Attachment 1: Authorization and Eligibility Requirements for the Mokelumne /Amador / Calaveras Region

✓ Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption

The MAC Plan Update was approved by DWR on May 30, 2014, and adopted by UMRWA (the Regional Water Management Group [RWMG]) and the project proponents (Amador Water Agency [AWA], Calaveras County Water District [CCWD]) and project partners (Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency [ATCAA], Foothill Conservancy).

According to the 2015 IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package, proof of adoption of the IRWM Plan by RWMG entities is not required if the IRWM Plan has been approved by DWR. The letter from DWR approving the MAC IRWM Plan and the adopting resolutions for all project proponents are included in Appendix 1.2.

Appendix 1.2 – 2013 MAC IRWM Plan Update DWR Approval and Adopting Resolutions

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
1416 NINTH STREET, P.O. BOX 942836
SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001
(916) 653-5791

May 30, 2014

Wm. Robert Alcott, Executive Officer
Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
15083 Camanche Parkway South
Valley Springs, California 95252

Mokelumne – Amador – Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (MAC IRWM Plan) Final Review

Dear Mr. Alcott:

This letter transmits the Department of Water Resources (DWR) final review of the MAC IRWM Plan. The public comment period on DWR's review of the MAC IRWM Plan has closed. Public comments were received and considered prior to finalizing the review. DWR has determined that the MAC IRWM Plan is consistent with the IRWM Planning Act and the related IRWM Plan Standards contained in the 2012 IRWM Program Guidelines. The final review is posted at the following link: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/prp.cfm.

If adopted by the Regional Water Management Group and project proponents, by the appropriate dates, the MAC IRWM Plan will satisfy the terms of the Round 1 and Round 2 Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Grant agreements default clause and the adopted plan eligibility criteria for the 2014 IRWM Drought Solicitation. Each agreement and grant solicitation has its own date for adoption compliance.

To simplify submitting proof of adoption, DWR will compile and track this information and inform DWR grant managers and grant application review teams appropriately. You may submit proof of adoption material as often as necessary. When submitting information, please fill out the IRWM Plan Adoption Form, found at: http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resourceslinks.cfm, along with scanned proof of adoption, and then submit the material directly to Craig Cross at the email address listed below.

If you have any questions, please contact Craig Cross at (916) 651-9204 or Craig.Cross@water.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

for

Tracie L. Billington, P.E. Chief
Financial Assistance Branch
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management

INTRODUCTION

IRWM planning regions must have an IRWM Plan that has been reviewed and deemed consistent with the 2012 IRWM Plan Standards by DWR for eligibilty to receiving Round 3 Proposition 84 funding. This 2012 IRWM Plan Standards Review Form for DWR staff use provides a consistent means in determining whether the 2012 IRWM Guidelines are being addressed in the IRWM Plan. It is part of the Plan Review Process that will begin prior to Round 3 solicitation. The form is similar to a grant application review form in that there is a checklist for each of the 16 Plan Standards and narrative evaluations where required. However, the evaluation is pass/fail; there is no numeric scoring. Each Plan Standard is either sufficient or not based on its associated requirements. Each Standard consists of between one and fourteen requirements. A Yes or No is automatically calculated in each Plan Standard header based on the individual requirement evaluations. In general, a passing score of "C" (i.e. 70% of the requirements for a given Plan Standard) is required for a Standard to pass. Standards with only one or 2 requirements will need one or both of those requirements to pass. Standards with 3 requirements will need at least 2 of the requirements to pass. Standards with 4 or 5 requirements will need at least 3 to pass. Some plan elements are legislated requirements. Such plan elements must be met in order to be considered consistent with plan standards. A summary of the sufficiency of each Standard is automatically calculated on the Standards Summary worksheet. A "No" evaluation indicates that a Standard was not met due to insufficient requirements comprising the Standard. The evaluation for each Plan Standard and any associated insufficiencies is automatically compiled on the Standards Summary page. Additional reviewer comments may be added at the bottom of each standards work sheet.

Note: This review form is meant to be a tool used in conjunction with the 2012 IRWM Guidelines document to assist in the evaluation of IRWM plans. It is not designed to be a substitute for the Guidelines document itself. Reviewers must use the Guidelines in determining plan consistency.

DEFINITION OF TABLE HEADINGS

IRWM Plan Standard: As named in the November 2012 IRWM Prop 84 and 1E Guidlelines.

