Tulare Kern Funding Area
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)
Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (DACIP)
Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
January 16, 2020, 9am-12 noon
Provost & Pritchard, 130 N Garden Street, Visalia, CA

***MEETING SUMMARY***

ATTENDEES

**Project Advisory Committee Members**

* Antonio Solorio, Westside San Joaquin IWM
* Bobby Kamansky, Southern Sierra IWM
* Christine Gutierrez, Poso IWM
* Dave Hoffman, Tule IWM
* Jim Maciel, UKIRWMA
* Ralph Gutierrez, Tule IWM
* Regina Houchin, Kern IWM
* Soua Lee, UKIRWMA
* Stephanie Hearn, Poso IWM
* Steve Haze, Southern Sierra IWM

**Project Team**

* Denise England, Tulare County
* Maija Madec, Provost & Pritchard
* Malka Kopell, facilitator, Consensus and Collaboration Program, CSUS
* Jessi Snyder, Self-Help Enterprises
* Paul Boyer, Self-Help Enterprises
* Seamus Guerin, Self-Help Enterprises

For others in attendance, see Appendix A.

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, & AGENDA REVIEW

Malka Kopell, facilitator from the Consensus and Collaboration Program, California State University, Sacramento, reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. Project Advisory Committee (PAC) members and members of the public introduced themselves.

Project Advisory Committee members and Project Team members in attendance are listed above. For a list of additional attendees, refer to Appendix A.

Ms. Kopell asked for public comments. There were none.

1. REVIEW OF MEETING SUMMARY FROM OCTOBER 17 PAC MEETING

The meeting summary from the PAC meeting on October 17, 2019 was reviewed. Ms. Kopell asked for comments from PAC members. There were none.

**PAC Action:** Ralph Gutierrez moved to approve the meeting summary. Jim Maciel seconded the motion.

Ms. Kopell asked for public comments regarding the recommendation; no public comments were made.

Motion passed with all PAC members in favor.

1. UPDATE ON PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Denise England, County of Tulare, said that all project development contracts had been finalized, except for one with the Sierra Resource Conservation District (RCD). Pending an amendment currently under negotiation with the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), no land can yet be developed nor equipment purchased.

Ms. Kopell asked for comments from PAC members; none were made.

1. TKFA DAC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM STATUS OVERVIEW

Maija Madec, Provost & Pritchard, reviewed the updated budget and spending table for the DAC Involvement Program (DACIP). The updated budget document can be found [here](https://tularelakebasin.com/alliance/index.cfm/tulare-kern-dac-involvement/program-budget-expenditures-thru-12-31-19/).

Ms. England noted that the table should include the contract for facilitation services.

1. DAC ENGAGEMENT AND EDUCATION PROGRAM STATUS PRESENTATION

Paul Boyer, Seamus Guerin, and Jessi Snyder, all of Self-Help Enterprises (SHE), reviewed progress on the DAC Engagement and Education Program (DACEEP). Much has been done during the first phase of the program but much still remains to be completed. The program has a total budget of $550,000; some of this funding has not yet been allocated. The Phase 2 proposal includes recommendations for allocation of the remaining funding. The DACEEP Phase 2 proposal can be found [here](https://tularelakebasin.com/alliance/index.cfm/tulare-kern-dac-involvement/dac-education-and-engagement-page/daceep-phase-2-proposal/); presentation slides are [here](https://tularelakebasin.com/alliance/index.cfm/tulare-kern-dac-involvement/dac-education-and-engagement-page/daceep-update-presentation/).

PAC members provided the following comments and questions regarding DACEEP.

