

# Upper Feather River IRWM Regional Water Management Group

## FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES

April 1, 2016

Meeting materials and video recording link are available on the website at:

[http://featherriver.org/rwmg\\_meetings/](http://featherriver.org/rwmg_meetings/)

### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on April 1, 2016 at 1 pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

### Members Present:

Sherrie Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Paul Roen, Sierra County

Terry Swofford, Plumas County

Jeffrey Greening, Public Member

Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission

Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium

Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)

### Members Absent:

Jim Roberti, Sierra Groundwater Management District

Bill Nunes, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District

Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District

Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)

### Staff Present:

Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting

Kristi Jamason, Agricultural Lands Stewardship

Leah Wills, Uplands and Forest Management Workgroup Coordinator

Terri Rust, Floodplains, Meadows, and Waterbodies Management Workgroup Coordinator

Paul Lakovic, Deer Creek Resources, Inc.

### **Additions or Deletions from the Agenda**

None noted

### **Public Comment Opportunity**

None noted

### **Announcements / Reports**

Trina Cunningham announced that the California Water Policy Conference is coming up on April 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> at UC Davis. Trina has been asked to be one of the panelists on the topic of workforce and water needs. She noted that she will be receiving some questions in advance and wondered if she could share them with this group to gain perspectives from people outside the tribal community. The RWMG welcomed the opportunity to participate.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**(Video 1, 00:3:01)**

**a. RWMG Approval of Meeting Minutes for February 26, 2016**

Upon motion by Paul Roen and seconded by Terry Swofford, the RWMG Meeting Minutes for February 26, 2016 were unanimously approved.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**1. Project Status Updates**

**(Video 1, 00:3:18)**

Uma Hinman presented an overview of the project schedule, tasks and budget. Uma Hinman noted that Randy Wilson and Debbie Spangler at DWR are working on an extension of time through October 2016 for project completion and a contract amendment to shift funding for Burkhard Bohm (Plumas Geo-hydrology) to complete the Community Vulnerability Study.

**2. Stakeholder Outreach Updates**

**(Video 1, 00:6:42)**

Uma Hinman presented an update on stakeholder outreach efforts to date including workgroups, Tribal outreach, and stakeholders.

**3. Draft Tribal Engagement Plan**

**(Video 1, 00:7:44)**

Trina Cunningham of the California Indian Environmental Alliance presented the final Tribal Engagement Plan and provided an update on the Tribal engagement efforts to date. Jeffrey Greening asked about the population size for the various Tribes. Trina estimated that Greenville Rancheria is about 150 people, Susanville Rancheria is much larger but is comprised of Paiute, Washoe, Pit River, and Maidu Tribes, and Mooretown Rancheria, Enterprise Rancheria, Berry Creek Rancheria, and Mechoopda all have between 200 to 1,000 people. Lorena Gorbet confirmed that Mooretown is between 700 and 800 people and Mechoopda has about 500 people. Trina noted that she is convening an Elders Gathering on April 9<sup>th</sup> in Susanville and this will be the first regional Elders Gathering.

**4. Draft Upper Feather River Watershed Socioeconomic Assessment**

**(Video 1, 00:15:56)**

Jonathan Kusel of the Sierra Institute for Community and Environment introduced Brooke Huffman who presented the Draft Upper Feather River Watershed Socioeconomic Assessment, including identification of disadvantaged communities within the region. Carl Felts asked about the data source for the average household income of \$149,000 for East Shore. Brooke Huffman responded that this is a good example of how the census data is very skewed by a small population size. Jonathan Kusel added that without getting into more detail on that particular number, a couple of things could have come up. This data could be the result of a small number of people responding or this data could be an estimate based on information collected for a census block group with a small sample size; the smaller the census block group the more problematic those estimates are. Carl Felts asked about the State reviewing their process and the way they get their data. Jonathan Kusel responded that there has been a change from 2000 and 2010, the Census has changed from including everyone in a basic census to doing estimates. This data is from 2009 to 2014; they are still sampling and using the American Survey Study. The methodology has changed quite dramatically and we have lost accuracy in that process. Carl Felts asked if the data is based on what we report as income on our tax statements. Jonathan Kusel confirmed. Carl clarified that the data is not based on what our value is worth, because I have poor income but a lot of property. Jonathan Kusel responded

that it is another interesting aspect, income versus transfer income kinds of things and different numbers capture those differently. So wage income is different than other forms of income in terms of when you add transfer income into it you have a different thing but ideally it's all based on what they know. However, given the lack of money for Census data collection, they have been increasing the use of sampling and making projections based on that sampling.

**5. Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Draft Request for Proposals (Video 1, 00:30:11)**

Tiana Bradley asked in reference to the Prop 1 changes for the Guidelines, for instance if you have arsenic they are asking for reports on how you are trying to resolve the issue with arsenic, and will we be required to provide more information in our proposals since the Guidelines have changed? Uma Hinman responded that for the new Prop 1 Requirements for Water Quality, it is more of a discussion in the plan chapters than an impact on the project applications at this point. We will be characterizing the issues in the region as best we can. Uma confirmed that she is not aware of any further work that needs to be done for the proposals at this time.

