

SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary
March 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"> • Maggie Dutton, 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Bradt, SFEP • Evyan Sloane, SCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adam French, Amah Mutsun • Deja Gould, Villages of Lisjan • Janice Hunter, GreenAction • LaDonna Williams, All Positives Possible

Others Present:

- Lisa Bankosh, Vice-chair, Valley Water
- Devon Becker, ACWD
- Marco Berger, Multicultural Center of Marin
- Natasha Dunn, SFEP
- Jarrad Fisher, San Mateo RCD
- Robin Freeman, ISPS
- Terrie Green, Marin City Climate Resilience and Health Justice
- Ryan Hirano, Woodard & Curran
- Katy Hornbeck, EBRPD
- Darcie Luce, SFEP
- Lonnie Mason, First Generation
- James Muller, SFEP
- Taylor Nokhoudian, SFPUC
- Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
- Kevin Padway, Zone 7
- Elke Rank, Zone 7

Matt Sagues, Marin Water
Mark Seedall, CCWD
Chelsea Spier, DWR
Alex Tavizon, CIEA
Charlie Toledo, Suscol Intertribal Council
Jing Wu, Valley Water

2. Status of Prop 84 Rounds 2 & 4

Natasha Dunn reported for Round 2 SFEP is awaiting final payment for Project 10 Bayfront Canal. For Round 4, Project 9 Novato Creek Flood Protection had a site visit with DWR and the State Coastal Conservancy in early March. Project 7 Mt. View Shoreline, Project 8 South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, and Project 9 Novato Creek Flood Protection are being amended. Ms. Dunn reported Projects 7 and 8 are no longer projects of significant concern.

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

James Muller discussed the memo included in the meeting packet that describes the approach to appointing community representatives to be included in the Coordinating Committee governance. LaDonna Williams and Keta Price volunteered to be the interim representatives as the communities work through their selection process. Janice Hunter will be in the interim representative filling the vacant seat for a community representative.

Alex Tavizon reported that the Tribal partners have selected their representatives to be included in the Coordinating Committee governance- Deja Gould representing the Villages of Lisjan, Adam French representing the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band, and Jonathan Cordero representing the Association of Ramaytush Ohlone. The Tribal partners plan to nominate 3 alternatives later.

In terms of next steps, the BAIRWMP gives the communities and Tribes the authority to determine their process and nominate representatives. The BAIRWMP doesn't require Coordinating Committee approval, so the appointed representatives can start participating formally going forward.

The group discussed the current functional area representation. It was suggested that Carol Mahoney from Zone 7 be replaced by Elke Ranke, also from Zone 7.

It was suggested to reach out to the current head of North Bay Watershed Association Andy Rodgers to potentially replace Judy Kelly.

The group discussed finding a replacement for Brad Sherwood.

Mark Seedall recommended to change his name to Maggie Dutton, also from CCWD.

Action Items:

- Taylor Nokhoudian will update the functional area representation list.
- Ms. Nokhoudian will reach out to Sonoma Water about potential replacement of Brad Sherwood as functional area representative for Water Supply-Water Quality.

4. Status of Prop 1 IRWM DACTIP

Mr. Muller reported that contracting is moving forward. The grant round ends in June, but it will be extended to December to allow time for wrapping up grant administration. Invoicing is up to date. Mr. Muller reflected on the fact that the insurance requirements have been difficult for the outreach partners. He asked the Coordinating Committee to share any info on insurance carriers and/or brokers that are easy to work with.

The Regional Needs Assessment Report is going through a final review of the graphics and maps. SFEP will also be discussing a media strategy for the release of the final report with the outreach partners.

Maddie Duda and Ryan Hirano have been working with the outreach partners on grant applications external to IRWM, including Prepare California Jumpstart Program, grants through the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, and an EPA grant. Mr. Hirano stated if any outreach partners need support, they should reach out to him or Ms. Duda. In the weekly emails Mr. Hirano sends out to the outreach partners, there are a couple grant programs included with a 3 month look-ahead.

Regarding project development, Josh Bradt reported he is discussing with the outreach partners as they put their project ideas into a spreadsheet.

Alex Tavizon reported on capacity building and project development with the Tribal partners. CIEA has met with the Association of Ramaytush Ohlone and Napa Suscol Intertribal Council. There's an upcoming meeting with Sogorea Te Land Trust. The City of Palo Alto and Association of Ramaytush Ohlone have been meeting regarding Tribal participation in the city's horizontal levee project. Association of Ramaytush Ohlone has decided to work with the City of Palo Alto on another grant. There's an upcoming site visit with Napa Suscol. CIEA is supporting the Regional Needs Assessment report with photos and logos from the Tribes.

Mr. Muller gave an update on tap water testing program. 364 tests have been ordered and 80 results have been received. There have been 3 MCL exceedances, 1 on Napa Suscol land from a well pumping groundwater) and 2 from the same tap in the Pittsburg public housing building.

The first sample from the Pittsburg public housing building was pulled from a first draw on a fixture, meaning that the water was sitting in the pipes. Another sample was taken, but it was taken from the hot water and needs to be re-taken from the cold water. The City of Pittsburg is interested in taking a side-by-side sample. The Tribal partners have completed over 30 tap water tests.

Action Items:

- At the next Coordinating Committee meeting, Ms. Duda will present on the needs assessment findings from people experiencing homelessness and the final Regional Needs Assessment Report.

