

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

Wednesday, November 16, 2011
9:30 am - 12:30 pm
Lee Vining Community Center
296 Mattly Ave.
Lee Vining, CA

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

Decision Items:

- 1. Approve newly appointed Admin. Committee members to serve January, 2012 – December, 2013.**
 - Bruce Woodworth moves to nominate Leroy Corlett, Irene Yamashita, and Darla Heil as new Admin. Committee members. The new members shall take the place of the departing members for the January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013 term. Pete Bernasconi seconds the motion. All approved.
- 2. Approval of California Trout as Round 2 Planning Grant fiscal agent**
 - Leroy moves to approve that California Trout as Fiscal Agent for the Round 2 Planning Grant. Morgan seconds the motion. All approved.
- 3. Approval of Program Office Implementation Budget, Schedule and Workplan.**
 - Irene Yamashita moves to approve the Program Budget, Schedule and Workplan as revised. Darla Heil seconds the motion. All approved.
- 4. Approve August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes**
- 5. Approve October 19, 2011, RWMG meeting notes.**
 - Bruce moves to approve meeting notes from August 31 and October 19 as provided. Irene seconds the motion. All approved.

Action Items:

1. The Program Office will be in communication regarding the next Admin. Committee meeting at which the Admin. Committee will discuss the new nominations for Chair and Vice Chair.
2. Darla informs Holly that she has a new contact for the Program Office for the Benton Paiute Tribe who now has a working environmental department and will provide the information to Holly along with the 2010 Census data link.
3. Match forms are due to the Program Office by November 30, 2011. Janet will send the direct link to the current match form on the website out with the notes.
4. The Program Office will formally agendize Organizational Structure at the January RWMG meeting.
5. The Program office will post the handout pertinent to Goals/Objectives and RMS revision process to the website.
6. An initial discussion will ensue next week among the Goals, Objectives and RMS (GO-RMS) Working Committee to gain initial thoughts on Goals/Objectives/RMS survey development.
7. Holly will send Austin all input received relevant to the Project Prioritization revision process this week.
8. A discussion on revisiting the Implementation project prioritization process will be agendized for the January RWMG meeting.
9. The Program Office will post Outreach summary documents to the website by November 18 for the Group to review.

10. The Program Office will reach out to other Round 2 Planning Grant project proponents to continue to build on the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Working Committee (R2PE) with the goal being to have the working committee assembled by November 23, 2011.
11. Bruce will assemble an agenda for the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Working Committee (R2PE) and coordinate the initial meeting.
12. The Program Office will send out Project Matrix they have compiled to the R2PE Work Committee within a week.
13. The Program Office will provide a general list of Round 2 Planning Grant Projects for the Group to review.
14. Irene will contact Valerie regarding the Group approval of Central Sierra's Budget, Schedule, and Workplan.
15. The Program Office will send the link to the DWR Process Improvement Workshops for the Group to participate if they would like.
16. Additionally the Program Office will provide the letter drafted in January regarding the comments to the Implementation PSP process to the website for members of the Group to use as a reference.

FINAL AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

- a. Administrative Committee Term Status and recruitment of new Admin.Committee members.

DECISION ITEM:

1. Approve newly appointed Admin. Committee members to serve January, 2012 – December, 2013.

2. Public Comment period

3. DAC Grant

- a. Status Update
- b. New Outreach Specialist
- c. Overview of work plan and early tasks

4. Round 1 Planning Grant

- a. Report on Planning Grant first reporting and invoicing period
- b. Planning Grant task updates
 - i. Needs Assessments and CRWA Workshops
 - ii. CEQA Workshops
 - iii. Outreach
 - iv. Planning documents analysis
 - v. Website
 - vi. Match forms
 - vii. Organizational structure
- c. Work plan for revisiting Phase I Goals, Objectives, and Resource Management Strategies
 - i. Update on recently-completed outreach/memo
 - ii. Proposed process timeline for updating Goals, Objectives, Resource Management Strategies, including schedule for Work Group
 - iii. Next steps

