

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
December 6, 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"> • Mark Seedall, CCWD • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheryl Munoz, City of Hayward, representing BACWA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Boucher, CCCFCWCD • Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Bradt, SFEP 	

Others Present:

Cam Bauer, BART
 Marco Berger, Multicultural Center of Marin
 Emily Corwin, Solano Stormwater Alliance
 Maddie Duda, Lotus Water
 Natasha Dunn, SFEP
 Robin Freeman, Ron Dellums Institute
 Janice Hunter, Greenaction
 Jennifer Krebs, representing Sonoma Water
 James Muller, SFEP
 Taylor Nokhoudian, SFPUC
 Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
 Leslie Perry, SFEP
 Charles Polc, DWR
 Alex Tavizon, CIEA
 Matt Sagues, Marin Water
 Chelsea Spier, DWR
 LaDonna Williams, All Positives Possible

2. Status of Prop 84 Rounds 2-4

Round 2 will be closing this month. There was a recent site visit to Project 10 Bayfront Canal and the project is near completion. For Round 4, James Muller met with DWR on the State

Coastal Conservancy projects (Project 7 Mt View Shoreline and Project 8 Eden Landing) about amending the grant agreement.

Jennifer Krebs provided an AQPI update. Invoicing for project is up-to-date. Contract extensions with project partners are being executed. NOAA is transitioning operation of the system to Colorado State. Radar siting for the East Bay and San Francisco radars is continuing slowly. Later this week the user group will be meeting.

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

Alex Tavizon presented the proposed governance structure to include Tribes. It reflects that fact that Tribes want to be part of the process and Tribes have already started to attend Coordinating Committee meetings. It also reflects that Tribes are representing their Tribal territory, which may overlap with more than 1 functional area and sub-region of the Bay Area IRWMP.

The Tribes finalized the proposal in October 2021. Beginning in January, the Tribal Advisory Committee will select which Tribes will be represented in the governing body. The Tribes' proposed governance structure includes 3 seats and 3 alternates. The representatives would serve 6-months first to determine who has capacity to attend. The seats will be open for all Tribes within the Bay Area. The Tribal Advisory Committee may form a sub-committee to have a forum to discuss Coordinating Committee issues.

The proposal also includes compensation for Tribal representatives to attend Coordinating Committee and other sub-committee meetings using the 4-party funds. Mr. Muller noted the 4-party are expected to be available to start compensating Tribal and community members in January or February. It was suggested to develop a framework to standardize how people get compensation, including eligible expenses.

The incorporation of community members into the governance structure has also made progress. The proposal was circulated to the group on Friday. It outlines the goals and objectives and the process for selecting representatives. The group suggested that while they're developing process, they should identify interim representatives to ensure communities are represented.

There was a concern expressed related to the number of seats for communities because the communities being represented are so diverse that 3 seats may not be adequate. It was noted that the recent update to the BAIRWMP formalized having 3 seats for communities and 3 seats for Tribes. The group would need to achieve consensus and the BAIRWMP would need to be amended to reflect any changes. There was a comment that there are many Tribes and Tribal organizations too. This is a step towards equity and it's not meant to be one size fits all. It's a step to improve the process.

LaDonna Williams asked if there is a document incorporated in the regional needs assessment that is connecting to the Coordinating Committee's efforts to improve equity. She expressed a desire to fill the community seats now and continue discussions about equity in governance moving forward.

There was a comment that the Coordinating Committee rarely votes and traditionally have tried to operate by consensus.

There was general desire to learn more about best practices to improve equity in grant programs. Maddie Duda offered to present on best practices raised by the outreach partners to elevate the challenges with grant programs and past inaccessibility by communities and Tribes.

Action Items:

- Mr. Tavizon will report on the Tribal members that will be represented in the Coordinating Committee governance structure at the January or February Coordinating Committee meeting.
- Taylor Nokhoudian will agendize a discussion of a process for providing compensation for participation in meetings.
- Ms. Duda will present on best practices to improve equity in grant programs at the next Coordinating Committee meeting.

