

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program  
Regional Water Management Group Meeting  
September 21, 2016  
Location: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, Moss Landing, CA**

**RWMG Attendees:**

Horacio Amezcua – San Jerardo Cooperative, Inc.  
Colin Bailey – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water  
Ross Clark – Central Coast Wetlands Group  
Gabi Estill – Elkhorn Slough Foundation  
Brenda Granillo – Cal Water  
Sarah Hardgrave – Big Sur Land Trust  
Tom Harty – Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
Bridget Hoover – Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Elizabeth Krafft – Monterey County Water Resources Agency  
Heather Lukacs – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water  
Mike McCullough – Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency  
Heidi Niggemeyer – City of Salinas  
Gary Petersen – City of Salinas  
Eric Tynan – City of Castroville

**Non-RWMG Attendees:**

Jeff Condit – Monterey Regional Storm Water Management Program  
Mike Godwin – Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Michael Goymerac – Kenndy/Jenks Consultants  
Paul Greenway – MNS Engineers  
John Hunt – UC Davis  
Sachi Itagaki – Kennedy/Jenks Consultants  
Karen Nilsen – Nilsen & Associates  
Susan Robinson – Greater Monterey County IRWM Program Coordinator

**Meeting Minutes:**

**1. Brief Introductions.**

**2. Salinas Area Storm Water Resource Plan:** Sachi provided an update on the process of developing a Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) for the Salinas area. She had handed out drafts of the first several sections of the SWRP prior to the meeting. Section 1 of the SWRP is Objectives. For the SWRP's objectives, Sachi explained that the planning team started with the IRWM Plan's objectives and organized the objectives that were applicable by the "benefit" categories listed in the SWRP Guidelines.

Section 2 of the SWRP is Watershed Identification. Sachi showed a map of the planning area, based on USGS hydrologic units, which includes the City of Salinas and encompasses the project region for the Pure Water Monterey project. She described land use briefly in the planning region, noting that the urban areas are MS4 areas and are actually a small portion of the planning area. Section 3 of the SWRP is Water Quality Compliance, which includes the following mandatory sections: 1) activities associated with pollution of storm water and/or dry weather runoff; 2) NPDES and TMDL compliance; and 3) other permits.

Section 4 of the SWRP is Organization, Coordination, and Collaboration. Sachi said they are most

concerned about involving MS4 operators. She asked whether the SWRP “community participation” effort should extend beyond the RWMG meetings. Susan said she thought it should. Sachi suggested sending out “blast emails” to the larger Greater Monterey County IRWM listserv. John suggested that an email be sent to all stakeholders at the commencement of the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning process, describing both plans and how they relate. Sarah added that Sachi may want to reach out to the City of Marina since they are no longer part of MRSWMP (Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Program). Elizabeth commented on the fact that the SWRP planning area includes a portion of the Monterey Peninsula IRWM region, and wondered how that will be dealt with in the Greater Monterey County SWRP. John responded that the Greater Monterey County SWRP will simply incorporate however much is applicable.

Sachi said that Section 5, Identification and Prioritization of Projects, is a work in progress. Section 6, Implementation Strategy and Schedule, will be a high-level discussion. Ross recommended that Sachi and her planning team work with the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning team on the project selection process and strategy for implementation, and they agreed to talk “off-line,” though Sachi noted that the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning team *can* take a different approach from the Salinas area SWRP, just as long as it is clearly stated in the plan. Sachi emphasized, though, that the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning team should look at these sections carefully now and provide input, to help ensure that the Salinas area planning effort is “setting up” the Greater Monterey County SWRP well. Ross suggested that quantifying project benefits to the extent possible would be helpful.

Section 7 of the SWRP is Education, Outreach, and Public Participation. Sachi asked for suggestions of existing or potential educational activities that might be included in this section. Jeff suggested looking at the MRSWMP website, which contains summaries of previous years’ educational activities. Gary added that there are numerous agencies involved in the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) effort and offered to send her the website address. Mike suggested that she look at the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) website as well.

