

## **Inyo-Mono Coordinating Committee Conference Call February 2, 2009, 1:00 - 3:00 pm**

### Meeting Agenda

1. Inyo-Mono IRWMP Funding Situation
2. State Budget Situation
3. Region Acceptance Process
4. Outreach Efforts
5. Strategies and Objectives Work Group
6. Budget Work Group meeting update
7. Update to Planning Committee in lieu of February meeting
8. Other items? Sierra Water Work Group Letter

### Participants:

Austin McNerny, CCP  
Lori Dermody, LADWP  
Rebecca Paranick, Mammoth Mountain  
Irene Yamashita, MCWD  
Debra Hawk, DFG  
Mark Drew, CalTrout  
Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff  
Erin Lutrick, Forest Service  
Cindy Wise, Lahontan RWQCB

The format of the call will be different: because of Austin's stop-work order, he will not be leading the call. His DWR contract was to provide rural IRWM projects facilitation support. His work was funded by bond money from the State and DWR has been instructed to stop payment on all bond work in the State. His January work is not currently being paid. Austin will continue to work in a limited capacity with Mark, Holly, and the CC and we are looking for funding to keep Austin involved. In Austin's place, Mark will facilitate the call.

### **1. Inyo-Mono IRWMP Funding Situation**

a. Rivers Network Proposal: collaborating with Miller-Coors. This would award us \$10,000 and the funds would be available immediately and the proposal was relatively simple. Even if this funding is not awarded, the proposal can be used for other opportunities. We will know by Friday, Feb. 6 if we have made the first-round cut (internal review). The second round is public vote and if we make it to the second round, we are guaranteed \$1000. If we make it to the next round, we will do major outreach to have people vote on the website.

b. There are significant short-term funding needs on the order of a few thousand dollars to keep the project moving and successfully complete the RAP application.

c. We will be asking for internal funding possibilities – LADWP, Mammoth Mountain, NPS – other groups. Core expense needs are staff time. We will be sending a one-page proposal for the PC and CC to use to ask for funding. Any funds put forth by PC member groups can be put towards the match contribution for the planning grant proposal.

d. Mark has been in touch with Julie Bear at SNC, and they may be able to provide some assistance to IRWMPs in planning grant stages to get through the RAP.

e. Cindy: even if State budget is resolved, it would take 90-120 days for funding stream to re-open. Even after that, it could take up to two years for projects to get funded because of the bond market. Yet Cindy is being instructed to move ahead on bond work because the situation can change rapidly. She says the RAP is moving ahead. In the federal recovery package, money will be in the state revolving fund and may be available for non-point source related projects – more for implementation than planning.

f. Mark: would it be worth gathering shovel-ready project ideas and descriptions now so that we can go for implementation-type funds? Cindy says there is a process open right now for some implementation funds and will provide Mark with more specifics. Information on the State Water Board's website:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/grants\\_loans/srf/index.shtml#announcements](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/index.shtml#announcements)

## **2. State Budget Situation**

a. Furloughs will likely start this month.

b. Short-term funding needs are small – around \$40,000 for RAP and planning grant proposal process. We will also need a match for the grant. Or we could go after larger funding sources outside of DWR for the planning process. Mark had the idea of going to Dave McCoy Foundation. There are two foundations and neither gave money in 2007. McCoy just committed some money to MLPTA. That we're not a non-profit or an entity may make it more difficult to have a group write us a check, although we could use CalTrout or another PC member group. The McCoy Foundation does have guidelines, and there are 5-6 other foundations in the area, all of which have guidelines. They are listed on the national foundation directory online. Rebecca said to not bother asking for much from Mammoth Mountain at this time, but she'll see what she can do within her department. NRCS will probably have money for watershed health projects from the economic recovery package. Debra Hawk will provide Mark with the appropriate link to the national foundation directory.

c. Mark would like the group to give consideration to become a legal entity. For long-term funding opportunities, having our own organization may make it easier. Mark would like CC members to think about this and begin thinking about logistical details. Coming up with some models to evaluate may be helpful. Rebecca shared that many local non-profits spend much of their time just trying to stay operational.

## **3. Region Acceptance Process**

a. Austin was part of a phone call in which he learned that RAP is moving forward. Comments for RAP guidelines were due last week, and we combined ours with Sierra Nevada Alliance's comments. We asked for more specific deadlines as well as clarification on how to deal with communities that are DACs but not identified due to their small size. The Alliance also felt that a lot of the information requested in the application guideline is not appropriate for the RAP but more appropriate for planning grant applications. They are asking for simplification of the guidelines. Thus, we are focusing on regional coordination as a priority for preparing the application, but we will hold off on some of the other components until the final guidelines are circulated (probably end of February – early March). Once final guidelines come out, we could

have anywhere from one month to 3-4 months to submit our application. Interviews are still tentatively scheduled for early April.

