

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from April 26, 2010 Meeting

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
Molly Petrick, SFPUC	Brian Campbell, EBMUD	Mark Boucher, CCCFCD; Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD	Harry Seraydarian, NBWA; Jennifer Krebs, SFEP; Melanie Denninger, SCC	Paul Helliker, Chair, MMWD

Others present:

Mitch Avalon (CCCFCD)
Erin Chappell (DWR-NCRO)
Chris Choo (MCFCWCD)
Theresa Eade (StopWaste.org)
Thomasin Grim (MMWD)
Cynthia Havstad (StopWaste.org)
Dale Hopkins (SF Bay RWQCB)
Margaret Johnston (Tomales Bay Watershed Council)
Carol Mahoney (Zone 7 Water)
Glenn Moeller (DWR-NCRO)
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Zone 7)
Dave Richardson (RMC)
Ann Riley (SF Bay RWQCB)
Joanne Siew (RMC)
Brad Sherwood (SCWA)
Renee T. Webber (SCWA)

2. Review Agreements/Action Items from March 22, 2010 meeting (Discussion, led by CC)

Comment Letter to DWR

- Paul Helliker informed the CC that the letter of comments to DWR on the draft Prop 84/1E guidelines and PSPs was submitted to DWR on April 23, 2010.
- In the letter to DWR, Paul highlighted that the requirement for a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) could potentially deter some project proponents from submitting projects due to the high cost in undertaking a cost-benefit analysis. He also noted that it was unclear from the guidelines if the CBA requirement would be applied only to projects in the grant proposal or all projects added to the IRWM Plan. Erin Chappell responded that DWR will be providing clarification on this.
- Mitch Avalon indicated that the Army Corp typically spends about \$2-3 million to conduct a full-scale cost-benefit analysis.
- It was noted that the requirement for a cost-benefit analysis would have an implication on the processes in the CC and the regional planning process, because it could prevent project proponents from participating in the regional planning and also subregional planning process due to the perceived high threshold.
- Chris Choo indicated that the North Coast region conducted cost-benefit analyses for projects in the Prop 50 grant proposals. She suggested that it may be worthwhile to bring

in project proponents who have done it before to get an understanding of the level of effort required. Thomasin Grim and Dave Richardson noted that the Bay Area region and other IRWM regions also did the same for projects in the Prop 50 grant applications, and Dave estimated that Sacramento spent approximately \$125K to conduct CBA for 10 projects.

- Melanie Denninger queried if DWR provided any guidance in terms of defined or accepted standards for quantifying benefits and costs, so that analyses can be comparable and substantive. Dave indicated that these standards were provided in the last Prop 50 grant application round, but Harry Seraydarian added that since DWR should be deferring to the local process where the “region” encompasses the entire funding region, the CBA criteria seems like an unnecessary and onerous requirement.
- Carl Morrison highlighted that although DWR has suggested that it would defer to the region process as defined in the RAP, the IRWM Plan nevertheless has to meet a certain legal standard (e.g. the selection process needs to satisfy certain criteria), before regions can receive funding from DWR. He suggested that the Bay Area CC get together with other similar regions (i.e. regions that share the same boundaries as their funding areas) and establish with DWR what the legal threshold is.

Discuss Timeline to Initiate Subregional Process for Prop 84 and Prop 1E projects

- The CC noted that Prop 1E is different from Prop 84 in that the former is a statewide competitive grant, whereas the latter has pre-determined allocations for funding regions. However, project proponents need to have their project in the IRWM Plan before it is considered eligible for Prop 1E.
- The CC acknowledged that it could potentially be dealing with numerous requests from project proponents to include their projects into the IRWM Plan, and that the CC needs to come up with a streamlined screening and management process for adding projects into the Plan.
- A flow chart for adding projects to the IRWMP was developed and finalized by the PnP and circulated at a CC meeting in November 2007 (therefore directly applicable to Prop 84 but not Prop 1E projects).
- Carol Mahoney suggested that the CC check in with the Flood Protection and Watershed FAs to see if their projects included in the Plan are still viable, and may be considered for Prop 1E.
- Harry Seraydarian suggested that BAFPAA could provide some guidance in terms of developing screening criteria for the Project Screening Subcommittee to use in evaluating Prop 1E projects. Brian Campbell noted that Prop 84 and 1E use different ranking criteria and that should be taken into consideration when screening criteria is being developed.
- Ann Riley noted that the Prop 1E solicitation seems to fit better with subregional process, and could serve as an opportunity to test out the subregional process. Mitch Avalon agreed that a subregional process would get better coverage in terms of projects, and noted that the East subregion outreach process took approximately three months.
- Glenn Moeller clarified that the region would need to use the process that was adopted in the Plan (if any), and that the region may not adopt a new Plan which specifically includes a process for adding new projects into the Plan and use that for implementation.
- Chris Choo suggested that the burden should be on 1E project proponents to meet IRWM Plan requirements, but Mitch Avalon noted that this would create an obstacle for non-profit or DAC groups, which may not have the resources to provide all the information to meet Plan requirements.
- Several CC members indicated their support for the initiation of the subregional process and suggested that the Project Screening subcommittee develop a fact sheet to be circulated to the subregions which will provide consistent information on Prop 1E, and the CC’s screening criteria and IRWM Plan requirements.
- The CC agreed with the suggestion for BAFPAA to develop a draft project template for Prop 1E for the CC to use when screening projects for inclusion into the IRWM Plan. There was general consensus that subregions would be responsible for conducting the outreach, and collecting/consolidating project information.