Sachi referred to the project list at the end of the handout as a work in progress. The 18 projects included in the table were taken from the Greater Monterey County IRWM Plan, and include all IRWM projects that were both located within the SWRP planning region and seem to have a storm water or water quality nexus. To prioritize projects, she noted that the planning team can either estimate how well the projects address the “benefit” categories, or look at quantified benefits (to the extent that benefits are quantifiable). She reminded the group that the Salinas SWRP planning team already has their projects for the SWRP, whereas the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning team will be both including existing projects and developing new projects to address that plan’s objectives. John commented that project prioritization, as pointed out in the Monterey Peninsula SWRP scope of work, might also take into account 1) cost benefits, 2) available funding, and 3) and match (criteria not mentioned in the SWRP Guidelines). Sachi asked the group to consider the projects included in the list and provide feedback.

Sachi asked for suggestions on what they should call the Salinas area plan. It was decided to use the title “Greater Salinas Area SWRP” (the County uses the phrase “Greater Salinas Area” in the General Plan). Sachi asked for everyone to send any comments back to the planning group – via an email to Susan – within the next two weeks.

**3. Prop 1 IRWM Planning Grant:** Prior to the meeting, Susan had sent the RWMG the draft Work Plan. She provided a brief summary of the Planning Grant application activities and budget. Requested grant funds total \$76,935. The California Marine Sanctuary Foundation will act as fiscal agent. The match totals \$32,980, which equals 30% of the total proposal costs. Susan said that the Greater Monterey County IRWM region contains 40.3% disadvantaged communities by population (according to 2014 American Community Survey data, by census block group). That means that instead of having to provide

a 50% non-State match, the RWMG can provide a 30% non-State match, since the match requirement can be reduced by the amount of DAC population in the region (as long as the project directly benefits those DACs, which it does).

Regarding the portion of the Work Plan concerning AB 1249 compliance (i.e., a plan to address arsenic, perchlorate, chrom 6, and nitrates in the region), several suggestions were offered for sources of data. Heather said that the Disadvantaged Community Plan team is already working with Monterey County Health Department (Cheryl Sandoval) to collect water quality data. After a general discussion, Colin motioned to approve the IRWM Planning Grant application, Gary seconded, all voted in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

**4. Regional Water Management Group Bylaws:** Bridget had sent the group the latest revisions to the RWMG bylaws prior to the meeting. She read through the article concerning the Executive Committee, and asked if anyone had further comments or suggested revisions. There was a short discussion about one revision that had been suggested previously, namely, that the same requirements for RWMG meetings should apply to Executive Committee meetings for Executive Committee members. Consensus was that this seemed reasonable. Brenda said it has been difficult to get all of the Executive Committee members together, but they will probably have their first meeting in October. Gary moved to approve the RWMG bylaws, with current revisions; Brenda seconded. All except one voted in favor; none opposed; Elizabeth abstained, saying she hadn't been present for recent RWMG discussions about the bylaws to be knowledgeable enough to vote.

**5. Salinas Valley Disadvantaged Community Plan – Budget Extension:** Susan provided a brief overview of the “Integrated Drinking Water and Wastewater Plan for Disadvantaged Communities in the Salinas Valley” planning effort that has been underway since January 2015. She noted that the State had originally given the RWMG \$500K for this effort, and the project team has managed to leverage those funds significantly with other grant funds; however, additional work is needed, and the State had recently awarded the RWMG an additional \$200K. The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) is the fiscal agent for the grant. Colin explained that EJCW submitted its recommended budget and scope of work for the \$200K budget extension to the State Water Resources Control Board last week. He noted that the State has concerns about being audited, so has asked the project team to take care to avoid any duplication between the first contract and the second.