* Consider whether there are opportunities to include data from other reports, such as the income survey conducted in Springville, into the Community Water Assessment (CWA).
	+ The focus of the CWA focuses on septic surveys, however other sources of data will be considered.
* Are the activities for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 all funded by the $550,000 or will additional funding be allocated?
	+ There is no need for additional funding; the total cost of all the activities will be covered by the $550,000.
* How is Fresno County participating in the DACEEP?
	+ SHE will be doing a road show to inform County Boards of Supervisors in Fresno, Kern, and Kings Counties (in the Tulare Kern funding area) about the Tulare Kern DAC involvement program, needs assessment, and community water assessment tool. The program has an overall goal to increase participation by counties. SGMA implementation may support this aim because more counties have staff dedicated specifically to water. Data from other counties are available, however there have not been county staff available to review that data.
	+ Steve Haze, Southern Sierra IRWM, offered support to garner Fresno County’s participation in the road show. Mr. Haze has existing relationships with Fresno County staff because of the Sierra RCD projects included in the Fresno County Hazard Mitigation Plan.
	+ Stephanie Hearn suggested working with Amy Routledge, Kern County Environmental Health Department; Ms. Hearn will follow up with Ms. Routledge.
* Include Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs) in assessments.
	+ SHE considers DUCs a subset of DACs, so includes them in their work with DACs. It is important to consider the challenges DUCs face that incorporated DACs may not face.
* What is the status of tribal engagement within DWR?
	+ DWR has a tribal liaison in each regional office, as well as in the statewide DWR office. The TKFA PAC recently added tribal representation. Tribal engagement is a new part of SHE’s work. Tule River Indian Reservation hosts an annual project development workshop with Southern Sierra IRWM. Kenneth McDarment, Tule River Councilmember, is tribal representative to the PAC.
* Has SHE produced bilingual materials that other PAC members can utilize?
	+ Yes, existing and updated materials in English and Spanish will be shared with the PAC, including updated “Get to Know Your IRWM” handouts.
* SHE should keep the PAC informed about the timing of the road show.

Members of the public provided the following comments and questions.

* Why was the allocation of the full $550,000 DACEEP budget not previously approved?
	+ An initial allocation included a phase of work focused on gathering feedback from the region; that feedback informed development of the proposal for the second phase of work. The Tulare County agreement with DWR includes the $550,000, however SHE was not yet contracted for the full amount. The PAC can reallocate any funding not used for this DACEEP work.
* Have films already been made?
	+ No.

**PAC Action:** Ms. Hearn moved to approve the Phase 2 DACEEP scope of work and budget. Bobby Kamansky seconded the motion.

Ms. Kopell asked for public comments regarding the recommendation; no public comments were made.

Motion passed with all PAC members in favor.

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATUS PRESENTATION

Ms. Madec presented the web application used for the needs assessment, including updates and proposed additional activities; see handout [here](https://tularelakebasin.com/alliance/index.cfm/tulare-kern-dac-involvement/needs-assessment/needs-assessment-update/) for details. An additional $14,000 was requested for clean-up activities and transition to the County; this funding is within the original $350,000 budget for this effort.

PAC members provided the following comments and questions.

* How are you identifying the location of wastewater treatment systems?
	+ We are identifying the location of the facility itself, not the service area of the system.
* Where does water quality data for private wells come from?
	+ There is a small sampling of data provided by SHE based on the sampling they have done in communities. There are less than twenty for which SHE has data and authorization to share that data.
	+ Ms. Hearn offered to share private well water quality data for Kern County from 1990 to the present.
* What is the weblink for the application?
	+ Houston Engineering is supporting development of the web application and it is currently housed on their server. The temporary link that was shared previously can no longer be accessed but it will transition to the Tulare County website in spring 2020, after which point it will become public.
* Mr. Kamansky requested confirmation that the feedback he sent to Gavin O’Leary, Provost and Pritchard, was received.
* Will the PAC have another opportunity to test the application before it is made public?
	+ There may not be time for the PAC to test it again, but feedback can continue to be incorporated after it is made public.
* Is Lake Isabella included in the map?
	+ Yes.
* Will the County continue to operate and maintain the application once it is transferred?
	+ Yes.
* It would be helpful to have support from other counties on maintenance of the tool and database.
* Is it likely to require a significant amount of maintenance once set up, beyond ensuring that data is current?
	+ In the past, maintenance included digitizing and tabulating individual well data. With increasing availability of such data from DWR, it is likely that maintenance will be less intensive. Houston has update protocol that allows them to upload current data automatically.
* The State Water Resources Control Board developed a Safe and Affordable Funding for Equity and Resilience (SAFER) needs assessment tool. It may be possible to connect the local needs assessment work with the data gathered through this tool. Recommend adding source data – including who, how, and when the data was collected – so that people can use discretion in deciding which data to use when there are discrepancies between datasets.
* Is the County prepared to take on maintenance and quality control?
	+ Yes. Tulare County is also working with Groundwater Sustainability Agencies on a well dataset and identifying a data steward in each subbasin who would take on tasks such as verifying data. The vision for maintenance also includes a similar role within each IRWM region.

