

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from October 27, 2008 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
Brad Sherwood, SCWA; Andrea Flores, CCWD; Molly Petrick (SFPUC)	Brian Campbell, EBMUD	Mitch Avalon, CCCFCD; Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Mark Boucher, CCCFCD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP	Nadine Hitchcock, Vice- Chair, State Coastal Conservancy

Others present:

Thomasin Grim (MMWD)
Terri Fashing (County of Marin – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program)
Bill Keene (Sonoma County)
Juliet Lamont (Sierra Club)
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Z7, SCC)
Kellyx Nelson (San Mateo RCD)
Dave Richardson (RMC/CC)
Ann Riley (SF Regional WQCB)
Rick Thomasser (Napa County FCWCD)
Joanne Siew (RMC)
Jayne Strommer, DDSD

2. Review agreements/action items from 9/22/08 meeting

Coordinating Committee Decision Process

- a. Per a 9/22 Action Item, Dave Richardson gave an update of the Coordinating Committee’s Decision Process reflecting the principles discussed at the 8/25/08 CC meeting.
- b. Members discussed the voting principles as stated in the draft Decision Process and provided comments/questions on the following:
 - The CC agreed that the words “consensus and” should be taken out of the first voting principle “Decisions requiring consensus and voting should be agendized” since it might preclude the CC from making decisions on items that are not on the agenda. If members have an issue that may require a vote, they should send it in at least 72 hours ahead of time to be included in the CC meeting agenda.
 - Bill Keene questioned if voting by email could be considered a fair approach, since it might be perceived as being less transparent. He asked about how transparency would be maintained in cases of email voting.
 - There was discussion on the number of appointed representatives for each Functional Area (FA) and proxy votes, including the following questions: Should it be restricted to 3 formally identified representatives? Should there be a secondary representative for each appointed FA representative to serve as the proxy? Do we need to identify a quorum?

- CC members discussed the tie vote situation and did not think that the Chair or Vice-Chair should be the designated tie-breaker, since they are specifically non-voting, as described in the IRWMP CC Chair and Vice Chair Roles document. Instead, it was suggested that the tie be brought to the next meeting for a re-vote.
- c. Dave Richardson called for CC members to send him their suggestions and comments on the process, and also recommended that process be finalized in the near future, just in case DWR moves ahead in the funding schedule.
- d. Nadine Hitchcock noted that there could be inconsistencies created with the updated Decision Process with the Letter of Mutual Understanding (LOMU). If inconsistencies are found, these inconsistencies may be addressed through updated the LOMU.
- e. The CC agreed that the Decision Process requires further consideration within the Functional Areas before a decision can be made to endorse the process, and will place this on the agenda at the next CC meeting on November 24, 2008, for further discussion.

Action Items:

- 1) Dave Richardson and Thomasin Grim will place the Decision Process item on next CC agenda for further discussion.

3. State Budget and Legislative Issues

SBx 2 1

- a. Dave led the discussion on the SBxx1 (also called SBx2 1) memo prepared by RMC. Highlights of the discussion are as follows:

Climate Change Impacts Provision

- It was noted that the bill requires that IRWMPs include consideration of greenhouse gas emissions of identified programs and projects, and evaluation of the adaptability to climate change of water management systems in the region. In reference to this, Jennifer Krebs questioned if it would mean that projects included in the Plan would have to address climate change, or if the Plan itself would have to address climate change, as it would require the use of either Implementation or Planning funding. RMC's interpretation is that the legislation requires programs and projects to consider GHG emissions and that climate change be addressed programmatically.
- Nadine Hitchcock noted that some water agencies are already looking into it individually, and would like some indication of the time and effort needed to update the IRWMP based on the assumption that these agencies would be able to contribute information fairly quickly.
- Brian Campbell indicated that the CC still needs to develop a clear definition of what climate change issues to include in the update (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, sea-level rise, etc.). He added that the EBMUD 2040 WSMP does include greenhouse gas emissions calculations.

Proposition 84 vs Proposition 1E

- The CC would like some clarification between Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E funding. Juliet Lamont noted that the RMC memo included the \$150 million from Proposition 1E for Stormwater Flood Management projects under Proposition 84 funding. Dave Richardson agreed that the RMC memo was addressing both and offered to provide an update to the CC either through email or at the next CC meeting.

- Carl Morrison indicated that \$20 million would be available from Prop 1E for urban stream stormwater flood management projects in watersheds that drain to the San Francisco Bay. Harry Seraydarian suggested that the agencies should collaborate to figure out the best way to obtain the \$20 million funding instead of competing for the funding individually. It was also noted that stormwater projects containing elements that addressed climate change (e.g. green infrastructure) would also raise the competitiveness of our proposals.

Action Items:

- 1) Per a 8/25 Action Item, Paul Helliker will invite Maria Pang, Tracie Billington, or other DWR representative to the next CC meeting to participate in the Prop. 84 and Prop. 1E discussions and other related discussions.

