

UPPER FEATHER RIVER
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
Regional Water Management Group

Sharon Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Paul Roen, Sierra County
Terry Swofford, Plumas County
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Bill Nunes, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Roberti, Sierra Groundwater Management District
Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)
Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)
Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

**AGENDA FOR REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GROUP MEETING OF
AUGUST 19, 2016 TO BE HELD AT 1:00 P.M. IN THE
PLUMAS COUNTY PLANNING CONFERENCE ROOM, 555 MAIN STREET, QUINCY, CALIFORNIA**

www.featherriver.org

AGENDA

The Regional Water Management Group of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Program welcomes you to its meetings, which are regularly held on the fourth Wednesday of every other month, and your interest is encouraged and appreciated.

Any item without a specified time on the agenda may be taken up at any time and in any order.

Any person desiring to address the Board shall first secure permission of the Regional Water Management Group Chair. Any public comments made during a regular Regional Water Management Group meeting will be recorded. Members of the public may submit their comments in writing to be included in the public record.

CONSENT AGENDA: These matters include routine administrative actions. All items on the consent calendar will be voted on at some time during the meeting under "Consent Agenda." If you wish to have an item removed from the Consent Agenda, you may do so by addressing the Chairperson.



REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please contact Randy Wilson at 530-283-6214. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. Auxiliary aids and services are available for people with disabilities.

STANDING ORDERS

1:00 P.M. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

ADDITIONS TO OR DELETIONS FROM THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Matters under the jurisdiction of the RWMG, and not on the posted agenda, may be addressed by the general public at the beginning of the regular agenda and any off-agenda matters before the RWMG for consideration. However, California law prohibits the RWMG from taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an urgency item by the RWMG. Any member of the public wishing to address the RWMG during the "Public Comment" period will be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/REPORTS

Brief announcements.

CONSENT AGENDA

These items are expected to be routine and non-controversial. The RWMG will act upon them at one time without discussion. Any RWMG members, staff member or interested party may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda for discussion.

A) RWMG

Approve RWMG Meeting Summary for the regular meeting held on June 24, 2016.

ACTION AGENDA

1. PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Update on project schedule, task, stakeholder and tribal outreach, and budget. Informational.

2. SIERRA WATER WORKGROUP MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Consider signing the Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG) memorandum of understanding. SWWG representatives presented to the RWMG in June 2016. No decision was made at that time due to the number of absent RWMG members.

3. PROPOSITION 1 DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT COORDINATION

Update and discussion of current coordination efforts for the Proposition 1 Draft Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposal. Discussion and/or direction to staff.

4. PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT UPPER FEATHER RIVER INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Presentation of the Public Review Draft Upper Feather River IRWM Plan and update on scheduled public meetings for Draft Plan. Informational.

5. DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES REVIEW/ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

Process and status of DWR's review for compliance with Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 standards. Informational.

6. NEXT MEETING

Schedule next RWMG meeting and discuss remaining tasks. Request for direction to staff.

ADJOURNMENT

Upper Feather River IRWM Regional Water Management Group

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

June 24, 2016

Meeting materials are available on the website at: http://featherriver.org/rwmg_meetings/.

Note: due to a technical error, no meeting video is available.

Call to Order and Roll Call

Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on June 24, 2016 at 1:05 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
Terry Swofford, Plumas County Board of Supervisors
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member
Nancy Francine, Plumas National Forest (Advisory) (sitting in for Joe Hoffman)

Members Absent:

Paul Roen, Sierra County Board of Supervisors
Bill Nunes, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Roberti, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission
Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)
Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

Staff Present:

Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Leah Wills
Burkhard Bohm

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda

None noted

Public Comment Opportunity

None noted

Announcements / Reports

Nancy Francine, Plumas National Forest, introduced herself and noted that she was sitting in for Joe Hoffman. Nancy announced that all Plumas National Forest management positions have been filled. Mickey Smith, Mt. Hough Ranger District; Sabrina Stadler, Beckwourth District Ranger; Barbara Drake, Deputy Forest Supervisor; and Daniel Lavato, Forest Supervisor.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. RWMG Approval of Meeting Minutes for May 20, 2016

Upon motion by Russell Reid and second by Terry Swofford, the RWMG Meeting Minutes for May 20, 2016 were unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Project Status Updates

Uma Hinman presented an overview of the project schedule, tasks and budget. Uma noted that DWR had officially approved the Grant Agreement extension to October 4, 2016. There are three more chapters to complete and send out for public review, which will occur within the next two weeks. An administrative Draft Plan will be prepared in July for internal review, with the public review Draft Plan ready in August. Three public meetings will occur for the Public Review Draft Plan: two public workshops in Chester and Portola, and a meeting to present the Draft Plan to the RWMG. The Final Plan will come to the RWMG for adoption in September.

The Forest-Water Balance Study will be completed at the end of June 2016. The DAC Community Vulnerability Study has been completed and will be presented later during this meeting.

Uma reported that she and Randy Wilson attended a Tribal consultation with members of the Mechoopda Tribe and Enterprise Rancheria on June 15, 2016 at their request. Another meeting was requested for August, which Uma and Randy will coordinate with them.

Frank Motzkus is now the General Manager for Chester Public Utility District (CPUD). The CPUD approved signing the UFR MOU at their last meeting: Frank provided a copy to Uma during the meeting. Sherrie Thrall congratulated him and thanked him for getting CPUD involved in the UFR IRWM process.

2. Sierra Water Workgroup Presentation

During the May 20, 2016 RWMG meeting, Uma presented the Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG) MOU for consideration. The RWMG had a number of questions and requested that representatives of the SWWG be invited to attend the next meeting. Liz Mansfield, Executive Director, and Kate Gladstein, GIS Specialist, attended and presented on the SWWG and the SWWG's online data management program.

Liz presented on the SWWG (presentation posted on website) background, purpose and vision. Liz explained that the SWWG is primarily geared toward facilitating collaboration and information sharing both between IRWM regions and between the State and the IRWM regions. Liz noted that participants in the UFR IRWM have long been involved in the SWWG efforts, including Leah Wills, Trina Cunningham, Jonathan Kusel, and Randy Wilson. Participation in the SWWG consists primarily of participating in meetings, which are almost always by conference call and occur 1-3 times per year, and optional participation in an annual workshop. This year's workshop will be held in August in Auburn and will be focused on supporting the Proposition 1 DACI Mountain Counties Funding Area coordination.

Kate Gladstein presented the SWWG's Interregional Data Management System (DMS), which is a GIS (ESRI) based system that is publicly available (presentation located on website). The DMS was developed in support of the Tahoe-Sierra IRWMP and serves as a platform for publishing spatial and tabular data to promote collaboration and data sharing between IRWM regions, stakeholders within the IRWM regions, and the public. The tool is a web-based data management tool as well as document library. The tool/application includes plan implementation projects, which are identified as RWMG approved, completed, or pending RWMG approval. The application can accept project applications online, which are identified as "pending RWMG approval" to insure that it is clear they are not yet approved. To date, region specific applications have been launched for Tahoe-Sierra IRWM and Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM, with

another one currently being developed for CABY. There are a lot of data layers available and an application can be tailored to individual IRWMs at cost. The rough cost estimate for having an IRWM application developed is approximately \$15,000 to \$20,000 to create the layers for the region. There is also an annual maintenance cost of approximately \$1,500 per region, which is expected to decrease as more regions join. IRWM regions must also sign the SWWG MOU in order to participate in the DMS program. The data is hosted on a secure ESRI server. Regions typically set up an IRWM data committee of 3-4 representatives to decide what data to portray in the application. Kate noted that each IRWM region is responsible for QA/QC of project submittals included in the DMS platform.

Ren Reynolds of the Enterprise Rancheria expressed concerns that the DMS tool should not include confidential Tribal information on the maps and within the database. He requested a follow-up meeting with Kate for the Enterprise Rancheria to explore Tribal uses for the tool. Trina Cunningham agreed that it was a valuable tool and that tribes may want to take advantage of it.

Jeffery Greening requested that Uma send the DMS links to the RWMG members. Trina Cunningham requested Kate provide a synopsis of the tool that she can share with the Tribal Advisory Committee and Tribes.

Sherrie Thrall suggested that consideration of signing the SWWG MOU be held until the next RWMG meeting because there were so many absences this meeting. The RWMG members in attendance unanimously agreed.

3. Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Coordination

Leah Wills provided an update from the last DACI coordination meeting, which was held in Mammoth, California on May 20, 2016. The all-day workshop focused on IRWM regions sharing their respective DAC outreach efforts, results and needs. The SWWG co-hosted the meeting with Inyo-Mono IRWM and is playing an active role in coordinating IRWM region outreach in support of the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DACI) RFP.

Liz Mansfield, SWWG, reported that the DACI RFP will be finalized in July and there will be approximately six months to submit a Funding Area application. Applications will need a letter of support from each IRWM in the Funding Area and there will be no option for “opting out.” There will be a one day, facilitated DACI workshop in Auburn in August. Each region should send representatives with the ability to select a fiscal sponsor and entity for preparing the applications.

Sherrie Thrall asked staff who they recommended for the region. Leah Wills noted that there were several people who have been involved from the beginning of the DACI RFP process: Uma Hinman, Trina Cunningham, Jonathan Kusel, and Leah. Sherrie said that the RWMG members would consider and make a decision.

4. Integration Presentation on Disadvantaged Community Outreach and the Community Vulnerability Study

Trina Cunningham has been performing DAC outreach for the Plan update team, which consists of contacting DACs who have not yet been involved in the Plan Update process, completion of surveys, and identification of DAC projects. Trina reported that she and Leah had met with the Plumas and Sierra County Environmental Health Departments and received great support and information from both. She reported that they had not yet been able to get a meeting Butte County representatives, but were working on it. Outreach to the DACs has been very well received so far and Trina will be working to finish up that effort in the next few weeks. Trina and Leah will be presenting to the Sierraville Public Utility District and meeting

with Loyaltan in early July. Uma noted that this effort is identified in the Grant Agreement work plan and will integrate with the Community Vulnerability Study being prepared by Burkhard Bohm and will also serve as the basis of a DAC needs assessment, which will be important for the upcoming DACI RFP. Sherrie Thrall asked if Trina had contacted Hamilton Branch CSD; Trina will get that contact from Sherrie.

Burkhard Bohm presented the methodology and results of 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. The purpose of this task is to incorporate the drinking and wastewater treatment needs of the disadvantaged communities. This will tie into the DAC outreach being performed by Trina Cunningham and Leah Wills and 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. The Community Vulnerability Study will be included as an Appendix in the IRWM Plan.

5. Draft Resource Management Strategies Chapter

Uma Hinman presented the Draft Resource Management Strategies chapter, including the required RMS Standard from the Guidelines, content, and format of the chapter. All comments received were provided to the RWMG on June 10 via email. The revised chapter, in which staff addresses the comments received, was provided to the RWMG in the meeting agenda packets. The RWMG had no comments on the chapter at this time and requested that Uma email a Word version of the chapter to them in case they have some edits to suggest.

