Agenda

County of Inyo
Board of Supervisors

Board of Supervisors Room
County Administrative Center
224 North Edwards
Independence, California

All members of the public are encouraged to participate in the discussion of any items on the Agenda. Anyone wishing to speak, please obtain a card from the Board Clerk and indicate each item you would like to discuss. Return the completed card to the Board Clerk before the Board considers the item (s) upon which you wish to speak. You will be allowed to speak about each item before the Board takes action on it.

Any member of the public may also make comments during the scheduled "Public Comment" period on this agenda concerning any subject related to the Board of Supervisors or County Government. No card needs to be submitted in order to speak during the "Public Comment" period.

Public Notices: *(1)* In Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please contact the Clerk of the Board at (760) 878-0373. (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II). Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. Should you because of a disability require appropriate alternative formatting of this agenda, please notify the Clerk of the Board 72 hours prior to the meeting to enable the County to make the agenda available in a reasonable alternative format. (Government Code Section 54954.2). *(2)* If a writing, that is a public record relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors, is distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, the writing shall be available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, 224 N. Edwards, Independence, California and is available per Government Code § 54957.5(b)(1).
Note: Historically the Board does break for lunch, the timing of a lunch break is made at the discretion of the Chairperson and at the Board's convenience.

January 10, 2012

9:00 a.m. ***INVOCATION*** by Supervisor Richard Cervantes

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

COMMENT **(Portion of the Agenda when Board takes comment from the public and County staff)**

1. ***PUBLIC COMMENT***

2. ***COUNTY DEPARTMENT REPORTS*** *(Reports limited to two minutes)*

CONSENT AGENDA **(Approval recommended by the County Administrator)**

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

3. ***Chairperson Susan Cash*** – Request approval of the 2012 Board of Supervisors committee assignments as recommended by the Chairperson Supervisor Marty Fortney.

4. ***Emergency Services*** – Request Board continue the local emergency as a result of the Inyo Complex Oak Creek Mud Flows.

5. ***Advertising County Resources*** – Request approval of Amendment #1 to the Contract between the County of Inyo and the Friends of the Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery for Grants-in-Support services and authorize the County Administrator to sign, contingent upon the appropriate signatures being obtained.

AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER

6. Request Board authorize the submittal of a proposal to the Inyo/Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Planning (IRWMP) group for invasive plant database services in an amount up to $105,387; and approve a resolution titled "A Resolution of the Board of Supervisors, County of Inyo, State of California, Approving the Application for Funds from the Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Program Under the Proposition 84 IRWM Planning Grant Program."

DEPARTMENTAL **(To be considered at the Board's convenience)**

7. ***TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR*** – Request Board approve a resolution rescinding Resolution No. 2005-03, applying the time period to tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property pursuant to Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the California Revenue & Taxation Code, resulting in the time period reverting from being eligible for Power to Sell at five years to being eligible for Power to Sell at three years.

8. ***TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR – TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR*** – Request Board approve a resolution delegating the investment authority to the Inyo County Treasurer.

9. ***TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR - TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR*** – Request Board approve the Inyo County Treasury Investment Policy as submitted.

10. ***PUBLIC WORKS*** – Request Board review and approve the Water Systems Operations and Maintenance Request for Proposals and authorize the Public Works Director to advertise for proposals for the project.

11. ***WATER DEPARTMENT*** – Request Board receive and update on Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) activities and provide direction concerning the January 11, 2012 Regional Water Management Group conference call and January 25, 2012 IRWMP Meeting.

12. ***CLERK OF THE BOARD*** – Request approval of the minutes of the December 27, 2011 Board of Supervisors Meeting.

TIMED ITEMS **(Items will not be considered before scheduled time)**

11:00 a.m. 13. ***CLOSED SESSION - PERSONNEL [PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §54957]*** - Public Employee Appointment - Title: Director Public Works.

1:00 p.m. 14. ***BOARD OF EQUALIZATION*** – The Board of Supervisors will convene as the Board of Equalization (Separate Agenda).

WORKSHOPS AND PRESENTATIONS **(To be considered at the Board's convenience)**

CORRESPONDENCE - ACTION

BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF REPORTS

COMMENT **(Portion of the Agenda when the Board takes comment from the public and County staff)**

15. ***PUBLIC COMMENT***

CLOSED SESSION

16. ***CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION (Pursuant to Government Code §54956.9(b)*** – *Significant Exposure to Litigation* (one case).

17. ***CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR [Pursuant to Government Code §54957.6]*** - Instructions to Negotiators re: wages, salaries and benefits - Employee Organization: Law Enforcement Administrators Association (LEAA) - Negotiators: CAO Kevin Carunchio and Labor Relations Administrator Sue Dishion.

18. ***CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR [Pursuant to Government Code § 54957.6].*** – Instructions to Negotiators re: wages, salaries and benefits – Employee Organization: Inyo County Probation Peace Officers Association (ICPPOA) – Negotiators: CAO Kevin Carunchio and Labor Relations Administrator Sue Dishion.

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION AS REQUIRED BY LAW

CORRESPONDENCE - INFORMATIONAL

19. ***AUDITOR-CONTROLLER*** – Notice that in accordance with Section 26905 and 26921 of the Government Code and your orders of February 5, 1950 and January 3, 1956, an actual count of money in the hands of the Treasurer was made on December 30, 2011 and that the count showed the funds to be in balance, pending written verification of inactive accounts.

20. ***SHERIFF*** – Sheriff and Jail Overtime Report for the month of December, 2011.

21. ***LICENSES*** – Application for Alcoholic Beverage License for the Bishop Paiute Tribe, Paiute Palace Casino in Bishop.

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER

3

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☐ Consent ☐ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: County Administrator
By: Patricia Gunsolley, Assistant Clerk of the Board

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Board of Supervisors Committee Appointments for calendar year 2012

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION: - Request approval of the 2012 Board of Supervisors committee assignments as recommended by Chairperson Supervisor Marty Fortney.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION: - Each year the newly elected Chairperson makes recommendations for Board of Supervisors appointments to the various boards, committees and commissions upon which the Board of Supervisors has representation. The requirement for Board of Supervisor representation on the various boards, committees and commissions may come from a variety of sources including but not limited to state law, county law, and/or Inyo County Board of Supervisors order. At this time your Board is asked to make the necessary appointments as requested by this year's Chairperson, Supervisor Marty Fortney.

ALTERNATIVES: Your Board could choose to change any of the recommended appointments.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: N/A

FINANCING: There is no expected fiscal impact associated with this request.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: _____ Date_____
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (*Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved:_____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received)_____ Date: 1-3-12
(The Original plus 20 copies of this document are required)

BOARD APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES FOR 2012
ACTIVE and AD HOC COMMITTEES ONLY

Agricultural Resources Advisory Board	Marty Fortney, alt. Rick Pucci
Aviation Advisory Committee Northern	Susan Cash and Rick Pucci
Aviation Advisory Committee Southern	Richard Cervantes and Marty Fortney
BLM Resource Steering Committee	Marty Fortney, alt. Rick Pucci
CSAC (California State Association of Counties)	Susan Cash, alt. Marty Fortney
Child Care Planning Council	Rick Pucci, alt. Susan Cash
Children and Families First Commission	Susan Cash
Children's Services Council	Rick Pucci
City of Bishop Liaison Committee	Susan Cash and Linda Arcularius
Collaborative Planning Committee	Richard Cervantes and Rick Pucci
County Service Area No. 2 Advisory Board	Linda Arcularius
Eastern Sierra Committee (COG)	Linda Arcularius and Susan Cash
Eastern Sierra Interagency Visitors Center	Richard Cervantes
Emergency Medical Care Committee	Marty Fortney
Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District	Richard Cervantes and Linda Arcularius, alt. Susan Cash
Foster Care Commission	Rick Pucci, alt. Susan Cash
Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee	Rick Pucci and Marty Fortney
Integrated Solid Waste Management Task Force	Richard Cervantes
Integrated Solid Waste Management Hearing Panel	Marty Fortney
Inter Agency Committee on Owens Valley Land & Wildlife	Marty Fortney
Inyo Council for the Arts	Linda Arcularius
Inyo Mono Area Agency on Aging	Susan Cash and Linda Arcularius
Inyo Fish & Wildlife Commission	Marty Fortney, alt. Rick Pucci
Juvenile Justice Coordinating Team (2000)	Richard Cervantes
Law Library Board of Trustees	Rick Pucci
Local Agency Formation Commission	Susan Cash and Rick Pucci, alt. Marty Fortney
Local Transportation Commission	Rick Pucci and Marty Fortney, alt. Richard Cervantes
Mental Health Advisory Board	Rick Pucci, alt. Susan Cash
National Association of Counties (NACo	Linda Arcularius, alt. Susan Cash
Workforce Investment County (formerly Private Industry Council)	Rick Pucci
Random Access Network Board (R.A.N.)	Marty Fortney
Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC)	Linda Arcularius, alt. Marty Fortney
Standing Water Committee	Susan Cash and Linda Arcularius, alt. Rick Pucci
Yucca Mountain Program Representatives	Richard Cervantes and Susan Cash
Community Focused Court Planning Team	Rick Pucci
Financial Advisory Committee	Susan Cash and Linda Arcularius
Eastern Sierra Subregional Committee – Sierra Nevada Conservancy (2 years appt. beginning 1-18-05)	Linda Arcularius
Internal Operations Committee (2 Board Members)	Susan Cash and Rick Pucci
Quadstate Local Government Authority	Susan Cash (Board Order 9-7-10)
Child Support Services Regional Oversight Committee	Richard Cervantes (Board Order 9-13-11)

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER

4

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☒ Consent ☐ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: Kevin D. Carunchio, County Administrator

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Continuation of declaration of local emergency

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION: - Request Board continue the local emergency as a result of the Inyo Complex Oak Creek Mud Flows.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION: - During your August 5, 2008 Board of Supervisors meeting your Board took action to continue the local emergency, which was a result of the Inyo Complex Oak Creek Mud Flows. Since the circumstances and conditions relating to this emergency persist, your Board directed that the continuation of the declaration be considered on a week-to-week basis. The recommendation is that the emergency be continued until the permanent diversions are in place. LADWP has notified your Board that the completion of the project is expected for sometime this fall. Therefore, it is recommended that your Board continue the emergency.

ALTERNATIVES: N/A

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: N/ A

FINANCING: N/A

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: _____ Date_____
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (M*ust be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved:_____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received)_____ Date:_____
(The Original plus 20 copies of this document are required)

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER
5

☒ Consent ☐ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: Kevin Carunchio – County Administrator
Kelley Williams

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Amendment #1 to the Contract between the County of Inyo and the Friends of Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

Request your Board approve Amendment #1 to the contract between Inyo County and the Friends of Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery for Grant-In-Support services and authorize the County Administrator to sign, contingent upon appropriate signatures being obtained

SUMMARY DISCUSSION

On October 11, 2011 your Board awarded FY 2011-2012 Grant-in-Support Program award funds to the Friends of Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery in the amount of $10,000. The grant application Scope of Work and Budget indicated $5,000.00 would be used for miscellaneous contract labor to aid in the maintenance of the hatchery and the remaining $5,000.00 would be used for the production of a professional video highlighting the history of the Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery. This video would be shown in their small theater.

The Friends of Mt. Whitney have requested that the contract budget be amended to reduce the contract labor line item by $2,000.00 and increase the video production line item by $2,000.00. The Board of Directors for the Fish Hatchery have indicated that completing the production of the video is considered the highest priority. They have asked their volunteer group to step up their time commitment to the hatchery maintenance, allowing them to reduce by $2,000.00 the need for contract labor.

ALTERNATIVES

Your Board could choose not to approve the requested Scope of Work/Budget Amendment

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

USFS, Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery.

FINANCING

The $10,000.00 Grant-In-Support award to the Friends of Mt. Whitney was funded with FY 2011/2012 County General Fund.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: — Date 12-27-11
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (M*ust be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: Yes Date 1/4/12
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved: ✓ Date 1/3/12

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received) Date: 1/3/12

AMENDMENT NUMBER 1 TO
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF INYO AND
Friends of Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery
FOR THE PROVISION OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR SERVICES

WHEREAS, the County of Inyo (hereinafter referred to as "County") and Friends of Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery, of Independence, California (hereinafter referred to as "Contractor"), have entered into an Agreement for the Provision of Independent Contractor Services dated November 7, 2011, on County of Inyo Standard Contract No. 127, for the term from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

WHEREAS, County and Contractor do desire and consent to amend such Agreement as set forth below;

WHEREAS, such Agreement provides that it may be modified, amended, changed, added to, or subtracted from, by the mutual consent of the parties thereto, if such amendment or change is in written form, and executed with the same formalities as such Agreement, and attached to the original Agreement to maintain continuity.

County and Contractor hereby amend such Agreement as follows:

ATTACHMENT A
SCOPE OF WORK AND BUDGET

1. Funded Activities/Service (Grant-In-Support):

	FUNDED COSTS:
Employee Costs	$3,000.00
Other Costs (video production)	$7,000.00
TOTAL FUNDED COSTS	$10,000.00

The effective date of this Amendment to the Agreement is _____.

All the other terms and conditions of the Agreement are unchanged and remain the same.

AMENDMENT NUMBER 1 TO
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF INYO AND
Friends of Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery
FOR THE PROVISION OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR SERVICES

IN WITNESS THEREOF, THE PARTIES HERETO HAVE SET THEIR HANDS AND SEALS THIS _____ DAY OF _____, _____.

COUNTY OF INYO

By: _____

Dated: _____

CONTRACTOR

By: _____
Signature

Bruce E. Hoff
Type or Print

Dated: Dec 22, 2011

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

_____
County Counsel

APPROVED AS TO ACCOUNTING FORM:

_____
County Auditor

APPROVED AS TO PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS:

_____
Director of Personnel Services

APPROVED AS TO RISK ASSESSMENT:

_____
County Risk Manager

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER
6

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☒ Consent ☐ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: George L. Milovich, Agricultural Commissioner/Director of Weights and Measures

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: **January 10, 2012**

SUBJECT: Request for Authorization for Submittal of Proposal to the Inyo/Mono Intergrated Regional Water Management Planning group for $105,387.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

That your Board of Supervisors approve the request for authorization to submit a proposal to the Inyo/Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Planning (Inyo/Mono IRWMP)group up to the amount of $105,387 and authorize and sign a resolution approving the application for grant funds from the IMIRWMP.

CAO RECOMMENDATION:

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

The Inyo/Mono IRWMP is accepting proposals for inclusion in a planning grant proposal under Proposition 84 funding for Integrated Regional Water Management Program planning. The Agricultural Commissioner's Office has assembled a proposal for submittal and consideration by the Inyo/Mono IRWMP to provide funding to update the invasive plant database, administered currently by the Agricultural Commissioner's Office. An updated geodatabase of invasive plant populations in Inyo and Mono Counties will allow future project planning and land management efforts to identify potential adverse effects from these weeds, and implement appropriate mitigation measures for issues resulting from these populations.

Proposal requests total $73,788 for costs associated with field data gathering activities, mileage, and equipment. This proposal includes $31,599 in in-kind contributions by Agricultural Commissioner's Office staff.

ALTERNATIVES:

Not approve this grant application, however this is not recommended as these types of funding opportunities are not readily available.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

N/A

FINANCING:

Funding for in-kind expenditures will come from the Eastern Sierra Weed Management Division fund. The county will be reimbursed for the work completed during this project after work is completed. Weed management activities are wholly funded by outside grants and contracts.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: yes Date 12/29/2011
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (M*ust be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: yes Date 12/29/11
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received) George Motovich by NR Date: 12/29/11

RESOLUTION NO. 2012-____
A RESOLUTION OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF INYO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR FUNDS FROM THE
INYO/MONO INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROGRAM
UNDER THE PROPOSITION 84 IRWM PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

Whereas, funds have been authorized for the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006, and

Whereas, the State of Department of Water Resources (DWR) has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant funds, establishing necessary procedures; and

Whereas, The Inyo/Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program member, CalTrout, is submitting a proposal to DWR on behalf of the group, including the proposal by the Inyo/Mono Counties Agricultural Commissioner's Office, and

Whereas, Inyo County, if selected, would enter into an agreement with CalTrout to carry out the project; and,

Whereas, Inyo County has identified the Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Plant Inventory Project as valuable toward meeting its mission and goals.

Now, therefore let it be resolved by the Inyo County Board of Supervisors to:

(a) approve the submittal of the proposal Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Plant Inventory Project;
(b) certify that Inyo County has sufficient funds to operate and maintain the resources consistent with the long-term benefits described in support of the application;
(c) appoint the Inyo/Mono Agricultural Commissioner and his/her designee, as agent to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents, including but not limited to: agreements, payment requests, etc., which may be necessary for the completion of the Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Plant Inventory Project.

Passed and Adopted by the Inyo County Board of Supervisors this _____ day of January, 2012 by the following vote of the Board of Supervisors:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

_____
Marty Fortney, Chair
Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
COUNTY CLERK

_____
COUNTY COUNSEL

Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Plant Inventory Project

Introduction

Healthy native plant communities are a critical component of healthy watersheds, promoting many positive attributes including enrichment of wildlife habitat, normal fire regimes, and better water quality and quantity (Donaldson, 1997). Invasive plants threaten these native plant communities, and thus reduce certain advantages that watersheds gain from healthy riparian conditions. Invasive plants degrade the watershed's ability to retain surface and ground water, while decreasing quality through intensification of sediment loading through erosion and other processes (Chambers, 2008). Alteration of natural fire regimes by these invaders increases runoff and erosion as well. In addition to quality and quantity concerns, weeds compromise significantly the flood capacity of watersheds (Donaldson, 1997). Likely climate change scenarios indicate that the presence of invasive plant species exacerbates the negative effects of such change (Sada, 2008).

A required component of successful watershed management is consideration and mitigation of invasive plant threats. Projects must know of the presence of these weeds for planning, and land managers require a means by which to prioritize projects to maximize meager resources available for developing healthy watersheds. Proper planning protects natural resources and habitat for wildlife including threatened and endangered species. Recreational planning must also account for the potential of invasive plant spread and how to respond to those threats if they occur.

Importance of this Project to the IRWMP Region

Taking into account the linkages between invasive plant species, watershed health, and water supply and quality consequences, the importance of a comprehensive inventory of weed species of regional importance is obvious. This project will fill the information gap that exists for regional planning purposes. The addition of this data into the IRWMP knowledge base will allow proponents of future planning and implementation projects to review potential watershed consequences from invasive plant infestations within the IRWMP region. Given this data, future projects can analyze how to mitigate any potential future weed problems.

Project Description

The goal of this project is to complete a survey of selected invasive weeds of regional importance, using existing data, interagency cooperation, and field surveys. This project will create accurate, comprehensive, and accessible data for multiple future uses. As a member in the Eastern Sierra Weed Management Area (ESWMA) group and the current database administrator, the Inyo/Mono Counties Agriculture Department (AgComm) can acquire and compile data from these various sources. AgComm can then disseminate this data to agencies or individuals, allowing future planning efforts and project proponents to assess potential invasive plant

consequences to mitigate the effects of these species on project success. AgComm also has experience managing several other GIS projects (pesticide permitting database, pest exclusion database, etc.). AgComm has the experience and equipment to spearhead this project.

This project will include initial meetings with ESWMA members to assess which data are current and what survey deficiencies exist. Surveys will then evaluate deficient areas and regions of likely spread within the watersheds. Locations of likely spread and species for inclusion in the survey will be predicated on species prioritization guidelines within the ESWMA's strategic plan, which was developed by 15 land management agencies, tribal governments, and nonprofit organizations within Inyo and Mono Counties. AgComm will then organize this information in a standard geodatabase for future use.

DAC support Justification

All local communities, including disadvantaged communities and tribes, will benefit from this foresight through appropriate planning. Proper planning of future projects will minimize negative effects of weed issues on the local and regional recreation and agriculture industries, which together comprise nearly all of the local economic input. Higher future invasive plant management costs may result from the current, and incomplete, data set. Proper data can assist local agencies and groups to plan and prioritize invasive plant abatement projects, saving these agencies and groups future resources. Data from this project can assist in fire hazard identification, helping local communities to plan for prevention of and recovery from wildland fires. Additionally, if this project is selected it will employ local residents, adding jobs and economic input. These jobs, coupled with support and protection of the two largest local economic drivers, will benefit greatly the economic future of DAC's and tribes.

