

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

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

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](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 as 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.

KEY

Project entirely closed out except for ongoing Post-Performance Reports
 Project with significant concerns

Critical Milestone achieved since last meeting.

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010575 - Round 2 Quarterly Status: Q18 was uploaded in June but has not yet been approved by DWR. Q19 will be uploaded to DWR at the end of August. Payments: No payments sent in July Amendments: None Pending Site Visits: No site visits occurred during this period Grant Term: December 31, 2020							Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 15 Underway: 2 Sig. Concerns: 2 Withdrawn: 1			Funds (as of Q19) Total Grant: \$20,000,000 Total Match: \$13,485,178 Grant Funds Spent: \$16,994,034.49 (85%) Match Funds Documented: \$9,899,778.72 (73.4%)	
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Project # and Title	Project Sponsor	Construction Implementation Status	Project Completion Site Visit Date	Engineer's Cert of Completion Rcvd (Y/N)	Submission Date for Final Invoice	Project Completion Report Status	Retention Requested (Y/N)	Retention Paid (Y/N)	Post-Performance Report # Submitted	Anticipated Date Retention Release Invoice Issued to DWR
01_Bay Area Regional Water Conservation & Education Program	Solano County Water Agency	100%	Mar-19	N/A	Mar-19	SFEP is Reviewing	N	N	None to Date	Oct-19
02_East Bayshore Recycled Water Project Phase 1A (Emeryville)	EBMUD	Complete	Nov-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
03_Lagunitas Creek Watershed Sediment Reduction & Managements	Marin Municipal WD	Complete	Nov-17	N	Nov-18	Awaiting draft #3	N	N	#1	Nov/Dec 2019
04_Marin/Sonoma Conserving our Watersheds, Agricult BMPs	Marin RCD	100%	Nov-17	Y	Feb-19	SFEP is Reviewing	N	N	None to Date	Oct-19
05_Napa Milliken Creek Flood Damage Reduction & Fish Passage Barrie	County of Napa	Complete	Feb-18	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	None to Date	Closed
06_5th St. East & McGill Road Recycled Water	Sonoma Valley Cnty San Dist.	Complete	Nov-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	None to Date	Closed
07_Oakland Sausal Creek Restoration	City of Oakland Pub. Wks.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
08_Pescadero Water Supply & Sustainability	County of San Mateo	99%	Mar-19	N	Jul-18	Draft #1 Fall 2019	N	N	None to Date	Nov-19
09_Petaluma Flood Reduction, Water & Habitat Quality for Capri Creek	City of Petaluma	100%	Feb-18	Y	Sep-18	SFEP is Reviewing	N	N	None to Date	Oct-19
10_Bayfront Canal/Atherton Channel Flood Improve & Habitat Restore	Redwood City	0%	None to Date	Jun-20	Sep-20	Draft #1 July 2020	N	N	None to Date	Dec-20
11_Regional Groundwater Storage & Recovery Phase 1A	SFPUC	Complete	Jun-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
12_Richmond Breuner Marsh Restoration	East Bay Regional Park Dist.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Final approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
13_Infrastructure Upgrades for Water Supply & Quality	Roseview Heights Mutual Water	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
14_SF Bay Climate Change Pilot Projects	SFEP & Oro Loma San Dist	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Dec-18	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	None to Date	Closed
15_SF Airport Reclaimed Water Facility	SFO/City of San Francisco	75%	None to Date	N	Sep-18	Draft #1 Winter 2019	N	N	None to Date	Feb-20
16_San Jose Green Streets & Alleys Demonstration	City of San Jose	Complete	May-18	Y	Sep-18	DWR is Reviewing	N	N	None to Date	Nov-19
17_San Pablo Rheem Creek Wetlands Restoration	Contra Costa Water Dist.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	closed
18_Upper York Creek Dam Removal & Ecosystem Restoration	City of St Helena	0%	None to Date	N	Oct-20	Draft #1 Oct 2020	N	N	None to Date	Dec-20
19_Students & Teachers Restoring a Watershed (North & East Bays)	Point Blue Conservation	Complete	Feb-18	N/A	Mar-19	Awaiting Draft #3	N	N	None to Date	Nov-19
20_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	N/A	N/A	Oct-20	Draft August 2020	N	N	N/A	Dec-20

