

**Department of Water Resources
Integrated Regional Watershed Management Program (IRWMP)
Greater Monterey County IRWMP Planning Grant
Grant Agreement # 4600009372**

Final Report

1. Executive Summary

The Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program (GMCIRWMP) Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) successfully completed all aspects of the IRWM Planning Grant that was awarded to the region on October 5, 2011. The intentions of the planning grant were to complete a DWR approved IRWM plan and develop tools that can be used in the future to successfully implement projects that further the goals and objectives of the region for integrated water management. In addition to successful completion of the deliverables, the planning grant enabled the region to build capacity of the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG), of which there are 18 active participants, and fund a Program Coordinator. Because of the diversity of the RWMG and strong leadership, we've built a solid foundation for the future of water planning and collaboration in Monterey County. There are now more resources on the Central Coast for disadvantaged communities. Conservation organizations are working directly with agriculture to improve water quality. There is more ingenuity and willing partnerships to explore potential water supply projects. The Planning Grant also helped us develop tools for the region to assist with implementing projects far into the future, including a disadvantaged community outreach plan, a comprehensive website, a preliminary economic analysis tool to assist project proponents determine project benefits, and an online tool - Central Coast Action Tracker (www.ccactiontracker.org) - to track projects and outcomes as well as greenhouse gas emissions and water quality conditions. Overall, there is much greater communication and cooperation between agencies and organizations in Monterey County in regards to water resource management, and better tools with which to plan for and implement projects beneficial to the region.

2. Comparison of Work Performed

Below is a comparison between the actual work performed and the tasks described in Exhibit A- Project Work Plan. We requested two contract amendments for this work. The first was approved on October 30, 2013. The second was approved on September 10, 2014.

TASK 1: Direct Project Administration

Subtask 1a: Administration: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation (MBSF) staff performed all necessary contracting, invoicing and general grant administration tasks. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 1b: Reporting: Invoices and progress reports were submitted in a timely manner and MBSF staff were responsive to inquiries and requests by DWR staff. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

TASK 2: IRWM Plan Coordination and Development

The Greater Monterey County IRWM (GMCIRWM) Program Coordinator performed every task related to coordination of the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) and plan development in the most professional and outstanding manner. All responsibilities detailed below were conducted without incident. The GMCIRWM region is unique in the state in that the RWMG is made up of 18 diverse entities. It includes government agencies, nonprofit organizations, educational organizations, water service districts, private water companies, and organizations representing agricultural, environmental, and community interests. The RWMG members were chosen to ensure balanced representation of the various resource areas, interests, and geographic areas throughout the Greater Monterey County region. Even with this large membership, the coordination and cooperation was both highly effective and efficient. All tasks listed below were successfully accomplished.

Subtask 2a: General Coordination of the IRWM Planning Process:

1. The Program Coordinator guided the RWMG to successfully gather information and develop a decision making process to complete a final IRWM plan.

2. The Program Coordinator successfully acted as a clearinghouse to disseminate IRWM-related news and opportunities.
3. The Program Coordinator communicated with neighboring IRWM regions with the hope of joint projects. Several are in development, with both San Luis Obispo and Monterey Peninsula regions, but have not been funded.
4. The public and stakeholders were regularly updated with plan progress and events primarily through the website and email listserv.
5. We held regular monthly RWMG meetings for the majority of the planning grant duration. There were several periods where meetings were not needed due to minimal RWMG activity so they were cancelled. There was never a time where the RWMG went without meeting for more than two months. We had a quorum of RWMG members at nearly every meeting. In addition, the Program Coordinator participated in all Round Table of Regions conference calls, in Central Coast IRWM regional calls, and was the primary contact for DWR and our region.
6. The Program Coordinator effectively worked with the RWMG and consultants to develop elements of the GMCIRWM plan. All of the work was incorporated into the final document.

