

SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
August 27, 2018
Location: EBMUD, 375 11th Street, 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 (by phone) • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheryl Munoz, SFPUC representing BACWA (by phone) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD (by phone) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Bradt, SFEP (by phone) | |

Others Present:

Leonard Ash, ACWD
Taylor Chang, SFPUC
Pat Costello, City of Napa
Maddie Duda, EJCW
Paul Gilbert-Snyder, EBMUD
Jennifer Krebs, representing SCWA
James Muller, SFEP
Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
Britton Schwartz, EJCW
Jake Spaulding, SCWA

By Phone:

Jessica Arm, DWR
Abby Carevic, DWR
Maggie Dutton, CCWD
Nahal Ghoghaie, EJCW
Robyn Navarra, Zone 7
Sherri Norris, CIEA
Meetra Richard, SCVWD
Alex Tavizon, CIEA

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

For Prop 84 Round 1, Josh Bradt gave an update. Project 21 San Pablo Stormwater Spine is experiencing permitting problems with the City of Oakland. Coordination with EBMUD is happening to turn off the

water main. SFEP was hoping for notice to proceed construction by July 30, but construction is delayed. Mr. Bradt is keeping Jessica Arm informed.

Regarding the rest of Round 1, SFEP is putting together invoice 20 to submit to DWR. SFEP is also reviewing completed project closure reports and working with conservation project managers and to get missing deliverables from conservation projects that were completed already. Mr. Bradt is working with Ms. Arm to close the round out and identify elements of the final contract modification to reflect the changes in deliverables expected and budget for remaining work.

James Muller gave an update on Prop 84 Round 2: Q14 invoices were submitted to DWR on July 31. Project 7 Oakland Sasual Creek Restoration retention payment is expected in early September. Amendment 5 (extending the grant term through 2020 and reallocated funds from Project 13) was executed.

Round 2 Project 18 Upper York Creek Dam Removal is moving forward. Natasha Dunn has been tracking progress on a weekly basis. It is still listed as project with significant concerns, but will consider removing from the list in the future. The project is on track to start construction in 2019 and must be completed by the end of the grant term on December 31, 2020.

Round 2 Project 10 Bayfront Canal appears to be moving forward. The project was facing a significant hurdle of not being included in the CEQA for the Phase 2 Salt Ponds project. Moving forward, the Bayfront Canal project will create their own action to be included in Salt ponds CEQA and Biological Opinion.

For Round 3, Q10 invoices were approved on August 6 and payment is expected in mid-October. Q11 invoices are under review by SFEP. no amendments pending. Want to extend grant term through 2020. SFEP is planning a site visit to SFPUC's Lower Cherry Aqueduct project in late 2018/early 2019.

For Round 4, Q7 invoices are under review and will be submitted to DWR on August 31. Q6 payment is expected in early September. SFEP conducted a site visit to Project 6 San Francisquito Creek on August 9.

Jake Spaulding provided an update on AQPI. Invoice 6 is under review at SCWA and will be submitted to DWR this week. Expenses are tracking within the budget and progress is in line with amendment 1 schedule. A permanent X-Band radar will be installed in Santa Clara in November or December 2018. Another permanent X-Band radar will be installed in Sonoma in December 2018 or January 2019. A temporary radar is planned for the East Bay in January 2019. There are also discussions to install a temporary radar in San Francisco. There will be another meeting with East Bay entities on September 18. The bigger project update meeting is being re-scheduled for October.

2. Approach to Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Funds

Britton Schwartz provided an update. Britton included update on status of contracts with sub-contractors. There are a few remaining that aren't in contract yet. The projects that don't have contracts yet are fiscally sponsored and so are taking longer to execute. At the next CC meeting, Ms. Schwartz will present their updated work plan and comprehensive 3 year budget.

EJCW will be submitting Q4 invoices this month, and have turned around sub-contractor invoices quickly due to still being within the advanced payment window.

Maddie Duda has met individually with the outreach partners and created a list of trainings that the partners are interested in. She is now creating a schedule of trainings for the outreach partners. Some partners have started on the needs assessment work and most will be starting on their needs assessments this month and next month.

Ms. Duda raised questions she has heard from the partners. If they want projects that will be ready for funding by the Implementation round, what's the scale they should be planning for? Will there be competition for funding? Should projects be considering consolidating with other projects?

There was a comment that in the Implementation round, there will be a certain allocated amount in Round 1 that must go to DAC projects. Regarding combining DAC projects, there was a comment that it depends on the region's overall grant application. In the past, the group has received 50-60 applications, and does not fund all of them. It may make sense to combine DAC projects so the grant application doesn't include too many projects. The group learned from Prop 84 that it is important to consider the grant administration costs associated with managing several projects. Projects should consider bundling under a single local project sponsor, as water conservation projects under Prop 84 Round 2 did.

Sherri Norris has been telling Tribal groups to bundle projects together if possible. She has also told projects that this is a competitive process, but they shouldn't be discouraged from applying for funding.

It was commented that the Bay Area has been successful at getting projects because careful thought has been put into ensuring the application is written responsively to the PSP.

It was commented that projects should look at the group's Prop 1 scoring criteria once it's set and think about the tradeoffs of administrative burden and grant funding.

It was asked that in order to build partnerships, are there organizations with higher administrative capacity to act as a sponsor for smaller groups. This would help achieve one of the goals of the DAC round, which is to develop stronger relationships between grassroots community leaders and local governments and water providers.