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010883 - Round 3 (Drought Round) Quarterly Status: Q15 materials will be uploaded to DWR at the end of August. Payments: ABAG received the Q14 payment from the state on August 13 and payments were sent out on the week of August 19. Amendments: SFEP will submit Amendment #5 to reallocate \$702,500 in admin funds and to extend project #01, in August. Site Visits: No site visits were completed this period. Grant Term: September 30, 2020							Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 6 Underway: 4 (all over 60%) Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 0			Funds (as of Q15) Total Grant: \$32,178,423 Total Match: \$25,121,180.72 Grant Funds Spent: \$30,876,284.37 (96%) Match Funds Documented: \$25,121,180.72 (100%)	
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

Project # and Title	Project Sponsor	Construction Implementation Status	Project Completion Site Visit Date	Engineer's Cert of Completion Rcvd (Y/N)	Submission Date for Final Invoice	Project Completion Report Status	Retention Requested (Y/N)	Retention Paid (Y/N)	Post-Performance Report # Submitted	Anticipated Date Retention Release Invoice Issued to DWR
01_Lower Cherry Aqueduct Emergency Rehabilitation	SFPUC	75%	None to Date	May-19	Submitted	draft #1 Spring 2019	N	N	None to Date	Jul-20
02_Zone 7 Water Supply Drought Preparedness	Zone 7	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
03_Los Carneros Water Dist. & Milliken Sarco-Tulocay Recycled Water	Napa Sanitation District	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
04_Sunnyvale Continuous Recycled Water Production & Wolfe Rd Pipe	Santa Clara Valley WD	96%	May-18	N	Submitted	Draft #1 Winter 2019	N	N	None to Date	Oct-19
05_DERWA Phase 3 Recycled Water Expansion	DRSanDist/EBMUD	Complete	May-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
06_Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility	City of Calistoga	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	closed
07_Drought Relief for South Coast San Mateo County	San Mateo RCD	92%	Jun-17	Feb-20	May-20	draft #1 Spring 2020	N	N	None to Date	Sep-20
08_Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness	Stinson Beach County WD	Complete	Mar-19	Sep-18	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed
09_Bay Area Regional Drought Relief Conservation Program	StopWaste	100%	None to Date	N/A	Submitted	Draft submitted to DWR	N	N	None to Date	Oct-19
10_WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR	Marin Municipal WD	99%	Mar-19	N/A	Jun-20	Draft #1 Summer 2020	N	N	None to Date	Mar-20
11_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	N/A	N/A	Sep-20	Draft #1 Fall 2020	N	N	N/A	Oct-19