#### **4. Outreach Efforts**

a. Darla has undertaken a lot of outreach with tribes and has been successful in making contacts. This is a priority area for us in preparation for both the RAP and the planning grant proposal. We encourage all members to undertake outreach to any groups, especially DACs. Holly will be following up with individuals about specific assignments made during the last Planning Committee meeting.

b. Last week, Mark made a presentation to the Collaborative Planning Team that is comprised of several stakeholders from the area. Mark gave background on the IRWMP and asked for formal support of the IRWMP through accepting the MOU or participating as fiscal sponsor. The Town of Mammoth Lakes has expressed interest in fiscal sponsorship. We can circulate the Powerpoint presentation, and this can be used. Holly will send to Coordinating Committee and/or put up on the website. Mark will be making another presentation to Mammoth's Town Council in the coming weeks (now scheduled for Feb. 18<sup>th</sup>).

c. Website: Holly is working on adding more outreach content.

d. Irene spoke with David Grah with Public Works in Bishop and he wants to be more involved but has not had time. Mark or Holly will follow-up with him.

e. Mark talk to Mike Bodine with Inyo Register to do an article or series of articles on IRWMP, including a plea for our funding needs. It should be out tomorrow (2/3). If there is an article, we will distribute a copy to the group.

#### **5. Strategies and Objectives Work Group**

a. Last conference call was productive and we need one more call to work through the rest of the document. David Varner has offered to facilitate this process. We had saved February 9 during the slated Planning Committee meeting time for the next S&O Work Group. The group agreed that we should still have this call and Holly will send out a notice this week. February 9 afternoon instead? Mark will be in touch with David and put David back in touch with Holly to discuss logistics.

b. ESF: We are at a clean breaking point given the work that ESF has done so far. Mark has some concerns with the ESF personnel available for this project. Other options are to contract with David Varner separately or work on the proposal as an IRWMP group. David is very interested in staying involved with our project. David has been a voice for including stakeholders in the planning grant proposal process vs. others at ESF who did not want as much stakeholder involvement. We need to make the decision when the next step on the planning grant proposal presents itself – possibly not for a while, depending on planning grant proposal guidelines. Mark will communicate with David and Mark Hill our thoughts on the process.

#### **6. Budget Work Group**

a. This work should go on hold right now because there are no imminent deadlines. However, should this group be more involved in fundraising?

#### **7. Update to Planning Committee in Lieu of February Meeting**

a. Do we need an update communication now or wait a while? Mark thinks that we need a sooner communication about funding needs. First email: summary of this meeting (and

request for funding) along with a one-page proposal (don't need to circulate it through the CC first) and match form reminder; and then subsequent emails about other news.

## **8. Sierra Water Group Letter**

a. Group of Sierra stakeholders to provide a voice at the State level for water issues in the Sierra. A letter has been drafted to State lawmakers to encourage them to address the budget situation immediately. The goal is to have the letter signed by participants of the larger group, but at least by individual IRWMPs. Mark suggests submitting one letter on behalf of Planning Committee and how do we get buy-in in a short amount of time. The letter would be coming from US, not the water group – they just provided a sample letter. Mark will circulate final draft to Planning Committee and we'll figure out what groups want to be involved and how we move forward in terms of signatures. Mark will also send a letter on behalf of CalTrout but also include verbage on IRWMP.

b. Letters of support for RAP: letters can be written but should stay on hold and we will provide further information and we'll probably collect the letters for our RAP application. We'll send this information out to the Planning Committee.

### **Action Items:**

- Holly: Send Mark's Powerpoint presentation to Coordinating Committee
- Holly: Update website content
- Holly: Follow-up with Planning Committee members about specific outreach assignments
- Mark: Communicate with David Varner about leading the next Strategies and Objectives Work Group call
- Holly: Send email to Strategies and Objectives Work Group about February 9 PM meeting and possible conference call line availability
- Mark: Talk with Mark Hill about the discussion of ESF's current involvement
- Mark and Holly: Involve the Budget Work Group in fundraising? (did not finish discussion on this topic during the meeting)
- Mark, Holly, and Austin: Planning Committee update email: one-page proposal, match form request, summary from Coordinating Committee meeting, clarification on what to do with letters of support for RAP application (which is to send to Holly)
- Mark: Distribute Sierra Water Group letter to Planning Committee to ask for "signatures"