

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
NOVEMBER 18, 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 August 19, 2016.

ACTION AGENDA

1. PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

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

2. PROPOSITION 1 DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT COORDINATION

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

- a. Appoint a representative and alternate for participation in the DACI Coordinating Committee.
- b. Consider contributing to SWWG for coordination and development of an SOQ for applicant selection.
- c. Provide direction regarding updates and gathering feedback from RWMG throughout DACI efforts.

3. FINAL UPPER FEATHER RIVER INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Report on public comments and meetings for the Draft Plan, DWR's compliance review, and presentation of the Final Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Update 2016.

- a. Consider resolution for adoption of the UFR IRWM Plan Update 2016.
- b. Consider and direction to staff regrading a draft letter to MOU signatories encouraging formal adoption of the Final Plan.

4. NEXT STEPS

Discussion and direction regarding continuing Upper Feather River IRWM Program implementation.

ADJOURNMENT

Upper Feather River IRWM Regional Water Management Group

DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES

August 19, 2016

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

http://featherriver.org/rwmg_meetings/

Call to Order and Roll Call

Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on August 19, 2016 at 1 pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

Members Present:

Sherrie Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Terry Swofford, Plumas County Board of Supervisors
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Rick Roberti, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Roberti, Sierra Valley 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)

Members Absent:

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

Staff Present:

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

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda

None noted

Public Comment Opportunity

None noted

Announcements / Reports

None noted

CONSENT AGENDA

(Video 1, 00:1:27)

a. RWMG Approval of Meeting Minutes for June 24, 2016

Upon motion by Terry Swofford and seconded by Roger Diefendorf, the RWMG Meeting Minutes for June 24, 2016 were unanimously approved as presented.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Project Status Updates

(Video 1, 00:1:52)

Uma Hinman presented an overview of the project schedule, tasks, stakeholder and tribal outreach, and budget.

Trina Cunningham provided an update that the Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC) is currently looking at two plan chapters on fisheries and general tribal involvement and she noted that scheduling issues have made it difficult to have a TAC meeting this summer. Uma also noted that a second Tribal Consultation request has been received from Enterprise Rancheria and the Mechoopda Tribe in Butte County. Uma explained that Randy Wilson and she met with members of the Mechoopda Tribe and Enterprise Rancheria a couple months ago upon receiving the first request and another meeting has been requested for August 2016. Randy added that they are working on scheduling that meeting. Ren Reynolds, from the Enterprise Rancheria, expressed concern that the Tribes in his area have been left out of the Tribal Engagement Plan and he asked for clarification regarding how their questions and issues will be addressed. Randy responded that he will work with Uma to schedule the requested Tribal Consultation meeting. Trina Cunningham expressed interest in working together and offered for Sherri Norris and her to meet with the Tribe in Oroville to discuss specific questions. Ren explained that the Tribe wants to meet with the Project Coordinator and the County and he provided Uma with a copy of questions from the Tribe and requested a response as soon as possible because the Tribe has an upcoming meeting.

Randy Wilson mentioned that due to the on-going nature of the plan, he is working on allocating money in the budget to retain Uma Hinman Consulting to assist with the Management Group quarterly meetings after the Plan is adopted. Randy emphasized that the work is not done once the Plan is adopted.

2. Sierra Water Workgroup Memorandum of Understanding

(Video 1, 00:9:08)

Uma Hinman presented the Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which would formalize the Upper Feather River IRWM Region's membership and participation in the SWWG. Uma noted that this item was continued from the June meeting due to the number of absent RWMG members at that time. Sherrie Thrall asked staff's recommendation on whether the SWWG is the appropriate organization for the coordination efforts between the IRWM Regions for the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement funding. Uma explained that individuals from the Upper Feather River region already participate in SWWG's coordinating meetings and annual conferences and there is no monetary or participation requirement in the MOU. Sherrie Thrall noted that a lot of the questions the Management Group had are addressed under the procedural understanding section of the MOU.

Upon motion by Russell Reid and seconded by Jeffrey Greening, signing of the Sierra Water Workgroup Memorandum of Understanding was unanimously approved.

3. Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Coordination

(Video 1, 00:13:14)

Uma Hinman presented an update on the outreach and coordination efforts with other IRWM regions in the Mountain Counties Funding Area regarding the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DACI) Request for Proposal (RFP) released on August 1st and the DACI Workshop Webinar hosted by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) on August 18th. Sherrie Thrall asked if they could declare the entire IRWM region as underrepresented per the DWR definition. Discussion ensued regarding the piecemeal approach of addressing individual disadvantaged areas when the entire region is disadvantaged. Randy Wilson noted that DWR is looking for one application from a very large funding region. Uma added that

DWR was asked during the webinar how they would handle receiving more than one application from a funding region. DWR responded that they don't want to see that happen, but if it does then they would select one based on the proposal and the qualifications of the team putting it forward. Discussion ensued regarding the letter sent by the Mountain Counties Water Resources Association on August 17th requesting support for their organization to serve as the coordinating entity for the funding region and the potential for a second application to be put forth from the Sierra Water Workgroup which will be discussed at the next DACI coordinating meeting in Auburn on August 24th.

4. Public Review Draft Upper Feather River IRWM Plan

(Video 1, 00:27:06)

Uma Hinman presented the Public Review Draft of the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan. Russell Reid asked if this was a compilation of all the chapters they have reviewed and provided feedback on already throughout the process and Randy Wilson confirmed. Randy Wilson noted that he is working on allocating money in the budget to continue the Management Group website hosted by Plumas County. Uma added that the website is searchable and includes resource planning documents, studies, scientific papers, other documents that have been collected during the preparation of the plan. Sherrie Thrall asked about what information will be presented during the public meetings since the Plan is long and technical in nature. Uma responded that she anticipates providing an overview of the Plan content, the process, and future implementation. Discussion ensued regarding the difficulty of engaging the general public on such a complex project, providing information in the presentation about the funding available for projects that will directly benefit people in order to engage public interest on the topic, and ways to get the word out about the public meetings through a newspaper article, social media, listservs, and tapping into existing groups.

5. Department of Water Resources Review/Acceptance Process

(Video 1, 00:57:17)

Uma Hinman presented on the process and status of DWR's review for compliance with Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 standards. Sherrie Thrall acknowledged all the great work that went into preparing the Plan and what a big accomplishment it will be to have a Proposition 1 compliant Plan. Russell Reid acknowledged the cooperation by Plumas County in taking the lead on funding this effort. Discussion ensued regarding appreciation for the people involved in this process, the level of collaboration that was achieved, and the desire to continue serving the community.

6. Next Meeting

(Video 1, 1:05:30)

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 30th at 1pm. Russell Reid asked for a summary of the types of issues that came out of the public meetings and the public comment period for when the group considers the Final Plan at the next meeting. Joe Hoffman asked for clarification regarding a September 30th deadline referenced on page 111 of the plan and Uma responded that she would look into it. Joe asked whether each agency that is a member of the management group needs to adopt the Plan. Uma responded that she would verify the language in the MOU and clarified that only the management group needs to adopt the Plan by the Proposition 84 grant deadline of October 4th.

Adjournment

(Video 1, 1:11:31)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 pm.

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 14
November 18, 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: November 13, 2016

SCHEDULE

The contract deadline between Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District is December 31, 2016. An extension of time was granted by DWR to allow additional time to ensure the Plan also complies with Proposition 1 IRWM Guidelines and adequate review time by DWR. 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 was September 14, 2016.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

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

On November 8, 2016, the Butte County Board of Supervisors signed an MOU to address planning and management in the overlap area, determine areas of responsibility, and provide for appropriate consultation as needed. The MOU had previously been approved by Plumas County Counsel.

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 25 invoices to DWR totaling \$654,907.25 in reimbursable services, equipment purchases, and operating expenses. Approximately 96 percent of project work has been completed and the \$611,697.12 invoiced to date for professional and consultant services represents 96 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 96 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 13 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 interregional collaboration with other IRWM regions within the Mountain Counties Funding Area to address the Draft Proposition 1 DAC Involvement RFP. 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, UFR IRWM PLAN UPDATE 2016, a subcategory under the menu section DOCUMENTS, contains the Draft and Final Plans.

Task 2: Baseline Technical Study

The Baseline Technical Study constitutes the Technical Analysis chapter of the Plan (Chapter 13). This task is complete.

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.

Deer Creek Resources 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. 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. This task is complete.

Task 5: Project Development Process

A total of 79 projects were completed and included in the Final Plan to support implementation of the Plan. This task is complete.

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 were due by 5:00pm on the September 14, 2016.

