



# Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

## MEETING SUMMARY

Regional Participants Committee (RPC) Meeting No. 8  
 May 22, 2012; 1:00 pm to 3:45 pm  
 Amador Water Agency Board Room, Sutter Creek, California

### Attendance and Introductions

RPC Members (Alternates)	Present	Absent	Affiliation
Pete Bell (Katherine Evatt)	X	X	Foothill Conservancy
Mike Daly		X	City of Jackson
Tom Francis	X		East Bay Municipal Utility District
Jeff Gardner		X	City of Plymouth
Tom Infusino	X		Calaveras Planning Coalition
Donna Leatherman		X	Calaveras Public Utility District
Gene Mancebo (Art Toy)	X	X	Amador Water Agency
Teresa McClung (Rick Hopson)		X X	US Forest Service
Ted Novelli		X	Amador County Board of Supervisors
Jeff Meyer	X		Calaveras County Water District
Rod Schuler	X		Retired Amador County PW Director
Gary Slade	X		Trout Unlimited, Sac-Sierra chapter
Hank Willy	X		Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Observers	Present	Absent	Affiliation
Jason Preece		X	Department of Water Resources
Bob Dean	X		Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority, Calaveras County Water District
Don Stump	X		Calaveras County Water District
Project Team	Present	Absent	Affiliation
Rob Alcott		X	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA)
Karen Johnson	X		Water Resources Planning
Alyson Watson	X		RMC Water and Environment
Lindsey Clark	X		RMC Water and Environment



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

### Purpose of RPC Meeting #8

The eighth meeting of the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (MAC IRWMP) Regional Participants Committee (RPC) was initiated by Karen Johnson at 1:00pm at the Amador Water Agency Board Room, in Sutter Creek, California, on Tuesday, May 22, 2012.

Johnson began walking through a PowerPoint presentation outlining the purpose and agenda for RPC Meeting #8. The two primary purposes of the meeting were to confirm the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures agreed upon at the previous meeting, and to discuss and finalize evaluation criteria and the evaluation and prioritization process.

The group approved the RPC Meeting #7 minutes.

### Confirm Final Policies, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The finalized policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures were discussed. A summary of the discussion is as follows.

- For Policy 4: Focus on areas of common ground and avoid prolonged conflict, information is needed from the project proponents. For each project proponent, we need to understand how these projects comply with the goal: "Prioritize projects that have the best likelihood of being completed in the planning horizon". The planning horizon is 20 years. The question is: does your agency prioritize the project to the point where it is likely to be implemented in the 20-year planning horizon.
  - For example, if there is a project to use ephemeral streams for water conveyance, there could be some environmental issues, but they could be overcome. Evaluation and scoring should evolve and reflect current conditions over time.
  - Projects should provide a process for outreach and input.
- A goal under Policy 3 was once "Minimize adverse effects on biological and cultural resources." It was separated into two goals based on RPC input at Meeting No. 6. The goals now include "Maintain or improve watershed ecosystem health and function" and "Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources." The score each project received for the combined former goal was used for each of the separated goals, as indicated in the revised project summary spreadsheet. Under this self scoring process, if there is a change to these rankings the project proponents are to notify RMC.
- Information should be emailed to Alyson Watson at [awatson@rmcwater.com](mailto:awatson@rmcwater.com).
- The performance measure for Policy 3, the first goal, second objective: "Promote water resource projects that achieve an equitable balance between conflicting interests while minimizing harm to natural resources and incorporating natural



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

resource protection, mitigation, and restoration” was revised based on RPC input. It now reads: “Percent and ratio of fully mitigated impacts by project as compared to all impacts”.

With these changes, the policies, goals, objectives, and performance measures were finalized.

### Project Evaluation Criteria

Johnson went over the Proposed Evaluation Criteria Modifications – March 8, 2012 handout and the list of Evaluation Criteria, RPC Meeting #6-March 21, 2012. Interest was expressed by the RPC to categorize projects by type of project. Categories were then based on the general policy topics and in turn reflected in the project summary spreadsheet, an update of which was provided in the mailing for this meeting with extra copies provided at the meeting.

An overview was provided of the three approaches to the Economic Feasibility criterion discussed previously. A new, fourth approach was recommended which is similar to the third approach, but would have static cutoffs for the low, medium, and high criteria as opposed to comparing projects against one another. The proposed evaluation approach tiers are as follows.

