

AGENDA | Tuesday, May 13, 2010, 1 to 3 p.m.
CABY Coordinating Committee

Location: PCWA, 144 Ferguson Rd., Auburn, CA

AGENDA

Updates

- Upcoming CABY meetings (most work group meetings on hold until September)
- Nevada County Grand Jury
- El Dorado County adoption of IRWMP
- El Dorado County Water Agency update re: board discussion of CABY participation
- Liz Mansfield retirement re: implications
- Sierra County project development with community of Allegheny
- SNC funding round – CABY projects?
- Prop 84 schedule and process

Prop 84 Preparation

1. **Desired outcome:** *Preliminary recommendation to PC for implementation grant projects*
 - Review Project Summary Table (see Attachment 1)
 - Review Revised Prop 84 Ranking Criteria (see Attachment 2)
 - Review Round 1 & 2 project scores (see Attachment 3)
 - Review staff recommendation for implementation grant projects (see Attachment 4)
2. **Desired outcome:** *Approve initial planning grant scope and budget strategy*
 - Review draft scope and budget (see Attachment 5)
 - Provide input on climate change strategy (see Attachment 6)
 - Review preliminary “match evaluation” strategy
3. **Desired outcome:** *Discussion regarding JPA versus NGO as applicant*
4. *Climate change consulting – help needed*

Outcomes of Fiscal Oversight Committee Meeting

1. **Key discussion topic:** *2010 budget cuts and 2011 carryover (see Attachment 7)*

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Western Placer Creeks	May 21
Planning Committee	June 10

Attachments

- 1: Round 1 & 2 Project Summary Table
- 2: Revised Prop 84 Implementation Grant Project Ranking Criteria
- 3: Round 1 & 2 project scores
- 4: Staff recommendations (to come on May 13, 2010)
- 5: Draft scope and budget for Planning Grant and Prop 84 Climate Change and Land Use Summary
- 7: 2010 budget with 2011 carryover information (to come on May 13, 2010)

**ATTACHMENT 1
ROUNDS 1 & 2 PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

Project Name	Project Sponsor(s)	Budget	Project Summary
Expanding the CABY Region Weather Station and Soil Moisture Monitoring Network to Increase Irrigation Efficiency	EID, NID, PCWA, possibly EDCWA	\$85,420	This project will result in the installation of six weather stations and approximately 100 soil moisture sensors across the CABY region, thereby enabling the CABY region water agencies to expand their IMS programs, which assist growers in irrigating accurately and efficiently.
Increasing Water Use Efficiency through Irrigation Management Workshops	EID, NID, PCWA, possibly EDCWA	\$133,613	This project will deliver 27 irrigation efficiency workshops (3 workshops per year for three years within each agency service area). These workshops will focus on providing direct training in irrigation efficiency for small-scale agriculturalists, domestic irrigators, and others. In addition, a minimum of 42 growers will participate in post-workshop voluntary monitoring to determine efficiencies achieved by implementing workshop recommendations.
Water Use Surveys for the Region’s Largest Irrigators	EID, NID, PCWA	\$64,170	The top ten water users within each water district will be contacted to solicit participation in a water survey project. It is assumed that three of the large water users in each district will ultimately participate in a water survey program with mandatory implementation of survey recommendations. Some water district match will consist of equipment provision to facilitate recommended actions.
Washington Comprehensive Water Conservation Program	Washington County Water District (WCWD)	\$1,175,000 (with pressure improvements) \$175,000 (without)	This program involves mapping the infrastructure system, creating a conservation/improvement plan, installing distribution system pressure improvements, a leak detection and repair program, residential water audits with replacement of fixtures, and a training class in irrigation efficiency. Washington is a DAC.
Grizzly Flats Comprehensive Water Conservation Program	GFCSD	\$140,150	This project includes a public involvement and customer awareness program, residential water audits and plumbing retrofits, a leak detection and repair program, and annual conservation plan reporting.

Project Name	Project Sponsor(s)	Budget	Project Summary
Georgetown Divide Comprehensive Water Conservation Program	GDPUD	\$1,540,000 (with meters) \$237,000 (without meters)	This project involves a customer awareness program, residential plumbing retrofits, updated digital map of system infrastructure, meter replacement and conversion program, and annual conservation plan reporting.
Leak Detection and Repair in the Communities of Alta and Colfax	PCWA	\$255,321	This project will be a comprehensive leak detection and repair program for the communities of Alta and Colfax (Colfax is a DAC).
Increasing Water Supply Reliability through Fully Metered Bulk Water	EID	\$217,665	This project builds on a stimulus-funded pilot project. The project will result in the purchase of four mobile bulk water stations, which will provide drought relief and emergency water supplies for the EID service area and possibly the surrounding region as well.
Grizzly Flats Reservoir Lining	GFCSD	\$507,965	This project will include the design and construction of a reservoir lining, pump station, and SCADA equipment upgrade for the Grizzly Flats reservoir. Pre- and post-project water loss will be calculated.
Upgrade and Expansion of the Sunset Industrial Well	PCWA	Under discussion	This project will include the update of an existing well and the expansion of another well to provide water supplies that will augment flows to western Placer County. Implementation of this project would allow PCWA to retain water in the upper watershed and conveyance system during periods of low or constrained water supply.
Water Neutrality	American Rivers	\$739,035	Similar to becoming carbon neutral, water neutrality means determining your water footprint, reducing that footprint through conservation and increased efficiencies, and then offsetting the remaining impacts through purchasing “water offsets” in the watershed that is impacted (see waterfootprint.org for a more complete description). The intent of this project is to pilot this approach in the CABY region at a range of scales to promote water efficiency and security in the face of drought.

