

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program
Regional Water Management Group Meeting
August 17, 2016
Location: Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary in Monterey, CA**

RWMG Attendees:

Horacio Amezcuita – San Jerardo Cooperative, Inc.
Ross Clark – Central Coast Wetlands Group
Monique Fountain – Elkhorn Slough Estuarine Research Reserve
Brenda Granillo – Cal Water
Bridget Hoover – Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
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
Paul Robins – Resource Conservation District of Monterey County
Rachel Saunders – Big Sur Land Trust

Non-RWMG Attendees:

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

Meeting Minutes:

1. Brief Introductions.

2. Prop 1 IRWM Planning Grant: Susan provided a very brief sketch of what will be required for submitting a Planning Grant application. Bridget asked if the Planning Grant funds have been accounted for in the Central Coast IRWM Region MOU. Susan responded that the competition itself is statewide (not Funding Area-wide) – so it will be competitive – but if the region is awarded funds, those Planning Grant funds will come out of the Greater Monterey County region’s allocation of Prop 1 Implementation Grant funds, as agreed upon in the MOU. Sachi suggested there may be economies of scale in dealing with arsenic removal, etc. by working with the Monterey Peninsula IRWM region. Susan emphasized that this Planning Grant will be very competitive, and asked the RWMG whether they thought it was worth going for. The general consensus was yes (though Bridget asked Susan to estimate how much time she thought it might take to write).

3. Salinas Area Storm Water Resource Plan/Functionally Equivalent Plan: Sachi gave an update on the process of developing a Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) for the Salinas area. She began by reporting that she had had discussions with John Hunt and the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning team, and they have all come to the conclusion that the two plans have different purposes and therefore will likely have quite different objectives and methods. She explained that for the Salinas plan (a smaller geographic area), the Kennedy/Jenks team will be “writing a plan to fit a set of projects” whereas for the Greater Monterey County (a larger geographic area), the team will be analyzing the area, determining where opportunities exist, and developing projects to respond to those opportunities. The Salinas team will be looking at the projects that are in the IRWM Plan 2016 Project List, prioritize those projects based

on metrics provided in the Guidelines, and use a subset of the IRWM Plan objectives for the SWRP objectives. The Greater Monterey County SWRP will incorporate the Salinas plan as much as “makes sense.”

Sachi noted that urban areas are a relatively small portion of the overall planning area, so the TELR model is not necessarily a good fit (TELR is meant to evaluate BMPs in 100-acre increments). She commented that by the time the Greater Monterey County SWRP is moving forward, the TELR model may have been developed to the point that it might be useful for that plan. She said the Kennedy/Jenks team is still trying to figure out how they will quantify benefits for the projects; it depends on how much information exists for each project. It's possible they may do a cost-benefit analysis. John said that the Greater Monterey County SWRP will be looking at opportunities and iterating between existing storm water projects and creating new projects to address problems and respond to opportunities. Sachi concluded by saying that the team will have several sections ready for review by the next RWMG meeting in September.

4. Greater Monterey County Storm Water Resource Plan: John gave a presentation on the planning team's plans for the Greater Monterey County SWRP. He began by noting that, hopefully, the City of Salinas/MRWPCA's projects will be awarded grant funds in October for the first round of Storm Water Implementation Grants, and if so, that would mean that those projects would not be included in the Greater Monterey County SWRP. There will be \$86M available for Round 2 Storm Water Implementation Grants. Round 2 will be awarded in the spring/summer 2018. The SWRP will need to be finalized within 90 days of the grant award.

John said that for the SWRP grant application, the team essentially followed the Guidelines for what a SWRP should look like. Cost of projects, feasibility, and matching funds were not mentioned in the Guidelines, but clearly should be taken into consideration. He noted that five categories of benefits are listed in the Guidelines: water quality, water supply, flood control, environmental, and community – with a primary focus on water quality and water supply. The State Water Board defines storm water as water that is running off of sources. Ag ditch is OK, but not a stream. The “holy grail,” he said, would be to take polluted water, store and treat it in areas that enhance habitat, and thereby make cleaner water available for water supply after the storm season. The team will use a regional approach, taking into consideration how projects work together.

John explained that the team will be expanding and integrating existing models as a basis for analyzing storm water capture opportunities in the region, and as a way to develop a functioning quantitative tool to evaluate project benefits. Heidi asked how much of the budget will be used for modeling. John responded about \$100K (out of the requested \$469K), with about \$250K in matching funds for models already developed. Heidi raised concern on the part of the City of Salinas that there would be enough money remaining to “create a plan.” John explained that at the core of the SWRP is a quantitative analysis of project benefits, so the modeling task is a key part of the planning process. Heidi expressed concern that the City might have to pay to use the model, once it is developed. John said that the models would be in the public domain and that no one would have to pay to use them (though they will require a certain level of expertise to use). He emphasized that the point of the modeling task is not to develop a new modeling tool per se, but to be able to quantify and evaluate potential storm water projects for the express purpose of developing a SWRP.

