

# **DRAFT**

## **Southern Sierra IRWMP**

### **Planning Meeting**

**September 8, 2010 1:00 - 4:30 pm**

**Tulare County RMA Office, Visalia, CA**

### **Meeting Notes**

#### Attendees:

Frank Aebly – Sierra National Forest  
Chris Acree – Revive the San Joaquin  
Nancy Bruce – SPUD & Circle J/ Norris Ranch  
Carole Clum – Tulare Co. Citizens for Responsible Growth/Sierra Club  
Hilary Dustin – Sequoia Riverlands Trust  
Sarge Green – CWI/CSU Fresno  
Steve Haze - SRCD / Upper San Joaquin River Watershed Program  
Jeannie Habben – Upper San Joaquin River Project/Madera Region RWMG  
Caroline Hunsaker – USDA Forest Service  
Jim May – Tulare County RMA  
Soapy Mulholland – Sequoia Riverlands Trust  
Shay Overton – Provost & Pritchard  
Scott Powell – Tulare Co. RCD  
Bob Puls – Tulare Co. RCD  
Robert Robinson – Desert Mountain RC&D/ Kern Valley Indian Council  
Chris Stewart – Sequoia National Forest  
Gary Temple – Sierra Resource Conservation District/SAFCA  
Kerri Vera – Tule River Tribe/Environmental Dept.  
Julie Allen – Facilitator, Sequoia Riverlands Trust  
Elissa Brown – Consultant/Project Grant Writer  
Bobby Kamansky, Project Manager, Sequoia Riverlands Trust  
Frances Tweed, Administration, Sequoia Riverlands Trust

#### Via Phone:

John Shelton – Department of Fish and Game  
Michelle Dooley – Department of Water Resources

### **Meeting Notes by Agenda Item**

#### 1. Introductions

Julie Allen started the meeting at 1:10.

Julie introduced herself and everyone around the table did the same. Then those on the phone identified themselves.

Julie started the meeting with a review of the rules: Focus on the work, listen to each other, one person speaks at a time, no side conversations, follow time-frames for agenda items, please keep sense of humor and have a good time so we will finish all tasks.

Julie reminded everyone that we have both a tape recorder to record our meetings, and the phone. The phones don't always work well, so everyone needs to use their "My dog pooped on the carpet" voices.

## 2. Review of Minutes/Agenda

- a. Notes from the last meeting . Bobby: review of minutes from the last meeting are half transcribed by Frances at this time. Budget for copies is slim and John Shelton will have to call in today to get copies, I apologize
- b. Additions to today's agenda. Julie is not going to ask for additions because of the amount of work and the time frame to do it in.

## 3. Administrative Report

### a. Financial report: Current SNC grant update - BK

Bobby everyone should have a copy of the fiscal report spreadsheet now. Report from SRT grant manager, Debbie Bratt, to understand what we have remaining in our budget and where we are going to go from here in terms of this process and how to complete this grant program. Reminder; there is a conservancy grant for about \$50,000 we received quite some time ago and we have been managing the process under that. Thank you for patience. A couple of points I would like to convey in respect to the budget; talked to Gary, Steve and Bob Robinson about stipends we have in our budget primarily for non-profit partners so they have a way of being compensated for travel, especially. There is \$1000 in the budget for that particular item. Bob has sent Bobby an itemized detail of his costs during our planning effort and we will be able to compensate four of our partners around \$250. Gary just walked in the room. Some have long travel. Special funding for Chris also. This money is deliberately set aside as a stipend to help anyone in the room in a tight fiscal situation.

There have been two donations received for Elissa's time. Stakeholders in our planning committee want to be sure Elissa is paid for time her time as much as possible. Thank you to those donors.

A little bit of time is reserved for the SRT grant manager/controller to submit the application. There is a some money set aside for Debbie to submit the online grant application. She has attended a webinar on how to do this.

Julie: Any questions or comments? There were none.

## 4. Major Topics of Discussion and Decision Julie: there are three main topics for the afternoon; two require a decision, one is problem solving.

### a. IRWMP Application

- i. Workplan, budget and timeline: Draft to Final

Julie: First Elissa will summarize the grant application. Questions can be answered as we go, Julie wants to keep the discussion focused to keep on time. At the end of Elissa's presentation we are asking the group to accept the coordinating committee's recommendation to accept Elissa's draft as written and forward it to DWR for funding. We will focus on substance of the application.

