

Planning and Process Subcommittee

May 4, 2009

Meeting Summary

1. PnP member meeting participation

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

The following issues were addressed and action items assigned:

2. **RAP submittal.** The RAP application has been submitted. Thomasin expressed appreciation to the PnP members who helped prepare the application and to RMC for preparing it for submittal. Christy Spector of DWR indicated that 46 applications were submitted statewide.

3. Next steps and upcoming work efforts:

- a. **Preparing for the RAP interview.** No action is needed until the DWR reviews the applications and extends an invitation for an interview with interview questions. The interview is tentatively scheduled for May 28 in Sacramento, with questions provided in mid-May. A firm date and time can be expected later this week. Maria Pang will be the lead for the review, but Christy will be one of the other reviewers.
- b. **Updating the IRWM Plan.** No action will be taken until the DWR plan standards are released this summer. Christy will inquire if planning grants will permit reimbursement for any efforts to update the plan before planning grants are awarded. She was encouraged to advocate such a possibility to encourage regions to start updating their plans now.
- c. **Next phase contract for consultant assistance.**
 - i. RMC has sufficient authorization and funds (about \$20,000) to continue work until sometime this summer. This includes assisting the CC, PnP and PSC, as well as helping with RAP interview process. If it

is authorized to proceed using the remaining \$20,000 in the four-party agreement (which will require the State Coastal Conservancy to have full access to its funds), it could help with preparing the grant application and at least starting to scope out the IRWM Plan update. Updating the Plan could cost from \$100,000 to considerably more, depending on what the plan standards require, and how many additional projects and project evaluations are added to the plan.

ii. Consulting efforts were broken down into two phases:

1. Phase I is the existing work that includes CC and subcommittee support, the RAP interview, assistance with the grant proposal, and some work preparing for updating the plan.
2. Phase II is the greater IRWM Plan update effort.

iii. Included in Phase I but not part of the RMC contract is the development of the website, specifically so it can be used for new project submission and existing project updates. Zone 7 has expressed a desire that another agency continue with the next phase of managing a website contract. RMC expressed willingness to have the website consultant as a subcontractor if that eases the problems of agency administration. Carol will arrange a conference call with the web designer to discuss details of how project information will be inputted. The FP/SM FA is willing to upload projects in the blind (not for public viewing) as test to see how the site functions for that purpose, etc.

d. **Grant proposal development.** Until the PSP is released there is still uncertainty with respect to preparation of the grant proposal. It was mentioned, however, that agency staff may be more willing to assist now than with past proposals. Also, there will be the question of who the applicant will be. It also was stated that while there is no requirement to “pay to play,” those receiving grant funds will have to come up with the required matching funds.

4. Action items

- a. Carol to set up conference call with the web designer to discuss project submittals and updates.
- b. Christy to find out if funds expended now to update the Plan can be included for reimbursement in upcoming planning grants.

5. **What to report to the CC at its June 1 meeting.** Nothing at this time.

6. **Next meeting.** No specific meeting time was set. If DWR issues the questions for the RAP interview before May 18, then a meeting could be held that day when the

PSC already is scheduled to meet. The committee also could meet its usual first Monday on June 1 if necessary. That is the same day as the CC meeting that is postponed a week because of the Memorial Day holiday.

Project Screening Subcommittee
May 4, 2009
Meeting Notes

1. Meeting participation

In Person:

Brian Campbell (WW/RW, East)
Ann Riley (RWQCB - Watershed/Habitat)
Dale Hopkins (RWQCB - Watershed/Habitat)
Thomasin Grim (WS/WQ, North)
Harry Seraydarian (Watershed/Habitat, North)
Carol Mahoney (FC/SW & WS/WQ, East)
Dave Richardson, RMC
Mark Boucher (FC/SW, East) – 1 hour only

By Phone:

Tracy Hemmeter (WS/WQ, South)
Brian Mendenhall (FC/SW, South)
Carl Morrison (for Sonoma CWA, North)
Molly Petrick (WS/WQ, West)
Christy Spector (DWR)

2. Review project selection process and schedule

- a. **Schedule.** The expected proposal period did not change (late Sept-Nov), but DWR will not have draft Guidelines available until late May or June. One change to the Draft Schedule (separate attachment) is that results from the sub-regional process would be reviewed by the Project Screening Committee prior to the Coordinating Committee.
- b. **Guidance for sub-regional selection process.** The delay in the availability of DWR draft guidelines changed the urgency of this document. The preference is for the Coordinating Committee to provide direction on the dollar allocation for regional and sub-regional projects rather than using a hypothetical example.

