

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Southern Sierra IRWM Regional Water Management Group

July 11, 2013

Provost and Pritchard Consulting Offices, Visalia, CA, 1 am to 5 pm

Table of Contents

1. Action Items	1
2. Welcome and Introductions.....	1
3. Regular Business.....	2
4. Planning Grant Update	3
5. Public Outreach Meeting Planning.....	6
6. Attendees	8

1. Action Items

1. **DORIAN** to circulate ACWA Headwaters policy, FWS frog and toad listing links, Southern Sierra Climate Change Adaptation Workshop links, and UC Davis ICE meeting
2. **SOAPY and BOBBY** to talk about outreach meeting opportunities
3. **BOBBY** to prepare a thank you card to DWR for support in the logo design, for signature at the October RWMG meeting
4. **BOBBY** to update Communication Plan with newspapers list from 6/28 CC meeting and 7/11 RWMG meeting, and **DORIAN** to circulate for further input
5. **CHRIS or DORIAN** to send Outlook invitations for CC and RWMG meeting dates
6. **BOBBY** to obtain sample public notice language from Eric Osterling
7. **BOBBY and CHRIS** to revise Watershed materials for public outreach meetings
8. **BOBBY and CHRIS** to revise Project Solicitation materials for public outreach meetings
9. **MICHELLE DOOLEY** to bring DWR IRWM brochure to the August 8 public meeting
10. **BOBBY and DORIAN** to update Near-Term Work Plan
11. **DORIAN** to revise public outreach meeting agenda and create public sign-in sheet

2. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Chris Moi, Southern Sierra Integrated Regional Watershed Management Group (SSIRWM) Project Manager, and Mr. Bobby Kamansky, SSIRWM Stakeholder Coordinator, welcomed and introduced participants to the meeting. Mr. Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) Facilitator, reviewed the agenda, asked individuals to introduce themselves, and stated the ground rules.

3. Regular Business

Project Manager and Stakeholder Coordinator Updates

- Mr. Kamansky noted materials for the Climate Adaptation Workshop were online, an editorial from a participant published in the Fresno Bee, and the participants comments; links are listed below. Water quality was a big issue discussed in the workshop.
 - <http://climate.calcommons.org/aux/sscaw/index.htm>
 - [http://climate.calcommons.org/aux/sscaw/misc/Valley Voices editorial by-Carolyn Murphy.3.9.2013.pdf](http://climate.calcommons.org/aux/sscaw/misc/Valley%20Voices%20editorial%20by-Carolyn%20Murphy.3.9.2013.pdf)
 - [http://climate.calcommons.org/aux/sscaw/SSCAW 2pager Final 20130611.pdf](http://climate.calcommons.org/aux/sscaw/SSCAW%202pager%20Final%2020130611.pdf)
- The planning grant agreement contract is close to complete. DWR informed Mr. Moi that the group can invoice DWR for costs associated with this meeting.
- IRWM groups plan to collaborate during a September summit. The summit's goals and objectives have not been established. Stakeholders plan to work with DWR to come up with these. Questions were asked by members:
 - How does the summit fit in with the future planning of this group? It was noted that the state's goals and objective could influence the group's planning process both directly and indirectly.
 - The group hoped that funding would continue for IRWM through a 2014 water bond, given its role in water solutions, land use planning principles, and sustainability
- The Sierra Water Work Group Summit was discussed, at which Ms. Kathy Wood-McLaughlin had presented. Topics discussed were:
 - The ACWA headwater policy gained attention and discussed connections between upper and lower watershed management.
ACTION ITEM: DORIAN to circulate ACWA Headwaters policy from Sarah Campe
 - It was noted that Ms. Sarah Campe would be working with the watershed initiative.
 - One topic is how catastrophic fire might impact the lower watershed. There is collaborative project taking place in Stanislaus and Eldorado National Forests, the Mokelumne Avoided Cost Analysis, which attempts to address the issue. The Conservancy has been active in researching and recording the data.
 - Another was the removal of mercury contaminants in sediment, and a new technology that might make this significantly more effective.
 - Tribal involvement was another theme, and there was good discussion of tribal sovereignty.