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600011486 - Round 4 Quarterly Status: Q11 materials were uploaded August 01, 2019. Q12 will be uploaded to DWR on August 31, 2019. Payments: ABAG received the Q10 payment from the state on August 06 and payments were sent out to LPSs on the week of August 19. Amendments: SFEP has obtained signatures for the amendment and the document is now with DWR for final signatures. These are expected by the end of August. Site Visits: None this reporting period Grant Term: December 31, 2020							Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 2 Underway: 3 Sig. Concerns: 2 Withdrawn: 1			Funds (as of Q11) Total Grant: \$21,469,025 Total Match: \$22,395,709 Grant Funds Spent: \$3,414,198.06 (15.9%) Match Funds Documented: \$0 (0%) *	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Project # and Title	Project Sponsor	Construction Implementation Status	Project Completion Site Visit Date	Engineer's Cert of Completion Rcvd (Y/N)	Submission Date for Final Invoice	Project Completion Report Status	Retention Requested (Y/N)	Retention Paid (Y/N)	Post-Performance Report # Submitted	Anticipated Date Retention Release Invoice Issued to DWR
01_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	N/A	N/A	Jun-21	Dec-20	N	N	N/A	Aug-21
02_Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit	Santa Clara Valley WD	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
03_Marin 2020 AMI Phase II	Marin Municipal WD	0%	None to Date	N/A	Sep-19	draft #1 April 2020	N	N	None to Date	Jun-20
04_East Palo Alto Groundwater Supply	City of East Palo Alto	100%	Aug-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	draft #1 October 2019	N	N	None to Date	Dec-20
05_Coastal San Mateo County Drought Relief Phase II	San Mateo RCD	65%	None to Date	Apr-19	Jun-19	draft #1 June 2020	N	N	None to Date	Aug-20
06_SFQuito Creek Flood Damage Reduction & Ecosystem Restore Phase 2	SFQuito Creek JPA	100%	None to Date	May-19	Submitted	draft #1 September 2019	N	N	None to Date	Dec-19
07_Mt View Shoreline Portion of SBSRPR	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	Dec-19	Feb-20	draft #1 February 2020	N	N	None to Date	Sep-20
08_Eden Landing Portion of SBSRPR	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	Dec-20	Oct-20	draft #1 October 2020	N	N	None to Date	May-21
09_Novato Creek Flood Protection and Habitat Enhancement	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	Dec-20	Dec-20	draft #1 December 2020	N	N	None to Date	Jul-21

*NOTE: No projects that have committed to matching funds have billed against the grant to date.

AQPI Update

Reporting, Invoices & Payments

- Resubmitting Invoice 9
- Invoice 10 under review at Sonoma Water

Budget/Schedule

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

Other Developments

- Valley Water X-Band Radar –Radar installed July 9th. Testing and calibration ongoing through 1st week of September. Radar expected to be fully online 2nd week of September.



- Sonoma Water X-Band Radar –Installation date for permanent radar delayed – 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.
- Local Project Agency Committee formed August 2019
- User Group meetings being planned for month of October

July 19, 2019

Devon Becker
Water Resources Engineer, Alameda County Water District
Representing the Bay Area IRWM Project Screening Committee

Subject: Project Screening Committee Decision Memo

Dear Coordinating Committee:

The purpose of this memo is to document the process used by the Project Screening Committee (PSC) to select projects for the San Francisco Bay Area region's 2019 Proposition 1 Grant Solicitation Proposal and to publicize the final list of recommended projects.

The PSC is a volunteer body composed of members active on the Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Coordinating Committee (CC) and representing local public agencies, tribes, disadvantaged communities (DACs) and Economically Distressed Areas (EDAs), and other stakeholder organizations.

To reduce the administrative burden on the Round 1 grant proposal administrator, the PSC was tasked by the CC to select no more than 10 projects for the Proposition 1 Round 1 Grant Proposal. In addition, the PSC embraced the concept of the regional Proposal representing each Functional Area and each Subregion in the Funding Area, as defined in the 2013 Bay Area IRWM Plan, if such projects could be considered competitive, and also elevating projects that provided benefits to tribes/DACs/EDAs, either through the 10% minimum reserved for tribes/DACs/EDAs or through the General Implementation Project funding.

Project Scoring and Selection Process

The PSC convened through a series of phone calls and an in-person 'Scoring Review and Project Selection' meeting on July 15th, 2019. To ensure the scoring and selection process was fair and equitable, the PSC agreed that PSC members considered to be directly affiliated with a project proponent could not score their own project. In addition, project scores that were not submitted by the agreed-upon internal deadline were not included in the quantitative portion of the review process. Similarly, PSC members who were not present at the July 15th in-person meeting did not participate in the qualitative assessment of top-ranked projects and therefore deferred to the final decision of the convened PSC.