3. Review of Regional Projects.

- a. Thus far, eight projects that are priorities for one or more functional areas are considered ready / near-ready for this grant round. (Separate attachment)
- b. Concepts reviewed at the 04/06/09 meeting that still do not have a proponent:
 - i. Regional fisheries enhancement.
 - ii. Analysis of allotment- based water allocation.
 - iii. Energy-water nexus (tankless hot water heaters)
 - iv. SB 811 Financing
 - v. Grey water pilot program
- c. Further, regional-type projects listed in the IRWMP that are not being pursued thus far include:
 - i. No. 36, Guadalupe Watershed Modeling Towards Mercury management to Achieve TMDL Goals (SFEI) - \$500,000.
 - ii. No. 80, Reducing Women and Children's Exposure to Mercury in the Bay and Delta Region (Ma'at Youth Academy) - \$2,000,000.
 - iii. No. 10, Bay Area Levee Certification (SCVWD) - \$610,000.
 - iv. No. 25, Defining Summer Low Flow Channels - \$450,000.

- v. No. 83, Regional BMPs, Field Manual and Training for Stream Maintenance Activities (Marin Co STOPP) - \$72-84M (need to be verified)
- vi. No. 19, Community Safe Drinking Water Project (Literary for Environmental Justice) - \$36,000.

4. Review of IRWMP Evaluation Criteria (IRWMP Sec. F – Regional Priorities)

- a. Discussion of this was deferred to next meeting.

5. Relationship of Prop 1E FC-SW IRWM projects and Prop 84 IRWM projects under “one application” – The Flood/Stormwater functional area was asked for feedback.

6. Action items:

- a. Brian C. to update Draft Schedule based on discussion.
- b. Harry S. to wait to update Guidance document until after June 1 CC mtg.
- c. Brian C. to prepare list of Regional Projects under active consideration.
- d. Mark B. to create web folder to hold templates for Regional Projects.
- e. SFEP, Zone 7 - Consider comments about improving project delivery method(s) and description of outcomes; potentially revise Project Descriptions.
- f. Harry S. to follow up with BACWA on potential to combine Mercury projects.
- g. All – review list of projects not under active consideration.

7. What to report to at the June 1 CC meeting

- a. Review working list of Regional Projects, as updated May 18+/-.
- b. Present 2 or 3 options for the regional /sub-regional funding allocation.
- c. Review DWR guidelines, if available, and approach to Guidance document (is this the Guidelines or another document?).

8. Next meeting, tentatively scheduled May 18, 10am or 11am to 2 pm (start time depends on whether 10am PNP meeting is held to prep for RAP interview).

- a. The meeting location is not confirmed yet.
- b. Key items to cover:
 - i. Review DWR Draft Guidelines, if available.
 - ii. Review Schedule
 - iii. Review list of Regional Projects under active consideration.
 - iv. Review IRWMP scoring criteria.
 - v. Develop two or three options for the CC to consider for the allocation of funding to regional and sub-regional projects.

Project Screening Subcommittee
May 18, 2009
Meeting Notes

1. Meeting participation

In Person:

Brian Campbell (WW/RW, East)
Ann Riley (RWQCB - Watershed/Habitat)
Dale Hopkins (RWQCB - Watershed/Habitat)
Jennifer Krebs (Watershed/Habitat)
Harry Seraydarian (Watershed/Habitat, North)
Carol Mahoney (FC/SW & WS/WQ, East)
Joanne Siew, RMC
Carl Morrison (for Sonoma CWA, North)

By Phone:

Tracy Hemmeter (WS/WQ, South)
Brian Mendenhall (FC/SW, South)
Molly Petrick (WS/WQ, West)
Melanie Denninger (Watershed/Habitat)

2. Update on DWR Draft Guidelines Schedule

- a. **Schedule.** There have been no updates from DWR on the release of the Prop. 84 draft guidelines. The RAP interview with DWR is scheduled for May 28, 2009.
- b. **Funding.** Project Screening subcommittee members indicated that only bond funding appropriated by SB2x 1 is anticipated for now. The Coastal Conservancy does not expect any funding for projects until at least the first quarter of 2010.

