

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Regional Water Management Group Meeting
June 20, 2012
1:30 - 3:30 PM
Moss Landing Marine Labs, Moss Landing, CA**

RWMG Attendees:

Sierra Ryan
Ken Ekelund
Elizabeth Krafft
Ross Clark
Horacio Amezcuita
Brian True
Michele Lanctot
Carol Corpus
Paola Ramos (EJCW)
Lisa Emanuelson (MBNMS, proxy for Bridget Hoover)
Monique Fountain
Mark Silberstein (ESNERR)
Dana Jacobson
Dawn Mathes
Paul Robins
Tamara Doan

Non-RWMG Attendees:

Susan Robinson – IRWMP Coordinator
Bill Phillips
Karen Nilsen (proxy for Karen McBride, RCAC)
Jennifer Biringer (The Nature Conservancy)
Beki McElvain (intern with EJCW)
Jeanette Pantoja (California Rural Legal Assistance)
Erin Gaines (California Rural Legal Assistance)

Meeting Minutes:

1. Introductions

2. Vote to approve concept proposals for inclusion in the IRWM Plan: Susan explained that she, Dawn, Sierra, and Kathy had reviewed all of the concept proposals from last fall's IRWM Plan project solicitation to ensure that they were eligible for inclusion in the Plan. They found that all of the proposals met the minimum criteria for inclusion in the Plan. The proposals were also reviewed by Horacio and Karen McBride for potential impacts to disadvantaged communities (DACs) or environmental justice concerns. None were found. Finally, the reviewers made note of any potential opportunities for project integration. Ken made a motion to approve the concept proposals for inclusion in the IRWM Plan. Ross seconded. All voted in favor. None opposed; none abstained.

3. Vote to submit Draft IRWM Plan for public comment: Susan asked the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) if there were any questions or comments about the draft IRWM Plan. Ken asked if the text regarding the desalination project had been revised to the satisfaction of both the Marina Coast Water District and the Monterey County Water Resources Agency. Susan said she had incorporated a combined revision from Brian and Rob (OK'ed by Jim Heitzman and Rob). She reminded everyone that if they're not entirely satisfied with this revised text, they can continue to work on it during the public comment period. Karen Nilsen noted that we still

haven't heard from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) regarding their final decision about DAC mapping. We may need to revisit the DAC section of the IRWM Plan depending on their decision.

There were no other comments, so Ken made a motion to vote to approve the draft IRWM Plan for a public comment period. Ross seconded. All voted in favor, with Susan acting as proxy for three RWMG members: Big Sur Land Trust (for Rachel and Joanna), Coastlands Mutual Water Company (for Butch), and the City of Salinas (for Michael). None were opposed, and none abstained. Susan then reviewed the timeframe for the public comment period. There will be an 8-week public period, which should begin on Friday (June 22) and run through August 17, 2012. Susan will then have about two months to incorporate suggestions and respond to public comments, and should have a revised IRWM Plan for discussion at the October 17, 2012 RWMG meeting. Paul (RCD) will facilitate two public workshops the week of July 9th, in King City and in Salinas, to present the draft IRWM Plan to stakeholders and to answer any questions about the public comment process.

There was some discussion regarding the logistics for the final approval process. The protocol is not entirely clear; Susan agreed to re-check the Guidelines and will inquire with DWR if the Guidelines aren't clear. Ken and Elizabeth both seemed to think that we need approval on the Plan from a minimum of three organizations with statutory authority over water systems.¹ Based on his experience with IRWM funding through the Proposition 50 process, Bill urged the Group to get the Plan done "on time" (December 2012, which is the deadline specified in the Round 1 Planning Grant) and emphasized the importance of getting approval from all members of the RWMG. He reminded everyone that our RWMG has built a reputation for cooperation and collaboration; it's important to show collective support from the whole group. Also, some recalled that project proponents for projects included in the Plan must also formally approve the IRWM Plan. Susan will check the Guidelines for the exact requirements.