Quantitative Review Process:

- PSC agreed to use the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Round 1 Grant Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Project Level Evaluation scoring criteria to evaluate all project submittals (25 point scale).

July 19, 2019
PSC Decision Memo

- Point totals were compiled for each project and averaged (Method 1). A second method compiled each project by rank and then averaged the rank, thus avoiding skew and outliers to provide all scorers equal voice (Method 2). Both Method 1 and Method 2 identified the same top 10 projects, just in a slightly different order.

Qualitative Review Process:

- PSC referenced the 2013 Bay Area IRWM Plan, the PSP, and the 2019 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines for guidance. The PSC removed any projects that the group agreed were not as competitive as other highly-ranked projects given the principles of the Bay Area IRWM and/or the statewide IRWM guidelines – i.e., projects that needed to better articulate claimed benefits or only provided benefits to a very limited geographical area in comparison to other projects.
- PSC reviewed the updated highest-ranked projects for Functional Area representation.
- PSC reviewed the updated highest-ranked projects for Subregion representation.
- PSC reviewed the updated highest-ranked projects for Tribal/DAC/EDA representation.

Managing Conflict of Interest

As mentioned above, to ensure the scoring and selection process was fair and equitable, PSC members representing agencies or organizations did not score their own projects. In addition, the accepted ground rules for the July 15th, 2019 in-person ‘Scoring Review and Project Selection’ meeting included an agreement by all present not to lobby the group or advocate on behalf of their project, and to only provide additional information about a project if requested. Lastly, no member of the PSC received any additional information on how to put together a competitive project application compared to other applicants: the qualitative review process mirrored DWR’s 2019 PSP scoring criteria exactly and the qualitative review process was based on IRWM principles in the 2013 Bay Area IRWM Plan, the 2019 PSP, and the 2019 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines. In addition, qualitative selection goals such as Functional Area representation, Subregion representation, and Tribal/DAC/EDA representation were discussed at public CC meetings leading up to the project application deadline.

Projects Selected for Round 1 Proposal

27 projects were submitted to the PSC for review. Through unanimous agreement, the PSC selected 8 projects to be recommended for inclusion in the regional Proposal, as shown in Table 1. The PSC agreed to fund Project 1 (a general implementation project that benefits DACs) from General Implementation funding and save the \$2.275M reserved specifically for Tribal/DAC/EDA Projects for Round 2.

Since the total grant request of the 8 selected projects was \$29,296,534, the PSC reduced the proposed award for certain projects to fall within the General Implementation funding cap for Round 1 (\$22.75M). The PSC reduced funding for projects with the highest grant requests. Project 11 was reduced by \$0.5M, Project 12 was reduced by \$1M, Project 17 was reduced by \$1M, and Project 19 was reduced by \$4,046,534. These projects were chosen by the PSC because they were considered viable despite cuts—i.e., projects were considered scalable and/or likely to go forward with agency support despite grant award reduction.

Once the proposed award was reduced to meet the General Implementation cap of \$22.75M, the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP) reminded the PSC that budget must be set aside for grant administration of the regional Proposal. Proposition 1 Round 1 grant administration costs are capped at

a maximum of 10% of the total grant request (or \$2.275M for Round 1). This 10% max includes the combined grant administrator costs for administration of the regional Proposal as well as any administration grant funding requests within the individual projects. The 8 individual selected projects have a combined administration grant request of \$541,484 already included in the total grant request. Currently, Table 1 shows a 5% placeholder value for grant administration costs for SFEP. The PSC recommends that SFEP and the CC come to an agreement on the total administration cost and how these costs will be allocated among the selected projects in time for project proponents to include these updates in the Pre-Application Submittal materials due to DWR on August 9th, 2019.

Table 2 shows the breakdown of selected projects by Functional Area and Tribal/DAC/EDA benefit. Table 3 shows the breakdown of selected projects by Subregion.