3. Review Draft Schedule

- a. Following DWR's current schedule, the following meetings are scheduled:
 - i. 6/1/09 – CC meets for preliminary decision on funding allocation for Regional projects, approval of the sub-regional project selection process, and discussion of DWR draft guidelines (if available).
 - ii. 6/9/09 (date change) – Project Screening subcommittee meets at the Coastal Conservancy to score Regional projects and develops options based on CC preferences stated at the 6/1 CC meeting.
 - iii. 6/22/09 – CC meets to make decisions on specific Regional projects.
 - iv. End July – Sub-regions to provide Project Screening committee with sub-regional projects before 8/24 CC meeting.
 - v. 8/11/09 – Project Screening subcommittee meets to prepare recommendations on sub-regional projects to report to the CC.
 - vi. 8/24/09 – CC makes final decisions on Regional and Sub-regional projects.

4. Review List of Regional Projects under Active Consideration

- a. In the May 4 Project Screening subcommittee meeting, there were 8 projects that were considered ready for the expedited grant round. Two new projects have been added since, bringing the total number of Regional projects to 10.
- b. Results of the project reviews are summarized in the attached table.
- c. General review comments are listed as follows:

- i. Carl Morrison mentioned that a local NBC affiliate is developing an outreach program where they would highlight activities of local agencies, and suggested this as a potential avenue for publicizing/expanding regional projects.
- ii. The subcommittee discussed whether there was a need to implement the sub-regional process if there are sufficient Regional projects for the CC to consider. Dale noted that this was an issue that needed to be discussed further because the notion of sub-regional projects has been circulated and those who have begun the process might feel disenfranchised if the sub-regional process was halted.
- iii. Ann Riley noted that some non-profit organizations have a lot of expertise in certain areas, and it would be advantageous for the subcommittee to identify the expertise nodes (including non-profits), so that the funding is distributed across a broad spectrum of organizations, and not just agencies.
- iv. Jennifer Krebs suggested that it would be useful to have a team that was responsible for evaluating what a 'successful' project is.
- v. Melanie Denninger noted that the deliverables of the project should be indicated in the project application, to facilitate the evaluation of the proposal. For example, it might be useful to have project proponents provide information on what the deliverables are, how much of the money would be going to staff versus project work, etc.
- vi. Brian Mendenhall questioned if DWR was looking more for construction-oriented projects for the expedited round, similar to the focus in the economic stimulus package. Harry Seraydarian noted that perhaps a qualifier could be added indicating that the focus of some projects could be shifted based on DWR's draft guidelines.

5. Review IRWMP scoring criteria

- a. The subcommittee agreed that the first section of review criteria (Bay Area IRWMP Regional Goals) remains relevant and would apply to the Regional projects.
- b. The second section (Bay Area Regional Assessment Criteria) will need to be updated to be consistent with Prop 84 and SBxx1 – specifically the funding match (which was previously 10% but is now 25%).
- c. The third section (Prop 50 Program Preferences) will need to be updated with Prop 84 program preferences when the draft DWR guidelines are released.
- d. The fourth section (Prop 50 Statewide Priorities) will similarly need to be updated to be consistent with Prop 84 guidelines.
- e. The subcommittee agreed that the Regional projects will be ranked preliminarily based on existing criteria. When Prop 84 preferences and guidelines are available, they will be overlaid onto the preliminary ranking and updated.

6. Develop two or three options for the CC to consider for the allocation of funding to regional and sub-regional projects

- a. The following options were proposed by the subcommittee:

- i. Option1: Regional projects (\$15 mil) – Recommended by the Project Screening Subcommittee due to availability of broadly supported regional projects and in view of the challenge of asking sub-regions to conduct an intensive process in a short time for a limited amount of funding.
- ii. Option 2: Regional projects (\$10 mil) and Sub-regional projects (\$5 mil)
- iii. Option 3: Regional projects (\$5 mil) and Sub-regional projects (\$10 mil)

7. Review Guidance document to sub-regions – this was deferred till the next meeting.

8. Action items:

- a. Brian C. to update changes in Draft Schedule based on discussion.
- b. Brian C (with support from RMC) to update changes in the Regional Projects list.
- c. Project leads to provide additional information requested from the review of projects and to obtain endorsements from relevant organizations. **Please refer to the Regional Projects Review summary table for action items (in bold) associated with each project.**
- d. Carol Mahoney to send out project proposals she is leading to key stakeholders to get their consensus.
- e. RMC to conduct preliminary ranking of the 10 Regional Projects (to be held till the next Project Screening meeting for further instructions).