Uma Hinman started the discussion on the Prop 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposals and the Prop 1 IRWM Guidelines which are both in draft form and the comment period will end on April 8<sup>th</sup>. The Mountain Counties Water Resources Association has prepared comments for DWR and the Sierra Water Workgroup is preparing comments for IRWM regions to review. Uma asked Trina Cunningham and Jonathan Kusel to share about the comments their offices are preparing.

Trina Cunningham shared that she was contacted by John Kingsbury who is the Executive Director of the Mountain Counties Water Resources Association (MCWRA) regarding the California Indian Environmental Alliance's (CIEA) interest in working with MCWRA as the lead applicant for the Prop 1 Mountain Counties Funding Area. Trina responded that Tribes already feel under-represented in the Northern Sierras and to have an entity lead whose interests are further south might continue to leave the Tribes unrepresented, so they prefer to work with an organization that is closer geographically and with whom they already have a working relationship. Trina explained that CIEA is looking into how to best coordinate the effort to prepare a single Funding Area-wide grant proposal with the 10 IRWM regions in the Mountain Counties Funding Area, which has only been allocated \$1.3 million for this first round of Prop 1 to do outreach to DACs. Trina noted the efforts of the Sierra Water Workgroup and the Sierra Fund and the idea of approaching it from a standpoint of identifying the strengths of each IRWM.

Sherrie Thrall asked Uma to go back and show the map of the Mountain Counties Funding Area because it is a very large region especially from the perspective of representation for limited grant funding in the northern, central, and southern parts of the region. Jonathan Kusel added that another reason this is really important is because of the CalEnviroScreen which is a Cal EPA effort to assess or identify disadvantaged communities. Due to the methodology used, the CalEnviroScreen project excluded every rural forested area in the State, which basically means that there are no disadvantaged communities in rural California, and we know that is not true. We need another methodology of identifying disadvantaged communities beyond CalEnviroScreen and we need to ask the question how do we set up a program that is appropriate in identifying the needs of disadvantaged communities and then responding to those needs.

Upon motion by Paul Roen and seconded by Terry Swofford, the RWMG authorized the Chair to sign the comment letter prepared by Sierra Institute for Community and Environment related to the DWR Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposals and the Prop 1 IRWM Guidelines was unanimously approved.

Carl Felts asked for assistance in reading the map. Is the heavy black line the Mountain Counties Funding Area? Sherrie Thrall confirmed and explained that the Mountain Counties Funding Area encompasses a huge area with very different needs. Sherrie pointed out that there is a heavy concentration of DACs in the northern area as compared to the rest of the area which underlies the concern of being left out of the funding intended to serve DACs. Joe Hoffman asked for clarification regarding the difference between the map on the right and the map on the left. Brooke Huffman responded that the map on the left is by census designated places and the map on the right is by census block groups. Jonathan Kusel explained the importance of using the appropriate unit of analysis through the example of mapping the census block groups on the spine of the Sierras.

Uma Hinman presented on the current coordination efforts in response to the Proposition 1 Draft Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposal. Uma explained that DWR is expecting one application for the entire Mountain Counties Funding Area. Sherrie Thrall commented that like most things when there's money people get very political, and she anticipated that we need to be very firm at the table of these discussions.

Trina Cunningham asked for clarification regarding whether Mountain Counties Water Resources Association is intending to represent their membership only or whether they want to work with and represent the entire Mountain Counties Funding Area. Uma noted that it is not clear yet whether MCWRA intends to represent organizations outside their membership in this process. Sherrie Thrall commented that this is obviously becoming political and the ideal solution would be for Sierra Water Workgroup to partner with MCWRA and ensure an inclusive coordination process with all 10 IRWM regions in the Funding Area. Jonathan Kusel commented that from what he's heard, DWR does not want competing proposals in a Funding Area, and they do want an entity that is reflective of the different interests and does capture, engage, and involve different folks.

## **6. Update on Project Development Process**

**(Video 1, 00:51:04)**

Uma Hinman presented the IRWM Plan implementation project review process and next steps. Kristi Jamason presented the Upper Feather IRWMP Project Review Criteria spreadsheet. Jeffrey Greening asked if the spreadsheet was published so we could review it online. Uma offered to email the spreadsheet directly. Carl Felts asked which two projects were pulled. Uma responded that the Creek Restoration at Lake Almanor and the Humbug Valley Outdoor Research/Learning Center projects were pulled by the project sponsors. Discussion ensued regarding appreciation for all the hard work that went into the Upper Feather IRWMP Project Review Criteria spreadsheet.

## **7. Draft Impacts and Benefits Chapter**

**(Video 1, 1:00:57)**

Uma Hinman presented the Draft Impacts and Benefits chapter. RWMG directed staff to move forward with adding the Impacts and Benefits Chapter to the Administration Draft Plan.

## **8. Next Meeting**

**(Video 1, 1:04:02)**

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 20<sup>th</sup> at 1pm.

## **Adjournment**

**(Video 1, 1:05:34)**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 pm.