

**Inyo-Mono IRWMP Special Meeting of the Administrative Committee**  
**Wednesday, February 16, 2011**  
**3:00 - 5:00 pm**  
**Meeting Notes**

\*\* Notes from the February 10, 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**

**3. Inyo-Mono IRWMP organizational chart**

- \* Discuss draft chart (attached)
- \* Develop recommendation to RWMG to adopt organizational chart and associated roles and responsibilities

**4. RWMG letter to DWR in response to Big Pine Paiute Tribe Letter of 1-5-11**

- \* Review comments received on 2-9-11 draft letter to DWR; have letter available during the meeting to discuss
- \* Develop recommendation for final letter to be approved by the RWMG

Notes

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

- BryAnna called meeting to order
- Mark reminded group that Chair will be initiating meeting, and in this case, turns the meeting over to Mark

In attendance

Holly Alpert, IRWMP Staff  
Mark Drew, CalTrout/IRWMP Staff  
Harvey Van Dyke, Wheeler Crest CSD  
Tony Dublino, Mono County  
Bruce Woodworth, Central Sierra RC&D  
BryAnna Vaughan, Bishop Paiute Tribe  
Gary Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe  
Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department  
Irene Yamashita, Mammoth Community Water District  
Darla Heil, Owens Valley Indian Water Commission  
Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe  
Morgan Lindsay, Mono Lake Committee

**2. Public Comment**

- No comments

#### **4. (in order) RWMG letter to DWR in response to Big Pine Paiute Tribe Letter of 1-5-11**

(put this first so that Gary and Sally could exit the meeting if desired)

- Mark sent a suggestion via email about an hour ago as a suggested way to move forward.
- Mark reiterated that this was an unfortunate situation but that it is time to move on.
- Mark cleaned up the version of the letter that was sent out yesterday in the agenda and is presenting this as a suggested final version.
- Irene is happy with this revision/cleanup of the letter.
- Morgan, Bob, Tony approve of current version.
- Bruce and BryAnna approve as long as Sally and Gary are satisfied with it.
- Bob reminded staff to do a final proofread of the letter.
- The goal for today is to develop a consensus-based recommendation to the RWMG per the letter. Suggestion that this should become a decision item for the Feb. 23 meeting, assuming the AC can reach consensus today. Tony thinks that this should not be a decision on the Feb. 23 agenda since that differs from what was shown to the Mono BoS this week.
- Gary: Item #2 – will the letter review what happened in December?
- Sally – letter does not address actual issue of what happened, which was the failure of reaching consensus at the Dec. 15 meeting. Previous letter acknowledged procedural problem of IRWMP and does not feel it is addressed in this letter.
- The sentence acknowledging responsibility on the part of all parties was suggested to be removed.
- Gary wonders what BPPT did wrong. Mark reminded the group that the process of Plan review and revisions was laid out and agreed to by the RWMG. It is the responsibility of all parties to come to meetings prepared. Gary and Sally feel that there was no way for them to be prepared because they did not have all the information.
- Gary: BPPT sent a letter to Inyo County stating what they believe are the facts. That letter was dated February 2, 2011. They have not received any response to the letter. Last week there was a meeting with Inyo County and it appeared that they did not read the letter.
- Mark reiterated that we need to remain focused on what is most germane to this group and that strongly recommended that issues otherwise not be brought into the group.
- Discussion ensued about what occurred at the December 15 meeting and various viewpoints of what happened.
- Bob sees substantial issue as being how we reach consensus on content of Plan in the future. He reviewed Inyo County's position of not being able to accept the Plan with the inclusion of the BPPT fish hatcheries project because it alluded to the elimination of fish hatcheries.
- Gary suggests that Sally's original edits to the letter be accepted and not be taken out as is currently reflected. Sally wanted to take out language about all parties accepting responsibility because she thought that not all parties accepted responsibility. She thinks this new version is significantly changed. The new letter does not acknowledge there was a problem with the procedure.
- Gary suggests that it could have been corrected if Bob Harrington had called BPPT to let them know that the project was being removed because Inyo County would veto it. Gary posited that it would be possible that BPPT could veto all of Inyo County's proposals.
- Sally thinks it needs to be stated that the consensus process failed at the Dec. 15 meeting; Irene does not think that this is the case. BryAnna agrees with Irene – she thinks it was the communication process that fell through.

- Irene – we need to accommodate various interests connected to hatcheries in the planning region and acknowledge that it's a controversial topic and should be discussed more openly.
- Sally agreed with Irene that the topic deserves discussion and said that she would have welcomed discussion at the Dec. 15 RWMG meeting.
- Bob suggested that it was obvious that he was referring to the BPPT hatcheries project as the only other hatcheries project was submitted by Inyo County.
- Bruce suggests letting the Tribe submit its own letter.
- Bob was okay with Mark's initial draft that included the sentiment that all parties could have done better and supports that the current draft does not speak to the past and only looks forward.
- Sally stated that outside baggage can come into the IRWMP from multiple sources.
- Gary and Sally do not accept that BPPT could have done anything differently.
- Mark is asking BPPT to provide some language to fit into the current letter that they could live with.
- Sally sees that "taking a solutions-oriented approach" is important to people. Also feels it's important to review how the RWMG handled the discussion of BPPT's letter.
- Mark suggests revising the letter with the request for feedback within 24 hours per the current discussion so that it can then be turned around to the RWMG.
- BryAnna suggests sending the revision just to BPPT first to make sure they can live with it. Mark will send it to Gary and Sally tonight and BPPT will get back to staff by noon Thursday. Gary and Sally agreed to this plan. The letter will then be sent to AC soon after that with feedback requested by Friday so that staff can get out the letter to the RWMG with the agenda.

### **3. Inyo-Mono IRWMP organizational chart**

- Harvey likes the new org chart.
- Nobody contested the proposed organizational chart in principle but had some comments.
- Bruce suggested an added task to the AC column reflecting its ability to propose initiatives to the RWMG, in collaboration with the Program Office
- Irene suggested adding a task to the Staff column to include website maintenance.
- MCWD attaches its org. chart to its annual budget and it could be revisited annually.
- Program staff vs. project staff (so that it does not get confused with individual implementation projects); was changed to Program...
- Some confusion about the various reporting requirements among the various IRWMP entities.
- Comments are reflected in the document itself.
- Recommendation for formal approval by RWMG for inclusion in next iteration of the Plan and is used as a working document.
- Bruce suggests that the org. chart goes into bylaws; Harvey thinks that the "box" level of the org. chart should be reflected in the MOU.

**Meeting was adjourned at 4:32 pm.**