



# Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

## MEETING MINUTES

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 1  
 January 22, 2009; 6:00 pm to 8:45 pm  
 Amador County Administration Building, Jackson California

### Attendance and Introductions

RPC Members	Present	Absent	Affiliation	Alternate
Pete Bell	X		Foothill Conservancy	
Krista Clem	X		Golden Dale Subdivision	
Brianna Creekmore		X		
Mike Daly	X		City of Jackson	
Bob Dean		X	Calaveras County Water District	
Debbie Dunn	X		Amador Water Agency	
Dixon Flynn		X	City of Plymouth	
Tom Francis	X		East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)	
David Graesch		X	Calaveras Public Utility District	
Ross Jackson		X	PG&E/ERC	
Chris Katopothis	Briefed 1/26		Alpine Watershed Group	
Gene Mancebo	X		Amador Water Agency	
Phil McCartney		X	Mokelumne Hill Sanitary District	
Ted Novelli		X	Amador County Board of Supervisors	
Ed Pattison	X		Calaveras County Water District	
Rod Schuler	X			
Gary Slade	X		Amador Flyfishers	
Susan Snoke		X	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Council	
Terry Strange	X		Resident	
Ed Struffenegger	X		Sierra Pacific Industries	
Madonna Wiebold	X			
Hank Willy	X		Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
Observers	Present	Absent	Affiliation	
Jerry Budrick	X		Ledger-Dispatch	
Gary Thomas	X		Amador Water Agency	
Dave Andres	X		Calaveras County Water District	



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Project Team	Present	Absent	Affiliation	
Rob Alcott	X		Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA)	
Leslie Dumas	X		RMC Water and Environment	
Karen Johnson	X		Water Resources Planning	

### Introductions and Background

The first meeting of the RPC for the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Update (MAC Plan Update) was begun by Rob Alcott at 6pm at the Amador County Administration Building Board of Supervisors Chambers in Jackson, California, on Thursday, January 22, 2009. Alcott talked along with a PowerPoint presentation providing background information on the 2006 IRWM Plan, the purpose of the MAC Plan Update, the new State integrated regional water management program requirements, and breakdown of Proposition 84 funding. The Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (Authority) history was described along with the MAC Plan Update organizational structure, and the Regional Participant's Committee (RPC) and Authority roles on the project. The MAC Plan Update has been divided into three project phases, the first of which is occurring now; Phase 2 will be the preparation of an application for planning grant funds for Phase 3; and Phase 3 is to prepare the Plan Update. Tasks associated with each project phase were listed, and the three over-arching goals for the project described as follows:

- Ensure a competitive plan
- Ensure a comprehensive plan
- Complete within timeframe and budget

There was a discussion about the number of IRWMPs in San Joaquin Valley competing for funds, DWR's need for conflicts to be identified and described and how they will be resolved through the identification of projects as strategies.

The group was OK with using Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) as a term describing economically disadvantaged communities within the watersheds (which are identified based on income data by census tract). Clarification was made that DACs do not receive money, but rather are communities whose input will be specifically solicited and with whom communications about the project will be provided through an identified representative. Representatives were identified for most DACs as presented in the Community Outreach Plan. Concern was expressed that the volunteer representatives may not be considered by the communities to be representing them. Recommendations of who would be a better representative for each of these DACs



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

were requested. Concern was expressed that other smaller non-DAC communities, such as Dry Town, should also have representation. There was a discussion about how difficult it is to solicit interest in volunteering for this role and that public agency representatives were identified wherever possible. For example, Wilseyville will be represented by Calaveras County Water District.

Alcott discussed how the State has not yet released the IRWM Plan guidelines to be followed for the MAC Plan Update; they are anticipated in early summer of 2009. We will know then what sections of the 2006 plan need to be updated.

### **Community Outreach Plan**

Alcott presented the highlights of the draft outreach plan which attendees received in a mailing prior to the meeting. The plan focuses on RPC involvement, community outreach, and participation from DACs. The project website will be the primary tool to notify interested persons of upcoming workshops and progress on the project. The RPC is to guide the development of the products by reviewing draft documents and providing input at the RPC meetings.

