

Plumas Watershed Forum

**Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
California Department of Water Resources
State Water Project Contractors**



Annual Report

January 11, 2006



Plumas Watershed Forum

Annual Report – January 11, 2006

Part I..... Overview

Part II.....Summary of Activities

Part III..... Financial Reports

Part IV.....Bylaws

Part V..... Watershed Forum Agendas and Meeting Minutes

Part VI..... Technical Advisory Committee Materials

Plumas Watershed Forum

Part I - Overview

The watershed for California's State Water Project encompasses the mountains and waterways around the Feather River, most of which lie within Plumas County. The State Water Project is the nation's largest state-built water and power development and conveyance system. Planned, designed, constructed and now operated and maintained by the California Department of Water Resources, this unique facility provides water supplies for 23 million Californians and 755,000 acres of irrigated farmland.

The Plumas Watershed Forum was formed on May 5, 2003, as part of a larger settlement agreement resolving a lawsuit related to the State Water Project. The Department of Water Resources, the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and the 28 other State Water Project Contractors created the Watershed Forum to implement watershed management and restoration activities for the mutual benefit of Plumas County and the State Water Project.

The Watershed Forum is funded by the Department of Water Resources, with a commitment of \$1 million dollars per year for the first four years (2003 through 2006). Depending on whether a new environmental impact report is successfully completed for certain changes to the water supply contracts between the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Project Contractors, the funding will be extended for an additional four years.

The following sections of this report provide a review of activities and projects undertaken by the Watershed Forum, reports of past expenditures and a budget for the current fiscal year, and the agendas and minutes from meetings of the Watershed Forum and its Technical Advisory Committee.

For more information, please visit the following websites or contact Plumas County or DWR staff at the addresses below. The Plumas County web page provides information about the Watershed Forum and specific projects that have been implemented. The Department of Water Resources web page includes the settlement agreement which created the Watershed Forum, as well as the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy, the document that was created to guide the Forum's watershed investments.

Plumas County – Plumas Watershed Forum

<http://www.countyofplumas.com/publicworks/watershed/index.htm>

California Department of Water Resources – Monterey Agreement Overview

<http://www.montereyamendments.water.ca.gov/>

**Tom Hunter, Director
Plumas County Flood Control and
Water Conservation District
1834 East Main Street
Quincy, CA 95971
(530) 283-6268**

**Dwight Russell, Chief
Northern District
California Department of Water Resources
2440 Main Street
Red Bluff, CA 96080
(530) 529-7342**

Plumas Watershed Forum Timeline

February 14, 2003 – First Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

June 20, 2003 – First Settlement Payment (\$1,000,000)

July 28, 2003 – First Watershed Forum Meeting - Bylaws adopted

August 13, 2003 – Watershed Forum Meeting

November 7, 2003 – TAC Meeting

January 9, 2004 – TAC Meeting

January 27, 2004 – Watershed Forum Meeting

March 15, 2004 – TAC Meeting

May 14, 2004 – Forum Meeting - *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*

June 18, 2004 – Deadline for Submittal of Initial Project Proposals

June 21, 2004 – Second Settlement Payment (\$1,000,000)

August 6, 2004 – Deadline for Submittal of Final Project Proposals

August 20, 2004 – TAC Meeting

August 31, 2004 – Watershed Forum Meeting

September 10, 2004 – TAC Meeting

October 26, 2004 – Watershed Forum Meeting

December 15, 2004 – Request for Concept Proposals

January 21, 2005– Deadline for Submittal of Initial Project Proposals

February 22, 2005 – TAC Meeting

April 1, 2005 – Deadline for Submittal of Final Project Proposals

April 28, 2005 – TAC Meeting

May 23, 2005 – Watershed Forum Meeting

June 17, 2005 – Third Settlement Payment (\$1,000,000)

October 25, 2005 – Watershed Forum Meeting

Part II - Summary of Activities

This document presents the first written annual report of the Plumas Watershed Forum, covering the period of time from June 2003 through September 2005.

The settlement agreement which created the Watershed Forum provides for funding of \$1 million per year for four years (2003 to 2006), with an additional four years of funding if a new environmental impact report is successfully completed for amendments to the State Water Project's water supply contracts.

The settlement agreement requires that a majority of each year's funds be spent on activities approved by the Watershed Forum and directly related to the goals set forth in the settlement agreement, including:

- Improved retention of water to improve base flow in streams.
- Improved water quality and stream bank protection.
- Improved upland vegetative management.
- Improved groundwater retention in major aquifers.

The remainder of each year's funds may be spent at the discretion of the Plumas County Flood Control District on other district related purposes after giving due consideration to the needs of the Watershed Forum.

2002-2003 Fiscal Year Activities

The Plumas County Flood Control District received the first \$1 million payment in June 2003. The money was divided into two cash accounts as required by the settlement agreement. The majority of the money, or \$500,001, was credited to what is referred to as the "Majority" or "A" fund. The balance of the money, \$499,999, was credited to what is referred to as the "Minority" or "B" fund. By the end of the 2002-2003 fiscal year, no expenditures were made using Majority or "A" funds resulting in a beginning "A" fund balance of \$500,320 for the 2003-2004 fiscal year. There were expenditures from the "B" fund. On June 10, 2003 the Flood Control District approved using \$50,000 to reimburse the Plumas County General Fund for emergency well drilling in Crescent Mills by the Indian Valley Community Services District. Additionally, the Plumas County Auditor set aside \$3,256 at the end of the fiscal year for payroll's compensated absence purposes. The beginning "B" fund balance for the 2003-2004 fiscal year was \$466,390, which included \$19,328 of Prop 204 funds.

2003-2004 Fiscal Year Activities

The settlement agreement did not specify a process to be used to choose which projects and activities to fund. Rather, it specified that the Watershed Forum would form a Technical Advisory Committee to assist in identifying activities that would attain the Forum's goals and provide timely and practical benefits for the Feather River watershed.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed and met during the summer and fall of 2003. The TAC reviewed the project proposals that the Flood Control District had begun to receive, discussed evaluation criteria, and decided they needed a strategic plan that set priorities

for watershed management and restoration activities. Ecosystem Sciences, led by Mark Hill, was hired to create a document, the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*, which would provide an overview of watershed conditions, identify and prioritize key problems, and prioritize solutions to the problems.

At Watershed Forum meetings during the 2003-2004 fiscal year, the following expenditures were discussed and approved for Majority/"A" funds:

- \$3,000 to UC Davis Cooperative Extension for Sulphur Creek project. \$3,000 was spent on two field studies monitoring fish movement within the creek.
- \$27,780 to Ecosystem Sciences for delivery of strategic watershed management and restoration plan. \$27,759 was spent.
- \$475,000 for a Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study. All bids received for this study were higher than the budgeted amount. Despite questions from Forum members regarding the cost to benefit ratio, the Forum increased the amount budgeted to \$488,260 in August 2004. No expenditures were made on this project, and the funds were reallocated in May 2005.
- \$75,000 to Plumas Corporation to carry out an upland vegetation management program. \$22,012 of this was spent seeking additional funding for fuels reduction work on private lands in the Feather River watershed. The remaining dollars were returned to the "A" fund as it was later determined (using the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*) that this type of capacity building project should be funded out of "B" dollars.
- \$115,000 to be for internal district overhead including a natural resources analyst.
- \$500 for Legislative Education Day. \$500 was donated to this educational event.

Minority/"B" fund expenditures require approval of the Plumas County Flood Control District. The expenditures are usually discussed at Forum meetings, however sometimes the district Board of Directors approves expenditures during regular district board meetings. Expenditures from the "B" fund which were discussed at Forum meetings during the 2003-2004 fiscal year included:

- \$100,000 for Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District well improvement. \$9,321 was spent installing a larger pump and deepening a well, resulting in a significant volume increase. The remaining \$90,679 was applied to another project during 2004-2005.
- \$20,000 for Pike eradication in Lake Davis. Nothing was spent and the entire \$20,000 has been returned to the "B" fund.
- \$32,325 for costs incurred by district counsel. The entire amount was transferred into County Counsel's budget.
- \$10,000 for district Travel Expense. \$677 spent
- \$452,000 to repay the County General Fund for past expenditures made on water issues.

During a Forum teleconference meeting in May 2004, a schedule for accepting and awarding the first round of project applications was approved and the *Feather River Watershed Management*

Strategy document was formally adopted. The *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy* indicated efforts should focus on restoring stream channels in priority areas, coupling active geomorphic techniques with passive ones to ensure the restoration was lasting and self-sustaining. Recommended geomorphic techniques include those that: halt headcutting; reduce sediment transport; increase riparian and upland vegetation; and recharge and retain groundwater. Identified priority areas include: the watershed on the east side of the Sierra Crest; the Sierra Valley groundwater basin; sub-watersheds transporting the greatest amount of sediments; and watershed areas where restoration will result in multiple benefits. Secondary priorities include encouraging educational and innovative projects.

At the end of the 2003-2004 fiscal year, “A” expenditures totaled \$139,206 resulting in a beginning “A” fund balance for the 2004-2005 fiscal year of \$871,478. Expenditures from the “B” fund totaled \$705,934 and included payments of over \$149,000 to Flood Control District attorney Michael Jackson and over \$81,000 for professional consultation done by: MWH Americas, Inc. for FERC relicensing; CH2M Hill; and Leah Wills. The resulting beginning “B” fund balance for the 2004-2005 fiscal year was \$452,835; this included \$134,747 of Prop 204 funds and \$50,000 from a JAMS client trust account.

2004-2005 Fiscal Year

The Watershed Forum met in August, October, and May of the 2004-2005 year. During those meetings, the Forum adopted formal processes for participation on the Technical Advisory Committee and for awarding grant money, and it agreed to issue a written annual report each October. The Forum also requested that the Flood Control District develop and maintain a website dedicated to the Plumas Watershed Forum. The website is accessible from links on the Plumas County home page and the Department of Water Resources’ Monterey Agreement Overview page. The site is directly accessible at:

<http://www.countyofplumas.com/publicworks/watershed/index.htm>

The Forum website includes all documents adopted by the Forum, links to other funding sources, and project information including when approved, amount funded, and updates on activities and accomplishments.

Following the guidelines set forth in the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*, the TAC evaluated the first round of project proposals and made recommendations to the Forum. During meetings in August and October, the Forum discussed and approved the following expenditures:

Majority/“A” funds:

- \$151,700 to Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (SVGMD) for a hydrogeologic study and installation of two multi-level monitoring wells. This project was completed in the spring of 2005 at a cost of \$120,984. SVGMD returned to the Forum during the second round of projects and obtained approval to use the remaining \$30,000 for well enhancement. As a result, \$716 will be returned to the “A” fund.
- \$35,000 to Feather River Coordinated Resource Management Group (FR-CRM) for relocating a road and rehabilitating a road channel crossing on the Charles Creek reach of

Last Chance Creek as part of a larger CALFED-funded restoration project. \$35,000 spent. This project was completed in the fall of 2004 with additional funds.

- \$115,000 to FR-CRM to complete restoration of the Charles Creek reach of Last Chance Creek and Hosselkus Creek in Genesee Valley. By October 1, 2005, \$6,892 had been spent and the following tasks were completed: CEQA documentation; permits from Army Corps of Engineers and SWRCB; watershed analysis; public notification of watershed restoration project. Progress had been made toward receiving a permit for streambed alteration.
- \$63,500 to the United States Forest Service to relocate a segment of road upslope from Rodgers Creek to eliminate the road-generated sediment that is being delivered into Last Chance and Rodgers Creeks. No expenditures to date.

Minority/"B" funds:

- \$23,000 to Plumas Geohydrology for an isotope monitoring project in the Last Chance Creek watershed to verify and quantify the effect of stream and watershed restoration on base flow and aquifer recharge. By October 1, 2005, \$12,910 had been spent.
- \$70,000 to FR-CRM for monitoring and coordination activities. By October 1, 2005, \$10,866 had been spent on activities including: hiring a watershed program coordinator; mid-season data processing on all permanent monitoring stations; servicing select monitoring stations; meeting in the field with various landowners and Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District to educate, garner interest, discuss possible project designs, and develop a Technical Advisory Committee; developing a draft concept design for Long Valley Creek.
- \$25,000 to Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District (SVRCD) for "capacity building" activities which include covering the direct costs of doing business for one year, thus providing the stability needed to ensure SVRCD is able to continue providing services to residents and protection to the natural resources of Sierra Valley. By October 1, 2005, \$5,922 had been spent on activities including: renting an office in Beckwourth; applying for funds from DWR's *Urban Streams Restoration Program*; releasing the Sierra Valley Watershed Assessment document; working to develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality and identify areas of concern; working to develop an Operational Agreement with NRCS; sponsoring an educational tour/workshop and a land use workshop; attending other workshops.
- \$17,750 to Feather River Resource Conservation District (FRRCD) for baseline "capacity building" funding to improve the infrastructure of FRRCD, thus expanding the District's ability to work with landowners and accelerate implementation of watershed improvement projects on private lands. By October 1, 2005, \$9,970 had been spent on activities including: developing brochures for outreach; providing training for personnel on watershed stewardship and permits; meeting with landowners to view possible projects; preparing presentation for Board of Supervisors; working on a long-range plan, emblem, and website.
- \$50,000 to Plumas Corporation to continue their "capacity building" work leveraging funds from other sources for fuels reduction projects; forest thinning projects; database

development; analyzing, cataloging, and mapping surplus lands within the Plumas National Forest. By October 1, 2005, \$19,857 had been spent.