7. Draft Plan Implementation, Performance, Monitoring, Data Management Chapter

Uma Hinman presented the Draft Plan Implementation, Performance, Monitoring, Data Management chapter, including the required Plan Standards from the Guidelines, content and format of the chapter. Uma noted that this chapter includes two Plan Standards. All comments received were provided to the RWMG on June 10 via email. The revised chapter, in which staff addresses the comments received, was provided to the RWMG in the meeting agenda packets. The RWMG had no comments on the chapter at this time and requested that Uma email a Word version of the chapter to them in case they have some edits to suggest.

9. Next Meeting

Uma Hinman reported that this was the 13th RWMG meeting (12 regular and 1 special meetings); the Grant Agreement Work Plan included 12 RWMG meetings. She went over the remaining chapters that had yet to be presented to the RWMG (Goals and Objectives, Finance, Introduction) Uma noted that she would be happy to do a meeting in July, but that perhaps it would be better to wait until August and present the Draft Plan at that time. The RWMG agreed that July was a difficult month to get member attendance.

Russell Reid suggested that we continue to follow the same process for chapter review to be consistent, but that the process could occur via email. After the public review period, staff will incorporate comments and send to the RWMG along with the consolidated comment chapters.

Sherrie Thrall noted that Bill Nunes had missed several consecutive RWMG meetings and asked Terry Swofford to coordinate with Paul Roen to reach out to Bill to see if he is still able to participate in the RWMG.

The next meeting was scheduled for Friday, August 19, 2016 at 1pm.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

DRAFT

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 13
August 19, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting

Subject: UFR IRWM Plan Update Project Schedule, Task and Budget Update

Date: August 15, 2016

SCHEDULE

Based on the contract date between Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, we are currently in the 26th month of the 2-year project. A four-month extension of time has been granted by DWR to allow time to incorporate additional IRWM standards for compliance with Proposition 1 IRWM Guidelines. The new standards will be required in order to be eligible for upcoming Proposition 1 IRWM funding opportunities. The Draft IRWM Plan was released for public review on August 12, 2016 for a 30 day public comment period; deadline for comments is September 14, 2016. The deadline for project completion is October 4, 2016.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

The MOU is posted on the website; to date, 35 signed MOUs have been returned.

On September 16, 2015, Randy Wilson, Uma Hinman, and Trina Cunningham met with Butte County representatives to discuss an MOU to address planning and management in the overlap area, determine areas of responsibility, and provide for appropriate consultation as needed. The MOU has been drafted, approved in form by Plumas County Counsel, and sent to Butte County for consideration.

BUDGET AND TASK UPDATE

The overall expenditures on the grant project to date are consistent with the project accomplishments, and demonstrate very efficient use of funds. In October 2014, Plumas County and its partners provided documentation of \$237,489 in match funds, which fulfills the match requirement for the grant contract in its entirety. To date, Uma Hinman Consulting has submitted 22 invoices to DWR totaling \$580,961.43 in reimbursable services, equipment purchases, and operating expenses. Approximately 85 percent of project work has been completed and the \$538,067.19 invoiced to date for professional and consultant

services represents 85 percent of the \$635,708 budget for those services. Additionally, the total grant amount invoiced to date includes county equipment and operating costs, for an overall billing of 85 percent of the total grant budget. See attachment for budget summary.

The following are summaries of work progress by task.

Task 1: Stakeholder Outreach/RWMG/Workgroups/Tribal Engagement/IRWM Coordination

The Stakeholder Outreach efforts have included coordinating, publicizing, and preparing outreach materials and presentations for and conducting twelve regular RWMG meetings; conducting a special meeting to review, discuss and approve the Draft Monitoring Policy and the Draft Project Selection and Scoring Criteria; reviewing and vetting the first and second phases of implementation project submittals; chapter reviews; special studies; and inter-regional integration discussions and presentations. Tasks and efforts that have been in progress throughout the grant process and are now completed included developing the Stakeholder Outreach Plan (SIP) and Tribal Engagement Plan (TEP); drafting the stakeholder contact lists and an MOU; updating the tribal contact list; and coordinating and scheduling individual workgroup meetings.

Ongoing project efforts include collaborating with the Mountain Counties Funding Area IRWM regions to address the Draft Proposition 1 DAC Involvement RFP, and coordinating completion of DAC surveys. Additionally, two public meetings for the Draft Plan have been scheduled for August 31 and September 1 in Chester and Portola, respectively.

Upon request for consultation, Randy Wilson and Uma Hinman met with members of the Mechoopda Tribe and Enterprise Rancheria on Wednesday, June 15, 2016 in Oroville. Another meeting was requested for August 2016.

As part of the DAC outreach, Plumas Geo-Hydrology prepared a draft DRASTIC analysis for select DACs including mapping the selected communities in Sierra Valley. The consultants reviewed an American Valley Ground Water Protection Study and Sierra Valley groundwater nitrate data collected by DWR to attempt a trend analysis and prepare a cumulative frequency plot and maps for nitrate and boron. They also generated a DRASTIC map for Chilcoot Basin and developed a spreadsheet to calculate DRASTIC ratings. Plumas Geo-Hydrology presented a summary of the DRASTIC method of assessing well vulnerability at the April 4, 2016, UFR Water Workshop. The Study has been completed.

Staff continues to post articles of interest under the NEWS section on the website, and maintains the calendar and meeting pages with meeting schedules and materials. Please remember to check the website periodically for new posts and information. On the website, DRAFT IRWM PLAN, a subcategory under the menu section, DOCUMENTS, contains the Draft Plan and notes the deadline for comments.

Task 2: Baseline Technical Study

The RWMG and Workgroups reviewed and provided input on the Draft Baseline Technical Study Report. The Administrative Draft Baseline Technical Study report was posted on the website and includes a database of background materials collected and catalogued to date. Additional studies and information has been added to the draft document throughout the Plan Update. The consultant team also

developed a data management site on the website, which catalogs studies and projects in the region. The database is linked via GIS to a map that provides a visual catalog of studies and projects in the region (similar to the SWIM site). Time was spent compiling, categorizing, summarizing, and uploading baseline studies. The Baseline Technical Study constitutes the Technical Analysis chapter of the Plan. Staff are adding final resources to the database spreadsheet and online catalog.

Task 3: Data Management Strategy, System Development and Implementation

The website/web portal of the UFR IRWM Project (<http://featherriver.org/>) has been kept current. The RWMG meeting agendas, packets, and archived videos of the meetings are and will be available on the site, as will project information and updates. Upon completion of the grant agreement work plan, the website will transition to Plumas County, which will assume responsibility for hosting the website.

The consultant team has developed an online, map-based catalog of studies and projects in the region. The database is linked via GIS to a map that provides a visual catalog of studies and projects in the region (similar to the SWIM site). Time was spent compiling, categorizing, summarizing, and uploading baseline studies. The catalog is available on the website at: <http://featherriver.org/catalog/index.php>.

The project submittal data have been incorporated into an online map, <http://featherriver.org/proposed-projects/>. The database includes a summary of the information submitted for each project.

Task 4: Climate Change

The Consultant team has completed the vulnerability to climate change assessment, a project worksheet for calculating GHG emissions, and the draft climate change chapter. Further, the Consultant Team has reviewed the new climate change requirements in the Draft Proposition 1 IRWM Guidelines and believes the Plan chapters have been updated to meet the new requirements. Strategies to address climate change vulnerabilities have also been incorporated into the staff Draft Resource Management Strategy Chapter. The subtasks associated with the Climate Change task have been completed.

Task 5: Project Development Process

Workgroups and Project Proponents completed development and refinement of IRWM implementation projects to ensure forms address required review factors and include completed GHG emission worksheets. Workgroup Coordinators also worked on project integration across workgroups. The final draft Project forms and a spreadsheet summarizing the status and integration of the Projects was presented to the RWMG for review May 20, 2016 RWMG meeting and has been posted on the website for public review and comment.

The deadline for the first stage of the project submittal process was June 1, 2015 at 5:00 p.m.

Approximately 80 conceptual projects submittals were received. The eligible conceptual project proposals were reviewed by the RWMG during a special meeting on June 15, 2015.

The deadline for Step 2 IRWM Project Information Forms was Monday, August 3, 2015 at 5:00 p.m.

Eighty-one (81) projects were received. The Step 2 project submittals were discussed during the August

21, 2015 Workgroup Integration and Climate Change Workshop with a focus on recommendations for project integration.

The Workgroup Coordinators worked with project sponsors to make sure project submittals met review requirements per DWR standards in order to be included in the IRWM Plan as implementation projects. A total of 79 projects were completed and included in the Draft Plan to support implementation of the Plan. The subtasks associated with the Project Development task have been completed.

Task 6: IRWM Plan Update

Based on collected information and what is generated through the workgroup meetings, chapters were drafted by staff and reviewed by workgroups, stakeholders and the RWMG. Each administrative draft chapter was made available for public review and comment. Comments were incorporated and/or addressed as appropriate in the preparation of the Draft Plan.

Draft Plan

The Draft Plan was released for public review on August 12, 2016. Comments are due by 5:00pm on the September 14, 2016. All comments should be submitted in writing to UFR.contact@gmail.com or to 555 Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971.

DWR is reviewing the Draft Plan for Proposition 84 compliance and feedback so far has been positive. Once the Proposition 84 compliance review is completed, we will coordinate with Sacramento to begin the Proposition 1 compliance review process. It is anticipated that the Proposition 1 review will start the week of August 22nd.

Task 7: Grant Administration

Work under Task 7 has included the documenting of matching funds and monthly invoicing and reporting. We have submitted 22 project progress reports and invoices to date. See attached budget summary for details. The grant management/coordination team met with Debbie Spangler, our Grant Manager from DWR, on May 31, 2016 to discuss tasks and timelines for completing the grant by October 4, 2016.

SPECIAL STUDIES

Forest-Water Balance Study: Plumas Geo-Hydrology has completed the Forest-Water Balance Study on infiltration potential from forest fuels thinning projects. The Study describes a methodology for further study and indicates that, from a watershed management standpoint, it is desirable to reduce evapotranspiration and minimize interflow. This implies reduction of canopy interception and eliminating land surface disturbances to minimize groundwater discharge via interflow. The Study is included in the Draft Plan as Appendix 3-2.

Community/Well Vulnerability Study: The Community Vulnerability Study is intended to better identify drinking water pollution risks for the approximately 40 percent of groundwater-dependent households in the region. In preparing the study, Plumas Geo-Hydrology assessed nitrate pollution risks to municipal

and domestic drinking water in high groundwater table areas with septic systems and agricultural livestock production. There are also significant outreach efforts to Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) and Tribal communities associated with this study. The Study has been completed and is included in the Draft Plan as Appendix 10-1.

Disadvantaged Community Assessment: Sierra Institute has completed a Socioeconomic Assessment of the Upper Feather River Watershed, which was presented at the April 1, 2016 RWMG meeting. The Assessment includes identification of the DACs within the region, which will focus and support the continued DAC outreach efforts including the Community Vulnerability Study discussed above. The accurate identification of DACs within the region also becomes particularly important for funding opportunities under Proposition 1, which includes two rounds of targeted DAC funding opportunities. The study was included in the Draft Plan as Appendix 3-1.

SCHEDULE

The deadline for project completion, including reporting and final invoicing, is October 4, 2016.