Stormwater Resource Plan Considerations

Invasive plants hinder the ability of a watershed to retain water during flooding events. This lack of retention often leads to increased streambed destruction during conditions of high runoff, resulting in streambank erosion or even failure. Water quality issues that can exist from this issue include increased sediment loading and altered nutrient cycles. Water quantity is affected by a watershed with degraded retention capacity. Obtaining data on invasive plant populations for mitigation and planning fosters healthy native riparian conditions, and improves the watershed's natural ability to manage floodwater and stormwater events.

Salt and Nutrient Loading Considerations

Adverse effects resulting from improper planning and weed expansion can alter the natural habitat and thus the natural nutrient cycle. Similarly, project planning that does not consider invasive plants may introduce or spread populations of certain weedy species that accumulate salt on the soil surface. Two examples of these types of weed species that occur locally include

Saltcedar and Perennial pepperweed. The elevated salt levels on soil surface generated by these two species destroys native vegetation alters associated riparian systems.

Schedule

October – December 2012	Project organization, stakeholder meetings, data needs assessment, field staff training, data collection
January – February 2013	Data entry and analysis
March – June 2013	Continue data collection
July – September 2013	No work
October 2013 – March 2014	Continue data collection
April – June 2014	Data analysis and entry, database completion and publishing

Project Budget

Confirmation of the matching requirements, as well as a resolution authorizing this project submittal is forthcoming (January 10, 2012 Inyo County Board of Supervisor's Meeting). Program staff will receive notification from the AgComm, and AgComm staff will attend the January 11 RWMG meeting as well.

Item	Rate	Quantity	In-Kind	Grant	Total
Personnel Services					
Program Coordinator (per hour)	*$40.06*	*416*	*$16,665*	-	*$16,665*
Field Technician II (per hour)	*$35.90*	*416*	*$14,934*	-	*$14,934*
Field Assistant (per hour)	*$17.25*	*1040*	-	*$17,940*	*$17,940*
Field Assistant (per hour)	*$17.25*	*1040*	-	*$17,940*	*$17,940*
Equipment Expenses					
Vehicle Mileage (per mile)	*$.52*	*40,000*	-	*$20,800*	*$20,800*
GPS Unit Rental (per day)	*$50.00*	*208*	-	*$10,400*	*$10,400*
		Subtotals	**$31,599**	**$67,080**	**$98,679**
		Administrative Costs (10%)		*$6,708*	*$6,708*
		TOTALS	**$31,599**	**$73,788**	**$105,387**

References

Chambers, J.C. (2008). Invasive species and the great basin. *Collaborative management and research in the Great Basin – examining issues and developing a framework for action.* Retrived from http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr204.pdf

Donaldson, S.G. (1997). Flood-borne noxious weeds: impacts on riparian areas and wetlands. *1997 California Exotic Plant Council symposium proceedings.* Retrieved from http://www.cal-ipc.org/symposia/archive/pdf/1997_symposium_proceedings1945.pdf

Sada, D. (2008). Great Basin riparian and aquatic ecosystems. *Collaborative management and research in the Great Basin – examining issues and developing a framework for action.* Retrived from http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr204.pdf

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER

7

AGENDA REQUEST FORM
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☐ Consent ☒ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☒ Informational

FROM: Alisha McMurtrie, Treasurer-Tax Collector

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: **January 10, 2012**

SUBJECT: Request rescission of Inyo County Resolution 2005-03, applying the time period to tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial propertypursuant to Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the California Revenue & Taxation Code; resulting in the time period reverting from being eligible for Power to Sell at five (5) years to being eligible for Power to Sell at three (3) years.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution as recommended, rescinding Resolution 2005-03.

CAO RECOMMENDATION:

N/A

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

On January 1, 2005, Section 3691 of the R&T Code was ammended by AB2144 requiring County Tax Collectors to attempt to sell at auction tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property 3 years after default instead of 5 years. Within this ammendment was a provision for local Boards of Supervisors to keep the Power to Sell date at 5 years upon adoption of an Ordinance or Resolution. Inyo County exercised its option on January 25, 2005 and adopted Resolution 2005-03, keeping the Power to Sell date at 5 years.

The reason for maintaining the 5 year Power to Sell date was to avoid potential increased financial burden upon various departments and the General Fund. After careful analysis, I disagree with that conclusion, especially in the light of the 2008 recession and the snail-paced recovery since. Normally, a recession results in increased in investments in land, especially through tax auctions. Since this was a real estate bubble, there was no flight into real estate and sales at auctions of tax-defaulted properties throughout the State of California essentially dried up. To date, we still have not begun to reach pre-resession sale rates.

Properties fall subject to the tax collector's Power to Sell every July 1st. Each year we have parcels available to be sold at auction. We are able to meet the mandate of Section 3691 each and every year, but I must clarify what that means. While nonresidential commercial property would be subject to Power to Sell at 3 years, Section 3692 of the R&T Code states that I am required to attempt to actually sell the parcels within four (4) years of the parcels being declared Power to Sell. Plainly put, I can declare the parcel Power to Sell at three years, but I have within four years after the Power to Sell date to attempt a sale. It is with this latitude that I am comfortable declaring that my office can meet the mandates required.

Another reason to consider this option is that nonresidential commercial properties, when delinquent, usually owe a higher dollar amount of taxes. Under the Teeter Plan of Distribution, the County basically covers the unpaid tax debt of secured property and distributes those taxes to the Local Agencies and Districts, for the duration of the deliquency. Recently, one local motel owed over $125,000.00 in delinquent taxes which averaged out to be just over 10% of the entire delinquent roll. They were just about to reach the 5 year mark and become Power to Sell. They have since redeemed, but those taxes were paid out under Teeter with the County carrying the debt. We would have been able to shorten the length of the delinquency by two years, reduce the amount of the delinquent roll thereby reducing the amount of the County Teeter "loan".

If your Board rescinds Inyo County Resolution 2005-03, you will effectively be putting a collection enforcement tool back into the toolbox.

ALTERNATIVES:

Your Board may choose not to rescind Inyo County Resolution 2005-03. In such an event, this office will continue to conduct business as usual. The length of time a parcel may go with taxes unpaid will remain at a minimum of 5 years and may delay collection attempts through auction by this office for two years.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

N/A

FINANCING:

As I mentioned above, I do not see any additional financial impacts outside the normal costs incurred when conducting a tax-defaulted land auction. A good portion of those costs are recoverable through R&T Code and are factored into the minimum bid price.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: _____ Date 12/21/11
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (*Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved:_____Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received) _____ Date: 12/22/11
(The Original plus 20 copies of this document are required)

RESOLUTION NO. 2012-__

A Resolution of the Inyo County Board of Supervisors Rescinding Resolution No. 2005-03, a Resolution Applying the Five-Year Time Period for the Offer of Sale at Public Auction of Tax-Defaulted Properties to Tax-Defaulted Nonresidential Commercial Property Pursuant to the Provisions of Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

WHEREAS, California Revenue and Taxation Code section 3691(a)(1)(B), as amended by Assembly Bill 2144 and effective January 1, 2005, required the Inyo County Tax Collector to attempt to sell tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property 3 years or more after the property becomes tax-defaulted unless the County elected by ordinance or resolution to apply the five-year period applicable to residential property to nonresidential commercial property; and

WHEREAS, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution 2005-03 applying the five-year time period for the offer of sale at public auction of tax-defaulted properties to tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property pursuant to the provisions of Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the California Revenue and Taxation Code; and

WHEREAS, when adopting Resolution 2005-03, both the Inyo County Board of Supervisors and the Inyo County Tax Collector expressed concern that California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 3691(a)(1)(B), as amended by Assembly Bill 2144, would result in increased expense to the County not off-set by new revenues; and

WHEREAS, it now appears that the financial impact to the County under the provisions of Section 3691(a)(1)(B) are nominal, as the cost of public auctions are generally recovered through applicable sections of the Revenue and Taxation Code and through the setting of minimum bids; and

WHEREAS, allowing the Inyo County Tax Collector the option to attempt to sell tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property 3 years or more after the property becomes tax-defaulted will better enable the County to collect delinquent taxes ; and

WHEREAS, Inyo County wishes to provide the Inyo County Tax Collector the additional option provided by California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 3691(a)(1)(B) and rescind Resolution No. 2005-03;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that resolution 2005-03 is hereby rescinded and the option elected thereunder is no longer effective.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Inyo, State of California, this __ day of January 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

_____
CHAIRPERSON, INYO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Attest: Kevin Carunchio
Clerk of the Board

By: _____
Patricia Gunsolley
Assistant Clerk of the Board

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-03

A Resolution of the Inyo County Board of Supervisors applying the five-year time period for the offer of sale at public auction of tax-defaulted properties to tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property pursuant to the provisions of Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 2144, Chapter 944, which became effective on January 1, 2005, amends California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 3691 and will require the Inyo County Tax Collector to attempt to sell tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property, as defined, 3 years or more after the property becomes tax-defaulted, and

WHEREAS, current law requires the Inyo County Tax Collector to attempt to sell tax-defaulted property other than non-residential commercial property 5 years or more after such property becomes tax-defaulted, and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 2144 will require the Inyo County Assessor, Inyo County Auditor-Controller and Inyo County Tax Collector to dedicated extensive staff time and to incur additional costs to the Inyo County General Fund, including the cost of identifying nonresidential commercial parcels on all future secured property tax rolls and the cost of conducting more frequent tax-defaulted land auctions, and

WHEREAS, There are no provisions in the law that will allow Inyo County to recover the total amount of the monetary costs it incurs in carrying out the mandates of AB 2144, and

WHEREAS, Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as added by AB 2144, allows a County to elect by Ordinance or Resolution to have the standard five-year time period for the offer of sale of tax-defaulted properties to apply to tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property, and

WHEREAS, Inyo County wishes to avoid incurring additional monetary expenditures to its General Fund that are not offset by new revenues,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Inyo County elects, pursuant to the provisions of Section 3691(a)(1)(B) of the California Revenue and Taxation Code, to have the five-year time period for the offer of sale at public auction of tax-defaulted properties apply to tax-defaulted nonresidential commercial property.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Inyo, State of California, this 25th day of January 2005, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Arcularius, Cash, Williams, Bilyeu and Cervantes
NOES: -0-
ABSENT: -0-
ABSTAIN: -0-

TED WILLIAMS, CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF INYO COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Attest: Rene Mendez
Clerk of the Board

By _____
Patricia Gunsolley, Assistant Clerk of the Board

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER

8

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☐ Consent X Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: Alisha McMurtrie, Treasurer-Tax Collector

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Annual delegation of investment authority to the Inyo County Treasurer.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION: Delegate investment authority to the Inyo County Treasurer by adoption of the attached resolution.

CAO RECOMMENDATION:

SUMMARY DISCUSSION: Section 53607 of the Government Code authorizes your Board to annually delegate its authority to invest or reinvest money in the county treasury, or to sell or exchange securities so purchased, to the County Treasurer, who shall thereafter assume full responsibility for those transactions until the delegation of said authority is revoked or expires. Since 1955, California county boards of supervisors, including the Inyo County Board, have exercised this authority. This action, as it relates to public funds on deposit in the county treasury, transfers fiduciary responsibility from your Board members to the County Treasurer, and, provides for the efficient day-to-day operation of the county treasury.

ALTERNATIVES: Your Board may opt not to delegate its investment authority to the County Treasurer. In such a case, the Board would assume the fiduciary responsibility for providing the day-to-day safety, liquidity and yield on the public funds on deposit in the county treasury.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: N/A

FINANCING: N/A

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: Yes Date 11/28/11
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (*Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* N/A Approved: _____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) N/A Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE: Alisha McMurtrie Date: 12-23-2011

Alisha McMurtrie, Treasurer-Tax Collector

RESOLUTION No. 2012_____

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF INYO DELEGATING TO THE INYO COUNTY TREASURER ITS INVESTMENT AUTHORITY PURSUANT TO SECTION 53607 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE

WHEREAS, this Board has previously exercised its prerogative under Section 53607 of the Government Code and delegated to the Inyo County Treasurer its authority to make investments of certain monies in the Inyo County Treasury; and

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 53607 requires that the delegation to the County Treasurer of this Board's investment authority be made annually; and

WHEREAS, this Board finds that the Inyo County Treasurer has lawfully, prudently, and wisely invested monies of the County and that it is in the public interest that the Treasurer continue to exercise this Board's investment authority; and

WHEREAS, this Board desires to renew the delegation of its investment authority to the Inyo County Treasurer pursuant to Government Code Section 53607,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to Government Code Section 53607 the Inyo County Board of Supervisors hereby renews the delegation of its authority to invest monies on deposit in the Inyo County Treasury to the Inyo County Treasurer provided that all such investments are made in accordance with the provisions of Article 1 of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53600) of the Government Code and the Investment Policy of the Inyo County Treasury.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Board reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its authority to revoke or restrict the investment authority and responsibility of the Inyo County Treasurer as delegated herein.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 10th day of January 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_____
Chairperson of the
Board of Supervisors of Inyo County,
State of California

ATTEST: Kevin Carunchio, Clerk of the Board

BY_____
Patricia Gunsolley, Assistant

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER
9

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☐ Consent X Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: Alisha McMurtrie, Treasurer-Tax Collector

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Annual Board approval of the Inyo County Treasury Investment Policy (Policy).

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION: Approve the Policy (copy attached) as submitted.

CAO RECOMMENDATION:

SUMMARY DISCUSSION: Section 53646(a)(1) of the Government Code requires your Board to annually approve the Policy at a public meeting. The Policy, as written by the County Treasurer, remains in compliance with the legal parameters for the deposit and investment of public funds, as those parameters are set forth in the California Government Code. Treasury Oversight Committee representatives would like to address the Board with their recommendations. There have been no significant changes to Government Code that would effect this Policy, therefore, I am recommending no changes to the current Policy.

ALTERNATIVES: Your Board may choose not to approve the Policy, or to amend the Policy as presented. In any event, the law requires your board to approve a Policy. Therefore, an action to disapprove or amend the Policy as presented must be accompanied by a substitute Policy or amended language.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: Inyo County Statement of Investment Policy Section 12(e) also requires that copies of the Policy be provided to members of the Inyo County Treasury Oversight Committee and the California Debt and Investment Advisory Committee.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: [signature] Date 12/5/11
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* N/A Approved: _____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) N/A Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE: [signature] Date: 12-23-2011
Alisha McMurtrie, Treasurer-Tax Collector

COUNTY OF INYO

STATEMENT OF INVESTMENT POLICY

January 2012

INVESTMENT POLICY
of the
INYO COUNTY TREASURY

(Note: All legal notations to "Sections" made herein are in reference to the California Government Code.)

Scope:

This investment policy applies to all public funds held for safekeeping in the Inyo County Treasury.

1- ***Policy Statement:***

The purpose of this Policy (Policy) is to establish cash management and investment guidelines for the County Treasurer, who is responsible for the stewardship of the Inyo County Pooled Investment Fund. Each transaction and the entire portfolio must comply with California Government Code Section 53601. Et seq., and this policy.

2- ***Prudent Investor Rule:***

The standard of prudence to be applied by the investment officer shall be the "Prudent Investor Rule", which states, "Investments shall be made with judgment and care, under circumstances then prevailing, which persons of prudence, discretion and intelligence exercise in the management of their own affairs, not for speculation, but for investment, considering the probable safety of their capital as well as the probable income to be derived." The Prudent Investor Rule shall be applied in the context of managing the investment portfolio.

3- ***Investment Objectives:***

The specific objectives for the Pooled Investment fund are ranked in order of importance:

{a}. Safety of Principal: The primary objective of the County Treasurer/Investment Officer is to safeguard, preserve and protect capital/principal in the portfolio.

{b}. Liquidity: As a second objective, investments shall be made in a manner that will provide for the daily cash flow demands of the Treasury and its participants.

{c}. Yield: As the third objective, investments shall be made in a manner so as to attain a market rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles while providing for the first two Objectives as stated above, consistent with the risk limitations, prudent investment principals and cash flow characteristics identified herein.

4- ***Participants:***

{a} **STATUTORY PARTICIPANTS**- General Participants are those government agencies within the County of Inyo for which the Inyo County Treasurer is statutorily designated as the Custodian of funds.

{b} **VOLUNTARY PARTICIPANTS**-Other local agencies, such as Special Districts, for which the Treasurer is not the statutory designated Custodian of Funds, may participate in the Pooled Investment Fund. Such participation is subject to the consent of the County Treasurer and must be in accordance with the California Government Code Section 53684, et seq. The agency must provide the County Treasurer with a resolution adopted by the agency's governing board approving the Inyo County Pooled Investment Fund as an authorized investment and accept the Inyo County Investment Policy.

{c} The County Treasurer does not solicit any agency's voluntary entry into the Treasury pool.

5- ***Delegation of Authority:***

Pursuant to Section 53607, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors may delegate the authority to invest or to reinvest public funds in the Inyo County Treasury to the County Treasurer for a one-year period. Thereafter, the County Treasurer shall assume full responsibility for those transactions until the delegation of authority is revoked or expires. Subject to review, the County Board of Supervisors may renew the delegation of investment authority each year.

If the County Board of Supervisors delegates the investment authority to the County Treasurer as referenced above, the County Treasurer may authorize the Assistant County Treasurer to purchase investments in the absence of the County Treasurer pursuant to the law and to the restrictions as herein stated.

6- ***Authorized Investments:***

Authorized investments: shall match the general categories established by the California Government Code Sections 53601, et seq. and 53635, et seq., and shall be listed herein. Authorized investments shall also include, in accordance with California Government Code Section 16429.1, investments into the State Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).

{a} Maturity Restrictions: No investment shall exceed one (1) year as calculated from settlement dates, except that no more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the total amount of the portfolio may consist of securities with maximum maturities of five (5) years as estimated on trade dates.

{b} Operating funds shall be invested so as to ensure that maturity dates will coincide with projected cash flow needs, taking into account anticipated revenue and expenditures

of significant dollar size.

7- ***Prohibited Investments:***

All investments not specifically listed within are hereby prohibited.

8- ***Investment Criteria:*** (Figure 1, see Table of Notes for figure 1 on next page for footnotes related to this figure))

Investment Type	Maximum Maturity	Maximum % of Pool	Rating
U.S. Treasury and Agency Securities (§53601(b&f))	5 years	100	N/A
Bonds and Notes issued by local agencies (see section 1) (§53601(e))	5 years	100	N/A
Registered State Warrants (see section 2) (§53601(c))	5 years	5 % of agency/district deposits	N/A
Bankers' Acceptances (see section 3) (§53601(g))	180 days	40	N/A
Commercial Paper (see section 4) (§53601(h) and §53635(a))	270 days	15	A-1/P-1
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit (§53601(i))	5 years	30	N/A
Repurchase Agreements (see section 5) (§53601(j))	1 year	25	N/A
Reverse Repurchase Agreements (see section 5) (§53601(j))	92 days	25	N/A
Medium-Term Corporate Notes (§53601(k))	5 years	30	A
Mutual Funds & Money Market Mutual Funds (§53601(l))	N/A	20	AAA
Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) (§16429.1)	N/A	As limited by LAIF ($40MM per Agency	N/A

Section	Information
1	The County Treasurer may only purchase the indebtedness of local agencies that receive an increment of Inyo County secured property tax revenue. The maximum amount of said indebtedness purchased from any individual agency in any fiscal year is restricted to 85% of that agency's anticipated current fiscal year uncollected Inyo County secured property tax revenue, and only that portion of those taxes that is secured by an assessee's fee ownership of land as estimated by the Inyo County Auditor-Controller. The maturity of such indebtedness is limited to fifteen (15) months from the date of issue.
2	Registered Warrants are restricted only to cash substitutes issued by the State during periods of declared fiscal emergency.
3	No more than 30 percent of the agency's surplus funds may be invested in the Bankers' Acceptances of any one commercial bank pursuant to this section.
4	All commercial paper issuers must maintain an "A-1" rating by Standard & Poor's Corporation or a "P-1" rating by Moody's Investor Service. No more than 15% of the agency's funds may be invested in commercial paper with no more than 10% of the assets be invested in any one issuer's commercial paper.
5	1. Reverse Repurchase Agreements may be utilized pursuant to the provisions of Section 53601(j) only for the purposes of supplementing the yield on previously purchased securities or to provide funds for the immediate payment of local agency obligations. The maximum maturity of repurchase agreements shall be one year. The maximum maturity of a reverse repurchase agreement shall be 92 days.

