

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from June 1, 2009 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

| WS-WQ | WW-RW | FP-SW | Watershed | Other |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| Mark Seedall, CCWD; Brad Sherwood, SCWA | Brian Campbell, EBMUD | Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD; Mark Boucher, CCCFCD | Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP; Melanie Denninger, SCC | Paul Helliker, Chair, MMWD; Nadine Hitchcock, Coastal Conservancy |

Others present:

Mitch Avalon (CCCFCD)
Jack Betourne (NCFCWD)
Chris Choo (Marin County FCWCD)
Jean Gardner (CCWD)
Rainer Hoenicke (SFEI)
Dale Hopkins (SF Bay RWQCB)
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Z7, SCC)
Ann Riley (SF Bay RWQCB)
Dave Richardson (RMC)
Joanne Siew (RMC)
Peter Vorster (The Bay Institute)

2. Report on RAP Interview

a. RAP interview summary

- Paul Helliker provided an overview of the interview with DWR and the team's responses.
- He noted that DWR's response to the interview was positive and that DWR indicated it will approve the Bay Area region.
- The Bay Area region interview was the 3rd of the 46 RAP interviews that DWR has to complete, tentatively by July 9.
- Key points from the RAP interview and follow-up discussion during the CC meeting are as follows:

Governance

- i. The DWR asked the CC how it would balance regional interests against local interests, and how it would ensure regional equity. Paul Helliker noted that the team addressed DWR's question with a discussion of the sub-regional process, and project screening process where projects that would rank the highest based on DWR criteria would also need to be evaluated for geographical equity.
- ii. There was a question from the CC on BASMAA's participation and interest in the IRWMP; Mitch Avalon indicated that BAFPA would represent Flood Protection and

Stormwater Management in the IRWMP arena, and BASMAA will represent Stormwater Management in the regulatory arena.

Public Outreach to DACs and Non-Profits

- i. The DWR brought up several DAC/EJ questions, including if the CC could provide funding for DAC/EJ groups to participate, and also whether the CC had identified any Indian tribes to consider as part of the IRWMP.
- ii. The team emphasized that the DAC/EJ issues would be best and most effectively addressed at the community/project level since many of the groups do not have resources to fully engage at the regional level (CC and subcommittee levels).
- iii. Nadine Hitchcock noted that during the development of the IRWMP, financial assistance was provided to these groups to facilitate their participation but the CC would need additional funding sources to provide continued support to these groups. Paul Helliker indicated that the team emphasized to DWR that part of the reason for developing the sub-regional process is to broaden participation of organizations in the IRWMP.
- iv. The team also provided an update to DWR on the progress of Plan development, the Bay Area IRWMP website, and efforts to focus on sub-regional groups that are involved in project development.
- v. Peter Vorster asked if there was a mechanism to include non-profit organizations and their projects in the IRWMP process because he noted that there were several interesting projects being developed (e.g. growing bamboo with recycled water in West Oakland).

Planning Grants

- i. CC meeting attendees were asked if they knew about any grant programs that could provide funding for DAC/EJ groups to participate in the IRWMP process, and to provide that information to Nadine Hitchcock.
- ii. There is no certainty on when Planning funds from DWR would be available, and whether the funds may be used for Project implementation. The Project Screening subcommittee is currently evaluating its feasibility.
- iii. Ann Riley provided some examples from other IRWMPs:
 - CABY (Consumnes/American/Bear/Yuba) applied for DWR funding to get money to pay for DAC/EJ groups to participate in IRWMP meetings.
 - North Coast used IRWM funds as well as agency funds (Sonoma County Water Agency)
- iv. Carl Morrison provided a post-RAP interview update from DWR indicating that there may be the potential for each sub-region and the overall Bay Area region to apply for Planning grants, therefore adding to total of 5 Planning grants. In addition, DWR may consider whether any funds expended from the day of the RAP acceptance could also be used for matching funds (including in-kind contributions).

Boundary Issues

- i. DWR accepted the Bay Area IRWM region's overlap with East Contra Costa County's region, and the gaps between the Bay Area and Northern Santa Cruz County IRWM regions.

Dissemination of Information from the CC

- i. On the question of how cities and counties were getting information on the CC's work and progress, the team indicated that ABAG would prepare and circulate reports to cities and counties if there was relevant information that needs to be distributed. The team also highlighted to DWR that there is a good representation of city and county agencies in the CC.

- ii. The CC discussed the relationship of the Bay Area Water Forum (BAWF) to the IRWMP, and whether it could be formalized into a mechanism to disseminate information. Ann Riley suggested that the IRWMP program could help BAWF organize annual or bi-annual events with the purpose of gathering and integrating project ideas.
- iii. It was mentioned to DWR that the Bay Area IRWMP is a standing agenda item on BAWF meetings (agendas are determined by the Steering Committee and Chair).
- iv. The next BAWF meeting is scheduled for June 22, 2009.

Timeline

- i. DWR will report on the RAP by the end of July/early August, followed by a public comment period.
- ii. Formal RAP decisions will be announced in early September, together with the final guidelines.
- iii. Draft funding guidelines are anticipated to be released in the very near future.
- iv. There is currently no authorization for providing bond funding so the timing of the funding projects is unknown. However, DWR is expediting the \$150 million allocated for stormwater management.
- v. DWR is working on an IRWM Plan standard update and long-term plans for the IRWM program.