DWR has completed reviewing the Draft Plan for compliance with Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 standards. As part of DWR's review process, the Draft Plan was posted on the DWR website with an additional 30 day public comment period, which ended November 1, 2016. No comments were received and the Plan was determined to be compliant with both standards.

Task 7: Grant Administration

Work under Task 7 has included the documenting of matching funds and monthly invoicing and reporting. We have submitted 25 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 December 31, 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 Final 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 Final 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 Final Plan as Appendix 3-1.

SCHEDULE

The deadline for project completion, including reporting and final invoicing, is December 31, 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
DWR Public Comment Period (30 days)	October 1, 2016	November 1, 2016
Final Hearing (<i>proposed date</i>)	<i>November 18, 2016</i>	<i>November 18, 2016</i>
Project Completion Report (Grant requirement)	November 1, 2016	December 11, 2016
Final Invoicing	November 1, 2016	December 11, 2016
Grant Agreement deadline		December 31, 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	\$ -	\$ 65,735.48	\$ 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	5/1/16-5/31/16	\$ 230.75	\$ 67.46	\$ -	\$ 22,182.08	\$ 22,480.29	\$ 2,248.03	\$ 862.25	
23	6/1/16-7/31/16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,632.12	\$ 19,632.12	\$ 1,963.21	\$ 774.13	
24	7/1/16-9/8/16	\$ -	\$ 315.89	\$ -	\$ 27,557.84	\$ 27,873.73	\$ 2,787.37	\$ 742.95	
25	5/1/16-10/31/16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,402.63	\$ 26,402.63	\$ 2,640.26	\$ 264.60	
26						\$ -	\$ -		

Total Amount Spent	\$ 34,220.00	\$ 4,136.29	\$ 4,853.84	\$ 611,697.12	\$ 654,907.25	\$ 65,490.73	\$ 33,908.30
---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Allotment Remaining	\$ -	\$ 594.71	\$ 144.16	\$ 24,010.88	\$ 24,749.75
----------------------------	-------------	------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------

% Budget Invoiced	100.00%	87.43%	97.12%	96.22%	96.36%
--------------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 14
November 18, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting

Subject: Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Coordination

Date: November 18, 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. Representatives of the Upper Feather River region have been attending DAC Coordinating Committee meetings to track and participate in the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DACI) proposal process.

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 Area's total. Round 1 is focused on DAC Involvement (DACI); the final solicitation package was released on August 1, 2016, with submittals expected by early spring; no deadline date was included in the RFP.. The intent of this first round is to ensure involvement of DACs, economically disadvantaged areas (EDAs), and 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-March 2017</i>
Approval of funding awards	Upon proposal approval

Italics denote dates 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)]. The American River Basin IRWM has indicated they will not be participating in the Mountain Counties Funding Area process.

DAC COORDINATION

The Sierra Water Workgroup hosted and facilitated an all-day DACI coordinating meeting on August 24, 2016 in Auburn. The purpose of the workshop was 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 outcome of the meeting included the following:

- SWWG to develop a draft Statement of Qualifications for soliciting an applicant for the Funding Area.
- Direction to attendees to discuss with their respective RWMGs the assignment of one representative and one alternate per Region.
- Request by SWWG to each Region to consider contributing funding for their coordination efforts.

Several representatives from the Upper Feather River IRWM Region were in attendance: Randy Wilson, Trina Cunningham, Jonathan Kusel, Leah Wills, and Uma Hinman. A summary of the meeting is included as an attachment.

A follow up conference call was held on October 31, 2016 to discuss the draft SOQ and next steps (meeting summary attached).

Representative/Alternate Appointed to Coordinating Committee

The DAC Coordinating Committee will be made up of representatives and alternates from each of the nine IRWM Regions participating in the Mountain Counties Funding Area proposal. Each RWMG will need to appoint a DAC representative and alternate who will have the authority to make decisions on behalf of their IRWM in regards to the DACI grant application. It will be the representative's responsibility to attend the DAC Coordinating Committee meetings or ensure that their alternate is fully prepared to participate in their absence. Each IRWM region will have one vote and all decisions will be brought back to their respective IRWM for concurrence.

The role of the DAC Coordinating Committee is as follows:

- Develop and issue an RFQ for potential applicants.
- Create quantitative and qualitative criteria that will be used to evaluate applicants.
- Review SOQs and rank submittals based on established criteria.
- Select an applicant.

- Create a schedule to prepare an application.
- Consult on methodology and implementation approach for the DAC grant.
- Approve the Scope of Work and Budget.
- Advise on the selection of a Project Manager.

SWWG Coordinating Budget

The SWWG has been asked by the Mountain Counties Funding Area IRWM regions to facilitate and coordinate the efforts of the DAC Coordinating Committee. Because they have no operational funding they have requested contributions from each of the IRWMs for the effort. Their estimated budget for coordinating the DACI is approximately \$7,000 (estimated budget attached). Several of the IRWM Regions have committed to contributing 10 percent, not to exceed \$700.

Future Updates

Because the RWMG will likely be meeting quarterly once the Final Plan is adopted, staff is requesting a discussion and direction regarding how best to update the RWMG on the DACI process and proposal development.

REQUEST

Staff recommends the following:

- a. Appoint a representative and alternate for participation in the DACI Coordinating Committee.
- b. Consider contributing to SWWG for coordination and development of an SOQ for applicant selection.
- c. Provide direction regarding providing updates and gathering feedback from the RWMG throughout the DACI efforts.

Attachments: August 24, 2016 DACI Coordinating Committee workshop summary
October 31, 2016 DACI Coordinating Committee conference call summary
SWWG estimated budget

Sierra Water Workgroup

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT (IRWM) / DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY (DAC) COLLABORATION WORKSHOP

Workshop Highlights

Date: Wednesday, August 24, 2016
Time: 9 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sierra Conference Room
11641 Blocker Drive
Auburn, CA

WELCOME

Sierra Water Workgroup (SWWG) Executive Director Liz Mansfield welcomed workshop participants. She shared the purpose of the meeting:

1. Understand the Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Final RFP.
2. Understand the DAC water management needs in the Mountain Counties Funding Region.
3. Provide an open, collaborative forum for DACs, RWMG(s), community-based organizations and stakeholders within the Mountain County Funding Region to discuss and select an applicant and fiscal sponsor to respond to the DWR IRWM Grant RRP for Prop 1 DAC Involvement Funding.

Ms. Mansfield described the mission of SWWG: to increase inter-regional cooperation and assist regional efforts in protecting and enhancing water quality, water supply, and watershed health. To facilitate inter-regional cooperation and collaboration, SWWG is hosting this workshop. She stressed that SWWG does **not** plan to be the DAC grant applicant.

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Jodie Monaghan, JM Consultants, introduced herself as the Facilitator. Self-introductions followed. There were representatives from eight (8) of the ten (10) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) programs in the Mountain Counties Funding Area, including:

- Cosumnes; American; Bear; and Yuba (CABY)
- Madera
- Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras (MAC)
- Southern Sierra
- Tuolumne-Stanislaus
- Upper Feather
- Yosemite-Mariposa
- Yuba

It was noted that the representative from the North Sacramento Valley IRWM was supportive of the workshop but was unable to attend because of a conflict. Ms. Mansfield also shared that the American River Basin IRWM will not be participating, since they have such a small footprint in the region and two of their water agency members are represented in the CABY Region.

Ms. Monaghan reviewed the agenda, meeting materials, housekeeping items and ground rules. She also reviewed the desired outcomes:

- Decision of whether or not to submit application for planning grant.
- Agreement on a process for coordination and collaboration with all IRWMs and DAC communities.
- Selection of an applicant and a fiscal sponsor, if possible.

OVERVIEW OF 2016 PROP 1 DAC RFP

Tracie Billington, Branch Chief, Financial Assistance Branch, Dept. of Water Resources (DWR), presented an overview of the 2016 Prop 1 Request for Proposals for Disadvantaged Community Involvement.

Tracie provided an excellent summary of the programs requirements and expectations. She covered meaningful engagement of DACs, ways to build off existing efforts, needs assessment and examples/model of involvement activities. She also described the process the state would take if more than one application was submitted from a funding area. The state could question both applications as being non-responsive (since the RFP calls for only one application from a funding area) and DWR could select another entity to do the work. She suggested that DWR would rather work with the funding area and was hopeful that DWR would not have to exercise other options.

