

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program  
Regional Water Management Group Meeting**

**April 18, 2018**

**Location: Moss Landing Marine Labs, Moss Landing, CA**

**RWMG Entity Attendees:**

Horacio Amezcuita – San Jerardo Cooperative, Inc.  
Dan Brumbaugh – Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve  
Ross Clark – Central Coast Wetlands Group  
Monique Fountain – Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve  
Brian Frus – City of Salinas  
Brenda Granillo – California Water Company  
Sarah Hardgrave – Big Sur Land Trust  
Bridget Hoover – Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Alison Imamura – Monterey One Water  
Elizabeth Krafft – Monterey County Water Resources Agency  
Karen McBride – Rural Community Assistance Corporation  
Mike McCullough – Monterey One Water  
Christina McGinnis – Monterey County Agricultural Commissioner's Office  
Heidi Niggemeyer – City of Salinas  
Paul Robins – Resource Conservation District of Monterey County  
Sarah Stevens – Monterey One Water

**Non-RWMG Attendees:**

Dan Bertoldi – Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
John Dugan – Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
John Hunt – UC Davis  
Gerry Malais – Monterey County Office of Emergency Services  
Teresa Meister – Monterey County Office of Emergency Services  
Karen Nilsen – Nilsen and Associates  
Gary Petersen – Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency  
Anna Quenga – Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
Susan Robinson – Greater Monterey County IRWM Program Director  
Kelsey Scanlon – Monterey County Office of Emergency Services

**Meeting Minutes**

**1. Brief Introductions.** After brief introductions, Susan Robinson welcomed Dan Brumbaugh, the new Coastal Training Program Coordinator for Elkhorn Slough Reserve, as a new member of the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG). Dan and Monique Fountain will be tag-teaming the RWMG meetings from this point forward. Dan introduced himself to the group.

**2. IRWM and Local Land Use Planning – Coordinating to Address Potential Impacts of Climate Change:** Ross Clark briefly presented key findings from the Central Coast Wetlands Group's (CCWG) recent work on climate change, and then facilitated a discussion with Monterey County land use planners and the RWMG to consider how the RWMG can support the County and other partners to address potential hazards associated with climate change. Staff from Monterey County Resource Management Agency (RMA) and Office of Emergency Services (OES) had been invited to participate in this meeting. Before Ross's presentation, Susan asked each of the County staff members present at the meeting to introduce themselves with a brief description of their role. Staff from RMA included:

John Dugan, RMA Deputy Director of Land Use and Community Development  
Anna Quenga, RMA Senior Planner, Current and Long Range Planning

Dan Bertoldi, RMA Sustainability Coordinator of the Green Program

Staff from OES included:

Gerry Malais, OES Director  
Teresa Meister, OES Senior Secretary  
Kelsey Scanlon, OES Emergency Services Planner

Ross noted that much of CCWG's work on climate change was in partnership with Monterey County, who acted as lead on an Ocean Protection Council (OPC) grant (Moss Landing SLR Vulnerability report is available at the CCWG website, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1c4HsjFkli9WFQyQXVqZVBuVk0/view>). His goal today was to provide County staff with additional information on findings, but primarily to answer the question: How can IRWM climate vulnerability and other IRWM efforts be better integrated with County resource management and land use planning efforts?

Ross outlined three project goals of the climate change project:

- Identify what critical coastal infrastructure may be compromised due to sea level rise and estimate when those risks may occur;
- Identify how fluvial processes may increase flooding risk to coastal communities in the face of rising seas; and
- Define appropriate response strategies for these risks and discuss with regional partners the programmatic and policy options that can be adopted within Community Plans, Hazard Mitigation Plans, and Local Coastal Plan (LCP) updates.

Ross then provided an overview of key findings. CCWG had performed a climate risk analysis for the broader region, and also performed a more targeted evaluation of coastal climate change vulnerabilities, specifically looking at the cumulative risks associated with predicted higher seas, increased storm intensity, and changes in rainfall patterns. CCWG used FEMA flood maps and 2010 combined ESA hazard layers for their analysis. They evaluated future vulnerabilities according to three time horizons (2030, 2060, and 2100), identifying coastal resources within the hazard zones (i.e., assets including buildings and farmland, roads, parks and beaches, utility infrastructure, and natural resources such as dunes, wetlands, and critical habitat).