Task	Start	End
Public Draft Released (30 day review)	August 15, 2016	September 14, 2016
Public Meetings (2)	August 31, 2016 Chester	September 1, 2016 Portola
Final Hearing (<i>proposed date</i>)	<i>September 30, 2016</i>	<i>September 30, 2016</i>
Project Completion Report (Grant requirement)	September 1, 2016	September 30, 2016
Final Invoicing	October 1, 2016	October 3, 2016
Project completed		October 4, 2016

REQUEST

Informational.

Attachment: Budget Summary

Agreement No.: 4600010066

Grantee: Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Awarding Body: California Department of Water Resources

Program: Prop 84

Encumbrance FY: 2012

Award Budget	Match
\$679,657.00	\$237,489.00

		Personnel Services	Operating Expenses	Equipment	Professional/ Consultant Services	Total	10% Withholding	Overhead	Match Total
Line Item Prop 84 Allotments		\$ 34,220.00	\$ 4,731.00	\$ 4,998.00	\$ 635,708.00	\$ 679,657.00			
Invoice No.	Billing Period								
1	10/1/08-9/30/14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,853.84	\$ 30,510.98	\$ 35,364.82	\$ 3,536.48	\$ 1,224.98	\$ 237,489.00
2	9/1/14-10/31/14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,925.60	\$ 22,925.60	\$ 2,292.56	\$ 1,675.85	\$ -
3	9/1/14-11/30/14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,009.60	\$ 13,009.60	\$ 1,300.96	\$ 513.61	\$ -
4	12/1/14-12/31/14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,867.88	\$ 4,867.88	\$ 486.79	\$ 255.38	\$ -
5	10/1/14-1/31/15	\$ 3,892.97	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,774.11	\$ 29,667.08	\$ 2,966.71	\$ 1,383.10	\$ -
6	7/1/14-2/28/14	\$ 2,971.73	\$ 1,427.55	\$ -	\$ 7,285.95	\$ 11,685.23	\$ 1,168.52	\$ 225.20	\$ -
7	11/1/14-3/31/15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,142.35	\$ 40,142.35	\$ 4,014.24	\$ 2,656.35	\$ -
8	3/1/15-4/30/15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,887.40	\$ 12,887.40	\$ 1,288.74	\$ 585.90	\$ -
9	3/1/15-5/31/15	\$ 4,963.08	\$ 874.41	\$ -	\$ 15,654.75	\$ 21,492.24	\$ 2,149.22	\$ 538.00	\$ -
10	9/1/14-6/30/15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,778.71	\$ 42,778.71	\$ 4,277.87	\$ 2,806.45	\$ -
11	6/1/15-7/31/15	\$ 3,926.40	\$ 313.37	\$ -	\$ 18,565.35	\$ 22,805.12	\$ 2,280.51	\$ 1,014.35	\$ -
12	3/1/15-8/31/15	\$ 3,886.74	\$ 110.54	\$ -	\$ 21,676.15	\$ 25,673.43	\$ 2,567.34	\$ 1,458.33	\$ -
13	1/1/15-10/31/15	\$ 2,004.15	\$ 564.52	\$ -	\$ 65,808.38	\$ 68,304.15	\$ 6,830.42	\$ 4,372.28	\$ -
14	9/1/15-10/31/15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,285.17	\$ 13,285.17	\$ 1,328.52	\$ 1,180.38	\$ -
15	8/1/15-11/30/15	\$ 2,125.99	\$ 68.09	\$ -	\$ 22,007.91	\$ 24,201.99	\$ 2,420.20	\$ 1,276.93	\$ -
16	12/1/15-12/31/15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,932.38	\$ 9,932.38	\$ 993.24	\$ 680.75	
17	12/1/15-1/31/16	\$ 4,815.07	\$ 56.66	\$ -	\$ 18,153.85	\$ 23,025.58	\$ 2,302.56	\$ 824.16	
18	3/1/15-2/29/16	\$ 953.85	\$ 87.73	\$ -	\$ 33,183.53	\$ 34,225.11	\$ 3,422.51	\$ 2,100.80	
19	7/1/15-3/31/16	\$ 2,511.11	\$ 28.38	\$ -	\$ 30,321.27	\$ 32,860.76	\$ 3,286.08	\$ 1,925.53	
20	11/1/15-4/30/16	\$ 1,074.35	\$ 137.86	\$ -	\$ 46,786.49	\$ 47,998.70	\$ 4,799.87	\$ 3,233.25	
21	5/1/16-5/31/16	\$ 863.81	\$ 83.83	\$ -	\$ 20,437.54	\$ 21,385.18	\$ 2,138.52	\$ 1,332.80	
22		\$ 230.75	\$ 67.46	\$ -	\$ 22,182.08	\$ 22,480.29	\$ 2,248.03		

Total Amount Spent	\$ 34,220.00	\$ 3,820.40	\$ 4,853.84	\$ 538,177.43	\$ 580,998.77	\$ 58,099.88	\$ 31,264.37
---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Allotment Remaining	\$ -	\$ 910.60	\$ 144.16	\$ 97,530.57	\$ 98,658.23
----------------------------	-------------	------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------

% Budget Invoiced	100.00%	80.75%	97.12%	84.66%	85.48%
--------------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 13
August 19, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group
From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Subject: Sierra Water Workgroup Presentation
Date: August 15, 2016

INTRODUCTION

The Sierra Water Workgroup's (SWWG) mission is to assist regional efforts to protect and enhance water quality, water supply, and watershed health; to develop cooperative regional responses; and to facilitate reinvestment in Sierra watersheds and water resources by all beneficiaries (<http://www.sierrawaterworkgroup.org/>). The SWWG was formed to promote and facilitate inter-regional cooperation and communication amongst the IRWM regions.

The SWWG addresses water issues of concern to the Sierra by:

- Coordinating amongst local and regional water plans;
- Exchanging information and tools for water and watershed management amongst stakeholders in the region;
- Serving as an information source regarding state and federal water policy issues for local governments, nonprofits, and other stakeholders; and
- Raising the profile of the Sierra to increase private, state and federal funding opportunities
- Advocating for Sierra water issues in state and federal legislative and administrative forums.

Although the Upper Feather River IRWM Region's membership in SWWG has not been formalized, individuals from the Upper Feather River region have been participating in SWWG's coordinating meetings and annual conferences over the years. Approval of the attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would formalize the UFR Region's membership and participation in the SWWG.

The SWWG presented to the RWMG at the June 24, 2016 meeting. Due to the number of absent RWMG members, the decision regarding the MOU was deferred to the next meeting.

REQUEST

Consider signing the Sierra Water Workgroup MOU.

Attachment: Sierra Water Workgroup Memorandum of Understanding

**Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
Regarding coordination among participants in the
Sierra Nevada Water Workgroup**

Recitals

WHEREAS the Sierra Water Workgroup (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “SWWG”) was formed to provide a collaborative multi-stakeholder, Sierra-wide, flexible approach to assisting regional efforts in protecting and enhancing water quality, water supply, and watershed health;

WHEREAS, the SWWG geographic boundary includes all or part of the twenty-two counties that make up the Sierra Nevada region and is organized into six sub-regions: North: Modoc, Lassen, Shasta Counties; North Central: Tehama, Butte, Plumas, Sierra Counties; Central: Yuba, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado Counties; South Central: Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa Counties; South: Madera, Fresno, Tulare, Kern Counties; East: Alpine, Mono, Inyo Counties;

WHEREAS, the SWWG is comprised of representatives from each Integrated Regional Water Management Planning region (IRWMP) in the Sierra Nevada and advisory members that include regional organizations representing diverse water interests: sovereign Tribal nations, non-profit/non-governmental organizations, local, state, and federal agencies, and private citizens;

WHEREAS the SWWG objectives include coordinating amongst IRWMP; coordinating and collaborating with local and regional agencies, organizations and other stakeholders interested in Sierra water; exchanging information and tools for water and watershed management; serving as an information source regarding state and federal water policy issues for local governments, non-profits, and other stakeholders; raising the profile of the Sierra to increase private, state and federal funding opportunities;

WHEREAS the SWWG will advocate for Sierra water issues in state, federal and legislative administrative forums as it relates to educating Californians on the importance of the State’s primary watershed, investing resources and funding to headwater stewardship; protecting water quality through watershed management; protecting the principles of the area of origin and watershed protection laws; supporting sustainable forest management practices; and improving headwater stewardship by coordinating state, federal, local and regional resource management agencies with regional stakeholders in the Sierra Nevada;

WHEREAS the SWWG represents a collaboration of IRWMP stakeholders in the Sierra, while recognizing that each IRWMP and participant in the Sierra region has different and unique issues of concern;

WHEREAS the SWWG recognizes that important relationships and mutual interests exist between the upper and lower watersheds, and in some cases, the objectives of one region are dependent on actions in the other;

WHEREAS the SWWG believes that collaborative communication and coordinated regional responses to water resource management within the Sierra Nevada will enhance watershed management activities and resource sustainability overall;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that each of the undersigned participants in SWWG agree to work in cooperation with the SWWG pursuant to the following Principles of Agreement and Procedural Understanding:

Principles of Agreement

1. The IRWMPs in the Sierra will select one formal designee to represent them on the SWWG. The designee will represent the views of the region that selected them to participate in the process.
2. SWWG members will attend meetings consistently and, if unable to attend, will send an alternate also designated by their participating region. However, use of alternates is not encouraged as this can interfere with the continuity of discussion and decision-making.
3. The SWWG is the decision-making body of the SWWG process, and its members will achieve consensus (agreement among all participants) in all of its decision-making.
4. Definition of "Consensus": In reaching consensus, some Workgroup members may strongly endorse a particular proposal while others may accept it as "workable." Others may be only able to "live with it." Still others may choose to "stand aside" by verbally noting a disagreement, while allowing the group to reach a consensus without them if the decision does not compromise their interests. Any of these actions still constitutes consensus.
5. SWWG members will regularly communicate information about the process and programs to their regional groups, which should include organizations and agencies, as well as the individual constituencies and communities they represent.
6. A SWWG member's eligibility to take part in SWWG decision-making depends on active participation by that member or alternate. "Active Participation" is defined as a member or alternate attendance of a minimum of three of the four previous meetings in person or by phone.
7. Regional stakeholders are non-voting members, who are regional organizations. They may choose to formally support any programs, projects, policies, or documents produced by the SWWG.
8. Regional Stakeholders will consist of regional organizations, state and federal agencies, and tribal interests.
9. Definition of a "regional organization": intended to describe an organization whose jurisdiction

and/or boundaries extend over multiple IRWMP regions in the Sierra Nevada.

