

**FINAL**

**Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee**

Agreements and Action Items from April 26, 2010 Meeting

**1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present**

<b>WS-WQ</b>	<b>WW-RW</b>	<b>FP-SW</b>	<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Other</b>
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

**Project Screening Subcommittee  
May 6, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**1. Meeting participation**

**By Phone:**

Mark Boucher (FC/SW, East)  
Brian Campbell (WW/RW, East)  
Carmela Chandrasekera (NMWD)  
Amy Fowler (SCVWD)  
Melanie Denninger (Watershed/Habitat)  
Teresa Eade (StopWaste.org)  
Thomasin Grim (for Marin, North)  
Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD)  
Jennifer Krebs (Watershed/Habitat)  
Carol Mahoney (FC/SW & WS/WQ, East)  
Brian Mendenhall (SCVWD)  
Carl Morrison (for Sonoma CWA, North)  
Ann Riley (Watershed/Habitat)  
Joanne Siew (RMC)  
Marie Valmores (CCWD, East)

**2. General Questions and Comments on the Final Prop 50 Supplemental Guidelines**

- Brian Campbell noted that DWR had indicated that the number of participants at the interview would be limited to no more than four (4) RWMG representatives.
- Ann Riley queried if there was any indication on the timeline between amendment of the BACWA-DWR agreement and the release of funds. Brian Campbell indicated that it is uncertain at this point when and how long the contract amendment between DWR and BACWA might take. Jennifer Krebs estimated that a reasonable date could be January 1, 2011.
- Ann Riley asked what the required match for DACs is. Brian Campbell noted that the DACs would need to be identified by census tract or based on the State's definition, and Bay Area communities may not qualify within that definition.
- Melanie Denninger noted that the improvement in the financial situation at the Coastal Conservancy may be indicative of a similar improvement in DWR. She added that the Coastal Conservancy may be able to provide some means of alternative funding for DAC projects if the Prop 50 Supplement requirements are too onerous for DACs to meet.
- Brian Mendenhall questioned if non-construction projects may be less favorable in DWR's selection process since this is not a Planning grant, and whether a low-scoring project within the group would affect the scores of the rest of the projects as well. Brian Campbell noted this would be a good question to check with DWR during the interim meeting.

**3. Review of Projects**

Cost-sharing

- Tracy Hemmeter indicated that as project proponents need to figure out a cost-sharing arrangement among SCVWD and project proponents to pay for the compilation of project information, and preparation of the grant application.
- Brian Campbell noted that the costs would also include costs for SCVWD's consultant to summarize and consolidate the grant application, develop graphics as necessary, and to provide support for the interview with DWR.

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

The current status on individual projects are as follows:

<b>Project<sup>(3)</sup></b>	<b>Lead Entity</b>	<b>Status</b>
Regional Green Infrastructure Project	SFEP / ABAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project contact is Jennifer Krebs.</li> <li>Jennifer will provide the consultant's contact to Tracy/Amy for follow-up when she is on vacation.</li> <li>SFEP will be using their consultant to summarize their project, before submitting to SCVWD.</li> <li>Jennifer Krebs indicated that the SFEP consultant would be contacting people who have local projects in the Project, and narrowing down the scope for the proposal.</li> </ul>
South Bay Advanced Recycled (R.O.) Water Treatment Plant	SCVWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project contact is Stanley Zhu.</li> <li>Project is ready to go.</li> </ul>
Bay Area Disadvantaged Communities Watershed Program	SFEP / ABAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project contacts are Ann Riley/Jennifer Krebs.</li> <li>Need to review the guidelines with project contacts to ensure that everyone can meet/fulfill the requirements of the guidelines.</li> </ul>
Mercury and PCB Risk Reduction Project	BACWA / DPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project contact is Amy Chastain.</li> </ul>
Regional Steelhead Trout Monitoring Program	TBD (either CEMAR sub to SFEP or SCVWD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project contact is Gordon Becker at CEMAR.</li> <li>In response to Molly Petrick's note during the April 26 CC meeting that the SFPUC would like to identify all potential projects in the SF region; Brian Campbell spoke to Gordon Becker at CEMAR and they indicated that they were not planning to work on SFPUC land, only East Bay Regional Parks District land.</li> <li>Jennifer Krebs will check with CEMAR on whether they would want to be a sub under SFEP or SCVWD.</li> </ul>
North Marin Recycled Water Project, Phase 2 North	NMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project contact is Carmela Chandrasekera.</li> <li>Was partially funded under previous Prop 50.</li> <li>Project ready to go.</li> </ul>