Subtask 2b: Plan Development: The final review and approval of the GMCIRWM plan was received from DWR on July 2, 2014. All elements detailed in subtask 2b(1-9) were successfully included in the plan. Some sections were written by the Program Coordinator and others were the result of RWMG subcommittees. All were presented to and approved by the RWMG. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 2.b.9.b: “No Regrets” Regional Climate Change Workshop: On December 6, 2011, the Center for Ocean Solutions, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA Coastal Services Center, City of Santa Cruz, CeNCOOS, ICLEI, ESA-PWA Associates, and other key partners hosted an all-day workshop entitled: “Preparing for the Future: Climate Change and the Monterey Bay Shoreline.” This one-day climate change adaptation planning workshop successfully sparked the first Monterey Bay region-wide discussion between 90 local decision-makers and focused on the impacts of sea level rise and coastal storm hazards. The day included a morning plenary session led by keynote speaker Dr. Gary Griggs, Director of the Institute of Marine Sciences at UC Santa Cruz. Case studies of adaptation strategies offered by an expert panel moderated by Charles Lester, Executive Director of the California Coastal Commission, followed, with participation by representatives of the Southern Monterey Bay Erosion Working Group, the City of Santa Cruz and King County, Washington. The afternoon breakouts focused on small, roundtable discussions such as the status of current local adaptation planning efforts, and then more specific topics addressing issues such as coastal infrastructure, impacts of sea level rise, connecting science and policy and improving regional collaboration. On December 7th, the planning committee met to debrief, review evaluations, and develop a summary report. All of the workshop materials were submitted to DWR and are available online at <http://centerforoceansolutions.com/preparingforthefuture>.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

TASK 3. Increase Outreach to DACs: The Greater Monterey County RWMG made a concerted effort to ensure that the water resource management needs and interests of disadvantaged communities (DACs) are fully considered and addressed in the IRWM Plan. Three organizations – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW), San Jerardo Cooperative Inc., and Rural Community Assistance Corporation – were asked to participate on the RWMG specifically to represent DAC interests. The subtasks listed below were led by the EJCW in partnership with California Rural Legal Assistance Inc. (CRLA). We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 3a. Develop a DAC Map of the Greater Monterey County Region: This was completed, the deliverable submitted, and is posted on the website.

Subtask 3a. Develop a DAC Outreach Plan: This was completed, the deliverable submitted, and is posted on the website.

Subtask 3b. Conduct Outreach Activities: EJCW/CRLA outreach activities were primarily focused on increased awareness of the IRWMP project solicitation and identification of DAC water resource projects

for inclusion in the IRWM Plan. Project staff utilized the DAC and Tribal Needs Assessment’s list of critical drinking water and wastewater projects to identify communities for targeted outreach and also collaborated with the Monterey County Health Department to identify additional communities. Because Project Staff already had a relationship with several of these communities, Staff used a variety of different outreach methods to inform them about the IRWM program and project solicitation which included direct phone calls, in-person meetings with governing bodies and stakeholders, and also community meetings with residents. EJCW conducted numerous meetings and provided direct assistance to a minimum of eight different DAC communities. They met with more than 30 elected officials and agency representatives to discuss and support DAC community needs. They were extremely successful in their mission and the work continues.

Subtask 3c: Integrate DAC and Tribes into the Greater Monterey County IRWM Planning Process: EJCW and CRLA reached out to DACs and tribes potentially interested in participating in the GMC IRWM planning process. Specifically, the communities of San Lucas and Springfield Terrace demonstrated an increased capacity to engage in water management planning processes. Additionally, EJCW and CRLA worked to deepen a relationship with members of the Esselen Nation, a Native California Indian tribe, who expressed an interest in participating in the RWMG. In the first contract amendment we revised the deliverable for this subtask in order to clarify that we were not “required” to include Native American representation on the RWMG, which was implied (though not intended as such) in the Planning Grant deliverable (“Participation of key DAC and Tribal representatives in the IRWMP process and governance structure (RWMG)”). We continued dialog with the Esselen Nation and requested a presentation at a RWMG meeting, which they conducted. The RWMG encouraged active participation in the IRWM planning process by the Esselen Nation but there was never a true commitment or identified need to include them in the governance structure. EJCW put members of the Esselen Nation in contact with a California Indian tribal IRWM working group, sponsored and coordinated by the California Indian Environmental Alliance, which operates as a support group and think tank for California Indian tribes that are involved in various IRWM regions around the State of California.