Action Item(s):

- 1) CC meeting attendees were asked if they knew about any grant programs that could provide funding for DAC/EJ groups to participate in the IRWMP process, and to provide that information to Nadine Hitchcock.

3. Project Screening Subcommittee Update

a. Review latest schedule of activities

- Brian Campbell provided an update on the latest milestone schedule. Key milestones are summarized below:

| Milestone | Tasks |
|---|--|
| June 9 Project Screening Subcommittee meeting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Project Screening Subcommittee will meet to review and update the list of Regional projects under consideration, review the IRWMP scoring, and identify tasks to complete before the next CC meeting. |
| June 22 CC meeting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Project Screening Subcommittee will report to the CC on which Regional projects are ready for CC review and which ones are not. ▪ The CC to decide whether to move on with the sub-regional process or not. |
| August | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sub-regions to respond to the CC <i>if</i> the sub-regional process is implemented. ▪ The Project Screening Subcommittee will need full information from Regional and Sub-regional projects by August to begin preparations for applications in September 2009. The subcommittee will require full project descriptions and cost information. |
| August CC Meeting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final project decisions |
| Sept – Oct | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proponents and applicant prepare regional proposal. |

- Brian Campbell provided a summary of each project on the current Regional project list (refer to Projects Summary Table in the June 1st CC Meeting Package).
- Specific projects that were called out and discussed at the CC meeting are as follows:
 - Project #2 (Bay Area Regional Water Conservation – Drought Relief and Water Conservation Innovation Project) is one of the largest in the Regional projects list and needs to be further refined (in July/August).
 - Project #3 (Regional Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Project) – there is potentially up to \$2 mil of matching EPA grants available. Harry Seraydarian noted that this project fits into the drought-related criteria. It is possible that the majority of counties will have green infrastructure projects that relate to water supply reliability and augmentation.
 - Project #5 is an existing project from the IRWMP list but it is uncertain if a detailed workplan can be developed by September.
 - Project #7 – not enough details provided. Seems like it might be more suitable for Prop 1E?
 - Projects #6, #8 and #10 could be combined as they are inter-related.
 - Project #9 – Harry Seraydarian checked with CEMAR and the main feedback is to avoid overlapping efforts in existing projects.
- Project templates are available on the Bay Area IRWMP website for download.
- Ann Riley and Dale Hopkins commented that sub-regional projects should not be left out because the process has already been developed. Watershed projects often occur at a sub-regional level. However, they agreed if Regional projects (e.g. the merging of Projects #6, #8 and #10) can address DACs/EJ/watershed community issues, then they could be an adequate fallback if there are no sub-regional projects. Brian Mendenhall commented that it might be good to keep the 3 projects separate because that would mean 3 funding opportunities instead of just one.

b. Suggestions for Outreach

- Dale Hopkins noted that the CC should continue to support the outreach to sub-regions and not hold it until the next funding cycle.
- Harry Seraydarian suggested that an outreach program for DACs may be developed and included in Regional projects.
- Melanie Denninger questioned whether it should be a standalone outreach plan, or be incorporated as outreach components within projects. She noted that participation at the project level is more meaningful for grassroots organizations. If the CC decides that the Regional projects are adequate, how should the outreach component be included into the proposals?
- Paul Helliker noted that the CC needs to ensure that the locally-focused projects fall within the criteria of SBxx1. He added that the CC needs to think about what groups that are currently not participating in the IRWMP process and should be included.
- Jennifer Krebs suggested that more outreach efforts should be directed towards cities with more DACs.
- Dave Richardson noted from the DWR interview that Norm Shopay suggested very strongly that the CC develop an outreach plan, and suggested that it should be on the CC's agenda looking forward.
- Ann Riley provided an example of outreach currently being implemented, e.g. SFEP's outreach to the watershed community, and assistance to the Bay Area Watershed Network (BAWN).
- Jack Betourne suggested that a potential project in Napa County could be American Canyon. They are getting only 30% of their water supply from the State and they do not have other sources. The Mayor is very engaged and can involve staff and locals easily.

- Ann Riley noted that the definition of DACs was changed for the Stimulus Funds proposals, and that the CC should discuss how communities can be disadvantaged in a range of ways and come up with a definition suited to the Bay Area.

c. Regional Projects and Sub-regional Process.

- The Project Screening subcommittee will be sending out guidance to the sub-regions on the sub-regional process after the Project Screening sub-committee meeting on June 9, 2009.
- The Project Screening subcommittee made the initial recommendation to go with only Regional projects but acknowledged the feedback on continuing outreach to the sub-regions and involving sub-regions in the Regional projects discussion.
- There was consensus among the CC for the Project Screening subcommittee to move ahead with the list of Regional projects preliminarily, and rank the projects based on the existing IRWMP criteria and DAC and Drought preferences.

