Upper Feather River IRWM
Regional Water Management Group

FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES

For the Special Meeting
On June 15, 2015

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, Chair, called the meeting to order on June 15, 2015 at 10:00 AM, 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
Terry Swofford, Plumas County
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Jeff Carmichael sitting in for Bill Nunes, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Roberti, Sierra Groundwater Management District
Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
Matthew Johnson for Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)

Members Absent:
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)
Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)

Staff Present:
Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Zeke Lunder, Deer Creek Resources, Inc.
Terri Rust, Floodplains, Meadows, Waterbodies Management Workgroup Coordinator

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda
None noted

Public Comment Opportunity
None noted

Announcements / Reports **(Part 1, 00:2:18)**

CONSENT AGENDA

Sherrie noted that sound was not recorded with the last meeting's video recording. Uma Hinman prepared a Draft Meeting Summary from the last meeting.

Motion by Paul Roen to approve the Summary, Jeff Carmichael seconded; unanimously approved.

ACTION AGENDA

1. Draft Project Eligibility Checklist **(Part 1, 00:3:14)**

Uma Hinman presented the modifications to the Eligibility Checklist, which will be used to walk the RWMG through determining the eligibility of conceptual projects in Item 4. Modifications and additions included the recently added Workgroup category, Tribal Advisory Committee, and Public Resources Code consistency. Added a line item for 'project location' and whether or not the project has the support of landowners.

Sherrie reiterated that nothing had been changed, just added some things that had been agreed to at the last meeting.

Motion by Jeff Carmichael to approve Eligibility Checklist, Terry Swofford seconded; unanimously approved. **(Part 1, 00:5:02)**

2. Draft Project Monitoring Policy **(Part 1, 00:5:11)**

Sherrie noted that at the last meeting the RWMG had asked staff to come up with a suggested monitoring policy for discussion and consideration.

Uma Hinman presented the purpose of having a monitoring policy, stating the requirements of the Proposition 84 Guidelines. Project monitoring must be addressed, be transparent and credible, and be applied to all IRWM sanctioned projects.

Draft Policy slide was read aloud. **(Part 1, 00:6:37)**

Although project monitoring requirements will vary by grant solicitation, it is the position of the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group that project monitoring for IRWM-sanctioned projects should be objective, transparent, available to the public, encourages to be conducted by a third party, and science-based.

Paul Roen Discussion around changing the word 'encouraged' to 'required.'
Jeffrey Greening noted that accountability is a good thing. **(Part 1, 00:8:21)**

Motion by Paul Roen to make word change, Terry Swofford seconded, unanimously approved.

Sherrie: Motion to accept the Project Monitoring Policy with the word change.

Motion by Terry Swofford to approve policy, Jeff Carmichael seconded, unanimously approved. **(Part 1, 00:8:34)**

3. Draft Project Selection & Ranking Criteria **(Part 1, 00:8:52)**

Sherrie reiterated that the ranking criteria will be reviewed and that projects will not be ranked at this meeting.

Uma Hinman presented an overview of the methodology discussed at the last RWMG meeting, including the Proposition 84 Guideline's project review factors that must be considered in the process. Also reviewed were the project categories approved at the last RWMG meeting:

- Agricultural Land Stewardship
- Floodplains, Meadows and Waterbodies
- Municipal Services
- Tribal Advisory Committee
- Uplands and Forest

Uma presented the revised Project Scoring Criteria, which consists of a point system from 1 to 3 and a 'weighting factor.' The matching funds and leveling criteria factors were removed. Several factors are presented now as 'yes' or 'no.' The weighting factor will be discussed at the next RWMG meeting.

Paul Roen noted that we should address the weighting factors at the July meeting. Sherrie agreed. **(Part 1, 00:11:38)**

Uma noted that the names of the five categories on the Step 2 Project Information Form should be modified to reflect the new project categories.

Sherrie noted that basically, the categories reflect the names of the Workgroups, but are not the Workgroups themselves.

Motion by Terry Swofford, Jim Roberti seconded; unanimously approved the Project Scoring Criteria, with weighting factors to be discussed and applied at a future RWMG meeting. **(Part 1, 00:12:44)**

4. Review of Conceptual Project Review/ Summaries – Step 1 (Part 1, 00:13:04)

Uma Hinman introduced the purpose of reviewing the Step 1 Conceptual Projects. The intent of this initial review is to determine whether a project meets the minimum eligibility requirements to move forward with the second phase of project submittals, not to score, rank or select projects for the Plan. See the Eligibility Checklist.

Staff has made an initial effort to categorize the projects, to organize them for review. Request to the RWMG was to affirm the category or reposition the project. Uma noted that this is also a chance to look for project integration opportunities and provide initial feedback to project proponents; much of the integration has been worked through at the Workgroup level.

Uma noted that, following this meeting, staff will compile vetted project information and send it to project proponents along with Step 2 project information form. Workgroups will start working with project proponents on development and integration of the Step 2 form.

August 3: Deadline for Step 2 submission
August 21: Workgroup integration workshop

Uma and Sherrie suggested starting with the Municipal Services proposals, as they should be fairly straightforward.

Russell Reid noted that most of these projects would likely meet minimum eligibility requirements. Today's effort is to look for the few projects that do not meet the criteria. The second step will be more in-depth. Russell suggested that we will lose projects because there is minimal staff to complete Step 2.

Sherrie agreed that the proposals all look qualified. She outlined an approach for going through the projects: each one will assumed to be "yes" unless a member(s) expresses a "no" or has a question. **(Part 1, 00:19:40)**

Uma reminded the RWMG that many project proponents were in attendance and could answer any questions. She presented a summary of each project, noting whether or not an MOU signatory. See the attached spreadsheet for a summary of the RWMG recommendations and eligibility determinations. In total, four of the 82 projects were determined ineligible to continue with the Step 2 application, all due to the lack of a signed MOU. (See attached Draft Summary of Conceptual Project Submittals).

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 31, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:20