

Meeting Notes

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program Administrative Committee Meeting

Wednesday, October 12, 2011
9:00 - 11:00 am:
Conference call, with in-person options

Call-in option:
1-866-862-2138
passcode: 1678718

Action Items Summary:

- Irene Yamashita will provide an updated timeline to Valerie Klinefelter regarding the MCWD Urban Water Management Plan, and then Valerie will send on to Parker Thaler at DWR for his review.
- Admin. Committee and meeting participants will provide edits via email with respect to the fiscal agent budget, schedule, and work plan to Valerie Klinefelter by this Friday, October 14, 2011 or soon thereafter.
- Irene moves that the Admin. Committee make a recommendation to the Group that Central Sierra keep working on revisions to the Budget, Schedule, and Work Plan with DWR. However, it is understood that these items will come back to the Admin. Committee with more detail based on comments received. New working documents will be provided to the Admin. Committee for review prior to a recommendation for approval by the Group. Tony seconded the motion. All approved. *There is some disagreement among meeting participants of the literal interpretation of the above motion. See Page 5 of the notes for more details.
- The Fiscal Agent will incorporate suggested edits from participants and provide a more detailed budget, schedule and work plan to the Program Office for dissemination to the Admin. Committee for review prior to the next scheduled Admin. Committee meeting.
- Program Office will revise its work plan, budget, and schedule for the Implementation grant based on feedback received during the meeting.

Meeting Notes

- Irene Yamashita convenes the meeting 9:02am
*Note Central Sierra Resource Conservation & Development Council is currently serving as Fiscal Agent to the Implementation grant awarded to the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. In the notes below fiscal agent and Central Sierra are used interchangeably but are in fact one in the same.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person

- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&DC
- Mark Drew, CalTrout/Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office
- Valerie Klinefelter, Central Sierra RC&DC
- Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District
- Peter Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes

Attending via Phone

- Geoff McQuilkin, Mono Lake Committee
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office
- Parker Thaler, Department of Water Resources (until approximately 10:15)
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
- Larry Freilich, Inyo County Water Department
- Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
- Bob Dean, Central Sierra RC&DC
- Keith Pearce, Inyo County Public Works

2. Public Comment Period

- There were no public comments.

3. Implementation Fiscal Agent Status

a. General Check-in

- Mark Drew opens the meeting and recommends taking a look at the big picture of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan implementation in an effort to reevaluate where we are and what it is we are trying to accomplish. The goal of the meeting is to come up with a plan that will facilitate the Group moving forward. He continues that the IRWM Plan that was submitted in January of 2011 is the guiding document for the Group and all members need to remember to use it as a work plan. Additionally, it is noted that it is important

to keep in mind that all related efforts, including project implementation and the administration of the implementation grant, are part of the overall Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. It is incumbent upon us all to ensure we do our best to perform and implement the Plan. In Chapter 11 the Plan calls out Monitoring and Evaluation and at this point it is time to refer to that chapter of the Plan as we enter into the implementation of projects.

- There are several specific questions asked by the Fiscal Agent to Parker Thaler about specific workings of the Grant Agreement process.
- Mark redirects group and reminds them we want to cover today's agenda items and not get too wrapped up in specific details.
- Valerie Klinefelter explains she still does not have all the needed documentation from all Project Proponents but that she will be working with project proponents one-on-one in the coming month.
- Several project proponents give updates to Valerie on the status of their project materials.
- Specifically, the timeline for submittal of Mammoth Community Water District's (MCWD) revised Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) to DWR is discussed.
- **Irene Yamashita will provide an updated timeline to Valerie regarding the MCWD Urban Water Management Plan, and then Valerie will send on to Parker at DWR for his review.**
- Parker recounts the steps that will need to take place once DWR has all of the necessary documentation and speaks to a timeline associated with all of the combined steps. He reassures the Admin. Committee that DWR will do everything it can to prioritize the completion of the Grant Agreement.
- Questions arise from Project Proponents on whether or not financial statements need to be notarized when they have been generated by a county auditor. Ultimately it is concluded that notarization of those documents is not necessary when generated by County auditors.
- Hilltop project has already provided the required financial paperwork and will likely be the first of the Project Proponents to submit all necessary financial paperwork and it is discussed that this could be used as a learning tool for other Project Proponents.
- Mark suggests the fiscal agent develop a checklist for working on contracts, work plans, schedules, budgets, etc... since the paperwork is going to be quite voluminous. He then asks Parker for clarification on what DWR needs.
- Parker reiterates that DWR needs revised budget, schedule and work plans for all projects to be funded as well as the revised MCWD UWMP.
- Bruce Woodworth asks once they have the UWMP what the timeline will be to turn it around to finalize the grant agreement. Parker responds that one month is the estimated processing time for DWR.
- Parker explains how the DWR processing works between departments and the time involved for those processes to be completed.
- Dan Jenkins asks on updated schedule detail from Parker. Parker replies that timeline estimates are, start date, milestones and estimated completion date. Dan clarifies that the details go in the schedule vs. the work plan.

