



Project Consistency with an Adopted IRWM Plan

The 2013 Bay Area IRWM Plan Update integrates long-term planning and high-quality project implementation in an adaptive management framework — fostering coordination and communication among the diverse stakeholders in the region. Focus areas for the Bay Area IRWM Plan include water supply and water quality, wastewater and recycled water, flood protection and stormwater management, as well as watershed management, habitat protection, and restoration. The overall objectives of the Bay Area IRWM Plan are to develop coordination, collaboration, and communication among Bay Area agencies responsible for water- and habitat-related issues, achieve greater efficiencies, and build public support for vital projects. The 2013 Plan Update expands upon the 2006 IRWM Plan, documents progress toward meeting IRWM Plan objectives, and identifies ongoing regional needs and issues.

The San Francisco Bay IRWM Region's 2014 IRWM Drought Relief Program (Bay DRP) grant proposal includes 11 projects that comprise a geographically diverse and well-integrated implementation program that will provide major drought relief benefits to the Bay Area's diverse population. These projects include water supply enhancement (emphasizing both large scale benefits and communities most in need) recycling, and effective drought preparedness measures across the region. On May 28, 2014, the Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee unanimously approved projects for inclusion in the Bay DRP grant proposal at its May 28, 2014 meeting.

All projects in this Proposal are included in the 2013 Plan Update, either as adopted by the Bay Area IRWM Coordinating Committee on March 24, 2014 (see meeting notes at the end of this file) or via Appendix F-1 to the 2013 Bay Area IRWM Plan, which lists projects added by the CC on May 28, 2014 (at the end of this file).

As requested in the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), demonstration of project consistency with the IRWM Plan is provided on the following pages of this Attachment. The Proposal and its 11 high-priority drought relief projects comprise a geographically diverse and well-integrated implementation program with multiple water supply, recycled water, drought preparedness, and human-right-to-water benefits. This section demonstrates that this Proposal contains significant, dedicated, and well-defined projects that meet multiple Program Preferences of the DWR Prop 84 IRWM Guidelines. The Bay DRP consists of grant administration and 11 drought relief projects that address four primary benefits:

- Water Supply Enhancement
- Recycled Water
- Human Right to Water
- Drought Preparedness

To facilitate review, the projects are grouped by primary benefit type, as listed in **Table 1-2**, below.

The overarching goals of the 2013 Bay Area IRWM Plan are as follows:

- Goal 1. Promote environmental, economic, and social sustainability.
- Goal 2. Improve water supply reliability and quality.
- Goal 3. Protect and improve watershed health and function and Bay water quality.
- Goal 4. Improve regional flood management.
- Goal 5. Create, protect, enhance, and maintain environmental resources and habitats.

The five goals listed above address applicable Basin Plan objectives, 20x2020 water efficiency goals, and the requirements of California Water Code (CWC) Section 10540(c). Objectives for the Bay Area Region were developed to support the goals. Demonstration of each project's consistency with the 2014 Bay Area IRWM Plan objectives is provided immediately following **Table 1-2**.

Table 1-2. Bay DRP Project Identification Numbers and Organization

Primary Project Benefit	Project ID#	Project Proponent	Project Title
Water Supply Enhancement	1	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	Lower Cherry Aqueduct Emergency Rehabilitation Project
	2	Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)	Rinconada Water Treatment Plant Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) Treatment
	3	Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7)	Zone 7 Water Supply Drought Preparedness Project
Recycled Water	4	Napa Sanitation District	Los Carneros Water District and Milliken-Sarco-Tulocay Recycled Water Pipelines
	5	SCVWD and City of Sunnyvale	Sunnyvale Continuous Recycled Water Production Facilities and Wolfe Road Pipeline
	6	DERWA*	DERWA Phase 3 Recycled Water Expansion Project
	7	City of Calistoga	Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility
Human Right to Water	8	San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	Drought Relief for South Coast San Mateo County
	9	Stinson Beach County Water District	Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness Plan
Drought Preparedness	10	StopWaste**	Bay Area Regional Drought Relief Conservation Program
	11	Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD)	WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR
Administration	12	Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)/ San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP)	Grant Administration

*DERWA: Dublin-San Ramon Services District (DSRSD) and East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) Recycled Water Authority

**This Project will be implemented by a group of 12 project proponents led by Alameda County StopWaste.org (StopWaste). Participating agencies and organizations include: Alameda County Water District, Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Authority, City of Napa, Contra Costa Water District, EBMUD, MMWD, SFPUC, SCVWD, Solano County Water Agency, Sonoma County Water Agency, StopWaste, and Zone 7.

Project 1. SFPUC – Lower Cherry Aqueduct Emergency Rehabilitation Project

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.3: Plan for and adapt to more frequent extreme climate events. With snowpack forecasted to decrease due to a warming climate, the ability to increase access to water storage and maximize flexibility in moving water between reservoirs within the Regional Water System will be key to SFPUC's ability to continue meeting demand. The Lower Cherry Aqueduct (LCA) Emergency Rehabilitation Project will allow SFPUC to adaptively manage water supplies under changing climate conditions.

Objective 1.4: Reduce energy use and/or use renewable resources where appropriate. Water delivered through the Lower Cherry Aqueduct will be transported to the Bay Area primarily by gravity, resulting in very low energy costs per million gallons delivered.

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. The LCA Emergency Rehabilitation Project will directly and immediately increase water supply for the region by more than 150,000 acre-feet (AF), thereby alleviating drought-year needs. It will also provide ongoing access to storage for potable water.

Objective 2.2: Provide clean, safe, reliable drinking water. The water provided through the LCA is expected to be of high quality due to its source and associated protected watershed.

