

**Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program  
Regional Water Management Group Meeting  
November 8, 2017  
Location: Big Sur Land Trust, Monterey, CA**

**RWVG Attendees:**

Horacio Amezcuita – San Jerardo Cooperative, Inc.  
Ross Clark – Central Coast Wetlands Group  
Monique Fountain – Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve  
Brian Frus – City of Salinas  
Brenda Granillo – California Water Service  
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  
Karen McBride – Rural Community Assistance Corporation  
Christina McGinnis – Monterey County Agricultural Commissioner’s Office  
Moises Moreno-Rivera – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW)  
Heidi Niggemeyer – City of Salinas  
John Olson – California State University Monterey Bay  
Karen Riley-Olms – Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
Rachel Saunders – Big Sur Land Trust  
Sarah Stevens – Monterey One Water

**Non-RWVG Attendees:**

Jeff Condit – Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Program  
John Hunt – UC Davis  
Matthew Keeling – Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Karen Nilsen – Nilsen and Associates  
Gary Petersen – Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA)  
Susan Robinson – Greater Monterey County IRWM Program Director

**Meeting Minutes**

**1. Brief Introductions.**

**2. Plan to Address Drinking Water and Wastewater Needs of Disadvantaged Communities:** Susan Robinson asked if anyone had any final comments or questions about the plan, prior to voting on whether or not to approve it. Bridget Hoover asked whether the plan changed the IRWM Plan or was just incorporated, and Susan replied the latter. Bridget motioned to approve the plan; Elizabeth Krafft seconded. All voted in favor; none opposed and none abstained. Susan thanked the Project Team and the TAC once again for their work on the plan. The final plan is available for download on the IRWM website: <http://www.greatermontereyirwmp.org/documents/disadvantaged-community-plan-for-drinking-water-and-wastewater/>

**3. Central Coast Regional Board Private Well Testing Program:** Matthew Keeling provided an overview of the Regional Board’s private well water quality testing program. The well sampling program focuses on private and local/state small water systems, and is a free and voluntary program. The Regional Board is targeting individuals through direct mailings to about 60,000 residents based on zip code areas outside of public water system boundaries. The program will be launched before the end of the year, and will run through at least the end of 2019. The funding will enable sampling for about 1,000 wells. John Hunt asked where the data will be stored, and Matt replied in GeoTracker. The owner names and

addresses will be protected, but the well locations and water quality information will be open to the public.

Bridget asked what the intent of the program is, and Matt responded that the priorities are: 1) to provide information to well owners about the safety of their drinking water, along with information on how to interpret results, how to address contamination, and other supporting services; 2) to improve the Regional Board's understanding of water quality with respect to beneficial uses in the region (they have a good handle on public water systems but not on small water systems). Heidi asked what the Regional Board's plan will be when contamination is found. Matt responded, primarily to tell residents to stop drinking the water, and then provide them with information regarding bottled water, and point-of-use (POU) or point-of-entry (POE) devices, or other alternatives.

Gary Petersen commented that this data will be critical for filling in information gaps related to groundwater quality. He noted that the GSA is concerned with groundwater quality as much as quantity. Karen McBride added that the data may indicate which residences might benefit by extension of service or consolidation with a larger utility. Matt said that was part of the Regional Board's long-term vision.

**4. RWMG Executive Committee:** Susan noted that Gary Petersen had left the City of Salinas to become the General Manager of the Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), and congratulated him on his new position. Susan asked whether the City of Salinas had decided who would be the City's representative for the RWMG, and the response was "not yet." Gary had represented the "Agency" seat on the Executive Committee and was also the Chair; therefore, she said the RWMG needed to determine a new representative for the "Agency" seat as well as a new Chair. Noting that the Executive Committee was not active (i.e., had met only twice in the 18 months since it was initiated), Susan asked whether it was worthwhile *having* an Executive Committee. This started a long discussion.

Bridget said she thought the Executive Committee served an important purpose, noting the need to ensure "accountability" for the RWMG (she used the upcoming Disadvantaged Community Involvement grant as an example). Gary added that it was important to have a small group of people who could think strategically for the RWMG and act quickly, if needed. Heather Lukacs mentioned the subcommittee that had been formed to determine the budget/work plan for the Disadvantaged Community Involvement grant, and said she thought accountability could be ensured either by a subcommittee or by the Executive Committee. Elizabeth Krafft noted that prior to formation of the Executive Committee, the RWMG had governed with subcommittees on an as-needed basis, and that had always worked well. Christina McGinnis offered that an Executive Committee would be helpful in an "emergency" situation.