Heather then went over EJCW's plan for allocating the additional \$200K, which is now pending the State's approval (the budget was summarized in a handout). The tasks include: Task 1 Administration; Task 2 Project Management and Coordination; Task 3 Mapping/Data/Database; Task 4 Technical Advisory Committee; Task 5 Stakeholder Engagement and Community Capacity-building; Task 6 Proposal Development, Engineering, and Write-up; Task 7 Final Plan Update/Amendments.

For Task 3: Work will be done on updating nitrate data, adding layers to the mapping, and expanding the focus to medium-sized (as opposed to very small) disadvantaged communities (DACs). For Task 5: In the course of their outreach thus far, EJCW has discovered several low-income neighborhoods adjacent to DACs to have similar drinking water problems. EJCW would like to extend outreach to these communities. For Task 6: Karen Nilsen will develop project proposals for several DACs (those not included in the original contract). This effort also includes engineering support and additional community engagement. For Task 7: The Draft Plan should be completed by May 1, 2017 (with the conclusion of the first contract). The Final Plan will be completed by December 31, 2017 (with the conclusion of the second contract).

Heidi asked what the plan was for, and Colin offered additional background. He said the planning effort was modeled after similar efforts in the Tulare Lake Basin (a \$2M planning effort) and Kings Basin.

EJCW advocated for \$2M for the Salinas Valley plan, but the region was awarded \$500K. Nonetheless, as noted previously, the planning team has managed to leverage those funds. The scope of work has been to identify DACs in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region, particularly those not necessarily “on the radar,” identify their drinking water and wastewater issues, and work with the communities to develop projects to address those problems. Heather noted that the team has focused entirely on unincorporated areas. They have partnered with the Community Engineering Corps (CEC), which has brought its own funding from USDA, to conduct engineering assessment for each of the priority communities. CEC is now interested in developing a long-term partnership to continue working with DACs in Monterey County.

Heather said that there are three main options for most communities: 1) wellhead treatment for nitrates (difficult and expensive for small communities); 2) drilling a deeper well; and 3) having service extended from a larger utility. The third option is the County’s preferred option. Mike McCullough (MRWPCA) said that there has been some momentum recently to look outside MRWPCA’s sphere of influence; there is money available to extend service to DACs, and Mike says MRWPCA is interested.

Bridget, who is on the RWMG subcommittee for developing a budget and scope of work for Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement funds, noted that some of the small communities are not officially designated as DAC. She asked if there would be funds included in the \$200K budget extension to conduct median household income (MHI) surveys. Heather said no, there would not be, noting that Meghan Tosney at the State Board has been encouraging EJCW to do MHI surveys through Prop 1 TA funds. Eric raised the issue of overcrowded housing (e.g., three households living in one house), which has skewed the MHI in Castroville. Gary said a similar situation is occurring in Salinas. Eric asked whether the State Board might take that into consideration when defining DACs. Colin responded that the State Board doesn’t have the authority to change the water code that defines DAC status. He said the issue may be addressed legislatively in an upcoming session, perhaps by early 2017. Eric wondered whether he should hold off on conducting an MHI survey, in that case.

There was discussion about the need to extend outreach to communities that are being impacted by very high levels of contamination. Horacio asked how many DACs were listed in the plan thus far. Susan and Karen estimated 30+. Horacio pointed out that CEC is working with a very small subset of those communities – only six. Karen added that the list had been developed over a year ago, and is already outdated; she said the project team needs to go back over the list since there is new DAC data. Colin emphasized the need to focus on source control, commenting that “the problem is only getting worse.” Bridget said she hopes there can be more coordination in the future for the RWMG to look at source control, referring particularly to the DAC Plan effort, the SWRP effort, the ongoing analysis of groundwater contamination, and groups within the RWMG that work closely with growers. Susan suggested that a RWMG meeting be held to brainstorm regional recommendations for the DAC Plan in regard specifically to source control.

Colin asked for a “no objection” vote to the \$200K extension budget as proposed by EJCW. Eric motioned to approve the budget, Sarah seconded; all voted in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

*The next RWMG meeting is scheduled for October 19, 2016, location TBD.*