

**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.

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: Q19 was uploaded in Aug but has not yet been approved by DWR. Invoices 18, 19, 20 and 21 are not yet approved by DWR. 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: \$17,075,267.29 (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 was uploaded on September 10 but has not yet been approved by DWR. Payments: Q15 payment from the state is expected in November. Amendments: SFEP has submitted the request to amend the contract (amendment #5) to reallocate \$702,500 in admin funds and to extend project #01. It is currently under review at DWR. Site Visits: A site visit for Project 01 was scheduled for October. 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: \$30,876,194.37 (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	DSRSanDist/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	Y	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: Q12 was uploaded on September 10 but has not yet been approved by DWR. Payments: No payments were sent or received this month. Amendments: Amendment #3 has been approved and finalized 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 Q12) Total Grant: \$21,469,025 Total Match: \$22,395,709 Grant Funds Spent: \$7,520,242.44 (35%) Match Funds Documented: \$12,747,949 (55.6%)	
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

AQPI Update

Reporting, Invoices & Payments

- AQPI team has been working through an issue where the standard documentation generated from the accounting system at NOAA does not contain enough detail to meet DWRs backup requirements. Sonoma Water has been in contact with DWR and NOAA to resolve. Currently working with NOAA accountants to generate financial reports acceptable to DWR.
- Will be resubmitting invoice # 9 and invoice # 10 in the near future with the improved NOAA documentation.

Budget/Schedule

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

Other Developments

- Valley Water X-Band Radar – Permanent radar installed and online. Ribbon cutting currently being scheduled for end of October.
- Sonoma Water X-Band Radar –Temporary radar installed and online - Installation date for permanent radar delayed but temporary unit will remain operational until permanent unit is online
- East Bay X-Band Radar – Negotiations and contracting for radar deployment progressing with five East Bay entities. Estimated agreement and installation of container mounted radar winter 2019.
- SFPUC X-Band Radar – Site preparation for an October/November deployment is progressing with new access road construction underway. 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.
- AQPI featured in September 2019 issue of EM Magazine, a copyrighted publication of the Air & Waste Management Association (A&WMA; www.awma.org).

Upcoming meetings

- Local Project Agency Committee September 23rd, 2019
- User Group meetings being planned for October 31st, 2019 @ Alameda County Public Works

Bay Area IRWM Prop 1 Implementation Workshop with DWR

Attendees:

Carmel Brown, DWR

Aston Tennefoss, DWR – SFBA FA Coordinator

Rachel Ballante, DWR

Ted Daum, DWR

Paul Detjens, Contra Costa County

Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD

Devon Becker, ACWD

Ellen Yuen, City of San Jose

Tiffany Ngo, City of San Jose

Jake Spaulding, SCWA

Chelsea Spear, DWR

Jennifer Morales, DWR

Leslie Perry, SFEP

Leah Walker, City of Petaluma

Chelsea Thompson, City of Petaluma

Tess Byler, San Franciscquito Creek

Len Materman, San Franciscquito Creek

Taylor Chang, SFPUC

Steve Ritchie, SFPUC

James Muller, SFEP

Derek Rayner, City of Calistoga

Jonathan Koehler, Napa County RCD

Pat Costello

Claire Nordile, EBMUD

Cheryl Munoz, SFPUC

Jolene Bertetto, EBMUD

Introduction -- Prop 1 Implementation Workshop

Mr. Ritchie gave an overview of the SF Bay Funding Area region's geographical, hydrological, and climate characteristics and of the Bay Area IRWMP. While other regions are unified by water supply, the thing that unifies the San Francisco Region is the Bay. Water supply and flood control are different because of the way the region is set up geographically. The bay is a complex hydrological network, with urbanization and land practice operations as its biggest impacts. In the future, dramatic population increases and greater density will continue to affect the Bay's water system. The Bay is often described as having a Mediterranean climate, with many microclimates due to fog and geography, receiving 90% of its precipitation between November and April.

The BAIRWMP is a 9 county effort to address the area's critical needs. The Region is broken down into four subregions: North/East/South/West, and attempts are made to balance funding by both subregion (created by distribution and land area) and functional area – water supply/water quality; wastewater/recycled water; flood control/stormwater; habitat/watersheds, though the Drought round of IRWM funding moved things to the water side heavily.

The BA IRWM Coordinating Committee serves as the RWMG for the region. The CC is made up of representatives from each functional area and subregion. The body meets monthly and is open to the public. The governance structure is currently made up of 12 voting representatives, 3 from each functional area.

Project Selection Process and Project Overview:

Mr. Muller gave an overview of the Bay Area's Project Selection Process and Projects selected by the Bay Area for Round 1 Implementation funding. The Project Selection Committee (PSC) reviewed and ranked 27 proposals based on DWR's criteria and additional criteria based on the region's priorities. They then convened at an all day workshop to discuss rankings and selected 8 projects for funding.

As an overview of the projects selected: 1 was regional, the Water Conservation Project, 1 DAC project, 2 specifically address the Human Right to Water. The lowest cost project is the SFPUC Zoo Recycled Water Project at the San Francisco Zoo at 500,000, the highest cost is just above 4 million for the Regional Water Conservation Project. There is a 75% match against these funds. The North subregion had a slightly larger share of the funding, the East and West a little less, the regional project will benefit all regions.

The majority of projects were watershed projects; then funding was split between water supply, water conservation, water reuse, and stormwater management (though most are multibeneficial). Benefits of these projects include: 26 linear miles of high quality spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead; 242 acres of eco and habitat restoration; 334 acres of impervious surface stormwater treatment; 44.78 acres protected from flooding; Reduction of annual mercury and PCB load to SF Bay, among others.

7 statewide priorities are addressed in the Bay Area proposal, and projects indirectly reduce the draw on the delta.

The Bay Area Proposal contains 1 project in a DAC; Calistoga water and habitat project, funded through Implementation Funds. It provides 480 AFY of increased water supply reliability and 2 acres of habitat restoration. Projects also protect against climate change (through shoreline resilience, flood protection, protection against drought through use of recycled water and conservation), of which SF is vulnerable to impacts.

Ms. Carmel Brown, DWR Thanked everyone for being at the workshop and participating in the process. The pre-application workshop is something new DWR is trying with Prop 1 implementation funding. Past programs have been more reactionary. DWR is trying to have as much interaction during pre-application period as possible; The Bay Area workshop is 5th or 6th workshop DWR has held, some groups have been solving their own problems in workshops about what is ready for round 1 vs 2. DWR is learning a lot through presentations and being able to ask questions

Ms. Brown wanted everyone to be aware that DWR has a full time climate change program and staff, in 4 regional offices with a climate liaison in each office that are at regions' disposal, here to help with regional climate change planning. They work with local agencies and have an abundance of climate change resources. DWR is also creating Cal Adapt model for water resources management – can go in and plug in impacts for your area (temperature, precipitation, etc) – water resources will show snow pack, moisture. They are hoping to roll out this tool in early 2020.

Project 5: North Bay Water Reuse Program Phase II – Jake Spaulding, Sonoma Water

Mr. Spaulding gave an overview of Project 5. The Project proponent, the NBWRA is comprised of 13 public agencies in the San Pablo Watershed – Marin, Sonoma, Napa that work together to develop, capture, and put to beneficial reuse highly treated recycled water. They have a history of successful project implementation. Phase 1 of the project is \$104 million Program providing 5,200 AFY, and several sub projects received IRWM funding under prop 84 rounds. Phase II, the content of this project proposal for Implementation funding is ~\$76 million program providing 5,039 AFY – to build off of phase 1. The proposed project for IRWM is comprised of 2 subprojects of 16 identified for implementation:

- City of Petaluma Increase Ellis Creek Water Recycling Facility Capacity Project 712 AFY
- City of American Canyon Recycled Water

The project will cost roughly 4 million dollars with about 61% cost share. They are looking to complete construction in 2020. The overall project addresses a number of statewide priorities including: manage and prepare for dry periods; increase regional self reliance and IRWM across all levels of government, and protect and restore important ecosystems. It addresses the IRWM goals and priorities of improved water supply, promoting environmental, economic, and social sustainability, and is aiming to protect and improve watershed health and function and bay water quality. The project is proposing benefits of 780 AFY of recycled water (over 5,000 total for Phase 2) and 221 AFY of potable water offset.

