

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary**  
**July 22, 2019**  
**State Coastal Conservancy, 1515 Clay 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> <li>• Mark Seedall, CCWD (by phone)</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</li> <li>• Mark Boucher, CCCFCWCD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Josh Bradt, SFEP</li> <li>• Brenda Buxton, SCC</li> </ul>	

**Others Present:**

Phoenix Armenta, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project  
Leonard Ash, ACWD  
Cam Bauer, BART  
Devon Becker, ACWD  
Kait Byrne, City of Hayward  
Taylor Chang, SFPUC  
Maddie Duda, Lotus Water  
Jarrad Fisher, San Mateo RCD  
Ryan Hirano, Woodard & Curran  
Joe Issel, San Mateo RCD  
Jennifer Krebs, representing Sonoma Water  
Sandy Mathews, representing ACCWP  
James Muller, SFEP  
Claire Nordlie, EBMUD  
Michelle Novotny, SFPUC  
Erika Powell, San Mateo County  
Jim Scanlin, ACCWP  
LaDonna Williams, All Positives Possible

**On the Phone:**

Lisa Bankosh, Valley Water  
Tess Byler, San Francisquito Creek JPA  
Pat Costello, City of Napa  
Craig Cross, DWR  
Maggie Dutton, CCWD  
Adam French, Amah Matsun

Nahal Ghoghaie-Ipakchi  
Paul Gilbert-Snyder, EBMUD  
Deja Gould, IPOC  
Anita Jain, representing West Bay Sanitary District  
Tiffany Margulici, East Bay Parks  
Robyn Navarra, Zone 7  
Sherri Norris, CIEA  
Lucas Patzek, Napa RCD  
Jake Spaulding, Sonoma Water  
Alex Tavizon, CIEA  
Aston Tennefos, DWR  
Leah Walker, City of Petaluma

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

Josh Bradt provided an update on the closeout of Round 1. This morning, Mr. Bradt uploaded the final grant completion report to DWR and sent it directly to Jessica Arm for review. This should be the last item before closing out the round.

James Muller provided an update on Rounds 2 through 4. For Round 2, final project completion reports were submitted for project 4 Marin/Sonoma Conserving our Watersheds Agriculture BMPs and project 16 San Jose Green Streets. Q16 payments were paid to local project sponsors in June. The status of Project 10 Bayfront Canal is that CEQA is in process. Screen check draft was issued last month for internal review. The project plans to begin construction in spring 2020. Project 18 Upper York Creek Dam Removal is delayed due to an issue with the topographic map. Steve Ritchie commented he would like more information on the map issue.

For Round 3, Q13 payment was issued to local project sponsors in June. SFEP is expecting Q14 payment from the State soon.

For Round 4, the grant amendment is being approved internally by MTC. Approval will be completed by the end of next week. Brenda Buxton commented the Coastal Conservancy is asking for extension on project 7 Mountain View Shoreline portion of South Bay Salt Pond Restoration due to delays caused by difficulty in sourcing materials. Ms. Buxton also mentioned the Conservancy may want to redirect funds from Project 8 Eden Landing portion of South Bay Salt Pond Restoration to another project in the south sub-region.

Jennifer Krebs provided an update on the AQPI project. Last week the first permanent radar was sited at the Penitencia Water Treatment Plant (Valley Water) site in San Jose. There will be a ribbon cutting event in October that she will provide info about later. There is a local project advisory committee meeting at the end of August at EBMUD. There will be a user training on how to receive data and use the data in September. The study on project benefits is ongoing.

### **3. Addition of Stormwater Resource Plans to the Plan**

Sandy Mathews representing Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program (ACCWP) introduced the ACCWP Stormwater Resource Plan. It was created by a consortium of 17 agencies to facilitate the identification of potential projects and programs for stormwater management. These projects will improve the human and natural environment and provide multiple benefits. To be eligible for state grant programs, a SWRP must be developed and submitted to the IRWMP for incorporation. The SWRP can be found online at Link to Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program Stormwater Resource Plan: <https://www.cleanwaterprogram.org/programs/green-infrastructure.html>

There were no objections to incorporating the ACCWP Stormwater Resource Plan into the BAIRWMP.

#### **Action Items:**

- Taylor Chang will draft an appendix to the Plan to incorporate Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program SWRP and include the appendix an attachment to the meeting packet for next month.

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

Mr. Muller reported that SFEP secured internal Board approval of the resolution that was needed for the grant proposal. Mr. Muller will send the resolution to DWR today.

Mr. Muller continues to work with CIEA to develop their scope of work. He is expecting scopes of work from other project partners tomorrow.

Craig Cross reported DWR is experiencing internal delays in processing the contract number, which is required to move forward with the grant agreement. Carmel Brown has reviewed the agreement. This is the final step before executing the grant agreement with DWR. It is anticipated that the agreement will be executed in the next few weeks. After that, SFEP will execute contracts with the local project partners.

In the meantime, some project partners are receiving interim funding from SFEI. Nuestra Casa and Ron Dellums Institute are receiving funding, and CIEA and Shore Up Marin will be getting funding soon.

