

Upper Feather River IRWM Regional Water Management Group

FINAL SUMMARY MINUTES

February 26, 2016

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

http://featherriver.org/rwmg_meetings/

Call to Order and Roll Call

Sherrie Thrall called the meeting to order on February 26, 2016 at 1 pm at the Plumas County Planning Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

Members Present:

Sherrie Thrall, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Paul Roen, Sierra County

Jim Roberti, Sierra Groundwater Management District

Bill Nunes, Sierra Valley Resource Conservation District

Russell Reid, Feather River Resource Conservation District

Terry Swofford, Plumas County

Jeffrey Greening, Public Member

Joe Hoffman, Plumas National Forest (Advisory)

Roger Diefendorf, Plumas County Community Development Commission

Lorena Gorbet, Maidu Summit Consortium (sitting in for Trina Cunningham)

Members Absent:

Trina Cunningham, Maidu Summit Consortium

Quentin Youngblood, Tahoe National Forest (Advisory)

Carol Thornton, Lassen National Forest (Advisory)

Staff Present:

Randy Wilson, Plumas County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Uma Hinman, Uma Hinman Consulting

Zeke Lunder, Deer Creek Resources, Inc.

Leah Wills, Uplands and Forest Management Workgroup Coordinator

Terri Rust, Floodplains, Meadows, and Waterbodies Management Workgroup Coordinator

Additions or Deletions from the Agenda

Addendum Item: Plumas County Fire Safe Council Request for RWMG Support for the Buck's Lake Thinning Project

Public Comment Opportunity

None noted

Announcements / Reports

Uma Hinman announced upcoming meetings. April 4, 2016, 11:30–4:00 pm, RCD meeting to highlight water topics at the Sierra Valley Grange in Vinton. April 20, 2016, 11:00-4:00 pm, University Cooperative Extension is putting on a Google Earth and mapping workshop. The workshop is limited to 18 people so register online early. The cost is \$30 per person.

CONSENT AGENDA

(Video 1, 00:2:35)

a. RWVG Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 22, 2016

Upon motion by Paul Roen and second by Jeffrey Greening, the RWVG Meeting Minutes for January 22, 2016 were unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

Addendum Item

(Video 1, 00:2:57)

John Sheehan presented the Plumas County Fire Safe Council Request for RWVG Support for the Buck's Lake Thinning Project. Discussion ensued regarding logistics for preparing the letter of support in time for application submittal the following Tuesday. Paul Roes asked if this was for implementation of the project and John confirmed. Randy Wilson mentioned that the Plumas County Fire Safe Council did sign the MOU for this IRWMP process. Upon motion by Paul Roen and second by Russell Reid, the request for RWVG to provide a letter of support for the Buck's Lake Thinning Project was unanimously approved.

1. Project Status Updates

(Video 1, 00:10:04)

Uma Hinman presented an overview of task progress and an update on schedule and budget. During the update on the project development process, Sherrie Thrall asked how things were moving along regarding workgroups turning things in. Uma Hinman thanked the workgroup coordinators for keeping things moving forward for meeting the March 7, 2016 internal deadline. During the update on the Disadvantaged Community Assessment, Sherrie Thrall commented that based on the presentation at the last meeting, the designation of Disadvantaged Community is pretty important when it comes to funding. Russell Reid asked about the process for addressing comments received on the chapters. Uma Hinman responded that she planned to talk about this under Agenda Items 5 and 6 and Russell agreed to wait until then to discuss it further.

2. Stakeholder Outreach Updates

(Video 1, 00:15:19)

Uma Hinman presented an update on Tribal Outreach and the five workgroups.

3. Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Draft Funding Package (Video 1, 00:16:57)

Uma Hinman presented the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Draft Funding Package. Sherrie Thrall commented that if DWR is going to release the final DAC Involvement RFP likely towards the end of April 2016, and the public comment period ends on April 8, 2016, then this a very short window. Uma agreed and thought that the RFP release date might change to May 2016. Sherrie Thrall commented that a question for Debbie at DWR is whether the Upper Feather River would even qualify for Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement funding if we don't have a completed Plan. Sherrie expressed concern that with only \$1.3 million available for 10 IRWM regions, the Upper Feather River might be immediately disqualified since we don't have a plan. Zeke Lunder asked if this money is just for coordination. Uma confirmed that the funding is for disadvantaged community involvement, not for plan implementation. The question was asked if the Upper Feather River is one of the 10 IRWMs and Uma confirmed. Randy Wilson commented that maybe not all those IRWMs will qualify because they were created under Prop 84 and haven't been updated on Prop 1, whereas the Upper Feather River IRWM will be Prop 1 compliant. Sherrie appreciated that Uma is working to make their plan Prop 1 compliant so that

we don't end up finishing a plan that is already out dated. Randy also noted that for implementation projects DWR is looking for a 50% match; under Prop 84 it was 25%. However, for disadvantaged communities DWR could waive the entire match requirement. Sherrie Thrall noted that the list of eligible grant activities appears to apply to what we've been needing which is capacity building, so our applicants and project submittal people can actually be able to do an implementation project. Uma clarified that all 10 IRWM regions have a Prop 84 compliant Plan, but none of the Plans are up to the Prop 1 standards yet, and the guidelines for Prop 1 haven't been finalized yet. Zeke Lunder asked which IRWMs are in the funding area so we know with whom we would need to work. Uma clarified that the Mountain Counties Funding Area is comprised of the entire Upper Feather River, Cosumnes-American-Bear-Yuba, Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras, Tuolumne-Stanislaus, Yosemite-Mariposa, and part of the Northern Sacramento Valley, Yuba County, American River Basin, Madera, and Southern Sierra.