Ms. Walker gave an overview of the City of Petaluma subproject. The subproject aims to expand the capacity of the Ellis Creek Water Recycling Facility to all tertiary, and to supply primarily all agricultural and urban uses, which will allow the area to meet increasing demands of urban and agricultural uses. The City of Petaluma Recycled Water Master Plan allows the NBWRA to serve water in City of Petaluma and agricultural areas established as RW use areas; they are planning to in the future develop urban and

agricultural pipelines. The subproject improves water supply reliability and quality, reduces reliance on groundwater: CP purchases 95% of drinking water supply from Sonoma Water as groundwater is not of the quality needed for vineyards or for local dairies, so they use surface water. This project allows the region to reduce supplies from Sonoma Water Agency as it provides an alternative to saline influenced groundwater (tidal slough, saline influence throughout region); Some Sonoma Water supply is coming from outside the watershed, and this project allows the region to reduce imports, reduce surface water within watershed, reduce groundwater, and increase supply to meet agricultural and urban needs. Agriculture is a big part of the Petaluma community with historic dairies and vineyards.

The NBWRA went from giving away recycled water 10 years ago to selling now at 50% of potable rate; the more they can generate taking something they'd be discharging to Petaluma river and can sell, they are benefiting the population. The project also reduces effluent discharge to Petaluma River – though this only makes a difference 10 days / year; they are prohibited from discharging may – oct. They discharge everything they can. These dates line up with demands for recycled water (don't have during non discharge season). The North Bay has extremely low nutrient levels, lowest of all POTWs in the Bay. This subproject provides an additional 712 AFY of recycled water during peak demands and 173 in water offset demands. Project admin for the CP group is very low. Environmental review is complete, design is almost complete and will be done by December 1; construction is bulk of the charge at \$3.6 million.

CEQA is complete, and they are hoping design will be done December 1. Regarding the wastewater change petition, they met with the Division of Water Rights a year ago, and are meeting again next Tuesday to hopefully get the wastewater change permit; building permit – they hope by July 1, and to end December 31 2020. Their workplan includes: project admin, land purchase easement – no tasks; planning/design/environmental – Construction/implementation.

NBWRA considered project alternatives including adding more recycled water storage -- the current basin has limited capacity. Though, they have 500 acres of mostly wetlands so can't build on it. They also considered another alternative to require agricultural users to provide nonpeak storage – which they are already doing for all new agricultural users. They also looked to expand potable supplies. The decided recycled water is better for the region. Stakeholder coordination for the project includes NBWRA, Petaluma Valley GSA, City, County, Sonoma Water, Sonoma RCD, NBWD, and the advisory committee.

Mr. Spaulding gave an overview of the City of American Canyon Project: Recycled Water Distribution Expansion project. They are looking to construct 3,000 ft of LF pipe. All pipelines that exist are in roadways, everything would be within a build area, and the project would supply water to 2 community parks, 2 schools, as well as county services. The project would reduce supplies of water from outside watershed, which gets water from the State Water Project. IRWM funding would provide revenue to support additional water system operations and reduce discharge to wetlands. The presentation included a detailed budget, which is about 61% of the costshare. The NBWRA has all permits and don't need to purchase land. CEQA is complete, their design window is 2019. They hope to bid in spring 2020, award summer 2020, and implement construction summer/fall 2020.

This project addresses climate change. The region is impacted by drought and SLR, and this project provides drought resistant alternative and contributes to regional resiliency by reducing demand on potable water supply.

DWR comments/questions:

DWR asked why these 2 projects were selected. The NBWRA identified a suite of projects from 11 member agencies who go through a process of evaluating projects to balance suite of projects for region. All were evaluated and ranked. Technical groups from participating agencies go through and select projects, and these are new projects, not involved with Phase 1 – these two subprojects are ready to go and have been waiting to go.

DWR reported that they appreciated the context for the program and recommended that in the final application NBWRA focus on these two subprojects specifically.

In terms of quantification of benefits, DWR noted that these should be for these two programs specifically, and similarly for HRTW – NBWRA should focusing specifically for these two projects would be very helpful.

DWR reported they have prepared information and will be getting specific direction for what need there might be for a potential revision.

DWR climate liaison reported she would love to see more specificity in the climate change section about these projects.

DWR commented that the project proposal has a heavy emphasis on drought protection, and that NBWRA could be shoring themselves on other benefits. They noted that if the project is providing saltwater or SLR protections at all, then they should spell that out, it doesn't have to be direct direct benefits. In general, DWR thinks NBWRA could find a few more benefits in this project. For example, depending on what energy sources are, this is a public project – if energy is coming from renewable sources, say that as well! Claim that!

Carmel Brown noted that DWR has obligation to check all of these state priority boxes and that they can be audited at any time, and that is why they are drilling down to these specifics they are asking about.

Project 3: Lower Walnut Creek Restoration Project

Paul Detjens gave an overview of Project three. The project is located where Walnut Creek meets the Suisun Bay, between Martinez and Marathon refinery; it is an Ex USACE channel that was deauthorized 2014. The project will be 2.5 miles on main stem; Plus 1.5 miles on a major tributary in the largest Watershed in Contra Costa County. The project is reconnecting a long diked off ACE area. The sediment balance in the ACE design was way off, and the ACE project needed to be dredged every 3 years which is unsustainable. The project will restore 196 tidal acres of wetlands, create/enhance 43 acres of seasonal wetland, create 3,500 LF of new setback levee, and provide wildlife compatible public access. The goals are to restore and enhance habitat of lower walnut creek and provide sustainable flood management while allowing opportunities for public access and restoration. The project meets IRWM goals and objectives 3, 4, and 5. The project will: Restore habitat to improve ecological function and habitat quantity, quality, and connectivity; Maintain appropriate levels of flood protection along lower walnut and Pacheco creeks; and Create sustainable benefits that consider future environmental changes.

Regarding SLR: the project was designed for a wide range of tidal waters. They designed a whole bunch of ecotones – very flat levees to allow habitats to migrate up Sloat; and are overbuilding the footprint of the setback levee. They are ‘blessed with elevation capital’ – they have had a lot of dredge which has been pumped into Pacheco marsh and are working to building connectivity between wetlands. The project is aligned with many state and federal programs: EPA flood control 2.0; Bayland habitat goals update; and is focused on habitat for site and regional benefits. The project will create 196 acres of tidal wetlands and 43 acres of seasonal wetlands. The project will have habitat restoration benefits for endangered species including the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, Black Rail, and California Ridgeway Rail as well as other terrestrial, avian, and aquatic species. The project proponents went through a comprehensive, community-based planning process and developed suite of measures, analyzed alternatives for costs, benefits, and environmental impacts. Additionally, a stakeholder advisory group provided input. They chose the option with the least impact, most benefits, and lowest cost.

They have flexibility in the administrative portion of their budget. As of now, 100% of IRWMP funds would go to implementation and construction phases. They are in SFBRA recommended status. They are continuing to look for implementation funding, CDFW encouraged them to apply for their next round. The current budget plan reflects 78% non-state fund match for the total project, with match for the IRWMP funds amounting to about 91%. They are currently ~65% completed with design, and hoping to reach 95% in the coming weeks. They plan to complete CEQA 11/19/2019; submitted all permit apps 7/15; and plan to begin construction 2020. They will complete monitoring and adaptive management 2020-2025 and will have ongoing community coordination and O&M by CCC, FCD, and JMLT. Stakeholder coordination and their community based planning process includes a “listening tour”, an active stakeholder advisory group, countless tours, and social media engagement. In terms of schedule, they started project administration in 2016, and it will go through 2021. They are closing out CEQA planning design at the end of the year. They included a photo of a very detailed schedule in their presentation. They aren’t exactly sure what the permit schedule will be due to construction in species’ homes.

DWR comments/questions:

DWR noted that schedule and budget included in the PIF didn’t have a lot of detail. They asked if they could split out the cost per component – the upper reach and lower reach – to ID a very specific area the funding is covering to take out some of the cost share and put in other cost share requirements because DWR won’t require that much, but they will have to justify all of it on DWR’s end. In short, DWR asked if they could dial back their cost share to simplify administration for DWR and CCFC.

DWR noted that the permitting timeline is going very well for a project of this scope. They asked about the agency consultations and draft EIR, specifically, has CCFC had the chance to include potential controversial issues like noise and construction? CCFC replied that they have taken mitigation measures, there is primarily concern raised about industrial neighbors. They don’t expect any cultural resource issues as they have done literary and ground surveys and Tribal consultations. They are primarily being aware of neighbors that aren’t the cleanest neighbors – they have measures in place for if it comes up during construction. They have flexibility in how they place materials so they won’t be exposed to tidal flows. The noise will really only be an issue for the Rails: their industrial neighbors will be very noisy. They will complete dawn-dark construction 7 days/week, with no nighttime work.

