

# Draft Notes

## Inyo – Mono IRWM Administrative Committee Meeting

**Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2014**  
**Conference call, with in-person option at:**  
**California Trout office (3399 Main St., Mammoth Lakes)**  
**10:00 am – 12:00 pm Pacific Time**

**Call-in option:**  
**1-866-210-1669**  
**passcode: 6194641#**

### Call-in locations

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. California Trout Office<br>3399 Main St. Suite V-1<br>Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 | 2. Leroy Corlett Residence<br>1217 N. Inyo St<br>Ridgecrest, CA |
|--|---|

### AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions  
  
Alan initiates meeting at 10:02 am PDT.  
  
In Attendance  
Mark Drew, CalTrout/Inyo-Mono IRWMP  
Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWMP  
Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe  
Leroy Corlett, Indian Wells Valley Water District  
Bruce Woodworth, Mono County RCD  
Malcolm Clark, Sierra Club
2. Public Comment Period
  - No public comment
3. Administrative Committee composition for 2015
  - MOU calls for updating composition of AC members on annual basis
  - Planning for January 2015
  - Term is up for Malcolm, Bruce, and Leroy at end of 2014
  - We will ask RWMG Members if anyone is interested in serving
  - All three are willing to continue their participation unless others want to join
  - **We will bring this to the attention of the RWMG to open up solicitation**
4. MOU Issues
  - a. Review of Inyo County concern on quorum requirement
    - Decision to reduce quorum requirement to 35% at last RWMG meeting
    - After decision, Inyo County counsel reviewed MOU change and rescinded support because of Brown Act concerns with quorum level; Mono County shares their position.
    - IWVWD counsel reviewed the memo but did not concur with the counties' opinion; however, IWVWD supports the idea of continuing to follow the Brown

- Act.
  - We also did not formally “terminate” the previous MOU before adopting a new one.
  - All agree that it is a good practice to abide by the Brown Act to maintain transparency and open process.
  - Malcolm reminded us that we went through a decision process to abide by the Brown Act and probably would not have enough support to cease following the Brown Act.
- b. Decision item at 10/22/14 RWMG meeting to return to 50% quorum requirement
- Since all agree to maintaining adherence to the Brown Act, we need to re-accept the 50% quorum requirement
1. Is this the best approach to the quorum issue?
- There are other potential changes to MOU too.
  - Discussion of whether 2.02 is applicable and instead abide by 2.10 to amend the MOU.
  - Suggestion to include a clause about meeting participation to maintain Members status. Bruce volunteers to keep track of meeting participation and communicate with Program Office about which Members are “active” for purposes of quorum counting for the next meeting. This initiated a lengthy discussion. Part of the issue is about Members maintaining participation and not just showing up for an issue or decision that affects them. The other part is to have a list of “active” Members so that the quorum is easier to achieve.
  - Some agree that missing two meetings means not an “active” Member. Leroy’s view is that we stay the way we are and encourage involvement of everyone or encourage non-participants to withdraw. He does not want a new clause in the MOU but would allow it.
  - The reinstatement issue: To become a Member, need to attend one meeting in the last three; to be reinstated as an active Member, need to attend a second of four meetings within a year.
  - **Bruce will circulate some draft language for the amendment to the AC to finalize before next Tuesday.**
  - Irene’s suggestion was to draft a letter of MOU withdrawal. **Alan will draft.** It will go out to all signatories.
  - To clarify: we are NOT requesting a re-signing of the MOU at this time. The previous changes have become moot and current changes are not triggering a re-signing process.
- c. Re-signing process
1. Update on re-signers/new signatories
  2. Options for moving forward:
    - Continue with re-signing process as show of commitment and encourage non-participants to not sign
    - Halt process since MOU has not changed; instead, AC encourages non-participants to withdraw as signatories
    - To clarify: we are NOT requesting a re-signing of the MOU at this time.
- d. Bylaws for RWMG (Bruce)
- Bruce does not want to talk about bylaws at this point. Malcolm agrees that it is not necessary at this time.
5. Letter of support process
- a. Review of last request of letter of support from CalTrout
    - At the last RWMG meeting, Mark sought a letter of support from the RWMG for a

proposal that would support the work of the IRWM Program. He made the request with a shorter timeline than what had been agreed upon in previous meetings. The Group approved but noted that this request was outside the approved process and that the process should be re-visited.

- b. Discussion of revised process
  - Bruce argues that if a Member representative has not had enough time to get approval from his/her board and is not comfortable giving approval to the letter, he/she can veto the decision on letter approval. Bruce suggests a seven-day window.
  - Discussion of what process to recommend.
  - **Action item: Program Office will work with county counsel to determine whether decisions require a meeting of the RWMG, and whether decisions can be put forth to the Group via email and still be in compliance with the Brown Act. Mark will ask Stacey about a special meeting.**

6. Grant administration/progress updates

a. DAC

- The DAC white paper/report was submitted to DWR on September 30, 2014. A communication was sent to the RWMG giving access to the report.
- We have invoiced through 8/31/14 and are in the process of finalizing that invoice.
- Some wrap-up work will continue through the end of the year.

b. Round 1 Implementation

- Valerie was asked to provide an update ahead of the meeting but did not.
- We do not know where we are with respect to what invoices have been submitted to DWR.
- Project proponents have another invoice due to Central Sierra by Oct. 21.
- The MCWD well profiling field work took place last month.
- Not sure where we are on the two remaining Inyo County projects.

c. Round 2 Planning

- Oak Creek: still anticipated completion by next June
- West Walker: draft of the restoration plan any time now; will have a public meeting to get some input and will incorporate and finalize by end of 2014.
- TOML: have not gotten current information from them.
- Because we had been waiting for updates from the planning studies, we have only submitted invoices through 6/30/14. Holly will start working on the next invoice ASAP.

7. General updates and announcements

- Eastern California Water Association: will meet on October 22 after the RWMG meeting.

8. Review of action items from the meeting

9. Next Admin. Committee/RWMG Meetings

- a. RWMG Meeting: October 22, 2014, Bishop Paiute Tribal Chambers

Alan closed meeting at 12:28 pm PDT.