- \$34,000 to Plumas Unified School District for a year-long Watershed Education program for all sixth-grade students throughout Plumas County. This funding was approved in two increments; on August 31, 2004, the Flood Control District approved \$11,000 for a watershed education program at C. Roy Carmichael School in Portola and on December 14, 2004, it approved \$23,000 for watershed education for other Plumas County sixth-grade students. \$30,958 was spent on expenses associated to the field trips, not salaries.

The second round of project proposals was evaluated by the TAC during the spring of 2005. During the May Watershed Forum meeting, the following projects were recommended by the TAC and approved by the Forum.

Majority / "A" funds:

- \$92,543 to Feather River College to improve 75 acres of native pasture and wetlands while managing livestock on the land, resulting in improved water quality to Spanish Creek, improved riparian habitat, and educational opportunities for students and the community. The first phase of the project entailed initial water quality sampling, constructing dry lots and a livestock watering system, and installing riparian fencing. This construction phase of the project was completed during the summer at a cost of \$80,432. The project plan budgeted \$5,610 for five years of monitoring.
- \$30,000 to Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District to enhance their current monitoring system with aquifer testing for water levels and interference characteristics. Contract sent to SVGMD; currently awaiting execution.
- \$25,000 to Plumas Geohydrology for pre-project monitoring in the Red Clover Creek area before a large CALFED-funded watershed project begins. Contract sent to Plumas Geohydrology; currently awaiting execution.
- \$84,500 to the United States Forest Service for the Clarks Creek Aspen Restoration project which removes conifer trees in the proximity of aspen groves, resulting in increased aspen community productivity and function, increased water yields, improved groundwater retention, downstream sediment reduction, reduced wildfire risk, rangeland improvement, habitat enhancement, and scenic enrichment. Collection Agreement executed October 2005.
- \$25,000 to FR-CRM for monitoring watershed health and project effectiveness throughout the watershed. Equipment at ten continuous monitoring stations will be maintained and calibrated as needed. Contract executed September 2005.
- \$64,000 to FR-CRM for gully elimination on Last Chance Creek and Jordan Creek using the pond-and-plug technique and for major fence repair around Jordan Flat to control cattle movement, thereby allowing vegetative re-growth to occur. Contract executed September 2005.

- Approved reallocating funds designated for the Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study to a new Lake Davis Water Treatment Plant, if necessary.

Minority or “B” funds:

- \$25,000 to Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District to continue to improve services within the district. Contract sent to SVRCD; awaiting execution.
- \$30,000 to Feather River Resource Conservation District to continue work within the district. The additional funds will be used for completing watershed management projects, monitoring, contract preparation and administration, and workshops. Contract executed October 2005.
- \$21,000 to Plumas Geohydrology for a pilot study to assess the use of isotope tracer methods to quantify the effect of forest canopy interception on baseflow. Contract sent to Plumas Geohydrology; awaiting execution.
- \$75,000 to Plumas Corporation to coordinate the fuels reduction projects of the Plumas Fire Safe Council and the forest thinning projects of the Quincy Library Group. Contract sent to Plumas Corporation; awaiting execution.
- \$33,668 to FR-CRM for public outreach and awareness. The funds will be used to sponsor the Feather River Headwaters Festival in October 2005 and to produce materials for outreach and education. Contract executed September 2005.
- \$50,000 to FR-CRM to coordinate project development on four creeks (Sulphur Creek, Last Chance Creek, Spanish Creek, and Long Valley Creek) in four separate valleys. Contract executed September 2005.

At the end of the 2004-2005 fiscal year, “A” expenditures totaled \$218,688; this amount includes \$22,224 in salary and benefits; \$176,461 in projects; and \$20,003 in services, supplies and administration. Expenditures from the “B” fund totaled \$455,705; this amount includes \$19,812 in salary and benefits; \$154,079 in projects; \$223,700 on professional consultation, including Michael Jackson (\$39,225), Leah Wills (\$52,389), MWH Americas (\$35,461), Ecosystem Sciences (\$99,610) and Maidu Cultural and Development Group (\$2,816); inter-fund transfers of \$25,000 to the Plumas County Board of Supervisors and \$14,323 to Plumas County Counsel; travel expenses of \$5,820; and \$12,971 of other services and supplies.

Progress Toward Goals and Priorities

Although the 2004-2005 fiscal year was the first time the Watershed Forum could rely on both the goals in the settlement agreement and the priorities set forth in the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy* for guidance in approving projects, fund balances were high enough that all applications complying with program requirements received funding. All projects funded with Majority/“A” funds were in geographic areas identified as priorities in the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*. These projects also addressed the following specific goals and priorities:

- Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District projects – trends identified in historical data analysis coupled with improvements in multi-level monitoring will enable the District to improve groundwater retention during periods of drought.
- The road relocation projects of FR-CRM and the Forest Service are being done in conjunction with other restoration work. The projects address the Forum’s goal of improving water quality and stream bank protection and the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy’s* priorities of reducing sediment transport and offering multiple benefits.
- The restoration work of FR-CRM on Last Chance Creek, Hosselkus Creek, and Jordan Creek and the Aspen Restoration project of the Forest Service address all of the Forum’s goals and the primary priorities set by the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*.
- The monitoring activities of Plumas Geohydrology and FR-CRM work toward verifying and quantifying the impacts of stream and watershed restoration on the flow regime of the Feather River basin and thus will document whether the goals of the Forum are being achieved. (Monitoring activities are also funded by Minority/“B” funds.)
- Feather River College’s project works toward the Forum’s goal of improving water quality and the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy’s* priority of improving riparian vegetation.

Minority/“B” funds are often expended on activities that work indirectly toward the goals of the Forum or address secondary priorities of the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy*.

- The project development and coordination efforts and capacity building activities of Plumas Corporation, FR-CRM, Feather River Resource Conservation District, and Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District all work toward on-the-ground projects that will directly address the goals of the Forum.
- The outreach and awareness program of FR-CRM and the Watershed Education program of Plumas Unified School District address the *Feather River Watershed Management Strategy’s* priority of encouraging educational projects.
- Work done by some professional consultants has resulted in Plumas County receiving grant funds for activities that will impact the overall health of the watershed.

2004- 2005 Activities and Expenditures By Project Sponsor

Sierra Valley RCD (\$25,000 granted; \$5,922 spent)

- Rented an office in Beckwourth, California
- Applied for funds from Department of Water Resources' "*Urban Streams Restoration Programs*" for a watershed restoration project in Smithneck Creek, a major contributor to the headwaters of the MFFR
- Applied to Plumas County Resource Advisory Committee for noxious weed management in order to create educational programs and strategies for preventing exotic species from entering the watershed
- Applied to Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) for an Operational Agreement specifying the responsibilities of SV RCD and NRCS in providing benefits to the people and resources of Sierra Valley
- Released the Sierra Valley Watershed Assessment document in April; CD's were made available to the public
- Working with Upper Feather River Watershed Management Group to develop a baseline monitoring program to evaluate water quality & identify areas of concern
- SV RCD Staff and/or Board Members attended: a USFS Contracts/Grants workshop; a Williamson Act workshop; a DOC Watershed Coordinators workshop
- Sponsored *Birds/Barns/BBQ* an educational tour/workshop
- Partnering with UC Cooperative Extension and High Sierra Resource Conservation & Development Council to sponsor a Land Use workshop in Fall 2005

Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District (\$151,700 granted; \$120,984 spent)

- Two nested monitor wells were installed in Chilcoot and Beckwourth, tested and water samples collected for chemical analysis.
- New subsurface geologic cross sections were developed.
- Updated records of metered pumpage and water levels for Spring 2003 through Spring 2005
- Interpreted trends after reviewing water level records extending back to 1960 in conjunction with 1989 – 2005 records of metered pumpage and water levels. Conclusion: metered pumpage of 6000 acre-feet per year results in near stable water levels
- Released a technical report on the 2003-2005 Sierra Valley Hydrogeologic Studies. Limited copies available for review from Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, 1834 East Main St. Quincy
- Submitted proposal to Watershed Forum to rollover surplus funds from the Monitoring Well project to aquifer testing

Feather River CRM - Hosselkus & Charles Creek (\$115,000 granted; \$6,892 spent)

- CEQA documentation completed
- Applications for permits submitted to Army Corps of Engineers; SWRCB; CA Department of Fish & Game

- Met with Forest Service regarding documents needed for NEPA; still awaiting completion of NEPA process. USFS will file a public notification of a categorical exclusion decision to be published September 28, 2005
- Permits received from Army Corps of Engineers and SWRCB
- Met with Dept. Fish & Game regarding permit for streambed alteration
- Watershed analysis completed and submitted to USFS
- Public Notification of Watershed Restoration Project; comment period ended

Feather River CRM - Monitoring and Project Development/Coordination
(\$70,000 granted; \$10,866 spent)

- Flow measurements collected at various locations in Indian and American Valleys
- TAC meeting included a presentation on the Stanford study using infrared technology
- Mid-season data processing on all permanent monitoring stations
- Service performed on monitoring stations on Spanish Creek and Lights Creek

Feather River Resource Conservation District (\$17,750 granted; \$9,970 spent)

- Met with landowners and viewed possible projects to fund
- Worked on brochures for outreach
- RCD personnel received training on watershed stewardship and permits
- Prepared presentation for County Board of Supervisors for outreach
- Worked on Long Range Plan; emblem; website
- Attended California RCD Day at the Capital for outreach

Plumas Unified School District - "Plumas to the Pacific" Watershed Education
(\$34,000 granted; \$30,958 spent)

Over 200 sixth-grade students attending Plumas County schools completed the year-long Feather River Watercourse. Students begin the school year with a residential out-door education camp followed by monthly field trips that initiate the study of the watershed in their local "backyard" and culminate with a 4 day field trip to discover where the river goes when it leaves home and learn first hand the costs and benefits of the seven primary ways that the Feather River is used.

Stops, activities and areas of emphasis include: PG&E's Stairway of Power; CA State Water Project facilities at Lake Oroville Dam; Feather River Fish Hatchery; Thermalito Bays; Skinner Fish Facility; Banks Pumping Plant; The CA Aqueduct; Grey Lodge Wildlife area; confluence of the Feather & Sacramento Rivers at Verona; Port of Sacramento; valley farms and orchards; islands of the Sacramento delta; San Francisco Bay estuary; Aquarium of the Bay; USS Pampanito; Golden Gate Bridge; the Bay Model; Muir Woods and Duxbury Reef

Feather River College: Riparian Corridor Project (\$92,543 granted; \$80,432 spent)

- Constructed four dry lots
- Installed riparian fencing
- Installed livestock watering system
- Conducted water quality sampling

Part III

Plumas Watershed Forum

Financial Reports

2004-2005 A Fund Expenditures

2004-2005 B Fund Expenditures

Approved Funding for Pending Projects

2005-2006 A Budget

2005-2006 B Budget

Plumas Watershed Forum 2004-2005 Budget

Majority "A" Fund

True Cash Balance6/30/04

871,477.96

REVENUE		
43010 Interest	17,709.27	
46611 Revenue from Settlements	500,001.00	
Fund Credit for 2003-2004 Expenditures*	<u>81,966.01</u>	
Total Revenue	599,676.28	599,676.28

Starting Assets (Cash Balance + Total Revenue)

1,471,154.24

*These funds transferred from the "B"fund to offset "A"expenditures that should have been from "B"

EXPENDITURES		
Salary & Benefits		
5100 Regular Wages	16,029.41	
51020 Other Wages	1,336.51	
51070 UI	87.88	
51080 Retirement	2,450.68	
51090 Group Insurance	150.00	
51100 OASDI	1,345.13	
51110 Workers Comp	1,601.77	
51111 Comp. Absence	<u>(777.09)</u>	
Total Salary & Benefits	22,224.29	22,224.29
Service & Supplies		
52020 Communications	155.26	
52170 Miscellaneous	135.00	
52190 Professional Services/Projects		
Plumas Corp	22,012.71	
FR CRM	33,500.00	
SVGMD	120,948.24	
Total Professional Services/Projects	176,460.95	
52370 Publications - Legal Notice	1,886.09	
52420 Rents& Leases - Structures	650.00	
52440 Special dept. Expenses	-	
52550 Auditor Fees	827.18	
52740 Routine Travel	367.36	
52750 Special Travel	352.32	
52775 In County Hosting	629.98	
52790 Administration	15,000.00	
52840 Contingencies	<u>-</u>	
Total Service & Supplies	196,464.14	196,464.14
Total Expenditures		218,688.43

Majority Fund Balance 6/30/05(Starting Assets minus Total Expenditures)

1,252,465.81

"A" Approved Funding(Approved Funding worksheet)

(900,478.48)

Majority Funds Available(Majority Fund Balance minus Approved Funding)

351,987.33

Plumas Watershed Forum 2004-2005 Budget

Minority "B" Funds

True Cash Balance 6/30/04

452,835.31

REVENUE		
43010 Interest	9,312.15	
46611 Revenue from Settlement *	418,032.99	
46070 Contrib from other Agency (Water for California)	<u>10,000.00</u>	
Total Revenue	437,345.14	437,345.14

Starting Assets (Cash Balance + Total Revenue)

