

Southern Sierra IRWMP

Planning Meeting

June 23, 2010 1:00 - 4:30 pm

Tulare County RMA Office, Visalia

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Nancy Bruce – Springville Utility District (SPUD)
Carole Clum – Tulare Co. Citizens for Responsible Growth
James May – Tulare Co. RMA
Dick Moss – Provost & Pritchard
Soapy Mulholland - Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Bob Puls – Tulare Co. RCD
John Shelton – Department of Fish and Game
Chris Stewart – Sequoia National Forest
Gary Temple – Sierra Resource Conservation District/SAFCA
Mandy Vance – Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Kerri Vera – Tule River Tribe/Environmental Dept.
Julie Allen – Facilitator, Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Bobby Kamansky, Project Manager, Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Frances Tweed, Administration, Sequoia Riverlands Trust

Via Phone:

Jeannie Habben – Upper San Joaquin River Project/Madera Region RWMG
Steve Haze - SRCD - Upper San Joaquin River Watershed Program
Robyn Smith – Yosemite/Sequoia RC&D

Meeting Notes by Agenda Item

1. Introductions

Julie Allen started the meeting at 1:10.

Julie introduced herself and everyone around the table did the same. Then those on the phone identified themselves.

2. Review of Minutes/Agenda

a. Julie said that the first item on our agenda is an agenda review. Does anybody have any questions, any clarifications to be sought, and any particular additions? Bobby said, at the end, there is a climate change event

that's actually some pretty good movement from a non-profit organization about climate adaptation and this is in Fresno, Madera, Tulare and Kings Counties and this is a focus on ecosystems. This is a conference that I think that somebody from this Planning Committee should attend. Bobby continued, under 6a, we have Sierra Nevada Conservancy, Mandy Vance, who is not here yet, but she will be here in about 45 minutes or so. Also, Carole Clum would like to take 3 minutes under Member Reports about Tulare County General Plan. Gary Temple said he'll have a couple of minutes on the capacity building grant for SRCD. Bobby said that he is already on the agenda under 5c. Chris Stewart said he wanted to mention under the member reports that the Kern IRWMP is going to be having a meeting in July. Julie will put him under Other Events. John Shelton said he could give an update on Madera, but he will tag-team with Bobby on 5c.

b. Julie said the next item is notes from the last meeting. Bobby has some comments on that. Bobby said that he has been having a lot of trouble getting around to making sure the meetings are in good enough shape to post on the website and we are now two down, and soon will be three down, to post on the website. We have Frances who has a really great tape recorder, but what that means is that there are many thousands of words in the transcripts that I have to review and to segment out and I don't want to post meeting minutes that are 14 to 15 pages long, but I'll open that up to the group, is that something that I should just go ahead and err on the side of more information, rather than less. Again, Frances has done a great job of putting all the information there, it's all there, in every minute detail, it's a great tool, but it means that it takes a lot more time to read to make sure that it's a little more presentable. I guess I'm asking is that OK? I apologize, it's just that with the fiscal agent selection committee stuff, the proposals coming in, I have no time left. Julie said that we all understand about Bobby having "no time left". Bobby asked again, should he be editing the notes down or should he be OK with 15 to 30 pages of meeting notes. Bobby said the purpose of the meeting notes is to enable stakeholders who can't participate in our meetings to understand the nature of the meetings and provide comments relative to those notes to me or anybody else to provide input in their absence. But eventually we will come under a legal obligation to provide transparency and minutes and notes, so we have an obligation to our stakeholders to be transparent and to let them know what transpired in the meetings so that they can comment on that and provide input but also we are going to be beginning the practice of really just nailing the notes and getting them up on the webpage quickly, so that's why I'm trying to make it clear what's going on with the respective timeline of the notes. We've had a couple of amendments to the three months ago meeting notes, those are all done and ready to go, but we're running up against a budget with copies as well. So probably what we'll need to do in the future is print one or two copies, instead of the 10 to 15, in fact we got a little kick back from SNC, we had a couple of hundred copies on one of our meetings and they objected a little bit. It just brings to light the fact that we are on a limited budget and we have a budget for copies and I know that we have a couple of members here who have offered in-kind services relative to that, so we may call on those members who

have offered to do copying and things like that, but I just wanted to update you on that and make sure that everybody's not mad at me for slipping on the notes a little bit. Julie said that she can't imagine that anybody would be aggravated at Bobby about that. Carole Clum said that, realistically is anyone going to read 15 to 30 pages? Julie said that there's a legal requirement. Bobby said that he wants to make it a little more readable, so that if someone opens it, they're not going cross-eyed from all of the text. John Shelton said there's also another way to look at it. If you have Frances doing the minutes already and they're detailed, posting them electronically doesn't take a whole lot of effort in leaving them detailed, it doesn't take that extra copying and it does give us that much more information, so the step that's taking is the time it's taking for you to review them, especially if you have to crunch it down into something smaller. His thought is that maybe we leave them detailed, we post them electronically, and what we do is at the meetings we basically say, if we're having a problem with photocopies we say, minutes have been posted, have enough people reviewed them? If people raise their hands and they've reviewed them and they're OK with it, we'll leave them open until the next month, and the next month we'll ask the same question and at that point we'll vote to take them, if nobody has comments. That way we haven't lost any information and we don't cause Bobby the extra work. Julie asked if everyone can live with that one? Jim May said he agrees with that, although there is some people that are technology challenged in the group that would need a hard copy. Julie said that all they need to do is speak up and make that need known. John Shelton said that he's one of the people who offered to Bobby and the Conservancy that if we need some of the handouts photocopied, that is something that his department can do, as long as we're not talking about thousands and thousands of pages, that would hit pretty high on the radar screen and he would get in trouble. But he could leave it up to all of the members, if you're coming to the meeting and you're either with an organization that doesn't have much of a budget, or you're an individual and you say I want to hand this out but I'm not going to go to FedEx on my way here and make 100,000 copies if there's a way to get the information to John, and it's a meeting he's coming to, he could definitely make the copies. He tries to make most of the meetings, sometimes by phone. Gary Temple asked if there would be a need later on to have the notes more condensed or not? Bobby said they would be easily referenced as a tool in a way to pull out a particular item, decisions, or something like that, there is some value in that. Having said that, it doesn't take too long to index them, since they are itemized by Agenda item. Julie summarized: as per John's suggestion, we will put the whole transcript, the unedited version, up on the net. We will leave them open for one month, ask at the ensuing meeting whether everyone has had a chance to look at them. If not, leave them open for a second month but, at the end of the second month, finalize and say that they are a done deal. Julie said that she will also look at those minutes and see how much would be involved in doing a summary, to take it off of Bobby's plate.