Project Name	Project Sponsor(s)	Budget	Project Summary
Aspen Restoration through Removal of Small Conifers	Tahoe National Forest (TNF)	\$30,000	This project seeks to develop a comprehensive restoration strategy for aspen stands that are suffering from small conifer encroachment. Hand removal of small conifers from aspen stands is much more cost effective and less disturbing to aspen stands compared to removal of commercial size conifers. The hand removal of small conifers will increase sunlight to understory plants and increase the amount of nutrients and water available for the aspen. This small amount of soil disturbance may also stimulate aspen regeneration at certain sites.
Fen Restoration – Duncan Fen and Cornish Flat	TNF	\$38,000	Fens are unique peat-forming wetland that are home to a diverse community of plants and animals. More specifically, they are very important habitat for a wide array of bird species and wetland plants. However, these two sites are degraded and deteriorating further. This project includes three phases: 1) erect a fence around each fen (in the case of Cornish Flat, repair the existing fence) as an emergency measure to assist the fen in recovering ecological function; 2) perform an in-depth resource assessment that would include the mapping of site hydrology, an assessment of geology and soils, a plant survey, and topographic mapping to evaluate the speed and configuration of the peat slumping; 3) develop a report outlining results of the fencing and assessment. This report will also discuss other necessary restoration efforts if any are identified.
Hangtown Creek Sewer Line Replacement	City of Placerville	\$1,000,000	The goal of this project is to realign an existing sewer main, which currently runs through Hangtown Creek in downtown Placerville. This realignment would result in the construction of a new sewer line, an upgrade of the lateral connections, restore affected riparian habitat and alleviate public safety issues associated with flooding in the creek.
Native Conservation Corps	Sierra Native Alliance	\$600,000 (2-year) \$800,000 (3-year)	This project will result in the creation of a conservation corps modeled after the 1940-era Civilian Conservation Corps and the existing Americorps. The Conservation Corps will provide job training for disadvantaged youth. Public and private land managers throughout the CABY region will work with CABY and the Corps to identify riparian and wetland sites needing restoration. The Corps will provide plant propagation services, a formal certified curriculum to educate participants, and will work to develop restoration plans with the cooperation of diverse CABY partners.

Project Name	Project Sponsor(s)	Budget	Project Summary
Finnon Lake Dam Reconstruction	Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District	\$1,610,880	The primary goal of this project is to replace Finnion Dam with an embankment, which will increase water storage capacity for combating wildfires. Two additional goals of this project are 1) to enhance watershed values, including aquatic habitat for fish and other biological organisms, and 2) increase capacity for recreational uses on Finnion Lake (fishing, boating, swimming, etc).
Nevada City Comprehensive Water Conservation Program	City of Nevada City	\$300,000 w/out Pine Street Dist System (currently an unknown factor)	The overall goal of this project is to increase water conservation and efficiency in the city of Nevada City. The project components include: mapping the distribution system, installing an integrated SCADA system (with altitude valves) on storage tanks, improving the Pine Street distribution system, installing meters on city facilities, purchasing leak detection equipment and training city staff to use equipment, and preparing a comprehensive water conservation plan.
CABY Region Water Trust	American Rivers	\$311,419	The overall goal of this project is to set up an institutional structure in the CABY Region that can purchase water rights or water leases from willing sellers and rededicate them to instream flow needs. Ultimately, the net effect of the CABY Water Trust will be increased protection of CABY rivers and streams coupled with the economic benefit to those water rights holders interested in and willing to provide water for instream uses. A market-based water transfer system would be an improvement over existing regulatory programs because the transfers would be voluntary and remunerated instead of imposed and uncompensated. Project elements include: a questionnaire for water rights holders regarding their needs and desires as related to their water rights, a barriers to benefits to report, outreach to surrounding areas to provide information on the water trust concept. A similar project is currently underway in Alpine and Plumas counties. Materials from this work effort could easily be adapted and used in the CABY region.

**ATTACHMENT 2
PROP 84 IMPLEMENTATION GRANT PROJECT RANKING**

	CABY Criteria	Score	Score Details		Purpose of Question
1	Support for CABY IRWMP. <i>The project sponsor must have formally adopted the plan.</i>	Pass/Fail	Demonstrates that the project sponsor has formally adopted the IRWMP plan.		See score details.
2	Implementation of the CABY IRWMP. <i>The project must address the goals, objectives and management and implementation strategies identified in the IRWMP.</i>	Pass/Fail	To fund projects that directly support and further the implementation of the region’s water management goals and objectives. Further, the project has been systematically integrated, either through the work group process or by CABY staff and project sponsors, to ensure regional applicability.		See score details.
3	Demonstrated match utilizing non-state funds. <i>The sponsor must be able to document a minimum of 25% matching funds unless the sponsor has been confirmed as a DAC.</i>	Pass/Fail	To determine that the project has met the minimum mandatory match requirements.		See score details.
4	CABY Task. The project budget must include a CABY Task.	Pass/Fail	To determine that the project has met CABY’s application requirements.		See score details.
5	Ready to Proceed/Project Status. <i>The project is ready to proceed.</i>	Pass/Fail	To determine if the project can begin implementation immediately upon funding, including CEQA/NEPA review.		See score details.
6	Purpose/Need/Problems. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project addresses the Regional Issues stated in the IRWMP.</i>	1-6	A higher score indicates that the project addresses the Regional Issues identified by the CABY IRWMP.		Assists in prioritizing projects into the regional plan.
7	Project scale/applicability. <i>Scoring is based on whether the project as proposed will generate benefits beyond the immediate project site and/or whether the proposed study is necessary to allow for the systematic development of projects that will cumulatively provide a regional benefit</i>	1-6	1-2	A score of 1-2 would be assigned to projects/studies that have a limited or site specific benefit or applicability.	Encourages the development of projects that are applicable at a regional level
			3-4	A score of 3-4 would be assigned to projects/studies that have a benefit or applicability to a single watershed (such as the American or the Yuba watersheds) and that would have applicability throughout the affected watershed.	
			5-6	A score of 5-6 would be assigned to projects whose benefits accrue to the entire CABY region and/or adjoining areas covered by the Sierra Water Work Group (convened by the SNC/SNA). A score of 5-6 would be assigned to studies that enable the design of projects of regional significance and are deemed essential to realizing long-term regionally impactful project design and	

