

**PLUMAS COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
 PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
 COUNTY OF PLUMAS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**MEETING OF THE PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
 COUNTY OF PLUMAS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 HELD IN QUINCY ON MAY 23, 2005**

AMENDED 06/09/05

1. Introductions

The Forum convened at 3:15 p.m. with Plumas County Supervisors Rose Comstock, Bill Powers and Ole Olsen present. Dwight Russell and Dan Flory were present for the Department of Water Resources; David Okita was present for State Water Contractors.

2. Public Comment Opportunity

3. Plumas Watershed Forum

A. Status of Existing Phase I Projects

Mr. Hunter reports on the contract amount and expenditures reported to him to date on the Phase I projects.

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Entity</u>	<u>Contract</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
A	Sierra Valley Groundwater	\$151,700	\$100,342.16
A	Beckwourth Ranger District	\$63,500	-0-
B	Bohm Isotope Monitoring	\$23,000	?
	Feather River CRM		
A	Two Creek Restoration	\$115,000	\$33,500
B	Monitoring	\$70,000	
B	Sierra Valley RCD	\$25,000	\$88.50
B	Feather River RCD	\$17,750	-0-
B	Plumas Corporation	\$50,000	\$34,014.95

B. Report and Update on Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study

Mr. Hunter reported the Forum allocated \$475,000 from Majority "A" funds to go toward a Flood Plain study of the entire Sierra Valley. Total cost for the study was estimated to be \$488,000 dollars for the areas within Plumas County. Plumas County has been working with Army Corps to obtain funding for a portion of project deliverables but The Army Corps' current budget does not include funds for the Sierra Valley project. Mr. Hunter reports that the County needs to obtain more Federal funding before moving forward with this project. Additionally the County is trying to get funds (\$3.7 million) for the Lake Davis treatment plant and feels that, for the public the cost to benefit ratio of the treatment plant is better than that of the flood plain study.

The County would like the Forum to agree that the funds allocated for the Flood Plain Study be reallocated for the Lake Davis treatment plant if needed. Target for reconstruction of the Lake Davis Water Treatment Facility is 2006.

Normally projects to be funded by “A” funds are reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee for consistency with the “Strategy” and recommendations are given to the Forum. The initial \$475,000 was allocated before the review process was approved by the Forum.

The question of whether the Monterey Agreement allows “A” funds to be used for this type of project was addressed by reading portion of the Settlement language [Plumas Matters section B (2)(c)] which states *The Watershed Forum seeks to obtain funding and investments in the Feather River watershed in order to facilitate programs that will generate significant local environmental and water supply benefits.*

Mr. Hunter stated the County should know if these funds would be needed for the treatment plant by January 2006.

A motion is made by Forum member Rose Comstock, seconded by Forum member Bill Powers and unanimously carried to reallocate \$475,000 of majority “A” funds allocated toward the Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study to the reconstruction of the Lake Davis Water Treatment Facility.

C. Overview and discussion of the tour held the morning of May 23, 2005.

The morning tour was led by Jim Wilcox of Feather River CRM and included Judy Dillon’s explanation of groundwater monitoring wells in Sierra Valley and Jim’s explanation of the watershed restoration projects on Last Chance Creek and Charles Creek. Jim also shared information on the history of the region and insight into proposed projects including Burkhard Bohm’s isotope measuring projects and the Forest Service’s Aspen Restoration project.

David Okita reports that the tour was very informative and helpful for those who live out of the area to see what the projects look like from the ground and how they develop through the years. He is impressed with the efficient process of getting projects on the ground and leveraging funds; he looks forward to continuing our relationship and seeing more projects. Dwight Russell agrees and comments that he likes the fact that information and data from projects is being shared via the Internet.

D. Phase II submittals and recommendations for funding by the core Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Tom Hunter shares a list of projects that have been submitted for Phase II of the Forum projects. Russell Reid from Feather River College is present to give an overview of the College’s proposed project. Core TAC members are recommending approval of all the submitted projects for the sums and category shown.

Feather River College \$92,453 “A” fund

Mr. Reid reports this projects fits best into the educational portion of use of Settlement funds. The project involves improving 75 acres of pasture/wetland to improve water quality to Spanish Creek while managing livestock on the lands. The project includes

construction of fencing, dry lots, protection of wetlands, educational uses for the college and a five-year commitment to monitoring. Mr. Reid states he hopes to develop best management practices guidelines by getting empirical data to prove that ranchers' tried and true methods actually work and end up with a model project available for field studies and tours. There is a mixture of funding sources for this project: USDA –NRCS \$34,240

Forum	\$92,453
Feather River RCD	<u>\$ 3,000</u>
	\$129,693

Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District \$30,000 “A” fund

This proposal is to modify the Phase I project and use unexpended funds (\$30,000 of “A”) to enhance their current system with aquifer testing for water levels and interference characteristics. This proposal would be added to the existing agreement for Phase I.

Sierra Valley RCD \$25,000 “B” fund

This is the second annual request for \$25,000 for “capacity building” within Sierra Valley. With the assistance of NCRS, the Sierra Valley RCD has rented office space to enhance their availability to the public. The original Phase I request is for three(3) years of \$25,000 each year.

Feather River RCD \$30,000 “B” fund

Originally the Phase II proposal was for \$17,750 and we have received a request to modify the amount to create dollars for on-the-ground projects.

The current proposal for \$30,000 is broken down for Field Work and Surveys, Contract Preparation, Contract Administration, Workforce cost, Monitoring and a workshop.

