



**North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP)  
Policy Review Panel (PRP) & Technical Peer Review Committee (TPRC) Meeting  
June 13, 2014; 3 pm; Conference Call  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**Conference call-in number: 1-888-947-3988; Conference code: 371890**

**Meeting Materials:** <http://www.northcoastirwmp.net/Content/10447/preview.html>

**I Welcome and Introductions**

PRP Chair, Jake Mackenzie convened the meeting at 3:05 pm and welcomed all participants. Meeting participant introductions were made by noticed location (location addresses – Attachment A).

Attendees:

PRP:

- Del Norte: Supervisors Gerry Hemmingsen & David Finnegan
- Humboldt: Supervisors Ryan Sundberg & Mark Lovelace
- Mendocino: Supervisors John McGowan & Dan Gjerde
- Sherwood Valley Rancheria: Carol Cook
- Siskiyou: Supervisors Grace Bennet & Marcia Armstrong
- Sonoma: Jake Mackenzie & Supervisor Efren Carrillo
- Trinity: Supervisor Judy Morris & Mark Lancaster (alternate)

TPRC:

- Sherwood Valley: Javier Silva, Sherwood Valley Rancheria
- Sonoma: Wayne Haydon, California Geologic Survey & Dale Roberts, Sonoma County Water Agency
- Trinity: Sandra Perez, Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program

Public:

- Del Norte: Eric Wier, Tom Romesburg of Crescent City
- Humboldt: Bill Verick, Westhaven Community Services
- Mendocino: Tim Erickson, Kevin Jones of City of Ukiah; Laurel Marcus, CLSI
- Sherwood Valley: Joy Wildflower, California Department of Public Health
- Siskiyou: None
- Trinity: None

Staff:

- Humboldt: Jennifer Jenkins Kuszmar
- Sonoma: Katherine Gledhill

Public - Other Locations:

- Nicole Sager, Klamath Tribal office
- Tasha McKee, Sanctuary Forest
- Tom Vargas, City of Fort Bragg
- Steve Shupe – Sonoma County Counsel

Chair Mackenzie introduced the topic and purpose of the meeting and provided background information. In 2006 Proposition 84 allocated \$37 M to the North Coast; \$19.7 M is currently remaining in the allocation. During the April NCRP meeting in Yreka, the PRP unanimously approved the motion that directed staff to move forward with a NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation with a funding cap of \$8.7 M. If funded, this would leave \$11 M for the final round of Proposition 84 funding. In addition, the PRP approved that the NCRP 2014 Drought Solicitation grant would be considered phase one of two funding phases to ensure regional representation in project selection for the remaining Proposition 84 Implementation funding. During the final 2015 Proposition 84 Implementation Funding round, project selection will take into account the location of the NCRP 2014 Drought Projects, if funded.

Supervisor McCowen requested clarification whether geographic equity was to be considered during the expedited drought funding. Chair Mackenzie confirmed that regional representation was not a consideration during this round of funding and that decisions made today will influence the final round of Proposition 84 funding and project selection process. Supervisor McCowen stated that the projects were to be reviewed on merit during the drought round of funding.

Chair Mackenzie continued to provide background information and described that on May 26, 2014 the NCRP received 23 Drought Project Proposals in response to a NCRP 2014 Drought Project Solicitation that was announced in late April. The project cost of the project proposals totaled \$26.5 M and the total request of IRWM funds was \$19.6 M. The TPRC received this information which consisted of over 1200 pages (3" binder) and thoroughly reviewed this material in a 2 week period. The TPRC consists of qualified and dedicated individuals with wide-ranging and relevant expertise. The TPRC evaluated the project proposals according to the NCRP Project Review and Selection Process Guidelines which were developed by the TPRC and Project Review Ad Hoc Committee which consisted of Supervisor McCowen, Toz Soto, Sandra Perez and Wayne Haydon. The Guidelines have been updated and refined by stakeholder, TPRC and Project Review Ad Hoc Committee interviews and input and approved by the PRP in April 2012 & April 2014.

