

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary  
 May 20, 2019  
 Location: StopWaste, 1537 Webster Street, Oakland, CA**

**1. Roll Call – Appointed Functional Area Representatives Present**

<b>Water Supply- Water Quality</b>	<b>Wastewater- Recycled Water</b>	<b>Flood Protection- Stormwater</b>	<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Disadvantaged Communities</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steve Ritchie, SFPUC, Chair</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheryl Munoz, SFPUC representing BACWA (by phone)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water (by phone)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Josh Bradt, SFEP</li> <li>• Brenda Buxton, SCC (by phone)</li> <li>• Judy Kelly, NBWA</li> </ul>	

Others Present:

Taylor Chang, SFPUC  
 Maddie Duda, EJCW  
 Natasha Dunn, SFEP  
 Nahal Ghoghaie  
 Ryan Hirano, EJCW  
 James Muller, SFEP  
 Jennifer Krebs, representing Sonoma Water  
 Michelle Novotny, SFPUC  
 Alex Tavizon, CIEA

On the Phone:

Jessica Arm, DWR  
 Lisa Bankosh, SCVWD  
 Craig Cross, DWR  
 Maggie Dutton, CCWD  
 Adam French, Amah Matsun  
 Paul Gilbert-Snyder, EBMUD  
 Deja Gould, IPOC  
 Chris Lim, CCRCD  
 Claire Nordlie, EBMUD  
 Sherri Norris, CIEA  
 Kanyon Sayers, Association of Ramaytush Ohlone  
 Brianna Schaefer, Daily Acts

Britton Schwartz, EJCW  
Caitlin Sweeney, SFEP

## **2. Status on Prop 84 Rounds 1-4**

For Round 1, Josh Bradt reported he just got back DWR's corrections on the final invoice. He made the revisions and they have been accepted by DWR. Once the retention invoice is released and final report has been approved, the round will be closed out.

For Round 2, James Muller reported 85% of the grant has been spent. 2 projects have been 100% constructed, Project 4 Marin/Sonoma Conserving our Watersheds and Project 9 Petaluma Flood Reduction. Payment for Q16 and retention for Project 14 SF Bay Climate Change Pilot Projects have been paid out. Mr. Muller will be presenting an assessment of Project 10 Bayfront Canal/Atherton Channel Flood Improvement and Project 18 Upper York Creek Dam Removal at the June 10 Coordinating Committee meeting, describing their current progress and recommendation on whether their grant funds need to be reallocated to other projects. Mr. Muller doesn't foresee that being the case.

For Round 3, Mr. Muller reported 90% of the grant has been spent. 100% of the match has been accounted for. He is expecting Q13 payment from DWR in July.

For Round 4, Mr. Muller reported Project 4 East Palo Alto groundwater supply is 100% constructed. SFEP hasn't received Q8 payment yet. Q9 payment is expected in July. SFEP is up to date with quarterly submittals.

Jennifer Krebs gave an update on AQPI. Since the last Coordinating Committee meeting, there was a project event. The scientists from Colorado were here and they showed local agencies how to look up the active radars in Bay Area. They did technical demonstrations and outreach to 60 people. The status on the invoicing and reporting is included in the meeting packet.

It was asked if someone could do a general presentation on AQPI to the North Bay. Ms. Krebs offered to do a presentation.

## **3. Discussion of Transition of Prop 1 IRWM DACI Grant Administration**

Ms. Novotny reported the transition subcommittee met 2 times. They have discussed setting up project partner meetings and how to mitigate the stop work for the sub-contractors. She developed a support letter from the transition subcommittee for the Transition proposal.

It is intended for the Coordinating Committee to endorse the Transition proposal today. Some folks have suggested edits. To reflect that SFEP may make small changes, Ms. Novotny requested that the Coordinating Committee endorse, instead of approve, the proposal's overall concept.

Mr. Muller reported he sent out an email to the listserv with new version of the Transition proposal that didn't get included in the meeting packet. It reflects changes requested by DWR to include language on process and due diligence. In the maps section, CIEA asked for some language about why Tribes weren't

mapped. Under Project 2, there are mostly copy edits. In section 2.1, he added language to improve the synergies between DAC and Tribal work. There are limited funds available to support technical capacity building, but everyone will have access to the funds. Projects 3 and 4 were updated. Per DWR's guidance, Mr. Muller created a new project for the development of Phase 2 and then another project for Phase 2. DWR recommended a more stepwise approach to the development of the scope for Phase 2.

The proposal needs to be finalized by June 1. Therefore Mr. Muller needs any remaining comments in the next 2-3 days. CIEA commented that the proposal looks good.

The budget reflects all local project partners that are interested in moving forward that haven't completed their scopes of work. CIEA has an increase of \$200k, which reflects the total adjusted budget minus what was invoiced through EJCW. Mr. Muller reviewed CIEA's budget with Sherri Norris. CIEA's budget is phased over 2 phases, with the work focused on engaging with Tribes and capacity building.

Shore Up Marin is also receiving additional funding. Some others project partners have small increased budget due to costs of starting again with a new grantee.

Nuestra Casa is absorbing YUCA's scope of work, so they are asking for an increase in budget.

Sonoma Ecology Center/Daily Acts and the Watershed Project didn't originally budget enough for project management so are adding to their budget.

The Coordinating Committee endorsed the Transition proposal and is looking forward to seeing the final version that will likely have some minor modifications but will overall look the same. Steve Ritchie made the comment that the letter from the Coordinating Committee says it is approving the proposal, but it should be noted that there will be minor changes. There were no objections.

#### Action Items:

- Mr. Muller will make the minor changes to the Transition proposal and submit to DWR.

#### **4. Updates on Prop 1 IRWM DAC Involvement Program Work**

Maddie Duda reported out on the work of Contra Costa RCD. CCRCD has been conducting outreach, listening sessions, and needs assessment work in Antioch, Pittsburg, and Bay Point. They developed and deployed a GIS needs assessment survey to engage a broader audience. In Pittsburg, the community is reporting water issues related to water quality, taste and appearance of the drinking water, lack of access to water for recreation, illegal dumping into creeks, and sewage backups. There are also concerns about retaliation from the city for bringing up issues. In Antioch, the community is reporting issues

related to polluted stormwater, litter, overuse of water during the warm season, and the need for education around water conservation, flooding and drought.

Ms. Duda also reported out on the work of Friends of Sausal Creek. FOSC has been attending existing community events and partnering with existing community partners, including the Unity Council, Sogorea Te' Land Trust, IPOC, and Cesar Chavez library. They developed a preliminary needs assessment survey and facilitated a water engagement curriculum for students. The community is reporting issues related to trash in storm drains, pollution of creeks specifically oil from illegal mechanics, rising cost of water, and water waste. The community is experiencing a lack of housing and sees housing as a solution for some of the litter and pollution in creeks originating from the homeless population.

Alex Tavizon also reported out on CIEA's project partners' work. All 5 Tribal partners are in contract. IPOC just built the 1st arbor in the Bay Area. It holds significance for ceremonies and spiritual connection to the land. IPOC is also purchasing 5,000 gallon water containers for emergency preparedness. CIEA met with a Muwekma historian and are planning an orientation to kick off the needs assessment in the next 2 months. CIEA also met with Adam French representing Amah Matsun. CIEA is developing a Tribal Advisory Committee. Summer is the most important time to reach Tribal partners as it's when they have community events. Over the next 2-3 weeks CIEA will narrow down their needs assessment question list.

#### Action Items:

- Ms. Duda will send her slides on CCRC and FOSC outreach work to Ms. Chang to send to the listserv.

