

# MEETING SUMMARY | Southern Sierra IRWMP Planning Committee November 17, 2011

## Table of Contents

Action Items.....	1
1. Welcome and Introductions .....	1
2. Review of Draft Near-Term Work Plan .....	2
3. Review of Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Requirements .....	2
A. Requirements .....	2
B. Advice from DWR for Grant Rewrite .....	3
C. Milestones .....	3
D. Application Format and Checklist.....	3
E. Required Standards.....	3
F. Table of Contents.....	3
4. Feedback on Draft Proposal Outline and Objectives .....	4
5. Preparation for December Meeting.....	6
6. Action Items and Next Steps.....	6
9. Attendees .....	6

## Action Items

1. **DORIAN** ASAP to work with Mr. Powell and Mr. Kamansky to ensure the accuracy of the list of Planning Committee members in the application.
2. **DORIAN** by COB 11/18 – send meeting date survey to all Planning Committee members, with a request for responses by COB 11/22.
3. **MICHELLE** by COB 11/18 – provide a link to the PSP and ranking categories.
4. **JOHN McCAULL** by 12/10 – Think further about how best to include cost-share and revenue stream information in the application.
5. **DORIAN** by COB 11/18 – provide a link to DWR’s 2010 Drought Contingency Plan.

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Bobby Kamansky, Project Manager, Southern Sierra IRWMP (SSIRWMP) welcomed participants to the call. He noted that the Sierra Nevada Conservancy had provided a small grant for Mr. Dorian Fougères, facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS, to support the group, until a larger facilitation support grant from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) was in place.

Following brief introductions by everybody on the call, Mr. Fougères introduced himself and reviewed the meeting agenda and standard ground rules. He noted that several Planning Committee members had not received the meeting announcement, and explained he would verify the addresses on the email list and ensure that anybody who wanted to participate would receive future announcements. He also noted that he would try to obtain a toll-free number for future calls.

## 2. Review of Draft Near-Term Work Plan

Mr. Fougères walked the group through the draft near-term work plan, explaining that it was meant to provide general guidance and might be modified as the process developed. The main focus was the steps between now and submission of the planning grant application. He noted that three important dates were **December 10** (when a full draft application would be available for review and comment by all Planning Committee members and any other interested parties); **January 10, 2012** (when comments would be due); and **February 1** (when a final application would be submitted and distributed to the Planning Committee).

Two priorities identified repeatedly in the work plan included providing feedback on key topics for the application, and working to ensure that the process included all Planning Committee members and other interested parties.

Mr. Scott Powell noted that Tulare County Resource Conservation District had agreed to sign the memorandum of understanding but was left off the Planning Committee in the application, and this required correction.

- **ACTION ITEM:** **DORIAN** ASAP to work with Mr. Powell and Mr. Kamansky to ensure the accuracy of the list of Planning Committee members in the application.

The group then provided feedback on the draft work plan:

- The current Proposal Solicitation Package is a draft, and people are providing comments to DWR. The group must ensure that the application reflects any significant changes, and should also keep in mind that the application due date may be postponed.
- Meeting in December may be difficult because the holidays. If needed, the meeting could be postponed until January. The facilitator noted this could be done, and that two meetings would still likely be needed to complete review of the draft application.
- **ACTION ITEM:** **DORIAN** by COB 11/18 – send meeting date survey to all Planning Committee members, with a request for responses by COB 11/22.
- **AGREEMENT:** The group agreed adopted the draft near-term work plan, keeping in mind the preceding comments.

## 3. Review of Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Requirements

Mr. John McCaull, Consultant, Conservation Strategy Group, walked the group through his update memo, including key requirements, advice from DWR, milestones, required standards, and a table of contents. Discussion followed:

### A. Requirements

- Mr. McCaull clarified that the group is assumed to be eligible because their previous planning grant application was accepted.
- Per the September 8, 2010, meeting summary, the group affirmed that Sequoia Riverlands Trust would be the applicant for the planning grant application; and that if a grant is received, the group would revisit the issue of the appropriate fiscal agent.