Overall Standard Sufficient: This field is either "YES" or "NO" and is automatically calculated based on the "Sufficient" column described below. If all fields are "y", the the overall standard is deemed sufficient. Any entry other than a "y" in the Sufficient column (i.e. "n", ?, not sure, more detail needed, etc.) results in a NO.

Plan Standard Requirements Which Must Be Addressed **Fields with an asterisk * are required by legislation to be included in an IRWM Plan.**

Requirement	Requirements are taken directly from the November 2012 Guidelines.
Included	Is the Guideline Requirement included in the IRWM Plan? The options are: y = yes, requirement is included in the IRWMP; or n = no, requirement is not included in the IRWMP. If only y or n then presence/absence of the requirement is sufficient for evaluation. If there is a "q" (qualitative) then add a brief narrative, similar to a Grant Application Review public evaluation or supporting information.
Plan Standard Source	
2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Page(s) in the Guidelines (November 2012) which pertain to the Requirement.
Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	The CWC or other regulations that pertain to the Requirement, **if applicable**. This is for reference purposes. The cell links to a weblink of the regulatory code.
Evidence of Sufficiency	
Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	The page(s) or sections in the IRWM Plan where information on the Requirement can be found. This can be specific paragraphs or entire chapters for more general requirements.
Brief Qualitative Evaluation Narrative	Supporting information for the Requirement if a "q" is in the Included column. This can be just a few sentences or a paragraph and can be taken directly from the IRWM Plan. Comments or supporting information may be entered regardless of whether required.
Sufficient	Is the Guidelines requirement sufficiently represented in the IRWM Plan (y/n).

2012 IRWM Plan Standards Review Form

Regional Acceptance Process Planning Region: **Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras (MAC)**
Regional Water Management Group: **Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority**
IRWM Plan Title: **Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Plan (MAC Plan)**

PLAN IS SUFFICIENT

IRWM Plan Standard	Overall Standard Sufficient	Requirement(s) Insufficient
Governance	Yes	
Region Description	Yes	
Objectives	Yes	
Resource Management Strategies	Yes	
Integration *	Yes	
Project Review Process	Yes	
Impact and Benefit	Yes	
Plan Performance and Monitoring	Yes	
Data Management	Yes	
Finance	Yes	
Technical Analysis	Yes	
Relation to Local Water Planning	Yes	
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	Yes	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	
Coordination	Yes	
Climate Change	Yes	

* If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per November 2012 Guidelines, p. 44.

Additional Comments:

No specific reference could be found in the Impact and Benefit Standard that meet the requirement to revisit project impacts and benefits during the plan update process. See Impact and Benefit Standard. We recommend addressing this in future updates.

IRWM Plan Standard: Governance						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Regulatory and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
Document a governance structure to ensure updates to the IRWM Plan							
The name of the RWMG responsible for implementation of the IRWMP	**y/n**	y	**18/35**	CWC §10539	Page 2-1		y
A description of the IRWM governance structure	**y/n**	y	**19/36**		Page 2-3		y
A description of how the chosen form of governance **addresses** and **ensures**:							
Public outreach and involvement processes	**y/n/q**	y	**19/36-37**	§10540, §10541	Page 2-6, Sec. 2.2.4; Page 2-7 to 2-10, Section 2.3	Public outreach includes direct mailings, local media, a Mokelumne Amador Calaveras (MAC) Plan website, and a Community Outreach Plan. The first and last Regional Participants Committee (RPC) meetings will be public.	y
Effective decision making	**y/n/q**	y	**19/37**		Page 2-5	Decisions are made on a consensus basis at the RPC level. RPC members are responsible for conveying information and feedback between the RPC and its constituency.	y
Balanced access and opportunity for participation in the IRWM process	**y/n/q**	y	**19/37**		Page 2-7. Sec. 2.2.5	Stakeholder and RPC member participation from all relevant areas of water resources management in the region, including public meetings and outreach, ensures balanced access to the process.	y
Effective communication – both internal and external to the IRWM region	**y/n/q**	y	**19/37-38**		Page 2-5	Communication includes ongoing RPC process and actions. Outstanding issues or concerns of RPC members are brought to the RPC first. Each RPC member states the interests of the organization or group they represent.	y
Long term implementation of the IRWM Plan	**y/n/q**	y	**19/38**		Page 2-11, Sec. 2.6	Each Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) member agency will adopt the MAC Plan and other agencies may also do so. The MAC Plan will continue to be updated in the future Regardless of grant funding.	y
Coordination with neighboring IRWM efforts and State and federal agencies	**y/n/q**	y	**19/38**		Page 1-4, Sec. 1.1.2; Page 2-10, Sec. 2.5	Coordination occurs with neighboring IRWM efforts and the UMWRA will coordinate with the appropriate state and federal agencies.	y
The collaborative process(es) used to establish plan objectives	**y/n/q**	y	**19/38**		Page 2-9, Sec. 2.3.2	Stakeholders are integral to all aspects of the IRWM planning process. The first and last RPC meetings will also be community workshops to provide feedback. During the second RPC meeting, stakeholders will provide input.	y
How interim changes and formal changes to the IRWM Plan will be performed	**y/n/q**	y	**19/38**		Page 4-7, Sec. 4.1.4; Page 4-15, Sec. 4.1.7	The MAC Plan will be updated periodically as determined by the RWMG. A project solicitation process will be conducted, and published as an appendix to the Plan Update and posted on the UMRWA website (www.umrwa.org).	y
Updating or amending the IRWM Plan	**y/n/q**	y	**19/38**		Page 4-15, Sec. 4.1.7; Page 2-11, Sec. 2.6	The MAC Plan may be updated to: 1) comply with updated IRWM Guidelines, per DWR; 2) update the project list and project evaluation; and 3) incorporate results of plan performance monitoring and/or project monitoring.	y
Publish NOI to prepare/update the plan; adopt the plan in a public meeting	**y/n/q**	y	**35**	CWC §10543	Page 2-11, Sec. 2.6	Upon completion of the MAC Plan Update, each UMRWA member agency will adopt it, as can any other agency that wishes to do so.	y