5. Round 2 Planning Grant

- a. Summary of timeline of events.
- b. Status report on viable Round 2 Projects
- c. Project ranking vs. narrative description
- d. Recruitment for Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Working Committee
- e. Next Steps/proposed schedule

DECISION ITEM:

- 1. Approval of California Trout as Round 2 Planning Grant fiscal agent

6. Implementation Grant Update

- a. Letter of Agreement/Contract with the RWMG
 - i. Additional documentation defining services to be provided by Fiscal Agent
- b. Update from M7 Working Committee
- c. Update from fiscal agent
 - i. Status Report: DWR report submission
 - ii. Budget/Schedule/Workplan review
 - iii. Next steps
- d. Update from Program Office
 - i. Revised Budget/Schedule/Workplan

DECISION ITEM:

- 1. Approval of Program Office Implementation Budget, Schedule and Workplan.

7. General Updates

- a. Update from Water Plan Plenary

8. Announcements

9. Process Check

10. Review August 31, 2011 and October 19, RWMG meeting notes

DECISION ITEM:

- 1. Approve August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes
- 2. Approve October 19, 2011, RWMG meeting notes.

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

12. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Admin. Committee meeting: early January
- b. Next RWMG meeting:
 - Wednesday, January 25, 2012
 - Wednesday, February 22, 2012
 - Wednesday, April 25, 2012
 - Wednesday, May 23, 2012

- Irene Yamashita convenes the meeting at 9:35 a.m.
- There was a discussion about lack of quorum and what that means in regards to the business being conducted at today's meeting.
- Those in attendance agree that we can continue with the agenda but will need to skip over decision items unless a quorum is obtained.
- The order of the agenda was adjusted significantly to allow business to proceed until minimum quorum numbers were reached. However for clarity reasons the agenda was left intact for note recording purposes.
- At the request of Bruce Woodworth, a break was taken approximately 45 minutes into the meeting to contact MOU signatories that sent positive RSVPs and were not in attendance in order to achieve minimum quorum requirements.
- Once the meeting was reconvened, a quorum was achieved and business proceeded as agendized.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person (Bold indicates MOU signatory)

- **Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee**
- **Pete Bernasconi, Town of Mammoth Lakes**
- **Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&DC, Mono County RCD**
- **Mark Drew, California Trout, Inyo-Mono IRWMP**
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
- **Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District**
- **Dan Jenkins, Eastern Sierra Unified School District**
- **Hal Curti, Mono County RCD**

Attending on the Phone (Bold indicates MOU Signatory)

- **Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission**
- **Larry Freilich, Inyo County**
- **Ceal Klingler, Owens Valley Committee**
- **Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District, Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group**
- **Brian Adkins, Bishop Paiute Tribe**
- Jen Wong, Department of Water Resources
- **Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe**
- Dustin Hardwick, California Rural Water
- Nate Reade, Inyo Department of Agriculture.
- **Malcom Clark, Sierra Club**

a. **Administrative Committee Term Status and recruitment of new Admin.Committee members.**

- Mark Drew reviews the current Admin. Committee terms of service and informs the Group that both Leroy Corlett and Irene Yamashita have expressed interest in serving on the next Admin. Committee term.
- There is a conversation as to the appropriate composition of the Admin. Committee
- Darla Heil volunteers to serve along with Irene and Leroy as the new two year term on the Admin. Committee.

DECISION ITEM:

1. **Approve newly appointed Admin. Committee members to serve January, 2012 – December, 2013.**
- **Bruce Woodworth moves to nominate Leroy Corlett, Irene Yamashita, and Darla Heil as new Admin Committee members. The new members shall take the**

place of the departing members for the January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013 term. Pete Bernasconi seconds the motion. All approved.

- The Program Office will be in communication regarding the next Admin. Committee meeting at which the Admin. Committee will discuss the new nominations for Chair and Vice Chair.

2. Public Comment period

- Irene announces Mammoth Community Water District Urban Water Management Plan Public Hearing is tomorrow evening, November 17, and that all are welcome to attend.