DWR asked about legacy contaminants. CCFC replied they have done testing in site – they have had materials in creek placed in the 60s and 70s and have not uncovered levels of concern. They said we get high levels of arsenic around the Bay, but theirs is below average for the background level for the Bay. The permitting process is one of their biggest concerns – they have done all that they can to have that integration and alignment between agencies and remain optimistic; they have put in a lot of investment to make sure the agencies know what they're doing.

DWR commented that it is refreshing to see a wildlife benefits project and that CCFC might be able to claim some carbon sequestration benefits. They are expecting CC to have impacts on water quality, and asked would this benefit flow and qual? If so, they might be able to claim those benefits. CCFC said they have worked to quantify some of those, can try to add them to their final proposal.

Project 7: San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection, Ecosystem, Restoration, and Recreation Project

Ms. Byler gave an overview of Project 7. The San Francisquito Creek JPA was created after a large flood in 1978. They work on and are focused on the management of the county line between San Mateo and Santa Clara County. In terms of other projects they have completed, last year they built a project to remove the creek floodplain from the area to take it from a 22 year to record flood event, which DWR provided two grants toward. Now that they've built the Bay-highway 101 project, they are focused upstream of Hwy 101. For this project, they have asked for funding to match local money to widen some of those areas. They are focused on widening 3 areas by removing concrete constrictions between Newell and Euclid where sacked concrete lines the Palo Alto Creek Bank; they plan to replace a large concrete structure in the channel.

The Draft EIR was released in April 2019 and they had a 60 day comment period. They are currently developing responses to comments in a final document that they will be bringing to their board September 26. By October they will have the final. In terms of schedule, they plan to conduct construction of the elements of the grant through October 2021 and complete the whole contract with DWR through 2023 to get the as builts. Currently they are finalizing the EIR and will be submitting permitting applications shortly thereafter. They are not anticipating permits in 6 month period – it will take at least a full year to get regulatory permits. They have had site visits by agencies in 2016-2018 and have a good starting point for their applications.

Because the project is in a Steelhead channel, they can only work for 4 months in the Channel from June -Oct 15 for construction.

DWR questions/comments:

DWR asked a number of questions. They asked about how permitting went on the Prop 84 grants. SFJPA responded that it was challenging. They had permitting agencies with other ideas about what they should do. In total, it took 35 months, but this previous experience developed relationships at the right level in agencies to hopefully make this next project go more smoothly.

SFJPA's local partners are Valley Water and San Mateo County (the land they work on belongs to both, which is why there's a JPA).

The Creek has had major floods. The biggest was in 1950s, and the overarching planning for the area has been done by the JPA. They had a long stakeholder process: NOP in 2016, stakeholder meetings in each of the cities, brought in an independent consultant to facilitate what the community wanted, and received broad support for project based on the comments.

DWR asked if they could elaborate on the recreation portion. There are 2 creekside parks planned in the EIR; one where they are removing a concrete structure and vegetating a sloped bank where there will still space between woodlands avenue. They will put a small park there and then another in East Palo Alto – this is not in their proposal but part of the broader project. This will include a small area between the top bank and roadway. There is very limited property here to provide green space and they are eaking out what they can. 0% of the overall budget was assigned to the park. They requested 3 million which they are matching with 6.5 million local dollars.

DWR asked SFJPA to elaborate on the outreach effort and community involvement process. The JPA board in elected from 3 cities, 2 counties who present to their governing bodies. Every time they roll out something, they do an NOP, draft EIR, and go to councils and make presentations. They do all of the necessary public outreach/hearings for CEQA. Also, at the recommendation of RWQCB they developed a stakeholder process: in the fall of 2017 they brought in a facilitator from Cal State Sacramento and she ran a series of meetings and a site tour of project sites with anyone who wanted to come, which they found to be a very healthy process. The area is very congested with a lot of interest and threatened species, yet, going through the process was very helpful to flesh out issues. Mr. Matterson went to property owners and sat down with them to talk about the process.

DWR noted that if they want to add information about their previous permitting experience to bolster their application that would be helpful. They also noted that DWR's CEQA/permitting requirement is 12 months starting after the funding award, which would put their timeline for permitting very close to the deadline. If they submit permits in Oct/Nov timeframe, this gives 18 months which is probably good.

DWR also noted that it would be important to include damage numbers from previous floods – 2017, 2012, 1998 (official scrub numbers).

DWR's climate representative was mildly concerned about the JPA's Climate Change answer in PIF. She asked how they are addressing what the impacts were? The JPA replied that this project was built to the standards of previous project; the previous project was built to accommodate SLF above high tide. DWR's representative asked them to provide (said they would need) a bit more. She said they could take what's in the goals and objectives and put it in the CC section, and that they should include more specifics about how this project addresses climate change impacts identified in the study listed here.

Project 2: RD1 System Fish Passage Improvements

Devon Becker gave an overview of Project 2. The total request from IRWM is 3,348,992; the total local cost share is: 28,182,370, including other cost share of 10 million and a total project cost of 41 million. The project is in the East subregion. The design was completed in 2018, permitting in 2017, CEQA in 2016, and the project is currently under construction. The goals of the project are to protect and restore important ecosystems, eliminate barriers to fish migration, and enhance water stream flows. The project includes a fish ladder, replacement of 2 unscreened diversion pipelines, and allows ACWD to

continue to divert water and not harm fish. The project is part of a broader effort to restore CCC's steelhead to the Alameda Creek Watershed, addressing multiple fish passage barriers. They finished the RD3 fish ladder earlier this year upstream of this project. This project will eliminate the last two barriers in lower Alameda Creek for fish passage, allowing fish access to the upper watershed for the first time in over 50 years. They have flow release requirements which are coordinated with a larger regional effort with cold water releases from SF's newly constructed cold water pool in Calaveras which will help the steelhead recovery effort as well. ACWD and the ACFCD are the local groups sponsoring the project, ACWD is sharing the fish screen costs. Water supply and reliability goals are met with this project. It gives ACWD more flexibility to manage the Niles Combs. ACWD is the GSA for the Niles Combs, and about 30% of their local supply comes from that basin. They practice conjunctive use of water basin, and this effort helps continue that effort and provide ability to manage saltwater intrusion from bay going forward. The project addresses goals 1, 2, 3, and 5. Mr. Becker highlighted goal 5, particularly those that protect fisheries, as well as goal 2 to improve water supply reliability and quality. This project will protect groundwater sources from overdraft. The project is highlighted as a highest priority project by the NMFS.

ACWD considered project alternatives and developed an alternatives evaluation report. From the Lower Alameda Creek/BART Weir fish passage assessment in 2008 the vertical slot fish ladder was selected as the preferred alternative. 30% is the basis of the design report for the Alameda Creek Lower Fishway (2017), from which the pool and weir style design was selected to accommodate for future ACFCD channel re-design. The Alameda Creek Pipeline has Fish Screen Improvements as #1.

The project includes two components: the RD1 Fish Ladder and Shinn Pond Fish Screens. Quantitative project benefits include addressing 2 physical barriers, providing steelhead with 26 miles of volitional habitat, increasing fisheries flows – 5-25 CFS of downstream bypass flows – though there will be a lot more flows that than going through latter, ACWD has just highlighted the minimum; increasing reliability of 10,500 AFY for diversions and groundwater recharge; and benefiting 1 federally threatened species, the Central CA Coast Steelhead. Qualitative benefits include natural watershed processes related to anadromous fish passage being restored and a project monitoring plan that will be incorporated into larger multiagency watershed wide steelhead recovery monitoring plan. The project enables climate change adaptation against further saltwater intrusion from SLR.

The fish ladder is owned by ACWD. O&M will be 100% conducted by ACWD, maintenance funding will be split 60/40 ACWD/ACFC; and environmental monitoring and reporting will be split 50/50. The fish ladder is owned and fully funded through ACWD's operating budget. Maintenance funding will be split 60/40 ACWD/ACFC; and environmental monitoring and reporting will be split 50/50. The project has been developed in collaboration with and received input from the workgroup. CAFW have been involved in project since beginning, had say in design. The project improves regional water self reliance by increasing the reliability of groundwater recharge operations by ~10,500 AF annually. It also optimizes conjunctive uses of Niles Cone Groundwater sub basin and protects against salt water intrusion from SF Bay.

