



Meeting Minutes

East Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

Subject: Steering Committee Meeting

Prepared By: Leslie Dumas/RMC

Date/Time: January 26, 2012 / 1:00 p.m.

Location: Modesto City Offices
1010 10th Street

Attendees: Jack Bond, Jim Alves (City of Modesto); Mike Brinton (City of Ceres); Dan Madden, Mike Cooke (City of Turlock); Leslie Dumas, (RMC); Jason Preece (DWR); Chester Anderson (East Stanislaus RCD); Laura Podolsky (Local Government Commission)

Project Number: 0080-009

1. Purpose of Meeting

- Approve project solicitation form
- Review and approve project prioritization process
- Discuss project status
- Discuss planning grant application

2. Discussion Summary

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

2.1 Action Items Review

Several action items remained outstanding. These are as follows:

- Jim was to draft several letters to neighboring regions, including response letters to the Merced and Tuolumne-Stanislaus regions and an introduction letter to all other regions. He has not completed the task, but said it would be completed by February 10th.
- The organization(s) with flood management/control jurisdiction in Stanislaus County still needs to be identified and representatives contacted regarding integration with and projects for the IRWMP.
- Recently, the PAC lost one member but gained another. All organizations are continuing outreach efforts to identify potential additional PAC members.

Action items that were completed included the following:

- All organizations have completed their AB1420 tables; however, it appears that Modesto needs to resubmit their tables. This is still pending.
- A Notice of Intent (NOI) was prepared and published in the *Turlock Journal* and *Modesto Bee*. Documentation/proof needs to be sent to RMC showing the NOI publication.
- The regional goals and objectives have been finalized.
- Information regarding the Integrated Storm Water Resources Plan was prepared and distributed to the SC.
- Jack Bond forwarded information regarding Native American communities in the region. The 3 Rivers Lodge in Manteca was identified as one potential organization to contact regarding potential Native American communities in the region.

- The SC has been preparing a list of projects to be included in the Prop 84 planning grant application. These projects were discussed during two conference calls on January 11th and 18th, and were discussed further during this meeting.

2.2 Steering Committee Business

- Recent efforts have focused on contacting Native American communities. Jack Bond forwarded letter identifying potential organizations; none of whom are within the region. One possible organization to contact about potential communities in the region is the 3 Rivers Lodge in Manteca.
- Jim is still communication with the adjacent regions. He recently spoke with the Tuolumne-Mariposa Region (Pat Garcia) about a cooperation agreement.
- Mike Cooke recently talked with the Stanislaus County farm Bureau and passed the contact on to Jim. The Farm Bureau indicated that they were interested but could not commit to being on the PAC as they are spread pretty thin right now. They will try to make a couple of the meetings. The SC agreed to put them on the contact list for ongoing communications.

2.3 Project Solicitation

- The final project solicitation package was distributed and reviewed. One question raised was, if the project is good but needs help in preparing the solicitation package, how do we help them?
- Steps to managing solicited projects are as follows:
 1. All projects are received and reviewed for completeness.
 2. The conceptual projects are separated from the non-conceptual (detailed) projects.
 3. The non-conceptual (detailed) projects are then evaluated by the SC and PAC subcommittees with respect to integration and/or recommended modifications to improve/increase project benefits.
 4. Recommendations for project revisions go back to the project proponents for incorporation and re-submittal.

It is only the non-conceptual (detailed) projects that are prioritized, although all projects are included in the IRWM Plan.

- The SC requested that the test projects that were prepared using the format be sent to them.
- The group also indicated that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions calculations should be included in the project solicitation process, including GHG reduction made to support the climate change vulnerability analysis.

2.4 Project Prioritization

- Leslie led discussion on the proposed weighting form that was the result of the PAC work.
- The SC is ok with the weighting process, but not so keen on the proposed scoring method and possibly the weight distribution.
- With respects to the scores, the SC felt that it did not allow for sufficient differentiation between projects. They felt that most (if not all) project would be designed to not have any negative impacts, so being able to assign a negative score is not really beneficial. The SC felt that scoring should be done on a basis from 1 to 10.

- The SC also felt that non-water related benefits overlapped with the economic and social responsibility goal and therefore having it as a separate line item was duplicative.
- With respects to greenhouse gas emissions, climate change vulnerability will be a big issue and perhaps it would be good to add a goal for this.
- The SC will return any comments on the scoring sheet and process to RMC by February 17th.

