

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from March 21, 2008 Meeting

1. Roll Call of Appointed Functional Area Representatives

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
	Paula Kehoe, BACWA, SFPUC	Mark Boucher, CCCFCO; Mitch Avalon, CCCFCO	Melanie Denninger, SCC; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP, ABAG; Harry Seraydarian, NBWA	Chair: Paul Helliker, MMWD; Vice Chair: Nadine Hitchcock, SCC
Brian Campbell, EBMUD; Thomasin Grim, MMWD; David Houts, Zone 7	Brian Campbell, EBMUD; Renee Webber, North Bay Water Reuse Authority & SCWA	Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Paul Curfman, Marin Co FC&WCD	Phil Stevens, Urban Creeks Council; Meredith Williams, SFEI; Amy Hutzal, SCC; Dale Hopkins, RWQCB	Carl Morrison, Morrison & Assoc.; Maria Pang, DWR; Jennifer Clary, CWA

2. Review Agreements/Action Items from 2/4/08 Meeting

Discussion regarding meeting dates, observation that Friday does not work for many participants, and that the fourth Monday in May is Memorial Day.

3. Major Items

a. DWR response to questions posed at January CC meeting

Maria Pang from DWR addressed the following questions, prefacing all with the statement that this information is still under development and subject to change:

1) How much funding will be available for planning grants under Prop 84?

\$30 million total statewide; \$15 million from regional allocations, \$15 million from the interregional funding (of which \$5 million is specifically for DAC.) DWR is proposing that each IRWM effort would be eligible for up to \$1M for planning, spread out over two years with two application cycles per year. No dates available yet for planning or implementation grants; guidelines expected this summer. NOTE: It was not clear whether it was \$1 million per region or per application; Maria Pang is going to check on this.

2) What is in the FY08-09 budget for implementation?

\$300M for Prop 84

\$100M for 1E

3) Can planning grant costs be reimbursed if we start working on it now and apply for funding later?

Guidelines are still in development, so it isn't clear yet. It may be that costs incurred before start of a grant contract would be allowed as cost share only.

4) Is DWR willing to help provide a facilitator for this group?

Possibly; the request would have to be coordinated with the Bay Area Water Forum, and it would only be considered in order to help with specific, targeted issues the CC needed assistance with, not as an ongoing situation. If we decide to go in this direction, we would want to coordinate with Eric Hong (DWR Local Assistance Program Supervisor).

5) Application process for 1E?

DWR is considering using the same application for Prop 84 and 1E, because both are tied to the IRWM program. Under this scenario, the applicant would need to identify which funds they are seeking. Details are still being worked out. It is also not clear whether DWR will create separate guidelines for 1E.

6) Can implementation funding be used for projects that are located outside the region?

Yes, if the region that wishes to fund the project uses a portion of their funding allocation to construct the project. No, if the region wishes to use another region's allocated funding.

b. Response from functional area representatives on next steps in updating the IRWMP

FP-SW FA choice is option #1 / #2 (seek Prop 84 planning funds when they become available). Also suggests that the CC work on policy issues in the meantime.

Watershed FA choice is #3 / #4 (move ahead with updating the Plan, using volunteer staff time and soliciting contributions from all FA's to hire a consultant.)

WW/RW FA choice is #1 / #3 (update Plan after Prop 84 guidelines are released; are prepared to contribute funding but need a written proposal to bring to BACWA's Board.)

WS/WQ FA choice is #1 / #3 (update Plan, solicit contributions from all FA's, CC and PnP group should continue work in the meantime.)

All FA's wish to further define the scope of work for updating the Plan, all agree we should continue to do whatever we can do towards the update effort (such as address DWR's comments). Three FA's are willing to contribute funds towards hiring a consultant prior to planning funds being made available.

There was discussion about creating a prioritized list of items to be worked on as well as defining the process to be used in updating the Plan. It was noted that the consultant that will soon be on board can help to scope the IRWM Plan update.

c. Brief follow-up to February 4 FA workshop

Melanie Denninger provided a brief summary of outcomes and reactions from the workshop, noting that it had provided an opportunity for all FA's to learn and begin to understand some of the other FA key issues. Paul Curfman distributed a document framing some of his observations and questions. Phil Stevens pointed out that the large number of NGO's participating in the Watershed FA actually do have the ability to effect land use decisions through grass roots efforts. Mitch Avalon said that Phil Stevens had given a compelling presentation about how endangered species (and restoration efforts) could serve as a focal point or organizing principle for integrating projects, and suggested this group might want to ask him to present the material at one of the CC meetings.

d. 2/7/08 Roundtable of Regions summit and conference calls

Paul Helliker summarized the February 7 summit meeting he attended: DWR provided some updates (but info learned today is more current), Prop 50, Step 2 applications will be reviewed by April; Leslie Friedman-Johnson spoke about the State budget and water bonds; “work groups” (legislative group is focusing on: AB 1489 (2007) – AB 1654 (2008), , DAC work group is preparing BMP’s and guidelines for DWR, contracting work group is developing a template to present to DWR, survey work group is conducting a survey of regions in order to determine how each is responding to various issues); finally, breakout groups discussed issues such as numeric targets in IRWM Plans, prioritization of Plan objectives, and regional competition. DWR stated that they want each region to have a single strategy re: dividing up Prop 84 fund allocations; if not a single IRWMP, then at least a single strategy.

e. Providing comments from CC on proposed Prop 84 guidelines

Agreed that the CC will submit comments, and the comments will be compiled by a group composed of one person from each FA. Carl Morrison will coordinate the effort and write a strawman document to circulate and begin the process, and then synthesize comments received into a final document for CC review.

- Paul Helliker will send a request asking for volunteers to participate in this effort. Carl will work with Maria Pang to accurately state planning grant funding issues we heard about today.
- Target date to get comments to DWR: early May.

4. Short updates

a. Website committee

David Houts announced that the new web site is up and running, new address is: bairwmp.org. Next steps include making the site more “browsable” for content, and beginning to post meeting notices, etc.

b. Planning and process subcommittee

Mark Boucher reported that he has distributed the project status survey, and has heard back regarding 64 of the 121 projects.

- Mark will send one last reminder to those that have not responded, and then it will become the responsibility of each FA to prod their project proponents into responding to the survey.

Thomasin Grim briefly described the work effort and resulting spreadsheet that the PnP group has developed in order to address DWR’s comments regarding the IRWMP objectives. Since there was very little time, this item was referred to the next CC meeting for discussion. The PnP group will wait until after receiving feedback from the CC before moving ahead with the work.

c. 4-Party Agreement status

Melanie reported that the RFQ has been released, the deadline for submitting SOQ’s is Monday, March 24, and it is possible a consultant contract could be in place by April 18. There are still a few outstanding contract issues, and the Scope of Work needs to be detailed for the contract.

d. Outreach to Tomales Bay and Coastside

- A meeting with the Tomales Bay Watershed Council is planned for April 24, which Paul Helliker and possibly Nadine Hitchcock are planning to attend. A meeting with the San Mateo County Coastside group will also be organized during April.

5. Announcements

No announcements.

6. Agenda and details for next IRWMP CC meeting

Next CC meeting will be held April 21, from 1-3.

Agenda items include:

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

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

Future presentation by Phil Stevens.

Review and approve draft Prop 84 comment letter so that it may be submitted by early May.