### **5. Discussion of Approach to Prop 1 Implementation**

Brian Mendenhall reported the work is transitioning from the Planning Committee to the Project Scoring Committee (PSC). The PSC will have a coordination call at 3pm on Wednesday. It is requested that all projects submit their project proposals on the PIF electronic form directly to Robyn Navarra.

DWR has been informed of the proposed workshop date of August 23. There are pre-application materials that need to be submitted to DWR 2 weeks prior to the workshop.

Devon Becker asked if the number of projects will be limited to 10-12. Based on Prop 84, if projects have shared or similar benefits, they should consider combining into 1 project. The PSC may recommend combining projects.

Regarding the Plan Update, Ms. Novotny is incorporating comments she received from CIEA.

#### Action Items:

- Ms. Chang will follow up with EBMUD or StopWaste to host the DWR workshop.

## **6. Announcements and Next Steps**

Mr. Mendenhall commented that the current Vice chair for the Coordinating Committee is Melanie Richardson with Valley Water. She doesn't have time to participate in meetings and calls, so he is recommending switching the Vice chair to Lisa Bankosh, Assistant Officer for Watershed Stewardship for Valley Water. She has availability to participate. The IRWMP doesn't explicitly require a vote to change the Vice chair. The change to have Lisa Bankosh be the Vice chair of the Coordinating Committee was approved.

Maggie Dutton announced there is an East County IRWM meeting this Wed at 9am.

The plan is to have a conference call for the July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Brenda Buxton will check if the State Building can host the July 22 meeting. Ms. Duda will check if one of the outreach partners can host the August 26 meeting.

## **AQPI Update**

### **Reporting, Invoices & Payments**

- Invoice 8 approved
- Invoice 9 submitted

### **Budget/Schedule**

- Expenses are tracking within the Budget and progress is in line with amendment 1 schedule

### **Other Developments**

- Valley Water X-Band Radar – Installation date for permanent radar mid-June.
- Sonoma Water X-Band Radar – Estimated Installation date for permanent radar June or October/November 2019 – Temporary unit will remain until permanent unit is operational.
- East Bay X-Band Radar – Estimated installation of container mounted radar October/November 2019
- SFPUC X-Band Radar – Estimated installation of radar October/November 2019
- Santa Cruz X-Band Radar – Estimated installation of radar summer 2020. Note that this radar is funded under a separate DWR grant.



**Coordinating Committee  
San Francisco Bay Area  
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan**  
c/o San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
525 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

May 20, 2019

Carmel Brown

Financial Assistance Branch, Division of Integrated Regional Water Management  
California Department of Water Resources  
P.O. Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Dear Ms. Brown:

The Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee is pleased to support the proposal from the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (attached) to administer the San Francisco Bay Area Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Involvement Program. We urge the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) and Department of Water Resources (DWR) to work together to expedite a grant agreement in order to allow the ongoing Bay Area needs assessment work to continue with as little interruption as possible.

In 2016, DWR solicited proposals to conduct outreach to Disadvantaged Communities using Proposition 1 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) grant funding. After a public application process in November 2016, the Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee selected the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) to both administer the grant and to act as programmatic lead. EJCW applied to DWR and entered contract in October 2017.

In 2017, EJCW issued a Request for Qualifications to look for Project Partners to conduct needs assessments in disadvantaged, under-represented and tribal communities throughout the Bay Area. EJCW staff and a number of Coordinating Committee members formed a proposal screening committee to review applications and recommend Project Partners. Those Project Partners were approved by the Coordinating Committee in November 2017 and EJCW began the process of entering into contract with each of the 14 different agencies, and also with the California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA) and its Tribal Partners. Those contracts were executed at different times and CIEA's was not executed until April 2019.

One of the primary activities undertaken by the Project Partners was to conduct a needs assessment in each of the communities they represented. Most of the needs assessment work was scheduled to be complete in the fall of 2019. Due to difficulties EJCW was having with grant administration, DWR issued a stop work on April 17, 2019. As a result, a number of the Project Partners were forced to abruptly halt their needs assessments. CIEA entered into contract with EJCW just before the stop work order, so they and their tribal partners had not been able to fully move forward with their work.

The Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee wants to ensure this work is accomplished and is dedicated to honoring the contracts the Project Partners and CIEA had to do their work. The needs

assessment work is necessary in order to identify projects for upcoming Proposition 1 implementation funding, and the region is dedicated to working with disadvantaged communities and tribes in the hopes that they can be better integrated into the IRWM process.

Over the past month, members of the Coordinating Committee have worked with SFEP to expedite a transition to a new grantee so that the important work of the Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Involvement Program can continue. SFEP has a solid track record in IRWM grants administration, and the Coordinating Committee has confidence in their ability to manage this contract and the Program with minimal disruption. We support the proposal included herein and we look forward to continuing to work with SFEP, DWR and all of the Project Partners.

Sincerely,

Steven R. Ritchie  
Chairman, Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Assistant General Manager, Water Enterprise  
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
525 Golden Gate Ave., 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102

# San Francisco Bay Area Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Involvement Program (DACTIP)

Draft Proposal to DWR – June 03, 2019  
Association of Bay Area Governments

## Cover Letter

This proposal is in response to the RFP published by DWR in 2016. This is the second proposal to the RFP due to the termination of the previous grant agreement with EJCW. EJCW was issued a stop work order on April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019, effective April 24, 2019. All work with local communities conducting the needs assessment and project development work was impacted by this order and the IRWM Coordinating Committee quickly requested that ABAG submit a proposal to DWR to continue this work with the remaining funding. The ABAG board approved the acceptance of the award of the grant, should DWR approve the proposal, on May 16, 2019. The IRWM Coordinating Committee officially approved the designation of ABAG as the grantee for the remaining funding on May 20, 2019, as described in the attached memo.

All disadvantaged community and Tribal project partners were notified of the stop work order and the desire of the Coordinating Committee to have ABAG become the new grantee. Many of these project partners participated in the Coordinating Committee meeting on April 22, 2019, where the stop work order and shift to ABAG was discussed. There were no objections to this course of action, given the State's order. However, many project partners voiced significant concern over the time required to get into contract with ABAG and the impact on their ongoing work. To mitigate these impacts to all extents possible, ABAG committed to working as quickly as possible to get into an agreement with the state and subsequently enter into contracts with these partners. Additionally, ABAG/SFEP staff has met with every project partner that was working with EJCW and wishes to continue under this new grant. These meetings took place in May, 2019, to ensure the local project partners are fully informed of the process, that their concerns are addressed, and to begin building relationships. These meetings also served as a platform for ABAG/SFEP to ensure that due diligence was conducted before entering into contact with local project partners that wish to continue with this grant program.

ABAG/SFEP is pleased to present this proposal to DWR for consideration and is prepared to work with the state to address any questions or concerns they have.

Sincerely,



James Muller

# San Francisco Bay Area Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Involvement Program

Proposal to DWR – June 03, 2019  
Association of Bay Area Governments

## A. Applicant Information

### The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)

#### Applicant Contact

James Muller  
Principle Environmental Planner  
375 Beale Street, Suite 700  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Office: (415) 778-6674 | Cell: (540) 922-2398  
[James.muller@sfestuary.org](mailto:James.muller@sfestuary.org)

#### Alternate Contact

Natasha Dunn  
Environmental Planner  
375 Beale Street, Suite 700  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Office: (415) 778-6687  
[Natasha.dunn@sfestuary.org](mailto:Natasha.dunn@sfestuary.org)

Please see the attached cover letter for information regarding the selection process. The Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee has provided a memo detailing their support of ABAG as the new grantee and is included as page 1 of this proposal.