Objective 2.7: Provide for groundwater recharge while protecting groundwater resources from overdraft. By providing water to all of SFPUC's customers, the LCA Emergency Rehabilitation Project will bolster water supplies for customers that also draw water from the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), reducing overdraft from the SCVWD's groundwater supplies.

Project 2. SCVWD – Rinconada Water Treatment Plant Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) Treatment

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. The Rinconada Water Treatment Plant Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) Treatment Project will enable SCVWD's treated-water customers to continue to receive treated drinking water from the Rinconada Water Treatment Plant (WTP) that meets drinking water standards for trihalomethanes (THMs) throughout the distribution system. Some customers are unable to meet their demands without Rinconada WTP supplies.

Objective 2.2: Provide clean, safe, reliable drinking water. This Project improves treated-water quality so that SCVWD and its treated-water customers can meet drinking water standards for THMs throughout the distribution system.

Objective 2.6: Expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. Since the 1930s, SCVWD's water supply strategy has been to maximize conjunctive use, to enhance water supply reliability. Provision of treated water provides in-lieu groundwater recharge and reduces the need to pump groundwater.

Project 3. Zone 7 Water Agency – Zone 7 Water Supply Drought Preparedness Project

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. The Zone 7 Water Agency's (Zone 7's) Zone 7 Water Supply Drought Preparedness Project provides a new source to tap the existing groundwater storage (Chain of Lakes Well No. 5 [COL-5]) and provides for the recharge of up to 15 million gallons per day (MGD) of groundwater discharges back into the groundwater basin for use at a later date.

Objective 1.3: Plan for and adapt to more frequent extreme climate events. An additional well will allow Zone 7 to provide more groundwater during periods of extreme drought. Also, once this Project is implemented, the mining company discharges will recharge the groundwater basin and allow Zone 7 to supply more water through its wells during extreme droughts.

Objective 1.4: Reduce energy use and/or use renewable resources where appropriate. The pipeline portion of this Project is a gravity-fed line so that no energy is required to move the water from Cope Lake to Lake I. A previous project was looking to pump the water from Cope Lake into Lake I.

Objective 2.6: Expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. With the pipeline portion of the Project, the water from mining activities that was previously discharged into the Arroyo Mocho and eventually flowed in the Bay now will be placed into Lake I, where it can percolate and recharge the Main Groundwater Basin, from which Zone 7 and others pump potable supplies. This will further enhance the ongoing conjunctive management of surface water and groundwater.

Objective 2.7: Provide for groundwater recharge while protecting groundwater resources from overdraft. Specifically with regard to CWC Section 10540(c) requirements, the Project protects and improves water supply reliability and reduces the threat of overdrafting of groundwater resources. The new well portion of the Project increases the amount of groundwater that may be used to replace the diminishing supplies from the State Water Project (SWP).

Objective 4.1: Manage floodplains to reduce flood damages to homes, businesses, schools, and transportation. In the future, when a diversion structure is built to channel floodwaters into the Chain of Lakes (the network of mined gravel pits), the pipeline will better enable floodwater to be detained in Lake I and also help recharge the groundwater basin.

Project 4. Napa Sanitation District – Los Carneros Water District and Milliken-Sarco-Tulocay Recycled Water Pipelines

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. The Los Carneros Water District (LCWD) and Milliken-Sarco-Tulocay (MST) Recycled Water Pipeline Project will deliver 1,950 AF of recycled water, with the additional benefits of reducing groundwater overdraft, increasing available potable water, and reducing pollution in the Napa River and San Francisco Bay.

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. The Project will directly provide recycled water for agricultural and irrigation purposes to areas that are groundwater deficient or have seen surface water quality drastically reduced due to drought conditions.

Objective 2.5: Increase recycled water use. This Project will provide the pipeline infrastructure necessary to increase recycled water usage in the community by 1,950 AF per year (AFY).

Objective 2.6: Expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. This Project will bring much-needed recycled water to the LCWD and MST areas. Neither area is served by a municipal water supply, and properties rely upon groundwater, surface water diversions, or both for agricultural, irrigation, and potable water needs.

Objective 2.7: Provide for groundwater recharge while protecting groundwater resources from overdraft. The LCWD area relies upon groundwater and surface water diversion. This area has seen significant reductions in surface water availability, with many storage ponds unable to retain even half the water that would normally be needed to maintain agricultural production. This Project will provide the LCWD area with 1,250 AF of recycled water for the first year after construction, increasing to 1,600 AF after additional phases of distribution are completed. By providing recycled water to the LCWD area, surface water will remain in creeks and streams, benefitting fish and other wildlife.

The MST groundwater aquifer is overdrafted by an estimated 2,000 AFY. This Project will offset 350 AFY of groundwater use initially, increasing to 700 AFY as more customers connect to the pipeline. This pipeline is also the backbone of a much larger plan (Phase 2) to build recycled water distribution to deliver 2,000 AF of recycled water to the MST area.

Objective 3.3: Minimize point-source and non-point-source pollution. By diverting 1,950 AF of treated wastewater from the Napa River, the Napa Sanitation District will decrease nutrient loading into the Napa River, which flows into the San Pablo/San Francisco Bay system. Based on current effluent quality, this diversion of treated wastewater will reduce pollutant loading by more than 3 metric tons of nitrogen, 12 metric tons of biochemical oxygen demand consumed over 5 days (BOD₅), and 18 metric tons of total suspended solids (TSS) annually.

Project 5. SCVWD-City of Sunnyvale – Sunnyvale Continuous Recycled Water Production Facilities and Wolfe Road Pipeline

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. The Project will benefit SCVWD's water supply reliability by permanently reducing 1,680 AFY of potable water demand, and it will improve San Francisco Bay by reducing pollutant loading to San Francisco Bay.

Objective 2.2: Provide clean, safe, reliable drinking water. The Project will increase regional water reliability and long-term sustainability by providing a drought-proof water supply that is not subject to cutbacks from the SWP.