- Melanie Denninger noted that there are three contact lists from the following sources: ABAG (Jennifer Krebs); BAFCAA (Mitch Avalon) and perhaps one from DWR (Prop 1E). Harry Seraydarian noted that outreach should only be limited to agencies in the Bay Area funding area boundary (i.e. watershed boundary) and not all agencies in the Bay area.
- Mark Boucher pointed out that the current Plan is based on Prop 50 criteria, so essentially projects could be added to the Plan if they only want to qualify for Prop 50 funding. Administratively, the CC will need to draft criteria for Prop 84 and Prop 1E projects to be added into the IRWM Plan
- The CC agreed that it would look into developing draft templates for review of Prop 84 projects and Prop 1E projects to ensure consistency in adding projects to the Plan.
- Brian Mendenhall indicated that the CC should define whether it is focusing only on regional projects for Prop 84, and what criteria a regional project needs to meet because some regional projects may not be as competitive or rank higher than single-area projects.

Action Item(s)

- Mitch Avalon will coordinate with BAFCAA to develop a draft project template for screening Prop 1E projects and will circulate to the subregional leads (Harry Seraydarian, Molly Petrick and Brian Mendenhall) for their comments.

Discuss Scope of Work for the Next Phase of Work

- Paul Helliker listed items that he scoped out for the next phase of work:
 1. Setting up of web portal to enable project proponents to submit and edit projects independently. (Cost: \$12-24K, depending on how comprehensive the datasheet needs to be).
 2. Continued CC and subcommittees meeting support
 3. Analysis of IRWM Plan projects, and supporting the Project Screening subcommittee in tasks.
 4. Updating the IRWM Plan (the CC will need support for this in the future).
- Brian Campbell queried if consultant services would be needed for the preparation of grant proposals for Prop 84/1E.
- Mark Boucher suggested that the future contract with the website consultant be subcontracted under RMC.
- The CC agreed that a final decision needs to be made at the next CC meeting in May/June.
- Melanie Denninger requested for the four parties to authorize the use of the remaining funds (\$8K) for continued CC/PSC/PnP support.

3. Update – Project Screening Subcommittee (Discussion, led by PSC)

DWR and Prop 50 Supplemental Funding Schedule

- Glenn Moeller indicated that the Prop 50 Supplemental Funding program final guidelines are likely to be released by May.
- Paul noted that once the guidelines are released, a quick turnaround would be needed for the development of the grant proposal. Brian Campbell indicated that Tracy Hemmeter suggested that the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) would take the lead in contracting for consultant services to prepare the application, for which BACWA will be “applicant”. The costs of preparing the applications would either spread out equally among project proponents or tiered. He added that no action from the CC is required for SCVWD’s managing these consultant services.

Project Updates

- Jennifer Krebs indicated that she will be circulating a revised project description of the Regional Green Infrastructure Project.

- Brian Mendenhall noted that he heard that CEMAR may not be the lead entity for the Evaluate Regional Ecosystem Restoration Using Steelhead Trout Project, because the project involves working with agencies in several counties and it is uncertain at this point if the counties would be able to devote resources and matching funds to the project. Harry Seraydarian suggested that CEMAR could team with SCWVD; Brian M indicated that SCVWD would be willing to work with CEMAR but they may not want to take the lead on the project since they are already taking the lead on another project, which is currently ready-to-go. Molly Petrick indicated that the SFPUC would like to get a sense of other agencies are proposing before they make a decision on whether they would be included in the project.
- The CC re-confirmed that action was taken during the March 22, 2010 meeting to add the following five scored **new** projects into the IRWM Plan.
 1. Regional Green Infrastructure Project
 2. Disadvantaged Communities Watershed Program
 3. Evaluate Regional Ecosystem Restoration Using Steelhead Trout
 4. Regional Water Recycling Project
 5. Flood and Waterways Infrastructure Analysis and Communication Tool

Action Item(s)

- RMC will add the above 5 projects to the IRWM Plan with the necessary documentation and circulate to the CC for review via email.

4. Announcements (Information, led by CC)

- No announcements.

5. Agenda Items for the next CC meeting

- The next CC meeting is scheduled for May 24, 2010
- Potential agenda items include:
 - Update on Prop 50 Supplemental Funding PSP status
 - Decide on future funding for next phase of work