890,180.45

*Revenue reflects transfer of \$81,966.01 to "A" fund. See III-1

EXPENDITURES		
Salary & Benefits		
51000 Regular Wages	14,982.74	
51020 Other Wages		
51070 UI	76.03	
51080 Retirement	2,034.79	
51090 Group Insurance	150.00	
51100 OASDI	1,162.88	
51110 Workers Comp	<u>1,406.06</u>	
Total Salary & Benefits	19,812.50	19,812.50
Service & Supplies		
52020 Communications	292.81	
52170 Miscellaneous	29.20	
52180 Office Expense	570.99	
52190 Professional Services/Projects		
Michael Jackson	39,225.00	
Leah Wills	52,389.02	
MWH Americas, Inc.	35,461.99	
Plumas Corp.	19,856.85	
Natural Resource	2,000.00	
Ace Federal Reporters	299.64	
Ecosystem Sciences	99,609.75	
Suzanne Stirling - PUSD Watercourse	5,416.15	
Robert Wade - PUSD Watercourse	17,162.80	
Burkhard Bohm	12,909.52	
Sierra Valley RCD	5,541.92	
Feather River RCD	2,513.00	
Maidu Cultural	2,815.93	
Road Department	276.86	
Total Professional Services/Projects	295,478.43	
52370 Publications	-	
52420 Rents & Leases - Structures	600.00	
52440 Special Department Expenses	-	
52550 Auditor Fees	-	
52740 Routine Travel	82.50	
52750 Special Travel	5,737.03	
Meacher - \$3879.14		
Goodman - \$413.21		
Dennison - \$262.04		
Hunter - \$82.64		
52775 In County Hosting	100.00	
52790 Administration	3,000.00	
52840 Contingencies		
54530 Construction GLRID	90,678.84	
58000 Transfer into BOS Budget		
Transfer into BOS Budget (Journal Entry 2204)	25,000.00	
Transfer into County Counsel Budget (J.E. 2370)	<u>14,323.00</u>	
Total Service & Supplies	435,892.80	435,892.80
Total Expenditures		455,705.30 455,705.30

Minority Fund Balance 6/30/05 (Starting Assets minus Total Expenditures)

434,475.15

"B" Approved Funding (Approved Funding worksheet)

(361,432.89)

Minority Funds Available (Minority Fund Balance minus Approved Funding)

73,042.26

Approved Funding

	\$ Approved	Expenditures to 10/1/05	Unspent Reserved	Available for Other Use	Notes
Majority "A" Funds					
2003					
Plumas Corp Veg. management	75,000.00	22,012.17	-	52987.83	See pg. II-2
UC Extension Sulphur Creek data collection	3,000.00	3,000.00	-		
Sierra Valley Flood Study	475,000.00	-	-		Reallocated - page II-6
2004					
Legislative Watershed Education Day	500.00	500.00	-		
Sierra Valley Flood Study 10/26/04	13,260.00	-	-		Reallocated - page II-6
SVGMD monitoring wells	151,700.00	120,984.24	-	715.76	\$30,000 to 2005 project
CRM- Charles Creek restoration	35,000.00	35,000.00	-		
USFS Beckwourth Road relocation	63,500.00	-	63,500.00		
CRM - Charles & Hosselkus Creeks	115,000.00	6,892.10	108,107.90		
2005					
FR College -habitat improvement	92,543.00	80,432.42	12,110.58		
SVGMD - well enhancement	30,000.00	-	30,000.00		
Plumas Geohydrology - Red Clover	25,000.00	-	25,000.00		
USFS Aspen Restoration	84,500.00	-	84,500.00		
CRM - monitoring	25,000.00	-	25,000.00		
CRM- Jordan Flat Restoration	64,000.00	-	64,000.00		
Lake Davis Water Treatment Facility	488,260.00	-	488,260.00		
Total		268,820.93	900,478.48		
Minority "B" Funds					
2003					
Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement Dist.	100,000.00	100,000.00	-		
Lake Davis pike eradication	20,000.00			20,000.00	See pg. II-3
2004					
Plumas Geohydrology - isotope	23,000.00	12,909.52	10,090.48		
CRM - monitoring & coordination	70,000.00	10,868.16	59,131.84		
SV RCD capacity building	25,000.00	5,922.37	19,077.63		
FR RCD Capacity building	17,750.00	9,970.14	7,779.86		
Plumas Corp	50,000.00	19,856.85	30,143.15		
PUSD Watercourse Education	34,000.00	30,958.07	3,041.93	3,041.93	
2005					
SV RCD capacity building	25,000.00	-	25,000.00		
FR RCD Capacity building	27,500.00	-	27,500.00		
Plumas Geohydrology-forest canopy	21,000.00	-	21,000.00		
Plumas Corp	75,000.00	-	75,000.00		
CRM - outreach & awareness	33,668.00	-	33,668.00		
CRM - project coord & development	50,000.00	-	50,000.00		
Total		190,485.11	361,432.89		

Plumas Watershed Forum 2005-2006 Proposed Budget

Majority "A" Fund

Beginning Fund Balance		1,252,465
Revenue		
46611 Revenue from Settlement		500,001
43010 Interest		9,800
Total Assests		1,762,266
Expenditures		
5100 Regular Wages		38,979
51020 Other Wages		1,500
51070 UI		195
51080 Retirement		7,101
51090 Group Insurance		500
51100 OASDI		2,982
51110 Workers Comp		3,800
5111 Comp. Absence		0
Total Salary & Benefits		55,057
Service & Supplies		
52020 Communications		250
52170 Miscellaneous		200
52180 Office Expense		0
52190 Professional Services/Projects		408,042
USFS -Beckwourth Road Relocation		63,500
CRM Charles & Hosselkus		108,000
FR College		8,042
SBGMD well enhancement		30,000
Plumas Geohydrology - Red Clover		25,000
USFS -Aspen Restoration		84,500
CRM - monitoring		25,000
CRM - Jordan Flat		<u>64,000</u>
		408,042
52370 Publications		2,000
52420 Rents & Leases		800
52440 Special Dept. Expenses		100
52550 Auditor Fees		900
52740 Routine Travel		500
52750 Special Travel		2,400
52775 In County Hosting		1,200
52790 Administration		15,000
Lake Davis Water Treatment Fac		488,260
Uncommitted		787,557
Total Service & Supplies		1,707,209
Total Expenses		1,762,266

Plumas Watershed Forum 2005-2006 Proposed Budget

Minority "B" Fund

Beginning Fund Balance	434,475.00	
Revenue		
46611 Revenue from Settlement	499,999.00	
43010 Interest	6,000.00	
Total Assests	940,474.00	
Expenditures		
5100 Regular Wages	38,979.00	
51020 Other Wages	-	
51070 UI	195.00	
51080 Retirement	7,101.00	
51090 Group Insurance	-	
51100 OASDI	2,982.00	
51110 Workers Comp	3,800.00	
5111 Comp. Absence		
Total Salary & Benefits	53,057.00	
Service & Supplies		
52020 Communications	1,000.00	
52170 Miscellaneous	100.00	
52180 Office Expense	1,000.00	
52190 Professional Services/Projects	593,758.00	
Plumas Geohydrology - isotope		10,090.00
CRM - monitoring & coordination		70,000.00
SV RCD - capacity building		40,000.00
FR RCD - capacity building		35,000.00
Plumas Corp -		75,000.00
Plumas Geohydrology - forest canopy		21,000.00
CRM - outreach & awareness		33,668.00
CRM - proj coordination & development		50,000.00
MWH Americas - FERC consultant		48,000.00
Leah Wills		50,000.00
Michael Jackson		40,000.00
John Mills		85,000.00
Maidu Cultural Dev, Gp.		<u>36,000.00</u>
		593,758.00
52370 Publications	200.00	
52420 Rents & Leases	1,000.00	
52440 Special Dept. Expenses	100.00	
52550 Auditor Fees	-	
52740 Routine Travel	100.00	
52750 Special Travel	10,000.00	
52775 In County Hosting	100.00	
52790 Administration	3,000.00	
Lake Davis Water Treatment Fac.	250,000.00	
Interfund transfer - County Counsel	26,588.00	
Uncommitted	471.00	
Total Service & Supplies	887,417.00	
Total Expenses	940,474.00	

Part IV

Plumas Watershed Forum

Bylaws

Bylaws for the Plumas Watershed Forum
(Adopted July 28, 2003)

These Bylaws are intended for adoption by the Forum as the organizational principles and governing procedures through which the Forum can conduct its business in an efficient and orderly manner.

1. **Mission Statement:** The Forum is a locally driven program to utilize watershed funds consistent with direction set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
2. **Voting:** Each of the three participating organizations shall have one vote, with formal decision-making requiring a unanimous vote of three, including selection of the Chair. Absent objection, business may be conducted by consensus in interests of time.
3. **Participants:** Three participant groups as follows:
 - 1) Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Represented by the Plumas County Board of Supervisors:
District One (Portola area and Sierra Valley, including Davis and Frenchman Reservoirs): B.J. Pearson
District Two (Feather River Canyon, east shore Lake Almanor, Greenville and Indian Creek drainage including Antelope Reservoir, Red Clover and Last Chance tributaries): Robert Meacher
District Three (Chester area, west shore Lake Almanor, and Butt Valley Reservoir): Bill Dennison
District Four (Quincy area and Bucks Lake): Ken Nelson
District Five (Graeagle area, Middle Fork Feather River, and La Porte): Ole Olson
 - 2) State Water Project Contractors
Represented by three contractor agencies:
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California: Tim Quinn
Solano County Water Agency: David Okita
Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District: Tom Hurlbutt
 - 3) Department of Water Resources, State of California
Represented by:
Northern District: Dwight Russell, Northern District Chief
State Water Project Analysis Office: Dan Flory, Office Chief
4. **Meetings:**
 - a) Shall be open and publicly noticed pursuant to the Brown Act, including meetings by conference call or video conference
 - b) Shall have one regular annual meeting per year in Plumas County on or about the first Thursday in October; and, shall have special meetings as needed in various locations subject to concurrence from all three participants.

c) Notices, agendas and notes of Forum meetings to be prepared by Plumas staff, with inclusion of other materials supplied by all participants through the Technical Committee.

5. **Technical Committee:** The Forum shall have a Technical Committee, chaired by a Plumas representative, to prepare documents and materials needed by the Forum. The Committee shall meet as needed, with staff assigned by each of the three participant groups. Subject to direction from the Forum, the Committee shall make reports and recommendations.
6. **Project Selection:** The Forum shall be guided in its selection of projects by the following principles:
 - a) Funding criteria emphasizing matching or supplemental funding.
 - b) Selection criteria linked to a strategic plan.
 - c) Project criteria emphasizing certain landscapes and types of work.
 - d) Probability of meeting performance criteria.
 - e) Probability of increasing public education and awareness.
7. **Settlement Principles:** The Forum shall be guided by the Settlement text entitled “Watershed Forum and Programs” (pp18 –20), to which reference shall be made in the event of an inability to reach consensus on any particular issue.
8. **Planning:** The Forum shall focus on both short-range and long-range planning in order to optimize expected benefits to the Plumas Watershed.
9. **Financial Reporting:** The Forum shall, at its annual October meeting, review the prior fiscal year’s income and expenditures prepared by the Plumas County Auditor-Controller for the Plumas Flood Control and Water Conservation District, which District shall hold, utilize and carry forward funds as set forth in the Settlement text.
10. **Annual Progress Reports:** The Forum shall direct Plumas’ preparation of an annual progress report in layperson’s language, with Technical Committee review, and with technical appendices as necessary, in order to assist public education and awareness. The report should be finalized by the annual October meeting.
11. **Amendment:** These bylaws may be amended by unanimous vote of the three participant groups.

Part V

Plumas Watershed Forum Agendas and Meeting Minutes

Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

AGENDA

Special Meeting of July 28, 2003 - PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

Location: Fairgrounds, Tulsa Scott Pavilion, East Quincy

Call to Order: 9:00 a.m.

Pledge

1. Welcoming Statements by the District Chair and members of the Board.
2. Public Comment Opportunity.
3. Introduction of Forum participants, and preliminary remarks.
4. Summary of the work of the Technical Committee (TC) established by Settlement Agreement section IV-B(2)(d). (County Counsel)
 - (a) Status as of Feb./March meetings.
 - (b) Status of proposed bylaws for the Forum.[See attached copy]
5. Discussion of Settlement Agreement [Copy attached], TC and bylaws - refer any action to Item 10 below.
6. Review and Discussion of Proposed Expenditures by the District Board
 - (a) Explanation by Board members and staff.
 - (b) Discussion by Forum of consistency with Settlement Agreement.
 - (c) Classification of each as either (1) ready for approval, (2) continuation with directions to District staff/TC, or (3) postponement to a future meeting.
7. Discussion of other proposed expenditures or projects.
 - (a) Roundtable of ideas between Forum participants.
 - (b) Classification as in 6(c).
8. Discussion of the work of watershed-related organizations, with short presentations if representatives are in attendance. [See attached copies on (a) - (d)]
 - (a) Feather River Coordinated Management Group (FR-CRM).
 - (b) Feather River Resource Conservation District.
 - (c) Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District.
 - (d) USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
 - (e) Others.
9. Discussion of any outstanding issues, and/or referrals to District staff/TC.
10. Motions by Forum participants and votes on items ready for approval.
11. Discuss arrangements for future meetings, with direction to District staff.