Objective 2.5: Increased recycled water use. The Project will reliably produce a minimum of 1,680 AFY (1.5 MGD) to meet current recycled water demand (1,120 AFY) and projected demand (560 AFY) to be served by the Wolfe Road Pipeline. It will reliably increase production capacity to 4,480 AFY (4 MGD) to supply existing customers with additional recycled water, if demanded. Plant production capacity in excess of existing demand will facilitate future planned expansion of the distribution system and corresponding recycled water use.

Objective 2.7: Provide for groundwater recharge while protecting groundwater resources from contamination. The Wolfe Road Pipeline is the first phase of a multi-phase project and is sized to convey 11,202 (10 MGD) of highly treated recycled water to SCVWD for future groundwater recharge.

Objective 3.3: Minimize point-source and non-point-source pollution. The Project will reduce nitrogen, organics, and solids pollutant loadings to the San Francisco Bay.

Project 6. DERWA – DERWA Phase 3 Recycled Water Expansion Project

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.1: Work with local land, water, wastewater and stormwater agencies, project proponents and other stakeholders to develop policies, ordinances and programs that promote IRWM goals, and to determine areas of integration among projects. The DERWA Phase 3 Recycled Water Expansion Project involves coordination of the local water and wastewater service providers, as well as coordination with local governments, for the provision of recycled water service to support a sustainable regional water supply and sustainable community development.

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. This Project will provide a local, reliable, drought-proof recycled water supply; reduce demands on the Delta, thereby improving its ecosystem and making more water available for downstream water users; and reduce pollutant discharge to the San Francisco Bay.

Objective 1.3: Plan for and adapt to more frequent extreme climate events. This Project will provide a new, reliable local water supply that reduces dependency on imported water supplies that are adversely affected by extreme climate events such as drought.

Objective 1.4: Reduce energy use and/or use renewable resources where appropriate. This Project will increase the use of local water supplies and decrease the energy consumption required to treat potable water, pump imported water supplies into the Tri-Valley, and pump treated wastewater out of the Tri-Valley. DSRSD will realize an overall reduction in energy use of 444,360 kilowatt-hours (kWh) annually. This Project will decrease EBMUD's potable water demand, resulting in reduced energy use to treat potable water.

Objective 1.6: Secure adequate support, funding and partnerships to effectively implement plan. This Project will be implemented through a partnership between two East Bay water suppliers and funded through the local agencies' water rates, developer connection fees, and state and federal funding opportunities.

Objective 2.4: Implement water use efficiency to meet or exceed state and federal requirements. Reducing potable water use by 867 AFY will help project proponents maintain compliance with SB X7-7 goals.

Objective 2.5: Increased recycled water use. This Project will provide the distribution infrastructure to supply an additional 867 AFY of recycled water to customers in the East Bay. The recycled water distribution system will be expanded to areas where current demand exists for non-potable service but no facilities exist through which the service may be provided. This Project will replace existing customers' current potable water demands that are

being used for landscape irrigation. By increasing the recycled water use in the region, this Project allows for sustainable development in the region.

Objective 3.3: Minimize point-source and non-point-source pollution. This Project will divert 867 AFY of treated wastewater from discharge to the San Francisco Bay, resulting in a reduction of pollutant loading to the Bay. This Project will benefit the Bay by reducing approximately 38.5 metric tons of nitrogen, 4 metric tons of carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (CBOD), and 7 metric tons of TSS from being added to the San Francisco Bay annually.

Project 7. City of Calistoga – Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. The Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility Project will deliver 25 AFY of recycled water, with the additional benefits of reducing demands on the Delta, reducing groundwater overdraft, increasing available potable water, and reducing pollution in the Napa River and San Francisco Bay.

Objective 2.5: Increased recycled water use. Calistoga is in a Stage II Water Emergency due to existing drought conditions. As a result of the drought, more new recycled water customers want to connect to the City's recycled water system and the City anticipates increased recycled water demand if the drought continues. The new recycled water storage pond will allow the City to store more water for existing, new, and upcoming recycled water customers. The new pond will initially support approximately 25 AFY of new customers, increasing the City's average annual recycled water use by 14%.

Objective 2.6: Expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. The City receives half of its water supply from the SWP. Increasing the City's recycled water supply will have a conjunctive benefit by reducing reliance on existing SWP water.

Objective 3.7: Control of Pollutants of Concern. The new recycled storage facility will be consistent with the Bay Area IRWM Plan goals of controlling "pollutants of concern" and improving downstream water quality of the Napa River and San Francisco Bay. The Napa River in Calistoga is a Section 303(d)-listed water body, impaired by total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), specifically pathogens and sediments. The City is already working with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to reduce additional discharge to the Napa River. Reduced discharge will decrease nutrient loadings (i.e., nitrogen, BOD, and TSS) to sensitive downstream habitats.

Project 8. San Mateo County RCD – Drought Relief for South Coast San Mateo County

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.1: Work with local land, water, wastewater and stormwater agencies, project proponents and other stakeholders to develop policies, ordinances and programs that promote IRWM goals, and to determine areas of integration among projects. This Project will provide greater water management flexibility and water security within San Mateo County's south coast region, including the Pescadero-Butano and San Gregorio creek watersheds, through coordinated region-wide water management and infrastructure improvements.

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. The Project addresses immediate human and environmental water supply needs. It also promotes environmental, economic, and social sustainability.

Objective 1.3: Plan for and adapt to more frequent extreme climate events. The Project will provide water management flexibility that will facilitate adaption to extreme climate events.

Objective 1.8: Promote community education, involvement and stewardship. This Project benefits communities that rely entirely on local water supply sources. Collaboration with agricultural water users is focused on education for land and water stewardship to protect resources.

