**Improvements to make in the 2013 MAC IRWMP Update**

**Prior to Round 3 Grant & Plan Review**

**Phase 1: Low Controversy, Low Cost & High Priority Improvements**

**Standard 1 Governance & Standard 14 Stakeholder Involvement:** Over the course of next year, hold a series of individual meetings to invite key missing stakeholder groups to put their two cents worth in on the plan (i.e. city and county governments planning and health department staff, school districts, Calaveras COG & ACTC, electrical utilities, Native American tribes, self-supplied water users, community organizations, tax-payer and ratepayer groups, recreational interests, industry organizations, state and federal agencies, and disadvantaged communities.). Delegate to RPC volunteers the responsibility of meetings one-on-one with additional stakeholder groups or their representatives. Provide RPC volunteers with questions to ask and materials to share. Note the suggestions of these new stakeholders. If project ideas result from these meetings, encourage participants to sponsor a project proposal for addition to the plan. Prior to the 2014 grant package submittal, add notes on the new stakeholders’ suggestions in the implementation section to the plan, and amend the plan as needed based upon their suggestions.

**Standard 10 Finance:** Have project proponents estimate the O&M costs and the local cost shares as soon as possible, and add them to the table in the appendix by 2014.

**Standard 13 Relation to Land Us Planning & Standard 5 Integration:** During 2013 there needs to be meetings (or series of meetings) in Amador and in Calaveras counties so that each of the land use and public service agencies can present their long-term plans for serving existing residents and the additional population and economic growth they expect. The agencies and districts need to come to some agreement on some basic level of growth that they all can accommodate. Each agency can then make an interim plan to most efficiently and effectively serve the existing population and the additional basic level of growth. The projects that are needed to serve existing residents and that basic level of growth need to become a high priority for the agencies. Then, the projects in the IRWMP project’s list can reflect those high priority projects. The MAC IRWMP can be amended to describe these meetings and to summarize their results. In subsequent years, there need to be a quarterly public meeting of these agencies to exchange current lists of pending projects and policy proposals, and to consult each other regarding the lists.

**Standard 15 Coordination: T**he MAC IRWMP needs to improve coordination with federal agencies actively involved with watershed management. The RPC should commit to sending a delegate to attend one or more of these existing stakeholder groups, to provide information regarding IRWMP projects, and to report back to UMRWA. The results of these meetings in 2013 could be mentioned in MAC IRWMP prior to DWR’s Round 3 grant review.

**Phase 2: Higher Controversy, Higher Cost, Lower Priority Improvements**

**Standard 1 Governance, Standard 5 Integration, and Standard 9 Data Management:** Delegate to an RPC committee the preparation of new guidance for the way that information will be received, reviewed, and accepted into the plan in future amendments and updates. (Higher Controversy)

**Standard 1 Governance & Standard 5 Integration:** To improve the balance of power and to promote collaboration, delegate to a balanced RPC committee the preparation of new guidance for MAC IRWMP governance. (Higher Controversy)

**Standard 6 Project Review Process:** Add a project call timed to allow for new projects to be added to the plan prior to its review during the Round 3 grants. Strategically include more projects that address the policies, statewide priorities, and resource management strategies that are currently under-subscribed on the project list. (Higher Cost)

**Standard 11 Technical Analysis & Standard 9 Data Management:** Before 2014, review the studies that form the basis for the MAC IRWMP and the technical feasibility of the projects. Assess the reliability of their data, and put that information in the plan tables. Also, where those studies identify data gaps, identify those gaps in the plan. Include in the IRWMP a request for funding to fill the data gaps in the documents upon which the plan relies. Also, if the data gaps are related to specific proposed projects, add to those project proposals the completion of the additional studies, and the funding needed to complete them. (Higher cost, Higher Controversy)

**Standard 10 Finance, Standard 8 Plan Performance Monitoring, and Standard 9 Data Management:** Make a definitive commitment to fund plan monitoring and implementation. (Higher Costs)