



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 10

August 29, 2012; 1:05 pm to 3:35 pm

Amador County Administration Building, Conference Room C, Jackson, California

Attendance and Introductions

RPC Members (Alternates)	Present	Absent	Affiliation
Pete Bell	X		Foothill Conservancy
(Joaquin Cruz)		X	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Mike Daly	X		City of Jackson
(Katherine Evatt)		X	Foothill Conservancy
Tom Francis	X		East Bay Municipal Utility District
Jeff Gardner	X		City of Plymouth
(Rick Hopson)		X	US Forest Service
Tom Infusino	X		Calaveras Planning Coalition
Donna Leatherman		X	Calaveras Public Utility District
Gene Mancebo	X		Amador Water Agency
Teresa McClung		X	US Forest Service
Jeff Meyer	X		Calaveras County Water District
Rod Schuler	X		Retired Amador County PW Director
(Don Stump)	X		Calaveras County Water District
(Art Toy)	X		Amador Water Agency
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
Ed Pattison	X		City of Ione
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

Purpose of RPC Meeting #10

The tenth 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 Alyson Watson at 1:05pm in Conference Room C at the Amador County Administration Building, in Jackson, California, on Wednesday, August 29, 2012.

Watson began walking through a PowerPoint presentation outlining the purpose and agenda for RPC Meeting #10. The primary purposes of the meeting were to discuss the approach to resolve RPC member comments on the project evaluation, and discuss comments on the Goals and Objectives, Impacts and Benefits, and Financing Plan Sections of the Plan Update.

Ed Pattison, who is now the City Manager of the City of Lone, requested joining the RPC to represent the City. After discussion, the RPC agreed to have Ed become an RPC member.

During discussion of approval of the RPC Meeting #9 notes, two errors were identified in the attendance table on page 1. The group agreed to approve the notes with the noted corrections.

MAC Plan Update Schedule

There are three RPC meetings scheduled after this meeting. At the next RPC meeting, scheduled for September 24th, the following items will be discussed:

- Implementing Projects and Programs section including project List and evaluation
- Plan Performance and Monitoring and Data Management, Technical Analysis
- Proposed Governance Changes
- Projects to include in implementation grant application

There currently is not an October RPC meeting scheduled. At the November RPC meeting, the following will be on the agenda:

- Endorse Plan Performance and Monitoring and Data Management, Technical Analysis
- Discuss Climate Change and Coordination with Land Use Agencies
- Endorse implementation grant projects

Then, at the January 2013 meeting, the RPC will endorse the Draft MAC Plan Update.

After the last RPC meeting, RPC members raised concerns over the project list which had been endorsed. In order to have a Plan Update and associated list of projects that all RPC members have reached a consensus on, concerned RPC members requested meetings with CCWD and AWA to discuss specific the prioritization scoring of projects, comments, and concerns. The FC and others met with AWA on August 21st and with CCWD on August 23rd. Not all of the projects were discussed so additional meetings have been scheduled.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

In order to meet the schedule requirements and have sufficient time to discuss projects to be included in the Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation Grant Application (Round 2 Application), the region must have an endorsed project list by the September meeting. If all of the projects are not discussed prior to the September RPC meeting, the MAC Plan Update will note that there is a subset of the project list which will require further vetting to confirm that the project scoring and evaluation is satisfactory to all RPC members. The vetted list, excluding the projects requiring further discussion, will serve as the list of potential projects for inclusion in the Round 2 Application. Comment meetings may continue to be held to discuss the non-vetted list. The MAC Plan Update will be revised prior to the November RPC meeting to reflect additional work complete, and the RPC will be asked to re-endorse the list at that time. No changes to the project list will be made following the November RPC meeting. In case all of AWA's projects cannot be discussed prior to the September 19 comment discussion, Gene Mancebo will prioritize the remaining AWA projects for discussion to ensure the projects he may want considered for inclusion in the Round 2 Application are discussed.

If there are comments or concerns that cannot be resolved during the comment discussion meetings, they will be brought to the RPC for discussion.

While the need to discuss specific projects in detail and conduct separate meetings was not anticipated, it was agreed that it will benefit the Plan and improve overall quality of the projects, plan, and process.

RPC members also commented on the governance structure at a previous meeting. Specifically, the question arose as to whether the MAC Region's governance structure is consistent with DWR requirements. Consistent with the Governing Procedures, RPC members Infusino and Bell will develop potential alternatives to the currently endorsed governance structure for discussion at the September RPC meeting. If agreed upon by the RPC, the proposed changes to the existing governance structure would be recommended to the UMRWA Board to be implemented during the next MAC Plan Update.