9- ***Criteria for the Selection of Broker/Dealers and <u>Financial Institutions</u>:***

The County Treasurer shall select only primary government securities dealers that report daily to

the New York Federal Reserve Bank, unless a comprehensive credit and capitalization analysis reveals that other firms are adequately financed to conduct public business. All broker/dealers and financial institutions must have a strong industry reputation and open lines of credit with other dealers. Further, these firms must have an investment grade rating from at least one national rating service, if applicable.

Any broker, brokerage, dealer or securities firm shall be prohibited from conducting business with the County Treasurer if the individual or firm has, within any consecutive 48-month period following January 1, 1996, made a political contribution in an amount exceeding the limitation contained in Rule G-37 of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, to the Inyo County Treasurer, any member of the Inyo County Board of Supervisors, or any candidate for those offices.

Each broker/dealer or financial institution will be sent a copy of this Policy and a list of those persons authorized to execute investment transactions.

Each broker/dealer and financial institution authorized to do business with Inyo County shall, at least annually, supply the County Treasurer with financial statements.

10- Criteria for the Management of Extraordinary Withdrawals:

Extraordinary Withdrawals are those withdrawals from the County Treasury that: are not predictable by the County Treasurer from an analysis of historic and current Treasury cash flow records; and, as a result of the dollar amount of such withdrawals, have a significant impact on the ability of the County Treasurer to satisfy the cash flow requirement of the participants in the County Treasury pool. Such Extraordinary Withdrawals from the County Treasury can create liquidity problems and negatively impact the earnings of the remaining County Treasury pool participants in the event the County Treasurer is forced to liquidate securities prior to their scheduled maturity dates in order to cover such withdrawals. A pool participant, who wishes to withdraw from the pool or make an Extraordinary Withdrawal, will be encouraged to work with the County Treasurer to arrange a withdrawal schedule that would prevent losses to the withdrawing agency or the remaining pool participants.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 27133(h), upon receipt of any request to withdraw funds from the County Treasury, the County Treasurer shall assess the effect of the proposed withdrawal on the stability and predictability of the investments in the County Treasury. The County Treasurer will approve a withdrawal only if he/she determines that said withdrawal would not adversely affect the interests of the other participants in the County Treasury pool.

If the County Treasurer determines that an Extraordinary Withdrawal will cause the County Treasury pool to realize a loss, the County Treasurer in his/her discretion may disapprove the withdrawal, or delay the withdrawal, or approve the withdrawal on the condition that any such

loss be borne by the agency requesting the withdrawal, and on any other condition necessary to prevent an adverse effect on the interests of the other pool participants. The County Treasurer reserves the right to choose which securities to liquidate to provide for the Extraordinary Withdrawal and could choose to sell the securities that have the lowest earnings.

11- ***Safekeeping:***

Pursuant to Section 53608 the Inyo County Board of Supervisors has, by its Resolution No. 95-97 dated September 26, 1995, delegated to the County Treasurer the authority to enter into safekeeping agreements with specified institutions. Investment securities purchased by the County Treasury shall be held in customer-segregated safekeeping accounts that qualify as "Category 1 Custody" as defined by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. Each institution where securities are held shall be required to provide a monthly safekeeping statement to the County Treasurer.

12 Apportionment of Interest and Costs & Calculation of the Treasurer's Administrative Fee:

The relationship of a participant's average daily fund balance to the total average daily balance of the entire Treasury pool determines the percentage of interest paid to that participant from a single apportionment. The proportionate amount of the Treasurer's Administration Fee paid by any participant in any quarter may be calculated in the same manner.

The County Treasurer's Administrative Fee, as authorized by Section 27013 and as calculated by the County Treasurer, shall not exceed the actual administrative costs incurred by the County for the operation of the County Treasury. In addition, pursuant to Section 27135 the cost of the County Treasury Oversight Committee's annual compliance audit shall be deemed as an administrative cost pursuant to Section 27013.

The Treasurer's Administrative Fee shall be imposed quarterly and deducted from interest earnings prior to the apportionment of those earnings to the participants in the County Treasury pool.

13 ***Audit, Supervision, Approval and Monitoring of the Investment Policy and Portfolio, including Reporting Requirements:***

{a} Pursuant to Section 25250 the County Board of Supervisors (Board) shall, at least biennially, cause to be audited in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards the financial accounts and records of all officers, including the County Treasurer, having responsibility for the care, management, collection, or disbursement of public funds.

{b} Pursuant to Section 25303 the Board will supervise the official conduct of the Inyo County Treasurer.

{c} Pursuant to Section 26920 et seq. the County Auditor shall, at least once each quarter, perform a review of the treasurer's statement of assets.

{d} Pursuant to Section 27100 the books, accounts and vouchers of the County Treasury are at all times subject to the inspection and examination by the Board and the County Grand Jury, or by any officers or agents designated by the Board or Grand Jury to make the inspection and examination. The County Treasurer shall permit the examination of the books and assets of the County Treasury.

{e} The County Treasurer shall annually render to the Board at a public meeting the Treasury Investment Policy (Policy) for the Board's review and approval. Any changes to the Policy shall also be reviewed and approved by the Board at a public meeting. In addition, the Treasurer shall annually provide copies of the Policy to the County Treasury Oversight Committee (Committee) and the California Debt and Investment Advisory Committee.

{f} The County Treasurer shall render a quarterly report to the Board, County Auditor-Controller and Committee. In addition, copies of the reports for the second and fourth quarters shall be forwarded to the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission. The report shall reflect, pursuant to the law, the detailed status of investments held by the County Treasury including the following information: (Refer to Section 53646)

1- The type of investment, name of the issuer, date of maturity, par and dollar amount invested on all securities, investments and moneys held.

2- A description of the funds, investments, or programs that are under the management of contracted parties, including lending programs.

3- The market values of all funds, investments or programs under the management of contracted parties, and the source of the valuation for any security within the treasury.

4- A description of the compliance or the manner in which the portfolio is not in compliance with the County Treasury Investment Policy.

- A statement of the County Treasury's ability to meet the projected liquidity requirements of participants in the treasury pool for the next six (6) months, or an explanation as to why sufficient money may not be available.

Upon request, the County Treasurer shall deliver to the County Auditor-Controller a detailed record of investment activity for the current or preceding fiscal year.

The County Treasurer shall routinely monitor the investment portfolio in relationship to limitations and restrictions imposed by the California statues and as herein stated, and will adjust the portfolio accordingly.

Internal Controls:

The County Treasurer shall establish a system of written internal controls, which shall be reviewed annually by all authorized persons. The internal controls shall be designed to prevent, or at least minimize, the loss of public funds due to fraud, error, misrepresentation, unanticipated market changes or imprudent actions. Where possible, investments shall be placed, confirmed, held, accounted for and audited by different persons.

PROHIBITIONS ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND HONORARIA:

The County Treasurer, Assistant County Treasurer and the members of the Treasury Oversight Committee shall comply with the provisions of the Political Reform Act (Section 87200 et esq.) as those rules may be amended from time to time by the Fair Political Practices Commission.

The provisions of the Political Reform Act shall also govern the conduct of the above referenced individuals, particularly with regard to restriction placed on the acceptance by members of honoraria, gifts and gratuities from financial and security advisors, brokers, dealers, bankers or other persons with whom the County Treasury conducts business.

PROVISIONS FOR THE SEPARATE INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT OF THE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROCEEDS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES THAT ARE TREASURY POOL PARTICIPANTS:

This section sets forth an alternative investment procedure for the separate investment management of certain general obligation bond proceeds belonging to local governmental agencies that are participants in the Treasury pool. The goal of this procedure is to maximize interest earnings on general obligation bond proceeds that are not immediately required by the issuing agency, thereby reducing the agency's bond interest costs.

Prior to the separate investment of general obligation bond proceeds as outlined below, the governing board of the local governmental agency that issued the bonds shall adopt a resolution authorizing the County Treasurer to make such investments on behalf of the agency. The agency whose bond proceeds will be invested as herein stated will have the option to restrict the type of such investment instruments purchased by the County Treasurer, provided such restrictions fall within the parameters of this Investment Policy, and are reflected in the agency's authorizing resolution.

General obligation bond proceeds (proceeds) of $100,000.00 or more belonging to a local governmental agency that is a Treasury pool participant and that are not immediately required by the agency, may, at the sole discretion of the County Treasurer, be separately invested for the financial benefit of said agency. The bond proceeds shall at all times remain in, and be considered part of, the County Treasury. The bond proceeds that have been separately invested may not be withdrawn from the Treasury. Once authorized by a resolution of the agency issuing

the bonds as above stated, the County Treasurer may use the bond proceeds to purchase specific investments that will thereafter be considered investments of said agency.

The agency that issued the bonds will deliver to the County Treasurer its most current schedule of calendar dates on which the agency anticipates withdrawing the bond proceeds from the Treasurer. The Treasurer will utilize the agency's most current withdrawal schedule to provide the necessary liquidity, while at the same time endeavoring to maximize interest earnings on the said proceeds. In the event the agency requires its bond proceeds prior to the maturity dates of the separate investments, and has no other source of funds to pay the financial obligation that should have been paid from those bond proceeds, the County Treasurer may purchase one or more of the agency's separate bond investments for the Treasury investment portfolio that is

shared by the other pool participants with assets of the Treasury, thereby making the necessary amount of the agency's bond proceeds available to the agency for withdrawal, provided, however, that no purchase may be made by the Treasurer of the separate bond investments of the agency if that purchase will result in a financial loss to the County Treasury or otherwise injure the Treasury pool participants.

For accounting purposes, such separate investments shall be segregated from those investments of the Treasury pool that are owned proportionately by all Treasury pool participants. The interest earned on the investments purchased with the agency's bond proceeds will be deposited, net of any Treasury Administrative Fees, in the issuing agency's bond proceeds fund within the Treasury, and will not be distributed to any other pool participant or Treasury fund. Said bond proceeds, when separately invested as herein stated, will not earn any interest earned on those Treasury investments that are owned proportionately by the Treasury pool participants and not separately invested.

DISCLOSURE OF SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITY:

The Treasurer's Office will inform the Office of the Inyo County Administrator by means of a written memorandum or email, prior to the close of business on the next business day, whenever the daily activity of the County Treasury includes one or more of the following transactions in an aggregate amount of $5,000,000.00 or more:

- Sale of a security prior to the stated maturity or call date of said security.
- Withdrawal or transfer of cash assets from a depository, including but not limited to a bank, investment pool or money market fund.
- Payment of an Extraordinary Withdrawal, as such Withdrawal is herein defined.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ACCRUED INTEREST
Interest that has accumulated but has not yet been paid from the most recent interest payment date or issue date to a certain date.

BANKERS' ACCEPTANCE
A time bill of exchange drawn on and accepted by a commercial bank to finance the exchange of goods. When a bank "accepts" such a bill, the time draft becomes, in effect, a predated, certified check payable to the bearer at some future specified date. Little risk is involved for the investor because the commercial bank assumes primary liability once the draft is accepted.

BASIS POINT
One basis point is equal to 1/100 of one percent. For example, if interest rates increase from 4.25% to 4.50%, the difference is referred to as a 25-basis-point increase.

BOOK VALUE
The value of a security as carried in the records of an investor. May differ from current market value of the security.

BROKER/DEALER
Any person engaged in the business of effecting transactions in securities in this state for the account of others or for his/her own account. Broker/dealer also includes a person engaged in the regular business of issuing or guaranteeing options with regard to securities not of his/her own issue.

COMMERCIAL PAPER
Short-term, unsecured promissory note issued in either registered or bearer form and usually backed by a line of credit with a bank. Maturities do not exceed 270 days and generally average 30-45 days.

COUPON RATE
The annual rate of interest payable on a security expressed as a percentage of the principal amount.

CREDIT RISK
The risk to an investor that an issuer will default in the payment of interest and/or principal on a security.

CURRENT YIELD
The annual income from an investment divided by the current market yield. Since the mathematical calculation relies on the current market value rather than the investor's cost, current yield is unrelated to the actual return the investor will earn if the security is held to maturity.

CUSIP NUMBERS
CUSIP is an acronym for Committee on Uniform Security Identification Procedures. CUSIP numbers are identification numbers assigned to each maturity of a security issue and usually printed on the face of each individual security in the issue. The CUSIP numbers are intended to facilitate identification and clearance of securities.

DISCOUNT
The amount by which the par value of a security exceeds the price paid for a security.

EARNINGS APPORTIONMENT
The quarterly interest distribution to the Pool Participants where the actual investment costs incurred by the Treasurer are deducted from the interest earnings of the Pool.

FAIR VALUE
The amount at which an investment could be exchanged in a current transaction between willing parties, other than a forced or liquidation sale.

FLOATING RATE NOTE
A debt security whose interest rate is reset periodically (monthly, quarterly, annually) and is based on a market index (e.g. Treasury bills, LIBOR etc.).

INTEREST
The amount earned while owning a debt security, generally calculated as a percentage of the principal amount.

LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND (LAIF)
The State of California investment pool in which money of local agencies is pooled as a method for managing and investing local funds.

MARKET VALUE
The price at which a security is trading and could presumably be purchased or sold.

MATURITY
The date upon which the principal of a security becomes due and payable to the holder.

MONEY MARKET MUTUAL FUND
A mutual fund with investments directed in short-term money market instruments only, which can be withdrawn daily without penalty.

PAR
The stated maturity value, or face value, of a security.

PAR VALUE
The stated or face value of a security expressed as a specific dollar amount

PREMIUM
The amount by which the price paid for a security exceeds the security's par value.

REPURCHASE AGREEEMENT OR RP OR REPO
An agreement consisting of two simultaneous transactions whereby the investor purchases securities from a bank or dealer and the bank or dealer agrees to repurchase the securities at the same price on a certain future date. The interest rate on a RP is that which the dealer pays the investor for the use of his/her funds. Reverse repurchase agreements are the mirror image of the RPs when the bank or dealer purchases securities from the investor under an agreement to sell them back to the investor.

REGISTERED WARRANTS

A registered warrant is a "promise to pay," with interest, that is issued by the State when there is not enough cash to meet all of the State's payment obligations.

SETTLEMENT DATE

The date on which the purchase or sale of securities is executed. For example, in a purchase transaction, the day the securities are physically delivered or wired to the buyer in exchange for cash is the settlement date.

TRADE DATE

The date and time corresponding to an investor's commitment to buy or sell a security.

WEIGHTED AVERAGE MATURITY

The remaining average maturity of all securities held in a portfolio.

AGENDA REQUEST FORM
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☐ Consent ☐ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action

☐ Public Hearing ☐ Schedule time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER
10

FROM: Public Works Department

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Approval of Request for Proposals for Water Systems Operations and Maintenance

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Review and approve the Water Systems Operations and Maintenance Request for Proposals (RFP) and approve for advertising.

CAO RECOMMENDATIONS:

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

As your Board is aware, the Contract for Operations and Maintenance for the Town Water Systems has been extended several times pending the completion of Public Works revision of the previous RFP. This current document differs from prior RFP's in several ways.

The greatest difference between this RFP and all prior RFP's is that this RFP also requests proposals to lease the systems, which will divest the county of most of the responsibilities as a utility owner. It is anticipated that a lease will include rate setting, which will likely fall within the purview of the Public Utilities Commission, not the Board of Supervisors and the required Proposition 218 process.

The RFP requests proposers to: 1) provide a complete description and discussion of the duties, tasks, materials, etc. proposed to be provided; and 2) provide a base bid proposal, and if necessary, a non-routine tasks proposal. Prior RFP's requested an all-encompassing proposal with a "one price covers most" aspect where if components needed to be replaced, within reason, the cost of the contract covered those replacements. Likewise, if no replacements were needed, the contract cost was the same as if several replacements were required. Previously, more than one contractor voiced their dissatisfaction with this format because it could work against either party equally in either extreme, likely costing the county more in contract costs.

The RFP also removed the detailed tasks list contained in previous RFP's, now asking for each responder to detail the necessary operations. This will better enable the County to evaluate the qualifications of the responders.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could direct changes to be made to the document. The Board could also decide not to approve this Request for Proposal. This is not recommended as the current contract's original termination date was June 30, 2010 and has been extended to June 30, 2012.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

County Counsel
Auditor's office

FINANCING:

Financing for the contract with a contractor will obtained through water user fees established by Inyo County Ordinance 1008, and is included in the Board approved 2011-2012 budget in Independence, Lone Pine, and Laws water system budgets (152101, 152201, 152301),object code 5265, Professional & special Services.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by County Counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved: [illegible] Date 1/3/12
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor/controller prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:

(Not to be signed until all approvals are received) _____ Date:_____

County of Inyo
Department of Public Works

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Operation and Maintenance
of
Town Water Systems
For
Laws, Independence and Lone Pine

December 21, 2011

1. Introduction

The County of Inyo is requesting proposals to operate, maintain, and repair three (3) Town Water Systems at Laws, Independence and Lone Pine (except the wells and pumps, which are owned, operated and maintained by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)). Proposals are requested that provide for the operations, maintenance and repair of the three systems either by qualified contractors or by lease to recognized purveyors. The county desires comprehensive proposals which cover all aspects of the business of purveying water to the public.

The Long Term Water Agreement (LTWA) and Environmental Impact Report- Draft 1991 (EIR) is referenced with in this document. It is available on-line at www.inyocounty.us. Click on 'Departments'. Scroll down and click on 'Water Department'. Click on the "Policies" link, fourth link from the left on the upper bar across the page. In the rectangle on the right, "Legal Framework" are the links for both the LTWA and the EIR. Within the LTWA, scroll down to 'XI Town Water Systems'. Within the EIR, pages 5-24 through 5-26, 17-6, and 17-7 may be of interest.

In either case of a contractor or lessee providing the desired services below, the selected entity shall be recognized by the State of California as the system operator.

Inyo County acquired the three water systems from LADWP and assumed partial operations and maintenance per the LTWA in 1999. Full operations including chlorination, SCADA and other operations and maintenance duties followed in 2003. Significant water main upgrades to all three Town Water Systems were completed in January 2003. With the exception of service laterals, these water main improvements included replacing approximately 36% of the systems in both Lone Pine and Independence and the replacement of the water mains in the community of Laws. As a consequence of the Inyo Complex fire of July 2007, the Independence Reservoir was replaced with two welded steel tanks of 200,000 gallons capacity each in 2009. There are 941 meters among the three town water systems; while about 120 meters have been replaced since 1999.The material types and installation dates for the various improvements to the distribution systems and components in the above referenced town sites are available on plans for each system available for review at the Inyo County Public Works Department.

The California Business and Professions Code provides that those responders who as part of their proposal will have contractors perform any work in the public right-of-way, such as any County road or alley, and Highway 395 within Lone Pine or Independence, shall be appropriately licensed by the State of California Contractors License Board. Include with your proposal the name and California State Contractor's License number of the contractor proposed to perform the work. Generally, all water meters are within the public right-of-way. Examples of tasks requiring a Contractor's License may include: any digging within rights-of-way, fixing main or service lateral leaks, water meter leaks or replacing water meters, or setting up traffic control devices. This list is not exhaustive or complete but rather identifies the range of operations and maintenance tasks which may require a Contractor's License. Acceptable licenses are either a General Engineering Class "A" or Pipeline Class "34" license. Such contractor may be the RFP responder, or a sub-contractor to the responder.

The duties listed in Title 22, Division 4, Section 63770 of the California Code of Regulations require a D2 Certification from the California Department of Public Health for Lone Pine and a

D1 Certification for Independence or Laws. Operators may treat water with sodium hypochlorite with a T1 or D1 Certificate.

See Inyo County Standard Specifications available on-line at the county's website (address above). Click on "Departments'. Scroll down to 'Public Works' and click on 'Public Works Department Specifications'. Reference in this document, and during the term of the contract or lease will be made to the Standard Specifications in so far as they apply to this work; therefore it is to the proposer's advantage to become familiar with the County Standard Specifications.

