Greater Monterey County Integrated Regional Water Management Program Regional Water Management Group Meeting and Storm Water Resource Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3

September 19, 2018 Location: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, Moss Landing, CA

RWMG Entity Attendees:

Horacio Amezquita - San Jerardo Cooperative, Inc. Patrick Breen - Marina Coast Water District Ross Clark – Central Coast Wetlands Group Lisa Emanuelson - Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Charlie Endris - Central Coast Wetlands Group Brian Frus – City of Salinas Sarah Hardgrave – Big Sur Land Trust Tom Harty – Monterey County Resource Management Agency Bridget Hoover – Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Karen McBride – Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC) Mike McCullough – Monterey One Water Victoria Nava-McClellan – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) May Nguyen – Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) Heidi Niggemeyer - City of Salinas Kimberly Null - Central Coast Wetlands Group Kevin O'Connor - Central Coast Wetlands Group Paul Robins - Resource Conservation District (RCD) of Monterey County

Non-RWMG Attendees:

Mike Godwin – Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board John Hunt – UC Davis Robin Lee – Citizen Heather Lukacs – Community Water Center Kelli McCune – Sustainable Conservation Susan Robinson – Greater Monterey County IRWM Program Director Cory Saltsman – Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Meeting Minutes

1. Brief Introductions. Brief introductions in the room and on the phone. May Nguyen introduced herself as the new Central Coast Program Director for EJCW. (Welcome, May!)

2. Vote to Approve Updated IRWM Plan. Susan Robinson noted that the RWMG has been working since February 2017 to update the IRWM Plan in order to be compliant with 2016 IRWM Guidelines. The RWMG had opportunity to review each chapter as it was revised, and to review all of the revised chapters again during the 30-day public comment period held in July. DWR also reviewed the updated IRWM Plan and approved it as being consistent with the 2016 IRWM Guidelines. Susan asked if anyone had comments, or wished to discuss anything prior to the vote on approving the updated Plan.

May Nguyen requested that the RWMG consider expanding engagement with Native American Tribes through the Disadvantaged Community Involvement program, and to include consideration of homeless populations. Sarah Hardgrave announced that the Monterey Peninsula IRWM region would be reaching out to Tribes, and offered to hold a combined meeting between the two IRWM regions with indigenous groups (Susan thought it was a great idea). Karen McBride noted that RCAC works extensively with Native American Tribes and would be able to provide outreach and other resources. Robin Lee suggested that the language be revised in the Stakeholder chapter to be more empowering to disadvantaged communities, rather than talk down to them. Susan asked Robin if she would be willing to send her those revisions in a Word version of the chapter, and Robin agreed to do so.

Ross Clark motioned to approve the updated IRWM Plan. Paul Robins seconded. All voted in favor, none opposed, and none abstained. (Note also that John Olson, California State University Monterey Bay, had submitted an electronic vote in favor of approving the updated IRWM Plan prior to the meeting.) The updated IRWM Plan is hereby approved by vote of the RWMG. Susan thanked Cory Saltsman (DWR) for his support during the update process.

3. Update on IRWMP Project Solicitation Process. Susan said she had been expecting DWR to release the draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Round 1 of the Prop 1 IRWM Implementation Grant in early September; she was planning on giving the RWMG an update on the process. However, the draft PSP has not yet been released. Once the draft PSP is released (any day now), Susan will develop a project solicitation form based on the PSP criteria, and will initiate a project solicitation for inclusion of projects into the IRWM Plan. She will announce the project solicitation to the RWMG and all stakeholders when it occurs.

4. Greater Monterey County Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) – Review Prioritized Project List: This meeting represented the third Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting for the Greater Monterey County SWRP planning process. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain input from the TAC/RWMG on the project prioritization process and project ranking for the SWRP. John Hunt, Project Manager for the SWRP, noted that, with the feedback obtained from this meeting, the project team would then begin writing the plan. The project team anticipates providing the TAC/RWMG with the draft SWRP for review in January.

John began with an overview of the project prioritization process. He noted that the process is based on the State Water Resources Control Board's SWRP Guidelines and closely follows the prioritization process established in the Greater Salinas Area SWRP. The Guidelines require projects to provide at least two or more "main benefits" (under the general categories of water quality, water supply, flood management, environmental, and community) plus as many additional benefits as feasible. The Guidelines require that SWRPs prioritize projects that:

- provide metrics for quantifying benefits
- o are supported by permanent, local, or regional funding
- o provide detailed geospatial analysis of multiple benefits
- are located on lands in public ownership
- augment local water supplies
- enhance watershed processes
- restore habitat, open space, parks, and recreation

A GIS opportunities analysis and hydrologic modeling effort was conducted as part of the SWRP planning process, and a number of projects were developed based on these tools. John provided an overview of the tools. The GIS opportunities analysis focused on the Lower Salinas and Gabilan watersheds. John presented some of the GIS layers, including historic freshwater streams and lakes (depression areas), hydrologic soil groups, groundwater recharge areas, riparian corridors adjacent to agricultural and conservation lands, disadvantaged communities, parkland, and bike routes. He then showed a map demonstrating opportunity areas identified from the analysis (for example, areas where some grading or restoration could do a lot to capture and treat storm water).

John then briefly described the hydrologic modeling. The model divides the region into subwatersheds, with each subwatershed a box model. John discussed calibration of the model, pointing out that the predicted flow from the model matches up with actual data from USGS gages extremely well on an annual basis, and fairly well on a daily basis. Using one project as a demonstration, he illustrated a 100-year flood event in Tembladero Slough with and without the project. He also showed tables that demonstrated how various concept projects might help reduce peak flow and flooded acreage downstream of the project areas under different storm event scenarios. He emphasized that the project team is using the modeling to show how projects included in the

SWRP support goals of the SWRP, and importantly, how the existing projects fall short in supporting those goals. The opportunities analysis is then used as a tool to address those gaps.