10. One formal designee and alternate will be selected, and will represent the views of the regional organization that selected them to participate in the process.
11. Nothing in this MOU shall obligate any signatory to transfer or commit any funds. Specific work projects or activities that involve the transfers of funds, services, or property among and/or between the various SWWG participants require the execution of a separate written agreement;

Procedural Understanding

1. The signatories to this MOU may extend, terminate, or otherwise amend this MOU at any time in their discretion by mutual written consent signed by all signatories to this MOU. This MOU will be reviewed and updated as needed.
2. Any signatory to this MOU may terminate its participation in this MOU at any time.
3. This MOU shall commence as of the Effective Date and continue for five (5) years thereafter, unless earlier terminated as provided herein.
4. Any group or individual with an interest in the SWWG may become a signatory to this MOU.
5. This MOU does not, in itself, provide such authority to bind any signatory hereto to any future project or activity. Negotiation, execution, and administration of each such agreement for future projects or activities must comply with all applicable statutes and regulations.
6. To the fullest extent allowed under State and federal law, including without limitation the Federal Tort Claims Law, each signatory to this MOU shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless each of the other signatories to this MOU (and their officials, employees, agents and representatives) from and against any and all liability, loss, expense, and/or claims for any injury or damages to any person (including without limitation death of any person) or property (real, personal or financial) arising out of any activity under this MOU but only in proportion to and to the extent that such liability, loss, expense, and/or claims are caused by or result from the negligent or intentional acts or omissions of the indemnifying party.
7. Because of the participation of several governmental organizations in the proceedings of the SWWG activities, any information shared or indicated within SWWG meetings or other meetings including SWWG agenda items and/or discussions may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552) and/or California Public Records Act (Gov. Code § 6250, et seq.).

8. The original MOU, including signature pages of all original and subsequent signatories, will be kept on file at the Sierra Water Workgroup Headquarters located at 3500 Valley View Road, Rescue, CA 95672 under the custody of Liz Mansfield, Sierra Water Workgroup Director (916) 273-0488. Complete copies will be made available upon request.

I have read the MOU, and agree to follow the established guidelines and perform the established tasks.

Liz Mansfield
Director, Sierra Water Workgroup

DATE

Designated
Representative: _____
IRWM: _____

DATE

Designated
Alternate: _____
IRWM: _____

DATE

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 13
August 19, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting

Subject: Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Draft Request for Proposals

Date: August 15, 2016

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this agenda item is to update the RWMG on outreach and coordination efforts with other IRWM regions in the Mountain Counties Funding Area. A presentation on the current Draft Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DACI) request for proposals (RFP) was provided during the February 26th RWMG meeting, with updates on the process presented to the RWMG at its April 1, May 20, and June 24, 2016 meetings. Representatives of the Upper Feather River region have been attending Mountain Counties Water Resources Association and Sierra Water Workgroup coordination meetings to track and participate in the process. The final version of the RFP was released on August 1, 2016 and is attached for information.

BACKGROUND

The first two rounds of Proposition 1 IRWM funding will be targeted to disadvantaged community (DAC) involvement and implementation (projects); each has been allocated 10 percent of the funding regions' total. Round 1 will be focused on DAC Involvement (DACI); the final solicitation package was released on August 1, 2016. The intent of this first round is to ensure involvement of DACs, economically disadvantaged areas (EDAs), or underrepresented communities within the regions.

Milestone/Activity	Schedule
Release of Final DAC Involvement RFP	August 1, 2016
DACI Workshop Webinar	August 18, 2016
Accept Proposals	<i>September 2016-January 2017</i>
Approval of funding awards	<i>Upon proposal approval</i>

Italics denote time that may vary

Source: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/docs/p1DACinvolvement/2016Prop1IRWM_DACIRFP_Final.pdf

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is seeking a single Funding Area-wide proposal from each of the 12 Proposition 1 Funding Areas. The Upper Feather River Region is located within the Mountain Counties Funding Area, which has an allocation of \$1.3 million for this round. There are 10 IRWM

regions wholly or partially within the Mountain Counties Funding Area [Upper Feather River, Northern Sacramento Valley (partial), Yuba County (partial), Cosumnes-American-Bear-Yuba, American River Basin (partial), Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras, Tuolumne-Stanislaus, Yosemite-Mariposa, Madera (partial), Southern Sierra (partial)].

Entities eligible for receiving funding include the following:

- Public agencies
- Non-profit organizations
- Public utilities
- Federally recognized Indian Tribes
- State Indian Tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission’s Tribal Consultation list
- Mutual Water Companies

Allocation of DAC Involvement Funding

Funding Area	Minimum Available Funds
North Coast	\$2,650,000
San Francisco	\$6,500,000
Central Coast	\$4,300,000
Los Angeles	\$9,800,000
Santa Ana	\$6,300,000
San Diego	\$5,250,000
Sacramento	\$3,700,000
San Joaquin	\$3,100,000
Tulare/Kern	\$3,400,000
Lahontan	\$2,450,000
Colorado	\$2,250,000
Mountain Counties	\$1,300,000
Total	\$51,000,000

FUNDING AREA COORDINATION

The next DACI coordinating meeting is being held on August 24, 2016 from 9am to 4pm in Auburn. The purpose of the workshop is to:

- Provide an open collaborative process for discussing and selecting an applicant and fiscal sponsor by the DACs, RWMG(s), community based organizations, and stakeholders within the Funding Area;
- Understand the Proposition 1 IRWM DACI Program Final RFP; and
- Discuss the DAC water management needs for the Mountain Counties Funding Area.

The following are desired outcomes of the meeting:

- Decision to submit application for planning grant;
- Agree on a process for coordination and collaboration with all IRWMs and DAC regions; and
- Selection of an applicant and fiscal sponsor.

Keynote speakers:

- Tracie Billington, Branch Chief, Fiscal Assistance Branch, Department of Water Resources
- Jonathan Kusel, Ph.D., Executive Director, Sierra Institute for Community and Environment

We will have several attendees from the Upper Feather River IRWM Region in addition to Jonathan Kusel (keynote speaker): Randy Wilson, Leah Wills, Uma Hinman, and Trina Cunningham.

REQUEST

Informational.

Attachments: 2016 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposals, Final

2016 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Request for Proposals

Integrated Regional Water Management
July 2016



CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
DIVISION OF
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT



FOREWORD

This document contains the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program.

This document is not a standalone document and the applicant will need to refer to the 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines (2016 IRWM Guidelines) for additional information (see link below).

Grant Program Website

DWR will use the internet as a communication tool to notify interested parties of the status of the grant funding opportunities and to convey pertinent information. Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program related information, including the 2016 IRWM Guidelines, can be found at the following website:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/prop1index.cfm>. DAC Involvement Program information and resources can be found from this link by clicking on the link at the right-hand side of the screen.

See the 2016 Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines (2016 IRWM Guidelines), Volume 1, Appendix A for other useful web links, Appendix B for common usage of terms and definitions, Appendix E for information on Disadvantaged Communities, and Appendix F for the criteria and terms related to Economically Distressed Areas.

Mailing List

In addition to the above-referenced website, DWR will distribute information via e-mail. If you are not already on the IRWM e-mail distribution list and wish to be placed on it, please visit the following site:

<http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/subscribe.cfm>.

Contact Information

For questions about the 2016 IRWM Guidelines, how to submit a proposal, or other issues, please contact DWR's Financial Assistance Branch at (916) 651-9613 or by e-mail at DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov.

I. INTRODUCTION

This document contains the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (Program) authorized by the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act (Proposition 1). The 2016 IRWM Guidelines can be found at the link listed in the Foreword.

Water Code §79745 requires DWR to expend not less than 10 percent of the Proposition 1, Chapter 7 funds authorized for the IRWM Grant Program, \$51 million, for the purpose of ensuring involvement of disadvantaged communities (DACs), economically distressed areas (EDAs), or underrepresented communities (in this document collectively referred to as DACs) in IRWM planning efforts. DWR is establishing this Program to support the following objectives:

- 1) Work collaboratively to involve DACs, community-based organizations, and stakeholders in IRWM planning efforts to ensure balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM planning process
- 2) Increase the understanding, and where necessary, identify the water management needs of DACs on a Funding Area basis
- 3) Develop strategies and long-term solutions that appropriately address the identified DAC water management needs

It is DWR's intent to move forward efficiently with the RFP process so that the water management needs of DACs can be more fully included in IRWM planning efforts and future funding opportunities through the IRWM Grant Program or other financial assistance programs.

II. PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The schedule in Table 1 outlines the timeframe for this Program. Updates for the events listed in this schedule may be required. Any schedule updates will be posted on the website listed in the Foreword.

Table 1 – DAC Involvement Program Schedule	
Milestone or Activity	Schedule
Release of final DAC Involvement RFP	August 1, 2016
DAC Involvement Call for Proposals Workshop (<i>web broadcast</i>) Byron Sher Auditorium 1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95812 This meeting will be web broadcast via the following link: https://video.calepa.ca.gov/	August 18, 2016 at 10:00am
Accept proposals	<i>Between September 2016 and January 2017</i>
Grant awards	<i>Upon proposal approval</i>

Italics denote time that may vary.

III. FUNDING

DWR requires a single Funding Area-wide proposal from each of the 12 Proposition 1 Funding Areas. DWR will work with the regional water management groups (RWMGs) within each Funding Area, to develop proposals to perform activities that involve DACs in IRWM planning efforts, including helping define, understand, and address DAC water management needs through a collaborative approach. The funding dispersed by this RFP will be allocated and awarded with not less than 10 percent by Funding Area, as shown in the minimum available funds column of Table 2. Local cost share is not required for this Program.

Table 2 – Proposition 1 Funding Allocation for the DAC Involvement Program	
Funding Areas	Minimum Available Funds
North Coast	\$2,650,000
San Francisco Bay Area	\$6,500,000
Central Coast	\$4,300,000
Los Angeles	\$9,800,000
Santa Ana	\$6,300,000
San Diego	\$5,250,000
Sacramento River	\$3,700,000
San Joaquin River	\$3,100,000
Tulare/Kern	\$3,400,000
Lahontan	\$2,450,000
Colorado River	\$2,250,000
Mountain Counties	\$1,300,000

IV. PROPOSAL SUBMITTALS

Applicants must submit the following information to DWR. Additionally, if phases of work are anticipated, provide that level of detail in the proposal.

A. Applicant

Provide the applicant contact information and a short statement (500 characters or less) of how the applicant was selected by the DACs, RWMG(s), community based organizations, and stakeholders within the Funding Area. The proposal must contain a letter from each RWMG in the Funding Area discussing whether the RWMG supports the selection of the applicant or provide an explanation if a letter is not included from specific IRWM regions.

B. DAC Background

Provide a baseline understanding of DAC water management needs from the Funding Area's perspective. This section must not exceed 5,000 characters and shall include the following:

- ◆ A description of the known DAC water management needs in the Funding Area.
- ◆ An outline of the existing Funding Area strategy(ies) to address DAC water management needs across the Funding Area.
- ◆ A discussion as to the level IRWM regions in the Funding Area have involved or engaged DAC members in IRWM planning efforts; if there has been no DAC involvement, identify possible barriers.
- ◆ A map that identifies all known DAC, EDA, and underrepresented communities within the Funding Area. Please show on the map all IRWM region boundaries and all proposed involvement activity boundaries. DWR's DAC and EDA mapping tools may be useful references and can be found at the links listed in the 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines, Volume I, Appendix A.
- ◆ A discussion of the underrepresented communities within the Funding Area.