## B. DACTIP Background

### Regional Disadvantaged Community Water Management Needs

The Bay Area is among the largest metropolitan areas in the United States; the second largest in California, with a population of 7.7 million (US Census Bureau, 2015 estimate), and the fifth largest in the nation. With a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of \$722 billion (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, VitalSigns), the Bay Area is the 19th largest economy in the world, and has the highest per capita income in the United States at \$74,815 (Bay Area Economic Forum, 2012). The region is at the cutting edge of global technology and is a leader in many key indicators of regional, national, and global competitiveness. Water supply, reliability, and quality have a tremendous effect on the continuing success of the Bay Area's economy, particularly in the context of risks associated with climate change, such as sea level rise and saltwater intrusion, and the associated impacts on poverty and the distribution of wealth.

The Funding Area is coextensive with the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 2). It is an expansive, diverse, and complex area. It includes all or portions of nine counties, including Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Solano, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco, numerous water, wastewater, flood protection, and land use agencies, many non-governmental and nonprofit organizations, and California Native American Tribes and Tribal communities, as well as rangeland, farming and rural areas.

Climate Change will exacerbate water supply and quality challenges, aquatic resource changes, sea level rise, risk from flood, drought and fire in upper watersheds from which much of the Bay derives its drinking water, and more. Residents of the Funding Area are facing rapidly changing conditions, mainly related to urban growth, that create challenges in water resources management and the stewardship of environmental resources. In addition to these water supply quality and reliability challenges, the key issues, needs, and priorities for the Bay Area with respect to water resource management include: the struggles of minority populations against the location and legacy of toxic waste dumps and waste facilities within their communities, equal access to clean, safe, affordable water supplies, protection from flooding hazards, the provision of open spaces, recreation opportunities (Liu, 2001), aging infrastructure, the availability of affordable, multi-family housing, limited or unsafe aquatic foods and the resulting challenges to continued consumption of traditional foods, and/or other cultural traditional uses by Bay Area Tribes, Tribal communities, and others.

Certain environmental hazards disproportionately affect communities of color and low-income neighborhoods and are increasingly being linked to a range of conditions such as asthma, cancer, and birth defects (Communities for a Better Environment, 2012; Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, 2005). A better understanding of where otherwise “hidden” disadvantaged communities are located can help the region to identify water resources management projects that improve water quality, open space and recreation opportunities, Tribal traditional uses, and flood protection within these neighborhoods.

The placement of water infrastructure in or near these communities can also cause concern. From the environmental justice perspective, sewage treatment plants, desalination facilities, and recycling plants – while providing benefit to the region as a whole – can serve to add to the cumulative environmental burden of nearby communities due to odors, effluent, sewage backups, and industrial buildings.

### **Disadvantaged/Underrepresented Communities**

Many San Francisco Bay Area communities have historically been challenged when it comes to qualifying for and participating fully in DAC grant efforts because the most impoverished residents are not easily visible in the Census data. The high median income in the Bay Area results in the poorest of its residents not often qualifying for DAC status. In many cases, those in economic need are found within Census tracts that also are home to the affluent, thereby masking those who are disadvantaged in the averages. Including Economically Disadvantaged Communities (EDAs) and Underrepresented Communities (URCs) will greatly assist many communities or portions thereof to qualify for needed IRWM funding. To address this need, the San Francisco Bay Area Stakeholder Engagement Committee developed the Bay Area’s definition of an Underrepresented Community (URC) (see ‘Underrepresented Communities’ section). This definition considers the aforementioned challenges in identifying DACs and EDAs, due to the overall high incomes in the Bay Area and the region’s distinct demographics.

As used within this proposal, the term Disadvantaged Communities is inclusive of Underrepresented Communities. Tribes, Tribal Communities and Tribal organizations are eligible as Underrepresented Communities, and often as Disadvantaged Communities. For purposes of this document and for the Bay Area IRWM in general, the following definition for Underrepresented communities was approved by the Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee:

*Underrepresented communities (URCs) are defined as groups that do not meet the state definition of a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) or Economically Distressed Area (EDA), but are below the median household income for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. URCs are also defined as groups that have a history of disproportionately less representation in water policy and/or projects and include, but are not limited to, African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, California Indian Tribes, Hispanic, Middle-Eastern, LGBTQ, homeless, new immigrant, youth and elderly populations, unincorporated communities, and small, independent organizations.*

### **Barriers to DAC Engagement and Involvement in the Bay Area IRWM Planning Process**

Engaging DACs in a regional water planning process presents barriers of a different character than engaging non-DAC communities for a variety of reasons. The demographic composition of the Bay Area further complicates this engagement.

#### **Bay Area Regional DACTIP Demographic Indicators**

- In 2010, the racial makeup of the nine-county Bay Area was 52.5% White, including White Hispanic, 23.5% Hispanic or Latino of any race, 6.7% African American, 0.7% Native American, 23.3% Asian, 0.6% Pacific Islander, 10.8% from other races, and 5.4% from two or more races (Bay Area Census, 2010). The Bay Area cities of Vallejo, Suisun City, Oakland, San Leandro, Fairfield, and Richmond are among the most ethnically diverse cities in the United States (Business Insider, 2015).
- The Chinese population of the Bay Area is concentrated in San Francisco, with the largest and most thriving China Town outside of Asia. The Bay Area is home to over 382,950 Filipino Americans, one of the largest communities of Filipino people outside of the Philippines (Filipino-American Law Enforcement Officers Association, 2012.) There are more than one hundred thousand people of Vietnamese ancestry residing within San Jose city limits, the largest population of any city in the world outside of Vietnam. The Vietnamese community is also concentrated in the Larkin Street district in San Francisco and the City of Fremont (San Francisco Chronicle, 2014).
- According to the 2010 US Census, the Native American population in the Bay Area is 48,493, with 15,000 people living in Contra Costa County alone. Bay Area Native American Tribes and Tribal communities are among the fastest growing urban populations in the nation; close to 5,000 Tribal members live in Oakland alone. Bay Area Tribes include the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band, Chochenyo Ohlone, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria, Kerkin Ohlone, Hum-U-Ren, Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, and Ramaytush. Urban Bay Area Native American communities are comprised of Tribal members from various Tribes across the country who relocated to the Bay Area during the 40s and 50s as part of United States policies to assimilate Tribes in an attempt to remove Tribal identity. In the Bay Area there is a vibrant community of Native Americans from across the nation that are culturally tied to their homelands.
- The Bay Area is home to the second highest number of homeless people in the nation. The homeless are dependent on access to public resources for basic necessities, including water, hygiene, and sanitation. However, many cities are decommissioning public water supplies, such as public drinking fountains, causing the homeless to lack access to safe drinking water and sanitation. Additionally, restricted access to public restrooms has caused localized sanitation crises, detrimental both to the health of homeless individuals and to the quality of the surrounding waters.

- The Bay Area’s thriving economy attracts a large number of undocumented immigrants (Sanctuary City Information Resource, 2016). All three main Bay Area cities (Oakland, San Jose, and San Francisco) are designated as Sanctuary Cities, offering undocumented immigrants social and medical services, ability to attend schools, and access to ID cards, all without threat of persecution on account of their immigration status.

Using Census data can complicate the identification of DACs because they are often “hidden” within broader, wealthier Census tracts. The absence of sufficiently granular data frustrates the identification of where DAC neighborhoods are located. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced in the Bay Area, due to the higher cost of living and incomes relative to state averages. Moreover, the State’s use of median household income as the single metric for “disadvantaged” status has tended to overlook the value of other important markers of socioeconomic disadvantage, such as micro-concentrations of poverty, linguistic isolation, poor health outcomes and lack of access to healthcare, and more, as a complement to a more community-based identification strategy.