Elissa: I was able to spend more time on this grant section by section with the coordinating committee. I will focus on our overall approach, the things that have changed since last gone through the budget and any other important elements. This is not complete yet there are still some items that are still being developed but this should be sufficient for knowledge of what is being submitted. The deadline is the 28<sup>th</sup> of September. We are so far ahead of this game, the question is how do you distinguish yourself from the other applicants? Two years of work will show in the quality of our application. (Bobby: Believe time has been well spent.) What are our application does is emphasize our work over the past two years. Here are some of the things we have to show. We have brought together a very good group of stakeholders from the area, developed a table of contents for our IRWMP plan, focused on ways of improving integrated management throughout the region. Plan is not just about projects but also about management. Resource management more effective by research in this area. How to involve and engage the disadvantaged community. Developed strategies for working where existing collaborative effort. Developed a detailed budget and workplan, this is very well thought out. How many have a workplan, a budget? Those who don't are you sitting next to somebody who does?

First: The Planning Objective: this workplan is the application. It describes specific tasks and the overall approach. You are welcome to read this and offer suggestions, but detailed wording is not needed at this time. This is not a legal document but we are tied to the budget and task. Do want to go over are objectives for the planning processes on page 3. This is not objectives for the plan but objectives for the planning process. Objectives for the plan are objectives for regional management. Objectives for the planning process are process objectives. What we want this planning process to accomplish. These are the desired outcomes, performance outcomes from the planning process itself. First: Create a regional plan, Second: Collect and compile all existing data, use this information to draw conclusions and create recommendations, (what this means is everything that we use to create the conclusion in the plan you are actually going to link to a database, so that all of those studies, plans and information will be available to anybody who wants to see the science behind the plan or who may want to use it in the future. We will also going to create this database in a way that it can be expanded in the future studies, plans etc. so anybody can use planning work within this region will have easy access. Third: Engage diverse stakeholders in the planning process..., stakeholders are informed etc, Four: Develop integrated strategies, Five: Develop a process, Six: Provide information, Any comments or suggestions on this?

Julie continues with next: New Items

First new item: Hydrologic capacity study. What will create more objective management within the region. Looking at three areas: the ability to collaborate together with the stakeholders, the ability to have the plan study usable to work with, data studies and reports that are needed in order to good management decisions.

Top area is what is the hydrologic capacity need

Bobby: Hydrologic capacity – (Gary understands the watershed in terms of the yield and extraction of irrigation water resources) Gary Temple and others working with Fresno County are basically the only ones with studies done in the foothills. Tried to leverage what Gary is doing in that effort trying to make that as a benefit to the rest of the region. There is not a lot of information about fractures of aquifers and how they contribute to riparian areas and what happens when you drill wells and extract water. Formed a subcommittee to deal with this and have DWR assist. Met with DWR: fair amount of information and data is available related on most of our watersheds but has not been processed or analyzed. Tried to find some middle ground, put enough money in our budget to coordinate with DWR and maybe do a pilot project. Then use other dollars to do more comprehensive studies. DWR, Dane Mathews responded we are available for technical assistance but they do not have an answer yet as far as what specifically they could commit in \$\$\$ to this effort and suggested that we include some portion of a pilot project or study in the foothills so we can utilize that information directly into our plan.

Anything to add or questions?

Julie added: it is important for planning purposes because it has a lot to do with land that whatever the hydrologic capacity of the area is for additional development so we can't really plan on something if we don't have the information.

Gary: DWR is enthusiastic about participating in this effort and providing data and expertise. Was a very collaborative meeting.

Sarge Green: Soapy is that private well monitoring over a period of time?

Soapy: They do not know. They have had groundwater wells but have not looked at it at all now there is a lot of tests that have come out that shows the groundwater overdraft where the aqueduct goes. The whole aqueduct could be in jeopardy if there was an earthquake so the state water board is saying you can't avoid groundwater monitoring any longer.

Unk: Is that specific to the valley or alluvial type situation?

Elissa: Moving on..... There are three components of the water study

1. Coordination with the department of water resources  
Look at the budget; on task 5, we do not have money for DWR and do not know what they will have but we do want to coordinate with DWR effort, put in 50 extra hours for the project manager for overseeing the study and coordinating the DWR effort.
2. Actual hydrologic capacity study for one representative area. (task 5)  
A type of analysis to determine the groundwater levels, direction of flow, and quality . There are a number of areas where this could be done relatively inexpensive. One of the areas (we chose) is Three Rivers possibly focusing on one study area into this application, remembering we do not have to do this with Ken Schmidt, this is a work in the budget,

(well known which is helpful but does not have to be done this way, can look at other options, but for purposes of this budget)

