

## **Final Meeting Notes** **Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group** **Regular Meeting**

**Wednesday, July 27, 2011**

**9:00am -12:00 pm \* (note change in regular meeting time)**

**Interagency Conference Room**

**351 Pacu Lane**

**Bishop, CA**

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

### Decision Items Summary

- Morgan Lindsay moves that the Needs Assessment disclosure document is approved as is, **pending suggestions by interested entities that will be provided to the Program Office within 7 days (Due Wednesday, August 3, 2011)** Then Dustin will be able to commence soliciting Needs Assessments interest and we can agendaize the document as a decision item at next month's meeting. Rick Kattelman Seconds the motion. All Approved.

### Action Items Summary

- The **Program Office** will send out the handout entitled "Thoughts for meeting engagement and participation" with the notes.
- A briefing paper was passed out at the meeting summarizing the current status of USFS Watershed Condition Framework. The **Program Office** will send this out with the Notes
- **Todd Ellsworth** (USFS) will contact Bob Harrington to coordinate a meeting detailing the Watershed Condition Framework project with the Inyo County Board of Supervisors.
- **Program Office** can circulate any announcements regarding the Watershed Condition Framework to their mailing list. (Open house, field trips, etc...)
- Program Office requests **Project Proponents to update them, in writing, on revisions to Project Budget, Work Plan and/or Schedule by Friday, August 12th**. Project Proponents; please use October 15, 2011, as new hypothetical start date. Holly and Mark will be out of town so please send updates to Janet.
- Mark Drew recommends, on behalf of the Program Office, for the **Group to take 10% for fiscal agent off the top and set it aside for Grant Administration**, and from the remaining funds the Group can decide on which projects get funded by working down the already agreed upon list.
- The **Program Office** will provide Dustin Hardwick (CRWA) with the MOU signatory list.
- **Program Office** will give Dustin a list of MOU signatories; Dustin will then evaluate which water entities that qualify for the Technical, Managerial and Financial (TMF) Needs Assessments according to his prioritization list. Also, parties in the Region interested in having Needs Assessments may contact the Program Office to express their interest. At that point Dustin will give a recommended list to the Program Office for future Group distribution, and contact the entities to see if they are interested. He will then research backgrounds on these entities regarding compliance and previous needs assessment efforts. The remainder of TMF needs assessments will fall to the discretion of CRWA. Bruce Woodworth motions, that throughout this process recognition that members and non-members alike are eligible to benefit from needs assessments. Darla

Heil seconds the motion. All approved. **Interest statements should be sent to [janet@inyomonowater.org](mailto:janet@inyomonowater.org) by August 8, 2011.**

Call-in locations:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Inyo County Water Department<br>135 South Jackson St.<br>Independence, CA 93514                             | 824 Burcham Flat Rd.<br>Coleville, CA 96107                               |
| 2. Mono County Environmental Health<br>Department Office<br>437 Old Mammoth Road #Q<br>Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 | 5. Malcolm Clark Residence<br>637 John Muir Rd<br>Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 |
| 3. Holly Gallagher's Residence<br>34264 Camino Capistrano #212<br>Capistrano Beach, CA 92624                   | 6. Ceal Klingler Residence<br>940 Starlite Drive<br>Bishop, CA 93514      |
| 4. Bruce Woodworth's Residence   | 7. Leroy Corlett Residence<br>1217 N. Inyo St.<br>Ridgecrest, CA 93555    |

**FINAL AGENDA**

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**  
Introduction of new Chair and Vice-Chair of Admin. Committee
- 2. Public Comment period**
- 3. Discussion of Inyo National Forest watershed condition assessment**  
Led by Todd Ellsworth, INF
- 4. Implementation Grant Update**
  - Communications with elected state representatives
  - Update from DWR on final recommendations
  - Updates from project proponents
  - Fiscal Agent
- 5. Planning Grant**
  - California Rural Water Association needs assessment criteria**
    - Review of Admin. Committee meeting discussion
    - Recommendation from Admin. Committee

**Decision Item: Approval of Admin Committee recommended selection criteria for needs assessments.** \*Note: Preliminary eligibility requires applicants to meet the standard definition of a small water system as provided by the State of California. (Serving fewer than 3,300 persons and having a minimum of 15 connections)  
[Small Water System official definition](#)

Tier 1 Filter: First 15 assessments go to Members, as selected by the Group. The remaining 5 assessments go to non-members (at least 1 being in each of the represented counties within the I-M IRWMP region) as chosen by CRWA. After selections are made, needs assessments shall commence, contingent upon the signing of the "Recommendation for Needs Assessment Information to be Shared" document generated by the Program Office.

