2015 (Justin Nalder, Alan Bacock, Irene Yamashita). **Holly will add this topic to the RWMG meeting agenda.** We will plan to call for nominations for new AC members and hold elections for new members and officers at the January RWMG meeting.
 - Alan Bacock gave a summary of the first phase of Walking Water, which ended September 29. This project will continue over the next two years. A photo exhibit will be developed from the full effort. **Alan will put together a short multi-media presentation for the RWMG meeting.**

3. Report on 2015 Implementation Grant Proposal

a. Proposal process

- Mark reminded the group that, according to our agreement with other Lahontan funding region IRWM groups, we were free to pursue \$1.89 million through this round of Implementation funding. Our final proposal was short of that total by about \$65,000.
- We expect preliminary grant awards to be announced in early November; as a reminder, we are being evaluated on a non-competitive basis.
- We originally aimed to submit seven projects – Mark reviewed all seven; we only submitted six in the final application
- The Bishop Paiute Tribe meters project had to be removed from the application because of compliance issues with a groundwater management requirement; subsequently, Alan Bacock spoke with other tribes and found that some had similar difficulties complying with requirements of the PSPs.

b. Funding proposal coordination (i.e., Program Office)

- Each project proponent contributed 1% of its grant ask to the Program Office for proposal coordination tasks and could seek reimbursement through the grant for this expense
- The Program Office raised about \$16,000 but spent about \$21,000
- Mark kicked in a little from CalTrout but not enough to cover all of the expenses
- One suggestion is to send a letter to project proponents asking them to chip in to cover the remaining balance, on a pro-rated basis
- **Leroy will send the letter as the chair and as a fellow project proponent**
- **Action Item: Holly will provide Leroy with the remaining amount, project proponent contacts, addresses, etc.**
- There was discussion about what to do regarding the Program Office contribution from Bishop Paiute for the meters project given that the project was removed from the overall application. Although a substantial amount of work was put into the project proposal before deciding to remove it, both Bob and Alan suggested reimbursing Bishop Paiute the full amount.
- **Mark will instruct CalTrout to reimburse Bishop Paiute the full amount of the contribution for the meters project**
- **Mark will work with Holly to determine what the net outstanding amount is after that reimbursement**
- Since most of the freed-up funding was moved to the IWWWD cash-for-grass proposal, **Leroy will ask IWWWD to contribute an additional amount to make up for the Bishop Paiute contribution. Holly and Mark will get Leroy the appropriate figure.**

c. Expected award date, next steps

- Again, preliminary awards are expected in early November
- There will likely be a 30-day public comment period
- Preliminary awards are not likely to change
- Final awards will be announced around the new year
- Grant agreements will be starting soon after, as they are motivated to get this round of projects started

4. Report on Round 1 Implementation projects and administration

- Holly provided an update from Valerie that she had received via email just this morning; the body of the email is included below:

I did not receive a response from Keith regarding SCADA. Regarding the status of Impl. 1.

Invoice # 6 has not been received but was sent to the controllers office the beginning of Sept.

The project completion for New Hilltop Well was approved and final invoice was sent to the controllers office the beginning of Sept.

The project completion report for the Tecopa project has been through final review.

The project completion report for Round Valley is in review.

I have provided the format for reporting to Inyo Public works for the CSA-2 project completion report.

I have provided the format for reporting to MCWD for their project completion report.

MCWD continues to be in Breech of contract for non reporting.

Invoice #7 is being prepared.

- **Bob and Irene said they would get updates as appropriate from Keith and Forrest, respectively**
- **Holly will forward Valerie's email to the Admin. Committee**
- Because Holly's computer was down, we were not able to match up the invoice numbers to actual time periods
- Mark asked what happens if there is money left over from any of the projects or from administration

5. New Planning Grant tasks

- The grant has been extended to February 29, 2016
- Oak Creek project came back with extra money for the Program Office, as did the West Walker project (a little)
- The Program Office has proposed two new efforts to utilize most of this funding – one within an existing task and one entirely new task
- Mark described the new task, which is a groundwater information assessment aimed at positioning the region to be better prepared to respond to the requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. This work would assess what information and knowledge we already have, identify where the gaps are, and propose a plan for filling those gaps. Two basins in the region – Owens Valley and Indian Wells Valley – already have groundwater management plans in place.
- Bob informed the group that Inyo County has gone to DWR to suggest that Owens Valley be split into two sub-basins (split off the Tri-Valley)
- Starting January 1, there will be a 90-day window for local agencies to request basin boundary changes to be considered
- Bob also said that the Long-Term Water Agreement does not cover the entire Inyo portion of the Owens Valley – only L.A.'s land – and that they still need a Sustainable Groundwater Management Agency and plan for the entire basin that dovetails with the LTWA (so there's work to be done in the OV still, bottom line)

- Rick will be heading up this work
- Mark suggest meeting with the Tri-Valley
- Holly talked about the new outreach work related to the finance plan. This work is being undertaken to get a more complete inventory of needs that are out there but also to start to direct specific resources to individual stakeholders with specific needs. The intention is to hold individual meetings with stakeholders to talk about project needs and TMF needs, and to collect information from them that can then be used to populate CFCC applications or the start of grant proposals.
- We are also hoping to have another person help with the work of these tasks, but without commencing a full hiring process, and are asking the Admin. Committee for any ideas. Bob suggested that Darla would perhaps be interested in helping out with the outreach work.

6. Inyo-Mono IRWM Program post-February 29, 2016

a. Prop. 1

- Mark sits on the Prop. 1 Stakeholder Engagement Advisory Committee
- First pools of Prop. 1 money to become available will be DAC-centric
- 10% of Prop. 1 IRWM money will be for DAC engagement and involvement and will be available on a non-competitive basis, perhaps by February 2016, in a hopefully abbreviated application process
- Another 10% will be hard project money for DACs (and maybe planning money) and may be available by summer 2016
- Discussion then turned to funding the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program apart from Prop. 1
- Leroy suggested sending a letter to all elected officials in the Inyo-Mono region describing the funding problem for the Program
- **Mark and Holly will provide information for a funding appeal letter**
- **Holly will add to the RWMG agenda a decision to pursue funding from all RWMG stakeholders**
- In the funding appeal, we will provide scenarios
- There will be two letters: one to the public (meaning general stakeholders?), one more focused to County and city officials
- Discussion of the role of Eastern California Water Association as the next lead agency/fiscal agent of the Inyo-Mono Program; some Admin. Committee members discussed having a board meeting next week
- Discussion of where finances go – Whitebark Institute or ECWA
- Discussion of dividing up Prop. 1 funding among Lahontan funding region IRWM groups
- Leroy suggested putting this on the agenda
- Holly argued that this should not become a decision item until there are scenarios with numbers and dollar figures to decide among – perhaps in January
- **For now, Holly will put it on the agenda as an informational item.**

7. Next Admin. Committee/RWMG Meetings

a. RWMG Meeting: October 28, 2015, Forest Service Supervisor's Office, Bishop