3. (Expanding the scope of work in of the actual plan to include a section which will be the equivalent of local groundwater management plan) In task 7 – an expansion of what we ask the planning firm to do, including some of the components of the groundwater management plan, is doing our budget for actually writing this plan. We have asked for them to include a new area which would be developing a groundwater management plan. It is the functional equivalent of an AB/30/30 plan, developed for groundwater basins in the Valley among other places when those requirements are grant funded to do it, but the hardrock areas can get that grant money because they just have to develop some of the components of the management plan. That was the focus of it. It turns out that in Madera County, when they did the AB/30/30 plan for the valley they also did a technical report for the hardrock areas, which was used for a local groundwater assistance grant for the future. Groundwater assistance grant funding which you can only get if you have a local groundwater management plan. We have asked the planning firm to increase the scope of the additives to the table of content. It will include all the components which are required for the local groundwater management fund in order to be able to get the grant. With the IRWMP we want to set ourselves up to be eligible for any future funding. In the local systems groundwater grant if you say you can have a functional equivalent of your AB/30/30 plan such as section of your IRWMP.

These are new from the last budget discussion.

Sarge Green: the design was the intent that you are planning on transferring surface water you can't extract groundwater to replace it so if anybody had anticipated transferring water rights from the mountain area to somebody else and they were going to use a hardrock well, then yes we qualify to cover that area

Carolyn Hunsaker: Concerned that hydrological capacity studies is so focused on groundwater and not the connection between surface and groundwater. There is a bit mentioned of surface water, but on the table where we rank things in terms of priority. Because our area is so vast and groundwater is an issue but our source water is coming from the headwater of the Sierras. Thinks the groundwater and source water need to be tied together. Willing to try to put some text together on this.

Gary: Have a line item in the scope of work about the understanding how the fracture bedrock aquifer contributes to the riparian runoff

Elissa: on Page 13 Developing understanding hydraulic connections between free flow groundwater. That may not be as extensive as you (Carolyn) were referring to.

Elissa: There is a vast amount of information on how the surface water streams are functioning, that is where the forest service and DWR have data

Carolyn: Is it a matter of coordinating the information? Do we need more money in the budget to create those connections to surface water? Does this go to the planning committee or do we want a subcommittee to work on.

Julie: When we are talking about hydrologic capacity we are really talking about a whole picture

Elissa: A matter of adding some sentences here and there to make sure a reviewer doesn't think we have forgotten a piece of the system.

Whether we need to put a small amount of money there to make sure we can pull some of that information together.

Carolyn: Page 13 has a statement about the DWR representative and working with DWR. So we have something in there about doing a new study on groundwater but do not have is information putting it together and extrapolating to the region.

Elissa asked if Carolyn is willing do this, done by Monday?

Steve Haze after meeting with DWR and experiences we have had as far as the type of analysis, I have a sample, where they actually go through a very thorough analysis of the whole hydrological cycle and the interrelationship of surface and groundwater that it is really and opportunity as Gary indicated to maybe put more language in there that shows their ability to provide that level of detail and I can circulate this around.

Called a Detailed analysis of San Joaquin River above Friant Dam

Their operations day to day and how it relates to the 2013 state water plan update....there is an opportunity where our application would be more compelling if we have that kind of language.

Julie: Is there any possibility that DWR would flake out on us?

Elissa: DWR has a great deal of resources and information that can be given to this effort. Are there additional resources that are needed in order for DWR to have the time to share those with us, then we need to know that and put in the budget.

Remember the function of the application: make sure there is money that is needed for resources that are out there. Those who review this need to know that we understand the situation. Steve and Carolyn send a couple sentences involving these comments.

Bob Pulse: The Pilot project we talked about including the hydrologic capacity study is located where?

Elissa: The Committee talked about doing that in Three Rivers because it has the characteristics of a hardrock fracture and a transition to alluvial water basin.

Bobby The coordinating committee and the hydrologic subcommittee was interested in how we could leverage a study or pilot study would benefit the most regions. Can we get something that is representative enough that it has the components, but there is also development pressure and water conflicts going on in that area and landowners willing to share data or there is existing well data. We can leave this as a study because based on the scope that we have from Ken we could select a different area if needed.

Elissa: Page 16 next area of the workplan

Elissa: turn to page 16 and look at data and technical information

This an area we have talked about before. Have had conversations since with GIS and data folks in Sierra Nevada Conservancy. Suggestions on the most effective way to focus resources that would be beneficial for the planners in the region within our budget constraints. In the workplan: data, technical information and how it will be collected, analyzed and managed.

Collecting existing plans and studies. Bobby has already collected and will continue to do that during the IRWMP planning conference.