C. Activity Descriptions

Provide a detailed description of the proposed activities. There is no page or character limit on this section, but applicants are encouraged to be clear and concise. The description should include the following:

- ◆ Provide a title, description, and task outline for the proposed activities
- ◆ Justify how the proposed activities meet one or more of the desired outcomes in Table 3; or other potential outcomes
- ◆ Include a list of deliverables that will result from the proposed activities, including required final reporting obligations (see below in Section VII. Grant Agreement and Appendix A of this RFP)
- ◆ A description of the key milestones of proposed activities and any related assumptions for the proposal schedule

D. Statement of Qualifications

The proposal must include a discussion of the entities that are anticipated to be tasked to undertake the proposed activities. The discussion must include a statement of qualifications for each activity that demonstrates that each entity tasked possesses the appropriate qualifications to interface and work with DAC members. This section must not exceed 5,000 characters and should include the following:

- ◆ List the necessary qualifications of staff, community-based organizations, or consultants that are needed to work on the proposed activities
- ◆ Identify participants, if known, including the applicant, RWMG representatives, community-based organizations, or consultants who currently work with DACs. If known, describe the existing participant's qualifications with the following criteria:
 - Past performance on similar projects at a regional, community or local level
 - Qualifications in and knowledge of DAC involvement activities listed in Table 3
 - Ability to proactively manage the proposed activities to ensure a timely and successful completion

E. Schedule

Provide a schedule of the key milestones for the proposed activities. Gantt charts, bar charts, or other graphic displays are acceptable. Proposed activities should be completed within three years of grant award. The schedule should show the anticipated overall start date and end date of each proposed activity and also show quarterly and final reporting obligations. Activity sub-task schedule dates are not required.

F. Budget

Provide a budget in tabular form for the proposal. This budget must include the anticipated overall budget for each proposed activity and the basis of estimate for the activities described within the budget. The budget must also include the estimate for all grant administrative costs, if any.

V. ELIGIBILITY

A. Eligible Applicants

The Funding Area applicant must be an eligible applicant as defined in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines Sections II.A and B, Appendix B, and shown below:

- ◆ Public agencies
- ◆ Non-profit organizations
- ◆ Public utilities
- ◆ Federally recognized Indian Tribes
- ◆ State Indian Tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission's Tribal Consultation list
- ◆ Mutual Water Companies

B. Eligible Costs

Costs incurred after award date are eligible for reimbursement. Eligible costs include, but are not limited to, expenditures for involvement activities as discussed below and travel costs at the state rate. Grantees are encouraged to limit grant administrative costs. Grant administrative costs include coordinating contractual obligations with DWR, quarterly reporting, and submitting invoices. DWR encourages grant administrative costs are no more than 5 percent of the total grant amount.

C. Eligible Activities

Table 3 provides guidance to applicants on the types of activities that are eligible for State reimbursement under this Program. Proposed activities submitted that fall outside of this guidance will need to be justified in the proposal for DWR to approve of the proposed activity and intended outcome. Applicants are encouraged to review previous DAC pilot projects funded by the IRWM Grant Program and other DAC Reports and Studies as cited in Appendix A of the 2016 IRWM Guidelines. Applicants are encouraged to review the documents and build off the prior works and general recommendations to the extent feasible.

Ineligible activities and costs are not reimbursable by this Program and include, but are not limited to, the following items:

- ◆ Application preparation costs for funding opportunities not consistent with the purposes of the Proposition 1 IRWM funding
- ◆ Meals not directly related to travel
- ◆ Payment of stipends

Table 3 – Eligible DAC Involvement Activities		
General Activity	Examples of Activity	Desired Outcome
Needs Assessments (required)	Surveys or meetings with community members to identify water management needs	Needs Assessments provide better understanding of water management needs to help direct resources and funding
Education	Translation or interpretive services for information sharing, water campaigns for community, RWMGs education on DAC needs	Education and interpretive services provide better understanding by community members or RWMGs of water management needs
Community Outreach	Public meetings open to DAC community members, door-to-door outreach	Outreach increases participation in IRWM planning or project development activities
Engagement in IRWM Efforts	DAC regional engagement coordinator role, DAC Advisory Committee to RWMG, DAC representatives in governance	Engagement activities increases activity and roles of DACs in RWMG decision making and increased participation in IRWM efforts
Facilitation	Facilitated RWMG meetings, facilitated project development meetings	Facilitation services encourage participation and stakeholders resolving or overcoming obstacles in communicating needs
Technical Assistance	Service provider trainings, local circuit rider programs to train water and wastewater staff	Technical, financial, or managerial assistance results in community staff able to support local decision making, knowledge, and skills
Governance Structure	Evaluation of governance structures and related plan financing, assessment of DAC involvement in decision making processes	Evaluation of RWMG governance to ensure DAC participation in IRWM regardless of ability to contribute financially
Site Assessment	Water quality assessments, median household income surveys, data and mapping activities	Site assessment results in knowledge gained by community staff on water management needs and data for project development
Enhancement of DAC aspects in IRWM plans	Development of Funding Area-wide DAC plan to be utilized as a unified approach for all IRWM plans	IRWM plan DAC-related changes result in IRWM plan updates that support the RWMG's understanding of DAC needs
Project Development Activities or Construction	Planning activities, environmental compliance, pre-construction engineering/design activities, or construction activities	Project development activities for future implementation/construction funding or construction activities

VI. PROPOSAL AND AWARD PROCESS

A. Funding Area Coordination

Prior to submitting a proposal to DWR, prospective applicants should, at a minimum, undertake the following actions, in conjunction with DACs, RWMG(s), community based organizations, and stakeholders:

- ◆ Discuss interest in being the Grantee for execution and management of the agreement
- ◆ Develop an initial list of potential involvement activities
- ◆ Evaluate whether the initial list of potential involvement activities aligns with the eligible activities listed below or whether those activities are ineligible

DWR will host a DAC Involvement “Call for Proposals” Workshop(s) prior to proposal submittals to discuss with Funding Area stakeholders the level of detail to be included in the proposals and expectations of this Program. The workshop information will be listed on the Upcoming Events on the website listed in the Foreword.

B. Proposal Review and Approval

Applicants should prepare and submit a proposal as based on the information requested in Section IV of this RFP. Complete proposals must be submitted in Microsoft Word format to DWR via email listed in the Foreword. Once proposals are submitted, DWR, in coordination with the State Water Resources Control

Board (SWRCB), will review the materials for its responsiveness to this RFP and then contact the Funding Area applicant to schedule a coordination meeting, if necessary. At this meeting, DWR may ask general questions regarding the proposal development process and discuss comments pertaining to the submittal. The Funding Area applicant and DWR may have additional meetings regarding any needed proposal changes to ensure the proposed activities are appropriate for this Program. Throughout proposal development and implementation, DWR expects broad participation by the applicant, members of DACs or community-based organizations, RWMG representatives, and stakeholders.

Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Each proposal will be evaluated based on the following criteria as being sufficient or not sufficient pertaining to responsiveness to the RFP.

- ◆ **Applied Nature of the Proposal.** The extents to which the proposed activities are structured to assist DACs, identify community water management needs, and meet the objectives of this Program.
- ◆ **Relevance and Importance.** The extent to which the regions develop the DAC involvement activities to adequately address the most relevant and important community needs, consistent with the intent of this RFP.
- ◆ **Feasibility.** (1) The extent to which the proposal objectives, methodologies, designs, and involvement activities are adequately and completely articulated; and (2) the likelihood of success given the methods and time frame proposed.
- ◆ **Past Performance.** The extent to which the proposal (1) provides an explanation of past IRWM practices of involving DACs; and (2) builds upon existing DAC involvement and engagement.
- ◆ **Qualifications of the Staff/Consultants.** The extent to which the qualifications of the staff/consultants are commensurate with the proposed activities and are experienced in regional, community, and local knowledge of DAC needs. The use of facilities and equipment must be justified.

Proposal Approval and Grant Award

Once all requirements of the RFP are met and DWR approves the proposal, DWR will announce awards by issuing a commitment letter on a per Funding Area basis. If an acceptable proposal is not developed in a timely manner, DWR may directly expend the funds to support DAC involvement actions within the relevant Funding Area or the Funding Area funds will remain un-awarded until such time that a responsive proposal is submitted. For this program only, the approval of grant awards has been delegated from DWR's Director to the Chief of the Division of IRWM; thereby modifying Section IV.D, Volume I of the 2016 IRWM Guidelines .

VII. GRANT AGREEMENT

After the grant award is approved, an agreement will be developed and executed between the DWR and the Grantee; funds will not be disbursed until there is an executed agreement. An agreement template will be posted on the DAC Involvement website as referenced in the Foreword.

As part of the grant agreement, the Funding Area Grantee will be required to submit quarterly progress reports, invoices, and deliverables. As part of reporting results on activity performance, DWR will host semi-annual coordination conference calls with the 12 Grantees. DWR will also request formal visits or meetings to monitor activities through the duration of the agreement. As part of the grant agreement, deliverables and a Final Report that includes a Funding Area-wide Needs Assessment will be required (see Appendix A). Funding Areas shall be requested by DWR to provide a presentation of completed activities near the end of the activities, prior to termination of the agreement.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A includes the templates for the Final Report and the Funding Area-wide Needs Assessment. The Funding Area may modify the Needs Assessment template based on the specific needs identified by the Funding Area in consultation with DWR.

FINAL REPORT TEMPLATE

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Stakeholder Summary
 - a. General description of water management needs of DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities at the Funding Area learned from the activities performed in this program
 - b. General summary of DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities involved in IRWM efforts through this Program
 - c. Map(s) identifying all DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities with IRWM regions learned from the activities performed in this program
- III. Involvement Activity Summary
 - a. General description of involvement activities performed in this Program, including both successful and unsuccessful involvement activities
 - b. Identification of projects developed from the DAC involvement activities, if applicable
- IV. Findings
 - a. Needs Assessment
 - i. Narrative summary of community characteristics identified and specific community water management needs and resources (technical, managerial, and financial) to address the needs of DACs, EDAs, and underrepresented communities
 - ii. Needs Assessment template table filled in (at the community level)
 - b. Identification of ongoing barriers for DAC involvement in IRWM efforts
 - c. Recommendations for water managers on future DAC involvement activities in IRWM efforts
- V. Looking into the Future
 - a. Next steps for the IRWM regions to continue DAC involvement efforts
- VI. References

NEEDS ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Example Tables - May be modified to best fit specific needs
Identify the following for DAC communities within the Funding Area:

Community Characteristics					Drinking Water							Wastewater		Stormwater	Other		Water System Financing	
Community	County	IRWM region	Describe community characteristics (i.e. MHI, population, or other DAC indicators)	Describe involvement with local IRWM Governance	Source(s) of water	Estimate number of private wells	Estimate number of public wells	Water supply treatment (i.e. carbon, RO, etc.)	Accessible for community (y/n)	Affordable for community (y/n)	Identify any drinking water system issues	Type of system	Describe any insufficient wastewater system issues	Identify stormwater/ urban water runoff/ flood management issues	Identify drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater regulatory/ compliance issues	Identify other conditions/ issues (drought, etc.)	Identify the rate structure (i.e. block, tiered)	Describe system financing needs (i.e. operation and maintenance costs)
1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6																		
7																		
8																		
9																		
10																		

*Note: Multiple rows can be used to describe the current characteristics of a community

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
DIVISION OF INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWVG Meeting No. 13
August 19, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group
From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Subject: Draft Upper Feather River IRWM Plan
Date: August 15, 2016

INTRODUCTION/PROCESS

The Draft Upper Feather River IRWM Plan was posted to the website on Friday, August 12, 2016. Email notifications with a link to the online Draft Plan were sent to the contact lists for all workgroups, the Tribal Advisory Committee, stakeholders, and Regional Water Management Group members. Hard copies of the Draft Plan are available for viewing at the Plumas and Sierra County offices, as well as the City of Portola offices.