3. DAC Grant

a. Status Update

- Mark explains the grant has formally been executed and that the Program Office has begun their work on the initial tasks.
- Holly Alpert gives a brief overview of the DAC process to date and reminds the Group that an early step was the hiring of the DAC Outreach Specialist.

b. New Outreach Specialist

- Holly briefly summarizes the hiring process as well as the qualifications and experience of the new Outreach Specialist, Heather Crall. She explains that Heather has already begun work but the bulk of her tasks will begin in January, 2012.

c. Overview of work plan and early tasks

- Holly informs the Group of the early tasks in the DAC grant. She will be examining how we have engaged DACs thus far and strategizing on how to improve and build upon that process.
- Dan Jenkins would like to know how many MOU signatories are DACs.
- Holly responds that the Program Office could provide that figure but that it is likely that the status of DACs may change with the unveiling of the 2010 Census data.
- There is a discussion about the availability of 2010 Census data.
- **Darla will provide 2010 Census data website to the Program Office for updating DAC status at the community level.**
- Mark informs the Group that a training will take place early on in 2012 regarding how to reach out and engage DACs. This is built into Task 1 of the DAC grant.
- Holly also informs the Group that a DAC Caucus is being formed for the CA Water Plan Update 2013 and has invited the Inyo-Mono Program Office to participate. Holly adds that this Caucus will support the development of the CA Water Plan by including involvement of DACs.
- Rick Kattlemann is the Project Development Specialist for the DAC grant and will be contracted as well in the Planning Grant.

4. Round 1 Planning Grant

a. Report on Planning Grant first reporting and invoicing period

- Mark gives update on reporting and invoicing with DWR and informs the Group that the Program Office is now waiting for the kickoff meeting with DWR before the first invoice can be submitted. The kickoff meeting is scheduled with Jen Wong and Parker Thaler on Thursday, December 1, 2011. Shortly after that meeting takes place the Program Office will be able to submit the first invoicing package to DWR for reimbursement to CalTrout.

b. Planning Grant task updates

- Mark gives synopsis of upcoming tasks and highlights the CRWA and CEQA Workshops.

i. Needs Assessments and CRWA Workshops

- CRWA Workshops are scheduled November 28 at Mammoth Community Water District, November 30 at the Bishop Paiute Tribe Community Center, and December 1 at the Fort Independence Indian Reservation Tribal Office.
 - Dustin Hardwick gives a status of reservations received thus far and informs the Group that he expects the numbers to climb now that the workshops have been publicized externally.
 - Mark informs the Group that KMMT will be running a radio piece about the upcoming workshops.
 - Dustin gives brief overview of the topics to be covered at the CRWA workshops. Those with additional questions can contact Dustin via the contact information listed on the CRWA Workshop flyer.
- ii. **CEQA Workshops**
- Mark gives overview of the two types of CEQA workshops being offered. Details of the events can be found on the website www.inyomonowater.org. These are basic CEQA 101 courses that will likely benefit many entities.
 - Holly opens the floor to those interested in CEQA workshop for sign-ups during the meeting.
 - Mark reviews the CEQA workshops scheduled for December 8 (Bridgeport Memorial Hall), December 9 (Mammoth Lakes Community Center), December 14 (USFS/BLM Conference Room, Bishop), and December 15 (USO Building Ridgecrest). More information can be found at the website www.inyomonowater.org. Registration is required.
- iii. **Outreach**
- Holly informs the Group that Austin will be joining the phone call shortly. Meanwhile, she delivers a summary of the Outreach efforts in October. Holly informs the Group that the findings from their Outreach efforts will be posted on the Web once completed. She speaks that several projects submitted in the Round 2 Planning Grant are resultant of the Outreach efforts. Holly communicates that the Program Office continues to learn what the issues are in the Region and will continue to strive to address new as well as standing issues throughout the Inyo-Mono region.
 - Holly has conducted some tribal outreach in Bridgeport but still needs to reach out to other tribes. This effort is part of the Planning Grant Work Plan that includes convening three outreach meetings with tribal entities in the region.
 - **Darla informs Holly that she has a new contact for the Program Office for the Benton Paiute Tribe who now has a working environmental department and will provide the information to Holly.**
- iv. **Planning documents analysis**
- Janet Hatfield reports that she has received input from Mark and Holly on her draft chapter on relevant documents and intends to incorporate their edits over the holidays.
- v. **Website**
- Janet communicates that the next step in website development is improved mapping components and that the initial steps have been taken toward achieving that goal.
- vi. **Match forms**
- Janet informs the Group that the revised match form for the September/October reporting period is available on the website under Documents/Downloadable forms. <http://inyomonowater.org/downloadable-forms/>

