

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from February 23, 2009 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
Jean Gardner, CCWD; Molly Petrick, SFPUC; Brad Sherwood, SCWA		Terri Fashing, Marin County FC&SW; Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Mark Boucher, CCCFCD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Melanie Denninger, SCC; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP	Paul Helliker, Chair, MMWD; Nadine Hitchcock, SCC

Others present:

Mitch Avalon, CCCFCD
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)
Joanne Siew (RMC)
Jayne Strommer (DDSD)

2. Reach consensus on Subregional Funding Allocation (Action Item, led by CC/FA representatives)

- The functional areas voted as follows:
 - WS-WQ: D, F, C
 - FP-SW: F, E, B
 - Watershed: E, F, B
 - WW-RW: FA representatives were not present, but voted on G, D in the previous meeting, and Brian Campbell had provided input via email.
- The CC reached consensus on **Allocation F**, noting that it was in the top 2 choices of the majority of votes.

3. Discuss process for adding projects to the IRWMP and establish “Project Screening Committee” (Discussion and Action Item, led by CC) and

4. Review updated Local Project Selection Process flow chart (Discussion, led by the CC)

Subregional Process

- Paul Helliker led the discussion. The CC reached consensus that in the adding of projects to the IRWMP, the CC would be the final decision-making body in the process.
- The concept and process for regional and subregional projects selection was discussed; the CC generally agreed that the Subregional process needs to undergo review before it is endorsed.
- It was noted that in the previous grant rounds, there was no specification on which projects were prioritized as the top, second, and third, but they were all agglomerated

together. The CC provided some suggestions for improving the project ranking/selection process:

- Run the entire list of projects through a baseline criteria – projects that passed the baseline criteria would qualify for ranking.
 - Subregional sub-committees could rank the projects that they submit to the CC.
 - The CC should keep track of subregions that have not received funding to date from the Prop 50 funds and take that into account for the allocation going forward.
 - Categorize projects in the database by subregions, to facilitate re-prioritization before they are brought to the Project Committee, and ultimately the CC.
 - The CC needs to conduct some form of outreach to get projects. By bringing the Subregional process plan forward, the CC could work with subregions to figure out how the subregions plan to conduct outreach.
- The current IRWM Plan does not specify clearly how projects would be added into the Plan. Paul indicated that the preparation of this current round of funding should not be combined with the wholesale update of the IRWM Plan. Also, he noted that it is difficult to begin the process of project ranking and without knowing the final guidelines from DWR.
 - The CC agreed that the Subregional Process should be an Action Item for the next CC meeting, to discuss participation in the subcommittees, existing working relationships, and potential leads. It was noted that clarification of this process would be important for the Region Acceptance Process (RAP).
 - Harry announced that Tomales Bay has joined in the NBWA. The CC noted that the NBWA was a working example of a subregional group and would be in a good position to take the lead in providing guidance for defining and implementing the Subregional process.
 - Paul noted that the Subregional process should be well-defined by May 2009.
 - The CC came up with some questions on how outreach would be conducted (e.g. how to solicit input from the NGOs, interested citizens, local water agencies), and whether a similar structure should be adopted for each subregion. As a minimum requirement, the CC needs to show that a broad representation of groups was solicited for participation. The CC was unsure of the implications on the overall Bay Area if a subregion was not functioning well.
 - Participation in the subregions could also be solicited through coalitions like BAFPA, where smaller cities are very active in.
 - The CC agreed that that subregional committees should be defined through the following process:
 - Paul Helliker to send email, on behalf of the CC, to interested parties soliciting their participation.
 - Parties who are interested in participating in the subregions would then be directed to the Subregional leads.
 - For some subregions, it may make more sense to identify a lead contact first which could facilitate the gradual involvement of a sub-committee, than to immediately appoint sub-committee members.
 - Dale Hopkins and Carl Morrison indicated that broad stakeholder involvement could create a lot of value for the subregions, and that in the long-term, it would be beneficial for the subregions to have an organization of citizens and stakeholders that they could work with.
 - Brian Mendenhall provided the SCVWD “Measure B” as an example where inclusion of all parties through workshops created a common mindset among people, whereas email might not have been that effective. The CC indicated while workshops might not be feasible in all subregions, the Subregional sub-committee would conduct outreach and gather a list of projects from stakeholder groups and rank the list according to the allocation criteria. Jennifer Krebs pointed out that it was also important to get in touch with the regional NGOs in the subregional process. Carol Mahoney noted that subregions may not be checking in with each other on their project lists, and suggested that an online repository be created to store these lists and to make it accessible to all subregions.

Action Item(s):

- 1) The CC to follow-up on the discussion of the Subregional process in the next meeting, and to define subregional leads and subcommittee participation.
- 2) Paul Helliker to send out emails regarding calling for subregional participation.

