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- $2.5 million from Prop. 84 IRWM inter-regional funding
- Goal: assist DWR in developing methods to improve DAC participation throughout the State
- Initially given to 5 regions; later 7
  - Inyo-Mono
  - North Coast
  - Imperial
  - Coachella
  - Greater LA
  - Upper Kings
  - Santa Cruz
**Inyo-Mono DAC Grant**

- **Rural/headwaters region**
- **Objectives of grant:**
  - Determining the most effective means of identifying DACs, including metrics other than median household income
  - Determining what methods are most effective in engaging DACs in the IRWM process, including developing targeted and appropriate education and outreach materials
  - Determining DACs’ constraints and challenges associated with being involved in the IRWM process and developing projects for eventual implementation, and helping to build capacity to overcome those challenges.
  - Identifying local, county, state and federal legislation/policies relevant to water needs of DACs.
  - Actively participating in local, regional and state fora relevant to DAC water-related issues and needs.
- **Started in 2011; completed by September 30, 2014**

---

**Inyo-Mono IRWM region**

- **Land area:** 17,259 mi$^2$
  - 11% of California
  - >50% of Lahontan funding region
- **Population:** ~68,000
  - Major population centers: Ridgecrest, Mammoth Lakes, Bishop
  - 4 people/mi$^2$
- **Mountains, desert, saline lakes, water exports**
  - Source water for >1 million people in L.A.
DAC Definition: 80% or less of CA Median Household Income = $48,706 or less

- ~½ of population centers are DACs
- 15 severely-DACs
  - 6 out of 10 tribes
- Major industries: tourism, agriculture, resource extraction
BUT...

- Census/ACS data incomplete
- Census geographies do not always match up with service areas
- Community-specific income surveys are expensive
- Is 80% of MHI even the best definition?

So...

- Explore alternative ways of defining & identifying DACs
- Come up with a substitute for MHI data
Which one is the DAC?

Community Surveys (n=10)

- Big Pine CDP
- Big Pine Paiute Tribe
- Big Pine CSD
- Bishop Paiute Tribe
- Bridgeport CDP
- Bridgeport PUD
- Lee Vining CDP
- McGee Creek CDP
- Mesa CDP
- Mono City CDP
- Pine Creek Village (Rovana)
- Shoshone CDP
- Swall Meadows CDP
- Tecopa CDP
### Using results to estimate MHI \( (DAC = $48,706) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>% Single Story Homes</th>
<th>Estimated MHI</th>
<th>Actual MHI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Pine CSD</td>
<td>90.72%</td>
<td>$47,279</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport PUD</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>$58,094</td>
<td>$41,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGee Creek CDP</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>$77,315</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Creek Village</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$40,895</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rovana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Take-homes from metrics exercise**

- Data gaps particularly prevalent & challenging in rural communities
- Find metrics that can replace incomplete data sets
- Collect data right in the community – create a rapid-assessment approach
- Our exercise useful for rural, headwaters, sparsely-populated regions
- Exercise not complete; needs more investigation & analysis

**Outreach**

- Formal meetings in region
  - With individual entities
  - Generic public meetings
- Formal meetings outside of region
  - Other IRWM groups with high % DACs
- Unexpected outreach opportunities
  - Trainings
  - World Water Day
Assessing Needs & Building Capacity

- Needs Assessments
  - 17 DAC water systems
  - 2 tribes, 6 public systems, 9 private systems
- Results (needs):
  - Operating plans
  - Aging infrastructure – tanks, transmission lines, generators
  - Water meters, SCADA
  - Water conservation plans
  - Five-year budgets
  - Capital Improvement Plans
  - Emergency preparedness

Assessing Needs & Building Capacity

- Trainings followed from needs assessments and outreach
- Targeted to DACs
- Topics:
  - Grantwriting/finding grants
  - Economic analysis
  - Mapping water systems
  - Utility Management
  - TMF Tune-up
  - Water Conservation
  - Budget Planning
  - Regulatory Update
  - Basic Hydrogeology
  - Rate Structures
  - Emergency Planning
  - Sampling Procedures
  - Drought Preparedness
What’s Next?

- Draft recommendations to DWR: June 15
- Film premieres
- Presenting results & recommendations
- Final report to DWR: September 30, 2014
- Continued Inyo-Mono DAC outreach & engagement
Recommendations (1)

1. DAC outreach requires time, persistence, creativity, community-specific knowledge
2. Utilize unlikely outreach venues
3. Further research alternative definitions of DAC

Recommendations (2)

1. Promote DAC water system training, technical assistance, capacity building – from State and local entities
2. Create different grant proposal and grant administration requirements for DACs
3. Investigate possibilities for water system consolidation
4. Develop realistic and adequate rate structures
We want to hear from you!

• What do you think of recommendations?
  • What are we missing?
• What outreach techniques have worked to engage DACs in your IRWMP?
• What non-income indicators would help identify your DACs?
• How might State and local policies change to better serve DAC water needs?

We welcome continued input…

THANK YOU and Contact Info

• Mark Drew, Program Director: mdrew@caltrout.org
• Holly Alpert, Program Manager: holly@inyo-monowater.org
• Rick Kattelmann, Project Development Specialist: rick@inyo-monowater.org
• Janet Hatfield, GIS/Data Management Specialist: janet@inyo-monowater.org
• www.inyo-monowater.org