Tier 2 Filter: Among the 15 Members, priority will be given to entities who are both a Tribe and DAC (highest priority); Tribe or DAC, (second priority); or simply a Member, (third priority). Within each category, each entity receives a higher priority ranking if public health/drinking water standards are out of compliance.

iii. Next steps

**b. Re-visitation of Strategic Goal Areas, Objectives and Resource Management Strategies for phase II planning.**

- i. Review of Round 1 goals/objectives/strategies (g/o/s)
- ii. Analysis: Evaluation of relationship between current projects and phase 1 objectives.
- iii. Next steps, including plan for outreach meetings in August

**c. Planning Grant Updates**

- i. Planning documents analysis
- ii. Website
- iii. Match forms
- iv. Organizational structure

**6. General Updates**

- i. Status report, Revised #1 MOU: Report on opposition to September 1, 2011 as effective date and MOU current signatories.
- ii. DAC funding meeting in Rancho Cucamonga
- iii. DAC Grant
- iv. Water Plan

**7. Announcements**

**8. Process Check**

**9. Approval of 6/15/2011 RWMG meeting notes**

Discuss comments, edits, and corrections

\* **DECISION ITEM: Approve June 15, 2011, RWMG meeting notes**

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

**11. Next meeting dates:**

\* Wednesday, August 31, 2011

\* Wednesday, September 28, 2011

- Irene convenes meeting 9:09am
- **Introduction of new Chair and Vice-Chair of Admin. Committee**  
Irene Yamashita of Mammoth Community Water District will serve as Chair, BryAnna Vaughan, of the Bishop Paiute Tribe, as Vice Chair.

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

### Attending in Person

- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- Holly Gallagher, Birchim CSD
- Todd Ellsworth, Inyo N.F
- Dustin Hardwick, California Rural Water Association
- Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe
- Rick Kattelmann, Eastern Sierra Land Trust
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Mark Drew, California Trout, I-M IRWMP
- Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
- Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee
- Susan Joyce, Inyo National Forest
- Alex Henson, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation
- Joy Fatooh, Bishop BLM
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County
- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes

### Attending Via Phone

- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD, Mono County RCD
- Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
- Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Keith Pearce, Inyo County
- Jen Wong, DWR

- Mark reminds the Group of the importance of professional communication and respectful conduct and that after working together for a number of years it's important to keep that in mind while interacting with one another.
- **The Program Office will send out the handout entitled "Thoughts for meeting engagement and participation" with the notes.**

