

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Regional Water Management Group Meeting
August 15, 2012
1:30 - 3:30 PM
Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Salinas, CA**

RWMG Attendees:

Rob Johnson
Kathy Thomasberg
Bridget Hoover
Rachel Saunders
Horacio Amezcuita
Brad Hagemann
Dana Jacobson
Michele Lanctot
Michael Ricker
Sierra Ryan
Ken Ekelund
Karen McBride
Tamara Doan
Monique Fountain

Non-RWMG Attendees:

Susan Robinson – IRWM Plan Coordinator
Monica Reis – DWR
Jeanette Pantoja – California Rural Legal Assistance
Laura Smith – The Nature Conservancy
Hector Hernandez – Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

Meeting Minutes:

1. Introductions. Jeanette (CRLA) announced that she is now acting as the community outreach staff for Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) to implement our Disadvantaged Communities Outreach Plan, supported through the Round 1 Planning Grant. She is based in Salinas. (This announcement was greeted with cheers.)

2. MOU Amendment: The Prop 84 IRWM Program Guidelines state: "The governing bodies of each agency that is part of the RWMG responsible for the development of the IRWM Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan must adopt the Plan." This means that if any RWMG member does not adopt the IRWM Plan, DWR will not approve the Plan. At last month's meeting the RWMG discussed what to do in the event that a RWMG member chooses not to adopt the IRWM Plan. The Group decided that any member that chooses not to adopt the Plan should not be in the RWMG. At today's meeting, Susan presented a slightly revised MOU with the following language added (additions in italics):

5.4 Adoption of the IRWMP: Upon completion of the Greater Monterey County IRWMP, RWMG members shall each accept, approve, or adopt the plan through resolution by their governing boards or by other means according to organizational protocol. *Any RWMG member that chooses not to accept, approve, or adopt the IRWMP will be removed from the RWMG, following 30-day written notice of the removal action and the reason therefore.*

Michael had also provided additional edits to the MOU, which had been forwarded to the RWMG prior to the meeting. Susan asked, to what extent can we make revisions to the MOU before we need to get new signatures?

Much discussion ensued. Tamara asked whether the head of her department at the Coastal Commission could sign, or would the Commission itself need to formally adopt the IRWM Plan – because she doesn't see the latter happening, especially since the Coastal Commission as a State agency has no "stake" in the IRWM Plan in terms of submitting or implementing projects. Susan explained that for the MOU, whoever signs is up to the individual entity, but for adopting the IRWM Plan, the Guidelines stipulate, "The governing bodies of each agency that is part of the RWMG...must adopt the Plan." Bridget pointed out that if the Coastal Commission doesn't adopt the IRWM Plan, they would need to relinquish membership in the RWMG but they could still continue to actively participate in the IRWM planning process, just as Hector does for the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The discussion went back to the revised MOU and to the question of whether the MOU would need to be re-signed if the Group accepted the revision. Rachel asked, do we need this additional language at all? Laura suggested that perhaps we send a letter to all RWMG members after the IRWM Plan is complete, reminding them that all RWMG entities must accept, adopt, or approve the Plan per item 5.4 in the MOU. Ken made a suggestion that we leave the MOU as is, but that we adopt the suggested additional sentence in the MOU as a "policy" of the RWMG. He made a motion to do so, Rob seconded that motion. All voted in favor, none opposed, none abstaining.

Susan asked Michael if he was OK with leaving the MOU as is, without his suggested changes, and he said he was. Susan commented that he raised some important issues in his comments regarding the IRWM planning process, however, and that we should re-visit those at a later date. The question was also raised about the signatures on the existing MOU of certain individuals who are no longer working at those agencies/organizations, and whether we should be getting updated signatures. The conclusion was no, the MOU holds regardless of those sorts of internal organizational changes.

3. Resolution to Adopt the IRWM Plan: Prior to the meeting, Susan had sent the Group a draft "Resolution to Adopt the IRWM Plan" to review. She explained the adoption process: First, each of the individual RWMG entities' governing boards will adopt the Plan via their own resolutions (based on the language in the draft resolution presented at today's meeting), and then the RWMG will adopt a resolution to formally adopt the IRWM Plan at a regularly scheduled meeting that is open to the public. Susan asked for input on the draft language for this resolution (particularly regarding the "preamble" and concluding paragraph). Rachel suggested we include the word "disclaimer" at the start. Everyone seemed OK with the rest of the language, though there was some discussion about whether to add "visitors" in the paragraph: "WHEREAS, the landowners and residents of the Greater Monterey County IRWM region will derive water supply, water quality, flood protection, natural resource enhancement, and/or recreational benefits from implementation of the IRWM Plan and the projects contained within the Plan..." The consensus was to leave that paragraph as is. Susan said she would run the draft resolution by Vanessa Vallarta, a lawyer at the City of Salinas, for further review.

