

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from August 25, 2008 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Official FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
Molly Petrick, SFPUC; Brad Sherwood, SCWA	Brian Campbell, EBMUD	Mitch Avalon, CCCFCD; Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Mark Boucher, CCCFCD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Melanie Denninger, SCC	Paul Helliker, Chair, Marin Municipal Water District; and Nadine Hitchcock, Vice-Chair, State Coastal Conservancy)

Others present:

Liza Crosse, Tomales Bay Watershed Coun.	Carlos Porrata, Tomales Bay Council
Terri Fashing (MCFCD)	
Thomasin Grim (MMWD)	
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Z7, SCC)	Ann Riley, SF Regional WQCB
Kellyx Nelson, San Mateo RCD	David Richardson (RMC/CC)
Elizabeth Patterson (Morrison Assoc.)	Peter Vorster (TBI)
	Renee Webber (SCWA/NBRA)

2. Review agreements/action items from 7/28/08 meeting

- a. Per a 5/21 Action Item, Paul, Nadine, Carl and Thomasin were to have created a proposed set of rules and procedures for distribution and discussion 6-23-08. Since neither Paul nor Nadine was able to attend that next meeting the three decided to postpone presenting the rules and procedures until the 7-28 meeting. That was postponed till today's meeting, and will be addressed as Agenda Item No. 3.
- b. Per a 7/28 action item, Brian Mendenhall and team from PnP is to present potential approaches to subregional organization. Brian, Harry and Brian Campbell will present on this issue at the next PnP meeting (September, 2008) and report back to CC at next Meeting (9/22/2008).

3. Process for CC Decisions

Paul led the discussion. The process is as follows:

1. First, Consensus is strived for in CC decisions. This is reflective of the LOMU and the process described in the current IRWMP.
2. If consensus cannot be achieved, voting can be used. Voting principles operate as follows:
 - Decisions requiring consensus or voting should be agendized. Agendas should be prepared and emailed to the CC at least a week in advance, but no less than 72 hours in advance of the vote. If a FA is ill-prepared to vote on an item, the vote can

be postponed by majority vote, but group should identify the timing of the vote at that meeting.

- Ideally, votes would occur at regular CC meetings, but special meetings or conference calls can be called and noticed if necessary for timely decisions. If neither of those 2 options is viable, voting by email is a possibility, but would need to be agreed upon by a majority of the FA reps.
- Rather than 2 reps per functional area, there will now be 3. Each of the 3 representatives within each functional area has an individual vote, if they are in attendance at the meeting where the vote takes place.

Action Item: Dave Richardson to write up “decision process” in meeting notes for CC review (see above). Also, when the “Bay Area IRWMP Management Process” writeup is updated by RMC, the word “LOMU” should be defined, and the Bay Area Stormwater Group should be defined.

4. Prop 84 and 1E Appropriation Bill and Water Bond Proposal

Paul led a discussion on the Governor and Senator Feinstein’s Water Bond Proposal, Huffman’s Water Bond legislation in the Assembly (AB 8) and Perata’s Appropriation Bill (SB 1XX). The key issues are as follows:

- The new bond legislation proposes \$1.5 Billion (vs. 1.0 Billion in Prop 84) for IRWMP, and Paul distributed a table with the regional breakdown. It appears that the Bay Area and other large population centers do not get their proportional share increase because the increased funding is proportioned based upon regional land area and not population.
- The CC should keep close tabs on these pending bills and bond issue proposals.
- The CC should not advocate for one vs. the other at this time.
- Paul should share his funding breakdown table with the IRWM roundtable to gain perspectives from other regions.
- Paul will share findings from these discussions with the CC via email.

5. Updates

a. Planning and Process Subcommittee (PnP)

Annual Report for 2007

Brian Campbell has taken the lead in preparing this document for the PnP and CC. There was some discussion of our projects currently in the IRWMP and their status. There was a project survey conducted last year and responses were received for 80 of our 127 projects. Mark continues to communicate with project proponents in the Flood Group. Carlos Porrata offered that they have 32 members in the Tomales Bay Watershed Group and they have 72 current projects. Regarding project updates, they are “working on it”. Brian indicated that a rough draft of the report will be ready for review and discussion at the next CC meeting in September.

Action Item: Mark Boucher will check with the Webmaster to see how easy it would be for our Bay Area IRWMP website to allow for individual accounts to be set up so that proponents could update project information on their projects.

Region Acceptance Process (RAP):

Notes from the August 4th PnP were attached to the agenda packet. Also attached to the agenda packet are letters from the following:

- CCWD – On behalf of the East County Water Management Group, they are as yet undecided as to whether to combine with the Bay Area IRWMP or stay separate. They are interested in how the Bay Area CC will be addressing subregions.
- Solano County Water Agency – will be participating in the Bay Area IRWMP. Interested in subregional approach.
- Tomales Bay Watershed Council – not sure whether to participate with BAIRWMP, but checking us out. No reason to object to the current proposed region and boundaries proposed by the State.
- Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District – will be participating in the Bay Area IRWMP for the portion of Napa County in the Bay Area region, and support a subregional approach for planning and implementation.

Also, for the region acceptance process, as summarized in the August 4th PnP meeting notes, RMC will be tasked with analyzing preliminary DWR guidance for “Region Description” for Prop 84, compiling what we already have and creating a list of what is missing, in preparation for DWR guidelines on the Region Acceptance Process, expected later this year. Recent communication with DWR indicates that the lack of a State budget continues to delay the process of the State issuing any Prop 84 Guidelines.

Action item: RMC to develop proposed scope of work/workplan and budget for Melanie to review and get approval from 4-party group.

Regional and sub-regional approach options:

Brian M, Brian C and Harry had formulated distinguishing criteria for options for sub-regional organization for certain IRWM purposes. Considering subregion options including quartiles, counties, watersheds, and water agency/district boundaries.

Action item: See Review of Action Items (2b) above. Brian M. and his group will present a subregional option matrix and narrative issue statement at the next PnP meeting, and, if PnP is prepared, the document will be presented at the September CC meeting.

b. Website Subcommittee

Mark indicated that he is working with the webmaster, David Siedland, to provide permission for RMC to upload materials to the website (this has been completed). CC members are receiving automated website updates. If CC members are not, let Mark know.

Action item: Mark will provide permissions to RMC (done)

c. 4-Party Agreement and consultant contract status

Agreement: RMC has been authorized to work on Task 2 (CC and PnP support) activities.

6. Announcements

a. Roundtable of Regions (RoR) survey was submitted by Paul Helliker on behalf of the Bay Area.

7. Agenda and details for next IRWMP CC meeting

Agenda items anticipated:
Subregional Options
Region Acceptance Process
State Budget and Legislative updates

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 22, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm Room 12 of the Elihu Harris State Building. The CC will continue to meet from 1:00-3:00 on the 4th Monday of each month through November. The date and time for a December meeting have not been determined. While BAWF did not meet in August, most future BAWF meetings, including September, will take place from 10:00-12:30 on the same dates as the CC and in the same room.