3. Administrative Report

Bobby presented a power point sheet that showed notes from our fiscal agent selection process. He said they had a conference call the first sub-committee meeting for the fiscal agent selection committee and Carolyn Hunsaker, Kerri Vera, Gary Temple and John Shelton and Bobby Kamansky were present during the meeting and Bobby's purpose there was simply to facilitate the first meeting and to assist agreeing on time line and next steps and process that everybody on the committee could live with. Then to hand off the facilitation to the committee Chair, so there was a fair amount on the agenda for the first meeting. He was comfortable with that, since the committee is very "seasoned". The idea was to meet and agree on process, timeline, next steps, and decision points relative to the time line. Also to designate a Committee Chair, and agree to waiting factors for the process, which up front we decided not to do, they decided not to weight any of questions heavier because it entirely complicated the process and, even though we felt like some items were worth more, that if the applicant was more qualified that would still come out. They also wanted to distribute the applications for fiscal agency and then to agree on somebody, or two people, to brief you all on that process today, so that's what we're doing now. After the first meeting, the committee is charged with actually ranking the applications and we had one withdrawal of an application and that was Desert and Mountain RC&D. Bobby had a nice conversation with Bob Robinson who is our representative, he's the Assistant Watershed Coordinator for Upper Kern and the group felt like the were more Kern County than Tulare County, and that they did not have the geographic representation for the region, that even though there were some of their boundaries within our planning boundary, they didn't feel comfortable enough and that they had strong enough representation across the region. So they respectfully withdrew their application. They still intend to be an active participant in our process and are excited about the process, but recognize that it would make it more streamlined if they would withdrew. Bobby thought it was probably a good decision, but nevertheless it would have been great to have them in the pile continuing because Bob has done a really great job doing a lot of outreach for us in that southern end of our region, so I'm happy to say that they're still participating. Julie asked who are the contenders now? Bobby said we have Sequoia Riverlands Trust, Yosemite/Sequoia RC&D, and the Tulare County Resource Conservation District. Those are our three fiscal agent applicants. Bobby said, just to remind everybody at this Planning Committee, that last time we met it was decided on a refinement to some of the criteria and, at John's suggestion, we took on the idea that some of the questions needed to be yes or no, do you have this, or do you not. Julie asked and this is per our discussion at our last meeting. Bobby said that was correct. He pulled out of the notes from the last meeting and sent them to the selection committee. Bobby went over those points:

- In place financial and administrative capacity to administer a large, complex multi-year grants.

- Capacity for financial tracking, invoicing, and reporting to DWR and the IRWMP Planning Committee
- Proven financial grant management track record with state, federal, and/or private entities
- Has required insurance premiums for state grants
- Has, or can put in place, financial and organizational policies that meet state criteria

These are items that we recognize are not always straight forward but we had to trust that the applicants were going to describe to the best of their abilities these five items. They are the original criteria. What we decided was to weigh all equal, one to five points, and then make notes on the range, so many of the committee members have already begun to look at the applications and to begin thinking about ranking those that they received. Julie asked, when you say “weigh all equal”, you’re saying to not weight the criteria, but the one to five is a ranking. Bobby said that’s correct, the most favorable score would be a five and, even though somebody submitted an application they should get at least a one. I think we did talk about zeros, but I don’t think anybody is going to be getting a zero. You have to submit something with just a paragraph to get a zero. Robyn Smith asked, “you are going to be sending those out to the three applicants, so that they can resubmit”. Bobby said that we had already decided on a deadline for that and the fiscal agent selection criteria was handed out three different times during our Planning Committee meetings, so we’ve actually passed that. If you feel like you weren’t able to get that in, Robyn, I can certainly bring that it as an item right now. Robyn said she doesn’t think they expect any special consideration. Apparently when she was traveling and lost her signal she missed the date, when it was talked about last time. She thought at the last phone conference, the last time we talked about it, it was going to be opened up for everyone to resubmit and that they were going to be contacted, so she must have missed something, she apologized. Bobby said that we did agree on that and he sent out an email to all the applicants that had submitted and we talked about that at the meeting and we had a deadline, the end of May, for any re-submittals. Robyn said OK and asked if there were any re-submittals? Bobby said we just had a new submission from Tulare County RCD, and then we had Bob Robinson who said, after re-evaluating with their Executive Committee, they withdrew. Julie said, so clearly it was an operational process that you put in place and it worked. Bobby, said yes, and apologized to Robyn if there was any unclear process there. Robyn said she’s sure it was clear, it’s just that she hadn’t seen that message on her email and she’s curious about what happened and she apologized. Bobby said no problem at all. Steve Haze asked what that means as far as the date for re-submission? Bobby said it just means that the application stands as it was originally submitted. Steve said alright and asked Robyn what her feelings were in terms of that, had she intended to reapply? Robyn said she had intended to answer questions related to the Council’s ability to manage those grants and fiscal management, but than again, if they

