

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee
Meeting Summary
December 4, 2017**

Location: Coastal Conservancy, Elihu Harris State Building, 1515 Clay St, Oakland, CA

1. Roll Call – Appointed Functional Area Representatives Present

Water Supply- Water Quality	Wastewater- Recycled Water	Flood Protection- Stormwater	Watershed	Disadvantaged Communities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Seedall, CCWD • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheryl Munoz, SFPUC representing BACWA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Boucher, CCFCWCD (by phone) • Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD (by phone) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brenda Buxton, SCC • Josh Bradt, SFEP 	

Others Present:

Carmel Brown, DWR
Taylor Chang, SFPUC
Rebecca Darr, SFEP
Maddie Duda, EJCW
Maggie Dutton, CCWD
Nahal Ghoghaie, EJCW
Mehdi Mizani, DWR
Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
Jake Spaulding, SCWA

By Phone:

Carl Morrison, Morrison & Associates
Melanie Richardson, Vice-chair, SCVWD

1. Status Round 1, Round 2, Drought Round, 2015 Round 4

For Round 1, Josh Bradt gave an update. All project completion reports have been submitted to Mr. Bradt except for 3 projects. However, all reports are due at the end of this year. Retention invoices will be released for projects 24, 28, and 30. SFEP’s San Pablo stormwater project has requested a 1 year extension due to utility conflicts.

For Round 2 reporting, invoices and payments, Rebecca Darr gave an update. Q10 invoices totaling approximately \$476,000 were paid by ABAG on November 2 . Q11 reports deliverables and invoices totaling approximately \$1,400,000 were uploaded at the end of October and DWR is wrapping up its review. Post-Performance Report #1 was submitted to DWR for Project 7.

Three project completion site visits occurred on November 2: Project 3, Marin Municipal Water District/Lagunitas Creek Sediment Reduction; Project 4 Marin Resource Conservation District,

Conserving our Watersheds: Agricultural Best Management Practices; and Project 6, Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District's Recycled Water Project.

For project completion reports and retention, Project #03:MMWD/Lagunitas Creek Sediment Reduction draft project completion report was due November 1, but is delayed. Project #06: Sonoma County Sanitation District's Recycled Water Project should be submitting draft #1 of the project completion report in January 2018. Project #07: Oakland/Sausal Creek Restoration submitted the first draft report in early November and is currently being reviewed. Project #11: SFPUC/Regional Groundwater Recovery & Storage Final Project Completion Report was approved and the retention amount of \$140,000 was released. Project #12: East Bay Regional Park District/Breuner Marsh Restoration draft Completion Report was uploaded in mid-November and is currently being reviewed. Project #17: Contra Costa Water District/Rheem Creek Mitigation Final Project Completion Report was approved and the retention amount of \$67,500 was released.

Projects for the most part seemed to have escaped the worst of the Wine Country Fires' impacts. Project 13 Roseview Heights Infrastructure Upgrades finally received a bid that is within their budget. Roseview is still negotiating, but now the concern is schedule and whether the work can be completed within the Grant Term. State Department of Finance's audit report for Round 2 was received on November 8. There were "no reportable observations or deficiencies".

For Round 3 reporting, invoices and payments, Q7 submission and invoices totaling approximately \$1,300,000 were approved by DWR in early November. Payment, dependent upon receipt of payment from DWR may go out before Christmas at the earliest, end of January at the latest. Q8 submission and invoices were received on November 15. Horizon and SFEP reviews are in progress with upload to DWR on December 29 for review and approval. Post-Performance Reports #1 were submitted to DWR for Projects 3 & 5.

No project completion site visits for Round 3 are scheduled at this time, but there is a ribbon-cutting ceremony for Santa Clara Valley Water District's Wolfe Road Recycled Water pipeline on December 13.

For project completion reports and retention, Project #05: DERWA/Extension of Recycled Distribution for Dublin and San Ramon Valley draft Completion Report was uploaded to DWR and review is in progress. Project #08: Stinson Beach Water Supply and Drought Preparedness submitted draft #1 of the Progress Completion Report in mid-November. It was reviewed and the local project sponsor is working on responses to comments and draft #2.

State Department of Finance's audit report for Round 3 was received on November 8. There were "no reportable observations or deficiencies".

For Round 4 reporting, invoices and payments, Q3 invoices totaling approximately \$65,347 were paid by MTC/ABAG on November 9. Q4 reports, deliverables, and invoices totaling approximately \$1,360,000 were uploaded to DWR on November 30. Reviews are in progress.

For project completion site visits, Ms. Darr anticipates scheduling Project#04 East Palo Alto/Gloria Way Well Treatment System for late January 2018.

Amendment 1 for the reallocation of the Anderson Dam funds was executed on October 31. The ABAG/East Palo Alto local project sponsor Agreement Amendment 1 was reviewed by MTC and documents are currently at East Palo Alto's counsel via DocuSign. ABAG/SFCJPA local project sponsor Agreement for the San Francisquito Creek Flood Reduction work (Project Sponsorship transferred from the State Coastal Conservancy to the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority) is making its way through final execution via DocuSign and is currently with SFCJPA's attorney.