Subtask 3d: Community Assistance for project preparation: EJCW and CRLA worked with DAC communities and Nilsen and Associates to develop technologically feasible and fundable DAC projects for submission in the IRWM plan. They worked with the Springfield Terrace community, Iverson & Jacks Labor Camp, Alpine Court, San Vicente, San Lucas, and San Jerardo communities to develop feasible projects.

Subtask 3e: Technical Assistance for Project Preparation –Nilsen and Associates provided technical assistance to project partners to develop DAC projects that were submitted for inclusion in the IRWM plan. Technical assessment and feasibility analysis were completed for:

- Springfield Terrace
- Alpine Court Well and Wastewater System Replacement
- San Vicente Court Well Replacement and Septic System Repair/Replacement
- San Jerardo Wastewater Recycling and Stormwater Diversion

Each of these projects was submitted during the GMCIRWM project solicitations. Two DAC projects, Castroville CSD Well 2b Treatment Project and San Jerardo Wastewater Project, were funded in the Round 1 Implementation grant and are currently being constructed.

TASK 4: Stakeholder Outreach: Public Workshops: Through matching funds from the Big Sur Land Trust, two public workshops were conducted in September 2009 in two different locations (Big Sur and the City of Soledad in the Salinas Valley) to introduce the IRWM process to stakeholders and to obtain stakeholder input regarding water-related “issues and conflicts” in various parts of the region. A second set of workshops was held in March 2010 in three different locations (Big Sur, King City, and Salinas) to solicit projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan.

With funding from the planning grant, the RWMG hosted two public workshops on August 30th and 31st, 2011 in King City and Salinas, respectively, for a second project solicitation public workshop. The workshops were designed to provide an overview of the Greater Monterey County IRWM planning effort (purpose, goals and process), a walk-through of the project solicitation process and forms, and group

discussion regarding project ideas, additional questions, and opportunities for project collaboration and integration. We announced the workshops through email to a large list of stakeholders, website posting, and press releases to the *Salinas Californian*, *Monterey Herald*, and *King City Rustler*. Although we announced the workshop in English and Spanish and announced the availability of translation services at the King City workshop, no attendees requested Spanish translation services at either workshop.

The second and final round of public workshops for the Greater Monterey County IRWMP effort, funded by the Planning Grant, were held on July 10 and July 11, 2012 in Salinas and King City. The public workshops promoted the 8-week public review period for the draft Greater Monterey County IRWMP and solicitation of new projects to be included in the plan. The workshops were announced through emails targeted to stakeholders in the region, website postings, and local newspapers. In the first workshop, Paul Robins of the RCD of Monterey County prepared and walked participants through a Powerpoint® presentation that outlined the contents of the draft IRWM Plan, pointing out the areas that had already been subject to public review and highlighting those that would most benefit from additional commentary. Participants also received guidance on how to submit comments and the timeline for submission. The second workshop was held at the public library in King City. Paul Robins conducted the presentation, and some discussion followed focusing on the needs of disadvantaged communities.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

TASK 5: Stakeholder Outreach: Website Development: Very minor changes were requested in the first contract amendment for this task. In subtask 5c, we removed the requirement for “user forms” since the online CCAT tool incorporated them.

Subtask 5a: Website Development: The Central Coast Wetlands Group was responsible for creating the website. They did so with input from the Program Coordinator and the RWMG. The website was officially launched in the last quarter of 2012. It has been continuously improved and updated since. It meets all criteria described in Exhibit A. The URL is www.greatermontereyirwmp.org