- Mark suggests viewing the schedule as a place to identify tasks, while the work plan is where subtasks can be described.
- Tony asks about the changes to the project list.
- Mark clarifies that DWR, in the Round 1 Implementation grant, needs to spend a certain amount of money on DAC projects. In the Inyo-Mono region, DWR only considered two of the submitted projects as DAC projects that address a critical water supply need. Further Mark explains there was an iterative process between the Program Office and DWR to decide which projects will be funded. The goal of the Program Office was to make a strong enough case to DWR that the top seven projects that were prioritized by the Group deserved funding. At present the issue has been reconciled and the initial seven projects will be funded as the Program Office was able to successfully make the argument that three of these projects serve critical water supply issues of DACs.

b. Update from fiscal agent

i. Budget, work plan schedule; possible recommendation to Group

- Tony Dublino asks for clarification regarding the Fiscal Agent schedule.
- Valerie explains the background of the Fiscal Agent schedule to the Admin. Committee.
- Several Admin. Committee members make recommendations for schedule revisions.
- Valerie suggests feedback be directed to her by email so as to not get bogged down in this meeting, then Central Sierra can finalize the documents.
- Tony would like to see budget broken down further among tasks.
- There was a discussion of detail by task vs. sub-task.
- The Program Office conveys that it has been helpful for internal workings to have budget and schedule by sub-task, but for DWR, to report by task.
- Valerie expresses her concern with the current timeline and reminds everyone that there are 35 days remaining and we need to move forward as efficiently as possible. She commits to working with Project Proponents to complete revised project materials in this 35-day period.
- Bruce asks if Central Sierra can only provide details of work plan, budget and schedule to the Admin Committee vs. bringing it all for review by the larger Regional Water Management Group.
- Mark brings the conversation back and asks for consideration of the process between Fiscal Agent and the RWMG. He would like clear direction from the Admin. Committee on which items need Group approval vs. Admin. Committee approval.
- Two parallel tracks: materials that need to get prepared and collated for DWR; and the process for the Group with respect to budget, Plan implementation, etc.
- Mark asks how the AC is feeling about making a recommendation to the group regarding the fiscal agent Budget, Schedule and Work Plan.
- Bruce reminds that 10% is the monetary amount already approved by the Group in the contract. Bruce argues that there should not be approval

needed about the details of the Fiscal Agent documents and that DWR will ensure there are no egregious charges. He continues by reminding the Admin. Committee how slow the process is, if we require Group approval of the edits to these documents.

- Holly Alpert explains the previous scrutiny we have undergone with CalTrout as the fiscal agent and believes the process should remain the same for Central Sierra.
- **The Fiscal Agent will incorporate suggested edits from participants and provide a more detailed budget, schedule and work plan to the Program Office for dissemination to the Admin. Committee for review prior to the next scheduled Admin. Committee meeting.**
- **Tony moves the Admin. Committee recommends to the Group to accept the work plan with the edits suggested in this meeting as well as the budget and work plan for the purposes of submitting these documents to DWR. Pete Bernasconi seconds the motion.**
- Mark argues that this motion may not be necessary because DWR will determine what is needed.
- Irene thinks there are too many edits still needed and does not feel comfortable recommending this to the Group before the edits are reviewed.
- Tony thinks the current detail is ample for DWR.
- Mark explains that DWR will have the final say as to the detail of the Budget, Schedule and Work Plan.
- **Admin. Committee and meeting participants will provide edits via email with respect to the fiscal agent budget, schedule, and work plan to Valerie by this Friday, October 14, 2011 or soon thereafter.**
- **Tony withdraws the above motion.**
- **Irene moves that the Admin. Committee make a recommendation to the Group that Central Sierra keep working on revisions to the Budget, Schedule, and Work Plan with DWR. However, it is understood that these items will come back to the Admin. Committee with more detail based on comments received. New working documents will be provided to the Admin. Committee for review prior to a recommendation for approval by the Group. Tony seconded the motion. All approved.**

* It has been requested to clarify in the notes that the Admin. Committee did not formally vote to require approval of Fiscal Agent Budget, Schedule and Work Plan by the RWMG. Several participants have differing opinions on the meaning of the above worded motion and the discussion will continue in a more focused working group.