Action Item(s):

Project Screening subcommittee to:

- 1) Review and update list of Regional projects under consideration.
- 2) Review IRWMP scoring criteria and rank Regional projects.
- 3) Send out guidance to sub-regions on the sub-regional process after the June 9 subcommittee meeting.

4. Announcements

- Carl Morrison announced that Norm Shopay is leaving DWR about July 1, 2009.
- Christy Spector is the DWR representative for the Bay Area IRWMP.

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

The next CC meeting will be held only if DWR draft guidelines are available for discussion. The meeting is tentatively scheduled for Monday, June 22, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm at the Elihu Harris State Building. A confirmation email and website update will be sent out the week of June 15th. Agenda items are:

- Discuss DWR guidelines
- Review Regional projects Scoring and make decisions on specific Regional projects
- Discuss sub-regional project selection process implementation

Project Screening Subcommittee
June 9, 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)
Carol Mahoney (FC/SW & WS/WQ, East)
Carl Morrison (for Sonoma CWA, North)
Melanie Denninger (Watershed/Habitat)
Joanne Siew (RMC)

By Phone:

Tracy Hemmeter (WS/WQ, South)
Brian Mendenhall (FC/SW, South)
Molly Petrick (WS/WQ, West)
Harry Seraydarian (Watershed/Habitat, North)

2. Review and update Draft Schedule

- a. Project Screening subcommittee members reported no updates from DWR regarding the release of Prop 84 guidelines.
- b. Updated schedule is attached.
- c. There was consensus among subcommittee members to put the subregional process on hold for now but to continue efforts to conduct outreach on the Regional projects being evaluated and the IRWM Plan update.

3. Review and update List of Regional Projects under Active Consideration

- a. General comments that apply to all projects are summarized below.
 - i. Non-profit organizations are not eligible to be project leads under the Prop 84 guidelines.
 - ii. Dale Hopkins mentioned that DWR indicated that projects should be in compliance with the State Water Board's Basin Plan, consistent with Prop 50 requirements. Perhaps the projects could be reviewed by a peer review committee comprised of technical reviewers, or people who are well-informed about the types of projects.
 - iii. An adhoc group of Federal agency staff was formed to review upcoming projects for the SF Bay Area. Ann Riley and Dale Hopkins will check the feasibility of having this group serve as the peer review committee for the Regional projects (review period most likely after the 8/24 CC meeting), and will report to the subcommittee.
 - iv. Carl Morrison suggested that a package providing information on the definition of a project lead and the responsibilities of a project lead should be drawn up and circulated to project proponents and interested parties. The subcommittee agreed with his suggestion.

- v. Ann Riley questioned the level of specificity that was needed on the projects at this point. She noted that scoring the projects would be difficult without a consistent level of project detail, and wondered if the current state of project descriptions should be used as the minimum criteria for scoring. Brian Campbell noted that the current project descriptions have a similar level of detail compared to projects that were submitted for the IRWM Plan.
- b. Project-specific comments are summarized in the attached Regional projects summary table (*PS Meeting –Regional Projects Review Summary Table 9-June-09*).

4. Review IRWMP scoring sheet

- a. There was consensus among the subcommittee to wait until the Prop 84 guidelines are released before getting RMC to score the Regional projects.

5. Action Items for next Meeting

- a. Grant Applicant Options
 - i. Identify Lead Staff Person (once the CC has made the decision, the project will be allocated to a staff person for follow-up) – ALL
 - ii. Gather feedback by the next meeting from SFEP, BACWA, water and flood agencies – ALL
 - iii. Provide write-up on Project lead responsibilities – Carl Morrison
 - iv. Contact Dave Houts regarding website funding – Brian Campbell
- b. Check the feasibility of having the group of Federal agencies serve as the peer review committee for the Regional projects (review period most likely after the 8/24 CC meeting), and report outcome to the subcommittee – Ann Riley and Dale Hopkins.
- c. Circulate information on CalEPA funding for EJ programs – Melanie Denningner.

6. Others

- a. PnP subcommittee will address the IRWM Plan update issues.
- b. The cost matching date could start as soon as the RAP results are released
- c. Carol Mahoney noted that additional funding will be needed to maintain and update the Bay Area IRWMP website. BACWA participants have indicated that they would be willing to contribute funds for website updating.

7. What to report to at the June 22 CC meeting

- a. Update on Regional projects

- 8. Next meeting**, tentatively scheduled July 6, 12.30 pm – 2.30 pm (with PnP held before - TBC).

