

FINAL

Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Agreements and Action Items from May 24, 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; Nadine Hitchcock, SCC

Others present:

Mitch Avalon (CCCFCD)
Kevin Booker (North Bay Water Reuse Authority)
Chris Choo (MCFCWCD)
Theresa Eade (StopWaste.org)
Thomasin Grim (MMWD)
Dale Hopkins (SF Bay RWQCB)
Margaret Johnston (Tomales Bay Watershed Council)
Carol Mahoney (Zone 7 Water)
Vivien Maisonneuve (DWR)
Glenn Moeller (DWR-NCRO)
Carl Morrison (Morrison Assoc/SCWA, Zone 7)
Ann Riley (SF Bay RWQCB)
Joanne Siew (RMC)
Renee Webber (North Bay Water Reuse Authority)

2. Review Agreements/Action Items from April 26, 2010 meeting (Discussion, led by CC)

Discuss status of draft project template for screening Prop 1E projects

- Mark Boucher presented the draft flyer developed by BAFPA to the CC. He added that a draft template was developed and has been circulated to the PnP and PS subcommittees for review.

Decide on funding commitments for the next phase of work

- 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.

Action Item(s)

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

Approve documentation for projects to be added into the IRWM Plan

- 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 the next phase of consultant work.
- 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 – Planning and Process (PnP) and Project Screening Subcommittees (Discussion, led by PnP and PS)

Approach for adding projects to the IRWM Plan in anticipation of Prop 84 and 1E grant opportunities

- The PnP subcommittee held a meeting on May 17, 2010 to brainstorm approaches to add projects to the IRWMP. Recommendations from the PnP are listed in the meeting notes from the PnP meeting, included in the May 24 CC meeting package.
- Key points from the PnP meeting are summarized below:
 1. A revised project information template for proponents to submit projects to the IRWM Plan with Prop 84 and 1E implementation funding in mind, will be developed and posted on the Bay Area IRWM website.
 2. The Flood Protection and Stormwater FA and BAFPAA will distribute a “Prop 1E” flyer to stakeholders as soon as it is finalized.
 3. The FPSW FA and BAFPAA will take the lead in collecting project information sheets from proponents wishing to add their project to the Bay Area IRWM Plan and qualify for Prop 1E.
 4. The subregion leads will be asked to assist with outreach by distributing the Prop 1E flyer.
 5. In adding projects going forward, the projects would not be scored per existing Prop 50 framework.
 6. Prop 50 project proponents must update their project information by filling out additional sections in the updated form in order to be considered for Prop 84 implementation funding. New projects would have to fill out the entire form.
 7. Outstanding issues:
 - i. Which entity will receive and process the updated project information forms and the new projects?
 - ii. Which agency will serve as the lead Prop 84 grant applicant?

General Questions and Comments on Prop 84/1E

- Vivien queried on whether it would be difficult to differentiate the projects for Prop 84 or Prop 1E – Thomasin indicated that finalizing the project information template would help in understanding if there are any complexities involved.
- Margaret Johnston from the Tomales Bay Watershed Council queried on how projects in the TBWC Plan could be incorporated into the IRWM Plan, without having to go through an additional process of reviewing and screening all projects before they can be included in the IRWM Plan. The CC agreed that the projects in the TBWC Plan would be added to

the IRWM Plan in the form of an appendix, so that the projects would meet the eligibility criteria of being included in the Plan.

- The CC clarified that all project proponents who want to apply for Prop 84 grants would need to fill out or update the project information form.
- Mark Boucher noted that project updates were conducted, where project proponents who had projects in the Plan were surveyed. He has documented the results of the preliminary survey in a spreadsheet and could make it available to the CC if requested.
- Paul Helliker asked about comments regarding the cost-benefit analysis requirement and whether DWR was reconsidering it – Vivien indicated that DWR will likely keep the requirement as is, but will also be realistic on the level of detail required for the analysis.
- Vivien added that DWR will work with the CC to determine the projects to be funded, and the cost-benefit ratio could be used as one of the criteria for project prioritization. Brian Campbell noted that this issue should be reiterated because of the level of effort required in conducting a benefit-cost analysis for a project, and if DWR wants the prioritization to be a collaborative process, then the timeframe for application should be longer.
- Paul noted that it wasn't clear if the cost-benefit analysis was required for all projects in the Plan, or only for projects applying for grants. It may be useful to add a note regarding the cost-benefit analysis requirement in the project information template.
- Molly Petrick suggested that a cost estimate for grant application preparation could be included in the project information template.
- The CC agreed that a flyer should be developed for Prop 84 – Carol Mahoney will lead the effort on this. The flyer will serve as an outreach tool to potential project proponents interested in applying for Prop 84 grants.
- Glenn Moeller noted that DWR is reviewing the response to comments and targeting for legal and executive approval of the responses by the end of June 2010.

Update of the “Regional” projects list

- The CC discussed ways to update the Regional projects list; one suggestion was to open up the subregional process to include solicitations for regional projects.
- Melanie Denninger noted that the definition of what constitutes a regional projects needs to be better defined (e.g. the project needs to advance regional coordination, multi-objective with a regional overlay, etc.)
- Brian Mendenhall suggested it would be worthwhile to have a “lessons-learned” component for each of the projects.
- Nadine Hitchcock noted that it would also be useful to encourage watershed-based projects.
- Paul Helliker suggested that the CC could apply the project categories considered for regional projects to the subregional process (e.g. green infrastructure, conservation, drought relief, water quality improvement).
- Functional area leads would be responsible for identifying projects that are ready-to-go. Subregion leads should get organized and start project outreach. Status check on outreach and project solicitation to be conducted at the next CC meeting.

Update on Prop 50 Supplemental Funding Program

- Brian Campbell provided an overall update to the CC – the project proponents met with DWR and DWR indicated the need for clear identification of benefits and project types. Project proponents have been reformulating their project descriptions based on feedback from DWR, and will submit the application package by June 1, 2010.

Action Item(s)

- Carol Mahoney to develop flyer for Prop 84 with draft language “The evolving regional priorities focus on...”.
- PnP/PS to finalize project information template for CC review.

4. Announcements (Information, led by CC)

- The CC agreed by consensus that Ann Draper (Assistant Operating Officer of the Watershed Stewardship Division in the Santa Clara Valley Water District) succeed the vice-chair role from Nadine Hitchcock.
- Funding commitments for continued Bay Area IRWMP support were announced:
 - BAWAC to fund \$63,000 for CC support and initial match for the Planning grant application
 - BACWA to fund \$60,000 for ongoing CC support
 - BAFPAA – some members are also water providers and will contribute to the WS/WQ functional area. Still in the process of discussing contributions, but assuming a contribution amount of about \$25K, similar to the last round of contributions. Mitch Avalon will check in and provide an update.
 - Watershed – Melanie Denninger indicated that the FA will solicit contributions from organizations in general, but may not be able to meet the same level of contributions as BAWAC or BACWA.

5. Agenda Items for the next CC meeting

- The next CC meeting is scheduled for June 28, 2010.
- Potential agenda items include:
 - Update on Prop 84/1E Status
 - Update on outreach efforts
 - Update on funding commitments