

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
February 28, 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"> • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC • Mark Seedall, CCWD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheryl Munoz, City of Hayward representing BACWA • Florence Wedington, EBMUD 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:

Lisa Bankosh, Vice-chair, Valley Water
 Marco Berger, Multicultural Center of Marin
 Julia Dowell, GreenAction
 Maddie Duda, Lotus Water
 Natasha Dunn, SFEP
 Jarad Fisher, San Mateo RCD
 Terrie Green, Marin City Climate Resilience and Health Justice
 Ryan Hirano, Woodard & Curran
 Katy Hornbeck, EBRPD
 Jennifer Krebs, representing Sonoma Water
 Lonnie Mason, First Generation
 James Muller, SFEP
 Taylor Nokhoudian, SFPUC
 Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
 Kevin Padway, Zone 7
 Leslie Perry, SFEP
 Keta Price, ISPS
 Elke Rank, Zone 7
 Kanyon Sayers-Roods, Association of Ramaytush Ohlone
 Chelsea Spier, DWR

Alex Tavizon, CIEA
LaDonna Williams, All Positives Possible
Jing Wu, Valley Water

2. Status of Prop 84 Rounds 2 & 4

Natasha Dunn reported that Round 2 closed out in December. SFEP is working on the final deliverables for DWR. SFEP will be applying for retention shortly. Only \$17,000 of Round 2 funding remains unspent.

A grant amendment was executed for Round 4, which extended the term through 2024. SFEP is working with the Coastal Conservancy to get their projects underway. SFEP will be conducting a site visit Project 9 Novato Creek Flood Protection.

Jennifer Krebs provided the AQPI update. Sonoma Water has a new project manager, Dale Roberts. He has been re-engaging on the siting of the Rocky Ridge radar, which is expected to be installed this Spring. Santa Cruz should have their radar operating by this Spring too. The other radars are not quite ready to be installed. The contract with Scripps was signed last Fall. Scripps staff are working on a con-ops plan for the project. They presented their work plan at the last LPAC meeting. Billing, invoicing, and reporting are up to date with DWR.

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

James Muller did not have an update on the list of interim community representatives to be represented on the Coordinating Committee. Once the representatives are identified, Mr. Muller noted he will take a step back to let the representatives take the lead. The discussion of compensation for meeting attendance is not on today's meeting agenda because he hasn't received the example compensation agreements. However, Mr. Muller is still committed to reviewing the example agreements to see how they could be used for this effort.

Alex Tavizon reported the Tribal representatives were identified, but he wasn't able to share the names prior to this meeting.

Action Items:

- Mr. Muller and Mr. Tavizon will share the names of the community and Tribal representatives who will be included in the Coordinating Committee governance.

4. Status of Prop 1 IRWM DACTIP

Mr. Muller reported that most of the outreach partner contract amendments are routing for signature, which would extend the contracts to June. SFEP has enough funding to administer the grant until then. SFEP will also be applying for a grant amendment with DWR to extend the term out to September to give enough time for final deliverables. MTC is experiencing extensive delays in contracting.

Regarding the tap water quality testing program, 349 water quality test kits have been ordered by the outreach partners. 51 tests have been sent to the lab. 21 test results have been returned. 1 exceedance of aluminum (a secondary MCL) has been found in an under-utilized faucet located in a common area of a public housing building in Pittsburg. A follow up water quality test will be completed and SFEP will be touching base with the water utility and the Division of Drinking Water. LaDonna Williams asked if additional testing occurred within the residential units within the building. Mr. Muller confirmed no. Terrie Green asked how long it takes for the results to come back. James confirmed 1 to 2 weeks. Taylor Nokhoudian asked what water quality parameters are being used. Mr. Muller confirmed Simple Lab is using California MCLs and California public health goals.

Maddie Duda noted that the regional needs assessment report is under final review. It will be ready for review by the Coordinating Committee by the next meeting.

Ryan Hirano is continuing to send out weekly emails with grant opportunities. He asked the outreach partners to contact him for assistance reviewing new grant programs or guidelines. He, Ms. Duda, and SFEP are supporting with some of the outreach partner with grant writing.

