

# MEETING SUMMARY | Southern Sierra IRWMP Coordinating Cmte. July 12, 2012

Teleconference, 9 am to 11 am

## Table of Contents

Action Items .....	1
1. Welcome and Introductions.....	1
2. Project Updates and Member Announcements .....	1
3. Refinements to Governance Policies and Procedures .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. Discuss and Select a Grantee, and Reflect on Process Improvements for Grantee Re- visitation Process.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5. Discuss Additional grantee Clarifications .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
6. Discuss the Draft Finance Work Group Charge and List of Potential Finance Plan Components .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
7. Discuss the Draft Communication and Outreach Plan Outline	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
8. Attendees.....	1

## 1. Action Items

- **MICHELLE DOOLEY** to share link to beta version of the DWR DAC mapping tool, and the Local Groundwater Assistance grant
- **STEVE HAZE** to review the DWR DAC mapping tool and note any missing communities
- **SOAPY MULHOLLAND, JULIE ALLEN, BOBBY KAMANSKY, STEVE HAZE, KYLE WRIGHT AND KATHY WOOD MCLAUGHLIN** – to begin the application process for the Local Groundwater Assistant grant
- **SOAPY MULHOLLAND** to check with SRT if payments are made with regard to calendar or business days, and whether this would be 10 or 15
- **BOB PULS AND JOHN SHELTON** to propose language regarding liability/risk management
- **DORIAN FOUGÈRES** to check in with Dick Moss regarding proposed contractor language, and Carole Clum regarding organizational representation on the RWMG, and Kathy Wood McLaughling regarding participation in the finance and communication plan revisions

## 2. Welcome and Introductions

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

## 3. Project Updates and Member Announcements

1. Three Rivers Community Services District has new projects and a new fulltime GM. There is potential for coordination.

2. Kathy will present to the Sierra Water Work Group on behalf of SS IRWMP.
3. Inyo-Mono IRWM received a DWR grant to try different outreach methods. They have been invited to the September meeting date, and will try to coordinate on Spanish-speaking outreach.
4. DWR Stormwater Grant: Counties may have projects that would be high on the PSP list, including levee mitigation of habitat. Will share announcement with Jim May, Tulare County RMA, if he's still active or someone else there.
5. Implementation Grant: Not clear if future rounds, it is doubtful.
6. John Shelton met with Wild Places, the director is very interested in volunteer support for implementation.
7. John Shelton met with the owner of River Ridge (Tule River), they are exploring an environmental easement for water supply.
1. John Shelton noted that Camp Nelson has an informal business group discussing sustainability, and that would support community outreach. There is a local residential group included. They are not looking at further development but sustainability, recreation values, use, ecotourism. Multiple water companies are involved.
2. John Shelton distributed a flyer for the Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District's groundwater supply planners luncheon, July 19 at Visalia City Hall.

## 4. Local Groundwater Assistance Grant Application

The group discussed the application details.

### Application

- Will the application be part of a larger scope of work submitted by Sierra RCD? Yes, with a work plan, schedule, project description, and scope of work. Final language will be expanded, this will be Phase 2 of the SRCD proposal. The SRCD Board has approved two separate proposals that, based on requirements, do not exceed \$250K.

### Introduction and Background

- There are minor errors and omissions already being addressed. Took bulk of language from planning grant application. There is an opportunity to explore supply and yield, and relationship with water quality and surface water. All General Plans call for foothill development; how is unclear. Few public agencies serve region, many disadvantaged communities and low capacity for research and management.
- Scoring criteria wants details and goals and demonstration of collaboration, and project description demonstrates long-term need and merit of the project.
  - Have goals at end of background. Will make sure keywords are highlighted for scoring purposes.

### Work Plan

- At end of each task, will make statement of each deliverable. Will have data summarized in technical memo that can share with stakeholders, so everything rolls into

a final report. Much language from original Schmidt proposal. Will work on first task with NPS, USFS, DWR, university, to pull together info about region and associated geology.

