



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 6

March 21, 2012; 1:35 pm to 4:00 pm

Amador County Administration Building, Conference Room C, Jackson California

Attendance and Introductions

RPC Members (Alternates)	Present	Absent	Affiliation
Pete Bell (Katherine Evatt)	X	X	Foothill Conservancy
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 (Art Toy)	*		Amador Water Agency
Teresa McClung (Rick Hopson)	X	X	US Forest Service
Ted Novelli	X		Amador County Board of Supervisors
Joone Lopez (Jeff Meyer)	X	X	Calaveras County Water District
Rod Schuler	X		Retired Amador County PW Director
Gary Slade	X		Trout Unlimited, Sac-Sierra chapter
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

*GM had a prior commitment and arrived late to the meeting.

Introductions and Background

The sixth 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, March 22, 2012.

Alcott began a PowerPoint presentation outlining the purpose and agenda for RPC Meeting #6. The primary purpose of the meeting was to review the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures, and discuss evaluation criteria. Rob explained that should we not get through all of the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures, a subcommittee of interested RPC members or the entire RPC could meet in April to continue the discussion. As described in the following sections, not all of the material was covered so the RPC agreed to meet on April 16, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. at the same location but downstairs in Conference Room A (next to the Board chambers).

The group approved the RPC Meeting #5 minutes.

Policies, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The draft policies, goals, and objectives were discussed at two prior RPC meetings with an updated version drafted between meetings. Gary Slade, Art Toy, and Pete Bell provided comments which were addressed by the project team through a revised draft mailed to the RPC prior to meeting No. 6. Tom Infusino provided comments on the previous version of materials on 3/20/12, too late for the team to incorporate before the meeting; hard copies of Infusino's comments were provided as handouts during the meeting.

A summary of the discussion is as follows.

- Alcott stated that RPC, when debating how best to articulate performance measures, should keep in mind that meaningful measures should (1) be clear and unambiguous, (2) address manageable conditions (e.g. we do not want to monitor the daily average temperature), (3) be reliable indicators of trends, and (4) be measureable (i.e. a number or percentage).
- None of the four RPC members who provided email comments on the goals and objectives document labeled any of the objectives/ performance measures as Tier 3, so none were removed.
- Teresa McClung wondered if we are to measure the objectives using the performance measures, many of which begin by "reduce" or "increase," do we have baselines. Alcott responded that where baselines do not already exist and are readily available, the first year of monitoring/measuring will create baseline data/information.
- It was suggested that language be provided in the IRWMP report describing examples of performance measures. In addition, the report should include a discussion of any divergent opinions of the group.
- Comments on the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- P1 Goal: Reduce sources of contaminants
 - Objective 1: Reduce abandoned mine flows and sediments. The question of how abandoned mines are defined was raised. Infusino called the Office of Mine Reclamation and determined they have a list and map of abandoned mines. If appropriate, this will be used to establish the baseline and provide the definition of abandoned mines. Objective will be modified to include definition. Bell and others commented that there are many other abandoned mines that the Office of Mine Reclamation is unaware.
 - Objective 2: Reduce leakage from septic systems. It was suggested to change “failed septic systems” to “problem septic systems” in the performance measure. The RPC agreed with this change. The performance measure may also be broken down into three separate measures (i.e. number of septic system problems identified, number of septic system problems corrected, and number of septic system problems eliminated). Infusino’s notes describe his conversation with Mike Israel (Amador County Environmental Health) and Brian Moss (Calaveras County Environmental Health) about potential projects to include in the IRWMP. The Septic System Management Plan, a project submitted by UMRWA during the recent MAC Plan Update project solicitation period includes further developing septic system improvements for Barney Way, as suggested by Moss. Karen Johnson suggested Infusino coordinate with Israel to submit his suggested project of obtaining state funds for a fee waiver for low income, senior, and Native American homeowners who need inspections. Both of these septic system related projects have environmental justice benefits which should be noted in the project form to ensure a high ranking of that criterion.
 - Objective 3: Increase bulky waste pickup programs, avoid illegal dumping, and increase collection of illegally dumped trash. PG&E will be added to the monitoring / reporting agency.
 - Objective 4: Provide toilets at informal recreation sites. Many questions arose regarding this objective. What is an informal recreation site? Do we want to install toilets at these sites? It was noted that adding trash receptacles at sites can actually increase illegal dumping. McClung explained that an informal recreation site, referred to as dispersed sites by the USFS, are by definition, sites without toilets and picnic tables. She does not think that the objective should prescribe the solution. If the USFS found a dispersed site that had waste issues, there are multiple solutions



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

they could explore including adding a toilet and waste receptacle, or adding signage regarding wag bags and/or leaving no trace. They may also try to discourage the use of the site. The project team will modify this objective to read: "Identify disposal and waste issues at informal recreation sites." And the performance measure to read: "The identification of problems and solutions for reducing contamination associated with informal recreation sites."

