

**Administrative Committee Meeting Notes**  
**Wednesday, January 26, 2011**  
**11:30 am – 12:30 pm**  
**California Trout Office, Mammoth Lakes**

In attendance

Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D  
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe  
Tony Dublino, Mono County  
Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission (alternate)  
Mark Drew, project staff  
Holly Alpert, project staff  
Gary Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe (BPPT) Tribal Administrator (visitor)  
Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee  
Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe (visitor)  
Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District

Agenda

1. The Big Pine Paiute Tribe letter of 1-5-11
2. The Admin Committee structural proposal submitted by Bruce (attached), including provisional election of Chair and Vice-Chair
3. Selecting another alternate for the Admin Committee in place of LADWP (they have not yet signed the MOU)
4. Recruitment of no more than three Members or Alternates to refine the Project Ranking approach (attached)
5. Recruitment of no more than three Members or Alternates to refine the Draft Bylaws (attached)

Notes

**1. Big Pine Paiute Tribe Letter**

- Staff and Admin Committee members agreed to put the 1-5-11 BPPT letter up front on the agenda to resolve the issues.
- Mark emphasized that the Group does not exist to dwell on water conflicts but to address low-hanging project needs.
- Most recently, on a very short, truncated schedule, we submitted an application to revise the Plan through a planning grant.
- This funding will allow us to obtain more input from stakeholders and improve our processes.
- Between September, 2010, and early January, 2011, the RWMG completed the Phase I Plan and a first implementation grant proposal.
- Staff recognizes that the schedule for these processes was very difficult given the deadlines and that processes can be improved next time.
- All of the steps in these processes were approved by consensus of the Group.
- The Group operates on consensus.
- Mark hopes to come away from this meeting with solutions and recommendations to the RWMG for moving forward.
- Mark suggests that all parties identified in the letter (project staff, Inyo County, and Big Pine Paiute Tribe) could have handled the situation better.

- Gary Bacock asked how consensus works with respect to approving parts of the Plan or a process. Mark answered that any decision-making item is decided by consensus.
- Before an item goes to an official decision, there is opportunity for dialogue and discussion.
- Sally stated that the letter represents the Big Pine Paiute Tribe's position. One of the BPPT projects was removed from the Plan. This project was not fully developed nor was it being submitted for funding in this round. BPPT also had concerns about other projects but did not request to omit them from the proposal wish list in the Plan.
- The letter has been sent to DWR via the email that Sally sent with the letter. We have not heard back from DWR with respect to the letter, so we do not know who has read it or discussed it.
- Per the planning grant, the RWMG will go through the process of revising the Phase I Plan and will include a more comprehensive process of including projects, as well as reviewing and deciding upon which projects to move forward for funding, in the Plan.
- Staff does not believe that the RWMG can modify the Phase I Plan document that has been sent to DWR.
- Bruce thinks that a letter bringing this issue to the attention of DWR could be sent. This was also suggested by the BPPT through their original letter to Mark.
- Darla: thinks that there may be some confusion about the consensus decision-making process. Darla also suggests putting language about consensus into the agenda.
- Tony: this conflict seems to be the primary victim of the rushed timeframe. Tony felt like the process probably was not handled properly and wasn't able to hear the entire discussion at the meeting because he was on the phone. It is Tony's responsibility, as a representative to the RWMG, to bring forth any concerns on behalf of the Board at a meeting and in a proactive way. He suggests Inyo County overreacted to the project since it was more conceptual and on the wish list. If all entities were to do this, then it would defeat the spirit of cooperation.
- Tony's potential solutions: project should be added to the Phase II Plan; no benefit of trying to get the project into the Phase I Plan that has already been approved; he would support the RWMG sending a letter to DWR explaining how we will address this in the future.
- Mark's recommendation: two hatchery projects were submitted for the Phase I Plan (BPPT and Inyo County). **Because there are many entities in the RWMG that are interested in hatcheries, Mark suggests that the RWMG create a hatcheries work group that works together to develop project(s) to move forward for funding that have multiple benefits.**
- Irene likes Mark's suggestion. All entities need to be aware of others' interests and should consider what projects would be appropriate for this funding source. Projects should not increase conflict or controversy and should support multiple benefits.
- Gary also approves of the idea to form a hatcheries work group and reminded the group that the project is to determine the efficiency of hatcheries and how they could be improved (example in Fish Springs). Many other groups would also be interested in this issue because of the over-use of water.
- Gary asked how many people were involved in removing the hatcheries project from the Plan.
- Bob Harrington had made a comment in his revisions to remove the BPPT hatchery Plan. Mark and Holly initially did not remove it. Bob came back to project staff after the December 11 draft and told staff that Inyo County would not approve the Plan with the project included. Mark asked Bob to call Sally prior to the December 15 RWMG meeting and also to bring up the issue at the Dec. 15 meeting. BryAnna commented that she did not completely understand the conversation that was going on about hatcheries at the

December 15 meeting. Sally recalled that Bob said that the Inyo Board would not approve a proposal to eliminate fish hatcheries. Big Pine Paiute Tribe was never mentioned, and it was unclear whether the project had been removed from the Plan. Also unclear was how many hatchery projects were included in the Plan. BryAnna also commented that Bob did not proactively bring up the discussion but responded to a question from Mark.

- Bruce: reminded the meeting attendees that there will be more time for the process to proceed in the future; also, the Admin. Committee will be helping to run the RWMG. The process will improve; and supports the RWMG submitting a letter to DWR, and an apology to BPPT.
- Both Sally and Gary stated BPPT's commitment to the IRWM process and they do not want to block the progress of the current Plan. This situation could have happened to any entity, and BPPT felt obligated to bring up this concern after it happened to them.
- Gary suggests that BPPT may need to deal with Inyo County directly about what happened. Mark encourages that this conversation happens outside of the realm of the RWMG.
- Mark noted another incident that occurred during planning process that occurred with LADWP. They submitted comments to the Plan after the deadline and staff was not able to address those comments. They will be considered in the Phase II Plan.
- Bruce suggests no details in the letter, but to let them know there was another project that was omitted because the process was not followed properly. It is a RWMG letter responding to the BPPT letter. Also acknowledge setting up the hatcheries working group?
- **Mark suggests drafting an initial letter to circulate to Admin Committee and BPPT for first round of revisions and then bring to the RWMG for approval.**
- BryAnna suggested that in the future we would try to not approve a Plan that wasn't fully complete.
- Gary says that the Tribal Council will also want to see the letter. He also recommit to being part of the IRWMP process.
- We will also be revising the process for evaluating and ranking projects within the RWMG.
- Morgan commented that the processes in place, in particular the consensus-based decision making, have been working well. This situation is a perfect example of what happens when the processes are not followed by all members. Morgan does not believe we need to re-open a discussion of the processes themselves, but rather follow them more diligently.
- Bruce motioned that the Admin Committee follow Mark's suggested process above: drafting a letter to DWR that describes the problem, but not in great detail, and recommends creating a hatcheries work group within the IRWMP.
- BryAnna seconded the motion, and all Admin Committee members approved. This suggestion will be brought to the RWMG meeting later today as a recommendation on behalf of the Administrative Committee.

## 2. Structural proposal

- In MOU, there is language to have a Chair and Vice-Chair
- There is no language about how selects the Chair/Vice-Chair
- Bruce suggests recommending a process to the Group
- Need to define what the Chair and Vice Chair

\*\* This item was not completed, nor were the other items on the agenda.