Additionally, culture, language, and lifestyle factors have challenged DAC engagement in the BA IRWM. For example, it is difficult and often impossible for working families to participate in daytime outreach meetings or meetings that are located long distances from the community members’ homes and/or from public transportation. Many DAC residents do not own or have access to a personal vehicle. When community members do attend meetings, they often face language-accessibility issues and may discontinue their engagement with IRWM, thereafter. Moreover, the language of IRWM, as with the water industry at large, is replete with acronyms and technical language that is difficult to penetrate, much less participate, even for native English speakers.

According to interviews undertaken with community leaders, who were engaged in the early stages of the BA IRWM process, in preparation for the development of this proposal, the initial BA IRWM meetings were not geographically accessible to members of the public and meeting coordinators, and committee representatives were not adequately prepared to answer questions presented by members of the public. Community members also came away with the perception that DWR and the IRWM process would only advance shovel-ready projects, which tended to exclude projects in and for the benefit of DACs, as those same communities had lacked, almost by definition, the resources necessary to advance a project concept to shovel-readiness. Community members also noted that projects that purported to provide a benefit to a DAC did not satisfy that same DAC’s notions of what a community benefit should look like or leverage the proposed project to its maximum community benefit. Finally, community members did not feel that these public meetings were actually where the important decisions were made, such that community input was not particularly welcome in the decision-making process, which itself was not accessible or transparent.

Bay Area DAC water-related issues are more commonly related to affordability, equitable allocation, and problems around flooding, stormwater management, and sea level rise.

### **Barriers to Tribal Engagement**

Tribal Communities face barriers similar to other Bay Area DACs and have added unique challenges. The legacy of dislocation, dispossession, cultural repression, and outright genocide loom large in the Bay Area, such that barriers to Tribal engagement include a lack of trust among Bay Area Tribes in present-day, colonial, settler-state institutions.

Under-representation of Bay Area Tribes in local government, includes an ongoing history of institutional disrespect for Bay Area Tribal cultural resources. The broadly geographically dispersed nature of the Native American population also poses a distinct barrier to BA IRWM efforts, as they are more difficult to identify and address than a geographically distinct population. Many descendants and members of Bay Area-based Tribes are disbursed throughout the State and beyond, which has resulted from federal programs to relocate and divest Tribal families from their homelands. A general lack of cultural understanding about Native communities and their needs, which are connected to ecosystem cohesion and Traditional Ecological Knowledge has been one of the most common problems. While the list of barriers to Tribal involvement is extensive, the fact that Bay Area Tribes are not federally recognized and underrepresented on the California Native American Heritage Commission contact list has posed one of the most significant and pervasive problems around this issue.

### **Past Disadvantaged Community Engagement Processes**

The Bay Area IRWM is an outgrowth of a collaborative process that began in 2004, when regional and local associations, agencies, groups, and organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area came together to facilitate development of the 2006 Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). The original Plan development and implementation process generated a stakeholder contact list representing local and regional water resource and flood agencies, watershed organizations, a list of elected city, county, and state officials, city and county land use agencies, disadvantaged community representatives, environmental and community groups, media, and Native American Tribal contacts. This master stakeholder list contained approximately 1,500 contacts, which were collected directly from water resources management agencies and through outreach efforts and public meetings. Future IRWMP efforts were informed by reflections and lessons learned from that IRWM Plan development process.

A stakeholder assessment was conducted in early 2012 by the BA IRWM Regional Water Management Group to inform the development of the engagement strategy. The assessment was informed by interviews with fourteen Bay Area IRWMP stakeholders, including Coordinating Committee participants, NGO staff, and representatives of DACs and Tribal communities. Interviews focused on understanding stakeholder experiences during the development of the 2006 Plan, identifying their interests and concerns, and soliciting their ideas on how best to address their concerns for the IRWMP process. Key findings from this stakeholder assessment included:

- Conducting outreach through the sub-regional groups is effective and should be leveraged as much as possible.
- Engaging disadvantaged and Tribal communities in the Bay Area is challenging, especially since water resource management issues are rarely a top priority in the Region.
- Stakeholder engagement goals were not clearly identified for the 2006 Plan development process.
- It is not realistic to expect an NGO or small public agency to develop a project proposal; they need to partner with a larger agency with the resources needed to develop the proposal.

The 2012 DAC engagement activities were planned and implemented to ensure the updated IRWMP Plan reflects the knowledge and interests of residents. The Outreach and Engagement process lasted from January 2012 to August 2013 and focused on 1) information gathering and consolidating and

augmenting the stakeholder contact list, 2) developing a Stakeholder Engagement Plan, producing easy-to-understand informational materials, and developing a process for identifying projects serving DACs and providing guidance to DAC project proponents, and 3) the implementation of outreach and engagement activities like providing guidance for DAC-serving project submissions and promoting stakeholder review of draft chapters of the IRWMP.

The 2012 Bay Area IRWMP process included targeted outreach to disadvantaged communities. All DAC representatives involved in the 2006 Plan were contacted to encourage their submission of new projects to be included in the Plan Update. Agency staff from Bay Area DACs were contacted to encourage their participation in the IRWMP process, including the identification of projects for their communities. Outreach was conducted through the Functional Area groups, particularly the water quality/water supply and flood protection FAs, to help identify DAC projects. In addition, all DAC contacts were included in the master contact list and received all BA IRWMP-related email notifications to ensure they were aware of upcoming events and deadlines.

The California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA) is serving as the Bay Area DACTIP Tribal Engagement Coordinator to involve Bay Area Tribes in the regional IRWM Program. The Tribal program was not in contract in the previous grant until the April, 2019, and as a result, the Tribal program is being expedited to catch up with the DACTIP Program as a whole. CIEA has served as the Tribal Engagement Coordinator for the North Coast since 2014, which has the most robust participation of Tribes in any IRWM region of California. There are two federally recognized Tribes in the North Bay that have traditional territory that overlaps with the North Coast IRWM region. Both of these Tribes are active in North Coast IRWM and DACTIP programs and the Tribal Representatives serving to represent North Coast Tribes have dedicated themselves to support Bay Area Tribal inclusion in the Bay Area IRWM program.

### **Maps**

Please see attached, maps that identify all known DAC, EDA, and underrepresented communities (URC) within the Funding Area and IRWM regional boundaries, as well as proposed DACI activity boundaries. Tribal data does not appear on this map as CIEA was not in contract to conduct this work until April 2019. As such, work to identify geographic boundaries of Tribal communities could not be undertaken. Additionally, census data does not capture sufficient Tribal data to map such communities.

## **C. Activity Descriptions**

### **Goal**

The DACTIP Program seeks to continue engagement with the disadvantaged stakeholders, Tribes and Tribal communities previously identified by the San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Watershed Management (IRWM) Coordinating Committee, the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW) and the CIEA. These stakeholders include Bay Area communities, community-based organizations, Native American Tribes and Tribal organizations. Engagement efforts will focus on supporting these stakeholders in conducting **Needs Assessments, Project Development, and Continued Stakeholder Engagement.**

## Project Description

The scope of work will be divided into two phases. Phase I will include the Needs Assessment and Project Development work and is fully detailed in the scope included with this proposal. Phase I will also include work to support the update of the Bay Area IRWM Plan to ensure disadvantaged and tribal communities are well represented and will also work with the Coordinating Committee to recognize and integrate these stakeholders into their governing structure. Phase II scope will be developed with the support by regional DACTIP stakeholders, Tribes and Tribal communities, and approved by the IRWM Coordinating Committee and is intended to provide technologies or systems to allow for the continuance of capacity building, needs assessment and continued inclusion of Tribes, Tribal communities and DACs communities in IRWMs after the grant is completed.