- **Match forms are due to the Program Office by November 30, 2011. Janet will send the direct link to the current match form out with the notes.**
- vii. **Organizational structure**
- Holly has not had the opportunity to investigate more on the Organizational Structure for the Group. She explains that with the loss of the Sierra Nevada Alliance support it has put the onus on the Program Office to continue the research. The intention is to formally agendize this topic at future RWMG meeting
 - Mark asks if the Group feels this subject needs to be prioritized.
 - Bruce asks if anyone is familiar with what the gestation period is to establish a 501(c)(3). He states that if the process will likely be a prolonged the Group should consider prioritizing organizational structure in the near future.
 - Pete Bernasconi replies that his experience was that the process may take up to a year.
 - **The Program Office will formally agendize Organizational Structure at the January RWMG meeting.**
- c. **Work plan for revisiting Phase I Goals, Objectives, and Resource Management Strategies**
- Holly introduces Austin McInerny to the Group and gives the background on what she and Austin have been working on regarding outreach and updating the Phase I Goals, Objectives, and RMSs.
 - i. **Update on recently-completed outreach/memo**
 - Austin shares that a summary analysis has been prepared that identify current issues as well as outlines take-home messages from in the recent Outreach efforts.
 - **The Program Office will make the outreach summary available to the Group.**
 - ii. **Proposed process timeline for updating Goals, Objectives, Resource Management Strategies(RMS), including schedule for Work Group**
 - **The Program office will post the handout pertinent to Goals/Objectives and RMS revision process to the website.**
 - Austin petitions for a working committee to assist them in revising the Goals/Objectives/RMS for the Phase II plan.
 - Austin explains that milestones have been outlined for each of the future RWMG meetings in 2012, in an effort to meet the Phase II Plan completion deadline. Austin informs the Group of his plan to develop an online survey that the Program Office can advertise as well as post to the website in an effort to gain public feedback on what issues and obstacles they face with regards to water resources within the Region.
 - Austin outlines the current planned schedule for conducting the survey and synthesizing the data. He identifies the goal to provide data analyses from the survey at the January, 2012 RWMG meeting. After vetting at the January meeting, the subsequent months will be used to incorporate revisions and prepare revised document for adoption by the Group (by May, 2012) for inclusion in the Phase II IRWM Plan. Austin reminds the Group that if it feels that the project prioritization process used in the Phase I Plan for ranking Implementation projects also needs revision that this would be an opportunity to revisit that process. In addition, Austin explains that an independent survey will be developed specifically for Members of the Group in addition to one developed for the general public. The intent of the second survey is to enable the MOU signatories to give input regarding revisions of goals, objectives and resource management strategies.