	CABY Criteria	Score	Score Details		Purpose of Question
				implementation goals.	
8	Project Feasibility. <i>Scoring is based on the proven nature of project components (e.g., strategies, methodologies, technologies, etc.). That is, the degree of surety that the project objectives will be met using the proposed project approach.</i>	1-8	1-3	A score of 1- 3 would be assigned to projects that use an experimental technology, methodology, and approach but for which the sponsor has developed a sound work plan, schedule and budget and has demonstrated that the project has the sound possibility of achieving the identified outcomes.	
4-6			A score of 4 - 6 would be assigned to projects utilizing technologies and/or methodologies that have been documented as generating the results claimed for the project but that may be considered more experimental or unproven in nature.		
7-8			A score of 7 -8 would be assigned to projects utilizing a proven technology, methodology and approach OR projects whose technical approach has a strongly documented likelihood of success.		
9	Partnerships. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project demonstrates partnerships through coordination, collaboration and public engagement. Partnerships must be formally documented with a letter or memorandum and must include some kind of implementation activity (i.e., a partnership needs to include more than the submittal of a letter of support).</i>	1-6	1-2	A score of 1-2 would be assigned to projects that involve active participation of one or more partners	Encourages collaboration and organizational capacity building.
3-4			A score of 3-4 would be assigned to projects that involve active participation of multiple partners, at least one of whom represents a region-wide interest.		
5-6			A score of 5-6 would be assigned to projects that involve active participation of diverse (across or within stakeholder groups) and multiple partners that represent the local area, region, and adjacent region or statewide perspective.		
10	Disadvantaged Community. <i>Scoring would be based on whether the project was directly benefiting a "disadvantaged community" as defined by the State.</i>	1-8	0	A score of 0 should be assigned if the project does not benefit a disc	Identify projects that benefit disadvantaged communities.
4			A score of 4 should be assigned if the project provides some direct benefits to a disadvantaged community.		
8			A score of 8 should be assigned if all of the project benefits accrue to a disadvantaged community.		

	CABY Criteria	Score	Score Details		Purpose of Question
			4	A score of 4 should be assigned if the project provides some direct benefits to a disadvantaged community.	
			8	A score of 8 should be assigned if all of the project benefits accrue to a disadvantaged community.	
11	Multiple Management Strategies. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project is able to respond to multiple management strategies as identified in the IRWMP.</i>	1-4	A higher score will be assigned to those projects that include multiple strategies. Projects that meet more than five strategies will receive a score of 4. Projects that meet four strategies will receive a score of 3. Projects that meet three strategies will receive a score of 2. Projects that meet two or fewer strategies will receive a score of 1.		Ensure that projects reflect and integrate multiple management strategies.
12	Multiple Benefits. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project results in multiple resource benefits.</i>	1-8	Projects that meet more than seven programs and initiatives will receive a score of 8. Projects that meet five to six programs and initiatives will receive a score of 6. Projects that meet three to four programs and initiatives will receive a score of 4. Projects that meet three or fewer programs and initiatives will receive a score of 1.		Encourages projects to address multiple resource management issues, integrate strategies (as expressed in the CABY Initiatives) and provide multiple benefits.
13	Data Management. <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project includes appropriate data management methods.</i>	1-3	A higher score would be assigned to a project that demonstrates a process for addressing current and ongoing data accessibility, usability and storage as appropriate to the project.		Evaluate the ability to develop, manage and report data for the project.
14	Financial Management. <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of project and includes a suitable match percentage.</i>	1-4	A higher score would be assigned based on documentation of firm financial commitments; clear resource commitments for ongoing monitoring, maintenance and operations; and a high percentage local match.		Evaluate readiness to successfully manage the project, clear financial commitments (via match percentage).
15	Technical Analysis, Engineering and Scientific Merit. <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project is based on sound science, engineering and technical analysis, as appropriate to the project.</i>	1-4	A higher score would be assigned based on the submittal of detailed technical studies, process for adaptive management and analysis that document the project's engineering or technical merit and feasibility as appropriate to the project.		Document project feasibility
16	Water Supply and Other Expected Benefits. <i>Scoring will be based on the certainty that the project will actually provide the claimed benefits and the magnitude and breadth of expected benefits. This criterion reflects the</i>	1-6	1-2	A score of 1 to 2 would be assigned to projects that provide an inadequate technical evaluation or the magnitude and breadth of expected benefits is relatively low.	