The scope of work, outlined below in Project 2, includes multiple elements intended to meet all of the objectives stated in Table 3 of the 2016 Request for Proposals. The Needs Assessment work will include education activities within local DAC and Tribal communities to help facilitate listening sessions, surveys, and solution finding. Extensive outreach activities will also be conducted during the Needs Assessments to ensure maximum participation. These activities include facilitating public meetings, participating in ongoing public planning processes, door to door surveys and discussions, and building partnerships with other community organizations for increased reach into communities. The local project partners will work with ABAG/SFEP, CIEA as the Tribal DACTIP program partner, and the IRWM Coordinating Committee to formalize DAC and Tribal participation and to update the IRWM Plan to support understanding of DAC and Tribal needs.

The scope of Project 2 is also explicitly crafted to provide capacity building trainings and workshops to enable DAC and Tribal community partners to participate more fully in and to apply for public sector grant funding opportunities intended to implement projects that meet the needs outlined in the Needs Assessments component of this grant. Additionally, local project partners will be provided technical assistance resources to help develop projects in their communities for Round 1 Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation funding, and additional future funding opportunities. Site assessment data will also be generated by consultants to help facilitate the Needs Assessment to project pipeline.

## Project 1: Grant Administration and Program Management

### Task 1 – Initial Grant Coordination

The DACTIP Grant will be administered and managed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)/San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP). ABAG/SFEP will provide grant administration in compliance with DWR's reporting and other requirements and will coordinate with the project managers of the local partners responsible for implementing the projects contained in this agreement. Program management tasks are described below.

- **Task 1.1 Program Coordination:** ABAG/SFEP will meet with all project partners during the proposal creation period to conduct its due diligence assessment and readiness to proceed with the scope of work as outlined in this proposal. This assessment will be provided to the IRWM Coordinating Committee for approval before entering into a Grant Agreement with DWR
- **Task 1.2 Proposal Preparation:** ABAG/SFEP, with concurrence with the Regional Coordinating Committee and Transition Subcommittee, will prepare and submit the IRWM DACTIP grant proposal.
- **Task 1.3 Contracting:** ABAG/SFEP will negotiate a grant agreement with DWR in accordance with DWR reporting and compliance requirements associated with grant administration. In

tandem with this agreement, ABAG/SFEP will negotiate and finalize contracts with each entity that will receive grant funding. ABAG/SFEP has obtained ABAG Board approval. Each project partner will execute a contract with ABAG before reimbursement is requested or distributed.

*Milestones:*

- Submittal of proposal: *June 03, 2019*
- Contracts with local project partners: *August, 2019*

*Deliverables:*

- IRWM DACTIP Proposal
- IRWM Coordinating Committee letter supporting ABAG as the new Grantee
- ABAG Executive Board approval
- Executed DWR Grant Agreement
- Contracts with all DAC and Tribal project partners

**Task 2 –Administration and Management**

After entering into a grant agreement with the state and subsequently entering into contract with local project partners, ABAG/SFEP will manage the DACTIP grant administratively and will also facilitate programmatic coordination. Grant administration will include soliciting, preparing, reviewing, and submitting to DWR invoices, progress reports, deliverables, and other documents as required by the grant agreement, in coordination with IRWM DWR project manager. Programmatic coordination will include tracking project partner's ongoing progress, supporting local project partners with their program work, and identifying any potential issues that may impact project partner's ability to complete their scopes of work.

Work includes ongoing administration and management of project partners and possible contractor(s), accounting, legal work, reviewing work products, and preparing documents for DWR review.

- **Task 2.1 Invoicing**

ABAG/SFEP will be responsible for compiling invoices for submittal to DWR. This includes collecting invoice documentation from each local project partner and compiling the information into a DWR Invoice Packet.

*Reimbursement Requests* (invoices) will be submitted to DWR no more frequently than monthly and no less frequent than quarterly in accordance with the format specified by the DWR Grant Agreement. ABAG will be responsible for preparing the reimbursement request based on records provided by the local project partners. The conditions for reimbursement will be specified in the contracts with the local project partners. ABAG will review each request and submit the reimbursement request (invoice) to DWR. A consultant may help to coordinate with local project partners and maintain records. ABAG will endeavor to pay all invoices from project partners upon receipt rather than paying in arrears. ABAG will track each disbursement and cumulative disbursements to date. Records will be maintained in accordance with the DWR Grant Agreement and generally acceptable accounting principles and practices. If needed, a consultant may be utilized to assist with tracking.

- **Task 2.2 – Program Coordination and Reporting**

ABAG/SFEP will be responsible for tracking the progress of the local project partners and reporting this information to DWR in quarterly Progress Reports. The ABAG/SFEP program

coordinator will provide limited support to local project partners with their programmatic and administrative work, and will identify any potential issues that may impact project partner's ability to complete their scopes of work and will report to the IRWM Coordinating Committee at their monthly meetings. ABAG/SFEP will coordinate with local project partners to prepare and submit Progress Reports. ABAG/SFEP will compile and submit a Project Completion Report. ABAG/SFEP may retain consultants, as needed, to assist with this work.

Reports will meet generally accepted professional standards for technical reporting and the required terms of the contract with DWR as outlined in the Grant Agreement. The Progress Reports will be prepared on a quarterly basis by ABAG/SFEP during the grant period. Progress Reports will explain the status of the project partner's work and will include the following information: key milestones achieved, percent completion on each task identified in the work plan, and accumulated cost to date organized by grant funded costs and non-State match costs for each project. Reports will be prepared per the format specified in the DWR Grant Agreement and submitted electronically to DWR.

The Project Completion Report will be compiled at the end of the grant. ABAG/SFEP will submit a draft Final Project Completion Report containing a description of the actual work completed, the final schedule showing actual progress versus planned progress, project results, and lessons learned. Copies of final documents and reports generated during the grant will serve as appendices. After DWR review, ABAG will finalize the final report submit to DWR within 90 days of DWR verification that all tasks have been completed.

- **Task 2.3 – Grant Agreement and Contract Management**

ABAG/SFEP will work with DWR to amend the Grant Agreement as necessary and will comply with all contract terms as well as applicable state and federal requirements. ABAG/SFEP will also work with project partners to facilitate any contract amendments as necessary.