- Mark is interested in participating on the survey and emphasizes the need to put the May Phase II Planning Grant schedule into perspective considering Round 2 Implementation. He revisits DWRs current schedule for release of the Round 2 Implementation PSP and suggests that the revision of the project prioritization process may be better suited as a conversation under the Phase II Planning Grant but that ultimately that decision needs to be made by the Group.
- Holly feels like the proposed schedule for revising Goals, Objectives, and RMS is realistic and attainable and acknowledges that the project prioritization revision process may in fact take additional time.
- Mark adds that by revising goals, objectives and RMS first, the Group could use those revisions to assist in the refinement of the project prioritization process.
- Bruce reminds the Group of the time intensive process of project prioritization and thinks the act of revising that process needs to be addressed as soon as possible in order to allow sufficient time for necessary refinement. He feels the mechanics of revising the project prioritization process can occur independent of goals, objectives and RMS.
- Austin thinks the MOU survey should invite input on the current project prioritization process to gain an understanding of what the Group would like to see with regards to changes in the process.
- Holly responds that initial input has already been received by the Group regarding the project prioritization process after the Round 1 Implementation Grant proposal was submitted and that she can provide that information to Austin as a starting point for the Members survey regarding project prioritization.
- Mark emphasizes the importance of survey design to facilitate prompt data analyses which will enable Austin to keep the survey open well into January, 2012.
- Irene suggests providing prior Member input on goals, objectives and strategies to the survey development working committee to assist in the public survey development process.
- Larry Freilich asks if a draft survey could be provided to the Group with an invitation to the Group for comment.
- Austin thinks that is a good idea and feels that he and the Program Staff could develop the survey promptly and get in out to MOU signatories for review.
- Pete, Irene, Mark are interested in serving the Phase II GO-RMS Working Committee.

iii. Next steps

- **An initial discussion will ensue next week among the GO-RMS Working Committee to gain initial thoughts on survey development.**
- **Holly will send Austin all input received relevant to the Project Prioritization revision process this week.**
- **An initial discussion on revisiting the Implementation Project Prioritization process will be agendized for the January RWMG meeting.**

5. Round 2 Planning Grant

a. Summary of timeline of events.

- Mark reviews the timeline of the Round 2 Planning Grant as well as a brief history of the Planning Grant ask thus far. He reminds the Group that the remaining \$764,000 is specific to planning processes only and encourages the Group to seek only relevant projects to this planning effort. He reminds

the Group of the current timeline and that the proposals should not be as involved as the Implementation proposal

- Holly reminds the Group of the importance of potential project proponents to closely read the current Round 2 Planning Grant PSP.
- The Program Office invites comments on the Round 2 Planning Grant PSP and will forward along with their comments if received by Friday, November 18.

b. [Status report on viable Round 2 Projects](#)

- Holly provides a review of the projects submitted thus far. She informs the Group that a total of 11 project ideas were submitted, the sum of which total well over the available funds.
- The Program Office sent questions to potential project proponents to gather baseline data to provide to the Round 2 Project Evaluation working committee (R2PE).
- Mark reminds the Group that one goal of the R2PE is to pare down the current ask to meet the current available funding. He notifies the Group of several other alternative funding opportunities and encourages the Group to seek out those sources in an effort to include the maximum number of viable projects.
- Darla asks for clarification on the projects submitted in the Round 2 Planning Grant vs. those implementation projects that did not receive past funding through the Implementation grant.
- Mark responds that the current projects invited were to be solely planning in nature and are not afforded any aspect of Implementation.

c. [Project ranking vs. narrative description](#)

- Mark suggests leaving this topic for discussion by the R2PE working committee.
- There is a discussion about prioritizing projects and who will be given the authority to approve prioritization of projects
- Mark thinks the R2PE should aim to bring a recommendation for approval by the Group to the January, 2012, RWMG meeting.
- Morgan clarifies that the decision should be brought back to the larger Group for approval.
- Larry asks for clarification that this Planning Grant is submitted as a package and needs to include all project proposals along with the Planning Grant proposal.
- Pete reminds the Group that the end result is to have ranked projects so that we know which projects get funded if full funding is not received.
- Holly suggests that it be up to the working committee to decide how they want to make a recommendation.
- Darla confirms that the working committee may ask for further details of the project proponents to make better decisions regarding this prioritization process. Mark and Holly confirm that they feel this would be beneficial.
- Larry advocates creating objective measures to evaluate projects

d. [Recruitment for Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Working Committee](#)

- Mark recruits participants to serve on the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Working Committee (R2PE).
- Darla asks for goals of the working committee are before volunteering.
- Bruce thinks that defining the evaluation process is the goal and that the Group should be left to the actual project evaluation.
- Morgan brings up the tight timeline and the need to present a final list to the Group in January for approval.
- Mark thinks the goal is a recommendation to the Group of the projects to be submitted in the proposal.

