

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
August 26, 2019
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 525 Golden Gate Ave, San Francisco, 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water (by phone) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Bradt, SFEP (by phone) • Brenda Buxton, SCC 	

Others Present:

Craig Cross, DWR
 Jolene Bertetto, EBMUD
 Maddie Duda, Lotus Water
 Ryan Hirano, Woodard & Curran
 Jennifer Krebs, representing Sonoma Water
 James Muller, SFEP
 Leslie Perry, SFEP
 Kanyon Sayers-Roods
 Aston Tennefos, DWR

On the Phone:

Devon Becker, ACWD
 Natasha Dunn, SFEP
 Jarrad Fisher, San Mateo RCD
 Deja Gould, IPOC
 Robyn Navarra, Zone 7
 Sherri Norris, CIEA
 Alex Tavizon, CIEA

2. Status on Prop 84 Rounds 1-4

Josh Bradt provided an update on the closeout of Round 1. The final closeout report was sent per Jessica Arm’s comments and Mr. Bradt sent out the final invoice for retention, which is last thing to close out the Round. Once the close out is signed by DWR, Round 1 will be officially closed.

Natasha Dunn provided an update on Round 2. A few project completion reports have been submitted, and SFEP is hoping to get 4 of these through shortly, including 1 (Bay Area Regional Water Conservation and Education Program), 4 (Marin/Sonoma Conserving Our Watershed Sediment Reduction & Managements), 9 (Petaluma Flood Reduction, Water & Habitat Quality for Capri Creek), and 16 (San Jose Green Streets & Alleys Demonstration). Project 14 (SF Bay Climate Change Pilot Projects) was officially closed out.

Ms. Dunn gave detailed explanations of a few projects. #10, Redwood City's plans specs are complete and they are now awaiting final permits which they will hopefully have this year. They hope to go out to bid in early 2020 and begin construction in Spring 2020. Project #18, Upper York Creek is moving along: they've gone out for phase 1, which is simpler than the second phase dam removal. They had a pre-bid meeting today and construction should happen before October. Phase 2 dam removal will need a more complete set of plans and phase 2 permits. They've hired a new set of consultants, EKI, and have good confidence that the project will be within the construction window.

Ms. Dunn and Mr. Muller described that SFEP is on a new schedule with all projects now; they have shifted so that everyone is on the same quarterly calendar schedule to submit at the same time. They will be uploading all rounds to the state at the end of August (the end of this week). A few invoices are lagging behind. Mr. Muller explained that DWR had to extend the budget for round 2. This should have happened recently, and they're expecting to have it executed soon. SFEP has been in limbo waiting for the process to happen at the state level. Luckily, there was only 1 quarter for project partners that was affected. Mr. Muller updated the CC that Ms. Dunn will be shepherding rounds through 2020.

Mr. Muller gave an update on Rounds 3 and 4. Q15 for Round 3 will be submitted this week. The amendment has been hanging out for a while – SFEP is waiting on one final piece of paper from a project partner; once they have that they will submit to the state and will go ahead with the change for 72,000. Project 1 (SFPUC) and Project 9 (StopWaste) billed out since the last meeting, and Stinson Beach is closed out. 96% of the grant funds in Round 3 have been spent.

Round 4 will be uploaded at the end of the week. Payment 10 was received on August 10th from DWR and SFEP subsequently sent out payments. The most recent amendment for this round was finalized. There have not been any site visits. There is not a lot of movement on grant funds since the last report, but this should speed up as projects move into construction season. As one note, the grant total spent did not include San Francisquito's numbers – SFEP will be submitting that this quarter (hopefully at the end of the month) and there will be a jump of 4 million next quarter.

SFEP is in conversations with DWR about the Mountain View and Eton projects, and how to update the schedule due to some delays. Brenda Buxton gave some details. She noted that she was hoping Mountain View could get an extension of a few years to have time to spend the money, but isn't sure if that is going to happen. Regarding Eton Landing, there had been discussions about directing those funds to another flood protection and restoration project in the Alviso community in the far South Bay. She said they want to have maybe one more conversation over mountain view, it is an enormously

expensive project that still has a big financial shortfall. Ms. Buxton said she can provide more details if need to go the route of redirecting funds.

