

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
January 24, 2022
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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florence Wedington, EBMUD representing BACWA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Boucher, CCCFCWCD • Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water 		

Others Present:

- Ajala Ali, DWR
- Lisa Anich, Contra Costa RCD
- Devon Becker, ACWD
- Marco Berger, Multicultural Center of Marin
- Tess Byler, San Francisquito Creek JPA
- Julia Dowell, Greenaction
- Maddie Duda, Lotus Water
- Natasha Dunn, SFEP
- Jarrad Fisher, San Mateo RCD
- Robin Freeman, Ron Dellums Institute
- Terrie Green, Marin City Climate Resilience and Health Justice
- Oceana Haaland, Civic Spark
- Ryan Hirano, Woodard & Curran
- Janice Hunter, Greenaction
- Lonnie Mason, First Generation
- James Muller, SFEP
- Taylor Nokhoudian, SFPUC
- Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
- Pablo Ortiz, Civic Spark
- Charles Polc, DWR
- Elke Rank, Zone 7
- Matt Sagues, Marin Water
- Kanyon Sayers-Roods, Association of Ramaytush Ohlone

Chelsea Spier, DWR
John Steere, Contra Costa County Watershed
Alex Tavizon, CIEA
Charlie Toledo, Suscol Intertribal Council
LaDonna Williams, All Positives Possible
Jing Wu, Valley Water

2. Status of Prop 84 Rounds 2-4

Natasha Dunn will be giving the Prop 84 updates going forward. Round 2 closed out at the end of December. Project 10 Bayfront Canal/Atherton Channel completed construction. SFEP is waiting on the project's final deliverables. An extension request was submitted to DWR for Round 4. If approved, it would extend the grant round through 2024.

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

Alex Tavizon commented he will report out on the specific Tribal representatives to be included in the Coordinating Committee (CC) governance in February. James Muller also stated he will report out on the interim community representatives to be included in the CC governance. SFEP received the 4-party funds from Marin Water and is creating a process to administer the funds to support community and Tribal participation.

The CC discussed how to determine the compensation amount and process for participation in CC and sub-committee meetings. The CC would like to have a standardized process for both Tribes and communities. \$100-\$150 for each participant was suggested. There was a question about whether \$150 is sufficient to cover any alternative representatives too. Family or childcare that's needed to attend meetings should be considered eligible for a stipend.

It was suggested that documentation of expenses would be needed to get reimbursement.

LaDonna Williams commented she participated in other group committees. They collectively came up with an agreement on what the stipend amount would be, consensus on time commitment and attendance expectations, and a payment schedule that included half upfront for the first 6 months and half at the end of 6 months. Receipts were not required, but she did have to sign an agreement. For childcare compensation, accommodations were made for each situation and everyone was made aware in advance.

Mark Boucher commented he participates on ABAG's planning committee. He expressed interest in understanding how the group would keep track of who attends what meeting in a way that's not burdensome.

Robin Freeman commented he is in agreement with the discussion.

Michelle Novotny commented that there's no more IRWM funding after Prop 1 Round 2. Therefore, she asked how much longer will the CC have these meetings.

There was a comment to make special considerations for participation on the Project Scoring Committee as it is very time consuming.

Maddie Duda gave a presentation on recommendations for improving equity in grant programs. The recommendations come directly from the Tribal and community outreach partners. DWR staff were acknowledged for being on the call. The equity issues with grant programs include: not enough funding, funding decisions not being made by the communities that are affected, historical lack of support for engagement and improvement, technical perspectives being prioritized over local perspectives, and different histories and experiences of different communities not being explicitly acknowledged.

Mr. Freeman and Kanyon Sayers-Roods expressed appreciation for Ms. Duda's presentation and acknowledged she and others leading this program have been listening to the community and Tribes perspectives.

Tess Byler commented she submitted a letter to the state regarding how the benefit-cost ratios are skewed towards benefitting wealthier communities.

Ms. Duda's presentation also included best practices to address the issues. Some of the best practices include: increase the amount of funding, support communities to lead decision making, follow Tribes' lead on Tribal specific funding and engagement, treat Tribes as a state water agency, recognize the uniqueness of differing histories, challenges, and needs, contract directly with frontline groups and Tribes with deep roots, require locally targeted hiring practices, streamline advanced payment, and reduce reporting burdens. The best practices are summarized in the Regional Needs Assessment report for the state to consider. There is an ask for the state to address all the best practices line by line.