Uma Hinman raised two items for discussion. **(a)** Does the management group want to participate in coordinating with other management groups in the funding region, and if so, how would you like to go about coordinating with other management groups? Uma noted that most regions are assigning a representative to make contact and start coordination with other management groups and she offered to assist Randy Wilson in this process. **(b)** Does the management group want to take the route of a DAC Assessment or develop a plan and include a needs assessment, project development assistance, and governance? Sherrie Thrall commented that we really don't know what our DAC status is until we get Jonathon's Socioeconomic Assessment of the region because we've heard so many different criteria defining DACs. We need that information first to know if it will have a big enough impact to make it a priority. Sherrie's concern more about capacity building for everybody. As far as participating in the larger group, we need to participate in the funding regions because if we're not at that table then we're not at the table at all. Does anyone know how the coordination will be structured? Uma responded that Katie Burdick has been assigned as representative for the Yuba County IRWM but she does not know about the other regions yet. Jeffrey Greening asked if Katie is limited to one region and Uma was not certain. Zeke Lunder commented that the Sierra Water Workgroup is a coordinating entity in the Sierra region and CABY IRWM is a powerhouse for getting water bond funding which leaves little for our area. Our advantage is that this is DAC only funding and we have more DACs. Sherrie Thrall asked when we need to make decisions on the questions posed. Uma responded that in regard to coordinating, the sooner we reach out to the other management groups the better so we can start talking about who may be interested in taking the lead and express our interest in being involved. Uma responded in regard to the DACs, the group can discuss a proposal at the next meeting. Upon motion by Paul Roen and second by Jeffrey Greening, direction to staff to start the coordination process with other management groups and report back at the next meeting was unanimously approved.

4. Proposition 1 Changes to Integrated Regional Water Management Guidelines (Video 1, 00:32:36)

Uma Hinman presented an overview of the changes to the IRWM Guidelines from the Proposition 84 standards to the new Proposition 1 standards. Russell Reid asked for more explanation of environmental justice. Discussion ensued regarding the creation of brownfields in low income neighborhoods and the associated health impacts to residents in such areas from water contamination. Leah Wills added that it has to do with polluted lands and development. Uma noted that in regard to the Prop 1 Guidelines, DWR is likely wanting to make sure that water quality is not being ignored in disadvantaged communities. Uma asked Lorena Gorbet if she had anything to add and Lorena said Sherri Norris wanted to work with staff on this.

5. Draft Governance, Stakeholder Involvement, Coordination Chapter (Video 1, 00:40:33)

Uma Hinman presented the draft Governance, Stakeholder Involvement, Coordination chapter. Uma also discussed the process for updating chapters of the plan based on comments received. Randy Wilson gave an example of a comment received in regard to providing in depth information on surface water rights. Discussion ensued regarding the types of comments that are relevant to the plan and result in revisions. Sherrie Thrall commented that the Governance chapter is very well done and that's probably why no comments were received.

6. Draft Region Description Chapter

(Video 1, 00:50:09)

Uma Hinman presented the draft Region Description chapter. Russell Reid asked if the 14 comment sets received were justified and warranted and Uma and Randy responded that most of the comments were pretty good. Russell Reid asked Joe Hoffman if he reviewed this chapter and Joe commented that he did review the chapter and thought it was good and had useful information. Lorena Gorbet noted that Trina is working on a paragraph of traditional fish species and habitat and she asked if this would be stand alone or if it would go in the fisheries discussion. Uma responded that the TAC can decide. Jeffrey Greening commented that it would be good to have a delineation of the County lines. Paul Roen noted that the map is missing Calpine and Loyaltan and that Sierra Brooks has a Water District too. Uma noted that the Grizzly Lake Resort is now a CSD. Joe Hoffman asked about the DWR ranking in the basin referenced in the sub watershed discussion. Uma responded that it's DWRs ranking per their Bulletin 118 for sustainability of groundwater basins. Discussion ensued regarding an upcoming meeting and the Sierra Valley Groundwater District being identified as a medium priority basin.

Uma Hinman presented a brief overview of the two public meetings that will be held once the Plan is complete. Sherrie Thrall asked when the public meetings would be held. Discussion ensued regarding a potential extension of the grant deadline and the desire to keep pressing to meet the deadline. Leah Wills asked for clarification on what needs to be done by the grant deadline. Uma responded that Debbie at DWR said that no billing is allowed after the contract completion date. Jeffrey Greening asked Uma where she is on her timeline. Uma responded that we're about two months farther along than anticipated originally, but the chapter review process is getting backed up. Randy Wilson reminded the group that they lost about two months early in the process to get a Plumas contractor on board, so a deadline extension is reasonable to complete the billing. Discussion ensued regarding whether DWR would accept a final billing without a final product. Uma clarified that there is a 10 percent grant retention that will not be released until the plan is complete. Uma also noted that trying to meet the Prop 1 Guidelines is going to take more work and DWR might approve an extension of time to complete the additional work which will result in a better plan. Sherrie Thrall commented that extending the grant to meet Prop 1 Guidelines is a worthy cause. Sherrie Thrall asked the group their feedback about the process. Discussion ensued regarding difficulties in spreading the news about this process, positive feedback about what the RWMG is doing, how helpful this process is for getting projects to a shovel-ready status and eligible for funding, compliments to staff for preparing a high quality product, compliments to the committee coordinators in managing their groups, creating a good line of communication and learning about the issues of each agency and organization involved, and how worthwhile this process has been.

7. Next Meeting

(Video 1, 1:11:25)

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 1st at 1pm.

Adjournment

(Video 1, 1:13:48)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:13 pm.