4. Changes to Project Ranking Criteria: At last month's meeting, Susan presented recommended changes to the Project Ranking Criteria. The proposed changes are minor, and mainly include the new requirement (per the Draft 2012 IRWM Program Guidelines) to consider, as part of the selection process for including projects in the IRWM Plan, whether a project proponent has, or will, adopt the IRWM Plan. Other edits are simply to better clarify the text. Susan reminded everyone of the suggested revisions, and asked if anyone had any questions or comments; no one did. Rob motioned to approve the recommended changes; Bridget seconded the motion. All voted in favor of approving the changes to the Project Ranking Criteria; none were opposed, and none abstained.

5. Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant: The final PSP for Round 2 will probably be released in October. There will be \$7,569,000 in Round 2 for the Central Coast Funding Area, and \$20,319,044 remaining in Round 3 for our Funding Area. Susan asked the Group, should we be having discussions with the other Central Coast IRWM regions about a funding strategy? Bridget said she was planning to arrange a "check-in" call with the other Central Coast IRWM Funding Area regions, not necessarily to discuss Round 2 but to see how they are doing with their Planning Grants, etc.

Karen mentioned that she had attended the Department of Water Resources' public comment meeting this morning regarding the 2012 Draft IRWM Guidelines and Round 2. She discussed DWR's definition of disadvantaged communities (DAC), and noted that the RWMG can be more creative in our projects to help DACs. In some cases groups of disadvantaged families live within boundaries that are not defined as DAC per se; however, using Median Household Income surveys we can potentially re-draw traditional boundaries to show an area as disadvantaged, increasing their eligibility for IRWM grant funds.

Susan asked, how should we go about deciding which projects get submitted in Round 2? Ken suggested we start discussing that next month. Bridget said she would like to see that decision based primarily on the project ranking, with other criteria considered secondarily. Ken mentioned the importance of seeing who will step up as the lead agency, and Bridget noted that all potential project proponents for Round 2 should start considering now whether they could act as the lead agency. Monica mentioned that there should be the clear understanding that there will be contract obligations with the State for whichever organization steps forward as the lead agency; all of that information is available on DWR's website. Ken noted that there are preparatory steps to consider, for example, who we should line up to do the economic analysis. We'll talk about "preparation" at next month's RWMG meeting, but we'll save the specifics for the October RWMG meeting when we have a final Ranked Project List.

6. Other Business

- a. **IRWM long-term planning:** Bridget expressed her disappointment at our region's not receiving the Round 2 Planning Grant award, particularly in regard to the IRWM planning coordination role (Susan's role) and for incorporating the results of the Round 1 Planning Grant work into the IRWM Plan. Someone asked if we knew how we scored for the Round 2 Planning Grant application, and why we didn't receive the grant. Susan said the evaluation is available on DWR's website. Essentially, since we had already promised to complete a "standards compliant" Plan through the Round 1 Planning Grant, and since the Round 2 Planning Grant was geared toward regions that need additional help in making their Plans standards compliant, our proposal suffered in the scoring. Also, we didn't establish the need for the individual tasks well enough (they were not well documented enough).

Given that we didn't get the Planning Grant, Bridget emphasized that we really need to start looking ahead. She briefly discussed the need for RWMG contributions (from those who can afford to contribute) to continue support for the coordination role. Bridget and Rachel, who is a member of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation (MBSF), approached Dennis Long (executive director of MBSF) to set up an account through MBSF for RWMG contributions. Dennis is in the process of writing up the MBSF's role and how the funds will be used. We will discuss this further at next month's RWMG meeting. Bridget asked the RWMG members to begin considering how much they can potentially contribute. She also said the Funding Committee would begin working on other long-term funding possibilities for the IRWM planning effort again soon.

- b. **Proof of landowner support:** Susan said we need an official process for obtaining proof of landowner support for IRWM-funded projects. She briefly recited her recommendation for such a process (which she had sent to the RWMG prior to the meeting). Rob reminded Susan that he, she, and Ken had decided at last month's RWMG meeting to work on this process together once Rob and Ken had spoken to certain landowners; and, he added, those conversations with landowners were still ongoing. Susan suggested that the three of them continue to work on this process together.

Monique asked if it were possible to get IRWM Coordination funds through the Round 2 Implementation Grant, and Bridget agreed we should consider that. Monica cautioned, however, that the Implementation Grant Program is truly meant for implementation projects, and coordination is considered planning; so adding coordination to an Implementation grant proposal would probably not score well.

Next month's RWMG meeting is scheduled for September 19th from 1:30 – 3:30 PM, location TBD.