In terms of best practices for agencies, Mr. Muller reported on the following suggested actions: increase funding for engagement, consider the structural imbalance in contractual relationships, accept increased risk in order to change inequitable structures, re-consider standard insurance requirements to understand what is really needed, and increase transparency and provide all information upfront. Additionally, personally identifiable information and the right to own data can complicate contracts.

Mr. Freeman commented that state contracting law makes it difficult to hire locally if there's a requirement to hire the lowest bidder. Mr. Muller commented he has been able to specifically name outreach partners in the proposal, which allowed for contracting with the named partners without having to do a competitive bid.

Matt Sagues reported that DWR just released a funding solicitation with some funding set aside for DACs and Tribes. It appears like DWR did a good job equitably distributing the funds, but asked for Ms. Duda and others to weigh in. Mr. Sagues provided a link to the state's map detailing the distribution of funding:

https://tableau.cnra.ca.gov/t/DWR_IntegratedDataAnalysisBranch/views/Drought_Projects_20211112/DashboardDroughtFunding?%3Adisplay_count=n%3Aembed=y%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y%3Aorigin=viz_share_link%3AshowAppBanner=false%3AshowVizHome=n

Ms. Williams asked if DWR knows how much of the funding went to frontline and African American communities. She also asked what processes are in place to ensure the money is actually going to disadvantaged communities.

Action Items:

- Mr. Tavizon and Mr. Muller will report on the Tribal and community members that will be represented in the Coordinating Committee governance structure at the February Coordinating Committee meeting.
- Ms. Williams will provide contacts for the group committees she participated in to help gather example agreements for compensation for meeting participation.
- Mr. Muller will take the lead on reviewing the example agreements for compensation and will draft a proposal for the next CC meeting. Mr. Boucher will assist.

4. Status of Prop 1 IRWM DACTIP

Due to lack of time, there was a brief update on the tap water quality testing program. The Tribal partners have tested around 15 households and so far have found no major contaminant issues. Mr. Muller commented additional tests are being ordered for the community partners and the water quality testing program will extend into May.

5. Status of Prop 1 Implementation Funding

Brian Mendenhall provided an update from the Planning and Process Committee (PPC). The PPC met last week and discussed the inclusion of regional scoring criteria to add onto the state's required scoring criteria. The state released the draft Project Solicitation Package (PSP) for Round 2 and the PPC discussed the changes from Round 1 to Round 2.

Action Items:

- The PPC will present the recommended scoring criteria and process at the February CC meeting and the CC will vote to approve, with the caveat that there may be changes from the draft PSP to the final that would need to be considered.

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 Q28)	
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 Feb 2022	N	N	None to Date	Apr-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	Mar-22	Draft Dec 2021	N	N	N/A	Apr-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: Amendment 5 extends the term and adjusts scope of Projects 7 & 8 Site Visits: None Grant Term: December 31, 2024							Complete:	4	Total Grant: \$21,469,025		
							Underway:	1	Total Match: \$22,395,709		
							Sig. Concerns:	2	Grant Funds Spent*: \$9,416,297.92 (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	Apr-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	Apr-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 SBSPR	State Coastal Conservancy	5%	None to Date	N			N	N	None to Date	Dec-24	
08_South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Project Phase I	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%	Mar-22	N	Jun-22	Draft #1 March 2022	N	N	None to Date	Mar-22	

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600013831 - Round 1 Quarterly Status: Q4 materials being compiled now Payments: No update 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	10%	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	60%	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	35%	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	10%	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	13%	None to Date	N	N/A	Draft 1 Expected 11/31/2024	N	N	None to Date	Mar-25

DWR Scoring Criteria		Prop 1, Round 1			
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?	<input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> A reasonable explanation of how the overall proposal demonstrates coordination and/or collaboration within and between agencies regions, and/or Funding Areas. (1 point) <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> A logical, reasonable, and clear project justification narrative in Section D.1 in the PIF. (1 point) <input type="checkbox"/> The narrative includes requisite referenced supporting documentation such as models, studies, engineering reports, etc. (1 point; full points if N/A) <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> A reasonable explanation of how the project addresses or adapts to climate change. (1 point) <input type="checkbox"/> 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					

