

**FINAL**

**Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee**

Agreements and Action Items from March 23, 2009 Meeting

**1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present**

<b>WS-WQ</b>	<b>WW-RW</b>	<b>FP-SW</b>	<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Other</b>
Jean Gardner, CCWD; Molly Petrick, SFPUC; Brad Sherwood, SCWA	Brian Campbell, EBMUD	Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Mark Boucher, CCCFCD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Melanie Denninger, SCC; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP	Paul Helliker, Chair, MMWD; Nadine Hitchcock, Vice-Chair, SCC

**Others present:**

Gina Bartlett (Center for Collaborative Policy)  
Jack Betourne (NCFCWD)  
Chris Choo (Marin County DPW/FC)  
Thomasin Grim (MMWD)  
Dale Hopkins (RWQCB)  
Carol Mahoney (Zone 7 Water)  
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Z7, SCC)  
Rolf Ohlemutz (VSFCD)  
Ann Riley (SF Bay RWQCB)  
Dave Richardson (RMC)  
Peter Vorster (The Bay Institute)

**2. Update on RAP**

**a. Review Final RAP Guidelines**

Thomasin Grim provided an update on the Final RAP guidelines and distributed a revised RAP Outline, updated based upon the Final RAP guidelines. Carl Morrison noted that DWR will be holding two workshops in April to assist RWMGs in the preparation of the RAP submittals. The workshops will include both public and private sessions. The workshops are scheduled for:

April 2, 2009 – Sacramento (CalEPA Building)  
April 8, 2009 – Los Angeles (Metropolitan Water District)

The group discussed the benefits of representatives from the CC (Thomasin, Carl or Joanne) attending to ask questions on the format of the RAP submittal, the process, and other related matters; it was agreed that attendance would be beneficial to the CC.

**Update:** *Thomasin Grim, Tracy Hemmeter and Carl Morrison will be attending the workshop on April 2<sup>nd</sup> on behalf of the CC.*

Thomasin indicated that the PnP had completed a draft RAP application package. The draft document is a compilation of sections worked on by subcommittee members, and is 91 pages in length at this point. PnP members are currently reviewing the document with the intent of providing RMC the draft work product as well as comments and suggestions.

The schedule is that RMC will receive the work from the PnP at the end of March, begin working on it on April 1, and produce a polished version for CC review by mid April. The CC will need to formally approve submittal of the RAP application package at the April 27 meeting, as it is due to DWR by April 29, 2009.

**b. Funding for RMC to work on RAP**

Melanie Denninger indicated that SCWA funding is currently being processed, and that hopefully the SCC will receive the check by April 1, 2009. Once the funding agreement is executed, the SCC may send an invoice to the SCWA, and payment will be made the next day.

**c. Input on RAP interview attendees**

The PnP provided a recommendation to the CC that the attendees for the RAP interview with DWR consist of the CC Chair, CC Vice-Chair, a representative from each Functional Area (also representing different subregions), and a representative from the Consultant Team. The CC concurred with this recommendation, and with the understanding that changes may be required due to scheduling conflicts once an interview date is announced, the CC reached consensus on the following provisional list of attendees for the RAP interview with DWR (total of 7 people):

No.	Title	Name	Subregion
1	CC Chair	Paul Helliker	
2	CC Vice-Chair	Nadine Hitchcock	
3	FA Representative – WS/WQ	Molly Petrick (SFPUC)	San Francisco/San Mateo
4	FA Representative – WW/RW	Brian Campbell (EBMUD)	East Bay
5	FA Representative – FP/SW	Brian Mendenhall (SCVWD)	South Bay
6	FA Representative – Watershed	Harry Seraydarian (NBWA)	North Bay
7	Consultant Team	Dave Richardson	

Based on the current timeline from DWR, it appears that the interview might be scheduled sometime in June 2009 (TBD).

**d. Update on East Contra Costa County IRWM**

- Jean Gardner indicated that she has checked the Functional Area documents (FAs) for projects that were included in both the East County and Bay Area IRWMPs. She did not find any; however, some projects that were not in the FAs did make it into the Bay Area IRWMP and they need to be addressed. The Project Screening subcommittee will review the existing IRWMP projects list and remove “duplicative” projects.
- The CC discussed the possibility of having the East Contra Costa IRWM region retract its region boundary to avoid the regional boundary overlap, but Jean noted that no planning process has been put in place in the East County so far to proceed further and will not be in the near future, so this is an issue to be addressed in the future—most likely after a planning grant has been received to move the East County from a Functional Equivalent IRWMP to a Full IRWMP. The area in question (within the regional boundary overlap) is within the Concord Naval Weapons Station property, and no projects in that area are anticipated in the near future. Because the East County Group and the Bay Area are going to collaborate on any projects whose benefits flow into or out of the Bay Area Funding Area, the CC agreed that there really is not an “overlap” issue; and the CC Chair indicated that he would prepare a response letter clarifying this issue.

