

**Monterey Regional Water Supply Reliability Collaboration  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates**

**Draft Meeting Notes Version 2, Sixth Meeting**

**June 27, 2007**

**Location: MBEST Center**, 3180 Imjin Road, Marina, CA 93933  
Phone at the center is: 831.582.1020

**Table of Contents**

Overview of Goals for Meeting #6 Steve Kasower, UCSC Center for Integrated Water Research	1
Review of the Notes from Meeting #5	2
The Monterey Regional Project planning process status Members of the Regional Plan Working Group	2
Status Report: Public Information and Involvement Work Group John Fischer and Sarah Corbin, Work Group Representatives	3
New Business/Old Business/Parking Lot Issues/Action Items	5
Discussion of Next Meeting Date, Agenda (Proposed for August 29, 2007)	5
Meeting Attendees	5

**Overview of Goals for Meeting # 6**

**Meeting #6 (June 27, 2007) Proposed Milestones**

Formulation of a regional project implementation strategy

The group's ability to meet the milestones that were set early on in the process was questioned last month but are now recognized as "back on track". More details on the project portfolio with the regional plan will be available in September.

A question was raised about the status of the regional governance issue regarding water reliability with the MOU Task Force. The overall goal of this regional process is not duplicative of the MOU Task Force. A meeting has been set for July 23 at MWRPCA offices for the MOU Task Force at 7pm.

The Regional Plan Work Group has embarked on constructing an economically, financially, politically feasible regional plan. The goal is to make sure that the plan is implementable, acceptable, and affordable. This is a tall order and the group must work hard to assure that this plan is real and supported. Moreover, now is the time to act. The group has discussed other areas of Monterey County and water resource needs and issues in those areas. Now is the time to get those interests and their water supply and municipal agencies to join this collaboration. This collaboration will close the door to no area, no agency, or no citizen. However, by ourselves, this collaboration cannot implement a project without the legal entity that is responsible for its

implementation, to agree in your area. Please see the document entitled "Overview of the Planning Process 6-21-07.

The Public Information and Involvement Work Group has proposed that participants of the REPOG consider signing "Articles of Confederation" that state for purposes of clarity in information dissemination how members of this collaboration all cooperate together and for what purpose. Since the work group is proposing that all agencies, groups, companies, and interested citizens sign, the meeting includes time to review and comment on this important document. The Public Information and Involvement Work Group seeks comments as well as support. Please see the "Monterey Regional Water Articles of Confederation Agenda Draft 6-22-07."

**Materials provided at the meeting included the following:**

"Meeting #6 Agenda, 6-27-07"

"Overview of the Planning Process 6-21-07"

"Monterey Regional Articles of Confederation Agenda Draft 6-22-07"

"Draft Meeting #5 Notes 5-30-07"

**Review of Notes from Meeting # 5**

Several comments were made about the notes.

- On page 3, last bullet, MOU Task Force "could morph into a JPA".
- Every month of delay raises the overall cost of the project for Cal Am by \$800,000, which is the interest on borrowing the money. Any project that goes forward is escalating at a high rate. Cal Am has not borrowed the money. The sum of \$200 million would need to be borrowed at some point in the future.