- Objective 5: Manage fire fuels to reduce wildfire impacts. No changes / comments.
- Objective 6: Increase public awareness of how contaminated water resources affect quality of life and public health. No changes / comments.
- A new objective was suggested. Objective 7: Monitor water quality in small water supply systems. RPC agreed to add it.
- P1 Goal: Manage stormwater flows and transport of sediments and contaminants. A member commented that if the goal is to reduce sediment, then timber harvesting should be addressed. He noted that each objective is more urban-focused. It was noted that the USFS already has best management practices (BMPs) in place for forest management, so the objectives should identify what can be done above and beyond existing requirements.
 - Objective 1: Reduce peak stormwater flows to minimize runoff. Change to "Reduce stormwater runoff from peak storm events." Someone asked what was meant by the number of public education actions taken to reduce stormwater flow, included in the performance measure. This refers to educating the public about retaining stormwater on-site slowing peak attenuations by encouraging the retrofit of existing developments with rain gardens, pervious pavement, and other low impact development techniques. Performance measure edited to clarify: "...and number of public education actions taken to encourage the reduction of stormwater runoff."
 - Objective 2, 3, and 4 – no changes / comments.
- Policy 2: Based on a suggestion received, Policy 2 was edited from "Improve water supply reliability" to "Ensure water supply reliability and ensure long-term balance of supply and demand." Toy disagreed with the addition of "ensure long-term balance of supply and demand." Infusino and Bell approved of the addition. This discussion was postponed until the next meeting.
- P2 Goal: Ensure sufficient firm yield water supply.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- Objective 1 - No changes / comments.
- Objective 2: Timely implementation of identified water supply enhancement projects. After discussion of the suggested addition of “environmentally, socially, and economically sustainable scheduled...” into the performance measure, the group agreed to remove this objective entirely because it would be difficult to measure accurately.
- Objectives 3 and 4 – no changes / comments.
- A new objective was suggested, Objective 5: Ensure that demand projections are supportable and realistic. Foothill Conservancy suggested this new objective and the associated performance measure: “Number of water demand projections that use Department of Finance and other historical and projected demographic data, as well as water cost sensitivity analyses, to determine demand.” Johnson described three primary approaches to developing demand projections: (1) Applying per capita water demands to population data. This reflects residential water demands only and not non-residential uses. (2) Using a socioeconomic model that is data intensive and based on assumptions that are not transparent. (3) Applying demand factors to land uses as identified in general plans which reflect local land use interests, public review, and environmental compliance requirements. Some RPC members noted that the Amador County general plan has not been update in 30 years. Infusino noted that EBMUD attached comments regarding its demand projections in their Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) as an appendix. He wondered if comments on Amador Water Agency’s and Calaveras County Water District’s UWMPs could be attached to the IRWMP also. It was suggested he request they be attached to the UWMPs instead of the IRWMP. This objective and performance measure will be edited and revisited at the next meeting.

The review of policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures was stopped because of the lack of time remaining. The RPC agreed to meet on April 16, 2012 to continue discussion of the policies, goals, objectives, performance measures, and evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria

Johnson provided a quick overview of the four different approaches for the economic benefit criterion. The four approaches are also described in the RPC Meeting No. 6 presentation handout. During Meeting No. 5 this criterion was discussed in more detail



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

(see notes from RPC Meeting No. 5) as an approach based on judgment of benefits. An RPC member suggested an approach to divide the grouping of benefits by the total project present value costs (approach #2) and, after the meeting, the Project Team developed approaches #3 and #4 based on groupings of costs and groupings of benefits. The recommended approach #4 is derived by dividing the number of goals the project reflects by three ranges of project costs: 1-up to \$2 million, 2-\$2 to \$20 million, and 3-greater than \$20 million. The RPC will review the approaches prior to the April meeting to aid in discussion at that meeting. This change and others made to the evaluation criteria, based on comments received before the meeting, will be reviewed at the next meeting.

A revised project summary spreadsheet was provided as a handout at Meeting No. 6 which shows the current score for each project. (The final ranking is based on approach economic criterion #4.) New project forms and updated forms can be submitted to Alyson Watson until May 23, 2012. Johnson emphasized the importance of completing the forms in full since the project team only uses information about the project based on what is provided in the form. If information was missing, the project received a "low" ranking on that criterion.

Next Steps and Adjournment

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

- Revise the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures discussed during RPC Meeting #6 based on RPC input received.
- Draft and distribute this meeting summary.

The RPC is asked to complete the following items in advance of the next meeting.

- Review the revised policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures.
- Review the economic benefit criteria approaches.

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 16, 2012 at the Amador County Administration Building at 1:30 p.m. The meeting room (Conference Room A) is located downstairs next to the Board of Supervisors' chambers.

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