

SC Meeting Notes

East Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Update

Subject: Steering Committee Meeting No. 4

Prepared By: Jennifer Kidson / RMC

Date/Time: August 28, 2017 / 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Location: Conference Call/Skype Meeting

1 (929) 274-8860; Conference ID:

3731472

Project Number: 0080-013

Attendees: Jim Alves (City of Modesto); Fallon Martin (City of Turlock); Jaylen French (City of Hughson); Karen Morgan (City of Waterford); Dhyan Gilton

(Stanislaus County); Leslie Dumas, Lindsey

Wilcox, Jen Kidson (RMC)

1. Purpose of Meeting

Learn about the Stanislaus County SWRP

Review work completed to date and outstanding action items

• Discuss OPTI and the project solicitation process

• Review Climate Change chapter

• Identify next steps and action items

2. Discussion Summary

- Brian van Lienden (RMC) gave an overview of the Stanislaus County Storm Water Resources Plan (SWRP).
 - Stanislaus County received a \$500,000 Proposition 1 Storm Water Grant from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and retained RMC through a competitive process to prepare the Plan.
 - o It is just getting started; there will be some overlaps and coordination with the work that we are doing for the IRWMP Update. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is being formed, similar to the SC, which will likely have some members also involved in the IRWMP Update.
 - Important to note if you submit a stormwater project to OPTI for inclusion in the IRWMP Update, make sure you check the box for it to also be in the SWRP. Later on, after the SWRP is further along, project proponents will be requested to go back in and add in more information for the stormwater projects so they can be thoroughly evaluated through the SWRP prioritization process.
- Jim and 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. An RFP will be released soon (possibly today) to retain a consultant to prepare the grant proposal. SLDMWA is requesting proposals back by Friday September 15th. The goal is to have a consultant selected by the end of September. 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

August 28, 2017 Page 1 of 3

within 6 months to help determine planning efforts and open lines of communications with DACs.

- Work Completed to Date and Outstanding Action Items
 - Lindsey reviewed work completed to date on IRWMP tasks. She noted that the Stakeholder Outreach Plan information could go on the IRWM Website. RMC is considering the following documents final: SC/PAC Roles & Responsibilities, Outreach Plan, and DAC/EDA/NA Memo.
 - o Current outstanding action items: asking for SC and PAC feedback on Climate Change chapter, Vulnerability Assessment Checklist, and GHG evaluation sheet.
- Update on OPTI and project solicitation process
 - Lindsey summarized how solicitation was announced (public meeting, website, emails). Hughson and Tuolumne River Trust have begun adding and updating projects, among others.
 - o Project solicitation began on 8/7 and will end on 9/15.
 - o The SC had no further questions on OPTI or project solicitation.
- Review weighting factors for project prioritization
 - The group reviewed the weighting factors handout which summarized the weighting factors agreed upon by the SC during Meeting No. 3 and the proposed weighting factors from two PAC members provided after the last SC/PAC meetings. The SC discussed the need for consideration of the PAC-suggested weights and importance of their feedback.
 - The proposed weights were discussed by category. The SC agreed that the weights in the Regional Objectives category shouldn't be modified since the SC has already taken into account multiple people's/sector's opinions and those that are most closely involved with water.
 - Weights in Feasibility do not require changes since PAC-proposed weights are the same as the SC-proposed weights.
 - The SC agreed to keep the Other Strategies weights the same since they do not think inter-regional project (i.e. projects within two more more IRWM regions) should receive a higher weight than the other criteria.
 - o The SC agreed that some of the weightings factors in the Statewide Priorities category could be revised. RMC will prepare a summary of revised proposed weights based on each of the 3 proposed weights and distribute for SC approval. The state-directed statewide priorities (i.e. Increase Operational and Regulatory Efficiency and Identify Sustainable and Integrated Financing Opportunities) should stay at 0%. Lindsey will address this revision process with the PAC in the following meeting. This process and reasoning will be documented in the climate change chapter.
- Climate change chapter overview
 - Lindsey reviewed the Powerpoint presentation, including new guidelines, climate change impacts on the region, and vulnerability assessment.
 - The SC was asked if they want to prioritize vulnerabilities any differently for this update. Jim suggested that ecosystems and habitat have other sources of support at the state level, but maybe water demand should be considered to be as important as water supply (in order to bump up conservation in the future). All SC members support the change. Water demand would be listed as priority #2, and flood management would be bumped down to #3.

August 28, 2017 Page 2 of 3

- o The presentation reviewed new requirements including detail on the feasibility of addressing priority vulnerabilities, and reflecting the 20-year planning horizon in the GHG worksheet.
- o Lindsey explained the vulnerability assessment checklist and its use in the 2013 IRWMP. This round, we are doing a more formal summary of the evaluation so DWR can see that the checklist was used and minimum requirements were addressed. Jim expressed concern about things that the Region may not currently view as a threat (for example, sea level rise and the Delta). Some consequence is likely to be forced upon the Region since the Delta is downstream of their Region. Lindsey noted how the Plan currently addresses that.
- Reviewed next steps including the SC providing comments on the Climate Change chapter, Vulnerability Assessment checklist, and GHG worksheet.

3. Action Items

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

Item No.	Responsible Party		Due	Task/Action Item
	Organization	Name	Date	i asivaction item
1	RMC	Jen and Lindsey	8/29	Provide the SC revised proposed weights based on each of the proposed weights in the Project Prioritization Factor Weights
2	SC	All	9/8	Provide comments on Climate Change chapter and associated materials (GHG sheet, vulnerability assessment)
3	RMC	Jen/Lindsey	8/28	Meeting notes from call
	RMC	Lindsey	9/15	Set up September meeting

4. Next Schedule Meeting

RMC will coordinate with the SC and PAC to schedule the next meetings in September. These will be face-to-face and focus on project integration and prioritization.

August 28, 2017 Page 3 of 3