Mr. Muller added that regarding the Mountain View project, they would need a few more years to get through construction. When they had a conversation with the state, the state had a request from another region to extend a grant that was denied, so they were told they couldn't extend to accommodate the Mountain View project. If this news is final, they will not be able to extend.

Ms. Buxton said she thinks she could make a good case for having the Eton Landing funds go to the Alviso Project, and asked if there would be any reason why the Mountain View funds couldn't also. The first part of the Alviso project being built is a flood protection levy, certified by ACE that would provide significant flood protection for 50+ years. Given the scale of the flood protection benefits, it could be a justified exchange, but Ms. Buxton noted that she wouldn't want to tie it to ultimate wetland restoration because that is further out, she'd want to frame it as a levy for flood protection that sets the stage for future wetland restoration. Mr. Muller and Ms. Buxton will talk and bring a proposal to rescope the projects to fit within the DWR grant timeframe back to the CC for discussion. Ms. Buxton has a great write up that will be agendized for the next meeting.

Jennifer Krebs provided an APQI update. Jake Spaulding with Sonoma Water provided a handout for the meeting. It notes that an X-Band radar has been installed at Valley Water's Penitencia Water Treatment Plant. It was installed July 9th. Testing and calibration is ongoing and a ribbon cutting will be held this fall. Last week there was a meeting of local project agencies committee (LPAC) which includes GMs of agencies that are hosting radar units. The group is discussing long term Operations and Maintenance of the AQPI System. Sonoma Water had a meeting on the admin side with Craig Cross and others at DWR. At the end of October they will have a user group meeting to figure out how to download and use data from the AQPI System this coming Wet Season.

Action Items:

- Ms. Chang will agendize a conversation about what to do with the Mountain View and Eden Landing projects for the September CC meeting.

3. Discussion of Transition of Prop 1 IRWM DACTI Grant Administration

Mr. Muller provided an update on the Prop 1 IRWM DACTIP administration. The Docusign for final execution was requested by DWR this morning and is going through MTC internal review. Mr. Muller has a Kickoff meeting for the DACTIP directly after the CC meeting with Mr. Cross and Aston Tennefoss. 4 Outreach Partners have finalized contracts/workplans/budgets and will hopefully be in contract in 2-3 weeks pending review of OPs and MTC, with 5-6 more on their heels.

SFEP is currently reviewing CIEA's contract. They are done with their scope of work and should have everything in place by the end of the week to send back to CIEA for their final comments and consideration.

Mr. Muller is working on forming a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He wrote up a description that explains the TAC structure and short-term efforts that he will circulate. Most short-term effort the TAC will take on includes scoping for Phase 2, what it looks like and what suggestions are on the table for how to spend the last million. One idea had been to develop a clearing house for OPs to access information. The next steps will be getting volunteers to serve on the TAC; James is hoping to have the first meeting next month to discuss ideas that have been floating around for what can be done with Phase 2. The group will work to tighten up phase 2 work for approval by the CC, then Mr. Muller will go to DWR to fold in that scope, budget, and schedule. More aspirational goals of the TAC include creating a connection between OPs/communities and the CC and to serve as an advisory body to help OPs move from needs assessment findings to developed projects through technical expertise and connecting groups to appropriate technical assistance. Mr. Muller is looking for approximately 10 representatives from various sub-regions, functional areas, DACs, Tribes, and various professions including engineers to inform those decisions at that level. Mr. Muller outlined his wish list for participation in the memo he will send out.

Mr. Muller gave a further description of Phase 2 for reference. Phase 1 includes \$215,000 for Project Development (in addition to the budget for Tribal Project Development), though phase 2 could be used for further development as needs surface. The overall vision for phase 2 is to create a structure or platform to not have the work done through the program just be a snapshot in time, but be a living resource to live past the grant lifetime. This might take the form of a website, database, or interactive map. The TAC will come together to discuss various options to see what would be the most useful.