missed the date, they missed the date, she's just concerned about why she didn't see that message. She was going back through her emails to if she could the fault or issue apparently here. She doesn't expect them to alter their decision in anyway. Steve Haze said that the only thing is that limits the pool of applicants. Bobby said no, that they've submitted. Robyn said she thought that's what she had heard (what Steve Haze said), but she would be listening on the teleconference call while traveling and lost signal so she could have missed something. Bobby said that's probably what happened and he apologized again, and it would be nice if he could have conversations with everybody and make sure that everybody is on board, and again, that's another reason why it's important to have the minutes circulated, for that kind of a key decision. That's an important aspect that we should think about relative to our minutes as well. Bobby wanted to add a note that if we did agree in the Committee that if there were questions relative to a particular application, two separate items: 1. if there were a lot of questions relative to an application, then the committee was free to make notes about their questions and submit them to him and he will act as a conduit to the applicant. And in that way, if there are gaps in the application and there is possibility to answer some of the questions, that may be an opportunity to provide that additional information. As well as, we decided that if the committee felt like all of the applications were so close that it would be difficult to select one, then we could go to a presentation or a interview process and so those are some of the back-ups that we built into the process to make sure that, even if somebody submitted, that if they missed something, they could do ahead and get that included, if there were other additional questions. Steve Haze said, OK, maybe a day late and a dollar short and all that good stuff but when they had their quarterly meetings, two members of the County Board of Supervisors really wanted to strongly encourage that they apply, that the Council applied, so I'm feeling like we've got our signals mixed here. Bobby said that the Yosemite/Sequoia RC&D did apply, they just did not apparently resubmit any new information for this most recent round, but they have an application in, they are under consideration for fiscal agency. Steve Haze asked, when was that submitted, early on? Gary Temple said, yes, September 3, 2008, that was the letter indicating interest, wasn't it at that time rather than full blown qualifications? Bobby said that's what we asked for was a letter of interest describing the qualifications initially and they were designed to be in response to the draft criteria that we've had basically since the beginning and that draft criteria circulated in our meeting at least three times, maybe four times now, or five even most recently. Steve Haze asked Robyn, where are her thoughts at this point in time? Robyn said as she understood it, there was a letter of interest, the Council did submit it, she would think that the Council would like an opportunity to express their financial ability to deal with these grants, as well as some of the other criteria. She does have County Supervisors of Fresno and Tulare County indicated a strong interest in having the RC&D be the fiscal sponsors so she doesn't know what to do at this point in time because if we missed the deadline, then we missed the deadline. Steve Haze said, so that means going back to Supervisor Wheeler of Madera County and Ishida for Tulare County. Robyn said, oh, yes, Wheeler too. Steve continued, because they were rather emphatic about that. Steve said he was pointing that out for informational purposes and he

apologized because of the fact that he had his own deadlines and he was out of the loop as it related to any key decision points or dates that were negotiated decision points like what you're conveying at this time. Robyn said she did know that there would be an opportunity to resubmit but she missed that date apparently and she's not finding it in her emails. Steve was going to look in his emails as well. Bobby said that Bob Puls today brought in a packet that relates to the Tulare County Resource Conservation District, Qualifications for Fiscal Sponsorship, and what I would say is that, if you guys have a handout that you would like to distribute to the committee, do so. Bob walked in and he had these pre-printed copies and I'm going to distribute these to the fiscal people. The RCD was able to get a letter of interest with at least some of the brief qualifications on there in due time, so nobody is saying, don't submit anything, I'm just saying that we had a process, we closed that, but there isn't anything to stop you from doing like Bob did today and just handing it out to the committee, that's your call. Julie said that she needs some clarification from Bob Puls. She asked if this is new information that he submitted today? Julie said that Bob is shaking his head, no, it's not new, it was included in your previous submittal? Bob said it's more detailed than the previous submittal. Julie said she thinks from the standpoint of equity here we need to try and accommodate additional information. Gary Temple said that we better adjust so that everybody is on the same page, otherwise we're going to lose one applicant and possibly two, if there's not equity, and I agree with Julie, that we really need to have that very clear and have the three applicants address specifically those items, because obviously there was some miscommunication somewhere. Legally maybe it can be done by Addendum or whatever, but it seems to me we ought to have it so that the committee has a similar playbook from all three of the applicants so we can make rational choices or rational rankings, that would be his opinion, as a member of the committee. John Shelton said he thinks it would be easier for the committee for these things if they come through, he's looking at what Bob gave us now, and seeing that it's filled out and they can get right to it, they don't have to dig things out. He very much agrees with Gary that we need to open it up to everybody and he also thinks that if we have these by a week from Friday, that he'd still have plenty of time to review them by the 16th. Gary was going to suggest that if it could be done in a week or close to that at a specific time than you're right, John, then we've got apples to apples in order to do a proper ranking. Julie said, let her make sure she understands what the two of them were saying, because it's only the members of the committee that received copies of the supplementary information. If she's taking what the two of you are proposing, it's that the three applicants that are in the stack at this point, be allowed time till next Friday, somebody pull the date up, to respond explicitly to these five or six, whatever the number is, selection criteria, is that correct? I'm referring from what Bobby said a moment ago that Bob submitted supplementary information that responded specifically to the criteria. Bob Puls said it's not the five points, it's the 15 points. Bobby said it was the original draft criteria. Julie said that the proposal is that all three submitted parties be allowed to supplement their existing proposals with explicit answers to those 15 criteria, is that correct, is that what I'm hearing? Bobby said that that was the original plan, so it's no different than the original plan, what we're doing is adding a little bit of time to