5. Status of Prop 1 Implementation Funding

Project 1 Alameda Fish Ladder has received CEQA concurrence. SFEP will be hosting an invoicing workshop for the local project sponsors on April 6. SFEP is expecting local project sponsors to submit a lot of deliverables next quarter.

The Process and Planning Committee (PPC) developed the memo and 2 attachments included in the meeting packet. The first attachment is DWR's scoring criteria for Prop 1 Round 2. The second attachment is the regional, Bay Area specific scoring criteria developed by the PPC. The regional criteria allow for more specificity about matters that are important to the Coordinating Committee. At the previous meeting, the PPC asked for comments, but didn't receive any.

The approach to distribution of funding historically has been to achieve target percentages across each sub-region and functional area. The recommended approach for Prop 1 Round 2 is instead to include at least 1 project from each sub-region and functional area (not mutually exclusive).

DWR is considering 2 different grant cycles, possibly in the Fall and Winter. The Coordinating Committee needs to decide when to submit the grant application. Previously it was discussed to wait until at least the Fall to allow enough time for the outreach partners to develop projects.

The PPC is recommending to do the optional DWR workshop.

The Project Scoring Committee (PSC) would need to be convened to review grant applications. When the PSC convenes for its scoring review meeting, it's recommended to ensure there's a scribe to document the highlights and shortfalls of each proposal to be able to provide feedback to applicants.

DWR significantly scaled back their scoring criteria.

When the Coordinating Committee is ready to share information with the public, 1-page summary or checklist should be developed to clearly outline the eligibility criteria, DWR's scoring criteria, and the regional scoring criteria.

There were a couple small changes to the regional criteria since the last meeting. There's a new criteria about climate change because DWR requires proposals to include at least 1 climate change project. Additional points are awarded to benefit communities and Tribes, but the proposal is to rely on DWR's mapping tool to identify DACs and EDAs. The mapping tool may create challenges since it doesn't recognize underrepresented communities or Tribes.

There was question about how the criteria differs from Round 1 to Round 2. There's a bigger emphasis regionally in Round 2 on elevating community and Tribal projects. It was intentional to go above the minimum set aside for DACs and Tribes.

Janice Hunter commented it was helpful to have a thorough explanation of the process.

Jarrad Fisher commented that DWR's mapping tool doesn't represent homeless and low-income populations that are within a high-income area. He asked if it's possible to allow applicants to justify that there is a funding need in an alternative way. Mr. Fisher also asked if projects that don't directly relate to drinking water (AB 1249), i.e. stream restoration, would be eligible for that extra point. He asked another question about whether Tribes need to be recognized by the state or federal government for the scoring criteria. Mr. Tavizon responded he's had success working around the requirement for Tribes to be federally recognized to be eligible for Prop 1 funding.

There was a comment about adding points for projects that can contribute significant match. This may help smaller projects be eligible that don't have match. There is discretion built into the process to elevate projects.

Maggie Dutton asked if any project can get an extra point for going above and beyond AB 1249. It was confirmed yes and that there's a possible extra point if the project is benefitting communities or Tribes. The intention is reflect the fact that frontline communities are disproportionately impacted by contaminated drinking water. Ms. Dutton pointed out that communication with Tribes could come much later in the project development process. Mr. Tavizon commented endorsement by a Tribe can be a general letter of support. The intention is to try to engage Tribes before the project is implemented and build relationships. There was a question about prioritizing projects that are not receiving other grant funding.

Action Items:

- Mr. Fisher, Ms. Dutton, Devon Becker, Brian Mendenhall will form a sub-committee to review comments from this meeting and come back at the next meeting with revised criteria.
- Ms. Nokhoudian will agendize a discussion about the potential grant applicant for Prop 1 Round 2 on the next meeting agenda.

6. Status of 4 Party Funds:

Mr. Muller reported SFEP and Marin Water are working through some administrative issues to be able to spend the funds.



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 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
Elke Ranke	Flood protection-Stormwater	Zone 7	BAFPAA
Cheryl Munoz	Wastewater- Recycled water	City of Hayward	BACWA
Florence Wedington	Wastewater- Recycled water	EBMUD	BACWA
Maggie Dutton	Water supply-Water quality	CCWD	BAWAC
Devon Becker	Water supply-Water quality	ACWD	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

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 points if climate adaptation is the primary project purpose, 1 point if it is an additional benefit)			2
10	Does the project provide benefits to underrepresented communities (e.g. disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, Tribes)?	<p>The applicant demonstrates* (points are additive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project supports a DAC or Tribe generally. (1 point) • Project supports an identified need from the Prop 1 DACTIP needs assessment. (1 point) • Project includes a support letter from the affected community. (1 point) <p>* Applicants shall provide documentation demonstrating at least 20% of the project benefits are for underrepresented communities via publicly available data tools to determine eligibility for Q#10 points</p>			3
11	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
12	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
13	Does the project provide safe, clean water from contaminants other than those listed in AB1249?	<p>Project considers safe, clean water and impacts by contaminants not listed in AB1249. (2 points for communities meeting at least 20% threshold* as underrepresented communities [e.g. disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, Tribes], 1 point for any applicant addressing contaminants).</p> <p>* To be eligible for 2 points on Q#13, applicants shall provide documentation demonstrating that at least 20% of the project benefits are for underrepresented communities via publicly available data tools</p>			2
14	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
15	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					12

BAIRWMP Coordinating Committee
Schedule of Future CC Meetings

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