

SIERRA WATER WORKGROUP

Conference Call Notes

Thursday April 1, 2010

Conference Call: Dial 1-218-936-4700, Code: 24546#

Webcast: <http://my.dimdim.com/marionjgee>

Action Items:

- 1) **URGENT: Prop. 84 Guidelines Phone Call Fri. April 9 from 2-3:30 (All)**
 - Review the guidelines
 - Call next week—FRIDAY April 9- 2pm
 - Come up with talking points to distribute (positive and negative comments)- Sierra IRWMs use as they see fit
 - SWW would NOT issue own official comments
- 2) **Save the Dates for Sierra Water Workgroup Meetings (All)**
 - **June 30, 2010 from 11 am- 4 pm in South Lake Tahoe, CA**
 - **Sept. 9, 2010**
 - **Dec. 9, 2010**
- 3) **Process, Purpose and Workplan for the Sierra Water Workgroup (Coordinating Committee)**
 - Next step: Coming up with common broad position points/principles and having them approved by all?
 - Next Step: Write down process for then taking positions based on our common points
 - Next Step: MOU? Get down in writing in how the group functions, what it does and does not do. Does not have to be an MOU.
 - How do we advocate?
 - Next Step: clarify what the workgroup does especially process on points 4/5 [what does advocating mean?]
- 4) **Set Up Google Documents Page for Sierra Water Workgroup (Marion):**
- 5) **Sign up for Sierra Day at the Capitol April 14 here (All):**

Participants:

John Mills

Pete Kampa

Bob Dean

Holly Alpert

Mark Drew
Kim Carr
Joan Clayburgh
Marion Gee
Liz Mansfield
Katie Burdick
John Buckley

1. Introductions and IRWM Updates/Announcements

- **Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM** (John Mills/John Buckley/Pete Kampa): Submitted NFWF grant with Tuolumne River Trust. DWR says they are eligible for CCP facilitator for 9 months (delay due to staff changes). DWR guidelines out, will submit comments, will attend workshop in Sacramento.
- **Inyo-Mono IRWM** (Holly Alpert/Mark Drew): in Planning Process/writing the plan. Mark Drew/Holly mostly doing the writing, fundraising now. Still doing outreach- went to Death Valley. Trying to get support from DWR for CCP facilitator. Working on governance (main issue). Will work through drafts of the plan with the Planning Committee.
- **MAC IRWM** (Bob Dean): MAC IRWM outreach meeting coming up Wed. May 26 in Jackson. Nothing happening in the meantime besides admin tasks. Upper Mokelumne River Authority (JPA) is now running the MAC IRWM process.
- **Sierra Nevada Conservancy** (Kim Carr): Water Report Scope of Work is drafted, thank you for your comments. Joan Keegan is leading that effort. In process of circulating RFP. Will be opportunity to comment on draft. John Buckley very interested in reviewing, providing support. Report authors should have glossary. Sierra Day at Capitol (17 co-sponsors). Email has gone out for RSVPs. If you are interested, email Kim Carr kcarr@sierranevada.ca.gov. We will email out info. Sierra Day at the Capitol attendees: Liz Mansfield, John Mills, Kim Carr, Mark Drew, Joan Clayburgh: Will try to ensure water person on each team
- **CABY IRWM**(Katie Burdick/ Liz Mansfield) Working on comments for Prop. 84 guidelines. EID lay offs, no longer has natural resources department. Not sure how this will effect participation in Sierra Water Workgroup.

2. Agenda Review, Recap 1/26 Meeting and 3/3 Coordinating Committee Call

3. Prop. 84 Guidelines Discussion/Comments

How should the Workgroup submit comments? As the SWW or should we

come up with common talking points/comments to share with our Sierra IRWMs and encourage them to echo them in their own written/in person comments?

Roll Call- What direction should the Workgroup take?

Holly: didn't get much response from planning committee, would be helpful to work with workgroup and get guidance. Could really benefit from experience of other IRWMs.

John Mills: has some serious concerns, will draft proposed comments to Tuol/Stan to ask them to support, TUD and MCWRA will likely submit their own comments. Strength would be to have comments coming from all IRWMs. Secondly it would be good to have comments from regional groups like SWW. Johns specific comments: 1) Lack of zero match for DAC (has discussed with DWR) change in direction 2) planning grants will compete statewide, compete against Met, Bay Area, SoCal

John Buckley: Strategy would depend on the specific comments, is their consensus, broad enough comments for the SWW to make—At least should have comments/concerns available for all Sierra IRWMs, this better course let them take them as they see fit. Should we coordinate and share or actually take action on behalf of Workgroup (related to priority task list).