The 30-day public comment period for the Draft Plan will run from August 15, 2016 to September 14, 2016 at 5:00pm. All comments will be provided to the RWVG, reviewed, addressed, and the UFR IRWM Plan finalized. The RWVG will consider the Final UFR IRWM Plan for adoption at a meeting, date TBD.

Upon RWVG adoption, a letter will be mailed to the MOU entities and agencies requesting formal adoption of the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan. As a reminder, all project sponsors must adopt the IRWM Plan in order to be eligible to submit projects for IRWM funding opportunities.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

The Grant Agreement work plan includes two public meetings on the Draft Plan, which have been scheduled in Chester and Portola. The Chester meeting will be held at the Almanor Recreation Hall on August 1, 2016 from 6:00-8:00pm. The Portola meeting will be held at City Hall on September 1, 2016 from 6:00-8:00pm. A public notice (attached) was sent to the Plumas, Lassen, and Sierra County newspapers, and will run the week of August 15th.

REQUEST

Informational and/or direction to staff.

Attachments: Draft Plan Table of Contents
Public Notice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.0	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1	Background	1-1
1.2	History, Purpose, and Status of the California IRWM Program	1-2
1.3	Purpose and Vision.....	1-5
1.4	Regional and Statewide Priorities for IRWM Program	1-6
1.5	Upper Feather River Planning Process.....	1-8
1.5.1	Plan Organization	1-11
1.5.2	Plan Adoption	1-12
CHAPTER 2.0	Governance, Stakeholder Involvement, Coordination.....	2-1
2.1	Introduction.....	2-1
2.2	Governance.....	2-1
2.2.1	Memoranda of Understanding and Entities Adopting the UFR IRWM Plan	2-1
2.3	Plan Governance Structure.....	2-2
2.3.1	Regional Water Management Group.....	2-3
2.3.2	Workgroups	2-5
2.3.3	Decision-making	2-6
2.3.4	Plan Adoption	2-7
2.4	Stakeholder Participation in the Plan Process	2-7
2.5	Stakeholder and Public Involvement.....	2-7
2.5.1	Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities	2-8
2.5.2	Outreach to Native American Tribes	2-8
2.6	Communication Plan	2-8
2.6.1	Methods, Technology and Information Access	2-8
2.7	Coordination	2-9
2.7.1	Adjacent IRWM Regions	2-9
2.7.2	State and Federal Agencies	2-9
CHAPTER 3.0	Region Description.....	3-2
3.1	Introduction.....	3-2
3.2	Explanation of Regional IRWM Boundary	3-2
3.2.1	Jurisdictional Boundaries	3-2
3.2.2	Physical Boundaries	3-7
3.2.3	Neighboring/Overlapping IRWM Region Boundaries	3-9
3.3	Social and Cultural Characteristics of the Regional Community.....	3-11
3.3.1	Population and Demographics.....	3-11

3.3.2	Disadvantaged Communities.....	3-12
3.3.3	Native American Tribes	3-15
3.3.4	Economic Conditions and Trends	3-16
3.3.5	Social and Cultural Values.....	3-16
3.4	Environmental Setting.....	3-18
3.4.1	Climate and Precipitation	3-18
3.4.2	Topography, Geology and Soils.....	3-18
3.4.3	Terrestrial Ecosystems.....	3-19
3.4.4	Aquatic Ecosystems and Fisheries.....	3-22
3.4.5	Endangered and Special-Status Species	3-23
3.4.6	Invasive Species.....	3-27
3.4.6	Role of Wildfire.....	3-28
3.5	Description of Watersheds and Water Systems.....	3-29
3.5.1	Watersheds and Groundwater Basins.....	3-29
3.5.2	Hydrology and Surface Water Resources	3-44
3.5.3	Groundwater Resources.....	3-45
3.5.4	Runoff Generation and Water Balance.....	3-45
3.5.5	Droughts and Floods.....	3-46
3.5.6	Climate Effects on Water Supply	3-49
3.5.7	Water Supply and Demand	3-49
3.6	Water-Related Infrastructure.....	3-52
3.6.1	Surface Water Infrastructure	3-52
3.6.2	Groundwater Infrastructure	3-57
3.6.3	Wastewater Infrastructure.....	3-57
3.7	Water Quality.....	3-57
3.7.1	Water Quality Regulations	3-57
3.7.2	Current Water Quality Conditions.....	3-59
CHAPTER 4.0	Regional Water Issues.....	4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	Regional Water Issues.....	4-1
4.2.1	Agricultural Lands Stewardship.....	4-1
4.2.2	Floodplains, Meadows, Waterbodies.....	4-4
4.2.3	Municipal Services.....	4-8
4.2.4	Uplands and Forest	4-11
4.2.5	Capacity	4-18

4.3	Conflicts in the Region.....	4-21
CHAPTER 5.0	Goals and Objectives.....	5-1
5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Development of Goals and Objectives.....	5-1
5.2.1	Process for developing Goals and Objectives.....	5-1
5.2.2	Prioritization of Goals and Objectives.....	5-2
5.3	Goals, Objectives and Performance Metrics.....	5-2
5.3.1	Goals and Objectives.....	5-2
5.3.2	Performance Metrics.....	5-3
5.4	Plan Integration of Goals and Objectives.....	5-4
5.4.1	Regional Issues.....	5-4
5.4.2	Resource Management Strategies.....	5-16
5.4.3	Implementation Projects.....	5-17
5.5	Relationship of Plan Objectives to Climate Change.....	5-22
CHAPTER 6.0	Resource Management Strategies.....	6-1
6.1	Introduction.....	6-1
6.2	Selected RMSs and Applicability to Region.....	6-2
6.2.1	Reduce Water Demand.....	6-2
6.2.2	Improve Flood Management.....	6-3
6.2.3	Improve Operations Efficiency and Transfers.....	6-4
6.2.4	Increase Water Supply.....	6-7
6.2.5	Improve Water Quality.....	6-9
6.2.6	Practice Resource Stewardship.....	6-13
6.2.7	People and Water.....	6-17
6.2.8	Other Strategies.....	6-19
6.3	Strategies not Applicable to the Upper Feather River Region.....	6-21
6.4	Strategy Recommendations.....	6-22
6.4.1	Process.....	6-22
6.4.2	Matrix of Recommendations.....	6-22
CHAPTER 7.0	Land Use and Water Planning.....	7-1
7.1	Introduction.....	7-1
7.1.1	Plan Area.....	7-2
7.1.2	Watershed Characteristics.....	7-3
7.1.3	Water Supply.....	7-3
7.1.4	Regional Land Use and Water Planning.....	7-3

7.2	Current Coordination between Land Use and Water Planning Entities	7-12
7.2.1	Westwood Community Services District.....	7-12
7.2.2	Sierraville Public Utility District.....	7-12
7.2.3	Plumas-Eureka Community Services District	7-12
7.2.4	City of Portola	7-12
7.2.5	Land and Water Use Patterns in the Region.....	7-13
7.2.6	Population Growth and Water Demand Trends in the Region	7-14
7.2.7	Coordination with State and Federal Planning Efforts.....	7-17
7.2.8	Local Planning Relationship to the IRWMP.....	7-19
7.2.9	Plan Area Evaluated in the Upper Feather IRWMP.....	7-19
7.2.10	IRWMP Participation.....	7-20
7.2.11	Programs, Policies, Standards, and Procedures.....	7-22
7.2.12	Consistency between IRWMP and Local Plan Goals.....	7-31
7.3	Plan in Relation to Neighboring Regional Planning Efforts.....	7-32
7.4	Recommendations to Improve Coordination	7-32
CHAPTER 8.0	Climate Change	8-1
8.1	Introduction.....	8-1
8.1.1	Regulatory Framework.....	8-2
8.1.2	Chapter Resources	8-3
8.2	Climate Change Trends.....	8-3
8.2.1	Introduction	8-3
8.2.2	Wildfire.....	8-6
8.2.3	Water Supply	8-7
8.2.4	Water Demand.....	8-8
8.2.5	Water Quality	8-9
8.2.6	Flooding.....	8-9
8.2.7	Ecosystem Habitat	8-10
8.3	Regional Climate Change Vulnerabilities	8-11
8.3.1	Water Demand.....	8-11
8.3.2	Water Supply	8-14
8.3.3	Water Quality	8-20
8.3.4	Flooding.....	8-23
8.3.5	Ecosystem and Habitat Vulnerability	8-25
8.3.6	Hydropower	8-29
8.3.7	Vulnerability Assessment Summary	8-30

8.4	Prioritizing Vulnerabilities.....	8-32
8.5	Further Data Gathering and Analysis of the Prioritized Vulnerabilities.....	8-34
8.6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and UFR Project Development and Selection.....	8-34
CHAPTER 9.0 Project Development and Review Process		9-1
9.1	Introduction.....	9-1
9.2	Project Development.....	9-2
9.2.1	Project Submission.....	9-2
9.2.2	Targeted Communities: Project Development Process	9-2
9.2.3	Integration Process	9-3
9.3	Project Review Process	9-4
9.3.1	Project Review Factors.....	9-4
9.3.2	Project Review Steps	9-5
9.3.3	Ranking and Scoring	9-6
9.3.4	Documenting the Projects	9-6
9.4	Project Selection for Funding Opportunities	9-15
9.5	Implementation and Updating Project Lists.....	9-16
CHAPTER 10.0 Impacts and Benefits		10-1
10.1	Introduction.....	10-1
10.2	Plan-level Impacts and Benefits	10-2
10.2.1	Plan-level Benefits.....	10-2
10.2.2	Plan-level Impacts	10-4
10.3	Benefits and Impacts for DACs and Native American Tribes.....	10-4
10.3.1	Benefits to DACs and Native American Tribes	10-5
10.3.2	Impacts to DACs and Native American Tribes	10-6
10.4	Project-level Impacts and Benefits.....	10-6
10.4.1	Project-level Benefits.....	10-6
10.4.2	Project-level Impacts.....	10-7
10.5	Impacts from Failure to Implement the Plan	10-7
10.6	Interregional Benefits and Impacts.....	10-8
10.6.1	Interregional Benefits.....	10-8
10.6.2	Interregional Impacts.....	10-8
CHAPTER 11.0 Plan Implementation, Performance, Monitoring and Data Management.....		11-1
11.1	Introduction.....	11-1
11.2	Plan Performance and Monitoring.....	11-2
11.2.1	Process for Plan Evaluation.....	11-2