The schedule of RPC meetings will be determined during scoping of Phase 3, once planning grant funds are obtained. During discussion it was noted that meeting every two to three months may not be enough to get through the tasks. Alcott noted that the meeting schedule will depend in part on the amount of funds received for Phase 3.

The RPC was ok with the draft Community Outreach Plan as written.

### **Governing Procedures Guidebook**

Karen Johnson walked through key points within each section of the Governing Procedures Guidebook. A healthy discussion was held on the proposed decision process of holding a majority vote when consensus is not reached. The group decided that the voting process will be removed from the Guidebook. The text of sections C.1 and C.2 will be rewritten to reflect the following:

- The decision-making goal is to have everyone agree on the matter at hand;
- Members should use "can they live with it" as their standard;
- If all members don't agree on the matter at hand, then those who disagree must put forward a reasonable alternative;
- If, after due consideration, agreement on the matter at hand cannot be reached, the RPC will determine how to resolve the impasse.

Additional members can be added to the RPC, but it was recommended that they be included before the next RPC meeting, anticipated to be held in the fall 2009. After the



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

second meeting, too much knowledge on setting up the project process and developing key decisions will already be passed and it will be difficult to bring others up to speed.

Concern was expressed over the governance structure of the Authority being the final decision maker because the Authority is primarily composed of water agencies, not a full range of organizations like the CABY IRWMP governance structure. However, with the majority vote decision process removed from the governing procedures, most of the concerns with the governance structure were resolved. The RPC Governing Procedures was subsequently approved by the RPC with the revisions documented above.

The boundary of the MAC Plan Update was reviewed and changes being made since the 2006 plan were discussed in detail. The overlap with Cosumnes/American/Bear/Yuba (CABY) boundary is still being resolved; two overlaps currently exist – the area of north western Amador County including Plymouth and a small area in the northeastern part of Amador County. The plan is to keep both areas in the MAC region if possible. The overlap with the region in San Joaquin County was removed entirely since it is in another IRWMP boundary and was only added original for a joint project. Little John's Creek watershed, which drains directly to the Delta, was added to the Stanislaus plan boundary. The only additional area which still needs attention is the Kirkwood ski area which does not overlap with CABY but the Kirkwood PUC's snow generating water supply is within the American River watershed of CABY.

A topic came up at the end of the meeting but is described here because it will be an additional edit to the Guidebook. If a RPC member plans to bring up a topic not on the agenda, they will notify the project team a week prior to the meeting so that all attendees can be informed of this new topic. Any information to be presented on the new topic will also be provided prior to the meeting to all attendees so that time is not lost at the meeting reviewing information that could have been reviewed ahead of time.

### **Regional Water Resource Issues**

A list of MAC Plan Update topics that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) will likely require addressing and a list of projects from the 2006 Plan were presented to the RPC to initiate discussion of potential conflicts and issues that will need to be resolved by the plan update in Phase 3. The DWR IRWM Plan guidelines will identify how the plan will be structured around the issues and conflicts to ensure that a strategy is developed for resolution of each issue. These issues and conflicts will also aid the project staff in drafting the first cut of a vision statement and goals and objectives for the RPC to develop in Phase 3. Johnson facilitated a brainstorming session on potential issues which is summarized in an attachment to these minutes.

### **Other Items**



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

Time will be allocated on future meeting agenda to allow participants to bring up topics relevant to the MAC Plan Update.

### **Next Steps and Adjournment**

The next RPC meeting will be scheduled, hopefully, during the summer or the fall of 2009. The RPC identified 1:30pm on the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesdays of the month as a good meeting time.

Once the application guidelines are released, the project team will submit a planning grant application for the Phase 3 effort. This is anticipated to occur in the early summer or late spring of 2009. RPC members will be kept apprised by email of application preparation and other activities between now and the next RPC meeting. If the application package needs letters of support from the community, Alcott will contact individuals with this request.

The revised Governing Procedures Guidebook and meeting minutes will be sent for review to those in attendance as well as RPC members who were not able to attend. It was requested that if RPC members have comments on the revised items or any other topic being discussed by email, that they not respond to all included in the email. This will reduce the number of emails RPC members receive.