**e. Update on other participating regions**

- CC Chair Paul Helliker indicated that he has not received any letters from Tomales Bay and San Mateo County and will be following up with them.

**3. Update on Subregional Process (Discussion & Action, led by the CC)**

- The CC noted that it would be beneficial for the Subregional Process to be described in the RAP submittal.
- Per Mark Boucher, the Flood Protection FA (Contra Costa and Alameda counties) has drafted a process. It was noted that there is a plan to involve watershed networks in this effort as well.
- Also, Mark's observation was that currently, there is some level of integration between FP/SW and the Watershed/Habitat Functional Areas, but less so between the FP/SW and Water Supply Functional Areas.
- The CC looked into organizations/groups that currently conduct regular meetings and suggested using Storm Water meetings at County-levels for outreach to cities, and LAVWMA and EBDA as a route for involving Wastewater agencies.
- Paul Helliker will consult BAWAC on the involvement of Water agencies in the Subregional Process.
- Tracy Hemmeter was identified as the subregional lead for the South Region. Potential organizations/groups in the subregion include the Creek Coalition, Open Space coalitions, counties and cities, and "Friends of..." groups.
- Molly Petrick was identified as the subregional lead for the San Francisco/San Mateo Subregion. Potential organizations/groups in the subregion include BAWSCA (Water), San Mateo RCD (Watershed), County of San Mateo (FC/SW), and WW organizations (yet to be identified).
- Harry Seraydarian was identified as the subregional lead for the North Bay (NBWA) subregion, which now includes Tomales Bay.
- The CC decided on a mid-April timeline for the following tasks:
  - Describe the process by subregion
  - Continue with the previous prioritization mechanics: including identifying people who will make prioritization decisions, rating and scoring lists, and describing the process of the meetings.

**4. Update on Project Screening Committee (Information, led by the CC)**

**a. Roles, Processes and Meeting Schedules**

- Brian Campbell reported on the status of the Project Screening committee. Committee meetings will be conducted back-to-back with the PnP committee meetings.
- Currently, the committee is reviewing regional projects, and will subsequently discuss new or changed projects. The committee is also working out a schedule or timeline for the screening process.
- The committee raised a question to the CC on how project information could be funded, without a planning grant in place.
- The committee will consult with the website consultant on the mechanics of accepting new projects for consideration via the web site.
- The CC also commented on whether Environmental Justice projects should be sought out and included. This would be beneficial based upon expected funding preferences in the "first round of Prop 84"

- In accordance with expected Prop 84 IRWM guidelines project proponents will be expected to match 25% in terms of overall funding, and fund upfront costs on their own with grant funds to be paid in arrears.

#### **b. Regional Project Concepts**

- Harry Seraydarian read from a draft list of Potential Regional Project Concepts. CC comments are summarized below:
  - Regional conservation – What is the project?
  - Regional recycling – Bay Area Plan and the North Bay Plan (outreach for “non-potable”; public acceptance, etc.)
  - Regional “Green Infrastructure” – Could have ‘pilot projects’ in each subregion.
  - Implementation on Environmental Human Health Risk Reduction Strategies for Mercury – BACWA & SFEI
  - Regional Mapping GIS/Habitat – FP/SW will be the Lead. A Lidar project was considered. MMWD is formulating a “Bay Area-wide” project description.
  - Floodplain/Watershed Forum – Has been discussed in the past, but may not need it on a regional level.
  - Fisheries Enhancement – Did have project #4 and #32 on the original list.
- Other comments from the CC are as follows:
  - Water – Analysis of Allotment base (coming from California Urban Water Conservation Council; ACWD has experience with it) Allotment methodologies carry both pros and cons. It is currently being worked on, and should be ready by summer
  - Sometimes small projects (not regional) are better.
  - Could do something with PG&E (Water-Energy nexus)
  - AB 811 Financing – Adding in Water Conservation
  - “Regional” projects that agglomerate one type of project (e.g. conservation activities or water recycling facilities) may not provide significant integration of multiple benefits and could rank lower with respect to prioritization/funding criteria than local projects that integrate multiple water resources benefits.
  - Carol Mahoney mentioned that a Bay Area-wide facilities mapping project is being written up by Sara Duckler from SCVWD for BAFPA, and Ralph Johnson is writing up the Bay Tidal Study.
  - Grey water projects could be an option.
    - Statewide grey water guidelines: people should comment on it
  - “Bay-level wide sea level rise” – should it be considered a regional or local project?
    - Good investment in elevation data, but groundtruthing is needed. BCDC – cartoon mapping (per Will Travis).
  - Peter Vorster mentioned the Los Vaqueros project as a potential regional project.
  - Another suggestion was to re-examine the water system inerties; now that we have done some, do we need more?
- The CC noted that local cost-sharing is needed for the projects, and that regional projects need to be in balance with local projects.

