

# MEETING SUMMARY | Southern Sierra IRWMP Planning Committee February 24, 2012

Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District, Fresno, 9 am to 1 pm

## Table of Contents

Action Items .....	1
1. Welcome and Introductions.....	1
2. Project Updates.....	1
3. Review of Final Draft Grant Application Part 1: Introduction and Background .....	2
4. Review of Final Draft Grant Application Part 2: Work Plan Tasks .....	4
5. Review of Final Draft Grant Application Part 3: Budget.....	6
6. Organizational Items .....	7
7. Attendees.....	7

## Action Items

1. **ALL MEMBERS by February 27** to email all comments on the grant proposal to Ms. Tasha Newman
2. **TASHA NEWMAN by March 9** to complete and submit final grant proposal application
3. **ALL MEMBERS by March 8** to review Grantee-related handouts
4. **DORIAN ASAP** to distribute webinar and call-in information for the March 8 special session on the Memo regarding Grantee Requirements

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Bobby Kamansky, Southern Sierra Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan (SSIRWMP) Project Manager, welcomed and introduced participants to the meeting. Mr. Kamansky reviewed the agenda and noted important discussion topics. Mr. Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) Facilitator, reviewed the ground rules.

## 2. Project Updates

Mr. Kamansky presented the group with current updates:

- Private landowners have an interest in stream use within the watershed and have requested not to divert the water for fish and wildlife purposes.
  - Mr. Kamansky researched their request, and discovered that they would have to obtain a permit through the State Water Resources Control Board.
  - It was also noted that some landowners have water trusts that benefits the fish and wildlife.
  - Mr. Shelton suggested that Mr. Kamansky contact him after the meeting to further discuss water rights.

- The Feather River Resource Management Group held back water for meadow restoration.
- Releasing water later in the season might have natural benefits.
- Local Ground water assistance grants are available, public comments are due March 1, 2012, and final grant applications are due in summer of 2012.
  - It was unclear whether the grant is more for planning or more for implementation.
  - The group noted that it would be helpful to have more groundwater information for planning, including unidentified basins.
  - It would also be an opportunity to coordinate with other IRWMs, like in the Kern watershed.

### 3. Review of Final Draft Grant Application Part 1: Introduction and Background

Ms. Tasha Newman presented the grant application draft to the group, and briefly described her drafting strategy. The members were instructed to make edits on their copy of the grant application and return it to Ms. Newman for inclusion. **The members had a variety of comments and questions on the introduction:**

- Add to the importance of the background by addressing disadvantaged communities (DAC) plans.
  - The group agreed to have an efficient plan for the DAC. The group wanted to elaborate on the specific areas of the DAC. Ms. Newman stated that the DAC areas are identified in another section of the proposal, and reminded the group that a concise introduction is critical.
- Mention the Native American groups and their strong cultural connection to water. The term “heal” in the draft would emulate the cultural connection.
- Define the term “ecosystem health,” though the group noted this term could have many meanings. For example, the term could include protecting the landscape from development. Another option would be the term “ecosystem services”.
- Add reference to recreation and potential impacts.
- Concern about application page limits. Though the proposal is under the limit, the group stated the first proposal was lengthy and the new draft should be clear and concise.
- Issues on the proposal scoring. The background information is not scored, but the work plan and schedule will be large scoring components.
- Suggest the reasons for the funding and adding a detailed list of urgent projects.
  - The group elaborated by suggesting the need for an emphasis on “why” there is an importance for funding. For example, including the area’s threats and increasing water flows to the central valley.
- Note that the introduction acts as an abstract.
- Add a timing coordination component in the introduction, in regards to federal cooperation.

- Add more statistics and numbers to the introduction. For example, the region size, the amount of water given to farmers, and any other impactful numerical data.
  - Ms. Newman stated that this information gives the introduction more strength. Mr. Steve Haze volunteered to contribute some data information and suggested another resource, Ms. Laura Bauer.

Ms. Newman continued to explain her thought process on developing the background section of the application. She noted the type of information she included within the background. For example, size, key components, rivers, hydrology, water supply and quality, partnerships, local and state agencies, and coordination within the region. Ms. Newman also explained the application needed more information and numerical data on important topics, such as dams and groundwater. She stated that including there is not currently an Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan (IRWMP) would be a persuasive point. **The members had comments and questions on the background section of the application:**

- Note the extensive burned areas of the sierra, which result in rapid snowmelt.
- Describe alternative ways for funding restoration projects, and suggest collaboration with other agencies.
- Include future impacts in the background description. For example, the issue of accelerated climate change, and the impacts on fire management preparation and reforestation.
  - The group decided to add a broad mention of climate change.
- Note the importance of supplying water to the Tulare Basin and regional self-sufficiency.
- In the coordination section, add a short list of projects that need funding, which include partnering with the Forest Service.
  - The group also stated that Mr. Kyle Wright, SNF, has already prepared a list of funding needs, and that each forest has their own list.
- Consider noting the need for public input on strategies, for example, nongovernmental participants, and California Native American Tribes.
- Note that the Forest Service is updating their planning process and the importance to act now.
  - The group mentioned the new Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) for the Forest Plan revision process, and Ms. Allen shared her hopes to join the group.
- Note the need for scientific synthesis for aquatic systems.
- Call out important components on the work plan.
- Concern about not including objectives in the background, but the group noticed that the objectives are located in the work plan, so it will be scored.
  - The group thought that the mission statement could be included in the background section, but not all the detail that currently exists.
- Rephrasing some language for more clarity.

