Call to Order and Roll Call (Video#1 1:29)
Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on June 22, 2018 at 1:05 pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

Members Present:
Sherrie Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Jeff Engle, Plumas County Board of Supervisors
Doug Teeter, Butte County Board of Supervisors
Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium
Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory) (Nancy Francine for Joe Hoffman)
Jeffrey Greening, Public Member

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

Staff Present:
Uma Hinman, Hinman & Associates Consulting
Leah Wills, Plumas County

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda (Video#1 2:34)
None noted

Public Comment Opportunity (Video#1-2:43)
None noted

Announcements / Reports (Video#1-3:07)
None noted
CONSENT AGENDA

a. RWMG Approval of Meeting Minutes for April 27, 2018
Upon motion by Jeff Engle and seconded by Jeffrey Greening, the RWMG Meeting Minutes for April 27, 2018 were unanimously approved as presented.

ACTION AGENDA

1. Integrated Regional Water Management Coordination Updates
   a. Update on the IRWM Roundtable of Regions efforts
      Uma Hinman presented the update on the IRWM Roundtable of Regions (RoR) efforts. The RoR held two meetings in May, focusing primarily on feedback to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) regarding the Administrative Draft Project Solicitation Packet (PSP) for the next round of IRWM funding. The RoR will be working more extensively on strategic planning moving forward. They are discussing the option to become an advocacy group, which entails hiring an administrative coordinator to be more active in obtaining baseline funding for IRWM regional programs, increasing membership for the RoR, and serving as a liaison to professional groups and NGO’s. Jeffrey Greening questioned what negative outcomes could potentially arise. Uma explained the negatives discussed were whether or not to become too structured. As an all-volunteer group, becoming overly structured adds another element of work to members whose plates are already full. The benefits could be promoting the IRWM program on a state level and getting some baseline funding. Sherrie Thrall, under the assumption they will ask for funding for the new Administrative position, asked if they have any anticipation on budget for each of the counties and if they do not, perhaps work should start as the counties are working on their budgets for this fiscal year. Uma will contact the RoR meeting facilitators to see if it has been discussed.

   b. Inter-regional IRWM Coordination
      Uma Hinman noted that there will be more coordination necessary for the inter-regional outreach as the next round of IRWM funding through DWR comes down, which is anticipated to be later this year. Current expectation is that it will most likely occur through the Mountain Counties Funding Area Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Involvement Project. This potential will be discussed at their next meeting, which is scheduled for July. This type of coordination for funding is required by DWR for the next round of IRWM funding. The IRWM Implementation Draft PSP is anticipated to be released in September with applications accepted in early late fall. A workshop with DWR and state agencies with each of the funding areas will be required and will be discussed during the July DACTI meeting as to what date or date ranges the regions are able to meet.

   c. Legislative Update
      Uma Hinman acknowledged that Proposition 68 passed earlier this month, which authorizes $4.1 billion-dollars in general obligation bonds for the creation and rehabilitation of state and local parks, natural resources protection projects, climate adaptation project, water quality projects, and flood protection projects. It also reallocated $100 million of unused funds from Prop 1, Prop 84, and Prop 40 for the same purposes. Prop 68 will also line out how non-state matched funding will affect severe DAC, which is defined as 60% of the overall household income. A funding breakdown is provided in the agenda packet.

2. Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Projects
   Uma Hinman presented an update from the Sierra Institute on the DACTI Project. To date, they have held three Community Capacity Assessment Workshops, three Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment Workshops, and two Tribal Orientations Workshops. The Sierra Institute is in the process of drafting the Needs Assessment as they move forward and could potentially be ready to turn in by the end of the day.
Trina Cunningham added the next outreach meeting is scheduled for July 24-25 in Madera. The tribal integration with the rest of the Needs Assessment has not been as collaborative as it could be. Trina Cunningham suggested that more overlap is needed so all parties involved are more informed to have a full understanding of all issues and/or sensitivities. Sherrie Thrall asked if the outreach meetings have been helpful and if the discussions and results of the meetings have been similar to the Upper Feather River region. Trina explained they have been fairly similar especially around tribal empowerment. More or less, the tribes want to be involved in all cultural aspects of the community. Uma mentioned that participation has been limited in some of the regions, which has delayed the Needs Assessment. Uma added there is $500,000 for technical assistant on this grant and it is hoped that some of the money may be released early to assist with grant developed for the next round of funding. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

3. IRWM Plan Implementation Project Proposals

A total of eight applications were submitted for RWMG consideration for inclusion in the UFR IRWM Plan. On April 27, 2018 the RWMG reviewed the project applications and gave direction to staff to work with the project sponsors to complete climate change assessments and greenhouse gas emissions worksheets for each before further consideration. All project sponsors have completed and submitted the forms, which are included in the agenda packet. Uma Hinman briefly presented the following eight proposed IRWM Plan Implementation Projects.

- Berry Creek Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
- Concow Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
- Feather Falls Forest Health and Watershed Protection Project, Butte County Fire Safe Council.
- Community Water Tank Inspection, Indian Valley Community Services District.
- Crescent Mills Raw Water Iron and Manganese Treatment Project, Indian Valley Community Services District.
- Wolf Creek Sewer Crossing Replacement Project, Indian Valley Community Services District.
- District-Wide Leak Survey and Pipeline Replacement/Repair, Sierra Water Works District #1 – Calpine.

Uma noted that three Tribal projects had been submitted today and that they will be included on the agenda for next meeting as they had not yet been reviewed by staff. Trina Cunningham provided a brief description of each of them.