LUNCH SERVED, THEN MEETING ADJOURNED.

Agenda - July 28, 2003

ATTACHMENT "A"

Proposed expenditures, as of District Meeting of July 22:

1. Sierra Valley Floodplain Study - ~~\$300,000~~ ^{\$475,000}
To map lands in and out of floodplains; amount based on proposals by independent contractors. *CATEGORY "A"*
2. Facilities Improvements of District to ensure water supply to Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District - \$100,000 *CATEGORY "B"*
Costs of new well and/or storage for when Lake Davis water unavailable
3. District costs related to pike eradication efforts at Lake Davis - \$20,000
Related to meetings and negotiations with DWR and DFG *CATEGORY "B"*
4. Internal overhead of District
\$115,000 - district staff, including natural resources analyst. *CATEGORY "A"*
\$32,325 - district counsel (transfer to county counsel budget) *CATEGORY "B"*
\$10,000 - travel expenses by district board and staff *CATEGORY "B"*
5. Outside counsel to District - attorney Michael Jackson - \$130,000 total.
\$80,000 to settle legal fees per Agreement of June 25, 2003
\$50,000 for representation concerning District watershed interests (Resolution No. 03-6885) and defense of implementation of the QLG Act (Resolution No. 03-6883)
[copies of agreement and resolutions attached] *TO BE FUNDED OUTSIDE THE MONTEREY SETTLEMENT*
6. Vegetative management for watershed protection - \$75,000 - contract with Plumas Corporation. [Copy of proposal attached - 4 pages] *CATEGORY "A" - REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL COMM.*
7. Repayment of county general fund for past loans to District:
(a) \$50,000 being received from JAMS (not Forum funds)
(b) \$452,000 based on Auditor-Controller analysis. *REQUEST FOR BETTER ACCOUNTING OF WHAT MAKES UP THE \$452,000*

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

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE MEETING OF THE PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM HELD IN
QUINCY, CALIFORNIA ON AUGUST 13, 2003**

SUPERVISORS PRESENT: Dennison, Meacher, Olsen and Pearson

SUPERVISORS ABSENT Nelson

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM PRESENT:

David Okita, Solano County Water Agency
Tom Hurlbutt, Tulare Lake Basin WSD
Katy Spanos, Department of Water Resources
John Coburn, State Water Contractors
Dan Flory, Department of Water Resources
Dwight Russell, Department of Water Resources

PUBLIC COMMENT

Fran Roudebush, a member of the public, addresses the Forum regarding the repayment of county general fund for past loan to District. Ms. Roudebush refers to settlement received from the State of California in regards to Lake Davis. Ms. Roudebush is concerned that proposed repayment may include costs already covered by the Lake Davis settlement.

Ms. Roudebush also raised concerns with regards to possible conflicts of interest.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES - ATTACHMENT "A"

There is discussion by the Forum regarding proposed expenditures, as outline in Attachment "A". The Forum concurs that costs for outside counsel to the Plumas County Flood Control District, Attorney Michael Jackson, shall be funded outside the Monterey Settlement. There is a consensus by the Forum regarding which category of funding the proposed expenditures shall come from (see Attachment "A").

UC DAVIS EXTENSION – SULPHUR CREEK PROJECT

The Forum authorizes \$3,000 to the UC Davis Extension for the Sulphur Creek project..

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting is adjourned at 10:40 a.m. to meet again on October 22, 2003.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THE FOREGOING TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF AN ORDER ENTERED ON THE MINUTES OF THE PLUMAS COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE ABOVE DATE

ATTEST MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 14th DAY OF AUGUST 2003


NANCY L. D'ALFONSO
CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Agenda - July 28, 2003

ATTACHMENT "A"

Proposed expenditures, as of District Meeting of July 22:

1. Sierra Valley Floodplain Study - ~~\$300,000~~ ^{\$475,000}
To map lands in and out of floodplains; amount based on proposals by independent contractors. *CATEGORY "A"*
2. Facilities Improvements of District to ensure water supply to Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District - \$100,000 *CATEGORY "B"*
Costs of new well and/or storage for when Lake Davis water unavailable
3. District costs related to pike eradication efforts at Lake Davis - \$20,000
Related to meetings and negotiations with DWR and DFG *CATEGORY "B"*
4. Internal overhead of District
\$115,000 - district staff, including natural resources analyst. *CATEGORY "A"*
\$32,325 - district counsel (transfer to county counsel budget) *CATEGORY "B"*
\$10,000 - travel expenses by district board and staff *CATEGORY "B"*
5. Outside counsel to District - attorney Michael Jackson - \$130,000 total.
\$80,000 to settle legal fees per Agreement of June 25, 2003
\$50,000 for representation concerning District watershed interests (Resolution No. 03-6885) and defense of implementation of the QLG Act (Resolution No. 03-6883)
[copies of agreement and resolutions attached] *TO BE FUNDED OUTSIDE THE MONTEREY SETTLEMENT*
6. Vegetative management for watershed protection - \$75,000 - contract with Plumas Corporation. [Copy of proposal attached - 4 pages] *CATEGORY "A" - REFERRED TO THE TECHNICAL COMM.*
7. Repayment of county general fund for past loans to District:
(a) \$50,000 being received from JAMS (not Forum funds)
(b) \$452,000 based on Auditor-Controller analysis. *REQUEST FOR BETTER ACCOUNTING OF WHAT MAKES UP THE \$452,000*

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

**AGENDA FOR MEETING OF JANUARY 27, 2004 TO BE HELD AT 10:00 A.M.
AT THE PLUMAS-SIERRA COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS, MINERAL BUILDING,
QUINCY, CALIFORNIA**

AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Any member of the public may address the Forum on matters, which are within the jurisdiction of the Forum. If you are addressing the Forum regarding a matter listed on the agenda, you are requested to hold your comments until the Forum takes up that matter. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes or less.

3. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

- A. Report and update on approved majority and minority project expenditures to date.
- B. Status report on progress of approved projects.
- C. Discussion and approval of Feather River Watershed Management Strategy Report, including discussion on process of accepting and awarding applications.
- D. California Watershed Network – Request for approval of \$500 for Legislative Watershed Education Day to be held on April 7, 2004 at the Capitol in Sacramento.

NOON RECESS

Lunch will be provided in the Mineral Building.

4. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Request for approval of the Plumas Corporation project for \$75,000 with a caveat.

5. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

Schedule next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum.

ADJOURNMENT

**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 JANUARY 27, 2004**

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

None.

**3. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
MAJORITY AND MINORITY PROJECT EXPENDITURES**

Tom Hunter, Director of the Plumas County Flood Control District gives a report and update on approved majority and minority project expenditures to date.

PROGRESS OF APPROVED PROJECTS

Tom Hunter, Director of the Plumas County Flood Control District gives a status report on progress of approved projects. A list of the projects is before the Forum and discussed in detail.

FEATHER RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY REPORT

Mark Hill Managing Partner of Ecosystem Sciences is present and addresses the Forum. Mr. Hill presents the Forum with a draft document of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy. The document is discussed in detail. The Chair receives comments from members of the Forum. Supervisor Pearson finds the document to be disturbing and refers to the cattle industry in Sierra Valley being removed from use of Forest Service land. Mr. Hill clarifies stating that the document is a plan designed to help the cattle ranchers and explains that with the help of the ranching industry in Sierra Valley the benefit to stream restoration and underground water will be substantial. Supervisor Meacher requests more verbiage under Economic and Social Feasibility in regards to the funding process. Various members of the public and representatives of various organizations address the Forum in support of the document. Dwight Russell, representing the Department of Water Resources encourages members of the ranching industry to attend the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings. The members of the Committee will be available to meet with members of the ranching industry to discuss funding needs, etc.

Motion is made by Forum Member Dwight Russell, seconded by Supervisor Pearson and unanimously carried to set a 30-day comment period of the draft strategy document. After the 30-day comment period the document will be reviewed by the TAC for recommendation.

Members of the Forum encourage private property owners and members of the various organizations to submit their comments in regards to the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy draft document.

**CALIFORNIA WATERSHED NETWORK - LEGISLATIVE WATERSHED EDUCATION
DAY, REQUEST FOR \$500**

At the request of Supervisor Meacher, motion is made by Forum Member, Dwight Russell, seconded by Forum Member, Tim Quinn and unanimously carried to approve \$500 for Legislative Watershed Education Day to be held on April 7, 2004 at the State Capitol in Sacramento.

4. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
PLUMAS CORPORATION \$75,000 PROJECT

Motion is made by Forum Member Dwight Russell, seconded by Forum Member, Tim Quinn and unanimously carried to approve the request of Plumas Corporation for \$75,000 for Vegetation Management for Watershed Protection. As recommended by the TAC, the \$75,000 shall come from Majority Funds with a caveat that when the Forum approved an application and approval process, they would need to apply.

5. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE FORUM

The next scheduled meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum shall be determined following the distribution of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy draft document and a meeting of the TAC.

URGENCY ITEM – PLUMAS COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT WITH JULIA COLEMAN AS COUNTY
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The meeting is convened at 10:00 a.m. with Supervisors Robert Meacher, B.J. Pearson, Ole Olsen and Vice Chair, Bill Dennison present. Chairman Kenneth Nelson is absent.

Motion is made by Supervisor Pearson and seconded by Supervisor Meacher to add this item to the agenda as an urgency item because the need for action was not apparent prior to the posting of the agenda. AYES: Supervisors Pearson, Olsen, Dennison and Meacher. NOES: None. ABSENT: Supervisor Nelson. Carried and so ordered.

Motion is made by Supervisor Pearson, seconded by Supervisor Meacher and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Nelson absent, to approve a contract between Julia Coleman and Plumas County to serve as the County Administrative Officer, effective March 15, 2004, and authorize the Chair to sign.

ADJOURNMENT

The Forum adjourns at 12:05 p.m. to meet again on a date to be determined following a meeting of the TAC.

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation District

PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

COUNTY OF PLUMAS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE MEETING OF THE PLUMAS WATERSHED
HELD IN QUINCY, CALIFORNIA ON MAY 14, 2004

AGENDA

- 9:00 A.M.** Roll Call
- 9:05 A.M.** Public Comment Opportunity
- 9:10 A.M.** 1. Review and approval of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy Document prepared by Ecosystem Sciences (Mark Hill).
- 10:00 A.M.** 2. Review proposed schedule of accepting and awarding project applications.
- 10:30 A.M.** 3. To consider funding of stakeholder costs to attend TAC or Forum meetings.
- 11:00 A.M.** Adjourn

Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation District

PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

COUNTY OF PLUMAS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE MEETING OF THE PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM HELD IN QUINCY, CALIFORNIA ON MAY 14, 2004

AGENDA

- 9:00 A.M.** Roll Call
- 9:05 A.M.** Public Comment Opportunity
- 9:10 A.M.** 1. Review and approval of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy Document prepared by Ecosystem Sciences (Mark Hill).
- 10:00 A.M.** 2. Review proposed schedule of accepting and awarding project applications.
- 10:30 A.M.** 3. To consider funding of stakeholder costs to attend TAC or Forum meetings.
- 11:00 A.M.** Adjourn

1. Review and Approval of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy Document prepared by Ecosystem Sciences (Mark Hill).

Recommendation: To approve the final draft of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy Document as modified by the Technical Advisory Committee.

Discussion: At the last Forum Meeting on January 27, 2004, the members heard a presentation by Mark Hill and a draft of the Feather River Watershed Management Strategy Document was reviewed. Members present commented on portions of the document. The forum members approved the concept of requesting a public review and comment period.

The draft document was noticed to the public by public notices in the local papers as well as the Department of Water Resources website. The comment period ended on February 27, 2004. On March 15, 2004, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met in Oroville to review each of the comments received and to make final modifications to the draft document and to make a recommendation to the Forum. Mark Hill has made our requested changes to the document, and the

Technical Advisory Committee is recommending that you approve the final draft of this document.

2. Review of Proposed Schedule of Accepting and Awarding Project Applications.

Recommendation: To approve the following schedule of events for the acceptance and awarding of projects:

- Forum Approval - Strategy, May 14th
- Application for the Initial Project Submittal, June 18th
- TAC Meeting to review and select projects for full submittal, June 28th - July 1st
- Full proposals due, August 6th
- TAC Review and Recommendation, August 12th - 17th
- Forum Meeting to review TAC Recommendations, August 23rd - 27th
- Flood Control Board of Directors
- Agreement Approval - Anytime after Forum Approval

Discussion: The TAC created a schedule to review proposals and ultimately have the Forum approve the successful applications for the first round of projects. This schedule was predicated on receiving Forum approval of the Strategy document within the first week of April. Due to Tom Hunter becoming ill, this meeting did not get scheduled.

With the establishment of May 14th as the probable approval date. The schedule has been revised to accommodate the delay. Please review the proposed time table.

It is important to note that there are two submittals for project applicants to submit. The first submittal is brief but includes the project summary, schedule, and costs. These will be reviewed by the TAC, and viable projects will be asked to submit final proposals which will be much more detailed.

The TAC will evaluate these detailed proposals and make recommendations to the Forum. Part of the TAC review will use the available monies to determine which projects should be approved within the first round of approvals.

3. To consider using a portion of the Funds for Stakeholder Participation.

Recommendation: To approve stakeholders that are approved by the Forum to receive mileage and reasonable meal costs to attend TAC and/or Forum meetings:

Discussion: The proposal to cover certain costs of stakeholders has been discussed sporadically since the Forum formation. To my knowledge, it has never been finalized.