make sure the Yosemite/Sequoia is comfortable with their submission. Gary said that should be done by addendum so that it's all proper, otherwise that's the only way of recording this extension. Julie said, whether we say it's an addendum or a supplement, I think from a legal perspective it's probably six of one, half dozen of the other, it probably doesn't matter, the point is the original proposal is still the main document and this is supplementary to it. Specifically those 15 criteria, and this is by next Friday, July 2. O.K., July 2 is the date. Bobby said, Robyn and Steve, can you live with that? Soapy Mulholland said that, representing Sequoia Riverlands Trust, she feels that we had a deadline, we met the deadline, and now everybody is going back to try and re-work on their thesis again and that's what my staff will have trouble with. Bobby said that he had a call from Debbie and she was comfortable with the application. Julie said that she could not have known what we've just come up with. Bobby said that what we've just come up with is no different than the original request, no different. Soapy said obviously it is, because Yosemite/Sequoia is saying they need an addendum to try to fix up what they originally submitted. Bobby said that they missed some communication in the process and so what we're trying to do is make sure that with the miscommunication in the phone line, or because we don't have the notes on the website, that they get an opportunity to have a full submittal, which they don't feel like they had. He doesn't think it's a big deal if you've already submitted one, it would be different if they hadn't submitted any letter of interest, but they did that from the very beginning. So in his mind, it would be OK to do that, but if it's something that as a member you can't live with it, then we need to discuss that in a different manner. Robyn said that whatever you decide is fine. John Shelton suggested that we go ahead and have Bobby send out, as soon as you can after this meeting, directly to the applicants that we have, the three, that still want to be part of this process, saying if they want to do an addendum...the committee that's looking at this, we took those draft criteria and moved them around a little bit, but it's still the same criteria. Steve Haze asked if it was the draft criteria from May 25? John Shelton said yes, that they tweaked it a little bit, the biggest thing that they did was they put some as yes or no, and some that they were putting rankings on, and the yes's or no's are the ones that kind of fall out, they should have been able to fall out too. Like, do you have the insurance? If you have all the insurance, you get a five, if you don't, you get a zero. If you have one part of it but not the other, but what we decided is if it's a yes or no we need all that or the ability to get it. It's straight forward, I think your answer would be the same whether it would be a yes or no or a ranking, so he doesn't think it's much different what we've done today, so my suggestion is that Bobby go ahead and send out an email to the three saying that, if you want to resubmit an amended proposal, or an amendment to your proposal, that addresses specifically those 15 criteria, you've got a week and two days until July 2 and that we're not requiring the amendment, in case the Trust is still happy with where they're at. Julie said that this is a consensus process it's not a voting process, can you live with that. Steve Haze said he's trying to find a date that the applicants would have had to responded and we have draft criteria from May 25 and I'm not finding it. Bobby said it would have been in the meeting minutes and that's what we're saying is taking so long for him to get done and posted and what's taking so

long is that we have things like this that are difficult to track unless they specifically were listening very carefully in a meeting or took notes, or were here, and that's part of the deal. Robyn asked if those get sent to Bobby? Bobby said he will send the request for amendments, but he would like them to all go directly to John Shelton, who is the Chair. Steve Haze do you have a finalized version of those 15 criteria? John Shelton said it should be the same as those on May 25, but Bobby will cut and paste those into an email. Robyn asked about what changes? Bobby said to remember that the changes, if you think about it, you address even the draft criteria whether or not they're yes or no questions does not matter, but just remember if you have the draft criteria you can go off of those and it will work just fine. Julie said to John that it was a matter of classifying some of those criteria as yes or no responses and some, for which there was a ranking that was possible and sensible, is that correct? John said yes. Julie said that the actual formulation of those 15 criteria are as they stood at the end of May. John said that there were one or two that we combined but they were the same as the draft, we just put it into one criteria, because we looked at and said if you answer one this way, you'll answer the next one the same way, they're very close. Gary asked if it was clear to Robyn. Robyn said she hoped so.

b. Staffing – Bobby said that the SNC grant is winding down, but we did have a member of our Planning Committee who decided to assist our process in getting the grant application in by donating about \$1,400 to our process. So we received our first cash contribution, which is very exciting and maybe this will give me a little more leverage in Fresno Co. who has cash but said that we don't require anybody to pay cash, they are going to offer in-kind contributions. So maybe he can work a little bit there and see if he can do that. It's a very generous donation and what it's going to do is enable Elissa to participate more actively in our meetings and to help formulate our agenda in the future to make sure she gets what she needs. She was trying to be as conservative as possible with her hours. Having said that however, on May 25 she agreed that she would submit an outline of the grant application to us and he does not have that. We do have a solid budget, which is pretty similar to an outline.

John Shelton reminded Bobby about his conversation with DWR. John knows a facilitator from the city of Clovis who currently works with the Center for Collaborative Policies and we have been pushing on DWR to offer the facilitation services to us at low or no charge. Michelle Dooley, from the Fresno DWR office, came to our meeting and has gone to bat for us in Sacramento. Right now we are discussing how much cost share we can do. They initially came back to us and asked if we could afford it if they would pay 75%. Bobby said no, that we didn't have the money. Michelle went back and pushed even harder for us and the last word was, can the SS IRWMP Planning Committee offer any in-kind services: meeting space, copying services, helping the facilitator coordinate the meetings. Bobby said yes, we can do that, because we have lots of in-kind services. Michelle is trying to finalize a way for us when we reach the end of our SNC grant that we will have a facilitator that is dedicated to our effort for both the