## 2. Public Comment period

- No comments

## 3. Discussion of Inyo National Forest watershed condition assessment

Led by Todd Ellsworth, INF

- **A briefing paper was passed out at the meeting summarizing the current status of USFS Watershed Condition Framework. The Program Office will also send it out with the Notes**
- The Inyo National Forests (INF) has completed Watershed Condition Assessments (Step A).
- Most watersheds (92 out of 125) in the Region have been classified into Condition Class 1 (Functioning Properly or Good) which was an expected outcome.
- 33 Watersheds were classified as Class 2 (Fair or At Risk)
- 0 were categorized at Class 3 (Poor or Impaired)
- Each National Forest is tasked with identifying two priority watersheds within the management area and to develop Action Plans for each by the end of the Fiscal Year.
- Oak Creek, in Inyo County and Deadman Creek, in Mono County have been selected for the INF.
- Irene asks if results of the Watershed Assessments are available to the Group. Susan Joyce assured the Group that they would pass on the URL where Assessment data are available for the Group to view.
- Susan and Todd explained the attributes given at the National level, and the challenges they faced at the Regional Level
- The Inyo National Forest evaluated those 33 watersheds in Condition Class 2, and looked to what type of management actions or cooperation could benefit these areas
- The USFS will focus on Oak Creek and Deadman Creek for this fiscal year. Watershed Restoration Action Plans will identify treatments and actions to help improve condition in these watersheds.
- USFS is looking for recommendations of companion projects that will assist in focusing on these watersheds. Todd encourages an all-lands approach and looking at the projects in the long term.
- The USFS will host open-house public meetings to encourage participation on these projects. Meetings will be held in Bishop and Mammoth Lakes and will be announced in future emails through the Program Office as well as through press releases from INF.
- The Forest Service is currently working with Fort Independence Tribe on the Oak Creek project and Friends of the Inyo on the Deadman Creek Project.
- Field Trips will be hosted to provide project details to interested parties with the aim being to host small trips with focused interest groups. The Program Office will help disseminate this information when it becomes available.
- Per the National Mandate, Watershed Restoration Action Plans are due for these Watersheds by September 30<sup>th</sup>, and will address actions implemented over a 5-year period.
- Bob Harrington asks for a briefing from the USFS to the Inyo County Board of Supervisors, and he reminds Todd to be sure to include DWP as they have diversion infrastructure in the Oak Creek Area.
- **Todd will contact Bob to coordinate a meeting detailing the Watershed Condition Framework project with the Inyo County Board of Supervisors.**
- Todd assures all interested parties are being engaged.
- Mark asks Tony if Mono County would be interested in a similar presentation to the Mono County Board. Tony says he'll pass the info along and see what reaction he receives.

- Todd encourages thoughts on the handout and encourages people to contact him or Susan with comments and questions. He continues to remind the Group of the importance of the timeframe and to remember this is a 5-year process, and that they are looking at landscape-level projects that can produce real change.
- **Program Office can circulate any announcements regarding the Watershed Condition Framework to their mailing list. (Open house, field trips, etc...)**
- Mark asks if the USFS will have funding to support recommended actions. Todd replies that they do.
- The USFS sees this as an opportunity to collaborate with Tribes and IRWMP at both the planning and project levels.

#### 4. Implementation Grant Update

- Mark recaps the Initial Funding recommendations; 17 letters were provided by the Inyo-Mono Region out of 75 letters total submitted to DWR.
- a. Communications with elected state representatives
- Team of IRWMP players hosted a phone conference with Senator Ted Gaines' staff. As a result, Senator Gaines' office drafted a letter that was forwarded on to DWR regarding our Region's Initial Funding Recommendations.
  - Mark spoke directly with Senator Fuller's Office; he is not certain what actions resulted from that conversation.
- b. Update from DWR on final recommendations
- Mark encourages Group to be optimistic regarding final recommendations
  - He tells Group to expect less than the initial request but a minimum of \$1 million is likely as the development of a Grant Agreement of less than that amount is likely too laborious for DWR to complete.
  - Holly A. projects the project list and Mark details what projects would receive funding based on several different scenarios, including 7.5% in administrative costs. At one million dollars 4-5 projects could be funded.
  - Final recommendations are expected within the next two weeks.
  - Mark reminds Group of the process; 1) An email will be circulated notifying awards posted to the DWR website, 2) DWR will draft commitment letters, 3) Grant Agreement with fiscal agent.
  - Commitment letters will likely be drafted within one month from the award announcements; other time frames will be similar to the Planning Grant.
  - Mark reiterates that **Project Proponents need to consider if they are able to meet their match requirements**, and to consider scheduling adjustments, and revised work plans and Budgets if applicable. He reminds the Group that this request will be under a 15-30 day time requirement as specified by DWR, so quick reaction from the Project Proponent is paramount.
  - Irene asks about scheduling around winter months when work is not feasible. Many others ask similar questions regarding schedule revisions.
  - Mark clarifies that a revised schedule from Project Proponents will need to be updated to reflect the delay in funding, if received. Also if winter weather will hamper implementation efforts, that too will need to be realized in the updated schedule.
  - **Program Office requests Project Proponents to update them, in writing, on revisions to Project Budget, Work Plan and/or Schedule by Friday, August**

**12th. Project Proponents; please use October 15, 2011, as new hypothetical start date. Please send updates to Program Staff; Mark, Holly & Janet.**