The District has received an invoice from Jan Stine, Sierra Valley RCD, in the amount of \$2,354.60. This includes 61 hours at \$35 per hour, plus 549 miles at .40¢ per mile.

The TAC membership is made up of several governmental agencies and stakeholders. The current stakeholders that have attended TAC meetings are:

- Jim Wilcox, Feather River CRM
- Jan Stine, Sierra Valley CRM
- John Sheehan, Plumas Corp.
- Farrell Cunningham, Maidu Cultural and Development Group
- John Schramel, Feather River RCD
- Carl Genasci, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
- Judy Dillon, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
- Burkhard Bohm, Plumas Geo-Hydrology

The stakeholders are interested in the process, and all have projects that they want to seek approval for. Their impact within both the TAC and Forum meetings are valuable to the process.

The TAC has discussed the payments for stakeholders and recommends that the Forum approve a list of stakeholders that can receive reimbursement for mileage and meals only. They can submit a proposal for further funding within the process that is currently proposed for the acceptance of projects.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF PLUMAS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**AGENDA FOR SPECIAL MEETING OF AUGUST 31, 2004 TO BE HELD AT 9:00 A.M. IN THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROOM, COURTHOUSE, QUINCY, CALIFORNIA**

KENNETH NELSON, CHAIRMAN
NANCY L. DAFORNO, CLERK

www.countyofplumas.com

AGENDA

1. 9:00 A.M. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

Sitting as the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the Board will meet with members of the Plumas Watershed Forum via teleconference to discuss issues related to the Monterey Settlement Agreement.

- A. Report and update on expenditures/budget of the Monterey Agreement majority/minority funds. (Tom Hunter)
- B. Update on Sierra Valley Floodplain proposals. (Tom Hunter)
- C. Discussion regarding project approval process and involvement of the Technical Advisory Committee.
- D. Technical Advisory Committee recommendations on first round project applications. (Tom Hunter)
- E. Approval of first round projects by the Plumas Watershed Forum.

2. 10:00 PLUMAS COUNTY AUDITOR/CONTROLLER

- A. Approval of Contract with Public Resources Management Group for SB-90 State mandate reimbursement claiming services for FY 2004/2005, and authorize the Chair to sign.
- B. Approval of Contract with Smith & Newell, CPA's for audit services for years ending June 30, 2004 and June 30, 2005 in the amount of \$38,500 and \$40,025 respectively, and authorize the Chair to sign.

3. 10:10 COUNTY CLERK/RECORDER

Request for exception to the hiring freeze to fill a vacant position of Elections Specialist at no additional cost to the general fund.

4. 10:15 DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Request for exception to the hiring freeze to fill a Legal Assistant position, created by promotion and at no additional cost to the general fund.

5. 10:20 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- A. Adoption of Contract or amended Contract for the High Sierra Music Festival, and authorize the Chair to sign.
- B. **RESOLUTION**, Adopting the Final Budget for Plumas County and the Dependent Special Districts therein for Fiscal Year 2004/2005 in Accord with Government Code §2V9092, and Other Budgetary Administrative Controls in Accord with Government Code §29092 and §29125. **Roll call vote.**
- C. Adoption of an **ORDINANCE**, first read on August 17, 2004, of the Grizzly Ranch Community Services District Regulating the Use of Water and Wastewater Facilities. **Roll call vote.**
- D. Discussion and possible action regarding a request for \$11,000 from the Monterey Agreement discretionary fund for a watershed project at C-Roy Carmichael School in Portola. (Supervisor Pearson)
- E. **CLOSED SESSION** for public employee performance evaluation – Interim County Counsel

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Approval of expenditures from Community Services Funds.

Department 20720 – Supervisor Meacher

Dawn Institute – Donation for Youth Mentoring Program \$ 500.00

Indian Valley Recreation & Park District – Donation for
Taylorsville Pool maintenance \$1,000.00

Department 20730 – Supervisor Dennison

Boy Scouts of America – Donation for picnic tables at
Camp Fleischmann \$ 500.00

Persons with a disability may request an agenda packet in appropriate alternative formats as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 by contacting the Clerk of the Board at (530) 283-6170. All persons requiring reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids in order to effectively participate in a meeting may contact the Clerk of the Board’s office by noon on the Monday preceding the meeting to make such arrangements.

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF PLUMAS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HELD IN QUINCY ON AUGUST 31, 2004**

1. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

Sitting as the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the meeting is called to order at 9:00 a.m. with Supervisors Bill Dennison, B.J. Pearson, Ole Olsen and Chair, Kenneth Nelson present. Supervisor Robert Meacher is absent.

Other members of the Plumas Watershed Forum present include:

David Okita, Solano County Water Agency	Tom Hurlbutt, Tulare Lake Basin WSD
Katy Spanos, Department of Water Resources	John Coburn, State Water Contractors
Dan Flory, Department of Water Resources	Dwight Russell, Department of Water Resources
Nancy Quan, Department of Water Resources	Tim Quinn, Metropolitan Water District
Judy Dillon, Sierra Valley Groundwater District	Tom Hunter, Plumas County Flood Control District
Todd Hillaire, Department of Water Resources	

Members of the Plumas Watershed Forum are meeting via teleconference to discuss issues related to the Monterey Settlement Agreement.

Tom Hunter, Director of the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District presents the Board with various information regarding today's meeting.

EXPENDITURES/BUDGET – MAJORITY/MINORITY FUNDS

At the request of John Coburn, State Water Contractors, this matter is continued to the October 2004 meeting to allow time to review the information presented to the Forum.

SIERRA VALLEY FLOODPLAIN PROPOSALS

The Forum approved the Sierra Valley Floodplain Study in 2003 for \$475,000 from Majority Funds. Mr. Hunter reports that there have been three proposals received. The lowest proposal is from Steve Devin for \$587,500. The US Army Corps of Engineers has funds to expend in floodplain local studies. Mr. Hunter has sent a letter requesting additional funding and is awaiting a response before making a recommendation to the Board.

PROCESS AND INVOLVEMENT OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

This item is before the Forum for discussion regarding project approval process and the involvement of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC is made up of representatives of each of the Monterey Agreement Settlement signatories. Also, there are some 20 stakeholders that attend most TAC meetings. Mr. Hunter has presented the Board with a draft document outlining the process for awarding grant money. The document states that the TAC will provide the Forum with recommendations. The Forum will make the final decision for projects. The Forum will also specify funding sources for projects approved. There is discussion by the Forum. Supervisor Pearson encourages participation by the various Resource Conservation Districts and the CRM regarding stream restoration projects.

FIRST ROUND APPLICATION SUBMITTALS

There are eight project applications that have been submitted for consideration. Two of the projects are before the Forum for approval as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee. Following brief discussion, motion is made by Supervisor Dennison and seconded by Supervisor Pearson to approve the following projects. AYES: Supervisors Dennison, Pearson, Olsen and Nelson, Forum Members from the Department of Water Resources, and Forum Members from the State Water Contractors. NOES: None. ABSENT: Supervisor Meacher. Carried and so ordered.

1. Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District - \$151,700 for the construction of two multi-level groundwater monitory wells.
2. Plumas Corporation - \$35,000 for restoration of Last Chance at Charles Creek area. These monies will be used in conjunction with a CalFed project.

MEETING SCHEDULE

The next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum will be held on October 26, 2004 at 10:00 a.m. at the Plumas-Sierra County Fairgrounds, Mineral Building, Quincy.

The Board adjourns as the Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and reconvenes as the Board of Supervisors for all purposes.

2. PLUMAS COUNTY AUDITOR/CONTROLLER **CONTRACT WITH PUBLIC RESOURCES MANAGEMENT GROUP – SB-90 SERVICES FOR FY 2004/2005**

As recommended by Michael Tedrick, Auditor/Controller, motion is made by Supervisor Dennison, seconded by Supervisor Pearson and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Meacher absent, authorizing the Chair to sign a contract with Public Resources Management Group for SB-90 claiming services for FY 2004/2005.

CONTRACT WITH SMITH & NEWELL, CPA's FOR AUDIT SERVICES

Upon report and recommendation of Michael Tedrick, Auditor/Controller, motion is made by Supervisor Olsen, seconded by Supervisor Pearson and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Meacher absent, authorizing the Chair to sign a contract with Smith & Newell, CPA's for audit services for years ending June 30, 2004 and June 30, 2005 in the amount of \$38,500 and \$40,025 respectively. As recommended by Julia Coleman, County Administrative Officer, the Auditor/Controller will be issuing a Request for Proposals for an independent auditor for fiscal year ending June 30, 2006.

3. COUNTY CLERK/RECORDER **EXCEPTION TO HIRING FREEZE – ELECTIONS SPECIALIST**

Motion is made by Supervisor Dennison, seconded by Supervisor Olsen and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Meacher absent, to approve the request of Kathleen Williams, Clerk /Recorder, authorizing an exception to the hiring freeze to fill the vacant position of Elections Specialist at no additional cost to the general fund.

4. DISTRICT ATTORNEY **EXCEPTION TO HIRING FREEZE – LEGAL ASSISTANT**

Motion is made by Supervisor Dennison, seconded by Supervisor Pearson and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Meacher absent, authorizing an exception to the hiring freeze to fill the position of Legal Assistant which may become vacant by the potential promotion to Paralegal, and at no additional cost to the general fund.

5. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS **CONTRACT WITH HIGH SIERRA MUSIC FESTIVAL**

This item is before the Board for approval of Amendment No. 1 to the November 2003 Agreement between Plumas County and High Sierra Music, Inc. Barbara Thompson, Interim County Counsel gives an overview of amendments made to the agreement. There is discussion by the Board. Supervisor Pearson questions who has the legal authority to set fees for law enforcement. The Plumas County Sheriff has the right to send as many deputies to attend the Festival as he deems necessary. Therefore, law enforcement costs could change from year to year. Barbara Thompson, Interim County Counsel informs the Board that law enforcement costs are a part of the license fees as set in the agreement with High Sierra Music Festival. Supervisor Dennison reminds the Board that the license fees could have been amended within the 60-day requirement notice. Supervisor Dennison believes that the Sheriff should be a part of negotiations to determine costs for law enforcement and costs should not be determined after the fact. Supervisor Dennison points out that the more the Sheriff charges for law enforcement, the less the Fair will receive. Supervisor Dennison further states that he is in favor of the event but disagrees with the process used for law enforcement costs. Supervisor Nelson addresses the sale of alcoholic beverages and the importance to follow requirement of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC). Julia Coleman, County Administrative Officer informs the Board that the County is held harmless from any claims resulting from the sale of alcoholic beverages as outlined in Section 19.-Indemnification.

Motion is made by Supervisor Pearson, seconded by Supervisor Nelson and carried, with Supervisor Olsen opposing and Supervisor Meacher absent, authorizing the Chair to sign Amendment No. 1 to the November 2003 Agreement between Plumas County and High Sierra Music, Inc.

RESOLUTION 04-7056 RE: FINAL BUDGET FOR FY 2004/2005

Motion is made by Supervisor Dennison and seconded by Supervisor Pearson adopting Resolution No. 04-7056, Final Budget for Plumas County and the Dependent Special Districts therein for Fiscal Year 2004/2005 in Accord with Government Code §2V9092, and Other Budgetary Administrative Controls in Accord with Government Code §29092 and §29125. AYES: Supervisors Dennison, Pearson, Olsen and Nelson. NOES: None. ABSENT: Supervisor Meacher. Carried and so ordered.

Julia Coleman, County Administrative Officer thanks Michael Tedrick, Auditor/Controller for all his help during the budget process.

ORDINANCE 04-1015 RE: GRIZZLY RANCH CSD WATER AND WASTEWATER FACILITIES

Motion is made by Supervisor Pearson and seconded by Supervisor Olsen adopting Ordinance No. 04-1015, first read on August 17, 2004, of the Grizzly Ranch Community Services District Regulating the Use of Water and Wastewater Facilities. AYES: Supervisors Dennison, Pearson, Olsen and Nelson. NOES: None. ABSENT: Supervisor Meacher. Carried and so ordered.

\$11,000 FROM MONTEREY SETTLEMENT DISCRETIONARY FUND FOR C-ROY CARMICHAEL SCHOOL

Motion is made by Supervisor Pearson, seconded by Supervisor Dennison and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Meacher absent, to appropriate \$11,000 from the Monterey Settlement discretionary fund for a watershed project at C-Roy Carmichael School in Portola.

CLOSED SESSION

The Board meets in closed session from 10:45 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. for public employee performance evaluation – Interim County Counsel.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

Motion is made by Supervisor Pearson, seconded by Supervisor Olsen and unanimously carried, with Supervisor Meacher absent, to approve the following consent agenda items.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Approval of expenditures from Community Services Funds.

Department 20720 – Supervisor Meacher

Dawn Institute – Donation for Youth Mentoring Program \$ 500.00

Indian Valley Recreation & Park District – Donation for Taylorsville Pool maintenance \$1,000.00

Department 20730 – Supervisor Dennison

Boy Scouts of America – Donation for picnic tables at Camp Fleischmann \$ 500.00

PLUMAS COUNTY DEPARTMENT HEADS COMMENT PERIOD

LIBRARY

Margaret Miles, County Librarian announces that she has been appointed as Vice President/President Elect for the California Library Association. Ms. Miles is proud to announce that this is the first time ever that a County Librarian from the rural north has been elected to this position. The Board congratulates Ms. Miles on her appointment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourns at 11:00 a.m. to meet again on September 7, 2004 at 9:00 a.m. as the Community Development Commission and at 10:00 a.m. as the Board of Supervisors for all purposes.

