

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #12 Summary

August 8, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Lodi, City of
Calaveras County	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Trout Unlimited
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	

Key Decisions

- Project Groupings: there will be five (5) project groupings, including regional benefits, upcountry benefits, valley benefits, MCG member priorities, and objectives. A sixth grouping will include all of the policies and initiatives identified to date.
-

Action Items

- RMC: send out new poll MCG members.
 - RMC: change concepts 1a and 7b to Regional Benefits Project Grouping.
 - RMC: add WID as co-sponsor to concepts 4c and 4d.
 - RMC: set up Policies and Initiatives Workgroup.
 - RMC: draft new language for concept 3a, renamed Desalination Study.
 - RMC: send out emails asking for additional concept co-sponsors.
-

Summary

I. July Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #11 (July 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

A new representative from Trout Unlimited was introduced to the MCG.

RMC updated the MCG on the status of communications with Ken Berry, a member of the Ratepayers Protection Alliance (RPA), including that a formal records request was submitted by Mr. Berry. In response to his request, a CD containing all documents provided to the MCG up to this point was sent to Mr. Berry.

RMC provided an update on Wild and Scenic, indicating that the legislation is currently in suspense due to the bill sponsor becoming injured while on vacation.

The MCG was made aware that the facilities at Pardee Reservoir have been reserved for the January meeting.

II. North San Joaquin Water Conservation District Presentation

North San Joaquin Water Conservation District provided an overview of the District, including a brief history of the District, the District's infrastructure, and projects being implemented by the District. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. Jackson Valley Irrigation District Presentation

Jackson Valley Irrigation District provided an overview of the District, including a brief history of the District, the District's infrastructure, and projects being implemented by the District. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Polling Results

RMC reviewed the polling request, specifically what each poll asked.

- 1) The first poll was intended to help determine the MCG Member Priorities project grouping. It asked MCG member organizations to identify, of the concepts submitted by that organization, which two (2) are their favorites.
- 2) The second poll was intended to help the MCG understand which concepts are currently most popular among all MCG member organizations. It asked MCG member organizations to identify, of the concepts they did not submit, which five (5) they are most interested in pursuing for analysis.

RMC explained that the polls were intended as “pulse checks” and results do not mean that any projects would be removed from the list or removed from the analysis phase. RMC explained the process by which the results for Poll 1 were completed. This included finding entities’ original concept submissions and tracking their evolution over the course of the MokeWISE process. Because some concepts were rolled into others and modified, there was some confusion regarding the accuracy of the results. Because of this confusion, it was decided that entities would not be attributed to their poll responses and Poll 1 would be removed from consideration as a Project Grouping for Analysis.

There was general interest in the results of the Poll 2, which lead to a discussion of facilitating a new poll. This is discussed further in the following section.

V. Preliminary Project Groupings

RMC presented the preliminary Project Groupings for Analysis. These included:

- 1) *Regional Benefits*- concepts that have a regional benefit;
- 2) *Upcountry Benefits*- concepts that only have upcountry benefits;
- 3) *Valley Benefits* – concepts that only have valley benefits;
- 4) *MCG Member Priorities* – concepts that MCG member organizations have identified as important to their organization;
- 5) *Objectives* – concepts which best meet the most MokeWISE objectives.

After RMC presented the geographic groupings, there was discussion about the merits of these groupings. It was suggested that project benefits be determined based on where the hardware is located instead of where potential benefits may be seen. A 20-minute caucus was called. After further discussion, the MCG decided that projects 1a and 7b be changed to the Regional Benefits Project Grouping. Pending these two changes, the MCG approved the geographic project groupings, Project Groupings 1 through 3.

Some concern was expressed about how project groupings would be analyzed, particularly where groupings included projects that were very conceptual in nature. After some discussion, two new project groupings were suggested in addition to the three geographic groupings. The fourth project grouping would include projects which required a low level of analysis and the fifth would include projects which required a high level of analysis. Those that require a low level analysis are expected to be the largely conceptual concepts and those concepts that will not alter demands and therefore will not require modeling. Those that require a high level of analysis are expected to include concepts that will alter demands and / or streamflows and will therefore require modeling.

There was general consensus that the results of Poll 2 were more representative of the MCG’s priorities, and that another polling effort would be beneficial. This poll would be similar to the previous Poll 2, with a slight modification: the new poll would ask each MCG entity to select its top five concepts to move forward for analysis. The results of this poll would be used to develop a new sixth project grouping.

Based on the discussion, the MCG decided on the following project groupings:

- 1) *Regional Benefits*- concepts that have a regional benefit (grouping approved by MCG);
- 2) *Upcountry Benefits*- concepts that only have upcountry benefits (grouping approved by MCG);
- 3) *Valley Benefits* – concepts that only have valley benefits (grouping approved by MCG);
- 4) *Low Level of Analysis* – concepts that have low levels of analysis, particularly ones requiring qualitative analysis or ones that do not alter demands and will thus not require modeling;
- 5) *High Level of Analysis* – concepts that have high levels of analysis, particularly ones that will alter demands and thus will require modeling;
- 6) *MCG Member Priorities* – concepts that MCG members have identified as important to their entities (informed by new poll);

The concepts within the Policies and Initiatives category are still moving forward under a different analysis method and are therefore not included in any of the above project groupings. A Policy and Initiatives Workgroup will be convened with representatives from the San Joaquin Farm Bureau, San Joaquin County, Calaveras Planning Coalition, Calaveras County, and East Bay Municipal Utility District to work on further developing these concepts.

The issue of sponsorship was discussed, as there are still three concepts with no sponsors. Because concept 9c is a policy and initiative, it is ok that there is no sponsor. Concept 6a has been removed since there was no sponsorship interest among the MCG. The MCG agreed that 3a should be revised to be a study which investigates all desalination opportunities available. RMC will draft a new description for this concept.

There was some question as to the role of a sponsor. It was decided that each concept can have both “Lead” and “Co-Sponsors.” RMC will send out an email defining these roles and ask that any MCG entities who wish to act in either of these roles respond to that email. These sponsors will work together to complete the concept request for information that was sent out.

The concept request for information was sent out to identified sponsors for each concept. These requests will help inform the analysis for the project groupings. RMC is hosting a webinar to review these requests on Thursday August 14, 2014. Responses are requested by Monday August 18, 2014.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.