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

- 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 actions by CC and respond to action items
 - ii. Review DWR funding guidelines (if available)

| No. | Project Name | Project Lead | Review Recommendations from May 18 | Updates from June 9 |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|---|--|
| 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). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MMWD may not want to manage a larger, combined program (i.e. Projects #1 and #2 combined). |
| 2 | Drought Relief and Water Conservation Innovation Project | BAWAC (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, BASCWA, 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project description is now fairly comprehensive. • There are many components included in this project. • More agencies are providing inputs to Carol. • Project amount stands at \$11 million and includes Bay Friendly Landscape, Water Footprint for Industrial use by DSRSD and City of Dublin. • There has been no further development of the project and the next step would be for the CC to review the project. • Sonoma County Water Agency is not participating in this project. • Jennifer Krebs noted that there is still some flexibility to make changes to the project up to when the grant applications are due in Sep (e.g. include more local agencies and organizations). • Brian Campbell noted that the project was discussed at the BACWA meeting, and it was indicated at the meeting that most of the money was going into a few programs within the project, then it should be highlighted and details should be provided on those specific programs. • Coordinating outreach for Projects #1 and #2 will take place further down the line, after Sep. • Jennifer Krebs clarified that SFEP is part of ABAG, and that SFEP being the lead is an option if there is no interest from other entities. |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Krebs reported that response to the project has been very positive and she is currently reviewing the feedback that she received. • She announced that EPA has postponed the release of the RFP. • Harry Seraydarian provided an update on his contact with North Bay counties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marin is still developing/deciding on the right project to propose. ○ Sonoma is working on the project template and Harry has started discussions with them on the match. ○ Solano did not accomplish much from the first stakeholders meeting but now has some leads. ○ Napa is in the process of developing their project description. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|--|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 situations. 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melanie Denninger noted a recent white paper by NWRI pointed out that one of the top priorities for future recycled water project development identified by CA water reuse task force was community outreach and public education. ACTION ITEM: Melanie will be circulating the NWRI paper to project applicants. The project was approved by BACWA. There were some suggestions to group this project with Project #2 since recycled water is part of the water conservation strategy. However, the subcommittee decided that this project should be kept separate for now and re-evaluated when the Prop 84 guidelines are released. The NBC program involving four water agencies in the Bay Area was brought up as a possible outreach component for this project, but the subcommittee noted that it was only targeted at four agencies and the schedule for the program and the grant application might not be in-sync. No updates from the CUWA 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subcommittee indicated that the timing for the detailed workplan and Prop 84 schedule may not be complementary as the workplan is only needed in March 2010, but decided to keep this project on the list, in view of the delay in the Prop 84 process. |
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the request of the Project Screening subcommittee and the CC, this project is combined with Projects #8 and #10 into one overall proposal, with the addition of disadvantaged communities stormwater management/training/outreach project in Marin City (Marin County FCD) Ann Riley described the combined proposal and elaborated on the additional Marin City proposal, which is new. The SFEI historical ecology |

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|---|
| | | | <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was questioned whether these stipends to encourage participation would qualify under Implementation grants; it may be a possibility since inputs from their participation feed into the planning and design of the projects. • 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. | <p>proposal has been revised. The Regional Watershed proposal and Regional Curves proposal have already been reviewed by the Project Screening subcommittee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of detail provided for each project is fairly considerable. • The combined project is developed with the intent to respond to DWR's questions on DACs during the RAP interview. • There may be a match from USFWS, which has been designated to assist with fieldwork in the project. • Project proponents are sending in letters of support for the project. • Carol Mahoney suggested that in addition to the four DACs, the project could identify a 'swath' of other DACs that could benefit from this project in future, which will make the project even more regional. • ACTION ITEM: Ann Riley will address the issue of imbalance in project amounts by verifying the source of the match, and cost estimates. She will also identify the watersheds in the projects. • Melanie Denninger noted that DWR does not favor a re-granting process and needs to where the funds are directed to. However, once the Program is approved for funding, DWR will not be micromanaging the projects. |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Mendenhall indicated that this project will be discussed at the upcoming BAFPAA meeting, and will provide an update thereafter. • He noted that SFEI might be taking the lead on this project even though the project was proposed by flood agencies, because SFEI has better expertise and experience in this area. • He clarified that the needs assessment/analysis will be conducted after the mapping is completed. • There were comments from the subcommittee that the purpose and need for the project needs to be better defined. • ACTION ITEM: Brian Mendenhall to provide update on BAFPAA evaluation of project need at the next PSC meeting, and to circulate full project write-up to subcommittee. |
| 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 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). • It was noted that the project required a lot of coordination effort for the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project has been combined with Projects #6 and #10. • See discussion under Project #6. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>grant amount it is requesting, but it was also acknowledged that it was important for the watershed community to have a regional scale project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harry Seraydarian explained the rationale for this project. The project was developed to provide more integrated and routine monitoring of steelhead production. Existing monitoring efforts are often project-based, and therefore less integrated and regular. The monitoring approach proposed in this project will be complementary to the Central Coast Steelhead Recovery Plan, which will soon be produced by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). • Molly Petrick indicated that SFPUC was not aware about this project, and noted that there is steelhead population in a San Francisco coastal watershed as well. • NMFS defines the Bay Area boundary as San Francisco Bay from Sherman Island at the base of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) seaward to the outer Golden Gate Channel (i.e. Point Bonita and Point Lobos), and south to the southern extent of San Francisco Bay. The boundary does not include the Delta. • Subcommittee members also noted that monitoring needs to be coordinated with CA Dept of Fish & Game and NMFS for it to be helpful. • Harry Seraydarian noted that the proposal could be strengthened if a link was drawn between the project’s outputs and how they would inform the NMFS’ Steelhead Recovery Plan. He added that DWR does not favor funding routine activities. • ACTION ITEM: Harry Seraydarian and Carl Morrison work with CEMAR to address the issue of coordinating the project with DFG and NMFS. |
| 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. • 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project has been revised and combined with Projects #6 and #8. • See discussion under Project #6. |

