

Draft Meeting Summary

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program Administrative Committee Meeting

Wednesday, June 6, 2012
10:00 am - 12:00 pm
Conference call, with in-person options

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

Summary of Action Items

- Mark emphasizes the power of a unified voice and will circulate the seven issues identified in the break-out discussion at the South Lahontan Regional Forum to those who participated for comments. He then pledges to synthesize all comments and provide a final draft to discussion participants prior to submitting to DWR. The “issues” document will then be submitted to DWR accompanied by the list of Inyo-Mono RWMG members and other supporters who participated in the discussion.
- Written feedback on the South Lahontan Regional Forum would be appreciated by the end of June to the Program Office who will forward it on to DWR.
- Janet will circulate an email to the RFP working committee to initiate continued conversation on funding allocation as well as category (bin) reconsideration. Those with constructive comments and ideas please articulate them via email to other working committee members.
- Program Staff will agendaize the MOU amendment for further discussion at the next Admin. Committee meeting.
- Program Staff will agendaize 501(c)(3) non-profit organization again at the next Admin. Committee meeting and allow for more time to discuss this topic further with the entire 501(c)(3) working committee.
- Those interested in participating in the Sierra Water Workgroup Summit (July 17,18) please contact Holly for more information about funding support for participation

Draft Meeting Summary

- Tony Dublino calls the meeting to order 10:02 am

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in Person

- Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RCD
- Tony Dublino, Mono County
- Heather deBethizy, Mono County
- Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
- Mark Drew, California Trout
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWMP Staff
- Janet Hatfield, Inyo-Mono IRWMP Staff

On the Phone

- Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
- BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
- Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
- Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District
- Harvey vanDyke, Wheeler Crest Community Services District

2. Public Comment Period

3. Administrative Committee Chair/Vice Chair Appointments

a. Personnel changes

- On behalf of the RWMG, Mark Drew thanks Tony for his contribution to the Inyo-Mono IRWMP and acknowledges the value he has contributed to the overall program and wishes him good luck in his new position at the County. At the same time he welcomes Heather deBethizy as the new Mono County IRWMP representative.

b. July 1 – December 31 Term

- Mark reminds the Admin. Committee that June 30 signifies the end of the current Admin. Committee Chair and Vice Chair positions, per the Inyo-Mono MOU and requests volunteers for the new term.
- Both Bruce Woodworth and Irene Yamashita offer to serve as Chair for the July 1 to December 31, 2012 term.
- There is concern expressed about Bruce serving as the Chair because of his affiliation with Central Sierra RC&D who is the current Fiscal Agent for Round 1 Implementation projects. Concern stems from the duty of the Admin. Committee to perform fiscal oversight of the Fiscal Agent. The Admin. Committee referenced section 2.11 of the MOU for direction on the issue.
- Several members ask Bruce specifically how he might handle situations where Fiscal Agent issues may conflict with the Admin. Committee's role.
- Bruce replies that his role with Central Sierra and the current Implementation grant is limited and that he feels he can provide objective and unbiased leadership to the Admin. Committee, and he agrees to recuse himself from any subject matter that may be considered a conflict of interest. He further explains he feels his experience with the Fiscal Agent has made him savvy to the pressing issues and needs of the RWMG for future Implementation rounds, and he believes the consensus model, by design, gives him equal power with all other members of the Admin. Committee. He continues that his priorities as Chair would include driving the 501(c)(3) establishment process as well as perhaps some of the issues and concerns with the MOU.
- Bruce suggests taking a vote from the Admin. Committee members while he and Irene are out of the room.
- Remaining Admin. Committee members discuss their concerns regarding the dual role Bruce would play as a member of the Fiscal Agent's organization as well as Chair of the Admin. Committee. The majority feel it is best to avoid such potential conflicts, and they elect Irene as the new Chair.
- Leroy Corlett moves to nominate Irene Yamashita as Chair of the Admin. Committee for the July 1 - December 31 term. Darla Heil seconds the motion. All approve.
- Mark asks for volunteers for the position of Vice-Chair, and Leroy volunteers to serve.
- Bruce nominates Leroy as Vice-Chair of the Admin. Committee for the July 1 - December 31 term. Irene seconds the motion. All approve.

4. South Lahontan Regional Forum Review

- Mark recaps the South Lahontan Regional Forum which was organized by DWR to gain necessary information relevant to the regional reports section of the CA Water Plan Update 2013.