Monique Fountain questioned the effectiveness of an Executive Committee if it had only met twice in 18 months. She noted that in the many years the RWMG has been meeting, subcommittees have been formed whenever a need has arisen, and those who agreed to participate did so because of an interest in that topic; she added that subcommittees allow for diversity. Bridget agreed that perhaps the RWMG *should* dissolve the Executive Committee if there is little interest in meeting regularly. Christina suggested that perhaps the RWMG use the Executive Committee just as a sort of "emergency group" that is available if a quick decision is needed. It was finally decided that the RWMG would keep the Executive Committee for now, and that the Executive Committee would meet quarterly or as needed.

Susan asked who would like to represent "Agency" for the Executive Committee. No one who was eligible and present (Bridget, Christina, and Tom Harty) expressed interest. Sarah Stevens for Monterey One Water said that Mike McCullough (not present) might want to sit on the "Agency" seat; and Christina agreed to take the seat if Mike was not willing. (Mike will let Susan know.) Someone asked about the requirements for Executive Committee members, and Susan responded that according to the bylaws, Executive Committee members were required to attend all RWMG meetings, but if they needed to miss a meeting they could send a proxy to no more than 25% of RWMG meetings. The idea was that Executive Committee members needed to be "engaged" with the RWMG. She noted that Colin Bailey (EJCW), who was currently the representative for the "Disadvantaged Community" group, had attended

very few RWMG meetings since he assumed that seat a year and a half prior, and therefore according to the bylaws was actually no longer eligible. She asked perhaps the RWMG should also be naming someone for the “Disadvantaged Community” seat. Karen McBride volunteered. Susan said she hadn’t discussed this with Colin prior to the meeting and agreed to contact him asap.

Susan asked if any of the current Executive Committee members would be willing to act as Chair. No one immediately volunteered. Susan suggested Elizabeth and she agreed. The RWMG decided to revisit the discussion about the Executive Committee again at next month’s meeting.

**5. Nexus between Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and IRWM:** Gary Petersen led a discussion on creating a stronger nexus and ongoing communication between the RWMG and the Salinas Valley GSA. He began by pointing out that the Department of Water Resources manages both programs, and had recently presented a panel on the relationship between the two programs at the California Water Plan Update Plenary. Gary provided background on the Salinas Valley Basin GSA. He noted that a lot of grant money would be coming in support of SGMA. He asked, what kind of project looks at *balance* in a basin? What is the role that watersheds play in recharging basins?

In discussing the crossover between the GSA and RWMG, Gary noted that both groups are “broadly represented” and named several entities that serve on both. On the 11-board GSA, these “crossover” entities include City of Salinas, City of Soledad (representing the South County cities), Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Monterey One Water, Cal Water, representation for disadvantaged communities (by EJCW, and Castroville CSD), and representation for ag. The GSA also has a 25-member stakeholder advisory group.

Bridget brought up the Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) that is currently being developed for the Greater Monterey County IRWM region (as a potential source of information for the GSA). Rachel Saunders suggested perhaps having some sort of quarterly or semi-annual meeting between the two groups to ensure good communication. Sarah Hardgrave asked Gary whether the GSA might want to see a presentation on the SWRP and he responded, absolutely; he said the board has a standing educational item at every meeting, and anyone is welcome to present.

Gary emphasized that there is law associated with SGMA, and the GSA can set fees. Therefore, there is need more than ever before for agencies/entities to really understand the water system. Someone asked how the GSA is getting ag to come to the table, and Gary said they are already at the table, with four seats on the 11-seat board.

There was some discussion about monitoring. Gary said the GSA will be looking into the effectiveness of the current monitoring network, including the location of wells.

Susan asked the group for suggestions on how to create ongoing communication between the RWMG and GSA. She wondered if the RWMG should have “ambassadors” amongst the overlap entities, one or two people to report on any relevant goings-on within either group. Gary said that the GSA currently meets every other month, and anyone is welcome to attend. Bridget suggested figuring out some sort of set schedule for attending GSA meetings. It was decided that Gary and Heather would come up with a plan for ongoing communication between the RWMG and GSA. Also, RWMG members can present information to the GSA (including the Disadvantaged Community Plan and the SWRP).

**6. Other Business:** Jeff Condit provided an update on the Monterey Peninsula SWRP. He reported that they had recently held a very successful stakeholder meeting and had received 80 project proposals for their project list. He is currently working on incorporating the Monterey Peninsula IRWM Plan into the SWRP, and is seeking to re-engage that RWMG (which hasn’t met in three years).

*The next RWMG meeting will be held on December 20, 2017, 1:30PM – 3:30PM, location TBD.*