

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from April 27, 2009 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
Jean Gardner, CCWD; Brad Sherwood, SCWA	Brian Campbell, EBMUD	Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Mark Boucher, CCCFCD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP	Paul Helliker, Chair, MMWD

Others present:

Mitch Avalon (CCCFCD)
Jack Betourne (NCFCWD)
Chris Choo (Marin County FCWCD)
Jennifer Clary (Clean Water Action)
Patrick Costello (City of Napa)
Thomasin Grim (MMWD)
Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD)
Carol Mahoney (Zone 7 Water)
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Z7, SCC)
Carlos Porrata (Tomales Bay Watershed Council)
Ann Riley (SF Bay RWQCB)
Dave Richardson (RMC)
Leigh Sharp (Napa County RCD)
Jayne Strommer (DDSD)
Stan Williams (Poseidon Water)

2. Approve RAP Submittal (Action)

a. Review Final RAP

- Paul Helliker asked the CC and interested parties for final questions and comments on the RAP.
- He indicated that letters of collaboration from Tomales Bay, Napa, Solano and East Contra Costa County would be included in the RAP, and clarified the language used to describe the overlap with East Contra Costa County.
- Thomasin Grim suggested that a footnote should be added to the map showing void areas between the SF Bay Area Region and Northern Santa Cruz County Region boundaries, indicating that the Northern Santa Cruz County boundary was based on the Prop 50 IRWM planning boundary.
- There was consensus among the CC to approve the RAP submittal.
- Paul Helliker will draft a signed cover letter (MMWD as the submitting entity) for the RAP submittal to DWR.
- RMC will prepare the final package for delivery to the Division of Planning and Local Assistance in DWR by April 29, 2009, no later than 5 pm.

Action Item(s):

- 1) RMC to append letters of collaboration to RAP submittal and add footnote to SF Bay Area/Northern Santa Cruz regions void areas map. (DONE)
- 2) Paul Helliker to send RMC cover letter for RAP submittal. (DONE)
- 3) RMC to finalize RAP package and deliver to DWR. (DONE)

b. Update on Subregional Process (Discussion)

East Region (Alameda and Contra Costa)

- Mitch Avalon presented an overview of the sub-regional process for the East Region to the CC.
- The sub-region will identify an Executive Committee and a Committee Chair annually, to be composed of a diverse range of stakeholders in the sub-region (e.g. NGOs and government agencies). Members of the Executive Committee and Chair will be reviewed on a yearly basis.
- Within the Executive Committee, leads will be identified for functional area outreach efforts (e.g. Wastewater FA lead to solicit input from Wastewater agencies and related stakeholders).
- The main roles of the Executive Committee are (1) to conduct sub-region-level meetings with Counties and Cities, representatives of Functional Areas, and sub-region interested parties, to address and respond to any requests that the sub-region entities might have, (2) to solicit projects, and (3) to review sub-region projects for integration opportunities.
- The Executive Committee will provide the CC with a final list of recommended projects from the sub-region, including both local and regional projects.
- Mitch also mentioned that the Contra Costa Watershed Forum is an active group that meets every month and disseminates information on watershed issues, and would make a good platform to solicit projects through.

North Region (Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Solano)

- Harry Seraydarian presented an overview of the sub-regional process for the North Region to the CC.
- The lead for the sub-region is the North Bay Watershed Association (NBWA), which consists mostly of elected officials from various Counties and functional areas (Water, Wastewater, Flood/Stormwater, etc.).
- NBWA has 15 organizational members (Tomales Bay has joined as an Associate Member). The North Bay Watershed Council acts as an advisory to the NBWA Board on the Watershed Stewardship Plan and other technical projects conducted by NBWA Committees.
- NBWA, being the lead, will conduct a general meeting with the Counties to review and implement the sub-region local project selection process guidance.
- Individual counties will then follow up with their own meetings after the general meeting. County leads representing a fairly broad geographical responsibility have been identified as follows:
 - Marin County: (Liz Lewis/Chris Choo – staff)
 - Napa County: Rick Thomasser
 - Solano County: Dave Okita
 - Sonoma County: Brad Sherwood
- Each county will develop a supplementary list of stakeholders and projects.
- NBWA will conduct a meeting with all the Counties after their outreach process to consolidate recommended projects from each County.