Plumas Hydrology \$21,000 “B” fund and \$25,000 “A” fund

Burkhard Bohm is proposing two projects. The first is using isotopes to show a relationship between forest canopy effects on base flow (\$21,000). The second proposal is to provide pre-project monitoring for the Red Clover Creek area before a large Cal Fed funded watershed project is done, possibly following up with post project monitoring.

Plumas Corporation \$75,000 “B” fund

Although Phase I approved the sum of \$75,000 approximately \$50,000 were spent. This proposal included expenditures within the 2004-05 and 2005-06 budget years. These monies will be used to coordinate forest practices related to Quincy Library Group and Fire Safe Projects.

U.S. Forest Service \$84,500 “A” fund

This proposal is for an Aspen Restoration which removes conifer trees in the proximity of aspen groves. The total project costs are \$233,500. \$149,000 will come from Forest Service funds and the remainder from Forum funds.

Feather River CRM	\$33,668 “B” fund	Outreach
	\$50,000 “B” fund	Project Development
	\$25,000 “A” fund	Project monitoring
	\$64,000 “A” fund	Jordan Flat Project

Outreach - Feather River CRM will develop a full outreach program to keep the public informed on their work.

The second project uses \$50,000 to coordinate project development on four creeks in four separate valleys: Sulphur Creek, Long Valley Creek, Spanish Creek and Last Chance Creek.

The third project is to install a pond and plug within 1,800 feet of Jordan Creek.

<u>SUMMARY</u>	Majority "A"	Minority "B"
Feather River College	\$92,453	
Sierra Valley Groundwater Management Dist.	\$30,000	
Sierra Valley RCD		\$25,000
Feather River RCD		\$30,000
Plumas Hydrology: Forest Canopy		\$21,000
Red Clover Monitoring	\$25,000	
Plumas Corporation		\$75,000
U.S. Forest Service	\$84,500	
Feather River CRM: Outreach		\$33,668
Four Creeks	\$25,000	\$50,000
Jordan Flat	<u>\$64,000</u>	
	\$320,953	<u>\$234,668</u>

A motion is made by Forum member Dwight Russell, seconded and unanimously carried to approve all Phase II projects as submitted.

E. Proposal by Dwight Russell, Department of Water Resources for the creation of an annual report, with a draft, for consideration at the October 2005 Watershed Forum Meeting.

Discussion of Mr. Russell's proposal. Formal report showing project status including amount spent and amount remaining would be beneficial to Forum in planning for future allocations, for sharing with their colleagues, and for historical purposes. Requirement for submitting a one page annual report to the acting director of the Watershed Forum and TAC could be included as a requirement in the RFP process and subsequent contract.

The annual report should include, at minimum, the starting fund balance, a description of all proposed projects, the status of approved projects, the ending fund balance, a copy of Forum and TAC meeting minutes, and a statement on the progress of achieving the Forum's goals. Each project status is to include a brief scope of work plus any authorized changes, an assessment of project progress, a schedule for deliverables, a statement of funds expended and any matching fund status.

A motion is made by Forum member Dwight Russell, seconded and unanimously carried to require an Annual Report as described above.

F Report and Update on status of the new Monterey Agreement EIR.

Nancy Quan, Department of Water Resources addresses the Forum. Ms. Quan states the draft EIR should be released to the public late this year (December) with the final EIR coming out in June 2006. If everything goes well and the EIR process is not slowed down funding could continue uninterrupted. Katy Spanos, Department of Water Resources cautions Forum and audience not to depend upon a timely EIR and uninterrupted funding as the EIR process is very complicated.

Brian Morris, Plumas County points out Settlement language, which could allow for a continuation of funding even if the EIR process is slowed down [Plumas Matters, section B (3)(c)].

On May 25, 2005 Nancy Quan submitted the following updated schedule for completion of the EIR: Draft EIR to Public in May 2006; Final EIR in December 2006

G Schedule to complete Monterey Settlement, Article IV Plumas Matters

This matter is tabled for discussion with the Forum until the next meeting in October.

H Develop a policy for unspent allocated funds.

There may be a difference between the project proponents estimate and their actual cost. Forum member Dwight Russell believes the Forum needs to adopt a policy to deal with these unspent allocated funds. Discussion of ways these funds could be handled: money could go back into the pot and the Forum could re-direct it as they see fit; money could go back into pot unless the entity re-applies for funds; contract manager could look at possible additions to the project when a proponent comes in under budget and approve using the funds if the addition is close in spirit to the original project.

Rose Comstock, Forum member and chair states proposed policy language needs to be prepared for Forum members before the next meeting in October.

I Report and update on financial situation for Watershed Forum funding.

Mr. Hunter states that Plumas County's financial reporting responsibility to the Forum is in October. Todd Hillaire, Department of Water Resources reports that their records indicate if the Forum doles out minority funds "B" as budgeted in existing proposals, there will be a deficit of \$200,000 and requests that Mr. Hunter clarify all actual dollar amounts in the next few months. Mr. Hunter provide the figures as soon as his budget is done.

J Improvements to Public Outreach process (Maintaining Internet Site)

Mr. Hunter informs the Forum that he has gotten an extra help employee to assist with Monterey Forum issues; duties will include making sure the Internet site is regularly updated. Mr. Hunter would like to try to keep upkeep of the site in-house with the County I.T. Department if possible.

K Schedule next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum

The next meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be the Forum is ready for the next round of projects, most likely January 2006.

The next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum is scheduled for October 25, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in Quincy, California.

ADJOURNMENT

The Forum adjourns at 5:00 p.m. to meet again on October 25, 2005.

Chair of the Plumas Watershed Forum

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Plumas Watershed Forum