Coordinating Committee, at least a certain number of meetings, and at least 6 to 10 Planning Committee meetings. So it's very good news, and we're not done yet, we don't have the full answer, but we have some serious progress. John Shelton said that Lynn Ashbek (sp?) is the one that he knows, she's a City Councilperson for the city of Clovis, she has been a Mayor, but they rotate through their council, and she also works for the CCP, which is the one that DWR has a contract in place for. If DWR is able to come through with this, they don't have to go through a contracting process, because they're already there. The great thing is that Lynn is a local, so it's not like we're helping to develop and give training to people in Sacramento, we have people down here. John asked if Lynn would like to come to a meeting. Also, John has worked with the CCP group a lot on water issues and they are very good. They always have good quality people.

c. Milestones – Bobby said that we haven't had any new transmissions from DWR to suggest that any of the deadlines have changed and they're still planning on finalizing a lot of these decisions and applicant materials for the end of July meeting on the 28th in Clovis and that's where we're going to have Elissa make a final request for materials for the grant application and we're going to make a decision relative to our process. Bobby doesn't know if we need to approve in the committee the consultant to write the plan. It's been requested to DWR to say, is this something we need to decide in advance, or do we just need to have scope and proposal so that we understand that our numbers are real and that when we submit numbers in our grant application that they're going to be valid and true in the real world. We need to make a decision at the end of July about that. If we do, we'll need to get together a committee. We do have two proposals at this point.

4. Major Topics of Discussion

a. Bobby said that there really are no updates on planning guidelines. We are on the same track as we were.

One housekeeping item will be to receive a reply back from DWR that we've met all of our criteria for full approval under the Region Acceptance Process. We've now completed all of the required items for that and he's gotten a response back from Jeannie Habben, who is our contact with Madera group. Jeannie said that, on that approval process, when they met with the DWR last week, for the central Cal issue, they said that anybody that has been conditionally accepted this round, is to reapply and re-justify their boundaries in November. Bobby said that DWR told us that all we had to do was sign agreements with Kern, which we did, and then with Madera, and we would automatically be fully approved. Bobby asked if this has changed? Jeannie said that they asked DWR specifically, if they work all this out between these groups, how do we get regionally accepted? They said everybody that was conditionally accepted in the last round has to reapply to be accepted in October/November in that round, along with anybody that's new. Bobby said that's pretty bizarre because that's after

the application would be due. Jeannie said that they said that everybody that's applied has been conditionally accepted for the grant, and then when you receive the grant, it states that you have two years to comply with that condition. Bobby said that earlier they suggested that you really had to get full approval before you could submit and receive those planning dollars and be an accepted region.

b. i. Bobby said that we are on Round 7 of the budget and it hasn't changed too much, but we have a couple of important developments. We have now two proposals to provide plans from Provost and Pritchard and WRIME (he handed them out). He only has three copies of the Provost & Pritchard proposal. Bobby said that they have been sent electronically to the Coordinating Committee but, because it has proprietary information, he didn't want to send to all 200 stakeholders. He said that the details that are in the P&P proposal, in terms of the budget, is very similar to our own budget that Elissa has developed for us. He asked what the group thought about him posting our own RAP budget on the website? Should he post qualifications on the website? One thing we could do is post both proposal qualifications and not necessarily have the full budget that Provost & Pritchard did for us on the website. Julie said it would be appropriate to publish the cover letters and the qualifications and the previous work reference. WRIME did not even do anything more than that, but Bobby said they might want to resubmit their proposal with some more materials. We want to let DWR and our stakeholders know that we have these proposals, we're checking our numbers against what we've thought about and making sure they make sense in the real world. Bobby and Julie asked if the Planning Committee can live with posting just the qualifications on the website? Gary Temple said yes, as long as the accessibility is transparent to all the stakeholders. All members present consented. Bobby said that Provost & Pritchard is a very local group that does a lot of water work for valley floor IRWMP's. They have very good connections with our neighbors, every one of them. WRIME is the one doing the upper Kings River Forum Plan, so they have done a plan that has been approved and is now in project money, so they have an asset under their belt. Julie asked if we could see their plan and Bobby said yes, that most of their documents are online. WRIME developed a really great data management tool.

ii. Bobby passed out a handout of the match documentation. This is a spreadsheet which shows, on an average basis, what we're looking at as far as how much our planning has cost us so far. He's going to itemize each of these, because Frances has documented each meeting and who was there, and then we can calculate the number of hours for each group. We've already agreed on the hourly flat rate, for agencies, non-profits and for public participation. We also know what the mileage is and we have been documenting now what the mileage is to Clovis and to Visalia. We can't use it as a direct match, but it's part of the cost, but the \$50,000 SNC match, or cash contribution, and the \$7,000 contribution from Fresno County going forward. Currently, DWR is

requiring a one-to-one match. So, if we determine, for example, that something is going to cost us \$800,000, we have to come up with \$800,000 more to match our planning, and we are no where near \$800,00 right now. Bobby made some assumptions, but he wanted to get a relative amount and he came up to \$300,000, and that was our match, in terms of meetings and mileage. SRT has definitely had some in-kind, Bobby's in-kind with his hours documented. We've had 22 meetings for Coordinating Committee, 18 meetings for Planning Committee, which falls from September 2008 till August. Nevertheless, we're up to \$250,000. We can project our in-kind out under our planning process, and it can be documented retrospectively, and we can go forward and extrapolate that. If we did that based on this, we would be able to apply for \$500,000. We will probably spend about 1/3 to 1/4 more because what we're going to be doing under our current plan is to use the watershed as planning units and to plan watershed by watershed, by having public meetings in the watersheds. Bobby imagines when we go forward we will be in the \$600,000 to \$700,000 range. We also have three or four grant applications out right now, and we could receive additional stakeholder or member donations. Bobby needs to get from DWR exactly what documentation they require for the match. What we assumed before was that every stakeholder could fill out by the timesheet and we could say we know that you were at these meetings, because we've been tracking that. You could then fill in your dollar per hour. The concern with that is that we've already decided on some of these rates. We need to make sure we stick to those and almost everybody underestimates their dollar value. Because you're offering in-kind, you don't think your services are worth that much, but especially an agency person, the dollar per hour is surprisingly high, because of the benefits package that comes with those, and even some non-profits as well. Part of what Bobby assumed we would need is what Frances has helped us do, which is to track every meeting and people's attendance. We have a record of every single stakeholder that has ever been at our meetings, whether they were present or not. We submitted that in our RAP application, there was a spreadsheet. We have notes from our Coordinating Committee meetings and our sub-committee meetings. Julie reiterated to everyone that we need to keep accurate records, which includes prep time and other expenses. Jeannie Habben had an email that gave a new estimation in regards to the value of volunteers and what can be used in grant proposals and such. She said that in the independent sector, the estimated value of volunteer hours reached \$20.85 per hour in 2009, plus 12% to allow for fringe benefits. This is based on the average hourly wage. That would be for all non-management or non-agricultural that type of thing. Julie clarified that that would not apply to donated professional services.

