



# PAC Meeting Notes

## East Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Update

**Subject:** Public Advisory Committee Meeting No. 4

**Prepared By:** Lindsey Wilcox, Jennifer Kidson / RMC

**Date/Time:** October 23, 2017 / 9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

**Location:** Ceres Community Center

**Attendees:** Walt Ward (Stanislaus County); Kevin Kauffman (Eastside Water District), Patrick Koepele (Tuolumne River Trust); Abigail Solis (Self Help Enterprises); Mike Brinton, Kathleen Falk, Sarah Kuo (Ceres); Jim Alves, Miguel Alvarez (Modesto); Leslie Dumas, Lindsey Wilcox, Jen Kidson (RMC)

**Project Number:** 0080-013

### 1. Purpose of Meeting

- Review work completed to date and outstanding action items
- Discuss project prioritization results
- Identify opportunities for integrating project components
- Identify next steps and action items

### 2. Discussion Summary

- Leslie gave an update on the Stanislaus County Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP) currently under development by the County. The first stakeholder meeting will be 10/23 at the same location as the PAC/SC meetings at 1pm. The SWRP must comply with guidelines developed by the State Water Resources Control Board while the IRWMP must comply with DWR's guidelines. Thus, there are different requirements, and some project information needed may be different (e.g., SWRP must quantitatively prioritize projects while IRWMP is only qualitative).
- Leslie gave an update on the San Joaquin Funding Area DAC Involvement Proposal Process.
  - San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) is coordinating with various IRWM regions within the San Joaquin Funding Area.
  - Ara Azhderian (at SLDMWA) was previously coordinating the effort. Andrew Garcia (at SLDMWA) is now coordinating.
  - The RFP was released and consultants were interviewed.
  - The Funding Area is eligible for a minimum of \$3.1 million for DAC planning efforts (design, engineering, CEQA, studies).
  - In a couple of months, the Funding Area/its consultants will likely be soliciting DAC planning efforts to include in the proposal.
  - SDLMWA is hoping to have the DAC needs assessment complete within 6 months to help determine planning efforts and open lines of communications with DACs.
- Work Completed to Date and Outstanding Action Items
  - Leslie reviewed work completed to date on IRWMP tasks.
  - No outstanding action items at this point.
- Project solicitation

- 51 projects submitted by 12 agencies – 28 of which were conceptual, 23 ready to proceed
- In order to qualify for funding, your project needs to be in an IRWMP. If implementation grant solicitation is next summer, conceptual level projects could be ready for inclusion in a grant application by next summer.
- Project prioritization
  - Project submitted and then we ensured they met the minimum eligibility requirements for inclusion in the IRWMP Update (project is in the Region, it meets at least one Regional objective, at least one RMS, and at least one Statewide Priority).
  - Conceptual projects were not scored (total of 28 projects).
  - Prioritization process applied to the 23 ready-to-proceed projects.
    - Step 1: score against goals, objectives, statewide priorities, and other factors. Based on the boxes the project proponents checked for their projects.
    - Step 2: GHG assessment – required by 2016 GLs
  - Scoring criteria included regional goals & objectives, statewide priorities, other strategies (direct benefit to DACs, readiness to proceed, interregional project, provides non-water related benefits), and feasibility (benefit-cost (B-C) ratio and financing feasibility).
  - How were B-C ratios calculated?
    - At a very high level.
    - Calculated present value based on capital and O&M costs. < \$2M: 1 point; \$2M - \$20M: 2 points; >\$20M: 3 points
    - Benefits calculated based on number of objectives achieved by the project. > 8: 3 points; 4 – 8: 2 points; < 4: 1 point
    - Cost Assumptions slide in the presentation is a summary of the B-C handout provided.
    - DWR previously required performing detailed benefit-cost analyses in Prop 50 grant applications. These cost up to \$250k, so we had to greatly simplify the B-C analyses for the purposes of this project prioritization process.
    - EWD comment: In the IRWMP Update, refer to the B-C ratios as “Relative B-C ratios”.
  - County Q: How will projects from the SWRP be added to the IRWMP? A: All projects added to the SWRP through its project solicitation will be incorporated into the IRWMP by reference as the SWRP will be appended to the IRWMP following adoption. Project proponents for the IRWMP and SWRP will have an opportunity to update existing or add new projects in OPTI.
  - Q: How are projects selected for inclusion in a grant application? A: Sort the existing project list to eliminate projects that would not be eligible for the specific solicitation (e.g. Round 3 of implementation grants were for drought-related projects only). Then, sit around the table and discuss who wants/needs funding, what the total amount of funding is available, and how to craft the most competitive proposal. San Joaquin Funding Area is the most competitive funding area – there are more IRWM regions in this Funding Area than any other.

- Scores were based on what project proponents entered into OPTI. As a third-party reviewer, we did not modify any regional objectives, Statewide Priorities, or RMS that were checked. We assumed the proponent knows the project the best and were honest in completing the form in OPTI.
- Results – handouts were provided to summarize the scores. Secondary project ranking (i.e. based on GHG assessment) was deemed benefit, mitigation or neutral based on completion of the GHG worksheet previously reviewed and approved by the SC/PAC.
- PAC to review rankings and see if they have any questions or concerns.
- EWD comment: it would be great to get feedback on what RMC thinks proponents should revisit when they have the opportunity to update projects in OPTI. Reply: try to maximize benefits and describe benefits (e.g., project benefits DACs).
- Next steps
  - RMC to draft Chapters 6, 7, and 8 and send to PAC for review.
  - PAC to review these chapters prior to our November meeting.

### 3. Action Items

The following table summarizes the action items that must be completed by the due dates shown.

Item No.	Responsible Party		Due Date	Task/Action Item
	Organization	Name		
1	RMC	Jen	10/24	Send meeting handouts to attendees in electronic format.
2	RMC	Jen	11/6	Edit discussion of B-C ratios in IRWMP update (relative B-C ratios).
3	PAC	All	11/1	Review rankings and communicate questions/concerns to RMC.
4	RMC	Jen/Lindsey	11/6	Send draft chapters 6, 7, and 8 to PAC.
5	PAC	All	11/20	Review draft chapters 6, 7, and 8.
6	RMC	Lindsey	11/2	Set up November meeting

### 4. Next Scheduled Meeting

RMC will coordinate with the SC and PAC to schedule the next meetings in November. These will be conducted as conference calls to discuss Impacts, Benefits, and Financing; Monitoring Plan to track East Stanislaus IRWMP Update performance; Technical Analysis and Data Management.