

**MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SALINAS RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN (BMP) COMMITTEE**

Silvio Bernardi, Chair
Claude Hoover
Deidre Sullivan

Bob Antle, Public Member
Don Chapin, Public Member
David Bunn, Public Member

TIME: 8:30 a.m.
DATE: Wednesday, February 12, 2014
PLACE: Monterey County Water Resources Agency
Board Room
893 Blanco Circle
Salinas, CA 93901
(831) 755-4860

MINUTES

1. Call to Order @ 8:34 AM by Committee Chair Silvio Bernardi.

Members present: Director Silvio Bernardi, Director Claude Hoover, Deidre Sullivan
(@ 8:37 am), Bob Antle, David Bunn

Members absent: Don Chapin

A quorum was established.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Approve the Minutes of the BMP Committee meeting held on January 15, 2014

Committee Action: On motion and second of Committee members David Bunn and Claude Hoover, the Committee unanimously approved the Minutes of the meeting held on January 15, 2014 by those members present.

4. Consider receiving a report regarding the purpose of the BMP Committee

Robert Johnson, Assistant General Manager, reported the Agency Act provides for establishment of standing committees and the Bylaws specifies the Basin Management Plan (BMP) Committee as one of those standing committees. Mr. Johnson reviewed the committee membership and purpose as identified in the Bylaws. One of the purposes of the day's meeting is to discuss possible changes in the BMP Committee.

Staff is recommending changes for the BMP Committee. Changes would include the following:

Name change	From Basin Management Plan To Basin Management Committee
Purpose change	From Review all matters concerning the Basin Management Plan

To Review and make recommendations concerning all issues and projects related to the Salinas River Basin and associated bodies.

Historically, the BMP was redirected to the Salinas Valley Water Project (SVWP) in the late 1990s. A formal Basin Management Plan document was never completed. The result of previous efforts was the Salinas Valley Water Project EIR.

Committee Questions/Comments (*Staff responses are emboldened and italicized*):

1. How would changing the name/purpose impact the Committee's authority? ***The Committee's authority would remain the same but the focus would turn to basin management issues rather than the Basin Management Plan, which does not actually exist.***
2. Would merging the BMP and Planning Committees together require Bylaws changes? ***Yes. At the Strategic Planning Workshop in November 2013, the Board began discussions of restructuring committees.***
3. Is the document prepared by EDAW the Basin Management Plan? ***It is an analysis of the Boyle report which resulted in the SVWP EIR.***
4. How does this fit within the Region 3 BMP? ***This would have to complement that plan, but focus on issues related to the Salinas River Basin.***
5. Who prepared the Region 3 BMP? ***The Region 3 BMP was prepared by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and dated June 2011. There are multiple basins in Monterey County; so, this would concentrate on Salinas River Basin.***
6. Where does the Salinas River Basin begin? ***Our portion begins at the Salinas River watershed in San Luis Obispo County.***
7. We need a definition of the Salinas River Basin.

The following information was requested for the next meeting:

1. Clear map of the Salinas River Basin (one was provided at the Reservoir Operations Committee)
2. A list of reports that are interrelated with this issue so we know what work has been done, etc. (groundwater reports, IRWMP information, etc.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

Committee Action: On motion and second of Committee members Claude Hoover and David Bunn the committee accepted the report on the purpose of the BMP.

5. **Consider receiving a report regarding the history of the Basin Management Plan**
Robert Johnson, Assistant General Manager, stated the primary purpose of the Basin Management Plan (BMP), as derived from the Salinas River Basin Management Plan Alternatives Analysis document, is to eliminate the seawater intrusion problem affecting the Salinas River Basin and to provide an adequate water supply to meet the anticipated needs within the Basin through the year 2030.

Over the years, a tremendous amount of data was compiled related to modeling, watershed conditions, etc. toward the development of a BMP. In January 1991, the Agency and USBR jointly worked on a BMP, receiving technical assistance from the US Geological Survey and the California Department of Water Resources, funded by USBR

loans. Multiple public workshops were held, and tasks were developed in five major categories:

- Data inventory;
- Management review;
- Water demand,
- Water supply; and,
- Tools.