2. Requested Services

Contract Operations: Inyo County will accept proposals for contract operations of the three water systems. Contractors are required to provide all functions, personnel, licenses, certifications, equipment, tools, materials, parts, supplies, chemicals, testing, vehicles, uniforms, etc. required for the business of purveying water to the public. The contractor will perform meter reading and billing every two months. Collections will be on-going during the month while proceeds will be submitted to the county monthly. Rate setting will remain the responsibility of Inyo County, with input from the contractor. Inyo County recognizes that contractors may determine that some aspects of the operation are frequent, repetitive, customary, routine or on going in nature that are required to operate the system (base services) while other services may be predictable but infrequent, annual, intermittent, non-routine or sporadic in nature (non-routine services). If, in preparing your proposal, you determine that the most cost effective means of providing services is to exclude certain non-routine or sporadic services from the base services proposal, you should identify the non-routine services as being excluded and provide a separate cost proposal for the non-routine services. Completion of the non-routine services may be subject to approval of the Inyo County Public Works Department prior to initiation of each service. Contractor shall be subject to oversight by the California Department of Public Health (Independence and Lone Pine systems), Inyo County Environmental Health Department (Laws system) and Department of Public Works (comprehensive project oversight).

> (Note: California state prevailing wage laws require the payment of prevailing wage for certain services performed by contractors on public works contracts. See California Labor Code §1700 et seq. The successful applicant will be required to comply with the provisions of the California State Prevailing Wage laws; and, upon request provide proof of such compliance to the County. Pursuant to Section 1773 of the Labor Code, the general prevailing wage rates in Inyo County have been determined by the Director of the State Department of Industrial Relations. These wage rates appear in the Department of Transportation publication entitled "General Prevailing Wage Rates" in effect at the time the project is advertised. Future effective wage rates, which have been predetermined and are on file with the State Department of Industrial Relations are referenced, but not printed, in said publication. Copies of the predetermined rate are on file at the Inyo County Public Works Department, 168 N. Edwards St, Independence, Ca 93526 (760) 878-0201, or the State Department of Industrial Relations http://www.dir.ca.gov/dlsr/PWD/index.htm. Go to Step 2b and choose the trade, or go to Step 4, choose Inyo County, and download the trades.).

The contract proposals shall be for a minimum term of 3 years with the possibility to extend the contract period.

The contract price paid for the work specified within the Scope of Work shall be considered the full compensation for furnishing all labor, materials, tools, equipment, incidentals, and for doing all the work involved in the business of purveying water to the public. No additional compensation will be allowed therefor.

Lease Operations: Inyo County will accept proposals from recognized purveyors to lease the three water systems. Responses from potential lessees will be evaluated based upon the lessee's demonstrated qualifications to provide comprehensive systems operations. Lessee shall assume the responsibilities as the system owner in all respects. Lessee shall provide all personnel, licenses, certifications, equipment, tools, materials, parts, supplies, chemicals, testing, vehicles, uniforms and the like required for the business of purveying water to the public. The Lessee shall perform meter reading, billing and collections. A Capital Improvements Plan and account shall be developed by the lessee and funded from rates proceeds. The unexpended funds in the Capitol Improvement account shall revert to the County of Inyo at the close of the lease period. Rate setting will be the responsibility of the lessee and subject to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The rates shall be sufficient to fund operations, maintenance, repairs capital improvements and other necessary funds as identified by the CPUC. Lessee shall be subject to oversight by the CPUC and their rules, orders, etc., California Department of Public Health and Inyo County Environmental Health Department as above for contract operations, and Department of Public Works (limited project oversight). Future over allotment charges during the period the lessee operates the systems shall be the responsibility of the lessee.

Lease proposal term shall be negotiable.

3. Scope of Work

Responders shall submit a comprehensive Scope of Work discussing both base and non-routine services to be performed. The submitted Scope of Work must describe specific responsibilities, functions, personnel, licenses, certifications, equipment, tools, materials, parts, supplies, chemicals, testing, vehicles, duties, goods and services to be rendered necessary to conduct the business of purveying water to the public and, provide assurance that the above Scope will be provided. Prior County authorization for personnel or subcontractor substitutions will be required. The request for substitutions will be evaluated expeditiously, and if granted, will be provided forthwith. Identify what inventory may be maintained and the storage location. Indicate all licenses and certifications held or to be provided. Identify where an office for public access will be located and office hours it will be staffed.

Reference is made to appropriate portions of the County Standard Specifications. Open excavations will not be allowed overnight. Wrap all metallic components to be backfilled in two layers of 10 mil polyethylene taped at edges. Parts, materials, chemicals, etc must be pre-approved by the county prior to use and meet appropriate ANSI/AWWA specifications, be NSF-61 approved and if available, be UL/FM approved. Installation of appurtenances will be accomplished with at least a D1 California Department of Public Health Operators certificate held by one or more staff on-site during installation.

Any installation / materials associated with installation covered by the Scope of Work shall be warranted for 3 years.
The Proposal must include the following:

A. Staffing Plan of personnel proposed for this project. If the staffing plan specifies employees using personal vehicles for the completion of the work, demonstrate that the drivers are appropriately insured. Discuss how on-call emergency response staff is rotated among staff; and where the staff responds from. Differentiate between Chief Operator and Shift Operator personnel. Demonstrate how the entity shall provide all necessary operations staff and be recognized by California Department of Public Health as the system operator. State how, in the event of a catastrophic emergency, the emergency response needs for water systems currently served by the contractor/lessee will be coordinated with the response needs of the County water systems. Include resumes of proposed staff. Once an agreement for services has been entered, prior approval will be required for staffing changes.

B. A comprehensive Scope of Work as described above and a Statement of Fees for providing the Scope of Work.

C. Experience with the Scope of Work. List continuing education, training, confined space safety or OSHA training operators have attended. Provide copies of certificates and continuing education units earned.

D. Names of the proposed Project Manager and the person authorized to negotiate on behalf of the firm.

E. Provide a statement on availability of the firm to provide services.

F. A list of references, with contact person, from previous projects. As a part of the evaluation of any proposal, the County may contact these references and request information regarding the responder's performance.

G. List and clearly identify exclusions your proposal does not address or cover. If there are no contract exclusions, provide a statement to that effect.

H. List and clearly identify exclusions your proposal does not address or cover. If there are no contract exclusions, provide a statement to that effect.

Some, or all of your proposal may be attached to any contract or agreement entered into with the county.

The County of Inyo reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and reserves the right after receiving proposals to seek completion of the work contemplated herein as it chooses.

4. Agreement Terms

Contract Terms

A. Minimum Term

The minimum contract term shall be three (3) years and may be extended. The term will be dependent on factors such as, but not limited to the minimum time for the provider to recover costs, breadth of past experience, abilities, etc. A copy of Inyo County Standard Contract

No. 116 (Modified) is attached. Prospective bidders are encouraged to review the terms of this document.

B. Minimum Insurance Terms

See attached Insurance Specification 1.

Surety Bonds

Contractor shall provide the following Surety Bonds:

1. Performance bond
2. Payment bond
3. Maintenance bond

The Payment Bond and the Performance Bond shall be in a sum equal to the contract price. If the Performance Bond provides for a one-year warranty a separate Maintenance Bond is not necessary. If the warranty period specified in the contract is for longer than one year a Maintenance Bond equal to 10% of the contract price is required. Bonds shall be duly executed by a responsible corporate surety, authorized to issue such bonds in the State of California and secured through an authorized agent with an office in California.

C. Non Performance

Contractor and county will jointly determine a non-performance clause.

Lease Terms

A. Minimum Term

The minimum lease term shall be negotiable and may be extended. The term will be dependent on factors such as, but not limited to the minimum time for the provider to recover costs, breadth of past experience, abilities, etc. The terms and conditions of the lease will be jointly determined by both parties.

B. Minimum Insurance Terms

See attached Insurance Specification 1.

5. Minimum Qualifications

A. Ability to demonstrate knowledge, skills and abilities to successfully provide the services in this request.

B. Possess the appropriate licensing and certification required by the State of California.

6. Service by Inyo County

Inyo County will provide the services listed below in support of the proposed services:

A. Furnish available reports and drawings that are in the County's' possession.

B. Participate in meetings with the provider as required.

C. Provide direction to the contractor or lessee as necessary.

7. Evaluation Criteria / Selection Process

The information provided in the proposal will be the basis for selecting a list of firms to be invited to continue in the selection process. The criteria for selection will be determined from the following areas:

A. Proposals which require the least time involvement by the county, that are efficient and cost effective means of operating the three Town Water Systems. (40%)

B. Experience in a comprehensive Scope of Work. (30%)

C. Staffing capabilities of the firm, experience/qualifications of the proposed staff members, in addition to general experience/qualifications of the firm. (30%)

Proposers scoring the highest on the above criteria will be provided additional bid documents to prepare and submit to the county to continue the selection process. It shall be the county's discretion to determine after evaluating all documents submitted, the lowest minimum score to qualify responders for interviews. All proposers scoring the minimum score or higher will be invited for an interview. All documents submitted thus far may be attached to the contract or lease agreement.

There is a pre-proposal job walk on January 30, 2012 at 8 AM starting at the Laws town water system continuing south through the Independence and Lone Pine town water systems. Any questions or need for clarification must be emailed to Keith Pearce, Inyo County Public Works Department, kpearce@inyocounty.us no later than February 13, 2012, after which answers to questions shall be forwarded to all responders via email by February 21, 2012.

The due date for the proposal is March 5, 2012; 5:00 p.m. All proposals shall be sent to the Inyo County Public Works Department, P.O. Drawer Q, Independence, CA. 93526. If you choose to mail your proposal, Independence is not a "Next Day Delivery" location.

All proposals to be considered must address Section 6 paragraphs A through G.

8. Project Locations and Description

The following general descriptions of the three (3) water systems are intended to give a perspective of the individual systems. These descriptions may not be all inclusive of every water system appurtenance, asset, or property, and are intended as a general overview. A pre-proposal

job walk will be scheduled for each site. Due to the nature of each system, the county does not warrant the condition of any of the three systems.

Laws: The community of Laws is located approximately seven (7) miles northeast of the City of Bishop. It is approximately 150 acres in area with a primarily transitory work population of about 30 people serving the businesses located in Laws, with an annual water consumption of approximately 25 acre-feet per year (2000 to 2004 average). This system is currently a California Public Health Department class D1 system. This water distribution system consists of:

1 – Deep water well
1 – Hydro-pneumatic tank and associated controls
Chlorination solution crocs, metering pumps, and associated equipment
1 - -Treatment building, frame construction.
1 – 150 kilowatt generator and transfer switch
17 – Metered services
12 – 2 ½"x 4" double fire hydrants
9,580 feet of pipeline:
830 feet of 1-½" diameter PVC or iron pipe
200 feet of 2" diameter PVC or iron pipe
2,469 feet of 6" diameter Class 150 C-900 PVC water main
6,081 feet of 8" diameter Class 150 C-900 PVC water main
1-Rugid telemetry system RUG-5
1- Standard telecommunication dedicated phone line
Associated sensors, transducers, etc.
1-AGM battery 12V 35.0 AH maintenance free battery & trickle charger
Intertie and appurtenances between LADWP Well 413 and distribution system.
CONFINED SPACES:
2 Intertie Vaults
1 Blow-off vault
2 Hydropneumatic tanks
1 Hypochlorite injection & swing check valve vault.

Independence: The community of Independence is located approximately forty-five (45) miles south of the city of Bishop. It is approximately 220 acres in area, with a population of 586, and an annual water consumption of approximately 450 acre-feet per year (2000 to 2004 average). The water system was purchased from the Independence Water Company by the City of Los Angeles in 1974. This system is currently a California Public Health Department class D1 system. This water distribution system consists of:

2 - Deep water wells (1 primary and 1 back up)
2 – Chlorination buildings-frame construction; solution crocks, metering pumps, and associated equipment
2 – 200,000 gallon welded steel water storage tanks and associated appurtenances, sensors, controls, and communication equipment
1 – 250 kilowatt generator
364 – Metered services
54 – 2 ½" x 4" double fire hydrants
48,750 feet of distribution water main:
810 feet of 1 ½" diameter iron pipe

2,330 feet of 2" diameter iron pipe
290 feet of 3" diameter iron pipe
1,127 feet of 4" diameter cast iron water main
23,939 feet of 6" diameter steel, cast or ductile iron, or PVC water main
14,316 feet of 8" diameter steel, cast or ductile iron, or PVC water main
5,938 feet of 10" and 12" diameter steel or ductile iron reservoir trunk line
1-Rugid telemetry system RUG-5
1- Standard telecommunication dedicated phone line
Associated sensors, transducers, etc.
1-AGM battery 12V 35.0 AH maintenance free battery & trickle charger
Pressure and Demand chart recorders.
CONFINED SPACES:
2 - 200,000 gallon welded steel tanks
1 Retention basin (old reservoir)
3 Swing check valve vaults at tanks
2 OS&Y valve vaults
1 swing check vault at old chlorination vault
Several large (4 inch to 6 inch) meter vaults
1 Well meter vault w/ hypochlorite injection point
1 backup well hypochlorite injection vault
1 backup well meter vault
1 underground contactor 7' dia. x 115' long

Lone Pine: The community of Lone Pine is located approximately fifteen (15) miles south of the community of Independence. It is approximately 300 acres in area, with a population of 1655, and an annual water consumption of approximately 600 acre-feet (2000 to 2004 average). The water system was purchased from the Lone Pine Water Company by the City of Los Angeles in 1967. This system is currently a California Public Health Department class D2 system. This water distribution system consists of:

2 – Deep water wells (1 primary and 1 back-up)
1 –500,000-gallon storage tank, sensors, controls, communication equipment and chlorination equipment
1 – 250 kilowatt generator
560– Metered services
67 – 2 ½"x 4" double fire hydrants
45,653 feet of distribution water main:
222 feet of 1 ½" diameter iron pipe
1,557 feet of 2" diameter iron pipe
1,310 feet of 4" diameter steel, cast or ductile iron water main
17,546 feet of 6" diameter asbestos cement, cast or ductile iron, or PVC water main
18,773 feet of 8" diameter cast or ductile iron, steel or PVC water main
2,553 feet of 12" diameter cast or ductile iron, or steel water main
3,692 feet of 16" diameter cast or ductile iron, or steel water main
1-Rugid telemetry system RUG-9
1- Standard telecommunication dedicated phone lines
Associated sensors, transducers, software, etc.
1-AGM battery 12V 35.0 AH maintenance free battery & trickle charger
1- UPS un-interruptible power supply

Pressure and demand chart recorders
CONFINED SPACES:
1 500,000 welded steel tank
Appurtenance vault at tank
2 Control valve vaults at aqueduct crossing
2 Hypochlorite injection & swing check valve vaults
1 Pressure regulating station vault
1 Town demand meter vault
Several large (4 inch to 6 inch) meter vaults
1 underground contactor 5' dia. x 180' long

(Notice: The list of confined spaces for each water system may be incomplete. There may be more spaces than those listed. The Contractor/Lessee is expected to provide all necessary manpower, training and equipment to legally enter confined spaces. All water storage tanks, hydropneumatic tanks and appurtenance or meter vaults are confined spaces. Some confined spaces are permit required confined spaces, while other spaces are non-permitted confined spaces. Entry shall follow all applicable CALOSHA regulations. The above CONFINED SPACES listings and this notice serves as the required safety effort the County must follow pursuant to CCR Title 8, Confined Space Safety).

Master RUGID System: The master RUGID system may be located in the location of your choice for maximum optimization of your operations. Inyo County personnel must have access to the RUGID computer at all times. This generally consists of:

1-RUG 9 unit with enclosure, software, etc.
1- computer and monitor
1-Printer
1-AGM battery 12V 35.0 AH maintenance free battery & trickle charger
1-APC Back UPS RS 800 un-interruptible power supply
2-Standard telecommunication dedicated phone lines provided by the Contractor/Lessee.

Billing Software: The County does not currently own billing software.

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER

☐ Consent ☒ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: **Water Department**

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Integrated Regional Water Management Plan: Regional Water Management Group January 11 conference call and January 25 meeting

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

The Water Department requests your Board receive an update on IRWMP activities and provide direction concerning the January 11, 2012 Regional Water Management Group conference call and January 25 meeting for the Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP).

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

The Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) is meeting January 11 by conference call and January 25 at the Bishop Paiute Tribe Community Center to consider and rank proposals from the RWMG to submit to California Department of Water Resources under the Proposition 84 Round 2 Planning Grant Proposal Solicitation Package.

The following proposals have been submitted to the RWMG for inclusion in the Inyo-Mono IRWMP (project proponent in parentheses):

1. **Continued Program Office Support Inyo-Mono Program Office** (California Trout). The Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office has been overseeing the day-to-day operations of the Inyo-Mono RWMG for almost four years. This funding request is to continue the regular operations of the Program Office, further enhance the Inyo-Mono IRWM planning process, and develop a long-term plan for supporting and sustaining the activities of the RWMG into the future.

2. **Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Plant Inventory Project** (Inyo/Mono Agricultural Commissioner's Office). The goal of this project is to complete a survey of selected invasive weeds of regional importance, using existing data, interagency cooperation, and field surveys. This project will create accurate, comprehensive, and accessible data for multiple future uses. As a member in the Eastern Sierra Weed Management Area Group and the current database administrator, the Inyo/Mono Counties Agriculture Department can acquire and compile data from these various sources. The Agricultural Commissioner's office can then disseminate this data to agencies or individuals, allowing future planning efforts and project proponents to assess potential invasive plant consequences to mitigate the effects of these species on project success.

3. **Oak Creek Channel Stabilization Technical Study** (USFS/Fort Independence Tribe). This planning effort would be conducted within the Oak Creek watershed analyzing resources and impacts to water quality and flood management at a watershed scale. The

project proponents propose to collect and analyze relevant geomorphologic, hydrologic, biologic, and climatic data to determine feasibility of restoration techniques to address on-site impacts to National Forest resources and downstream turbidity and increased peak flows adversely impacting values at risk.

4. **Town of Mammoth Lakes Stormwater Master Plan Development** (Town of Mammoth Lakes). This project will developing standards that require development projects to infiltrate portions of stormwater to enhance water quality and groundwater by capturing and managing runoff, and develop standards to improve the quality of urban runoff and stormwater, by developing standards and projects that will reduce erosion and sedimentation, by developing standards to protect public and aquatic ecosystem health while supporting appropriate recreational activities.

5. **West Walker River Restoration Plan** (California Trout). The goal of this project is to develop a restoration plan via the completion of an assessment of the riverine and riparian conditions associated with approximately three miles of the West Walker River located within the Antelope Valley-designated as an economically disadvantaged community.

6. **Water Master Plans for Independence, Lone Pine and Laws** (Inyo County Public Works). The project will create planning documents to be included in the Inyo Mono IRWM Plan and website as an excel spreadsheet or database of water main size, material, age, soil characteristics, acidity, etc. conforming to the American Water Works Association Research Foundation's project # 4195 which is an adaptation of the United Kingdom Water Industry Research database. Further, the spreadsheet will be offered up for inclusion on the Inyo Mono website to make it available to the general public worldwide.

7. **Sewer Master Plan for CSA-2, Aspendell** (Inyo County Public Works/USFS). The CSA-2 (County Service Area number 2) sewer collection system and the USFS Bishop Creek sewage treatment plant are in dire need of renovation because of continued seepage, reoccurring blockages, infiltration inflow and an aging sewer plant and ponds. These conditions have created a situation where costs for system maintenance, operations and effluent treatment are high and also create a potential for significant environmental impacts. The collection system has not been evaluated since the late 1970's and no accurate plans for the collection system exist. The proposed master plan evaluation would consist of survey mapping and measure the entire system as well as preforming a video inspection of the existing main lines to document the existing conditions and problem areas in the sewer mains and the treatment plant. Following the map and measure portion of the evaluation, plan and profile drawings would be created and these drawings would be used to develop recommendations for the rehabilitation of the sewer system and plant.

Summaries of these proposals are attached. The RWMG will rank these proposals for submittal to the California Department of Water Resources. Criteria for ranking the proposals (attached) were developed by a RWMG working group. Each member's application of the ranking criteria will be discussed on the January 11 conference call.