Objective 1.10: Enhance monitoring network and information sharing to support proper management of watersheds. The Project involves the coordination of water management and information sharing among a variety of agricultural and community stakeholders.

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. The Project includes a combination of immediate actions aimed to minimize drought impacts across the region as well as actions to improve both immediate and long-term water supply and water quality reliability.

Objective 2.2: Provide clean, safe, reliable drinking water. The Project will provide a more reliable drinking water supply to approximately 4,050 residents and 9,000 County park visitors throughout the south coast of San Mateo County.

Objective 2.4: Implement water use efficiency to meet or exceed state and federal requirements. The Project will repair broken pipes and leaks to improve efficiency in storage and distribution of potable and agricultural water supplies.

Objective 2.6: Expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. This Project will expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface water and groundwater resources.

Objective 5.1: Protect, restore, and rehabilitate habitat for species protection/Objective 5.3: Enhance wildlife populations and biodiversity (species richness). Better management of stream flows will protect and restore important stream habitat for salmon and other species.

Project 9. Stinson Beach County Water District – Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness Plan

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. The Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness Plan includes a water supply component (additional groundwater supply) and water savings/conservation components (leak reduction resulting from pipeline replacements and improved metering to identify and reduce water system losses). Both components will increase water supply to meet demands, thereby alleviating water supply needs for dry seasons and drought years.

Objective 2.2: Provide clean, safe, reliable drinking water. The water supply and water savings/conservation components of the Project will increase water supply available to meet demand, thereby enhancing drinking water supply reliability that is critically important for an isolated water district that has no feasible physical or technological options to connect interties or transfer water with other water purveyors.

Objective 2.6: Expand water storage and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. Sources of water supply for the Stinson Beach County Water District include existing groundwater wells and small creek flows. Historically, the District relied on groundwater for approximately 1/3 of its total supply and surface water sources for the other 2/3 of its supply. In recent years, the trend has reversed and the District now relies more on groundwater and less on surface water. The Stinson Beach Water Supply & Drought Preparedness Plan specifically includes supplemental groundwater supplies (a new groundwater well) as part of its Project, which will enhance the District's ability to conjunctively manage its surface water and groundwater supplies.

Objective 5.1: Protect, restore, and rehabilitate habitat for species protection. In addition to providing multiple benefits for increased water supply reliability and water conservation during water shortages, this Project provides benefits for fish, wildlife, and watershed resource management for environmental stewardship, which would result from a reduced dependence on surface water. New sources of groundwater supply are generally more reliable than surface water sources and would enable the District to reduce diversions from stream sources during dry or drought years, thereby increasing surface water supply for habitat and species protection.

Project 10. StopWaste – Bay Area Regional Drought Relief Conservation Program

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.1: Work with local land, water, wastewater and stormwater agencies, project proponents and other stakeholders to develop policies, ordinances and programs that promote IRWM goals, and to determine areas of integration among projects. The 12 public agencies participating in the Bay Area Regional Drought Relief Conservation Program have the statutory authority to enter into a grant agreement and a demonstrated ability to

ensure the performance of the Project implementation and tracking of funds. Each agency has implemented mandatory or voluntary emergency measures targeting a reduction in water use in response to the drought.

Objective 1.2: Encourage implementation of integrated, multi-benefit projects. Using water efficiently is a foundational action for water management, one that serves to mitigate ecosystem conflicts and adapt to the immediate and long-term economic, social, and environmental impacts of water shortages resulting from climate change.

Objective 1.3: Plan for and adapt to more frequent extreme climate events. The Project will reduce water demand by increasing indoor and outdoor water use efficiency and increase supply reliability by sustaining the existing water supply in the most cost-effective manner, vital to reducing drought impacts to the greatest degree possible.

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. An immediate and long-term reduction in potable water demand of approximately 1,200 AFY will be achieved as a result of implementing this Project, with the majority of the water-saving benefits occurring in the Bay-Delta watershed.

Objective 2.2: Provide clean, safe, reliable drinking water. The Project will increase local water supply reliability and quality in multiple ways: Existing drought-reduced water supplies will be conserved to the greatest extent possible, extending the timeline during which agencies can reliably meet community demands; installing high-efficiency plumbing and irrigation fixtures will allow the public to maintain healthful living conditions while simultaneously reducing demand and protecting water supplies from contaminated urban runoff; water quality in supply reservoirs will be improved, reducing the need for chemical treatment to control algae.

Objective 2.4: Implement water use efficiency to meet or exceed state and federal requirements. By combining near-term drought response with long-term water conservation measures, this Project will leverage the drought emergency to help meet target per-capita water use reductions by 2020.

Objective 3.3: Minimize point-source and non-point-source pollution. The Project will reduce runoff from the urban landscape that contains fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides.

Project 11. MMWD – WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR

The Project aligns with regional priority needs in the Bay Area IRWM Plan as follows:

Objective 1.8: Promote community education, involvement and stewardship. The WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR (Advanced Metering Infrastructure/Advanced Meter Reading [AMI/AMR]) Project will conduct outreach to and communication with landscape irrigation account consumers. The outreach will aim to foster greater understanding about impacts associated with irrigation methods and a greater sense of stewardship and buy-in for extending water supplies and implementing efficient irrigation practices.

Objective 1.9: Support data management for climate change vulnerabilities. Once this Project is implemented, MMWD's and customers' ability to track water usage will be enhanced, and the data will be available for analysis as climate change vulnerabilities are evaluated.

Objective 1.10: Enhance monitoring network and information sharing to support proper management of watersheds: This Project constitutes a big step in MMWD's long-range goal of incorporating AMI/AMR throughout its service area, which will ultimately result in making real-time water use data available to every consumer in a web-based format. The availability of this information will in turn allow consumers to study, understand, and consequently modify their individual water use patterns, as well as to detect leaks early. This Project therefore will contribute to enhanced information sharing that will support proper management of recycled and potable water use in the watersheds within MMWD's service area.