2.5 Project Status

- Are present burn rate has us running out of budget in the next few months. As indicated in the IRWMP scope and budget to be included in the grant application, the whole process has gotten extended as a result of DWR scheduling and a number of additional meetings that have been needed to get to where we currently are. (For example, we had 7 meetings for the RAP but only four were budgeted.)
- One possible approach will be to extend the project solicitation period to be from March to May, by which time we'll know if we're being awarded a planning grant application. Also recommend rescheduling the next PAC meeting to be in March, at which time they can finalize the project prioritization process.
- Jim noted that RMC's contract has a \$21,000 contingency which could be released if needed. A discussion ensued as to whether or not the contingency was included in the cost-sharing agreement.
- A revised project schedule was presented. Key dates that drive the schedule are:
 - Prop 84 planning grant applications are due March 9th.
 - Announcements for draft recommendations of planning grant awards are assumed to be on May 4th.
 - Final awards to be announced mid-2012 per DWR (assumed to be July 13th)
 - Per DWR, the step 1 implementation grant applications are due Fall 2012. Based on recent intel, this will be August 2012. Supposedly, we're supposed to have to have a preliminary list of projects to present to them at that time.
 - Per DWR, the step 2 implementation grant applications are due summer of 2013 (assumed to be April 2013 in our schedule). The IRWM Plan must be adopted by then.
- It was also recommended that RMC revisit the project schedule/budget to determine if more meetings should be planned for given the project's history.
- The SC also wondered if there were places where staff can help move the IRWMP forward, especially over the next few months.
- Jason noted that SC members should be attending the PAC meetings in order to provide continuity. Jim pointed out that several of them do attend the PAC meetings as they are able.

2.6 Planning Grant Application

- Leslie briefly went over the current list of projects. She had added one more – a 'project' to provide funding to the City of Turlock for administration of the planning grant.
- Jack showed that he's working on the groundwater banking FS scope and budget and hopes to have that completed soon.
- There are still a few outstanding projects that need to be resolved.

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"> • Identified region name • Developed regional governance structure • Identified regional boundaries • Began preparing Stakeholder Contact List • Prepared draft MOU and finalized • Reserved the City of Ceres Community Center for the 3/16 public meeting • Prepared draft public meeting presentation • Prepared notice and flyer for public meeting announcement • Prepared draft posters for public meeting • Prepared draft Roles & Responsibilities for Steering Committee and Public Advisory Committee • Prepared draft Outreach Plan • Hold first public meeting on 3/16/2011 • Prepare and submit RAP application on 4/13/2011 • Prepare for and attend RAP interview • City of Ceres, Hughson and Modesto Councils approve execution of MOU • Executed MOU • Prepared IRWM Regional website • Developed PAC/identify members • Developed SC/identify members • Conduct first ESRWGM, SC and PAC meetings • Approve final Outreach Plan • Approved letterhead • SC members have time sheets to document time spend on IRWM work • Notice of intents published in local newspapers • Regional goals and objectives completed. • Prepare timesheet for Cities to use to track time spent on IRWM process. • Complete metering certificates and AB1420 tables for grant application 				
WORK IN PROGRESS				
Item No.	Responsible Party		Due Date	Task/Action Item
	Organization	Name		
1	Modesto	Jim Alves	ASAP	The City needs to complete and resubmit their AB1420 tables
2	Modesto	Jim Alves	2/10	Draft response to Tuolumne-Stanislaus IRWM region letter
3	Modesto	Jim Alves	2/10	Send copy of letter from Merced IRWM region to SC
4	Modesto	Jim Alves	2/10	Draft outreach letter to adjacent IRWM regions. Send to SC for review and comments
7	All	All	2/17	Find out who has county flood control jurisdiction
9	RMC	Leslie Dumas	3/9	Contact 3 Rivers Lodge in Manteca re: Native American communities in region
10	All	All	2/3	Finalize list of projects to be included in the planning grant application
11	RMC	Leslie Dumas	2/3	Send test project write-ups to SC
12	Cities	All	2/17	Send comments on proposed project

				prioritization methodology
13	RMC	Leslie Dumas	2/17	Review and revise IRWMP budget and scope, if necessary, to ensure sufficient number of meetings to completion
14	Modesto	Jack Bond	2/10	Complete scope and budget for groundwater banking feasibility project
15	Turlock	Dan Madden	2/10	Confirm with SC as to if they want a project in the grant application for reimbursement of grant administration
	Cities	All	2/10	Finalize projects for planning grant application
16	Cities	All	Ongoing	Contact and draft possible PAC members
WORK TO BE COMPLETED				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalized Planning Grant projects • Review proposed project prioritization method • Complete Prop 84 Planning Grant Application • Continue outreach to gain PAC members 				

4. Next Schedule Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be on March 22, 2012 at 3 PM at a location to be announced.