



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 7

April 16, 2012; 1:35 pm to 4:00 pm

Amador County Administration Building, Conference Room A, 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)	X X		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

Introductions and Background

The seventh 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 approximately 1:35pm at the Amador County Administration Building, Conference Room A, in Jackson, California, on Monday, April 16, 2012.

Alcott began the meeting, following the agenda for RPC Meeting No. 7 provided in the RPC meeting packets sent to participants via mail. The primary purpose of the meeting was to review the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures, and discuss evaluation criteria, if time allowed.

The group approved the RPC Meeting #6 minutes.

Karen Johnson and Rob noted that the next RPC meeting is scheduled for May 9th which falls during the middle of the ACWA conference. Because several PRC members will be attending ACWA, it was proposed the meeting be rescheduled; the group agreed on Monday, May 14th at 1:00 p.m. in Conference Room C (upstairs).

Policies, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The draft policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures were discussed at three prior RPC meetings with updated versions drafted between meetings based on RPC input. Gary Slade, Art Toy, Pete Bell, and Tom Infusino previously provided comments which were incorporated into a single handout (in track changes) and provided in the RPC packets prior to this meeting. In addition, edits agreed upon during RPC Meeting No. 6 were incorporated in the handout. For the most part, policies, goals, and objectives highlighted in yellow in the handout were discussed, while edits not highlighted were thought to be straight forward and less controversial and thus required less time.

The discussion began with the first goal of Policy 2. A summary of the discussions is as follows.

- Policy 2: Improve Water Supply Reliability and Ensure Long-Term Balance of Supply and Demand
 - The RPC agreed on the addition of “and Ensure Long-Term Balance of Supply and Demand” to the policy.
- P2 Goal: Ensure sufficient firm yield water supply.
 - At RPC Meeting No. 6, the RPC agreed to delete Objective 2: Timely implementation of identified water supply enhancement projects. Infusino suggested adding a status column to the project summary spreadsheet that agencies could update annually to show progress is being made on the projects included in the MAC Plan Update. He noted that if an agency were applying for State funding to implement a project to meet a regulatory requirement and did not receive funding and therefore could not implement the project, the tracking of the status



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

would be a useful tool in demonstrating this non-action. It was agreed that Objective 2 remain deleted, and that this discussion be noted in the Plan itself.

- Objective 2 (previously 3). Encourage diverse water supply portfolios to meet agency demands: edits made to performance measure to add examples: "..., including for example but not limited to, demand management, water reuse, and water neutral development ordinances."
- Objective 4. Ensure that demand projections are supportable and realistic: Bell believes that the general plan land use methodology is too complex to be implemented in this region but was ok with the suggested wording. All agreed on the suggested wording of the objective and performance measure. Infusino requested the RPC members be added to Monitoring/Reporting Agency so that they are recognized in case they would like to express concern over demand projections.
- Objective 5. Balance long-term regional supply and demand: This was a new objective suggested by Foothill Conservancy. It was discussed that the performance measure "Number of water plans that incorporate demand management and water reuse" does not relate to balancing water supply and demand. After much discussion, it was suggested the performance measure instead reference agencies' water supply planning process and multiple documents as a source. The objective was revised to: "Balance long-term regional supply and demand in a water supply plan" and the performance measure was modified to: "Number and/or percentage of water agencies addressing supply and demand in their long range planning process."
- P2 Goal: Maintain and improve water infrastructure reliability. No changes made.
- P2 Goal: Promote water conservation, recycling, and reuse for urban and agricultural uses.
 - Objective 1. Establish and implement water conservation and efficiency programs based on best management practices (BMPs): The performance measure referenced California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) BMPs. Gene Mancebo noted that AWA has a stand-alone conservation plan that does not include the CUWCC BMPs. It was agreed that the percentage of agencies meeting SBx7-7 targets (20% reduction in per capita consumption by 2020) would be an adequate performance measure. If an agency is not meeting its reduction target, it will report what percentage of BMPs it is implementing. Edits made.
 - Objective 2. Maximize use of recycled water from wastewater treatment plants: Hank Willy would prefer this objective be removed as he has worked with the City of Jackson to get treated effluent from its



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

wastewater treatment facility to irrigate JVID fields, but has not been successful due to State and other regulatory requirements. Other participants believed the objective should stay in with modifications to the performance measure to acknowledge efforts by agencies to promote increased use of recycled water. Tom Francis noted EBMUD is a monitoring/reporting agency, but their primary service area is not within the watershed or region. He will report data as available. The performance measure was modified to reflect “efforts to promote” increased use instead of programs.

- Objective 3: Reduce demand through water-neutral development: This is a new objective proposed by Foothill Conservancy. The RPC agreed with the addition of this objective with revisions to reflect agencies’ willingness to promote water-neutral development. Joone Lopez commented that CCWD works with developers to reduce water use, but to force developers to create water-neutral development through an ordinance could have a significant impact on local economy. Objective revised to: “Moving toward a reduction in demands through water-neutral development.” Performance measure revised to replacing ending with: “... number of land use agencies that are working towards developing water neutral results within the watershed.”
- P2 Goal on drought mitigation measures, no change.
- Policy 3: Practice Resource Stewardship
 - P3 Goal: Protect, conserve, enhance, and restore the region’s natural resources
 - Objective 1: edits accepted
 - Objective 2: Promote water resource projects that achieve an equitable balance between conflicting interests while minimizing harm to natural resources and incorporating natural resource protection, mitigation, and restoration: It was agreed the performance measure “Number of projects with broad based community support” did not relate to the objective. With the addition of the new policy, Policy 4: Focus on areas of common ground and avoid prolonged conflict, all agreed the performance measure should be changed to: “Percentage of fully mitigated impact by projects.”
 - Objective 3: In the performance measure, “programs” was changed to “land area”.
 - P3 Goal: Maintain or improve watershed ecosystem health and function
 - Objective 1: Teresa McClung noted that many of the performance measures are “number of...” but that oftentimes the USFS measures restoration in acres or miles of stream for example. This



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

performance measure will include the addition of “and/or land area” after “number of projects.”

- The remaining two P3 goals were accepted as edited.
- Policy 4: Focus on areas of common ground and avoid prolonged conflict. This is a new policy proposed by Foothill Conservancy. It was agreed that portions of the objective and performance measure are redundant with the implementation risk evaluation criterion. There was much discussion over this policy because of the reference in the goal to prioritizing projects with the broadest community support. Lopez noted that she does not believe the goal as written should be a goal because sometimes agencies make decisions to implement projects that may not have full public or community support (e.g. some communities may not support recycled water projects). All were accepting of the following language.
 - Goal: Prioritize projects that have the best likelihood of being completed in the planning horizon.
 - Objective: Identify high controversy projects and work towards common ground solutions.
 - Performance Measure: Percentage of projects that have parties working on common ground solutions.

This completed the review and discussion of the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures. They will be revised based on the discussions at this meeting to create a final version.

Evaluation Criteria

The discussion of evaluation criteria was postponed until RPC Meeting No. 8.

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 #7 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 economic benefit criteria approaches which were distributed in the Powerpoint handout prior to RPC meeting number 6.

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 14, 2012 at the Amador County Administration Building at 1:00 p.m., upstairs in Conference Room C.

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