The Water Department requests direction on the following: if any of the above projects are unacceptable to your Board, we should inform the RWMG of those objections on the January 11 conference call. Under the RWMG's consensus-based decision-making process, we are able to remove a project from consideration if it is contrary to the County's interests.

ALTERNATIVES:

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

Numerous MOU signatories.

FINANCING:

No impact.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL: N/A	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: _____ Date_____
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER: N/A	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (*Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved:_____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR: N/A	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS (Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.) Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received)_____ Date: 1/4/11
(The Original plus 20 copies of this document are required)

Inyo-Mono INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Criteria

Inyo-Mono IRWM Regional Priorities

1. Has the applicant demonstrated BY JANUARY 11, 2011, with significant confidence, that there is a minimum 25% match available? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)
2. Has the applicant demonstrated clearly that the application includes only planning efforts and no implementation components? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)
3. Does the proposal clearly support the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program? (5 points)
4. Does the project help to address Inyo-Mono Phase I regional objectives and Resource Management Strategies (see attachment below)? (5 points)
5. Does the project help to fill planning gaps in the Inyo-Mono planning region? (5 points)
6. Is the budget reasonable for the scope of work? (10 points)
7. Discretionary points based on overall merit and importance of project to the planning region (up to 10 points)

(35 points available for Inyo-Mono IRWM regional priorities)

DWR Priorities

8. Does the project proposal address current DWR priorities, *as set out in the PSP*?
    a. Does the project involve and/or benefit a DAC (must be demonstrated)? (5 points)
    b. Does the project involve and/or benefit a Tribe? (5 points)
    c. Does project help to integrate stormwater resource plan requirements into the IRWM Plan as specified in California Water Code Section 10562 (see full text of the section below)? (5 points)
    d. Does the project address stormwater and/or flood management? (5 points)
    e. Does the project address salt and nutrient management planning? (5 points)
9. *In the PSP*, DWR specifies that the Planning Grant must help the IRWM Group meet the Plan Standards as set out in the Prop. 84 Guidelines. Does the project help to meet the IRWM Plan Standards (below)? (5 points total)

Table 2 – IRWM Plan Standards	
• Governance	• Data Management
• Region Description	• Finance
• Objectives	• Technical Analysis
• Resource Management Strategies (RMS)	• Relation to Local Water Planning
• Integration	• Relation to Local Land Use Planning
• Project Review Process	• Stakeholder Involvement
• Impact and Benefit	• Coordination
• Plan Performance and Monitoring	• Climate Change

10. Does the project help address IRWM program preferences *as set out in the PSP*? (0.5 point for each of the following, for a maximum of 7 points)
    - Include regional projects or programs
    - Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region.
    - Effectively resolve significant water- related conflicts within or between regions
    - Contribute to attainment of one or more objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (not applicable to Inyo-Mono region)
    - Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities.
    - Effectively integrate water management with land use planning
    - Include actions designed to integrate the Stormwater Resource Plan
    - Drought Preparedness
    - Use and reuse water more efficiently
    - Climate Change Response Actions
    - Expand environmental stewardship
    - Practice integrated flood management
    - Protect surface and groundwater quality
    - Improve tribal water and natural resources
    - Ensure equitable distribution of benefits

(37 points available for DWR priorities)
72 Total points available

<u>Schedule for Round 2 Planning Grant Application Process</u>

December 16, 2011: Send R2PG evaluation criteria to R2PG project proponents for revising and updating project materials based on the criteria

December 23, 5:00 pm: Revised/updated R2PG project proposals due to Program Office

December 28: Program Office send R2PG project materials and ranking criteria to RWMG to use in preliminary ranking decisions

January 6, 2012, 5:00 pm: Preliminary ranking from Group Members provided to Program Office via email

January 11: RWMG conference call meeting to decide preliminary ranking and recommend final ranking to boards

January 25: RWMG in-person meeting to decide final ranking

January 25 – application due date (likely late February or early March): preparation of application materials to be submitted to DWR

California Water Code Section 10562:

(a) A city, county, or special district, either individually or jointly, may develop a stormwater resource plan pursuant to this part.

(b) Stormwater resource plans shall:

(1) Be developed on a watershed basis.

(2) Provide for multiple benefit project design to maximize water supply, water quality, and environmental and other community benefits.

(3) Provide for community participation in plan development and implementation.

(4) Be consistent with, and assist in, compliance with total maximum daily load (TMDL) implementation plans and applicable national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permits.

(5) Be consistent with all applicable waste discharge permits.

(6) Be consistent with any applicable integrated regional water management plan.

(c) The proposed or adopted plan shall meet the standards outlined in this section. The plan need not be referred to as a "stormwater resource plan." Existing planning documents may be utilized as a functionally equivalent plan, including, but not limited to, watershed management plans, integrated resource plans, urban water management plans, or similar plans. If a planning document does not meet the standards of this section, a collection of local and regional plans may constitute a functional equivalent.

(d) Stormwater resource plans shall identify all of the following:

(1) Opportunities to augment local water supply through groundwater recharge or storage for beneficial reuse of stormwater.

(2) Opportunities for source control for both pollution and stormwater runoff volume, onsite and local infiltration, and reuse of stormwater.

(3) Projects to reestablish natural water drainage treatment and infiltration systems, or mimic natural system functions to the maximum extent feasible.

(4) Opportunities to develop or enhance habitat and open space through stormwater management, including wetlands, riverside habitats, parkways, and parks.

(5) Design criteria and best management practices to prevent stormwater pollution and increase effective stormwater management for new and upgraded infrastructure and residential, commercial,

industrial, and public development. These design criteria and best management practices shall accomplish all of the following:

(A) Reduce effective impermeability within a watershed by creating permeable surfaces and directing stormwater to permeable surfaces, retention basins, cisterns, and other storage for beneficial reuse.

(B) Increase water storage for beneficial use through a variety of on-site storage techniques.

(C) Increase groundwater supplies through infiltration, where appropriate and feasible.

(D) Support low-impact development for new and upgraded infrastructure and development using low-impact techniques.

(6) Activities that generate or contribute to the pollution of stormwater, or that impair the effective beneficial use of stormwater.

(7) Projects and programs to ensure the effective implementation of the stormwater resource plan pursuant to this part and achieve multiple benefits.

(8) Ordinances or other mechanisms necessary to ensure the effective implementation of the stormwater resource plan pursuant to this part.

Inyo-Mono IRWM Phase I Objectives and Resource Management Strategies

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
1. Protect, conserve, optimize, and augment water supply	A. Improve water supply reliability B. Improve system flexibility and efficiency C. Support compliance with current and future state and federal water supply standards D. Address local water supply issues through various techniques, including, but not limited to: groundwater recharge projects, conjunctive use of water supplies, water recycling, water conservation, water transfers, and precipitation enhancement E. Protect and improve the quality and quantity of groundwater supplies F. Identify existing gaps in groundwater and surface water quantity data G. Monitor groundwater and surface water supply variability H. Optimize existing storage capacity I. Conserve and adapt water uses to future conditions J. Capture and manage runoff K. Incorporate and implement low-impact development design features, techniques, and practices to reduce water demand

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
	L. Support appropriate recreational activities
2. Protect, restore, and enhance water quality	A. Support compliance with current and future state and federal water quality standards B. Improve the quality of urban runoff, storm water, and wastewater C. Reduce erosion and sedimentation D. Protect public and aquatic ecosystem health E. Match water quality to water use F. Support appropriate recreational activities
3. Provide stewardship of our natural resources	A. Protect, restore, and enhance natural processes, habitats, and threatened and endangered species B. Protect ecosystems such as upland forests and meadows dependent on surface/shallow water supply C. Enhance recreational and educational opportunities D. Identify, develop, and implement efforts to better control invasive species E. Assess ecosystem health of watersheds in the region
4. Maintain and enhance water, wastewater, and power generation infrastructure efficiency and reliability	A. Systematically and strategically rehabilitate and replace aging water and wastewater delivery and treatment facilities in rural communities, including tribal lands B. Ensure fire protection capacity C. Improve energy efficiency of water systems and uses D. Promote use of water efficiency in power generating facilities
5. Address climate variability and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	A. Increase understanding of water related greenhouse gas emissions B. Manage and modify water systems to respond to increasing climate variability C. Use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water
6. Increase participation of small and disadvantaged communities in IRWM process	A. Engage regional communities in collaborative water and natural resource related efforts B. Provide assistance for tribal and DAC consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for water programs and projects

Continued Program Office Support
Inyo-Mono Program Office
Scope of Work
Round 2 Planning Grant

Project Synopsis:

The Inyo-Mono IRWM Program Office has been overseeing the day-to-day operations of the Inyo-Mono RWMG for almost four years. This funding request is to continue the regular operations of the Program Office, further enhance the Inyo-Mono IRWM planning process, and develop a long-term plan for supporting and sustaining the activities of the RWMG into the future. Task 1 will allow the Program Office to continue supporting the RWMG on a daily basis, while Tasks 2, 3, 5, and 6 include activities specific to updating and enhancing the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan, including a deeper consideration of climate change and the concept of integration for our planning region.

Recognizing the uncertainty of future bond funding availability for the statewide IRWM Program, the Program Office intends to develop a long-term operations and funding plan for the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program through Task 4 of this work plan. The Inyo-Mono RWMG sees value in continuing its successful and collaborative work to enhance and improve water management in the planning region.

Task 1: Program operations:

1. Regularly scheduled Group & Admin. Committee meetings (bi-monthly at MOST for Group meetings; up to monthly AC meetings)
2. Revisiting of MOU/governance, organizational structure (org. structure work will be based on outcomes of Round 1 Planning Grant work)
3. Grant and project administration-both with subcontractees and DWR
4. Liaison with DWR, Sierra Water Workgroup, Roundtable of Regions and others as needed (includes trips to Sac for DWR meetings and workshops)
5. Conference presentations of Inyo-Mono IRWM planning process as a case study
6. Other day to day business

Task 2: Integration

1. Articulation of what integration means at the regional, Sierra Nevada, state and "basin" scales
    - Outreach to discuss concept of integration with stakeholders based on geography, water issue, and stakeholder category, as well as moving forward with project needs
    - Consideration of integrating climate change adaptation and mitigation options into project ideas
2. Analysis of Inyo-Mono IRWM program in comparison to other state and/or national integrated resource management programs.
3. Proposed strategy to realize and actively promote integration at different hierarchical scales

Task 3: Climate change:

1. Identification of the State of Knowledge regarding climate change at the regional and sub-regional (community) level

2. Inventory of existing tools/models relevant to climate change within the region (and possibly state/federal levels?)
3. Identify and prioritize vulnerabilities based on the vulnerability assessment and I-M's decision making process (PSP requirement)
4. Develop plan, program and/or methodology for further data gathering/analyzing of prioritized vulnerabilities (PSP requirement)
5. Quantitative CO_2 emission evaluation
6. Assessment of water/energy nexus for the I-M region.

Task 4: Long-term funding plan:

1. Long-term identification of funding needs
2. Development of comprehensive list of local, state, federal, foundation funding opportunities with detailed information
3. Development of strategic approach/plan to meet anticipated short and long-term funding needs.

Task 5: Updating Phase II Plan

1. Filling newly identified gaps/further gap analysis
2. Phase III Plan revisions-to include findings from DAC grant, needs assessments, integration workshops, climate change analyses, and responding to revised Guidelines
3. Development of Round II & III Implementation proposals
4. Assess current status of Salt and Nutrient planning within the Inyo-Mono IRWM Region

Task 6: Program Technical Development, Analyses, and Management

1. Website maintenance and development
2. GIS data maintenance, management and development.
3. Specific analyses in support of Tasks 1-5 above.
4. Define spatial analysis needs of the region and develop strategy to meet identified needs.

R2PE Criteria Responses:

1. Has the applicant demonstrated BY JANUARY 11, 2011, with significant confidence, that there is a minimum 25% match available? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)
   Yes. Similar to the Round 1 Planning Grant, the large majority of the match will come from the time and expense of RWMG Members in traveling to, attending, and participating in RWMG, Administrative Committee, and working committee meetings. Thus, no one organization is responsible for providing or committing to the matching funds. As fiscal agent, CalTrout will be ensuring that match requirements for the Program Office budget is met.

2. Has the applicant demonstrated clearly that the application includes only planning efforts and no implementation components? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)
   Yes, per the tasks provided above, all of the proposed activities center on and support planning efforts for the Inyo-Mono IRWM region. The proposed tasks will also directly support

the enhancement, based on identified gaps, of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan, essential to the regional program as well as to helping secure long-term funding for implementation purposes.

3. Does the proposal clearly support the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program? (5 points)
   Yes. In addition to supporting the Plan as a whole, this proposal specifically targets such topics as climate change and integration, both of which have been called out in the Phase I Plan and by DWR as important components of the Inyo-Mono IRWM planning process. Also see response to #2 above.

4. Does the project help to address Inyo-Mono Phase I regional objectives and Resource Management Strategies? (5 points)
   Yes. Although the proposal is not specific to a "project" the realization of objectives 1-4 and associated RMSs are ingrained in work the Program Office performs on a daily basis in support of the Inyo-Mono IRWM program. Task 5 of our proposal includes support work for pursuit of Phase II and III of DWR Implementation Proposals. Implementation projects are the basis on which these objectives and RMSs can be realized and the Program Office support is crucial to the success of future Implementation rounds. Objective 5 is aggressively addressed in this proposal in Task 3: Climate Change. Objective 6 has been addressed by the receipt of a separate DAC grant awarded in Fall of 2011. As outlined in Task 5 of this proposal, findings from the DAC grant work will be incorporated into the Phase III plan per the anticipated rewrite of the plan in response to revised DWR guidelines.

5. Does the project help to fill planning gaps in the Inyo-Mono planning region? (5 points)
   Yes. As proposed, the current scope of work will identify existing data gaps. Most notably are the call to identify State of Knowledge of Climate Change at the regional and sub-regional level, inventory of existing tools and models relevant to Climate Change in the region, and development of a plan for further data acquisition in support of the many facets of Climate Change. Additionally the work outlined in the Scope of Work aims to conduct an assessment of the current water/energy nexus for the region as well as conduct a quantitative CO_2 emissions evaluation. Task 3 will result in needs and direction with respect to how the Program aims to integrate activities within the Inyo-Mono Region, with neighboring IRWMP efforts as well as assessing the potential to integrate our work with neighboring states. In addition, the proposed Task 4 will fill an essential need to develop a short and long-term funding strategy for the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. This particular task will be critical to the success of the Program given Prop. 84 funds are to be completely expended by 2015.

6. Is the budget reasonable for the scope of work? (10 points)
   Yes. The Program Office has strategically recorded all hours worked on current Planning Grant operations to date in an effort to produce more meaningful future budgets. The current budget has been developed using those data and accurately and realistically reflects time needed to successfully complete the outlined tasks. Indeed, the proposed budget, while able to fund the proposed work, contains very limited discretionary funds. The Program Office paid close attention to what the PSP is calling for, what the needs of the Inyo-Mono Region were and crafted a scope of work and budget accordingly.

7. Discretionary points based on overall merit and importance of project to the planning region (up to 10 points)
   The Program Office performs daily duties vital to the continued success of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program. The Staff provide professional assistance to the RWMG as well as focused attention to IRWM matters without the daily distractions of additional professional obligations. Paramount to our duties is the facilitation of communication of the RWMG, organization and administration of RWMG meetings and ensuring adherence to DWR grant and overall IRWM Program guidelines. Secondarily, the Staff works to realize tasks set forth in the Phase I Plan, coordinates and collates future funding opportunities, continues to strive to learn about new water issues throughout the region and maintains the Inyo-Mono IRWM Website. The Program Office also serves as a liaison between DWR and the RWMG as well as performs the critical tasks of Grant Administration for the current Planning Grant. Internally the Program Office has continued to strengthen its taskforce and currently maintains a robust team of professionals capable of producing professional quality products and services to both the RWMG and DWR alike. Additionally, the Program office keeps pulse on the larger Statewide IRWM programs and participates using other funding sources in broader State level programs such as the California Water Plan and various caucuses, thereby further strengthening our reputation as a valid IRWM region. The Inyo-Mono IRWM Program is currently emerging as a leader at the State level in areas such as Climate Change and DAC Program development.

   It is important to note Task 4 of this proposal concentrates on the development of a long term funding strategy for the Inyo-Mono IRWM program. The fact that in 2015 Prop. 84 funds will terminate necessitates a strategy such as called out in Task 4 to ensure the perpetuation of the IRWM Program. The anticipation by the Program Staff of future IRWM funding shortages and their willingness to proactively pursue alternatives speaks to the dedication and resolve the Staff possesses to seeing this region's water needs continue to be addressed.

<u>DWR Priorities</u>

8. Does the project proposal address current DWR priorities, *as set out in the PSP*?

   a. Does the project involve and/or benefit a DAC (must be demonstrated)? (5 points)
      Yes. There are numerous DACs throughout the planning region. As such, the various tasks proposed will have relevance to the region as a whole and in turn will benefit the DACs within. Additionally Task 5 calls out the synthesis of information gained from work in the separately funded DAC grant currently underway. The Inyo-Mono region is in a prime position to demonstrate statewide leadership with insights gained from our current DAC work. We fully intend to apply knowledge gained from our work on the DAC grant to the Phase III Plan and future planning strategies within the Inyo-Mono region.

   b. Does the project involve and/or benefit a Tribe? (5 points)
      Yes. There are numerous tribes involved in the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program and others that are within the region that have yet to be engaged. The Program Office intends to engage and work with as many tribal entities within the region as possible. Moreover,

the various tasks proposed will have relevance to the region as a whole and by default will at minimum involve and ideally benefit tribes within the region.

c. Does project help to integrate stormwater resource plan requirements into the IRWM Plan as specified in California Water Code Section 10562? (5 points)
Yes, in that the revised Inyo-Mono Phase II Plan will provide necessary information for Cities, Counties and/or Special Districts to comply with California Water Code section 10562 and may be able to use in their respective planning efforts.

d. Does the project address stormwater and/or flood management? (5 points)
Yes in that these issues will be addressed comprehensively in the revised I-M IRWM Plan per the outcome of recent outreach efforts.

e. Does the project address salt and nutrient management planning? (5 points)
Yes, Task 5 calls for an assessment of current Salt and Nutrient planning throughout the Inyo-Mono IRWM Region. The results will contribute to help guide the development of region-wide Salt and Nutrient management plans. Additionally Task 2 promotes integration which will foster collaborative planning efforts across the region by identification of similar needs/issues.

9. In the PSP, DWR specifies that the Planning Grant must help the IRWM Group meet the Plan Standards as set out in the Prop. 84 Guidelines. Does the project help to meet the IRWM Plan Standards (Guidelines provided in supplemental Information)? (5 points total)
Yes. The proposed scope of work will involve addressing essentially all of the Prop. 84 Plan Standards identified in Table 2 of the PSP. The Program Staff maintain a careful pulse on DWR planning guidelines at all times and continually strive to ensure the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program adheres to and compliments those guidelines in all the work we perform. This proposal is a reflection of that commitment.

10. Does the project help address IRWM program preferences *as set out in the PSP*? (0.5 point for each of the following, for a maximum of 7 points)

The majority of the program preferences from the Round 2 Planning Grant PSP are addressed in the Program Office Proposal submitted above. (Refer to tasks 1-6 in Scope of Work)

- Include regional projects or programs
Task 1-6. The entire proposal encompasses regional level planning for both projects and programs.

- Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region.
Task 2 specifically addresses the need to effectively integrate programs and projects throughout the region and beyond.

- Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions
No, not directly, however Task 2 addresses integration at a broader level to include inter-regional as well and interstate cooperation and proposes to strategize and promote

different levels of integration. The Inyo-Mono RWMG also has established itself as the main forum for discussing and resolving water conflicts and issues in the region.

- Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities.
  Tasks 1-6. Essentially the whole proposal will work to continue to address critical needs of DACs. In tandem with the DAC grant, we plan to seize the opportunity to continue to make real differences in DACs of the Inyo-Mono region.

- Effectively integrate water management with land use planning
  Task 2 is dedicated to actively promoting integration at all levels within the Inyo-Mono region.