- Bruce does not want to constrain the parameters of this working committee and thinks the working committee needs maximum flexibility in order to perform the task at hand.
- Morgan voices the need to define the basic goals of the working committee.
- A discussion ensues regarding the role and goals of the working committee.
- Darla is reluctant to volunteer on this Working Committee without a definition of the goals.
- Pete suggests the working committee develop a matrix to construct the strongest proposal applications.
- Hal Curti asks if the Program Office would be allowed to request more funding than is currently available and then based on the award received, prioritize projects accordingly.
- Mark reminds the Group of the 25% match commitment as called out by DWR in the PSP and sees the match requirement as a critical component in identifying viable projects for submission.
- Bruce asks for definition for what match commitment really means.
- Mark replies that it means 25% of the project budget is assured by the project proponent as a match as required by DWR's Round 2 Planning Grant PSP.
- Mark reiterates the need for the projects to fit the current PSP in order to submit a viable and competitive proposal to DWR. He asks the Group if the Admin. Committee could act as the default R2PE working committee in the event no one steps up to participate.
- Janet reminds the Group that the purpose of the working committee is to provide a well thought-out project list to the Group by the January meeting. She continues that by encouraging participation from as many entities as possible for this working committee the Group will decrease the likelihood of encountering opposition of the recommended list in January.
- Darla recommends that project proponents participate in this working committee.
- Dan Jenkins suggests this working committee could be used as a project refinement tool and agrees that project proponent participation is important.
- Mark reminds the Group that the success of the working committee is paramount and that the Group needs to make sure, as a package, the Round 2 Planning Grant proposal is as strong as possible to avoid loss of potential funding by the Group as a whole.
- Dan, Bruce, Darla, Nate Reade, Pete, and the Program Office offer to serve on the R2PE working committee.
- **The Program Office will reach out to other Round 2 Planning Grant project proponents to continue to build on the Round 2 Planning Grant Project Working Committee, with the goal being to have the working committee assembled within one week from today.**
- **Bruce will assemble an agenda and coordinate an initial R2PE meeting.**
- **The Program Office will send out Project Matrix they have compiled to the R2PE Work Committee within the week.**
- The R2PE working committee will coordinate with the Admin. Committee and provide an initial project list to them with an explanation of the evaluation process. At that time the Admin. Committee will provide feedback and formulate a recommendation to the Group. The final goal of the R2PE is to formulate a list of prioritized projects to be submitted in the Round 2 Planning Grant proposal package.
- Leroy asks that a list of the Round 2 Planning Grant projects be provided to the larger Group via the website.
- **The Program Office will provide a general list of Round 2 Planning Grant Projects for the Group to review.**

e. Next Steps/proposed schedule

DECISION ITEM:

1. Approval of California Trout as Round 2 Planning Grant fiscal agent

- Bruce brings up the concept of splitting the Round 2 Planning Grant administration for planning projects out from the Program Office, and seeking a fiscal agent for the grant administration of the projects.
- Darla argues that CalTrout has done a great job thus far as fiscal agent and would like to see them continue the fiscal agent role for the next Planning Grant round.
- Pete also supports CalTrout's continuing as the fiscal agent for the Planning Grant.
- Irene would like a Letter of Agreement from CalTrout that describes Scope of Services and approves their status as fiscal agent contingent upon receiving that document.
- Dan Jenkins brings up that the process seems backwards and that it seems the Scope of Services need to be defined before approving a Fiscal Agent.
- Bruce thinks that approving the Fiscal Agent before seeing a budget and Letter of Agreement is premature.
- Morgan agrees with Darla that CalTrout has done an outstanding job but agrees that the expectations of all future Fiscal Agents needs to be defined by the Group.
- Mark agrees to provide a Letter of Agreement to the Group but argues that separating the grant administration responsibilities between two fiscal agents add to the complications of grant administration and creates additional costs.
- Bruce asks what portion of the \$250,000 Program Office budget would be directed toward serving to administer the grant. Mark replies that a rough estimate is that between \$30,000-35,000 would be used for actual grant administration.
- Holly brings up that the budget will depend on the number of projects that are funded. She continues that the goal for CalTrout would be to seek approval of the Budget/Schedule/Workplan by the Group at the January RWMG meeting.
- Bruce clarifies that the budget will be available to review by the Group.
- Mark reminds the Group of the generous support CalTrout has provided to date in support of the continuing IRWMP effort and identifies the trust that they have developed working with the Group.
- Darla supports the idea of developing a procedure about what we expect from all Fiscal Agents.
- Mark suggests including the Fiscal Agent scope of services into the Organizational Structure conversation identified as needed by the Group.
- Irene supports the opinion that CalTrout has established a good reputation.
- Larry reiterates the services CalTrout has provided thus far has been exceptional and fully supports CalTrout as the new Fiscal Agent.
- **Leroy moves to approve that California Trout as Fiscal Agent for the Round 2 Planning Grant. Morgan seconds the motion. All approved.**