Project information submittal process

- SCVWD will coordinate the project information submittal process, contact project proponents to submit relevant information, and be the point of contact between DWR and the project proponents.
- Tracy Hemmeter noted that Amy Fowler and she will be setting up a conference call next week with project proponents to discuss scheduling.
- Brian Campbell will forward the necessary documents to project proponents, including the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget templates.
- Brian Campbell indicated that once all the projects and project information has been confirmed, a meeting or conference call with DWR, either led by representatives from project proponents, or SCVWD, would be useful to understand if DWR has any questions on the

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

selection of projects and whether they disapproved any of the projects. The key contact at DWR is Trevor Joseph. Christy Spector will be transferring to another division on May 17, and a new coordinator for the Bay Area IRWMP will be announced later.

- Prepare for DWR interview by June 1, 2010.

#### Other Comments

- Brian Mendenhall was concerned that there might be too many projects on the list. Brian Campbell noted that it would be difficult to take projects off the list at this point if they say they are ready and suggested that the group check with DWR during the interim meeting.
- Ann Riley suggested including some projects on a B-tier, which could replace a project(s) on the original list if DWR reacts negatively to the pool of projects. Brian Campbell noted that this would not be feasible within the Prop 50 schedule because new projects added to the list would require CC approval. Brian's point was seconded by Tracy Hemmeter.
- Brian Campbell indicated to the group that the BACWA Board wanted to make sure that new grantees are aware that the grants would be paid in arrears, and the terms would be the same as those in the existing agreement between DWR and BACWA, which includes a joint liability clause between BACWA and the project proponent. He also noted that there is a definite preference by existing grantees not to reopen the grant agreement, given the time that it took to get finalized, and instead add in a Phase 2 of the agreement. Project proponents should be prepared to advance significant legal costs between August 2010 and January 2011 (estimated finalization of the agreement) that will be reimbursable under the proposed grant budget.

#### **4. Prop 1E/84**

##### Prop 1E

- Mark Boucher noted that he is meeting with Zone 7 (East subregion) to start working on their sub-regional process. The group has obtained a list of projects in the subregion from the IRWMP and will review the status of the projects and conduct outreach efforts to solicit projects for Prop 1E. Carol Mahoney added that the group will be providing recommendations to BAFPA for Prop 1E, and they will also consult with Harry Seraydarian on the NBWA outreach process.

##### Prop 84

- The group questioned if the existing process to add projects into the IRWMP is adequate given the economic analysis requirement. Thomasin Grim and Brian Campbell suggested that projects submitted for grant applications before the Plan update should not be required to have an economic analysis in order to be added into the Plan, but if the projects are to be included in a grant proposal, they would have to meet the economic analysis criteria in the guidelines.
- The Prop 84 PSP indicates that there is up to \$30 million of funding available for the Bay Area, compared to the \$15 million that the PSC was assuming before which led to the decision to only consider regional projects. If \$30 million is available, more projects need to be considered for the list. [Update: the \$30M that the Bay Area could receive under Prop 84 is based on the scenario that some regions may not apply (not ready, no plan yet, etc.). DWR decided that if this is the case a region could potentially get up to twice its "allotment".]
- Brian Mendenhall noted that if the projects going for the Prop 50 Supplemental funding are successful, those projects would already make up a large portion of the regional projects considered for Prop 84 as well.

