

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Regional Water Management Group Meeting
August 18, 2010
1:00-3:00 pm
at the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Salinas**

Attendees:

Ken Ekelund	Rob Johnson
Dipti Bhatnagar	Dana Jacobson
Horacio Amezcuita	Gary Rogers
Elizabeth Krafft	Kevin O'Connor
Bridget Hoover	Dawn Mathes
Donna Meyers	Eric Tynan
David Hart (MCWRA Board of Directors)	
Mike Sandecki (Coastal Commission)	

Non-RWMG members:

Susan Robinson — IRWMP Project Coordinator

Meeting Minutes:

1. Continued financial support for IRWMP Project Coordinator

Donna explained the need for funds to continue support for the IRWMP Project Coordinator (Susan). The private funds that have thus far supported development of the IRWMP, including Susan's time since January 2009 and two sets of public workshops, will last only through September or October. We expected to complete the IRWMP with those private funds. However, several factors—including the RAP, unanticipated delays in the planning process itself, and the release of the new Prop 84 Guidelines, which introduced some significantly different requirements for the IRWMP from the Prop 50 model—have delayed completion of the Plan.

We are hoping to receive Planning Grant funds to continue development of the Plan, and those funds should be available in February or March 2011; but the Plan has great momentum now, we are moving in a positive direction, and there is much work that needs to be done between now and when the Planning Grant funds become available. For clarity, the work still to be done on the IRWMP was explained as a two-step process: Step 1 is to finish the work that Susan expected to complete with private funding, based generally on the Prop 50 model; this is what Donna is requesting funds for now from the RWMG members. Step 2 is to add the extra sections that have been required by Prop 84, including, for example, analysis of climate change impacts on our region, additional outreach to disadvantaged communities, economic feasibility analysis, and a stepped-up effort on data management and plan performance. Bridget suggested that we don't rely completely on getting Planning Grant funds, that we raise enough money to cover finishing the Plan regardless.

Discussion ensued regarding which organizations and agencies on the RWMG may or may not be able to contribute funds at this time. Donna offered the Big Sur Land Trust to act as a middleman, in order to avoid Susan having separate Professional Services agreements with several different agencies. Some members noted that they were willing to request funds for this purpose, but it may take some time to get approvals and agreements in place. Organizations that have committed some amount of funding include Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation, Elkhorn Slough National Estuary Research Reserve, and Big Sur Land Trust. Others looking into it include Monterey

County Water Resources Agency, Monterey County Ag Commissioners Office, Marina Coast Water District, and San Jerardo Cooperative. Donna and Bridget will be contacting those members not present at the meeting to determine whether they would be able to contribute.

2. Brief overview of the July 23rd Central Coast IRWM "face-to-face" meeting

Donna gave a brief overview of the Central Coast IRWM Regions "face-to-face" meeting that was held at MCWRA in Salinas on July 23, 2010. The regions decided not to go forward with inter-regional projects as previously proposed, including climate change analysis for the entire Central Coast and economic analysis of projects. Donna noted that a conference call meeting which took place between the Central Coast IRWM regions earlier that day (August 18th) has changed some of the outcomes of the July 23rd meeting regarding a Central Coast funding strategy for IRWM grant funds. The discussion then turned to the Central Coast regions meeting which took place earlier that day.

During that meeting, Bridget queried, as a starting point for discussion, whether the regions would be amenable to *evenly dividing* the entire \$52 million pot of IRWM grant funds that have been allocated to the Central Coast funding area. If we were to decide amongst ourselves how much each region would ultimately receive from the IRWM grant fund allocation (rather than letting DWR decide during each solicitation), we could perhaps be more strategic in our planning and our timing of projects. Susan added that Jerry Snow of DWR just informed us that approximately 8.5% of the \$52 million will be taken to pay for DWR administration and bond interest, leaving \$47.58 million in grant funds for the Central Coast funding area. The representatives of the Central Coast meetings agreed to ask each of their respective RWMGs whether they would consider evenly splitting the whole pot of funds. The "funding strategy," then, would be a two-step process: 1) decide how to allocate the funds (i.e., should we split it up evenly? Should some regions get more, based on previous Prop 50 agreements? Or should we not decide ourselves how to allocate the funds, but just compete in each solicitation and let DWR decide?); 2) if we do decide how to allocate the funds amongst ourselves, then we'd need to determine the timing – i.e., which regions would apply in earlier rounds, which regions would apply later, and for how much in each round.

Ken asked whether the Central Coast regions would be permitted to submit *one proposal* to DWR, *one time only* (that is, one proposal specifying exactly how we'd like to divvy up the \$47.58 million pot, including a detailed project list and schedule for implementation, enabling us to avoid having to apply in each individual solicitation). Bridget explained no, DWR has informed us that we must apply for each solicitation. Also, we would be permitted to submit just one proposal from the entire Central Coast region during each solicitation; however, in that case we would have to actually *become* one IRWM region, i.e., we would need to develop one IRWMP for the entire Central Coast region. And everyone agreed that would be a bad idea (there are good reasons why the regions are separate; it would cost way too much money and effort to develop a whole new IRWMP; and it would be tremendously difficult to prioritize projects within such a massive geographic area, where problems, priorities, and needs differ so greatly from one sub-region to another).