Subtask 5b: Data Management Integration: The Central Coast Action Tracker (CCAT) online version was created by GreenInfo and incorporated into the GMCIRWM website under the Performance tab of the GMCIRWM website <http://www.greatermontereyirwmp.org/performance/>. Also incorporated into this online integrated data management system is CalEEMod, a statewide land use emissions computer model to track greenhouse gas emissions, and the statewide Wetland Tracker. This website is intended to be a source of information on all IRWM efforts and projects. It includes interactive maps, types of projects and ultimately results/outcomes of the projects. It meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 5c: Database Development: The GMCIRWM website, under the Performance tab, includes links to other statewide sites that include protocols for the groundwater monitoring (GAMA), surface water monitoring (SWAMP), water quality data upload (CEDEN), wetland restoration (Wetland Tracker) and greenhouse gas emissions tracking (CalEEMod). The CCAT is the database that was developed to track all aspects of both IRWM projects and other conservation efforts occurring within the watersheds. The CCAT was created to store information needed for data reporting and has a reporting function that is easily manipulated to include graphs, tables, pictures, maps and narrative. The CCAT includes the ability for custom-built queries. The website meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 5d: Maximize Usability and Accessibility: The website was reviewed by the RWMG, IRWM stakeholders, and the Program Manager to ensure it is accessible and information is easy to locate. The website has been added to and improved upon throughout the planning grant contract period. We worked with the organizations supporting DAC efforts to ensure it was bilingual and informative. Priority pages were translated into Spanish and contact information was included for Spanish speaking staff at Environmental Justice Coalition for Water. The website meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

TASK 6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) Analysis: This task was revised significantly in our first contract amendment. The original workplan described creation of a GHG emissions tool and tracking system that would be available on the GMCIRWM website. While the outcomes remained the same, in the first amendment we requested to use an existing GHG tracking tool called California Emissions Estimator

Model (CalEEMod) and have a contractor develop an instruction document for its use by IRWM project proponents.

Subtask 6a: Develop GHG Emissions Analysis Tool: An instruction document was created for the CalEEMod tool. It was submitted as a deliverable and is available for download on the GMCIRWM website. This subtask was successfully completed and meets the criteria described in Exhibit A of Amendment 1.

Subtask 6b: Develop GHG Emissions Tracking System: The GHG tracking system was incorporated into the CCAT. The project proponent will complete the CalEEMod and put the results into the CCAT for each project. As projects are implemented over time, the tracking system will analyze emissions on a regional scale. This subtask was successfully completed and meets the criteria described in Exhibit A of Amendment 1.

TASK 7: Data Management A very minor change was requested in the first contract amendment for this task. In subtask 7d, we changed the reference to properly reflect that the tracking and reporting system developed in Subtask 7b (not Subtask 7c) be integrated with the website.

Subtask 7a: Assessment of Monitoring Programs and Gaps: A document titled “Greater Monterey County IRWM Assessment of Water Quality Monitoring Programs and Data Gaps” was completed. It meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 7b: Tracking and Reporting System: We worked with many partners from diverse backgrounds, i.e., agriculture, NGOs, cities, resource managers, etc., to develop a database to capture the necessary fields for adequate reporting of water projects and restoration efforts within the region. This database was then integrated with the website in the form of the Central Coast Action Tracker. It is capable of tracking all IRWM projects as well as creating interactive reports based on the reporting needs. It meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 7c: Develop a Regional Monitoring Program: A document titled “Greater Monterey County IRWM Conceptual Regional Monitoring Program” was completed. It meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 7d: Coordinate Data Management System with Website: All aspects of Task 7 have been integrated into the website, mostly through the CCAT. That system is capable of tracking and reporting on the IRWM efforts that have been initiated. Project proponents, grant funders, resource managers, and the general public can easily access the results of IRWM projects on the GMCIRWM website. It meets all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 7e: Provide Training and Data Management Services: Staff from the Moss Landing Hub of CEDEN (the Regional Data Center (RDC)), provided two trainings for project proponents and RWMG members that collect water quality data and would have a need to upload data to CEDEN. MBSF staff successfully uploaded water quality data to the statewide database, RDC/CEDEN. They uploaded over 260 monitoring stations and over 1,500 instruments with associated meta-data to the site. Over 5,000 rows of water quality data were successfully uploaded to the statewide database. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

TASK 8: Water Project Reconciliation (also called Water Resource Project Coordination (WRPC))

Subtask 8c – 8e were included in the first contract amendment because we didn’t have all of the details when the initial workplan was developed. It took time to hire a facilitator and begin engaging the participants to determine the best path forward to accomplish our goals. A second contract amendment was needed at the end of the project because of miscommunications with DWR and unclear deliverable documentation. Subtask 8d required the second amendment because we were unable to produce two of the deliverables.