Ms. Billington also recapped the requirements for the applicant. They must be one of the following:

- Public Agency
- Nonprofit Organization
 - 501(c)(3) qualified to do business in California
- Federally recognized Indian Tribe
- California Native American Tribe
 - Listed on Native American Heritage Commission consultation list
- Public Utility
- Mutual Water Company

Please see her full presentation on the Sierra Water Workgroup Webpage:

<http://www.sierrawaterworkgroup.org/2016-workshop---august-24.html>

DAC ACTIVITIES

To understand the outreach activities and current level of engagement with DACs in the region's IRWMs – as well as the water management needs of the DACs within each IRWM, a request was sent prior to the workshop asking IRWM representative to complete a DAC matrix. Five responses were received prior to the workshop and are attached to this summary. It was acknowledged this was a preliminary assessment and further work would be done under the auspices of DAC grant.

A representative from each IRWM shared an overview of their DAC outreach activities. The following is a brief recap:

Madera

- Jeannie Habben described Madera's DAC membership. Information on DAC membership and the DAC application can be found at: <http://www.madera-id.org/index.php/rwmg>
- She also discussed the challenges of the working with federally recognized tribes.

Yosemite-Mariposa

- Melinda Barrett discussed the outreach done to small community water systems, the result was the inclusion of 10 new projects in the 2016 Plan Update.
- She also discussed the success of the Mariposa Bio-mass project.

Upper Feather

- Uma Hinman explained the inclusion of a multitude of DACs in the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) and Municipal Services Workgroup.
- She also discussed the needs assessment survey currently in process.

CABY

- Izzy Martin discussed the extensive outreach to Nevada City and the little town of Washington to implement water infrastructure improvements.
- CABY has met one-on-one with numerous DACs and provided technical assistance for them to draft project applications.

Yuba

- Katie Burdick mentioned that DACs have been contacted but don't have the funding to participate. They have both "big" DACs who have been identified and "tiny" DACs who are mostly invisible.
- The biggest challenge facing Yuba is capacity and process fatigue.

Southern Sierra

- Steve Haze described some outreach to DACs who are mostly in the unincorporated areas.

- Their issue is that zip code census tracts are not always representative of actual demographics.

Tuolumne-Stanislaus

- Tom Trott commented that the T-Stan Advisory Committee includes DACs. They also have a DAC Committee. Outreach is conducted through the County.
- As with other IRWMs, the issue for DACs is capacity and funding.

MAC

- Dave Eggerton briefly discussed the MAC's outreach activities.

DAC OUTREACH

Jonathan Kusel, Ph.D., Executive Director, Sierra Institute for Community and Environment, presented his findings from research done with DACs in selected areas of the sierras.

Jonathan provided an expert account of general methods, and approaches to assessing the needs of DAC communities in the Sierra. He also discussed social and economic trends that will affect any needs assessment.

GRANT APPLICATION DECISION

There was unanimous agreement to submit a DAC Involvement Grant Application from the Mountain Counties Funding Area.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

A question was raised about who in the room had the authority from their respective IRWMs to make decisions about the DAC grant application. It was determined that the following representatives had officially been designated by their IRWMPS:

Madera	Jeannie Habben
Yosemite-Mariposa	Melinda Barrett
Yuba	Katie Burdick
Tuolumne-Stanislaus	Tom Trott (Alternate: Cindy Secada)
CABY	Izzy Martin and Neysa King *
Yuba	Katie Burdick *

* Designated to represent their IRWM at this workshop and report back to their IRWM.
Not authorized to vote for an applicant.

It was agreed that each IRWM will go back to their IRWM, and if not already done, designate a DAC representative and alternate who will have the authority to make decisions on behalf of their IRWM in regards to the DAC grant application. The body will be referred to as the DAC Coordinating Committee. There was also agreement that it will be the primary representative's

responsibility to attend the DAC Coordinating Committee meeting or ensure their alternate is fully prepared to participate if the primary is unable to attend.

DAC COORDINATING COMMITTEE – Decision Making

The group agreed that:

- Every IRWM has an equal voice in the Coordinating Committee. Each of the IRWMs has 1 vote, regardless of how many individuals attend from that region.
- All decisions made by the Coordinating Committee would be brought back to their respective IRWM for concurrence.

The role of the DAC Coordinating Committee was defined as:

- Develop and issue a Request for Qualifications for potential applicants.
- Create quantitative and qualitative criteria that will be used to evaluate applicants.
- Review Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) submitted, and rank submittals based on established criteria.
- Select applicant.
- Create a schedule to prepare the application.
- Consult on the methodology and implementation approach for the DAC grant.
- Approve the Scope of Work and Budget.
- Advise on the selection of a Project Manager.

GRANT APPLICANT

The group deferred a decision about selecting a grant applicant. Instead, they created the following *Concepts for Selecting an Applicant*:

- Ability to collaborate with all 10 IRWMs in the funding region.
- Knows the culture of the IRWMs including the history and process and has direct experience with IRWMs.
- Knows/has long-term experience and success with DAC outreach including individual communities and water organizations.
- Knows/has experience with tribal outreach.
- Has grant management and fiscal management experience – and the capacity - with DWR and the IRWMs.
- Familiarity with water management and natural resource characteristics of the Sierra Nevada region including:
 - Scale
 - Diversity
 - DAC knowledge and experience
 - Tribal knowledge and experience
- Interdisciplinary team with technical team capacity. Respected and trusted partner.
- Proven track record with references.

It was agreed that while there was likely no one who could meet all the *Concepts* listed, the DAC Coordinating Committee would use the Concepts to evaluate prospective applicants.

NEXT STEPS

It was agreed that SWWG would continue to coordinate meetings of the DAC Coordinating Committee. Meetings will be held in-person with the option to participate remotely using GoToMeeting, Skype or other technology. The following timeline and task list was created by participants:

Task	Responsibility	Timeframe
Send notes from this workshop to all participants and IRWMs	SWWG	1 week – by August 31, 2016
IRWMs will provide sponsorships and funding for SWWG coordination activities, as able.	All IRWMs	ASAP
Using the <i>Concepts for Selecting an Applicant</i> and DWR's guidance, draft Request for Qualifications for review by the Coordinating Committee.	SWWG	October 15 th
Each IRWM designates a DAC representative and an alternate to participate in the DAC Coordinating Committee. Each representative will have decision-making authority.	All IRWMs	October 15 th
DAC Coordinating Committee will review and comment on the Draft RFQ.	DAC Coordinating Committee Reps	November 7 th
DAC Coordinating Committee meets to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize organization structure • Draft Charter? • Develop communication protocols • Finalize RFQ • Develop applicant selection criteria 	SWWG, DAC Coordinating Committee Reps.	Mid-November
Distribute RFQ	SWWG	Mid-December
Receive Proposals; Review with individual IRWMs	SWWG, DAC Coordinating Committee	Mid-January 2017
Select applicant	DAC Coordinating Committee	Mid-January
Get letters of support from each IRWM for applicant	DAC Coordinating Committee	Mid-January

Task	Responsibility	Timeframe
Meet with applicant to develop approach	Applicant, DAC Coordinating Committee	Early February
Prepare DAC application	Applicant with support from DAC Coordinating Committee	Early March
Review DAC Application	All IRWMs	Mid-March
Finalize grant application and submit to DWR	Applicant	April 1, 2017

ATTENDEES:

Steve Haze, Southern Sierra IRWM
 John Shelton, Southern Sierra IRWM
 Jeannie Habben, Madera IRWM
 Melinda Barrett, Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM
 Tom Trott, Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM
 Ron Ringen, Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM
 Dave Eggerton, MAC IRWM
 Izzy Martin, CABY IRWM
 Neysa King, CABY IRWM
 Katie Burdick, Yuba IRWM
 Uma Hinman, Upper Feather IRWM
 Leah Wills, Upper Feather IRWM
 Randy Wilson, Upper Feather IRWM
 Tim Keesey, Lahontan Basins IRWM
 Tracie Billington, DWR
 Jennifer Watts, DWR
 Jonathan Kusel, Sierra Institute for Community and Environment (participates in Upper feather IRWM)
 Debbie Whaley, California State University, Sacramento
 Heather Knutson, Placer County Water Agency
 Julie Griffith-Flatter, Sierra Nevada Conservancy
 Kelsey Westfall, The Sierra Fund
 Peter Pumphrey, California State Bar
 Trina Cunningham, Mountain Maidu community (participates in Upper Feather IRWM)
 Lisa Dernbach

 Liz Mansfield, SWWG
 Katie Gladstein, SWWG
 Jodie Monaghan, JM Consultants

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT (IRWM) DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY (DAC) COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting Notes

Date: Monday, October 31, 2016

Time: 9 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.

