



# Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

## MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 5

February 8, 2012; 1:30 pm to 4:00 pm

Amador County Administration Building, Conference Room C, Jackson California

### Attendance and Introductions

RPC Members	Present	Absent	Affiliation	Alternate
Pete Bell	X		Foothill Conservancy	Katherine Evatt
Mike Daly	X		City of Jackson	
Tom Francis		X	East Bay Municipal Utility District	
Jeff Gardner	X		City of Plymouth	
Tom Infusino	X		Calaveras Planning Coalition	
Donna Leatherman		X	Calaveras Public Utility District	
Gene Mancebo	X		Amador Water Agency	Art Toy
<del>Teresa McClung</del> <a href="#">Rick Hopson</a>	<del>X</del> X		US Forest Service	Rick Hopson
Ted Novelli	X		Amador County Board of Supervisors	
Edwin Pattison	X		Calaveras County Water District	
Rod Schuler	X		Retired Amador County PW Director	
Gary Slade	X		Trout Unlimited, Sac-Sierra chapter	
Art Toy	X		Amador Water Agency	X
Hank Willy	X		Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
Observers	Present	Absent	Affiliation	
Jason Preece	X		Department of Water Resources	
Bob Dean	X		Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority, Calaveras County Water District	
Don Stump	X		Calaveras County Water District	
Project Team	Present	Absent	Affiliation	
Rob Alcott	X		Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA)	
Karen Johnson	X		Water Resources Planning	
Alyson Watson	X		RMC Water and Environment	
Lindsey Clark	X		RMC Water and Environment	

### Introductions and Background

The fifth meeting of the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (MAC IRWMP) Regional Participants Committee (RPC) was initiated



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

by Rob Alcott at 1:30pm at the Amador County Administration Building, Conference Room C, in Jackson, California, on Wednesday, February 8, 2012.

Alcott began the discussion by confirming that each RPC member received his or her packet of meeting materials. Alcott then began a PowerPoint presentation outlining the purpose and agenda for RPC Meeting #5. Changes to RPC membership were reviewed (removal of Krista Clem, Sarah Green, and Susan Snoke). Alcott noted that he had attempted to reach out to Krista Clem, but did not receive a response. He also contacted Sarah Green, who explained she cannot travel to each meeting due to the distance [and conflicts](#). Rob agreed to [keep-include her on the interested parties email list her informed and](#) allow her to participate on an issue-by-issue basis. Susan Snoke stated she was unable to participate. Alcott asked whether there are other representatives from the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Council that could participate in her place, but no other candidates were identified. The RPC agreed to remove these three members and move them to the interested parties list. This is consistent with the RPC Governing Procedures Guidebook which states that if an RPC member misses two sequential meetings, the RPC may elect to remove that member from the RPC.

Teresa McClung and Rick Hops~~en~~[open](#) represent the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Stanislaus National Forest and USFS El Dorado National Forest, respectively. Rather than have separate representatives, Alcott proposed that the two jointly represent the USFS with McClung acting as the primary representative and Hops~~en~~[open](#) as the alternate. The RPC agreed on this approach.

The group approved the RPC Meeting #4 minutes. Pattison had one comment regarding weighting criteria which is discussed later during the meeting.

Alcott also [summarized a series of out](#)reached [communications](#)~~out~~ to three local Native American groups to solicit their participation. None have expressed interest in participating to date.

### **Policies, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures**

An overview of the draft Policies, Goals, and Objectives was presented at [the prior](#) RPC [meeting](#) (Meeting #4). The RPC [had then](#) attempted to discuss each policy, goal, and objective, but not all of the information was reviewed during the meeting, so at Meeting #4 it was agreed that an editable electronic version (in MS Word) of the draft policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures would be emailed to the RPC for input. Edits were requested to be provided to the project team before the RPC Meeting #5. Gary Slade provided comments which were addressed by the Project Team. The Project Team provided the RPC the revised list of draft policies, goals, objectives, and



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

performance measures prior to meeting #5 to review. A monitoring/reporting agency is needed for each performance measure. The draft document provided to the RPC had some suggested monitoring/-reporting agencies for some of the performance measures to provide a start to the discussion. It is important to avoid developing performance measures that are impractical or impossible to monitor or achieve. It was suggested that the Plan could include language stating that more detailed performance measures or related information may included in the annual report. This would provide an opportunity to clarify some of the measures at the time of reporting, as appropriate (e.g. if only one mine was remediated, but it was a large mine that caused significant groundwater quality impacts, that might be worth noting in the annual report).

Alcott suggested the RPC categorize the measures as follows: Tier 1 - keep the objective and performance measures as is; Tier 2 - keep the objective as is, but modify the performance measures; Tier 3 - drop the objective and measure entirely. Rather than review each performance measure during the meeting, the [RPC agreed the](#) Project Team will send the RPC an electronic version of the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures. The RPC will review these and provide comments by February 22, 2012.

### **Project Solicitation Process and Schedule**

Watson revisited the proposed project solicitation process. The [initial](#) Project Solicitation process occurred from December 20, 2011 through January 20, 2012. A total of 28 projects were submitted by the RPC members. Other projects can be submitted until May 23, 2012. If an RPC member submitted a project that was not included in the list in the presentation or in the handout, let the Project Team know.