Subtask 8a: WRPC Groundwork: A pilot project to test the WRPC process in one sub-watershed area of the Greater Monterey County IRWM region – the Gabilan Watershed – was initiated in early 2011, and involved numerous stakeholders representing agricultural interests, environmental groups, government

agencies, academic institutions, and interested citizens. A subcommittee of the RWMG identified the Lower Gabilan watershed as an appropriate location to conduct the pilot of the WRPC process, based on the number of projects submitted for inclusion in the IRWM Plan. A workplan was developed and a scope of work for a facilitator was completed. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 8b: Identify and Invite Representative Stakeholders to Participate in WPR Process: Over 40 stakeholders, 10 Technical Advisors, and 10 elected officials received regular emails and updates on the WRPC process. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A.

Subtask 8c: Conduct WPR meetings: Many planning meetings and sub-committee meetings occurred throughout the process and to finalize the four sections of the Blueprint. This subtask was included in the first amendment to the contract. The number of “large” stakeholder facilitated meetings was determined to be four, and are listed below. All agendas, announcements, meeting minutes and summary outcomes were submitted as deliverables. We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendment 1.

- The first stakeholder meeting was held on Jan. 30, 2012
- The second facilitated meeting was held on Jan. 30, 2013
- The third facilitated stakeholder meeting was held on June 4, 2013
- The last large stakeholder meeting occurred on May 28, 2014

Subtask 8d: Information Gathering: In May 2012, the facilitator for the Gabilan Watershed WRPC pilot project began interviewing key stakeholders individually to get a comprehensive perspective on the various issues in the watershed. Some of their observations included the following:

- *Ag Waiver:* The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements For Discharges From Irrigated Lands (known as the “Ag Waiver”) and related legal actions was identified as contributing to increasing the challenge for solution-seeking collaboration between people and organizations in this region. This polarized climate seemed to have fundamentally shifted the local collaborative environment.
- *Outcomes of the “Spinach Scare”:* In 2006, an outbreak of E. coli from contaminated spinach originating in the area resulted in significant public relation, legal, and regulatory impacts that have affected growers’ efforts to implement water quality protection management measures.
- *Existing Local Collaborations:* The richness and diversity of existing and emerging collaborative projects was considered impressive and hopeful.

Based on the outcomes of the January 2013 stakeholder meeting, the WRPC Committee determined that the challenges to “making progress” in the Gabilan Watershed had less to do with a lack of information and more to do with funding constraints and other barriers. The challenges spanned such a large range of topics that the Committee felt a comprehensive “umbrella” was needed, which they termed the “Gabilan Watershed Blueprint.” The Gabilan Watershed Blueprint was envisioned as a process to address some of the major hurdles that have slowed and prevented progress in resolving problems related to water quality, and to a lesser extent flooding, in the Gabilan Watershed. Stakeholders were brought in to help design the outline of the Blueprint, and a third stakeholder meeting was held in June 2013 (attended by about 30 individuals) to recruit Blueprint “working groups.”

The Gabilan Watershed Blueprint has four main “sections,” designed to address some of the regional challenges and opportunities expressed during the January 2013 stakeholder meeting. The four Blueprint sections are 1) The Landscape Strategy, 2) On-Farm Solutions, 3) Corporate Social Responsibility, and 4) Agency Coordination. The final Blueprint document can be downloaded as a complete document or by each section on the GMCIRWM webpage.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendments 1 and 2.

Subtask 8e: Evaluation: The Program Coordinator was responsible for the evaluation of the WRPC process. She incorporated feedback from the stakeholders, subcommittees, and RWMG. She completed the process description and evaluation of the WRPC process for the IRWM Plan. The process and outcomes are described in detail in Section I - Integration of the Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan and on the website. The RWMG meeting occurred on June 18, 2014 in which

the group had an internal discussion of the outcomes of the process, lessons learned, and approval of the final WRPC description to be included in the IRWM plan.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendment 1.