	CABY Criteria	Score	Score Details		Purpose of Question
	<i>qualitative benefits of project implementation.</i>		3-4	A score of 3 to 4 would be assigned to projects that provide an adequate evaluation and methodology with all benefits conclusively demonstrated.	
			5-6	A score of 5 to 6 would be assigned to projects that provide an exceptional, fully documented, technically accurate methodology that conclusively demonstrates claimed benefits, as result in benefits that address IRWMP goals and objectives and identify benefits that address a variety of critical water management issues.	
17	Economic Analysis— Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits. <i>Scoring will be based on the methodology used to identify benefits, the magnitude of identified benefits, and the certainty of the benefits. This criterion reflects the quantitative benefits of project implementation.</i>	1-6	1-2	A score of 1 to 2 would be assigned to projects that provide an inadequate technical evaluation or the magnitude and breadth of expected benefits is relatively low.	
			3-4	A score of 3 to 4 would be assigned to projects that provide an adequate evaluation and methodology with all benefits conclusively demonstrated.	
			5-6	A score of 5 to 6 would be assigned to projects that provide an exceptional, fully documented, technically accurate methodology that conclusively demonstrates claimed benefits, as result in benefits that address IRWMP goals and objectives and identify benefits that address a variety of critical water management issues.	
18	Contribution to Mitigating Climate Change. <i>Scoring will be based on how a project affects the ability of the region or project sponsor to adapt to climate change through implementation of water conservation, system reoperation, infrastructure improvements, development of adaptive management strategies, and diversify watershed stewardship projects.</i>	??	<p>A score of ___ would be assigned to projects that do not directly influence the region’s ability to adapt to climate change.</p> <p>A score of ___ would be assigned to projects that demonstrably contribute to the region’s ability to adapt to climate change (both infrastructure adaptation and support natural environment’s ability to adapt).</p>		
19	Contribution of project to reducing Green House Gas emissions. <i>Scoring will be based on net emissions</i>	??	A score of ___ would be assigned to projects that demonstrate ___ emissions and/or ___ reduction in emissions.		

	CABY Criteria	Score	Score Details	Purpose of Question
	<i>and/or the reduction in emissions resulting from project implementation.</i>		???	
20	Program Preferences. <i>Scoring is based on whether project addresses DWR's stated scoring preference for drought-relief projects. (pass/fail)</i>	P/F	Demonstrates project's eligibility/applicability for Prop 84 funding.	

Program	Initiatives
Water Quantity	Reliability Demand Management Conservation and Recycling Conjunctive Use Conveyance Ground Water Management Diversions Water Rights Flooding
Water Quality	Legacy Mining Contaminants Sedimentation Contamination Temperature
Watershed Restoration and Preservation	Wetlands/Mountain Meadows Fisheries and Aquatic Biota Catastrophic Fire Instream Flows Habitat Alteration
Climate Change	Water System/Infrastructure/Operations Natural Systems Socio-economic

Regional Issues

Water Quality
(Sediment, Mercury, Contamination, Temperature)
 Water Diversion
 Water Demand
 Water Rights
 Infrastructure
 Fire and Fuels

Groundwater
 Flooding
 Instream Flow
 Habitat Alteration
 Fisheries and Aquatic Biota
 Agriculture
 Recreation
 Climate Change

**ATTACHMENT 3
ROUND 1 PROP 84 PROJECT RANKING**

CABY Criteria		Irrigation Efficiency	Georgetown Divide ¹²	Grizzly Flats Water Cons. Prog.	Alta/Colfax	Bulk Water	Grizzly Flats Res
1	Support for CABY IRWMP. <i>The project sponsor must have formally adopted the plan. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P
2	Implementation of the CABY IRWMP. <i>The project must address the goals, objectives and management and implementation strategies identified in the IRWMP. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P
3	Demonstrated match utilizing non-state funds. <i>The sponsor must be able to document a minimum of 25% matching funds unless the sponsor has been confirmed as a DAC. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P
4	CABY Task. <i>The project budget must include a CABY Task. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P
5	Ready to Proceed/Project Status. <i>The project is ready to proceed. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P
6	Purpose/Need/Problems. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project addresses the issues, concerns and/or opportunities that is critical to the success of the IRWMP. (1-6)</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3
7	Project scale/applicability. <i>Scoring is based on whether the project as proposed will generate benefits beyond the immediate project site and/or whether the proposed study is necessary to allow for the systematic development of projects that will cumulatively provide a regional benefit.(1-6)</i>	6	2	2	2	4	2

¹ This project has a “with meter/without meter” budget. The difference in the level of benefit between new meters versus existing meters is not yet quantified.

² If all water conservation/drought-relief projects are bundled as a single project, this score increases to a six. If project in this group are DAC-only, this further raises the score and makes the bundle eligible for an additional funding source.

CABY Criteria		Irrigation Efficiency	George-town Divide¹²	Grizzly Flats Water Cons. Prog.	Alta/ Colfax	Bulk Water	Grizzly Flats Res
8	Project Feasibility. <i>Scoring is based on the proven nature of project components (e.g., strategies, methodologies, technologies, etc.). That is, the degree of surety that the project objectives will be met using the proposed project approach. (1-8)</i>	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	Partnerships. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project demonstrates partnerships through coordination, collaboration and public engagement. Partnerships must be formally documented with a letter or memorandum and must include some kind of implementation activity (i.e., a partnership needs to include more than the submittal of a letter of support). (1-6)</i>	5	1	1	1	1	1
10	Disadvantaged Community. <i>Scoring would be based on whether the project was directly benefiting a “disadvantaged community” as defined by the State. (1-8)</i>	Scores pending ³					
11	Multiple Management Strategies. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project is able to respond to multiple management strategies as identified in the IRWMP. (1-4)</i>	4	2	2	2	2	3
12	Multiple Benefits. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project results in multiple resource benefits. (1-8)</i>	6	6	6	6	6	8
13	Data Management. <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project includes appropriate data management methods. (1-3)</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3

³ DAC status research is underway and will be completed by May 13 CC meeting. This research will focus on the comparison between using Census numbers and Dept of Finance numbers. Additionally, environmental justice issues will need to be added to our consideration of DAC.