**The Monterey Regional Project planning process status**

**Members of the Regional Plan Working Group**

- The name of the group will have "plan" not "project" in it.
- MOU is a commitment of resources from cities and water organizations to work together.
- Idea to conduct an analysis of available water projects that will extend from the projects that are underway or in the planning stage. For example, the group will look at the work the MPWMD is conducting with their ASR and replenishment of Seaside Groundwater Basin. Recycled water projects and Marina Coast Water District's work to develop additional water supplies will also be analyzed.
- The idea is to take a menu, or portfolio, a selection of options to put into a matrix, identify projects, with the goal to find the least-cost projects to serve the needs of the areas. Priority areas are the Monterey Peninsula and Fort Ord, however the group is mindful of the North Monterey County area.
- RMC is the contractor and MCWRA hopes to have the contract ready in the next few weeks.
- Much of the work exists but the analysis has not been done.
- On July 23, 2007 the policy-related group associated with the MOU Task Force will meet. The majority of its members have signed on to the MOU as well as committed \$5,000 to develop the regional water supply plan.
- Important issues for the group are to analyze the technical data to develop a target size for the desal plant, keeping in mind the cost is to the ratepayer. In addition to cost, timing issues that have been raised in the REPOG group about implementability raise the question of what relative impediments relate to these projects.
- The document "Overview of the Planning Process" explains the series of tasks, products and timelines. The "Plan of Study" that was presented and accepted at the last meeting is a series of philosophical lenses that show ways to look at new water supply. This "Plan of Study" will be used as a basis for understanding the goals of the REPOG participants for evaluating projects.

- MWRCPA has announced the fourth policy level meeting of the MOU Task Force on July 23<sup>rd</sup> in its offices. This is likely to be a historic event where cities agree to work regionally on water supply issues.
- The next work group meeting is on July 18, 2007.
- In the REPOG meeting in August the work group will share information on project components and perspectives on them.

## **Status Report: Public Information and Involvement Working Group**

*John Fischer and Sarah Corbin, Members of Public Information Group*

The underlying question in the discussion is how can the REPOG publicize its work? The following ideas were discussed in detail in the discussion.

- Write a letter to the editor of local papers with under 250 words.
  - It can be difficult to capture the interest of the newspaper editor as a citizen. A recommendation was made to ask one of the larger agencies to issue a statement in a press release or write a letter to the editor. For example the statement could be authored by a researcher at UC Santa Cruz, or a representative of the Division of Ratepayer Advocates. This may be necessary if the REPOG intends to disseminate information about this process.
- Be a guest on a radio show.
  - North County listeners would be missed by Monterey centric broadcasts.
  - KSEO is suggested as a good station to reach North County.
- Write a press release.
  - AMBAG has a press release list that could be used for the REPOG to send a message to media outlets in the area.
  - Press releases are not effective without a phone call follow up to stress the importance of the message to the area's residents.
- Send a notice to The Herald for the "Our Town" column.
  - Is there a standing request for this?
  - Why is Kevin Howe not covering the REPOG meetings?
- The media access opportunities available in the area include the aforementioned venues as well as TV.
- Which papers would be useful to contact? News readers in a poll of voters in Pacific Grove reported that 75% read the Monterey Co. Herald, 48% read the Pacific Grove Bulletin, and 25% read The Monterey County Weekly and the Monterey Pine Cone.
- Some participants mentioned that the newsworthiness of the REPOG meetings is questionable. The important issues that citizens should know about may be hidden to those not involved in the process, such as the knowledge that projects are now going to be analyzed from a regional collaboration lens.
- Jessica Lyons wants to include notices in her column in the Monterey County Weekly.
- Outreach is a very important part of project process. The REPOG may want to hire an expert to manage this outreach.
- Controversy: taxes, public/private, other issues. When do we want to solicit this controversy to stimulate interest?
- The planning process does not have currency with the news editors because the process itself is not newsworthy.
- Politicians should be considered an audience for the REPOG in addition to citizens. Congressman Farr knows about this process. The REPOG should have its act together before bothering Congressman Farr with a request.

- What are the controversial issues? Ownership: project sponsors and governance. When will the REPOG address this? Is this something that should be addressed in this meeting? This is a lens in the Plan of Study; to discuss this in the REPOG is premature.
- A solution was suggested with the process-oriented suggestion to discuss ownership. The Technical Working Group will bring the item from its meetings to the REPOG.
- If the JPA ends up with elected officials assigned to JPA responsibility as a collateral duty, such assignments will not reflect the interest of primary interest of the elected official.
- Is the REPOG engaged in a problem-solving process or a planning process? If the REPOG is a problem-solving group its participants will address the issues that create controversy and therefore be making progress.