TASK 9: Economic Feasibility Analysis: This task was significantly revised in the first contract amendment.

Subtask 9a: Preparation: The Program Coordinator, with assistance from the CCWG Coordinator, created a database of potential project benefits (including both quantifiable and non-quantifiable benefits), which the economist used as a basis for developing an economic analysis tool. They also created three implementation project “examples” – representing types of projects typically included in the IRWM Plan (e.g., water quality, restoration, and water supply projects) – for the economist to do a “test run” cost-benefit analysis, in order to help the economist understand the type of data needs a project proponent will have in conducting economic analyses.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendment 1.

Subtask 9b: Develop Draft Templates for Project Proponents: ECONorthwest was hired to design and create the templates. They worked with the Program Coordinator and members of the RWMG to ensure the necessary types of information were captured. They took the feedback from the RWMG members and created draft templates.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendment 1.

Subtask 9c: Pre-test Draft Templates: Draft templates were provided on February 13, 2014, to a subcommittee of the RWMG. The draft templates were tested on potential IRWM projects and feedback provided to ECONorthwest.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendment 1.

Subtask 9d: Produce Final Templates: ECONorthwest incorporated the comments into the tool. Draft final templates were submitted on March 4, 2014. ECONorthwest representative gave a presentation of the final product to the RWMG at the March 19th meeting. The final templates were produced and submitted.

We met all criteria described in Exhibit A - Amendment 1.

3. Discussion of Tasks that involve DACs or NA Tribes

Task 3 was completely focused on DAC activities. We hired Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) in partnership with CA Rural Legal Assistance Inc. (CRLA) to take the lead on all activities that involved DACs. We also had a representative from the San Jerardo Cooperative that was on the RWMG and attended all meetings. The Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC) also joined the RWMG and attended the majority of the meetings. In addition to participating on the RWMG and implementing deliverables in the planning grant, DACs were also represented in other GMCIRWM activities. They include:

- Spanish translation of the GMCIRWM website
- Spanish translation at GMCIRWM public meetings
- Spanish translation of project solicitation documents
- Field trip to San Jerardo for RWMG members to better understand the situation DACs are facing
- Support for Assembly Bills 1 and 1630 with ultimate award of \$500,000 to the GMCIRWM for developing an integrated drinking water and wastewater treatment program plan for DACs in the Salinas Valley (focusing on nitrate contamination in drinking water).

4. Discussion of Major Problems that Occurred

The biggest hurdle we had in this contract was time. Everything always takes longer than anticipated. We regularly missed deadlines detailed in the contract schedule. We tried our best to meet the deadlines and described delays in the quarterly reports if we were behind schedule. The largest delays occurred with Tasks 6, 8 and 9. Each of these tasks required a contract amendment to the original work plan. We requested the first amendment on June 19, 2013 and received approval on October 30, 2013 after multiple iterations of the revised work plan. Once approved, Tasks 6 and 9 were initiated immediately and completed without any problems. Task 8 (WRPC), required a lot to regain the momentum with stakeholders and get all the sub-contracts in place. This problem was brought up multiple times in the stakeholder meetings and in the debrief by the RWMG. In the end, we completed the deliverables, but if given more time, we would have been more strategic in our efforts and had the time to ensure the products met the needs of the region.

5. Detailed Description and Analysis of Project Results

Overall, this contract went really well and we accomplished all we set out to do. We had tremendous cooperation from the RWMG and all partners involved in carrying out these tasks and deliverables. In total 14 different organizations were sub-contracted and responsible for the successful outcomes of this contract.

The planning grant work plan was designed first and foremost to develop an IRWM plan for the Greater Monterey County region, which we did. This was a tremendous effort that was led by our Program Coordinator with the help of numerous sub-committees of the RWMG. The plan was reviewed by DWR¹ and determined to be consistent with the IRWM Planning Act and related IRWM Plan Standards contained in the 2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines.

