



Meeting Summary

MEETING: 2018 MAC IRWMP RPC Meeting 2

MEETING DATE: 8/30/2018

LOCATION: 810 Court St, Jackson, CA

ATTENDEES: Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency, Amador Water Agency, Buena Vista Rancheria, Calaveras Amador Forestry Team, Calaveras County Water District, East Bay Municipal Water District, Foothill Conservancy, Jackson Valley Irrigation District, UMRWA, Woodard & Curran

-
1. Introductions and Meeting Procedure Review
 - a. There were no questions on meeting procedure and the RPC accepted the guidelines for discussion.
 2. MAC IRWMP Plan Chapters 1 – 3 RPC Comments
 - a. Climate Change Priorities
 - i. AWA proposed to move Water Quality from “High” to “Highest” and Ecosystem & Habitat from “Highest” to “High”.
 - ii. The RPC approved the prioritized climate change vulnerabilities list with both Water Quality and Ecosystem & Habitat as “Highest” priorities.
 - iii. There was discussion around what Hydropower meant and it was clarified that it was only pertaining to climate change impacts on existing hydropower facilities.
 1. A footnote will be added to the prioritization table to clarify the above statement.
 3. Proposed Project Scoring and List
 - a. The RPC approved the new recommended scoring system, in which projects with nine “highs” were prioritized “High” and two “medium” scores were counted as one “high” score.
 - b. Most project scores remained the same as what was submitted on the project information sheet by the project proponent, but reviewers did make some changes to scores that they felt were inappropriate or where no score was provided by the project proponent.
 - i. The most common evaluation criteria scores that were altered by the reviewers are climate change adaptation and mitigation, as the two concepts were often confused.
 - ii. The reviewers initially did not count projects with wildfire prevention benefits as climate change mitigation projects, but wildfires do cause a large amount of CO2 to be emitted into



the atmosphere, so the climate change mitigation evaluation criteria will be re-evaluated for these projects.*

- c. The DAC Benefits and Native American Tribal Benefits evaluation criteria were scored such that projects that provided targeted benefits to DACs or Native American Tribes received a High score, projects that benefited an entire service area that includes DACs or Native American Tribes received a Medium score, and projects that did not provide benefits to DACs or Native American Tribes received a Low score.
- d. There was a concern raised about the number of planning projects submitted since many grants require environmental review to be complete.
 - i. This Plan will not be updated for several years, so these projects may have moved through environmental review by then.
 - ii. The DAC grants are also waiving the requirements to have environmental review done before they get funding, so planning projects will be eligible for those grants.
 - iii. There is no drawback to including a large number of planning projects in the Plan.
- e. Project information sheets submitted after the deadline will be added as appendices to the Plan. These projects are not scored, prioritized, or included in the text of the Plan.
- f. The RPC approved the project list for the 2018 MAC Plan.

4. Next Steps

- a. Materials for review will be re-sent to the group to ensure everyone gets a chance to review them.*
- b. Comments on Chapters 4 and 5 of the Plan are due September 7.
- c. The public review period will open on September 20 and close on October 11.
- d. RPC Meeting 3 and Community Workshop 2 is scheduled for October 25.
- e. The Plan will be finalized in November.

* Denotes Action Item.