Much discussion ensued about the advantages and disadvantages of evenly dividing the Central Coast funding allocation amongst the six IRWM regions, the uncertainty regarding timing of solicitations and the amount of money that will be offered in each round, and the question of how to provide assurances that any Central Coast regions agreement would be kept over the duration of the Prop 84 program. Ken pointed out that there would be no real "enforcement" of such an agreement, it would be a matter of trust. It was suggested that if some sort of agreement were

made, perhaps it could take the form of a signed MOU that would be formally incorporated into each region's IRWMP, and updated with each new solicitation.

An informal tally was held regarding three possible scenarios:

- 1) Divide the entire pot of IRWM funds evenly amongst the Central Coast regions, with a signed MOU included in each region's IRWMP and updated with each solicitation as described above, and then decide general timing of which regions will get funds first;
- 2) Divide the IRWM pot of funds evenly between the six regions in each funding round;
- 3) No agreement at all (i.e., each region competes for as much funding as they need in each solicitation).

Most members of the RWMG preferred option #1, with a couple of members preferring option #2. No one chose option #3. This is what we'll take back to the other Central Coast regions at the next Central Coast IRWM Regions meeting (scheduled for September 3, 2010). Several members indicated that this should be a process in which we all try to work together and encourage collaboration. We don't want to be the region that doesn't cooperate. There are many potential benefits to collaborating and cooperating on a Central Coast region-wide basis, including future inter-regional projects that will benefit all of us.

3. Integration Committee: Brief update on the project review process

Bridget asked the Project Committee members whether all of the projects have been reviewed (answer: just about). The first Integration Committee meeting will be held on August 26th, from noon – 4:00PM, at the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary office. All Project Committee members should try to be there (it is important that at least one representative from each Project Committee be present). The process: Each Project Committee will provide a brief overview of their projects, one by one. As each project is reviewed, the whole group (the Integration Committee) will discuss any problems that may need to be resolved and any opportunities for integration (with Project Committee members paying particular attention to potential opportunities with the projects on their list).

Dawn asked whether the issues that Darlene Din had brought up during the July 21, 2010 RWMG meeting was resolved. Discussion ensued, with Ken (and others) emphasizing that a project proposal could not be submitted for IRWM grant funds unless landowner agreements were in hand. In other words, you can't get grant funds to do a project on someone else's property unless you have written permission. Dawn indicated that individuals she has spoken to would like to see landowner support prior to the projects being ranked. That is currently not in our process but the group agreed to discuss it again after the projects have all been "integrated" and the list is presented to the RWMG for approval at the next meeting. Someone else pointed out that obtaining landowner agreements are not always possible at the early stages of project development (particularly in the case of concept projects), and so it doesn't necessarily make sense to require landowner agreements for a project simply to be listed in the IRWMP; however, we should make it clear to all project proponents and stakeholders that a project *cannot be submitted for grant funds* unless it has landowner support.

4. Resource Management Strategies: Whether to omit "Water and Wastewater Treatment"

Susan noted that the RWMG had approved the Resource Management Strategies by vote on March 17, 2010. However, upon drafting descriptions for each of these strategies for the IRWMP, she felt that the strategy "Water and Wastewater Treatment" was covered already by three other strategies, namely, "Drinking Water Treatment and Distribution," "Recycled Municipal Water,"

and "Infrastructure Reliability." She asked the RWMG whether it would be OK to omit "Water and Wastewater Treatment" as a strategy. Several RWMG members pointed out that wastewater treatment per se isn't covered by the other strategies, and they felt it was important to keep as a strategy. They offered to help draft the justification of this strategy for the IRWMP.

5. Planning Grant Committee: Update

Donna gave an overview on progress of the Planning Grant Committee. The committee has selected the following items to include in the Planning Grant proposal (which is due September 28th):

- 1) Climate change impacts and analysis for the Greater Monterey County IRWM region
- 2) Increased outreach to disadvantaged communities
- 3) Data management system
- 4) Water project reconciliation and facilitation, where redundancies and conflicts exist
- 5) Website support and development
- 6) Support for Project Coordinator to incorporate this new information into the IRWMP and to improve other aspects of the Plan, including a better quantification of objectives, and closing the gap between regional objectives and projects included in our project list.
- 7) Maybe also: Development of a cost-benefit model that applicants can use (to satisfy economic analysis requirements of Prop 84). Donna will follow up with Michelle Dooley about this.

Gary inquired about development of a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan and whether that was considered for the Planning Grant. Because DWR does not require it as part of the IRWMP it was not included; the Planning Grant Committee decided to concentrate on only the most essential elements needed to complete the IRWMP according to the Prop 84 guidelines. However, we may consider future planning money for developing a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan for the region.

A question that needs to be decided quickly is who the applicant and grant administrator for the Planning Grant proposal will be. Three organizations have agreed to assume this role: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation, San Jose State Foundation, and the Monterey County RCD. Discussion ensued about the advantages of the different organizations assuming this role, though unfortunately the representatives for SJSF (Kevin and Sierra) and the RCD (Paul) were not present at the meeting to discuss the issue. Given the time constraints of the Planning Grant application, Ken made a motion to vote on who the applicant should be, Rob seconded, and all voted in favor of the MBSF acting as the applicant. This has been decided with the condition that if Kevin, Sierra, or Paul have any strong objections to the decision it will be brought up again for discussion by the RWMG (via email, given the time constraints).

The Planning Grant Committee has promised to provide the RWMG a draft of the Planning Grant proposal prior to the next RWMG meeting, September 15th, for in-depth discussion at that meeting (keeping in mind that the final proposal is due September 28th).

Next month's meeting is scheduled for September 15th from 1:00 – 3:00 PM, at Moss Landing Marine Labs.