Regarding climate change, the project increases the reliability of 10,500 AFY of local water for groundwater recharge; maintains positive groundwater gradient to limit saltwater intrusion; and will allow ACWD to better meet changing water demands. The project will also reduce dependency on the Delta based supplies that are at risk from changing hydrology, annual snowpack variability, rising temps,

and SLF. It could also potentially allow ACWD help other IRWM regions in the state. Additionally, it provides for improved downstream flow releases for migrating steelhead in Alameda Creek. Mr. Becker gave an overview of the project budget and schedule. They have received two state grants and CEQA, project design, acquisition of permits and property rights assessment are all complete.

DWR questions/comments:

DWR noted that the entire cost for the project is 41.8 million. If IRWM is only providing 3 million, can we look at a smaller amount for the total cost? Mr. Tennefoss noted he did not want to look through 40 million worth of invoices. Mr. Becker replied that the contractor purchased big items up front, and that this was dependent on the schedule – they were careful about what tasks they asked for money on. They are pretty close with what they can do on grant ask. The payment schedule to the contractor is all together and clearly delineates items that the contractor has completed related to construction. They can look into ways to accommodate needs and desires to not look through 40 million in cost share.

DWR noted that ACWD documents fishing improvements and noted some in the presentation. They encouraged ACWD to make sure these are in the final PIF.

DWR asked Mr. Becker to give more details about O&M. Their O&M is funded by ACWD 60%, and ACWD is responsible for performing O&M.

If project changes they might need an addendum somewhere down road.

DWR noted that Mr. Becker mentioned they're not mandated to put in fish ladder – it is a voluntary decision they worked with CAFW to preempt it being necessary.

DWR asked where the number 10,500 AFY came from and if this was supply they are already getting from the creek or stormwater capture? Mr. Becker replied that currently ACWD diverts water from November – May. They are searching for water supply reliability here; they are concerned that down the road they could get regulated about what they've been doing. This is water that they definitely need in terms of planning for resiliency as a water agency. It's not new supply but establishing a higher level of reliability. DWR encouraged ACWD to change their wording so it's clear they are not providing new supply.

Mr. Becker noted there's the potential for them to streamline invoicing depending on how they break down between projects. He mentioned the chain of custody of invoices – they need to go to the LPS and there are some examples that don't match that exactly. This is more on the ACWD side of things.

Project 6: Calistoga Water and Habitat Project

Mr. Rayner and Mr. Koehler gave an overview of project 6. The City of Calistoga has a population of ~5,200. Their project is comprised of three sub-projects: Conn Creek Water Transmission Main; Riverside Treatment Pond Upgrade; and Fish Passage Barrier Removal Pioneer Park Bridge. The overall project addresses the statewide priorities to provide safe water for a small DAC with water supply and water quality improvements and to restore ecosystems and eliminate fish barriers. The City is partnering with the Napa County RCD. There are wastewater ponds on the Napa River they have

identified as a problem. There are 2 fish barriers they'd like to see come out and are using this as an opportunity to do all of this at once in an efficient way. The tree subprojects are detailed below.

Conn Creek Water Transmission Main: water main replacement project and fish passage improvement

The Napa river supports central coast steelhead. This subproject is taking out concrete case piping for the main water supply to town that serves the whole city for fish passage and water security. The main is 12 inches in diameter. It runs 12 miles to serve almost total water supply of community. It is a critical water line that was put in in the 80s and that they had to replace at least one time before that. Cal Trans is replacing the bridge above it, and they are coordinating getting hanging on bridge for the pipeline. This would be a huge water reliability improvement as the main has become exposed with erosion around the concrete cap.

Riverside Treatment Pond Upgrade

This subproject is the relocation and improvement of a wastewater treatment pond right on the Napa River. The river sustains CA freshwater shrimp which is a state and federally endangered species. They need to reinforce banks near the ponds. They are going to put 2 ponds back instead of 4 to reduce footprint, put levy around it to get out of floodplain and lining the ponds. This project has the environmental benefit of making sure they don't have catastrophic event at the treatment plant. There is a small habitat improvement component to this project.

Fish Passage Barrier Removal Pioneer Park Bridge

This is a footbridge right in downtown Calistoga. They have shrimp in this area and chinook salmon (not special status at this point but is the species they see stacked up against this barrier), and the bridge acts as a temporal barrier when the river is low. The idea is to take that bridge out and replace it with a free span aerial bridge which will be beneficial to community by providing access across the river for disabled folks or anyone with disability issue. This is a vital corridor within the community. They are taking concrete out of the channel and restoring it with native vegetation.

RCAC did a MHI study. Calistoga qualifies as a DAC and EDA. The RCAC study found the city MHI is \$43,366. The CA MHI is \$67,169 which puts Calistoga at 65% of CA MHI. < 85% MHI; <20,000 population. Calistoga has some of the highest water and wastewater rates in valley and they recently went through a rate increase – over 4 years bills will be increasing about 40%. Currently the average bill is about 250/month. The community is pretty upset they're paying that much for water and wastewater. These prices are due to economy of scale: they have such a small population and have so much infrastructure – a dam, water and wastewater treatment plant, and reservoir.

Local match for this project is through FEMA programs, transportation funding for public bridge. This funding would make the project 100% grand funded: HMGP FEMA grant for Riverside Pont Relocation; Conn Creek HMGP Grant.

They have begun the CEQA and Permitting for Conn Creek and Pioneer Park. There is a possible easement acquisition related to Conn Creek. They have been in discussion with CDFW, USFWS, NMFS, SRWQCB, and developed the project in coordination with Cal Trans.

DWR questions/comments:

DWR asked if they could do a CEQA plus document. They said this was worth talking about.

DWR had questions about the project's benefit to a DAC. The project is not asking for DAC funds, not asking for match but a CEQA waiver. The PIF claims 100% DAC benefits. The wastewater is 100% DAC benefit and water quality benefits in the creek.

DWR noted that they are not allowing projects that are mitigation and compliance related in a punitive funds situation. The treatment plants have a cease and desist order for the liner portion. DWR said they can point out PSP guidelines where it states that. This part might not be eligible.

FWS requested the removal of the barrier at Conn Creek in recent conversations, but they have not been mandated to do this.

DWR reiterated that they have to check boxes at state level for state priorities. The project needs to be truly eligible and meet all requirements.

DWR noted that the PIF timeline should be updated for the Riverside Pond specific project. The permitting and permitting consultations haven't started yet, but they have worked with agencies in this area before. DWR asked if they foresee any issues that might kick timeline further back. The project proponents do not think so; the agencies are all aware of project, and supportive, they have good relationships with them. They started the Cal Trans process already.

DWR noted they are concerned that part of their climate change question response might be missing. If what is currently in the PIF is all they meant to include, only goals that they are checking as far as CC benefits are listed. DWR encouraged the project proponents to double check and articulate how the project is building water reliance in the face of CC and that they don't want to lower water quality of that river. Flush these benefits out in discussion.

Project 4: River Oaks Stormwater Capture Project

[Notes for this section are less complete because the note-taker left the room briefly at the beginning of the presentation].

The LPS for this project is the city of San Jose. The total grant request is for 3,203,550, the total project cost is ~9 million. The City of San Jose learned from past Prop 84 funding and want to build a larger scale project. The stakeholder coordination they've conducted to date includes 2 public meetings for the stormwater resource plan, 1 public meeting for the GSI plan, and discussing the project at the last Parks and Rec commission meeting and at a recent Transportation and Environmental committee meeting. The City plans on having discussions on the preferred alternatives, to include a presentation and meeting with the public, as well as during CEQA and preliminary design phases. The cost share for the program will be fully funded by the Measure T Bond Program.

DWR questions/comments:

DWR asked about the City's choice to call the project new or innovative. The project is a new kind for the City. The City hasn't had this scale of water stormwater capture project implemented, though there have been private projects. The project is multibeneficial because it is also a park. Though projects like

these have been implemented in other cities and countries; for San Jose and relatively for the Bay Area it's a newer process.

DWR asked if outreach activities were built into the budget. They are not, the City is relying on a consultant's plan for engagement.

DWR noted that the PIF focuses on the selection process for the project. They said if the City focuses more on what they've said in their presentation, they will probably have a stronger application.

DWR also noted that right now the city has a regular detention basin and asked if they are using that as needed when the capacity of the pump is exceeded. Is the city going to maximize the storage capacity of it, or are you changing it at all? Deepening the basin itself? The City replied that they are anticipating doing that, but it will depend on the project area conditions. They anticipate high ground level which might limit the amount of extra space for a bioretention area. They are going to be diverting flow and expect benefits in that sense; instead of release it will now just be recharge. Right now it only goes there for overflows, it is not built for recharge right now.