Watson provided a brief overview of the proposed evaluation process discussed during RPC Meeting #4. The Project Team performed a preliminary evaluation of the 28 projects based on the project review process which helped identify proposed changes and additions to the project review process.

- A new evaluation criterion was proposed. Based on DWR's Prop 84 Guidelines, project status should be considered in the project review process. Readiness to proceed will not affect the Plan Update, so it will not be "scored" as high, medium, or low.
- The economic benefit criterion needs to be assessed. The Project Team proposed using a Benefit-Cost (B:C) analysis approach, consistent with the DWR Guidelines. Not all project proponents provided all of the information requested on the project information form used for the project solicitation process. As a result, complete cost information for the 28 projects is unavailable (i.e. very few provided capital costs and O&M costs, and very few provided quantitative benefit information). This



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

makes it difficult to complete a quantitative B:C analysis. The Project Team proposed the following:

- Calculating the cost portion of the B:C Ratio:
  - If the project proponent does not submit any capital or O&M cost information, the project will receive a cost score corresponding to a high-cost project.
  - If a capital cost is provided, but no O&M cost, then O&M is assumed to be 1% of the capital cost.
  - If the project proponent does not include a project life, then a life of 25 years will be assumed.
  - A present value cost will be developed based on this information.
  - Present value costs for all submitted projects will be calculated.
  - A cost score of 1 will be assigned to those projects with PV costs in the lowest third compared to other submitted projects, a score of 2 will be assigned to those projects with PV costs in the middle third compared to other submitted projects, and a score of 3 will be assigned to those projects with PV costs in the highest third compared to other submitted projects.
- Calculating the benefits portion of the B:C Ratio:
  - The RPC suggested that, rather than subjectively assigning a benefit score, the same methodology used to assign an objectives score could be used to assign the benefit portion of the B:C ratio.
  - A benefit score of 1 will be assigned to those projects achieving only one goal, a score of 2 will be assigned to those projects achieving 2 to 4 goals, and a score of high will be assigned to those projects achieving 5 or more goals.
- Calculating the B:C Ratio:
  - The B:C ratio will be developed by dividing the benefit score (1, 2 or 3) by the cost score (1, 2, or 3).
- Calculating the Economic Benefit Score:
  - An economic benefit score of “Low” will be assigned to those projects with B:C ratios in the lowest third compared to other submitted projects, a score of “Medium” will be assigned to those projects with B:C ratios in the middle third compared to other submitted projects, and a score of



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

“High” will be assigned to those projects with B:C ratios in the highest third compared to other submitted projects.

The Project Team will reevaluate the projects based on the new method for developing B:C ratios and will create score cards summarizing the results of the evaluation for each project. The score cards and project information forms will be uploaded to the MAC IRWMP website so the RPC members can look at other project proponent's forms and scores.

### Project Evaluation Process

~~Karen~~ Johnson reviewed ~~propo~~suggested changes to the proposed project review process. At RPC Meeting #4 recommended changes from the 2006 Plan were highlighted. The initial screening process, which relies on the submitted project reflecting Plan Goals, Statewide Priorities, and RMSs was retained. For the projects that passed the screening step into the evaluation process, the 2006 Plan included a step to prioritize projects based on three specific criteria that were determined to be of greater importance than other criteria (i.e., updates antiquated water and wastewater infrastructure, generates additional regional water supply, or improves fire suppression capabilities). Johnson suggested eliminating this step as it determines a separate set of prioritized criteria and the three groupings must be maintained throughout the evaluation process. The RPC agreed.

Instead, the projects passing the screening steps would then be evaluated against a set of evaluation criteria, and a draft set of criteria was presented for discussion. Because of the lack of remaining time at the RPC Meeting #4, the evaluation criteria was revisited at RPC Meeting #5; the RPC agreed with all evaluation criteria and descriptions.

Johnson emphasized the importance of completing the forms in full since the project team only knows about the project, based on what the forms says.

Bell wondered if a regulatory-focused evaluation criterion should be added. The RPC agreed it should be added, but the question of how it can be quantified was a question. Johnson stated the project team would develop draft language for the implementation risk criterion for discussion at RPC Meeting #6.

During Meeting #4 there was discussion that source water supply protection and how different forms of land use, land management, vegetation, etc, can affect water supply should be included in the MAC Plan Update. Pattison and Dean agreed to draft language to address this issue. Pattison prepared draft language and provided it to the Project Team who provided it to the RPC has a handout. No comments were provided at the meeting on the language. The RPC is to provide input by February 22.



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

### **Next Steps and Adjournment**

The project team will complete the following items in advance of the next meeting.

- Distribute electronic versions of the PowerPoint presentation to the RPC.
- Distribute electronic versions of the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures and instructions for separating them into different groups (i.e. Tier 1, 2, and 3) to the RPC.
- Revise the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures based on RPC input received before RPC Meeting #6.
- Reevaluate 28 projects based on new methodology for B:C ratios and economic analysis criterion. Create score cards.
- Upload project information forms and score cards to the MAC IRWMP website.
- Draft and distribute this meeting summary.

The RPC is asked to complete the following items.

- Provide comments on draft policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures by February 22.
- Provide comments on draft source water supply protection language Pattison prepared.

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 21, 2012 at 1:30pm.

The meeting concluded at approximately 4:00 p.m.