In the late 1990s, with the help of community involvement, the Agency's focus changed from the development of a Basin Management Plan or programmatic EIR to the development of a project EIR. This shift ultimately resulted in the Salinas Valley Water Project, funded in part by a Proposition 50 grant awarded to the Agency.

Committee Questions/Comments: *(Staff responses emboldened and italicized):*

1. Would the 1994 EDAW report qualify as the Basin Management Plan? ***The 1994 EDAW Report is an alternative analysis report as part of the BMP effort. In 1995, a Groundwater Management plan was developed along with other plans that allowed the Agency to apply for grant funding relative to stopping seawater intrusion.***

Committee Action: On motion and second of Committee members David Bunn and Deidre Sullivan, the Committee unanimously received the report provided.

General Manager Dave Chardavoyne requested Mr. Johnson to inform the Committee about current activities of the USBR in regard to Basin analysis, as well as Monterey County's proposal for a ground water study of the Basin.

Mr. Johnson reported the USBR is providing a cost-share program related to basin studies. MPWMD, MRWPCA and SLO County have submitted plans investigating the Salinas River Basin. Agency Staff determined other agencies should not perform studies on the Salinas River Basin without Agency participation. The Agency joined into the fray a bit late; but, we are now in coordination with the process...especially aligned with SLO County as many of our requests for studies are similar (related to climate/pattern change, sea level rise, etc. and how that affects water supply/water demand, etc.). The Agency's proposal was approved and we are now on Step 2: a 20-page submittal from the area that looks at the Carmel and Salinas River Basins together to show the effects of changes in Monterey Bay climate on those basins. There is no effort to connect the basins for a water supply solution at this time.

Committee Questions/Comments: *(Staff responses emboldened and italicized):*

1. Who will conduct the study, and will consultants be hired? ***Peninsula Water Management District and SLO have hired consultants. The Agency's cost-share match will be comprised of in-house work that has already been done (i.e., work related to WR #11043, Ground Water Extraction [related to demands and supply] and IRWMP) which totals over \$300,000.***
2. Will there be conflicts in getting monies between our area and other Monterey areas? ***The Monterey entities are ahead of the Agency in the process; but, the focus of the other entities is the Carmel Basin. The common denominator is the Marine***

- Sanctuary; but, we will ensure a bright line is maintained between the two basins. We acknowledge climate change on the Monterey Bay will affect both basins.*
3. What is the cost-share formula? *The USBR contributes \$700,000 worth of work related to climate change; while the Agency's cost-share match is \$300,000.*
 4. What consultants have been hired by SLO and PCA? *San Luis Obispo has hired Carollo Engineers; we have no knowledge who PCA has hired; and are uncertain of the name of the firm MRWMD has hired (possibly Robert Shibatani).*

General Manager Chardavoyne mentioned a misconception held by MPWMD that the Carmel and Salinas River Basins were connected.

Mr. Johnson reported that Supervisor Calcagno, as Chair of the Monterey County Board of Supervisors, directed a County water study, which in fact is a groundwater study of the Salinas River groundwater basin. There is also a lawsuit tied in with the 2010 General Plan, and Agency staff is looking into a possible nexus to tie the two studies together. The County is looking for the Agency to lead that study; but, no work will be performed until an agreement for payment is in place.

1. What is the financial impact on the Agency's budget? *We hope that there will be zero impact because the County will reimburse us. We do not want to incur charges through general liability chargeback.*
2. Has a scope of work been identified? *No. One will not be developed until an agreement is in place.*
3. What new information will this study provide? *This study is part of the General Plan lawsuit settlement brought by the Salinas Valley Water Coalition and Monterey County Farm Bureau. Through the settlement discussions, a five-year study was requested to determine the effects of the Salinas Valley Water Project on the groundwater situation in the Salinas Valley and the effectiveness of the Salinas Valley Water Project.*

General Manager Chardavoyne added it is his understanding that in the five-year study period there is the presumption of a long-term sustained water supply; so, parcels can be subdivided during that period. After the five-year study period, if it is determined there is a deficit, subdivisions will be prohibited.

4. The lawsuit was against Monterey County which implemented the General Plan, which is why the County should provide the resources to do the work.
5. Supervisor Calcagno requested this study to demonstrate the seriousness of the water problem.

