

Joint IRWMP Administrative Committee and MOU work group meeting notes
Thursday, February 10, 2011
9:00 am - 12:00 pm

** Notes from the January 26, 2011, Administrative Committee meeting are available at the Inyo-Mono IRWMP website under the Administrative Committee Meetings heading:

<http://www.inyomonowater.org/index.php?page=Documents>

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Public comment period
3. Discussion of roles and responsibilities of Admin. Committee and project staff
 - * Discussion of draft proposal put forth by project staff (to be sent out at later date)
 - * Discussion of Chair and Vice-Chair selection, roles, and responsibilities
 - * Discussion of alternate Administrative Committee members
 - * Discussion of Admin. Committee member terms (3 one-year terms; 3 two-year terms)
4. Discussion of MOU/bylaws
 - * What is the more appropriate way to deal with bylaws vs. MOU amendments?
 - * Develop recommendations to RWMG on how to institutionalize the roles and responsibilities of project staff and Administrative Committee
5. Discussion of proposed work groups
 - * Topics of proposed work groups
 - * Bylaws for the RWMG
 - * Bylaws for the Administrative Committee
 - * Organizational structure of the RWMG
 - * MOU amendments (in process of formation)
 - * Project ranking process for Round 1 projects
6. Development of regular meeting schedule for Admin Committee
 - * Develop recommended schedule for consideration by the RWMG
 - * Date of next meeting
7. Adjourn

Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attending in person

Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff
Mark Drew, CalTrout/IRWMP Staff
Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Dept.

Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District
Greg James, Amargosa Conservancy
Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D

Attending via phone

Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee
Louis Molina, Mono County Environmental Health
John Drozd, Mono County Environmental Health

2. Public Comment Period

- No comments

3. Discussion of roles and responsibilities of Admin. Committee and project staff

* Discussion of draft proposal put forth by project staff

- Per the outcome of the last RWMG meeting, Mark Drew and Holly Alpert developed a document laying out roles and responsibilities of project staff and Administrative Committee.
- These roles were laid out per the Planning Grant staffing structure and the descriptions were partly taken directly from the Planning Grant.
- In addition, Harvey Van Dyke provided some thoughts on the structure of the IRWMP organization and roles of the various groups.
- Bruce Woodworth also provided some comments on Harvey's information
- Bruce argues for a more general approach without specific assignments and that the staff and Admin. Committee work with each other. If it is general, then groups won't be locked in to specific tasks.
- Harvey argues for an organizational chart and for each group, there needs to be a description of its function and interaction among groups within the organization. Start with an org. chart that we can agree on and then provide a level of description in the MOU. Also thinks the level of detail in the current document is too specific (i.e. language on specific tasks that will be done within a certain amount of time). He does see some need to add detail to the MOU regarding staff and Admin. Committee.
- Greg James asked who the staff works for and suggested an MOU between CalTrout (fiscal agent) and the RWMG.
- Discussion of the loosely held group; there is no ability for the RWMG to sign an MOU because the group doesn't officially exist; a consideration of organizational structure in the coming months (i.e. forming a 501c3) will be taking place through the Planning Grant work
- Harvey argues that the role of the fiscal agent(s) needs to be defined in the org. chart.
- Bruce indicated some hesitation to include details for the fiscal agent at this point.
- Discussion of Harvey's organizational chart:
- Bruce sees Admin. Committee as having oversight. Operationally, the staff does the work, but the Admin. Committee could choose to participate in staff work based on interest and time.
- BryAnna Vaughan sees it as the responsibility of staff to pull in Admin. Comm. members for help when needed.
- The language in the new MOU is vague with respect to the administrative duties of the Admin. Committee.
- Harvey brought up that the Admin. Committee is not stable because of the rotating nature of its members and may not be able to take on all responsibilities that the current AC may define.