- He expresses his opinion that the most productive part of the forum was the breakout discussion sessions. Mark reminds the Admin. Committee that this is a huge opportunity to influence the CA Water Plan Update which in turn largely influences state policy as well as funding priorities. He informs those who could not attend that within the breakout sessions, seven key issues were identified for the region with the intention to submit collaborative, unified input to DWR from the Inyo-Mono region.
- There is a discussion if the document Mark plans to send should be submitted on behalf of the Inyo-Mono RWMG and if so, would it require Group approval. It is decided that to include Inyo-Mono RWMG affiliation alongside names of those who support the document of seven regional issues but not to seek approval by the Group.
- **Mark advocates the power of a unified voice and will circulate the seven issues identified in the break-out discussion to those who participated for comments. He then pledges to synthesize all comments and provide a final draft to discussion participants prior to submitting to DWR.**
- Holly adds there were a total of 50 participants in this year's Forum and reminds the Admin. Committee that there will be continued opportunities for participation on the CA Water Plan Update.
- There is a conversation regarding the importance of submitting comments in a timely manner and it is agreed that early comments will be beneficial to the region.
- A question arises as to why DWR sought comments from LADWP and Inyo County on the draft regional report outline independent of the Regional Forum.
- Bob Harrington clarifies that it was an invitation to comment on the 2009 Water Plan in an attempt to revise the old plan and create an outline for the 2013 Update. He believes that Inyo County was invited to participate because of Linda Arcularius's involvement on the South Lahontan Forum Design Team.
- Staff requests feedback from anyone who attended the Regional Forum.
- Initial comments were that the Powerpoint presentation text was too small to read and that the website referenced to view the presentations was not in working order. Other comments were in agreement with Mark's earlier comment, that more time for discussions would have been valuable.
- A North Lahontan Regional Forum will be scheduled soon and the Admin. Committee agrees that it would be beneficial to get a location in Northern Mono County.
- **Written feedback on the South Lahontan Regional Forum would be appreciated within the next three weeks to the Program Office who will forward it on to DWR.**

5. Standardized RFP/Project Ranking

a. Report from RFP working committee

- Tony recaps progress on the current document, he acknowledges Harvey's concern regarding quantifying such information, yet emphasizes the need for progress.
- Harvey communicates that he will not "thumbs down" the process and explains that he used the meeting to express the problems with such an exercise. He states he does not want to be obligated to use such a ranking system.

b. Recommended next steps and associated timeline

- Tony acknowledges Harvey's concerns and comments but notes that many of the issues of concern were discussed at length amongst the working committee. He proposes the document is not perfect but instead a best effort toward a challenging task. Tony proposes bringing the document as is to the RWMG for approval.
- Bruce explains that a few more issues need to be ironed out before submitting the document to the Group. Amongst those issues are: funding prioritization by bin, and other mechanics of how funding allocation will work. He thinks these topics need to be discussed further prior to bringing the document to the Group.
- There is a discussion about the value of waiting to finalize the RFP document until after the Draft PSP is released so that we can respond to DWR's needs as identified in the PSP.

Those in attendance agree that the working committee needs to reconvene to work out some of the final details in advance of the release of the Draft PSP. This will ensure that the document is as complete as possible and the Group is positioned to respond to requirements of the PSP.

- Mark further explains the need to have the concepts of the RFP as complete as possible for inclusion in the IRWM Plan review process which is quickly coming to a close.
- Irene thinks that further thought needs to be put into the current bins as she indicated at the last meeting. She communicates that the online project upload form uses the proposed five bins, and she had trouble fitting some of the Mammoth Community Water District projects into those bins.
- There is a conversation about the genesis of the current bins. It is communicated that extensive thought and discussions were invested in an effort to develop the bins and currently project proponents have the liberty to assign their project to whichever bin they deem most appropriate.
- A lengthy discussion ensues about many aspects of the current document focusing on current categories as defined.
- It is acknowledged that further discussions need to take place within the working committee, in an effort to iron out some of these topical issues. It is agreed that email conversations may be beneficial to get working committee members memories refreshed prior to hosting a conference call.
- **Janet will circulate an email to the RFP working committee to initiate continued conversation on funding allocation as well as category (bin) reconsideration. Those with constructive comments and ideas please articulate them via email to other working committee members.**

6. Program Office Update

a. Plan Review Process

- Holly updates the Admin. Committee on the current progress to the Plan review process. She thanks both Irene and Bob for their extremely helpful comments. She gives warning that some of the later chapters may have shortened review periods but that the content of the chapters will also be less. Holly communicates that the Program Staff still intends to have a complete plan in mid-July for RWMG members to bring to their respective boards for approval. The goal will be approval of the final Plan at the late August RWMG meeting.
- Holly emphasizes that NOW is the time for comments to the Plan, and that the draft in mid-July will not be open to major input or edits. She explains this timeline is established in an effort to ensure the Plan is completed within an acceptable timeframe. She maintains if you have issues with any of the specific Plan chapters; please contact chapter authors with comments or questions.
- Bob reminds those on the call of the importance of inputting comments as DWR has made it clear that these plans will be heavily relied upon for future funding allocation as well as used in the update to the CA Water Plan which has the potential to largely affect water policy and management priorities in California.