IRWM Plan Standard: Region Description						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Legislative Support and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
If applicable, describe and explain how the plan will help reduce dependence on the Delta supply regionally	**y/n**	n/a	**20**	--		n/a	n/a
Describe watersheds and water systems	**y/n**	y	**19/39**	PRC §75026.(b)(1) and CWP Update 2009	Pages 1-6 to 1-10		y
Describe internal boundaries	**y/n**	y	**19/39**	--	Pages 1-6 and 1-12		y
Describe water supplies and demands for minimum 20 year planning horizon	**y/n**	y	**19/39**	--	Page 1-27		y
Describe water quality conditions	**y/n**	y	**19/40**	--	Page 1-32		y
Describe social and cultural makeup, including specific information on DACs and tribal communities in the region and their water challenges.	**y/n/q**	y	**19/40**	--	Pages 1-19 and 4-28	Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) totally or partially located in the MAC region are described. Focused outreach to Native American tribes within the MAC Region was completed as part of the Plan update.	y
Describe major water related objectives and conflicts *	**y/n/q**	y	**19/40**	§10541. (e)(3)	Section 1.4 starting on Page 1-75	The MAC region RPC identified a number of regional water resource conflicts and issues. Additional issues were obtained from the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Assessment and Planning Project (UMRWAP).	y
Explain how IRWM regional boundary was determined and why region is an appropriate area for IRWM planning.	**y/n/q**	y	**19/40**	--	Page 1-3	The four primary regional boundaries and the reasons these boundaries were used in defining the MAC region are described.	y
Describe neighboring and/or overlapping IRWM efforts	**y/n**	y	**19/40**	--	Starts on Page 1-4		y
Explain how opportunities are maximized (e.g. people at the table, natural features, infrastructure) for integration of water management activities	**y/n**	y	**38**	--	Pages 2-10		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Objectives						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Legislative Support and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Qualitative Narrative**	**y/n**
Through the objectives or other areas of the plan, the 7 items on pg 41 of GL are addressed.*	**y/n**	y	**20/40 - 41**	§10540.(c)	Page 3-2 and following		y
Describe the collaborative process and tools used to establish objectives: - How the objectives were developed - What information was considered (i.e., water management or local land use plans, etc.) - What groups were involved in the process - How the final decision was made and accepted by the IRWM effort	**y/n**	y	**20/41**	--	Page 3-1		y
Identify quantitative or qualitative metrics and measureable objectives: Objectives must be measurable - there must be some metric the IRWM region can use to determine if the objective is being met as the IRWM Plan is implemented. Neither quantitative nor qualitative metrics are considered inherently better. *	**y/n/q**	y	**20/41 - 42**	10541.(e)	Page 3-4 and following	A series of performance measures have been established. These measures and their associated water resource goals and objectives are presented.	y
Explain how objectives are prioritized or reason why the objectives are not prioritized	**y/n/q**	y	**20/42-43**	--	Page 3-8	The RPC chose not to prioritize the MAC Plan objectives because all were deemed equally important, and implementation of projects that contribute to any of the objectives would benefit the Region.	y
Reference specific overall goals for the region: RWMGs may choose to use goals as an additional layer for organizing and prioritizing objectives, or they may choose to not use the term at all.	**y/n**	y	**43**	--	Page 3-2 and following		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Resource Management Strategies (RMS)						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Legislative Support and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
Identify RMS incorporated in the IRWM Plan: Consider all California Water Plan (CWP) RMS criteria (29) listed in Table 3 from the CWP Update 2009 *	**y/n**	y	**20/43**	CWP Update 2009 Volume II; 10541(e)(1)	Page 3-9 and following		y
Consideration of climate change effects on the IRWM region must be factored into RMS	**y/n**	y	**20/43**	--	Page 1-66		y
Address which RMS will be implemented in achieving IRWM Plan Objectives	**y/n**	y	**44**	--	Page 3-9 and following		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Integration						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Contains structure and processes for developing and fostering integration [1]: - Stakeholder/institutional - Resource - Project implementation	y/n/q	y	20/44 - 45	§10540.(g); §10541.(h)(2)	Section 2.4 Integration and Section 4.1.4 Project Integration	This is described in the governance structure. Resource integration has occurred through the creation of UMRWA providing a focus and lead voice to the IRWM planning process in the MAC region.	y