Josh Bradt provided a project development update. The outreach partners are working towards developing their project concepts. There are outreach partners considering projects related to sea level rise in San Rafael and Richmond, green infrastructure and stormwater management in Richmond and East Contra Costa County, creek restoration and public access improvements in Deep East Oakland, and water quality and soil monitoring in San Francisco.

Mr. Tavizon reported that the Tribes finalized their approach for tap water quality testing. The Tribes are also developing project concepts. 2 Tribes in the South Bay are looking to create partnerships with the open space authorities in the areas of Coyote Valley and Pajaro. The Napa Suscol Intertribal Council is exploring partnerships with the open space authority and RCD in the Napa area. Association of Ramaytush Ohlone is looking into potentially working with San Francisco and SFEI to develop sustainable community gardens for people experiencing homelessness and food insecurity.

Mr. Muller mentioned one of the most acute capacity building needs is grant writing. The outreach partners are seeking partners to assist with writing the grants and he encouraged the Coordinating Committee to contact the outreach partners to help lend a hand.

Action Items:

- Ms. Duda will preview the regional needs assessment report at the next Coordinating Committee meeting.
- Ms. Duda will give a presentation on the needs assessment findings from the outreach partners representing people experiencing homelessness.

5. Status of Prop 1 Implementation Funding

Leslie Perry is uploading Q4 deliverables to the state this week. She is submitting an invoice for over \$5 million of match. 5 of the 6 eligible projects are finished with contracting. She will be hosting an invoicing workshop in April for the local project sponsors.

Brian Mendenhall reported on Prop 1 Round 2 process and planning. He reviewed the regional scoring criteria included in the meeting packet. The Planning and Process Committee (PPC) is getting closer to finalizing the regional criteria. The PPC is proposing 10 new regional criteria. There are several points related to projects providing benefits to Tribes and Disadvantaged Communities/Economically Distressed Areas/Under-represented Communities. The PPC felt it was appropriate to give additional weight to these projects. It was suggested that the Coordinating Committee consider whether to aim for more than the state minimum of 10% for these projects.

This Fall may be the first deadline for grant application submittals to the state. There could be another later date too, but DWR has not confirmed.

Mr. Mendenhall also mentioned the memo attached to the meeting packet. It discusses the issue of balancing functional area needs and funding to each sub-region. The memo proposes to include at least 1 project from each functional area and sub-region, as opposed to the previous approach of aiming for approximately 25% of funding for each sub-region.

Julia Dowell asked what is considered capital improvement project and if data mapping is eligible. The response was that eligibility information is available in the state's proposal solicitation package. Decision-support tools are eligible, which could cover data mapping.

Mark Seedal asked how scoring criteria would be used to prioritize grant applications. The response was that DWR and regional criteria would be added for a total score.

Steve Ritchie commented that the addition of the regional scoring criteria are within the bounds of what DWR is looking for. If the proposal covers the state's minimum requirements, the regions are encouraged to look beyond to address regional needs. Chelsea Spier with DWR concurred.

Mr. Muller shared that the funding breakdown from Round 1 included 28% allocated to the North, 15% to the South, 22% to the East, and 16% to the West.

Action Items:

- Feedback on the regional scoring criteria proposed for Prop 1 Round 2 should be sent to Mr. Mendenhall and Devon Becker by March 18.
- The Coordinating Committee will vote to approve the regional scoring criteria and decision criteria memo at the next meeting.

6. Status of 4 Party Funds:

Mr. Muller reported SFEP received the money from Marin Water. He is working through some administrative issues to be able to spend the funds.

7. Announcements and Next Steps

It was suggested to include a discussion of who the grant applicant for Prop 1 Round 2 will be for the Bay Area region.

Taylor Nokhoudian announced that Eryan Sloane from the Coastal Conservancy will be replacing Brenda Buxton, who retired. Ms. Sloane will be the functional area representative for Watershed in replacement of Ms. Buxton. It was also suggested to have a discussion of the functional area representatives at the next Coordinating Committee meeting.