## B. Advice from DWR for Grant Rewrite

- Mr. McCaull reiterated suggestions that DWR had provided on how to strengthen their application.

## C. Milestones

- Mr. McCaull reiterated the milestones identified in the work plan for the draft, comments, and final submission and distribution to the Planning Committee.

## D. Application Format and Checklist

- Mr. McCaull noted that the bulk of the materials would be the attachments, including #3 (work plan).

## E. Required Standards

- Mr. McCaull reviewed the list of standards and noted that the project review process, relation to local water planning, and relation to local land use planning would be key topics for feedback. The facilitator noted that, assuming a grant is received, an important part of his role was to support the group in developing and applying a robust project review process.
- Ms. Michelle Dooley, DWR South Central Regional Office, noted that while the group would compete with applications from throughout the State, there will be less competition because seven RWMGs are not eligible to compete for individual Round 2 Planning grants because they have already been awarded the \$1,000,000 Planning grant maximum. However, as stated in the Draft Round 2 IRWM Planning Grant PSP, there will be *balance points* or *tie breakers* available to those IRWM planning efforts that have not yet received Prop 84 IRWM Planning Grant funding, such as Southern Sierra.
- In response to a question, Ms. Dooley clarified that there are five categories that DWR uses to score applications: the work plan (weighted heavily), disadvantaged community involvement, schedule, budget, and program preferences (including statewide priorities and IRWM program preferences). DWR uses its discretion for tie-breakers.
- The facilitator summarized that the group would need to consider the categories, standards, and advice from DWR when reviewing the draft application.
- **ACTION ITEM: MICHELLE** by COB 11/18 – provide a link to the PSP and ranking categories.

## F. Table of Contents

- Mr. McCaull reviewed the table of contents, noting that the task descriptions in the work plan would be tied closely to the timeline and budget, and that sections 2 (public outreach), 3 (develop regional management strategies and projects), and 4 (prepare draft and final IRWM plan) would require the most work.
- The revised proposal would build heavily on the previous application, and likely not require the development of lots of new content. Mr. McCaull's efforts will focus primarily on reorganizing the document to improve its flow, readability, and story.

- It was recommended that the Planning Committee should clarify and emphasize in its communications that the work they did to date is exceptionally valuable and provides the basis for the revised application.
- Ms. Dooley clarified that DWR thought the local cost-share component of the original application was sufficiently well-established, although it was unclear whether a reliable revenue stream existed. Task 4 (prepare and draft a final IRWM plan) includes a finance standard, and the application could list potential avenues.
  - Mr. McCaull added that such information would also be included in the proposed budget.
  - **ACTION ITEM: JOHN McCAULL** by 12/10 – Think further about how best to include cost-share and revenue stream information in the application.
- Ms. Dooley clarified that when a planning grant is received, the Grantee (the entity that is entering into the agreement with the State and signs the grant agreement) ~~fiscal agent~~ must confirm it has sufficient funds to advance the work plan, as DWR payments are in arrears.
  - Mr. Kamansky added that it would be important to further discuss the effort and time needed to document in lieu contributions (e.g., mileage), and incorporate this in the budget table. The original application included participation back to 2008.
  - The facilitator agreed to include this on an upcoming meeting agenda.

## 4. Feedback on Draft Proposal Outline and Objectives

Mr. McCaull reviewed DWR’s guidance on plan objectives, noting that IRWMs must also consider statewide and regional objectives. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Basin Plan, the RWQCB’s State of the Watershed report, and the California Water Plan (CWP) were important references.

- Mr. John Shelton clarified that the SSIRWMP boundary includes a part of the San Joaquin River, providing a nexus to fish issues.
- Ms. Dooley noted that the CWP did not provide substantial analysis of the southern Sierra in its Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region ~~Mountain Counties~~ regional report.
  - However, ~~To remedy this~~ Ms. Dooley recommended that the application include some reference to working with DWR’s South Central Region Office to conduct a hydrologic capacity study for the Southern Sierra region. This would provide a link to the statewide objectives included in the CWP. She explained that the regional office was willing to provide technical support for this effort if a planning grant is received.
  - In response to a question, Ms. Dooley clarified that the hydrologic capacity study could be highlighted in the planning grant, and be supported either as part of future implementation or separately as local assistance or technical support services conducted by DWRs South Central Region Office.
- In response to a question, Ms. Dooley commented that she did not feel that the CWP Mountain Counties Overlay Regional Forum would significantly advance discussions on