2. Website Discussion

Brian Mendenhall updated that the Coordinating Committee is still receiving any submissions on the new project template. Zone 7 staff on the website subcommittee are out in December so the effort will be picking back up in January.

3. 4-party Funds

Mark Boucher discussed the status of the 4-party agreement. He explained that it is legal document. Version 3 of the agreement is included in the meeting packet. It explicitly defines MMWD as treasurer, and without amending the agreement the responsibility of treasurer over the 4-party funds can't be transferred to another agency. If SCVWD wants to be treasurer, the agreement has to be amended. The agreement includes a termination clause, which states that if agreement is terminated, the funds would go back to the contributing parties. It was suggested that it may be best to go this route because there isn't a real need to use the 4-party funds right now.

It was suggested that a formal letter could be drafted along with the termination, detailing that the rest of the funds be transferred to SCVWD. The Coordinating Committee could then create an MOU to ensure the funds are handled appropriately.

Cheryl Munoz stated that BACWA would have to present any action to terminate the agreement before their Board. It would be helpful to have an official statement from the Coordinating Committee representing various agencies.

Action Items:

- Mr. Boucher will to discuss with the 4-parties on terminating the 4-party agreement due to a lack of current need for the funds.

4. Approach to Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Funds

Nahal Ghoghaie presented to the Coordinating Committee the process of how the outreach partner statement of qualifications were reviewed and scored by the 7 people on the review sub-committee.

18 proposals for outreach partners were received by the deadline. The sub-committee reviewed and scored all proposals and came up with a final recommendation to fund 10 outreach partners. The final list is included in the meeting packet.

In the North Bay, the sub-committee recommends funding Marin County Community Development Commission, Shore Up Marin, and Sonoma Ecology Center for a total of \$145,000. MCCDC's proposal is focused on engaging the Dillon Beach community on water resources issue. MCCDC is considering this area an URC, which is hard to ground truth.

In the South Bay, the sub-committee recommends funding Keep Coyote Creek Beautiful for \$45,500. It is the only project in South Bay, which means that this sub-region will get $\frac{1}{4}$ of the funding that should be distributed to each sub-region to maintain a geographic balance in funding. The Nuestra Casa proposal is not being recommended for funding because it scored too low. Ms. Ghoghaie plans to explore more opportunities to partner with other organizations in the South Bay during the gaps analysis phase or a subsequent outreach phase.

In the East Bay, the sub-committee recommends funding Ronald V. Dellums Institute for Sustainable Policy Studies and Action, the City of Hayward, the Watershed Project, and Friends of Sausal Creek for a total of \$215,000. The Watershed Project has bigger scope than SFEP so EJCW plans to ask the Watershed Project to include SFEP in their scope of work that includes north Richmond.

In the West Bay, the sub-committee recommends funding BCDC and Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice for a total of \$105,000. The BCDC proposal highlighted Resilient Communities Initiative as a potential partner. RCI is not being recommended for funding because the proposal scored low because the proposal was dependent on BCDC's proposal. It's possible for either RCI to become a partner under Greenaction or BCDC.

The total recommended funding amount for phase 1 outreach partners is \$530,000. This amount covers 1 year of outreach work and does not include funds necessary to perform a gaps analysis to uncover DACs that exist but haven't been covered through these proposals. The gaps analysis looks at where we have outreach partners currently and which high priority DACs aren't included. Ideally, the gaps analysis could happen concurrently with Phase 1 outreach, but it needs to pencil out with the budget.

There was a question regarding the amount of recommended funding for each outreach partner. Ms. Ghoghaie explained that the RFQ set the range of funding at \$10,000 to \$50,000 (high-target/not to exceed amount). The exact funding amount for each outreach partner needs to be confirmed through a work plan and task-by-task budget and EJCW will work with review sub-committee and the Coordinating Committee to determine exact funding amounts.

There was a question whether the recommendations for funding include the overlap area with the East County IRWM. Ms. Ghoghaie explained that the one proposal was received from Contra Costa County Resource Conservation District, but it didn't hit mark because the proposal didn't demonstrate a focus on DACs. Maggie Dutton explained that she continues to ensure that the East County IRWM is aware of the Bay Area IRWM's efforts. Ms. Dutton gives updates at the East County IRWM meetings on what the Bay area is doing. Ms. Ghoghaie will be giving a presentation at the next East County meeting asking for anyone that wants to apply for the gaps analysis.

There was a question about invoicing for trainings and workshops. It was confirmed that reimbursement is allowed for training/workshop attendance.

DWR requested that the Coordinating Committee keep track of issues encountered during this grant round and inform DWR. Tribal engagement: there will be a certain chunk available for Tribal engagement.

Steve Ritchie asked if anyone had any objections to the funding recommendations. No objections were expressed. Subsequently, the Coordinating Committee approved the recommended approach with the not to exceed funding amounts. It was requested that this item be kept on the agenda for future discussion.