Mr. Tavizon noted that the North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP) has about 40 projects they've planned on their website, which includes explanation of what the funding is, what's funded, and goals. This is one great resource for Outreach Partners to look at to begin to think about project development. One of the Tribal water engineers, Javier, might be a great resource for the OPs to talk and break down each of the projects on the NCRP website. The projects on the website are broken down by past and future, and each project has a well detailed definition of what doing, goals, outcomes, and what communities the project is outreaching to.

Action Items:

- Mr. Muller will send out a write-up of the TAC before COB today.
- Ms. Duda will send out preliminary needs assessment results to inform potential TAC participation as these are available.
- Mr. Tavizon will send Ms. Duda the NCRP website that details projects they have funded and Javier's contact information.

4. Discussion of Prop 1 Implementation Funding

Brian Mendenhall gave an update on Prop 1 Implementation. Last Friday the Bay Area had its pre-application workshop with DWR. Overall, it was a very successful workshop, the 6th workshop DWR has held. DWR brought a diverse team to look at the proposals from different angles. There were 8 presentations, one from each of the potential projects the Bay Area is recommending. Everyone did a great job; there were questions from DWR, but the applicants were well prepared.

With the Bay Area water conservation project, there were questions raised on the direction DWR is going with rebate programs. We will have to work through that with DWR and see how flexible they're willing to be; it could potentially affect this project. Mr. Muller will be working to get DWR's final comments, and then we have until November 15 to submit the application. It will be 4 weeks to get DWR comments and then 8 weeks to submit our final app.

Mr. Muller wanted to flag for the CC that he will be having follow-up conversations about whether the San Jose Stormwater Basin project is ripe for this round. DWR expressed concern at the meeting that it was at a conceptual level at this point. If it gets redlined, the PSC may need to get back together to discuss, or we could add other money to projects that had some funds slashed. Mr. Muller wants to wait to get final comments from DWR before making any decisions.

A question was raised about the Conservation project: were the questions related to something we're doing differently or is DWR doing something different? Mr. Muller clarified that DWR was audited a few years ago and they have taken a different approach to looking at these kinds of programs. They raised concerns about "continuing" programs – if funding is allocated to a rebate program, DWR does not want to allocate bond funding to replace an existing program. A few other things were flagged, including a reporting feature that Ms. Carmel Brown did not think was necessarily project implementation and concern over "gifts of public funds" for rebates. They will need to look at how DWR has defined things in guidelines. Mr. Muller spoke briefly with the project sponsors after and they have some ideas. Mr. Muller is confident they can drill it down in the next 12 weeks. Mr. Tennefoss said that Ms. Brown has already talked to DWR legal and is ready to talk to James and the project sponsors about the San Jose and Water Conservation Projects.

Mr. Muller reported that Ms. Brown was complimentary that the Bay Area decided to fund its DAC project through the general implementation pot and save the DAC funding for the next round.

Action Items:

- Mr. Tennefoss will check in with Ms. Brown about reaching out to Mr. Muller to discuss the Water Conservation and San Jose projects.

5. Status of Plan Update

Ryan Hirano gave an update on the status of the BAIRWMP Plan update on behalf of the Plan Update Team. Mr. Hirano, Michelle Novotny, Katie Cole with Woodard and Curran, and Ms. Duda have been diligently working on the Plan Update. They are working with Bay Area water agencies to compile groundwater contaminant information per state requirement. They have also incorporated most of CIEA's edits and are updating the DAC sections. Woodard & Curran has reviewed the plan, the state requirements, and Ms. Novotny's proposal for the changes that need to be made and we are making good progress on making those changes.

Their plan is to bring the draft updated Bay Area IRWMP to the Coordinating Committee in September, and then have the Coordinating Committee approve the update at its October meeting, set for October 28th. The updated Bay Area IRWMP could then be submitted to DWR by the end of October, in advance of the Prop 1 application due date of November 15th. Once DWR gives its approval, the updated Bay Area IRWMP can be adopted by the necessary agencies. According to the Plan, the agencies that need

to adopt it are the “governing bodies of each agency that is part of the CC” which consists of the “Chair, Vice Chair and FA representatives (formal members).” Others may wish to adopt it as desired.