General Manager Chardavoyne stated the study had two objectives: in the short term to demonstrate the seriousness of the water problem; and in the long term, the five-year study will provide documentation of same.

Committee member David Bunn left the dais at 9:05AM.

6. Are other mandated obligations imposed upon the Agency from external entities? State Water Resource Board, etc. imposed from external entities? *Yes...information we provide to FERC re: dam safety, the Salinas Valley Water Project Biological Opinion mandates reports related to fish monitoring, etc.*

7. Since there is a statewide strategic plan, are there obligations with which we must comply? *Since we do not receive State water, we have reduced State restrictions.*

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

6. Consider receiving a report regarding efforts related to Water Rights Permit #11043

Robert Johnson reviewed a PowerPoint presentation that was provided at the Strategic Planning Workshop held in November 2013. The original intent of the permit was to combat seawater intrusion; and that intent has not changed. He provided historical information related to the permit and previous actions taken leading to the Settlement Agreement currently in place, which voided the revocation of the permit.

The parameters of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

- Reduction in face value of permit from 168,538 to 135,000 acre-feet/year;
- Bypass flow requirements;
- Sets 16 milestones for use of water with associated timelines for each milestone;
- Named a project: Salinas Valley Water Project Phase II, which actually conflicts with a previous portion of the SVWP that would provide water for only urban use.

The most imminent milestones are the development of a NOP (Notice of Preparation) by July 2014; development of a DEIR by July 2015; and, a draft financing plan by July 2016. The financing plan will be driven by the project suites that comprise the NOP.

The Regional Advisory Committee is an integral part of the process in designing the projects. The Boyle report has been utilized in determining a project that will conform to the parameters of the Settlement Agreement.

1. Has the committee determined which projects fit within the parameters of the permit without modification? *The committee is in the process of winnowing down the projects to those that are viable.*
2. Isn't a legal definition required? *We will seek a legal opinion on the list of projects for review once the winnowing has been completed.*

Mr. Johnson reviewed the purpose of the Regional Advisory Committee:

- Update/retain Water Rights Permit #11043;
- Determine feasibility of utilizing water pursuant to this permit within the context of the original permit; and,
- Identify the water available pursuant to Permit #11043 and work together to identify feasible projects that put those water resources to the most beneficial use.

The RAC will develop some project alternative concepts; turn those concepts over to the BMP. The BMP will consider those concepts in regard to utilization of Water Right Permit #11043 water in the context of a more comprehensive solution. Water Right Permit #11043 would be one piece of a comprehensive solution.

Mr. Johnson briefly reviewed some of the projects previously discussed including: Interlake Tunnel, Upper Nacimiento River – Jerrett Site; Arroyo Seco-Salinas River Conveyance Canal; SV M&I Water Delivery Projects; and, East Side Canal.

Mr. Johnson then discussed the strategy for moving forward:

- Continue working toward conceptual project alternatives
- Commence working with State Water Resources Control Board staff
- Champions political support – Public input, Board of Directors, Board of Supervisors, State and Federal
- Commit sustainable resources – County/State/ GMC IRWMP Round 3 in 2015. With regard to the GMC IRWMP, the Agency will compete with six other region entities for a portion of \$20 million.

Board Comments/Questions/Concerns:

The matrix provided with regard to the Salinas River Channel Maintenance Program was very helpful in understanding the parameters of each project and side-by-side comparison. This type of information will be provided once all of the pieces are compiled...whether it is a feasibility or project component matrix.

General Manager Chardavoyne indicated that the ability to finance a project is an important parameter.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Committee Action: On motion and second of Committee members Claude Hoover and Deidre Sullivan, the Committee accepted the report on Water Rights Permit #11043.

7. Set next meeting date and discuss future agenda items.

For next meeting, Director Deidre Sullivan requested each member be provided a binder with relevant information/reports (i.e., EDAW Report, Boyle Report).

The next BMP Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 12, 2014.

8. Adjournment

Committee Action: On motion and second of Committee members Bob Antle and Deidre Sullivan the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:07AM by those members present.

Submitted by: Wini Chambliss