Review of Action Items

The group reviewed the outstanding action items noted in the agenda document. Comments were made for each item:

1. There was no action done to item one. It would be beneficial to have a meeting with a tribal councilor to receive input regarding tribal concerns and outreach efforts.
2. The Springville Chamber of Commerce would be willing to have a SSIRWM public outreach item on their agenda on August 12, 2013.

ACTION ITEM: SOAPY and BOBBY to talk about outreach meeting opportunities.

3. Regarding news outlets and public outreach, many members offered connections to various publications or organizations around the region, for example Upper Tule River Association, Huntington and Shaver Lake board meetings, and the Ridgecrest Daily Independent.

ACTION ITEM: All Members to email community outreach contacts to Dorian.

4. Action Item completed.
5. Action Item completed.
6. It was noted that the US Fish and Wildlife Service proposed listing the Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog and Yosemite Toad as endangered species, and to have critical habitat designated, which has created interest in people who live in the foothills about the potential impacts to their ways of life and economies.
7. It was noted that the group should be aware of the implications of the listing, and get involved with the concerned communities.

ACTION ITEM: DORIAN to circulate FWS frog and toad listing links.

General Announcements

- It was noted that the USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station plans to sign the group's MOU.
- Halstead Meadow Restoration Project, organized by Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, was making progress and is a good example to the type of projects the group should fund.
- The PG&E Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council has struggled to come up with a template for turning over its lands to the public and establishing necessary easements. SRT has been instrumental in developing the agreement for the first such project, Doyle Springs. The agreement and associated easements will now go to the California Public Utilities Commission for review. It is part of PG&E requirement to monitor the water quality. Not at the bottom of the watershed.

4. Planning Grant Update

Work Plan, Schedule, and Responsible Parties, and Scope and Budget

- The award letter was received in February, and the original schedule displayed a two-year period. The revised schedule deadline stayed at the end of 2014, which allows Provost and Pritchard 14-15 months to do the work before the third round of Implementation Grant solicitations.
- The near-term work plan highlighted the goals for the group, which was noted in the handout, and back-to-back coordinating committee meetings. The new "compressed" schedule was possible. Alternate representatives could attend if individuals did not have sufficient time available for the now monthly coordinating committee meetings.
- Regarding the SSIRWM Logo, the group liked the graphic, and a thank you letter should be sent as soon as possible to Aha from DWR.

ACTION ITEM: BOBBY to prepare a thank you card to DWR for support in the logo design, for signature at the October RWMG meeting.

- Regarding the near term work plan, the public outreach meetings need to be completed by the end of August, per the facilitator's contract. The full group meetings were listed.
 - Public outreach meeting was confirmed for August 8, 2013, at the Sierra National Forest Supervisor's Office in Clovis.
 - Southern location and date to be determined.
 - The Springville Public Utilities District will include an agenda item for a briefing on the Southern Sierra IRWM at its August 12 meeting.

ACTION ITEM: CHRIS or DORIAN to send Outlook invitations for CC and RWMG meeting dates.

AGREEMENT: The group accepted the revised project schedule and associated near-term work plan.

Yes: Bobby, Chris, Sarah, Koren, Dave, Owen, Bob, Carolyn, Kathy, Soapy, Kurt, Michelle, Pam, and Richard.

Data Collection

- The need for coordinating efforts data collection and inventory efforts within the region was a long topic of discussion.
- The group noted that they wanted to collect higher quality data from areas lacking in information, and also wanted to focus the data on information that pertained to the group's goals and interests, not just whatever was available.
- The UC Davis Information Center for the Environment has made efforts in publicizing data by region, including drinking water service areas. Their systematic approach to making diverse data available through GIS is a good example of what is needed to make data both accessible and applicable to specific problems.
- CSU Fresno's California Water Institute data initiative is largely completed. It was hoped that more than maps would be produced, but this is unlikely.
- Inventory management was suggested as start in organizing data.
- It was suggested that the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the California Department of Water Resources all had extensive data in the region that should be coordinated. An inventory like that called out in the IRWM plan was helpful, but only the first step.
- Municipal jobs would benefit from filling the data gap that occurs throughout the area because it would inform decisions.
- Members stated that there should be clear purposes for gathering and organizing the data that are linked directly to the IRWM plan, such as the relationship between surface and ground water, upper and lower watersheds, and how to inform the public.
- It was noted that groundwater and other topics were not static, and that data gathering and analyses would have to be ongoing and dynamic with periodic updating.
- In regards to technical analysis, some members needed clarification on what the analysis would entail.