#### **c. Website Update**

Carol Mahoney indicated that the website consultant currently had \$5,000 remaining funds from the original contract amount of \$20,000 (plus \$11,000 that was funded from elsewhere). She asked if the CC would consider setting up an interactive spreadsheet/project setup form and hosting it on the Bay Area IRWM Plan website. Carol is working with the web-designer to facilitate his presence at the next conference call for the PnP subcommittee meeting to discuss options.

## **5. Discuss future funding for consultant work**

- The CC discussed future funding for consultant work and agreed that the Bay Area IRWM Plan update would need to be completed within 2 years of a grant application. The point was made that participants need to pay to stay involved. Paul noted that when he raised this with BAWAC, there was general acknowledgement of this point.
- Funding for consultant work should be coordinated with the timing for Planning grants.
- Jennifer Krebs questioned if “shovel-ready” projects might be a criterion for getting funding.
- The CC agreed to develop a rough scoping of the work and might propose that funding contributions should be in alignment with subregional allocations (for example, using Allocation F). Paul Helliker will discuss this with the Functional Areas (FA) and Subregion Leads.

## **6. Announcements**

The DWR will be conducting a Bay Area regional public workshop to gather and share information about the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan (CWP) Update 2009. The SF Bay regional workshop will be held in Fairfield on Monday, April 20, 2009 from 9.30 am to 4.30 pm at the Solano County Administration Building. A draft workshop agenda is available online at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm?subject=apr2009>

### **Action Item(s):**

- 1) The RAP application document will be available around April 20, 2009. The CC needs to approve the document on April 27, 2009. It is due April 29<sup>th</sup>.

## **7. Agenda Items and Details for the next IRWMP CC Meeting**

- Act on RAP Application

The next CC meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 27, 2009, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm at the Elihu Harris State Building.

# Planning and Process Subcommittee

April 6, 2009  
Meeting Summary

## Notes

### 1. PnP member meeting participation

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other/Multiple
<b>Present</b>				
Thomasin Grim Molly Petrick	Brian Campbell	Mark Boucher Carol Mahoney	Melanie Denninger Dale Hopkins Harry Seraydarian Jennifer Krebs	Joanne Siew
<b>Called in</b>				
Tracy Hemmeter		Brian Mendenhall		Carl Morrison David Siedband (website consultant)
<b>Absent</b>				
Brad Sherwood Pat Costello	Paula Kehoe Cheryl Muñoz	Rick Thomasser		Maria Pang Jennifer Clary Dave Richardson

The following issues were addressed and action items assigned:

2. **Website use - submitting new and updating existing projects.** David Seidband, website consultant, joined the first part of the meeting by phone. There was significant discussion about the use of the website for adding new projects and updating information for projects already in the IRWM Plan. Major points were as follows:
  - a. At this time, PnP would like project proponents to be able to submit information on a new project using the same template as that for existing projects (Mark will work with Dave to update the template) and to update information on existing projects.
  - b. The process would be: a person goes to the “add a project” page on the website and is directed to contact Mark Boucher in order to obtain a login. Presumably the spammers will not take this step, and only legitimate users would contact Mark. Mark then sets them up with a login, and then they are able to access the project information template on line. Due to the “workflow engine” for the website, all newly submitted projects will then be in a “draft” state, and only after review (by the Project Screening Committee?) and receiving the “okay” from a site administrator will the projects be visible to anyone viewing the website.
  - c. David described the potential for creating “folders” associated with each project. This would allow project proponents to add photos and other materials to their project folder, potentially increasing the project reporting and information gathering potential of the website. Adding this folder or “folder-like” capability would take several days of David’s time to set up. The PnP agreed this might be something to pursue at a later time, after the more immediate concern of adding/updating project information has been accomplished.
  - d. Allowing proponents to submit projects via the website helps make the IRWM planning process more transparent and easier for everyone to participate.
  - e. David cannot start on any work until his contract is executed, which may be about April 15.