- Bruce sees the task list for the staff and the Admin. Comm. are the same. This oversight would not be the same as supervising the staff.
- Irene Yamashita: staff should work under direction of AC.
- Mark suggests quarterly reports between staff and AC to go over financials. Bruce wants more frequent financial reports.
- Staff could also bring concerns about AC involvement to the AC.
- Harvey argues for having staff as part of the Admin. Comm. as a voting member.
- Suggestion: staff proposes annual budget and work plan to give to AC and Group. Reports to AC quarterly and perhaps meet more often.
- For organizational chart: Staff answers to Group; reports go through Admin. Committee; feeling is that the org. chart proposed on p. 4 seems to reflect what was discussed. The next step is to define specific tasks.
- Admin. Comm. would have power to ask for reports as needed; Bruce suggests taking out quarterly.
- **Feeling was to keep quarterly staff reports (at least) with the flexibility of the AC being able to request additional reports if needed. Staff will develop annual work plan and budget to go through AC and be approved by Group. If there is a disagreement or lack of consensus within the RWMG, it gets passed to the Admin. Comm. or work group for further work. Admin. Comm. will function by consensus. AC can be proactive in recommending direction and actions. These recommendations could go into bylaws/policy statements.**
- Bruce –Can AC take on initiatives of its own? He feels like that's allowed. The AC would make a recommendation to the Group to have staff work on it.
- BryAnna sees AC as a guidance group.
- Greg suggests allowing AC to raise issues to the staff or the RWMG because they are more closely involved in the IRWMP.
- Holly will develop recommendation to take to RWMG on relationship and roles of AC and staff.
- Bruce suggests waiting to add fiscal agent into the org. chart.
- Morgan Lindsay suggests adding a side branch for fiscal agent answering to the Group.
- Bob sees AC as liaison between Group and fiscal agent so that AC can take care of more of the detailed oversight.
- Holly – add another box for fiscal agent at same level of AC and staff.
- Bruce on fiscal agent: contract with DWR, contract with project proponents, send reports to DWR and RWMG
- Dotted line from fiscal agent to DWR
- Harvey argues that the boxes just show they exist; this does not describe what they do.
- The list that Mark and Holly put together is more for internal use, and AC feels that the staff can work out who does what tasks.
- BryAnna: Project director (PD task as liaison between PD and boards – outreach would be a better word. As desired by the Group (sometimes it's better to have someone else go). Spokesperson a better word. Be available as spokesperson.
- PM and PD co-direct work groups and RWMG
- Issue of PD as voting member of AC.
- Holly: there's no real decision-making authority of the Admin. Committee anyway, so the split of feelings is taken to the Group as information in addition to the recommendation. But what about a smaller type of decision, like writing a report? No substantive decision-making authority. Votes are reported to the Group on any issue.
- Bry emphasized the cooperation and communication aspects.

- **Staff does not have a vote on Admin. Comm. but will be represented and will participate at all meetings.**
- Responsibilities of the boxes on the org. chart:
- Issue of chairing meetings – Bruce suggests going into bylaws. He wants Chair and Vice Chair to ask staff to run meetings. Mark wants to make sure that Project Director is always on-point for running the meetings, but that he recuses himself on issues where he is directly involved. PD will preside at the meetings, or other senior staff as necessary.
- **Holly and Mark will draft a new org. chart with general categories of responsibilities. Suggestion is to send this back out to AC and have a short phone call before the next RWMG meeting.**
- Please provide feedback on individual tasks in the position descriptions (not the org. chart) if desired.
- **Individual staff responsibilities will be aggregated under each group's responsibilities. Work plan items need to be generalized and will be presented by staff and work plans.**