Project Screening Subcommittee
July 6, 2009
Meeting Notes

1. Meeting participation

In Person:

Brian Campbell (WW/RW, East)
Ann Riley (RWQCB - Watershed/Habitat)
Dale Hopkins (RWQCB - Watershed/Habitat)
Melanie Denninger (Watershed/Habitat)
Joanne Siew (RMC)

By Phone:

Tracy Hemmeter (WS/WQ, South)
Jennifer Krebs (Watershed/Habitat)
Carol Mahoney (FC/SW & WS/WQ, East)\
Brian Mendenhall (FC/SW, South)
Carl Morrison (for Sonoma CWA, North)
Harry Seraydarian (Watershed/Habitat, North)
Thomasin Grim (for Marin, North)

2. Review DWR Draft Guidelines Schedule & Budget Issues

- a. Based on an update from a DWR source (Gary Libner?), final guidelines will be released on/around September 28, and draft guidelines around July 22nd. There are no other updates on the draft guidelines.
- b. Prop 50 grants have not been paid out yet, and invoices are pending – the State Board is facing the same situation. Melanie Denninger indicated that the Coastal Conservancy will be allocated money from the sale of State bonds which will be used for bill payment. However, she noted that because the allocation from bond sales did not meet the Coastal Conservancy's payment obligations fully, they had to prioritize payments.
- c. Brian Campbell noted that there were some projects under Prop 50 that were depending on Prop 50 grants for project cashflow.
- d. The Build America Bond program was discussed, and it was noted that there is a capital project requirement and projects need to fulfill certain criteria including project life expectancy. Melanie Denninger noted that the Coastal Conservancy's experience with capital versus non-capital projects for Build American Bonds has been whether overheads are covered by the bonds. If the overhead is incorporated into the rate for project administration, then it would be covered under bond payment. However, there is a small subset of projects that cannot be funded through these bonds.
- e. Melanie Denninger indicated that the current directive from the Coastal Conservancy is that it will not be authorizing any new projects until 2011. It was unclear at this point if DWR would get the rights to authorize grants earlier than the Coastal Conservancy.
- f. The NOAA grants for habitat restoration projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 was brought up. The list of projects in California is attached.

3. Review and update Schedule

- a. The next CC meeting is scheduled for July 27, 2009. Brian Campbell and Brian Mendenhall will not be able to attend this meeting.
- b. The next Project Screening sub-committee meeting is scheduled for August 11, 2009. The PnP meeting will be held on the same day before the Project Screening meeting.
- c. **Agency Review Group (to be implemented in early September, 2009)**
 - i. There was discussion on the agency review group that was mentioned by Ann Riley and Dale Hopkins at the June 9, 2009 meeting. Dale indicated that the role of this group was more to coordinate projects to ensure that the grant applications were not in conflict. The group has been inactive since the budget freeze, but Dale will email DFG, FWS, NOAA, the Regional Board and SCC to follow-up. She suggested that other agencies could be included as reviewers too.
- d. **Lead Agency**
 - i. It was suggested at the June 9, 2009 PS meeting that the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) could be the lead agency for some of the Regional projects. Jennifer Krebs indicated that the SFEP is conceptually in agreement with acting as the lead agency, but she would need to provide more legal/contractual details to SFEP management and their legal department to get confirmation.

Action Item(s):

1. Dale Hopkins to contact listed agencies on the setup of an agency review group for the Regional projects.
2. Melanie Denninger to provide Jennifer Krebs with an example SCC contract with DWR.
3. Brian Campbell to provide Jennifer Krebs and Melanie Denninger with the executed Agreement language.

4. Regional Projects Update

- a. Please refer to Regional Projects Review Summary Table – July 6, 2009.
- b. Scoring of projects will be undertaken by RMC once draft guidelines are released, and presented to the PS subcommittee and then the CC.

5. Grant Applicant Options and conditions by functional area:

- a. WS/WQ: no update.
- b. WW/RW: BACWA has acted as the lead agency before and Michelle Pla as indicated that BACWA could take on the role again, but the project participants will need to advance the funds, not BACWA. Also, the BACWA Board may not want to invest too much time managing non-member agencies.
- c. FC/SW: waiting for Prop 1E guidelines
- d. Watershed/Habitat: no update.

6. What to report to at the July 27 CC meeting

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

- a. Update on Regional projects
- b. Discuss grant applicants

7. Action Item(s)

- a. Thomasin Grim to coordinate with Paul Helliker on adding grant applicant responsibilities and options discussion item on the BAWAC meeting agenda.
- b. Carl Morrison to contact Maura Moody regarding NOAA funded projects.
- c. Dale Hopkins to check in with agencies on forming a review committee for the Regional projects.