The City noted that some aspects of the project are conceptual in nature right now – it's early in the project. They are in the planning stage, going through the process, and will do preliminary testing to determine final project design.

DWR asked if recharge didn't work out the way the city wanted, would they go forward? The City replied yes, stormwater treatment a large portion of project, with soil mix and filtration aspects.

DWR noted that the final application is due November 15 and when they submit their application the readiness needs to be there because they have a 12 month window for permits. The city doesn't expect to need many permits, though they are adjacent to the river so that could be an issue. They have not yet talked to the regional board but plan to.

DWR noted that the permitting issue is microcosm of the overall stage of project – they need to do an initial study to nail down what permits needed. Connectivity to the river isn't detailed enough to determine if they will need an obligation permit. The timeline should be refined on permitting; CEQA. The initial study will probably let the City know whether needs to be full EIR and will weight on timeline. The sooner the city can get this information the better.

The City noted that portions of the Guadalupe River are shown to not have substantial breeding ground for red legged frog which have been found in studies for other projects. They won't be touching the creek at all, so just proximity and operation of the pump could be an issue.

Project 8: Bay Area Regional Water Conservation District

Ms. Nordile gave an overview of Project 8. EBMUD is the LPS. The project is comprised of 7 subprojects with 50% cost share from the local project partners. The 7 projects include:

- Qualified Water efficient landscaper – a shovel ready project. They have a trainer selected and marketing consultant already on board. They will be educating 300 landscapers in a 25 class series. The cost is 10,000/class series; all going to marketing and materials. The total request is for 125,000. This program is expected to save 342 AF over program life.

- Weather based irrigation controller – controller that adjusts automatically based on local weather. This project is also shovel ready.
- Water Efficient landscape rebate – Provides a rebate to incentivize customers to replace existing lawn with water-wise plants.
- Smart metering devices – they plan to install 1000 meters with a sensor that detects and transmits hourly water use to customer and agency.
- Consumer Water report – reports emailed or sent via snail mail to customers to compare water usage to similar homes and recommend personalized conservation actions. Sends 4 reports annually.
- Component analysis – an assessment of distribution system that categorizes real water losses to assist agencies in targeting cost-effective leaks for repair; being implemented by 22 agencies.

The total project budget for implementation and project admin is \$4,177,870 (IRWM grant amount), 50% total project cost. The project will run from January 2020 to December 31, 2022. Goals met by this project include: promoting environmental, economic, and social sustainability by being a regional project that provides community education, involvement, and stewardship; improving water supply reliability and quality by implementing water use efficiency; and protecting and improving watershed health and function and Bay Area water quality by minimizing water pollution (minimizing pesticides used for lawns). It meets the statewide priority of making conservation a California way of life through mitigation strategies including reducing community and municipal water use through landscape design and improvements and encouraging smart water meters, as well as adaptation strategies including continuing water education and reducing reliance on imported water.

Project proponents considered project alternatives. They have been doing regional water conservation programs in the bay for many years. They had a collaborative brainstorming session about what kinds of projects would work in their areas and wanted to make sure they were not duplicating efforts with what's federally or state mandated. They had Prop 84 funded verified savings of 73,238 AFY. Currently they are focusing on outdoor programs (because indoor savings have been tapped) and information services. The program is driven by legislation (SB 606, AB 1 668).

DWR questions/comments:

DWR asked EBMUD to elaborate on rebate program and structure; specifically where the number claimed for water savings came from. EBMUD responded that this project is a continuation of programs. Customers have shown they are interested in water use gardens – they will be paying 50 cents/square foot to put in more draught tolerant plants which is an effective way to reduce water use on site. Past efforts show that 24 gallons/square foot of water can be saved when lawns are removed, and low water use plants are put in. Based on current saving and anticipated program participation, the number given is what's anticipated to be saved. DWR recommended that a little more elaboration on this point in the final PIF would be useful.

DWR asked about what kind of outreach programs the project proponents already have in place so people are aware of these programs. EBMUD responded that each different project component has different ways in which they market: they all have websites; have a direct link with customers through their water bill and inserts; social media pages; and interact with partners by going to various different events. They also work with nonprofits to advertise to their customer bases and advertise through print media. The drought was a wonderful opportunity for water conservation programs. It got them out

there and helped people understand that water utilities were there to help them save money to save water – it's not too hard to give away money.

DWR asked if the rebate programs are fully funding the devices offered. EBMUD responded that it depends on the project. If a customer is removing their lawn and putting in a garden, 50 cents/acre foot is not going to cover the cost. The cost for the customer will be variable depending on what they want to do. They can get a controller for \$100. EBMUD can elaborate more in their application.

DWR noted that with rebate programs in general they are looking for a useful life of 15 years and some kind of certification. Their lawyers aren't fond of rebate programs because they could look like a gift of state funds.

DWR encouraged EBMUD to think carefully about their suite of 7 projects – of which one is a decision support tool (consumer water reports) and others are more implementation related – and look at each as its own project. They asked if only those directly connected/associated with meters and controllers would get the consumer water reports, or if it would be more widespread. They are specifically looking to see that the consumer water reports are connected to the rest of the project because in and of themselves they are kind of a grey area for implementation. They must check certain boxes to make sure nothing is seen as a gift of public funds.

DWR asked how many of the 7 programs are ongoing. EBMUD responded that it depends on the agency; each project is different for different agencies – they could provide this information agency by agency, project by project regarding which are new and which are ongoing. DWR noted that for those that are ongoing, they need to know this is not a replacement of an existing funding source. If they have an old funding source and it has ended and we're a new funding source, that is OK. EBMUD responded that they would not be doing this program without the grant funding.

DWR noted that they might want to highlight the requirements they're bringing up. EBMUD will get the opportunity to include a full workplan, schedule, and budget in the application.

Mr. Becker asked if a water agency has conservation programs which their board assigns funding to for future years and they've had a program going on in the past, if there is new money allocated in the future, is that something the water agency shouldn't fund? DWR said they will get back to us.

The question was raised whether DWR is counting an agency's own, existing funding as a funding source (that they can't use prop 1 to replace). DWR thinks yes, but is going to get back to us.

Project 9: San Francisco Zoo Recycled Water Pipeline Project

Ms. Munoz gave an overview of Project 9. The local project sponsor is the SFPUC. The total grant request is for 538,051 with 422,849 total match. 960,900 is the total project cost. The project addresses statewide priorities 2&5 and local goals 1 (promote environmental, economic, and social sustainability) and 2 (2 improve water supply reliability and quality). Quantitative and qualitative benefits include 307 AFY offset of groundwater with recycled water, not pumping groundwater allows the basin to recharge, sustainability elements at the zoo, zoo education curriculum including the water cycle and water reuse, and education and outreach opportunities for the SFPUC. The project addresses climate change and regional self-reliance by reducing the vulnerability of the PUC's regional water

system by developing a reliable and sustainable local water supply to help meet long term regional needs and creating an additional water supply that is not from the delta. It also frees up groundwater for supplemental potable water supply and allows the basin to recharge. It will produce an average of 1.8 pdg, 4 pdg during peak production.

SFPUC previously developed a new treatment facility within the oceanside plant, completed the construction of 7.7 miles of new pipeline, and added a new reservoir and pump station in Golden Gate Park. The proposed project would replace the zoo's current use of groundwater with recycled water (the current sources are groundwater from an onsite well and potable water from the SFPUC) for irrigation reservoir replenishment, general use, and decorative fountains. The project will include construction of a new pipeline on Sloat which will connect to the existing stub-out and will fill the zoo reservoir. The project will provide advanced treated recycled water, which includes micro-ultrafiltration, 100% reverse osmosis and disinfection with UV light. Th water provided will be comparable to the current groundwater supply. The existing groundwater line will be kept as a make-up source if needed. An emergency overflow was installed and a series of retrofits in the zoo and along the great highway will need to be done to bring it up to title 22 standards. An alternative analysis report and preliminary concept plan was completed by Lotus Water and SRT consultants prepared cost estimates. The SFPUC chose the lowest cost alternative. The cost share is from the SFPUC capital program.

In 2019 the SFPUC received a MOU from the zoo indicating they want to move forward on the project. They expect the environmental review and permitting to be completed in 2020, and bidding and contracting will happen in 2021/20122. The project is exempt under CEQA. The overall project will be on-line in mid to late 2021, and construction will ideally be completed by 2022. In 2022+ recycled water will be delivered for use at the SF zoo.

