

Greater Monterey County IRWMP

1-20-10 Regional Water Management Group Meeting Minutes

Monterey County Water Resources Agency Board Meeting Room

Participants: Donna Meyers, Bridget Hoover, Elizabeth Krafft, Horacio Amezcuita, Ken Ekelund, Gary Rogers, Butch Kronlund, Michael Ricker, Bill Phillips, Rob Johnson, Dana Jacobson, Dawn Mathes, Mike Jones, Kevin O'Connor

On phone: Michelle Dooley, Brad Hageman, Amy Vanderwarker, Susan Robinson

Miscellaneous Business:

- Elizabeth indicated that the MCWRA conference room is not available for the May meeting. That meeting will instead be held at the MBNMS conference room. This change will be posted on the web site.
- Bill gave a report on the status of the MOU with the MCWRA. **There will be a special board meeting held on Monday Jan. 25th at 3:00 pm at MCWRA to make a decision whether to sign the MOU or not. All RWMG members are encouraged to attend.**
- This led to a discussion regarding the meeting held on Tuesday evening with the Salinas Valley Water Coalition and the Monterey County Farm Bureau. Bridget reported that the outcome of the meeting was three conditions they requested of the RWMG. The RWMG discussed these requested actions and thus delayed approval of RWMG Agenda Items #1 and #6 until the February meeting of the RWMG.

The following items were requested by the Farm Bureau and Salinas Valley Water Coalition and discussion held by the RWMG:

1. If the RWMG governance structure cannot currently be changed, a commitment to consider review during the next regional acceptance process (RAP) required by DWR.

The RWMG agreed that when the DWR requires an updated regional acceptance process (or whatever they choose to call it) in the future, we will review the membership of the RWMG and its governance structure. There was no opposition to this by the RWMG members in attendance and on the phone; we all felt that the membership of the RWMG would need to be considered based on continued participation and interest of each organization.

2. Given that the public comment period for Goals and Objectives officially ended on December 23, 2009, and the SVWC and FB both opted not to comment during the public comment period, they now request additional time (until January 29, 2010) to submit their comments on the Goals and Objectives.

The Group decided to postpone the voting on the Goals and Objective to allow time for their comments. Those comments must be received by January 29th for consideration by the Group. **Voting on the final Goals and Objectives will take place at the February RWMG meeting.**

****Discussion:**

Susan did prepare responses on behalf of the Goals and Objectives Subcommittee to the comments received from Monterey CoastKeepers and NMFS. Those responses will be

distributed to RWMG for the February meeting along with comments from FB and the RWMG.

Susan, out of respect to the hard work from the G&O subcommittee and the fact that all other stakeholders were held to the December 23, 2009 deadline for public comments, felt that we shouldn't grant the extension. She also felt that extending the deadline wouldn't set a good precedent.

Amy commented that if the extension is granted, the SVWC and FB may assume that we'll accept and make changes to the G&Os. We should be clear that all comments will be considered but there is no obligation to incorporate them, just as there has been no obligation to incorporate comments from other stakeholders. It was agreed by the Group that the subcommittee will review, take appropriate action and bring a final version to the RWMG at the February meeting.

Bridget thought we should consider allowing the extension. She reasoned that it wouldn't delay our process and is a good faith effort to work with the organizations. If we allow the extension this time, we need to be clear that we will not waiver on future deadlines. After much discussion, the RWMG decided to grant the extension.

3. Revise the bylaws regarding voting protocols. Rather than a simple majority of a quorum of the RWMG (present or on phone) they requested a simple majority of the entire RWMG, present or not.

The Group discussed this issue at length and concluded that, in recognition of the Salinas Valley Water Coalition's concern that voting could potentially occur without any "public agencies" being present, the language should be changed in the bylaws such that in order for voting to occur, at least two local agencies with statutory authority over water supply or water management must be present (this language derives from the definition of a "Regional Water Management Group" for Integrated Regional Water Management Plans in Senate Bill No. 1). **Voting on the revised bylaws (emailed by Susan on 1/21/10) will take place at the February meeting.**

****Discussion:**

Donna noted that each RWMG member is responsible to work within their organization to provide updates as necessary for appropriate decision making and transfer of information. She asked Elizabeth to work within MCWRA to determine their internal needs.

Ken commented that MCWRA will need 45 days for decisions brought to their board of directors.

Bridget will contact Traci and inform her of the Group's decisions. She will type up the response for the MCWRA board of directors meeting on Monday.

Public Workshops have been postponed until late February (they were originally scheduled for mid-January). The decision to postpone the workshops was due to SVWC's objections to MCWRA signing the MOU, and the ensuing disruption to the IRWMP development process. Paul Robins is currently working out logistics for the public workshops.

Project Ranking: The Project Ranking Subcommittee has moved forward with the project ranking system, with ranking being based on three categories – objectives (50%), integration (25%) and IRWMP programmatic objectives (25%). The focus this month was on the ranking criteria for the objectives section. There was some concern raised within the subcommittee that a project wouldn't be ranked high enough if it was a really good project but only addressed one water issue, so the subcommittee decided to rank like projects against each other. This would allow each Project Committee (i.e., the Water Supply, Water Quality, Flood Management, or Natural Resources Project Committee) to rank projects just within its water resource area and then each project would also be ranked against all other projects in the IRWMP. So essentially there will be two ranking scores in the IRWMP. This will hopefully place less emphasis on the placement of where the project is ranked overall. In other words, a project ranked number 7 overall might be proposed for funding over a project ranked 2, if the funding source has certain criteria that better match the project ranked number 7.

Dawn expressed a concern that if a project did a really good job at meeting one objective, it wouldn't be scored very well overall or within its own water resource Project Committee. Susan noted that Bryan Largay had expressed a similar concern in an email to her. The case could occur, for example, that an exceptionally strong project that solved a major regional problem and addressed one objective fully might get ranked lower than a less beneficial project that addressed several objectives, but addressed those objectives only partially.

The Group wasn't sure how to deal with this issue. We talked about providing each Project Committee some flexibility in ranking these projects. Susan also mentioned the concept of allocating partial and full points to a project according to *how well* it addressed each objective; for example, a project would get a half point for addressing an objective partially and a full point for addressing an objective fully (or increments thereof).

Someone noted that disadvantaged communities and climate change are topics that will be particularly competitive for State grant funds; how can we ensure that projects that address these things will be given extra emphasis (when there is no "DAC" or "Climate Change" Project Committee per se)? The Project Committees will be given instructions to ensure they consider these topics in each project. Also, Susan pointed out that projects that address these issues will be given extra points through the project ranking system, since both "DAC" and "Climate Change" are two goal categories with many objectives associated with them, and are also preferences of the State and of the IRWM Program (so extra points will be allocated for those reasons, too).

The Group decided to post the Draft Project Ranking System "as is" on the website and open it up for a 30-day public review and comment period. Bill mentioned to Susan to be sure to ask stakeholders for "positive, constructive" input – positive solutions to these tricky issues.

The Group also discussed the fact that the Prop 84 guidelines are not out yet and the proposal application form may need to be changed due to future requirements. Susan feels confident that, based on the Prop 84 legislative text and Senate Bill No. 1, we pretty much on track and we shouldn't have too many surprises. The Group decided to move forward with what we have and make changes later, if need be, to a project application form that could be posted on the website for stakeholders to download.

The next meeting will be held February 17th in Monterey at MBNMS conference room, at 1:00 PM. Meeting adjourned 3:05 PM.