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

- The PnP subcommittee will conduct a meeting to brainstorm approaches to adding projects to the IRWMP in anticipation of upcoming Prop 84 and 1E grant opportunities, for recommendation to the CC.

# Planning and Process Subcommittee

May 17, 2010  
Meeting Summary

## Notes

### PnP meeting participation

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
<b>Present</b>				
Thomasin Grim Brad Sherwood	Brian Campbell	Mark Boucher	Dale Hopkins Harry Seraydarian Jennifer Krebs	Carl Morrison Renee Webber, NBWRA Kevin Booker, NBWRA
<b>Called in</b>				
Tracy Hemmeter Marie Valmores		Carol Mahoney		

**Meeting purpose: Brainstorm approaches to adding projects to the IRWMP in anticipation of upcoming Prop 84 and 1E grant opportunities, and provide recommendations for CC consideration.**

We agreed upon the following assumptions:

- The "process" for adding projects to our adopted IRWMP per page G-4, #8, allows the CC to add to the IRWMP project list in a manner that makes sense based on available funding opportunities.
- The "martini glass" step-by-step process for adding projects was approved by the CC in fall of 2007, but we can create new or variations on this process for Prop 84 and 1E.
- The "subregional process" for vetting, collecting and submitting potential projects was developed with Prop 84 in mind and was approved by the CC in 2009. It was agreed that this process could be an appropriate mechanism for conducting outreach, as well as for selecting and prioritizing projects for grant funding when the anticipated grant amount was sufficient to warrant submitting subregional and individual projects as opposed to regional projects only.
- We will update the IRWMP per final Prop 84/1E Guidelines.
- We will not consider what may required for eventual Plan update when screening projects to add to the IRWMP now (and until Plan is updated.)
- We will create a revised project information template for proponents to submit projects to the IRWM Plan with Prop 84 and 1E implementation funding in mind.
- In adding projects going forward, we will not score projects per existing Prop 50 framework.

## **Prop 1E projects - How to invite and incorporate projects into the IRWMP?**

The PnP recommends the following:

- Update the “project information sheet” template to reflect Prop 84 and 1E draft grant criteria and parameters.
- Post the revised “project information sheet” template on the Bay Area IRWM web site.
- The Flood Protection and Stormwater FA and BAFPA will distribute a “Prop 1E” flier to stakeholders (as soon as finalized).
- The Flood Protection and Stormwater FA and BAFPA will take the lead in collecting project information sheets from proponents wishing to add their project to the Bay Area IRWMP, will vet and preliminarily screen submitted projects, and provide project lists/descriptions to Project Screening Subcommittee for discussion and approval.
- The subregion leads will be asked to assist with outreach by distributing the Prop 1E flier (when finalized) to stakeholders as feasible.
- Once projects have been forwarded by BAFPA and reviewed by the PSSC, the CC will authorize their addition to the IRWMP. The Prop 1E projects would be added as a separate appendix.

## **Prop 84 projects - How to update Prop 50 project list and invite and incorporate new projects into the IRWMP?**

The PnP recommends the following:

- Update the “project information sheet” template to reflect Prop 84 and 1E draft grant criteria and parameters.
- Post the revised “project information sheet” template on the Bay Area IRWM web site.
- Send mass email to Prop 50 project proponents indicating that they must update their project information by filling out updated form in order to be considered for Prop 84 implementation funding.
- Receive new project submissions.
- New projects would go to the PSSC for review and then be forwarded to CC for authorization to add to IRWMP.

Questions still on the table:

Who will “receive” and process the updated project information forms and the new projects?

Who/what agency will serve as Prop 84 grant applicant?

### **Action items**

- a. Mark to forward draft 1E flyer to RMC for inclusion in CC agenda package.
- b. Mark to distribute working draft of revised Project Information Sheet template to PnP.
- c. PnP to review and edit revised Project Information Sheet template and then present a final version to CC.
- d. Mark to post final version of Project Information Sheet to Bay Area IRWM web site (assuming CC approves concepts outlined above.)
- e. Mark/BAFPA to distribute Prop 1E flier following CC approval.