Location: Conference Call

ACTION ITEMS

1. Liz Mansfield, SWWG, will contact John Woodling, American River Basin IRWM, to confirm they will not be participating in the Mountain Counties Funding Region DAC grant process. She will ask for a letter of support.
2. Liz Mansfield, SWWG, will contact Vickie Newlin, North Sac Valley IRWM, to confirm their participation in the Mountain Counties Funding Region DAC grant process.
3. Izzy Martin, CABY, will work with Jennifer Watts, DWR, to define DWR's reimbursement policy for the DAC grant.
4. Leah Wills, Upper Feather IRWM, will ask the North Coast IRWM for a copy of their DAC Grant Work Plan. Leah will send the Plan to the DAC Coordinating Committee.
5. Draft RFQ comments are due Monday, November 7th.
6. Melinda Barrett will contact John Kingsbury, Mountain Counties Water Resources Association, to determine the response they got to their request for a letter of support.
7. SWWG will send out a Doodle Poll/Survey Monkey to determine the best date and location to hold the November DAC Coordinating Committee meeting.
8. All future meeting materials will be sent to Coordinating Committee members a minimum of a week in advance of any meetings.

WELCOME

Jodie Monaghan, facilitator, welcomed the DAC Coordinating Committee representatives. She reviewed the purpose of the meeting and the agenda. The purpose of the meeting is to answer any questions about the materials that were sent including the draft Request for Qualifications (RFQ), draft Organizational Model and draft budget. She emphasized that no decisions will be made at this meeting. All decisions will be considered at the next DAC Coordinating Committee meeting, likely in November.

DAC COORDINATING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

Representatives from the Mountain Counties Funding Region reported the following representatives have officially been appointed to the Committee by their respective IRWMs:

IRWM	Primary Representative	Alternate Representative
Cosumnes, American, Bear, and Yuba (CABY)	Izzy Martin	Shelly Covert
Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras (MAC)	Rich Farrington	
Madera	Jeannie Habben	Carl Janzen
North Sac Valley		
Southern Sierra	Bobby Kamansky	Steve Haze John Shelton
Tuolumne-Stanislaus	Tom Trott	Cindy Secada
Upper Feather	Randy Wilson	
Yosemite-Mariposa	Melinda Barrett	
Yuba	Katie Burdick	Joanna Lessard

Those IRWMs without a designated alternate will work with their groups to identify and appoint an alternate.

American River Basin IRWM indicated to Liz Mansfield that they since they have such a small footprint in the region – and that two of their water agency members are represented in CABY - they will not be participating in Mountain Counties Funding Region DAC grant application process. Liz will contact Vickie Newlin, North Sac Valley IRWM, to determine their interest in participating.

DRAFT RFQ REVIEW

A few representatives commented that they did not receive the meeting materials prior to the meeting. They were sent the materials in the moment. The following comments were received:

- While some of the language could be polished, overall it is a good document.
- The project is more than just a needs assessment. The RFQ does not include some of the actions in the DWR Request for Proposal (RFP) such as:
 - Education
 - Capacity Building
 - Outreach
 - Engagement

These need to be included in the RFQ.

- DWR's reimbursement policy needs to be understood and included in the RFQ so prospective applicants can fully gauge their ability to manage the fiscal requirements of the grant.

- The total of the DAC grant for the Mountain Counties Funding Region is \$13 M. A question was asked about how much should be allocated to the needs assessment and how much should be used for actual projects. A suggestion was made to attach Table 3 from DWR's RFP to the RFQ,

Comments on the draft RFQ are due Monday, November 7th. Representatives were asked to provide comments in track changes and copy the entire group.

DRAFT ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL

Several representatives opined that the model was helpful. Others had questions about the model. It was agreed that the Organization Model would be on the November meeting agenda.

Several questions were discussed:

- Is every IRWM in the region participating? At this point, all but the American River Basin IRWM is participating. The reason is that they have such a small footprint in the Mountain Counties Finding Region and two of their water agency members are represented by CABY. Liz Mansfield will contact North Sac Valley IRWM to confirm their participation.
- How does American River Basin IRWM non-participation affect the DAC application? American River Basin IRWM has offered to write a letter of support to the DAC Coordinating Committee. If North Sac Valley IRWM decides not to participate, Liz will ask for a letter of support.
- Who all is participating in the DAC Coordinating Committee and contributing to the cost of organizing and selecting a DAC grant applicant?
 - CABY will likely contribute – possibly through Sierra Fund.
 - MAC will likely not contribute.
 - Madera is committed to paying 10% of the SWWG budget up to \$700.
 - Southern Sierra will likely not contribute.
 - Upper Feather will discuss at their next Board meeting on November 18th.
 - Yosemite-Mariposa is committed to paying 10% of SWWG's budget up to \$700.
 - Yuba is committed to paying their share and is waiting for allocations to be decided by the DAC Coordinating Committee.

NOVEMBER DAC COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

After a short discussion, it was agreed that a Doodle Poll or Survey Monkey will be sent to the Coordinating Committee to determine the best date and location to hold the November meeting. Members are encouraged to attend in person but a conference call option will be available. Meeting materials will be sent out a minimum of a week in advance of the meeting.

SCHEDULE

The schedule agreed to at the August 24th meeting is included for everyone's information.

Task	Responsibility	Timeframe
Send notes from this workshop to all participants and IRWMs	SWWG	1 week – by August 31, 2016
IRWMs will provide sponsorships and funding for SWWG coordination activities, as able.	All IRWMs	ASAP
Using the <i>Concepts for Selecting an Applicant</i> and DWR's guidance, draft Request for Qualifications for review by the Coordinating Committee.	SWWG	October 15 th
Each IRWM designates a DAC representative and an alternate to participate in the DAC Coordinating Committee. Each representative will have decision-making authority.	All IRWMs	October 15 th
DAC Coordinating Committee will review and comment on the Draft RFQ.	DAC Coordinating Committee Reps	November 7 th
DAC Coordinating Committee meets to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize organization structure • Draft Charter? • Develop communication protocols • Finalize RFQ • Develop applicant selection criteria 	SWWG, DAC Coordinating Committee Reps.	Mid-November
Distribute RFQ	SWWG	Mid-December
Receive Proposals; Review with individual IRWMs	SWWG, DAC Coordinating Committee	Mid-January 2017
Select applicant	DAC Coordinating Committee	Mid-January
Get letters of support from each IRWM for applicant	DAC Coordinating Committee	Mid-January
Meet with applicant to develop approach	Applicant, DAC Coordinating Committee	Early February
Prepare DAC application	Applicant with support from DAC Coordinating Committee	Early March

Task	Responsibility	Timeframe
Review DAC Application	All IRWMs	Mid-March
Finalize grant application and submit to DWR	Applicant	April 1, 2017

ATTENDEES:

Melinda Barrett, Yosemite-Mariposa IRWM
Katie Burdick, Yuba IRWM
Rich Farrington, MAC IRWM
Jeannie Habben, Madera IRWM
Uma Hinman, Upper Feather IRWM
Bobby Kamansky, Southern Sierra IRWM
Jonathan Kusel, Upper Feather IRWM
Joanna Lessard, Yuba IRWM
Izzy Martin, CABY IRWM
Jennifer Watts, DWR
Debbie Whaley, California State University, Sacramento
Leah Wills, Upper Feather IRWM
Randy Wilson, Upper Feather IRWM

Liz Mansfield, SWWG
Katie Gladstein, SWWG
Jodie Monaghan, JM Consultants

	Role	Project Coordination	Technical Assistance	Facilitation				
	Organization	Sierra Water Work Group	Sierra Water Work Group	JM Consultants	Total Hours per Task	Total Labor Cost	Direct Costs	Total Project Costs
	Individual	Liz Mansfield	Kate Gladstein	Jodi Monaghan				
	Rate	\$85.00	\$35.00	\$85.00				
1.0	Project Coordination							
1.1	Project team meetings (8 conference calls/month at 1 hour/each)	8	8	8	24	\$ 1,640.00	\$ -	\$ 1,640.00
	Task hours	8	8	8	24	\$ 1,640.00	\$ -	\$ 1,640.00
	Task cost	\$680.00	\$280.00	\$680.00				
2.0	IRWM Meetings (DAC Coordinating Committee)							
2.1	Draft and review meeting agenda and all materials for Mid-November meeting.	4	2	4	10	\$ 750.00	\$ -	\$ 750.00
2.2	Outreach to IRWM stakeholders and DAC Designees to discuss agenda topics	4		2	6	\$ 510.00	\$ -	\$ 510.00
2.3	Organize Logistics of meeting venue and food.	2	4	1	7	\$ 395.00		\$ 395.00
2.4	Travel	2	2	2	6	\$ 410.00	\$ -	\$ 410.00
2.5	Facilitate Meeting	3	3	5	11	\$ 785.00		\$ 785.00
2.7	Summarize, review and distribute meeting minutes	1	1	2	4	\$ 290.00	\$ -	\$ 290.00
					0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
					0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Task hours	16	12	16	44	\$ 3,140.00	\$ -	\$ 3,140.00
	Task cost	\$1,360.00	\$420.00	\$1,360.00				
3.0	Request for Qualifications Documentation							
3.1	Draft Request for Qualification	4	1	1	6	\$ 460.00	\$ -	\$ 460.00
3.2	Update RFQ with DAVC Coordinating Committee Comments	2	1	1	4	\$ 290.00	\$ -	\$ 290.00
3.3	Distribute RFQ	1						
3.4	Receive Proposals; Review with individual IRWMs	6	2		8	\$ 580.00	\$ -	\$ 580.00
3.5	Coordinate letters of support from each IRWM for applicant	8	4		12	\$ 820.00	\$ -	\$ 820.00
	Task hours	21	8	2	31	\$ 2,150.00	\$ -	\$ 2,150.00
	Task cost	\$1,785.00	\$280.00	\$170.00				
	Hours Totals	45	28	26	99	\$ 6,930.00	\$ -	\$ 6,930.00
	Cost Totals	\$ 3,825.00	\$ 980.00	\$ 2,210.00				