6. Implementation Grant Update

a. Letter of Agreement/Contract with the RWMG

i. Additional documentation defining services to be provided by the Fiscal Agent

- Irene recaps the discussion of the Letter of Agreement (LOA) from the project sponsor (M7) meeting. She explains that Central Sierra believes that the Group approval of Central Sierra as the fiscal agent over a year ago constitutes a contract. Further, Central Sierra sent a letter to Holly, dated

Sept. 22, 2011 that they believe also serves as a letter of Agreement. She reads the three components in the letter and confirms that there will not be any additional documents providing further clarity to the services Central Sierra will provide.

- Bruce maintains that Central Sierra's contract is with the State and that all materials provided to DWR will also be provided by the Group.
- Irene brings up that the Project Sponsors would like to see further detail as to the working relationship between Central Sierra and the Group.
- Mark asks if Central Sierra is willing to provide a contractual letter of agreement based on the components Harvey VanDyke purposed in his email.
- Bruce feels that Harvey's ideas are common sense items and doesn't feel the need to formalize these basic comments into a contract or Letter of Agreement. Bruce continues that Central Sierra cannot summarize the current Implementation Grant Agreement for project proponents as Central Sierra as an organization does not contain the internal expertise, for example in labor or environmental law, and therefore the liability is too high.
- Mark asks again if Central Sierra is willing to include language in their contract with project proponents regarding their responsibilities.
- Bruce responds that the Grant Agreement template is the guiding document to the Implementation process and that it outlines the responsibility of project proponents as well as the Fiscal Agent to seek guidance from DWR when needed. He continues that the Grant Agreement template ultimately needs to be adhered to and cautions of the danger of relying on interpretations or summaries of the Grant Agreement to all parties. Bruce maintains that Central Sierra has and will continue to forward all inquiries to DWR as part of its duties.
- There is a discussion about Central Sierra's willingness to provide further direction to Project Proponents.
- Larry doesn't understand why Central Sierra is resistant to providing this simple ask.
- Darla reiterates this provides rationale for creating standards for Fiscal Agent as it seems that this is a basic service that should be provided.
- Dan Jenkins is not averse to requesting a checklist from Central Sierra; however, he acknowledges that they should not be held liable for someone not knowing the Grant Agreement.
- Irene speaks that a checklist would help Project Proponents identify the key points of the Grant Agreement and reminds the Group that the Program Office has provided similar assistance in past grants.
- Bruce speaks to the liability of Central Sierra to calling out requirements of the Grant Agreement.
- Pete agrees that providing expertise and technical guidance on the part of Central Sierra could become very expensive.
- Irene speaks that she is simply trying to clarify what services Central Sierra will provide to the Project Proponents. She emphasizes the need to be able to rely on Central Sierra as a conduit of information from DWR given that they are the sole point of contact with DWR in regards to Implementation projects.
- Mark suggests saving the Letter of Agreement discussion to have once contracts from Central Sierra to Project Proponents are drafted and that legal counsel will likely ask for specific language in each of the contracts that may cover the needs of the Project Proponents.
- Morgan brings up the need for the smaller entities that don't have the means for Grant Agreement interpretation, etc... and that the future Fiscal Agents should include this as a service.