4. Status of Prop 1 IRWM DACTIP

Related to grant administration, SFEP is processing amendments to extend contracts with the outreach partners to the end of May 2022. The amended contracts will be circulated for signature in January. SFEP will be submitting an invoice and report to the state, which will bring everything up to date through August.

Regarding the tap water quality testing program, Simple Lab is under contract and the water quality testing kits are being mailed out to the outreach partners. This program is gaining interest in southern California as this tap water quality testing program hasn't been done ever on a regional scale.

The contents of the Regional Needs Assessment report will be made publicly available in February.

There was a comment that the voices of people experiencing homelessness are not typically represented in these forums. It's important to have their voices at the table in the Coordinating Committee governance and represented in the decision making process.

Ryan Hirano commented that he is working on how to make the funding opportunities sheet for the outreach partners more active and helpful. There will be a discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Josh Bradt reported that the outreach partners continuing to identify potential projects and partners for implementation.

Mr. Tavizon discussed the Tribal needs assessment process. Due to covid, they weren't able to gather as many surveys as originally planned. While the online survey did not get many responses, individual follow up with the Tribes and Tribal organizations was more effective. The outreach was focused on communication with the elders, environmental directors, and leadership staff. 20 Tribal organizations conducted outreach and provided input for the needs assessment. The focus of the needs assessment were on public health, infrastructure, and flooding. The major areas of concern included pollution of creeks from chemicals or trash, illegal dumping, invasive species, air pollution, access to green space, and access to ceremonial land.

Mr. Tavizon stated an interest for agencies to engage with the Tribal Advisory Committee on issues facing the Tribes. Michelle Novotny expressed that the SFPUC is open to attending a future meeting or workshop.

Action Items:

- At the January Coordinating Committee meeting, Ms. Duda will present on the needs assessment findings from the outreach partners representing people experiencing homelessness.
- Mr. Bradt will lead a discussion of the outreach partners' progress on developing implementation projects.

5. Status of Prop 1 Implementation Funding

Prop 1 round 1 quarter 3 invoices were submitted last week. Project 1 RD1 System Fish Passage Improvements and Project 2 Lower Walnut Creek Restoration are scheduled to be completed next year. The 2 placeholder projects that haven't been amended into the contract yet are also making progress.

Brian Mendenhall provided an update from the Process and Planning Committee (PPC) for Prop 1 round 2. The goal is to better define the process for selecting projects for Round 2. It is the intention that the PPC does the planning and the Project Scoring Committee (PSC) takes over to review project applicants, rank projects, and propose projects for funding. The memo included in the meeting packet explains the draft recommendations for scoring in Round 2.

The aim is to select around 10 projects, but additional projects may be added later to meet regional goals and expend the grant funds. It's important to consider there needs to be enough funding for grant administration.

Instead of allocating 25% of the grant funding for each sub-region, the PPC wanted to make sure the group is funding the best projects. Therefore, they recommend more flexibility to be able to fund the projects with the highest need. It's recommended to include at least 1 project from each sub-region and functional area.

Additionally, the PPC doesn't want to be limited by the 20% minimum of the total funding for Tribal and DAC projects. Tribal and DAC projects that are elevated to the general pot of funding will still get the CEQA requirements waived.

The PPC discussed being able to capture feedback from the PSC reviewers to the projects applicants. It was suggested for the PSC reviewers to capture one strength and weakness of each project to include in the overall feedback to project applicants. It was suggested to have a scribe at the final PSC review meeting to capture the scoring per category and general strengths and weaknesses of the projects.

The PPC is recommending regional scoring criteria in addition to DWR's required scoring criteria.

Action Items:

- Coordinating Committee members should review the PPC's memo and provide feedback on the draft scoring criteria to Mr. Mendenhall and Devon Becker.
- The Coordinating Committee will vote at the next meeting on the proposed scoring criteria, with the caveat that the criteria is dependent on DWR's Project Solicitation Package.

6. 2021 Urban and Multi-benefit Drought Relief Program

Mr. Muller presented on the grant application that was submitted for funding. There was no opposition to the grant application expressed. The Coordinating Committee approved the grant application.