Julie mentioned that Dick Moss, Provost & Pritchard, came in to the meeting and Soapy Mulholland, Sequoia Riverlands Trust, stepped out of the meeting and will be back in when she can. She asked additional new

arrivals to introduce themselves: Mandy Vance, Sierra Nevada Conservancy and Kerri Vera, Tule River Tribe.

Bobby asked that item 4. b. i. could be covered again, since Dick Moss walked in, to make sure that, if there's anything that he wanted to say regarding his proposal, he could. Dick's only comment was that Provost & Pritchard put a lot of effort into developing the budget and the descriptions in the budget are really what would ascertain whether they have a good understanding of the project or they don't. They didn't put a lot of effort into the cover letter, with general package of qualifications. Most of the effort went into the budget and making the budget consistent with what he had seen the group generate before in terms of both approach and desire. The budget lists a number of things that aren't standard in terms of developing an IRWMP plan. There are some special things in there including a couple of studies from Ken Schmidt with groundwater and watershed capacity studies, as well as the data portal. Don't let the total dollars scare us, he said. It's a draft budget and when they get down to seriously preparing the grant application they're going to have to refine all that and get exactly what it is we want. Bobby said that Dick, Elissa and he sat down and fleshed out ideas relative to our current budget and that's what Dick used to build on that.

Kerri asked if the RFP has been closed on that? Bobby said that we did not have a formal RFP process. He tried to reach out to consulting firms he knew of. He sent out to a couple firms, that he didn't hear from, and has made mention during our meetings that if you know of additional planning firms, we certainly would be interested in hearing from them. Kerri asked if there was a list and Bobby said he has bullet point items about our planning process. John Shelton said that, for a point of clarification, until we get our planning grant, we probably don't need to get our engineering firm in place right now. Anything we're getting at this point is helping us put together the grant proposal. We're not really looking at hiring right now because we can't make a decision until we have the grant. Bobby asked Dick Moss, where the planning firm needs to be relative to the planning committee when we submit the grant. Bobby's understanding is that at least if you've checked your numbers and have some consultant you've spoken with, you can submit that in good faith. Dick Moss said you have to have enough detail in your proposal for the grant to clearly show you know what you're talking about, but you can't hire anybody till you have the money.

iii. Bobby wanted to bring up a concern to the group that he has. In looking at our match dollars, we're looking at somewhere between \$800,000 and \$1 million dollars for our current budget, which means we need to think about, #1, is asking DWR for nearly \$1 million for a very sparsely populated region, is that going to be fruitful. The reason he asks that is #1, we will have trouble getting up in excess of \$800,000. What we've scoped in terms of our planning process so far has been three year planning horizon from the actual plan, activities, writing the

plan, and getting the plan approved. We've been active for two years. Bobby said it wouldn't surprise him if DWR were to question why are we asking for that much money for three years, if we've done basically \$300,000 over two years. Why aren't we capitalizing on the planning we've already done. Bobby's question to the Committee was, is there value in looking at this again, and trying to be conservative about the budget amount so that we drop our planning request down a notch. We approach it in maybe a two year planning time-frame, a time-line that incorporates a full year of public meetings, instead of two full years. And a full year to finish up our meetings and adopt a plan. The reason he brought this up was, the more he thought about it, the more concerned he is about the dollar amount being very high, relative to a) our match ability, and b) and DWR is willing to invest in a region that is pretty remote, pretty sparsely populated. Gary Temple said it seems like two years is do-able, if we put our nose to the grindstone. One of the things that Dick Moss and Bobby talked about was having a certain number of big meetings, and instead of having maybe one every quarter, or four per year, maybe we'd drop that number to two a year. And then we'd focus more on watershed meetings. Stakeholders are screaming at us for watershed meetings, for us to come to the watershed to get their take outside of Planning Committee meetings. Julie asked Bobby to talk about the watershed meetings. Bobby said what we've talked about before is that we will hold public meetings at some central point, more populated locations in each of these major watersheds. And we won't just do it once, we will go back several times to the same watershed and same location and do a public meeting. But then we will also have smaller meetings so that we have small groups that can really get ideas in details. Perhaps some small water purveyors, utility districts, those sorts of things, really interact with some of these water management stakeholders or, in some cases, Forest Service or RCD's that may have stakes in some of these particular watersheds, that we gather these groups, facilitate that meeting outside of the standard, bigger public meeting. That would yield a very strong position relative to our outreach and relative to identifying and addressing our issues in our region. Almost every one of our meetings has been big meetings, like our Planning Committee meetings in a central location in Fresno or Visalia. We recognize that it's very difficult to get into a watershed with the system we have now. So Bobby was asking that, not asking for a decision now. He wanted to plant that seed that perhaps we won't be able to provide the match in-kind that is required for a three year process. John Shelton agreed that we could probably do it in two years. Bobby said that another argument is that there are implementation dollars out there and it's not chump change. It's a pretty big pot of money. Reminding everybody that this is a region that likes to do work, it isn't a region that likes to plan, in fact it's hard to get this region behind planning, we've done it but it's been awful hard work, but they love implementation. Dick's point was let's not miss out on implementation, let's get in that line and start bringing in some implementation dollars. It's a very powerful argument to say that we