Objective 2.1: Provide adequate water supplies to meet demands. This Project will save 400 AF annually, freeing up water supply to meet other demands, and these savings will occur every year once the Project is built.

Objective 2.4: Implement water use efficiency to meet or exceed state and federal requirements. This Project will save 400 AF annually, thereby contributing to MMWD's ability to successfully meet the 20% demand reduction by 2020 per state mandate. Irrigation efficiency standards, including Assembly Bill (AB) 1881, the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act, are incorporated into MMWD's municipal code and require all new landscape areas to comply

with rigorous standards for irrigation system design and operation. This Project will make it possible for all MMWD irrigation customers to meet these conservation goals and requirements by providing incentives for efficiency hardware upgrades, scientific water budgets based on AB 1881 standards, weekly monitoring of actual consumption at each water meter, and a report delivered to each customer comparing weekly consumption to the budget target. This combination of improved irrigation equipment, accurate water budgets, and increased reporting frequency will provide the foundation for this Project to achieve the necessary conservation savings.

SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee

Monday, March 24, 2014, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m.

Meeting Location:

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

375 11th St., Oakland, CA

Large Training Room – 2nd Floor

Dial in: (888) 232-3867, Access code: 970289

Meeting Objectives:

- Adopt 2013 BAIRWMP
- Discuss next steps regarding the 2013 Plan, including DWR review
- Discuss next steps for Prop 84 Round 3
- Discuss introduced legislation relating to IRWM

Agenda:

1:00 – 1:05	Welcome and Introductions	Chair
1:05 – 1:25	Final 2013 BAIRWMP <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adoption by the Coordinating Committee• DWR Review• Next Steps	Chair / T. Grim
1:25 – 1:55	PSC Updates: Status and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Changes to Round 3• Regional/Subregional Funding Allocation• RD 3 Applicant/consultant	Chair / M. Gerhart
1:55 – 2:10	Legislation relating to IRWM <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Emergency Drought Legislation – SB 103&104• AB 1731• AB 1874• SB 1049	Chair
2:10 – 2:20	Announcements and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Action items from meeting• Future meeting times and locations	Chair

Attachments:

1. February 24, 2014 CC meeting summary
2. March 3, 2014 PSC meeting notes
3. SF Chronicle Public Notice of Intent to Adopt BAIRWMP
4. DWR Plan Review Process Draft Results
5. Schedule of future CC meetings

**SF Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee
Meeting Summary
March 24, 2014**

1. Roll Call—Appointed FA representatives present

WS-WQ	WW-RW	FP-SW	Watershed	Other
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomasin Grim, MMWD • Brad Sherwood, SCWA • Marie Valmores, CCWD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linda Hu, EBMUD • Cheryl Muñoz, SFPUC • David Williams, BACWA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Boucher, CCCFCWCD • Carol Mahoney, Zone 7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matt Gerhart, SCC • Jennifer Krebs, SFEP • Harry Seraydarian, NBWA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Ritchie, Chair, SFPUC • Norma Camacho, Vice Chair, SCVWD

Others Present:

Kevin Booker, Sonoma Valley CSD
Teresa Eade, StopWaste
Paul Gilbert-Snyder, EBMUD
Christy Kennedy, RMC
Carl Morrison, Morrison & Associates
Michelle Novotny, SFPUC
Molly Petrick, SFPUC
Mark Seedall, CCWD
Jeanny Wang, UC Berkeley
Renee Webber, NBWRA

By phone:

Chris Choo, MCFCWD
Robyn Navarra, Zone 7
Bruce Shaffer, DWR
Melissa Sparks, DWR
Jake Spaulding, SCWA

2. Final 2013 BAIRWMP

Thomasin Grim stated the objective to have the group adopt the 2013 Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. Jennifer Krebs made a motion to adopt the Plan. Harry Seraydarian seconded the motion. All present approved, so the 2013 Plan was officially adopted by the Coordinating Committee.

Matt Gerhart thanked Ms. Grim for her work. Ms. Grim said that everyone had worked hard on the Plan.

Ms. Grim stated that DWR had finished their review of the Plan. They only had one “no,” which was that in the Project Review Process, we did not include the status of Plan adoption.

Steve Ritchie asked whether we need to do anything about DWR's comment. The group didn't think any action needed to be taken.

Mr. Ritchie asked whether there are other steps that need to occur.

Ms. Grim replied that there is a 30-day review period that began on March 17th. The CC could make comments or other members of the public could make comments that we could address.

Bruce Shaffer stated that DWR will render its final review decision on April 17th. He did not anticipate any problems.

Ms. Grim said there is one piece of unresolved business, which is the request KJ made for \$117,000 in additional funds. The PUT reviewed their request, and created a detailed response. The PUT thinks about \$50,000 of the charges seem warranted. Based on future expenditures anticipated as of last June, about \$35,600 would still be available through the 4-party agreement, so we need to close this out. There is no need to do another review of the request, since that has already been done.

Carl Morrison asked whether we need to wait until the 30-day comment period is over.

Ms. Grim said regardless we should discuss today what we should do. The 4-party agreement is one way to pay Kennedy/Jenks, but it might not be the only way. If that's the only way we could pay them, then we should call a meeting of the 4-party agreement.

Teresa Eade asked whether the PUT is recommending a payment of \$50,000.

Ms. Grim replied the PUT hadn't gone so far as to make a recommendation, but they said \$50,000 seems like a justifiable claim.

Mr. Gerhart noted the \$35,600 is just the amount that we think we would have left.

Ms. Grim agreed. That analysis was done back in June, and the number might be different now.