*Milestones:*

- Updates to IRWM Coordinating Committee: *Monthly at IRWM CC meetings*
- Contracts with consultants: *July 2019*
- Grant amendment for phase II scope, budget, and schedule: *January 2020*
- Amendments to local project partner contracts as needed: *As needed*

*Deliverables:*

- Consultant contracts (if needed)
- Invoices and associated backup documentation submitted to DWR
- Quarterly Progress Reports submitted to DWR
- IRWM CC Meeting Minutes
- Draft and Final Project Completion Reports submitted to DWR

## **Project 2: DACTIP Phase I – Needs Assessments, Capacity Building & Project Development, and Coordinating Committee Integration**

### **Task 1 – Needs Assessments**

ABAG/SFEP will contract with local project partners to complete Needs Assessments in their communities to identify Bay Area DAC and Tribal water needs and solutions. Local project partners have been previously identified by the EJCW in the first Prop 1 IRWM DACI grant that ended April, 2019. While some of these partners have withdrawn their participation in the grant program, most will continue their work under the new DACTIP grant with ABAG. Local project partners will identify water-related needs and solutions based on the Bay Area IRWM's four (4) Functional Areas. These Needs Assessments will be developed, and where ongoing will continue to be implemented, to guide the capacity-building and technical assistance components of this Project. These Needs Assessments have been developed for some local project partners by local project partners with support from EJCW by incorporating templates provided by DWR and those available from other state agencies, and from previous Bay Area IRWM needs assessments to meet each community's needs. Needs assessments that have not yet been developed will be designed similarly by project partners with support from ABAG and project support consultants for the non-Tribal local project partners. The CIEA, which has administered needs assessments successfully in other regions, will work with the Tribes and Tribal Organizations and administer these needs assessments in the Bay Area. CIEA has developed a Tribal Needs Assessment for the SF Bay Program and is ready to gain approval by SF Bay Tribes and initiate administration. Needs Assessments have been or will be tailored to each community they are being conducted in to account for the variation in community capacity, context, and needs but will be designed to ensure varying individual strategies result in information that can be used to identify capacity building and technical assistance needs, further project development and to support continuance in DACTIP communities and Tribes to participate in the regional IRWM processes after the life of this DACTIP program.

Activities included in this Task include but are not limited to meetings and presentations; surveys; direct outreach and education; participation in local events to conduct broader outreach and education; website updates; data collection, processing, analysis, Tribal interpretation for the final report, and packaging; and solutions development in preparation for project development

*Milestones:*

- Completed needs assessments for local project partners: *October 2019 – March 2020*
- Presentation to IRWM Coordinating Committee on needs assessments and proposed project development recommendations: *October 2019 – March 2020*

*Deliverables:*

- List and dates of meetings, listening sessions, and presentation conducted by each local project partner
- Matrix of sub-regional water needs
- Report of sub-regional DAC and Tribal water needs and proposed solutions
- Summary of outreach and education efforts conducted

**Task 2 – Capacity Building, Technical Assistance and Project Development**

ABAG/SFEP will work with local project partners to ensure successful participation in the Bay Area IRWM Program's ongoing efforts. The focus of this task will be to develop long term capacity with local project partners to participate in federal/state/local grant funding opportunities as well as to prepare communities in the development and submission of proposals to IRWM Prop 1 and other grants as applicable. This task will include trainings, workshops and site visits that will be largely facilitated by consultants intended to address the varied DAC and Tribal needs more efficiently. While Technical

Assistance provided to Tribes and Tribal Communities may overlap with the assistance provided to Bay Area DACs, there are several needs that Tribes have that are specific to Tribal Nation sovereignty and Tribal traditional use of water. Since the traditional territories of Northern Bay Area Tribes overlap with the neighboring North Coast IRWM Region, it may be possible to share Technical Assistance consultants and hold shared trainings in some cases. CIEA serves as the Tribal Engagement Coordinator for the North Coast and is able to share resources and strategies as appropriate.

- **Task 2.1 – Capacity Building**

The capacities for the local project partners to develop solutions to problems in their communities, write grants, administer contracts and agreements, collect data, and report on their ongoing work are all at different levels. The goal of the Capacity-Building work is to promote successful participation in the Bay Area IRWM and to ensure that communities have sustainable structures and systems in place to stay engaged, after this grant program is completed.

This subtask will provide resources for the local project partners to develop these capacities such that they are prepared to identify funding sources, propose projects for funding opportunities, and to manage the programmatic and administrative components of such work. These capacity building needs will be identified by the local project partners in partnership with CIEA, CIEA's Tribal Partners and/or the CIEA, the Tribal Partners and/or the Tribal Advisory Committee, the IRWM Coordinating Committee, ABAG/SFEP, and consultants as they complete their Needs Assessment and solution development work. The capacity building needs of DAC partners and Tribal partners will be coordinated, where possible, to allow for trainings, workshops, and other educational opportunities to be broadly accessible. The capacity building elements include but are not limited to:

- 1) Organizational

Grant writing, book keeping, grant administration and facilitation

- 2) Technical

Environmental data collection, GIS mapping, database creation and maintenance, permitting, and regulatory compliance

- **Task 2.2 – Project Development**

Local project partners will work with the CIEA, the Tribal Partners and/or the Tribal Advisory Committee, the IRWM Coordinating Committee, ABAG/SFEP, and consultants to determine project development needs that are not considered capacity building in nature. These project development needs will be summarized alongside the solutions identified in the Needs Assessments for consideration. ABAG/SFEP will work with the local project partners, the IRWM Coordinating Committee, CIEA, the Tribal Partners and/or the Tribal Advisory Committee, and consultants to identify additional consultant talent needed to enable the local project partners to develop and submit projects for funding opportunities, including IRWM Prop 1 funding.

Project development work will result in scopes of work, estimated budgets, project timelines, potential design and engineering reviews, and/or environmental compliance, as needed. In consultation with CIEA, the Tribal Partners and/or the Tribal Advisory Committee and other technical consultants and with input from community representatives and the Coordinating

Committee or its designated proxy, a subset of high priority projects will be selected for further development into proposals. The number of projects selected for development support will depend on the amount of funds needed to develop each project and will be limited by the funds available.

*Milestones:*

- Selection Criteria for capacity building and project development providers: *September 2019*
- Procurement of a bench of capacity building and project development Providers: *January 2020*
- Meetings with providers to regionalize curriculum and materials: *February 2020*
- Scheduling of Trainings/Workshops: *February 2020 – June 2020*

*Deliverables:*

- A summary of the solutions identified in the Needs Assessments for each local project partner with required capacity and project development needs to advance solutions for funding proposals
- Schedule of meeting dates, agendas, workshop materials, presentations and resources
- Selected DAC and Tribal proposals developed for implementation funding
- Selection criteria for capacity building and project development providers
- List of selected capacity building and project development providers

**Task 3 – IRWM Coordinating Committee Integration**

ABAG/SFEP will work with local project partners and the IRWM Coordinating Committee to ensure successful participation in the Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee and the IRWM Plan update.

*Milestones:*

- IRWM plan updated to include DAC and Tribal perspectives and integration: *March 2020*
- Tribal representatives to develop Tribal Representatives structure: *April 2020*
- Governing structure and workgroups updated to include DAC and Tribal representatives: *June 2020*

*Deliverables:*

- Written proposed updates to the Bay Area IRWM Plan
- Tribal representative candidates for addition to the Coordinating Committee, Project Selection committee, and/or other decision-making bodies, as they are developed
- Representative candidates of DACs, EDAs, URCs, etc., for addition to the Coordinating Committee, Project Selection Committee, and/or other decision-making bodies as they are developed

**Project 3: DACTIP Phase II Scoping**

The goal of Phase II is intended to ensure the needs assessment, capacity building, and the IRWM CC integration efforts continue past the end of this grant program. ABAG/SFEP will work with the local project partners and the IRWM Coordinating Committee to develop a scope, budget, and schedule for the Continued Stakeholder Engagement phase.

**Task 1 – Develop Detailed Workplan/Budget/Scope**

ABAG/SFEP will work with DAC project partners, CIEA, the Tribal Partners and/or the Tribal Advisory Committee, and the IRWM Coordinating Committee to develop a detailed scope, budget, and schedule

for DWR consideration intended to achieve the overarching goal stated in Phase II. Phase II work will be informed by Phase I activities and findings.