Sincerely,

Devon Becker as representing the PSC:

Judy Kelly
Brenda Buxton
Shalini Kannan (with Brenda Buxton)
Kanyon SayersRoods
Maddie Duda
Adam French
Mark Boucher
Cheryl Munoz
Alex Tavizon
Sherri Norris
Ryan Hirano
Neeta Bijoor (representing Valley Water in place of Metra Richert)
Metra Richert (unable to attend in-person meeting)
Robyn Navarra (unable to attend in-person meeting)
Deja Gould (unable to attend in-person meeting)
James Muller (SFEP: grant administrator)

Table 1. Summary and Funding of Selected Projects

Project Title	Sponsor	Project Number	Subregion	Functional Area	Prop 1 Grant Request	Rank by Ave Score	Reduction	Proposed Award (Prop 1 Grant Request minus Reduction)	SFEP Grant Administration Cost for Proposal	Total Project Award	% Funded
RD1 System Fish Passage Improvements	Alameda County Water District	#11	East	Watershed-Habitat	\$ 4,000,000	1	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 153,008	\$ 3,346,992	84%
Lower Walnut Creek Restoration	Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	#6	East	Watershed-Habitat	\$ 1,500,000	2	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 65,575	\$ 1,434,425	96%
River Oaks Stormwater Capture Project	City of San José	#12	South	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 4,350,000	3	\$1,000,000	\$ 3,350,000	\$ 146,450	\$ 3,203,550	74%
NBWRP Phase 2	North Bay Water Reuse Authority	#17	North	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 5,246,931	4	\$1,000,000	\$ 4,246,931	\$ 185,661	\$ 4,061,270	77%
Calistoga Water and Habitat Project	City of Calistoga and Napa County Resource Conservation District	#1	North	Disadvantaged Communities	\$ 2,121,555	5	\$ -	\$ 2,121,555	\$ 92,747	\$ 2,028,808	96%
San Francisco Creek Flood Protection, Ecosystem Restoration, and Recreation Project	San Francisco Creek Joint Powers Authority	#15	West	Watershed-Habitat	\$ 3,100,000	6	\$ -	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 135,521	\$ 2,964,479	96%
Bay Area Regional Water Conservation	East Bay Municipal Utility District	#19	Multiple	Water Supply-Water Quality	\$ 8,415,400	6	\$4,046,534	\$ 4,368,866	\$ 190,991	\$ 4,177,875	50%
San Francisco Zoo Recycled Water Pipeline Project	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	#10	West	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 562,648	8	\$ -	\$ 562,648	\$ 24,597	\$ 538,051	96%
TOTALS					\$29,296,534	N/A	\$6,546,534	\$ 22,750,000	\$ 994,550	\$ 21,755,450	N/A

Table 2. Functional Area Representation of Selected Projects

Functional Area or DAC/EDA/Tribal Benefits	Proposed Award	% Total
Disadvantaged Communities	\$ 2,121,555	9.3%
Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 6,450,000	28.4%
Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 4,809,579	21.1%
Water Supply-Water Quality	\$ 4,368,866	19.2%
Watershed-Habitat	\$ 5,000,000	22.0%

Table 3. Subregion Representation of Selected Projects

Subregions	Proposed Award	% Sub Reg
North	\$ 6,368,486	28%
South	\$ 3,350,000	15%
East	\$ 5,000,000	22%
West	\$ 3,662,648	16%
Multiple	\$ 4,368,866	19%