The Plan Update Team would like consolidated comments that are not conflicting. They plan to submit updated plan to DWR by end of Oct. Nov 1 is the tentative submittal date to give a 2 week buffer period before the Prop 1 application is due to DWR; then the plan can be adopted by the necessary agencies – chair, vice chair, voting members.

Mr. Muller included that the region will also have to have the Local Project Sponsors (LPS) for Round 1 included in the Plan, and the agencies will have to adopt the updated Plan to receive grant funds. DWR clarified that LPS’ will need to adopt the updated Plan prior to agreement execution (this information can be found on Page 30 of the PSP, as well as in Table 1 on Page 9 of the PSP).

DWR mentioned that the award would probably be Spring, and execution will be after that. Ms. Navarro suggested putting adoption on agency calendars for February/March to adopt the Update early.

Action Items:

- The Plan Update Team will have a draft update of the Plan for the CC to review at the October meeting so there will be a 2 week period for review before final updates.
- Mr. Hirano will send Mr. Tavizon the edits made on the Tribal DACTIP comments in track changes.

6. Addition of Stormwater Resource Plans to the Plan

Mr. Mendenhall asked the CC to re-adopt the Santa Clara Basin Stormwater Resource Plan. Mr. Mendenhall brought their Plan to the CC in January 2019 and have since made edits to add info regarding their schedule and budget. The State Water Board now considers their Plan final and they are currently routing to sign the actual plan. It’s all there, State Board approved, and they are now waiting on the signed copy for the record.

The SCB Stormwater Resource Plan was adopted unanimously by the CC.

7. Announcements and Next Steps

Mr. Mendenhall announced that he recently received a request to consider future funding of the Estuary Magazine through the IRWMP process. Mr. Mendenhall supported this request as potentially reasonable because it would help demonstrate to the public the larger value of IRWMP as we face times of uncertainty and less bond funding for IRWMP. If we funded, we could count on having some pages dedicated to IRWMP in each article. There are a number of possibilities for how this could happen. We could consider doing a request to each IRWM member or re-open the 4 party agreement. Mr. Mendenhall asked if this topic could be agendized for the September CC meeting.

Ms. Buxton and Mr. Mendenhall discussed past options that have come up for using the 4 party funds, including for consultants for the application and transfer of data to the new IRWM website.

Kanyon Sayers-Roods announced that she will be part of holding a Canoe Journey on Indigenous Peoples' Day, October 12, an after sunrise ceremony that will take canoes out around the Bay to honor truth and history of Indigenous peoples in the Bay, connect a network of people, and start a conversation around water quality and what it means to be a shared watershed. She encouraged anyone interested in joining and standing in solidarity to visit canoejourney2019.com for additional information. Many families from Washington State will be coming down. The goals are connection to community, honoring and acknowledging the occupation of Alcatraz on the 50th anniversary, and tying in how everything is related. The event is an opportunity to gather information about water quality in the Bay. Canoe Journey is an annual event up north, and this is California's protocol sharing opportunity.

Mr. Muller formally introduced Leslie Perry to the group. She has been with SFEP for 13 years, primarily at the State Water Board doing permitting. She will be working on the Prop 1 Round 1 grant.

The September CC meeting will be held at Stop Waste. The October CC meeting will be held at Nuestra Casa, and Nuestra Casa will present on their DACTIP Needs Assessment findings at this meeting. Ms. Duda will have a carpool sign up sheet for this meeting at the September CC meeting. The combined November-December CC meeting will be held on December 2 at the State Coastal Conservancy. The January CC meeting will be held in Marin and the Marin OPs will present on their needs assessment findings at this meeting.

Action Items:

- Ms. Chang will add discussion of possibly funding the Estuary Magazine through the BARIWMP Process to the September CC meeting agenda.
- Ms. Duda will have a carpool sign-up sheet for the October CC meeting at Nuestra Casa at the September CC meeting.