KEY

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

Critical Milestone achieved since last meeting.
 *Grant Funds as documented through invoices submitted to DWR. MTC Financial records may differ

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600010575 - Round 2							Construction Status Breakdown			Funds (as of Q25)	
Quarterly Status: All quarterly uploads complete Payments: SFEP awaits final payment for Project 10 Amendments: None Site Visits: None Grant Term: December 31, 2021							Complete:	19	Total Grant: \$20,000,000		
							Underway:	0	Total Match: \$13,470,177.66		
							Sig. Concerns:	0	Grant Funds Spent*: \$19,971,795.86 (99.8%)		
							Withdrawn:	1	Match Funds Documented: \$13,470,177.66 (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_Bay Area Regional Water Conservation & Education Program	Solano County Water Agency	Complete	Mar-19	N/A	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#3	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	#3	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	#2	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	100%	Oct-21	N	Submitted	Draft #1 Jan 2022	N	N	None to Date	Mar-22	
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	#3	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	Y	None to Date	Closed	
19_Students & Teachers Restoring a Watershed (North & East Bays)	Point Blue Conservation	Complete	Feb-18	N/A	Submitted	Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#2	Closed	
20_Grant Administration	ABAG	N/A	N/A	N/A	Jan-22	Draft Dec 2021	N	N	N/A	Mar-22	

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600011486 - Round 4							Construction Status Breakdown			Funds (as of Q18)	
Quarterly Status: Q22 materials being compiled now Payments: No update Amendments: Formal amendment request sent to DWR to extend projects 7, 8 and 9 Site Visits: None Grant Term: March 31, 2022							Complete:	4	Total Grant: \$21,469,025		
							Underway:	1	Total Match: \$22,395,709		
							Sig. Concerns:	2	Grant Funds Spent*: \$9,408,459.40 (43.8%)		
							Withdrawn:	1	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	Apr-22	Apr-22	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%	Aug-21	N/A	Submitted	Draft #2 in review	N	N	None to Date	Jan-22	
04_East Palo Alto Groundwater Supply	City of East Palo Alto	100%	Aug-18	Y	Submitted	Draft #3 with LPS	N	N	None to Date	Jan-22	
05_Coastal San Mateo County Drought Relief Phase II	San Mateo RCD	Complete	Aug-21	Y	Submitted	Final Approved by DWR	Y	Y	#1	Closed	
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 SBSRPR	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	N			N	N	None to Date		
08_Eden Landing Portion of SBSRPR	State Coastal Conservancy	0%	None to Date	N			N	N	None to Date		
09_Novato Creek Flood Protection and Habitat Enhancement	State Coastal Conservancy	90%	None to Date	N	Apr-22	Draft #1 March 2022	N	N	None to Date	Mar-22	

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600013831 - Round 1 Quarterly Status: Q4 materials due 1/31/2022 Payments: SFEP awaits payment to Project 04 Amendments: None during this period Site Visits: None Grant Term: March 31, 2025	Construction Status Breakdown Complete: 0 Underway: 3 Sig. Concerns: 0 Withdrawn: 0			Funds (As of Q3) Total Grant: \$22,750,000 Total Match: \$23,440,554 Grant Funds Spent*: \$889,293.86 (4%) Match Funds Documented: \$455, 372 (1.75%)	

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 Passgae Improvements	Alameda County WD	86%	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	75%	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	7%	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	70%	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	5%	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	28%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 11/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Mar-25
07_Upstream San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection Project	SFCJPA	8%	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	12%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 11/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Mar-25