Because of past problems with mailings for Pete Bell, paper copies of documents will be sent via overnight service without signature to ensure that the package is delivered to his home. Address corrections were made for Debbie Dunn and Gary Thomas. Materials will also be sent via email to all members and others on the RPC mailing list. Gary Thomas will check with Amador Water Agency regarding his participation as a RPC member.

The meeting concluded at approximately 8:45 p.m.



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

### ATTACHMENT

#### Brainstorming Session on Potential Conflicts and Issues

Note: This list reflects comments provided by RPC members during a brainstorming session during the meeting. Additional issues and conflicts were obtained from the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Assessment and Planning Project and are noted here with that source. The potential conflicts and issues were then organized by topic. They will be consolidated and refined in Phase 3 of the MAC Plan Update project.

#### Land Use and Water Use Conflicts

- Amador County General Plan housing element will result in more development in areas with no water/wastewater infrastructure
- Supply and infrastructure not adequate to meet growth planned for in the general plans of Amador County and its cities
- Provision of infrastructure in dispersed, low density areas
- Watershed protection versus community economic needs
- Groundwater overdraft versus development approvals
- Groundwater quantity and quality is not adequate to accommodate growth
- Disperse development does not allow for management of contaminated runoff versus compact or low impact development (UMRWAP)
- Increased population in watersheds per the General Plans will increase presence and expedite the transport of contaminants to waterbodies (UMRWAP)

#### Environmental Protection

- Wild and Scenic River status versus additional storage
- PG&E pumped storage project on North Fork
- Third party impacts from reuse and conservation (reduced return flows)
- Fish passage on lower Mokelumne River
- Management of federal lands resulting in environmental impacts

#### Water Quality Conflicts

- Recreational water quality impacts
- Wastewater discharge water quality
- Failing septic system contaminant leakage to river versus the right to live near the river
- Failing septic system contaminant leakage to surface water and groundwater versus body contact recreation and drinking water (UMRWAP)
- Cloud seeding water quality impacts
- Wastewater treatment levels and technology versus environment and benefits
- Improper disposal of household wastes (UMRWAP)



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- Wastewater treatment plan overflows during high precipitation events (UMRWAP)
- Inactive mines without restoration cause leaching of soils with high mineral content and surface runoff of contaminants to waterbodies (UMRWAP)
- Over application of household fertilizers contributes contaminant loadings to surface waters (UMRWAP)
- Increased impervious surfaces exacerbates flooding which contributes contaminants to surface waters versus designing streets and compact development with techniques to reduce peak flows, minimize runoff, and remove contaminants during flow (UMRWAP)

### **Supply Management**

- New water supply versus recycled water versus conservation of supplies
- Stormwater management and rights to use this water
- Climate change impacts
- Water rights concerns
- Supplies not matched to use (e.g., industrial users receiving potable supplies)
- White water recreation versus flat water recreation

### **Forest Management**

- Timber harvesting practices cause disturbance of vegetation and soils which contributes loadings to surface waters (UMRWAP)
- Roads and road maintenance practices contribute to erosion, peak runoff, and transport of contaminants in runoff to surface waters (UMRWAP)

### **Fire Management**

- Wildfires cause disturbance of vegetation and soils which contributes loadings to surface waters (UMRWAP)
- Fire response to protect landowner and water quality objectives versus managing naturally-occurring fires (UMRWAP)
- Fuel management techniques can result in short term water quality impacts (UMRWAP)

### **Economic Impacts (in addition to above related issues)**

- Costs of projects and financing
- Aging existing water and wastewater infrastructure
- Drinking water regulations may not reflect realistic protection of human health (treatment levels too onerous)
- Local economic opportunities versus out of region resources



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

### Miscellaneous

- Upstream versus downstream interests differ
- Cumulative effects of IRWMPs on the Delta (e.g., projects changing flows to Delta)
- State decisions impact region
- Lack of public understanding of watershed issues
- No coordination between groups that need to solve problems (e.g., agricultural costs of water testing)