1. If not included as an individual section use Governance, Project Review Process, and Data Management Standards per November 2012 Guidelines, p. 44.

IRWM Plan Standard: Project Review Process						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Regulatory and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
Process for projects included in IRWM plan must address 3 components: - procedures for submitting projects - procedures for reviewing projects - procedures for communicating lists of selected projects	**y/n**	Y	**20/45**	§75028.(a)	Pages 4-1, 4-2, 4-7 and 4-14		Y
Does the project review process in the plan incorporate the following factors:							
How a project contributes to plan objectives	**y/n**	y	**20**		Page 4-2		y
How a project is related to Resource Management Strategies identified in the plan.	**y/n**	y	**20**		Page 4-2		y
The technical feasibility of a project.	**y/n**	y	**20**		Page 4-4		y
A projects specific benefits to a DAC water issue.	**y/n**	y	**20**		Page 4-4		y
Environmental Justice considerations.	**y/n**	y	**20**		Page 4-4		y
Project costs and financing	**y/n**	y	**20**		Page 4-36		y
Address economic feasibility	**y/n**	y	**21**		Page 4-3		y
Project status	**y/n**	y	**21**		Page 4-5		y
Strategic implementation of plan and project merit	**y/n**	y	**21/48**		Page 4-4		y
Project's contribution to climate change adaptation	**y/n**	y	**21**		Section 3.1 Policies, Goals, and Objectives Tables 1-22 and 3-2		y
Contribution of project in reducing GHGs compared to project alternatives	**y/n**	y	**21**		Page 1-73 and Appendix C		y
Status of the Project Proponent's IRWM plan adoption	**y/n**	y	**21**		Page 2-11		y
Project's contribution to reducing dependence on Delta supply (for IRWM regions receiving water from the Delta).	**y/n**	n/a	**21**				n/a

IRWM Plan Standard: Impact and Benefit						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Discuss potential impacts and benefits of plan implementation within IRWM region, between regions, with DAC/EJ concerns and Native American Tribal communities	**y/n**	y	**21**	--	Page 4-23; Table 4-7, and; Page 4-28		y
State when a more detailed project-specific impact and benefit analysis will occur (prior to any implementation activity)	**y/n**	y	**49**	--	Page 4-24		y
Review and update the impacts and benefits section of the plan as part of the normal plan management activities	**y/n**	n	**50**	--		No specific reference could be found that meet the requirement to revisit project impacts and benefits during the plan update process.	n