The data analysis: most will be analyzed in order to produce the plan, includes the background and key issues and recommendation, most of this will be done by the planning firm. Recommendations and analysis will be done by coordinating and planning committee. Technical advisors may oversee data collection and analysis.

All should be easily available through an online database with footnotes that link to the plan. It was suggested by Liz that there are programs that can do this. This format can be expanded in the future. The database should be formatted that the information can be brought into a GIS environment in the future. Cost? \$3500 put in for development of website and contact manager.

Next item: (in budget right now is task 4) on page 17

Suggested based on cumulative watershed effects model to be able to combine information about various planned projects within the region and determine what the cumulative effects might be and the impact of another project. They have a database of all the projects, when a new project comes in

Goal: the development of separate systems is beyond the scope of the

Note on pg. 17 : models that have already been tried : Forest Service Cumulative Watershed Effect Analysis Database and under development: The Southern Sierra Conservation Cooperative (on climate change) and UC Merced Research Institute may have something.

Consistent methodology or approach to fund those effects in a way that you understand what is happening in that watersheds.

Forest Service is just a model we need to find a way to make a tool that is useful throughout the entire region and something that is consistent, so we will need to look at developing a new model.

Elissa: What was recommended: that we not put in the budget the development of entirely a new system but put in the assessment of what would be needed for a new system. This assessment would include going out to the potential users and asking them what kind of data is useful for them to have, who would use it and what is their position in the organization, what are their skill sets, what kind of questions do they ask, what would it take to put the data into electronic or GIS format, and what kind of decisions to use the potential user and that somehow the people who develop these kind of

systems could use it to create a scope of work for the project of developing a new system.

Julie: any questions or comments on this?

Jim May: who establishes how we weigh the impact on these matters?

Elissa: each individual organization could apply their own policies to the result of number crunching. I think what we are talking about here is a method to analyze not a method to determine

Jim May: This is a value judgment issue, you already have a watershed that has been analyzed and the model says do this and this, who decides whether a stream is healthy or not right now based on the biological indicator and the capacity indicator. I prefer the local people to help decide on what they believe is good conditions and something that they can support and rely on, not someone else's value judgment.

Elissa: fortunately we do not have to go that far but that would become part of the analysis, or could be done as part of the assessment of this, or part of the development. There are two more steps before we have to do a workable model. At this point this could be something that would be needed and exactly what is that and who would use it. At a point where we are applying for an implementation grant we would have to get into some of these value issues. That is the data management.

Next: in the budget is task 4: Organize and Staff a committee to help do this assessment: project manager, committee to help oversee this work

Questions: look at the budget narrative, I took out a column to the right with text about how I developed this and put that in budget. Task 4 tells you about what that means and the assumption is there is a steering committee of partner agencies to identify possible model and outline local needs and provide input to the project. The project manager organizes the staff and the steering committee, there are five representatives from partner agencies will contribute in kind services and a consultant contract cost estimated at \$35,000 by individuals familiar with type of project. Feedback on this?

Next: Climate Change page 23 update and analysis : already included in the table of contents in the IRWMP folded into current the budget estimate but, The National Center for Conservation of Science is already considered a good analysis.

Bobby: those are the documents sent out in the stakeholders' email; it was a conference looking at specific impacts for this region and a bit farther north(Madera County) The have written a couple of reports that look specifically at some effect of climate change proposed mitigation and adaptation options. They have kind of done the work for us as it relates to our water resource, there are some concerns about data, I think they are using the forest service's watershed model and DWR uses a different one. Some

concern about data compatibility. State and Federal levels will have some tension between the data. Asked them to look at what it would cost to write that part of the plan either review something the planning committee comes up with through the stakeholder process and facilitate those meetings and to contrast it with the cost it would take for that group to do the work and submit that to the planning committee.

Elissa: Bobby will follow up with this and \$35,000 has been put in as a placeholder.

Next: Budget and Budget Narrative: will go through the specific tasks, be sure everyone understands and get the final okay.

Elissa went over the different items in the budget and budget narrative Starting with Task 1a,b,c including planning committee, coordinating committee, outreach and info meeting, 24(28) month planning process, website and plan review and adoption process and travel

Sarge: How the Federal Agencies can participate, I think an MAA is one way it has been done in other areas (such as in reclamation) an implementation project and they want financing out of the ultimate plan how would they participate effectively that would be one way would be through management agency. How you get adoption from partner agencies.

Elissa: good question but there is money in the budget for this. We assume 16 presentations to 8-10 to stakeholders I could change that to 20. Agreed.

Task 2 Stakeholder workshop: discussed before but instead of 4 workshops we have 6. Assisting that disadvantaged community areas forming watershed committees. Cumulative watershed effects model, Hydrologic capacity and Climate Change.