Paul Robins emphasized the need to be sensitive as to how the information is presented, especially if concept proposal polygons include areas of private property prior to discussions with landowners. Ross noted that the SWRP is a *plan*, and concept proposals show where possibilities exist; nothing can happen without at least knowing where the potential for opportunities lies. He emphasized that any projects resulting from the plan would need to be designed in cooperation with landowners, in a way that would meet everyone's needs. Ross added that the GIS layers used as part of the opportunities analysis were sourced from public documents, such as historical floodplain maps and FEMA flood zones.

John then provided an overview and brief description of each project included in the SWRP. There are 18 projects, ranging from concept projects with initial rough estimates of quantitative benefits to implementation projects in various stages of engineering design. There are nine concept proposals and nine design proposals, the distinction being that design proposals included sufficient quantitative information to evaluate metrics for at least most of the five major benefits. A number of the projects were developed based on the opportunities analysis described previously.

John noted that the list of projects <u>does not</u> include the projects in the Greater Salinas Area plan; those projects were not carried over to the Greater Monterey County SWRP because they are already included in a SWRP and are therefore already eligible for storm water grant funds. The Greater Salinas Area plan and the projects included in it will be included as an appendix in the Greater Monterey County SWRP. The projects included in the main text of the Greater Monterey County SWRP are all new projects.

John described how the projects were prioritized. Concept proposals were prioritized using two categories:

- Category 1: Based on project funding and land availability (each "yes" receiving 40 points, for a potential maximum total of 80 points)
- Category 2: Based on number of main and additional benefits claimed (each main benefit receiving 4 points, and each secondary benefit receiving 2 points, for a potential maximum total of 50 points)

A third category was used in addition to Categories 1 and 2 to evaluate design proposals:

• Category 3: Based on quantitative benefit metrics analysis (taking into consideration the magnitude of benefits)

The score for Category 3 is derived from a project's benefits, quantitatively described (e.g., volume of storm water captured) according to four general categories (percent pollutant reduction, acre-fee/year of storm water captured, acres of wetland habitat created or restored, and acres of open space created), relative to the other projects in the plan.

John presented tables showing the results of the prioritization process for both concept proposals and design proposals. He pointed out that if a concept project has funding and is located on public land (Category 1 criteria), it scores the highest. There was some discussion about the relative weighting of points between the categories. Susan thought that Category 1 (based on funding and public land) was weighted too strongly relative to Categories 2 and 3 (based on number and magnitude of benefits), particularly since the Guidelines do not suggest that one category should be weighted more heavily than another, and the benefits categories seem most important. John said he would send a summary of the project prioritization process, plus the slides from the meeting, to the TAC/RWMG. He asked them to send him comments over the next couple of weeks.

Heidi asked whether it would be possible to feed projects into the SWRP on an ongoing basis, once the SWRP is finalized and approved. John responded that the SWRP needs to be approved in advance of the next round of Prop 1 Storm Water funding; and once approved, this plan will be "done." Ross suggested that perhaps project solicitations for the SWRP could be held in conjunction with project solicitations for the IRWM Plan. But the question was raised, who would be responsible for reviewing/prioritizing projects, and who would ultimately be responsible for the SWRP itself? Susan pointed out that the future of IRWM itself is unknown.

Ross took over the presentation to provide more detail on the storm water opportunity assessment. He first reviewed the five storm water goals of the SWRP:

- Water Quality Goal: Improve water quality so that waters in the planning area are suitable for human and environmental uses.
- Water Supply Goal: Manage storm water to increase water supply for urban, agricultural and environmental uses.
- Flood Management Goal: Manage storm water systems to reduce surface water peak flows and flood risk.
- Environmental Goal: Protect, preserve, restore, and/or enhance watershed features and processes through storm water management.
- **Community Goal:** Enhance economic prosperity and quality of life through improved urban spaces, availability of clean water, and related job creation and training.

Ross demonstrated how the different GIS layers (maps) could be used to identify opportunities for supporting each of those goals. He showed maps illustrating the location of the submitted design projects and concept proposals in relation to riparian corridors, floodplains and flood ponds. He then described how the modeling has been used to estimate cumulative storm water benefits in terms of each of the five SWRP goals. Ross summarized the model outcomes for storm water evaluation as follows:

- Water Quality Goal: The model analysis compared nutrient loading with project-specific water quality benefits. The model outcome showed that a number of identified projects, if implemented together, would have more than enough capacity to restore nitrate concentrations to below water quality standards in the planning area's impaired water bodies.
- Water Supply Goal: The model analysis identified potential wet weather water capture and reuse. The model outcome predicted 2,000 acre feet of potential capture (infiltration or reuse) within various subbasins.
- **Flood Management Goal:** The model analysis compiled individual flood reduction potential of each project to estimate overall downstream flood reduction potential. The model results included a map and estimated flood reduction potential of various size projects throughout the watershed.
- Environmental Goal: The model analysis assessed current condition and loss of aquatic habitat for each subbasin. The model results included maps showing cumulative habitat enhancement potential of projects on the watershed condition.
- **Community Goal:** The model analysis identified areas with limited public parkland and mobility limitations. The model results included a map of areas with need of additional parkland and identification of recreational opportunities that coincide with storm water projects.

John said that the applicants will get a chance over the next few weeks to review their applications and the ranking, and to submit comments to the SWRP team.

5. Other Business. May announced that EJCW is seeking to hire a part-time water engineer, and will be sending out that announcement soon.

The next RWMG meeting will be held on October 17, 2018, 1:30PM – 3:30PM, location TBD.