Note* - August 24th Workshop:

SWWG Staff Volunteered their time and Jodi was compensated for \$200 by Sierra Fund

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 14
November 18, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group
From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Subject: Final Upper Feather River IRWM Plan
Date: November 13, 2016

BACKGROUND

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 were made available for viewing at the Plumas and Sierra County offices, as well as the City of Portola office.

The 30-day public comment period for the Draft Plan was from August 15, 2016 to September 14, 2016 at 5:00pm.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Two public meetings on the Draft Plan were held in Chester and Portola on August 31 and September 1, 2016, respectively. The meetings were publicly noticed in the Plumas, Lassen, and Sierra County newspapers, which ran the week of August 15th and flyers posted in Chester and Portola. Approximately nine people attended the Chester meeting and three attended the Portola meeting. The only comment on the process received was from the Butte County representative who stated that the 30-day public review period was not long enough for them to adequately review the Draft Plan. Some discussion about Butte County's involvement within the overlap area ensued, with the conclusion being that opportunities remained and were encouraged for their involvement in the future. All other discussion was regarding future project submittals, integration of projects, and concerns regarding capacity for proposal development.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON DRAFT PLAN

Staff received a total of six public comments on the Draft Plan. Comment letters were received from the Tribal Advisory Committee, Butte County, California Sport Fishing Alliance, Trout Unlimited and Lassen National Forest. All comments and draft revisions were provided to the RWMG via email on October 5,

2016. The following table summarizes the commenting entities, their topic of comment and corresponding location of revisions.

Commenting Agency/Individual	Topic of Comments	Revisions
Tribal Advisory Committee	Traditional Ecological Knowledge; water quality; cultural importance	Chapter 2 Governance; Chapter 3 Regional Description
Butte County	Insufficient review time; MOU	Chapter 7 Land Use and Water Planning
California Sport Fishing Alliance	Fisheries	Chapter 3 Regional Description
Trout Unlimited	Fisheries	Chapter 3 Regional Description
Trout Unlimited	Water quality; fisheries	Chapter 4 Regional Water Issues
Lassen National Forest	Fisheries	Chapter 3 Regional Description

Comments were reviewed and revisions to the document incorporated. Additionally, all comment letters have been included in Appendix 1-4 of the Final Plan.

DWR CONSISTENCY REVIEW

In October DWR reviewed the Draft Plan for compliance with both Propositions 84 (2012) and 1 (2016) Standards. As part of their review process, the Draft Plan was posted on the DWR website for an additional 30-day public review period, which ended on November 1, 2016. No comments were received by DWR and the Plan passed the compliance review for both 2012 and 2016 standards. The Upper Feather River Plan Update 2016 is officially the first Proposition 1 compliant IRWM plan in the state. The DWR compliance letter is attached for information.

DWR identified one deficiency in the Draft Plan: limited water supply and demand projections for the region. Staff added a paragraph to Chapter 3 Region Description to explain the difficulty in obtaining water supply and demand projections, which was due to a number of factors: much of the region is supplied by private wells; small water districts and municipalities are below the threshold for preparing urban water management plans; and districts/municipalities are DACs and have limited funding for long range planning and assessments.

FINAL PLAN

The Final Plan was posted on the website (<http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/>) on November 9, 2016, and email notifications sent to the RWMG and all stakeholder, workgroup and Tribal email lists. Additionally, consistent with Government Code Section 6066 and Water Code 10543, a Notice of Intent to adopt the Plan was published in newspapers throughout the Region the week of November 7th (attached).

Once adopted by the RWMG, the governing bodies of each agency that is part of the RWMG responsible for the development of the IRWM Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan, including sponsoring projects included in an IRWM Plan, must formally adopt the IRWM Plan. In order to be eligible for Proposition 1 grant funding opportunities, RWMG member agencies and project sponsors must adopt the Final Plan. A draft resolution of adoption is attached for consideration.

In order to encourage MOU signatories and project sponsors to adopt the Plan through their own governing boards, staff recommends a letter and draft resolution be mailed to the MOU entities and agencies requesting their formal adoption of the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan. DWR requires proof of adoption of the Final IRWM Plan in order to establish eligibility for upcoming grant solicitations. A draft letter to MOU signatories is attached for the RWMG's review and direction.

The Final Plan will also be provided to DWR for posting on the state IRWM website.

REQUEST

Staff recommends the following actions:

- a. Approve the resolution of adoption for the Final Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Update 2016.
- b. Approve the draft letter to MOU signatories encouraging formal adoption of the Final Plan.

Attachments: DWR Compliance Review
Notice of Intent to Adopt Plan
Draft Resolution of Plan Adoption
Draft letter to MOU signatories

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

1416 NINTH STREET, P.O. BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001
(916) 653-5791



November 4, 2016

Mr. Randy Wilson
Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
County of Plumas
555 Main Street
Quincy, California 95971

Subject: Plan Review Process, Upper Feather River IRWM Plan 2016 Update

Dear Mr. Wilson:

This letter transmits the Department of Water Resources (DWR) final review of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan. The public comment period on DWR's review of the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan has closed and no public comments were received. DWR has determined that the Plan is consistent with the IRWM Planning Act and the related IRWM Plan Standards contained in the 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines. The final review is posted on the following link: <http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/prp.cfm>.

If you have any questions, please contact Ted Daum at (916) 651-9264 or Theodore.Daum@water.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Tracie L. Billington".

Tracie L. Billington, P.E. Chief
Financial Assistance Branch
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management

IRWM PLAN REVIEW FORM

INTRODUCTION

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 of the 2016 Guidelines and represented in Table 7 of the Guidelines, 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 summarized 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 2016 IRWM 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 Guidelines in determining plan consistency.

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 a footnote () are required by legislation to be included in an IRWM Plan.

Requirement	Requirements are taken directly from the 2016 IRWM Guidelines.
2016 IRWM Guidelines Source Page(s)	Page(s) in the 2016 IRWM Guidelines which pertain to the Requirement and include the regulatory or other citations where applicable.
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.
Evidence of Plan 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 Review Form

(Per 2016 Plan Standards)

IRWM Planning Region:

Upper Feather River

Regional Water Management Group:

Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group

IRWM Plan Title:

Upper Feather River IRWM 2016 Update

RESULT: PLAN IS SUFFICIENT

IRWM Plan Standard	Overall Standard Sufficient (yes/no)	One or More Requirement(s) Insufficient
Governance	Yes	
Region Description	Yes	X
Objectives	Yes	
Resource Management Strategies	Yes	
Integration *	Yes	
Project Review Process	Yes	
Impact and Benefit	Yes	
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Yes	
Data Management	Yes	
Finance	Yes	
Technical Analysis	Yes	
Relation to Local Water Planning	Yes	
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	Yes	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	
Coordination	Yes	
Climate Change	Yes	

* If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per 2016 Guidelines, p. 52.

Additional Comments:

While deemed sufficient with the 2016 Guidelines Plan Standards, DWR recommends that the following be addressed in future IRWM Plan updates:

Region Description

Water Supply Assessment, Urban Water Management Plans and compliance with SB 610 are mentioned in general but specific information on water supply and demand for all communities in the region is lacking. 7.2.6 provides detailed development projections for much of the region, but water supply and demand discussion is qualitative and limited to several individual communities. A 20-year analysis of the regions water supply and demand for all communities should be included in future updates.