IRWM Plan Standard: Plan Performance and Monitoring						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Contain performance measures and monitoring methods to ensure that IRWM objectives are met *	y/n	y	21/53	PRC §75026.(a)	Page 5-1 and following		y
Contain a methodology that the RWMG will use to oversee and evaluate implementation of projects.	y/n	y	21/53		Page 5-7		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Data Management						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Regulatory and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
Describe data needs within the IRWM region	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Pages 5-8 and 5-9		y
Describe typical data collection techniques	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Page 5-9		y
Describe stakeholder contributions of data to a data management system	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Page 5-12		y
Describe the entity responsible for maintaining data in the data management system	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Page 5-12		y
Describe the QA/QC measures for data	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Page 5-11		y
Explain how data collected will be transferred or shared between members of the RWMG and other interested parties throughout the IRWM region, including local, State, and federal agencies *	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Pages 5-12 and 5-13		y
Explain how the Data Management System supports the RWMG's efforts to share collected data	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Page 5-13		y
Outline how data saved in the data management system will be distributed and remain compatible with State databases including CEDEN, Water Data Library (WDL), CASGEM, California Environmental Information Catalog (CEIC), and the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System (CERES).	**y/n**	y	**54**	--	Page 5-12	Data collected will be compatible with statewide databases because the project-specific monitoring plans will be developed based on guidance provided for applicable statewide databases.	y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Finance						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Include a programmatic level (i.e. general) plan for implementation and financing of identified projects and programs* including the following:	y/n	y	21	§10541.(e)(8)	Page 4-35 and 4-36		y
List known, as well as, possible funding sources, programs, and grant opportunities for the development and ongoing funding of the IRWM Plan.	y/n	y	21		Table 4-8		y
List the funding mechanisms, including water enterprise funds, rate structures, and private financing options, for projects that implement the IRWM Plan.	y/n	y	21		Pages 4-36 to 4-38		y
An explanation of the certainty and longevity of known or potential funding for the IRWM Plan and projects that implement the Plan.	y/n	y	21		Pages 4-36 to 4-38		y
An explanation of how operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for projects that implement the IRWM Plan would be covered and the certainty of operation and maintenance funding.	y/n	y	21		Page 4-38		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Technical Analysis						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Legislative Support and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
Document the data and technical analyses that were used in the development of the plan *	**y/n**	y	**22**	--	Page 4-39		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Water Planning						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Identify a list of local water plans used in the IRWM plan	y/n	y	22	§10540.(b)	Pages 4-18 and Table 4-6		y
Discuss how the plan relates to these other planning documents and programs	y/n	y	22		Pages 4-17 and 4-18		y
Describe the dynamics between the IRWM plan and other planning documents	y/n	y	22		Page 4-20		y
Describe how the RWMG will coordinate its water mgmt planning activities	y/n	y	58		Page 4-16		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Relation to Local Land Use Planning						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Document current relationship between local land use planning, regional water issues, and water management objectives	y/n	y	22/59 - 62	--	Page 4-21		y
Document future plans to further a collaborative, proactive relationship between land use planners and water managers	y/n	y	22/59 - 62	--	Page 4-22		y

IRWM Plan Standard: Stakeholder Involvement						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Contain a public process that provides outreach and opportunity to participate in the IRWM plan *	y/n	y	22/63	§10541.(g)	Pages 2-7 and 2-8		y
Identify process to involve and facilitate stakeholders during development and implementation of plan regardless of ability to pay; include barriers to invlovement *	y/n	y	64	§10541.(h) (2)	Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3		y
Discuss involvement of DACs and tribal communities in the IRWM planning effort	y/n	y	23	--	Page 3-28		y
Describe decision-making process and roles that stakeholders can occupy	y/n	y	23	--	Page 2-10; Section 2.4		y
Discuss how stakeholders are necessary to address objectives and RMS	y/n	y	23	--	Page 2-8		y
Discuss how a collaborative process will engage a balance in interest groups	y/n	y	23	--	Page 2-9		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Coordination						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	Included		Plan Standard Source		Evidence of Sufficiency		Sufficient
From IRWM Guidelines	y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.		2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)	Legislative Support and/or Other Citations	Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan	Brief Evaluation Narrative	y/n
Identify the process to coordinate water management projects and activities of participating local agencies and stakeholders to avoid conflicts and take advantage of efficiencies *	y/n	y	23/65	§10541.(e)(13)	pg. 2-10; Section 2-4, and; pg. 4-14		y
Identify neighboring IRWM efforts and ways to cooperate or coordinate, and a discussion of any ongoing water management conflicts with adjacent IRWM efforts	y/n	y	23/65	--	Pages 4-16 and 4-17		y
Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of IRWM Plan components, processes, and projects, or where State or federal regulatory decisions are required before implementing the projects.	y/n	y	23	--	Paages 2-10 and 2-11		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

