

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from April 21, 2008 Meeting

1. Roll Call of Appointed Functional Area Representatives

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
Kill Keene, SCWA Molly Petrick, SFPUC	Paula Kehoe, BACWA, SFPUC		Melanie Denninger, SCC; Harry Seraydarian, NBWA	Chair: Paul Helliker, MMWD
Brian Campbell, EBMUD; Thomasin Grim, MMWD;	Brian Campbell, EBMUD; Renee Webber, North Bay Water Reuse Authority & SCWA	Carol Mahoney, Zone 7; Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Paul Curfman, Marin Co FC&WCD	Dale Hopkins, RWQCB; A.L. Riley, RWQCB	Carl Morrison, Morrison & Assoc.; Maria Pang, DWR; Juliet Lamont, Env. Consultant/Sierra Club

2. Review Agreements/Action Items from 3/21/08 Meeting

The Chair suggested reorganizing today's agenda in order to ensure adequate time for the most important discussion items, such as review and response to the PnP subcommittee work product and prioritizing IRWMP update work items.

3. Updates

a. Website committee

Carl Morrison distributed a two-page printout from the new web site. The site is up and running, the address is: bairwmp.org. The consultant anticipates that within 30-60 days the site will be more interactive and more "browsable" for content. It is now possible to post meeting notices and other material. We should be able to post the next CC meeting agenda package on the web site, and send an e-mail message with a link to access/download the agenda package. One advantage to this approach is that individuals could then access the agenda package prior to CC meetings, regardless of whether they have received an announcement e-mail.

b. 4-Party Agreement and consultant selection status

Melanie Denninger reported that three applicants (RMC, Winzler Kelley, and Stan Williams with Peter Sakai) have responded to the re-release of the RFQ. Interviews are scheduled for May 1, 2008.

c. Outreach to Tomales Bay and Coastsides

- Paul Helliker will be attending the Tomales Bay Watershed Council meeting on Thursday, April 24. A meeting has not yet been arranged with the San Mateo County Coastsides group.

4. Major Items

a. Providing comments from CC on proposed Prop 84 guidelines.

Carl Morrison reported that while we had agreed that a group composed of one person from each FA would participate in drafting the “Prop 84 comments” document, only a couple people had actually come forward to volunteer. We discussed the draft comments included with the agenda package, although Carl made it clear that he did not believe it was a comprehensive list. Feedback included:

- Disagreement over item #5 in the draft list, regarding prioritizing grant funds for projects that would not otherwise receive local funding.
 - DWR should revise contracting procedures in order to facilitate multiple entities working on regional projects (as opposed to the current contracting policies which make it difficult if not impossible for regions such as the Bay Area to execute an implementation grant contract).
 - DWR should include language endorsing local project selection processes.
 - We should revisit the letter the CC sent in October; it had some good suggestions and we ought to review that prior to finalizing this letter.
- The following people volunteered to help work on drafting the comment letter: Paula Kehoe, Bill Keene, Brian Mendenhall, and Melanie Denninger, with Carl Morrison coordinating the effort and writing a strawman document to circulate and then synthesize comments received into a final document for CC review.
- We decided to revise our time line so that the comments could be finalized after DWR’s Proposition 84 meeting, to be held on May 13. The new target is for the CC to approve/finalize the comments document at the next CC meeting, on May 19; May 15th is the deadline for including the draft document with the May CC agenda package.

b. Planning and Process subcommittee

Carol Mahoney, Brian Mendenhall and Thomasin Grim briefly described the work effort the PnP group has started in order to address DWR’s comments regarding updating the IRWMP objectives section.

General discussion then included relating the IRWMP objectives to the CA Water Plan’s water management strategies, and whether or not to establish targets for the IRWMP objectives and potential sources to help derive those targets.

- There was agreement that we should update the IRWMP objectives, but we did not agree on how or next steps.

We discussed the questions “What do we want this IRWMP to do?” and “How can any entity take responsibility for implementing projects other than the project proponent?” and “What does ‘implement the IRWMP’ mean?” It was pointed out that in the beginning, the CC essentially served as “gatekeeper” and forum for the IRWM Plan and grant proposal development process. We agreed that there seems to be a difference between what DWR is suggesting the IRWMP and the CC should do and what we participating entities believe is realistic or possible.

We discussed adding language to more fully describe the “complexity” issues the SF Bay Area region faces, as well as possibly a section discussing potential subregions and subregional efforts. We discussed updating the Plan to include a section that more fully describes the real situation here in the SF Bay Area, how the CC functions, what is possible and what is not possible; in other words, take the approach of carefully and clearly outlining what is workable within existing constraints and circumstances. It was

pointed out that the Plan already describes existing conditions. But, those existing conditions could be more fully and accurately described and a rationale for our approach more fully developed so that it is made clear that this region's unique characteristics mean that our approach is the most effective one.

We discussed creating two documents: 1) an outline for a Plan update which could be shared with representatives from DWR in order to get their buy in for our approach before we start doing the work, and 2) a "statement of existing conditions" per paragraph above.

Since our goal is to have an IRWM Plan that is deemed acceptable to DWR, we agreed we should seek some clarity as to our approach and concept for the end results before moving forward. Maria Pang was asked who at DWR we should approach in order to address these complex issues; she indicated that Tracie Billington or possibly John Woodling would be the appropriate individuals.

- Agreed that Paul Helliker will schedule a meeting which will include himself, one rep from each FA, Maria Pang and Tracie Billington. Based upon the outcome of that conversation, we will decide at the CC level what to do next regarding the IRWMP update.

c. Discuss approach for IRWM Plan update.

(Included in above discussion.)

d. Create and prioritize a list of IRWM Plan update work items.

(Included in above discussion.)

5. Announcements

No announcements.

6. Agenda and details for next IRWMP CC meeting.

Next CC meeting will be held May 19, 2008, from 1-3 p.m.

Agenda items include:

Review and approve draft Prop 84 comment letter

Summary of meeting with DWR

Review of May 13 DWR Prop 84 Workshop

Discuss/develop process for Plan update – shall we go back to the 4 FA approach or update the Plan as a whole?

Create a prioritized list of items to be worked on as part of the IRWM Plan update.

Future presentation by Phil Stevens.