need to get going, we can't wait that three years, we really need to get those dollars as soon as possible. Point of reference, the eastside, Inyo-Mono, they started about the same time as we did and they are going to have a plan ready for implementation. They pressed DWR hard to say could we just write a plan right now, us, and submit it to you, call it a plan, and qualify for implementation and DWR said yes. Basically what they needed was issues, governance, MOU, goals and objectives, project lists, and so they will qualify at an early stage for project implementation.

Julie said, speaking as a planner now, she reminds everyone that thankfully this is not a situation where there is an EIR involved. This is actually something we could put together quite quickly. And since it's our first shot at it, we could amend it without huge procedural processes in place. She would say to go for the two year time frame and see where this takes us.

Bobby wanted to insert a statement about our approach. Our approach thus far is, we've talked about, aside from the "watershed approach", is that we will have kind of a hybrid approach that says the public approach will be managed by a staff from the fiscal agent, and the planning firm will actually write the plan, it will submit them to the Planning Committee for review. The Planning Committee can then provide feedback into the planning process and that way the planning firm can amend on a monetary basis, the chapter and parts of the plan that are written in a more technical manner. Is that still something everybody can live with? Jim May asked when Bobby thought the project planning will begin? Bobby said it's already begun. We have a list of projects we've gathered from the stakeholders, a master list; we've made repeated calls for projects. What we have is project concepts for the most part right now, they don't have a budget or any kind of documentation or due diligence in front of them. What we've agreed on as a goal, is that when we submit our grant application, we want to have a firm project list, so that we can begin working on that. Bobby said we sponsored some of the implementation projects through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the three national forests, borders that are well within our region, submitted some pretty strong proposals for meadow restoration, so we said that this is an opportunity and we're going to go ahead and do this. So if you have flood control projects, or if the county has other projects, please get them in, we'd be happy to begin thinking about them. Jim May said that the problem he's faced with is that they're going in to the feasibility phase with Army Corps and if they do project planning before we get into that, that's unaccounted for. Bobby asked if he had a list of things that he would like to do, just project ideas? Jim is struggling with this because he needs to hold on projects in the South County that would be impacted by any project planning until after December. Bobby asked if anyone has any comments on that, how to approach that, any recommendations? Jim said that the Corps wants groundwater replenishment, that's their guideline now, their direction, that fits with our group. White River, Deer Creek, and Frazier

Creek are the ones that he's concerned with and some of those areas will be included in our boundary.

John Shelton said that some of the other arenas he's been involved with they've phased projects and one of the initial phases is the feasibility analysis. The fish screen one he mentioned earlier with Patterson Irrigation District was the first thing that they did, and Cal Fed gave them a grant for the feasibility analysis and there was also federal funding that came through. And part of the reason they got funding for the implementation is we already funded their earlier phase and we knew that if we didn't fund the next part of it, we'd leave some stuff on the table. That happens with big projects, state and federal agencies all have to go through that analysis ahead of time and they all know it. Bobby said that for the nature of this region, the phased approach is probably going to be the default way, because the ability to plan and implement the projects is pretty thin. The phased approach is almost going to be like a default way to do it to think about it over several years that make more sense. We barely have the expertise to do some of the project implementation. John Shelton said that he may be way off base, but in talking about going from a three year to a two year process, might we also get to the point where maybe we come out with a preliminary plan at the end of the first year, that we can then vote on and say this is our plan, but we have it in our proposal to say that we are going on through to a second year to re-evaluate that preliminary plan and come up with a much better or a more comprehensive plan. He would assume with P&P writing something you, as the consultant, might be able to handle the fact that you're still on time for this, but in the draft, instead of ten chapters that come out over two years, you can have the first ten chapters all come out. Dick Moss said that Bobby described it as well that the minimum things that you have to have for the plan, which a lot of it you have already done, the approach, the governance aspect of it. He thought John's idea had some merit in terms of documenting what we have done. Bobby said that would really build steam if we could begin getting out ahead of ourselves, if we have projects that are ripe or feasibility of what we want to do, while we have first cut draft plan that is approved, holds up merit, but maybe we want to start testing that as we go and defining it as we go so that we're working parallel with implementation and planning in the second year. Dick said the thing that will suffer is some of your outreach to the extent you just turn over what you've done to a consultant and have it drafted, that can be done pretty quickly. But if you want to vet it, often and in different places, then you will lose some of that. Julie asked if John was proposing anything different from what really amounts to a two stage process. Is it different in kind, or different in degree? John said it's mostly different in degree, in that we get something that's a complete enough document, like Dick said, we can run it through the process, but also agree as a committee that we know we want to do better, both more detail but even maybe some tweaks that we may do, as we start figuring out where we're going. That gives us the ability after a year to say we have an approved

plan and we can start some of our implementation right at that point, but we also have funding to be able to get a better plan that would take the two years to get. We may have to cut back a little bit on the number of meetings, but a lot of times we may have to go out with this document. The second year might be a little bit more effective to go out to stakeholders saying, here's what we've got, but what do you think, with your input.

Bobby said that this discussion was very helpful and he would like to vet it in the broader stakeholder group. John said it would be a good one to have Elissa here to listen to and she's coming to the next meeting. Julie said that this is an issue that will come forward at our July meeting. We are explicitly not making a decision as to whether it be a two or three year process at this time. And we may or may not make that decision in July.