It was suggested to continue to meet virtually.

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 March 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 invoice executed Payments: No update Amendments: Amendment 5 extends the term and adjusts scope of Projects 7 & 8 Site Visits: Project 9 site visit March 3 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*: \$9,419,344.87 (43.9%)		
							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-24	Oct-24	N	N	N/A	Mar-24	
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	May-22	
04_East Palo Alto Groundwater Supply	City of East Palo Alto	100%	Aug-18	Y	Submitted	Draft with DWR	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	Oct-24	Oct-24	N	N	None to Date	Dec-24	
08_South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Project Phase I	State Coastal Conservancy	2%	None to Date	N	Oct-24	Oct-24	N	N	None to Date	Dec-24	
09_Novato Creek Flood Protection and Habitat Enhancement	State Coastal Conservancy	95%	Mar-22	N	Jun-22	Draft #1 April 2022	N	N	None to Date	Sep-22	

ABAG/DWR Grant Agreement #4600013831 - Round 1 Quarterly Status: All Q4 materials uploaded 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 Q4) Total Grant: \$22,750,000 Total Match: \$23,440,554 Grant Funds Spent*: \$889,293.86 (4%) Match Funds Documented: \$5,743,460 (24.5%)	

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



IRWM Coordinating Committee Governance – Proposal for Disadvantaged Community Representation

Meeting Dates: February 23, 2021; April 02, 2021; November 15, 2021

Governance Structure Meeting Participants: Janice Hunter (Greenaction), Brian Mendenhall (Valley Water), Robin Freeman (BDISPSA), Erica Mitchell (BDISPSA), Terrie Green (Shore Up Marin), Adriana Fernandez (Nuestra Casa), LaDonna Williams (All Positives Possible), Marco Berger (Multicultural Center of Marin), Desmond Jeffries (City of Oakland, Rebecca Kaplan's Office), Sharika Gregory (MCCSD), Lonnie Mason (First Generation Environmental Health and Economic Development), Roxana Franco (Nuestra Casa)

Interim Disadvantaged Community Representatives

The following have volunteered to be interim representatives and will work to advocate for Disadvantaged Communities as DAC representatives and to advance the nomination and selection of formal representatives and alternates.

- Keta Price
- LaDonna Williams
- Vacant

Overview of Document

This document is meant to provide the intention and framework for voting member selection and representation at the San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Water Management Coordinating Committee (CC) for Disadvantaged and Underrepresented communities. This document is intended to inform the CC and should be considered a living document.

Goal

To represent, within the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Coordinating Committee (CC) and all subcommittees, the diverse and varied communities that have been historically underfunded, underrepresented, and therefore, disadvantaged. This includes but is not limited to Frontline, Black, Latinx, Asian and Pacific Islanders, immigrant and other minority communities and their youth.

Objectives

- To continue to guide the IRWM program toward equitable and just outcomes
- To create and implement a model for disadvantaged community inclusion in governance
- To hold IRWM stakeholders accountable for advancing equity and addressing environmental injustice occurring throughout the Bay Area
- To ensure funding provided through the IRWM CC is distributed in a manner that advances racial, social, and environmental equity across the Bay Area
- To promote new funding models that invest resources deeply into communities to help them identify and address their needs

Process for Selecting Representatives

Until the process outlined below has been utilized to select representatives and alternates, interim appointees will be named to ensure disadvantaged communities are represented as early as possible. These interim appointees will be responsible for meeting the objectives and goals listed in this document until representatives and alternates are selected and will be responsible for organizing disadvantaged community stakeholders to engage in the selection process. These interim appointees will be selected by a group of no less than 10 individuals representing or part of disadvantaged communities.