- It was noted that DWR requires 16 plan standards, some noted were: regional decisions, resource strategies, climate change, and then provided analysis on the given information.
 - Provost and Pritchard would standardize the information gathered.
 - Historical project proposals included water data collection and standardization.
- DWR is trying to create a more comprehensive collection of data, and fill in areas where there is less information. Regional efforts were important to bringing information together.
- It was noted that DWR would like locals to manage their own water, and not rely heavily on the government in time of crisis. Note a more preventative approach.
- The opportunity was noted for configuring fragmented GIS layers in adjacent regions.
- They noted that other organizations were attempting to build a standardized database that could be used at the federal, state, and local levels. However, funding has depleted. Noted was the California Water Institute.
 - The group stated interest in continuing the conversation of standardizing all levels of government's database.
- The California Landscape Conservation Cooperative was also conducting similar work, and was planning to have a meeting on Monday, July 15, at 1 pm at Provost and Pritchard.
- DWR has obtained a surface water hydrologist.
- Data should be integrated into the projects to better drive information.
- It was noted that the Climate Adaptation Workshop had brought attention to downstream users. It was noted that water quality is also a federal concern.
- Public engagement could draw on information from the Climate Adaptation Workshop.
- The third round of Implementation Grant funding will have associated guidelines. These will help to inform what kind of data management projects might be proposed.
- The group mentioned different supplemental funding opportunities, such as San Diego regarding water quality and DAC studies.
- In summary, data collection had four components. First, the Planning Grant calls out creating an inventory. Second, there are efforts to standardize and synthesize data, which could be put forth as an implementation grant. These could be designed as either (A) a synthesis of specific data sets for a given topic, (B) a framework for standardizing other data sets, or (C) a project to develop a predictive capacity.
 - One member reiterated that the group should ask itself, What is the best data to support our Plan? The data effort should be product-driven.
 - One member suggested the most important task was to integrate water and land use data. Another consideration could be integration of traditional ecological knowledge.

5. Public Outreach Meeting Planning

Review the Draft Agenda, Goals, and Member Roles

- A meeting was scheduled for August 8, 2013, at the Sierra National Forest Supervisor's Office in Clovis.
 - The group reviewed the August 8th draft agenda and additional presentation materials, which were included as handouts. The goals were to introduce the public to the plan, the process, the schedule, the key players, opportunities for involvement, and allow for a commenting period.
 - They would create an opportunity to interact at the meeting and break the public into smaller groups to discuss watersheds of interest. They would answer the following questions about the meetings handout:
 1. Are there any major activities missed in the handout?
 2. What are your big concerns?
 3. What are the major planning questions that would like to be answered?
- Members had some suggestions for the outreach meeting materials:
 - The community of the southern area of the boundary would not attend the Clovis meeting, so the meeting in Clovis should only cover the more northern watersheds. The handout should be revised accordingly
 - The public should know what an IRWM does, and be given examples of projects.
 - Include a map as a handout, contact information, and a one-page flyer of general information. If people want more information, they will ask for it or search for it.
 - Ms. Dooley stated that DWR had a color brochure, which she could bring to the meeting.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** MICHELLE DOOLEY to bring DWR IRWM brochure to the August 8 public meeting.
 - Cover difficult concepts at the beginning of the meeting.
 - The public should not feel overwhelmed or bored. They should be allowed to leave after the introductory presentation. The event should be clearly messaged as a briefing or as a workshop, or clearly include some option for either.
 - Include as much engagement with the public as possible.
- Regarding the Watershed Handout, it was noted that it should include issues that were common to all watersheds, then note the specific issues under each watershed.
- The group noted Millerton New Town as another possible location.
- It was suggested to include the Fresno County Water Committee and the Tulare County Water Commission in the group's updates and events. Targeted invitations should be sent to the County Supervisor and any local leaders.