Ms. Krebs asked, other than the 4-party agreement, whether are there other organizations who might have money to contribute.

Mr. Seraydarian stated that NBWA had contributed \$10,000 to the completion of the Round 2 application several years ago. NBWA doesn't have any more. Unless there are other people with money, this is a 4-party agreement decision.

Ms. Grim said that, if that's true, the next steps are to convene a call of the four parties. The group agreed on that path forward.

Molly Petrick stated we don't want to go back and fundraise for things that still need to be done, so we need to ensure there's enough money left to complete what we need to do.

Mr. Morrison asked who the four parties are.

Ms. Grim replied that the four parties are the State Coastal Conservancy, Marin Municipal Water District, Bay Area Clean Water Agencies, and the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Action Items:

- Ms. Grim will convene a call of the four parties to discuss how much to pay Kennedy/Jenks.

3. PSC Updates

Mr. Gerhart stated that there's a lot we don't know about Round 3 and a lot has been changing. Since the last CC meeting, the drought legislation passed (SB 103 & SB 104). The latest we've been hearing is that there will be two rounds, including one expedited drought round. The PSP and guidelines for that expedited round should be released by April 1st. DWR needs to put the PSP out for a month for public review. It will be finalized by June 1st, and applications will be due August 1st. There will be at least a 60-day application period. It is still unclear how the allocation for the expedited round is going to work, e.g. whether there will be an allocation by funding area, or statewide. The regions will be the eligible entities to apply. There had been a discussion of allowing people to apply for more money than is allocated to their region. DWR might use up the \$200M for regions that would need it most. So regions that are not deemed highest priority might not get their 40% in this round.

Participants in the PSC call on Friday expressed concern that we could apply and not get any money. The PSC is saying we might want to comment on this issue to DWR before the guidelines come out. We would like to suggest that regional targets be included; it shouldn't be a statewide competition. They also think DWR needs to be cost-effective in their resources and very clear in their guidance.

Mr. Seraydarian said that his understanding is that DWR can't allocate more than the total for a funding region.

Mr. Gerhart replied that the remainder of the money not spent in a drought round would be spent in a future round, and at the end of that round everyone would get trued up by funding area.

Mark Boucher noted that it could be a statewide grant round where you can get up to your funding amount. If you couldn't get much you would have to decide whether it's worth applying.

Mr. Morrison noted that some of the regions where it's needed the most are so small that you might not even reach the \$200M.

Mr. Gerhart said the PSC didn't agree whether we are a region of high need or not. He asked Melissa Sparks to confirm the accuracy of his comments on process.

Ms. Sparks replied that Mr. Gerhart captured the situation accurately. Rest assured that after the final round what's remaining in the region should come back to you. Funding targets for funding areas cannot be changed. The method of distribution will be in the PSP and guidelines. When they're in draft review you can send comments to DWR. The draft PSP is with executive management. They are waiting to see if they approve of it. The deadline is April 1st and we are hoping to stick with that.

Mr. Gerhart asked whether it would be better for the group to just comment on the draft, and Ms. Sparks confirmed it would.

Mr. Gerhart noted the second round wouldn't be until later in the year, and would have a separate guidance. This drought round will be streamlined. We are hoping DWR can carry through some of the streamlining into the future.

Mr. Boucher asked what the rounds are being called.

Ms. Sparks replied DWR is calling them the 2014 Drought Solicitation and the 2015 IRWM Solicitation.

Mr. Gerhart noted that a separate pot of money in the drought legislation uses Cap & Trade revenue; that is a statewide competition not going through the regions. It isn't IRWM money. It's focused on energy reductions and water supply. It is good timing to have all of the applications for subregional and regional funding. By the end of April we will be able to peel off the drought projects and get going on the submittal.

Mr. Boucher noted he's a subregional lead and he has received proposals. What should he do with them?

Mr. Gerhart replied projects should be submitted to projects@bairwmp.org. Chris Choo, Mark Boucher, and Matt Gerhart get the emails.

Mr. Morrison said they should compare notes after the deadline date to make sure they all get the same proposals.

Steve Ritchie commented that we need to just keep doing what we're doing. Compared to other regions, we're doing well. We can hop on this faster than others.

Mr. Gerhart discussed the subregional vs. regional funding allocations. The PSC looked at the past practice, and in the past regional projects got credited to a subregion. Some regional projects were credited against subregional targets. We are not proposing to change that, and he wanted to get the group's input.

Robyn Navarra asked whether regional conservation projects do not have submit subregionally.

Mr. Gerhart said that, last time, Brian Campbell figured out how to split up the regional projects subregionally.

Mr. Seraydarian suggested Ms. Navarra submit regionally. Splitting it up is down the road. We can divide it up if necessary.

Ms. Navarra noted that she doesn't want to be excluded in the event that the numbers don't work out and then we're missing conservation from the subregions.

Mr. Gerhart said we need to be able to elaborate where it breaks down subregionally so we can understand how it breaks down by region.

Molly Petrick asked whether the decision to allocate regional projects to subregions was a policy call the CC ever made. The regional priorities dictate the subregional activities. Let's say recycled water gets

funded regionally, then as a subregion the West has to spend a certain chunk of their money on recycled water.

Mr. Seraydarian noted that for Round 1 the whole application was regional. We ended up meeting the subregional amounts in round 1, but with regional projects. In Round 2, we did a hybrid.

Ms. Petrick stated that she didn't know that the money for the regional conservation project was coming out of the West Subregion. It was not clear.

Mr. Gerhart agreed that he didn't recall a policy call on it. The split happened consciously by reducing the pool of money that's available.

Mr. Morrison stated the people participating in the West subregion meetings were aware of the policy.