DWR questions/comments:

Ms. Brown asked if overhead and soft costs were included in the PIF? She warned SFPUC to be careful how they characterize costs.

DWR noted that in the benefits section the SFPUC quantifies the same volume of water twice. They said it would be helpful if there was another secondary benefit they could quantify.

DWR noted that in the climate change section the SFPUC might want to recharacterize the last sentence and describe more benefits of offsetting groundwater use. SFPUC will also probably want to remove anything that is not a climate change benefit from this section such as earthquake and disruption activities.

DWR noted that another benefit of the project might be water supply reliability, conjunctive use.

Action Items:

- DWR will provide general comments on PIFs to James to pass on to project applicants

Round 1 Implementation Funding Lessons Learned

Overview

In order to memorialize lessons learned from the first round of implementation funding to inform and improve future funding rounds, surveys were sent to Project Selection Committee (PSC) members and representatives from entities that submitted a Project Information Form for Round 1 funding.

This process resulted in this memo to the CC on lessons learned from the perspective of members of the PSC and entities that submitted projects for IRWM Implementation funding, as well as an “advice for applicants” memo. Additionally, feedback, in the form of scoring criteria proponents did not receive full points for, was provided to unsuccessful project proponents who indicated on the survey that they would like it. In total, 6 agencies received feedback on 8 of 27 total proposals submitted for funding (an additional 8 of which were successful). Below, overall takeaways and detailed findings from the Project Proponent and PSC Member surveys are provided.

Overall takeaways

There was a great deal of overlap in feedback provided by PSC members and project applicants. Major feedback included:

- Address technical issues with and choose one consistent format for the PIF to be posted across all platforms
- Standardize PIF instructions, and specifically:
 - o include an explicit note to let applicants know to check ‘yes’ for the question regarding inclusion in the IRWMP;
 - o clarify DAC eligibility and explicit reasons for disqualification
 - o clarify what additional materials/attachments applicants can submit
 - o include definitions for some key terms involved in DWR's scoring criteria. For example, what the term “leveraged funds” means
- Include a section at the beginning of the PIF for applicants to give an overview of/describe their project so reviewers know what the project is at the outset to make following along with other PIF answers easier (currently the form breaks information up by project information and various components are scattered throughout the application)
- Hold a training session for applicants/develop an FAQ sheet with an example of a completed project proposal form with detailed instructions and advice for applicants (how/if to include attachments) to ensure better proposals
- Solicit for all materials, including detailed budgets and schedules (if going to ask for them), at one time (and if going to ask for additional materials, provide clarity on expectations for or a template for a detailed budget and schedule)
- If must resolicit for additional materials, check to make sure all entities that submitted a PIF have a representative included on any requests for additional information
 - o Ask for email addresses for a Point of Contact from proponents for questions/feedback
- If going to go through short form solicitation process, provide feedback on submitted short forms or otherwise substantiate this process’ value
- Send confirmation of receipt for PIFs
- Combine PIFs and any additional/supporting materials into one document for PSC review

- Have an ‘introduction to the materials and technology’ trial run at the first PSC meeting to make sure that everyone understands how to access, add information to, and save the google docs, and generally has equal ease of access to documents
- Take measures to ensure PSC scoring is as consistent as possible, including:
 - o PSC/CC should have a general discussion about what kinds of projects the BAIRWM is looking for/what elements ideal projects would have
 - o Have a trial run/mockup a project with the full PSC to practice applying criteria
 - o Clarify specific scoring criteria
- Weight/add additional, informal scoring criteria to reflect Bay Area priorities to help distinguish great from mediocre projects, such as:
 - o Increasing the weighting for projects that achieve multiple IRWM benefits and/or benefit large populations/large regions (with exception of DAC benefitting projects)
 - o Whether a project would happen without the funding
 - o Project readiness
 - o Credit for agencies which don’t have a direct mandate to work on water issues that are doing water conscious work
 - o If a project is “ready,” and meets other positive IRWM criteria, a scoring metric that would elevate projects that have not yet received grant funding to avoid the issue of grant dollars following other grant dollars
- Eliminate any proposals that do not meet basic criteria to save PSC members time scoring them
- Have PSC members input scores for applications on google form or other service that will run analyses on answers by applicant/subregion etc.
- Once all PSC members have scored each application, sort proposals by average rank, not by average score to ensure more fair scoring/to account for differences in scores by individuals
- Provide feedback to applicants (at least criteria applicants did not receive full points for; the PSC could potentially ask on the front end if applicants would like feedback on their proposal if they are unsuccessful so the PSC knows which applications to provide feedback for)
 - o Set up score sheet to check which criteria applicants didn’t receive full points for so this information is generated automatically and wouldn’t require volunteer time to collate
- The PSC should consider administration costs on the front end of project selection
- Publish and share a transparent description of PSC review and selection process, including project scores; ensure that folks who have submitted projects do not score those projects/are not in the room when those projects are discussed, or have all applicants in the room when proposals are discussed
- Highlight the total request amount after announcing the selected projects to help soften the blow for those projects not picked
- Find more ways to truly integrate proposals prior to the application process, rather than taking individual ones and tossing them into the arena to compete; cross incorporate across functional areas
- Consider who is participating on the PSC and potential compensation for community representatives to participate
- Increase outreach to solicit proposals from groups that haven’t historically been involved in the process

PSC survey

Questions:

- What lessons learned about the scoring process would you pass on to the next group of PSC members? (examples: make PIFs and additional materials available as one document; discuss scoring criteria before scoring, etc)
- What were the biggest challenges of being a member of the PSC?
- What, if anything, could have made the scoring process easier?
- Were there any criteria that were confusing? Which and why?
- Are there any criteria that you feel the PSC should "weight" differently? Why?
- Are there any informal scoring criteria that could be added to help better differentiate between good and mediocre proposals? (examples: projects that will be built in the next 12 months; projects that mitigate direct impacts to health and safety, etc.)
- Is there anything else you would change about the scoring criteria? If so, what?
- What advice would you give to someone applying for the next round of implementation funding?
- What is the best way to give feedback to unsuccessful applicants (should PSC members provide qualitative feedback for every proposal while reviewing; should unsuccessful applicants only be provided with the categories they scored low on, etc)
- Are there any other lessons learned from this process that would help inform the next round of implementation funding?

Major takeaways from PSC member survey

1. Lessons learned about the scoring process that PSC members would pass along to the next group of project scorers

- If the Bay Area opts to create a different PIF for applicants to include Functional Area, Subregion, contact, etc., the new form should allow users/scorers to scroll down on answers, just as DWR's Excel version of the PIF allowed, and should not downsize text in boxes so that it is unreadable for scorers if applicants' materials are transferred over from the DWR PIF (to avoid additional submission of materials by applicants including their full responses and additional PSC time to review these)
- Have an 'introduction to the materials and technology' trial run at the first PSC meeting to make sure that everyone understands how to access, add information to, and save the google docs, and generally has equal ease of access to documents
- The PSC should have a general discussion at the outset about what kinds of projects the BAIRWM is looking for – e.g., multibenefit, ready to break ground, environmentally beneficial – or what elements ideal projects would have so that scoring is oriented similarly. This would

allow for then tweaking the scoring criteria (potentially 'weighting' criteria differently internally) in a way that is meaningful to the Bay Area and its priorities

- PSC members should discuss/clarify specific definitions of the key terms and requirements of DWR's scoring rubric before reviewing so scoring is consistent. For example, "leveraged funds" was a term that caused confusion as well as "new or innovative technology". Determining which projects legitimately benefited DACs/EDAs/Tribes could possibly be determined by a few PSC members prior to the scoring process and shared with the group (some PSC members were not familiar enough with project area to determine this for themselves and defaulted to going with what the project applicant claimed)
- Have a short "trial-run" session with the PSC and mockup a "project" that everyone scores to answer questions about how to interpret criteria before the actual review process
- Additional materials should be combined with the PIF into one PDF per project for PSC member review to cut down on time moving between and hunting down documents
- Have PSC members input scores for applications on google form or other service that will run analyses on answers by applicant/subregion etc instead of one person having to compile everyone's scores on the back end
- Develop an FAQ sheet with an example of a completed project proposal form with detailed instructions for applicants (for example, how/if to include attachments)
- PSC should solicit for all materials at once, on the front end