Ross noted that coastal storm flooding will lead to inland flooding, eventually threatening crops in the Salinas Valley. By the year 2030 inundation will occur mostly in wetland areas, but by 2060 flooding will begin to impact developed areas. The Moss Landing Road and Potrero Road tide gates most likely will not function as designed by 2060, leading to overtopping by wave surge; so the 2060 and 2100 scenarios show no protection from the tide gates, based on current infrastructure. Ross then briefly reviewed fluvial impacts, impacts from rising tides, erosion, and future risks to specific infrastructure, noting that different infrastructure will be vulnerable to different hazards at different times. He pointed out that natural creeks and managed conveyances will see higher flow rates, leading to increased erosion and flooding. Ross emphasized the importance of planning *now* in order to reduce impacts later.

In addition to the coastal modeling with OPC funds, the CCWG team has been using Storm Water Resource Plan planning grant funds (from the State Water Resources Control Board) to model changes in rainfall patterns and evaluate how those changes might exacerbate flooding in the Reclamation Ditch. The CCWG team is also modeling different types of watershed and water management projects to determine how such projects might reduce peak flooding. Ross presented a table showing specific coastal assets (e.g., storm drains, culverts and tide gates, groundwater wells, Moss Landing Harbor, dunes, beach, wetlands), the predicted impacts, and recommended actions along with feasibility, estimated cost (based on a simplified cost-benefit analysis), and potential partners. He noted that the Draft Tide Gate Management Plan and Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy for Moro Cojo Slough project, in partnership with CCWG, Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, has been funded and is underway. CCWG is continuing to work with local stakeholder groups to develop projects in order to address these predicted vulnerabilities.

Ross then opened the floor for discussion, posing the questions: What programs/plans are the County using within which adaptation/resiliency objectives could be added/expanded? Do the climate recommendations within this report support County environmental management/land use planning challenges, and if so, how? Are there priority water resources management challenges (that will be exacerbated by climate change) that the IRWM Program could address within future project solicitations?

Ross posed the question, “How can we help the County address these hazards?” Gerry Malais responded that from the OES perspective, they can use CCWG’s data to address climate change in response planning. Kelsey Scanlon added that the State and federal governments are requiring Hazard Mitigation Plans to include climate adaptation planning. Kelsey said that there will be a Working Group for 2019 that CCWG and others can participate in. She commented that hazard mitigation planning typically focuses on short-term planning; she appreciates this long-term perspective. Gerry said they have started accepting special districts as part of the Hazard Mitigation Plan, and invited those individuals representing a special district to get in touch with him, if interested.

Dan Bertoldi said (from the RMA Sustainability Coordinator’s perspective) that they are more focused on climate mitigation rather than climate adaptation side, i.e. reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. He said he very much appreciated the opportunity to work together with CCWG, MCWRA, the Ag Commissioner’s Office, and others in the room.

Horacio Amezcuita asked about drought conditions causing increased nitrate contamination in the Salinas Valley, as a potential consequence of climate change. Alison Imamura noted that two efforts – the North Monterey County Drought Contingency Plan and the Bureau of Reclamation-funded Salinas/Carmel Rivers Basins Studies – are in the process currently of being integrated. The study will be focused primarily on water supply, but to the extent that water supply is directly impacted by seawater intrusion, the study will also need to address water quality (though uncertain whether it will extend to other contaminants).

Ross commented that the stronger the relationships built between different agencies and organizations within the region, the more successful they will be at obtaining grant funds for studies and projects. Kelsey noted that the Hazard Mitigation Plan provides a great opportunity to list projects that need to occur to mitigate hazards. Those projects will then be eligible to apply for FEMA grant funding for project implementation.

John Hunt noted that 2030 is coming quickly, and asked how well the region is prepared to put protective measures in place by then. Ross responded that infrastructure is less at risk in this area for the year 2030 than it is, for instance, in Santa Cruz. The tide gates are the biggest immediate challenge. CCWG is already doing dune restoration to help increase coastal protection. Ross discussed some adaptation response planning actions recommended by CCWG. A brief discussion about managed retreat ensued. Anna Quenga said that RMA is currently looking at Moss Landing’s Community Plan. The current plan does not include policies for addressing sea level rise, and so they are working on that now. They will be taking information to the County board of supervisors for guidance in what to plan for. Anna added that if anyone is interested in being included in the noticing for that board meeting to email her.