**PAC Action:** Mr. Kamansky moved to approve the additional $14,000. Regina Houchin seconded the motion.

Ms. Kopell asked for public comments regarding the recommendation; no public comments were made.

Motion passed with all PAC members in favor.

1. REVIEW ANY REMAINING APPLICATIONS FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FROM INDIVIDUAL IRWM FUNDS

Project development applications for individual IRWM funding were reviewed.

Ms. Madec presented the following proposal.

* Lebec County Water District – Phillips Pressure Zone Expansion
	+ Project cost of $32,000; request for $12,000 from Kern IRWM.
	+ This project was originally submitted to the regional funding pot, however it was not funded through that vehicle. The project was re-submitted for the $12,000 funding remaining in the individual funding pot for Kern IRWM.
	+ How much of the project can be accomplished with $12,000 of the $32,000 project cost?
		- Lebec County Water District will share the cost of the project.
	+ Why was this project not funded previously?
		- The project was originally submitted to the competitive regional funding pot but that funding was allocated to other projects. The project is now under consideration for funding through its own IRWM funding pot.

**PAC Action:** Ralph Gutierrez moved to approve $12,000 from the Kern IWRM funding pot for this project. Mr. Kamansky seconded the motion.

Ms. Kopell asked for public comments regarding the recommendation; no public comments were made.

Motion passed with all PAC members in favor.

Mr. Kamansky presented the following proposal.

* Sierra Resource Conservation District (Sierra RCD) – Water Supply Assessment for the Tule River Reservation under Changing Climate & Fire Regimes
	+ Project cost of $85,000 requested from Southern Sierra IRWM.
	+ Project would assess whether planned new infrastructure will hold up in a hotter and dryer climate. Southern Sierra IRWM plans to have UC Merced evaluate hydrologic models for each watershed; this project would utilize the IRWM’s remaining funding to begin this larger study by looking at the South Fork Tule River Watershed. Additionally, the project hopes to provide downstream benefits, including beyond the Southern Sierra IRWM region.
	+ Ms. Hearn expressed support for the project, noting that it will prepare the Tribe to qualify for future project development climate change funding.
		- Mr. Kamansky noted that the area of this project is the same footprint where future well analysis is also planned – the area is both Tribal and DAC.

**PAC Action:** Ms. Hearn moved to approve $85,000 from the Southern Sierra IWRM funding pot for this project. Ms. Houchin seconded the motion.

Ms. Kopell asked for public comments regarding the recommendation; no public comments were made.

Motion passed with all PAC members in favor.

1. REVIEW APPLICATIONS FOR REGIONAL POT OF FUNDING

The regional pot of funding includes only $100 remaining and therefore there were no applications for funding from that source.

1. UPDATES FROM PAC MEMBERS

There were no updates given from PAC members.

Michael Prado, Jr., thanked the PAC for its efforts and noted that the Sultana project would be moving forward.

1. NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING

The next PAC meeting was scheduled for March 19, 2020.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next PAC meeting will be held:

March 19, 2020

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Provost & Pritchard

130 N Garden Street

Visalia, CA 93291

Appendix A: Additional Attendees

* Michael Prado, Sr., Sultana CSD
* Michael Prado, Jr., Sultana CSD