

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from January 25, 2010 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
	Brian Campbell, EBMUD	Mark Boucher, CCCFCWCD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP	Paul Helliker, Chair, MMWD

Others present:

Mitch Avalon (CCCFCWCD)
Amy Chastain (BACWA)
Chris Choo (MFCWCD)
Thomasin Grim (MMWD)
Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD)
Carol Mahoney (Zone 7 Water)
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Z7)
Ann Riley (SF Water Board)
Harry Seraydarian (NBWA)
Joanne Siew (RMC)
Renee Webber (North Bay Water Reuse Authority)

2. Review Agreements/Action Items from December 7, 2009 meeting (Discussion, led by CC)

- Ann Riley will work on drafting a letter from the CC to Senator Boxer regarding the Boxer-Kerry Climate Bill.
- Joanne Siew will coordinate with Paul Helliker to extend an invitation to Ted Droettboom to give a presentation on Bay Area climate change issues/perspectives at the next CC meeting.

3. Status of Prop 50 Supplemental PSP and Prop 84 Guidelines (Discussion, led by CC)

- Based on updates from DWR staff, the timeline for Prop 84 guidelines is on schedule.
- The draft guidelines will include grant program process issues, the IRWM plan standards, a planning grant PSP, an implementation PSP, and how the Prop 1E stormwater funding will be integrated with the IRWM program.
- There would be \$130 million available under Prop 84 - \$100 million for implementation grants and \$30 million for planning grants.
- DWR will be finalizing the Prop 50 Supplemental Funding Program package, but will not issue application due dates until the funding is secured and available.
- Brian Campbell noted that if Federal bonds are being used to fund part of Prop 50 Supplemental Funding program, then there could be some capital requirements (e.g. Build America Bonds can only be used for new capital expenditure).

4. Update on Roundtable of Regions (Information, led by Tracy Hemmeter)

- Tracy Hemmeter provided a summary of key points from the Roundtable of Regions meeting held on January 13, 2010 (please refer to RoR meeting notes in CC meeting package for details).
- Comments from the CC on key points from the RoR meeting are noted below:
 - The RoR questioned if it was fair that regions without an IRWM plan would qualify for a maximum planning grant award of \$1 million while established regions with a plan would get \$500,000. Mitch Avalon noted that this could be arguable because the Bay Area region is a result of several merged sub-regions and has a higher level of complexity, so it would make more sense that the region would obtain a larger Planning grant.
 - The finalization of the Prop 84 guidelines and the issuance of the PSP will depend on bond sales and how the bond funds are allocated among departments. The CC noted that DWR would need to clarify the kind of work that would be eligible for implementation funding, based on the requirements tied to the bonds (if applicable).
 - DWR is required to allocate grants on a competitive basis with each funding area. However, regions within a funding area can coordinate their applications. The CC discussed if DWR would defer to the Bay Area Region's project selection process, and agreed that since the Bay Area Region has demonstrated that it has an adequate project selection process through RAP and the Project Screening subcommittee, that it should not be an issue for DWR.
- Brian Campbell queried if there would be a date for matching funds for the Planning grant. He noted that this would be an important driver for many agencies since they have to provide a match of 25% by a certain date, and would need to start planning for the availability of these matching funds. It was uncertain if this requirement would apply to both Planning and Implementation grants, and it is likely that the matching date would be tied to the date when the funds for Prop 84 is appropriated.

5. Project Screening Subcommittee Update (Discussion, led by CC/Project Screening SC)

- Brian Campbell reported that the BACWA Board met in December 2009 and indicated that they supported the submission of the proposal with BACWA as the proposed lead applicant, but that BACWA would reserve the right to review the proposal before providing their official confirmation.
- Brian provided a status update on each of the nine Regional projects, and noted that there are three additional projects which were added to the list for the Prop 50 Supplemental PSP. These three projects are existing projects that received partial funding from the previous Prop 50 rounds.
- Specific project comments are as follows:
 - **Project 3 – Regional Green Infrastructure Project:** Carl Morrison to send Brian Campbell information on a proposed Sonoma County green infrastructure project to include in the Regional project under Prop 84.
 - **Project 7 – Evaluate Regional Ecosystem Restoration using Steelhead Trout:** Harry Seraydarian pointed out that CEMAR has scaled down the program to one year instead of three years for the Prop 50 Supplemental PSP and added funding for Alameda and Santa Clara tributaries for a total request of \$371K.
- Partially-funded projects under Prop 50 were solicited and collected via email. It was noted that the budget requested for the partially-funded projects exceeds the funds available (\$3.75 million) under Prop 50 Supplemental PSP.