Chair Mackenzie explained that the purpose of the meeting is for the NCRP Policy Review Panel to consider, amend and finalize the Priority Drought Projects for inclusion in the North Coast 2014 IRWM Drought Project grant application due to California Department of Water Resources on July 21, 2014.

## **II. Review and Approve Agenda**

Chair Mackenzie requests approval of the agenda. No comments.

**Motion:** Supervisor Sundberg

**Second:** Supervisor Lovelace

**Decision:** *Unanimous*

## **III Public Comment for items not on the agenda**

No Public Comment

## **IV NCRP Proposition 84, 2014 Drought Grant Priority Project Selection**

Chair Mackenzie introduced TPRC Co-chairs, Wayne Haydon and Sandra Perez.

Co-chairs, Wayne Haydon described that on June 9 & 10, 2014 the NCRP TPRC met to review the project proposals and select a recommended portfolio of Priority Drought Projects. Seven TPRC members were in attendance with 2 participating via conference call. The meeting was a public meeting and 15 members of the public participated representing 11 proposed projects. At the request of TPRC members, staff provided input provided by California Department of Public Health and Indian Health Services regarding the proposed projects standing on their 'critical' and 'vulnerable' lists based on drought risk assessments. The Guidelines processes were reviewed by the TPRC members during a project proposal review preparation meeting prior to their proposal review on May 2 and again at the beginning of the TPRC Project Review meeting on June 9. The Guidelines were strictly adhered to.

Wayne Haydon described the review process per the Guidelines. Staff compiled all TPRC individual scores received by the due date to determine an initial average project score. He explained that this preliminary score is meant as a gut check and only included the TPRC scores received by the specified due date. TPRC members and staff met to discuss each project. If the TPRC had questions regarding a project, staff relayed these questions to the project proponent and project-level clarification was provided to the TPRC by NCRP staff. TPRC made adjustments to their individual scores based on the group discussion. Staff compiled all updated TPRC individual scores including scores from TPRC members that provided scores later than that specified due date to determine an updated average project score. The TPRC reviewed the new average scores and determined that many of the lower scored projects (those that scored less than 50) were less competitive under the Drought Expedited Funding Guidelines.

Wayne Haydon stated that the TPRC thoroughly deliberated and selected a draft suite of NCRP Priority Projects and draft budget amounts. The selection process is not based solely on project scores and Wayne quoted from the NCRP Guidelines:

*"The selection will be based on technical project scores, project scalability and potential funding allowance, as well as the overall balance of projects based on the PRP's defined guidelines for project selection and the collective ability of the projects to meet NCRP goals and be competitive for the funding opportunity."*

Wayne Haydon introduced the TPRC Recommendation for 2014 Drought Priority Projects (see Attachment B).

- The TPRC has consensus on recommending funding \$6,039,720 for the listed Priority Projects of the available funding: \$8.7 M – 5% admin cost = \$8,265,000. The TPRC could not come to consensus on the remaining \$2,225,280 for a variety of reasons. Present the TPRC recommendation table.
- The next highly ranked projects exceeded the remaining amount of funds available
- The TPRC felt that many of the lower scored projects (scored less than 50) were less competitive under the Drought Expedited Funding Guidelines

The PRP discussed the TPRC recommendation and the funding cap of \$8.7 M. Wayne Haydon explained that the \$8.7 M includes the 5% contract administration for Humboldt County leaving \$8,265,000 for project implementation funding. Wayne also explained that project proponents were formally asked in the application if their project was scalable. If a project budget was not flexible the TPRC was left to either accept the presented budget or not. Wayne also explained that as this is a state-wide competition it was important to the TPRC to include the most competitive drought-related projects into the recommended portfolio at risk of lowering the over-all regional application.

Supervisor Armstrong asked about what outreach was conducted regarding the Newell project, not recommended for funding. Wayne explained that the project proponent sent a letter to the TPRC during the review meeting to request revising their entire proposal. TPRC felt that the new proposal could not be accepted at the time that it was presented.