CARWSP Update

The RPC was updated on the status of the Camanche Area Regional Water Supply Plan (CARWSP) effort. The purpose of the Plan is to develop a mutually agreeable preferred project description, preliminary engineering documents and preliminary project plan which collectively meet the documented needs of the 3 project partners – AWA, CCWD, and EBMUD. The tasks that will be completed were briefly described; currently the participating agencies are in the process of developing water demands and the potential areas that could be served by the project. The participating agencies identified the



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

following critical success factors (CSFs) for the project (i.e. conditions that must be met for the project to be viewed as successful):

1. Meet Current and Future Demands in the Wallace Area
2. Maintain or Reduce Operating Costs to Provide an Affordable Supply
3. Provide a System that is Easy to Operate
4. Provide Reliable Supply Year-Round
5. Clear and Fairly Resolve Water Rights
6. Build Regional Partnerships
7. Garner Local Community Support
8. Transfer Responsibility for Local Residents
9. Meet All Applicable Regulatory Requirements
10. Beneficially Impact Water Treatment-Related Wastewater Discharges
11. Maximize Ability to Secure Outside Funding
12. Improve Water Supply and Quality in the Lake Camanche Village Area
13. Provide an Affordable Supply
14. Minimize Capacity Impacts to the Mokelumne Aqueduct

RPC member comments included:

- CSF number 1 is unclear because it suggests that future (unplanned / unapproved) development may be served. Through discussions with CCWD the RPC member thought that future demands would not be served. Watson clarified stating that the project will serve existing and approved development and agreed that the wording may not be clear. Until CSFs 4, 5, 6, and 13 are figured out, public participation will not matter because there will be no project.

RPC members commented that they would like to discuss the CARWSP project with representatives from Burson. The participating agencies requested the information stay within the RPC for now. It is possible that serving Burson from the Camanche-area plant may not be feasible and / or may not be the most cost-effective option; those details have not yet been resolved. The map included in the presentation shows potential areas to serve, but it is believed the demands for the areas that could be served may exceed the amount of water that would be available from the project. Infusino contended that Burson should be invited to discuss project development and that the role of the public gets diminished in water planning exercises. While there was discussion that public should be involved, the RPC determined that they should not put information forward if questions will be asked and the only answer is "I don't know." The goal is to fine-tune demands, supplies, and potential areas to be served prior to the September public workshop so that the information can be presented there for discussion.

RPC members pointed out that CSFs were developed without public input and Watson clarified that they are intended to clarify the needs of the participating agencies, and are not intended to reflect the input of other entities at this time.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

CARWSP-specific outreach has been and will continue to be performed by the participating agencies prior to endorsement of the MAC Plan update. In addition, a CARWSP update will be provided at the September 24th MAC Plan Update Community Workshop.

Goals and Objectives

The policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures were endorsed by the RPC at Meeting #8 on May 22nd. Prior to Meeting #10 the RPC was provided a revised Goals and Objectives section that incorporated their agreed-upon changes.

RPC members suggested improvements to the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures, but agreed that they have been endorsed and meet the needs of the region presently. It was suggested that more environmental enhancement and groundwater considerations be incorporated in the future.

Other comments on the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measure section were discussed, and changes will be made to reflect the comments.

RPC members discussed whether the use of the word “collaborative” was appropriate to characterize the RPC process. The RPC determined, in concurrence with Jason Preece of DWR, that the process has been collaborative, and the terminology is appropriate.

The RPC also discussed the use of the word “broad” to characterize RPC membership. Because the outreach effort to identify RPC members was significant, and the representation is relatively varied, including representatives from disadvantaged communities, governmental and non-governmental agencies, City and County representatives, and other interests, representation can be accurately described as broad. In addition, while no Native American representatives are currently on the RPC, it is because they declined to participate.

RPC members discussed that although there are 4 identified, overarching policies, there isn't one ‘big picture’ policy stating the overall benefit to the watershed within the boundaries of MAC. It was noted that the policies, goals, and objectives form the tapestry that is the overall regional policy.

Impacts and Benefits, and Finance Plan Sections

Watson provided an overview of the Impact and Benefit and Finance Plan standards as defined in the DWR Prop 84 & 1E Guidelines. RMC will resend the electronic sections of the impacts and benefits and finance sections to the RPC for review and comment, and



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

preparation for endorsement/discussion at the next RPC meeting. Comments on the sections are due to RMC by September 10th.

Next Steps and Adjournment

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

- Make corrections to the Meeting #9 notes.
- Email MS Word versions of the Impacts, Benefits, and Financing sections to the RPC for review.
- Finalize Implementing Projects and Programs section.
- Draft Plan Performance and Monitoring, Data Management, and Technical Analysis sections.

The RPC is asked to review the meeting notes prior to the next meeting.

AWA will prioritize the list of projects to discuss with commenters, in case not all of the projects can be discussed during their next scheduled meeting.

RPC members with concerns related to projects and scoring will set up meetings with project sponsors to discuss project-specific comments.

Infusino and Bell will also develop a list of suggested improvements to the governance structure. The list will be provided to Watson on or before September 17th.

Dean will prepare a list of suggestions to the policies, goals, and objectives for future consideration and possibly inclusion in the MAC Plan Update.

The RPC will review the Impacts, Benefits, and Finance sections and provide comments to RMC by September 10th.

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 24th, 2012 at the Amador County Administration Building from 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the upstairs conference room. After the RPC meeting, the MAC Plan Update public workshop will be conducted in the same building in the Board Chambers from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

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