- Mark emphasizes that we don't want to get caught in a time predicament when DWR makes their final recommendations, and that it will be likely that only 15-30 days are given to respond with our revisions.
- Jen Wong explains the Program Office and DWR will have to work together on a revised schedule and Work Plan with expected Project Start dates of October 15 instead of the previously thought June.
- Keith asks when spending on projects can commence. Mark replies that once the Final notification is given, a project proponent is able to start spending. However, he further explained that any work done before the Grant Agreement is signed is not necessarily guaranteed to be reimbursed by DWR, and that guaranteed reimbursement is contingent upon the signing of the Grant Agreement. If Project Proponents wish to begin Projects earlier, they assume the risk of reimbursement delays and/or default.
- Keith asks if the project changes from the project level to a feasibility study instead, is that going to be acceptable to DWR.
- Jen Wong said she will look into that and will communicate an answer back to the Group.
- Mark thinks this is a decision for the Group if a project changes dramatically in scope, he continues that it will be up to the Group to decide how the awards are distributed down the list.
- There was some discussion about discomfort in providing money to projects that have been re-conceptualized from the original proposed project.
- Holly G. asks Mark to define the terminology used, when DWR notifies us of final award monies. Mark responds, "Final Notification" is the term used when the final recommendation is announced. He further explains that a commitment letter is an interim step in the process, indicating the intention to draft a Grant Agreement. The final step in the process is the Grant Agreement.
- Holly G. also wants clarification of when spending can commence. The answer given is after Final Notification of grant awards are announced, that commences the official beginning upon which funds may be reimbursed by DWR, technically speaking.
- Jen Wong of DWR confirms that information.
- Mark adds that when the Program Office re-submits the revisions to DWR, we will also need to include an administrative budget from the fiscal agent.
- Mark has asked Central Sierra RC&D to be prepared to notify the Group regarding administrative budget details and projected costs to be included in the Program Office revised budget, schedule and work plan that will be submitted to DWR. Mark asks DWR to provide greater detail of fiscal agent budgeting requirements as soon as they are made available to assist Central Sierra RC&D in their planning efforts, as a detailed budget plan will be essential to the Group to assist in their future decision-making processes regarding project implementation.

**c. Updates from project proponents**

- Holly A. updates the Group that the Program Office has heard back from the top 10 Project Proponents.
- Project 2, Coleville School (\$620,000): Dan Jenkins is pursuing additional funding sources and feels like they can provide a lesser ask than the initial ask.

They are re-evaluating their needs so that other projects may receive funding that would otherwise be left out.

- MCWD is willing to cut their funding ask in half, if that can be of help to the rest of the group (\$200,000 initial ask, approximately \$100,000 could be made available for other projects).
- Inyo County has offered to phase their projects if it comes down to that. Keith says that he has been in communication with Paul Hancock of Inyo County, and there are options for restructuring the CSA-2 project into phases although the overall budget may not change much.
- Indian Wells Valley could not budget their match requirement, which makes their project not feasible for this fiscal year. That frees up approx. \$217,000.

#### d. Fiscal Agent

- Fiscal Agent will need to provide revised budget to DWR that is approved by the Group under the timeline provided by DWR. (Estimated 15-30 days after Final Notification.)
- Mark asks the Group if the overall revised Implementation budget will need to be approved by the Group or the Admin. Committee. If so, we need to address stringent timeline parameters in order to be prepared with a timely response to DWR.
- Irene asks if we have heard back from Central Sierra, and that we have asked several times for a sample budget.
- Bruce responds that the budget will be highly dependent on the award amount, and until an award announcement is made they will not have specifics to share with the Group. Bruce further states that because the contract details with the State will determine the extent of Fiscal Agent efforts, (this will not be done until after the Implementation money is granted) the RWMG will be best served by assuming that the not-to-exceed 10% agreed upon contract is the best estimate that can be made.
- Mark tells group that he communicated with Valerie of Central Sierra RC&D yesterday via email and provided her with two scenarios around which hypothetical budgets can be considered. He also provided her with the Project Proponent spreadsheet including initial ask amounts (as projected in meeting) in order to assist Central Sierra in their planning efforts. Mark reminds Bruce that those budgets will need to be approved and submitted to DWR by the end of August, which is a tight timeline.
- Rick Kattelmann suggests that the Group give authority to the AC to approve a revised budget in the case that time becomes critical to meeting the associated deadlines.
- Bob feels comfortable without having to officially approve a revised budget and adds that as long as we are not deviating significantly from the agreed-upon processes, the Inyo County BOS should not have issues with this.
- Tony agrees that as long as the process is within the confines of the MOU, they he doesn't foresee any problems with Mono County BOS.
- Holly G. points out that because the revised budget is only considering downsizing of all projects that it's not necessarily needed to re-approve the project list.
- Tony brings up that some projects may change from implementation project to a feasibility study but that they were ranked originally by their initial work plans. He

feels that to change those plans substantially would necessitate re-consideration by the Group.