Supervisor Gjerde stated that he had attended the TPRC meeting and listened to the deliberations throughout. Many excellent questions and points were made. It was clear that there were projects that were very strong. Unfortunately there were time constraints in the deliberation process.

**Motion:** Supervisor Lovelace – to approve the slate as recommended by the TPRC and secondly consider augmenting individual applications up to the \$8.7 M limit.

**Second:** Supervisor Morris: 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Public Comment on the motion:**

- Tom Vargas, City of Fort Bragg appreciates ability and consideration to allocate the remaining \$2.2 million.
- Eric Wier, Crescent City restated Tom's comments for consideration of funding additional process. Commended the TPRC on their efforts and the responsibility that they have. Crescent City project doesn't necessarily address drought as the first consideration, but water reliability is a DWR eligibility criteria. The elevated tank is a critical component of the Crescent City system serving 15,000 people. This project meets the intent of this grant.

**Discussion:**

Supervisor Mc Cowan introduced a proposed listing of projects that Supervisor Gjerde emailed to the PRP and TPRC prior to the meeting. He explained that Gjerde prepared an alternative portfolio that result in funding all of the projects from the TPRC recommendation minus one project in Mendocino County. The proposal deducts some funding to 2 Mendocino projects but adds to 2 additional Mendocino projects, as well as funds the Crescent City project, and increases funding to the Westhaven and Sonoma County Water Agency project. Supervisor Gjerde's proposal takes a global approach and funds more projects over a broader geographical area. The proposal would also provide funding to the California Land Stewardship Institute project which involves a recycled water project which if funded, would reduce 200 AF from withdrawal from the Russian River. The City of Ukiah project representatives are in support of Supervisor Gjerde's proposal.

Supervisor Lovelace described that the purpose of the motion was to move forward with a baseline. Given that the projects that would be adjusted are primarily located in Mendocino, defers to the Mendocino PRP members. Supervisor Lovelace withdrew his motion. Supervisor Morris rescinded her motion. Steve Shupe, Sonoma County Counsel confirmed that the motion was dead.

Supervisor Armstrong expressed support for the TPRC's efforts and recommendation.

**Motion:** Supervisor Armstrong – to approve the slate as recommended by TPRC

**Second:** Supervisor Bennett

**Decision by roll call:**

**Approved:** Chair, Mackenzie, Supervisor Morris, Carol Cook, Supervisor Armstrong, Supervisor Bennett

**Opposed:** Supervisor Hemmingsen, Supervisor Finigan, Supervisor Sundberg, Supervisor Lovelace, Supervisor McCowen, Supervisor Gjerde, Supervisor Carrillo, Mark Lancaster

**Motion fails.**

A new motion is made by Supervisor McCowen.

**Motion:** Supervisor McCowen – to fund the following projects and funding amounts:

- Yurok Tribe, Weitchpec Water Station: \$201,770, as recommended
- City of Rio Dell, Rio Dell and Scotia CSD Emergency Water Intertie: \$783,000, as recommended
- Lewiston Park Mutual Water Company, Meter Installation: \$224,604, as recommended
- Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Flow Program: \$255,200, as recommended
- Gualala River Watershed Council, the Flow Bank Program: \$594,226, as recommended
- Westhaven Community Services, Water Loss Reduction Project: \$493,500, adding \$118,000
- Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma-Mendocino Immediate Drought Relief: \$1,050,000, adding \$300,000
- City of Crescent City, Elevated Water Tank Rehabilitation: \$438,000 [100% requested], adding \$438,000

- Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Implementing On-Farm Water Conservation Strategies in the Navarro Watershed: 0%, *deducting \$144,171*
- City of Ukiah, Ukiah Valley-Redwood Valley Water Supply Reliability Intertie and Well Development Project: \$1,554,450 (\$836,000 – 100% -- for interties), *deducting \$1,156,800 from wells*
- California Land Stewardship Institute, Agricultural Water Conservation and Water Supply Reliability Program: \$1,970,251, adding \$1,970,251
- City of Fort Bragg, Summers Lane Reservoir Project: \$700,000, adding \$700,000

**Second:** Supervisor Gjerde

**Public Comment on the motion:**

Tim Ericson, City of Ukiah recommends the motion.