Kenneth R. Nelson, Chairman of the Board

ATTEST:

Nancy L. DaForno, Clerk of the Board
Annual Report
Page 39

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

**AGENDA FOR MEETING OF OCTOBER 26, 2004 TO BE HELD AT 10:00 A.M. AT THE PLUMAS-SIERRA
COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS, MINERAL BUILDING, QUINCY, CALIFORNIA**

KENNETH NELSON, CHAIRMAN
NANCY L. DAFORNO, CLERK

www.countyofplumas.com

AGENDA

1. 10:00 A.M. INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Any member of the public may address the Forum on matters, which are within the jurisdiction of the Board. If you are addressing the Forum regarding a matter listed on the agenda, you are requested to hold your comments until the Forum takes up that matter. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes or less.

3. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

- A. Review of budget expenditures for FY 2003/2004.
- B. Proposed budget for FY 2004/2005 Majority Funds.
- C. Proposed budget for FY 2004/2005 Minority Funds.
- D. Approval of Phase II of First Round Projects.
- E. Status of Existing Projects:
 - 1. Sierra Valley Floodplain
 - 2. Charles Creek
 - 3. Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
- F. Schedule for Second Round Projects.
- G. Approval of Technical Advisory Group Membership.
- H. Schedule the next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum.

ADJOURNMENT

Lunch to be provided in the Mineral Building.

**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 OCTOBER 26, 2004**

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Forum convenes at 10:00 a.m. with Plumas County Supervisors Robert Meacher, BJ Pearson and Vice Chair, William Dennison present. Members from the Department of Water Resources include Dwight Russell, Dan Flory, Nancy Quan, Todd Hillaire and Katie Spanos. Members from the State Water Contractors include John Coburn, Tim Quinn, Tom Hurlbutt and David Okita.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Holly George, County Director of Cooperative Extension is present and addresses the Forum. Ms. George presents the Forum with information in regards to implementation of a grant proposal (Prop 40/50 Ag Water Quality Grant) to establish and implement a program to address water quality issues related to discharge from irrigated agricultural lands in the upper Feather River watershed area.

Kelley Goldsmith, a member of the public and property owner in the Sierra Valley, addresses the Forum opposed to the use of Monterey Settlement money to fund the Sierra Valley Floodplain study because the study was never subjected to criteria that other projects had to meet and because it will not meet the strategy goals.

**3. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
FY 2003/2004 BUDGET EXPENDITURES**

Tom Hunter, Director addresses the Forum. At the August 31, 2004 Forum Meeting, Mr. Hunter delivered budgetary material which included a list of expenditures from the Minority and Majority funds. Subsequent to the Forum meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee met in Oroville on September 10, 2004. At that time the list of expenditures was discussed. Most of the comments dealt with costs for consultants, and those costs were requested to be moved from the Majority funds to the Minority funds totaling \$81,966.

As recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee, motion is made by Forum Member Dwight Russell, seconded by Forum Member BJ Pearson and unanimously carried to transfer \$81,966 from the Majority funds to the Minority funds for consultants' fees, and upon receipt of the next Monterey Settlement payment in June 2005.

Mr. Hunter further reports that another item within the review was the expenditures within the Minority funding for FY 2003/2004 for Attorney Michael Jackson. There is \$149,184 that was paid to Mr. Jackson in the last fiscal year. \$74,000 of that amount was fees related to the settlement meetings.

Forum Members from the Department of Water Resources refer to minutes of the Plumas Watershed Forum from August 13, 2003. The Forum agreed that costs for Attorney Michael Jackson as outside counsel to the Plumas County Flood Control District shall be funded outside the Monterey Settlement. John Coburn, representing the State Water Contractors informs the Forum that in the past years there has been concern about Mr. Jackson's involvement in the Monterey Amendment lawsuit. Forum Member Robert Meacher believes this is a broad approach. Mr. Meacher states that overall forest health is important to all, protection to the watersheds, etc, and from time-to-time requires legal representation.

It is the intent of the County to pay the \$149,184; \$74,000 out of the Judicial Arbitration Mediation Services (JAMS) and the remainder will be paid from funding to be determined.

FY 2004/2005 MAJORITY FUNDS

Tom Hunter, Director gives an overview of the proposed budget for FY 2004/2005 Majority funds. The budget includes \$244,130 for half of the cost for the Sierra Valley Floodplain Study. Kelley

Goldsmith, a member of the public and property owner in the Sierra Valley addresses the Forum opposed to use of the Monterey Settlement to fund the Sierra Valley Floodplain Study. The Forum concurs with the budget presented.

FY 2004/2005 MINORITY FUNDS

Tom Hunter, Director presents the Forum with a proposed budget for FY 2004/2005 Minority Funds. The proposed budget represents \$60,000 for Attorney Michael Jackson for legal services. John Coburn, representing the State Water Contractors informs the Forum that they are opposed to the use of Monterey Settlement funds for the retention of Attorney Michael Jackson to represent Plumas County in the Lake Oroville FERC Project 2100 relicensing negotiations. The State Contractors believe that Mr. Jackson is not cooperative or supportive in the Lake Oroville collaborative negotiations. Dwight Russell, representing the Department of Water Resources concurs with Mr. Coburn. Forum Member Robert Meacher believes this is a matter that needs to be reconciled. Jim Murphy, City of Portola Administrator informs the Forum that the City will continue to work with the County in regards to the Lake Davis Treatment Plant. The Forum concurs with the budget presented and agrees that it is at the discretion of Plumas County to retain Attorney Michael Jackson.

FIRST ROUND PROJECTS, PHASE II

On August 31, 2004, the Forum approved two projects from the Majority Funding, Charles Creek for \$35,000, and two monitoring wells for the Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District for \$151,700.

Upon report and recommendation of Tom Hunter, Director, motion is made by Forum Member BJ Pearson, seconded by Forum Member Dwight Russell and unanimously carried to approve the remaining projects for Phase II of the First Round as follows:

<u>Beckwourth Ranger District</u> (“A” Majority Funds) Partial funding to relocate 3.9 miles of road	\$ 63,500
<u>Burkhard Bohm</u> (“B” Minority Funds) Isotop monitoring	\$ 23,000
<u>Feather River CRM</u> Two Creek Restorations (“A” Majority Funds) Project Coordination & Monitoring (“B” Minority Funds)	\$115,000 \$ 70,000
<u>Sierra Valley RCD</u> (“B” Minority Funds) (\$25,000 for three years)	\$ 25,000
<u>Feather River RCD</u> (“B” Minority Funds) (\$17,500 for three years)	\$ 17,750
<u>Plumas Corporation</u> (“B” Minority Funds) QLG & Forest Watershed Participation	\$ 50,000

STATUS OF EXISTING PROJECTS

Sierra Valley Floodplain

The Forum has approved \$475,000 for this project. The lowest responsible proposal is from Steve Devin for \$488,260. **Following discussion by the Forum, motion is made by Forum Member BJ Pearson, seconded by Forum Member David Okita and unanimously carried to increase the funding for the Sierra Valley Floodplain Study by \$13,260 from “A” Majority Funds for a total of \$488,260 with an understanding that if the Flood Control District receives any funding from the Army Corps. of Engineers there will be a reduction in project costs, and if costs for the floodplain study exceed \$488,260 the overages will be funded from “B” Minority Funds.**

Charles Creek

The Board of Supervisors approved this contract in early September 2004 and construction is underway.

Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District

The Board of Supervisors approved the contract with the Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District on October 19, 2004. The well areas have been secured by easements to the District and the well drilling has been completed.

SECOND ROUND PROJECTS

Following review, the Forum concurs with the schedule, as presented, for the second round of projects.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Tom Hunter, Director addresses the Forum. At the last meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) there was discussion regarding the TAC membership and how project would be approved. The TAC is recommending that all applications for membership be entertained and approved by the Forum. Forum Member BJ Pearson encourages the City of Portola to apply as a member of the Technical Advisory Committee.

NEXT MEETING OF PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

The next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum is scheduled for May 24, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in Quincy, California.

ADJOURNMENT

The Forum adjourns at 12:15 p.m. to meet again on May 24, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in Quincy, California.

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

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

**AGENDA FOR MEETING OF MAY 23, 2005 TO BE HELD AT 3:00 P.M. AT THE
PLUMAS-SIERRA COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS, MINERAL BUILDING, QUINCY, CALIFORNIA**

**WILLIAM N. DENNISON, CHAIRMAN
NANCY L. DAFORNO, CLERK**

www.countyofplumas.com

AGENDA

1. 3:00 P.M. INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Any member of the public may address the Forum on matters, which are within the jurisdiction of the Forum. If you are addressing the Forum regarding a matter listed on the agenda, you are requested to hold your comments until the Forum takes up that matter. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes or less.

3. PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM

- A.** Status of existing Phase I projects.
- B.** Report and update on Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study.
- C.** Overview and discussion regarding tour held May 23, 2005.
- D.** Phase II submittals and recommendation for funding by the Core Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- 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.
- F.** Report and update on status of the new Monterey Agreement EIR.
- G.** Schedule to complete Monterey Settlement, Article IV Plumas Matters.
- H.** Develop a policy for unspent allocated funds.
- I.** Report and update on financial situation for Watershed Forum funding.
- J.** Improvements to Public Outreach process (Maintaining Internet Site).
- K.** Schedule next meeting of the Plumas Watershed Forum.

ADJOURNMENT

**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 clarifies 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

Part VI

Plumas Watershed Forum

Technical Advisory Committee Materials

MEETING OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE FOR
PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
February 14, 2003
Agenda

Plumas Corporation Conference Room, Airport, Quincy, California
8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. - Tour of CRM projects to follow

1. Introductions (and exchange of Valentine's cards)
2. Review of Status of Plumas Watershed Technical Committee (see hand-out)
Discuss any gaps or additions.
3. Review of Organization of the Watershed Forum (see hand-out)
Discuss any gaps or additions.
Emphasis on connectedness to SWP mission: water supply reliability
Establish relevant time horizon (e.g., 10 years, or longer)
4. Project Administration issues.
 - a) Defining its relationship to the existing "Upper Feather River Watershed Management Program".
 - b) Defining its relationship to FR-CRM (Feather River - Coordinated Resource Management)
 - c) Possible linkages to the larger watershed: Sacramento River Watershed Program.
 - d) Identify other issues and next steps.
5. Preliminary Criteria for Project Selection and recognition of institutional priorities:
 - a) Focus on relevant landscape:
 - 1) Uplands and forest (watershed vegetation management)
 - 2) Meadows (natural reservoirs)
 - 3) Streams (base flows and peak flows)
 - 4) Floodplains (spreading water and recharging aquifer)
 - 5) Reservoirs and detention areas (project facilities)
 - b) Focus on relevant work
 - 1) Data collection, inventories, and mapping.
 - A. Gages
 - B. Monitoring
 - 2) Erosion/sedimentation reduction.
 - A. Streambank stabilization (and meadow restoration)
 - B. Road drainage improvements
 - C. Other non-point sources
 - 3) Snowpack enhancement (interception reduction)
 - 4) Resistance to catastrophic fire
 - 5) Floodplain protection
6. Education and Public Awareness
7. Other

MINUTES OF MEETING
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE FOR PLUMAS WATERSHED FORUM
February 14, 2003

The meeting was held between 8:30 and 10:30 a.m. at the Plumas Corporation Offices, Airport, Quincy, California. Attending were: Dwight Russell, Andy Corry, Rob Cooke, Nancy Quan, Delores Brown, Katy Spanos, John Coburn, Tom Hunter, Christi Goodman, Rob Shulman, John Schramel (FR-RCD), and Jim Wilcox, Leslie Mink, and Terry Benoit (all of FR-CRM), and Kathy McEfee (EIR consultant).

The status of the Committee was discussed. It was confirmed that the composition would include DWR (Northern, SWPAO, and Legal), Plumas (Hunter, Goodman, Shulman), and SWP Contractors (Coburn), plus the FR-CRM (Wilcox and Mink), plus the Feather River RCD (Schramel) and Sierra Valley RCD (Jan Stine). Interim Chair is Shulman.

Jim Wilcox will prepare partnerships in funding information for next meeting.

Funding for development of proposals, and review criteria, were deferred.

Tentative initial Forum meeting dates were set for June 20 or June 24.

Discussion ensued about planning, noting the SWP Planning Committee (David Okita, Chair), Northern District annual briefing (Andy Corry), annual workplan (DWR/SWPAO confers with CRM). Points made of need for "strategic plan" and "management plan" to avoid piecemealing (cf. CalFed approach).

Wilcox explained CRM management plan, and need to leverage funds (e.g., RAC or Resource Advisory Committee on funds from the "Secure Roads and Schools Community Stability ACT").

Organization Principles of the Forum were discussed. It was clarified that Dwight Russell would represent DWR, with Dan Flory as his alternate. Shulman to work on bylaws for discussion at next meeting.

Next meeting: March 26, in Oroville, 10-noon at **DWR Oroville Field Division, 460 Glen Dr. (530) 534-2303** Shulman to invite the other Plumas representatives and to prepare next agenda.