### 3. Preparation for the Region Acceptance Process.

- a. **Overlapping areas.** This was an issue discussed during the interview with DWR staff immediately after the workshop held April 3 in Sacramento. What is needed in the RAP application is as follows:
  - i. Narrative describing what the Bay Area Region has done to address overlapping areas. The PnP offered suggested language to Joanne.
  - ii. Supporting documentation. The supporting documentation does not need to be every piece of correspondence, just the latest letters from the outlying areas expressing their desire to participate with the Bay Area Region.
    1. In the case of Eastern Contra Costa County it may be necessary for Paul to respond to their non-definitive letter, summarizing what we understand its position to be.
    2. The narrative will address the sliver of the Tomales Bay area in the North Coast hydrologic area, as it will with portions of San Mateo County and Santa Cruz County where there is some overlap.
    3. There appears to be sufficient narrative and/or documentation with respect to other outlying areas.
- b. **RAP application development**
  - i. RMC will now take the lead in developing the application. This includes incorporating comments and editing the entire document to make it flow (inasmuch as the sections were written by different people).
  - ii. RMC will edit the introduction, conclusion, add maps and other graphics as required, and create a user-friendly and polished hard copy presentation for the application package.
  - iii. As confirmed during the aforementioned interview with DWR, sections will address issues in sequence per DWR's Final RAP Guidelines, which will mean that some information may be repeated in sections. Appendices will be placed at the end of each section for the ease of DWR reviewers.
  - iv. Paul has indicated that he has some suggested edits. Those will be considered with other comments.
  - v. The RAP application development schedule is as follows:
    1. RMC send draft to PnP members and Paul and Nadine NLT April 13.
    2. Comments due back to RMC NLT April 17.
    3. RMC send draft final to CC members NLT April 20 indicating that any "red flag" comments must be received by 9 a.m., April 24.
    4. RMC to submit final RAP application (with MMWD cover letter as applicant) NLT than 5 p.m., April 29.
  - vi. The April 14 meeting that Thomasin reserved with DWR is primarily for RMC if needed.

### 4. Action items

- a. Mark to work with David Siedband on new project template.
- b. Thomasin to prepare a draft letter for Paul to send to CCWD to clarify the CC's understanding of how Eastern CCC overlap will be handled.
- c. PnP members to provide quick review and comments of the RMC draft RAP application, but NLT April 17.

- d. Joanne to place on April 27 CC agenda an action item for formal approval of the RAP application.
5. **What to report to the CC at its April 27 meeting**
  - a. Status of sub-region efforts.
6. **Next meeting.** The PnP Committee will at meet at 10 a.m., Monday, May 4, 2009, at the State Coastal Conservancy in the 13<sup>th</sup> floor conference room. The Project Screening Committee will meet in the same room at 12:30 p.m. the same day. Telephone access will be provided for both meetings.

**Project Screening Subcommittee**  
**April 6, 2009**  
**Meeting Notes**

**1. Meeting participation**

**In Person:**

Brian Campbell (WW/RW)  
Ann Riley (RWQCB)  
Melanie Denninger (Watershed/Habitat)  
Molly Petrick (WS.WQ, West)  
Jennifer Krebs (Watershed/Habitat)  
Thomasin Grim (WS/WQ, North)  
Harry Seraydarian (Watershed/Habitat, North)  
Carol Mahoney (FC/SW & WS/WQ, East).

**By Phone:**

Tracy Hemmeter (WS/WQ & FC/SW [today only], South)  
Carl Morrison (for Sonoma CWA, North)

**2. Discuss membership.** Consensus that members from each functional area and sub-region are important, recognizing one person may be able to fill more than one role.