* Discussion of Chair and Vice-Chair selection, roles, and responsibilities

- What is the role of the Chair?
- Bruce – Chair the meeting and potentially represent the Group at outside meetings.
- Signatures on documents can be decided by the Group.
- BryAnna suggests amending MOU to remove Chair and Vice Chair. Morgan concurs.
- If the AC needs a point person on something, perhaps the AC just appoints someone for that issue/time.
- Somebody else should run the Administrative Committee meetings; not Mark, because AC has oversight of staff and there could be a conflict. This would fall to the Chair. Staff would create content; agenda may have Chair input. But they all go out as draft agendas for feedback from the Group.
- How is it selected? Bruce suggests rotating Chair/VC every two months. He has a suggestion of how to select these and what the rotation would be: roll dice.
- Greg argues that we have an MOU in place that we have to follow. It may be amended, but for right now it stands. Because the Chair is supposed to run Group meetings, that person can defer to Mark to run the meeting.
- Mark advocates for longer seat than two months – suggests 6 months.
- **Chair is NOT representative. Only chairs the meetings and finalizes agendas. Also reports from Admin. Comm. to RWMG.**
- **6-month terms.**
- **Bob, Irene, Morgan don't really care to serve.**
- **BryAnna volunteers for Chair; Bruce for VC until July 1, 2011**

* Discussion of alternate Administrative Committee members

- Suggestion that alternates are just back-ups of each Admin. Committee member
- Bruce suggests that the alternates are necessarily members of the same organization; rather alternates should be different organizations; they're not alternate people, they're alternate organizations.
- Bry argues that her alternate follows all the emails and meeting notes
- Are alternates from same organization or from a different organization to fill it in?
- **Recommendation: each organization has an alternate person identified as the alternate to the MOU**

- **Holly will include alternates on to the email list.**

* Discussion of Admin. Committee member terms (3 one-year terms; 3 two-year terms)

- **One-year term: MCWD, ICWD, MLC**
- **Two-year terms: BPT, Central Sierra, Mono County**
- **Recommend January 1 as the start date of Admin. Comm. terms**

4. Discussion of MOU/bylaws

* What is the more appropriate way to deal with bylaws vs. MOU amendments?

* Develop recommendations to RWMG on how to institutionalize the roles and responsibilities of project staff and Administrative Committee

- Mark proposes that one work group takes on both bylaws and MOU
- As part of MOU organization, general rules could be adopted as bylaws to run the day-to-day of the organization.
- There may be a different structure in the near future (during Planning Grant term).
- Think about bylaws now in anticipation that the Group may change structure.
- Pretty wide open what can go into bylaws, but there's no specific definition of what has to go into them.
- Right now, the RWMG can or cannot have bylaws, but they need to be approved by the RWMG.
- Bylaws would deal with ambiguities of the MOU; they could also be put into policies or resolutions. Could just call it a policy document rather than bylaws because it's an MOU organization.
- MOU amendments and bylaws/policies could be discussed on a parallel process.
- **MOU work group will consider amendments and bylaws/policies and will present to Group. Bruce, Harvey, and Holly G. will be the work group. They may or may not take on both amendments and bylaws. Should consider whether bylaws are really necessary at this time.**

5. Discussion of proposed work groups

* Topics of proposed work groups

- * Bylaws for the RWMG
- * Bylaws for the Administrative Committee
- * Organizational structure of the RWMG
- * MOU amendments (in process of formation)
- * Project ranking process for Round 1 projects

- **Mark suggests putting bylaws and MOU work groups together**
- **Organizational structure: Bruce feels this is urgent and wants to form a work group; Bob is concerned about deviating from the work plan of the Planning Grant.**
- **Mark also expressed strong reservation about deviating from what is considered an approved work plan for the Group housed within the Planning Grant.**
- **At next RWMG, solicit interest in organizational structure work group to begin work.**
- **Priority reports are from MOU/bylaws and project ranking process work groups.**
- Irene expressed concern about the time required for RWMG members to review reports and other outputs from the work group.

- **Proposed work groups will be agendized at the RWMG meeting, including hatcheries work group.**

Next Administrative Committee meeting:

- Agendize BPPT letter and developing a final draft before the Group meeting.
- Discuss org. chart
- Next meeting next week: Holly will send out a Doodle.
- Approval of last meeting's notes on each agenda.