Mr. Gerhart said we can bring the issue back to the CC as a policy decision. We were going to wait until we had some idea of the projects, etc.

Ms. Krebs stated we also asked the agencies which project was their top project. Conservation was the top project in SCVWD.

Ms. Grim asked whether anyone has done the math to see whether it would make a difference. We either allocate it to each subregion, or we take it off the top.

Ms. Petrick said that, for this round, a floor/ceiling of regional/subregional pots of money doesn't make sense if we keep using this method.

Mr. Gerhart noted there are few truly regional projects.

Ms. Petrick said that people submitting regional projects should coordinate with people looking at subregional projects.

Mr. Gerhart noted that in the past it's been the same people, and we can cross-compare what's happening regionally with what's happening sub-regionally.

Teresa Eade said that the IRWM grants are trying to get us to do integrated programs regionally. But we also want each of our own projects. We've made a lot of progress talking with one another and working together, but this kind of thing is a growing pain of the process. I think this round does have some regional, innovative ideas coming forward.

Mr. Gerhart committed to putting the decision on the agenda of a future CC meeting. Obviously, the process will all be colored by the PSP for the drought round.

Mr. Gerhart then discussed possible grant administration for Round 3. Jennifer Krebs and SFEP have applied to be grant administrators for Round 3.

Ms. Krebs distributed the key points of their proposal and discussed them. SFEP is proposing to have one consultant for both rounds. They will try to send an RFQ out in April, with proposals due back in April. They will try to have a consultant on board in May so that we're ready to run with an application.

The last time we had a small subcommittee to decide what would be in the RFQ and who we will choose. Current volunteers for the Oversight Committee are Carl Morrison, Tracy Hemmeter, Cheryl Munoz, Linda Hu, Mark Boucher, and Harry Seraydarian. Ms. Krebs asked whether they can charge \$1,000 per project selected to be a proponent to oversee the grant round. It takes a lot of staff time to oversee. During the grant we would charge what we have been charging, which is 5% or less.

Mr. Gerhart commented that another factor is how quickly this would go out. Ms. Krebs thinks there's a way to get the pool of interested folks through an RFQ and then do a faster application.

Ms. Krebs added that maybe we have a per project cost that is baseline, and then we could vary it based on the complexity of the project.

Mr. Morrison asked whether this would be for submitting both solicitations, and Ms. Krebs confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Grim asked whether the committee could say that we like the idea of SFEP/ABAG being the applicant and not agree right away to everything in the proposal.

Mr. Gerhart replied that if we do want to get going with a consultant application process, Ms. Krebs needs some affirmation from the group.

Mr. Seraydarian said that since we only have one choice at this point, we should affirm SFEP and give them the blessing to put out an RFQ. But the subcommittee could adjust the process.

Ms. Grim stated she is not comfortable agreeing fully with everything being proposed. She might be fine with it, but it's too early to say right now. It needs to be further vetted. \$1000 seems arbitrary. She also doesn't know how we could get a consultant on board to write proposals that we don't know anything about.

Mr. Seraydarian replied that we are approving SFEP as an applicant and pursuing an RFQ. We are not approving anything else.

Mr. Gerhart said we need to have a process to get input to Ms. Krebs or the subcommittee.

Ms. Krebs stated she thinks there's a way to commit to a ceiling for consulting services without promising how much we're going to pay. We don't know how many applicants we're going to have in either round. We're going to word the RFQ to allow flexibility, and then we'd spell it out more explicitly in the contract.

Ms. Petrick noted we don't know if the cost/benefit is going to be included. The RFQ might be different depending whether or not it's included. Last time they brought in David Mitchell to do the cost/benefit analysis.

Ms. Krebs commented that everyone wants David Mitchell again.

Ms. Grim asked what if there's one project for one water agency, or just a couple projects, in the next drought round. She wondered about the wisdom about getting too far down the road.

Mr. Ritchie said the plan is to put the RFQ out on April 14th. The PSP is supposed to be out on April 1st. That's enough time to modify. We should maintain flexibility.

Mr. Seraydarian said it's possible that the application process is so streamlined that we might not need a consultant. If DWR is willing to fund locally "not cost effective" projects, then they can't require a cost/benefit analysis. But history has told us that we will need a consultant.

Linda Hu said she appreciated the fact that Jennifer Krebs and SFEP has stepped up.

Ms. Petrick asked whether we could delay until April 28th in order to bring the matter to the CC again. It seems like we're asking for approval of something we don't know anything about yet.

Mr. Morrison commented that we've used SFEP before.

Dave Williams stated that since it's an RFQ, when you have more details you negotiate a scope of work and the contract. The CC would have time for input.

Mr. Boucher agreed, and added that on-call contracts are picked based on a consultant's qualifications based on a general scope of work. This is similar. We want someone who can do this kind of work and do it well. To get ahead of the game, this is what we have to do.

Mr. Seraydarian stated that we're better off knowing what consulting firms are interested at our next meeting in April. We will be better informed if we go with the RFQ.

Mr. Boucher said there's a limited number of consultants who do this well, and we don't want to be late to the dance. If we don't act soon enough, we might not get the consultant that's best for us.

Mr. Gerhart proposed we move forward and bring the responding set of consultants back to the CC at the April meeting. He asked whether anyone objected, and no one in the group did.

Action Items:

- The group will consider commenting on the draft PSP once it is issued.
- The subregional vs. regional funding allocations decision will be on the agenda of a future CC meeting.
- Jennifer Krebs and SFEP will move forward with issuing an RFQ and bring the results back to the CC at the April 28th meeting.

4. Legislation

Michelle Novotny discussed legislation related to IRWM that has been introduced at the state level. She had clarified that AB 1731 (Perea) would require not less than 10% of IRWM funding in each region be used for planning and projects that address water supply or water quality needs for disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Seraydarian noted the dilemma is still going to be how DWR defines what is eligible for disadvantaged communities. For water supply the Bay Area Region doesn't have too many communities that currently qualify.