- A Community Advisory Group (CAG - or similar body) composed of community members, community-based organizations, and other stakeholders representing or working with the groups referenced in the Goal section, will nominate and select three representatives and three alternates. Priority should be given to community members that wish to serve in this capacity. The CAG members will be compensated for their time.
- Nomination process
 - All nominations must be submitted to the CAG no less than one week in advance of any vote on representatives or alternates
 - Nominations may be submitted by an interested party
- Selection process
 - There must be at least 10 people attending a voting session of the CAG to hold a vote on filling representatives or alternates
 - Votes may be verbal or in writing. No votes may be submitted before the beginning of the meeting in which a vote is being held

Representatives and Alternates

- Three representatives and three alternates will be elected by the CAG
- Will represent stakeholders referenced in the Goal section
- Will coordinate with and consult the CAG

- Up to three representatives and/or alternates per meeting will be paid for their time and compensated for the costs of attending any CC or subcommittee meetings, including family care, lost wages, transportation, as needed
- Will commit to serving for one year and will assure there are three representatives or alternates at each CC meeting
- Will train and prepare the representatives that are selected to follow their term
- At the completion of their year long term, representatives may choose to continue their service with a majority vote by the CAG
- At the end of their term of service, representatives will be provided with a certificate of participation by the CC

Outstanding Concerns

The participants of these meetings have voiced concern over the fact that there are only three voting representatives for all the groups listed in the Goal section. Additionally, there are 101 cities, 9 counties, and a myriad of communities that all have their own unique challenges, needs and perspectives. The group asked that this concern be included in this memo and that the Coordinating Committee engage in discussions of increasing the number of representatives for Disadvantaged and Underrepresented Communities in the IRWM Plan.

Proposed Draft Governance structure additions/changes created by CIEA with the collaborations of the Tribal Advisory Committee once we hear from more Tribes and Tribal Organizations:

**** Each of the Tribal representative seats has a designated alternate.**

Name	Functional Area		Alternate Tribal Rep
Adam French (Amah Mutsun Tribal Band)	Tribal		Alternate:
Jonathan Cordero (Association of Ramaytush Ohlone)	Tribal		Alternate:
Deja Gould (Villages of Lisjan)	Tribal		Alternate:

Overview of Tribal Governance

This document was constructed by the Tribal Advisory Committee of the Bay Area IRWM and the goal of this document is to state what the Tribal Representatives structure will be within the Coordinating Committee (CC), the governing structure of the San Francisco Bay Area. Tribal representatives will be selected, participate in discussions, cast votes alongside other voting members of the CC, and be responsible for attending necessary meetings to discuss Tribal issues and concerns in relation to improvements for the Tribe, regional lands, and water. One of the main objectives of the Tribal representatives will be to take leadership and assist the Tribes’ inclusion in the “IRWM Plan” and to participate in the selection of projects for funding submissions and decision making process of the CC. **It will also be necessary to select alternates, in the case that these voting members are unable to attend a CC Meeting.**

An important question that continues to be brought up is how should we compensate Tribal members for their participation in the CC. We would like to develop a strategy towards sustained Tribal Representative engagement in the CC and Bay Area IRWM structure as a whole. SFEP is planning to administer the Four-party Agreement Funds and, as approved by the entities that funded the Agreement, pay for the time and commitment for those Tribal representatives who attend the CC meeting[s] and subcommittee meetings. Each person representing the Tribes in either Coordinating Committee meetings or subcommittee meetings will receive a stipend per meeting.

While the Coordinating Committee plans to allocate three seats to Tribal members from the Bay Area IRWM region, the Tribal Advisory Committee (TAC) with support from CIEA, will collectively decide how to appropriately establish a nomination and voting process in allocating the three seats. TAC members will work collectively through this process with a respectful

approach that is mindful of members' values. Through this process, TAC members can discuss working relationships, the process, as well as any information pertinent to the issue at hand. CIEA will also conduct outreach and include the Tribes of the Bay Area that chose not to participate in this process to let them know that if they choose to participate at a later date, that we will support them and that they retain that ability and right as the original Peoples of the Bay Area, their traditional territory. Throughout this process, CIEA and/or the Tribal Representatives will communicate decisions made with all Bay Area Tribes regardless if they have a seated Representative in the CC.