Creating the IRWMP plan: Pass around table of contents; questions.....

Steve Haze: general question on the assumptions, task one for example, assumes that if such individuals are hired as employees their hourly rate will be lowered but the cost of benefits and overhead will make up the difference for the purpose of the budget. Per \$ rate how and what would be the assumption as it relates up to a billable rate and what would be the assumption as it relates to the overhead to that.

Elissa: the facilitator should be independent of any of the stakeholder agencies, the facilitator is at \$75hr and the administrator is at \$35hr. That is a situation where it balances and it will be up to the fiscal agent to determine. The project manager has a great deal of hours in this project. The bottom of the budget shows the total hours. The work is not always done evenly so unless you have a fiscal agent who has another task for project manager that would fit well around this task chances are that project manager is going to be open as well.

Steve Haze: the question is within that billable rate the consultant comes in at say \$60hr and overhead is \$10

Elissa: overhead is another budget item, task 1j at \$10,000 a year. The budget narrative shows that in general

Steve: so if you were to hire rather than contract

Elissa: it represents only salary and budget not overhead

Steve: critical to understand because sometimes they bill on the billable rate a overhead cost already added to that billable rate and your assumption is 100% cost for the employee/contractor with no overhead

Elissa: I have put in there we are having a local person doing this probably not an employee or a contractor through the planning committee. With the facilitator we are looking more of a grass roots person that is going to be around and knows the stakeholders and continue to be around and be able to continue to work in this area.

Steve: where do they pick up the cost of being responsible as a fiscal sponsor what I am hearing is those to line items only,

Elissa: that is correct.

A budget is an estimate Budget is detailed hour by hour. There is a contingency of about \$50,000 so it is at the beginning

GaryTemple: We do not want to be in a hole. Is it from the beginning or the midpoint (is inflation considered?)

Elissa: Final comments and questions may be made to Elissa by email by Monday. Then this will be wrapped up by Bobby and Debbie, we can go ahead because it is due by the 28<sup>th</sup>

Julie: Decision point for the day: whether to accept the coordinating committee's recommendation according to the numbers as worked tirelessly at much further with develop exactly what she has been presented today whether to accept the recommendation to go forward substantively with this application by the rules we make decisions by consensus which basically means, can you live with this? There is the possibility of abstaining by standing aside but the whole point is can you live with this? We are talking about the substance of this application. I would like to see thumbs up from all stakeholders who can support or can live with the application that Elissa has put forth. Consensus has been reached and thank you Elissa (send comments by Monday).

Break

4b. Communication and improving communication going forward

Julie: Next: communication issues to sort out. Identity what the issues are:

Discussion on what the issues are included;

1. Timely and strong communication between the Planning and Coordinating committees
2. Understanding the purpose and results, and meeting times of the subcommittees
3. Discrepancies and deficiencies to be fixed especially in emails; need a standardization of procedure
4. Lists and streams of distribution of communication are correct and include all who need to have the information, the potential to drop someone has increased; but do not want email overload.
5. Possible fix is to use the website once we have grant funding

Julie: are there other problems of communication that have not been put up on the chart?

Steve Haze: Part of the issue or challenge is knowing when somebody is speaking, whether it is an organization they are involved with which one are they speaking in behalf of (wear more than one hat) Communication issue – who or what entity are you speaking in behalf of on a given issue?

Gary Temple: Some points it may be appropriate to use mail communication on sensitive items that may have legal or contractual implications, may have more of this as we go down the trail. This may become critical and need to be in written form. Not on everything but some.

Julie: to have an annual calendar and show up for a meeting, but there is the responsibility to show up if you want to have a say

Bob Pulse: the planning committee members need to know where and when so they can participate

Julie: a possible solution purpose is that everyone should have access to a calendar that says this is where all the different committees are going to meet and be conscientious about this calendar and be individually responsible And their responsibility to communicate if they cannot be present.

Bob Pulse: Notification needs to be in a timely fashion, keep advance time on the calendar

Bobby noted that Planning committee needs more time – a month of notice in advance of meetings and that the Coordinating committee usually is 5 days minimum unless emergency

Bobby: some stakeholders have more than one email.... Be sure you have given us the one you want us to communicate with. There were some problems when switched to a new gmail account. As Project manager: get a communication style that works for as many as possible.

Future will be critical to know what is needed (such as a graph) and deadlines  
Julie: as long as we are in existence as a group we will try to learn these lessons and make appropriate changes. For all purposes the present standard will function until future grant is accepted.

Action items to improve communication

Who do I communicate with on certain concerns?