DWR Regional Acceptance Process

- a. Carl Morrison provided an update from his recent conversations with DWR staff. He mentioned that the \$100 million for IRWMP implementation (of the \$900 million allocated for IRWM regions in Prop 84) will place preference on projects addressing the drought, but it will not be restricted to only these projects. The other preference is projects that support Disadvantaged Communities (DACs). However, all projects will still have to be identified in an IRWMP.
- b. Carl also learned that even with the expedited grants, it is likely that plans will still have to undergo the Region Acceptance Process (RAP). He said that after the draft RAP guidelines are released, there will be a 30-day comment period, then once the final RAP guidelines are released, there will be 30 days to submit for region approval. In addition to the RAP submittal, regions will be invited to interviews to 'defend' the region. Following this, there will be a shorter comment period on the list of approved regions that DWR will publish sometime in March/April 2009. The final guidelines for implementation grants would be released around March/April 2009.
- c. Carl also said that DWR is still thinking that a minimum amount will be available to each funding area, but a better proposal that meets the preferences (drought and DACs) could result in a larger grant award.
- d. DWR will be holding a series of workshops on the Prop 84 and 1E funded IRWM Program in November. Three workshops will be held to open discussions with potential grant applicants on how DWR plans to award these funds. More information is attached with the minutes.
- e. Dave Richardson noted that RMC is tasked to work on the RAP and will provide information for the PnP to review before the scheduled PnP meeting on Nov 3, 2008.

Action Items:

- 1) Brad Sherwood indicated that he will be attending the funding workshop(s) and will provide updates in the next CC meeting.
- 2) RMC will be preparing a memo providing next steps involved in getting the IRWMP updated to meet DWR's Regional Acceptance Process, as well as funding timelines.

4. Updates

Planning and Process Subcommittee

- a. Annual Report for 2007
 - Brian Campbell indicated that the text is complete, and he is awaiting data so that RMC can finalize a water-use graphic for inclusion. He did not receive any additional comments on the report from the last CC meeting on Sep 22, 2008. CC members indicate that they would like to finalize the report over the next month.

b. Region Acceptance Process

- This is now being worked on by RMC, as part of Task 1A of their scope of work, which has been approved by the 4 parties. That work (identifying gaps in the current IRWMP relative to Region Acceptance based upon DWR draft guidance) will be completed by early to mid-November 2008. Dave Richardson will be sending information to the PnP for preliminary review before it is presented to the CC.

c. Regional and Subregional Approach Options

- Thomasin Grim provided an update on the options scoring analysis, conducted by the PnP. An 11x17 matrix showing 7 subregional options and criteria (dated Oct 17, 2008) was distributed to the CC for review. The highest scoring option was Option 5 (see attached map). Harry Seraydarian explained to the CC that Option 7, the 'watershed' option, was in essence similar to Option 5, as both options are based on DAUs and also involve the splitting of a Detailed Analysis Unit (DAU). Option 5 would split DAU 045 into north and south portions, while Option 7 would split DAU 047 into north and south portions. The rationale for Option 7 was to keep the Alameda Creek watershed intact, compared to Option 5. However, Option 5 scored higher than Option 7 for the following reasons:
 - Option 5 is easier to implement compared to Option 7 since it is based on County boundaries.
 - The southern portion of DAU 045 is largely SFPUC watershed lands and is relatively unpopulated; and stakeholder activities in the Alameda Creek watershed actively involve the Alameda Creek Alliance, a community based watershed group.
 - Option 5 maintains the integrity of the bay coastal DAUs, but Option 7 splits up a bay coastal DAU.
- The CC reached consensus on Option 5 as the preferred option. Nadine Hitchcock requested that the PnP develop a write-up on the evaluation process and the preferred option (i.e. Option 5).
- Harry Seraydarian noted that with the subregional option being finalized, the next step would be to develop a write-up on the local project selection process.

Action Item:

- 1) PnP to develop a write-up on the subregion approach evaluation process and preferred option (Option 5).

d. Funding Allocation Approaches

- Harry Seraydarian presented calculations showing how Props 84/1E or other grant funding could be allocated to the subregions. The process for developing the hypothetical allocations was based on a similar process used for the Prop 50 Round 2 proposal. Five allocation alternatives were presented:
 - Allocation A (7/16 distributed based on no. of counties in each subregion, 9/32 based on population, and 9/32 based on area)
 - Allocation B (7/16 divided evenly among subregions, 9/32 based on population, and 9/32 based on area)
 - Allocation C (7/16 divided evenly among subregions, 3/8 based on population, and 3/16 based on area)
 - Allocation D (1/4 divided evenly among subregions, 1/2 based on population, 1/4 based on area)

