



# Meeting Minutes

---

## East Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

**Subject:** Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

**Prepared By:** Jack Doo/Cardoza Associates

**Date/Time:** December 1, 2011 / 6:00 p.m.

**Location:** Ceres Community Center

2701 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Ceres

**Attendees:** Ron Jeske/Modesto Citizen; Paul Boyer/Self-Help Enterprises; Felipe Casas/Self-Help Enterprises; Jim Alves/City of Modesto; Daniel Padilla/Central Valley Engineering; Michael Brinton/City of Ceres; Garner R. Reynolds, City of Newman; Mike Willett, City of Patterson; Leslie Dumas, RMC

**Project Number:** 0080-009

---

## 1. Purpose of Meeting

Prepare Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan for East Stanislaus IRWM Region.

## 2. Discussion Summary

The group discussed items as outlined in the agenda and summarized in the following sections.

### 2.1 Previous Action Items and Meeting Minutes

- The PAC adopted the meeting minutes from the October 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### 2.2 Regional Goals & Objectives

- Leslie went over the proposed regional goals and objectives. She showed the group the various goals and objectives that the Steering Committee (SC) had streamlined and combined and where the SC eliminated redundant items. Members of the PAC added a few additional changes. Leslie will send out a finalized version to PAC members.

### 2.3 Project Solicitation Process

- The next main step in the IRWM planning process is to solicit projects for inclusion in the IRWMP. Leslie said anyone in the region can submit a project. The projects can be submitted via hardcopy or online at the ESRWMP website once iProject is up and running.
- Ron Jeske noted the application must be changed due to the new objectives. Leslie agreed and said that it will be updated to reflect the final goals and objectives are previously discussed.
- Leslie then led a review and discussion of the draft application form. She focused on two boxes, which one must be checked: Concept Project and Ready to Proceed Project. She said only Ready to Proceed Projects would be considered, but Concept Projects would continue to be worked and might be ready by the next round of funding. Other information requested on the form included Project Details, Funding Information, Project Schedule and Local Planning Documentation.
- Daniel Padilla suggested defining what is “ready-to-proceed” to the application. Leslie agreed that this was a good idea and said she would add it to the application and send it to the PAC to review.

- Part of the application, which includes project details, was discussed as was DWR's statewide priorities. It's a positive to have a project that benefits our region and also meets a state priority.
- Ron Jeske suggested our database also should have a section for updating a project. This would allow interested parties to see a concept project is moving forward. Leslie liked the idea.
- Daniel Padilla suggested a third box be added to better rank a project that is between concept and ready-to-proceed. He said preliminary design completed could be the middle box.
- The group then discussed general criteria for each level of planning. Projects that would be 'conceptual' would have 10% or less design completed and have no environmental documentation completed. Those considered 'preliminary design' would be between 10% and 60% design completed and would have environmental documentation in the work; while those considered 'ready-to-proceed' would be 60% or more design completed and environmental documentation would be completed or close to completion.
- Felipe Casas suggested that we may want to consider separating design from environmental documentation and have one set of check boxes for the level of design completed (as discussed above) and a separate set of check boxes for the status of environmental documentation.

## 2.4 Project Prioritization

- The PAC then discussed how to rank the projects received. Leslie showed a draft/strawman prioritization process that would consist of a Tier 1 evaluation (preliminary screening for inclusion in the IRWMP) and a Tier 2 evaluation (a ranking of the ready-to-proceed projects). Project that are conceptual or in preliminary design would be summarized but not prioritized.
- Group discussed evaluation criteria
- Leslie handed out an evaluation criteria submitted by Ron Jeske. Ron that a City of Modesto group he participates with uses the methodology outlined in the handout.
- Possible criteria for evaluating the projects: Regional Goals & Objectives, Statewide priorities/RMC; and others. Other criteria could include: benefits to DAC, benefits to neighboring regions, schedule, benefits to the local community, such as recreation; provides non-water related benefits.
- The PAC decided on a weighted evaluation method were each objective is scored between -5 and +5, and then the score is multiplied by the associated weight assigned to that objective. The weighted scores are then summed to provide an overall score for the project.
- In developing the weights, the group decided to break the overall weights down by 50 percent for Regional goals, 30 percent for statewide priorities, and 20 percent for other benefits.
- The group then discussed several scenarios, breaking down the three sections into subsections and giving each subsection a percentage value. For Regional Goals, subsections or objectives were water supply, water priorities, water quality, environmental stewardship, regional communications, and economics and social responsibilities. For Statewide Priorities, subsections or priorities were address long-term drought preparedness, use and reuse water efficiency, address key climate change issue, expand environmental stewardship, practice integrated flood management, protect surface and groundwater quality, improve tribal water and natural resources, and benefits to DAC. For Other Benefits, the subsections or benefits were directly benefit Native-American community, inter-regional projects, schedule/readiness-to-proceed, and provide non-water-related benefits.
- The final weightings as proposed by the PAC are as follows:
  - For Regional Goals, 10% for each the water supply, flood protection and water quality goal; 7% for each environmental and regional communication/cooperation goals; and 6% for the economic and social responsibility goal.

- For Statewide Priorities, 5% each for drought preparedness and use/reuse water more efficiently; 4% each for practice integrated flood management and protect surface and groundwater quality, and 3% for all other priorities.
- For Other Strategies, 10% for schedule/readiness to proceed, 6% for direct benefit to DAC and Native American communities, and 2% each for inter-regional project and provide non-water related benefits.
- Leslie will create a hypothetical scoring sheet and send it along with several test projects for the PAC members to score in order to test how well the scoring process would work. Leslie asked if the PAC could do the test coring before the next meeting, which may not be necessary if this work can be completed externally.

### 3. Action Items

The following table summarizes the work completed to date, the work in progress (i.e. action items that must be completed) and work that will be completed in the future.

WORK COMPLETED				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Complete PAC formation and orientation</li> <li>● Approve PAC Roles &amp; Responsibilities</li> <li>● Review and revise Regional Goals and Objectives; accept revised goals and objectives</li> </ul>				
WORK IN PROGRESS				
Item No.	Responsible Party		Due Date	Task/Action Item
	Organization	Name		
1	RMC	Leslie	ASAP	Make up hypothetical scoring sheet and test projects and send to PAC members
2	PAC	All	When received	Complete scoring sheets for test projects and send back to RMC
WORK TO BE COMPLETED				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Complete project solicitation form</li> <li>● Finalize development of project prioritization process</li> </ul>				

### 4. Next Schedule Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be on February 23, 2012 at 6 PM at a location to be announced.