- Mark re-emphasizes that feedback from Project Proponents is essential on any changes they anticipate. Specifically, whether or not the project is simply downsizing by completing only one or two phases of the total project or if their proposed revision changes the project scope altogether.
- Pete Bernasconi and Harvey provide clarification on what they consider to be components of a feasibility study.
- Harvey brings up that the Group approved the list already, so he doesn't see need in readdressing the same list. The projects were voted on and as long as they remain in order and only downsize in budgeted asks without changes in the actual project fundamentals, the list should still be valid.
- **The general feeling of the Group is that unless major changes occur in the fundamental scope of the project, the standing list of projects with their revised budgets should not need to be re-approved. A formal vote was not taken.**
- Several members recommend decision item placeholders on next month's agenda in case a project's revisions or changes in the overall project ranking list need to be decided on by the Group.
- Mark brings up that the only unknown in the equation remains the percentage of funds set aside for grant administration by the Fiscal Agent.
- Holly A. asks group if we need a placeholder on the Agenda next month to approve Fiscal Agent budget as well.
- Harvey asks if we can get an administrative cost percentage from the Fiscal Agent within two weeks of hearing the Final Notification.
- **Mark recommends, on behalf of the Program Office, for the Group to take 10% for the fiscal agent off the top and set it aside for Grant Administration, and from the remaining funds the Group can decide on which projects get funded by working down the ranking list.**
- Bob realizes that the percentage of administrative fees from Central Sierra RC&D is highly dependent upon the number of contracts managed, but asks if Central Sierra has an idea about costs incurred per contract?
- Bruce reiterates that is very difficult to estimate costs, due to all the uncertainties involved. He reiterates again that DWR will have to approve costs.
- Holly A. asks if the fiscal agent will have to present a line item budget to DWR for the administration of the Grant, similar to what the Program Office/California Trout has presented to DWR for the Planning Grant administration.
- Jen is unclear at this time what the requirements will be but will pass them on when they become available.
- Bruce brings up the issue of fundamentals changes in projects; if these materialize, he thinks they should be agenized and potentially re-ranked by the revised project by the Group.
- Harvey advises that we never will have time to reapprove the list. He recommends if you want to make significant changes in your project you get moved to the bottom of the list.
- **Mark recaps the sentiment of the Group being that if the project is simply phased, without changing the fundamental scope of the project, re-approval is probably not needed. Therefore changing the scope of your project is not advisable, but instead consideration of a phasing strategy is recommended.**

## 5. Planning Grant

- Mark informs Group that we are getting very close to signing the Planning Grant Agreement with DWR and that the Program Office is on schedule for completion of tasks as specified in the schedule. As soon as the Program Office receives the signed Grant Agreement, we will be providing an update report to the Group on current status and budget.

### a. California Rural Water Association needs assessment criteria

- Mark recaps that the Group approved 20 needs assessments in the Planning Grant.
  - i. **Review of Admin. Committee meeting discussion**
    - Mark explains the rationale behind the recommendations provided by the Admin. Committee below as discussed in the Admin. Committee meeting.
  - ii. **Recommendation from Admin. Committee**

**Decision Item: Approval of Admin Committee recommended selection criteria for needs assessments.** \*Note: Preliminary eligibility requires applicants to meet the standard definition of a small water system as provided by the State of California. (Serving fewer than 3,300 persons and having a minimum of 15 connections)  
[Small Water System official definition](#)

Tier 1 Filter: First 15 assessments go to Members, as selected by the Group. The remaining 5 assessments go to non-members (at least 1 being in each of the represented counties within the I-M IRWMP region) as chosen by CRWA. After selections are made, needs assessments shall commence, contingent upon the signing of the “Recommendation for Needs Assessment Information to be Shared” document generated by the Program Office.