8. Next meeting, scheduled August 11, 12.30 pm – 2.30 pm (with PnP held before - TBC).

- 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 actions by CC and respond to action items
 - ii. Update on Regional projects status
 - iii. Review DWR funding guidelines (if available)

Project Screening Subcommittee Meeting
 July 6, 2009
 Summary of Regional Projects Review

| No. | Project Name | Project Lead | Updates from June 9 | Updates from July 6 |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Landscape Irrigation Calculator | MMWD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MMWD may not want to manage a larger, combined program (i.e. Projects #1 and #2 combined). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thomasin Grim noted that MMWD will be implementing the Landscape Irrigation Calculator program if it was not awarded a grant under Prop 84. |
| 1 | Drought Relief and Water Conservation Innovation Project | BAWAC (Zone 7 Water Agency) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project description is now fairly comprehensive. There are many components included in this project. More agencies are providing inputs to Carol. Project amount stands at \$11 million and includes Bay Friendly Landscape, Water Footprint for Industrial use by DSRSD and City of Dublin. There has been no further development of the project and the next step would be for the CC to review the project. Sonoma County Water Agency is not participating in this project. Jennifer Krebs noted that there is still some flexibility to make changes to the project up to when the grant applications are due in Sep (e.g. include more local agencies and organizations). Brian Campbell noted that the project was discussed at the BACWA meeting, and it was indicated at the meeting that most of the money was going into a few programs within the project, then it should be highlighted and details should be provided on those specific programs. Coordinating outreach for Projects #1 and #2 will take place further down the line, after Sep. Jennifer Krebs clarified that SFEP is part of ABAG, and that SFEP being the lead is an option if there is no interest from other entities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An email was sent out by Zone 7's Water Conservation specialist to verify the level of interest in this project, and interested parties were asked to commit to a specific amount of matching funds and projects that they want to be involved in. Contacted by Bay Friendly, DSRSD (Water Footprint), Cash for Grass (Parks District), currently awaiting confirmation on commitment and specific involvement from these groups. Zone 7 will not serve as the project applicant, so the project needs a lead agency (perhaps SFEP or Bay Friendly). Administrative costs incurred by the lead agency for managing the project will have to be worked out (either through MOU or similar agreement). BAWAC was suggested as a possible entity for developing a mechanism to address this. Carl Morrison/Thomasin Grim noted that this discussion could be added to the BAWAC meeting agenda. She will add in the following agenda items: (1) Identifying a lead for the Project; (2) Feedback on Applicant Options. From experience, it was noted that DWR would only want to deal with one agency. Jennifer Krebs indicated that SFEP could be the overall lead provided that the number of sub-projects in the project are kept reasonable (<5). Carol Mahoney noted that she will need to have the project write-up finalized prior to the 8/11 PS meeting, after which it would be handed off to the lead agency/agency review committee for evaluation. ACTION ITEM: Thomasin Grim to add discussion items in BAWAC meeting agenda. |
| 2 | Regional Green Infrastructure Capacity Building Project | SFEP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer Krebs reported that response to the project has been very positive and she is currently reviewing the feedback that she received. She announced that EPA has postponed the release of the RFP. Harry Seraydarian provided an update on his contact with North Bay counties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marin is still developing/deciding on the right project to propose. Sonoma is working on the project template and Harry has started discussions with them on the match. Solano did not accomplish much from the first stakeholders meeting but now has some leads. Napa is in the process of developing their project description. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The deadline for EPA competitive grant application is Sep 23, 2009. The deadline for submission via SFEP is July 13. Eligibility: green infrastructure projects that are pretty much ready-to-go. Jennifer Krebs reported that SFEP does not have consolidated funding amount that projects are seeking via SFEP so far, but should have the information by July 13. She will provide an update on which counties have responded and which have not. The North counties will be submitting a more general application, which is TMDL-related. |
| 3 | Regional Marketing for Recycled Water Use in the Bay Area | City of San Jose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melanie Denninger noted a recent white paper by NWRI pointed out that one of the top priorities for future recycled water project development identified by CA water reuse task force was community outreach and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No updates until DWR draft guidelines are released. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>public education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION ITEM: Melanie will be circulating the NWRI paper to project applicants. • The project was approved by BACWA. • There were some suggestions to group this project with Project #2 since recycled water is part of the water conservation strategy. However, the subcommittee decided that this project should be kept separate for now and re-evaluated when the Prop 84 guidelines are released. • The NBC program involving four water agencies in the Bay Area was brought up as a possible outreach component for this project, but the subcommittee noted that it was only targeted at four agencies and the schedule for the program and the grant application might not be in-sync. • No updates from the CUWA meeting. | |
| 4 | Disadvantaged Communities Watershed Program | SFEP/CEMAR/SCVWD or other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the request of the Project Screening subcommittee and the CC, this project is combined with Projects #8 and #10 into one overall proposal, with the addition of disadvantaged communities stormwater management/training/outreach project in Marin City (Marin County FCD) • Ann Riley described the combined proposal and elaborated on the additional Marin City proposal, which is new. The SFEI historical ecology proposal has been revised. The Regional Watershed proposal and Regional Curves proposal have already been reviewed by the Project Screening subcommittee. • The level of detail provided for each project is fairly considerable. • The combined project is developed with the intent to respond to DWR's questions on DACs during the RAP interview. • There may be a match from USFWS, which has been designated to assist with fieldwork in the project. • Project proponents are sending in letters of support for the project. • Carol Mahoney suggested that in addition to the four DACs, the project could identify a 'swath' of other DACs that could benefit from this project in future, which will make the project even more regional. • ACTION ITEM: Ann Riley will address the issue of imbalance in project amounts by verifying the source of the match, and cost estimates. She will also identify the watersheds in the projects. • Melanie Denninger noted that DWR does not favor a re-granting process and needs to know where the funds are directed to. However, once the Program is approved for funding, DWR will not be micromanaging the projects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakdown of projects is listed in the updated Regional projects list (07-10-09). • Ann Riley sent out revised project descriptions and budgets for the 3 sub-projects in this project. • Carol Mahoney noted that some of the projects seem to be related to the BAFPAA proposal on Floodplain Infrastructure and Needs Assessment, and perhaps the project could be combined with the BAFPAA project to make the proposal stronger and have BAFPAA backing on the project as well. • Ann Riley indicated that it would be advantageous if she could pull in flood managers to support the project. San Mateo County is engaged in BAFPAA and would bring up for discussion, the combination of the BAFPAA proposal and this project at the next BAFPAA meeting. • Brian Mendenhall pointed out that SFEI has indicated that they would be willing to serve as the lead agency for the BAFPAA project, and is currently working on trying to determine the funding amount and developing a revised proposal. • Tracy Hemmeter noted that it would be important to present the projects as a coherent overall project with the same theme. Ann Riley will review the summary project description to ensure this. |
| 5 | Evaluating regional ecosystem restoration using steelhead trout | Center for Ecosystem Management and Restoration, Inc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harry Seraydarian explained the rationale for this project. The project was developed to provide more integrated and routine monitoring of steelhead production. Existing monitoring efforts are often project-based, and therefore less integrated and regular. The monitoring approach proposed in this project will be complementary to the Central Coast Steelhead Recovery Plan, which will soon be produced by the National | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant updates. • CEMAR has not confirmed their role as the lead agency due to funding and staffing issues. • Carl Morrison noted that NMFS will be making a presentation to the Alameda Creek Fisheries Workgroup on September 10, 2009. The Draft Plan is expected sometime in January/February 2010, and the project may |

