

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
 May 24, 2021
 Conference Call Dial-in Only**

1. Roll Call – Appointed Functional Area Representatives Present

Water Supply- Water Quality	Wastewater- Recycled Water	Flood Protection- Stormwater	Watershed	Communities/ Tribes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC • Mark Seedall, CCWD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florence Wedington, EBMUD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Boucher, CCCFCWCD • Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Bradt, SFEP • Brenda Buxton, SCC 	

Others Present:

Devon Becker, ACWD
 Marco Berger, Multicultural Center of Marin
 Tess Byler, San Francisquito Creek JPA
 Taylor Chang, SFPUC
 Vernon Medicine Cloud, Indian Health Center of Santa Clara Valley
 Maddie Duda, Lotus Water
 Natasha Dunn, SFEP
 Maggie Dutton, CCWD
 Roxana Franco, Nuestra Casa
 Robin Freeman, Dellums Institute for Social Justice
 Adam French, Amah Mutsun Land Trust
 Terrie Green, Marin City Green
 Ryan Hirano, Woodard & Curran
 Jennifer Krebs, representing Sonoma Water
 Darcie Luce, SFEP
 James Muller, SFEP
 Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
 Leslie Perry, SFEP
 Chelsea Spier, DWR
 Alex Tavizon, CIEA
 Reena Thomas, EBMUD

2. Status of Prop 84 Rounds 2-4

Natasha Dunn reported that for Round 2 Project 10 Bayfront Canal is the last outstanding project. Construction bid has been awarded. Construction should begin by June 10 and wrap up by December 2021.

James Muller reported that for Round 4 there is movement on Project 7 Mountain View Shoreline and Project 8 Eden Landing. The State Coastal Conservancy Board is meeting on Thursday and is expected to approve a modification to the project agreement with US Army Corps of Engineers. Once this is complete, the grant will be amended and submitted to DWR around June or July.

Jennifer Krebs provided the AQPI update. The new X-Band radar will be installed at Rocky Ridge on July 14. SFPUC will place a new X-Band radar on Sawyer Ridge in late 2021/early 2022. Invoice 13 was submitted to DWR two weeks ago. The project applied for a grant extension through end of 2023 to complete permitting for the C-Band radar.

3. Discussion of Actions to Improve Equity in Bay Area IRWMP

There are two working groups representing communities and Tribes, respectively, that are selecting their representatives to the Coordinating Committee. There has been difficulty scheduling meetings for the communities working group. Mr. Muller is considering drafting a document summarizing the discussions to date. The working group representing Tribes has finalized their governance recommendations. Alex Tavizon plans to share with Mr. Muller and the Coordinating Committee. The plan is to have the communities and Tribal representatives filled by July.

Taylor Chang reported on the effort to address equity with the Roundtable of Regions. She is working with Yuba IRWM region to establish funding to kick off an equity working group. Yuba will be funding community and Tribal representatives to participate in a process of defining equitable outcomes for integrated water management projects. The recruitment of community and Tribal representatives to participate in the working group has kicked off. The plan is to convene the working group for its first call in June.

4. Status of Prop 1 IRWM DACTIP

SFEP is amending the contracts for all outreach partners to participate in the tap water quality testing effort. SFEP is working on the contract with Simple Lab for the water quality testing. The entire grant has now been budgeted. It was originally there would be grant funding budgeted for developing tools and resources to help carry the project on after the grant. However, the outreach partners' project development needs were bigger than expected and the grant funding will be prioritized for this work.

Maddie Duda is working with the outreach partners to finalize the regional needs assessment report. It will be submitted to DWR in July. The South Bay partner and the two partner organizations representing people experiencing homelessness are conducting their needs assessments.

Ryan Hirano reported on capacity building efforts with the outreach partners. He prepared recommendations for funding opportunities for each outreach partner. He sends out weekly updates and resources to the partners on a collaborative Google Drive.

Alex Tavizon reported on the Tribal outreach program. The Tribal partners had a Tribal Advisory Committee meeting at the beginning of May where they finalized their recommendations for the governance structure. Mr. Tavizon is working on finalizing the Tribal portion of the regional needs assessment report and noted that the report contains a regional land acknowledgment. The Association of Ramaytush is working with the San Francisco Estuary Institute on a potential climate resiliency project collaboration. The Him re-n Ohlone Tribe is working on a potential project in Coyote Hills Regional Park. Mr. Tavizon connected with Vernon Medicine Cloud with the Indian Health Center of Santa Clara Valley to discuss participation in the tap water quality testing program.

