

Tulare Kern Funding Area  
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)  
Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (DACIP)  
Project Advisory Committee (PAC)  
August 30, 2018, 9am-12pm  
800 West Burrel Avenue, Visalia CA 93291

**ATTENDEES**

**Project Advisory Committee Members**

Deanna Jackson, Tule IWM  
Bob Martin, Westside San Joaquin IWM  
Julie Allen, Southern Sierra IWM  
Ralph Gutierrez, Tule IWM  
Stephanie Hearn, Poso  
Vanessa Yap, Poso  
Mike Camerena, Kaweah, IWM  
David Vang, Westlands Water  
Israel Sanchez, Westlands Water  
Charlotte Gallock, UKIRWMA  
Danny Wade, Tranquility Irrigation  
Frank Ohnesorgen, Poso IWM  
Bobby Kamansky, Southern Sierra IWM  
Jim Maciel, UKIRWMA

**Project Team**

Denise England, Tulare County  
Maija Madec, Provost & Pritchard (P&P)  
Gavin O’Leary, Provost & Pritchard (P&P)  
Mark S. Thompson, Provost & Pritchard (P&P)  
Stephanie Lucero, Facilitator – Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP), CSUS  
Malka Kopell, Facilitator – Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP), CSUS

For others in attendance, see Appendix A.

---

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Stephanie Lucero, CCP introduced herself and reviewed the agenda. Ms. Lucero is the neutral facilitator provided by a grant from the Department of Water Resources (DWR). Project Advisory Committee (PAC) members and members of the public introduced themselves. Ms. Lucero affirmed the ground rules agreed to in the Charter with the group.

**2. REVIEW DAC ENGAGEMENT AND EDUCATION PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

Maria Herrera with Self-Help Enterprises (SHE) reviewed the previous Disadvantaged Community Engagement and Education Program (DACEEP) proposal, adding the SHE vision. Phase One of the proposal includes carrying out a needs assessment, based upon which recommendations for Phase Two will be developed. See Scope of Work Phase One Disadvantaged Community Engagement and Education Program document for further details. PAC members raised questions and discussed the DACEEP proposal.

PAC members discussed inclusion of private wells in Task 1, in addition to existing public water systems in DACs. Members emphasized that it is not necessary to identify all private wells, but communities can help self-

identify wells and the focus should be on identifying challenges and possible solutions due to clustering or proximity to resources.

PAC members discussed identification of areas where there are issues relating to storm water, in reference to section 2.2.7 of the DACEEP Proposal. Members indicated that Tule, Poso, and Southern Sierra have some data about areas identified as having issues related to storm water.

The survey will be carried out through multiple avenues, including email, in-person, phone calls, key board meetings, and regional and community meetings.

PAC members noted that the schedule of the proposal lacks detail, and that meeting intermediate deadlines is key. PAC members suggested updating the Needs Assessment Workplan with the tasks from the DACEEP project.

**Action Item:** Ms. Herrera to work with Maija Madec, of Provost and Pritchard (P&P), to update the Work Plan. Detailed schedule to be developed, DACEEP activities to be incorporated, and clear tasks and milestones to be identified. To be completed before the next PAC meeting or as part of an intermediate progress report to the PAC.

PAC members discussed how to identify and engage communities that do not have standing community meetings. Ms. Herrera shared that regional meetings will be coordinated to provide community members a chance to meet in a central location. PAC members suggested utilizing community events and schools as opportunities to reach DACs that do not have standing community meetings. Identification of difficult to reach communities will occur in Phase Two of the program.

PAC members asked why surveys on the conditions of septic systems would only be conducted in four communities, and suggested that it may be useful to conduct the surveys in more than four communities. It was also suggested that the surveys focus on getting additional information in areas that are less data-rich. For example, Three Rivers and Springfield may not need the survey, since the IWMs there already completed similar assessments.

Time was offered for public comment; no public comment was made.

***PAC Action:** Recommendation to County for Approval for DACEEP Proposal.*

***Motion:** PAC members moved and seconded motion to recommend the DACEEP Proposal for approval*

*All PAC members were in favor.*

### **3. UPDATE ON ADDITIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT SCOPE**

Ms. Madec reviewed the draft scope of work for additional services requested, including an overview of the costs of completing septic tank density evaluation and surface water rights information mapping. See Scope of Work Needs Assessments – Additional Requests for details.

PAC members noted that the work outlined in the additional requests is an example of work that will feed directly into the work of SHE.

Time was offered for public comment; no public comment was made.