- Task 2 about individual well yield information.
- Task 3 will use public wells, and handful of local volunteers. Will scale back number of wells.
- Task 4 what watersheds are and where water is coming from.
- Task 5 hydraulic streamflow and groundwater. Source of conflict in region. Housing along riparian zone and dewatering/reducing channel, immediate local ecology and downstream impact. So gauging impact.
- Task 6 water quality, some natural uranium issues. Also heads up regarding mines and other future concerns, septic as well as nitrates, biological threats (e. coli).
- Task 7 outreach and town halls re: briefing and technical memos.
- Task 8 final report and materials.
- Some tasks are complex and have multiple elements and communication needed.
- Good to specify task deliverables. Do not forget Task 9 project administration – need narrative explanation. Include specific consultants if have them up front, not just background but scope. Call out where expected consultant would work on task, and qualifications. University expert support. Point is to demonstrate have good team behind project. If working on specific task, what you expect from them.
- Task 6: if specific to Three Rivers, replace general statement.
- Where can tie back to overall goal/intent, do this, and need from project description.
- Note that CEQA not needed for this.
- Under each task, after opening statement have bullets a-b-c with actions clearly stated. Like the format, “Summarize available data; Develop programs; Prepare maps.”
- Is it helpful to link budget items to schedule and sub-tasks?
  - Yes, under each task have to call out costs of sub-tasks and schedule has to match that exactly, so easy to cross-walk during review.
  - Narrative should be more accessible, graphic schedule, and link to budget items.
  - Not need to go to sub-tasks. Key is actions. Lump sum though. If can break out, great, but not required. Schedule: task 1 a-b-c-d and approximate time for whole task, and if possible sub-tasks. Schedule and tasks must match up exactly.
  - This is just a proposal, not written in stone. If you allocate hours to a component and this ends up being a bit off, that’s okay. Scores better if higher level of detail in work plan, schedule, and budget – even if seems unreasonable, shows that proponent is aware of all the parts of the tasks.

## **Budget**

- Will include Task 9 in the narrative. Based on template from SRCD. Second table corresponds with internal subtasks, need additional detail.
- Budget, material, and labor costs table should be integrated. People and duties under each task should be called out.

- Ideally rates for each subtask and who's accomplishing that. Integrate two tables and add detail.
- Task 9, 2.5%, but PM below at 11%, should combine.
  - PM isn't same as administrative costs. So insert line item for PM for each task.
  - Two-table approach is confusing. Also will add quarterly reporting, and final report.
- Recommend task descriptions in budget match what's in narrative – the headers.
  - Office operations for Task 9: do not think grant will want to fund renting space. Administration rates can include overhead, that's where to capture that expense. Do not call out overhead, just include rates to cover those expenses.
  - Project administration: do not want to say ops or overhead, rather "loaded rate" that takes into account benefits etc.
- Mention project will benefit a DAC.
  - Reiterate in work plan under the water quality part. Also Native American Tribe notification.

### Schedule

- Will have graphic, check in with Dane/Michelle re: potential notification date so reasonable timeline. We be based on website timeline.
  - Monitoring depends on seasonality.
- Budget table can extend out several columns with months/years and build timeline with cells, so all parallel with budget and scope.
- In schedule, don't know should call out limit where certain entities are working. Ken may be involved in compiling data, so when assemblies report so it's consistent?
  - Ken's primary role is to take and assemble data he generates. We were assuming we'd work particularly with DWR ASAP. Then outsource second piece late.
  - It is not needed to call out Ken's term, focus on task basis.
- Insert 'quarterly report' into schedule.
- Depending on the area, the task make sense, but do not see the Forest service doing pump tests etc though. Is this a shared assumption?
  - Yes, will analyze what have, not gather new data. National Park Service different because upper watershed and Kaweah, but other parts in Sequoia NF.
- Then task finishes, include the deliverable on the schedule.

## 5. Next Steps

Bobby will update and complete the application, send to Steve Haze for his submission, and work with Steve to get it to Sacramento.

## 6. Attendees

1. Michell Dooley
2. Dorian Fougères,  
facilitator
3. Steve Haze
4. Kurt Hupp
5. Bobby Kamansky
6. Dane Mathis
7. Kathy McLaughlin
8. Soapy Mulholland
9. Bob Robinson
10. John Shelton
11. Kyle Wright