There was a question whether there are any potential Tribal projects addressing sea level rise. Mr. Tavizon responded that there are potential project ideas in East Palo Alto, San Francisco, and areas near San Gregorio Creek.

Regarding the overall status of the tap water quality testing program, the outreach partners are strategizing on how to deploy testing in their communities. The contract with Simple Lab will be finalized by mid-June. There is outreach occurring to water utilities that serve the areas that will be doing tap water quality testing.

Action Items:

- Ms. Duda will share preliminary results from the needs assessments of the South Bay partner and the two partner organizations representing people experiencing homelessness next CC meeting.

5. Status of Prop 1 Implementation Funding

Prop 1 Round 1 projects are now included in summary update sheet included with the Coordinating Committee meeting packets. SFEP is processing Q1 submittals. Project 4 Calistoga Water and Habitat project is finalizing their funding agreement and 1st invoice. SFEP is requesting a grant amendment with DWR to formally include Project 6 River Oaks Stormwater Capture.

DWR held a workshop on May 6 to report out on lessons learned from Prop 1 Round 1 and the proposal for Round 2. A big take away from Round 1 was requesting that DWR shorten the timeline for Round 2. DWR may offer 2 application deadlines, one in March 2022 and another in September 2022. DWR noted that these timelines may shift if Round 2 is consolidated with drought funding opportunities associated with the Governor's new budget priorities. There was a comment that the later deadline of September 22 may work better for the Bay Area because it will give more time for project development.

Brian Mendenhall reported that the Process and Planning Committee is considering regional scoring criteria in addition to DWR's scoring criteria.

Action Items:

- The Process and Planning Committee will provide suggestions for regional scoring criteria at the June Coordinating Committee meeting.

6. Status of 4-Party Funds

Mr. Muller reported that the ABAG contracts team reviewed the approach for transferring the funds from Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) to SFEP for administration. The plan is to add ABAG to the 4-party agreement, which will allow ABAG to invoice MMWD for the rest of the 4-party funds. The plan is to use the 4-party funds to fund community participation in BAIRWMP meetings. The next step is for the 4 parties to adopt the amended agreement.

7. Discussion of Structure of Future Meetings

Mr. Muller commented that the Coordinating Committee received feedback that meetings haven't done the best job making space for community member input. Since then, changes have occurred to streamline the agenda. For example, the report out on Prop 84 Rounds 2-4 has been streamlined.

Mr. Muller led the discussion regarding suggestions to improve the Coordinating Committee meetings. When new people join the Coordinating Committee, there is a lot of time spent on getting them up to speed. One suggestion is to have an annual meeting, which provides a general overview of IRWM and provides space for evaluation and continuous improvement. The annual meetings could be recorded and the presentation posted to the website for later viewing. There was a comment to have a strategic planning portion of the annual meeting to align the group's goals with its activities. The group decided to have the annual meeting in January 2022.

There was a suggestion to identify Coordinating Committee liaisons. Possibly the sub-regional representatives could serve in this role. The sub-regional representatives are Brian Mendenhall for the South Bay, Michelle Novotny for the West Bay, Mark Boucher or Maggie Dutton for the East Bay, and Jake Spaulding or Matt Sagues for the North Bay.

There was a suggestion to create more space for creative planning such as bundling projects between community partners and agencies.

Another suggestion was to survey everyone participating in Coordinating Committee meetings to understand what participants want to get out of the meetings.

There was a comment that the invitation is still open for Coordinating Committee members to participate in the DACTIP core team meetings.

Maggie Dutton commented that there are resources available statewide about IRWM that help orient people to IRWM when they are new. She also mentioned that DWR is preparing webinar series this summer on how to apply for grants, targeting communities and Tribes.

Action Items:

- Ms. Chang will follow up with Jake Spaulding and Matt Sagues to see if one of them would be willing to be the North Bay sub-region representative.
- Ms. Chang will review the website to determine if the sub-regional contacts need to be updated.
- Steve Ritchie and Ms. Chang will assemble a group to start planning for the annual meeting in January.
- The DACTIP core team will work on identifying community and Tribal representatives to participate in the planning for the annual meeting.

KEY

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

Critical Milestone achieved since last meeting.