2. Biggest challenges of being a member of the PSC

- The volume of proposals and additional information and time it took to evaluate these materials and set up the process (though some members were glad to have read through each project to be able to make comparisons)
- Being aware of where the projects were located and where their target area was
- The re-solicitation of materials to accurately grade projects' detailed budgets and schedules required some scorers to return to projects a second time with new information
- The PIF documents and the Excel sheet with all answers from the PIFs for each project were difficult to read
- Difficulty figuring out whether applications were backing up their claims in the amount of time PSC members had to review
- Questions about how to apply certain DWR criteria
- Seeming inadequacy of DWR scoring criteria to differentiate between good and great projects. Some PSC members would have liked to have given additional weight to some criteria, such as projects that are multi-beneficial (and de-emphasize projects that have a single benefit or are for every day operational / maintenance funding)

3. What could have made the scoring process easier for PSC members

- Readable, easily accessible PIFs that are combined in the same PDF file as any additional materials to avoid navigating back and forth / eliminate any questions about whether a project submitted additional information
- Universal understanding of DWR's criteria among PSC members so scoring is consistent
- Eliminating proposals that do not meet basic criteria to save PSC members time scoring them
- Potentially dividing proposals between reviewers

- After scoring, sorting proposals by rank, not by average score to ensure more fair scoring/to account for differences in scores by individuals
- Including a section at the beginning of the PIF for applicants to give an overview of/describe their project so reviewers know what the project is at the outset to make following along with other PIF answers easier (currently the form breaks information up by project information and various components are scattered throughout the application)
- More pre-planning: providing FAQs for applicants; holding training session for applicants to ensure better applications; providing an example of a completed proposal and instructions on how to name and submit proposals
- A trial run for PSC members to test the application of criteria

4. Scoring criteria that were confusing/should be further clarified

- Clarify DAC/EDA/tribal eligibility for projects
- Clarify definition of leveraged funds
- Clarify AB1249 criteria
- Clarify requirement for providing safe drinking water to a small DAC
- Clarify overall budget match requirements (50% of proposal versus 50% local cost share for each project)
- Clarify what “innovative” means in this context
- Given what was asked for in the project form, PSC members struggled to evaluate the work plan and budget which was particularly problematic given how many points this criterion had, and asking for additional information later created more work for both the PSC reviewers and applicants

5. Scoring criteria PSC members think should be “weighted” differently

- Generally, PSC members are in favor of “weighting” DWR’s criteria or adding additional informal criteria to match the Bay Area’s priorities
- Projects that are multi-beneficial (as differentiated from those that provide a single benefit or are standard operations/maintenance funding) should receive additional weight (some suggested weighting multi-beneficial projects on a 1-5 scale to help differentiate projects with many benefits) (currently budget and schedule are the highest weighted categories which some PSC members did not agree with)

6. Informal scoring criteria that could be added to help better differentiate between good and mediocre proposals

- Project readiness/projects that are closer to breaking ground (fleshed out and formalized to avoid confusion; e.g., have CEQA completed, have permits, etc); might involve more explicit questions about the status of permits, bid documents, etc. that would reveal more about the "realness" of the project than budgets and schedules
- Projects that go above standard work already being done by an organization or entity or maintenance work that would otherwise be funded locally [exclusive of DAC project work]
- Projects that meaningfully benefit the environment
- Whether a project has received other grant funding already to elevate good projects that have not received grant funding already

- Items in the BA IRWM plan not included in DWR's scoring criteria (including recreational benefits, etc)

7. Advice PSC members would give to someone applying for the next round of implementation funding

- Make sure your detailed budget breaks out into DWR's categories. With some projects, it was difficult to determine what an applicant was including under admin versus engineering design versus construction, etc
- Make sure your budget, schedule, and PIF are all consistent
- Read DWR's scoring criteria and make sure your project addresses the criteria and craft your responses to score well under this rubric
- Cite engineering documents that justify the project benefits and the project cost/preferred alternative. Many projects did not reference how they determined the benefits they claimed
- We're looking for projects that are ready to go (are beyond the conceptual design stage), provide multiple benefits, go beyond the work of the organization (are not just infrastructure replacement projects), and benefit a wide geographic area [unless a DAC project]
- Answer yes/no questions accurately and get clarification if you are unsure
- Plan and prepare ahead. Prepare your documents early and do not submit at the last minute
- Make sure application is well written and provides a coherent narrative
- Answer all questions, don't write "see attached"
- Claimed benefits should be substantiated/justified in a tangible way
- Find multiple partners

8. Suggested ways to give feedback to unsuccessful applicants

- Some PSC members think applicants should be provided with overall qualitative feedback if they ask for it, while some think that qualitative feedback for every project might be too much effort for the volunteer scorers (and, the PSC did not discuss in detail many of the lowest scoring projects to record overall feedback from the group)
- Some PSC members think sharing categories applicants did not receive full points for is adequate
- One PSC member suggested developing additional criteria that add on to DWR's to include different weighting for existing criteria so that everything is accounted for (including informal qualitative feedback used in this round) by the quantitative criteria. This way, applicants could be given their average scores for each category

9. Other lessons learned from this process that would help inform the next round of implementation funding

- The value add of the short form was questioned
- Additional appendices should be allowed or disallowed from the start
- Project applicants would benefit from a training or webinar describing what the BA IRWM is looking for, what kinds of projects score well, and general grant application tips
- The PSC should consider administration costs on the front end of project selection
- Consolidate PIFs and any supporting materials into one document for reviewers
- Ask for email addresses from proponents for feedback

- Consider whether project / project proponent has been funded in the past
- Consider who is participating on the PSC and potential compensation for community representatives to participate
- Additional criteria or weighting of existing criteria would be useful for distinguishing great from good/mediocre proposals. Additional criteria should be considered for DAC projects (on top of existing criteria so DAC projects can also be compared with general implementation projects for competitiveness within this pot)

Suggested action items based on takeaways

- Address technical issues with PIF (fillable text becoming so small it is unreadable, not being able to scroll to see answers, etc)
- Hold a training session for applicants/develop an FAQ sheet with an example of a completed project proposal form with detailed instructions/advice for applicants (how/if to include attachments) to ensure better proposals
- PSC should solicit for all materials at once, on the front end
- Include a section at the beginning of the PIF for applicants to give an overview of/describe their project so reviewers know what the project is at the outset to make following along with other PIF answers easier (currently the form breaks information up by project information and various components are scattered throughout the application)
- Ask for email addresses for a Point of Contact from proponents for questions/feedback
- Combine PIFs and any additional/supporting materials into one document for PSC review
- Have an 'introduction to the materials and technology' trial run at the first PSC meeting to make sure that everyone understands how to access, add information to, and save the google docs, and generally has equal ease of access to documents
- Take measures to ensure PSC scoring is as consistent as possible, including:
 - o Have a general discussion about what kinds of projects the BAIRWM is looking for/what elements ideal projects would have
 - o Trial run/mockup a project with the full PSC to practice applying criteria
 - o Clarify specific scoring criteria
- Weight/add additional, informal scoring criteria to reflect Bay Area priorities to help distinguish great from mediocre proposals (including weighting multi-benefit projects and adding project readiness, etc)
- Eliminate any proposals that do not meet basic criteria to save PSC members time scoring them
- Have PSC members input scores for applications on google form or other service that will run analyses on answers by applicant/subregion etc.
- Sort proposals by rank, not by average score to ensure more fair scoring/to account for differences in scores by individuals
- Provide feedback to applicants (at least criteria applicants did not receive full points for; PSC could potentially ask on the front end if applicants would like feedback on their proposal if they are unsuccessful so the PSC knows which applications to provide feedback for)
- Set up score sheet to check which criteria applicants didn't receive full points for so this information is generated automatically and wouldn't require volunteer time to collate
- If going to go through short form solicitation process, provide feedback on submitted short forms or otherwise substantiate this process' value

- The PSC should consider administration costs on the front end of project selection
- Consider who is participating on the PSC and potential compensation for community representatives to participate

Project proponent survey

Questions:

- What was the biggest challenge of submitting a proposal for IRWM Implementation funding?
- What could be improved about the IRWM Implementation funding project solicitation process?
- What additional information could the BAIRWM Coordinating Committee/Project Selection Committee (PSC) provide to make the process easier/more understandable/accessibile?
- Did you look at the DWR scoring criteria before submitting your project proposal?
- If you've reviewed the scoring criteria, are there any criteria not on that list that you think would be important for the PSC to consider in their evaluation of projects?
- How did you learn about IRWM Implementation funding?
- Is there anything else we should know to improve our process?
- Would you like to receive feedback on your application? (If so, please let us know which project you submitted and we will send you details on which criteria you did not receive full points on)