[Currently agenda in preparation].

**Action Items From The Monterey Agreement Forum Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
on November 7, 2003**

(Revised 12/01/03 to amend Paragraph 4a and add Paragraph 4g)

1. Introductions: In attendance were Tom Hunter, Plumas County; Karen Oglesby, Plumas County; Farrell Cunningham, Maidu Cultural & Development Group; John Schramel, FRRCD; Dan Martyn, NRCS; Jim Wilcox, FRCRM; Barbara Drake, USFS; Katy Spanos, Department of Water Resources; Nancy Quan, Department of Water Resources; Mark Hill, Eco Systems Sciences; John Coburn, SWC; Todd Hillaire, Department of Water Resources; Dwight Russell, Department of Water Resources; John Sheehan, Plumas Corporation; Dennis Heiman, Regional Water Quality Control Board; Fraser Sime, Department of Water Resources; Richard Flint, Department of Fish and Game; Fran Roudebush and Carl Genasci, Sierra Valley Groundwater District; Pat Whitley, Sierra County Supervisor; Holly George, U.C. Cooperative; Jim Pena, Plumas National Forest Supervisor.

2. **Why are we here and who else should be?**

We are here to implement the terms of the Monterey Agreement Settlement and to make recommendations to the Forum for action.

It appears that most of the affected agencies and stakeholder entities are present except for Jan Stine, Sierra Valley RCD who was ill. Also noteworthy is that Angie Dillingham, Forest Supervisor, Beckwourth District, will be representing the U. S. Forest Service at future meetings.

3. **Presentation by Mark Hill on proposal to review the Plumas County Watershed.**

Mark led an informative discussion on what his firm proposed to deliver and the schedule. The proposal totals \$27,780. The three primary entities (Plumas County, Department of Water Resources, SWC) agree that the Forum has acknowledged that a strategic plan is needed before we can proceed with accepting projects. The Forum has heard a \$20,000 budget, but the difference (\$7,780) and the need to proceed have moved us to approve the contract with Ecosystem Sciences as proposed.

4. **Discussion of items or projects that have been presented to the Forum.**

These items were submitted to the Forum at the July meeting and re-discussed at the August 13, 2003 Forum Conference Call. Our discussion was meant to update the status of each item.

- a. Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study, \$475,000 Proposed Majority Expenditure. Tom Hunter gave an explanation of the background. Department of Water Resources agrees that the flood plain study should be addressed and will work with the County staff on the best way to proceed after reviewing the strategic plan. Todd Hillaire of DWR will send a letter to the County staff describing the available Flood Insurance Studies and Flood Insurance Rate Maps available for Sierra Valley and the technical service programs for assisting with Flood Insurance studies, and include a copy of the Flood Insurance Study for Smithneck Creek.
- b. Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District well improvement \$100,000 Approved Minority Expenditure. Tom Hunter stated that deepening of the well and a new pump have been authorized and should cost less than \$10,000.
- c. Lake Davis Pike Eradication - Approved \$20,000 expenditure from the Minority Funds. No expenditures to date.
- d. Internal District Overhead.
\$115,000 Majority - Approved.
\$32,325 Minority - Approved.
\$10,000 Minority - Approved.

Expenditures are being made in all three items.

- e. Plumas Corporation \$75,000 Majority funding proposed. John Sheehan left for another meeting before this agenda item. This item will be discussed at the next TAC Meeting.
- f. Plumas County General Fund, \$452,000 proposed for both Minority and Majority funding. Tom Hunter is to meet with Katy Spanos to go over the past expenditures. The expenditure sheets have been created for Tom's review and sharing with Katy before the next meeting.
- g. Fran Roudebush recommended that the TAC ask the County to look to the Lake Davis pike settlement for funding paragraph 4b, well improvement for Grizzly Lake Resort Improvement District, and Paragraph 4c, pike eradication, before using Monterey settlement money. Using the pike settlement would free up more money for watershed work.

5. **Existing submitted projects.**

There are seven projects that have been submitted to Plumas County for consideration:

- 1. Johnsville Water System, \$140,036.
- 2. Plumas Geo Hydrology, \$25,000.
- 3. Jamison Creek Step Pool Construction Project, \$83,000.
- 4. Feather River CRM, \$250,000 annually.
- 5. NRCS, \$25,000 annually for matching funds for local projects.
- 6. Watershed Assessment Study Beckwourth Ranger District, USFS \$65,000.
- 7. Sierra Valley Ground Water District, \$82,430.

Each was briefly discussed – no action.

6. **Discussion of when the next Forum meeting should occur and agenda items.**

The following schedule was agreed to:

- Mark Hill draft to us by December 19th.
- Comments back to Mark December 25th.
- Mark to email report to all January 5th.
- Next TAC Meeting January 9th at Oroville.
- Proposed January 27, 2004 Forum Meeting in Quincy.

March 15, 2004 TAC Meeting

Introductions: In attendance were Tom Hunter, Brian Morris and Karen Oglesby, Plumas County; Dennis Heiman, CA Regional Water Quality Control Board; Jim Wilcox, Feather River CRM; Jan Stine, Sierra Valley RCD; Carl Genasci and Judy Dillon, Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District; John Coburn, State Water Contractors; Dwight Russell and Todd Hillaire, CA Department of Water Resources/ Red Bluff; Lori Powers, CA Department of Fish and Game; Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest; Burkhard Bohm, Plumas Geo-Hydrology; Nancy Quann, CA Department of Water Resources/State Water Project Analysis Office; Katy Spanos, CA Department of Water Resources/Office of the Chief Counsel

Review of Submitted Comments re: Strategy document and suggested action:

- Written suggestion that the West Branch of the Feather River be added in.
Brief discussion of geography; west branch will not be added.
- Written suggestion that beaver be specified in the strategy document as a tool.
Explanation by Jim Wilcox of beaver's value as tool in Last Chance Creek Watershed.
Comments by Dwight and John that tools don't need to be in the strategy; the document was intended to be a guide.
- Alan Abrams wants to be an active participant. **Tom Hunter will contact him.**
- Suggestion made by Dwight that the TAC does not need to comment on each suggestion/comment/request that was submitted and then reply to the submitter. TAC should include all who want to participate and note who offered comments so people realize their comment was discussed and considered by the committee.
- Written suggestion that the last paragraph on page 17 of the strategy document be softened.
Decision made to delete second and third sentences and rewrite the fourth. New paragraph will read: Projects must also be socially feasible. Successful projects will have landowner support and willingness to participate. Also, public opinions are transformed and awareness is built with proven success; thus, highest priority should be given to those projects that include landowner participation and transparency; i.e., the project report is open to public examination and review. Public access without landowner permission is not a requirement of the strategy.
- Comment made that the Forum will want written protection of their need to be able to review project sites. Discussion of landowner agreements. **Decision made to add # 23 to page 30 which will specify the responsibilities of all involved parties for monitoring, management and maintenance. Jim Wilcox will send language FRCRM is using for their projects.**
- Written suggestion that Sierra Valley RCD must be major player; Jan Stine participates in TAC so this is taken care of.
- Discussion of status of Sierra Valley Flood Plain Study. Army Corps will do hydrology study. Plumas County BOS doesn't want to consider a smaller, community based study even though that would reduce the cost and possibly bring in \$\$ from FEMA. BOS wants RFPs; Hunter will be sending those out in April. Forum approved \$475,000 of majority funds for this; if RFPs come back higher, Forum will need to reconsider value of funding this project.
- Written comment on the value of passive restoration. **Decision made to add the word solely to the third sentence in the second paragraph on page 9:** However, a solely passive

approach to restoration is not feasible in the Feather River watershed because of conditions, economics and time.

- Written comment on education. Strategy allows for education. **Decision made to add education to the selection criteria chart on page 23 and give it the same weighting as innovation and collaboration.**
- **Decision made to replace item 4 on page 16 with the paragraph submitted by Judy Dillon of Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District.**
- Brief explanation by Burkhard Bohm on why monitoring is important and why monitoring as a research project design should not be eliminated.
Discussion of monitoring. On a project by project basis TAC doesn't think project proponents should be spending the majority of project \$\$ on monitoring however TAC needs to develop a strategy for the Forum to monitor the effectiveness of their expenditures. **Decision made to change the Innovative Project paragraph on page 21 to reflect this:** The TAC will encourage projects that are innovative, including those which will monitor globally. **Also, the second paragraph on page 24 will be changed by adding the word project before monitoring (2 times) and the word solely before research.**
- Discussion re: eliminating types but keeping two tiers.
Project proponents will still be asked to identify which type their project falls into but it should be made clear that types within each tier are given equal weight. **Decision made to eliminate types from the chart on page 23; change the second paragraph on page 19 to read** Restoration projects are grouped by tier and described by type. Tier 1 projects are given priority over Tier 2 projects; types within each tier are given equal weighting. **Also on page 23, the General project description bullet under Concept Proposal should be changed to read** General project description and type of project.
- At DWR's request **DWR will be deleted from the inside front cover under Prepared for and DWR website will be added to the footnote on page 3.**
- Discussion of how to make it more clear that RCDs and other entities can be involved in the administration and/or management of projects. **Decision made to asterisk Plumas Corp. on page 25 in the Venn diagram and the second paragraph under Administration and Management.** The asterisk explanation will be: Other legal entities, such as Resource Conservation Districts, may be substituted for Plumas Corp. as cooperatives with PCFCD.
- Modify front cover by adding **For Implementing the Monterey Settlement**
- **Dennis Heiman will provide Hunter or Hill with his comments for changing Ag. Waiver section on page 17**
- **Jan Stine will provide Hunter with her comments (Hill already has them)**
- **Tom Hunter will call Mark Hill 3/16/04 @ 10:00a.m. to discuss changes to the strategy document and Hill's costs. Hunter will ask Hill to provide CD of the final document.**

Administrative procedure and tentative schedule:

- **Forum** Conference Call: (mid to late April) to approve final document and schedule
- **Tom Hunter** will prepare **Public Notice to solicit RFPs** using concept proposal on page 23; 3 page limit + map, hard copy and disc required.
- **DWR** will post strategy and Public Notice on website ASAP
- **Jan Stine** will send criteria ranking form used by RAC to Tom Hunter. It can be modified for our use.

- **April 30, 2004:** Deadline for 1st review of concept proposals
- **May 7, 2004:** All TAC members should have received concept proposals
- **May 17, 2004:** TAC meeting to review proposals
- **May 28, 2004:** Requests go back to proponent for detailed proposal
- **June 25, 2004:** Deadline for receipt of final proposal
- **July 12, 2004:** TAC meets to review final proposal

Hunter will send example of contract with Plumas County Flood Control District to Nancy.

Hunter will provide TAC with detailed description of expenditures to date.

Stakeholder funding for attendance at TAC meetings:

Discussion of what various people remember Forum saying regarding funding. Some TAC members think meals and mileage were approved for reimbursement. RCDs have no money for participation; if salaries are not reimbursed Sierra Valley RCD will not be able to participate. Suggestion made that those who cannot participate without funding should submit a concept proposal for funding in the first round.

Plumas Watershed Forum
Technical Advisory Committee

*Plumas County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
California Department of Water Resources – State Water Contractors*

Mailing Address: 1834 East Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971 † Ph: (530) 283-6268 † Fax: (530) 283-6323

Monterrey TAC Oroville

9/10/04

9:30 AM Dept. of Water Resources Administration Building, Oroville CA

Think Tank monies remain un-expended. Attachment from Rossman (letter)

Update on Board of Supervisors Meeting, 9/6/04

Report on expenditures

Proposed budget

Sierra Valley Floodplain study: 3 proposals including total pkg of r Sierra Valley, break out Sierra County portion. \$488,000 low bid, \$475,000 approved. Sent out letter to Army corps for matching dollars under program for local works 30-60,000 Hydrology.

Project approval process: Approved BOS

Draft process and schedule for project review presented

The 2 wells in Chilcoot and Beckwourth and Hosselkus Creek approved

\$100,000 set aside (B funds) BOS discretion: \$11,000.00 for C Roy Carmichael School Watershed Program

DWR: There are 3 watershed Co-coordinators that should have had input on the allotment and the program activities. These funds are outside of the application process.

DWR will send an informational e-mail on how to utilize education resources

Why would one school coup the entire counties budget for the program?

East program? High School

Rob Wade was funded through usfs. There is a plan through the CRM. Will provide it to committee. DWR has resources such as the snowmaster that could be useful in an education program. There is broad general support for the program. Budget items included for bus service, etc.

Coordination of process to insure there is no double billing

Full forum meeting on October 26 <Mineral Building, Quincy CA

Review of Draft Process:

Public comment: timeliness

Identify opportunities; beware the 45-day comment period.

Applications of the Brown Act; if the result of (public comment) would result in the Forum taking an action, the Brown Act apply. It is to ensure the proper use of monies

Include public comment on Agenda.

There is automatically a place for public comment in Agenda

TAC vs. BOS process The presence of Board member engages Brown Act

Plumas Watershed Forum

If you going to allow public comment you must allow for public review: available at office, web site, library, notice, e-mail

Brown Act requires 24 hours notification for special meeting, 7 days for regular meeting.