### *Discussion Concerning the “Articles of Confederation”*

- How can the Public Information and Involvement Group make the Articles of Confederation acceptable to everyone?
- Purpose is to solidify what the members of this collaboration are here to do and points of agreement. Goal is to capture the points on how the REPOG functions, plans, and the geopolitical boundary.
- General comments about language?
  - Add reliability to the subtitle "Identifying Water Supplies that are "Affordable, Attainable, and Implementable".
  - Intent of this document should not be to create "Articles of Confederation" but rather a "Points of Consensus in our Collaboration". As such, these are goals the REPOG will try to achieve in the projects but do not represent the official position of water agencies. Essentially, this represents a non-binding consensus of recommendations suggested for regional water solutions and/or water supply projects.

Comments about process to sign document?

The process that will ensue is to ask each person who has been a part of this process if they agree or not to sign this document.

What is the goal of having us sign this? Do you need agencies to sign this if they signed the MOU? Agencies may take up to 7 months to sign.

As an alternative goal, why not state that the agencies participating in this process are X,Y,Z; you may have more success than having people say they concur with the Articles of Confederation.

- I. Participation:
  - Use the word districts or agencies to avoid redundancy of cities or municipalities.
- II. Existence and Involvement:
  - Include as vii. “governance”
  - Break down into elected bodies and make sure they have representatives at the table.
  - II.a.i. Include "long-term" as well as "near-term".
  - Include "as defined by the General Plans of the City and County".
  - II.a.i. erase "agencies" and insert "public and private entities".
  - Include "socioeconomic" instead of equity or Environmental Justice.
  - Supporting communication or public outreach under II. b. Support communication with the public providing timely updates on this process to their own boards and the community.
- III. Geopolitical Boundary
  - Confusing because the County is represented so is it not County-wide?
  - Why is the position of the group “Either you are at the table or we will not plan how to benefit the constituency of an area”? If you define the boundaries, then state that the plan is dependent upon the participation.

A discussion ensued from the suggestion to include equity as a criterion in the document to define environmental justice and relate it specifically to the work of this regional water supply reliability planning work. One participant raised these questions: What is the connection with a solution for a water supply project? Is it a lifeline rate? Is it siting? Is it economic? What does this

mean? Several other participants offered suggestions. One was to define equity issues to help the public understand the intent of the planning group with this issue.

The Study Team will look at income groups and impacts at different socioeconomic levels. This work requires sensitivity on the part of the analyst to notice what is going on in the community for public benefit.

## **New Business/Old Business/Parking Lot Issues/Action Items**

### **Discussion of Next Meeting Date/Agenda**

- **Meeting #7 (August 29, 2007)**

### **Meeting Attendees**

Tom Barnes, ESA Water/CPUC  
Andy Bell, MPWMD  
Dave Berger, MPWMD  
Catherine Borrowman, DRA/UCSC  
Janet Brennan, League of Women Voters  
Diana Brooks, DRA  
Amy Campbell, AMBAG  
Madeleine Clark, Elkhorn Slough Coalition  
Sarah Corbin, Surfrider  
Manuel Fierro, Citizens for Public Water  
John Fischer  
Brent Haddad, DRA/UCSC  
Deirdre Hall, NOAA Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Maryann Hulsman, ESA  
Keith Israel, MRWPCA  
Steve Kasower, DRA/UCSC  
Margie Kay  
Steve Leonard, Cal Am  
Marc Lucca, Marina Coast Water District  
Jessica Lyons, Monterey County Weekly  
Steve Matarazzo, City of Sand City  
Kenneth Nishi, MCWD  
David Pendergrass, MPWMD  
George Riley, CPW  
Tom Rowley, MPTA  
Peggy Shirrel, Moss Landing Harbor District  
Jim Smith, Cal Water Service Company  
Cynthia Walker, DRA  
Curtis Weeks, MCWRA

---