Focus points goes to Bobby the project manager. Bobby will document conflicts with stakeholders and bring them to the committee, or larger group.

Steve: Identification of representation will be very critical as we go forward, there are definitions of stakeholders, for members of coordinating committee etc. It is critical to know that we have a county, landtrust and other different important representatives to make critical decisions.

Julie: be sure we have the proper representation if we are talking about problems and solutions. In the beginning of the meeting say with a clear statement of who we are and the entity represented.

Timely communication: Calendar on a webpage for meetings and subcommittees and what meetings will be about for transparency.

Gary: using SRT's current webpage? Julie: for now but we hope to eventually have own.

How much advance notice?

Planning committee is the ultimate decision maker so timeliness and representation will be important.

Julie: wrap up:

1. identification of who you represent at the beginning of the meeting introduction by name and by organization. If you are late make sure it is announced.
2. Webpage calendar will have CC and PC meetings conference calls advance notice PC is 5 days, for good reasons the project manager can call the meeting as a conference call in fewer than 5 days but that should still go on the webpage.
3. Regular mail will be used for legal stuff, contracts, RFPs, etc.
4. Email lists will have one address per person.
5. If you know you are not going to be at a meeting and you have a concern, call somebody who is going to come and ask that person to relay the concern.
6. Resolution of conflict or concern - Bobby will determine which committee the matter should go to first.
7. The roles of project manager and facilitator will continue to be an ongoing effort.

Bobby – Julie will type up resolutions and Bobby will send them to the stakeholders and continue to provide comments.

#### 4c. Selection of fiscal agent

Everyone reintroduced themselves and the organization they represent

This will be a 4 step process

1. Bobby – establish factual basis for this decision (refers to handout describing actions and process over the last couple of months)

Sarge Green: May not be a reason to hire a fiscal agent at this time until we have a regional water management group in place.

Are we selecting a fiscal agent today to get through the application process?

Bobby: this assumes a more traditional role of entities such as water agencies. This effort has been crafted such that entities that have proper authority sign the MOU, and thus begins the regional water management group. This is according to legislation. We have been operating under the assumption thus far that we have a regional water management group which does not have decision-making authority; authority rests with the Planning Committee.

Sarge Green: They have ultimately the duty, responsibility and opportunity to figure out how to operate

Bobby: good clarification: What the regional water authority and what DWR is requiring where the contract is concerned isn't exactly clear, but DWR already determined that RCDs can serve on the regional water management group.

Julie: what we are trying to determine here is whether to accept the Coordinating Committee and Fiscal Agent Selection Committee recommendation for fiscal agent for the next approximately five to six months

Sarge: then another decision that can be made assumes the planning grant is being offered and you have to have those legal entities and they will have some responsibility and assume the opportunity to select a fiscal agent go forth from there

Several participants asked, "Why would we want to go through that again?"

Bobby: what Sarge has said is that the regional water management group would be delegated an authority, that would be different than what we determined early on and on what we've been working. We determined that the sole decision making authority rests with this group and that the regional water management group is an authority over water resources under CA water code, we are working toward a process whereby this group not the regional water management group would select the fiscal agent.

Julie: I think there is no conflict between these points of view. Sarge is saying it doesn't matter because legally the water management group has authority.

Bobby: assumes going forward delegating authority to the planning committee because that is what we agreed with best for the region very early on.

Gary: do we have something in writing that we can take that there are not going to be issues later on? Looking at the water interests?

Bobby: your concern is the DWR coming back to us and saying well you went through all this effort but you don't qualify?

Bob Pulse: Regional group will be responsible and should take the lead in this. Our concern is that because we are very accountable to the public, more than most groups. We are concerned about our legal liabilities.

Bobby: Sarge's concern is that the legality aspect is really that the regional water management group will be contractually responsible for the deliverable under the plan and grant. Which would mean that the regional water management group members would need some oversight of the process.

Gary: The planning committee would design the thing that would give them some comfort that they met the requirements of the contract but ultimately they are responsible for liability.

Bobby: we designed the process so that the Coordinating Committee would have fiscal oversight because of this. I have tried to provide the fiscal information to this group and to the CC. We developed our process in complication with DWR with respect to that.

Julie: we must stay on track of what is in front of us

In effect the decision before us is selection of fiscal agent from now to the time the grant is granted and possibly beyond that but we as a planning committee cannot make that commitment of granting of the grant.

Need to acknowledge the responsibility of the grant for following the process

Bobby: DWR made a determination as to whether or not this group would qualify as a regional water management group. This group has been going forward under the assumption that DWR made a determination that this group qualifies and that it could accept state funds going forward. We received approval under the Region Acceptance Process.

