



**Tuolumne-Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water
Management Authority Board Meeting
February 20, 2019**

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:

1. Consider fee change based on increased membership.
2. Include funds in reserve account on financial report.
3. Ms. Mattos to reach out to GCSD regarding potential storm water projects for inclusion in the IRWMP

HOMEWORK:

1. Review materials sent in advance of the meeting and bring copies with you to the meeting.

MEETING GOALS:

1. To consider action on WAC recommendations

****FINALIZED MATERIALS WILL BE AVAILABLE ONLINE**** <http://tstan-irwma.org/>

Opening Remarks

Chair Ringen called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

Public Comments

Chair Ringen opened the comment period. None were offered.

Members in Good Standing

Ms. Carolyn Lott provided a report. It was suggested Ms. Lott contact Ms. Liz Peterson regarding Tuolumne County attendance.

Attorney Opinion

Ms. Lott shared the attorney opinion on a quorum of board members attending a WAC meeting. Ms. Lott said the attorney opined an alternate board member would not be counted toward a quorum of board members at a WAC meeting as they only have board power if seated as the replacement for the primary board member. If there is a quorum of actual board members, then those not seated in an official WAC capacity may not speak.

Grant Update

Ms. Lindsay Mattos said she submitted an amendment for Round 2 projects. ATCAA asked for an extension and GCSD has completed their project. Two invoices are pending. The Drought Grant was amended to extend to 2021 and two invoices are pending. Ms. Mattos has a phone conference with DWR regarding Phoenix Lake next week.

Summary: T-S IRWM JPA Meeting

New JPA Member

Chair Ringen reported GCSD has requested to become a member of the JPA board. Ms. Lott noted GCSD was not able to be present and asked if the board wished to postpone the item. The board agreed they wished to move forward with the item.

Action: Director Joe Fontana moved, and Director Cindy Secada seconded, a motion to accept GCSD as a member of the JPA. The motion was approved unanimously.

Action: Director Secada moved, and Director Fontana seconded, a motion to prorate the annual fee, charging GCSD 25%, for the 2018-2019 fiscal year. The motion was approved unanimously.

Meeting Summary

Action: Director Fontana moved, and Chair Ringen seconded, a motion to approve the November 28, 2018 meeting summary. The motion was approved unanimously.

Financial Report

Ms. Mattos noted \$900.69 in interest was accumulated so far this year. The county pays interest if they utilize others funds deposited with the county. Membership fees came in at \$58,000 for a total revenue of \$58,900.69. Total expenses to date have been \$22,214.06.

It was requested that Ms. Mattos include the current account balance in the next financial report. It was suggested to agendize consideration of a change in fees on a future agenda. It was also requested that the reserve amount be designated on the financial report.

Action: Director Secada moved, and Alternate Director seconded, a motion to approve the financial report. The motion passed unanimously.

Press Releases on Completed Projects (TRT, ATCAA, GCSD, MSD)

The WAC recommended approval noting ATCAA decided to wait as they are not done with their project. Suggestions from the WAC included adding tribal government and the total grant amount.

Action: Director Secada moved, and Director Fontana seconded, a motion to approve the press releases. The motion passed unanimously.

Recommendation for Closing Date Inclusion in IRWMP

The board requested Ms. Mattos reach out to GCSD to determine if they have any projects for consideration. It was also suggested the link to the application be redistributed.

Action: Director Fontana moved, and Director Secada seconded, a motion to extend the project inclusion date to April 30, 2019. The motion was approved unanimously.

Consideration of Storm Water Recommendations

Ms. Mattos said three projects were scored the first time. The Project Review Team (PRT) did not score the GCSD rainwater capture project as the PRT did not think it fit in stormwater chapter. The current scoring was set up to score implementation, not planning. The THCS Stormwater Planning project scored 74.33. The PRT recommends adding a checkbox, instead

Summary: T-S IRWM JPA Meeting

of a measured weighting, if a project is a planning project. The PRT said, in a planning project, the PRT wants to be sure the proponent is going to address everything.

Ms. Mattos passed out the draft storm water project evaluation structure for acceptance into the storm water chapter.

Mr. Tom Trott shared information about the Twain Harte Community-wide Planning Project which spans from the shopping center to the lake. It is a multi-agency planning process – a suite of projects – that would include capture of water for reuse at parks and perhaps at the school and includes an educational demonstration project at a one-acre park.

The WAC recommended the TWCSO Storm Water Planning Project and the draft scoring changes be included in the stormwater chapter of the IRWMP.

Action: Director Secada moved, and Director Fontana seconded, a motion to approve the WAC recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Mattos shared the Watershed Progressive proposal. During discussions with Watersheds Progressive's Regina Hurst, Ms. Hurst spoke about the potential value of a GIS mapping tool which she calls "Stormwater Project Identification Tool" (SPIT). She proposes to work with a committee of the WAC and create a mapping tool with all the data available, add planning areas, and calling out projects that are suggested by the mapping. The map tool would user-friendly for future use and the project is scalable. Ms. Mattos said it is possible to fund this through the current budget. The tool would be put up in the public domain.

It was noted that at the WAC meeting, Ms. Bietz said the Tribe is supportive and looking forward to being able to identify opportunities. She said this would be money well spent and LIDAR data could be added later. She added having flood maps as an overlay would be helpful.