- **A timeline for possible submittal of fiscal agent and Program Office materials and approval by the Group will be discussed at the Oct. 19 RWMG meeting.**

ii. Letter of Agreement; possible recommendation to Group

- Agenda item not addressed.

iii. Draft contract with project proponents

- There is a conversation about the draft contract between project proponents and Central Sierra.
- Valerie will send out a draft project proponent contract as soon as she gets it back from legal counsel.
- Irene communicates that she will be more comfortable submitting all paperwork for the MCWD project once a contract with Central Sierra is in place.

iv. Revised flow chart (discussion from 8/31 RWMG meeting)

- Agenda item not addressed.

v. Communications/transmittals between Central Sierra and DWR

- Mark suggests improving lines of communications between all parties.
- Valerie is committed to improving communication, especially as she starts working one-on-one with project proponents on project materials.
- Valerie wants all communications to go through her.
- Bruce would like Central Sierra's Implementation team and Mark and Holly cc'd on all Implementation specific email correspondence.
- Harvey argues that there needs to be specific feedback on each of the project materials at this point and has not gotten any specific feedback so far on his materials.
- Valerie agrees and says it is time to start working individually with project proponents.
- Keith Pearce asks if his questions for DWR were reworded in any way when submitted through Central Sierra. The answer is no, they were submitted verbatim.

vi. Other grant related updates

- Geoff McQuilkin speaks to integration and collaboration as a whole as a reflection of the success of the Program. In order to position the Inyo-Mono region for future funding success, this collaboration needs to continue.
- There is concern expressed by Valerie about the time that Central Sierra needs to invest in meetings with the Admin. Committee or Group and reminds them that she is also involved in numerous other programs. She asks at what frequency they will be required to meet.
- Mark refers to the MOU and responds that it specifies monthly meetings.
- Valerie suggest quarterly meeting with fiscal agent.
- Holly explains that Central Sierra is a member of the Group and the importance of following the Groups pre-established processes as defined in the MOU.
- Valerie brings up signage and explains the importance of continuity and compliance regarding signage of projects.
- Valerie will work with Irene on developing appropriate signage.
- Irene will provide a list of local sign companies as well as establishing appropriate media coverage.

- Valerie says Central Sierra is willing to cover the signage costs.
- c. Roles and responsibilities of fiscal agent, including specific roles of fiscal agent staff members
- Irene asks for clarification of roles and responsibilities from Central Sierra. She states a contract would provide the much needed clarification regarding roles and responsibilities of each staff member as well as the overall organization's role as Fiscal Agent.
 - Mark clarifies that Central Sierra's fundamental role is to provide clarity to the Project Proponents.
 - Valerie explains in general terms the roles and responsibilities of Central Sierra Staff. Bob Dean will have tasks as needed; Bruce will provide compliance; Valerie will be working on invoicing, narratives, contracts, reporting to satisfaction of DWR and the Group.
 - Irene expressed confusion about Bruce's role as ensuring "compliance" and asks for clarification on specifically what compliance means in this context.
- d. Roles and responsibilities of Program Office with respect to the Implementation grant
- Mark directs meeting participants to the work plan from the Program Office. He states that the Program Office role is to act as the overall liaison among all entities. Secondly, the Program Office is on point for communications to general public and Fiscal Agent.
 - Fiscal Agent is now in charge of Implementation and the Program Office is here now to support Project Proponents as needed.
 - Valerie asks to go through the complete Implementation Budget with Program Office to ensure all numbers match up. She also asks if Parker has seen the Program Office documents. She didn't see the link to Implementation in the work plan and suggests rewording the documents accordingly.
 - Role of Program Office is the Implementation of the larger IRWM Plan, which includes project implementation.
 - In addition, part of Program Office role is to make sure meeting agendas and materials are sent out on time to the Group. When Program Office asks for documents by a certain deadline, it's simply following Group protocols.
 - Tony comments in regards to the Program Office budget that all planning activities should be covered under Planning Grant funds and that money taken from the 3% should be specific to Implementation.
 - Mark explains to the Admin. Committee that another role of the Program Office is to ensure the approved Group process is being followed. This includes dissemination of agendas and associated meeting materials in a timely manner so that participants have ample time to appropriately discuss and decide upon these documents prior to schedule meetings.

The Agenda items below were not covered due to a shortage of time.

- e. Expectations from project proponents, Administrative Committee, and Program Office of fiscal agent
- f. Discussion of how fiscal agent serves the RWMG and the implementation of the IRWM Plan

4. Implementation Grant

- a. Recommendation to Group regarding Program Office budget, schedule and work plan
- b. Status of items contained in DWR Commitment Letter schedule and material needed from project proponents
- c. Status of DAC Implementation projects

Meeting Process Check – Prioritize agenda items based on time remaining

5. Planning Grant

- a. Reimbursement Report to DWR
- b. Program Office reporting on budget

6. Status of MCWD Urban Water Management Plan

- The status of this plan was discussed in the General Check-in portion of the meeting notes.

7. Review of action items from the meeting

- Holly reviews action items from the meeting.

Meeting adjourned 11:07am