Everyone is back from the break and Jeannie Haben and Robyn Smith are still on the phone.

5. Outreach and Communication

- a. Bobby said he is trying to get with the smaller community services districts, that we haven't been able to meet with yet. They are interested in our process, but have not been able to attend meetings. Initially they are some of the folks we would like to do re-granting to. Many of them are disadvantaged communities and we need to be able to provide an inventory for their needs. Bobby said he pushed DWR hard about outreach to the disadvantaged communities, because we have a lot of small purveyors who have some type of an obstacle. An example is the New Auberry Water Association, they need an engineer's report. It's about a \$10,000 document, according to them. That is the gateway to state grants so that they can increase the number of hookups to their systems, so that they can increase the quality of the treatment, so basically they need this document. Bobby has been saying to DWR that, if part of our planning could be to address their needs, open their door, than that is enhancing the water management portfolio of the region, in particular those communities. DWR doesn't like the idea very much because he thinks they feel like it's more implementation, but what they did say was that they do have a little bit of money, make us a proposal. So what Bobby is doing is trying to put together a list of all the small water purveyor needs in our entire region. Then he will go back to DWR and say, give us the money to deal with this, help us to re-grant, or perform some feasibility or facilitation or outreach so that they get their needs met and move beyond that critical obstacle. Bobby should come back at the July meeting with a list of those and a description and then can turn into a proposal to DWR in advance of our planning, outside of the planning grant application. Julie asked if Bobby was limiting it to community services districts? Bobby said he was using them as an example. Dick Moss said that the County has a list, but Bobby said that

they have not been forthcoming. Dick said he has a list that he will share with Bobby. Jim May said that the representative for the overall organization didn't feel that the Southern Sierra had much bang for the buck, so they didn't want to participate as a stakeholder. He took it that there was more need in other areas. Bobby said that it boils down to that there is interest, but not that much interest.

- b. JPA – Julie said that there were many more questions raised than answers. There were some questions about our boundaries.

Dick Moss made some comments about the JPA meeting, which he also attended.

- Rick Inger said that bond sales continue to go very slowly. Having said that, DWR has sold some bonds, because they are funding a \$2 million water study.
- A lot of discussion at the meeting was regarding those entities that have gone through the Regional Acceptance Process (RAP) and had gotten a list of things that DWR wanted to be fixed. What constitutes fixing? When do we know we've met that threshold?
- As a matter of interest, Paula Landis, who is the Regional Chief for Integrated Regional Planning, will be at the next meeting on July 12.
- Michelle Selliman, the DWR specialist relative to climate change came to an EPA event. There were a lot of questions about what will be required in an IRWMP plan to address climate change. That was the topic of a seminar that was put on by EPA and DWR. Bobby will post that presentation to our website. He said that we had tried to get David Purkee, the previous climate change person with DWR, to come present to our Planning Committee meeting in 2009, but because of the freeze we haven't been able to capitalize on that.

John Shelton said that Michelle Selmon used to be with Fish and Game and he would make the contact to invite Michelle to one of our Planning Committee meetings.

John Shelton said that the DFG had a senior staff meeting and their regional manager asked if anybody wanted to be their regional coordinator for climate change, and someone said that DWR actually gets funding for a position for that. Their manager said that there was no funding, just extra title and extra work, and John Shelton raised his hand for it.

- c. Bobby talked about boundary updates he was showing, using the watershed based maps on power point, produced as an in-kind

contribution by SNC, Liz and Steve Beckwit. Bobby talked about the Kern County boundary, which is our southern boundary. The Poso Group is looking to change the boundary from about a 600 ft. contour to a Section, Township and Range, so this will be more of a straight line and the line will follow land use. The reason this boundary didn't get finalized earlier is because the Poso Group was deferring to the Kern Group as it relates to boundary land, and so by the time the RAP had gone, they were deferring to Kern, and when Kern and South Sierra finalized, it left it hanging. The DWR guidelines, the RAP recommendations, said that Poso should merge with Kern.

Bobby said, regarding Madera, he had sent Jeannie Haben his MOU signature. He will be checking with DWR to make sure all that is confirmed. Jeannie said they're still trying to find a lead agency for Madera and the MOU has been put on hold until then.

- d. Gary Temple talked about datamining and GIS development for that data. Another more important task is to develop water well monitoring protocol for long-term well monitoring. There's the public outreach component that's part of this, which would be for a year duration. SRCD will be handling the program. Gary had copies of "Capacity Building for Future Groundwater Management Planning" for whoever wanted it.

6. Member and Area Reports

- a. Mandy Vance with the Sierra Nevada Conservancy, talked about, and went through a power point presentation for, the Sierra Nevada Forest and Community Initiative (SNFCI), which was formally adopted in June, 2010.

Mandy passed around a Sierra Nevada Forest and Community Resolution from SNC that she hopes the SS IRWMP and other agencies will endorse.

She also said that, due to the successful bond sales, SNC will have approximately \$10 million for grants. Details will probably be announced in July.

- b. Carole Clum talked about her and her husband, Pete's, responses to the Tulare County General Management Plan. They submitted their comments under the Sierra Club.

Chris Stewart announced that it's been about a year since the Kern IRWMP has a meeting and they have one scheduled on July 16.

Bobby mentioned that he had received a Save the Date email about workshops the National Center for Conservation Sciences Policy and the local government commission are going to hold regarding climate

change adaptation. The series of workshops will start on August 12, 2010, in Fresno, Madera, Tulare and Kings Counties.

7. Public Comment

None

8. Calendar Update

The next Planning Committee meeting will be on Wednesday, July 28, from 1:00 to 4:30, in Clovis, at the Sierra National Forest Headquarters.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40.