

# Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #1 Summary

September 5, 2013

---

## Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County	My Valley Springs
Calaveras County Water District	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County, Public Works
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Stockton, Municipal Utilities	Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Delta Flyfishers	Stockton East Water District
East Bay Municipal Utilities District	
Foothill Conservancy	

---

## Key Decisions

- Meeting start time: 9AM. Coffee, snacks, and mingling from 8.45 to 9AM.
- Meeting location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau with two future meetings held at a venue in the upcountry.
- Meeting dates: Second Friday of every month.
- Remote meeting participation: A phone number with 'listen-only' capabilities will be provided should an organization be unable to attend a meeting in-person.
- Meeting documentation: High level meeting summaries will be prepared and include discussion topics, key points made without attribution, action items, and decisions with key rationale.
- Late participation: There will be a three-month cut-off period (November 2013) after which no additional stakeholder organizations will be admitted into the MCG. Late-comers will not be permitted to revisit decisions made prior to their joining the group.

- Poor attendance: If poor attendance becomes an issue, the MCG will discuss it at that time. A clause to this effect will be written in the Process Design Technical Memorandum to be adopted by the MCG.
  - Media communication: Valley media outlets will be directed to Brandon and upcountry media outlets will be directed to Rob. If Pete Bell is approached by the media, he may also serve as a contact, while also referring to Rob or Brandon as appropriate. Any MCG stakeholder can talk to the media generally about their own interests as well as published documents and website content.
  - Public comments: Meetings are open to the public. However, public participation will be limited to a designated 16-minute public comment period to be held right after lunch and each speaker will be allowed four minutes to speak. The comment period is not intended to be a question-and-answer period, and the MCG will generally not respond to comments made during this time.
  - Process Design Technical Memorandum (TM): A Process Design TM will be drafted by RMC and submitted to a sub-committee consisting of 3 members of the MCG. Comments from the sub-committee will be addressed by RMC and then a revised draft submitted to the MCG at the October meeting for review and adoption.
  - Breakfast snacks: MCG organizations will take turns bringing breakfast snacks and coffee to the meetings.
  - Lunch: The Group will eat together on-site. Those who do not bring their own lunch will contribute money. Lunch will be 45 minutes.
  - Mailing/contact list: Jordie Bornstein will maintain and update the MCG stakeholder list as needed.
- 

## Action Items

- All MCG members: Contact Jordie Bornstein regarding contact info for potential new stakeholders. Rainwater & Associates, LLC (R&A), will conduct outreach to the stakeholders once the contact information is provided.
  - All MCG members: Complete and send Interest Statement to Katie Cole by Thursday September 12<sup>th</sup>.
  - Rob Alcott: Reach out to our grant representative Jason Preece regarding agencies tracking time spent for possible future reimbursement. Report back to Group.
  - RMC: Include a clause in the Process Design TM stating that MCG members are expected to attend meetings and that poor attendance will be handled on a case-by-case basis.
  - R&A: Provide breakfast snacks at the October meeting.
-

## Summary

### I. Introductory Comments

Rob Alcott and Brandon Nakagawa presented the history of the Mokelumne River Forum and provided context for the current MokeWISE process.

### II. Project Overview

Dave Richardson presented on the project, giving a general overview of the IRWM program, the MokeWISE program purpose, the potential benefits of the program, and the schedule and organizational structure.

### III. Process Design: Interview Results Overview

Marie Rainwater (facilitator) summarized the Process Design Report, outlining the interview results and answering questions.

### IV. Unresolved MCG Process Design Issues

The facilitator went through the following list of identified areas which still needed group consensus after the interviews.

#### a. Meeting Schedules & Start Times

- *Discussed: meeting start time; meeting location; meeting day/date*
- It was decided that meetings should begin at 9 AM to allow additional travel time, though coffee will be provided beginning at 8:45 to allow some time for discussion in advance of the meetings.
- After some discussion, it was decided that every meeting will be held at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau, with two future meetings held at a venue in the upcountry. This will provide a more central meeting location for travel purposes, while ensuring that the group does travel to the upcountry during the course of the project.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of every month was agreed to be the preferred schedule for future meetings.

#### b. Remote meeting participation

- *Discussed: the potential for organizations to remotely participate at meetings*
- It was decided that a phone number with 'listen-only' capabilities will be provided to allow organizations unable to attend meeting(s) in-person to listen in.