Note: Grant funds spent are approximate

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010575 - Round 2 Quarterly Status: No questions on Q26 from DWR Payments: Retention invoice executed for Project 18, awaiting payment from DWR Amendments: No update Site Visits: None Grant Term: December 31, 2021	Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 18 Underway: 1 Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 1	Funds (as of Q25) Total Grant: \$20,000,000 Total Match: \$13,470,177.66 Grant Funds Spent: \$18,684,870.20 (93.4%) Match Funds Documented: \$12,795,577.66 (93.4%)
--	---	--

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	Complete	Mar-19	N/A	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed
02_East Bayshore Recycled Water Project Phase 1A (Emeryville)	EBMUD	Complete	Nov-16	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
03_Lagunitas Creek Watershed Sediment Reduction & Managements	Marin Municipal WD	Complete	Nov-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
04_Marin/Sonoma Conserving our Watersheds, Agriculture BMPs	Marin RCD	Complete	Nov-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
05_Napa Milliken Creek Flood Damage Reduction & Fish Passage Barrier Remo	County of Napa	Complete	Feb-18	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
06_5th St. East & McGill Road Recycled Water	Sonoma Valley Cnty San Dist.	Complete	Nov-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
07_Oakland Sausal Creek Restoration	City of Oakland Pub. Wks.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
08_Pescadero Water Supply & Sustainability	County of San Mateo	Complete	Mar-19	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed
09_Petaluma Flood Reduction, Water & Habitat Quality for Capri Creek	City of Petaluma	Complete	Feb-18	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed
10_Bayfront Canal/Atherton Channel Flood Improve & Habitat Restore	Redwood City	10%	None to Date	N	Oct-21	Draft #1 Oct 2021	N	N	None to Date	Dec-21
11_Regional Groundwater Storage & Recovery Phase 1A	SFPUC	Complete	Jun-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
12_Richmond Breuner Marsh Restoration	East Bay Regional Park Dist.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	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	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
15_SF Airport Reclaimed Water Facility	SFO/City of San Francisco	Complete	Jul-20	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed
16_San Jose Green Streets & Alleys Demonstration	City of San Jose	Complete	May-18	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
17_San Pablo Rheem Creek Wetlands Restoration	Contra Costa Water Dist.	Complete	Apr-17	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
18_Upper York Creek Dam Removal & Ecosystem Restoration	City of St Helena	Complete	Jan-21	Y	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	N	None to Date	Jun-21
19_Students & Teachers Restoring a Watershed (North & East Bays)	Point Blue Conservation	Complete	Feb-18	N/A	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed
20_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	N/A	N/A	Dec-21	Draft August 2021	N	N	N/A	Dec-21

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010883 - Round 3 (Drought Round) Quarterly Status: All quarterly uploads complete. All invoices have been submitted to the state for this grant. Payments: Retention has been received from DWR for all projects and will be paid out in late June. Amendments: None Site Visits: None Grant Term: December 31, 2020	Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 11 Underway: 0 Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 0	Funds (as of Q19) Total Grant: \$32,178,423 Total Match: \$25,121,180.72 Grant Funds Spent: \$32,177,053.76 (Final Balance: \$1,369.24) 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	Complete	Oct-19	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	#1	Jun-21
02_Zone 7 Water Supply Drought Preparedness	Zone 7	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	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	#3	Closed
04_Sunnyvale Continuous Recycled Water Production & Wolfe Rd Pipe	Santa Clara Valley WD	Complete	May-18	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	None to Date	Jun-21
05_DERWA Phase 3 Recycled Water Expansion	DSRSanDist/EBMUD	Complete	May-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
06_Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility	City of Calistoga	Complete	Aug-16	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	Closed
07_Drought Relief for South Coast San Mateo County	San Mateo RCD	Complete	Dec-20	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	None to Date	Jun-21
08_Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness	Stinson Beach County WD	Complete	Mar-19	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
09_Bay Area Regional Drought Relief Conservation Program	StopWaste	Complete	Mar-19	N/A	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
10_WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR	Marin Municipal WD	Complete	Mar-19	N/A	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	None to Date	Jun-21
11_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	N/A	N/A	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	N/A	Jun-21