Project Number	Project Title	Sponsor	Subregion	Functional Area	Prop 1 Grant Request	Rank by Avg Score ¹
#11	RD1 System Fish Passage Improvements	Alameda County Water District (ACWD) Leonard Ash	East	Watershed-Habitat	\$ 4,000,000	1
#6	Lower Walnut Creek Restoration	Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	East	Watershed	\$ 1,500,000	2
#12	River Oaks Stormwater Capture Project	City of San José, Jeff Sinclair	South	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 4,350,000	3
#17	NBWRP Phase 2	North Bay Water Reuse Authority - Jake Spaulding	North	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 5,246,931	4
#1	Calistoga Water and Habitat Project	City of Calistoga and Napa County Resource Conservation District, Derek Rayner	North	Disadvantaged Communities	\$ 2,121,555	5
#15	San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection, Ecosystem Restoration, and Recreation Project, Upstream of Highway 101	San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority	West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 3,100,000	6
#19	Bay Area Regional Water Conservation	East Bay Municipal Utility District	Multiple	Water Supply-Water Quality	\$ 8,415,400	6
#10	San Francisco Zoo Recycled Water Pipeline Project	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	West	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 562,648	8
#7	McCosker Creek Restoration	East Bay Regional Park District, Tiffany Margulici	East	Watershed-Habitat	\$ 910,500	9
#8	Palo Alto Flood Basin Tide Gates Improvements	Santa Clara Valley Water District	South-West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 6,500,000	10
#9	OLSD Sewer Pipeline Replacement Project	Oro Loma Sanitary District	South	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 1,000,000	11
#3	Sutter Urban Flood Reduction	City of San Pablo; Amanda Booth	East	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 4,000,000	12
#5	Implementing BMPs on Rural Lands	Sonoma Resource Conservation District, Valerie Quinto	North	Watershed	\$ 1,193,047	12
#14	San Mateo Water Resources Program	San Mateo Resource Conservation District	West	Water Supply-Water Quality	\$ 2,955,000	14

#24	BART Hayward Maintenance Complex Rainwater Catchment, Bio-Retention Basin, and Solar Thermal project	BART	East	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 5,441,180	14
#20	Bayfront/Atherton Flood Protection Project	County of San Mateo, Erika Powell	South	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 3,216,484	16
#22	Belmont Creek Watershed Restoration Project	County of San Mateo	West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 10,680,548	16
#13	Hayward Recycled Water Project Phase-2	City of Hayward; Jan Lee	East	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 3,980,000	18
#2	Bayfront Recycled Water and SLR Protection	West Bay Sanitary District, Phil Scott, Manager	West	Wastewater-Recycled Water	\$ 15,000,000	19
#4	Graywater Direct Installation Program for Underserved Communities	Ecology Action	Multiple	Water Supply-Water Quality	\$ 338,387	20
#18	Athlone Terrace Pump Station Upgrade	County of San Mateo Dept of Public Works. Joe LoCoco (jlococo@smcgov.org)	West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 3,750,000	20
#16	Walnut/Angus pump stations upgrades	San Mateo County Flood Control District. Mark Chow (mchow@smcgov.org)	West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 2,181,450	22
#25	Aging Concrete-Lined Channels	Zone 7 Water Agency	East	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 10,375,000	23
#23	Bluff Erosion Protection Preservation Esplanade	City of Pacifica, Louis Sun	West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 1,700,000	24
#21	Beach Boulevard South Seawall Replacement	City of Pacifica, Louis Sun	West	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 9,000,000	25
#26	Chain of Lakes Pipeline	Zone 7 Water Agency	East	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 33,000,000	26
#27	Regional Upstream Detention Improvements	Zone 7 Water Agency	East	Flood Protection-Stormwater	\$ 7,625,000	27

ⁱ Identical values for rank indicate a tie. The following number was then skipped in the ranking.