Kelsey commented that managed retreat is being discussed at the state level. Climate adaptation work is being done in “silos” within the counties, and there is an attempt being made to streamline that work across departments. It is both a very political and personal subject; it therefore needs to be a strongly community-engaged effort, which also must be addressed in their Hazard Mitigation Plan. Ross concluded, “We’ll need to be cognizant of each other’s efforts,” and offered to keep funding opportunities in mind for coordinated planning through IRWM and other funding sources. Anna said that when the time comes to bring revised policies and the draft General Plan to the community, it would be a good idea to bring the CCWG team to talk about sea level rise.

Someone asked Ross whether CCWG’s work focused strictly on coastal resources, or whether they could evaluate risks to inland areas, e.g., for increased wildfire impacts. Ross responded that CCWG could bring in additional expertise to address inland areas – so yes, CCWG could evaluate these other geographic areas.

Someone else mentioned the value in expanding the reach of the coastal study to go down to the county line. Kelsey noted that climate change impacts will in turn impact every other hazard, such as soil stability, etc. She said she intends to include climate change as a factor in each of the other hazards addressed in the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

**3. Updated Climate Change Chapter of the IRWM Plan:** Susan had forwarded the revised Climate Change chapter to the RWMG prior to the meeting, and asked the RWMG to review the chapter over the next few weeks and to send her any comments/revisions. (If anyone would like a Word version to enable Track Changes, let Susan know.) Susan will ask for the RWMG's "thumbs up" on the chapter revisions at the next (May 16, 2018) RWMG meeting. Sarah Stevens expressed interest in including the RWMG members' responses to the climate survey in the chapter or as an appendix, and Susan said it will be included as an appendix.

**4. Monterey Bay Community Power:** Mark Bachman from Monterey Bay Community Power (MBCP) introduced himself and his agency to the RWMG. Monterey Bay Community Power is a joint power authority governed by three counties (Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey) and 16 municipalities. MBCP operates as a "Community Choice Aggregation" (CCA), which gives residents and businesses the opportunity to purchase electricity from a local government agency that sources and manages energy resources and energy environmental attributes on their behalf. Mark explained that this is becoming the standard by which local areas are sourcing their energy; within 3-5 years the entire state will likely be served by CCAs.

MBCP purchases clean-source power, which will allow the region to dramatically reduce its GHG emissions while capturing revenues within the local area. For 2018 MBCP generation sources include 70% large hydro and 30% eligible renewables (solar and storage/wind). MBCP purchases energy, while PG&E will continue to own and maintain power lines and other infrastructure and to provide customer service. Mark explained that MBCP will charge customers for the power generation portion of the bill, maintaining the same rates that PG&E charges (which includes a PG&E surcharge amount), while PG&E will continue to charge for the delivery costs. At the end of each year MBCP will return a rebate to each customer (the surcharge amount), resulting in overall lower annual costs to the customers than current PG&E bills. In 2018, for example, MBCP will return 3% of total revenues to customers.

In 2017-2018 MBCP enrolled non-residential customers. They will begin accepting residential customers in July. Mark said that 2% of MBCP revenues will go back into community programs, for example, battery storage, fuel switch (e.g., from natural gas to electric power), etc. They are currently forming a community advisory council that will advise on these community programs. He welcomed RWMG members to apply to join the council (go to MBCP's website, apply on their "Jobs" page).

Bridget asked about the geographic sources of power. Mark replied: hydro comes from the Pacific Northwest, solar/wind comes from California sources or sources that are otherwise part of the California grid. Bridget asked about customers who are generating their own electricity. Mark responded that MBCP's net surplus compensation is slightly better than PG&E's. There was a discussion about the amount of solar power being generated in the state of California, with Mark commenting that solar generation is actually slowing down. He said MBCP will be working to get new solar on the market by such methods as offering community solar projects, assisting in bringing technology to areas that are lacking such technology, e.g., electric vehicle charging stations.

**5. IRWM Prop 1 Implementation Grant Round and the Next Project Solicitation:** Susan reviewed information to date regarding the upcoming Prop 1 Implementation Grant round, along with a suggested timeframe for the IRWMP project solicitation. She provided a brief outline of DWR's anticipated schedule for Round 1 of the Prop 1 Implementation Grant:

- May 4, 2018: DWR will present a preliminary draft PSP to Roundtable of Regions for discussion
- End of June: Draft PSP released
- September: Final PSP released
- DWR will then begin scheduling workshops with each Funding Area

- Winter: DWR will accept grant applications on a rolling basis. Deadlines are anticipated about two months after each Funding Area's workshop.