IRWM Plan Standard: Governance					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
Document a governance structure to ensure updates to the IRWM Plan						
The RWMG and individual project proponents who adopted the Plan.	37	y/n	y	2.3.1, 2.3.4, Table 2-1	The Upper Feather River RWMG consists of twelve member agencies (Table 2-1), all signatories of the MOU, with seven of the agencies having statutory authority over water supply or management. Member agencies and signatories to the MOU are expected to adopt the completed plan.	y
A description of the IRWM governance structure including a discussion of whether or how Native American tribes will participate in the RWMG.	37	y/n	y	2.3.1, 2.5.2, Figure 2-1, Table 2-1, Table 2-2	Member Agency: Maidu Summit Consortium- Native American Representative-representing federally and State recognized Tribes and Maidu Native American interests. Workgroup: Tribal Advisory Committee: Cultural and Environmental issues that cross all workgroup categories; topics such as Traditional Ecological Knowledge toward restoration and stewardship. The description of the governance structure including member agencies and work groups is included in 2.3.1 and Figure 2-1. Tribal interests are represented on the RWMG board and formation of a Tribal Advisory Committee that meets regularly and provides input to the RWMG.	y
A description of how the chosen form of governance addresses and insures:						
Public outreach and involvement processes.	37	y/n/q	y	3.3	A communication plan describes communication efforts to ensure that stakeholders, project proponents, and the public remain well informed of the latest IRWM activities and accomplishments. The Stakeholder Involvement Plan (Appendix 2-2) contains a detailed communication strategy for the IRWM Plan update process.	y
Effective decision making.	37	y/n/q	y	3.3	The Plan Update process includes decision-making criteria at two levels. A majority of the RWMG membership constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business and decisions. The affirmative votes of at least a majority of the RWMG members shall be required for any action by the RWMG. A process for decision-making at the workgroup level is also established in the MOU. Decision-making by workgroup members is structured to seek consensus (approval) through super majority agreement.	y
Balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM process.	37	y/n/q	y	3.3	The governance structure and the processes of the RWMG are intended to elicit public participation and involvement in developing the IRWM Plan Update, project selection criteria, and other RWMG activities. To this end, all RWMG meetings are open to the public, in person or by video conference, and each meeting includes scheduled time for public input.	y
Effective communication – both internal and external to the IRWM region.	37	y/n/q	y	3.4, 3.5	The overall communications strategy for the UFR IRWM Plan Update is designed to be accessible, inclusive and transparent. RWMG members and stakeholders receive timely and consistent updates and information regarding Upper Feather River IRWM Program activities and goals.	y

IRWM Plan Standard: Governance					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Long term implementation of the IRWM Plan.	37	y/n/q	y	3.2.1	The Upper Feather River (UFR) RWMG is committed to an IRWM Program with a planning horizon that goes well beyond the recommended 20 years. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) brings together entities that intend to collaboratively address the long-term water resources management needs of the UFR Region.	y
Coordination with neighboring IRWM efforts and State and federal agencies.	37	y/n/q	y	3.5	The RWMG and consultant team members communicate with neighboring IRWMs to share lessons learned, process feedback, and share resources where appropriate. Additionally, members of the UFR IRWM Plan update team regularly attend and are involved in the Sierra Water Workgroup, a group that works to coordinate local and regional water planning efforts in the Sierra.	y
The collaborative process(es) used to establish plan objectives.	38	y/n/q	y	5.2.1	The RWMG's development of draft goals and objectives occurred during public meetings held on January 28 and March 27, 2015. In developing draft goals and objectives, the RWMG also reviewed and considered regionally relevant objectives contained within the California Water Code § 10540(c), the Sacramento River Basin Plan, and objectives developed by other IRWM regions.	y
How interim changes and formal changes to the IRWM Plan will be performed.	38	y/n/q	y	11.2.1	Plan Performance will be evaluated annually in a report to the RWMG by the appointed representative. Evaluation of Plan Performance will also accompany each successive IRWM implementation grant solicitation; release of updated IRWM Guidelines by DWR; update to regulations; or emergence of new data, science, or awareness of changed regional conditions that affect the issues and priorities within the Region.	y
Updating or amending the IRWM Plan.	38	y/n/q	y	11.2.2	Also Table 11-1.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline

IRWM Plan Standard: Region Description					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
If applicable, describe and explain how the plan will help reduce dependence on the Delta supply regionally.	38	y/n	n/a	--	n/a	y
Describe watersheds and water systems.	38	y/n	y	3.5		y
Describe internal boundaries.	38	y/n	y	3.5.1		y
Describe water supplies and demands for minimum 20 year planning horizon.	38	y/n	n/a	6.2.1, 6.2.2	Water Supply Assessment, Urban Water Management Plans and compliance with SB 610 are mentioned in general but no specific information is given for any water supply and demand in the region. 7.2.6 provides detailed development projections for much of the region, but the qualitative discussion for water supply and demand is limited to several individual communities.	n
Describe social and cultural makeup, including specific information on DACs and tribal communities in the region and their water challenges.	38	y/n/q	y	3.3	Population and demographics, Native American Tribes, and Disadvantaged Communities are described and include maps and tables.	y
Describe major water related objectives and conflicts (1).	38	y/n/q	y	4.3	The most pervasive conflict arises from the fact that disadvantaged rural communities in the region exist in an abundance of immensely valuable water resources but receive very little compensation (i.e., more disadvantaged communities have fewer resources to pursue grant funding, or the grants are geared towards more urbanized areas).	y
Explain how IRWM regional boundary was determined and why region is an appropriate area for IRWM planning.	38	y/n/q	y	3.2	The physical boundary of the IRWM Plan Area reflects the watershed- and landscape-scale issues that define the region, and provides a workable geographic scale for addressing those issues in an effective, efficient, and integrative manner for local, regional, and downstream needs and values.	y
Describe neighboring and/or overlapping IRWM efforts.	38	y/n	y	4.2.3		y
Explain how opportunities are maximized (e.g. people at the table, natural features, infrastructure) for integration of water management activities.	38	y/n	y	2.3		y
Describe water quality conditions. 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 (2).	38	y/n	y	3.7.2	Discussion of occurrence, likely source, location, and potential for impact of each component is included. Nitrates levels above the MCL have been detected in several public wells that were located within the current set-back requirement for leach fields. Both wells were replaced and no longer have nitrate detection. Low levels of nitrate, arsenic, and hexavalent chromium have been detected in areas throughout the region. No mitigation is necessary because of the low levels.	y
Describe likely Climate Change impacts on their region as determined from the vulnerability assessment.	38	y/n	y	3.5, 8.0	General climate change assessment indicated a potential for an average temperature increase in the region of up to 5 degrees F. Additionally, the assessments indicate that wider swings in temporary climatic conditions, drought, etc. are more likely. The plan includes descriptions of potential impacts to wildfires, water supply, water demand, water quality, flooding, and ecosystem habitat.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(3).

(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(14).

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Objectives					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
Through the objectives or other areas of the plan, the 7 items on pg 49 of GL are addressed (1) .	49	y/n	y	1.1, Table 1-4, various		y
Describe the collaborative process and tools used to establish objectives: - How the objectives were developed - What information was considered (i.e., water management or local land use plans, etc.) - What groups were involved in the process - How the final decision was made and accepted by the IRWM effort.	48 - 50	y/n	y	5.4.1		y
Identify quantitative or qualitative metrics and measureable objectives: Objectives must be measurable - there must be some metric the IRWM region can use to determine if the objective is being met as the IRWM Plan is implemented. Neither quantitative nor qualitative metrics are considered inherently better (2) .	49	y/n/q	y	11.2.1	Plan performance is evaluated annually. The annual report is available to the public on websites and other locations.	y
Explain how objectives are prioritized or reason why the objectives are not prioritized	50	y/n/q	y	5.2.2	The RWMG chose not to prioritize Plan objectives, determining that all of the objectives had equal weight and that to prioritize them would limit the potential breadth of stakeholder interests and involvement, and ultimately support for the full potential for integrated water management.	y
Reference specific overall goals for the region: RWMGs may choose to use goals as an additional layer for organizing and prioritizing objectives, or they may choose to not use the term at all.	50	y/n	y	5.3.1		y
Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality and variability of runoff and recharge.	39	y/n	y	5.5, 6.2.2, 8.2	Climate change projections predict an increase in runoff and decrease in recharge. Objectives that will address these factors include restoring natural hydrologic functions in the watershed, reducing potential for catastrophic wildfires, protecting and enhancing groundwater recharge areas, and maximizing ag, environmental, and municipal water use efficiency.	y
Consider the effects of sea level rise (SLR) on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	39	y/n	n/a	n/a	Not Applicable	y
Reducing energy consumption, especially the energy embedded in water use, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions.	39	y/n	y	5.5, 9.0	Water supply systems in the region are small scale and not large energy consumers. Water use efficiency is a stated objective of the plan. The area is a region of significant hydroelectric power production - contributing to the statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions.	y
In evaluating different ways to meet IRWM plan objectives, where practical, consider the strategies adopted by CARB in its AB 32 Scoping Plan1.	39	y/n	y	5.5	Sustainable Forests and Water objectives relate directly to plan objectives.	y

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Objectives					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Consider options for carbon sequestration and using renewable energy where such options are integrally tied to supporting IRWM Plan objectives.	39	y/n	y	5.5	Plan objectives include objectives to reduce the potential for catastrophic wildland fires, enhance groundwater recharge, and promote forest health and economic activity in the Plan area through stand thinning and development of biomass energy production infrastructure.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (c).