9. What to report to at the June 1 CC meeting

- a. Present the 3 options for the regional /sub-regional funding allocation.
- b. Discuss the need to implement sub-regional process or not with the CC.
- c. Present preliminary ranking of Regional projects.
- d. Review DWR guidelines, if available, and approach to Guidance document.

10. Next meeting, tentatively scheduled June 9, 12.30 pm – 2.30 pm (start time has been changed since the May 18th announcement due to recent conflicts in Brian Campbell's schedule).

- a. The meeting location is tentatively set for the 13th Floor meeting room at the Coastal Conservancy. Teleconference call-in information will be sent out closer to the date of the meeting.
- b. Key items to cover:
 - i. Review preliminary scoring of Regional Projects
 - ii. Develop Project-specific recommendations for the CC
 - iii. Discuss status of sub-regional project selection processes.

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
 May 18, 2009
 Summary of Regional Projects Review

| No. | Project Name | Project Lead | Review Recommendations |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|--|
| 1 | Landscape Irrigation Calculator | MMWD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check with BAWAC on endorsement on the project (the project was presented to BAWAC approximately 6 months ago). • Check with MMWD if they would be interested in scaling up the project to combine with other regional programs (e.g. water conservation or Stopwaste.org programs). |
| 2 | Drought Relief and Water Conservation Innovation Project | BACWA (Zone 7 Water Agency) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project description has not been developed yet because data inputs for the project are still coming in. • Brief survey conducted by Carol Mahoney indicates a minimum project amount of \$5 million, up to potentially \$22 million. • The following agencies have responded to Carol confirming their participation in the project: SFPUC, Napa, SCVWD, BACWA, ABAG, Zone 7, and ACWD. No official response from Sonoma yet. Some email correspondence from Stopwaste.org and Bay Friendly Gardening Program. • Jennifer Krebs suggested that the outreach component of the project be consolidated into one program, similar to the outreach program of the Regional Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Project. • The Green Plumbers and Bay Friendly programs were noted as leading examples of successful outreach and consolidation, and technical progressiveness in addressing climate change issues (e.g. developing a data repository). • The subcommittee proposed to coordinate the outreach component of this project with the outreach of the Regional Green Infrastructure Capacity Project, as they are similar and both would benefit from a regional outreach program. The subcommittee also noted that it was important to add that this project is scalable. • Jennifer Krebs indicated that SFEP could be the administrator of the combined projects, but it would depend on how many project collaborators there are. |

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
 May 18, 2009
 Summary of Regional Projects Review

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--|
| 3 | Regional Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Project | SFEP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Krebs indicated that she is communicating with the Flood & Stormwater Districts on this project, and noted that the drought situation did not encourage significant commitment to the proposed project. • She also noted that SFEP recently issued an RFP (anticipating EPA funds of \$ 5 mil) for green infrastructure proposals. • Harry Seraydarian indicated that he has contacted all four counties in the North Bay: Napa (interested in rainwater harvesting and some other LID components); Solano (has not been actively engaged but is developing an LID manual); Sonoma (has a potential project on groundwater recharge); Marin (has a project ready for construction this Fall). • Tracy Hemmeter mentioned that DWR is emphasizing more on stormwater management and has recently set up a stormwater management task force. • The proposed amount for each county works out to ~ \$750,000, with an equivalent amount for project analysis, management, evaluation and match. Total grant request is approximated at \$7.5 million. • Ann Riley noted that the project could be linked to restoration projects as well (e.g. collected water off rooftops may be used to irrigate restoration areas). • The subcommittee proposed for the outreach component of this project to be coordinated with the outreach component of the Drought Relief and Water Conservation Innovation Project. |
| 4 | Regional Marketing for Recycled Water Use in the Bay Area | City of San Jose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall marketing strategy/approach is being developed. BACWA (with Board Member present) provided some feedback on the project, and individual agencies are currently conducting their own outreach efforts. Currently awaiting BACWA endorsement of the project on May 28th. • Subcommittee members had questions on what the project deliverables are, and how the project funding would be distributed. • Harry Seraydarian noted that this project has a strong linkage to drought because recycled water is considered a reliable water supply in drought |