IRWM Plan Standard: Climate Change						Overall Standard Sufficient	Yes
Requirement	**Included**		**Plan Standard Source**		**Evidence of Sufficiency**		**Sufficient**
From IRWM Guidelines	**y/n - Present/Not Present in the IRWMP. If y/n/q qualitative evaluation needed.**		**2012 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines Source Page(s)**	**Legislative Support and/or Other Citations**	**Location of Standard in Grantee IRWM Plan**	**Brief Evaluation Narrative**	**y/n**
Evaluate IRWM region's vulnerabilities to climate change and potential adaptation responses based on vulnerabilites assessment in the DWR Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning *	**y/n**	y	**23/66 - 73**	Climate Change Handbook vulnerability assessment: http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/CCHandbook.cfm; November 2012 Guidelines Legislative and Policy Context, p. 66 §10541.(e)(11)	Section 1.3.5; 1.3.6		y
Provide a process that considers GHG emissions when choosing between project alternatives *	**y/n**	y	**23/68**		Section 4.1.3		y
Include a list of prioritized vulnerabilites based on the vulnerability assessment and the IRWM's decision making process.	**y/n**	y	**23/66 - 73**		Section 1.3.5		y
Contain a plan, program, or methodology for further data gathering and analysis of prioritized vulnerabilities	**y/n**	y	**23/66 - 73**		Section 1.3.7		y
Include climate change as part of the project review process	**y/n**	y	**23/68**		Section 4.1.3		y

* Requirement must be addressed.

Regulatory Citation	Link	Notes
IRWM Prop 84 and 1E Guidelines	http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/docs/Guidelines/GL_2012_FINAL.pdf	DWR November 2012 Guidelines - Final
CWC §10539	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10532-10539	
CWC §10540, §10541	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10540-10543	
CWC §10543	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10540-10543	
PRC §75026, §75028, CWP Update 2009, and California Watershed Portal	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=prc&group=75001-76000&file=75020-75029.5	The Department of Water Resources shall give preference to proposals that satisfy the criteria specified in PRC §75026.(b)(1). §75028.(a) - the department shall defer to approved local project selection, and review projects only for consistency with the purposes of Section 75026.
	http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/cwpu2009/index.cfm	2009 California Water Plan Volumes I and II
	http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/watershedportal/Pages/Index.aspx	California Watershed Portal
§10541. (e)(3)	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=wat&group=10001-11000&file=10540-10543	

UPPER MOKELUMNE RIVER WATERSHED AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION 2013-1

ADOPTING THE UPDATED MOKELUMNE-AMADOR-CALAVERAS
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

January 25, 2013

WHEREAS, the State electorate approved Proposition 84 on November 7, 2006, which contains a total of $5.39 billion for water and natural resource projects and programs, including $1 billion for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program with $57 million of that amount allocated to the San Joaquin River Funding Area; and

WHEREAS, the benefits of integrated regional planning for water resources management activities are intended to include increased efficiency and effectiveness, enhanced collaboration across agencies and stakeholders, and improved responsiveness to regional needs and priorities; and

WHEREAS, the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) is a regional water management group as defined by the California Water Code. A Joint Powers Agency formed in 2000 to address water quality, water supply and environmental matters, UMRWA is comprised by Amador Water Agency, Calaveras County Water District, Calaveras Public Utility District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Jackson Valley Irrigation District, Alpine County Water Agency and the counties of Amador, Calaveras and Alpine; and

WHEREAS, the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Region (MAC Region) is an established region as determined by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in 2009 under DWR's Regional Acceptance Process; and

WHEREAS, the original 2006 MAC Plan, developed and adopted under then-existing rules and guidelines, must be updated to comply with new rules and guidelines established by DWR in November 2012 to fulfill the terms of UMRWA's 2011 Planning Grant and to be eligible for future grant funding; and

WHEREAS, the updated MAC Plan provides an implementation framework that calls for collecting data, tracking accomplishments, developing lists of prioritized projects and periodically updating the MAC Plan as circumstances warrant, providing funding and resources are available to UMRWA to carry out these activities; and

WHEREAS, the updated MAC Plan, developed over the past eighteen months under the direction of the Regional Participants Committee and vetted in three public community workshops, is herewith presented for adoption by UMRWA Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the updated MAC Plan does not entail a direct commitment of resources, and implementation of each project listed in the MAC Plan will be the responsibility of individual project proponents, and there is no joint commitment or responsibility by the MAC Plan participants to implement any or all of the projects; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of the updated MAC Plan is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15262 and §15306 because the Plan involves planning studies for possible actions that participating agencies have not yet approved and consists of basic data collection that would not result in the disturbance of any environmental resource; and

WHEREAS, the MAC Plan is meant to be complementary to participating agencies' individual plans and programs and does not supersede such plans and programs, and adoption of the MAC Plan does not prohibit nor affect in any way a participating agencies' planning efforts separate from the MAC Plan;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UMRWA Board of Directors does hereby adopt the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Plan.

