



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 9

June 27, 2012; 1:05 pm to 3:30 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 (Joaquin Cruz) | X | 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 |
| Jeff Meyer (Don Stump) | X | X | Calaveras County Water District |
| Rod Schuler | X | | Retired Amador County PW Director |
| | | | |
| 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 |
| | | | |
| Pat McAvery | X | | Calaveras Parks and Recreation Commission |
| 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 |



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Purpose of RPC Meeting #9

The ninth meeting of the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (MAC IRWMP) Regional Participants Committee (RPC) was initiated by Rob Alcott at 1:05pm in Conference Room C at the Amador County Administration Building, in Jackson, California, on Wednesday, June 27, 2012.

Alcott began walking through a PowerPoint presentation outlining the purpose and agenda for RPC Meeting #9. The primary purposes of the meeting were to finalize the project review process and associated project summary spreadsheet, reconfirm governance structure and text, and determine responses to Project List commenters.

The group approved the RPC Meeting #8 minutes.

Project Review Process

Alcott briefly summarized the three letters that were provided to the RPC providing comments on the project list. The letters were from Muriel Zeller, Foothill Conservancy, and the Ratepayers Protection Alliance. RPC members were asked to individually consider the comments as they review and discuss the projects. The commenters will be invited to the September 24th Community Workshop to provide additional public input.

Prior to RPC Meeting #9, the Tamarack Spring Mutual Water Company contacted Alcott with interest in submitting a project for inclusion in the MAC Plan Update. Alcott provided the project information form, which the Tamarack Spring Mutual Water Company completed and submitted. The form was provided to the RPC meeting attendees as a handout. Alcott asked if the RPC was okay with the project being evaluated and included in the Plan (even though the project solicitation period had ended). Some RPC members asked whether the project is within the MAC Region or the Tuolumne-Stanislaus Region. The RPC agreed that the project could be included in the project evaluation if it was determined to be located within the boundaries of the MAC Region. RMC will confirm project location. If the project meets the minimum requirements and is within the MAC Region, it will be evaluated and added to the project summary spreadsheet and the Plan. [Note: It was subsequently determined that the Tamarack Spring Mutual Water Company service area is not located within the MAC Region. The Tamarack Spring representative was provided Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM Region contact information and has since established a working relationship with that region.]

The Project Team proposed a new evaluation criterion to comply with the DWR Prop 84 Guidelines. The proposed criterion is as follows:

- Project Status/Readiness



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- High – Fully ready with design and environmental documentation completed
- Medium – Advanced planning completed, final design and environmental documentation not completed
- Low – Conceptual or preliminary planning completed.

Alyson Watson explained that the addition of the criterion to the evaluation process would not hurt any project's final score or remove any of the projects from the list. Conversely, it could improve a project's final score by assigning an additional high score. The group recognized that some of the projects submitted for inclusion are construction projects while others are planning-level (e.g. modeling or evaluations), and planning-type projects may receive a lower score, when in actuality, they are ready for implementation. Jason Preece from DWR noted that it is important to include the criterion because DWR needs this information later in the process, especially during grant applications. Because we are at evaluating the projects for inclusion in the MAC Plan Update, not a grant application, there was discussion about whether the criterion should be included. The RPC agreed the criterion should be added, with the understanding that it refers to implementation project readiness at this particular time, and would be updated in the future as the project list is updated and during grant application processes.

Because new evaluation criteria were added at this meeting and at RPC meeting #8 (i.e. best project for intended purpose), Karen Johnson discussed the potential need to change the scoring threshold for final project scores. The final score was previously based on the number of high scores on evaluation criteria received, as follows: 3 or more High scores = High; 1 to 2 High scores = Medium; no High scores = Low. To prevent all of the projects from receiving high scores, the RPC agreed that the scoring thresholds should be changed such that 5 or more High scores = High; 1 to 4 High scores = Medium; no High scores = Low. This change will be made in the project evaluation spreadsheet which will be distributed (hard copies) to the RPC members upon finalization.

Watson asked if the RPC was okay with the project evaluation results. This led to a more detailed discussion of the projects. Pete Bell reviewed some of the comments submitted by the Foothill Conservancy in its letter dated May 30, 2012. He noted that there were two projects that had the Resource Management Strategy "Fog Collection" checked off, but the proponent must have thought "Fog" meant fats, oils, and grease, rather than actual fog. The two check marks were removed from the evaluation spreadsheet. Questions over aspects of several other Amador Water Agency (AWA) projects were raised. RPC Member Gene Mancebo responded to the questions with additional clarifying information. Several other suggested changes were discussed and some were incorporated into the spreadsheet as approved by the RPC.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

The committee then discussed whether additional time was needed to further review the project list. Bell commented that he could not support all of the listed projects, and he felt that some project descriptions are inadequate and some project assessments are inaccurate. Watson replied that the RPC needed to decide if further project review was desired; the Project Team would support additional review but noted that the project schedule and budget were becoming constraints. Watson also reminded the committee that inclusion of a project in the updated MAC Plan does not constitute support for the project and that the draft Project Review section includes language to that effect. The majority of RPC members indicated that they did not wish to continue a project-level review process. Bell commented that he was not satisfied with the project descriptions and not in agreement with some of the project evaluation scores but because inclusion of the projects in the plan did not represent endorsement of the projects he could 'live with' the project list and evaluations. Other committee members agreed, and the project list and evaluations were accepted by the RPC.

Watson commented that the RPC should be commended for their project vetting process. In many regions, stakeholder committees do not have the opportunity to review project information and discuss questions, comments, and project details at meetings. The discussion was valuable and helped clarify certain stated benefits of some of the projects, as well as identify errors.

Governance

In response to a request by Bell, the RPC was asked to discuss the MAC Plan Governance section (which had been reviewed at RPC meeting #3 on October 12, 2011). In a meeting of an IRWM region south of the MAC Region, an attendee incorrectly stated that the UMRWA Board of Directors make all of the MAC Plan Update-related decisions, and the stakeholders do not have decision-making authority. Bell referenced a section of DWR's Prop 84 Guidelines that discussed inclusion of non-profit organizations and questioned whether the MAC Region's governance structure is consistent with DWR requirements. RPC Member Bob Dean explained that UMRWA would only intervene if the RPC could not come to an agreement on a particular item.

Alcott said that the governance structure for the MAC region was reviewed and approved by DWR during the 2009 Region Acceptance Process (RAP), whereby it was deemed to be consistent with the IRWM Guidelines. The MAC governance structure, with the RPC as its foundation, is designed to allow for input from all local agencies, including non-profit organizations.

Other RPC members went on to say that because the MAC governance structure is more successful than structures in place in other regions they have been involved with, they



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

often recommend this structure to others. Preece commented that he sees no issue with the structure.

Impacts and Benefits, and Finance Plan Sections

RMC will resend the electronic sections of the impacts and benefits and finance sections to the RPC for review and comment.

Next Steps and Adjournment

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

- Determine if Tamarack Spring Mutual Water Company is within the MAC Region. If so, evaluate project using finalized project review process.
- Finalize project summary spreadsheet and mail hard copies to RPC members for review.
- Update project score sheets and upload to MAC documents webpage.

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

- Review the meeting notes.
- Provide comments on the Implementing Projects and Programs, Impacts and Benefits, and Financing Plan sections of the Plan Update. Provide comments by July 10, 2012.

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 29, 2012 at the Amador County Administration Building at 1:00 p.m. in the upstairs conference room.

The meeting concluded at approximately 3:30 p.m.