**Decision by roll call:**

**Approved:** Chair Mackenzie, Supervisor Morris, Supervisor Hemmingsen, Supervisor Finigan, Supervisor Sundberg, Supervisor Lovelace, Supervisor McCowen, Supervisor Gjerde, Supervisor Carrillo

**Opposed:** Carol Cook, Supervisor Armstrong, Supervisor Bennett, Mark Lancaster

**Decision Approved.**

**Public Comment:**

Tom Vargas, Fort Bragg thanked the committee.

Eric Wier, Crescent City thanked the committee and stated it was a good use of funding.

Bill Verick, Westhaven Community Services thanked the committees for their attention to this matter.

Chair Mackenzie reminded everyone that the next NCRP meeting date was October 16 in Eureka. The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

## **Attachment A**

### **Conference call locations:**

Del Norte County Administration Building  
Multi Purpose Room  
981 H Street, Suite 130  
Crescent City, CA 95531

Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District  
828 Seventh Street  
Eureka, CA 95501

Mendocino County Administration Building  
Board of Supervisors Conference Room A  
501 Low Gap Road  
Ukiah, CA 95482

Sherwood Valley Rancheria Tribal Office  
190 Sherwood Hill Drive  
Willits, CA 95490

Siskiyou County Administration Office  
Conference Room  
1312 Fairlane Road,  
Yreka, CA 96097

Sonoma County Water Agency  
Redwood Room  
404 Aviation Blvd.  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Trinity County Board of Supervisor Office  
11 Court Street, Room 224  
Weaverville, CA 96093

## Attachment B

### TPRC RECOMMENDATION:

- The TPRC has consensus on \$6,039,720 for funding the projects below (see projects below)
- The TPRC felt that many of the lower scored projects (those that scored less than 50) were less competitive under the Drought Expedited Funding Guidelines
- The next highly ranked projects exceeded the remaining amount of funds available

### North Coast Resource Partnership Technical Peer Review Committee Recommended 2014 Drought Priority Projects

#	Organization Name, Project Name	County / Tribal Land	Total Cost	Match	IRWM Funding Request	TPRC Recommended Funding	AVG SCORE
12	Yurok Tribe, Weitchpec Water Station	Yurok	\$294,576	\$92,806	\$201,770	\$201,770	62.7
1	City of Rio Dell, Rio Dell and Scotia CSD Emergency Water Intertie	Humboldt	\$913,449	\$0	\$913,449	\$783,000	58.3
2	City of Ukiah, Ukiah Valley-Redwood Valley Water Supply Reliability Intertie and Well Development Project	Mendocino	\$4,820,000	\$1,205,000	\$3,615,000	\$2,711,250	56.8
5	Lewiston Park Mututal Water Company, Meter Installation	Trinity	\$224,604	\$0	\$224,604	\$224,604	56.1
13	Westhaven Community Services District, Westhaven Community Services District Water Loss Reduction Project	Humboldt	\$605,500	\$112,000	\$493,500	\$375,500	55.8
9	Sanctuary Forest Inc., Mattole Flow Program: Storage and Forbearance	Humboldt	\$693,993	\$438,793	\$255,200	\$255,200	55.5
8	Gualala River Watershed Council, The Flow Bank - Protecting Stream Flow in the Gualala River	Mendocino, Sonoma	\$1,052,032	\$259,731	\$792,301	\$594,226	53.7
16	Mendocino County Resource Conservation District, Implementing On-Farm Water Conservation Strategies in the Navarro watershed to Address Critical Low Flows	Mendocino	\$266,374	\$80,155	\$192,219	\$144,171	53.6
4	Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma-Mendocino Immediate Drought Relief Project	Mendocino, Sonoma	\$2,000,000	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	\$750,000	51.2
			<b>\$26,503,309</b>	<b>\$7,352,761</b>	<b>\$17,346,620</b>	<b>\$6,039,720</b>	