**3. Review Local Project Selection Process Outline (Step I-IV).**

- a. Those attending 4/2/09 DWR Workshop reported that DWR will commence a 45 day implementation grant application period immediately following the conclusion of the Regional Acceptance Process (RAP) in Sept.
- b. The Bay Area grant amount could be \$15.3M based on Nov 08 Table from DWR, and would increase only if other regions are not ready for their allotment.
- c. Draft implementation grant guidelines will be posted for review prior to finalization of the RAP process, maybe in the May-June period.
- d. The actions needed prior to Sept were discussed, assuming the DWR schedule holds\*. A draft milestone schedule will be circulated. Basics:
  - i. May CC meeting – Make initial \$\$ Allocation for Regional Projects based on depth of Regional Projects. By inference this also sets Sub-Regional Allocations;
  - ii. May CC meeting –Approve subcommittee guidance to subregions per “Local Project Selection Process Description”
  - iii. End of May – Initiate Sub-regional prioritization process;
  - iv. June CC meeting – Make specific decisions on Regional Projects under the IRWMP evaluation / scoring system; discuss grant applicant
  - v. Mid-July – Sub-regions provide preliminary prioritization results to CC;
  - vi. July CC meeting – Preliminary determination of Sub-Regional Projects.
  - vii. August CC meeting – Final project decisions; update IRWMP project lists.
  - viii. Sept-Oct – Proponents and applicant prepare regional proposal.

\* This schedule of activities would be lengthened if DWR’s schedule does not hold.

**4. Initial Discussion of Project Categories**

- a. How to treat EJ-DAC projects needs discussion at the CC level.
  - i. Whether any “community” in the Bay Area as defined by DWR meets the 80% MHI standard will be investigated before the CC meeting.

- ii. Even if no community technically meets the state's definition whether the CC wants to affirmatively address projects that provide benefits to EJ-DAC areas should be reviewed.
  - iii. Info about potential EJ-DAC projects will be gathered, both those already in the IRWMP and specific projects identified by Ann Riley (East Palo Alto, Richmond).
  - b. Regional Project concepts from 3/23/09 CC draft meeting notes were reviewed:
    - i. Regional Conservation – specific info to come after 4/13/09 BAWAC mtg;
    - ii. WW/RW Recycling – outreach on public acceptance, \$300k, lead – City of San Jose, multi-agency project;
    - iii. Regional Green Infrastructure – to be developed by either FC-SW or WS-Habitat functional area with SFEP; need more info by May (cost, staff lead, etc)
    - iv. Human Health Risk Reduction Strategy related to Mercury – BACWA work plan info pending;
    - v. Regional Mapping GIS/Habitat
      - 1. Impervious-pervious mapping; MMWD lead, need more info;
      - 2. Ann Draper at SCVWD may be working on something related to this topic; need more info by May mtg;
      - 3. Related project? - Historic Ecology (SFEI); need more info;
    - vi. Floodplain / Watershed Forum? – may be dropped if no proponent;
    - vii. Regional Fisheries Enhancement? – may be dropped if no proponent;
    - viii. Analysis of Allotment based water allocation? – will drop if no proponent;
    - ix. Energy–Water nexus (w/PG&E?) – SF will investigate tank less water heaters; may be combined under Regional Conservation project
    - x. SB 811 Financing – may not match up well w/IRWM funding program (in arrears); WaterSmart revolving loan concept may be similar in nature.
    - xi. Bay Area wide facilities mapping – info pending, Ralph Johnson, BAFPAA
    - xii. Grey water regional pilot program – a proponent is needed;
    - xiii. Bay Area wide sea level rise – may be similar to tidal flooding project that Ralph Johnson is working on.
  - c. Proponents need to complete a project template if project info is not in IRWMP or out of date. Submit via e-mail to anyone on Sub-Committee until web site is capable of accepting projects directly.
  - d. Consensus to allow new regional projects to be submitted – stress time urgency (basic info needed by May 4). Announce at CC and other venues.
- 5. Other – Relationship of Prop 1E FC-SW IRWM projects and Prop 84 IRWM projects under “one application” (defer to next meeting).**
- 6. Action items:**
- a. Brian C. to develop draft milestone schedule for grant proposal.
  - b. Harry to develop draft guidance for sub-regional prioritization process.
  - c. Brian C. to provide IRWMP evaluation/rating criteria that need review next mtg.
  - d. Ann Riley to investigate specific projects in EJ-DAC areas.
  - e. Molly Petrick to confirm non-profit entities with projects can or cannot be funded.
  - f. More info on Regional Projects is needed from the proponents.

Project Screening Sub-Committee  
Meeting Notes (cont'd)

g. Regional concepts without proponents may be dropped in May w/o more info.

**7. What to report to at the April 27 CC meeting**

- a. Review tentative schedule of activities leading to a Sept 2009 regional proposal.
- b. Invite discussion of and direction for consideration of EJ-DAC projects.
- c. Review info needs and status of Regional Projects working list.

**8. Next meeting.** Monday, May 4, 2009, at the State Coastal Conservancy in the 13<sup>th</sup> floor conference room - 12:30 p.m. Telephone access will be available.