Takeaways from short form VS PIF submittal analysis:

- 34 short forms submitted
- 27 PIFs submitted
- Of the 34 projects submitted via short form, 19 were not submitted as a PIF and 15 were submitted as a PIF
- Of the 14 project proponents who submitted the 19 short forms for a project that was not also submitted as a PIF, 8 submitted another project they'd submitted as short form or a different/new project as a PIF, and 6 did not submit a project as a PIF (the 8 includes CCWD and EBMUD as one project component, EBMUD submitted a different project for a PIF on behalf of 11 agencies, but CCWD did not submit a different project as a PIF)
- *Organizations that submitted short forms for a project not submitted as a PIF, but submitted a different project as a PIF:*
 - o Santa Clara Valley Water District
 - o East Bay Regional Parks
 - o Contra Costa Water District/East Bay MUD
 - o Ecology Action
 - o Zone 7 Water Agency
 - o City of Hayward
 - o Alameda County Water Agency
 - o San Mateo County
- *Organizations that submitted short form for a project but not a PIF:*
 - o Marin Municipal Water Agency
 - o Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
 - o City of Palo Alto
 - o Sonoma Water
 - o SFEP
 - o City of Milpitas
- *Projects submitted as a short form but not a PIF:*
 - o *Repair of water tank infrastructure that is sole source of water supply to Marin City (MMWA)*
 - o *Almaden Lake Improvement Project (SCWD)*
 - o *South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Project (SCWD)*
 - o *Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project (EBRP)*
 - o *Santa Venetia Timber-Reinforced Berm Improvement Project (MCFCWCD)*
 - o *CCWD-EBMUD Treated Water Intertie Expansion Project (CCWD/EBMUD)*
 - o *Turfgrass Replacement with Climate Appropriate Landscaping Project (Ecology Action)*
 - o *Enhanced Recycled Water Facility (City of Palo Alto)*
 - o *Alameda County Watershed "Confluence" Conference and expanded stakeholder engagement 2019-2022 (Zone 7 Water Agency)*
 - o *Field GIS Capabilities (Zone 7 Water Agency)*

- *Sonoma Valley Groundwater Banking Program (Sonoma Water)*
 - *City of Hayward Well B Replacement Project (City of Hayward)*
 - *Vallecitos Channel Betterments Project (ACWD)*
 - *Upper Lichau Creek Stormwater Management (Sonoma Water)*
 - *WaterLink Community Catch-up Project (Ecology Action)*
 - *Palo Alto Horizontal Levee Project (SFEP)*
 - *Delta Septic Relief (SFEP)*
 - *Infrastructure Replacement Project (County of San Mateo Service Area No 7)*
 - *Milpitas Recycled Water Pipeline Extension Segment 4 (City of Milpitas)*
- Of the 27 projects submitted as a PIF, 13 had not previously been submitted as a short form, and 14 had been. Of the 12 project proponents that submitted the 13 projects (City of Pacifica submitted 2 of these) as PIFs that had not been submitted as a short form previously, only 2 had submitted a different project as a short form, while 10 had not submitted any projects previously as a short form.
 - Of the 13 projects that were submitted as a PIF but not a short form, 4 were funded (of 8), and of the 14 projects that were submitted as a PIF and also as a short form, 4 were funded (of 8).



Appendix G-7

Storm Water Resource Plans Added to the 2013 Bay Area IRWMP by the Coordinating Committee on July 22, 2019



Appendix G-7: Storm Water Resource Plans Added to the Plan

The California State Water Resources Control Board adopted the Final Proposition 1 Storm Water Grant Program Guidelines on December 15, 2015, which established the process and criteria for awarding grants for multi-benefit storm water management projects, through the development of a Storm Water Resource Plan. To be eligible for a Proposition 1 Storm Water Grant, each Bay Area applicant must first develop and submit their Storm Water Resource Plan, or functionally equivalent plan, to the Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (BAIRWMP) Coordinating Committee for incorporation into the BAIRWMP.

The goals of the Storm Water Resource Plans are consistent with those of the BAIRWMP. As such, the Bay Area Coordinating Committee is in support of including Storm Water Resource Plans in the BAIRWMP, when the plans are complete.

The Storm Water Resource Plan listed below aligns with BAIRWMP priorities and protects Bay Area watersheds, and is hereby added to the 2013 BAIRWMP:

- Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program Stormwater Resource Plan

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
September 23, 2019	StopWaste
October 28, 2019	Nuestra Casa
December 2, 2019	??