



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting

March 12, 2015; 2:00 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	X		Foothill Conservancy
Craig Case - <i>added</i>	X		Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency (ATCAA)
(Reuben Childress)	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
Pat McGreevy - <i>added</i>	X		Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)
Jeff Meyer	X		Calaveras County Water District
Ed Pattison - <i>removed</i>		X	City of Lone (formerly)
Sarah Rutherford - <i>added</i>	X		Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Rod Schuler - <i>removed</i>		X	Retired Amador County PW Director
(Terry Strange) - <i>added</i>	X		Calaveras County Water District
(Don Stump) - <i>removed</i>		X	Calaveras County Water District (formerly)
(Art Toy)	X		Amador Water Agency
Hank Willy	X		Jackson Valley Irrigation District
(Damon Wyckoff) - <i>added</i>	X		Amador Water Agency
Project Team	Present	Absent	Affiliation
Rob Alcott	X		Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA)
Alyson Watson	X		RMC Water and Environment
Dawn Flores	X		RMC Water and Environment

Purpose of RPC Meeting

The March 12th meeting of the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (MAC IRWMP) Regional Participants Committee (RPC) was initiated by Alyson Watson at approximately 2:05pm in Conference Room C at the



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Amador County Administration Building, in Jackson, California, on Thursday, March 12, 2015.

Watson began walking through a PowerPoint presentation outlining the purpose and agenda for the RPC meeting. The primary purposes of the meeting were to review the project review process from the MAC Plan Update and resulting prioritization of projects; and discuss the project list and revise it to reflect RPC input.

Introductions and RPC Membership

RPC members, alternatives, observers and the project team introduced themselves. Following introductions, Alcott announced three new potential RPC members: Sarah Rutherford (Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board), Craig Case (Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency) and Pat McGreevy (Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group). There were no objections; therefore, the three new members were accepted to the RPC.

Overview and Update on Prop 84, Round 3

Watson presented the latest Prop 84, Round 3 implementation grant schedule and described the tasks necessary for the MAC Region to be prepared to submit a grant application. The draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) is expected on March 12th, with applications due in early August 2015. In order to meet this deadline, the RPC will need to finalize the list of projects for incorporation into the MAC Plan and discuss projects to be included in the application during the April 9th RPC meeting. There is approximately \$6.7 million remaining for the San Joaquin funding area. Some IRWM regions will be ineligible due to CASGEM requirements, though UMRWA (as the applicant) will be eligible.

Pete Bell noted that the total cost of projects submitted to the IRWMP is \$132 million; therefore, it will be necessary to develop a process to narrow down the list for the grant. Bell asked whether there would be a draft recommendation for projects to include in the grant at the next RPC meeting. Watson said that the project team would develop a preliminary assessment of how projects would be expected to perform in Round 3 based on draft scoring criteria in the PSP. This preliminary assessment will be used as the basis for selecting projects at the April 9th RPC meeting. Bell also asked whether DACs would be exempt from the match requirement, and if the match was still 25%. Watson replied that this information will be included in the draft PSP and Guidelines due by the end of the day (March 12th), but that it was expected that the match would continue to be 25% and that DACs would continue to be eligible for a waiver.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Project Review

The project review process was conducted for those projects submitted to RMC in response to the January 2015 call for projects using the process laid out in the 2013 MAC Plan Update. Watson walked through the project review process, describing the screening and evaluation processes. There were 48 projects submitted, all of which passed the screening. The draft evaluation resulted in the prioritization of projects as follows: 33 projects in the “High” grouping, 15 projects in the “Medium” grouping, and no projects in the “Low” grouping.

Pete Bell recommended that ATCAA, AWA, and Foothill Conservancy work together to consolidate the water conservation projects. Alcott agreed to put the groups in touch following the meeting, and said that the project team would put together the projects as the “MAC Conservation Program”. Craig Case noted that his position is being replaced, and therefore the group would need to work with his replacement. Case supported putting together the MAC Conservation Program with different tasks for each project. Case indicated that ATCA operates on a state-approved system to identify the most disadvantaged, and prioritize those who receive assistance.

Terry Strange commented that instead of doing more planning for meadow restoration, projects should implement restoration based on existing planning. ACCG did an analysis of meadows for restoration, and will be meeting with the Forest Service to get a prioritized list of meadows for restoration. Teresa McClung said that planning is being done to allow the projects are ready to proceed as soon as funding is obtained.

Pete Bell noted that there is overlap of the projects on the MAC IRWM Plan list with the projects on the MokeWISE project list, and stated that the comments that he had on the MokeWISE projects are the same as for those matching projects on the draft project list.

Pat McGreevy commented that the CPUD projects are fundamental to supply in the northern part of Calaveras County. Project 38 (Middle Fork Ditch Pipeline and Hydroelectric Power Project) could score higher if it were to add partners. McGreevy recommended adding CCWD, Stanislaus National Forest (by expanding the project to Schaads Reservoir), and West Point Fire District. Terry Strange commented that Project 38 could be expanded to include Sandy Gulch Ditch by partnering with CCWD, and that this would improve water quality and reduce energy needs (adding benefits). Donna Leatherman noted that to claim these benefits, the water would have to be supplied to constituents. Leatherman will discuss with CPUD and CCWD additional partnerships, benefits, and a title change, recognizing that the expanded project would require infrastructure to convey water to Wilseyville. Jeff Meyer said that he would have Larry Diamond contact Leatherman.



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Pat McGreevy commented that Project 36 (CPUD Water Distribution System Improvements) could bring in more partners as well.

It was asked whether the meadow and creek restorations could be combined (Projects 44, 45, 46). Teresa McClung replied that the projects all have different timing, and therefore can't be combined.

Project List

Watson reminded the RPC that when the previous project list included in the recent IRWM Plan Update was developed, the process initially involved separated projects into two lists: one for "endorsed" projects, and a separate list for projects requiring "additional vetting." The project team proposed a similar but streamlined approach to project review for this 2015 Project Update in which RPC member agencies with reservations/concerns related to projects raise them today for preliminary discussion. Questions/concerns not addressed today should be resolved offline prior to the April meeting. The RPC will be asked to endorse the final project list at the April meeting.

It was noted that some RPC members did not receive the email containing the project lists and summary of the project review process, making it difficult to discuss the projects at the time of the meeting. RMC will re-send the email attachments, as well as post all documents to the UMRWA website and email the link to the group. Watson asked that the RPC submit a list of any projects they'd like to discuss further by Tuesday, March 17th so that the project team can put those agencies into contact with the project proponents. The project team also requested that any comments on the project evaluation be provided to Dawn Flores by Thursday, March 26th. RMC will prepare a red-line revision of the project lists that incorporates comments.

The RPC also asked that information on other funding opportunities be included as part of the next RPC meeting, as it could be useful to identify different funding pots for the projects on the list. For example, John Kingsbury of the Mountain Counties has had presentations from different agencies regarding funding. The project team said that at the end of the next meeting, information on Prop 1 can be provided. It was suggested that Rob Alcott may provide such updates and related information at future UMRWA meetings.

Next Steps and Adjournment

The Project Team will:

- Re-send the project list, descriptions, and project review process summary to those that did not receive it and will post the documents to the UMRWA website
- Help to set up meetings between project proponents and those who would like to discuss their projects



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- Revise the project prioritization based on RPC input

The RPC members will:

- Submit a list of projects that require discussion by Tuesday, March 17th
- Submit comments on the project prioritization by Thursday, March 26th
- Attend the April 9th RPC meeting

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