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600011486 - Round 4 Quarterly Status: No questions from DWR on Q19 Payments: None during this reporting period Amendments: None during this reporting period Site Visits: None occurred this reporting period Grant Term: March 31, 2022							Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 4 Underway: 1 Sig. Concerns: 2 Withdrawn: 1			Funds (as of Q18) Total Grant: \$21,469,025 Total Match: \$22,395,709 Grant Funds Spent: \$9,351,727.45 (43.6%) 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	Dec-21	Dec-21	N	N	N/A	Mar-22
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	100%	None to Date	N/A	Submitted	Draft #1 July 2021	N	N	None to Date	Aug-22
04_East Palo Alto Groundwater Supply	City of East Palo Alto	100%	Aug-18	Y	Apr-21	Draft #3 July 2021	N	N	None to Date	Aug-21
05_Coastal San Mateo County Drought Relief Phase II	San Mateo RCD	Complete	Aug-21	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	N	None to Date	Jul-21
06_SFQuito Creek Flood Damage Reduction & Ecosystem Restore Phase 2	SFQuito Creek JPA	Complete	Dec-19	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed
07_Mt View Shoreline Portion of SBSRP	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	N			N	N	None to Date	
08_Eden Landing Portion of SBSRP	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	N			N	N	None to Date	
09_Novato Creek Flood Protection and Habitat Enhancement	State Coastal Conservancy	70%	None to Date	N	Dec-21	Draft #1 September 2021	N	N	None to Date	Mar-22

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600013831 - Round 1 Quarterly Status: LPS quarterly submittals due at the end of April and were uploaded to the state for review and approval Payments: None to date Amendments: An amendment request was submitted to DWR in late May to add Project 6 into the grant agreement as an LPS. Currently with DWR for processing Site Visits: None occurred this reporting period Grant Term: March 31, 2025							Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 0 Underway: 2 Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 0			Funds (As of Q1) Total Grant: \$22,750,000 Total Match: \$23,440,554 Grant Funds Spent: \$198,014.12 (1%) Match Funds Documented: \$5,288,008 (22.6%)	
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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
00_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 2/1/2025	N	N	N/A	Jun-25
01_RD1 System Fish Passage Improvements	Alameda County WD	72%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 7/31/2022	N	N	None to Date	Nov-22
02_Lower Walnut Creek Restoration	Contra Costa Flood Control	0%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 2/28/2022	N	N	None to Date	Jun-22
03_North Bay Water Reuse Program Phase II	Sonoma County Water Agency	0%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 6/30/2024	N	N	None to Date	Oct-24
04_Calistoga Water and Habitat Project	City of Calistoga	39%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 12/15/2023	N	N	None to Date	Apr-24
05_Bay Area Water Conservation	EBMUD	0%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 10/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Feb-25
06_River Oaks Stormwater Capture	City of San Jose	N/A	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 11/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Mar-25
07_Upstream San Francisco Creek Flood Protection Project	SFCJPA	N/A	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 11/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Mar-25
08_San Francisco Zoo Recycled Water Pipeline	SFPUC	N/A	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 11/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Mar-25

SENT VIA EMAIL

May 21, 2021

Michelle Novotny
Senior Water Analyst and BAWSCA Liaison
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Final Review – San Francisco Bay IRWM Plan

Dear Ms. Novotny:

This letter transmits the final review of consistency of the San Francisco Bay Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan (Plan) with the IRWM Planning Act and the related IRWM Plan Standards contained in the 2016 IRWM Program Guidelines (Guidelines). DWR finished the draft review of the Plan and determined it to be consistent with the Guidelines. The draft Plan was then posted on DWR's website from February 21, 2020 to March 21, 2020 to satisfy the required 30-day public comment period, and no comment was received. Therefore, DWR made the final determination that the Plan is consistent with the Guidelines. The final review is posted on the following link: <https://www.water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/IRWM-Grant-Programs/Plan-Review-Process>. We request that you maintain access on your web site to the version of the IRWM Plan that was reviewed by DWR, as we will provide a link to that plan on our web site.

If you have any questions, please contact Ted Daum at (916) 651-9264 or Ted.Daum@water.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Zaffar Eusuff, Ph.D., P.E.