Volunteers for the committee include Ms. Bietz, Ms. Dillon, someone from the county, Mr. Seth Connolly, perhaps CSERC, and the Calaveras County Public Works Director.

It was suggested the project workshop be a joint meeting. Mr. Trott will see if SI can contribute technical support funds for the mapping.

Action: Director Secada moved, and Director Fontana, seconded a motion to fund the full proposal through the current budget. The motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of WAC Workplan Recommendation

Ms. Lott presented the proposed workplan recommended by the WAC. She noted some of the specifics still must be worked out.

Action: Director Fontana moved, and Director Secada seconded, a motion to approve the workplan. The motion passed unanimously.

DACI Update

Mr. Trott attended a meeting last week and is participating in subcommittees. He said the committee talked about submitting a bundled approach (\$4M available) proposal focused on a

Summary: T-S IRWM JPA Meeting

common need and is phaseable and scalable. He said most the IRWMs are in favor of this approach. CABY not ready to participate at this time as their IRWMP is not updated. The MAC is still unsure about joining together. Mr. Martin said he has concerns about splitting the money as admin eats up a lot.

DWR was in the room doing discussions. While aging infrastructure was the number one priority, it was determined it was not really aligned with the focus. Fire vulnerability is the next priority and everyone in agreement with this priority. Mr. Trott said he would suggest flumes and fire water draft points if acceptable to the T-Stan. This is something that can be replicated. Another consideration is should the available funds be split 50/50 between the two rounds or 35/65. So, the considerations are:

1. Does the T-Stan want to participate in a bundled approach? If so, what project/s would the T-Stan support for their \$1.1M share? Bundled approach
2. Does the T-Stan want to split the available funds equally, which would mean \$1.1M for each of the nine IRWMs?
3. Is fire vulnerability the focus the T-Stan wants to name as the priority for this funding? Fire vulnerability includes watershed protection, water quality, and water supply.
4. If the projects are DAC project, CEQA and permitting can be in progress. If not DAC< CEQA and permitting must be completed. The WAC said merit and the ability to phase the project/s should be criteria when determining which project/s to put forward. It was mentioned there is a need to at water storage at a regional level. Which project/s to put forward should be discussed at the next meeting.
5. The WAC prefers a 70/30 split between the two rounds, understanding whatever is not awarded in round one will go to round two anyway.
6. Regarding grant administration, is the RFQ the way to proceed? Mr. Trott mentioned Sierra Fund may be interested...go forward
7. There is \$550,000 available in technical assistance. Suggestions for utilizing that include information sharing – developing a clearinghouse of resources available, or mapping, or providing technical support to Tribes, or a resource center for assistance. Splitting the \$550,000 nine ways equals approximately \$60,000 for each IRWM. It was suggested funds should be used for on-the-ground coordinators who work with DACs/Tribes on meeting needs and getting grants. These people would work with folks at a local level and help coordinate with funding agencies and the IRWMs. If this is not something the region can agree to, the WAC would like to take its share of the technical assistance funding and proceed locally with this idea.

The WAC agreed to recommend to the JPA that Mr. Trott relay the T-Stan is in favor of the bundled approach, with fire vulnerability as the priority, preference for a 70/30 round split, utilizing the RFQ process for grant administration, and applying the technical assistance funding towards on-the-ground coordinators or allowing the T-Stan to utilize their share to do this independently.

Action: Director Secada moved, and Director Fontana seconded, a motion to give Mr. Trott authority to bring forward to the DACI committee the WAC recommendation and to compromise as needed. The motion passed unanimously.

Summary: T-S IRWM JPA Meeting

Board Comments

Director Fontana said attending WAC meetings makes the board meeting so much easier and board members are well informed. The Chair said it is important to hear discussions at the WAC as one hears all the comments and how recommendations are arrived at. WAC members trust each other and collaborate.

Chair Ringen said Mr. Randy Jorgenson and Mr. Michael Pickard put on a meeting regarding the vulnerability of the flume and fire water draft points. The flume is Tuolumne County's Achilles Heel regarding water reliability. SNC offered TUD a \$500K grant to remove brush, etc.

Wrap up and Adjournment:

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:07 p.m.

Next WAC and JPA Meetings:

The next WAC and JPA meetings will be held March 20th.

Submitted by:

Ms. Carolyn Lott

JPA Meeting February 20, 2019

MEETING ATTENDANCE JPA Board Member/Alternate

| | | |
|----------------|---|---------|
| Cindy Secada | Calaveras County Water District | Present |
| Russ Thomas | CCWD/Alternate | |
| Joseph Fontana | Murphys Sanitary District | Present |
| | MSD/Alternate | |
| Karl Rodefer | Tuolumne County | |
| Ryan Campbell | TC/Alternate | |
| Ron Ringen | Tuolumne Utilities District | Present |
| Barbara Balen | TUD/Alternate | |
| Gary Sipperley | Twain Harte Community Services District | |
| Tom Trott | THCSD/Alternate | Present |

JPA Board Staff

| Name | Organization | Attendance |
|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Carolyn Lott | Carlson Consulting | Present |
| Lindsay Mattos | TCRCD | Present |

Summary: T-S IRWM JPA Meeting

Other Interested Parties Present

| Name | Organization |
|-------------|---------------------|
| | |
| | |