***PAC Action:** Recommendation to County for Approval for additions to Needs Assessment Scope.*

***Motion:** PAC members moved and seconded motion to recommend approval of additions to Needs Assessment Scope.*

*All PAC members were in favor.*

#### **4. UPDATE ON NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

Gavin O’Leary provided an update on the activities conducted to date on development of the needs assessment tool. There has been a consolidation of information incorporating new population information since 2012. Some fixes have been made, for example using US Census data on median household income. Mr. O’Leary noted that based upon new Census data Visalia is now considered a DAC, although in 2012 it was not. There is a lot of data available, so there is a need to balance how to query the data to make it usable. The tool for using the data is currently in development with Tulare county, and will be more refined by the time of the next PAC meeting. It incorporates 2016 data, although DWR does not have that data on their portal. Requests have been sent to Integrated Regional Water Management grantees (IRWMs) for feedback about the tool, which is emphasizing simplicity and usability. Story maps, videos, and links to other websites can be incorporated.

PAC members asked what the intended outcome of the tool is. It is primarily an information sharing tool, which would allow data to be communicated outside of a large spreadsheet and make the information more easily sharable. For example, it can help identify needs or provide a summary by DAC. It will be possible to create pre-set queries to make the process of using the tool more efficient. The tools that Esri has available are quite robust, so there is a balance to find of not overdeveloping the needs assessment tool.

PAC members noted that the group has provided significant input on the tool in past meetings, and that the work that P&P and SHE are doing will contribute to upcoming work. It is hoped that the tool will be a helpful information sharing tool that can support both outreach to community members and processes like grant writing. The data it is based on will remain available for those who want to dive into the raw data.

PAC members noted that a challenge will be ensuring that the tool remains useful after the PAC is no longer active, and consideration is needed about how to maintain an updated database. The database and tools will be a part of Tulare County’s data structure, but maintenance of the data needs to be determined. Tulare County staff are likely to complete some maintenance of the data, and Mr. O’Leary noted that it is possible to assign privileges for others to also input data. The data is in cloud-based storage, which will make it easier for additional data to be uploaded by users outside Tulare County. PAC members discussed whether responsibility may fall to the IRWM and Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) or whether counties should be looked to for funding data maintenance positions. Consider how long-term planning for this effort may be coordinated with Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) efforts.

#### **Further discussion is needed of how this tool will be funded in the future.**

PAC members identified the following issues for continued discussion regarding the needs assessment tool:

- Intended outcomes for reporting to community
- Identifying what information is needed by the IRWM
- Getting information from DACs and the PAC regarding the information that they need access to via the database and tool
- How to get data to P&P
- Input on the types of queries groups are interested in (including look at past meeting notes)
- Figure out the process for getting more questions
- Figure out how groups will access the tool

- Consider future funding and maintenance
- Discuss sample queries to include

There has been difficulty engaging counties, but the tool can be helpful to them, so further effort should be put to engagement with counties. The challenge of working with other counties has been in part that there is not a single person to engage with, but rather multiple departments that may be responsible, and although some counties have expressed interest in the effort, they may lack the time to attend meetings. Different counties have a different level of interest in the project because of different human and physical characteristics of the counties.

It can be helpful to clarify specifically what is needed from the counties so that they understand why their presence at meetings is important. PAC members identified that two key pieces of information needed from counties include well data and well density data. PAC members also suggested that creating a formal invitation to counties for their participation could be helpful, as well as developing "participation nodes" to bring the effort to the counties. Emphasis should be on helping counties identify their needs, discussing the benefits of engaging, and clarifying the role that counties will play through their engagement.

**Action Item:** Ms. Hearn and Ms. England to will reach out to Kern County, including drafting a letter to the County with specific requests before next meeting.

**Action Item:** Ms. Jackson to reach out to Fresno County

## 5. UPDATE ON PAC ROSTER AND MEMBERSHIP

Current PAC membership and roster were reviewed. Participants discussed the need for a Kern IRWM DAC representative, and discussed announcing via the listserv that a DAC representative would be appointed at the next meeting.

**Action Item:** Ms. Herrera to follow up regarding a DAC representative for Kern County

**Action Item:** Ms. Hearn to follow up with Kern County IRWM

Tribal representation on the PAC was discussed. There are two Tribes that participate in the Mountain Funding Area. Past meetings have not had Tribal participation. A local tribal representative is on the interested parties list. There is interest among the Tule River Tribal Council in having representation on the PAC. A formal letter of invitation has been sent to Tribes, so follow-up is needed.

**Action Item:** Ms. Lucero, Mr. Kamansky, and Ms. England to draft a follow-up letter for Tribal participation. Letter to be agendized for October meeting.

***PAC Action:** Recommendation to Agendize nomination of DAC representative for Kern IRWM for October PAC meeting.*

***Motion:** PAC members moved and seconded motion to Agendize nomination DAC representative for Kern IRWM for October PAC meeting.*

*All PAC members were in favor.*

## 6. NEXT STEPS AND ADJOURN

Ms. Lucero reviewed the action items discussed and adjourned the meeting.

**APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES**

Maria Herrera, Self Help Enterprises

Sonia Sanchez, Self Help Enterprises

Adriana (last name?), Community Water Center