



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting

April 9, 2015, 2015; 1:35 pm to 3:00 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	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		X	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)
Jeff Meyer		X	Calaveras County Water District
Sarah Rutherford	X		Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
(Terry Strange)		X	Calaveras County Water District
(Art Toy)		X	Amador Water Agency
Hank Willy	X		Jackson Valley Irrigation District
(Damon Wyckoff)	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 April 9th meeting of the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (MAC IRWMP) Regional Participants Committee (RPC) was initiated by Alyson Watson at approximately 1:35 pm in Conference Room C at the Amador County Administration Building, in Jackson, California, on Thursday, April 9, 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 discuss



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

project list revisions and finalize the project list; and develop a short-list of Prop 84 (Round 3) implementation grant candidate projects.

Introductions

RPC members, alternatives, observers and the project team introduced themselves. Watson stated that the meeting notes from the March 12th meeting were sent out to RPC members following the meeting, and that comments on the meeting notes are due one week from now (April 16th). Notes will be finalized with RPC comments, and uploaded to UMRWA.org.

Project List

Watson provided an overview of the project list update process agreed upon at the March 12th RPC meeting: RPC member agencies with reservations or concerns related to projects would raise them at the March 12th meeting and if needed, resolve them offline prior to the April 9th meeting; the RPC would then be asked to endorse the final project list at the April 9th meeting.

Watson stated that Foothill Conservancy, AWA and ACCG provided comments on projects and/or provided updated project information sheets. Foothill Conservancy met with AWA, City of Plymouth and Calaveras Public Utility District to discuss projects. RMC updated the project list to reflect comments and discussions, and adjusted scores as appropriate.

Watson pointed out that the conservation projects submitted were combined into the MAC Conservation Program, and that the program required a lead agency. Damon Wyckoff volunteered AWA to lead the Conservation Program.

Tom Francis asked whether MokeWISE Project 7f should be included in the project list if it will be funded through Prop 1. Watson provided an overview of Project 7f. Pete Bell and Damon Wyckoff both feel this is an important project to include in the IRWMP project list. Rob Alcott asked whether the MokeWISE plan will serve as a “back door” for projects to get into the IRWMP. Watson answered that the MAC Plan established a screening process for projects that is fundamental to ensuring that projects meet the goals of the IRWMP prior to being added to the project list. Bell had reservations about projects getting into the IRWMP without going through the process. Watson said that RMC will work with AWA to put together a project description and develop a project information form. The project information form will be sent to the RPC via email for comment.

Wyckoff noted that AWA submitted an additional project following the March 12th meeting – the Amador County Fairgrounds Water Line Replacement. Dawn Flores said



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

that this project was scored, and added to the list as project number 50. Wyckoff provided a brief overview of the project. RPC members voiced concern that the distribution system is on the State of California's property, and whether grant money should go towards state-owned systems. Watson recommended that the project be included on the project list but with a footnote that the project requires additional vetting by the RPC. There were no objections.

Alcott asked that the conservation projects struck out on the project list be removed as they were combined into the MAC Conservation Program. Watson agreed, and noted that the project information forms submitted would still be included.

Watson asked the RPC to vet the project list. There were no objections to the project list, therefore the project list will be finalized.

Implementation Grant Preparation

Watson provided an overview of the Prop 84, Round 3 grant funds available to the San Joaquin Funding Area, and the results of the Prop 84 Drought Solicitation, where the MAC region received its full grant request of \$5.8 million. For Round 3, the funding area is allocated \$6.7 million and has 11 eligible competing regions. It's known that the Tuolumne-Stanislaus, East Contra Costa County and Eastern San Joaquin regions won't be applying, while the Merced and Consumnes American Bear Yuba regions will. It's unknown whether the other six regions will apply.

Watson gave an overview of the scoring criteria provided in the draft Prop 84, Round 3 PSP, noting that the key focus areas for scoring are on projects that meet the goals of the Human Right to Water policy, address long-term drought preparedness, provide direct water-related benefit to a DAC, and can be completed by October 31, 2019. The Final PSP isn't expected to significantly change the scoring.

RMC prepared a draft project prioritization based on these key scoring criteria, focusing on project readiness/status, long-term drought preparedness, and benefit to a DAC. It was recommended that the RPC select three to four projects totaling \$1.5 million to \$2 million, with at least one project that supports the Human Right to Water Policy.

Alcott also described the project sponsor qualifications, which include: 25% local match (unless the project benefits DACs), a written commitment to fulfill the project, submittal of three years of audited financial statements (required by DWR), and ten years of post-project monitoring (required by DWR).

The RPC discussed the inclusion of the following projects:

- Lake Camanche Water Service Replacement – Phase III



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- MAC Conservation Program
- Sheep Ranch Drinking Water Conservation
- Citizen Water Quality Monitoring
- Hemlock Landscape Restoration

During discussion of the Lake Camanche project, Wyckoff said that AWA is in the process of replacing service laterals as a Phase III – all of which are leaking. AWA could potentially break out pieces of the project to reduce the overall project cost.

The Sheep Ranch Drinking Water Conservation project would support the Human Right to Water Policy, but Watson noted that CCWD should be contacted to ask whether they prefer the Sheep Ranch project or the West Point Water Treatment Plant Drinking Water Compliance Project be included in the application. Donna Leatherman said that the Sheep Ranch project may have already been partially complete to satisfy an order from the state, and would fit the DAC component.

The group noted that in the case of the MAC Conservation Program, it may be difficult to show direct DAC benefits. Watson said that it could be possible to reference the Governor's order to conserve water in the DAC benefit description as support, and use a similar argument as was used in the Drought Solicitation Grant Application. The group decided that the project should be scaled down to approximately \$50,000, and focus on DAC areas.

Bell noted that the Citizen Water Quality Monitoring project will bridge the gap between PG&E monitoring in the upper watershed and EBMUD monitoring in the lower watershed. Bell also noted that it may be difficult for the Foothill Conservancy to provide the required three years of audited financial statements. The potential for the project to be added as a component of the Hemlock Restoration Project was raised – Bell said that Foothill would be willing to partner. Watson will contact Theresa McClung to discuss the opportunity.

Watson said that the Hemlock Restoration Project is estimated to cost \$12 million, but could be scaled down.

The group decided that the following list of projects will be brought before the UMRWA Board for approval to include in the grant application:

1. Lake Camanche Water Service Replacement – Phase III
2. MAC Conservation Program
3. Sheep Ranch Drinking Water Conservation
4. Hemlock Landscape Restoration



Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Sarah Rutherford recommends looking at the Prop 1 accountability website to see the status of the Prop 1 programs. RMC will send a link to the website to the group.

Next Steps and Adjournment

The Project Team will:

- Finalize the project list
- Provide the recommended list of projects to include in the Prop 84, Round 3 grant application to the UMRWA Board
- Send a description and preliminary assessment of Project 7f to the RPC for comment

The RPC members will:

- Attend the April 24th UMRWA Board Meeting

The meeting concluded at approximately 3:05 p.m.