ADOPTED this 25th day of January, 2013

Board Chairperson

ATTEST:

Authority Secretary

RESOLUTION 2013-03

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF AMADOR WATER AGENCY

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE UPDATED MOKELUMNE-AMADOR-CALAVERAS INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the State electorate approved Proposition 84 on November 7, 2006, which contains a total of $5.39 billion for water and natural resource projects and programs, including $1 billion for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program with $57 million of that amount allocated to the San Joaquin River Funding Area; and

WHEREAS, the benefits of integrated regional planning for water resources management activities are intended to include increased efficiency and effectiveness, enhanced collaboration across agencies and stakeholders, and improved responsiveness to regional needs and priorities; and

WHEREAS, Amador Water Agency is a member of the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority, the designated regional water management group for the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Region (MAC Region); and

WHEREAS, the MAC Region is an established region as determined by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in 2009 under DWR's Regional Acceptance Process; and

WHEREAS, the original 2006 MAC Plan, developed and adopted under then-existing rules and guidelines, must be updated to comply with new rules and guidelines established by DWR in 2012 and to be eligible for future grant funding; and

WHEREAS, the updated MAC Plan, developed over the past eighteen months under the direction of the Regional Participants Committee and vetted in three public community workshops, is herewith presented for adoption by Amador Water Agency Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the updated MAC Plan does not entail a direct commitment of resources, and implementation of each project listed in the MAC Plan will be the responsibility of individual project proponents, and there is no joint commitment or responsibility by the MAC Plan participants to implement any or all of the projects; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of the updated MAC Plan is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15262 and §15306 because the Plan involves planning studies for possible actions that participating agencies have not yet approved and consists of basic data collection that would not result in the disturbance of any environmental resource; and

WHEREAS, the MAC Plan is meant to be complementary to participating agencies' individual plans and programs and does not supersede such plans and programs, and adoption of the MAC Plan does not prohibit nor affect in any way a participating agencies' planning efforts separate from the MAC Plan;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Amador Water Agency Board of Supervisors does hereby adopt the updated Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Plan.

The foregoing resolution was duly passed and adopted by the Board of Directors of the Amador Water Agency at a Board meeting held on this 28th day of February, 2013, by the following vote:

Ayes: Directors Thomas, Toy, Manassero, Farrington and Molinelli

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

Signed and approved by me after its passage this 28th day of February, 2013

Paul Molinelli, President
Board of Directors

ATTEST:

Cris L. Thompson
Clerk of the Board of Directors

RESOLUTION NO. 2013-22

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CALAVERAS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

ADOPTING THE UPDATED MOKELUMNE-AMADOR-CALAVERAS INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the State electorate approved Proposition 84 on November 7, 2006, which contains a total of $5.39 billion for water and natural resource projects and programs, including $1 billion for the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program with $57 million of the amount allocated to the San Joaquin River funding area; and

WHEREAS, the benefits of integrated regional planning for water resources management activities are intended to include increased efficiency and effectiveness, enhanced collaboration across agencies and stakeholders, and improved responsiveness to regional needs and priorities; and

WHEREAS, the CALAVERAS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT is a member of the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority, the designated regional water management group for the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Region (MAC Region); and

WHEREAS, the MAC Region is an established region as determined by California Department of Water Resources (DWR) in 2009 under DWR's Regional Acceptance Process; and

WHEREAS, the original 2006 MAC Plan, developed and adopted under then-existing rules and guidelines, must be updated to comply with new rules and guidelines established by DWR in 2012 and to be eligible for future grant funding; and

WHEREAS, the updated MAC Plan, developed over the past eighteen months under the direction of the Regional Participants Committee and vetted in three public community workshops, is herewith presented for adoption by CALAVERAS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the updated MAC Plans does not entail a direct commitment of resources, and implementation of each project listed in the MAC Plan will be the responsibility of individual project proponents, and there is no joint commitment or responsibility by the MAC Plan participants to implement any or all of the projects; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of the updated MAC Plan is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15262 and §15306 because the Plan involves planning studies for possible actions that participating agencies have not yet approved and consists of basic data collection that would not result in the disturbance of any environmental resource; and

WHEREAS, the MAC Plan is meant to be complementary to participating agencies' individual plans and programs and does not supersede such plans and programs, and adoption of the MAC Plan does not prohibit nor affect in any way a participating agencies' planning efforts separate from the MAC Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the CALAVERAS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT does hereby adopt the Updated Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Plan.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by this 13th day of March 2013 by the following vote:

