

Upper Feather River IRWM Regional Water Management Group

FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES

May 20, 2016

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

http://featherriver.org/rwmg_meetings/

Call to Order and Roll Call

Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on May 20, 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
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Jim Roberti, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)

Members Absent:

Paul Roen, Sierra County Board of Supervisors
Terry Swofford, Plumas County Board of Supervisors
Bill Nunes, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)
Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

Staff Present:

Randy Wilson, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda

None noted

Public Comment Opportunity

(00:1:14)

Greg Hines introduced himself and shared that he grew up in Graeagle and he just finished graduate school (environmental engineering degree) and moved back to the area. Greg acknowledged the RWMG's hard work in developing the draft plan chapters and offered to help out wherever he can.

Announcements / Reports

None noted

CONSENT AGENDA

(00:2:08)

a. RWMG Approval of Meeting Minutes for April 1, 2016

Uma Hinman noted that Frank Motzkus suggested we add that the RWMG welcomes the opportunity to participate in relation to Trina's announcement for the California Water Policy Conference at the bottom

of the first page. Upon motion by (00:2:39) Russell Reid and second by Roger Diefendorf, the RWMG Meeting Minutes for April 1, 2016 were unanimously approved as amended per Frank's suggestion.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Project Status Updates (00:2:49)

Uma Hinman presented an overview of the project schedule, tasks and budget. Uma noted, and Randy Wilson confirmed, that the Plumas County Counsel has finished their review of the Memorandum of Understanding for the DWR contract extension and that Butte County Counsel is now reviewing the MOU. No issues with the MOU have been identified to date. Uma also noted that there was an Upper Feather River Water Workshop on April 4th in Vinton at which Burkhard provided an initial presentation on the Community Vulnerability Study related to the approach and identified DACs.

2. Stakeholder Outreach Updates (00:5:38)

Uma Hinman presented an update on stakeholder outreach efforts to date including workgroups, Tribal outreach, and stakeholders. Trina Cunningham provided an update on the Tribal Advisory Committee meeting on May 16, 2016. Trina contacted Chairman Ramirez of the Mechoopda tribe to follow up since there has been no participation from Butte County tribes to date. The Mechoopda tribe is currently in formal consultation with Plumas County government. Creig Marcus, the Tribal Administrator from the Enterprise Rancheria in Butte County, was on the conference call for the recent Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and provided helpful information. Trina noted that the TAC will continue to explore the convergence of the political and tribal boundary lines between Plumas and Butte County to ensure that the tribes in the Butte County portion of the Lake Oroville area are well represented in our Plan because they are incredibly tribally and culturally significant. Trina also noted that the tribes have not really been engaged in the process of looking at DACs through the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement RFP that is coming out and she spoke with Jim Branham from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) who indicated that SNC would pay for tribes travel expenses and food to support tribal participation in IRWM regional meetings. Uma provided a brief update on the chapter review schedule and noted that there are three new chapters available for review online.

3. Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Coordination (00:9:22)

Uma Hinman presented an update on the current coordination efforts in response to the Proposition 1 Draft Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DACI) Request for Proposal (RFP). Trina Cunningham mentioned the coordination meeting occurring today, which is co-hosted by the Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG) and the Inyo-Mono IRWM region to bring IRWM practitioners from the Sierra, eastern California and beyond together to discuss meaningful engagement, involvement and capacity building of DACs and broader regional coordination for moving forward with Proposition 1 funding.

4. Update on Community Vulnerability Study (00:13:00)

Uma Hinman presented an update on the content and progress of the Community Vulnerability Study and DAC outreach. Sherrie Thrall asked for clarification regarding DAC outreach efforts and whether staff is working with municipal service providers in the DACs. Randy and Uma confirmed that initial contact with the DACs is made to the municipal service providers prior to DAC outreach occurring on a community-scale. Trina Cunningham confirmed that they have not encountered a community without a service provider, although some communities have very few service connections which has raised the question of

what is a community and how do we represent it. Jeffrey Greening commented that it is interesting that the designation of Brownfields is not used in DAC reviews and asked why, especially since it is such a powerful word for State funding. Uma responded that Brownfields designation is more common when working in environmental justice and DACs are designated based on a median household income and do not specifically address issues of pollution. Discussion ensued regarding Brownfields designation and blight. Uma clarified that this a Department of Water Resources (DWR) based process and DWR defines DACs, which does not include a designation of Brownfields.