The application writing is to be completed by March 2, 2012. Ms. Newman concluded by stating that she would like all comments and feedback by Monday February 27, 2012. Ms. Newman stated she was willing to stay after the meeting and discuss further comments on the application. The application itself is due on March 9, 2012.

**ACTION ITEM:** ALL MEMBERS *by February 27* to email all comments on the grant proposal to Ms. Tasha Newman

**ACTION ITEM:** - TASHA NEWMAN *by March 9* to complete and submit final grant proposal application

## 4. Review of Final Draft Grant Application Part 2: Work Plan Tasks

Ms. Newman presented the work plan section of the application to the members, which will be a scored section. She further reviewed the layout of the Work Plan Tasks, and noted that each task is a chapter within the Work Plan has deliverables and a timeline. The tasks are suggested by the DWR, and it is wise to use them to structure the application. Ms. Newman stated that Mr. Dick Moss was unable to attend the meeting and that the group would not be reviewing a detailed budget estimate, but that he had prepared rough numbers. The members had comments and questions on the Work Plan Tasks:

- Consider adding subtasks.
- Acknowledge the work by Provost and Pritchard on the application.
- Adding additional tasks.
  - The group discussed that adding a new task would require a clear set of guidelines, and ideally, the group would like to stick to the original outline requirements and elaborate the tasks in later sections.
  - It was agreed to leave the tasks alone, but there should be more cross-referencing between tasks.
- Questions on where to include details on the website. For example, in task 9 or 16, there is confusion on where to reference information. Also, consider adding a portal to website, and watershed maps to the application.
- Note that the group has a previously accepted governance plan, and suggest it can be improved. Also, note that the group is working with a planning firm and facilitator to guide and recommend changes.
- Consider separate policy documents that are supplemental to the application. The group still questioned whether it was necessary to add supplemental documents.

Ms. Newman continued to review tasks 2-6. She briefly highlighted the important points of each tasks, specifically stating task 6 is important because it addresses how the group will include projects. The members had questions and comments on tasks 2-6:

- Recommend longer timelines, though there are minimums of twenty years, and consider the consistencies between task timelines. On task two, there could be a longer time for more critical analysis.
  - The group suggested following the idea of the 2050, based on the California Water Plan, as a timeline guide.
- Clarification on certain lines of the application, such as line 321, 338, and 349. The group felt there were a few places where wording was misleading, for example line 400.
- Identify potential projects for each task throughout the application.
  - The group has a project list identified that will be noted in the application, although this would be refined through the planning process itself. The group also suggested adding projects that can be funded by other programs and potential future project opportunities.
- Create the ability to amend the plan.
- Consider opportunities to reference the four county DAC study, and state that the group is working to address DAC issues in the Southern Sierra. In addition, the group can reference DAC information from the California Department of Finance.
- Comment about the California Water Plan 2013 and trying to extend the planning area to include Mountain Counties regional issues.
  - There was a suggestion to take on that plan, but the group realized that the project is too complex to add in the application.
- Concern that the first preliminary objective would be unachievable. The group recalled that in December they had agreed that draft objectives were more accurately goals, and measurable objectives would have to be developed.
- Change of language in line 364 discussing drinking water standards. For example, suggesting “expected needs” instead of stating “expected demands”.
- Discuss the recharging of groundwater.
  - The group stated that the region consists of mainly source water, and due to fractured rock and other issues, the area has little recharge. The group decided to mention groundwater recharge in the integrated flood management and water supply objective.
- Note the Constituents of Emerging Concern (CEC).
  - Some members felt that it was already addressed in line 365, but another noted that this only referred to listed constituents.

Ms. Newman continued to review tasks 7-12, briefly highlighting the important points of each task. The members had questions and comments on tasks 7-12:

- Analysis in the minimum 20-year period is used to understand future needs. The group suggested that Provost and Pritchard should develop that piece for task 11.
- Consider language changes for clarity in task 9.
- Comment on the difference between task 9 and 11. The group stated that task 11 was intended for goal and objective formulation and monitoring.
- Consider adding a Tribal component to task 11.