Tier 2 Filter: Among the 15 Members, priority will be given to entities who are both a Tribe and DAC (highest priority); Tribe or DAC, (second priority); or simply a Member, (third priority). Within each category, each entity receives a higher priority ranking if public health/drinking water standards are out of compliance.

- Irene asks for Dustin to explain how CRWA selections will be made.
- Dustin describes the prioritization processes as provided by CRWA.
- Bob asks for clarification why CRWA is not prioritizing all 20 assessments, as CRWA expertise far exceeds that within the Group.
- Dustin says that we wanted to be sure to capture the IRWMP focus in this first round of assessments.
- Darla reminds Group that it’s likely that the Group will not fill the 15 reserved slots for members.
- Holly A. projects list of IRWMP entities that would be eligible based on the current criteria. There are 14 possibilities on that list, including sponsorship of some water systems that are not specifically members but have representation

through a “parent” member (i.e. Amargosa Conservancy representing the town of Tecopa).

- Bob does not agree that membership should be weighted as a qualification to receive needs assessments, and instead any small water system in need within Inyo and Mono counties should be eligible.
- Harvey would like to see water quality emphasized more in the criteria, and thinks saving 15 spots for members may be too many.
- Joy agrees that human health priorities should take precedence, regardless of membership status.
- Dustin adds that the Needs Assessments are also to help identify which entities are interested in pursuing IRWMP-specific funding and to bring back meaningful projects to the Group as a whole. He reminds the Group that there are significant time investments in implementing technical/managerial/financial (TMF) recommendations and that some entities simply may not be able to sustain a project once initiated.
- Dustin reminds Group that this is the initial contact and that continued support will likely continue with these systems from various other programs as identified by CRWA. He reminds the Group of the great needs of Small Water Systems due to lack of hiring capacity of specialists.
- Darla thinks the Program Office should solicit applications to see where the interest lies. This would be the first indicator of how willing entities are to do the work required.
- Irene asks why this was included under the Planning Grant.
- Mark replies that this was to be used to generate project needs within the Region and to help the Group further examine the efficacy of its goals, objectives, and strategies.
- Dustin reminds that emphasizing membership gives an indication of which groups are going to commit the necessary time in order to fully utilize the support provided, as a significant time commitment is required for a successful outcome.
- Tony asks: if we approve criteria now, are we going to have to have another decision next month to approve the entities selected for these assessments?
- Mark emphasizes we are trying to approve a “process” that is acceptable to the Group and that we would rather not have to approve a list at a later date.
- Tony asks for information on needs assessments - will this help systems qualify for other funding sources?
- Dustin refers to the documents circulated in the email with the Agenda. And replies yes, that other State funding opportunities will become available by completing a CRWA Needs Assessments.
- Harvey asks which criteria you have to fulfill in order to complete a Needs Assessment.
- Dustin explains the mandatory criteria and refers to the document circulated in the RWMG emails. He also has a sample TMF for Group members to see after the meeting. He explains that once TMF is completed, the results are submitted to the California Department of Public Health and that qualifications for additional funding are based on these results.
- Bob thinks that whether or not a group has had a TMF Needs Assessment should be the first question in the filter, and that we should prioritize assessments for systems that have not yet received this assistance.
- Dustin reminds the Group that the question of whether or not a TMF has been done is already in the CRWA Initial Contact form.