Brian remarked that his board (Marina Coast Water District) may not want to sign a plan that is "as diverse" as this, especially if they don't have a project immediately ready for submission for grant funds. Susan asked why the MCWD board *wouldn't* approve the Plan, reminding him that each major piece of the Plan has been approved by the RWMG as it's been developed. Brian explained that his board may worry about adopting the policies in the IRWM Plan, that those policies may conflict with their own. Lisa Emanuelson (MBNMS) clarified that the Plan doesn't contain "policies." She suggested getting the lawyers from the public agencies on the RWMG to craft a disclaimer, which would be placed at the very beginning of the IRWM Plan, to the effect that the IRWM Plan is a voluntary plan which should in no way be interpreted as changing or impacting the policies, objectives, mission statements, etc. of any signatory entity. All agreed this was a good idea. Susan said she would organize that ASAP.

Ross asked who from each entity should be the signatory for the IRWM Plan. Should it be the same person who signed the MOU? Susan said she thought that should be up to each organization. Ken made a statement that although he is a member of the MCWRA board, his role as part of the RWMG is strictly as representative for the Garrapata Creek Watershed Council; and that he would recuse himself as appropriate.

4. Update on EJCW: Paola Ramos gave a brief update on the status of the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) and its DAC outreach activities for the IRWM Plan (funded through the Round 1 Planning Grant). She noted that EJCW had been going through a transition this past year, but now they are ready to fully participate on the RWMG once again and to begin implementing the DAC outreach plan. EJCW will be collaborating with the California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) office in Salinas. Paola introduced two

¹ This is based on: According to California Water Code §10539, a RWMG is "a group in which three or more local agencies, at least two of which have statutory authority over water supply or water management, as well as those other persons who may be necessary for the development and implementation of a plan that meets the requirements of [IRWM planning], participate by means of a joint powers agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other written agreement, as appropriate, that is approved by the governing bodies of those local agencies."

members of CRLA, Erin Gaines and Jeanette Pantoja, who will be assisting in this effort. She also introduced Beki McElvain, who is a summer intern with EJCW; Beki will be helping particularly with mapping. EJCW will also be hiring a staff member to focus on the Central Coast, and who will be based at the CRLA office in Salinas. Susan mentioned that EJCW should be sure to coordinate their DAC efforts with Karen McBride and Horacio (and Karen Nilsen), and Paola said absolutely.

There was also some discussion about San Lucas, and whether it qualified as a DAC (it does not currently qualify according to American Community Survey data from the US Census). Karen Nilsen said they had established San Lucas as a DAC based on income surveys a few years ago, so again, it will depend on what data DWR will accept. Bill noted that the definition of DACs in the past (for Proposition 50) was the result of the Legislature rather than DWR's interpretation of data. DWR had "loosened" up on the definition a bit with Prop 50, but it took a lot of work on the part of communities to provide DWR with the justification they needed to back up their decisions to the Legislature. Bill suggests EJCW and CRLA could be helping with this now on a statewide level. Bill also urged the RWMG to work with the Monterey Peninsula and Pajaro IRWM regions on this issue.

5. Update on Water Resource Project Coordination (WRPC) process: Sierra gave a brief update on the WRPC process. The committee has hired a facilitator, Katie Burdick, and held its first stakeholder meeting to develop a strategy. Katie now plans to conduct 10 individual stakeholder group meetings to get buy-in for the process and to hear their individual concerns before meeting collectively. The next big stakeholder meeting will be held in late summer/early fall.

6. Update on Climate Change TAC: Ross gave a brief update on the TAC that has been convened to provide input into the IRWM Plan Climate Change chapter. The main purpose of the TAC is to provide feedback and input on the vulnerability assessment and on technical information. They will hold at least two TAC meetings, and intend to have revisions on the draft chapter by the end of the public comment period (August 17, 2012). The TAC includes Stanford University climate change modeling folks, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Elkhorn Slough (although Bryan is now leaving), AMBAG, Monterey County Planning, Cal Water, Monterey County Ag Commissioner's Office, Moss Landing Marine Labs, and the Monterey and Santa Cruz County RCDs. He asked for suggestions for additional TAC members.

Objectives include:

- Review the assessment of climate change variables. Ross said they currently use State online tools, and they're confident with that, but they are looking for feedback on their interpretation of how that will affect the resources and infrastructure in the region.
- Streamline and improve the vulnerability assessment procedure. Ross replicated the procedure that Santa Cruz County used, but he said it's "a little clunky," so he is looking to improve it.

Ross said he's hoping to have our climate change conclusions vetted by local agencies to help justify getting additional grant funding for the climate change planning effort.

Next month's RWMG meeting is scheduled for July 18th from 1:30 – 3:30 PM, location TBD.