Layout and Structure of Tribal Governance Body

Each of the Bay Area Tribes and Tribal groups exerts their authority to manage water according to their own traditional policies, laws, mandates and capacity. Tribes and Tribal groups are separate and independent sovereign nations within the territorial boundaries of the United States. This sovereignty is inherent and flows from the pre-constitutional and extra-constitutional governance of the Tribe. Tribal governmental structures recognize the sovereign and political independence of Tribal nations and its members. This right is also recognized by the State of California. Pursuant to the Executive Order B-10-11, the State "recognizes and reaffirms the inherent right of these Tribes to exercise sovereign authority of their members and territory." The Bay Area is the ancestral territories of several Bay Area Tribes who have an inherent responsibility for stewarding their ancestral territories whether they currently have the capacity to or not. Therefore, Bay Area Tribes' jurisdiction goes beyond the gathering, fishing, and hunting rights, which each individual Tribal member retains.

The Tribes' purposes is to fully participate in the San Francisco Bay Area IRWM's Coordinating Committee (CC) to continue in their traditional roles of stewarding and caring for the land like their previous generations have since time immemorial. Through their participation in the CC, the Tribes want to be a part of the decision-making body in order to provide feedback on how their traditional lands in the San Francisco Bay Area will be affected or changed. This will be the first time since the CC began that Tribes will be a part of governance structure and will give the Tribes an opportunity for their perspectives to be heard and for these to be part of decision-making. As we continue this process, not only will the Tribes be able to speak and be a part of the decision-making body, it will also have the added benefit of providing information to Bay Area water agencies so that they will begin to understand the importance of bringing Tribes into project development early, before planning has been completed.

During the Tribal Advisory Committee meeting, the Tribes agreed upon a six-month term for each CC representative. The three seats set aside for Tribal Representatives will be filled by consensus selection from the other Bay Area Tribes. All Tribes and or Tribal Organizations with named seats have these in order adjust for marginalization and past experiences working with local agencies and governments, wherein outside entities have pit these Tribes against others in the area. For each participating Tribe they will designate which Tribal members or people are designated to speak on behalf of the Tribe to the CC members. These seats are not guaranteed to be given to each of the Tribes in perpetuity, rather decisions for interested Tribes or members will based on continued participation. Each of the representatives' seats need to have an alternate designated, as chosen by the Tribe, in the case that the representative cannot attend the CC

meeting, their alternate will attend to ensure that there is always Tribal presence at all meetings. Those who do choose to represent have agreed to speak on behalf of their Tribe and to continue to make spaces for those Tribes that have not been able to attend so far, including the following Tribes of the North Bay: Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria, Lytton Band of Pomo, Mishewal Wappo of the Alexander Valley. During the first six months of service the Tribal Representative, the TAC and CIEA will reach out to those Tribes who have chosen not to participate. Even though they are not participating at this time, this does not mean they are not welcomed to attend or participate in the TAC or CC at any point in time because both entities are open to all Tribal members of the San Francisco Bay Area. We expect all participants who are either CC Representatives or Alternates to attend every meeting, whether virtual or in-person (when possible). We also expect to hold meetings for these members so they can coordinate and build consensus amongst themselves.

We estimate that it will can take 5-10 hours a month being a part of the CC, which includes research, attending (2hrs) meetings every 4th Monday of the month, etc. We expect members who want to be CC members to be active participants and when questions arise that they cannot answer or provide feedback on without the authority of their Tribes, that they will bring the question to their Tribal Chair and bring these issues to the Tribal Advisory Committee for deliberation.

The San Francisco Bay Area Tribes who have seated Representatives in the CC will be compensated for their time through the Four Party Funds if they are not compensated through the DACTIP grant for their participation. At this point in time, we are considering stipends between \$100-\$150 for each participant per meeting to be paid by the Four Party Funds when the DACTI Grant is closed and is no longer able to pay for Tribal members' participation. This amount is subject to change based on the funding available for DAC/Tribal participation. Due to extraneous costs, the stipends given to the representatives will be padded with the amounts related to but not limited to mileage, childcare, and other expenditures that can be incurred from doing this work.