CABY Criteria		Irrigation Efficiency	George-town Divide ¹²	Grizzly Flats Water Cons. Prog.	Alta/ Colfax	Bulk Water	Grizzly Flats Res
14	Financial Management. ⁴ Scoring will be based on whether the project describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of project and includes a suitable match percentage.(1-4)	3 ⁵	4	4	4	4	4
15	Technical Analysis, Engineering and Scientific Merit. Scoring will be based on whether the project is based on sound science, engineering and technical analysis, as appropriate to the project. (1-4)	4	4	4	4	4	4
16	Water Supply and Other Expected Benefits. Scoring will be based on the certainty that the project will actually provide the claimed benefits and the magnitude and breadth of expected benefits. This criterion reflects the qualitative benefits of project implementation. (1-6)	Economics/benefits sections for these projects are incomplete and therefore no scores will be given in this round of ranking.					
17	Economic Analysis – Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits. Scoring will be based on the methodology used to identify benefits, the magnitude of identified benefits, and the certainty of the benefits. This criterion reflects the quantitative benefits of project implementation.(1-6)	Economics/benefits sections for these projects are incomplete and therefore no scores will be given in this round of ranking.					
18	Contribution to Mitigating Climate Change. Scoring will be based on how a project affects the ability of the region or project sponsor to adapt to climate change through implementation of water conservation, system reoperation, infrastructure improvements, development of adaptive management strategies, and diversify watershed stewardship projects.	Numerical value for this criterion has not yet been determined. This will be a topic of discussion at the May 13, 2010 CC meeting.					

⁴ Top ranked projects will get a final review to confirm match and financial management systems.

⁵ Budget needs final review with sponsors and EID confirmation of software/website resources availability.

CABY Criteria		Irrigation Efficiency	George-town Divide ¹²	Grizzly Flats Water Cons. Prog.	Alta/ Colfax	Bulk Water	Grizzly Flats Res
19	Contribution of project to reducing Green House Gas emissions. <i>Scoring will be based on net emissions and/or the reduction in emissions resulting from project implementation.</i>	Numerical value for this criterion has not yet been determined. This will be a topic of discussion at the May 13, 2010 CC meeting.					
20	Program Preferences. <i>Scoring is based on whether project addresses DWR's stated scoring preference for drought-relief projects. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P
Total score:		39	33	33	33	35	36

ROUND 2 PROP 84 PROJECT RANKING

CABY Criteria		Water Neutrality	Aspen	Fen	Hangtown Sewer Line	Native Cons. Corps	Nev City	Water Trust	WCWD	Finnon
1	Support for CABY IRWMP. <i>The project sponsor must have formally adopted the plan. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P ⁶	P ⁷	F ⁸	F ⁹	P	P	P	P
2	Implementation of the CABY IRWMP. <i>The project must address the goals, objectives and management and implementation strategies identified in the IRWMP. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
3	Demonstrated match utilizing non-state funds. <i>The sponsor must be able to document a minimum of 25% matching funds unless the sponsor has been confirmed as a DAC. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
4	CABY Task. <i>The project budget must include a CABY Task. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	? ¹⁰	? ¹¹	P	P	P	P
5	Ready to Proceed/Project Status. <i>The project is ready to proceed. (pass/fail)</i>	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

⁶ USFS has not/cannot adopt IRWMP. Assuming local non-profit will act as project sponsor (e.g., SYRCL, American Rivers, CABY NGO, etc).

⁷ USFS has not/cannot adopt IRWMP. Assuming local non-profit will act as project sponsor (e.g., SYRCL, American Rivers, CABY NGO, etc).

⁸ Adoption in process but not yet complete

⁹ Adoption in process but not yet complete

¹⁰ This element of the project is still under development.

¹¹ This element of the project is still under development.

CABY Criteria		Water Neutrality	Aspen	Fen	Hangtown Sewer Line	Native Cons. Corps	Nev City	Water Trust	WCWD	Finnon
6	Purpose/Need/Problems. Scoring is based on how well the project addresses the issues, concerns and/or opportunities that is critical to the success of the IRWMP. (1-6)	3	3	3	4	5	3	6	3	2
7	Project scale/applicability. Scoring is based on whether the project as proposed will generate benefits beyond the immediate project site and/or whether the proposed study is necessary to allow for the systematic development of projects that will cumulatively provide a regional benefit.(1-6)	5	4	3	2	6	2	5	2	2
8	Project Feasibility. Scoring is based on the proven nature of project components (e.g., strategies, methodologies, technologies, etc.). That is, the degree of surety that the project objectives will be met using the proposed project approach. (1-8)	6	7	5	8	6	8	6	8	8
9	Partnerships. Scoring is based on how well the project demonstrates partnerships through coordination, collaboration and public engagement. Partnerships must be formally documented with a letter or memorandum and must include some kind of implementation activity (i.e., a partnership needs to include more than the submittal of a letter of support). (1-6)	4	4	3	2	6	1	4 ¹²	1	4
10	Disadvantaged Community. Scoring would be based on whether the project was directly benefiting a “disadvantaged community” as defined by the State. (1-8)	Scores pending ¹³								

¹² Water agency partnerships need to be confirmed. This score could increase if these partnerships are confirmed.