Regional water management group is responsible for processing the implementation grant. The person who signs the grant and who is responsible for the application etc is the fiscal agent. Who is accountable for the fiscal management?

Bobby: what we hear from the DWR is that for the fiscal agent specifically needs to be 501C (3)

Julie: this is about election of fiscal agent, specifically whether to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee based on the evaluation to accept that recommendation or not --- it is for fiscal agent up to the next 2 years depending on when the grant is received, in order to apply for this grant by Sept. 28<sup>th</sup> we need to make a decision.

Identify the issues continued:

Steve Haze: representing the President Yosemite Resource conservation and development council (Tom Wheeler) chair of the Madera county board supervisor : need clarification there is no overhead available except for management of approximately of 5%, we received a copy thanks to Bobby and based on the CC: how is that possible? Mr. Wheeler's letter sent to Bobby to give to full planning committee this 5% can be directly applied to contract labor, consultants or employees as a result you end up with about \$80,000 applied to the project; one representative from 4 counties which includes the IRWMP region creates a quasi governmental organization that clearly overlays into the IRWMP region and there is a value of \$175,000 that would be inherited by the IRWMP provided by services of the NRCS. Want to clarify this and insurance is an area of weakness but this is not an issue. The NRCS has provided a tribal liaison to get more involvement of underprivileged communities with \$35,000 provided for the coming year for this service. Here is an organizational chart which shows how it has regional coverage.

Bobby summarized: Refer to the handout of process review.

Notes:

- SRT current fiscal agent for Sierra Nevada Conservancy grant – Stakeholders, BK, JA, FT, EB were the project management team and grant writer.
- Initial criteria were developed by Sierra Nevada Alliance based on effective processes in the Consumnes American Bear and Yuba watersheds

Review of Events:

1. Fiscal agency was discussed numerous times and the criteria were handed out and discussed multiple times over the last two years. The most recent process was designed to culminate in selecting a fiscal agent for the planning phase under the DWR planning grant.
2. In the fall of 2008, applicants Desert and Mountain RC&D, SRT and Y/S RC&D submitted letters of interest after the Planning Committee solicited them in anticipation of an April 2009 grant application due date.
3. April, 2010 meeting discussed the three applicants at the time: Desert and Mountain RC&D, SRT and Y/S RC&D. Bob Pulse asked on behalf of Tulare County RCD if the process could be opened to another applicant. This was approved by the Planning Committee. Fiscal agent application were opened until May 31<sup>st</sup>. There was discussion of interviews, but no decision. The group discussed basic eligibility. The Planning Committee nominated a sub-committee to make a recommendation to the Planning Committee.
4. The Planning Committee reviewed the selection process and fiscal agent selection criteria in detail during the May, 2010 meeting. Participants were encouraged to comment if they didn't like an aspect of the process.

5. At the June Planning Committee meeting, participants were briefed on the progress of the fiscal agent selection process. The process steps were reviewed in detail and the criteria were discussed again. The Committee was notified that Desert and Mountain RC&D decided to withdraw their application for fiscal agent. Tulare County RCD supplemented their application at the start of the meeting. The Committee discussed the need for equity and agreed to extend the deadline one week to accommodate Y/S RC&D who had missed a deadline. The Committee gave all three applicants until July 2 to submit any and all supplemental information.
6. July meeting - Subcommittee reports back to Planning Committee that it ranked the Sequoia Riverlands Trust the highest for fiscal agent and recommends SRT for fiscal agent.

Concerns Raised by Y/S RC&D:

1. Felt process was not clear;
2. Expected interviews as part of process;
3. Y/S felt it was only regional entity;
4. Felt penalized in ranking for low overhead

Alternatives for going forward:

1. It can accept the recommendation coming out of the current selection process;
2. The Planning Committee could decide to wait until the next grant opportunity;
3. It could set aside the recommendation and agree on a process that gets us a fiscal agent by the grant application deadline at the end of the month.

The pc needs to make this call as a group, but if we elect to change what we followed as a procedure, we need to have a proposed process to do this.

We need those who can't agree to the result of the existing process to advance something that quickly sets up a new process that we can run through in a couple of weeks, or suggest how we can use what we already have done to reach consensus in that time frame.

Bobby noted that is important to acknowledge concerns and learn from the process going forward.

Someone: thought there was poor communication in the process at one point changed monthly

John Shelton: From working on subcommittee and old job at DWR - Time commitment you can ask of people and how thorough of a process there is. Sometimes you do not have much choice of what you can put in there.

Sometimes it is straight hours of extra time. You do have to balance that out of how good of a process you can put together.