- High: Project cost is <\$2 M = score of 1
- Medium: \$2M - \$20 M = score of 2
- Low: >\$20 M = score of 3

The cost score (e.g., 1, 2, or 3) is then divided by the benefit score (based on number of goals addressed, and the resultant ratio was used as the basis for the Economic Feasibility score, based on the following cutoffs.

- High: 2.5+
- Medium: 1.5 – 2.5
- Low: 0 – 1.4

Additional comments included:

- Tom Infusino would appreciate a new table with project title; Resource Management Strategies (RMS), Statewide Priorities (SPs), and MAC goals; capital costs; and priority result. This summary table will aid in the review of projects to ensure that they are meeting all RMS, SPs, and goals.
- The group discussed the time limit of having project information submitted by May 23. The consulting team agreed to extend the deadline for revising projects to May 30. This will be noted on the website.



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- EBMUD is reviewing the disadvantaged communities (DAC) definition for the region to ensure that the list is complete. RMC will send the RPC members a link to DWR's GIS DAC coverage for reference.
- Implementation Risk criterion
  - If anyone is going to submit information on why a project has implementation risk, they will need to coordinate with the project proponent prior to the score being adjusted.
  - The June RPC meeting will provide an opportunity for the group to discuss any projects that have low / medium scoring based on disagreements between project opponents and proponents.
- Reasonable end-user cost criterion suggested by Pete Bell was discussed.
  - The group reviewed the proposed criterion. The consultants discussed the difficulties in assessing costs to end users for projects, as well as determining whether the customers will consider the costs reasonable. This criterion includes multiple dimensions of cost avoidance, rate affordability, fines and health impacts, and the cost of doing nothing.
  - The group agreed that the criterion is a good concept, but is probably not feasible to do in this process at this time due to budget and staff constraints. It will be noted in the section of the MAC Plan Update as a recommendation for a future criterion during an update.
  - This criterion and the following criterion regarding best project for intended purpose may not apply if the project is mandated.
- Best project for intended purpose criterion suggested by Pete Bell was discussed.
  - It was discussed that sometimes projects that have the greatest likelihood of being realized are not necessarily the best projects. The best projects may not be cost effective or may have compliance issues, etc.
  - This new criterion would have to be well-defined in order to score projects.
  - The RPC decided to include this criterion as drafted; this will be self-reported by project proponents and is due by May 30 to RMC.
- Amador Water Agency's Camanche South Shore Treatment Plant should be removed from the list because it is the same project as the EBMUD project.

### Project Evaluation and Prioritization Process

Johnson asked whether we should retain the three high scores as the threshold for the overall high score. The RPC agreed.

Johnson asked the RPC if they would like to prioritize the goals. Discussion included:

- All members of the group have agreed to the goals, regardless of priority, which is a success.



## Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority's MAC Plan Update

- Goals of the diverse range of RPC members are very different, thus making it difficult to prioritize which are most important and of limited value.
- The RPC decided that it would not make sense to prioritize the goals because the existing goals are all important for different reasons for each participant and the entity they represent on the RPC.
- Should mandated projects be elevated in importance? RPC members will discuss mandated projects outside of the committee meetings so discussion can be added to the plan document to describe which are mandated projects, etc.

### Impacts and Benefits, and Finance Plan Sections

RMC will email the electronic sections of the impacts and benefits and finance sections to the RPC for review and comment.

### Next Steps and Adjournment

The project team will complete the following items in advance of the next meeting.

- Send Pete Bell hard copies of the project information forms.
- Email Jeff Meyer CCWD's project information forms in MS Word format.
- Revise the Project Summary Spreadsheet to include the new evaluation criterion on best project for the intended purpose and the goal associated with the new Policy 4; remove columns showing Economic Benefit approaches 1 through 3; and delete AWA's South Shore Camanche Regional WTP.
- Create a project summary table that shows the project title; project goals, SPs, and RMSs it meets; capital costs, and final priority score (high, medium, or low).
- Provide information to RPC regarding MAC DAC definitions.
- Note project solicitation extension to May 30<sup>th</sup> on the website.

The RPC is asked to complete the following items in advance of the next meeting.

- Revise project information forms including the following information.
  - Overall accuracy, completeness, and any updates of the projects
  - The ranking for the goals "Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources" and "Maintain or improve watershed ecosystem health and function."
  - Discuss how the project will meet the new evaluation criterion regarding best project for intended use.
  - Does the project meet the goal in the new Policy 4. "Prioritize projects that have the best likelihood of being completed in the planning horizon."

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 27, 2012 at the Amador County Administration Building at 1:00 p.m. in the upstairs conference room. The meeting concluded at approximately 3:45 p.m.