Regarding timeline, EJCW will begin drafting the sub-contracts with the approved outreach partners. Contracting will be done directly between EJCW and the outreach partners. Subsequently, EJCW will look into the gaps analysis.

Ms. Dutton provided an update on the East County IRWM DAC Involvement Program. The San Joaquin funding area isn't as far along as the Bay Area. Through an RFP process, East County selected Woodard & Curran to represent them in this process. A \$270,000 contract was awarded to Woodard & Curran to do the needs assessment, grant agreement, timeline, budget, and contracting with DWR. San Luis Delta Mendota will hold the contract with Woodard & Curran. East County is seeking another agency to serve as the grantee with DWR. CCWD may serve as the grantee, with the decision being made in January.

Action Items:

- Ms. Ghoghaie will ask MCCDC to provide additional explanation on how they consider Dillon Beach to be an URC.
- Ms. Ghoghaie will provide a write-up explaining why Nuestra Casa, Gallinas Watershed Council, and Contra Costa County Resource Conservation District proposals were initially removed from review and not included in the follow-up calls to the outreach applicants.
- Ms. Ghoghaie will contact all outreach partner applicants and notify them of the outcome of the review and scoring process.
- Ms. Ghoghaie will follow up with the approved outreach partners for more details on their work plans and budget. She will also draft the sub-contracts with the approved outreach partners.

5. Discussion of Plan Update

Regarding the groundwater section of the 2013 Plan, it may need minor revisions if any Groundwater Management Plans (GWMPs) were adopted after 2013. The Plan has several places where it acknowledges the fact that agencies have GWMPs and other local planning efforts, but specifically lists these in Appendix D and provides the date of the plan adoption. Potentially, the new requirements can be met by simply updating Appendix D to reflect any GWMPs that were adopted after the our 2013 plan update was finalized.

The 2016 Prop 1 Guidelines state that an applicant must meet the following in this interim time between GWMPs and full Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) compliance since it is recognized that DWR has not certified anyone per SGMA yet.

For groundwater projects or for other projects that directly affect groundwater levels or quality, the applicant or the project proponent responsible must meet one of the following conditions (Water Code §10753.7 (b)(1)):

- Conform to the requirements of an adjudication of water rights in the subject groundwater basin.
- For projects in a high or medium priority basin, as designated by DWR, a GWMP that complies with Water Code §10753.7 must be prepared, implemented, and have been adopted before January 1, 2015. If the GWMPs was not by adopted after January 1, 2015, then the project(s) is(are) not eligible to receive funding (Water Code §10750.1 (a)). However, this does not apply to a plan submitted as an alternative pursuant to Water Code §10733.6, unless DWR has not determined that the alternative satisfies the objectives of Part 2.74 (commencing with Section 10720) on or before January 31, 2020, or DWR later determines that the plan does not satisfy the objectives (Water Code §10750.1 (c)).
- Participate or consent to be subject to a GWMP, basin-wide management plan, or other IRWM program or plan that meets the requirements of Water Code §10753.7.
- For projects located in low or very low priority groundwater basins, as designated by DWR, without an existing GWMP, the proposal must commit to adopting, within one-year of the grant application submittal date, a GWMP that meets the requirements of Water Code §10753.7 or a GSP that meets the requirements of Water Code § 10727 et seq.

Maps with high, medium, and low priority groundwater basins are available on DWR website.

Sherri Norris will be updating the parts of the Plan related to Tribes.

The revised Plan must be reviewed and approved before draft funding recommendations are issued for the Prop 1 Implementation grant round.

6. Announcements

The concept PSP for the Prop 1 Implementation grant round will be released in early 2018. The official draft PSP will be released in Spring 2018. The final draft PSP will be released around June 2018. Subsequently, DWR will hold meetings with each funding region. The grant funding will be released in a staggered fashion, instead of rounds, in order to encourage strategic planning.

DWR has been in discussion with the IRWM Roundtable of Regions regarding the competitive nature of the IRWM grants. DWR is finding that regions have their own structures and competition exists at the local level. DWR is exploring how to define competitive grants in a different way.

Carl Morrison participates in the Roundtable of Regions and the Water Bond Coalition. SB 5 doesn't contain any language appropriating funds for IRWM, but it may be worth reaching out to the legislature to advocate for funds to be appropriated for IRWM. Legislators want to understand why IRWM needs more money when the existing IRWM funds haven't been spent yet. The Roundtable is working with DWR to describe why IRWM is needed and why the money hasn't been spent yet. It's important to show the value of multi-purpose funding. DWR is creating regional atlas where projects can post their stories on a website.

Mehdi Mizani is transitioning out of his role as grant manager for Prop 84 to DWR's sustainable groundwater management group. In January, there will be a new grant manager.

Igor Skardoff, Board Chair of Contra Costa County Resource Conservation District, introduced himself and made an announcement. Historically, RCDs have been inadequately active in IRWM area even though it's a natural fit. He would like to be more involved in the Bay Area IRWM so that the IRWM process can be more inclusive of RCDs.