Phase 2 of the grant needs to be scoped out. Mr. Muller suggested forming a technical advisory committee to assist with the development of Phase 2. He is hoping to have the first TAC meeting in September. It was asked how participation on the TAC will be determined and what the time commitment will be. There was a comment that CC members who are engaging with DACs in their service area should participate on the TAC.

LaDonna Williams commented about the water issues her community on the east side of Vallejo is facing. She asked about how the interim funding was distributed. Michelle Novotny responded that the transition funding was made available to project partners who hadn't finished their needs assessment work under the EJCW contract. The transition funding will help them continue the needs assessment work through the summer. All Positives Possible finished their funding with EJCW; therefore, they didn't

get interim funding. Ms. Williams asked if there's emergency funding available for partners that need emergency funding now.

Action Items:

- Ms. Chang will put a discussion of the TAC on the agenda for the August CC meeting.
- Mr. Muller will write a description of the TAC's role and send it to Ms. Chang.

## **5. Discussion of Prop 1 Implementation Funding**

Mr. Mendenhall thanked everyone who participated on the Process and Planning subcommittee and Project Scoring Committee. Participants helped with the optional call for projects in November 2018, the formal call for projects that occurred in June 2019, review of the project applications, and coming up with recommendations for the CC on projects to include in the grant application to DWR.

Maddie Duda reported out on her analysis comparing what was received during the optional call for projects versus the formal project solicitation. There were many more projects submitted during the optional call for projects. She said she would share her analysis with the group.

There was a question about how project applicants can submit feedback. A survey was suggested. There was a comment that not every project submitted the same level of documentation. There was consensus that more direction should be provided to applicants on what documents can be included. There was a question about whether the PSC can provide comments on specific proposals.

San Mateo RCD requested feedback on their application. They requested information on the scoring criteria and the differences in information provided by projects.

The PSC consisted of 14 members, 12 of whom scored project applications. Members were included from local agencies, representatives for DACs and Tribes, and other stakeholders. The PSC met via conference call a couple times and had one in-person meeting. Devon Becker wrote the memo outlining the project scoring and selection process. The PSC decided that all PSC members would review every submittal. Mark Boucher commented he only reviewed submittals in the east sub-region. The PSC received guidance from the CC to limit the number of projects to 10 in effort to reduce the grant admin burden. The PSC set up a modified version of the PIF that included additional entries for projects to record their functional area and sub-region. During their evaluation, the PSC sent a request for additional information on projects' budget and schedule. Scores were re-adjusted with the new info if needed.

The PSC used DWR's scoring criteria to do the quantitative evaluation of the projects. At the in-person meeting, all the scores from each reviewer were combined. The group used 2 methods to compile the scores. First, the scores were averaged because not everyone had a chance to review all the projects. The second method compiled each project by rank and then averaged the rank, thus avoiding skew and outliers to provide all scorers equal voice. Both methods identified the same top 10 projects, just in a slightly different order. The PSC also used a qualitative scoring process to account for equal representation of functional areas and sub-regions, and to elevate DAC and Tribal projects. The qualitative scoring also took into consideration adherence to Bay Area IRWM principles, including projects that could demonstrate integrated and multiple benefits.

To avoid conflict of interest from PSC members scoring projects they submitted, the PSC did not allow members to score their own projects or advocate for their project. At the in-person meeting, the PSC established the rule that members could only talk about their project if someone had a question about the project. No advocacy was allowed.

The PSC came to consensus quickly on which projects stood out. The PSC unanimously decided on a list of 8 projects to recommend to the CC to include in the grant application to DWR. The list is included in the CC meeting packet. There is 1 DAC project which will be funded through the general implementation funding. It was decided to save the DAC implementation funding for the next round to ensure there is adequate funding for projects that get proposed from the Prop 1 IRWM DAC Outreach work.

Mr. Muller is developing a list of items he will need from every project to compile the grant application.

There was a question about how match was factored into the scoring. Match didn't factor into the scores because individual projects didn't need to meet the 50% match. DWR is allowing the overall grant application to meet the 50% match and this requirement is being met with the list of 8 projects.

Placeholder for SFEP to manage grant admin. Max amount that could be requested is 2,275,000.

About \$1M request for SFEP grant admin. 994,550

The CC approved the PSC recommendations for including the 8 projects, plus SFEP grant admin, in the application to DWR. The total funding request is \$22,750,000.

#### Action Items:

- Ms. Duda will develop a survey to gather feedback from project applicants on the project solicitation process.
- Mr. Becker will add project numbers to the Prop 1 Round 1 Projects by Rank table that is attached to the CC meeting packet.
- Mr. Becker will add the names of the PSC members to the PSC decision memo attached to the CC meeting packet.
- Mr. Becker will coordinate with Mr. Muller to finalize SFEP's grant admin budget estimate and update the PSC decision memo.
- Ms. Chang and Mr. Ritchie will send an email to the project applicants notifying of the projects that were selected and that their budget request may be reduced.
- Ms. Duda will send Ms. Chang her analysis comparing what was received during the optional call for projects versus the formal project solicitation

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

The October CC meeting may potentially be hosted in East Palo Alto at Nuestra Casa. The November and December CC meetings will likely be combined into one meeting in early December.