¹³ DAC status research is underway and will be completed by May 13 CC meeting. This research will focus on the comparison between using Census numbers and Dept of Finance numbers. Additionally, environmental justice issues will need to be added to our consideration of DAC.

CABY Criteria		Water Neutrality	Aspen	Fen	Hangtown Sewer Line	Native Cons. Corps	Nev City	Water Trust	WCWD	Finnon
11	Multiple Management Strategies. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project is able to respond to multiple management strategies as identified in the IRWMP. (1-4)</i>	3	3	4	2	4	2	4	2	2
12	Multiple Benefits. <i>Scoring is based on how well the project results in multiple resource benefits. (1-8)</i>	6	6	6	4	8	6	8	6	1
13	Data Management. <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project includes appropriate data management methods. (1-3)</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
14	Financial Management. ¹⁴ <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of project and includes a suitable match percentage.(1-4)</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
15	Technical Analysis, Engineering and Scientific Merit. <i>Scoring will be based on whether the project is based on sound science, engineering and technical analysis, as appropriate to the project. (1-4)</i>	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
16	Water Supply and Other Expected Benefits. <i>Scoring will be based on the certainty that the project will actually provide the claimed benefits and the magnitude and breadth of expected benefits. This criterion reflects the qualitative benefits of project implementation. (1-6)</i>	Economics/benefits sections for these projects are incomplete and therefore no scores will be given in this round of ranking.								

¹⁴ Top ranked projects will get a final review to confirm match and financial management systems.

CABY Criteria		Water Neutrality	Aspen	Fen	Hangtown Sewer Line	Native Cons. Corps	Nev City	Water Trust	WCWD	Finnon
17	Economic Analysis— Water Supply and Water Quality Benefits. <i>Scoring will be based on the methodology used to identify benefits, the magnitude of identified benefits, and the certainty of the benefits. This criterion reflects the quantitative benefits of project implementation.(1-6)</i>	Economics/benefits sections for these projects are incomplete and therefore no scores will be given in this round of ranking.								
18	Contribution to Mitigating Climate Change. <i>Scoring will be based on how a project affects the ability of the region or project sponsor to adapt to climate change through implementation of water conservation, system reoperation, infrastructure improvements, development of adaptive management strategies, and diversify watershed stewardship projects.</i>	Numerical value for this criterion has not yet been determined. This will be a topic of discussion at the May 13, 2010 CC meeting.								
19	Contribution of project to reducing Green House Gas emissions. <i>Scoring will be based on net emissions and/or the reduction in emissions resulting from project implementation.</i>	Numerical value for this criterion has not yet been determined. This will be a topic of discussion at the May 13, 2010 CC meeting.								
20	Program Preferences. <i>Scoring is based on whether project addresses DWR's stated scoring preference for long-term drought preparedness projects. (pass/fail)</i>	P	F	F	F	F	P	P	P	F
Total score:		37	38	35	33	46	33	44	33	30

ATTACHMENT 5
INITIAL OVERVIEW OF PLANNING GRANT SCOPE OF WORK

DWR Plan Standard	Level of Effort/Expense	Comment
Governance	*	Take from RAP. Minor research to identify additional DACs.
Region Description	*	Minor updates for water quantity and quality data. Must include likely climate change impacts. Revisit water-related conflicts.
Objectives	***	Process: vision ⇔ goals ⇔ TAC ⇔ review of other IRWMPs ⇔ review existing (in context of project review criteria) ⇔ draft to TAC review ⇔ PC review ⇔ refine. Identify measurable outcomes for each objective. Prioritize each objective or explain why they are not prioritized.
Resource Management Strategies	***	Complete re-do.
Integration	*	Processes and procedures (information, expertise, knowledge, leverage action) with stakeholders.
Project Review Process	*	Revise and refine process and criteria (review other IRWMP criteria). Add regional, multi-project, multi-stakeholder project development process. Add climate change considerations.
Impact and Benefit	*	Minor revisions to reflect sum total of updates.
Plan Performance and Monitoring	**	Revisit methods, process, and strategy for assessing outcomes of IRWMP implementation on a regional basis.
Data Management	**	Evaluate other IRWMP Data Management Systems. Evaluate existing SWIM data. Develop specific strategy for finishing SWIM database and for developing project-specific databases within CABY.
Finance	**	Evaluate a variety of strategies to fund CABY as well as individual projects. Strategy could include increase are tiered projects to application-ready, broader marketing of projects, and tutorial/capacity-building for project sponsors (especially for qualitative and quantitative benefits).
Technical Analysis	**	Required format will necessitate complete re-do of existing section, as well as addition and expansion of identified regional data sets.

Relation to Local Water Planning	*	See below.
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	*	See below.
Stakeholder Involvement	*	Minimal additional work.
Coordination	*	Minimal additional work.
Climate Change	***	Update WEAP model database to include greater detail for PCWA and NID. Additional required elements are listed below.