*Milestones:*

- List of project 4 goals and objectives: *October 2019*
- Proposed list of tasks and budgets: *November 2019*
- IRWM CC or subcommittee approval of tasks and budgets: *December 2019*

*Deliverables:*

- Detailed scope, budget, and schedule for Phase II

#### **Project 4: DACTIP Phase II – Continued Stakeholder Engagement**

This project will be scoped and developed by ABAG/SFEP in coordination with DAC project partners, CIEA, the Tribal Partners and/or the Tribal Advisory Committee, and the IRWM Coordinating Committee. This project's budget is the balance of the grant funds awarded less the budgets for Projects 1 – 3.

### **D. Statement of Qualifications**

ABAG is the official Council of Governments (COG) representing the San Francisco Bay Area's nine counties and 101 cities and towns. ABAG holds the distinction of being the first COG in California and is the Bay Area's official regional planning agency. Its mission is to strengthen cooperation and coordination among local governments and address social, environmental, and economic issues that transcend local borders. The San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP), administered by ABAG, is one of 28 national programs under the National Estuary Program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). SFEP's mission is to protect and restore the natural resources of the San Francisco Bay Estuary. ABAG and SFEP has participated in the regional Integrated Regional Watershed Management (IRWM) planning effort since its inception.

To date, ABAG has received three grants to date (Prop 84, rounds 2 – 4), and was asked to close out the final suite of projects for Prop 84, round 1, totaling over \$100,000,000 in grant funding with well over \$250,000,000 in total project costs. These funds benefit 69 projects throughout the bay area that help local public agencies meet the long-term water needs of the state, including the delivery of safe drinking water and the protection of water quality and the environment. ABAG's role as the grantee has been to administer these grants, coordinate with Local Project Sponsors, and to report to the Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee. ABAG's administration of the 3 rounds it has been granted has been successful in meeting grant requirements and has submitted accurate and acceptable deliverables in a timely manner, accurately tracked project costs, actively communicating with DWR's grant manager, and ultimately closing out projects successfully. To date, ABAG has successfully closed out 11 of the 35 projects and anticipates closing out and additional 11 projects by the end of 2019. ABAG is confident that, given its experience, it can complete the proposed scope of work within the proposed budget and schedule.

Please see the table on the next page for an explicit breakdown of the qualifications, knowledge and abilities of the SFEP staff, project partners, and consultants.

	<b>Necessary Qualifications</b>	<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Past performance on similar projects at a regional, community, or local level</b>	<b>Qualifications and knowledge of DAC involvement activities listed in Table 3 of the RFP</b>	<b>Ability to proactively manage the proposed activities to ensure a timely and successful completion</b>
<b>SFEP Staff</b>	Ability to properly administer complex grant programs with multiple project partners, public engagement and facilitation, previous DAC and Tribal involvement	1, 2, 3	See narrative above	Josh Bradt will be the program coordinator. Josh has experience working with DAC communities and has a thorough understanding of the activities listed in Table 3. Additionally, Josh was working with one of the proposed local project partners in Richmond, CA, as part of the previous DACIP Grant under EJCW.	James Muller will be administering the grant on behalf of ABAG/SFEP. James currently successfully administers three rounds of IRWM Prop 84 grants. For additional information, see narrative above
<b>Local Project Partners</b>	Outreach, education, meeting facilitation, community involvement, environmental justice knowledge	2, 3	All local project partners will have proven and successful experience in community involvement, outreach and education, and environmental justice. Prospective project partners have been reviewed and approved by the IRWM Coordinating Committee to ensure they have engaged their local communities and have the capacity to complete the work as proposed.	Some local project partners will have experience in the activities included in Table 3 of the RFP. However, this program is intended to build capacity for these partners to understand and participate in these activities. Pre-existing qualifications in or knowledge of these activities are not required for successful participation by local project partners.	All local project partners will have the capacity to achieve the scope as written below. Both James and Josh will work with project partners to ensure they are timely, able to meet grant requirements, and complete their workplans
<b>Consultants</b>	Qualifications will depend on scope of work given consultant is asked to complete. These could require qualifications in (not limited to):	1, 2	The San Francisco Estuary Institute provided data mapping services to support the local project partners under EJCW and will provide those same services under this grant. SFEI has a great deal of experience	N/A	N/A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Administration</li><li>➤ Facilitation</li><li>➤ Grant Writing</li><li>➤ Project Design</li><li>➤ Environmental Regulations and Permitting</li><li>➤ GIS mapping</li><li>➤ Data management</li><li>➤ Online tool development</li></ul>		<p>in data visualization and mapping and has successfully completed projects at the local and regional scales.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	--



## F. Budget

Please see the budgeting spreadsheet (Attachment 1) for Project budgets and detailed ABAG staff budgets. Total project budgets can be found below, broken out by task.

<b>Project 1 - Grant Administration and Program Management</b>	<b>Task 1 - Initial Grant Coordination</b>	<b>Task 2 - Admin and Management</b>
	\$77,849.84	\$278,170.36
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$356,020.20</b>	

<b>Project 2 - Needs Assessments, Capacity Building &amp; Project Development, and Coordinating Committee Integration</b>	<b>Task 1 - Needs Assessment</b>	<b>Task 2 - Capacity Building and Project Development</b>	<b>Task 3 - CC Integration</b>
	\$932,489.41	\$640,984.83	\$66,847.14
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$1,640,321.38</b>		

<b>Project 3 - Phase II Scoping</b>	<b>Task 1 - Develop Workplan/Budget/Scope</b>
Phase II Scope Creation and IRWM CC Coordination	\$4,810.56
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$4,810.56</b>

<b>Project 3 - Continued Stakeholder Engagement</b>	<b>Remaining Budget</b>
Phase II Scope of Work	\$1,018,847.86
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$1,018,847.86</b>

# Attachment 1 – Detailed Budgets

## Project Budgets

<b>Project 1 - Grant Administration and Program Management</b>	<b>Task 1 - Initial Grant Coordination</b>	<b>Task 2 - Admin and Management</b>
ABAG	\$77,849.84	\$278,170.36
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$356,020.20</b>	

<b>Project 2 - Needs Assessments, Capacity Building &amp; Project Development, and Coordinating Committee Integration</b>	<b>Task 1 - Needs Assessment</b>	<b>Task 2 - Capacity Building and Project Development</b>	<b>Task 3 - CC Integration</b>	<b>Local Project Partner Subtotals</b>
ABAG	\$34,236.16			\$34,236.16
Program Support Consultant	\$81,143.28	\$62,236.08	\$15,254.64	\$158,634.00
California Indian Environmental Alliance	\$534,825.42	\$366,248.75	\$51,592.50	\$952,666.67
Friends of Sausal Creek	\$20,557.55			\$20,557.55
Shore Up Marin	\$32,940.00			\$32,940.00
Institute for Sustainable Policy Studies and Action	\$34,117.20			\$34,117.20
Nuestra Casa	\$26,550.00			\$26,550.00
Sonoma Ecology Center & Daily Acts	\$58,828.00			\$58,828.00
Greenaction	\$29,844.00			\$29,844.00
The Watershed Project	\$22,606.00			\$22,606.00
Marin County Community Development Commission	\$11,536.00			\$11,536.00
Contra Costa RCD	\$45,305.80			\$45,305.80
Technical and Training Consultants (\$15k x 14 projects + \$2.5k for SFEI Needs Assessment support)		\$212,500.00		\$212,500.00
<b>Task Subtotals</b>	<b>\$932,489.41</b>	<b>\$640,984.83</b>	<b>\$66,847.14</b>	
<b>Project Total:</b>		<b>\$1,640,321.38</b>		