DWR Scoring Criteria					
Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation					
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.1? 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?	Tasks that will likely lead to a completed project and a brief description of those tasks and deliverables necessary to be submitted to DWR. <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
8	Collectively, are the Work Plan, Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other? Considerations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the <u>project description</u> 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 <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> consistent? Are the costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? Is the <u>Schedule</u> reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan? 	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A <u>Project Description</u> 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 <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> that are generally consistent with each other indicating the project can be completed on time and within budget. (1 point) Costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> are supported by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation (such as hourly rates, consultant fees, etc.). (1 point) A <u>Schedule</u> that is reasonable considering the tasks presented in the Work Plan, which indicates the project will likely be completed by the end 	NA	PIF/C and Attachments 4-6	4
9	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?	<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) 	NA	PIF/D.11	2
Project Benefits and Program Preferences					
10	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/or other fund sources. (1 point) 	79707(b)	Attachment 5	1
11	Is the primary benefit* claimed in Table 3 of the Project Information Form logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? *For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered.	A properly completed Table 3 for at least one (and up-to two) benefit(s) of each project. For physical (quantitative) benefit(s): <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 <u>quantitative</u> 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) For non-physical (qualitative) benefit(s): <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 <u>qualitative</u> measure of benefit logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? (1 point) 	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	2
12	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Is a secondary benefit claimed that meets all of the physical or non-physical benefit criteria of Question 11? (1 point)	NA	PIF/D.2 – Table 3	1
13	Does the project provide benefits to more than one IRWM region and/or Funding Area?	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)	79742(a)	PIF/D.3	1
14	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community?	<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. 	10545	PIF/D.5	1

15	Does the proposed project employ new or innovative technology or practices?	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)	79707(e)	PIF/D.7	1
16	Does the project provide a benefit(s) to a DAC, EDA and/or Tribe (minimum 75%)?	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)	NA	PIF/D.8 and/or D.9 and/or D.10 & Attachments 7-9	1
Cost Considerations					
17	Did the applicant provide a narrative on cost considerations that is fully explained based on information requested in the Project Information Form?	A narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors listed below: <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? One of the cost considerations listed above is sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (1 point) Both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (2 points)	NA	PIF/D.4	2
Max possible DWR Criteria					
Draft Bay Area IRWM Regional Scoring Criteria					
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)	A		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
Maximum Points Available					

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
				TOTAL	41

December 1, 2021

Bay Area Integrated Water Resources Management Plan
Planning and Process Committee

Subject: Project Screening Committee Decision Criteria Memo

Dear Coordinating Committee:

The purpose of this memo is to document the process that will be used by the Project Screening Committee (PSC) to select projects for the San Francisco Bay Area region's Proposition 1, Round 2 Grant Solicitation Proposal and to publicize the final list of recommended projects. In the event the PSC encounters an unforeseen issue outside the guidance of this memo or within it, the PSC will address the issue internally and bring the final recommendation to the CC for approval.

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

To reduce the administrative burden on the Round 2 grant proposal administrator, the PSC will target approximately 10 eligible projects for the Proposition 1 Round 2 Grant Proposal, but may add additional projects to meet regional needs and/or to spend all available grant funds. In addition, the PSC will balance funding distribution by including at least one project from each Functional Area (Flood Protection-Stormwater, Wastewater-Recycled Water, Water Supply-Water Quality, Watershed-Habitat, DAC) and one project from each Subregion (North, South, East, West) in the Funding Area, as defined in the 2019 Bay Area IRWM Plan Update, if such projects could be considered competitive (i.e. top 33% of ranked projects). The PSC will also elevate eligible projects that provide benefits to tribes/DACs/EDAs through the General Implementation Project funding as well as the 20% minimum reserved for tribes/DACs/EDAs.

Project Scoring and Selection Process

The PSC will convene through a series of preparatory Zoom/Teams/BlueJeans meetings and a final Zoom/Teams/BlueJeans 'Scoring Review and Project Selection' meeting. To ensure the scoring and selection process is fair and equitable, PSC members considered to be directly affiliated with a project proponent will not score their own project. In addition, project scores that are not submitted by the agreed-upon internal deadline will not be included in the review process. Similarly, PSC members who are not present at the final 'Scoring Review and Project Selection' meeting must defer to the final decision of the convened PSC.

Review Process:

- PSC will use the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Round 2 Grant Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Project Level Evaluation scoring criteria in combination with additional regional scoring criteria approved by the CC to evaluate all project submittals. This quantitative scoring process will be referred to as the

“Combined Criteria” and will have a 41-point scale. The Combined Criteria is presented in Attachment 1.