#### c. Meeting documentation

- *Discussed: if and how meetings should be documented*
- Meeting notes will include key decisions, a high level summary of discussions, and rationale for decisions. This will allow key decisions to be documented and reasoning for making specific decisions to be documented without requiring significant time for discussion and editing. Comments will not be attributed to specific MCG members to encourage a more honest and open dialogue.

d. *Late participation*

- *Discussed: if and how late stakeholder participation should be handled*
- Late-comers will be allowed to join the group for the first three months of the program, but will not be permitted to revisit decisions made prior to their joining the group. Limiting late participation will ensure that the project continues to move forward with an engaged MCG that has the benefit of understanding decisions made and technical information presented throughout the process. However, allowing some time for additional participants to join provides time for MCG members to do additional outreach to ensure that all interested stakeholders with a clear interest in the project have the opportunity to participate. If potential stakeholders are identified, their contact information will be forwarded to Jordie Bornstein so the facilitation team may schedule and conduct stakeholder interviews.
- Resource agencies will generally be involved as Tier 2 stakeholders, meaning that they will be consulted for feedback during specific points in the process, but will not be MCG members and thus will not be directly involved in the collaborative decision-making process. Many resource agencies approached indicated that they did not have resources to fully participate.
- Interested party status is for non-agency stakeholders who want to stay informed of the MCG progress but choose not to participate as a member.

e. *Poor attendance*

- *Discussion: how to handle MCG members whose participation dwindles over time*
- The Process Design TM will include a clause that states that participants are expected to attend meetings, and should poor attendance becomes an issue, the MCG may consider how to address it on a case-by-case basis. This provides flexibility for the MCG to address attendance issues, should they arise, while recognizing that members have committed to participate in this voluntary process.

f. *Media communication*

- *Discussed: the way in which MCG members communicate with the media*
- It was decided that if upcountry media outlets contact a MCG member, they should be referred to Rob, and if valley media outlets contact a MCG member, they should be referred to Brandon. If Pete is approached, he may discuss the project prior to referring the media to the appropriate contact. This will ensure that the media receives consistent information on the project from the contracting entities and provides clear points of contact for media inquiries. Any MCG member can talk to the media generally about their own interests as well as published documents and website content.

*g. Public comments*

- *Discussed: if meeting agendas will allow time for public comments and if meetings are open or public*
- Meetings will be open to the public and a designated 16-minute public comment period will be held immediately following lunch. Comments will be limited to four minutes per commenter. This will allow members of the public to listen to MCG discussions and understand which members may represent their viewpoints prior to commenting. The MCG will not respond to comments at that time, but comments will be taken under advisement by the group.

## **V. Next Steps – Process Design**

The facilitator introduced the Process Design Technical Memorandum as the document which will outline the decisions made by the group during this meeting as well as the consensus items reached during the interviews. This document will serve to outline the process protocols of the group and be adopted by the MCG when completed.

- RMC will prepare a draft Process Design TM that summarizes the process decisions made by the MCG. This document will be provided to a sub-committee for preliminary review on September 20<sup>th</sup>, with comments back from the sub-committee by September 27<sup>th</sup>. The revised TM will be provided to the full MCG for review one week prior to the next MCG meeting, consistent with the standard review schedule.

## **VI. Schedule Overview and Project Work Flow**

Dave Richardson presented the program schedule and work flow, going through the timeline for each task, the stakeholder meeting schedule, and how to access documents on the website. There were several fundamental questions raised including the following.

- How do the outcomes of this program fit into CEQA?*

The initial expectation has been that the MokeWISE program will be comparable to a planning feasibility document. In any case a CEQA legal review of the MokeWISE program resulting from the MCG process will be performed. Commonly used CEQA terminology (such as “preferred alternative”) will be avoided during the MokeWISE development process wherever possible.

*b. What about modeling?*

The project will use MOCASIM as a modeling tool, and assumptions and inputs to the model will be reviewed and vetted by the MCG and / or a sub-committee thereof.

*c. Should agencies be tracking time for possible future grant reimbursement?*

Rob Alcott will check with our DWR grant representative Jason Preece and report back to the group.

## **VII. Interest Statement Development**

The facilitator introduced the Interest Statement Development sheet and explained that each organization is responsible for submitting one. The purpose of this exercise is for each organization to express their interests. There were two components of the exercise: formulating a general interest statement narrative and outlining potential program objectives that reflect those interests.

- **Formulating an Interest Statement Narrative:** Asks for a general statement about each organization’s interests/concerns in the Mokelumne River. What are the few things that each organization most cares about as it relates to the watershed?
- **Outlining Potential Program Objectives:** This asks organizations to brainstorm *initial* thoughts about MokeWISE program outcomes they would like to see and consequences they would like to avoid. This exercise is intended to be a starting point, not an exhaustive final exercise. The information will be collected, synthesized, and presented at October’s meeting to facilitate further discussion.

## **VIII. Logistics**

The facilitator led discussion on who is responsible for providing breakfast snacks and lunch at future meetings. Logistics of mailing/contact list was also discussed. The results of this discussion are captured in the key decisions presented at the beginning of this summary.