

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Regional Water Management Group Meeting  
April 21, 2010  
1:00-3:00 pm  
Moss Landing Marine Laboratories Seminar Room**

**Attendees:**

Sierra Ryan  
Kevin O'Connor  
Donna Meyers  
Michael Ricker  
Dana Jacobson  
Brad Hagemann  
Bridget Hoover  
Bill Phillips  
Ken Ekelund  
Gary Rogers  
Robert Johnson  
Horacio Amezquita  
Elizabeth Krafft  
Bryan Largay  
Amy Vanderwarker  
Paul Robins  
Susan Robinson – non-RWVG member – Plan Coordinator  
Greg Pepping – non-RWVG member, Coastal Watershed Council

**Meeting Minutes:**

**Agenda Item #1: Project Ranking**

Susan walked everyone through the latest project ranking system, as proposed by the Project Ranking Subcommittee.

Bryan raised a concern: Will the Ranking #1 (i.e., ranking according to the number of objectives addressed, and the extent to which those objectives are addressed) encourage project proponents to collaborate with other partners or add on additional features *just* to score more points? Susan pointed out that that, in fact, is an objective of IRWM planning (collaboration, multiple objectives...). But when does this become unreasonable? Is it acceptable or desirable for project proponents to “glom projects together” just to score additional points? Donna noted that the role of the Integration Committee will be in part to ensure that projects are combined in a way that “makes sense” (i.e., not in an unreasonable way).

Ken raised a concern with the overall IRWM Program, that projects in smaller watersheds (e.g., in Big Sur coastal watersheds) won't get funding because they are not “regional” enough. There was general agreement of concern that smaller projects will likely fall through the cracks in the

IRWM Program. In regards to regionalism per se, Susan pointed out that “regionalism” receives only 5 points in the project ranking scoring system out of a possible 100, which is not much.

The RWMG will review the latest project ranking system and get back to Susan with comments in advance of the next RWMG meeting, with the goal of having a final project ranking system to vote on at the next RWMG meeting.

## **Agenda #2: Project Committees**

Susan noted that Project Committees will need to begin their work the first or second week of June (after all of the project applications are in), so RWMG members who will be participating on the Project Committees should begin forming those committees now. Susan will send Guidance to the RWMG members and the most recent Project Committee expert list. The RWMG members on each of the Project Committees will discuss how they will call the potential members of the committee to solicit their involvement and explain what is needed from them.

## **Agenda Item #3: Comment Letter to DWR on Draft Prop 84 Guidelines and PSPs**

The RWMG discussed the draft comment letter to DWR. Ken emphasized that land use planning is a real problem in Monterey County; he doesn’t know how we can meet that requirement. Bill noted that the relationship between water management planning and land use planning is a statewide problem. From the Roundtable of Regions meeting on April 15, he thinks perhaps DWR realizes this, and that the IRWMP requirements will basically ask for a description of what exists now and how communication can be improved.

Gary Rogers raised some concern over the comment about the points awarded for water supply projects. He felt the language was a little too strong... Others supported the comments as written.

The RWMG approved sending the comment letter, with only minor changes (specifically, requesting 10%, or max of 25%, funding match for Planning Grants, and no match for DACs).

## **Agenda Item #4: Project Eligibility for Round 1 IRWM Grant Solicitation**

Given that the Greater Monterey County IRWMP will not be completed and approved before the Round 1 IRWM grant solicitation (which will probably begin in early July), the question was raised whether the Region would be eligible to apply for implementation grants in Round 1 based on the Salinas Valley FEP “Primary Project List.” And if the projects included on that list are in fact eligible, is it fair to the other project proponents who are currently submitting projects for inclusion in the new plan, but whose projects don’t happen to fall within the “Primary Project List”? Another issue is that the projects on the Primary Project List have not gone through a project ranking process.

Bryan noted that if we have projects we know we will eventually want to find funding for, we should fund them now if we can. That will make more money available in the future for other projects in our Region. Ken agreed (“you snooze, you lose”). To address the issue that the

projects on the Primary Project List haven't been ranked, Bridget suggested that we put those projects through our new project ranking system. There was general acceptance of that idea. Ken pointed out that this would serve to tie in the FEP with the new Plan.

The question was raised whether the Central Coast Funding Area regions have a strategy for getting IRWM funds. Susan and Bill noted (based on the most recent Central Coast IRWM Region meeting) that there is no strategy for "splitting" funds (at least not yet); however, the regions have agreed to share their project lists when they have them, and to try to provide as much match as possible (so as to make more money available for IRWM Implementation funds within the Funding Area).

The RWMG agreed that we should apply for a Planning Grant to continue developing the IRWMP (including funds for increased DAC outreach and the development of additional IRWMP sections, such as Data Management and Monitoring, Salt and Nutrient Management, and Integrated Flood Management). The RWMG also supported the idea of the Central Coast Funding Area applying for an inter-regional Planning Grant to evaluate the impacts of Climate Change on the Central Coast region. No one had a problem with submitting projects for Implementation funding in the first round, if we can ascertain that the projects from the FEP would indeed be eligible. Susan will set up a meeting with DWR to check on that.

#### **Agenda Item #5: The Applicant**

The RWMG began the discussion of who the "Applicant" should be in applying for IRWM grants. The Applicant will not only apply for IRWM grants on behalf of the Greater Monterey County region, but will also be the grant administrator (i.e., responsible for supervising all of the projects in the proposal). It is unclear from the Guidelines whether the Applicant can be reimbursed for costs associated with applying for IRWM funds; however, there are various options for supporting grant administration once the grant is awarded. During the Roundtable of Regions, most Regions said they took between 2% - 6% of project costs for grant administration. Some Regions, such as Northern Santa Cruz, have set up separate non-profit organizations to deal with IRWMP grant application and grant administration functions. Susan will investigate some of these options and bring that information to the next RWMG meeting for continued discussion. In the meantime, RWMG members were asked to consider whether their organization would be able and/or willing to serve as the Applicant for any future IRWM grant proposals.

**Next month's meeting is May 19th from 1:00 – 3:00 PM at the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary office.**