- Each individual PSC scorer will compile point scores for each project based on the Combined Criteria, and then these individual scores will be sorted by rank (with 1 being the highest scoring project on the 41-point scale). Final project scores will be calculated by average rank, thus avoiding skew and outliers (i.e. fairness issues with universally high-scorers versus universally low-scorers) to provide all scorers with an equal voice. The project with average rank closest to 1 will therefore be the top choice.
- PSC will review the updated highest-ranked projects for Functional Area representation.
- PSC will review the updated highest-ranked projects for Subregion representation.
- PSC will review the updated highest-ranked projects for Tribal/DAC/EDA representation.

Managing Conflict of Interest

As mentioned above, to ensure the scoring and selection process is fair and equitable, PSC members representing agencies or organizations that have submitted a proposal will not score their own projects. In addition, the accepted ground rules for the in-person ‘Scoring Review and Project Selection’ meeting will include a verbal agreement by all present not to lobby the group or advocate on behalf of their project, and to only provide additional information about a project if requested. Lastly, no member of the PSC will receive any additional information on how to put together a competitive project application compared to other applicants: the review process will follow the “Combined Criteria” scoring criteria exactly and any additional selection requirements will be based on preestablished direction from the CC.

DWR caps Proposition 1 Round 2 grant administration costs at a maximum of 10% of the total grant request (or \$2.275M for Round 2). This 10% maximum includes the combined grant administrator costs for administration of the regional Proposal as well as any administration grant funding requests within the individual projects. The PSC will set aside a 5% placeholder value for grant administration costs; the CC and grant administrator will come to an agreement on the total administration cost and how these costs will be allocated among the selected projects in time for project proponents to include these updates in the Pre-Application Submittal materials due to DWR.

Communication and Transparency with Project Proponents:

The Planning and Process Committee (PPC), in collaboration with the PSC, will hold a workshop (for applicants to ask questions and for the PPC and PSC to provide an overview of DWR’s eligibility criteria as well as the Combined Criteria used in scoring. The PSC will also provide the following materials to the CC to be posted on the public-facing Bay Area IRWM website:

- Links to the 2019 Bay Area IRWM Plan Update, the Project Solicitation Package (PSP) for Proposition 1, Round 2, and the Proposition 1, Round 2 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines.
- A definitions sheet of key terms used in DWR's IRWM scoring criteria. For example, what the term “leveraged funds” means.
- The scoring criteria to be used by the PSC to score Proposition 1 Round 2 projects (the Combined Criteria)
- The PSC Decision Criteria Memo (this memo)
- The PSC Lessons Learned Document from Proposition 1, Round 1 Grant Program

- A comprehensive list of what applicants must submit to PSC as well as the dates/schedule for submission. This will include the Project Information Form (PIF) as well as all additional materials required for project review including detailed budgets, project schedules, and proof of DAC eligibility (if submitting as a DAC).
- The final list of projects recommended by the PSC, as well as a breakdown of grant funding between all recommended projects, to be posted upon approval by the CC.
- The final PSC spreadsheet showing the aggregated point scores for each project submitted, but not individual ratings per reviewer per project.

The PSC will also require an email address for a Point of Contact from applicants for questions/feedback to be submitted along with the project application. The PSC will send confirmation emails to these addresses upon receipt of the required project application materials. Once the scoring process is complete, the PSC will present a list of recommended projects to the CC for final approval. The PSC will provide feedback on categories, where full points were not received, to applicants within one month of announcing funding decision. This information will be captured at the final PSC review meeting by a designated scribe so that it is available as determined necessary.

Internal PSC Requirements:

The CC will approve the members who will serve in the PSC. The CC will also consider potential compensation for community representatives to participate. The CC will also approve whether a small team of PSC volunteers can help eliminate any proposals that do not meet DWR eligibility criteria to save the larger PSC members time scoring them. Once the PSC for Proposition 1 Round 2 projects is formed, the PSC will host a technical training for all PSC members that will introduce the materials and technology to be used to review and score project applications. PSC members will be instructed on how to how to access, add information to, and save the shared Google Docs. The PSC will have a mockup scoring session to ensure all scorers can access the shared Google Docs and successfully enter the full range of scores for a hypothetical project.

Sincerely,

Brian Mendenhall
On behalf of the Planning and Process Subcommittee

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
February 28, 2022	Virtual
March 28, 2022	Virtual
April 25, 2022	Virtual