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
 May 18, 2009
 Summary of Regional Projects Review

| | | | |
|---|---|------|---|
| | | | <p>situations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie Denninger questioned on what the best scale would be for the project at this point. The approach of the project needs clarification (e.g. why is it not possible to transfer knowledge from Southern California recycled water outreach programs to Northern California?), and project deliverables need to be defined. • Molly Petrick mentioned that she will be attending a CUWA meeting on May 21 and will try to ask for feedback on the project during that meeting. |
| 5 | Developing and Implementing Options for Mitigating Public Health Impacts of Eating Fish | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change in project description from the Prop 50 round – the only change is the project amount. • This project has not been endorsed by the BACWA Board, but Brian Campbell indicated that they will likely support it since it is a regulatory condition. • Harry Seraydarian has emailed Michelle Pla re this project but has yet to hear back. • Carol Mahoney noted that there was a concern that the project only consists of outreach, but Harry Seraydarian indicated that Prop 84 language has provisions for both projects and programs. |
| 6 | San Francisco Estuary Regional Watershed Project | SFEP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project aims to set up different working groups that are comparable to BASMAA, BACWA, and a group with the purpose of interacting with the IRWMP. • One objective of the project is to provide direct funding to disadvantaged groups that are trying to get organized. Examples provided included the IRWMP models that were developed for the Consumnes/American/Bear/Yuba Rivers (CABY) and North Coast, where small non-profits or DAC representatives were provided with financial assistance/stipends for them to participate in outreach efforts. • It was questioned whether these stipends to encourage participation would qualify under Implementation grants; it may be a possibility since |

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
 May 18, 2009
 Summary of Regional Projects Review

| | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| | | | <p>inputs from their participation feed into the planning and design of the projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project is complementary to Projects 2 and 3 and could be combined? • A qualifier could be added to note that the focus on outreach in this project could be shifted to be more aligned with DWR’s draft guidelines. • The project could be more closely linked to DACs and the requirements in SBxx1. • The project will be combined with Project 8 - Bay Area Regional Design Curves for Creek Restoration and Bank Stabilization. |
| 7 | Regional Flood Control Infrastructure Mapping and Needs Assessment | SCVWD or other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project was highlighted at the recent BAFPAA meeting. • There is not much information on the project, should it stay on the list? • The project description is very basic, and the components or deliverables in the project can be potentially very expensive. • SCVWD is taking the lead on the project and is currently getting feedback on each county to understand what their needs are. • Timing-wise, it might be difficult to pull together a full project description by June 1, and the project might not necessarily meet Drought/DACs preferences. • The project might be more appropriate under Prop 1E instead of Prop 84. • The subcommittee decided to categorize this project as “TBD”, and will check during the BAFPAA meeting on May 21 if this was the top project proposal that was agreed on, or whether it was just one of the projects proposed for the list. |
| 8 | Bay Area Regional Design Curves for Creek Restoration and Bank Stabilization | SFEP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is to create a design tool for creek restoration – work product would be a graph showing the drainage area where restoration projects would be located, and what the width/depth of the channels should be. • It is a combination of a regional and sub-regional (watershed-level) project. • The SFEP has ~\$30,000 from their first EPA grant to develop a regional |

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
 May 18, 2009
 Summary of Regional Projects Review

