

South Sierra IRWMP
Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes
December 5, 2008 12:00 - 5:00 pm
In Person Meeting
Tulare County Farm Bureau
737 N Ben Maddox Way, Visalia

Present: This meeting was attended by regular members of the Coordinating Committee and those of the Planning Committee who were particularly interested in this workshop.

Those present:

John Austin, NPS

John Shelton, DFG

Max Norton, SNA

Bobby Kamansky, SSIRWMP Project Manager, SRT

Julie Allen, Facilitator

Elissa Brown, grant writer

Sarah Graber, TBWP

Sarge Green, CWI

Preston Van Camp, RSJ

Gary Temple SRCD/SHFCA

Jeannie Habben SRCD/USJR

Sandy Wright, outreach

Meeting Themes: The overall task for this workshop was to put the “P” in IRWMP, that is, to formulate a better understanding of what the **substance** of our SSIRWMP Plan might look like, the **process** by which we might develop it, and the **relationships** we need to form and strengthen the substance and process to ensure it happens. We are focused on how to make the additional time before grant proposals are due to DWR work in our favor.

Notes by Agenda Item

Updates:

- JPA: The JPA is continuing its formation work despite Kings River withdrawing because they feel they will be more successful with DWR on their own. The rest of us still have good reason to work together and they may wish to rejoin later.
- Boundaries: We continue to work with neighbors to finalize boundaries. Should be able to finalize with KDWCD and DCTRA IRWMP soon after beginning of 2009. KCWA, Poso Creek to follow.
- Milestones: See below

Workshop Agenda In order to preserve the logic and flow of the conversation, the answers to these questions are summarized below as they appeared on the agenda:

- ❖ Substance
 - Brainstorm the substance of the SSIRWMP
 - What will be the substance and process of the plan?
 - Next steps
- ❖ Process
 - Brainstorm ideas for the IRWMP process
 - How we go about getting things done?
 - Next steps
- ❖ Relationships
 - What are the relationships we need to establish to develop the SSIRWMP?
 - With whom are the relationships?
 - What progress has the SSIRWMP made towards these relationships?
 - What is the role of the Coordinating Committee in the SSIRWMP?
 - What is the role of the Planning Committee in the SSIRWMP?
 - Next steps

Summary of Workshop Results

Substance of IRWM Plan: it will contain general conditions, specific conditions in our region, recommendations

- General conditions: general info on precipitation, climate, hydrology—use published data, or data from other plans and studies.
- Specific conditions: Water demand, supply, quality; flooding hazards; erosion; sensitive species/habitats; infrastructure in place. Some data available; some need to be developed.
- Recommendations: Elissa proposed that we do some of the information development as part of the IRWMP development process. Need to inventory what the counties are already doing and what are “knowledge gaps” we might decide to fill as an IRWMP that will assist our members and our stakeholders, including future studies/monitoring, policies and projects.
- Sarge emphasized the importance of a systemic approach to assessing watersheds and water budgets. Need to improve overall long term conditions in area, not drive the IRWMP just to get short term project dollars. This means background information for landscape level water budget including: historical precipitation; the estimated effects of climate change on precipitation, filtration, and run-off under several scenarios; recognizing the systemic consequences of management, e.g., fuel reduction may reduce net air quality emissions from wildfire.

Process Our strategic plan- making process results in a plan that:

- Contains general approach which provides a flexible process for easy update of implementing projects and monitoring protocols
- Contains region-wide assessments and shared data bases to encourage partnerships and build capacity
- Is based on extensive outreach to stakeholders
- Will be directly useful to counties doing general plan updates
- Will bring money into the area to fund project implementation
- Project implementation will achieve the plan goals and objectives.

Relationships To take advantage of additional time before our planning grant application is due, Elissa recommends launching a major stakeholder outreach effort. She proposes a series of two meetings with each major stakeholder such as boards of supervisors, in order to meet these objectives:

- Introduce the purpose of the IRWMP and request time to brainstorm with that stakeholder's staff to get information re their plans in place and upcoming updates
- Improve planning for integrated resource management based on a clear understanding of commonalities and differences in understanding the issues of the South Sierra region.
- As a result of the above, focus specifically on how the SSIRWMP will spend its planning grant money. For example, on strategic data development as well as the plan document.

Elissa also recommends, and the group agreed, that a **Plan Review Committee** be established to analyze and summarize several IRWMP's. Which are the best technically? Which received funding? Which for building relationships? Start with Madera and CABY IRWMP's and looking at other plans as well.

Governance and MOU

- Planning Committee (PC) is the decision-making body. It makes decisions based on a "consensus approach". This means that, at each decision juncture, the Planning Committee asks if everyone can live with the decision. The qualification for membership is simply that you are interested in water management in the Southern Sierra. Attendance is required, and annual meetings will enable updates to the MOU and a review of the Planning Committee membership. All participants in decision-making. Meetings should take place monthly, but the CC and PC should alternate.
- Coordinating Committee (CC) reviews and recommends material for PC consideration and decision making. CC should meet as needed, no less than every other month.
- Stakeholder is self-proclaimed; is anyone with an interest in SSIRWMP.

- Need to cast net broadly at this point in order to include all who should be included and to ensure a full set of appropriate goals and objectives.
- Need an annual meeting to report out to all stakeholders and general public.
- Need to develop consistent set of talking points about organization for publication on (soon to be new) SRT website.
- Regional authority: cannot be a federal agency. Fiscal agent can be a federal agency

Decision-making: PC makes specific types of decisions as part of the three phases of IRWMP process (pre-planning, planning and implementation, see below). At each phase, PC must base priorities on parsing urgency, tractability and importance. Must pay attention to what “is at own feet as well as what’s down the field”. The three phases and PC responsibilities are:

- **Pre-planning Phase** (we are here): decide what the plan covers (table of contents), initial objectives for the plan, and expenditures during the pre-planning phase, ratify MOU, governance, planning grant application and fiscal agent.
- **Planning Process:** decide goals and objectives of IRWMP, governance of IRWMP, criteria for prioritization of projects, monitoring of results, further studies required/desired, on-going involvement of stakeholders
- **Plan Implementation:** “I’ll think about that tomorrow”, says Scarlett O’Hara!!! We’ll deal with this later.

Milestones: Workplan and Schedule—see attached table

Action Items

1. Send email to PC to let know that outreach goes through Sandy Wright (email: blondieright@hotmail.com)
2. Update milestones
3. Create Gannt chart for milestones
4. Draft mission, values and vision statements
5. resend clean MOU draft and briefly describe what changes occurred
6. Draft table of contents
7. Construct outreach plan
8. Draft/sign letter to DWR about planning money delay
9. Submit application for additional funding
10. Use a survey tool to gain understanding of priorities with stakeholders