# BAFPAA

BAY AREA FLOOD PROTECTION  
AGENCIES ASSOCIATION, EST. 2007

## GRANT OVERVIEW

Max. Grant Award: \$30M per project

Minimum Local Match: 50%

Funding Round 1: \$212M (statewide)

## DATES (TBD)

Final PSP Out by: --/--/2010

Application Due Date: --/--/2010

Grant must be expended by: --/--/----

## ELIGIBLE GRANT APPLICANTS

Local agencies or non-profits are eligible grant applicants. Other groups can submit grants through eligible sponsors.

## OTHER KEY INFORMATION

The SWFM (1E) grant utilizes statewide competition. Each grant application submitted is scored according to criteria and then the applications are ranked by score without regard to geographic location in the state. Only work performed after execution of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement.

## SUBMITTING PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE BAY AREA IRWM PLAN

1. Complete an [IRWMP Project Template](#). (A needed update will be available soon.)
2. Submit template to: [mbouc@pw.cccounty.us](mailto:mbouc@pw.cccounty.us).
3. A subcommittee will screen the project.
4. The Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee will vote on acceptance and adding project to the plan.

## GOTO:

<http://www.bairwmp.org/> for Bay Area IRWM Group meeting information.

## FOR FURTHER INFO.

This summary is based on the DRAFT Prop. 1E PSP found at the following website:

[http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio\\_new10.cfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_new10.cfm) (Search "Stormwater Flood Management Grant PSP")

See also Prop. 84/1E DRAFT Guidelines:

[http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/docs/prop84/guidelinepsp/GL\\_drtf\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/docs/prop84/guidelinepsp/GL_drtf_FINAL.pdf)

# Storm Water Flood Management Grant Program for Flood Protection Projects

## Proposition 1E



<http://www.bairwmp.org/>

### The Bay Area Flood Protection Agencies

**Association (BAFPAA)** represents flood protection and stormwater entities and is a key participant in the **Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Group**. Proposition 1E grant funding for flood protection projects is anticipated to be announced prior to fall 2010. [This brochure seeks to help you understand your project's potential eligibility for Proposition 1E.](#)

### ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

- Projects must be consistent with an adopted Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan, which means projects must be included in an IRWM Plan or have been added to the implementation project list for an IRWM Plan according to established procedures (see left). **Projects added to the Bay Area IRWM Plan (BAIRWMP) through a screening committee process are considered to be "consistent" with the plan.**
- Designed to manage stormwater runoff to reduce flood damage.
- Consistent with the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)
- Cannot be part of the State Plan of Flood Control (projects located outside Central Sacramento – San Joaquin Valley are not part of the SPFC)
- Yield multiple benefits which may include one of the following elements:
  - Groundwater recharge
  - Water quality improvement
  - Ecosystem restoration and benefits
  - Reduction of instream erosion and sedimentation

### WHO TO CONTACT

Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District – Mark Boucher  
925-313-2274 or [mbouc@pw.cccounty.us](mailto:mbouc@pw.cccounty.us)

### SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Project proponents must provide specific project information to meet the grant application requirements. The DRAFT Proposition 1E Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) describes the attachments required for submittal. They are bulleted below.

The Bay Area IRWM group and other State IRWM groups commented on the guidelines and PSP. These comments may change the level of detail required for these attachments.

- Proof of Formal Adoption (documents showing your agency has adopted the current Bay Area IRWMP)
- Project Work Plan
- Project Budget Information
- Project Schedule
- Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures
- Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction\*\*\*
- Project Benefits Summary
- Program Preferences

\*\*\* For the economic analysis, draft guidance states a narrative description is required at a minimum. Economic analysis data requested by DWR for this attachment can be extensive. BAFPA and IRWM Groups have requested that DWR reduce this requirement. See websites listed at left for more info.