AYES: Directors Stump, Ratterman, Dean, Davidson and Dooley
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

CALAVERAS COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

Dennis Dooley, President
Board of Directors

ATTEST:

Mona Walker
Clerk of the Board

AMADOR-TUOLUMNE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

BOARD RESOLUTION: Number 15-03

WHEREAS, the California State Department of Water Resources (DWR) is accepting grant applications from integrated regional water management groups (IRWMG's), in order to award bond monies from CA Proposition 84 (The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006), and;

WHEREAS, The Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency (ATCAA) is representing the disadvantaged community within the Watershed Advisory Committee (WAC) of the Tuolumne-Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Authority (T-S IRWMA), and;

WHEREAS, ATCAA seeks to widen the scope of work conducted by its Energy and Conservation Department to include a suite of water conservation measures and;

WHEREAS, ATCAA seeks to perform similar water conservation measures throughout our northern service territory and to that end, the Program Director has joined the Mokelumne – Amador – Calaveras (MAC) IRWMG, administered by the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) and;

WHEREAS, in order for ATCAA to advance water conservation projects for inclusion in future MAC grant applications it is necessary for the ATCAA Board of Director to accept the MAC IRWM "Plan", which is a collection of all current and future projects that are being contemplated by the MAC IRWM, including a $200,000 water conservation project submitted by ATCAA that mirrors ATCAA's T-S IRWM Proposition 84 Round II project;

WHEREAS, ATCAA certifies that all uses of funds will be in compliance with CA Proposition 84 as well as the regulations, guidelines and contract provisions put forth by DWR,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors of the Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency (ATCAA) hereby accepts and endorses the MAC IRWMG plan with the intention of advancing water conservation projects for inclusion in future grant opportunities and specifically, those grant opportunities related to CA Proposition 84.

The foregoing resolution was duly passed and adopted on this 10th day of April, 2015 by the ATCAA Board of Directors by the following vote:

Ayes: 7

Nays: Ø

Abstentions: Ø

Absent: 7

Laurie Webb
Signature

Laurie Webb, Chairperson
Printed or Typed Name and Office Title

Lloyd A Schneider
Signature

Lloyd Schneider, Vice Chairperson
Printed or Typed Name and Office Title

Authorized Signatures:

Shelly Hance, Executive Director _____

Patti Cunningham, Deputy Director of Administration _____

RESOLUTION 2015-02

FOOTHILL CONSERVANCY

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE UPDATED

MOKELUMNE-AMADOR-CALAVERAS INTEGRATED REGIONAL

WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, state law provides for funding of water supply, conservation, wastewater, watershed improvement and other projects through a system of Integrated Regional Water Management Plans, including the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras Regional Water Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, the benefits of integrated regional planning for water resources management activities are intended to include increased efficiency and effectiveness, enhanced collaboration across agencies and stakeholders, and improved responsiveness to regional needs and priorities; and

WHEREAS, Foothill Conservancy is a charitable nonprofit corporation based in Jackson, California, within the MAC IRWMP Region, that works to restore, protect and sustain the natural and human environments for this and future generations; and

WHEREAS, Foothill Conservancy is a member of the Regional Participants Committee that developed the 2015 update to the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, the MAC Region is an established region as determined by California Department of Water Resources (DWR); and

WHEREAS, the original 2006 MAC Plan, developed and adopted under then-existing rules and guidelines, must be periodically updated; and

WHEREAS, support for the updated MAC Plan does not entail a direct commitment of resources, implementation of each project listed in the MAC Plan will be the responsibility of individual project proponents, inclusion of project studies in the plan does not imply support for the ultimate projects that result from the studies, and there is no joint commitment or responsibility by the MAC Plan participants to implement any or all of the projects; and

WHEREAS, the MAC Plan is meant to complement participating agencies' and organizations' individual plans and programs and does not supersede such plans and programs, and adoption of the MAC Plan does not prohibit nor affect in any way a participating agencies' planning efforts separate from the MAC Plan or limit any agency's or organization's ability to pursue a course of action that may conflict with or challenge a project in the MAC Plan; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the individual projects in the MAC Plan will be subject to all applicable environmental laws;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Foothill Conservancy Board of Directors does hereby support the 2015 update of the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Plan.

The foregoing resolution was duly passed and adopted by the Board of Directors of the Foothill Conservancy at a Board meeting held on this 29th day of June 2015, by the following vote.

Signed and approved by me after its passage this 29th day of June 2015.

Katherine K. Evatt, President
Board of Directors

Attest

Cecily Smith
Executive Director