

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

**MEETING OF THE PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
HELD IN QUINCY ON MAY 22, 2007**

1. Introductions

The Plumas Watershed Forum meeting convenes at 10:00 a.m. with Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District board members Ole Olsen, Rose Comstock, Sharon Thrall and Robert Meacher present. Members from the Department of Water Resources include Dwight Russell. Members from the State Water Contractors include David Okita, Tim Quinn and Tom Hurlbutt.

2. Lake Davis Pike Eradication

Brian Morris, General Manager of the Flood Control District, informs the Forum that the Department of Fish and Game is planning another chemical treatment of Lake Davis to attempt to eradicate pike. The pike project is scheduled for September or October, and DFG has made arrangement to assist the City of Portola and Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District with well improvements as part of the project's mitigation package.

The Flood Control District has not taken water deliveries from Lake Davis since the first pike project in 1997, but a new water treatment plant will begin construction this summer. It is anticipated that Portola and GLRID will return to Lake Davis as a water supply sometime in mid-2008, once the treatment plant is completed.

3. 06-07 Budget

Mr. Morris presents a budget summary showing year-to-date expenses for program administration and projects, as well as the status of outstanding funding for approved projects. Approximately \$1.7 million has been approved for Majority/A Fund projects, with \$1.1 million expended and \$600,000 pending. The bulk of the unexpended funds are for Feather River CRM projects in 2007 and 2008, as well as the Forest Service's Clark's Creek Aspen project. For the Minority/B Fund, \$420,000 in funding was approved by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Forum, and approximately \$120,000 remains to be spent for approved projects.

All Minority/B funds have been committed or will be spent by the end of the current fiscal year on June 30. Based on the Majority/A fund budget, Mr. Morris and Todd Hillaire of DWR agree that at least \$70,607 in funds are uncommitted, with an additional \$100,000 in reserves for program management in future years. Following the close of the fiscal year, a report will be prepared for the Forum meeting in October to provide the exact amount of Majority/A funds that are still available.

The Forum reviews the budget for the 2006-07 fiscal year, which is revised from the budget presented at the October meeting to reduce funding for salaries and benefits to a total of \$60,000, as approved by the Forum in May 2006. In response to questions from Mr. Russell, Mr. Morris reports that the Flood Control District did not hire a full time natural resources analyst, but that Karen Oglesby has continued to assist with administration of the program.

4. Administrative Policy Implementation

Mr. Russell informs the Forum that a policy was developed by staff and approved by the Forum regarding administration of contracts with the individual project sponsors, and he requests that the Flood Control District update the Forum regarding implementation of the policy. Mr. Morris responds that he has been reviewing and approving invoices for the Forum program, although there have not been many invoices since October. A final invoice was received from the Feather River Resource Conservation District, and Mr. Morris reviewed the reports and photographs that were submitted to ensure the contract requirements had been satisfied.

5. Administrative Staffing for Plumas Watershed Forum

Mr. Morris reports that the Flood Control District's staffing has been in transition since the retirement of Tom Hunter, but the Board of Supervisors has approved a reorganization that will be effective with the new fiscal year on July 1. Mr. Morris, who was designated General Manager of the Flood Control District in October 2006, has submitted his resignation to the Plumas County Counsel and will be working full-time on water and natural resources issues.

The Flood Control District has also budgeted Forum funds and other monies to pay one-half the cost of a natural resources analyst position within the Plumas County Department of Public Works. The natural resources analyst will assist with administration of the Forum program and help manage other grant funds.

Any necessary engineering review of project plans or completed projects will be undertaken by the Department of Public Works. To review the projects scheduled to proceed during the 2007 construction season, Mr. Morris and the new Public Works Director, Bob Perreault, will both meet with the project sponsor as they determine the proper allocation of responsibilities for carrying out the Administrative Policy.

Mr. Russell questions how the Forum will coordinate with the Integrated Regional Water Management program, the Feather River Coordinated Resource Management Group, and other activities and groups in the Upper Feather River area. Mr. Meacher responds that between the members of the Board of Supervisors and the Flood Control District's staff and consultants, there is ongoing contact with all the other agencies and organizations in the region, and most meetings are attended by at least one representative of the Flood Control District. The Flood Control District holds regular meetings between its staff, consultants, a rotating group of board members, and the Feather River CRM staff to ensure coordination of activities.

Mr. Morris informs the Forum that the Upper Feather IRWM plan was prepared with assistance from Ecosystem Sciences Foundation and Mark Hill, who also prepared the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy on behalf of the Forum. As a result of that continuity, the IRWM plan is fully consistent with the Forum's objectives and methods. Also, the Feather River CRM and the Plumas National Forest, each of which have undertaken multiple projects funded by the Forum, are sponsoring the two largest projects in Plumas County's Prop. 50/IRWM implementation grant.