<b>Project 3 - Phase II Scoping</b>	<b>Task 1 - Develop Workplan/Budget/Scope</b>
Develop Phase II Scope	\$4,810.56
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$4,810.56</b>

<b>Project 4 - Continued Stakeholder Engagement</b>	<b>Remaining Budget</b>
Phase II Scope of Work	\$1,018,847.86
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$1,018,847.86</b>

ABAG Budgets by Project

**Project 1 - Task 1**

Staff	Task Number	Description	Hours	Rate	Totals
James Muller					
	1.1	Strategic Planning and Coordination	80		\$17,200.00
	1.2	Proposal Writing	40	\$215.00	\$8,600.00
	1.3	Contracting	80		\$17,200.00
Josh Bradt		Task 1.1			
	1.1	Project Partner Meetings (10 @ 4 hrs/meeting)	40	\$185.13	\$7,405.20
	1.1	Project Evaluation	24		\$4,443.12
Natasha Dunn					
	1.3	Internal Coordination	60	\$132.56	\$7,953.60
	1.3	Contracting	80		\$10,604.80
Athena Honore					
	1.3	Contracting and Administrative Assistance	24	\$185.13	\$4,443.12
<b>TOTAL:</b>					<b>\$77,849.84</b>

**Project 1 - Task 2**

Staff	Task Number	Description	Time Estimation	Hours	Rate	Totals
James Muller						
	2.1	Invoicing	Support and finalization of partner invoices, creation of ABAG invoices, 40 hours per quarter. 6 quarters total	240	\$215.75	\$51,780.00
	2.2	Progress report review and finalization	14 hours per quarter	84		\$18,123.00
	2.2	Project completion report	Estimate based on prev. reports	80		\$17,260.00
	2.3	Grant Agreement and contracts management	10 hours per additional contract (4), 10 hours per amendment (2), 10 hours per contract amendment (4)	100		\$21,575.00
Josh Bradt						
	2.2	Project partner tracking and support	75 hours per quarter	468	\$185.13	\$86,640.84
	2.2	Progress report drafting	24 hours per quarter	144		\$26,658.72
	2.2	Project completion report	Estimate based on prev. reports	40		\$7,405.20
Natasha Dunn						
	2.1	Invoicing	20 hours per quarter	120	\$132.56	\$15,907.20
	2.3	Grant Agreement and contracts management	8 hours per additional contract (4), 8 hours per grant amendment (2), 8 hours per contract amendment (4)	80		\$10,604.80
Athena Honore						
	2	General assistance in grant and contract management and invoice support as needed	20 hours per quarter	120	\$185.13	\$22,215.60
<b>TOTAL:</b>						<b>\$278,170.36</b>

**Project 2 - Task 1**

Staff	Task Number	Description	Time Estimation	Hours	Rate	Totals
Darcie Luce						
	1	Project Partner Needs Assessment Support	16 hours per week from June 24 - September 30, 2019.	224	\$152.84	\$34,236.16

**Project 3 - Task 1**

Staff	Task Number	Description	Time Estimation	Hours	Rate	Totals
James Muller						
	1	Scope creation and CC engagement	Work with IRWM CC and SFEP staff to craft scope for Project 4	12	\$215.75	\$2,589.00
Josh Bradt						
	1	Scope creation and CC engagement	Work with project partners and SFEP staff to craft scope for Project 4	12	\$185.13	\$2,221.56
<b>TOTAL:</b>						<b>\$4,810.56</b>



Minutes for Prop 1 IRWM Round 1 Implementation

Project Scoring Committee (PSC) Call

May 22, 2019

Attendees:

Alex Tavizon

Taylor Chang

Robyn Navarra

Brenda Buxton

Metra Richert

Kanyon Sayers

Devon Becker

Maddie Duda

Brian Mendenhall

Mark Seedall

Adam French

Deja Gould

Judy Kelly

Mark Boucher

Cheryl Munoz

The Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee (CC) released the formal project solicitation on May 2. Proposals are due back June 3. Robyn Navarra developed an electronic format of DWR's PIF. Everyone should submit proposals to her. All proposals will be held in an electronic database. A couple items were added to DWR's PIF, including functional area and sub-region. DWR confirmed these items will need to be removed before submitting to DWR.

The PSC will have 6 weeks (June 3 to July 12) to review the proposals. Then the PSC will develop recommendations to CC on which projects to fund. It is planned to have the PSC deliver their recommendations at the July 22 CC meeting. CC approval is needed to move forward with grant

application with DWR. After CC approval, the grant application is developed. The application will include DWR's project summary form and each PIF for projects that were selected for inclusion. DWR is requiring submittal of a pre-application packet prior to the optional workshop. Aug 9 has tentatively been selected for the due date for the pre-application packet. The workshop with DWR would happen 2 weeks later on August 23. Any comments from the workshop with DWR would be wrapped into the application.

Key dates include: Getting proposals back by June 3. PSC reviews proposals by July 12. PSC delivers recommendations on funding projects at July 22 CC meeting.

In terms of putting together the grant application, SFEP has expressed interest. Taylor Chang sent out a notice to the CC listserv asking if others were interested in being the grant applicant. She didn't receive any responses.

The Prop 1 IRWM Implementation Process and Planning (PnP) committee agreed to maintain the same funding allocations as Prop 84, of 25% per sub-region. The CC approved this approach. It is expected that Prop 1 Implementation to have at least 2 rounds. The funding may not be split perfectly in Round 1 but could even out over future rounds.

The main purpose of the PSC is to evaluate the proposals and score them. It's important that the PSC meet in person at the end to come to agreement on the recommendations. This can take a lot of work. The CC wants to limit the number of funded projects to 10 because of the administrative burden.

Regarding combining multiple projects, it's hoped that projects can combine on their own. However, it's within the PSC's purview to request projects be grouped together if they seem similar. Combining projects could create regional projects that then score better.

Regarding project readiness, it's important to know which projects are ready to go. The CEQA requirement helps with this.

Ms. Navarra said she can export the projects from database into excel and set the scoring scale (e.g. 1-5) with the scoring criteria. There was agreement to use Google Drive to store all the project proposals so that the PSC can access at any time.

Ms. Navarra has only received 2-4 proposals to date.

It was suggested that the PSC uses Google forms to do the project scoring, instead of a spreadsheet. The PSC agreed with this approach. It was commented that every reviewer's scores need to be able to be downloaded in one sheet at the end.

There was discussion about how to do the scoring and if it's feasible for everyone to review 30-40 proposals. It was discussed to wait to see how many proposals are received after June 3. In the past, the proposal review was divided up by each reviewer's region and specialty.

Brian Mendenhall mentioned DWR has 6 additional criteria for proposals.

It was discussed that a chair of the PSC is needed. The chair would organize the group, take meeting minutes, and draft a memo on the process and recommendations for projects to fund. It would be great to have someone who has experience with grant rounds. No consensus was reached on who would be the chair.

Action Items:

- The PSC will follow up with DWR to confirm the dates for the workshop and pre-application package submittal due date.
- Taylor Chang will add to the next CC meeting agenda who will be the PSC chair.
- Taylor Chang will create a Doodle poll to schedule the in person PSC meeting the week of July 15.
- Maddie Dude will look into create a Google form for the project scoring.
- Robyn Navarra will upload the project proposals she receives to Google Drive and send out to the PSC.

**BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee**  
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
June 24, 2019	MTC/SFEP 5 <sup>th</sup> Floor Redwood Room (5150)
July 8, 2019	Conference call
July 22, 2019	Elihu Harris State Building (Oakland) 10 <sup>th</sup> Floor Del Norte Conference Room
August 26, 2019	??