- Dustin has a list of every entity within Inyo and Mono Counties that has completed a TMF. Both Inyo and Mono Counties have done some TMF work.
- Morgan asks for clarification on what actual needs assessments will look like.
- Dustin replies 2-3 hours will be spent on-site followed by email communication support. It is left up to the water system to complete the required TMF documents, using templates provided by CRWA
- Dustin does acknowledge it is difficult to predict which system will follow through with the recommendations given by CRWA.
- Harvey voices concern regarding giving needs assessments to entities not capable of following the process through to completion.
- Mark recaps: the Program Office will solicit applications for needs assessments within the Group membership. If only 5 come up, the remainder will be left for CRWA to decide and reminds the Group that 20 additional assessments will become available through the DAC grant.
- Bob suggests Dustin gets info on what TMF needs assessments have been done already within the Region, then address water quality and health safety standards secondarily, followed by DAC status, and with those criteria come up with a suggested list for the Group.
- Mark asks then if membership will play into the filter at all.
- Bob thinks priority needs to go to entities out of compliance, and that membership is secondary.
- Morgan argues that if membership is given some priority it may be incentive for some entities, who are not DACs, to become more involved.
- Tony doesn't see why DACs are getting preference under the Planning Grant when the DAC grant will provide 20 additional assessments.
- Tony asks if applications are being accepted currently for entities interested in needs assessments.
- Mark replies that the Program Office has been asking for interest for several months now, please send information to Janet regarding new interest.
- **Motion for Action Item: Program Office will give Dustin a list of MOU signatories; Dustin will then evaluate which water entities prove most eligible for the TMF Needs Assessments according to his prioritization list. At that point he will give a recommended list to the Program Office and CRWA will contact the entities to see if they are interested. Dustin will then research backgrounds on these entities regarding compliance and previous needs assessment efforts. The remainder of TMF needs assessments will fall to the discretion of CRWA. Bruce motions that throughout this process, recognition of the importance of members and non-members alike is needed in deciding which groups would benefit from needs assessments. Darla seconds the motion. All approved. Interest statements should be sent to [janet@inyomonowater.org](mailto:janet@inyomonowater.org) by August 8, 2011.**
- Mark recaps information from Needs Assessments to be shared with the Group.
- Holly A. projects TMF Outline and Program Office recommendations for disclosure information to be shared with the Group.
- Pete thinks that meter information should be disclosed to the Group. Dustin adds that baseline monitoring does address metering but the Group needs to decide whether it's shared or not.
- Mark adds that we would not be asking for amounts of water but simply whether or not metering is in place.

- Rick clarifies that the point of the agreement document is to inform the participant what information will be shared or kept confidential among the outputs generated by the needs assessments.
- Bob confirms that compliance information should be kept confidential.
- Mark specifies that the Program Office focus was on information to be shared and that all other outputs generated are fine to be kept confidential.
- Dustin emphasizes that we need to finalize this disclosure document prior to the needs assessments initiation, and that participants are going to want to know in advance what information is going to be shared among the larger Group. He emphasizes how sensitive these issues are and encourages the Group to clearly identify disclosure information.
- Dustin asks if he should work with the Program Office to identify which elements will be valuable to the Group and need to be shared with them.
- Confidentiality information was discussed among the Group.
- Harvey advocates general statistics that are helpful to the Group yet remain anonymous in an effort to maintain confidentiality. Perhaps splitting the data into specific and general categories.
- Mark emphasizes this information should be aggregated to provide valuable summary information to the Group.
- Mark asks if the Group is OK with the document or not.
- **Morgan moves that the document is approved as is, pending suggestions by interested entities that will be provided to the Program Office within 7 days (Due Wednesday, August 3, 2011) Then Dustin will be able to commence soliciting Needs Assessments interest and we can agendize the document as a decision item at next month's meeting.**
- **Rick Kattelmann Seconds the motion. All Approved.**
- Meeting adjourned by Irene: 12:01pm.

**\*\*\*The remaining agenda items were not covered in this meeting as a result of time constraints.**

~~~~~`

iii. Next steps

**b. Re-visitation of Strategic Goal Areas, Objectives and Resource Management Strategies for phase II planning.**

- i. Review of Round 1 goals/objectives/strategies (g/o/s)
- ii. Analysis: Evaluation of relationship between current projects and phase 1 objectives.
- iii. Next steps, including plan for outreach meetings in August

**c. Planning Grant Updates**

- i. Planning documents analysis
- ii. Website
- iii. Match forms
- iv. Organizational structure

**7. General Updates**

- i. Status report, Revised #1 MOU: Report on opposition to September 1, 2011 as effective date and MOU current signatories.

- ii. DAC funding meeting in Rancho Cucamonga
- iii. DAC Grant
- iv. Water Plan

**12. Announcements**

**13. Process Check**

**14. Approval of 6/15/2011 RWMG meeting notes**

Discuss comments, edits, and corrections

\* **DECISION ITEM: Approve June 15, 2011, RWMG meeting notes**

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

**16. Next meeting dates:**

\* Wednesday, August 31, 2011, Mammoth Community Water District

\* Wednesday, September 28, 2011, Fort Independence Tribe