**Bay Area IRWMP
Functional Area Representation**

Name	Functional Area	Agency	Functional Area Body
Steve Ritchie	Chair/Water supply-Water quality	SFPUC	
Lisa Bankosh	Vice-chair	SCVWD	
Brian Mendenhall	Flood protection-Stormwater	SCVWD	BAFPAA
Mark Boucher	Flood protection-Stormwater	CCCFCWCD	BAFPAA
Carol Mahoney	Flood protection-Stormwater	Zone 7	BAFPAA
Cheryl Munoz	Wastewater- Recycled water	City of Hayward	BACWA
Florence Wedington	Wastewater- Recycled water	EBMUD	BACWA
Mark Seedall	Water supply-Water quality	CCWD	BAWAC
Brad Sherwood	Water supply-Water quality	SCWA	BAWAC
Evyane Sloane	Watershed	State Coastal Conservancy	BAWN
Judy Kelly	Watershed	NBWA	BAWN
Josh Bradt	Watershed	SFEP	BAWN

March 28, 2022

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 2022 Proposition 1 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 10% minimum reserved for DACs/EDAs and tribal projects benefitting DACs/EDAs as defined by DWR. In addition, competitive projects that bring additional match to the benefit of the regional proposal may be considered for higher priority.

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.

March 28, 2022
PSC Decision Criteria Memo

Review Process:

- PSC will use the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Round 2 Grant Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) Project Level Evaluation scoring criteria (Attachment 1) in combination with additional regional scoring criteria approved by the CC (Attachment 2) to evaluate all project submittals. This quantitative scoring process will be referred to as the “Combined Criteria.”
- 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 27-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 10% 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, including redistribution of any funding remaining after administration costs are formally determined.

Communication and Transparency with Project Proponents:

The Planning and Process Committee (PPC), in collaboration with the PSC, will hold a workshop (date TBD) 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 2022 PSP, and the 2022 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines

March 28, 2022

PSC Decision Criteria Memo

- 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 dated March 28, 2022 (this memo)
- 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 general feedback on proposals during the PSC proposal evaluation meeting. This information will be recorded by a scribe in the evaluation meeting and can be made available upon request by applicants.

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. 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 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. The PSC will also consider assigning a subset of the volunteer PSC to review and eliminate any proposals that do not meet DWR eligibility criteria to save the full PSC time scoring them.

Sincerely,

Brian Mendenhall, Valley Water (on behalf of the Project Screening Committee)

Final DWR Scoring Criteria					
Proposition 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					
				TOTAL	13

Bay Area IRWM Regional Scoring Criteria		Proposition 1, Round 2			
Q#	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 change is the 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 disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, underrepresented communities and Tribes?	Project demonstrates a benefit to disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, underrepresented communities, or Tribes regardless of reaching the 75% threshold in the Prop 1, Round 2 Project Solicitation Package, but reaching at least 20%. (2 points). Applicants shall use DWR mapping tool to determine eligibility.*			2
11	Does the project address a challenge identified through the Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement Program (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, implementation, and/or operations and maintenance of the project. (1 point)			1
13	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
14	Does the project provide safe, clean water from contaminants other than those listed in AB1249?	Project considers safe, clean water and impacts by contaminants not listed in AB1249. (2 points for communities meeting at least 20% threshold as disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, underrepresented communities, or Tribes, 1 point for any applicant addressing contaminants). Applicants shall use DWR mapping tool to determine eligibility.*			2
15	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
16	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
17	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 points)			2
Maximum Possible Project Regional Score					14

* DWR Mapping tool for disadvantaged communities is limited to disadvantaged communities (DACs) and economically distressed areas (EDAs) and may limit scoring eligibility for underrepresented communities (URCs) or Tribes not coinciding with mapped DAC and EDA areas.

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

Date	Location
April 25, 2022	Virtual
May 23, 2022	Virtual
June 27, 2022	Virtual