6. Capacity Building Projects

Mr. Morris reports that Forum funding for the Feather River Resource Conservation District and Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District came to an end in December of 2006, and that the progress reports included in the Annual Report reflect most of what the districts have done. A final report has been received from Feather River RCD, and a similar report from Sierra Valley RCD is forthcoming.

Mr. Russell states that the reason the Forum funded the "capacity building" efforts was to conduct education to broaden the base of potential project sponsors and to help new entities submit successful project proposals. If that goal has not been accomplished, there may be a need to keep looking at how that type of assistance can be provided.

Mr. Meacher states that a good example of how Minority/B funds were used was to obtain the \$7 million Prop. 50 grant, which was pursued with Forum funds and additional Plumas County funds.

Mr. Russell requests that the next Annual Report include a full review of the Forum's capacity building projects.

7. 2006 Annual Report

Mr. Morris notes the edits that were requested at the Forum meeting in October, as well as the revised Majority/A fund budget. Upon a motion made by Mr. Russell, seconded by Ms. Comstock, and unanimously carried, the Forum approves the 2006 Annual Report and directs the report to be posted on the web page.

Mr. Morris reports that at the October meeting, Mr. Russell and Supervisor Dennison had requested that staff contact Water for California and obtain a report on that group's activities to include in the Annual Report. Mr. Morris states that he forwarded the request to one of the Water for California board members, but the response from the board of directors was that Water for California was not related to the Watershed Forum. If the Department of Water Resources or the State Water Contractors would like information from Water for California, they were asked to make a direct request to the organization.

Mr. Russell states that with the Minority/B fund depleted, Water for California might be a source of funding to continue the program. Mr. Morris reports that Plumas County will be making a direct request to Water for California for funding in the next fiscal year.

8. Monterey EIR

Nancy Quan reports that at the last EIR Committee meeting the plaintiffs and the Contractors agreed that a second administrative draft would be useful. There will be another EIR Committee meeting in July and the public review draft is currently anticipated to be released in August.

Mr. Morris reports that in October the Forum had requested a letter be sent to Lester Snow urging that the EIR be completed by September 2007, based on DWR's schedule at that time. Mr. Morris stated that he did not believe he had license to describe how that should be accomplished and that a letter simply asking DWR to finish the EIR would be relatively meaningless. Mr. Quinn stated that time has passed by and the letter is no longer relevant.

9. Upper Feather IRWM Program

Mr. Morris reports that Plumas County had received a \$7 million IRWM implementation grant from DWR and was looking to begin work in July.

Katie Spanos asks about the relationship between the Forum and the IRWM program. Mr. Morris responds that the programs are parallel efforts with close coordination. Plumas County entered an MOU with the Plumas National Forest and the Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District to adopt the Upper Feather IRWM plan, and the MOU provides for a joint annual meeting and annual report with the Forum. In response to a question from Mr. Russell, Mr. Morris reports that Forum funds are not part of the matching funds for the IRWM grant.

Following discussion about the coordination of monitoring efforts in the Upper Feather region, Mr. Russell requests that the mid-term report include a review of monitoring activities and needs.

10. Program Review

Mr. Morris reports that there have been a number of discussions among staff about the desire of DWR and the Contractors to have a third-party program review and the desire of Plumas to use remaining Majority/A funds for actual projects.

Mr. Russell states that a program review is important for DWR and the Contractors to evaluate the program and decide whether to continue funding prior to completion of the Monterey EIR, which is one of DWR's options under the Settlement Agreement.

Following discussion, upon a motion made by Mr. Russell, seconded by Ms. Comstock, and unanimously carried, the Forum directs staff to prepare a scope of work for a program review, identify appropriate third parties to conduct the review, and proceed with the review.

Mr. Russell suggests that the Technical Advisory Committee should meet to complete the scope of work for the program review.

11. 07-08 Budget

Mr. Morris reminds the Forum that \$100,000 was set aside in May 2006 for use in fiscal year 2007-08 and beyond. Mr. Morris suggests that the Forum allocate \$50,000 per year for 2007-08 and 2008-09 for program administration, and that the program review be funded out of the \$70,607 in uncommitted Majority/A funds. Following discussion, it is the consensus of the Forum to structure the budget as proposed by Mr. Morris and to anticipate the program review should cost at least \$50,000.

Based on the scope of the program review and the budget, Mr. Okita suggests that the review can be accomplished in three to six months. Mr. Quinn states that the quicker the review is completed the better. Ms. Spanos states that six to nine months is a reasonable timeframe for the review. Mr. Russell suggests that the scope of work can be completed in 30 days, with a draft report by September or October.

12. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for October 23, 2007, at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Hillaire asks whether a field tour will be scheduled in conjunction with the annual meeting. Following discussion, it is the consensus of the Forum to plan for a tour in conjunction with the May 2008 meeting, which will allow viewing of the landscape and projects at a different time of the year than the 2005 and 2006 tours.

13. Adjournment

The Forum adjourns at 12:05 p.m. to meet again on October 23, 2007.