

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program
Regional Water Management Group Meeting
July 20, 2016
Location: Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency in Monterey, CA**

RWMG Attendees:

Horacio Amezcuita – San Jerardo Cooperative, Inc.
Melanie Beretti – Monterey County Resource Management Agency
Ross Clark – Central Coast Wetlands Group
Ken Ekelund – Garrapata Creek Watershed Council
Monique Fountain – Elkhorn Slough Estuarine Research Reserve
Tom Harty – Monterey County Resource Management Agency
Bridget Hoover – Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Frank Lopez – Harris & Associates, representing City of Soledad
Heather Lukacs – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Mike McCullough – Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency
Christina McGinnis – Monterey County Agricultural Commissioner’s Office
Heidi Niggemeyer – City of Salinas
Rachel Saunders – Big Sur Land Trust

Non-RWMG Attendees:

Jeff Condit – Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Program
Sachi Itagaki – Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
Michael Goymerac – Kenndy/Jenks Consultants
Karen Nilsen – Nilsen & Associates
Susan Robinson – Greater Monterey County IRWM Program Coordinator

Meeting Minutes:

1. Brief Introductions.

2. Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Funding Update: Bridget reported briefly on the RWMG subcommittee’s progress on developing a scope of work and budget for DAC Involvement funds. The subcommittee has met a couple of times and has roughly determined a scope of work, but is still working on deliverables and budget.

3. Salinas Area Storm Water Resource Plan/Functionally Equivalent Plan: Sachi Itagaki from Kennedy/Jenks gave a presentation on the process of developing a Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) for the Salinas area. Susan asked for clarification whether this would actually be a SWRP or a Functionally Equivalent Plan (FEP). Sachi responded that they intend to cover all of the items required for a SWRP on the self-certification checklist (see below), and are therefore referring to the plan as such. Bridget pointed out that the distinction between an FEP and SWRP is 1) stitching together existing plans (FEP) vs. 2) developing an entirely new plan (SWRP); and so this would seem to be an FEP. Sachi said they are trying to keep the plan as simple as possible, while still doing some quantitative analysis to meet the requirements.

Sachi gave brief background regarding storm water regulations and the need for this SWRP/FEP. She referred to Senate Bill 985 that recognizes storm water as a resource, places emphasis on the multiple benefits of storm water projects, and requires public agencies to develop a storm water resource plan prior to receiving bond funds for storm water projects. The Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) and City of Salinas have submitted a grant application for Round 1 of Prop 1 Storm Water Implementation Grant funds, and if awarded, they must complete a SWRP or an FEP within 90 days of receiving the grant award. Kennedy/Jenks intends to have a plan completed by November/December 2016.

Sachi showed a map of the project target area, which overlaps the Monterey Peninsula IRWM region slightly at the Seaside Basin (area of coordination). Sachi then went through the SWRP Guidelines checklist for self-certification, which must be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board for review upon completion of the plan.

Regarding the stakeholder outreach element (Organization, Coordination, Collaboration), Sachi said the Kennedy/Jenks planning team intends to do outreach via the regularly scheduled RWMG meetings, unless the group advises to expand the outreach effort otherwise. Regarding the quantitative analysis element, Sachi said the team plans to use project-specific simple tools; and they *may* take a broader GIS analysis approach. Tom and others brought up the Regional Board's Tool for Estimating Load Reductions (TELR), which the Regional Board is currently in the process of finalizing. Tom noted that TELR may be used for MS4 jurisdictions for the SWRP that will be prepared for the larger Greater Monterey County IRWM region, and Sachi commented that the Kennedy/Jenks team will want to keep in line with that effort. Sachi will get in touch with Tom about using the beta version for the plan. Bridget recommended also using Action Tracker, which is already built for the purpose of tracking existing projects on the Central Coast. She suggested perhaps they work toward integrating TELR and Action Tracker in terms of tracking BMPs for public use.

Going back to the checklist, Sachi noted that quantification and prioritization of projects will be a large part of the planning effort. The Kennedy/Jenks planning team is considering adapting the IRWM Plan prioritization method for the SWRP. Ross commented that the Central Coast Wetlands Group does have a technical team that's been working within the target geographic boundary for several years – have identified issues and projects, and have done extensive stakeholder outreach. Bridget added that the RWMG had also conducted a major effort to identify and prioritize multi-benefit projects in the Gabilan watershed (through the Blueprint, in the IRWM Plan). When all of the projects were reviewed together, several areas of conflict emerged. Ross encouraged the planning team as well as the RWMG to identify multi-benefit projects, but in ways that are sensitive to the other projects within the same region. Sachi said they will start the process, and then will hand over the Salinas SWRP/FEP to the RWMG to incorporate that plan into the larger SWRP and to continue the conversation.

Sachi said that they intend to address every element of the checklist (both mandatory and recommended). Sachi asked for assistance with GIS in terms of defining watershed/subwatershed boundaries. Ross and Tom offered to assist. For water quality compliance (Questions 10 – 12), the Kennedy/Jenks team will work with Tom (unincorporated county) and Heidi (city of Salinas). For quantitative methods (Question 15), Sachi suggested the group discuss TELR at the next meeting. Regarding project prioritization (Questions 29 – 33), Susan advised that using the IRWM Plan prioritization method as a basis for the SWRP/FEP prioritization process will likely not be sufficient, since the basis of quantification is so different. Sachi said she's seen other draft SWRPs do this, and thinks it will be OK. Bridget suggested that the IRWM Plan method be used as a "first cut." Regarding benefits analysis and schedule, Sachi said that upcoming funding opportunities would help them figure those out.

Sachi said they planned to adapt the IRWM Plan objectives as a basis for the SWRP/FEP objectives. She noted that every IRWM Plan objective appeared to be relevant, though they will likely pare down and perhaps add some that are directly storm water focused. Regarding storm water projects for inclusion in the SWRP/FEP, Sachi said they are using the IRWM Plan project lists as the basis. There was a discussion as to whether a project solicitation would be required to solicit new projects, but the group decided that would not be necessary since there will be another project solicitation as part of the larger Greater Monterey County IRWM SWRP, which will also occur prior to the next funding round. Sachi asked the group if they knew of sources of water quality *summary* data. Bridget mentioned CCAMP (though Sachi said this data source was overwhelming), and Heidi and Tom offered additional advice.

Moving forward, Sachi said there will be four more "stakeholder" meetings, between now and December. Susan

noted that that would comprise the next four regularly scheduled RWMG meetings (August through November). There was a suggestion that some alternative outreach be done (e.g., webcast conference, or presentation to Monterey Peninsula RWMG). Susan asked if Sachi knew what the SWRP/FEP review process might be like. Sachi noted that it consisted simply of the self-certification checklist that the State Water Board would conduct the review; she didn't expect it to be too rigorous. As long as they are able to check all of the boxes, they should (in theory) meet the requirements. Sachi and Mike then briefly described the Storm Water Implementation Grant application that the MRWPCA/City of Salinas had recently submitted. Mike noted that it will be very competitive.

4. Other Business. No one from the Executive Committee was present at the meeting (Ken was present for most of the meeting, but had left by this time); however, Bridget reported on their behalf that the Executive Committee had met (without Susan present), and voted Gary Petersen chair and Brenda Granillo vice chair.

Rachel gave an update on Big Sur Land Trust's Carr Lake property acquisition. The Big Sur Land Trust had just received new grant funds and has now secured 85-90% of the funding they need to purchase the 73-acre property. They are very optimistic that the remaining funds will be obtained, and hope to close by end of the year or early 2017.

The next RWMG meeting is scheduled for August 17, 2016, location TBD.