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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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: <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Are the tasks shown in the <u>Work Plan, Schedule and Budget</u> consistent? <input type="checkbox"/> Are the costs presented in the <u>Budget</u> backed up by and consistent with supporting justification and/or documentation? <input type="checkbox"/> 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: <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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 date listed in Attachment C. (1 point)	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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Sponsor has legal access rights, easements, or other access capabilities to the property. (2 points) <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> Project Sponsor does not have legal access rights, easements, or other	NA	PIF/D.11	2
Project Benefits and Program Preferences					
10	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	<input type="checkbox"/> 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): <input type="checkbox"/> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.). (1 point) <input type="checkbox"/> 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): <input type="checkbox"/> Does the type of benefit claimed match the intended outcome of the proposed project as described in the narrative (Section C.1.). (1 point) <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<p>A narrative on cost considerations that provides at least one of the factors listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Were other projects evaluated with similar levels of claimed (quantitative or qualitative) benefits as the proposed project? <input type="checkbox"/> 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) Both of the cost considerations listed above are sufficiently and reasonably addressed. (2 points)</p>	NA	PIF/D.4	2
Max possible DWR Criteria					

DWR Scoring Criteria Prop 1, Round 2

Scoring Criteria - Proposal Level Evaluation					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
1	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)?	Provide specific explanation of how the project(s) addresses existing 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)	GRanTS Application	1
Maximum Possible Proposal Score					1
Scoring Criteria - Project Level Evaluation					
Q#	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
2	Does the budget leverage funds with other private, Federal, or local fund sources?	Project Budget contains non-state cost share and/ or other fund sources. (1 point)	79707 (b)	Attachment 3	1
3	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) 		Attachment 2	3
4	Collectively, are the Work Plan , Schedule, and Budget thorough, reasonable, and justified; and consistent with each other? Considerations include: 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?	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: 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)		Attachment 2,3, and 4	3
5	Is the primary benefit* claimed logical and reasonable given the information provided in the Work Plan? * For Decision Support Tools, non-physical benefits will be considered.	A properly completed quantification of 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) 	N/ A	GRanTS Application	2
6	Does the project provide physical 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)	GRanTS Application	1
7	If the proposed project addresses contamination per the requirements of AB 1249, does the project provide safe drinking water to a small, disadvantaged community?	Provide specific explanation of how the project provides safe drinking water to a small disadvantaged community as defined in the 2022 IRWM Guidelines. (1 point) Full points awarded if the project does not have contaminant issues per AB1249 requirements.	10545	GRanTS Application	1
8	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision Support Tools that support the integration of multiple jurisdictions, new and/or innovative business approaches, technology and partnerships etc. Technologies that were developed and/ or became accessible within the last ten years (e.g., Smart Meters , new apps , etc.) New applications of existing technologies Pilot studies seeking to test new technologies or management strategies for future implementation projects 	79707(e)	GRanTS Application	1
Maximum Possible Project Score					12
Max possible DWR Criteria					13
				TOTAL	13

DRAFT Bay Area IRWM Regional Scoring Criteria	Questions	Evaluation Guidance and Scoring; the application must contain:	Leg Citation	Form/Question No.	Maximum Points Available
9	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 (2 pts if climate is primary project purpose, 1 point if it is an additional benefit)			2
10	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, EDAs, URCs or tribes regardless of reaching the 75% threshold in the Prop 1, Round 2 Project Solicitation Package.			2
11	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 needs and/or assets 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
12	Does the project include training and communication between the community and agencies planning, implementing, operating and maintaining a project?	Project includes a component of training and communication between the community and agencies where applicable, including aspects related to planning, implementaton, and/or operations and maintenance of the project.			1
13	TENTATIVE - WORDING REVISIONS REQUIRED Does the project give priority to hiring local businesses from the community in the area of the project?	Project includes specifications to build capacity in the community where project is proposed, including emphasis on hiring local, small or minority businesses to support the project.			1
14	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 the Tribe. (1 point)			1
15	Does the project provide safe, clean water to a disadvantaged, EDA, URC or underserved community or Tribe?	Project goes beyond drinking water in Question 7 to consider safe, clean water and impacts by contaminants not listed in AB1249. (1 point)			2
16	Is the project being planned and implemented as a partnership (e.g. multiple organizations, counties/areas)?	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
17	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
18	Does the project provide multiple (more than one) benefits?	Project provides for multiple (more than one) benefits, with focus on meeting statewide priorities and regional needs.			2
Maximum Possible Project Regional Score					15

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
March 28, 2022	Virtual
April 25, 2022	Virtual
May 23, 2022	Virtual