South Region (Santa Clara)

- Tracy Hemmeter presented an overview of the sub-regional process for the South Region to the CC.
- As a start, a stakeholder list, including both NGOs and government agencies, has been compiled.
- An appropriate organizational structure for the sub-region has not yet been defined. The general approach is to include any interested stakeholders. Suggestions from the CC included the Water Commission and the Santa Clara Watershed Management Initiative.
- Tracy noted that the project selection process will be similar to the other two subregions.

West Region (San Francisco, San Mateo)

- Molly Petrick (lead) was not present at the CC meeting to present on the sub-regional process for the West Region.

3. Update on Project Screening (Discussion)

a. Review tentative schedule of activities

- Brian Campbell provided an update on the draft milestone schedule that was developed during the subcommittee's meeting on April 6, based on the assumption that the DWR schedule holds. He noted that the April 2 DWR workshop reported that DWR will commence a 45-day implementation grant application period immediately following the conclusion of the Region Acceptance Process (RAP).

Milestone	Actions Needed
May CC Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Make initial funding allocation for Regional projects based on depth of Regional projects. By inference this also sets sub-regional project allocations.▪ Approve subcommittee guidance to subregions per "Local Project Selection Process Description"
End of May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Initiate sub-regional prioritization process
June CC Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Make specific decisions on Regional projects under the IRWM Plan evaluation/scoring system; discuss grant applicant.
Mid-July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Subregions provide preliminary prioritization results to CC
July CC Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Preliminary determination of sub-regional projects
August CC Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Final project decisions; update IRWM Plan project lists
Sept – Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Proponents and applicant prepare regional proposal.

- The Project Screening subcommittee is planning to review criteria for project evaluation at the upcoming May 4 subcommittee meeting. Feedback and outcomes from the meeting will be relayed through Sub-regional Leads to Functional Area representatives and stakeholders within their sub-region.
- There was discussion among the CC on whether to proceed with implementing the sub-regional process, as the project selection criteria would depend on DWR's yet-to-be released Prop 84 guidelines. The CC agreed that initiating the sub-regional process earlier would allow for more stakeholder involvement and opportunities to identify other regional projects that may not be on the existing IRWMP list.

- The Project Screening subcommittee reported that they are currently addressing Regional projects and ensuring that each project has adequate information for consideration. Some of the projects that required proponent information were highlighted at the CC meeting:
 - Regional Green Infrastructure – a draft has been developed. Jennifer Krebs suggested that the SFEP could be a match for this project.
 - Regional Mapping GIS/Habitat – Mitch Avalon noted that this was a BAFPAA proposed project.
 - Floodplain/Watershed Forum – BAFPAA proposed project.
 - Bay Area wide facilities mapping – BAFPAA proposed project.
 - Bay Area wide sea level rise – BAFPAA proposing with FEMA.
- The Project Screening subcommittee noted that their role was to review project lists from each sub-region, and that sub-regions would be responsible for compiling their own project list.