Project Screening CommitteeFunction of Sub-committee

- This committee would be a sub-committee under the CC, with the main function of screening projects from the current list of projects in the IRWM Plan and project lists from the subregions, based on criteria defined by the CC, and performing tasks and roles per the Local Project Selection Process flow chart and process description. The CC will decide on final list of projects to be included in a grant proposal or Plan update.
- The tasks of the Project Screening Committee were defined by the CC as follows:
 - Working with subregions to conduct both regional and local outreach to stakeholders
 - Receiving and organizing project proposals
 - Reviewing projects and making sure that the projects are appropriate given DWR guidelines and parameters of specific funding opportunities.
- The CC nominated Brian Campbell to serve as the Chair of the Project Screening Committee (TBD).

Process of adding projects

- Harry reiterated that there is a difference between prioritizing and adding in projects for the current round of funding versus the entire update of the IRWM Plan.
- There were questions from the CC on the approach to managing new project proposals, and who/where to direct the proposals to.
- The CC discussed and came up with some guidelines to define legitimate projects for the current round of funding:
 - Projects that show a high level of integration, and are reviewed by the Subregional sub-committees.
 - Regional projects that may be reviewed at the subregional level.
- The CC agreed with Jennifer Kreb's proposal that a regional callout for projects should be conducted as soon as possible. However, the CC was unsure on how guidelines for Regional projects should be defined, and noted that there are currently no leads for Regional projects that are in the Plan.
- Nadine Hitchcock questioned the extent to which the CC would like to solicit new projects, in view that there are already good projects in the existing IRWM Plan. It was noted that SBxx1 has specific funding criteria and existing projects in the Plan may or may not meet these criteria.
- It would be important for the CC as part of the project solicitation process to notify project proponents that their project would be better positioned if they met as many criteria as possible.
- Chris Choo suggested that instead of reviewing a full list of new projects to meet the criteria, that the project solicitation guidelines could be designed in a way to provide project 'types' for proposed projects to fit into, thus reducing the amount of project filtering that would be needed.

Other Issues

- Nadine suggested that the CC should apply for a planning grant from the DWR for staffing purposes, targeting it for the wholesale update of the IRWM Plan.

Action Item(s):

- 1) The CC asked each Functional Area (FA) to begin discussions on identifying Regional projects. It was noted that these projects should meet as many Prop 84 and SBxx1 criteria as possible, and should not be too expensive.

- 2) The CC will conduct outreach to Regional NGOs to obtain a list of Regional projects for the CC to review.
- 3) Carol Mahoney will check in with Dave Houts on getting the website consultant to develop an online shared 'repository' for depositing projects. Mark Boucher noted that this might not be done in time for the current round of funding, in view that contractual issues were still being worked out.
- 4) Paul Helliker volunteered to send out an email calling for interested parties to start preparing proposals for Regional projects, with the recipient of the proposals to be identified at a later date.

5. Report on draft RAP application and discuss list of policy questions arising from the review of the draft RAP application sections that the CC needs to address (Discussion Item, led by the CC/PnP)

- Thomasin Grim provided a report of the draft RAP application status to the CC.
- Section authors were asked to update their sections before the March 2 PnP meeting.
- The draft RAP sections would only be finalized after DWR comes out with final guidelines for the RAP.
- Responses to the questions are as follows:

Section/Questions	Response
<p>Stakeholder Section</p> <p>How will the CC improve stakeholder involvement and identify new entities (e.g. DACs and local stakeholders)?</p>	<p>Currently, meetings are held in conjunction with the Bay Area Water Forum, CC meeting information and decisions are posted on the Bay Area IRWM Plan website, and coordination between the CC and FAs encourage participation from FA stakeholders. Identification of new entities would be conducted on a subregional level through the subregional sub-committees.</p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Paul Helliker: The CC needs to pull together examples of existing projects that involve multiple stakeholders and DACs. ▪ Mitch Avalon: Most outreach of projects tend to be more project-specific. ▪ Harry Seraydarian: Emphasize use of the website and highlight the functional areas and BAWF. ▪ Melanie Denninger: Review the IRWM Plan when Prop 84 guidelines are available to determine how the Plan will be updated, and indicate to DWR how public involvement can be encouraged (e.g. through workshops). ▪ Get more participation in the IRWMP among members of the Bay Area Watershed Network. ▪ Include descriptions of existing public associations like the Contra Costa Water Forum and NBWA in the RAP. ▪ Nadine Hitchcock: Argument will be more persuasive to the DWR if we can link the IRWMP goals to a change in the way projects are being proposed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carol Mahoney: RAP section needs more information and examples of stakeholder outreach organizations in the Bay Area.
--	---

Action Item(s):

- 1) Carol Mahoney will draft a template of descriptions of public associations and send it out to the PnP for review.