Major takeaways from applicant survey

1. Biggest challenges to submitting a proposal for IRWM funding

- PIF located in multiple places in varying formats
- Technical issues with the PIF: some background text didn't disappear when typed over, different size fonts appeared in the same table; fillable PDF made text in boxes with a lot of text very small; the later version of the PIF released by the Bay Area didn't exactly conform to DWR's PIF (i.e., didn't allow for "other" to be selected on drop down menu for Project Benefits Table)
- Some proponents were not contacted during the request for additional information
- Conflicting instructions (i.e., PIF had instructions to include certain items while instructions sheet said include no attachments)
- Staying within DWR's PIF word limit while also providing enough detail to justify a project
- There was significant confusion regarding the process/criteria for inclusion in the IRWM Plan
- Lack of clarity on schedule for funding (date of first expected payment, etc)
- Lack of clarity on what proponents could submit as attachments/additional materials
- Lack of clarity on expected format for detailed budget
- Creating a detailed schedule

2. Suggested Improvements to the IRWM Implementation Funding Project Solicitation Process

- There was some concern expressed by project applicants about how projects are chosen and the nature of participation of agencies who had submitted projects on the PSC / selection of projects submitted by entities that participate in CC activities; proponents suggested being

transparent and showing scores, not having people who applied for funding in the room or having all applicants in the room when proposals are discussed

- Provide more clarity on how to get into/what it means to be included in the IRWM Plan (that anyone whose application is selected will be included)
- Encourage responses with attachments to allow for complete responses and inclusion of maps
- Send confirmation of receipt of PIFs
- Solicit for all materials, including detailed budgets and schedules, at one time
- If need to resolicit for additional materials, check to make sure all entities that submitted a PIF have a representative included on any requests for additional information. Perhaps include a "contact for questions regarding this application" line on the application, as the project manager is not necessarily the key application contact
- Share more comprehensive feedback from the initial short form process if going to utilize it
- Find more ways to truly integrate proposals, rather than taking individual ones and tossing them into the arena to compete; cross incorporate across functional areas

3. Additional information the CC/PSC could provide to make the process easier/more understandable/more accessible

- Selected projects will be included in the IRWM Plan (Attachment 1 implied that applicants already needed to be included in the Plan)
- More comprehensive feedback, on a project by project basis, based on the initial short form submissions
- Ensure instruction sheets don't contradict instructions on actual proposal documents
- Definitions for some key DWR terms involved in DWR's scoring criteria. For example, what the term "leveraged funds" means
- Provide guidance on how the detailed budget and schedule should be organized
- Detailed and rollup budget templates
- PSC's selection process data and scoring information
- Greater clarity on DAC eligibility and explicit reasons for disqualification

4. 9/10 applicants reviewed DWR's scoring criteria before submitting a project proposal

5. Recommended additional scoring criteria for projects

- Whether a project would happen without the funding
- Project readiness
- If a project is "ready," and meets other positive IRWM criteria, a scoring metric that would elevate projects that have not yet received grant funding to avoid the issue of grant dollars following other grant dollars
- Credit for agencies which don't have a direct mandate to work on water issues doing water-conscious work
- Increasing the weighting for projects that achieve multiple IRWM benefits and/or benefit large populations/large regions

6. How applicants learned about IRWM funding

- Been aware of it for many years / have been participating in IRWM

- From organizations that have submitted project proposals in the past
- Referral from the State Water Board grant staff
- IRWM Coordinating Committee
- From supervisor
- Regional Water Board website

7. Other recommendations to improve the IWRM Application Solicitation process

- Highlight the total request amount after announcing the selected projects to help soften the blow for those not picked
- Provide more feedback based on the initial short form submission process
- Explore options for improving the technical function of the fillable PIF which made text very small and hard to read or look sloppy or select an alternative method

8. Many project applicants took the opportunity to thank the PSC and CC for the time to put everything together and review all applications, as well as responsiveness to questions and updates/details shared at CC meetings

Suggested action items based on takeaways

- Address technical issues with and choose one consistent format for the PIF to be posted across all platforms
- Standardize PIF instructions, and specifically:
 - o include an explicit note to let applicants know to check 'yes' for the question regarding inclusion in the IRWMP;
 - o clarify DAC eligibility and explicit reasons for disqualification
 - o clarify what additional materials/attachments applicants can submit
 - o include definitions for some key terms involved in DWR's scoring criteria. For example, what the term "leveraged funds" means
- Clarify schedule for funding
- Solicit for all materials, including detailed budgets and schedules (if going to ask for them), at one time (and if going to ask for additional materials, provide clarity on expectations for or a template for a detailed budget and schedule)
- If must resolicit for additional materials, check to make sure all entities that submitted a PIF have a representative included on any requests for additional information
 - o Ensure each submitting agency is represented on email lists for communications about the process. Perhaps also include a "contact for questions regarding this application" line on the app, as the project manager is not necessarily the key application contact.
- Send confirmation of receipt for PIFs
- Consider the following additional, informal scoring criteria for future selection processes:
 - o Whether a project would happen without the funding
 - o Project readiness
 - o Credit for agencies which don't have a direct mandate to work on water issues that are doing water conscious work
 - o Increasing the weighting for projects that achieve multiple IRWM benefits and/or benefit large populations/large regions

- If a project is “ready,” and meets other positive IRWM criteria, a scoring metric that would elevate projects that have not yet received grant funding to avoid the issue of grant dollars following other grant dollars
- Increase outreach to solicit proposals from groups that haven’t historically been involved in the process
- Share more comprehensive feedback from the initial short form process if going to utilize it
- Highlight the total request amount after announcing the selected projects to help soften the blow for those not picked
- Publish and share transparent description of PSC review and selection process, including project scores; ensure that folks who have submitted projects do not score those projects/are not in the room when those projects are discussed, or have all applicants in the room when proposals are discussed (which leads to...)
- Find more ways to truly integrate proposals prior to the application process, rather than taking individual ones and tossing them into the arena to compete; cross incorporate across functional areas

Ideas for consideration

- Form a PSC “screening” committee
- Discuss Bay Area priorities with broader CC to orient PSC selection process
- Appoint a PSC Chair who is available to answer questions for applicants and facilitates conversation about proposals but doesn’t score proposals
- Hold a “Project Bundling Workshop” before soliciting for the second round of implementation funding (if soliciting for short forms, it could be useful to use that process to facilitate these conversations)

**IRWM Proposition 1 Implementation Funding: Advice for applicants from past Project Selection
Committee members**

The Bay Area IRWM is looking to fund projects that are ready to go (beyond the conceptual design stage), that provide multiple benefits, go beyond the work of mandated operations and maintenance, and ideally benefit a broad geographic area. We encourage, welcome, and prioritize projects from Disadvantaged Communities and Community groups, as well as projects that benefit these communities.

When applying for IRWM Implementation Funding, consider the following:

- Read the solicitation guidelines and Prop 1 Project Solicitation Package carefully for what DWR is looking for (available at water.ca.gov)
- Look at the BAIRWM and State priorities for IRWM funding and make sure your project meets at least one of these
- Read DWR's scoring criteria and make sure your project addresses the criteria and craft your responses to score well under this rubric
- Answer all questions in the Project Information Form (PIF), rather than writing "see attached"; provide information relevant to each question in the space provided
- Answer yes/no questions accurately and get clarification if you are unsure
- Finding multiple partners will generally benefit your project and proposal
- Coordinate with other stakeholders and related efforts
- Make sure your budget, schedule, and PIF are all consistent
- Make sure your detailed budget breaks out into DWR's categories and it is clear what amounts you are including under admin versus engineering and design versus construction, etc
- Cite engineering documents that justify the project benefits and the project cost/preferred alternative
- Reference how you have determined the benefits you are claiming
- Make sure your application is well written and provides a coherent narrative
- Plan and prepare ahead. Prepare your documents early and do not submit at the last minute

If you have questions about the Project Information Form, project or proposal development, DWR's scoring criteria, or the PSC selection process, please reach out to Maddie Duda at Mduda@lotuswater.com.



Appendix G-8

Storm Water Resource Plans Added to the 2013 Bay Area IRWMP by the Coordinating Committee on August 26, 2019



Appendix G-8: 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:

- Santa Clara Basin Stormwater Resource Plan

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
October 28, 2019	Nuestra Casa
December 2, 2019	State Coastal Conservancy
January 27, 2019	Marin County Building (1600 Los Gamos Drive, San Rafael)