- The CC discussed and came up with three conceptual approaches to consider in the evaluation and ranking of the projects in terms of eligibility and competitiveness for the Prop 50 Supplemental PSP:
 - 1) Emphasize existing partially-funded projects**
 - Focus on scoring existing partially-funded projects because the projects are already well-defined and would be less complicated and administratively easier to manage. Since the partially-funded existing projects already exceed the available funding of \$3.75 million, it would not be feasible to add in Regional projects.
 - 2) Emphasize equitable allocation among functional areas**
 - Score all projects based on Prop 50 Supplement PSP criteria but ensure that all functional areas would receive the same level of benefit from the selected projects. Functional areas would need to cut back proportionately on grant requests since only \$3.75 million is available through Prop 50. In addition, because of specific allocations (%) determined for sub-regions for the Prop 84 funds, should the Prop 50 Supplemental funds be counted towards the bottom line of the Prop 84 allocation?
 - 3) Emphasize best-scoring Regional project**
 - Score all Regional projects competitively against Prop 50 Supplemental PSP criteria and select the top-scoring Regional project and submit only one project in the Prop 50 application.
- The CC agreed on several follow-up actions while Prop 50 guidelines are being finalized:
 - Hold off on scoring projects until final Prop 50 guidelines are issued, and DWR has appropriated the funds.
 - Decide whether to apply the Prop 84 project selection process in addition to the scoring for Prop 50 Supplemental PSP.
 - The CC should hold a meeting with DWR staff after the release of the Prop 50 final guidelines, to seek DWR's input on the recommended projects to ensure that they are in line with DWR's objectives and expectations.
 - CC to coordinate with RMC to understand the level of effort involved in scoring the projects for Prop 50 criteria, as well as possible participation in an interview and presentation to DWR if required. RMC to provide a preliminary scope and budget for the scoring task to the CC.

Action Item(s):

- RMC to provide preliminary scope and budget to the CC for project scoring for the Prop 50 Supplemental Funding PSP, and interview and presentation preparation.

6. Discuss funding for consultant services for CC support (Discussion, led by CC)

- RMC provided a preliminary scope and budget for the remaining \$20,000 authorized by the Coastal Conservancy for continued support of CC/PnP/PSC meetings.
- It was noted that the Coastal Conservancy previously indicated that they would prefer not to manage the next consultant contract. Paul Helliker will confirm this with the Conservancy, and also asked for potential volunteers for the next round of contract management.
- Functional areas will need to begin planning how much money they would need for the next contract and their contributions to the CC.

- Mitch Avalon noted that BAFPA is currently reviewing its mechanisms for fund collection and distribution to the CC.

Action Item(s):

- Paul Helliker will check with BAWAC on their budget status and how much they would be willing to contribute to the Bay Area CC.
- All functional areas should planning and budgeting how much money they would need for the next contract and their contributions to the CC.

7. Succession of CC Chair and Vice-Chair (Discussion, led by CC)

- There was consensus among the CC for Paul Helliker to extend his term as CC Chair by another term to June 2011, following which a call for nominations for the Chair will be released. (The Chair and Vice-Chair both serve two year terms in accordance to guidelines established in June 2007).
- Mitch Avalon noted that Ann Draper (SCVWD, Assistant Officer, Office of Stewardship Planning) indicated that she would be willing to consider a position in the CC. He will follow up with Ann on whether she would be interested to take on the Vice-Chair role.

Action Item(s):

- Mitch Avalon to follow up with Ann Draper regarding Vice-Chair position.

8. Other Additional Items (Discussion, led by CC)

- The CC discussed the role of the Bay Area Watershed Forum (BAWF) and how their activities and agenda could be better coordinated with the CC's, noting that it would be a mutually beneficial relationship, and that maintaining a profile in BAWF's activities would allow for the CC to disseminate information to non-profit organizations and other elected officials who might not be as actively involved in the CC's activities.
- Carol Mahoney suggested that it would be useful for the CC to work with BAWF to obtain Federal funding for localized water projects.
- Paul Helliker asked the CC on when the sub-regional process would need to be restarted, in terms of moving towards Prop 84 guidelines. The sub-regional process would enable for decision-making at the project implementer's scale, and make it easier to interact with non-profits (e.g. watershed groups). Harry Seraydarian noted that the watershed groups are currently very active in the NBWA Watershed Council meetings and have been involved in the decision-making process via this platform.

Action Item(s):

- Paul Helliker will contact Cynthia Murray to discuss potential opportunities for collaboration between BAWF and the CC.

9. Announcements (Information, led by CC)

- Ann Riley announced that the Bay Area Watershed Network Annual meeting will be held on February 10, 2010 from 9.45 am to 12 noon at the State Elihu Harris Building, Room 1.
- Harry Seraydarian announced that the North Bay Watershed Conference will be held on April 9, 2010. The website link for registration is:
<http://nbwatershed.org/pages/2010conf.php>

- Brian Campbell announced that the old purchase order for the web consultant has expired and BACWA has created a new purchase order for \$5,000 with the consultant, David Sieband to provide services for maintenance of the Bay Area IRWMP website and troubleshooting.

10. Agenda Items for the next CC meeting

- The next CC meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2010.
- Potential agenda items include:
 - Presentation by Ted Droettboom on the Joint Policy Committee and Climate Change issues in the Bay Area
 - Update on preparation and project recommendations for Prop 50 Supplemental Funding Grant application.
 - Update on scoping of project scoring for the Prop 50 Supplemental Funding PSP.