Liz Mansfield: What do the IRWMs have to say about Prop. 84? What are their issues? Once find those out, the workgroup could take action.

Katie: Another week to review then convene IRWMs a phone call identify key points that all of us agree on and make these points- (50% match too onerous) id key themes, get them to all Sierra IRWMs--- their participants want complete review of anything sent by the SWW before it is sent (this could be an issue for getting approval for a SWW letter)

Bob Dean: has no prob with SWW taking a position.

John Mills: Need transparency of decisions in the Workgroup

Next Steps for Sierra Water Workgroup regarding Prop. 84 draft guidelines:

- 1) Review the guidelines
- 2) Call next week—FRIDAY April 9- 2pm
- 3) Come up with talking points to distribute (positive and negative comments)- Sierra IRWMs use as they see fit
- 4) SWW would NOT issue own official comments

4. Op-ed Process Review- How did the process work? How do we approve actions (ie sign on letters, op-eds, sponsorship etc) on behalf of the Workgroup in the future?

Liz: It was unclear (when put together committee), need to communicate that the committee function was to comment in detail and put it together—there was confusion from the workgroup members about their role and what they should be doing.

- John B: anytime write by committee, value in having comments from broader group. Less likely to be polished, simple piece coming from a single focused author, then the challenge is when IRWMs are looking at it, many people had little pieces they wanted to change and/or didn't feel comfortable with. Agrees that we should focus on theme and message and get full agreement on those and then allow the committee to do the detail work and then see if folks can live or not live with it.
- Katie: at CABY, they had a CC meeting planned but was canceled, they were not able to review it, water agencies were concerned and not sure why they were signing on, what is the political strategy? They wanted their board and attorney to review it- calmed down in the end but it was a challenge. CABY would like to see it and have time to review. Process issue that manifested as content issue. In end they were ok with content and not process. Timing issue: CABY CC was not able to review it as according to their process. Liz: this is a group of IRWMs (these things should go to IRWM process not individual boards) Katie: Water agencies worried that in future SWW will sign on to things would be perceived that individual water agencies are signing on not the IRWMs themselves. Will not be able to make quick turnaround decisions. Mark: shares concern about process, Inyo Mono will not be able to make quick turn around. John: This is a tension that exists in any group with agencies w/ boards.
- John B: if we look at the mission of the SWW, three of them are to coordinate, exchange info, info source on policy issues – other two: raise profile of Sierra [doesn't see any tension or controversy among the groups on this], advocate in state/fed forums [there will always be different points of views on this]. Thinks the SWW should not be doing divisive things or getting very technical comments. We do have value of taking broad positions once those positions have been approved by all members.
 - Next step: Coming up with common broad position points/principles and having them approved by all?
 - Next Step: Write down process for then taking positions based on our common points
 - Next Step: MOU? Get down in writing in how the group functions, what it does and does not do. Does not have to be an MOU.
 - How do we advocate?
 - Next Step: clarify what the workgroup does especially process on points 4/5 [what does advocating mean?]
 - This would eliminate reactions but the last part of the mission could derail the process of taking this back to the groups
 - DWR wants to see improved coordination among regions- this group can do that-
 - Other venues for legislation, SWW can provide other benefits
 - John Buckley will also help

5. Review, Discuss and formalize prioritized checklist of Sierra Water Workgroup work items (see attached)

→ Proposal: Should the Workgroup also decide on shared principles? For example, we would adopt the RCRC/Sierra Nevada Alliance watershed restoration principles?

→ Should we form sub-committees to work on the action items within the checklist?

6. Next Steps

- Set Up Private Blog or Google Docs Folder?- People ok with Google Docs
- Next Meetings: June 30 South Lake Tahoe 11-4, Sept. 9, 2010, Dec. 9, 2010
- Do a call out for people to facilitate before meetings. People who suggest agenda items lead on them.
- Kim: Proposal to ACWA conference 1st week of May 1.5 hours to present. Panel of speakers. Focus: communicating significance of Sierra and Sierra water. Present factual data. Specific case studies that show challenges (TUD), potential opportunities for cost sharing (TNC), water quality impacts/source water protection (suggestion by Liz)
- State Water Plan out now