Julie: Any other clarifications for Bobby to make? Want to make sure everyone understands the time frame and facts involved? This is another reason that it is helpful if minutes be available before the next meeting.

Carol Clum: Concerned about the fiscal agent selection criteria that are not here. The criteria does not include past performance in that the client They were not interviewed to see if the work was done in a timely fashion and if under high quality which I think is one of the most important things.

Julie: We discussed criteria at length a number of times, the question before us is whether to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee to select SRT as fiscal agent going forward and if so we are talking about consensus.

Bob Pulse: At the direction of the board of directors of Tulare County Resource Conservation District will not support SRT as fiscal agent but will support Yosemite Sequoia.

Julie: so you are saying that you cannot live with this recommendation and that you block the Consensus?

Keri Vera: what is the problem? Why can't you accept this recommendation?

Nancy Bruce: this looks like you are bitter because you weren't ranked the highest. This is last minute.

Bob Pulse: Julie, you are the facilitator.

Julie: Without consensus, need to clarify who can vote.

Bobby in the event that cannot come to consensus we have to go to signatories. (MOUs) These are Sequoia Riverlands Trust, Sierra Resource Conservation District, San Joaquin Valley Leadership Forum, Revive the San Joaquin, Department of Fish and Game region 4, Sequoia National Forest, Sequoia National Park, Sierra National Forest, Springville Public Utilities District and Carole Clum, Sierra Foothills Citizens Alliance, Yosemite/Sequoia RC&D

Steve Haze: Letter from supervisor Wheeler on behalf of the RCD council and they signed the MOU (Julie: no provision for proxy vote, 75% if signatory means that the recommendation is accepted.)

Gary Temple: we really have three options here:

1. decide to wait until the next grant opportunity,
2. decide to accept the recommendation out of the current process or

3.set aside the recommendation and agree on a process that gets us a fiscal agent by the grant application deadline at the end of the month.

Gary: This decision was on the agenda today to select the fiscal agent.

Steve Haze: I think we can move forward in a way that all can be satisfied and the process that was made is to illustrate as a fiscal sponsor looking at that 5% that everything else goes for the project itself, and that is who is the project manager, who is the administrator, that are hired or an independent contractor agreement so the thought was is there a way to move this forward keeping the overhead low and builds off of what we have established today. Let Yosemite Sequoia RCD council be that fiscal sponsor, SRT on the workchart shows open position and have them become a voting member of the council and you can subcontract and have their personnel..... to talk about this as an option, talked with Bobby offline

Jeannie Habben: says contingency 5%, grant administration, fiscal agent 2.5 years at \$10,000 a year is \$25,000

Julie: question before us is consensus? to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee to select SRT as fiscal agent going forward ; can you live with this?

TCRCD “stands aside” from the vote

SRT – yes

Carole – no

Chris A – no

Gary – yes

Nancy – yes

Steve – abstain

Chris Stewart- abstain

John – yes

Julie: we are in a voting situation and need 75% to move forward and to meet application for the grant money.

Chris Acree: Go with SRT being the placeholder fiscal sponsor based on how Sarge describes it.

Bobby: the regional water management group already has fiscal oversight over the process. The coordinating committee continually monitors and is provided information to review the fiscal situation for the current grant. The Planning Committee is also provided information to review the fiscal process. Is there a way to reach consensus?

Chris A: Is the vote today on who will be the fiscal agent throughout the entire 2 year planning process?

Bobby: look, we are either going to walk away from this two-year process empty-handed and say that this kind of planning is not for this region, or we are going to find a way to form a consensus.

Bobby: Steve or someone can you make a concrete, direct proposal that will work.

Steve Haze: Here is the proposal, that we accept recommendations of the subcommittee with the condition that the if we are awarded the grant that the IRWMP will then revisit fiscal sponsor.

Bobby: Soapy can you live with that?

Soapy: if this is a process that goes forward – yes

Bobby: this is called conceptual consensus. Gary – good?

Gary: yes

Julie: Then the consensus is to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee to elect SRT as fiscal agent with the understanding when the grant is awarded, it is empowered to review the selection of fiscal agent. Do we have consensus and can we live with this?

Nancy – yes

Steve – yes

Chris - abstain

TCRCD is standing aside

Gary – yes

Julie: we have consensus for record keeping we reiterate that TCRCD, Sequoia National Forest, and Sierra National Forest have stood aside.

John: (on phone) – yes

Julie: for the record there members of the group who chose to “stand aside” and other members said that they could “live” with this decision.

Julie: Set the next meeting date after putting in the grant application at the end of month.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25