11.2.2	Plan Performance Measures.....	11-4
11.3	Project Performance and Monitoring	11-10
11.3.1	Project-Specific Monitoring Plans.....	11-10
11.4	Data Management Standard	11-13
11.4.1	Data Needs and Typical Data Collection Techniques.....	11-13
11.4.2	Data Submission to the Website	11-15
11.4.3	Stakeholder Access to Data	11-15
11.4.4	Data Quality Control.....	11-15
11.4.5	Integrating Data into State Databases.....	11-16
CHAPTER 12.0	Finance	12-1
12.1	Introduction.....	12-1
12.1.1	Finance IRWM Standard.....	12-1
12.1.2	Funding History	12-1
12.2	Program-Level Funding Sources.....	12-4
12.3	Project-Level Funding Sources	12-5
12.4	Project Operations and Maintenance Funding Sources.....	12-9
CHAPTER 13.0	Technical Analysis	13-1
13.1	Introduction.....	13-1
13.2	Review of Mandatory Documents.....	13-2
13.2.1	Federal Resources.....	13-2
13.2.2	State Resources	13-4
13.2.3	Local and Regional Plans.....	13-7
13.3	Review of Other Data	13-11
13.4	Analysis of Data Gaps.....	13-11
13.4.1	Conjunctive Water Use & Management Resources.....	13-12
13.4.2	Recreation Planning Resources.....	13-12
13.4.3	Water Supply and Management Plans.....	13-13

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 1	Voter-approved Bond Measures – Integrated Water Management	1-3
Figure 1 2	IRWM Planning Process Overview	1-10
Figure 2-1.	Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Governance Structure	2-3
Figure 3 1	Map of Upper Feather River IRWM Region.....	3-2
Figure 3 2	Map of Counties within the Upper Feather River IRWM Region.....	3-4

Figure 3 3 Map of Water and Wastewater Districts in the Upper Feather River IRWM Region.....	3-7
Figure 3 4 Map of Neighboring IRWM Regions	3-9
Figure 3 5 Disadvantaged Communities in the UFR Region.....	-13
Figure 3 6 Map of vegetation communities in the Upper Feather River Region	3-20
Figure 3 7 Subwatersheds within the Upper Feather River watershed.	3-30
Figure 3 8 Groundwater basins within the Upper Feather River watershed	3-39
Figure 3 9 Mapping of FEMA's 100-year floodplains within the Upper Feather River Region.....	3-48
Figure 3 10 Map of State Water Project facilities and hydroelectric projects.....	3-56
Figure 8-1. Mean Annual High Temperature (Fahrenheit).....	8-4
Figure 8-2. Annual Average Inches of Precipitation per Decade (A2 and B1).....	8-5
Figure 8-3. North Fork Feather River Water Year (October 1–September 30) Runoff.....	8-14
Figure 8-4. North Fork Feather River April–July Runoff	8-15
Figure 8-5. Harkness Flat Snow Course April 1 Snow Water Equivalent and November 1 through March 31 Precipitation at Canyon Dam.....	8-16

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1 Statewide Priorities, Proposition 1 Guidelines.....	1-5
Table 1-2 Proposition 84 and 1 standards discussed in the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan Update.....	1-10
Table 3-3. Counties within the Upper Feather River Watershed	3-3
Table 3-4. Agency Services within the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	3-5
Table 3-5 Disadvantaged Communities in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	3-12
Table 3-6 Vegetation and Land Cover in the Upper Feather River Watershed IRWM Plan Area.....	3-19
Table 3-7 Common fish species in the Upper Feather River Watershed IRWM Plan Area.....	3-21
Table 3-8. Special-Status Species and Habitats in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	13-23
Table 3-9 Noxious Weeds Managed by the Plumas-Sierra County Department of Agriculture.....	3-26
Table 3-10 Major Divisions of the Upper Feather River Watershed.....	3-29
Table 3-11. Population Projections for the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	3-50
Table 3-12. Agricultural Water Use in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	3-51
Table 3-13. Dams and Diversions in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	3-53
Table 3-14. Summary of Applicable Regulations for Water Resources in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area.....	3-57
Table 3-15. Impaired Waters in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area (Clean Water Act Section 303(d))	3-17
Table 4-16 Summary of Regional Water Issues Identified by Workgroups, 2014-2015.....	4-14
Table 5-17. Agricultural Lands Stewardship Workgroup Issues and Plan Objectives	5-4
Table 5-18. Floodplains, Meadows, and Waterbodies Workgroup Issues and Plan Objectives	5-8
Table 5-19. Municipal Services Workgroup Issues and Plan Objectives	5-11

Table 5-20. Uplands and Forests Workgroup Issues and Plan Objectives	5-13
Table 5-21. Plan Objectives and Resource Management Strategies	5-15
Table 5-22 Plan Objectives and Implementing Projects	5-17
Table 6-23. Summary of Workgroup Recommendations for Resource Management Strategies.....	6-23
Table 7-1. County Acreages in the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Area	7-1
Table 7-2. Primary Land Management Agencies in the Plan Area	7-3
Table 7-3. Water Purveyors and Managers in the Plan Area	7-3
Table 7-4. Other Water Stakeholders in the Plan Area	7-5
Table 7-5. Participation in the Upper Feather IRWMP Process.....	7-19
Table 7-6. Water and Land Use Planning Documents and Programs in the Upper Feather IRWMP Region.....	7-22
Table 8-1. Climate Change Vulnerability Summary	8-30
Table 8-2. UFR Climate Change Priorities.....	8-32
Table 9-24 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan implementation project review criterion	9-4
Table 9-25 Implementation Projects for the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan	9-7
Table 10-26. Summary of Potential Regional Impacts and Benefits from Plan Implementation	10-9
Table 11-27. Plan Performance Measures and Metrics.....	11-4
Table 12-1 UFR Proposition 50-Funded Implementation Projects.....	2
Table 13-1. CWP Resource Management Strategies.....	13-4

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1-1: Organizations that have adopted/endorsed the Plan

Appendix 2-1: MOU

Appendix 2-2: Stakeholder Involvement Plan

Appendix 2-3: Tribal Engagement Plan

Appendix 3-1: Socio-Economic Assessment of the Upper Feather River Watershed

Appendix 3-2: Forest and Water Balance Study

Appendix 6-1: Linkages between RMS recommendations and Plan objectives

Appendix 7-1: General Plan consistency review

Appendix 9-1: Call for Projects, press releases

Appendix 9-2: Project Information Form, GHG worksheets

Appendix 9-3: Project Submittals

Appendix 10-1: Community Vulnerability Study

Appendix 13-1: Baseline Database

Upper Feather River IRWM Draft Plan Available for Public Review

Notice of Public Meetings

Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

The Draft Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan is available for a 30-day public review from **August 15, 2016 to September 14, 2016**.

IRWM is a collaborative effort to identify and implement water management solutions on a regional scale that increase regional self-reliance, support collaborative relationships, and manage water to concurrently achieve social, environmental, and economic objectives. One of the benefits of developing a DWR-compliant IRWM Plan is that it will support local and regional efforts to secure grant funding for projects identified as part of the planning process. A key goal of the IRWM planning process has been to garner public participation and input from residents, Tribes, and stakeholders within the region to create a Plan that reflects the priorities of communities and stakeholders in the region.

The Draft Plan can be accessed from the project website at <http://featherriver.org/draft-irwm-plan>; copies are available for reading at the offices of Plumas and Sierra counties.

Three public meetings will be held to present the Draft Plan and receive comments.

Quincy: **August 19, 2016** (regular RWMG meeting)
County of Plumas, 555 Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971

Chester: **August 31, 2016, 6:00-8:00pm** (public meeting)
Almanor Recreation Center, 400 Meadowbrook Loop , Chester, CA 96020

City of Portola: **September 1, 2016, 6:00-8:00pm** (public meeting)
City Hall, 35 Third Avenue, Portola, CA 96122

Comments on the Draft Plan are encouraged and should be submitted in writing by **September 14, 2016** to:

Uma Hinman, Project Coordinator
UFR.contact@gmail.com
555 Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 13
August 19, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group
From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Subject: Department of Water Resources Review/Acceptance Process
Date: August 15, 2016

INTRODUCTION/PROCESS

The Upper Feather River RWMG is in the unique position of preparing a Plan that will comply with both Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 IRWM Plan requirements. It was determined by Department of Water Resources (DWR) that the review process would be two-fold: 1) our DWR Grant Manager would perform the Proposition 84 compliance review, and 2) Sacramento DWR's technical review committee would perform the Proposition 1 compliance review.

Given we will be undergoing two reviews, in order to facilitate a timely review we have been sending administrative draft chapters to our Grant Manager for the past month. That initial review is nearly complete and the feedback has been very positive to date. It is anticipated that the Proposition 84 compliance review will be completed the week of August 15th, at which time we will coordinate with Sacramento DWR to begin the Proposition 1 compliance review.

The Final Proposition 1 IRWM Guidelines were released on August 1, 2016. Because of the timing, we have been working with the Draft Proposition 1 Guidelines. Attached for information is a matrix identifying changes and updates from the Proposition 84 to Proposition 1 IRWM guidelines.

Staff will keep the RWMG informed of the DWR compliance review.

REQUEST

Informational.

Attachments: Changes to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards
IRWM Plans Standard Review Form

TABLE 4: CHANGES TO 2012 IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
Region Description	2012 Guideline (GL) Requirement (if applicable): Describe and explain how the plan will help reduce dependence on the Delta supply regionally. Updated code citation for the requirement: Public Resources Code §29700-29716.	34
	2012 GL Requirement: Describe water quality conditions. Same requirement with the following additional detail pertaining to SB 985: "If the IRWM region has areas of nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination, the Plan must include a description of location, extent, and impacts of the contamination; actions undertaken to address the contamination, and a description of any additional actions needed to address the contamination (Water Code §10541.(e)(14))."	34
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Describe likely Climate Change impacts on the region as determined from the vulnerability assessment ¹ .	40
Plan Objectives	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.	35,40
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	35,40
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.	35,40
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: In evaluating different ways to meet IRWM plan objectives, where practical, consider the strategies adopted by CARB in its AB 32 Scoping Plan.	35,40
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Consider options for carbon sequestration and using renewable energy where such options are integrally tied to supporting IRWM Plan objectives.	35,40
Resource Management Strategies (RMS)	2012 GL Requirement: Consider all 29 California Water Plan (CWP) RMS criteria listed in Table 3 from the CWP Update 2009. Identify RMS incorporated in the IRWM Plan. Same requirement with the following updates: CWP Update 2013 referred to instead of 2009. Additional RMS's in the 2013 update are Sediment Management, Outreach and Engagement, and Water and Culture (for a total of 32 requirements).	36
	2012 GL Requirement: Consideration of climate change effects on the IRWM region must be factored into RMS.	36,40
	Same requirement with the following additional detail: Identify and implement, using vulnerability assessments and tools such as those provided in the Climate Change Handbook, RMS and adaptation strategies that address region-specific climate change impacts. •Demonstrate how the effects of climate change on its region are factored into its RMS. •Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions. •An evaluation of RMS and other adaptation strategies and ability of such strategies to eliminate or minimize those vulnerabilities, especially those impacting water infrastructure systems.	

