

**Inyo-Mono IRWMP Coordinating Committee
Conference Call Summary
September 17, 2008 (1-3 pm)**

Agenda:

1. MOU: Review and discuss comments on Version 10
2. Discuss possible new additions to Coordinating Committee (inclusion of Indian tribes)
3. Discuss and develop next steps for outreach to possible new participants
4. Fiscal Sponsorship: review outreach status and discuss next steps
5. Draft Budget for Planning Grant with match: discuss work group formation and next steps
6. Provide update on steps being taken to determine planning boundary
7. Review proposed agenda for September 29 Planning Committee Meeting
8. Review/revise project website mock-up (will be circulated prior to call)
9. Review proposed name changes submitted to date

Attendees:

Austin McInerney, Center for Collaborative Policy
Bob Harrington, Inyo County Water Department
Holly Alpert, Valentine Reserve/Inyo-Mono IRWMP Staff
Mark Drew, CalTrout/IRWMP Staff
Rebecca Paranick, Mammoth Mountain Ski Area
Gary Sisson, Mammoth Community Water District
Clarence Martin, LADWP

Highlights:

DWR/budget update: Governor may veto budget and that would delay the process for issuance of Prop. 84 guidelines and funding availability. Also, because of the State's drought situation, the Governor is talking with DWR to prioritize drought prevention actions (including IRWMPs that have drought plans within), and leftover money would be available to other IRWMPs. It is not clear whether they would pull money from certain regions to give to other regions. It is also unclear whether this would affect planning grants, implementation grants, or both. If news from DWR is bad, we need to somehow put the news out there without deflating our excitement and momentum. Process should still move forward.

1. MOU – Version 10

Austin received a response from Greg James, who says MOU looks good. He also received comments from Rick Breeze-Martin. Rick had some minor edits, mostly about consensus decision-making. He would like to see some training provided to the group and an annual review of the consensus process. He also suggested keeping a list of decisions that couldn't be reached by consensus to revisit them periodically. This speaks to some larger concerns about the workability of the consensus process. We can set aside some time at a future Planning Committee (PC) meeting to do some training, and we will address this issue in the MOU to reassure that this process will work. Austin has materials he can attach to the MOU on consensus decision-making.

How do we reach closure on the MOU, especially when different boards are reviewing different versions? The goal is to bring Version 11 to the next PC meeting and ask for adoption; then the groups within the PC can take the MOU to their boards for approval. We will give the PC a last opportunity to provide comments, knowing that some may bring comments to the PC meeting on Sept. 29. An adopted MOU will be an accomplishment and set the stage for future work.

The issue also arose regarding how to evaluate and accept new PC members. Some feel those criteria should be in the MOU so that we have it in writing if we decide to deny an application. Austin will think on this, though our MOU is more detailed on this than most Austin looked at. The guiding principle could be that it is our intent to have an inclusive group. At this pre-planning phase, perhaps there should not be criteria, and criteria only come into play in the implementation phase. The roles of stakeholders that sign the MOU vs. those that don't were also discussed. PC membership may not require review and acceptance, but they should be required to sign the MOU to have an actual vote. Austin will clarify these sections and put into Version 11.

Action item:

- Austin/Holly will send Version 11 to PC with a last call for comments before taking it to PC on Sept. 29 (deadline for comments Sept. 26)

2. New additions to Coordinating Committee

It was suggested to ask the Owens Valley Indian Water Commission to join the Coordinating Committee (CC). Bob Harrington thinks they are interested.

It would be good to revisit the composition of the CC given that certain interests, especially tribal organizations, are currently not represented.

Action Item:

- Present the composition of the CC at the September PC meeting so that current and new membership can be discussed.

3. Outreach

Holly, Austin, and Mark are creating an outreach packet that consists of an introduction letter and the one-page brief update. Staff would like to solicit ideas on additional groups to direct outreach to.

Holly has developed a list of meeting times for other IRWMP efforts in the Lahontan region.

Action Item:

- Ask PC for ideas as to who to conduct outreach to and for volunteers to help with effort.

4. Fiscal Sponsorship

The public notice has been submitted to the *Mammoth Times* and will go into next week's edition (9/25) and will run for two weeks (same with the *Inyo Register*, starting Thursday 9/25). The deadline for applications will be three weeks from publication date (Thursday, October 16). It has been confirmed that non-profits are eligible to be fiscal sponsors. The public notice will also be circulated to the Planning Committee. The goal is to make a decision by the end of November.

Action Item:

- Holly will submit public notice to Planning Committee along with the September meeting agenda and Version 11 of MOU.

5. Draft Budget for Planning Grant

We have identified a list of volunteers to participate in the work group. We will wait to proceed with developing the budget until we have more clarity from DWR as to funding availability and guidelines.

Action Item:

- Mark will send an email to the work group to let them know we are holding until we hear more from DWR regarding the guidelines.

6. Planning Boundary

There was a conference call this morning (9/17) with representatives from south Lahontan region IRWMPs. They are trying to come to consensus on boundaries. The goal is to have a letter from all of the signatories describing and justifying boundaries to send to DWR. Each group will send its current map, along with a written explanation of its current boundaries, to Holly by September 26. Within 2-3 weeks, we hope to begin drafting a letter to go to DWR.

Action Item:

- Present the collected maps to the PC at the September meeting.

7. Proposed Agenda for Planning Committee Meeting

Proposed agenda topics for the September 29 are:

- Welcome/introductions
- Announcements
- Gut check
- Review of past meeting summary
- MOU status and adoption and lay out next steps
- Update on fiscal sponsorship – outreach status and next steps
- Planning grant budget work group update – formation and volunteers
- Update on boundary definition with maps and explanations
- Outreach activities with introduction packet and getting recommendations for outreach recipients (look at current list); ask for volunteers to help volunteer
- Website – under development and hopefully show mockup
- Name change – is it worth changing the name given that we have inyomonowater.org?
- Update from ESF – they’ll let us know that they want us to present; Dave may be here because of other business or they will call in; they are making progress on all fronts
- Update on DWR guidelines – what we’ve learned
- Future meeting schedule
- Coordinating Committee membership

Action Item:

- Austin and Holly will develop the agenda and sent it to PC by the end of the week.

8. Proposed Name Change

We have received six proposed name changes, including the suggestion of do nothing. The proposals so far include:

- Sierra Water
- Eastern California IRWMP
- Water Initiative Sierra East “WISE”
- Walker Mono Owens Desert Watershed
- Eastern Sierra IRWMP

Action Item:

- Revisit this issue at the PC and push to decide whether we really want to change the name or not.

9. Website

Mark met with Marion and Greg and they are aiming to have at least a hardcopy still shot of the website but hopefully will have something more dynamic to show to PC. The domain name “inyomonowater.org” is bought and is official.