- Note that on line 468, there is confusion as to whether it is noting water quality or quantity. The group did note that the application should discuss the benefit of plan that considers water quality and water contamination. Examples are places in the region where there is uranium contamination.
- Focus on high-level information, so as not to be too specific in the application.
- Line 528 should reference the budget for administrative tasks and the process, including facilitation.
- Identify the needs for funding then creating a strategy.

Ms. Newman continued to review tasks 13-17. She briefly highlighted the important points of each task. The members had questions and comments on tasks 13-17:

- Distinguish between section 13.2 and 13.3.
- Provide examples of groups for coordination in task 14.
- Define roles under administration.
  - The group discussed that Provost and Pritchard were the primary resource in the application process.
  - It was suggested that the schedule be called out visually with colors associated with the party responsible. The group said that the other tasks, for example 6-7, identify responsible parties.
  - Along with a document, the group considered adding an implementation element to demonstrate confidence. It was noted that yes, in theory, every plan would be implemented, but calling this out more specifically would make it clear that the process would continue. Implementation itself would have to be managed.
- Identify public educational materials in task 13.2. For example, people volunteering with tribes, educational presentations, and materials added to the website. The group noted that educational presentations could introduce future projects.
- Discuss the supervisor role for implementation. The members mentioned that the projects have an administrator and manager. Ms. Kathy Wood McLaughlin volunteered to discuss the implementation process with Ms. Charisse Sydoriak.
- Note not to group Tribes with the DAC. Include planning money for the DAC in the budget because if the grant is given the DAC money will be separate.
- Ask if a task budget is necessary. It was noted that the application illustrates the budget by task. The group stated that workshops can be used for multiple benefits.
- Use the DWR climate change handbook for reference. The group stated that task 15 (climate change) should use the SWR available information for reference. Ms Sydoriak volunteered to contribute information on vulnerabilities. The group further stated to address the issues of poor air quality and its effects on water quality.

## **5. Review of Final Draft Grant Application Part 3: Budget**

Ms. Newman presented the Budget handouts, and reviewed it with the members. She stated that one handout displays major expenses, and the total estimated amount. She continued to

discuss the present and future facilitation services and the consultant numbers. She stated that the numbers illustrated on the handouts are accurate. The members had questions and comments on the budget:

- Note funds for preparing the grant can be including in the matching funds.
- Provide evidence in the budget of past meetings and associated costs. For example, use meeting notes as evidence as form of documentation.

**AGREEMENT:** All members present approved of Ms. Newman making final revisions, per direction at this meeting, and submitting the final application on behalf of the Southern Sierra IRWMP. Members present at that time included:

- |                     |                                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Julie Allen      | 7. Bob Puls                      |
| 2. Pam Buford       | 8. Bob Robinson                  |
| 3. Carole Combs     | 9. John Shelton                  |
| 4. Steve Haze       | 10. Charisse Sydoriak            |
| 5. Carolyn Hunsaker | 11. Kathy Wood McLaughlin        |
| 6. Bobby Kamansky   | 12. Kyle Wright, SNF (Telephone) |

## 6. Organizational Items

The group supported Ms. Newman, and encouraged her to finish her work on the application. Ms. Newman agreed to make sure the group has access to all the materials.

The group agreed to add Ms. Wood McLaughlin as a Coordinating Committee member.

Mr. Fougères passed out the Memo regarding Grantee Requirements (developed in response to questions from Planning Committee members, and vetted for accuracy by DWR) and the Proposed Process for Revisiting Grantee Selection, and noted the timeline as an important component. He noted that there was not sufficient time to discuss the materials today, but they would be the focus of the next Planning Committee meeting. He asked the group to review these documents in preparation for appointing a new grantee in July. He also asked members to hold the March 8 date for a special webinar with DWR to review the Memo regarding Grantee Requirements and answer any additional questions that members might have.

**ACTION ITEM:** ALL MEMBERS *by March 8* to review Grantee-related handouts

**ACTION ITEM:** DORIAN *ASAP* to distribute webinar and call-in information for the March 8 special session on the Memo regarding Grantee Requirements

## 7. Attendees

- |                 |                     |                          |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 13. Julie Allen | 15. Carole Combs    | 17. Dorian Fougères, CCP |
| 14. Pam Buford  | 16. Michelle Dooley | 18. Gabriella Golik, CCP |

- 19. Steve Haze
- 20. Carolyn Hunsaker
- 21. Kurt Hupp
- 22. Bobby Kamansky
- 23. Jerry Lakeman
- 24. Luke Long (Telephone)

- 25. Dane Mathis  
(Telephone)
- 26. Tasha Newman
- 27. Bob Puls
- 28. Bob Robinson
- 29. John Shelton

- 30. Charisse Sydoriak
- 31. Kathy Wood  
McLaughlin
- 32. Kyle Wright, SNF  
(Telephone)