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
Project Review Process	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Project's contribution to climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Include potential effects of Climate Change on the region and consider if adaptations to the water management system are necessary. •Consider the contribution of the project to adapting to identified system vulnerabilities to climate change effects on the region. •Consider changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge. •Consider the effects of sea level rise on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures. 	37,40
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Contribution of project in reducing GHGs compared to project alternatives.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Consider the contribution of the project in reducing GHG emissions as compared to project alternatives •Consider a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over the 20-year planning horizon. •Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions. 	37,40
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American Tribal communities.	50
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Contain policies and procedures that promote adaptive management and, as more effects of Climate Change manifest, new tools are developed, and new information becomes available, adjust IRWM plans accordingly.	36,41
Local Water Planning	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Discuss how the plan relates to these other planning documents and programs.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail:</p> <p>"It should be noted that Water Code § 10562 (b)(7) (i.e. SB 985) requires the development of a stormwater resource plan and compliance with these provisions to receive grants for stormwater and dry weather runoff capture projects. Upon development of the stormwater resource plan, the RWMG shall incorporate it into IRWM plan. The IRWM Plan should discuss the processes that it will use to incorporate such plans. This requirement does not apply to DACs with a population of 20,000 or less and that is not a copermittee for a municipal separate stormwater system national pollutant discharge elimination system permit issued to a municipality with a population greater than 20,000." Minor wording differences - e.g. Groundwater Sustainability Plan example in the 2016 Guidelines instead of Groundwater Management Plan in the 2012 Guidelines.</p>	59 - 60
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Consider and incorporate water management issues and climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies from local plans into the IRWM Plan.	37,40
Local Land Use Planning	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Demonstrate information sharing and collaboration with regional land use planning in order to manage multiple water demands throughout the state, adapt water management systems to climate change, and potentially offset climate change impacts to water supply in California.	37,41
Native American Tribes and Stakeholder Involvement	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Contain a public process that provides outreach and opportunity to participate in the IRWM plan.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "Native American Tribes – It should be noted that Tribes are sovereign nations, and as such coordination with Tribes is on a government-to-government basis."</p>	38

IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Plan Standards: Updates to 2012 IRWM Plan Standards	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Identify process to involve and facilitate stakeholders during development and implementation of plan regardless of ability to pay; include barriers to involvement.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "Stakeholder Involvement" in the 2012 Guidelines is changed to "Native American Tribe and Stakeholder Involvement" in the 2016 Guidelines and Tribes are referred to specifically.</p>	38
Climate Change	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Evaluate IRWM region's vulnerabilities to climate change and potential adaptation responses based on vulnerabilities assessment in the DWR Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "At a minimum, the vulnerability evaluation must be equivalent to the vulnerability assessment contained in the Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, Section 4 and Appendix B."</p>	40,66 - 68
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Provide a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "At a minimum, that process must determine a project's ability to help the IRWM region reduce GHG emissions as new projects are implemented over a 20-year planning horizon and consider energy efficiency and reduction of GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives."</p>	40,66 - 68
	<p>2012 GL Requirement: Include a list of prioritized vulnerabilities based on the vulnerability assessment and the IRWM's decision making process.</p> <p>Same requirement with the following additional detail: "A list of prioritized vulnerabilities which includes a determination regarding the feasibility for the RWMG to address the priority vulnerabilities."</p>	40,66 - 68
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff and recharge.	40
	Additional requirement, not in 2012 GL: Areas of the State that receive water imported from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, the area within the Delta, and areas served by coastal aquifers must also consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	40

1. The vulnerability assessment contained in the Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, Section 4 and Appendix B in 2016 Guidelines.

V. IRWM PLAN STANDARDS REVIEW FORM

IRWM planning regions must have an IRWM Plan that has been reviewed and deemed consistent with the IRWM Plan Standards by DWR for eligibility to receiving Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant funding. DWR will use this IRWM Plan Standards Review Form, which can be found at the link in Volume 1, Appendix A and represented in Table 7, to ensure a consistent assessment of whether the 2016 IRWM Guidelines are being addressed in the IRWM Plan. The form contains a checklist for each of the 16 Plan Standards and narrative evaluations where required. The evaluation is pass/fail; there is no numeric scoring. Each Plan Standard is either sufficient or not, based on its associated requirements. Each Standard consists of between one and fifteen requirements. A Yes or No is automatically calculated in each Plan Standard header based on the individual requirement evaluations. In general, a passing score of "C" (i.e. 70% of the requirements for a given Plan Standard) is required for a Standard to pass. Standards with only one or 2 requirements will need one or both of those requirements to pass. Standards with 3 requirements will need at least 2 of the requirements to pass. Standards with 4 or 5 requirements will need at least 3 to pass. Some plan elements are legislated requirements. Such plan elements must be met in order to be considered consistent with plan standards. A summary of the sufficiency of each Standard is automatically calculated on the Standards Summary worksheet. A "No" evaluation indicates that a Standard was not met due to insufficient requirements comprising the Standard. The evaluation for each Plan Standard and any associated insufficiencies is automatically compiled on the Standards Summary page. Additional reviewer comments may be added at the bottom of each standards work sheet.

Note: This review form is meant to be a tool used in conjunction with the relevant IRWM Grant Program Guidelines document to assist in the evaluation of IRWM plans. It is not designed to be a substitute for the guidelines document itself. Reviewers must use the relevant guidelines in determining plan consistency.

Table 7 Plan Standards Review Tool Content		
DEFINITION OF TABLE HEADINGS		
IRWM Plan Standard:	As named in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.	
Overall Standard Sufficient:	This field is either "YES" or "NO" and is automatically calculated based on the "Sufficient" column described below. If all fields are "y", the overall standard is deemed sufficient. Any entry other than a "y" in the Sufficient column (i.e. "n", "?", not sure, more detail needed, etc.) results in a NO.	
Plan Standard Requirements Which Must Be Addressed	Fields with an asterisk * are required by legislation to be included in an IRWM Plan.	
Requirement	Requirements are taken directly from the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.	
Included	Is the Guideline Requirement included in the IRWM Plan? The options are: y = yes, requirement is included in the IRWMP; or n = no, requirement is not included in the IRWMP. If only y or n then presence/absence of the requirement is sufficient for evaluation. If there is a "q" (qualitative) then add a brief narrative, similar to a Grant Application Review public evaluation or supporting information.	
Plan Standard Source		
2016 IRWM Guidelines/Source Page(s)	Page(s) in the Guidelines (2016 IRWM Guidelines) which pertain to the Requirement.	
Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	The CWC or other regulations that pertain to the Requirement, if applicable . This is for reference purposes. The cell links to a weblink of the regulatory code.	
Evidence of Sufficiency		
Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	The page(s) or sections in the IRWM Plan where information on the Requirement can be found. This can be specific paragraphs or entire chapters for more general requirements.	
Brief Qualitative Evaluation Narrative	Supporting information for the Requirement if a "q" is in the Included column. This can be just a few sentences or a paragraph and can be taken directly from the IRWM Plan. Comments or supporting information may be entered regardless of whether required.	
Sufficient	Is the Guidelines requirement sufficiently represented in the IRWM Plan (y/n).	
IRWM Plan Standards Review Form		
Regional Acceptance Process Planning Region:		
Regional Water Management Group:		
IRWM Plan Title: DWR Reviewer:		
ONE OR MORE PLAN STANDARDS NOT SUFFICIENT		
IRWM Plan Standard	Overall Standard Sufficient	Requirement(s) Insufficient
Governance	Yes/No	

Table 7 Plan Standards Review Tool Content		
Region Description	Yes/No	
Objectives	Yes/No	
Resource Management Strategies	Yes/No	
Integration ¹	Yes/No	
Project Review Process	Yes/No	
Impact and Benefit	Yes/No	
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Yes/No	
Data Management	Yes/No	
Finance	Yes/No	
Technical Analysis	Yes/No	
Relation to Local Water Planning	Yes/No	
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	Yes/No	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes/No	
Coordination	Yes/No	
Climate Change	Yes/No	
Additional Comments:		
1. If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per the relevant IRWM Program Guidelines.		

VI. REGION ACCEPTANCE PROCESS

DWR uses the RAP to evaluate and accept an IRWM region into the IRWM Grant Program, pursuant to Water Code §10541(f). Acceptance of a region through the RAP process is necessary for IRWM regions that anticipate applying for DWR's IRWM grant funding programs.

This section discusses When to Submit, Who Should Submit, What to Submit, How to Submit, and the RAP Review Steps.

DWR will conduct RAP evaluations on an as needed/on request basis in order to provide an opportunity to those regions that have not been accepted into the IRWM Grant Program or that have addressed any prior conditional approval requirements to be evaluated for acceptance into the IRWM Grant Program.

Events that may cause a region to have their previously approved region acceptance status suspended by DWR include but are not limited to: changes in the regional boundary, loss or addition of signatory agencies of the RWMG, continued and prolonged inactivity, and inability to self-sustain IRWM efforts, changes in statutory requirements, or changes in state water management policy. DWR will evaluate any above-listed changes on a case-by-case-basis and will make a suitable determination of the region acceptance status. In the event that DWR suspends a region's acceptance status, DWR will provide the RWMG with written notice of their suspension and the basis for that suspension.

The RWMG may also use the RAP process to formally document more ministerial actions, such as changes to the region name or minor alterations to the regional boundary.

When to Submit

An IRWM region seeking acceptance into the IRWM Grant Program may submit a complete RAP application to DWR at any time.

Who Should Submit

The RWMG, or an entity representing an IRWM, region that meets one of the following conditions should submit RAP materials on behalf of the proposed IRWM region:

- ◆ Has not already been granted region acceptance
- ◆ Has made significant modifications to the region's characteristics that necessitate reevaluation of the region

Any entity submitting RAP materials on behalf of the RWMG must have been granted specific consent by the RWMG.

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 13
August 19, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group
From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Subject: Next Meeting
Date: August 15, 2016

INTRODUCTION

It is recommended that the next RWMG meeting be held on September 30, 2016 to consider adoption of the Final UFR IRWM Plan.

This will be the last scheduled meeting of the RWMG under the Grant Agreement and will be the opportunity to address any final issues and/or provide direction for further efforts. For example, the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement RFP will be underway and the RWMG may wish to provide direction to ensure the UFR Region continues to remain engaged in that effort. Another topic for consideration may be the continued maintenance of the UFR website.

REQUEST

Direction to staff.

Calendar for year 2016 (United States)

January

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

☉: 2 ☊: 9 ☋: 16 ☌: 23 ☍: 31

February

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29					

☉: 8 ☊: 15 ☌: 22

March

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

☉: 1 ☊: 8 ☋: 15 ☌: 23 ☍: 31

April

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

☉: 7 ☊: 14 ☌: 22 ☍: 29

May

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

☉: 6 ☊: 13 ☌: 21 ☍: 29

June

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

☉: 4 ☊: 12 ☌: 20 ☍: 27

July

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

☉: 4 ☊: 11 ☌: 19 ☍: 26

August

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

☉: 2 ☊: 10 ☌: 18 ☍: 24

September

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

☉: 1 ☊: 9 ☌: 16 ☍: 23 ☎: 30

October

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

☉: 9 ☌: 16 ☍: 22 ☎: 30

November

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

☉: 7 ☌: 14 ☍: 21 ☎: 29

December

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

☉: 7 ☌: 13 ☍: 20 ☎: 29

Holidays are listed on the following page.