Susan said that the RWMG should essentially decide which projects they want to select for the Round 1 Implementation Grant application by October, since DWR will be asking for information on proposed projects *prior* to the Funding Area's workshop, and workshops may be scheduled as early as October 2018. She briefly presented a timeframe for soliciting projects to the IRWM Plan, and for selecting which projects to put forward for the region's application:

May 7, 2018: Announce project solicitation for IRWM Plan (short application form – the purpose of which is simply to get projects into the IRWM Plan)

June 29, 2018: Short-form applications are due. Also, the draft PSP is expected to be released by DWR by this time.

July 2, 2018: Susan will create the “long-form” application based on DWR's draft PSP, and will announce their availability to stakeholders. (The long-form application is specifically intended for those project proponents who have projects in the IRWM Plan and want their projects to be considered for Round 1.) Project proponents will have about six weeks to work on their “long-form” applications.

August 13, 2018: Long-form applications are due.

August 15 RWMG Meeting: RWMG votes on Ranked Project List (which is based on responses in the “short-form” applications). RWMG takes a first look at projects on the table for Round 1, and begins process of figuring out how to select which projects to put forward. Susan reminded everyone that while in the past there has always been a Project Selection Committee, this time the entire RWMG will serve as the Project Selection Committee.

September 19 RWMG Meeting: RWMG needs to decide, at least preliminarily, which projects to put forward in the application.

October 17 RWMG Meeting: If RWMG hasn't decided on a final project package in September, now's the time!

Susan said if anyone had questions, or would like to suggest a different schedule, to please contact her. She then asked John Hunt, Project Manager for the Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) Planning Grant, to talk about the project solicitation for the SWRP. John said they originally thought that the Round 2 Storm Water Implementation Grant would be released about now, but it was significantly delayed – affecting the original project solicitation schedule for the Greater Monterey County SWRP. There are currently only two projects included in the SWRP, but John says there are almost certainly a lot more projects out there that should be included in the plan. They will be incorporating the projects that were listed in the Greater Salinas SWRP, since the Greater Monterey County SWRP is intended to encompass and supersede the Salinas plan.

In addition, John noted that the SWRP planning team has put a lot of effort into modeling and other tools to identify *opportunities* for storm water projects (storage, infiltration, etc.). The team will be looking to generate new projects based on the results of that analysis. They will also be reaching out to the County and to cities for potential projects.

Sarah Hardgrave asked Susan, if a project is not ready for Round 1 IRWM but would likely be ready for Round 2 in 2020, should the project proponent submit the project now? Susan clarified that they can apply now, but it is not necessary since there will be another project solicitation prior to Round 2. However, if it is a storm water project then yes, it is important to submit that project now for inclusion in the SWRP, despite its degree of development/readiness – because a storm water project must be included in a SWRP in order to be eligible for State Water Board Prop 1 Storm Water Implementation Grant funds, and this is likely the only project solicitation that will occur for this SWRP.

John added that the State Water Board seems to be expecting a fairly “low threshold” of detail for projects, and encouraged anyone with a project – even a concept proposal – to submit it to the SWRP. Sarah Hardgrave noted that the Monterey Peninsula SWRP team had identified about 2,000 potential projects; this number includes numerous projects on a “microscopic” scale. Ross commented that many of those projects are located on municipal properties, and were put forward by those municipalities. Conversely, many of the potential projects that the SWRP planning team is looking at are located on private lands, or unincorporated County land – the process is entirely more complicated in terms of obtaining approval/support.

Regarding the project solicitation schedule, John said the SWRP Implementation Grant schedule is probably a month or two behind the IRWM schedule. He noted that it would be efficient, however, if, as before, the IRWM and SWRP project solicitations could occur simultaneously, utilizing the same application form. He and Susan will discuss that.

**6. Other Business.** There was no other business.

Susan thanked everyone for participating, especially the Monterey County staff, and thanked especially Ross and Mark for their presentations.

*The next RWMG meeting will be held on May 16, 2018, 1:30PM – 3:30PM, location TBD.*