Zaffar Eusuff, Ph.D. 5/21/2021

Carmel Brown, P.E. Chief
Financial Assistance Branch
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management

BA IRWM Regional Criteria	Question	Additional Regional Evaluation Guidance and Scoring	Maximum Points Available
18	Is the project a DAC/Tribal project and thus exempt from CEQA/NEPA completion at the time of application?	DAC and Tribal projects are exempt from requirement to have completed CEQA/NEPA and permits at time of application. If answer is yes and project is representing a DAC or tribe, award points comparable to other non-DAC and/or tribal projects that would receive a point for completing this requirement (1 point)	1
19	Is the project consistent with the IRWM plan and Bay Area IRWM identified needs focused on the following: climate change?	Project includes consideration for climate change including drought (2 points) Project includes consideration for climate change but not drought (1 point)	2
20	Is the project consistent with the IRWM plan and Bay Area IRWM identified needs focused on the following: providing equitable outcomes for DACs and tribes?	Project demonstrates a benefit to DACs or tribes regardless of reaching the 75% threshold in Question 16 (1 point)	1
21	Does the project address a challenge identified through the DACTIP program needs assessment process?	Project addresses one of the key identified needs in the needs assessment process in the specific identified community. Point for addressing identified need from the needs assessment in the community and doing so in collaboration with that specific community (letter of support + collaboration) (2 points) Point for addressing identified need from the needs assessment in the community (1 point)	2
22	Does the project raise an issue of impacts to cultural resources?	Project raises concerns of impacts to cultural resources and provides proof of communication with an affected tribe, including response and endorsement from tribe. (1 point)	1
23	Does the project provide safe, clean water to a disadvantaged or underserved community or tribe?	Project goes beyond drinking water in Question 14 to consider safe, clean water and impacts by contaminants not listed in AB1249. (1 point)	1
24	Is the project being planned and implemented in collaboration as multi-area, multi-jurisdiction or multi-organization?	Bay Area IRWM recognizes the benefit of partnering and/or covering an extended area with a project. Point for the project clearly describing a collaborative element either across multiple areas (i.e. cities, counties, watersheds, IRWM subregions), multiple jurisdictions (i.e. multiple cities or counties), or multiple organizations (e.g. cities, counties, water districts, non-profits, communities, tribes) (1 point)	1
25	Has the project received other grant funding sources?	Project has not received grant funding from other sources but still meets eligibility criteria including any match requirements. (1 point)	1

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation (Proposal includes all DAC and General Projects)					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring: the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
1	Does the proposal support the intent of IRWM? Is coordination and /or collaboration within and between agencies, regions, and/or Funding Areas discussed? Are any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized discussed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal supports the intent of IRWM as discussed in the 2019 Guidelines and the IRWM Planning Act. (1 point) A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal demonstrates coordination and/or collaboration within and between agencies regions, and/or Funding Areas. (1 point) A sufficient description of any efficiencies or mutual solutions realized. (1 point) 	10531; 79741 (b)	Proposal Summary/ 8	3
2	If the IRWM region has been identified as an area where contaminants listed in AB 1249 exist, does the proposal contain project(s) that address the contaminant(s)?	A reasonable explanation of how the project(s) addresses AB 1249 contaminants (nitrate, arsenic, perchlorate, or hexavalent chromium contamination). (1 point) If the requirements of AB 1249 do not apply to the applicant's IRWM region(s), full points awarded.	10541 (e)(14)	Proposal Summary /PIF/D.5	1
3	Does the proposal include one or more projects that provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes?	A reasonable explanation of how one or more projects meet a specific need(s) of a community to provide safe, clean, affordable and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking and sanitary purposes. The applicant will receive one (1) point for each project, up to a maximum of two (2) points.	106.3 (AB 685)	PIF/D.6	2
Maximum Possible Proposal Score					
6					
Scoring Criteria – Project Level Evaluation					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring: the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
Meeting Needs of the Region/Nexus to the IRWM Plan					
4	Does the project address the critical needs and/or priorities of the IRWM region as identified in the IRWM plan?	A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses at least one goal(s) and/or objective(s) in the IRWM Plan. (1 point)	79707(a)	PIF/B.2	1
5	Is the project sufficiently justified by the description given in the narrative of Section D.17? Does the narrative include requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc.? Does the narrative include other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point) The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point: full points if N/A) The narrative includes other information that supports the justification for the proposed project, including how the project can achieve the claimed level of benefits. (1 point) 	NA	PIF/D.1	3
6	Does the project address and/or adapt to the effects of climate change? Does the project address the climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point) A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses climate change vulnerabilities assessed in the IRWM Plan. (1 point) 	79741 (a); 79742 (e)	PIF/B.4	2
Work Plan, Budget, Schedule, and Grant Agreement Readiness					
7	Does the Work Plan include a complete description of all tasks necessary to result in a completed project? Are all necessary and reasonable deliverables identified?	<p>Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Work Plan appears to be sufficiently complete, with all deliverables identified, and reasonable given the intent of the project. (3 points) The Work Plan is generally complete and/or deliverables generally listed, but it appears pertinent information is missing or gaps in the scope of work are identified. (2 points) The Work Plan is sparsely filled out, with minimal information and/or minimal deliverables listed. (1 point) 	NA	Attachment 4	3