Sherrie Thrall asked about the status of the Community Vulnerability Study in relation to the Sierra Valley communities that were selected for further study. Uma presented background on the Community Vulnerability Study (also referred to as the Well Vulnerability Study) which supports one of the tasks for DAC Outreach in the Grant Work Plan. The Study identifies a number of DACs in the Sierra Valley and analyzes their vulnerability to groundwater pollutants. Nine DACs were reviewed in the study and four communities were selected for more intensive analysis. Burkhard has prepared an administrative draft of the study, which is currently being reviewed internally. The purpose of this task is to incorporate the drinking and wastewater treatment needs of the disadvantaged communities. This will be very important for the projects that come out of the next round of Proposition 1 funding available from DWR for DAC projects; Prop 1 Round 1 is for DAC involvement and Round 2 is for DAC implementation projects focused on water and wastewater needs. Robert Meacher asked if the focus was on nitrates only. Uma responded that the study did focus on the risk of nitrate pollution based on the scope of the work plan. Randy Wilson added that when the work plan was originally prepared, nitrates were the primary concern, and currently there are concerns regarding other pollutants which were not anticipated when DWR approved the work plan. Discussion ensued regarding the regulatory basis for monitoring and reporting nitrate levels in groundwater related to agricultural activities. Uma noted that Proposition 1 requires additional water quality discussion in the Plan regarding arsenic and a number of other water quality constituents; those issues in the watershed can be addressed in those sections.

5. Update on Project Development Process (00:25:45)

Uma Hinman presented the IRWM Plan implementation project review process to date, the draft project list, and next steps. All projects on the list have been determined to meet the minimum requirements per Proposition 84. Upon approval by the RWMG, the next step is to release the draft project list to the workgroups and general public for review and comment. Upon motion by Jeffrey Greening and second by Trina Cunningham, the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Implementation Projects were unanimously approved to be released to the general public for review and comment.

6. Draft Regional Water Issues Chapter (00:29:00)

Uma Hinman explained an added step in the chapter development process. All public comments on the draft chapters will be consolidated into a single document and provided to the RWMG for information. The revised chapters, in which staff addresses the comments received as appropriate, are provided to the RWMG in the meeting agenda packets. RWMG members are encouraged to bring forward any comments that they feel were not adequately addressed in the revised chapter. Uma also reminded all that there will be another opportunity to comment during the Public Review Draft stage.

Uma Hinman presented the Draft Regional Water Issues chapter. Jeffrey Greening asked about involvement from college students to assist with implementation of the Plan. Randy Wilson responded that the level of experience with undergraduate students would not necessarily meet our needs. Sherrie Thrall asked about solutions beyond monetary approaches to address the issue of capacity building which seems to be coming up across the board. Jeffrey Greening commented that is why he suggested Chico State students. Discussion ensued regarding who will apply for and administer grant funding once Uma's

professional services are no longer under contract. Russell Reid expressed concern about how funds for implementation projects will be identified and pursued. Uma noted that the issue of capacity is being discussed at the SWWG meetings.

7. Draft Land Use and Water Planning Chapter (00:47:18)

Uma Hinman presented the Draft Land Use and Water Planning chapter, providing an overview of the Proposition 84 standards for Land Use and Water Planning and approach taken on the chapter.

8. Sierra Water Workgroup Memorandum of Understanding (00:52:15)

Uma Hinman presented the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG); a non-profit organization that focuses on water issues of concern in the region through coordination between local and regional water planning efforts and promoting the exchange of information and tools amongst stakeholders in the region. Jeffrey Greening asked how far south SWWG covers in relation to advocating for IRWM regions. Uma responded that SWWG covers the Inyo-Mono area and possibly as far as the southern Sierra. Jeffrey Greening asked if they currently have access to SWWG's data management system. Uma confirmed that anyone can access their data management system online. Sherrie Thrall raised concerns regarding item 6 of the MOU Principles of Agreement requiring active member participation in order to be eligible to take part in SWWG decision making, including the RWMG process for selecting a SWWG representative and covering travel expenses. Discussion ensued regarding the types of people representing signatories of the SWWG MOU, logistics for SWWG representation, and the risks and benefits of membership. Uma and Trina noted that the SWWG is primarily focused on sharing of information and collaboration. RWMG directed staff to invite the SWWG Executive Director to a future RWMG meeting to share the advantages of being an MOU signatory and to define active member participation. Discussion ensued regarding the Proposition 84 contract extension from June 4, 2016 to October 4, 2016 and the estimated completion of an Administrative Draft of the Plan in July 2016.

9. Next Meeting (1:07:04)

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, June 24th at 1pm.

Adjournment (1:08:50)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 pm.