The Planning Grant was also intended to develop tools for the region to help with implementation projects far into the future; which it did. Those tools included a DAC outreach plan, comprehensive website (www.ccactiontracker.org) to track projects and outcomes as well as greenhouse gas emissions and water quality conditions. We also developed a preliminary economic analysis tool to help project proponents of any IRWM projects determine the general benefits; including quantified, non-quantified, and monetized benefits. This type of information is required by DWR for any grant application. Each of these projects is described in more detail in Section 2 above.

Second to development of the IRWM plan, the next largest effort was to help regional partners collaborate and better integrate projects as part of the Water Resource Project Coordination (WRPC) effort. The WRPC process, based on a collaborative fact-finding process, represented a new approach to conflict-resolution in the region. The goal of the WRPC effort was to alleviate areas of mistrust and confusion and increase collaborative dialogue so that mutual solutions could be achieved. A pilot project to test the WRPC process in one sub-watershed area of the Greater Monterey County IRWM region – the Gabilan Watershed – was initiated in early 2011, and involved numerous stakeholders representing agricultural interests, environmental groups, government agencies, academic institutions, and interested citizens. The pilot project ended in mid-2014. The Gabilan Watershed Blueprint is the result of this pilot project, and is included as Appendix L in the GMCIRWM Plan and is available on the GMCIRWM website for download. The Gabilan Watershed Blueprint was intended to address some of the major hurdles that have slowed and prevented progress in resolving problems related to water quality and flooding in the Gabilan Watershed, and includes four sections including: 1) The Landscape Strategy, a graphic visualization process toward achieving desired outcomes in the watershed; 2) On-Farms Solutions, which offers tools for growers regarding in-season nitrate sampling of soils; 3) Corporate Social Responsibility, an effort to initiate discussion amongst agricultural leaders on the Central Coast regarding conservation initiatives; and 4) Agency Coordination, an attempt at removing some of the confusion associated with the regulatory and permitting process for implementing water-related projects in the region. The WRPC pilot project, through support of planning grant funds, was deemed a great success, and the RWMG will consider using the WRPC process, if needed, to help address and resolve water-related conflicts in other areas of the region, while promoting stakeholder collaboration and project integration.

6. Summary of Costs Incurred

We successfully stayed within budget of the planning grant contract. We requested two amendments to the contract and the budget was revised with each amendment. In amendment 1, Exhibit C, the following changes were made:

- a. \$10,000 was moved from Task 7 to Task 1

- b. \$1,910 was moved from Task 4 to Task 2
- c. \$10,000 was moved from Task 8 to Task 2

In amendment 2, Exhibit C, the following change was made:

- a. \$2,000 was removed from Task 8 (\$140,000 to \$138,000)

The final budget totals are in the table below.

Greater Monterey IRWM Planning Grant					
Budget Category	Funding Match	Requested Grant Funding	Dedicated DAC funding	Total Spent not including match	Amount Remaining
Task 1 - Direct Project Administration	\$ -	\$ 47,000.00		\$ 46,996.54	\$ 3.45
Task 2 - IRWM Plan Coordination and Development	\$ 312,700.00	\$ 184,510.00		\$ 184,481.67	\$ 28.33
Task 3 - Increase Outreach to DACs	\$ 43,700.00	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 159,997.54	\$ 2.50
Task 4 - Stakeholder Outreach: Public Workshops	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 8,090.00		\$ 8,090.00	\$ -
Task 5 - Stakeholder Outreach: Website Development	\$ -	\$ 85,000.00		\$ 84,969.46	\$ 30.87
Task 6 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00		\$ 9,999.82	\$ 0.18
Task 7 - Data Management	\$ 22,000.00	\$ 70,664.00		\$ 70,641.70	\$ 22.30
Task 8 - Water Project Reconciliation	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 138,000.00		\$ 137,985.74	\$ 11.25
Task 9 - Economic Feasibility Analysis	\$ -	\$ 50,000.00		\$ 49,968.15	\$ 31.85
GRANT TOTALS :	\$ 389,900.00	\$ 753,264.00	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 753,130.62	\$ 130.73

ⁱ DWR letter dated May 22, 2014