(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e).

IRWM Plan Standard: Resource Management Strategies (RMS)				Overall Standard Sufficient		Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Address which RMS will be implemented in achieving IRWM Plan Objectives (1).	39	y/n	y	9.2, 9.4		y
Identify RMS incorporated in the IRWM Plan: Consider all California Water Plan (CWP)RMS criteria (29) listed in Table 3 from the CWP Update 2013.	39	y/n	y	6	All strategies were evaluated - 3 deemed not applicable and additional strategies were identified	y
Consideration of climate change effects on the IRWM region must be factored into RMS. 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 (2).	39	y/n	y	6.0, Table 6-1, Table 8.1	Sections 6.2 and 6.3 present a brief summary of each standard RMS; how it supports the region's climate change adaptation objectives. Climate change was discussed and factored into all RMS plan objectives. Table 6-1 describes RMSs and the applicable implementation techniques and indicates which are influenced by climate change projections, contribute to reduction in GHG emissions, and improve water supply reliability.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (e)(1).

(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (e)(10).

IRWM Plan Standard: Integration				Overall Standard Sufficient	
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency	Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation
Contains structure and processes for developing and fostering integration ¹ : - Stakeholder/institutional - Resource - Project implementation	39	y/n/q	y	2.3 and elsewhere throughout the Plan.	The Upper Feather River RWMG consists of 12 member agencies, all signatories of the MOU, with 7 of the agencies having statutory authority over water supply of management. The composition of the RWMG provides a broad representation of water resource, natural resource, and land use management interests for the Upper Feather River region. Members have agreed to work together to serve as the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group and to carry out the IRWM Program in the region throughout the planning and implementation phases.

1. If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per 2016 IRWM Guidelines, p. 52.

IRWM Plan Standard: Project Review Process					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Process for projects included in IRWM plan must address 3 components: - procedures for submitting projects - procedures for reviewing projects - procedures for communicating lists of selected projects.	39 - 40	y/n	y	9.2.1/9.3/9.3.4		y
Does the project review process in the plan incorporate the following factors:						
How a project contributes to plan objectives.	40	y/n	y	9.2.3		y
How a project is related to Resource Management Strategies identified in the plan.	40	y/n	y	9.1		y
The technical feasibility of a project.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
A projects specific benefits to a DAC water issue.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Environmental Justice considerations.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Project costs and financing.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Address economic feasibility.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Project status.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Strategic implementation of plan and project merit.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Status of the Project Proponent's IRWM plan adoption.	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Project's contribution to reducing dependence on Delta supply (for IRWM regions receiving water from the Delta).	40	y/n	y	9.3.1		y
Project's contribution to climate change adaptation. •Include potential effects of Climate Change on the region and consider if adaptations to the water management system are necessary (1) . •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 SLR on water supply conditions and identify suitable adaptation measures.	40	y/n	y	9.1, 9.3.1, Table 9-1	Potential of the project to contribute to climate change adaptation was identified as one of the criterion.	y

IRWM Plan Standard: Project Review Process					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM 2016 Guidelines	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Contribution of project in reducing GHGs compared to project alternatives. •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.	40	y/n	y	9.1, 9.3.1, Table 9-1	The potential for each project to contribute to the reduction of GHG was identified as an evaluation criterion.	y
Specific benefits to critical water issues for Native American tribal communities.	53	y/n	y	Table 9-1	Benefit to Native American tribal communities is included as a project review factor, as part of assessing the project's ability to address statewide priorities. However, no critical water supply issues were identified by the TAC during this initial "Call for Projects". A future proposal may include something benefiting tribal communities; for example, enhancement of habitat suitable for plants that may be used for cultural purposes.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10540 (e)(10).

IRWM Plan Standard: Impact and Benefit					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Discuss potential impacts and benefits of plan implementation within IRWM region, between regions, with DAC/EJ concerns and Native American Tribal communities.	40	y/n	y	10.3, 10.4, 13		y
State when a more detailed project-specific impact and benefit analysis will occur (prior to any implementation activity).	55	y/n	y	10.2		y
Review and update the impacts and benefits section of the plan as part of the normal plan management activities.	55 - 56	y/n	y	10.2		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Performance and Monitoring					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Contain performance measures and monitoring methods to ensure that IRWM objectives are met (1) .	40	y/n	y	11.2		y
Contain a methodology that the RWMG will use to oversee and evaluate implementation of projects.	40	y/n	y	11.3		y
Each project in the IRWM Plan is monitored to comply with all applicable rules, laws, and permit requirements.	58	y/n	y	11.1, 11.3	Each project approved under the Plan is monitored to comply with all applicable rules, laws, and permit requirements. This is stated as a required monitoring/evaluation criterion.	y
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.	40	y/n	y	6.0, 8.0, 11.2.1.2	Annual review and update or update in response to new data or changes in the region.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(7).

IRWM Plan Standard: Data Management					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Describe data needs within the IRWM region.	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.1		y
Describe typical data collection techniques.	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.1		y
Describe stakeholder contributions of data to a data management system.	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.2		y
Describe the entity responsible for maintaining data in the data management system.	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4		y
Describe the QA/QC measures for data.	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.4		y
Explain how data collected will be transferred or shared between members of the RWMG and other interested parties throughout the IRWM region, including local, State, and federal agencies (1) .	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.3, 11.4.5		y
Explain how the Data Management System supports the RWMG's efforts to share collected data.	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.3		y
Outline how data saved in the data management system will be distributed and remain compatible with State databases including CEDEN, Water Data Library (WDL), CASGEM, California Environmental Information Catalog (CEIC), and the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES).	59 - 60	y/n	y	11.4.5		y

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(12).

IRWM Plan Standard: Finance					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Include a programmatic level (i.e. general) plan for implementation and financing of identified projects and programs (1) including the following:	41	y/n	y	12.2		y
List known, as well as, possible funding sources, programs, and grant opportunities for the development and ongoing funding of the IRWM Plan.	41	y/n	y	12.3		y
List the funding mechanisms, including water enterprise funds, rate structures, and private financing options, for projects that implement the IRWM Plan.	41	y/n	y	12.4		y
An explanation of the certainty and longevity of known or potential funding for the IRWM Plan and projects that implement the Plan.	41	y/n	y	12.3		y
An explanation of how operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for projects that implement the IRWM Plan would be covered and the certainty of operation and maintenance funding.	41	y/n	y	12.4		y

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(8).

IRWM Plan Standard: Technical Analysis					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Document the data and technical analyses that were used in the development of the plan (1) .	41	y/n	y	13		y

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(11).

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Water Planning					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Identify a list of local water plans used in the IRWM plan	41	y/n	y	7.2.11, Table 7-6		y
Describe the dynamics between the IRWM plan and other planning documents	41	y/n	y	7.2.11		y
Describe how the RWMG will coordinate its water management planning activities	41	y/n	y	7.2.11		y
Discuss how the plan relates to these other planning documents and programs. Same as 2012 GL with the following addition: "It should be noted that Water Code § 10562 (b)(7) 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." Minor wording differences - e.g. Groundwater Sustainability Plan example in the 2016 Guidelines instead of Groundwater Management Plan in the 2012 Guidelines.	63 - 64	y/n	y	7.1.4, 7.1.4.9	There are currently no Storm Water Resource Plans within the UFR Region. However, should a SWRP be developed within the Region, the RWMG would incorporate it into the UFR IRWM Plan as an appendix and include the SWRP in the Data Management System.	y
Consider and incorporate water management issues and climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies from local plans into the IRWM Plan.	63 - 64	y/n	y	5.5, 7.2.11	Provides a description of local issues and climate change strategies. All applicable planning documents were reviewed and incorporated in the appropriate section of the plan.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Land Use Planning					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Document current relationship between local land use planning, regional water issues, and water management objectives	41	y/n	y	7.2.11		y
Document future plans to further a collaborative, proactive relationship between land use planners and water managers	41	y/n	y	7.2.11		y
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.	41	y/n	y	5.5, 6.2, 7.1.4, 8.2	Demonstrated sufficiently throughout of the plan.	y

	IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

IRWM Plan Standard: Stakeholder Involvement					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Discuss involvement of DACs and tribal communities in the IRWM planning effort.	41 - 42	y/n	y	2.5, 3.3.2		y
Describe decision-making process and roles that stakeholders can occupy.	41 - 42	y/n	y	2.3		y
Discuss how stakeholders are necessary to address objectives and RMS.	41 - 42	y/n	y	2.3		y
Discuss how a collaborative process will engage a balance in interest groups.	41 - 42	y/n	y	2.3		y
Contain a public process that provides outreach and opportunity to participate in the IRWM plan (1). Per 2016 GL: "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."	41 - 42	y/n	y	2.5, 2.5.2, Table 2-1	A Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP) adopted by the RWMG in November 2014 sets forth outreach efforts to encourage a diverse group of informed local stakeholders through the UFR region (Appendix 2-2) to participate. Additionally, a Tribal Engagement Plan (TEP) was developed to describe outreach and involvement means for engaging Tribal communities in the Region (Appendix 2-3). Outreach plan clearly identifies Native American outreach methods and full representation on RWMG - the same as all other government agencies.	y
Identify process to involve and facilitate stakeholders during development and implementation of IRWM plan regardless of ability to pay; include description of any barriers to involvement (2). "Stakeholder Involvement" in the 2012 GL is referred to "Native American Tribe and Stakeholder Involvement" in the 2016 GL and Tribes are referred to specifically.	41 - 42	y/n	y	2.4, 2.5, 2.5.2, Table 2-1, 2.6	1. The governance structure and the processes of the RWMG are intended to elicit public participation and involvement in developing the IRWM Plan Update, project selection criteria, and other RWMG activities. 2. Stakeholders may take part in the IRWM Plan update process through the workgroups and Tribal Advisory Committee as well as by attending RWMG meetings and workshops. All stakeholders are added to contact lists; they then receive Plan Update communications and notices.	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 IRWM Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (g).

(2) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (h)(2).

IRWM Plan Standard: Coordination					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.		Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation	y/n
Identify the process to coordinate water management projects and activities of participating local agencies and stakeholders to avoid conflicts and take advantage of efficiencies (1) .	42	y/n	y	2.7		y
Identify neighboring IRWM efforts and ways to cooperate or coordinate, and a discussion of any ongoing water management conflicts with adjacent IRWM efforts.	42	y/n	y	2.7		y
Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of IRWM Plan components, processes, and projects, or where State or federal regulatory decisions are required before implementing the projects.	42	y/n	y	2.7		y

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(13).

IRWM Plan Standard: Climate Change					Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement		Included		Evidence of Plan Sufficiency		Sufficient
IRWM 2016 Guidelines Requirement	IRWM 2016 Guidelines Page Number	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWM Plan. If y/n/q, qualitative evaluation needed.	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Qualitative Evaluation		y/n
Contain a plan, program, or methodology for further data gathering and analysis of prioritized vulnerabilities.	42 - 44	y/n	y	8.5, 11		y
Include climate change as part of the project review process.	42 - 44	y/n	y	9.3		y
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 (1). Addition in 2016 GL - "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."	42 - 44	y/n	y	8.3	Analysis equivalent to the vulnerability assessment contained in the Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning.	y
Provide a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives (1). Addition in 2016 GL - "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."	42 - 44	y/n	y	5.5, 8.6, 9.1, Table 9-1, Appendix 9-2	Project sponsors were required to respond to a checklist that provided high-level GHG emissions. Project GHG analysis in Appendix 9-2. The potential for each project to contribute to the reduction of GHG was identified as an evaluation criterion.	y
Include a list of prioritized vulnerabilities based on the vulnerability assessment and the IRWM's decision making process. Addition in 2016 GL - "A list of prioritized vulnerabilities which includes a determination regarding the feasibility for the RWMG to address the priority vulnerabilities."	42 - 44	y/n	y	Table 8-2	Plan provides a concise prioritization of identified vulnerabilities.	y
Address adapting to changes in the amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff and recharge.	42 - 44	y/n	y	5.5, 6.2.2, 8.2, 11.2.1, 11.2.1.2	Annual review and update or update in response to new data or changes in the region.	y
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.	42 - 44	y/n	n/a	n/a	Not Applicable	y

IRWM Plan Standard Requirements for 2016 IRWM Guidelines in Addition to Previously Required 2012 Guideline Requirements. See Appendix H in IRWM 2016 Guidelines.

(1) Requirement must be addressed per CWC §10541 (e)(9).

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT AN
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
NOVEMBER 18, 2016

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) intends to adopt an update to the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWM Plan) at its November 18, 2016 meeting. The meeting will be held at 1:00 p.m. in the Plumas County Planning Department Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

The IRWM Plan is a planning document that includes input from many stakeholders to improve water resources management in the Upper Feather River IRWM Region. The IRWM Plan identifies projects that provide multiple benefits for water supply, water quality, disadvantaged communities, environmental resources, and forest and range health. The updated IRWM Plan was prepared in accordance with the State of California Department of Water Resources IRWM Guidelines.

Additional information on the RWMG and a draft copy of the updated IRWM Plan can be found at <http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/>. A copy of the IRWM Plan is also available at the office of the Plumas County Planning Department, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California for public review.

For more information on the IRWM Plan, please contact ufr.contact@gmail.com or Randy Wilson at (530) 283-6214.

**A RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER FEATHER RIVER REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GROUP APPROVING
THE "UPPER FEATHER RIVER INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE 2016"
AND AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO SIGN THE PLAN AND SUBMIT IT TO THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF WATER RESOURCES**

WHEREAS, by Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU"), a broad array of governments, agencies, and organizations created the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group ("RWMG"); and

WHEREAS, the RWMG prepared and approved an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan in 2005;

WHEREAS, the RWMG was awarded a Proposition 84 Planning Grant in 2012 from the California Department of Water Resources to update the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan; and

WHEREAS, staff and representatives of the RWMG, working with a consultant, have prepared the "Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Update 2016" and,

WHEREAS, this version of the Plan Update 2016 is consistent with both the 2012 and 2016 Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Guidelines released by DWR (Proposition 84 and Proposition 1, respectively), and it addresses the major water-related issues and needs of the Upper Feather River planning region;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT in accordance with the provisions of the MOU, the Members of the RWMG hereby approve the Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Update 2016 and direct the RWMG Chair to sign this Resolution of Plan Adoption and to submit the Final Plan to the Department of Water Resources.

Passed and adopted this 18th day of November, 2016, by consensus of a quorum of the Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group.

SIGNED: _____

Sherrie Thrall, Chair, Upper Feather Integrated Regional Water Management Program

ATTEST: _____ Randy Wilson, Grantee, Co-Manager of the Plumas County
Flood Control and Water Conservation District



PLUMAS COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

<<DATE>>

<<NAME>>, <<TITLE>>

<<AGENCY>>

<<ADDRESS>>

<<CITY>>, <<STATE>> <<ZIP>>

RE: Adoption of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)
Plan Update 2016

Greetings <<NAME>>,

At a regular meeting of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) on November 18, 2016, the Final Upper Feather River IRWM Plan Update 2016 was formally adopted. As a signatory to the Upper Feather River IRWM Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), your agency is encouraged to formally adopt the Final Plan by resolution. The Final Plan is posted on the Program website: <http://featherriver.org/ufr-irwm-plan/>.

In order to be eligible for Proposition 1 grant funding opportunities, the governing bodies of RWMG member agencies and Plan implementation project sponsors must formally adopt the Final IRWM Plan. DWR will require proof of adoption of the Final IRWM Plan in order to establish eligibility for upcoming grant solicitations.

Thank you for your continued interest and support of the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Program. Please contact Randy Wilson at (530) 283-6214 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Randy Wilson, Co-Manager
Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Enc: Upper Feather River RWMG Resolution of Plan Adoption

**Upper Feather River
Integrated Regional Water Management**

**RWMG Meeting No. 14
November 18, 2016**

To: Upper Feather River Regional Water Management Group
From: Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting
Subject: Next Steps
Date: November 12, 2016

INTRODUCTION

This is the final meeting under the planning grant, which will be completed in December. There are a number of tasks that should continue on in order to ensure continued participation in interregional DAC coordination (Proposition 1 DACI RFP) and encourage continuance of coordination efforts for Plan implementation.

1. Participation in DAC Coordinating Committee, communication and decision-making. The Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement RFP is in process and the RWMG may wish to provide direction to ensure the UFR Region continues to remain engaged in that effort.
2. Website transition and maintenance. Hosting of the website is currently paid through the Consulting Team.
3. Schedule RWMG quarterly meeting.

REQUEST

Discussion and direction.