- Include actions designed to integrate the Stormwater Resource Plan
  Again, Task 2 promotes integration at numerous levels within the planning region, this will include but not be limited to the recognition of stormwater runoff issues where applicable and the integration of needed Stormwater Management planning.

- Drought Preparedness
  Task 3,4,5. With in-house Climate Change expertise the Program Office is proactively addressing realistic shortages through Climate Change modeling and analysis as described in Task 3. Additionally, gaps will be identified though Tasks 3 and 5 and addressed in the revised Phase III plan. Lastly the plan to create long-term funding security acknowledges long term water issues across the region such as drought preparedness.

- Use and reuse water more efficiently
  Task 2 & 5. The strong emphasis on integration in our proposal facilitates responsible environmental stewardship and thus the commitment to use and reuse water in the most efficient manner possible as a region. Identified as Objective 1 in the current I-M IRWM Plan, the protection, conservation and optimization of our regional water supply is of utmost importance and will continue to take priority throughout the Plan revision process identified in Task 5.

- Climate Change Response Actions
  Task 3 is devoted to Climate Change and provides many avenues in which to address Climate related needs of the region.

- Expand environmental stewardship
  Task 2, 5, 6. By promoting integration, identifying gaps in the Planning region and development of a more robust GIS program, the Program Office has set forth the foundation to promote and expand environmental stewardship projects and plans throughout the region.

- Practice integrated flood management
  Task 2 is set aside specifically to promote and foster integration at many levels. As flood management needs continue to be identified, tasks, 2 and 5 are in place to incorporate the flood management aspects of planning into the broader IRWM Plan.

- Protect surface and groundwater quality
  Task 2 focuses on integration and will in-turn lead to greater protection of all natural resources within the planning region, including surface and groundwater quality.

- Improve tribal water and natural resources
  Task 2,3,4. Promoting Integration across the region, addressing the realities of Climate Change and securing long-term funding all intends to ensure improvement of tribal and regional water and natural resources.

- Ensure equitable distribution of benefits
  Task 1,2,4,5. Program Office oversight, the emphasis on Integration, future funding strategies and finally the gap analysis and plan revisions in Task 5 all aim to ensure equitable distribution of benefits to regional participants.

Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total	
Staff Time				
Program Director	1215	$60	$72,900.00	
Program Manager	1530	$35	$53,550.00	
Program Assistant	1530	$30	$45,900.00	
Consultants		Subtotal		$172,350.00
Consultants	540	$50	$27,000.00	
Supporting Funds		Subtotal		$27,000.00
Travel to Meetings			$1,000.00	
Travel for Outreach			$2,000.00	
Conference Travel & Tuition			$3,400.00	
DWR Workshop Attendance			$800.00	
Office Expenses	(50% of Phone, rent, internet)		$15,500.00	
Office Supplies/printing/postage		($100/ month)	$1,800.00	
		Subtotal		$24,500.00
		Total		$223,850.00
		General O & A	12%	$26,862.00
		Grand Total		$250,712
		25% Match Required		$83,571
		Total Project Cost		$334,283

Inyo/Mono Watersheds Invasive Plant Inventory Project

Introduction

Healthy native plant communities are a critical component of healthy watersheds, promoting many positive attributes including enrichment of wildlife habitat, normal fire regimes, and better water quality and quantity (Donaldson, 1997). Invasive plants threaten these native plant communities, and thus reduce certain advantages that watersheds gain from healthy riparian conditions. Invasive plants degrade the watershed's ability to retain surface and ground water, while decreasing quality through intensification of sediment loading through erosion and other processes (Chambers, 2008). Alteration of natural fire regimes by these invaders increases runoff and erosion as well. In addition to quality and quantity concerns, weeds compromise significantly the flood capacity of watersheds (Donaldson, 1997). Likely climate change scenarios indicate that the presence of invasive plant species exacerbates the negative effects of such change (Sada, 2008).

A required component of successful watershed management is consideration and mitigation of invasive plant threats. Projects must know of the presence of these weeds for planning, and land managers require a means by which to prioritize projects to maximize meager resources available for developing health watersheds. Proper planning protects natural resources and habitat for wildlife including threatened and endangered species. Recreational planning must also account for the potential of invasive plant spread and how to respond to those threats if they occur.

Importance of this Project to the IRWMP Region

Taking into account the linkages between invasive plant species, watershed health, and water supply and quality consequences, the importance of a comprehensive inventory of weed species of regional importance is obvious. This project will fill on information gap that exists for regional planning purposes. Addition of this data into the IRWMP knowledge base will allow proponents of future planning and implementation projects to review potential watershed consequences from invasive plant infestations within the IRWMP region. Given this data, future projects can analyze how to mitigate any potential future weed problems.

Project Description

The goal of this project is to complete a survey of selected invasive weeds of regional importance, using existing data, interagency cooperation, and field surveys. This project will create accurate, comprehensive, and accessible data for multiple future uses. As a member in the Eastern Sierra Weed Management Area (ESWMA) group and the current database administrator, the Inyo/Mono Counties Agriculture Department (AgComm) can acquire and compile data from these various sources. AgComm can then disseminate this data to agencies or individuals, allowing future planning efforts and project proponents to assess potential invasive plant

consequences to mitigate the effects of these species on project success. AgComm also has experience managing several other GIS projects (pesticide permitting database, pest exclusion database, etc.), AgComm has the experience and equipment to spearhead this project.

This project will include initial meetings with ESWMA members to assess which data are current and what survey deficiencies exist. Surveys will then evaluate deficient areas and regions of likely spread within the watersheds. Locations of likely spread and species for inclusion in the survey will be predicated on species prioritization guidelines within the ESWMA's strategic plan, which was developed by 15 land management agencies, tribal governments, and nonprofit organizations within Inyo and Mono Counties. AgComm will then organize this information in a standard geodatabase for future use.

DAC support Justification

All local communities, including disadvantaged communities and tribes, will benefit from this foresight through appropriate planning. Proper planning of future projects will minimize negative effects of weed issues on the local and regional recreation and agriculture industries, which together comprise nearly all of the local economic input. Higher future invasive plant management costs may result from the current, and incomplete, data set. Proper data can assist local agencies and groups to plan and prioritize invasive plant abatement projects, saving these agencies and groups future resources. Data from this project can assist in fire hazard identification, helping local communities to plan for prevention of and recovery from wildland fires. Additionally, if this project is selected it will employ local residents, adding jobs and economic input. These jobs, coupled with support and protection of the two largest local economic drivers, will benefit greatly the economic future of DAC's and tribes.

Stormwater Resource Plan Considerations

Invasive plants hinder the ability of a watershed to retain water during flooding events. This lack of retention often leads to increased streambed destruction during conditions of high runoff, resulting in streambank erosion or even failure. Water quality issues that can exist from this issue include increased sediment loading and altered nutrient cycles. Water quantity is affected by a watershed with degraded retention capacity. Obtaining data on invasive plant populations for mitigation and planning fosters healthy native riparian conditions, which improve the watershed's natural ability to manage floodwater and stormwater events.

Salt and Nutrient Loading Considerations

Adverse effects resulting from improper planning and weed expansion can alter the natural habitat and thus the natural nutrient cycle. Similarly, project planning that does not consider invasive plants may introduce or spread populations of certain weedy species that accumulate salt on the soil surface. Two examples of these types of weed species that occur locally include

Saltcedar and Perennial pepperweed. The elevated salt levels on soil surface generated by these two species destroy native vegetation and their associated riparian systems.

Schedule

October – December 2012	Project organization, stakeholder meetings, data needs assessment, field staff training, data collection
January – February 2013	Data entry and analysis
March – June 2013	Continue data collection
July – September 2013	No work
October 2013 – March 2014	Continue data collection
April – June 2014	Data analysis and entry, database completion and publishing

Project Budget

Confirmation of the matching requirements, as well as a resolution authorizing this project submittal is forthcoming (January 10, 2012 Inyo County Board of Supervisor's Meeting). Program staff will receive notification from the AgComm, and AgComm staff will attend the January 11 RWMG meeting as well.

Item	Rate	Quantity	In-Kind	Grant	Total
Personnel Services					
Program Coordinator (per hour)	*$40.06*	*416*	*$16,665*	-	*$16,665*
Field Technician II (per hour)	*$35.90*	*416*	*$14,934*	-	*$14,934*
Field Assistant (per hour)	*$17.25*	*1040*	-	*$17,940*	*$17,940*
Field Assistant (per hour)	*$17.25*	*1040*	-	*$17,940*	*$17,940*
Equipment Expenses					
Vehicle Mileage (per mile)	*$.52*	*40,000*	-	*$20,800*	*$20,800*
GPS Unit Rental (per day)	*$50.00*	*208*	-	*$10,400*	*$10,400*
		Subtotals	**$31,599**	**$67,080**	**$98,679**
		Administrative Costs (10%)		*$6,708*	*$6,708*
		TOTALS	**$31,599**	**$73,788**	**$105,387**

References

Chambers, J.C. (2008). Invasive species and the great basin. *Collaborative management and research in the Great Basin – examining issues and developing a framework for action.* Retrived from http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr204.pdf

Donaldson, S.G. (1997). Flood-borne noxious weeds: impacts on riparian areas and wetlands. *1997 California Exotic Plant Council symposium proceedings.* Retrieved from http://www.cal-ipc.org/symposia/archive/pdf/1997_symposium_proceedings1945.pdf

Sada, D. (2008). Great Basin riparian and aquatic ecosystems. *Collaborative management and research in the Great Basin – examining issues and developing a framework for action.* Retrived from http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr204.pdf

Round 2 planning grant Evaluation Criteria

Oak Creek stream channel stabilization technical study

Draft

Todd J. Ellsworth, Inyo National Forest

December 2011

IRWM Regional Priorities

1. The Inyo National Forest has committed approximately $30,000 in FY'12 to begin studies in Oak Creek Watershed related to channel stabilization and other projects (ie. Road stabilization and restoration, weed treatments on the mud flow, re-vegetation of the mud flow, and fuels treatments. We anticipate committing at least an additional $20,000 of appropriated federal dollars in FY'13 related to this project or other projects outlined above. Additional anticipated cash and in-kind contributions for this project include:

- Bureau of Reclamation (BOR): The Ft. Independence tribe has an existing grant with the BOR related to water uses and irrigation on tribal lands. Part of the grant is to evaluate condition of the water supply and establish gauging stations to measure stream flow of Oak Creek on to tribal lands. In addition, personnel at the BOR have committed to providing matching funds for this project. I will have additional information on anticipated matching funds the week of January 2nd. The BOR can also provide technical assistance related to stream restoration techniques. I estimate a match of cash and in-kind contributions of at least $30,000 for this project.
- Natural resources Conservation Service (NRCS): The tribe recently put in a preliminary grant application with the NRCS through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) Tribal Initiatives program. The proposed grant would help evaluate and address water quality issues on tribal lands related to continuing impacts from the fire and flood. The NRCS has also committed to providing technical assistance in stream restoration data collection needs and stream restoration techniques. The amount of the proposed grant and in-kind contributions are unknown at this time. I would estimate an amount of $20,000-$30,000.
- LA Department of Water and Power (LADWP): The Forest is in the process of reissuing term permits for water spreading and diversions on both North South Fork of Oak Creek. This project is likely to be funded through cost recovery with LADWP. Stream channel condition and anticipated effects to the stream channel would be addressed in a limited fashion through this project. Exact cost estimates are unavailable at this time. I would estimate an amount of that $10-15,000 for this project.
- Other cash or in-kind contributions include: technical assistance for data collection and monitoring from the Sierra Nevada Aquatic Research Lab. (SNARL); data collection and

monitoring assistance from Friends of the Inyo (FOI); and State of California OHV money for road decommissioning work.

Conclusion: I anticipate that this project will have $75,000 to $100,000+ in in-kind and/or cash contributions to match the requested funds. The Forest and the Ft. Independence Tribe have been actively engaging and soliciting partnerships and will continue to do so. This is a high priority project for the Inyo National Forest and the Ft. Independence Tribe.

2. We propose to collect and analyze relevant geomorphologic, hydrologic, biologic, and climatic data to determine feasibility of restoration techniques to address on-site impacts to National Forest resources and downstream turbidity and increased peak flows adversely impacting values at risk. To this end, this project is 100% planning.

In 2008 a large debris/mud flow caused extensive hillslope rilling and gullying of the mid- and lower elevation segments of both the North Fork and South Fork of Oak Creek. The debris flow damaged the Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery and more than 50 homes. In addition, the mud flow crossed State Hwy. 395, temporarily closing the road and causing damage to the road bed. The area remains vulnerable to accelerated hillslope erosion, increased sedimentation and turbidity and higher peak flows. The higher peak flows and turbidity are adversely affecting Ft. Independence tribal infrastructure and irrigation system. There is continued risk to LADWP infrastructure, water rights and water conveyance structures.

One of the key objectives of this planning project is to further the work of the Inyo Mono IRWM in terms of engaging a wide range of stakeholders in developing a solution to watershed specific ,on-going water quality and flood potential issues. I believe by doing such this will increase the capacity of the Inyo Mono IRWM and provide a watershed specific area to extend the collaborative and integrated planning efforts already in place.

We anticipate two phases of this planning effort as outlined below:

Phase I: Collection and analysis (bullets are not in a particular order as the planning process is iterative)

These steps would be completed in collaborative, integrated fashion with partners identified above and other interested parties.

- Identify problems (clarify values at risk)
- Determine objectives
- Inventory resources
- Analyze resources data

Phase II: Decision Support (Design)

These steps would be completed in collaborative, integrated fashion with partners identified above and other interested parties.

- Formulate alternatives
- Evaluate alternatives
- Make recommendations

This proposed planning effort addresses Inyo Mono IRWM objectives (1-6) and Resource Management Strategies. Specifically by planning this watershed based project in a collaborative, integrated fashion Objectives 1,2,3, and 6 are clearly met with Objectives 4 and 5 met in a more indirect manner. This project would address upland resource concerns affecting both on-site resources and downstream users and resources. This project would address water quality and flood management issues in a specific watershed. Processes developed, partnerships and data collected could be applied to other areas in the Inyo Mono IRWM planning area.

Funding Estimate: Total requested for round 2 planning is $75,000

Item of expense	Qty	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Collaboration and stake holder meetings					
Project Leader	30	days	$400	$12,000	
Data Collection, Inventory +analysis					
Project Leader	10	days	$400	$4,000	
Data Collection	100	days	$300	$30,000	
Report writing + alternative evaluation					
Project Leader	20	days	$400	$8,000	
Results roll-out meetings, discussions					
Project Leader	10	days	$400	$4,000	
Misc.(vehicles, etc.)				$5,000	
NEPA (other specialists data collection and analysis)				$12,000	
Total				$75,000	

DWR priorities:

This proposed project will directly involve and/or benefit the Ft. Independence Tribe and land owners within and downstream of Oak Creek. Inyo County in its entirety is considered a DAC. The tribe is and

will continue to be a major stakeholder and partner in this planning effort. We will conduct a focused outreach to private landowners and Inyo County through this process.

This planning effort would be conducted within the Oak Creek watershed analyzing resources and impacts to water quality and flood management at a watershed scale. It also proposes to engage stakeholders and continue the integrated planning that is currently on-going in the Inyo Mono IRWM. As such it addresses the integrated stromwater resource plan requirements and addresses flood management which is also a planning gap in the Inyo-Mono planning region. I anticipate that one of the products of this planning effort is a discussion and recommendations as to continued flooding risk and specific actions that can be taken to lessen the risk to downstream users and infrastructure.

This project may address nutrient management planning related to soil productivity and soil nutrients. Nutrients can impact downstream beneficial uses such as tribal irrigation and recreation.

This project addresses the following Plan standards in the Prop. 84 guidelines:

- Objectives
- Resource Management Strategies
- Integration
- Plan performance and monitoring
- Data management
- Technical analysis
- Local water planning
- Local land use planning
- Stake holder involvement
- Coordination and
- Climate change.

This project addresses the following IRWM program preferences:

- Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region.
- Critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities
- Effectively resolve significant water- related conflicts within or between regions
- Effectively integrate water management with land use planning
- Include actions designed to integrate the Stormwater Resource Plan
- Climate Change Response Actions
- Expand environmental stewardship
- Practice integrated flood management
- Protect surface and groundwater quality
- Improve tribal water and natural resources
- Ensure equitable distribution of benefits

The following would be partially met:

- Drought Preparedness
- Use and reuse water more efficiently

Inyo-Mono INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Mammoth Lakes Stormwater Management Plan
Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Criteria

Inyo-Mono IRWM Regional Priorities

1. ***Has the applicant demonstrated BY JANUARY 11, 2011, with significant confidence, that there is a minimum 25% match available? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)***

RESPONSE: The Town Council will take action of this project and grant application at the January 5, 2012 regular meeting. Adoption of a resolution will be presented for discussion and approval. The Town has several sources of funding which are restricted including the Over All Work Program for the LTC, Drainage Impact Fees, and is applying for a small urban stormwater grant from the EPA. Other unrestricted sources include General Fund and in kind services for staff time. This project will have significant data collection work for an intern and our GIS services group.

2. **Has the applicant demonstrated clearly that the application includes only planning efforts and no implementation components? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)**

RESPONSE: The proposed project does not construct any new facilities but will development and preparation the implementation of a Stormwater Management Plan and include strategies to estimate cost benefit analysis for potential projects for both flooding protection and environmental water quality and restoration projects.

3. **Does the proposal clearly support the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program? (5 points)**

RESPONSE: This project is a listed is project 15 in Chapter 8 of the IRWMP. The project will develop strategies and standards that include at least the following:

Objective 1, by developing standards that require development projects to infiltrate portions of stormwater to enhance water quality and groundwater by capturing and managing runoff

Objective 2, by developing standards to improve the quality of urban runoff and stormwater, by developing standards and projects that will reduce erosion and sedimentation, by developing standards to protect pubic and aquatic ecosystem health while supporting appropriate recreational activities.

Objective 3, The Master Plan will cover all of the drainage in the Mammoth Basin, which has almost the same boundaries as the Town Limits and is about 25 square miles with a population of 8,400 permanent and 25,000-30,000 on weekends. This project will develop standards to retain natural channels and restore eroded and impacted areas. All of the urban drainage from Mammoth Lakes that is not infiltrated terminates in Mammoth Creek. A component of the plan will be public education and outreach to protect the watershed resources and ecosystem.

Objective 5, The plan will include a discussion about Climate Change and the impacts and planning and monitoring that will be incorporated into the documents as it relates to global warming and runoff.

Objective 6. The Town is not a DAC, however there are pockets of the community that would qualify if they were a standalone community. The educational and outreach portion will the plan will seek to engage these groups for education and to become more involved in living and working in the community. The Public Works Department will build on the advances to the Hispanic community though their community outreach program.

4. **Does the project help to address Inyo-Mono Phase I regional objectives and Resource Management Strategies (see attachment below)? (5 points)**

   RESPONSE: This project will develop a Stormwater Management Master Plan that will integrate the stormwater system and environmental stewardship by identifying arrears where natural channels should be maintained, identifying potential pollutants and developing standards to implement those standards and objectives.

5. **Does the project help to fill planning gaps in the Inyo-Mono planning region? (5 points)**

   RESPONSE: This project will develop and implement the preparation of a Stormwater Master Management Plan for the Mammoth Lakes Basin. The plan will address flooding and stormwater quality.

6. **Is the budget reasonable for the scope of work? (10 points)**

   RESPONSE: See attached budget table. We have been working hard to reduce and streamline the scope of work while maintaining viable project that will be a guide the Town and region.

7. Discretionary points based on overall merit and importance of project to the planning region (up to 10 points)

   RESPONSE: A new chapter of the plan will be to develop a cost benefit relationship for flood control projects and water quality projects. This information is critical to evaluate future projects with the limited dollars available. The capital improvement part of the plan will work to identify projects that in particular will help to solve the Sierra Valley Site problems (much of this area is work force housing). Many of the houses in this area were constructed blow the streets and prone to localized flooding and erosion problems. A priority will be to identify projects that have high benefit for the cost.