Review of Outreach Materials

The materials Mr. Kamansky presented included slide print outs, boundary map, the timeline, governance structure, history and milestones of the group. The members followed with suggestions for the public meetings:

- Address any misconceptions, such as stating that the IRWM cannot change water rates or laws.

- Simplify the message to the public and handouts, for example, stating “we got water, we got problems, and we need solutions.”
- Many of the boundaries overlap with other regions on the map, and part of the northern boundary was at Millerton Lake and at Temperance Dam.
- There were some formatting suggestions for the slides. Individuals were asked to provide their comments to Mr. Kamansky.
- They noted that they would only pass out materials after they had been introduced, so that the public kept their attention on the speaker.
- Regarding the group’s history, it was suggested that a single slide cover the information.
- A member suggested letting the public know about important key meetings in the future to support their future involvement.
- Have a public sign-in sheet at the meeting.
- Focus on the success of the group, and that they have been around for a few years.
- Inform the public about what would be involved with the solicitation process for round three projects.
- Regarding the timeframe of the meeting and to keep the marketing clear, they considered call this meeting a workshop, since it would be longer and interactive.
- To clarify the projects listed, label them as “current projects submitted” and note the next deadline for new projects.
 - Clarify how the group plans to use the suggestions from the public, and be upfront about the requirements when submitting a project.
 - It was noted that the public could find other funding opportunities even if the group does not pick up their project.
 - Consider creating a submittal template for the public and be clear about the expectations and timeline.
 - Consider showing examples of projects that were funded with IRWM groups to help inform the public on the types of projects that would be considered.
- Consider having engagement at the beginning of the meeting, then have the informational presentations, and follow up with next steps.
- Regarding the watershed handout:
 - In regards to the format, consider having each watershed on its own page, and highlight that area on a map. It was noted that it could be a package, and each page would have a map of the particular watershed, contact information, and a project submittal form.
 - Note some terms needed more detailed definitions and/or context because they could have different interpretations, such as “management portfolio” and “limited or moderate capacity. “
 - Capacity referred to the amount of information available to a specific watershed. For example, San Joaquin has a large capacity, and a lot of data gathered because it is a higher profile watershed.
 - A lack of capacity would mean the public has the opportunity to better the watershed. This was an important point and needed to be clarified in the materials.

- “Management portfolio” was referring to an areas water management options.
- It was suggested to not include adjectives, so as to stay neutral and objective.
- Consider using a graphic chart for the watersheds, and have it formatted in charts.

Review of Communication Strategy

- Members discussed media outlets that would be beneficial for marketing the public meeting, such as local newspapers, and radio stations (KTIP, KJWL, PBS, KMJ, and KFSR).
- The group will adhere to the public noticing requirements set forth in the IRWM guidelines and California Government Code, which include publishing a notice of intent for a certain period of time and frequency.
- **ACTION ITEM: BOBBY** to obtain sample public notice language from Eric Osterling
- Concern was noted regarding the vigorous schedule for the public meetings in August. With the date quickly approaching, the members thought it might be better to postpone.
 - The group agreed that the August 8, 2013 meeting would continue as scheduled, as well as the briefing in Springville on August 12, 2013.
 - Both meetings could serve as pilot public outreach meetings that will help to improve future efforts. In this regard the planning and development of a good agenda and materials was worth the investment.
- Members had suggestions for larger venues for the southern meeting in Springville:
 - Consider churches, libraries, schools, Tule Tribe offices, the Forest Service office in Porterville, and the recreation hall in Three Rivers.

6. Attendees

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Pam Buford
(Telephone) | 8. Kurt Hupp (Telephone) | 13. Dave Norman |
| 2. Sarah Campe | 9. Bobby Kamansky,
Stakeholder | 14. Koren Nydick |
| 3. Michelle Dooley, DWR | Coordinator | 15. Bob Robinson |
| 4. Dorian Fougères, CCP | 10. Owen Kubit | 16. Kathy Wood
McLaughlin |
| 5. Richard Garcia | 11. Chris Moi, Project
Manager | |
| 6. Gabriella Golik, CCP | 12. Soapy Mulholland | |
| 7. Carolyn Hunsaker | | |