- Pete thinks that the larger entities may be able to serve as project proponents for some of these smaller agencies to help enable these smaller groups to participate.
 - Dan brings up we all have differing expectations of Fiscal Agents and identifies the need to define those expectation as a Group for future use. He further suggests M7 convene a meeting to help one another with the interpretation of the Implementation Grant Agreement template.
 - Those in attendance concur to move on from the Letter of Agreement approval by the Group.
- b. [Update from M7 Working Committee](#)
- Bruce will convene another M7 Working Committee meeting in the near future to continue further conversation between Central Sierra and M7.
- c. [Update from fiscal agent](#)
- i. [Status Report: DWR report submission](#)
 - Bruce reports that materials have been submitted to DWR on November 15.
 - ii. [Budget/Schedule/Workplan review](#)
 - Mark speaks of the budget refinement process that took place between the Program Office and Central Sierra.
 - Dan asks if Bruce knows a timeframe for DWR to respond to the documents submitted.
 - Bruce replies that he is unsure of the turnaround time with DWR.
 - Irene brings back the issue of getting Group approval of Central Sierra's Budget, Schedule and Workplan.
 - Bruce maintains he feels the process is unnecessary but that Irene may follow up with Valerie regarding the issue.
 - **Irene will contact Valerie regarding the Group approval of Central Sierra's Budget, Schedule, and Workplan,**
 - iii. [Next steps](#)
 - Bruce reports that Central Sierra is expecting to have draft contract from their attorney by November 24. He informs the Group that Central Sierra staff aim to turn that around and provide draft contracts to Project Proponents soon thereafter, with the hope being to provide contracts to project proponents in early December.
- d. [Update from Program Office](#)
- i. [Revised Budget/Schedule/Workplan](#)
 - Holly reviews that the Program Office revised Task 3 as requested by the Admin. Committee and has incorporated the suggested changes.
 - There was no further discussion of the Program Office budget, schedule, and work plan before the decision item was addressed.

DECISION ITEM:

1. **Approval of Program Office Implementation Budget, Schedule and Workplan.**
 - **Irene moves to approve the Program Budget, Schedule and WorkPlan as revised. Darla seconds. All approved.**

7. General Updates

a. [Update from Water Plan Plenary](#)

- Mark informs Group of the Program Office participation in the Water Plan meetings. He and Holly both serve on the design team for regional forums for the Lahontan which are about to commence.
- Holly brings up DWR Process Improvement Workshops; most importantly revisions regarding the PSP proposal process are due by Friday.

- The Program Office will send the link to the DWR Process Improvement Workshops for the Group to participate if they would like. (<http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/processimprovement.cfm>)
- Additionally the Program Office will provide the letter drafted in January regarding the comments to the Implementation PSP process to the website for members of the Group to use as a reference.

8. Announcements

- The Sierra Nevada Alliance is now hiring a Wyss Fellow position out of their Tahoe office. The position will replace Matt Griffis and will work to support the Inyo-Mono IRWMP. The position announcement is on the Inyo-Mono website in the News. <http://inyomonowater.org/2011/11/sierra-nevada-alliance-now-hiring-wyss-fellow/>
- Irene announces that the MCWD solar array is producing power and is working as designed.

9. Process Check

10. Review August 31, 2011 and October 19, RWMG meeting notes

DECISION ITEM:

1. Approve August 31, 2011, RWMG meeting notes
 2. Approve October 19, 2011, RWMG meeting notes.
- Bruce moves to approve meeting notes from Aug 31 and Oct 19 as provided.
 - Irene seconds the motion. All approved.

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

12. Next Meeting Dates

- a. Admin. Committee meeting: early January
- b. Proposed next RWMG meetings:
 - Wednesday, January 25, 2012
 - Wednesday, February 22, 2012
 - Wednesday, April 25, 2012
 - Wednesday, May 23, 2012