Mr. Gerhart stated the bill author would be defining that.

Ms. Novotny then discussed AB 1874 (Gonzalez), which would require DWR to develop a streamlined application process for the funding of regional projects and programs, and prompt review and payment of invoices associated with grants, and SB 1049 (Pavley) which would require IRWM groups to include all water providers in the watershed and to include projects that reduce energy used to acquire, transport, treat, or distribute water as regional projects. The group did not have comment on either bill.

5. Announcements

Carol Mahoney announced that she will be on a panel at a CA Water Policy Conference for IRWM. They sent a list of questions, such as what has been the most significant accomplishment of IRWM planning to date. Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Morrison noted they will be in the audience.

Mr. Seraydarian stated the NBWA annual conference is coming up on April 11th. Congressman Jared Huffman will be the luncheon keynote. He was a Co-author on the House drought relief bill.

Mr. Shaffer announced that the CA Water Plan update 2013 is having its final meeting this Wednesday in Sacramento. Go to www.waterplan.water.ca.gov to find out more. The California Finance Coordinating Committee will be holding seven workshops giving information on getting grants and loans from state. For information go to www.cfcc.ca.gov. Also, the California Department of Public Health will now be collecting public water system statistics for DWR. For information go to www.drinc.ca.gov/ear.

The next meeting will be held on April 28th 2014, at the Zone 7 offices in Livermore. Mr. Morrison volunteered to pick people up at Pleasanton BART if anyone needs a ride.



Appendix F-1

Projects Added to the 2013 Bay Area IRWMP by the Coordinating Committee on May 28, 2014



Appendix F-1: Projects Added to the Plan

In anticipation of a third round of Proposition 84 funding, the Coordinating Committee in early 2014 solicited regional and subregional project concept proposals. The solicitation resulted in a total of 54 projects submitted, with the total amount sought for funding exceeding \$420 million. These projects were then scored using 10 factors that had been developed for this concept proposal solicitation. Table F-1-1 lists the scoring factors and potential score for each factor. In some cases just a yes or no answer was all that was required.

Subsequent to the scoring, statewide drought legislation was passed and DWR essentially divided the third round in two parts with the first specifically addressing the drought. The Coordinating Committee then evaluated and rescored the submitted regional and subregional concept proposals as to how they would respond to the drought. The Bay Area regional factors in Table F-1-1 as well as scoring criteria developed after review of the DWR's Drought Solicitation Guidelines and Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) were key in selecting projects to include in the Drought Solicitation Proposal.

The eight projects listed in Table F-1-2 were ranked highly both because of Plan priorities and drought specific needs and are hereby added to the Plan. Submitted project concept proposals not evaluated for the Drought Round are being carried forward for evaluation under DWR's anticipated final Prop 84 IRWM round in 2015.

Table F-1-1: Project Scoring Factors

Factor	Criteria	Scoring (or yes or no)
1	In the Plan?	(Y/N)
	Goals/Objectives	1 to 3 points (Total of 200 points allocated among the 5 goals; 10 points per objective until 40 points maximum per goal [for flood goal, 40 points if all objectives addressed]) Tier into 3 categories: 1 – 1-66 of 200 2 – 67-123 of 200 3 – 124-200 of 200
2	Readiness to proceed	1 to 3 points 1 – Conceptual or early planning 2 – In CEQA or final design phase 3 – CEQA and all permitting complete – can start construct before April 2015
3	Provides 25% match?	(Y/N)
4	Provides at least two physical benefits?	(Y/N)
	Physical benefits	1 to 3 points 1 - Does not discuss benefits or evidence of minor benefits for project type 2 - Evidence of moderate benefits for project type 3 - Evidence of high level of benefit for project type
5	Benefit-Cost	1 to 3 points 1 - Not discussed or B/C below 1 2 - B/C between 1-3 3 - B/C above 3
6	Cash for consultant to prepare proposal?	(Y/N)
7	Collaboration with other entities	1 to 3 points 1 - Does not discuss or only narrow collaboration 2 - Moderate level of partners, some limitations to partnership 3 - Broad collaboration appropriate to project type
8	Degree of integrated benefits	1 to 4 points 1 - Benefits in only one FA or resource area 2 - Benefits 2 FAs or resource areas 3 - Benefits in 3 FAs or resource areas 4 - Benefits in 4 FAs or resource areas
9	Proposal indicates scalability?	(Y/N)
10	Regionality (for regional proposals only)	1 to 3 points 1 - Does not discuss or constrained to approx 1/3 of relevant part of region or less 2 - Brings benefits to a significant proportion of relevant region (up to 2/3) 3 - Benefits large portions in nearly all of relevant regions



Table F-1-2: Projects Added and Project IRWMP Factors Score

	Project	Total IRWMP Factors Score
1	Bay Area Regional Water Supply and Conservation Project	16.8 / 21
2	Bay Area Regional Recycled Water Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calistoga Recycled Water Storage Facility • Continuous Recycled Water Production Facilities and Wolfe Road Recycled Water Pipeline Extension 	16.7 / 21
3	Drought Response & Water Supply Reliability on the Central Coast	13.2 / 18
4	Enhancing and Balancing Beneficial Uses of Water Resources in the Pescadero-Butano Watershed	13.1 / 18
5	Lower Cherry Aqueduct Emergency Rehabilitation Project	12.3 / 21
6	MMWD WaterSMART Irrigation with AMI/AMR	11.5 / 18
7	Rinconada Water Treatment Plant Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) Treatment for Drought Water Quality Conflicts	9.6 / 18
8	Zone 7 Water Supply Drought Preparedness Project	12.6 / 18