1. Genesee Valley Watershed Improvement Project and Tribal Springs Restoration – The project is a 3,000-acre project, including some of the upland area above Genesee Valley. The NEPA decision memo has been received and CEQA has been submitted.
2. Middle Fork Feather River Headwaters Tribal Big Time Phase II – This is the first Big Time in over 100 years in Sierra Valley.
3. Tribal Outreach and Consultation on Reintroduction of Salmon into the Seneca Reach of the North Fork of the Feather River – The project will encompass reintroduction of Salmon by trap and haul from Lake Oroville into the Seneca Reach.

Trina noted a tribal forum will be held in Oroville next month, July 18-19, sponsored by the US Forest Service and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy. The forum will focus on tribal conversations regarding water and land issues, fires, and how to interface more effectively.
Sherrie Thrall stated those projects will be an action item for the next meeting and will be considered for addition to the IRWM Plan Implementation Project list at the time. Uma noted that the recommended action was to adopt a resolution, including the eight projects reviewed as implementation projects for the 2016 Upper Feather River IRWM Plan, making them eligible for funding opportunities through the DWR IRWM Program. Jeffrey Greening asked if there was a source of accounting to see what the product is when the projects are completed. Leah Wills shared the Department of Conservation just released a preliminary evaluation of previous watershed projects through the Sierra Institute, which was extremely favorable. Other than that, there are no real evaluations thus far to indicate financial output compared to a quantifiable outcome. Doug Teeter suggested reaching out to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to request a report on their Watershed Improvement Program.

Upon motion by Doug Teeter and seconded by Russell Reid, the RWMG unanimously approved the inclusion of the eight projects as implementation projects of the 2016 UFR IRWM Plan.

Doug Teeter was asked to contact the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to request a presentation on how they evaluate their investments on projects.

4. IRWM Plan Implementation Projects

Uma Hinman continued the discussion of how to prepare for the upcoming Prop 1 IRWM project solicitation. There are currently 81 implementation projects in addition to the eight accepted today and the three up for consideration next meeting. The Prop 1 Implementation funding is allocated by Funding Area; the Mountain Counties Funding Area includes 10 IRWM Regions. At that point, it is possible that it will become a competitive process between the IRWM Regions within the funding area. There is an opportunity for the funding area to request distribution differently, but that has to be discussed by the Mountain Counties Funding area IRWM representatives and will be a topic at the July DACTI meeting.

On a regional level, the RWMG will need to identify projects to be considered for the next round of funding. Also, there are a number of funding sources other than DWR’s Proposition 1 IRWM funding. They included the State Water Board for drinking water; the Sierra Nevada Conservancy for DAC, Tribal, environmental project development and capacity building for grant applications or CEQA; and Proposition 68 Water Bond which allocated $250 million for clean drinking water and drought programs as well as restoration projects. Staff needs to track these closely and discuss the best way to achieve this.

Uma reminded the RWMG that Roger Diefendorf had previously stated his department, Plumas County Community Development Commission, had the capacity to help develop grant applications. It may be beneficial for the Staff to work directly with Roger, or a similar entity, to identify the projects that are ready to move forward and begin the grant applications.

Another topic to discuss is how to identify those projects that are ready to move forward. One idea would be to discuss with the project sponsors, one on one, and ask them if they are ready to apply for a grant, thereby compiling a list for the RWMG to consider. Another option would be to do a workshop in a group setting with the project sponsors. The Prop 1 IRWM grant applications will be due in April 2019, with coordination required beforehand, so the projects should be identified by around September.

Uma requested direction from the RWMG. Sherrie Thrall noted a formal motion is not needed but asked the RWMG for a general consensus to move forward with Plumas County Community Development Commission. Jeffrey Greening asked if Doug Teeter knew of anyone in Butte County that could perhaps assist. Doug agreed to look into it. The RWMG directed staff to coordinate with Rodger to discuss capacity and identify projects for assistance.
5. **Grant Opportunities** *(Video# 3 – 16:35)*

Uma Hinman presented a number of grant opportunities. The State Water Resources Control Board provides technical assistance to DAC’s and is tentatively scheduled to the end early 2019. A link to their website is provided in the agenda packet. The USEPA Water Finance Clearinghouse is a database for water funding sources. The Sierra Nevada Conservancy just issued their June-July Funding Opportunities Newsletter. They have also released their solicitation for pre-applications for the next round of Proposition 1 and the first round of Proposition 68 Funding; applications are due July 18th. The DWR Proposition 1 Implementation Funding solicitation is still being discussed and developed with stakeholders. They anticipate releasing the draft PSP in September and will hold three public meeting throughout the state. The Round 1 Final PSP is anticipated to be completed in late fall and Round 2 of funding is scheduled to begin in 2020.

6. **Next Steps** *(Video#3 – 21:00)*

Next meeting is scheduled for September 7, 2018 at 1pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

Sherrie Thrall requested Uma Hinman and Doug Teeter reach out to the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to coordinate a presentation or information on how they evaluate their investments on projects. Sherrie also stated she wants to discuss the RWMG membership and potential reorganization. She also requested an election of the chair and vice chair.

**Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 pm.

---

**Attendees:**
Susan Coffi, Westwood Community Services District
Paul Rose, Calpine and Sierraville Public Utilities District
Kelly Peterson, Butte County
Frank Motzkus, Chester Public Utilities District
Leah Wills, Plumas County
Evan Hasse, Plumas County
Brad Graeves, Feather River Resource Conservation District
Chris Gallagher, Indian Valley Community Services District
Rebecca Herrin, Plumas County