6. Discuss relations between outlying/overlapping areas and the SF Bay Area IRWMP and decide on the method for documenting agreement (Discussion Item, led by CC)

- The CC shall publish letters of collaboration from Tomales Bay, Solano County and East Contra Costa County to the website.
- Jean Gardner will work together with the Bay Area to identify projects that are beneficial to the Bay Area. These projects will be submitted through the Bay Area IRWMP Plan. Projects on the list that do not have any predominant benefits to the Bay Area will be identified for removal from the Bay Area IRWMP Plan.
- The CC needs an updated letter from CCWD on the collaboration and coordination between the Bay Area and East Contra Costa County.
- Paul Helliker called for the same methodology to be applied to the San Mateo region that extends outside of the Bay Area IRWMP region boundary.
- Tracy Hemmeter has been in contact with Northern Santa Cruz County over the San Mateo issues.
- Mitch Avalon suggested for the CC to obtain a letter from Northern Santa Cruz County indicating their agreement over the 'switch' in project management areas.

Action Item(s):

- 1) Jean Gardner to provide an update on her review of projects at the next CC meeting.
- 2) Jean Gardner to provide a letter from CCWD on collaboration and coordination between the Bay Area and East Contra Costa County.
- 3) The CC to publish letters of collaboration from Tomales Bay, Solano County to the website, and update the letter of collaboration with East Contra Costa County (CCWD).

7. Announcements

- Paul Helliker is circulating the contract amendment for RMC to continue work among the four parties for agreement. He indicated that one of the parties will need at least 2-3 months to process the contract amendment, and that might not free up enough money in time for RMC to work on the RAP.
- Melanie Denninger indicated that she was sourcing alternative funds to replace the State's portion, and is also looking into using trust fund monies for compensation.
- Nadine Hitchcock provided an update on the State's budget status. New projects are unlikely to receive much assistance in the next 6 months or so. The State's current priority is to pay off old bills, and it is unlikely that the bond freeze will be lifted anytime soon.

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

Subregional Process: discuss participation in the subcommittees, existing working relationships, and identify potential subregion leads.

The next CC meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 23, 2009, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm at the Elihu Harris State Building

Planning and Process Subcommittee

March 2, 2009
Meeting Summary

Notes

1. PnP member meeting participation

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

The following issues were addressed and action items assigned:

2. Review agenda and action items from 2/9 PnP and 2/23 CC meetings

- a. Feedback on the draft RAP sections was to have been submitted by February. 17. Section authors will make any revisions and resubmit to Thomasin NLT March 9. Final modifications will made after the final guidelines have been released.

Melanie indicated that RMC is still under the Stop-Work order, which means they are operating “at risk.” The draft contract amendment is nearly ready for the attorneys to review. Mitch Avalon indicated that his approval process will take two or three months. Melanie has been looking into other alternatives, but it hasn’t been very successful. Another possibility is the loosening of the freeze, but that is moving slowly.

- b. RAP section updates:
 - i. Governance – comments have been incorporated; the section is essentially complete.
 - ii. Historical IRWM efforts – received no comments on this section.
 - iii. Stakeholders – Carol is going to request that Jennifer Clary give input to this section.
 - iv. Region Physical Description – Melanie has a few comments, but has not yet submitted them. Harry provided a comment to Tracy which has yet to be forwarded to the team.
 - v. RWMG Description & Composition – Thomasin and Carl have developed a first draft. The list of agencies with water management responsibilities in the region is still being completed by RMC, and the complete section draft should be finished and distributed to the PnP in the next few days.