b. Discussion and direction for consideration of EJ-DAC Projects

- Jennifer Clary queried if a process had been set up to identify Disadvantaged Communities. The CC noted that there was no specific definition from DWR of what constitutes a 'community', but agreed that more analysis will need to be conducted to develop an accurate definition for the Bay Area.
- Jennifer Clary noted that the scale of the project needs to be considered when determining whether it is an EJ-DAC project. If the population served by the project is large (and may include DAC census tracts within the served population), it may not qualify as an EJ-DAC project because it does not serve a target DAC population. However, if the project was targeted at lower income areas (e.g. Richmond or West Oakland), then it could be considered a better example of an EJ-DAC project.
- Jennifer Clary suggested analyzing income levels based on census subtracts instead of census tracts, and conducting income surveys, as a more accurate approach of determining DACs in the Bay Area.
- The CC also acknowledged that there are lower income households that are not located in a defined community (e.g. in the Tomales watershed), and the difficulty would be to define a targeted projects, but among those could be projects such as conservation programs that include direct installation of high efficiency toilets in qualifying homes; well-testing or assistance with deficient septic systems in rural areas; or tap water sampling for lead in schools that serve low-income households or in housing projects.
- Ann Riley noted that one of the alternative categories used by the State Water Board to define a DAC for the ARRA subsidy funds is a community that pays at least 4% of their MHI toward wastewater infrastructure.
- Jennifer Clary also noted that agencies should highlight any EJ projects that they are sponsoring. She mentioned that she prepared a list of suggestions on ways existing projects in the IRWMP could be designed to address DACs, and would forward that on to interested parties.
- Ann Riley mentioned that the RWQCB is considering proposing a watershed EJ project, and that it would be beneficial if it teamed up with SFEP for the project.

c. Review info needs and status of Regional Projects working list

- The CC noted that SBxx1 guidelines indicated a preference for drought response and DAC-targeted projects, but Regional projects will likely undergo a similar evaluation process as with Prop. 50 and the multi-benefit criteria would still apply.
- Brian Mendenhall queried if there should be a higher percentage of Regional projects as it would seem like DWR would favor that.
- Harry Seraydarian indicated that one of the action items from the Project Screening subcommittee meeting on April 6 was for FA representatives to solicit

input from their stakeholders on whether the current list of Regional projects is sufficient, and to notify stakeholders that new regional projects should be submitted to the Project Screening subcommittee as soon as possible.

- Brian Campbell mentioned that the Project Screening subcommittee needed more definitive information on the existing list of Regional projects urgently in order to be able to evaluate how robust the projects are and how much funding should be allocated to Regional projects vs the sub-region local projects. Definitive information would include sponsor and matching funds information. A tentative list of Regional projects should be available after the May 6 Project Screening subcommittee meeting.
- Mitch Avalon noted that sub-regions should be given an overarching summary guidance on project selection/submittal, to ensure consistency among the sub-regions.
- Harry Seraydarian mentioned that he prepared a preliminary draft of a Local Project Selection Process (LPSP) Guidance, as an action item from the April 6 Project Screening subcommittee meeting.
- Brian Campbell questioned how the CC intends to address Prop 1E in the application, since it is grouped with Prop 84 in this funding round.
- Mark Boucher clarified that new projects could be submitted through the Bay Area IRWMP website by downloading the project information template (from 2006) and emailing the completed form to him.

Action Item(s):

- 1) Sub-regions to identify projects (with a focus on drought-response or DAC-targeted projects) for submission to the Project Screening subcommittee.
- 2) Sub-regions and FA representatives to provide definition of 'unknown' Regional projects listed in the April 6 Project Screening subcommittee meeting notes to the subcommittee as soon as possible.
- 3) Project Screening subcommittee to propose guidance on the level of funding for Regional projects, and distribute draft sub-regional project selection guidelines and ranking criteria at the June 1 CC meeting.

4. Announcements (Information)

- Carlos Porrata announced that the Tomales Bay Watershed Council is operational again as they were able to obtain funding for 3 more years of continued work.
- Paul Helliker announced that the Bay Area IRWM Plan has received Prop 50 Implementation grants.
- Paul also announced that funding for RMC to provide continued support to the CC, PnP and Project Screening committees has been secured.

5. Agenda Items and Details for the next IRWMP CC Meeting (Information)

- Update on scope of Regional projects
- Guidance from the Project Screening subcommittee on sub-regional project selection criteria
- Sub-regional projects funding allocations

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