| | | | | |
|---|----------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Molly Petrick indicated that SFPUC was not aware about this project, and noted that there is steelhead population in a San Francisco coastal watershed as well. • NMFS defines the Bay Area boundary as San Francisco Bay from Sherman Island at the base of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) seaward to the outer Golden Gate Channel (i.e. Point Bonita and Point Lobos), and south to the southern extent of San Francisco Bay. The boundary does not include the Delta. • Subcommittee members also noted that monitoring needs to be coordinated with CA Dept of Fish & Game and NMFS for it to be helpful. • Harry Seraydarian noted that the proposal could be strengthened if a link was drawn between the project's outputs and how they would inform the NMFS' Steelhead Recovery Plan. He added that DWR does not favor funding routine activities. • ACTION ITEM: Harry Seraydarian and Carl Morrison work with CEMAR to address the issue of coordinating the project with DFG and NMFS. | <p>be completed before the grant funds are available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie Denninger noted that depending on what the draft guidelines, this project could be combined into actual restoration projects to make it more competitive. • ACTION ITEM: Carl Morrison and Harry Seraydarian will follow up and provide a status update at the next PS meeting. |
| Regional Flood Control Infrastructure Mapping and Needs Assessment | SCVWD or other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Mendenhall indicated that this project will be discussed at the upcoming BAFPAA meeting, and will provide an update thereafter. • He noted that SFEI might be taking the lead on this project even though the project was proposed by flood agencies, because SFEI has better expertise and experience in this area. • He clarified that the needs assessment/analysis will be conducted after the mapping is completed. • There were comments from the subcommittee that the purpose and need for the project needs to be better defined. • ACTION ITEM: Brian Mendenhall to provide update on BAFPAA evaluation of project need at the next PSC meeting, and to circulate full project write-up to subcommittee. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project was discussed at the last BAFPAA meeting. • SFEI has agreed to take the lead on the project, and is developing a revised project description and the project costs (~ \$0.5-\$1 mil). The match needs to be sorted out. • The development of this project is built upon previous SFEI projects (e.g. wetland tracker). • At the BAFPAA meeting, there were recommendations to expand the coverage further to include wastewater, water and stormwater infrastructure data. • The title would be changed to not include the word 'assessment'. • Ann Riley noted that the SF joint Bay Ventures has a creek subcommittee and the information that was really needed in the Bay Area to protect creeks and streams is map of hydraulic constrictions (culverts and bridges) that cause flooding. Brian Mendenhall noted the project would utilize the new DFIRMS to better identify areas susceptible to flooding, but adding in hydraulic constriction data could be quite costly. Ann Riley suggested that City/County public works departments may have these data on-hand and could be an good, economical resource. • ACTION ITEM: Brian Mendenahall to send out revised project description before the next PS meeting on 8/11. | |
| Developing and Implementing Options for Mitigating Public Health Impacts of Eating Fish | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subcommittee indicated that the timing for the detailed workplan and Prop 84 schedule may not complementary as the workplan is only needed in March 2010, but decided to keep this project on the list, in view of the delay in the Prop 84 process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No updates. | |

Habitat Restoration Projects in California to be funded by American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, managed by NOAA.