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

<p>Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other?</p> <p>Considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project description clearly and concisely address all required topics listed in section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project? Are the tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget consistent? Are the costs presented in the Budget backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the Schedule reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan? 	<p>Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Project Description that clearly and concisely addresses all required topics listed in Section C.1 of the PIF, including summarizing the major components, objectives and intended outcomes/benefits of the project. (1 point) Tasks shown in the Work Plan, Schedule and Budget that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the Budget are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A Schedule that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end date listed in Attachment 6. (1 point) 	<p>NA</p>	<p>PIF/C and Attachments 4-6</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Does the project sponsor have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities, to the property to implement the project? If not, does the project sponsor provide a clear and concise narrative and schedule to obtain the necessary access?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points) Project Sponsor does not currently have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property but provides a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (1 point) Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property and does not provide a sufficient narrative with a reasonable schedule to obtain said access. (0 points) Full points awarded if not applicable. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>PIF/D.11</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Project Benefits and Program Preferences</p>				
<p>Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point) 	<p>79707(b)</p>	<p>Attachment 5</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Is the primary benefit* claimed in Table 3 of the Project Information Form logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan?</p> <p>*For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered.</p>	<p>A properly completed Table 3 for at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project.</p> <p>For physical (quantitative) benefit(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.). (1 point) Is the benefit description and quantitative measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? Does the claimed benefit use industry standard units of measure (as described in D.2)? (1 point) <p>For non-physical (qualitative) benefit(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.). (1 point) Is the benefit description and qualitative measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point) 	<p>NA</p>	<p>PIF/D.2 – Table 3</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?</p>	<p>Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 11? (1 point)</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>PIF/D.2 – Table 3</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?</p>	<p>A sufficient description of the benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area. The description must include an explanation of the benefits to various IRWM regions and/or Funding Areas. (1 point)</p>	<p>79742(a)</p>	<p>PIF/D.3</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2019 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point) Full points awarded, if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements. 	<p>10545</p>	<p>PIF/D.5</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?</p>	<p>A reasonable explanation of how a project employs new or innovative technology or practices, including, but not limited to: Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. (1 point)</p>	<p>79707(e)</p>	<p>PIF/D.7</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?</p>	<p>A sufficient explanation of how the project provides a benefit to DAC, EDA and/or Tribe and how the project will address the needs of that community. (1 point)</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>PIF/D.8 and/or D.9 and/or D.10 & Attachments 7-9</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Cost Considerations</p>				

Table 4: Scoring Criteria

<p>17</p> <p>Did the applicant provide a narrative on cost considerations that is fully explained based on information requested in the Project Information Form?</p>	<p>A narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were other projects evaluated with similar levels of claimed (quantitative or qualitative) benefits as the proposed project? In terms of cost, is a justification provided as to why the project was selected? <p>One of the cost considerations listed above is sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (1 point)</p> <p>Both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (2 points)</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>PIF/D.4</p>	<p>2</p>
Maximum Possible Individual Project Level Score 24				
Average DAC Project Score				
(Sum of Individual DAC Project Scores/ Number of DAC Projects; rounded to the nearest whole number)				
DAC Application Score		General Application Score		
Enter Proposal Score		Enter Proposal Score		
Enter Average DAC Project Score		Enter Average General Project Score		
At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?		At the time of submittal, was the application deemed complete and eligible?		
DAC Application Score (Sum Above Three Rows)		General Application Score (Sum Above Three Rows)		
24		24		
Maximum Possible Score		Maximum Possible Score		
6		6		
24		24		
1		1		
31		31		

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
July 26, 2021	Virtual
August 23, 2021	Virtual
September 27, 2021	Virtual