b. Round 2 Planning Grant

- Holly reports that the Program Office expects to hear preliminary award notifications from DWR for the Round 2 Planning Grant by the end of June.
- Mark adds that additional DAC funding is still pending but looks favorable based on correspondence with DWR representatives.

7. MOU Amendment

a. Legal mechanics of MOU amendment

- Mark reports that he recently spoke with Stacey Simon regarding revision to the current MOU. According to her advice, signatures would be required, or at minimum, there should be a verifiable paper trail stipulating delegated authority to RWMG representatives to support

any amendments to the MOU document regardless of scope. Staff adds that with 31 current signatories, it is likely to take 6 months just to acquire signatures. Mark expresses his concern with this process and asks the Admin. Committee how they would like to proceed with regards to this issue.

b. **Benefits and drawbacks of MOU amendment**

- There is a discussion about other topics that could benefit from an MOU amendment such as redefining quorum requirements as well as the consensus model. It is expressed that if the MOU is opened, that a provision needs to be added allowing for amendments that do not require signatures in the future.
- The enormity of such process is acknowledged, and Program Staff communicates concern regarding more pressing work to be done that could benefit the Group, and they propose that unless major concerns are heard, to push this topic back until after Round 2 Implementation projects are submitted.
- Bob communicates that the Inyo County board has expressed concern about the IRWMP voting process in the past. He has used the current consensus model as a justification that Inyo County's interest would be fairly represented and that no one entity has power over another. He maintains if the Group moves away from that process, he may face challenges with his Board.
- Bruce communicates his concerns regarding postponing movement on this topic until a more convenient future date. He argues that much of the work that needs to be done could be done by a volunteer working committee. Bruce calls for others with concern about the current consensus model to speak out. He feels that Irene as the Chair of the Admin. Committee should drive the establishment of this working committee.
- Irene feels that the Group should be allowed to decide whether or not an MOU working committee is necessary, and that it is not the Chair's place to decide for them.
- Holly requests that Bruce explain how the 501(c)(3) bylaws may or may not interact with the RWMG MOU. She suggests that as the non-profit organizational structure is established that these issues with the MOU can be worked on simultaneously by one committee.
- Bruce disagrees and feels the two are distinct efforts and that any bylaws the non-profit develops will not help solve current RWMG MOU issues. He suggests continuing the discussion at the next Admin. Committee meeting.

c. **Next Steps**

- **Program Staff will agendize the MOU amendment for further discussion at the next Admin. Committee meeting.**

8. **501(c)(3) Organizational Structure**

a. **Progress report**

- Bruce maintains there are two major points to discuss. He reminds the Admin. Committee that a vote still needs to take place at the Group level to signify officially that the RWMG would like to form a non-profit organization.
- Secondly he questions if the new organization should be limited to water issues only or provide a larger scope that could encompass more broad topics region wide.
- He reminds the Admin. Committee that defining a scope will help the working committee come up with an appropriate name and reminds them that a name is required before an application can be submitted.
- Bruce suggests that the Admin. Committee could serve as the new organization's Board of Directors for the first 2 years. He asks AC members for input.
- There is a discussion about the scope of the 501(c)(3) and the need is identified for a more guided discussion with the working committee before bringing this topic to the larger RWMG.

b. **Next steps**

- **Program Staff will agendize 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Organization again at the next Admin. Committee meeting and allow for more time to discuss this topic further with the entire 501(c)(3) working committee.**

9. General updates

a. Sierra Water Workgroup Summit: July 17 – 18, Kings Beach, CA

- Holly gives a synopsis of the Summit and encourages members to attend. She informs the Admin. Committee that funds are available to cover travel expenses as well as registration for DACs who would like to attend the Summit.
- **Contact Holly for more information about funding support for participation in the SWWG Summit.**
- There is a brief discussion about encouraging specific DAC representatives to participate. Holly will send out a specific invitation to DACs.

10. Review of action items from the meeting

- Janet reviews action items from today's meeting.

11. Next RWMG Meeting

- Wednesday, July 11, 9:30 am -12:30 pm (TBD)
- Meeting adjourned 12:06 pm