- **South San Diego Bay Restoration (San Diego, Calif.)** – \$2.9 million – Restores tidal circulation to former salt ponds, restore 120 acres of intertidal wetlands, as well as removes non-native vegetation and replaces it with native estuarine plants.
- **California Coastal Fisheries Restoration Partnership** – \$1.5 million – Employs California Conservation Corps members to complete more than 20 identified coastal restoration activities that benefit threatened and endangered salmon throughout coastal California.
- **Elkhorn Slough Restoration (Watsonville, Calif.)** – \$3.9 million – Restores tidal flow, reduces erosion, and creates long-term protection and erosion control for more than seven acres of wetland directly and 450 acres overall. This project also prevents seawater intrusion into the coastal aquifer, which supports more than \$100 million annually in agricultural production.
- **San Francisco South Salt Pond Restoration (San Francisco, Calif.)** – \$7.6 million – Opens and restores more than 1,990 acres of three former salt ponds to tidal flow, as well as reinitiating the removal of *Spartina alterniflora*, an invasive wetland plant on the U.S. West Coast.
- **American Canyon Salt Pond Restoration (San Francisco, Calif.)** – \$8.5 million – Restores wetlands and re-create tidal flow to improve 1,135 acres of habitat for threatened Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and green sturgeon by removing levees around former salt ponds.
- **Salmon Creek Restoration (Bodega, Calif.)** – \$1.5 million – Restores four acres of a streamside corridor and in-stream habitat for endangered coho salmon and threatened steelhead trout by installing rain catchment tanks to improve instream flow, planting native vegetation, and implementing other stream-related restoration activities to benefit fisheries resources.
- **Lower Klamath Riparian Restoration and Tribal Plant Nursery (Bodega, Calif.)** – \$527,000– Restores nine acres of in-stream and streamside river habitat of the lower Klamath River to benefit threatened coho salmon as well as Chinook salmon and steelhead trout.
- **Big Springs Shasta River Restoration (Big Springs, Calif.)** – \$1.6 million – Restores habitat for chinook, steelhead, and threatened coho salmon by planting 20 acres of native vegetation and incorporating new agriculture conservation measures to enhance water quality, including a fence to exclude cattle from 70 acres of the riparian habitat.
- **Magnolia Marsh Restoration (Huntington Beach, Calif.)** – \$3.3 million – Restores more than 41 acres of an urban tidal marsh by expanding rearing habitat for many species of marine and coastal fish.

**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 | Score | Notes |
|--|----------------|---|----------|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|--|
| 1 | 11 (Updated) | 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 | ? | 28 | Show components in \$ order. Details pending on admin of individual components. More info coming by 8/11. Is there a DAC element? |
| | | Regional | TBD | \$15,000,000 | \$11,000,000 | \$4,000,000 | | | | | |
| 2 | 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). 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 habitat and riparian areas while reducing flood risk. | Regional | S.F. Estuary Partnership | \$9,500,000 | \$7,500,000 | \$2,000,000 | Yes | Yes | | Website for info: http://sfep.abag.ca.gov/greeninfill.html |
| 3 | New | Regional Recycling Outreach Project. Multi-agency project to develop appropriate messages 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 | | | |
| DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES WATERSHED PROGRAM | | | | | \$1,630,800 | \$1,195,000 | \$435,800 | | | | |
| 4 | New | Bay Area Watershed Network Technical Assistance. This will help build capacity for restoring wetlands, river and stream corridors, and watersheds in four Bay Area communities (Richmond Shoreline, Pescadero Watershed, San Francisquito Creek, and Marin City) by supporting and representing grassroots watershed groups and watershed partnerships, including disadvantaged and underrepresented community groups. | Regional | S.F. Estuary Partnership | \$835,800 | \$530,000 | \$305,800 | | Yes | | |
| | | Stream Channel Shapes and Floodplain Restoration Guidance. 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 | | \$150,000 | \$120,000 | \$30,000 | | | | |
| | | Stream Restoration -- Historical Ecology Restoration Objectives Data. 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 | | \$645,000 | \$545,000 | \$100,000 | | | | |
| 5 | 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 Mgt & Restoration, Inc. | \$750,000 | \$562,500 | \$187,500 | | | | Additional follow up on physical improvements possible. |
| * | New | Floodplain Infrastructure and Needs Assessment. Mapping of flood protection structures and flood prone areas to fill gaps or update existing mapping to better plan for future flood protection actions. | Regional | SCVWD or other | \$1,000,000 | \$750,000 | \$250,000 | | | | Suitable for Prop 1E IRWM? Matching verifiable? |
| TOTAL | | | | | \$27,680,800 | \$20,732,500 | \$6,948,300 | | | | |
| Projects that may not be ready this round (Sept 2009) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * | 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 | \$50,000 | \$37,500 | \$12,500 | | Yes | 39 | IRWMP Cost estimate (\$50,000) need updating Detailed work plan not available by Sept-Nov. |