(35 points available for Inyo-Mono IRWM regional priorities)

<u>DWR Priorities</u>

8. **Does the project proposal address current DWR priorities, *as set out in the PSP*?**
   a. **Does the project involve and/or benefit a DAC (must be demonstrated)? (5 points)**

   RESONSE: No.

   b. **Does the project involve and/or benefit a Tribe? (5 points)**

   RESPONSE: No.

   c. **Does project help to integrate stormwater resource plan requirements into the IRWM Plan as specified in California Water Code Section 10562 (see full text of the section below)? (5 points).**

   RESPONSE: Yes. This project will directly help to integrate stormwater resource plan of Section 10562. The Town is the only incorporated City and "Urban Pocket" in Mono County and will develop a plan that is consistent with the local basins and the Owens River Basin Plan with multiple benefits. The plan will meet the standards in Subsection (d) with emphasis to utilize natural channels and water drainage treatment opportunities that will reduce infrastructure needs and better management stormwater and stormwater quality. This project will lead to revision in the Municipal Code as a mechanism for long term for enforcement and public education.

   d. **Does the project address stormwater and/or flood management? (5 points)**

   RESPONSE: Yes this project is the development of a Stormwater Management Plan, which will address stormwater and flood management.

   e. **Does the project address salt and nutrient management planning? (5 points)**

   RESPONSE: The Town does not have significant agricultural component. The plan will incorporation Stormwater Best Management Practices that will address potential runoff from the two golf courses and commercial landscape areas in town and their applications of herbicides and fertilizers.

9. ***In the PSP*, DWR specifies that the Planning Grant must help the IRWM Group meet the Plan Standards as set out in the Prop. 84 Guidelines. Does the project help to meet the IRWM Plan Standards (below)? (5 points total)**

Table 2 – IRWM Plan Standards	
• Governance • Region Description • Objectives • Resource Management Strategies (RMS) • Integration • Project Review Process • Impact and Benefit • Plan Performance and Monitoring	• Data Management • Finance • Technical Analysis • Relation to Local Water Planning • Relation to Local Land Use Planning • Stakeholder Involvement • Coordination • Climate Change

RESPONSE: The new plan will work on ojectives for managing stormwater and use resource managnement strategies to reduce cost. The plan will integrate flood control, water qualtiy and groundwater recharge programs that will seek to quantify impacts and benefits. The plan will use GIS data base for the technical analyisi and monitoring performance measures. There will be stakeholder meetings to edjucate residents regarding envirnemtal stuardship and water quality.

10. **Does the project help address IRWM program preferences *as set out in the PSP*? (0.5 point for each of the following, for a maximum of 7 points)**
    - Include regional projects or programs. Yes
    - Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region. Yes
    - Effectively resolve significant water- related conflicts within or between regions
    - Contribute to attainment of one or more objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (not applicable to Inyo-Mono region)
    - Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities.
    - Effectively integrate water management with land use planning. Yes
    - Include actions designed to integrate the Stormwater Resource Plan. Yes
    - Drought Preparedness. Yes
    - Use and reuse water more efficiently
    - Climate Change Response Actions. Yes
    - Expand environmental stewardship. Yes
    - Practice integrated flood management. Yes
    - Protect surface and groundwater quality. Yes
    - Improve tribal water and natural resources.
    - Ensure equitable distribution of benefits.

(37 points available for DWR priorities)
72 Total points available

Schedule for Round 2 Planning Grant Application Process

December 16, 2011: Send R2PG evaluation criteria to R2PG project proponents for revising and updating project materials based on the criteria

December 23, 5:00 pm: Revised/updated R2PG project proposals due to Program Office

December 28: Program Office send R2PG project materials and ranking criteria to RWMG to use in preliminary ranking decisions

January 6, 2012, 5:00 pm: Preliminary ranking from Group Members provided to Program Office via email

January 11: RWMG conference call meeting to decide preliminary ranking and recommend final ranking to boards

January 25: RWMG in-person meeting to decide final ranking

January 25 – application due date (likely late February or early March): preparation of application materials to be submitted to DWR

California Water Code Section 10562:

(a) A city, county, or special district, either individually or jointly, may develop a stormwater resource plan pursuant to this part.

(b) Stormwater resource plans shall:

(1) Be developed on a watershed basis.

(2) Provide for multiple benefit project design to maximize water supply, water quality, and environmental and other community benefits.

(3) Provide for community participation in plan development and implementation.

(4) Be consistent with, and assist in, compliance with total maximum daily load (TMDL) implementation plans and applicable national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permits.

(5) Be consistent with all applicable waste discharge permits.

(6) Be consistent with any applicable integrated regional water management plan.

(c) The proposed or adopted plan shall meet the standards outlined in this section. The plan need not be referred to as a "stormwater resource plan." Existing planning documents may be utilized as a functionally equivalent plan, including, but not limited to, watershed management plans, integrated resource plans, urban water management plans, or similar plans. If a planning document does not meet the standards of this section, a collection of local and regional plans may constitute a functional equivalent.

(d) Stormwater resource plans shall identify all of the following:

(1) Opportunities to augment local water supply through groundwater recharge or storage for beneficial reuse of stormwater.

(2) Opportunities for source control for both pollution and stormwater runoff volume, onsite and local infiltration, and reuse of stormwater.

(3) Projects to reestablish natural water drainage treatment and infiltration systems, or mimic natural system functions to the maximum extent feasible.

(4) Opportunities to develop or enhance habitat and open space through stormwater management, including wetlands, riverside habitats, parkways, and parks.

(5) Design criteria and best management practices to prevent stormwater pollution and increase effective stormwater management for new and upgraded infrastructure and residential, commercial, industrial, and public development. These design criteria and best management practices shall accomplish all of the following:

(A) Reduce effective impermeability within a watershed by creating permeable surfaces and directing stormwater to permeable surfaces, retention basins, cisterns, and other storage for beneficial reuse.

(B) Increase water storage for beneficial use through a variety of on-site storage techniques.

(C) Increase groundwater supplies through infiltration, where appropriate and feasible.

(D) Support low-impact development for new and upgraded infrastructure and development using low-impact techniques.

(6) Activities that generate or contribute to the pollution of stormwater, or that impair the effective beneficial use of stormwater.

(7) Projects and programs to ensure the effective implementation of the stormwater resource plan pursuant to this part and achieve multiple benefits.

(8) Ordinances or other mechanisms necessary to ensure the effective implementation of the stormwater resource plan pursuant to this part.

Inyo-Mono IRWM Phase I Objectives and Resource Management Strategies

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
I. Protect, conserve, optimize, and augment water supply	A. Improve water supply reliability B. Improve system flexibility and efficiency C. Support compliance with current and future state and federal water supply standards D. Address local water supply issues through various techniques, including, but not limited to: groundwater recharge projects, conjunctive use of water supplies, water recycling, water conservation, water transfers, and precipitation enhancement E. Protect and improve the quality and quantity of groundwater supplies F. Identify existing gaps in groundwater and surface water quantity data G. Monitor groundwater and surface water supply variability H. Optimize existing storage capacity I. Conserve and adapt water uses to future conditions J. Capture and manage runoff K. Incorporate and implement low-impact development design features, techniques, and practices to reduce water demand L. Support appropriate recreational activities

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
2. Protect, restore, and enhance water quality	A. Support compliance with current and future state and federal water quality standards B. Improve the quality of urban runoff, storm water, and wastewater C. Reduce erosion and sedimentation D. Protect public and aquatic ecosystem health E. Match water quality to water use F. Support appropriate recreational activities
3. Provide stewardship of our natural resources	A. Protect, restore, and enhance natural processes, habitats, and threatened and endangered species B. Protect ecosystems such as upland forests and meadows dependent on surface/shallow water supply C. Enhance recreational and educational opportunities D. Identify, develop, and implement efforts to better control invasive species E. Assess ecosystem health of watersheds in the region
4. Maintain and enhance water, wastewater, and power generation infrastructure efficiency and reliability	A. Systematically and strategically rehabilitate and replace aging water and wastewater delivery and treatment facilities in rural communities, including tribal lands B. Ensure fire protection capacity C. Improve energy efficiency of water systems and uses D. Promote use of water efficiency in power generating facilities
5. Address climate variability and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	A. Increase understanding of water related greenhouse gas emissions B. Manage and modify water systems to respond to increasing climate variability C. Use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water
6. Increase participation of small and disadvantaged communities in IRWM process	A. Engage regional communities in collaborative water and natural resource related efforts B. Provide assistance for tribal and DAC consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for water programs and projects

CALIFORNIA TROUT

KEEPER OF THE STREAMS

West Walker Restoration Plan

Project Synopsis:
The goal of this project is develop a restoration plan via the completion of an assessment of the riverine and riparian conditions associated with approximately three miles of the West Walker River located within the Antelope Valley-designated as an economically disadvantaged community. The Antelope Valley in Northern Mono County is home to roughly 15,000 acres of actively farmed land contributing significantly to local livelihoods. The West Walker River is also ecologically important to imperiled, native trout. However this same area has experienced significant damage from stormwater events that have in turn resulted in significant impacts, including loss of productive farmlands, from flooding of the Walker River. Most recently in 1997 a hundred year flood event occurred resulting in extensive losses of productive farmland and deleterious impacts to the Walker River ecosystem. Today, threats from stormwater and flood events remain and losses of active riparian farmlands occur annually. Better understanding of the historical and current geomorphological processes associated with the West Walker River along with assessing the current riparian habitat condition is the first step in developing a comprehensive restoration plan empathizing stormwater/flood management issues providing the basis for long-term management of this economically and ecologically important portion of the Inyo-Mono IRWM region. This project will pay particular attention to assessing approximately three miles of the lower West Walker River system with the intent of developing management recommendation to ameliorate threat to stream bank stabilization and in doing so, contribute positively to local livelihoods and local fisheries. In summary, this project responds to identified needs of a distinct watershed that focus on storm and flood threat mitigation in a DAC. Moreover, it responds to both newly identified planning gaps within the Inyo-Mono region as well as DWR storm/flood management priorities.

Responses to ranking criteria:

Inyo-Mono Priorities

1. Has the applicant demonstrated BY JANUARY 11, 2011, with significant confidence, that there is a minimum 25% match available? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)

California Trout is committed to providing at least 25% of project expenses.

2. Has the applicant demonstrated clearly that the application includes only planning efforts and no implementation components? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion)

As noted in the project synopsis, this is purely a planning project that will result in short and long-term management recommendations. In order to complete this project research and analyses

will be conducted. While this project is 100% planning in nature, it is expected that the outcome of the project will result in project implementation recommendations.

3. Does the proposal clearly support the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program? (5 points)

This project responds to identified and expressed needs relating to storm and flood management from stakeholders directly involved with the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program. Such stakeholders include local residents living in Antelope Valley as well a local NGO involved with resource conservation and federal agency tasked with managing the West Walker River watershed. The project also responds to multiple objectives and resource management strategies that have been developed by members of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program themselves (see below).

4. Does the project help to address Inyo-Mono Phase I regional objectives and Resource Management Strategies (see attachment below)? (5 points)

Although this is purely a planning project, it is expected that the results will address, in some degree, the following objectives and resource management strategies.

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
1. Protect, conserve, optimize, and augment water supply	A. Improve water supply reliability B. Conserve and adapt water uses to future conditions C. Support appropriate recreational activities
2. Protect, restore, and enhance water quality	A. Support compliance with current and future state and federal water quality standards B. Improve the quality of urban runoff, storm water, and wastewater C. Reduce erosion and sedimentation D. Protect public and aquatic ecosystem health E. Match water quality to water use F. Support appropriate recreational activities

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
3. Provide stewardship of our natural resources	A. Protect, restore, and enhance natural processes, habitats, and threatened and endangered species B. Protect ecosystems such as upland forests and meadows dependent on surface/shallow water supply C. Enhance recreational and educational opportunities D. Identify, develop, and implement efforts to better control invasive species *E.* Assess ecosystem health of watersheds in the region
4. Increase participation of small and disadvantaged communities in IRWM process	A. Engage regional communities in collaborative water and natural resource related efforts B. Provide assistance for tribal and DAC consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for water programs and projects

5. Does the project help to fill planning gaps in the Inyo-Mono planning region? (5 points)

The Phase I Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan did not identify stormwater/flood threat mitigation as a priority need. Nor was ecological stewardship/restoration a priority in the Round 1 Implementation Proposal. Since completing the Phase I Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan, and based on Group discussions and recent outreach efforts conducted by the Program Office, addressing watershed needs, flood and stormwater threat mitigation and management all have been identified as explicit needs for region. Given these recognized gaps in Round 1 planning and the nature of the project and focus on ecological restoration, flood and stormwater threat mitigation, this project does respond directly to filling planning gapes in the Inyo-Mono planning region.

6. Is the budget reasonable for the scope of work? (10 points)

The budget is based on site visits and discussions with consultants familiar with the Walker River and surrounding area and that are directly involved with the types of projects now being proposed. The proposed budget is thought to be conservative but adequate to achieve the project's intended goal (see proposed budget below). Primary tasks to be completed include:

- Developing a Scope of Work, administer and manage subcontract with consulting firm-Caltrout
- Establishing and execute contract to draft proposed restoration plan-Caltrout/consultant
- Outreach and engagement of Antelope Valley residents-Caltrout/Consultant

7. Discretionary points based on overall merit and importance of project to the planning region (up to 10 points)

This project will serve to address a region-wide need to develop flood & stormwater management planning and implementation efforts. This project will also contribute to the broader goal of developing resource plans that address a specific watershed level need yet also may have direct application to other watershed needs within the Inyo-Mono planning region. It will also serve to address ecosystem stewardship needs and in doing so, serve an economically disadvantaged community that is reliant upon the health of local natural resources for their livelihoods.

DWR Priorities:

1. Does the project proposal address current DWR priorities, *as set out in the PSP*?
   a. Does the project involve and/or benefit a DAC (must be demonstrated)? (5 points)

   Yes, the entirety of the project takes place within Antelope Valley, a recognized DAC per the 2000 census. Landowners residing in the Valley will be directly involved.

   b. Does the project involve and/or benefit a Tribe? (5 points)

   Although there is not a formally recognized tribe (?) in Antelope Valley, although there is a health clinic located in Walker that serves members of tribes in adjacent communities.

   c. Does project help to integrate stormwater resource plan requirements into the IRWM Plan as specified in California Water Code Section 10562 (see full text of the section below)? (5 points)

   Yes. Currently, stormwater planning is not adequately addressed in the Phase I Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan and therefore, completing this project will not only address a local need within the Antelope Valley, it will contribute to the broader needs of the region towards addressing this issue. Moreover, this project addresses many of the elements required per CA Water Code Section 10562 (including but not limited to many of Codes Sections B & C). Code Section A refers to a plan that is developed by cities, counties or special districts. It is anticipated and hoped that the findings of the proposed restoration plan will be adopted by relevant authorities. Given the results of the study are not available at this time it is difficult to state emphatically whether all of the Code will be addressed.

d. Does the project address stormwater and/or flood management? (5 points)

The primary goal of this project is to develop a restoration plan that will directly address threats from storm and flood events within the Antelope Valley.

e. Does the project address salt and nutrient management planning? (5 points)

This project does not directly address salt and nutrient planning. It may, depending on the results, respond to potential impacts from various land-use activities, notably grazing, that may or may not relate to nutrient loading.

8. *In the PSP*, DWR specifies that the Planning Grant must help the IRWM Group meet the Plan Standards as set out in the Prop. 84 Guidelines. Does the project help to meet the IRWM Plan Standards (below)? (5 points total)

Table 2 – IRWM Plan Standards	
• Governance	• Data Management
• Region Description	• Finance
• Objectives	• Technical Analysis
• Resource Management Strategies (RMS)	• Relation to Local Water Planning
• Integration	• Relation to Local Land Use Planning
• Project Review Process	• Stakeholder Involvement
• Impact and Benefit	• Coordination
• Plan Performance and Monitoring	• Climate Change

The project helps to meet the following IRWM Plan Standards:
Regional description, objectives, resource management strategies, integration, technical analysis, relation to local water planning, relation to local land use planning, stakeholder involvement, coordination, climate change.

9. Does the project help address IRWM program preferences *as set out in the PSP*? (0.5 point for each of the following, for a maximum of 7 points)
   - Include regional projects or programs-**Yes**
   - Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region- **Yes**
   - Effectively resolve significant water- related conflicts within or between regions- **No**
   - Contribute to attainment of one or more objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (not applicable to Inyo-Mono region)-**NA**
   - Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities- **Yes**
   - Effectively integrate water management with land use planning- **Yes**

- Include actions designed to integrate the Stormwater Resource Plan-
- Drought Preparedness-**No**
- Use and reuse water more efficiently-**No**
- Climate Change Response Actions-**Yes**
- Expand environmental stewardship- **Yes**
- Practice integrated flood management- **Yes**
- Protect surface and groundwater quality-**Yes**
- Improve tribal water and natural resources-**No**
- Ensure equitable distribution of benefits- **Yes**

Proposed Budget:

Expense	Total	DWR Request	Caltrout
Salary	$10,000	$4,500	$5,500
Contract/consultants	$70,000	$60,000	$10,000
Travel	$1,000		$1,000
Miscl. supplies	$1,000	1000	0
Subtotal	$82,000		$16,500
Admin (10%)	$8,200	$2,300	$5,900
TOTAL	**$90,200**	**$67,800**	**$22,400**

Inyo Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Round 2 Planning Grant
Inyo County Public Works: Laws, Independence, and Lone Pine Leak Detection & Condition Assessment Project
Narrative

Inyo-Mono IRWM Regional Priorities

1. Has the applicant demonstrated BY JANUARY 11, 2011, with significant confidence, that there is a minimum 25% match available? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion).

   25% match will either be provided by Inyo County as in-kind labor by employees, or a consultant's charge.

2. Has the applicant demonstrated clearly that the application includes only planning efforts and no implementation components? (This criterion will be used in the January 11 ranking discussion).

   The project will create planning documents to be included in the Inyo Mono IRWM Plan and website as an excel spreadsheet or database of water main size, material, age, soil characteristics, acidity, etc. conforming to the American Water Works Association Research Foundation's (AWWARF) project # 4195 which is an adaptation of the United Kingdom Water Industry Research database. Further, the spreadsheet will be offered up for inclusion on the Inyo Mono website to make it available to the general public worldwide. The AWWARF spreadsheet adaptation is currently being formulated. Google search "U.S. Beta Testing of the UKWIR National Mains Failures Database" project #4195. The database is a recommendation of a USEPA funded research paper "Condition Assessment of Ferrous Water Transmission and Distribution Systems STATE OF TECHNOLOGY REVIEW REPORT" June 2009. The above document, pg 46, demonstrates that the UKWIR database is a valuable planning tool for the UK utilities and the American adaptation of the UKWIR database is expected to likewise be a valuable planning tool for the nation's water utilities. The spreadsheet on the Inyo Mono water website will be a valuable tool to other local small utilities and disadvantaged communities. If posted on the Inyo Mono Water website, it will likewise be available to any access worldwide. No other similar database is publicly available. The documents created as a result of this project will also be incorporated into Inyo County Water Master Plans for Independence, Lone Pine, and Laws, and will be provided to the custodian of the National Water Mains Condition database discussed above.

3. Does the proposal clearly support the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program? (5 points)

- The Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program, as outlined on the website: "Provide focused assistance for disadvantaged communities, Native American Indian Tribes, and small water districts" is embodied by this project. This project provides assistance to three

disadvantaged water utilities in the small Owens Valley communities of Laws, Independence, and Lone Pine.

4. Does the project help to address Inyo-Mono Phase I regional objectives and Resource Management Strategies? (5 points) Leak detection and condition assessment achieves the following:

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
1. Protect, conserve, optimize, and augment water supply	A. Improve water supply reliability: More water provided to system. B. Improve system efficiency: Less water lost to ground, less electricity wasted. C. Support compliance with current and future state and federal water supply standards: Maximum 10% leakage. D. Address local water supply issues through various techniques, including, but not limited to: groundwater recharge projects, conjunctive use of water supplies, water recycling, water conservation, water transfers, and precipitation enhancement: Water conservation. E. Optimize existing storage capacity: Keep existing water in the system. F. Conserve and adapt water uses to future conditions: Leak detection is water conservation.
4. Maintain and enhance water, wastewater, and power generation infrastructure efficiency and reliability	A. Systematically and strategically rehabilitate and replace aging water and wastewater delivery and treatment facilities in rural communities, including tribal lands: Project will provide course of action to follow to implement this. B. Ensure fire protection capacity: More water in system means more water for fire protection. C. Improve energy efficiency of water systems and uses: Water conservation is energy efficiency
5. Address climate variability and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	A. Increase understanding of water related greenhouse gas emissions: Conserved water equates to less GHG emissions and impact on environment. B. Manage and modify water systems to respond to increasing climate variability: Conserved water supports understanding of climate variability. C. Use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water: At the margin, less water pumped can mean less

Objective	Resource Management Strategies
	water pumped at peak times of day, which reduces electric generation pollution.
6. Increase participation of small and disadvantaged communities in IRWM process	A. Engage regional communities in collaborative water and natural resource related efforts: The three water systems are regional- within 60 miles of each other. B. Provide assistance for tribal and DAC consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for water programs and projects: Provides assistance to 3 DAC's Lone Pine, Independence, and Laws.