- vi. Thomasin indicated that section authors should finalize their drafts in the simplest way. If appropriate, by just adding comments to the original text as markups (“Track Changes”), and then send updated drafts to her.
 - vii. Tracy noted that there are many maps needed to support the Regional physical description section. We’ll need to come up with a plan to make those maps if the final guidelines are released soon.
 - viii. Dale Hopkins will assist Carol in adding text about the Bay Area Watershed Network into the Stakeholders section.
 - ix. Carl is to call DWR to get a status report on when final RAP guidelines could be expected as well as get some guidance on dealing with repeated material.
 - x. Brian M. agreed to do some preliminary work on formatting the sections such that they have a more standardized appearance, so that we can more easily see how the whole package works together.
- c. Questions posed from PnP to CC, at the February 23 CC meeting:
- i. Stakeholders. There was no definitive CC direction on improving stakeholder involvement except that additional outreach at a local level would be a likely outcome of the subregional effort.
 - ii. How will the subregions work with or within the CC governance framework? The CC agreed that each subregion may have a unique governance structure but that it needs to be sufficiently adequate to not detract from the entire IRWM planning effort.
 - iii. Region description and adjacent and overlapping areas. This issue was discussed at the CC. The PnP will recommend that policy be the same for all outlying areas: that Bay Area region boundaries be that of DWR’s funding area boundaries, but that projects may be included in the Bay Area IRWM Plan outside the funding area if they provide benefit to the area. Mark B. will follow up with Jean Gardner of CCWD to get closure on that agency’s written acknowledgement for Eastern CCC to participate in the Bay Area IRWM Plan. Mark also will prepare a map showing the portion of the county at issue. The PnP will not recommend the territory exchanges in southern San Mateo County.
- d. PnP verbal reports to CC on works status to date. Done at the February 23 CC meeting.
- e. Project Screening Committee. The conclusion at the February 23 CC meeting was that several PnP members agreed to serve on a Project Committee. Brian C. was “nominated” as the chair. He accepted at this PnP meeting. The meetings will be held the same day as the PnP meetings, but agendized separately. Brian and Thomasin will work out the details. Dave and Joanne will send the PnP the IRWM Plan project listings in editable format. Harry will look at the 2007 process used for the Prop 50 Round 2 grant program to see how it applies now. Carol will talk with Dave Houts about the status of the website consultant contract. When on board, the consultant will be asked to at least join a Project Committee meeting by phone to discuss how the website can best be used to add new projects. There was discussion on how so few participate in subcommittee efforts, resulting in those who do participate having a greater workload as new issues arise. The hope is that subregional efforts will bring out those who are willing to participate in the CC’s subcommittees.

- f. Updated Local Project Selection Process chart. The chart that Mark B. updated was briefly reviewed. There is no need to change anything until after the Project Committee meets.
- g. Melanie continues to pursue funding for RMC to continue work now. In addition, PnP discussed securing funding for consultant work in the future. Above and beyond the current stop-work order issued to RMC by the Coastal Conservancy and the associated constraints that have been placed on RMC's work effort, the PnP believes the CC should begin to secure funding for consultant work beyond what is provided through the four-party agreement. It was decided that the CC will be asked to take steps to secure funding for consultant efforts once the existing funding is exhausted.

3. **Preparation for Region Acceptance Process.** Please see 2.b. in notes above.

4. **Project Subcommittee**

- a. Discuss Process, Roles, etc. Please see 2.e. in notes above.
- b. Adding projects to the IRWM Plan. Please see 2.e. and 2.f. in notes above.
- c. Local Project Selection Process. Please see 2.f. in notes above.

5. **Action items**

- a. Carol to seek Jennifer Clary's assistance with the RAP application stakeholder section (in time to be included in update due March 9).
- b. Dale to provide Carol information on the BAWN for inclusion in the stakeholder section (in time to be included in update due March 9).
- c. All authors send RAP application section updates to Thomasin (by March 9).
- d. Carl to call DWR to get the latest on the release of the Final RAP Guidelines (done and e-mail sent to PnP).
- e. Brian M. to begin standardizing the sections once he receives from Thomasin the updated sections due to her March 9 (before the March 23 CC meeting).
- f. Mark to contact Jean Gardner about responding to the CC regarding CCWD's overlapping area (before the March 23 CC meeting).
- g. Mark to make map of CCWD's overlapping area (before the March 23 CC meeting).
- h. Dave and Joanne to send the PnP the IRWM Plan projects list in editable format.
- i. Harry to review the 2007 project selection process to see how it could apply to current regional project identification (before the March 23 CC meeting).
- j. Carol talk to Dave Houts about moving forward with the website contract (before the March 23 CC meeting).
- k. Carol (through Dave) arrange for website consultant to join by phone the next Project Committee meeting.
- l. Thomasin and Brian C. confer on how best to schedule, agendize and run the PnP and PC meetings.
- m. Melanie will reserve the 13th floor conference room from 10 a.m. – 2 p.m. on April 6, in order to allow time for both the PnP and the PC meetings.

6. **What to report to the CC at the March 23 meeting**

- a. Status of the draft RAP application.
- b. Need to address future funding for consultants once the funds in the existing four-party agreement are exhausted.

- c. Need for subregions to identify regional projects and subregional governance.
- d. Inquire of status of CC documentation regarding outlying areas (letters received?).

7. **Next meeting.** The PnP and Project Committee will meet Monday, April 6, 2009, at the State Coastal Conservancy in the 13th floor conference room.

The PnP will meet at 10 a.m., to be followed by a short break, and then the Project Committee will meet until 2 p.m. Subcommittee members should bring lunch or a snack.

Telephone access will be provided.