- Allocation E (1/3 divided evenly among subregions, 1/3 based on population, 1/3 based on area)
- Thomasin Grim asked for the Functional Area representatives to review the allocation alternatives and state if they had any preferences or suggestions for other scenarios to be considered.
- Three additional allocation alternatives were asked to be added:
 - Allocation F (Even distribution between population and area): 50% entities, 25% population, 25% area
 - Allocation G (Population heavily-weighted): ≥75% population, ≤25% area
 - Allocation H (Area heavily-weighted): ≥75% area, ≤25% population
- Nadine Hitchcock noted that if a particular subregion has really good projects, then they could be held on till the final/eventual allocation.
- Mitch Avalon noted that the allocation needs to take into consideration regional equity.
- Juliet Lamont suggested that the funding allocation development process should be completed and an approach agreed upon before the grant application process begins, since agencies could be more objective in reviewing the allocation if they are not simultaneously involved in the competitive grant application process as well.
- The CC agreed that the funding allocation needs to be decided no later than December 2008.

e. Website Committee

- Mark Boucher announced that the committee has been working with the Clean Water agencies and is moving ahead to set up folders for their projects on the IRWMP website.
- Brian Campbell noted that that the website might be used for more extensive applications and may need to be expanded in terms of functionality. This would either require the website consultant's contract to be extended or for agencies to volunteer their time. He also enquired about the timeline for updating projects on the website.
- Thomasin Grim noted that the template for the projects might change with Proposition 84 guidelines and this was one reason the CC had postponed accepting new projects.

Action Items:

1. The Website Committee will place website development as a discussion item on the next CC agenda.

5. Announcements – all covered in items above

- a. Jennifer Krebs announced that the SFEP was recently awarded a \$5 million grant for Estuary 2100. The grant will go towards integrated watershed planning, coastal conservation, green infrastructure, and TMDL projects in the South Bay. Nadine Hitchcock and Ann Riley acknowledged that the preparation of the IRWMP and ongoing efforts of the CC in the previous year helped to set up the funding for this project.
- b. Kellyx Nelson announced that the Pilarcitos Integrated Watershed Management Plan is now available on the San Mateo County RCD website (<http://www.sanmateorcd.org/>).

6. Agenda Items and Details for the next IRWMP CC Meeting

- CC Decision Process (Voting Principles)
- Prop 1E

- DWR mid-November IRWM Funding Workshops update
- RMC memo on next steps in getting the IRWMP updated to meet RAP guidelines (possibly for December meeting)
- Funding Allocation Approaches
- Website Development

The next CC meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 24, 2008, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm Room 12 of the Elihu Harris State Building. The date and time for a December meeting have not been determined. BAWF will be meeting on the same day as the next CC meeting. The meeting will take place in the same room from 10.00 am – 12.30 pm and the primary topic will be a Panel Presentation on Greywater and Other Water-Saving Methods.

Attachment:

Announcement from DWR on Informational Workshops for IRWM Grant Program (Oct 31, 2008)



News for Immediate Release

October 31, 2008

Contacts:

Joe Yun, Conjunctive Water Management	(916) 651-9222
Ralph Svetich, Conjunctive Water Management	(916) 651-9291
Don Strickland, Information Officer	(916) 653-9515
Ted Thomas, Information Officer	(916) 653-9712

DWR PLANS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOPS FOR INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM

SACRAMENTO -- The Department of Water Resources (DWR) has scheduled a series of mid-November workshops on the Propositions 84 and 1E funded Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program.

The purpose of the meetings is to discuss how DWR plans to expedite both the Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation and Proposition 1E Stormwater Flood Management grant funding.

On September 30, 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger signed SBxx1 which contained appropriations for the IRWM program.

Proposition 84

\$181,791,000, of which \$100,000,000 is for implementation grants

Proposition 1E

\$150,000,000 for Stormwater Flood Management projects

Three workshops will be held to open discussions with potential grant applicants on how DWR plans to award these funds. The region acceptance process will be discussed, questions will be answered, and a draft schedule will be reviewed.

November 18, 2008 - 1-3 p.m.

California Tower conference room,
3737 Main Street, Magnolia Room 204,
Riverside, CA 92501.

November 19, 2008 -1-3 p.m.

California Environmental Protection Building
1001 "I" Street, 2nd Floor, Coastal Hearing Room
Sacramento, CA 95814

This workshop will be web broadcast at
<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/broadcast>. During the broadcast, listeners may
e-mail comments or questions to: DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov.

November 21, 2008 -10:30am – 12:30 pm and 1-3 p.m.

Goleta Sanitary District
1 William Moffett Place
Goleta, CA 93117

Prior to November 18, meeting material will be posted at
http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/grants/irwm/integregio_news.cfm.

If you need reasonable accommodation due to a disability, please contact Linda
Woolridge, (916) 653-6255; TDD (916) 653-6934

-0-

The Department of Water Resources operates and maintains the State Water Project, provides dam safety and flood control and inspection services, assists local water districts in water management and water conservation planning, and plans for future statewide water needs.

Contact the [DWR Public Affairs Office](#) for more information about DWR's water activities.