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>curve for the eastern part of Contra Costa County and Sonoma County. There is also information for western Alameda County and the North Bay, but design curves need to be developed for each sub-region and county (18 curves in total).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the project required a lot of coordination effort for the grant amount it is requesting, but it was also acknowledged that it was important for the watershed community to have a regional scale project. • The subcommittee decided to combine this project with Project 6 - San Francisco Estuary Regional Watershed Project. |
| 9 | Evaluating regional ecosystem restoration using steelhead trout | Center for Ecosystem Management and Restoration, Inc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept for this project was developed independent of other ongoing programs in other counties, and should be reviewed for overlaps. • There needs to be clarification in the project proposal on how the project does not overlap other similar steelhead trout restoration programs. • There is a possibility that this project could be tied-in to other projects to create a robust project. • The subcommittee agreed that the project concept is supportable although it may not necessarily meet the requirements for the expedited round. This project will not be eliminated from the list as yet – Harry Seraydarian will provide Gordon with inputs from the subcommittee, namely clarification on any duplication and the funding match. • Carl Morrison volunteered to engage in discussion with the project proponents as well. |
| 10 | Regional Historical Ecology Tools for Designing Sustainable Water Management Strategies | SFEI/ASC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project aims to address annual flooding in an area currently occupied by homes but installing a continuous vegetation corridor based on the historical ecology of the area. • Ann Riley noted that that historical ecology is a critical component of restoration design, and therefore, from a regulatory standpoint, historical ecology information is often requested in the application for bond funding of restoration projects. |

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
May 18, 2009
Summary of Regional Projects Review

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The subcommittee questioned if this project could be combined with Project 8 - Bay Area Regional Design Curves for Creek Restoration and Bank Stabilization, since the historical ecology information/data is usually available before the design curves can be developed.• The project cost could range around \$200,000.• An alternative was to scale down the project and incorporate it into a DAC-focused project (e.g. identify a smaller project area within a DAC).• Ann Riley will follow up on getting more information on the project – the San Mateo Coast might be a good candidate area. |
|--|--|--|--|

DRAFT

05/05/09

**Bay Area IRWMP
Project Selection and Grant Application Schedule**

4/2/09 DWR announces 45 day implementation grant application process to start in Sept 2009

Milestones to meet DWR's proposed schedule¹

4/6/09 Project Screening Sub-Committee - discuss project selection process and schedule; review preliminary list of Regional Projects.

4/27/09 Coordinating Committee - receive an overview of the proposed selection process and provide feedback; discuss how to address EJ/DAC projects.

5/4/09 Project Screening Sub-Committee – discuss project selection process and schedule, review readiness of Regional Projects.

5/18/09 Project Screening Sub-Committee – discuss project selection process and schedule, review scoring criteria; develop recommendations on funding allocations for Regional Projects.

6/1/09 Coordinating Committee – preliminarily decide on funding allocation for Regional Projects; approve the sub-regional project selection process. (DWR guidelines available?)

6/9/09 Project Screening Sub-Committee – Score Regional Projects and develop project specific recommendations for CC; receive update on sub-regional project selection processes.

6/22/09 Coordinating Committee – Make decisions on specific Regional Projects; receive update on sub-regional project selection process; discuss grant applicant.²

7/6/09 Project Screening Sub-Committee - review actions by Coordinating Committee and respond to action items; receive update on local project selection process.

7/27/09 Coordinating Committee – receive update on local selection process and provide feedback.

7/31/09 Sub-regions to forward preliminary results of sub-regional prioritization process to Project Screening Sub-Committee.

8/11/09 (date change) Project Screening Sub-Committee – prepare recommendations for the CC and revise or update lists of projects for the IRWMP.

8/24/09 Coordinating Committee – Make final decisions on Regional and Sub-regional Projects; approve changes to project lists in the IRWMP; approve application submittal.

Sept-Oct, 2009 – Project Proponents develop and submit proposal; update Coordinating Comm.

¹ Whether DWR can meet its announced schedule is uncertain. A delay would lengthen this schedule.

² The applicant may need a formal Board approval, which will become a schedule item at some point.

**S.F. BAY AREA INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
DRAFT LIST OF REGIONAL PROJECTS FOR NEXT IRWM GRANT ROUND (2009)**