the Southern Sierra for the Update 2013; however, the Tulare Lake Regional Forum is an the current and most appropriate venue for discussions on the Southern Sierra, given that the Southern Sierra region is mostly in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region. If the Mountain Counties Overlay area is expanded geographically, then this was more likely to be seen in the CWP Update 2018.

Mr. McCaull based the draft objectives he wrote on successful IRWMP applications. Acknowledging that the group had had a robust public involvement process for the original application, he strongly recommended focusing on water management objectives in the revised application, and downplaying process-oriented objectives. Mr. McCaull also noted that objectives needed to be specific and realistic.

Members discussed the categories of objectives:

- The group agreed that “flood management” should be changed to “integrated flood management,” as this included **drought** as well as flood events. This expansion would need to be highlighted so people knew that drought was included.
  - **ACTION ITEM: DORIAN** by COB 11/18 – provide a link to DWR’s 2010 Drought Contingency Plan.
- The group acknowledged that **financing** was an implicit part of each category of objectives and critical to the feasibility of any project, and at the same time, finance might also warrant its own category.
  - Along the same lines, objectives can heuristically be divided into those that are results-oriented and carried out on the ground (which necessarily includes a financing component), and those that are organizational/procedural objectives (which could include finance, administration, etc, more generally).
- The group acknowledged that it would be worthwhile to continue to look at additional federal and state funding opportunities, beyond the IRWMP funding.
  - Under the **Stakeholder Involvement and Outreach category**, it was suggested to add an objective along the lines of “building partnerships to leverage resources” and “building capacity by developing relationships.”
- Under the **Stakeholder category**, it was suggested to add an objective around, “Increase communication and engagement with California Native American Tribes.”
- Under the **Environmental Resource Management Category**, it was suggested to add an objective around, “Integrate fire and fuel management with water management, including watershed health.”
  - It was noted that watershed health involves things like water flows and meadow restoration.
- It was suggested to add an objective around, “Promote best practices in range, forest, and land use management,” and noted that this included both public and private lands, as well as federal and county land use planning and decision making.
  - It was suggested that this objective fit under both the **Environmental Resource Management and Land Use Planning/Management categories**, and also could become its own category.

- Under the **Stakeholder and Land Use Planning/Management categories**, it was suggested to strengthen the disadvantaged communities objective by drawing on SB 244 (Wolk), including the Tulare four-county region study on water and wastewater.

## 5. Preparation for December Meeting

The facilitator reiterated that, per the near-term work plan, the December meeting would include discussion of key policies and procedures, as well as the structure and composition of the group, to ensure that it included interested parties and the key agencies and organizations that needed to be part of the discussion. Mr. Kyle Wright agreed to hold his Forest Service presentation until a later date.

## 6. Action Items and Next Steps

The facilitator reiterated the action items identified earlier, and added that he would be providing an online survey tool for Planning Committee members and other interested parties to provide additional comments on the draft objectives. He also reiterated that he would provide a high-level meeting summary, including key issues and discussion points, action items, and group decisions and agreements, within a week of the meeting. He would also work to identify December and January meeting dates as soon as possible, per the earlier action item.

Mr. Kamansky thanked everyone for their participation and support of the process.

## 9. Attendees

- |                                    |                     |                    |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Julie Allen                     | 6. John McCaull     | 12. Chris Stewart  |
| 2. Michelle Dooley                 | 7. Kathy McLaughlin | 13. Bill Templin   |
| 3. Dorian Fougères,<br>facilitator | 8. Dick Moss        | 14. Terry van Huss |
| 4. Steve Haze                      | 9. Soapy Mulholland | 15. Kerri Vera     |
| 5. Bobby Kamansky                  | 10. Scott Powell    | 16. Kyle Wright    |
|                                    | 11. John Shelton    |                    |