Mark Seedall asked when the group will hear back from the outreach partners on results. EJCW responded that they have just got partners into contract in the past couple months, and can provide a more detailed report at the next meeting. It was also mentioned that the outreach partners themselves

should come to the CC meetings and present their work. There was discussion about having presentations at the December 3 CC meeting.

It was requested that EJCW develop a table/spreadsheet similar to the one SFEP uses to track the project status for Prop 84 Rounds 2 through 4.

Ms. Norris provided an update on Tribal outreach. She has a new Tribal coordinator Alex Tavizon. They have had 3 meetings with Tribal representatives from the Bay Area. They have learned that Tribes are working through land trusts to have access to and build a cultural connection to the land. The plan is to have 4-6 partners established between now and end of September.

Abby Carevic introduced herself as DWR's new Tribal Liaison. She announced that Tribes that were affected by the fires should contact DWR if assistance is needed.

Action Items:

- Ms. Arm will provide the contact information for the DWR staff working on Prop 1 Implementation.
- The Coordinating Committee will discuss the need for limiting the number of projects included in the grant application for Prop 1 Implementation.
- EJCW will provide an update on the work plans of the outreach partners at the next meeting.
- EJCW will work with the outreach partners that are ready to have presentations of their work at the December 3 CC meeting.
- EJCW will develop a partner status spreadsheet similar to the one SFEP uses to track the project status for Prop 84 Rounds 2 through 4.
- Ms. Schwartz will present EJCW's updated work plan and comprehensive 3 year budget at the next meeting.
- Ms. Norris will research more into how Tribes are partnering with land trusts in an urban environment.
- Ms. Norris will coordinate with EJCW on the needs assessment for Tribes to ensure the assessments can be comparative.

3. Status on Plan Update

Michelle Novotny continues to work on the updates as she outlined in the table presented at June's CC meeting. She will coordinate with CIEA on the updates.

Ms. Duda, Jennifer Krebs, Leonard Ash, Ms. Norris, and James Muller volunteered to review the draft updates once they're complete. The goal is to have the draft updates ready for review by the October 22 CC meeting.

4. Discuss DAC and Tribal Participation in the Coordinating Committee

Included in the meeting packet are the pages from the 2013 Plan about the CC's governance structure.

Ms. Norris commented that she is working on understanding how Tribes see themselves participating in governance structure. Tribes want confirmation that they can't be left out in the future, as has historically happened. North Coast IRWM has a governance structure for Tribes that could be adopted to fit the Bay Area.

It was commented that there is a difference between participating as a voting representative versus participating to participate. Anyone can call in to the meetings and be part of the process. The goal is for the IRWM process to be inclusive. There's another discussion to be had on what percentage of voting members are allocated to DACs and Tribes. DACs have historically not participated, so there's a need to have them in the voting structure regardless of what they're working on. There was a question about whether this needs to be addressed before the PSP and before projects get selected.

There has been discussion about including DACs and Tribes within the function areas as separate boxes or under each box in the functional areas. Currently, there is a designated DAC box as a functional area, but this is subject to change with discussion. There was a comment that the separate box doesn't create integration of DACs.

Ms. Carevic commented that SB 18 requires Tribes be consulted when any general plan gets adopted.

There was discussion about incorporating DACs from a sub-regional perspective because it's easier to think about distinct geographic areas. It has been the group's primary funding principle to balance the allocation of grant funding within the four sub-regions based on size and population.

Paul Gilbert-Snyder commented that too much emphasis is being placed on the governance structure. Decisions happen here at the CC meetings. Governance structure is meant to help the group when there are problems, but ultimately groups need to be at the table in order to be included.

Action Items:

- Taylor Chang will distribute the table that outlines the elected functional area representatives for the next meeting.
- Ms. Norris will show the Tribes the functional area and sub-regional concepts to see how they see themselves fitting into the existing governance structure.

5. Discussion of Approach to Prop 1 Implementation

The Process and Planning (PnP) subcommittee reported that the draft project scoring criteria spreadsheet was included in the meeting packet. Items highlighted in yellow are new criteria. There are notes included items that need to be checked with the PSP once it's released. Factor 16 grants experience is new. It was included because projects that have previous grants experience will probably

make grant administration for the round easier and a point should be given to reward people for that. CASGEM was removed from grant criteria, but it was noted that CASGEM is included in the 2016 Prop 1 Guidelines so it should be added back.

Also included in the meeting packet was the Prop 84 scoring spreadsheet to provide context for how ranking and scoring has happened in the past.

There was a question about whether projects have to be included in the Plan or consistent with the Plan prior to receiving funding.

The PnP is developing a 1 page call for projects.

Action Items:

- The PnP will check with DWR on whether projects must be included in the Plan or consistent with the Plan prior to receiving funding.
- The PnP will include a note on the draft scoring criteria Factor 16 (grants experience) to exempt DACs to avoid putting them at a disadvantage.
- The PnP will revise the draft scoring criteria to include CASGEM.
- The PnP will develop the call for projects form and distribute to the CC for feedback at the next meeting.

6. Announcements

Ms. Chang made an announcement for Brenda Buxton because Ms. Buxton couldn't attend the meeting. The Conservancy has \$2,730 leftover in accumulated interest from the funds they held for the previous agreement. Is there a CC approved IRWM expense that the funds can be used for such as contractor expenses related to the new website and database? The group discussed and wants the Conservancy to hold the funds until they are needed to pay for a consultant to put together the grant application for the Implementation round.

The next CC meeting is on September 24 at Contra Costa Water District (Delta Conference Room).