

November 2, 2015

Dear Tracie,

I am writing in regards to future funding rounds for Prop. 1 IRWM monies. As I understand it, there are to be two separate funding rounds specifically supporting DACs. The first is to provide, based on a non-competitive, funding for engaging and involving DACs in IRWM efforts. Although yet to be fully defined, I understand these funds may support activities such as providing means for more direct involvement in IRWM efforts, conducting needs assessments, capacity building, trainings etc. The second round is to provide, based on a competitive process, funding for " implementation" types of projects that directly support DACs.

Based on the experience of the Inyo-Mono IRWM Program, particularly having to do with our multi-year DAC project, I offer the following thoughts.

1. Improving the involvement and achieving lasting engagement of DACs in IRWM efforts take time, commitment and devoted resources.
2. Identification of project needs can be done relatively easily, but to understand needs within the context of IRWM requires understanding local communities, their representatives, connections between DACs and their associated needs. It requires functional relationships.
3. I am certain that many IRWM regions have identified projects that could be implemented today with sufficient funding.
4. I am less certain that many regions have been able to develop the in-depth understanding of their DAC constituents, constituent needs, let alone are realizing functional DAC involvement in IRWM.
5. If being considered, I would encourage DWR to not combine the two DAC funding rounds into one. Moreover, I would encourage DWR to allow for DAC funding to be up to regions in terms of duration and in particular provide regions the opportunity to utilize such funds over a multi-year period, at least two.
6. If combining the DAC rounds, I am not sure how DWR can successfully implement a combined program that contains a portion of funds that are to be made available based on a non-competitive process with funds that are to be allocated based on a competitive process.
7. It might be worth considering two DAC implementation rounds to allow those regions that are eager to pursue such funding to do so while allowing other regions that desire to conduct more involvement/engagement activities to do so first and pursue implementation funding at a later date.
8. Best use of funds to achieve the greatest benefit in terms of addressing the core intent of the money should be a guiding principle-not how fast can the monies be made available.

I am happy to provide further thoughts if desired. I do appreciate the work of DWR and the opportunity to share the above thoughts.

Sincerely,
Mark

Mark Drew, Ph.D.
Director, Sierra Headwaters Program, California Trout
Director, Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program

Mailing address:

PO Box 3442
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Physical address:
3399 Main St., Suite W6
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Office ph: (760) 924-1008
Cell ph: (760) 709-1492
Fax: (760) 924-1009

This email has been scanned by McAfee.