#9 should be changed “comment at forum”

#5 “full” should be changed to “concept”

Provide link to incorporate the process document w/ appropriate language

Provide TAC list w/ contact

Those that wish to participate will provide a letter of introduction with a defined role: multiple attendees will be accepted

Send a form letter out to potential attendees

Re-imburement of expensed: Forum dis-approved

SWRCB: identify technical advisors (forum should identify those that they are seeking technical advise) consultant as well as allow for public input alienation of those that can't participate regularly. Forum should deal with politics and define TAC role.

As long as the Forum realizes that the TAC is leading the Forum decision-making process

The county can do anything wants to do with B money. Forum who' make a recommendation until they hear from the TAC

USFS fish & Game are missing will the decision be valid in their absence?

Public Forum VS TAC: Review settlement agreement language

TAC was to advise Forum on Suitability of Projects. Forum directs funding based on TAC advice=> not a public forum

At face value yes, but the public may come present a proposal

There is no standard for a technical Advisory Committee. Find list from a year ago to determine spread of attendees

There is an education gap among agencies: logistic problems. Presentation of projects drew more people that a reviews committee meeting

List => form=> review by Tom, Dwight, and John C=> defined role in review. Whom ever wants to come to the party, non-participation by Agencies their choice. Include pass code

SWRCB wouldn't forma TAC by invitation. Could offend some

SVGD is a special interest and the TAC should have a broader interest. Forum to make a command decision and decide on entities

Complaints of Oroville relicensing is that there is a role of the public because Agencies are often out of touch

Where would someone like Fran get to voice her options: The experts should not be confused with politician agendas

Tom Hunter wouldn't change the list because we don't want to diminish the current level of participation.

Plumas Watershed Forum

SWRCB wasn't suggesting only agencies on the TAC. Concept was broader than that, input from both

Russell: One concept: what are the qualifications of a TAC member? What does each member bring to the table? All comers have something to offer

36: the rating sheet: preferred the RAC system.

Instead of front-loading with construction, try a deliverable. Rating sheet can work. Start-ups score lower than (CRM) capacity building is a serious departure from management strategy: Remove process hurdle by Have Forum recommend A projects. Use B money for capacity building.

Why can't proposal include some of these actions? Because they take field review first=> \$ support

Problem usually crosses property lines and getting all landowner on the same page takes time and money outside of the application process.

Does the strategy include this? Yes, "Watershed improvement" can include collection of data as a legitimate. Not everything needs to be defined by construction.

Wear not allowed, by the language, to accommodate programmatic funds if you can't make a direct link to goals

All funds should be used to contribute to all of 1 of the proposed benefits

There is a gap between the Strategy and the Settlement Agreement

We can seek new goals by splitting A&B funds

B money may bypass or make a new chart

Does TAC want to like at the connection between goals: Still need a score sheet.

Perhaps they should go straight to the Board or fill out sheet=>TAC=>recommendation to Board.

DWR: Applicants need to re-write proposals to promote Conformity. It was difficult to mix and match needs.

FRCRM: Unnecessary. Application process included the answers. Proposals that didn't answer question were deferred (Green Gulch Ranch). Next time request inclusion of definable deliverables. All capacity building requests could score high on scoring sheet

Perhaps this is unnecessary if the B money expenditures won't require TAC review.

Develop contract language coupled with deliverable "what do we get out of it" report.

Scope of work should have been included in application.

Sometimes Scope of Work is developed in contract stage as part of a negotiation (Cal FED)

This is promoting an onerous application process. If adopted, the number of applications will dramatically decrease which will in turn reduce the effectiveness of work in the watershed.

Inclusion of TAC process will expedite the BOS decision.

Plumas Watershed Forum

There are more than 2 categories for comparison: there are 5:
Education, research, capacity, and construction: where do they all fit?

A: pure Construction

B: conflicting comparisons. We don't want to preclude B monies for construction

Proposal:

FRCRM: B funds

FFRCDS: B funds

SVRCD : B funds

Plumas Corp: A and B funds

SVGMD: A funds

Bohm: B funds

USFS: A and B funds

Monies are approved up to the actual costs, not the entire allotment which may free up some monies for next year.

C Roy should have gone through process: TAC philosophy is lost on BOS

It's just good business for the Board to seek advice: Not happening

If TAC members get proposal they don't like, refer it to the forum: reduce double dipping.

Discussion on merits of projects: clarification of elements

SWRC: not enthusiastic about most of them but willing to consider level of funding as low and therefore worth funding this round. Rating sheets were not completed by most participants and these applications only had to pass or fail

We'll get better as we go along; the first round bagged the more complete evaluation process.

The level of funding is not being stressed by competition or merit; pass-fail is adequate for first round

Green Gulch served as good example of process

Forum has not heard think tank recommendations

Set another meeting ½ hour per proposal. Have project proposed there to provide additional information to flush out scope of work

What about scope of work discussion: Maybe DWR can staff, separate from TAC the contract negotiations.

e-mail existing group=> draft process, for letter, meeting dates=> comments to be received by specific due date

**Meeting Notes
Monterey Forum TAC
2.22.05 Quincy, Ca**

Schedule of Events:

March 4 letter

April 1 final proposal

2 approved projects in August are completed. SVRCD contract is on the March 1 Agenda.

A and B funds will be discussed April 29,2005

Past approvals: DWR hired a consultant to prepare Management Strategy, review process pgs 28-37.

Floodplain study: Board order for agreement, stagnant project: May agenda.

Proposals:

Russel Ried at FRC: fencing from NRCS looking for funding for water development. Dry lots to rest the pasture during wet months. NRCS does not pay for dry lots or water. 5 acres for cooperators with in college to make outdoor laboratory. 15 year restoration agreement. 3 other contributors to project. Demonstration water quality project, re-activation of a floodplain, . College has riparian rights from Spanish creek, but corrals are on well system that will be expanded to the 4 acres of dry lots. Issues include meadow health, manure management and carrying capacity. Requires defined deliverables and methodology to quantify success. Include pre-project monitoring (photo). Identify monitoring spots into and out of fish hatchery, cite seasonal changes. Plumas county requires adequate setback for proposed bike path. FRC will not contribute dollars. Define plumbing affects on wetlands. Include map of irrigation system.

County Prop 50: planning grant due in March. Construction grant due in May. Forum meetings aren't timely enough to acquire funds for development of proposal. Sierra County portion is missing from proposal.

Sierra Valley RCD: When these were approved we decided to approve based on deliverables: Lease of building, advertising for district manager, submitted applications for two projects (Smithneck Creek and Little Last Chance). Include semi-annual reporting. Forum may request to see contracts before they're signed.

Burkhardt Bohm Forest Canopy: Samples are currently being pulled out of Charles Creek now. Ground water and surface water co-mingle under various

vegetation management scenarios. What is the fingerprinting? Water at East had conductivity of 100, other side had 300, so the idea is to identify the source and is based on a Stanford project. Provide more details in methodology and define a comparable project (defined control).

Red Clover: Pre-project analysis. Address permits: 1603, 401, Nationwide #27. Water rights may require additional layer of bureaucracy. Plumas cites Water Board response to Schramel letter (2002).

Plumas Corp: increase in firesafe council monies and QLG activities. Buffalo Creek in Denver sedimented a reservoir after a fire.

Feather River RCD: Deliverables? Letter on fire submittal to change contract. Previously approved as B funds and creates a bookkeeping dilemma for County. Proposed to keep original contract language and incorporate new work into current proposal for January 2006. Break out costs and complete last year's contract. Include bi-annual reporting on deliverables.

SVGMD: Requests to re-program \$30,000 from last year to complete work on identifying water producing zones. This additional work will close a data gap. Modify current contract with changes.

FRCRM: List landowner groups for Big Grizzly, Spanish Creek, Meadow Valley and Sulphur Creek watershed. Jordan flat NEPA done.

USFS: needs to address dollars generated by timber sales for proposed project. Broad scale precludes effective monitoring. Provide a literature search on scientific method, deliverables and measures of success. Define monitoring term.

Water Rights discussion lead by Holly George and Curtis Levine. Refer to letter from State Water Resources Control Board, 2002. The purpose of restoration is to attenuate flood waters for improved water quality and quantity during irrigation season.

Monterey Technical Advisory Committee Notes

4/28/05

Attendees:

Tom Hunter Plumas County
Brian Morris Plumas County
Christi Goodman Plumas County
Jim Murphy City of Portola
Jim Wilcox Feather River CRM
Jan Stine Sierra Valley RCD
Holly George U.C. Cooperative Extension
Russel Reid Feather River College
John Sheehan Plumas Corporation
Andrea Rowland Feather River RCD
Lori Powers CDFG
Dennis Heiman CA RWQCB
Fraser Sime SWR Watershed Program
Barbara Drake PNF
Todd Hillaire SWR_ND
Dwight Russel DWR-ND

Introductions

Purpose of the meeting is to make a recommendation to Forum on May 24

EIR for Monterey Agreement: Requires Certification prior to additional monies (4 million) will be released to the Forum, barring a lawsuit.

Deliverables don't seem consistent: Will Monterey data go onto the website so that it's accessible?

No- hard copies are available at Public Works

DWR will be requesting an annual report, an October Draft Expenditure Report to be available on an improved website. The (State) Water Project needs this information to justify this kind of work: Expect a status report from the Contractors. Dedicate one or two meetings to reporting.

May 24: mini tour on the 23rd for Contractors. Start at 5 bridges and work backwards through Beckwourth to Genesee.

Contracting:

Budget item for FRRCD: \$2500 to be included in budget request for #30,000- not an additional request.

First Round Projects	
A Sierra Valley Ground Water District	87,855.31
	12,486.79
A Beckwourth Ranger District	63,500.00
B Bohm Isotope Monitoring	23,000.00
FR CRM	
A 2 creek restorations	115,000.00
B Coordination & Monitoring	70,000.00
A Charles Creek	35,000.00
B Sierra Valley RCD	25,000.00
B Feather River RCD	17,750.00
B Plumas Corp	50,000.00
Original Project 8/11/03	
UCD Extension	3,000.00
A Sierra Valley Floodplain	475,000.00
A Plumas Corp	75,000.00
B GLRID Facilities	\$100,000.00
A Mark Hill	25,000.00
B Pike Eradication	20,000.00
B 452,000 to loan	452,000.00
Internal Overhead	
A 115,000.00 District staff	
B 32,325 Counsel	
B 10,000 Travel	
Cash balance as of 4/20/05	
A Majority funds	\$674,277
B Minority funds	\$ 216,318

Some alterations needed

Natural Resources Staff after 1/1/06

Administrator x\$

2 staff x\$

Dependant on prop 50 application approval. If not approved an Administrator will be needed prior to June 2006

\$500,000 encumbered will be discussed at forum meeting. A funds Process: We've never done a full review of the proposals. We'll be using a pass/fail criteria for this round. Scale can be used when we don't have enough funding.

Contracts will define deliverables.

Projects are a mess. Budgets need cleaning up: develop electronic format. Use RAC process and have TAC review it.

Should we have a re-submittal? NO

Consistently w/ RFP needs to be maintained. Reformat opportunity during contracting. Maintain equity by making all proponents go through concept proposals, or go to the Board. In this case, the proponent would not have met deadline for activities if approval is delayed. How much of this can go on and still do business? A limited amount.

The concept proposal is designed to help the proponent use their time efficiently.

We hope to improve timeline to use the construction season.

Continuous concept proposals process is easier on reviewers. County prefers the deadline method. The RAC has improved the comment process to ease the workload on manager. They have 2 more rigorous review processes.

Some questions didn't fold into project description. Review pg 28 of strategy. That would help the reviewers. Add a section to address responses to question so the reviewers know the question were addressed.

Tell the forum one them came in late; wait for recommendation

Projects:

Plumas Geo Hydrology: pre-post project monitoring. Budget of \$25,000 might just be first year and will be coming back for more monitoring later. Follow up with years 2,3,4 w/ new application for monitoring.

Red Clover: will it change forest management? Basic research opposed to Applied Research. S=Forest Service could use this locally to do meadow encroachment work, sales tool.

Feather River RCd: What are the projects? NRCAS doesn't fund all the projects, sw were looking to add cost share (EQUIP funding) to get the 50% match. RCD should include monitoring component. Conflict w/ confidentiality agreement. Full disclosure to landowner.

Format doesn't address capacity building.

FRC: macroinvertebrate work is expensive. College hoping to get environmental dept. to assist with monitoring component.

Pond water rights: The pond is a sump to the well from fish hatchery and overland drainage. Monitoring spot below fish hatchery, 5 years 3 spots. Three months ago Chlorinated well water got into the hatchery and killed all the fish.

Incorporate benthics through the CRM. Has EQUIP money been confirmed? Yes. Is this consistent with the Contract? Did the Forum approve using B money for on the ground projects? Look in the minutes. Must have been a conference call not answered by the full forum. Monitoring plan: record livestock use. Already party of the management plan. Will this work occur prior to project funds being dispersed? Yes: baseline sampling to be done now.

The use of BMPs should be standardized (NRCS, USFS) The use of BMP's is secondary to recording the management of animals. Proposal will move forward without mods.

The Board can determine capacity building , then to the Forum for recommendation.

Is Feather River CRM monitoring A or B? It was broken out last time.
25,000 out of B
50,000 out of A

Jordan Flat: mail USFS proposal to Fraser. When will the monitoring report be out? Generated in a couple of years on the entire reach.

USFS Aspen release: By taking out the bigger pumps (conifers) establishes healthy aspen generation (clones)