John said that objectives for the SWRP will need to be clearly defined. Objectives will be defined with input from stakeholders. The stakeholder outreach component will primarily involve the RWMG, with additional outreach through the IRWM listserv. There will be at least two stakeholder meetings, the first probably in December. The planning team will also coordinate with and eventually incorporate (to the extent possible) the City of Salinas/MRWPCA plan, and will coordinate with the Monterey

Peninsula/MRSWMP plan as well (at a minimum, in terms of information sharing, and potentially in terms of overlapping projects). Jeff agreed, saying he was happy to share the work plan, schedule, and budget for the Monterey Peninsula SWRP. Jeff said that the City of Monterey and Monterey Peninsula Water Management District are undertaking a \$170K water recovery study, which will be an underlying foundation of the plan. Because they are focusing on an urban area, he said they *will* be using TELR for much of the quantitative analysis.

John then briefly reviewed the planning budget for the SWRP: the grant award is \$469K, with \$477K being contributed in matching funds. He thanked the various agencies and organizations for the match, and said the team was hoping to begin work in November after the contract has been finalized. They will develop a new website for the SWRP for purposes of sharing documents, and until that is developed, will use the IRWM website.

5. RWMG Bylaws: Bridget reminded everyone of previous discussions and the RWMG’s decision to create an Executive Committee for the purpose of “taking IRWM to the next level.” This includes bringing in more funding for the Program Manager. She remarked on the “amazing” collaborative effort that has brought the IRWM effort to this point. She then went over suggested amendments to the bylaws, which included membership updates and the new Executive Committee article. She said she thought it was really important that the Executive Committee be engaged in the IRWM process, and that Executive Committee members *attend* the RWMG meetings. Upon someone’s inquiry, Bridget replied that the current Executive Committee members are Gary Petersen (City of Salinas), Brenda Granillo (Cal Water), Ken Ekelund (Garrapta Creek Watershed Council), and Colin Bailey (EJCW).

There was some discussion of whether the Executive Committee could allow alternates to attend the meetings for them. Rachel commented that it made sense that the actual Executive Committee members should have to be present (not their alternates), noting that alternates aren’t allowed for Board meetings, for example. She noted, if the Executive Committee is going to work closely with Susan (Program Manager), there will need to be continuity, consistency, good communication. Mike said he thought that the Executive Committee was a “higher function” and as such, could still “provide direction” if they got reports back from their proxies. Susan said that the Executive Committee wouldn’t be serving in a higher decision-making role since all decisions of any substance would still need to get discussed and approved by the RWMG; but the Executive Committee will be more like a “strategic working group.” As such, from her perspective as Program Manager, she said that the Executive Committee should be *involved* in the IRWM process. Ross agreed, saying he thought it was critical to have “full participation.” Monique also agreed, saying she thought it was important to have the Executive Committee members (and not their alternates) present at the meetings; though perhaps there could be a limited number of RWMG meetings that an Executive Committee’s alternate could attend in their stead, for example 25%. Bridget said she would send the draft bylaws to the RWMG for input.

6. DAC Involvement: Bridget reported that the DAC Involvement subcommittee (she, Christina, Horacio, Monique, and Mike) have had discussions with EJCW, RCAC, and Karen Nilsen about their potential work for the Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement funding. She noted the \$200K budget augmentation that was recently awarded by the State for the current DAC Plan work for the Greater Monterey County IRWM region, and reported that the scope of work and contract for those additional funds had not yet been determined – so it was a little difficult to finalize a scope of work and budget for DAC Involvement without knowing that information. However, the subcommittee has come up with the following, thus far:

1. **Project Manager/Coordinator:** There will be an RFP for this part-time position, a person “in tune” with local DACs who can both work closely with them and also oversee the contract itself.
2. **Project development:** Bridget noted the amount of State funding that has already been spent on DAC needs assessment in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region (a total of \$860K: \$160K

for IRWM Round 1 Planning Grant; \$500K for the current DAC Plan, plus the recent \$200K budget augmentation for the DAC Plan). She said with so much needs assessment work already done, the subcommittee felt that the majority of funding now should go toward project development and implementation. With DAC Involvement funds, they are expecting two projects to be completely developed for implementation (“ready to go”), and four mostly developed (not full CEQA).

3. **Building DAC capacity:** Bridget emphasized the need to find and work closely with “community champions” so as to build community capacity.
4. **MHI surveys:** Bridget noted the importance of ensuring that the communities *are* DACs, in order for them to be eligible for DAC funding. Therefore, some money will be set aside for MHI surveys.

Heather asked if funding for the Coordinator position would be over three years. Bridget said it would. Horacio asked where that person would be housed, and Bridget responded that was to be determined, but it would need to be local. Bridget concluded by saying that the subcommittee intended to reach out to EJCW, RCAC, and Nilsen and Associates for one more round of discussions before finalizing its recommendations.

The next RWMG meeting is scheduled for September 20, 2016 at Moss Landing Marine Labs.