LAND USE PLANNING

- Require exchange of knowledge between water and land use managers
- Examine how RWMG and land use managers currently communicate
- Specific measures to improve planning efforts (refer to Water Plan 2009 Water Management Strategies)
- Change relationship from reactive to proactive
- Specific measures and strategies for information exchange on technical issues
- Consider involving land use planners in RWMG
- Create specific relationships between RWMG and local Planning Commissions or Boards of Supervisors
- Specific measures to improve existing relationships (mechanisms for interacting with land use planning community, design and delivery of regional forums, strategy for adherence to Ahwahnee Principles, nexus of land use planners and water managers with respect to plan implementation, and identify specific planning strategies to address identified water issues

CLIMATE CHANGE

- Identify measures for adapting to changes in amount, intensity, timing, quality, and variability of runoff/recharge
- Use California Climate Vulnerability Assessment (CCVA) by sector to determine regional risks (when available)
- Adopt “no regret” adaptations as interim measures prior to available of CCVA
- Consider California Air Resources Board/AB32 Scoping Plan
- Identify specific options for carbon sequestration
- Project-level greenhouse gas evaluations required
- Bottom line:
 - Quantitative tools for vulnerability analysis when available – specific adaptation strategies must be developed in the interim
 - Specific actions for adaptation to effects of climate change – with performance measures
 - Disclose and consider quantitative analysis of new project greenhouse gas emissions

SUMMARY NOTES | May 13, 2010

CABY Coordinating Committee Meeting

ATTENDEES

Andy Fecko, PCWA
Tim Crough, NID
Steve Rothert, American Rivers
Tracey Eden-Bishop, EDCWA
Bill Center, Sierra Nevada Alliance
Carrie Monohan, Sierra Fund
Katie Burdick, CABY
Keri Modrall, CABY

ACTION ITEMS

ANDY FECKO

1. Check with legal staff to determine preference for JPA or CABY non-profit as Prop 84 applicant/contracting entity

CABY Staff

1. Track JPA versus NGO conversations within water agencies and raise the issue for a final decision as soon as possible
2. Contacts with CC members to further climate change discussion

UPCOMING CABY MEETINGS:

- ❖ Western Placer Creeks Work Group meeting on May 21
- ❖ PC meeting on June 10

UPDATES

- Liz Mansfield has retired. It's uncertain who will become EID's CABY representative. CABY staff is having ongoing conversations with Liz to identify a possible representative.
- April Naatz and Tracey Eden-Bishop are both representing EDCWA in CABY for the time being. They will keep the CABY CC updated as to the ongoing status of their agency.
- Allan Eberhart has requested that CABY draft a letter of opposition to the Garden Bar Dam project. This information was presented to the CC and will be raised at the upcoming PC meeting on June 10, 2010.
- Tim Crough and Carrie Monohan provided an update on the Combie Reservoir Mercury Removal Project. Senator Diane Feinstein has listed the project as part of her appropriations request (\$3 million). Ongoing project activities have determined that the mercury removal machine removes 94% of the mercury present in sediment. The U.S. Geological Survey plans to publish this information, and Carrie Monohan will likely be listed as the primary author.

AGENDA ITEM: Prop 84 Preparation

CABY staff has worked with project sponsors throughout the year to develop Round 1 and 2 projects to application-ready status. These projects are now under consideration for inclusion in a Prop 84 implementation grant proposal. Staff ranked the projects and then evaluated them from three key perspectives: disadvantaged community (DAC) status (which is a stated preference of DWR), budget, and applicability to DWR's stated

preference of long-term drought preparedness. Using these criteria, staff developed a list of projects recommended for inclusion in a Prop 84 implementation grant proposal.

This list of projects was presented to the CC and includes: Grizzly Flats Comprehensive Water Conservation Program, Nevada City Comprehensive Water Conservation Program, Washington County Water District Water Conservation Program, Grizzly Flats Reservoir Lining, Leak Detection and Repair in Alta and Colfax, the CABY Region Water Trust, and CABY Region Irrigation Efficiency. The Georgetown Divide Comprehensive Water Conservation Program is also under consideration.

Other projects were developed during the Round 1 and 2 processes; however, if they did not address long-term drought preparedness directly they were taken off the list of consideration for this round of Prop 84 funding.

The overall proposal budget is a key factor in the choice of projects that will be included in a Prop 84 application. A limited amount of funding will be available in the first round (\$8 to \$16 million for the Sacramento River Funding Area), and this will affect which projects, and which project elements are ultimately included in the proposal. Current DWR information suggests that the CABY proposal budget should be no more than \$2 million. It is possible, depending on which IRWMPs in the Sacramento River Funding Area (SRFA) apply for implementation money, that this could go up to \$3 million. In response to this, staff's recommendation excluded some components of the Nevada City project (improvement of the Pine Street distribution system), the Washington County Water District project (the Relief Hill pressure improvement), and the Georgetown Divide project (the replacement of water meters).

Staff has a conference call scheduled for Monday, May 17, with the IRWMP representatives of the SRFA. That conversation will assist staff in determining what the overall proposal budget should be. If fewer IRWMPs plan to apply for implementation funding, then staff will recommend a \$3 million budget. If more IRWMPs plan to apply for funding, then staff will recommend a \$2 million budget.

COMMENTS and QUESTIONS from CC MEMBERS:

1. This process lends itself to a weighting or a priority. Is DAC a higher value than water use efficiency? If so, then WCWD is a no-brainer. Do we get better bang for our buck by putting our eggs in one basket? Is water use efficiency going to reward us with a grant? Or would a DAC focus make the grant more likely? A larger suite [of projects] might water down the strength of our projects. If we put all of our effort on getting Washington this project, that would be a big success. But if that's not what DWR is looking for then we'd be shooting ourselves in the foot.
2. When I look at the scale of bang for the buck, I look at the number of folks that live in Washington, versus Georgetown and Nevada City. From a regional perspective, it's a larger project, but how many people does it benefit? Not that that's a measuring stick, but it should be factor. Looking at this from the state's perspective. If they have leaky pipes it goes right back to the river. If you look at these other projects, it becomes a question of how many people are involved and how much water we're talking about.
3. We need to have a win. That's the bottom line. I think we should look at DWR and what they're looking for.
4. The logic you used to put this together is very sound. It comes up with a good total budget. The package of projects is very strong. As far as deciding which [additional project elements are included], I think we can use a lot of different perspectives (where in the watershed the projects happen, the community's ability to manage a project, etc). A more well-rounded discussion on this would be helpful.
5. You did a great job of establishing criteria. It looks like a strong group of projects. It would be helpful to have an additional discussion once we know more about how much money is available.