| Reg # | IRWMP Proj No. | Project Summary | Location | Lead Entity | Total | Grant | Match | Drought / 20% by 2020 | DAC Benefits | Notes |
|--------------|----------------|--|----------|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|
| 1 | 11 (Updated) | Bay Area Regional Water Conservation - Landscape Irrigation Calculator. Create a computer based tool to calculate the amount of water needed to irrigate landscapes in the Bay Area and provide other benefits. The primary goals are to conserve potable water, reduce urban irrigation runoff, maintain a healthy urban forest and preserve property values. | Regional | Marin MWD | \$500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | Yes | | Endorsed by BAWAC yet? Can this be combined with next project even if administered separately? |
| 2 | 11 (Updated) | Bay Area Regional Water Conservation - Drought Relief and Water Conservation Innovation Project. A menu of programs to improve water use efficiency throughout the S.F. Bay Area, including: 1. Green Plumbers Program, 2. Rainwater Harvesting and Low Impact Development, 3. Large Landscape Efficient Irrigation (LLEI), 4. Water Wise Activity Kit, 5. High Efficiency Toilet and Urinal Rebate Program, and 6. Targeted Water Use Efficient Schools Program. | Regional | TBD / Zone7 (placeholder) | \$13,500,000 | \$10,000,000 | \$3,500,000 | Yes | | Endorsed by BAWAC on 5/11 Will regionalized outreach be incorporated? |
| 3 | New | Regional Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Project. A three year program to implement innovative green infrastructure projects in each Bay Area county (\$750,000 each). The water management techniques may involve green streets, rainwater harvesting, bio-infiltration systems, water conserving landscapes, small and large scale low impact development (LID) techniques, and flood control projects that restore stream channel habitat and riparian areas while reducing flood risk. | Regional | S.F. Estuary Program | \$9,500,000 | \$7,500,000 | \$2,000,000 | Yes | Yes | - Link this project to prior one? - This effort is stormwater based w/other benefits. - More project level detail would be available by Sept. |
| 4 | New | Regional Recycling Outreach Project. Multi-agency project to develop appropriate message to relevant communities to reinforce the the value of recycled water, including involvement of key stakeholders such as those concerned about recycled use in parks/schools and for streamflow augmentation. | Regional | San Jose | \$300,000 | \$225,000 | \$75,000 | Yes | | Subject to 5/28 BACWA Board approval |
| 5 | 26 (Existing) | Developing/Implementing Options for Mitigating Public Health Impacts of Eating Fish. This project will identify populations at risk of detrimental effects associated with consumption of fish from S.F. Bay, provide outreach and education to potentially affected groups, and identify appropriate actions to mitigate risk. | Regional | BACWA (subject to approval) | \$50,000 | \$37,500 | \$12,500 | | Yes | - Costs in IRWMP (\$50,000) need updating - Detailed work plan by Nov. is uncertain - Project is subject to BACWA Board approval |
| 6 | New | San Francisco Estuary Regional Watershed Project (name change pending). This project will build capacity for restoring wetlands, river and stream corridors, and watersheds throughout the Bay Area by supporting and representing the many grassroots watershed groups and watershed partnerships, including disadvantaged and underrepresented community groups in the region. | Regional | ABAG / S.F. Estuary Program | \$500,000 | \$375,000 | \$125,000 | | Yes | |
| 7 | New? | Floodplain Infrastructure and Needs Assessment. Detailed info not available yet. | Regional | SCVWD or other | \$? | \$? | \$? | | | May be suitable for Prop 1E IRWM funding. |
| 8 | New? | Bay Area Regional Design Curves for Creek Restoration and Bank Stabilization. Collect data to develop this stream restoration design tool across more areas, including San Francisquito Creek, Wildcat & San Pablo Creeks, and Pescadero Creek. The primary benefit of regional stream design curves are restoration of natural creek functions and watershed improvements. | Regional | S.F. Estuary Program | \$120,000 | \$90,000 | \$30,000 | | Yes | May be combined with Project No.6. |
| 9 | New? | Evaluate Regional Ecosystem Restoration Using Steelhead Trout. This project will measure the production of steelhead smolt in key Bay Area watersheds as a measure of the success of IRWMP implementation. Monitoring locations may include two or three north bay watersheds, Alameda Creek, and one or more watersheds in Santa Clara county. | Regional | Center for Ecosystem Management and Restoration, Inc | \$750,000 | \$562,500 | \$187,500 | | | Clarification is needed that this effort will not overlap site specific efforts. |
| 10 | New? | Regional Historical Ecology Tools for Designing Sustainable Water Management Strategies. This project will synthesize information about how Bay Area watersheds naturally capture, recharge, and distribute water to reveal sustainable strategies for improving ecosystem functions through natural flood protection and well-designed water management protocols. | Regional | S.F. Estuary Institute | \$2,000,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$500,000 | | Y? | May be investigated on a smaller scale, i.e. Pescadero |
| TOTAL | | | | | \$27,220,000 | \$20,540,000 | \$6,680,000 | | | |