5. Does the project help to fill planning gaps in the Inyo-Mono planning region? (5 points)

   The Inyo Mono planning region is silent with regard to specifically how small rural DAC's can be assisted by the IRWMP process. This project will directly benefit other utility's planning efforts in the region because a spreadsheet of comparable information is not currently available.

6. Is the budget reasonable for the scope of work? (10 points)

   The budget is reasonable for the acoustic leak correlation technology (Echologics LEAKFINDER and THICKNESSFINDER) expected to be used for this project. Acoustic Leak correlation costs $3.25 per foot of pipe evaluated for leaks and condition assessment for lengths of pipe from 5 miles to more than 10 miles of pipe evaluated. Less than 5 miles of pipe is evaluated at $3.50 per foot. This project contemplates evaluating up to 8-10 miles of the county's 18 miles of distribution system infrastructure within the three towns. There is also a $7,500 mobilization and pre engineering cost to move on to the project from Ontario, Canada (where the technology is located) to locations in the Owens Valley. The prior referenced USEPA funded document estimates that the cost for the technology is about 10% of the installed cost of pipe. The above figure of $3.25 per lineal foot of pipe investigated is far below the cost estimates for pipe replacement based upon Public Works prior project experience and escalating past prices for inflation. If 3 miles (15,840 lineal feet) of 6"(inch), 3 miles (15,840 lineal feet) of 8" (inch), 1 mile (5,280 lineal feet) of 10" (inch) and 1 mile (5,280 lineal feet) of 12" (inch) pipe are replaced, the average cost per foot of all above pipe replaced is $133 per lineal foot, which includes engineering costs. 10% of that cost is $13 per lineal foot. This project will cost approximately $4 per lineal foot, one third of the approximate 10% of installation costs. Note that this is for the expected technology, to be determined by a consultant. A consultant may determine that less costly technology is equally appropriate.

7. Discretionary points based on overall merit and importance of project to the planning region (up to 10 points)

The planning region, or the nation for that matter, currently does not have access to a database or spreadsheet of water main age, condition, soil type, acidity, leak history, etc. proposed by this project. Local soil types will be referenced to the USDA's "Soil Survey of Benton-Owens Valley Area", thus making it possible for a local utility, using the above soil report in conjunction with the database or spreadsheet available on the web, to compare a proposed pipeline path's soil type and characteristics with an existing pipeline with the same or similar soil characteristics listed in the database to estimate the performance of the pipeline over time. This project would make the results available to anyone on line, anywhere the world wide web can be accessed. The information will be a valuable Capital Improvement Plan planning tool to smaller Owens Valley utilities assisting with pipeline age, maintenance, and replacement expectations.

DWR Priorities

8. Does the project proposal address current DWR priorities, *as set out in the PSP*?
    a. Does the project involve and/or benefit a DAC (must be demonstrated)? (5 points) Yes, Laws, Independence, and Lone Pine have been demonstrated to be Disadvantaged communities.
    b. Does the project involve and/or benefit a Tribe? (5 points) No
    c. Does project help to integrate stormwater resource plan requirements into the IRWM Plan as specified in California Water Code Section 10562 (see full text of the section below)? (5 points) No
    d. Does the project address stormwater and/or flood management? (5 points) No
    e. Does the project address salt and nutrient management planning? (5 points) No
9. *In the PSP*, DWR specifies that the Planning Grant must help the IRWM Group meet the Plan Standards as set out in the Prop. 84 Guidelines. Does the project help to meet the IRWM Plan Standards (below)? (5 points total) Yes. This project follows or meets the plan standards as shown in Table 2, below.

Table 2 – IRWM Plan Standards	
• Governance	• Data Management
• Region Description	• Finance
• Objectives	• Technical Analysis
• Resource Management Strategies (RMS)	• Relation to Local Water Planning
• Integration	• Relation to Local Land Use Planning
• Project Review Process	• Stakeholder Involvement
• Impact and Benefit	• Coordination
• Plan Performance and Monitoring	• Climate Change

10. Does the project help address IRWM program preferences *as set out in the PSP*? (0.5 point for each of the following, for a maximum of 7 points)
    - Include regional projects or programs: Yes, Towns are regional

- Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region: The project integrates leak detection & resulting capital improvement plan to replace leaking pipes and achieve conservation of water, among other goals.
- Effectively resolve significant water- related conflicts within or between regions: A significant conflict within the three towns, which is not commonly recognized, is that there is a need for a rate increase to fund capital improvements and contingency funds among other necessary funds. The local populace doubts figures presented by Public Works relating to the need for a rate increase, system condition, and costs for replacement. This project will help address this conflict by independently determining the condition of the mains evaluated which will help establish a defensible Capital Improvement Program which also leads to a defensible rate increase.
- Contribute to attainment of one or more objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (not applicable to Inyo-Mono region)
- Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities. Yes, establishment of condition assessment and leak detection is a critical water supply need for the three DAC's.
- Effectively integrate water management with land use planning: No
- Include actions designed to integrate the Stormwater Resource Plan: No
- Drought Preparedness: Yes, water conservation enhances Drought preparedness.
- Use and reuse water more efficiently: Yes, Water conservation is water use efficiency
- Climate Change Response Actions Yes, water conservation is a climate change response.
- Expand environmental stewardship: Yes, water conservation is environmental stewardship.
- Practice integrated flood management: No
- Protect surface and groundwater quality: No
- Improve tribal water and natural resources: No
- Ensure equitable distribution of benefits: Yes, enhances distribution of benefits to DAC's

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

168 NORTH EDWARDS STREET - P.O. DRAWER Q
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526
PHONE: (760) 878-0201 FAX: (760) 878-2001

COUNTY
OF
INYO

Doug Wilson, Interim Director
Jeff Ahlstrom, Interim Deputy Director

Inyo-Mono IRWMP Round 2 Planning Grant Project Proposal

Name of project: **BISHOP CREEK SEWER SYSTEM MASTER PLAN**

Project proponent: **INYO COUNTY, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS / US FOREST SERVICE**

Contact persons: **Doug Wilson, Interim Director of Public Works, Olin Beale, Forest Engineer**

Phone: **760-878-0201 (Doug Wilson)** **760-873-2487(Olin Beale)**

E-mail: **dwilson@inyocounty.us** **obeall@fs.fed.us**

Submitted: **December 22, 2011**

Project Proposal

The CSA-2 (County Service Area number 2) sewer collection system and the USFS Bishop Creek sewage treatment plant are in dire need of renovation because of continued seepage, reoccurring blockages, infiltration inflow and an aging sewer plant and ponds. These conditions have created a situation where costs for system maintenance, operations and effluent treatment are high and also create a potential for significant environmental impacts.

The collection system has not been evaluated since the late 1970's and no accurate plans for the collection system exist. The proposed master plan evaluation would consist of survey mapping and measure the entire system as well as preforming a video inspection of the existing main lines to document the existing conditions and problem areas in the sewer mains and the treatment plant. Following the map and measure portion of the evaluation, plan and profile drawings would be created and these drawings would be used to develop recommendations for the rehabilitation of the sewer system and plant.

A consulting engineering firm specializing in sewer system evaluations will be selected to make recommendations for treatment plant options and equipment upgrades/replacements at the plant; collection and conveyance system upgrades, replacements or repairs and a rates analysis.

The preliminary engineering report and master plan prepared as part of the proposed evaluation is often required for application for State and Federal Grant and Loan Programs. A rough estimate of the cost for completion of the evaluation and preparation of the master plan is in the range of $75,000. The proposed budget is included as **Attachment A.** The collection system is a community owned and County operated system and is located in Aspendell, east of Bishop, CA.

The treatment facilities are owned and operated by the US Forest Service. The treatment plant was installed in 1973 to treat effluent generated from the USFS operated campgrounds and was later connected to the CSA-2 collection system. The evaluation and master plan proposed here will also include of the Forest Service portion of the system. The USFS has indicated that they will partner in the application for future grant funds. CSA-2 provides proportionate payment to the Forest Service for the effluent treated in the Forest Service plant.

Round 2 Planning Grant Project Evaluation Criteria discussion

The Proposed project will meet the evaluation criteria by the ability of the County and Forest Service to provide the 25% grant match. The CSA-2 Board has in the past gone on record that they will support a recommendation to the Inyo County Board of Supervisors to provide matching funds. The Inyo County Board of Supervisors has approved past Grant applications with the same requirements.

The project clearly qualifies for a planning grant because the project proposes the development of a sewer system master plan and system evaluation, if the project proposal is approved.

The proposed master plan supports the Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Program by addressing water related issues and strategies to deal with them. Inyo County and the Forest Service are entities that were originally identified to be served by the IRWMP plan. And, the proposed project falls into the categories identified in the scope of the original Inyo-Mono IRWMP Phase I Plan.

The proposed evaluation also clearly addresses the Inyo Mono Phase 1 regional Objectives and Management Strategies criteria by:

- The protection and enhancement of the water quality of the Bishop Creek watershed by insuring that leachate and spillage from the sewer system does not enter the groundwater or the flowing channel of Bishop Creek. The Bishop Paiute Tribe has indicated support for the proposed project because the tribe obtains irrigation water and groundwater derived from this watershed. This will also support California Regional Water Quality Board standards by reducing the potential for Regional Board violations. Potential sewage spillage in Bishop Creek may cause the creek to be closed to fishing, thereby reducing recreational opportunities.
- Provide stewardship by demonstrating environmental responsibility for the Bishop Creek watershed through efficient management and operation of the sewer system. This will also protect the wetlands in the area by preventing infiltration of leachate and prevention of sewer spillage.
- Providing for more efficient and reliable treatment of waste water in the collection and Forest Service treatment facilities. The master plan will identify areas needed for replacement and rehabilitation. The increased efficiency will reduce overall operations cost to both the Forest Service and the County as well as reduce greenhouse gasses.
- Addressing climate variability by planning and designing a more energy efficient plant, thereby reducing effluent treatment, which reduces plant operational costs. The reduced effluent treatment will provide a direct reduction in electrical consumption. There is a possibility that Southern California Edison will coordinate with the project proponents for a more efficient design of treatment equipment. The overall goal is to reduce electrical consumption, costs to the USFS and the County and reduce greenhouse gasses.

The proposed project is will address planning gaps in the Inyo-Mono planning region by developing a wastewater related master plan, which if followed will allow for the development of infrastructure that reduces overall costs of operation, reduces greenhouse gas emissions, provides for protection of the watershed of Bishop Creek.

The proposed budget, in the opinion of the project proponents is reasonable considering the proposed scope of work.

The improvements identified in the master plan, if constructed also addresses the DWR priorities by:

- Indirectly providing water quality benefits to the Bishop Paiute Tribe.
- Reducing the potential for ground and surface water pollution. These measures will also provide watershed protection, including ecosystem protection. The proposed project could possibly address nutrient planning by limiting potential nitrate groundwater pollution and eliminating non-point source pollution in the sewer collection system area.
- Helping the IRWMP Group meet the Plan Standards in the DWR Prop 84 guidelines as the pertain to objectives, resource management strategies, impact and benefits stakeholder involvement, providing a technical analysis, coordination between governmental agencies and climate change.

The project will help address IRWM program preferences as identified in the PSP by:

- Reducing overall treatment plant electrical consumption and thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER

12

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

☐ Consent ☒ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for ☐ Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: CLERK OF THE BOARD
By: Patricia Gunsolley, Assistant Clerk of the Board

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: Approval of Minutes

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION: - Request Board approve the minutes of the Board of Supervisors of December 27, 2011, as requested per draft provided.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION: - The Board is required to keep minutes of its proceedings. Once the Board has approved the minutes as requested the minutes will be made available to the public.

ALTERNATIVES: - Staff awaits your Board's changes and/or corrections.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: - n/a

FINANCING: n/a

APPROVALS	
BUDGET OFFICER:	BUDGET AMENDMENTS *(Must be reviewed and approved by Budget Officer prior to being approved by others, as needed, and submission to the Assistant Clerk of the Board.)*
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the Assistant Clerk of the Board.)* Approved: _____ Date_____
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS (*Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the Assistant Clerk of the Board.)* Approved:_____ Date_____
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the Assistant Clerk of the Board.)* Approved:_____ Date_____

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received)_____ Date:_____
(The Original plus 20 copies of this document are required)

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

For Clerk's Use Only:
AGENDA NUMBER
16 -
17 -
18

☐ Consent ☐ Departmental ☐ Correspondence Action ☐ Public Hearing

☐ Scheduled Time for X Closed Session ☐ Informational

FROM: **COUNTY COUNSEL**

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: January 10, 2012

SUBJECT: ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION [Pursuant to *Government Code § 54956.9(b)].* *– Significant Exposure to Litigation (one case).*

B

PERSONNEL [Pursuant to Government Code § 54957]. Public Employee Appointment - Title: Director Public Works.

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR [Pursuant to Government Code § 54957.6]. - Instructions to Negotiators re: wages, salaries and benefits - Employee Organization: Law Enforcement Administrators' Association (LEAA) - Negotiators: CAO Kevin Carunchio and Labor Relations Administrator Sue Dishion.

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR [Pursuant to Government Code § 54957.6]. - Instructions to Negotiators re: wages, salaries and benefits - Employee Organization: Inyo County Probation Peace Officers Association (ICPPOA) - Negotiators:CAO Kevin Carunchio and Labor Relations Administrator Sue Dishion.

APPROVALS	
COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS *(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)* Approved: — Date 1-3-11

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE: Date: 1-3-11
(Not to be signed until all approvals are received)
(The Original plus 20 copies of this document are required)

19

LESLIE L. CHAPMAN, CPA
Auditor- Controller
lchapman@inyocounty.us

(760) 878-0343
(760) 872-2700
(760) 876-5559
FAX: (760) 878-0391

COUNTY OF INYO

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-CONTROLLER
P. O. Drawer R
Independence, California 93526

AMY SHEPHERD
Management Analyst
ashepherd@inyocounty.us

ANNETTE DENNING
Business Analyst
adenning@inyocounty.us

NITA LINDSEY
Fiscal Supervisor
nlindsey@inyocounty.us

MAUVRA JACOBS
Payroll Tech
mjacobs@inyocounty.us

RIANNAH LUMMIS
Account Tech III
rlummis@inyocounty.us

BETTY BIROS
Account Tech III
bbiros@inyocounty.us

VICKI HERLEMAN
Account Tech II
vherleman@inyocounty.us

JOEY PETERSON
Account Clerk II
mhanawalt@inyocounty.us

12/30/2011

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Inyo
Independence, Calif. 93526

Honorable Board Members:

In Accordance with Section 26905 and 26921 of the Government Code and your orders of February 5, 1950 and January 3, 1956, an actual count of money in the hands of the Treasurer was made on this date. The count showed the funds to be in balance, pending written verification of inactive accounts.

Very Truly Yours,

Leslie L Chapman

Leslie L. Chapman
Auditor-Controller

By; Vicki Herleman, Deputy

STATEMENT

MONEY IN COUNTY TREASURY

For DEC 2011

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF INYO

The undersigned, County Auditor, having counted the money in the County Treasury of said County, as required by Section 26921 of the Government Code, and being duly sworn on oath, makes the following report for the period ending
December 29, 2011.

Amount of money that should be in the treasury on December 29, 2011

is	$109,722,255.36	
RECEIPTS FROM 10/01/11-12/29/11	$38,958,987.83	
(Less paid warrants) Amount actually therein is	($37,405,066.46)	
Active Balance		$945,544.50
Silver		$11.81
Currency		$411.00
Certificates of Deposit		$110,330,209.42
Warrants		
Bonds and Coupons		
Checks		
	111,276,176.73	$111,276,176.73

Leslie L Chapman
County Auditor

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of December, 2011

Patricia Gunsolley
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
INYO COUNTY

20

OFFICE OF THE
SHERIFF
INYO COUNTY, CA

WILLIAM R. LUTZE
SHERIFF

KEITH HARDCASTLE
UNDERSHERIFF

"A Professional Service Agency"

Memorandum

COPY

To: Sheriff Lutze, U/S Hardcastle

From: Janis, Assistant to the Sheriff Janis L. Odlum

CC: Board of Supervisors, CAO, Assistant to the Board

Date: 1/3/2012

Re: December Overtime

Following, please find the amount of overtime expended and overtime balances for the month of December, 2011.

	Expended	Balance
022700 Sheriff General	$ 3,209.67	$ 21,919.63
022710 Sheriff Safety	$17,236.29	$106,544.66
022910 Jail General	$ 2,998.85	$ 44,994.93
022910 Jail Safety	$ 3,092.88	$ 21,218.82
Grand Total	**$26,537.69**	**$194,678.04**

Account Director Reports are attached. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you!

P.O. Drawer "S" (550 South Clay Street) Independence, CA 93526
Phone: 760-878-0383 Fax: 760-878-0389

21

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

State of California

APPLICATION FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE LICENSE(S)

ABC 211 (6/99)

TO: Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
4800 STOCKDALE HWY
STE 213
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93309
(661) 395-2731

File Number: **517856**
Receipt Number: **2090731**
Geographical Code: **1400**
Copies Mailed Date: **December 27, 2011**
Issued Date:

DISTRICT SERVING LOCATION: **BAKERSFIELD**

First Owner: **BISHOP PAIUTE TRIBE**
Name of Business: **PAIUTE PALACE CASINO**
Location of Business: **2742 N SIERRA HIGHWAY**
BISHOP, CA 93514-2218

County: **INYO**
Is Premise inside city limits? **No**
Census Tract **0004.00**
Mailing Address:
(If different from premises address)

Type of license(s): **41**
Transferor's license/name:
Dropping Partner: Yes___ No___

License Type	Transaction Type	Fee Type	Master	Dup	Date	Fee
41 - On-Sale Beer And Wine	ORIGINAL FEES	NA	Y	0	12/27/11	$300.00
41 - On-Sale Beer And Wine	ANNUAL FEE	NA	Y	0	12/27/11	$350.00
NA	STATE FINGERPRINTS	NA	N	2	12/27/11	$78.00
NA	FEDERAL FINGERPRINTS	NA	N	2	12/27/11	$48.00
					Total	$776.00

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? **No**
Have you ever violated any provisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, or regulations of the Department pertaining to the Act? **No**
Explain any "Yes" answer to the above questions on an attachment which shall be deemed part of this application.

Applicant agrees (a) that any manager employed in an on-sale licensed premises will have all the qualifications of a licensee, and (b) that he will not violate or cause or permit to be violated any of the provisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA County of INYO Date: December 27, 2011

Under penalty of perjury, each person whose signature appears below, certifies and says: (1) He is an applicant, or one of the applicants, or an executive officer of the applicant corporation, named in the foregoing application, duly authorized to make this application on its behalf; (2) that he has read the foregoing and knows the contents thereof and that each of the above statements therein made are true; (3) that no person other than the applicant or applicants has any direct or indirect interest in the applicant or applicant's business to be conducted under the license(s) for which this application is made; (4) that the transfer application or proposed transfer is not made to satisfy the payment of a loan or to fulfill an agreement entered into more than ninety (90) days preceding the day on which the transfer application is filed with the Department or to gain or establish a preference to or for any creditor or transferor or to defraud or injure any creditor of transferor; (5) that the transfer application may be withdrawn by either the applicant or the licensee with no resulting liability to the Department.

Applicant Name(s)

Applicant Signature(s)

See 211 Signature Page

BISHOP PAIUTE TRIBE

RECEIVED
JAN -4 PM 4:08