If, after the conference call on May 17, staff recommends a \$3 million proposal budget, then an online survey (e.g., Survey Monkey) will be sent to CC members so they can assist staff in the decision. The CC discussed which criteria they might use to determine which project would get the additional \$1 million.

POSSIBLE CRITERIA:

- Benefit to population
- Capacity to handle the project (ability to carry it out? Downside to doing nothing?)? What role would CABY play?
- Efficiency gained/water saved --- quantitative
- Unquantifiable benefits the projects provide (e.g., demonstration projects that could educate the public?)
- What the past behavior of the sponsor is re: water conservation (e.g., pricing structures, water conservation activities, etc). Reward behavior moving in the “right direction”, rather than the “wrong direction.”
- Level of participation in CABY (Washington and Georgetown are long-term participants; Nevada City isn't)

OUTCOME:

- Staff's project recommendations were confirmed by the CC.
- After Monday, if the available budget is \$3 million, then staff will send project information and other requested info (i.e., benefits information—water saved, people served) to the CC so they can assist staff in making the decision about which project will should receive the additional \$1 million.

AGENDA ITEM: NGO vs. JPA

NID will not act as the fiscal agent for this grant as they did for Prop 50. As a result, CABY needs to decide whether the applicant will be the CABY non-profit or a JPA. Most of the projects included in the implementation grant proposal will be water agency projects. The Fiscal Oversight Committee has communicated their preference for a JPA; however, the non-profit has been established and a JPA has not. This conversation will continue and a decision will be made as soon as possible.

SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS RAISED:

- The JPA could be set up as a result of getting a grant award.
- The agencies form JPA's often. It does come with “some pain (i.e., cost and confusion).”
- Elected officials will likely think a JPA would be a “collar around the agency's neck.”
- If the NGO is the applicant, then the contracting entity would have to be the NGO.
- One of the initial motivations for the JPA was CEQA and that's not a question with these projects.

AGENDA ITEM: Planning Grant Scope

Staff has reviewed the DWR planning grant guidelines extensively and prepared a summary of what will be required to update the CABY IRWMP. Many elements that will be required for a Plan update are minor and will not require an intensive work effort. Staff recommends that CABY undertake these updates as part of the regular activities this fall. These updates could be used as match contribution.

Some elements of the Plan update will be time intensive or require technical assistance outside of the CABY membership. Staff recommends that these items be included in a planning grant application. They are: data management, finance, objectives, Resource Management Strategies, and climate change.

An important element of the planning grant scope that staff recommended is the hiring of a new staff position. This person would act as the non-profit's contract manager and would handle most of the CABY activities that current staff is responsible for (e.g., PC and CC meetings, governance, contract administration, etc). This new NGO contract manager, or program manager, would oversee contract implementation. In this scenario, current

staff would remain consultants to CABY but would focus on project development. The CC tentatively approved this concept.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE CHANGE DISCUSSION:

- The CABY proposal will include the expansion of the WEAP model. David Purkey has estimated \$50,000 for this. CABY will likely ask for planning money to figure out as a group what to do with the WEAP information. The grant will explain why we think it's a good idea and what we think we would do with it. But we will ask for money to make these things happen and work adaptively to use WEAP effectively.
- Agency value: Searching for a common baseline to use across watersheds. Agencies all have good hydrology models. We need a baseline for climate change. This would help with new regulations and CEQA.
- Possible starting point: Circulate an updated version of the project's purpose. Does it capture enough common ground? Currently stated purpose is to better understand the impacts of climate change on hydro facilities and infrastructure as well as impacts on the river and river resources and ways to protect both with the model as a tool.
- If the purpose was kept more general it would engender common ground through the PC, and this would expand the proposal. Start more general and let the PC members identify interests that they'd like to achieve.

OUTCOME:

- Katie Burdick will call Steve Rotherth to discuss the current scope of the Heat is On project.
- The outcome of this conversation will be sent to all CC members.
- Katie will then call all CC members and gather information on their interests regarding the WEAP model and climate change in the IRWMP.
- Staff will then create a matrix to present this information that will be sent out to all CC members by June 1.
- Staff and CC members will have a conference call at 11 a.m. on June 4 to discuss the outcome of this effort.
- The information will be presented to the PC on June 10.

AGENDA ITEM: Prop 84 Planning Grant Proposal Development Schedule

The planning grant proposal is due to DWR on August 10, 2010. Staff is aiming to deliver the application to DWR by August 1. Staff requested that CC members act as peer reviewers for the planning grant proposal.

OUTCOME:

- Staff will send a review draft of the planning grant proposal to the CC on June 21.
- Anything "heartburn-ish" will be sent out in advance of this.
- The focus of the July 8 CC meeting will be to review the planning grant proposal.

AGENDA ITEM: 2010 Budget and 2011 Carryover

Staff worked with the Fiscal Oversight Committee to develop the 2010 budget. This budget was reduced and certain line items were restricted to a Prop 84 proposal work effort. Staff will use these restricted funds to develop Prop 84 proposals for planning and implementation. This will not affect the carryover. Staff is confident that if CABY is awarded Prop 84 planning implementation funds that, along with the existing carryover, will fund the organization for three more years.